Richard A. Hutch
University of Queensland, Australia

Psychosocial Dimensions of Religious Founding

In her massive historical survey of notable American women, which spans the time from the colonial period up to and around 1920, editor Janet Wilson James has catalogued no fewer than thirty-eight women as "religious founders."[1] Not only does she include the most notable women founders like Mary Baker Eddy, who in 1866 slipped on some ice, was placed in bed, and then arose from her bed, as she put it later, "on the third day," and went on to found the Christian Science movement. James also gives places of prominence to lesser known figures like Ann Ayres, founder of the first monastic order for women of the Episcopal Church in America in 1852. Much of the field of women's religious history still is unexplored. However, the biographies accumulated and catalogued by Janet James offer enough information about the activities and concerns of American women in the world of affairs to make possible an attempt at synthesis. At least, it is important to begin.

To suggest that the time is ripe for a comprehensive comparative biographical study of the lives of women religious founders in America is to point in several possible directions such an inquiry might take. Generally, characteristics of religious founders need to be pointed out, and then an example should be offered. Four related directions suggest themselves. First, the psychosocial development of leadership is considered according to a theory of play. Second, on the basis of this understanding of leadership, we will note its specific coincindence with a model of religious founding familiar to historians and pheno-menologists of religions. These two directions of inquiry join together to supply us with a comprehensive understanding of a religious founder which depicts a broad range of psychobiographical and historical

---

1. See the Index of her work: Janet Wilson James, ed. *Notable American Women* 3 Vols. (Cambridge: Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1971).

considerations.   Our third consideration is to show an example of a
founder whose life is illuminated by such considerations, namely, the
life of Ann Lee Standerin (1736–1784), founder of the American Shaker
movement.   The final concern is to suggest a possible typology of
women religious founders on the basis of an empirically tested and
certified understanding of founding broadly conceived.   However,
this will be done only after a discussion of how women in the formative
period of American national life learned to embrace equality mainly
through religious experience.   A general theme throughout this study
is that a preoccupation with religious experience has been a major
first step taken by American women on their way toward constitutio-
nally guaranteed equal rights.

Psychosocial Pattern of Leadership

We may begin with Erik H. Erikson's observations of children
involved in what he referred to as "play constructions," in which each
child is told to take blocks, set a scene on a table, and then animate
the scene by lending it some kind of dramatic interpretation. Erikson
has discovered that, as he puts it, the "function of playfulness" is
constituted by the "quality of all things alive, namely, the restoration
and creation of a *leeway of mastery* in a set of developments and
circumstances" pertaining to the exciting scene one has created,
whatever its magnitude, and the child's own sense of self being re-
created within it.[2]   Creating the scene involves what Erikson calls
"free movements," that is, manipulating the blocks in a host of ways,
and doing so within "prescribed limits," that is in the form at hand,
on the table, nowhere else, and according to strict instructions.[3]
Creating a scene, then, is a matter of putting oneself into the job of
arranging the blocks in new ways, within a certain context.

But there is more to play than that.   Blocks and arrangements of
blocks become objects expressive of emergent self-mastery.   In a sense,
such playful manipulation of these symbols of the self is a process of
ritualization.[4]   Rituals are responses to situational ambiguities in
which a loss of conceptual, affective, and/or behavioral control is

2. Erik H. Erikson, "Play and Actuality" in *Explorations in Psychohistory,*
   edited by Robert Jay Lifton with Eric Olson, (New York : Simon and
   Schuster, 1974), p. 111.

3. Ibid.

4. See Erik H. Erikson, *Gandhi's Truth* (New York : W. W. Norton, 1968) pp.
   393-448.   Also, see Erikson, "Play and Actuality," pp. 116-122.

sensed. This is the nature of the bare tabletop and unorganized blocks. To set a scene and to animate it anew over and over again establishes a pattern of control. Through ritualization situational clarity, new control and final resolution are sought.[5] The implications of ritual for the process of founding can be pointed out briefly here. As we shall see, it is precisely by means of playfulness according to a specific religious pattern that a founder establishes new "leeway of mastery" in her personal developments and in her historical circumstances.

Besides having implications for the phenomenology of religious founding, Erikson's theory of play bears on the question of most kinds of historical leadership, of which religious founders are but one group of examples. Generally, the magnitude of play activity varies. Though it may be limited to a table top, a person may play not only in terms of blocks as symbolic tools for self-mastery, but also with historical circumstances and attending ideological developments. In line with this is the pioneering typological study of American corporate leadership by Michael Maccoby. It deals with twentieth century economic circumstances and the ideologies of businessmen. His book itself is aptly entitled, *The Gamesman*, and owes its impetus to the sociopsychoanalytical work of Erich Fromm and David Riesman.[6] At any rate, historical events and the way they are perceived and given shape in ideological pronouncements also may serve as symbols of the self, means for re-creating not only oneself, but others as well according to a broad, new leeway of mastery porn of a leader's vision. For example, wars often are referred to as "games," and generals pondering moves on land maps enjoy a leeway of mastery when they imagine how best to get an edge on an enemy. Like military generals, who deal with wars as formalized ritualizations in history, leaders in religion, including founders, depend for their identities on a similar style of "gaming" by which mastery of their situations might be secured. Erikson has said that such persons are "great,"

> precisely because their sense of identity vastly surpasses the roles foisted upon them, their vision opens up new realities, and their

---

5. Some historians of religions have linked together the phenomena of play, attitudes of playfulness, ritual, and attitudes of reverence. See Johan Huizinga, *Homo Ludens* (Boston: Beacon, 1955), p. 18 and Adolf E. Jensen, *Myth and Cult Among Primitive Peoples* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), p. 41.

6. Michael Maccoby, *The Gamesman* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976).

gift of communication revitalizes actuality. In freeing themselves from rigidities and inhibitions they create new freedoms for some oppressed categories of men, find a new leeway for suppressed energies, and give new scope to followers who, in turn, feel more adult for being sanctioned and encouraged. The great, we say, are 'gifted' with genius; but, of course, they often must destroy too, and will seem evil to those whom they endanger, of whom they exclude.[7]

Therefore, being cognizant of the way children play is an introduction to understanding subsequent creations of leeways of mastery in history by leaders of many sorts.

Religious Founding

Religious leadership is forged freely within the prescribed limits of man's universal sense of meaning or sense of "cosmic order." Such leaders become more-or-less free to explore the extraordinary and the bizarre, but do so within the confines of some broad tradition of meaning. The leeway that first grants a child a sense of identity in a wider world is the source of similar leeway by which the founder senses herself essentially as one gripped by the unusual mysterium, gripped in a new, meaningful way. Experienced perhaps first as initial terror in the face of risking social and historical scorn *(tremendum)*, the founder soon may feel a joyous exhilaration *(fascinans)* at having enjoyed a new vision of reality and at having committed herself to the leeway specified as its codification in some kind of ideological creation.

Within Erikson's description of the leader or, as he puts it, the "great adult," one may recognize a pattern related not only to the structure of play activity, but also to the dramatic sequence of events constituting religious foundings. This latter aspect of leadership arises from a cross-cultural depiction of the stages involved in founding a religious movement, to one degree or another.[8] To wit, the

---

7. Erikson, "Play and Actuality," pp. 132-133.

8. General phenomenological depictions of the religious founder in the history of religions, as well as in other perspectives, include the following pertinent studies: Millar Burrows, *Founders of Great Religions* (New York: Scribner's, 1931). Erik H. Erikson, *Dimensions of a New Identity* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1974), pp. 11-60, and *Gandhi's Truth* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968), pp. 393-448; Herbert Stroup, *Founders of Living Religions* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), pp. 13-30; and Joachim Wach, *Sociology of Religion,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), pp. 130-145, 341-344.

historian of religions, G. Van der Leeuw, has written that founding a religious movement is a dramatic response to a felt sense of power in one's midst.   As a ritualization of this experience, religious founding involves three fairly distinct stages, each related to the other two as an essential step in the formation of a new ideology according to which the extraordinary reality sensed by the founder becomes articulated.[9]   The sequence involves :

1. how persons become "sacred" by surrendering to and participating in an experiential sense of otherness;

2. how they appear to others as sustaining minimal mastery over some sense of "holiness" on the basis of that experience, which is revered by others; and

3. how effective they become, as noticed in the proliferation of hagiographical descriptions offered by popularizers of the extraordinary reality and the newly-founded movements.

From stage one to stage three, founding is described as moving from an experiential stage in which there is a sense of loss of control over one's world, through the next stage in which the founder makes contact with others sharing a similar sense, to an ideological stage where, after the founder's death, the memory of the followers and their life together are both organized in a certain way.   The dramatic sequence suggested by Van der Leeuw prescribes the limits of cultural tradition within which religious founding is freely staged, for example, the creation of "revivalism" within the Puritan Christian tradition of New England by Jonathan Edwards during the eighteenth century. As long as these three steps find adequate expression, then a founder's work merely certifies the ritual action stemming from such broad leeway of mastery represented in history by the founder herself.   Let us look closer at the potently religious determinants of such a scheme.

Each stage of the sequence implies a major experiential determinant.   Later, each determinant will give rise to certain testable, operational definitions which we will note to be characteristic of a comprehensive typology of founders.   The first determinant, of course, is *surrender*—surrender to situational pressures which appear, at least, as dissonant or ambiguous, but may also seem overwhelming.   The

---

9. Gerardus Van der Leeuw, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation* 2 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), II, p. 650.   The three stages of founding summarized Van der Leeuw's expanded description of the founder.

founder surrenders by losing control over events in her life, perhaps understanding the composite impact of those events as the occasion when she encounters "sacred power." Symbolic play then commences. To play where it counts is first to surrender to and grapple with the composite limits within which one must work. Usually, cultural traditions prescribe these boundaries as, say, Christianity is noted to bind most American women founders to one degree or another. If founding is to be completed, then the founder must play (and play effectively) within that particular tradition of self-understanding and collective meaning. She becomes possessed, as it were, by a sense of creative freedom in arranging the symbolic building blocks of her new religious awareness, if only to render more clearly a statement of the limits of the original tradition. Thus, the complete sequence of founding is activited when one gives in to possible instructions implied by surrendering to situational forces buffetting one about. Giving in is preliminary to securing a leeway of mastery over the usually adverse impact of the moment. Situational ambiguities are clarified ritually insofar as the founder is able to amend her cultural heritage with fresh ideological vistas. Success in doing this depends on the recognition she receives.

The second religious determinant is *interplay,* or the highpoint of vivification that actually occurs during the initial days, weeks, and months of the founding of a new religious movement and usually extends until the founder's death. Critical in this stage is the founder's charisma or holiness as perceived by followers. This interplay is likened to the mutuality of regard which exists between a mother and an infant, which reciprocally confirms a bondedness to the other, but also suggests individual distinctiveness.[10] In the case of the religious founder, situational forces not only supply the possibility of a leeway of mastery, but also are understood as "sacred power," or that which works to frustrate attempts at ego-mastery of situational ambiguities, be they primarily psychological, historical, or some combination of factors.

The last determinant, of course, is *mastery* of an experience of sacred power by a founder who is remembered after her death by her

---

10. See Erik H. Erikson, "The Development of Ritualization," in *The Religious Situation,* 1968, edited by Donald Cutler (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), pp. 713-719.

followers as a virtual incarnation of God. This usually is accomplish-
ed hagiographically, where followers identify the founder as an actor
in the drama of situational ambiguities, working to right them.   Let
us turn to an example of a religious founder who worked through
this whole process, achieving victory over forces of ambiguity which
might very well have torn apart her life.

Ann Lee, "Mother of the New Creation": Example of Founding

Nestled fairly comfortably within the historical forms of Christia-
nity is the religious movement of the United Society of Believers in
Christ's Second Appearing, commonly known as the Shakers, founded
in America around 1774 by the English woman, Ann Lee.   Factors
associated with her situation in Manchester were of sufficient force to
precipitate Ann Lee's surrender to personal and historical adversities,
as well as to engender her subsequent victory over them.   Mastery
resulted when she managed to elaborate ideologically on peculiar
visionary experiences, as well as to initiate a religious movement of
considerable magnitude.   How did she first undergo a loss of ego
control or, we might say, experience what she understood to be
"sacred power?"

Ann Lee experienced a complete nervous breakdown sometime
around 1768.   Whatever the nature of the situation preceding this
experience, reasons for it were clearly associated with her 1762 un-
wanted marriage to Abraham Standerin, a blacksmith employed in
her father's shop.   The reluctant bride soon became a mother of
despair.   Four children were born, all of whom died in infancy, the
last nearly claiming the life of its mother.   However, marriage and
thwarted family life were not the only reasons serving as a catalyst for
Ann Lee's peculiar inclinations.   Also contributing to her surrender
to the force of circumstances was her secret association since 1758
with James and Jane Wardley, one-time Quakers, who by 1750 were
enjoying more than the contemplation of an "inner light" as did
their fellow-Quakers, dare say enjoying ecstatic religious practices.
Their animated rites, of course, were banned by the Society of Friends
since they involved such activities as dancing, tongue-speaking, and
singing.   The Church of England, in which Ann Lee was still a
member, frowned as well upon these "shaking Quakers."   Worn out
by all the years of toil in the mills, subjects to living conditions in an
overcrowded slum, and sensing imminent personal tragedy, Ann Lee
broke down completely and surrendered to the brunt of life as it erod-

ed her best intentions. But, now that she had surrendered to power-
ful circumstances, how did she begin actively to master the situation
both for herself and for the subsequent edification of followers? We
can ask, how did Ann Lee achieve the next stage of the ritualization
of founding, namely, the sense of interplay or mutuality with a
coterie of followers?

The first steps taken by Ann Lee were to mortify herself, foregoing
sleep and all but the meanest food until, weak and wasted, she felt as
"helpless as a child." This activity she thought was atonement for her
"violation of God's laws," the deaths of her four babies being God's
punishment, she believed, for her concupiscence. If associating with
Abraham Standerin proved to be the root of her sense of evil, then surely
her relationship with the Wardleys prompted her to seek goodness in
terms of a nascent religious identity. At this time, she began seeing
her sense of doom to be a strain of an even more pervasive, universal
evil. Her sufferings, she believed, were not only a result of her bad
marriage, but due to the general state of relations between men and
women. That is, due to the "cohabitation of the sexes," which resulted
in the perpetration of the cardinal sin of mankind, namely, sexual
intercourse. Here, then, were planted the seeds of ideological creation.
Through a subtle and extraordinary process of imaginative restructuring
of the force of her situational ambiguity, Ann Lee readied herself to
master what before prompted total surrender. The "double-bind" of
being married reluctantly, and enthusiastically associating with the
Wardleys, soon was transformed ritually into a positive religious event.

If she came to believe her sexuality was thoroughly evil power,
then Ann Lee realized not only how to participate in a sense of divinity
when, as she said, her soul "broke forth to God" during her break-
down, but also how to sustain a sense of holiness which would evoke
reverence from followers. Simply, she felt her new religious duty to be
in refrain from all sexual commerce, to become celibate.   Celibacy is
not new, and had Ann Lee's curiosity stopped there her point of view
about sexuality would never have become woven into the fabric of
American life in quite the way it did during the "gilded age" of the
nineteenth century.[11]   She also had a mission that stretched beyond

---

11. A description of the "gilded age" in American religion, written as a
historical study itself about the ambiguous situation of religious awareness
at the time, from the birth of the nation to the twentieth century, is, Paul
Carter, *The Spiritual Crisis of the Gilded Age* (De Kalb, Illinois: Northern
Illinois University Press, 1971).

her own personal life. Marriage, which brought forth no fruit, was replaced symbolically by her embrace of a religious group which afforded her the opportunity of giving birth to the American Shaker movement. However, the crux of her innovation of Christianity came only when she was able to offer a would-be following more than the story of her own personal tragedy and sense of celibate religious duty.

What she supplied followers was no less than a total re-understanding of the mythical origins of the human species, that is, a new point of view on the Biblical story of creation. Around 1768 Ann Lee returned to the religious society of the Wardleys and was soon elevated to a position of leadership two years later. While marriage shrank into insignificance, her religious militancy soared to a high pitch. Carrying the Shaker mission to the streets, the society was, as it was soon understood by the followers of Ann Lee, "persecuted" twice, once in 1772 and again in 1773. Ann Lee was arrested and imprisoned for breach of the Sabbath, an action which would result in a new valorization of the times in which she lived. This is to say, in prison she experienced what has come to be known as her "grand vision," which served symbolically to complete a state of affairs previously understood only in a sexual manner: She saw the evil of man being generated by the fornicating couple, Adam and Eve, in the Garden of Eden, thustransgres sing her belief that God's intention was for man to abstain from all sexual relations. She felt this extraordinary revelation to be a sign of her holiness, or Christ's presence within her soul. Moreover, many of her followers could understand easily her sense of Christ's presence as constituting the beginning of his Second Coming, born in "Mother Ann Lee." Therefore, on the basis of emotional, torment, this founder latched into a piece of Christian myth upon which her spirits played and which she soon re-interpreted and used as the ideological basis upon which an historical movement would be built.

It is at this point that Ann Lee moved beyond personal surrender and interpersonal interplay with those immediately around her. We may begin to ask, how did Ann Lee achieve an awareness of the last stage of the founder's religious determinants, historical mastery of her initial situational adversities. Characteristic of ushering in of a "new age" was an attendant move to the west, away from England. So the

Shakers came to the United States, landing in New York in August of 1774, so that Ann Lee's revelation could find soil more fertile than that of England.   By the time of their arrival, the new Shaker community already was calling Ann Lee "Mother of the New Creation," or just "Mother," thereby initiating a genuine hagiographical tradition with which to bolster the new religious movement from the outset. This aura of regard surrounding the founder would last far beyond her death in 1784. Perhaps of most significance was the emphasis she placed on equal rights and responsibilities for women within Shaker society, thus anticipating much of the feminist movement during the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries.   Through her "play" within the "prescribed limits" of eighteenth-century, lower-class English life, at least in the religious sector, Ann Lee broke down.   Only when she was able to prescribe her own religious limits, with the support and sanction of the Wardleys and other, was she founder of the new "freedom" which became ritualized as all the Shakers were and continue (very modestly) to be in America.

Therefore, from the time of her twenty-sixth year to that of her thirty-sixth (1772), Ann Lee completed the dramatic sequence of founding, establishing a new leeway of mastery for her followers—an ideology of cosmological proportions. Ann Lee is remembered foundly by her followers through that protracted event as the women for whom being a wife was not necessarily a prerequisite to motherhood.

Religious Experience and Aggression

So far we have discussed the structural and dynamic characteristics of the religious founder.   To raise the question of a typology, is to probe into the forces at work which differentiate founders from each other, but do so within the limits of our new understanding. Also, it is important to explain why women founders are unique.   I would like to suggest that any leader, especially women leaders who become founders of religious movements in America, depends upon a preoccupation with aggression management on her way toward attaining a degree of authority in regard to a following.   Later on, when a typology of founders is presented, three testable questions will be asked about this theme of domination: How does a founder manage to secure a sense of dominance over herself, others, and shared events? To what degree is she successful doing so? Is the historical data available a sufficient basis upon which judgment can

be made? For now, however, some preliminary comments about women and the function of religious experience are necessary.

Inherent in the process of founding a religious movement is the attainment of a new sense of reality which gets confirmed time and time again insofar as the founder is independently committed to and personally invested in it. This process is particularly troublesome for women in America, since matriarchal visions of reality have generally been suppressed. The equality of men before God, express- ed so effectively in the Declaration of Independence, had little impact on most women's lives during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. However, in religion the equality of religious experience itself was something they *could* experience, and no man could deny it to them. Women and men could be seized by sacred power in the same ways. They also could convey such events with equal force and cogency to loyal followers. Thus, religious experience, especially its general "levelling" quality, placing men and women alike in the role of creatures before a creator, should be seen as a key to the unique role of women founders in the history of American religions.

It has been in the process of engendering religious experiences— conversions, visions, trances, and so on—that women have helped turn the tides of society from the start. Some strong founders go so far as to create a reality which turns out to be very different, almost alien, from that of the popular culture. For example, Helena Blavatsky astounded Christian America when she announced she was in touch with "Mahatmas" dwelling on the "astral plain." To make such announcements requires a high degree of domination and personal independence with which skeptics might be met with strength. Other founders, of course, evidence less independent commitment to a particular reality. Usually, this kind of person relies heavily on prevailing self-understandings evident in the general populace or inherent in her childhood, modifying them only slightly as did, say, Frances Dickinson. This woman was co-founder, with Ann Theresa Mathews, of the first Roman Catholic convent in the United States in 1794 under the watchful eye of the country's very first bishop, Bishop John Carroll of Maryland. Not only was the contemplative reality in which Frances Dickinson lived stylized according to traditional Catholicism, but her sense of mission within the patriarchal culture of Roman Catholicism depended as well on guidance from the good bishop. Thus, a continuum exists between clear domination on the

one hand, and dependence on the other.   Finding one's place on the continuum is an exercise in aggression management and authority maintenance.

Speaking about the management of aggression, one psychoanaly-tically-oriented author has said, "the conflict of reality and pleasure principles will produce situations of ambivalence."[12] Aggressiveness derives from successes in tipping the scale in favor of the pleasure principle, short of a thorough and final alleviation of ambivalence. We have maintained that it is precisely the resolution of personal situational ambiguities like those posed in games that precipitates founding, especially when such resolutions assume historical magnitude, as they obviously did, for example, for Martin Luther early during the sixteenth-century.   In effect, founding resolves the conflict between the reality and pleasure principles of psychosexual functioning by substituting (or modifying) an alternate reality crafted out of the founder's inner depths and place in time and space, in other words, out of her psychohistorical situation. The more aggressive the founder the more distinctive her reality will be.   Thus exists the revitalizing "drama" of history characteristic of emerging move-ments.[13]   Here, aggressive energy is used by the ego to resolve the conflict, to add "motive power to the drive to reality."[14]   How do founders come by this seemingly over-abundance of aggressive energy ? During the Jacksonian period of American life, women especially were asserting themselves in unique ways, ways which often were very disconcerting to men.   "The curse of our age," wrote Orestes Brownson early in the nineteenth century, "is its femininity. Its lack, not of barbarism, but of virility."[15]

In regard to the origins of aggressive behavior, Beatrice B. Whiting, an anthropologist, follows a status-envy theory of the so-called "masculine protest" syndrome, which is a characteristic style used by male adolescents who have been overly dependent on infantile mother identifications. These males continue to seek to give birth to

---

12. Eli Sagan, *Canabalism: Aggression and Cultural Form,* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), p. 86.

13. For a study on this process of historical revitalization due to religious move-ments see, Anthony Wallace, *Religion: An Anthropological View* (New York: Random House, 1966), pp. 30-39, 157-66, 209-15.

14. Sagan, p. 86.

15. Orestes Brownson, "Literature, Love, and Marriage" in *Works* Vol. 14, p. 21.

amature sense of virility out of their more primitive "barbarism." Although most studies have documented males who "protest" against a constricting mother or against unenviable feminine cultural styles. Whiting's theoretical stance will help us explain the unique militancy among the more masterful founders. Their strength is due to a kind of "masculine protest" against sacred power to which, ironically, they remain intensely bound. Thus, Whiting's status-envy theory in regard to masterful women would read,

> that an individual indentifies with that person who seems most important to (her), the person who is perceived as controlling those resources that (she) wants. If during the first two or three years of life a child is constantly with (her) mother and infrequently sees, and is handled by, (her) father, (she) will identify strongly with (her) mother and not with (her) father. . . . If, later in life, (she) is involved in a world that is obviously dominated by men, a world in which men are perceived to be more prestigious and powerful than women (she) will be thrown into conflict. (She) will develop a strong need to reject (her) underlying female identity. This may lead to an over-determined attempt to prove (her) masculinity. . .[16]

The important thing to note here is a woman's perception of the status not merely of the men in her world who are prestigious and powerful, but also her perception of the women in her world of childhood. Evidence suggests that women reared in mother-child households, where father salience is absent or low, are more dominant and aggressive as adults than women reared in nuclear households.[17] Whiting explains this is due to "secondary male identification engendered by the perception that in the 'lower-class' world men have more power than women;" or it also could result from a "primary identification with a masculine-type mother who has to fend for herself without a man and hence is more aggressive."[18] In other

16. Beatrice Whiting, "Sex Identity Conflict and Physical Violence: A Comparative Study.' *American Anthropologist,* Part 2, 67, no. 6 (December, 1965): 126-27.
17. Roy D'Andrade, "Father-Absence and Cross-Sex Identification." Ph.D. dissertation, Howard University, 1962; Antonia Ridington, "The Relation of Household Structure to Child-Rearing Practices in St. Christopher, Barbados," Senior Honors Thesis, Radcliffe College, 1964.
18. Whiting, "Sex Identity Conflict and Physical Violence: A Comparative Study," p. 127.

words, strength is envied regardless of its embodiment. Such envy prompts aggressiveness especially when a woman perceives her mother's style of life as weak in contrast to that of her father. This insight may occur during adolescence or young adulthood when social behavior takes on more importance and greater self-consciousness. At this time, the early childhood identification with the mother can conflict radically with a woman's envy of a man's universe. When she grows reticent and refuses to find being a woman in a man's world an enviable lot, an alternative is posed and she may thus find resolution in terms of a precipitated and independent religious experience, like a conversion or a vision. The result is to be put on equal footing with religious experiences of men of the day. Ann Lee's vision of Adam and Eve resolved her marital disappointments based upon, perhaps, a secondary male identification with her successful father, and fulfilled her envy of the single, celibate life, perhaps an exclusive feminine "power" as far as the men of her time were concerned. The force of equality with men brought by such an event can not be denied. Her "protest" succeeded.

Typology of Founding

Status envy sets the stage for asserting degrees of domination and authority over others. Of course, dominance is a matter of the degree of ego-mastery attained through the course of religious experiences by women. Some founders are less masterful, less aggressive than others. If dominance can be said to imply social isolation, then one courts feelings of intimacy in like manner. We saw how, "dominated" by her husband, Ann Lee sought out intimate association with the Wardleys and the shaking Quakers. In turn, this led to a situation in America where intimate surrender to the radical Quaker movement in England served to set parameters in which Ann Lee herself could achieve mastery. The result was the founding and leading of the Shakers. In short, mastery is not understood apart from its opposite, surrender to limitations of one's desire for broad dominance in life.

These limits can be understood to have two sources which give rise to a three-fold typology of founders. First, limitations on one's hope for dominance may stem from the situational context of the ritual encounter of founding itself. Of course, surrendering to the realities of her poor marriage and to the Wardleys implied that Ann Lee was less than "in control" of them. Furthermore, the general

cultural context of Anglican and Quaker piety set ideological bounds on her freedom of thought. Second, limitations may stem as well from the founder herself. A modest sense of ego-mastery is a prelude to a broader hold on cultural questions. Ann Lee might very well have dismissed her vision of Eden as a bad dream, but did not. Instead she was able to interpret it as being salient to mastery of her personal situation and, later, central to her dominance in the Shaker movement. Generally, the most effective founder will achieve and defend a posture of isolated dominance, while the least effective founder continues to try to dominate but succeeds mainly only by surrendering intimately to situational pressures.

Therefore, when she risks hostility from those around her (as surely Ann Lee did) by seeking a new religious identity, she may do so by "giving in" in part to the social pressure not to deviate from ordinary religious meanings. Or, she may assert the strength of will enough to avoid those external pressures altogether, "winning over" those most resistant to her ritual creation, the new movement. Or, some clear mid-point or "containment" of aggression between the founder and her followers and critical peers not willing to join her may be achieved.[19]

Therefore, on the basis of this broad sketch of the parameters of dominance, a three-fold typology of women religious founders is offered below, and possible representative illustrations of the thirty-

---

19. Robert A. Nisbet, *The Sociological Tradition* (New York: Basic Books, 1966), pp. 142-44. To the scholar of social movements, these three ranges on the isolation-intimacy continuum can generally be understood to be paralleled by Weber's three types of "domination," or sources of psychosocial authority in history. "Giving in" is surrendering one's aggression to traditional authority. As Weber has put it, such authority stems from belief in the "sanctity of the order and attendant powers of control as they have been handed down from the past, 'have always existed'." On the other end of the continuum is "winning over" others with aggressive action. Here looms Weber's charismatic type of authority, or that which is weilded by an individual who shows "through revelation, magical power, or simply through boundless personal attraction that he possesses *charisma*, a unique force of command that overrides in popular estimation all that is bequeathed by either tradition or law... a mode of change induced by the impact of some great individual." Finally, the mid-point of the continuum, "containment," suggests Weber's rational authority. Although characterized by the rational ordering of personal relationships, it is clear that the focus is on the mutual processes of interpersonal action within groups. When the "application of organizational reason" breaks down, so too dissolve groups. Thus, the Weberian types of domination parallel the more psychohistorical aim of this study namely, to generate similar types of religious founders whose lives evince formative struggles of one degree or another with all three sources of psychosocial authority.

eight founders are included under each type initially thought appropriate by this author. In the last section of this paper, "Empirical Test by Related Professionals," these inclusions will be judged by outside reviewers for the appropriateness of the fit of each founder in one of the three types. Correlations in percentages will be given at that time.

1. *Defeated Founders,* for whom the success is marked by their appropriation of more of the prescribed limits of their circumstances —the given identities of their inherited culture—than the free exercise of ideological leeway. Her personal style of surrendering precipitates an experience of founding which usually modifies inherited religious views of her parents or other significant figures of authority, doing so usually with their blessing not their scorn. A movement initiated by such a founder usually has a long duration, but only because it primarily is an enrichment of a broader, long-standing tradition and not a clear departure. Defeated founders are defeated from the start because they do not entertain even the hope of creating an entirely new or different sort of religious movement. Generally, these founders tend to give in to the overwhelmingness of situational factors, which, initially, seem beyond their control, and continue to appear little controlled even after the movement has begun. For example, Rose Philippine Duchesne wanted to work with American Indians in 1815 but her Mother Superior curbed her impatience, making her a pious French Roman Catholic nun. Only after submitting herself to the slow processes of the church hierarchy was she able in 1841 (her seventy-second year !) to rise to a position of responsibility and founding. Then she travelled to America and led a group of nuns to Kansas to found the first convents of the Sacred Heart there for the purpose of establishing schools for the Potawatomi Indians. A working list of women founders of this type might include the following :

1. Ann Ayres (1816), first Episcopal Sisterhood in America.
2. Evangeline Cory Booth (1865–1950), fourth general of the Salvation Army.
3. Cornelia A. Connelly (1809–1879), Society of the Holy Child Jesus.
4. Rose P. Duchesne (1769–1852), American convents of the Sacred Heart; beatified (1940).
5. Mother Angela Gillespie (1824–1887), Sisters of the Holy Cross.

6.   Mother Mary A. Hardey (1809–1886), organized Sacred Heart convents in Midwest and South, as well as several in Northeast.

7.   Mother Mary A. Lathrop (1851-1926), Dominican Congregation of St. Rose of Lima; First thanatologist of her order.

8.   Ann T. Mathews (1732-1800) with Frances Dickinson (1755-1830), first Roman Catholic convent in the United States (Carmelite contemplatives).

9.   Mary Rhodes (1782?-1853), Sisters of Loretto in Kentucky.

10. Mother Benedicta Riepp (1825-1862), Sisters of St. Benedict in the United States.

11. Mother Mary B. Russell (1829-1898), Sisters of Mercy in San Francisco.

12. Catherine Spalding (1793-1898), superior of Sisters of Charity of Nazareth.

13. Anna White (1831-1910), Shaker eldress and reformer with international scope and pacifist principles.

14. Lucy Wright (1760-1821), Shaker leader, established the "dual order" of equal but separate living quarters for the sexes.

2. Contained Founders, for whom the emphasis of success is defined in terms of the life experienced with a coterie of followers, insofar as the new religious community sustains the ritual encounter or communication with the wider, historic world. This sort of founder evidences a personal style of mutuality with the prescribed limits of other religious traditions rather than giving in to their potential to overwhelm and snuff out the immediacy of religious feeling. Because of the immediacy necessary for this emphasis within founding, the movement founded usually is of a shorter duration than that of the former type of founder. Generally, contained founders find situational factors less threatening than they are thought of by defeated founders. However, the formative situation is volatile and may overwhelm at any moment should the ritualization of founding begin breaking down. An example would be Jemima Wilkinson of western New York who, in 1776 had a vision of herself as being sent back from the dead as the "Publick Universal Friend," to preach repentance and to urge followers to do whatever she said ought to be done, including parading communally with herself in the lead. When she died followers attem-

pted to keep the religion of the "Friend" alive, but within two decades (1839) the movement had all but disappeared. A working list of this type of founder would include:

1. Maud B. Booth (1865–1948), co-founder (with husband) of Volunteers of America, devoted to prison reform (defected from Salvation Army).

2. Harriet Starr Cannon (1823–1896), first Mother Superior of the Episcopal Community of St. Mary (defected from Anne Ayres Sisterhood).

3. Mary F. Davis (1824-1886), Spiritualist lecturer and reformer (defected from Baptists).

4. Myrtle P. Fillmore (1845-1931), co-founder (with husband) of Unity School of Christianity (defected from Christian Science influences).

5. Ursula N. Gestefeld (1845–1921), New Thought leader, founder af Exodus Club, Church of the New Thought, College of the Science of Being (defected from Christian Science).

6. Barbara R. Heck (1734–1804), John Street Methodist Church in New York City.

7. Emma C. Hopkins (1853–1925), the major leader in the "New Thought" movement (defected from Christian Science).

8. Anne Hutchinson (1591–1643), leader of first organized attack of antinomian thought on the Puritan orthodoxy of Massachusetts Bay Colony.

9. Aimee Semple McPherson (1890–1944), International Church of the Foursquare Gospel.

10. Eliza H. Spalding (1807–1851), with husband and Dr. and Mrs. Marcus Whitman, pioneer missionary to Oregon.

11. Augusta E.S. Stetson (1842–1928), Christian Science leader, emphasizing wealth and beauty as results of beliefs (defected from Mary Baker Eddy).

12. Katherine A.W. Tingley (1847–1929), Point Loma community in Los Angeles (Theosophical), (defected from Blavatsky and Besant brands of belief, by emphasizing yogic "balance")·

13. Jemima Wilkinson (1752–1819), Quaker-oriented cult of the "Publick Universal Friend" in upstate New York.

3. Victorious Founders, for whom success is marked mainly by the long tradition of memory supplied by followers after the founder's death. This hagiography betrays the fact that movements founded by such cultural laborers have, indeed, offered new religious identities, or modes of self-understanding, to followers.   These endure through time as bona fide new religions, or clear departures from prevailing religious traditions. The personal style of such a founder involves definite mastery of situations, where ritualization eventuated by and large in changing fairly radically the course of broadly-based religious concern, often throughout a significant range of the social structure. These founders tend to take situational factors surrounding the experience of founding by "both horns," so to speak, shaping events to their advantages. An example is Helena P. Blavatsky, founder of the Theosophical Society in 1875. Blavatsky's bizarre visions drew heavily upon the Hindu religious tradition and broad occult lore' rejecting entirely ideological formation which owed anything to prevailing Christian fashions. To this day, theosophists refer reverently to their founder as "the Madam." Other founders of this type would include the following:

1. Helena Petrovna Blavatsky (1831–1891), Theosophical Society.
2. Saint Francis Zavier Cabrini (1850–1917), Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart; first saint of the United States (1946).
3. Mary Baker Eddy (1821–1910), Christian Science.
4. Fox: Ann Leah (1818?–1890); Margaret (1833?–1893); Catherine (1839?–1892), Spiritualist mediums, focussed the movement in America.
5. Barbara Heinemann (1795–1883), Amana Society (with husband).
6. Ann Lee (1736–1794), United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Coming (Shakers).
7. Elizabeth A.B. Seton (1774–1821), convert to Roman Catholicism, Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph.
8. Henrietta Szold (1860–1945), Zionist founder of the Hadassah Chapter of Daughters of Zion after conversion experience.
9. Alma B. White (1862–1946), Pillar of Fire Church, Zarepoth N.J.: Supported Ku Klux Klan as "greatest moral and political movement of the generation".

10.   Ellen G. Harman White (1827–1915), Seventh Day Adventist
       Church (with husband).

Empirical Test by Related Professionals

For each proposed type of religious founder an operational defini-
tion was developed, and a major indicator by which founders could
easily be compared and contrasted was selected.   Biographical descrip-
tions written by experts about each of the thirty-eight founders listed
above, taken from Janet James' catalogue, *Notable American Women,*
were read and analyzed by twenty-five professional psychologists,
sociologists, anthropologists, and historians.   These reviewers were
told to read the biographical descriptions in light of the operational
definitions of the three types of founder, and to give particular atten-
tion to each founder's attitude toward mother/father salience during
childhood, toward marriage, and, where evident, to each founder's
behavior toward their spouse(s).

Marriage was selected as a primary indicator of the types of
founders because it is an institutional embodiment of the continuum
of intimacy and isolation mentioned above.   Often modelled uncons-
ciously on early childhood experiences of the salience of one's mother
and father, marriage is the social and historical context in which the
emotional crisis of young adulthood is posed and worked out.[20]
Therefore, during marriage or, at least, within the founder's attitude
toward marriage, an observer gets offered a glimpse into formative
stages according to which subsequent religious patterns of authority
get woven together so as to constitute a religious movement.   The
way a founder generally regards social interactions is seen best in her
attitude and behavior toward marriage, the social interaction *par
excellence*, at least for the period studied (up to 1950).   For example,
although Ann Lee suffered from her marriage, her own wishes usually
dominated life with Abraham Standerin from her early beginnings in
England to the full-blown religious mission of the Shakers to America.

---

20. For a description of the embodiment of the intimacy/isolation relationship
    from the perspective of ego-psychology, see Erik Erikson, *Childhood
    and Society* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1963), pp. 255-258.

NOTE: Data returns on the following women were not available: Gillespie,
         Riepp, Russell, Booth (M.B.), Gestefeld, Stetson, Tingley Wilkinson,
         Heinemann, White (E.G.H.).

Abraham followed her in her roles as his wife and religious leader to the end of his days. But this is jumping ahead of ourselves somewhat.

The operational definitions and corresponding marital indicators which were used by the reviewers follow here. Presumably, high ratings for any of the definitions would confirm that the founder being analyzed was of that particular type. Each definition is broken down further into three major variables (A, B, C):

I. DEFEATED FOUNDER

A) A person dependent during childhood on receiving parental "blessings" (approval) for religious inclinations, who usually receives them at an early age.

B) A person dependent during adulthood on receiving the sanction of authority figures within the tradition of religion with which this person seeks a vocational identity, who usually receives such sanction.

C) Marriage, if available and entered into, finds this person cast in a role where her spouse's wishes dominate their life together. Throughout, aggression is managed according to "traditional" forms of authority, e.g., "A wife's place is in the home."

II. CONTAINED FOUNDER

A) A person dependent during childhood on receiving sibling and/or peer group "blessings" (approval) for religious inclinations, who usually receives them at an early age.

B) A person dependent during adulthood on the sanction of followers and confidantes who, in turn, reinforce and confirm this person's vocational identity.

C) Marriage, if available and entered into, finds this person cast in a role where her spouse's wishes equalize their life together. Throughout, aggression is managed according to "rational" (e.g., mutual) forms of authority, e.g., "Together, we do the will of God."

III. VICTORIOUS FOUNDER

A) A person who remains restive and uneasy about dependence on sources of psychosocial authority other than herself during

a relatively lonely childhood, which itself lacks a sense of stable roots.

B) A person for whom adulthood is generally tumultuous, forcing this kind of person to stand alone and to seek "blessings" from all but human sources, usually for making a new reality and new religious tradition.

C) Marriage, if available and entered into, casts this person in a role where her wishes dominate life together with a spouse. Throughout, aggression is managed by invocations of "charismatic" forms of authority, e.g., "Hear what I tell you!"

Two scales were used to measure the findings of the reviewers' analyses of each founder according to each of the nine variables above (i.e., I. A, B, C; II. A, B, C; III. A, B, C). The first scale dealt with *descriptiveness* and asked each reviewer three questions: (1) Is this particular variable descriptive of the founder under consideration ? (2) If so, to what degree is the variable descriptive of the founder? (3) If not, to what degree? Ratings of degrees from a low of one ("1") to ten ("10") were employed on each questionnaire. The second scale dealt with *informational adequacy* and assessed each reviewer's attitude toward scholarly pitfalls of this broad psychobiographical and historical inquiry, such as the lack of information about early childhood, the availability of self-disclosures, the reliability of statements by persons who knew the founder, and the like. Three questions were asked in regard to this second scale: (1) Is the information about this person's life adequate for you to make a reasonable personal judgment about this variable? (2) If so, to what degree is the information adequate? (3) If not, to what degree? Again, ratings from a low of one to a high of ten were employed as measures. The key questions were the second ones, number two ("2") on each scale, since these reviewers would report degree of positive corroboration of descriptiveness and informational adequacy respectively. Likewise, the third questions of the scales pulled in the opposite direction. High ratings on either of these would indicate either a lack of corroborated descriptiveness or the reviewers' overall inability to make a judgment due to a lack of adequate biographical information. All corroborations (or lack thereof) were in regard to this author's attempt to type the founders in the section, "Typology of Founding."

Reports of the findings were readily translated into percentages of agreement/disagreement in regard to scale one, descriptiveness; and adequate/inadequate in regard to scale two, informational adequacy. In addition to these ratings, it was possible to note how the reviewers typed each founder. Table A indicates the reviewers' judgment as to the "most dominant" type of founder reflected in the life of each of the founders analyzed. Table B indicates judgment about the "least dominant" type of founder; and Table C shows percentages of the "middle range" so as to complete the picture of the collective corroborative efforts of the tweny-five reviewers. This researcher's prior and independent typing of each founder is reflected in the way the list of women is arranged. The first group at the top of each table is the hypothesized working list of Defeated Founders (I), the next group was believed to include all the Contained Founders (II), and the working list of the last group at the bottom of each table includes those women considered to be Victorious Founders (III).

TABLE A

Founders (A)	Most Dominant Type (I, II, III)	Degree of Descriptiveness		Adequacy of Information	
		Agree	Disagree	Adequate	Inadequate
Ayres	I	37%	3%	67%	3%
Booth, E.C.	I	47%	57%	59%	0%
Connelly	II; III	27%	3%	40%; 33%	0%; 0%
Duchesne	II	20%	0%	0%	33%
Gillespie	——	——	——	——	——
Hardey	I	13%	6%	20%	0%
Lathrop	I	50%	43%	40%	42%
Mathews	None indicated	0%	——	0%	——
Rhodes	I	30%	20%	33%	33%
Riepp	——	——	——	——	——
Russell	——	——	——	——	——
Spalding, C.	I	53%	33%	60%	10%
White, A.	I	53%	33%	47%	33%
Wright	III	60%	17%	60%	33%
Booth, M.B.	——	——	——	——	——
Cannon	II	53%	45%	53%	0%
Davis	II	40%	0%	27%	3%
Fillmore	II	33%	6%	27%	30%
Gestefeld	——	——	——	——	——
Heck	II	53%	30%	37%	10%
Hopkins	II	50%	3%	17%	33%
Hutchinson	III	47%	17%	20%	50%
McPherson	I	70%	0%	53%	20%
Spalding, E.H.	II	63%	0%	57%	0%
Stetson	——	——	——	——	——
Tingley	——	——	——	——	——
Wilkinson	——	——	——	——	——
Blavatsky	III	45%	12%	15%	17%
Cabrini	II	53%	3%	83%	0%
Eddy	III	60%	0%	43%	10%
Fox, M.	III	60%	0%	43%	10%
Fox, C.	II	57%	30%	30%	27%
Heinemann	——	——	——	——	——
Lee	III	57%	33%	57%	17%
Seton	III	67%	0%	47%	30%
Szold	I	60%	0%	83%	0%
White, A.B.	III	100%	0%	97%	0%
White, E.G.H.	——	——	——	——	——

TABLE B

Founders (B)	Least Dominant Type (I, II, III)	Degree of Descriptiveness		Adequacy of Information	
		Agree	Disagree	Adequate	Indequate
Ayres	II	23%	0%	33%	13%
Booth, E.C.	III	6%	37%	60%	0%
Connelly	I	13%	6%	47%	0%
Duchesne	III	0%	43%	20%	7%
Gillespie	---	---	---	---	---
Hardey	II; III	0%; 0%	17%; 40%	20%; 7%	0%; 30%
Lathrop	II; III	27%; 27%	33%; 30%	27%; 52%	33%; 10%
Mathews	None indicated	0%	---	0%	---
Rhodes	III	0%	43%	17%	33%
Riepp	---	---	---	---	---
Russell	---	---	---	---	---
Spalding, C.	II	33%	60%	57%	10%
White, A.	III	0%	77%	20%	66%
Wright	I; II	30%; 30%	67%; 33%	0%; 57%	97%; 33%
Booth, M.B.	---	---	---	---	---
Cannon	I	20%	38%	45%	20%
Davis	III	0%	6%	23%	3%
Fillmore	III	0%	53%	20%	23%
Gestefeld	---	---	---	---	---
Heck	I; III	0%; 0%	73%; 47%	40%; 43%	17%; 17%
Hopkins	III	10%	55%	27%	32%
Hutchinson	I	27%	63%	53%	23%
McPherson	II	33%	7%	63%	3%
Spalding, E.H.	I; III	7%; 7%	47%; 33%	43%; 53%	10%; 0%
Stetson	---	---	---	---	---
Tingley	---	---	---	---	---
Wilkinson	---	---	---	---	---
Blavatsky	II	25%	38%	32%	8%
Cabrini	III	0%	20%	66%	0%
Eddy	II	30%	33%	47%	7%
Fox, M.	I	53%	30%	33%	7%
Fox, C.	III	47%	0%	47%	0%
Heinemann	---	---	---	---	---
Lee	II	23%	48%	43%	10%
Seton	I	13%	47%	33%	27%
Szold	II	40%	0%	66%	3%
White, A.B.	I; II	0%; 0%	93%; 57%	97%; 37%	0%; 23%
White, E.G.H.	---	---	---	---	---

TABLE C

Founders (C)	The Middle Range (I, II, III)	Degree of Descriptiveness		Adequacy of Information	
		Agree	Disagree	Adequate	Inadequate
Ayres	III	30%	0%	33%	17%
Booth, E.C.	II	43%	55%	58%	0%
Connelly	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
Duchesne	I	17%	13%	0%	27%
Gillespie	——	——	——	——	——
Hardey	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
Lathrop	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
Mathews	None indicated	0%	——	0%	——
Rhodes	II	23%	3%	43%	3%
Riepp	——	——	——	——	——
Russell	——	——	——	——	——
Spalding, C.	III	40%	33%	20%	33%
White, A.	II	33%	53%	33%	63%
Wright	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
Booth, M.B.	——	——	——	——	——
Cannon	III	33%	55%	53%	7%
Davis	(No report for I)	——	——	——	——
Fillmore	I	20%	17%	17%	27%
Gestefeld	——	——	——	——	——
Heck	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
Hopkins	I	23%	20%	27%	17%
Hutchinson	II	43%	27%	47%	27%
McPherson	III	57%	0%	0%	37%
Spalding, E.H.	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
Stetson	——	——	——	——	——
Tingley	——	——	——	——	——
Wilkinson	——	——	——	——	——
Blavatsky	I	30%	87%	62%	28%
Cabrini	I	50%	0%	80%	0%
Eddy	I	50%	0%	17%	0%
Fox, M.	II	57%	17%	27%	37%
Fox, C.	I	53%	7%	37%	0%
Heinemann	——	——	——	——	——
Lee	I	37%	50%	47%	47%
Seton	II	17%	57%	47%	27%
Szold	III	47%	0%	70%	0%
White, A.B.	(See A & B)	——	——	——	——
White, E.G.H.	——	——	——	——	——

It is interesting to note that the reviewers' reports coincided with this researcher's hypothetical typing of each woman founder at a rate of 71.3% (28.5% disagreement). Nonetheless, several reviewers wrote to explain some of the difficulties they encountered while attempting to do this sort of psychobiographical and historical inquiry.   Among their comments are the following:

"I feel that I would like to have seen other variables related to these particular personalities than authority and dependency. Those are certainly important variables, but given the historical information, limited as it is, it is difficult to draw inferences with any degree of confidence, regarding these variables."

"Would you say that being unhappily married is a prerequisite for being a woman religious leader? It seems most were."

"I found the scale items occasionally tough to answer. (1) Answering 'no' could mean *both* that there *is* evidence the variable does not apply, or there is no evidence at all. (2) I wasn't sure whether question 6 implied a double negative, which affects which end of the scale is marked."

"I should say that I was not exactly a *tabula/rasa* for your experiment, since I had read all the biographies which you sent me previously, and also had read other works about Ann Lee and Rose Lathrop (my dissertation was partially about the latter)."

"I had a hard time in most cases deciding an adequacy of information supplied, especially about childhood. The biographies were generally 'factual,' and they were not written with psychohistorians in mind."

"I appreciate that a valuable projection of what the relationship (with another person or persons) must have been like can be constructed on the basis of limited data and a certain amount of insight. I sense this is what you will be attempting and what you may achieve"