

## 'Scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd': the pastoral responses of the Irish churches to emigration<sup>1</sup>

From an Irish clergyman's point of view, by far the worst of the iniquities facing migrants was the perceived threat to their faith. While for rhetorical reasons anti-emigration diatribes tended to highlight any wilful oppression – real or imagined – inhibiting the freedom to express one's religion, it was more mundane limits on the ability to practise it which were of most pressing import. Reports of nativist attacks on churches in the United States, for example, may have prompted 'gasconade, froth, foam and fury' in the Irish Catholic press, but the churches that had yet to be built were the real barriers to incoming migrants' religious participation.<sup>2</sup> Immigrants of all denominations and in all rural destinations could find themselves at a considerable remove from the ministrations of their church, while those who migrated to cities might be among thousands of parishioners under the auspices of one over-stretched cleric.<sup>3</sup> Evidently more clergy were needed, and until a body of 'native' ministers could be cultivated – relatively late in the day in many instances – the infant churches of the New World looked to the Old World to supply them. This chapter will explore the elements of this call, the readiness of the home churches to heed it, and the effectiveness of their responses.

Before 1815, spiritual efforts on behalf of Irish emigrants were uneven. Although eighteenth-century Presbyterian emigrants were sometimes accompanied by their pastors, the extent of this phenomenon, as Patrick Griffin has shown, can be exaggerated.<sup>4</sup> There were certainly a few 'cult heroes' such as James McGregor of Aghadowey, who regarded themselves as leading latter-day Israelites out of oppression and into a land of relative freedom, but, as Kerby Miller has argued, there were also those who admitted to emigrating for essentially careerist reasons. Isaac Taylor of Ardstraw, for one, left owing to

'the want of necessary support' from his congregation.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, while over a third of clergy in the pre-1750 American Presbyterian Church were Irish-born, after that date, with increasing economic expansion in Ulster, and a resultant greater supply of decent clerical livings, the emigration of clergy abated.<sup>6</sup> The need for them among emigrants did not abate, however. Griffin notes that in the 1750s 'settlers in the Shenandoah Valley pleaded with Irish Presbyterian Church officials to send ministers and help in organising congregations in the scramble to bring order to frontier chaos', yet there seems to have been great difficulty in procuring such well into the next century.<sup>7</sup>

Irish Catholic emigrants of the same period were at an even greater disadvantage. The eighty-eight diocesan priests in the American Catholic Church in 1820 were ostensibly enough to attend to the estimated 160,000 Catholics then in the country, but most Catholics outside of larger towns and cities struggled to gain access to the church, and there was already an influx underway of Catholic immigrants from Ireland (and other European countries) which threatened any notional ratio.<sup>8</sup> The Catholic Association recognised that such a problem existed in 1824, when its committee resolved to spend £5,000 a year on procuring 'a sufficient number of priests' for the 'daily increasing' Catholic population of the United States.<sup>9</sup> It is not clear, however, that the 'Catholic rent' ever paid for any clergy for emigrant communities, and one historian has deemed it merely an aspiration.<sup>10</sup>

Irish Anglicans who emigrated before 1815 were the best served as far as spiritual matters were concerned, benefitting from an organisation that was specifically dedicated to sending clergy to their destinations. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (S.P.G.) was founded in London in 1701 with the aim of 'promoting Christian Religion in our Foreign Plantations'. In its early years that meant, in practice, providing clergy to UK emigrants.<sup>11</sup> An Irish branch was established in 1714, and went on to provide several ministers for the North American colonies.<sup>12</sup> As with the Presbyterian Church, many of these missionaries left for want of opportunities at home: most 'were from among the excessive numbers of poorer clergy with little or no expectation of ever escaping from the poverty at the bottom of the church's essentially class-determined structure'.<sup>13</sup> That need not impugn the value of their work, as W. J. Marshall has noted, but it also implies that any improvement, or perceived improvement,

in opportunities at home would have lessened the number of clergy available to emigrant communities. Indeed, there was a 25% increase in the number of benefices in the Church of Ireland between 1787 and 1832, a factor which helped ensure that, by the early decades of the nineteenth century, the S.P.G., including its Irish auxiliary, was moribund and awaiting revival.<sup>14</sup>

With the sesquicentenary of the society's formation approaching, revival came. In its train came the establishment of the Colonial Church and School Society, the emigrant-related offshoot of the more evangelical Anglican Hibernian Church Missionary Society. At around the same time, in 1848, the Presbyterian Church founded its own Colonial Mission. Meanwhile the Catholic Church had seen the establishment of an Irish branch of the Paris-based Association for the Propagation of the Faith (A.P.F.) in 1838, and of All Hallows College of Missionary Education in Dublin in 1842. Therefore, while the notion that mass emigration from Ireland began in the 1840s is certainly outmoded, it would seem that the formal, organised involvement of the Irish churches in the religious care of diaspora communities was largely a mid-nineteenth century phenomenon. Before then, for most Irish emigrants, it was an ambition realised only occasionally and sometimes almost incidentally.

There were several spurs to this concert of new and renewed activity, but the pleas of the destination churches loomed large. These were often the corollary to the kind of anti-emigration warnings detailed in the previous chapter. If the loss of emigrants to the church could not be avoided by arresting their departures, such commentators implied, it should be prevented by ensuring an adequate supply of clergy to emigrant destinations.<sup>15</sup> This point particularly exercised Bishop John England, whose conclusion that any leakage of Catholics could be blamed on 'the absence of a clergy sufficiently numerous and properly qualified for the missions of the United States', prompted him to make several requests for clergy from his native Ireland.<sup>16</sup> In an 1823 letter, England urged Daniel O'Connell to use his influence with the Irish hierarchy to procure '*five good priests*' for his vast diocese. His request was most likely behind the Catholic Association's abortive efforts in that direction.<sup>17</sup> The emphasis on 'good' was pointed since, as England's biographer has noted, 'During the first decades of American Catholic life it cannot be held that the Irish hierarchy showed any anxiety to protect the young church of the United States from the evil of unworthy priests.'<sup>18</sup> In England's judicious phrase, it was 'those who

had the least hopes in Europe, among them scandal-hit 'wandering clerics,' who normally made it across the Atlantic.<sup>19</sup> Thus as late as 1843, overseas bishops, many of them Irish-born, still had to travel to Ireland personally in order to persuade young seminarians of quality to commit themselves to their charge.<sup>20</sup>

The Irish Protestant churches were subject to similar demands. In 1834, Ballymena's Robert Boyd wrote to Henry Cooke from Upper Canada

Let my ministerial brethren of the Synod of Ulster remember that immense multitudes of these dear immortal souls that once sat under their ministry, have now hung their harps upon the high cedars and sturdy oaks of Canada [...] I ask the ministers of Ireland, who among them will come and take these harps down, and again teach their dear countrymen to sing the wonders of redeeming love in this strange land?<sup>21</sup>

Calls of a similar sentiment, if not quite the same eloquence, came from all over the New World. A Pittsburgh clergyman requested 'young and healthy ministers, who are willing to endure hardships as good soldiers of Jesus Christ,' while 'Episcopos' informed readers of the Belfast evangelical magazine the *Christian Freeman* that the Bishop of Ohio was on a visit to the United Kingdom in search of volunteers for his diocese.<sup>22</sup> The Scottish Presbyterian minister John Dunmore Lang, famed splitter of the New South Wales church, was another who visited Ulster in search of clergy, although his efforts were characteristically not without controversy.<sup>23</sup>

Crucially, these requests were buttressed by the testimony of emigrants themselves.<sup>24</sup> Letters from migrants of all denominations detailed a lack of, and a desire for, appropriate ministrations. Even on the relatively well-developed east coast of America, many found themselves at a considerable distance from a church or ministers of their own creed. Patrick Fitzgerald, a Catholic originally from Co. Tipperary, explained in a letter from New York State in 1846:

This village contains about 2,500 inhabitants. Here there are Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Episcopalians all having meeting houses but no Catholic church and not any nearer than Rochester between 30 and 35 miles. I was down there about 6 weeks ago. I left here Saturday night and got back Monday morning about 5 o'clock. [...] So you see if I go to hear mass I have to go a long ways to hear it.<sup>25</sup>

Fitzgerald's story must have been at once typical and unusual: of the many who found themselves in his situation, it seems likely that few would have had the time or ability to make such a long journey to church on a regular basis. His sister Eliza, a domestic servant normally based in New York City, had a similar problem attending Mass while summering with her employers upstate. She thought this 'the greatest difficulty in this country but we should not forget our confidence in Divine Providence and the blessed hopes of a Glorious immortality in a world to come'.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps that confidence explains her later decision to relocate to Mobile, Alabama, where wages were higher but Catholic churches and priests – certainly of Irish extraction – may well have been less readily accessible.<sup>27</sup>

The obviously devout Fitzgerald siblings had something of a head start. Where an effort needed to be made to practise their religion, they were willing and able to make it. Another Catholic emigrant writing from New York State, Arthur Quin, asserted unsympathetically that, contrary to what some thought, 'it is our own fault if we don't attend our duty as we can attend it as well here as we can at home'.<sup>28</sup> Yet other Catholics placed in the same and often worse positions simply fell into indifference, or, perhaps harder for those in the home church to hear, converted to other faiths. The Catholic Bishop of Little Rock, writing privately to Ireland in the mid-1840s, noted that he had recently visited families in the farthest reaches of his diocese who had not seen a priest for twenty-five or thirty years, in which the parents or grandparents had been Irish and Catholic but for want of ministry the subsequent generations had fallen away. He baptised some, but others had long since joined more accessible Protestant churches.<sup>29</sup> Similar experiences were reported from other large sees with scattered populations.<sup>30</sup> But all was not lost. The reception priests often reported from those who had not seen a priest for some time suggested a ready audience for their ministrations. Visiting Maine in 1855, Fr James Donnelly was met by a frenzy. 'Poor people!' he wrote in his diary, 'How sad to see so many and so good without a Pastor! crushing and pushing for confession, [they] broke 2 panes of glass. Well [they] didn't pull down the house'.<sup>31</sup>

Letters from Protestant emigrants in North America and Australia suggested that the absence of a church of their own sect within reach sent them even more readily into other churches.<sup>32</sup> Gamble Crawford, who wrote to his brother from Ohio in 1860, was quite unsentimental about joining a Baptist congregation.

I had a letter from the Revd Ray of Buchnaw stating my character and standing as a member extending me the privilege of uniting with any denomination or church of christians to which I should feel inclined to attach myself, this I have done[.] about a year since [I] united with the Baptist church of Richfield, their doctrines are much the same as the presbyterians all the difference is in the ordinance of Baptism [...] I have examined the scriptures on this point to my satisfaction.<sup>33</sup>

Tyrone's James Smyth wrote from Canada: 'I go to Methodist church I don't see any difference none of these ones would go to the Methodist if there was a Presbyterian church here but there is none nearer than Essex'.<sup>34</sup> Later, when the couple had evidently moved to Essex, James's wife was still inclined towards Methodism:

I attend the Methodist Sunday School here as the girl here goes and I go along. I would go to the Presbyterian but Jim don't go to Sunday School so I wouldn't go alone. Jim & I went to the Presby. church this morning not very many attends. The Methodists has the majority here. [...] Jim was mad because I went to the Methodist twice since I came up here he says I should go to my own but there were two [strange?] ministers to preach in the Methodist so I thought I would go & hear them. The Presbyterian minister that they have here is just like a drone bee there seems to be no life in his preaching at all.<sup>35</sup>

Other Presbyterian correspondents were less enthusiastic about having to attend alternative churches. Mary Adams, writing from Arkansas, told her former pastor that her family's distance from their church of choice meant that 'we must either live in our unprotected state entirely dependent on the will of others, or take a step which would for a time disconnect us with the church. [...] I beg my dear Sir you will give me your Advice how to see in this dark path'.<sup>36</sup> Mary Ann Blair, a Belfast woman who settled in Georgia, wrote rather indifferently to her aunt in 1847: 'you will think it strange when I inform you that I have not been to church in four years I mean a Presbyterian church I take my family and go occasionally to the Baptist and Methodist'.<sup>37</sup> Yet John Henry, a Coleraine man who settled in Kansas, and Robert McElderry, who addressed his Ballymoney relatives from Virginia, stand out as unusual for not joining any church and awaiting the establishment of Presbyterian congregations in their own districts.<sup>38</sup>

There were plenty, however, who agreed with Mary Smyth that those Presbyterian ministers available were not up to standard. Henry Coulter dismissively described the clergy of his local presbytery in New Brunswick to Rev. William Moreland of Co. Down: 'They

come on very middlingly; as between external foibles, and internal jealousies of one another, they are easily seen through.<sup>39</sup> Andrew Greenlees in Ottawa blamed for this 'the Eastern folks' who 'thinks anything will do the barbarians in the west and send on few that is capable of doing any good'.<sup>40</sup> Many correspondents therefore appealed directly to the home church for good ministers. Alex McLeod wrote to William Stavely: 'I envy you in Ireland and envy be without benevolence, for the humble of prime men that adorn your church. [...] I regret that some of your young men do not venture hither. I think a man of talents would do more good to the general cause of America than there.'<sup>41</sup> Later he implored 'Can you not send us an honest enterprising Hybernian? [...] we have need of help. [...] Oh, for a few good volunteers from Europe – good soldiers of the Cross of Christ!'<sup>42</sup>

These pleas were common to all denominations. Letters collected and published by Rev. William Hickey, and by a Dublin rector, Thomas Radcliff, detail Church of Ireland emigrants earnestly seeking Irish ministers. 'J. and M. T\_\_\_\_' wrote to their parents from Yarmouth, Nova Scotia, 'We should be extremely happy if there were a meeting near us [...] I hope you will make up your minds to come, and bring with you a number of truly religious people, and among them an humble preacher.'<sup>43</sup> Radcliff's daughter-in-law told him they saw no acceptable clergymen, only '*preachers*, once in a while; and then they *sing* so, really I am sometimes in roars of laughter at them'. Her husband confirmed that 'clergymen are in great demand'. Radcliff's other son had a novel solution related to Church of Ireland reform: 'We hear that in Ireland you are striking off ten bishops; I wish you could send some of them to us – we have much occasion for them.'<sup>44</sup> In a similar vein, the correspondence of the Kirkpatrick family – amongst whom were not only lay emigrants but also Anglican ministers based in Dublin, Ulster and Canada – continually emphasised the extent of 'the wide field there is for the exertions of a zealous clergyman in [Canada]'.<sup>45</sup>

Catholic priest Michael Buckley, meanwhile, noted that for many Irish Catholic emigrants, the desire for a priest from home went even further: 'The Irish are never content with any priest except one of their own, and they go so far in this desire that they prefer a priest from their own part of the country to any other.' In illustration, Buckley relayed the story of a Corkwoman whose husband had died in New York. Asked if he had had a priest to comfort him in death she replied cryptically, 'he had and he hadn't'. The priest who adminis-

tered the last rites being a 'Far-down' or Ulsterman, she could not be certain that his blessing counted.<sup>46</sup> Not all emigrants could afford to be quite so geographically particular, but there was a reasonably clear consensus that 'the Irish people must and will have the Irish priest'.<sup>47</sup> As one Canadian correspondent put it: "Those born here are not as much esteemed by the people, as the children of Erin. No matter how gifted or how exemplary they be".<sup>48</sup> Other European-born priests were no more welcome; they were 'foggy Things who can not speak English and are a laughing stock to [Irish-]Americans'.<sup>49</sup>

Of course, as Arthur Quin noted, the failure of emigrants to practise their religion was not always about a lack of access to clergy. Even in larger North American cities, correspondents confirmed, there were many who simply rejected religion. Henry Neill, writing in 1839 from Louisville, Kentucky, to his father in Co. Down, verified that for all the churches in the city, 'not more than two thirds of the population attend any church or religion at all'.<sup>50</sup> Maggie Black writing from Chicago, noted that "There are a great many non church goers in the city [...] too many spend the day in driving "baseball" & other questionable ways".<sup>51</sup> To that extent, the religious freedom of the New World could have negative outcomes. There may have been room for all creeds, but as the Irish-American cleric 'Peregrinus' observed, in language often echoed by other commentators, it also meant that 'the atmosphere [...] is impregnated with the spirit of "no religion"'.<sup>52</sup> Immigrants were at liberty to ignore their church, change it, or even start their own. Michael Buckley was told when he questioned the religious fate of second generation immigrants that there was, 'Great freedom of religion – freedom to all [...] every man may have a view of religion different from another, and start a theological theory, and open a church, and appoint a minister of his own'.<sup>53</sup> This backsliding and deviation merely drove home the need for more clergy. As Peregrinus concluded:

Much would be accomplished if the clergy of Ireland once felt the full amount of responsibility they have in this matter. It may be thought that if they do their duty to their people at home, the Irish clergy are not bound to provide for the peculiar dangers that beset those who leave their own country. But emigration is now too important a fact to be ignored by any Irish priest who inquires into his duty to his people.<sup>54</sup>

It was understood, therefore, both by emigrants themselves and the infant churches in their new countries that the home churches bore

a responsibility – by some reckonings, the primary responsibility – towards the maintenance of migrant religion. We should now consider whether this interpretation was accepted by the Irish churches, if they acted upon it, and whether they were they successful.

It is important, firstly, to determine whether and to what extent the Irish churches themselves felt responsible for the safe-guarding of emigrants' religious welfare once abroad. Most accepted the reports of apostasy and indifference at face value. The wrongness of his calculations notwithstanding, the testimony of a figure like Bishop England understandably held immense weight. As one priest argued *pro hominem*: 'that Dr England should note with sorrow, as he has done, the falling-off of the children of Irish emigrants in America from the faith, is, as I have remarked, the best evidence of the truth of this lamentable fact'.<sup>55</sup> Consequently, there was, as has been seen, a genuine anxiety among Irish clergy that those who left their congregations were risking their chances of salvation. Much as this handwringing went on, however, there is an obvious distinction between accepting and regretting that a phenomenon is taking place, and conceding that one bears any accountability for it, or any duty to reverse or lessen its effects. Nevertheless, for a variety of reasons, both practical and sentimental, the Irish churches seemed prepared to admit at least partial responsibility for meeting the declared spiritual needs of their departed brethren.

First among these reasons was a sense of history. Presbyterians, for example, were acutely conscious that their Plantation ancestors had initially relied on the Church of Scotland to supply their ministers, and the comparison with those now leaving Ireland was not lost on them.<sup>56</sup> All the churches, however, took pride in those Irish clergy who had gone on to found their sister churches in North America. It was well known that many of the pioneers of Presbyterianism in Colonial America, Francis Makemie and Gilbert Tennent among them, as well as the first Anglican bishop in the empire, Charles Inglis of Nova Scotia, were Irish-born, while the first Catholic bishop in the United States, Baltimore's John Carroll, was of Irish parentage. These and other high profile Irish religious figures were reminders that previous generations of emigrants had not been neglected by the Irish churches. Many clergy, both Protestant and Catholic, delved even further into the past. Irish monks between the fifth and eighth centuries had spread Christianity – Roman or non-Roman, depending upon the claimant's allegiance – all over Europe, and should act as an

inspiration to the modern cleric.<sup>57</sup> Tied in with this reading of the past, of course, was a very particular view of the present: the perception that emigration represented the enactment of a providential mission to spread the faith (explored in further detail in Chapters Four and Five). The many clergy who bought into such theories could not, in good conscience, then deny their ministerial support to emigrants.

A further motivation to attend to the religious needs of emigrants was the parallel development of the foreign missionary impulse. This affected each Irish communion differently, and on significantly different time scales. However, as some of the emerging historiography of Irish missions indicates, mass emigration and the move to provide spiritually for emigrants were frequently precursors to 'foreign missions' as they are generally understood today, i.e. the evangelisation of non-Christians.<sup>58</sup> This could be simply communicating to young Irish clergymen that service abroad was an option, or by directly bringing them, into contact with indigenous populations as pastors to emigrant communities. Regardless, over time, and certainly by the end of the nineteenth century, the greater exoticism and glamour of 'missions of discovery', as distinct from 'missions of recovery', were well established amongst all denominations.<sup>59</sup> Despite that, to a core of individuals within each church throughout the century, it seemed unreasonable to expend energy on converting 'heathens' while swathes of emigrants born into the faith were reportedly being lost. The philosophy of George Selwyn, the first Anglican Bishop of New Zealand, of 'building up the colonial churches as missionary churches' was appealing, but if it was to work, it meant, as he told a meeting in Armagh, that, 'The duty devolves upon you of making provision, to the best of your ability, for the spiritual wants of your fellow countrymen who come to us'.<sup>60</sup>

There were also more instinctive and emotional reasons for Irish clergy to respond positively to the pleas of emigrants and their new churches. For many, simple ties of humanity, nationality and kinship bound them to do so. 'Millions of our fellow-creatures, seated in darkness, and in the shadow of death, anxiously look towards Ireland, and earnestly call upon us to have pity on them,' wrote one Catholic priest.<sup>61</sup> 'It is,' claimed a Presbyterian minister, 'ours to supply the spiritual wants of our expatriated countrymen. [...] Though they are gone from us, they are still of us [...] they are our brethren still, and we are bound to love and succour them'.<sup>62</sup> The *Presbyterian Magazine* asked readers whether such people were not 'our brethren, our

kinsmen, according to the flesh – those who sat at the same mother's knee with us, and shared our youthful sorts around the same household hearth?' and were they not, therefore, deserving of aid.<sup>63</sup>

This affective reasoning had a more prosaic counterpart. For some clergy, it seems clear that a recognition had simply formed that a problem existed, and that the sending churches were as yet the only actors in any position to address it. Emigrants themselves, of whatever class, were taken to be largely helpless in the early years of their migration. The words of Samuel Hinds in relation to Church of Ireland incomers in the colonies rang true for all:

Emigrants in a new settlement have generally no more than enough means to provide for their bodily wants and existence. Necessity is the cause of emigration. Who then cares for the spiritual welfare of these men? What is the channel through which the provision comes to the members of our Church? <sup>64</sup>

In answer, Hinds determined, it could not always be through the receiving churches alone. As it was understood, they had all the problems of under-resourcing and under-staffing that came with being in their relative infancy, while the home churches increasingly had a surfeit of trained personnel. There seemed to be an obvious single solution to this dual problem. Accordingly, for each of the Irish churches, a combination of the above motives meant that a sense of duty prevailed, and efforts were made by individuals and organisations within the churches to ensure that their emigrating co-religionists stayed within the fold.

The range of institutions which began to meet the growing demand for migrant clergy from the 1840s onward were not insignificant endeavours, but historians have paid surprisingly little attention to them. Most of the literature relating to them can be labelled as insider chronicles – what Patrick Comerford has described in the Church of Ireland context as 'partial approaches [which] often border on hagiography [...] written for [and by] supporters and members of the agencies.'<sup>65</sup> They are often based on extensive research and represent a good starting point for anyone curious about the basic facts of missionary efforts on behalf of Irish emigrants, but, as Patrick O'Farrell has sharply observed, 'The marvellous achievements of Irish missionary endeavour, and the eternal indebtedness of other countries to that ministry, spiritual dynamic and personal self-sacrifice, cannot signal the end point of evaluation.'<sup>66</sup> The remainder of this chapter

aims to draw out some of the common problems and deficiencies, as well as the motivations and the achievements connected with these disparate, but nonetheless comparable endeavours.

The precise genesis of each church's emigrant mission deserves attention. The Irish Catholic hierarchy began contemplating the matter in 1832 when Bishop England, on a visit to Ireland, suggested that American dioceses might annually receive surplus ordinands from Maynooth and Carlow seminaries. These were men whom Irish bishops had declined to appoint for a lack of parochial vacancies, and who generally ended up offering their services to the English mission instead.<sup>67</sup> Bishop England considered this mooted deal to be rather a *coup*, but his attempts to sell it to a still ethnically divided American hierarchy failed, one colleague relaying 'the suspicion with which every measure emanating from Bishop England was viewed'.<sup>68</sup> It seems unlikely that it would, in any case, have provided the continuous stream of clergy which England anticipated, and which was increasingly needed.<sup>69</sup> Indeed, priests did not leave Maynooth for the Foreign Missions until 1838, and two years later, having sent forty candidates abroad, the Dean of the College was convinced that, 'We must get a seminary in Ireland for foreign missions'.<sup>70</sup>

This had been on the hierarchy's agenda for some time. William Ullathorne, vicar-general of New South Wales, noted that in 1837 'the Irish Prelacy was seriously thinking of establishing a college for educating priests for the English colonies and foreign settlements, and the Primate, Archbishop Crolly, asked me to draw up a scheme of the probable numbers of priests that might be annually required. I drew up a paper of the kind and presented it to him'.<sup>71</sup> No action was taken by the bishops, however, until 1842. In February of that year, the Archbishop of Cashel, Michael Slattery, searching for a purpose for his diocese's recently opened but directionless seminary in Thurles, suggested to the Association for the Propagation of the Faith that it might serve as a foreign missionary college.<sup>72</sup> Undeterred by that committee's preference for a Dublin location, Slattery set about acquiring a rescript from Rome to allow the establishment of a missionary department, which was duly granted in July.<sup>73</sup> Both Bartholomew Crotty, the Bishop of Cloyne and Ross, and the Bishop of Cork, John Murphy, offered Slattery their nominal support.<sup>74</sup> Crotty pointed out, however, that much as he wished to see such a college in Thurles, Slattery may have been 'too late'. Crotty had heard that premises and land had already been purchased near Dublin for the same purpose.

The premises in question were Drumcondra House, which, oddly enough, had originally been built by Marmaduke Coghill, founder of the S.P.G. in Ireland. In September 1842 it re-opened its doors as the Missionary College of All Hallows. This was the result not of action from bishops or the A.P.F., but of the almost singular efforts of its founding president, John Hand. A young priest from a relatively modest background, Hand had been inspired to try and meet the demand for clergy for the increasing emigrant stream by, firstly, the establishment of the Irish branch of the A.P.F. four years earlier and, secondly, the 1838 publication of Bishop England's injunction regarding Catholic migrant 'leakage' in its *Annals*. The story of how he realised this, collecting the necessary funds by personally traversing the countryside in a horse and cart, reads like a founding myth when given prominence in later heroic biographies of Hand.<sup>75</sup> However, it is essentially true, and, as we will see, serves as a neat encapsulation of the college's rather isolated position within the church over the next fifty years.

All that being said, it ought to be acknowledged that Hand did not act entirely alone. In David Moriarty and Bartholomew Woodlock he had competent and ultimately well-connected fellow professors (and successors as President of the college), and in Archbishop Murray of Dublin and Bishop John Cantwell of Meath he had some, largely personal, hierarchical patronage. It was Cantwell, prelate of Hand's native Meath who had secured him his place in Maynooth, his poor background notwithstanding, and Murray who had appointed him to his first position as a deacon shortly before his ordination.<sup>76</sup> Although Hand had acquired permission directly from Rome to establish the college, was endeavouring to fulfil a need for missionary clergy that was widely acknowledged to exist, and had attracted students from the beginning, he still struggled to have his efforts recognised by the wider church. All but Murray and Cantwell ignored a circular Hand sent to the bishops in December 1840 proposing the college's foundation, and his annual reports to the hierarchy went unanswered until 1846, when the bishops merely resolved, 'That the assembled prelates feel much gratified by the progress of the Missionary College of All Hallows and that they wish the establishment continued success.'<sup>77</sup> This brief and belated acknowledgement came too late for the man whose work it commended, however: shortly before, Hand had died of tuberculosis, which implies that sympathy for the late priest, rather than simple admiration for his institution, lay behind the resolution.

Nonetheless, episcopal recognition did allow the college to begin fundraising on a national scale, and advertisements to this end began appearing regularly in the Catholic press.<sup>78</sup> From that point the college's survival, albeit still outside of the mainstream of the church, seemed more or less assured.

Given that there was clearly an acceptance in principle that a missionary training college was needed, preferably in Dublin, what did the bishops' reticence on All Hallows signify? A number of points must be considered. The first is that Hand was not the only enthusiastic 'man on a mission'. In 1839 another obscure cleric, John Foley, had founded St Mary's College for the foreign missions in Youghal, Co. Cork. This institution seemed, despite the apparent support of Dr Foran, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, to operate under the radar for some time, and when Tobias Kirby, then the deputy rector of the Irish College in Rome, visited the establishment in September 1841, he reported back to Cullen in Rome that, 'It is a surprising business. No one knows how Mr Foley has done it. But the work is done; a noble establishment is really in operation [...] four zealous priests teaching volunteers for the good work'.<sup>79</sup> There was some support for Foley's efforts: Cullen and Cardinal Fransoni (Prefect of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in Rome) together contributed £70 to the college on foot of Kirby's positive assessment.<sup>80</sup>

However, when Cullen himself inquired about the college on a trip to Ireland in July 1842, he heard a very different story. 'I fear,' he told Kirby, 'Fr Foley's establishment is not going so well as you imagine':

I saw a most excellent priest who had been lately there and who is anxious for the success of the enterprise – but still he gave me information which makes me fear that Fr Foley is not over prudent. He has established a penitentiary for disgraced females within a few yards of his college – a most dangerous experiment – he has also received students of very dubious character from distant parts of Ireland, without ever asking for a testimonial of their conduct from Priest or Bishop. This will certainly destroy the name of his college. Rev. Mr Forbes is also, I am informed, about to leave, in which case I believe he has no one remaining fit to teach any thing to their students. [...] If all these things be true, there can be little reason to hope.<sup>81</sup>

Indeed there was none; Foley died in 1844, 'considerably in debt' – with Cullen among those seeking in vain for a return of his donation – and the college did not survive him.<sup>82</sup>

Yet Cullen had been no more hopeful for Hand's endeavour. He and Kirby may, according to one historian of All Hallows, have been instrumental in helping to smooth Hand's path with *Propaganda Fide*, enabling him to get Papal permission to set up the institution, but, Cullen claimed, 'He will fail, I suppose, for the want of fit men to manage the undertaking'.<sup>83</sup> This appraisal came despite Murray's spirited defence of Hand in an earlier letter to Cullen:

I perceive good Mr Hand has succeeded to his heart's content [...] you thought he had no energy. You can hardly have a notion of the energy and perseverance of that man. If his positive success be equal to his energy it will be great indeed.<sup>84</sup>

There is a sense, however, that even Murray had his doubts about Hand, and he understood why other church authorities may have held back from lending him support. 'The council of the Propagation of the Faith have declined,' he told Cullen in June, 'to do anything for the new College except to provide outfit for the young missionaries after they have completed their studies and to contribute to their support when engaged in their missionary labours. Perhaps after all they have acted wisely in proceeding with caution until they see how the thing will work'.<sup>85</sup>

In this last sentence lies the rub. For all that the hierarchy may have recognised the need for more missionary clergy, they were slow to initiate the work necessary to provide them, and were, moreover, suspicious – perhaps rightly – of those necessarily zealous and assertive individuals who stepped into the breach. One of Hand's biographers plausibly suggests that the Maynooth funding controversy was preoccupying the bishops and preventing their acting on a matter over which there was general agreement, while 'others in less responsible positions were not reduced to inactivity'.<sup>86</sup> 'Less responsible' individuals had to prove themselves before gaining the trust of the hierarchy, however, and with it the means to establish their colleges permanently. Fr Foley failed in this, but while Hand (at least in death) and his successors were more successful, the initial lack of hierarchical approval had long-term repercussions. As a consequence, All Hallows occupied a curious administrative grey area. Dr Crotty's early warning that any missionary college should be committed to government under the bishops or to a congregation of secular priests, rather than relying on one 'isolated individual clergyman' was not heeded until 1892; indeed, not even the Holy See was mentioned

in All Hallows' constitution.<sup>87</sup> This uncertain positioning, as Kevin Condon points out, stored up internal disciplinary problems for later, but it might also be added that it contributed to a far from exemplary religious provision for the many Irish Catholic emigrants.<sup>88</sup>

In contrast to All Hallows, the Colonial Mission of the Presbyterian Church was conceived and founded as a central part of its church's wide-ranging missionary programme. This, as it turned out, was both a blessing and a curse, but it appeared at the time to be a logical progression. The eighteenth-century antecedents of Presbyterian missions to emigrants were often random in nature, relying on the happenstance of the individual ministers' personal migration decisions. By the 1830s it became clear that this self-generating process had all but ceased, even as emigration from Ulster congregations, increasingly directed towards the empire, remained significant. Henry Cooke's *Orthodox Presbyterian* was vocal in tackling this anomaly. Its third number, announcing the departure of Hope Waddell, Edinburgh-based but Monaghan-born, for Jamaica, set the tone when it asked 'How long shall he be the only missionary from amongst the Presbyterians of Ulster?'<sup>89</sup> In the ensuing years, such admonitions routinely included reference to the 'thousands of our fellow-countrymen' who had emigrated and now looked to Ireland to provide them with ministers:

[I]f all our Clergymen and Elders were to rouse themselves to a sense of their duty – if they were to use all their endeavours to excite a spirit of Missions in their Parishes, we should soon have funds wherewith to establish a number of Clergymen in our Colonies, where from the multitudes of emigrants from Ireland and Scotland their labours are most anxiously required.<sup>90</sup>

Moves in this direction were slower than the authors of these sentiments hoped, however, and those clergy who did rouse themselves during the rest of the decade followed Waddell in aligning with the Church of Scotland, first through the Scottish Missionary Society, and after 1836 through the Kirk Colonial Mission.<sup>91</sup> Of this latter scheme Don Chambers has noted both the internal power struggles which delayed its establishment and the external pressures which eventually made it inevitable,<sup>92</sup> and it is possible to see similar, though perhaps less pronounced, dynamics at work within the Irish church. While the evangelicals represented in the *Orthodox Presbyterian* pushed for more co-operation with colonial churches, they were met with a certain apathy. In 1831 a delegation sent to Ulster by the Scottish

Missionary Society expressed disappointment at the lack of interest in their cause from ministers and congregations alike.<sup>93</sup> External influences were also powerful. The calls from emigrants themselves and the correspondence from clergy abroad were, as noted, compounded by visits from senior foreign church figures seeking ministers, including John Dunmore Lang.

It seemed, however, that as long as a few Irish clergy could fulfil a sense of missionary duty towards emigrants under a Scottish banner, or could regard the thriving Home Mission as a means of indoctrinating future emigrants,<sup>94</sup> that the establishment of a distinct Irish Colonial Mission could remain on the back-burner. The Synod of Ulster may have expressed the hope of following the Mother church's example in founding four separate mission schemes, including a Colonial Mission, but with the formation of the General Assembly in 1840, only a Foreign Mission, focused on 'heathen' conversions in India, was immediately formed.<sup>95</sup> The following year did witness the appointment of a Colonial Committee, but this was a mere formalisation of the arrangements already in place, in that it co-operated closely with the Scottish Colonial Mission and continued to allow delegations from Scotland to fundraise in Ulster.<sup>96</sup>

The Scottish connection was finally broken when, somewhat ironically, a Dundee Free Church clergyman offered the General Assembly news of 'spiritual destitution' among Ulster emigrants in Canada which shocked it into action. In 1846 P. L. Millar 'pressed upon the Assembly the necessity of encouraging her licentiates and students to devote themselves to the religious instruction of that people.'<sup>97</sup> Although Millar did not appear to specify how that was to be achieved, and he may, indeed, have simply been making a bid on behalf of his own newly constituted sect for any Ulster missionaries who volunteered for colonial service, an exploratory committee appointed to assess the question came to the conclusion that the Assembly needed its own Colonial Mission.<sup>98</sup> This came into being in August 1848 under the convenorship of William McClure of Derry, whose opening address in that capacity referred to 'the General Assembly having had its attention forcibly directed to the religious destitution of emigrants.'<sup>99</sup> This would prove to be an unconsciously prophetic statement, as 'forcibly directing attention' to the religious needs of emigrants might easily have served as McClure's new job description.

Although ostensibly the oldest of all the Irish church bodies providing clergy to emigrant communities, the S.P.G. had fallen into decline

in Ireland by the time each of the above institutions was being created. An attempt made to rejuvenate the Society in Belfast in 1840 proved abortive. The clergy of Down and Connor convened a meeting which was addressed by the well-known evangelical preacher Hugh McNeile and by Dr Russell of the London S.P.G. Though it was resolved to found a diocesan branch, this appears to have existed in name only until 1848.<sup>100</sup> In September of that year, Dr Mant, the Bishop of Down and Connor, chaired a similar, if sparser, gathering which nonetheless had more success.<sup>101</sup> From that date, with the attentive input of Mant's successor, Robert Knox, a reasonably regular programme of activity was kept up, including an annual meeting and appeal for donations.<sup>102</sup> The diocese of Armagh, meanwhile, had raced ahead in reconstituting S.P.G. branches; between 1840 and 1846, eleven parochial associations were formed.<sup>103</sup> Movement was also afoot in the diocese of Dublin. The Dublin University branch of the S.P.G. had evidently remained potent enough to occasionally encourage students to offer their services to the parent society in London, yet weak enough to lend the Irish auxiliary neither the kind of national profile that would increase such vocations, nor the donations necessary to fund them.<sup>104</sup> So it was that Samuel Hinds, a chaplain to Richard Whately, gave two speeches in Trinity College on the need for 'increased exertion', in 1846 and 1847, years of rapidly growing emigration. Subsequently published in pamphlet form, Hinds' words seem to have been influential; he left Dublin for Carlisle and afterward the see of Norwich in 1848, but the Dublin and Kildare auxiliary to the S.P.G. was active from at least 1849, under the presidency of Archbishop Whately.<sup>105</sup>

The other major strand of the Anglican missionary movement, the Church Missionary Society, or as its Irish branch, founded in 1814, was known, the Hibernian Church Missionary Society, regarded emigrants' religious aid as at best a secondary concern. Although it sent missionaries to areas of Irish settlement, including Canada and New Zealand, they concentrated there, as elsewhere, on the conversion of the native peoples.<sup>106</sup> In part, this reflected its origins as the avowedly evangelical counterpoint to the more high-church S.P.G., which many in the eighteenth century (and perhaps after) felt had concentrated on preserving the faith of colonial settlers to the detriment of spreading it among non-Christians. Nonetheless, elements of the Hibernian Church Missionary Society did take part in the mid-century renaissance of emigrant missionary activity. By means of a bewildering number of name changes and a merger of societies

concentrating on North America and Australia, the Colonial Church and School Society came into being in 1851, with Irish branches formed first in Belfast then Dublin by 1854.<sup>107</sup> Its goal was to provide missionary clergy and teachers to British emigrants, and although it was not officially linked to the Church Missionary Society, there was an overlap in both membership and philosophy. As a later, post-name-change report pointedly noted, ‘The Church Missionary Society has no more powerful auxiliary than the Colonial and Continental Church Society. Their principles are identical. If, therefore, adversaries tauntingly ask – “While eager for the conversion of the heathen, how do you provide for your own?” – we answer by pointing to our Society.’<sup>108</sup> The reference to taunting adversaries hints that the Church of Ireland’s efforts on behalf of emigrants’ spiritual welfare would be no more straightforward than those of the other Irish churches.

Detailing these awakenings of missionary activity in relation to Irish emigrants primarily serves to illustrate that they did not occur in isolation. Certainly, as noted, such missions must be considered firstly as responses to the requests from the diasporas concerned and from the destination churches. They were also part of an international picture, spurred on by similar, sister movements across the North Channel in the case of the Presbyterians, in London for the Church of Ireland, and in France as far as the Catholic Church was concerned.<sup>109</sup> Finally, the increased and increasing emigration before, during, and in the immediate aftermath of the Famine forcibly drove home a point with which each institution had already begun coming to terms. It is also the case, however, that the efforts of the Irish churches did not happen without reference to each other. All of the above missionary endeavours began within a few years of each other, from the foundation of All Hallows in 1842, to that of the Colonial Church and School Society in 1854. Notably, the S.P.G.’s branch in Belfast was reconstituted in the very shadows of another church’s efforts in the same city. This might seem mere chronological coincidence, were it not that the inter-denominational – if hardly ecumenical – influences were often given voice. From the beginning, the language used at public meetings of emigrant missionary societies, and in the literature they issued, was frequently suffused with a sense of religious competition which indicated a continuing awareness – however illusory it may sometimes have been – of the other Irish churches’ equivalent activities. The abiding suspicion of all concerned was that the other denominations were racing ahead in the peopling of emigrant destinations

with clergy. A speaker at the founding meeting of the Belfast S.P.G. in 1848, for example, 'adverted to the efforts of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to propagate the errors of Popery in the colonies and showed how needful it was to be vigilant, in order to counteract the effects thus made.'<sup>110</sup> Six years later, an early meeting of the Colonial Church and School Society, also in Belfast, was told that, 'There was not a spot on the face of the earth so priest-ridden as Canada. There were not three miles without a Roman Catholic chapel' and, with regard to Australia, that 'Popery was sending out fifty agents for the one that we send.'<sup>111</sup> Samuel Hinds put it in the most explicit terms: 'Roman Catholic chapels are rising everywhere [...] and Roman Catholic priests are everywhere active and zealous - [...] there is the Kirk, too, and its Presbytery - should we not be provoked to zeal that we be not left behind in the race of sacred rivalry?'<sup>112</sup>

Supporters of the Presbyterian Colonial Mission were just as conscious of the urgency of ensuring that 'Rome [...] shall not be established in this fast rising empire.'<sup>113</sup> One missionary in Queensland warned McClure that the redoubtable Catholic bishop in the state, James Quinn, was receiving 'vessel after vessel' of priests from the south of Ireland. 'Let Protestants be up and stirring,' he begged, 'or this fine and fertile country will soon be wrested from their hands, and over its fair fields supposition and idolatry will reign.'<sup>114</sup> Presbyterians, too, could display a more even-handed paranoia, also fearfully invoking the missionary efforts of the Anglican Church:

All denominations seem alive to the importance of the colonies and that church will be predominant that can afford the greatest number of talented and devoted Missionaries. The Roman Catholics are sending troops of priests and men. The Church of England is procuring everywhere the erection of new bishoprics, and filling them with men, some of whom are evangelical, and others of a very different spirit.<sup>115</sup>

For the Catholic Church, there was no such confessional subtlety and all Protestant missionary efforts towards settlers in the colonies, and indeed the United States, could be tarred with the same brush; one that was often used at home to apply anti-'souper' rhetoric. There was thus little or no sense that the above-mentioned missions of Protestant churches, whether of Irish origin or otherwise, were devised simply to serve Protestant emigrants. Rather, as the Annual Reports of All Hallows continually alleged, the S.P.G. *et al.* were bent on 'the destruction of Catholic truth among our exiles.'<sup>116</sup> They

formed the vanguard of an 'Anglo-American conspiracy', of a 'crusade' to overthrow the Catholic Church which was driven by 'inexhaustible resources, blind zeal, and the highest official influence'.<sup>117</sup> Such allegations were not entirely without substance, as we will see, but more convincing was the testimony of Catholic bishops abroad, who contrasted their penury with the alleged expenditure of Protestant missions. As the Bishop of Auckland lamented, 'The Protestants in these two respects (in number of Missionaries and in pecuniary means) are far superior to me'.<sup>118</sup>

If all of this poor-mouthing seems somewhat circular – each church being at once better off and worse off than its rivals – it must be remembered that different churches had different strengths depending on the region and the period concerned, and much of the above rhetoric was based on the genuine perceptions of missionary clergy of their relative situations. However, some of these assessments were likely exaggerated in order to convince home churches of the need for further aid. It follows, then, that the sort of competitive rhetoric employed in missionary publications and at missionary meetings served a similar purpose. It was designed not simply as sectarian grandstanding for its own sake, but was calculated to elicit the kind of emotions that would move readers and listeners to donate funds, and prompt worthy clergymen to offer themselves for emigrant missionary service. The success of the latter will be explored, but the issue of how these exploits were funded requires attention first.

Sending clergymen abroad was an expensive business. Although in certain territories, at certain times, there was limited government financial assistance available to colonial churches for the support of clergy, by mid-century most of this support had been discontinued.<sup>119</sup> Each of the above-named institutions had therefore to fund themselves. The costs involved depended on the nature of the model they operated, but one line of expenditure common to all was the training of personnel. For All Hallows, as a missionary seminary, such costs were obviously central, but for the Presbyterian Church and the Church of Ireland they were hidden, since the mission schemes did not directly pay for their volunteers' education. Nonetheless, if Protestant commentators often lamented emigration for its human capital costs, this was oddly reinforced by sending highly educated ministers to serve overseas. Regardless of the quality of the clergyman (and there were, as we will see, questions surrounding this issue) his training had cost his home church both time and money which

would not be repaid. Naturally the Irish churches thought about such matters in altruistic terms, if at all, but they were nonetheless financially weakened by this clerical ‘brain drain.’ That being said, there were more direct funding problems to be confronted, and while each church did so differently, they shared the unfortunate characteristic of frequently falling short of what was necessary or expected.

This was true, above all, of the Presbyterian Colonial Mission. The costs to be met from its budget included the outfit and passage of missionaries, and in certain cases their salary, or a part thereof, for the first few years of their posting. The Mission may also have been subject to further funding requests from colonial congregations until such time as they became self-sufficient. In its first forty years the Mission sent somewhere up to 110 missionaries, so a considerable income was required.<sup>120</sup> This had to be derived from an annual collection taken in every congregation on a given Sunday, with bequests and subscriptions also coming in year-round. Indeed, this was how all of the missions of the church were supported – from the ground up, with ordinary churchgoers, prompted by their ministers, expected to contribute financially to each.<sup>121</sup> Monetary support for the Colonial Mission, however, was minimal. The monthly newspaper which documented all the church’s missionary endeavours, the *Missionary Herald*, regularly published the yearly collections from each congregation and for each mission side by side. The following table samples from there the quantities collected for Foreign, Home, Jewish and Colonial Missions from Belfast, the largest Presbytery, for a selection of years:

**Table 3.1** Belfast Presbytery donations to Missions (in £ sterling)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Foreign</i>	<i>Home</i>	<i>Jewish</i>	<i>Colonial</i>
1850	579	523	265	91
1855	689	398	280	234
1860	833	616	362	291
1865	923	817	411	350
1870	888	377	424	342
1875	1,019	436	450	356
1880	931	333	297	271*

\* Note: this is a bi-annual figure

Some points relating to the table should be explained. Firstly, while it is apparent that the Colonial Mission remained the poor relation in terms of contributions – attracting less than a quarter of the Foreign Mission total – the picture is bleaker than even these bare figures suggest. What is not apparent from the table is that the seeming jump in donations between 1851 and 1863, and the later drop, do not reflect any changed perception of the Colonial Mission, but rather denote its amalgamation with and subsequent splitting from the Continental Mission, in 1856 and 1879 respectively. Moreover, following the split, the Colonial Mission had its annual collection changed to bi-annual, so post-1879 figures must be halved to give the true annual rate. It was suggested hopefully by one minister that this implied that ‘gifts should be double what is given to the objects which obtain annual aid’, but this does not appear to have got through to congregations.<sup>122</sup> Therefore, over thirty years after its foundation, the Colonial Mission was attracting barely more congregational funding per annum than it had in its initial years.

To give these meagre amounts some further context, it may be observed that just one request from a single colonial congregation, particularly in the more sparsely populated regions of Western Canada and Australasia, could far outstrip them. Writing from Queensland in 1864, Rev. John Wilson asked that the home church guarantee a £200 per annum salary for any minister it sent out, with the hope that in as little as three months, the expatriate congregation would provide a sufficient maintenance themselves, all the more readily for not having been bombarded with begging sermons from the newcomer.<sup>123</sup> For some clergy, financial requests to the convenor were made to avoid destitution rather than mere social embarrassment. Thomas McPherson, a minister in Stratford, New Brunswick asked, obviously reluctantly, for £200, ‘which is not a large sum to you,’ towards his congregation’s £500 debt, its church-building fund, and the support of his own ten children. McClure, despite his mission’s admirable policy of continuing to fund clergy after their appointment to the colonies when necessary and when possible, was able only to tell McPherson that £250 had been given to the entire Canadian Home Mission that year and ‘a part of this may, probably, be given to Stratford’.<sup>124</sup>

Both McClure and his successors as convenor, David Wilson, James Cargin, and Thomas Hamill, clearly despaired of these straitened circumstances, but beyond impassioned appeals in the press there seemed to be little they could do to improve them.<sup>125</sup> As early

as 1852, McClure had felt compelled to defend the Mission against a creeping apathy:

An impression has gone abroad, in some quarters of the church, that contributions for the Colonial Mission are not expected to be so general and regular as in other cases. This impression is erroneous. The Colonial Mission, it is true, was established at a period somewhat later than the Home, Foreign and Jewish Missions, but it stands upon the same footing with them.<sup>126</sup>

Evidently, this impression was never successfully countered. Year after year, the reports of the Colonial Mission therefore had the same defensive quality, the need to justify its work seeming only to confirm its marginal status. By the end of the 1880s there were even efforts in some quarters to have the mission wound up. The presbytery of Newry unanimously asked the General Assembly in 1889 that no further collections be made on the Colonial Mission's behalf, while there were attempts by some in the Ards presbytery to table a motion to close the mission down on the grounds that 'the colonial churches [...] had grown to be much wealthier churches than theirs.'<sup>127</sup> These moves were beaten back with the usual arguments, but they highlight the precarious nature of the Colonial Mission's existence.<sup>128</sup>

Unsurprisingly, none of this played well with the missionary clergy themselves, who, while they retained sympathy for the convenor, were also considerably disheartened by the level of support offered by their compatriots. James Caldwell, a missionary in Victoria, Australia, was highly critical of the home church's lack of commitment to the religious needs of the colonies, and of Irish congregations' financial contributions to clergy in the colonies. 'I have often been deeply humbled,' he said, 'nay, obliged to blush, over the reports that have reached us of the miserable givings of some of your congregations for the maintenance of those engaged in the noblest and best of work.'<sup>129</sup> Yet the apparently misguided supposition that 'a missionary to the colonies receives at once adequate support from the people to whom he ministers' – true only in Victoria, according to McClure – meant, inevitably, that the Colonial Mission was not well supported and so perhaps not all that it could have been.<sup>130</sup> The perception of the Ards presbytery in 1890 that colonial churches were increasingly better off than the Irish church forms part of the explanation as to why this was. Certainly, intermittent gold rushes did not help the colonial churches' case with potential benefactors at home, even if, as one minister in New

Zealand pointed out, prospectors were not exactly 'digging up lumps of gold like potatoes', and, as a minister in Victoria told McClure, this had not actually led to any increase in support for the church. 'The majority,' another gold field correspondent noted, 'lives as if there was not a God to call us to account.'<sup>131</sup> All the same, Irish Presbyterians at this later stage could perhaps be forgiven for believing their work had been done in relation to colonial churches. McClure's opening address in 1848 had, after all, emphasised that 'a great recommendation of this mission is that it requires only commencement'; emigrant congregations were intended to become self-sustaining in relatively short order.<sup>132</sup> Yet there had never been a particular enthusiasm for the Colonial Mission. On its twenty-fifth anniversary, McClure told the General Assembly sadly that 'he did not think [it] had made such an impression on the mind of the church as it ought to do' and for all the 'white unto the harvest' rhetoric – one New Zealand missionary was not alone in asking 'What other of our Missions could show for £1,000 what you can show for £100?' – the Colonial Mission remained the least supported of all, even as the Foreign Mission went from strength to strength.<sup>133</sup>

The key to this disparity can be gleaned from a doctoral thesis on 'the birth and development of the overseas missions of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland', which contains only one passing reference to the Colonial Mission in its introduction: 'it was not really a 'foreign mission' – it sought to serve Irish and other Presbyterian emigrants.'<sup>134</sup> This raises an interesting question as to whether the Colonial Mission can even be strictly considered a mission. By modern definitions, possibly not, and while the most ungenerous response to that question never came fully to the surface during the nineteenth century, an unspoken conflict surely existed. The writer of an article on 'pastoral versus missionary duties' which insisted that 'A Presbyterian family saved in county Clare is as precious as a family converted in Syria' suggested that in a church which had neither the money nor the manpower to do all it would wish, the pastoral duties of the Home Mission were primary and the missionary activity of the Foreign Mission secondary.<sup>135</sup> This in itself would prove a minority view in the later nineteenth century as missions in China and India became the priority, and the mission to Irish Catholics waned. Meanwhile, the Colonial Mission, which aspired to 'save' families in Canada and Australia, appeared to fall awkwardly between these two stools, serving, in the main, people who were Irish and Presbyterian from

birth, but doing so in circumstances and on a scale that was comparable to the Foreign Mission. Any underlying idea that the Colonial Mission was 'not really a mission' can therefore only have harmed its standing in a church in which mission was an increasingly powerful principle.<sup>136</sup> A final word on this must go to Rev. P. M. Pollock, who in a series of articles on mission work in Canada sharply outlined – though in rather crude terms – what he saw as the reasons for the neglect of the religious needs of emigrant communities:

I often think it is a great pity these poor settlers have neither a pigtail or woolly heads, nor thick lips, a nose jewel, a pagoda, a red tissue paper visiting card, or a paperpocket handkerchief to show in Toronto or Montreal. Unfortunately they are only of English, Irish, or Scotch descent, and cannot claim the sentiment which is lavished on India or Formosa.<sup>137</sup>

It seems reasonable to suppose, in this instance, that what was true in Canada applied equally to Ireland.

The Church of Ireland's missions towards emigrants also had problems attracting donations from the laity, partially as a result of the ecclesiological split which had begun to dominate the wider Anglican Church. The S.P.G., as the longer-established and traditionally high-church society, had to defend itself against evangelical allegations of Tractarian or Romanist tendencies, prompting protestations from its members in Ireland that no particular ethos ruled, whether high or low church.<sup>138</sup> For the Irish church, especially, this may have been true.<sup>139</sup> Yet, while perhaps not quite as riven by the Oxford movement as the Church of England, the auxiliary status of the mission societies meant they could not be isolated from the troubles of the parent organisations. This left two societies with broadly similar aims competing for the support of a relatively small Irish church population, and created a rivalry which may well have damaged both, rather than benefiting either. Although Bishop Knox organised a joint meeting of the S.P.G. and the Church Missionary Society in Belfast in 1859, insisting that 'there is no rivalry existing between them but that holy rivalry of which will do the most good', the tenor of many of the speeches suggested otherwise.<sup>140</sup> Certainly, neither the S.P.G. nor its evangelical counterpart ever seemed satisfied with their annual collection totals, asserting that they were 'altogether unworthy' of the particular diocese, or 'still far short of the amount that we might reasonably be expected to contribute'.<sup>141</sup> It became routine to blame 'ignorance and

misconception' of the societies' aims for these shortcomings, Richard Whately even suggesting that in the S.P.G.'s case 'the term "Foreign Parts" is not unlikely to mislead some persons; or at least, to keep out of sight that the main object of the Society is to provide religious instruction and superintendence for our fellow-subjects'.<sup>142</sup>

There was, however, a happier side to auxiliary status which meant that such financial deficits were a matter of less pressing concern to the Church of Ireland societies than they were to the Presbyterian Colonial Mission. While the latter scheme relied largely on congregational collections in Ireland to pay for the missionaries whom it sent out itself, the S.P.G. and the Colonial Church and School Society were in reality little more than cheer-leading adjuncts to far larger (and much richer) entities in London. Clergy of the Church of Ireland who wished to serve emigrant communities abroad, had, like their English counterparts, to go before the societies' respective boards of examiners in London, which assessed their suitability before allowing them to go on the mission.<sup>143</sup> Therefore, there was a less direct relationship between Irish emigrants, Irish missionaries and Irish fundraising for them in the Anglican Church than was the case in the Presbyterian and Catholic churches.

This is not to suggest that the financial arrangements underpinning the Catholic All Hallows College were by any means straightforward. Like the S.P.G. and Presbyterian Colonial Mission, the college was responsible for the passage and outfit expenses of its missionaries. Unlike its Protestant counterparts, however, it also had to find the funds to educate them, though this was balanced by the fact that All Hallows did not offer financial support to its alumni or their new churches once they had left. It is unlikely it could ever have done so, since its guiding principle over the following decades was expansion, including a physical expansion of its buildings to accommodate ever more students who had to cater for ever more emigrants in ever wider territories.<sup>144</sup> This, naturally, required a corresponding increase of its financial support, and several avenues were therefore explored. As noted, All Hallows began fundraising nationally after receiving tacit episcopal approval in 1846. The college authorities followed the normal pattern of Catholic charity in the period. Press advertisements, including lists of donations by parish and of large individual subscriptions, were regularly placed, parochial collections were made in Ireland (although these were discontinued in 1863), and funding was sought from overseas.<sup>145</sup> Collections were

often organised on the missions by alumni of the college, and in 1854, Dr O'Brien, professor of rhetoric in the college, conducted a well-publicised lecture tour of England designed to raise funds.<sup>146</sup> A year later, and again in 1864, William Kelly, a former Christian Brother who was initially employed by the college solely as a collector, went to the United States.<sup>147</sup> Such tours, as always, had mixed success, and could be limited by the unwillingness of overseas bishops to allow collections in their dioceses, which many of them felt distracted from their own projects.<sup>148</sup> For All Hallows, these kinds of charity lectures were in any case not without politically-tinged controversy. In 1855, Woodlock was forced to accede to Archbishop Cullen's request that no more public meetings be held to raise money for the college. This was brought on primarily by O'Brien's invitation of Thomas D'arcy McGee to speak in Dublin on All Hallows' behalf – 'likely to be looked on as a political fact' as Cullen warned – but was not unconnected to 'O'Brien's proceedings in England'. As Woodlock acknowledged, 'a good deal of money has been brought into the College during the last year. However, I think it is a great question whether it could not have been collected without quite so much noise little to the purpose'.<sup>149</sup>

While all of this activity certainly attracted more money than had Hand's horse and cart odyssey, it was not to be the only source of funding. In fact, the authorities at the college soon realised that collections from the faithful alone would not sustain them. The initial assumption that the A.P.F. would make some contribution, even if only by donating a portion of the sum annually collected on its behalf in Ireland, turned out to be quite misguided. These parochial collections, according to the *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, usually garnered in the region of £6,000–£7,000 before and after the Famine and £3,000–£4,000 during it, but they were transmitted directly to the central fund in Paris. All Hallows was not in line to benefit from the Irish A.P.F. collections. As Kevin Condon explains, the Paris committee had a policy, tied in with the French missionary system, of granting money to missionaries and missionary societies, but never directly to missionary supply colleges, which were usually either government-funded, or attached to the missionary societies.<sup>150</sup> This did not prevent an on-going and often fractious campaign by All Hallows in favour of the idea, which resulted, during the exceptional circumstances of the Famine, in some small, but vital, concessions for a few years. Government funding was more of a blind alley. In light of the Maynooth grant increase in 1845, both Moriarty and Woodlock

appealed to the Colonial Office for a subsidy for All Hallows, pointing out that the government was already paying salaries to some Irish priests in the colonies. Aside from one sympathetic official, their pleas fell on deaf ears.<sup>151</sup> The best they could do was secure a few one-off sponsorships of missionaries' outward journeys, a minor relief which some overseas dioceses were also occasionally prepared to concede.<sup>152</sup>

Indeed, for all these disappointments, the college did have a notable success in its unique arrangement with overseas bishops – the brain-child of Hand – whereby the adopting diocese was asked to pay half of the student missionary's annual college fees. Until 1861, this was £10 (afterward £15), with the student himself also paying £10. The system got off to a rocky beginning. An initial round of correspondence sent by Hand in 1842 to bishops in the United States and the colonies offering missionary priests was for the most part either ignored or acknowledged in the negative, many bishops no doubt wondering who this lowly priest was with his unsolicited offers of half-price priests. Contrary to one historian's view, this was not owing to any general pre-Famine lack of demand for missionaries from Ireland, but was a result of the inability of many bishops to come up with the £10 per capita required.<sup>153</sup> The bishops of New Orleans, Philadelphia, St Louis and Nashville were among those pleading poverty in 1843–44.<sup>154</sup> Matters quickly turned around, however, and by 1845–46, still before the Famine emigration took hold, the college was dealing with multiple requests for its students.<sup>155</sup>

There is some irony that the money the bishops remitted often came ultimately from the A.P.F. in Paris, so that, in a circuitous manner, All Hallows benefited from the monies gathered by the A.P.F. in Irish parishes far more than it might have seemed.<sup>156</sup> More importantly, Irish emigrants themselves owed a considerable debt to the Association, as an advertisement placed by the Irish branch in 1853 pointed out:

The Society has allocated annually the large sum of thirty thousand pounds to those countries in which most of the Catholics are either Irish, or the children of Irish parents. Many Irish Missionaries, Bishops, and Priests, in foreign lands, have a considerable portion of the expenses of their missions constantly defrayed by this Society. On the prosperity, then, of the institution, the spiritual interests of Irishmen all over the world are very much, and in many places entirely, dependent: and be it therefore always remembered, that whilst contributing to the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, we in Ireland, are receiving a ten-fold return in favour of our own exiled fellow-countrymen.<sup>157</sup>

Thus, 'Priests for the emigrants' were paid for from a wide variety of sources. In contrast to the Presbyterian Colonial Mission, collections from the laity were not the only, or even the main source of income. As in the Church of Ireland, however, there existed an external missionary body, to which the Irish church contributed far less than was ultimately expended on its emigrants. Yet, perhaps the factor which most distinguished the Catholic provision of clergy to its emigrants from the corresponding Irish Protestant missions was the significant extent to which the receiving churches and the emigrants themselves directly contributed towards the clergy they asked for, via the half-fee system and foreign collection tours. What the Irish Catholic Church offered its emigrants by way of religious aid, then, was simply personnel, and if anything, financial aid for religious purposes went in the opposite direction.

As noted, students of All Hallows bore a considerable financial burden. Most had to find £10 towards their fees each year, and several who were not lucky enough to be sponsored by an overseas diocese during their training paid even more.<sup>158</sup> In return, they were subjected to a notably spartan regime. During the Famine, one American priest wrote to Moriarty sending £3 to one 'inmate' (an unintentionally telling choice of language) who had complained of having no clothing allowance: the money was to pay a washerwoman to have his outfits cleaned.<sup>159</sup> Later, Woodlock felt the need to warn a potential student of what to expect, 'lest he should find the place rather rough in the beginning'.<sup>160</sup> To some degree this was an inevitable result of the college's financial straits, but there may also been an element of design to such hardship.<sup>161</sup> Certainly, Woodlock explained the college's 'roughness' in terms of its missionary status, and *The Tablet*, pondering where best of England or Ireland to locate a missionary college, agreed that 'the willingness to endure the hardships of a foreign mission, to live roughly, to fare coarsely, and to undergo the privation and suffering which accompany the priestly vocation across the ocean, are to be looked for mainly in the poorer of the two countries'.<sup>162</sup> Moreover, during early debates over the foundation of a missionary college, Bishop Crotty, speaking with the killjoy facility of the outsider, stated that he 'would not have either the students or supervisors too highly fed. Such a diet as we had in the Parlour and Refectory of our National College at Maynooth would be a bad preparation for the privations they would have to endure in travelling through the wilds of America or Australia or even through the Highlands of Scotland'.<sup>163</sup>

Crotty and *The Tablet* had a point. Clergy of all denominations had frequently to endure harsh conditions in ministering to emigrants and overseas prelates were wont to warn as much in their correspondence with All Hallows. Prospective missionaries for Texas, according to the Bishop of Galveston, 'must submit to a great many privations',<sup>164</sup> while the Bishop of Richmond, when requesting six missionaries from Hand in 1845, chose to emphasise the dispersed, tough nature of the work to be done (as well as its scant rewards) to forestall any surprises on arrival:

[They] must expect a life of great labour and fatigue, much exposure to cold, heat and rain, bad roads, very indifferent diet and lodging, but little respect for [their] dignity, few Catholics, little of society and a compensation barely adequate to support [them] in the plainest and most economical manner. [...] I want *no* priest who does not come fully prepared to enter upon such a charge.<sup>165</sup>

This itinerant life was the lot of many All Hallows alumni, the inevitable result of clerical shortages amid scattered settlements, particularly in the emerging, territorially vast dioceses in the western and southern United States and in the colonies. It meant suffering, as one later All Hallows graduate observed of Australian missionaries, 'the constant fatigue and strain of long sweltering hours in the saddle, the ever present danger of losing their way in the dense, trackless bush with the cheerless prospect of spending the night under the stars, surrounded by the indescribable loneliness of the mysterious primeval forest'.<sup>166</sup>

Some notable feats of endurance resulted. Fr Willie O'Brien is said to have performed 'the most remarkable sick call in Australian history' when he covered 150 miles on horseback in a round trip one Saturday night, returning home in time to say his two Sunday morning Masses in the process.<sup>167</sup> George Dillon, in New South Wales, told Dr Woodlock that in eight months he had travelled 4,000 miles visiting the scattered Catholic settlers of his diocese.<sup>168</sup> These duties did become easier as territories progressed. William Hamilton, writing from Florida in 1856 anticipated that 'we have just now commenced to construct railroads in this state, which will render missionary life much more expeditious and comfortable'.<sup>169</sup> Until such infrastructure was in place, however, there was little comfort for many missionaries, and while one All Hallows alumnus claimed that all his travelling was 'healthful and invigorating', and another that his new climate was

'good and healthy', there were many who succumbed to an early grave as a result of their exertions.<sup>170</sup> Beyond the anticipated hardships, there were also occasional crises which compounded the difficulties of life on the mission. Certainly, the staff and students of All Hallows were aware of the ultimate sacrifices made by several Irish priests working among the fevered immigrants of Quebec in 1847–48.<sup>171</sup>

Anglican clergy, of course, had also died while tending the sick at Grosse Île, and many Church of Ireland men who volunteered for service to settlers in the colonies were also destined for peripatetic lives covering parishes of considerable geographic extent.<sup>172</sup> Henry Irwin, or 'Father Pat' as he was known to all, was one such in British Columbia, where he tended to the communities springing up alongside (and building) the railroad. A fellow minister later recorded the wide reach of Pat's mission:

Father Pat did not confine his work to the main line of the C.P.R. [Canada Pacific Railway] but journeyed down the Arrow Lakes, services being held as far south as Nelson, then a mere mining camp. We find, too, that he followed the Columbia from Golden to the Kootenay River, services being recorded at these places. Some six or eight clergy now occupy the territory thus covered, divided into five or six parishes.<sup>173</sup>

This extensive travelling was physically exhausting – at one point Irwin was forced home to Wicklow and the care of his family while he recovered his health – and whatever its rewards, they were not material. In a letter home Irwin described himself sitting down to eat his lunch at the mines: 'a dirty, travelled-looking individual, a poor imitation of a parson, sitting at one side of the log fire; a tin plate with his bacon and beans on it, and his tinney of tea; bread just cooked on the fire in a dirty pan.'<sup>174</sup>

Another Irish S.P.G. missionary, Edward Synge, was an even more significant pioneer in the Australian colonies, where the Bishop of Sydney charged him with organising church structures in the bush. His efforts led, within a few years, to the foundation of the separate bishopric of Goulbourn.<sup>175</sup> Again, this was wide-ranging and lonely work; according to one source, 'Equipped with a compass, pack-horses, and the barest necessities for travel, it was not an uncommon thing for him to make itinerating journeys in the bush extending over a period of nine months at a time and covering a distance of over five thousand miles.'<sup>176</sup> While there are, in fact, several wildly varying but always impressive estimates of the extent of Synge's labours to be

found, their difficulty, and the commitment they required, rings out from each.<sup>177</sup> If such exertions went above and beyond the normal call of duty, the lot of the ordinary colonial clergyman had its own challenges; one Colonial and Continental Church Society missionary was told by his receiving bishop, that 'his post will be an arduous one, he will have to hold three services on Sunday, and travel thirty miles over very bad roads, he will not be able to sit down to a meal till evening, but must eat as he gallops along'.<sup>178</sup>

There were equally gruelling and poorly paid assignments for Presbyterian missionaries in the colonies, and equally noble acts of selflessness ensuring they were fulfilled. In 1871, Robert McKinney won praise for his decision to stick with his itinerant mission in New Zealand, turning down, in the process, a settled ministry with a trebled income. A colleague wrote that McKinney felt his mission would not have survived his leaving.<sup>179</sup> McKinney himself further outlined his reasons for staying put:

The colonial minister is rewarded in the hearty welcome he receives from the isolated settler, in the good that notwithstanding many discouragements, he feels assured he is doing, and, in my case, also, rewarded by the approval which my labours met with from the church of which I am still proud to regard myself as the missionary – the Irish Presbyterian church.<sup>180</sup>

His commitment was even more impressive when one considers that it was a New Zealand missionary magazine which later asserted that 'Colonial ministers, as a general rule, are doubtless the hardest worked clergymen of any in the world'.<sup>181</sup>

Another Ulster minister, James Patterson, filled a similar itinerant role in the Australian colony of Victoria in the early 1860s, visiting dispersed communities of 'diggers' who, he suggested, had previously only encountered clergy seeking 'money for baptising and five pounds for marrying' rather than the salvation of the miners' souls. He would, no doubt, have despaired at the idea later communicated to McClure by a correspondent in Victoria that the scattered, poor nature of some congregations in the colony meant, 'There is not at present a single vacancy in the church of Victoria which is really worth anything'.<sup>182</sup> That said, while passionately committed to his missionary work, Patterson was also realistic about the toll it was taking on his health: 'It is still my intention to return home. [...] Three years of this rough work is my contribution to the cause, and I feel convinced the strings

of my being will wear longer at home than here'. Yet, to Patterson's mind, 'travelling ministers (themselves the Presbytery)' were precisely what was required in the colonies, and he was critical of the home church for sending out clergy with 'settled down notions in their heads, instead of urging them to itinerate in long-neglected places'.<sup>183</sup>

These few representative examples demonstrate that within each denomination, the mission to emigrants, no less than mission to non-Christians, could be a deeply felt vocation undertaken despite sometimes ruinous implications for health, lifestyle or finances. As many insider histories and contemporary reports emphasise, that was to be commended, and several of the more industrious Irish clergymen could lay claim to be true 'pioneer priests', extending the structures of their church into previously ignored territory. Nonetheless, as much as receiving bishops, or fellow clergy, or settler congregations might have lauded the zeal of such ministers, they were also unafraid to point out that very many others failed to live up to the same standard.

Allusions to the questionable quality of All Hallows alumni, in particular, are not especially hard to find. The historian Owen Dudley Edwards has observed that, both at home and abroad, general opinion unofficially placed the college in third rank behind the diocesan seminaries, which primarily produced parish priests for the home church, and behind Maynooth, the *alma mater* of bishops.<sup>184</sup> Some specific instances of third class (and perhaps even fourth class) candidates do arise in the college's overseas correspondence. These include William Roddy, who, before he was even ordained, was shunted between adoptive prelates on the basis of an unspecified but apparently serious misdemeanour, and an unnamed All Hallows graduate who, according to his bishop, 'had several times become intoxicated, and taking up a chalice from the church, tried to sell it to a silversmith in a city in Maryland'.<sup>185</sup> Some allowance has to be made for their dissolute ilk. Certainly, what Donna Merwick (by way of Graham Greene) calls 'whiskey priests' were an occupational hazard, and there is nothing to suggest that they were the disproportionate preserve of All Hallows or of the missions in general.<sup>186</sup>

That being said, if we are to believe the memoir of one former student, Richard Howley, a different form of rather unpriestly rambunctiousness was tolerated at All Hallows, if not at times encouraged. Writing after the takeover by the Vincentian order – an outcome he described as 'being bullied into line with other institutions' – Howley described the college's 'mad youth' in the early 1850s, when

‘a grand freedom of spirit that scorned the machine-press system of the regulation seminary pervaded the whole body, superiors and students’. ‘The memory and the mood of ’48,’ he recalled, ‘were alive and burning in those young breasts,’ creating a ‘fervour of nationalism’.<sup>187</sup> This fervour produced the worrying ‘noise’ that Woodlock had told Cullen the college could do with less of, but it is unclear whether or not it was ever successfully quietened. Dr O’Brien, the teacher of moral theology who was the cause of Cullen’s concern, gradually drifted away from the college in the ensuing years, preoccupied with spreading his Catholic Young Men’s Societies.<sup>188</sup> This was not before he had made his mark on some of the students, however. David McRoberts attributes to him the All Hallows men in Scotland who ‘seemed more concerned with the grievances of Dark Rosaleen than with the Five Ways of Aquinas’.<sup>189</sup> This was a well-documented problem in the Scottish church, and Ruth-Ann Harris, citing the All Hallows Scotland correspondence, observed an early pattern of professors warning their graduates not to engage in political activities in their adoptive parishes. One 1843 letter urged: ‘leave behind your national feelings, try to accommodate to the habits and ideas of the people among whom you have come to live and consider yourselves sent by God to preach the Gospel to Foreign Nations, in place of preaching to their Irish politics’.<sup>190</sup>

The very fact that such cautions were deemed necessary speaks of an awareness, even from very early on, that the college was producing politically-minded priests with the potential to cause headaches for their adoptive bishops. It is therefore curious to note that Howley, for one, did not discern any clipping of nationalist wings while he was attending the seminary. He claimed, in fact, that issues of *The Nation* were regularly the basis of study, that patriotic sing-alongs (led by the teaching staff) were frequent and that Dr Moriarty, then president, ‘gave no evidence of disapproval of the national spirit he knew to exist in the college’. Indeed, Moriarty had been an avowed supporter of the Young Ireland movement and remained a lifelong friend to Charles Gavan Duffy through ‘trying and troubled times’.<sup>191</sup> He even asked for a dispensation for early ordination of an All Hallows priest so that he might provide a chaplain to the 1848 leaders during their transportation to Australia.<sup>192</sup> This was in spite of his subsequent reputation, when translated to Kerry, as ‘the most Castle-loving of all the bishops on the Irish bench’, a description seemingly justified by his infamous condemnation of the Fenians.<sup>193</sup> That ‘unconsidered flight of fancy’

was obviously a sore point with Howley and his peers and indeed in 1871, when one of Paul Cullen's anti-Fenian pastoral letters was being read aloud in the refectory of All Hallows, those assembled reportedly 'erupted into a noisy demonstration of displeasure', preventing it being finished, an occurrence which Cullen's nephew, Bishop Patrick Moran of Ossory, saw as evidence of 'radical evils' in the college.<sup>194</sup>

The presence of this nationalist spirit was confirmed by another contemporary chronicler of All Hallows, Fr John Curry. A fairly innocuous early draft of his thoughts on the college's founding which preceded Howley's account by a few months avoids any mention of political sentiments among the student body.<sup>195</sup> However, drawing somewhat on Howley's testimony, Curry's longer study of 1900 delicately speculates:

Whether the superiors of the College were inspired with like feelings (which, I believe, was the case with most of them), or whether they foresaw the advantages this national spirit would confer towards carrying out the work of the missions among Irish exiles, certain it is that they did not discourage, if they did not actively foster it. They did not deem it of obligation, at all events, to strive to convert this band of Irish youth<sup>196</sup>

Curry makes an astute point here, which might perhaps be extended. The unique status of the college as a kind of unofficial religious order producing secular priests who could not be centrally recalled from overseas dioceses in the same way as, say, the Christian Brothers were withdrawn from the diocese of Sydney in the 1850s,<sup>197</sup> created internal disciplinary problems which eventually led to the Vincen-tian takeover in 1892.<sup>198</sup> Before that occurred, however, the superiors of the college, in harnessing a nationalist spirit and allowing it to flourish, may have sought to create a useful and probably otherwise unobtainable sense of togetherness, a common and fondly remembered bond of community among the students. Advantageous though this might have been, it was not always helpful to send forth priests who might stray into politics in their new homes, hence the advice of one later All Hallows teacher to a missionary to 'forget All Hallows except in your prayers'.<sup>199</sup>

This was a very fine line for the college authorities to walk, however, and they may not always have succeeded. Adopting bishops were certainly alert to the problems that priests of ardently nationalist sympathies might present, particularly in the context of a Fenian

movement which had begun among emigrants in America and was spreading quickly among the diaspora elsewhere. Some complained to the college superiors. In the 1860s Bishop Demers of the diocese of Victoria in Canada undertook to sponsor eight All Hallows students, of whom only two ever settled under his charge. One did go on to become vicar-apostolic, but the other, William Moloney, was 'an extremely outspoken man, [who] was soon infuriating the English [...] with his "sermons" on British "history"'. A fellow missionary of Belgian origin, who was to succeed to the bishopric, described Moloney as 'God's curse on the diocese of Victoria.' Unsurprisingly, Demers chose not to use All Hallows again.<sup>200</sup> In a separate context, Archbishop McCloskey of New York despairingly told Patrick Leahy of Cashel that 'most of the clergymen who have come out from Ireland have allowed themselves to be caught in the Fenian trap'.<sup>201</sup>

It ought to be noted that Kevin Condon sought to dismiss any sense of nationalist spirit that may have existed in All Hallows, but his efforts are unconvincing. He suggested that Howley's recollections of nationalism in the college were 'coloured by his own prejudice', and that 'the only [member of staff] about whom there was even a suggestion of nationalist feeling was [Fr William] Fortune'.<sup>202</sup> Yet it is abundantly clear that R. B. O'Brien was a fervent nationalist, and Woodlock's suggestion to Cullen that O'Brien was 'against Young Ireland' and that his friendship with D'arcy McGee was simply a personal one, can be seen as an attempt to retain a gifted teacher by way of a (probably) disingenuous denial – O'Brien was even then an anonymous contributor to the *Nation*.<sup>203</sup> Coupled with the obvious Young Ireland sympathies of Moriarty, this rather confirms Howley's memoir. In addition, Condon noted that the report of the later hostile reaction to Cullen's anti-Fenian letter emerged only because an outsider was present, something which might suggest that similar outbursts of national sentiment often occurred without anybody present to witness them.<sup>204</sup>

Admittedly, as far as emigrants themselves were concerned, this nationalist hue to All Hallows priests need not have been a problem. As Curry suggests, any hint of an advanced nationalism probably even endeared many a missionary priest to his flock. However, in the long run, priests considered troublesome to their bishops in this respect can only have slowed down the spread of the church and impeded its ability to provide pastoral care to emigrants, by exacerbating disputes among prelates of different national outlook or origin, by necessitating parochial transfers and a search for replacement clerics, by

irking the imperial authorities with whom the Catholic Church often had a mutually beneficial colonial relationship,<sup>205</sup> and ultimately, as Harris's Scottish correspondent warned against, by preaching politics rather than the Gospel. However, there was a yet more invidious deficiency in many All Hallows-trained priests which impacted much more directly on emigrant communities.

Returning to Owen Dudley Edwards' point, there is certainly ample evidence to support the 'third class' accusation. Sponsoring bishops routinely made subtle and not-so-subtle reference to the poor intellectual capacity and pastoral skills of the priests they had been sent. The Bishop of Dubuque, a diocese which had previously received All Hallows alumni, wrote to request 'good priests' in 1860, feeling obliged to underline 'good' twice.<sup>206</sup> Others were more to the point. James Bayley writing to Woodlock from Newark declined to adopt one Fr Quinn as he was given to understand that he 'was not very well endowed with brains' and 'a priest on the mission in this country needs all his wits about him'. Woodlock obviously tried to persuade him to the contrary, but Bayley had already been burned and he warned 'If Terence Quinn is not superior, in his appearance and manners to Rev. Cornelius O'Reilly, I do not want him. An awkward clownish priest makes a bad impression.'<sup>207</sup> Bad preaching seems to have been a recurring flaw of migrant Irish clergy. Bishop Walsh of Halifax bluntly informed Moriarty in 1848 that 'Fr Lyons can't preach'. Bishop John Andre of Pittsburgh generalised the point, claiming that many young Irish priests lacked this vital skill, including those from All Hallows. He could, he said, 'scarcely catch a word in ten' and was forced to 'imagine that their mouths were full of meal.'<sup>208</sup> This had worrying implications, as Walsh noted, as it deprived the people of necessary instruction. Of related concern was poor knowledge of the rituals of the church. The Bishop of Savannah, for one, entreated of the All Hallows superiors that any men intended for his mission be properly acquainted with all ceremonies, relics, and altar arrangements.<sup>209</sup>

All of which suggests a less than complete education on the part of many All Hallows priests. This was often literally the case. So urgent was the apparent need for missionaries that a significant proportion of All Hallows graduates were not technically that, often being ordained by their adopting bishop following a truncated period of training in Drumcondra. This arrangement had mixed reviews. On one hand, the likes of Bishop Celestine of Vincennes suggested that priests would benefit from a longer stay in Drumcondra; on the other,

Bishop Loras of Dubuque was amongst those pushing for priests to be readied as soon as possible.<sup>210</sup> There is little doubt where Moriarty stood on the issue in the immediate post-Famine period. It was he who was responsible for greatly increasing the capacity of the college so that the needs of Loras and his fellow bishops could be met, and there is some suggestion that he may have been prepared to sacrifice quality for quantity in doing so. As he later told Woodlock 'I am not afraid of the growing number of students [...] If they have to live in tents I would take a multitude into All Hallows.'<sup>211</sup> Whether the resulting priests were up to standard is clearly questionable.

Curry admitted that the shortened course of training was one factor which 'interfered somewhat considerably with [the college's] results.'<sup>212</sup> Moriarty may have come to agree with that assessment. His *Allocutions* contain some remarkable passages written in 1867 which cast aspersions on clerical education in Ireland compared with that in America and England; an unfavourable contrast he was surely aware of from his All Hallows days.<sup>213</sup> The other factor Curry cited was related: 'the necessity [...] of admitting students that were not as well trained for college life as was desirable.'<sup>214</sup> A similar allegation, it must be recalled, had been thrown at Fr Foley's failed college in Youghal, with Cullen suggesting that his students were of dubious character and provenance. Equally, many a sow's ear to silk purse transformation was attempted at All Hallows.

Moriarty himself was aware of this: during his presidency he asserted that the college must ensure that 'the rude and vulgar boy from the country is changed into the saintly priest.'<sup>215</sup> The 'rude and vulgar boy' was often, like the founder of the college, from a poorer social background than most of those who found their way to well-fed Maynooth.<sup>216</sup> Indeed, one historian of the college suggested that All Hallows' intake largely comprised of 'young men who would not otherwise have had the opportunity of being ordained'; those who were either unable to pay fees at Maynooth, or, the corollary must follow, who were of insufficient quality to gain a scholarship there, as Hand himself had.<sup>217</sup> Condon makes a similar point, declaring that 'The college had its own place within the ecclesiastical framework of the country...it gave an outlet for vocations' – hardly a ringing endorsement of the student body.<sup>218</sup> A contemporary American contributor to Orestes Brownson's magazine chose to frame the same opinion in less delicate terms:

They say in Ireland that there is a great difference between the raw material of Maynooth, Carlow, the Irish Houses of Rome and Paris, on the one hand, and that of All Hallows, on the other. The reasons are obvious. All the men fitted for home service want to stay at home, those only volunteering for the foreign brigade who can do no better.<sup>219</sup>

Many Presbyterians appear to have shared this assumption. Indeed, the notion that colonial service was a second-best or even a last-resort career option for ministers seems to have preceded the Colonial Mission and therefore hampered it from the outset. One congregational history, for example, records the removal of a Mr Watson from his ministry in 1836 on account of ‘a difficulty that had arisen.’ Watson, presumably unable to find a new Irish congregation, decided to emigrate to the colonies for work, where, despite the earlier controversy, ‘for several years he was a diligent and successful minister.’<sup>220</sup> Problems emerged, however, when such rejected ministers proved to be neither diligent nor successful, and the perception of colonial congregations as a dumping ground for less gifted, or otherwise objectionable pastors was thereby compounded.

Colonial presbyteries bridled at this unofficial assignation of second-class status to their ministries, and were dismayed by the consequent reluctance of clergy of talent to take them up. A campaign was launched on two fronts to combat the problem. Sub-standard clergy were repeatedly and plainly told by correspondents in the *Missionary Herald* that the colonies would not provide the soft-touch or desperate congregations that they might have hoped would accept them. Dr Burns of the Canadian Home Mission was among the first to assert that, ‘Those who would not succeed at home can have little hope of being useful [in Canada],’ and warnings of the kind became more explicit as time went on.<sup>221</sup> A Queensland correspondent told McClure in 1862 that ‘It is a great mistake to suppose that men of inferior talents, and whose hopes of success at home have nearly expired, are good enough for the colonies,’ while six years later, the point having obviously gone unheeded, the same colony’s General Assembly stated more emphatically:

We cannot get a supply of ministers from the home churches, nor are those who come in all cases suitable. It is a charming delusion that prevails extensively at home, that a minister who cannot get on there should emigrate to the colonies. It is a delusion which is often rather rudely dispelled when sometimes it is too late.<sup>222</sup>

In all of this, the good faith of the Colonial Mission convenor was rarely directly questioned, although the Queensland General Assembly came close in suggesting that 'men of piety, prudence and ability' were not always the ones who found favour with the Colonial Committees. McClure magnanimously acknowledged that the stricture was 'severe but not wholly undeserved,'<sup>223</sup> but he was perhaps guilty of an undue harshness on himself. In reality, the convenors of the Colonial Mission were in much the same bind as successive presidents of All Hallows. Good clergymen were needed but were not always available, certainly not in the numbers required, so a choice often had to be made: send a less-than-stellar candidate or send none at all. The former may have all too often seemed the better bet. However, as one clergyman in Victoria, Australia, warned, 'Our vacant congregations prefer to be vacant rather than take any preacher.'<sup>224</sup>

McClure and his successors as convenor therefore felt obliged to guard against poor colonial clergy by actively striving to attract the best volunteers to their Mission. Again, although there are occasional references to the convenors speaking to students at Assembly's College 'on the great claims of the colonial field', annual reports and the pages of the *Missionary Herald* provided the most useful fora for their persuasions.<sup>225</sup> Young ministers were asked to contemplate 'whether they would not be serving God quite as much by going to the colonies as by remaining with small congregations at home', and the advantages of colonial service over the other foreign missions were also extolled: 'the ministers we send forth do not require to learn new languages, and no lengthened course of training is required.'<sup>226</sup> The matter was also painted in sacrificial terms for the wider church: 'If we wish to be successful abroad, we must learn to give up some of our most able and efficient ministers.'<sup>227</sup> Coupled with the kind of crusading rhetoric observed earlier, this might have been expected to capture the imaginations and the commitment of many worthy young preachers. However, McClure continued to report difficulty in finding acceptable missionaries, a function, he was convinced, of colonial service's second-rate reputation. As he told the General Assembly in 1866, 'promising men [are] frequently dissuaded from going out by their brethren.'<sup>228</sup> He later elaborated:

The impression seems in many quarters to exist that for a young man of first-rate ability to give himself to this department of the church's work, is virtually to throw himself away. Never was there a greater mistake.

Emigrants are usually among the most enterprising and intelligent portion of the community and are able to appreciate the abilities and work of the most talented ministers.<sup>229</sup>

That may well have been the case, if the commonly expressed idea held true that it was the 'bone and sinew', 'the cream of the nation', 'the very flower of the people' who were leaving Ireland.<sup>230</sup> The Church of Scotland minister David MacKenzie certainly believed that, apostates aside, congregations in Australia were more attentive than any he had known in Europe: 'There is here less yawning, less listlessness, and assuredly less sleeping, than I have often witnessed in my younger days when attending the churches in evangelical Scotland'.<sup>231</sup> One theory suggested that the very lack of religious ordinances in the colonies and the struggle to obtain them were such that it made 'those who are religious more decidedly so'.<sup>232</sup> The fact remains, however, that colonial congregations only rarely got the outstanding clergy they apparently deserved.

There is an interesting political tangent to this issue which ties in neatly with some of the misgivings about All Hallows' priests. In the late 1860s it became apparent that in certain Australian colonies, where Presbyterian congregations were of mixed, or of majority Scottish national origin, ministers from Ireland were sometimes rejected for the very fact of their Irishness. As James Caldwell explained 'There is [...] a considerable number of Scotch people in Victoria who take the standard of all things Irish from Irish harvesters and Fenians. Such act on the principle that nothing good can come out of Ireland'.<sup>233</sup> John Wilson in Queensland wrote similarly that 'The plain sad truth is, that a minister coming from Ireland is just as likely to be a hindrance as a help. This is not the result of national jealousy, but of recent events'.<sup>234</sup> The feeling did apparently dissipate: J. M. Abernethy observed from Victoria in 1872 that 'the old reproach is now pretty well rolled away [...] no Presbyterian minister is thought the worse of for hailing from the North of Ireland'.<sup>235</sup> However, as with the Catholic mission, it was yet another factor which may have impacted negatively on efforts to meet the spiritual needs of emigrants.

In the end, then, the efforts of each of the three churches to respond to reports of mass apostasy, however exaggerated they may sometimes have been, and to reasonable pleas for spiritual aid on the part of emigrants themselves were incomplete. This was inevitably so, given the scale of the problem. To suggest that there were often

outstanding individuals initiating and carrying out these efforts, or that more could have been achieved with greater financial or moral support seems in some respects redundant; these truisms tend to apply to any similarly Herculean task. Yet, at the same time, it seems fair to surmise that, for all the rhetoric, aside from the driven likes of John Hand or William McClure there was a notable failure to accept serious responsibility for emigrants' religious welfare on the part of the churches that they were leaving behind. That applied both to the levels of financial support and to the standard of clerical personnel they deigned to send. In fact, as we have seen, any urgency that was attached to emigrant missions was often of precisely the wrong kind, bordering on undue, and ultimately, perhaps, self-defeating haste.

### Notes

- 1 The title's biblical quotation (Matthew, 9:36) is taken from the King James translation, and differs slightly from the Catholic (Douay) version: 'distressed and lying like sheep that have no shepherd'. Both Protestant and Catholic clerics nonetheless made use of their preferred form when speaking specifically of spiritually-deprived emigrants. Thomas Rawlings, *Emigration: An Address to the Clergy of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales on the Condition of the Working Classes, with a few Suggestions as to their Future Welfare* (Liverpool, 1846), p. 7; *All Hallows Second Annual Report* (1849), 22; M.G.A. (1848), 701; Anon, 'Colonial scheme of the Church of Scotland' in *McComb's Presbyterian Almanack and Christian Remembrancer* (1843), 85.
- 2 W.T., 12 Aug. 1854, 19 Aug. 1854; Tyler Anbinder, *Nativism and Slavery: The Northern Know Nothings and the Politics of the 1850's* (Oxford, 1992), p. 12.
- 3 Brian P. Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism: Lay Voluntary Associations and the Creation of an Irish-Catholic Community in Toronto 1850-1895* (London, 1993), p. 35.
- 4 Griffin, *The People with No Name*, p. 91.
- 5 Miller *et al.*, *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan*, p. 436; Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles*, pp. 158-9.
- 6 Miller *et al.*, *Irish Immigrants in the Land of Canaan*, p. 381. One later example is Thomas Clark of Ballybay, Co. Monaghan, who led 300 families from his congregation to the new world in 1764. I. R. McBride, *Scripture Politics: Ulster Presbyterians and Irish Radicalism in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1998), p. 115.
- 7 Griffin, *The People with No Name*, p. 158; An Orthodox Presbyterian, 'Thoughts on missions' in *Orthodox Presbyterian*, i:5 (Feb. 1830), 161-9.

- 8 Jay P. Dolan, *In Search of an American Catholicism: A History of Religion and Culture in Tension* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 14–15.
- 9 ‘Report of the committee appointed by the Catholic Association, 1824’ in Edmund Curtis and R. B. McDowell (eds), *Irish Historical Documents, 1172–1922* (Cork, 1968), pp. 243–7.
- 10 Fergus O’Ferrall, “‘The only lever...’? The Catholic priest in Irish politics, 1823–29’ in *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, lxx:280 (Winter 1981), 310; *F.J.*, 16 Feb. 1824; Michael Keyes, *Funding the Nation. Money and Nationalist Politics in Nineteenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2011), p. 15.
- 11 Thompson, *Into all Lands*, p. 15; Thomas McDonald, ‘The Church overseas’ in Michael Hurley (ed.), *Irish Anglicanism, 1869–1969: Essays on the Role of Anglicanism in Irish Life presented to the Church of Ireland on the Occasion of the Centenary of its Disestablishment by a Group of Methodist, Presbyterian, Quaker and Roman Catholic Scholars* (Dublin, 1970), p. 93.
- 12 Audrey Lockhart, *Some Aspects of Emigration from Ireland to the North American Colonies between 1660 and 1775* (New York, 1976), p. 32.
- 13 Daniel O’Connor and others, *Three Centuries of Mission: the United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel 1701–2000* (London, 2000), pp. 28–9, as cited in W. J. Marshall, ‘Irish clergy abroad’ in Toby Barnard and W. G. Neely (eds), *The Clergy of the Church of Ireland 1000–2000: Messengers, Watchmen and Stewards* (Dublin, 2006), p. 263.
- 14 Donald Harman Akenson, *The Church of Ireland: Ecclesiastical Reform and Revolution, 1800–1885* (London, 1971), pp. 120–1. It ought to be noted that American independence did not help matters for the S.P.G., nor did the wider challenge posed by the foundation of its evangelical rival, the Church Missionary Society, in 1814.
- 15 Anon., ‘Missions of the United States’ in *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, i:5 (Sept. 1838), 289–92.
- 16 *F.J.*, 28 Feb. 1833, 20 May 1833.
- 17 John England to O’Connell, 4 Oct. 1823 in O’Connell, *The Correspondence of Daniel O’Connell*, ii, p. 512.
- 18 Guilday, *Life of John England*, ii, p. 362.
- 19 *Ibid.*, i, p. 527; See also Ignatius Murphy, *The Diocese of Killaloe 1850–1914* (Dublin, 1995), pp. 357–8.
- 20 William Bernard Ullathorne, vicar-general of New South Wales visited Ireland in search of priests in 1837. William Bernard Ullathorne, *From Cabin-Boy to Archbishop: The Autobiography of Archbishop Ullathorne* (London, 1941), pp. 99–100. His bishop, John Bede Polding of Sydney, led seven Maynooth graduates back to Australia in 1838. Patrick J. Corish, *Maynooth College, 1795–1995* (Dublin, 1995), p. 96. Michael O’Connor, Bishop of Pittsburgh, visited Maynooth to acquire priests in 1843. I.C.R.A., Cullen Supplements, CUL/OCO/31, letter from O’Connor to Cullen, 1 Sept. 1843.

- 21 Robert Boyd, 'The American Church' in *Orthodox Presbyterian*, v:52 (Jan. 1834), 146. The phrasing here refers to Psalm 137, 'By the rivers of Babylon...', which speaks of the difficulties of expressing one's faith in exile.
- 22 A. H. Wright, 'Emigration to North America' in *McComb's Presbyterian Almanack* (1846), 87; 'Episcopos', 'Episcopacy in America' in *Christian Freeman*, iii:29 (Mar. 1835), 171.
- 23 *B.N.L.*, 9 July 1839; Lindsay Proudfoot, 'Place and Presbyterian discourse in colonial Australia' in Lindsay J. Proudfoot and Michael M. Roche (eds) *(Dis)Placing Empire: Renegotiating British Colonial Geographies* (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 72–3.
- 24 The bulk of the correspondence consulted for this section comprises the c.3,500 letters, mainly from Ulster emigrants to North America, on the original Centre for Migration Studies' Irish Emigration Database (I.E.D.), now digitised at [www.dippam.ac.uk](http://www.dippam.ac.uk). Only a fraction of these letters mention religion or church-going in any depth. Some of the originals of these letters are held in the Centre for Migration Studies and some remain in private hands, in which cases the document number from the I.E.D. database has been used as the reference. Those letters located in P.R.O.N.I. have been footnoted according to their P.R.O.N.I. references.
- 25 I.E.D., Fitzgerald letters, 9601014, letter from Patrick Fitzgerald to Michael Cahill, 22 Nov. 1846.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 9511085, letter from Eliza Fitzgerald to Michael Cahill, 4 Dec. 1845.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 9601014, letter from Patrick Fitzgerald to Michael Cahill, 22 Nov. 1846.
- 28 P.R.O.N.I., Park and Quin papers, D/1819/8, letter from Arthur Quin to siblings, 18 Sept. 1876.
- 29 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, LRO/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Andrew Byrne to John Hand, 19 Oct. 1845; *Ibid.*, LRO/2: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Byrne to Hand, 3 Apr. 1846.
- 30 F. X. Gartland of Savannah, for example, noted that he had only nine priests in his diocese which incorporated the whole of the state of Georgia and the greater part of Florida. A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, SAV/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Gartland to A.H.C., 16 Mar. 1851.
- 31 P.R.O.N.I., Clogher Diocesan Records, DIO(RC)1/11B/2, Diary of Rev. Dr James Donnelly, written during a fundraising trip in America, 1852–53.
- 32 On Australia, see Fitzpatrick, *Oceans of Consolation, passim*; Fitzpatrick, 'Beloved country', p. 335.
- 33 P.R.O.N.I., Crawford emigrant papers, T/2338/1, letter from Gamble Crawford to brother, 26 Mar. 1860.
- 34 I.E.D., Smyth letters, 0401004, letter from James Smyth to Bella M. Smyth 19 Oct. 1901.

- 35 *Ibid.*, 0410201, letter from Mary Smyth to L. C. Smyth, 30 Sept. 1902.
- 36 P.R.O.N.I., Greer, Hamilton and Gailey papers, D1835/27/2/2, letter from Mary Adams to William Stavely, 17 Feb. 1818.
- 37 P.R.O.N.I., William John Campbell Allen papers, D1558/1/1/11, letter from Mary Ann Blair to Jane Allen, 25 Sept. 1847.
- 38 P.R.O.N.I., Clay family emigrant correspondence, T1480/2, letter from John Henry to Mrs John Henry, 15 Nov. 1867.
- 39 P.R.O.N.I., R. H. Elliott papers, T3032/1/1, letter from Henry Coulter to William Moreland, 14 June 1820.
- 40 P.R.O.N.I., Aiken McClelland papers, T2046/5, letter from Andrew Greenlees to his brother, 10 Mar. 1854.
- 41 P.R.O.N.I., Armour genealogical papers, D1792/E, Alex McLeod to William Stavely, 6 Dec. 1816.
- 42 *Ibid.*, D1792E, letter from McLeod to Stavely, 24 Feb. 1818.
- 43 Doyle, *Hints*, pp. 77–8.
- 44 T[homas] Radcliff (ed.), *Authentic Letters from Upper Canada; With an Account of Canadian Field Sports by T. W. McGrath esq.* (Dublin, 1833), p. 142., pp. 187–8., p. 202.
- 45 P.R.O.N.I., Kirkpatrick papers, D1424/11, letter from Thomas Kirkpatrick to Rev. G. Kirkpatrick, 3 Mar. 1825.
- 46 Buckley, *Diary*, pp. 245–6.
- 47 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, OTT/22: microfilm, N.L.L., p. 2849–51, letter from Fr Stenson, Ottawa to Fr William Fortune, 1873.
- 48 *Ibid.*, JNFD/25: microfilm, N.L.L., p. 2849–51, letter from T. Power to Fortune, 30 July 1873.
- 49 *Ibid.*, DET/1: microfilm, N.L.L., p. 2782, letter from Patrick Tierney to A.H.C., Mar. 1875.
- 50 I.E.D., Neill papers, 0611002, letter from Henry Neill to Samuel Neill, 16 Oct. 1839.
- 51 P.R.O.N.I., Hall papers, D2041/Bundle 13, letter from Maggie Black to Susan Hall, 25 June 1890.
- 52 ‘Peregrinus,’ ‘The falling off of Irish Catholics in the United States,’ 436. The choice of pseudonym is instructive: ancient Irish missionaries termed themselves ‘*peregrinatio religiosa*’ or ‘*peregrinatio pro Christo*’, that is, religious exile or exile for Christ, signifying a deliberately chosen expatriation in the service of Jesus. Daniel Murphy, *A History of Irish Emigrant and Missionary Education* (Dublin, 2000), p. 54.
- 53 Buckley, *Diary*, p. 219.
- 54 ‘Peregrinus,’ ‘The falling off of Irish Catholics in the United States,’ 436.
- 55 John McDevitt, *Father Hand: Founder of All Hallows College for the Foreign Missions, The Story of a Great Servant of God* (Dublin, 1885), pp. 9–10.
- 56 James Morgan, *Recollections of my Life and Times: an Autobiography with*

- Selections from his Journal edited by his Son* (Belfast, 1874), p. 56; *B.N.L.*, 12 June, 1894.
- 57 R. J. O'Neill, *Ireland: Her Monks at Home and Abroad, A Lecture delivered to St Nicholas's Young Men's Society, Liverpool* (Liverpool, 18[83?]); Thomas Nicholas Burke, *Lectures on Faith and Fatherland* (Glasgow, [1874]); R. W. Buckley, D.D., *Saint Patrick, Apostle of Ireland and Missionary A.D. 441 to A.D. 493: The Substance of a Sermon preached in St Paul's Church, Dublin, on Sunday, March 17th, 1878 in aid of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (Dublin, 1879); William Thomas Latimer, *A History of the Irish Presbyterians* (Belfast, 1902), pp. 1–19.
- 58 Hogan, *Irish Missionary Movement*, pp. 25–51; Andrew Holmes, 'The shaping of Irish Presbyterian attitudes to mission, 1790–1840' in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, lvii:4 (Oct. 2006), 720.
- 59 Porter, *Religion Versus Empire?*, p. 160.
- 60 *Ibid.*; *B.N.L.*, 19 Oct. 1867.
- 61 *F.J.*, 15 Nov. 1843.
- 62 *B.N.L.*, 17 Mar. 1854.
- 63 Anon., 'Our Home Mission – its nature and its claims' in *Presbyterian Magazine*, i (Nov. 1859), 265.
- 64 Samuel Hinds, *The Speech of the Rev. Dr Hinds (now Lord Bishop of Norwich) at a Meeting of the Dublin University Branch of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 13th December, 1846* (Dublin, 1850), p. 3.
- 65 Patrick Comerford, 'Success or failure?: Church of Ireland overseas missions', based on a lecture given at N.U.I. Maynooth, 3 March, 2008 <http://revpatrickcomerford.blogspot.com/2008/03/success-or-failure-church-of-ireland.html> (accessed 22 Aug. 2012). Among such works are, for the Church of Ireland, Harry Vere White, *Children of St Columba: A Sketch of the History, at Home and Abroad, of the Irish Auxiliary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (Dublin, 1914); F. E. Bland, *How the Church Missionary Society came to Ireland* (Dublin, 1935); H. M. Harriss, *Outward and Onward: Ireland and S.P.G., 1714–1964* (Dublin, 1964); Jack Hodgins, *Sister Island: A History of the Church Missionary Society in Ireland 1814–1994* (Belfast, 1994); for the Presbyterian Church, Godfrey Brown, 'The Colonial Mission' in Jack Thompson (ed.), *Into all the World: A History of 150 years of the Overseas Work of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland* (Belfast, 1990), pp. 163–73; and for the Catholic Church, Kevin Condon, *The Missionary College of All Hallows, 1842–1891* (Dublin, 1986).
- 66 Patrick O'Farrell, *Vanished Kingdoms: Irish in Australia and New Zealand, A Personal Excursion* (Sydney, 1990), p. 117.
- 67 Guilday, *Life of John England*, i, pp. 521–2.
- 68 I.C.R.A., Cullen Supplements, CUL/AME/22, letter from Francis Kenrick to Cullen, 20 Mar, 1834.

- 69 Guilday, *Life of John England*, i, p. 536.
- 70 Corish, *Maynooth College*, p. 96; I.C.R.A., Cullen papers, CUL/1840/575, letter from Miles Gaffney to Cullen, 2 Feb. 1840.
- 71 Ullathorne, *Cabin-boy to Archbishop*, pp. 99–100. This is a more faithful version of the original manuscript source than that produced by the ‘pious editress’ A. T. Drane in 1892 and quoted by Larkin. Emmet Larkin, ‘The beginning of the Irish effort to provide for the Roman Catholic Foreign Missions before the Famine’ in Tom Dunne and Laurence M. Geary (eds), *History and the Public Sphere: Essays in Honour of John A. Murphy* (Cork, 2005), pp. 83–99.
- 72 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 47.
- 73 Christy O’Dwyer, ‘“The beleaguered fortress”, St Patrick’s College, Thurles, 1837–1988’ in William Corbett and William Nolan (eds), *Thurles: The Cathedral Town: Essays in Honour of Archbishop Thomas Morris* (Dublin, 1989), p. 239; Thurles did not, however, begin producing missionary priests in numbers until the 1870s, *Ibid.*, p. 243.
- 74 C.D.A., Slattery papers, 1842/26: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 6001, letter from Crotty to Slattery, 13 Nov. 1842; *Ibid.*, 1842/27: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 6001, letter from Murphy to Slattery, 1842.
- 75 John Curry, *All Hallows College, Dublin and its Founder* (Dublin, 1900); MacDevitt, *Father Hand*.
- 76 Condon, *All Hallows*, pp. 11–14.
- 77 MacDevitt, *Father Hand*, pp. 101–28; Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 70.
- 78 *Battersby’s Registry for the Catholic World* (1846), 572–3.
- 79 I.C.R.A., Cullen papers, CUL/1841/678, letter from Kirby to Cullen, 20 Sept. 1841.
- 80 *Ibid.*, CUL/1841/700, letter from Thomas Cullen to Cullen, 24 Dec. 1841.
- 81 I.C.R.A., Kirby papers, KIR/1842/106, letter from Cullen to Kirby, 27 July 1842; I.C.R.A., Cullen papers, CUL/1845/1080, letter from Michael O’Sullivan to Cullen, 30 Aug. 1845.
- 82 *Ibid.*; Larkin notes that Foley became preoccupied with some apparent cases of stigmata among the young women in the adjoining refuge, to the damage of his reputation, and the college went into terminal decline. Larkin, ‘The beginning of Roman Catholic Foreign Missions’, pp. 83–99.
- 83 William Purcell, ‘Father Hand (1807–1846)’ in *I.E.R.*, 5th series, lx (Dec. 1942), 415; I.C.R.A., Kirby papers, KIR/1842/106, letter from Cullen to Kirby, 27 July 1842.
- 84 I.C.R.A., Cullen papers, CUL/1842/720, letter from Murray to Cullen, 19 Mar. 1842.
- 85 *Ibid.*, CUL/1842/733, letter from Murray to Cullen, 11 June 1842.
- 86 Purcell, ‘Father Hand’, p. 343.
- 87 C.D.A., Slattery papers, 1842/26: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 6001, letter from Crotty to Slattery, 13 Nov. 1842.

- 88 Condon, *All Hallows*, pp. 76–8.
- 89 Anon., ‘First foreign missionary from the Ulster Presbyterians’ in *Orthodox Presbyterian*, i:3 (Dec. 1829), 98.
- 90 Orthodox Presbyterian, ‘Thoughts on missions’, *Ibid.*, i:5 (Feb. 1830), 161–9; An Orthodox Presbyterian, ‘Presbyterian missions’, *Ibid.*, ii:13 (Oct. 1830), 21.
- 91 Thomas Leslie is accepted to have been the first Synod of Ulster minister to serve overseas as a foreign missionary, going to Jamaica in 1835 with the Scottish Missionary Society. Bill Addley, ‘Irish Presbyterian attitudes to mission before 1840’ in Thompson, *Into all the World*, p. 21.
- 92 Don Chambers, ‘The Kirk and the Colonies in the early 19th century’ in *Historical Studies* [Australia], xvi:64 (1975), 381–401.
- 93 Anon., ‘Scottish Missionary Society’ in *Orthodox Presbyterian*, ii:22 (July 1831), 357–9.
- 94 Chambers notes several examples of this kind of reasoning among moderates in the Church of Scotland. Chambers, ‘The Kirk and the Colonies’, 399. Chapter four below explores similar thinking in the Irish church.
- 95 *B.N.L.*, 31 Aug. 1838.
- 96 *B.N.L.*, 18 Mar. 1842.
- 97 *M.G.A.* (1846), 488.
- 98 *M.G.A.* (1847), 592.
- 99 *B.N.L.*, 15 Aug. 1848.
- 100 *B.N.L.*, 11 Sept. 1840.
- 101 *B.N.L.*, 29 Sept. 1848. Mant also chaired S.P.G. meetings in Ballymena and Coleraine on successive days, his ‘last labours’ before illness overtook him. Richard Mant, *Memoirs of the Right Reverend Richard Mant, Lord Bishop of Down and Connor, and of Dromore* (Dublin, 1857), p. 462.
- 102 Robert Knox, *A Charge Delivered in the Primary Visitation of the Dioceses of Down and Connor, and Dromore, in September, 1850* (Dublin, 1850), p. 19.
- 103 Joseph Hardwick, *An Anglican British World: The Church of England and the Settler Empire, c. 1790–1860* (Manchester University Press, 2014), ch. 5.
- 104 *John Bull*, 28 Oct. 1839.
- 105 Samuel Hinds, *Speech of Dr Hinds... 13th December, 1846*; Samuel Hinds, *Speech delivered at a Meeting of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel held in Dublin in the Autumn of 1847* (Dublin, 1849); *Derby Mercury*, 17 Nov. 1847; Anon., *Report of the Dublin and Kildare Diocesan Auxiliary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts for the years 1849 and 1850* (Dublin, 1851).
- 106 Hodgins, *Sister Island*, pp. 30–47.
- 107 *B.N.L.*, 22 Feb. 1854, 19 May 1854.

- 108 Anon., *Financial Report of the Irish Auxiliary to the Colonial and Continental Church Society for supplying Clergymen, Catechists, and Teachers to the Colonies of Great Britain, and to British Sojourners on the Continent for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December, 1870* (Dublin, 1871), p. 7.
- 109 On the continental background to Irish Catholic missionary endeavours, see Hogan, *Irish Missionary Movement*, pp. 55–90.
- 110 *B.N.L.*, 29 Sept. 1848.
- 111 *B.N.L.*, 22 Feb. 1854.
- 112 Hinds, *Speech delivered at a Meeting of the S.P.G...1847*, p. 6; see also Rowan Strong, *Anglicanism and the British Empire, c. 1700–1850* (Oxford, 2007), p. 285.
- 113 *M.H.* (1853), 2085; See also *Orthodox Presbyterian*, vii:73 (1836), 210.
- 114 *M.H.* (1862), 67.
- 115 *M.H.* (1858), 50–1.
- 116 *Fifth Annual Report of All Hallows* (1852–3), pp. 4–5. It should also be noted that the *Freeman's Journal* regularly printed reports of S.P.G. meetings – perhaps a case of keeping an eye on ‘the other side’.
- 117 *Sixth Annual Report of All Hallows* (1854), 15.
- 118 *Fourth Annual Report of All Hallows* (1851), 34–5.
- 119 Up until the 1830s, the S.P.G. received a direct grant from Westminster. Porter, *Religion Versus Empire?*, p. 158. In Canada up to 1840 the Anglican Church was endowed with tracts of land known as ‘clergy reserves’; after that date, under pressure from the Church of Scotland, the net of those who benefited from these reserves was widened, but they were discontinued in 1854, not long after they had actually begun turning a profit for the churches. Robert Choquette, *Canada's Religions: An Historical Introduction* (Ottawa, 2004), pp. 220–2. In some Australian colonies, meanwhile, the colonial authorities began giving stipends to ministers of religion – regardless of their denomination – in the late 1830s, but owing to budgetary constraints these were capped in 1842. Ian Breward, *A History of the Churches in Australasia* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 72–5. This meant that the stipends were often not sufficient to allow the minister an adequate living. Proudfoot, ‘Place and Presbyterian discourse in colonial Australia’, pp. 70–1.
- 120 *M.H.* (1872), 624; *M.H.* (1887), 178.
- 121 Holmes, ‘The shaping of Irish Presbyterian attitudes to mission’, 728.
- 122 *M.H.* (1891), 132.
- 123 *M.H.* (1864), 332.
- 124 *M.H.* (1864), 423.
- 125 Wilson, a Limerick-based minister who served twice as moderator, succeeded McClure on his sudden death in 1874; Cargin of Derry succeeded Wilson in 1890, but illness meant he lasted only until 1895, when Hamill assumed the convenorship.

- 126 M.H. (1852), 1027.
- 127 B.N.L., 18 Apr. 1889, 17 Apr. 1890.
- 128 B.N.L., 12 June 1894.
- 129 M.H. (1868), 251.
- 130 M.H. (1872), 624.
- 131 M.H. (1869), 321; M.H. (1871), 251; M.H. (1858), 15.
- 132 B.N.L., 15 Aug. 1848.
- 133 B.N.L., 10 June 1873; M.H. (1865), 647–8. ‘White unto the harvest’ is a biblical phrase (John, 4:35) used to refer to the ease with which souls might be ‘harvested’ in missionary work.
- 134 W. P. Adley, ‘A study of the birth and development of the overseas missions of the Presbyterian church in Ireland up to 1910’ (PhD thesis, QUB, 1994), p. 3.
- 135 M.H. (1884), 257–8.
- 136 Holmes, ‘The shaping of Irish Presbyterian attitudes to mission’, 711–37.
- 137 P. M. Pollock. ‘Mission work in Canada’ in *Presbyterian Churchman* (July, 1883), 155.
- 138 Hely Hutchinson Smith, *Reasons Why Evangelicals should not Support the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (London, 1883); Hinds, *Speech of Hinds... 13th December, 1846*, p. 5; B.N.L., 12 July 1854; Richard Whately, *Thoughts on Christian Moral-Instruction: The Necessity, and the Mode of imparting it. A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Dublin, Glendalagh, and Kildare, at the Visitation in June and July, 1854* (Dublin, 1854), pp. 41–2. Whately, as he intimated in the above charge, rejected such allegations from a strong position, his edited book *Cautions for the Times* having been a key anti-ritualist text. Richard Whately (ed.), *Cautions for the Times* (London, 1853).
- 139 Akenson suggests that ‘Ireland was untouched by the Oxford Movement’. Akenson, *The Church of Ireland*, p. 207. Peter Nockles has, however, qualified this somewhat, showing that an influential, if decreasing, high-church element continued to exist in Ireland even as evangelicals were in the ascendant. Peter Nockles, ‘Church or Protestant sect?: The Church of Ireland, high churchmanship, and the Oxford movement, 1822–1869’ in *The Historical Journal*, xli:2 (June 1998), 457–93. See also Nigel Yates, *Anglican Ritualism in Victorian Britain 1830–1910* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 137–43.
- 140 B.N.L., 19 Oct. 1859.
- 141 Anon., *Dublin and Kildare S.P.G.*, p. 3; Anon., *Financial Report of the Irish Auxiliary to the Colonial and Continental Church Society for supplying Clergymen, Catechists, and Teachers to the Colonies of Great Britain, and to British Sojourners on the Continent for the year ending 31st December, 1872* (Dublin, 1873), p. 13.
- 142 Whately, *Thoughts on Christian Moral-Instruction*, p. 41.

- 143 *Irish Church Directory* (1874), 253; A note on numbers: according to Alan Acheson, 106 Irish clergy were sent overseas by the S.P.G. between 1824 and 1870, including 67 to Canada and 19 to Australia; Acheson, *History of the Church of Ireland*, p. 185.
- 144 By the end of the century, some 1,500 priests had graduated from All Hallows to destinations across the world. Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 144.
- 145 These included a series of advertisements headlined 'Priests for the emigrants' which appeared in the *Freeman's Journal* in 1853. Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 165.
- 146 W.T., 8 July, 1854.
- 147 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 242.
- 148 In 1855 Kelly got permission to collect only in Boston and Baltimore. A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, BAL/2/135: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Kelly to Woodlock, 26 Sept. 1855.
- 149 D.D.A., Cullen papers, 45/3/File VI/1, letter from Woodlock to Cullen, 18 Jan. 1855.
- 150 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 269.
- 151 *Ibid.*, pp. 162–3. See note 118 above.
- 152 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, LOU/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from M. J. Spalding, Louisville to Woodlock, 25 July 1854.
- 153 Larkin, 'The beginning of Roman Catholic Foreign Missions', p. 98.
- 154 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, NOR/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Anthony Blanc to Hand, 31 Mar. 1843; *Ibid.*, PHIL/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Francis Kenrick to Hand, 18 Mar. 1844; *Ibid.*, SLO/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Peter Kenrick to Hand, 29 Mar. 1843; *Ibid.*, NAS/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Richard Miles to Hand, 20 Mar. 1843.
- 155 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, MIL/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from P. E. Moriarty to Hand, July 1845; *Ibid.*, VIN/8: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Celestine de la Hailandiere to Hand, 26 Oct. 1845; *Ibid.*, DUB/2: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Mathias Loras to Hand, 10 June 1846; *Ibid.*, RCH/3: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Richard Whelan to Hand, 23 Oct. 1845.
- 156 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, DUB/22: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Clement Smyth to Woodlock, 9 Feb. 1863; *Ibid.*, HAR/53: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Francis McFarland to Woodlock, 16 June 1864.
- 157 'Address of the central committee of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith' in *Battersby's Registry for the Catholic World* (1853), 159.
- 158 Condon, *All Hallows*, pp. 165–6.
- 159 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, HART/12: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from John Brady to Moriarty, 10 Mar. 1848.

- 160 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 269.
- 161 *Ibid.*, p. 165.
- 162 *The Tablet*, 11 July 1846.
- 163 C.D.A., Slattery papers, 1842/26: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 6001, letter from Crotty to Slattery, 13 Nov. 1842.
- 164 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, GAL/3: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Jean Marie Odin to Woodlock, 14 May 1860.
- 165 *Ibid.*, RCH/ 3: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Whelan to Hand, 23 Oct. 1845.
- 166 Roger Wynne, 'New South Wales' in *Capuchin Annual*, 26 (1959), 299–300.
- 167 Anthony Cleary, 'All Hallows in Victoria' in *Ibid.*, 294.
- 168 *Annals of All Hallows* (1863), 79.
- 169 Kevin Condon, 'United States of America' in *Capuchin Annual*, 26 (1959), 315.
- 170 William L. Smith, *Irish Priests in the United States: A Vanishing Sub-Culture* (Oxford, 2004), p. 60; *Second Annual Report of All Hallows* (1850), p. 5; John O'Brien [Patrick Joseph Hartigan], *The Men of '38 and Other Pioneer Priests*, ed. T. J. Linane and F. A. Mecham (London, 1975), p. 77; Smith, *Irish Priests in the United States*, pp. 60–1.
- 171 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, KST/2: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Patrick Phelan to Fr O'Brien, 1 Feb. 1848; *Ibid.*, TOR/1: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from Michael Power to Woodlock, 17 June 1847.
- 172 As well as several thousand Irish immigrants, five Catholic priests and two Anglican clergymen died from typhus at Grosse Île; a further ten contracted the disease but recovered. Coleman, *Passage to America*, pp. 150–1.
- 173 Mrs Jerome Mercier, *Father Pat: A Hero of the Far West*, [no pagination] (Gloucester, 1909) available at Project Canterbury, <http://anglicanhistory.org/canada/fatherpat.html>. (accessed 10 Apr. 2009).
- 174 Mercier, *Father Pat*.
- 175 Marshall, 'Irish clergy abroad', p. 271.
- 176 A. E. David, *Handbooks of English Church Expansion: Australia* (London, 1908), p. 59 available at Project Canterbury, <http://anglicanhistory.org/aus/aedavid1908/04.html> (accessed 10 Apr. 2009).
- 177 'Setting out on foot in 1855, he made a tour of 3,500 miles' H. E. King, *Australia* (London, 1935), p. 39 cited in Marshall, *Irish Clergy Abroad*, p. 271; 'In six months he had travelled on horseback 2000 miles.' Edward Symonds, *The Story of the Australian Church* (London, 1898), p. 74 available at Project Canterbury, <http://anglicanhistory.org/aus/symonds1898/> (accessed 10 Apr. 2009).

- 178 Anon., *Financial Report of the Irish Auxiliary to the Colonial and Continental Church Society ... year ending 31st December, 1872* (Dublin, 1873), p. 7.
- 179 M.H. (1871), 498.
- 180 *Ibid.*, 484.
- 181 M.H. (1873), 84.
- 182 M.H. (1871), 251.
- 183 *Banner of Ulster*, 29 July 1862.
- 184 Edwards, 'The Irish priest in North America', p. 332.
- 185 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, BO/23: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from James Healy to Woodlock, 12 July 1860; *Ibid.*, RCH/21: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Whelan to Woodlock, 23 Mar. 1857.
- 186 Donna Merwick, *Boston Priests, 1848–1910 A Study of Social and Intellectual Change* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), p. 10; Graham Greene, *The Power and the Glory* (London, 1940); See also Clarke, *Piety and Nationalism*, pp. 36–7. The phenomenon of 'the drunken priest' in Irish folk memory has also been discussed in Lawrence J. Taylor, *Occasions of Faith: An Anthropology of Irish Catholics* (Dublin, 1995), pp. 145–66.
- 187 Richard Howley, 'Reminiscences of All Hallows' College' in *I.E.R.*, 3rd series, xiii (Dec. 1892), 1125.
- 188 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 276.
- 189 David McRoberts, 'The restoration of the Scottish hierarchy in 1878' in David McRoberts (ed.), *Modern Scottish Catholicism 1878–1978* (Glasgow, 1978), p. 11.
- 190 Ruth-Ann Harris, *The Nearest Place that wasn't Ireland: Early Nineteenth Century Irish Labor Migration* (Ames, Iowa, 1994), p. 167.
- 191 Moriarty was introduced to Gavan Duffy in the offices of *The Nation* in 1845. Charles Gavan Duffy, *My Life in Two Hemispheres* (2 vols, London, 1898), i, p. 217; Charles Gavan Duffy, *Young Ireland: A Fragment of History* (London, 1880), p. 27.
- 192 I.C.R.A., Kirby papers, KIR/1849/623, letter from Moriarty to Kirby, 20 Apr. 1849.
- 193 The description comes from Oliver P. Rafferty, *The Church, the State and the Fenian Threat 1861–75* (Basingstoke, 1999), p. 127. Moriarty had said that 'eternity [was] not long enough, nor hell hot enough' for the Fenians.
- 194 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 138; O'Farrell, *Vanished Kingdoms*, p. 98. I.C.R.A., Kirby papers, KIR/1872/74, letter from Moran to Kirby, 21 Mar. 1872.
- 195 John Curry, 'All Hallows' College' in *I.E.R.*, 3rd series, xiii (Oct. 1892), 874–85.
- 196 Curry, *All Hallows' College*, p. 17.
- 197 Murphy, *History of Irish Emigrant and Missionary Education*, p. 373.
- 198 See Condon, *All Hallows*, pp. 167–90.

- 199 Fr Timoney, 'New Zealand' in *Capuchin Annual*, 26 (1960), 309.
- 200 Vincent J. McNally, *The Lord's Distant Vineyard: A History of the Oblates and the Catholic Community in British Columbia* (Edmonton, 2000), p. 192.
- 201 C.D.A., Leahy papers, 1867/26: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 6001, letter from McCloskey to Leahy, 1867.
- 202 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 209, p. 251.
- 203 D.D.A., Cullen papers, CUL/43/3/3, letter from Woodlock to Cullen, 6 Mar. 1855.
- 204 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 138.
- 205 Oliver P. Rafferty, 'The Catholic Church, Ireland and the British Empire 1800–1921' in *Historical Research*, lxxxiv:224 (May 2011), 288–309.
- 206 A.H.C., Overseas Missionary Correspondence, DUB/20: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Smyth to Woodlock, 22 Oct. 1860.
- 207 *Ibid.*, NEW/16: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from James Bayley to Woodlock, 29 Feb. 1860; *Ibid.*, NEW/19: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Bayley to Woodlock, 23 Oct. 1860.
- 208 *Ibid.*, HAL/17: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2849–51, letter from William Walsh to Woodlock, 13 Feb. 1848; *Ibid.*, PIT/3: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from John Andre to Moriarty, 4 Aug. 1853.
- 209 *Ibid.*, SAV/6: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Gartland to All Hallows, 15 Mar. 1854.
- 210 *Ibid.*, VIN/4: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Hailandiere to Hand, 5 Feb. 1844; *Ibid.*, DUB/3: microfilm, N.L.I., p. 2782, letter from Loras to Moriarty, 5 Nov. 1847.
- 211 Moriarty to Woodlock, 8 Mar. 1859, cited in Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 89.
- 212 Curry, *All Hallows College*, p. 22.
- 213 David Moriarty, *Allocutions to the Clergy and Pastorals*, ed. A. Griffin and J. Coffey (Dublin, 1884), pp. 182–3.
- 214 Curry, *All Hallows College*, p. 22.
- 215 O'Farrell, *Vanished Kingdoms*, p. 98.
- 216 Corish, *Maynooth College*, pp. 39–40.
- 217 Patrick Murray, 'Missionary priests of All Hallows College, Dublin, from the Archdiocese of Armagh, 1842–75' in *Seanchas Ardmhaca: Journal of the Armagh Diocesan Historical Society*, i:2 (1955), 96.
- 218 Condon, *All Hallows*, p. 149.
- 219 Jeremiah Cummings, 'Our future clergy: an inquiry into vocations to the priesthood in the United States' in *Brownson's Quarterly Review*, i:4 (Oct. 1860), 506. This article provoked controversy in the US and Ireland. See Thomas T. McAvoy, 'Orestes A. Brownson and John Hughes in 1860' in *The Review of Politics*, xxiv:1 (Jan. 1962), 19–47; Henry L. Walsh, *Hallowed Were the Gold Dust Trails: The Story of the Pioneer Priests of Northern California* (Santa Clara, 1946), p. 39.

- 220 W. T. Latimer, *A History of First Ballynanty Presbyterian Church* (Belfast, 1915), p. 8.
- 221 *M.H.* (1853), 2085.
- 222 *M.H.* (1862), 67; *M.H.* (1868), 202.
- 223 *M.H.* (1868), 201.
- 224 *M.H.* (1875), 521.
- 225 *B.N.L.*, 7 June 1877.
- 226 *B.N.L.*, 11 July 1861; *M.H.* (1861), 822.
- 227 *M.H.* (1858), 51.
- 228 *B.N.L.*, 12 July 1866.
- 229 *M.H.* (1872), 624.
- 230 Edward Marcus Dill, *The Mystery Solved: Or Ireland's Miseries: The Grand Cause and Cure* (Edinburgh, 1852), p. 19.
- 231 MacKenzie, *The Emigrants' Guide*, p. 54.
- 232 *M.H.* (1884), 268.
- 233 *M.H.* (1869), 266.
- 234 *M.H.* (1869), 439.
- 235 *M.H.* (1872), 706.