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Preface

The aim of this sketch is threefold.

First, it is to tell something about Catherine Disney (1800-1853). She is known as the ‘lost love’ of the famous Irish mathematician Sir William Rowan Hamilton (1805-1865), who invented what we now know as Hamiltonian mechanics, and was knighted for his work in 1835. In 1843 he discovered the quaternions from which vector analysis emerged, and which are now used for smoothly changing orientations in for instance robotics, gaming and spacecraft. Because throughout his life Hamilton corresponded extensively, and based upon his letters, poems and personal notes two biographies were written, his life can be read about in almost meticulous detail.

Yet about Catherine’s own life hardly anything is known, and what is known seems to merely reflect the view men had on ‘good’ women in the protestant ascendency class of Regency and Victorian Ireland: in the 1880s Hamilton’s biographer Robert Graves described her as of “singular beauty, amiable, sensitive and pious,” and according to Hamilton she was ‘graceful,’ and had a “simple loveliness,” a “natural bloom,” and a “retiring timidity.”

Having fallen in love with Hamilton Catherine was forced by her family to marry William Barlow, a clergyman who was also her brother-in-law, and as long as she could she was a good and obedient wife. In 1848 she broke down and tried to commit suicide, survived, but was weakened by the attempt. As far as is known thereafter she lived with family members, yet only five years later, shortly before she died, she was finally able to tell Hamilton that she had also loved him.

Gathering data about Catherine’s life was greatly facilitated by the publicly available Irish censuses, church records, Griffith’s Valuation, previews of newspaper articles, and the abundance of books on the Internet Archive containing information about members of the protestant ascendency class in Ireland, especially the clergy. Acquiring insights into Catherine’s personal feelings was much more difficult because letters written by her do not seem to exist any more. Yet Hamilton wrote many letters about her in the months after her death in 1853, and in the summer of 1855 when he unburdened his heart to his friend Aubrey de Vere; through these letters it is possible to at least catch a glimpse of how it must have been for her.

Second, it is to underpin what I showed in my 2015 essay A Victorian marriage: Sir William Rowan Hamilton, that what happened between Hamilton and Catherine was much more nuanced than what has been claimed, that his whole life Hamilton only loved Catherine. Just having turned nineteen he fell in love with her at first sight, and after some very happy months in which he enjoyed being around her but did not tell her that he loved her, in February 1825 he heard from her mother, for him
completely unexpectedly, that Catherine was betrothed to William Barlow. It took him almost seven years to come to terms with his feelings of loss. Thereafter he was clearly in distress about Catherine three times: in 1830 after having met her, in 1848 after having corresponded with her, and shortly before her death in 1853 after having spoken with her twice. That seemed to suggest that he had always remained in love with Catherine, and had consequently unhappily married.

Yet in his letters and poems it can be read that around the time of Catherine’s marriage he had assumed that she wanted to marry Barlow. Noticing in 1830, and reading in 1848, how terribly unhappy Catherine was in her marriage was very difficult for him, yet due to the social strictness in the Victorian era there was nothing he could do. But when Catherine finally told him, almost on her deathbed, that she also had loved him, that she had wanted to marry him but had been forced to marry Barlow, that was devastating. Being in distress thereafter had nothing to do with his own marriage; it simply was very hard to hear that from the woman he once deeply loved, and who had been so unhappy that she now was dying before her time.

Having shown in my essay that Hamilton had a good marriage, it appeared to me that giving the above mentioned facts as arguments why his distress over Catherine had nothing to do with his own marriage might still not be completely convincing, and that became a second reason to write this sketch about Catherine’s life. What I hope to accomplish is that reading about what happened to her will make it more easy to see that distress about her fate would not only be restricted to Hamilton and his romantic contemporaries, but probably to most people who learn about it, especially when imagining that that would happen to someone they love themselves.

Third, it is to show that although in the Victorian era the influence of mothers on especially their sons was publicly much less visible than that of their husbands, and generally only the warmth they gave to their sons as babies and small children seems to have been acknowledged, their influence was of course as strong as that of the fathers. Next to apparently having been a loving mother, as can be read in one of Hamilton’s poems, Catherine’s unhappiness seems to have had a hitherto unnoticed influence on her eldest son James William Barlow (1826-1913). He was rebuked and forbidden to preach because he stated that the doctrine of eternal punishment did not come from the Bible, and that it drove many people away from the Church; an idea which can be connected directly to his mother’s suicide attempt and her having lost her faith in her last years. It has been contemplated how James Barlow came to his extreme ideas, but no one linked it to his mother’s utter unhappiness, as if that could not be a motivation for such a learned man to live his life the way he did. To show his mother’s influence on him, also his life and that of his daughter Jane Barlow (1856-1917), a once very famous Irish writer, will be briefly discussed.

Of Catherine’s sad and unhappy story anyone can be a judge. Human suffering is known to everyone, regardless of country, culture, religion or beliefs. That made it seem justifiable to extrapolate from the scarce known facts about Catherine even though she may have seen things differently; ascribing feelings to her most people can relate to was a way to visualize how hard it must have been for her. But also parts of James Barlow’s motives and thoughts have been filled in although that is not in any way backed by sources. It was chosen to do so for the sake of the story, and to avoid many mights and may haves while investigating how his mother’s story may have influenced his theological ideas.
About Jane Barlow much more is known, and although the story of her life cannot be told without taking into account the political and social circumstances of Ireland then, that has, nevertheless, been left out because my goal was not to write a sketch about her life, but to show that in what has been written about her Catherine’s influence is missing. Having been completely absent in the descriptions of her son and granddaughter diminished Catherine to how she is mostly seen: a romantic ideal, someone’s lost love, a clergyman’s invisible wife.

The use of tragic stories in times of omnipresent death

In the first half of the Victorian era there was a high mortality rate because of a lack of understanding about hygiene, and antibiotics did not exist yet. Sorrow was such a frequent occurrence that the people then appear to have almost been used to it. This seems to be recognizable in a letter written by Hamilton, who then was only seventeen and lived in Trim with his aunt Elizabeth and uncle James, to ‘Cousin Arthur’, a first cousin once removed who lived in Dublin. The story is given here because it illustrates how, in those socially very strict times, the fact that women had to vow obedience to their husbands at the altar, and were not granted a divorce on the ground of not loving their partners, caused very much misery. In first instance Jenny, the story’s protagonist, reluctantly agreed to marry her suitor, but when she heard that she could have married the man she loved her marriage turned into a mental prison; she had to stay in that unhappy marriage for the rest of her life.

“Trim, November 12, 1822. Past eleven at night.

“Do you remember me sending you some crumbs of a bride-cake in a letter, a few months ago? I think you will be interested in the history of the bride, told partly from my own recollection, and partly from very good authority: Jenny Walker was a very pretty girl, our children’s maid some years ago. There never goes from this town a regiment with as many bachelors as came into it; one of the soldiers courted Jenny, and it seems she was equally in love with him. But her mother did not choose her to marry him, because he was a soldier, and because he was poor. She came to Aunt [Elizabeth] to request her to lock her up, or at least confine her to the house. Aunt refused to take charge of her, and parted with her. In time the regiment went, and Jenny heard no more of her lover. Early in this year there came another, and one of the soldiers, an Englishman, a serjeant, I will not say fell in love with her at first sight, but declared that moment, she shall be my wife. Accordingly he soon went to Mrs. Walker, and got her over completely to his interest. She came to Uncle [James] to request him to add his influence to hers, to get her daughter to marry this Englishman, who (although she did not like his being a soldier) was of very good character, and had saved a great deal of money. Jenny was at last prevailed on, for she supposed the Scotchman had forgotten her. Unwillingly she consented. The soldier gave a ball, at which the officers were present. Huge bride-cakes were made, of which you got a crumb. A separate room was given them in the barrack, and everything done in the first style. They were married at eight o’clock by Mr. Butler [Vicar of Trim], and at ten she received a letter from the man she had really loved, saying that he had (I believe by legacy) got a good deal of money, left the army and turned farmer, and would soon come to Trim to marry Jenny.

1 [Graves 1882, 122-123]. He lived with them during the largest part of his youth, see p. 25.
“She and her husband went to Dublin with the regiment, and are now there. She returned last week to see her friends, and paid a visit to Aunt. She told her that her husband was a dark, distant man.

“Have you ever read Mackenzie’s novel called Julia de Roubigné? The facts that I have mentioned are very like the fictions of that novel. There is a great deal of romance in real life. Everyone that saw her last week remarked that, though she was dressed so well, she was not at all so handsome as she used to be; but this is easily accounted for, by those that know the history of the letter for it has probably been preying on her mind.”

In the Introduction to Julia de Roubigné Mackenzie gives his reason to admire such tales so much, “One advantage I drew from [writing, or arranging the writings of others], which the humane may hear with satisfaction; I often wandered from my own woe in tracing the tale of another’s affliction; and, at this moment, every sentence I write, I am but escaping a little farther from the pressure of sorrow.” When he was writing his letter also Hamilton had already experienced many deaths of relatives, and he once said that he could not write verses on the deaths of family members, being hindered by a “crushing sensation of disaster” whenever that happened. Being used to sorrow clearly did not make it any easier.

But whether it was due to his youth, or indeed to being used to sorrow, or to having been used to the fact that women had hardly anything to say about their own lives, in his comment to Jenny’s story, next to feeling for her, Hamilton also sounds touched by the romance in it. He does not seem to have fully realized that Jenny’s life had become a misery, and it can be wondered whether he saw it differently when, many years later, he heard about Catherine’s forced and very unhappy marriage, and their own story came to resemble that of Jenny and the man she loved.

### Given names and surnames

When writing the essay A Victorian marriage I was in doubt how to call Catherine Disney and William Hamilton. Calling her by her given name and him by his surname seemed to imply that he was taken more seriously than she was, or seen more as an independent person. But it appeared unavoidable; based on the custom that women’s surnames changed when they married, and the uneasy feeling I had when calling her Barlow, I decided I had to call her Catherine, the name she did have throughout her life. And as regards his name, using William for him was not an option because also Barlow’s given name was William. I therefore called him Hamilton, as he called himself in his letters.

---


3 Before writing this letter Hamilton’s parents Archibald Hamilton and Sarah Hutton had died already. Also three little children had died: his sister Sarah, his brother Archibald, and his cousin Kate, daughter of uncle James and aunt Elizabeth. And when Hamilton was only nine years old his aunt Sydney, sister of Hamilton’s father and uncle James, died of cancer. She had also lived in Trim, had written many proud letters about him to his mother when he was little, and had helped him learn Latin and Hebrew. She died in Dublin, having been taken care of by Hamilton’s parents. [Graves 1882, 26-27].

4 [Graves 1882, 26], [Graves 1889, 302]
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Catherine Disney is known as the ‘lost love’ of the famous nineteenth century Irish mathematician Sir William Rowan Hamilton, yet hardly anything is known about herself. Her birth record was not found online but her marriage record was, as were newspaper articles about the births of most of her seven sons. Her burial record is also online; she died in Donnybrook in 1853, her age was given as fifty-three. And there appeared to exist a portrait of her, which is held in the Hamilton collection in Trinity College Library in Dublin, it is shown here on p. 29 and on the back cover.

In this part Catherine’s life is described, as far as that was possible, from her birth until her marriage in 1825. Because her father placed many work-related advertisements in various newspapers it is known where during her youth his offices were, and although not entirely certain, there are reasons to assume that whenever possible he held office in the family residence. From Hamilton’s correspondences it is known that Catherine and Hamilton met and fell in love with each other in 1824, when he still was a student at Trinity College Dublin. Catherine’s family does not seem to have trusted Hamilton’s capabilities to take care of a family, and forced her to marry the reverend William Barlow. Catherine was never able to reconcile herself with the marriage, and Hamilton, who did not know about the coercion, needed almost seven years to cope with having lost her.

A scenario is suggested here for how Catherine’s family may have come to their decision, and for the sake of visualizing what happened, thoughts and feelings have been ascribed to Catherine. Neither the scenario nor what she may have thought or felt is based on direct sources, yet everything imagined has strictly been kept within the boundaries of what is known about her.
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 A forced and unhappy marriage

It is generally acknowledged that the unhappiness of parents can profoundly influence the lives of their children. This idea however often seems to have been lacking in historical descriptions, especially when the unhappiness was hidden, not expressing itself in openly visible ways such as violence or addiction. Unhappiness of parents thus influencing the children holds for instance for forced marriages, if partners cannot find their peace with them yet silently endure. Based on mostly indirect information, this sketch is about such a forced and unhappy marriage, in the protestant ascendency class of Regency and early Victorian Ireland.

Many marriages were arranged then; there were no health insurances or pensions, and therefore parents tried to marry their children into families with good reputations, with enough money to acquire a good education for the children, and to secure a well-provided for old age. But while in case of arranged marriages both partners had a choice and agreed with the marriage, and many such marriages worked out well, forced marriages were of a very different order. Most often marriages seem to have been forced in cases of pregnancies out of wedlock, or when a family in financial trouble could be saved by such a marriage. But it also happened when a family felt that its honour was at stake, for instance when, after the families had come to an agreement, one of the partners had a change of heart and wanted to break off the engagement.

In case of silent sufferings, of the forced partner but perhaps in the long run also of the unloved one, these forced marriages often did not recognizably influence the lives of Victorian men. But for women they could have devastating consequences; at their weddings they had to vow obedience to their husbands while a divorce was hardly ever granted, and forced marriages could therefore turn into lifelong mental prisons. In 1825 Catherine Disney (1800-1853) was forced by her family to marry the reverend William Barlow (1792-1871) although she had fallen in love with the then Trinity College Dublin student and later famous mathematician Sir William Rowan Hamilton (1805-1865), a love which was mutual. She never found her peace with the marriage, and after having tried to commit suicide in 1848, weakened by the attempt
she died five years later. Catherine Disney’s role in Hamilton’s life has been discussed
extensively, but her own life does not seem to have been described. This sketch is an
attempt to do so, mainly based on the information given in Hamilton’s biographies,
supplemented by newspaper articles and various scraps of information.

Hamilton’s first biographer Robert Perceval Graves published his biography,
which consists of three volumes, in the 1880s, deep in the Victorian era, and conse-
quently wrote about Catherine Disney in a very concealed way. In the descriptions
of the years after Hamilton’s marriage Graves acknowledged, albeit very cautiously,
Hamilton’s periodic distress about her, but at the same time gave much emphasis to
the fact that his work was hardly influenced by it. Reading original letters and per-
sonal notes written by Hamilton and kept in Trinity College Library, Thomas Leroy
Hankins published a second biography in 1980. He had discovered that Catherine’s
influence on Hamilton’s life had been much larger than Graves had indicated, and
argued that his whole life Hamilton had only been in love with Catherine. This idea
was challenged in 2015; in *A Victorian Marriage: Sir William Rowan Hamilton*, an
essay based upon these two biographies, it was shown that the truth rather lies some-
where between these two extremes.¹

Using the ideas put forward in that essay, in this biographical sketch it will be
tried to look at what happened from Catherine Disney’s point of view. Thereafter it
will be briefly discussed what influence Catherine’s unhappiness apparently had on
her eldest son James William Barlow and her eldest granddaughter Jane Barlow, two
in their times well-known Irish writers. James Barlow was Erasmus Smith’s Professor
of Modern History at Trinity College Dublin from 1860 until 1893, and Vice Provost
from 1899 until 1908; Jane Barlow was a poet and novelist, writing mainly about
peasant life in Ireland.² Because many members of Catherine’s large family play a
role in this biographical sketch, and quite a few of them share the same names, an
overview of the families involved is given in the Appendix.³

Motivation for interpreting Catherine Most parts of this sketch are factual;
all mentioned events did happen, and almost all indications of Hamilton’s thoughts
and feelings come directly from his letters,⁴ interpreted as discussed in the essay *A
Victorian Marriage*. Yet about Catherine so little is known that to be able to paint
a vivid picture of what happened to her scenarios have been added; one describing
a screening of Hamilton’s family by the Disneys, and others for what may have hap-
pened during Catherine’s 1845 visit to the observatory, in Carlingford around her
suicide attempt in 1848, and at her son’s wedding in 1853. Yet they were extrapolated
from Hamilton’s observations, and have strictly been kept within the boundaries of
what has been written about Catherine.

For the sake of visualizing what happened to her also feelings and thoughts have
been ascribed to Catherine, again within the boundaries of what is known. It will
mostly but not always be indicated when that is done without proof that that really
was her opinion; that holds especially for the chapters 4 to 7, and it will again be
stressed at the beginning of Part II.

¹ [Graves 1885, 692], [Hankins 1980, 358], [Van Weerden 2017]
² For James and Jane Barlow’s work see footnote 17 on p. 97, and footnote 18 on p. 113.
³ The Appendix can be found on p. 129.
⁴ What is added are feelings of betrayal, see p. 84. It seems obvious that Hamilton will have had
such feelings, but they have not been mentioned in the biographies.
1.2 Unhappiness and history

As regards the influence Catherine’s unhappiness had on her son and granddaughter, and through them on history, it can be contemplated how things could have been if she had not been forced into a marriage which made her so terribly unhappy. Of course, what would have happened if she had been allowed to marry Hamilton is too complex to fantasize about because it would include for instance different children, making this family story non-existent. But it can be imagined that if she had never met Hamilton she would have married Barlow willingly. If it then also is imagined that they would have had the same children and grandchildren, not only Catherine’s life, but also their lives would most likely have been very different.

Catherine’s eldest son James Barlow was seen as having had an “interesting and original mind” and perhaps, if he had not been so preoccupied with “the nature of life after death and the possibility of evaluating human happiness and misery,” which with hardly any doubt had to do with his mother’s terrible fate, he would not have been rebuked for heterodoxy and might have become Provost instead of Vice Provost. He then probably would have used his originality to steer Trinity College in a different way, for better or worse, than it went now.

In her Obituary in the Journal of the Society for Psychical Research it was written about Jane Barlow, “In the recent death of Miss Jane Barlow the Society has lost an early, a very gifted and valued member. […] Slight in appearance with large and deep-set eyes she looked as if the flame of genius and thought had almost burnt out her physical frame, so frail was she.” If her father would have been a valued clergyman and perhaps Provost, she might have defended herself much more than she did and mingle much more in the literary circles, and she perhaps would have been able to put her mark on Irish literature so firmly that no one would even have thought about excluding her from anthologies of Irish literature.

But the story of this family line ends with her; as far as is known James and Mary Barlow did not have grandchildren, and there thus are no direct descendants. And therefore no one to remember and to judge the specific suppositions made in this sketch about Catherine’s long lasting influence on her son and granddaughter. Still, Catherine had other children, and descendants who have not been discussed here; perhaps they do have memories or family stories. And she of course profoundly influenced Hamilton, who through his fame in turn influenced very many people; Catherine’s forced marriage thus was in any case not an isolated personal problem, as many people writing about Hamilton seem to have regarded it.

This story is therefore also a plea. In many places in the world the difference in roles between men and women, or perhaps rather in esteem, is slowly disappearing, but unfortunately earlier conceptions are still recognizable. Although much research is now done on women who would have been famous had they lived now, what still seems to be necessary is to scrutinize the stories of earlier times and see whether or not the roles played by less conspicuous women were described truthfully, or given the importance they should have had. No one enters this world as an adult, everyone

---

5 See p. 103.
6 See p. 97, p. 96.
has some family history, good or bad, but including both men and women. These family histories always have an influence, and especially when it concerns people in power or people who did remarkable things in any place at any time, these influences extend to the history of humankind in general.

1.3 Biographies and letters

**Hamilton’s biographies** In both Graves’ and Hankins’ biographies it has been described how in August 1824 Hamilton, just having turned nineteen, fell head over heels in love with Catherine Disney. Hamilton did not know that, at some unknown time, she was betrothed, until in February 1825 Catherine’s mother told him, for him completely unexpectedly, that Catherine was going to marry in May. He found that very difficult and it took him almost seven years to come to terms with his loss.

The deviation in *A Victorian Marriage* from the biography by Hankins, who had concluded that Hamilton had always and only loved Catherine, starts with taking Hamilton literally when he compared falling in love and being rejected by Ellen de Vere in December 1831 with falling in love and losing Catherine. Having visited Catherine in 1830 and having seen, for the first time, her unhappiness, he had become very distressed, and Lady Campbell had comforted him. After Ellen de Vere’s rejection having had some very difficult months, in August 1832 he wrote to Lady Campbell, “Since that time when your affectionate sympathy first manifested itself towards me, I have had another affliction of the same kind and indeed of the same degree, except that my mind had been a little better disciplined to receive it.”

This letter was written shortly after Hamilton had realized that he had lived a “passion-wasted” life, which led to an important psychological discovery. Acknowledging his subsequent psychological change led to the most important deviation in *A Victorian Marriage* from the biography by Graves who wrote that, having been rejected by Ellen de Vere, Hamilton started to have “tenderer and warmer feelings” for Helen Bayly after he “had felt obliged to suppress his former passion,” therewith vaguely suggesting that Helen Bayly was not a first choice. Yet Hamilton did not suppress his feelings; after the difficult months in the spring of 1832, in the following summer he started to understand why he could be so lastingly unhappy, and then discovered how to handle himself. He remained to use this discovery through the years, and although he could be very distressed and unhappy when someone close to him was unwell, he was never again so melancholic for such long periods of time.

---

8 Graves nor Hankins mentions when the family betrothed Catherine to Barlow, therefore in this biographical sketch the scenario is adopted which seems to be the best fit to the known details.

9 See p. 39.

10 See p. 51, [Van Weerden 2017, 117]

11 This remarkable discovery, where it came from and what its long lasting positive consequences were, has been described in [Van Weerden 2017]. Ellen de Vere’s brother Aubrey, who had become Hamilton’s friend, does not seem to have recognized the importance of this discovery; the poetic bachelor he was very much appreciated their reminiscences about “beautiful Visions” of the past, as Hamilton had called seeing Catherine for the first time [Van Weerden 2017, 313]. Also Graves did not recognize the importance of the discovery; he saw Hamilton as a “simple, zealous, great man” [Graves 1885, 286], [Van Weerden 2017, 498-499], somehow not crediting him with deep feelings or useful contemplations about his own emotions. [Van Weerden 2017, 192-194, 200-202].

12 [Graves 1885, 2]

13 [Van Weerden 2017, 272]
After this psychological change having felt as if his “health of mind and even of body were greatly improved,” as he wrote to his friend Aubrey de Vere, in October 1832 Hamilton discovered conical refraction for which he would be knighted, and fell in love with Helen Bayly. In November he asked her to marry him. They married in April 1833, and according to Hankins Hamilton never regretted having married her, while according to Graves Hamilton “remained to the end of his life an attached husband.”

In 1879 De Vere wrote to Graves, who then was preparing the biography, “[In 1837] Hamilton’s affection for his wife had not waned. Indeed I do not know that it ever did.” This letter having been written after Hamilton’s death, it substantiates the conclusion that the Hamilton marriage was a good one.

Meeting Catherine and writing letters In *A Victorian Marriage* it was also argued that Hamilton did not know that Catherine was forced to marry Barlow, and that only slowly, by bits and pieces over the course of many years, he learned what exactly had happened with Catherine. After Hamilton had heard about her engagement he had not seen her any more; they only saw each other during two visits in 1830 and one in 1845, they corresponded during six weeks in the summer of 1848, and shortly before Catherine’s death in November 1853 they had two ‘parting interviews’ as Graves called them.

As can be read in a poem Hamilton wrote after he visited Catherine in 1830, that was indeed the first time he noticed that something was wrong with her. About the 1845 visit nothing further is known; Hamilton only mentioned this visit in letters to brothers of Catherine. During the 1848 correspondence Catherine apparently told him that her marriage had been unhappy from the start, but only during the parting interviews shortly before her death in November 1853 she could finally tell him that she had also loved him and had wanted to marry him, but that she had been forced by her family to marry Barlow. Both in 1830 and 1848 having learned about Catherine’s unhappiness Hamilton became very distressed, and it must have been difficult for him that there was nothing he could do for her; as a deeply religious man he had a reverence for marriage, both for hers and for his own. But in the parting interviews hearing that her marriage had been forced upon her was devastating, as it would be for most people who lost a first love without having known why.

In those times it was utterly forbidden for a married man to talk about such feelings, but after Catherine’s death in 1853 Hamilton was able to relieve his stress by

---

14 [Hankins 1980, 126], [Graves 1885, 335]
15 For how and why over the years subsequent writers concluded from Graves’ biography, or from each other, that Hamilton had a bad marriage, that it had been fated from the start or even fell apart, see [Van Weerden and Wepster 2018]. De Vere’s letter is part of a collection of letters written by him to Graves, mainly regarding Hamilton, which is held by the Department of Special Collections of the Hesburgh Libraries of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana. library.nd.edu. See Irish Studies Resources for Graduate Research, *Aubrey de Vere Letters to Robert Perceval Graves*, Collection No. MSE/IR 1040.
16 [Van Weerden 2017, 274-275]. Hamilton thought that Catherine had happily married Barlow, see p. 28.
17 [Graves 1882, 185], [Graves 1885, 691]. On the latter page it can also be read how extremely cautious Graves was about revealing how these parting interviews came about, especially when compared with Hankins’ description.
18 See p. 6 and the poem on p. 51.
19 [Van Weerden 2017, 303]
writing very many letters about her, yet without revealing her identity, to many people he judged to be discrete.\footnote{[Hankins 1980, 353]. Apparently next to the Disneys only Lady Campbell knew that it concerned Catherine Disney, see [Hankins 1980, 354]. Discretion was indeed very important because of Hamilton's fame; he was so widely known that he could not risk their story or her identity to become public, it would have ruined the reputations of many people. Also the Dublin gossip, see [Van Weerden and Wepster 2018], had to do with Hamilton's fame: many people will have found it interesting to talk about him because of it, while not many people really knew him. His sense of humour did not help either; when he once was asked what he was thinking about he answered that he was trying to multiply the North-East by the South-West. Not everyone will have understood the joke. [Van Weerden 2017, 224].} Among the people Hamilton corresponded with about Catherine were his then new friends Mr. and Mrs. Hassell, whom he had learned to know during a meeting in Hull in the summer of 1853.\footnote{According to Hankins Hamilton had asked whether he could be allowed to correspond with Mrs. Hassell. Her husband “thought his wife too sensitive to bear the burden of such confidence,” but he had invited Hamilton to write to him instead. [Hankins 1980, 353].} Hamilton ended his correspondence with the Hassels writing, “The Ancient Mariner of Coleridge is described as being under the impulse of a spell, which constrained him to talk his tale to some selected persons, & obliged them to listen. “I pass, like night, from land to land; I have strange power of speech; ...” But even the Ancient Mariner at last released the Wedding Guest; and it is time for me now to release you & Mrs Hassell from the position of listeners to my own story.”\footnote{[Ishikura 2008, 69]. In this 2008 article Waka Ishikura describes the influence on Hamilton of the famous romantic poet and philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and their meetings in 1832. The story in her article about the Lawrence sisters, not mentioned in this sketch, is based on an unfortunate error Graves had made in the biography; he had assumed that Hamilton had befriended the eldest sister, Sarah Lawrence, who was a friend of Coleridge. But Hamilton's friend was her younger sister Arabella Lawrence, see [Van Weerden 2017, 58 footnote 21]. For the 1834 text of ‘The Rime of the Ancient Mariner’ by Samuel Coleridge see The Poetry Foundation, poetryfoundation.org/poems/43997/the-rime-of-the-ancient-mariner-text-of-1834.} Having been able to express himself like that, and having found enough friends to correspond with, writing all these letters may have been Hamilton’s salvation and that of his marriage; it apparently greatly helped him to come to terms with his feelings. After some months he regained his balance, and the outpouring of letters diminished.

Hamilton had been distressed after hearing about Catherine’s betrothal in February 1825, after the 1830 visits, during the six-week correspondence in 1848, and after her death in November 1853, and that seemed to suggest that during his entire life he had only loved Catherine. In the meantime however he lived quite a normal daily life as a very hard working mathematician with many social duties, who loved his family and always tried to remain humble despite all the praise he received through his exceptional intellect.

**Information from Hamilton’s letters** Having been triggered to dwell on memories by reading letters which were left to him by his in 1851 deceased sister Eliza, in 1855 Hamilton entered into an intense correspondence with De Vere which lasted from July until October; most of what is known today about Catherine and her very unhappy marriage comes from this correspondence.\footnote{Unfortunately, not much more than the parts of the letters given by Hankins and Graves are publicly available. In these letters Hamilton “unburdened himself” about Catherine, as Hankins called it, and therefore the letters are different from, and more informative than, the many letters Hamilton wrote to...}
many people shortly after Catherine’s death. For instance, the fact that Catherine was forced to marry, that she “pleaded desperately against the marriage,” but that her father had an “iron will” and she was “led as a victim to the altar,” would not have been known if it had not been for this correspondence.24

Yet also the letters Hamilton wrote shortly after Catherine’s death contain crucial information. In December 1853 Hamilton wrote to the Hassells,25 “The marriage of the lady, to whom this letter relates, was a constrained one, & from the very first (as I long afterwards came to know) was not a happy union: yet during a long course of years she contrived (as I have heard and believe) to discharge, with the most exemplary propriety, all duties of a wife, a mother, & a Christian: and was, to the last, the idol of her own family, & a cherished favourite with all her acquaintances. At length her health of body, & (in some degree) of mind, broke down.” The remark that he “long afterwards came to know” that the marriage was “from the very first […] not a happy union” is in complete accord with the earlier statements that Hamilton had not known about the coercion around the time of Catherine’s wedding, and that he learned how very unhappy Catherine was during their six-week correspondence in 1848; he obviously had not heard that ‘only recently’ during their parting interviews.

And there are pieces of information in other correspondences from Hamilton. Shortly after her last 1848 letter Catherine tried to commit suicide, and according to Hankins, thereafter she “lived almost constantly with her mother or with her sisters and brothers.” It can, unfortunately, not be deduced therefrom whether or not in the last five years of her life she also lived with Barlow even if it was only for short periods, or how often she saw him or spoke with him. But in 1855 Hamilton wrote to a friend that in one of the parting interviews Catherine had “confided to [him] that she looked forward with terror to the bare possibility of her recovering health enough to make it necessary for her to live with [Barlow] again.” Next to this having been the most clear expression of her very negative feelings for Barlow, it also suggests, although some uncertainty remains, that she had not returned to him any more.26

1.4 Birth and death

Catherine Disney was born as one of the six daughters and eight sons of Thomas Disney (1766-1851) and Anne Eliza Purdon (ca 1765-1858). At the time of writing of this sketch her baptism record, if it exists in the Dublin records, has not appeared online yet, making both the place and the date of her birth uncertain. It has generally been assumed that Catherine Disney was born in 1806. However, it is known from newspaper articles that she died on the 3rd of November 1853,27 according to Graves while she was “staying in the house of a brother near Dublin,” and from Hankins’ biography it is known that this was Robert Anthony who lived in Donnybrook.28

24 For Thomas Disney’s ‘iron will’ see p. 39.
25 [Ishikura 2008, 68]. As an illustration of Hamilton’s romanticism, Ishikura writes that after Catherine’s death Hamilton “began narrating the story of his love for Catherine as a romantic tale,” and quotes from this letter, which is not mentioned by either Hankins or Graves.
26 [Hankins 1980, 350], p. 84.
27 Genes Reunited : Search British Newspaper Archive (hereafter Genes Reunited : SBNA), genes reunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: William Barlow rector Creggan, years: 1853-1853.
28 [Graves 1885, 691], [Hankins 1980, 351].
burial record of a Catherine Barlow who died in Donnybrook and was buried on the 7th of November 1853 will thus with hardly any doubt be that of Catherine Disney, and it gives her age at the time of her death as fifty-three.

Figure 1.1: Catherine Disney’s burial record on Irish genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-3-126-5-154. It is not known why she was buried at St. Werburgh, but also three sons who had died young, see the Appendix on p. 129, were buried there. She may have wanted to be buried close to them.

Another reason to assume that Catherine was not born in 1806, therewith making it very likely that her age as given in the record is indeed correct, is that it can be deduced from a combination of sources that her brother Henry Purdon was born in the summer of 1806. Catherine’s age in the burial record having been given as fifty-three means that she was born in 1799 or 1800, and since it is known from the headstone of her brother Thomas’ grave at Mount Jerome Cemetery that he was born on the 22nd of February 1799, it is possible but highly unlikely that she was born in the same year. It will therefore be assumed here that Catherine was born in 1800, and that she thus was five years older than Hamilton.

29 According to [Leslie 1911, 320, 338] Henry was the sixth son, and James the seventh. In the [Alumni Dubl., 231] it can be seen that when on the 1st of July 1822 Henry entered Trinity College Dublin he was fifteen, which means that he was born in 1806 or 1807. His brother James was sixteen when he entered on the 7th of July 1823, he therefore was also born in 1806 or 1807. Henry thus must have turned sixteen very soon after entrance, while at his entrance James had just turned sixteen; if Henry was born in July 1806 and James in June 1807, that would make their age difference eleven months, which is on the verge of what is possible in case of full term pregnancies. But it would be in accord with the birth on the 26th of July 1808 of Thomas and Anne Disney’s eighth son Lambert, of whom there is a baptism record, making him one of the only two Disney children whose birth date is certain. See Irish genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-244-1-2-001. Another reason to accept Catherine’s age as given in the record is that 1800 would give a far more logical sequence of birth years for the Disney children than 1806. For the Disneys having had six daughters and eight sons see p. 20, for the list of children see the Appendix on p. 129.

30 See for a transcription of the headstone Ireland Genealogy Projects Archives : Dublin Headstones : Mount Jerome Cemetery, Dublin, Part 68, No.10112. igp-web.com/IGPArchives/ire/dublin/photos/tombstones/1headstones/mt-jerome68.txt [accessed 17 May 2017]. Thomas Disney’s brother Robert did have two sons in the same year; Robert was born in January and Patience Ogle in December 1806, a time difference of eleven months. But even if Catherine would have been born late in December there would only have been ten months between her birth and that of Thomas.
Although it is not known with complete certainty where Catherine was born, up to the street it is known where she died because less than two years after her death in November 1853, on the 14th of February 1855, Robert Anthony’s wife Caroline died. Having given birth to a still-born son on the 1st of February, she died of influenza, only forty-four years old. In her burial record it is mentioned that she had lived at Seafield Terrace in Donnybrook; in a family notice in the Cork Examiner her death day is given, and her address as Sea-view Terrace.

![Seaview Terrace no. 5, from a 2014 Google Maps street view recording. A car in front of the house was erased to make it more easy to imagine that Catherine lived there. If this is indeed the house where she died, it was here that she could finally tell Hamilton that she had loved him, and had wanted to marry him. After having been notified of Catherine’s death Hamilton again came to the house. He was not invited in yet saw “the upper right hand shutters open but the light was soon afterwards concealed.” [Hankins 1980, 352].](image)

31 Caroline Disney was Catherine’s first cousin and sister-in-law. See for the birth of her son and her death Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Robert Disney, years: 1855-1855, type: familynotice. For the house presumably having been no. 5 see p. 12.

32 She had lived in Donnybrook but was buried in Dublin, in the parish of St. Mark. Rather unusually, the burial records of that parish in those years also give the causes of death such as influenza, scarlatina, convulsion, fever, asthma, head complaint, insanity, decline, old age. Irish genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pd-30-4-4-041.
The six houses of Seafield Terrace, or Seaview Terrace as it is called now, still exist. It is not known exactly in which house the Disneys lived, yet Caroline Disney died in February 1855, and in June 1855 the Victorian writer Anthony Trollope came to live at number 5, which makes it quite possible that that had been the Disneys’ house. Robert Anthony was a solicitor working in Dublin, and having to take care of his very young children, he may have moved his family back to Dublin; for instance his eldest sister Jane, who had married John Barlow, lived in Dublin, in Raheny.

1.5 Descent and addresses

Descent Catherine’s mother, Anne Eliza Purdon (ca 1765-1858), was a daughter of William John Purdon (1740-1793) and Jane Coote (1742- ..). She had a brother Simon who was born in 1767; in the Dictionary of the Landed Gentry it is stated that Simon was an only son, Anne is not mentioned. In The Gentleman’s and London Magazine of July 1791 it is written that Thomas Disney, “third son of the late Dr. Brabazon Disney,” married “Miss Ann Purdon, only daughter of Wm. John Purdon of Ely Place, Esq.;” William and Jane Purdon thus had one son and one daughter. Anne Purdon’s parents married in Dublin in 1764, and her brother Simon having been born in 1767 it is assumed here that Anne was born around 1765.

Anne Purdon came from rich and high-classed families; the Dictionary of the Landed Gentry mentions that the Purdon family was an “ancient family, […] possessed of considerable property in the co. Clare.” According to the Dictionary of the Peerage and Baronetage, Anne’s mother Jane Coote was a daughter of Robert Coote, Esq. of Ash Hill, Co. Limerick, and on the website Landed Estates Database it is mentioned that the Purdon family was an “ancient family, […] possessed of considerable property in the co. Clare.”


From 1851 until 1858 Robert Anthony is mentioned as working from 43 Dame street in Dublin, see Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney 43 dame, county: Dublin, years: 1850-1860.


For the year of this marriage see Irish genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=prs11-anne-16.
can be read that this family was “descended from a younger brother [Chidley Coote] of Sir Charles Coote, Earl of Mountrath. In 1666 Chidley Coote was granted almost 3,000 acres in counties Limerick and Kerry. The Cootes of Ash Hill married members of the Evans (Lord Carbery), Purdon and Carr families.”

Also Catherine’s father Thomas Disney had, from both sides, a rich and high-class background. His mother, Patience Ogle (1730- after 1798), was from her mother’s side of the Meade family, and around the 1800s the ‘Meade Ogles’ formed a “dynasty of wealthy merchants who dominated the representation of Drogheda.” That had started already before 1700; Patience Ogle’s father and grandfather, both called Henry Ogle, had been sheriff and mayor of Drogheda, Co. Louth. According to the Armagh Clergy and Parishes Patience’s brother John left the Disney couple a house in Drogheda, and from a nephew, William Ogle, they bought a house; both houses were hers after her husband’s death. In 1773 she also inherited, from her brother John, a sum of £5000, an in those days very large amount of money.

According to the Clerical and Parochial Records of Cork, Clonmel, and Ross and the Dictionary of the Landed Gentry, the Disneys descended from the De Isney or D’Eisney family, which had come to Lincolnshire, England, with William the Conqueror in 1066. Thomas’ father Brabazon Disney (1711-1790) was born in Co. Louth, became a Fellow at Trinity College Dublin in 1736, Professor of Laws in 1747, Archbishop King’s Lecturer in 1754, Professor of Divinity in 1759, and was Chancellor of Armagh. Brabazon Disney and Patience Ogle married in 1761, and they had five sons of whom Thomas was the third. The two eldest sons and the fourth son, William, Brabazon and Robert Disney, attended Trinity College Dublin, Thomas and his youngest brother Edward did not.

When Brabazon Disney died in 1790 he left his family very well provided for. To his wife Patience he left “£300 per annum (in addition to £200 under marriage settlements),” “£8000 to four younger sons,” he had “bought a Commission for

---

41 [Burke 1869, 261], Landed Estates Database, landedestates.nuigalway.ie/LandedEstates/jsp/estate-show.jsp?id=2417 [accessed 22 Jan 2018].
43 See the Ogle Research Group, oglekin.org/Ahnentafel/Chart-uk/BOB-Ped12.htm [accessed 11 Dec 2018].
44 See D’Alton, J. (1844), The History of Drogheda, with its Environs, volume 1. Dublin: Published by the Author. archive.org/details/historydrogheda00dalgoog.
45 [Leslie 1911, p. 40].
47 [Brady 1864, vol 2, 71], [Burke 1852, vol 1, 334-335]. On the Geni website the lineage can be followed from Catherine, geni.com/people/Catherine-Disney/6000000083354468310, up to her forefather Lambert De Isney, geni.com/people/Lambert-De-Isney-of-Norton-Disney/600000022186716337 [all pages accessed 11 Dec 2018]. According to Burke this “Lambert De Isney” was “the first mentioned in the records of this kingdom” and the “ancestor of the Disneys of Norton D’Isney,” which was “in the wapentake of Boothby Graffoe, and part of Kesteven.”
48 [Alumni Dubl., p. 231].
49 According to the website MeasuringWorth in 2016 a sum of £500 in 1790 treated as wealth would have an economic status value of £799,000, or an economic power value of £5,051,000.
50 William was not explicitly mentioned as a beneficiary, yet it can be assumed that as the eldest
his son Thomas, and apprenticed Edward to John Patrick, merchant, also bought lands of Galtrim, Boycetown and Mitchelstown in Meath, and had obtained a living for his son Brabazon, etc.”

Addresses In his younger years Thomas Disney was in the military; his father had, as mentioned, bought a commission for him. In 1791 he married, according to a short wedding announcement in *The Lady’s Magazine*, as an “esquire of the 5th regiment of foot,” an infantry regiment of the British Army, “miss Ann Purdon, of Ely place.” It is not known where they lived in the first years of their marriage; they may have lived at Anne’s family home at Ely Place, or perhaps with Thomas’ mother who then also lived in Dublin.

The first year for which an address of the Disneys was found is 1797, when they already had four children; newspaper articles mentioning Thomas Disney appeared after the death of his youngest brother Edward. In the November and December editions of *Saunders’s News-Letter* it can be read about the “late merchant Edward Ogle Disney of Abbey-street,” that “such persons as having demands against Disney are desired to furnish their accruals at the office on no. 49 of said street,” while “persons who were indebted the said Disney are requested to pay the amount of their accounts to Thomas Disney Esq. of the Royal Hospital, who is authorized to give discharges for the same.” In those days the Royal Hospital of Kilmainham at the Road from Inchicore was a home for aged and maimed soldiers, and Thomas Disney was “Auditor and Registrar” at the Hospital as can be read in newspaper articles between 1797 and 1805.

Through various sources it can be seen that the Disney family actually lived at the Hospital: in some newspaper articles published between 1802 and 1805 there is a son he inherited the rest of the legacy.

---

51 Leslie 1911, p. 40. Leslie mentions that the eldest son, William, was still “under 21,” which will have referred to the year in which the will was made, 1777, not to the year of the proving of the will, 1793; William was in his early thirties then. According to the *Oxford Dictionaries*, a ‘commission’ is a warrant conferring the rank of officer in an army, navy, or air force. Buying a commission was common usage in those days; they could be bought, sold or earned, as a whole or partially. Also according to the *Oxford Dictionaries*, a ‘living’ is a position as a vicar or rector with an income or property.


53 Ely Place is in Dublin, some blocks south of Trinity College. In 1794, a year after their father’s death, Simon Purdon sold 6 Ely Place, which thus will have been their parental home. See *Genes Reunited: SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Purdon Ely, years: 1793-1794.

54 The year before his marriage Thomas’ father had died in Dublin, see note 1 on p. 131.

55 As mentioned, Thomas’ youngest brother Edward had been apprenticed to the merchant John Patrick, and combined with his second given name, Ogle, there is hardly any doubt that this is indeed Thomas’ brother. There is a burial record online of a Disney of Abbey Street who was buried on the 12th of November 1797, but during the writing of this sketch the record had not been scanned yet. churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords. Keywords: Disney Abbey street.

56 *Genes Reunited: SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Thomas Disney or Thomas Difney, county: Dublin, years: 1797-1805. According to the *Oxford Dictionaries* an audit is an official inspection of an organization’s accounts, and a registrar is an official responsible for keeping lists of names or items, or official records.
mention of “the Register’s apartments at the Hospital,” and in the web article *An afternoon in Ireland’s grandest classical building, the Royal Hospital Kilmainham* it is mentioned that next to the soldiers, also the staff resided at the Hospital, “The Governor of the Royal Hospital was usually a distinguished general, and the [staff] included a master, deputy-master, chaplain, secretary, registrar, pay-master, physician, surgeon, assistant-surgeon, apothecary, reader, providore, chamberlain, butler, and fueler, who had apartments in the house.” Therefore, assuming that Catherine was indeed born in 1800, she will have been born in the Royal Hospital.

---

**Figure 1.3:** The Royal Hospital in Kilmainham, looked at from the north-north-east, where now the gardens are. This drawing is reproduced from p. 217 of the *Dublin Penny Journal*, Vol. IV, 9 January 1836, No. 184. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433081677647. The hospital was built between 1680 and 1684, see dublincity.ie/image/libraries/dg17b-royal-hospital-kilmainham. Catherine will have been born at the side of the hospital which can be seen in this drawing because the staff, amongst whom the registrar, had their apartments in the north wing, see footnote 58 on this page. Or she may have been born in the Lying-in Hospital, now called the Rotunda Hospital, which was founded in 1745 and moved to its present location in 1757. grassrootsgaa.ie/rotunda-pdfs/chronological_History_of_The_Rotunda_Hospital.pdf [all websites accessed 17 March 2018]. However, most babies seem to have been born at home under guidance of an accoucheur, as in case of both Hamilton and his three children. [Van Weerden 2017, 223].

---

57 *Genes reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: register apartments Disney, county: Dublin, years: 1802-1805.
From around 1800 Thomas Disney’s whereabouts are rather easy to trace because due to the nature of his work he placed many advertisements, articles and notices in the newspapers. It can be seen therefrom that next to working for the hospital he became an estate agent; in 1802 he was, for instance, looking for a game-keeper, “a person who has been a soldier will be preferred,” and in 1804 he was managing property of the Earl of Darnley.\(^59\)

At some time between April 1805 and January 1806 Thomas Disney seems to have become a full time estate agent.\(^60\) He moved his offices to 31 Upper Merrion Street; the newspaper articles were, for instance, about land as part of an estate, or about furnished houses with excellent gardens, “for terms apply to Mr. Lawler, at Thomas Disney’s, Esq. Upper Merriion-street, where tickets of admission will be given for any day except Sunday.” Having had apartments in the Royal Hospital, and also his later office address having been mentioned as the family address,\(^61\) it is assumed that whenever possible Thomas held office in the family residence.

As far as can be derived from the articles, he worked from Upper Merrion Street until October 1809, but the growing family may not have been able to remain there because in 1808 they seem to have resided temporarily in Glasnevin. Although there are no online baptism records of most of Thomas and Anne’s fourteen children,\(^62\) two records do exist, of William John and Lambert; they were written in 1808 by Thomas’ brother Robert, who then was a reverend in Glasnevin. Having been born in July 1808 Lambert was registered in Glasnevin in August, which may indicate that they lived there, but remarkably also William John, who had been born in February 1796, was registered then; he apparently did not have an earlier baptism record.\(^63\)

From October 1809 until August 1810 Thomas Disney worked from 33 New Gardiner street, and from August until the end of 1810 from 32 Lower Gardiner street. Between 1811 and 1812 no articles were found, in 1813 he is found working from an office in 38 Gloucester Street, now Seán MacDermott Street. It can be seen in the articles that he held office there until September 1823, but on the 30\(^{th}\) of September 1822 a notice appeared in Saunders’s News-Letter, “Mr. Thomas Disney, has removed his Office from No. 38, Gloucester-street, to No. 4, Westland-row.”\(^64\) The new location at Westland-row contained a house, offices and yard, and was in the parish of St. Mark.\(^65\)

---

\(^{59}\) Genes reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Thomas Difney Darnley, county: Dublin, years: 1800-1805.

\(^{60}\) Thomas Disney placed many articles about houses and lands to be sold or let, see Genes reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Thomas Difney or Thomas Disney, county: Dublin, years: 1800-1824.

\(^{61}\) From September 1822 Thomas Disney held office at 4 Westland-row, and when in April 1824 two of the Disney brothers, Henry and James, were confirmed in St. Anne’s Church, their home address was indeed given as 4 Westland-row. See Irish genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-30-1-3-002.

\(^{62}\) Six Disney brothers entered College; they were registered as having been born in Dublin as sons of Thomas, Generosus. [Alumni Dubl., 231]. Generosus means eminent, or ‘of gentle birth’, [Graves 1882, 6]. The two eldest sons went into the military.

\(^{63}\) Both records can be seen at Irish Genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-244-1-2-001. The Disney family may have lived temporarily with the family of Robert and Jane Disney in Glasnevin, but in 1809 they moved to Mitchelstown where Robert became rector, see [Brady 1864, vol 2, 71].

\(^{64}\) Genes reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Westland-row, county: Dublin, years: 1822-1822.

\(^{65}\) See p. 149 of the Parliamentary Papers: 1780-1849, Volume 11, Part 2, books.google.com/boo
Figure 1.4: The Grosvenor Hotel, Westland Row, 1974. It was directly opposite to the first Dublin train station, Westland-row Station, now Pearse Station, which was built in 1834. The hotel was number 5, the two columns of windows to the right of the hotel belonged to number 4, where the Disney family lived. The block of houses does not exist any more; it was demolished in 2005 to make way for the Naughton Institute / Crann Building. dublin.sciencegallery.com/blog/sab/2005/08/ground-broken-naughton-institute [accessed 10 Sept 2018]. The photo comes from the Dublin City Council Photographic Collection on Dublin-city.ie, dublincity.ie/image/libraries/sc014-grosvenor.

This would be Catherine’s last known Dublin address, because in 1826 her eldest son James William was born there, and very soon thereafter she moved to Eglish. It is not known however where she lived between her marriage and her son’s birth; Barlow apparently did not have a house of his own. Yet something can be derived from what is known. After Hamilton heard, in February 1825, that Catherine was going to marry, they did not see each other any more until 1830. She therefore did not live at Summerhill; in September 1825 Hamilton stayed there for some weeks. 66

But she will also not have lived at Westland-row, because the Disneys knew that when Hamilton attended college he lived with his Cousin Arthur at 10 South Cumberland-street, which is very close to Trinity College’s campus; the only street in-between is Westland-row. It is hardly conceivable that Barlow and the Disneys would have taken the risk that Hamilton and Catherine would meet each other in the streets, and Catherine thus may have lived with Barlow’s parents, or perhaps, because Barlow’s father died in 1825, with John and Jane Barlow. 67

Figure 1.5: On this map, published in 1818, the places have been indicated where Thomas Disney is known to have held office, and where Catherine thus will have lived before she moved to Eglish in 1826 or 1827. 1 is the Royal Hospital where she most likely was born. 2 is Upper Merrion Street, 3 is New Gardiner Street; it has been assumed here that what is now Upper Gardiner Street was new then, hence the name which is not used any more. 4 is Lower Gardiner Street, on the map called Gardiner Street; this would be in accord with the aforementioned assumption. 5 is Gloucester Street, since 1933 Seán MacDermott Street, and 6 is Westland-row, which did not exist yet when this map was made, it was the Vice-Provost’s garden. The map can be seen in Warburton, J., Whitelaw, J., Walsh, R. (1818), *History of the City of Dublin from the earliest accounts to the present time*, Vol. II. London: Printed for T. Cadell and W. Davies. archive.org/details/historyofcityofd02warb.
Chapter 2

The Disney family

2.1 Deaths of two brothers

The family was doing well financially, but between 1812 and 1815 the two eldest sons, who were in the army, became engaged in battle. The Disney’s second son, William John, who was born in 1796, was a midshipman in the Royal Navy, on the HMS La Hogue under Captain T.B. Capel.\(^1\) Only seventeen years old,\(^2\) he is mentioned as having been a member of the crew of one of the “warships that blockaded the Connecticut coastline” in the War of 1812,\(^3\) the blockade having commenced in February 1813. He then died in an accident on the HMS La Hogue.\(^4\)

Born in 1794, Brabazon Disney went into the army around 1812. He fought in the 1815 battle at Waterloo where he became slightly wounded and had “some hairbreadth escapes.” Around 1830 his health deteriorated, and in 1831 he was so ill that “he had no hopes of ever being able to join in the active duties of his profession.” He resigned, and died on the 14\(^{th}\) of March 1833. In 1838 Thomas Disney wrote letters, sounding quite desperate, or perhaps indignat, to General Lord Hill, about his son not having been permitted to sell his Lieutenant-Colonelcy, and in these letters he asked to return the money for the benefit of his three unmarried daughters.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) See p. 20. For the La Hogue see for instance [Wikipedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HMS_La_Hogue).

\(^2\) Boys could join the navy at very young ages indeed: there is a letter in the [National Archives of Ireland](https://search.nationalarchives.ie/Details/archive/110201703/), written in 1821 or 1822 by Thomas Disney’s eldest brother William, “outlining difficulties experienced by his brother Reverend Robert Disney, Church of Ireland rector of Mitchelstown, County Cork, in keeping an examination appointment for his twelve year old son William Thomas Disney, at the naval college.”

\(^3\) “Disney, Wm. Midshipman Dublin,” see p. 7 of [The Shanachie](https://digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1046&context=shanachie), volume 26 (2). digitalcommons.sacredheart.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1046&context=shanachie [accessed 16 Feb 2018].

\(^4\) See p. 20. There is an online article [anon.], stating that the ship’s logs show that he died on the 23\(^{rd}\) of March 1813. familysearch.org/service/records/storage/das-mem/patron/v2/TH-904-82.119-2247-18/dist.txt?ctx=ArtCtxPublic [accessed 12 Dec 2018]. The article contains a small error: William John was not born in Glasnevin but registered there when he was twelve already, see p. 16.

\(^5\) [Disney 1838]. This correspondence contains a letter Brabazon wrote to his father about the battle at Waterloo on the 18\(^{th}\) of June 1815. See for Brabazon Disney also p. 96 of Dalton, Ch. (1904), *The Waterloo Roll Call*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. archive.org/details/waterloorollcall00dalduoft. It is mentioned there that Brabazon was a “son of Thos. Disney, of Rock Lodge, co. Meath,” that in 1816 he was a Captain “in the 67th Foot,” “exchanged to Rl. Fusiliers” in 1819, became a Major in 1825, Lieutenant-Colonel in 1830, and died “in Dublin 14th March, 1833.” His
In those days commissions in the army could be bought full-pay or half-pay, and full-pay commissions could be sold back again. Brabazon was on half-pay, and although in 1831 he applied for permission to sell, for some reason he could not be restored to full-pay in the one and a half year thereafter. In 1832 and 1833 Thomas Disney, who saw that his son was getting worse until he even was in “a very dangerous state,” tried again to sell but it was not allowed; they had to send a medical certificate stating that Brabazon’s life was “in no immediate danger.”

Commissions seem to have costed on average a few hundred pounds, making it quite understandable that Thomas Disney tried to get the money back. Moreover, the reason why he was refused the money will have felt very unjust because Brabazon had been “worn out in the service.” But the way Thomas Disney was arguing in these letters to grant him the sum is remarkable, even more when knowing that he decided to publish them.

He wrote to Lord Hill, “the price of his Commission I did, and do conceive, I had a right to. It was the money of my children; I have still twelve alive, six sons and six daughters. When any step was to be purchased for their brother they all petitioned me to purchase, so much was he beloved by them. I had also a son in the Navy who was killed in a horrible manner, the tiller of a seventy-four, Lahogue, (I think under Hon. J.B. Capel,) having caught his head, and, oh God, smashed it! but enough of this, excuse this. I either have or have not a right to the purchase-money of my late son’s Lieut.-Colonelcy. […] I have three daughters unmarried, they have very little; it will be for them.” But Lord Hill answered that Thomas Disney had “no claim under the regulations of the service to the value of [Brabazon Disney’s] Commission,” leading Thomas Disney to the decision to publish these letters.

It is difficult to interpret Thomas Disney’s letter; it seems strange that such a man, working with the law, used such emotional arguments. Although the letter is about honour and injustice it is foremost about money, and it can be wondered why Thomas Disney thought that in that context painting a vivid picture of his dying son would help his case. Even more remarkable is the exclamation mark because this was no conversation, and he decided to publish it. Unless in their time this would evoke sympathy, it could perhaps indicate a slight lack of insight in other people’s feelings.

2.2 The death of Lambert Disney

Although in the correspondence Thomas Disney fought an apparently just and certainly understandable case, his letters suggest that he had a strong focus on money
department in the *Limerick Chronicle* of the 20th of March 1833 reads, “Lieutenant-Colonel Disney, late of the 7th Royal Fusileers, eldest son of Thomas Disney, Esq. of Westland-row, Dublin.” limerickcity.ie/media/03 20 33.pdf. Remarkably, as Thomas Disney’s address both Rock Lodge and Westland-row are mentioned. Searching for the oldest newspaper article mentioning Rock Lodge as his address, an article was found from the 11th of February 1832. Genes Reunited: SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Rock, years: 1828-1832. Because Thomas Disney still kept his offices for some time, see footnote11 on p. 58, both addresses will have applied when Brabazon died.

6 See for instance pp. 640-641 of the *Journals of the House of Commons*, vol. 76, 1821. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.c000032649;view=1up;seq=656.

7 According to the website MeasuringWorth, measuringworth.com, in 2016 a sum of £500 in 1820 treated as a commodity would have an income value of £518,400 [accessed 13 Oct 2017].
and position, which may have been connected to the fact that contrary to his still living brothers he had not attended college. Also understandable is that he wanted to have especially his daughters financially well provided for, but he apparently felt the need to carry out his decisions with an “iron will.”

Many of his children married well and led financially stable lives, but the apparent idea of necessarily having to be rich and of high status also brought utter misery. In any case for Catherine, who tried to commit suicide after having been forced to marry into more financial stability than love then seemed to offer her. But apparently also for her brother Lambert who, according to John Herson in his book *Divergent Paths: Family Histories of Irish Emigrants in Britain 1820-1920*, became obsessed and depressed by suffering a decline in status which he found impossible to accept; in December 1867 he ended his life by walking in the dark on the rails in a tunnel where he was overrun by a train.

Lambert had been a college friend of Hamilton, who in September 1824, while being in Trim, wrote to his sister Eliza, “A person could say a good deal on one of those sheets,” exclaims Lambert at my elbow, as he eyes aghast their formidable appearance – true, my dear sir, and I have a great deal to say. When in all my life did I ever sit down or stand up to write to Eliza without having a great deal to say?” At the end of the letter Hamilton wrote, “You will perhaps wonder who is the Lambert I mentioned at the beginning of this letter. He is a son of Mr. Disney that has now the house and demesne of Summerhill [. . .]. He is now with Uncle [James Hamilton] [. . .], and I am to dine at his father’s with him to-day.”

Lambert did not stay in Trim very long; in January 1825, having stated that his favourite Disney was Edward, Hamilton wrote to uncle James, “Of Edward’s brothers, the next in my interest and affections is Lambert. I cannot but regret, for his sake and for yours, that he was not so completely or so long resigned to your care as to enable you argillâ quidvis imitari udà [to shape anything out of him, as out of moist clay]; for I think he has latent principles of Taste and of Genius worthy to be developed by your hand, and which would have repaid your culture. But I do not regret his removal from Trim, if, on the one hand, he was not intended to remain with you for a period such as you would have yourself desired; or if, on the other hand, while so remaining, and for the first time in his life separated from all his family, his almost too finely affectionate disposition had lost in melancholy the power of adequate exertion. He is now reading for Entrance with a Dublin tutor.”

From Hamilton’s remarks it can be inferred that Lambert Disney loved his family very much, but also that he strongly clung to them. His “almost too finely affectionate disposition” seems to indicate that he did not have a very positive self-image, and may be a token that the children had learned from their father that their worthiness was not primarily determined by who they were as a person. That is a harsh statement, yet it is in line with the observation Herson made in *Divergent Paths*, that Lambert Disney’s “sense of self was determined by his position in the commanding Anglo-Irish landed class that equated Ireland’s best interests with its own.”

---

8 See p. 39. Unfortunately, nothing is known about Anne Disney Purdon’s stance in this matter.
9 [Graves 1882, 162, 164]. They walked to Summerhill, and thus will have dined at the mansion.
11 [Graves 1882, 172]
12 [Herson 2015, 225]
According to Herson, Lambert Disney had been “an established member of the local squirearchy in Co. Meath.” He was an estate agent, but in 1850 he had to give up his duties because of a severe and protracted illness. In 1853 his friend Eyre Trench John Richard Nugent was commissioned into the militia, and some months later Lambert Disney was commissioned into the same regiment. When in 1856 Nugent was appointed in England, in the 2nd Staffordshire Militia, he soon found a job for Lambert Disney as a paymaster.

Herson writes, “The Disney family were never reconciled to their exile from Ireland. Such a conclusion is often made in relation to Catholic Celtic emigrants but rarely in relation to Protestant ones. Yet the evidence clearly suggests it in relation to this family. They failed to settle in Britain for a number of reasons. Firstly, they experienced a drop in social status. They had enjoyed a privileged existence in Ireland as members of the Ascendancy, but from a life networking with people at all levels of the Protestant establishment Lambert Disney descended to working in a back-street barracks and dealing with the burghers of a small English town. Clifton Lodge in the Co. Meath countryside had been swapped for Clifton Lodge in a street in Stafford. These changes must have been unpalatable to him and his wife.”

Herson further argues that Lambert Disney was, politically, an obsessive man. Already in Ireland having been defending his protestant class securities, “evidence survived from his death” that he was “on a one-man crusade against threats to his religion and his class.”

The suggestion that for Lambert Disney losing his place in the higher circles of society entailed losing his value as a person therefore does not appear too far-fetched; Herson’s observation about Lambert’s “sense of self,” Hamilton’s remark about his “almost too finely affectionate disposition,” and Catherine’s forced marriage, all seem to be directly connected with what could be recognized in Thomas Disney’s letter to General Hill, that he had an overly strong focus on status and money. Even if he just tried, well-intendedly, to protect his children.

It has not been proven that Lambert Disney killed himself, yet Herson makes a strong case for it. Disney’s friend Nugent did not claim that he had been suicidal, yet he “testified that he had been with Disney on the evening before his death and that he ‘had not been in his usual spirits. He had, indeed, been suffering much depression – of a religious character – for some time past.’” Very early the next morning, the 13th of December, walking in the “pitch-black Shugborough Tunnel,” Lambert Disney was “near the far end when the luggage train came up behind him but he must surely have heard it and even perhaps seen its headlamps. He could then have stepped on to the opposite track, squeezed against the wall or laid down between the rails. He did none of these things. Instead, his head was on the rail itself. It might have been a tragic accident, but the weight of evidence points to depression and suicide.”

---

13 From personal email correspondence. In Divergent Paths Herson stated that Lambert Disney was born in in Galtrim, Co. Meath, [Herson 2015, 222], but he now believes this to be erroneous.
14 [Herson 2015, 223]
15 [Herson 2015, 226-228]. The Disneys had named their house in Stafford ‘Clifton Lodge’ after their old home in Athboy, according to Herson “a clear sign of nostalgia for a lost past.”
16 [Herson 2015, 224]
17 This view was also held by some newspapers in 1867; combining articles of for instance the Birmingham Journal and the Stamford Mercury, it was written that “Captain Disney, of the 2nd Staffordshire Militia, was seen upon the line as early as two a.m., and was supposed to have met with his death from the engine of a ballast train which left Stafford at 5.30 a.m.. Captain Disney, we are informed, had been unwell for some time, and the conclusion to be drawn is, that he committed
2.3 Summerhill and absent fathers

Catherine saw Hamilton for the first time in 1824, when she lived with her family at Summerhill. Graves called the house where they lived “the residence of the family of Disney,” and from combining letters by Hamilton with other sources it can be seen that this residence was the famous mansion in County Meath; in 1850 Hamilton wrote that the house where he “first met the Disneys” was “greatly decayed,” and in 1855 he wrote that it had “passed into other hands.”

Figure 2.1: Summerhill in Co. Meath. The website archiseek mentions that the mansion had a hundred rooms. archiseek.com/2012/summerhill-co-meath. According to the website The Irish Aesthete Summerhill, “the greatest of Ireland’s country houses” and “one of Ireland’s greatest architectural beauties,” was demolished in 1957. theirishaesthete.com/tag/summerhill. The entrance and tree-lined avenue still exist. See Buildings of Ireland, buildingsofireland.ie/niah/search.jsp?type=record&county=ME&regno=14333005 [all websites accessed 29 Oct 2018].

The ‘decay’ Hamilton wrote about is in complete accord with an 1846 description in The Parliamentary Gazetteer of Ireland, in which it was mentioned that the “neat and well-built town of Summerhill” was in a state of decay, that the house and the demesne, which had been “regarded as one of the finest in Ireland,” had been “nearly denuded of its venerable and magnificent woods,” and that they were “in the fair way to become a scene of comparative desolation. The mansion was a splendid specimen of Grecian architecture; but is now reduced to a condition too sadly in keeping with the demesne.”

The ‘passing into other hands’ before 1855 is also mentioned on the website The Irish Aesthete, “The house was seriously damaged by fire in the early 19th century suicide.” See Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Stafford ballast Shugborough tunnel watch unwell suicide, years: 1867-1867.

18 See p. 26. Hamilton remarked that “Mr. Disney” “had Summerhill,” p. 21, yet Summerhill was owned by the Langford family in any case until 1825. [Van Weerden 2017, 57 fn. 18]. Hamilton may therefore have indicated Thomas Disney’s offices, because it seems that around 1821 Thomas Disney had become estate agent for the Langfords. Genes reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Summerhill, years: 1818-1822.

19 [Graves 1885, 648], [Hankins 1980, 351], [Van Weerden 2017, 297-298]

20 In his 1826 poem Hamilton indeed mentioned that the mansion had been surrounded by “dark woods,” see p. 27.

and thereafter successive generations of the Rowley owners [...] never seem to have had sufficient funds to oversee a comprehensive refurbishment. In fact in 1851 the estate was offered for sale.”  

In his biography Graves does not comment to the fact that, although Thomas Disney had his offices at Westland-row in Dublin, the Disneys then lived at Summerhill as if it was their own home; Catherine and Hamilton saw each other for the first time in the drawing-room where the Disney family apparently had gathered, and then the family and their guests dined together, also in the mansion. What is known though is that fathers more often did not live with their families for shorter or longer periods.

Figure 2.2: A staircase in Summerhill. This photo is, together with that of the entrance hall which can be seen on the cover of this sketch, one of the few glimpses left of the inside of the mansion. archiseek.com/2012/summerhill-co-meath [accessed 29 Oct 2018].

22 The Irish Aesthete, theirishaesthete.com/2013/04/01/my-name-is-ozymandias, theirishaesthete.com/2016/04/13/an-echo-of-lost-grandeur [both websites accessed 18 Aug 2018].

23 They will already have had many connections there; according to Herson in personal email correspondence, the Disney family’s close links with Co. Meath had developed in the eighteenth century. See also ‘Disney of the County of Meath’, [Burke 1852, vol 1, 335].

24 [Graves 1885, 648], [Hankins 1980, 37-38]

25 Travelling was exhausting and took much time; when Catherine met Hamilton there were no trains yet. That it was quite customary for a husband and a wife to be often away from each other can, for instance, be seen in the unhappy story of Susan Phillips Burney. They did have problems, but that was not due to being away from each other. Quaile, D. (2005), An Eighteenth Century Family at Bellcotton : The story of Susan Burney and Molesworth Phillips. Online article, first published in the Review of the Termonfeckin Historical Society, termonfeckinhistory.ie/an_eighteenth_century_family_at_bellcotton_12.html [accessed 21 May 2018]. In that story also the romance between Thomas Disney’s younger brother Robert and Jane Brabazon is mentioned. And Mrs. Patience Disney, Catherine’s grandmother who, as can be read, was held in high regard by her then
Because Thomas Disney was an estate agent, and took care of estates very far removed from one another, he doubtlessly also was very often away from home. It is therefore possible that the Disney family lived in Summerhill while Thomas Disney worked elsewhere, being with his family as often as he could. And that having them in Summerhill simply was convenient because it was more central than Dublin as regards the places where he worked. In the early 1830s Thomas Disney would move to Rock Lodge in Freffans Little, which is, as the crow flies, about six kilometres from Summerhill.

2.3.1 An apparent consequence of absence

Also Hamilton’s father Archibald Hamilton was often away from his family. He was a solicitor who had gone bankrupt in 1807, and in any case after the bankruptcy he mostly worked far away from Dublin. Although the bankruptcy was due to choices he had made himself it was not seen as just his fault; in 1809 he was compensated after winning a law suit against Archibald Hamilton Rowan, one of the founders of the Dublin Society of United Irishmen. But it had led to the public sale of the family’s “entire household furniture, plate and plated ware, china, delft, glass, and house linen […]”, together with very valuable collection prints, and five small wax figures, elegantly adapted for a drawing room, executed in a very superior style, and highly deserving the attention of the connoisseur. There is an excellent mangle, and washing machine, which will be sold Tuesday the second day of sale. Dublin, 17th Aug 1807.” Graves writes that Archibald Hamilton “was soon furnished with introductions to manufacturing houses in the North of England, which […] brought him at once promises of employment. […] In the year 1814 he [was] employed by the Fishmongers’ Company of London, as their solicitor in an important suit.” It made him travel through the country and even work from London.

It has often been assumed that a direct consequence of the bankruptcy and Archibald Hamilton’s subsequent absence was that Hamilton was sent to Trim, to live with and be educated by his uncle James and aunt Sydney Hamilton. A reason to doubt this direct connection however, is that the public sale was in August 1807, the month in which Hamilton turned two, while the first letters from aunt Sydney to his mother about how he was doing were written in September 1808, a year later. He then had been in Trim for some time, but as it appears not for months already. It is therefore far more plausible that, Hamilton’s mother having noticed even before he was one month old that he was uncommon, and soon everyone around him realizing how extremely intelligent he was, sending Hamilton to Trim really was a decision

---

26 Around this time Thomas Disney also was estate agent for the Wolfe estate in Co. Limerick, see Landed Estates Database: Estate: Wolfe. landedestates.nuigalway.ie/LandedEstates/jsp/estate-show.jsp?id=2307 [accessed 5 Jan 2018].

27 See the maps of the National Inventory of Architectural Heritage, buildingsofireland.ie/cgi-bin/viewsite.cgi?siteid=5167 [accessed 24 May 2015].

28 For what happened, financially, between Archibald Hamilton, Hamilton’s father, and Archibald Hamilton Rowan, Hamilton’s godfather, see [Graves 1882, 11-14].

29 Saunders’s Newsletter, Genes Reunited: SBN, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Archibald Hamilton linen mangle drawing, county: Dublin, years: 1807-1807.

30 [Graves 1882, 14]

31 [Graves 1882, 29]
in his interest; Archibald Hamilton now worked far away from home and could therefore not oversee his son’s education, while uncle James was a very good scholar who was teaching in the diocesan school of Meath. Also Hamilton’s eldest sister Grace came to live in Trim; perhaps they were sent to Trim together to make it more easy for them both, their little sister Eliza having been only one and a half years old.32

The Hamiltons obviously did not just send the children away; after Eliza four more children were born,33 they all visited each other often, and by the families on both sides many amazed and very proud letters were written about Hamilton while they also warned him for vanity, a danger of which they were fully aware. The Hamiltons of Dublin and Trim were attached families, internally and to each other; after the deaths of Hamilton’s parents when he was in his teens,34 the bonds between Hamilton and his sisters, and between him and his uncles, aunts and cousins, were very strong indeed. But one of his upcoming problems may have been a result of what the wise decision of sending him to Trim must have looked like from the outside; what people in Dublin will have seen and talked about was a bankruptcy, a public sale, a father away from home and children sent to Trim to live with an uncle.

2.4 A very happy but unfortunate meeting

In July 1823 Hamilton had entered Trinity College Dublin, and he was starting on his second year when uncle James took him with him on a visit to the Disney family. Graves writes, “It is carefully recorded by Hamilton that Tuesday, August 17, 1824, was the day on which he made his first visit to the residence of the family of Disney at Summerhill, a place in the county of Meath, not far from Trim, then and now the property of Lord Langford, to whom Mr. Disney senior was agent. The Disney family, to whom he was then introduced by his Uncle, became at once to him the objects of warm friendship, and one daughter of the house the source of a still deeper feeling, which influenced his whole life. The five sons were nearly of his age, were fellow-students in College, and were men of ingenuous dispositions, of ability and culture. The sister by whose charms Hamilton’s susceptible heart was instantly captivated was, by all accounts, of singular beauty, amiable, sensitive, and pious.”35

In ‘The Enthusiast’, a poem written in January 1826, Hamilton described their very first meeting,

It was an August evening, and the youth
Had numbered nineteen summers when – a guest –

32 Since in any case 1802 James Hamilton had been curate of Trim. He also was Master of the school for the diocese of Meath which was located at Talbot’s castle in Trim, and he lived there with his sister Sydney. At college, uncle James had received very high grades, and next to Latin and Greek he knew several oriental languages, while aunt Sydney knew Latin and Hebrew. [Graves 1882, 24, 84]. Uncle James then did not have children yet, but in 1814 he married Elizabeth Boyle and they raised a warm family, as can be read at various places in Graves’ biography. Hamilton lived with uncle James almost his entire youth, yet he saw his own family very regularly, and regarded them as his ‘real’ family. [Van Weerden 2017, 235].

33 Soon thereafter Hamilton’s father was earning money again and they raised a normal family, which underpins the suggestion that Hamilton was in Trim by choice and not by necessity. Sadly, a son named Archibald died early, a daughter Sarah when she was four years old.

34 Hamilton’s mother died in 1817, when he was twelve, his father died in 1819.

35 [Graves 1882, 160]. Graves mentions five sons. Next to Brabazon who then was in the army, and William John who had died already, there were six more sons, see the Appendix on p. 129. The third
He came within an old romantic mansion,
With dark woods round. – He found a brilliant circle
And, (holier charm!) a happy family.

He then wrote about how impressed he was by Catherine,

But, oh! how soon, and how entirely faded
All else, when his enthusiastic gaze
Had fallen upon a form of youth and beauty,
A maiden in her simple loveliness,
With locks of gold, and soft blue eyes, and cheeks
All rich with artless smiles and natural bloom: –
He sat beside her at the board, and still
He saw her only, thought of her alone –
But now it was on other charms he dwelt,
Her thoughts, her tastes, her feelings – and these were
So full of mind, of gracefulness, of nature,
Blended with such retiring timidness,
They rivetted the chain her beauty wove. –

For Hamilton it was love at first sight; he “committed all kinds of social blunders. He ignored Mrs. Disney, whom he should have led into dinner, and took Catherine’s arm instead, and completely monopolized her during the whole evening.”

Catherine also fell in love with Hamilton, but it is not certain when that happened. In 1861, almost eight years after their parting interviews, Hamilton corresponded for a while with Catherine’s younger sister Louisa. She had only been eleven or twelve when Hamilton and Catherine fell in love, and meeting him again at her brother Thomas Disney’s house she became fascinated by her sister’s story. Having asked Hamilton about it he wrote, “Wonderful hour! of my sitting, irregularly, from the very first, beside her: when, without a word said of love, we gave away our lives to each other. She was, as you know, beautiful; I was only clever and (already) celebrated.” Combined with what is known from the parting interviews, it clearly leaves room for the suggestion that also Catherine fell head over heels in love with Hamilton on that unexpected and happy first meeting.

From the foregoing quote, and a sentence in the 1826 poem,

They met again, too often for his peace;
Her image became twined into his being,

it can be inferred that they saw each other quite often during those months; Hamilton will have visited Summerhill regularly because he and his sisters befriended the family, and he clearly felt at home there. They apparently also regularly met in

son, Thomas, had graduated in 1819; Robert Anthony, the fourth son, graduated in the autumn of 1823, a few months after Hamilton had entered; Lambert, the eighth and youngest son, entered Trinity College in 1825. [Alumni Dubl., 231] Because Hamilton entered in the summer of 1823 and graduated in 1827, his ‘fellow-students’ were Robert Anthony, Edward Ogle, Henry Purdon, James and Lambert.

36 [Hankins 1980, 37-38]. The parts of the poem ‘The Enthusiast’ are given here in the form in which they were published in the Dublin Literary Gazette, and National Magazine, September 1830, 276-277. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=chi.17194895. See also [Graves 1882, 183-185].

37 See p. 83.

38 See p. 46.
Dublin; Graves continued his introduction of Catherine, “When they met in Dublin, the young people on both sides – for [Hamilton’s] three elder sisters were then in town – formed a literary society which brought into full mutual communication their thoughts, their tastes, and their feelings.” 39 It all sounds very happy, they were a privileged group of youngsters. And that contributes to the idea that Catherine had an overall happy childhood; in a poem written in 1830, Hamilton mentioned that she had loved the home of her youth. 40

But they did not tell each other how they felt; in the poem Hamilton also wrote,

He had not talked of love – his happiest hours
Were those he spent with her, yet then his words
Were only such respectful tenderness,
As if he were addressing a dear sister –
And she thought of him but as of a brother.

2.5 Fraternal love for a rare but fading beauty

In one of his letters to De Vvere of 1855 Hamilton mentioned that it was “almost curious” to him “‘to recall how ‘platonic’, how sexless, or at least how perfectly fraternal’ his love to [Catherine] was; it began “by a sudden burst of boyish admiration for a rare, but fading beauty.”” 41 This platonic and fraternal picture is in perfect correspondence with the above given lines from the 1826 poem, although without Hamilton’s letter it would hardly have been guessed that the poem could be taken so literally. Also striking is the remark about Catherine’s ‘fading beauty’ which perfectly fits the assumption that she was born in 1800; at that time just having turned nineteen Hamilton was still a boy, while Catherine was twenty-three or twenty-four already, substantially older in the eyes of a teenager.

It is not at all certain however that also Catherine’s feelings were so platonic. Described as having been pious and timid, as a woman in her times she probably did not have much freedom to show her feelings, especially because she was not certain about those of Hamilton. In any case, Hamilton did not know about her love for him as can be seen from his poems; he had written in his 1826 poem that “she thought of him but as of a brother,” in a poem composed shortly after her marriage that he wished her “richest bliss, unmixed and long,” and in an 1830 poem that her marriage had “not to her brought perfect happiness,” something he apparently had expected. 42

39 [Graves 1882, 160]. Grace was twenty-two then, Eliza seventeen, and Sydney fourteen. Catherine’s elder sister Anne Eliza Disney became very close to Eliza Hamilton, who seems to have known how Catherine felt about her brother. Hamilton “did confide in Eliza,” but she was “prevented by the instinctive and right reserve of her sex” from ever relaying back any information about Catherine’s feelings.” [Hankins 1980, 38]. What her motives were can only be guessed, but people then were generally very secretive about anything that had to do with love and marriage. Still, it can be wondered what would have happened if she would have told Hamilton that Catherine also loved him. Their literary society was called the ‘Stanley Society’, and Graves continues, “To give stated expression to these, and so furnish material for regular discussions, they set on writing of essays, called the Stanley Papers, one of which was to be supplied in turn by the members to a weekly meeting, at breakfast.” But the writing of the papers only commenced in June 1826 [Graves 1882, 211], and by that time Catherine was not a member any more because she married in May 1825.

40 [Graves 1882, 361]
41 [Ishikura 2008, 68]
42 For the poem written shortly after her marriage see p. 45, for the 1830 poem see p. 51.
A portrait of Catherine Disney

Figure 2.3: According to Trinity College Dublin Library this portrait is “attributed as being Catherine Disney. It is quite faded and bad quality so it is difficult to ascertain whether it is Disney in the portrait.” Shown here in an adapted form, it is certainly possible that this is Catherine; Hamilton’s lines about her “locks of gold, and soft blue eyes, and cheeks All rich with artless smiles and natural bloom” seem to be easily recognizable. The picture has been darkened and given more contrast, and because a part of the drawing, containing Catherine’s nose, the right side of her mouth and her right cheek, was damaged, this part has been adjusted while keeping as much as possible like the original and trying not to be overly specific. For her nose her son James’ image, see p. 95, has been used as an example, and the iris of her right eye, which looked quite strange, was slightly lowered, unexpectedly easily making her face more symmetrical. This drawing apparently having been in Hamilton’s possession it is either an 1854 copy of a miniature portrait he had borrowed from Thomas Disney to have it copied in Dublin, or a portrait he received from Louisa Disney in 1861. Courtesy of The Board of Trinity College Dublin.
Chapter 3

A shattered life

3.1 Happy youngsters and parental worries

Considering Thomas Disney’s focus on money and status, he will have seen with displeasure what happened with his daughter. She was in her mid-twenties while Hamilton was very young and still needed some years to finish his studies. But what was probably worse was that it was not at all certain that he would use his enormous intellect to gain a strong and well-paid position.

Hamilton’s parents had died already when Catherine and Hamilton met, but realizing that her father was a real estate agent and Hamilton’s father had been a solicitor, and that many people of the Dublin higher classes seem to have known each other, it can easily be assumed that Thomas Disney had also known Archibald Hamilton. And that may have had as a consequence, Archibald Hamilton not having handled his “money concerns” very well,\(^1\) that Thomas Disney did not hold him in very high regard,\(^2\) even though after his bankruptcy in 1807 Archibald Hamilton had been able to regain his social status. A further aggravating circumstance will have been that only some months before his death in 1819 Archibald Hamilton had married a widow who already had a son. She was pregnant when her new husband died, and therefore his money had to be divided between his wife and the seven children.

In September 1824, just two weeks after he had been introduced to the Disneys, Hamilton had dined with in any case Thomas Disney and Lambert,\(^3\) and by January 1825 Catherine’s parents had learned to know him well. On the 11\(^{th}\) of January, while staying with Cousin Arthur,\(^4\) Hamilton wrote a letter to uncle James in which he described how close he was becoming to the Disney siblings, and that several times already he had dined with some of them in town. He then wrote about their parents, “Mr. and Mrs. Disney have shown a desire to cultivate our society. Mr. Disney called

---

\(^1\) Archibald Hamilton made such a remark in an 1814 letter to his wife, [Graves 1882, 44].

\(^2\) Although before and after his bankruptcy, see p. 25, Archibald Hamilton was certainly not poor as can be seen from what was publicly sold at the time of the bankruptcy, he also was not rich.

\(^3\) See p. 21.

\(^4\) Hamilton mainly lived with his uncle James in Trim, but studying in Dublin he stayed with Arthur Hamilton, Cousin Arthur, as Hamilton called him, was a barrister, and a cousin of Hamilton’s father and uncle James. After the death of their parents Hamilton and his sisters often saw each other at his house; he seems to have been a father figure to them.
on Cousin Arthur, and Mrs. Disney has paid us a still more welcome and delicate attention, by making a visit to my sisters, who are now with me. These visits were preparatory to an invitation for Monday the 3rd, which included us all. I accepted it: Cousin Arthur was engaged at Court till eleven that night, and Grace, Eliza, and Sydney were [at the house of a maternal relative].

Which means that on the 3rd of January Hamilton had dined with the Disneys without the other members of his family even though the Disneys had taken much trouble for them; it may have contributed to an image of the Hamiltons as a scattered family.

It is not known how often Hamilton dined with the Disneys but, as mentioned, he did so in any case in September 1824 and early in January 1825. During these dinners, having been young and enthusiastic, Hamilton probably did not hide his love for science which, as clearly appears from his biographies, he intended to pursue if necessary at the cost of a luxurious life. He was indeed very willing to make sacrifices for science; when only a few years later he was given a choice to become a Fellow, with prospects of a substantially higher income, he rejected it because “so decidedly did I prefer the Observatory to Fellowship in point of liking, that I would have accepted it if it had been offered to me without any money at all.” But even if Hamilton had not been so explicit, Thomas Disney will soon have found out that, like his father, Hamilton did not value money very highly, and that will have done Hamilton’s case not much good. Thomas Disney must have dreaded the idea of his daughter having to endure a public sale of her family’s possessions, or perhaps of a family he would have to support financially in order to avoid a public humiliation.

In the meantime Catherine was very happy. She loved her family and her home, she loved playing the harp, and she loved the company of that very promising boy, even when he was a bit young for her. Sometimes, on dark winter evenings when they all sat around the fire and she played, she gently glanced at his face and saw that he was intensely focused yet without looking at her, but when she started to sing he could not help himself and hung over her in a silent trance of pleasure. She then tried even harder to captivate him as long as she could, wishing that these intense feelings would never stop again.

And she started to dream about how that would be, that she would be the wife of such an affectionate man, that she would be able to enjoy his never ending enthusiasm and the wonderful combination of his genius and humble kindness, and that they would grow old together peacefully.

---

5 [Graves 1882, 173]. After the deaths of their parents their youngest sister Archianna, who then was only ten years old, seems to have lived with relatives on a more permanent basis than her three elder sisters.

6 [Graves 1882, 241]

7 In 1819 Archibald Hamilton wrote to a friend, “I need not urge on you to attend to your son. I am sure you and [your wife] will unite in every step that is proper for securing to him the best education and the best advantages; still recollect, you cannot do so too soon or too early; William is a proof of the great advantage of early attention [. . .]. No property in money is equal to such advantages, or can compensate for their neglect.” [Graves 1882, 64]. Of course, also for Thomas Disney very good education for his sons was important, but Archibald Hamilton’s preference of education over money will have been, to say the least, not entirely equal to Thomas Disney’s idea of how to gain a secured future.

8 See p. 51. Marrying a younger man was not too unusual; her sister Anne Eliza would marry a man who was eight years younger than she was.

9 This image is taken from the poem ‘The Enthusiast’. [Van Weerden 2017, 62-64].

3.1.1 Screening the Hamiltons

Hamilton saw the attention of Catherine’s parents as very friendly, yet they may have had a quite different motive. A plausible scenario for what happened may be that, having noticed that their daughter had fallen in love with Hamilton, the Disneys were screening him and his family in order to come to a decision about their daughter’s future. Thomas Disney probably made up his mind months ago already, but Anne Disney apparently knew that Catherine was in love and wanted her daughter to be happy;¹¹ she may have argued with her husband to give Hamilton a last chance by investigating the soundness and supportive powers of his family.

Used to being very close as a family themselves as can be seen from Hamilton’s poem and Lambert Disney’s home sickness,¹² after having learned to know Hamilton’s family better the Disneys knew that it was a warm one, but also as scattered as they had suspected. Uncle James was not poor but certainly also not rich,¹³ and knowing about his very unconventional education methods which probably worked in Hamilton’s case but not in Lambert’s, they may have concluded that the most stable family member was Cousin Arthur. That in itself will have been slightly reassuring; as an unmarried barrister he would be able to guide Hamilton in his money business.

But then there were the Hamilton sisters, who should be able to support themselves and not become dependent on Hamilton. If they would marry financially stable men that would be no problem, but during her visit to them Mrs. Disney will have seen that there was a good chance that they would not marry at all.¹⁴ They now lived at various places with relatives, and if they would indeed remain unmarried there would always be the risk that after the deaths of the elder family members Hamilton would have to provide for them. Thomas Disney had already been worried about his own three unmarried daughters;¹⁵ having even more unmarried women in the family will not have been a particularly positive prospect.

3.2 An elder suitor

Also the reverend William Barlow seems to have been a regular guest of the Disneys. The “elder Disneys had long contemplated” a marriage for Catherine with Barlow,¹⁶ who appeared to be a very good choice overall. In those days marriages were regarded as sacramental, and they usually were more contract-like than bonds of love.

¹¹ As can be inferred from the way she spoke with Hamilton, see p. 39.
¹² See p. 27, p. 21.
¹³ [Graves 1885, 406].
¹⁴ Hamilton’s four sisters did not marry, and Grace, Sydney and Eliza lived at Dunsink Observatory with their brother from 1827 until his marriage in 1833. Thereafter they became frequent visitors. [Van Weerden 2017, 162].
¹⁵ See p. 20.
¹⁶ [Hankins 1980, 39]. In August 1861 Hamilton wrote to Catherine’s sister Louisa, who “had become fascinated by their story,” about an evening when they all sat around the fire and listened to Catherine play the harp, “alas, there was another person in the room, whose presence or absence seemed then to me a matter of supreme indifference.” [Hankins 1980, 358, 405 note 70]. It is not known who exactly the ‘elder Disneys’ were, yet it is hardly conceivable that amongst them were members of the Stanley Society, see footnote 39 on p. 28, since that would imply very untrustworthy people. It may therefore have indicated the Disneys older than Anne Eliza: Catherine’s parents, their eldest daughter Jane and her husband John Barlow, and their eldest son Brabazon.
Already betrothals could hardly be broken once a proposal had been accepted, although women had slightly more room for further considerations than men had, but especially to women divorces were hardly ever granted. It meant that parents had to be very cautious to whom they promised their daughters; suitors had to be of good reputation and able to provide for them.

Born in 1792 Barlow was thirty-two, he was incumbent of Clonturk, now Drumcondra, and he had good prospects of a further career in the Church of Ireland. His family belonged to the higher classes of Ireland, also in that regard making the choice for this marriage a good one; his father James Barlow was a solicitor in Dublin, his brother John would become Director and Governor of the Bank of Ireland, and his brother Maurice a General.

Further aggravating parent’s choices for male marriage partners was that at the altar women had to pledge obedience to their husbands. The families their daughters married into should therefore not only be trustworthy financially, but also personally. Marrying within the own extended family was a way to feel confident about the characters of the partners; in 1829 Catherine’s sister Anne Eliza married her first cousin John James Disney, and in 1841 her brother Robert Anthony married his first cousin Caroline Disney.

Also siblings of one family marrying siblings of another after a good marriage was common. In 1813 Catherine’s eldest sister Jane had married Barlow’s elder brother John, and their marriage apparently was both a happy and a financially very stable one. Therefore, marrying Catherine to Barlow seemed to assure her of a prosperous future, and it may even be assumed that, next to his focus on money and status, in making these plans for Catherine also the warm side of Thomas Disney’s fatherly love had played a role.

This marriage being a good choice equally held from Barlow’s point of view; he had found in his sister-in-law a lovely and beautiful woman, who came from a wealthy family of which members were important clergymen, and being pious and timid she was exceptionally well fitted to become a reverend’s wife. But Barlow’s incumbency did not come with a glebe or a glebe house, and he will have been looking for a better position. The Disneys apparently were prepared to wait for him and there thus did not seem to be a problem; with all his good prospects and the support of his family-in-law, for Barlow the future had been full of promises.

But then, on that very unfortunate summer evening, Hamilton walked into their lives, and Barlow soon started to notice that Catherine was falling in love with the boy. It made him feel uneasy; for him it meant that, while he was working hard to give her a home, in came a youngster, barely nineteen years old, who cheerfully and

---

17 [Van Weerden 2017, 156]
18 See Pedigree No. 10, Barlow of Dublin, Ireland. Supplied by Mr. Disney Barlow, of Loughborough. This pedigree can be found between pages 32 and 33 of Barlow, M. (ca 1932), Barlow Family records. [London]: s.n.. archive.org/details/barlowfamilyreco00barl.
19 An indirect reason to assume that it had been a happy marriage is the description by Katharine Tynan of their daughter Mary Louisa Barlow as a warm and strong woman, see p. 116, p. 117. That it was financially stable can be derived from their apparently large heritage, see the caption of figure 7.1 on p. 78.
20 See p. 47 of Erck, J.C. (1820), The Ecclesiastical Register. Dublin: Printed by J.J. Nolan. books.google.com/books?id=CjpMAAAAYAAJ. Barlow was incumbent of the parish of Clonturk from 1816 until 1826, see p. 183 of Ball, F.E.(1920), Southern Fingal : being the sixth part of A History of County Dublin. Dublin: At the University Press. archive.org/details/historyofcountyd06ball.
unknowingly was on the verge of destroying all his dreams. Who had no living parents and no family money, who had not even graduated yet, who just was surrounded by promises of a brilliant future and by a bunch of unmarried sisters. Barlow decided that he was not prepared to give up his dreams of a life with this woman, something which does not show him as a very kind or respectful man but which is, regarding him and his motives in the light of those times in which many men saw their wives as property, also not completely unintelligible; Barlow felt that he had every right to Catherine, he owed that ‘mere boy’ nothing.21

Looking very happy, as Hamilton later described it even “radiant with delight,” Catherine clearly had no idea what her family was up to,22 nor that they had given Hamilton a last chance by screening him. The screening obviously did not have a good outcome, and the Disneys will therefore again have been prepared to wait, as they had been before they learned to know Hamilton, for Barlow to gain a position which would come with a house for his new family. Postponing this marriage was still not a problem because in those times women generally did not marry very young, and Catherine being in her twenties was not a reason to hurry.

What no one seems to have taken into account however was the depth of Catherine’s love for Hamilton. Before Hamilton walked in, she might happily have accepted her family’s choice, as was customary in those days. But that changed dramatically in that August month, making meeting Hamilton a very unfortunate event indeed.

3.3 A Valentine poem

Still completely unaware of what was happening Hamilton was very much in love; he ended the letter to uncle James of the 11th of January23 writing, “It is absolutely necessary that I should no longer defer speaking of Miss Disney. Beautiful as she is, the stranger only can observe her beauty; her mind and her heart, with those who know her, are the objects which engage their attention and secure their love.” And on the 14th of February he wrote her a poem.24

To Miss C. D.

A VALENTINE ODE.

Look how returning Valentine
Woos timid spring again to shine!

---

21 See p. 39. Barlow’s motives are unknown, what is described here are interpretations.
22 See p. 51. The reason to assume that Catherine did not know about the marriage plans is that the first time Hamilton saw sorrow in her eyes was in 1830, see p. 51. If she had known about the plans while falling in love with Hamilton she would have felt anguish, and he would have noticed that. The fact that he did not, that he wrote in the 1826 poem that she had seen him as a brother, and that in a farewell poem written in 1825, see p. 45, he even assumed that she was happy to get married, certainly allows for the scenario adopted here, in which the decision to force Catherine into marriage was very quickly made, see p. 38.
23 See p. 31.
24 [Graves 1882, 173-176]. It is not certain that Hamilton sent this poem to Catherine, but Graves did mention about the poem ‘A Farewell’, see p. 45, that Hamilton had written but not sent it, and about this poem he made no such comment. Moreover, Hamilton was in the habit of sending his poems to very many people, even if the poems were emotionally quite explicit. It thus will be assumed here that he did send his poem to Catherine.
Flowerless is the mossy hill;  
The garden glories slumber still:  
Yet shall Spring yield her tribute gem,  
Catharine! to thy diadem.  
See, to braid thy golden hair,  
Starts the virgin snow-drop fair;  
And the modest violet’s hue  
Emulates thine eyes’ soft blue!  
O if I the wreath might twine,  
O if I might call thee mine,  
Life should be one undying Spring,  
Scattering flow’rets from his wing!

Forgive me, that on bliss so high  
Lingers thrilling phantasie:  
That the one Image, dear and bright,  
Feeds thoughts by day, and dreams by night:  
That Hope presumes to mingle thee  
With visions of my destiny!

Hast thou not seen the summer Sun  
Rise, his rejoicing race to run;  
Ardour and light around him throwing,  
In all his morning promise glowing:  
As if no cloud could overcast  
His lustre ere the morn be past?  
Perchance it may be mine to soar
Higher than mortal e’er before:  
Climb the meridian steeps of fame,  
And leave an everlasting name.  
Perchance it may be mine to span  
Whate’er man most admires in man:  
The awful glories of the Sage,  
And the diviner Poet’s rage!
If such my lot. ... O then how sweet  
To lay my triumphs at thy feet:  
Recall the days of chivalry;  
And hope the crowning meed from thee!  
Yet, should those hopes, which brightly play  
Now round my path, all pass away;  
And o’er my tempest-darkened soul  
The cold world’s billows wildly roll:  
Then, trust me, Kate! some joy ‘twould bring,  
Blunt even misfortune’s sharpest sting,  
To think I had not cast o’er thee  
The shadow of my misery.

When first I saw thee, Kate! my gaze  
Was fixt in rapturous amaze:  
I had not thought on earth to find  
So much of loveliness combined.  
In fairy-land awhile I seemed to be –
But 'twas a bright reality!
The hallowed memory of that day
From me shall never, never pass away!
How felt my soul subdued, refined,
By the soft music of thy mind:
In lines how deep thy beauty pressed
Its image on my inmost breast!
O the unutterable power
Which dwelt in that, Love's natal hour:
The chords of finest feeling then
Awakened, ne'er to sleep again!

Still shall that form the beacon be
To guide my bark o'er Honour's sea.
But I will love it as I love a star,
In its high sphere, so radiant and so far!
For could I speak the spell
Which (Arab legends tell)
The Genii fraught with mystic art
To fascinate the unconscious heart:
Its magic potency
Should not be tried on thee!

I could not bear that Kate should prove
The anxious hours of untold love;
I would not that her gentle spirit
Should aught of care or grief inherit:
Or dim those eyes with secret tears
Of hope deferred, through lingering years.

No! be life's bitterness to thee unknown,
And may thy cup be full with bliss alone!
In purity and beauty shining,
With happiness around thee twining,
Earth smile upon thee, like a younger Heaven,
And be this daring lay forgotten – or forgiven!

February 14, 1825.

Introducing the poem, Graves writes, “The Valentine verses [...] disclose with ingenious openness the lofty aspirations of the student, the dazzled admiration of the lover, and the bitter pangs inflicted on him by the thought that the circumstances of his position afforded no footing for his hopes; for it is to be remembered that when he wrote them, the Fellowship, which was the object of his ambition, was clogged with the obligation of celibacy.” 25

Theoretically Graves was right, Fellows were not allowed to marry. Yet considering that Hamilton was only nineteen and therefore perhaps not yet too impressed by the old rule of celibacy, or even already confident that also without a Fellowship he could “climb the meridian steeps of fame,” the poem can be read very differently. The

25 [Graves 1882, 169]. In 1840 the celibacy statute was repealed, when Franc Sadleir was provost of TCD. [Graves 1885, 422], tcd.ie/provost/history/former-provosts/f_sadleir.php.
lines in which Hamilton reflects on what could happen if he would not become as famous as he expected might indicate indeed that he would then be happy not to have asked her to marry him, yet it is also possible that he felt that he would be so happy with her at his side that he would be able not to cast his shadows over her life and even feel joy for succeeding therein; after all, he was young and full of hope. The stanza in which he contemplates to love her as he would love a star is another one which might have been prompted by the rule of celibacy, but he may as easily have alluded to his assumption that she thought of him but as of a brother; his assurance that he would never use tricks to win her over seems to serve as comfort for her if she indeed was not in love with him. Lastly, the fact that he did contemplate using a spell in the first place is again not in line with being certain that he would never marry.

Catherine must have been very happy with the poem; now she knew that Hamilton also loved her and, whether or not that was possible, wanted to spend his life with her. But seeing her become so happy the family must have been in shock; even if they did not read the poem themselves and she did not speak openly about it, from her happiness they will have been able to guess that in the poem Hamilton declared his love for her. Knowing Hamilton well by now and having screened his family, they realized that he would do anything for science but also for love, and that if necessary he would indeed give up his chances to become a Fellow. That being married to Catherine he thus would become a very happy, very laborious, very famous, but also very poor mathematician, who in times of need would not be supported by a rich and stable family.

What then followed makes the last but one stanza of Hamilton’s poem even more remarkable. Written while contemplating the effect of a spell and realizing that she then would not marry him out of love, which could mean that, especially if she was in love with someone else, she would become very unhappy once the spell would be broken, up to coercion instead of a spell he precisely described her future life. If Catherine indeed read this poem, the comparison between Hamilton’s thoughtful contemplations about her feelings and the demands of her husband who was obviously less sensitive to them, will have made her life even more difficult.

3.4 A hastened marriage agreement

Now knowing that Hamilton also loved Catherine, the Valentine poem may have been the trigger for Barlow to come into action. When he made his move Thomas Disney will not have hesitated for a moment. The first thing they had to do was to take care that Catherine would not react to the poem and make sure that Hamilton would not know about her love for him; the romantic youngster he was he might try to elope with her.

From a letter Hamilton wrote to Peter Guthrie Tait in 1858 it is known that the Disneys came to their decision in February, and from Graves that Hamilton “learned quite unexpectedly from the lips of her mother that the lovely object of his passionate admiration was claimed as bride by an elder suitor, and that her marriage would shortly take place.”

---

26 It also possible that Catherine did not read the poem because the family intercepted Hamilton’s letter, but that would not change Catherine’s having fallen in love nor the family’s shock.

27 [Graves 1885, 610], [Graves 1882, 182]
To prevent Hamilton from seeing Catherine again Mrs. Disney will have visited him in Dublin or in Trim to tell him.\textsuperscript{28} She seems to have felt very sorry for them; Hamilton wrote in one of the letters to De Vere of 1855, after Catherine’s death and then knowing everything, that he “heard that she was engaged, from her mother, whose anguish of manner, whether arising from compassion for me, whose love she no doubt divined, or through pity for her daughter, [...] I never can forget.”\textsuperscript{29}

For Catherine her family’s decision must have come as a thunder stroke. Having been happy and full of expectations, and apparently trusting her beloved family, she was rudely shaken out of her daydreams about a future at Hamilton’s side, and her sheltered life was shattered to pieces. In the 1855 letter to De Vere Hamilton wrote, as paraphrased by Hankins, “Catherine pleaded desperately against the marriage, [...] but her father had an “iron will” and Barlow was too proud to let his prize be taken by a “mere boy.” [...] Catherine’s relatives told her it would be a sin to break the marriage agreement. The family’s honor was mentioned and she was “led as a victim to the altar.””\textsuperscript{30}

But what in the long term weighed most heavily on her conscience was that, because she did not see Hamilton any more, she could not explain to him what had happened. That she had not been deceiving him by reacting so lovingly to his attentions, that she had not known about this marriage herself. She became afraid that if he would feel betrayed by her he would think unkindly of her, and she started to have feelings of guilt about what they had done to Hamilton, who had still been so young and so full of life and spirits. Of course, it was not her fault that her family had forced her, but she had given him hope by looking at him as if she had already promised to marry him, even though she knew that as a pious Christian woman she had to wait for a man to propose, and until her family would allow such a marriage. Her feelings of guilt towards Hamilton became a heavy burden.\textsuperscript{31}

### 3.4.1 Suicide as a sin or as an act of madness

In the 1858 letter to Tait, Hamilton described his deep despair after having been told about Catherine’s betrothal. “Perhaps it may be because we are as yet so slightly acquainted with each other, that I am willing to confess to you on this occasion of the melancholy event which you report,\textsuperscript{32} that I have, once in my life, experienced, in all but its last fatal force, the suicidal impulse. It was (as I full well remember) in the month of February, 1825, ... and (curious coincidence) when I was on my way from Dublin to this very Observatory:\textsuperscript{33} for Dr. Brinkley had invited me to join a dinner

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{28} Even though several Disney siblings were his friends, before Catherine’s marriage Hamilton apparently did not visit Summerhill any more. That can be derived from the fact that he did not see her distress then; he assumed that Catherine was happy to get married, and the first time he saw her unhappiness was in 1830, see p. 51, see also footnote 22 on p. 35. He would visit Summerhill again at least once, but that was in the summer of 1825, after Catherine had moved out, see p. 46.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} [Hankins 1980, 39], [Van Weerden 2017, 303]
  \item \textsuperscript{30} [Hankins 1980, 39]
  \item \textsuperscript{31} For Hamilton having been full of life and spirits see footnote 27 on p. 51, for indications of Catherine’s feelings of guilt see for instance p. 52 and p. 83.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} That may have had to do with Tait having lost a very close friend, William John Steele, some years earlier, see [Van Weerden 2017, 56 fn. 14].
  \item \textsuperscript{33} The Royal Astronomer of Ireland lived at Dunsink Observatory. Before Hamilton succeeded him in 1827, Brinkley thus lived there.
\end{itemize}
party here. The grief, which had then recently and suddenly fallen upon me was one which I feel even yet. ... I remember – and have many hundreds of times passed the exact spot, where I thought for a moment of plunging, for death, into the water. I wish that I could add that it was religion ... which protected me. My recollection has always been that it was simply a feeling of personal courage, which revolted against the imagined act, as one of cowardice. I would not leave my post; I felt that I had something to do.” 34

From these sentences it is evident that however important and impressive that moment was for Hamilton, he was not suicidal; he did not contemplate suicide for a longer period of time, nor had he lost his hopes for his entire future, he thought of it for a moment yet immediately felt important enough not to do it. He then still was a youngster, and having been so much praised as he already was he had an enormous inner confidence; his most difficult task was how to stay humble, something he worked on all his life. 35 But because of his enormous self-confidence 36 he also seems to have found it difficult to understand why someone else would not want to live, and he consequently saw really committing suicide as an act of cowardice. Or, as he would see it many years later in Catherine’s case, as an act of madness. 37

It is not known exactly how anxious her suicide attempt in 1848 made him; he seems to have been very angry with Barlow, 38 yet in 1855 he wrote to De Vere that, having corresponded with Catherine from mid-July until the end of August 1848, his “agitation” after Catherine’s last letter “was extreme,” but not that that had again been the case after her suicide attempt in October. 39 As can be read in his letters, given by Graves in his biography, Hamilton was a very religious man who regarded matrimony as holy, and he will have seen suicide as a sin. He was strict enough not to make an exception for Catherine’s very unhappy marriage, 40 and therefore probably also not for her suicide attempt. That might perhaps be attributed to his inability, as a Victorian higher class male, to understand what it is for someone not to have control over one’s own life, something he always more or less did have. But it does not at all mean that he was not empathetic; every time he heard that Catherine was even more unhappy then he already knew he became distressed again. He had wished her all the happiness in the world, even when married to someone else.

34 [Graves 1885, 610]
35 [Van Weerden 2017, 65]
36 [Van Weerden 2017, 59]
37 See p. 73.
38 [Van Weerden 2017, 289]
39 For the six-week correspondence see p. 68. Graves would have withheld such information, but the fact that also Hankins did not mention a renewed agitation suggests that Hamilton really reacted differently to Catherine’s suicide attempt than to her letters.
40 It is not known whether that would also have held for a forced marriage; Hamilton only learned about the coercion shortly before Catherine died.
Part II

Catherine’s married life

Catherine married in May 1825. As was mentioned in the Introduction, thereafter Catherine and Hamilton met again only a few times. When in 1830 Hamilton was staying at Armagh Observatory, he visited Catherine and she made a return visit, she visited Hamilton at Dunsink Observatory in 1845, they corresponded for almost six weeks in 1848, and Hamilton visited her twice in October 1853.

The first time Hamilton saw Catherine’s unhappiness was during his 1830 visit. It is surmised here that after her return visit Catherine’s marriage became worse because Barlow did not allow her to have further contact with Hamilton. Of the 1845 visit not much is known, but a possible scenario is given. It was, most likely, during the 1848 correspondence that Hamilton learned that Catherine’s marriage had been unhappy from the start. After they ended the correspondence, Catherine confessed to Barlow that she had contacted Hamilton and that was in fact the end of the marriage; she tried to commit suicide some weeks later.

Having survived the attempt which left her physically weakened, Catherine apparently did not live with Barlow any more, she lived with family instead. In October 1853, only shortly before her death, she invited Hamilton. They talked with each other twice, and during these interviews she could finally explain to him that she had been coerced into the marriage, and that she had also loved him.

Part of the aim of this sketch is to visualize what happened to Catherine and how unhappy she was, therewith underpinning the assertion that Hamilton’s periodic distress about her had nothing to do with his own marriage. To allow for such visualizations, just as in the first part of this sketch thoughts and feelings have been ascribed to Catherine which are not based on sources; such sources do not seem to exist. Yet, again everything described here has strictly been kept within the boundaries of what is known about her.
Chapter 4

A clergyman’s wife

Apart from what Hamilton wrote about Catherine, not much is known about her. To give, nevertheless, an impression of her life, in the next chapters it has been tried to describe it from her point of view, within the boundaries of what is publicly known. The description is not without hiatuses and inaccuracies however. For a more complete picture of Catherine’s private life Hamilton’s letters in Trinity College Library could be read again, searching for details which until now were perhaps deemed to be too personal, or not interesting enough to publish. To give a more accurate description of Catherine’s life also a good knowledge of the lives of clergymen’s wives in the Regency and early Victorian era would be needed. In the following chapters, therefore, only what is mentioned to come from original sources should be taken literally.

4.1 A forced signature

Catherine Disney and William Barlow were married on the 5th of May 1825. The marriage announcement in Saunders’s News-Letter reads, “Marriages. On the 5th inst. the Rev. William Barlow, second son of James Barlow, Esq. of North Great George’s street, to Catherine, daughter of Thomas Disney, Esq. of Westland-row.”¹ They were married by James Jones, Rector of Urney, and witnesses were Thomas Disney junior, one of Catherine’s brothers, and James Barlow junior, one of William’s brothers. And as seen from his signature compared with his handwriting, the marriage record was written by Barlow.²

Both James Jones’ and Catherine’s signatures are very shaky. It is not known why James Jones’ hand seems to have trembled, he may have guessed a lot by watching them. But knowing how Catherine must have felt that day, her apparently also tear-stained signature seems to be a heartbreaking token of how terribly unhappy she was.

¹ Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Barlow Westland-row, years: 1825-1825. Inst. is the abbreviation of instant, the day of the current month.
² See figure 4.2 on p. 46.
Catherine had searched for Hamilton in the crowd attending the wedding, but she could not find him. She soon realized that he would not come, that he would not be able to bear seeing her with Barlow, and in her wedding dress. Her heart sank even further; now he would not see how much she had cried the weeks before the wedding, and know that she had not betrayed him during those very happy months. She felt responsible and very guilty towards him even though she had not wanted this marriage; if she had not looked at him so lovingly, he would not have been so hurt. What had they done to this wonderful and lovely boy. She could only wish that he would recover soon and find someone for himself.

Figure 4.1: In this church record it can be seen that William Barlow was from the parish of St. George, which was then Clonturk, now Drumcondra. Catherine’s parish was St. Mark’s, the parish in which the marriage took place, and which entails Westland-row. Irish Genealogy.ie: Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/pdf.jsp?churchrecords/display-pdf Name=d-30-1-3-123.

Barlow will have been full of hope about his future with Catherine. She was beautiful and pious, natural and timid, and he had gained her parent’s consent. She was looking a bit tired now but that would certainly soon pass; he deeply felt that God would be on their side. He firmly resolved to be a very good husband, and fully compensate her for not loving him by giving her a financially very stable life, granting her as much freedom as he could bear, and by giving her any material goods she would like to have. And if he tried hard enough Catherine would eventually completely submit to the sacrament of matrimony which prescribed that her mind and body now belonged to him, and start to love him as she should.

---

3 See the poem ‘A Farewell’ on p. 45.
4 Shortly before the start of the Victorian era weddings were mostly private, not the large events they often are now, see [Van Weerden 2017, 160 fn. 4]. Yet Hamilton mentioned a ‘festal throng’, see p. 45; if only the families attended there would have been a crowd already, see the Appendix on p. 129, and if also Hamilton had been invited, it may have been a much larger wedding.
5 As Hamilton had described her in his poem, see p. 27.
6 Which, according to Hamilton in later letters, he did, see p. 50.
7 Because women were often seen as property, and had to vow obedience to their husbands before God, very pious women could only hope to marry a loving or at least considerate husband.
But as seen from Catherine’s point of view, even if once she would have accepted Barlow’s intentions and probably even have been happy with them, having fallen in love with Hamilton she now was forced into this marriage, and that had changed everything. To be owned by Barlow for the rest of her life was a truly horrific notion, completely explaining her shaky signature in the marriage record; she will have realized all too well that from that night on she would have to do her duties as a wife and produce children.

Hamilton had indeed not attended the wedding; he could not. Still assuming that Catherine had married happily, on the 13th of May, about a week after the wedding, he wrote a poem in which he described his feelings.

**A Farewell**

I could not see thee on thy bridal day,
I could not mingle with the festal throng;
Though not perchance less fervently than they
I wished thee richest bliss, unmixed and long –
But not at once are quelled those feelings strong,
Which held entire dominion o’er the mind,
Nor high resolve hath power, nor charm of song,
At once the wounded spirit to upbind,
Or do the trace away, that love hath left behind.

To me thou canst not be what thou hast been –
The polar star in Hope’s high firmament –
The fount that made life’s desert pathway green –
The spell that bound me wheresoe’er I went;
The treasure of my musings, the dream blent
With many a rainbow hue of far delight,
O’er which my fancy but too fondly bent; –
The prize my young ambition to invite –
The one dear thought that tinged all else with its own light.

Seldom, how seldom! shall we meet again,
And stranger-like, and part as strangers part;
I shall, perhaps, be quite forgotten then,
And chilled may be this once impassioned heart.
Yet though no more my star of hope thou art –
My spring of loftiest, sweetest fantasy –
Thy cherished image never shall depart,
Still will I wish all joy to wait on thee,
Still pray thy lot on earth a younger heaven may be.

He did not send the poem to her however, and she therefore did not know that he still thought very highly of her, and that he did not feel deceived by her. Although reading about his pain might again have added to her feelings of guilt.

---

8 As can be deduced from her use of the word ‘terror’ in the first parting interview, see p. 84.
9 This poem was published under the ‘pseudonym’ W.R.H. in *The Dublin Literary Gazette, and National Magazine* for August, 1830, p. 149. It is reproduced here in its published form. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=chi.17194895;view=2up;seq=175.
10 [Graves 1882, 182].
11 As is suggested on p. 54.
Four months later, in September 1825, Hamilton stayed with the Disney family for more than two weeks, writing to his sister Eliza on the 6th and the 24th from Summerhill, “I am now, as you will observe by the date, in Summerhill. If you wish to have a more minute description, know that I am in the chamber of the eastern wing upon the north side of the castle, as I conclude from the stars – time midnight, as I learn from the deep tolling of the clock in the tower. A shaded lamp is burning before me; all is quiet now except the audible ticking of my watch; both doors of my room are open, one of which leads to a suite of uninhabited apartments, so long that my light only shows their gloom, through which the beams wander without filling their extent. [...] I have been making a very long visit here, and a very pleasant one. I could talk to you about many of the reasons, difficult yet interesting to analyze, which still make Summerhill to me “like a heart-cherished home on some desolate plain,” but I have neither inclination nor time to write about them.”

From both the poem and the fact that he felt comforted at Summerhill staying with the Disney family it can again be concluded that Hamilton was totally unaware of the fact that the elder Disneys had forced Catherine into marriage. It can only be guessed what would have happened if he had seen her on her wedding day, and would have recognized the anguish in her eyes.

### 4.2 A son and a perpetual curacy

Catherine got pregnant at some time in January 1826, about eight months after the wedding, which might indicate that Barlow tried for a while not to hurry her. Not yet having a house of their own they may have lived with family, and the announcement in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of the birth of their eldest son James William reads, “25 Oct 1826. Births – On the 21st inst., Westland-row, the Lady of the Rev. William Barlow of a son.”

![Baptisms](image)

Figure 4.2: The baptism record of William and Catherine’s first child, James William Barlow. *Irish Genealogy.ie: Church Records*, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-30-1-3-067.

---

12 [Graves 1882, 188-190]. In the photo on p. 23 his room was on the left side of the house.
13 *Genes Reunited: SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: William Barlow, county: Dublin, years: 1826-1826.
During Catherine’s pregnancy Barlow was appointed as a perpetual curate in Eglish, in the diocese of Armagh, and that position did come with a glebe house. He resigned his incumbency in Drumcondra in August 1826, published a Farewell note in September, and thereafter he will have had to prepare their future home in Eglish. James William was privately christened on the 25th of November and registered on the 6th of December, apparently by Barlow himself; comparison of the record with his signature shows that Barlow also wrote the record.

It is not known why James William was born at Westland-row, nor why he was privately baptised. Baptisms were usually done publicly, in church, but children could be baptised in their parent’s house, for instance if there was fear the child would not live. James does not seem to have had a weak health, yet Catherine may have been unwell. Again imagining her life then, she had been expecting a baby from a man she did not love, and she may have felt uncertain whether or not she could love this child. If she had been silently hoping that her baby would not look like his father too much, but feeling bound by her promise at the altar was at the same time trying to reject these thoughts, such inner conflicts may easily have affected her health.

A more practical reason may have been that Barlow was not allowed to baptise his son in church because he was not the incumbent any more. Wanting to baptise his son himself was in itself quite customary; as can be seen in the Glasnevin church records also Robert Disney, Catherine’s uncle, baptised his own children. The Book of Common Prayer ascribes that after a private baptism the child would “be brought into the Church, and be received into the Congregation. If the Minister who receiveth it have not himself baptised the Child he shall examine and try whether the Child be lawfully baptised, or no.” Since it was Barlow himself who did the baptism and it thus was lawful, baptising him privately in Dublin, and later receiving him in Eglish, was probably the most convenient thing to do.

### 4.3 Trying to make a life in Edenderry

In December 1826 or early in 1827 Catherine moved to Eglish, and in September she became pregnant again; their second son, Thomas Disney Barlow, was born on the 15th of June 1828. The birth announcement in the *Dublin Evening Packet and Correspondent* reads, “Births. June 15, Edenderry Glebe, the Lady of the Rev. William Barlow, of a son.”

In the 1837 *Topographical Dictionary* the parish of Eglish is described: it was some seven kilometres north-west from Armagh and had about 5400 inhabitants.
who mainly lived from husbandry and weaving linen cloth. Barlow is mentioned as living in the glebe house which is called “commodious”, and as perpetual curate, he earned £200 per annum. The parish had an “old church” and an apparently also old parish school, which seem to have been at about a kilometre to the west of the glebe house. In 1821 a new church had been built, at about two kilometres south of the old church, and of the glebe house, “a large handsome edifice, having a square tower with pinnacles.” There were various schools, apparently for boys and for girls, and one of them was on the glebe grounds as is also indicated on the map, south-east of the glebe house.

Figure 4.3: The glebe house of Eglish parish was in the townland of Edenderry as can be seen in this historic map on Ask about Ireland : Griffith’s Valuation, askaboutireland.ie/griffith-valuation, Griffith’s Places, Edenderry, Armagh, Map views. The maps of the Griffith’s Valuation have been drawn between 1847 and 1864, therefore after Catherine had moved to Carlingford. Edenderry is the third townland south of Benburb, which can be seen on the modern map at about ten kilometres north-west of Armagh. The road from Benburb which crosses Edenderry from north to south is called Maydown road.

Although the house and the land were beautiful, it is not at all certain that Catherine could see it that way, the quiet of the land may have been difficult for her to enjoy. Perhaps, if her sons attended the school on the glebe grounds, Catherine may have made contact with the children or their teachers and parents or even helped at the school; it is not known how much she valued status and standing. One of Hamilton’s poems seems to indicate that she loved children, therefore, if she did make contact she may have enjoyed it, it would certainly have made her surroundings a bit more lively. Barlow in the meantime seems to have tried hard to make life bearable.

---

18 The Griffith’s Valuation map indeed shows a “School Ho.” and a “Church (in ruins)” at the western border of the townland Eglish, which itself is west of Edenderry.

19 [Lewis 1840, 596, vol 1]. Earning £200 pounds per annum made Barlow certainly financially stable; according to the website MeasuringWorth, measuringworth.com, in 2017 the relative economic status value of that income or wealth in 1837 was £232,500, the economic power value of that income or wealth £797,500.
Figure 4.4: The former glebe house in Edenderry as seen from Maydown road, reproduced from a 2011 Google Maps street view recording.

Figure 4.5: The Holy Trinity Church of the parish of Eglish, near Edenderry at Drumsallan, with its “square tower with pinnacles.” This is also seen from Maydown road, and reproduced from a 2011 Google Maps street view recording.
for her; Hamilton wrote in a later letter that she “had a handsome carriage (which Lady Hamilton never had), and was allowed to receive members of her own family as often (apparently) as she could wish.”

Doubtlessly to Catherine’s happiness, in 1829 her brother Edward Ogle Disney became curate in Tynan, about eight kilometres from the Barlows’ glebe house in Edenderry, and in 1831 he became perpetual curate of Killylea, only some five kilometres away. In 1833 a second brother, James Disney, became curate in Drumcree, about two kilometres north of Portadown, and about twenty-five kilometres from Edenderry; as Hamilton had mentioned, they will have visited each other regularly.

Still, the roles of men and women having been so strictly separated, it can be wondered whether Edward and James recognized Catherine’s unhappiness, and if they did whether they were able to comfort her. Both men were still unmarried, moreover, Barlow had been their brother-in-law since 1813 when their eldest sister Jane had married his brother, at which time Edward had been nine and James only six; they thus already knew and perhaps even had liked Barlow for most of their lives.

4.4 Upsetting visits

In 1827 Hamilton became Royal Astronomer of Ireland, and he therefore moved into Dunsink Observatory. He had frequent contact with Thomas Romney Robinson, the astronomer from Armagh Observatory, and in March 1830 Hamilton stayed with him for some time. While he was in Armagh, Hamilton and Catherine saw each other twice; Hamilton visited her, and she made a return visit. From Graves’ and Hankins’ biographies separately it is difficult to see what exactly happened during Hamilton’s visit to Armagh, but combining them parts could be retraced.

It is not known whether Hamilton had planned the visit beforehand or decided to do so during his stay. He wrote to Cousin Arthur that he had made the visit on the 26th of March 1830, and that the journey had been “rather long for an inexperienced horseman.” It is also not known whether they met each other in Edenderry where Catherine lived, or in Tynan where Edward Ogle lived, but because in either case it was a long ride from Armagh, he will not have made this visit unannounced. And if he expected that it would be difficult to see Catherine being happy as Barlow’s wife, he may have found the presence of Edward, his favourite among the Disney brothers, reassuring.

Also Hamilton’s motives for visiting Catherine are unknown, yet it is remarkable that he thought that he would be able to cope with meeting her; he was apparently coming to terms with his feelings. Because Hamilton still thought that Catherine had married willingly, and he doubtlessly had read the announcements in the papers of the births of her sons, he will have assumed that she had a happy family. He therefore may have wanted to try whether he could bear to befriend the family, which would enable him to visit her every now and then, and make him feel certain that she was

20 [Hankins 1980, 354]. Lady Hamilton used an Arabian for “her own independent excursions.”
21 [Graves 1889, 136, 498]
22 It can easily be assumed that the Disney brothers did like him; Thomas Disney would hardly have insisted on this marriage if his sons would have had a problem with Barlow.
23 See [Van Weerden 2017, 86].
24 See p. 21.
all right. Deciding to visit Catherine can in any case be regarded as a brave plan, and seeing her in happily married circumstances and with her children around her might have eased down the last parts of the feelings of loss he had had since that terrible day in February 1825.

But it all turned out very differently; Catherine was by far not as happy as he had expected, and when Hamilton returned to Armagh Observatory he was very distressed. According to Graves Lady Campbell, who thereafter became a very good friend, recognized Hamilton’s feelings, could “attract his confidence,” and saved him from “giving way to morbid despondency.” 25

That same evening Hamilton wrote a poem from which it can be seen that for him Catherine’s unhappiness was completely unexpected,

We two have met, and in her innocent eyes
A meek and tender sorrow I have seen;
Ah! then, the change which my glad light put out,
And threw a gloom over my once bright way,
Has not to her brought perfect happiness,
Has not been able wholly to repay
Her for the severing of those earlier ties,
The parting from that home she loved so well.

Though more than one fair child, about her knees,
Sports, or puts up his prayers, or fondly gazing
Soothes her to peace and joy; and though a spell,
And witchery is round her, that constrains
Whoever sees her to admire and love;
And though wealth is not wanting, nor the things
The many care for, yet she seems to me
Far, oh how far! less radiant with delight,
Less safe from sadness than when first we met.

[...]

Hamilton may have succeeded in bringing the visit to a good end, but his ride back to Armagh Observatory must have been very difficult. Also Catherine will have felt terrible; it was said about Hamilton that it was generally very easy to read his feelings 26 and therefore, if he could see the sorrow in her eyes, she will certainly have seen the shock in his.

After Hamilton had left Catherine started to worry about him, and she felt very guilty that he had arrived so full of hope and energy 27 but had left in such altered mood. These feelings of guilt were added to the guilt she had felt towards him all along, and that triggered her reaction. She almost immediately decided to make a return visit to the observatory; knowing him very well she realized that if seeing her upset him so much he would not dare to visit her any more, and she therefore had to talk with him before he would return to Dublin. Perhaps, if she could make him believe

---

25 [Graves 1882, 360]
26 [Van Weerden 2017, 40]
27 In 1827 someone said about Hamilton that he was “so full of life and spirits that [...] I believe that for the sake of making a tour among the stars, he would willingly be fastened on to a comet’s tail.” [Graves 1882, 270].
that she was actually happy, he would calm down again. Or even better, if she could
convince him that she would be happier if they would see each other more often, they
might become friends.

Catherine was really very happy to see Hamilton for a second time. He offered to
show her the telescope, and while he was conducting her upstairs to the dome she
almost started to feel familiar with him again, having talked with him during the
wonderful hours of his visit to her and now being so close to him, receiving his undi-
vided attention. It slightly eased her worried feelings, and she cautiously started to
hope that they could have a real friendship. But then, when he tried to explain to her
how the telescope was used, she saw that he was trembling.

Hamilton was very nervous indeed, being alone in the dome with the woman of his
dreams, and so close to her again as he had been five years ago. He wanted to ask her
what had happened, why she was not happy, if Barlow did not treat her well. But he
could not, in those days such questions were unheard of; according to Graves, Ham-
ilton was “forbidden by circumstances to manifest that interest.”

Despite his nervousness Catherine still felt wonderful and she enjoyed his ex-
planations, until he asked her if she wanted to look through the telescope. He had
tried very hard to stay calm, but managing the telescope to make that possible he
broke the wires in the eyepiece. With the wires also the spell of hope was broken. He
was very ashamed and she comforted him, at the same time feeling guilty all over
again; what had they done to this lovely man. Catherine returned home filled with
happiness because she had seen him again, with frustration over the lost moments of
having felt released from some of her feelings of guilt, and with desperation because it
might have been the very last time she had spoken with him.

4.5 A crushing refusal

In the following weeks Catherine started to worry about Hamilton even more, feeling
very badly towards him. That feeling kept haunting her, and became so strong that
she decided that she would ask her husband whether she could write to Hamilton.
She still wanted to explain to him that she had not known about the marriage plans
earlier, that she felt so very sorry for him, and that she would be very happy if they
could keep in contact. To Barlow she wanted to say that he could trust her, that she
certainly was not going to tell Hamilton about the coercion or trouble him with her
unhappiness and things he could not do anything about; she knew very well that as
a married woman she could not say such things. And if a real friendship between her
and Hamilton would be too much for him to bear and he would be afraid that he
would become too jealous, he could perhaps allow her a nice correspondence.

When Barlow came home that evening she watched him carefully. He seemed to
be in a good mood, and she decided to speak with him after the children would have
gone to bed. But singing them to sleep she started to feel very nervous; it suddenly
did not seem to be possible any more to speak with him about all her carefully pre-
pared nuances, they never spoke with each other like that. She went downstairs and

28 [Hankins 1980, 106]. Graves did not mention this visit but Hankins did. Almost three months
after Catherine’s death Hamilton wrote to Thomas Disney Jr. that he had offered to show her the
telescope, and in his agitation had broken the wires in the eyepiece. [Hankins 1980, 450 note 34].
29 [Graves 1882, 361]
then, as if listening to someone else, she heard herself ask bluntly for his permission to write to Hamilton, to “explain that she had not been responsible for his rejection in 1825 and that she wished to keep his friendship.” Barlow refused, leaving Catherine devastated.

![Figure 4.6: Dark clouds above the glebe house, as looked at from across the river Blackwater. Reproduced from a 2011 Google Maps street view recording.](image)

It was perhaps the worst decision he ever made in his life. If he had let her, if he had trusted her, she would finally have been relieved from her incessantly nagging feelings of guilt. That would doubtlessly have made her more happy, and she would perhaps have been thankful that he allowed her to do something he dreaded, which might even have helped her to value his kindness again. And Barlow could also have trusted Hamilton; his reverence for marriage was so absolute that he would never have allowed himself to become the cause of a crisis between a husband and a wife.

But Barlow simply could not trust them. He had seen how full of emotions his wife had been after Hamilton’s visit, he had asked her many times how her visit to Armagh had been but she had not given clear answers, and he was certain that he could see how eager she was to renew her friendship with Hamilton. A boy who still was a threat, being unmarried and apparently not yet in love with someone else.

He started to preach to her, about the position women had in a marriage under God and how she should love him and obey him. Pious as she was, and having vowed obedience to Barlow at the altar, Catherine could not but refrain from contacting Hamilton. She had to live on while bearing the loss of her dream of a friendship with him, the growing distrust of her dominant husband whom she started to dislike, and the ever more heavy burden of her feelings of guilt.

30 [Hankins 1980, 348]
31 According to Hamilton, in 1848 he “preached her into madness, and very nearly into suicide.” [Hankins 1980, 354]. What Barlow actually felt or said is unknown.
4.5.1 Attempts at comfort

Hamilton in the meantime still knew nothing about Catherine’s forced marriage. Believing that Catherine had wanted to marry Barlow, that she perhaps even had loved him, he now assumed that her marriage had not given her what she had expected from it, that it somehow had lost its lustre.\(^\text{32}\) He could not stop worrying about her, and in an attempt to console her he tried to establish a friendship for her with Lady Campbell. He felt that Catherine would greatly benefit from such a friendship because Lady Campbell had been able to recognize his feelings so well, and had comforted him when he had been in agony.

He described his plan to Lady Campbell in April 1830, “You will be to us a connecting link, a bond of sympathy, a being that we both shall love, and that shall have added to the happiness of both. She indeed will not know that I have had any part in procuring for her your friendship, but the thought that I have had so will cheer and soothe me not the less.”\(^\text{33}\) Very unfortunately, exactly at that time Lady Campbell moved to Dublin and the plan fell apart. Hamilton now feared that no one would console Catherine, and he decided that he would try to comfort her himself by publishing his poems ‘A Farewell’ and ‘The Enthusiast’ in the August and September 1830 issues of the *The Dublin Literary Gazette, and National Magazine*,\(^\text{34}\) hoping that Catherine would be soothed by his love for her.

But not knowing about the coercion, Hamilton also did not know about Catherine’s feelings of guilt; in his writings there is not any sign of him having felt betrayed by her and of course, those feelings had only taken root in Catherine’s unhappy mind because of the coercion. The consequence of not knowing what caused her sorrow was that the ways in which Hamilton tried to comfort her\(^\text{35}\) did not work; consoling someone who was happy once and perhaps can find that happiness again is very different from consoling someone who feels trapped and is forbidden to say so.

Catherine did read the poems. In August she read about the pain Hamilton had felt when he heard that she was going to marry, that he could not see her on her bridal day; so she had guessed correctly why he had not attended her wedding. Reading about how he had seen her, as his “polar star in Hope’s high firmament – The fount that made life’s desert pathway green –” reminded her of her overjoyed feelings when she had read his Valentine poem; it now made her feel loved and terribly sad at the same time. But in September reading in the last sentences of ‘The Enthusiast’ that losing her had left him “darkly changed” was again devastating. It reinforced her feelings of guilt about what they had done to him, she by letting him fall in love with her, and her family by taking her away from him.

And also Barlow read the poems. It caused further tensions between them; for Barlow the decision to publish these poems simply meant that Hamilton would not stop making his life difficult. He tried even harder to keep his wife away from that boy, and Catherine became unhappier by the day.

\(^{32}\) As has been argued in [Van Weerden 2017, 274], see also p. 9.

\(^{33}\) [Graves 1882, 362].

\(^{34}\)[Van Weerden 2017, 91]. Hamilton’s motives to publish the poems were not given by Graves, but this is certainly plausible. The poems were published under the easy to guess pseudonym W.R. H., in the August issue on p. 149 and the September issue on pp. 276-277, respectively. For further details see footnote 9 on p. 45.

\(^{35}\) As he would also do in their 1848 six-week correspondence, see p. 69.
Chapter 5

Children and bereavements

5.1 A growing family

In October 1830 Catherine became pregnant again. The birth of their third son, William Brownlow, was announced in for instance in the *Belfast News-Letter* of the 12th of July 1831, “Births, Deaths, Marriages and Obituaries. On the 3rd inst. at Edenderry Glebe, Co. Armagh, the Lady of the Rev. Wlm. Barlow, of a son.” A fourth son, Brabazon John, was born in March 1833; an article in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of the 1st of April 1833 reads, “Births, the 24th at Edenderry Glebe, county Armagh, the Lady of the Rev. Wm. Barlow, of a son.”

According to the *Armagh Clergy and Parishes*, on the 24th of February 1835 their fifth son, Arthur Edward, was born, but of him no birth announcements were found. There will most likely have been notifications though, and because such articles were very widely read, the notification of William’s birth even having been published in for instance the *Southern Reporter and Cork Commercial Courier*, also Hamilton will have known about the births of the children.

Hamilton had fallen in love with Helen Maria Bayly in 1832, and they married on the 9th of April 1833. Catherine will certainly have heard about the marriage; if she had not read it in the papers, she will have been told about it by her Dublin family members. She sincerely hoped that he would become very happy because she granted him happiness from the bottom of her heart. Also Barlow hoped that Hamilton would become very happy yet with a very different motive; it would release him from the vague but constant unrest about that boy who never seemed to get married and thus remained a threat. He even started to feel some hope again; with Hamilton married perhaps Catherine would finally accept that she was his wife and should think of him alone.

---

1 *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. For William Brownlow, keywords: Barlow Edenderry glebe son, years: 1831-1831; for Brabazon John, keywords: Edenderry glebe, years: 1833-1833.
2 [Leslie 1911, 45]
3 *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Royal Rowan Helen Hamilton Bayly, years: 1833-1833.
4 This is again an interpretation; it is unknown what Barlow’s opinions were in this matter.
5.2 Life in Carlingford

In 1837 Barlow became vicar in Carlingford and also there they lived in the glebe house.\(^5\) Built in the neighbourhood of King John’s castle and adjoining Carlingford Bay, Carlingford was very different from Eglish. “The town is beautifully situated on the south-west side of the spacious lough or bay to which it gives name, and immediately at the base of an extensive range of mountains which terminates at this point. It consists of 288 houses. […] A new glebe-house was built […] in 1813: the glebe, in its immediate vicinity, comprises about 21 acres.”\(^6\) “[This ancient town] is thoroughly Celtic, in its total disregard of the “unities” in architecture; but not the less picturesque on that account are the roofless castles, the mouldering Abbey overrun with ivy, the taper tower of the church, and the cottages and dwellings, with trim shrubberies and green grass plats. […] The Glebe House, surrounded by gigantic old sycamores,\(^7\) [is] the residence of the excellent rector,\(^8\) the Rev. William Barlowe. […] Contiguous to the old Abbey is a capacious and handsome modern church, erected upon the site of an ancient religious edifice, the tower of which, being in good preservation, serves as a steeple to the present building. It is surrounded by a remarkable green graveyard, well stocked with old oaks and spreading sycamores.”\(^9\)

![Carlingford Castle, or King John’s Castle](https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951000728778j;view=1up;seq=35)

Figure 5.1: Carlingford Castle, or King John’s Castle, as shown in the Dublin Penny Journal, Volume 1 No 4, July 21, 1832. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=umn.31951000728778j;view=1up;seq=35.

---


6 [Lewis 1840, 254-255, vol 1]

7 The European Acer pseudoplatanus.

8 According to the Armagh Clergy and Parishes Barlow actually was vicar of Carlingford.

9 See p. 77 of the 1846 A Picturesque Handbook to Carlingford Bay, and the Watering Places in its Vicinity [anon.], Neway: Greer. books.google.com/books?id=9x4wAAAAMAAJ. For the “handsome modern church” see figure 5.6.
5.3 Deaths of two sons

But then disaster struck for the family. In March 1837 a sixth son, Maxwell Close, had been born,\(^{10}\) and a death announcement in the *Dublin Morning Register* of the 1\(^{st}\) of June 1838 reads, “Deaths. At Westland-row, Maxwell, youngest son of the Rev. William Barlow.”\(^ {11}\) It is not known why they were in Dublin, perhaps Maxwell had been ill and they had sought help from the best doctors in Dublin.

\(^{10}\) Also of his birth no newspaper articles or family notices were found.

\(^{11}\) *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Weitland Maxwell, years: 1838-1838. At the time of the death of Maxwell Close Thomas Disney had already bought Rock Lodge in Co. Meath, see footnote 5 on p. 20, but he seems to have kept his offices for some more years; members of the Disney family still lived at Westland-row until in any case 1842. In 1835 for instance ‘Rev B. Disney’, ‘Thomas J. Disney’, and ‘Rev J. Disney’, who will have been two cousins of Catherine, and perhaps her brother James, see p. 18 of *Report of the Fifth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, books.google.com/books?id=Nh9LAAAYAAJ. And
Maxwell Close was buried in the parish of St. Werburgh on the 30th of May 1838 and his burial record gives his age; he was fourteen months old.\textsuperscript{12} His parish was given as St. Peter’s, a parish south of the river Liffey,\textsuperscript{13} perhaps indicating that they were also staying with other relatives, or that Maxwell had been in a hospital.\textsuperscript{14}

Figure 5.3: The Rectory, or Vicarage, or Glebe House, at Dundalk Street in Carlingford was a large house, having had twenty-two rooms. The date of this photo is unknown, but it may have been made in the early twentieth century. It is slightly adjusted to make it easier to imagine that Catherine lived there. The photo is now in the possession of the Carlingford Heritage Centre, and shown here courtesy of the current owner of the property. For the twenty-two rooms see yourirish.com/folklore/ghost-carlingford-rectory.

more people lived there; in 1834 a baby called Robert Sandham was born at 4 Westland row, “Father occupation: servant,” see Irish Genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-30-2-1-075. Also in the 1840 birth announcement of the first daughter of Catherine’s sister Louisa it is mentioned that the baby was born “at the residence of her father, Thomas Disney, Esq. 4, Westland-row” although she then lived with her husband Henry Hobson at Jenkinstown Glebe, Dundalk, Co. Louth. Genes Reunited : SBNA, keywords: Jenkinstown glebe, years: 1840-1840. The last time Westland-row was mentioned in connection with the Disneys is when in 1842 Mrs. Disney, Elizabeth McMollan, widow of Brabazon Disney and aunt of Catherine, died at Westland-row. Genes Reunited : SBNA, keywords: Westland Disney, years: 1842-1842. Thereafter no more Disneys at Westland-row were found in newspaper articles, and in any case in 1850 someone else lived in the house, see the Dublin City Directory 1850, dublin1850.com/dublin1850/xdubdir63.html.

\textsuperscript{12}See Irish Genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-326-4-2-017.

\textsuperscript{13}[Lewis 1840, 556-557, vol 1]

\textsuperscript{14}Adelaide hospital was in St. Peter’s, in Bride street, but it was founded a year after Maxwell’s death. Perhaps they already treated patients before officially opening.
When in 1841 Catherine was in the sixth month of her seventh and last pregnancy they lost their son William Brownlow. His death announcement in the Monaghan *Northern Standard* of the 5th of June 1841 reads, “Died. May 26, in his 10th year, William Brownlow Barlow, third son of the Rev. William Barlow, Vicar of Carlingford.” He was buried in Dublin on the 29th of May 1841, just like his little brother in St. Werburgh, but as his parish Carlingford was given.\(^\text{15}\)

![Figure 5.4: “The rectory was destroyed by fire when it was unoccupied in the late 70s, and demolished in 2008.” Shown here courtesy of the website Carlingford People and The Cooley Peninsula. carlingfordpeople.ie/gallery/meissner-rectory [accessed 24 Oct 2018].](image)

John Lambert was born three months later; his birth announcement in the *Dublin Morning Register* of the 20th Aug 1841 reads, “Births. August 16, at the Vicarage, Carlingford, the lady of the Rev. Wm Barlow, of a son.”\(^\text{16}\) It must have been very difficult, even though in those years many children died young, for the parents that did not make it any easier. For Catherine it will even have been more difficult than it already is for any parent; she was trapped in an unhappy marriage and seems to have been, as could be derived from Hamilton’s 1830 poem, soothed in her unhappiness by her love for her children.

\(^\text{15}\) *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Brownlow Barlow vicar Carlingford, years: 1841-1841. *Irish Genealogy.ie : Church Records*, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-326-4-2-0-020. Also other members of the Barlow family were buried at St. Werburgh, for instance John and Jane Barlow of Sibyl Hill, Clontarf. Apparently more people from other parishes were buried at St. Werburgh: on the same page as William Brownlow, Hamilton’s Cousin Arthur is registered; apparently having moved house, he was from St. George’s. And next to Carlingford, also someone from Co. Kildare was registered on that page. It may have been customary there; in 1728 fees were published for marriages and burials, foreigners could be buried in the church yard for £2.40. See theirishaesthete.com/2013/05/18/terms-and-conditions-may-apply.

\(^\text{16}\) *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Vicarage Carlingford, years: 1841-1841.
Figure 5.5: As seen from Cuchulaín Heights, the remnants of what once was the glebe house. Behind the rubble the Catholic Church of St. Michael can be seen, and in the background the Slieve Foye mountain. A last sycamore still stands. Reproduced from a 2010 Google Maps street view recording.

Figure 5.6: The church and its graveyard. John Lambert, and perhaps also Maxwell Close, will have been baptised in this church. Reproduced from a 2009 Google Maps street view recording.
5.4 The comfort of nearby siblings

In 1844 a new church was needed in Carlingford because the parish was very extensive, and families had to travel too far to come to church. Donations were given, and in an article of May 1844 in the *Dublin Evening Packet and Correspondent* it can be read that Catherine did act as the vicar’s wife, “Rev. William Barlow donated £20, Mrs. William Barlow donated £5;” she apparently had money of her own. In the article it can also be seen that, as was suggested earlier, they had frequent contact with their families: both Barlow’s brother John Barlow of “Sibyl-Hill, Dublin” was mentioned, and Catherine’s brother Thomas Disney, “jun., Esq., 68, Lower Gardiner-street, Dublin.” The church was indeed built; its foundation stone was laid in September 1844, and the newspaper articles mentioned that the “Rev. William Barlow, Vicar of the Parish, delivered a suitable address on the occasion.”

Although not very close by, now three of Catherine’s brothers and two of her sisters lived within a one day travelling distance from Carlingford. Catherine’s brother James Disney was, since 1837, perpetual curate in Charlemont, about ten kilometres north of Armagh; the same year, 1837, her brother Henry Purdon had become curate in Tynan, and in 1840 he became perpetual curate of Kildarton. And in the

---

17 *Genes Reunited*: SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Barlow Carlingford, years: 1844-1844.
18 From the baptism records of their daughters Margaret Izabella and Catherine Maria it can be seen that John and Jane Barlow moved from Dublin city, parish St. George, to Sibyl Hill, parish Clontarf, between 1824 and 1826. See churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords. Keywords: Baptism, Izabella Barlow; Catherine Maria Barlow.
19 In the article two men are mentioned who were called Thomas Disney, one from Dublin, and one from Rostrevor. In the 1847 marriage announcement of Thomas Disney, Catherine’s brother, and Dorathea Evans, it is mentioned that he was from county Dublin, and she from Rostrevor where her father was vicar. See *Genes Reunited*: SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Evans Disney Rostrevor, years: 1847-1847. It is therefore possible that Thomas Disney learned to know Dora Evans when he visited family at Rostrevor.
20 [Leslie 1911, 164]. The church is St. Andrew’s Church of Ireland, Bush. “Situated in the beautiful Cooley Peninsula Co. Louth, the church was built as a Chapel-of-ease for nearby Carlingford Parish although it now functions in practice as the Parish Church. [...] The Church was consecrated on Tuesday, September 16th 1845. grangebushresidents.webs.com/sharedhistory.htm [accessed 15 Dec 2018].
21 [Leslie 1911, 338].
22 Kildarton Church is about three kilometres east of Armagh. Henry Purdon seems to have been one of the family members who defied his father’s focus on money and status. “Mr. Disney did not enter Holy Orders at his first outset in life. He held for some years an employment under the Board of Ordnance, which would have been of rising pecuniary value; but he was desirous of entering upon a life of greater usefulness, and had fixed his thoughts upon taking part in the Christian ministry; so that he eventually resigned his appointment, and, at his ordination [in 1837], entered the service of the Church, in Ireland, as a curate at 75l a-year.” See *The Colonial church chronicle and missionary journal, and foreign ecclesiastical reporter*, 9: 81-89. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=hvd.ah6b1r. According to the website *MeasuringWorth*, measuringworth.com, the relative income in 2017 of £75 in 1837 would be about £87,000. That is not by any standard a small amount of money, but apparently substantially less than he could have earned. Between 1850 and 1852 he was a missionary in Newfoundland and Labrador, see Ralph, R.F. (2015), *Travel and Trial: An Examination of the Establishment of an Anglican Community in the First Church of England Missions of Southern Labrador, 1848-1876. Newfoundland and Labrador Studies*, 30 (2): 187-219. journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/nflds/article/view/25132/29080. After Henry Purdon returned to Ireland, in May 1854 his brother Edward Ogle took him as curate in Newtownhamilton where he himself was rector. “As a result of looking after the poorest in the parish, Henry caught typhus and died in July 1854.” Disney. H. (1995), *Disneys of Stabannon: A Review of an Anglo-Irish Family*
Figure 5.7: St. Andrews Church, The Bush. Catherine donated £5; the only public activity in her capacity as a vicar’s wife which was found in the newspapers. To put her donation in perspective, in 2017 a donation of £5 in 1844 seen as a commodity would have, according to the website MeasuringWorth, measuringworth.com, an income value of £6,000. Reproduced from a 2010 Google Maps street view recording.

year mentioned, 1844, Edward Ogle, who had been curate of Armagh since 1834, became rector of Newtown-Hamilton, which is south of Armagh, about twenty kilometres closer to Carlingford. But none of these three brothers had married yet, and as was remarked earlier, as Victorian men they were perhaps not really able to understand Catherine’s misery. On the other hand, it may have made them rather free to invite her, or make longer visits to her.

Catherine’s sister Anne Eliza had, in 1829, married their cousin John James Disney and now lived in Slane, about sixty kilometres from Carlingford. But their youngest sister Louisa lived indeed quite close to Catherine; she had married Henry Hobson who was rector in Ballymascanlan, which was only ten kilometres from Carlingford as the crow flies, and twenty kilometres if travelling around the mountains. They will have seen each other often; Hamilton wrote about Catherine that she “was allowed to receive members of her own family as often as she could wish,” and of Louisa it was said that in Ballymascanlan “she was surrounded by relatives.”

from the Time of Cromwell. [Oxford]: Hugh Disney.

[Leslie 1911, 332]

The name Newtown-Hamilton is what it reads, a new town founded by Mr. Hamilton around 1770. “The surrounding district was erected into a parish by Primate Robinson, who severed it from the parish of Creggan, built a church [in 1775], and endowed the living […] , a rectory and vicarage, in the diocese of Armagh […] . The glebe-house […] is a handsome residence; it was built under the old acts in 1806 […] [and improved] in 1830.” [Lewis 1840, 438-439, vol 2]. Edward Ogle Disney was rector in Newtown-Hamilton until 1854.

See Louth, Ballymascanlon Churchyard, igp-web.com/IGPArchives/ire/louth/cemeteries/ballymascanlon01.txt.

It is not known who of the Disney siblings knew about Catherine’s forced marriage. Of only two siblings something can be inferred: Thomas and his wife Dora would later become intermediaries between Hamilton and Catherine; they will have known. But Louisa’s later fascination with her sister’s story seems to indicate that before 1861 she had no clue at all. Louisa had been only twelve or just thirteen when Catherine married; perhaps her family had not said much to the younger children, in those days marriages always were a difficult subject.

If therefore Louisa and Catherine saw each other often at Carlingford or Ballymascanlan, but Catherine did not openly speak of her unhappiness, or did not want to tell Louisa whom she had been in love with before her marriage, than that would certainly explain Louisa’s later fascination; she must have seen her sister’s unhappiness. But marriage having been holy then Louisa could not help Catherine with that, yet what she could do for her is be a good and loving sister, and take care that Catherine saw much of her family. Indeed always having loved them, Catherine will have found much comfort in her siblings’ closeness, especially when her eldest children left their parental home.

5.5 An emptying house

About a year after William Brownlow’s death, on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of July 1842 Catherine’s eldest son James William, sixteen years old, entered Trinity College in Dublin.\footnote{In the \textit{Alumni Dublinenses} it is mentioned that he had been at Wakefield school,\footnote{This may have been the Queen Elizabeth Grammar School, a boys school in Wakefield, England, which was founded in 1591. archive.org/details/historyoffreegra00peacuoft. However, James Barlow is not mentioned as a pupil, and therefore it is uncertain.} James thus will have left the house even before 1842. And if he was sent to the school in 1838 when he was twelve, as was done more often in case of eldest sons,\footnote{Hamilton’s eldest son William Edwin went to Clapham School in London when he was twelve, and so did two other eldest and twelve year old sons of friends of Hamilton [Graves 1885, 524].} he had left home around the death of his little brother Maxwell Close.}

As inferred from the \textit{Alumni Dublinenses} Catherine’s second son, Thomas Disney, had been privately tutored, allowing him to stay at home a bit longer. But in 1844 he followed James to Dublin, he entered TCD on the 1\textsuperscript{st} of July, also sixteen years old. Catherine’s once lively home was half empty now; she doubtlessly loved her three younger sons, Brabazon John, Arthur Edward and John Lambert, but four sons were not with her any more. She was forty-four, and even though many women had children until being almost fifty, Catherine did not get pregnant any more after John Lambert’s birth in 1841. The delivery may have been difficult bringing her life in danger, or perhaps John was not in good health; he would also die young.\footnote{See p. 77.}
Chapter 6

The end of the marriage

6.1 Visiting Dunsink Observatory

In 1845 Catherine visited Hamilton at Dunsink Observatory, together with her brother Thomas, who was an ‘intimate friend’ of Hamilton and then seems to have lived in Ballygall, some four kilometres from the observatory. It is not known when exactly they made their visit; Hankins remarks that Hamilton “left little record of this visit,” and Graves does not mention it at all.

Catherine may have been in Dublin to see her sons James William and Thomas Disney, then students at Trinity College. From the fact that she visited Hamilton it can safely be assumed that she was in Dublin without Barlow; if he forbid her to contact Hamilton, he doubtlessly would also not have given his consent to this visit. The house at Westland-row was not in the Disney family any more, and Catherine will have stayed with family members, perhaps with her sister Jane at Sibyl Hill, or at Thomas’ house.

Thomas inviting Catherine to come with him to visit Hamilton would have been quite curious if he knew how unhappy Catherine was, and knew about her love for

---

1 In the fall of 1845 the famine started. Barlow apparently was “active during the famine,” see p. 69, but because nothing was found indicating what he did it is unknown if and how it influenced Catherine’s life. A letter does exist from Edward Ogle, who then was rector of Newtownhamilton and had become chairman of the Newtownhamilton Relief Committee. On the 13th of November 1846 he wrote to the Lord Lieutenant, “The terrible necessity of our present miseries cannot afford to wait. Strong men perishing with hunger are willing to work for daily bread, but are now compelled to exist on the very refuse of our fields. The beasts of the earth are at this moment better fed than hundreds of our fellow creatures around us. Disease and death will soon follow, as they have ever done before on the rack of famine. In a few months, Public Works may only serve to dig the graves of the people. After such a melancholy catastrophe, relief will come in vain.” McMahon, K., McKeown, T. (1985), Agrarian Disturbances around Crossmaglen, 1835-1855; Part IV. Seanchas Ardmhacha: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society, 11 (2): 342-362.

2 In his later marriage announcement, see footnote 19 on p. 61, it is written that Thomas was “of Ballygallbeg, county Dublin.” If Ballygallbeg was the name of his house it is possible that he lived in Ballygall and had his offices in Lower Gardiner street, as was mentioned earlier, see p. 61. Graves does not mention Thomas Disney in the descriptions of the years around 1845; having been very focused on Hamilton’s ‘important’ friends he hardly wrote about Hamilton’s private friends. Yet describing 1851 Graves calls him an ‘intimate friend’ of Hamilton, see [Graves 1885, 671].

3 [Alumni Dubl., 40].
Hamilton; he then would have been aware that he could worsen her unhappiness. If he on the other hand still had no idea that her marriage had been forced upon her, he might have seen it as just a reunion, remembering the old days when they all saw each other regularly. But that would imply that he had not seen the stark contrast between her ‘radiant’ happiness before that defining day in February 1825 and her unhappiness thereafter, and that he would not have guessed what had been happening; being almost of the same age, having been one of the two witnesses at her wedding, and later becoming an intermediary between Hamilton and Catherine, that does not seem very plausible. The most likely scenario therefore is that Catherine decided to make this visit, and that she asked Thomas to accompany her, just as Edwin Ogle had been with her when Hamilton visited her in 1830.

6.1.1 Feelings of warmth and a spark of anger

From the day she was in Dublin Catherine had wanted to see Hamilton, being so close to him now. She doubted whether she would dare to visit him, risking to make him so nervous again as he had been in Armagh in 1830 when he had broken the wires of the eyepiece. But she felt that she could try how he would react because he now also was married himself; having heard from her brothers that it was a happy marriage, she expected that that would make seeing her again much more easy for him, and perhaps even pleasant. And assuming that Hamilton would not recognise how terribly unhappy she was if she would try very hard to look kindly at him, she hoped that he would also look kindly at her, and that she would be able to draw strength from it, that it would counteract the coldness of her own marriage, even if that feeling would last only for a little while.

She decided to take the risk and asked Thomas to make an appointment, fully aware that she therewith would break her wedding vow of obedience to her husband. Thomas may have accepted to come with her out of love for his sister, perhaps he hoped that it would do her good, she looked so unhappy lately. And he did not worry about Hamilton; he had seen him fall in love with Ellen de Vere in 1831 and then with Helen Bayly, and he will have assumed rightly that Hamilton saw Catherine as a love from the past, albeit as such very important.

At the observatory Catherine felt very happy, and she made her acquaintance with Hamilton’s wife. For Lady Hamilton it will have been very special to speak with Catherine; she had known Hamilton for several years already before their marriage, she had read the poems Hamilton had written about Catherine, and she had doubtlessly often talked with her husband about her because Hamilton had known since 1830 that Catherine was unhappy and found that very difficult. From the beginning Hamilton had made it very clear that he would not hide his feelings for both Catherine Disney and Ellen de Vere, arguing that if he would deny his feelings for

---

4 See p. 79.
5 Lady Hamilton was from Nenagh, Tipperary, but before her marriage she had been in Dublin often. She had learned to know Hamilton during her many visits to two of her sisters, who lived with their families in the houses neighbouring the observatory. Moreover, several family members seem to have lived in the city of Dublin, her parents had married there, and she had at least one friend in Dublin, see [Van Weerden 2017, 137]. Because many members of the higher classes seem to have known each other, and Helen Bayly had been twenty-three already when Catherine moved to Eglish, they may already have met before.
them now he would have been a liar then; Hamilton was, as friends testified, indeed extremely honest. Having been so open about his feelings, the fact that Helen Bayly still decided to accept him in marriage shows that she did not see that as a problem, he also was very open about his feelings for her.

After Hamilton had shown them the astronomical instruments, this time without problems, Lady Hamilton very kindly served them a luncheon of bread, jam, coffee, and milk. Catherine felt happy for Hamilton that he had married such a lovely wife; she had granted him all the happiness in the world, and now talking with him again, feeling his warmth, seeing the love and togetherness between him and his wife, she very much enjoyed her visit to the observatory. And although she could not speak freely with him, she again felt some relief from her feelings of guilt.

Yet towards the end of her visit the thought of having to return to Barlow suddenly came over her. To her abhorrence she became flooded with feelings of sin and guilt over the breaking of her wedding vows, again darkening everything she had been so happy with. Hamilton could not but recognize these thoughts in her eyes but it made no difference, he had noticed her unhappiness already; it had lasted so many years that it had become ingrained in her features. Hamilton now knew that she was even worse than she had been in 1830 and he became very worried about her, realizing that she was reaching a breaking point. He again could do nothing because openly supporting her was not allowed then, but that day he made two decisions: he would ask Thomas very regularly how his sister was doing, and he would take even more care to be a good and kind husband, he did not want to be the cause of such unhappiness for his wife as Barlow so clearly was for Catherine.

Catherine again saw how difficult it was for Hamilton to see her so unhappy, and she reflected with sadness on her intention, so many years ago, of writing to Hamilton and explain that she had not known about the marriage plans. She started to feel a slight anger about how Barlow had refused to allow her to seek contact; he had been stern and harsh, and it had become a forbidden subject thereafter. But then she had heard about Hamilton’s marriage, and she had started to weigh in her mind whether she would dare to bring the issue up again, after all, he was not a threat any more. Moreover, it was widely known that Hamilton had more married lady friends, all entirely within the accepted social limits of those days, and she had felt certain that seeing Hamilton with his wife more often would help her to come to terms with her feelings for him. But it had never felt as if she could in any way talk with Barlow about Hamilton, and they had never spoken about it again.

After her return to Carlingford the thought that she still had had no opportunity to explain to Hamilton what had happened started to haunt her. During the visit having observed Hamilton’s affectionate marriage, a marriage she could have had, she experienced renewed feelings of loss, making Barlow’s refusal ever more difficult. Her aversion against her husband further intensified.

---

6 As can be read in the poem starting with ‘O be it far from me’, [Graves 1885, 4]. For how open Hamilton was towards his wife about his former loves see [Van Weerden 2017, 131-132].
7 [Van Weerden 2017, 40]
8 What exactly happened during this visit is unknown; this is just a possible scenario, yet again entirely within the boundaries of what is known.
9 As she did for visitors to the observatory, see [Van Weerden 2017, 67, 217].
10 This does not come literally from letters by Hamilton but was deduced from circumstances, see [Van Weerden 2017, 411].
6.2 A heavenly correspondence

In 1847 Catherine’s eldest son James William received his bachelor’s degree, and he decided to compete for a Fellowship. In those years a scholarship in Dublin was mainly concerned with mathematics, physics and classics, and James William took up mathematics for his Fellowship exams. Hamilton, who was Andrews Professor of Astronomy, decided to tutor him.

At some unknown time Catherine heard that Hamilton was taking much trouble to help James William, and regarding it as a delightful message from the love of her life, in July 1848 she decided to break her wedding vow of obedience for a second time. She had not told Barlow about her 1845 visit to Hamilton and had weighed in her mind whether she could feel even more guilty than she already did; finally concluding that it could hardly become worse she wrote a letter to Hamilton in which she thanked him for helping her son. Hamilton, who received the letter on the 18th of July, answered the letter as if he had written first, he perfectly understood that what Catherine had done could cause her severe marital problems.

Receiving his letter turned her life upside down; it was the beginning of a correspondence which lasted for almost six weeks. For some weeks the correspondence was really heavenly, and Catherine deeply enjoyed writing and reading all these letters. But starting to feel close to him again something changed; she could no longer help herself, and although it made her feel very agitated, she told him that her marriage had been unhappy from the start, something he had not known until then.

Hamilton must have felt frustrated that he still could not do anything for her, and while they both started to become very distressed he “urged an end to the correspondence” but she could not, she wanted to hear from him and read his lovely and warm and very kind letters and never lose contact with him again. But she could not write about the coercion; Hamilton loved her family and she was too afraid of what would happen if he learned about it. Would he become depressed, feel betrayed...

---

11 [McDowell & Webb 1982, 240]
12 James William received his BA in spring 1847. On p. 270 of the *Dublin University Calendar for the year 1892* it can be seen that he received his BA as fourth Senior Moderator in Mathematics, the star means that he later became a Fellow. archive.org/details/calendar1892trinuoft. An explanation of the degrees and medals is given on p. 270.
13 [Hankins 1980, 348]. Although there is hardly any doubt that this had to do with Catherine, Hamilton’s actual motivation to tutor James William, or how he saw it, has not been given by either Graves or Hankins, see [Van Weerden 2017, 289, fn. 57].
14 From letters Hamilton wrote to James William from Parsonstown in 1848, see p. 93, it can be inferred that during those years James William did not know anything about what had happened between Hamilton and his mother.
15 That summer had seen the Young Irelanders’ Rising, and the famine still raged. But again nothing is known about how much it affected Catherine’s private life, or what she thought about it.
16 [Graves 1885, 609], [Hankins 1980, 348]. Not revealing Catherine’s name and calling her “an old friend,” Graves mentioned that “this writer” had thanked Hamilton for “kindness to a relative.” It only became publicly known that Hamilton’s correspondence had been with her when Hankins published his biography in 1980, and also Catherine’s first letter having been about James William is known from Hankins’ biography.
17 Unfortunately, Graves only gave a few “extracts” from Hamilton’s letters, and because the correspondence does not seem to exist any more hardly anything is known about Catherine’s letters. According to Graves, she “took occasion to express interest in his inner life, and specially in his spiritual state.” [Graves 1885, 609].
18 [Hankins 1980, 348]
by her family, would he become angry, revengeful, raged; he was a broad-shouldered man who possessed “abundant physical courage.”19 Or, probably even worse, what would Barlow do if he would find out that she had written about it to Hamilton.20 And what would happen to her children if they would learn about it all; showing her feelings about her marriage so openly as she had done already was unheard of in Victorian society, and Barlow was, after all, their father.

Although Graves only wrote about the correspondence in a very concealed way, something can be inferred from the ‘extracts’ he gave. Hamilton apparently told Catherine how despondent he had been after having heard that she was going to marry and that he had, for a moment, considered suicide. But that he was now “deeply convinced that, along with resignation and heavenly hope, it is a duty to cherish also, if possible, a spirit of hope, though not of anxiety, with respect to this earthly existence.” And calling it “an important secret of experience,” it can be recognized that he then tried to comfort her by telling her what he had discovered in the summer of 1832, when he had struggled to cope with having lost his second love Ellen de Vere, “namely, that, blessed a thing as meditation is, it is Action, rather than Meditation, which is the appointed remedy, the divine specific, against Despondence; and that present duties, which may at first seem irksome, are part of the medicine wherewith God healeth the sickness of those that are broken in heart.”21

It seems likely that Hamilton wrote this advice after Catherine had told him that her marriage had been unhappy all along. And it certainly could have have been a good counsel; if she had willingly entered into the marriage she apparently once liked Barlow enough. Yet Hamilton still did not know that he was writing about his “important secret of experience” to a woman who was trapped in a forced marriage. For Catherine, reading in the handwriting of such a lovely person that she should have a spirit of hope with respect to this earthly existence, and fulfil her present duties which for her as a Victorian woman included obeying her husband and be with him, and that that would help her broken heart, that was too much. If that was the best advice she could get, and it was surely warm and spoken from the heart, then nothing had any use any more.

She became even more depressed, and realizing that this warm and wonderful correspondence could not but stop at some time and she would be back, alone, in that cold and loveless marriage, finally her strength of mind started to fail. No matter how hard she tried not to give in, the guilt about her disobedience to her husband won from her wanting to continue this correspondence for ever. She wrote to Hamilton that she had to confess to Barlow what she had done, but Hamilton urged her not to. They again exchanged letters for a while, but she was breaking down. Around the 23rd of August 22 she wrote her last sentence to Hamilton, and while writing it the

19 [Graves 1882, 166]. Hamilton had challenged someone to a duel once, when he had felt his “honour or truth impugned,” but his second “succeeded in obtaining for him adequate verbal satisfaction.” [Graves 1889, 236].
20 Also Barlow was far from being a coward; in November 1855 Hamilton wrote in a letter to a friend that Barlow “had been active during the famine and had been absolutely fearless regarding assassination.” [Hankins 1980, 354].
22 Having received Catherine’s last letter, Hamilton left for Parsonstown on the 26th of August, according to Graves “before his feelings had quite recovered their normal tranquillity.” If the correspondence lasted six weeks as Hankins wrote, [Hankins 1980, 349], and if Catherine had written the first letter around the 16th of July, she must have written the last letter around the 23rd of August.
world seemed to turn black at the thought that she would never receive letters from this wonderful man again, “to the mercy of God in Christ I look alone, for pardon for all my sins.” They had become older and a little wiser since that unhappy day in 1830 when he had refused her to contact Hamilton, and he might be able to trust her now. But her husband preached.

Barlow wrote a letter to Hamilton, according to the latter “a curious kind of half-anger,” which ended with a “half-apology.” Hamilton politely answered that he would not contact them any more. Barlow was satisfied and for him that was the end of the public side of this sordid affair. But in their own home he preached, and preached, and preached. And he also preached in their parish church. About women having to obey their husbands, and about all the comfort coming from the scriptures and the doctrines of their Christian faith and the creeds and commandments of their church. The parish members drew strength from his sermons, not suspecting anything although they did notice his wife’s unhappiness. Yet the incumbent being such an excellent vicar, and his sons being all kind and educated and very well mannered, they concluded that his wife just had an overall slightly depressed attitude to life and they felt sorry for them. But it drove her mad, completely mad, and she wanted out. She was very, very tired and of the future nothing was left but blackness.

### 6.3 The suicide attempt

In September Catherine started to gather the necessities for her demise. Laudanum, much laudanum. It was freely available, that was not a problem, but no one should become suspicious. Ten centilitres should be enough to kill her, and she decided to buy some small bottles at different places. For what, for a child with fever, a headache, women’s complaints. Poor children! But she had to, living like this was like hell on earth and she could not bear it any more. She realized that her children became worried, and felt that she would better die now than cause them years of distress over her; years in which she would linger and finally die of a broken heart or was it from having been given away as if she was a pricey blood horse or perhaps rather a brood hen or having been preached at far too often and starting to believe she just was a sinner. She did not know any more.

Catherine’s hopes that the grief of her children would be less if she died now than if she lived on gave her a temporary feeling of tranquillity, she felt more relaxed than she had been in a very long time. But at the same time she became ever more desperate. She wanted to give Barlow a message but could not make up her mind about what it should be, she hardly could think straight any more. That she had always loved Hamilton? No, that was not the point; the point was that she should have

---

23 [Van Weerden 2017, 273]
24 See footnote 31 on p. 53.
25 See p. 56.
trusted her when she wanted to establish a friendship with Hamilton, that he should not have been so jealous, that he should have given her the freedom to make her own choices instead of mentally imprisoning her. Because he had not trusted her, had not even for a moment considered to trust her, she could not live with him any more, she did not want to live with him any more, she could no longer bear his proximity. Yes, that should be her message.

Figure 6.1: Laudanum is a mixture of opium and alcohol. It was very widely used as can be seen in this Victorian advertisement.

Having decided what she would write to Barlow she shortly pondered on the thought whether it could still help if he would read her message but no, she did not believe any more that he would ever understand anything regarding her thoughts or her feelings. Then she started to worry about what could happen if he would find her too early, have her life saved while also finding the letter to him, causing her to live on this unbearable life which then would even be burdened further with a sinful suicide attempt and such a disobedient letter. Becoming trapped in her fears she thought up a scheme: she would ask Hamilton to help her, he would doubtlessly do that for her. She would send him an envelope containing her letter to Barlow, a stamped envelope addressed to him, and instructions for Hamilton himself; he should send her letter in the stamped envelope to Barlow. That would ensure that Barlow would receive it, but only after her death. She wrote these instructions down for Hamilton, and felt relieved. But then she started to doubt whether or not to put the letter to her husband in the stamped envelope and close it, or leave it open for Hamilton to read.
She could not come up with any good argument any more, not for anything for that matter, and she decided that the last person she had secrets for was Hamilton. She wanted him to know every thought she had, to show him all her feelings, and she just hoped that he would read the letter, which then indirectly also was her last message to him. Her message to Barlow was that she had been unhappy in this marriage from the beginning. That at times she really had tried to love him and accept her fate but that he had preached away all the last kind thoughts she had had for him. And that she wondered how ashamed he now would be: such a highly valued reverend having cure of souls for his parishioners who could not even trust his own wife or make her at least a bit happy. Who thought that buying her carriages and allowing her so see her family would be enough to be loved even though he forbid her to do things she wanted and demanded her obedience when she was angry instead of talking to her as if she was a real person.

It was very difficult to write the letter to Barlow. She could not remember the train of her thoughts long enough to put them on paper in some comprehensible way. And she was so tired and so angry that her hands were shaking, she could not write a neat word any more. She thus had to send Hamilton the letter with instructions, the stamped envelope and the letter to Barlow, and after posting it take the laudanum. Not only could he not save her in this plan, he also could not preach to her again; she would finally have the last say. And she cried because of her children, because of what she was going to do to the living and how she missed the dead ones.

About one thing she was happy though; that she did not have girls, who would need her to prepare them for the potentially very difficult life of married women, or to fight her husband if he would threaten to marry them off against their will. The boys were becoming men already, even John, who had a weak health making him very wise for his age. They did not need her any more, they were going to school and started to be interested in the things that concerned men, they did not have much interest any more in listening to her children’s stories and singing together after dinner.

And although she did not love Barlow, she knew that her sons did, they knew nothing about what had happened and they trusted him. He was wealthy enough to afford as many servants and staff they would need when she was gone, and in a few years also the three youngest boys would leave their parental home; Brabazon was fifteen, Arthur thirteen, and John had just turned seven. She did not doubt at all that they would succeed in life, they were clever boys. The only thing she did hope for them was that she had instilled enough love and compassion for others in them to help them avoid making the choices their father had made. That they would choose a woman who also loved them, that they would trust their wives and not try to just impose their will upon them as he had done.

---

27 It is not known what was in the letter exactly. But the fact that she still felt the need for explanation in the weeks before her death, see p. 100, shows that the letter did not contain a complete record of what had happened.

28 Hankins wrote that Catherine’s letter was written “in open defiance of her husband. The letter [Catherine sent to Hamilton] contained a stamped envelope and instructions to Hamilton to mail the letter to her husband in the envelope provided. The contents of the letter and the handwriting showed signs of a complete emotional breakdown.” [Hankins 1980, 349]. Hamilton wrote in 1853 that Catherine wrote the letter on the 5th of October 1848. [Van Weerden 2017, 284, 288-289].

29 In those years, before psychology became a science, nothing was known about the potentially devastating influences in later life of too early broken bonds, because some people suffer dearly from it, while others manage to cope with it and seem just fine.
6.3.1 The silent nothingness

Towards the end of September 1848 Catherine started the actual preparations because she knew that early in October Barlow would have to leave Carlingford for a few days. She had postdated the letter to him and the instructions for Hamilton to the 5th of October, and now she had to arrange for the stamped envelope. No one suspected anything although she got worse by the day; it was difficult to keep her head to her daily worries but she could not risk anyone to discover what she was up to.

Having received the stamped envelope, on the 5th of October she asked a servant to bring the letter to the post office; to avoid suspicion she had just addressed it to ‘The Royal Astronomer of Ireland, Dublin.’ That evening she had wanted to sing with her sons and play the harp for a last time, something she had hardly done any more lately, but she felt that she could not, her children would certainly notice her sadness. She managed to kiss her youngest son without crying when she handed him over to the nursemaid who would put him to bed, and talked and read something with her elder sons until it was their bedtime. She then retreated to her room, a private one which she had asked for after the birth of their youngest son.

For a last time she looked around; it was beautiful room, and she sometimes even had felt safe here, but it still was a room within a prison. She was certain of what she was going to do, even though she did not know what God would think of it. She just had no strength to go on any more and vaguely hoped that He would understand that her life had become too awful, and that He would know that she had tried for so many years to be a good wife and a good mother.

She locked her door, mixed the laudanum with three glasses of wine hoping that it would not taste so bad that it would make her nauseous, then she undressed, put on her nightclothes, got into bed and nestled herself in the pillows. Thinking about her children she cried for a last time, felt strangely relieved and finally free from Barlow and her life, became slightly fearful thinking about hell, contemplated for the first time in her life a non-existence of God, then drank the glasses quickly; she had to finish them before she would pass out. She snuffed the candle on her bedside table, rearranged her pillows and laid down, felt a vague pain in her stomach which quickly disappeared again, and observed herself slowly sinking away into a deep and silent nothingness while feeling an overwhelming peace.

6.4 Waking up again

Hamilton received Catherine’s letter, yet he decided not to send her message to Barlow, perhaps because he saw Catherine’s plan and suicide attempt as “a terrible attack of mental disease.” He did feel a strong urge to go and visit her but suppressed the thought; he worried about whether he would be able to control himself if he would meet Barlow face-to-face, but also, he had promised not to contact them any more and he was not a man to break a promise. And not the least important, he had a family he loved and he did not want to cause them harm in any way.

---

30 It is not known whether he was at home or not. What follows is what may have happened, again within the boundaries of what is known.
31 [Hankins 1980, 449 note 8], [Van Weerden 2017, 284]
32 [Van Weerden 2017, 289]
But Catherine’s life was saved; the next morning the children and the servants became worried when she did not come down for breakfast, and breaking down the door they found her in her bed, apparently in a very deep sleep, the wine glasses and laudanum bottles on her bedside table. The children were horrified, the personnel shocked,\(^{33}\) the doctor was called upon, and he gave her something to throw up, in an effort to remove any laudanum which still was in her stomach. They gave her tea and lemon juice which seemed to do her good although she did not really wake up,\(^{34}\) and someone was sent to fetch her sister Louisa, who lived closest to them.\(^{35}\)

The staff and servants had, in hindsight, noticed Catherine’s unhappiness but no one had realized how very unhappy she was. They had hardly dared to say it to each other because marriage was not something Victorian people freely discussed, but they had not seen much affection between these two people lately, or perhaps ever since they had come to Carlingford. Catherine had never uttered any complaint about Barlow but she had looked depressed, and Barlow had often been emphasizing the important role of men in a marriage because women could be so weak.

When Louisa arrived they reluctantly and hesitatingly told her about the unhappy marriage and their suspicions that Catherine’s attempt had something to do with it, but Louisa recognized what they were trying to say. They then made a quick decision: before Barlow returned Louisa took Catherine and the children with her. Not having enough means to support them herself, she brought them to their brother Edward Ogle in Newtown-Hamilton, using her own carriage and that of Catherine.

### 6.5 Staying with family

Slowly Catherine came to her senses again. To her horror she lived, but soon she realized, to her enormous relief, that she was not in Carlingford any more. They had brought her to Newtown-Hamilton: what a place to find herself in waking up. She was secretly happy about it, in her mind it brought Hamilton more close to her. Her children were with her and she was surrounded with concerned and loving family members; she felt truly and utterly thankful.

During the following weeks she discovered how much her body had suffered from her suicide attempt but her mind was free for now: her alarmed family members had decided that she could stay with them as long as she was so weak. It is entirely unknown how her father reacted, but she must soon have discovered that her mother was on her side, and that she could stay with her and her other family members as long as she needed to.\(^{36}\)

---

\(^{33}\) That will have gone even farther than realizing the extreme unhappiness of someone they knew so well. According to Lady Wilde suicides were accursed; it was widely believed then that “all the dead who have been recently buried turn over their faces if a suicide is laid amongst them.” See p. 192 of Lady Wilde (1887), *Ancient Legends, Mystic Charms, and Superstitions of Ireland*, Vol. I. Boston: Ticknor and Co. archive.org/details/cu319240744445762.

\(^{34}\) See the article about the effect of a large quantity of laudanum, footnote 26 on p. 70.

\(^{35}\) Louisa had lived in Ballymascanlan, but in 1847 her husband had died. In 1850 she remarried in Bangor. It is not known where she lived in the meantime; very often women lost everything after the deaths of their husbands. But because her husband had lost his life while caring for his parishioners, see [Leslie 1911, 134], they may have allowed her to stay and have granted her a temporary pension.

\(^{36}\) After Catherine’s death Hamilton wrote to a friend, “What I really can in my thoughts thank
After a few weeks Barlow sent a letter to Edward Ogle that he would allow her to stay in Newtown-Hamilton for the time being. Catherine was surprised that he finally seemed to understand that something was really wrong with her, and that demanding so unrelentingly that she should just obey him had done their marriage not much good. She felt really thankful, after all, she still was his wife, and in the end he had the power to decide what he wanted. She felt at peace in her brother’s house, and because the Disneys were a very close family, her eldest sons came up from Dublin to be with her for some time, and much trouble was taken to make her younger sons feel well taken care of.

Catherine lived at the rectory for quite some time. “Edward was receiving letters from Hamilton, to one of which, dated 24th May 1849, he replied, ‘I had the pleasure of receiving your kind letter this day. May I offer you on behalf of my sister my warmest thanks for the interest you have taken and continue to take in the prospects of her son, James. I have not told Mrs Barlow (Catherine) that I have heard from you, though there is much in your letter which would gratify her highly. Mrs Barlow’s health is improving, though very slowly – we will keep her here as long as we can and when she leaves will contrive some little tour which I hope will be useful.’”

37 Disney. H. (1995), *Disneys of Stabannon: A Review of an Anglo-Irish Family from the Time of Cromwell*. Oxford: Hugh Disney. The letter continued, “I am very sorry to hear you have not been well. I suppose you lead a sedentary life – nothing conduces so much to health as exercise – Do you ever walk from the Observatory to Dublin or do you ever ride a runaway horse?” Remarkably,
The family was obviously worried about Catherine, and they were taking very
good care of her. But it is not entirely clear whether Edward had not found time yet
to tell Catherine about Hamilton’s latest letter, or that he had not told her at all
that Hamilton had been inquiring after her. Yet it can be imagined that he did not
want to tell Catherine; considering possible reasons for her suicide attempt he may
have heard from Thomas about her strong emotions around the 1845 visit to the ob-
servatory. Love and marriage were almost forbidden subjects but preventing another
suicide attempt will have allowed for breaking some rules, and if they indeed talked
about the 1845 visit they may have judged that being notified of Hamilton’s interest
in her well-being would again make things too difficult for her.38

What clearly can be read in the quote however is that Catherine was expected to
return to Barlow,39 that she only could stay as long as her health was so weak. That
seems to be a particularly harsh standpoint, especially of the family members who
knew about her forced marriage and how she had tried to resist it. But just as it held
for Hamilton, unhappiness will not have changed their mind about the sacredness of
marriage, a vow before God’s altar still was a vow. Moreover, for those times it was
not in any way an unusual standpoint; good Victorian women were seen as almost
perfect in feeling, being caring and loving wives such as the men, who were seen as
much more rational, were much in need of, while they were deemed to be hopeless
in logic or analysis and thus needing their husbands to take care of all the difficult
demands society imposed on them.

Many people did not marry for love but had their marriages arranged for reasons
of convenience or financial stability, yet in order to succeed such a marriage did need
much mutual trust, kindness and respect. Looking at the marriage from the outside,
Catherine’s siblings will have seen how hard Barlow had tried, how well he had taken
care of her and how he had given her everything she wanted, and they may have con-
cluded that she had internal problems with accepting him as her husband, and that
that had caused her depression. Next to taking care of Catherine’s health the Disneys
thus seem to have been trying to calm her, giving her much time to regain her senses,
hoping that in the end she would make a full recovery and be able to return to her
husband, to be at his side again where she belonged.

Yet, just as Hamilton knew nothing about the coercion, Catherine’s siblings will
not have known about Barlow’s jealous and distrustful refusal in 1830, nor about his
preaching to her and so rigidly demanding her obedience, because as a good wife she
will not have told them and expose him as an unkind and dominant husband. And
they certainly did not know about the six-week correspondence between Hamilton
and Catherine; Hamilton would never have risked exposing her as a disobedient wife.

Edward does not seem to have associated Hamilton’s not being well with Catherine’s suicide at-
tempt. Knowing now how terribly unhappy Catherine had been and receiving Hamilton’s letters
he could easily have made such a connection; Hamilton will therefore just have been ill indeed. But
Edward obviously knew nothing about Hamilton’s daily life, that he even was a very fervent walker
and regularly walked to Dublin, [Van Weerden 2017, 289 fn. 37], or that he had been contemplating
mathematics on his runaway horse Comet, [Van Weerden 2017, 348].

38 As can also be assumed about the contact Thomas had with Hamilton about Catherine, most
likely since their 1845 visit to the observatory, see p. 65, and in any case after 1848 when Thomas
and his wife Dora became intermediaries between Hamilton and Catherine, see p. 79; it is unknown
whether they ever told Catherine that they were bringing personal news about her to Hamilton.
39 See p. 84.
Chapter 7

The last years

7.1 Death of a third son

Catherine had felt safe in her brother’s rectory, having been happy to have her family and her three youngest children around her. But only a few days after Edward Ogle’s letter to Hamilton, towards the end of May 1849, her life was in turmoil again when her youngest son John Lambert became very ill. It was decided quickly that, as in case of their other two sons, Maxwell Close and William Brownlow, they would go down to Dublin to seek help from the best doctors. Barlow came to Newtown-Hamilton to pick Catherine and John up, and to their great relief they could stay with their eldest siblings John and Jane. Sibyl Hill was a very large house, allowing both families to visit John Lambert, while Catherine and Barlow could be with him together yet retreat from one another whenever they wished to.

But the doctors could not save John Lambert, and he died at home, only seven years old. The article in The Advocate: or, Irish Industrial Journal Dublin of the 6th of June 1849 reads, “Deaths. On the evening of the 2nd Inst., Sibyl Hill. John Barlow, aged near eight years, youngest child of the Rev. Barlow, Vicar of Carlingford.”¹ John was buried on the 5th of June, like his brothers also at St. Werburgh, and Catherine was devastated again.²

Still feeling very guilty about her six-week correspondence and her suicide attempt, and even after having been separated from Barlow for months now still not having been able to tell Hamilton about her forced marriage, Catherine was rapidly losing her faith. The loss of her son felt like a punishment, while at the same time the overwhelming peace and quiet of the nothingness she had experienced after having taken the laudanum became more and more important for her; she started to strongly prefer this idea of nothingness over the ideas of heaven and hell she had been brought up with. Only once she talked about her experience, with her eldest son James who, to her great surprise, was not at all shocked, and even did not seem to completely reject this notion.

---

¹ Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Sibyl Barlow, years: 1849-1849. What happened around John’s death is actually unknown, this is a scenario.
² John Lambert’s burial record gives his abode as Carlingford, see Irish Genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-326-1-5-151.
Figure 7.1: Sibyl Hill is now the house of the Vincentian community at Sybil Hill road, directly west of St. Anne’s park and at the north side of St. Paul’s College. The photo comes from the website Liceo Cavalleri, liceocavalleri.gov.it/comenius/comenius2009/partners Ing.htm. Again the cars in front of the house have been erased to make it look more like the house as it was in Catherine’s time. A better picture, but only showing the front of the house, can be seen on the Vincentians website, vincentians.ie/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/IMG_0398.jpg. After John Barlow’s death in 1876 his sons sold the house and estate to the Guinness family who were enlarging St. Anne’s estate. See History of St. Anne’s Estate, dublincity.ie/AnitePublicDocs/00452203.pdf, and St. Paul’s College : History of College, stpaulscollege.ie/history-of-college [all websites accessed 25 Nov 2018].

Figure 7.2: St. Anne’s park is one of the large parks in Dublin, it is located north of Dublin Port. Catherine may have walked here to find some peace while staying with her sister Jane. Reproduced from a 2014 Google Maps street view recording.
Catherine did not talk about her experience with her siblings but they did notice that she was losing her faith, and at some moment one of them told Hamilton about it. True to character and having had a reverence for marriage, Hamilton had not broken the promise he had given to Barlow, and had only inquired after Catherine when he visited her brothers or by writing his letters to Edward Ogle. But having been a deeply religious man, her suicide attempt had made him anxious for her eternal soul, and now hearing that she was also losing her faith was a turning point. He decided that he had to do anything he could to help her restore her faith; he could not bear to think about how lonely she must feel without her bond with the loving God. All his adult life he had donated money for the Christian mission, how could he stand aside if someone so dear to him was losing such a powerful source of peace and comfort.

7.2 Exchanging gifts

To Catherine’s great surprise Hamilton started to send her gifts, mostly religious, but also personal. He simply sent her anything he could think of to make her want to renew her bond with God again, all within the boundaries of what he considered to be allowed. He sent her his poem called ‘A Prayer for Calm’, about how he had trusted Christ to soothe him when in his heart the ‘billows had raved’ after their six-week correspondence in 1848, and in May 1850 he wrote her a poem called ‘To an Afflicted Friend Suffering under Religious Depression’, in which he tried to comfort her, and reassure her that God was at her side no matter how much she blamed herself for what she had done.

Hamilton also sent her a book he had borrowed from a friend “to try to reclaim her lost religious conviction,” but for Catherine the most touching gift was a lock of his hair “to be mingled with hers after his death.” The day she received it feeling especially weak it made her smile a bit, it sounded as if he thought that he would die before she would. Although from the addition “after his death” she again understood that he would never hurt his wife by seeking direct contact with her, she drew much strength from it; now she was certain that even though he loved his wife, in his heart he also had a special place for her. She contemplated how to comfort him in turn about his worries about her religious feelings, and hearing that he was a frequent visitor of her brother Thomas and his wife Dora who now lived in Rock Lodge, through them she sent him a Bible and a Prayer Book.

She would very much like to see Hamilton, speak with him and finally explain to him what had happened, and she fantasized about visiting Thomas and Dora at Rock Lodge and then, seemingly accidentally, meet Hamilton. But she knew she could not do that, she did not want to risk jeopardizing his life; that she was unhappy should not mean that he had to become unhappy also. Still, she could not help herself entirely and decided to send him another gift, and this time she did take a risk.

Still having been tutored by Hamilton, in May 1850 James William had finally succeeded in winning a Fellowship. Having become a Junior Fellow he had been awarded a Fellowship Examinations, [TCD 1907, 57, 48]. Already on the 11th of September 1849 Hamilton called James William F.T.C.D., Fellow of Trinity College Dublin, [Graves 1885, 643].

---

3 [Graves 1885, 652]
4 [Hankins 1980, 350]. For Thomas and Dora having moved into Rock Lodge see p. 80.
5 James William had won a Bishop Law’s prize in 1847, and received premiums in 1848 and 1849 for his Fellowship Examinations, [TCD 1907, 57, 48]. Already on the 11th of September 1849 Hamilton called James William F.T.C.D., Fellow of Trinity College Dublin, [Graves 1885, 643].
given the privilege of rooms in Trinity College, which had brought him in even closer contact with Hamilton. But knowing how discrete Hamilton was when it came to revealing Catherine’s identity it is very unlikely that at that time he knew that Hamilton and his mother had corresponded, or that his mother’s suicide attempt could have had anything to do with Hamilton.\footnote{[Van Weerden 2017, 278, 280-285].}

In the summer of 1850 Hamilton decided to take James William with him to Edinburgh to a meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and during that week he shared lodgings with James. When Catherine heard about it she sent Hamilton a note of presentation to go with the Bible and the Prayer Book, which he indeed received in Edinburgh.\footnote{[Hankins 1980, 449 note 13].} In hindsight she was not entirely sure why she had done that, perhaps a part of her had hoped that James, who was so mature now, would find out about what had happened, which would finally give her the opportunity to talk openly with her eldest son. But Hamilton was again very discrete, and James William still did not suspect anything.

Every now and then Catherine received more news about Hamilton through her brothers, and despite all her sufferings she could be happy again, in any case happier than she had been in a very long time; Hamilton felt as close to her as he could ever be. She heard that he was writing an elaborate book about his quaternions of which she of course did not understand anything, but she felt happy for him, he would become an even more celebrated mathematician than he already was, and she was proud of him. She kept his 1848 letters in her bed\footnote{[Van Weerden 2017, 304]} and regularly indulged herself with rereading those wonderful letters, in that beautiful handwriting, trusting that Hamilton could love her while also loving his wife who had been so kind to her.

She did not recover from her suicide attempt, but sometimes she felt a bit better. That was not a very happy feeling, because whenever that happened she became instantly terrified that she would have to return to Barlow; that he would claim her as his wife again and she would have to go, as the rules of society prescribed. Although no one talked about it openly she was certain that her family would not stop Barlow from demanding her return, after all, they were very religious people.

Next to her incidental fears about having to go back and the ever painful sufferings about the deaths of her sons, what in the end mainly kept her from feeling at peace was that she wanted ever more desperately to tell Hamilton, who probably still thought that so many years ago she had chosen Barlow over him, about the coercion, but she could not, not as long as the risk existed that she would have to go back to Barlow sometime. She felt that if Hamilton would know about her marriage having been forced upon her by her family, the thought of her being back with Barlow would be absolutely unbearable for him. She did not know what to do.

### 7.3 Renewed contacts

Combining various newspaper articles, it can be seen that in 1850 Thomas and Dora Disney had moved into Rock Lodge,\footnote{Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Rock Lodge Trim Adamstown, years: 1850-1851.} while Thomas and Anne Disney had moved to

---

\footnote{[Van Weerden 2017, 278, 280-285].}
\footnote{[Hankins 1980, 449 note 13].}
\footnote{[Van Weerden 2017, 304]}
\footnote{Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney Rock Lodge Trim Adamstown, years: 1850-1851.}
The last years

Newtownhamilton to live with their son Edward Ogle at the rectory. But soon thereafter Rock Lodge and Adamstown, then also property of Thomas Disney Jr., were sold under the Encumbered Estates Act, and in any case before September 1852 Thomas and Dora Disney moved to Carlingford. Very soon after having moved to Newtownhamilton, in January 1851, Thomas Disney Sr. died after a few days of illness. It is not known where Anne Disney stayed after her husband’s death, yet it is known that in her last years Catherine made long visits to her. That might indicate that Anne Disney, who was eighty-five or eighty-six when her husband died, lived with her children, making it possible for Catherine to visit her while at the same time both women could be taken care of.

Catherine felt relieved that she could now see her mother without her father; after her marriage speaking with him had never been easy any more. And also Anne Disney was happy with their renewed contact, there was very much to talk about after so many years of silence. She secretly confided to Catherine how sorry she had been that she had agreed with forcing her to marry Barlow; Hamilton’s future had seemed so uncertain. That the more famous he became, the more ashamed she had been, especially when some years after having moved into the observatory he had married, an apparently stable marriage. That she now believed that she should have trusted her daughter, and Hamilton too, she had also seen that he was a very laborious young man. And that she should have trusted his sisters, who had not married as she had expected, but who had managed to take care of themselves very well. She again felt a deep pity for her daughter who in case of a recovery would be forced to be with Barlow all over again, something she as a mother would not be able to prevent.

While staying, in the years between her suicide attempt in 1848 and her death in 1853, with her mother and with various siblings, Catherine felt welcomed by each of them. Some of her older siblings had guessed what had driven her to her attempt, but they did not speak openly about it and carefully kept it away from the younger siblings; not knowing Barlow so well as the older siblings did, if one of them would get upset they could start to blame him, and that would seriously affect his sons. James William now worked very close to Hamilton while at the same time having a very good relationship with his father, and he therefore should not find out what Hamilton had to do with his mother’s unhappiness. Agreeing with their decision Catherine regretted that she had sent her gift to Hamilton when he was in Edinburgh with James William, and she now was happy that he had been so cautious about it.

James and Thomas both having taken holy orders they probably had, more than their younger brothers who both would become merchant navy officers, problems

10 [Hankins 1980, 450 note 16], see also the aforementioned newspaper articles. Thomas had petitioned for sale in October 1850 at the Incumbered Commission Court, see p. 2 of The Waterford Evening News of Oct. 25, 1850, snap.waterfordcoco.ie/collections/enewspapers/WNS/1850/WNS-1850-10-25.pdf [accessed 28 Sept 2018].
11 Hamilton visited them in Carlingford in September 1852. [Van Weerden 2017, 288 fn. 54].
12 Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney rectory Newtownhamilton, years: 1851-1851.
13 See footnote 36 on p. 74. In 1858 Anne Disney would die “peacefully” in Warrenpoint Co. Down, at an “advanced age.” Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Disney widow Warrenpoint advanced, years: 1858-1858.
14 Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. For Brabazon John, keywords: Captain Brabazon Barlow, years: 1900-1900; for Arthur Edward, keywords: Barlow formerly Peninsular Oriental, years: 1911-1911.
with their religious contemplations about what would happen to their mother after her death; whether she would be punished for what she had done, or for now losing her faith. They still believed that she had tried to commit suicide simply because she was unhappy, and not having entrusted her life to God would make it a grave or perhaps even mortal sin. It was very hard for Catherine not to be able to explain to them what had happened to her but she could not, she did not want to endanger their relationships with their father. She loved her sons, and very much treasured the close contact she had with them.

7.3.1 A happily marrying son and failing health

During his frequent visits to his aunt and uncle at Sibyl Hill, especially around the time of the death of his little brother John Lambert, James William had fallen deeply in love with one of their daughters, his double first cousin Mary Louisa, a love which happily appeared to be mutual. They decided to marry in July 1853, hastening the date of the wedding a bit because they hoped that Catherine’s health, which had been in slow but steady decline lately, would still allow her to attend.

Figure 7.3: James William and Mary Louisa Barlow married on the 6th of July 1853. It can be seen that James Barlow lived at Trinity College. From the handwriting it can also be seen that Barlow acted as witness; James Barlow apparently had normal contact with his father. Irish genealogy.ie : Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-833-3-1-027.

Catherine did attend even if only the official part; the marriage rites and ceremonies were performed by Edward Ogle, and she clearly and openly enjoyed it, feeling very proud of her strong attentive son and his beautiful and very lovely wife.\footnote{See for an indication of an affectionate marriage p. 116. What happened around this marriage is again a scenario.}

She even managed to sit next to Barlow without too many negative thoughts, he was after all James’ father and she felt it as a true gift that her eldest son had become so happy. And what no one knew was that, deep down and in utter silence, she rejoiced knowing that a part of what had enabled James to marry so happily now had been a gift to her from Hamilton, who had helped her son so marvellously.

Soon after the wedding she felt that her health was finally failing. Ironically, in order to fight the insomnia she suffered from as a result of the suicide attempt, and the pains she now often felt in her stomach, her head and her limbs, the doctors had
prescribed laudanum. Still, it was better to take it in low dosages than to be in so much pain. And irony was all around. After Rock Lodge had been sold Thomas and Dora had moved to Carlingford, while early in 1852 Barlow had moved away to become rector of Creggan. Since the exchange of gifts, every now and then Thomas had told Catherine about Hamilton’s visits to them, and now he had told her that Hamilton had visited them in Carlingford, in the very same town in which she had tried to get out of this life. She understood that Hamilton loved “the beautiful bay of Carlingford” just as she had done, and knowing that he would always go to church on Sundays, she was very happy for him that during his visits to Carlingford he could worship without risking to meet Barlow, or even having to listen to his sermons.

7.4 Parting interviews and death

In October 1853, while staying with her brother Robert in Donnybrook, Catherine felt that she was dying. The moment she knew that she would not recover this time she did not feel any social or religious impediments any more, and she could no longer wait to finally tell Hamilton everything. She sent him her last gift, a pencil case and an inscription, “From whom you must never forget, nor think unkindly of, and who would have died more contented if we had once more met.” She hoped with all her heart that Hamilton would understand her message and would dare to come; knowing that she was dying would make everything different because no one would have to worry any more about future contact between them or about marriages.

Immediately after having received her gift Hamilton came to Donnybrook, but they could not let him in, perhaps the Barlows were visiting, or Catherine was just too tired or sleeping. But he was invited to come back on another day, which he did. That evening Catherine was full of expectation but also very nervous. Robert and Caroline had, very caringly, made a large fire in the hearth because of the October cold, and a sofa was put in front of it for Catherine to lay upon while she would talk with Hamilton in private. Robert and Caroline were happy for her, they knew what she was going to do. They had seen her utter unhappiness for so many years, and also how much time it had, after her marriage, taken their friend to get on with his life. They wholeheartedly granted Catherine and Hamilton these moments of truth, so shortly before it would be too late.

7.4.1 The long awaited explanation

Catherine was a bit surprised to see that Hamilton had become grey at the temples; he looked somewhat older than she had expected. She still remembered him most vividly as the youngster he once was, and she had seen him for the last time in 1845, when his hair had still been dark. But it took only a moment until she was already used to him again and she smiled, she was happier than she had been in twenty-eight years. Hamilton on the other hand was rather shocked; in 1845 he had again noticed that she looked unhappy and unwell, but now she was also extremely thin and looking very tired, very old.

---

16 [Graves 1889, 413-414]
17 [Hankins 1980, 351]
18 [Graves 1885, 691]
He described the moment he saw her, “she lay, languid and strengthless, but interested and attentive and happy on a sofa to which she had been carried that she might meet me: – kneeling, I offered to her the Book [Lectures on Quaternions] which represented the scientific labours of my life.” Catherine was amazed, she had heard about all his achievements and the publication of his book that summer, but she had not known it would be such a small yet enormously thick book. She happily and proudly accepted it and then, when he stood up, to her great surprise he suddenly bent over her and kissed her! She did not know what to do, she was..., oh well, she was dying, and she relaxed while he kissed her again and again making her feel as if she finally was in heaven. This was how it could have been, how it should have been, all these years, these were kisses given and received with love.

When he sat down next to her she slowly started to talk, she could finally explain and tell him what had happened. About how happy she had been when he had walked into her life, how she had fallen in love with him, and about that terrible day when she heard that she had to marry Barlow. How she had pleaded and cried but that her father had had an iron will and that she had to, how they had told her what a shame it would be to break the promise her family had made to Barlow, and how sinful that would be. How terrible she had felt on that wedding day, how she had searched for him in the crowd but could not find him, how guilty she had felt towards him when she had realized that he might have felt betrayed, and how she had feared that he later might have doubted her sincerity during those wonderful evenings when she had played the harp and had let him feel how loveable he was.

While telling him what had happened she watched his face, and she saw all its expressions; extremely happy when realizing that she had also loved him, terribly upset when he heard about the coercion, appalled when hearing about Barlow not having been willing to give up his ‘prize’. She noticed traces of anger and betrayal when he heard about her desperate pleadings and her father who would not listen. And they cried, for lost years, for so much sadness, but also for ineffable happiness about finally being so close together and being able to talk so openly.

And because he was so quiet now, and had reacted so lovingly to her horrid explanations, she also dared to say what she had never said before, having tried for so many years to be a good mother, a good Christian and therefore also a good wife, listening obediently to all Barlow’s preachings and not once having complained about him. She told Hamilton that she had not wanted to recover, that she had “looked forward with terror to the bare possibility of her recovering health enough to make it necessary for her to live with him again.”

Catherine regretted that she was becoming tired, her mind wanted to go on and talk with him endlessly, but her body could not. While she was carried back to her

---

19 As if fulfilling the promise in his 1825 Valentine poem in which he had written, “To lay my triumphs at thy feet.” See p. 36.

20 Hamilton had continued, “Rising, I received, or took, as my reward, all that she could lawfully give – a kiss, nay many kisses: – for the known and near approach of death made such communion holy. It could not be, indeed, without agitation on both sides, that for the first time in our lives, our lips then met. ... Yet dare I to affirm that our affectionate transport, in those few permitted moments, was pure as that of those who in the resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the Angels of God in Heaven.” [Hankins 1980, 351-352].

21 [Hankins 1980, 354]. This comes from an 1855 letter by Hamilton to a friend. The quote by Hankins has slightly been adapted because its simple past tense seemed to suggest that she thought
room again she felt extremely blissful and utterly sad at the same moment. She knew
that he was downstairs now, dining with the family, and she wanted to be with him
but she could not, she just was incapable of sitting at a table.

Finally having been able to explain everything to Hamilton, and having seen his
loving gaze, she felt relieved from her burden of guilt. Yet it did not at all cause her
to regain her religious feelings, she was more and more in protest against what the
church had done to her. It felt even more difficult now that they had kissed, and she
knew how her life could have been. But she was delighted that it had happened, that
Hamilton had dared to do that, and she thought of his kisses all the time.

In the course of October Catherine’s brother Robert noticed that she was even
further losing her religious feelings, and how much she doubted God’s existence. He
must have been very worried because he talked about it with Hamilton, who was
again horrified. He sent a letter to Robert, in which he wrote that he hoped that
somehow feeling his love for her might restore her belief in the love of God. “If human
affection can thus have a sort of earthly immortality, she ought not to doubt the con-
stancy of that Divine Friend, in whose love she certainly did once believe, who knows
and feels for all our weaknesses and infirmities and who, in his more than earthly love,
sticketh closer than a brother.” And in that letter he asked for a second interview,
which she gladly granted.

### 7.4.2 Meeting for a second time

In their first interview having talked about the most difficult subjects their second
one was much more happy and quiet. Catherine had been looking forward to it, to
just talk and enjoy that last time she could see him, even though she knew that Ham-
ilton still was worried about her eternal soul. She did not want to think about that,
about what she had learned about sinners and their afterlives; perhaps Hamilton’s
love would plead for her after her death. No, no, she more and more hoped for the
nothingness which for Hamilton was not open for consideration. But it did not mat-
ter at all; she loved to listen to him when he talked about his faith in the loving God
so reassuringly, while his love for her was streaming through his words.

In a letter to the Hassels Hamilton described a scene from this second inter-
view. “I asked her, did she remember some little occurrence of almost thirty years
ago: to which question, with a sweet yet sad, & (as I thought) almost reproachful, but
still celestial smile, she answered, Do I! and then, to prove to me that her memory
was better than I thought, she repeated several lines of mine, not exactly what would
be called love-verses, although (no doubt) inspired by love, which I had given (or
repeated) to her, so long ago as 1824, & of which I have preserved no copy, but which
sounded sweetly from her lips, though her voice was little more than a whisper. As
verses, they are lost – but I am well content that they should now sleep for ever[r] in
oblivion, after having been so long, & with such faithful affection, preserved, in my
dear & sacred guardianship of her loving but innocent remembrance.”

---

22 See p. 8.
23 Hamilton actually wrote, “Another time I asked her,” where the words ‘Another time’ seem to
indicate that this was indeed during their second interview.
24 [Ishikura 2008, 68-69]
And he also composed a sonnet about that moment, describing her lying on the sofa and making it almost possible to see them talk with each other:

Do you remember, I inquired,  
Some incident of long ago?  
For unforgotten thoughts desired,  
Their image in her heart to know.  
Then do I! with sad voice she said,  
While clothes propped up her languid head;  
And then, as if her fond and faithful love,  
All doubts of her remembrance would remove,  
She roused herself to murmur over again,  
A long lost fragment of a boyish strain,  
Which in her heart and sacred recollection,  
Had lingered from those days of young affection;  
For thrice ten years it lay enshrined,  
Within the casket of her mind.

Catherine was happy, very very tired and happy to be able tell him that she indeed still remembered, that she had kept some of his lines with her all these years, and she was delighted to see how moved he was when she said those verses. His smile was heavenly, and she was so very very happy, she felt completely satisfied. She had told him what she had wanted to tell him for so many years and he had reacted more lovingly than she had dared to hope for. She now was ready to die. She would miss her children, or rather, she was extremely sad that they would miss her, losing her so early in their lives. And she was sad that she would not see their children who would certainly be lovely, but who would never know their grandmother.

She completely trusted Hamilton who had reassured her that God would not be revengeful towards her; she could now also believe herself that she had tried to be good for most of her life, which finally freed her from her long-standing feelings of guilt and sin. And she felt satisfied knowing in her heart that there would be no afterlife for her, that she would enter the nothingness she now firmly believed in. In the following days she sank further and further away in her tiredness, thinking about her dead children, about her living children, about Hamilton and the very happy hours she had at last had with him and which seemed to have filled a lifetime.

Catherine died on the 3rd of November 1853. When she woke up that morning she knew, and for the last time she looked at Hamilton’s letters, which she still kept in her bed. She kissed them, bade them farewell, hoped that Hamilton would be able to feel it from a distance, and asked for her children. They all came, and surrounded by the people she loved most of all she could finally let go. They talked a bit, cried a bit, and laughed a bit. She told them how much she loved them, and that she hoped they would think about her with love in their hearts. She was happy that she would be buried in St. Werburgh; that in death she would be with the three boys she had missed so terribly. Slowly losing her sense of being she slid away, and to her vague relief and utter happiness she felt that it was again into the nothingness she had known before, and which thereafter she had so much longed for. It was good, her struggles were over. Poor living children.

7.5 Carlingford’s haunted Rectory

Catherine’s death announcement in the *Armagh Guardian* of the 11th of November 1853 reads, “Nov. 3, after a lengthened and severe illness, Catherine, the dear wife of Rev. Wm. Barlow, Rector of Creggan, in the diocese of Armagh.” 26 This short yet somehow touching advertisement is surprising because it seems to signify that until the very end Barlow hoped that Catherine would recover and come back to him, and that they would become happy after all.

Hardly anything is known about Barlows thoughts and feelings, which makes it easy to see him as the cause of Catherine’s unhappiness, yet he can almost as easily be seen as another victim of the social circumstances of their time, and perhaps even as both. Pondering on how all that had happened must have looked like from Barlow’s point of view, and realizing that no matter what it must have been difficult for him also, a 2016 web article about a haunted Rectory in Carlingford became truly amazing when this Rectory appeared to have been the house where the Barlow family had lived, and where Catherine had made her suicide attempt.

Figure 7.4: This photo of Carlingford Rectory was made in 1965 or 1966, and apparently shows the front of the house. It comes from Holzer’s 1997 book *Ghosts: True Encounters with the World Beyond*, chapter 6, section 90: The Haunted Rectory. See also footnote 33 on p. 89.

---

26 *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Barlow Creggan lengthened, years: 1853-1853.
The 2016 article, ‘The Ghost of Carlingford Rectory’ on the website Your Irish Culture, mentions some stories which have been told about the house, and ends with a conclusion by a medium, that the Rectory had been haunted in connection to a romantic tragedy in the mid 19th century, involving a girl in a red dress and a clergyman. A strong association imposed itself, of a very young Catherine, looking beautiful with her blonde locks and soft blue eyes in a red evening dress, and Barlow who, having become a reverend, had waited for years for the best moment to propose to her, but then had lost her for ever.

Obviously, knowing about Catherine’s 1848 suicide attempt there is a natural way to explain where the local stories about the Rectory may have come from. In Catherine’s time many people in Carlingford must have known about her unhappiness and her attempt. But suicides were looked at as accursed, and because for some years after Catherine had left Carlingford Barlow still was vicar there, it will only have been discussed very secretly. If then through the generations it was slowly forgotten who had been accursed and about whom the secret stories had been told, what was left in Carlingford of the unhappy marriage were vague and fractured memories about much sadness, and wandering ghosts in the Rectory. Nevertheless, the haunted Rectory as a remnant of Catherine’s unhappy marriage is intriguing, and the accuracy of the time frame surprising.

The 2016 article describes the search by ‘ghost hunter’ Hans Holzer in 1965, after what could have been behind the various stories told about the house. The main story given in the article was told by Ernest McDowell, who lived in the house in the 1960s. “One hot September evening McDowell and his brother were at the house. McDowell was mowing the lawn while his brother worked in the nearby field. Glancing up McDowell spied a girl in a red velvet dress moving towards the front door and before he could see her face she disappeared. [ . . . ] Looking around McDowell spotted a gentleman entering the gate wearing the high stiff collar of [a] clergyman, but as soon as he tried to get a good look he too disappeared. Convinced that this couldn’t be a coincidence and that the two visions must be connected McDowell decided to dig deeper. Records showed that an earlier resident, Canon Meissner, had witnessed

---

27 Ó Longáin, S., ‘The Ghost of Carlingford Rectory’, yourirish.com/folklore/ghost-carlingford-rectory [accessed 5 March 2018]. In the article the Rectory is assumed to have been built in the seventeenth century, but that may have been what in the Irish Historic Towns Atlas, see footnote 29, is indicated as the Rectory which was mentioned in 1578 but of which the location is unknown.

28 As Lady Wilde had written, see footnote 33 on p. 74.

29 That this haunted Rectory was indeed the house where Catherine lived can be seen from various sources. It is certain that they lived in the glebe house, and its location, south of Carlingford centre at Dundalk Street, can be seen on the historical map in figure 5.2 on p. 57. It is also known that in 1806 there was no glebe house, p. 156, ‘Carlingford’, in Carlisle, N. (1810), A Topographical Dictionary of Ireland. London: William Miller. archive.org/details/topographicaldic00carluoft. In O’Sullivan, H., Gillespie, R. (2011), Irish Historic Towns Atlas No 23: Carlingford, Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, ria.ie/ga/node/94255, in the entry ‘Text’, section 22, pp. 5 and 12, it is mentioned that the Rectory at Dundalk Street was built in 1813, see also p. 56, that for most of the nineteenth century it was called the Glebe House or the Vicarage, as can also be seen in John Lambert’s birth announcement, see p. 59, that in the twentieth century it was called the Rectory, and that it was demolished in 2008. See also figures 5.3-5.5 on pp. 58-60.

30 The clothes of the apparitions were described as Edwardian. In this picture Barlow was wandering, and thus could have worn anything from the Regency until the 1960s, but Catherine as a sixteen year old girl must have worn a Regency dress. That is not impossible; in the mid 1810s and late 1900s the waist lines were higher and the silhouettes much slimmer than in the Victorian era.

31 The Meissner family lived in the house from 1935 to 1960.
the girl in the red dress inside the house.” The article ends with mentioning that “research carried out by Holzer who also used the services of famous medium Sybil Leek\textsuperscript{32} discovered that McDowell was correct and that the two figures he had seen were connected. Leek stated that there had been romantic tragedy in the mid 19th Century involving the girl in the red dress and the clergy-man.”\textsuperscript{33}

When in 1813 his brother John had married Catherine’s sister Jane, William Barlow had seen Catherine for the first time, thirteen years old, still a girl yet already breathtakingly beautiful. In the following years she had become even more beautiful and when he had fallen in love with her he had had hope, she had surely seemed to like him too. But he had had no house and nothing to give her, something which had been very important for her father, and he had therefore worked, and worked, and every year his prospects had improved. He had started to fantasize about how happy he would be with her, and how happy she would be with him too, and in 1824 he finally had almost achieved what was necessary to ask her to marry him. But then, on the verge of winning her for himself, that young, annoying and life wrecking Hamilton boy had walked in and had trampled all his dreams.

To his relief her father had been on his side, and he did marry her, still having felt certain that if he would be kind to her and give her everything she wanted she would again learn to like him and perhaps even love him, and be a good and obedient wife as a reverend’s wife should be. They had to have children of course, but he had tried to be as kind as he could, even in that. He had soon started to feel that he was not good enough for her, but marriage was sacred and he had hoped on; if they would have children she would love them, and through them also him as their father. And for some time it had seemed to work. But then she asked him whether he would allow her to contact that boy, famous now but for him still ‘that boy’, which he had of course refused; such a contact would have set them back years again. Or, to be honest, he would not have been able to endure even a faint smile on her face when she would read a letter from that boy, and he would feel that she was happier with these letters than with making love to him.

Still, he had lost her in the end. And not only did he lose her, he lost her in the worst way possible; she committed a mortal sin, for which not only she would be punished eternally by his God, but which also had deeply humiliated him, both as her husband and as a man of God. Moreover, his eldest son, of whom he had been so proud, had been rebuked in 1859 and could never preach any more because he had attacked the doctrine of eternal punishment, therewith suggesting that his mother would be allowed by God to disappear into the emptiness all people come from when they are born.\textsuperscript{34} Pure blasphemy.\textsuperscript{35}  

\textsuperscript{32} See for Sybil Leek en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sybil_Leek.  
\textsuperscript{33} In his book Ghosts: True Encounters with the World Beyond Holzer described the details Leek gave of the romantic tragedy; they do not in any way fit in with Catherine’s story. But since only the girl in the red dress and the clergyman were seen as apparitions, and no other facts were revealed in the reports of the people who had seen them, McDowell’s story can be taken as he told it, without the explanations. Yet keeping, of course, the remarkable time range. Holzer, H. (1997), Ghosts: True Encounters with the World Beyond. New York: Black Dog & Leventhal. books.google.com/books?id=X6oKFkd_H-kC.  
\textsuperscript{34} See p. 96. James William never mentioned his mother in his 1865 essay, nor in his later novel, [Barlow 1891], see also p. 101, but it can very easily be read between the lines, see p. 98.  
\textsuperscript{35} Barlow’s burial record shows that, next to John Henry Mac Mahon, apparently the incumbent of the parish, the ceremony was performed by Edward (William) Whately, who then was rector of
Even long after Catherine’s death he could not let it go, every quiet moment he thought of her, of how he had known her so long ago, so beautiful and so radiant. And how she changed and never became her happy self any more. He firmly believed that it all went wrong in Carlingford when their dear little son Maxwell Close had died and she had been so utterly grief stricken and beyond his ability to comfort her; he had started to realize that what he had hoped for was never going to happen, it had all become a lost cause. He wished they had never come to Carlingford, that place with all its ruins, representing the ruins of his life.

Seen from the outside he lived his life as he had done before, and all his friends felt sorry that his once so beautiful wife had gone mad. But he knew what he had done when he insisted on this marriage although something inside him had silently warned him. He simply could not let go; until his last years his thoughts drifted back to Carlingford, where he had lost his precious sons, his dear wife, and his hopes. He stayed in Carlingford forever, chasing that beautiful young girl in her red dress who in the end was not even there; she did not exist any more, only as a ghost, and only in his mind. She was long gone, gone to the void her eldest son had made up for her, and he was left with nothing.

St. Werburgh. He was the only son of Richard Whately, who as Archbishop had rebuked James Barlow. It might suggest that Barlow had agreed with Whately, and thus had rejected the ideas of his son. churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-326-1-5-168.
Part III

Catherine’s posthumous influence

In this last part it is argued that traces of Catherine’s unhappiness can be recognized in the work of her eldest son James William Barlow, Erasmus Smith’s Professor of Modern History at Trinity College Dublin and at some time Vice-Provost, and of his eldest daughter Jane Barlow, who was a poet and novelist.

Fellows were required to be in holy orders when in 1850 James Barlow won his Fellowship. But nine years later he lost his priesthood again; he had argued that the doctrine of hell did not come from the Bible, and that it drove people away from the Church, ideas for which he was rebuked. In his later years he wrote a science fiction novel, about a society on Venus which did not have the strict Victorian rules for marriage, but also no God. It is suggested here that the ideas in his essay and his novel were directly related to his mother’s unhappiness, her suicide attempt, and the fact that in her last years she had been losing her faith. For the sake of the story thoughts and motives have been ascribed to James Barlow, and a possible scenario is given about how his ideas may have been inspired by his mother. It is not supported by any sources, yet it has again strictly been kept within the boundaries of what is known about him.

James Barlow’s eldest daughter, Jane Barlow, was a famous author who has both been highly praised and severely criticized. Assuming that James Barlow’s theological ideas were indeed closely linked to his mother’s unhappiness, Catherine’s indirect influence on her granddaughter can be recognized in Jane Barlow’s acknowledgement of her father’s ideas about the non-existence of hell, and her rejection of organized religion, in which she went much further than her father. Another aspect of Catherine’s influence was a “shadow over the house” due to James Barlow’s ecclesiastical ban because Jane Barlow’s shyness seems to have been directly related to it; without this shyness her work might have been remembered much better than it has been now.
Chapter 8

James William Barlow

It is not the intention here to give extensive biographical sketches of James and Jane Barlow; the following chapters are meant to show the apparent influence of Catherine’s unhappiness on their lives by discussing some telling descriptions which were given about them. In the context of this sketch James Barlow’s motives to develop his ideas about Eternal Punishment and Eternal Death have been freely interpreted, connecting them with his mother’s fate. It is entirely unknown whether he had such motives, yet it is shown that when Catherine’s story is taken into account, they can very easily be read between the lines. For Jane Barlow it was not necessary to guess at motives; enough has been written about her to gain an idea of who she was.

8.1 Contact with Hamilton

It is not known when, or how, James Barlow learned about his mother’s forced marriage. He presumably came to know Hamilton in the summer of 1843, when the latter became his astronomy professor, from 1847 he was tutored by Hamilton, and he corresponded with him in the summer of 1848, when Hamilton was in Parsonstown on a visit to Lord Rosse who had built a new telescope. This visit had started almost directly after the end of Hamilton’s six-week correspondence with Catherine, which had been very distressing because he then had learned how terribly unhappy Catherine was. In the third week of his visit Hamilton wrote to James Barlow, “I am recovering from a sort of (mental rather than bodily) fatigue and languor, which I was conscious of (perhaps from having worked rather too hard some time ago) when I came here,” from which it can be inferred that Hamilton had not told James Barlow about the correspondence with his mother.

1 After 1841 Hamilton lectured on astronomy in the summer, at the end of the academic year. [Graves 1885, 355].
2 [Van Weerden 2017, 278, 314]. See also p. 68.
3 Apparently only Hamilton’s Disney friends and Lady Campbell then knew Catherine’s identity, see p. 8. Having been extremely honest, see p. 67, it was argued in [Van Weerden 2017, 284] that using and even italicizing the word ‘perhaps’ indicates that Hamilton could not bring himself to really lie about why he had been tired.
James Barlow will have known that several of his Disney uncles were Hamilton’s friends, and they even may have told him that once Hamilton and his mother had also known each other. Then having read, in September 1848, about Hamilton’s “fatigue and languor,” the first hint at a connection between Catherine and Hamilton may have come in October, when Catherine made her suicide attempt. Although suicides were a very difficult subject, James Barlow must have known about it; not telling him that will not have been a real option for the family. He then was twenty-two already, and it would certainly be better to tell him than take the risk that he would hear it through gossip, something which was highly probable because many people in their social circles knew each other; if someone would find out such a story could not be withheld for a very long time. But it still remains entirely possible that even then James Barlow had no idea that it had anything to do with Hamilton. In May 1850 James Barlow became a Junior Fellow of Trinity College Dublin. It was not a very good position, the “non-tutor Fellows” then were “the most under-privileged and discontented body in College,” but the Fellowship did come with rooms at Trinity College. In the summer Hamilton took James Barlow with him to the yearly meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science which then was held in Edinburgh, they lodged in the same house and shared a sitting room. During their stay in Edinburgh Hamilton received a gift from Catherine, yet having had a reverence for marriage and loving his wife, Hamilton having let her son know about it is inconceivable. In July 1853 James Barlow married his cousin Mary Barlow, and only a few months thereafter, in October, Hamilton and Catherine spoke with each other in his uncle Robert’s house in Donnybrook. Hamilton also dined there with the family, and because it will hardly have been possible to hide that from Catherine’s grown up children, that may have been the time James Barlow learned about their early love. Also allowing for such a time frame is that in November 1853, apparently shortly after Catherine’s death, Hamilton wrote to a friend, “On one occasion [William Barlow] was hiding behind a door, in his son’s rooms in ... Trinity College Dublin during a short interview of mine with that son; ... he wanted to listen to our conversation, but ... was afraid to meet me face-to-face.” It seems very unlikely that James Barlow would not have noticed that, and if he still did not know he may have asked his father, who after all was the grieving widower, why he stayed away from Hamilton.

There thus are reasons to assume that by 1854 James Barlow knew about the early love between Hamilton and Catherine. Having named his eldest son, who was born in 1855, William Ruxton, after his father and his paternal grandmother, will be a sign that his contact with his father was not impaired, but it might also indicate that he still did not know about the coercion.

---

4 "‘The Board,’ wrote Barlow [in 1906, being Vice-Provost], ‘enjoys the perhaps undesirable privilege of being the most heartily and universally abused body in Ireland. This is no peculiarity of the present Board; unpopularity seems to be an essential attribute of a Senior Fellow; my own personal knowledge of this sad fact goes back as far as 1843, in which year I was a Junior Freshman, and I have rarely heard the Board spoken of without the prefix of some uncomplimentary adjective.’ […] There was a short period around 1852 when this was not true, but Barlow at that time belonged to the most under-privileged and discontented body in College (the non-tutor Fellows), and doubtless one of the uncomplimentary adjectives was often on his lips.” [McDowell & Webb 1982, 525-526].

5 See p. 80.

6 [Hankins 1980, 354]

7 It is not known whether or not he blamed his father for what he did.
Figure 8.1: James Barlow was Erasmus Smith’s Professor of Modern History at Trinity College Dublin from 1860 until 1893, and Vice Provost from 1899 until 1908. Courtesy of The Board of Trinity College Dublin.

8.2 Heterodoxy

In the years after his mother’s death James Barlow had brooded often on what she had told him about her experience when she had committed her horrible deed in 1848, and how peaceful the nothingness had been. It led to his philosophical and theological conviction that entering his mother’s nothingness was the most logical, or just, thing to happen after the deaths of people who cannot go to heaven because they have committed a mortal sin for which they should be punished, while the punishment of being tortured for all eternity seems utterly unjust for anyone.

---

8 See p. 77. How James Barlow came to his ideas is described here in the context of Catherine’s story; it is not supported by any sources but has again been kept entirely within the boundaries of what is known. And it must be emphasized that it is not known whether or not the idea of nothingness came from Catherine; it was suggested here to give her an active role in the development of her son’s ideas, and it seemed to fit their story very well.
Hamilton apparently believed that God would forgive Catherine for her suicide attempt and that she would be saved; the fact that in his eyes Catherine’s attempt had been ‘an act of madness’ means that he trusted that the demand of full knowledge and awareness of her sin, which would have made it a mortal sin, was not met. But different from Hamilton, James Barlow was not so convinced that his kind and loving mother had been mad, he had not seen madness, just the very deep sadness which had always been around her, as long as he remembered. He still did not know anything about the coercion; he just could not accept that in case of her full awareness doctrine dictated that she would be tortured mercilessly and for all eternity, because it would completely ignore that she had been a good and loving mother, who just had been so unhappy that she had found life to be unbearable.

Yet for both Hamilton and James Barlow it was not so much Catherine’s suicide attempt which was the most difficult as seen from a religious point of view, but that in her last years she had been losing her faith. It is not factually known why she lost it; in the poem Hamilton had sent to Catherine in 1850 he had written, “Thyself to blame, by Him acquitted be, Such is the present lot assigned to thee,” from which it could be deduced that he had heard from her brothers that she did see her suicide attempt as something she should be blamed for and was afraid to be punished for her sins, making her turn away from the Church and her beliefs. For Hamilton, who was very strict in church matters, that had meant that he had to try to help her, and he had hoped that for Catherine feeling his love for her would restore her reliance on the love of God. Knowing that at the time of her death her faith had not been restored must have been very difficult for him, yet he seems to have trusted that God would know that she had been a deeply good person, and that He would grant her forgiveness instead of punishing her after having had such a difficult life, and having been treated so terribly unjust.

James Barlow went much further than Hamilton in not taking the doctrines absolutely literally; he started to question them. Using theological and even mathematical arguments, he showed why eternal death is in the Bible, but eternal punishment is not. Having seen his mother lose her faith as a result of the, as he now saw it, flawed doctrine of hell became decisive for his career; what was new in his ideas was not that they had not been conceived earlier by other theological thinkers, but that he started to argue that the doctrine could have the same negative influence on other people. “In [1859] J.W. Barlow, a Junior Fellow of nine years’ standing, attacked the doctrine of eternal punishment as constituting a serious obstacle to the acceptance of Christianity by many modern minds. For this he incurred a rebuke from the Archbishop [Whately] which was enough to deter him from ever officiating again as a clergyman, though he remained a faithful member of the Church of Ireland.”

---

9 About Hamilton’s opinion much is known, as regards James Barlow this is a possible scenario.
10 [Graves 1885, 652], see also p. 79.
11 In his 1865 essay James Barlow argues that the punishment after death is exclusion from heaven, [Barlow 1865, 170-171]. For the mathematical arguments see [Barlow 1865, 109-110].
12 No article or pamphlet was found in which James Barlow made these statements before the 1865 essay; he may have incorporated his ideas in his sermons.
13 [McDowell & Webb 1982, 241]. “He had also quarrelled with the Provost as the result of a rebuke administered to him for an unsuitable (though quite orthodox) sermon delivered at an ordination service. See N.J.D. White, Some recollections of Trinity College, Dublin (1935), 30.” [McDowell & Webb 1982, 538 note 2].
8.2.1 Professor of modern history and an essay

Fellows of Trinity College Dublin were required to take holy orders,\textsuperscript{14} and in December 1853, a month after his mother’s death, James Barlow became Deacon in Cork, in 1854 he became Priest.\textsuperscript{15} Yet the family apparently did not stay in Cork for long, because in April 1855 and October 1856 the eldest two children, William Ruxton and Jane, were baptised in Dollymount, Clontarf, Dublin.\textsuperscript{16}

Not being allowed to preach any more, in 1860 James Barlow became Professor of Modern History at Trinity College Dublin. Even though he had taken his Fellowship exams in mathematics that was not unusual then; “a substantial minority of the Fellows [. . .] turned back to the classics or related subjects after they had won their Fellowship mainly in mathematics.”\textsuperscript{17} He was not the first professor in “modern history, jurisprudence, economics and English literature [. . .], [but] it was only with the appointment of J.W. Barlow in the 1860s that the post holder could be considered an active historian, as previous holders did not publish or regularly lecture. Barlow [. . .] declared at a lecture in 1873 that ‘we must view, as something absolutely portentous, the courage of a lecturer who, unbacked by the police, takes as his subject a period not merely of modern history, but of Modern Irish History.’ ( Italics in original.)”\textsuperscript{18}

However, despite being an active historian now, James Barlow did not stop writing theological essays and expressing his thoughts. He had “more of a philosophical than a historical mind, and he meditated constantly on such problems as the nature of life after death and the possibility of evaluating human happiness and misery.”\textsuperscript{19} Indeed, apparently wondering why some unhappy people could cope with life while others like his mother could not, he was searching for a measure for the ratio between misery and happiness, which in his later science fiction novel about Hesperos can be recognized in the Hesperian joy-and-sorrow-metronome, a device used to measure whether one’s pain or suffering, physically or mentally, exceeds one’s joy.\textsuperscript{20}

In 1865, six years after having been rebuked and about half a year before Hamilton’s death, James Barlow published his \textit{Eternal Punishment and Eternal Death; an Essay}. In the preface, written in December 1864, he very clearly repeats his stance towards the doctrine of Eternal Punishment, writing, “the Eternity of Future Punishments has been, in truth, the immemorial doctrine of the great majority of the Church, but at no period of her history has the influence of such doctrine been so energetic for evil as it is in our own days. It is now – sometimes openly, but much oftener in secret – driving out thousands from us to infidelity; and it is, beyond all question, THE great repulsive force which prevents the alien from entering within the Christian Pale.”

\textsuperscript{14}In 1840 the celibacy rule was repealed, see footnote 25 on p. 37.
\textsuperscript{15}[Brady 1864, vol 3, 146-147]
\textsuperscript{16}The baptism records of the other children were not found.
\textsuperscript{17}[McDowell & Webb 1982, 530 note 97]. What between 1850 and 1860 exactly James Barlow’s position at TCD was has not been found, but in both 1851 and 1852 he had been Examiner in Mathematics. See [TCD 1907, 133, 134], compared with \textit{Genes Reunited : SBN A}, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index, keywords: Mathematics, Harlow, county: Dublin, years: 1851-1851; keyword: Maturulu, years: 1851-1851; keywords: Trinity, Junior, Hcmy, Barlow, years: 1852-1852. See for a short list of books and articles written by James Barlow [TCD 1907, 507].
\textsuperscript{19}[McDowell & Webb 1982, 300-301]
\textsuperscript{20}[Barlow 1891, 59-61], see also p. 101.
In the essay James Barlow discusses the ratio between misery and happiness from a theological standpoint. He argues that punishment which lasts for ever can never benefit the sinner himself, and must therefore be for the benefit of others, withholding them to do sin and so deserving eternal happiness. It thus is taught that unending torture of one person is justified because it is useful for another, as if there is a measure in which the eternal unhappiness of someone can be equalled by the eternal happiness of someone else; “The feelings which such propositions excite in me may possibly arise from some defect in my moral constitution, but I unreservedly state that I know no words sufficiently strong to express my abhorrence of such doctrine.”

As an example he then supposes that if a father was given the choice to disappear with all his children after death, he would favour that choice over one in which one child has to go to hell in order to let the others go to heaven, even if in the latter choice there would be a “clear preponderance in the scale of total happiness.” Indeed every father would “suffer himself and all his children to sink back for ever to the silent void from which they were called to life by the voice of God, rather than purchase the joys of heaven at such a price.” And that should therefore also be the choice of any moral being as regards humanity as a whole.21

Following these arguments his mother would perhaps not go to heaven, as Hamilton clearly believed, but she would also not be used as a deterrent for others by being tortured for all eternity. She would be allowed to sink back into the silent void she had come from when she was born, the nothingness which would still be a frightful prospect for many people who hope to go to heaven, perhaps even enough to withhold them from doing sin, but which for her had felt so peaceful.

### 8.3 The biography

In September 1865 Hamilton died, and it is known that James Barlow still was in contact with him. Soon after Hamilton’s death Graves started to prepare for his biography, and in 1882 the first volume was published. The early love between Hamilton and Catherine was now completely in the open; Graves could not have been more clear, describing how Hamilton visited the Disney family that first time, and how a daughter of the house “influenced his whole life.” The Disneys became very worried about what Graves would reveal in the second volume, and in May 1883 they wrote to Graves that they were of the opinion that he had been too open about Hamilton’s life. Indeed, in the first volume describing 1830, Graves had already mentioned that Hamilton would meet Catherine again “when she lay upon her deathbed,” and the Disneys will have been very afraid that in the upcoming volume Graves would also be too open about that of Catherine, about her suicide attempt and the subsequent separation from her husband.22

In the second volume, published in 1885, Graves described Hamilton’s 1848 visit to Parsonstown; he gave a letter Hamilton had written to De Vere while on his way to Parsonstown, still very agitated after the six-week correspondence with Catherine,23 and letters to De Vere and James Barlow, then his pupil, during the first weeks of his

---

21 [Barlow 1865, 48-51]
23 See p. 68. Graves did not reveal that the correspondence had been with Catherine, but he was very explicit about the impact it had had on Hamilton.
visit there when he was calming down. For James Barlow it must have been unsettling to see the letters written to himself within the context of Hamilton’s life then: the extracts of the six-week correspondence between Hamilton and “an old friend” and the following emotional correspondence with De Vere about first loves; the 1848 poem ‘A Prayer for Calm’, written only a day before Hamilton’s visit to Parsonstown and of which Hamilton mentioned that that related “mainly to an impression upon my affections, which was made twenty-four years ago,” now he knew why Hamilton had felt languor and fatigue, and had used the word perhaps in his letter from Parsonstown; a remark by Graves that he had withheld a letter to De Vere because in that letter Hamilton “disclosed fully the nature of his trial” which had to do with the “vivid picturing in memory of the incidents of that by-gone time;” the 1850 poem ‘To an Afflicted Friend Suffering under Religious Depression’ to which Graves remarked that “Hamilton, deeply moved by the state of spirits, as reported to him, of one long dear to his heart and imagination, composed the following lines.”

Now knowing about Hamilton’s once deep love for his mother, it is entirely possible that James Barlow still suspected nothing about the coercion until he read, in the second volume, Graves’ description of 1853. Even though Graves had not written about Catherine’s suicide attempt, he wrote that “early in November died the lady who had been the object of [Hamilton’s] first serious passion,” and then gave her name in the index, “Disney, Catherine, 648. Her death, 691.” Graves was also very clear about the ‘parting interviews’, “This friend of his youth, from whom events and duties had parted him for nearly thirty years, aware of her approaching end, felt herself free to permit a parting interview, at which the two friends, who under other circumstances might have been more than friends to each other, could at last blamelessly exchange assurances of the feelings of mutual esteem and regard which had remained unchanged during the long period of severance, and of which only the highest

---

24 Hamilton continued, “That was, really, love at first sight – mysterious – wonderful – all that has happened to me since is, in comparison, unreality.” This sentence might seem to imply that Hamilton only loved Catherine, but there is a very different way to look at it. In [Van Weerden 2017] it was discussed that Hamilton seems to have felt his feelings of the moment as the only and absolute truth, as if they would never change any more. But because he was also extremely honest, in his letters he therefore regularly seems to contradict himself. About his college years for instance he both claimed that he had been depressed, and that they were the happiest years of his life. He also described emotional events differently to different people; perhaps he chose whom to write to according to his emotional state. [Van Weerden 2017, 295-299]. Another example of Hamilton taking his feelings of the moment as the inalterable truth is his poem ‘The Enthusiast’, in which he wrote that he was left ‘darkly changed’, yet in later years he wrote that “the gloom described at the close is […] not a fair description, or anticipation, of my subsequent life.” [Graves 1882, 182]. De Vere was his most metaphysicizing friend, see [Van Weerden 2017, 102, ff.], and choosing to write to him, the sentences about how he fell in love with Catherine, and how thereafter everything seemed to be “unreality” in comparison, were doubtlessly deeply sincere, but in the moment, not as a statement that his love for his wife was not real. Or his love for Ellen de Vere, about whom he had written that the “affliction” of having lost her had been “of the same kind” and “of the same degree” as losing Catherine, see p. 6. And indeed, about his love for Catherine he also wrote, again to De Vere but seven years later, how “perfectly fraternal” it was, and about the impressive moment of falling in love with her that it had been “a sudden burst of boyish admiration for a rare, but fading beauty,” see p. 28. Having had a reverence for marriage, and as can be seen from his poems also deeply loving Helen, Hamilton regarded his bond with her as the most important bond, “sealed by mystic ring of wedded love.” [Van Weerden 2017, 211, 187-188, 169].


26 [Graves 1885, 708]. On p. 648 Graves gave Hamilton’s description of an 1850 visit to “the mansion of Summerhill,” where he “first saw C.D.”
elements could in the near presence of death find admission to the thoughts of either. Such an interview took place twice. To the departing Christian it brought a sense of justice done by due explanation, and the consciousness that the remembrance of her parting words would strengthen the spiritual aspirations and endeavours of her friend; and to Hamilton it imparted a melancholy satisfaction, assuring him that his early devotion had been recognised as no unworthy tribute by her to whom it had been paid, and consecrating her memory by a light shed upon it from the region of eternity. The agitation caused to [Hamilton] by the event did not soon pass away.”

For James Barlow this must have been a very puzzling description. If Hamilton had been in love with his mother so openly, as Graves had described in the first volume, even giving the years it took Hamilton to overcome his loss, and he now wrote that they “might have been more than friends to each other” which would imply that their love had been mutual, then what could still have been hidden which had needed a further explanation. Moreover, if Hamilton had been happily married when his mother died, then what had caused him so much agitation after these parting interviews, apparently more than usual when losing a dear friend or even a first love.

He started to wonder whether Hamilton’s agitation had had anything to do with his mother’s ever-present sadness. His father had died in 1879, three years before the first volume of the biography had been published, and he therefore started to ask family members about Catherine and Hamilton. Also knowing that Graves, in preparation for the biography, had received letters written by Hamilton from very many correspondents, he asked him if he could read these letters. Amongst these letters were the 1855 letters to De Vere in which Hamilton had opened up about Catherine, and in which he had written that Catherine had pleaded desperately against the marriage, but that Barlow had not been prepared to give up his ‘prize’. Reading these letters, talking with the elder family members, and finally understanding what had happened to his mother, shook his whole existence.

Being happily married himself, it was very difficult for him to learn that his father had claimed his mother as a bride. To read about his grandfather’s iron will, his mother’s desperate pleadings, that Hamilton had seen her sorrow during that visit in 1830 when he had been only four years old yet now he vaguely remembered it because his mother had been so terribly sad thereafter, his father’s refusal when his mother asked permission to write to Hamilton, her long years of silently enduring, it was too much. But it did explain it all, up to Hamilton tutoring him; he surely resembled his mother very much. His poor, poor mother.

Yet something kept nagging his soul and his religious feelings. His father certainly should not have forced his mother to marry him, but still, after the pledges at the altar their marriage had become a sacred commitment, a bond before God. How someone could become trapped in so much lovelessness because of God’s presence in even such a marriage, became a terrible dilemma for the deeply religious James Barlow.

8.4 Alternative marriages in a doomed society

In 1891, two years after the publication of the third volume of the biography, James Barlow published a science fiction novel, History of a World of Immortals Without

27 [Graves 1885, 691-692]
a God, using the pseudonym Antares Skorpios. The novel contained issues he had written about in his 1865 Essay, such as Christianity teaching that the vast majority of the human race awaits everlasting life in fire, and the evaluation of human happiness and misery, which received the form of a device to measure the ratio between them, the Hesperian joy-and-sorrow metronome. But what he added was marriage.

In his novel James Barlow describes a society on Venus, which is called Hesperos. The Hesperians do not know where they came from, twenty thousand years ago they just came into being. There are men and women, and attraction between them, but there are no births and no deaths, people grow older and then rejuvenate again without getting very young or old, nor forgetting what happened during the cycles. James Barlow then starts on a description of marriage on Hesperos which contains the most telling sentences in connection with his mother, while showing how difficult it was in those days to talk about it.

He discusses the subject of marriage very cautiously, and to be very clear that it all is not his own opinion he uses the ‘notes’ of the protagonist of his novel, the very misanthropic Dutchman Gervaas van Varken [Gervase of Pig]. “I should here say a few words on the relations between the sexes in this strange planet. On this difficult subject I have taken abundance of notes from the information I received; information which, I am bound to say, was given me without the slightest reserve. (I suppress all details in these notes, as public opinion, very rightly, does not permit the discussion of such matters.) It is obvious of itself that the permanence of individual life renders the establishment of such a life-contract as marriage an impossibility. Accordingly, the Hesperian relation which most nearly corresponds with the matrimonial institution on earth usually lasts for one of the cyclical periods [. . .]. This is, I say, the customary procedure; but the relation is terminable at any time, and at the will of either party concerned. It should, of course, be remembered that, as there are no children, the disastrous consequences which would be the inevitable result of such a state of things on earth do not take place.” James Barlow thus describes a society on another planet in which his mother would not have been forced to marry his father, and would not have felt compelled to stay with him because the for the children disastrous consequences of a divorce does not exist on Hesperos; his mother could have been very much happier there.

But the novel ends in a terrible way. The Hesperians do not understand where they came from, and are on a Quest to find their Maker. They want to know how life is on Earth, but they do not know that Gervaas had a terrible youth and loathes the people from Earth. He tells them how every religious group on Earth fights each other, and that Christianity even teaches that their Maker designed the greater part of the human race to live everlastinglly in excruciating torture by fire. Hearing about such a Maker fills the Hesperians with horror and dismay, and they want to visit Earth to examine it for themselves. But although Gervaas manages to leave Hesperos in the way he came, the Hesperians discover that they can never leave the planet.

The last sentence of the novel describes an alternative hell when it is realized that they do not die and have to live like that for ever, “Here ends our knowledge of the

---

28 [Barlow 1891]. Almost twenty years later a second edition, with the exact same text but supplemented with a Preface, was published under his own name: Barlow. J.W. (1909), The Immortals’ Great Quest. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. archive.org/details/immortalsgreatqu00barl.

29 [Barlow 1865, 1], [Barlow 1891, 61], p. 97
Godless Immortals. It is not likely that their hundred and sixty years’ additional existence [after Dr. Van Varken’s visit] has lightened the World-Weariness and Sorrow which was plainly settling down upon them like a heavy pall.”

Obviously, for James Barlow, living in a less strict society, which for his mother would have meant less earthly sorrow, would mean living without upholding the sacraments, and thus without God, for him a truly horrific idea. Even though his mother was forced to live a miserable life she should have endured, because she then would have been rewarded for her earthly misery by everlasting happiness. Nevertheless, although she had lost her courage and her faith, and had committed a mortal sin, she had not been so wicked that she should be tortured for eternity. Far more righteous would be the punishment of being excluded from heaven, by disappearing into the void everyone comes from and indeed, as he had argued in his 1865 essay, that was what he had found in the Bible and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.

In 1909 a second edition of the Hesperos novel was published, and in the Dublin Irish Independent of the 29th of March a reviewer openly questioned James Barlow’s motives for describing marriage on Venus. “Fiction written by a philosopher, and very entertaining fiction too, such is The Immortals’ Great Quest. A quaint tale of how a Dutch doctor, in the year 1730, discovers a secret by which he can transfer himself to another planet. […] He finds the Hesperians very like the people of earth, but there is no death amongst them, and no birth. Why, then, does Mr. Barlow bring in the sex question at all? There are a couple of other slips. A man writing in 1730 wouldn’t have mentioned tramways, stock jobbers, and policemen.” 30 Not knowing anything about James Barlow’s private life the explanations about marriage apparently seemed superfluous, merely a slip just as some others; thus placing James Barlow in the context of his time, the connection between his work and his mother’s unhappiness becomes all the more likely.

8.5 Reputations and an original mind

The first edition of the science fiction novel was soon withdrawn31 but it is not known why. It was published at the end of March 1891 and, like the later edition, it seems to have been received with mixed feelings. The Athenæum gave a very short but very positive review, describing it as “astonishingly clever,” 32 yet the Midlothian The Scotsman of April gave a more negative review. “It tells how a learned Dutchman went to Thibet and there learnt how to disintegrate himself (whatever that may be) and thereafter arrive upon Hesperos […] ; then goes on to explain the manners and customs […] of the inhabitants of Hesperos. There is no story or action. The Dutchman does not fall in love with any fair Hesperian young person. Perhaps he might have done so if he had not been a Dutchman: They are a phlegmatic people. Perhaps a man does not think of such things when he is disinfected. […] Dr Van Varken […] sticks to such abstractions as Cyclical Organic Life, the Universal Language, the Sympathetic Telegraph and comprehensible impossibilities of that sort. Once

---

30 For the article see Genes Reunited : SBN A, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: immortals quest, county: Dublin, years: 1909-1909.
you get East of the Sun and West of the Moon anything is probable, so no objection can be taken to the probability or naturalness of the story. As a work of imagination, it is cold, abstract, and not strikingly ingenious. It has, however, the merits of brevity, of consistency, and of unity of development – the last a rare enough quality in books of the kind; and its fancies will prove suggestive to a reader of a speculative turn of mind.”

The withdrawal may have had to do with such or more negative reviews, yet it may also have been due to the publication in January 1892 of *Bog-land Studies*, the first collection of poetry by James Barlow’s eldest daughter Jane Barlow. Writing anonymously for newspapers, she apparently had used the pseudonym Antares Skorpios before her father used it for the publication of his sf novel, and because she had published her *Bog-land Studies* as J. Barlow, which led some reviewers to assume that it was written by a man, it could lead to the assumption that the same writer had written the Hesperos novel, which then might influence the acceptance of her poetry negatively.

That the withdrawal was done with an eye on Jane Barlow’s reputation also seems to be plausible because her father does not seem to have cared much about his, as can be seen in *Trinity College Dublin 1592-1952*, where James Barlow’s unusual place among the Fellows at Trinity is discussed. “At the head of the list of Junior Fellows in 1892 stood J.W. Barlow, and he is best considered in isolation as he fits into no category [of scholars and tutors]. Under a cloud in his younger days for a heterodoxy which verged on heresy […] and in his old age a defender of some of the more preposterous aspects of the status quo [at TCD], he seems to have antagonized at least some of his colleagues by mere perversity. He could never resist the temptation, even when proposing quite sensible and commonplace motions, to coin epigrams and deploy far-fetched arguments. This was a pity, as he had in some respects an interesting and original mind.”

Of this ‘original mind’ a short example is given. “In the early years of the College daily attendance at Chapel was compulsory, not only for the students, but also for the Fellows […] at any rate for those living within the walls. […] [For a number of reasons it seems that no] more than a minority attended weekday Chapel during any part of the nineteenth century […]. Barlow, writing in 1871, with a characteristic mixture of acute comment and malicious irony, pointed out that the average attendance at weekday services (deducting those who were paid to attend and perform specific duties) amounted to 2.78378 students and 0.29729 Fellows.”

And apparently some of his fellow scientists did react to his ‘antagonizing’ them, “[Barlow] was bullied mercilessly by [Sir John Pentland] Mahaffy [later provost and president of the Royal Irish Academy] and [Anthony] Traill [also later provost], but the fact that he was elected as a representative of the Junior Fellows on the Council from its foundation until he became a Senior Fellow, and was re-elected as its secretary annually for thirteen years, despite the opposition of Traill, shows that he at least in his middle years he was not generally unpopular. He was, as we have seen, the

---

33 *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Hesperos Dutchman, years: 1891-1891.
34 [Barlow 1892, Bog-land], [Tynan 1924, 292], *SFE : the Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*, sf-encyclopedia.com/entry/barlow_jane, *Genes Reunited : SBNA*, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Barlow Jane Borland wellknown reviewers, years: 1909-1909. The confusion did happen; it still is regularly assumed that Jane Barlow wrote the novel. See footnote 17 on p. 113.
first Professor of Modern History for many a long year to take his duties seriously, and he published two useful books on the medieval history of Italy, and another, more original, on the medical profession in seventeenth-century France.”

In a note it is added, “Mahaffy is said to have asked a dull student in a classical *viva voce* [oral] examination, after he had missed two questions, ‘Why was Dr Barlow made a Fellow?’ Again the student did not know. ‘Quite right. You get a mark for that. Nobody does.’ On the Council there was hardly a year in which Traill did not either oppose Barlow’s re-election as secretary, or move that he should be given extra duties or that his salary should be decreased.” 35

Not knowing anything about his mother, it thus seems to have been possible for people to see James Barlow in very different ways; on the one hand as a bullied man suffering from the consequences of his early heterodoxy, and on the other hand as a valued representative, a loving husband and a good friend. Only when Catherine’s influence on his life is accounted for, his protests against the doctrines of his Church, his “constantly meditating on such problems as the possibility of evaluating human happiness and misery,” and his “cold, abstract” but “astonishingly clever” novel, can be recognized as utterings of his concerns with his mother’s afterlife. 36

### 8.6 The Society for Psychical Research

Even though he was obviously bullied, Mahaffy and James Barlow seem to have been on speaking terms. In April 1901, while being Vice-Provost, James Barlow had become a member of the English Society for Psychical Research, 37 and in 1908, a year before he republished his science fiction novel, he became chairman and the first vice-president of the then new Dublin section of the Society. In his obituary, published in 1914 in the *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, it was mentioned that when he was vice-president, a “great work on *Human Personality [and Its Survival of Bodily Death]*” 38 deeply impressed Mr. Barlow, and he brought it under the notice of Dr. J.P. Mahaffy, who included a considerable portion of this work in the Dublin University Fellowship Course – the earliest official recognition by a famous, and indeed conservative, University of Psychical Research as a branch of science. In this connection we may here record the interesting fact that Dr. J. P. Mahaffy, S.F. T.C.D., the present Vice-Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, has consented to take Mr. Barlow’s place as Vice-President of the Dublin section of our Society.” 39


36 In 1863 his brother Thomas Disney Barlow published *Rays from the Sun of Righteousness. Sermons*. London: James Nisbet & Co. books.google.com/books?id=CoIEAAAQAQAJ. In his sermons no clear connections with his mother’s story were found. Yet he does mention in his Preface that “souls are born from above,” which will allude to heaven. That would be in contrast to his brother’s convictions, that we all come from a void in which there is nothing, only eternal death.

37 *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, 10 (178): 49. archive.org/details/journalofsociety07sociuoft

38 Myers, F.W.H. (1903), *Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death*. archive.org/details/humanpersonality01myeruoft (vol. 1), archive.org/details/humanpersonality02myeruoft (vol. 2). London: Longmans, Green, and Co. In the same volume of the *Journal* also some book reviews by Jane Barlow can be found. She had become an associate in 1895, see p. 33 of the *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*, March and April 1895, archive.org/details/journalofsociety07sociuoft.

Remarkable, and perhaps a sign that James Barlow had very personal motives to become a member of the Society, is that the Dublin Section was “dominated” “from the start […] by investigations into the planchette, ouija board, automatic writing, and séance phenomena. These were all in contrast to [the English Society’s] earlier interests in psychical research (telepathy, Reichenbach phenomena).” The planchette and the ouija board were used to make contact with spirits, usually deceased loved ones, automatic writing was unconscious writing guided by a spirit, and séances were meetings where people tried to talk with spirits through a medium. That was indeed in contrast with telepathy which would happen between living people, or the Reichenbach phenomena, emanations of light attributed to a universal life force which was expected to explain mesmerism, and which also had nothing to do with spirits.

Catherine, Hamilton and Barlow had died many years before James Barlow became a member of the Society, and he may have been searching for answers. Perhaps he hoped that he could make contact with his father and with Hamilton, both of whom he wanted to ask so many questions, and with his mother if she had been forgiven. But had she not, she should not answer, because then she had disappeared into the silent void he was certain she would have been allowed to enter. And now that he was at it anyway, what he hoped with all his heart was that he would be able to make contact with his daughter Mary who had died so very young, and with his wife who had died in 1894, and whom he missed so terribly.

---

section of the Society ceased to exist in 1913 or 1914; its last report, about 1912, appeared in the 1913-1914 issue of the Journal, and it is therefore not known whether Mahaffy did become vice-president after all. The English Society and its journal still exist: spr.ac.uk/about/our-history.

Psychic phenomena were not so alien to scientists as they are now. The Society was described as “a research group of intelligent, informed and highly placed men and women,” and also other scientists of Trinity College were members. See p. 5 of McCroristine, S., (2011), William Fletcher Barrett, Spiritualism, and Psychical Research in Edwardian Dublin. Estudios Irlandeses: Journal of Irish Studies, 6: 39-53. lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/32789/4/WFB, McCroristine.pdf.

Mary had died in 1887 when she was only twenty, see the Appendix on p. 129.
Chapter 9

Jane Barlow

While it is almost impossible to see Catherine Disney other than through Hamilton’s eyes, and to see James Barlow other than through his work, supplemented with some bits of information, about Jane Barlow many and very different views have been given, both about her work and her private life. How divers, and sometimes almost opposite, the opinions about her work have been will only be shown briefly, because the focus here is on her private life and the connection with her grandmother’s story. As regards Catherine’s family history, it must be noted that it has not been researched here if or how the influence of her forced marriage and subsequent unhappiness could be recognized in the lives of her descendants other than James and Jane Barlow; people, even when they are siblings, can react quite differently to extreme situations. James Barlow’s work offered a singular insight into his thinking; it was there that Catherine’s unhappiness seemed so recognizable. In Jane Barlow’s case it was the unusualness of her private life, but the link with her grandmother could not have been made without her father’s work.

9.1 A very close or inward-turned family

Born in Dollymount in 1856, Jane Barlow was the second child and eldest daughter of James and Mary Barlow, in a family with seven children.¹ The family seems to have been a happy one, with parents who loved each other and their children. But it was also a marriage within a very closed family circle because James and Mary Barlow were double first cousins; their parents had been two Barlow brothers, John and William, who had married two Disney sisters, Jane and Catherine. Consequently, instead of having had eight great-grandparents, their children had only four, at the Barlow side James and Elizabeth Barlow, and at the Disney side Thomas and Anne Disney. Jane Barlow never knew her grandmother Catherine Disney because she was born after the latter had died, but she will have known the other three grandparents. Also her great-grandmother Anne Disney still lived when Jane was born; she died in 1858, and may have seen Jane as a baby and a toddler.

¹ See the Appendix on p. 129.
Figure 9.1: Jane Barlow’s baptism record. “Baptisms Solemnized in the Parish Church of Clontarf in the County of Dublin in the Year 1856.” As can be seen by his first name in the rightmost column, combined with his handwriting, Jane Barlow was baptised by her father who then was not rebuked yet. Irish genealogy.ie: Church Records, churchrecords.irishgenealogy.ie/churchrecords/display-pdf.jsp?pdfName=d-833-2-1-018.

It also does not seem to have been an average family in other ways; apparently none of the children married. Mary Louisa, the sixth child and third daughter, had died in 1887 when only twenty years old, but a comparison between the 1901 and 1911 censuses strongly suggests that in 1901 all the other children, the youngest having been thirty already, still or again lived with their father.

Figure 9.2: The 1901 census of Ireland. Mrs. Mary Barlow had died in 1894, the youngest daughter Mary Louisa in 1887. The other six children were at home with their father. censuse.nationalarchives.ie/pages/1901/Dublin/Howth/Ballyhoey/1270314.
Before the 1901 census of Ireland William Ruxton Barlow, the eldest son, had been a colonel in the Royal Artillery, and superintendent of the Royal Laboratory. He had been an expert on ammunitions,² and had retired on half pay in 1897.³ Even though the censuses recorded who was in the house that night, not who officially lived there, having been at home in both 1901 and 1911 indicates that he moved back in with his father and siblings before the 1901 census, and as can be seen in the census of 1911 he had an “income from dividends.” Also John, in the 1911 census recorded as a “civil servant – clerk, local Government Board in Ireland” seems to have lived in the family home in both 1901 and 1911; of Jane, as an “author of poetry and prose fiction,” and Katharine, without a paid profession, it is certain that they lived there until their father’s death in 1913.⁴

Maurice, who in 1901 was a “student at the Royal Veterinary College,” moved out at some time between the censuses, and as can be seen in the 1911 census, having become a veterinary surgeon he lived at Marlborough Terrace in Bray.⁵ Of James Arthur no profession was given in 1901 when he was with his father in Dublin, nor in 1911 when he was with his brother Maurice. He may have moved in with Maurice, because in the census the latter was indicated as “head of the family” although next to the brothers there were no other persons in the house.

² William Ruxton published two books, a *Treatise on Ammunition*, books.google.com/books?id=D6EZn9XnLwC, and a compilation, *Notes on Ammunition*, books.google.com/books?id=R1gBAAAAAQAJ.
³ Cemetery: County Wicklow, St. Patrick’s, Enniskerry. igp-web.com/IGPArchives/ire/wicklow/cemeteries/st-patrick-enniskerry.htm [accessed 3 Dec 2018].
⁴ See p. 117.
⁵ For the 1911 census showing Maurice’s Bray address see census.nationalarchives.ie/pages/1911/Wicklow/Bray/No_2/Marlborough_Terrace/891889.
After their father’s death in 1913 the siblings moved to St. Valerie in Bray, Co. Wicklow. They apparently all lived together in St. Valerie; for William Ruxton and James Arthur a direct connection to this house was not found, but it was found for Jane, John, Maurice and Katharine. Jane Barlow died in October 1917, William Ruxton in 1922, Maurice in 1923, and Katharine in 1929. John’s death date does not seem to be publicly known; in March 1930 he was mentioned as copyright holder of some of his sister’s books, but no later trace of him was found.

James Arthur moved to England at some time before or early in 1929; when in June that year he became a member of the English Society for Psychical Research he lived in Richmond, Surrey. He was the fourth family member who joined the English Society: in April 1895, four months after her mother’s death, Jane Barlow had become an associate; their father had become a member in 1901 and in 1908 he had helped to establish the Dublin Section of the Society; in January 1918, only some months after Jane’s death, Katharine became a member of the English Society, the Dublin section having ceased to exist before 1915. Like Jane before him after her mother’s death, and Katharine after Jane’s death, James Arthur became a member around the time of Katharine’s death, which might show personal interests in the Society’s researches rather than scientific ones.

Although John’s death date is not known, James Arthur may have been the longest living sibling. He died in 1932, and an article in the Midlothian The Scotsman of the 26th of February seems to imply that he was unmarried, had inherited the family money, and that there was no family left, “Bequests to Charity. […] James Arthur Barlow, of the Old Court House, The Green, Richmond, Surrey, son of the late Rev. James Barlow, sometime [Vice-]Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. Net personalty £9095; gross £9223.”

6 In Jane Barlow’s death announcements St. Valerie or St. Valery is called her “residence,” but it is unknown whether they bought it or rented it. Genes Reunited: SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/se archbna/index. Keywords: Jane Barlow death Bray delighted, years: 1917-1917. It was a large house; in Griffith’s Valuation, therefore between 1847 and 1864, for St. Valery next to landlords also tenants were given. askaboutireland.ie/griffith-valuation, Griffith’s Places, place-name St Valery, county Wicklow, barony Rathdown, parish Kilmacanoge.

7 For John this address was given when in 1920 he became a member of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, see p. xviii of the Journal Of Hellenic Studies vol. 40, archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.70866, for both John and Maurice on p. 12 of the Trinity College Calendar 1918-1919, archive.org/details/calendar2191819trimoft, for Katharine on p. 106 of the Journal of the Society for Psychical Research of January 1918, archive.org/details/journalofsociety18soci.

8 On p. 23 of the February 1930 issue of the Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, vol. XXVI, no 462, Katharine is mentioned as one of the deceased. archive.org/details/journalofpsychicalresearch2526soci/page/22.

9 See p. 2327 and 2438 of the Catalog of copyright entries, Part 1, Group 1, Books, Including List of Renewals. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015076106460.


11 See p. 104, and footnote 38 on the same page.


13 Perhaps with less focus than the Irish section, also the English section was interested in life after death, see the remarks on p. 104 by W.F. Barrett, founder member of the Society.

14 Genes Reunited: SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: James Arthur Barlow, years: 1932-1932. According to the website MeasuringWorth, measuringworth.com, in 2017 the relative income value of an income or wealth of £9000 in 1932 was £3,113,000. For the house see Historic England: Old Court House, Richmond Green. historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1181217 [accessed 4 Dec 2018].
Figure 9.4: Jane Barlow in 1895. From *The Bookman: A Literary Journal*, II (4): 260-261. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.8b623090;seq=271.
Figure 9.5: “Miss Jane Barlow, D.Litt. 1894. Oil on canvas 62.2 x 67.4 cm. Presented by Mrs Barlow. This is a portrait of Jane Barlow [by Sarah Purser]. The Barlow and Purser families both had members on the academic staff of TCD, and Jane and Purser met at latest in 1892 during the College Tercentenary celebrations. That year Jane published Irish Idylls, a book so popular on both sides of the Atlantic that six years later it was in its eighth edition. She maintained her success through a prolific output of books and short stores about Irish peasant life; some of the stories were illustrated by [Purser]. Jane’s five letters respectively concern times for an initial sitting, ‘another sitting,’ ‘the grey jacket, the sight of which you must ... by this time hate,’ a further sitting time, and her account of favourable comments from mutual friends who had seen the work in Purser’s studio; half length, seated frontally in left half of picture with a table in right foreground; head lowered but gaze on viewer, knuckles of left hand touching her temple, left elbow and right hand on table; grey jacket with white and gold frontal inset, cuffs and collar; before her on the fawn and crimson tablecloth lies an open illuminated book, a vase of flowers behind it; background dark brown-grey. Exhibition of the portrait was probably delayed by the mourning for her mother. Despite her literary success Jane lived a retired life, but in June 1904 was conferred a Doctor of Letters by the University of Dublin; she died in 1917. (Information taken from John O’Grady, Sarah Purser, Four Courts Press, 1996, p. 223.)” See the online collection on hughlane.ie. Courtesy of Dublin City Gallery The Hugh Lane.
9.2 Delightful gems or exhausted knowledge

Jane Barlow lived during the last period of the Ascendancy. In the Dictionary of Irish Biography it is written about her political stance that “despite her family’s unionist background, she considered herself a nationalist from childhood. Inspired by the Young Ireland and Fenian movements, she contributed romantic nationalist verse to the United Irishman [...], though this was published anonymously, to avoid embarrassing her father. Similarly influenced by the Gaelic revival, she attempted to learn Irish and in 1900 was elected as an honorary member of the St Columba branch of the Gaelic League. Her lengthy correspondence with Katharine Tynan and Sarah Purser [...] testifies to these influences, and she often signed herself Sinéad.\(^{15}\) However, she later became alienated by the radical turn of Irish nationalism, and responded critically to the 1916 rising in verse.”\(^{16}\)

Jane Barlow mainly wrote about peasant life in Ireland, but before publishing, in 1892, her first collection of poetry, Bog-land Studies,\(^{17}\) she had written articles and poems for periodicals and newspapers, signing only with her initials or using pseudonyms.\(^{18}\) In her own time Jane Barlow’s work was very widely read. In an article in The Bookman of December 1895,\(^{19}\) written after the publication of a second series of her “delightful Irish idylls, under the title Strangers at Lisconnel,”\(^{20}\) she is supposed to have “perhaps inherited some title to meddle in the making of books, as her father, Professor Barlow, of Dublin University, is a writer of historical and philosophical works, and her great-great-grandfather, Brabazon Disney, was responsible

\(^{15}\) In her Memories, see p. 115, Katharine Tynan, who was Catholic, writes, “[In 1893] the Irish leaven stirred and surged in her. The Fenian Rising of 1867 had gone out like the spluttering of a damp squib, but its ideals and that of its leaders had lifted it to the regions of Romance. Imaginative and generous children all over Ireland, in the Unionist houses as in the others, coloured their dreams with that romance. It was startling to find how much Jane Barlow and I had been thinking alike in childhood. The moon behind a hill had represented for each of us the watch-fires of the Fenians; a distant sound that suggested drums set up delicious thrills of hope and fear that the Fenians were coming; a rumble that might be guns, blown on the wind brought us news of the battle: strange lights in the sky meant the enemy strongholds were a fire. We were of the children who listened and watched for those lights and sounds when our parents thought us asleep, – she at the North side of Dublin, I at the West.”\(^{16}\) [Clarke 2009, 2013, Jane Barlow]. Also Tynan “was far from comfortable with the radical climate of the country she returned to [in 1911]. For her, ‘affection for England and love of Ireland could quite well go hand in hand’. She became increasingly supportive of Britain after her two sons enlisted to fight in the first world war, and had little sympathy for the Easter rising, which she referred to as a ‘rebellion’.” [Clarke 2009, 2013, Katharine Hinkson Tynan].

\(^{17}\) [Barlow 1892, Bog-land]. The most compelling evidence that Jane Barlow did not write the 1891 Hesperos novel was found in a 1901 letter to Alfred Russel Wallace, in which “she names her father as the author.” See p. 8 of Devine, M. (2017), In the common light of day. Carlow: Institute of Technology, Master Thesis. research.thea.ie/bitstream/handle/20.500.12065/2356/MA MariaDevine2017.pdf. For the letter see nhm.ac.uk, search: Wallace online. Being very different from her other work, also the 1908 novel A Strange Land, published under the pseudonym Felix Ryark, may have been written by her father. worldcat.org/oclc/7386257. Unfortunately, it is not available online.

\(^{18}\) [Tynan 1919, 292]. For an overview of Jane Barlow’s work, with short, generally positive reviews, see [Brown 1919, 27-28]. For a second overview see [Boyd 1916, 402], the pages 209-211 and 376-378 contain mixed reviews of her work. A contemporary overview can be found on Ricorso: A Knowledge of Irish Literature. ricorso.net/az-data/authors/b/Barlow_J/life.htm.

\(^{19}\) The Bookman was a New York literary journal, founded in 1895 and published until 1933. It was preceded by the London The Bookman, a monthly literary magazine which was founded in 1891 and published until 1934.

\(^{20}\) [Barlow 1895, Strangers]
for a commentary on the Psalms which attained to considerable repute [...].\textsuperscript{21} \textit{Irish Idylls}\textsuperscript{22} has been pronounced an Irish classic; and, indeed, no book that has been published for a long time affords a truer insight into Irish peasant character and ways of life and thought. [...] One cannot read such work as Miss Barlow’s without, as [has been said], “laughing lips and a sobbing breast.”\textsuperscript{23}

Nevertheless, reviews of her work differed enormously. Many reviews concerned the question whether or not she understood the people she wrote about; whether her stories were vigorous studies of character, or if she wrote about the Irish peasants as looked at from the distance of her quiet ascendancy home. Almost opposite opinions about the same book can be found easily, as illustrated by the following reviews in \textit{The Athenæum} of her book \textit{Maureen’s Fairing}.\textsuperscript{24}

In \textit{The Athenæum} of the 20\textsuperscript{th} of July 1895 very positive reviews can be found, coming from various newspapers. From the \textit{Spectator}, “Six of these eight stories are charming, with all the charm of Miss Barlow’s subtle humour and fine insight into Irish character. [...] The first story, ‘Maureen’s Fairing,’ is exquisite. The most perfect of all these charming tales is that which she calls ‘Stopped by Signal.’ [...] The story is a perfect gem. [...]”; the \textit{Manchester Guardian}, “Miss Jane Barlow’s charming talent shows no sign of falling off. Indeed, it is doubtful if she has ever done a more finished, delicate bit of work than the sketch called ‘Stopped by Signal.’ [...]”; the \textit{Dublin Evening Herald}, “Three or four of them stand side by side with the best in ‘Irish Idylls,’ and the less admirable are still admirable. One, ‘A Year and a Day,’ is a masterpiece;” the \textit{St. James’s Gazette}, “No writer is more skillful in blending tears and sunshine, and it is enough to say that these little sketches are worthy of Miss Barlow’s reputation.”\textsuperscript{25}

Yet a review in the issue of the 13\textsuperscript{th} of July, apparently by one of \textit{The Athenæum}’s own critics, reads, “This little volume, so charming in appearance, is one of the most disappointing that we have ever read; for the stories are not only poor, disjointed, and without grip on the reality of things, but they are so like a false and feeble echo of Miss Barlow’s earlier work as to reveal many falsities even in the best that she has done. [...] A thousand pities that these tales were ever published! [...] Miss Barlow, like every other artist, sees life through the medium of her own temperament, and, like every other artist, she must constantly correct her vision of the world by comparison with life. Either from carelessness or from the fatal sense that human nature is not what it ought to be, she has ceased to do this, with the result that she now depicts beings who are not merely eccentric or abnormal, but lifeless. [...] Probably her knowledge of the Irish poor is neither intimate nor deep, and the admirable volumes of ‘Bogland Studies’ and ‘Irish Idylls’ exhausted it.”\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{21}This most likely alludes to Disney, B. (1810), \textit{A Companion to the Psalms of David}. Dublin: William Watson. This work was written however by his son Brabazon Disney, a brother of Jane Barlow’s great-grandfather Thomas Disney. See for the family connections the Appendix on p. 129.

\textsuperscript{22}\text{Barlow 1892, Idylls]

\textsuperscript{23}See p. 260-261 of \textit{The Bookman : A Literary Journal}, December 1895. babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.8b623090;seq=271.

\textsuperscript{24}See for \textit{Maureen’s Fairing} [Barlow 1895, Maureen].

\textsuperscript{25}\textit{The Athenæum}, N\textdegree 3533, July 13 1895. For the reviews about \textit{Maureen’s Fairing} p. 111, third column. archive.org/details/p2athenaeum1895lond.

\textsuperscript{26}See p. 64, first column, of \textit{The Athenæum}, N\textdegree 3533, July 13 1895, also being reviews about the book \textit{Maureen’s Fairing}, [Barlow 1895, Maureen].
9.3 Extremely shy or delicately strong

In 1904 Jane Barlow became a Doctor of Letters as one of the first three women who were awarded an honorary doctorate from Trinity College Dublin, showing that in her time her work was generally regarded very highly. She nevertheless has been largely forgotten now, for instance because she was left out of important anthologies of Irish literature. That may have had various reasons, such as the changing social and political circumstances in Ireland, and criticisms as given above, but also the following descriptions of her private life will have done her reputation not much good, because they strengthen the suggestion that Jane Barlow had never really been in contact with the people she wrote about.

The descriptions come from the Irish writer Katharine Tynan Hinkson who knew Jane Barlow personally. Tynan wrote about her at least twice; once in 1907 in a short ‘Critical and Biographical Essay’, and once in her autobiographical Memories, published in 1924, seven years after Jane Barlow’s death. Tynan gives mixtures of high praise for Jane Barlow’s work and an apparently rather superficial view on her private life. They sound almost condescending, which is remarkable when it is realized that Tynan called Jane Barlow her friend. Nevertheless, large parts of these descriptions have been given here because even if they may be coloured, they provide a unique view into the Barlow family’s private life.

9.3.1 A home-bound spinster

Critical and Biographical Essay (1907) After a short introduction about who Jane Barlow was, and a description of the location and surroundings of her home called ‘The Cottage’, Tynan writes, “Miss Barlow has led a singularly retired and gentle life, wrapped about with home affections and very far from the world. The love of country things, of birds and animals and flowers are part of her life: but seeing that she is shyer of the world than any hermit of the desert, shy even of the friendly village folk, it is nothing less than marvellous that she should have written those intimate

---

27 The other two women were Isabella Mulvany and Sophie Bryant, see the web page ‘A Timeline of the History of Women in Trinity’, tcd.ie/about/trinity/events/Womens_Centenary/timeline.php. On that page it can also be read that in 1892 ten thousand Irish women had presented a memorial requesting admission to the College. After rejection it was re-presented by a group of men. That may have been connected with a pamphlet called ‘Suggestions on the Subject of University Degrees for Women’, written that same year by Hamilton’s biographer Robert Graves, in which he proposed that Trinity College Dublin should admit female students. library.catalogue.tcd.ie/record=b13459414~S9. It took until 1904 for the first woman to enter TCD.

28 See Ricorso, Commentary, W.B. Yeats. ricorso.net/rx/az-data/authors/b/Barlow_J/life.htm#comm [accessed 23 Dec 2018].


31 Also remarkable is that Tynan, who was born in 1859 and who learned to know Jane Barlow in 1892, does not know when she was born; in her 1907 Essay, when she knew Jane Barlow for fifteen years already, she assumes that Jane Barlow was “born in the early sixties,” making her younger than herself instead of older.
and sympathetic sketches of Irish life in prose and poetry which have followed each other at intervals since “Bogland Studies” was published in 1892. A couple of visits to Connemara and the South, an occasional flying visit to relatives in England, constitute pretty well all her travels; and never did a traveller’s thoughts turn so fondly and lovingly to home. Up to the time of her publishing “Bogland Studies” her social entourage, apart from her own family, was such as might have surrounded Jane Austen. Sweet old ladies of an unquestioning conservatism in all things chiefly inhabit those white-walled, old-fashioned villas about Raheny. They little knew what a gentle rebel was in their midst. All the time those studies of Irish life, as delicate and observant as humorous and wise, in their own way, as Jane Austen’s, were forming in the quiet girl’s mind. She has found her own way to a broad and enlightened patriotism; if indeed that great civic virtue was not fostered in a home in which grew all the virtues.”

Extracts of the Memories (1924) “She is a fragrant, a shy, a sorrowful memory. [At] The Cottage, Raheny, Co. Dublin, […] when I first knew her, lived Jane Barlow, with an adored father and mother, a sister and one or two brothers. […] The children of that house had been brought up to much love, although there had been sickness and sorrow.32 […] Apart from the natural sorrows there was a shadow over the house. The Rev. James Barlow had been one of the clerics who denied Baptismal Regeneration, and with those in England who shared his heresy he had fallen under ecclesiastical ban.33

“I can’t believe that Jane Barlow ever went to school. I think of her always in that enclosed garden of love at Raheny; but she must have been her father’s pupil, for she was a good classical scholar, and in a house overflowing with books she had absorbed all that was best; she had a thoroughly cultivated mind.

“It was in ’90 or ’91 that she published Bogland Studies, a volume of narrative verse which immediately attracted attention. […] Some of Jane Barlow’s poems I had by heart, and I was greatly interested in the mere statement that they were the work of a parson’s daughter who lived at Raheny. […] I reviewed the book enthusiastically […]. I suggested that “J. Barlow” was probably a pseudonym. The prim formality did not seem to go with the poetry. A few days later I had a letter from Jane Barlow. Another little while and I was bidden to meet her at an afternoon party.

“There came in a handsome, dignified lady with a presence and an agreeable manner. There was nothing of the recluse about Mrs Barlow. In her wake came shrinkingly a slender, old-fashioned figure – I cannot imagine Jane Barlow going to the dressmaker or the shops – clothed in black. She could have been no more than thirty at that time, but already “spinster” was stamped all over her outward appearance.34

32 The third and youngest daughter, Mary Louisa, had died in 1887. Tynan learned to know Jane Barlow after the publication of Bogland Studies in 1892, therefore five years after Mary’s death.

33 Tynan’s next sentence reads, “That would have given Jane Barlow a sense of wrong and injury against all the orthodoxies, for she might have been called “Jane the Daughter.”” Yet it is not clear whether Jane Barlow had talked about it with her, or if it was her interpretation. About baptismal regeneration James Barlow argued that in the “stern old times” it was taught that a baby which was rushed to the baptismal font but died just before receiving the “mystic drops,” was “condemned by God to suffer everlasting tortures.” But that that now was hardly accepted any more, which showed that the doctrines were not unchangeable, as the “apologists for eternal punishment” asserted. See pp. 12-14 of Barlow, J.W. (1865), Remarks on Some Recent Publications Concerning Future Punishment, Dublin: William M’Gee. books.google.com/books?id=ONhAAAACAAJ

34 Bogland Studies having been published in 1892, Jane Barlow actually was thirty-six then.
One had to know her to discover how little spinsterish was her mind. She had a spare figure, the spareness not to be wondered at, since she ate nothing; an oval face which would have been fresh coloured if she had given it a chance, fine fair hair.

“She hid herself behind her mother on that occasion and was not to be detached. I had a few soft-spoken words from her, but all the time she had a shrinking air of flight – her eyes moved from side to side, as though she would escape. I was not surprised when she wrote to me a little later that as soon as she had got into the room she wanted to run and run till she had got back to her beloved seclusion and locked the door upon the world. I supposed she only yielded to the adored mother in doing a thing she abhorred.

“I went to see her [in] February or March, and outside the windows of the long, spacious drawing-room […] the sky was cold grey. It was a beautiful room, with an organ at one end. […] There were portraits on the walls, many pictures and books, a piano, bibelots of one kind or another, the things a cultivated mind and taste gathers through the generations. There was a glorious fire, and everywhere there were growing violets and lilies of the valley; hyacinths perhaps. The room was sharply sweet. Mrs Barlow was there that day, and one could see that Jane was child with her. There was also present Jane’s younger sister Kitty. The mother was the corner-stone of the house – the fire on the hearth of life: without her everything was cold.

“My real friendship with Jane Barlow began after her mother’s death, which took place just before Christmas of that year [1894]. She died with tragic suddenness […]. She had come in from a drive: sat down in the hall and died. There had been unsuspected heart-trouble. And so the pillars of the house were down for poor Jane and she was amidst the ruins of her happiness. […] Jane Barlow never recovered from the grief of her mother’s death, though she kept a hold on life while her father lived: a very gentle sequestered, twilit life. In those years before the shadow finally descended upon her, she had still the energy for friendships. She was very large-minded and tolerant of other people’s ways, even when they were not hers and her shyness might have found them repellent.

“[Her] tales were idylls and idealizing. Jane Barlow possessed a beautiful prose style: she had depths of feeling with vision and gentle humour. […] A little less of the rose-tint would have made for more truthful observation. […] All the same her work was sincere even if it was steeped in poetry and there was a deal of truth in it.

“Her home […] was the place for a romantic child to grow up in. There were delicious long corridors, steps up and down into the rooms, and the Cottage had a tight-fitting cloche of thatch […]. Under these sheltering eaves the Cottage garden grew all manner of old-fashioned flowers. At one point, where a projection of the house made a sheltered and sunny corner, there was an aviary of canaries that lived in the open all around the year. The canaries were Kitty’s. Perhaps because of the open-air life they had qualities not belonging to the ordinary cage-bird.

“We had common charities. There was an old man we kept from the workhouse, for whom Kitty sewed. […] I remember Jane and Kitty coming to lunch […] when I revisited Ireland: so Jane must have been getting out of her cell. […] There was a period when Jane was less frightened of her world. Miss Purser painted her during those years, and she appeared at literary gatherings now and again.

“When we came back on visits to Ireland we always went to the Cottage for lunch or tea. If it was the latter meal it must have been of the “high” variety, “because we
had come such a long way.” But it was oftener a most delightful lunch. […] I never saw Jane eat anything at those banquets beyond about the size of a nut of mashed potato, washed down with a glass of water. She did not even like tea. Kitty used to say in a dear plaintive voice, which I can hear now, “Yes, do scold her, Mrs Hinkson, please scold her. She is really dreadful, starving herself as she does.” But Jane persisted in a fare which would hardly have left a bird alive.

“I think they always wore soft black garments. The house was very silent except sometimes when the father played the organ. He must usually have been absent in the daytime, – at Trinity College probably, where he had become Vice-Provost [in 1899]. […] The walls were brown-panelled, sometimes hidden in books. Mr Barlow was an omnivorous reader of novels. At the stair-head, outside the drawing-room door was that particular and attractive portion of the library. We always went away with armfuls. […] There was always a little time when she and I were alone in her room upstairs, under the thatch, when we talked quietly of our secret and sacred things. It was a dim, long room full of a girl’s and a woman’s treasures.

“There was a winter, 1899-1900, when we had a house at Dalkey and Jane and Kitty came to see us there. Indeed, I believe in those years, perhaps as a distraction from the still house, Jane fared forth a good deal. She visited relatives in England, travelling alone, I think, and she went to Achill and to the south of Ireland with her father. […] By the time Jane visited us at Dalkey we had two children […]. She was very fond of Toby, especially, I think, because he was wild and freakish. My husband used to tell her she had a streak of the devil in her which made her like Toby. She shook her head and laughed, but I don’t think she objected the accusation. […] A few years later, Jane and Kitty pressed for Toby’s opinion of a very stately lady they suspected him of not liking. When the opinion came it was uncompromising. “She’s a beastly lady.” Jane was delighted: so was Kitty. They kept saying over and over again while their eyes sparkled: “Oh, Toby, what a dreadful thing to say about a lady!”

“My relations with Jane Barlow had been very close and tender. I could hardly tell when they relaxed. […] Somehow, in the years following I lost her. When I offered myself for a visit, her father was ill and they could not receive me.35 I had always known that when he died her last real link with life would be broken, although she might go on living for a time. I cannot remember if he was dead when I met her for the last time. It was in 1913 at a little party given by Miss Winifred Letts.36 […] To my amazement she was cold, – not the Jane Barlow I knew or thought I knew. My Twenty-Five Years had just been published.37 She said, looking down in her lap, that she might be old-fashioned but she thought the book showed a great lack of reticence.

“I retired sadly, and when I went home flew to the book. What indiscretion had I committed? There was none that affected her. She was not in the book. But though we were neighbours for a year or so38 we did not meet. Then I heard of her death. One chilliness does not blot out the warmth of twenty years. I keep her as she was in all those nights and days.”

35 In Jane Barlow’s Obituary in the Journal for Psychical Research, see p. 5, it is written, “Deeply affectionate, she was devoted to her father and during the long illness which ended in his death a few years ago, she hardly ever left his bedside except to snatch a few moments of rest.”


38 After 1911 Tynan lived in Shankill, Co. Dublin, [Clarke 2009, 2013, Katherine Hinkson Tynan],
9.3.2 An independent-minded hill walker

Tynan thus paints an extremely withdrawn or even unworldly picture, yet for instance Miss Winifred Letts, who had given the 1913 party where Jane Barlow broke off her contact with Tynan, regarded her quite differently, “I see Jane Barlow, in a wind-blown cloak; a spirit just made tangible in slender form and pale colouring, austere, shy, delicately strong; an exquisite poet.”

Also the description in the Dictionary sketches a very different picture, especially as regards her alleged home-boundness, “She was educated by the family’s governess and her father. She became proficient in French and German, and was a talented classical scholar and an accomplished pianist. She travelled much throughout Ireland, and in her twenties visited Italy, France, Greece, and Turkey. Having written prose and verse from an early age, she began her published career in 1885, with anonymous contributions to the Dublin University Review, then under the editorship of T.W. Rolleston, who was impressed by her work and encouraged her to write more. These early efforts, like so much of her later work, were inspired by the Irish peasantry, with whom she was familiar from walking holidays along the west coast. […] She also contributed to numerous magazines and journals such as The Nation, Irish Homestead, Hibernia, Dana, The Bookman, Cornhill Magazine, National Review, Living Age, and, in America, the Literary Digest and Eclectic Magazine.”

In the Dictionary also Tynan’s view on Jane Barlow is mentioned, “Contemporaries such as Katherine Tynan remembered Barlow as a quiet, introverted woman, who led a secluded life centred almost entirely on her family home. However, she was in many ways an active and independent-minded woman. Throughout her life she remained a keen hill walker, and took regular holidays along the west coast of Ireland. She was also an active member of the National Literary Society. A regular contributor to their ‘original nights’, in 1897 she was elected its vice-president. From 1896 to 1898 she acted as an examiner in English for the Department of Education. Having rejected organised religion, in later years she became increasingly interested in the Psychical Research Society. She was among the first members of the society’s Irish branch, and became a good friend of its founder, Dr Alfred Russel Wallace.”

9.4 Interpretations

The foregoing description raises the question why Tynan regarded Jane Barlow in the way she did. The first possible reason would be the simple fact that Tynan will hardly have seen Jane Barlow live her daily life because between 1893, a year after she had learned to know her, and 1911, Tynan did not live in Ireland. In 1911 James

and in 1913 Jane Barlow moved to St. Valerie in Bray, only some four kilometres from Shankill. In 1915 Tynan moved to the west of Ireland, see footnote 43 on p. 120.

39 See Jane Barlow on Ricorso, Commentary, Patricia Boylan. ricorso.net/rx/az-data/authors/b/Barlow_J/life.htm#comm.
40 [Clarke 2009, 2013, Jane Barlow]
41 See also p. 120.
42 The main founder of the Society was Sir William Fletcher Barrett. In the first issue of the Journal of the Society for Psychical Research, 1884-1885, Wallace is mentioned only in the library catalogue. archive.org/details/journalofsociety01soci. Thereafter Wallace became a regular contributor to the Journal.
Barlow had apparently been ill already and the Barlows “could not receive her,” and thereafter they only met again once, at the 1913 party where Jane Barlow broke off their friendship. 43 If Tynan thus only saw Jane Barlow on announced visits, even if they then also talked in private for a while “under the thatch,” she did not see Jane Barlow in normal circumstances. 44

Also about Tynan’s autobiographical work Twenty Five Years, which was published in 1913, the year of James William Barlow’s death, something can be said. It is of course not known what exactly Jane Barlow was referring to when she remarked that the book showed “a great lack of reticence,” and apart from her assumption that Tynan might find her opinion “old-fashioned,” she apparently did not say anything else about it. Tynan could not find an “indiscretion affecting” Jane Barlow, and remarked that she was not in her book. Describing her life until 1891, therefore just before she came to know Jane Barlow personally, Tynan indeed mentioned her only in one sentence, that she had made her first appearance as an author around 1883 in the Hibernia. 45 But even if she had written about Jane Barlow that might not have been the problem; if Jane Barlow knew about her description as being “more shy than any hermit in the desert” yet kept seeing Tynan, she will not easily have felt insulted.

But in her Twenty Five Years Tynan writes rather openly about people, living or dead, even giving parts of letters written to her, something which seems to have been completely alien to Jane Barlow and may have led to her remark about the lack of reticence. And there are some passages of which it can easily be assumed that they were painful for her. Tynan was Catholic, and referring to the rising of the protestants who had become the ruling class at the cost of the Catholics she writes, “Many outsiders have remarked on the grace, the beauty, the refinement of Irish girls of the shop-keeping and farming classes, qualities not always shared by their brothers. Something of course is explained by the ups and downs of Irish history which have reduced the descendants of the old families to the cabins and placed the sons of the freebooters in the castles.” Even if Jane Barlow had been a nationalist, and even if she partially agreed, she may have found the crudeness of the statement difficult.

Perhaps even worse was a passage about the Bible. Although Jane Barlow “rejected organised religion,” and “mentioned in [her] will that there was to be no service of a religious kind” at her funeral, 46 rejecting organized religion does not mean that she thus must also have lost her faith, as her father’s rejection of the doctrine of Eternal Punishment had not meant that he had left his Church. In Jane Barlow’s eyes Tynan’s following view on the Bible may therefore have gone way too far.

Having mentioned that the Catholics did not read the Bible, Tynan continued, “Back to my Bible. Even in my young days the Old Testament at least was regarded by the majority of Catholics as a Protestant book. I daresay a good many people, Protestant as well as Catholic, thought that the Bible was written by a Protestant


44 This was also one of the suggested explanations for the negative view Graves had on Hamilton’s marriage; that for the largest part of Hamilton’s marriage Graves did not live in Ireland, and therefore only saw Hamilton’s family life as an official guest. See [Van Weerden 2017, 488 ff.].

45 The Hibernia was a Dublin literary journal which lasted only for a year.

46 Genes Reunited : SBN A, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: eeuaectod, years: 1917-1917.
for Protestants. The Irish Protestants had laid violent hands on the Book and made it their own. They had wrought evil deeds upon the peasantry in the Rebellion of '98, Bible in hand, finding full justification for their doings in the pages of the Old Testament. To myself its pages were smeared with blood and something more terrible than blood. No one ever taught me this feeling. I think the average well-to-do Irish Catholic simply regarded the Book as excellent for Protestants and went back to his or her Key of Heaven and Catholic Piety."

Still, after all these comments, Tynan’s importance here is that she did what no one else did, giving unique insights in Jane Barlow’s life within her own home. And what is even more important in the light of this biographical sketch, is that she mentioned the “shadow over the house” caused by James Barlow’s “ecclesiastical ban.”

9.5 The great sleep

It is not known with certainty what Jane Barlow knew about her grandmother’s story, but at the latest in 1890 she must have known at least the outlines. On the 19th of June, in the annual meeting of the Senate of Dublin University, it was moved by the Senior Proctor that Robert Perceval Graves should receive an honorary degree for his biography about Hamilton. 47 On Thursday the 26th of June “a meeting of the Senate of Dublin University was held in the Examination Hall, Trinity College, for the purpose of conferring degrees. There was a crowded attendance, which included a large number of ladies.” An honorary degree “of LL.D [was] conferred [amongst others] on the Rev R Graves, MA, Sub-Dean of the Chapel Royal.” 48 Both meetings were presided by James Barlow, who then was Senior Master Non-Regent. 49

Graves’ biography must have made quite some impact if it gained him an honorary degree, and her father presiding these well-attended meetings makes it very unlikely that Jane Barlow would not have known about the contents of the biography, about her father’s friendship with Hamilton, and the role her grandmother played in Hamilton’s life. Moreover, the conferring of this degree will have caused the story about Hamilton’s lost love “Disney, Catherine” and her “elder suitor,” as Graves had called them, 50 to gain much attention again, and if James Barlow had not yet told his now all grown-up children the details of his parent’s marriage, this may have been an inducement to do so.

Thus assuming that Jane Barlow knew about her grandmother’s suicide attempt, and perhaps also about her great-uncle Lambert Disney’s suicide, the impression it doubtlessly had made on her may have been the reason that her stories contain so many suicides, including an even for those times “unusually tragic” one in her novel Flaws. 51 Sometimes they are anticipated for a long time already, as in her story ‘An Advance Sheet’ where the protagonist knows what will happen in five years, and

---

47 Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Qangbton bonoor, years: 1890-1890. Trinity College is the college of the University of Dublin.
48 Genes Reunited : SBNA, genesreunited.co.uk/searchbna/index. Keywords: Seller Stubbs honorary Graves, years: 1890-1890.
49 The Chancellor, the Provost and the Senior Master Non-Regent together formed the Caput, which headed the meetings of the Senate. All members of the Caput had an individual veto; James Barlow obviously did not object to this honorary degree bestowed upon Robert Graves.
50 [Graves 1885, 708], [Graves 1882, 182].
51 [Brown 1919, 27-28]. The novel Flaws was not found open access. worldcat.org/oclc/11062009.
when that time comes shoots himself. Sometimes they are very sudden and completely unexpected, and therefore perhaps accidental, as in ‘As Luck Would Have It’ when someone sees the girl he loves with someone else and is overrun by a train. And sometimes even indirectly, as in the poem ‘By the Bog-Hole’, in which the innocent protagonist takes the blame for an apparent murder even though he knows he will be hanged.

9.5.1 ‘By the Bog-Hole’

In James Barlow’s obituary it was mentioned that Jane Barlow had “the most intimate knowledge of her father’s views,” and they both were interested in the Psychical Research Society; even if she did not completely agree with him politically, Jane Barlow therefore may well have agreed with him in most spiritual matters. In her work her father’s ideas about the afterlife for people who do not go to heaven seem to be recognized easily; where James Barlow put forward the “silent void,” apparently as an alternative afterlife for his mother instead of eternal torture by fire, in Jane Barlow’s poem ‘By the Bog-Hole’ she mentions a “great sleep” as the afterlife.

That this sleep indeed indicates a similar alternative afterlife can be seen from the quotation going with the poem, “Non omni somno securius exstat?” This line comes from Lucretius’ poem _De Rerum Natura_ [On the Nature of Things], and in a thesis called _Lucretius and the Fears of Death_ it is translated and given in context. In his poem Lucretius “invites his readers to reflect on being dead by considering the time before they were born. […] And since the time after they die is, in all relevant aspects, the same for them as their previous non-existence, that time too will not be bad for them.” Lucretius thus “describes the time before life as a mirror image of the time after death, and he concludes […]: ‘Numquid ibi horribile apparet, num triste videtur quicquam, non omni somno securius exstat?’” “Surely nothing awful appears there? Nothing seems miserable, does it? Doesn’t it emerge (as something) more peaceful than any sleep?”

In her poem Jane Barlow makes a very literal connection with Lucretius’ views. Apparently using “omni somno” as “all sleep,” she visualizes the afterlife as a sleep without thoughts or dreams or waking up again, a sleep which her protagonist prefers over having to live with the thought that the love of his life had called someone else “her darlint.” And seemingly showing that Jane Barlow did know the whole story of her grandmother, her grandfather and Hamilton, thus including the forced marriage and her grandmother having lost her faith, the poem contains all of the basic notions

---

52 [Barlow 1898]
53 This poem can be found in Jane Barlow’s _Bog-land Studies_, [Barlow 1892, Bog-land].
54 For the Obituary see footnote 39 on p. 104. Jane Barlows also used mysticism in her stories, for instance in the form of knowing things beforehand as in the above-mentioned story ‘An Advance Sheet’, an appearance of a widow who saved a marriage although she was apparently dead already in ‘At Krimori’, or very strange appearances as in ‘The Mockers of the Shallow Waters’, where a woman mystically takes revenge for her son who was falsely accused of theft. [Barlow 1898].
55 See p. 113, and footnote 15 on the same page.
56 Aronoff, P. (1997), _Lucretius and the Fears of Death_. Ithaca: Faculty of the Graduate School of Cornell University. philarchive.org/archive/arolat.
57 Jane Barlow was described as “a talented classical scholar,” see p. 119, and as having had a “thoroughly cultivated mind,” see p. 116; having been educated by her father therefore raises the possibility that also his “void” as a mirror image of the time before birth came directly from Lucretius.
of what had happened; next to the ideas about an alternative for hell, also reflections about women’s freedom to freely choose whom to marry, and arguments for rejecting organized religion have been incorporated, as can be seen in the quotes given in the following summary.

From the time she was very young Jimmy had watched over Nelly, the girl next door, and he especially had to take care that she would not fall in the bog hole and drown. Having saved her often while she grew up, one day he saw that she had become a beautiful young woman, and he fell in love with her. But at the moment he realized he was in love, Felix Margrath came to the village; being in the military he was on leave wearing his beautiful uniform. Nelly quickly fell for him, but there was talk that Felix just amused himself with her, and that she meant nothing to him.

Then one night, at sunset, some girls tell Jimmy that Nelly is with Felix on the bog, and he goes there to see them. It is raining, and he sees Nelly kneeling on the edge, stooping low over the blackness within the bog hole. He calls out to warn her, but hearing him she stands up and wants to jump in, still staring into the water. Jimmy runs towards her and drags her away as he was used to do, and by holding her in his arms he assumes that he is saving her from falling in and drowning.

He had considered earlier what would happen if he, being stronger than Felix, would provoke him, making Felix leave the village again,

Till the next thought I had was if Nelly’d be fretted whin Felix was gone.
For I knew that the comfort was crep’ from me life like the light from the day
Since she’d tuk up wid him; an’ belike now if aught chanced that dhruv him away,
She’d be heart-broke. An’ what call had I to go vex her wid comin’ between,
Whin she’d liefer have him than meself in me shows of ould brogues an’ caubeen?
‘Divil take me,’ sez I, ‘thin it’s schemin’ I am to have Nelly to wake
Wid her heart every mornin’ like lead, if there’s lead that can thrimble and ache,
Wid no pleasure in aught, feelin’ lonesome an’ lost in the world dhrear an’ wild
I might betther ha’ left her to dhrown, an’ she on’y an imp of a child.’

Jimmy therefore, while holding Nelly, lets her know that he will not stop her if she is in love with Felix. But then, in a low voice, Nelly says to let go of her because Felix is drowning; he had told her that he was married and would leave her, but he had wanted a farewell kiss. She had refused and had pushed him away, upon which Felix, who apparently forgot that he was close to the bank, stepped back, fell into the hole and drowned. She now wants Jimmy to let her go and try to save Felix,

[...] ‘Och, Felix,’ sez she, ‘I’d give body an’ sowl for your life,
Felix darlint.’ I knew it afore, yet to hear her seemed twistin’ a knife
That was stuck in me heart. But I held her the closer. I’ve learnt since I’ve thried
How a man can hold Heaven an’ Hell in wan grip. Thin most piteous she cried,
An’ she snatched her two hands out o’ mine to her throat, an’ seemed gaspin’ for breath,
An’ her head dhrooped aside, an’ she lay in me arms like the image o’ death.
The neighbours come and assume that he murdered Felix out of jealousy, and Jimmy decides to take the blame for the ‘murder’ because in her distress Nelly seems to say that he had done it and he does not want them to think badly of her.

Jimmy then apparently is questioned,

[...] Her darlint, her darlint – I hear that asleep and awake;
I’d a right to quit hearin’ it now, whin he’ll listen no more than she’ll spake.

For they tould me this day little Nelly had died o’ the fever last night,  
An’ the frettin’; so nothin’ that matthers a thraneen’s left under the light.
What’s the differ if people believe ‘twas meself shoved him into the pool?
They can’t help her or harm her. But, faith, sir, ye’ll think me a powerful fool,  
Or ye’d scarce have the face to be biddin’ me spake out the truth now, afore  
Tis too late; an’ yourself sittin’ there tellin’ lies this last half-hour an’ more,  
Wid your little black book full o’ blatheremskyte as its leaves is o’ print;
Sure, I’d heard all your stories; an’ sorra a wan ye’ve the wit to invint
That ’ill show folk the sinse o’ the life where they’ve come, an’ the death where  
they’ll go.
If there’s sinse in’t at all; wan thing’s certin: it isn’t the likes o’ yez know –  
Wid your chapels an’ churches, Heaven walled up in each, an’ Hell’s blazes all  
round.
Och, the Divil I keep is contint plaguin’ crathurs that bide above ground,  
Widout blatherin’ affer them into the dark; that’s the Divil for me;58  
Tho’ he wouldn’t suit you, sir: the folk’s aisier frighted wid things they can’t  
see.
But just leave me in paice wid your glory an’ joy – they’re as bad as the rest.
If there’s anythin’ manes me a good turn at all, let it give me what’s best –  
The great sleep, that’s all sleep, ne’er a fear wan could wake, ne’er a thought  
to creep in;
Ne’er a dhrame – or I’d maybe hear Nelly call Felix her darlint agin.59

In these last sentences of the poem Jane Barlow thus appears to give her alternative for hell, and to show her negative stance towards organized religion. Obviously, Jimmy’s claims that organized religion was used to keep the people under control do not have to have represented Jane Barlow’s private opinions, but the intensity with which she gives these lines, combined with Lucretius’ quote, certainly indicate that they did. And it can be assumed that, although the lines apparently concerned in particular poor and illiterate people, they also referred to the vows of obedience women had to pledge at the altar, which thereafter controlled their whole lives.

58 A heartbreaking reminder of how important pensions and organized care for the elderly are, is Jimmy’s remark about his grandmother who had no one but him to take care of her, and after his death she would be alone. It seems to depict what for him was work of the devil and hell on earth:

And I seen Granny mopin’ about wid the fright puckerup in her face.
Och, she ’ll starve, now, the crathur, she ’ll starve; that ’s the trouble I ’m lavin’ behind.

59 The poem is given here in the form of the third edition. There had been criticisms about Jane Barlow’s use of “a dialect perilously close to that caricature of Anglo-Irish speech” with which the “stage Irishman” had been “endowed,” and in the 1894 edition “Jane Barlow was wise enough to modify or abolish some of the more outrageous distortions.” [Boyd 1916, 209-210].
The motivation for making such a connection between the misuse of religion and women’s obligatory vows is that the part about how Jimmy decides to let Nelly go if she wants to be with Felix was not really necessary for the story; he could just have decided not to become a murderer out of love for Nelly. It therefore rather seems to have been used as a statement against men who forced women to marry them because they saw women as their property. Indeed, Jane Barlow even words Jimmy’s stance that he should ‘give’ Nelly to Felix if she was not in love with him, instead of claiming her as he could have done,

An’ sez I to her: ‘Nelly, me darlint, I’ve made up me mind in the nights
That I’d give ye to Felix Magrath; for, sure, how should I grudge you by rights,
If it’s him your heart’s set on? [...]’

9.5.2 From grandmother to granddaughter

It was argued that Jane Barlow knew that her grandfather forced her grandmother to marry him although he knew that she did not want to, and that she was in love with Hamilton, and Jimmy’s stance can be seen as Jane Barlow’s judgement of her grandfather. If he had not forced his will on her grandmother, her father would not have been so preoccupied with the concept of hell and the problem of measuring human sorrow. He would perhaps have written about afterlife and wondered about happiness, but in a more theoretical and pensive way, and thus have escaped the rebuke. There would not have been a shadow over his house, and the family would perhaps not have been so closed.

Assuming that Jane Barlow’s shyness was in any case partly due to the closedness of the family, her grandmother’s unhappiness thus even influenced her literary legacy; if she had not been so shy and had befriended many important writers and literarians, and would have visited many literary gatherings and parties, everyone would have accepted that the stories she wrote were indeed inspired by what she had experienced herself while having been in close contact with the people she wrote about, and she would not have been forgotten so soon.

James Barlow’s children not having had children, here thus ends this family narrative. It has been shown that strong indications can be found of a relation between Catherine’s forced marriage and suicide attempt, and James and Jane Barlow’s work and private life. What is left therefore of Catherine’s unhappiness is her role in Hamilton’s life as his ‘lost love’, James William’s essay in which his stance against the doctrine of hell can be taken as a rejection of the abhorrent idea of his mother being tortured for all eternity, his science fiction novel in which he apparently sought for a society in which she could have been happy but which he could not find, and Jane Barlow’s poem in which her negative stance towards organized religion can be seen as a protest against her grandmother’s fate, her marriage having been forced upon her using the Bible as a threat.

---

60 This is reminiscent to James Barlow’s apparently superfluous description of marriages on Hesperos, see p. 102.
61 And if Jane Barlow read Hamilton’s Valentine poem which Graves had given in his biography, [Graves 1882, 174-176], see also p. 35, she will have seen that also Hamilton would not have used a spell to cheat Catherine into marriage if that would mean that she could have become unhappy.
Epilogue

In the first part of this sketch about Catherine Disney it was shown, as far as that was possible, what her family background was, and how she fell in love with Hamilton but was forced to marry someone else. In the second part it was shown where she lived during her marriage and how her family grew, but also that death took its toll. Her suicide attempt ended her living with a man she did not love but it also weakened her health, and she died five years later. Shortly before her death she could finally talk with Hamilton, and tell him that she had also loved him.

In the third part of this sketch it was argued that Catherine’s suicide attempt, and her losing her faith during her last years, directly influenced her eldest son James William Barlow. Apparently not believing that his mother should go to hell after what was done to her, he protested against the doctrine of eternal punishment and thereupon lost his priesthood. It influenced the life of his daughter Jane Barlow; it was shown how traces of her grandmother’s story can be recognized in her work, and it was suggested that it may have led to her shyness which influenced her literary legacy. Catherine’s influence therewith seems to have lasted much longer than the direct memories of the people who knew her.

The importance of acknowledging this influence is that many people who were almost invisible, such as Catherine and with her very many Victorian women, influenced the lives of famous historical figures, and that their influence sometimes explains what happened in these lives. Catherine’s story can obviously explain Hamilton’s periodic distress over her, whereas without knowing its details that merely had seemed to be a sign of an unhappy life, therewith greatly influencing his remembrance. It can explain why her son lost his priesthood and occupied himself so much with the nature of life after death and evaluating human happiness and misery, and the apparent shyness of her granddaughter, which will have contributed to her having been largely forgotten now. But having lived in Victorian times, what happened to Catherine had not been spoken about, and it was therefore not recognized in the story of Hamilton’s life, nor in the lives and work of James and Jane Barlow.

Hamilton was periodically in distress over Catherine: during and after their six-week correspondence in 1848 and perhaps, but that is unknown, after her suicide attempt; after her death in 1853; he unburdened his heart in 1855 in letters to De Vere; and for a last time in 1861 he corresponded for about two months about her with Catherine’s younger sister Louisa Disney, who had become interested in her sister’s story. It is unknown how Lady Hamilton reacted, but because Hamilton was so extremely honest about his former loves and wrote about it in his poems which he sent
to many people, she knew all about it when she accepted his marriage proposal, and nowhere in the biography any sign was found of her having had problems with Hamilton’s feelings about Catherine.

Yet it was argued in *A Victorian Marriage* that especially the intense correspondence in 1855 took a toll on the marriage. Early in 1856 Lady Hamilton became ill, apparently because during the months of the correspondence Hamilton had neglected her needs, which must have been very difficult in a time in which women could hardly stand up to their husbands. Her falling ill made him stop reminiscing, which he had learned how to do when he had been melancholic for a long time after having lost Ellen de Vere, and he took care of his wife for months. She recovered, and thereafter their marriage seems to have become more stable again. Still, during all these difficult times, of worries about each other and distress over loved ones who were not well in those times of omnipresent death, when he was immersed in his mathematics Hamilton trusted and could lean on his truthful wife, who was there when he needed her. And the biographers agreed; the Hamiltons remained attached to each other until the end.

Hamilton visited Parsonstown directly after the end of the six-week correspondence with Catherine. Upon arrival he had still been very anxious, but in the following days he had slowly calmed down. When he was in Parsonstown for about two weeks he made an evening walk, and he wrote to his friend De Vere that the delicious walk beside the river and the lake had been in the moonlight, which had been too strong for astronomy, but not for poetry. “Indeed one spot, where trees on a hillside shut in and overarched a space, the moonlight showing overhead a roof of tender yellowish-green, while the unseen river was heard to murmur lower down, appeared to me so lovely, and so strange, that for an instant I fancied myself removed to some new universe, and was distinctly conscious of proposing for a moment the question, resolved of course at once in the affirmative, but passing, as a question, through my mind, Whether the moral laws of the old world held also here?” Not living in Victorian times any more, it can be wondered whether this could be the only glimpse, since he of course at once resolved the question in the affirmative, of Hamilton contemplating if in this new universe he could be allowed to openly love both Helen and Catherine at the same time.

Catherine died shortly after her second interview with Hamilton, feeling certain that he knew that she had loved him, and that she had not betrayed him, freeing her of her long-standing feelings of guilt. She felt reassured that he had a good marriage and was happy with his life, which when she had learned to know him had promised so much which indeed was achieved; she had heard about his knighthood, and had been very happy when he gave her his impressive book. In her last days she had often stared at its formulae without understanding any of them, but her feeling of awe had been strangely consoling. For a last time she had felt his closeness, which she remembered so well from their very early years, and the deep love between them which had been like that of the Angels in Heaven, and that was enough. She died trusting that her son would find the nothingness in which she would never be disturbed again, and where she would be at peace forever.
Appendix

Many members of Catherine Disney’s immediate family play a more or less active role in this sketch. Keeping track of who is who is rather difficult because Barlow brothers married Disney sisters, Barlows and Disneys married within their own extended families, and many names were used more than once. An overview therefore seems useful.

Children (5) of Brabazon Disney (1711-1790) and Patience Ogle (1730- after 1798), 1 married 1761, paternal grandparents of Catherine:
William Disney (1762-1847), m. 1804 Ann Oliver (1765-1848)
Brabazon Disney (ca 1765-1831), m. 1793 Elizabeth McMollan (.. -1842)
Thomas Disney (1766-1851), m. 1791 Anne Eliza Purdon (ca 1765-1858)
Robert Disney (1769-1832), m. 1798 Jane Brabazon (1767-1840)
Edward Ogle Disney (ca 1771-1797)

Children (2) of William John Purdon (1740-1793) and Jane Coote (1742- ..), married 1764, maternal grandparents of Catherine:
Anne Eliza Purdon (ca 1765-1858), m. 1791 Thomas Disney (1766-1851)
Simon Purdon (1767- after 1809), m. ca 1792 Anne le Hunte (.. - after 1809)

Children (14) of Thomas Disney (1766-1851) and Anne Eliza Purdon (ca 1765-1858), married 1791, Catherine’s parents:
Jane Disney (1792/1793-1865), m. 1813 John Barlow (1791-1876) 2
Brabazon Disney (1794-1833)
William John Disney (1796-1813)
Anne Eliza Disney (1797-1839), m. 1829 John James Disney (1805-1865) 3
Thomas Disney (1799-1889), m. 1847 Dorathea Jane Evans (1823-1896)
Catherine Disney (1800-1853), m. 1825 William Barlow (1792-1871)
Robert Anthony Disney (1802-1885), m. 1841 Caroline Disney (1810-1855) 4
Edward Ogle Disney (1804-1882), m. 1854 Matilda Miller (ca 1816-1881)
Henry Purdon Disney (1806-1854)
James Disney (1807-1896), m. 1851 Susan Paton (.. - ..)
Lambert Disney (1808-1867), m. 1835 Anne Henrietta Battersby (ca 1815-1873)
Caroline Disney (1809/1810-1839)
Louisa Disney (1812- after 1861), m. 1839 Henry Theophilus Hobson (1802/1803-1847), m. 1850 Alexander Orr Reid (ca 1809-1886)
A daughter (.. - after 1838) 5
Children (8) of James Barlow (1748-1825) and Elizabeth Ann Ruxton (1761-1829), married 1787, parents of William Barlow:
Margaret Barlow (1788-1825)
Anne Barlow (1789- ..)
John Barlow (1791-1876), m. 1813 Jane Disney (1792/1793-1865) 2
William Barlow (1792-1871), m. 1825 Catherine Disney (1800-1853)
James Barlow (1793-1828)
Maurice Barlow (1795-1875)
Peter Barlow (1797- after 1876), m. 1830 Jane Goddard (1810-1851)
Arthur Barlow (1799-1877), m. 1841 Mary Bourchier (.. - after 1861)

Children (3) of Brabazon Disney (ca 1765-1831) and Elizabeth McMollan (.. -1842), married 1793, uncle and aunt of Catherine:
Brabazon William Disney (1797-1874), m. 1827 Anne Margaret Beauman (ca 1797-1869)
John James Disney (1805-1865), m. 1829 Anne Eliza Disney (1797-1839) 3
A daughter (.. - ..)

Children (11) of Robert Disney (1769-1832) and Jane Brabazon (1767-1840), married 1798, uncle and aunt of Catherine:
Brabazon Disney (1799-1801)
Harry Disney (1800-1847), m. 1830 Charlotte Augusta Matilda L’Estrange (1800/1801-1882)
Lambert Brabazon Disney (1802-1834)
Jane Disney (1804- after 1832)
Robert Disney (Jan 1806-1831)
Patience Ogle Disney (Dec 1806- ..)
William Thomas Disney (1809-1840)
Caroline Disney (1810-1855), m. 1841 Robert Anthony Disney (1803-1885) 4
Edward George Disney (1811-1854)
James William King Disney (1813/1814-1877), m. 1841 Anna Maria Oliver (1815-1884)

Children (12) of Jane Disney (1792/1793-1865) and John Barlow (1791-1876), married 1813, double uncle and aunt of James William Barlow: 2
James Barlow (1815- ..), m. 1845 Alicia Jane Corrigan (ca 1827- ..)
Anne Eliza Barlow (1816- ..)
Elizabeth Barlow (1817- ..)
John Barlow (1818 or 1821-1885), m. 1857 Eliza Susanna ... (1833-1866), married 1871 Agnes Florence Smythe (.. - ..)
Jane Barlow (1819-1872)
Caroline Barlow (1820- ..)
James Thomas Barlow (1822- ..), m. 1851 Maria Dorathea Bushe (1831-1904)
Margaret Izabella Barlow (1824- ..)
Catherine Maria Barlow (1826-1828)
Mary Louisa Barlow (1832-1894), m. 1853 James William Barlow (1825-1913) 6
Louisa Barlow (1834-1835)
William Ruxton Barlow (1835-1921), m. 1867 Mary Evelyn Wrench (1846-1926)
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Children (7) of Catherine Disney (1800-1853) and William Barlow (1792-1871), married 1825:

James William Barlow (1826-1913), m. 1853 Mary Louisa Barlow (1832-1894) 6
Thomas Disney Barlow (1828-1905), m. 1871 Letitia Amelia McClean (1851-after 1901)
William Brownlow Barlow (1831-1841)
Brabazon John Barlow (1833-1900), m. 1866 Harriette Ellen Guinness (1839-1931)
Arthur Edward Barlow (1835-1911), m. 1870 Adelaide Joanna Loftus Pickard (1846-1898)
Maxwell Close Barlow (1837-1838)
John Lambert Barlow (1841-1849)

Children (7) of James William Barlow (1826-1913) and Mary Louisa Barlow (1832-1894), married 1853: 6
William Ruxton Barlow (1855-1922)
Jane Barlow (1856-1917)
Katharine Barlow (1857/1858-1929)
John Barlow (1861/1862- after 1930)
James Arthur Barlow (1864-1932)
Mary Louisa Barlow (1866-1887)
Maurice Barlow (1870-1923)

Notes
1.) Mrs. Patience Disney Ogle is mentioned in the story of Susan Burney and Molesworth Phillips, see footnote 25 on p. 24. From the story it can be seen that she was still alive around her son Robert’s wedding in 1798, and that she then lived in Dublin. In the Armagh Clergy and Parishes it can be seen that her husband had been Chancellor of Armagh Cathedral since 12 April 1782 until before 17 March 1790 when his successor was installed, and that he was buried in St. Peter’s, Dublin.62 That would be in accord with a Dublin burial record, at the time of writing not yet scanned, of a Disney of Mume Street, buried in the parish of St. Peter’s on 27 January 1790. If the street is actually Hume Street, between Ely Place and St. Stephen’s Green, then that might explain how Thomas Disney learned to know his wife Anne Purdon who lived at Ely Place.
2.) In 1813 Catherine’s elder sister Jane married John Barlow, an elder brother of William Barlow. Around the time of Catherine’s betrothal, they had been married for twelve years already, making it not unthinkable that Catherine’s parents trusted that this marriage also would be a good one.
3.) Catherine’s elder sister Anne Eliza married a son of their father Thomas’ elder brother Brabazon. Anne Eliza thus married her first cousin John James who, according to their gravestone,63 was eight years younger than she was.
4.) Catherine’s younger brother Robert Anthony married a daughter of their father Thomas’ younger brother Robert Disney. Robert Anthony was therewith the second child of Thomas and Anne Disney who married a first cousin.

62 [Leslie 1911, 40]
5.) About the sixth daughter, whom Thomas Disney mentioned in his letter to General Lord Hill, see p. 20, no information was found. Yet it may be assumed to have been true and not written for the sake of urgency because he published it. Then looking at the names of Thomas’ and Anne Eliza’s parents, Brabazon Disney, Patience Ogle, William John Purdon and Jane Coote, it can be seen that the first three children were named after their grandparents, and the next two children after their parents. There thus is a fair chance that there also was a daughter Patience, born before Anne Eliza Junior. Disappearing last names, such as the mother’s maiden names and the maiden names of both grandmothers, were often given as second names, albeit mostly to sons. The family names Ogle and Purdon were given to Edward and Henry, which leaves the name Coote. The unknown daughter therefore may have been born in 1795, and called Patience, or if they also gave family names to daughters, Patience Coote. She still was unmarried in 1838 because in his letter Thomas Disney mentioned three unmarried daughters, and if this is true, he will have been very worried about her future because she was in her forties already, and would likely not marry any more.

6.) James William and Mary Louisa Barlow were double first cousins: their fathers William and John Barlow were brothers, their mothers Catherine and Jane Disney were sisters. Jane Barlow therefore had only two great-grandfathers, James Barlow and Thomas Disney, and two great-grandmothers, Elizabeth Ruxton and Anne Eliza Purdon.
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Catherine Disney (1800-1853) is known as the ‘lost love’ of the Irish mathematician Sir William Rowan Hamilton (1805-1865), but about herself little is known. Based on what Hamilton wrote about her and scraps of information which were found on various places, extended with conclusions which could be drawn from known events, this is a sketch of how she fell in love with Hamilton in 1824, what the motives may have been for her family to force her to marry the reverend William Barlow (1792-1871), what may have triggered her suicide attempt in 1848 after which she did not live with Barlow any more, and how she spoke with Hamilton shortly before she died. In these two interviews she could finally tell Hamilton that she had also loved him.

In the last chapters it is discussed how Catherine’s unhappiness seems to have influenced her eldest son, James Barlow (1826-1913), and through him also her granddaughter Jane Barlow (1856-1917).

This sketch is supplementary to the essay *A Victorian Marriage: Sir William Rowan Hamilton*. But being self-contained, it can also be read on its own.