'Imperium in Imperio': Irish Episcopal Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*

ON 30 June 1870 some forty Irish-born Roman Catholic bishops gathered at the Irish College in Rome. Although a day late, the occasion was the giorno onomastico (saint's day) of Paul Cullen, the cardinal archbishop of Dublin. As one participant recorded, 'America North and South ... -Australia, Tasmania, N. Zealand, Africa, Asia, N.F. Land, [and the] Canadian Dominions, had their representatives'.¹ The partygoers were the bulk of the some sixty-two² Irish-born prelates in attendance at the First Vatican Council. As well as comprising one of the most substantial national blocks at the council, these men lent important support to that high-water mark of nineteenth-century ultramontane Catholicism: the definition of papal infallibility. As Cullen wrote of the night, 'we drank the Pope's health and infallibility most enthusiastically'.³ The celebration nearly demonstrates the sheer number and geographic distribution of Irish bishops by 1870, their ideological uniformity⁴ and their common links to the cardinal archbishop of Dublin and the Irish College in Rome.

How, in the nineteenth-century, did the Irish achieve their domination of the Roman Catholic episcopal hierarchies of the United States and, more particularly, what became the 'white dominions' of the British Empire? This aspect of Irish participation in the Empire is particularly relevant as historians have begun to devote sustained attention to the Irish Imperial experience, both as part of the wider Irish

*A number of friends and colleagues very kindly looked over all or part of this article, and it has been much improved by their attentions. I would like to record my thanks to P. J. Ayres, E. F. Biagini, R. V. Comerford, R. P. Davis, G. Laragy, J. J. Lee, C. McGregor, C. L. Romens and R. Sweetman.

I. Patrick Francis Moran to George Conroy, I July 1870, Ardagh and Clonmacnoise diocesan archives (ADA), from a transcript in the Archives of the Archdiocese of Sydney (AAS). The fate of the originals of the Moran-Cullen-Conroy correspondence is uncertain. They were lent to Moran in Sydney as part of his uncompleted Cullen biography project. Sydney now retains only the transcripts. The present author has been unable to confirm that the originals were returned to Ardagh.

2. Sixty-two was Moran's count: Moran to Conroy, 23 Dec. 1869, ADA, from a transcript in the AAS. Sheridan Gilley notes that 'some seventy bishops of Irish birth and 150 of Irish descent are said to have attended the First Vatican Council'. S. Gilley, 'Catholicism, Ireland and the Irish Diaspora', in S. Gilley and B. Stanley, eds., *The Cambridge History of Christianity: World Christianities, c. 1815–c. 1914* (Cambridge, 2006), 250.

3. Cullen to Conroy, 1 July 1870, Conroy papers, ADA, from a transcript in the AAS.

4. By no means all of the twenty or so Irish-born bishops not in attendance were opposed to infallibility. Some had gone home, and some could not attend that night. Moreover, a substantial number of ultramontane Irish-born bishops were unable to come to Rome. Although an exact number is impossible to arrive at, probably no more than seven or eight 'Irish' bishops opposed the definition. This includes two incumbents of Irish sees: David Moriarty of Kerry and John MacHale of Tuam.

diaspora and in its own right.⁵ It is possible to discern a pattern of what might be called Irish Episcopal Imperialism that first began to take shape in the United States from 1830, and then spread to British North America, the Cape of Good Hope, Australia, New Zealand and Scotland. (Although many Irishmen were appointed to British India, the pattern there was different and less enduring.) By 1900, the hierarchy in each of these countries save Scotland was largely Irish, and, in large part, a particular sort of Irish, moulded by a Hiberno-Roman fusion of devotional and administrative practice. Hiberno-Romanism was itself a subset of a wider neo-ultramontanism that swept the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century.⁶ The Catholic communities, and to a certain extent the wider culture of each of the affected countries, are still marked by this particular form of Irish 'colonisation'.

The phenomenon has not gone unnoticed by historians.⁷ Sheridan Gilley has noted that 'Quite the most remarkable achievement of nineteenth-century Ireland was the creation of an international Catholic Church throughout the Celtic diaspora in the British Empire and North America'. It was, Gilley continued, 'A true Irish empire beyond the seas'.⁸ Writing in the context of New Zealand, Donald Harman Akenson remarked that 'One must constantly remember that what the British thought of as their colonial empire, was, simultaneously, the spiritual empire of the Irish Catholic church'.⁹ Historians of Australia have long understood the process as it unfolded in their own country.¹⁰ Nevertheless, to date there has been no attempt either to consider this Irish 'spiritual empire' globally or to explain the means by which it was created.

This involved the complex interactions of three distinctly transnational entities: the British Empire, the Roman Catholic Church and the Irish

5. For example, see K. Kenny, ed., *Ireland and the British Empire: Oxford History of the British Empire* (Oxford, 2004); S. Howe, *Ireland and Empire: Colonial Legacies in Irish History and Culture* (Oxford, 2002). For a bracing analysis of recent diaspora historiography, see J.J. Lee, 'The Irish Diaspora in the Nineteenth Century', in L.M. Geary and M. Kelleher, eds., *Nineteenth Century Ireland: A Guide to Recent Research* (Dublin, 2005) 182–222.

6. For neo-ultramontanism, see S. Gilley, 'The Papacy', in Gilley and Stanley, eds., *World Christianities*, 13–14.

7. Although it is remarkable that the name Paul Cullen appears nowhere in Kenny, *Ireland and the British Empire*, despite the not insubstantial coverage of the Irish Catholic missionary enterprise in the editor's own chapter 'The Irish in the Empire', 113–21.

8. S. Gilley, 'The Roman Catholic Church and the Nineteenth-Century Irish diaspora', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xxxv (1984), 188.

9. D.H. Akenson, *Half the World from Home: Perspectives on the Irish in New Zealand, 1869–1950* (Wellington, 1990), 160.

10. There is a rich historiography concerned with the experience of the Catholic Church in Australia, beginning with P.F. Moran, *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia from Authentic Sources* (Sydney, n.d.). This massive work—over 1000 pages—was written by the half-nephew of Paul Cullen. In more recent times, three major works dealing with the Australian Church as a whole in the pre-Federation period have appeared: T.L. Suttor's unsatisfactory but influential *Hierarchy and Democracy in Australia*, 1788–1870: The Formation of Australian Catholicism (Melbourne, 1965); J.N. Molony's *The Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church* (Melbourne, 1969) and finally P. O'Farrell's *The Catholic Church and Community in Australia: An Australian History* (3rd edn., Kensington, 1992). In addition to these major studies, there is a substantial and sophisticated literature dealing with more focused concerns.

diaspora. Outside the United States (and, to certain extent, Argentina), Irish emigration followed the expanding empire of the country which many of the emigrants considered their own oppressor. Once established, the Irish (or a section of them) manipulated the quintessential transnational institution—the Catholic Church—to secure their own domination of the national churches of the English-speaking world. The complicated interactions of these three bodies across four continents shed an important light on the prevalence of the transnational in the nineteenth century, a topic of great interest to recent scholarship.

Beyond Irish, Imperial and transnational history, the phenomenon of Irish Episcopal Imperialism has a relevance beyond the merely ecclesiastical to the countries affected by it. Albeit to differing degrees, the Catholic Church everywhere played an enormous role in society. It sought responsibility for education and health care, and shaped the moral and political views of the faithful. Catholic bishops directly and indirectly influenced politics and were courted (or attacked) by politicians. Protestant–Catholic conflict was at different times endemic to American, Canadian, Australian and New Zealand society. It lingers in Scotland. To understand the political, social or cultural history of, say, Australia, it is necessary to consider the Australian Catholic Church. To do so, how that institution took on the form it did must be understood; a narrow attention to the machinations of bishops enables a fuller understanding of their host societies.

The organisation of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century was rigidly hierarchical. So long as a bishop did not annoy Rome, he had almost complete power in his diocese. He controlled both personnel and Church institutions, and set the tone for devotional life. By choosing where to educate his seminarians, a bishop shaped his see long after his death. That is not to say that the laity were unimportant, but the Hiberno-Roman ecclesial model minimised their involvement. Nor were the diocesan clergy insignificant, but priests were at the mercy of their bishop, and subject, under Rome, to his untrammelled authority. Thus the personalities, connections and ideological formation of the relevant bishops demand close attention. Although there is unquestionably a risk of losing sight of a larger picture, Irish Episcopal Imperialism was *episcopal*; everything else flowed from that fact.

Throughout the English-speaking world, Irish bishops were systematically appointed by Rome at the behest of Paul Cullen in his various capacities of rector of the Irish College in Rome, archbishop of Armagh and archbishop of Dublin. Excepting India and Scotland, the outcome was Irish domination or near domination of the local Catholic hierarchy. In the 1830s and 1840s when Cullen was acting as an agent of others in the United States, India and British North America, these appointments merely assured ethnic Irish dominance (transient in the case of India). When Cullen was acting on his own, as in the Cape (from 1856), Australia, New Zealand and Scotland, Irish ethnicity and ultramontane ideology

went hand-in-hand. Thus the phenomenon of Irish Episcopal Imperialism had two distinct parts. The first was the ethnic Irish take-over or attempted take-over of the Church in the English-speaking world; this happened in each case. The second was the Hiberno-Roman orientation of many of those appointed, especially after 1850. In both phases, Cullen was at the centre of events.

Born in co. Kildare in 1803, Paul Cullen was sent to study in Rome in 1820, remaining there until his return to Ireland as archbishop of Armagh in 1850. He was translated to Dublin in 1852, created cardinal in 1866, and died in 1878. In that time, Cullen oversaw the take-over or attempted take-over by the Irish of every English-speaking national Church in the British Empire, and indeed part of Britain itself. Cullen's relatives, friends, students and diocesan priests became bishops around the world. They in turn established seminaries—such as St Patrick's College, Manly, near Sydney—that educated the next generation of Irish bishops and priests.

The Catholic Church was not a *terra nullis* in any of these countries, not even Australia; except in the Cape, there were pre-existing ecclesiastical establishments in each. The United States was heavily dominated by French and German bishops and missionaries; the maritime provinces of British North America by Scots;¹¹ New Zealand by French Marists and Australia by English Benedictines. Scotland had its own native bishops, although the Scottish hierarchy was not restored until 1878. In each case, the existing establishment fought the Irish tooth and nail. And in each case, save that of Scotland, they lost. (New Zealand might be judged a short-term draw and a long-term Irish victory.) Cullen succeeded because of two related facts. First, the Church in the United States, British Isles and the British Empire was under the supervision of a Roman congregation called the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith-the Propaganda. Secondly, Paul Cullen was uniquely influential within the Propaganda from about 1830 to near the end of his life.

Cullen entered the Propaganda's college at sixteen, became a professor and did not leave until 1831 when he was appointed rector of the Irish College in Rome. A top student, he learned Italian fluently and was well liked, making a particular impression on the cardinal prefect, Mauro Cappellari. In 1830, Cappellari became Gregory XVI, reigning until 1846. Cullen also formed close links with successive cardinal prefects of the Propaganda. The most important of these relationships was with Alessandro Barnabò, from 1848 secretary to the Propaganda and cardinal prefect from 1856. Barnabò's death in early 1874 marked the end of

^{11.} Although as part of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec, the Catholic Church in the Maritimes was subject to a certain amount of French-Canadian influence.

Cullen's personal dominance at the Propaganda. Although he had a reasonable relationship with Barnabo's successor, Cullen always lamented the death of his 'staunch friend'.¹²

Cullen's influence was not simply the result of his popularity, but also chance. The working language of the Holy See was Italian. In almost any controversy, even if the parties involved could communicate in Italian or in useable Latin, it was inevitable that many relevant documents would be in the vernacular. Since the Propaganda lacked English speakers, these had to be passed to a trusted translator. He was expected to master the question himself, explain it to the Propaganda and in many cases recommend action to the busy cardinals. Conveniently, they had such a man at hand in Paul Cullen. When Cullen left Rome, the Propaganda utilised Tobias Kirby, his friend and successor as rector of the Irish College.¹³ Either way, Cullen secured a near-monopoly on the explication of English-language conflicts, either directly or at one remove.

Cullen learned of his opportunities as a result of his friendship with the Dublin-born Francis Patrick Kenrick, from 1830 coadjutor bishop of Philadelphia.¹⁴ On arrival, Kenrick fell out with his elderly bishop, Henry Conwell.¹⁵ The diocese was already embroiled in a long-running dispute over lay control of Church property, an issue known as trusteeism.¹⁶ Although the fight between Kenrick and Conwell was about personalities,¹⁷ not ethnicity, it was a prelude to a larger struggle within the American Church between the old guard and the new men who were ultramontane in ideology, and not infrequently Irish in ancestry. It was not simply Irish versus French as it was in, say, New Zealand. Although the leaders of what might be termed (albeit with some care) the 'Roman'

15. Henry Conwell (1748–1842) was the first appointed bishop of Philadelphia in 1819. His weakness in the face of the trusteeism controversy made it clear that a coadjutor was needed. Conwell never gave up his title as bishop, nor his claim to exercise authority and never reconciled with Kenrick.

16. For an extended treatment of the conflict over trusteeism, see D.B. Light, *Rome and the New Republic: Conflict and Community in Philadelphia Catholicism between the Revolution and the Civil War* (Notre Dame, 1996).

17. Light, *Rome and the New Republic*, 250–1. Kenrick was the near-unanimous choice of the American bishops to succeed a man who was universally regarded as unfit for his post.

^{12.} Cullen to James Murray, 'Good Friday' 1876, Murray papers, Maitland and Newcastle diocesan archives (MNDA), A.1.48. Born of a noble family in Foligno, Barnabò (1801–74) trained as a lawyer in Rome before ordination in 1833. He was appointed pro-secretary to the Propaganda in 1847.

^{13.} Ordained a priest of the diocese of Waterford and Lismore, Kirby (1803–95) spent almost his entire career in Rome. He finally retired from the Irish college in 1891 (after being made a titular archbishop by Leo XIII).

^{14.} Kenrick (1796–1863) was born in Dublin. There exists an old, but well researched and still useful study of his early career: H.J. Nolan, *The Most Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick: Third bishop of Philadelphia*, 1830–1851 (Philadelphia, 1948).

faction were Irish—Kenrick himself and the Corkman John England,¹⁸ bishop of Charleston—their allies included the French-born bishop of Mobile and the German-born bishop of Detroit.

From his arrival in Philadelphia, Kenrick intended to call a diocesan synod. Although envisaged by the first provincial council of Baltimore in 1829, only John England and one other bishop had had one.¹⁹ Kenrick held his in 1832. The synodical decrees marked Kenrick out as a Hiberno-Roman avant la lettre. As well as asserting episcopal primacy in all matters, the decrees mandated, among other things, the accurate keeping of parish records, the proper placement of baptismal fonts, confessionals in every church, a uniform catechism and strict controls over the treatment and exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.²⁰ As Dale B. Light has written, Kenrick's policies in their 'essential features anticipated the later reforms of Paul Cullen in Ireland and Nicholas Wiseman in England'.²¹ From Philadelphia, Kenrick's legislation spread through the American Church, as 'bishops throughout the country' 'enacted the same decrees to meet similar conditions in almost all the young and unorganized [sic] dioceses of the land'.²² Encouraged by their diocesan synods, Kenrick and England began to push for a second provincial council of the American Church.²³

Kenrick's energy made much of the rest of the hierarchy nervous. As early as 1831, Archbishop Whitfield of Baltimore informed Rome that Kenrick's 'ardent and enthusiastic spirit' could go 'beyond the boundaries which prudence constitutes'.²⁴ Whitfield's apprehensions were only confirmed when Kenrick and England secured a Roman mandate for a provincial council over the archbishop's objections.²⁵ Dissension began to spread beyond Philadelphia and to issues other than trusteeism or

18. John England (1786–1842) cannot easily be classed as a Hiberno-Roman, or indeed as a member of any other identifiable ecclesiastical faction. He openly held to Irish models—remarking that 'I profess in America what I professed in Ireland' (P. Carey, *An Immigrant Bishop: John England's Adaptation of Irish Catholicism to American Republicanism* (Yonkers, 1982, 87))—but at the same time was apparently deeply influenced by Gallican theological ideals that were anathema to ultramontanes (ibid., 166–8). England was simultaneously both more Roman and Irish than the existing American hierarchy, and more pragmatic, liberal and flexible than the Hiberno-Romans. Certainly Kenrick was often uncomfortable with his southern colleague (P. Guilday, *The Life and Times of John England, First Bishop of Charleston (1786–1842)* (2 vols., New York, 1927), ii. 397). Despite its age, Guilday's book remains the best on England. For a discussion of the local ethnic context of England's episcopate, see D.T. Gleeson, *The Irish in the South, 1815–1877* (Chapel Hill, 2001).

19. Nolan, Francis Patrick Kenrick 138–9. The other was De Neckere of New Orleans.

20. Ibid., 144–8.

21. Light, Rome and the New Republic, 256.

22. Nolan, *Francis Patrick Kenrick*, 147.Writing in 1948, Nolan could still remark that 'This synod's legislation has come down to us almost in its entirety'.

23. The first provincial synod of Baltimore in 1829 had clearly envisaged triennial meetings. For a variety of reasons, Whitfield and others in the hierarchy were unwilling to call any.

24. James Whitfield to Propaganda Fide, 17 Oct. 1831, quoted in Nolan, *Francis Patrick Kenrick*, 132.

25. Nolan, Francis Patrick Kenrick, 166-7.

personality conflict. Bishop England told Cullen in 1833 that the French Sulpician bishop of New York, John Dubois, was rightly 'looked upon as worse than crazy' and that the situation in the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore was 'exceedingly unpleasant' as the 'tricks & low cunning' of those 'who for some years have ruled the American church' had 'disgusted and alienated' all the best sort of Catholics.²⁶

Wider divisions in the American Church did begin to be drawn in ethnic terms. As England told Cullen after the second provincial council of Baltimore in late 1833, at which he and his allies were systematically outvoted, 'the good folks who have so long shut out the Irish from their proper place in the American Church, have now French and Americans ... united & are likely to continue their operations with more powerful effect. All the acts of the last council were based upon this principle.'²⁷ Kenrick agreed, telling Cullen that the opposition to England at the council had been at least in part based on 'anti-Irish feeling'.²⁸ Naturally, the majority of the American hierarchy saw England, Kenrick and their allies as troublemakers, not representatives of an under-privileged ethnic group.

The problems could not be resolved in America. Despite their defeat in Baltimore, Kenrick, England and their allies were not prepared to give up. Mindful of the total power of the Propaganda over the mission territories, they again turned to Rome. Both Kenrick and England were known to the Propaganda; England had a substantial reputation in papal Rome as a whole.²⁹ But their opponents were not without friends of their own. Both sides needed an on-the-spot advocate.

As early as 1830, Kenrick had sought to tempt Cullen across the Atlantic.³⁰ England went even farther, suggesting Cullen for the see of New York and actually arranging for him to be appointed coadjutor at Charleston—an appointment he declined.³¹ It did not take either man long to realise that Cullen was more useful where he was. Writing in July 1833, Kenrick almost begged for help: 'Can you conceive that no advantage to Religion would arrive [*sic*] from frequent communications? I am persuaded that great good would thence accrue'. He instanced cases—such as problems over the creation of a diocese in Kentucky and a long vacancy in Cincinnati—that would benefit from 'familiar and confidential communications' in which Cullen could make 'opportune suggestions' as to the course of action best to be followed.³² England

32. Kenrick to Cullen, 4 July 1833, Moran papers, AAS, U2206.

^{26.} John England to Paul Cullen, 26 Sep. 1833, American Letters, Irish College Rome Archives (ICRA), 10.

^{27.} England to Cullen, 3 Jan. 1834, American Letters, ICRA, 15.

^{28.} Patrick Francis Kenrick to Cullen, 20 Mar. 1834, American Letters, ICRA, 19.

^{29.} During much of this period, England was also responsible for negotiating a concordat between the Holy See and the government of Haiti. See Guilday, *John England*, ii. 270–313.

^{30.} Kenrick to Cullen, 21 Jan. 1830 (but sent 1 Apr.), Moran papers, AAS, U2206.

^{31.} England informed Cullen of the decision in Aug. 1834. It was only then—to England's consternation—that Cullen declined the appointment. England (in Rome) to Cullen, 1 Aug. 1834, American Letters, ICRA, 28. After England's death in 1842, Kenrick again suggested Cullen.

made similar appeals.³³ So did Irish priests in places like New York, who thought Cullen the appropriate recipient of complaints about Bishop Dubois.³⁴

Kenrick and England recognised that Cullen was uniquely placed to advance their interests at the Propaganda, a place where he spoke the language both literally and figuratively. As Kenrick put it in 1836, 'I beg to solicit your kind office, and to communicate to you my thoughts that you may make them known to his Eminence the Cardinal Prefect, and the Sacred Congr^{3,35} Moreover Cullen was known to be a favourite of the reigning pope. From at least 1832, he threw himself into the fight. In the course of a long letter of advice about Roman attitudes towards America written just before the second provincial council of Baltimore, Cullen told Kenrick that he had 'never let any opportunity pass in which I can promote the interests of religion in America, without doing it³⁶.

In Rome, Cullen assumed two important roles on behalf of his American friends. First, he provided advice: how things stood, what the opposition was saying, and what tactics stood the best chance of success. Since 'complaints will certainly be carried to Rome' by their enemies, it was crucial that Kenrick and England 'write frequently to the Propaganda upon the particular wants of the American Church'.³⁷ Cullen's second task was to represent the Americans' interests at the Propaganda. Although acting informally, Cullen was very active indeed. His letters to Kenrick (those to England are lost) are full of references to conversations with various officials in Rome, including the pope.³⁸

The first Irish success was to establish firmly the practice of triennial provincial councils.³⁹ Despite being systematically outvoted in 1833, Kenrick at least saw regular councils as likely (eventually) to produce eminently Hiberno-Roman outcomes—a view later Hiberno-Romans shared.⁴⁰ Over the following years, numerous new dioceses were created, and while they were not all filled with Irishmen or the allies of the Irish,

33. For example, England to Cullen, 17 Dec. 1833, American Letters, ICRA, 13. Reporting on the proceedings at the recent council, England told Cullen 'I wish you would tell Monsignor Mai ... as well as Cardinal Weld what I have stated here'. Mai was secretary to the Propaganda; Weld (an Englishman) was influential at the congregation.

34. For example, see Thomas Sevins to Cullen, 18 July 1834, and John Power to Cullen, 23 July 1834, American Letters, ICRA, 26, 35.

36. Cullen to Kenrick, 1 Sep. [?] 1833, Kenrick papers, Baltimore archdiocesan archives, Associated Archives, St Mary's Seminary and University (BDA), 28R2.

37. Cullen to Kenrick, Dec. 1833, Kenrick papers, BDA, 28R3.

38. The archives of the Propaganda record a number of occasions when Cullen became involved in American affairs. Two examples: in 1831 Cullen forwarded to the Propaganda a letter written to him by Kenrick detailing the state of affairs in Philadelphia; in 1849, the Propaganda asked Cullen to assess for the congregation the decrees of the recent seventh provincial council of Baltimore. F. Kenneally et al., eds., *United States Documents in the Propaganda Fide Archives: A Calendar* (12 vols., Berkley, 1966–2002). For Kenrick's letter: i, document 1369; Propaganda's request re. Baltimore: iv, document 1141; Cullen's reply: vi, document 282.

39. Guilday, John England, ii. 256.

^{35.} Kenrick to Cullen, 23 July 1836, Moran papers, AAS, U2206.

^{40.} Kenrick to Cullen, 20 Mar. 1834, American Letters, ICRA, 19.

many were. To take one early example, the Irish-born John Baptist Purcell⁴¹ was named bishop of Cincinnati in 1833 over Whitfield's objections. John England told Purcell some years later that there had been a concerted attempt to substitute a French name for Purcell's even after his appointment.⁴²

Purcell's elevation was part of a pattern that saw John Hughes⁴³ succeed Dubois in New York after first being appointed his coadjutor, and Kenrick's brother Peter appointed the second bishop of St Louis in 1841 (and the first archbishop in 1847). Other appointees included the American-born but Irish-allied Vincentian John Timon at Buffalo,⁴⁴ and Cullen's former vice-rector at the Irish College, Michael O'Connor, in Pittsburgh.⁴⁵ By 1843, Kenrick of St Louis was privately suggesting what amounted to a formal policy of appointments from Ireland to American sees, citing both the lack of suitable domestic (for which read Irish) candidates and the success of Irish appointees in India.⁴⁶

Kenrick's reference to India was particularly apposite: in the late 1830s and early 1840s, Cullen worked on behalf of Archbishop Daniel Murray of Dublin⁴⁷ to secure Irish appointees to Indian sees, notably Madras, Calcutta and Bombay. After the 1855 death of Patrick Carew of Calcutta (whom Kenrick had nominated in 1837 for an American see),⁴⁸ and the earlier exile of Bombay's John Whelan, Cullen paid little attention to the subcontinent, although Irish bishops remained in Madras⁴⁹ and Hyderabad.⁵⁰ The Church in India, unlike the United States, did not

41. Purcell (1800–83) was born in Mallow, co. Cork, and ordained in 1826. In 1850, Cincinnati was raised to an archdiocese with Purcell as its first archbishop. There is one early study: M.A. McCann, *Archbishop Purcell and the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (Washington, 1918).

42. England to Purcell, I July 1837, CACI, University of Notre Dame Archives (UNDA), II-4-f.

43. Born in Annaloghan, co. Tyrone, John Hughes (1797–1864) was ordained for Philadelphia in 1826, appointed coadjutor at New York in 1837, succeeded in 1842 and became the first archbishop in 1850. Although Hughes was too strong willed to be classed as a client of Kenrick or anybody else, as a bishop he put himself firmly in the Hiberno-Roman camp—certainly he based the legislation of his own diocesan synod in 1842 on the 1832 Philadelphia synod. Nolan, *Francis Patrick Kenrick*, 147, n 101. Hughes has been the subject of a number of studies. See, for example, R. Shaw, *Dagger John: The Unquiet Life and Times of Archbishop John Hughes of New York* (New York, 1977).

44. Timon (1797–1867) was born in Conewago, Pennsylvania. See L.F. Riforgiato, *The Life and Times of John Timon (1797–1867): The First Bishop of Buffalo, New York*, ed. D. Castillo (Ceredigion, 2006).

45. For O'Connor 's career, see below.

46. Peter Richard Kenrick to Purcell, 17 Feb. 1843, CACI, UNDA, II-4-h.

47. Educated at the Irish College in Salamanca, Murray (1768–1852) was appointed coadjutor bishop of Dublin in 1809 and succeeded to that see in 1823. His influence on the Church in Ireland and on Irish society was massive. Despite this, and despite the enormous surviving source material, little has been written directly on Murray. A recent exception is D. Kerr, 'Dublin's Forgotten Archbishop: Daniel Murray, 1766–1852', in J. Kelly and D. Keogh, eds., *History of the Catholic Diocese of Dublin* (Dublin, 2000), 247–67.

48. Nolan, Francis Patrick Kenrick, 208.

49. Carew's successor in Madras (to which he was appointed before Calcutta) was Maynooth's bursar, John Fennelly. He was in turn succeeded in 1868 by his brother Stephen.

50. Daniel Murphy, who on Cullen's recommendation was translated to Tasmania in 1866 (see n. 20).

develop in a particularly Irish or Hiberno-Roman direction, but it was another example of Cullen's use, albeit on behalf of others, of his influence in Rome to secure Irish episcopal appointments.⁵¹

In 1832, Kenrick and England were an isolated minority; even their few allies were not Irish. By turning to Rome-where Paul Cullen was their principal agent until his departure for Ireland⁵²—they were able over time to rout their opponents in the American hierarchy. Francis Patrick Kenrick's translation to Baltimore in 1851 capped an Irish and to a lesser extent Hiberno-Roman⁵³ dominance that although never complete, was substantial and proved durable. The ways in which that happened are identifiable and can be found repeating themselves years later in places like Australia and Scotland. First, Irish-born priests began to make loud complaints about their non-Irish bishop, either to an isolated Irish bishop in the same hierarchy or directly to Rome; the complaints-however unlikely-were taken seriously at the Propaganda, which began to turn on the existing (non-Irish) hierarchy. Over time the Propaganda enabled an Irish take-over of the episcopate in three distinct ways: appointing a coadjutor with right of succession to the most important see or the most important non-Irish bishop; creating new dioceses and appointing Irishmen to head them; filling vacancies of existing dioceses with Irish candidates. Once a majority was achieved, regular national synods imposed the policies of the majority on any remaining minority. Even when the strategy failed, the pattern was clear.

In the United States, Cullen was an agent of others, especially Kenrick. And, although Hiberno-Romanism certainly existed in America, it developed in its own distinct fashion after 1850 largely without Cullen's involvement; his contribution was to influence Rome to direct the American Church along the path desired by Kenrick and England. Although the tremendous regional variations in the United States should not be minimised, its heavily Irish character and increasing focus on Rome⁵⁴ were clearly the result of the efforts of Kenrick,

51. For the Irish bishops in India, see K. Ballhatchet, *Caste, Class and Catholicism in India*, *1789–1914* (London, 1998) and G. Kottuppallil, *History of the Catholic Missions in Central Bengal*, *1855–1886* (Shillong, 1988). For a more general account of the Irish presence in India, see B.J.C. Crosbie, 'The Irish Expatriate Community in British India, c. 1750–1900' (Univ. of Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 2005).

52. In 1848, the Irish vicar general of Chicago forwarded to Cullen a petition of 'the Priests of the Diocese of Chicago' urging the appointment of a particular candidate for the vacant see; less than two weeks later, Purcell of Cincinnati asked Cullen's help at the Propaganda with the coadjutorship of Louisville; in late 1848, Peter Richard Kenrick of St Louis wrote to give Cullen his thoughts on the Chicago vacancy. J.A. Kinsella to Cullen, 3 June 1848; Purcell to Cullen, 14 June 1848; P.R. Kenrick to Cullen, 18 Oct. 1848: American Letters, ICRA, 125, 126, 128.

53. It is important to note that a number of episcopal candidates supported by Kenrick, England and Walsh (see below) did not develop into true Hiberno-Romans in the sense that men like Purcell, Peter Richard Kenrick and Thomas Louis Connolly (see below) were opposed to the definition of papal infallibility in 1870.

54. See P.R. D'Agostino, *Rome in America: Transnational Catholic Ideology from the Risorgimento to Fascism* (Chapel Hill, 2004).

England and Cullen. As David Noel Doyle has noted, even before the massive immigration associated with the famine, 'the major centres of Irish presence and future growth were under Irish bishops'. 'These bishops', Doyle continued, 'in turn accelerated the creation of a distinct Irish-American culture that was urban and catholic'.⁵⁵

Although not an exact match with what came later, it is nevertheless possible to draw the conclusion that Paul Cullen, by watching and helping enable the Irish take-over of the American Church, learned how to go about achieving such a profound shift in a national Church.

The lessons of America and to a lesser extent India were confirmed for Cullen when he became involved in the affairs of the Maritime provinces of British North America. In 1842, the Waterford-born Dublin priest William Walsh⁵⁶ was appointed coadjutor to the Scottishborn vicar apostolic of Nova Scotia, William Fraser.⁵⁷ The area was created the diocese of Halifax at the same time. Fraser learned about the appointment from the newspapers; he thought it a slur against his administration, and bitterly asked the Propaganda whether 'in any court, before pronouncing judgement, is it not right that both parties be heard?⁵⁸ To make matters worse, the existing vicariate was divided between a largely Scottish hinterland and Irish-dominated Halifax. Fraser aggravated relations by living in rural Antigonish, rarely visiting the city. His choice of deputy there, John Loughnan, despite being Irish proved a disaster.⁵⁹ Beyond ethnic tensions, Halifax suffered conflicts over trusteeism similar to those in Philadelphia.⁶⁰

Walsh's appointment grew out of the experiences of two Irish missionary priests.⁶¹ On arriving in Nova Scotia in 1839, they clashed with both Loughnan and the distant Fraser. In 1840, a transiting John England heard the priests' complaints and passed them to Archbishop Murray of Dublin. Murray raised the issue with the Propaganda, which eventually chose to send Fraser a coadjutor. The reasoning, based on

55. D.N. Doyle, 'The Irish in North America, 1776–1845', in W.E. Vaughan, ed., A *New History* of *Ireland, Vol. 5: Ireland under the Union, 1801–1870* (Oxford, 1989), 714. The total US Catholic population was c. 300,000 in 1830, c. 660,000 in 1840 and c. 1,100,000 in 1845 (ibid., 713.)

56. Walsh (1804–58) was suggested as a possible bishop of Calcutta in the 1830s.

57. Fraser (1778 or 1779–1851) had first come to the area as a missionary in 1822. He was appointed vicar apostolic of Nova Scotia in late 1824. For Fraser, see A.A. Johnston, 'A Scottish Bishop in New Scotland: The Right Reverend William Fraser, Second Vicar Apostolic of Nova Scotia, First Bishop of Halifax and First Bishop of Arichat', *The Innes Review*, vi (1955), 107–24.

58. Fraser to Cardinal Fransoni, 24 May 1842, quoted in A.A. Johnston, *A History of the Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia*, (2 vols., Antigonish, 1960–71), ii. 191. Giacomo Filippo Fransoni (1775–1856), from 1834 cardinal prefect of the Propaganda.

59. See K.F. Trombley, *Thomas Louis Connolly (1815–1876): The Man and His Place in Ecclesiastical History* (Leuven, 1983), 46–71.

60. For inter-Irish divisions and trusteeism, see T. Murphy, 'Trusteeism in Atlantic Canada: The Struggle for Leadership among the Irish Catholics of Halifax, St John's, and Saint John, 1780–1850', in T. Murphy and G. Stortz, eds., *Creed and Culture: The Place of English-Speaking Catholics in Canadian Society, 1750–1930* (Montreal and Kingston, 1993), 126–51.

61. Lawrence Joseph Dease and Richard Baptist O'Brien.

the testimony of the disgruntled Irish (although perhaps not inaccurate for that), was that Fraser was incapable of managing his diocese alone.

According to Cullen, the Propaganda at first had had only the Scottish side of the story.⁶² Looking out for Irish interests, he wrote to Murray in March 1842 soliciting 'any accurate information on the state of affairs, [as] it wd be well to inform the Propaganda, otherwise they will not know what to do, and Nova Scotia is so far off, that it is with difficulty they can expect to get accurate information directly from that country'.⁶³ Murray provided the 'accurate information', Cullen interpreted it (in both senses)⁶⁴ and the Propaganda appointed Walsh. As Kirby told the new bishop, 'the good Dr Cullen worked hard to get you into harness'.⁶⁵

Despite his best efforts, Walsh proved unable either to placate Fraser or pacify Halifax.⁶⁶ Even before Walsh's delayed arrival, the various factions began to appeal to Rome. As Walsh put it, 'It is clear that the Bishop & his friends had determined on having a Coadjutor of their own choice'.⁶⁷ Cullen and Kirby acted as Walsh's agent at the Propaganda. As early as August 1842, Walsh implored the 'worthy Dr Cullen' to call on the cardinal prefect 'in my name'.⁶⁸ The two men translated documents into Italian, and delivered Walsh's letters so as to ensure their good reception and correct interpretation.⁶⁹ Walsh recognised the crucial importance of access to the Propaganda: on the same day that he posted his first report (written in English) of the situation in Nova Scotia to Cardinal Fransoni, he also wrote to Kirby asking him to 'wait on him [Fransoni] the moment you receive this, and offer to translate it for him'.⁷⁰

The Propaganda was so concerned by the conflict that it chose to send an investigator of its own, the Italian Antonio DeLuca.⁷¹ His July 1844 report put the blame squarely on ethnic divisions. According to DeLuca, European emigrants as a rule carried with them their national characteristics and prejudices. 'This', he wrote, 'is happening in Nova Scotia, where the Scots and the Irish, who form the majority of the population, are keeping up their inborn mutual hostility'. '[T]he Irish

62. Fraser knew of Dease and O'Brien's complaints and worked to pre-empt them.

63. Cullen to Murray, 14 Mar. 1842, Murray papers, Dublin diocesan archives (DDA), 34/9.

64. Cullen to Murray, 4 Apr. 1842, Murray papers, DDA, 34/9.

65. Kirby to Walsh, 14 Apr. 1842, Walsh papers, Halifax diocesan archives (HDA), 151.

66. Fraser enjoyed the overwhelming support of the diocesan clergy.

67. Walsh to Murray, 22 June 1842, Murray papers, DDA, 31/9/112.

68. Walsh to Kirby, 10 Aug. 1842, Kirby papers, ICRA (from transcript in HDA).

69. See, for example, Kirby to Walsh, 23 May 1843, Walsh papers, HDA, 154: 'On receipt of your Lordship's letter I hastened to go to Cardl Fransoni to whom I communicated its contents. The good Dr Cullen has also interested himself a good deal, and I hope not without effect'.

70. Walsh to Kirby, 'Feast of the Purification' [thus 2 Feb.] 1843, Kirby papers, ICRA (from transcript in HDA).

71. Antonio DeLuca, 'Report on Nova Scotia', 15 July 1844, APF, Acta (1844), vol. 207, fos. 234–47. The report is extensively quoted in translation in Johnston, *Catholic Church in Easter Nova Scotia*, vol. ii, ch. 8–9.

are inclined to complain should the bishop be a Scot, and the Scots if he be Irish'.⁷² DeLuca went on to criticise both Walsh and Fraser, but particularly Walsh and the Irish of Halifax.

To ensure his own victory, Walsh set out for Rome in March 1844. While there, he continued to enjoy the support of Cullen, who boasted to Murray that he had managed to dispel the bad impression of Walsh held by the Propaganda.⁷³ Bishop Fraser, who had hoped for Walsh's total removal from the Maritimes, must have been badly surprised when it was announced on 22 September 1844 that Walsh would stay in Nova Scotia and the diocese of Halifax be divided in two.⁷⁴ Fraser's hopes were not entirely unreasonable; according to Cullen, he had the support of the archbishop of Quebec in addition to the generally anti-Walsh tenor of DeLuca's report.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, with Cullen's help Walsh prevailed, retaining the Irish-dominated city, while Fraser was consigned to the heavily Scottish rural areas as bishop of Arichat.⁷⁶ Walsh quickly eliminated Scottish influence in his new diocese, bringing back with him from Europe five Irish-born priests, and ordaining another four on arrival in Halifax. Within weeks, only two Scottish-descended clergy remained in the diocese.⁷⁷ After Fraser died in late 1851, Halifax was raised to an archdiocese with Walsh its archbishop.⁷⁸

The elevation of Walsh and Halifax marked a new stage in the development of the Catholic Church in British North America. Previously, the centre of power was in francophone Quebec. Now a new province with an Irishman at its head contested that dominance. To ensure the continuation of Irish influence, however, it needed to be extended beyond Halifax. Cullen and his Rome-based allies were closely involved in the process. When the bishop of Saint John's, New Brunswick,⁷⁹ died in mid-1851, Walsh threw the choice of a successor on Cullen: 'My humble advice ... would be to let the Primate of Ireland [Cullen] be requested to select the best man he can get in the Irish Church (with some knowledge of French) and he should be consecrated and sent forthwith'.⁸⁰

The nominee was Walsh's Irish confidant, Thomas Louis Connolly. Connolly had studied in Rome, where he was acquainted with both

76. Johnston, Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia, ii. 212.

77. Ibid., ii. 219.

79. Although Irish-born, the bishop, William Dollard, had finished his clerical training in Quebec City after responding to a call from the bishop there for Irish-speaking missionaries.

80. William Walsh to Bernard Smith, 16 Sep. 1851, quoted Trombley, Thomas Louis Connolly, 103.

^{72.} Ibid., ii. 176.

^{73.} Cullen to Murray, 27 July 1844, Cullen papers, DDA, 40/4.

^{74.} Trombley, *Thomas Louis Connolly*, 76. Fraser did not object in principle to the division of his diocese, he just did not want to have to deal with Walsh in any capacity.

^{75.} Cullen to Murray, 8 June 1844, Murray papers, DDA, 34/9. Cullen was soliciting Murray's help in defending Walsh.

^{78.} Walsh had been pushing this idea since at least 1850, and Kirby involved another Irish bishop, the visiting John Hughes of New York, in presenting the case to a sympathetic Propaganda. Kirby to Walsh, 14 Jan. 1851, Walsh papers, HDA, 162.

Kirby and Barnabò.⁸¹ Arichat was too Scottish to attempt an Irish appointee,⁸² but Walsh ensured that a long-time Scottish ally (and Urban College graduate), Colin MacKinnon, was appointed.⁸³ For the time being, there would be two Scottish and two Irish bishops in the Maritimes.

Walsh's death in 1858 precipitated a brief panic among the North American Irish. Even before the archbishop's death, Connolly wrote to Cullen about the succession. Although he disclaimed any desire to be translated himself, Connolly insisted that there was no suitable candidate in the Maritimes. He also reminded Cullen of the ethnic balance without Walsh: 'We have here two Scotch Bishops with a strong National bias. We have nobody in all Nova Scotia competent to represent Irish Catholic interests in Rome.' Connolly, who was 'conscientiously opposed to any other but an Irishman', promised to support whomever Cullen named.⁸⁴ Prodded by Connolly,⁸⁵ Archbishop Hughes wrote from New York to the same effect.⁸⁶ Despite his protestations, Connolly was prepared to accept Halifax 'To prevent a Scotchman or a foreigner or any of the Nova Scotia Priests from being foisted into such a position';⁸⁷ he was duly appointed in 1859.

In 1840, Fraser and the Scottish-born bishop of Charlottetown, Bernard Donald MacDonald, between them had had responsibility for the entire Maritimes. By 1860, Irish bishops in Halifax, Saint John and the new diocese of Chatham⁸⁸ outnumbered the remaining Scottish bishops in Prince Edward Island and Arichat.

Cullen again turned his attention to the region when, in 1869, he helped arrange the appointment of Thomas Power, the rector of Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, to the see of St John's, Newfoundland. Cullen had received letters from there alleging, among other things, that the bishop's palace 'is converted into a drinking club'.⁸⁹ The appointment of Power

83. Trombley, *Thomas Louis Connolly*, 103–4. Walsh had suggested MacKinnon as the ideal coadjutor for Fraser from as early as 1843. See Walsh to Kirby, 28 Apr. 1843, Kirby papers, ICRA (from a transcript in the HDA).

84. Connolly to Cullen, 10 Aug. 1858, Cullen papers, DDA, 319/19/11/38.

85. Connolly to Hughes, 30 Aug. 1858, Hughes papers, Archives of the Archdiocese of New York, A9.

86. Hughes to Cullen, 17 Dec. 1858, Cullen papers, DDA, 319/1/II/56.

87. Connolly to Cullen, 10 Aug. 1858, Cullen papers, DDA, 319/19/11/38.

88. Erected in 1860, two years after the temporary Scottish majority created by Walsh's death, Chatham is now known as Bathurst.

89. Cullen to Conroy, 3 June 1870, Conroy papers, ADA, from a transcript in the AAS.

^{81.} Trombley, *Thomas Louis Connolly*, 164. Connolly's (1815–76) later career—like that of Peter Kenrick in St Louis—demonstrates that in these early years Cullen could be mistaken about his man. Both Connolly and Kenrick of St Louis were active members of the minority at the first Vatican Council—a fact that enraged the ultramontane Cullen.

^{82.} As late as 1871, two-thirds of the diocese was Scots Gaelic-speaking and a further tenth French-speaking Acadians. J.D. Cameron, "Erasing Forever the Brand of Social Inferiority": Saint Francis Xavier University and the Highland Catholics of Eastern Nova Scotia', *CCHA Historical Studies*, lix (1992), 53.

ended the decades-old tradition of Irish Franciscan bishops in St John's.⁹⁰ In 1871, Cullen tried to undermine the newly appointed bishop of Harbour Grace, the Italian-born Franciscan Enrico Carfagnini.⁹¹ He forwarded to Rome complaints against the bishop which he had recieved from the sister of James Lynch, the coadjutor bishop of Kildare, and previously vicar apostolic of the Western District of Scotland. Cullen had not been consulted about Harbour Grace, and was clearly annoyed by this, telling Kirby 'I was at home when this Bishop was appointed, so I had noting to say to the matter.' Cullen thought that Carfagnini would 'probably occasion a schism unless the Propaganda interfere.'⁹²

The lessons of the United States and British North America remained with Cullen after his appointment as archbishop of Armagh in late 1849. Although this article is primarily concerned with events outside Ireland, it is worth noting that Cullen used the same tactics at home that he had learned while helping others abroad. He converted a chronically divided Irish hierarchy into a body that was largely prepared to follow his lead, and acquiesce in his vision of Church organisation and episcopal practice.⁹³

Cullen achieved this in barely five years by ensuring that a substantial majority of the new bishops or coadjutor bishops appointed to Irish sees were men he approved of, regardless of the opinion of the relevant diocesan clergy or provincial bishops. He could do this because he had the full trust of the Propaganda and because Kirby filled his old role in Rome. In effect, the Propaganda re-made the Irish episcopate to Cullen's order.⁹⁴

As the Irish spread out across the British Empire, Cullen's attention followed. Before turning to Australia, he involved himself in the appointment of Irish bishops to the Cape of Good Hope. Unlike the other regions discussed in this article, the Cape was always an Irish mission. The first vicar apostolic (appointed in 1837) was Raymond Griffith, an Irish Dominican. As with the Irish bishops in India, Cullen assisted Griffith on behalf of Archbishop Murray.⁹⁵ In 1847, the vicariate was divided at Griffith's request, and another Irishman, Aidan Devereux, appointed to the new Eastern District. In 1856, Patrick Francis Moran, a Dublin priest unrelated to either Cullen or the other

90. For the religious history of Newfoundland in the period before Power's appointment, see J.P. Greene, *Between Damnation and Starvation: Priests and Merchants in Newfoundland Politics*, 1745–1855 (Montreal and Kingston, 1999).

91. Harbour Grace, now called Grand Falls, is also in Newfoundland.

92. Cullen to Kirby, 15 Jan. 1871, New Kirby papers, ICRA, Carton III, Folder III, #55.

93. For the Irish Church in the 1840s and early 1850s, see D. Kerr, Peel, Priests and Politics: Sir Robert Peel's Administration and the Roman Catholic in Ireland, 1841–1846 (Oxford, 1982) and 'A Nation of Beggars'?: Priests, People, and Politics in Famine Ireland, 1846–1852 (Oxford, 1994). Also E. Larkin, The Making of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, 1850–1860 (Chapel Hill, 1980) and C.P. Barr, Paul Cullen, John Henry Newman, and the Catholic University of Ireland, 1845–65 (Notre Dame, 2003).

94. This process is definitively described in Larkin, *The Making of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland*.

95. W.E. Brown, *The Catholic Church in South Africa*, ed., M. Derrick (New York, 1960), 8. As with Carew and Whelan in India, Cullen took an active part in securing Griffith's appointment on Murray's behalf. See Cullen to Murray, 20 Oct. 1836, 30 May 1837, 1 Aug. 1837, Murray papers, DDA, 34/9.

Moran, succeeded Devereux. As Cullen put it, 'He is very young, but an excellent man'.⁹⁶ According to his biographer, Moran was 'a protégé of Archbishop Cullen and a professedly staunch supporter of papal authority'.⁹⁷ The first true Hiberno-Roman in southern Africa, Moran became in 1870 the first bishop of Dunedin, New Zealand.

From 1856, Cullen became more directly involved in the Cape, often at his protégé's request. Writing to his Dublin representative in early 1860, Moran noted the recent physical collapse of Bishop Griffith and asked him to raise the issue of a coadjutor with Cullen: 'I know Dr Cullen will do everything he can for the South African Missions'.⁹⁸ Although Moran was premature in declaring Griffith incapacitated, Thomas Grimley, a Dublin priest and canon of the pro-cathedral, was appointed his coadjutor the next year, most likely on Cullen's recommendation.⁹⁹ Moran also kept Cullen informed of South African affairs in some detail.

The fact that Cullen arranged for an unwilling Moran's transfer to New Zealand in 1869/70 suggests that southern Africa was not a high priority.¹⁰⁰ Possibly this was because the area received relatively few Irish immigrants, and of those relatively few were Catholic;¹⁰¹ or possibly because there was no 'foreign' episcopal competition in the colony.¹⁰² Still, when the Catholics of the Cape wished to express sympathy with the pope in 1870, and send him £310, they did so through Cullen.¹⁰³ And when Rome wanted to inform Moran's handpicked (Irish) successor of his elevation, it was Cullen who wrote the letter.¹⁰⁴ As J. B. Brain has written, 'Irish prelates laid the foundations of the catholic church in the Cape and extended them to almost every part of southern Africa'.¹⁰⁵

Unlike South Africa, Australia engaged Cullen's full attention. From nearly the beginning of the colony of New South Wales, the Australian mission had been entrusted to the English Benedictines, except in

96. Cullen to Kirby, 5 Apr. 1856, New Kirby papers, ICRA, Carton II, Folder I, #113. Cullen was announcing Moran's imminent arrival in Rome on his way to South Africa.

97. H.M. Laracy, 'Moran, Patrick 1823?–1895'. Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, (Wellington, 1993), 334.

98. Moran to [Andrew] O'Connell, 14 Mar. 1860, Cullen papers, DDA, 333/1/15. O'Connell obviously did as he was asked, as the letter is preserved in Cullen's files.

99. Grimley hardly appears in Cullen's correspondence. However, it is difficult to imagine a Dublin canon without any connection to the region being appointed to the Cape in 1861 unless it was on Cullen's nomination.

100. Moran resisted the appointment for some time, only relenting when confronted in Rome by Barnabò on 23 June 1870. Moran (the nephew) to Conroy, 24 June 1870, Conroy papers, ADA (from a transcript in the AAS).

101. D.H. Akenson, Occasional Papers on the Irish in South Africa (Grahamstown, 1991), ch. 3.

102. Unlike the Cape, Natal was firmly in the hands of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, a largely French order. See J.B. Brain, *Catholic Beginnings in Natal and Beyond* (Durban, 1975).

103. A. Wilmot, The Life and Times of the Right Rev. James David Ricards, Bishop of Retimo, in partibus infidelium, and vicar-apostolic of the Eastern Districts of the Cape Colony (Cape Town, 1908), 86–7.

104. Cullen to James David Ricards, 19 Feb. 1871, in ibid., 87–8.

105. J.B. Brain, 'The Irish Influence on the Roman Catholic Church in South Africa', in D.P. McCracken, ed., *The Irish in Southern Africa 1795–1910* (Durban, 1992), 121.

distant Western Australia.¹⁰⁶ The steady growth of the colonies required a commensurate expansion of Church structures.

Cullen was first invited into Australian ecclesiastical affairs by John McEncroe, a long-serving Irish priest in New South Wales.¹⁰⁷ Looking for allies against John Bede Polding,¹⁰⁸ the English Benedictine archbishop of Sydney, McEncroe's eye turned toward Dublin. In 1856, he requested Cullen's help in getting new dioceses created and Irishmen appointed to head them. Australia, he thought, 'although an English colony', should be 'an affiliation from [sic] the Church of *Ireland*'.¹⁰⁹ Two years later, Cullen received a letter from another Irish priest on the Australian mission, Peter O'Farrell, who wrote that the future of the Church in Australia 'rests upon the appointment of good Bishops'. 'I would earnestly beg of Your Grace to come to the assistance of the Church in N.S. Wales, and help in the selection of proper Irish Bishops for it'.¹¹⁰ Although Irish complaints went to any interested recipient, Cullen, as he had been for many disgruntled Irish-American priests, was a special target; his correspondents understood his influence.

Cullen's first intervention was to recommend the 1859 appointment of James Quinn as the first bishop of Brisbane.¹¹¹ He had been a student of Cullen's in Rome, and a close associate in Dublin. Quinn was the first of a long line of Hiberno-Roman appointments to the Australian episcopate. Intolerant of dissent in Brisbane, Quinn inspired unhappy Irish priests elsewhere and acted as a conduit of their complaints to Rome. He undoubtedly made a lasting impact on Queensland; one contemporary critic even re-christened it 'Quinnsland'.¹¹²

By the end of 1862, the persistent Irish attacks on Polding reached a fever pitch. The charge against him was that he favoured English priests over the vastly more numerous Irish. There was a certain irony in accusing Polding of anti-Irish bias; in 1844, he had publicly declared O'Connell's

110. O'Farrell to Cullen, 7 Sep. 1858, Cullen papers, DDA, Australia box. From a transcript posted online by Brian Condon at http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/research/condon/CatholicLetters/18580907.htm. Accessed on 21 Jan. 2006.

111. There is only one book-length study of Quinn (1819–81): A. McLay, *James Quinn, First Catholic Bishop of Brisbane*, (rev. edn., Toowoomba, 1989). According to the Brisbane diocesan archives, Cullen's letters to Quinn were burned after his death by his nephew.

112. See T.P. Boland, *James Quinn: Monarch of All He Surveyed*, Aquinas Memorial Lecture for 1979 (Brisbane, 1981), 10.

627

^{106.} Western Australia was entrusted to Spanish Benedictines.

^{107.} McEncroe was one of the first priests on the Australia mission and had long pursued the 'hibernicisation' of the Australian Catholic Church. See D. Birchley, *John McEncroe: Colonial Democrat* (Blackburn, 1986), ch. 8.

^{108.} Polding (1794–1877) was first appointed vicar apostolic of New Holland and Van Dieman's land in 1832. In 1842, he became the first archbishop of Sydney. Polding is obviously the central figure in most works on the Australian Catholic Church in the period. He has received one biography: F. O'Donoghue, *Bishop of Botany Bay: The Life of John Bede Polding, Australia's First Catholic Archbishop* (Sydney, 1982). His letters have also been published: Sisters of the Good Samaritan, eds., *The letters of John Bede Polding, OSB* (3 vols., Sydney, 1994–8).

^{109.} McEncroe to Cullen, 11 Apr. 1856, in Moran, *Catholic Church in Australasia*, 781–2. Emphasis in original.

Repeal movement to be one of 'justice, of morality, of religion, and of God.'¹¹³ Writing to Alessandro Barnabò, Polding pointed out that his deans were in fact Irish, with names like Sheehy and Hanly, and that moreover it was a myth that the Irish were the dominant population in New South Wales.¹¹⁴ He urged the cardinal to ignore Irish claims: the Church 'should favour not English, not Irish but Australian, and if the Irish or the English or any other do not wish to be considered Australian, but obstinately claim for themselves some altogether different origin, they will destroy unity, social harmony and fidelity towards the Holy See as happened in America'.¹¹⁵ Polding was being somewhat disingenuous: his real concern was not to secure 'Australian' (or even English) bishops, but rather to perpetuate his idiosyncratic vision of a Benedictine abbeydiocese in New South Wales.

Whatever Polding's ambitions, he was in no doubt about the source of his troubles. He told Barnabò in late 1861 'that if the prelates in Ireland continue to involve themselves in the ecclesiastical affairs of this province, they give too little thought to the good of the Church' in Australia.¹¹⁶ The plural in 'prelates' was only a courtesy. By 1860, there was only one Irish prelate that mattered: Paul Cullen.

Polding simply could not understand why scurrilous and false charges were given such a hearing. As he wrote in 1863, when renewed complaints were made against 'English appointments':

When is all this to end? How long are Bishops who have faithfully served the Church for more than a quarter of a century to stand in the Court of the High Priest, blindfolded, to guess who are their anonymous calumniators, to be slapped and spit upon and asked *Prophetiza quis te percussit*?¹¹⁷ I would not subject a School Boy to such treatment as I myself have experienced at the hands of his Eminence. Let me know my accuser and the ground on wh. he rests his accusation.¹¹⁸

By late 1863, it was clear to Polding that Rome was in Irish hands, and he would be entirely bypassed in all decisions affecting the future of the Australian Church. In December of that year, he received a letter from one of his priests—an Irishman—in which the archbishop was informed that he, the priest, was a candidate for the new see of Goulburn in New South Wales. It was the first Polding knew of it, and his outraged and painfully ironic letter to Patrick Geoghegan, the

117. 'Prophesy who it is who struck you', Luke 22, 64.

^{113.} M. Roe, Quest for Authority in Eastern Australia, 1835–51 (Melbourne, 1965), 104.

^{114.} He claimed that they were at most one-seventh of the population and were not even a majority of the Catholics.

^{115.} John Bede Polding to Alessandro Barnabò, 22 Dec. 1861, Polding Letters, iii. 54.

^{116.} Ibid., 56.

^{118.} Polding to Bernard Smith, 21 Dec. 1863, *Polding Letters*, iii. 137–8. Compare with Fraser to Fransoni in 1842 (above n 58).

B[isho]ps in Ireland to recommend Priests in Australia to the Episcopacy, not to Dioceses in Ireland but in Australia! ... I wonder whether these B[isho]ps were the vehicles of the wholesale slanders against me for wh. the Card. deemed it his duty to call me to an account And this an Irish colony! Would you believe it?

'How', Polding lamented, 'is it possible for us to govern the Church, with an *imperium in imperio*?'¹¹⁹ In 1864 and into 1865, Polding watched helplessly as rumours of episcopal appointments swirled around Australia. The first two—to the prosperous dioceses of Maitland and Bathurst immediately surrounding Sydney (and thus Polding)—were finally agreed in 1865. Cullen's secretary, James Murray, was appointed bishop of Maitland, and Matthew Quinn, the brother of the bishop of Brisbane, went to Bathurst.¹²⁰ Murray was a cousin of both the Quinn brothers and Cullen; all three had been students at the Irish College in Rome. Polding, who had set out for Rome in 1865 in an attempt to influence matters, was appalled, telling the Benedictine bishop of Newport in Wales that there was now 'Too much "Quinnine" for my taste' in the Australian hierarchy. As Polding admitted, it was a 'bitter pun', but one that caught the full extent of his defeat.¹²¹

Although he arrived too late to block the appointment of Murray and Quinn, Polding told Bishop Brown that since he was now in Rome the Propaganda could hardly fail to consult him; perhaps he could 'prevent that intensely Irish party from having all things their own way'.¹²² Although Cullen had moments of anxiety,¹²³ Polding enjoyed little success. Cullen's 1866 elevation to the cardinalate—which carried membership of the Propaganda—only deepened his influence. Announcing the appointment to Murray, Cullen assured him that 'If I can do any thing for Australia, you may count on my exertions'.¹²⁴ To take a practical example of this helpfulness, in April 1867 he told Murray that his letter to Barnabò (which Murray had sent for comment) was fine and he was forwarding it on to Rome. 'I wrote', Cullen continued,

119. 'Empire Within the Empire'. Polding to Patrick Bonaventure Geoghegan, 17 Dec. 1863, *Polding Letters*, iii. 132–3.

121. Polding to T.J. Brown, 20 Jan. 1866, Polding Letters, iii. 201.

122. Ibid.

123. In two letters to Murray, Cullen expressed the fear that Polding 'has got some bishops appointed'. Cullen to Murray, 19 Dec. 1866, 18 Jan. 1867, Murray papers, MNDA, A.I.12, A.I.13. 124. Cullen to Murray, 2 July 1866, Murray papers, MNDA, A.I.11.

^{120.} James Murray's (1828–1909) paternal uncle was Daniel Murray, archbishop of Dublin. His maternal aunt was the mother of James and Matthew Quinn. His mother was also connected to the wider Cullen and Moran families. See B. Zimmerman, *The Making of a Diocese: Maitland, Its Bishop, Priests, and People, 1866–1909* (Melbourne, 2000), 13. Matthew Quinn (1821–85) was ordained in 1845 after study at the Irish College. Uniquely among the Cullenite bishops, he served as a missionary priest (in Hyderabad) before his return to Ireland.

'at the same time (I did not refer at all to yr letter to the Cardinal) and I gave his Eminence the substance of the letters which you had written to me about F. Sheehy etc'.¹²⁵ A few months later, Cullen reported on the effectiveness of his allies' attempts to weaken Polding by discrediting his cherished Benedictines: 'Dr Mat. Quinn has made serious charges against some of the Benedictines individually—if these charges be not contradicted, they will produce the desired effect'.¹²⁶

By 1868, Polding had given up: 'You know', he told his agent in Rome,¹²⁷ 'that *not one* whom I recommended to the Episcopacy was accepted ... and how all recommended by Card. Cullen were appointed.' He thought the best thing would be for Rome to appoint an administrator in Sydney and 'allow me to retire'.¹²⁸ Polding simply could not understand why 'Abp. Cullen should interfere so much in our affairs'.¹²⁹

Irish appointments kept coming. In Tasmania, the English-born Robert Willson — who in the late 1840s had been accused of anti-Irish bias¹³⁰ – actually recommended that his successor be Irish.¹³¹ Danial Murphy became his coadjutor in 1866. Murphy had been vicar apostolic of Hyderabad since 1846; Mathew Quinn was one of his priests there.¹³² The first bishops of Armidale (1869), Ballarat (1874) and Sandhurst (1874) were all Cullen nominees, either directly or at one remove.¹³³ The first resident bishop of Goulburn¹³⁴ was a protégé of Patrick Leahy, archbishop of Cashel and Cullen's close ally in the Irish hierarchy.¹³⁵ Even those areas that avoided direct-from-Dublin bishops were influenced by Cullen. In Adelaide, Patrick Geoghegan, more an ally of

125. Cullen to Murray, 25 Apr. 1867, Murray papers, MNDA, A.1.14.

126. Cullen to Murray, 16 June 1867, Murray papers, MNDA, A.1.16.

127. The relationship between Polding and his Roman agent, Bernard Smith, is covered in detail in A.E. Cunningham, *The Rome Connection: Australia, Ireland and the Empire 1865–1885* (Darlinghurst, 2002).

128. Polding to Smith, 1 May 1868, Polding letters, iii. 296. Emphasis in original.

129. Polding to Smith, n.d. (but before 1866), quoted in Molony, *Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church*, 27.

130. Roe, Quest for Authority, 116.

131. W.T. Southerwood, *The Convicts' Friend (Bishop R. W. Willson)* (Georgetown, Tas., 1989), 370–71. I am greatful to Professor R. P. Davis of the University of Tasmania for this reference, and to Fr. Southerwood for a copy of this book.

132. Molony, Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church, 34.

133. Timothy O'Mahony (1825–92) (Armidale) was an Irish College product and was ordained there in 1850. Despite intense lobbying in Rome from Cullen, Kirby and Moran, he resigned Armidale under a cloud in 1878, going into exile in Canada; Michael O'Connor (1829–83) (Ballarat), a Dublin diocesan priest, was supported by Quinn of Brisbane who gave Cullen as a character reference; Martin Crane (1818–1901) (Sandhurst), although an Augustinian, was well known to Cullen, who provided his name to the Propaganda when two earlier nominees (both favourites of Bishop Goold of Melbourne) declined. Molony, *Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church*, 36.

134. William Lanigan distinguished himself only by exceeding even Quinn of Brisbane in his priggishness. Lanigan (?–1900), was technically the second bishop, as Patrick Geoghegan of Adelaide arranged his own translation there, but died in Ireland before ever visiting the diocese.

135. Molony, Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church, 35.

Polding's than Cullen's Irish, was nonetheless careful to make Cullen the gift of a solid gold chain in 1862.¹³⁶ His successor, Laurence Shiel, knew Cullen in Rome and Ireland before he left for Australia in 1853.¹³⁷ In 1872, Cullen tried and failed to get him a Hiberno-Roman successor.¹³⁸ In Melbourne, the Irish Augustinian Bishop James Goold (appointed in 1847), although not himself a Cullenite, was careful not to cross the Irish archbishop. Only Western Australia remained immune, and then only because James Murray refused the see of Perth in 1865.¹³⁹

Although Polding somewhat improbably¹⁴⁰ secured an English Benedictine coadjutor in 1873, the Australian Church was firmly in Hiberno-Roman hands from about 1866—despite some setbacks after the deaths of Cardinal Barnabò in 1874 and Cullen himself in 1878.¹⁴¹ Even in Sydney, and even while Polding lived, Archbishop Vaughan was 'at pains to gain the confidence of his Irish suffragans'. He had largely succeeded by Polding's death in 1877.¹⁴² Vaughan was followed in 1885 by Cullen's half-nephew Patrick Francis Moran.¹⁴³ Moran's successor, Michael Kelly, had succeeded Kirby as rector of the Irish College in Rome before his appointment to Sydney. He died in 1940.

As in the United States, and Ireland itself, the Hiberno-Roman capture of the Australian hierarchy was consolidated by synodical decree. In 1869, an unwilling Archbishop Polding was compelled by Rome to accede to his suffragans' desire for a provincial council; their primary aim was to end Polding's toleration of mixed marriages in Sydney.¹⁴⁴ In 1885, the newly appointed Moran was instructed to call the first plenary council of the Catholic Church in Australasia. As with Cullen before the synod of Thurles

136. Cullen to Geoghegan, 29 Oct. 1862, Geoghegan papers, AAS, U1419. Geoghegan (1805– 64) was a close associate of Goold in Melbourne before his appointment to Adelaide.

137. Molony, *Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church*, 34. Also a Franciscan, Shiel had taught at St Isidore's in Rome before setting out for Australia.

138. 'I have just heard that Dr Shiel has died last week. I have written a line to the Propaganda'. Cullen to Murray, 22 Mar. 1872, Murray papers, MNDA, A.1.35.

139. For Murray's appointment to, and avoidance of, Perth, see Zimmerman, *The Making of a Diocese*, 19–21.

140. The extent of Cullen's disappointment with Vaughan's appointment can be gauged by the fact that he reminded Murray no fewer than three times that as the pope's choice the new archbishop was entitled to a good reception: 'Some times things look badly, but in the end they turn out well especially when they are done by one like the Pope under the guidance of heaven'. Cullen to Murray, 8 Oct., 30 Oct., 29 Dec. 1873, Murray papers, MNDA, A.I.39, A.I.41, A.I.44.

141. For example, the forced departure of Timothy O'Mahony from Armidale and the related willingness of Cardinal Franchi—Barnabò's successor—to listen to complaints about the behaviour of Irish bishops in Australia.

142. K.T. Livingston, The Emergence of an Australian Catholic Priesthood, 1835–1915 (Sydney, 1977), 80.

143. Moran (1830–1911) was the eldest son of the second marriage of the only daughter of Hugh Cullen's first marriage. Paul Cullen was the third son of Hugh Cullen's second marriage. The Cullen family tree is traced in M.J. Curran, 'Cardinal Cullen: Biographical Materials', *Reportorium Novum: Dublin Diocesan Historical Record*, i, no. 1 (1955), table II. Like his uncle, Moran eluded biographers until the publication of P. Ayres, *Prince of the Church: Patrick Francis Moran, 1830–1911* (Melbourne, 2007).

144. Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, 64.

(1850), Rome gave Moran special authority over the council as apostolic delegate. As one Irish College-trained priest wrote in relation to the council, Moran 'will do for Australia what his great uncle did for Ireland'.¹⁴⁵ The decrees of the council established, in Moran's words, 'uniformity of discipline as far as it was possible, the same catechism, the same *ordo* for reciting the Divine Office, the same rules for fasting, for holidays, for reserved cases etc'.¹⁴⁶ As Kenrick's 1832 legislation in Philadelphia was in the United States, or the decrees of the synod of Thurles were in Ireland, the legislation of Moran's 1885 council became the dominant model in Australia (and New Zealand) even beyond Moran's own death in 1911.¹⁴⁷

The scope of Cullen's involvement in the Australian Church—and its enduring legacy—seems beyond question. In one year alone (1845), no fewer than six future Australian or New Zealand bishops were his students in Rome. As one Sydney newspaper noted in its obituary of Cullen, it was to 'his judgement America and Australia are mainly indebted for the admirable selection of their bishops'.¹⁴⁸

New Zealand followed a slightly different path from its larger neighbour. There, the dominant ecclesiastical power was the French Society of Mary—the Marists. There was also a relatively smaller Irish population in New Zealand in the early 1860s, not least because of the lack of transportation. Although Irish numbers would quickly increase¹⁴⁹—and by the 1870s Irish issues were prominent in New Zealand politics¹⁵⁰—the Marists were well entrenched. And, unlike the English Benedictines, they were relatively well prepared for a fight when one was forced upon them.¹⁵¹

As in Australia, the incumbent bishops, particularly the long-serving Jean-Baptiste Pompallier of Auckland,¹⁵² were the subject of regular complaints to Rome. In Pompallier's case, the charge was financial incompetence, which seems to have been reasonably well founded.¹⁵³

145. Quoted in K.J. Walsh, *Yesterday's Seminary: A History of St. Patrick's Manly* (St Leonards, 1998), 64.

146. Moran to Kirby, 1 Dec. 1885, quoted in Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, xv.

147. Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, xv.

148. *Freeman's Journal*, 16 Nov. 1878, quoted in Molony, *Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church*, 26. Not to be confused with its Dublin namesake, the *Freeman's Journal* was the primary Catholic paper in New South Wales.

149. For a detailed discussion of Irish immigration to New Zealand, see Akenson, *Half the World from Home*, ch. 1. The gold rush of the mid-1860s drew in substantial numbers of Irish, just as the earlier Australian one had done.

150. See R.P. Davis, Irish Issues in New Zealand Politics, 1868–1922 (Dunedin, 1974).

151. See L. Fraser, 'To Tara via Holyhead: The Emergence of Irish Catholic Ethnicity in Nineteenth-Century Christchurch, New Zealand', *The Journal of Social History*, xxxvi (2002), 431–58 at 444.

152. Pompallier (1801–71) was appointed vicar apostolic of Western Oceania in 1836, of New Zealand in 1842 and bishop of Auckland in 1848. See L.G. Keys, *The Life and Times of Bishop Pompallier* (Christchurch, 1957), and E.R. Simmons, *Pompallier: Prince of Bishops* (Auckland, 1984).

153. E.R. Simmons, In Cruce Salus: A History of the Diocese of Auckland, 1848–1980 (Auckland, 1982), 81.

In early 1868, Pompallier left New Zealand in an attempt to raise money in Europe. In the bishop's absence, the diocese's financial position disintegrated. In September 1868, the contents of the episcopal residence were disposed of in a forced sale.¹⁵⁴

Tired and humiliated, Pompallier resigned on 23 March 1869. Meanwhile, Auckland had degenerated into infighting between those who broadly supported Pompallier and those who did not. Naturally, Rome and Dublin heard all about it—as early as 1868 requests had been indirectly made to Cullen to secure Irish bishops for New Zealand.¹⁵⁵ The decision was taken by the Propaganda to require Bishop Goold of Melbourne to stop off in New Zealand on his way to the Vatican Council and to make a report on what he found. Goold's report was a root-and-branch condemnation of Pompallier's tenure. If pointing out Pompallier's administrative incompetence was fair enough, Goold went so far as to report—and endorse—what appear to have been ludicrous charges of sexual immorality against the elderly bishop.¹⁵⁶

After describing the state of the diocese in the darkest possible terms, Goold offered his prescription: 'immediate nomination of a new bishop'. Not just any bishop, however: 'I would recommend that the future bishop be an Irishman, simply because, the Catholic people being for the most part Irish, a bishop who knows the ways of that nation could govern them better'.¹⁵⁷ Goold gave his report to Barnabò on 24 February 1870,¹⁵⁸ although he 'declined to send in' any names, as 'Cardinal Cullen has done this'.¹⁵⁹ Significantly, when Barnabò submitted the report to the cardinals (Cullen included) in early June, it came complete with six names that the archbishop of Dublin thought suitable to take-over in Auckland.¹⁶⁰

On 23 June, one of Cullen's nominees, Thomas William Croke, was appointed Pompallier's successor. Croke, who is much better known as the patriotic archbishop of Cashel, was a product of the Irish colleges in Paris and Rome and was ordained in Rome in 1847. He then taught at Paris during the rectorship of Cullen's friend John Miley, and later at

154. Ibid., 90.

156. Ibid., 100.

157. Quoted in ibid., 101. Even though Goold was never a pure Cullenite, given the experience of Australia by 1870 (see above), he could have had no doubt exactly what sort of Irish bishop would be appointed.

158. Entry in Goold's diary for 24 Feb.: 'Finished my report on the New Zealand mission; took it to the Propaganda myself, and delivered it to the Cardinal's servant'. Printed in Moran, *Catholic Church in Australasia*, 804.

159. Goold to J. Dalton, SJ, 'April' 1870 [copy], Melbourne diocesan historical commission, from an original in the Melbourne Jesuit archives.

160. Simmons, In Cruce Salus, 101.

^{155.} For Rome, see ibid., 96–7. For Dublin, see, for example, Hickie to Bartholomew Woodlock, 24 Dec. 1868, DDA. Hickie was in New Zealand fund raising for the Catholic University of Ireland. Woodlock was rector of the university and a close Cullen associate in Dublin. I am grateful to Dr Rory Sweetman of the University of Otago for this reference.

Cullen's own alma mater, Carlow College.¹⁶¹ Not long after his arrival in Auckland, Croke told Kirby that 'An Irish bishop was not sent here one day too soon. Had there been more of a delay, I fear the faith would have died out here altogether'.¹⁶²

As elsewhere, an integral part of the attempted Irish conquest of the New Zealand Church was the creation of new dioceses. There was little question that New Zealand needed them; the existing two were evidently inadequate to a growing population. The Marists recognised that there was little chance of avoiding the appointment of Irishmen to any new or vacant see; Cullen's power was too well known, and anyway the vast majority of the surging Catholic population was Irish. Their fatalism was neatly caught in a letter the bishop of Wellington, Philip Viard, sent to the Marist Superior General in 1869: 'Yesterday I saw Cardinal Barnabò. His Eminence awaits, as we do, the names that the Cardinal [Cullen] has promised to send him, for the sees of Auckland and Otago; till then nothing can be concluded'.¹⁶³

Cullen's nominees were duly appointed to both sees: Croke to Auckland and Patrick Francis Moran of the Eastern District of the Cape to the new diocese of Dunedin.¹⁶⁴ In Dunedin, Moran removed the Marists¹⁶⁵ (whom he believed had neglected the area)¹⁶⁶ and did everything he could to build his diocese on Hiberno-Roman lines. Moran also served as a rallying point for Irish Catholics in other parts of New Zealand who were dissatisfied with the Marists.¹⁶⁷ In a striking example of the persistence of the Hiberno-Roman and Cullenite networks, he was succeeded by another Cullen nephew, Michael Verdon.¹⁶⁸

By mid-1870, New Zealand seemed headed down the same road as Australia. In the short term, however, things did not go quite as planned. Croke was an ambitious man, and saw his future in Ireland, not the antipodes.¹⁶⁹ In early 1874, he left New Zealand for Europe, secretly planning to resign Auckland on arrival. A surprise to Cullen, it foreshadowed the problems he would have with Croke in Ireland; Croke had a mind of his own, not least on political issues. Although the Propaganda at first refused to accept his resignation,¹⁷⁰ Croke's June

162. Croke to Kirby, 10 July 1871, quoted in ibid., 54.

166. Fraser, 'To Tara via Holyhead', 447.

167. Ibid., 448.

- 168. Verdon's exemplary Hiberno-Roman career is discussed below.
- 169. Tierney, Croke of Cashel, 64-5.

^{161.} For Croke's life, see M. Tierney, *Croke of Cashel: The Life of Archbishop Thomas William Croke*, 1823–1902 (Dublin, 1976).

^{163.} Philip Viard to Julian Favre, 8 June 1869, quoted in L.G. Keys, *Philip Viard: Bishop of Wellington* (Christchurch, 1968), 218.

^{164.} For Moran's career in New Zealand, see H.M. Laracy, 'Bishop Moran: Irish Politics and Catholicism in New Zealand', *The Journal of Religious History*, vi (1970), 62–76.

^{165.} Akenson, Half the World from Home, 162.

^{170.} Simmons, In Cruce Salus, 121.

1875 translation to the archdiocese of Cashel ensured Auckland's vacancy.

With Croke's departure, Auckland fell out of Irish hands for many years. Moran was appointed apostolic administrator and eventually in 1877 a Dutch Jesuit was named bishop; his successor was—ironically enough—an English Benedictine. The Irish were also frustrated in their designs on Wellington, the most important New Zealand see.

Following the established pattern, the Propaganda had since at least 1868 been contemplating imposing a coadjutor on Bishop Viard on the grounds of incompetence.¹⁷¹ That image was carefully furthered by Croke, who urged that an Irish bishop should be appointed 'as soon as possible'.¹⁷² At one point, Cullen's protégé Thomas Power told friends that he had been appointed to the post.¹⁷³ (He went to Newfoundland instead.) With strenuous efforts at the Propaganda, the Marists delayed any decision about a coadjutor until Viard's death in 1872.¹⁷⁴ Here the Marists were clever. They recognised that one of the strongest Irish claims was the fact that the vast majority of New Zealand Catholics were English speaking; it was hard to justify French bishops in perpetuity. Their solution was to put forward a young English-speaking Marist, Francis Mary Redwood.

English-born, but raised in New Zealand from the age of three-anda-half, Redwood first studied for the priesthood in France, but was transferred, in 1863, to the relatively new Marist college in Dundalk, co. Louth. Even better, he was a graduate (1866) of Cullen's own pet educational project: the Catholic University of Ireland.¹⁷⁵ Redwood first came to the attention of his superiors as a potential bishop when, in 1868, Bishop Viard met the young man at the Marists' French headquarters. From that time on, Redwood was the Marists' secret weapon. He was despatched back to Ireland where he remained until Viard's death. Then, as Michael O'Meeghan puts it, the Marist leadership 'to have him [Redwood] handier to Rome and available for interview ... recalled him quietly to Lyon late in 1872 where he spent an anxious year in suspense and being groomed as a bishop'.¹⁷⁶

172. According to Croke, Viard 'does not visit his diocese, and has not done so for several years. Confirmation is not given and things are in a sad way'. Croke to Kirby, 22 Mar. 1872, quoted in Tierney, *Croke of Cashel*, 59–60.

173. M. O'Meeghan, *Steadfast in Hope: The Story of the Catholic Archdiocese of Wellington*, 1850–2000 (Palmerston North, 2003), 101.

174. Ibid., 102. The Propaganda's mandate to Viard to find an Irish or English coadjutor was 'adjourned' in 1870. See Keys, *Philip Viard*, 218–19.

175. O'Meeghan, *Steadfast in Hope*, 99–100. For Cullen's relationship to the Catholic University of Ireland, see Barr, *Cullen, Newman, and the Catholic University of Ireland.*

176. O'Meeghan, Steadfast in Hope, 101.

^{171.} Viard's Marist superior did not help matters by telling the Propaganda in 1867 that Viard, while 'a good and simple missionary ... does not possess the qualities of a bishop'. (Quoted in Keys, *Philip Viard*, 211.) The Marists changed their tune when it became obvious that any vacancy would be filled by a non-Marist Irishman.

With such a qualified—indeed nearly Irish¹⁷⁷—candidate, the Marists fatally weakened the case for a Cullenite appointee.

Although the Irish gained a foothold with Moran, the Marists fought a partially successful rearguard action; in 1887 they secured the appointment of an English-born member of the order, John Joseph Grimes, to the new see of Christchurch despite strong pressure for an Irishman.¹⁷⁸ Still, while Cullen was at the height of his power and activity before about 1873, they resisted his nominees futilely; Redwood was not appointed until 1874. It was only after Cullen began to fade,¹⁷⁹ and after Barnabo's death in February 1874,¹⁸⁰ that they were able to prevent—for a time at least—not only further Irish appointments but also secure a temporary continuation of the Marist tradition in Wellington. It was, as Rory Sweetman has written, something of a 'Houdini Act'.¹⁸¹

Nevertheless, the Irish came to dominate the Church in New Zealand at episcopal level: 78% of the bishops appointed to New Zealand sees between 1869 and 1950 were of Irish birth or extraction.¹⁸² More importantly, it took on a Hiberno-Roman hue. The Marists' French legacy was effectively swept away. As with Vaughan in Sydney, Redwood pursued essentially 'Cullenite' policies, especially in the crucial field of education.¹⁸³ The Marists also made a point to bring as many Irish-born members of the order as possible to New Zealand.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, the decrees of Moran's 1885 synod applied to New Zealand as well as Australia. Although the Marists endured, what happened in New Zealand was, as Donald Akenson has written, an 'Irish-Cullenite take over'.¹⁸⁵

No observer of Scotland in the nineteenth century could miss the scale of Irish immigration. The 1840s alone saw a near doubling of the Irish born; by 1851, they were over 7 per cent of the population. The immigration was heavily Catholic: some 30,000 Catholics in 1800 became nearly 150,000 by 1851 (and over 300,000 by the 1880s); it was also concentrated: some 25% of Glasgow's population was Irish as early

177. Redwood encouraged the association: he chose to be consecrated on St Patrick's day because 'I held the apostle of the Irish in the greatest veneration ... I also considered that the bulk of my flock was Irish and I longed for the blessing and assistance of their great apostle upon my labours on their behalf'. Quoted in Akenson, *Half the World from Home*, 162.

178. Fraser, 'To Tara via Holyhead', 450.

179. Cullen's health (never good) and energy began to deteriorate markedly from about 1872 or 1873. In 1877, Cullen limited himself simply to passing on the recommendations of both Moran and Redwood for the long vacant see of Auckland; he offered none of his own. O'Meeghan, *Steadfast in Hope*, 122.

180. More than ten years after the death of Cardinal Barnabò, Moran of Dunedin still complained to the other Moran that 'Since Barnabò's death Propaganda has studiously refrained from consulting me on New Zealand affairs ... whilst it has heard all the Marists have to say about us all'. Moran to Moran, 26 May 1887, AAS. I am grateful to Dr Sweetman for this reference.

181. R. Sweetman, 'The Furthest Outpost of an Irish Empire: Catholicism in Colonial New Zealand' (forthcoming).

182. Akenson, Half the World from Home, 162.

183. Ibid., 176.

184. Fraser, 'To Tara via Holyhead', 449–50.

185. Akenson, Half the World from Home, 163.

as the 1830s.¹⁸⁶ When an Irish bishop was appointed to Glasgow, it was the realisation of a long-standing Scottish Catholic fear: a take-over by the numerically superior Irish. The Scottish bishops had long been unwilling to recruit Irish priests, partly because of bad experiences with individuals, and partly because of fears that they would stir up national feelings among the immigrant Irish. In 1833, they had reacted with horror to a Roman suggestion that Cullen act as their agent.¹⁸⁷ It was not until 1837 that a formal decision was taken to solicit Irish priests from Ireland.¹⁸⁸

A dread of being swamped by the Irish was not limited to the higher levels of the Catholic Church, but a familiar feature of mid-Victorian Scottish life. Thus the ferocity of the resistance mounted by the Scottish Catholic Church to the Irish episcopal intrusion must be seen in the wider context of Irish-Scottish relations in Scottish society as a whole, although it was inter-Catholic, not the Catholic-Protestant, Irish-Scottish conflict that still echoes, most obviously in the sectarian divisions of Scottish football.¹⁸⁹

Until 1878, the Scottish Church had no hierarchy of its own, instead being governed by three vicars apostolic of episcopal rank. The lack of a hierarchy made Scotland even more vulnerable to Roman interventions.¹⁹⁰ The large numbers of Irish in and around Glasgow gave Cullen his excuse. The opportunity arose in February 1866, when the Propaganda ordered that a coadjutor should be appointed in the tumultuous Western District because of the ill health of Bishop Gray.¹⁹¹ The choice was left to the three Scottish vicars apostolic. Bishops Gray¹⁹² and Kyle (Northern District)¹⁹³ agreed on three Scottish names.¹⁹⁴ The Eastern District's John Strain (himself part Irish),¹⁹⁵ who

186. Statistics drawn from J.F. McCaffrey, *Scotland in the Nineteenth Century* (Basingstoke, 1998), 7–8.

187. R. McCluskey, ed., The Scots College Rome, 1600-2000 (Edinburgh, 2000), 77.

188. See M.J. Mitchell, "In General, They Do Not Answer Well": Irish Priests in the Western Lowlands of Scotland, 1838–50', in O. Walsh, ed., *Ireland Abroad: Politics and Professions in the Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 2003), 147–59.

189. Despite its initial repulsion, the long-term success of the Irish take-over of Scottish Catholicism can be appreciated when it is remembered that Glasgow Celtic supporters draw no distinction between Catholic and Irish either symbolically or as a reason for loyalty to the club. This is also true of Hibernian, the team of east coast Catholics.

190. This could cut both ways. The Scottish bishops were worried about the re-establishment of a hierarchy (rumoured in the late 1860s) because, if such a hierarchy were stocked with Irish bishops, it would be largely independent of Roman oversight. The Propaganda might be under Irish influence, but at least there was a chance of appeal.

191. John Strain to John Kyle, 15 Feb. 1866, Scottish Catholic Archive (SCA), PL3/856/1.

192. John Gray (1817–72) was appointed coadjutor vicar apostolic of the Western District in 1862, and succeeded in 1865.

193. James Kyle (1788–1869) was appointed vicar apostolic of the Northern District in 1827.

194. Kyle to Strain, 19 Apr. 1866, SCA, ED₃/₃₇/₄.

195. Of the relevant Scottish vicars-apostolic, only Strain (1810–83) has received a biography, albeit an adulatory one: M. Turner, *Life and Labours of John Menzies Strain, First Archbishop and Metropolitan of Saint Andrews and Edinburgh in the Restored Hierarchy of Scotland* (Aberdeen, 1922).

was accidentally left out of the initial discussions,¹⁹⁶ preferred a list with at least one Irishman.¹⁹⁷ Nevertheless, he told his colleagues that he would accede to their suggestions as the will of the majority.¹⁹⁸ So far as Gray and Kyle knew, the Scottish bishops were united.

Instead, Strain wrote privately to the Propaganda attacking the *terna*, suggesting that no Scottish priest was suitable for the appointment. Gray and Kyle only learned of this 'treachery' when Gray's agent to Rome (of whom more below) discovered it from a source in the Propaganda.¹⁹⁹ The Propaganda was thus confronted with conflicting advice from Scotland. Two of the vicars apostolic had proposed episcopal candidates whom the third identified as being involved in the disturbances that had roiled Glasgow for some years. This is a crucial point: the district was already divided on Scots v. Irish lines, and Irish priests and laity, associated with a radical newspaper, the Glasgow Free Press, had done much to make the Church there effectively ungovernable.²⁰⁰ As Gray's predecessor wrote in 1864 of the Irish editor of *The Free Press*, 'he entered on the course of bold misrepresentation & lying, by means of which he has laboured to make me odious to his countrymen as being steeped in prejudice against & antipathy to their race'.²⁰¹The Propaganda wanted to impose a coadjutor on Gray not least because a firm hand was needed to control Glasgow.

As David McRoberts has written, 'The Congregation of Propaganda Fide was nonplussed but the *deus ex machina* appeared in the person of Archbishop Paul Cullen of Dublin'.²⁰² Cullen, who in almost his first act as cardinal attended the meeting of the Propaganda charged with sorting out Glasgow, suggested James Lynch, an Irishman based at the Irish College in Paris. As a young man, Lynch had been a founder, with Peter Richard Kenrick and a few others, of the Irish Vincentians, Cullen's favourite male religious order.²⁰³ Privately, Cullen believed that he would be the 'salvation of Scotland'.²⁰⁴

The Scottish reaction was sharp: Gray told Kyle that 'The Scotch portion of the clergy in the West are storming at the appointment of

196. Strain to Gray, 8 Mar. 1866, SCA, OL2/114/2, Gray to Strain, 5 Apr. 1866, SCA, ED3/50/12 and Kyle to Strain, 19 Apr. 1866, SCA, ED3/37/4. Gray clearly did send his list of nominees to both Strain and Kyle, but for whatever reason Strain felt excluded. Kyle—who probably came to regret it—suggested to Strain that the latter was within his rights if he wished to dissent from the *terna*.

197. Strain to Kyle, 26 Apr. 1866, SCA, PL3/856/5.

198. Ibid.

199. Macdonald to Kyle, 14 Oct. 1866, SCA, PL3/847/12.

200. For the background to the controversy surrounding *The Free Press* and its lay and clerical allies, as well as the wider Scots-Irish dynamic in Scotland, see J.E. Handley, *The Irish in Scotland 1798–1845* (Cork, 1945); D. McRoberts, 'The Restoration of the Scottish Catholic Hierarchy in 1878', *Innes Review*, xxix (1978), 11–13; M.J. Mitchell, *The Irish in the West of Scotland, 1797–1848: Trade Unions, Strikes and Political Movements* (Edinburgh, 1998).

201. Murdoch to Nicholas Wiseman, 13 Mar. 1864, Wiseman papers, Westminster diocesan archives, 30/1/166.

202. McRoberts, 'Restoration of the Hierarchy', 14.

203. J.H. Murphy, ed., *Nos Autem: Castleknock College and its contribution* (Dublin, n.d.), 2–7. 204. Cullen to Moran, 31 July 1866, Cullen papers, DDA, 40/4.

Dr Lynch, because they look upon it as a condemnation of the Scotch priests and people'.²⁰⁵ The supposedly weak Gray took immediate action, secretly despatching one of his priests, Coll Macdonald, to Rome as fast as he could go. Gray really was doing everything he could 'to avert the appointment of an Irish Bishop for this District'.²⁰⁶

As 'an old Propagander',²⁰⁷ Macdonald could navigate the corridors of power in Rome. As he told Bishop Kyle, Cardinal Barnabò 'remembered me & recognized me well'.²⁰⁸ Macdonald was able to speak to the Propaganda in its own language, in both senses. His case was simple: appointing Lynch was an insult to all Scottish Catholics; it rewarded the rebellion of the Irish priests, laity and the *Free Press*; it would only make matters in Glasgow worse.²⁰⁹ As Alexander Grant, the rector of the Scots College in Rome, told Bishop Kyle, 'Mr McDonald [*sic*] has been well received in Propaganda and has made a very strong and straightforward statement which has shaken them a good deal'.²¹⁰

Macdonald even hoped that if the Scots could 'make a courageous and united effort just now we will succeed late as it is'.²¹¹ He could have spoken for many when he observed that 'it is easier to keep the Irish out of possession, than to get them out of it, if they are once fairly in it'.²¹² Certainly Macdonald's presence in Rome shook the Propaganda, but they could not be seen to back down on an appointment that was widely known. Lynch went to Glasgow, but the Scots knew that they would at least be heard in Rome.

Gray was an old man, and did not object in principle to an assistant, but Lynch was appointed without his input and against his wishes. Like Walsh and Fraser in Nova Scotia, the two men had radically different ideas of exactly who was in charge. Gray wanted a helper; Lynch wanted to rule. Despite some immediate tensions caused by Lynch's behaviour,²¹³ things at first proceeded well enough. Gray made an apparently sincere effort to get along with his unwelcome deputy, while Lynch (as he reported to Cullen) was pleased that Gray 'has given me all powers [and] agrees to everything I suggest'.²¹⁴

Lynch proved unable, or unwilling, to placate Gray for long; he anyway thought him 'entirely & irretrievably incompetent for his

206. Gray to 'Mr Glennie', 12 Oct. 1866, SCA PL3/844/10.

209. Ibid.

211. Macdonald to Kyle, 12 Oct. 1866, SCA PL3/847/1. Macdonald knew that the Scots had to move quickly before Lynch could accept the appointment.

212. Macdonald to Kyle, 16 Nov. 1866, SCA, PL3/847/4.

213. Gray was offended when Lynch declined to accept the rooms prepared for him in the bishop's own house. Lynch preferred to set up in the wealthy west end of the city. Strain to Kyle, 28 Nov. 1866, SCA, PL3/856/17. Lynch did not help matters by declining to be consecrated in Glasgow, choosing instead the Irish College Paris. McRoberts, 'Restoration of the Hierarchy', 17.

214. James Lynch to Cullen, 13 Dec. 1866, Cullen papers, DDA, 327/5/30.

^{205.} Gray to Kyle, 1 Oct. 1866, SCA, PL3/844/9.

^{207.} Ibid.

^{208.} Macdonald to Kyle, 12 Oct. 1866, SCA PL3/847/1.

^{210.} Grant to Kyle, 17 Oct. 1866, SCA, PL3/843/1.

position²¹⁵ By March, the situation had broken down entirely. According to Cullen, things had been going fine 'until a short time ago when Dr Gray took into his confidence three Scotch priests who were ... hostile to Dr Lynch²¹⁶. As Lynch put it, Gray had brought in the three 'most Anti-Irish priests of the district' to advise him and, in effect, govern.²¹⁷

Lynch sought Cullen's help, asking the cardinal to send his account of Glasgow to 'Cardinal Barnabò with any remarks you may think well to add'.²¹⁸ Although Cullen was frustrated with Lynch's impatience and lack of tact,²¹⁹ he did his best to help the Irish cause. After all, the 'Scotch are altogether only a handful [in the Western District], whilst the Irish are over 150 thousand'. Kirby was instructed to translate Lynch's letter to Cullen (one of many) and 'give it to the Cardinal'.²²⁰ Kirby continued to translate, and Cullen continued to write to Rome (or instruct Lynch how to write)²²¹ until Lynch left Glasgow.

By late March 1867, Lynch had urged Rome to either suspend Gray or allow Lynch himself to leave Glasgow.²²² Lynch's case was that Gray was incapable of running the District. (This was not necessarily untrue: at times Gray 'had signs of premature senility and he had attacks of amnesia²²³) The Irish clergy and laity in Glasgow added their voice. Lynch's allegations and Cullen's interventions began to turn the tide in Rome against the Scots. In early March, Alexander Grant still felt able to write that 'They are conscious in Propaganda of having made a mistake with [the] election of Dr Lynch and there is naturally a reaction against the Irish influence in Scotland'.²²⁴ Two months later, Grant was writing of a 'wide spread plot' to destroy Gray, a plot that had 'succeeded too well in making the Pope and his authorities in Propaganda believe that he [Gray] is totally unfit for his post'. 'I can trace', Grant continued, 'the origin of this feeling to communications received in Propaganda among the rest some from Card. Cullen about 3 weeks ago'.²²⁵ According to Grant, the Scots did not simply have to worry about attitudes in the

215. Lynch to Cullen, 16 Mar. 1867, Cullen papers, DDA, 334/4/5. Emphasis in original.

216. Cullen to Kirby, 22 Mar. 1867, Kirby papers, ICRA, K-67–108.

217. Lynch to Cullen, 20 Mar. 1867, Cullen papers, DDA, 334/9/11.

218. Lynch to Cullen, 16 Mar. 1867, Cullen papers, DDA, 334/4/5.

219. Cullen to Kirby, 22 Mar. 1867, Kirby papers, ICRA, K-67–108.

220. Cullen to Kirby, 24 Mar. 1867, Kirby papers, ICRA, K-67–114. Cullen promised to write to Barnabò the next day.

221. An excellent example of this can be found in a letter of Cullen's to Lynch dated 19 Dec. 1868. In it, Cullen dictated practically word-for-word a letter from Lynch to the pope. Lynch then forwarded Cullen's letter on to Kirby. Kirby papers, ICRA, K-69–23(b). Cullen was responding to Lynch's own request for such assistance. See Lynch to Cullen, 16[?] Dec. 1868, Cullen papers, DDA, 334/8.

222. According to Bishop Strain, see Strain to Kyle, 1 Apr. 1867, SCA, PL3/882/1.

223. McRoberts, 'Restoration of the Hierarchy', 18.

224. Grant to Kyle, 10 Mar. 1867, SCA, PL3/869/10. Scottish confidence at this time should not be overstated: Coll Macdonald (admittedly back in Scotland) was relieved to learn that Bishop Kyle had recovered from an illness, as 'We cannot afford to lose you under the present circumstances. If we did, we should be entirely in the hands of the enemies of our nation'. Macdonald to Kyle, 4 Mar. 1867, SCA, PL3/873/11.

225. Grant to Kyle, 21 May 1867, SCA, PL3/869/11.

Propaganda: 'I believe the Pope as influenced by Cardinal Cullen is our greatest danger and not so much Propaganda'.²²⁶

The effect was noticed: Bishop Gray wrote in May 1867 that Barnabò seemed 'to put implicit confidence in assertions and explanations sent to him by Dr Lynch, without attaching the slightest importance to the real state of matters as plainly and fully indicated by me'.²²⁷ The Scots had no doubt who the enemy was. As James Kyle told Grant, 'It is clear that Cardinal Cullen & the Vincentians of Lanarck are the soul of the present movement'.²²⁸ Gray was summoned to Rome to prove his fitness. Bishop Strain, now fully on the Scottish side,²²⁹ joined him there. According to Strain, Lynch had 'identified himself with the Irish part in the Western District, and with what I may call the worst portion of it'. Lynch, Strain continued, intended to go himself to Rome 'in the train of Cardinal Cullen'.²³⁰ The stakes were high, as Bishop Kyle wrote:

The aim of Dr Lynch & of those who support him is very clear, they wish to do the same thing in Scotland as some years ago they did in Nova Scotia. It is not merely to get rid by their present & late misrepresentations of Dr Gray but of every one who has a warm feeling for Scotland. In Nova Scotia, by dint of misrepresentations and intrigues they laboured & succeeded after ... insinuating themselves into missions that the Scotch had founded to get the native clergy superseded, the Irish Bishop promoted into an ArchBp. and to leave no room ... for any one who could speak to the poor people. This is plainly what they mean by Scotland.²³¹

In fact, Lynch was so bad that some native clergy worried that he would be maintained in the Western District to cover Cullen's mistake in suggesting him and Barnabo's in appointing him. As one Glasgow priest told Grant, '... we have every reason to fear that we are being sacrificed to sustain and make the most of a bad speculation on the part of Cardinals Cullen and Barnabo'. He related that many English bishops, including Birmingham's William Bernard Ullathorne, were openly quoting 'the case of Dr Polding Abp. of Sydney as a similar case and to show that Scotland is not the only place where the same influences have done the same things'.²³²

- 226. Grant to Kyle, 4 June 1867, SCA, PL3/869/12.
- 227. Gray to Grant, 1 May 1867, Scots College Rome Archives (SCRA), 17/8.
- 228. Kyle to Grant, 1 June 1867, SCRA, 17/13.

229. Alexander Grant reported to Kyle that 'Dr Strain has behaved uncommonly well [in Rome] and may I think be depended upon', Grant to Kyle, 11 Aug. 1867, SCA, PL3/869/14.

230. Strain to Kyle, 27 May 1867, SCA, PL3/882/2.

231. Kyle to Strain, 29 May 1867, SCA, ED3/37/16. The reference to speaking to the poor people presumably refers to the fact that much of the Scottish population in Nova Scotia at that time was Gaelic speaking and the Irish appointees were not. (Although an Irish speaker would be comprehensible to a Gaelic speaker, especially if the former was from Ulster.)

232. James Cameron to Grant, 22 May 1867, SCRA, 17/15. Cameron was one of the three 'anti-Irish' priests of whom Lynch had complained. It was natural for Ullathorne to make such a comparison. He was a Benedictine who had been on the Australian mission before his appointment to Birmingham.

The Propaganda was in an awkward position. On the one hand, the entire native-Scottish church was united against Lynch; on the other, Cullen and the Irish were reporting that Gray was a weak and incompetent 'tool' of others, whereas Lynch was 'doing an immensity of good'.²³³ The solution was to ask Henry Edward Manning, the archbishop of Westminster, to investigate.²³⁴ Manning was the obvious choice: he was nearby and neither Irish nor Scottish. He was also conscious of Irish ambitions and was afraid that a successful conquest of Scotland could be the prelude of an attempt on England.²³⁵

After a brief visitation, Manning delivered his report in December 1867.²³⁶ It recognised the real failures of Gray's administration but also condemned Lynch's more boisterous Irish allies and implicitly Lynch himself; his recommendation was that both Lynch and Gray depart, clearing the way for a new bishop free of the squabbles of the past few years.²³⁷ Although the affair dragged on for some time, Lynch's position was untenable and Cullen brought him back to Ireland.²³⁸

The primary reason for their success is that the Scots were able to interfere with Cullen's control of access to the Propaganda. The willingness of the Scottish bishops to go to Rome meant that the Propaganda was exposed to a different stream of information about what was going on in Glasgow—not least about the state of Gray's health, which whatever it had been earlier in 1867 had recovered by the time of his arrival in Rome.²³⁹ The decision to send Coll Macdonald ensured that the Propaganda heard the Scottish case in its own language from a trusted former student.

In a sense, Rome was the unwitting agent of Cullen's ambition; in every case, the Propaganda acted as it thought best for the Church in a given place, not as it thought best for the Irish. What Rome got from Cullen was clear, consistent advice about difficult conflicts in far-away places, presented in its own language by a familiar, trusted, face (Cullen's

236. See V.A. McClelland, 'The Irish Clergy and Archbishop Manning's Apostolic Visitation of the Western District of Scotland, 1867, Part II: A Final Solution', *Catholic Historical Review*, liii (1967), 229–50.

237. Manning also envisaged the establishment of a Scottish hierarchy with an Englishman, George Errington, as archbishop of Glasgow. According to Manning, one of Errington's prime qualifications was that he 'enjoys the full trust of the Most Eminent Cardinal of Dublin'. *Manning report*, 18. The Scots were not dramatically more pleased with an English archbishop than an Irish vicar apostolic. Errington turned down the appointment, which went instead to another Englishman, Charles Eyre, the vicar general of the diocese of Hexham and Newcastle.

238. Lynch was appointed coadjutor bishop of Kildare and Leighlin (in the ecclesiastical province of Dublin) on 13 Apr. 1869. He succeeded to the see in 1888 and died in 1896.

239. McRoberts, 'Restoration of the Hiearchy', 18–19.

^{233.} Cullen to Kirby, 18 Mar. 1867, Kirby papers, ICRA, K-67–100.

^{234.} Manning's report (in both Italian and an English translation) was published by J.F. Walsh in the *Innes Review*, xviii (1967).

^{235.} Alexander Grant reported that Manning had told him that 'he will do all in his power ... to check this Irish Nomination, which threatens England as well as Scotland', quoted in McRoberts, 'Restoration of the hierarchy', 20.

or Kirby's). Although Barnabò was personally committed to Cullen, Rome as a whole was not. In the case of Scotland, Cullen temporarily lost his monopoly on the explication of English-language conflicts partly as a result of Macdonald's mission (and Gray's visit), and partly because he was seriously ill for much of the period and unable to follow events in Scotland, let alone intervene.²⁴⁰ After Barnabò's death, Cullen lost it entirely. By then, however, the Irish were in most places entrenched and reproducing.

In the end, the Scots were able to repel not only Lynch but also further Irish intrusions for many years to come. In the autumn of 1867, Bishop Kyle—taking care to secure the approval of his colleagues—ensured that his first-choice coadjutor was appointed by Rome; the *terna* contained only Scottish names.²⁴¹ In 1878, the hierarchy was re-established in Scotland, this time with the approval of the vicars apostolic. Cullen died the same year.

An important aspect of Irish Episcopal Imperialism was its ability to perdure. For that, the foundation of Hiberno-Roman seminaries was crucial. Kenrick, for example, placed the highest priority on opening a seminary in Philadelphia.²⁴² When he failed to secure Cullen as rector,²⁴³ he arranged for him to provision its library with Roman books,²⁴⁴ and eventually procured Cullen's former vice-rector in Rome to run it.²⁴⁵ Upon securing full control in Halifax, Walsh asked the British government to establish a colonial seminary there, claiming that of the large number of Catholics in the Empire 'the great majority ... with two or three exceptions, are Irish, or most closely connected with Ireland'.²⁴⁶ Cullen himself established Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, to provide an alternative model of priestly formation to that offered at nearby Maynooth.²⁴⁷ In 1876, Matthew Quinn opened a seminary in Bathurst explicitly modelled on the Irish College in Rome. As its first rector told Kirby, 'everything is carried out as nearly as possible just as in the old alma mater, so much so that I look on our little institute as [a] branch house of the Irish College Rome'.²⁴⁸

240. Cullen fell seriously ill in early July 1868 and was unable to do any business until October. He relapsed, and by Christmas 1868 could still not walk down stairs. For Cullen's own account, see Cullen to Murray, 11 Oct., 24 Dec. 1868, Murray papers, MNDA, A.1.24, A.1.25.

241. Kyle to Gray and Strain, 1 Sep. 1867, SCA, OL2/115/5.

242. Nolan, Francis Patrick Kenrick, 148-55.

243. Within weeks of arriving in Philadelphia, Kenrick wrote to Cullen pleading with him to join him and run the seminary. Kenrick to Cullen, 5 May 1830, Moran papers, AAS, U2206.

244. Kenrick to Cullen, 7 Sep. 1832, American Letters, ICRA, 3.

245. Nolan, Francis Patrick Kenrick, 224.

246. Walsh to Sir Robert Peel, n.d. [but 1845], British Library, Peel papers, Add. 40567, fos. 63–82. Walsh wanted the seminary in Halifax, but was prepared to accept a 'wing' at Maynooth. He got neither.

247. For Clonliffe, see R. Sherry, *Holy Cross College, Clonliffe, Dublin, 1859–1959: College History and Centenary Record* (Dublin, 1962).

248. John Ryan to Kirby, 8 June 1876, quoted in Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, 92.

In 1889, Cardinal Moran opened St Patrick's College at Manly, near Sydney. Like the cardinal, its first rector was a nephew of Cullen's. According to the college's historian, 'Moran's founding of Manly, of course, paralleled his uncle's establishment of Clonliffe'.²⁴⁹ For thirty-five years, Manly was the 'sole' college educating priests for the Australasian mission.²⁵⁰ The ultimate model for each of these institutions was the Irish College in Rome. And its mission, as Cullen told Kenrick in 1833, was to produce students who 'will be the means of introducing Roman maxims into Ireland and uniting that Church more closely with the Holy See'.²⁵¹ It was their experience at seminary that formed most of the Hiberno-Roman bishops (who had varied, albeit largely prosperous, social origins),²⁵² and it was seminary education that they used to ensure their own legacy.

It was through clerical education that the top-down approach of the Hiberno-Romans became, in a sense, bottom-up. The agenda of the Hiberno-Roman bishops was often foreign even to the Irish priests they found on arrival in their see. A certain uniformity could be imposed, and more obtained by the voluntary conformity of clerical careerists. But by forming future priests in the Irish College or one of its clones, Hiberno-Roman bishops ensured not only the continuing supremacy of their fellow-Irish but also a genuine and enduring support for their fusion of Irish and Roman churchmanship. Those priests were in turn responsible for the education of a laity who in time came to see Hiberno-Roman Catholicism as normative.

Three men neatly exemplify the interconnectedness and endurance of the Hiberno-Roman episcopal network. The first, Michael O'Connor, was ordained in 1834 after studying at the Propaganda. For some years, he lived in the Irish College and acted as vice-rector. In 1839, he became rector of Kenrick's seminary in Philadelphia. Four years later, he was appointed—on Kenrick's nomination and with Cullen's help²⁵³—the first bishop of Pittsburgh. In 1851, he was nearly elevated to Baltimore, which went instead to Kenrick.²⁵⁴ Two years later, he became the first bishop of Erie, Pennsylvania, before returning to Pittsburgh after a year. O'Connor died in 1872, but four years later his brother James was named vicar apostolic of Nebraska, and in 1885 the first bishop of Omaha.²⁵⁵

249. Walsh, Yesterday's Seminary, 89.

250. Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, xv.

251. Cullen to Kenrick, 9 Dec. [?] 1833, Kenrick papers, BDA, 28R3.

252. Although there was slight predisposition towards the sons of strong farmers (Cullen himself, the Quinns, Murray, both Morans), or merchants (Verdon, Connolly), the Kenricks' father was a Dublin scrivener, Lynch's a prominent physician, Croke's a Cork 'estate agent' and Robert Dunne's family ran a drapery shop in Lismore. The common link was the money to attend a seminary, usually outwith Ireland, and the intelligence to excel there. Even wealth was not an absolute requirement: a bright young man such as Michael O'Connor or Patrick Dwyer could attract patronage and find his way to Rome without familial help.

253. See Kenrick to Cullen, 23 June 1840, American Letters, ICRA, 71.

254. Nolan, Francis Patrick Kenrick, 224.

255. H.A. Szarnicki, *Michael O'Connor: First Catholic Bishop of Pittsburgh, 1843–1860* (Pittsburgh, 1975). In 1860, O'Connor left the episcopate to become a Jesuit.

The second case, Michael Verdon, enjoyed a career arc that perfectly encapsulated the Hiberno-Roman experience. The third son and seventh child of Cullen's sister Mary Anne, Verdon was born in Liverpool in 1838. He attended the Vincentian college in Castleknock, and then the Irish College in Rome. From there he joined the teaching staff at Clonliffe, in 1870 succeeding as rector the newly appointed bishop of St John's, Newfoundland, Thomas Power. In 1879, he returned to Rome as vice-rector to the ageing Kirby. In 1888, Cardinal Moran asked him to be the founding rector at Manly. Finally, in 1896 Verdon was appointed to replace the other Moran as bishop of Dunedin.²⁵⁶ Four years later, he opened Holy Cross College there as the national seminary.²⁵⁷ He died in 1918.

The career of the first native-born Australian bishop, Patrick Vincent Dwyer, demonstrates just how well Irish Episcopal Imperialism took root. Born in Albury, New South Wales in 1858, Dwyer was sponsored by Murray of Maitland to attend Quinn of Bathurst's seminary. He was then sent to Clonliffe, where Cullen thought he had 'more the appearance of a stout Irishman than of an Australian'.²⁵⁸ He was also impressed by Dwyer's examination results. Next came the Propaganda and residence in the Irish College before returning to Australia. Dwyer was appointed Murray's coadjutor at Maitland in 1897, succeeded in 1909, and died in 1931.²⁵⁹

It seems clear that the Hiberno-Roman conquest of the Englishspeaking Churches was not at all accidental, but rather a systematic, well planned and centrally directed operation; contingency no doubt dictated timing and tactics, but the pattern continued over too long a time and in too many places to be coincidental. Although there is a risk that too close a focus on the papers of Cullen and his allies can distort by making their network appear too important, it is nevertheless the case that outsiders both identified that network and saw Cullen as its leader and their primary antagonist. As we have seen, that was certainly the view of Polding, Viard or Kyle.

Ethnic conflict was an important catalyst in the internal divisions of each national Church. Nevertheless, it is important that Irish Episcopal Imperialism not be seen in simply ethnic terms; both ethnicity and ideology had a role to play. Certainly the former lay at the heart of the allegations made against non-Irish bishops by Irish clergy and laity. And it is undoubtedly true that these complaints (which were local in origin), whether directed against Dubois, Fraser, Polding, Gray or Pompallier, provided the pretext for Cullen's interventions. Irish

^{256.} For the Verdon family, see Sherry, *Holy Cross College*, 273-4. For Verdon's career, Walsh, *Yesterday's Seminar*, 93.

^{257.} Ironically, Holy Cross College has now merged with the Marists' St Mary's College to form Good Shepherd College.

^{258.} Cullen to Murray, 27 Sep. 1877, Murray papers, MNDA, A.1.54.

^{259.} For Dwyer's career, see Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, 97.

priests and laity were unhappy with non-Irish bishops; but their ambition was to secure an Irishman, not necessarily a Hiberno-Roman. Cullen, however, was not simply interested in promoting Irish bishops as Irishmen. As the Franciscans of Newfoundland discovered, Cullen wanted his bishops to be both Irish *and* Roman.²⁶⁰ It is instructive to note that in every case save one, the disgruntled Irish were not embraced by the newly appointed Irish bishop. One of the primary features of the Hiberno-Roman episcopal model was an insistence on both lay and clerical obedience. Thus the Irish-Australian priests who had undermined Polding got short shrift from Murray and the Quinns. Only Lynch made the mistake of allying with the militant Irish of Glasgow.

It is therefore not possible simply to locate Irish surnames among the world's episcopate in the period and assume that they were a part of the Hiberno-Roman cohort. Other networks existed, such as the Maynooth-trained bishops in India (for example, the Fennelly brothers in Madras) or the missionaries sent out by All Hallows College in Dublin.²⁶¹ With few exceptions, products of neither institution were trusted by the Hiberno-Romans: Cullen's suspicion of Maynooth was well known and heritable;²⁶² in Australia, the Hiberno-Roman bishops particularly distrusted graduates of All Hallows, despite relying heavily on them for parochial clergy.²⁶³ Of the some 1,500 students who matriculated at All Hallows between 1842 and 1878,²⁶⁴ only about seventeen became bishops—an episcopal 'success rate' of less than 2 per cent.²⁶⁵ Not one of the All Hallows bishops was a Cullen nominee; only two were consecrated before his death.²⁶⁶

Other caveats: in places like Ontario, a small-scale episcopal imperialism can be identified that was both local—managed by John Joseph Lynch of Toronto—and aggressively, even chauvinistically,

265. Less than two per cent when measured against total ordinations, and less than one per cent of total matriculated students. These numbers are derived from the matriculation records published in Condon, *All Hallows*, 290–364. I am grateful to my students, Elizabeth Michels, Bridget Mullen and Nicholas Eaton for analysing these records.

266. Ibid. The two consecrated before 1878 were John Tuigg (a protégé of the Cullenite Bishop O'Connor) for Pittsburgh in 1876 and Eugene O'Connell, the first bishop of Grass Valley (later Sacramento), California.

^{260.} Some Australian scholars have gone too far in minimising the distinctively Irish orientation of the Hiberno-Roman bishops, even as they correctly note their devotion to Roman models. K.T. Livingston rightly criticizes Molony's *The Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church* for this. See Livingston, *Australian Catholic Priesthood*, 100–1.

^{261.} K. Condon, The Missionary College of All Hallows, 1842–1891 (Dublin, 1986).

^{262.} For Cullen's attitude to Maynooth, see P.J. Corish, *Maynooth College*, 1795–1995 (Dublin, 1995), esp. 138–57.

^{263.} Livingston, *Australian Catholic Priesthood*, 89. 100. (Indeed, Livingston makes an important distinction between the Irish-Australian clergy and the Hiberno-Roman Australian bishops, see ibid., 100–1.)

^{264.} Perhaps 1,100 of the 1,561 recorded matriculants both received ordination and survived at least five years on the mission.

nationalistic. Here, the orientation was Irish, not Hiberno-Roman.²⁶⁷ There were cases where Irish College-trained Cullen protégés, like Robert Dunne in Brisbane, began to have doubts about the Hiberno-Roman agenda and act against it.²⁶⁸ Moreover those seeking to resist Hiberno-Roman incursions often sought to appear as Irish as possible; the Marist Redwood, for example, 'made a fetish of his Irish sympathies' for tactical reasons, and urged other non-Irish bishops in New Zealand to do so too.²⁶⁹ As the beleaguered Bishop Dubois of New York put it in 1835, what was needed was the 'appointment of an Irish name, and at the same time the importance of having that *name* corrected by American habits & education'.²⁷⁰ Although it was possible to be Irish but not Hiberno-Roman, the success of the Hiberno-Romans and the power they exercised as bishops in a hierarchical Church ensured that over time, with some mostly North American exceptions, ethnically Irish and Hiberno-Roman became largely indistinguishable. Their success was such that it eventually became possible for non-Irish bishops to behave like exemplary Hiberno-Romans.

Within the Catholic Church, the Cullenite bishops are clearly associated with the spread of devotional forms that were particularly Roman—the forty hours' devotion, the Sacred Heart and so forth. As K. T. Livingston wrote of Australia, 'The characteristic practices of Irish Catholic devotional life which began to flourish in Cullen's time, ranging from parish missions and popular devotions to the Sacred Heart ...

all became an established part of Irish-Roman Catholicism in Australia'.²⁷¹ In Ireland, this phenomenon has famously been termed a 'Devotional Revolution'.²⁷²

As a group, the Cullenite bishops also favoured particular religious orders such as the Vincentians and the Redemptorists. The Sisters of

267. R. Perin, *Rome in Canada: The Vatican and Canadian Affairs in the Late Victorian Age* (Toronto, 1990), 20–2. Lynch (1816–88) was appointed coadjutor bishop of Toronto in 1859, succeeded in 1860 and became archbishop in 1870. Dominant in Ontario, he imported favourite episcopal candidates direct from Ireland, yet in Toronto worked hard to present Catholicism in a guise that would be acceptable to Protestant society. At the same time, he enthusiastically backed Irish nationalist causes such as Home Rule.

268. See N.J. Byrne, *Robert Dunne: Archbishop of Brisbane* (St Lucia, 1991). Dunne's defection took place after Cullen's death and his own appointment as bishop of Brisbane in 1881 (archbishop from 1887).

269. R. Sweetman, 'Felice Vaggioli and Colonial Catholicism in New Zealand', in Felice Vaggioli, *A Deserter's Adventures*, translated by J. Crockett (Dunedin, 2001), xviii.

270. Dubois to Purcell, 29 Sep. 1835, CACI, UNDA, II-4-f. Dubois was referring to the need to appoint a coadjutor in New York able to appease the disgruntled Irish element in the diocese that were making his life a misery. Emphasis in original.

271. Livingston, Australian Catholic Priesthood, 88. See also E. Campion, 'Irish Religion in Australia', Australasian Catholic Record, lv (1978), 4–16.

272. Emmet Larkin first advanced the concept in 'The Devotional Revolution in Ireland, 1850–75', *American Historical Review*, lxxii, (1967), 625–52, although he subsequently modified some of his conclusions. For Larkin's mature thought on the subject, see *The Pastoral Role of the Catholic Clergy in Pre-Famine Ireland*, 1750–1850 (Washington, 2006).

Mercy formed an extensive Hiberno-Roman network of their own, and their presence in a diocese was a good indication of a Hiberno-Roman bishop.²⁷³ Devotional reforms were matched by an emphasis on social controls, such as a near-ban on mixed marriages.²⁷⁴ Beyond that, the Hiberno-Romans proved to be enthusiastic builders, and much of the Church's physical infrastructure in the English-speaking world can be traced to their episcopates.

Whether implemented by Kenrick in 1832 (and 1852), Cullen in 1850, Murray and the Quinns in 1869 or Moran in 1885, these policies were successfully imposed on an individual national Church because the Hiberno-Roman dominance of each hierarchy allowed for a top-down insistence on uniform practices by means of diocesan, provincial or national synods. The hierarchical nature of the Church already ensured that Hiberno-Roman bishops enjoyed free hands in their dioceses; with a majority in a provincial or national synod, they could impose their views in neighbouring ones. An example of the importance the Hiberno-Romans placed on councils was the fact that Moran's (the nephew) first thought on learning that Croke had been appointed to Auckland was that he and the other Moran should immediately hold in Rome 'a sort of Provincial council of New Zealand'.²⁷⁵ In 1870, the Hiberno-Romans had a temporary majority there.²⁷⁶ This imposed devotional and disciplinary uniformity went hand-in-hand with an assertion of epsicopal supremacy that marked every Hiberno-Roman bishop. As Quinn of Brisbane (admittedly an extreme example) wrote: 'I am a sacred person; I have been ordained and received the Holy Ghost; anyone attacking my character commits a most gross and sacrilegious act'.²⁷⁷

Just as they demanded obedience, the Hiberno-Romans gave it, preeminently to the pope. Devotion to the papacy was deeply felt by all Cullenite bishops.²⁷⁸ With only a handful of exceptions, the Irish-born bishops voted at the Vatican Council to define a dogma in which the vast majority of them passionately believed, and which in its final form was the work of the man many saw as their mentor, Paul Cullen.²⁷⁹

274. For an example of the importance placed by Hiberno-Roman bishops on controlling the behaviour of their flocks, see ibid., ch. 7.

275. Moran to Conroy, 24 June 1870, Conroy papers, ADA, from a transcript in the AAS.

276. There were two Hiberno-Romans (Croke and Moran) to one Marist, Viard.

277. Queensland Times, 19 Aug. 1862, quoted in Molony, Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church, 66.

278. It was this fulsome papalism that separated the true Hiberno-Romans from those early beneficiaries of Cullen's support such as Peter Richard Kenrick, Purcell and Connolly who proved to be dubious about papal infallibility.

279. Cullen, probably with the assistance of his nephew Moran, researched, drafted and presented the compromise language on infallibility that was ultimately accepted by the council and is now Roman Catholic doctrine.

^{273.} The lack of attention paid to the Sisters in the present article should be taken only as an indication that their importance was so great as to merit a separate discussion. An excellent account of the importance of religious women in a Hiberno-Roman diocese can be found in Zimmerman, *Making of a Diocese*, ch. 6.

In the public sphere, the Hiberno-Roman bishops pursued Catholic education and separatism in general as a matter of utmost priority. As Quinn of Bathurst said in 1867, 'As I believe ... in the Incarnation, so do I disbelieve in an infidel education, and as I would shed my blood, sooner than relinquish my belief in the Trinity, so I would shed my blood for Catholic education'.²⁸⁰ In his first four years in the Eastern District of the Cape, Moran turned one school with 'a few pupils and one old piano' into two girls' and two boys' schools (one with 'four very fine pianos'). His stated object was to tempt Catholic students away from Protestant schools.²⁸¹ Murray's first pastoral as bishop of Maitland insisted on the importance of religiously separate education.²⁸² These examples can be multiplied at will. Although this emphasis often put the Church in conflict with the civil authorities, it nevertheless resulted in the extensive and enduring Catholic school systems of the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (and, for that matter, Northern Ireland).

Although Cullen enjoyed a high degree of success in moulding colonial Catholicism, his ability to transmit his views and prejudices did have limits. The most obvious was politics. Although not the 'Castle Bishop' of nationalist legend, Cullen was sceptical of post-O'Connell Irish nationalism, which he associated with events in Italy. He effectively strangled the Independent Irish party of the 1850s and was the primary Catholic opponent of Fenianism in the 1860s. In the early 1870s, he only grudgingly tolerated the new Home Rule party.²⁸³ Cullen's protégés were less hostile to political expressions of Irish nationalism. This was most obviously true in the United States, where a number of Irish bishops expressed at least some sympathy with Fenianism. Cullen wrote long and hard to convince them of their error.²⁸⁴ In Australia, Quinn of Brisbane was prepared to help the political career of the former Young Irelander Charles Gavan Duffy,²⁸⁵ a man 'to act with whom', Cullen had said,

280. Quoted in Molony, Roman Mould of the Australian Catholic Church, 111-12.

281. Moran to Cullen, 15 May 1860, Cullen papers, DDA, 333/1/20. For Moran's education policy in New Zealand, see H.M. Laracy, 'Paranoid Popery: Bishop Moran and Catholic Education in New Zealand', *The New Zealand Journal of History*, x (1976), 51–62.

282. Zimmerman, Making of a Diocese, 160.

283. For Cullen's attitude towards the various manifestations of Irish nationalism in the period 1850–78, see E.D. Steele, 'Cardinal Cullen and Irish nationality', *Irish Historical Studies*, xix (1974–5), 234–60; and C.P. Barr, 'Giuseppe Mazzini and Irish nationalism', in C.A. Bayly and E.F. Biagini, eds., *Giuseppe Mazzini and Globalization of Democratic Nationalism, 1805–2005, Proceedings of the British Academy* (forthcoming).

284. See, for example, the extensive correspondence—much of it related to Fenianism between Cullen and Bishop Wood of Philadelphia, Archbishop Spalding (a former student) in Baltimore and Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati. (Held, respectively, in the Philadelphia archdiocesan historical research center, the archives of the archdiocese of Baltimore at St Mary's Seminary and University and the archives of the University of Notre Dame.)

285. M. Pawsey, *The Demon of discord: Tensions in the Catholic Church in Victoria, 1853–1864* (Melbourne, 1982), 66. Quinn brokered a peace between Duffy and the other leading Irish Catholic politician in Victoria, John O'Shanassy.

649

'... was impossible until he had fasted fifty years on bread and water'.²⁸⁶ Cullen's aversion to overt political activism was not emulated either. In 1883, Moran of Dunedin unsuccessfully stood for the New Zealand parliament on a platform demanding religiously separate education; in 1897, Cardinal Moran—who on arrival in Sydney had chosen to associate himself with Irish Home Rule politics—unsuccessfully sought a New South Wales seat at the Federal Constitutional Convention.²⁸⁷

In no country—not even Ireland—did Paul Cullen control every episcopal appointment; even while Barnabò was alive, Rome did not work like that. Although Cullen had disappointments, it is clear that from about 1832 he set out with great success to mould the Roman Catholic Church in the English-speaking world to his vision of Catholicism, first in aid of friends and then on his own account. And although the exact mixture (which shifted over time) can be debated, there can be little doubt that that vision contained both Irish and Roman elements. To a great extent, it is Cullen's Hiberno-Roman Catholicism that those regions that received his family, friends and students as bishops have retained to nearly the present day.²⁸⁸

Writing in the context of British India, S. B. Cook has suggested that the British 'borrowed' Irish models in their governance of the subcontinent. The 'point to be made', Cook writes, 'is that beneath the complexities of a far-flung empire lay a network of personal ties, reinforced by similar experiences and outlooks that infused the imperial structure with a measure of cohesion and facilitated the dissemination of "Irish lessons" to different parts of the globe'.²⁸⁹ Although Cook was writing about British strategies to control India, he could equally well have been describing Cullen's Irish. In the nineteenth century, Paul Cullen and his allies 'borrowed' the British empire and more besides to build a transnational Irish spiritual empire of their own.

Ave Maria University, Naples, Florida

COLIN BARR

286. Frederick Lucas to Duffy, 26 Jan. 1855, published in E. Lucas, *The Life of Frederick Lucas*, *M.P.* (2nd edn., 2 vols., London, 1887), ii. 123-4.

287. Ayres, Prince of the Church, 196-204. He received some 42,000 votes.

288. Although Mary Heimann is right to emphasise the continuing power of local devotions (and their diversity) in the nineteenth century, and to warn against an overemphasis on top-down impositions, it is clearly the case that the choice of bishop—at least in the United States and the 'white dominions'—profoundly affected the devotional life of a particular area. See M. Heimann, 'Catholic Revivalism in Worship and Devotion', in Gilley and Stanely, eds., *World Christianities.*

289. S.B. Cook, Imperial Affinities: Nineteenth-Century Analogies and Exchanges between India and Ireland (New Delhi, 1993), 29.

EHR, cxxiii. 502 (June 2008)

650