

State University of New York College at Buffalo - Buffalo State College Digital Commons at Buffalo State

History Theses

History and Social Studies Education

12-2017

“I am the Handmaid of the Lord”: The Spiritual Development of Mary Ward Amidst English Catholic Clerical Crisis, 1585 – 1630

Alyson Borowczyk

State University of New York College at Buffalo - Buffalo State College, franklak01@mail.buffalostate.edu

Advisor

Dr. Andrew Nicholls

First Reader

Dr. Andrew Nicholls

Second Reader

Dr. Martin Ederer

Department Chair

Andrew D. Nicholls, Ph.D. Professor and Chair

To learn more about the History and Social Studies Education Department and its educational programs, research, and resources, go to <http://history.buffalostate.edu>.

Recommended Citation

Borowczyk, Alyson, ““I am the Handmaid of the Lord”: The Spiritual Development of Mary Ward Amidst English Catholic Clerical Crisis, 1585 – 1630” (2017). *History Theses*. 43.

http://digitalcommons.buffalostate.edu/history_theses/43

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.buffalostate.edu/history_theses



Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), and the [Women's History Commons](#)

ABSTRACT

In late Tudor and Stuart England, exercising one's Catholic beliefs could potentially lead to a martyr's reward. Since the practice of Catholicism was clandestine, homes became parishes within themselves, with the woman of the house serving as pastoral administrator. She was charged with taking care of the priests she was illegally harboring, and she was also responsible for educating the young in the ways of the Faith to ensure it did not die with her generation. These were indeed subversive acts, because she defied the State and its laws. Mary Ward, foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the first self-governing unenclosed order of female religious, was born into Elizabeth's England in 1585, and experienced this subversive activity through the way the Catholic recusant women in her life managed their homes. She also experienced a much different Church than her Catholic brethren on the Continent had; the Catholic Church in England had little structure, with secular priests and Jesuits fighting for the souls of England's faithful. Her lack of understanding of the Church's hierarchal structure and chain of command, coupled with her increasingly independent approach to spiritual discernment, resulted in her Institute's suppression by Pope Urban VIII in 1630. Though modern journalists may portray her as one of the Church's first feminists, Ward did not create the Institute because she desired more power for women in the Church. Rather, like her foremothers, she desired that God's will to preserve the Catholic faith in England be done through her.

State University of New York
College at Buffalo
Department of History and Social Studies Education

“I am the Handmaid of the Lord”: The Spiritual Development of Mary Ward Amidst
English Catholic Clerical Crisis, 1585 – 1630

A Thesis in
History

by
Alyson K. Borowczyk

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts
December 2017

Approved by:

Andrew D. Nicholls, Ph.D.
Chair and Professor of History
Chairperson of the Committee/Thesis Adviser

Kevin J. Miller, Ed.D.
Dean of the Graduate School

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	4
Historiography	
CHAPTER II: THE FIRST GREAT DECISION - ENTRANCE INTO RELIGIOUS LIFE	22
Key Spiritual Influences	
<i>The Spiritual Combat</i>	
Reaction to Perceived Resistance to Her Personal Discernment	
CHAPTER III: THE SECOND GREAT DECISION - CREATION OF THE INSTITUTE	33
Early Vocation as a Poor Clare in St. Omer	
Departure from the Walloon Poor Clares	
Foundation of the English Poor Clares at Gravelines	
Return to England and Early Visions and Foundations of the Institute	
CHAPTER IV: THE THIRD GREAT DECISION - REEXAMINING PRIESTLY SPIRITUAL DIRECTION	41
The St. Omer Conferences	
The Archpriest Controversy and its Effects upon the Institute	
Fr. Roger Lee: A Deterioration of Trust	
Fr. John Gerard: A Growing Spiritual Independence	
CHAPTER V: THE FINAL GREAT DECISION - DEFYING CHURCH AUTHORITY TO SAVE THE INSTITUTE	61
Ward's Plea Before the Cardinals in Rome	
Winifred Wigmore's Campaign of Defiance	
Official Suppression: The Pope Settles the Matter	
CHAPTER VI: CONCLUSION	70
BIBLIOGRAPHY	74

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Though the 1559 Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity firmly cemented the Church of England as the country's official religious institution with Elizabeth I as its "Supreme Governor", Catholicism did not simply disappear in post-Reformation England. In fact, several English counties, especially in the North Country, were home to a significant number of Catholic recusants.¹ Catholic recusants were unlike their brethren the "church papists" because they refused to outwardly conform by attending the compulsory Anglican Church services. Though records were kept and fines were issued as a result of recusant behavior prior to 1570, Catholics were unaware of the extent of penal legislation that would target them following the turn of the decade. After Pope Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth and therefore effectively released her Catholic subjects from any allegiance to her via his 1570 papal bull, *Regnans in Excelsis*, the Elizabethan regime took a hardline legislative approach to the perceived Catholic threat. Catholic priests needed to shroud themselves in secrecy to avoid government suspicion. Catholic laymen faced steep financial penalties for nonconformity, and their ability to hold public office would be put in jeopardy if any "papist" behavior was identified. Both Catholic priests and Catholic laymen relied upon Catholic women to keep their faith, their families, and themselves alive. Recusant women performed subversive acts that their male counterparts could not, like "maintaining the liturgical rhythms of the Catholic calendar... catechising the young, patronising devotional literature, preserving relics, [and] championing home-grown 'martyrs'," because they maintained their homes, which they transformed into their own clandestine parishes.²

Several Catholic recusant women are known to us from the annals of history, though most preferred a private life to being active agents for their faith outside the home. Those of whom

we are aware of have been made known to us through their open persecution by the English government. These women, some of them martyrs for their faith, most of them prisoners for some time in their lives, defied the existing patriarchal structures of both the State and the home not out of some perceived want, but instead out of some desperate need. Though their Protestant contemporaries portrayed these women at their best as witless betrayers of virtue, and at their worst as whorish enchantresses who lured unsuspecting Englishmen to the darkness of the heretical faith, these women were often just ordinary English wives and mothers or religious sisters who desired to keep what they believed to be the "One True Faith" in existence for the next generation.³ According to Robert Southwell, a prominent Jesuit in the English mission, "The work of God...is being pressed forward, often enough by delicate women who have taken on the courage of men."⁴ Though recusant women indeed defied the State's authority and even, in some cases, the authority of their husbands or priestly superiors, they did not do so as adherents to a perceived early modern brand of the feminist ideology. Rather, they modeled themselves after the Blessed Virgin Mary as "handmaids of the Lord," mere servants of their almighty God, ready to sacrifice everything so that His will be done.⁵

Mary Ward - the English foundress of the first self-governing unenclosed order of women religious in the Catholic Church, the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary (now with a second branch known as the Congregation of Jesus) - was of no exception to this worldview. It is certainly true that through the nature of Mary's religious proclivities she was provided an opportunity to exhibit subversive agency against the State. However, she also unintentionally grew to be known as a subversive agent within the very church she dedicated her life to serve. The Catholic Church had all but erased Ward from its history after the suppression of her Institute in 1630. Though her Institute received official papal approval from Pope Pius IX in

1877, Ward was not permitted to be recognized as its foundress until a decree was issued by Pope Pius X in 1909.⁶ Given the recent breadth of literature written about her life by the sisters of her order, due in part to the release of documents from the time period that were previously inaccessible, the modern Catholic Church views Ward in a much more positive light. In fact, Pope Benedict XVI declared Ward a Venerable in 2009, beginning her path to sainthood.

A plethora of primary sources are available about the life of Mary Ward. However, up until 2007, they were “previously available only in manuscript, or in extracts quoted in later biographies.”⁷ In 2007, all of the source texts were published in their original languages in Germany under the title, *Mary Ward und ihre Gründung. Die Quellentexte bis 1645 (Mary Ward and her Foundation: The Source Texts until 1645)* edited by Ursula Dirmeier.⁸ Since the introduction and notes of this series are in German, a resource for English-speaking researchers was not yet available. In 2008, an entirely English volume of select Mary Ward source texts was published as *A Briefe Relation...with Autobiographical Segments and a Selection of Letters*.⁹ Christina Kenworthy-Browne CJ, a sister in one of the two modern-day branches Mary Ward's order, the Congregation of Jesus, serves as the editor of this volume. At the time of its publication, Kenworthy-Browne was the principal librarian for the Bar Convent in York. The Bar Convent, founded in 1686 by Frances Bedingfield, is viewed by the Congregation of Jesus as the answer to one of their foundresses' final prayers: that "a considerable summe of money" be somehow endowed to the Institute by God in order to begin a school or foundation in England.¹⁰

Two of the primary sources that this study relies heavily upon are found within Kenworthy-Browne's compilation. The first is the earliest biography of Mary Ward, titled by its author as *The Briefe Relation*; it is also known by the title *The English Vita* in order to distinguish between the English language manuscript and the Italian language manuscript, aptly

referred to as *The Italian Vita*.¹¹ (To maintain clarity in citations, the biography will be referred to in this study as *The English Vita*.) *The English Vita* was written between 1645 and 1650 by a companion of Mary Ward, Mary Poyntz.¹² The work was under disputed authorship for some time, with many scholars insisting it was the work of Poyntz and another companion of Mary Ward's, Winifred Wigmore. The matter appeared to be put to rest in the 19th century, when Sr. M Thecla of the Convent of the Institute at Bamberg informed Canon Lawrence Toole, an "ardent admirer of Mary Ward," who was studying the Manchester manuscript of *The English Vita*, that sole authorship should be attributed to Mary Poyntz.¹³ According to Thecla, Winifred Wigmore was known for her beautiful handwriting, and was therefore chosen to act as scribe for Poyntz.¹⁴ However, it seems highly likely that Wigmore, who was a companion of Mary's before the younger Poyntz joined the Institute, provided some context and content for Poyntz's work.

Mary Ward's autobiography is another primary source upon which this study is based.¹⁵ Ward did not write a cohesive autobiography, but instead wrote several fragmented manuscripts over the course of a ten year span, from 1617 to 1627.¹⁶ Kenworthy-Browne posits that in addition to Ward focusing on the various other pursuits that begged her attention during this time, "writing about herself was evidently distasteful to [Mary]. This is clear from the numerous deletions, overwriting, and other corrections seen in the original manuscripts".¹⁷ It is obvious through Ward's writings that she was reluctant to partake in this work, and only did so because she "was commanded 3 or four years since by my confessor father Roger Lee of the holy Society of Jesus, unto whom I had on my part vowed obedience."¹⁸ Kenworthy-Browne is able to provide the reader with excellent notes that clarify Ward's writing, due in part to the evidence provided by the unique painted images of Ward's life commissioned by her sisters to enshrine

their foundress' legacy known as *The Painted Life*. This compilation provides the reader with several pieces from *The Painted Life*, which have illuminated studies of Ward by providing additional information regarding Ward's companions and certain pivotal events.

Discrepancies exist between how Mary Ward is portrayed by Mary Poyntz in *The English Vita* and how Ward describes herself in the autobiographical fragments. As is to be expected, Ward is idealized in *The English Vita*, and "each decision and action is defended, even when it was clear that mistakes had been made."¹⁹ Though *The English Vita* is undoubtedly hagiography, it differs from works like Fr. John Mush's *Life of Margaret Clitherow* in its audience and intention. While it can easily be argued that Mush embarked on his *Life* with the intention of furthering his friend's cause for sainthood, which indeed he did, Poyntz was likely under no illusion that her holy Mother Mary Ward would ever be canonized, given the suppression of her Institute by the Holy Father in 1630. However, a work that idealized her dear foundress could still serve several valuable purposes. According to Kenworthy-Browne, *The English Vita* "was written to strengthen the fidelity of the companions who, like their foundress, had never lost hope that the Church would one day approve their plans."²⁰ It would also "enabl[e] Mary's followers to keep in their minds and hearts their great foundress and leader, faithful till death to the call she had received from God."²¹ To these ends, it seems obvious that Poyntz was successful; "the original manuscript version and the translations made from it were widely circulated among the members of Mary Ward's institute."²²

Ward's autobiographical fragments are much more candid, "reveal[ing] a woman whose holiness developed slowly, conscious of her own sinfulness, no different from other human beings in weaknesses, errors, and failures."²³ This is not much different than other more popularized autobiographies of religious individuals of the time period, which prized humility,

self-denial, and even self-deprecation above self-aggrandizement.²⁴ However, in her honesty about the sins of her youth and her slow yet steady progression in the spiritual life, Ward becomes accessible, and her words make her more credible to the modern reader, who may be prone to skepticism of religious figures.

In order to avoid an unfortunate tendency to impart modern concerns upon figures of a foregone era, it should be noted that accessibility, even credibility, were of no obvious concern to Mary in this venture. She pledges her purpose and intent several times throughout her various autobiographical manuscripts. She begins the first manuscript in her series of autobiographical fragments with an expression of intent:

I beseech all thos (even for our lords love) that shall read these my falts [faults], and the goodness of god towards me, notwithstanding my unworthynes...that the readers of thes [this] would endeavour thence forward, to become lovers of truth and workers of justis...I intreat all my frinds to converse [converse] much with such and would to god I had ability in anie thing to further thes to heaven, our lorde will not denye me to doe something for them...²⁵

In this excerpt, Mary expresses what she hopes the reader gains from her story. It appears as though her intended audience for this work are those close to her, especially the sisters in her order, as she urges her friends to converse about the manuscript. Given Mary's frequently expressed humility, it is likely that she did not conceive of this work to go far beyond those of her order. It is also clear that she hopes that, through reading of God's many graces in her life – of which she deems herself unworthy – the reader will grow in love for the Catholic faith (which is what she would have meant by the word "truth"). She then expresses her desire for them to work for justice. Given the fact that this manuscript was written in 1617, a time of optimism for her young Institute, Mary is likely speaking of the evangelization of England and the protection of the country's Catholics. Lastly, she implores those who read this – her friends – to converse about her story, with the hope that it will somehow further their journey towards heaven, as God

would not will it to the contrary. In this statement of purpose, Ward reveals that her ultimate aim in writing this autobiography is the spiritual benefit of those in her Institute.

Mary does make it apparent, however, that she does not seek to sacrifice truth to attain her desired end. In *Autobiographical Fragment 3*, she states: "Though knowest oh Lord my hart, and that I doe this by commandment; and that my only care ys [is] to tell true, and to sett down all that I can call to remembrance good, and badd."²⁶ It quickly becomes apparent to the reader that Ward is prepared to uphold her promise. In *Autobiographical Fragment 1*, Mary describes how she partook in several acts that would be deemed sinful in the Catholic Church while living with her grandparents:

In this five years my fortune was asked, and tould severall tims, once or twice I think I procured yt [it], at the least as I remember I was glad to hear yt, and according to my capacity beleevd what was sayd. I was intended and ded till I got myself seized with hunger to fast sant Agnes fast...I thinke I once procured that unlawfull practis of sive, and sheers to be done excercised, and help [hope] to doo yt my self, for the finding of a triffle of mine that was lost...²⁷

In this excerpt, Ward confesses to the reader that she visited a fortune teller, neglected to fast when prescribed to do so, and engaged in a practice of the black arts called sieve and shears.²⁸ The candid way in which she describes the sins she committed in her adolescence is of stark contrast to her spotless portrayal by Mary Poyntz in *The English Vita*:

Her very childish years were not onely exempt from displeasing actions which commonly accompany those Years, but adorned with such graces as rendered her amiable and agreeable to all, never gave offence...²⁹

Though it is possible that Poyntz was not aware of the nefarious practices Ward sometimes engaged in during her youth, it is unlikely. Poyntz, being a leading figure in Ward's then-laicized order, would have likely been in possession of Mary Ward's autobiographical fragments. Poyntz appears then to have made a blatant attempt to expunge any record of these sins from her account of Ward's life, preferring instead that the members of the Institute perceive their late Holy Mother as being a "blessed Child," free of blemish in her youth.³⁰ There may also have been a practical reason why Poyntz omitted Ward's experiences with superstitious and magical practices

from *The English Vita*. In 1617, when Ward wrote *Autobiographical Fragment 1* in which her experimenting with clandestine metaphysical practices is described (and the only one in which it is present), her infantile Institute seemed to be gaining traction and support. Ward, perhaps naively, presented her sins with no thought as to how they could come to be interpreted in the future; she has truth as her singular focus in this moment. Mary Poyntz, writing in the late 1640s after the downfall of the Institute and the death of its foundress, understood the delicate situation in which she and her sisters found themselves, both in the eyes of their English brethren and the eyes of the Church. As Frances Dolan explains in *Whores of Babylon*, Anglican print culture of seventeenth-century England was not kind to Catholic women in many ways.³¹ One common tactic used to defame them was to accuse them of being witches who exercise the black arts to ensnare good Englishmen in their web of errors. English opinion aside, of more pertinent concern in this case is the Catholic Church's outright condemnation of any superstitious or magical practices. Shielding Ward's reputation from such a severe blow would have been of the utmost importance to Mary Poyntz, lest the blemish of Ward's past rub off on the vestiges of her forsaken Institute as it struggled for survival.

Though Ward's earnest expression of her past sins is important to note (especially in contrast to the way she is portrayed during her childhood and adolescence in *The English Vita*) what is more interesting to consider is the manner in which she articulates her sins. Ward does not simply inform the reader of the sin; she addresses specific details that a priest would use to determine the moral culpability of an individual in confession. First, in each sinful instance, she expresses whether or not she procured, or sought to perform, the sinful action. When she describes that "her fortune was asked and tould severall times," she makes the distinction that though her fortune may have been read several times, she only *sought* to have her fortune read

"once or twice."³² Ward does this on purpose, because this detail is crucial in determining the level of culpability an individual has when he or she sins. Mortal sins are the most severe sins that a Catholic can commit, because they result in complete separation from God. If one dies without repentance of mortal sin, the Catholic Church teaches that the individual's soul is in danger of eternal damnation, which is why a faithful Catholic like Ward would view the sacrament of confession as of the utmost importance. Mortal sin is committed if three conditions are met: the sin is of grave matter, or a serious offense against God; deliberate consent was given, meaning the individual was not coerced into committing the sin by a third party; and the individual had full knowledge of the immoral nature of his or her action. If she merely submitted to having her fortune read, a priest may deduce that her moral culpability is less than if she had proactively sought out the fortune teller for the sinful purpose of having her fortune read. In the former instance, the sin may not be mortal because she could have been encouraged by a friend to commit the sin. However, in the latter instance, the sin appears to be mortal because it is of grave matter, she did provide deliberate consent, and as she goes on to explain, she had full knowledge: "And I am morrally certain that in the execution of thes 3 last things I had some fear and understanding, that they were sinne."³³ Ward appears to be writing her autobiography as a means of catharsis, recanting the sins of her past as if she were alone with a priest making a general confession. She makes clear that her spiritual development was stunted at times by tumultuous periods – much different than the angelically pure child of *The English Vita*.

Despite her importance to the history of women religious in the Catholic Church, and the somewhat controversial nature of her legacy, Mary Ward has scarcely been discussed by modern secular historians. In fact, one is hard-pressed to find an entire work dedicated to Ward written by an individual who is not a sister in one of the two branches of Ward's order. However, Ward

has often been a component part of larger works and articles written about the Catholic Church in England during the early modern period. By examining Ward's presence in these studies, even though she is relegated to a smaller role, one can begin to understand how Ward has been treated in secular works.

For centuries, English Protestant historians, in an effort to rid their country of what they believed to be the refuse of their Catholic past, continued the polemical depiction of Catholic women as "whores of Babylon," a reference to the New Testament book of Revelation. To many Protestants, the Catholic Church itself was the Whore of Babylon, and her faithful daughters were just fellow members of her brothel. Print culture during the late Tudor and Stuart periods portrayed Catholics, especially Catholic women, as the enemy of virtue, the opposite of all that was deemed to be properly English: the "other." No historian has broached this topic in a more thorough manner than Frances Dolan.

In *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture*, Frances Dolan argues that the establishment of Catholicism's "otherness" was a necessary component of establishing an English national identity in the wake of the Reformation.³⁴ Dolan argues that the representation of Catholic women as the "definitional other" in seventeenth-century English Protestant print culture was a necessary component of establishing the English national identity as white, Protestant, and masculine.³⁵ Dolan explains:

Undermining Englishness and Protestantism by not being different enough, English Catholics unsettled the nation's relation to its own past and, with their allegiances divided between England's sovereign and Rome's pope, blurred the distinction between the English and the foreigners, loyal subjects and traitors, us and them. It was in the tension between the foreign and the familiar, the different and the same, that the particular threat of Catholicism lay.³⁶

Dolan argues that Catholic women posed an especially significant threat to the establishment of the new English national identity, because the elevated role women played in the Catholic Church created an inversion of the gender roles that were of such importance to the hierarchy of

the English state.³⁷ She explains that the veneration of the Virgin Mary, especially utilizing iconography that showcases the Blessed Mother as being much larger than the Christ figure, imbued Catholic women with an inappropriate level of power.³⁸ Dolan explains:

The problem with Catholicism, from this point of view, is that it inappropriately empowers women, spiritually, symbolically, and socially. For if Catholicism is the ‘Whore of Babylon’, larger than life, monstrous, grotesquely feminine yet not human, she is also a wife and a mother in England, sheltering inside English homes, lying even in the king’s own bed.³⁹

Dolan suggests that it is precisely this fear of a “gender inversion” that led to penal legislation meant to restore the “gender hierarchy” within Catholic families.⁴⁰ She claims that despite the Catholic Church’s patriarchal hierarchy, feminine “influence as wives and mothers, their authority as queens of heaven or of earth” was revered in Catholic apology.⁴¹ This, she argues, is in direct opposition to Protestant polemic, which “mobilized misogyny” to discredit prominent female Catholic recusants.⁴² Catholic recusant women were also provided with a unique opportunity to exercise both active and passive forms of agency as a result of their Catholic male counterparts’ tenuous position in post-Reformation English society. Dolan explains:

[The Reformation] pushed men out of public office and into the home, and pushed priests out of the monasteries and into domestic dependency [while it] pushed Englishwomen out into the world – into court, into print, across the seas – offering them access to activism in the international arena, an occasion for resistance both domestic and political, the opportunity for influence and significance, and the prospect of communities of women.⁴³

Ward was certainly not exempt from the cunning criticism of anti-Catholic polemic; indeed, she was often the subject of it, especially after the suppression of her Institute in 1630. Dolan explains that portraying the relationship between priests and nuns as sexually intimate was a common rhetorical tactic used against the Catholic Church, and Mary Ward found herself painted as a “fornicator” due to her close relationship with her Jesuit confessor Fr. John Gerard.⁴⁴ According to Dolan, “such accusations ridiculed and debased the alliances between men and women” that had long been a strong-suit of the Church.⁴⁵ Dolan suggests that the male-female confessor-penitent relationship was critiqued so harshly in anti-Catholic polemic due to a general

uneasiness at this time in England over gender roles and their relationship to one another.⁴⁶ In order to articulate this “larger phenomenon in early modern culture,”⁴⁷ Dolan quotes Jeffrey Masten’s work “Playwriting: Authorship and Collaboration,”⁴⁸ where the author explains that this was the result of “the uneasiness (in both senses) in imagining the possibility of an equitable conversation between the heterosexes,” which ultimately resulted in “the pejorative portrayal of the impossibilities and dangers of cross-sex communication.”⁴⁹

It was not just the Protestant polemicists that attacked Ward’s character but also several of her co-religionists. Given that Ward was proposing an unenclosed order of women religious that defied the decree of the Council of Trent and the history of the Church, it is of no surprise that she had her detractors. Ward knew that she would have to argue her case effectively. She understood that if she could portray her Institute as a continuation of prior scriptural and saintly practice of the Church, she would appeal to the Church hierarchy’s adherence to tradition. In Lowell Gallagher’s essay entitled “Mary Ward’s ‘Jesuitresses’ and the Construction of a Typological Community”, he underscores the importance of Ward’s work by illustrating the manner in which Ward attempted to justify the unconventional nature of her Institute.⁵⁰ Gallagher argues that Mary Ward utilized typological argument to convince the male-dominated Church hierarchy that her order, though on the surface a deviation from established norms of female religious life, was actually a continuation of “female saintly practice.”⁵¹

In order to develop his argument, Gallagher relies heavily upon Mary Ward’s *Ratio Instituti* (1616). The *Ratio*, which was intended to be a set of instructions written for the sisters of the Institute, also became its primary written defense and justification. Gallagher justifies the *Ratio* as the crux of his argument by explaining its importance to the overall theme of Ward’s work:

The *Ratio [Instituti]* lays out two principal aims for the Institute: to establish an international network of boarding schools and day schools for girls and to participate in the missionary project of recovering England for Catholicism. Broadly speaking, both aims derived from the educational incentive of early modern humanism and the proselytizing agenda of the Counter-Reformation. What was innovative and unorthodox was Ward's approach to the conceptual boundary maintaining distinctions between male and female agency and vocation in the cultivation of an engaged and informed Christian social practice.⁵²

Gallagher also utilized the definitive biography of Mary Ward, Mary Chambers' *The Life of Mary Ward: Foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary*,⁵³ as the backbone of his research on Ward's victories and challenges in establishing the Institute, and her efforts in proselytizing the "apostates" in England. By utilizing both of these sources, in addition to the letters of prominent Catholic priests and bishops who both supported and antagonized Ward's efforts, Gallagher is able to construct a portrait of the so-called "Jesuitress" that showcases a compelling form of Catholic female recusant agency in early modern England.

Mary Ward understood that the religious order she was forming was not only illegal in her home country, but illicit in the eyes of the Catholic Church. Prior to Ward's Institute being formally recognized by the Church in 1703, women religious needed to be cloistered, and they needed to be clothed in the traditional habit.⁵⁴ Ward knew that in order for her sisters to perform their work without being imprisoned these two rules could not be followed. Also, female religious orders were usually placed under local episcopal authority. Considering all Catholic priests and bishops were in hiding, and therefore no Catholic hierarchy could be established in England, this was also not possible. What Ward was proposing, in light of the situation of English Catholics, seemed logical: her sisters could not wear a habit for fear of being recognized as Catholic religious, they could not be cloistered because they needed to be mobile in order to accomplish their work without garnering government suspicion, and they needed to be governed internally because a Catholic episcopal could and did not exist. However, certain members of the Catholic Church's patriarchal leadership and their Protestant counterparts refused to see

anything in Ward's *Ratio* aside from open defiance of male authority. Gallagher explains that both Catholics and Protestants alike accused Ward's sisters of "taking over two privileged arenas of male authority: public preaching and the direction of conscience."⁵⁵

Ward's Institute did not just disturb gender norms with the Church. Its existence also further perpetuated the struggle of authority between Jesuits and seminary priests over which group should be in charge of converting England's "lost souls".⁵⁶ Gallagher outlines the rhetoric of Ward's antagonists by discussing their use of the term "Jesuitress".⁵⁷ Not only were the seminary priests suggesting what Gallagher refers to as the "perceived kinship" between both the organizational structure and goals of Mary Ward's Institute and the much-maligned Jesuits, but the priests were also highlighting the Institute's deviation from "acceptable" orders of women religious. Gallagher explains:

The word 'Jesuitress' encapsulates the prevailing notion of the proper jurisdiction of female agency...Ward's institute had ventured an 'unbecoming' (because female) appropriation of an exclusively male (Jesuit) preserve in the ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁵⁸

Ward understood that she was, as Gallagher explains, "mapping an uncharted itinerary through the prevailing ecclesiastical and social orders of the world."⁵⁹ However, she also knew that in order for such an innovative venture to be successfully approved by such traditional arenas of established authority, Ward would have to utilize a familiar method of exegesis to effectively relay her argument to her conservative audience.

Typology, according to Gallagher, is the method of scriptural exegesis that "the unifying structure of Old and New Testaments by positing the retrospective figurality of the Christ-event."⁶⁰ Simply put, the method of typology justifies persons and events – namely Christ and his crucifixion, otherwise known as the "Christ event" – in the New Testament by explaining their prefiguration through persons and events in the Old Testament. Typology ascribes the Old Testament as the "time of promise", suggesting that the events written in this series of scripture

are all intended to explain the promise of salvation through the Christ event.⁶¹ The New Testament, on the other hand, was labeled “the time of fulfillment,” since the Christ event would fulfill the promise of redemption described in the Old Testament.⁶² Ward understood the typological method quite well, and knew her audience would understand what she was alluding to when she labeled the epoch she inhabited as the “time of negotiation.”⁶³ Ward explained that what she and her sisters were doing was not a deviation from established norms for female religious. Rather, it was a continuation of what she referred to as “female saintly practice.”⁶⁴ Ward cited several female saints, including St. Mary Magdalen St. Lucy, and St. Thecla, as setting the precedent on which the Institute was constructed. Ward employed this traditional method of scriptural interpretation to her analysis of the history of Catholic feminine piety in order for her audience to perceive continuation rather than difference.⁶⁵ Gallagher explains:

Ward was relying on two related schemes of thought common to Catholic and Protestant reformist cultures: hagiographic exemplarity and a kind of performative typology. These schemes provided Ward with an imaginative screen on which to project the future for providential history by remembering the past strategically.⁶⁶

Ultimately, Gallagher explains that Ward’s use of what he refers to as “performative typology” was useful in Ward’s effort to utilize the epitome of feminine piety – female saints – as the “personifications of a new institutional ethos – a self-governing apostolic community of contemporary women.”⁶⁷ According to Gallagher, the establishment of the Institute and the *Ratio*’s method of argumentation put Ward’s career “at a point of crossing between two emancipatory figures: the theological figure of ‘grace’ and the pre-Enlightenment one of ‘reason’.”⁶⁸

The vast majority of those who have decided to approach thorough studies of Ward’s life are sisters of the Congregation of Jesus, and several Jesuit fathers. The hallmark biography of Mary Ward for many years was written by Mary Catherine Elizabeth Chambers, also a sister of

Ward's Institute. Published in 1882, *Life of Mary Ward: foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, was the first work to thoroughly explore Ward's life by examining both her writings and those of her contemporaries.⁶⁹ Chambers wrote the *Life* during an uncertain time for her foundress' legacy. Merely five years prior, Pope Pius IX published the Apostolic Constitution *Quamvis Justo*, which gave ecclesiastical approval to the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary as the first self-governing unenclosed female religious order.⁷⁰ However, the Apostolic Constitution also prohibited the Institute from formally recognizing Mary Ward as their foundress.⁷¹ Though Chambers was the first to examine many pivotal sources, including Ward's autobiographical fragments and the only contemporary biography of Ward in existence, it is clear throughout the work that she is approaching the task at hand with an agenda: to resurrect her foundress's legacy from the brink of complete dissolution.⁷² Nevertheless, nearly every historian who has approached the subject of Mary Ward has examined and quoted the Chambers biography extensively.

In 1994, Sr. Dr. Henriette Peters published a comprehensive and scholarly biography of Ward entitled *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*.⁷³ This work has surpassed Chambers' work as the definitive biography of Mary Ward, not only because of its more objective treatment of the subject, but also because Peters had access to documents that were not made available to Chambers. While Chambers primarily drew her research from the aforementioned documents, as well as material from the Institute Archives in Munich/Nymphenburg, Peters had the Vatican Archives and the Archives of the Society of Jesus at her disposal.⁷⁴ Thus, a multifaceted portrait of Ward emerges, complete with a panoply of opinions about her expressed by powerful figures – mostly men – who held the fate of her Institute in their hands.

Even though Ward's Institute shattered pre-established gender roles for female religious in the Catholic Church, the modern conception of her as a "feminist" is a misnomer on several levels. When rumors of her impending Venerable status were swirling around England prior to Pope Benedict XVI's 2009 visit, several English papers portrayed Ward as a "feisty nun," with *The Independent* heralding her as "the first sister of feminism."⁷⁵ However, the sensationalism surrounding this portrayal of Ward is the result of at best, poor research, and at worst, a hidden ideological agenda, as we shall come to understand.

This thesis is not the first to argue that Mary Ward developed and pursued the concept of the Institute out of pure adherence to God's will and not out of a desire of ecclesiastical equality for her sex. Peters addresses this in her biography of Ward, stating that in her work she "tried to demonstrate [Ward's] utterly loyal consistency in carrying out the commission which God had entrusted to her."⁷⁶ Mother Immolata Wetter addresses this topic more explicitly in her work, *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*:

Realizing that her mission was to be worldwide she rejected episcopal government, substituting government by a superior general of her own order. Such features, enjoyed by thousands of women religious working in many ministries, are now taken for granted and are seldom ascribed to Mary Ward, to whom they are due. But she cannot be claimed as a feminist in the modern sense of the term, for her motivation was not the rights of women, but always the will of God.⁷⁷

Though it must be noted that Peters and Wetter are both religious sisters of Ward's order, their historical scholarship is sound, and their arguments should not be discarded simply due to their closeness to the subject. They should and will, however, be approached through the same critical lens of other historians who have studied Ward and her Institute.

This study is not meant to be a comprehensive biography of Ward, as Peters' work is (though she claims her subject is limited, the sheer scope of her 612 page work suggests otherwise), nor is it an in-depth treatment of one period of Ward's life, as is Mother Wetter's work.⁷⁸ Rather, this thesis is an examination of Ward's spiritual development set against the

chaotic religious and political climate of early modern England and the Counter-Reformation Catholic Church. This study will address the major events of Ward's life, and the various influences that could have shaped the many situations she encountered and the different ways in which she approached them. Namely, this thesis will discuss how English Catholic clerical politics influenced Ward through her spiritual directors. Though Ward makes apparent throughout her own writings that her desire to follow God's will was the primary impetus for all of the major decisions she had made throughout her life, a concerted effort needs to be made to examine the possible worldly influences upon her spiritual development.

Several pivotal events in Ward's life will be examined within their historical context: Ward's decision to enter religious life, her departure from the Poor Clares to found her own religious order, her decision to discontinue her reliance on priestly spiritual direction, and her reaction to the suppression of her Institute. These specific turning points in Ward's life must not be understood within a vacuum. Rather, one must understand the political and religious turmoil surrounding these pivotal moments, developing in a multitude of ways under the reigns of three English monarchs and five distinct popes. Through this focused treatment of Ward's spiritual development, we will not only be given insight into the mind of one of the Catholic Church's female pioneers, but we will also see the Catholic clerical climate of early modern Europe develop from a different angle.

CHAPTER TWO

The First Great Decision - Entrance into Religious Life

Though convents and orders of women religious were largely eradicated from English life during the dissolution of the monasteries under King Henry VIII in the 1530s (with a brief reappearance mid-century under the reign of Henry's eldest daughter, Queen Mary), it was still not uncommon for young Catholic women of means to realize the call to religious life abroad. Mary Ward was born of a reasonably wealthy Catholic family in York county, known as a hotbed of recusant activity since the early days of Elizabeth's reign. Given her strong Catholic upbringing, there is nothing particularly out of the ordinary about her desire to forgo the married life to dedicate herself to a religious vocation. While her decision does not seem remarkable on the surface, and this author is not denying Ward's assertion that she received this call from God and God alone, one must penetrate the surface of her words to explore the fertile subtext hidden between the lines. For it is not the decision to enter religious life, but the various influences leading up to her decision to enter religious life, that provide one with an intricate examination of Ward's unique spiritual development. Through understanding the infancy of Ward's spiritual life, one begins to understand why she chose later on to abandon her dependence upon priestly spiritual direction.

The England of 1585 that Mary Ward was born into was rife with religious upheaval. The practice of Catholicism was not only illegal, but the harboring of priests was an offense punishable by death. No one was spared of the penalties for hiding these perceived enemies of the state – not even wives and mothers. In fact, Catholic women were under even more suspicion than their male counterparts, because they largely stayed in the home, an area not relegated to the public sphere and continuous watchful eye of the State. Margaret Clitherow,

now a saint in the Catholic Church, is perhaps the most prominent female Catholic martyr of the Elizabethan era. On March 25, 1586, Clitherow, a butcher's wife, was convicted of harboring priests and was executed in the following manner: "She was laid flat on the ground, tied up half-naked in the form of a cross between two doors, with a great sharpened stone in the small of her back; and then she was crushed to death."⁷⁹ Though she was not the first Catholic to be executed by the State in Elizabeth's England, and certainly would not be the last, Clitherow's death would have a profound impact upon young Mary, especially because of their proximity of kin.

Clitherow's dramatic martyrdom, enshrined in Fr. John Mush's *A true report of the life and martyrdom of Mrs. Margaret Clitherow*, which "was copied and in general circulation amongst Catholics,"⁸⁰ brought to light the reality of execution for the Faith. Fr. James Walsh, SJ explains that "in actively recusant families martyrdom passed from being an ardently desired ideal to a distinct possibility: a reality for Mary Ward's young girlhood."⁸¹ Ward herself corroborates her desire for martyrdom in *The Italian Autobiography*, stating that during her youth she had "burning desires to be a martyr."⁸² Clitherow became a hero of the young Mary Ward, who would listen intently to tales of this saintly figure from her maternal grandmother, Ursula Wright, who was also an acquaintance of the martyr.

Wright herself was an outspoken recusant who was imprisoned several times. Mary Ward claims that her grandmother had "suffered imprisonment for the space of 14 years...in which time she manie tims made a profession of her faith before the presedent of yorke, Huntintone."⁸³ This statement implies that Ursula Ward was a bold defender of the Catholic faith, because Henry Hastings, the 3rd Earl of Huntingdon, was the fear of many a Catholic. Hastings was appointed as President of the Council of the North in 1572 by Queen Elizabeth in the wake of the ill-fated Northern Rebellion of 1569, a plot concocted by the Catholic nobility of the North

country to overthrow Elizabeth and install Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne. Elizabeth selected Hastings for his tenacity, and she trusted him to eliminate the Catholic threat from the North country, especially the notoriously recalcitrant York. The fact that Ursula Wright gave “speaches to the sayd Huntintone tending to the exaltation of the catholicke religion”⁸⁴ shows that she would rather risk her life than do something that she felt would offend God. Wright’s unflinching commitment to doing what she felt in her heart was God’s will, despite tremendous adversity, greatly influenced Ward, who would grow to develop this trait later on in her spiritual development.⁸⁵

Ward portrays her grandmother as pious woman, claiming that in the five years she lived with her, she could not “remember [a time] when I perceived her not to be at prayer.”⁸⁶ According to Ward, her grandmother had been out of prison for five years at the time she took her granddaughter in.⁸⁷ Wright’s harrowing experience in prison did not cause her to cease her external activism, however. Ward explains that her grandmother “used to provide much almiss [alms] to catholicke presoners, which she sent them secretly at several tims of the year.”⁸⁸ In her discussion of her grandmother’s zealous passion for the Catholic faith, Ward admits her own spiritual immaturity. She explains that she only volunteered to help her grandmother give alms to the Catholic prisoners out of a desire to please her, not God. In *Autobiographical Fragment 1*, Ward describes a situation in which her grandmother ordered the killing and preparation of poultry to be clandestinely sent to the prisoners.⁸⁹ Ward admits that she had developed a fondness for the birds, “loving them as children will such toys,”⁹⁰ and she was upset at the idea of killing them. However, during a discussion with her grandmother about the issue, she tells her grandmother that she was “desirous [that] such poullen which she had given me should be so bestowed,” though she admits to the reader that “I sayd yt only to gaine her esteem.”⁹¹ Ward’s

candor in admitting her perceived spiritual faults not only makes her appear more credible, but it also begins to show the reader that her spiritual development was a gradual and difficult process. In contrast to her pious and deeply devoted grandmother, young Mary Ward was still spiritually immature, which one might expect for her age. This also highlights the hagiographical character of *The English Vita*, where Mary Ward is portrayed as a near-saintly figure, erroneously characterizing her childhood as “exempt from displeasing actions which commonly accompany those years.”⁹² However, it would not be her grandmother, but a maidservant she encountered while living with the Babthorpe family, who ignited a fire within Mary’s heart for religious life.

Around the year 1600, when Mary was about fifteen years old, her parents sent her to live with the Babthorpe family, cousins of the Wrights who were also devout Catholics.⁹³ Mary describes Lady Grace Babthorpe as “of more than ordinary virtue, and all things in her howse so well ordered for the service of God, as led me by degrees to begin to serve him.”⁹⁴ It was in this virtuous environment that she first became aware of her natural inclination towards the chaste life of a religious. While she cites Lady Grace Babthorpe as a primary influence of this virtue, Ward explains that “I had naturally a great aversion from this vice [immodesty].”⁹⁵ Unlike her grandmother’s house, where she was constantly troubled by the immoral actions of a kinswoman who lived with her, Ward was now in a place where she was no longer distracted by what she perceived to be the scandalous and sinful actions of others.⁹⁶ It was during this time that she became acquainted with Margaret Garrett,⁹⁷ a maidservant of the Babthorpes’ whom Ward describes as being “of great vertue.”⁹⁸ Ward describes how she spoke frequently with Garrett, and that it was through “some speches of hers I found myself first moved to love a religious life.”⁹⁹ Ward describes the particular conversation wherein God provided her with “such a desire

never to love anie but him.”¹⁰⁰ In this discourse, Garrett told Ward a story she had heard concerning a nun who had betrayed her vow of chastity:

[The nun] violat[ed] her virginity and being found with child...[was for her penance] to lye prostrate...for all the other Nunns passing by to tread upon. This so great a penance made the falt seem extreem and withall I reflected...by which I emediately conceived a singuler love, and esteem of religious life, as a sanctuary whear all might, and must be holy.¹⁰¹

It was at this time that Ward became convinced that she must enter into religious life. However, it would not prove to be an easy feat for her to accomplish. Ward’s parents, especially her father, were not keen to accept her chosen vocation. Though they were ardent Catholics who were zealous in their faith, they had very different plans for their daughter than she had for herself.

Ward describes her parents as "verie vertuous"¹⁰² people who "suffered much for the catholyke cause."¹⁰³ Though she evidently loved and appreciated her mother, Ursula, she appears to have had a special fondness for her father, Marmaduke Ward, who like her maternal grandmother was also an outspoken recusant. Marmaduke refused to attend the compulsory Church of England services, claiming that church papists were schematics who were openly denying the necessity of the Catholic Church to achieve salvation.¹⁰⁴ Recusancy was a dangerous enterprise during the 1590s, and Marmaduke and Ursula were saddled with heavy fines, and even lost their home to a fire during a riot against known recusants on February 2, 1595.¹⁰⁵ It was because of this constant state of turmoil as a result of her parents’ defiance that Ward was sent to live with relatives for the better part of her childhood. Despite this, Marmaduke Ward still managed to deeply influence his daughter. Mary Ward describes her father as taking the education of his children very seriously, “espetially in matters of purity.”¹⁰⁶ Her father’s emphasis on chastity had a profound impact on Ward later in life. As the foundress of her order, Ward was insistent that her sisters maintain a chaste life, and provided them with a series of rules

to ensure that their purity of heart could not be questioned. In *The English Vita*, Mary Poyntz articulates one of Ward's rules regarding chastity:

Of exterior cautions one was that ours shou'd never be alone for any space of time, though the Men were Religious and spirituall, in our owne Houses or abroad. The serving Men be they of what quality or desert whatsoever, must not onely respect her owne persone, but all ours, yea the meanest Lay Sisters, for [Ward] would say that familiarity was the beginning of further evill.¹⁰⁷

Marmaduke Ward had instilled the importance of chastity in Mary from a very young age because he desired a virtuous marriage for his daughter. At the age of thirteen, Mary is "urged to marry, the Person and Estate being completely advantageous, but her mind was so much the other Way..."¹⁰⁸ Her father ended the betrothal; he was under the impression that his daughter was repelled by some aspect of this young man, but would eventually take to the appropriate suitor. However, that was not to be, as Poyntz explains, because "her heavenly Father had higher designs on this his blessed child."¹⁰⁹ Though she had high esteem and affection for her earthly father, her heavenly father took precedence, and she could not ignore his demands. However, obedience was a virtue that good Catholic young women were to cultivate, and Mary was no exception. She did not dare to act without her father's approval. For seven years, she attempted to persuade him to grant her permission to forsake marriage and enter religious life.¹¹⁰

Mary's father was not the only authority figure from whom she needed to seek permission. Her confessor, also referred to as her "Ghostly Father," was ardently pushing her towards marriage for many years.¹¹¹ There is some dispute over who was her assigned confessor at the time; it was likely Fr. Richard Holtby, SJ, but it could have possibly been Fr. John Mush, former confessor and biographer of Margaret Clitherow, a hero of Mary's.¹¹² Though Mary felt certain that she was not to marry, the persisting of her confessor, "carrying the colours of Religion and Zeale" left her shaken.¹¹³ She was now questioning the validity of her call to the

religious life, because she so trusted and esteemed the opinion of confessor, who was acting *in persona Christi*, in the person of Christ. *The English Vita* describes a distressed Mary, desperately seeking an answer from God: "cast[ing] her self at the feete of her deare Lord, [she] said it was he who must answer for her."¹¹⁴ It was during times of great tribulation during her discernment process, when all earthly authority seemed to be leading her contrary to her vocation, that Ward found consolation in spiritual reading and contemplative prayer. One book introduced to Ward in her adolescence proved to be profoundly influential, not only during this initial period of spiritual confusion and self-doubt, but also throughout subsequent turbulent periods of her spiritual life: *The Spiritual Combat*.¹¹⁵

Mary Ward refers to *The Spiritual Combat*¹¹⁶ as "the best master and instructor I have had in the spiritual exercises for many years, and perhaps one of the greatest helps."¹¹⁷ The book was first given to her when she was roughly fifteen years of age by a priest who was serving as her confessor while Fr. John Mush, her confessor of many years, was away in Rome.¹¹⁸ According to Kenworthy-Browne, the priest in question was either Fr. Richard Holtby, SJ or Fr. John Gerard, SJ, who wrote the original English translation of the book.¹¹⁹ Ward explains that the book was given to her by her then-confessor, who after denying her the opportunity to make a general confession, gave her the book in hopes that it would ameliorate what he perceived to be scrupulosity.¹²⁰ Though Fr. Mush granted her a general confession once he returned to England, the confessor who denied her this exercise did not deny her spiritual growth; as previously stated, the book was "one perhaps of the greatest helps."¹²¹ Therefore, in order to understand how Mary Ward approached her spiritual and intellectual development, it is necessary to examine exactly how *The Spiritual Combat* may have affected her through the decisions she would later make.

The Spiritual Combat, written by the Italian priest Fr. Lorenzo Scupoli¹²², was first published in 1589 in Venice and "contained but 24 chapters."¹²³ The authors of the 2013 edition's preface posit that later editions of the book contained more chapters because "the Theatines or another religious order may have been part of the composition."¹²⁴ The most recent edition, lists sixty-six chapters.¹²⁵ In an effort to only examine the chapters that Mary Ward would have read, a 1598 edition of the book (translated then as *The Spiritual Conflict*) will be used.¹²⁶ It is likely that this is the edition Mary Ward would have read, given that the translation is attributed to Fr. John Gerard, an English Jesuit priest who she frequented for confession (as previously mentioned, she may have even received it directly from him). This edition of the book has thirty-three chapters, though it is unknown whether or not Gerard had separated the chapters for the sake of clarity, or if other authors had contributed to the book at this stage. The dedication was addressed "to the right reverend Mothers, the Abesse and Sisters of the Monastery of S. Andrew in Venice, desireous of christian perfection."¹²⁷ It appears as though this particular edition was tailored to this group of religious women, given that the reader is frequently addressed using "O Daughter," "deare daughter in Christ," and other feminine salutations; these are substituted with gender-neutral phrases like "My Beloved" and "dearly beloved in Christ" in other early English language translations of the book.¹²⁸ It is important to note that this edition emphasizes instances in which female religious may encounter problems progressing in the spiritual life. These are also present in the 1652 edition, which is dedicated to "The Right Reverend Fathers, Religious Dames, and devout Brothers and Sisters of the holy Order of Saint Bennet [Benedict]." However, it is not present in the 1698 edition, which was not only approved by Rev. Richard Lucas, an Anglican priest, but was also published in London.¹²⁹ Clearly, this edition was modified to suit the Anglican faith. The other two Catholic translations,

published outside of England (Antwerp and Paris, respectively) would not have made it to print in England had references to the spiritual betterment of religious sisters been included. It is fortunate that Mary Ward received this specific 1598 edition from Gerard, because it included solutions to spiritual issues that would be pertinent to her life as a religious sister later on.

Upon close examination of this early edition of *The Spiritual Combat*, it becomes abundantly clear how this book affected how Ward developed in the spiritual life. Though many aspects of this book would inform Ward throughout her life, especially later on once her attitude towards priestly spiritual direction had changed, the overarching theme of the book – total adherence to God’s will – would prove to be the strongest influence upon her approach to the spiritual life. Chapter One of *The Spiritual Combat*, under the abbreviated title “Christian Perfection,” explains that following God’s will for one’s life is the paramount goal of spiritual development, which inevitably will necessitate a certain degree of death to self.¹³⁰ Scupoli explains:

This is the denying of our selves, which the Redeemer doth seek in us...and because thou aspiring to the top of great perfection, must use force with thy selfe, and courageously overcome thy owne will, both in great and little things...¹³¹

Early on in life, both prior to her entrance into religious life and during the early years of her vocation, Ward would interpret this teaching much differently than she would as the development of her Institute progressed. At this immature stage in her spiritual progression, she interpreted this method of attaining perfection in her spiritual life to mean that she must yield to the authority figures that God had bestowed with power over her on Earth to represent what His will for her life should be, even if it contrasted with her ardent desire to become a bride of Christ. However, there is evidence in her autobiographical fragments that even at this early stage, she trusted her personal relationship with God, revealed to her through meditative and contemplative prayer, over the authority figures whom she was instructed to obey.

Though she waited until both her confessor and her father had given her their blessing, it is interesting to note that she remained insistent that she was not to marry. Had she truly exercised the “denying of our selves” that Scupoli described, she would have given up her resistance to the will of her father and of her confessor – the earthy authority figures she viewed as imbued with this power by God himself – and would have married. In *The Italian Autobiography* (English translation), Ward describes her determination to leave England and enter religious life on the Continent despite her father’s adamant prohibition:

My father came in person to the place where I was, and most peremptorily prohibited me from departing out of England without his express leave and order, to which command I made no resistance either by word or sign (though I loved him extremely, and had not the heart to say anything to him which would grieve him), but at the same moment I was most firmly resolved to observe nothing less than this precept...¹³²

In this same section of *The Italian Autobiography*, Ward articulates the level of adversity she experienced in her choice of vocation, not only from her father, but nearly everyone she knew: “Of all of my relations and friends...there was not one, as far as I recollect, who did not more or less dissuade me from taking up that state of life.”¹³³ Not only were the authority figures whom she was supposed to obey advising against her will on this issue, but so were all of Ward’s family and friends.

Though she on the surface exercised obedience by not leaving England to enter religious life, she never fully conformed her will to theirs by marrying any of the young men whom her father had proposed for her. The situation surrounding Mary’s final suitor is described by Poyntz in *The English Vita*.¹³⁴ Edmund Neville, heir to the powerful title of Earl of Westmorland, was pushed so intently upon Mary by her father and her confessor, who instructed Mary that “were she a Novice in any Religion she would doe God more Service to come out and marry this party, then to proceede.”¹³⁵ Still she resisted, and according to Poyntz, Edmund “resolv[ed] never to marry if she would not have him,” and as a result he became a priest, “and from him the Title

went to the Heretikes, so as by his absence the Catholikes lost a great support.”¹³⁶ Despite the serious sociopolitical ramifications of her refusal for the English Catholic community, Ward persisted in her conviction that she must enter the religious life. Ward justified her defiance with her firm belief that it was the will of God that she would eventually practice this vocation. In *The Italian Autobiography*, Ward explains that even though her confessor’s insistence that she refrain from entrance into religious life was “pious, prudent; regardful of the service of God and the common good,” she still believed that God “would not permit that I should be hindered through his means, so that finally [God] caused him to change his opinion.”¹³⁷ It is apparent that even at this early stage in her spiritual development, Ward placed her personal interpretation of God’s will for her life over that of her father and her confessor, though she obeyed them on a superficial level.

Ward’s concept of obedience to her superiors would consistently be subject to her personal conception of God’s will once she was permitted to continue on in her vocation. As we shall see, the struggle between her personal conviction of God’s will and her subsequent confessors’ interpretation of the same was far from over – in fact, it had only just begun.

CHAPTER THREE

The Second Great Decision - The Creation of the Institute

Once Ward had finally obtained permission from her father and her confessor to enter religious life at the age of twenty-one, she admits that she did not know enough about the various different religious orders available for her to join, and thus “had noe instructions tuchinge anie perticuler Order.”¹³⁸ Ward did, however, spend time reflecting upon what type of religious life she desired to enter. She explains to Msgr. Albergati in 1620 what she sought to find in a religious order:

...it seemed to me most perfect to take the most austere Order that a soul might give herself to God not in part but altogether, since I saw not how a religious woman could do good to more than herself alone. To teach children seemed then too much distraction, might be done by others, nor was that of perfection and importance as therefore to hinder that quiet and continual communication with God which strict enclosure afforded. This enclosure and observance of poverty were the two especial points I aimed at in whatsoever Order I should undertake.¹³⁹

At this stage in her spiritual development, Ward was still very much influenced by the virtuous quiet the Babthorpe house had provided her soul, and she wished to continue her life in this tranquility of spirit and calmness of mind that this sort of life provided. There is no evidence that she desired to innovate female religious life at this time, and she was in fact of the contrary mindset that women were not suitable to do any good on their own – a point she would dispute almost eleven years later. The continual, contemplative prayer of cloistered life that she so ardently desired was made readily available to her through several religious orders, including the Poor Clares. Since convents were prohibited in England, Ward had to travel to the Continent to realize her dream of becoming a religious sister. Like many young Englishwomen before her, Ward chose to travel to St. Omer in Northern France to begin her religious life. Once Ward had arrived in St. Omer, Fr. Richard Holtby, SJ, the newly-appointed Jesuit Superior of the English mission and Ward’s former confessor, put her under the direction of Fr. George Keynes, SJ, who instructed that she would enter the Poor Clares.¹⁴⁰

Ward was disenchanted by the order she had been instructed to observe. In *The Italian Autobiography*, Ward describes that the sisters of the Poor Clares, “were expecting me with much anxiety and had already assigned me a place.”¹⁴¹ The place that they had reserved for Ward was, however, nothing like the religious life she had expected and desired. Since foreigners were not permitted to immediately enter enclosure, Mary was to enter the Poor Clares as an unenclosed lay sister, whose sole responsibility was to beg in the streets for those enclosed.¹⁴² Aside from the fact that Fr. Keynes convinced her that this was the will of God, her fears were also placated at the time by his erroneous information that the unenclosed and enclosed sisters were of the same rule:

I stood silent for awhile feeling an extreme repugnance to their offer, but reasoning within myself that the Rules being the same and the place offered to me only more abject and contemptible, this disinclination and repugnance could only come from pride.¹⁴³

The life of an unenclosed sister, or "out-sister," provided Ward with daily physical, spiritual, and emotional hardship. Chambers describes the trials Ward endured in her work:

The astonished and admiring inhabitants of St. Omer saw this noble and delicate girl going her rounds, a basket on her arm, and begging from door to door the daily bread of the poor and numerous community, exposed to scoffs and contempt, which indeed she often received instead of the alms she asked.¹⁴⁴

The critical reader could examine this passage and conclude that Ward could have possibly felt so repulsed by the extern work of begging because of her noble birth. Prior to the English Reformation, her family's standing would have ensured that she would be able to enter the enclosed life she so desired. Here she was but another postulant who had no choice but to follow the orders which she was given. Also, though she admits that she enjoyed the enclosed life, it seems ironic that she left it to found the very first unenclosed female religious order. Perhaps it was not being unenclosed that she despised, but the work she had to do while unenclosed that so repulsed her. She was, however, able to set her dissatisfaction aside as she persevered in this undesirable vocation, her sights set solely on doing God's will.

Two months after she had accepted to live as an unenclosed lay sister with the Walloon Poor Clares, she expressed her desire to take the habit.¹⁴⁵ She was met with great difficulty by the Provincial, who "made a difficulty about receiving me for the service of the enclosed, judging perhaps that I was not fit for the practices."¹⁴⁶ According to Mary "the people of the city likewise protested"¹⁴⁷ that she be admitted to the enclosed, but the Abbess proclaimed that Ward insisted upon serving as an unenclosed lay sister, due to her unmatched humility.¹⁴⁸ However, Ward tells us that a scandal amongst the out-sisters was the real cause of the Abbess's insistence that she remain unenclosed:

Some of the out-sisters had given disedification causing dishonour and loss to the Convent so much so that one of the choir nuns had been obliged privately to break her enclosure in order to superintend to the out-sisters until someone satisfactory could be found for such a post.¹⁴⁹

Ward explains that the Abbess was grooming her to take over the governance of the out-sisters upon the completion of the novitiate.¹⁵⁰ Once she understood this, her frustration greatly increased, proclaiming "had I known, assuredly I should never have entered....having a very different idea...as to the affection I might have to such an office."¹⁵¹ Despite her innate displeasure at the thought of serving as an out-sister, let alone an out-sister with a position of power, her confessor, Fr. George Keynes, SJ, insisted that this was her true vocation:

I was clothed by the advice and command of my Confessor...who affirmed that such was the will of God, and this my true vocation and that if an angel from heaven should tell me to the contrary, I ought not to believe him.¹⁵²

Yet again, Ward did not receive the instruction she desired, but she submitted to her confessor's command that she pursue this avenue of religious life: "I followed it willingly, but with such aversion and grief that death by any kind of torment...appeared most sweet to me."¹⁵³

It would not be long before Ward's personal discernment would take her in a direction contrary to the advisement of her confessor. On St. Gregory's Feast Day in 1607, Ward entreated herself to ardent prayer in the name of the English Mission, petitioning that the saint

“help and protect one of that nation” by interceding on her behalf that she “might live and die by the word of God.”¹⁵⁴ Shortly thereafter, Ward met with Father General Andreas de Soto of the Spanish Franciscans who happened to be visiting. De Soto instructed Ward that she “was still free and fit to serve God in any state or religion, but having once made my profession I should be obliged to remain.”¹⁵⁵ Ward states that it was at that moment that she was “enkindled with a vehement desire to procure a monastery for the English of this Order.”¹⁵⁶ Peters suggests that the desire for an English foundation of the Poor Clares was shared by several of the Englishwomen who experienced some level of dissatisfaction with the Walloon Poor Clares.¹⁵⁷ Even though others wanted the English foundation to come to fruition, Ward was, as far as is known, the only one who struggled with how to accomplish this difficult feat. Peters posits that Ward struggled with the decision to leave “despite strong interior certainty” because she “still had little experience of mystical prayer accompanied by illumination, so she remained cautious and wary.”¹⁵⁸ At this stage of her spiritual development, Ward still desired some measure of affirmation from her superiors to confirm the proper course of action. In this instance, it would be Sr. Mary Stephen Goudge, another English sister in the Walloon Poor Clares and Ward’s novice mistress, who would provide her with the guidance she required.¹⁵⁹

Internally convinced that it was not God’s will that she remain an extern sister at the Walloon Poor Clares, Mary Ward nevertheless sought affirmation from Sr. Mary Stephen Goudge that her decision was what God willed. Unfortunately for Ward, Sr. Mary Stephen had fallen ill and would need time to recover before speaking with Ward about this issue.¹⁶⁰ During this period of waiting, God comforted Ward in prayer with what she described as “frequent and clear lights, accompanied by peace and strength of soul far more than I had ever before experienced, showing me that this was not my vocation” adding that as a result, she “could,

without scruple, depart from there.”¹⁶¹ Ward wrote down everything she had experienced during this deep contemplative prayer for Sr. Mary Stephen to review.¹⁶² Upon her examination of Ward’s papers, Sr. Mary Stephen had concluded that Ward should no longer be an extern sister, because her countenance was fit for the enclosed life.¹⁶³ This validation of her interior longing for enclosure was finally given to Ward through Sr. Mary Stephen, though the manner in which it was given provided Ward much disappointment. Ward expresses that she felt as though her confessor and her superior had previously demanded that she stay in the extern role for reasons that “appeared to me too human.”¹⁶⁴ She became aware that Sr. Mary Stephen was finally revealing Ward’s true vocation to her because she no longer needed her to fill the role as an extern. At this revelation, Ward’s trust in her novice mistress had been broken, and she felt “like a person deprived of the help and counsel necessary in such a conjecture.”¹⁶⁵ Ward explained that despite the questionable circumstances of the advice given, she still felt it was appropriate that she leave the Walloon Poor Clares because “what the mother now said to me was the only guidance which was granted to me, therefore I would embrace it with all affection as the will of God.”¹⁶⁶

Not much is expressed by Ward regarding the period between her departure of the Walloon Poor Clares in spring of 1607 and her entrance into the new English foundation at Gravelines in November of 1609.¹⁶⁷ What Ward does make clear about this particular time period is her struggle with spiritual dryness.¹⁶⁸ Ward had initially believed that this aridity was caused by “some unknown negligence of mine in divine service, which led to a loss of the spirit of devotion and the sensible sweetness that I used to feel.”¹⁶⁹ Fr. Keynes was her confessor for the majority of this period, though Peters postulates that Fr. Roger Lee, SJ, would assume the responsibility during the latter portion.¹⁷⁰ Ward articulates that Keynes “guided my conscience

entirely by the way of fear; for instance that I ought to hate myself, to fear the judgements of God, to tremble at the pains of hell."¹⁷¹ After much contemplation, Ward ultimately discerned that her spiritual dryness had stemmed from her internal incompatibility with his methods of spiritual advisement, though she explains that he may have advised her so harshly because he wished to mitigate all of the praise she was receiving for founding the new English foundation.¹⁷²

Ward's spiritual discontentment and physical stress were abated once she was settled into her new vocation as a contemplative enclosed sister. Though her own newly-founded house of English Poor Clares at Gravelines would not be ready until November of 1609, Ward and the other English sisters enjoyed the contemplative life during a brief stay in St. Omer. However, given Mary Ward's tendency towards scrupulosity, one cannot help but wonder if she felt such contentment was hindering her spiritual growth. As referenced earlier in this chapter, Ward explains that she held austerity and seclusion as "two virtues I had, in theory, placed all perfection."¹⁷³ It is possible that this began to disturb her, because placing these things at the height of perfection was discouraged in *The Spiritual Combat*:

And many other also (amongst the which you many finde some clad with religious habite liuing [living] in cloisters) persuade themselues [themselves] that this perfection wholly consisteth of the frequenting of the Quire [choir], in silence [silence], in solitarinesse [solitude], and in well ordered discipline. And thus some in these, and some in other external exercises beleue [believe] that the perfect state of the spirituall man is founded: but yet notwithstanding is is not so, for although the foresaide exercises are sometimes means to obtaine Spirite, sometimes fruits of Spirite, yet cannot it be saide, that in these only consisteth christian perfection, and the true Spirite..."¹⁷⁴

Though establishing the convent at Gravelines was a laudable accomplishment, and Ward was finally permitted to pursue the form of religious life she had intended to live amongst her own countrywomen, her soul would yet again become restless concerning the question of God's will for her life. When Ward was following the Rule of St. Clare according to Mother Mary Stephen Goudge's insistence, she admitted that she found this life most pleasing to her:

Which austerity and retirement were extremely to my content, and so far as I remember nothing then could have disturbed me, or given me cause of temptation, except to hear that there was some other order in the

Church of God, more austere and more secluded, in which two virtues I had, in theory, placed all perfection.¹⁷⁵

Despite the fact that the Order of St. Clare was the Rule most pleasing to her disposition, she only observed this Rule for a short duration.¹⁷⁶ Though she had finally obtained what she felt was her vocation, as was realized through Mother Mary Stephen Goudge, "the only guidance which God granted,"¹⁷⁷ she felt uncomfortable about her newfound purpose within the span of a year. Ward attributes her sudden change of heart to a spiritual experience she had on the feast of St. Athanasius, May 2, 1609:

It appeared wholly Divine, and came with such force that it annihilated and reduced me to nothing; my strength was extinguished, and there was no other operation in me but that which God fulfilled in me; the sight – intellectually – of what was done, and what was to be done in me, I willing, or not willing, of this only was I conscious. The suffering was great because [it was] far beyond my powers, and the consolation was greater to see that God willed to make use of me in what pleased him more. Here it was shown me that I was not to be of the Order of St. Clare; some other thing I was to do, what, or of what nature I did not see, nor could I guess, only that it was to be a good thing, and what God willed.¹⁷⁸

Ward was so thoroughly convinced through this experience that she was not to remain a Poor Clare, and left the new foundation she played an instrumental role in creating to return to England to discern her future.¹⁷⁹ Again, not much is known regarding the details of her stay in England, except for perhaps the most monumental turning point in Ward's life – a mystical experience she had while immersed in contemplative prayer which came to be known as the Glory Vision.

Prior to leaving for England, Ward had made a vow under the direction of her confessor at the time, Fr. Roger Lee, SJ, "to be a religious, but not of any order in particular," and also promising to become a Carmelite if Lee so willed it.¹⁸⁰ During her stay in England, while preoccupied with procuring a dowry for a young girl to enter religious life, Ward experienced a vision so vivid to her soul that she could not help but be affected by it.¹⁸¹ Ward explains:

I was abstracted out of my whole being, and it was shown to me with clearness and inexpressible certainty that I was not to be of the Order of St Teresa, but that some other thing was determined for me, without all comparison more to the glory of God than my entrance into that holy religion...I remained for a good space without feeling or hearing anything but the sound "Glory, glory, glory."¹⁸²

The Glory Vision gave Ward no specificity regarding what God had specifically ordained for her life, but provided her with internal spiritual certainty that she was not to be a Carmelite, despite Lee's insistence. This conflict between her individual discernment of God's will and her confessor's interpretation of the same initially caused Ward great consternation and suffering. In an effort to attain spiritual clarity, Ward resorted to making severe acts of corporal penance, primarily the wearing of a haircloth.¹⁸³ She desired to achieve internal certainty that this was the will of God and not merely her own inclinations.

It was not until 1611 that God would provide Ward with the more specific instruction that she so desperately needed. During a pilgrimage to our Blessed Lady of Sichem near Louvain, France in 1611, Mary gained clarity in prayer regarding the task she was to embark upon:

Being alone in some extraordinary repose of mind I heard distinctly, not by sound of voice, but intellectually understood, these words: TAKE THE SAME AS THE SOCIETY – so understood as that we were to take the same in both matter and manner, that only excepted which God, by diversity of sex, hath prohibited. These few words gave so great measure of light in the particular Institute, so much comfort and strength, and so changed the whole soul that it was impossible for me to doubt but that they came from him...it only remains that I be faithful on my part.¹⁸⁴

Both the Glory Vision and her call to "Take the same as the Society" were realizations of God's will that were discovered through contemplative prayer, and both of these interior revelations ran contrary to the advisement of her spiritual director, Fr. Roger Lee. Ward's spiritual development had experienced much turmoil throughout the first five years of her religious life, but she had also experienced much growth through her sorrows. The young woman who had approached her newfound vocation with a strong inclination towards her own individual discernment had to endure several spiritual crises when her conception of God's will did not coincide with that of her superiors, whom she felt at times acted out of their desire to abate worldly concerns instead of their duty to ensure God's will be done. As she entered the next phase of her life, Ward would continue to encounter this, only on a much larger scale with much greater implications.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Third Great Decision - Reexamining Priestly Spiritual Direction

Priestly spiritual direction was of the utmost importance to Mary Ward throughout her life. This is evident from the infancy of her spiritual development, when her confessor openly discouraged her from entering the religious life; she did not act upon her vocation, which she had ardently felt was God's will for several years, until she gained his approval. Her confessors also played major roles in her spiritual development and subsequent decisions during her time as a Poor Clare and even in the founding of her Institute. Ward's longtime confessor, Fr. Roger Lee, SJ, was even credited with the founding of the Institute by many who criticized it, using the pejorative phrase "Rogerites" in reference to the English virgins.¹⁸⁵ Under Lee's direction, the Institute's "twofold purpose" was "the sanctification and salvation of its members...and the education of young girls to the end that they may learn to know and love God and live in obedience to him and their parents."¹⁸⁶ The first plan for the Institute, written in 1612 and entitled *Schola Beate Mariae*, is greatly influenced by Ward's time as a Poor Clare and Lee's insistence that Ward's new order be similar in constitution to an existing order of female religious by observing some level of enclosure.¹⁸⁷ Ward's full understanding of what the Institute should be was not realized in this document; it was not until 1616's *Ratio Instituti* that Ward would reveal her desire to grow beyond schools on the Continent, and instead focus upon working for the good of her home country from within its borders. Though she had not yet understood the full magnitude of what she perceived to be God's mission for her Institute in 1612, she also felt pressure from Lee to follow some level of enclosure. Ward had a definite suspicion that Lee's direction was being influenced by his fellow Jesuits who were not friends to Ward or her Institute. However, it was not until after Fr. Lee's passing in November of 1615 that

Ward began to make her increasing skepticism of priestly spiritual direction known, since she took her vow of perpetual obedience to Lee very seriously.¹⁸⁸ Ward began to realize, during the formation of her Institute, the complex interpersonal relationships that influenced priests and consequently affected the type of direction they gave those under their charge. She explains in a 1620 letter to Msgr. Albergati (then papal nuncio of lower Germany) how the Jesuits pressured Fr. Lee to instruct Ward according to the best interest of the Society:

Their [the Jesuits] uncooperative attitude did and still does cause great trouble, especially in the first seven years while my confessor, to whom I have vowed obedience, was still alive. They tried to persuade him to their way of thinking, against his judgment and knowledge, which I afterwards understood.¹⁸⁹

It was not until 1617 during her St. Omer Conferences that she openly discouraged her sisters from “look[ing] upon them [men] as prophets” because then “we shall see their imperfections.”¹⁹⁰ Instead, she urged them to “look upon them as men” because “we shall see them as far otherwise.”¹⁹¹ Ward advised her sisters, “that you may not be deceived, you may know them by the fruits of their counsels.”¹⁹² It is important to note that these statements are not meant to discourage her sisters from seeking out priestly spiritual direction. In her notes from the Spiritual Exercises retreat she took with her new confessor, Fr. John Gerard, SJ, in 1616, Ward still emphasizes her reliance upon her confessor: “Touching the Institute and this course of life, I will do without exception what he [her confessor] thinketh best.”¹⁹³ However, the statements Ward made during her First Instruction at the St. Omer Conferences are meant to encourage her sisters to think critically about the direction they are given. In place of blind trust of their confessors in spiritual matters, Ward is suggesting a critical understanding of spiritual direction, enlightened by one’s personal understanding of God’s will.

Ward’s changing attitude towards spiritual direction is a result of her experience with the clerical politics that colored the manner in which she had been directed throughout the course of her life. As previously mentioned, it was not until Ward became aware of the pressure imposed

upon Fr. Roger Lee by his fellow Jesuits that she fully comprehended the human element of divinely-inspired priestly spiritual direction. This did not cause Ward to abandon the practice, or to find it less efficacious, but it did cause her to undergo it with scrutiny, and as a result, she relied upon the practice far less than she had in her youth.

An examination of the issues rife within the English Catholic priesthood is necessary if one is to understand how these issues would affect the spiritual direction that Mary Ward received. It is important to first assess a controversy that undoubtedly affected not only Ward, but her Institute, in various important ways. The continuing conflict between the English secular clergy (seminary priests who did not belong to a religious order) and the English Jesuit priests throughout Ward's life was profoundly influential: it not only framed the way her confessors advised her, but also how those in England viewed her once she wished to adopt the same model as the Society of Jesus and how the Pope and the congregation of bishops approached her cause.

The Archpriest Controversy, also referred to as the Appellant Controversy, exacerbated hostilities that were already present between the English seminary clergy and the English Jesuits.¹⁹⁴ The trouble began in 1598, when George Blackwell was named Archpriest of England by Pope Pius VIII. This was seen as a major victory for the Jesuits, especially Robert Persons, who felt that Blackwell was the archpriest that could help to further develop their fledgling mission.¹⁹⁵ In contrast, the English secular clergy despised the Jesuit-friendly Blackwell and viewed his appointment as further evidence of an underlying Jesuit usurpation of spiritual authority in England.¹⁹⁶ In response to the perceived Jesuit threat that Blackwell embodied, the appellants launched a prolific pamphlet propaganda campaign, which in some instances was State-supported.¹⁹⁷ The seminary priests, also known as "appellants" because of their appeals to Rome against the archpriest, "set themselves up in opposition to a Jesuit-dominated English

Catholicism,” claiming that, in contrast to their Jesuit counterparts, “their religion was one of private devotion and ministration to the faithful, not a public challenge...to temporal authority...[or] to the official religion.”¹⁹⁸ The secular priests were not primarily concerned with the conversion of England; they instead chose to focus on maintaining the faith of English Catholic aristocratic and gentry families.¹⁹⁹ The majority of English secular priests came from gentry families, and they tended to support the gentry and aristocratic families whom were already members of their social circle. Their wealthy patrons were also not keen on their priests utilizing their fiduciary support to become agents of social change.²⁰⁰ When the question of succession arose at the end of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, the lay gentry Catholics “regained the upper hand” over their priests, because there was great hope that tolerance of an English brand of Catholicism could be possible, and thus support was often given dependent upon how the priest conducted himself in the public square.²⁰¹ Michael Questier explains, “Many patrons were less than enthusiastic about their priests engaging in popular evangelization or taking upon them any kind of public role or responsibility.”²⁰² This becomes apparent in appellant literature, as secular priests made appeals to the State for tolerance of “a Catholic episcopate in England would help curb political extremism among Catholics...and to promote the true worship of God.”²⁰³

The Jesuits saw the plight of the Catholic Faith in England through a much different lens. As opposed to the secular priests, who under the influence of their wealthy gentry patrons and their desire for spiritual control of the Catholic faithful in England, primarily desired State tolerance, “the Jesuits regard[ed] England as more of a missionary territory, more like the New World than a European Christian State.”²⁰⁴ The Jesuits had already established a reputation for themselves as subversive agents of a foreign-supported religious order founded by a Spanish soldier, the soon-to-be canonized Ignatius of Loyola.²⁰⁵ It was not only their perception as

foreign, but also their ultimate aim to regain England for the Pope, that the secular priests claimed made the Jesuits fundamentally “anti-England.” As Stefania Tutino points out, the most prominent representative of the Jesuit mission in England, Robert Persons, “did not want Protestant England to tolerate Catholicism, he wanted a Catholic England.”²⁰⁶ While Jesuit apologies during the controversy stand firm on allegiance to the Pope, pamphlets published by secular clergy apologists tend to draw a distinction between “loyal Catholics” and those whom supported the 1571 papal bull excommunicating Queen Elizabeth I. According to Tutino, “the model of the secular priests provided for a clean-cut division between...temporal authority and the authority of spiritual power.”²⁰⁷ Tutino illustrates this division by quoting a tract written by an unnamed English secular priest:

[The secular priests] firmly and clearly state that the Pope has no power to deprive kings their scepters and royal standards...even though the priests recognize the authority of the Pope is supreme in spiritual matters, nevertheless they deny the same authority in temporal matters.²⁰⁸

In order to illustrate the conflict between the English secular clergy and the English Jesuits, it is necessary to examine the rich pamphlet literature that emerged from the conclusion of the sixteenth century through the dawn of the reign of James IV. Though this was only the beginning of a conflict that would resonate throughout the early seventeenth century and beyond, knowledge of its foundation is critical, because it informs us of the subsequent quarrels that affected the Jesuit mission in England and, by extension, Mary Ward’s Institute. Since Ward insisted upon taking on a similar constitution to the Society of Jesus, her Institute would be viewed by English eyes as nearly synonymous with the Jesuits, and therefore it is of no surprise that much of her opposition arose from English secular clergyman. This is not meant to be an exhaustive treatment of the controversy, but rather a summary of important content to provide context of certain events in Ward’s life. By examining the conflict between the secular clergy and the Jesuits at its roots, we will be able to develop a more thorough understanding of the

suppression of Mary Ward's Institute nearly thirty years later. Though many pamphlets and tracts were examined and contributed to this study, the primary works considered within the Archpriest Controversy are as follows: *A briefe apologie*,²⁰⁹ written by Robert Persons (also referred to as Parsons), which outlines the Jesuit cause in reaction to its maligning by the secular priests; Fr. John Mush's *A dialogue betwixt a secular priest, and a lay gentleman*,²¹⁰; a tract written in defense of the secular priests; and Matthew Sutcliffe's *A challenge concerning the Romish church*,²¹¹ wherein Anglican clergyman Sutcliffe's scathing diatribe against the Jesuits illustrates how the Archpriest Controversy affected broader English culture.

Robert Persons was arguably the most important figure of the early English Jesuits, though he is often eclipsed in notoriety by his companion on the first mission to England, Edmund Campion, who was martyred and later canonized. Persons was the superior of the first Jesuit mission in England, though he would never return to the land of his birth upon his departure in 1585. At the time *A briefe apologie* was written, Persons was the Rector of the English College, Rome, and the Prefect of the Jesuit mission to England.²¹² Upon the death of the English Cardinal William Allen in 1594, the English Catholics lacked clear leadership, and tensions between secular clergy and the Jesuits grew with unbridled tenacity.²¹³ This absence of cohesive leadership, Persons feared, would open the door to a fragmented English church; as Victor Houlston explains, "where the lay people faced dilemmas of citizenship and faith, and the clergy were unevenly dispersed and connected with a diversity of gentry families, there was a real danger of fragmentation."²¹⁴ In response to this concern, Persons believed a bishop should be appointed to ensure English Catholic unity and order.²¹⁵ However, Pope Clement VIII refused to appoint a bishop, and would only agree to the appointment of an archpriest.²¹⁶ Houlston explains why the secular clergy took issue with this decision:

[To secular clergy] Bishops represented normality; as long as the Pope refrained from appointing Catholic bishops to episcopacies held by Protestants, England was being treated as a mission field, where the Jesuits would have far too much freedom of action. An archpriest, on the other hand, would have authority only over the seculars, while the Jesuits remained virtually autonomous.²¹⁷

Though much of the secular clergy originally accepted the proposition of an archpriest and George Blackwell as the nominee to the post, a vocal minority saw this action – at the time lacking any evidence of papal approval – as a covert attempt made by Persons and the Jesuits to seize control of English Catholicism.²¹⁸ Persons was disturbed by this resistance, and felt that these representatives of the secular clergy were standing in the way of the unified, uncompromising English Catholicism that he had desired to establish and develop.²¹⁹ *A briefe apologie* was his response to the backlash he and his order were experiencing in the wake of secular clergy protest against the archpriest. Though not the first pamphlet written in response to the appellant arguments (the first, *An Epistle of Pius Grief*, was likely written by Fr. Nicholas Smith, SJ, Persons' secretary), it is, according to Houlston, a piece “that contain[s] some of his best and most sustained, passionate writing.”²²⁰ Both *A briefe apologie* and *A Manifestation of the Great Folly*, Persons' second and final contribution to the literature concerning the Archpriest Controversy, are “a sustained treatment of the theme of slander.”²²¹ Persons firmly believed that the Jesuit plan was the approach most likely to yield success in the quest to reclaim England for the Catholic faith, and he felt as though the appellant slander towards not only himself, but the Jesuit order as a whole, “threatened to extinguish the light of virtue” that Persons desired to maintain.²²²

A briefe apologie begins with an epistle addressed to the Pope with the intent of discrediting the appeals made by the secular priests to the Holy Father. Persons begins by outlining a history, albeit a subjective one, of the Catholic struggle under Queen Elizabeth I. He is quick to align himself and the Jesuits with the late Cardinal William Allen, and the secular

priests with the State. This distinction is important, because it allies the Jesuits with strong Catholic authority, thereby installing them as defenders of truth, as opposed to the secular priests, whom are enemies of truth because they aim to slander such authority. Persons explains:

In the years 1587 and 88 two of these priests were induced to write...books in favor of heretikesm as it were by reason of State the one against Doctor Allen, the other against the Jesuites, and F. Persons by name, delivering also the same into the hads of Sir Francis Walsingham Secretarie to the State, from whom they had money, and one of the said Priest was...a spy for the Counsel of England...²²³

Persons persists in this distinction within the epistle as he begins to discuss the Archpriest Controversy. He describes the secular priests as insubordinate to the Holy Father's directive, plotters against the Jesuits, and loyal to the Queen and her State at the expense of the Catholic faith. Persons outlines how the secular priests are given pardon by the State to conduct their affairs during the controversy:

Divers scandalous and temerarious propositions have been printed...having dealt expreslie with the Queene and counsel heere against the Fathers of the Society...[the secular priests] have obteyned that foure of their seditious companie that were in prison before have libertie...to ryde up and downe all Englad for a tyme to gather money and letters (which few Catholikes wil dare to deny them least the detect them to the Counsel)...²²⁴

Once the actual work begins, he does not let this theme cease; in fact, portraying the secular priests as disloyal to the Pope and colluding with the State is the core of his argument against them. Persons depicts the secular priests as recalcitrant children who, unlike the Jesuits, have been largely shielded from torture and martyrdom because of their cooperation with the State, and are unjustly upset when situations do not develop as they wish:

Fewe of these men have byn eyther wounded or put to death by the common enemy, but rather are cherished, and favored in secret to make opposition against the whole body...and as for their oppression it is none, but such as they list to imagyne, when they canot have their owne licentious wil in al things.²²⁵

Though Persons' rhetoric is undoubtedly emotionally-charged, his accusation that the State sponsored the pamphlets of the secular priests was not unfounded. The State welcomed any opportunity it could seize to divide the Catholic community, in hopes of destroying it. Houlston explains that "the English Protestant authorities...were doing everything to encourage the state

of disunity and strife among the Catholics by sponsoring anti-Jesuit tracts.”²²⁶ This is not to say that all secular clergyman were mere puppets of their aristocratic supporters and Protestant sponsors. Some, like Fr. John Mush, could hardly be called loyalists, yet still found issue in how the Jesuits handled the situation.

Fr. John Mush, secular priest and longtime confessor of the young Mary Ward, eloquently expressed his indignation with the Jesuits in his tract, *A dialogue betwixt a secular priest and a lay gentleman*. Mush was a highly-respected secular priest, most well-known today for his biography of the now St. Margaret Clitherow, a married recusant woman who he served as confessor prior to her martyrdom in 1586. Though he had worked comfortably with Jesuits throughout his priesthood, and continued to do so after the Archpriest Controversy came to a close, he felt he and his fellow secular priests were done a great injustice in this matter. In *A dialogue*, Mush formulates his argument against the Jesuits in response to a series of questions the layman character posits. In his first series of questions, the layman points out two serious charges the Jesuits have leveled against the secular priests:

[The Jesuits] say you were Schismaticks, because you refused for a whole yeares space to accept of the authority [of the archpriest] instituted by the Pope, and to submit your selves to maister Blackwell, ordained Arch-priest over you. And in this refusal you were Schismaticks...²²⁷

Mush answers these charges, claiming that the Jesuits were acting outside of their jurisdiction, and had no authority to charge the secular priests with such egregious crimes as insubordination and schism:

The decision of this question belonged nothing at all to [the Jesuits], but was to be had from the See Apostolicke and Supreme pastor of Gods church, before whose sentence pronounced, no man was to be condemned of so foule a fault, or punished for the same with publick infamie...²²⁸

Mush focuses a great deal of *A dialogue* disproving the Jesuit charge against them that they are in schism with the Church due to their perceived insubordination against Archpriest Blackwell. He quotes St. Thomas Aquinas’s work extensively in Latin, explaining that “Schisme is that

(sayeth [St. Thomas]) whereby one refuseth to bee subject to the Supreame Bishop.”²²⁹

Considering that the Pope, the “Supreame Bishop,” had not yet officially ruled the secular priests as “Schismaticks,” Mush concludes that the slander he and his fellow priests had suffered was at the hand and quill of “a private man’s opinion,” condoned by the Jesuit order.²³⁰

Later on in *A dialogue*, Mush discusses the volatile question of English succession, again distancing the Jesuits from proper Englishmen, determined only to further the Spanish cause.²³¹ In these final pages, Mush illustrates the primary difference between the secular priests and that of the Jesuits on the question of succession at the conclusion of Elizabeth’s reign. The secular priests believed, in Mush’s words, that they should “commit the disposing of kingdomes and princes businesses to Gods wisdom and providence.”²³² They looked upon the Jesuits’ involvement in such issues – namely Persons and his proposal of the Spanish Infanta – as not only wrong, but anti-English. Not only is Persons committing a treasonous act, but he is also endangering the Catholic faithful in England. Mush explains:

No less than the Jesuites have done, with their efforts to set up a Spaniard; it beeing prohibited by the lawes of the realme, under a capital penaltie, that none should meddle in the matter of succession, during her Majesties life...perhaps it had not beseemed Fr. Parsons [that he his act would] thereby bring us all in mortall hatred with the State, and in manifest daunger of our lives, he knowing that it would so mightily offend them.²³³

Mush expresses valid concerns regarding the possibility of Catholic interference in the issue of succession. However, the fact that he and his secular brethren desire no longer to be involved in affairs of the State is a marked departure from Mush’s approach to his former spiritual charge, Margaret Clitherow, whom he frequently encouraged to openly subvert the State in manners of religion.²³⁴ It was doubtful here that Mush’s change of heart was due to State or aristocratic cajoling; he, like many other secular priests, hoped for Catholic toleration to come during the twilight years of Elizabeth’s reign, and saw Persons’ meddling as inhibiting progress.

Given that the Archpriest Controversy had touched upon political matters, it is hardly surprising that the issue was not exclusive to the pens of Catholic priests. Protestant clergymen were not exempt from involvement in this controversy themselves. Matthew Sutcliffe, a clergyman of the Church of England, published *A challenge concerning the Romish Church* in 1602. The book, as is evidenced by the full title and much of the preface, was expressly directed toward Robert Persons. In the preface, Sutcliffe makes mention of a series of written exchanges between himself and Persons regarding what Suffolk sees as the Jesuit brand of Catholicism.²³⁵ According to Sutcliffe, Persons did not successfully defend himself, and evidently did not respond to the most recent challenge issued to him.²³⁶ Sutcliffe takes Persons' silence as tacit agreement that the Jesuits are not true Catholics, and he even goes so far to call upon the Pope to punish Persons:

For taking upon him to debate some matters in my late challenge, he is neither able to contradict my arguments...nor hath he abilitie to discharge his consorts of the crimes of haeresie and treason, wherewith they stand charged, and now by his silence seem to be convicted. So that I doubt not, but if the pope may understand, and be well informed of this prating fellowes treacherous dealing in his cause, that he will either punish him, as a false traitor to his See, or at least commaund him to silence as a weake ideot, and foolish pleader in matter of religion.

The central purpose of Sutcliffe's book was to prove that the faith professed by the Jesuits and "the adherents to the archpriest" was not in fact the Catholic faith. Though he denounces all "papists," he appears to be drawing a distinction between those who look to the pope in all matters, and the loyalist Catholics who do not betray the Queen by putting the pope before her. Though he takes issue with Persons on many levels, even resorting to petty insults regarding his grammar, his main contention appears to lie with Persons' meddling in the question of English succession. In Persons' tract *A Conference About the Next Succession*, Persons proposes that the Catholic Spanish Infanta, Isabella Clara Eugenia, is the proper choice to succeed the childless Queen Elizabeth. Sutcliffe claims that Persons is "a very vain fellowe to demand of us such a conference."²³⁷ He makes clear that he shares the view of his fellow Anglicans, and also the

secular priests, that the Jesuits were a foreign entity attempting to hold power over all of England; Sutcliffe taunts Persons, coyly asking “if the Jesuites and their consorts be combined with forreine enemies, what reason have they to challenge the favour due to subjects?”²³⁸ Later on in his book, Sutcliffe attempts to discredit Persons again, pointing out that priests of his own religion are fighting against the Jesuit order: “The secular priests that deale against the Jesuites are neither Turks nor Infidels in Parsons his reckoning. Yet have they manfully stood against the Jesuites treacherous plots for our contry...”²³⁹ Sutcliffe is clearly no friend to the Catholic cause, but he believes the Jesuits to be the true traitors. Though the secular priests have religious proclivities that are still erroneous in Sutcliffe’s eyes, he still likens them to countrymen, while the Jesuits are a shadowy foreign enemy with eyes on reclaiming England for Catholicism. It is evident that Sutcliffe does not feel nearly as threatened by the secular priests because of their loyalist tendencies. Ultimately, Sutcliffe is utilizing the Catholic factionalism made manifest by the Archpriest Controversy to try to defeat what he understands to be the true Catholic threat: the Jesuits.

The Archpriest Controversy officially came to an end in 1602, when Pope Clement VIII issued a decree cementing the archpriest’s authority while making some concessions to the secular priests.²⁴⁰ Though the pamphlet war concerning the issue had ceased, the fundamental differences between the secular priests and the Jesuits persisted. As we will see, the conflict was far from over. As Thomas Graves wrote in *The Archpriest Controversy*, “the general tendency and habit of mind which had marked the Appellants now became characteristic of the secular clergy in England as a whole for the next two centuries.”²⁴¹ Mary Ward and her Institute would perpetually find themselves in the crosshairs of this heated rivalry.

The conflict between the Jesuits and the English secular clergy was still very much alive and well when Mary Ward was seeking approval for her Institute in 1616. Michael Questier acknowledges this in his work, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*²⁴², where he outlines the continuing power struggle between the seminary priests and the Jesuits to procure patronage among the Catholic gentry and nobility in England:

This [patronage of wealthy English Catholics] gave them [priests] an influence quite out of proportion to their numbers...and their claim to represent the whole community, both clerical and lay, meant that their own intellectual differences and polemical quarrels could become struggles for the heart of the Catholic community itself.²⁴³

Though he had been living on the Continent for the vast majority of his priestly ministry, Fr. Roger Lee, Ward's confessor during the infancy of her Institute, was very much influenced by the clerical politics that plagued the English Catholic clergy. As previously mentioned, the Jesuits were concerned about associating themselves with Ward's Institute for several reasons. Ignatius of Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus, strongly urged the men of his order to stay away from the spiritual direction of female religious. This was often cited by the Jesuits as reason enough to be averse to Ward's Institute. However, as Orchard suggests in *Till God Will*, this reasoning lies in a fundamental misunderstanding between the Jesuits and Ward regarding the role of the Jesuits in the proposed Institute.²⁴⁴ Ward was not proposing that the Institute be subject to the Jesuits, and she makes this clear beginning with her very first proposal for the Institute in 1612, the *Schola Beate Mariae*: "And though this Institute for just causes is subject to no Religious Order of men, but the sisters decided to live wholly as disciples of Christ..."²⁴⁵ However, many Jesuits, like "successive Generals of the Society, Claudius Aquaviva and Mutius Vitelleschi" strongly discouraged involvement with the Institute on these grounds.²⁴⁶ They also urged Fr. Roger Lee and Fr. John Gerard, Ward's confessor after Lee's death, to oppose the Institute and to encourage Ward to either take an order that was already established or to

construct her new order based upon rules of strict enclosure. However, their intense opposition to the Institute did not hinge solely upon their founder's discouragement of associating themselves with orders of women religious. One can indeed argue that the Jesuits abhorred the thought of the Institute because they knew associating themselves with it would provide more fodder for the secular priests to use against them with the English nobility.

The Jesuits were fervently opposed to Ward's vision to "Take the same as the Society," or to name her Institute in a similar manner to the Society of Jesus.²⁴⁷ Ward outlines this tribulation in her letter to Msgr. Albergati in 1621:

[The Jesuits urged them to] take the name of some Order already confirmed, or some new one, or any we could think of, but not that of Jesus. This the fathers of the Society urged exceedingly, and still do so every day, telling us that though they recognize that we will not be satisfied unless we take their Constitutions at least in substance, nevertheless they are unwilling that we use the same name or the same written form for our Rule...²⁴⁸

Though Fr. Lee eventually relented in his insistence that Mary should take an order contrary to the one she had envisioned and distant in name and scope from the Society of Jesus, Ward began to understand through this experience how much English clerical politics had affected the way in which Fr. Lee directed her. As Ellen Macek explains in her article "‘Ghostly Fathers’ and Their ‘Virtuous Daughters’: The Role of Spiritual Direction in the Lives of Three Early Modern English Women," Ward knew Fr. Lee was advising her against his better judgement because of the pressure he was under by his superiors:

Although relieved by the clarity of her call, Mary soon perceived in her director's reaction that the spiritual advice she would henceforth receive would be influenced by the political concerns of the Jesuits. Mary submitted in obedience, even though she realized that external pressures were forcing Lee to act against his better judgment.²⁴⁹

Even though Fr. Lee had relented and decided to support Mary's young Institute – even enduring the "censure of his superiors" – Ward still perceived in him various measures of resistance to her Institute's structure that echoed the concerns of his fellow Jesuits.²⁵⁰ When Fr. Lee drafted the second proposal for the Institute which was to be sent to the Pope for approval entitled *Ratio*

Instituti, Ward was pleased by its Ignatian character, but was troubled by its adherence to the idea of enclosure. In the *Ratio Instituti*, Ward desired to part from the *Schola Beate Mariae* description of some measure of enclosure because she wished to broaden the scope of the Institute's work, but Fr. Lee did not seem to initially regard this.²⁵¹ Macek explains:

She consulted her Jesuit confessor, Fr. Roger Lee, and it may have been he who, in response, drew up an outline constitution for the proposed new foundation. Though it included certain Ignatian features, it nevertheless insisted on a measure of enclosure, and was too monastic for Mary to accept.²⁵²

Two likely reasons exist for Lee's resistance to Ward's desire for her Order to be unenclosed.

The most obvious reason lies within the precepts of the Council of Trent, where it was reaffirmed that female religious orders must remain cloistered. However, it is also important to consider this from the perspective of the English secular clergy and how the association with an unenclosed order of female religious could negatively affect the Jesuits and their position amongst the English Catholics.

The Jesuits who discouraged Fr. Lee from supporting Ward's Institute knew that the secular clergy would seize the chance to attack the Jesuits on this ground, and they were not wrong. Several prominent members of the English secular clergy would publish oppositional tracts against the Institute, and in so doing, against the Jesuits. Perhaps the most deafening blow to Ward's Institute was issued by Fr. William Harrison, who served as Archpriest of England from 1614 to 1621. According to Henriette Peters, the "Informacio" of Archpriest Harrison "was regarded as a great drawback to the continuance of negotiations" with Pope Gregory XV in the early 1620s.²⁵³ Though Peters clarifies that there is no evidence that the Archpriest intended for this to be seen by the Pope, since this was likely brought to Rome after Harrison's death by John Bennet, the Archpriest's former assistant, the article nevertheless undoubtedly affected the first audience Ward had with the Pope regarding her Institute.²⁵⁴ Though its contents did not provide

any information that the Pope assuredly already knew, it further affirmed the negative view of the Institute in the eyes of the English secular clergy.

In his “Informacio,” Archpriest Harrison constructed his argument against the Institute upon seven points, which Peters believes “can hardly have given the Curia any new information but did confirm the increasing disaffection towards these women on the Roman scene.”²⁵⁵ The Archpriest begins his exhortation against the English virgins by claiming that women are not capable of apostolic work, and thus the very duties these women desire to perform are not within their skillsets.²⁵⁶ Continuing on in this same vein, Harrison claims that “women should keep silent in church,” yet the women of this Institute “dare to speak on religious topics,” in public when priests are present.²⁵⁷ He also questions their character, stating that the women “creep into the houses of the aristocracy, put on different sorts of dress, consort with men among others and talk with people of ill-repute,” and he even goes so far to call certain women in the Institute “a scandal to the catholic faith.”²⁵⁸ The Institute’s lack of enclosure, perhaps the most obvious criticism wielded against it, is restated by the Archpriest. Harrison explains that “Such an Institute, without enclosure, is canonically forbidden.”²⁵⁹ Though many of these points would not have been new in Rome’s eyes, a particularly stinging point made by the Archpriest may have caused even the most sympathetic member of the Curia to reconsider his stance. Harrison boldly proclaims that the Institute “is not needed in England by the Church, [and it is] a danger to its reputation.”²⁶⁰ Many who were supportive of the Institute in Rome felt it was justified in light of the precarious situation of the English Church, and the Archpriest’s claim that the Institute is not only of no use to the English mission, but also a danger to its already fledgling reputation, would have undoubtedly resonated with Rome.

Though Harrison's attack on Ward's Institute did not expressly mention the Jesuits in a determinately negative light, Dr. Matthew Kellison, then president of the seminary at Douai, cited the Institute's preference for the Jesuits as a critique of its structure and operational method.²⁶¹ In Kellison's "Accusations," he claims that the women of the Institute "introduce the Jesuits into houses of the nobility and despise secular and religious priests."²⁶² This sentence alone provides evidence of the struggle between the secular clergy and the Jesuits to obtain patronage amongst the Catholic nobility and gentry in England. Kellison claims that the English virgins were providing the Jesuits with an unfair advantage in procuring patronage by introducing them to their wealthy kin and acquaintances. Though he shared many of the same objections as Harrison, this particular objection illustrates how Ward and her Institute became caught in the crossfire of English clerical politics.

Despite her strict adherence to her vow of obedience to Fr. Lee, Ward's blind trust of her spiritual director was now shattered. Though she took Fr. John Gerard as her confessor following Fr. Lee's death, her reliance upon him was considerably less than her reliance upon past spiritual directors, especially Lee. Fr. John Gerard was the confessor who was the most accepting and accommodating of Ward's vision for the Institute. This is likely so, at least in part, because Gerard knew firsthand the severity of the English situation. In his memoirs, aptly titled *The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest*, Gerard describes being brutally beaten and tortured by agents of the English government, the squalor he endured during his imprisonment in the Tower of London (and his harrowing escape in 1597), and the suffering and martyrdom of many of his colleagues and dear friends.²⁶³ He witnessed how badly Catholics in England were yearning for priests, because without them they could not receive the sacraments. While Mary Ward's Institute would not have been able to abate this suffering, they would have been able to provide

essential spiritual nourishment in the form of education. Despite his understanding and support, Ward's attitude towards spiritual direction had changed after her experience with Lee. Macek is correct in stating that Ward's "past experience had shown her that when human and divine direction clashed, the divine would eventually triumph."²⁶⁴ This perspective would color the way Ward would approach spiritual direction in the future.

Though she frequently undertook the Spiritual Exercises with Fr. Gerard in the first few years of his direction, she found that it was not her spiritual director, but the exercises themselves, that provided her with the clarity of mind she desired concerning God's will for her life. Macek explains that "it was through this process of meditation and discernment, according to the Spiritual Exercises, rather than by way of any human voice, that Mary found greater confidence and clearer vision in her call."²⁶⁵ After these first few years of closer direction, Ward began to distance herself from Gerard, due in part to geographic impediments and various assignments Gerard would be called to during this time. However, it must be noted that Ward "never appears to have given her entire confidence, let alone a new vow of obedience, to human directors."²⁶⁶ Again, this is evidenced most prominently by excerpts from her St. Omer Conferences in 1617, where she discouraged the sisters of her Institute from viewing their confessors as "prophets," and relying on their confessor's advice only when coupled with personal discernment.²⁶⁷

It must be noted that at this time Ward had still maintained a relatively close relationship with Gerard. As previously referenced, her retreat notes during the Spiritual Exercises led by Gerard in 1616 reveal that she still recognized a need to adhere to her confessor's advice regarding the Institute: "Touching the Institute and this course of life, I will do without exception what he [her director] thinketh best."²⁶⁸ In a letter dated April 1619, Ward implores Gerard's

guidance in dealing with an insubordinate lay sister in her Institute, referred to as Sr. Praxedis, ultimately ending the letter by putting the situation in his hands: “Doe with this what pleaseth you.”²⁶⁹

However, as the 1620s wore on and Ward’s Institute began to amass further opposition, Ward not only distanced herself from her spiritual director and his fellow Jesuits, but also began to encourage her sisters to openly defy or ignore their advice in place of what she saw as “divine direction.” Macek explains:

Mary appeared to realize that in the precarious world of ecclesiastical politics then being played out, she and her companions would need to rely more upon divine than human direction. At times, she clearly ignored Jesuit advice. Willing to admit even poor women into her houses, Mary told her companions at the Perugia foundation to ignore the advice of the Society members that no girl should enter their house without a dowry.²⁷⁰

As shall be explained later, this outward defiance of Jesuit direction would not sit well with Gerard, who would come to distance himself from Ward due to what he perceived as her “pride.”²⁷¹ However, what Gerard saw as disordered pride, Ward saw as personal discernment. Her lack of trust towards priestly spiritual directors as a result of her past experience with Lee, coupled with her growing reliance upon meditation and contemplative prayer to discern God’s will, resulted in Ward developing into her own spiritual director. According to Macek, Ward grew beyond her direction:

Mary Ward’s initial experiences in spiritual direction had profited her much, but the radical consequences of her personal growth in holiness disrupted the direction process itself and propelled her into activities deemed subversive to social, political, and religious institutions.²⁷²

Though Macek is correct that Ward’s “personal growth in holiness disrupted the direction process,” one may argue that it only did so because Ward had lost trust in her confessors’ ability to correctly discern the divine will. Ward’s reliance upon priestly spiritual direction was strong until she perceived a worldliness in her confessors that discouraged her. She felt as though the “ghostly father” who was meant to guide her in the ways of heaven was too blinded by concerns

of this world to be able to provide her with the proper direction to lead her there. As a result, Ward turned to meditative prayer informed by the Spiritual Exercises – which were always led by a priest – to effectively discern God’s will free of the politics of this world that she believed distracted her confessors.

However, one must remember that as early on as her discernment to the religious life in her adolescence, it appears that Ward had internally ordered her own spiritual discernment of God’s will over that of even those confessors whom she saw as “pious, prudent; regardful of the service and the common good.”²⁷³ It seems that the unveiling of Ward’s naïveté regarding the true motives of her confessors justified her decision to exercise outwardly what she had ordered internally for the better part of her spiritual development. She now felt it reasonable to openly practice what she had privately, internally believed: that her own spiritual discernment of God’s will was to be trusted over that of outside influences. This would not be a mere personal revelation, either. Ward would grow to become the primary spiritual director to the sisters in her Institute. It is true that by the early 1620s, “Mary had become a spiritual guide in her own right, providing a model of faithfulness to that small band of women who now considered her their ‘ghostly’ mother.”²⁷⁴ Though Ward’s newfound attitude towards spiritual direction seemingly liberated her from the obedience of conforming her Institute to the desires of men who were more interested in politics than proper discernment, it would also lead to several missteps that broke key relationships and provided stumbling blocks to saving her already compromised Institute.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Final Great Decision: Defying Church Authority to Save the Institute

Though the suppression of Ward's Institute had begun in 1625, when the schools the English virgins ran in Rome were ordered to be closed by Church officials, Ward still felt that her Institute would survive for one reason: she believed she had the support of the Holy Father, Pope Urban VIII. As late as 1629, Ward was invited to plead her case in Rome before the Commission of Cardinals the Pope had assigned to examine the Institute. Mary Poyntz details Ward's speech before the Commission in *The English Vita*:

[In her speech] she made it appeare the Institute was not onely lawfull, but laudable and necessary, and that there was nothing in it, nor practised by her her or hers, which had not been practised by Holy Woman, and approved by the Holy Church in particular Persons, but never practised by a community...²⁷⁵

Ward understood that the Church was very sensitive to any deviation from its sacred tradition, especially at this point in its history. Though her Institute was the first of its kind, she had argued for many years that female Catholic saints throughout history had lived lives similar to the order she had proposed for the English virgins. She firmly believed that her Institute, though new and innovative for women in many respects, was merely an official affirmation of a certain kind of feminine piety lauded by the Church throughout the ages.

According to Poyntz, Ward also expressed an understanding of the Church's hesitancy to approve the Institute in her speech before the Commission. Despite this, however, Ward stood firm, claiming that she had suffered much in her ardent fight to follow God's will for her life, and thus she could not accept her Institute in any other format:

Nor did she wonder that the Holy Church made difficulty in a thing that was new, contrary-wise she did profoundly reverence that vigilancy of theirs, but for her owne part, she did there protest before them, that the much it had cost her in 10 Yeares of Labours and sufferance to know God's will...so as to desist if His Holynes and their Emminencyes thought good she cou'd, but alter or take other she cou'd not.²⁷⁶

Ward had left Rome satisfied and nearly certain that the Commission would rule in her favor. Though some of the cardinals supported the idea of Ward's Institute, she had amassed many powerful enemies within the Church hierarchy, and this burden became too much for her supporters to bear. Poyntz explains that Cardinal Borgia asked Pope Urban VIII for his permission to withdraw from the commission, stating that "he held [the Institute] to be of God, and that he cou'd neither or durst be against it, nor was his power enough to assist it, such and so powerfull were her enemies."²⁷⁷ Though one must approach *The English Vita* with caution, considering that Poyntz made it her mission to stress that Ward had strong supporters within the clergy, this is likely true. She was received warmly in Rome by the Pope and his Commission of Cardinals, despite that fact that several of them were not fond of the Institute and sought to suppress it. It is of no surprise that Ward left Rome with an idealistic mindset, stating that she was confident in "God Almighty and his devine disposition." However, Ward was sorely mistaken. Within the next year, her Institute would be officially suppressed by the Church.

By April of 1630, news had reached Ward that her Institute was to be officially suppressed by the Church. Ward, still of the belief that she had the Pope's support, understood this as merely another ploy made by her enemies to inhibit her work. Because of this, she instructed the sisters of her Institute to ignore the orders of suppression:

Regarding those orders for suppression of the Institute...I would have you know that the basis for what has been determined against us rests on falsehood, and that the decrees themselves were written and sent out by Cardinal Bentivoglio, the old enemy of our Institute. The aforesaid order was given without His Holiness' knowledge.²⁷⁸

What Ward did not understand, however, was that the nuncios and bishops were acting on behalf of papal authority. She was not completely aware of the inner-workings of the Roman Curia, and how certain papal orders were to be executed. According to Wetter, "The link between bishops and priests and the Pope was not yet part of her inner world. It was hardly evident to her

that orders given by a nuncio or a bishop were based on papal authority.²⁷⁹ This also explains why Ward did not seem to be alarmed by the nuncios or bishops threatening her and her sisters with excommunication; if she were indeed under the assumption that the Pope had nothing to do with this threat, then this statement to her sisters to persist in the face of the “persecution” of the nuncios and bishops is more easily understood:

If it seems good to bishops or nuncios to proceed to a sentence of excommunication (which I would not believe) let it happen; a remedy will be found. It is for Ours to remain faithful to their Institute, and to suffer persecution for it, although this persecution, when the source of it is clearly considered, must be judged as an act of great severity.²⁸⁰

The confessor to the women of the recently-closed house in Liege, English Jesuit George Duckett, was given this very letter by the undoubtedly distraught women he served.²⁸¹ The letter then made its way from Duckett’s hands all the way to the eyes of the Nuncio in Cologne, Fr. Pierluigi Carafa, who decided that the letter needed to be sent to Rome because “the matter clearly had to do with obedience to the Church and to the Pope, and therefore had to go to the Holy Office.”²⁸² A copy of Mary Ward’s letter, translated from English into Latin, reached the Inquisition on July 15, 1630. Wetter explains that “at first no action was taken, since the Inquisition did not deal with copies of documents,”²⁸³ and so “the Pope ordered the Nuncio to get hold of the original document and to send it.”²⁸⁴ Though the original was never to be found, and the Inquisition did not pass an official resolution against her, “the Pope declared that the so-called general superior deserved severe punishment for inviting disobedience.”²⁸⁵

Meanwhile, in late summer of 1630, ignorant to what was transpiring in Rome, Mary Ward sent one of her companions, Winifred Wigmore, to visit the northern houses of the Institute to encourage the women of those houses to resist the suppression. When the house in Trier was suppressed in August of 1630:

The eight companions explained to the Auxiliary Bishop, Georg von Helfenstein, that they were ready to obey the Pope in all things, but that they could give up the Institute only after obtaining permission from the general superior [Ward].²⁸⁶

According to the letters of the Nuncio, Fr. Carafa, this was all done at Winifred Wigmore's urging. Fr. Carafa's letters indicate that Wigmore had arrived in Liege on August 20, 1630, though it is unclear when Wigmore had arrived in Trier and how long she had stayed there.²⁸⁷ Nevertheless, Trier seemed an easier feat to manage for Wigmore than Liege as far as the remaining companions were concerned. Wigmore treated the women of Liege with much consternation due to their ready compliance to the houses' suppression back in April of 1630.²⁸⁸ On September 5, 1630, Wigmore had demanded that Mary Copley, the superior of the Liege house, be relieved of her duties, and appointed Elizabeth Hall to be her successor; both women left the house under the cloak of darkness early the following morning.²⁸⁹ Despite this setback, Wetter explains that Wigmore remained undeterred:

She reintroduced the former manner of life, which had been forbidden; she ordered the ringing of the bells and the renewal of vows, completely against the strong advice recently given to them by their Jesuit confessor, Fr. Ducket.²⁹⁰

Wigmore's outright defiance of Fr. Ducket would soon come to a head. Once he learned of Wigmore's disobedience, he paid the companions of Liege a visit, at which point Wigmore informed him that "she had no need to discuss these matters with him"²⁹¹ because she "stood on firm ground and could not act against Mary Ward's will."²⁹² This infuriated Ducket and he tendered his resignation as confessor to the women, which Wigmore accepted without hesitation.²⁹³ This incident not only ruined the established relationship between the English College of Jesuits and the Institute, but it also resulted in a visit from the nuncio himself, Fr. Carafa.²⁹⁴ Wigmore's strong will – which some may also judge as lack of tact – resulted in a threat of excommunication from Fr. Carafa. Wetter accurately assesses the situation, stating that Wigmore "kept strictly to the task she was authorised to do, without taking account of the situation. The folly of this loyalty brought great harm to Mary Ward and her companions."²⁹⁵

Indeed, Wigmore's brash demeanor in dealing with Fr. Carafa would lead to further consequences from Rome. In two letters, "one to Cardinal Ludovisi, head of the Congregation of Propaganda, and the other to his secretary, Francesco Ignoli," Carafa outlined the hearing he had conducted with several sisters of the Institute.²⁹⁶ In his letter, he correctly pointed out "that the suppression of the Institute had not been sufficiently made known."²⁹⁷ He also suggested "that a papal bull should be published in order to dissuade the princes from their support of the Englishwomen."²⁹⁸ Francesco Ignoli was more than willing to articulate the arguments for an official papal bull of suppression against the Institute. According to Wetter, Ignoli "had been an opponent of the Jesuitesses, as also of the Jesuits, for years."²⁹⁹ Wetter believes that Ignoli's preexisting bias against the women due to their tie to the Jesuits weakened the argument he made in his document against them, which became known as his *Parere*, or his report to the Congregation of Propaganda.³⁰⁰ Wetter claims that the *Parere* "brought forth only calumnies and unsubstantiated failings" and failed to mention "any of the answers from the hearing which betrayed the uncertainty and helplessness of the women."³⁰¹ Wetter also claims that Ignoli ignored the statements made by the women "which reveal their attitude towards obedience to the Pope."³⁰² This concern is especially well-founded, given that Mary Ward had always expressed in earnest her fidelity and obedience to the Holy Father, and no written evidence exists that proves that she ever suggested otherwise. Despite the lack of evidence that Ward or her sisters ever desired to disobey the Pope, Ignoli still issued the charge in his *Parere* that their guilt was partially proven because they had "transgress[ed] a command coming from the Pope and from Propaganda."³⁰³ Ignoli also accused them of "disregard of church laws," "influencing members through false motives," "sayings... not in keeping with the faith," and "for arrogating to themselves spiritual jurisdiction."³⁰⁴ Though seemingly flawed in its presentation of evidence –

or lack thereof – the *Parere* was strong enough in its assertions to convince the Holy Father to appropriate the case of the English virgins to the Tribunal of Faith in November of 1630. As Wetter aptly puts it, “Mary Ward now stood under the shadow of the Inquisition.”³⁰⁵

In late November of 1630, news had reached Mary Ward, who was residing in Munich at the time, that her case had been reallocated to the Tribunal of Faith.³⁰⁶ Knowing that “they wanted to imprison her as a heretic,”³⁰⁷ Ward wrote a final appeal to Pope Urban VIII dated November 28, 1630.³⁰⁸ In the letter, she stresses that she was inspired to form the Institute “not...through the persuasion or suggestion of any man living...but totally and entirely (as far as human judgement can reach) ordained and commanded to me by the express word of Him.”³⁰⁹ It is likely that Ward included this statement because she wished to quell the preconceived notion many in Rome, who were sympathetic to the secular clergy and hostile towards the Jesuits, had about the English virgins: that they were merely pawns in a Jesuit ploy for power. Once she had made certain that the Holy Father understood that her intentions were purely of God, she makes a point to humble herself, stating that “I have not the least intention of preferring such lights or inspirations before the authority of Holy Church.”³¹⁰ Ward also makes clear that she does not value her own spiritual discernment over that of the Pope’s instruction: “nor [do I prefer] my interior assurance before the judgement and decision of the Supreme Pontiff.”³¹¹ In closing, Ward guarantees the Holy Father that “if your Holiness commands me to desist in such practices, I will not fail to obey.”³¹² Unfortunately for Ward and her sisters, she would be forced to uphold her promise – the papal bull of suppression, *Pastoralis Romani Pontificis*, was officially signed by the Holy Father on January 13, 1631.³¹³

By this time, Ward had sufficiently distanced herself from her former confessor, Fr. John Gerard, whom nearly fifteen years prior she had adopted as her spiritual director. According to

Wetter, “The hopeless situation of the Institute was certainly clear to Fr. Gerard, he but obviously could no longer get Mary Ward to listen to him.”³¹⁴ Gerard clearly resented Ward’s blatant disregard for his advice in the late 1620s, and upon hearing that official suppression of the Institute was in order, he openly criticized Ward. In papers written by Fr. Gerard dated 1630, Ward’s former confessor claims that he “turned against the English General when he became aware of her pride.”³¹⁵ He was also concerned that the members of the Institute had no longer “retained their first fervor,”³¹⁶ and now that “they wanted to be mistresses of their own affairs, and no longer obeyed the Apostolic See”³¹⁷ he could no longer condone their actions. Gerard’s argument that they had no longer “retained their first fervor,”³¹⁸ echoes the comments of a clergyman whom Ward cited in the First Instruction of her 1617 St. Omer Conferences. The clergyman, only referred to by Ward as Father Minister, responds to a commendation of Ward’s Institute by saying: “It is true – while they are in their first fervour, but fervour will decay and when all is done, they are but women.”³¹⁹ The implication of his statement was that women could not possibly be driven to do the work necessary to accomplish their beyond their initial period of realization. Ward took issue with his claim, stating that gender had nothing to do with success or failure in religious pursuits:

Fervour is a will to do well, that is, a preventing grace of God and a gift given freely by God, which we could not merit. It is true that fervour doth many times grow cold, but what is the cause? Is it because we are women? No, but because we are imperfect women. There is no such difference between men and women.³²⁰

Gerard’s use of similar language could be evidence of her bitterness towards Ward, because she, especially as a woman, should have sought his spiritual direction and obeyed it when it was given. Though Ward may have pledged obedience to former spiritual directors – at least in her conception of the word – she had no intention of approaching direction from Gerard in the same manner.

However, Ward did not take spiritual direction upon herself in any futile attempt to procure more power for women in the Church. Ward instructs her sisters that the Church hierarchy is still to be respected, but outside of the rightly-ordered ecclesial authority, there is no reason to determine that women are any less capable of working for the good of the Church than their male counterparts:

“I confess, wives are to be subject to their husbands, men are head of the Church, women may not administer sacraments nor preach in public churches, but in all other things, wherein are we so inferior to other creatures that they should term us ‘but women’?”³²¹

Though Ward’s belief that women religious can contribute in an active, apostolic way to the life of the Church would come to their full realization centuries later, her arguments would unfortunately fall upon deaf ears within the male Church hierarchy. Ward, upon hearing that the Pope had signed a bull of suppression of her Institute, informed her sisters that they must no longer resist the will of the bishops and nuncios. In a letter dated February 2, 1631, Ward instructs her sisters that they must “obey at once” any religious official who “forbids you to continue your religious practices” because “His Holiness wishes it.”³²²

Mary Ward, under the watchful eye of the Inquisition, obeyed the papal bull of suppression superficially by closing all houses and schools, but she and her sisters continued to live a life in line with the Rule Ward had proposed. Though she endured several periods of imprisonment in the early 1630s, where her health suffered almost to the point of death, the Pope eventually eased his condemnation of Ward and her sisters in subsequent documents; according to Wetter, the 1633 decrees regarding the Pope’s opinion of the Institute “were generally more balanced in tone.”³²³ Wetter also points out that according to Mary Ward’s letters during this period, the Pope also “gave his consent for the purchase of [a] Roman house.”³²⁴ Mary was eventually cleared of the charge heresy, and returned to England, where she would die in the midst of the English Civil War on January 30, 1645. In a letter to Barbara Babthorpe, a fellow

sister of the Institute, Mary Poyntz wrote that Ward's last instruction to her sisters was to "shew our loves by advancing our Trade."³²⁵ Just as Mary Ward upheld her promise to the Holy Father, so did the sisters of the Institute uphold their promise to their spiritual mother.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion

Mary Ward came of age during a turbulent period for English Catholics. Unlike her Catholic brethren on the Continent who inhabited countries presided over by a Catholic monarch and whose laws were predominantly informed by and subjected to the magisterium of the Catholic Church, Mary Ward never experienced an England where traditional clerical hierarchal structures were allowed to operate. Her experiences of clerical organization within her country began and ended with Jesuit priests who travelled from home to home clandestinely under the cloak of night, operating independently of a bishop, since the Pope refused to appoint one. Though she was acquainted with some secular clergy who were subject to the Archpriest – Fr. John Mush being a primary example – Ward grew up in a world where clerical primacy appeared to belong to the Pope alone.³²⁶ It is possible that the scarce availability of priests fostered an independent nature within Ward towards the spiritual life. Beginning in her adolescence, when she was first called to be a religious, it became apparent that she was determined to hold fast to ideals she believed to be revealed to her by God through personal discernment. Still, she outwardly obeyed her superiors out of love and respect, not only to them but also to God, whom she believed entrusted her to their guidance.

As she left England, pursued her vocation, and progressed in the spiritual life on the Continent, Ward began to experience how the Catholic clerical hierarchy was supposed to be structured. Her conception of the Pope as the only authority figure that truly mattered would serve much to her detriment as she sought approval for her Institute. There was much resistance to her assertion that the Institute report directly to the Pope, bypassing the primary jurisdiction of

the local bishop. In the early 1620s, Ward believed her Institute to be safe because she felt she had the approval of the Holy Father, but she was ignorant to the power of the Curia upon the fate of her work. Though she understood she had enemies within the Church, she was naïve of the complex clerical politics at play and just how influential the testimonies of detractors like Harrison and Kellison actually were. Perhaps most importantly, though she was most likely aware of the Archpriest Controversy and the troubled relationship between the Jesuits and the secular clergy, she was not aware until later in her life just how dramatically this conflict would affect her proposed Institute.

The more Ward became aware of clerical politics, the less she trusted priestly spiritual direction. Though she had internally ordered her own personal discernment through prayer and private revelation over priestly advice from an early age – as is evidenced by her discernment of a religious vocation despite the insistence of the contrary by both her father and her confessor – she did not begin to outwardly disregard or even disobey priestly spiritual guidance until after her relationship with Fr. Lee had concluded with his death in 1615. Ward's relationship with Lee was a turning point in her life, because prior to that point she had not understood how potent of an affect that the influence of clerical politics had been on her confessors. Though she valued outward obedience until she began to openly urge her sisters to the contrary in the mid-1620s, she had always remained firm internally to her own personal discernment of God's will. Once she discovered that it was indeed the Holy Father's will that her Institute be suppressed, she outwardly obeyed in theory, but not in practice. Though she agreed to the closure of the schools and houses throughout the Continent, and despite the fact that she was monitored by the Inquisition in the years subsequent to the suppression of her Institute, Ward still encouraged the sisters of her seemingly defunct Institute to persist in their vocation. Ultimately, Ward may have

conformed superficially to the spiritual direction or demands that her various confessors, bishops, nuncios, and popes had imposed upon her, but it was through personal discernment in contemplative prayer that Mary Ward often discovered what she perceived to be God's will for her life, regardless of whether the authorities within the Church hierarchy agreed with her discernment or not.

Though the modern reader may view Ward as a feminist who defied Church authority to fight for more power for women in a patriarchal Church, it was unlikely that Ward pursued the structure that she did for her Institute out of some solemn venture for women's rights. Despite the fact that her St. Omer Conferences make it very clear that she was disgusted by how certain men in the Church viewed women, Ward never expressed any distaste for the hierarchal structure of the Church itself. Rather, she was driven by what she believed to be the will of God. Mother Immolata Wetter also subscribed to this argument:

Realizing that her mission was to be worldwide she rejected episcopal government, substituting government by a superior general of her own order. Such features, enjoyed by thousands of women religious working in many ministries, are now taken for granted and are seldom ascribed to Mary Ward, to whom they are due. But she cannot be claimed as a feminist in the modern sense of the term, for her motivation was not the rights of women, but always the will of God.³²⁷

Now a Venerable in the Catholic Church and her cause for sainthood open, it appears that Mary Ward had finally attained what Mary Ponytz, Winifred Wigmore, and her other companions had hoped for but had never gotten the chance to see in their lifetime. Upon the death of their beloved foundress, they took it upon themselves to carry forth her design for the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and they did so by exercising her approach to growing in the spiritual life: use personal discernment through meditative and contemplative prayer to discern the will of God, judge your confessors "by the fruits of their counsels" instead of viewing them as "prophets,"³²⁸ and pursue this highest spiritual good, as *The Spiritual Combat* instructs, by "couragiously overcom[ing] thy owne will, both in great and little things."³²⁹ As a result,

Mary Ward's Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary, named for the original "handmaid of the Lord,"³³⁰ who conformed to his will perfectly in all matters, not only continued and flourished, but also influenced the way in which many female religious orders are structured today.

¹ Raleigh Trimble, William. *The Catholic Laity in Elizabethan England: 1558-1603*. (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1964), 15.

² Childs, Jessie. *God's Traitors: Terror and Faith in Elizabethan England*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 146.

³ For more information of Protestant polemics and propaganda of this period, please see Dolan, Frances. *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth Century Print Culture*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

⁴ Devlin, Christopher. *The Life of Robert Southwell, Poet and Martyr* as quoted in *God's Traitors: Terror and Faith in Elizabethan England*, 148.

⁵ Luke 1:38 is known to Catholics as the Blessed Virgin Mary's "fiat," or "yes" to God, accepting his request that she become the mother of Jesus: "Mary said, 'Behold, I am the handmaid of the Lord. May it be done to me according to your word.'" Catholics believe Mary was preserved from sin, and thus lived her life in complete conformity to God's will. She has long been revered as the model whom all Catholics – male and female – aspire to emulate.

⁶ Chambers, Mary Elizabeth Catherine. *Life of Mary Ward: foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary*. (London: Burns & Oates, 1882), 13.

⁷ Kenworthy-Browne, Christina, *Introduction in A Briefe Relation...with Autobiographical Fragments and a Selection of Letters*. Christina Kenworthy-Browne CJ, ed. (Suffolk, England: The Boydell Press, 2008).

⁸ *Mary Ward und ihre Grundung. Die Quellentexte bis 1645*. Ursula Dirmeier CJ, ed. 4 vols. (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

⁹ *A Briefe Relation...with a Autobiographical Segments and a Selection of Letters*. Christina Kenworthy-Brown, ed. (Suffolk, England: The Boydell Press, 2008).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 92.

¹¹ Poyntz, Mary. *The English Vita in A Briefe Relation...with Autobiographical Segments and a Selection of Letters*. Christina Kenworthy-Browne, ed. (Suffolk, England: The Boydell Press, 2008).

¹² Kenworthy-Browne, *Introduction in A Briefe Relation*, xvi.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragments in A Briefe Relation*.

¹⁶ Kenworthy-Browne, *Introduction to the Autobiographical Segments in A Briefe Relation*, 103.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1 in The Briefe Relation*, 104.

¹⁹ Kenworthy-Browne, *Introduction in The Briefe Relation*, xviii.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, xvii.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, xix.

²³ *Ibid.*, xviii.

²⁴ A near-contemporary example can be found in *The Life of St. Theresa of Ávila by Herself*, first published in Spain in 1565. Also written at the behest of her confessor, St. Theresa articulates her spiritual struggles, and speaks of herself in humble terms, giving all glory to God in her successes. Mary Ward was considering entering St. Theresa's order, the Carmelites, but decided against it after some discernment. Being an avid reader of the lives of the saints, it is likely she would at least have been familiar with the book, but an English translation may not have been available. Humility was nonetheless a cardinal virtue in the eyes of the Church, and it was of no surprise that a faithful Catholic would have emphasized this virtue extensively, perhaps even to the point of exaggeration.

²⁵ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1 in The Breife Relation*, 104-105.

²⁶ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 3 in A Briefe Relation*, 115.

²⁷ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1 in The Briefe Relation*, 109.

²⁸ Sieve and shears was a prominent superstitious practice in seventeenth century England. According to Christina Kenworthy-Browne, "A sieve and a pair of shears were held in balance, and after a prayer formula the name of the

suspect was spoken. If the sieve began to move, that person's guilt was considered to be proved." (Note 26 of *Autobiographical Fragment 1* in *A Briefe Relation*, 110).

²⁹ Poyntz, Mary. *The English Vita* in *The Briefe Relation*, 3.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 4.

³¹ Dolan, Frances. *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

³² Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1* in *The Briefe Relation*, 109.

³³ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1* in *A Briefe Relation*, 109.

³⁴ Dolan, Frances. *Whores of Babylon: Catholicism, Gender, and Seventeenth-Century Print Culture*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 5.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 8.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 8-9

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 9-10.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ Masten, Jeffrey. "Playwriting: Authorship and Collaboration," in *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997) as quoted in *Whores of Babylon*, 91.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵⁰ Gallagher, Lowell. "Mary Ward's 'Jesuitresses' and the Construction of a Typological Community" in *Maids and Mistresses, Cousins and Queens: Women's Alliances In Early Modern England*. Ed. Susan Frye and Karen Robertson. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 199-217.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 210

⁵² *Ibid.*, 10.

⁵³ Chambers, Mary Elizabeth Catherine. *The Life of Mary Ward: 1585-1645*. (London: Burns and Oates, 1882).

⁵⁴ Gallagher, Lowell. "Mary Ward's 'Jesuitresses'", 210.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 205.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 207.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 217.

⁶⁹ Chambers, Mary Elizabeth Catherine. *Life of Mary Ward: foundress of the Institute of the Blessed Virgin Mary*. (London: Burns & Oates, 1882).

⁷⁰ Kenworthy-Browne, Christina, *Introduction* in *A Briefe Relation*, xiv.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*. Helen Butterworth, trans. (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1994), xi.

⁷³ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*. Helen Butterworth, trans. (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1994).

⁷⁴ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, xi.

⁷⁵ Caldwell, Simon. "The first sister of feminism." *The Independent*. (June 11, 2009).

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/this-britain/the-first-sister-of-feminism-1702163.html>.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Wetter CJ, M. Immolata. *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*. M. Bernadette Ganne CJ and M. Patricia Harriss CJ, trans. (Campion Hall, Oxford: Way Books, 2006), 27-28.

⁷⁸ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, xi.

⁷⁹ Walsh SJ, James. "Introduction" in *Till God Will: Mary Ward through her writings*. M Emmanuel Orchard IBVM, ed. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1985), xi.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

⁸² Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 124.

⁸³ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1 in A Briefe Relation*, 107.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 106.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 107.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Poyntz, Mary. *The English Vita in A Briefe Relation*, 3.

⁹³ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 3 in A Briefe Relation*, 112.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 113.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Alice Wright, Mary's maternal aunt, lived with Mary's grandmother during the duration of her stay. Alice was not known for her purity, and committed several scandalous acts that Mary was privy to as a young woman. Mary claims that there were "manie and great daingers I so narrowly escaped in thos 5 years whyll I lived where she was." (*Autobiographical Fragment 1 in A Briefe Relation*, 108).

⁹⁷ According to Kenworthy-Browne, Garrett's name is known to us from Painting Number 9 of *The Painted Life*. (Note 6, *Autobiographical Fragment 3 in A Briefe Relation*, 115).

⁹⁸ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 3 in A Briefe Relation*, 114.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1 in A Briefe Relation*, 105.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 106.

¹⁰⁵ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 7 in A Briefe Relation*, 110.

¹⁰⁶ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 1 in A Briefe Relation*, 106.

¹⁰⁷ Poyntz, Mary. *The English Vita in A Briefe Relation*, 80.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 5.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 8.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid., 9.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Combat*. William Lester & Robert Paul Mohan, trans. (New York: Catholic Way Publishing, 2013).

-
- ¹¹⁶ Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Combat*. William Lester & Robert Paul Mohan, trans. (New York: Catholic Way Publishing, 2013).
- ¹¹⁷ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 123.
- ¹¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁹ Kenworthy-Browne, Note 5 of *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 124.
- ¹²⁰ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 123.
- ¹²¹ Ibid.
- ¹²² According to Lester and Mohan, many seventeenth-century editions of the book were attributed to the Spanish Benedictine, John of Castanzia, and many Jesuits had considered it to be authored by Fr. Achilles Gagliardi, also a Jesuit. However, most critics have concluded that it was indeed Scupoli.
- ¹²³ Lester, William and Robert Paul Mohan. *Preface in The Spiritual Combat*. (New York: Catholic Way Publishing, 2003), 1.
- ¹²⁴ Ibid.
- ¹²⁵ Ibid.
- ¹²⁶ Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Conflict*. John Gerard SJ, trans. (Antwerp: 1598). Early English Books Online.
- ¹²⁷ Ibid, x.
- ¹²⁸ Other early English language editions examined:
1. Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Conflict*. John Gerard SJ, trans. (Rouen, France: Cardin Hamillon, 1613). Early English Books Online. This appears to be a reprint of Gerard's 1598 translation.
 2. Scupoli, Lorenzo, attributed to John of Castanzia. *The Spiritual Conflict*. Unknown trans. (Paris: 1652). Early English Books Online.
 3. Scupoli, Lorenzo, attributed to John of Castanzia. *The Spiritual Combat*. Unknown trans. (London: Samuel Kelbe, 1698). Early English Books Online.
- ¹²⁹ Scupoli, Lorenzo, attributed to John of Castanzia. *The Spiritual Combat*. (London: Samuel Kelbe, 1698).
- ¹³⁰ Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Conflict*. John Gerard SJ, trans. (Antwerp: 1598), 4.
- ¹³¹ Ibid., 9.
- ¹³² Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 124.
- ¹³³ Ibid.
- ¹³⁴ Poyntz, Mary. *The English Vita in A Briefe Relation*, 8.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid., 9.
- ¹³⁷ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 125.
- ¹³⁸ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 4 in A Briefe Relation*, 119.
- ¹³⁹ Ward, Mary. "Letter to Msgr. Albergati" in *Till God Will*, 23.
- ¹⁴⁰ Ward, Mary. *Autobiographical Fragment 5 in A Briefe Relation*, 120.
- ¹⁴¹ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 126.
- ¹⁴² Ibid.
- ¹⁴³ Ibid., 126.
- ¹⁴⁴ Chambers, Mary Catherine Elizabeth. *Life of Mary Ward*, 16.
- ¹⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 127.
- ¹⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁵¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁵² Ibid.
- ¹⁵³ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁴ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 129.
- ¹⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁷ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, 82.
- ¹⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

-
- ¹⁶⁰ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 131.
- ¹⁶¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁶² Ibid.
- ¹⁶³ Ibid., 131-132.
- ¹⁶⁴ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁶⁷ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, 83.
- ¹⁶⁸ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 133.
- ¹⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁷⁰ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, 83.
- ¹⁷¹ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 133.
- ¹⁷² Ibid.
- ¹⁷³ Ward, Mary. "Letter to Msgr. Albergati" in *Till God Will*, 23.
- ¹⁷⁴ Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Conflict*. John Gerard SJ, trans. (Antwerp: 1598), 2.
- ¹⁷⁵ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 135.
- ¹⁷⁶ Mary claims that she had been observing the Rule "for four or five months" when she received a directive from God that he "willed to make use of me in what pleased him more." Ibid., 136.
- ¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 132.
- ¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 136.
- ¹⁷⁹ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, 108.
- ¹⁸⁰ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 139.
- ¹⁸¹ Peters, Henriette. *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, 108-109.
- ¹⁸² Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography in A Briefe Relation*, 139.
- ¹⁸³ Ibid.
- ¹⁸⁴ Ward, Mary. "Letter to Msgr. Albergati" in *Till God Will*, 29.
- ¹⁸⁵ Ward, Mary. *Till God Will: Mary Ward through her writings*. M. Emmanuel Orchard IBVM, ed. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1985), 50.
- ¹⁸⁶ Orchard, "Intro to *Schola Beate Mariae*" in *Till God Will*, 35.
- ¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 34.
- ¹⁸⁸ Ward, Mary. "Letter to Msgr. Albergati" in *Till God Will*, 26.
- ¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 53.
- ¹⁹⁰ Ward, Mary. "First Instruction" in *Till God Will*, 60.
- ¹⁹¹ Ibid.
- ¹⁹² Ibid.
- ¹⁹³ Ward, Mary, "Retreat Notes, 1616" in *Till God Will*, 39.
- ¹⁹⁴ Hostilities between the English secular clergy and the English Jesuits began to surface after the 1594 Wisbech Stirs, wherein a Jesuit prisoner and a secular prisoner quarreled for spiritual leadership of the other inmates in the Wisbech recusant prison. See Stefania Tutino's *Law and Conscience*, 66.
- ¹⁹⁵ Tutino, Stefania. *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570-1625*. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007), 67.
- ¹⁹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁹⁸ Questier, Michael. *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 291.
- ¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 289.
- ²⁰⁰ Ibid., 294.
- ²⁰¹ Ibid.
- ²⁰² Ibid.
- ²⁰³ Ibid.
- ²⁰⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁰⁵ St. Ignatius of Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits), was canonized in 1622 by Pope Paul V.
- ²⁰⁶ Tutino, Stefania. *Law and Conscience*, 68.
- ²⁰⁷ Ibid., 69.

²⁰⁸ “Declaration of the secular priest of Rheims” as quoted in *Law and Conscience*, 69-70.

²⁰⁹ Parsons, Robert. *A briefe apologie or defence of the Catholike ecclesiastical hierarchie, & subordination in England erected these later yeares by our holy father Pope Clement the eyght; and impugned by certayne libels printed & published of late both in Latyn & English; by some vnquiet persons vnder the name of priests of the seminaries. VVritten and set forth for the true information and stay of all good Catholikes, by priests vnited in due subordination to the Right Reuerend Archpriest, and other their superiors.* (Antwerp: A. Conincx, Permissu superiorum, 1601). Early English Books Online.

²¹⁰ Mush, John. *A dialogue betwixt a secular priest, and a lay gentleman. Being an abstract of the most important matters that are in controuersie betwixt the priests and the Spanish or Iesuiticall faction.* (Rhemes [i.e. London]: Adam Islip, MDCL, 1601). Early English Books Online.

²¹¹ Sutcliffe, Matthew. *A challenge concerning the Romish Church, her doctrine & practises, published first against Rob. Parsons, and now againe reuiued, enlarged, and fortified, and directed to him, to Frier Garnet, to the archpriest Blackevvell and all their adhaerents, by Matth. Sutcliffe.* (London: Arnold Hatfield, John Windet, and J. Harrison, 1602). Early English Books Online.

²¹² Houliston, Victor. *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England: Robert Persons's Jesuit Polemic, 1580–1610.* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007), 117.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 118.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 120.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 121.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 117.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 123.

²²² *Ibid.*

²²³ Parsons, Robert. *A briefe apologie or defence of the Catholike ecclesiastical hierarchie*, 5. Early English Books Online.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

²²⁶ Houliston, Victor. *Catholic Resistance in Elizabethan England*, 123.

²²⁷ Mush, John. *A dialogue betwixt a secular priest, and a lay gentleman*, 7. Early English Books Online.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, 13.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 128.

²³² *Ibid.*, 129

²³³ *Ibid.*

²³⁴ See Mush, John. *The Life of Margaret Clitherow*. Much openly admits to advising Clitherow to act against all who inhibit her expression of religion, even her husband. He also directed her to willingly accept martyrdom.

²³⁵ Sutcliffe, Matthew. *A challenge concerning the Romish Church*, 5. Early English Books Online.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*

²³⁷ *Ibid.*

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 11

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, 206

²⁴⁰ The Pope decreed that the next three archpriests had to be secular priests, and the archpriest was no longer required to consult the Jesuits.

²⁴¹ Graves, Thomas. *The Archpriest Controversy*, Vol II. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1898), xxxi.

²⁴² Questier, Michael. *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, 289.

-
- ²⁴⁴ Orchard, "Introduction to *Schola Beate Mariae*" in *Till God Will*, 35.
- ²⁴⁵ Ward, *Schola Beate Mariae* in *Till God Will*, 36-37.
- ²⁴⁶ Orchard, "Introduction to Opposition" in *Till God Will*, 48.
- ²⁴⁷ Ward, *Letter to Msgr. Albergati* in *Till God Will*, 29.
- ²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 33.
- ²⁴⁹ Macek, Ellen A. "Ghostly Fathers" and Their "Virtuous Daughters": The Role of Spiritual Direction in the Lives of Three Early Modern English Women." *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 90, No. 2 (Apr., 2004), 228.
- ²⁵⁰ Orchard, "Introduction to Opposition" in *Till God Will*, 48.
- ²⁵¹ Ward, *Schola Beate Mariae* in *Till God Will*, 35.
- ²⁵² Wetter CJ, M. *Immolata. Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 23.
- ²⁵³ Peters, *Mary Ward: A World in Contemplation*, 338.
- ²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 339.
- ²⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 341.
- ²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 340.
- ²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*
- ²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²⁶¹ Orchard, "Opposition" in *Till God Will*, 49.
- ²⁶² Kellison, Matthew. "Accusations" in *Till God Will*, 49.
- ²⁶³ Gerard SJ, John. *The Autobiography of a Hunted Priest*. Philip Caraman SJ, trans. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2012).
- ²⁶⁴ Macek, Ellen A. "Ghostly Fathers" and Their "Virtuous Daughters," 229.
- ²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 229-230.
- ²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 233.
- ²⁶⁷ Ward, Mary. *First Instruction* in *Till God Will*, 60.
- ²⁶⁸ Ward, Mary. "Retreat Notes, 1616" in *Till God Will*, 39.
- ²⁶⁹ Ward, Mary. "Mary Ward to John Gerard, SJ, 1619" in *A Briefe Relation*, 141.
- ²⁷⁰ Macek, Ellen A. "Ghostly Fathers" and Their "Virtuous Daughters," 232.
- ²⁷¹ Wetter CJ, M. *Immolata. Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 36.
- ²⁷² Macek, Ellen A. "Ghostly Fathers" and Their "Virtuous Daughters," 235.
- ²⁷³ Ward, Mary. *The Italian Autobiography* in *A Briefe Relation*, 125.
- ²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷⁵ Poyntz, *The English Vita* in *A Briefe Relation*, 38.
- ²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*
- ²⁷⁸ Ward, Mary. "Letter to Companions in Trier, Cologne and Liege dated 6 April 1630," in Wetter, *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 32.
- ²⁷⁹ Wetter, *Immolata. Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 35.
- ²⁸⁰ Wetter, *Immolata. Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 32.
- ²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 37.
- ²⁸² *Ibid.*
- ²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 38.
- ²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 39.
- ²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*
- ²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 40.
- ²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 41.
- ²⁹² *Ibid.*
- ²⁹³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 42.

-
- ²⁹⁶ Ibid., 59.
²⁹⁷ Ibid.
²⁹⁸ Ibid.
²⁹⁹ Ibid.
³⁰⁰ Ibid., 59-60.
³⁰¹ Ibid., 60.
³⁰² Ibid.
³⁰³ Ibid.
³⁰⁴ Ibid.
³⁰⁵ Ibid., 61.
³⁰⁶ Ibid., 67.
³⁰⁷ Ibid.
³⁰⁸ Ward, Mary. "Final Appeal to Pope Urban VIII" in *A Briefe Relation*, 155.
³⁰⁹ Ibid., 155-156.
³¹⁰ Ibid., 156.
³¹¹ Ibid.
³¹² Ibid.
³¹³ Kenworthy-Browne, Christina. "Introduction to Letter 5: Mary Ward to the Superiors and Members of her Society, 1631" in *A Briefe Relation*, 157.
³¹⁴ Wetter, Immolata. *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 36.
³¹⁵ Ibid.
³¹⁶ Ibid.
³¹⁷ Ibid.
³¹⁸ Ibid.
³¹⁹ Ward, Mary. *First Instruction in Till God Will*, 58.
³²⁰ Ibid.
³²¹ Ward, Mary. *First Instruction in Till God Will*, 59-60.
³²² Ward, Mary. "Mary Ward to the Superiors and Members of her Society, 1631" in *A Briefe Relation*, 157.
³²³ Wetter, *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 194.
³²⁴ Ibid.
³²⁵ Poyntz, Mary. "Letter to Barbara Babthorpe on Mary Ward's Death, 1645" in *A Briefe Relation*, 159.
³²⁶ This point is also made in Wetter, *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 35.
³²⁷ Wetter CJ, M. Immolata. *Mary Ward Under the Shadow of the Inquisition*, 27-28.
³²⁸ Ward, "First Instruction" in *Till God Will*, 60.
³²⁹ Scupoli, Lorenzo. *The Spiritual Conflict*. John Gerard SJ, trans. (Antwerp: 1598), 9.
³³⁰ Luke 1:38