The Reformation of Philadelphia Catholicism, 1830-1860

During the middle decades of the nineteenth century the Roman Catholic church in America underwent an extensive and profound transformation. In a remarkably short time a Catholic establishment infused with the egalitarian and republican ideals of the American Revolution was replaced by one in which hierarchical principles and absolutist administration predominated; a “plain style” of Catholic devotion that had characterized the church in the early years of the republic gave way to elaborate devotional exercises, intense pietism, and apostolic zeal; and an institutional structure was erected that made the Catholic church a physical presence in local communities throughout much of the nation. 1

This reformation—and it was nothing less—of Roman Catholicism in the nineteenth century has attracted little attention from American historians, but it carries important implications for our understanding of the social and cultural dynamics of antebellum America. One area open for reconsideration is the relationship that obtained between the church and America’s swelling immigrant population. American historians have commonly assumed that Catholicism gave “perfect expression” to “the dejection that was the peasant experience and . . . to the insouciant morality of traditionalist culture.” How-
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ever, the vast changes that overtook the church during the period of rising immigration owed little to the peasant cultures of rural Europe. Rather, they derived from the sophisticated urban environment of restoration Rome and were part of a general attempt to impose universal and absolute standards upon national churches everywhere.\(^2\)

Because the reform impulse centered in Rome and did not reflect either American or northern European cultural imperatives, it provoked strong resistance within the American church both from “Americanists” who held to republican traditions that grew out of the American revolutionary experience, and immigrants who sought to preserve their national and ethnic traditions in the New World. America’s Catholic community in the antebellum years was thus a complex and dynamic entity within which widely differing ideological, institutional, and cultural interests competed for dominance.

Nowhere in America were the Roman reforms manifested earlier or with greater effect than in Philadelphia, and nowhere were the controversies attending the imposition of universal and absolute standards more heated. There, in the three decades before the Civil War, two extraordinary men—Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick and his successor, Bishop John Nepomucene Neumann— instituted reform programs that had significant consequences for the development of the church on both sides of the Atlantic. Because Philadelphia was in the vanguard of the transformation of the American church, a close examination of the development of the diocese can provide important insights into broader themes in the history of the American church as well as new perspectives from which to view the general social and cultural history of mid-nineteenth-century America.

Beginning in 1815 with the final defeat of Napoleon and the restoration of the papacy, western Catholicism embarked upon a half-century of reform that culminated in a major redefinition of doctrine and dogma at the First Vatican Council in 1869-1870. This international reform imperative was directed by the Roman Curia and represented a reaction against the liberal, secular, and nationalist

tendencies that had been unleashed during the "Age of Democratic Revolutions."³

In ecclesiastical terms these reforms involved a progressive centralization of authority in the Roman Curia and the pope, a tendency legitimated by the doctrine of papal infallibility which gained broad acceptance within the restoration church and was formally adopted by the Vatican Council in 1870. This centralization of authority was accompanied by a broad "monarchization" of the church as episcopal authorities extended controls over both laity and parish clergy and systematically suppressed any internal expression of democratic or nationalist tendencies. Taken together, these ecclesiastical reforms cast the international church as an unyieldingly absolutist and universal institution, firmly opposed to the liberal and nationalist tendencies that characterized so much of nineteenth-century Western political culture.

The reform imperative also had a profound effect upon religious life. Beginning in the episcopacy of Pius VII (1800-1823), the church embarked upon a general redefinition of Catholic life. The new reforms were inspired by those resulting from the sixteenth-century Council of Trent, and involved a vast expansion of the institutional structures and devotional activities that gave form and substance to Catholic communities throughout the Western world. Tridentine Catholicism emphasized parish life, and, in order to do so, reformers of the restoration period undertook elaborate and expensive building programs. They sponsored the organization of parish missions and promoted the formation of religious societies, confraternities, and sodalities, all of which supported a determined attempt to involve intimately the laity in a comprehensive social network centered on the parish church.⁴


⁴ On Tridentine Catholicism, see John Bossy, "The Counter Reformation and the People
Devotional activities were similarly expanded and elaborated. Pius VII himself increased the number of Marian feasts and instituted new sanctification processes "in the conviction that the heroic virtues of the saints would inspire the simple believer to imitation." He and his successors also called for processions and pilgrimages and other elaborate public displays of devotion as a means of inspiring religious fervor among the faithful. At the same time, reformers greatly elaborated and standardized Catholic liturgies and devotional practices, and everywhere strenuous efforts were made to upgrade the religious instruction of priests.⁵

Reformers also emphasized the apostolic mission of the church. During the nineteenth century old missionary orders were revitalized and new congregations established and, under the direction of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, the church undertook nothing less than "the restoration of society in a Christian spirit." In addition to the clerical orders, an extensive network of mission and tract societies—similar to those of the Protestant "Benevolent Empire"—were founded in an attempt to "rechristianize" the world. The Association for the Propagation of the Faith was founded in 1822 in Lyons, and two years later the Annales de la Propagation de la Foi began to be distributed internationally. In Vienna the Leopoldine Foundation began its extensive support for foreign missions in 1828 and was soon joined by the Rhenish Xaverius Society and the Bavarian Ludwig Society.⁶

Apostolic zeal involved more than support for missionary orders. Ironically, perhaps, Ultramontane "zealots"—the most reactionary faction among the antimodernists, and the one which dominated the Curia after 1824—were quick to turn modern methods of generating popular enthusiasm to their purposes. They made extensive use of the popular press and lay organizations and in the realm of education, especially at the elementary level, were absolutely hostile to any education that was not "single-minded." Thus, the nineteenth-century
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Catholic reformation, while politically reactionary and inspired by an idealized conception of society, incorporated within itself many forms of social and political organization that are characteristic of "modern" Western culture.⁷

Taken together, these reforms effected a massive transformation of Western Catholicism, but their impact was not everywhere simultaneous. In Europe the reform impulse generally proceeded from south to north, affecting first the countries adjoining the Mediterranean and spreading northward in the second half of the century. In England the Roman revival was sparked by Cardinal Nicholas Patrick Stephen Wiseman who was appointed Pro-Vicar Apostolic of London in 1847. Upon his appointment, Wiseman instituted a far-reaching program of reform that included a major evangelical campaign, the development of an elaborate network of Catholic associations, and the establishment of myriad schools, churches, and devotional societies. Wiseman's efforts generated an enormous revival of Catholic devotional activity. Within one year of his arrival in London, some 15,000 Catholics were said to have returned to the church as a result of the missions and retreats he sponsored. But this was only the beginning. Over the next eighteen years, under Wiseman's direction, the number of Catholic institutions and clergy swelled, episcopal controls were extended over both clergy and laity, and devotional exercises were elaborated. So profound were the changes Wiseman wrought that upon his death in 1865 it was said that he "found English Catholics a persecuted sect and left them a Church."⁸

Wiseman's reform of the English church paralleled the efforts of his contemporary, Paul Cardinal Cullen, in Ireland. In 1850 Cullen, the rector of the Irish College at the Propaganda in Rome, became bishop of Armagh and soon thereafter assumed the archepiscopacy of Dublin. Over the next quarter of a century this "Counter-Reformation
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zealot for whom the Council of Trent was still a living reality," completely remade Irish Catholicism. Like Wiseman, he promoted the construction of schools and churches, standardized and elaborated devotional practices, fostered the growth of religious associations, asserted episcopal authority over clergy and laity, and instigated a major evangelical revival. As a result of this "devotional revolution," according to a recent study, "the great mass of Irish people became practicing Catholics."9

What is significant for the student of American history is that these revolutions in English and Irish Catholicism were anticipated in America by as much as two decades. Beginning in the 1830s members of the American hierarchy began to adopt the new institutional and ideological imperatives that originated in Rome with the result that by the time that the great mass of emigrants from Catholic regions of northern Europe began to flood into the United States, the American church in many areas had already instituted reform programs that would not be replicated in their homelands until the second half of the century. Thus, immigrants in antebellum America encountered a Catholic community organized around principles and practices quite different from those to which they had been accustomed. What is more, the Catholic church in America, under the influence of the reform imperative emanating from Rome, made little effort to accommodate—indeed was often hostile to—traditional practices rooted in the peasant societies of northern Europe. Rather than reflecting and embodying the immigrants' cultural perspectives, the Roman Catholic church in America actively sought to modify them.

The first efforts to reform American Catholicism took place in Kentucky among French emigré priests, but they had little influence upon the nation’s burgeoning urban centers. Then, in 1830, Francis Patrick Kenrick, a graduate of the Urban College at the Propaganda who had served previously at Bardstown, Kentucky, assumed the episcopacy of Philadelphia. There he instituted a series of reforms that decisively influenced the development of Catholicism in his

diocese and provided a model for similar efforts elsewhere. So broadly did this reform imperative spread and with such effect that by the 1860s the American church was, in the words of the archbishop of Baltimore, "Roman to the core."\(^{10}\)

To understand the rapid spread of the Roman reforms in America and Philadelphia's place at the forefront of change, it is necessary to review the condition of the church during the three decades before the Civil War. America's Catholic population swelled dramatically in the middle decades of the nineteenth century. However, most of the new arrivals from Catholic regions of Europe were, as the Propaganda wryly noted, not of "that class of Catholics who are most punctual in the discharge of their religious duties." Only nominally Catholic in their homelands, immigrants often shed their faith in America. Bishop Francis Kenrick, writing to Rome in 1838, complained of a widespread "want of desire to approach the sacraments," among his charges. "Religious exercises are neglected and forgotten," he continued, "and though the majority profess at least an external respect for some sect or other, there are many who have no creed at all." John England, bishop of Charleston, was more succinct in his assessment. America, he said, was an "ungrateful land, which seems to devour its Catholic population."\(^{11}\)

Apostacy was by no means the only problem faced by the American hierarchy. In a vast and rapidly growing country where the constitutional separation of church and state precluded use of the civil government to enforce dogma and where innumerable sects competed for the adherence of a mixed population that was largely unchurched, institutional controls, such as they were, quickly broke down. Even in urban areas priests were often poorly supervised and educated. Some of them were even unfamiliar with essential elements of Catholic faith. In this situation varieties of religious practice and belief proliferated and heresy erupted as a polyglot clergy improvised ritual and doctrine.\(^{12}\)

\(^{10}\) Archbishop Martin Spalding's comment is cited in Robert D. Cross, *The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America* (Chicago, 1968), 19.

\(^{11}\) All three quotations are from "The Missions of the United States in 1838," *Annals of the Propagation of the Faith* (September 1838), reprinted in *American Catholic Historical Researches* 8 (1891), 161-67 (hereafter, *Researches*).

\(^{12}\) The concern of American prelates for the proper training of priests is evident in accounts
Particularly disturbing, because it struck directly at episcopal authority, was the practice of "trusteeism"—the tendency of lay leaders to assume control of the government of local congregations even to the point of hiring and firing pastors. This practice had originated in colonial times when laymen in many communities—on their own initiative and without clerical supervision—had raised money, purchased land, and built a church, and only then petitioned authorities to send them a priest. The result was a congregational form of local church government in which the operations of the church were overseen by a board of lay trustees, often democratically elected. In the eyes of the American bishops such democratic tendencies and lay involvement in the government of parishes constituted a "great evil"—the work of "ignorant or unprincipled" laymen and priests who had been influenced by Protestant heresies and who claimed "imaginary rights." By 1829 conflicts over the issue of trusteeship already had been the source of "dangerous schisms" within the church, and in the minds of the bishops, the practice had to be suppressed at all costs.\(^1\)

As the men who directed the American hierarchy sought to formulate solutions to these challenges, they were profoundly influenced by Rome. America in those times was still a mission territory and since the Revolution had been administered by the archbishop of Baltimore under the direction of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. Thus, from an administrative standpoint, the Roman Curia was necessarily a powerful presence in America. But within the American hierarchy even opponents of Roman centralization proved to be receptive to major elements of the reform impulse, because the reformers—with their emphasis on absolute submission to episcopal authority, the standardization and elaboration of doctrine and ritual, and unrelenting evangelism—directly addressed many of the most pressing difficulties besetting the church in the New World. What
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\(^1\) "Pastoral Letter to the Laity," issued by the First Provincial Council of Bishops at Baltimore in 1829, reprinted in ibid., 19-30. The extensive literature on the subject of trusteeship is reviewed in Carey, *People, Priests & Prelates.*
is more, the effectiveness with which these reforms could be prosecuted was amply demonstrated in Philadelphia.

Philadelphia in the second quarter of the nineteenth century was an extreme example of the turmoil within the American church. At the time the First Provincial Council met in 1829, the diocese encompassed the states of Pennsylvania and Delaware as well as the western regions of New Jersey. Within that vast area lived approximately 100,000 Catholics served by only twenty-two churches and thirty-five priests. The city of Philadelphia contained only four churches and two schools for a local Catholic population of approximately 25,000.14

Philadelphia was also a hotbed of trusteeism. In Philadelphia, lay trustees had battled to preserve their autonomy against a succession of bishops since the days of John Carroll. The most celebrated of these conflicts centered in St. Mary’s Church, since its founding (in the 1760s) the parish of Philadelphia’s Catholic elite and since 1808 the cathedral church of the diocese. St. Mary’s became a center of controversy in the 1820s when a group of prominent laymen, aided by local clergy, steadfastly defied the authority of Henry Conwell, Philadelphia’s second bishop, and determined to govern their own affairs in accordance with democratic principles.15

What was at stake at St. Mary’s, according to a recent study, was nothing less than “an attempt to create an American national church—one identified with American republicanism.” This American church would “incorporate both lay and clerical participation in local and national administration, thereby establishing a constitutional balance of powers within church government.” The bishops had to learn, according to William Hogan, parish priest at St. Mary’s and

a leader of the trustees' revolt, that "laymen are not [their] inferiors in society, nor perhaps in the order of Christianity." Furthermore, they had to understand that those who held "elevated stations, unless supported by virtue and a strict regard for the rights of others" would, in America, become nothing more than an "object of contempt." Mathew Carey, perhaps the most influential of the lay leaders, echoed the sentiments of his priest when he warned the bishops that "A different order of things prevails in this country. . . . The opinions and wishes of the people require to be consulted to a degree unknown in Europe."16

The institutional conflict at St. Mary's reveals a profound discrepancy between the democratic values that had become an integral element of America's "civil religion" in the age of Jackson and the absolutist doctrines of the restoration church. St. Mary's trustees were determined to resist the encroachment of episcopal authority and to assert rights that to them had been sanctified by the American revolutionary experience. Through the 1820s the conflict raged, subsiding to a temporary lull at the end of the decade as a result of direct Roman intervention, but in 1830 when the newly elevated bishop, Francis Patrick Kenrick, arrived to take control of the diocese, tensions were still seething and threatened to erupt at any time.17

Francis Kenrick was a graduate of the Urban College of the Propaganda. Born to a prosperous Dublin family, he had entered Rome in 1815, the year of Napoleon's final defeat, and, like many other seminarians of his generation, was profoundly influenced by the air
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of triumphant reaction he found there. Upon his ordination in 1821, he volunteered for the American mission, the first Propaganda graduate to do so, and was assigned to duty at Bardstown, Kentucky. There he distinguished himself as an evangelist and an uncompromising defender of episcopal prerogatives. He incessantly railed against the peculiarly American "spirit of independence" which, he complained to the Propaganda, "is felt by all [and] fills them with a proud confidence in their own judgments and with a jealous distrust against the exercise of every species of authority." His apostolic zeal, his administrative acumen, and his devotion to episcopal authority recommended him highly as the man to bring order and discipline to the chaotic and refractory Philadelphia diocese.\(^{18}\)

During the two decades in which he presided over the church in Philadelphia, Francis Kenrick systematically asserted episcopal authority over both laity and clergy, standardized and elaborated Catholic devotional activities, vastly expanded the institutional base of the church, promoted the development of a distinctively Catholic associational structure, and fostered a popular religious revival that brought thousands of apostates back into the church. Together with his successor, John Neumann (a Bohemian Redemptorist who ruled the diocese in the years after mid-century), Kenrick effected in Philadelphia a local variation of the international Roman reformation.

Bishop Kenrick's reign began and ended with bitter conflicts over episcopal authority. Shortly after his arrival, Philadelphia's third bishop assumed the position of chief pastor at St. Mary's Church, and by virtue of that title demanded the right to sit on the board of trustees. This set off a round of confrontations and denunciations between the bishop and lay leaders that resulted in the church's interdiction in the spring of 1831. Explaining his actions in a pastoral letter to the laity, Kenrick made it clear that "Catholic principles of church government" admitted no scope for democracy and local

autonomy. Instead, Catholics owed "rational and Christian obedience and subjugation . . . to the Prelates of the Church."\(^{19}\)

After services were interdicted, much of St. Mary's congregation, weary after a decade of controversy, drifted away into other churches. All that remained, Kenrick gleefully observed, were "the few ring leaders and some devoted partisans," who "assemble in the church yard to complain and plot." In order to weaken further the trustees' position, the bishop authorized the construction of a new church, St. John the Evangelist, which would be organized without trustees and would compete for the allegiance of the city's Catholic elite. Father John Hughes, the future archbishop of New York who at that time served as Kenrick's vicar general, supervised the project which was subsidized by a $40,000 interest-free loan from Marc A. Frenaye, a prominent silk merchant who served as procurator for the diocese. Kenrick then made public his intention to move the seat of the diocese from St. Mary's to St. John's as soon as construction of the latter was completed, and he petitioned Rome for permission to do so.\(^{20}\)

As their support melted away, the trustees retreated slowly. On May 21, 1831, they delivered to the bishop a letter in which they acknowledged that they had no right to appoint, reject, or remove pastors, but reserved to themselves the right to fix or withhold the salaries of clergy. Kenrick then lifted the interdict on the condition that three clergymen be allowed to sit as members of the board of trustees, and he publicly proclaimed that the interdict would be immediately reinstated if there were any attempt to withhold priests' salaries.

\(^{19}\) Francis Patrick Kenrick, *Diary and Visitation Record, 1830-1851*, trans. by Francis E. Tourscher (Lancaster, 1916), 44-50, gives a detailed account of the conflict from the bishop's perspective. See also Nolan, *Kenrick*, 117-25. The trustees' position is outlined in *Address of the Trustees of St. Mary's Church to the Congregation, April 16, 1831* (Philadelphia, 1831). Bishop Kenrick's response is expressed in *Pastoral Address of the Right Rev. Dr. Kenrick to the Congregation of St. Mary's, 22 April 1831* (Philadelphia, 1831).

\(^{20}\) The quote is from a letter written by Kenrick to Archbishop James Whitfield, May 17, 1831, in Nolan, *Kenrick*, 122. The circumstances surrounding the building of St. John's are treated in Joseph Kirlin, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1909), 275; Kenrick, *Diary and Visitation Record*, 50; Nolan, *Kenrick*, 125-27. Francis E. Tourscher in his edition of *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence, 1830-1862* (Philadelphia, 1920), viii, quotes Marc Frenaye to the effect that the specific purpose behind the building of St. John's was "to break down the system of trustee control at St. Mary's."
salaries. On May 23 the trustees in a formal meeting acknowledged their submission to these terms.\(^{21}\)

There then followed, between Kenrick and the trustees, a series of inconclusive skirmishes that dragged on through the summer. Salaries could not be paid except by the specific action of the trustees, and the board refused to meet. Kenrick responded with a proposal to remove himself completely from St. Mary's and to transfer the deed to the property, which he held, to the Society of Jesus. Rather than accept Jesuit control, the trustees capitulated completely on December 6, 1831, granting the bishop his full salary, which he accepted "with bad grace."\(^{22}\)

Buoyed by his victory over St. Mary's trustees, Kenrick moved to banish "every shadow of a doubt" as to his absolute authority, and to establish it "in such a way that even the Civil Tribunals could not make it a matter of question." The Baltimore Council of Bishops in 1829 had issued an edict requiring that wherever possible the deeds to all new churches were to be made out in the name of the bishop. Kenrick, however, proposed to go further. He sought to have all existing church property in the diocese legally transferred to his person. As a first step toward this end, he applied for, and on June 29, 1831, was granted American citizenship. There also was some question as to who represented episcopal authority in the diocese—Kenrick or his aged coadjutor, Bishop Conwell. A papal decree in August 1831 resolved this ambiguity by depriving Conwell of all episcopal jurisdiction and vesting all power in Kenrick.\(^{23}\)

Thus armed, the bishop set out on a visitation tour of the western parishes, resolved to implement his authority everywhere throughout the diocese. In Pittsburgh he confronted the laity of the newly constructed St. Paul's Church. There the trustees had independently secured a charter from the state legislature and "had the support and sympathy of the Catholic people at large." Kenrick attacked them directly. In a public address he told the congregation:
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\(^{21}\) Kenrick, *Diary and Visitation Record*, 50-51.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 51-57.

The church is yours. You have a perfect right to do what you please with it. . . . You may make of it, if you will, a factory, and I will not interfere. But . . . if you wish it to be a Catholic church, you must comply with the requirement of the law which I have laid before you. Now, do as you please.

Ultimately, St. Paul's trustees acquiesced to the bishop's demands, and so it continued throughout the diocese. Almost everywhere churches were reorganized "exclusively under ecclesiastical control." 24

On his return to Philadelphia Kenrick continued his assault on lay independence. In May 1832 he called his first diocesan synod and there promulgated a decree to the effect that no new church could be begun nor any old one enlarged without his personal sanction and further required that in every such case title to the property was to be legally reassigned to his person. Another decree threatened suspension to any priest who abetted attempts on the part of trustees to infringe on episcopal authority. 25

He also carried his campaign into the political arena, petitioning the state legislature for a formal recognition of his personal control of church property. This was granted with the passage on February 20, 1844, of an act specifically empowering the bishops of Philadelphia and the newly created diocese of Pittsburgh to "take and hold real property for the support and maintenance of . . . religious or charitable institutions[.]" 26

Bishop Kenrick attacked not only the legal basis of lay autonomy, but he was also determined to eradicate any democratic tendencies within local congregations. Time and again he required congregations to request changes in their church charters so as to allow him to appoint members to the boards of trustees. In the few cases where local congregations refused to accede to his orders, he challenged the legality of their charters in the courts, winning a number of significant victories. The bishop was thus not merely content with establishing

24 Nolan, Kenrick, 127; Kenrick, Diary and Visitation Record, 59, 63; O'Connor, Kenrick and His Work, 12; Francis P. Kenrick, Substance of a Sermon Preached in St. Patrick's Church, Pittsburgh, Pa. . . . (Pittsburgh, 1832).
absolute ecclesiastical authority as a general principle. He worked tirelessly to apply that principle to the government of each parish in the diocese. By 1838 it seemed that the battle had been won. In June of that year Kenrick wrote to inform Pope Gregory XVI that, “Almost nothing remains now to bar the free exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Trustees indeed still exist in a few of the churches; but they are not now meddling in affairs that belong to the Church.” However, the trustees’ silence did not signal their submission, and the bishop’s penchant for meddling in the affairs of individual parishes eventually involved him in a confrontation as acrimonious as that which had inaugurated his reign.  

In May 1850 Kenrick intervened in a dispute between the pastor and trustees of Holy Trinity parish, Philadelphia’s oldest German congregation. Instead of simply adjudicating the conflict, he advised the congregation that all future difficulties could be avoided if they simply gave up their right to elect trustees and allowed him to appoint the members of the board. When the congregation refused to acquiesce and instead threatened to suspend the pastor’s salary, Kenrick excommunicated the trustees and placed the church under interdict. Writing in his diary, the bishop noted his determination to “punish the leading troublemakers by cutting them off from communion with the church.” Furthermore, he wrote, “I imposed a censure even more severe on those among them who had entered into a conspiracy to uphold their rights.” Nothing could better illustrate the gulf between the American political tradition and Roman absolutism than the extraordinary assertion that men should be punished for conspiring to uphold their rights. Such conspiracies were integral to the American revolutionary heritage, but the form of Catholicism taking shape under Kenrick’s direction demanded that both clerics and laity be “tenacious to the Faith and most obsequious to the Holy See.”

Obsequity, however, was not in the character of Holy Trinity’s
trustees. They struck back. A new election for trustees was held and
the newly elected board immediately suspended the priest’s salary.
To emphasize their defiance, they then threatened to evict the priest
from his residence. Kenrick responded by excommunicating the new
board of trustees and instructing other churches to ban all members
of Holy Trinity’s congregation from attending services. He further
warned the congregation that he intended to close all Catholic cem-
eteries to them. This led to a temporary settlement in which the
board of trustees agreed to turn over control of the church to the
Jesuits. The interdict was then lifted, but the affair was far from
over. In 1851 a newly elected board of trustees challenged the set-
tlement in court, charging that it was contrary to the provisions of
the original charter. A long court battle ensued during which the
church was closed again.29

Thus the matter stood in August 1851 when Kenrick was elevated
to the archepiscopacy of Baltimore. He left behind a church in turmoil,
but one that had been largely transformed by his presence. During
his tenure in Philadelphia the “Americanist” tendency within the
church had not been completely obliterated, but authority relationships
within Philadelphia Catholicism had been substantially transformed.
Only at Holy Trinity did lay resistance to episcopal absolutism con-
tinue, and there pressures on the congregation were mounting.

Bishop Kenrick’s successor in Philadelphia was John Neumann. It
may have been that the hierarchy hoped that the appointment of a
German bishop would quiet the controversy at Holy Trinity, but such
was not the case. Bishop Neumann continued Kenrick’s unrelenting
campaign against lay autonomy, and Holy Trinity’s congregation
refused to yield. Following the same tactics that had proved to be so
effective in the battle against St. Mary’s trustees two decades earlier,
Neumann in 1852 ordered the construction of a new German church,
St. Alphonsus, to replace the idle Holy Trinity. At the same time,
he vigorously pursued court action against the trustees, appealing the

29 Dignan, The Legal Incorporation of Catholic Church Property, 182-83; Hertkorn, Retro-
spective of Holy Trinity, 101; “The Opening of Holy Trinity Parish,” Researches 22 (1905),
57.
case all the way to the state Supreme Court. In March 1854 the court decided in the bishop's favor.\textsuperscript{30}

As a result of the court's decision, Neumann recovered full legal title to all of Holy Trinity's property, and the court further ordered that the board of trustees be dissolved and a new one elected. The trustees, however, remained defiant. They refused to surrender the church and issued an appeal to the state legislature. On April 8, 1854, several of the trustees were arrested for contempt of court and thrown into Moyamensing Prison, where they remained for several weeks. Upon their release, the trustees were warned that any further intransigence would earn them several years in prison, and they, at last, submitted.\textsuperscript{31}

The capitulation of Holy Trinity's trustees effectively ended any lay challenges to episcopal authority in Philadelphia. Bishop Neumann followed up his victory with diocesan legislation that undercut what little power had been left to the laity. In 1855 he required that each parish supply and furnish a rectory for its pastor and curates, thus assuring the clergy of permanent housing. He further directed that all revenues of the parish be deposited with a treasurer appointed by the pastor and that a careful record of receipts and expenses be kept. Other legislation fixed the salaries of pastors and curates so that they could not be modified or suspended by the laity. Laymen were even prohibited from speaking in the church without the bishop's personal permission. The only concession made by Neumann to lay involvement in church affairs was a provision that two laymen, appointed by the bishop, were to be consulted on matters of importance. At the same time, he required that the deeds to all church property in the diocese be handed over to him within three months. Refusal to do so would result in forfeiture of the parish.\textsuperscript{32} By the end of 1855, as

\textsuperscript{30} On John Neumann's life and administration, see Michael J. Curley, Bishop John Neumann, C.SS.R., A Biography (Philadelphia, 1952). The court battle against Holy Trinity's trustees is treated on pp. 221-27. During this conflict Bishop Neumann was advised by Kenrick who, as archbishop of Baltimore, was Metropolitan of a see that included the Philadelphia diocese. See also Albert H. Waible, "Venerable John Nepomucene Neumann, Fourth Bishop of Philadelphia," Records 52 (1941), 25-33.

\textsuperscript{31} Curley, Bishop John Neumann, 221-27.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 286-87, 350.
a result of these decrees, absolutist principles of government had been firmly established throughout the diocese.

These autocratic practices had their origins in the Roman restoration, not in the peasant societies of northern Europe, and were unfamiliar to the great mass of immigrants, many of whom resisted the imposition of episcopal authority as strongly as the "Americanists" within the church. Much of the resistance came from the clergy. Prior to Kenrick's entry into the diocese, parish priests had operated with relatively little interference from higher authorities. Many of these mission priests were poorly schooled in Catholic doctrine—some had entered the diocese with questionable credentials—and they represented a number of different national Catholic traditions. In the absence of effective episcopal direction, devotions and practices varied considerably from place to place. At times local practices verged on heresy, and in some cases parish clergy had openly defied the hierarchy.

Bishop Kenrick was determined to bring order out of this administrative chaos and to discipline what, in his mind, were "unworthy" and "evil priests." It was absolutely necessary, he felt, that priests under his jurisdiction adopt "a line of conduct strictly conformable to the general Rules of the Church, which are so often neglected by individuals whose Rule is their own Sentiment, or the practice of some few others." Beginning with his first diocesan synod in 1832, he promulgated a series of decrees that "laid the cornerstone of ecclesiastical discipline throughout the diocese." At this first synod restrictions were placed on the observance of sacraments; standardized record-keeping procedures were inaugurated; priests were prohibited from exercising clerical functions outside their own parishes; and visiting priests from outside the diocese were banned from performing sacred functions. Furthermore, as a bar to the evils of simony and concubinage, priests were prohibited from accepting pay for performance of the sacraments and from hiring young girls as servants.33

These decrees were elaborated and supplemented in later synods. In January 1844 limits were placed on missionary orders operating

---

33 Bishop Kenrick to Cardinal M. Cappellari, Prefect of the Propaganda, July 15, 1830; and Bishop Kenrick to Fr. John Purcell, Aug. 24, 1830, both in Nolan, Kenrick, 109, 112-13; on the decrees of the 1832 synod, see ibid., 147; "Philadelphia's First Diocesan Synod."
within the diocese. The Redemptorists were given charge of the German parishes while the Jesuits and Augustinians were prohibited from administering sacraments to persons who were not pewholders in their churches. Guidelines were also established for the division of stipends between pastors and assistants, and strict rules were set regulating the administration of confession to women and young girls. Priests were required to keep “perfect parochial registers” on pain of suspension, and controls over visiting clergy were also strengthened. Henceforth, all priests entering the diocese were required to present their credentials to the bishop before being permitted to say Mass. Finally, in order to overcome the educational deficiencies of many of the clergy, quarterly conferences were established, during which instruction on moral theology took place. Attendance was mandatory.

Bishop Kenrick’s final synod was called in 1847. At it he standardized bookkeeping procedures throughout the diocese and required parish priests to submit regular financial reports. The rights and responsibilities of mission priests were further clarified, and priests were required to adopt a uniform dress—the ubiquitous frock coat. Although it was not mandated by church law, during this period priests in the diocese first began to insist upon the title “father.”

Bishop Neumann, at a synod he convened in 1855, elaborated upon the regulations established by his predecessor. He required that any priest entering the diocese from another place should render an “oath of obedience” and receive permission from both his own bishop and Philadelphia’s before being allowed to preach. Priests were also forbidden to visit seaside resorts, and curates were prohibited from leaving the rectory for a full day or night without the consent of their pastor or the bishop. Pastors, in turn, were not allowed to be absent from their rectories or to delegate spiritual duties to their assistants. Like his predecessor, Bishop Neumann also established a

34 Nolan, Kenrick, 281.

35 Ibid., 381-83. There is an extensive discussion of the usage of the term “father” in Researches 18 (1901), 83, 174-75. There the term is described as an “innovation” of the time, “after the church in the United States had begun to shake off the trammels of Protestant surroundings and influence and the laity had become more Catholic in spirit; say about 1840, the period of the decline of the Trustee system” (p. 175).
schedule of diocesan retreats as well as regular conferences at which points of moral theology were discussed.36

Enforcement of these regulations was not left to chance. Dissidents among the clergy were severely disciplined and censured. Some of them, despite the desperate need of clergy to staff the expanding institutions of the church, were exiled from the diocese. From his first days in Philadelphia Kenrick made it clear that he demanded from his clergy the same qualities of "humility, disinterestedness, obedience, docility, temperance, and purity with zeal . . . ," that he sought to inculcate in the Catholic laity. During the years of his tenure, according to his biographer, he "cleared the diocese, by removal or discipline, of those clerics who were not worthy of their calling." "Generally the life of the secular clergy is without blame," the bishop reported in 1838, and "the scandals that can arise by opposition to the excercise of episcopal authority have been removed or punished."37

Many clergymen chafed under these stringent restrictions—but while Bishop Kenrick reigned in Philadelphia, they kept their peace. With his successor it was another matter. Bishop Neumann proved to be a poor administrator and was therefore held "in low esteem" by many clergymen and lay leaders. His regulations of 1855 raised a storm of criticism among the parish clergy and, when he did not move quickly to discipline them, led to open denunciations. Dissident clerics sought to undermine the bishop by carrying their complaints to other members of the American hierarchy such as Michael O’Connor, the bishop of Pittsburgh, who then conveyed them to Rome and Baltimore. Viewing the situation from Baltimore, Archbishop Kenrick was dismayed at his successor’s inability to “apply a remedy” to the “manifestly unworthy” priests in his charge and added his voice to those who petitioned Rome for a change.38

38 Bishop Michael O’Connor to James Cardinal Franzoni, Aug. 16, 1855; and Archbishop Francis Kenrick to Archbishop Gaetano Bedini, July 23, 1856, both in Curley, Bishop John Neumann, 281-82, 290. The response to Bishop Neumann’s regulations is discussed on pp. 286-87.
The breach in discipline did not last long. In April 1857 a coadjutor was appointed for the Philadelphia diocese, and the new bishop, James F. Wood, moved strongly and decisively against the dissident clergy, sending the most obdurate rebels out of the diocese. Bishop Wood's appointment did not in any way reflect a retreat from the monarchical course upon which Kenrick had set the diocese nearly three decades earlier. Like Kenrick, Wood was a graduate of the Urban College at the Propaganda, and was firmly committed to the principle of episcopal absolutism. Although Wood had been brought into the diocese to quell dissatisfaction with Neumann's administration, the policies he pursued did not in any substantial way deviate from those of his predecessors. The difference between Wood and Neumann was not ideological, but rather a matter of personality and administrative acumen.  

The reforms instituted by Bishop Kenrick and his successors involved far more than the assertion of episcopal authority. Some of the most significant changes took place in the realm of Catholic devotion as Philadelphia's bishops sought to elaborate and standardize Catholic ritual and practice by bringing it into line with the Roman model. One of his primary objects in Philadelphia, Kenrick wrote shortly after his arrival in the diocese, was "to check the rash Spirit" that prevailed there and to bring "attention to the Sacred rites" into conformity with "the solemn practices of the Universal Church."  

At his first synod in 1832 Kenrick took steps to regularize Catholic devotions, particularly the sacraments. He required that strict records of marriages and baptisms be kept, that baptisms be performed in a church in the parish in which the parents resided, and that marriage rituals be standardized. Other decrees required that all churches be equipped with baptismal fonts and confessionals and that, except for emergencies such as the administration of last rites, no sacraments

---


40 Bishop Kenrick to Fr. John Purcell, Aug. 24, 1830, in Nolan, Kenrick, 112-13.
should be performed outside of a church. Other aspects of worship were also regulated. Kenrick prohibited midnight Masses, proscribed all religious books other than those he personally approved, and instituted a uniform catechism. In January 1844 music performed during worship services was standardized, and further specifications were made concerning the rituals of baptism and marriage.41

Bishop Neumann, described by his biographer as a “liturgist’s ideal,” attempted to impose an absolute uniformity of practice throughout his domain, and he “painstakingly” sought “to observe the smallest prescriptions of the church’s law governing her services.” He promulgated precise rules regarding the ceremonies attending the administration of the sacraments, even to the point of prescribing the quality of wine used in the Holy Sacrifice. He added the litany of Our Lady of Loretto to the invocation during services and distributed a uniform ceremonial.42

Under Philadelphia’s reforming bishops Catholic rituals also became more elaborate. As a result, the “Garden of the Soul” Catholicism that many writers have attributed to the “republican” church in the early years of the century was replaced by a new “devotional” style of worship which centered on the “exercise of piety” either through private devotion to a sacred image or through public exercises and displays. A number of devotional exercises and confraternities devoted to their observance were introduced into the diocese. These included the Confraternity for a Good Death, the Confraternity of the Scapular, the Confraternity of the Rosary, and the Confraternity of the Immaculate Heart, as well as the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament and the Confraternity of Our Lady of the Cincture. European missionary orders were also welcomed into Philadelphia, and apostolic associations such as the St. Vincent DePaul Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, and the Sodality for Conversion to the Faith were promoted there. By 1838 the work was well underway, and Kenrick was happy to report that “the practice of piety is seen

41 Nolan, Kenrick, 146-47; “Philadelphia’s First Diocesan Synod.”
among the people and a building up of moral life,” though, he admitted, “there are scandals too.”

The most important of these innovations was the Forty Hours devotion, observed in Philadelphia as early as 1832, long before it appeared elsewhere in America. Under Bishop Neumann the Forty Hours devotion became an exercise in the Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Eucharist and provided a powerful focus for Catholic piety. He established a rotating schedule of observances so that the Blessed Sacrament was always on display somewhere in the diocese and the exercises associated with it were expanded to involve “confession, Mass, Holy Communion, visits and the deepening of Christian doctrine from the sermons.” This round of devotional exercises was extremely popular, attracting thousands of worshippers wherever it was observed, and contributing greatly to the “spiritual building up” of Philadelphia Catholicism.

Institutional development accompanied this reorganization and elaboration of Catholic devotion. Drawing their inspiration from the Council of Trent, the reforming bishops sought to replicate in as many ways as possible the parish organization of the Tridentine church. This led to an intensive building program that made the church a physical presence in every community in which substantial numbers of immigrants settled. When Francis Kenrick arrived in Philadelphia, the diocese contained only twenty-two churches. Within eight years the total had grown to sixty-three, and when he left to become archbishop of Baltimore, his diocese, though much reduced in size after the creation of the diocese of Pittsburgh, boasted ninety-


two churches. During his administration the number of parishes in
the city of Philadelphia increased from four to twenty, and during
his two decades there Bishop Kenrick was responsible for the con-
struction of nineteen churches as well as the early work on the
Cathedral of Sts. Peter and Paul, the city's most enduring symbol of
Catholic unity.45

The extraordinary nature of this growth can be seen by comparing
it with that of other dioceses. In 1834, when Boston had fourteen
Roman Catholic churches and New York but six, Philadelphia had
already constructed forty-one. Two years later, Boston had added two
churches; New York, eight; and Philadelphia, seventeen. By 1838
Boston had increased the number of churches to eighteen; New York,
under the leadership of John Hughes, Bishop Kenrick's protegé, had
expanded to a total of thirty-eight; but Philadelphia remained far
ahead with sixty-three churches. In subsequent years other dioceses
gradually closed the gap between themselves and Philadelphia, but
Kenrick's primacy among America's "building bishops" was well
established.46

Philadelphia maintained its position at the forefront of Catholic
institutional development under Bishop Neumann. In fact, the pace
of church construction actually accelerated in the 1850s. During his
first thirty-four months in the diocese, John Neumann completed six
churches begun by his predecessor, rebuilt six others, and added thirty
more of his own. By 1855 he was able to report that his diocese, "in
the number of priests caring for souls, and the number
of . . . churches . . . , [is] larger than any other diocese or arch-
diocese" in America. Still the expansion continued. In 1857 alone
eleven new churches were constructed. Ultimately, in little more than
seven years Neumann was responsible for the construction of eighty
parish churches.47

45 The Tridentine emphasis on parish cohesiveness is discussed in Dolan, The Immigrant
Church. Figures on the institutional status of Philadelphia upon Kenrick's arrival and when
he left are from Nolan, Kenrick, 433, and were originally compiled from various sources.
See also Dennis Clark, "A Pattern of Urban Growth, Residential Development, and Church

46 Comparative statistics for Philadelphia and other dioceses are from the Catholic Directory
(Baltimore, 1833-43).

47 Curley, Bishop John Neumann, 219-20, 350; Clark, "A Pattern of Urban Growth,"
167; John Neumann to James Cardinal Franzoni, May 28, 1855, in Curley, Bishop John
Neumann, 274-76.
In order to staff these churches, a large number of new clergymen, many of them representing European missionary orders, were recruited into the diocese. Most of these were from northern Europe and as a consequence, in the eyes of a committed Ultramontanist like Bishop Kenrick, doctrinally suspect. He therefore went to great lengths to obtain properly trained parish clergy, and to this end solicited help from Rome. He induced his friend Paul Cullen, who was at that time rector of the Irish College at the Propaganda, to send properly trained priests to America, and Kenrick sent promising young men from Philadelphia to study in Rome. He also established St. Charles Borromeo's Seminary in 1832, housing and teaching theology to the first students in his own home. By 1838 the seminary, under the direction of Bishop Kenrick's younger brother, Peter Richard Kenrick, had produced fifteen priests and another thirteen were in training.48

Bishop Neumann was himself a Redemptorist missionary and did not share his predecessor's suspicion of such orders, but he continued Kenrick's interest in the preparation of priests. Under him the curriculum at St. Charles was broadened and the course of study lengthened from five to six years. He also founded a preparatory seminary to recruit young boys for the priesthood, and during his brief tenure he ordained sixty-one priests, many of them Redemptorist missionaries, for work in the diocese.49

Educational facilities expanded rapidly in the years after Bishop Kenrick's arrival. During his tenure he encouraged the establishment of two Roman Catholic colleges, Villanova (Augustinian) and St. Joseph's (Jesuit), and fostered the development of a parochial school system that embraced half the parishes in the diocese. He also required each parish church in the city to establish a Sunday school and a circulating library. John Neumann continued and greatly accelerated this work. By his own account, "the number of children [enrolled] . . . increased from five hundred to five thousand" within

the first year of his reign. In all, during his seven years in Philadelphia, Bishop Neumann founded thirty parish schools.50

Although the Catholic school system depended in its early years upon lay support and many schools were administered by laymen, steps were taken to minimize the possibility of lay interference in the socialization of Catholic youth. Under Bishop Kenrick a number of teaching orders were brought into the diocese and given charge of the educational facilities. Bishop Neumann continued this policy of shifting control of the educational process away from local congregations and the laity. He established a Diocesan Central Board of Education and charged it with developing and overseeing a general plan of instruction for all parochial schools. Texts and lessons were standardized, and priests were instructed to closely supervise classroom activities, especially those conducted by secular teachers. Like his predecessor, he brought into the diocese a number of teaching orders.51

In order to build and maintain constituencies within the immigrant population, Bishop Kenrick sponsored the development of an elaborate network of Catholic associations. Under him each parish church became the center of a constellation of societies, confraternities, sodalities, and other associations through which it operated as a neighborhood social center and insinuated itself intimately into the lives of local communities. Church-sponsored associations organized a wide range of activities. They sponsored lectures, held balls, mounted charity drives, organized fairs, excursions, and concerts, and in a hundred ways provided opportunities for social interaction, community participation, and the display of social differences.52


St. Augustine's Church, famous as a target of anti-Catholic mobs in 1844, provides an excellent example of such a parish network. Under Bishop Kenrick's aegis the parish developed a number of local associations that by the time of the nativist riots included a beneficial insurance society, a library society, a Christian Doctrine society, a total abstinence society, a youth's literary institute, a Confraternity of Our Lady of the Cincture, a Sunday school, a reading room society, a free school, and an orphan asylum run by the Sisters of Charity.

Institutional expansion and the growth of a Catholic associational network were closely linked to mission work. Prior to his arrival in Philadelphia, Kenrick had served for eight years on the Kentucky mission and he brought with him a determination "to carry the light of faith to . . . people seated in the darkness of error." One of his first acts upon entering the diocese was to proclaim a Jubilee to honor the ascension of Pope Pius VIII. In conjunction with this three churches in Philadelphia held two weeks of spiritual exercises that took on the aspects of a revival. "Piety assumed her ascendancy," the bishop thrilled, "and thousands [of prodigals] crowded to the Tribunal of Penance, and to the Divine Banquet . . . with streaming eyes and broken hearts, to deplore their excesses and seek mercy."

To stimulate conversions and a revival of faith, Kenrick assembled a remarkable body of clergy, many of whom were noted for their apostolic zeal and charismatic qualities. They included converts from Protestantism such as Charles C. Carter, a native Kentuckian who served as pastor at the Church of the Assumption and brought to his post the evangelical style of a frontier revivalist. Father Augustine Hewit, the son of a Presbyterian minister, eventually became general of the Paulists, an American missionary order dedicated to the conversion of Protestants. There were also several Jesuits, including Father James Cotting, a speaker of such power that Bishop Neumann

---


was moved to remark that if there were ten more like him the diocese would be completely converted in ten years. Father James Ryder, also a Jesuit and former president of the College of Holy Cross, was "one of the country's best speakers, everywhere attracting great audiences," as was Father Patrick E. Moriarty, an Irish partisan and "one of the best known Catholic orators of his day."

In the early 1840s Catholic associational activity began to mount, spurred by an evangelical total abstinence crusade. Temperance sermons were preached throughout the diocese and often precipitated revivals. In the summer of 1840 alone more than 5,000 Catholics in Philadelphia took the total abstinence pledge. Catholic temperance societies took to the streets in public displays that were reminiscent of religious processions in Rome. This intense activity reflected as well as promoted morale within the Catholic population. "Religion advances amidst difficulties," Bishop Kenrick informed the Propaganda in the spring of 1843, and he added that "Conversions are numerous and the eagerness to hear Catholic truth is increasing." Writing to the Propaganda in 1842, Michael O'Connor noted "the good spirit that is pervading the whole body of the clergy and people, emanating from the hierarchy and spreading through the whole mass."

The anti-Catholic riots of 1844 dashed Catholic spirits and almost completely halted evangelical and associational activity in the diocese, but the arrival of John Neumann in 1851 sparked a new revival.

---


56 The Catholic temperance movement in antebellum Philadelphia is treated in Edith Jeffrey, "Reform, Renewal, and Vindication: Irish Immigrants and the Catholic Total Abstinence Movement in Antebellum Philadelphia," in this issue of the Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography. Bishop Francis Kenrick to Paul Cullen, March 28, 1843; and Michael O'Connor to Paul Cullen, July 8, 1842, both in "Transcripts from the Archives of the Irish College in Rome, 1832-1848" (Record Collection #36) (American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia).
Under him, the Redemptorist fathers, an Austrian missionary order that had been first invited into the diocese by Bishop Kenrick in 1832, began an extensive round of parish missions aimed "not just at the Germans but the English."\textsuperscript{57}

Bishop Neumann himself took the lead in this evangelical activity. His annual visitations to the parishes of the diocese "were really missions" and the round of devotional activities he sponsored often "took on the proportions of a mission." He also introduced a system of collections in the diocese to support the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and requested that a local branch of the society be opened in Philadelphia. The popular response was enormous. A Jesuit mission held in St. Patrick's parish in 1858 attracted more than 3,000 communicants. Another mission in the Cathedral parish attracted 2,700, twenty-three of whom were Protestants who converted on the spot, while an observance of the Forty Hours in St. Paul's parish attracted about 3,000 communicants. "And so it goes," wrote Bishop Neumann to his sister, "the whole year almost without interruption."\textsuperscript{58}

The cumulative impact of these reforms upon the diocese of Philadelphia can hardly be overstated. Nearly every aspect of Catholic life and devotion was dramatically changed and set in a pattern that would continue well into the twentieth century. As a result of these reforms, Catholicity in the diocese was reinvigorated and a coherent Catholic community created. What is more, the programs and policies followed by Bishop Kenrick and his successors had an impact that was felt far beyond the bounds of the diocese.

In terms of institutional development, administrative reforms, and


\textsuperscript{58} Griffin, "History of St. John's," 137; John Neumann to his sister, March, 1858, in Curley, \textit{Bishop John Neumann}, 353. See also ibid., 158, 214, 227, 230, 350, 356, and 383 for other reports of mission activity. The general phenomenon of parish missions and their importance for American Catholic development is treated in Dolan, \textit{Catholic Revivalism}. 
devotional practice, Philadelphia was well in advance of other urban centers such as New York or Boston. Much of the legislation promulgated by Kenrick and Neumann was reenacted elsewhere and principles inculcated in Philadelphia “exercised everywhere a powerful influence.” Many of America’s most influential prelates served apprenticeships there.\(^{59}\)

But Philadelphia’s Catholic reformation took place within a broader context than American ecclesiastical development, for it was part of an international movement. Francis Kenrick, like Paul Cullen and Nicholas Wiseman, represented a generation of Propaganda-trained bishops who effected a general reformation within Western Catholicism. Not only did these three men, each so significant in the ecclesiastical history of a different nation, share a common commitment to reform, they also remained close friends throughout their lives. Kenrick’s efforts in Philadelphia were carefully monitored in Rome, and Paul Cullen, in particular, kept up a steady stream of correspondence with him in which nearly every aspect of the Philadelphia reform was detailed.\(^{60}\)

It would be too much to say that Ireland’s “devotional revolution” or the parallel reforms instituted in England by Cardinal Wiseman were modeled upon Philadelphia’s, for all derived from a common source. Still, making the comparison reminds us that antebellum

\(^{59}\) Nolan, *Kenrick*, 144, 417; Scharf and Westcott, *History of Philadelphia*, 2:1381; and O’Connor, *Kenrick and His Work*, 4. The prelates included John Hughes, secretary and vicar-general to Bishop Kenrick and pastor of St. John’s Church, who went on to become archbishop of New York; Francis X. Gartland, Hughes’s successor at St. John’s, who became bishop of Savannah in 1850; Peter Richard Kenrick, Bishop Kenrick’s younger brother, who served as rector at St. Charles Borromeo’s Seminary before becoming bishop and then archbishop of St. Louis; and Michael O’Connor, who also directed St. Charles Seminary before being elevated to the position of bishop of Pittsburgh.

\(^{60}\) Copies of the voluminous correspondence between Francis Kenrick and Paul Cullen are on file in Record Collection #36 (American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia). The continuing friendship between Bishop Kenrick and Cardinal Wiseman is noted in Nolan, *Kenrick*, 27, 168, 230, and 393.
America was very much part of a general complex of social, economic, and institutional relationships that encompassed all of Western culture and that important social and cultural processes in America often originated in events far beyond its borders.\textsuperscript{61}
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\textsuperscript{61} It is clear, for instance, that any account of anti-Catholicism in antebellum America that does not consider the changing nature of the church is inadequate. There are some few excellent works that consider themes of American development in an international context. These include, but are not limited to, Frank Thistlethwaite, \textit{The Anglo-American Connection in the Early Nineteenth Century} (Philadelphia, 1959); Robert Kelley, \textit{The Transatlantic Persuasion: The Liberal-Democratic Mind in the Age of Gladstone} (New York, 1969); and David Brion Davis, \textit{The Problem of Slavery in the Age of Revolution} (Ithaca, 1975).