

CAROLINE CHISHOLM AND THE POLEMICS OF SAINTHOOD

Clara Staffa Geoghegan

This paper was written for the Conference, *A Millennium of Christianity: 1000-2000*, held at the University of Melbourne on 6 & 7 October, 2000.

Is Caroline Chisholm a 'saint'? At the most basic level the Christian understanding of a saint is one who lives a life of heroic virtue and provides example and inspiration to others in living a Christian life. The Catholic Church has stringent and even mysterious requirements, which must be met before an individual is officially recognised as a 'saint'. The 'cult of the saints' had its origins in the early church. The highest honour a Christian could achieve during the persecutions was that of martyrdom. After Constantine's Edict of Milan in 313 brought the persecutions to an end, Christians continued to honour the memory of the martyrs and prayed to them to intercede for them in heaven in the same manner in which Roman citizens sought the patronage of influential persons on earth. As the time of the martyrs came to an end, Christians honoured others who had pre-deceased them who had led lives of heroic virtue and thus the cult of the saints had its origins. Until the medieval period, holy persons were recognised as saints by public proclamation – that is, they were widely acknowledged by their community to have lived holy lives. The local bishop made the final proclamation of sanctity. However, this process was open to abuse by local authorities as there were obvious political advantages for towns and villages to be able to claim their own saints, whereupon the process was formalised and brought into the jurisdiction of the papacy.

In the current practise, canonisation is a declaration by the Pope that a person who died as a martyr or practiced Christian virtue to a heroic degree, is in heaven and is worthy of honour and a role model for all. Canonisation is preceded by a process of beatification which requires a detailed investigation of the person's reputation for holiness, and the confirmation of any alleged miracles which occurred through their intercession after their death. It is usual for a period of fifty years to lapse between the time of the person's death to the time of commencement of the process. The present process relies much more heavily on scientific method, than in the past – the historical case must be proved and the miracle required is of the nature of a healing which must be verified by competent medical authorities. In unusual circumstances, the Pope may dispense with some of these requirements. In recent time the case of Mother Teresa of Calcutta is one example of a situation where her reputation for holiness amongst believing Catholics was so great that some of the usual requirements have been dispensed with and the cause was opened immediately after her death without waiting the customary fifty years after death.

Although far more stringent than in the Middle Ages, it is naive to believe that the current process is not open to manipulation. The way in which the process operates means that dioceses, religious orders, congregations, and other organisations which have a high profile within the church, have more ready access to the necessary

information and are able to commence and accelerate their causes. As the requirements of the process are not openly or widely publicised it may appear to be biased in favour of certain categories of Christian faithful and against others. It is certainly much more difficult to bring to the attention of the relevant congregation the cause of a lay person who lived a holy life compared to that of the founder of a religious congregation. The financial factor is also an impediment to many, as the process is lengthy and expensive.

In initiating a cause, historians play a significant part as a historical case needs to be made before any approval can be given for the cause to proceed. Two principal questions need to be answered:

1. What documentary evidence is there that during her lifetime, at her death, and since that time, people stated their conviction that she was a saint? And
2. On what basis did they reach that conviction?

What needs to be shown is 'renown for sanctity' and the virtues on which that renown was based. A prima facie case needs to be established before any further steps can be taken. .¹

For Caroline Chisholm a case can easily be constructed to answer these questions; the more difficult ones relate to why this has not yet been done.

Time restrictions and my main purpose prevent me from using this forum to list her total achievements, but I will provide a brief summary of her work as it relates to her Christian motivation and the issue in question.

Caroline Chisholm's central motivation was the gospel virtue of charity. In her case it manifest itself as 'love of neighbour'. It was her love of neighbour that caught the attention of Herminie Chavanne, a young Swiss girl, who met Caroline Chisholm while both were guests of Mrs James Macarthur. Upon returning to Switzerland, Chavanne had her Australian diary published. Having expected to meet a 'grave and serious lady' she was surprised by Caroline's pleasant manner. She writes:

Kindness shone from her face, with never a hint of weariness and it was obvious that God had granted her all the courage and energy she needed for this living work for her 'neighbour' (this simple and profound word says so much that I need say nothing more).²

From her earliest memories Caroline Chisholm felt drawn to working for the well being of others. In her youth she accompanied her widowed mother and visited the elderly poor in her village in the north of England whose children had migrated to the burgeoning new industrial cities. In the early years of her marriage she established a school for the daughters of poor soldiers in Madras. Upon arriving in Australia she is best remembered for her work amongst single immigrant women, through providing refuge and employment. Her contribution as a woman on behalf of women and other underprivileged groups extended far beyond this.

Caroline Chisholm was the first woman in Australia to publish on matters of public policy when in 1841 she published a pamphlet, *On Female Immigration*³ which

outlined the dangers of the existing practice and proposing a series of reforms. She was the first woman to bring a case to court when she filed a case against the captain and surgeon of the *Carthaginian* for the maltreatment of a female passenger. Caroline won the case which was described in its own time as ‘one of the most significant cases in the colony so far,’ by the solicitor-general Roger Therry. She was the first woman to assist the government in Australia by appearing before three enquiries on immigration. She became involved with settling unemployed families and single men from the overcrowded city to the country where labour was scarce.

Caroline Chisholm saw the family as the cornerstone of society and it was this firm belief that caused her to become a critic of the squattocracy. She condemned them for locking up the lands thereby preventing the establishment of small family farms, and accused them of discriminating against families by running ‘bachelor stations’ – a policy of hiring only single men who attracted lower wages and rations. She also expressed concern about the treatment of Aborigines, of Chinese immigrants, and on preserving the freedom to worship.

Caroline Chisholm’s work has often been regarded in the context of nineteenth century female philanthropy. It was not uncommon for middle-class women, many with an evangelical religious background, to devote their energies to welfare and social reform. What is significant for the purpose of this paper is Caroline’s own self-understanding of her work as stemming from what she perceived to be a call from God and the extent to which she sacrificed her own resources to this end. From her early twenties she had a firm conviction that she was being called to give herself totally to work for the welfare of others – a fact she made abundantly clear to Lieutenant Archibald Chisholm when he proposed marriage. She feared that as a consequence she might not be a good wife and mother so, before consenting to the marriage she refused to see him for one month so that he might consider the implications of her call. If Archibald wanted to marry her, he had to marry God’s vocation for her as well. He accepted the test of a month’s separation and they were married.

Lieutenant Chisholm’s first posting was to Madras, where Caroline established a school for the daughters of poor soldiers whose education and moral formation was often neglected. In 1841 Archibald suffered ill-health and they chose Australia for his convalescence. Soon after arriving in Sydney, Caroline was struck by the plight of young single women in the colony, particularly the moral dangers they faced, and began to assist individual cases. She felt she needed to awaken the conscience of the colony to their plight but received little support. The desperate situation of these women weighed heavily on Caroline’s conscience and it soon became clear she had to go it alone. Caroline herself explained the agony she suffered and the way in which God was speaking to her in these circumstances:

I was impressed with the idea that God had, in a peculiar manner, fitted me for this work; and yet I hesitated . . . my delay pressed on my mind as a sin; and when I heard of a poor girl suffering distress and losing her reputation in consequence, I felt that I was not clear of her sin, for I did not do all I could to prevent it.

During the season of Lent that year, I suffered much; but on Easter Sunday I was enabled, at the altar of our Lord to make an offering of my talents to the God who gave them.

I promised to know neither country nor creed, but to try and serve all justly and impartially. I asked only to be enabled to keep these poor girls from being tempted, by their need, to mortal sin; and resolved that to accomplish this, I would in every way sacrifice my feelings – surrender all comfort – nor in fact consider my own wishes or feelings, but wholly devote myself to the work in hand.

I felt my offering was accepted and God's blessing was on my work.⁴

These are Caroline's words, but their validity needs to be measured by the recognition of her sanctity by others – in her own time and since. Again, this is not a difficult task. In her own lifetime the *Westminster Review* declared that she had done more for the regeneration of the Australian colonies than all the Churches 'and the five Australian Bishops to boot'.⁵ Henry Parkes' *Empire* newspaper wrote: 'If Captain James Cook discovered Australia – if John Macarthur planted the first seeds of its extraordinary prosperity – if Ludwig Leichhardt penetrated and explored its before unknown interior – Caroline Chisholm has done much more: she has peopled – she alone has colonised in the true sense of the term.'⁶ She was likened to Moses leading his people to the promised land in a poem by Henry Kendall'.⁷ French historian, Jules Michelet, declared, 'Australia has but one saint' referring to Caroline Chisholm and suggested her memory would live on through the ages.⁸ She won the admiration of Florence Nightingale,⁹ Charles Dickens,¹⁰ and Pope Pius IX.¹¹ Her 'renown for sanctity' is inextricably linked to the works she performed. She was responsible for settling some 14,000 people in Australia. Beginning with the settlement of young women, she soon began family reunification programs for the families of convicts and free settlers who had been forced to leave children behind in England. She sought to settle young women from famine-stricken Ireland. Much of this work was carried out while her husband was in China in active duty of the East India Company and she had the care of three small children.

The Chisholm family returned to England in 1848 where Caroline remained until 1854. Caroline gave birth to a fourth child, who was born on board ship, and another two were born in England. During this time in England she established the Family Colonisation Loan Society to enable intact family migration. The Society organised for families to meet with each other before embarkation. It chartered ships which were fitted out to Caroline's specifications which allowed for privacy especially for nursing mothers. Her husband returned to Australia in 1851 to act as an agent for the Society. Between September 1850 and July 1852 seven ships sailed to Australia and employment was found for most of the 1288 adults on board. The Chisholms were again reunited in Victoria in 1854. With the advent of the gold rushes Caroline established a series of shelter sheds along the road to the Mt Alexander goldfields to provide shelter and facilities for women and children travelling from Melbourne to join their husbands. Caroline's ill-health – a kidney complaint – forced the family to move from Kyneton to Sydney where, reduced to poverty, she established a school for girls partly to provide an education for her young daughters and also as a source of income. She died in England in 1877 at the age of 69.

Again, my list of her 'renown for sanctity' in her lifetime is not exhaustive. Since her death, it is fair to say that she has continued to live in our historical

consciousness as our 'founding mother'. During the 1988 Bicentennial celebrations, Caroline Chisholm was the only woman among the faces on the banners which festooned Sydney's Macquarie Street.

In church circles, her memory has been kept alive by Catholic women. The Catholic Women's League in Manchester, the Diocese in which Caroline Chisholm was born published a lecture given by one of their members in 1909. It was subtitled 'A Great Catholic Woman'. In the 1920s, upon formation of the Catholic Women's League in Australia they readily identified Caroline Chisholm as a role model for themselves and the issue of canonisation was first raised. There are a number of agencies including women's refuges, pregnancy support services and emergency accommodation centres which carry her name. Given her strong presence in the consciousness of Catholic women, why has the cause not progressed?

Some clues may be found in the debate which began with the publication of Timothy Suttor's book *Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia 1788-1870: The formation of Australian Catholicism*.¹² The book was reviewed in *The Bulletin*, May, 1966 by James McAuley who seized upon Suttor's reference to Australia's 'two saints': Archbishop John Bede Polding and Caroline Chisholm. Writes McAuley:

My heroine is Caroline Chisholm, the greatest Catholic Australian in our history . . . motivated by Christian charity and seeing all things in the light of Christian theology, she was at the same time wholly above and beyond sectarianism and sectional advantage. Neither in the ghetto, nor obsessed with being outside the ghetto; with her eye fixed on the real issues, with real love in her heart.

. . . It is she who ought to be the first Australian saint – even before Mother Mary MacKillop.¹³

The comparison with Mary MacKillop is not insignificant, as we shall see.

Suttor identifies a number of issues which would become stumbling blocks in the Caroline Chisholm Cause. The first is her relationship with the Catholic clergy. He writes of her relationship with Polding:

(S)he was now the most influential lay Catholic in Polding's jurisdiction. She knew the immigrant poor, and had an almost magical ability to get them what they wanted – food shelter, work, marriage . . . she had immense organisational ability . . . a talent for accurate statistical generalisation, an eye for the moral bearing of economic factors, a shrewdness to read the heart . . . And she had the graces of prayer . . . Polding completely failed to grasp her importance; his country was ready for a lay and social apostolate conducted by women as Mrs Chisholm proved. But he had no language with which to take possession of such a concept . . . Hers was an apostolic sanctity beyond the range of vision, not of Polding alone, but of most of her contemporaries except a few distinguished Protestants like Shaftesbury, Dickens, Florence Nightingale and also Pius IX.¹⁴

Here Suttor identified some of the aspects of the Caroline Chisholm story which universalise it in terms of contemporary relevance to the church. However, he recognises that Caroline's 'apostolic sanctity' was beyond the vision of her catholic contemporaries. Polding was caught up in his own struggles, many involving upstart laymen challenging his vision. Her concerns with social justice issues such as a family wage; private ownership of family farms; freedom to migrate; were yet to be articulated by the Catholic Church. Her main work unfolded in the 1840s and 1850s. The encyclical *Rerum Novarum*¹⁵ which marks the beginning of the Church's social justice teaching for the Modern Age, and deals with such issues, was written by Pope Leo XIII in 1891, fourteen years after Caroline's death.

Suttor was writing in 1966 and still Caroline Chisholm's prophetic voice was ahead of its time. Suttor speaks of Polding having 'no language to take possession' of the concept of a lay and social apostolate. While he was instrumental in establishing the congregation of the Good Samaritan, for laywomen who wished to engage in apostolic works, these women, like those in other congregations formed in the nineteenth century, lived an apostolic life in community under the authority of the bishop. Polding had no concept of a married laywoman exercising an active social ministry independently of episcopal authority. Caroline Chisholm's work was concurrent with the work of Frederick Ozanam in France and Wilhelm Emmanuel von Kettler in Germany, but where they both identified themselves within the catholic milieu and consciously sought to shape an emerging theory of social justice within the church, Caroline Chisholm did not attempt a broader social theory nor did she seek to situate her work within the institutional church. Hers was a 'practical genius' which responded to concrete situations of need as they presented themselves. Her concerns diversified as the needs of those around her changed. The absence of a social theory can be attributed to her lack of education when compared to Ozanam and Kettler, and her practical approach can possibly be attributed to her evangelical protestant background. She did not require the approval of bishops or clerics to endorse or justify her vocation. Caroline Chisholm's life can be seen as a prototype of the lay apostolate which was not fully articulated until the more recent Post-Vatican II era – largely due to the work of French Dominican theologian Yves Congar which he developed in the 1950s. In many ways Caroline Chisholm's 'apostolic sanctity' personifies the model of catholic laity articulated by the documents of Vatican II which speak of lay people as being the experts in bringing Christianity to bear upon the social political and economic structures of contemporary society.¹⁶ It was this role which was identified and has appealed to Catholic women for most of this century. It can be argued that the church is still struggling with fully comprehending its significance.

McAuley's review of Suttor caught the public imagination. A devil's advocate style rebuttal by Malcolm Ellis appeared in *The Bulletin* the following month.¹⁷ Ellis' article actually reinforces McAuley's claim. Ellis suggests her style may have led her to the same path to excommunication as Mary MacKillop because her work was not for the glory of the church but for humankind:

She could have been accused of seeming to encourage infidels to practice their heresies as taught by the Protestant Church.

. . . She cared not whether those she set out to succour were Jews, Lutherans, calathumpians or humanists; if somebody within her franchise needed help and she could give it he got it.¹⁸

Ellis identified another aspect of the same issue which could prove a stumbling block in Caroline Chisholm's cause. He suggested that by not working within the authority structures of the church she placed herself on a path of possible conflict with the bishops. Paradoxically, this may well have been her greatest strength. Her work was within the church's traditional understanding of charity, but she did not at any time seek official approval from the Church. She was undertaking corporal works of mercy, she was struggling for justice, further she understood this in the context of fulfilling her God-given vocation. She trusted her own judgment and acted accordingly. She did not use her work as a tool for proselytising; indeed she was keenly aware of the right to freedom of conscience in matters of religion and did not discriminate on religious grounds when offering assistance. Caroline Chisholm was working within the parameters of a lay ministry which the church was yet to formally acknowledge. Her understanding of ministry was broader than that which the church herself understood. Caroline's operating principles with regard to the lay ministry, ecumenism and freedom of religion did not clearly emerge within the Catholic church until the end of Vatican II.

This *Bulletin* debate brought a Catholic response. A series of five talks were given by Fr James Murtagh on *The Catholic Hour*, a popular radio program, on 'Caroline Chisholm: was she a saint?'¹⁹ There is some suggestion that Mary Hoban, a member of the Catholic Women's League and later Caroline Chisholm biographer, provided much of his research. At this point the Catholic Women's League resumed its campaign with renewed vigour. In 1976, in response to the teachings of Vatican II, the bishops called a Laity Conference. At this conference a motion was carried calling for the canonisation of Caroline Chisholm. This was referred to the Bishops Conference where a prayer was approved and the requirements for the process with which I began my paper were outlined. No individual bishop showed any particular interest. They were already some way down the track with the Mary MacKillop cause. It was all handed back to the laity, namely the Catholic Women's League. With the unexpected death of Mary Hoban in 1987, the CWL's work came to a standstill. In 1992, with the beatification of Mary MacKillop, the CWL officially dropped the Caroline Chisholm cause due to disillusionment with the official church's lack of support. The CWL and the Catholic laity in general were fairly ignorant of the canonisation process. The Mary MacKillop beatification drew their attention to some of what might be required. The CWL were privately advised that the cause would be 'enormously expensive' and a 'waste of time'²⁰. It had been made obvious during the MacKillop process that without the support of the institutional church any cause was doomed to failure. While the clergy had rallied in support of MacKillop, the laity-sponsored move for Caroline Chisholm had been largely ignored. While the Jesuits donated the services of Fr Paul Gardiner SJ as Postulator of the MacKillop Cause in Rome, the CWL could not afford to buy such expertise. In addition to a postulator, the Sisters of St Joseph themselves were able to gather and prepare information about their founder – material which was readily accessible to them. All of Mary MacKillop's correspondence to Rome, and those of her detractors, had been carefully collated in the archives of Propaganda Fide in Rome. Establishing a case from historical records was relatively simple. Yet, the whole process is believed to have cost some millions of dollars. Mary MacKillop had 'the unfair advantage of having a religious order propagating her claims', observed McAuley when comparing her to Caroline Chisholm.²¹

With the beatification of Mary MacKillop, another Australian cause has been raised, that of Eileen O'Connor, founder of the Brown Sisters of the Poor. The Brown

Sisters have found a supporter in Bishop David Walker of Broken Bay, and a clerical biographer in Fr T.P. Boland. Again, like the Josephites and Mary MacKillop, the historical records pertaining to the founder of their congregation have been preserved. Not only the historical records but Eileen O'Connor's bedroom has been preserved as a shrine. A niece of one of the sisters remembers as a child of being taken up to Eileen's room and there it was as though awaiting Eileen's return. Everything as she had left it.²² Veneration of the founder is part of the ethos of religious congregations. It justifies their existence. It also makes it easier to meet the Church's criteria for canonisation.

Lay people have no such traditions. No lay person would be venerated in such a way by their family. No matter how holy one thought their grandmother to be, the grief counsellor would instruct them to sort out her belongings, clean out the room and get on with their lives. No beginnings of a cult here.

The canonisation process is skewed to favour clergy and religious. The month of September 2000²³ saw the beatification of two Popes, one archbishop, one Benedictine Abbott; one male religious founder and the canonisation of 120 Chinese martyrs, and three female religious. Two lay people beatified in recent times are Pier Giorgio Frassati, a young Italian who died early this century and Frederick Ozanam. But Frassati was from a prominent wealthy family and a member of the Dominican Third Order while Ozanam was the founder of the St Vincent de Paul Society. Yet, in the Catholic Church, clergy make up only 0.04% of the Catholic population, and together with religious they number 1.64%.²⁴ A minority by any calculation, yet amongst the 'saints' the proportions must be in reverse.

Suttor's second observation is more damning and perhaps the crux of the issue:

One feels indeed that had her marriage only been a sad affair, like Mrs Seton's or Mrs Connolly's, and had she in consequence become a nun, as they did, Polding would have taken her to his heart. But her bed knew no sorrow or discord, no pain but the triumphant pain of childbirth itself.²⁵

The issue here moves beyond ignoring the female voice to ignoring the voice of the laity, particularly married, female laity.

The problem is that until recently the Church did not expect lay people – especially happily married lay people – to be saints. Saints were virgins, martyrs, women who providentially escaped marriage through the death of their spouse and entered religious life, founders of religious congregations, and clerics. The attitude is illustrated in the story of Blessed Lucy of the Trinity whose life is one of many in Mary Jean Dorcy's *St Dominic's Family*.²⁶ Lucy lived in Lima, Peru and was a contemporary of St Rose. One day Lucy was greeted by Rose, whom she had not previously met, as the Mother prioress of the new Dominican monastery (which had not yet been built). Lucy explained that Rose must be mistaken, as Lucy was married with five children. No guesses what happened next. Her husband died, and so did her children, one by one. 'Children often died in Lima in the 16th century', explains Dorcy as the narrator. Lucy helped build the monastery, became the superior and is remembered for her holiness. Would her holiness have been remembered if she has

remained the dutiful mother of five children, or were husband and children a hindrance to holiness?

In 1935, Pius XI in his encyclical on the priesthood quoted the 1917 Code of Canon Law ‘affirming that both interiorly and exteriorly, the lives of clerics must be more holy than the lives of laymen’.²⁷ Implicit in this statement is that the laity have an inferior vocation and a lesser faith. Official Church teaching has changed, but the practice has not caught up with it. There is still a notion that holiness requires removal from the world, not involvement with it. Yves Congar, writing in the 1950s, points out the essential difference between the lay and religious vocations. Medieval Christianity equated monasticism as the vocational paradigm. Congar suggests the laity have a different mission: ‘There are indications that God wills something quite different. Lay people are Christians in the world, there to do God’s work *in so far as it must be done in and through the work of the world*’²⁸ (emphasis is Congar’s).

Much of Congar’s theology of the laity was adopted by Vatican II, especially in the *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*. This theology has been further developed through the Revised Code of Canon Law²⁹; the Synod of Bishops on the Laity (1987) and John Paul II apostolic exhortation *On the Vocation and Mission of the Lay Faithful in the Church and the World (Christifidelis Laici)*³⁰. While the Church still recognises a difference between the ordained and the non-ordained, they are seen to be part of the same mission of evangelisation. All are called to holiness in a manner which is fitting to their particular mission in life. *Christifidelis Laici* sets out areas in particular need for the attention of the laity.³¹

1. Promoting the dignity of the human person (37)
2. Fostering respect for Life (38)
3. Supporting religious liberty (39)
4. Assisting marriage and family life (40)
5. Carrying out works of charity (41)
6. Serving in public life (42)
7. Promoting social and economic justice (43)
8. Engaging in the evangelisation of culture (44)

If the fulfilment of these criteria constitutes a measure of holiness, Caroline Chisholm’s life does so in abundance.

To return to Suttor and his observations about Polding’s understanding of the significance of Caroline Chisholm’s apostolate, the Church now has ‘the language with which to take possession of such a concept’. It merely requires a bishop or bishops’ conference to recognise her prophetic role as a model of lay spirituality.

The under representation of lay people, particularly married lay people has been taken up by Cardinal Ratzinger of the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith who has criticised the criteria for choosing saints. ‘The choice is linked to some chance events: for example a religious order will be able to gather testimony about an individual’s sanctity and follow the canonisation process far more easily than those who are

ignorant of the process'.³² He urged the church to turn to lay saints and to those whose lives carry a message to the universal church.

Caroline Chisholm was a laywoman. Her concerns in the 1840s, 1850s and 1860s are issues that still concern the church and society today. She was a prophetic voice in her ability to understand and articulate an authentic and enduring Christian vision in a colonial society that was facing new and radical challenges. The principles she identified are as valid today as in her own time, yet her cause awaits a champion. As Malcolm Ellis suggested in comparing her with Mary MacKillop, Caroline Chisholm's was not consciously working for the glory of the church but to ease the burden of humankind. This may constitute a considerable obstacle to canonisation. In the end Mary MacKillop's legacy was an educational system and a religious congregation which the universal church and the Australian bishops can claim as their own. Caroline Chisholm left no institutional legacy to which the church can lay claim; she simply succeeded in doing what all lay people are called to do. She fulfilled the vocational call given to her by God with heroic virtue and in the process contributed much to the health and happiness of thousands of families, not to mention the health and happiness of a nation. Unlike Ellis' interpretation however, working for the church and for humanity are not mutually exclusive for it is by feeding the hungry, clothing the naked and visiting the prisoner that Christians build the kingdom of God.

At a time of extreme sectarianism Caroline Chisholm was able to transcend religious barriers and rise above accusations of being 'a female Jesuit'. Ironically it is the church which she claimed as her own that has thus far failed to recognise her contribution. Caroline Chisholm was a convert to Catholicism yet it is interesting to note that the Anglican Church in England, lists her in its Calendar of Saints as a "Commemoration" – albeit a minor and optional celebration – for 16 May³³ and the Uniting Church in Australia acknowledges her contribution as 'renewer of society' on 26 March³⁴.

¹ K.M. Manning, Secretary to Australian Catholic Bishops Conference, Letter to author dated 1 March 1990.

² Herminie Chavanne, *Une Jeune Suisse en Australie*, (Geneva, 1852), 164.

³ Caroline Chisholm, *On Female Immigration*, (Sydney, 1842).

⁴ Caroline Chisholm

⁵ Malcolm Ellis, 'Caroline Chisholm and her Circus', *The Bulletin*, 25 June 1966, 37.

⁶ *Empire*, 1859.

⁷ Henry Kendall, poem 'Caroline Chisholm'.

⁸ Jules Michelet, *La Femme*, (Paris, 1862), 468. Michelet devotes a chapter to Caroline Chisholm entitled 'La femme protectrice des femmes – Carolina'.

⁹ Mary Hoban, *Fifty-one Pieces of Wedding Cake*, (Melbourne: Polding Press 1984), 322. Florence Nightingale made a financial contribution to Caroline Chisholm's work.

¹⁰ Hoban, *Fifty-one Pieces of Wedding Cake*, 159. According to Hoban, Charles Dickens invited Caroline Chisholm to contribute to his magazine *Household Words*.

¹¹ *Freeman's Journal*, Sydney, 15 June 1861: 'the Pope rose and took her by the arm and said "Caroline Chisholm, eccelentissima perseveranza, bravo(sic)," and clapped his hands to show his approbation of her conduct.' He also presented her with several gifts including a gold medal and a marble bust of herself.

- ¹² T.L. Suttor, *Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia 1788-1870: The formation of Australian Catholicism*, (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1966).
- ¹³ James McAuley, 'The Australian Tragedy', *The Bulletin*, May 21, 1966.
- ¹⁴ Suttor, *Hierarchy and Democracy*, 148.
- ¹⁵ Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*, 1891.
- ¹⁶ *Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, n.16.
- ¹⁷ Ellis, Malcolm, 'Caroline Chisholm and her Circus'.
- ¹⁸ Ellis, 'Caroline Chisholm and her Circus'.
- ¹⁹ published as pamphlet, James Murtagh, *Caroline Chisholm: was she a saint?* (Melbourne: Australian Catholic Truth Society, 1966).
- ²⁰ Terry Smyth, 'Saintly Caroline', *Newcastle Herald*, 1 February 1992, 41.
- ²¹ McAuley, 'Australian Tragedy'
- ²² Mary Conlan, Interview by author, Newcastle, 16 December 1999.
- ²³ There is no particular reason for choosing September 2000 simply that this was the date this paper was written.
- ²⁴ Sherry Weddell, and Michael McSweeney, *The Parish: Mission or Maintenance?* (Seattle: Siena Institute, 2000), 2.
- ²⁵ Suttor, *Hierarchy and Democracy*, 49.
- ²⁶ Mary Jean Dorcy, *St Dominic's Family: Lives and Legends*, (Illinois: Tan, 1983).
- ²⁷ as quoted in Russell Shaw, *To Hunt, to Shoot, To Entertain: Clericalism and the Catholic Laity*; (San Francisco: Ignatius, 1993), 28. The title of Shaw's book 'To hunt, to shoot, to entertain' is attributed to Mgr George Talbot, chamberlain to Pope Pius IX in response to a question as to the role of the laity.
- ²⁸ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, (London: Geoffrey Chapman 1985), 19.
- ²⁹ *Revised Code of Canon Law*, (Rome, 1983).
- ³⁰ John Paul II, *Christifidelis Laici*, Apostolic Exhortation arising from 1987 Synod of Bishops on the Laity, Rome, 1989.
- ³¹ numbers in parentheses relate to paragraph numbering system in Vatican documents.
- ³² Joseph Ratzinger, as interviewed by M. Ricci, 'A Few False Facts and . . . the Polemics Rage' and 'Too Many Saints?' in *30 Days in the Church and the World, Rome*, Vol 2, 5 May 1986; also 'A Profusion of Saints', *The Tablet*, London, 15 April 1989, 436.
- ³³ Brother Tristram SSF (ed); *Exciting Holiness: Collects and Readings for Festivals and Lesser Festivals of the Calendar of the Church of England*, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1997), as quoted by S. Benner and S. Kershaw on the website: <http://oremus.org>.
- ³⁴ as noted annually in *Australian Religious Diary*, (Richmond: Jesuit Publications).