ANRO, INC.
Devon, Pennsylvania

# SOURCE
# SOURCE
# SOURCE

# SOURCE

STUDIES AND REFLECTIONS

ON THE HERITAGE OF THE

SOCIETY OF THE HOLY CHILD JESUS

SPECIAL ASSEMBLY ISSUE

No. 13, SUMMER, 1983

Special thanks are due to the speakers who turned in good typescripts, to Carlotta and her committee who taped the whole assembly, to Mary Claire Ryan who typed from cassettes, to Melinda who prepared the typescript of Monika Hellwig's main talk, to Emma Virginia who, as usual, typed the copy for offset.

# THE RELEVANCE OF CORNELIA CONNELLY'S CHARISM

Marie Tierney, SHCJ

This is a momentous occasion. Today, we feel the strength and beauty of the heritage of the Society. We are about to spend some days together testing that heritage, to know again what it has to say to us in our times; to find again, please God, that it draws from a well of living, life-giving water. Today, we stand at a moment of transition in our history, moved by, grateful for the past, courageous and willing for whatever in faith is to come. We want to give impossible thanks and tribute to Elizabeth Fitzmaurice, Virginia Gaine, Peg Doyle, Anne Bryson -- and before Ginny, Peg and Anne, to Mel Loomis, Catherine Edgar and Catherine Mary Murray who, since 1976 have interpreted the vision for American SHCJ courageously, tirelessly, creatively. We want, also, to tell Bernadette Longtin, Anne Bryson, Melinda Keane and Patricia Phillips that we give <u>them</u>, now, what sometimes seems an "impossible dream" with trust and confidence that the God who is at work in all of us "<u>can</u> do infinitely more than we can ask or imagine," can cast the fire of his love and his peace upon the earth in our time.

I speak for us all when I say: "For all that has been, thanks. For all that will be, yes."

---

In a way, the history of who we are is caught up in that phrase of Dag Hammarskjold, as is also what I am about to do. I want to touch back into the history we share, with grateful memory in a moment of transition, in order to use that history as a springboard to leap forward with a renewed "yes". It will

not be a journey backward into nostalgia, but one seeking the basis in our history for a confident, future stance. I will not tell the story we know and love. Rather, I will reflect on Cornelia as touchstone, the one to whom we look, after Christ and his Mother, as model and guide, and on some of the implications of her story. I do this because she represents for us an example of one who lived a life not possible by purely human dedication, a life lived for goals beyond her span of years, a life of faith and trust in her God, of sensitivity to the needs of his people, of energetic, active love -- ardor, she called it -- for God in himself and for God in his people. She shows us that, with his help, it becomes possible to receive God with ever-deepening capacity; to learn to give him to his people without reserve; to give oneself and to remain given, without recall. She witnesses to us even today to the discovery of God in prayer and in human relationships; to the possibility of applying the Gospel to everyday experience in response to that prayer. Her response to God set free all that she was, all her giftedness, her strength and her fragility, to reveal God's infinite love and mercy to a culture in transition and in need. This is why we look to her.

A few years ago, I was struck by a statement of Henri Nouwen. "Only one who has faith can see the vision. Only one who sees the vision can shape the future." So I offer you this message: the quality of our faith in Jesus -- Child, servant and beloved of his Father, - in Cornelia who believed that her life was drawn into the life and mission of Jesus, - in ourselves as called and sent by God as she was, will shape our vision of SHCJ and of our ministry today. Out of this vision, inevitably, we will shape the Society's future -- our future. If our faith is impoverished, the vision will be dim, and the future will also be dim. If our faith is strong, the vision will be clearer, and we will entrust the future to God with Cornelia's freedom and discerning love, love, with the Lord's "Into your hands, Father, I give over my spirit."



Cornelia, the Woman We Know was a nineteenth century woman, formed by her age and culture, gifted by nature and by grace for the many-faceted vocation to which she was called. It was, I suggest, always a single vocation -- to be totally, forever, God's -- "to belong all to God" (CC21:34-5) -- as she wrote in 1845, with insight born out of a long pilgrimage and suffering surrender. Throughout her life, she responded to that call consistently, as young wife, mother, and as foundress, in the hiddenness of ordinary days and in the public forum. She responded freely, with high courage, because her strength lay in her faith in God.

Born in an emerging nation -- America in 1809 -- she knew that freedom, both national and personal -- was a prize to be fought for and won. So she became that anomaly in Victorian England, an independent, dependent woman. It was her way early in life to reason to truth, to pray through to the conviction of what pleased God, then to carry out what she believed to be his will. She did this in her marriage in 1831. She did it as a young bride, when she crossed what was then the settled United States -- 1000 miles across mountains, plains and rivers -- to settle with her husband in Natchez on the banks of the Mississippi, an affluent but still a frontier settlement. This was not the smooth passage by plane of our day. It was a pioneer's journey, by railroad as far as it went, by stage coach and river boat; for

She was essentially a pioneer -- first in Natchez, later in Louisiana, in England and in Civil War America. She thought and prayed to conviction before entering the Catholic Church in New Orleans in 1835. She did it again when she travelled to England in 1846 to found the Society. Her description of that decision tells us much about who we are to be in the Church. It tells us that she was indeed a pioneer in spirituality for women, in establishing a rule of life for them which would enable them to be contemplatives in action, in her choice of ministries, in moving towards the needs of her day, in educating girls and women of all classes for vital Christian life in their world. In making the decision which sent her to England, she showed herself to be a woman who reflected, listening to the world around her, touching into her own inner core of truth in the movements of her mind, heart and human spirit; who recognized and confirmed the action of the Spirit of God in the movement of grace within her before she acted.

In September 1846 she wrote to her brother, Ralph Peacock: "At that time /November 1845/ I wrote to Ady I think that I had determined not to enter the Order of the Sacred Heart. . . . "After remaining then for nearly a year longer and reflecting over the wants of the day and the means of Spiritual Mercy to be exercised my Revd. Father Director decided upon my coming to England to form an order upon the Rule of St. Francis de Sales. . . . Oh! I forgot to mention that our rules were at first drawn up for the United States as I had no intention nor have I now for deserting my own dear country but the immense number of converts in England offered so large a field for Spiritual Mercy that it seems more in the designs of God to begin here . . ." "I will write to you and dear George together &



send you the heads of our rules which will please you I am sure since we enter so into the active duties of the world and will not be cloistered. . . ." (CC 1:68-70B)

After her decision not to enter the Society of the Sacred Heart, Cornelia had planned to return to America to found an active apostolic congregation devoted to a universal concept -- the works of Spiritual Mercy. This was her original plan. However, her discernment made with Fr. Grassi, was modified in 1846 by the call of the Church, heard through Lord Shrewsbury and Bishop Wiseman. She was to go to England, rather than to America, to meet the demands of a culture and a church in transition. Our biographies speak of the holy plot for the conversion of England which motivated Shrewsbury and Wiseman. What led to this resurgence of hope for the English Church among the community of English residents in Rome?

Since the turn of the 19th century, legislation limiting the rights of Catholics in England, imposed from the time of Elizabeth I and Henry VIII, had gradually been repealed. John Henry Newman's conversion in 1845 was a highpoint in the Second Spring of Catholicism brought about by the Oxford Movement. Cornelia heard of the numerous converts reported in England through her circle of friends in Rome, and listed their needs as primary among her reasons for going to England. The Church itself was on the threshhold of renewed life there, as the restoration of the Hierarchy in England seemed not only possible, but imminent.

Wiseman, an educated man and an educator himself, saw the value of forming the future in England through careful education in the present. In Cornelia, he saw also the rare combination of gift and grace which suited her to be a counterpart to Newman and the converts of

the Oxford Movement, providing quality education for girls and women equal to that already being given to boys and men. One of the tasks outlined for her by the Bishop was that she also help in the endeavor to bring back into the mainstream of English life the Old Catholics, descendants of the English martyrs, who had lived in obscurity to preserve the faith for more than two centuries. Inevitably, there would be profound suspicion to be overcome before they could be reconciled with the converts of the Oxford Movement. She would work towards reconciliation principally by educating for the future, doing what she could to befriend the present generation, molding the next generation through education.

In Derby in 1846, she was in an industrial town, caught up in its social/cultural tensions. She reached out immediately to the people she found there, all of them marginated to some degree: the displaced poor who had thronged to the cities seeking work; factory workers who were children, or Irish immigrants fleeing famine. There, too, she met the children of the rising middle class, and by 1847 provided education for them, enlisting them in service of the poor side by side with the Sisters. The Clergy sent her converts for instruction, and she provided Retreats for them, as well. Sometimes, she took them in, offering peace and security for long or short periods when families disowned them or prevented them from living out their new-found faith.

So much activity. In so many directions. So few Sisters. In Derby in 1846, we were four at the outset. Numbers fluctuated, but they also increased. Side by side with immediate apostolic ministry, Cornelia was building a careful foundation for apostolic prayer and community. Though she met the needs she found



in Derby, as she had companions able to take up the task, she also developed those who would be the ministers through every spiritual and cultural means her ingenuity could devise as she set them to work to improve the quality of life around them. Above all, she taught them to be faithful to their call, to be free, to be ardent and, therefore, generous witnesses to the Gospel. Through a community united in faith and in true spiritual kinship, they would together reveal the message of the Incarnation entrusted to them: "God so loved the world that he sent his Son ..." Because of the Incarnation, God's mercy and his boundless love are given for all races, all ages, all classes, for all time.

As swiftly as she moved in 1846 to the priority of education and religious education among the spiritual works of mercy, she also moved to the priority of the integrated personal and communal formation of SHCJ.

What are the implications for us of even this brief reflection on the vision which guided Cornelia in 1846?

.. The Society was founded by a woman for women in a time of transition, as part of the effort made by the Church to meet that transition. What was true then,is, I submit, true now. The Society is moving in an age of transition, striving to meet that transition. The universal Church is evolving, as the Church in England was evolving at the foundation of the Society.,- but now to meet global needs. I have heard it said that Vatican Council II was a somewhat belated attempt on the part of the Church to catch up with a world moving away from the moorings of

belief and stability into the world we are now part of. Before Vatican II, there had been the efforts of Pius XII urging us to adapt in order to "stay with" a world in need; the attempts of Leo XIII through the social encyclicals to stem the defection from the Church of the working class. After Vatican II, in our own day, we are watching the struggle of the American Church to take a stand against nuclear weapons -- a stand for universal peace: a Pope who is a world traveller. Transitions are global today more complex and more profound; but we have always moved in transition.

What are the transitions you see in process in the Church and in our culture today? In light of the grace we share with Cornelia, how can we move effectively to meet them?

.. To the future, Cornelia brought in 1846 a careful analysis of the present. To analysis, she also brought simultaneous, prayerful discernment of God's action in herself and in those who joined her, thus giving shape and focus to the ministry of her sisters, her greatest asset.

.. Cornelia's discernment was modified by the discernment of others, by a call from the Church which carried her far beyond her own plans and desires. To this new discernment she brought further analysis, putting in careful priority the needs to be met and the resources available to her. She brought, also, freedom to let go of previous plans, and the flexibility to adapt to new needs. In 1846 she had written: "We enter so into the active duties of the world and will not be



cloistered." Thirty years later, in 1872, in writing to Bishop Dannell, she added another commentary. "If there were not an almost unlimited elasticity & simplicity of spirit amongst us I should look upon the faithfully loving confidence proved in our dear Community as an undeniable miracle of God and of His Immaculate Mother." (CC 16:51)

Cornelia discerned well because she was sensitive to the presence and action of God. "Only those who listen, hear the voice of God." "Has mine been a listening soul?" she wrote. This ability to discern was the basis for her saying throughout her life: "The Society . . . is not my work. I have only followed the inspirations of God in obedience to His, not my will." (1877 - GA:35)

What means do we have/can we use to insure ongoing analysis of the wants of this age? What means do we have to facilitate and refine individual and communal discernment?

.. Cornelia dealt with challenge within the limits of the gifts of those who formed the Society, and in ways congruent with their call and commitment. In addition, she continued to deepen their capacity to meet the challenge through spiritual and human formation.

We have many opportunities for growth within the Society. How do we use them?

.. There are parameters to our charism -- the works of Spiritual Mercy in an apostolic religious community. In 1846, one of the works of mercy -- education -- became dominant and remained dominant through our Constitutions. The other works remained,

however, in secondary, auxiliary position. This was the best way to meet the needs of that 19th century age. It may still be, always be, the best way to build faith, work for justice, peace, reconciliation. However,it is also possible that a different age may present a new dominant need, and new ways to meet it. Within the scale of the works of spiritual mercy, another work than education may, conceivably, assume dominance, while all the others remain present. What is the dominant need today which nearly 400 American women might address? As we address it, name it, let us remember that we were not in 1846 single-issue people. We witnessed then, as now, to the infinite mercy and boundless love of God as revealed in the Incarnation.

As I propose these implications, I must also admit their limitations. They are mine -- grapes and wheat, if you will, gathered and prayed over, not yet ground, distilled by you in this Assembly, to make them a more worthy offering, not yet offered freely to be transformed and made holy by the Lord. For that, another process is needed: prayer and reflection together on the grace/given/received in each one of us. Then, as we pray, action may be needed to shape the implications which emerge in these days, to make them "ours". Lastly, there must be the offering of what is "ours" to God, the Father of us all, that "through Christ, with him and in him" our offering may be blessed, made fruitful and given to his people, "that they may have life, life to the full."



If Cornelia's life history is reflected upon, the realization dawns quickly: its direction was not always hers to control. Her great grace was that she understood clearly that her life was part of the Christ-life, part of his entry into the human condition, part of the redeeming pain and joy of the risen Lord. It was not a velleity, nor an unfilled dream when she wrote, "I belong all to God." It was a starkly beautiful reality -- as real as the Lord's own words: "I do always the things which please /my Father/." To her could be applied some words of Simone Weil, a Jewish author with a deep faith relationship with Christ: "Waiting patiently, in expectation, with eyes open for what is still to come, is the foundation of the spiritual life."

How deeply am I bound, as Cornelia was, to the "mystery of Christ among us"? How free, to allow him to witness to the Father through my life?

Finally, there is the question of relevance. I have struggled with the title of this paper, "The Relevance of Cornelia's Charism", finding it, somehow, wide of the mark. Look where I will, I find Cornelia supremely relevant -- in her appreciation of apostolic spirituality, community, ministry, flexibility in the face of real need. Beyond the scope of this paper, it is possible to identify other areas important for today, as well. Let me mention only one: her honest, courageous dialog with Churchmen in defense of the Rule, the internal government of the Society, expansion into other places of ministry, the use of money, education, itself. Set beside her continuing critical analysis of the mission of apostolic religious women, there

is her unfailing obedience when she was not heard, or the decision went against her, to the Church as visible expression of "accepted suffering" in her life for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Churchmen found her strong, fearless -- difficult, sometimes; yet she merited high praise from the Vicar of Christ in 1893 -- 14 years after her death, it is true. In the brief which accompanied the restoration of her original Rules and Constitutions, Pope Leo XIII referred to her as "a woman outstanding for her filial obedience." (MMT: Preface - J. Walsh).

We have a heritage that is rich and vital, capable of adaptation for apostolic purposes. It rests on the foundation which sustained Cornelia's own fidelity. When she wrote in 1845 in Rome: "I belong all to God. There is nothing in this world I would not leave to do his holy will -- and to satisfy him" she spoke of her own response to God. Later, in Customal and Constitutional writings, she offered that response to us: "Charity, rule me, possess me, inflame, that I may remain in God and He in me forever."

No reflection on apostolic relevance can be complete without reflection on our own individual response to God. Are we, as 20th century SHCJ, authentically in touch with our vision and with our times? Are we women of Cornelia's tenacious faith, freedom, ardent adherence to God? Only if our answer to these questions is the desire to say "Yes" in response to all that these questions mean, can a relevant charism continue to live, <u>in us</u>, today. The question is not: Is our charism relevant? It is, rather, "Do we understand it sufficiently, believe in it enough to live it?"

Let me conclude by summarizing: As a step toward accomplishing the purpose and goals of



this Assembly, we have looked at Cornelia's vision and her task in 1846. Her vision was broader than the immediate task, but the task flowered from the vision, the vision channelled in practical, possible ways to influence the place where she was.

Her response to God - without reserve and without recall - brought her vision to the reality which for 140 years has been our heritage, planting and nourishing the kingdom of God.

The implications of her vision challenge us, as they challenged her. "There is something <u>more</u> to be done for the glory of God" she wrote to John Connelly from Paris, on her way to England. To meet the challenges of this age, we have a tradition which is relevant, universal in its vision, precise in practical means to carry it out, sensitive to the gifts and limitations of those to whom it is entrusted, rich enough to form us in continual human and spiritual growth. To live, it can only live <u>in us</u>. Therein lies the burden and also the bright hope for our future.

If Cornelia were here today -- and I believe that she is among us, along with that "Community in Heaven" -- SHCJ who have gone before us--I wonder what her message might be. Might it be her Epiphany message of 1857:

> "Let us not rest, my dear Sisters, for we are ourselves the only obstacle of the overflowing of the Divine Love."

THEOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS
FOR APOSTOLIC COMMUNITY

Talk by Dr. Monika Hellwig
SHCJ Assembly, 3 July 1983

I am happy to be here with you, and I hope I can manage to keep you awake in spite of the prevailing heat.

I suppose that to very many religious communities today, there is on the one hand the excitement of new vistas opening up in the apostolate and personal lives of the members, but on the other a time of mourning for what has been and clearly isn't going to be any more. There has been a style of community basically, we could say, monastic in character, a style of community that meant the stability of having your companions around you, doing things with them and knowing that you were going to be with them for a long time--having the kind of comfort that a family gives. The challenge of the present situation, I think, is to look at the whole tradition again and ask: What are the fundamental characteristics, aspects of community that must be preserved in order to maintain that eschatological witness, in order to fulfill that dream of Jesus that religious communities try to fulfill?

And I suppose that the harsh thing that has come to most of us in our lifetime is the realization that community doesn't mean doing things in unison, doing things together. And the reason I call it harsh is that I think it's rather nice to do things together. If you are accustomed to doing things together, it's very painful when suddenly change comes and great mobility sets in. You are not alone in that experience, of course, because for most people in the western hemisphere, at least in the northern part of it,



this has happened in their family life: the extended family with grandparents and aunts and uncles and cousins no longer has that lovely, comfortable stability about it, in that your relatives live up the street or at least across town, and you maintain constant contact with them.

A German sociologist, Ferdinand Tönnies made a comment which I think raises the theological question about it: that, as he looked at the Western experience of living together, it occurred to him that some of the drastic changes in modern society have to do with a transition from one kind of social pattern of relationship to another. He called them by the German names, Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. The translations would be fairly arbitrary--but what he was talking about in Gemeinschaft was the pattern of community which meant you could take things very happily for granted because there was a stability, a matter-of-factness to the situation (for instance, in a little farming town, or a traditional monastery). He talked about a transition to a quite different kind of community which he called Gesellschaft (fellowship, you might translate it, though that wouldn't capture the whole of it), a contractual community: people come together because there is something they want to do together.

Now, in a way, religious communities as they have existed in our lifetimes have the best of both worlds. Because people came together contractually, if you like; they came together of set purpose because there was something they wanted to do in common; but they came into an existing community with great stability. As they came into it, it combined all the good characteristics of both kinds of communities: the kind that you could

take for granted and where you could be taken for granted; you were accepted simply because you were a member of the community, independently of any achievements or contributions you could make, and you were accepted into a group that had its established customs and had worked out a good way of life.

At the same time, you were there because you wanted to be, and only those who wanted to be were there. It really combined the best of both worlds. The difficulty is that that kind of combination doesn't seem to be too possible any more, in the changing circumstances of both the world and the Church of our times.

What then is the essence of community? Well, theoretically the essence of community is very simple. It consists first of the surrender of competition with one another. No competing against one another. Secondly, a dedication to a common purpose, something you want to do together. And thirdly, mutual support and encouragement in that common purpose. But the problem which is so simple theoretically is not so simple practically. It's not so simple practically, I think, because we are part of a history of redemption from a sinful pattern of affairs in the world. In other words, when we set those sociological perceptions within the biblical and theological perspective that we have as Christians, we begin to wrestle with the practical dimensions of it.

Let me try to do that. If you look at the Genesis story of creation and sin, one of the aspects that becomes quite clear is that the human person is drawn from the course of events in the material universe by having the breath of God breathed into her or him, and by being called to likeness to God. When you try to find out what that likeness is about, the



aspect that is underscored by the story is freedom, self-definition, co-creating of the world, co-creating of life in the world. It's equally clear that the story of the garden tells us about Adam, and you know Adam is not a proper name, of course it is not specifically male person--Adam in the Hebrew is simply person--it is the story of every person. The story has it that Person is put into a garden, that is to say a situation of harmony where everything fits together, but that at the center of the garden--what holds the harmony of the garden together--is something that is the prerogative of God alone.

And as you look at the story you find that there is mention of the two trees, and it is not clear whether the two trees are the same or separate. But anyway, the two trees are the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. And the mandate to the human person is, leave those sources of power, of control, of freedom to God. If you live your life in dialogue with God, but allow God to be at the center of the garden, you can live in harmony and life can make sense.

Now, so far, that story seems to be about persons individually. In fact, the emphasis that God makes them male and female in the divine image, and the story of the creation of Cheva (Eve, the source of life, mother of the living), give a whole new cast to the story. You probably have noticed that in the bible, female figures seldom seem to speak in any very realistic terms of the experience of an individual. That is because for the most part, the female figures in the bible are quite stylized and represent community experience, whole peoples, whole traditions. In the story of the garden, you

have something very subtle and very important being said when it says it isn't good for Adam, person, to be alone; there has to be company--and produced side by side with person is Cheva, the source of life. And as you look at the story further you realize that Eve is made to symbolize community, the companionship of other persons. It is not by accident that we have this extraordinary story of the fall in which the tempter, disguised in the form of a serpent (who by the way was a dragon then; you know he lost his legs from the curse and became a serpent, but he was a dragon before)--the tempter, disguised as a dragon, appeals to Cheva, the source of life, the community.

You have probably reflected at various times on the pattern of that story and on that part of it where God returns to the garden in the cool of the evening and finds them hiding from him, trying to cover themselves up--finds them worried about their vulnerability, because nakedness is always symbolic in the story. That they are in the garden naked and not afraid means they have no fear of their own frailty, their own dependence, their own vulnerability. That they begin to be embarrassed and ashamed and frightened and cover themselves up means that they have discovered their vulnerability. They are afraid, not only to appear before each other, but they are afraid to appear before God as they are (in their frailty, in their nothingness), and they put up a screen between themselves. You probably have reflected on this, that the clothes we wear (apart from keeping us warm and apart from any question of modesty in the basic sense relating to sexuality) are, in a sense, a screen we put up in front of other people by which we tell them how they are



supposed to think about us. We make a statement about the kind of person we are or the way we want to be seen.

Extraordinary in that story is that when Adam, person, is summoned before God and asked: "Why did you do this disastrous thing that smashes the possibility of your harmonious life," that Adam turns around and says to God: "Well, Eve, the one you gave me, was the temptress." She is the source of the temptation. I suppose most of us have heard at some time a moralistic reflection on that --that you get into trouble and immediately you start blaming other people. The moralistic reflection is beside the point because what Adam says to God is quite correct. It was supposed to be too desperate for a person to live alone, so society was to build up the person. That isn't just the story of what happened at the beginning to one or two people. It is the story of what happens to all of us, all the time. It's the story of sin. The story of creation is that the very nature of what we are and what's in us is dependent, interdependent on one another. The freedom that we receive is a conditioned freedom, a situated freedom. It's not an unlimited freedom; it's not the freedom of God. It's a freedom to be with others before God. You might even say that we can only really be free when we're free together.

There is a sad contrast to that in the thought of modern existentialism. In the most stark forms of modern existentialism, downright atheist forms, human freedom is a bad joke. Because human freedom is the promise of all kinds of fulfillment and becoming that can never be realized. Because human freedom offers possibilities of creating a world, of shaping things as we want them,

as we envision them, and then it's always smashed because we always bump up against two things: other people and death. There are other limitations besides, but basically, other people and death.

The story of the garden talks about freedom, it talks about human becoming, but it suggests something very subtle. It suggests that the freedom that is offered us is a freedom that we can only have together. That there is no freedom for the human person as isolated, as excluding other people, as setting up a world my way without consideration of how you want to set up your world. And the story of the garden suggests in a very powerful way that the condition of an open and trusting relationship with God, which is consummated freedom, is open and trusting relationships with one another--doing things together. But the story of sin suggests that as soon as we put self at the center of the harmony, the harmony falls apart. As soon as we put self as the objective, or as the source or the meaning of life, there can be no real way to say "we." There can be no real way to function together.

In the whole history of Israel as it is portrayed for us in the Hebrew scriptures, there is this hankering, this yearning for the rule of God to be re-established in human society. The symbolism of an angel with a flaming sword says: there is no return to paradise, there is only a road forward through history. But the promises and the covenant that God makes with Israel as his people-- the slave tribes of the Hebrews as his people--the promises say that God will be their ruler. God will put himself back at the center of the garden to reassemble the harmony of life, if they will do two things: make God the focus



of their lives, and accept one another in covenant as a people. The Sinai story gives you the symbolism of a betrothal or a wedding ceremony, the covenant of a wedding ceremony. And the terms are set out for the wedding contract. The terms are always twofold: one, peoplehood (rules about how they are not to oppress one another, rules about how they are to consider themselves in alliance, with a common purpose and with the task of supporting one another), and the other side of it is that that can continue only while God is the sole ruler of Israel and the sole purpose and meaning of their lives together--while they are not idolatrous. As Paul addresses the early followers of Jesus in the New Testament he says: the trouble is, the law seems never to have been able to do this for us, because we remained external to the law and therefore it remained external to us. But in the person of Jesus this becomes possible: that we should enter into the law and it should enter into us so as to build, towards the end time, a symmetry with the story we have from the beginning. So that we re-establish that harmony.

Well, what Jesus had preached and what Paul saw with such clarity was the simple acceptance of the reign of God here and now. What Jesus discovered and the letter to the Hebrews meditates on at great length is that people at large are so trapped in the consequences of evil deeds, so trapped in the structures of sin, that they cannot respond to the call of Jesus. Paul and Hebrews meditating on that tell us: well, what has happened is that Jesus in what he did in his own person has established a new possibility of it. By his self gift in his ministry, his

teaching, in his encounters with other people, and finally in his discernment of what was the only way to speak the word of God into the world (that is to say, in his going willingly to his death), and in the divine response of the creator Father in the resurrection--in this, the New Testament reflects for us, what we have is really a new possibility. It isn't just the traditional teaching of the covenant law of Israel, it isn't just the promise that in his own good time God will put things to right, it isn't only the preaching of Jesus calling for a response to the reign of God here and now; but it is the self gift of Jesus becoming, so to speak, the foundation stone of that--making it possible, providing a platform on which it can be rebuilt.

All of that being said and done, Jesus called in his preaching and in his death and resurrection for the welcoming of the reign of God in the present. The reign of God is not what has happened to date. What has happened is an attempt, a stumbling attempt, a many times very faulty attempt, to gather together a small witness community that lives out of the inspiration and the joy and courage and vision of the resurrection. And who at least among themselves experience the promise, at least in glimpses, so as to be able to reflect that into the world and further the acceptance, the welcoming of the reign of God in the human community. In fact, the church that is supposed to be that small witness community keeps going astray, keeps becoming something very unrecognizable. It keeps becoming something that is not too distinct from society at large. So that just as the church is, so to speak, contingency plan for the reign of God that is not yet, so again and again our revivals of community



and worship and caring concern, ministry in the church that are, so to speak, contingency plans for church that is not yet. For church which is trying to be. And among the many renewals, of course, are the religious communities, which are supposed to be the contingency plan, the witness communities for what the church is not yet. Needless to say, religious communities also bog down and again and again have to rethink, have to renew what this is all about.

Why is that? I think the reason is that living community cannot be guaranteed by institutional structures. It can only keep arising from the continued living commitment and input of the people concerned. You could put it this way: life always tends to structure itself, but structures never beget life. The structures are useful, but they're useful only as scaffolding for living things to grow on. The structures can't substitute for the living reality.

What I am saying here is that a certain amount of rethinking and reshaping are constantly going to be inevitable. But I'm saying more than that: I'm saying that religious communities are justified in the church not only by the apostolic works they do, they're justified by what we call the eschatological witness that they give. Eschatological means referring to that outcome, that dream, end time, hope, that we are all reaching for. And religious communities justify themselves precisely to the extent that they typify, that they witness to, that they exemplify the hope toward which all of Christian life tends. Precisely to the extent that they typify and exemplify what the church as a whole is trying to be and never manages to be. Now that clearly means that they are community in those

three theoretical dimensions that I spoke of at the beginning.

The first is the renouncing of competition with one another, the renouncing of that betrayal in the human community that makes all of our lives so sad. Our lives generally lead us to experience others as competitors. We experience others as rivals just as much as we experience them as allies. Sometimes much more, sometimes much more. The general situation of the ordinary Christian in the Western world today is one more or less of uprootedness, because there isn't very much family stability. It's a situation of having to be accepted for cash value you have for other people or the convenience value you have for other peopeople. Having to persuade people to make a place for you, quite literally a place to live in, because you can come up with the cash for it. Having to persuade people to allow you to have membership in various groups because you can pay your way. Or because you can contribute services that act for the convenience of others. Or even having to persuade people to include you in their social circle because you're entertaining, amusing to be with. Now when you think about that soberly, that is a situation that people most desperately need to be redeemed from. Because the way they are able to value themselves is always in terms of what they are able to produce, how they can compete, how they can translate themselves into cash value. In other words, people are persuaded very much to evaluate themselves in terms of money, material goods. And, related to that, to evaluate themselves in terms of power. What kind of power? How to compel other people, to manipulate them. And related to that, evaluate themselves by status. What kind of status? The status that says you had better



watch out for me and treat me with respect because of the power and the cash that I have and because of the control that I have over other people through these.

At the very root of community is the understanding of acceptance of others in cooperation, acceptance of others in a non-competitive way. That kind of acceptance is almost impossible to find in the world today. People have it to some extent in their families, but most people's families are very fragile. Not only the divorce statistics say that; but also common observation of the breaking up of the extended family (that constant mobility and quest of work and so on) means that there is very little being with one's relatives, and outside the circle of one's relatives there is very little being accepted for who one is and being able to accept others for who they are.

That obviously points already to some of the mission of religious communities. By the way, it doesn't mean that you have to be always together in the same house. To have the bond, the pact among yourselves of non-competition, of acceptance as one family already is a powerful and important witness. It does something to each member of that bond, each member of that fellowship, which in turn enables the rest of those members to face the rest of the world in a quite different way.

I said that the second part was dedication to a common purpose. Of course, community in the basic human sense ought to mean that we are all concerned for the common welfare of the world. It takes only a few seconds to flash through your mind, your imagination and memory, the way we as

the human race are with one another in the world today. Think of the arms race. The arms race certainly doesn't exist because we are all, on a world-wide basis, concerned about a common purpose. The arms race is a horrendous symbol and revelation, manifestation of what the relationships among us really are in the world. Think of the stock market. The stock market doesn't exist because we are all so concerned about a common purpose. It exists because people are--to put it in crude language--very slickly trying to enrich themselves at the expense of others. Think of our international trading. Think of the way we lock our houses. Think of the number of commercial companies that sell burglar alerts, special devices for locking your doors from the inside and so on.

It is quite clear, when you look simply at the way people make a living in our society, that a great many of us are making a living out of producing things that say we are not about a common purpose in the world. Our ordinary way of living together is not at all dedication to the common good, to a common purpose. The second aspect of community, after the renouncing of competition against one another, is the positive one of commitment to a common purpose. One of the ways that a religious community can experience what human life is supposed to be about and can witness that to other people is precisely by that dedication to a common purpose in two dimensions: in the life of worship and the pursuit of a common spirit in the world that comes from your foundress and your history, but also in specific apostolates. And I think it may be very important at a time of rethinking, a time of critical re-evaluation of how to move into future possibilities, it may be quite important to make this very explicit for yourselves and to make it something of a rallying cry, something of a common property for the community. The goal toward which all the specific apostolic works are focused, so that that goal is a purpose the community has in common, and a purpose which is constructive for the redemption of the world, constructive for the move toward welcoming the reign of God in the human community.



The third aspect that I mentioned, that of mutual support, also speaks in a positive way to a very great lack and suffering in the contemporary world. I suppose that each community has to discover for itself the ways of giving mutual support, but the common basis is empathy. The common basis is to be able to enter by empathy into the experience of others and lighten their burdens, lighten the burden of loneliness, fear, particular hardships, trouble, work, etc., that is involved. The discernment of that in a community is a most powerful redemptive tool. Because of the creative energies it releases out of the members themselves, within the members themselves, and because of the different way they are able to do two things: to relate as individuals to the world at large, to those they meet, but also to embrace, so to speak, in their own community experience, outsiders. That would be particularly true in your works of education, because in the whole educational process it makes a tremendous difference whether there is a class of children facing an individual adult or whether the experience is of the young person being embraced into an existing adult community. And the whole pattern of a school or an educational enterprise can be so profoundly redemptive where there is an existing community

that is truly a mature community in Christ, and young people (raw, full of possibilities but also rather barbarian in their behavior and their outlook on life) can be brought into a genuine sector of Christian civilization. No mission was ever more urgent or more productive, and no barbarians were ever more in need of such a mission as the young.

The discernment of how to be a community in this positive dimension of mutual support is of course a constantly changing, constantly moving process, especially today because the situations in which religious communities function are changing so rapidly and sometimes throw the members of the religious communities into such totally unexpected situations and environments. What that means of course is that the mutual support cannot always be in the style of a stable living-together. You have to devise, you have to find the ways of supporting someone who has to live completely by herself because the task to which she appears to be called by its very nature and character isolates her physically. You have to find ways of sustaining one another when you have to live in small or rapidly changing groups, groups that keep reassembling. How do families do that? Well, not always very successfully, but they try to do it by letter, by phone, by family custom, by occasional reunions. In general, by that quality that says: we are covenanted for life and your troubles are my troubles, your friends are my friends, your enemies my enemies. I'm quoting the pattern stated in the Hebrew scriptures, but putting it a little more broadly. Your cause and your concern and your welfare are my concern. We have to find ways of expressing



that in modern society where change is rapid and mobility is universal, people are always on the move.

The patterns in which we find that kind of support for one another will be the patterns that spill over in apostolic dimensions, in apostolic directions. The task of the church today has, I suppose, one major competitor, and that competitor is the Marxist doctrine of salvation. Both of us, Christians and Marxists, have a doctrine of salvation that has to do very profoundly with the relations of people with one another and with the overcoming of a basic human alienation, with moving from a state of suffering and estrangement into a state of reconciliation. In the Marxist understanding of alienation and of reconciliation, community plays a large role, but community is understood somewhat differently. It's understood on the primary model of liberation of each individual from being subservient to the profit of another. The liberation of each individual from that, so that the work of each individual is the profit of the upbuilding of that individual. In other words, it's an understanding of liberation from oppression, particularly by greed. What seems to be the problem wherever people try the Marxist mode of liberation and redemption is that the mode of action supposes it can be done from the outside, by external sanctions. It can be done by a revolution that reassigns the resources and the task and sets rules for the way people are to function. What we have seen over and over in the modern world is how little the Marxist dream of liberation is ever quite realized. How it keeps leading to an oppressive situation.

The alternative to the Marxist liberation is not capitalism, the alternative is Christian-

ity. It's basically a theory of salvation. Capitalism is no theory of salvation. But the alternative is another understanding of the reconstruction of human society that differs from the Marxist theory of salvation basically in this: that it expects a transformation from within individual human freedoms. It expects a transformation into community not by external sanctions, but by the internal sanction of the rightness of it. And the only reason that Christian salvation, Christian redemption can be proposed at all is that we believe there is a God who holds things together and whose wisdom we share. We believe that we can have a personal relationship with God which makes sense of our personal relationships with one another. We believe that there is grace, that the life of God flows into the human situation even after sin, after alienation, after oppression and the consequences of evil harden into structures. We believe that grace, the very life of God, flows into the human situation redemptively, and that true human community is possible. But we also believe that that human community is founded in the spirit of God that we receive from the risen Christ, and that it begins from the inside out. That it begins from little communities, little associations of people whose lives have been shaped, inspired, brought to life, by the resurrection and by the spirit of God. That it has to be fostered in whatever little clusters it can be caught in, and treasured and made fruitful for others.

I think that what has been true for the church at large--that the project has to begin over and over again--is true also for religious communities. That just to have rules and constitutions and a structure of govern-



ment and self-perpetuation doesn't guarantee it. The project has to begin over and over again, with small tentative beginnings between two and reaching out from each exchange between two people to include others. And I think that community in that vital, constantly growing sense of leaven in the dough permeating the whole, is going to be very much the pattern of the future. Of having to take the responsibility and begin it again and keep permeating society. What is so good about it is that our formally monastic patterns of religious communities have been cracked, broken open, so as to divert the activity again into the world at large. So as to throw out the influence, the impact, life, hope, strength, the relationships that come from the traditional, more monastic style, throw them out into a wider sphere of influence.

I think it does mean that the task is considerably more difficult and throws the emphasis considerably more on what each individual does creatively out of those changing situations. It makes it less possible to rely on what is said in a rule or what has been the custom. It means always facing new situations and trying to find new ways to bring that about.

Jesus, you will find that he seldom said anything that relates to the larger scene--so some people have said, "You see, Jesus is not political. He's not interested in that." That is not a true conclusion. The true conclusion is, I think, that his perception of the structures of human society and the task of redemption in human society makes a far more radical judgment, analysis, of what's wrong and how it has to be put right. His perception is, as I mentioned in relation to Marxism, that you don't get any further towards the kingdom by external sanctions, but only by winning people over in a network of relationships that are based upon freedom and free response. He sees the kingdom coming always through invitation and never through compulsion. I believe that the temptation stories, the temptations of Jesus in the wilderness, are put together that way in part to tell us that he rejects a messiahship that would consist of putting things right by external manipulation, that he limits himself to a messiahship that is wholly contingent upon a free response of the people to whom he addresses himself. He will not do any tricks of power.

Now you'll say, how are we to pray and how are we to act in a world that is very much structured by sin, and that is threatened with a nuclear holocaust. I think those biblical indications tell us how to act: always by invitation and always by hope and always by a focus of everything towards the transcendent God, and at the same time with total empathy with other persons. Whatever is partisan falls short of the kingdom; whatever is manipulative or matter of compulsion of others falls short of the kingdom; whatever is achieved by tricks or simply by technological advancement can be made to serve, but is not of itself the building of the kingdom. And needless to say, whatever is concerned with



the most oppressed and the poorest of the poor is most directly connected with the kingdom.

Q . . . characteristics of an apostolic spirituality--

A The basis of an apostolic spirituality as I understand it is a kind of radical renunciation of one's private life program, a radical commitment to do what needs to be done in the service of God, and to tailor one's life style accordingly. That raises the question of vocation--how do you know what needs to be done --not just vocation in the sense of entering a religious community or not, but vocation in the ongoing, unfolding sense. I suppose the clearest indication of God's call to each of us at any time is the discernment of that point at which the needs of others and my capacity to meet them intersect, in other words, where the needs of others knock on my door and I find in prayerful discernment that I have both the talent and the training (or the possibility of training), and the health and temperamental constitution and the backing to move into the work in question. And I suppose that apostolic spirituality therefore has to mean a constant readiness to be taken by surprise and to be interrupted, to be interrupted in the project that you have and to be asked to do things you never dreamed you would do and perhaps never dreamed that you could do. I think that apostolic spirituality perhaps also means to be prepared to contribute most by your failures--to find that the things you've set yourself to do collapse, but to go on in trust and simplicity searching for what you're supposed to do by back alleys that you couldn't have found except through the failures. I suppose that's been very much the experience in missionary

enterprises in the contemporary world, and perhaps rather commonly the experience for religious communities today.

Q . . . surrender of competition with one another--

A The most basic reason, I think, that people are competitive is that they don't feel accepted unless they do better than someone else. The most basic remedy for competitiveness is every move, every step in community that makes people feel comfortable being themselves. Every step that makes them feel they can be accepted for what they are and not for what they achieve is a move towards dismantling attitudes of competition. Of course we're in a sinful history, and one of the wise things that the Catholic Church has said officially, doctrinally, is: don't ever get the idea that original sin is only "out there"--it's inside you. You know we've had all kinds of discussions as to how that is so, and the most obvious explanation is that none of us arrives in the world as a fully fashioned freedom, as a reflexive self-awareness. We arrive as a possibility; we're not doing much thinking when we're born, and by the time we begin, our outlook, our expectations have already been shaped by a society which itself is injured, is helpless, is crippled, is distorted. Just to be born into the human community is to be very much the heir of this unfortunate heritage of sin. Because we are in this situation we can't expect to be totally free of competitiveness. From birth upwards we have never been totally secure, totally accepted, and some people have suffered more deprivation of acceptance and affection and security than others, which they can't help. So it's a struggle in a sinful situation, but everything that builds up confidence that I can



be accepted for what I am is a blow struck to dismantle this terrible Tower of Babel that represents our competitive desires. I suppose there are ways that modern psychology has suggested to us which have to be used very cautiously and carefully for setting about that in a group. Certainly spontaneous prayer, meditation, reflection together tends to help in that direction. When I worked with the Better World Movement which was much influenced in those techniques by the Focolarini, it was a basic principle that in trying to build community in a group you begin by sharing your ideals and your goals, what you're looking for, what you have in common. And you continue by learning to express to one another your appreciation of what is good in the others, and only very cautiously do you move into an exchange of critical understandings of what is going on, or practical discussions of how we set about these goals, where there would be a tendency to disagreement and having to sort out disagreements. I have found it very helpful in building community with others first to be explicit about common purpose, common ideals, to share ideals, vision; secondly, to try to be very explicit about appreciation of the others--and there are always some things you can appreciate about other people and their collaboration, their living together--and then only very slowly move into a frankness with one another as existing bonds are able to tolerate that frankness about matters on which you differ.

Q . . . in connection with the story of the garden--were the human person and companion in competition with God? We find ourselves trying to do God's work, but then we find ourselves trying to be God.

A I think that's a very good insight. It's

precisely when we try to take the role that belongs to God, when we put ourselves at the center in opposition to God, that we can't manage it together. If I'm the center of my world, there's no place that you're going to be happy to occupy, and vice versa. But if God is the center of my world, then I've already been put in my place, and it's quite comfortable to let you be in your place. I think the story of the Tower of Babel is a profoundly symbolic way of saying that, and as you probably know, the Pentecost story is so written as to be a deliberate reversal of the Tower of Babel. They come to the upper room in response to God's call and they are there in a stance of humility waiting for God to come down to them, for the spirit of God, and when it comes they burst the bonds, they burst the boundaries of that little upper room, and they are able to speak to and be understood by those who came from different languages, while the Tower of Babel, you remember, is the story of the confusion of the languages.

I think the point is exactly what you identified: that to have God as the center means I am in my proper place and I'm comfortable there, so I can allow you to be in your proper place and be comfortable there, and we can both be doing it together. But if I'm at the center, you can't possibly find a place in my world in which you're going to be comfortable, and if you're at the center, I can't find a place in your world in which I am going to be comfortable.

(The questioners were Jeanne Marie Guerin, Leonore Britt, Estelle Logue, Gladys Feeley, Mary Popit, Elizabeth Ann Barber.)

## THE CHARISM OF CORNELIA AND THE SIGNS OF OUR TIME: From Inner Liberty to Outward Liberation

Caritas McCarthy, SHCJ

It has been moving for me to see that others in this Assembly have been challenged by the question which I shall address: "What has Cornelia, graced for founding the SHCJ, to say, not just to the 'signs' of our time, but to the great sign of our time--the call to minister to the poor and oppressed?" Responding to this question has grown more urgent for me within the last few years; this Assembly reveals the same sense of urgency in other SHCJ.

Our Assembly has crystallized additional questions we want to deal with: "What is our basic, operative understanding of 'charism' of Cornelia, of 'spirit of the Society'; what is the process by which we can individually and corporately continue to realize the spiritual potential these supernatural realities hold for us?" Sensing within the Society a growing desire to come to shared meaningful responses to these questions, I hope in the months ahead to provide input on content and process, and opportunities to explore together and come to consensus.

But here we center on Cornelia's charism, that is, her giftedness for the service of the People of God, and the insistent and urgent call of the Church since Vatican II, especially to those celibate for the kingdom, to minister to the oppressed, dispossessed, suffering men, women and children of the world. It was with these that Christ, the Poor One of God, identified himself and continues to identify himself. Previous studies have noted Cornelia's insight into the identity of Christ the Holy Child, with the

anawim, and her own union of herself and her sisters with him in this mystery.[1] Let us recall tonight a further powerful expression of that faith-vision through which Cornelia articulated her charism: that we are to "seek in the mysteries of the life of this Divine Lord all that can serve. . . ." "To seek in the mysteries . . ."--this poured forth, rang out from the depths of Cornelia's spirit as she commenced her Constitutions for her Society,[2] her own expression of who the SHCJ are as a living body. Let us turn to a particular mystery, one involving a spiritual friend of hers, John the Baptist, who was himself "seeking in the mysteries" to know more of the Lord he heralded. Luke and Matthew tell us of John's seeking:

> John, in prison, heard about the works Christ was performing and sent a message by his disciples to ask him, "Are you 'He is to come' or do we look for another?" In reply Jesus said to them: "Go back and report to John what you hear and see: the blind recover their sight, cripples walk, lepers are cured, the deaf hear, dead men are raised to life, and the poor have the good news preached to them. Blest is the man who finds no stumbling block in me."
> (Mt 11:2-6; cf Lk 7: 18-23)

We ask, with Cornelia, to find no stumbling block in the Lord, the Poor One, with whom we are are called both to identify and to serve. We ask to find no stumbling block in her who calls us, as Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus, the Poor One of God, both to be and to serve the anawim.

Does our very membership in the Society constituted through Cornelia's charism, enlighten, empower and energize us to respond to the pre-



sent call of the Church to minister to the poor and oppressed? The answer would seem to be a resounding "Yes", first of all because fundamental to Cornelia's faith-vision was the intention to respond ardently to the Church's needs in the historical life of the People of God. We all know, and need not repeat here, the fulness of her commitment as a faithful daughter of the Church. In fact, the charisms given to all founders of religious congregations would seem to include an imperative to respond to the calls of the Church, because inherent in charisms as the primitive Church first recognized them is the grace to serve the on-going needs of the community.

"But," we are asking, "beyond this grace of response-to-need common to founders, do Cornelia's graces offer us something more specific, offer some potential for a truly discerning and effective service of the poor and oppressed?" There is variety in the graces of founders and thus some may have more, some less, of vision, insights, and skills in responding to particular calls. My own researches and reflection have shown that the graces central to Cornelia's personal spiritual pilgrimage, from which she shaped her vision for the Society, take us to the very roots of those graces needed for Christ-like service of the poor, and give the foundation for authentic Christian ministry to the oppressed. What she manifests is what Monika Hellwig called fundamental for all who would be minister-liberators--that one be always journeying on one's own pilgrimage to inner liberation, if one is to be an instrument for the liberation of others. There is much source material to show that Cornelia led forcefully and directly the work of what we might call outward liberation, especially in effective education of the poor through which they were enabled to rise out of oppression, e.g., SHCJ work

in the Poor Schools in Derby, England, at the time of the Industrial Revolution. But behind this external work, and most important for all her works, was Cornelia's perception of her life experiences as opportunities for growth in that inner freedom to which the Lord called, and her inspiration to articulate her vision for growth in the liberty of God to all who were drawn to her for guidance.

It would seem that those like Cornelia who can guide us surely on the road to inner liberation are as important in the total ministry to the poor and oppressed as those who research and guide us in, e.g., opposition to unjust structures, to contructive social programs, etc. Only the inner liberation of the ministers insures authenticity and discernment in the external ministry. Not all engaged in the latter are fully appreciative of the kind of contribution Cornelia makes. I experienced a "put-down" recently when a priest prominent in the work of social justice rather scoffed at the fact that I had done a theological dissertation on Cornelia's spiritual pilgrimage "in times of such grave social crises." Continued reflection and study in the light of the "put-down" has made me more sure than ever that spiritual leaders like Cornelia give us the absolutely necessary foundation for Christ-like response to "grave social crises."

I propose that we now turn to a series of events in her life which mark stages in her arduous inner pilgrimage, remembering that she, as all of us, had the human limitations of the adolescent, the young adult, the young wife, the middle-aged woman, etc. Using the insights of developmental theorists we can read our sources anew, and, allowing her her faults and mistakes as well as her virtues and strengths, see her as one always becoming more herself in God, in



the "liberty of the children of God." We shall, as much as possible, let her speak for herself, not projecting our own ideas on her.

Cornelia had her share of the struggles of the young adult when, at 20 or 21, she was courted by the Reverend Pierce Connelly, a suitor not acceptable to her foster-mother. Fortunately, we have a reminiscence of Cornelia's niece, to show us the direction in which she was moving at the time of the courtship:

> He /Rev. Pierce Connelly/ was an assistant clergyman in one of the Episcopal Churches--was very handsome, fascinating --a number of the young ladies, friends of Cornelia Peacock, were vying with each other for the attentions of the young minister.[3]

". . . young ladies were vying . . ." This suggests what will be remarked later in Cornelia--she wanted to win! Her Holy Child Sisters observed this in her mature life in the Society. She wanted to win in games at recreation! This very human desire to win may well have contributed later in life to her keeping the Society in existence when it was threatened by opposition from within and without.

Cornelia's niece continued about the courtship:

> When Mrs. Montgomery, half-sister of Rev. Mother Cornelia Peacock, discovered the growing attachment of Cornelia, she was much displeased, as she had great ambitions that her beautiful and accomplished sister should make a better match. The young minister was poor and his family had not the social standing

of the Peacocks and Montgomerys, young Pierce's father being in trade, furniture business, I believe.

Mrs. Montgomery forbid him the house. He must discontinue his visits. I think Cornelia--Rev. M/o̲the̲r/--sang in his church. She had a beautiful and cultivated voice.

Cornelia--Rev. Mother--always possessed of strong will power, appealed to her eldest sister (Adeline--Mrs. Lewis Duval) and arranged to visit her and be married from her house . . . the handsome residence of my mother.[4]

Cornelia did choose counter-culturally, disregarding her foster-mother's norms for social position and wealth. She chose also to be associated with pastoral ministry, with the financial sacrifices that entailed. She seems to have aspired to a very close association in her husband's ministry, perhaps even more than the role of minister's wife accorded her in the early 19thC.

Her family made sure that she was schooled in the well-defined role of the 19thC wife. Evidence for this appeared in a letter her older sister wrote to her when, after four years of marriage, Cornelia and Pierce were considering entering the Catholic Church. Her sister Adeline expressed grave reservations about her becoming a Roman Catholic, but, as we see below, no reservations about Cornelia's wifely obligations. After advising strongly against Catholicism she relented in favor of a higher priority:

> Be a Catholic--or whatever will make you the happiest--follow the path of duty strictly--be adivsed by your dear good partner--he is your earthly guide--be



> of one heart and soul--and love each other if possible more than ever--for you both possess all the requisites for an earthly paradise. God forbid that anything I have said should tend to destroy that bliss for which you are so well calculated.[5]

Cornelia matched her older sister's sentiments with:

> I have perfect confidence in the piety, integrity and learning of my dear husband . . . I am ready to submit at once to whatever my loved husband believes to be the path of duty.[6]

There is much in these sentiments on marriage values and complementarity of roles that we can appreciate in the late 20thC, but there are also indications that the submissiveness of the role spelled out for the 19thC wife sometimes went beyond the bounds of good complementarity.

Cornelia's native initiative and energy seems to have broken through the oversubmissiveness while her graciousness sustained the wifely role expected of her. While Pierce was in St. Louis she wrote to him of the visit of one of the vestrymen on parish business:

> I showed him one of the letters I received for you. It was from Mr. Biddle and on church affairs. . . . If I did wrong you must never allow me to open your letters again, but I think and hope, love, that you will say it is all right.[7]

That letter was, as would be all her letters to Pierce for the next five years, full of tender

loving concern for him and their children, full of joyful optimism for the family's future. That joyful optimism was remarkable in a young wife who knew in 1835 after only four years of marriage that her husband wished somehow to continue his priesthood in the Catholic Church which allowed only celibate clergy. In the face of the dilemma with which the couple was confronted, Cornelia continued to believe in her marriage, to struggle to hold it together as she grew in faith in the God who had blessed it. This is certainly evident in the report that Cornelia's niece gave of an interview she had with Cardinal McCloskey (of New York) some years after her aunt's death. The Cardinal had a vivid memory of a conversation he, a young American priest studying in Rome in 1836, had had with Cornelia in the Spring of that year:

> I can see Reverend Mother Connelly approaching me clasping her hands and her beautiful eyes uplifted to my face--Fr. McCloskey is it necessary for Pierce Connelly to make this sacrifice and sacrifice me--I love my husband and my darling children. Why must I give them up --I love my religion and why cannot we remain happy as the Earl of Shewesburys /sic/ family--[8]

The published biographies have already given us that poignant recollection of Cardinal McCloskey, but, to the present, they have not given the observations with which the Cardinal concluded his report to Cornelia's niece:

> My heart was full of sympathy. I gave all the consolation in my power. I looked upon the action of the Pope as a mistake.



> But I could not say so. I felt the ways of God were mysterious and no doubt something great was to be accomplished; and the great results of her noble work, as foundress of the Order of the Holy Child through so many vicissitudes have proved it--but don't let us talk about it.[9]

In the past it would seem it was not thought wise to publish "I looked upon the action of the Pope as a mistake." But McCloskey had already foreseen the possibly negative far-reaching implications of a "Pope's mistake" and had answered them as Scripture does: "We know that God makes all things work together for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to his decree." (Rom 8:28) The Cardinal recalled "the ways of God were mysterious . . . something great was to be accomplished. . . the great results of her noble work have proved it." Current theologians remind us that the infinite power of the Spirit to work <u>within</u> the flawed human context to divine purposes is central to the theology of charisms. St. John has Jesus say: "The Spirit blows where it will." (Jn 3:8)

Cornelia, we know, would be challenged to the utmost in the twenty years following her meeting with Cardinal McCloskey to discern the action of the Holy Spirit in very flawed, tangled human circumstances, and to believe in divine power to bring good from evil. Doubtless she made mistakes but we can see her growing in inner strength and in discernment of God's mysterious ways.

We shall have to pass over the events from 1836 to 1853, except for one--Cornelia's private prayer of offering her family joys to God at the end of January, 1840. The way in which this personal spiritual event, recorded

by M.M.J.Buckle from a reminiscence of Cornelia, has been told in published accounts has raised some questions regarding the soundness of Cornelia's spirituality. Utilizing facts as we now know them and their proper sequence, especially the fact that Cornelia knew from at least 1835 that Pierce was seeking a way to continue in the Catholic Church the priesthood to which he had been ordained in the Episcopal Church--we can eliminate unsound interpretations of the event. Cornelia confided to M.M.J. Buckle that, seeing her beautiful children playing happily on a lovely day in January, 1840, she was moved to offer "O my God! If all this happiness is not to thy greater glory and the good of my soul take it from me. I make the sacrifice."[10] This prayer was understandable and sound in the light of her husband's intense yearnings for the priesthood and the ever-present possibility that he might ask for some radical change in their family circumstances--as he did, indeed, before the year was out, asking her to consider a separation. The day after her prayer, their two-and-one-half year old son was fatally burned in a tragic accident, dying after forty-three hours in his mother's arms. The two events--the prayer of offering and the death of her son--were indeed juxtaposed in time and fact, and doubtless the prayer of offering acquired infinite depths of meaning for Cornelia in the days after it. But that is not to say, as is sometimes implied, that she offered the life of her son in a kind of foreknowledge. Such an interpretation finds no echo in the spiritual notes of this woman who portrayed her God as a God of life, a God infinitely compassionate toward those to whom he allows the sufferings of the human condition.

Deep sufferings and deep joys succeeded one another in quick succession in the years



after 1840 during which Cornelia and Pierce separated, he was ordained, and she was called to found the Society of the Holy Child Jesus in England. Then came the ultimate testing of her spirit in the late 1840's and early 50's, as Pierce, deteriorating emotionally and mentally, apostatized, and tried to force Cornelia to return to him. She knew that God was not present in Pierce's madness, and revealed in a few terse statements the lengths and depths of the arduous spiritual journey she had traveled since her early years of marriage. She annotated a slanderous pamphlet Pierce published in 1853. In the margin beside "why she is still kept /in the convent/" she wrote "Because she wishes it for herself. C." Beside "I will never see you," she wrote, "Yes, this is my will because he has broken his promise." And finally, in response to his citation from a newspaper she wrote "But Mrs. C. knows better what she wishes for herself than the Morning Herald can know."[11]

We turn now to Cornelia as founder and superior of her religious congregation, mature, yet open to further growth. Among the source materials that reveal her best, her letters to bishops rank high. Indeed, a whole book could be written on her relations with the hierarchies of England, America and Rome. Her letters to them show how consistently she labored to build and maintain those adult apostolic relationships she fostered in her sisters, relationships which often countered the Victorian expectations with which she was surrounded. She was always cooperative, supportive, concerned about episcopal burdens, but never subservient. She took a stand when it was needed, varying her approach according to personalities and circumstances. When her Ordinary capitulated to unjust demands of parishioners against her congregation she wrote:

> I took your letter recd by the 3o'cl post . . . . and read it to Our Lady of Sorrows asking her in her own sweet meekness to listen to it--and the interior answer I got was 'burn the letter and tell the Bp to forget what he wrote & to come to tell you what more you can do than you have done.' I have burnt it, my Lord, & now will you come down & tell me what more I can do than I have done?[12]

Cornelia had already had bad experiences with the excessive timidity of this Ordinary, Thomas Grant, who, five years before had been driven by his own fears to ask her Congregation for "peace at all costs." She had been forthright in repudiating such terms, and, in acknowledging the obligations of religious obedience, confronting the bishop with his responsibility:

> . . . Your charity for all parties, my Lord, would induce to every sacrifice, but it would have to effect some superhuman means to bring forth satisfaction for these claims. We have not the means to meet your wishes nor could we honestly promise to raise them.[13]

And when the bishop persisted with unjust demands through fear of publicity, Cornelia spoke more forcefully:

> My Lord Bishop (Grant)
> . . . I have already represented the absolute impossibility on our part to meet the demand. You my Lord are our Superior and I am ready to second the responsibility you take to the very utmost of my power. Will you remember this my Lord, but at the same time I again repeat that it is impossible for us to meet your last proposal.[14]



Letters from the sisters Cornelia had sent as missionaries in 1862 to the privations and cold of a small town in Pennsylvania, USA, are as revealing of her as of themselves. Rosemary Haughton wrote that the "kind of spiritual toughness and sense of priorities" the SHCJ missionaries displayed was

> not a matter of luck, of "breeding". It was the direct result of the type of Christian formation which these women had received from the foundress, and that was the result of Cornelia's own growth in the experience of the Spirit.[15]

The letters of the pioneers showed how they viewed themselves as women and religious. One wrote that their American bishop welcomed them because

> . . . he sees we have been trained to work for ourselves and help ourselves without depending upon the bishops and priests to do all for us. . . . He said he saw . . . the first afternoon he spoke to us in Philadelphia that we would do our own work. His definition of a lady--"One who will put her hand to everything.[16]

An even more telling letter, giving the first reaction of the young superior of the mission to other religious congregations, shows her concept of religious woman vis à vis the clergy. Although the letter reveals snobbery it also manifests the spontaneous awareness of Cornelia's sisters that they were women--not children--and were meant to minister with the clergy as adult

collaborators:

> The community we are now staying with is the third we have been introduced to since our arrival in America. Oh, Reverend Mother, if anyone wants an increase of devotion and love to our Society let them see other religious as we have done. . . . seems to me I could never have been a religious if our Society had not been instituted--the extraordinary want of education, of mind, of independence of priestly government, oh dreadful! a Bishop or priest lord and master of the house!! --we can never be sufficiently grateful for our training. Of course we must not judge but in some cases the apparent want of religious spirit is to us startling, and in others the over subdued looks would make me wretched.[17]

Hopefully all that we have just reviewed has been insightful and stimulating, even heartwarming; but it has had a limitation which has characterized much of our reflection in the Society--Cornelia is always the heroine! I have been guilty, as others have, of not allowing Cornelia the mistakes, faults, limitations, sinfulness that are part of the human conditions and which can provide potential for spiritual growth. Let us turn to a portion of Cornelia's life in the Society--the time of its greatest crisis, of near schism, from 1869 into the 70's.

Published biographies have given the basic facts of the crisis--the sending of representations against Cornelia to Rome by the Preston SHCJ at the same time they sent to her their signatures approving the new Constitutions she had sent them. Internal discord in the Society at this time generated enough correspondence now found in the archives of the SHCJ, of the dioceses of Southwark and Liverpool, England, of Philadelphia, USA, and of Propaganda Fide, Rome, to enable us to go beyond the published accounts and see that there were faults as well as sufferings on Cornelia's side, and sufferings as well as faults on the side of the Preston sisters and others.



Many details are given in the biographies showing the real steadfastness, dignity, forgiveness, and magnanimity with which she acted throughout the 1870's. More could be given from the sources to show many excellent examples of her practice of subsidiarity. And more could be added to the biographical accounts of her practice of spiritual government, that is, missioning, and providing in other ways, for individual sisters in terms of her intimate knowledge of their capabilities, spiritual aspirations and spiritual difficulties. But more could also be added to show the very real distress and concern of the many sisters for whom, by 1870, she was no longer a personal spiritual guide, and who found that there were no effective constitutional means for communicating in an objective forum, their very real concerns about constitutional defects of the Society to which they had committed themselves for life. Their concerns were shared by at least one Jesuit to whom Cornelia had sent them for help, and by several other ecclesiastics, who, it must be admitted, involved themselves rather avidly in the SHCJ schism.[18]

A number of SHCJ (apparently more than Cornelia realized), no longer, in 1870, shared her absolute commitment to obtain pontifical status for the Society. As that year opened she had every hope that this approbation would finally be given for the latest revision of the Society's Constitutions. She did not realize how much these Constitutions seemed to the Preston

sisters to be one more product of her arbitrary government. At first she took in stride their delay in signing approval of the Constitutions: "You must, however, make your own remarks" /on the election of the General/, she wrote, adding, You must think and act for yourselves." But as the year wore on, she grew more anxious, and wrote: "I hope this will give you a clear light upon the subject and that I shall receive your signatures in good faith by return of post."[19] Finally, however, she seems to have lost her equilibrium. Her charismatic ardor to fulfill her mission as founder by obtaining pontifical approval and the much-needed security of Constitutions, made her forget, at lease momentarily, her obligation as Superior General to receive and respect representations made "in conscience." A copy of what she wrote to at least one of the Superiors in Preston was sent by the latter to the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda Fide where it can be read today:

> Will you, therefore, have the rules signed without delay, that all may be forwarded to Rome immediately. . . . The vows stand just as they were made, and under the same conditions as received, until the last Vows. Therefore let there be no further discussion. . . . If anyone should turn up whose opinionatedness or obstinacy (or soi-disant conscience) will not allow them to sign, leave them to themselves, and to do as they please, sign or not. They are perfectly free, and it will be an excellent test of how much they prefer their own will and opinions to union with the Society."[20]

Mother Lucy Woolley, the Superior who sent the copy of this letter to Cardinal Barnabo, added: "These words were regarded by the Religious as



coercion, and after taking advice on the subject, they signed the rules to prevent further troubles. At the same time we wrote to your Eminence by the advice of Monsignor Capel."[21]

Another Preston Superior who also cited Cornelia's reference to "self-opinionatedness or obstinacy of soi-disant consciences" represented to Cardinal Barnabo:

> This put many sisters into a dilemma. They felt that if they refused to sign they would be looked upon as obnoxious persons that their lives would be rendered very miserable, and that, in consequence they might be dismissed from the Institute.
>
> Considering the unlimited authority of Mrs. Connelly, and the arbitrary and unconstitutional manner in which, from time to time, she uses it, the Sisters are afraid to oppose her. Besides this, many feel there is a want of probity and straightforwardness in her intercourse with them.[22]

These are serious charges; they can be countered by charges not only of Cornelia, but also of bishops and priests (who, as has been said, involved themselves in the conflict), that Mother Lucy Woolley was herself a source of conflict, though not lacking in considerable apostolic and administrative gifts.[23] We would be caught entirely between two unwitting protagonists if there had not come to light recently the private representation of Mother Gertrude Day who was somewhat of a third party to the sad conflict between Cornelia and Preston. Mother Gertrude, who had been for fifteen years a loved superior and apostolic leader in Blackpool, was affirmed, even as Cornelia was in the elections of the General Chapter of 1874. She was elected a General Councillor.[24] Shortly after her election, she wrote a confiden-

tial representation to her Ordinary, Bishop O'Reilly of Liverpool, demanding confidentiality because "it would be ruinous to my happiness for life if it were known to the Society that I had put matters before your Lordship."[25] Her representation also confirmed with regard to at least one sister what Preston superiors had reported to Cardinal Barnabo of Cornelia's General Councillors appointed by herself previous to 1874.[26] (It must be kept in mind that she had consistently begged for a General Chapter for election of these.) Mother Lucy Woolley's report on the Councillors sums up succinctly what others had also said:

> That during the twenty-five years that the body has been in existence, M.C. /Mrs. Connelly/ has had no advisors or counsellors except those of her own election, and these have not been remarkable for their practical sense, but only for their devotion to M.C. and for their facility in adapting their views to hers.[27]

Mother Gertrude gave an even more significant confirmation to a basic representation of the Preston sisters. They maintained that there were problems in the government of the Society so urgent as to demand the intervention of the Bishops. The Preston superiors had, in fact, been in communication with Bishop Danell while he was composing his Constitutions prior to the Chapter of 1874. When Mother Gertrude wrote to her Ordinary the Bishop of Liverpool, shortly after the Chapter, she expressed her conviction that Bishop Danell's Constitutions should be accepted for the Society because "it contains a form of government and limits the power of superiors" (emphasis added).[28] In other words,



even Mother Gertrude, trusted enough by the Society to be elected a General Councillor, trusted and praised by Cornelia,[29] believed that a resolution of the Society's problems concerning its government must take priority over its mission to be pontifical.

Mother Gertrude died suddenly after only two years in office. Even by that time the General Council and superiors elected in constitutional form were beginning to have a salutary effect. The General Councillors had enough opportunity throughout the 1870's to confront with Cornelia the mounting dilemmas caused by the assertion over the Society of three conflicting episcopal authorities (Southwark, Liverpool, and Philadelphia) to see the wisdom of Cornelia's vision for a pontifical Society. They pursued the quest for pontifical approbation and received it after Cornelia's and Pierce's deaths, 1879 and 1883.[30] In her last years they shared increasingly, and finally took over the burdens of the Society, as their founder, humiliated, but courageous, and hastening toward her death in serious and painful illnesses, handed over the reins of government. As she did so, her spiritual influence was somewhat renewed, and in her last illness she became again a powerful exemplar, this time of dying humbled in union with her "humbled God."[31]

There were still frustrations for her and her sisters as Bishop Danell continued to be Bishop-Superior of the Society which ministered in several dioceses near and far. Within the Society there were also sources of humiliation and suffering, as the troubles of the 1870's "tended to estrange from her so

many of those who in former years had been her most devoted children," while "with regard to others who knew her less well, the result was want of confidence, and . . . opposition to her views and wishes." One of her earliest companions who noted these reactions, was "much struck by the calm dignity with which she encountered all the opposition . . . and the many humiliations she had to undergo." It was the same when, almost thirty years before, Pierce had humiliated her before the world; she had gone on attending "calmly and cheerfully to all the details of community life."[32]

Those who had shared with Cornelia the early vicissitudes of the Society and had themselves contributed in no small measure to the spirit, held fast to their conviction of the charismatic nature of her role and of the Spirit's continued guidance of the Society. One wrote:

> . . . the last supreme trial had its fruit in the perfection of the Institute. Mother Connelly had given up so much to commence--The last sacrifice was the most painful of all--and Mother Connelly's character underwent its last transformation--crushed and annihilated before men, she annihilated herself more profoundly before God, and in a letter she wrote to me at the time . . . she expressed herself as receiving only what she deserved, and begged me to pray for her that her pride might be forgiven by God and that He would spare the Society and accept her as its victim.[33]

And in a later recollection M.M.J.Buckle added: "She took all the humiliations she received from persons in authority as a Saint, and said, 'God has permitted all as a punishment of her



pride'"/sic/.[34]

What is most moving and lends authority to what Cornelia wrote to others, are her few private spiritual notes which have somehow survived from the 1870's. Their emphasis is all on humility, charity, and that center toward which her whole being was directed--the will of God. These jottings are in continuity with her private spiritual notes from Grand Coteau and Rome thirty years before when her insistent prayer had been to attain to that Third Degree of Humility which would make her more like Christ.[35] In 1872 when the sting of the Preston schism was still weighing heavily upon her, she wrote: "In difficulties . . . ask . . . 'Why did I become a Religious--To become perfect-- To become a Saint.'" She continued:

> . . . thinking too much of self, weighing every little slighting word and act of others, yielding to wounded feeling and anger, compassionating myself, giving way to sadness and tears. The remedy for this is meditation on the sufferings of our Lord and a generous desire to accept suffering for His sake--Rejecting all thoughts of self-love and self-compassion. The heavier the cross the more Our Lord loves you, the more constant the touches of His hand, the more He thinks of you, cares for you. Walk on steadfastly in your sorrows to meet Jesus at Jerusalem.[36]

By 1875 the imposition of Danell's Constitutions with all its consequences had brought Cornelia even closer to the Jerusalem of Christ's Passion. As was her custom she made retreat notes for that year:

1. Frequently to renew my Intention of

doing all my actions for God.
2. When forgotten, passed over and neglected, to say as fervently as I can: "Deo Gratias."
3. When corrected or disapproved, even for what I had intended well--to make an offering of this to Our Lord in atonement for past sins, saying "Give me Thy Humility." . . .

The following year she was still much preoccupied in prayer and in daily life with acquiring his and his Mother's humility:

. . . 2. Have I conducted myself like a Religious, cherishing interior humility, regarding myself as the last and least of all?
3. Have I been humble and respectful in my words and manner to my Superiors and all the Sisters?
4. Have I obliged myself to put away wounded feeling and vanity, and be even-tempered --not one day dull, and another bright . . . asking myself: what is God's view of this matter? How would Our Lady have me act, overcoming self generously?[37]

Accompanying these notes were her questions to herself on "Charity." She had frequently reminded her sisters: "Perfection consists in Charity." Now she examined herself:

1. Have I allowed any feelings of dislike to grow up in my heart, to any one?
2. Whenever I have perceived such feelings, have I immediately made an act of charity saying, "O my God, I love Thee and my neighbor as myself, for the love of Thee" --"Jesus most charitable," etc., or a Hail Mary for the person?
3. Have I made it an especial point to do as many acts of personal kindness as I could, either in words or actions? . . .
6. Have I been the first to apologize for any want of humility? or charity? Remembering Our Lord's words "Love one another as I have loved you."[38]



These notes are dated April, 1876. In May she jotted: "However deeply thou mayest humble thyself, thou wilt never be more humble than Christ crucified;" and "In all the troubles and difficulties of life, one only support is left to us, the will of God." Finally, her retreat notes of 1876 reveal her spirit at peace in loving, simple union with her God:

1. To aim at loving and serving God alone, and all creatures in Him.
2. When creatures trouble or neglect me, to turn to God to whom alone I ought to give my heart: "God alone." "For thy sake, my God."
3. To aim at simple, childlike obedience in all things, as being the will of my God whom I love. . . .[39]

". . . the will of my God whom I love." It was because she was so faithful interiorly that, in spite of illness, advancing age, and seeming failure, she could still touch the hearts of her sisters with the themes that expressed their spirit. What she wrote to the American novices in 1876 provides commentary on that "childlike obedience" she aimed at. It included the love of all that He--the Holy Child--loved and taught."[40] For her the will of the Father was personified in his Son.

As 1879 began it became apparent that Cornelia

was in her last illness, one complicated by incredible suffering from a virulent eczema over her whole body so that she was like one scalded. She prayed in her moments of consciousness between periods of delirium. On the day before her death she struck one hand with the other three times and said with great decision: "In this flesh I shall see my God." (Job 19:26) How deeply she must have grasped the meaning of her life in the Lord in order to be able to pray the prayer of the great Old Testament figure with whom she was surely identified! Cornelia had been Job for a long time. She knew how to stand with the oppressed and to grow through faith to inner liberty. We close, praying with her the prayer of her heart when she "saw with her own eyes her Redeemer" in glory.

> Oh, would that my words were written down!
> Would that they were inscribed in a record:
> That with an iron chisel and with lead
> they were cut in the rock forever!
> But as for me, I know that my Redeemer lives,
> and that he will at last stand forth
> upon the dust;
> Whom I myself shall see:
> my own eyes, not another's shall
> behold him,
> And from my flesh I shall see God;
> my inmost being is consumed with
> longing. (Job 19:23-26)



1 See Source 3:25-35

2 Source 4:77-78

3 Synopsis: Life of Rev. Mother, compiled by Adeline Duval Mack, Jan. Feb., 1911; N.S. Cat., Family Affairs, IV, D 9 a646, No.18, SHCJ Archives, Rome, p.18

4 Mack, p.18

5 D 2:67-68

6 CC 1:39

7 CC 1:5

8 Mack, p.13

9 Mack, pp.13-14

10 D 64:35

11 D 8:134, 138, 123.

12 CC 13:81

13 CC 11:69

14 CC 11:75

15 R. Haughton, Theology of Experience (N.Y., 1972), p.158

16 D 30:101-02

17 D 30:48

18 D 52:30-39, 53-56, 74-84, 90-93, 96-103, 131-35; D 54:188-91, 207-19

19 D 52:46-47, 71

20 D 52:102

21 D 52:102

22 D 57:37

23 D 54:184, 213

24 D 83, Part 1:115

25 D 54:207-16

26 D 54:214

27 D 52:99; D 54:147, 202

28 D 54:215

29 CC 7:30; CC 8:119-21; CC 17:33

30 M.A.Weinig, "The Long Desired Approval of Our Rule" Source 7:5-29

31 Const. 1850, Source 4:51

32 D 67:52; D 78:73, 26

33 D 63:36-37

34 D 78:67

35 CC 21:14-15, 27-29, 47, 74

36 CC 22:16-17

37 CC 22:20-22

38 CC 22:21

39 CC 22:17-18

40 CC 8:118