

ALFRED C. RUSH

SAINT JOHN NEUMANN AND
THE AMERICAN COLLEGE IN ROME

It is a fact of history that the American College in Rome has found its historian. In 1955, if one counts the formative years from 1855 to 1859, that institution had a hundred years of history. To commemorate this centenary, Robert F. McNamara published his richly-documented study¹. Prior to that, readers depended on the account published by Henry A. Brann in 1910². Brann's work had its own style and flavor. Cardinal Edward Mooney wrote: « Monsignor Brann's work has served us well for nearly fifty years. Written on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee of the College, it is a rich source book which has preserved many documents of great interest, as well as many delightfully chatty and informal remi-

Abbreviations

- AAB = Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore
AANY = Archives of the Archdiocese of New York
ABPR = Archives of the Baltimore Province of the Redemptorists, Brooklyn, N.Y.
ACUA = Archives of The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
APF = Archivio della S. Congregazione de Propaganda Fide, Roma.
— Acta = Acta Sacrae Congregationis
— LDB = Lettere e Decreti della Sacra Congregazione e Biglietti di Monsignor Segretario
— SOCG = Scritture originali riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali
— SRC AC = Scritture riferite nei Congressi. America Centrale, dal Canada all'Istmo di Panama
— Udienze = Udienze di Nostro Signore
CL = *Collectio Lacensis. Acta et decreta conciliorum recentiorum usque ad 1870*, ed. G. Schneeman SJ, 7 vols., Freiburg 1870-1890
KFC = *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, ed. Francis Tourcher OSA, Philadelphia 1920
Mansi = *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. J. Mansi — J. Martin - L. Petit, 53 tomes in 59 vols, Paris 1901-1927

¹ Robert F. McNamara, *The American College in Rome, 1855-1955*, Rochester, N.Y. 1956. This will be referred to as *American College*.

² Henry A. Brann, *History of the American College of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, Rome, Italy*, New York 1910.

niscences that reflect the tenor of seminary life in earlier days ». He then goes on to speak of the need of McNamara's « thorough historical study », a study that is « set forth » in « uniform style and treatment »³. An important addition was given to American College research in 1960 when James F. Connelly published his study on the visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States and translated this report that played such a large part in making the college a reality⁴. To concentrate on the formative years of the college — with which this article is concerned — it seems that, because of the depth and substance of the research already done, all that one can now do is to shed some light on this or that event, on this or that person. The purpose of these pages is to study the literature, printed sources and archival material to learn a little more about Saint John Neumann, C.S.S.R., Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia, and the American College in Rome.

By way of background — to lead up to Bishop Neumann — some well-known facts must be mentioned. The founder of the American College in Rome is Pope Pius IX. It was he who encouraged the American bishops and made them realize that his wish for the college was much more than wishful thinking⁵. However, the plan to have an American College in Rome came from the Italian archbishop, Gaetano Bedini. He conceived the idea during his visit to America in the latter half of 1853 and the early days of 1854. The idea became a conviction. He outlined his plan to Archbishop John Baptist Purcell of Cincinnati and to other American bishops and prelates. After arriving in Rome in March 1854, he proposed his plan to Pius IX. The Pope listened « with great interest and approbation ». However, protocol demanded that nothing be done until Bedini had submitted his official report on his mission. In the official report, dated July 12, 1854, Bedini gave the reasons for an American College in Rome and then outlined the means to be taken to establish, maintain and administer it⁶. Bedini maintained: « The single most important thing that would satisfy every desire, achieve every purpose and would give the greatest enthusiasm to America would be the erection of an American College in Rome »⁷. One can easily understand why Archbishop Purcell spoke of the college as « the Nuncio's inspiration »⁸. Bedini was convinced of the need for such a college. There is also another reason for his interest, as is learned from Father John Virtue of England, the secretary of the Nuncio during his visit. In a letter to Archbishop John Hughes of New York, he tells him how Bedini looked mainly to two things from his visit, namely, the establishment of a Nuncio or other Representative of the Holy See at Washington and the foundation of an American

³ Edward Cardinal Mooney, *Foreword*, in McNamara, *American College*, XI.

⁴ James F. Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop Bedini to the United States, June 1853 - February 1854*, Rome 1960. This will be referred to as *Bedini Visit*.

⁵ McNamara, *American College*, 14, 16, 19, 21, 27, 35.

⁶ Connelly, *Bedini Visit*, 171-173, 243-249.

⁷ *Ibid.* 243.

⁸ See McNamara, *American College*, 15, 691, n. 7.

College at Rome. He then adds: « If these can be obtained, the mission will not certainly have been in vain »⁹. The college would be a sign of papal approval upon his mission. The papal approval was Bedini's from the very start. However, it was only after the official report had been submitted and acted upon that the Pope could make the cause his own, contact the American bishops and back their efforts or prod them on. It is only at this stage that we can begin to say something of the part of the Bishop of Philadelphia, Saint John Neumann, C.S.S.R.

I

Of Neumann's years in Philadelphia (1852-1860), the period from the later months of 1854 to the early months of 1855 has been called his « European Interlude »¹⁰. The return to Europe gave Neumann the opportunity to visit with his father, sisters and friends whom he had not seen since he landed in America in 1836¹¹. His presence in Rome offered him the opportunity of making his *ad limina* visit to the Pope. Here he gave his report on the status of the Church of Philadelphia. It was a report of zeal and progress for which he received warm praise from Rome. Pope Pius IX was anxious to meet the Redemptorist to whom he had to give a command of obedience, without any appeal or recourse, to accept the office of bishop¹². The main motivation underlying his trip to Europe at this time was the invitation of Pius IX, sent through Archbishop Francis Kenrick of Baltimore, for the bishops to come to Rome for the solemn definition of the Immaculate Conception¹³. Neumann gladly availed himself of

⁹ AANY, A-14, Virtue to Hughes, May 24, 1854, London; ACUA, HM 16, reel 4.

¹⁰ Michael Curley CSSR, *Venerable John Neumann CSSR, Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia*, Washington, D.C. 1952, 233-246. This will be referred to as *Neumann*.

¹¹ For a homey eyewitness account written by his nephew, see John Berger CSSR — Eugene Grimm CSSR, *Life of Reverend John N. Neumann CSSR*, New York 1884, 294-313. For the visit home in the bishop's letters, see ABPR, N, Rodler Papers, Neumann to his Father and Sisters, April 21, 1852, Philadelphia; Neumann to his Father, November 8, 1854, Paris; Neumann to H. Dichtl, December 17, 1854, Rome; Neumann to his Father, April 10, 1855, Philadelphia. See André Sampers CSSR, *Sechzehn Briefe Johann Nep. Neumanns aus den Jahren 1851-1858, in Budweis 1891 für den Seligsprechungsprozess gesammelt*, in *Studia Neumanniana* (Bibliotheca Historica CSSR 6), Rome 1977, 251-300.

¹² APF, SRC AC, vol. 16 (1852-1854), ff. 852r-857v. See G. Orlandi, *La diocesi di Filadelfia nella relazione di Giovanni Nep. Neumann del 16 dic. 1854*, in *Spic. Hist.* 24 (1976) 31-73.

¹³ KFC, 376. Francis Patrick Kenrick to Peter Richard Kenrick, October 8, 1854, Baltimore. This correspondence will be referred to as Kenrick to Kenrick.

the invitation¹⁴. Besides Neumann, the other American prelates who went to Rome were Archbishops Kenrick, John Hughes of New York, Anthony Blanc of New Orleans, and Bishops John Timon, C. M., of Buffalo, and Michael O'Connor of Pittsburgh¹⁵. On November 17th and on four subsequent occasions, these bishops, together with their brother bishops throughout the world, met to discuss the revision and the final wording of the dogmatic constitution, *Ineffabilis Deus*¹⁶.

The presence of American bishops in Rome towards the end of 1854 offered Pope Pius IX the perfect opportunity for bringing up the subject of the American College. Actually, it is the Pope himself who informs us that he spoke to American bishops. His words, and the interpretation put on them, raise difficulties as to their exact meaning. In a letter to a group of bishops — to be discussed shortly — he urges them on to mutual consultation and collaboration to make the American College a reality. In a parenthetical remark he says: « As we already indicated to some from among your members when, to our great joy, they were here in Rome for the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God »¹⁷. The question is, to whom does the word « some » refer? Did he speak to *all* the American bishops present in Rome and then tell the bishops in his letter that these constituted some from among their members? Or did he only speak to *some* of the American bishops present in Rome?

Speaking of this early private contact of Pius IX with American bishops, R. McNamara writes: « At some time during their stay — certainly before December 11th — the Pope had an informal conversation with these prelates or the majority of them; it was in the course of this conversation that he disclosed his wish to see a North American College installed in Rome »¹⁸. Within the space of a few pages, McNamara speaks of a later « uncertain response » from the

¹⁴ For an interesting account of Neumann's stay with his Redemptorist confreres, see Oreste Gregorio CSSR, *Ricordo del Ven. G. Neumann tra i Redentoristi napoletani*, in *Spic. Hist.* 11 (1963) 233-242.

¹⁵ *Official Documents connected with the Definition of the Immaculate Conception with a Complete List of the Cardinals present in the Basilica of St. Peter*, Baltimore 1855, 153, 156-157; *L'Osservatore Romano*, December 8, 1904.

¹⁶ *KFC*, 377-380, Kenrick to Kenrick, November 21, 1854, Rome; Vincenzo Sardi, *La solenne definizione del dogma dell'Immacolato Concepimento di Maria Santissima*, Rome 1905, II, 199-300.

¹⁷ See below, n. 26.

¹⁸ McNamara, *American College*, 14. On page, 691, n. 15 he says that the Pope spoke to all or a quorum of the bishops.

bishops in America and admits that « they did not react very sympathetically ». He then writes:

This may seem surprising in view of the fact that the American prelates, to whom the Pope first spoke of the matter the previous December, had given His Holiness the impression that they approved. Perhaps he had been led by the demonstrative enthusiasm of Bishop O'Connor to believe that all the bishop's American colleagues shared his fervor. Actually, the bishops present, whom deference to Pius dissuaded from offering objections, were not of one mind on the issue. Archbishop Francis P. Kenrick of Baltimore who, like O'Connor, was a former Roman student, agreed with the proposal. Bishop Timon of Buffalo tended in the same direction. Archbishop Blanc of New Orleans and Bishop Neumann of Philadelphia, even less decided, were inclined to believe with Bishop Timon that the Church in America was too poor at present to carry out the plan, however meritorious¹⁹.

After this he speaks about the early opposition from Archbishop Hughes. The difficulty with this later account is that it takes for granted that all the American bishops were involved. Furthermore, what documentary evidence is there to say with certainty what was the mind of Blanc, Timon and Neumann in December 1854?²⁰ The meeting of Pius IX and American bishops, however, received this careful evaluation in McNamara:

When Pius made this disclosure and invited their comment on it, the American bishops seem to have been caught somewhat off guard. Since the foundation of such a college would imply American cooperation, their first thought seems to have been how could they ever finance it? This thought, however, remained prudently unexpressed. They found little difficulty in giving approval to the idea in general, and at least one of their number, Bishop Michael O'Connor of Pittsburgh, a former Roman student, reacted with manifest enthusiasm. In any case, His Holiness considered their joint reply as favorable to his wish, although he understood it was an informal answer to an informal question²¹.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 20.

²⁰ In 1856 Timon confessed that he « always relished the idea so strongly urged by His Holiness ». See AAB, 31-R-26, Timon to Kenrick, December 12, 1856, Buffalo. There is no evidence that the College was brought up in Neumann's *ad limina* audience with the Pope.

²¹ McNamara, *American College*, 14.

II

For these early contacts with American bishops about the American College, the letters of Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore are a source of help. Writing to his brother, Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick of St. Louis, three days after the definition of the Immaculate Conception, he tells him: « The Pope and others seem to favor the founding of a college for the United States in Rome. The Archbishop of New York [Hughes] opposes it strongly. He says that the Propaganda students lack training for the missions. The Bishop of Pittsburgh [O'Connor] favors the design; the others oppose it on the grounds of lack of funds »²². The following month he wrote him: « His Holiness wishes to open a college in Rome for American students. This will, however, depend upon us for financial support. The Archbishop of New York is opposed to the plan. The Bishop of Pittsburgh favors it, as I do. The others hardly declare where they stand »²³. As is evident, there are nuances of expression in the two letters. The first says that the Pope seems to favor the founding of the College; the second emphatically states that he wishes to found it. In the second letter, Kenrick openly states that he favors it; such an avowal is lacking in the first. From both letters, « the others » are either worried about the financial problems or hardly declare where they stand. At this early date, there was one who strongly opposed it (Hughes), one who enthusiastically favored it (O'Connor), one confessed backer (Kenrick) and the others worried about money or not knowing where they stood. Where did Neumann stand? A difficult question, historically, because documents are lacking. Making a psychological judgment, and knowing something still to come, it is safe to say that Neumann was not one who would hardly declare where he stood. His life shows him ready to take stands, stands that cost him dearly. It is a working hypothesis that the seminary-and-university-trained bishop²⁴ would be eager for such a center of education. At the same time he would be conscious of extra financial burdens, burdens that would only add to the almost insupportable burdens he had in Philadelphia. Aside from those who were outrightly

²² *KFC*, 385, Kenrick to Kenrick, December 11, 1854, Rome.

²³ *Ibid.* 362, Kenrick to Kenrick, January 21, 1854[=1855]. As is evident from the chronology and also from AAB, Kenrick's *Literarum Registrum*, 74, this letter was written in 1855.

²⁴ Curley, *Neumann*, 19-36.

opposed to a « Roman » or « European » institution, the American bishops were apprehensive about the college for financial reasons. In 1854 we have no document on Neumann. It is not known whether Pius IX consulted him. It is only from the following year, 1855, that we have documentary evidence showing how Neumann backed the college and worked hard for the cause.

After the private sounding out of American bishops in December 1854, Pius IX must have judged that the project was ready to be undertaken. It did not take him long to act. The first public, papal announcement of the college took place on New Year's Day, 1855. This is in a letter addressed to Archbishop Hughes and the suffragan bishops of the metropolitan province of New York. Actually, the letter has for its primary purpose the approval of the acts of the First Provincial Council of New York, held in 1854²⁵. Midway in the letter, Pius IX speaks of his desire that there be an American College in Rome, outlines the advantages of it for the Church in the United States, tells them that he spoke to some of their colleagues about this, and urges them to get together and work together on this goal. He then writes: « If you are willing to go along with this project of Our's, which looks only to the spiritual good of your territories, We, to be sure, will by no means neglect to help you with all our backing, as far as in Us lies, that you may be able to establish this college »²⁶. With his Roman tact and diplomacy, Pius IX was not unmindful that his words would reach the ears of one who firmly opposed the college; of one who, as a vigorous leader and as archbishop of the most wealthy archdiocese, was indispensable for the cause. By April, Hughes was won over to the cause and he told Kenrick: « The American College is a favorite project in Rome. I think, in time, it will do well, although at first I thought it impracticable »²⁷. His change of heart — to the delight of Kenrick who referred to it as his conversion — was enthusiastic. Even though he did not always see eye to eye with Kenrick in his plans for promoting the college, he did give the project his energetic backing²⁸.

²⁵ *Concilium Neo-Eboracense Primum habitum anno 1854*; CL III, 259-270; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLVII, 81-106.

²⁶ Pius IX, *Venerabilibus Fratribus*, January 1, 1855; CL III, 268; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLVII, 92. See also Donald Shearer OFM Cap, *Pontificia Americana, A Documented History of the Catholic Church in the United States, 1784-1884*, New York 1933, 295-297.

²⁷ AAB, 29-I-6, Hughes to Kenrick, April 3, 1855, New York.

²⁸ McNamara, *American College*, 16-17, 21, 28, 31-33. For the relationship between Hughes and Kenrick in the planning of the College, see John P. Marschall CSV, *Francis*

The official announcement came from the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. As still a missionary church, the church in the United States was under the jurisdiction of this Congregation²⁹. The American College began to come up in the Acts of the Congregation. The Prefect, Cardinal Giacomo Frasoni, was told by the Pope to prepare a letter that would urge the bishops to support this institution where « students from various dioceses can be educated in sound and uniform doctrine for the good and benefit of those dioceses »³⁰. This letter is dated February 12, 1855. Actually, it is a circular addressed to the other American archbishops, Francis Patrick Kenrick of Baltimore, John B. Purcell of Cincinnati, Joseph S. Alemany of San Francisco, Francis N. Blanchet of Oregon City, Peter Richard Kenrick of St. Louis, and Anthony Blanc of New Orleans³¹. The same difficulty, noted in the letter of Pius IX, is found in this letter from Propaganda, that is, whether the Pope spoke to all the bishops present in Rome who then manifested a desire for the college, or whether he only spoke to some of them. The letter was sent to the archbishops and they were to take the problem up with their suffragan bishops. For the most part, they waited to do this in forthcoming Provincial Councils. It is here that Neumann will be very much involved.

III

The Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore was held in 1855 from May 6 to 13. Present with Archbishop Kenrick were Bishops Vincent Whelan of Wheeling, Michael O'Connor of Pittsburgh, John McGill of Richmond, John Neumann of Philadelphia, Josue Young of Erie. Fathers John Barry and Patrick Lynch also took part as the Administrators of the vacant Sees of Savannah and Charleston³². In the first private congregation, the archbishop read the letter from

Patrick Kenrick, 1851-1863: The Baltimore Years, Washington, D.C. 1965, 275-276, 289-292. This is a typed Ph. D. dissertation to be found in the library of the Catholic University of America. This will be referred to as Marschall, *Kenrick*.

²⁹ R. Hoffman, *Propagation of the Faith, Congregation for the*, in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* XI (1967) 840-844.

³⁰ APF, Acta, vol. 220 (1856), f. 378v. See Connelly, *Bedini Visit*, 174.

³¹ AAB, 32C-I-9, Frasoni to Kenrick, February 12, 1855, Rome; APF, Acta, vol. 220 (1856), f. 403. See McNamara *American College*, 692, n. 2.

³² *Concilium Baltimoreense Provinciale VIII habitum anno 1855*, Baltimore 1857, 4-5; *CL* III, 155-168; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLVII, 139-168. See John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, New York 1892, IV, 373.

Propaganda and explained the desire of Pius IX for an American College in Rome³³. The Acts of the Council report that O'Connor, Young and Neumann had many remarkable things to say about the project. The others eagerly expressed their gratitude and all unanimously approved the project. After this, a motion was made that Kenrick appoint a committee of three who would report on a later day what they considered necessary for the inauguration of so great a project. It was then that Kenrick named Bishops O'Connor and Neumann and Father Lynch³⁴. This is the terse account in the official Acts of the Council. It is probable that we shall never know « the many remarkable things » that O'Connor and Neumann said. However, we learn a bit more from the manuscript account of the minutes written by Father James A. Corcoran of Charleston, South Carolina³⁵. Here we are told that after Kenrick spoke of Rome's desire for the College, the motion was made by O'Connor « that we deem it desirable to adopt the aforesaid recommendation of the Holy See ». The second for this motion came from Neumann. After Young suggested that the motion read « highly desirable », it was passed unanimously. It was then that Father Lynch moved and O'Connor seconded the setting up of the committee. That was how there came about Kenrick's committee of O'Connor, Neumann and Lynch³⁶. It is not surprising that Kenrick appointed Neumann to the committee. He had a well-earned reputation for learning. His work in Philadelphia for education at all levels — parish schools, private academies, colleges and seminaries — was a matter of record³⁷. Furthermore, at the First Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1852, Neumann had served on the Committee on Education³⁸.

³³ See above, n. 31.

³⁴ *Conc. Balt. Prov. VIII*, 10-11. For the manuscript copy of the Acts, see AAB, 32B-G-1.

³⁵ AAB, 32-B-G-5, James A. Corcoran to Kenrick, November 14, 1855, Charleston.

³⁶ AAB, 32B-G-6, ff. 4-5.

³⁷ For Neumann and education, see Curley, *Neumann*, 67-68, 128, 133-134, 141-142, 207-212, 263-265. See also the section on Neumann and education written by the present writer in *The History of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia*, ed. James F. Connelly, Philadelphia 1976, 225-231. In that chapter the present writer is responsible solely for the material on Bishop Neumann. He had nothing to do with the material on Archbishop Wood despite the fact that, in the editing, the material on Neumann and Wood was combined to make one chapter.

³⁸ *Concilium totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae Baltimorei habitum anno 1852*, Baltimore 1853, 10, 35, 37, 47. See Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore, 1791-1884*, New York 1932, 179-180. The acts can also be found in *CL III*, 129-154, 1143-1156; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLIV, 655-700.

Four days later, on May 10 in the fourth private congregation, the Committee made its report. One learns in the official *acta* that the Council made its own three proposals: 1) that the Holy See be asked to name three bishops as a committee who would consult together and be in charge of this project; 2) that the archbishops represent the bishops until the setting up of the episcopal committee; 3) that a priest, capable in business affairs, be sent to Rome to represent them and carry out what he deemed necessary for inaugurating the work³⁹. The printed acts indicate that the committee came up with many suggestions when they speak of the three just mentioned as « the principal ones among the many proposed ». They also state that the Fathers « gave thought to these and other proposals one by one ».

The manuscript account of the minutes of the meetings show that O'Connor, Neumann and Lynch made many proposals that were specific and forwardlooking, proposals which, at that early stage in the project, would be a source of apprehension to Rome. To quote the minutes, the Committee proposed:

(1) That a suitable person be appointed to go to Rome to attend to this affair in the name of the Bishops of the United States, who will cooperate in the project, and to do what he can for the establishment of the College. Sending such a person with full authority to act, we consider sufficient to secure the desired end, in view of the known dispositions on the subject on the part of the Holy Father and the Sacred Congregation.

(2) It is recommended that a subscription be entered into by the Bishops to defray his travelling expenses, and his expenses while in Rome. The sum of twenty-five or fifty dollars or any intermediate sum, according to the means of each one would be deemed a proper contribution from each Bishop.

(3) We would think it well, that the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda should name three Bishops in this country, whose duty it would be to select a suitable person for Rector, and attend to the interests of the College in the United States. It would also be their duty to make such suggestions to the Sacred Congregation, as they deem necessary or useful for its government; and to communicate to the other Bishops what they consider necessary or proper to secure their cooperation. Each Bishop so appointed should hold the office for three years, and his place be then filled by another, or the same re-appointed, as the Sacred Congregation would think best, but the office should not be attached permanently to any See.

(4) The Archbishop of Baltimore should be requested by the Bishops of the Province to attend to this affair in their name until a committee, as before provided for, be named by the Sacred Congregation.

³⁹ *Conc. Balt. Prov. VIII, 16-17.*

(5) The President of the College should always be a clergyman belonging to some diocese in the United States, selected by the three Bishops, as provided for above.

(6) The pension for the students shall be fixed at a moderate amount; and until the income from this source shall be sufficient to pay the rector's salary and meet the expenses of the college, the committee of Bishops shall have a right to call upon the Bishops for their subscription annually, or at least in such proportion as may be needed to make up the deficiency.

(7) The foregoing committee of Bishops will make such arrangements, as circumstances will enable them, to equalize the advantages of the Institution amongst all the dioceses of the United States, and let each Bishop know what students he can send and on what terms.

(8) Provision for meeting the expenses of the support, clothing, etc., shall be made by each Bishop or other person sending a student in accordance with the rules that may be made. The students shall attend the schools of the Roman College, the Roman Seminary, Propaganda or the Sapienza.

(9) The Archbishop is requested to communicate our action to the other Archbishops and invite their cooperation and through them that of their suffragans.

It is interesting to note that the report of the committee was not rushed through hurriedly and in a bloc. Each proposal had to be voted on separately. In this voting process, it was Neumann who moved for the acceptance of the fourth, sixth and seventh proposals⁴⁰.

It was from the recommendations of the committee and the discussions on the floor that there emerged the first conciliar decree on the college. Proposed and unanimously approved in the sixth private session on May 12, it reads:

Clearly understanding how much our most holy religion will profit in these regions if a college is established in Rome under the very shadow of the Apostolic See, a college in which young men, destined to exercise the sacred ministry in our provinces, are trained in all doctrine and discipline, as befits ecclesiastical life, so that they may go forth as worthy ministers of the Gospel, the Fathers of this Council strongly decided that such a college should be established, if possible, without delay. Furthermore, they requested that the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore (to whom they had already made known their mind on the better way of carrying out this project), would deign to represent them, in this matter, both with the Holy See and the other archbishops and bishops of the United States⁴¹.

⁴⁰ AAB, 32B-G-6, ff. 13-15; APF, Acta, vol. 220 (1856), ff. 432r-433v. See Connelly, *Bedini Visit*, 176.

⁴¹ *Conc. Balt. Prov. VIII*, 19, 24-25. The manuscript copy of the decrees is found in AAB, 32B-G-2.

As is customary, the acts of the council were submitted to Rome for approval. It was not until September 9, 1856, that Propaganda took up the Provincial Councils of 1855⁴². As is readily seen, the decree on the college could easily win approval. The same, however, could not be said for all the American proposals regarding the American College. Rome's answer was as follows: « The eighth decree was approved. However, the Congregation thought an answer should be deferred regarding the deputing of some bishops who would act as a Board for the college and regarding other matters pertaining to the election of the Rector, of which mention is made in the Acts of the Council »⁴³.

The Fathers of the Council sent the customary letter to the Holy Father. Written by Bishop O'Connor and signed by the rest, this letter of May 13, 1855, has this to say of the American College:

Before bringing this letter to a close, Most Holy Father, we cannot refrain from expressing the tremendous gratitude that we have for the latest benefit that You have bestowed upon us and our people. You have made known Your desire that a college be established in Rome, at the very See of Peter, the strongest citadel of the faith, a college in which young men will be reared and who, after completing their studies, will devote themselves to the sacred missions in this country of ours. [You have expressed] Your readiness to promote this work with Your help and authority. After so many great proofs of Your benevolence, Most Holy Father, by which You have proven Your fatherly love for us, this comes as the apex⁴⁴.

As will be pointed out shortly, Rome and Pius IX were pleased with this council. However, in his early reply of August 9, 1855, after pointing out how pleasing the project is to him because it redounds to the good of the American people, the Pope goes out of his way to bring home a point to the American bishops through these bishops of the Province of Baltimore. In his own words: « Wherefore, as far as we can, We shall not fail to help this work most willingly with all our backing, since this college is to be erected in this city of Ours by your efforts, plans and money, along with those of the Venerable Brother Bishops

⁴² APF, Acta, vol. 220 (1856), ff. 389-391. See McNamara, *American College*, 692-693, nn. 2, 16. As will be seen (n. 45), Pius IX acknowledged receipt of the acts in 1855.

⁴³ *Conc. Balt. Prov. VIII*, 38.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* 19-20, 30. For the manuscript copy, see AAB, 32B-G-4.

of the other provinces »⁴⁵. As one looks back at this meeting, one finds that it was here that the American College was first treated in a council. The Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore had the first conciliar committee, the first discussion on the floor, the first conciliar decree, and the first conciliar letter to the Pope. In all of these, right from the start after Kenrick proposed the Pope's plan, Neumann was involved.

IV

In its grateful approval of the Council of Baltimore, and in connection with the modifications to be made, Rome added a very significant remark. Cardinal Barnabò wrote to Kenrick on January 17, 1857, and said:

I would like to add that it came as a surprise that the same harmony was not found among the bishops of the other provinces in such an important matter. Such harmony is especially to be sought because some bishops think that they can scarcely help the work in the same way as others.

The letter written in the name of His Holiness had as its purpose the commendation of the work, about the utility of which there can be no controversy. Although the bishops may give help in different ways, either on their own or through the more wealthy who are opportunely led to take an interest in the matter, some giving more, and some less, and perhaps more in the course of time, nevertheless, the thing that was most desired was that all should join together for the carrying out of the work with a unanimity of will and mutual agreement. The Most Reverend Fathers [of Propaganda] also wished this to be noted in order that Your Excellency may be able to carry out better what the bishops of the Council of Baltimore had decreed about your dealing with the other bishops that they might deal with this matter in the synods of their provinces with a happy result. I shall not fail to explain the meaning of this letter to the Archbishops of Cincinnati, St. Louis and New Orleans, just as I did to the Archbishop of New York, who has recently promised that he was ready to contribute a great deal to the project⁴⁶.

In the language of diplomacy, this extremely heavy paragraph contains much more than meets the eye and refers to a great deal of

⁴⁵ Pius IX, *Maximam quidem Laetitiam*, Breve epistolare ad Patres Concilii Baltimorensis Provincialis Octavi, *Conc. Balt. Prov. VIII*, 31-35.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* 38-39. For the original letter, see AAB, 32C-M-7, Barnabò to Kenrick, February 17, 1853, Rome. See also *CL III*, 155, n. 2.

history that can be summed up here merely to carry on the Neumann story. Briefly, the other provinces were not as enthusiastic as were those of Baltimore and New York. Consultations were held on the West Coast⁴⁷. Provincial Synods were held at Cincinnati (May 1855), at St. Louis (October 1855), and at New Orleans (January 1856)⁴⁸. Some opposed any European institution (Rome and Louvain) and wanted to concentrate on American education. Others feared trouble from outside forces in the then form of Nativism, known as Know-Nothingism⁴⁹. All had their own local problems and the plea of poverty and lack of money was heard on all sides. What Rome looked for was a solid backing of loyalty for a cause. At Rome « the impression seems to have been created that the Pope's project had not been accorded so sympathetic a welcome by the American prelates as it should have been ». Describing this in greater detail, McNamara writes:

This, then, was the mixed reception which the American hierarchy accorded to the Holy Father's proposition. And when the Roman authorities had received replies from all the provinces, they were not pleased. They no doubt valued the indications of relative prosperity of the various American sees; these would give them a key as to how much they could expect each to contribute. They doubtless did not question the sincere interest which the American prelates manifested for their own seminaries. But reasons like these were, to the Propaganda officials, beside the point. They considered the papal plan an order. And since His Holiness had already ordered the founding of the college, the matter was closed, and opinions on it were not being sought. Nor was there any reason for complaining of the inability of one's diocese to contribute. Cardinal Fransoni and Archbishop Barnabò needed only to point out in the circular letter itself the statement that what the American prelates could not give, the Congregation and Pope would supply⁵⁰.

Even as early as 1856 Cardinal Fransoni and Archbishop Barnabò told Father Etienne Rousselon, who was in Rome representing the New Orleans Province, that « it never was the intention of the Holy Father to force on the Bishops of the United States a charge that might prove too heavy for them »⁵¹.

⁴⁷ McNamara, *American College*, 24-26.

⁴⁸ *CL III*, 183-202, 233-248, 303-312; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLVII, 167-190, 307-318, 319-336.

⁴⁹ M. Fell, *Know-Nothingism*, in *New Catholic Encyclopedia VIII* (1967) 223-234. See also Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860*, New York 1938.

⁵⁰ McNamara, *American College*, 26-27.

⁵¹ AANY, A-11, Blanc to Hughes, May 5, 1856, New Orleans; ACUA, HM 16, reel 4.

Many an American bishop thought that Rome was merely asking for his advice. With his Irish-American bluntness, Peter Richard Kenrick told Hughes: « The Cardinal Prefect asked our advice and we gave it to him »⁵². One can now read Franson's remarks to Kenrick (n. 46) and understand his statement about explaining matters to the Archbishops of Cincinnati, St. Louis and New Orleans. In the light of all this, it is also easy to understand why Rome singled out the Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore of 1855 where the process got rolling with Kenrick's Committee of O'Connor, Neumann and Lynch. In the words of McNamara:

They saw in the Council's plan an understanding approach to the enterprise, and in the Archbishop of Baltimore the man best qualified to secure the joint cooperation of the American Hierarchy. So they ordered the officials of the Sacred Congregation « to write to the Archbishop straightening out the difficulties, and pointing out the real nature of the foundation, and the real sense of the Pope's circular ». This, thought the Cardinals, would help him in the discharge of the duty which his provincial council had imposed upon him⁵³.

V

A published — but little used — Neumann letter⁵⁴ of early 1857 throws a great deal of light on Neumann's own life, on the fortunes of the American College and on Neumann and the college. Bishop Peter Paul Lefevere of Detroit wrote Neumann to ask his backing of the American College at Louvain. This college, the work of Bishops Lefevere, Martin J. Spalding of Louisville, and Father Peter Kindekens of Detroit, opened in March 1857⁵⁵. As is evident, the Church in the United States in the 1850s was concerned with two European projects, namely, Louvain and Rome. It has already been remarked that Neumann was not one who would « hardly declare

⁵² AANY, A-12, Peter Richard Kenrick to Hughes, January 2, 1856, St. Louis. See also AAB, 34-M-3, Peter Richard Kenrick to Spalding, January 3, 1857, St. Louis for the former's opposition to both Louvain and Rome.

⁵³ McNamara, *American College*, 27.

⁵⁴ To my knowledge this letter was used only once in Neumann research. See John D. Sauter, *The American College in Louvain, 1857-1898*, Louvain 1959, 46. I learned about the letter in Maurice de Meulemeester CSSR, *Bibliographie générale des écrivains rédemptoristes*, 3 vols., Louvain 1933-1939, II, 295, n. 12.

⁵⁵ J. Sauter, *op. cit.* 3-59. For the write-up of the College in Neumann's Philadelphia, see *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, March 14, 1857.

where he stood ». In his letter to Bishop Lefevere we find him giving very honest and forthright answers. Neumann explains his situation in Philadelphia. This was the period in which he was awaiting an answer from Rome. In 1855, in his desire to do justice to his ideals as a bishop, he had suggested that the vast diocese of Philadelphia be divided, that a new See be created at Pottsville and that he give up Philadelphia and take the poorer, smaller diocese⁵⁶. As of Feb. 20, 1857, he had received no definite answer. Actually, three days earlier the official notice had been sent to Kenrick that James Frederick Wood had been named coadjutor to Neumann with the right of succession. It was not until March 30 that the news arrived here⁵⁷.

It is against this background that Neumann tells Lefevere: « In this uncertainty I do not feel free to engage in any measure which will require some time yet to accomplish ». A little later in a statement that gives an insight into his own status, he says: « If I am to remain in Philadelphia, which is at present not improbable, I will certainly take an active part in the projected American College at Louvain. The high reputation for learning and discipline in Belgium is too well known as to allow me to hesitate a moment ». To be true to himself, after making these remarks about the college at Louvain, he admits honestly: « Personally I would be more in favor of an American College in Rome ». It is then that he makes a statement that is significant for the fortunes of the college at Rome. He tells Lefevere that « consultations on its erection seem to have adjourned *sine die* »⁵⁸.

Neumann could well write that. In his own ecclesiastical province, the archbishop was not consulting his suffragans; he knew where they stood. Actually, Kenrick was busy — and frustrated — trying to get the project off the ground. The Council of 1855 decreed that a priest should be sent to Rome on the business of the college. Three attempts were made and ended in failure. Neither Fathers James Frederick Wood and David Whelan of Cincinnati, nor James A. Corcoran of Charleston went to Rome on this mission⁵⁹. In desperation,

⁵⁶ Curley, *Neumann*, 267-305.

⁵⁷ AAB, 32C-M-7, Barnabò to Kenrick, February 17, 1857, Rome; Kenrick's *Literarum Registrum*, March 30, 1857, 120.

⁵⁸ Neumann to Lefevere, February 20, 1857, Philadelphia. Photoduplications of the letter can be found in *The Ecclesiastical Review* 33 (1905) insert at pp. 182-183; 150 (1964) 91-92.

⁵⁹ McNamara, *American College*, 28-29. For the beginning of the process to send Wood, see AAB, 32B-G-6, f. 15.

when in Feb. 1856 Kenrick learned that Father Rousselon had brought the Acts of the New Orleans Provincial Council to Rome, he decided to use him in some capacity « so as not to let it appear that we are taking no interest in the Pope's large-hearted design »⁶⁰. In the summer of 1856, Father Kindekens was in Rome. At the « special request » of Kenrick he was to « look for and secure a suitable location for the projected 'American College' in that city ». Because of the occupation of Rome by the French to protect the Pope, Pius IX informed Kenrick that « he could not say when it would be in his power to assign a suitable building for that purpose »⁶¹.

Kenrick was frustrated not only in getting a priest to take the mission to Rome, but in getting money for his travelling expenses as recommended in the Council of 1855. In September 1855, Kenrick thought that « fifty dollars at least ought to be the contribution of each diocese ». Two months later, he reported that « only seven prelates have sent in subscriptions ». Here it can be reported that Neumann did not let Kenrick down and that he is to be listed among the seven who contributed to the cause⁶². A response from so few is not to be regarded as a mark of stinginess or as a lack of cooperation in the project. Rather, it is a sign of growing concern to have the American hierarchy represented in Rome by a bishop rather than by a priest⁶³.

One of those who refused Kenrick's request for a contribution to defray the expenses for sending a priest to Rome to negotiate the college was Archbishop Hughes. He bluntly informed Kenrick that the mission will be « only a waste of time and money »⁶⁴. He energetically campaigned in his own Province and with his fellow bishops for a more expeditious procedure. As he saw it, a bishop was needed to represent the American hierarchy in Rome. Furthermore, it was

⁶⁰ KFC, Kenrick to Kenrick, February 27, 1856, Baltimore.

⁶¹ AAB, 30-H-1, Kindekens to Kenrick, November 5, 1856, Detroit. See John Tracy Ellis, *Documents of American Catholic History*, 2 ed., Milwaukee 1962, 315-317.

⁶² For the remarks of Kenrick, see KFC, 391, 393, Kenrick to Kenrick, September 29, November 30, 1855. Both McNamara and Sauter list contributors. However, neither gives the complete list. For the contributors, see Archives of the Diocese of Charleston, 9-K-6, Kenrick to Lynch, December 9, 1855, Baltimore; Marschall, *Kenrick*, 275. Specifically, for Neumann's contribution, see AAB, *Literarum Registrum*, November 2, 1855, 94. Other pertinent material is found in AAB, 32A-N-19, Spalding to Kenrick, October 17, 1855, Louisville; 34-J-26, Kenrick to Spalding, October 20, 1855, Baltimore.

⁶³ McNamara, *American College*, 31-34.

⁶⁴ AAB, 29-I-7, Hughes to Kenrick, October 22, 1855, New York.

up to Rome to see that it appointed a special person in Propaganda to deal with the American College. There must be, on the part of the bishops, agreement on these two basic principles, he said in his circular of Dec. 23, 1855⁶⁵. The Roman problem met a successful solution when, after the death of Cardinal Fransoni on April 29, 1856, and the promotion of Cardinal Barnabò to Prefect, Archbishop Bedini, the first to propose the college, was appointed Secretary of Propaganda in June⁶⁶. Meanwhile, the problem at home saw a very happy solution when O'Connor of Pittsburgh was the bishop chosen to carry on the negotiations in Rome. This took place in November 1856, as we know from a letter of Hughes to Bernard Smith in Rome, in which he sings the praises of the one selected⁶⁷. O'Connor was a suffragan bishop of the Province of Baltimore. Although the energies of Hughes were at the root of much of this past activity, it was Kenrick who had to be involved in the mission of O'Connor. He himself tells us that he went at the request of Kenrick⁶⁸. The letters of the period make in clear that it was Kenrick who authorized O'Connor⁶⁹. Rome was happy with the choice of the American bishops. It was O'Connor who encouraged Pius IX in 1854 by his enthusiastic backing of the Pope's proposal. It was O'Connor who was the chairman and spokesman for the first conciliar committee on the American College, the committee of himself, Neumann and Lynch in 1855.

VI

The year 1858 brings us back to Baltimore, to Neumann and the American College. That was the year when the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore was held from May 2 to May 9. The personnel of the Council is practically the same as that of 1855. John Barry and Patrick Lynch were present in their capacity as bishops of Sa-

⁶⁵ AAB, 29-I-8, Hughes to Kenrick, December 23, 1855, New York. See Marschall, *Kenrick*, 275-276.

⁶⁶ Connelly, *Bedini Visit*, 164, 290.

⁶⁷ APF, SRC AC, vol. 17 (1856), f. 752v, Hughes to Smith, November 28, 1856, New York; McNamara, *American College*, 33.

⁶⁸ *Concilium Baltimoreense Provinciale IX habitum anno 1858*, Baltimore 1858, 18. The acts can also be found in *CL III*, 169-182; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLVII, 571-596.

⁶⁹ AAB, 30-W-70, O'Connor to Kenrick, January 9, 1857, Dublin; *Literarum Registrum*, January 22, 1857 (wrongly dated 1856), 116. In a letter to Spalding, Kenrick says that he « authorized O'Connor for the mission ». See 34-K-29, Kenrick to Spalding, February 19, 1857, Baltimore.

vannah and Charleston. Bishop Augustine Verot was present as the Vicar Apostolic of Florida. Father David Whelan acted as Procurator for his brother, Bishop Richard Vincent Whelan⁷⁰. At the request of Neumann, arrangements were made for his coadjutor to be present at the Council and have a decisive vote. He was at the meetings from the fourth to the sixth of May when he was given leave to return to Philadelphia « because of urgent business »⁷¹. Neumann also asked that the name of Bishop Wood be added to the letter that the Council addressed to the laity⁷².

The American College came up in the seventh private congregation on May 8. Bishop O'Connor gave the bishops an account of his mission to Rome. He told of Pius IX's desire to give the building that was formerly a Visitation convent, but which he was not yet able to finalize because it was still occupied by French soldiers. The Pope hoped in time to have this building for the college. On hearing this news, the bishops expressed their thanks and noted that their gratitude should be mentioned in the letter to the Pope. There was agreement among the bishops that, as soon as they knew for sure that the promised building, or another one, was ready, they would see to it that the collections would be taken up in all the churches of the Baltimore Province. At this point, the bishops were asked to state how many students they would send over, at the tuition rate of \$ 150.00 per student. They were also to transmit this information to Propaganda. Bishops Whelan and Barry promised to send one each; Bishops O'Connor and Lynch, two each; Archbishop Kenrick, four; Bishop Neumann, six. The Acts then say that the other bishops intend to send some as soon as they can, and that those who indicated a specific number hope to send more⁷³.

In the eighth private congregation on May 9, each of the bishops signed his name to the letter of the Council to the Pope. The last paragraph deals with the college in these words:

Finally — and it would be wrong to omit this — we thank you for your outstanding generosity to our people and our Church, the news

⁷⁰ *Conc. Balt. Prov. IX*, 3, 12. For the manuscript copy, see AAB, 32B-H-1.

⁷¹ AAB, *Literarum Registrum*, April 27, May 1, 1858, 146; *Conc. Prov. Balt. IX*, 12-15. See Giuseppe Orlandi, *G. N. Neumann e i vescovi degli U.S.A. nelle lettere dell'Archivio di Propaganda Fide, 1852-1860*, in *Spic. Hist.* 24 (1976) 337-338; Curley, *Neumann*, 322.

⁷² *Conc. Prov. Balt. IX*, 20. For the letter see *Freeman's Journal*, May 29, 1858.

⁷³ *Conc. Prov. Balt. IX*, 18-19.

of which has just reached us. We have learned that Your Holiness had assigned a very spacious building for the use of a college which is soon to be established in Rome for the sacred missions in this country. For this and the almost innumerable other blessings you have conferred on us, we profess that we will keep the memory of them with grateful hearts until our dying breath⁷⁴.

Rome's answer to this Council came in a letter from Cardinal Barnabò to Archbishop Kenrick, dated Aug. 16, 1858. The officials of Propaganda praised the diligence of the bishops in their work for the college. They then told Kenrick that he would hear of the future decisions and grants of the Pope in a circular letter from Propaganda and especially in the Apostolic Bull that would inaugurate the college⁷⁵. With regard to Rome's answer, it can be said that Propaganda spoke too quickly. There would be no Apostolic Bull to celebrate the college. The uncertainty with regard to the money to be raised caused uncertainty with regard to the stability of the college. In the words of McNamara: « It would be prudent not to celebrate its birth with too much pomp and circumstance »⁷⁶. A word, too, is needed with regard to the Baltimore Council. The earlier Council of 1855, with its detailed recommendations from O'Connor, Neumann and Lynch regarding government and administration, was a bit too fast for Rome's pace. In a similar manner, the Council of 1858 was ahead, not only of the other American provinces, but also of the plans of Rome, especially with regard to the collections and the early choosing of the students. Here, one must find out Rome's plans, America's response, and the response of Neumann.

VII

Rome's plans involved money for the college, its rectorship and the students. Barnabò and Bedini sent their circular to the American Bishops on August 15, 1858. After speaking of the generosity of Pius IX in supplying the Umiltà convent to be used for the college, the letter urges the bishops and laity to generosity, saying:

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 28.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 32. See APF, LDB, vol. 349 (1858), ff. 626-627, Barnabò to Kenrick, August 16, 1858, Rome. The *Conc. Prov. Balt. IX* contains a photo of a handwritten copy of the letter.

⁷⁶ McNamara, *American College*, 39.

Nothing now is more proper than that the prelates of the United States, in fulfillment of repeated promises, exert themselves to the speedy completion of the work, of which the Roman Pontiff has laid the foundation, and which he has undertaken to promote in word and deed. Nor can we doubt of the ready assistance in this matter of the faithful of North America, because of their noble liberality towards every good work and particularly because through this institution the glory of the American name will be advanced, and the Catholic faith and religion increased throughout America. It is left to the prudence and zeal of the Archbishops and Bishops to provide the new seminary with every requisite, so that it can be opened as soon as possible to American youths⁷⁷.

This was the August signal from Rome to begin the work of gathering funds, a work that had previously been legislated by the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore in May, in the form of parish collections. Aside from some generous contributions from wealthy individuals, the bulk of the money came from the parish collections in the dioceses in late 1858 and throughout 1859.

Archbishop Kenrick got the process going with his circular of October 10, 1858, that called for the collection to be taken up in the churches of the country on December 12, the Sunday within the octave of the feast of the Immaculate Conception⁷⁸. The *Catholic Mirror* for this period is replete with news about the collections in the archdiocese of Baltimore or receipts from other dioceses⁷⁹. The total amount from the parish collections and private donations was \$ 47,879.00. At least two-thirds of this amount came from the two metropolitan provinces of New York and Baltimore. New York contributed about \$ 19, 000 and Baltimore about \$ 10,000⁸⁰. Included in the latter was the contribution from Philadelphia and the other suffragan Sees. Our problem here is to ascertain some details about the collection in Neumann's Philadelphia and the amount realized.

Philadelphia's contribution must first be approached by way of Pittsburgh and Baltimore. In a January letter of 1859, O'Connor wrote Kenrick and expressed the hope that he was not offended at

⁷⁷ The English translation can be found in the *Catholic Mirror*, October 2, 1858; *Dunigan's Catholic Almanac for 1859*, 341-342; McNamara, *American College*, 35. For the Latin, see APF, LDB, vol. 349 (1858), ff. 625v-626r, Barnabò and Bedini to the American Hierarchy, August 15, 1858, Rome.

⁷⁸ *Catholic Mirror*, October 16, 1858.

⁷⁹ *Catholic Mirror*, October 2, 10; December 11, 18, 25, 1858; January 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, February 6, 12, 19, 26, March 5, April 9, 16, August 13, October 1, December 24, 1859.

⁸⁰ *Catholic Review*, ed. Patrick V. Hickey, Brooklyn and New York 1872-1898, vol. 28, nr. 26, December 20, 1885, 49; McNamara, *American College*, 36-37, 695, n. 41.

the little respect for the generosity of the Maryland Catholics displayed by the editor of the *Pittsburgh Catholic*⁸¹. The first report from Baltimore showed a collection of \$ 1,035.43⁸². Hearing this, the editor wrote a stinging editorial. He started out by saying that the stingy collection did not surprise him because of the reputation of « the old stock of Maryland Catholics » who had « piety for the faith and a lack of spirit in sustaining it ». The collection showed that the 1859 generation of Catholics had the same spirit of piety and penuriousness as their ancestors⁸³. O'Connor explained to Kenrick that the editor did this because it was made to appear that Americans were opposed to the college. The editorial was an occasion to put the cause in its true light. O'Connor then made a strange remark when he said that « unfortunately, Philadelphia has acted almost as badly »⁸⁴. The remark is strange in view of the fact that the editorial itself praised the generosity of New York and Philadelphia. It is also strange in view of the facts.

We have previously seen Neumann's presence at the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore in May 1858, where the college was again discussed. There also he heard Kenrick's pastoral that encouraged the people to generosity in their contributions⁸⁵. Neumann had the college brought to the attention of the Philadelphia Catholics early in October by publishing in the diocesan paper the English translation of the Roman circular of the previous August⁸⁶. Shortly after that, he received Kenrick's circular of October 10 that called for collections to be taken up, as previously seen, on December 12, the Sunday within the octave of the Immaculate Conception⁸⁷. This gave the diocese plenty of time to get ready for the drive. Later in December a write-up in the diocesan paper expressed regrets at not being able to publish the full text of a sermon by Archbishop Hughes of New York, in which he defended parochial schools and the American College against current Protestant attacks. It then goes

⁸¹ AAB, 30-Y-16, O'Connor to Kenrick, January 24, 1859, Pittsburgh.

⁸² *Catholic Mirror*, December 25, 1858. For more data, see below n. 90.

⁸³ *Pittsburgh Catholic*, January 1, 1859.

⁸⁴ See above, n. 81.

⁸⁵ For the manuscript copy, see AAB, 32B-H-4. See the printed version published at Baltimore by John Murphy & Company, 1858. See also *CL III*, 169-182; Mansi, *Concilia*, XLVII, 571-578.

⁸⁶ *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, October 9, 1858. See above, n. 77.

⁸⁷ See above, n. 78.

on to happily report the generous response of both New York and Philadelphia to the cause of the college⁸⁸.

The collection from Philadelphia amounted to \$ 3,350.00. Included in this is an anonymous donation of \$ 1,000.00⁸⁹. A comparison with other collections shows that Neumann does not have to apologize for Philadelphia's contribution to the American College. Baltimore, like Philadelphia, had one contribution of \$ 1,000. Allowing for this, the collection, in the counting of the writer, amounted to a little more than \$ 2,800.00⁹⁰. Pittsburgh contributed \$ 2,000.00, Brooklyn \$ 2,321.46, Newark \$ 3,342.78 and New York \$ 5,932.88⁹¹. In other words, Philadelphia's collection ranked second out of these six Sees.

In the eyes of Rome, the American collection of \$ 47,879 was disappointingly small. In 1856, before Rome came to the realization that it would have to provide the building for the college, it was thought that \$ 250,000 would not be too much to hope for⁹². After the collection came in, Cardinal Barnabò, aware of the generosity of the Provinces of New York and Baltimore, told Kenrick that « in the other provinces in the United States a greater effort would have been expected by the Sacred Congregation »⁹³. Assessing the collection, Propaganda saw that it would not have an endowed college where the tuition would be gratis. It then informed the bishops that they could only send over students for whom they could provide the annual tuition of \$ 150⁹⁴. Here a word can be said about the Roman and American plan. Rome thought in terms of a vast amount that would result in a fully-endowed, tuition-free college. The American bishops thought in terms of the « pay-as-you-go policy ». Tuition for them was the normal procedure in higher education. It was

⁸⁸ *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, December 25, 1858.

⁸⁹ *Catholic Mirror*, February 19, 1859.

⁹⁰ The *Catholic Mirror* (April 16, 1859) says that the Baltimore collection was \$ 2,660.00. The amounts recorded in the issues of December 25, 1858, January 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, February 6, 12, 19, 26, March 5, April 16, 1859, add up to slightly over \$ 2,800.00. This is the more likely final tabulation in view of the fact that the issue of March 5, 1859, lists the amount as \$ 1,842.26. This is the amount collected in the churches and does not include the contribution of \$ 1,000.00 from B. Spalding.

⁹¹ *Catholic Mirror*, February 6, April 9, 16, August 13, 1859.

⁹² AANY, A-11, Blanc to Hughes, May 5, 1856, New Orleans; ACUA, HM 16, reel 4.

⁹³ AAB, 32C-Q-2, Barnabò to Kenrick, April 7, 1859, Rome; APF, LDB, vol. 350 (1859), ff. 230v-231r.

⁹⁴ AAB, 32C-R-2, Barnabò to Kenrick, June 1, 1859, Rome; APF, LDB, vol. 350 (1859), ff. 369v-370v.

no surprise for them to be told that they would have to pay tuition for the students. The Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1858 legislated that the bishops would pay \$ 150.00 per student annually. Furthermore, at the Eighth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1855, the Committee of O'Connor, Neumann and Lynch assumed that the bishops would pay the students' travelling and other expenses⁹⁵. Although Rome's disappointment was keen, in the light of the tuition, yearly contributions and emergency collections, the American collection does not seem to be a major catastrophe.

With a clear picture of the situation in the United States, Rome decided that the college would be opened in the fall of 1859. In a circular, dated June 1, 1859, the bishops were informed that they should begin to choose the students whom they planned to send to the college⁹⁶. It will be recalled that, at the Ninth Provincial Council of Baltimore, Neumann promised to send six students. The first class at the American College saw twelve students from eight dioceses; Philadelphia was not one of them⁹⁷. It was not until the following year that students from Philadelphia were enrolled. These appointments, however, were made by Bishop Wood, Neumann having died less than a month after the formal opening of the college. The promise of students from Philadelphia goes back to Neumann; the fulfilling of the promise is the work of Wood. Actually, it was one of the first things he did. On February 24, 1860, five of the six students promised left for the American College. In the words of the write-up in the *Catholic Herald and Visitor*: « Under the auspices of the Rt. Rev. Bishop, five young gentlemen, Messers Ignatius F. Horstmann, Charles P. O'Connor, James P. Moroney, Cornelius McDermott and James J. Byrne, sailed for Havre in the steamship, Vanderbilt, last Saturday on their way to Rome. All have been students, for some time, at St. Charles Preparatory Seminary, and after their arrival in Rome will enter the American College »⁹⁸.

⁹⁵ See above, nn. 73, 38.

⁹⁶ See above, n. 94.

⁹⁷ McNamara, *American College*, 64.

⁹⁸ *Catholic Herald and Visitor*, March 31, 1860. See Ella Flick, *Bishop Horstman*, in *American Catholic Historical Society Records* 46 (1935) 173; *Catholic Standard and Times*, May 6, 1908.

VIII

Finally, the problem of the rectorship and government of the college had to be settled. In the United States there was some talk that the matter would be treated at a Plenary Council. Curiously, the talk about a Plenary Council centers around Neumann and affairs at Philadelphia. Briefly, the appointment of Bishop Wood as coadjutor to Neumann was a source of tension. Temperamentally and psychologically, the two men were vastly different. Through a misreading or misinterpretation of his appointment document, Wood thought that Neumann was supposed to resign and hand over the government of Philadelphia to him. Although Neumann had previously desired to have Philadelphia divided and had volunteered to go to the smaller diocese to be set up at Pottsville, he never offered to resign the office of bishop; he did not think that he had the canonical reasons to justify such a step. When the relations between Wood and Neumann became strained, Neumann offered to let Wood have Philadelphia and expressed his willingness to go to the new diocese to be created at Easton, Pennsylvania⁹⁹. Rome refused to go along with the proposal to divide the diocese. On November 15, 1858, Barnabò told Neumann to carry on his pastoral duties in Philadelphia, utilizing the expertise of his coadjutor in temporal matters; he also told him that the problem of dividing Philadelphia would be taken up at the next National Council. On the same day he wrote Wood: « But without rejecting the proposal [to divide Philadelphia], the officials of Propaganda decided to refer it to the next National Council which will be held in the United States at the time appointed for it. And so, all that remains for Your Lordship to do is to try and manage what Bishop Neumann cannot perform, since it was precisely with this in view that the Holy See, relying on the known excellent qualities of Your Lordship, chose you to be the coadjutor of the Bishop of Philadelphia »¹⁰⁰.

In the fall of 1858, « the next National Council which will be held in the United States at the time appointed for it » meant that the idea of a Second Plenary Council of Baltimore was in the air. As archbishop, Kenrick was informed about the decision regarding Phil-

⁹⁹ Curley, *Neumann*, 307-336; G. Orlandi, *Neumann e i vescovi degli U.S.A. nelle lettere dell'Archivio di Propaganda Fide, 1852-1860*, in *Spic. Hist.* 24 (1976) 336-340.

¹⁰⁰ APF, LDB, vol. 349 (1858), ff. 936r-937v, Barnabò to Neumann, Barnabò to Wood, November 15, 1858, Rome.

adelphia, one of his suffragan Sees. In his answer to Barnabò he tells him that his letter does not say when the Council is to take place¹⁰¹. It was Kenrick who associated the American College and the Plenary Council. In January 1859, before he knew that he was not to call the Council, he wrote his brother: « In the meantime I am awaiting an answer of the Cardinal Prefect [on another subject]. He wrote me lately that a plenary council would be held very soon... This Plenary Council will be quite necessary, in order to fix upon the government of the [American] College »¹⁰².

When one considers the time required for setting up a plenary council, holding it and getting it approved, it seems that Kenrick must not have realized with what speed Rome was to finalize the establishment of the college that had been in the planning stage since 1854. In the letters from Rome, dated June 1, 1859, the bishops were told to consult on candidates for the office of rector; the archbishops were to consult with their suffragans and settle upon three names to be proposed to the Pope, who would appoint one of them as rector. The other provinces were to work through the archbishop of Baltimore who would send the data to Rome¹⁰³. The rector was to be an American. This was one of the initial recommendations of O'Connor, Neumann and Lynch in 1855. At that time Rome said that an answer « pertaining to the election of the rector » was a matter that « should be deferred »¹⁰⁴. The decision regarding an American as rector was a delicate matter. In March of 1859 Kenrick wrote his brother: « The Americans will want one of their own as rector and it is hard to find one both willing and fitted for the work ». He also said that he foresaw « jealousies arising if an American is not given the honor of rector »¹⁰⁵.

The choice of the rector is well known. In a letter of November 22, 1859, Rome informed Kenrick that Father William George McCloskey of New York had been elected by Propaganda on November

¹⁰¹ AAB, 32C—P-4, Barnabò to Kenrick, August 16, 1858, Rome; APF, LDB, vol. 349 (1858), ff. 626-627; Kenrick to Barnabò, October 4, 1858, Baltimore, APF, SRC AC, vol. 18 (1858-1860), ff. 339-340. See Orlandi, *Spic. Hist.* 24 (1976) 397-398, 403.

¹⁰² *KFC*, 417, Kenrick to Kenrick, January 19, 1859, Baltimore. More work needs to be done on the early Roman reports, beginning in 1858, concerning the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore which, *de facto*, was not held until 1866.

¹⁰³ AAB, 32C-R-1-2, Barnabò to Kenrick, June 1, 1859, Rome. For Hughes' dislike of this arrangement regarding the role of Kenrick, see Marschall, *Kenrick*, 289.

¹⁰⁴ See above, nn. 40, 43.

¹⁰⁵ *KFC*, 419, Kenrick to Kenrick, March 4, 1859, Baltimore.

14 and confirmed by Pope Pius IX on November 20¹⁰⁶. To understand Neumann's part in this phase of the history of the college, we must return to the metropolitan province of Baltimore. In a letter of July 14, 1859, the archbishop of Baltimore wrote his brother: « In accordance with the wishes of the S. Congregation I have recommended the names of three priests from whom the rector of the American College is to be chosen »¹⁰⁷. In accord with the wishes of the same Congregation he had also contacted his suffragans for their nominations. In his reply, Neumann says: « We have no priest in this diocese whom I could freely recommend to [*sic*] the Rectorship of the American College in Rome. I am moreover but very little acquainted with the clergy of the other dioceses and find myself incompetent to judge about their qualifications for the above important office ». After making a recommendation about the Vincentians — to be treated shortly — he adds: « I will be perfectly satisfied with any nomination or appointment, made by others who are more acquainted with American clergy and with the circumstances of Rome »¹⁰⁸.

One of the names submitted was of the Philadelphia priest, William O'Hara, whose name was first on the list of Bishop Lynch of Charleston, South Carolina¹⁰⁹. Neumann did not propose his name; he was trying to keep him for Philadelphia where he was desperately needed. The diocesan seminary there was founded by Kenrick in 1832; beginning in 1841 it was conducted by the Vincentians¹¹⁰. The very year that Neumann entered Philadelphia, 1852, he was faced with the crisis of the loss of the Vincentians. They were suffering from a lack of manpower, with too many of their seminary

¹⁰⁶ AAB, 32C-R-6, Barnabò to Kenrick, November 22, 1859, Rome. See McNamara, *American College*, 61-62, 89-94.

¹⁰⁷ KFC, 422, Kenrick to Kenrick, July 14, 1859, Baltimore. See Kenrick to Barnabò, July 19, 1859, Baltimore, APF, SOCG, vol. 984 (1859), ff. 789rv.; Kenrick to Bailey, August 8, 1859, Baltimore, AAB, 32A-U-4. See Marschall, *Kenrick*, 289; Orlandi, *Spic. hist.* 24 (1976) 421.

¹⁰⁸ AAB, 30-U-26, Neumann to Kenrick, July 15, 1859, Philadelphia. For similar statements made by other bishops, see Marschall, *Kenrick*, 288. For the writer's edition of the Neumann-Kenrick Letters, see *Spic. hist.* 28 (1980) 47-123. The editing required that the letters be numbered differently. The present letter (26) is listed as 25 in the printed edition.

¹⁰⁹ APF, SOCG, vol. 984 (1859), ff. 803-804v, Lynch to Barnabò, August 10, 1859, Charleston. See McNamara, *American College*, 702, n. 3.

¹¹⁰ Hugh Nolan, *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851*, Philadelphia 1948, 148-155. See also George O'Donnell, *St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia*, Philadelphia 1964.

teachers becoming bishops, including Father Thaddeus Amat, the rector of the Philadelphia seminary, whose name was first on the list for the diocese of Monterey and who was named bishop the following year. Neumann's attempt to save Amat was in vain¹¹¹. With his acute lack of priests in the diocese, he was anxious to bring in a religious order but did not succeed¹¹². His appreciation of the diocesan seminary was so great that he decided, despite the shortage of priests, to have the diocesan priests conduct it; it has remained ever since in their care. The man chosen by Neumann to be the rector was Father William O'Hara who gathered a capable faculty and continued in office all the time Neumann was bishop¹¹³. This is the man that Neumann did not want to lose, the man about whom he grew apprehensive when his name began to come up for a bishopric¹¹⁴. In the light of this background it seems that Neumann's answer to Kenrick is a clever answer, one worded with great care. He does not say that he does not have a candidate, but that he does not feel free to name a man. Neumann likewise was not involved in the process whereby the name of his coadjutor, Bishop Wood, surfaced as a possible candidate for the office of rector of the college. This was an affair between Wood and Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati. In a letter to Purcell, Wood refuted the rumor that the locale chosen for the college was unhealthy. He then asked how the rector was to be chosen¹¹⁵. In a letter to Kenrick, Hughes tells him that Purcell had mentioned the name of Wood as a candidate for the rectorship. To this he adds: « I would be pleased with that appointment »¹¹⁶.

Although Neumann made no specific nomination regarding the rector, he had decided convictions regarding the government of the college. After informing Kenrick that he had no specific name to recommend, he goes on to say: « The most easy and expeditious way to settle the affair would be in my opinion to entrust the direction

¹¹¹ APF, SRC AC, vol. 16 (1852-1854), ff. 114r-115r, Neumann to Cardinal Prefect, June 7, 1852, Philadelphia. See André Sampers, *Bischof Johann Nep. Neumanns Briefwechsel aufbewahrt in römischen kirchlichen Archiven, 1852-1859*, in *Spic. Hist.* 24 (1976) 255-258.

¹¹² Curley, *Neumann*, 346-347, 473, n. 44.

¹¹³ O'Donnell, *St. Charles Seminary*, 39-40.

¹¹⁴ Curley, *Neumann*, 347.

¹¹⁵ AUND, Cincinnati Papers, II, 4-0, Wood to Purcell, April 15, 1859, Emmitsburg. Copies of these Wood letters are contained in ABPR, N.

¹¹⁶ AAB, 29-J-4, Hughes to Kenrick, September 17, 1859, New York.

of the college to the direction of the Lazarists — but there appears to be a considerable reluctance against them in several of the bishops as to make them probably unavailable »¹¹⁷.

Although this was Neumann's view, it seems that the move to entrust the institution to the Vincentians was especially the work of Bishop John Timon, C. M., of Buffalo who, in his years as a Vincentian, had spent ten years in seminary administration¹¹⁸. In 1856, when there was difficulty getting a building for the college, Timon suggested that the Vincentians conduct the college in one of their two houses in Rome¹¹⁹. With the problem more to the fore in 1859, twice within a little over a month, Kenrick wrote his brother in St. Louis: « The bishop of Buffalo thinks that it ought to be given into the charge of a religious order or congregation in order to insure success ». The second letter spoke of a « religious order or congregation of clerics »¹²⁰. This refers to the Vincentians as is clear from Timon's recommendations. His diary, which shows us that he was in New York City on August 2, 1859 reads: « Send names of three Lazarists for President of American College: S[tephen] Ryan, J[ohn] Lynch, A[nthony] Penco. Signed by Archbishop, self and Bishop Smith »¹²¹.

Other names were associated with the move to have the college conducted by the Vincentians. After telling his brother in St. Louis about Bishop Timon's proposal, Archbishop Kenrick goes on to say: « I quite agree with him and would not oppose a plan to give it to the priests of the Congregation of the Mission, whom I hold in high esteem ». That was written in January 1859. In March he reaffirms his stand, but points out a difficulty when he writes: « I would not oppose such a plan, though I foresee jealousies arising if an American is not given the honor of Rector. I would willingly give the charge to the priests of the Mission of St. Vincent de Paul »¹²². Even as late

¹¹⁷ AAB, 30-U-26, Neumann to Kenrick, July 15, 1859, Philadelphia.

¹¹⁸ I. F. Mogavero, *Timon, John*, in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV, 165; J. F. Easterly, *The Vincentian Fathers. A Survey, in Thought Patterns* 9 (1961) 120-157.

¹¹⁹ AAB, 31-R-26, Timon to Kenrick, December 12, 1856, Buffalo.

¹²⁰ KFC, 417, 419, Kenrick to Kenrick, January 19, March 4, 1859, Baltimore.

¹²¹ Archives of the Diocese of Buffalo, Timon Diary, August 2, 1859. I am indebted to my confrere, Reverend Joseph Adamec, who sent me a copy of this page of the Diary. The Bishop Smith mentioned here is Timothy Clement Smith OCSO (1810-1865) who was appointed coadjutor bishop of Dubuque with the right of succession in 1857 and who was bishop there from 1858 to 1865. See Joseph Bernard Code, *Directory of the American Hierarchy (1789-1964)*, New York 1964, 274.

¹²² See above, n. 120.

as July, Kenrick could write to Barnabò and tell him that he would be well satisfied if the measure of entrusting it to the Vincentians were adopted¹²³.

That is a statement of theory that must be seen against the existential circumstances. It was made in the letter in which Kenrick forwarded to Rome the names of three American diocesan priests to be considered for the rectorship. Furthermore, he candidly reports a certain amount of prejudice against the American College because some did not regard it as an American institution. One of the roots of the bias was the problem of the designation of an American priest as rector. Although, theoretically, Kenrick could go along with the desire to have the college run by the Vincentians, he proposed the names of three diocesan priests for consideration and candidly admitted his fears that it would not be regarded as an American College if it were confided to a religious order¹²⁴. Kenrick's statement is also made against the background of informing Barnabò that he heard from Timon who suggested that the college be entrusted to the Vincentians and who also reported that the archbishop of New York (Hughes) went along with this. Timon must have read more into Hughes' remarks than Hughes intended. In his letter to Barnabò, Hughes proposed his own three candidates, the first on the list, William McCloskey, becoming the first rector of the American College. In the letter he also gave an assessment of Kenrick's candidates, despite an earlier statement that he would forward no objections. With regard to Timon's *terna* of Ryan of St. Louis, Lynch of Buffalo and Penco of Genoa, Italy, Hughes wrote: « To these names I should have no objection except that it has been understood that the Holy See desired secular clergy to be at the head of the college »¹²⁵. This could allow some probability that, on the theoretical level, Hughes would be willing to go along with the Vincentians, if the actual circumstances were different.

¹²³ APF, SOCG, vol. 984 (1859), ff. 789rv, Kenrick to Barnabò, July 19, 1859, Baltimore.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* For bias against the College, see McNamara, *American College*, 38-39; Marschall, *Kenrick*, 287-288. Kenrick's candid report was an occasion for Barnabò to rebuke once again the nationalistic spirit associated with the institution. See AAB, 32C-R-4, Barnabò to Kenrick, August 18, 1859, Rome; APF, LDB, vol. 350 (1859), ff. 519v-520r. Barnabò asked Kenrick to do his utmost to refute the accusation against the College. See also *KFC*, 426, Kenrick to Kenrick, Sept. 16, 1859, Baltimore.

¹²⁵ APF, SOCG, vol. 984 (1859), ff. 801rv-803rv, Hughes to Barnabò, September 23, 1859; AANY, A-12; ACUA, HM 16, reel 4. See also AAB, 29-J-3, Hughes to Kenrick, September 3, 1859; Marschall, *Kenrick*, 289-291.

From the above it is evident that Neumann was not alone in the Vincentian project. His view in 1859 is a change of opinion from his stand in 1855 when, as a member of the conciliar committee of three, he agreed that the rector should be a « clergyman belonging to some diocese in the United States ». It is possible that Neumann merely went along with this as a member of the committee. As can be recalled, that committee came up with nine recommendations. When these were brought to the floor and voted on, Neumann moved for the acceptance of the fourth, sixth and seventh proposals; it was not Neumann who moved for the acceptance of the fifth proposal which stipulated that the rector be a diocesan priest¹²⁶. Furthermore, other things could account for the change of stand, viz., time to give the matter more thought, his personal appreciation of the Vincentians in conducting seminaries and his psychological closeness to Timon, to whom Neumann was « the good and holy bishop »¹²⁷. In his personal honesty he recommended that the college be administered by the Vincentians; at the same time, reading the signs of the times, he saw, as already noticed, that there was not much chance of this measure being adopted by the bishops.

CONCLUSION

As previously stated, the purpose of these pages was to study the literature, printed sources and archival material dealing with the American College to find out the role of Neumann in this episode. The study of the literature was necessary for background and continuity. The printed sources and especially the archival material show that Neumann was much more involved than the present literature indicates. This, in its own way, is a contribution. These pages also shed added light on Neumann's life and personality. They show his forthright honesty and courage in expressing his mind, in expressing a view that was not the popular one (the American College and the Vincentians), in giving an opinion which was not all that the questioner would like to hear (telling Lefevere that he preferred Rome to Louvain). In the Gospel sense his yes was yes and his no was no. They also give added confirmation for his interest in education, an

¹²⁶ See above, n. 40.

¹²⁷ For Neumann and Timon in Rome, Germany and in Buffalo where Neumann gave the annual retreat to the diocesan clergy, see Curley, *Neumann*, 229, 233, 245.

interest for which he was especially noted. Clearly to the fore is his appreciation of priestly learning along with holiness; to him, one without the other did not constitute priestly education. These pages evidence his appreciation for priestly vocations in general. Furthermore, in his years as bishop of Philadelphia, this foreign-born, but naturalized American citizen¹²⁸, saw that the answer to the shortage of priests was a native clergy. He worked tirelessly to foster native vocations, insisted that vocations could come from among the poor and it was up to the diocese to foster and finance such vocations¹²⁹. The work of this immigrant bishop for the American College in Rome is another manifestation of his concern for a native clergy, and also for the building up of what we in the twentieth century can now designate as the native Catholic Church in the United States of America.

¹²⁸ For the documentary evidence for his citizenship, see Neumann Center Museum, St. Peter's, Philadelphia, Wilfrid Zielinski to Francis Litz, September 21, 1959, Baltimore; C. Francis Poole to Litz, September 28, 1959, Baltimore. See also *Neumann Newsletter* VI.

¹²⁹ Curley, *Neumann*, 379-381. See the writer's *People's Response to St. John Neumann*, in *Pastoral Life* 27 (May 1978) 38-42.