

The University of Hull

**Politics, Interdenominational Relations and Education  
in the Public Ministry of James Doyle, O.S.A.,  
Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, 1819-1834**

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

in the University of Hull

by

**Thomas Gerard McGrath, M.A., Ph.D.(N.U.I.)**

September 1992

## CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Preface	iii
Maps	vii
Abbreviations	xi
Chapter 1 : Catholic Emancipation	1
Chapter 2 : Repeal and Reform	116
Chapter 3 : Interdenominational Relations	159
Chapter 4 : Education	238
Chapter 5 : Conclusions	355
Appendix 1 : Irish episcopal appointments, 1829	370
Appendix 2 : Rules and regulations for schools - in the Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin prescribed by the Right Rev Dr Doyle	373
References	376
Bibliography	450

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Here I wish especially to thank my supervisor Professor V. A. McClelland for his enthusiasm for this thesis, his constructive advice and his never-failing courtesy. I am also particularly indebted to Most Rev Dr Laurence Ryan, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, who tangibly supported this thesis by granting me a research year, 1988-1989, at Carlow College. I would like to express my appreciation to Mrs Eileen Francis who typed this thesis. Finally, as always, I would like to thank my parents, Denis and Mary McGrath.

## PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the public ministry of James Doyle, O.S.A., Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, 1819-1834. Bishop Doyle perceived his involvement in political life which in his time was dominated by Catholic issues as part of the public profession of his ministry. In 1825 in justification of his pronounced public role he wrote: 'In every nation a clergyman is separated from society only that he may labour the more efficiently for his fellow-man, and his duty of administering to their temporal wants is not less pressing than that of devoting himself to their spiritual concerns'.<sup>1</sup> In his era Doyle was widely regarded as the outstanding member of the Irish Catholic hierarchy and his profile was such that he enjoyed an international reputation. Yet apart from the work of the present writer on Doyle's pastoral ministry, which latter was exceptionally impressive, he has not been studied at length in the twentieth century.<sup>2</sup>

James Doyle was born near New Ross, County Wexford, in the diocese of Ferns in 1786. He was educated locally and by the Augustinians in New Ross. He entered the Augustinian novitiate in 1805 and pursued his studies at the University of Coimbra, 1806-1808, until these were interrupted by the opening exchanges of the Peninsular War. He was ordained priest in County Wexford in 1809 and attached to the Augustinian friary in New Ross until he was appointed to the Chair of Rhetoric in Carlow College in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin in 1813. The following year he competed successfully for the Chair of Theology and Sacred Scripture in the Carlow seminary. In November 1819, at the age of thirty-three, he was consecrated Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin.



This thesis studies the totality of Doyle's public life by examining the inter-related themes of politics, interdenominational relations and education. During Doyle's early years the penal laws against Catholics had been substantially removed from the statute book though the great and fundamental issue of Catholic Emancipation or principally Catholic membership of parliament remained outstanding despite having been promised about the time of the Act of Union, 1801.<sup>3</sup> The government of Ireland from the Act of Union to the period when Doyle became bishop was predominantly Orange. Ireland was managed in the Protestant interest with an accepted bias against the Catholics, who were excluded from virtually all administration and civil service positions of consequence.<sup>4</sup> While most of the penal laws had been struck down de jure, Catholics remained de facto second-class citizens. The whole spirit of Irish government and administration was hostile to Catholics and Catholicism even if the letter of punitive legislation had been largely removed. Catholic politics in the same period was characterised by divisive splits over how to secure Emancipation - the principal question being what concessions, if any, should be made by the Catholics in return for Emancipation. Doyle entered the Irish episcopacy and public life almost at the beginning of the decade which saw the issue of Catholic Emancipation dominate Irish and English politics. This is the subject of the first chapter of this thesis. Chapter two deals with the period from the achievement of Emancipation in 1829 until Doyle's death in 1834 when the cause of the Repeal of the Union, promulgated by O'Connell, was the dominant Irish political issue, perhaps to the detriment of possible legislative gains through piecemeal reform.

The 1820s also witnessed the beginnings of an evangelical crusade in Ireland known as the New Reformation. The Protestant archbishop of

Dublin declared before a parliamentary body in 1825 that 'In truth, with respect to Ireland, the Reformation may, strictly speaking, be said only now to have begun'.<sup>5</sup> Inter-church relations and the tithe war are examined in the third chapter in the context of the debate at national level in which Doyle was crucially important and also in relation to what was happening in his diocese. In Kildare and Leighlin the ratio of Protestants to Catholics was variously estimated by Bishop Doyle at one Protestant for every eight to ten Catholics.<sup>6</sup> For representations of the diocese see maps i-iii.

In the early nineteenth century education controlled by the state through the Established Church had only a marginal impact on the vast majority of the population which was Catholic. Education among the poor Catholics in pay or hedge schools was almost completely unregulated apart from the occasional intervention of the Catholic parochial clergy to ensure that catechesis took place or to deal with notoriously disreputable teachers. The state feared that politically disaffected teachers, without any proper or formal training, using unsuitable tracts, were teaching subversion in these schools. A parliamentary report of 1812 urged the government to support the interdenominational education of Catholics and Protestants without any hint of proselytism. The government more or less by default entrusted this task to the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland (more usually known from its place of residence as the Kildare-street or the Kildare Place Society) which had been founded in 1811 by a group of Dublin middle-class Protestants on the principle of non-interference with children's religious beliefs. Chapter four of this thesis examines why Bishop Doyle and the Catholic Church had difficulties with the Kildare

Place Society and also explores the divisive politics of education in the 1820s leading to the foundation of the Irish national system of education in 1831.

Within the major themes of this thesis, as adumbrated above, the issues are treated in a narrative chronological framework indicating the often-subtle changes of day-to-day Irish politics. The writer has assumed a certain familiarity with the basic issues on the part of his readership and has been concerned to make extensive use of the primary sources which allow us a detailed insight into the public and private faces of Bishop Doyle. This thesis then is a new and comprehensive study of Doyle's politics and his public career.

MAPS

		Page
i	Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin	viii
ii	County boundaries	ix
iii	Parochial structure	x

Diocese of Kildare & Leighlin



Diocese of Kildare & Leighlin, County boundaries



Diocese of Kildare & Leighlin Parochial Structure circa 1829



## ABBREVIATIONS

<u>Acta</u>	Acta Congregationum generalium, Archives of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, Rome.
Battersby, <u>Doyle</u>	[W. J. Battersby], <u>The life of the Rt Rev Dr Doyle, compiled from authentic documents by the author of the "Priesthood Vindicated" (3rd ed., improved and enlarged, Dublin, 1850).</u>
<u>Cath. Ency.</u>	<u>Catholic Encyclopaedia</u> , 16 vols (1st ed., New York, 1907-1914).
D.D.A.	Dublin Diocesan Archives.
<u>D.E.P.</u>	<u>Dublin Evening Post</u>
Doyle/J.K.L.	
____, <u>Pastoral, Lent 1821</u>	<u>Pastoral instructions for the Lent of 1821, addressed to the Roman Catholic laity of the dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin being a brief explanation of the sacrament of penance and the laws of the church, relating to Paschal Communion with observations on the nature and tendency of illegal associations to which is subjoined an appendix (Carlow [1821]).</u>
____, <u>Pastoral, Nov. 1822</u>	<u>Pastoral letter addressed to the Roman Catholics of the Deanery of Kilcock to be read to their respective flocks (corrected ed., Dublin, 1823).</u>
____, <u>Pastoral, June 1823</u>	<u>Miracle wrought by Prince Hohenlohe in the person of Miss Maria Lalor, of Rosskelton, Queen's County, who recovered the use of speech after more than six years' privation of that faculty through the intercession of James Doyle, D.D. Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin - from the original MSS in English, Latin and French (Dublin [1823]).</u>



- \_\_\_\_, Vindication                      A vindication of the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics addressed to his Excellency, Marquis Wellesley, K. G. Lord Lieutenant General, and General Governor of Ireland, etc., etc., by J.K.L. (Dublin, 1823).
- \_\_\_\_, Defence of the Vindication                      A defence by J.K.L. of his vindication of the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics (Dublin, 1824).
- \_\_\_\_, Letters on the State of Ireland                      Letters on the state of Ireland addressed by J.K.L. to a friend in England (Dublin, 1825).
- \_\_\_\_, Essay on the Catholic Claims                      An essay on the Catholic claims addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool, K.G. etc., etc., by the Right Rev James Doyle (Dublin, London, 1826).
- \_\_\_\_, Letter to Spring Rice                      Letter to Thomas Spring Rice, Esq., M.P., etc., etc., on the establishment of a legal provision for the Irish poor and on the nature and destination of church property (Dublin, London, 1831).
- Doyle et al., Letters on a re-union of the churches                      Letters on a re-union of the churches of England and Rome, from an to the Rt Revd Dr Doyle, R.C. Bp of Kildare, John O'Driscoll, Alexander Knox and Thomas Newenham (Gloucester [1824]).
- D.N.B.                      Dictionary of National Biography, Leslie Stephen and S. Lee (eds.) (London, 1910-).
- Fitzpatrick, Doyle                      W. J. Fitzpatrick, The life, times and correspondence of the Right Rev Dr Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin 2 vols (1st ed., Dublin, 1861; revised ed., Dublin, 1861 [reprinted Boston, 1862]; 2nd ed., Dublin, 1880, reprinted Dublin, 1890).
- Hansard                      Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (new or 2nd series 1820-1830; 3rd series, 1830-).
- K.L.D.A.                      Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives.

Malcolmson, Parliamentary roll

Robert Malcolmson, The Carlow parliamentary roll : comprising lists of the knights of the shire, and members for the borough of Carlow, from the earliest times to the introduction of the ballott, and of the representatives for Old Leighlin to the period of the Union, with genealogical notes and illustrative extracts (Dublin, 1872).

N.L.I.

National Library of Ireland.

O'Connell Corr.

M. R. O'Connell (ed.), The correspondence of Daniel O'Connell 8 vols (Dublin, 1973-81).

O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation

Fergus O'Ferrall Catholic Emancipation. Daniel O'Connell and the birth of Irish democracy, 1820-30 (Dublin, 1985)

Scritture

Scritture riferite nei congressi, Irlanda, Archives of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, Rome.

S.O.I. evidence

(for state of Ireland evidence) Second report from the select committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.

—  
Third report from the select committee appointed to enquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 193.

—  
Minutes of evidence taken before the Lords' select committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.

S.P.I. evidence

(for state of the poor in Ireland evidence) Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee on the state of the poor in Ireland, H.C. 1830 (654), vii, 1.

Tithe evidence

Second report from the select committee appointed to inquire into the collection and payment of tithes in Ireland and the state of the laws relating thereto, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245.

\_\_\_\_\_

Second report from the select committee of the House of Lords appointed to inquire into the collection and payment of tithes in Ireland and the state of the laws relating thereto with minutes of evidence and an appendix and index, H.L. 1831-32 (663), xxii, 181.

Wellington (ed.) Despatches

Duke of Wellington (ed.), Despatches, correspondence and memoranda of Field Marshall Arthur, Duke of Wellington 8 vols (London 1867-1880).

CHAPTER I  
CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

In the second decade of the nineteenth century Henry Grattan's attempts to secure a Catholic relief bill from parliament had been unsuccessful. Moreover, Irish Catholic opinion was deeply split because of the quid pro quo sponsored by Grattan of securities or 'wings' in return for Emancipation. Daniel O'Connell established his reputation in Ireland through leading the opposition to the proposed securities which were some form of state or royal veto on Irish Catholic episcopal appointments and state payment of the Catholic clergy. The 'wings' were designed to secure the state from Roman pretensions and to make Emancipation palatable to the diehard ultras.

In May 1819 James Doyle read of the defeat by two votes of Grattan's attempt to move a motion in the House of Commons on the Catholic claims with mixed feelings. He dearly desired Emancipation but he had grave reservations about the wisdom of conceding the proposed securities. On Grattan's death in 1820 the Irish barrister, William Conyngham Plunket - a former Attorney General for Ireland and a prominent whig politician - assumed the leadership of the pro-Catholics in the House of Commons. On new year's day 1821 in a letter to his fellow countrymen O'Connell wrote: 'Our lives wear away, and we still continue aliens in our native land'. He called for Irishmen of all shades of opinion to forget about the individual 'wings' and to sink their differences to secure their natural and inherent rights.<sup>1</sup> When Plunket brought forward a Catholic Relief bill in the House of Commons in early March 1821 however, O'Connell quickly attacked the bill because of its concession of the veto.<sup>2</sup> For their part the members of

the Irish Catholic hierarchy appear to have been more worried about the proposed Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy in Plunket's bill than they were by the veto.

Daniel Murray, Coadjutor Archbishop of Dublin, informed Bishop Doyle on 14 March 1821 that his 'speedy advice would be of much value' on the Emancipation bill. He desired to know 'can the proposed oath of allegiance and supremacy (as now sought to be explained) be taken by a Catholic? Can we renounce as heretical the doctrine therein declared to be such?'.<sup>3</sup> Dr Doyle replied promptly stating that 'the doctrine abjured in the oath of supremacy is clearly not heretical in the ordinary or scholastic acceptation [sic] of the term'. But, he continued, 'to the oath, however amended, I have very strong objections, and yet if the terms of it were softened I think it could be taken. I would not say it could not be taken even in its present shape'.<sup>4</sup>

Archbishop Murray had also sought the opinion of Archbishop Curtis of Armagh, the primate of all Ireland. Dr Curtis stated that he was not surprised that Dr Murray was agitated by the bills. In somewhat convoluted prose Curtis accepted that their objection to the Oath of Supremacy was

fairly explained and done away, but it is a very awkward thing for a R. Cath. to take that oath, as it formerly stood (that now satisfactorily explained), because it says the pope has no spiritual power, jurisdiction, etc in these Kingdoms which is not only false but heretical, which note can hardly be done away, by saying the words only mean, that all persons whatever are subject to the King and can have no power or faculty, withdrawing them from such allegiance - it would therefore be desirable that the wording of the oath be changed, or at least, that the official declaration of the sense, should be expressly attached to it when taken by the R. Cath. 5

Bishop Kyran Marum of Ossory diocese maintained that popes from Gregory VII to Paul V could not be denounced for claiming the right to depose kings, de jure divino, even if 'they unquestionably held, and acted upon a doctrine contrary to the word of God - but not in theological terms

heretical'. Dr Marum was slightly less anxious about the matter than the primate. He held that there could be no objection to Plunket's legislative explanation of the Oath of Supremacy provided that this was not merely understood but actually expressed, the latter being 'indispensably necessary'.<sup>6</sup>

Archbishop Oliver Kelly of Tuam was decidedly negative, stating he 'never will recommend any man to take the Oath of Supremacy in its present shape'. He believed that the Oath of Supremacy could not be taken without accusations of mental reservation and equivocation.<sup>7</sup> Dr Doyle correctly foresaw difficulties with English divines over the Oath of Supremacy.<sup>8</sup> The controversialist Dr John Milner, Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District, held that Catholics should not and could not take the Oath of Supremacy to, as he put it, purchase Emancipation and he published his theological opinion to that effect. Milner was horrified at the prospect of Plunket's bill being passed: 'I cannot trust my pen to my feelings' he informed Murray, 'Is then Catholic Ireland to swallow the Oath of Supremacy together with the veto?'.<sup>9</sup>

It would seem that a veto of some sort was a price which the bishops felt they might have to pay however opposed to it they were, for the boon of Emancipation. Curtis did not touch on the veto at all in his correspondence with Murray. Marum contented himself with the comment that Castlereagh's idea of the state paying the Catholic clergy would be much more detrimental in its effects than any veto vested in the crown.<sup>10</sup> Even Doyle's hostility to the veto seemed muted, 'as to the veto why our opinions are known! no doubt 'tis modified, for it is more easy to reject a man previous to his nomination than when such nomination has made him in some degree a public, and therefore an interesting character'.<sup>11</sup> Dr Kelly, on the contrary, found this very

aspect of the proposed legislation 'infinitely more objectionable' than that of 1813 'inasmuch as a restricted veto would not operate so powerfully against the existence of the Catholic Church, as the unrestricted disapprobation which Mr Plunket proposes to vest in the hands of the State Secretary when there is a question of appointing Catholic Bishops'. He feared that an unfriendly Secretary of State could leave Catholic sees unfilled throughout Ireland.<sup>12</sup>

The seemingly minor issue of state inspection of Roman correspondence gave rise to strong feelings. Archbishop Curtis held that the concept was 'very harsh and offensive'.<sup>13</sup> Archbishop Kelly declared it 'as unjust as it is unnecessary'.<sup>14</sup> Bishop Marum thought it would be 'often seriously embarrassing and perhaps injurious' given the nature of Irish clerical disputes which would be detailed in the correspondence with Rome.<sup>15</sup> Bishop Doyle demonstrated greater prescience when he stated that he had no great objection to the inspection of the correspondence in the manner proposed.<sup>16</sup> Doyle thought that if there was a settlement of the Catholic question then a nuncio would probably be appointed to transact routine business between the Catholic Church and Rome and that consequently the correspondence issue would become a 'dead letter'.<sup>17</sup>

The public discussion by Catholic clergymen of Plunket's bills which took place throughout the country generated more heat than light with the exception of the diplomatic procedure adopted by the Dublin province. Archbishop Troy chaired a general meeting of the prelates of the Dublin province and the clergy of the Dublin diocese in the chapel of SS Michael and John on 26 March 1821 to consider the bills. This meeting declared that it had read the Relief bill with 'unmingled satisfaction' and deemed it a duty to state that 'the Oath of

Supremacy as therein modified, may be taken by any Roman Catholic without violating in the slightest degree, the principles of his religion'. The prelates and clerics noted the 'great, unnecessary and injurious severity' of the securities but nonetheless considered that the liberal framers of the bill thought they were acting in the best interests of the church and without bad intentions. The meeting considered whether it was just that the confidential communication with the pope should be laid before persons of a different creed. The proposed unlimited negative on the appointment of Catholic bishops which 'appears to us equivalent in its effect to a right of positive nomination' was viewed with the 'greatest concern'.<sup>18</sup> This Dublin meeting set the tone for the Dublin province. An Ossory clerical meeting chaired by Bishop Marum passed similar resolutions.<sup>19</sup> Likewise the clergy of Kildare and Leighlin diocese under the chairmanship of Bishop Doyle met in the chapel of St Patrick's College, Carlow, on 6 April 1821 and approved and adopted the Dublin resolutions. The Carlow meeting expressed its admiration of the conciliatory spirit yet firm and temperate language of the Dublin meeting.<sup>20</sup>

In the three other ecclesiastical provinces the reception of the bills was far less conciliatory. In the Cashel province the Waterford clergy found the bill 'repugnant to our feelings'.<sup>21</sup> The Catholic clergy of the dioceses of Cork, Cloyne and Ross, and Kerry all rejected the bill.<sup>22</sup> At the Cork meetings there was even a 'round of groans' for the efforts of W. C. Plunket, Sir John Newport and Sir Henry Parnell.<sup>23</sup> The clergy of Limerick diocese were also strong in their denunciation of clauses 'subversive' of Catholicism.<sup>24</sup> In Tuam province Bishop McNicholas's clergy in Achonry diocese moved for a rejection of 'these obnoxious clauses'.<sup>25</sup> The clergy of Elphin diocese were also less than



satisfied with the securities.<sup>26</sup> In Tuam diocese itself the clergy considered the securities, if enforced by pains and penalties, to be akin to a 'religious persecution'.<sup>27</sup> The only exceptions were Bishop Costello's clergy in Clonfert who were disposed to follow the Dublin lead.<sup>28</sup> In Armagh diocese a clerical meeting under Archbishop Curtis's guidance was probably much stronger than he would have wished in condemning 'vetoistical interference for peremptorily approving or rejecting at will the Rescripts of the pope, appointing the bishops and deans of the Church'.<sup>29</sup> Dr Doyle regretted the harsher spirit that was manifest in clerical reaction to Plunket's bills in the ecclesiastical provinces of Cashel, Tuam and Armagh. He considered that the resolutions of the Dublin province were sensibly couched in measured language which did not disguise their difficulties with the securities.<sup>30</sup>

Doyle and Murray, at one stage during discussion of Plunket's bill, planned to go to London to present the pro-Catholic Lord Donoughmore with the resolutions of the Dublin meeting for presentation in the House of Lords. An additional clause was added stating that if the Secretary of State excluded Catholic candidates for high church office he should give a 'specific cause' for so doing and the justice of his decision could be legally tried so that if not upheld the appointment could proceed. However the bishops decided not to visit London because there were 'so many symptoms of disunion in our body' that to have done so would only have aroused further dissensions among Catholics in Ireland.<sup>31</sup> If the bill passed the House of Commons Doyle predicted that the collective hierarchy could be brought around to a measured statement 'but as to an arrangement which would give the crown an influence in the appointment of bishops, I am confident we will not

agree to it'.<sup>32</sup> In a letter to Parnell Doyle noted that Milner was working against them in London and if he succeeded 'our cause is lost, not only for this session but probably will make no progress for several years to come'.<sup>33</sup> Bishop Milner in his letters to Archbishop Murray sought to exploit the difference between the conciliatory approach to the Emancipation bill of the Dublin province compared with its almost unanimously hostile rejection by the Cashel, Tuam and Armagh provinces. He informed Murray that the Irish hierarchy was now divided into two parts on the essential question of the Oath of Supremacy, an oath for which O'Hurley and O'Creagh in Ireland and Fisher and More in England had 'suffered a glorious martyrdom'.<sup>34</sup> Milner playing on the fears of Murray regretted that any particular diocese in Ireland should have formed resolutions apart from the rest and stated that there were 'strong symptoms of disunion and animosity among some of the prelates and clergy'. He suggested that Troy and Murray might lose their public popularity because of their stance on the issue.<sup>35</sup>

Acting on behalf of the archbishops of Dublin, Drs Troy and Murray and the archbishop of Armagh, Dr Curtis, Doyle corresponded with Sir Henry Parnell in an attempt to modify the Emancipation bill to Catholic satisfaction. Parnell used Doyle's letters, without naming the bishop, to make a favourable impression in the House of Commons.<sup>36</sup> The second reading of the bill passed the Commons on 16 March 1821 by 254 votes to 243 against, a majority of only eleven votes. Parnell probably fearing that the bill would not get through the Commons noted that as the majority was so small 'it is impossible to say how the business will now end . . .'.<sup>37</sup> However the bill passed its third reading in the Commons on 2 April 1821 with a majority of nineteen. In the House of Lords the Catholic spokesman Lord Donoughmore expressed grave doubts about the

passage of the bill when so many of the Catholic clergy saw it as a bill of pains and penalties against them.<sup>38</sup> In the Lords, Parnell enlisted the support of former prime minister Lord Grenville and reported to Doyle that Grenville was willing to do all that can be done 'with safety to the Bill, in compliance with your wishes'.<sup>39</sup> Even if the Emancipation bill was not going to make progress in the Lords, Doyle was determined that his church should make every effort to have it conform to Catholic requirements. Of this intervention he would later write

At that time and at present my great object was, to have the Bill, and the Oath contained in it, not only unexceptionable in themselves, but also such as would not create a division of sentiment in our body . . . it would be better to have the penal code as it is, than to have a schism created. 40

Thus Doyle endeavoured to secure further modifications of the amended bill. He was concerned firstly that the ecclesiastical members of the commission which would oversee the operation of the securities would be selected from members of the English Catholic clergy. This, he posited, 'would be likely to excite jealousy and distrust in this country, as our people have but little confidence in our brethren of England . . .'. The attendance of Irish prelates as commissioners in London was impracticable. Doyle secondly expressed concern that some bishops had scruples over the disclaimer of the pope's authority which was confined to matters of 'religious belief' as they thought this would exclude matters of a religious nature which would not fall under religious belief. He wanted the form of words 'in religious concerns' in its stead. He also worried that the form used in the preamble to the bill to affirm the pope's authority seemed to be contradicted in the act itself which seemed to say that the pope was subservient to the monarch in religious matters.<sup>41</sup>

Parnell forwarded Doyle's letter to Lord Grenville and informed Doyle that Grenville 'expressed his readiness to pay the most patient attention to any suggestion of any modifications of the Catholics on all matters relating to feelings of conscience'.<sup>42</sup> This in fact was a highly misleading account of Grenville's reply to Parnell as the peer was very much disinclined to propose any changes in the Emancipation bill. Grenville deemed Doyle's 'scruples' about the bill to be largely 'groundless' and felt that to make changes at this late stage 'in the very crisis of battle, is the most hazardous of all measures'.<sup>43</sup> Parnell however also sent extracts from Doyle's letter of 6 April to Lord French and commented 'I confidently expect that he will find no difficulty in altering the words in the preamble as you suggest'.<sup>44</sup> If the bill got through to a second reading Parnell believed that Doyle's alterations would be incorporated in it. Realistically he appreciated that they could not look forward to a majority in the Lords. Doyle was no less realistic.

It is instructive to examine the degree of misunderstanding and prejudice which greeted the Roman Catholic Disability Removal Bill when it was carried to the House of Lords from the Commons by Sir John Newport on 3 April 1821. Before the bill was even read for the first time in the Lords, the prime minister, Lord Liverpool, and the Lord Chancellor, Lord Eldon, both objected to it.<sup>45</sup> Moving the first reading of the bill the earl of Donoughmore asserted that the securities which accompanied it were a sop to 'blind intolerance' and he strongly opposed the veto on episcopal appointments.<sup>46</sup> The former prime minister, Viscount Sidmouth, then Home Secretary, pointed out that Catholics were not satisfied with the bill. There had been numerous meetings of Roman Catholic clergymen in Ireland 'at all of which there had been but one

unanimous feeling of hostility towards the clauses contained in the second part of the bill'. He also showed some awareness of Catholic division on the issue when he remarked that there had been a general meeting of the Roman Catholic clergy of Dublin city 'at which resolutions were unanimously passed against the clauses in the second part of the bill. He understood that a petition, founded on these resolutions, had been sent to the metropolis in order to be presented to the House and he did not understand why that presentation had not taken place'. Sidmouth opposed the second reading of the bill.<sup>47</sup> The prime minister's speech epitomised the case against Emancipation. He stated: 'When people asked "Do you really believe that Catholics would subvert the Established religion?" he answered, that undoubtedly he did believe that every zealous Catholic would make the attempt, because he must feel it his duty to do so'. He foresaw that Catholics would object to paying tithes to a man who was not their minister. The more he considered Catholic Emancipation 'the more he was convinced that by this measure they were sapping the foundation of all the great establishments of the country, both church and state. It was said that the dangers he had pointed out were visionary. They might be so; but if they were not provided against, who could say that the safety of the state was secured'. He added that the bill would have no effect on the great mass of the Irish population.<sup>48</sup>

Earl Grey supported Emancipation holding that

The head of the Roman Catholic Church, whose power might once have been formidable, could no longer be an object of apprehension. It could not now be alleged that the pope was under the influence and control of the power which had been the terror of Europe. The present bill had not met with that opposition on the part of the public which former bills of a similar kind had received. The present bill had passed through one House of Parliament without any expression of public discontent. 49

The Anglican bishop of London expressed 'sincere apprehension for the safety of the Protestant Establishment'. Bishop Bathurst of Norwich was the only Anglican bishop to support the Catholic claims.<sup>50</sup> Earl Darnley maintained that opponents of the measure had been 'warped by long continued prejudices'. Lord Grenville, Viscount Melville, the Marquis of Lansdowne and the duke of Sussex, a member of the royal family, were among those who voiced their support for the bill.<sup>51</sup> But of crucial significance was the opposition of the duke of York, the heir to the throne, who objected to Catholic relief as a measure which he believed 'would effect a great change in the Constitution as established at the revolution of 1688 . . .' by which he meant the Protestant Constitution.<sup>52</sup>

In April the Irish hierarchy spent four days discussing a proposal to agree to any legal arrangement which the government might make to ensure their loyalty 'provided such arrangement were sanctioned by the head of our church'.<sup>53</sup> But even on this point unanimity could not be secured. Some prelates threatened to refuse their signatures no doubt fearing that a deal contrary to the interest and independence of the Irish church would be worked out between London and Rome.

The defeat of the bill on its second reading in the House of Lords on 17 April by 159 votes to 120 caused Parnell to reflect that, on the whole, considering how little reason there had been to expect that the Emancipation bill would pass the House of Commons when it was introduced by Plunket that 'very great progress has been made'.<sup>54</sup> He noted the adhesion to the Catholic position of Lords Anglesey, Headford, Conyngham, Melbourne, Granard and Grenville 'who usually vote in union with the sentiments of the king'.<sup>55</sup> Unrealistically, in the circumstances, Parnell suggested to Doyle that it would be useful to

have addresses from the Catholics, not referring to their claims, but professing attachment to their king. This would both please the king and conciliate public opinion.<sup>56</sup> Doyle, taking counsel from leading Catholics, sensibly considered that following the defeat of the bill and in the 'depressed' state of the public mind it would be very difficult to hold such meetings without violent agitation from those who believed that there was nothing to be hoped for. Doyle felt that if the king came to Ireland the expressions of loyalty would be 'strong, general and sincere; but something new and striking must occur to excite our feelings'.<sup>57</sup>

In July 1821 Dr Doyle informed his brother Peter that the hierarchy were to present an address to the king when he visited Ireland the following month 'so I will have the honour of seeing his Majesty'.<sup>58</sup> Archbishop Murray's idea of an address to the king by the Irish hierarchy was communicated by Lord Donoughmore to the prime minister and the home secretary and was favourably received. Dr Doyle set himself the task of drafting this address. His draft was forthright. Indeed had it been presented it would have created serious controversy. Irish Catholics, Doyle wrote, were 'the oppressed of your people' who 'seek in your pastoral care that refuge and succour which is denied them by other men'. The address expounded on the plight of the unemancipated Catholics in 'a world which rejects them and treats them as outcasts'. If, he continued, he informed the king of the 'profound grief and intense pain' of the Irish Catholics 'your wisdom would decree our relief'. He elaborated that the actions of the Catholics were misconstrued, their intentions maligned, and their language deliberately misrepresented. Catholics were presented as deserving of 'increased penalties or utter extirpation'. So much so that their cause was almost

hopeless. 'But there is left to us one resource, a resource weak indeed and indeed almost fruitless that of committing our complaints to a sheet of this sort . . . [page is torn].'<sup>59</sup> Doyle's draft was far too blunt and too much to the point for Archbishop Murray and Lord Donoughmore. The latter concurred with Dr Murray's idea of keeping the address to one of 'hearty welcome' disallowing all other sentiments.<sup>60</sup> Doyle's direct approach - a statement of the intolerance experienced by unemancipated Catholics - was effectively vetoed. Doyle himself also seems to have realised the risks his approach would have incurred. In a reference to his draft he agreed with Murray that 'Lord Donoughmore has acted with great kindness in suggesting the rejection of that strange address'.<sup>61</sup>

Doyle urged Murray to write the address but undaunted by the failure of his own first effort he submitted a second draft address for Murray's approval stating 'if you find it worth anything use it so far if not place it with the other out of your recollection'.<sup>62</sup> Doyle's second draft evidenced a remarkable contrast with his previous hard-headed effort. In this there was no mention of the Catholic claims. Instead there was nothing but the expected gushing effusion of loyalty so typical of its time:

. . . this country long devotedly attached to Royalty is now favoured with the presence of the most beloved of Kings and we can with truth assure your Majesty, that the exultation with which she abounds is the fruit of a peculiar veneration for your royal person, of a deep rooted attachment to the happy constitution over which your Majesty presides and of gratitude for the many rights and privileges to which she has been restored by the God-like beneficence and enlightened policy of your august house. 63

Temporarily at least, the iron fist had been concealed in the velvet glove. Eleven of the bishops in their episcopal robes led by Archbishop Curtis and including Drs Troy, Murray, Kelly and Doyle presented the address to George IV in Dublin Castle.<sup>64</sup> Donoughmore had warned Murray that on the occasion the bishops 'cannot take the style of any



particular dioceses'.<sup>65</sup> Murray read the address to the king which welcomed a sovereign who 'comes to his people with the olive-branch of peace in his hand' and pledged the bishops' 'undivided allegiance'.<sup>66</sup> The king expressed himself well pleased with the bishops' sentiments of cordial and dutiful attachment. All the bishops kissed his majesty's hand.<sup>67</sup>

The king's visit to Ireland was completely misinterpreted by Irish Catholics as a sign of royal goodwill towards the Catholic claims and viewed almost as a prelude to Emancipation itself whereas in reality his visit was merely an attempt to escape his vast unpopularity in England caused by his unsavoury divorce bill of pains and penalties against his estranged and allegedly adulterous wife, Queen Caroline, which failed to pass through parliament and had to be withdrawn. The appointment late in 1821 of the Irish-born Marquis Wellesley as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was similarly misinterpreted as the first boon of the king's visit. Wellesley, eldest brother of the duke of Wellington, was a former governor general of India, foreign secretary and would be prime minister had his lifestyle not degenerated into dissolution and indolence. Wellesley favoured the Catholic claims and thus his appointment and that of W. C. Plunket as Irish attorney-general in place of the Orange, Saurin, gave rise to grave Protestant suspicion, even though it was typically balanced by that of an anti-Catholic Irish chief secretary in Henry Goulburn. Wellesley acknowledged that the 'great evil' of Irish public life was the animosity between the two contending parties. He attempted to adopt a balanced attitude repressing radicalism of whatever hue with an even hand. When he encountered the open hostility of the Orange faction - notably the bottle-throwing incident in a Dublin theatre which he magnified into an assassination

attempt - his correspondence was shot-through with outrage and combativeness almost to the point of a persecution complex. He seems also to have tended towards hypochondria and often proclaimed himself so unwell as to be unable to write. His six-year tenure as head of the Irish administration was characterised by a holding operation - maintaining the king's peace and no more. He was however keen to exercise and protect his own interests, particularly his crucial role in determining Irish patronage; his power of recommending to the Irish peerage, to knighthoods, to bishoprics, etc, and much time was devoted to such matters.

On his appointment the new Lord Lieutenant let it be known that he would welcome an address from the Catholic bishops in the style of the address presented to the king in August 1821. Such an intimation was not to be ignored.<sup>68</sup> Archbishop Murray saw it as an opportunity for the bishops to confirm 'the footing which we have already obtained and of securing the favour of the new government'.<sup>69</sup> Doyle also pondered the possibilities in correspondence with his brother:

Our friends are of opinion we ought gladly to establish ourselves in the high station to which his Majesty raised us, and that our cultivating a good understanding with government may serve the interests of religion. I hope this may be the case; and though I don't like the parade of attending every new Viceroy on his arrival (which must now be done as a matter of course), yet I am glad that we are thus considered. <sup>70</sup>

Drs Curtis, Murray, Kelly, Marum, Murphy and Doyle presented their address at the Marquis Wellesley's first levee in Dublin Castle on 8 January 1822.<sup>71</sup> The bishops, as usual, pledged their loyalty to the king and obedience to the laws. They also stated that they deplored those 'atrocities which have lately outraged all religion, in some parts of the Country'. Wellesley replied that he had full confidence in the bishops' principles of affectionate loyalty towards their king, and that for his part he would administer the law with a 'firm, but even and temperate hand'.<sup>72</sup>

In the second half of 1821 the most influential members of the Irish hierarchy contemplated the failure of the Emancipation bill and looked again at the securities suggested and pondered how to solve the 'veto' security which was unacceptable to them. Curtis, Murray and Doyle began discussing the possibility of domestic nomination of the Irish bishops by the bishops themselves; that is the appointment of Irish bishops without reference to Rome except for institution. Rome would simply confirm the Irish decision. This would be acceptable to the government, the prelates felt, as no disloyal candidate would be elected bishop. Rather than the government having a right of veto the Irish bishops themselves would veto unsuitable candidates. Domestic nominations had two obvious advantages. Firstly it would replace the royal veto issue with an alternative which would be acceptable to Irish Catholics and probably to London and Rome, yet it would work without reference to the state or the pope. Secondly it would end much of the factionalism and squabbling that were part and parcel of Irish episcopal elections among the second order clergy.

The mode of nomination after the Stuart right ended in 1766 was described by Doyle in 1822 as 'irregular and uncertain as it is to this day'.<sup>73</sup> There had been no definitive mode of electing Irish Catholic bishops for almost sixty years. The traditional method of election on the continent by dean and chapter was problematic in Ireland because the chapter offices had fallen into desuetude during the penal era and had not, in many dioceses, been revived. So power was even more effectively centralised in the diocesan bishop who had a useful means of securing the successor of his choice by applying to Rome to have his nominee appointed coadjutor bishop cum iure successionis, a method resented by

the second order clergy, particularly the parish priests who felt that they had a right to be consulted. In some dioceses no-one was quite sure what the precise procedure for electing to a vacant see actually was.<sup>74</sup>

Bishop Milner was unhappy with the concept of domestic nomination: 'it has long been known to me that some of our body are bent on getting rid of all application to Rome' except on matters of religious belief.<sup>75</sup> However Milner was hardly in a position of influence - his volte-face in earlier controversy on the veto and his intolerance of conflicting arguments did not win him many friends within the Irish or English hierarchy. The Irish hierarchy had in fact lost confidence in Milner. Archbishop Troy of Dublin did not write to him and Bishop Murphy of Cork did not even answer his letters.<sup>76</sup> For similar reasons Doyle also had a poor view of Milner's political judgement and this was known to the latter who complained to Murray that 'Dr Doyle objects to whatever originates with me'.<sup>77</sup> Likewise Milner informed Curtis that 'Dr Doyle affirms that nothing will do that comes from me'.<sup>78</sup> Thus as early as 1821 Milner had taken cognisance of the fact that Doyle was an emerging figure of consequence in Irish ecclesiastical affairs.

Murray suggested to Doyle in October 1821 that plans needed to conciliate the real or pretended concern of the government should not in future be left to the last moment as an Emancipation bill passed through parliament. Murray considered the split which had arisen within the Irish church over Plunket's bill and concluded:

Our own unfortunate divisions seem to point out the expediency of making an attempt to obtain for our distracted church some such arrangement even tho' it were not wanted to conciliate the confidence of Government. It would be a most favourable moment to introduce such a subject at Rome; and, if it obtained the countenance of Government there is no doubt but it would be accomplished. <sup>79</sup>

The Catholic, A. R. Blake, Chief Remembrancer of the Treasury, Wellesley intimate, and behind-the-scenes operator par excellence, who had had a hand in Plunket's bill, informed Murray that in future the Catholic question would not be raised at parliamentary level without consultation with the bishops. Blake had proposed to the Marquis of Londonderry (formerly Lord Castlereagh), the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, that the nomination of bishops should be vested in themselves as a very adequate security to government. Londonderry was reported to think favourably of the idea although 'it did not yet come up to his expectations'.<sup>80</sup> In December 1821 Murray informed Doyle that Curtis was most anxious that a strong application should be made to Rome for the purpose of obtaining a final mode of nomination to Irish sees. Murray thought it would not be granted 'without the sanction of a certain quarter' namely London.<sup>81</sup> By the new year even Milner was prepared to accept the 'negative' veto or domestic nomination as understood by Murray but again he wondered: 'Is there no danger of your Prelacy losing a great part of its influence over the laity by consenting to this measure?'. Milner also asked Murray would O'Connell accept domestic nomination.<sup>82</sup> At this time O'Connell was also privately discussing the question of domestic nomination with the influential Dublin priest, Dr Michael Blake. Archbishop Murray was certainly party to, if indeed he had not inspired, their correspondence.<sup>83</sup>

In January 1822 O'Connell publicly took up the domestic nomination idea as a solution for the securities: the veto controversy which had so divided Irish Catholics and also for the Roman correspondence problem.<sup>84</sup> O'Connell had been scathingly critical of Plunket's bill but he had now more or less resolved his differences with Plunket. He still nonetheless could not resist criticising Dublin Catholic reaction to the

1821 Emancipation bill. He characterised the conduct of Dublin Catholics in discussion of the bill as 'excessively discreditable' to them. He saw their silence and acquiescence as indicating that they were prepared to barter their religion for civil rights advantages. In the final analysis O'Connell felt that civil liberty was subordinate to religious liberty.

. . . the only difficulty arises from an apprehension lest in looking for the greatest of all human blessings, civil liberty, we should injure that which is of greater importance than anything that men bestow, the unsullied and ancient religion of Ireland. 85

O'Connell's plan for the domestic nomination of the Catholic prelates in Ireland included full security to the government against the appointment of any disaffected or disloyal person. O'Connell proposed that the only person eligible for elevation to a Catholic see in Ireland should have taken the Oath of Allegiance (in a Dublin superior court) and have discharged clerical duties for at least five years in Ireland. The election should be either by the Catholic bishops of the province wherein the vacant see lay or by the dean and chapter of the vacant see. O'Connell even proposed that every diocese should have twenty-four clerics in its chapter. Before the election the head elector, be he the metropolitan, senior suffragan or dean, should make a solemn oath that he would not vote for any person not known to him to be strictly loyal and peaceable in his principles and conduct. The oath was to be taken by all electors. The government was to be given notice of the election and two months were to be allowed the state to examine the character of the nominee. If the government found him to be disaffected his case was to be referred to the Irish archbishops who would have the right to hear the case against the nominee and require proofs from the government. If accusations against the nominee were not disproved the archbishops could issue an order for a new nomination.<sup>86</sup> In O'Connell's plan every new

bishop was to take an oath within six months of election that he would not correspond with the pope or foreign prince outside the British dominions or any political subject whatsoever directly or indirectly having a tendency to be injurious to the rights of the crown, government or to the civil or temporal interests of any of his Majesty's subjects. Furthermore if the pope or any foreign power communicated on such matters with the bishop by rescript, mandate or letter the recipient would promptly place a true copy in the possession of the government.<sup>87</sup>

Edward Hay, former secretary to the Catholic Association, maintained that domestic nomination was little more than a plot by the Catholic bishops to secure the nomination of their own order by themselves at the expense of the second order clergy. He noted the 'studied neglect' of the chapter in several dioceses. What bothered Hay particularly was his belief that if the bishops were thus successful they would concede the veto. Hay commented on the likely adverse consequences of episcopal communication with Dublin Castle and quoted the famous Burke-Hussey correspondence to effect.<sup>88</sup>

Bishop Doyle decided to reply to Hay under the rebus J.K.L. (James of Kildare and Leighlin, making the territorial claim though not in the accepted fashion which would have been the full form and not the initials). J.K.L.'s long letter dated 2 February 1822 was not published in the Dublin Evening Post until 16 February. This letter is interesting in that it reveals Doyle's then attitude to a political role for the Irish Catholic hierarchy. Doyle dealt with the consequences which would arise in Hay's words 'from the meddling of the Catholic bishops with the Castle, and of the Castle with them'. Edmund Burke's observation was, he held, just to a certain extent but firstly it would be useful 'that some substitutes were found for a Catholic aristocracy

(which we have not) . . .'. Would Burke regret to see honest men interfere as mediators between an angry government and an afflicted people, to see some kind of aristocracy bridging the gap that separated the head of state from the great mass of the people?

Had the Catholic prelates free access to the government, they better than any other, could create a just confidence in a loyal people; could expose their wants, suggest the means of relieving them, and unmask the designs of those men who have no love of country, and who calumniate only that they may oppress with impunity. 89

A prejudice existed against Catholic bishops being admitted to the Castle but when they greeted George IV it was hailed as a boon by the entire Catholic population. No prelate through ambition or personal consideration would desire personal communication with government yet these motives were attributed to them and a clamour raised which had its origins in prejudice and short-sightedness. Doyle maintained that from the days of Constantine to his own time there was no monarch in a Christian state to whom prelates of the church did not have access 'nor were they all larks at the mercy of hawks'.<sup>90</sup>

Doyle was very unsympathetic, almost hostile, to the election of bishops by dean and chapter (which Hay upheld) 'unless it be greatly tempered and controlled by the authority of the Metropolitan and Suffragans'. Deans and chapters had frequently fallen victim to the dangers of simony, local influence and the almost inevitable degeneracy of corporations. Nonetheless Doyle did not rule out election by dean and chapter stating that 'some obvious advantages of this mode of election, might be combined with the right of appointment by the Metropolitan and Suffragans'.<sup>91</sup>

Hay replied to J.K.L.'s letter by calling on the editor of the Dublin Evening Post not to publish anonymous letters. The editor, F. W. Conway, replied that the writer who was known to him, was 'worthy of



Mr. Hay's opposition'.<sup>92</sup> J.K.L.'s letter also drew forth a response from an equally awkward opponent, Laicus, writing from Carlow, the pseudonym of Thomas Finn, who had a personal dispute of long standing with Doyle and whose contribution is thus not above the suspicion of malice. Laicus attacked J.K.L.'s reasoning on the grounds that 'in proportion as Churchmen become more politicians in the same degree they become less ecclesiastics'. Irish prelates, Laicus claimed, had access to Dublin Castle since 1793 but had anything substantial been achieved? If substantial justice was given to Irish Catholics more would be accomplished than by giving Catholic bishops access to Dublin Castle.<sup>93</sup>

J.K.L. responded to Laicus and Hay in an extremely lengthy, detailed and almost pedantic fashion. His reply was not so much a letter as an essay. He stated that he wrote to check the 'evil effects' which the Hay and Laicus' letters might have on the public mind if allowed to go unnoticed. He defended his concept of the bishop as a political mediator between the state and an oppressed people. In such a role the bishops would conciliate rather than offend, deprecate but not revile 'they would consider what was expedient as well as what was just'. They would give to Caesar the things that were Caesar's. He even suggested that Cardinals Ximenes, Wolsey, Richelieu and Mazarin 'were no reproach to the church though they were politicians'.<sup>94</sup>

Domestic nomination was still exercising the minds of Murray, Curtis and Doyle early in 1823. In March Archbishop Murray expressed his belief that nothing the Irish bishops proposed to Rome would have a chance of success unless supported by the influence of the government, which if the bishops sought he felt they would receive.<sup>95</sup> In that same month Archbishops Curtis and Troy received an order from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide in Rome to have them each propose a plan

for the future nomination of Irish bishops.<sup>96</sup> Murray was particularly appalled by the controversy and factionalism that surrounded the appointment of an archbishop of Cashel during a two-year interregnum (1821-1823) in that diocese. Murray requested Doyle to send him the best plan he could devise so 'that nothing at least on our part may be left undone whereby we may have a chance of guarding against those disgraceful scenes which . . . everyone who regards the honour of our National Church has been deploring with so much bitterness'.<sup>97</sup> Doyle was pleased that Propaganda was going to consider the matter even if it seemed to him unlikely that anything would come of it. He prefaced his reply to Archbishop Murray with a revealing comment on Irish Catholic impotence before Rome and his fear of English influence at the Vatican.

I cannot but feel something like regret that the Holy See should be so tenacious of her privilege as not to suffer us even to treat with her about our own discipline - that she should consider us in all respects a prostrate Church as we are a prostrate people, and withhold from us all right to elect our own pastors; but perhaps it is good for us to be so humbled, and that our interests will be better guarded by her continuing unfettered by any contact with us! God grant she does not reserve the power she is so anxious not to communicate, for the purpose of entering into arrangements with others who should not be entitled to her confidence. 98

Doyle held that the power of electing bishops should be removed from the lower clergy and restored to the bishops. However if this idea was acted upon it would not be well received by Rome and would excite great opposition in Ireland. Consequently 'preferring what is most practicable to what appears to me most wise' Doyle stated that he would divide the right of election between the first and second order clergy. He would preserve or re-establish chapters and limit the number of dignitaries so that they would not exceed one-third of the total number of parish priests in each diocese respectively. Thus at the election the dean and chapter would elect three persons. The metropolitan and suffragans would meet later to do the same.<sup>99</sup> The outline of a future

resolution was here.<sup>100</sup> Dr Curtis put his finger on a crucial point, later accepted, that election by chapter was generally disliked and rejected by parish priests and curates.<sup>101</sup>

Archbishop Murray was not enamoured of W. C. Plunket who was liaising with the bishops to amend the Oath of Allegiance to quieten Catholic scruples. As attorney-general Plunket led the prosecution in autumn 1822 in Dublin of a number of Ribbonmen for political and sectarian conspiracy. While Plunket had shown himself to be well disposed towards the Catholic religion in the trial, Dr Murray thought that he had pushed the evidence too far. 'He stated directly that there exists among Catholics (of the lowest description to be sure) a conspiracy for murdering all the Protestants of the Kingdom. I do not believe that such a conspiracy exists - only evidence adduced was Pastorini's Prophecies and [the] end of [the] Protestant religion in 1825.' But it may be suspected that Murray's real concern was Plunket's insistence on securities in the Emancipation bill. 'He professes himself to be among those who think securities necessary; not merely for the satisfaction of our enemies, but for our own.'<sup>102</sup>

In December 1822 only two weeks after his well-received pastoral letter denouncing Ribbon violence in the deanery of Kilcock, Doyle entered the lists of religious controversy, as J.K.L., against the Anglican Archbishop Magee of Dublin who had enraged Catholic opinion throughout Ireland by his animadversions on Catholicism. As this controversy developed a phalanx of pamphleteers and letter-writers to the public prints entered the fray on both sides and heightened religious tensions.<sup>103</sup> In June and August 1823 the publication by Bishop Doyle and Archbishop Murray respectively, of miracles in their dioceses drew an outraged reaction from Protestant writers down on their

heads.<sup>104</sup> Tensions between Catholics and Protestants reached such a pitch in summer 1823 that the normally sober Conway, of the Dublin Evening Post could write to Doyle: 'I have no doubt whatever that a Rebellion is planned by the Orangemen . . . though I do not think I am a nervous person, I cannot get rid of my alarm'.<sup>105</sup> In reply to the vituperative attacks of the Protestants on Catholicism J.K.L. published his Vindication of the Religious and Civil Liberties of the Irish Catholics in a treatise (of seventy-one pages) addressed to the Marquis Wellesley, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. This pamphlet was written with remarkable vigour, fired by righteous indignation and a fierce sense of oppression reflecting 'the heart-burnings of a highminded man who is unjustly excluded from his rights'.<sup>106</sup> It was indeed pamphleteering of the very highest order:

We will never cease, my Lord, whilst our tongues can move, or our pens can write, to keep alive in the whole empire, as well as in our own people, a sense of the wrongs we suffer and to exhibit to an indignant world, all the privations we endure. Our fetters are too galling, our chains are too closely riveted, our keepers are too unfeeling, for us to remain silent, or permit them to enjoy repose. <sup>107</sup>

This was a new departure which spared no-one's sensibilities. Doyle now emerged clearly as a powerful new and representative voice taking it upon himself to act as spokesman for Catholics and to address the Lord Lieutenant in an unprecedented manner where previously there had only been expressions of loyalty and obedience without reference to the Catholic claims. J.K.L.'s mediation, albeit public, with the government in this fashion, was in keeping with the attitude he had adopted to church-state relations in the domestic nomination controversy. The Vindication aimed to demonstrate to the Lord Lieutenant that he had Catholic support and rallied that support behind him. It would transpire that it was misplaced. Doyle correctly maintained that

Wellesley's considerable difficulties with the Orange faction stemmed from the fact that he had acted impartially towards the Catholics rather than adopted the traditional Castle policy of paying lip-service to them while maintaining the Orange status quo in all branches of the civil administration. But Doyle held that the spirit of the penal laws continued unabated after the letter of them had been partially effaced in the courts, magistracy, police, education, corporations and revenues.<sup>108</sup>

J.K.L. vindicated Catholicism, which had been 'abused, assailed, reviled', and the Catholics in Ireland from four main charges thrown up by an intolerant press in 'religious phrenzy or political hate'.<sup>109</sup> Firstly he rejected the charge that Catholicism was superstitious and anti-Christian. Secondly he rejected the charge that Catholics were hostile to the Established Church in Ireland. Thirdly he rejected charges of intolerance against Catholicism and that Irish Catholics were agitators. Fourthly he objected to the accusation that Catholics were opposed to the education of the poor.<sup>110</sup> J.K.L. stated that Catholics objected not to the Protestant Church but to its Establishment. In fact the Established Church 'does not answer the ends for which any Christian Church has been erected'.<sup>111</sup> It was a 'monstrous' Establishment which 'in the opinion of many Protestants as well as Catholics, as should not be suffered to exist in any civilized country . . .'.<sup>112</sup> Furthermore Doyle examined the history of tithes and predicted that whilst tithes existed 'peace or concord will not be re-established in Ireland'.<sup>113</sup>

The Dublin Evening Press editorialised that J.K.L.'s pamphlet would cause a 'prodigious sensation' which indeed it did.<sup>114</sup> But Doyle had gone too far for some of his brethren on the hierarchical bench. Doyle informed Curtis that Wellesley and his circle approved of the

Vindication (as well Wellesley might for he was fulsomely praised in it) but Curtis was not impressed. He had tried to dictate to Doyle what policy he should pursue but he had failed. He now read Doyle a lecture castigating the aggressiveness of the Vindication mainly because he feared a tremendous Orange counter-reaction.

. . . I am happy to find, you have taken no offence, at the sincere and candid, but perhaps too blunt reflections, I took the liberty, at your request, of making, not indeed on the unimpeachable substance of Your Lordship's immortal lucubration itself, but alone on its issuing, at this moment of convulsive agitation, from a member of our own mild and peaceable Bench. Which circumstances, I was apprehensive would, more than the very subject matter, call forth the virulent retaliation of our already frantic and implacable enemies. -I am astonished, at not having, as yet seen, or heard of, any effort of that description on their part; but I am still persuaded, they are only brooding over the mortal wound . . . . 115

Similarly Archbishop Murray was taken aback by the temper of Doyle's publication stating: 'I hear no one complain of the violence of J.K.L.'.<sup>116</sup> Even Milner who so often announced his preparedness to join O'Hurley and More for the faith was concerned about the ferocity of Doyle's attack on the Established Church

. . . I doubt of the prudence of a Catholic bishop expressing so roundly and so warmly . . . his wish to strip the Establishment (however useless, tyrannical and hypocritical it is) of its wealth and honours, considering how strongly it is supported by the Nobility, and the lawyers of both countries. I would rather attack their clergy in their doctrine, discipline and conduct in the most unreserved manner, than touch the smallest part of their revenue. I know that this must come to the hammer sooner or later, and it is fair for laymen to propose this even now; but I think it is hazardous for a Catholic clergyman, and more so for a Catholic bishop to publish these sentiments, especially when we are looking for Emancipation. 117

But not all were so cautious. Archbishop Kelly of Tuam considered the Vindication a 'most valuable production' and hoped it would be circulated to members of parliament.<sup>118</sup> Bishop James Keating of Ferns also praised Doyle's 'most excellent production'.<sup>119</sup> Richard Lalor Sheil wrote to Doyle promising a favourable review from his pen.<sup>120</sup>

Even Sir Edward Bellew formerly numbered among the timid was 'delighted' with J.K.L.'s work.<sup>121</sup>

O'Connell, who had been likened to Demosthenes in the Vindication moved a vote of thanks to J.K.L. at the Catholic Association and proclaimed: 'There was not a sentence in it which did not meet the full concurrence of the Catholic laity and the Catholic people of Ireland'. O'Connell identified J.K.L.'s challenge to the tithe system as the most important aspect of the work. But he also feared a considerable reaction:

. . . they did not dare speak of Tithes; it was a forbidden question . . . the Orange press would howl at them if they did; he therefore conceived it to be the duty of the Association to throw the shield of their approval over the author, in case any assault should be made on him by the vilest portion of a Press which ever disgraced the country.<sup>122</sup>

The contemporary importance of the Vindication has always been recognised. One historian of Emancipation has termed the Vindication the 'manifesto' of the Catholic Association claiming it had a comparable impact on the new movement in 1823 as Paine's Common Sense had on the morale of Americans in 1776.<sup>123</sup> Certainly the Vindication was a huge morale boost for the Catholic Association from a Catholic bishop but whether it can be termed the 'manifesto' of the Catholic Association is a moot point. The Vindication defended Catholics from polemical accusations but it did not offer a sustained plan of campaign to the Association nor did it suggest a particular political direction in which to make progress apart from the sustained exposition of Irish Catholic grievances. J.K.L.'s attack on the Established Church did not become part of Catholic Association policy; in fact, criticism of tithes were played down as much as possible so as not to hinder the Emancipation campaign. Consequently it may be inaccurate to state that 'Doyle's short tract . . . crystallised the political ideology of the Irish

Catholics just at the significant moment when the Catholic Association was entering on a crucial debate about countrywide expansion'.<sup>124</sup> But what Doyle's pamphlet did do was to raise the issue of tithes and the Established Church as a major focus of Catholic opposition for decades to come.

In early February 1824, only four months after the publication of the Vindication J.K.L. replied to his many detractors and critics in his Defence of the Vindication. He acknowledged in his work that the Vindication had produced a 'considerable sensation' which had however already gradually subsided 'but the impression produced by it on the public mind and common sense of the country, is not likely to be so transient and temporary'. The Defence of the Vindication was written to 'confirm that impression'.<sup>125</sup> In this one-hundred-and-twenty page work Doyle conducted a lengthy defence of miracles and again attacked the wealth of the Irish Established Church and tithes. He supported the union although he regretted that Ireland had been subjected to the sway of the foreigner and was consequently unable to develop her own institutions and sovereignty or form a federal league with England.

If I be a Milesian, why should I be less well effected to a Norman or a Saxon, than to a Dane or a Firbolg, or to any one of the numerous tribes whom Sir James Ware, for example, enumerates as forming the ancient population of Ireland. What is wanted - what is desired - are men Irish in affection, no matter whence their origin. Men who seek to promote the happiness of their country in the only way in which is now possible - by identifying her laws, institutions, interests with those of England and forming of both islands one solid empire . . .<sup>126</sup>

They seek for no separation, they have received good and evil from England. They know that a contest with her would prove destructive to Ireland, but that a cordial union of the countries would impart to this country a proportion of the power and industry of Britain - the blessing of her laws and institutions, as well as the security and privileges to be derived from her invincible strength and towering station amongst nations. <sup>127</sup>

O'Connell received more high praise in the Defence of the Vindication.

Doyle wrote of him: 'I shall always deem it a high honour to number Mr



O'Connell among my friends, and wish earnestly I could lend him any assistance in his efforts to cheer the despondency, and sustain the sinking fate of the country. He has long been one of her finest ornaments, and most efficient as well as most faithful supporters . .

.'.<sup>128</sup> In April 1824 Dr Doyle published his letter in reply to the M.P., John Henry North, on the education of the Catholic poor in Ireland.<sup>129</sup> Constantly in the public eye in this period, in May 1824 he published his remarkable letter on the union of the Catholic and Protestant churches which seemed very strongly to cast doubt on his allegiance to the throne.

The allegiance adhered to by Doyle was within the framework of the constitution which he understood in terms of the somewhat old-fashioned whig model.<sup>130</sup> This model was, as he explained in the Vindication basically that the crown is held in trust for the benefit of the people; and should the monarch violate his compact the subject is freed from the bonds of his allegiance.<sup>131</sup> The whig theory of the constitution gave Doyle the flexibility and latitude he needed to agitate while simultaneously proclaiming his allegiance. Doyle's understanding of the constitution was based on his reading of whig theorists especially Locke and Blackstone. For Doyle, the constitution originating with Magna Carta - 'the palladium of . . . liberties' - was essentially the contract between the monarch and his subjects; the king offering the mantle of his protection, the subjects, fealty and loyalty in return. The constitution was thus a vibrant quid pro quo arrangement which provided an umbrella under which all elements in society could find shelter. If either subject or monarch broke the contract then he was liable to the just retribution of the other party. This breaking of the contract was the justification provided by legal theorists for

the monarchical eviction of James II in 1688. However as the constitution was not codified there was much scope for differing interpretations as to its content and the weight to be given to any of its accretions. Doyle did not accept the argument of the conservatives and controversialists who proclaimed that the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688 introduced and inaugurated an immutable Protestant definition of the constitution from which the Catholics must be indefinitely excluded at peril of the traditional rights and privileges of Englishmen. J.K.L. observed: 'I am sometimes induced to read, or forced to hear . . . of the essential Protestantism of the Constitution. The essence of the Constitution is . . . to make all who live under it free and happy . . .'.<sup>132</sup>

Bishop Doyle's letter to Alexander Robertson, M.P., published in the Morning Chronicle of 18 May 1824 was inspired by both political and religious motives.<sup>133</sup> The dichotomy between the startling political analysis of the Irish problem contained in the first half of the work and the equally surprising solution of the latter half has been reflected historiographically; the work is now known as the 'letter on the union of the churches' although it was published in contemporary newspapers under the title 'Conciliation of Ireland'.<sup>134</sup> It is significant that Doyle chose to publish his letter to Robertson in the London Morning Chronicle rather than in his favourite newspaper, the virtual house journal of Irish Catholics, the Dublin Evening Post. J. E. Devereux, and possibly even F. W. Conway, among Doyle's circle, impressed upon him the need and importance of influencing English public and political opinion which could not be achieved by publishing in Irish newspapers alone. In Devereux's opinion Doyle was better known in England by his letter to North than for any of his works as J.K.L. From

London Devereux advised Doyle on 24 April 1824: 'It is here we must strike'.<sup>135</sup> The paper in which Doyle chose to publish was a solidly whig organ (though it had not escaped O'Connell's criticisms) and Doyle was keenly aware of whig efforts to secure a parliamentary committee to inquire extensively into the state of Ireland. His letter may have, in part, been intended to increase the pressure on the government in that respect. On 14 May Parnell wrote from Westminster announcing that a select committee on Ireland had been granted.<sup>136</sup> Doyle informed Murray and commented: 'Our agitation has done all the good in the world; it is it that kept the public attention of England fixed upon us and thereby forced the Ministry to the solemn enquiry'.<sup>137</sup>

Alexander Robertson's brief intervention in the House of Commons on the radical Joseph Hume's motion on the Irish Church Establishment suggesting the union of the Catholic and Protestant churches as the best means of pacifying Ireland gave Doyle an opportunity which he promptly took to encourage a project which had been dear to his heart for several years and to discuss the condition of Ireland before an English audience.<sup>138</sup> The letter to Robertson mirrored and amalgamated Doyle's oft-repeated love of country and religion in a sweeping political and theological synthesis which proposed that the political union of Ireland and England could best be secured by the religious union of Catholicism and Protestantism. The dual purpose of the letter is apparent from Doyle's introductory remark that 'the best, if not the only effectual means of pacifying Ireland, improving the condition of her people, and consolidating the interests of the Empire, would be found in a union of the churches which distract and divide us'.<sup>139</sup>

Slightly more than half the letter dealt with the depressed state of Ireland which was incapable of benefiting from legislation. An

intolerable situation which demanded remedial action had been produced by the inequality of the laws and the unending conflict of religious opinions. Although the prime minister and home secretary knew that Irish Catholics were impatiently disaffected they were 'manifestly at a loss' as to how to govern Ireland. The government must be aware that an exasperated Irish nation was on the brink of erupting in a 'torrent like lava from the crater of a volcano'. In this pithy and almost frighteningly expressive fashion Doyle was prophesising revolution; some feared that he might be nurturing or even preaching revolution.<sup>140</sup>

The government was 'preparing fuel for the flame in Ireland' by educating the people without providing for their distress, thus putting the 'sharpest weapons' that could be possessed into the hands of the people. Education would enable them to calculate their strength and plot retaliation. An educated population would not pacify the country by inducing the resident gentry to behave themselves and the absentee landlords to return. Neither would the people have much time for the clergy of the Church Establishment who 'are and will be detested by those who differ from them in religion' because of the 'oppression arising from tithes and church rates'. Moreover the growing middle class of propertied Catholics would not support the government 'should eventual times arrive'. The Catholic aristocracy was looked on with suspicion and was without influence. Indeed if the government continued on its present course it could only expect 'defiance or open hostility' from the leaders of the Irish lay Catholic community.<sup>141</sup> Thus all moderating influences which might check revolution were rapidly disappearing. Doyle's most notorious statement however was on the role the Catholic clergy would adopt in this revolutionary scenario:

The minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic priesthood: they have been ill-treated, and they may yield for a moment to the influence of nature, though it be opposed to grace. The clergy, with few exceptions, are from the ranks of the people, they inherit their feelings, they are not, as formerly, brought up under despotic governments, and they have imbibed the doctrines of Locke and Paley more deeply than those of Bellarmin, or even of Bossuet, on the divine right of kings; they know much more of the principles of the Constitution than they do of passive obedience. If a rebellion were raging from Carrickfergus to Cape Clear, no sentence of excommunication would ever be fulminated by a Catholic prelate, or if fulminated, it would fall, as Grattan once said of British supremacy, like a spent thunder-bolt 'some gazed at it, the people were fond to touch it'. 142

If the Catholic hierarchy did not denounce rebellion then its loyalty to the crown could be questioned.<sup>143</sup> For its time and place Doyle's statement was a remarkable admission from a Catholic prelate. The reverberations from Doyle's diagnosis of the likely consequences of the Irish polity's diseased state were such that his ecumenical prescription for its cure was largely ignored, overlooked or dismissed out of hand.<sup>144</sup>

The most immediate and vehement response to Doyle's letter came from the ultra peer, Lord Colchester, in the House of Lords on 24 May 1824. He characterised the letter as 'an extraordinary manifesto of sedition and insolence' and clearly identified many debatable passages in it. However the sharpness of his accuracy was lost in the bluntness of his criticism.<sup>145</sup> Colchester's unjustifiable attack, said the pro-Catholic Bishop Bathurst, was 'sufficient to try the patience of a primitive martyr'.<sup>146</sup> O'Connell defended Doyle from Lord Colchester's charges at several meetings of the Catholic Association. Bishop Doyle's letter, he pronounced on 29 May, bore the imprint of a philosopher, statesman, and conciliating Christian. On 12 June, O'Connell compared Colchester intellectually with Doyle as a pygmy to a giant.<sup>147</sup>

Doyle's letter on the union of the churches does not appear to have been a hasty or ill-considered production. He informed a friend on the Maynooth staff that he anticipated the objections he was likely to meet and the quarters from which they would emanate. He was not prepared to deviate from 'the plan of life which I have proposed to myself' even if he was forced to resign his bishopric: 'if the course I have entered upon should facilitate my retirement from public life, instead of being a penalty I should hail it as a blessing'.<sup>148</sup> The evidence, however, clearly shows that for some days after the publication of his letter Doyle's mind went through a period of considerable turmoil. It appears that Doyle suffered a crisis of confidence and in this state drafted his episcopal resignation. His letter to Rome resigning the see was dated 1 June 1824 and though it was never sent it is nonetheless of great interest. Several inconsistencies indicate that it was written under stress.

He was, he explained, only a young man of thirty-three when he was raised to the bishopric 'not through my own interest or effort and indeed against my will but by the commendation of the clergy of the diocese'. He had come into the see unprepared by experience or talent 'nor indeed did I find many men versed in ecclesiastical affairs. For the prelates who preceded me were impeded by age or ill-health so that both clergy and people looked to me to perform tasks to which I also was unequal'. The duties and difficulties of the diocese, he maintained, would have been within the capacity of a judicious man to resolve

but for me who was not sufficiently knowledgeable of men, a bit hasty, better endowed with talk than piety, and not mindful of my sins, my ignorance and my weakness, rarely kind or humble and prone to be involved in controversy it was not. So that I constantly desired that this burden which was unsuitable to a man of my power should be given back into the hands of the Holy See.

Doyle had hoped to go to Rome to meet the pope personally 'but neither time nor circumstances permit this'. His resignation would not be to the detriment of the diocese, he claimed, as he unwittingly acknowledged the reforms he had effected:

For there are some priests therein of excellent life, doctrine and report from whom undoubtedly the more worthy would be recommended for the vacant See. The welfare of clergy and people should in fact be the better for the change and the new incumbent should not find any insuperable difficulties.

Even more paradoxical was to follow: 'Another consideration is that the oppression of our people has long grieved me and my writings on the subject have meant that the government would be pleased if I retired from my public position to one more obscure'. Although in the beginning of his letter Bishop Doyle asked that he be allowed to return to teaching in Carlow College in its conclusion he indicated that he was unsure what he wanted to do.

There are precedents in Ireland for bishops leaving their churches, taking up religious life or bringing the gospel overseas, and even if I have not the virtue or divine grace for such calling then I might devote myself to teaching or writing some other work appropriate to a cleric . . . 149

The reaction to the letter on the union of the churches was undoubtedly the cause of this contemplated resignation. Doyle felt he had gone too far and there was only one option open to him. It seems likely that Archbishop Curtis of Armagh had called on him to resign. But his draft resignation letter was to prove only a temporary aberration, a questioning of motives about where his capacity and self-confidence were leading him; and worry about his own unworthiness for the task in hand of the kind often found in church leaders. That Dr Doyle recovered his self-possession promptly is evidenced in his letter to Dr Jeremiah Donovan, Professor of Rhetoric at Maynooth, written probably in early June 1824, which revealed an almost contemptuous

estimate of the collective worth of most of the Irish hierarchy: 'I am sure there are many prelates who disapprove of the sentiments of the letter; but I am much deceived if they do more than converse about it; and if not, you may be firmly assured I care not with what freedom they censure'.<sup>150</sup> On 2 June 1824 Archbishop Curtis wrote privately to a member of the cabinet, the duke of Wellington, an old acquaintance from Salamanca during the Peninsular war, condemning Doyle's letter in the most forthright terms as an 'eccentric and wild production' and threatening to have him silenced

It is in nothing analogous with his former writings, some of which were edifying and useful; and though others of them were not equally so, in the entire, yet they contained no passage as harsh, unreasonable, or reprehensible . . .

It has caused an extraordinary sensation here, but in general, a feeling of deep regret and of an irritation against the bishop, who, among many other absurdities, has clumsily placed the Roman Catholic prelates and clergy in a very awkward predicament, and even in an odious point of view, which they certainly do not deserve, as the author elsewhere abundantly proves, as he is their ultra-apologist. But what gives us most pain is that the letter in question must be offensive to government . . . It is possible your Grace may here exclaim, Why do you not yourselves disavow, silence, suspend, and put down, such a man at once? You may depend, my Lord Duke, it will end in that, and very soon, if the aggressor himself does not come forward and make speedy, full and sincere atonement for his error, which I have every reason to expect he will do, and is actually preparing, and it will be the most effectual remedy for the evil. 151

In direct contrast to the primate's very deferential letter to Wellington, the English Vicar Apostolic, Dr Peter Baines, Coadjutor of the Western District, wrote to Doyle to encourage him to

proceed on your bold and upright career. It is the only one suited to the times and circumstances. I am most particularly happy that you have had the candour to tell the government that they do wrong in 'looking to the exertions of the Catholic priesthood' and that the Catholic bishops would no longer support oppression by ecclesiastical censure. 152

Doyle had judged correctly that no Irish Catholic bishop would publicly attack his letter but he may not have reckoned with the 'Maynooth



Manifesto' which was, in effect, a public condemnation, dated 2 June 1824, from five influential professors of the 'Royal College of St. Patrick's, Maynooth'. All the more annoying perhaps because Doyle, from 26 June 1823, was a trustee of Maynooth College.<sup>153</sup> The Maynooth reply to Doyle's letter dealt only with the bishop's assertion of a new political outlook within the Irish Catholic clergy which might lead them to turn a blind eye to rebellion. Apparently it was felt by some members of the Maynooth staff that if Bishop Doyle's letter stood uncontradicted the status of the College as a government funded seminary might be endangered.<sup>154</sup> The 'Manifesto' was a direct response to Doyle although it did not mention him by name. It declared Maynooth's obedience to the law, respect for the state and allegiance to the sovereign. Biblical references from Saints Peter and Paul and a Tertullian commentary were adduced to explain the immutable teaching of the Catholic Church vis-à-vis loyalty to the constituted authorities. The 'Manifesto' group appealed to the 'peaceable and loyal' Maynooth educated clergy to preserve public order. They professed that 'if any change has been wrought in the minds of the clergy of Ireland, it is that religious obligation is here strengthened by motives of gratitude, and confirmed by sworn allegiance, from which no power on earth can dissolve'.<sup>155</sup>

The 'Manifesto' was signed by two émigrés from revolutionary France: Louis Delahogue, Professor Emeritus of Dogmatic Theology at Maynooth and formerly of the Sorbonne; and Francis Anglade, Professor of Moral Theology. They had brought to Maynooth an ancien régime strain of gallicanism. These two instigated the reply to Doyle (which is sometimes rather confusingly called the 'Sorbonne Manifesto').<sup>156</sup> On first hearing Doyle's letter read at the Maynooth professors' dining

dining table, Delahogue's reported reaction was 'est ce possible qu'il prêche la revolution?'.<sup>157</sup> The three other signatories of the 'Manifesto' were Irish and all subsequently members of the Irish episcopal bench. James Browne, Professor of Sacred Scripture, was appointed Coadjutor Bishop of Kilmore in 1827.<sup>158</sup> Charles McNally, Professor of Logic and Moral Philosophy, became Coadjutor Bishop of Clogher in 1844.<sup>159</sup> John MacHale, Professor of Dogmatic Theology, was elevated to the Coadjutor Bishopric of Killala in 1825. The last named is the most unexpected signatory. MacHale was placed in a rather awkward position. He was a friend of Bishop Doyle's but he was also a former pupil of Delahogue; he had lectured in his department for six years and succeeded to his chair in 1820. Thus Delahogue had a strong claim on his support but only after coming under intense pressure did the author of the letters of Hierophilos actually sign. Doyle did not in fact have a high opinion of the prolific MacHale, remarking in 1834 that 'there is no ballast in him'.<sup>160</sup> Dr Bartholomew Crotty, President of Maynooth College and a Doyle correspondent, refused to sign the 'Manifesto'.<sup>161</sup>

John Healy, the nineteenth-century historian of Maynooth College, maintained that the theological faculty at Maynooth was not invited to pronounce on Doyle's letter but he suggested that it was highly improbable that the 'Manifesto' group published 'without, at least, the tacit consent of the archbishop of Dublin'.<sup>162</sup> Doyle's perception of Archbishop Murray's likely attitude is indicated in a letter from the bishop to the Augustinian Provincial, Rev Charles Stuart. The latter had warned Doyle that certain Dublin priests were actually planning some form of public rebuke but Doyle was 'certain' that such proceedings would not be countenanced by the archbishop.<sup>163</sup>

At the Catholic Association, Dr Doyle's consistent supporter, Daniel O'Connell, kept his comments on the 'Maynooth Manifesto' diplomatically brief although he objected to its politics and protested that he did not see what grounds Catholics had for 'gratitude' though they were bound to give their allegiance to government.<sup>164</sup> Bishop Doyle replied publicly to the 'Manifesto' signed by 'some gentlemen of Maynooth' by announcing that it had his entire approval. He thus stifled further public division within the Catholic community. Deftly if indirectly censuring the Maynooth group he declared that Lord Colchester's attack on him would not have been made by anyone familiar with his pastoral and published work to check disaffection in Ireland. Doyle observed that if the political opinions of Lord Colchester were allowed to prevail in government then a rebellion would occur which the hierarchy would be unable to restrain.<sup>165</sup> In a private letter to Dr Donovan, Doyle informed him

I have exposed myself knowingly and willingly to danger from as many sources as it beset St Paul; but I will keep my eye upon my great object, the good of my country, however remote, and will endeavour to bear with whatever I may have to undergo.

In a reference to the most controversial political passage in the letter on the union of the churches he wrote:

Surely you know that to leave the ordinary track in any usage . . . is calculated to excite sneers, and censures and jealousy. Why not then the unfolding of a great political truth such as the nature and extent of our allegiance to the throne? . . . The man who first stirs up these truths will be decried by all. The government will fold itself in its strength and dignity, and make a show of severity and vengeance. But he is a fool who does not see that the truth works secretly, and, like a grain which must corrupt before it gives fruit, will after it has suffered obloquy, produce advantage. 166

In reply to the customary vote of thanks of the Catholic Association, which had been proposed by O'Connell, Doyle returned to the question of his allegiance: 'My principles of allegiance are those and no other

on which the British Constitution is based'. However Doyle did not much elaborate claiming that discussion of those principles was hardly ever productive and even less so in an atmosphere of heated public debate. 'The nature and extent of this obedience', he wrote, 'is expressed in our oaths of allegiance which oaths we have observed, and will . . . continue to observe.'<sup>167</sup> Doyle bluntly informed the Lords' committee on the state of Ireland in March 1825 that 'he never took the oath of allegiance in this country till about a year ago, and probably should not have done so, had I not been appointed to some situation'.<sup>168</sup>

The significance of the political aspect of Doyle's letter on the union of the churches was that Doyle came as close as possible to proclaiming that the Irish people could in the near future legally, legitimately and justifiably break the constitutional contract between the monarch (now represented by his government) and his Irish subjects. In these circumstances revolution would be justified. Throughout the 1820s Doyle's critics in Ireland and England regularly drew attention to this letter as evidence of the bishop's subversive intentions. At the Catholic Association in January 1827 Richard Lalor Sheil used Doyle's letter as his authority when claiming that the Irish Catholic clergy 'no longer stand in that state of alienation from the French government which was so deeply deplored by Tone'. This imputation of disloyalty so worried A. R. Blake that he wrote anxiously to Doyle giving his own interpretation of the letter: 'I think you spoke in it of the uselessness of excommunication as a political weapon in the present state of public feeling and this it seems proves that the Catholic clergy are favourable to the French government'.<sup>169</sup> Thus, it would appear that even a political operator of Blake's astuteness failed to appreciate the significance of Doyle's words.

The omens for the Catholic Association in 1824 could hardly have been regarded as auspicious when its meeting on 31 January had to be postponed because it failed to reach a quorum of ten members.<sup>170</sup> Consequently it may well have been a feeling of desperation that forced O'Connell to revive an old idea which would fundamentally alter Irish Emancipation politics and constitute what later historians would describe as the beginnings of Irish democracy. In early February 1824 O'Connell proposed the nation-wide Catholic rent of a penny-a-month subscription from Ireland's six million Catholics. In March he circularised the Catholic bishops seeking their approbation and requesting a list of parishes and parish priests in their respective dioceses. Doyle immediately responded with his list for Kildare and Leighlin.<sup>171</sup>

However it was not until the autumn of 1824 that the idea of the Catholic rent began to become a reality. From its foundation in spring 1823 Doyle was the Catholic prelate most strongly associated with the Catholic Association, whose letters or publications were regularly read, commented upon and applauded at its meetings. There is no extant record of Doyle being formally enrolled as a member of the Association. Such would have been academic in any case as he was the Association's prelate par excellence. Strictly speaking enrolment was superfluous as all Catholic clerics were ex officio members. Nonetheless in November 1824 O'Connell enrolled the aged Bishop Plunkett of Meath as a member.<sup>172</sup> Formal enrolment probably served as a device to put pressure on those bishops who were not closely linked to the Association and who soon rushed publicly to grasp this opportunity to prove their adhesion to its principles. The Ossory diocese had been criticised for non-payment of rent but Bishop Marum now promptly sent in his subscription.<sup>173</sup> Bishop

Coen of Confert and more notably Archbishop Curtis of Armagh did likewise. Curtis who had been criticising the Association in private correspondence with the duke of Wellington now publicly declared his allegiance primarily because he felt the weight of popular opinion bearing down strongly upon him.<sup>174</sup>

The leadership, Doyle, who was now being called the 'patriot prelate', gave, was a great stimulus to the furtherance of the objectives of the Catholic Association in his own diocese and beyond. As might be anticipated the town parishes of the diocese having a greater proportion of middle-class inhabitants were more politically aware, more active and easier to organise than rural parishes in the collection of the Catholic rent. The crucial figure in the taking of the collection was the parish priest who allowed the rent to be collected at the church gate thus maximising the potential number of contributors among those going to Sunday Mass. Rent committees were formed in August and September 1824 in Tullow, Carlow and Naas parishes; in Kildare and Rathangan, Maryborough and Philipstown in October; in Abbeylaxey in November and Ballinakill and Portarlinton in December 1824.<sup>175</sup>

The Kildare Catholic rent meeting in the parish chapel on 5 September 1824 was brought to the attention of the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary by the magistrate, Major Tandy, who reported the proceedings on oath (although it seems unlikely that he was present and was probably relying on an informant). Tandy's account conveyed an image of a domineering parish priest haranguing his flock in unmeasured terms. It was alleged that the Rev Patrick Brennan stated that he had travelled in America, France, Switzerland and Germany, all free countries and was now determined 'to lose the last drop of my blood

with you to redeem you from tyranny and slavery'. The parish priest hoped that women parishioners would not scruple to sell their shawls and ribbons and even their shoes - for they should think it no hardship to go barefoot - to support the Catholic cause. When he was dead it would be the joy of his flock to accept the 'happy tidings of the overturn of Government'. Rev Brennan cautioned his parishioners if asked the reason for the meeting to answer that it was on 'the order of Bishop Doyle for to pay up the Catholic rents in order to support a printing office in London and another in Dublin . . .'. Wellesley informed Goulburn that the Kildare meeting was held 'expressly for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the Realm'.<sup>176</sup>

In four public letters between August and November 1824 (three of which were to Catholics in his own diocese) Bishop Doyle continued to attack the status quo with a vigour which his critics denounced as inflammatory at the very least. These letters were occasioned by votes of gratitude to Doyle for his defence of the religious and civil principles of Catholics (and in one case his maintenance of the public peace) from Catholic rent committees in Waterford city, Kildare, Maryborough and Abbeyleix.<sup>177</sup> Doyle took the opportunity thus presented to heighten Catholic political consciousness and to promote the Catholic Association's agitation as much as possible. His letters contributed to the country-wide expansion of the Association through parochial rent committees which gave local committees a raison d'être. Doyle held that the moral force of the country had to be concentrated on committees of this kind rather than in individual exertion. Doyle deemed the Catholic rent 'undoubtedly the most efficient measure ever adopted by the Catholic body'. He threw all his weight behind the Catholic Association with his imprimatur: 'You do well to identify yourselves with the

Catholic Association, they represent every interest and sentiment in our Body. If they be wise and temperate, they will achieve much, and the Catholic who is not for them, is against them'. Doyle correctly forecast that the government would either dissolve the Association or grant Catholic Emancipation.<sup>178</sup>

Doyle's exhortations to the Catholic rent committees reached a crescendo of fervour in his letter to the Catholics of Kildare (Brennan's flock):

Our country is still enslaved. A tyranny generated by the laws, and introduced by a worthless, heartless and bigoted faction, to the fireside of every peasant, requires us all to take from our competency, or even wretchedness, whatever may have escaped the hands of the despoiler, and consecrate it to our public and personal redemption.<sup>179</sup>

Agitation was the key to success. The silent slave would be converted into a beast of burden. But perhaps fearing that he might have been too extreme and anticipating the judgement not alone of his contemporary critics but even the historian that this was very strong language indeed, Doyle toned down his declamatory tendencies in his (next) address to the Abbeyleix Catholic rent committee of 28 November 1824. He urged the Abbeyleix Catholics to persevere according to constitutional processes in strict conformity with the laws so that their opponents would not have an opportunity of censuring them and so that 'our conscience and our posterity may not reproach us with having swerved from the patience and long suffering which our religion and our interest enjoin'. He was, in this letter, also slightly more circumspect in his advice on agitation: 'Be patient therefore in your sufferings, but at the same time lift up your voice and proclaim your wrongs loudly'.<sup>180</sup>

In mid-February 1825 J.K.L. published his Letters on the state of Ireland which was directly intended to influence the parliamentarians participating in the impending committees on Irish affairs. This



book comprised twelve letters on Irish public affairs. Two of these letters, those on education and the biblical societies, had already been published as a separate pamphlet in November 1824. The other letters considered the character of the Irish government, the administration of justice, the state of religion and politics, demographic change and the question of disfranchising the forty shilling freeholders. Emancipation and a legal provision for the poor received more lengthy treatment in two letters each.<sup>181</sup>

In his preface J.K.L. advised his readers that allowance should be made for the passion and prejudice that might have inadvertently crept into his work, remembering that he belonged

. . . to a class of men who are supposed to be rendered bigots by their profession; that I have been bred up a slave and imbibed from infancy strong prejudices against the ruling party, that my religion is only emerging from persecution; and that my love of country however laudable in itself, tends to inspire me with wishes for her happiness which perhaps cannot be realized.<sup>182</sup>

J.K.L.'s work was a thorough survey of the contemporary Irish public scene drawing analogies from classical civilization (Socrates, Plato, Demosthenes, Caesar, Cicero, Horace), the church fathers (St Augustine, Tertullian), modern political theory (Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Burke, Malthus) and history to illustrate his fundamental contention that the moral foundation of Irish government was built on quicksand. In Ireland where the truth was generally disregarded through ignorance, adulation, or hatred, the need for moral standards was everywhere apparent.<sup>183</sup> Doyle maintained in his Letters on the State of Ireland, perhaps the most celebrated of his public works, that unless the whole system of Irish government was altered the country would never enjoy peace. The spirit and letter of the laws, he held, and not just the penal laws, but even contemporary laws, was hostile to the people. Furthermore 'all the

elements of discord are fermenting, and any trivial or unforeseen circumstances may now, as heretofore, produce an explosion'.<sup>184</sup>

The Irish government had no fixed character and was agitated by factions. That faction which was beyond the law in Ireland, the Orange, must be broken. J.K.L. divided the country into three parties: Orangemen, Catholics and the government. There was also, he wrote contemptuously, a 'vast mass of inert matter, or what Swift would call prudent men'.<sup>185</sup> For J.K.L. the Catholics were, morally speaking, the people of Ireland, though they were kept in a constant state of agitation by the taunts of Orangemen, a hostile press, education societies and 'itinerant saints'.<sup>186</sup> Ireland was a country with no public institution which was not sectarian. The Insurrection Act was 'nothing else than force and violence legalised'.<sup>187</sup> The Constabulary Act was ruined in its implementation by party spirit. A 'low' element of questionable character had been admitted into the ranks of the constabulary on the grounds of their 'exclusive loyalty' whilst the sons of farmers were excluded. Consequently, J.K.L. stated, with obvious irony, that he was unsure whether the constabulary had done more to disturb or preserve the peace.<sup>188</sup> J.K.L. welcomed the Tithe Composition Act not only because it would afford some relief but because it would enable the public to estimate the wealth of the Established Church 'and we shall see whether this mighty Babylon can be suffered to exist'.<sup>189</sup> He argued for a clause in land leases prohibiting the sub-division of land. He believed from examination of his parish registers that population increase was not as great as was imagined although he estimated the population to be seven millions in extent and stated presciently that if a famine occurred one million would perish.<sup>190</sup> J.K.L. tended to overestimate Wellesley's significance in the government

and his interest in Ireland. But he acknowledged that the Lord Lieutenant had been appointed to administer the laws, not to change them, and that all hope of improvement under him had ended in disappointment.<sup>191</sup>

Bishop Doyle's strong perception of the penal laws is well exemplified in his overstatement: 'Catholics have for nearly three centuries been passing through an ordeal more severe than any in recorded history'. He gave evidence that his perception was widely shared.<sup>192</sup>

There are thousands of people in this country who scarcely know the nature of any law, whether favourable or penal; but you will not find an old woman or a ragged child who has not imbibed from the breast, or is taking into the grave, the hatred and horror of the system by which you govern the Irish Catholics. They know not what the system is, but they think it is something horribly, ineffably unjust, and wicked. . . . How often have I perceived in a congregation of some thousand persons, how the very mention from my tongue of the penal code caused every eye to glisten, and every ear to stand erect; the trumpet of the last judgement if sounded, would not produce a more perfect stillness in any assemblage of Irish peasantry, than a strong allusion to the wrongs we suffer.<sup>193</sup>

The comparative freedom which contemporary Catholics enjoyed was a relaxation of pressure rather than a rightful possession. J.K.L. perceived the influence of the penal code working through the law sometimes unconsciously to such an extent that the administration of justice in Ireland was thwarted by the spirit of the law. The proverb 'there is no law for a Catholic' was a commonplace among the people.<sup>194</sup> Where the laws of the country were unjust it was impossible that they could be justly administered. Permeating the Letters on the state of Ireland was a deep-seated fear of civil war. If there was no amelioration of the laws and if a foreign war occurred there could be a general rebellion in Ireland. If Catholic complaints were not satisfied 'we need no Pastorini to foretell the result'.<sup>195</sup> J.K.L. contended

that there were no arguments against Emancipation which remained unrefuted. The state should cease to be a religious partisan. Religion when not restricted would cease to agitate the public mind. 'How ridiculous it will one day appear, to have excluded a man from the bench or the bar, because he kissed the pope's toe or took his opinion on some case of conscience.'<sup>196</sup> He attacked as 'disgraceful to the nation' the oath and declaration taken by public servants of the crown which declared against the spiritual power of the papacy (which obviously was a fact) and that transubstantiation and the invocation of the saints were 'superstitious and idolatrous'. He took particular exception to the notion of idolatry and he asserted that Protestant belief in the saints, as in so many other matters, was 'substantially the same' as Catholic teaching.<sup>197</sup> If Ireland continued to be treated unjustly the Irish would become reformers and 'reformers of the very worst kind'. The cry for Emancipation would become a clamour for the repeal of the union.<sup>198</sup> Here J.K.L. anticipated the words of O'Connell who wrote after the defeat of Emancipation legislation later in 1825 that every possible means of agitation would have to be tried including repeal - 'that would be the cry'.<sup>199</sup>

Doyle was summoned to give evidence before the parliamentary committees on Ireland by Lord Harrowby on 2 March 1825.<sup>200</sup> The Rev Jeremiah Donovan wisely warned Doyle of the danger of entering into 'sole responsibility' for arrangements on the Catholic question which Sir Francis Burdett introduced in the House of Commons on 1 March.<sup>201</sup>

Donovan urged Doyle to maintain close contact with the other Irish bishops who had been summoned to London to give evidence. Three of the archbishops were present: Curtis of Armagh, Murray of Dublin and Kelly of Tuam (the fourth, the diffident Robert Laffan of Cashel pleaded ill-

health); Bishop Magauran of Ardagh and Clonmacnoise and Bishop Doyle constituted the Irish episcopal complement.<sup>202</sup> All these bishops were examined briefly with the exception of Doyle, who because of his renown, was deliberately subjected to lengthy and rigorous questioning by opponents of the Catholic claims. The object of the exercise was to embarrass and confound Doyle and thus damage the Emancipation bill then before parliament. Thus Doyle became the principal witness for the Irish hierarchy in which he was already the dominating personality. Before the House of Commons committee on 16 and 18 March and before the House of Lords committee on 21 March and 21 April Doyle gave exhaustive evidence in answer to hundreds of questions on Catholic belief and practice in Ireland.<sup>203</sup> This examination was notable for Doyle's thorough defence of all aspects of Catholicism and for his ability to think on his feet. He was obliged to answer on a whole range of issues, several of which on confession, absolution, indulgences, saints, relics, excommunication, etc, reflected simple ignorance of Catholic doctrine. Doyle's evidence provides the ecclesiastical historian with a wealth of detailed and accurate information on current Irish Catholic practices and customs regulating the education of priests, church appointments, clerical dues, the use of the Bible, and on popular education and the state of the poor.

Bishop Doyle stressed several times, in the clearest language, that he would not accept a crown veto on the appointment of Irish bishops. He would protest to the pope and if that failed he would resign his office rather than give his assent to such a provision and he hoped that every bishop in Ireland would do likewise.<sup>204</sup> Before the Lords' committee, Doyle bluntly gave his reasoning for objecting to the veto: 'I have observed since I came to manhood, that there has been uninterrupted and strong efforts made to injure, and even to subvert

the Catholic religion in Ireland'.<sup>205</sup> On the securities or so-called 'wings' that were eventually brought forward to make the parliamentary passage of the Emancipation bill more palatable to the diehards and therefore more likely, Doyle was more circumspect. The first security on this occasion was state payment of the Catholic clergy. Doyle asserted that he would much prefer to be supported by the laity but would not withhold his consent if such opposition on his part would be an obstacle to the settlement of the Catholic question.<sup>206</sup> In his Letters on the state of Ireland J.K.L. had stated that if Catholics were emancipated then a provision for the Catholic clergy could be made 'unconnected with, and totally independent of court favour, and which would not add probably a single shilling to the burthens of the country'.<sup>207</sup> A year earlier Doyle had discussed a provision for the clergy made by parochial vestries of Catholic freeholders which would remove the payment of dues.<sup>208</sup> (Doyle's idea for a poor law for Ireland based on a parish vestry system was along similar lines.) He outlined a detailed scheme of vestry provision for parish priests and curates to A. R. Blake in April 1825. The bishop was to be provided for by a percentage paid by the parish priests. Doyle even allowed for a sliding scale within certain parameters so that the vestry payment could reflect the parishioners' estimate of services rendered by their pastors. An objection to this plan was also considered by him: that it would impose too great a burden on the already overburdened. He responded that 'what is now given throughout Ireland, in the shape of voluntary contributions, by only a portion of this class of persons, is perhaps nearly equal to what would then be levied by a legal assessment from the entire community'.<sup>209</sup>

In the course of the parliamentary consideration of Emancipation in 1825 and the proposed provision for the clergy Doyle privately made it clear to the government that his objections to state payment of the Catholic clergy were so strong 'that no consideration but a fear of retarding the settlement of the country could prevent me from enforcing them with the public'.<sup>210</sup> He feared correctly that the object of the church link with the crown was to make government minions of the clergy. A mode of providing for the clergy based on the royal bounty, the regium donum or annual provision would, Doyle asserted, never be acceptable to him. 'In the event of a provision being made, it should proceed on the principle of connecting the Catholic clergy, not with the Crown, but with the State, and of preserving inviolate the mutual dependence and connection of the Priesthood and the people with and upon each other.'<sup>211</sup>

On the second security mooted in 1825, the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders, Doyle refused to be drawn requesting that he be permitted to abstain from expressing an opinion on what was essentially a political issue.<sup>212</sup> However in his Letters on the state of Ireland J.K.L. had devoted a chapter to a defence of the forty shilling freehold franchise. He looked upon that franchise as a natural right and a constitutional right containing the 'very seeds of freedom'.<sup>213</sup> Disfranchisement would inflict a grave wound on the cause of civil liberty throughout the empire. He condemned the weak expedients used to dismiss it. It was far from universally true, as alleged, that the forty shilling freeholders were driven like cattle to the hustings by their landlords, and even if so, it was a better condition than having no vote. J.K.L. argued that raising the freehold valuation required for entitlement to the franchise would give it to the

middlemen - 'the worst description of oppressors that the curse of Cromwell has produced in Ireland'. Disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders would lead to ejections. The middleman class would sell their votes to the highest bidder. His defence of the freeholders was remarkable for its foresight.

They already have power, and it is the very exercise of this power which has contributed to raise an outcry against them. It is a power at present only in its bud; every friend of civil liberty should shield it from the blast which might now destroy it; he should protect it with all his might, as the very palladium of Irish rights. 214

Hitherto it has been argued, that as we possessed political power by this very franchise, we were entitled to eligibility to office, as it was an anomaly to grant a power and withhold the right of exercising it. This argument is equally sound and judicious; but what becomes of it now, when it is proposed to withdraw the power, and concede the right to exercise it? 215

I would expect that if it were proposed to Catholics to barter the elective franchise for emancipation, that they would indignantly reject the unworthy compromise. I do hope they are intelligent, and can see that this franchise is the germ of Ireland's greatness . . . 216

But in his parliamentary committee evidence Doyle was not prepared to jeopardise Emancipation, which seemed likely, by protesting the intended disfranchisement. In the debate on the Elective Franchise in Ireland Bill (the disfranchisement 'wing') George Dawson, the virulently anti-emancipationist M.P., suggested that Doyle's Letters on the state of Ireland had been published before he was let into the secret of the compromise to secure Catholic Emancipation and that like a good general but an indifferent ecclesiastic he had parried the question.<sup>217</sup>

The awkward position Doyle had been placed in with regard to state payment of the Catholic clergy and the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders arose from O'Connell's unilateral acceptance of these securities for Emancipation without consultation. While Emancipation seemed likely this tactic did not appear to present a



problem for his supporters. Success would have carried all before it. But once the Emancipation bill failed, muted grumbling turned to open hostility. O'Connell's mistake was to have been too sanguine of the prospect of Emancipation in 1825. Furthermore the evidence suggests his head had been turned by the high society he now found himself moving in for the first time. When dining out in one of London's great whig houses he reported to his socially ambitious wife on the number of noblemen present: dukes, earls, barons, lords by courtesy, baronets: 'You cannot think how everybody says it is I who am carrying emancipation, that it will be carried this session I look on as nearly certain'. In this letter he also acknowledged one of his major failings: 'Your husband is lost by flattery'.<sup>218</sup> O'Connell had probably been bounced into accepting the securities, without a mandate from Dublin, by the Irish attorney-general, W. C. Plunket.<sup>219</sup>

Doyle's evidence on the papal claims was of intense interest to the parliamentary committees on the state of Ireland. He denied, at length, the temporal power of the papacy. He was questioned:

If the Pope were to intermeddle with the rights of the King, or with the allegiance which Catholics owe to the King; what would be the consequence so far as the Catholic clergy are concerned? The consequences would be, that we should oppose him by every means in our power, even by the exercise of spiritual authority. <sup>220</sup>

He repeatedly stressed that domestic nomination secured by a concordat was his preferred means of choosing Irish bishops.<sup>221</sup> He objected to the 'veto' even if sanctioned by the pope. He maintained that it was an 'evil' that the pope had the naked right of appointing bishops to the Irish church though it would be 'morally impossible' for him to exercise that right.<sup>222</sup> Doyle was anxious to see an Irish national church independent of both crown and papacy (in all matters not relating to faith). He held that each national church had its own rights which

could not be subverted or affected by the pope without the agreement of that church's hierarchy. Doyle would not receive any bull from the pope 'that would trench on our rights as a national church'.<sup>223</sup> Sentiments such as these from the Irish hierarchy's leading spokesman did much to convince some waverers that there was nothing to fear from the pope if Catholics were emancipated. Doyle, of course, put forward the best possible scenario for the likely consequences of Emancipation. It was highly politic to do so. He stressed his belief in the union and his reverence for the British constitution. He held that Emancipation would lead to an end to religious controversy and animosity in Ireland. He also stated, in response to a question, that the Irish Catholic objection to the payment of tithes would be greatly removed if the Catholics were emancipated.<sup>224</sup>

I conceive that the removal of the disqualifications under which Roman Catholics labour would lessen considerably those feelings of opposition which they may at present entertain with regard to the Establishment, chiefly for this reason, that whilst we labour under the disabilities which now weigh upon us, we find that the clergy of the Establishment, being very numerous and very opulent, employ their influence and their opulence in various ways in opposing the progress of our claims; and I do think, that if those claims were once adjusted, and the concessions which we desire granted, the country would settle down into a habit of quiet, and that we would no longer feel the jealousy against the clergy of the Establishment which we now feel; because that jealousy which we do feel arises from the unrelaxed efforts which they have almost universally made to oppose our claims. We would view them then, if those claims were granted, as brethren labouring in the same vineyard as ourselves, seeking to promote the interests of our common country. 225

Dr Doyle's persuasive and commanding performance was much commented upon by both Catholic and anti-Catholic observers, and in the press, and received with jubilation in Ireland. O'Connell informed his wife that Doyle 'made a most powerful impression in our favour'.<sup>226</sup>

For his own part the bishop wrote to his brother on 12 April 1825 that his parliamentary examination had been witnessed not alone by the

committees but by several other parliamentarians 'such was the interest prevailing with regard to J.K.L. and Doctor Doyle'. Of the committees of the Lords and Commons Doyle stated: 'in both places there are clever men and a still greater number of ignorant contemptible beings, but the misfortune is, that all can interrogate after having studied their questions and written them down whilst the witness is assailed on all sides and has no preparation or even time for reflection'.

My object was, besides telling the truth, to communicate along with the necessary answer whatever further information I deemed useful, but it not infrequently happened that those most averse to our claims such as Mr Peel and Lord Colchester afforded by their questions opportunities of refuting many groundless charges. 227

The ultra Lord Colchester strongly attacked Doyle's opinions in the House of Lords, as he had a year earlier, when Doyle's letter on the union of the churches was published. The former Speaker acknowledged Doyle's ability in the Lords as 'the boldest and most prominent of their churchmen, whose learning, talents and views are all equally remarkable'.<sup>228</sup> Such words of praise were not reciprocated. Doyle informed his brother that Colchester was 'a trifling little man whom could I meet upon an equality I would undertake to grind to dust'.<sup>229</sup>

In the Commons committee Sir Henry Parnell and Thomas Spring Rice had asked him useful and helpful questions. The Marquis of Lansdowne had performed a similar role in the Lords committee. Doyle found the prime minister, Lord Liverpool, 'most just in all his enquiries, seemingly anxious only to ascertain the truth . . .'. Doyle admitted in this private correspondence that the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders and the provision for the Catholic clergy were conditions without which the Relief bill would not pass or even be likely to pass. On the provision for the clergy Doyle was glad that there appeared to be no intention of doing more with regard to the bill

than voting in both houses that it would be desirable to provide by law for the clergy. Thus even in the event of Emancipation passing the means of working the provision would be open to future discussion which was what the bishops desired. He had 'strong objections' to the plan as proposed and was ready with his own plan.<sup>230</sup>

The prestige and notoriety attaching to Doyle's name and the weight given to his evidence in committee can be gauged from the frequency of allusion to the bishop and his various publications in parliamentary reaction during consideration of the Emancipation bill and the accompanying securities. Indeed a feature of these debates was the impact of Doyle's evidence on several speakers who had hitherto been opponents of Emancipation. Chief among the bitter opponents of Emancipation who professed themselves converted on the basis of Doyle's reassuring evidence was Charles Brownlow, M.P. for County Armagh, who informed the House of Commons on 19 April 1825 that he was now convinced that Catholic allegiance between king and pope was not divided in temporal matters. Brownlow noted that Dr Doyle was prepared to oppose the pope with his spiritual authority if he interfered with allegiance to the king. But Brownlow misread Doyle's evidence for his own purposes when he stated that 'Dr Doyle would tell the people to oppose the pope. Surely there is not much of a papist here'.<sup>231</sup> The formidable Home Secretary Peel alluded to Doyle's impact on Brownlow and acknowledged that Doyle was 'one of the most acute and learned Prelates of the Irish Church' but stated that he was totally unable to reconcile Doyle's evidence with J.K.L.'s publications.<sup>232</sup> This argument was repeatedly adopted by the anti-emancipationists. George Dawson (Peel's brother-in-law) found the greatest inconsistency between Doyle's statements as a political writer and as a parliamentary witness. Indeed he was

astonished that 'both should come from the brain of the same man'.<sup>233</sup> Sir Charles Wetherell, the solicitor-general, and Sir Robert H. Inglis likewise attacked the apparent contradictions. Even pro-Emancipation parliamentarians (with the exception of Lord Binning who held that J.K.L. and Dr Doyle were not at variance) were at pains to distance themselves from this argument.<sup>234</sup> The former Irish Chief Secretary Charles Grant regretted that Doyle's zeal had allowed his pen to hurry him beyond what his mature judgement might not approve. He was sorry that to the energy of a Bossuet, Doyle had not joined the meekness of a Fenelon, but he did allow that Doyle had been provoked by Irish wrongs.<sup>235</sup> Henry Brougham suggested that Doyle in his calmer moments probably felt sorry for his intemperate and indiscreet remarks.<sup>236</sup> Brougham's comments and the attacks on his consistency or alleged inconsistency provoked Doyle to reply. He wrote to Brougham requesting him to read his letter onto the record of the House.<sup>237</sup> This Brougham evidently refused to do and in his place Sir John Newport read Doyle's vindication:

There is not a passage in the writings of 'J.K.L.' or in those attributed to me, which, if not mutilated, or distorted from its true and obvious meaning, can be proved, either to be opposed to, or inconsistent with, the evidence given by me before the Committees of both, or either Houses of Parliament. <sup>238</sup>

In this letter Doyle also argued that he was hostile to interference with the property of the Established Church unless it was approved by parliament.<sup>239</sup>

The post-Emancipation fate of the Church Establishment in Ireland had been discussed by several anti-Catholic M.P.s who were disquieted by J.K.L.'s strictures on that church (although curiously tithes were hardly mentioned). The Irish Chief Secretary Henry Goulburn, whom O'Connell contemptuously dismissed as an 'arrant blockhead',<sup>240</sup> held that Catholic

Emancipation was inconsistent with the constitution which was indissolubly united with the Church Establishment. He was unhappy with Doyle's views and while Catholics might not intend a Catholic Establishment in place of a Protestant Establishment 'he could easily conceive that a conscientious Catholic might think himself justified in removing an establishment which he looked upon as a monstrous heresy and a great evil'.<sup>241</sup> Dawson argued that Catholic supremacy would follow Catholic Emancipation. The agitation of O'Connell and Doyle in Ireland was such that every Protestant feared a convulsion from concession and every Catholic expected to gain something. Doyle would strip the Established Church of all its property. The concession of power to Catholics would finally end in the overthrow of the Protestant Establishment.<sup>242</sup> Peel doubted the value of conciliation when he read Doyle's remarks on the state of the Protestant Church in Ireland.<sup>243</sup> Similarly Sir Robert Inglis attacked Doyle's views on Protestant Church property holding that there was no Church of Ireland since it had ceased to exist at the act of union and that consequently there was only one establishment.<sup>244</sup> Lord Colchester claimed that Doyle denied the justice of the law by which the Established Church in Ireland held its property.<sup>245</sup> Charles Blomfield, Bishop of Chester, believed that Doyle was 'kindly disposed towards the church, as a church but as an establishment he would starve her to death'. He went on to inquire scathingly:

What degree of weight, as a matter of opinion, ought to be attached to the testimony of a man who, from the covert of his half-concealment, hurls firebrands into the sanctuary of the Protestant faith, and darts his poisoned arrows abroad, who engrafts upon the intolerant bigotry of the Romish Church the levelling doctrines of Jacobinism.<sup>246</sup>

In these circumstances, the earl of Darnley went against the tide when

he asserted somewhat incongruously that Dr Doyle would be an ornament to the Protestant bench.<sup>247</sup>

It was however, the prime minister, who dealt in the most detail with the Catholic attitude to the Protestant Establishment in Ireland.

It was not the immediate object to possess themselves of the property of the established church. They were too wary to proceed openly and directly in any such design. No: their object was, in the first instance, merely to diminish the property of the church. What was the language held by one of their great authorities, Dr Doyle, upon this very point? That he did wish to decrease the magnitude of the possessions of the church; but he wished it, not as a priest, but as an Irishman. Was any man so blind - was any man so deaf - was any man so lost to all the benefits of experience, as not to know what such language really meant? Was any man so thoroughly ignorant of the course of human actions, as not to know, that when once property of the church was violated under any such a pretence, it would soon be seized upon, and that such was the real object of Catholic cupidity? . . .

The grand maxim of the Catholics was, if one church sinks, the other must swim; destroy or depress the Protestant establishment, and that of the Catholics would flourish. . . . To destroy that church was, in fact, their grand object. It was their duty, their religion, their oath, their everything, to effect its downfall.<sup>248</sup>

That the opposition to Catholic Emancipation existed at an even more fundamental level can be seen from the speeches of the most important players. The Home Secretary objected to Catholic doctrines on transubstantiation, confession, scripture reading, absolution, and indulgences. 'He could never consent to any measure which diminished the security of our Protestant establishment and thereby threatened the foundation of civil and religious liberty.' He was ready to make all 'reasonable' concessions to Catholics while he upheld the Protestant character of the throne, parliament, church and judiciary.<sup>249</sup> The duke of York made a decisive contribution in the Lords when he insisted that Catholic Emancipation struck at the very root of the constitution and was also contrary to the king's coronation oath wherein the monarch swore to uphold Protestantism. He would never consent to Emancipation 'So help me God'.<sup>250</sup> Henry Goulburn was of the opinion that the

objections Catholics had against the different interpretations of scripture could not be forgotten. Church infallibility in all matters of faith was also unacceptable to him.<sup>251</sup> Even a leading pro-Catholic George Canning, the foreign secretary, who made a strong speech in favour of Emancipation (on the grounds that the allegiance of Catholics was not divided) could indulge in remarks which must have been offensive to Catholic ears. He maintained that the priests in Ireland were regarded with a 'veneration bordering on idolatry'. Emancipation, however, 'would speedily wean them from their present political idolatry; and leave deserted the spurious shrines at which they bow down before their Doyles and their O'Connells'.<sup>252</sup> Dismissing the attitudes of members of parliament, O'Connell opined: 'It really is bigotry which stands between us and Emancipation . . .'.<sup>253</sup>

O'Connell privately recognised that the view of Lord Liverpool would be decisive.<sup>254</sup> And indeed the most comprehensive speech of the 1825 Emancipation debates was made by the prime minister against the Catholic claims. Unknown to the public his cabinet was in turmoil. Peel had already privately conveyed to him his intention to resign because he felt the pro-Catholics could not be stopped. Such had been the success of the Emancipation cause in the Commons that Liverpool felt that his own position was untenable. It was his intention to resign because the Lords could not stave off the wishes of the Commons indefinitely.<sup>255</sup> As he was thus prepared to resign for his anti-Catholic principles he made one of his strongest speeches which reinforced the majority against Emancipation in the Lords to forty-eight and rendered his resignation unnecessary. Liverpool in his speech made a thorough defence of the state's position frankly declaring that 'Catholics were not entitled to equal rights in a Protestant country'.



His reasoning was based on the old claim (which Doyle had done so much to destroy) of divided allegiance: ' . . . he could not admit that the Roman Catholic whose allegiance was divided between a spiritual and a temporal master, was entitled to the enjoyment of the same civil rights and privileges as the Protestant whose allegiance was undivided and who acknowledged but one ruler'. He expressed himself surprised at the 'extraordinary influence' still exercised by the pope of Rome, particularly in the strict right of nomination to bishoprics, reserved to the pope. Unlike Peel he did not object to the doctrine of transubstantiation but he did object to the temporal power of the priesthood and clerical power over all relations of private life, including confessions. He indicated that there would be 'insurmountable difficulties' in education if the relief bill was passed, especially over the use of the Bible, but otherwise these 'difficulties' were unspecified. Marriage law was another area where Catholic canon law was at variance with the law of the land. He saw danger in the use of the power of excommunication by political priests apparently oblivious to the fact that this was a faculty almost universally reserved to the bishop. Liverpool acknowledged that 'very objectionable measures' had been resorted to for keeping the peace in Ireland. For all that, religious dissension was not the cause of the trouble there. The Insurrection Act was not in force in sectarian Ulster but always in the religiously calm south. The prime minister's critical objection to Emancipation was that 'a Protestant succession was the foundation of our constitutional system. He would say, that if the measure should pass, the Protestant succession would not be worth a farthing'.<sup>256</sup>

Through his sustained defence of Irish Catholicism Doyle had greatly enhanced his reputation as one of the most important figures

in Irish public life. Carlow College was illuminated to welcome him on his return from England. In late July 1825 when he stayed in Waterford city en route to the coastal resort of Tramore, for health purposes, a bonfire was lit opposite the house in which he resided and a large crowd gathered to catch a glimpse of the bishop. A deputation of the most respectable inhabitants invited him to a public dinner which he declined.<sup>257</sup> The diocesan clergy of Kildare and Leighlin, at the conclusion of their annual religious exercises in Carlow College (presided over by the bishop), decided to mark their esteem for Dr Doyle by instituting a subscription of clergy and laity to purchase a suitably impressive residence for their bishop and his successors.<sup>258</sup>

O'Connell's reception on his return to Ireland was far less flattering. He was blamed for conceding too much to gain Emancipation. This turned out to be the most serious political rebuff O'Connell had ever encountered and his popularity sharply declined. But he defended himself with customary vigour. At a public meeting in St Audeon's Church, Dublin, on 9 July he stated that he saw there had been a prospect of achieving Emancipation, which, under other circumstances, and if acting only on his own judgement, he would have 'shuddered with horror' before accepting. But he had not rested on his own authority: 'I was in communication with two prelates who are the ornaments of Ireland - Dr Doyle and Dr Murray. Can I offer a better plea when I say that I did nothing, said nothing, that had not their entire concurrence and sanction'.<sup>259</sup> O'Connell now announced that he would no longer support the freehold wing; that this policy had been a mistake but his change of mind was at best half-hearted. He spent the summer and autumn preventing public meetings from condemning the 'wings' because by implication they censured him. In his 9 July speech O'Connell further

suggested that the bishops had been taken by 'surprise' by the artifices of designing persons.<sup>260</sup> This accusation could more truthfully be made of O'Connell himself than it could of the bishops. Doyle was rankled by O'Connell's speech. O'Connell had tried to spread, if not to pass, the public odium attached to the 'wings' to the bishops. Doyle would be duped by no man. He was not prepared to have his subtle and carefully conceived position swept away by one remark of O'Connell's. His response in the form of a thorough refutation of O'Connell's allegation came in a long public letter from Rev William Kinsella of Carlow College, undoubtedly acting on behalf of the bishop.<sup>261</sup> Kinsella asserted that if O'Connell thought he had Doyle's approval to sanction the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders and state payment of the Catholic clergy then he was greatly mistaken. Kinsella pointed out that Doyle left Carlow on 7 March for England unaware that it was intended to add 'wings' to the Catholic relief bill. Drs Doyle and Murray arrived in London on 13 March and before that date they had no communication whatsoever with O'Connell. However on 7 March 1825 O'Connell had addressed a letter to the Catholic Association in which he had mentioned 'both the obnoxious measures in terms of approbation'. Consequently O'Connell could not say that his approval of the 'wings' was a result of his discussion with Dr Doyle. Furthermore O'Connell's examination before the committees of parliament in which he had approved the 'wings' had concluded before the arrival of the bishops in London. Kinsella also noted that in J.K.L.'s Letters on the state of Ireland the author had 'expressly condemned the measures in question'. This alone should have reminded O'Connell that his approval of the 'wings' could not have been based on Dr Doyle's opinions.

The Rev Kinsella stated Doyle's position with regard to a legal provision for the clergy. The bishop had perceived that if he had 'entered into unqualified protest against it' he would have been credited with bringing about the failure of the general measure. Doyle had therefore given his reluctant acquiescence to the measure provided it did not interfere with the rights of the church or Irish liberties. Having given this reluctant acquiescence Dr Doyle was anxious that the provision for a Catholic clergy should not be a regium donum or made to depend on an annual vote of parliament but that it should be a permanent legally established provision. This was the manner in which it was introduced which thus allowed the bishops and clergy full time to consider the details of the arrangement with the government. The Catholic laity should not worry about a state provision for the clergy. The bishops would be well able to deal with the government and would not 'barter the rights and liberties of their religion for the Mammon of iniquity'. On the second security - disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders - Doyle had extricated himself from giving an opinion which would if delivered have been hostile to O'Connell's position.<sup>262</sup>

O'Connell replied robustly to Kinsella's 'strange' and 'most unnecessary public assault'. He regretted that he should have been 'humiliated' in print as 'the assertor of falsehood and proved historically and chronologically to be a liar'. He had been branded a liar 'amidst honied accents of undeserved praise'. He attempted to wriggle free of this self-pronounced charge. Clearly dissembling he denied the accuracy of the newspaper reports of the meeting at St Audeon's Church. On the state provision for the clergy O'Connell repeated that in everything he did he acted with the sanction of the

prelates. On the freehold wing he claimed that he had not associated any bishop with his support for or acquiescence in that wing (nonetheless he added gratuitously that he certainly differed from Dr Doyle on the forty shilling freehold system in Ireland).<sup>263</sup>

If O'Connell's reply was far from wholly satisfactory it did at least exonerate Bishop Doyle from the disfranchisement controversy. No purpose, only disunity, was served by unnecessarily prolonging the correspondence and so Kinsella concluded it. He replied that, although he had consulted four different newspaper accounts of the St Audeon's meeting, O'Connell had shown that the whole mistake arose from the inaccuracy of the reporters: 'I feel sorry I am only doing bare justice, by declaring, that his explanation is perfectly satisfactory'.<sup>264</sup> But it was in fact far from being so. Bishop Doyle had been O'Connell's most useful episcopal supporter but trust once broken could not be easily restored. Damage had been caused to an important relationship and from 1825 onwards Doyle privately regarded O'Connell with a certain suspicion while generally continuing to back him publicly (at least until their later public controversy).

Throughout the latter half of 1825 O'Connell's enemies within the now defunct Catholic Association - Lawless, O'Gorman, his brother-in-law William Finn and lesser minions - attempted at every opportunity to have him censured for agreeing to the 'wings'. In England William Cobbett accused O'Connell in his Political Register of bartering the 'wings' for a patent of precedence at the bar if Emancipation passed.<sup>265</sup> From America Bishop John England wrote to O'Connell attacking the disfranchisement of the freeholders.<sup>266</sup> O'Connell's ability to pack meetings with his supporters and his 'ruthless attacks on less able opponents ensured his survival during those crucial months'.<sup>267</sup> A

Carlow Catholic meeting on 28 November at which the priests William Kinsella, Edward Nolan and James Maher were prominent, passed strong resolutions condemning the 'wings'.<sup>268</sup> When Doyle in early December 1825 contributed a five pounds subscription to the New Catholic Association O'Connell entered into a more than usually fulsome, even for him, tribute to Doyle's capacity and 'celestial intellect'.<sup>269</sup> Was this perhaps the honied accent of undeserved praise in a knowing jibe at Doyle's haughty self-confidence in his own ability? This attempt to placate Doyle was apparently treated as so much hot air by the bishop. Matters were due to come to a head at the provincial meeting of Leinster Catholics, which unfortunately from O'Connell's point of view, was scheduled for Carlow College on 15 December. O'Connell knew that trouble lay ahead. He informed his wife: 'there is a violent party raised against me . . . The object probably is to drive me off the stage of Catholic politics'.<sup>270</sup> His own conduct had only compounded the situation. In one of his public letters to the Catholics of Louth in November he stretched logic to breaking point when he claimed that the 'Disfranchisement Bill, as it has been called, was, in truth, an Enfranchisement Bill to a very great and comprehensive extent. What class did it exclude? dependent and fictitious votes. What class did it let in? independent and real freeholders'.<sup>271</sup> In another letter to the Louth Catholics actually published on 15 December O'Connell asserted that the ecclesiastical 'wing' had received the reluctant assent of Drs Curtis, Murray, Kelly, Magauran and Doyle. The wing was free from any taint of vetoism. It would improve the temporal position of the clergy and he would be glad to see it carried into effect.<sup>272</sup>

The 'wings' were condemned at a preliminary meeting in Carlow College on 14 December to agree resolutions for the provincial meeting

of the following day. O'Connell was not present nor was he at a dinner that night for participants hosted by Dr Andrew Fitzgerald, President of Carlow College, where Doyle made a 'powerful speech'. Here Doyle stated that as long as dissension and disunity pervaded the Catholic body the clergy would remain silent as best befitted their religious character. But in a thinly-veiled public attack on O'Connell he continued: 'It was not by seeking the advancement of any man, or any opinion that they must expect the assistance of their body (the clergy); when they should be guided by the common council and not by an individual whim then would the Catholic clergy come to their aid and support'. He would not swerve from his opinions on the franchise; he would not accept a 'paltry bribe' from the crown. The Catholic Church would be defiled by such a compromise as the crown was opposed to its security. 'Unless the church be made totally and securely independent we shall never listen to any other terms.'<sup>273</sup>

When O'Connell arrived in Carlow College on 15 December he managed to have the resolutions determined upon the previous day reopened for discussion before they were put to the general meeting. At this second preliminary meeting O'Connell again apparently attempted to place the onus for his acceptance of the 'wings' on the bishops.<sup>274</sup> When Doyle who was in the college learned of O'Connell's position (from a priest who left the meeting to inform him of what was going on) he forthwith interrupted the meeting to defend his position. Doyle pointed out that an 'awful responsibility' was placed upon the bishops when it became clear that their opposition to a state provision for the clergy would most likely sink the Emancipation bill. Moreover the Catholic deputation in London and the Association in Ireland were 'silent' on the 'wings'. If the bishops rejected them all the consequences of defeat

would rest on their heads. As Doyle put it: 'We saw that a pit was dug for us, and our duty was to seek how to get beyond it, without falling into it'. The regium donum was the intended form of the state provision. Doyle announced this to his colleagues once he learned of it and resolved if this plan was implemented 'to denounce it to the country and seek amongst the Irish people at home some support in resisting it'. But before resorting to this course of action and with all its consequences for the Emancipation bill Doyle attempted to see what could be done to alter the bill. He maintained that it was due to the efforts of the bishops 'alone' that the basis of the measure was changed (that is, a provision in law rather than on the basis of a royal bounty or annual vote). Furthermore the bishops had also gained time - a whole year - so the clergy and laity had ample time to formulate the workings of the provision. What Doyle's view was, he had declared to his brethren in London and Dublin: that if the prelates accepted that 'the ministers of Christ were to be paid by the ministers of state for dispensing the mysteries of God' he would resign - 'for if my hand were to be stained with government money, it should never grasp a crozier'. But to be free thereafter of the accusation of bad faith in agreeing to a principle but refusing to implement the arrangement Doyle had handed in his counter proposal (through A. R. Blake to Lord Francis Leveson Gower) which was his own vindication. Consequently Doyle could say that he had agreed to the principle of the provision but he had submitted to government the only plan upon which the principle could be carried into effect without his resignation.<sup>275</sup>

After Doyle addressed the meeting O'Connell withdrew 'almost entirely' his opposition to the resolutions. But once Doyle left the meeting O'Connell renewed his opposition and managed to keep the



committee engaged until at two o'clock they were obliged to proceed to the general meeting in the college chapel without a single resolution determined. There, according to a contemporary witness and critic of O'Connell, Philip Barron, proprietor of the Waterford Chronicle, different parts of the chapel were 'regularly packed' by O'Connell's supporters who were 'disciplined to approve or disapprove according to the signal from any one of the "managers"'.<sup>276</sup> Thus O'Connell succeeded in avoiding a condemnation of the 'wings' which would have been a condemnation of himself. The Dublin newspapers were accused of giving very incomplete accounts of Doyle's intervention at the provincial meeting, suggesting that O'Connell had also succeeded in muzzling the press. O'Connell informed his wife who anxiously awaited news of his 'trial' at Carlow that he had been 'triumphant': he had beaten his critics 'out of the field'. The whole business had gone off so well that 'I never in my life was so delighted with any meeting'.<sup>277</sup>

But on 18 December O'Connell wrote to Professor Donovan of Maynooth, complaining that Doyle's 'mind is full of something towards me that indeed I do not understand' and requesting Donovan confidentially to discover what it was so that he could avoid giving similar offence in future.

The attack of Mr Kinsella; the omitting [recte: attempting] to anticipate the provincial meeting at Carlow; the speech at the College Dinner; the interference the next day under the supposition that I had accused the prelates of inconsistency; the total absence of an error in fact on that subject, even after I had explained; the personal salute which I was obliged literally to extort from him - all these circumstances convince me that I have said or done something to make Dr Doyle displeased with me.<sup>278</sup>

This was disingenuousness taken to a high degree. It is impossible to credit that O'Connell did not understand the cause of Doyle's anger. The fundamental problem was that in early March 1825 O'Connell had

accepted the 'wings' without consulting the bishops who had been unwillingly obliged to accept them or jeopardise Emancipation which then seemed a real probability. O'Connell had been out-manoeuvred by Plunket and the whigs and had made a strategical error for which Doyle was not prepared to accept blame. Intellectually as opposed to politically O'Connell had no difficulty with the concept of the 'wings' but it was not so with Bishop Doyle who held that both measures would constitute an impairment of Irish civil and religious liberties.<sup>279</sup>

In autumn 1825 the parliamentary friends of the Catholics suggested the expedient of an Irish episcopal declaration denying the main charges imputed against Catholicism in the Emancipation debate in parliament and at the popular level. A short declaration containing a seriatim refutation of anti-Catholic calumnies resulted. It would appear that Dr Doyle played an active role in drawing up this declaration and given that he was also writing the national hierarchical pastorals at this time it seems likely that its wording was in large measure his. Archbishop Murray was also involved as a conduit for the opinions of his episcopal brethren. The Anglican minister and Edinburgh Review contributor the Rev Sydney Smith, who conceived the original idea, stressed to Doyle that 'you must all sign, or it will do no good'.<sup>280</sup> But in truth the contribution of the collective episcopal bench was negligible. Although they were consulted the great majority of them played no significant role in national affairs, preferring to concentrate on their own dioceses. For instance, Bishop Waldron of Killala confessed that he was 'quite incompetent' to comment on the declaration.<sup>281</sup> A newcomer to the purple, Bishop Logan of Meath, felt it would be 'presumptuous' of him to offer an opinion on the wording of the declaration.<sup>282</sup> Both offered the same non-committal opinion that

'it cannot injure our cause'.<sup>283</sup> Bishop Tuohy of Limerick naively believed that the declaration would somehow impede the attacks of the Bible societies.<sup>284</sup> Both he and Bishop Plunkett of Elphin realised the importance of countering the 'divided allegiance' canard.<sup>285</sup> Bishop Coppinger of Cloyne was enthusiastic that the declaration would render 'essential service'.<sup>286</sup> A lone dissenting episcopal voice was articulated by the nationalistically-minded though somewhat prickly Patrick Kelly of Waterford who not unreasonably wondered what advantage would accrue from the declaration. He professed that he was 'inclined to think [that] nothing short of certain good ought to make us swallow the mortification of sending forth these humiliating declarations, that have been so often emitted before'.<sup>287</sup> The leading English Catholic, Charles Butler, was also unconvinced. Catholic oaths and conduct were already before the public: 'we cannot go beyond them'.<sup>288</sup> Archbishop Curtis found the fourteen articles of the declaration 'sound and orthodox enough' but worried about their exactness.<sup>289</sup> There was considerable anxiety to make the wording attack-proof and not to leave any window of opportunity for an anti-Catholic onslaught. Sydney Smith looked for the omission of anything that might be construed as an aggressive presentation of the Catholic claims.<sup>290</sup> The declaration, signed by the entire Irish hierarchy on 25 January 1826, aimed to present a simple and correct view of tenets of Catholic belief and aspects of practice most often misunderstood or misrepresented.<sup>291</sup>

The declaration stated: (1) Catholicism did not interfere with and was not inimical to any regular form of constituted governmental authority whether monarchical or republican. (2) Catholics of 'mature years' were permitted to read approved translations of the Bible with explanatory notes. The clergy of the Catholic Church were bound to a

daily recital of the canonical office which contained in the course of a year almost the entire Bible. Clergy were also required to expatiate on the gospel on Sundays and holidays. (3) Catholics believed in miracles but belief in modern miracles was not a term of Catholic communion though they were many so conclusively demonstrated that they could not easily be rejected. (4) Catholics revered the Blessed Virgin and the saints and invoked their intercession but they worshipped God alone. (5) Catholics respected images without holding that they were endowed with any 'intrinsic efficacy'. If 'divine virtue' was ascribed to the images themselves rather than what they were representative of then the bishops were obliged to censure the error. (6) The Catholic Church received and respected all the Ten Commandments in their entirety as found in Exodus and Deuteronomy. 'The discordance between Catholics and Protestants on this subject arises from the different manner in which these divine precepts have been arranged.' (7) Catholics believed that in order to attain salvation it was necessary to belong to the 'true Church' and that heresy or wilful opposition to revealed truth made one ineligible for salvation. Catholics, however, were not obliged to believe that all those not of the 'true Church' were 'wilfully and obstinately attached to error'. (8) Catholics believed in transubstantiation and could not conceive how anyone who admitted the divinity of the Son of God could accuse them of idolatry. (9) Neither pope nor priest could forgive sin without sincere penance on the part of the penitent for having offended God with a resolution to avoid similar offence in future and to atone for past transgressions. Anyone receiving absolution without meeting these conditions only incurred further guilt. (10) No power on earth could loose Catholic priests from their duty of maintaining the secrecy of the confessional (the

obligation would be redundant without the secrecy). (11) Catholics did not believe that it was lawful to murder heretics or that no faith should be kept with heretics. Furthermore they declared that no unjust act could be done for the good of the church or in obedience to a church authority. The bishops stated 'that it is not an article of faith, neither are they thereby required to believe, that the pope is infallible'. Nor were they bound to obey any immoral order emanating from the pope. (12) Catholics swore a (lengthy) declaration of true allegiance to their monarch and denied the temporal or civil power of the pope to interfere in affairs of state. On the basis of this oath they could not conceive on what grounds they could be justly charged with bearing a divided allegiance. (13) Catholics would not in any way at any time interfere with the land settlement of Ireland. (14) Catholic bishops were at all times ready to give authentic information on the beliefs and practices of their church to the authorities.<sup>292</sup>

As Bishop Doyle had privately acknowledged the fairness of Lord Liverpool's questioning of him before the parliamentary committee of the House of Lords, the hostility of the prime minister to Catholic Emancipation presented Doyle with an intellectual challenge, which was how to persuade Liverpool to adopt a more favourable approach to the Catholics. Thus Bishop Doyle's lengthy Essay on the Catholic Claims was addressed to Lord Liverpool because he was most formidable as well as the most important opponent of Catholic Emancipation. Doyle noted that Liverpool had remained in office with very different colleagues over many years and that he had 'manifested something like a spirit of hostility to our religion'<sup>293</sup> when at the Colonial Office and that he supported biblicals who promoted discord in Ireland. Notwithstanding this Doyle felt that some Catholic had to take up the task of refuting

the arguments against Catholicism which had been urged with some plausibility by opponents. These arguments partook more now than formerly of a theological character. This duty, Doyle stated, devolved on 'him, who not without great pain to himself, has been more frequently mentioned or alluded to in the late parliamentary proceedings than any of his . . . colleagues'.<sup>294</sup>

The Essay on the Catholic Claims was in substance the Declaration writ large. It was a solid and scholarly historical and theological refutation of the several influential calumnies imputed to Catholics. All the familiar themes were once again examined and the Catholic position asserted. The outstanding feature of the work was its concentration on the 'divided allegiance' theme.<sup>295</sup> This received extended treatment. Doyle traced the origins of the papal temporal power from the decline of the Roman empire through Charlemagne and its progress in the conflict between Gregory VII and Henry IV to its decline in the imbroglio between Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair of France which led to the bull Unam Sanctam. Doyle held that 'no Bull of any Pope can decide our judgement, if it not be received and assented to by the pastor of the Church; an assent which this bull Unam Sanctam never received'.<sup>296</sup> It is clear that Dr Doyle favoured conciliar authority over papal authority as the ultimate arbiter of church doctrine though he acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the pope. He maintained that the doctrine of the papal power to interfere with the temporal claims of kings was not held at any time by the Catholic Church. It was not found in the gospel and it was never an article of faith.<sup>297</sup>

Doyle was dismissive of Archbishop Magee's knowledge of Catholic doctrine.<sup>298</sup> Magee had claimed that the fourth Lateran Council in 1215 had given Catholics the power of exterminating heretics and asserted the

power of absolving subjects of their allegiance. Doyle pointed out that whatever decrees the fourth Lateran Council had made against the Albigensian heresy were long since irrelevant. Moreover he doubted their validity: 'I would be inclined to infer that, at least, such portions of the Council as related to temporal matters were not regularly enacted, and probably at no time had the force of law'.<sup>299</sup> Doyle rejected the argument that contracts entered into by Catholics with heretics could be broken even though confirmed by an oath. The classic case pointed to by Protestant theologians was the Council of Constance which had declared that there had been no violation of faith by Emperor Sigismund when he granted safe passage to the Council to John Hus.<sup>300</sup>

Terms such as heretic, schismatic, idolater, which were frequently traded between the churches, were 'insulting designations'.<sup>301</sup> It was in the nature of all churches to claim that 'exclusive salvation' was to be found only within its own beliefs. But to show Catholic liberalism Doyle quoted from his own pastoral letter to the Ribbonmen of the deanery of Kilcock in November 1822 wherein he stated: 'It is not everyone who differs from you in religion who should be branded with the odious name of heretic. Errors in religion do not constitute heresy but a wilful and obstinate adherence to them'.<sup>302</sup>

It was argued that the 'invading spirit of the Church of Rome' intended to subvert the Church Establishment. The speeches and pamphlets of Catholics on what they considered the immoderate wealth of the Establishment gave grounds for this contention. Doyle acknowledged that his own opinions and writings had been seen as the outstanding proof of this charge against the Catholics.<sup>303</sup> But he contended that he was not the less opposed to the temporal aggrandisement of his own

church than 'what I deem the overgrown wealth of the Establishment'.<sup>304</sup> Doyle foresaw the seeds of future destruction in the aggrandisement of his own church.<sup>305</sup> He argued that a state provision for the Catholic clergy as recently contemplated would be 'most unwise'.<sup>306</sup> On the then current system of collecting Catholic dues Doyle advised:

I abhor a sort of tax indefinite in its amount levied off the most indigent of society, and in a manner, if not purely arbitrary, yet uncertain and unsettled. I would wish, for the honour of the priesthood and the country - for the sake of liberty, of the law, and above all, of the poor - that even what is now actually received by the Catholic Clergy was legally regulated, so as that each pastor would still be supported by his own flock, whilst their mutual connection would remain unbroken and unimpaired.<sup>307</sup>

Doyle hoped that a legal provision for the clergy would not be mixed up with Emancipation or made possible through a regium donum or treasury fund.<sup>308</sup> He again maintained that a concordat with Rome would be in the best interests of the government and the Irish Church, fixing the rights of all indefinitely. He held that such a concordat could be easily obtained; that it would ensure the security of the state by restricting the rights of Rome in Ireland and that it would secure the 'lasting independence' of the Irish Catholic Church.<sup>309</sup> An unintentionally revealing remark indicated the Irish Church's desire not to be caught in a bind between London and Rome.

It has been conjectured . . . that the Catholic prelates sometimes played off the pope against the Government and at times the Government against the pope. This has never been the case; but these prelates have indeed been often oppressed by the government; and sometimes, if not aggrieved, at least but little attended to by the pope. 310

In the Essay on the Catholic Claims Doyle once again stated his belief that if the government failed to relieve the Catholics then the alternative was rebellion:

. . . retaining indefinitely a whole nation in a state of discontent and misery; holding Ireland as a garrison, peopled with enemies; always standing as it were upon the surface of a mine in which the combustible matter is daily accumulating, and which every moment is liable to explode. 311



Other aspects of this work examined the concept of equivocation and mental reservation, confession, absolution and the secrecy of the confessional.<sup>312</sup> There was a polemical dimension to this work where Doyle refuted not alone the arguments of Archbishop Magee on the fourth Lateran Council but Bishop Blomfield of Chester on the Catholic doctrine of oaths and the Lord Chancellor Eldon on the meaning and Protestant nature of the oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy and Abjuration.<sup>313</sup> The book ended in this controversial strain where Doyle assessed the usages and discipline of the Church of England and stated that contemporary England resembled the country in the time of the Venerable Bede: 'Insula, aliquid non semper scire gestiens, et nil certi unquam inveniens: an island always anxiously seeking something new, never finding anything certain'.<sup>314</sup>

Doyle's publisher, Richard Coyne, remarked that Archbishop Murray was well pleased with the Essay on the Catholic Claims but he speculated that it would not escape the censure of those 'having neither title nor character nor belonging to any school whatsoever'. Coyne announced publication of the work on 16 February 1826 and immediately reported to Doyle that it was 'doing right well' and that he had not the least doubt that it would be out of print in three months.<sup>315</sup> It was an accurate prediction for in May Coyne announced the publication of a second edition.<sup>316</sup> F. W. Conway suggested, with what degree of accuracy is unknown, that the Essay on the Catholic Claims was being read with interest in government circles in England.<sup>317</sup> Indeed Sir Henry Parnell advised Doyle that the book would produce the 'most beneficial results' by influencing the general Catholic question.<sup>318</sup> In the House of Lords on 9 March 1826 the earl of Darnley praised the Essay and suggested to the prime minister, who was still insisting on doubts over the

allegiance of Catholics, that he should promptly read the work which had been addressed to him.<sup>319</sup> The English Vicar Apostolic, Dr Baines, informed Doyle that he was delighted with the Essay 'the most admirable of all your works'. He opined that 'the effect of such works may not be instantaneous, but it must be great and increasing'.<sup>320</sup>

The year 1826 was almost inevitably something of an anti-climax after the excitement of Catholic politics and the parliamentary debate of the previous year. There was no point in introducing a new motion for relief soon after the 1825 defeat and the members of the old illegal Catholic Association struggled to find new legal ways of keeping up the momentum for concession in the New Catholic Association. The 1826 general election led to pro-Catholic successes in Ireland with the value of the forty-shilling freeholders becoming increasingly self-evident. They played a sterling role in several constituencies, most spectacularly in County Waterford.<sup>321</sup> Doyle had not foreseen the strength of the forty-shilling freeholders being realised in his generation. He believed that circumstances had warranted their involvement but privately he felt that their use had been premature: 'I wish heartily that it had been their good fortune to have been gradually trained to the contest, so as to be enabled by a demonstration of their intelligence and strength to effect what could only be gained through desperate exertion and actual combat'. But the exertions of the forty-shilling freeholders had proved, Doyle reflected optimistically, that 'in times of difficulty and trial our people may be counted on as possessing more energies, more patriotism, more moral and political virtue than almost any other people however circumstanced in any country in Europe'.<sup>322</sup> In England during the 1826 general election the anti-Catholic card was well played resulting in a stronger anti-Emancipation

lobby in the House of Commons. Doyle, for his own account, was determined to maintain Catholic pressure in any way he could. In summer 1826 he wrote to his brother:

Whether we succeed or fail I hope we will have done our duty to God and our Country, certain it is that we have awakened a spirit which it will be difficult to allay nor shall we relax now that we have advanced so far let the issue be what it may. 323

In July 1826 Bishop Doyle subscribed £5 to the New Catholic Association which had determined to help any forty-shilling freeholders who were evicted because of their votes in the general election.<sup>324</sup> In September Doyle was a signatory with eleven parish priests and two curates of a requisition for a Catholic meeting in the Queen's County.<sup>325</sup> In autumn and winter 1826 a series of Catholic meetings were held throughout the parishes of the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin under the chairmanship of their respective priests to respond to a Doyle pastoral on education. These meetings also discussed the education census which the New Catholic Association sought from every parish and also examined the question of proselytism and the progress of the Catholic claims. Catholics throughout the diocese did not fail to acknowledge the commitment of their bishop to their affairs. In Killeigh parish in King's County the meeting expressed its gratitude to Dr Doyle for the 'many signal benefits he has conferred upon the diocese and the country'.<sup>326</sup> The Bagenalstown parish meeting praised Doyle's publications which had 'stripped our adversaries of every pretext for our degradation'.<sup>327</sup> The Naas meeting praised his 'unwearied assiduity'.<sup>328</sup> Doyle himself spoke powerfully from the platform of the Carlow Catholic meeting on 5 October 1826 and made a very strong attack on English rule in Ireland.<sup>329</sup>

In January 1827 O'Connell requested Doyle's support for the New Catholic rent in his diocese.<sup>330</sup> Doyle pointed out that the Catholic rent was collected in Carlow town and that he had been among the subscribers so that as far as example and approval were concerned he had played his part. He was confident that the clergy throughout the diocese would approve of its collection but they would not themselves, for a variety of reasons, become collectors. This reluctance arose firstly because there was an apprehension that they would appear to be prominent in public affairs; secondly they simply did not have time being understaffed as they were; thirdly they were constantly under the necessity of collecting from an impoverished flock for the building and improvement of chapels and schoolhouses: for the support of the sick and indigent and 'occasionally, relief for the crowds of poor people, who, without exaggeration, are dying in great numbers, of a slow but progressive famine'. There was thus no unwillingness on the part of the bishop and his clergy to support the New Catholic rent but other duties clearly had a prior claim on them.<sup>331</sup>

Later in 1827 Dr Doyle again subscribed £5 to the New Catholic Association. He had been in arrears, he allowed, but this was 'owing to the pressure of the times, the late appalling distress having exhausted all our resources'. For this reason and because of the 'interminable' collections for chapels, schools and charitable institutions, the Catholic rent was not generally proceeded with in the Carlow area. Yet Doyle was confident that despite the numerous burdens of rent, tithes, taxes and church rates on the 'industrious class' they would 'cheerfully contribute' when applied to as in the past.<sup>332</sup> Doyle approved of the use made of the Catholic rent for the relief of persecuted forty-shilling freeholders and those in dispute with the New Reformation

but he privately regretted that the funds of the Association did not enable it to extend its sphere of activities in the 'present national struggle' to supply more of the general wants of the poor.<sup>333</sup> In 1827 the Catholic rent declined to its lowest level since its inception in 1824.<sup>334</sup>

The year 1827 began however with O'Connell determined to heighten the agitation in Ireland. He introduced the subject of the repeal of the union and independence for the first time at a special fourteen-day meeting of the Catholic Association in January.<sup>335</sup> On the same occasion an inflammatory speech of Sheil's attacking the memory of the recently deceased duke of York, occupied the attention of the law officers of the crown for several months before a mooted prosecution was finally dropped.<sup>336</sup> On 2 March 1827 W. C. Plunket introduced a loyal petition of the Irish Catholic bishops in favour of Emancipation in the House of Commons. Plunket maintained that if the laws in Ireland were obeyed it was mainly owing to the efforts of the great body of the Catholic clergy.<sup>337</sup> However the discussion of the petition largely centred on certain hostile remarks of Bishop Doyle's on the Protestant Church in Ireland made by him in the course of an angry public response to the proselytising claims of Ireland's leading evangelical nobleman, Lord Farnham. In this letter in February 1827 Doyle had contended that the Church Establishment must fall sooner or later and he compared the worship of the Established Church with that of the Juggernaut to which human victims were sacrificed.<sup>338</sup> Inevitably these remarks brought severe criticism of Doyle from such as H. Maxwell (a member of the Farnham family) and the vigorously anti-Catholic George Dawson.<sup>339</sup> Plunket was not of a mind to defend Doyle whom he condemned 'altogether' though he could not ignore the provocation Doyle had received.<sup>340</sup>

The parliamentary context was thus rather inauspicious when Sir Francis Burdett introduced his motion for the relief of Catholics in the House of Commons on 5 March 1827. Doyle's letter to Lord Farnham provided the main ammunition for the anti-Catholics and forced the pro-Catholics on the defensive. Several speakers - Hart-Davis, the Master of the Rolls - attacked Doyle.<sup>341</sup> This time Plunket while condemning Doyle's sentiments, entered into an apologia justifying his letter to Farnham.<sup>342</sup> The home secretary found Doyle's letter inconsistent with the loyal declaration of the episcopal petition. Peel also complained of Archbishop Curtis 'whispering his dissent' and called on him to speak 'plainly and simply'.<sup>343</sup> Arguably this was something Curtis was incapable of doing. Apart from attacks on the political influence of the priests in the general election in Ireland in 1826 and the need for (unspecified) securities, no new intellectual ground was broken in the March 1827 debates. However the Catholic question was defeated in the House of Commons for the first time since 1819. The anti-Catholics who had come in, in the 'no-popery' election ensured a slim four-vote majority against the Catholic claims.<sup>344</sup> Doyle wrote O'Connell urging him not to lose faith in the cause.<sup>345</sup> There was some reason for hope. The defeat in the Commons may have had more to do with jockeying for power than with the Catholic question per se. For on 17 February 1827 the most redoubtable opponent of Emancipation, the prime minister, had suffered a stroke, and was to all intents and purposes, politically dead, although it did not become publicly clear that he could not carry on until late March.<sup>346</sup> In the second week of April King George IV invited the foreign secretary, the slippery and clever pro-Catholic George Canning to form a government. Half the old cabinet went out, opposed as they were to Canning's attitude on the Catholic question,

suspicious of his foreign policy and not least disliking the man himself. A whig adhesion to Canning secured a government: a pro-Catholic cabinet replaced an anti-Catholic one. The whigs were in office for the first time in twenty years. Nonetheless the issue of Emancipation remained in Canning's government, as it had done in Liverpool's long administration, an 'open question'. Canning was adroit. The leader of a faction rather than a party he had played an ambivalent part in the past. Only he could manage the disparate elements forming his government but his health was extremely poor. Canning was expected to deliver reform in Ireland almost immediately. In Ireland hopes of concession were raised to their usual over-optimistic level. To O'Connell and the Catholics in general, Canning and his government were a blessing compared with Liverpool, Peel, Wellington, Eldon, Goulburn, etc., all of whom were out. The new administration pleaded that it needed time to make changes and O'Connell determined that his agitation should be completely toned down to demonstrate Ireland's faith in Canning's government. O'Connell went so far as to promise to postpone the Emancipation struggle in return for a liberal administration in Dublin Castle. Thus O'Connell on behalf of the Irish Catholics gave his general approval of the new pro-Catholic government.<sup>347</sup> The price expected for Irish quietude was prompt attention to Ireland. Throughout May 1827 in his letters to the Knight of Kerry O'Connell expressed growing disquiet that immediate reform was not forthcoming and that the 'Irish nation' was 'kept in the miserable state of hope deferred'.<sup>348</sup>

By early June 1827 Bishop Doyle was reproaching O'Connell for entering into a rapprochement with the government which was not yielding legislative reform for Ireland. Dr Doyle was particularly incensed by

two bills before parliament whose object, according to him, was the aggrandisement of the Church Establishment in Ireland. He called on O'Connell, now that the Catholic Association was silent, to 'save us from being swallowed alive by a cormorant church'. But Doyle's suspicion of the new government was of a more fundamental nature than mere annoyance with aspects of its parliamentary legislation. As he commented perspicaciously to O'Connell:

It has from the beginning of the present changes been doubtful to me whether it were not better for the Irish Catholics to see Canning and the Grenvilles forced to join the Whigs in opposition rather than to see the Whigs playing second fiddle to Canning and both truckling to the Court and the Bishops.

For his part Doyle did not see 'one symptom of amendment in any department' where Ireland was concerned. Liberal ministry or no, the Irish people continued to starve in their thousands: 'are we to bear our sufferings untold, and not only to stay the indignation of our own people, to weaken the sympathy of foreign nations, but even make the Minister think that what some people call hope renders us insensible to neglect, injury and even insult'. Doyle wanted strong representations made to the government through those members of parliament who had been so anxious to secure the cessation of Irish agitation to give the new government a favourable atmosphere in which to begin implementing its Irish policy.<sup>349</sup> O'Connell forwarded Doyle's letter to the Knight of Kerry and instructed him to make known its substance to his friends in cabinet 'as evidence of the state of the Catholic mind in Ireland'. O'Connell pointed out to the Knight of Kerry that he could readily perceive from the bishop's letter the 'very unpleasant state' in which he had placed himself by suspending the Catholic claims during that session of parliament.<sup>350</sup> Parliament was prorogued in late 1827 until January 1828.



The death of George Canning on 8 August 1827 had a depressing effect on Irish expectations of impending reform. Canning was succeeded by the former Chancellor of the Exchequer under Liverpool, Frederick Robinson, who had been elevated to the House of Lords as Viscount Goderich. Emancipation remained an 'open question' in his administration. Doyle seems to have been disposed to look on Goderich much less suspiciously than Canning. In a public letter to the Catholic Association in November Doyle acknowledged that he had imposed silence on himself until the policy of the administration was developed at the opening of parliament. He did not doubt that the government would 'do every thing that is possible towards the adjustment of our great question'. Indeed he awaited the development of government policy with 'great confidence'. Doyle's reasoning was grounded on the assumption that the friends of Ireland, as he styled the whigs, now more firmly entrenched in the government, were on the brink of introducing legislative reform which had been promised for so long: 'we cannot forget that the Administration is composed of men who thought and acted most justly and most zealously whilst out of power, in every thing, which appertained to this distracted country'.<sup>351</sup> But this was to overestimate Goderich who was far less politically able than Canning and whose administration was already showing signs of terminal decay.

In late December O'Connell wrote to Doyle seeking his approval for simultaneous parochial meetings in the Catholic chapels in his diocese (and throughout the country) which were planned for early January 1828.<sup>352</sup> Archbishop Murray who received a similar request from O'Connell queried Doyle: 'Should it be answered? and if so, how?'.<sup>353</sup> These meetings took place on 13 January 1828 all over Ireland and the significance of this new manifestation of Catholic cohesive action and

strength was not lost on informed observers. It was yet another display of how the Catholic Association had discovered a means of marshalling the Catholic people of Ireland in one vast, bold, disciplined sway. The simultaneous meetings called for Catholic Emancipation and the repeal of the vestry and sub-letting acts. Doyle hoped for substantial relief from the vestry laws under the Goderich administration.<sup>354</sup> O'Connell was quite active in denouncing the 1826 sub-letting act which subjected tenants to harsh legal penalties if they sub-let without their landlord's permission.<sup>355</sup> Doyle, contrary-wise, had always supported the sub-letting act. He saw the sub-division of small holdings which had been taking place at an exponential rate as achieving no more than the pauperisation of the Irish peasantry on miniscule patches of land.<sup>356</sup> O'Connell attacked the act for preventing peasants from becoming farmers but Doyle welcomed it for cutting out middlemen and forcing tenants to make a realistic assessment of the potential of their small-holdings for the provision of their offspring. Doyle's attitude showed by far the greater prescience.

The fall of Goderich's government on 8 January 1828 and the accession of an anti-Catholic ministry under the hero of Waterloo, the duke of Wellington, as prime minister (on 22 January) with Robert Peel at the home office in place of Lord Lansdowne, gave the Catholic Association renewed cause to pursue its agitation with vigour. The effect was immediate. On 24 January the Catholic Association declared its opposition to the return of any M.P. in the next parliament whether or not he was favourable to Emancipation if he supported Wellington's government. In March the Marquis of Anglesey finally replaced the Marquis of Wellesley as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Anglesey was expected to be anti-Catholic but to Catholic delight he did not live up

to Orange expectations. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts affecting dissenters in April was an important constitutional breakthrough on the road to Emancipation. Sir Henry Parnell saw it as strong proof of the progress of public opinion in favour of liberal principles and he held that Emancipation would soon be carried.<sup>357</sup>

On 8 May Sir Francis Burdett, once again, brought forward a motion for a committee of the whole house to consider Catholic relief. In a letter to Bishop Doyle, the Catholic earl of Shrewsbury commented with insight on this debate: 'Now, no man is bold enough to accuse us of undivided allegiance, or to impute to us, otherwise than by very disguised insinuation, any principles hostile to morality or to civil government'.<sup>358</sup> The opponents of Emancipation had been thrown onto the defensive. Bishop Doyle however still furnished them with grounds for attack. Aspects of his letter on the union of the churches and his Letters on the state of Ireland gave opponents such as the strongly anti-Catholic Inglis and the Attorney General Wetherell scope for denunciations of Catholic pretensions.<sup>359</sup> On 12 May the resolution passed the Commons by 272 votes to 266. The majority of six was small but significant in that it was the first time the 1826 'no-popery' intake of M.P.s had supported Emancipation. The question was due to come before the House of Lords on 9 June. On 23 May Bishop Doyle suggested to O'Connell the prudence of suspending the planned simultaneous meetings of Irish Catholics on 15 June. He pointed out that until parliament rose it would not be wise to give it cause to re-enact the Algerine Act against the Catholic Association which had lapsed on 2 May 1828 and had not been renewed.<sup>360</sup> In the debate in the House of Lords, the episcopal bench, evidently fearing the worst, threw all its weight against concession. Dr Doyle proved an irresistible target

for their lordships. The archbishop of Tuam attacked his position on the use of the Bible in schools for the education of the poor. He claimed that the 'Catholic objection was not to the authorized version of the Bible but to the Bible itself'.<sup>361</sup> The bishop of Lincoln argued that the effect of concession would be not to produce peace but to change the subject of contention in Ireland. He believed Dr Doyle to be perfectly serious when he stated that permanent peace could be achieved in Ireland through the union of the two churches but by this, he opined, Doyle meant that Ireland to have peace must become Catholic. Doyle did not mean to relinquish the claim of his church to infallibility. He quoted from Doyle's letter to Lord Farnham and surmised that Catholic Emancipation would be but a prelude to a Catholic Establishment in Ireland.<sup>362</sup> The bishop of Durham also attacked Doyle. The bishop of Bath and Wells stated apocalyptically if unoriginally that if Catholic Emancipation was conceded the 'sun of England's glory would be set forever'.<sup>363</sup> In response to all this the earl of Haddington rather sensibly contended that a great question should not be decided by reference to the opinions of one individual alone:

The success of a good cause was not to be retarded because one of its supporters was indiscreet enough to fulminate his wrath against all who differed in opinion from him. He had no intention of defending Dr Doyle. Indeed he believed that that individual had done a monstrous amount of mischief. It should however be recollected that Dr Doyle was not the only angry person who had written on the question.

Haddington argued that Catholic Emancipation would deprive Doyle of his 'sting'. Furthermore though Doyle 'was imbued with a strong Catholic spirit, he was not so much the slave of the pope as of that national Catholic spirit which was not so much derived from the pope, as from the harsh enactments of their lordships'.<sup>364</sup> The Lord Chancellor, Lyndhurst, asserted that Dr Doyle was a leader in Ireland and that his

sentiments were those of the whole body of Irish Catholics. He also drew attention to the statements of the Catholic coadjutor bishop of Killala, John MacHale, who, he said, had censured the Church Establishment in even more explicit terms than Doyle.<sup>365</sup> The duke of Sussex, a pro-Catholic prince of the royal blood, pointed out that Ireland was held down by force without which its government was impossible 'and then you talk of the advantages which Ireland enjoys under the British Constitution'.<sup>366</sup>

The prime minister argued against Emancipation more from expediency than principle. His speech disappointed by being vague. Wellington was in the process of preparing to consider Emancipation but he certainly could not announce a possible policy shift without thoroughly preparing his ground. Observers nonetheless detected signs of change. Wellington asserted that in Europe there were agreements with the pope determining the scope and conduct of Catholic affairs in several countries. While the British government would find it impossible to enter into such an arrangement some kind of security might be devised. Wellington also stated that if the agitation in Ireland was quietened down then 'it would be possible to do something'.<sup>367</sup> There was a majority of forty-four against the motion for Catholic relief in the House of Lords.

It was the aspect of the prime minister's speech which dealt with relations with Rome which stimulated Doyle's public letter to Wellington on 19 June 1828 which was widely published in England and Ireland. The Times and the Morning Chronicle both praised its contents.<sup>368</sup> Bishop Doyle had raised the desirability and feasibility of a concordat between London and Rome in his parliamentary evidence in 1825 and in his Essay on the Catholic Claims. Wellington had introduced the idea of a

concordat into cabinet discussion at that time and had also written a memorandum on the possibility in 1825.<sup>369</sup> Wellington's statement as prime minister in the Catholic debate in 1828 gave Doyle hope that the idea which he privately thought would secure the Irish Church from the attentions of both London and Rome might actually become a reality. In his letter of 19 June Doyle thoroughly and at length dismissed the supposed danger of the see of Rome interfering in the affairs of the British state. Danger to the constitution, said Doyle, was as likely to proceed from Mecca as from Rome. He proposed an arrangement which he thought would be both beneficial to Ireland and would assuage the apprehensions of the ultras whom Wellington would be obliged to conciliate. Doyle argued that whatever papal encroachments still existed could be effectively prevented by diminishing communication between the Vatican and Ireland. His reasoning here was interesting:

The state is perfectly secure against them, but I would be anxious to see the Catholics of Ireland equally secure. At present and for the whole of the last century they have not been molested, but they are liable to inconvenience and even to be vexed and troubled by the Pope, while he holds in his hands, as he now does, the unqualified right of appointing Bishops to the Catholic Church in Ireland. 370

Doyle's remedy was to have the right of electing bishops vested in the Irish Church (domestic nomination) thus excluding 'all foreign influences and encroachment'. This could be achieved, he posited, without mutual mistrust, by the government acting with the Irish Catholic Church in making such a proposal to the pope. If the government failed to act in concert with the Irish Church or if it approached Rome separately it would only create suspicion and outright opposition in Ireland. The Irish clergy, Doyle reminded Wellington, would not be separated from their flock by pensions and they could not be bought. The proposal to the pope would have for its object 'to

render the Catholic Church in Ireland more national, and the appointment of its prelates entirely domestic'. Doyle had little doubt that such a proposal properly made would succeed. It could be further arranged, he went on, that the pope would agree to vest in an Irish prelate or group of prelates power in 'matters of conscience and ecclesiastical discipline' then held by various Roman congregations. This was more or less the idea of an Irish patriarchate. The pope would allow native clergymen to elect their bishops 'reserving to himself the same right only of rejection as is reserved to him with regard to the Bishops elect of France, Belgium or Germany'. By this means communication between Ireland and Rome 'would be diminished, and almost cease'.<sup>371</sup> The Rev Henry Philpotts, then Rector of Stanhope, considered that Doyle's letter showed that he was alarmed by the state of Ireland and that the bishops would use every means to establish both their 'despotism' over their clergy and their independence of Rome which was 'jealous of them'. He wondered if the best means of managing the Irish bishops would not be to acquire an influence in their nominations at Rome by placing a minister there.

To comply with Dr Doyle's suggestion of making the Irish hierarchy thoroughly independent, would be, I conceive, the most impolitic step that could be taken. Those bishops are, on principle and by every motive of interest, the enemies of the Protestant constitution; against their permanent hostility, therefore, we are bound to provide. <sup>372</sup>

The difficulties which some Catholics had with Doyle's letter to the duke of Wellington were well illustrated by the remarks of William Wallace, a Scottish Catholic, who considered that Doyle's proposal would make the Catholic Church in Ireland 'too national'. He was worried that Doyle was proposing 'papal powers' for the Irish prelates and 'isolating the Irish Church' from Rome. Was Doyle contemplating an infallible Irish Church?<sup>373</sup> Wallace subsequently informed Archbishop Murray that

he had received a 'most satisfactory answer' from Bishop Doyle though he still had some reservations.<sup>374</sup>

Doyle's letter to the duke of Wellington was quickly over-shadowed by Daniel O'Connell's decision, on 24 June, to stand in the County Clare by-election caused by the elevation of the pro-Catholic Vesey Fitzgerald to the cabinet. Doyle contributed to O'Connell's decision to stand and he subscribed £10 towards defraying his expenses. Using the good offices of the Dublin publisher, Coyne, O'Connell anxiously sought a letter from Doyle supporting his candidature for publication in Clare.<sup>375</sup> On 27 June Doyle's letter to O'Connell was published:

It is when difficulties press on us that we should increase our exertions, and exhibit in our conduct that decision which is the harbinger of success. I am unable and unwilling to calculate the consequences which must result from your contest with Mr Vesey Fitzgerald, but I am satisfied that these consequences will be as useful as they must be important, if the lovers of civil and religious liberty in Clare do their duty to the sacred cause to which you have devoted anew your time, your talents, your fortune, and your life. I shall be most happy to hear of your progress, and will always be ready to contribute every thing in my power to sustain, in your person, the cause of civil and religious liberties of our oppressed fellow countrymen. Farewell my dear friend: may the God of truth and justice protect and prosper you.<sup>376</sup>

On receipt of this letter O'Connell is said to have declared: 'The approbation of Doctor Doyle will bring in our cause the united voice of Ireland - I trust it will be the vox populi - vox dei'.<sup>377</sup> The Dublin Evening Post suggested that there were dissensions within the hierarchy on the propriety of O'Connell standing for County Clare. The Lord Lieutenant, Anglesey, reported to the Home Secretary, Peel, that Doyle's letter to O'Connell was 'most mischievous' but he hoped 'most' of the other bishops would not countenance O'Connell's stand.<sup>378</sup> It was an idle hope. Doyle's name stood higher in public esteem than any other Irish Catholic cleric and his approval made it very difficult for any prelate or priest to disapprove publicly of O'Connell's campaign. The anti-Catholic Dublin Evening Mail stated that several thousand copies of



Doyle's letter to O'Connell had been printed and sent to various chapels in County Clare. Its correspondent reported that 'this document is to form one of the great themes on which the priests are to descant upon from the altars . . . That the peace of the country will be outraged and lives lost I much fear'.<sup>379</sup>

The overwhelming victory of O'Connell in the Clare election was a magnificent boost to the Emancipationists and served to confirm Wellington and Peel in their private opinion that Emancipation had to be conceded to hold Ireland. The newly-elected M.P., now at the height of his authority in Ireland, promptly proclaimed himself a 'radical reformer'.<sup>380</sup> O'Connell was determined to maintain his agitation at a high pitch in a way which he had not done in 1825 during the Emancipation debates and when Canning became prime minister in 1827. He believed that he had been twice mistaken in pursuing such a course. But his statement that he was a radical did not appeal to Doyle. While publicly O'Connell enjoyed Doyle's support, privately the bishop was severely critical of him. The pro-Catholic whig M.P. for Limerick city, Thomas Spring Rice, who had been under-secretary to Lansdowne at the Home Office in the Canning and Goderich administrations, wrote to Doyle on 20 July 1828 to complain that O'Connell had denounced him as one whom the Catholics of Ireland might oppose at the next election. Spring Rice wrote to vindicate himself from O'Connell's charge that he had used his influence with Lord Limerick's tenants to have them support Vesey Fitzgerald in the Clare election: 'the whole thing's utterly false'.<sup>381</sup> Spring Rice felt he could put O'Connell in a very awkward position if he chose to (a reference to O'Connell's correspondence with him over a patent of precedence at the Irish Bar late in the previous year) but he would not do so: 'I shall not be provoked or say or

do anything that can injure the cause to which in principle I as an Irishman am for ever attached'.<sup>382</sup> Doyle responded:

I am quite askance at what O'Connell has been heard to say of you and Reform. I had the horror [of learning] how you felt compounded at this man's precipitancy. I would not avoid writing to him on the subject but tho' he should endeavour to set the public right, he cannot remedy the evil which results from excessive credulity - from inattention to our best friends, and from those defects in himself which place him so often under the necessity of either persevering in a wrong error or proclaiming his own want of some qualities most essential to the success of a public man. Our misfortune is that he is so much the representative of Catholic feeling and opinion that even his errors and faults are imputed to us all, whilst many of us differ widely from him. Thus he is at present talking in language entirely unsuited to our circumstances, and which may detract from us and attach to our opponents many persons of weight and influence. I have ventured to express my doubts to him on the wisdom of coalescing with the Radical Reformers as he seems inclined to do, for what is that but preparing the way for violence, and suggested whether it be not better to seek a coalition with the whigs on the principles of 1688 leaving out the Religious Tests, but I doubt whether he will now listen to such reflections . . . 383

In the Catholic Association O'Connell moved to conciliate Doyle by declaring at its meeting on 2 August that they should convey their 'most marked thanks' to Bishop Doyle for his part in the Clare victory.<sup>384</sup> In a public response to this vote of thanks Doyle stated that he would be a rebel to his own conscience if he did not support the Catholic Association but he went on obliquely to criticise O'Connell's new penchant for radical reform.

Our duty is to sustain the hopes of the people, to combine their energies, and direct them to one single and attainable point. Let us not aim at what is above our reach or beyond our competency, or occupy ourselves about business which is not properly our own. Let us burst the Penal Code, and enter into the enjoyment of existing privileges and rights. Then will the Catholic Association cease; then can I and those of my calling return to the work of the ministry, and to that alone; then you, Sir, and your fellow labourers, merged into the great mass of the nation, with the glorious principles of 1688 as a beacon before you, may deliberate about Irish interests, and endeavour, not as Catholics, but as British subjects, to promote them. 385

In his correspondence throughout July, August and September 1828 Doyle feared extreme consequences if the government did not relieve the Catholics. In late August Doyle confessed to Sir Henry Parnell that for some time he had been filled with apprehension, indeed real alarm, about the state of Ireland. He had been endeavouring to prevent Catholics from despairing of the force of public opinion and likewise from coalescing with the radical reformers in England. Nonetheless he feared the worst: 'every hour exposes us to the danger of anarchy'.<sup>386</sup> Another contested election would expose the country to the danger of a major civil war. On 14 September he wrote in a similar vein to his brother. The English government of Ireland seemed determined to 'struggle against justice to the last, and the cause of Ireland so often tried by the sword will once more be decided by it'.<sup>387</sup> The semi-military meetings of the peasantry throughout County Tipperary and elsewhere in the south and the near affray at Ballybay in County Monaghan between Catholics and Orangemen provided good grounds for Doyle's concern.<sup>388</sup>

In October Bishop Doyle opposed the establishment of a Liberal club in the Queen's County. Liberal clubs conceived by Thomas Wyse were established in many counties after O'Connell's success in Clare. They were, in effect, county branches of the Catholic Association, and a further extension of the democratic idea whose main objective was to maintain the freehold registers in readiness for the elections. The Clare result also provoked an anti-Catholic reaction in the form of Brunswick clubs devoted to the maintenance of the 'Protestant Constitution'. Almost as a matter of course where either a Liberal or a Brunswick club was established the other was soon set up in response. All this led to a heightening of sectarian tensions. In the Queen's

County, Patrick Lalor of Tennakill, a prominent middleman and embryonic politician, led the agitation for a Liberal club in a series of letters to Nicholas O'Connor, parish priest of Maryborough.<sup>389</sup> Bishop Doyle decided that whatever the merits of Liberal clubs being set up throughout the country generally in those counties which lay within his diocese their institution was inadvisable. In a letter to O'Connor, his rural dean in Maryborough deanery, he argued against the establishment of such a club on the grounds that 'there is too much of exasperation and menace, too much of hatred and violence, prevailing in some parts of Ireland'.<sup>390</sup> This stance perhaps veiled to some extent what was probably Doyle's other and major reason for objecting to the Liberal club, namely that it might pose a threat to the political future of the sitting M.P., Sir Henry Parnell, in whom Doyle had the greatest confidence.

The Dublin Evening Post on 2 December 1828 quoted the Catholic Journal to the effect that O'Connell would be politically disappointed by the 'revolt of Bishop Doyle from the standard of agitation in Ireland'. The Dublin Evening Post denounced the report which was inspired by the Queen's County affair. The editor did not see any harm in having a Liberal club in the Queen's County 'because we are quite sure that such a club would not throw any impediments in the way of the sitting members'. But Conway further opined that where a difference of opinion existed and the authority of Bishop Doyle was hostile then serious dissensions might result among local Catholics from the establishment of such a club.<sup>391</sup>

In a draft letter to O'Connell dated 'December 1828' Doyle sought to resolve to his own satisfaction the differences which existed between them:

It is said that I differ in opinion from you in some matters than which nothing can be more true, and why should not each of us, at least in politics, abound in our own sense? When for example you enter into conflict with individuals in place of combatting opinions or principles, when you propose . . . to bring back the golden age of legislation - when you lead the simple to think they can repeal the union, reform the parliament and cause them to insert the design of so doing in pledges to be given by them to their representatives, when you recommend the formation of clubs as well in Antrim where they could have no effect, as in other places where the people have nothing to learn, and where the members of parliament are secure in their places and as good as can be desired, when you find fault with the Duke of Norfolk and those who concern with his Grace for forming and expressing their own opinions in their own affairs, I certainly differ from you.

Doyle expressed concern that 'wings' were being 'foolishly dragged into discussion without cause or end or purpose'. He regretted that the English press had not been properly used by the Association. He was not interested in parliamentary reform or repeal of the union until he saw how the country fared under Emancipation and other legislative measures.

My heart is set on the extinction of our national feuds and of the Penal laws which creates them, and every proceeding which seems to me to embarrass the repeal of those Penal laws fills me with anguish.

Most damning of all, perhaps, was Doyle's critique of O'Connell's vanity. He contended that O'Connell was beguiled by an anxiety 'to preserve entwined about your head the wreath woven for you by the feelings of the people even at the expense of their interests and perhaps of your own judgement . . .'.<sup>392</sup>

We cannot be certain that O'Connell received this letter. It is not in his published correspondence. Circumstantial evidence suggests the probability that O'Connell was aware of Doyle's sentiments. At the Catholic Association O'Connell proposed that the Association should meet the expense of printing a letter of Bishop Doyle's to the controversialist, Dean Henry Philpotts, which had been published in the Dublin Evening Post in November.<sup>393</sup> This work had been written at the

behest of the earl of Shrewsbury against Philpotts's interpretation of the monarch's coronation oath.<sup>394</sup> Philpotts had argued that the coronation oath wherein the king swore to uphold Protestantism was an insurmountable obstacle to Catholic Emancipation.<sup>395</sup> Doyle held that the spirit of the constitution was comprehensive not exclusive and that the king's contract with his subjects was mediated through parliament which had the right to change the law and therefore the contract. In substance and style, though unmistakably the work of Dr Doyle, this letter was far less important than most of Doyle's public works.<sup>396</sup> That O'Connell should ask the Catholic Association to fund the printing by Coyne of one thousand copies of the work is suggestive of an attempt to appease Doyle.<sup>397</sup> The Catholic Association had not done this before despite far more significant works from Doyle. Yet even if this was a propitiatory gesture by O'Connell it would seem that he could not resist a rather back-handed compliment in his remarks on the letter. He told the Association that 'he had seen in some of the English papers certain sneers at the letter of Dr Doyle; but it must be confessed, that it was much easier to sneer at than answer him'.<sup>398</sup>

The tardiness of the president and professors of Maynooth College in replying to attacks upon their institution was another source of anxiety to Bishop Doyle in December 1828.<sup>399</sup> He expressed his particular annoyance to Professor Jeremiah Donovan at his College's failure to answer the serious attacks levelled against it by Leslie Foster in the Quarterly Review which had been followed up by the ultra peer, Lord Bexley. The attacks against Maynooth which enjoyed an extensive circulation were to the effect that the pope had the power to dispense Catholics from their allegiance and from their oaths. And although the Maynooth professors interviewed before the Education

Commission (of which Foster was a member) had denied this, their oaths it was alleged were of no value and consequently their evidence was untrustworthy. Rhetorically Bishop Doyle asked Donovan: 'Is it possible that an establishment which should be the shield of our defence, will be found the only point through which a fatal blow is inflicted upon our reputation and interests?' Doyle had learned that A. R. Blake (who had also been a member of the Education Commission) was drafting a reply to Foster and he suggested that Blake would put his work at the disposal of the president of Maynooth.<sup>400</sup>

Donovan forwarded Doyle's letter to Maynooth's president, Dr Crotty, but the latter had been ill for some time and his energies were 'torpid'. In fact the staff in each department of the College had submitted a refutation of the allegations to Dr Crotty for his sanction but there had only been 'dead silence' from him. No professor could publish anything in his own or the college's name without the president's 'formal approbation'. However Blake had produced his reply to Foster and given it to Dr Crotty to be published under the president's name. Crotty appended his signature to the pamphlet but in Donovan's view Blake's rebuttal was characterised by 'more zeal than delicacy' and he successfully persuaded Dr Crotty to withdraw his name from the work.<sup>401</sup>

The Catholic Association also expressed its concern at the attacks on Maynooth. Not unlike Dr Doyle, O'Connell took a very poor view of Maynooth's failure to respond to the attacks of Foster and Bexley. O'Connell was blunt in his criticism: 'although Maynooth was so grossly libelled, not one of the professors had the manliness to come forward and put his name to a contradiction of the calumny'. He publicly called on Dr Crotty not to allow false allegations to remain unchallenged.<sup>402</sup>

Richard Lalor Sheil noted that when Doyle had expressed the sympathy of the priests for the people in 1824 he had been criticised in a signed letter on the duties of obedience from several Maynooth professors. But when their College was criticised they had failed to respond.<sup>403</sup>

A pamphlet from Blake written under the pseudonym 'An Irish Roman Catholic' and published under the title Thoughts upon the Catholic Question was in the hands of the public as 1828 drew to a close. Apart from replying en passant to the charges against Maynooth, Blake drew on Doyle's letter to the duke of Wellington on the question of securities. O'Connell (without mentioning Bishop Doyle) censured the pamphlet for what he called 'vetoistical conditions'. But Sheil did not let this remark pass. He stated that Doyle's letter which he, no less than Blake, approved of, could not be construed as conceding 'vetoistical' securities.<sup>404</sup> In March 1829 Dr Crotty of Maynooth finally produced a reply to the charges of Lord Bexley against the college.<sup>405</sup>

On 4 December 1828 Archbishop Curtis wrote privately to the duke of Wellington stating that it was generally asserted that the Emancipation question would be resolved in the next session of parliament and that a concordat with Rome was said to be envisaged. Dr Curtis offered his own suggestion on the appointment of bishops and the problem of the veto. He had a 'plain, easy and secure plan; that, while it can displease no party, would render to government that deference, respect, and submission so justly due to it from all'. The archbishop suggested to the prime minister that when an Irish bishop was elected and instituted by the pope he should be presented before a government commission for investigation. If a



charge arose which the bishop could not 'clear up to the satisfaction of the commission or the government' then the bishop could not take possession of his diocese or any diocese in Ireland. This was, said Curtis, giving the government a 'real veto' which undoubtedly it would have been.<sup>406</sup> It is difficult to see how Bishop Doyle would have accepted such an arrangement as it ran totally contrary to his idea of an independent national church. Heretofore the proposed veto took place before episcopal institution; in Curtis's proposal it would take place after institution but the effect would be the same. His proposal was ill-thought out and likely, if accepted, to have led to conflict over appointments in relations between the Catholic Church and the state. The archbishop of Armagh was an ancien régime figure who was not in sympathy with the new dynamic in Irish national affairs. His political judgement was also suspect. His peculiar views on the Emancipation campaign are illustrated in a letter of his to the Scottish polymath, Sir John Sinclair, of 22 October 1828:

My own firm opinion is, and I wish I could get Catholics to adopt it, namely that said emancipation is a contemptible thing and not worth the tenth part of the struggle, labour, expense and irritation it has cost already, and is likely still to be attended with; its value is quite mistaken and overrated, as it can really do very little good or harm on either side. Yet not this, but the very reverse is the general opinion . . .<sup>407</sup>

Wellington's reply of 11 December to Curtis's letter of 4 December made no reference to the archbishop's proposal but simply stated that he was 'sincerely anxious to witness a settlement of the Roman Catholic question'. His brief response contained the significant remark on the Catholic question that 'If we could bury it in oblivion for a short time, and employ that time diligently in the consideration of its difficulties on all sides (for they are very great), I should not despair of seeing a satisfactory remedy'.<sup>408</sup>

This seemed to say that if the Catholic Association called off its agitation Emancipation was likely to be conceded shortly. Wellington's letter was not marked private or confidential and it was franked by the duke himself so that once it reached Drogheda post-office its origin and destination became generally known and gave rise to much speculation, some of it probably unfavourable to Archbishop Curtis. The primate informed Bishop Doyle that he was consequently obliged in his own defence to let some 'chosen friends' see Wellington's letter and 'report its contents to the multitude'.<sup>409</sup> Curtis sent a copy to Archbishop Murray and Daniel O'Connell was shown a copy in confidence. The latter undoubtedly saw the advantage in publishing it which he promptly did. Or at least that was the conclusion of Dr Curtis who opined that in this and in other matters O'Connell did not behave with the exactness required of him.<sup>410</sup> Wellington complained to the primate that his private correspondence was published without his permission.<sup>411</sup> But Curtis was unimpressed. He informed Murray that he had received a petulant note from Wellington 'more worthy of a peevish old woman than a Field Marshal'. Curtis felt that Murray 'with all your kindness' would not easily approve of his response to the prime minister. Curtis had stated that in his judgement the duke's advice to extinguish the agitation in Ireland 'would now appear intolerable'.<sup>412</sup> Curtis's opinion was that the 'Duke tho' pretending to be displeased, really wishes and intended that both his Letter, and note should be made public' as it were, without his consent.

The manner in which the Marquis of Anglesey conducted government business in Ireland troubled Wellington, Peel and especially King George IV almost from the beginning of his

appointment. And he soon ceased to enjoy the confidence of key members of the cabinet. His refusal to remove the Emancipation activists, O'Gorman Mahon and Steele, from the magistracy and his friendship with known nationalists, particularly Lord Cloncurry, a United Irishman suspect in 1798, exacerbated disapproval of Anglesey. Anglesey's most serious error was to labour under the grave not to say naive misconception that the goodwill of his own character would be sufficient to appease all sides in Ireland. Moreover Anglesey lacked the insight to see that Wellington and Peel were contemplating Emancipation from at least early summer 1828. He was unable to read between the lines of Wellington's official communication to him.

When Wellington's letter to Curtis was published Anglesey requested the letter from Curtis so that he could see for himself that it was genuine. Curtis thought the fact that Anglesey was unaware of the contents of Wellington's letter was a 'gross insult' to Anglesey and 'probably meant as such'.<sup>413</sup> Once Anglesey had ascertained that the letter was what it was purported to be he wrote to Curtis stating that for the first time he now knew the 'precise sentiments' of the duke of Wellington with regard to Ireland and he felt free to offer Irish Catholics some advice, namely to sustain their agitation. This letter was remarkable because Anglesey publicly enunciated his differences with the head of his government on a matter of vital public policy.

I differ from the opinion of the Duke, that an attempt should be made to 'bury in oblivion' the question for a short time. First, because the thing is utterly impossible; and next, because, if the thing were possible, I fear that advantage might be taken of the pause by representing it as a panic achieved by the late violent reaction, and by proclaiming that if the government at once and peremptorily decided against concession, the Catholics would cease to agitate, and then all the miseries of the last years of Ireland will be re-enacted.

Curtis described Anglesey's letter as akin to a 'declaration of war, against a numerous and still powerful party. . .'.<sup>415</sup> The duke of Wellington wrote on 25 December to the king seeking Anglesey's removal from the Irish Lord Lieutenancy.<sup>416</sup> However in Ireland, where Anglesey's letter to Curtis was published on 1 January 1829, it seemed that Anglesey had been dismissed for his open support for Emancipation in his letter to the archbishop of Armagh. That letter did indeed bring forward Anglesey's removal from Ireland but it was not the specific cause of it. O'Connell lauded Anglesey at the Catholic Association and praised his 'strict impartiality'. With marvellous hyperbole he even went so far as to state that in the ten months of Anglesey's government, Ireland had never been so tranquil since the English invaded Ireland.<sup>417</sup> Doyle attended a meeting of Carlow Catholics which called for Anglesey's recall.<sup>418</sup>

Still unaware of the government's intentions on the Catholic question Doyle addressed a paternal letter to O'Connell on 12 January 1829 which was read at the Catholic Association and which seemed to indicate a desire to lay aside or rise above the private and thinly-veiled public disputes of the recent past. Lest there be any doubt about Bishop Doyle's adherence to the Association he forwarded his subscription to the Catholic rent 'at the present time to mark my continued attachment to our common cause'. This interesting letter opened with a muted criticism of O'Connell, went on to excuse him for his mistakes, urged him to a careful and moderate course before parliament where he was intent on testing his belief that he could take his seat at the opening of the new session without having to subscribe the objectionable oaths, and finally concluded by praising him strongly. O'Connell stated that Doyle's letter showed 'how

difficult it was to avoid giving offence in discussing public questions'.<sup>419</sup> The letter read as follows:

He who speaks often and handles exciting topics, will not fail to commit mistakes and to give offence, nor can a popular assembly, writhing under injustice, be justly condemned even for the excesses into which it may be betrayed.

We do not claim exemption from error, but the purity of our principles entitles all we do and say to the most charitable construction, whilst those who oppose and condemn us, even when their language is fair and their proceedings moderate, deserve reproach, because they are not sustained by any sound principle either of justice or policy. I think I can judge without passion - and I can find nothing in the conduct of our opponents respected. Who can respect ignorance or stupidity? Who can defer to bigotry or monopoly? All opposition is founded on ignorance, religious intolerance, or self-interest. When you proceeded to combat this opposition in Clare, I saw to its fullest extent the difficulties and dangers, public and personal, to be encountered; but I thought they ought to be braved, and I cheered you upon your way. You were well fitted for that contest, but that which is now before you is of a different and more delicate character. Courage, perseverance and address were then necessary, but in addition to these you now require Parliamentary knowledge, great fortitude, and that cool deliberation which cannot be circumvented, but who knows how to turn every occurrence to the best account.

The suaviter in modo and fortiter in re, so little suited to us Irish, would be always useful to you, but in your approaching struggle will be indispensable. You will have to give 'honor to whom honor is due' whilst you enforce the rights you possess; knowing that they belong to you even as the crown belongs to a king. Were I not of a profession which prescribes to me other duties I should attend you to the door of the House of Commons and share in your success, for success must attend you; but at home I shall pray unceasingly to Him who holds in His hand the hearts of men, that he may direct and prosper you in all your ways, that he may vouchsafe to give peace in our days, and not suffer His people to be tried beyond what they can bear. <sup>420</sup>

The duke of Wellington's difficulty between July 1828, when after O'Connell's success in Clare it became necessary to concede Emancipation, and January 1829, was principally how to gain the consent of King George IV who conducted a sustained rearguard defence and secondly how to manage Robert Peel, the home secretary, as he

wrestled with his conscience and resignation of his office. Only at the last moment, before the opening session of parliament and by resigning was the prime minister able to force the king into allowing the government to propose Emancipation and into realising that Wellington had to continue in office. On 4 February 1829 O'Connell informed Bishop Doyle from Dublin that the reports circulating of an Emancipation bill were true. He commented: 'the blessing you bestowed on its infancy has prospered'.<sup>421</sup>

The king's speech at the opening of parliament on 5 February confirmed for the first time to the public that a remarkable volte-face had indeed taken place in the government's position on the Catholic question. The speech recommended parliament to 'review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his majesty's Roman Catholic subjects' and 'whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and permanent security of our establishment in church and state, with the maintenance of the Reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and of the clergy of this realm and of the churches committed to their charge'.<sup>422</sup>

In his speech Peel asserted that the government was 'obliged to yield to the remedy of the times; and to adopt a course which, although they believed to be prejudicial to the interests of the State, they knew to be unavoidable'. He stated that the 'disaffection' which prevailed in Ireland could not be viewed without 'fear'.<sup>423</sup> Heretofore principle had governed Peel's rejection of Emancipation now expediency governed his acceptance. The king's speech recommended the suppression of dangerous assemblies in Ireland. Against O'Connell's advice the Catholic Association led by

Sheil and supported by the bishops dissolved voluntarily on 12 February almost a month before the law suppressing it came into effect.<sup>424</sup> Indeed until the Emancipation bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 5 March neither O'Connell nor Bishop Doyle knew what form it might take or what securities would be required. Only by resigning a second time was Wellington able to force the king into accepting the Emancipation bill.

The bill granted complete freedom to Catholics. It abolished all the civil disabilities affecting Roman Catholics by repealing the oaths of supremacy and abjuration and substituting an oath of allegiance to the Protestant succession of the house of Brunswick, binding Catholics to defend the settlement of property as established by law and not to injure or subvert the Church Establishment. The bill rendered Catholics eligible for all offices in the state except the Lord Chancellorship of England and Ireland and the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland. Catholics could now hold all civil offices: they could be judges, mayors, sheriffs, aldermen and of course parliamentarians of both houses. It was far more complete than O'Connell had reason to expect: 'whoever thought we would get such a bill from Peel and Wellington' he exclaimed.<sup>425</sup> The 'wings' supporting Emancipation were the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders and the extinction of the Jesuits and the gradual suppression of the regular clergy in Ireland. There was no sign of the dreaded veto, state payment of the Catholic clergy, interference with correspondence or church discipline and authority; none of which could be attempted without acknowledging the Catholic Church's existence. On 6 March O'Connell wrote from London to Bishop Doyle requesting his opinion on the proposed settlement:

Look (if you will do so at my request) at the wings of the new bill. Give me advice and assistance on this subject. It is a critical moment. I desire to do right. I have already exerted myself against the freehold wing here but I believe the bills as proposed by the minister will be carried. The monastic bill is an absurdity and I think I will easily supersede it but this is a moment of great value and advice and assistance are now absolutely essential.

I shall long to hear from you on these points. At all events let me know your opinion on the state of Ireland at this moment. Tell me anything you think may be useful. 426

O'Connell and Doyle were powerless to prevent the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders which middle-class Ireland readily accepted as the price of unrestricted Emancipation. When the whigs sought O'Connell's support for the disfranchisement he refused remembering that he had been 'trapped' in 1825 and no doubt also recalling the serious downturn in his political fortunes which had then resulted.<sup>427</sup> The whigs for their part were reluctant to attack the disfranchisement lest they strengthen the opposition to Emancipation in the Lords and ultimately endanger the bill itself; at least that was their public excuse for their inaction. O'Connell found it impossible to rouse Ireland to petition against the disfranchisement. O'Connell was not now prepared to desert the forty-shilling freeholders who had proved their worth so convincingly in Clare even if privately he believed that the £10 franchise would give more power to Catholics.<sup>428</sup> So great was the anxiety for Emancipation that Bishop Doyle could not foresee any opposition being made to the disfranchisement in Ireland. Doyle was now more concerned with the survival of the forty-shilling freeholders as tenants than with their political power. He had evidently been convinced, rather like O'Connell, that politically the disfranchisement, however great an infringement of a civil liberty,



would not alter the political balance in Ireland. With some hyperbole he wrote explaining his new attitude:

I would suffer my limbs to be broken on the rack to save the forty-shilling freeholders - not for the political power they give Catholics, for that after their disfranchisement, will continue in its relative position the same nearly as it is now, but on account of the favour and protection it would insure to them after the present agitation will have been forgotten.

While he sincerely regretted the disfranchisement he decided to remain quiescent.<sup>429</sup>

On 13 February (three weeks before the Emancipation bill was published) the provincial of the Augustinian order in Ireland, Daniel O'Connor, addressed his confrère, Dr Doyle, on the fears of the regular clergy that they might be affected by the wings; that in effect they might be sacrificed for Emancipation.<sup>430</sup> A year earlier Doyle had presciently warned the provincial that the regulars needed to reform themselves: 'should a day of danger to them arrive' Doyle wanted to be enabled 'to plead for them with effect and not find myself embarrassed by anything which would shock public opinion, or furnish arguments to my adversaries'.<sup>431</sup> In February 1829 Doyle did not foresee the government noticing the regulars in the Emancipation legislation but confidently he desired O'Connor to understand

that as there is no person more likely to become acquainted with whatever may be in contemplation than I am, so there is no one you could select for the purpose who will be more watchful for your safety. I don't think there is the least danger that any of us will be taken by surprise. <sup>432</sup>

He must then have been at least mildly surprised to find that the Emancipation legislation made provision for the 'gradual suppression and final prohibition of Jesuits and members of other religious orders, communities or societies, of the Church of Rome, bound by monastic, or religious vows . . . resident within the United

Kingdom'. It was decreed in the legislation that regulars were to be compelled to register; foreign members of the regular clergy entering the United Kingdom were to be banished, and persons admitted or instrumental in admitting novices to such orders were to be liable to prosecution. There was no mention of female religious in the legislation.

Doyle however was quickly convinced that the clauses against the regulars would be 'either amended or not enforced'.<sup>433</sup> He could not see what purpose they served. Their main target was the Jesuits, with whom in his own diocese Doyle had had difficult relations in the past. But, he informed A. R. Blake, 'even if the Jesuits were to be sacrificed to the clamors of a party who do not know how harmless they are in this age and country, there is no reason why the other Orders should be involved in their fate'.<sup>434</sup> If friars who owed allegiance to foreign superiors were to be excluded from Ireland Doyle foresaw them establishing their own superiors in the United Kingdom or acknowledging their fidelity to the diocesan bishop as the monks in his diocese did. He did not see why such native and local congregations with no foreign connections should be affected by the monastic provisions of the Relief bill.<sup>435</sup> It may be suggested that a situation where friars in Ireland answered to Irish superiors or the bishops parallels Doyle's idea of an Irish patriarchate resolving its own disciplinary problems without reference to Rome except in matters of faith.

O'Connell was quite confident that he would drive a 'coach and six' through the legislation affecting the regulars. His legal knowledge convinced him that this would remain a dead letter on the statute book. He deemed the law inoperable for several reasons.

Firstly, it gave no power or jurisdiction to magistrates to investigate complaints against the regulars. Secondly, no individual apart from the attorney general could prosecute a friar or monk. Thirdly, no friar was obliged to accuse himself nor could his colleagues be called as witnesses. Finally, O'Connell declared it 'almost impossible' that any prosecution could be undertaken and 'quite impossible' that such a prosecution could be successful.<sup>436</sup>

The penal clauses against the regulars would undoubtedly have occasioned a major outcry in Ireland if they had been likely to be implemented or to be effective. This legislation was merely an unworkable sop thrown to the ultras. Nevertheless Dr Doyle did not see why Catholics should not protest against its injustice. He acted as a conduit for the fears of regular clergymen such as O'Connor and the Carmelite, Spratt. Doyle drew up a petition signed by all clergymen in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin against the penal clauses. This petition stated that the regulars (mentioning the Jesuits at Clongowes Wood) were blameless and entitled to the protection of the state. It was presented in the House of Lords by Lord Clifden on 1 April 1829.<sup>437</sup>

The government's about-turn on Emancipation left the ultras irreconcilable. Wellington fought a duel with Lord Winchelsea. Peel, the Protestant champion resigned his seat for Oxford University and lost the ensuing by-election to Sir Robert Inglis, though he immediately found a safe seat. The progress of the Emancipation bill through parliament was otherwise unremarkable. In the House of Commons Inglis continued his attacks on Bishop Doyle whom, he claimed, maintained that Catholic Emancipation was 'chiefly valuable for opening the door to ulterior measures'.<sup>438</sup> In the House of Lords

on 7 April there was a curious irony with the Lord Chancellor, Lyndhurst, quoting Bishop Doyle in opposition to his anti-Catholic predecessor, Lord Eldon. The latter had inquired if Catholics admitted the Church of England to be a Christian Church. Lyndhurst responded with Doyle's statement: 'I look upon the Established Church in two lights - as a Christian community, and as a corporation possessive of extensive revenues. For the purity of the doctrines it professes I esteem it more than any other church except my own'.<sup>439</sup> Doyle brought several minor particulars, fine points of word meaning and interpretation, to the attention of Sir Henry Parnell and A. R. Blake. Parnell went to see Peel on Doyle's amendments to the bill. Parnell urged that it would be better to wait a year before attempting to modify objectionable parts of the bill.<sup>440</sup>

On visitation in the Queen's County when the bill was introduced into parliament, Doyle had endeavoured to take the opinions of all classes on its merits. The conclusion he drew from these soundings, he reported to Blake, was that 'we have to choose between insurrection and rebellion at some uncertain period, and the settlement offered by the government'. He preferred the latter alternative. And he hoped Emancipation would lead to religious peace.<sup>441</sup> But the omens were hardly encouraging. He informed Sir John Sinclair on 20 February that Irish Catholics in many places feared a Protestant backlash indeed a massacre at the hands of violent Brunswickers. Doyle hoped that these fears were groundless but he had to acknowledge that they existed.<sup>442</sup>

The Emancipation bill passed easily through both houses of parliament. On its second reading in the Commons on 17 March the majority in favour was 180; on the third reading on 30 March the

majority was 178. In the Lords the majority was 105 on the second reading on 2 April and 104 on the third reading on 10 April. This was a decisive vote in the Lords. The king eventually and reluctantly signed the Emancipation Act into law on 13 April. 'The first day of freedom' was how O'Connell marked a letter dated 14 April 1829. He exulted that the passage of Emancipation was one of the great triumphs of human history. It encompassed, he contended, 'a bloodless revolution more extensive in its operation than any other political change that could take place'.<sup>443</sup> At the request of Lord Gormanston Doyle allowed his name to be added to the committee of the O'Connell tribute; a tribute collected along the lines of the Catholic rent throughout Ireland to recompense O'Connell for his endeavours. Doyle contributed a £10 subscription and wrote that O'Connell's services were 'too signal ever to be forgotten, and far too great to be requited'.<sup>444</sup>

In a letter bearing the legend 'pray burn this when you read' and written ironically on the day King George IV signed the Roman Catholic Relief Act into law, the great non-violent Catholic 'break-through' into the rights and privileges of the constitution, Doyle pondered what would have happened had rebellion broken out in Ireland in the previous year:

We are a divided people and so divided that it was impossible to calculate the strength of the country. We ourselves would march in front of the enemy's force and furnish numerous auxiliaries against ourselves. We are unlike in many respects to any people who ever obtained independence in despite of a powerful state. And the advantages we possess cannot be made available to that great purpose. I have made the calculation a thousand times and I always came to the conclusion 'tis impossible and ought not to be attempted'. We must proceed on another course, there is less risk in it, there may equal success attend it. Change not less important than revolutions may be effected without the sword; for tho' Solomon says 'what is there but what has been' yet I think that the power of

knowledge is able to effect in a peaceable manner what heretofore could only be produced by war. I would rather see England [recte? Ireland] regenerated than ruined and I would prefer a Tesser degree of happiness than is possible than to see her thrown into a furnace having no assurance of her escape from it.

Analysing the means by which the Portuguese, Americans and Dutch had achieved their independence Doyle rhetorically asked how would Ireland fare in rebellion 'without a fleet, arsenal, money credit, or any single fortress or munition of war but with a people arrayed in a deadly hate against each other, and having all the agents of power and those skilled in administration in the ranks of the enemy'.<sup>445</sup> Doyle's ardent views were contained by a penetrating intelligence which allowed him to differentiate between what was desirable for Ireland and what could realistically be achieved. He did not envisage circumstances permitting a revolutionary course of action in his lifetime: in the longer term he placed his faith in the enlightening power of education which he powerfully advocated. The raw material of revolution in the 1820s was a downtrodden peasantry which could not possibly achieve success. Doyle looked forward and promoted the growth of an educated, self-confident Irish nation which in the course of time would be able to achieve independence.

## CHAPTER II

### REPEAL AND REFORM

O'Connell greeted Emancipation by remarking to the erstwhile secretary of the Catholic Association, Edward Dwyer: 'How mistaken men are who suppose the history of the world will be over as soon as we are emancipated! Oh! that will be the time to commence the struggle for popular rights'.<sup>1</sup> The 'Liberator', as he was now called à la Bolivar, was sorely vexed by not being allowed to take his seat for Clare in the House of Commons without subscribing the old oaths of Supremacy (on the grounds that his election pre-dated the Relief Act). So there was to be no outbreak of goodwill in Anglo-Irish relations on the passage of Emancipation. O'Connell was forced to stand again for Clare. His address to the electors, known as the 'Address of a Hundred Promises' pledged his support for a wide variety of liberal reforms. He was returned unopposed on 30 July 1829.

Both Bishop Doyle and O'Connell hoped that the concession of Emancipation would lead to an end to political and sectarian divisions between Irish Catholics and Protestants. This proved to be a vain hope, though for perhaps a year after Emancipation it remained a real one. The passage of Emancipation certainly calmed a potentially revolutionary situation which would have commenced, as Wellington acknowledged in the House of Lords when justifying the concession, with a bloody civil war in Ireland. The fact that the arch tories, Wellington and Peel, granted Emancipation gave some cause to believe that further relevant and less difficult to accomplish reforms would follow. But it was foolish to expect that in Ireland interdenominational relations would quickly change from

grave mutual suspicion to making common cause under the name of Irishmen.

In November 1829 Bishop Doyle helped to calm a rural revolt caused by distress in the deanery of Maryborough by issuing a pastoral which contended that hunger could not justify revolt in the year of Emancipation. He told his flock that the penal code - 'the greatest cause of our national misfortunes' - had been removed and the road to improvement in Ireland lay open and the work of improvement had already been commenced by government.<sup>2</sup>

In February 1830 almost ten months after the passage of the Relief Act the Irish Catholic bishops published a pastoral letter to the clergy and people welcoming Emancipation.<sup>3</sup> This belated collective official reaction was apparently thought-up by Doyle as a means of garnering political goodwill and strengthening a simultaneous episcopal petition to parliament on education. The pastoral address was written by Doyle (even though five bishops, not including Doyle, were delegated to a hierarchical sub-committee to draw it up) and it was as fawning in tone as he deemed it expedient.<sup>4</sup> Undeserved praise was heaped on King George IV who had conferred on Ireland 'the inestimable blessings of peace'. If this latter assertion was true it had happened almost in spite of the king. Wellington, Ireland's 'most distinguished' son, received a similar encomium. The pastoral exhorted Irish catholics to good behaviour, religious concord and respect for the constitution, king and legislature. The pastoral mentioned the injurious legislation affecting the regulars en passant while it rejoiced at the overall boon of Emancipation. This address contained the 'fervent hope' that the clergy's role in politics was now at an end. Post-Emancipation



the clergy were 'discharged from a duty which necessity alone had allied to our ministry'. This was a duty 'gladly relinquished'. The 'priest in politics' phenomenon had been a subject of attack from the anti-Catholics in parliament in the late 1820s. But the pastoral was far from being an explicit rejection of, or admonition against, clerical participation in politics. The Times was delighted with the pastoral, which it stated breathed in every line the most edifying spirit of loyalty, charity and concord.<sup>5</sup> Archbishop Murray sent copies of the address to Wellington, Peel, the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary of Ireland, among others. Neither Peel nor Wellington replied. The Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary expressed great satisfaction. Thus the archbishop decided to forward the hierarchical petition on education to those two.<sup>6</sup>

The failure of the government to produce effective reform led O'Connell to move towards a repeal agitation. In early April he founded 'The Society of Friends of all Religious Persuasions' which was intended to be an all-purpose reform organisation which included the repeal of the union among its objectives.<sup>7</sup> O'Connell complained to the Knight of Kerry that 'the working of the system here is as completely Orange as if the Relief Bill had not passed'. William Gregory - 'the very demon of Orangeism' - was still in charge of the Irish civil service at Dublin Castle. The Orange Attorney General Henry Joy controlled state prosecutions. Catholic barristers were still refused silk gowns.<sup>8</sup> O'Connell's new society conducted but very few meetings before being quickly suppressed by proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant, the duke of Northumberland, on 24 April 1830.<sup>9</sup>

The death of George IV on 26 June 1830 and the accession of King William IV led to the customary general election. Despite an

expected change of government Wellington's ministry survived. However the July Revolution of the bourgeoisie in France against a reactionary monarchy seemed to announce that the sweeping tide of reform could not be held back indefinitely even by the duke of Wellington. Intense interest in Ireland was also devoted to the successful revolt of the Belgians from the Dutch in August. The success of the Catholic Belgians in separating from the Calvinist Dutch had an obvious appeal for Irish opinion and occasioned a long detailed letter from Bishop Doyle to Thomas Wyse examining why it happened.<sup>10</sup>

On 23 October 1830 O'Connell founded an 'Association of Irish Volunteers for the Repeal of the Union'.<sup>11</sup> O'Connell's activity was countered by anti-repealers who inspired the duke of Leinster and several peers to call a meeting of the friends of the union in Dublin on 29 October. Leinster sought Doyle's support for his stance. Doyle's brief, carefully-worded response to the duke was masterly.<sup>12</sup> He stated that he was unable to judge whether the repeal of the union was 'practicable' and had consequently decided to refrain from making a public declaration. If the movement for repeal was not based on the true interests of the country it would shortly fall into desuetude; if otherwise then the peers might find it undesirable to be committed against the 'general will' of the country. Dr Doyle did not think that the repeal agitation should cause alarm or slow government efforts - 'should it be disposed to make them' - to reform Ireland. Doyle concluded his letter to Leinster by appealing for an end to 'open and avowed division' which would leave the aristocracy defenceless before a hostile population.<sup>13</sup>

In November in response to a Protestant pro-repeal meeting of the united Dublin parishes of SS Andrew, Ann, Mark and Peter, Doyle stressed that all sides were entitled to debate the merits of repeal fully and openly. He opined:

I think the repeal does not necessarily, nor even probably involve a separation of these islands, or a diminution of power, wealth or integrity of the state. It may indeed, involve a conflict of democracy with aristocracy - of public happiness with privileged abuse; but this conflict was commenced, is proceeding, and will, sooner or later be consummated. 14

On 18 November, again in reply to a pro-repeal meeting in Dublin, this time in Booterstown parish, Doyle expressed a very definite pro-repeal opinion. He declared that he had given the question all the consideration of which he was capable. 'I am unable to calculate all the consequences of repeal; but so far as I can do so, they appear to me useful to both countries - favourable to public liberty, and embracing those great and salutary reforms which a united parliament will be slow and timid in effecting in Ireland.' Doyle's response to the Booterstown parishioners also contained a dismissive estimate of a 'certain class' of the peers and Anglican bishops who supported the union (by December the 'Leinster Declaration' had been signed by 75 peers and 23 M.P.s), 'not all of whom are competent to form a clear or sound judgement':

Those persons, and such as those, who are 'clothed in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day', are averse to all change, are often dull of intellect, fond of ease, heedless alike of public misery, and of those encroaching on the liberty, and on the fruits of industry which scarcely ever reach themselves.

The people should not be swayed by these men, for they neither feel nor suffer with them, nor should government repose on their power and influence, for power and influence, especially in Ireland, are not always allied to rank and wealth. 15

The king's speech at the opening of parliament condemned, inter alia, efforts being made to raise disaffection within the union. However the occasion was chiefly memorable for Wellington's decisive rejection of reform in any serious form. On 15 November his government fell (on a civil list motion introduced by Sir Henry Parnell) and next day the whig leader, Earl Grey, finally reached the highest office. In the Dublin Evening Post on 23 November, Conway, a leading anti-repealer, published an editorial implying that Bishop Doyle was anti-repeal (and quoting his November 1829 pastoral that 'the road to improvement in Ireland is now open'). Doyle, concerned that Conway had compromised him, replied in an important résumé of his political outlook between the concession of Emancipation and the accession of Grey's ministry.<sup>16</sup> Doyle maintained that in November 1829 he had held hopes of reform which he thought were well founded. He then expected that the Relief Bill would be acted upon and Ireland would be governed justly. There would be an end to local oppression, the continued 'prostitution of the magisterial office', equal and impartial laws, an end of gross abuses in the administration, reform of corporations, 'above all in providing a good system of education' and some support however slight for the destitute poor:

An able man could, at any time, these five years past, have drawn up in one month 'heads of bills' sufficient to renovate Ireland and heal all her wounds. But nothing was done - there was no prospect of anything being done. And what remained to the country or to the friends of the country? Should the former lie inanimate - or the latter advise the people so injured and disappointed, to hope in a Government which had abused their confidence; or to lie down and receive Extreme Unction preparatory to their dying of famine and disease? No! all things should be tried before a nation can despair. Peace, property and life are not to be put in competition with the total wreck of one's country. But there is no necessity to look to extreme cases. The repeal of the union, the restoration of a national legislature having, as it should have, a reformed House of Commons, was the obvious, the

national means whereby to remedy the grievances of Ireland; and I thought it but just and reasonable, and I still think so, to ascertain by discussion, whether such repeal was practicable and what effect it would have on the future of both islands . . . The assertion of those who tell the public that repeal means separation, or who say that our commercial intercourse with Great Britain in the event of a repeal of the union would be less profitable than at present appear to me entirely erroneous. May I think I could prove that a federal union of these islands under one crown, would be more lasting than that which now exists; and that agriculture, commerce, and consequently the strength of both countries, would be greatly increased by the repeal of the union, and by the reform in England and Ireland, which should necessarily attend or follow such repeal.

Doyle contended that he would probably argue the case for repeal but the change or administration had brought in men who were the consistent friends of Ireland and consequently he would refrain from arguing repeal and resume his former hopes of reform.<sup>17</sup> Doyle was prepared to wait for the whigs to deliver reform in Ireland. In the previous month he had aided the discussion of repeal and support for that measure by his public letters. These now ceased. The Times was out of date in early January 1831 when it claimed that the Irish priests who had at first held aloof from repeal had 'taken the field with Bishop Doyle a sort of chief of staff to the Popish hierarchy of Ireland, at the head of them'.<sup>18</sup> While Doyle was pro-repeal in principle and would describe Ireland's relationship with England as 'such as to make us a province',<sup>19</sup> in practice he did not see how it could be obtained in the near future. Hence his emphasis on whether it was 'practicable' to agitate for repeal. He looked privately to the importance of substantive if piecemeal legislative reform and desired that O'Connell would cease chasing the elusive chimera of repeal. The division of opinion that this attitude opened up between Doyle and O'Connell had important consequences for not alone their personal relationship but for the nature of the popular agitation.

Under the new ministry Anglesey replaced the duke of Northumberland as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. This could not fail to be a popular appointment given that Anglesey's support for Emancipation had helped to hasten the termination of his previous Irish administration. Indeed O'Connell pondered whether Anglesey's reappointment would weaken the fervour of his repeal agitation.<sup>20</sup> Sir Henry Hardinge was replaced as Chief Secretary by the young but formidable Edward Stanley, a future prime minister. In his letters to members of the hierarchy O'Connell wrote of Anglesey's 'best intentions' towards Ireland.<sup>21</sup> But O'Connell's attitude soon changed. An unsophisticated attempt to kill off the repeal agitation by appointing O'Connell to a high legal position - possibly Irish Master of the Rolls - was to mistake a patriot for a placeman (even if O'Connell had no difficulties in using the system for his own relatives) and was rejected scornfully.<sup>22</sup> O'Connell looked on Ireland and her interests as his primary constituency. He quickly came to distrust the whig ministry and became convinced that the repeal card was the hand to be played. He stated the case succinctly to Bishop MacHale on 3 December 1830: '"The Repeal of the Union" is good for everything. It is good as the means of terrifying the enemies of the people into every concession practicable under the present system'.<sup>23</sup>

Despite assurances to the contrary the failure of the government to replace John Doherty, the Orange solicitor-general, and Henry Joy as attorney-general, convinced O'Connell of whig deceit. Doherty was a hate-figure among nationalists because of the manner in which he conducted government prosecutions and for his remarkable personal animus towards O'Connell.<sup>24</sup> The balloon went up on Anglesey's administration almost before it had begun, when Grey in an

attempt to appease the ascendancy faction in Ireland which was discomfited by Anglesey's re-emergence, promoted Doherty to chief justice of the common pleas. The whig Philip Crampton became solicitor-general in his place where O'Connell had hoped for the liberal Catholic Michael O'Loughlen. The Orange Francis Blackburne became attorney-general. In terms of the new government of Ireland the appointment of Doherty had a fatal effect on public confidence. And Anglesey who had left Irish shores in martyred glory now returned on 23 December to a storm of protest.<sup>25</sup>

Bishop Doyle was duly cognisant of O'Connell's grip on public opinion. He had complained bitterly of the inability of the government to comprehend the state of Ireland and to effect reform throughout 1830. He considered that the manner in which the government in Ireland had been carried on had made O'Connell 'all-powerful' in Ireland. Doyle even went so far as to acknowledge that if he were found in opposition to O'Connell 'I should be deserted by the men of my own household'. Quietly Doyle endeavoured to influence public opinion within his diocese to leave aside the union question until Anglesey's administration produced reforms.<sup>26</sup> Doyle in his private letters to the whig earl of Darnley which were read by Lords Grey and Holland stressed that Ireland was not in or near a state of rebellion and that efficient reform measures would dampen O'Connell's agitation. Doyle suggested reforms of education, the Irish corporations and the Irish Church Establishment with some of the Church's property being applied to the relief of the poor.<sup>27</sup> But O'Connell did not expect anything from the government. On 6 January 1831 he founded 'The General Association of Ireland . . .' which was committed to the pursuit of repeal.<sup>28</sup> Anglesey was keen to conciliate Irish opinion but not prepared to countenance an anti-

union agitation contending as did both whigs and conservatives alike that such a departure would lead to the separation of Ireland from England. He decided that if O'Connell could not be managed he must be confronted. A series of proclamations on 7, 10 and 13 January outlawed every repeal activity O'Connell had initiated. On 11 January Bishop Doyle held a meeting with his old adversary Thomas Finn, who was connected to O'Connell, and discussed with him the 'doubtful policy' pursued by the latter. Doyle argued that O'Connell's opposition might deprive Ireland of several measures of beneficial legislation or inadvertently contribute to the conservatives coming in. Doyle found that Finn 'seemed inclined to brave the worst that might come in pursuit of the Repeal, and his purpose appeared to me to rest on a conviction that the present Ministry could not, or would not, serve Ireland to the extent he thought I seemed to anticipate'.<sup>29</sup>

Doyle believed that O'Connell by pursuing the illusion of repeal was jeopardising the opportunity of substantive reform. O'Connell held that he was ensuring that the contrary was the case. Doyle held that O'Connell's repeal agitation was a journey up a political cul-de-sac when several avenues of political reform lay open. The whigs assured Doyle that if the anti-union agitation ended substantive reform would be put in place. Doyle maintained that O'Connell's repeal agitation must eventually subside when it became clear that he could not make progress on that question. But while O'Connell was discovering this the hard way Doyle undertook the delicate task of liaising through the good offices of Sir Henry Parnell and the earl of Darnley with several members of the government, making clear to them what measures of reform would prove useful to Ireland and simultaneously depress the Irish agitation.



Doyle was thus embarked on a dangerous behind-the-scenes course of mediation. By advising the government on how to reform and quieten Ireland he was also undermining O'Connell's repeal agitation. Doyle had good direct contacts with leading members of the government such as Melbourne and Stanley at this time. Doyle had moved decisively against O'Connell's repeal campaign though it was not politic to make his position public. He provided the government with an important alternative assessment of Ireland from the key Catholic bishop within the broad popular spectrum. Arguably this compromised him by forcing him to keep silent where he might have taken issue with the government. This was a significant divergence from the unity of O'Connell and the bishops during the Emancipation campaign. The Marquis of Anglesey informed the cabinet member Lord Holland that 'entre nous, Dr. Doyle is at my feet . . . He is a clever man, full of information, full of prejudice and full of condemnation of that in others . . . You must see the importance of having a counter-poise to the Arch-Fiend, O'Connell. This prelate, in his heart hates him'.<sup>30</sup>

On 18 January, O'Connell and five associates were arrested on thirty-one charges of conspiring to evade the proclamations forbidding repeal meetings. Doyle opined that between them Anglesey and O'Connell had placed the country in a state of 'unexampled peril'. He discerned a 'bad spirit' prevailing; a disposition or at least talk on the part of some of the peasantry to rescue O'Connell if he was imprisoned. He saw no point in discussing reform until this issue had been resolved.<sup>31</sup> Parnell was equally pessimistic. He feared that the government would do nothing right; the arrest of O'Connell seemed to rule out all hopes of conciliation. He noted

that what ought to be done in a week the government had some half-hearted notion of doing in six months. What government did do retained the old character of granting the least amount of concession possible. Yet he acknowledged that what action was taken arose from Irish agitation.<sup>32</sup> In early February Doyle was invited to a Castle levee which he did not attend. Anglesey regretted his absence but Doyle rightly felt that Anglesey only wanted him there for show. Doyle did not think his opinions would be listened to if he attended. Besides 'I might be stoned if I were seen at the Castle'.<sup>33</sup>

Doyle considered that both O'Connell and Anglesey had proceeded too far in their conflict to recede. But as it turned out it was in the mutual interest of the parties to avoid a direct collision. O'Connell did not relish the thought of a perhaps lengthy gaol sentence even as the first repeal martyr. Pursuing repeal in the weeks before his trial would certainly have made that likelihood more certain and increased the duration of his incarceration. As usual he was however not without resource. In February he attempted to prevent Lord Duncannon's return for County Kilkenny. Duncannon, a prominent whig member of government, survived by a mere sixty-one votes. In Kilkenny the Catholic clergy, under the control of Doyle's protégé, Bishop Kinsella, had been withheld from opposing Duncannon. But Doyle believed that at the next election in Kilkenny and elsewhere the bishops would be unable to restrain the clerics.<sup>34</sup> It was nonetheless clear from the Kilkenny election that O'Connell's imprisonment could lead to serious electoral consequences for the whigs in Ireland, not to mention popular agitation per se. O'Connell's efforts to thwart the state prosecution were time-consuming and helped by the political situation. As the law officers

closed in, the value of O'Connell and his supporters in the House of Commons increased as the government faced stiff opposition to parliamentary reform. There is a suspicion that a quid pro quo was reached though O'Connell and Stanley vehemently denied it.<sup>35</sup> In return for his freedom O'Connell would support reform and tone down the repeal agitation. By late February it was clear that this was O'Connell's new policy.<sup>36</sup> The law case against him was allowed to lapse.<sup>37</sup>

Doyle informed Parnell that he was glad that O'Connell was found 'manageable'. Doyle held that 'everything should be done' to bring O'Connell into line with government policy. What Doyle had seen of the Kilkenny election had convinced him that O'Connell had the power of 'totally deranging the affairs of this country'.<sup>38</sup> The parliamentary reform legislation of the whigs (Lord John Russell's great Reform bill) was, as Doyle remarked, well-received in Ireland and gave O'Connell a policy to latch onto which he genuinely believed in while repeal agitation was temporarily allowed to cool off.

One of the reforms most cherished by Bishop Doyle was the idea of a poor law for Ireland. Doyle's philosophical approach to this issue was based on the contention that the state was bound by the law of nature, by the positive law of the gospel, and by its constitution, whatever its form of government, to provide for the preservation of the lives of its subjects. Thus making a legal provision for the poor was not a matter of choice for the government but a dictate of the laws of nature and of the gospel which the government was imperatively bound to obey. The degree of misery in Ireland was such, he stated, as to demand a remedy from the government: 'we should not have their blood upon us'; the state

should give priority to protecting the lives of its citizens anterior to their property.<sup>39</sup>

Dr Doyle believed that the primary cause of poverty was unemployment. He traced Ireland's massive unemployment problem to the recession which followed the ending of the Napoleonic wars. Moreover the competition for land, so crucial to survival, was such that the landlord, or more generally middleman, could name his terms. Land according to Doyle was leased at between twenty and thirty per cent, occasionally up to one hundred per cent above its value. The disposition among landlords to consolidate their holdings by evictions added to the worst of the destitution problem. Furthermore the numbers out of work increased substantially between 1825 and 1830.<sup>40</sup> The outstanding social 'evil' of subdivision was the result of the natural affection and ignorance of the poor who were almost incapable of judging the consequences of their own actions thus leading to improvident marriages and the rapid multiplication of the population. Consolidation was motivated by landlord desire both to improve their holdings and to check the exponential growth of a pauper population through subdivision. Doyle was hostile to subdivision but he argued that its eradication must be accompanied by a poor law provision which would provide a safety net for the destitute.<sup>41</sup> Consolidation was facilitated by Newport's act which made quick evictions feasible and discouraged by the Sub-Letting act which prohibited subdivision without landlord consent. Consolidation also occurred post-Emancipation when the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders made this variety of tenants politically irrelevant. However the public outcry raised against these evictions helped to curb their number.<sup>42</sup> 'Many' landlords helped the tenants

they ejected with financial compensation, by assisting them to emigrate to America or by settling them elsewhere on their estates though on normally less desirable locations such as mountains, bogs and other unreclaimed lands. However, Doyle maintained that a 'good many' landlords had 'entirely abandoned' their erstwhile tenants to an unenviable fate. Indeed, Doyle who was never at a loss for a well-turned phrase, opined that 'no language can describe' the suffering endured by the evicted homeless. They were reduced to living in hovels on the outskirts of towns where they lived on weeds and fell prey to the mindless depression of misery and 'even vice' and vast numbers perished from malnutrition-related diseases.<sup>43</sup>

Carlow town was better off in the 1820s than many similarly sized towns. In the latter half of the decade considerable numbers were employed on public works particularly Carlow Cathedral from 1828 at an average payment of ten pence a day. Carlow suffered very little from serious crime but it was not immune from national trends.<sup>44</sup> The nation-wide contagious typhoid fever affected County Carlow in 1816-1817 but not as much as elsewhere. There was little fever in the town which had better means of relieving those affected. A fever hospital then opened was subsequently discontinued though reopened in 1829. Doyle did not think it was necessarily required, there being only two or three patients. The hospital was supported by voluntary subscriptions matched or exceeded by a grand jury grant. Demands on the County Carlow infirmary were small. On the other hand demand on the county dispensary was considerable.<sup>45</sup>

Disease and near-famine conditions were prevalent in 1821-1822, 1824 and 1826-1827. During the winter of 1821 the sovereign of Carlow town distributed food to the poor.<sup>46</sup> In the severe distress

of 1822 the Carlow Morning Post urged that charity sermons should be preached for the relief of the destitute and suggested that the young seminarians of Carlow College who traditionally performed a play before their vacation should institute a relief fund instead.<sup>47</sup> Perhaps the depth of the distress is illustrated by the information that the clergy were endeavouring to remove prostitutes from the streets of the town. The local newspaper fulminated against the prevalence of common prostitutes 'in Dublin-street and other leading avenues' of Carlow. This, despite the fact, that from 1809 there was a Magdalen Asylum in the town which in 1821 had fourteen inmates employed as laundresses.<sup>48</sup> There was no manufacturing industry in Carlow town. Efforts were made to establish a flax committee in 1822. Bishop Doyle tried to establish the spinning of coarse linen yarn in the town and also made great efforts to have children trained as Leghorn bonnet-makers even paying for a woman to learn the process.<sup>49</sup> In Carlow parish in 1824, 237 families with an average of 5.5 individuals per family were relieved as public paupers. Doyle considered that more than five hundred others suffered in extreme want rather than come forward to receive public help.<sup>50</sup> In April of that year the tanners of Carlow petitioned parliament for relief in a falling market.<sup>51</sup> In Killeshin parish, in which Doyle resided until 1826, seven hundred people in a total population of between three and four thousand were in a state of starvation until relieved and the remainder were in a very bad situation.<sup>52</sup> Dr Doyle and his priests in Carlow and Killeshin parishes relinquished their Sunday collection for two months in 1824 so that the money could be distributed to the starving poor.<sup>53</sup> The poor sold or pawned their furniture, clothes and other movable

possessions to survive. The distress even affected substantial occupiers in Killeslin to such an extent that the bishop was obliged to lend money to them that they could buy seed otherwise their land would have remained untilled. In January 1828 Bishop Doyle, influenced by Sir John Sinclair's ideas on the preservation of the potato in meal form, published a circular letter to the priests of his diocese for dissemination to their parishes.<sup>54</sup> The third major outbreak of distress in the 1820s occurred in 1826-1827. The Dublin Evening Post in August 1826 reported that the lower classes of Carlow were in a state of uncommon privation, distemper was ranging amidst a silent starving population: 'Hundreds of these are no more than animated skeletons wrapped in rags'.<sup>55</sup> As we have already seen Doyle himself commented on the extent of the tragedy in a letter to the Catholic Association in January 1827.<sup>56</sup> In March the priest James Maher described the 'utter destitution' of some two thousand people in Carlow. Later in the same month fathers of families were employed on public works breaking stones for some streets in the town.<sup>57</sup>

The position of the destitute was made worse by the seasonality of labour, especially unemployment in winter from early November to early March. Doyle personally knew of only one case, where he lived, of death from absolute starvation but he was aware of many deaths from malnutrition-related diseases and inanition. These cases generally referred to victims of eviction. The evicted travelled into the lanes of small towns perhaps seeking a licence to sell beer and whiskey. Many of them were unable to rent even a room but were reduced to taking a 'corner' of a room with other families. Here they lived in appalling poverty and misery amidst disease and the spectre of death:

I have known a lane with a small district adjoining in the town in which I live, to have been peopled by about 30 or 40 families, who came from the country, and I think that in the course of twelve months, there were not 10 families of the 30 surviving, the bulk of them had died. 58

Paupers paid between six pence and ten pence a week to lodge in a 'corner' of a house. They subsisted by begging from door to door but were forced to resort to the pawn shop - where they pledged their coats or cloaks to pay the rent. Thus discommoded they were unable to beg and pay their rent the following week. A Mendicity Association established in Carlow town was disestablished after two or three years when it was found that it only encouraged beggars. Carlow inhabitants found it too great a strain on their resources to support both the Mendicity and the ordinary beggars in the streets. The inhabitants had no power to exclude vagrants from the town. The Mendicity Association, while operative, provided meals at a stated time for the mendicants using a ticket system. These meals consisted of potatoes, stirabout and broth. The Mendicity also tried to procure some 'coarse work' for the mendicants.<sup>59</sup> The funds of the Mendicity Association were transferred to its successor: 'The Ladies' Institution for encouraging industry amongst the poor'. The Institution, supported by private individuals, gave employment at the lowest possible rates to a 'considerable' number of unemployed poor who manufactured various items and engaged in spinning wool or flax. Once a year the mendicants were provided with some clothing.<sup>60</sup>

Dr Doyle found a general disposition to support the poor amongst farmers and other industrious classes. He conveyed an impressive picture of farmer benevolence towards the poor. He mentioned cases, to his own knowledge, where farmers paying high rents sometimes planted one, two or three acres of potatoes



specifically for the poor. He had seen farmers holding two to three hundred acres distributing stirabout, aided by a servant maid, to thirty or forty paupers and doing this throughout seasons of distress. He had also known of a farmer in County Kildare who distributed the milk of twenty to thirty cows to the poor and to kill and boil a bullock at Christmas for them.<sup>61</sup> One of the causes of the rural revolt in the Maryborough deanery in November 1829 was the change in the manner in which farmers paid their labourers; they stopped providing them with food and this led to undernourishment, distress, and outrage.<sup>62</sup> But overall Doyle described the charitable feelings of the farmer class as of the 'finest description'. He found the charity of the poor towards the poor to be of the most touching kind but he considered that 'the poor are prompted by a kindly feeling, which is not so much the fruit of reflection as the impulse of nature'.<sup>63</sup> The peasantry, Doyle believed, were stronger and more manly and animated in his childhood c. 1790 than they were c. 1830. In his opinion children born to the destitute poor 'become of an inferior caste' diminished in physical size, in mental capacity, in energy and character, indeed they were reduced to a state of effeminacy.<sup>64</sup> Doyle knew of instances of parental neglect of children.<sup>65</sup> But he was hostile to foundling hostels. He was opposed to housing foundling children together because the child was 'like a tender plant reared in a hothouse, and liable to danger upon the first exposure'.<sup>66</sup>

While Bishop Doyle did not question the right of trade unions to exist he contended that combinations of artisans were 'most injurious to the public interest'. He instanced the Kilkenny weavers employed principally in blanket-making who had destroyed this industry by high wage demands and strikes.<sup>67</sup> He personally

intervened in a strike dispute between the weavers of Prosperous and their employers which resulted in industrial peace and the demise of the combination.<sup>68</sup> He also intervened in a colliery dispute in north Kilkenny in the parish of Abbeyleix where he reasoned with the colliers to explain to them what their true interests were. This dispute was also settled amicably. Doyle opined that the peaceful result in both these cases was not owing as much to his own influence as to making the strikers understand what their true interests were. He believed that if these artisans had been well educated the strikes would not have taken place at all.<sup>69</sup>

Doyle was favourably disposed towards the view that the excess of population in Ireland could be relieved by emigration which would benefit both landlord and tenant and should be assisted by the former if not by the government.<sup>70</sup> Emigrants from Kildare and Leighlin diocese went west rather than east. Labourers in Carlow, Kildare, Wexford and Wicklow hardly ever emigrated to England. Tradesmen and weavers (the latter tended to be mobile) did occasionally go to the north of England and in particular Manchester but even in times of great distress Doyle found no tendency among the labouring poor to emigrate to England. On the contrary Doyle pointed out that there was a 'very great disposition' to emigrate to America, especially amongst the able-bodied unemployed poor who had the means to do so. There was a trend to emigrate to Newfoundland (with which south-east Ireland had long-standing fishing links) and the Canadas in 1829-1830 but more generally emigration was to the US to which the Canadas often acted as a gateway.<sup>71</sup>

Doyle was keenly conscious of emigration because people from his diocese generally and the Carlow area in particular invariably

went to him for letters of reference before emigrating. Husbands often left their families in Ireland but hoped to enable them to travel out later with money sent from America. Without exception, in Doyle's experience, Irish emigrants sent back favourable reports of life in America. Doyle often acted as a channel for this correspondence and as agent for the financial transactions involved in sending out the remainder of the emigrants' families. Emigration from Dublin to America was 'cheap' at approximately fifty shillings but because Bishop Doyle was known to have relatives in the shipping business in the port of Ross he was begged by poor people to get them a passage at any cost.<sup>72</sup>

Although the poor had a right to support founded in Dr Doyle's estimation upon natural justice and evangelical law he did not think that the poor should be given a strict right in law to support if the state adopted an Irish poor law of the manner he proposed.<sup>73</sup> Thus Doyle avoided the accusation that his scheme for an Irish poor law provision would encourage mendicity. In any case he discerned an aversion to seeking relief in the minds of many of the poor.<sup>74</sup> Doyle proposed the following law. In each parish every householder not a pauper should meet in vestry and select six residents of the parish to administer the poor law. To their number should be added ex officio the clergy of whatever denominations and the resident or senior magistrate. This body would hold office for one year, elect a secretary, treasurer, etc., and have the authority to appoint apploters to assess the value of each of the property holdings within the parish. Upon the returns made by the apploters, the committee would levy assessment by appoudage on each individual property. Perhaps the crucial significance of Doyle's scheme was that the

tenant paying the assessment would be entitled to make a reduction when paying his 'rent or tithe charge or whatever burden he might be subject to, of three-fourths of the sum total paid by him'. Thus Doyle's poor law would in effect - with one-quarter falling on the occupier of the soil and three-quarters on the owner - have been a land or property tax on ownership. In parliamentary evidence, Doyle reckoned that the support of the poor fell only indirectly on the landlord but fully on the fruits and industry of the farmers and the middling classes. His poor law would have equalised this burden. An Irish poor law of this type, would, he felt, lead to absentee landlords taking a greater interest in their estates.<sup>75</sup>

His parochial committee would have authority to levy the assessment by distress; to receive all applications for relief and to examine the merit of such applications and to give relief as they saw fit. The assessment would be levied seasonally four times a year. The committee would call a meeting of the parish to state its views of the needs of the parish, undoubtedly encouraging, if indirectly, the growth of local democracy. An end-of-year meeting would account for its stewardship of the funds entrusted to it. The accounts were to be made available to any parishioner who requested them during the course of the year and to the public at large at the year's end.<sup>76</sup> Doyle was convinced that the committee chosen at the vestry to administer the poor relief would invariably comprise the 'heads of the parish', men of practical experience, charity, intelligence and strict integrity. Men who would represent the sense and wisdom of the parish. Indeed, Doyle stated, 'it is in the nature of the lower classes to put into prominent situations those of a higher rank'. The parochial committee would have discretion to give relief as it

saw fit. Doyle saw the committee acting as mediators between the public and the paupers, watching the interest of the former while ensuring that the latter had the necessities of life.<sup>77</sup>

Doyle classed the poor in two categories: the impotent poor and those who were able to provide for themselves. The impotent poor were persons suffering from infirmity, accident, the desertion of friends or extreme old age. The able-bodied poor who were unable to find employment would not be entitled to relief except in a period of 'extraordinary distress' and might then be employed on public works such as roads and sewers. Doyle's parochial committees would also have been given the power from their funds to assist poor families, rather than individuals, to emigrate.<sup>78</sup> Relief would only be made available to paupers resident in a parish for three years. The law of domicile based on a Roman civil law principle would have obviated difficulties seen in the working of the English poor law system. In ordinary years, Doyle would have given the impotent poor the right of begging within their own parishes. This he knew from practical experience would have enabled them to live from day to day. A pauper could support himself on two pence or two pence-halfpenny per day. Doyle suggested that the impotent poor would wear a label with their right to beg stated on it. If this were done in ordinary years he believed that the parochial committees would only have to give such relief as would pay the very small sum needed for the lodging of the poor and provide them with shoes and stockings, some clothing and bedding.<sup>79</sup> Such an arrangement he believed would have an important moral effect, curbing an 'immensity of evil in Ireland' namely the great number of able-bodied beggars of the 'most vicious character' who by their effrontery extorted money from the charitable.

A law of domicile would lead to the expulsion of such bad characters from the parish and preserve it for the resident deserving poor. The residence regulation would also control wandering beggars of such description as 'gypsies, and fortune tellers, and strumpets and thieves, who go about from parish to parish vending all manner of lies, disseminating vice, and troubling the minds of the people with false prophesies and stories'. A pauper who applied for relief would on rejection of his application have the right to appeal to the petty sessions. Otherwise the magistrates had no legal function in the application of the relief.<sup>80</sup>

Doyle discerned certain likely benefits from his system. The parochial committees would give the Irish poor a settled character and would reduce the 'extreme feeling' manifested at times of great distress by the poor. This excess of feeling, generally benign though with the danger of veering towards the contrary, needed, Doyle argued, to be curtailed by moderation and the rule of reason. Doyle held that his poor law plan would lead the poor to an attachment to the state and decrease the number of outrages caused by combinations of the unemployed.<sup>81</sup> He further held that the failure of the English poor law was not a good enough reason for not attempting an Irish poor law. The inherent deficiencies of the English poor law system were to be avoided in Doyle's plan. He did state en passant in 1830 that if the English poor law system were transferred to Ireland, it would be less of an evil than the continuation of the then state of Ireland. But under no circumstances did Doyle envisage the establishment of workhouses which he deemed totally unsuitable for Ireland. He decried their existence in England as 'very prejudicial' and held that expense alone should rule them out in Ireland.

He was indeed quite adamant in his opposition to Irish workhouses: 'I abominate workhouses'.<sup>82</sup>

In early March 1831 Dr Doyle made a major contribution to the debate on a poor law in his Letter to Thomas Spring Rice, M.P., on the establishment of a legal provision for the Irish poor; and on the origin, nature and destination of Church property. This was a pamphlet of 131 pages addressed to the then secretary to the treasury who had chaired the select committee on the state of the poor in Ireland in 1830 before which Doyle had given extensive evidence in favour of a poor law.<sup>83</sup> Spring Rice, however, remained an opponent of an Irish poor law. Doyle's purpose in this pamphlet was simply to convince Spring Rice intellectually of the need to change his mind. The report of the select committee on the state of the Irish poor did not make any specific recommendations. In his pamphlet Doyle took the report and distilled its contents. His method was to set forth consecutively the arguments of the opponents of a poor law and to refute them seriatim. He adduced nine major arguments, of which the most important he judged to be that the poor had no claim in justice to a provision being made for them. This was refuted by Doyle who claimed that historically the church gave a fourth part of its income to the support of the poor. The wealthy Established Church in Ireland had appropriated Catholic Church property at the Reformation and therefore acquired also the duty of caring for the poor. Doyle wanted a diminution of the wealth of the Church Establishment, an end to tithes, and the resulting money appropriated for the use of the destitute poor. Tithes he termed an 'obnoxious impost' and he coined the memorable phrase that the Irishman's hatred of tithes was inspired by his love of justice.<sup>84</sup>

The most potentially important response to this work was not from Spring Rice but from O'Connell, long an opponent of an Irish poor law. He enthusiastically wrote, in words he would come to regret, to Bishop Doyle on 29 March in a public letter, that the pamphlet had 'completely convinced' him. O'Connell professed himself an 'unwilling' though sincere convert. He worried if his 'own selfishness as a landowner' had made him an opponent of a provision for the destitute.<sup>85</sup>

Perhaps the most publicised criticism of Doyle's view of poor laws came from the young Nassau Senior, first holder of the chair of Political Economy at Oxford, in a public letter to Lord Howick.<sup>86</sup> Senior's pamphlet took the form of a commentary on the 1830 evidence on the state of the Irish poor and on Doyle's letter to Thomas Spring Rice. The tone of Senior's work was set early on with his observation that Irish poverty was 'somewhat overrated in popular estimation'.<sup>87</sup> The three great bonds of civilized society, industry, providence and mutual benevolence, would be threatened by Doyle's plan. A legal provision for the unemployed able-bodied poor would destroy the social fabric of society.<sup>88</sup> Senior remarked that there were some errors so naturally plausible that nothing but experience could detect them. And it was this very 'plausibility that enables Dr Doyle to fill his evidence and his pamphlet with clap-traps on the rights of the poor and the duties of the state . . .'.<sup>89</sup>

Doyle did not restrain his anger in his reply to Senior. He accused his adversary of not fairly meeting one argument adduced by him. And of being typically ignorant of Ireland.<sup>90</sup>

He insinuated that I have exaggerated the distress of our poor; how does he know? - Is he, buried in the dens of the Inns of Court, or vending political philosophy to beardless youths at a



coterie in the 'west end' or I, visiting the hovels and communing with the ears of the poor - is he or I the better judge? and who is Mr Senior and whom am I, why he should presume to question a statement vouchsafed by me? 91

Rhetorically Doyle asked why Senior had not replied to that aspect of his pamphlet which had dealt with Church property. Senior could not do so with advantage to the Established Church in England or Ireland. Moreover Doyle went on scathingly, Senior himself was 'a plant of that hot bed of idleness and vice and bigotry, Oxford'.<sup>92</sup> Doyle moved his argument to its most extreme position when he claimed that those who did not relieve the poor, when in a position to do so, namely the Church Establishment, the state, the wealthy, and even political economists by their writings, were guilty of their murder:

how can certain persons escape the guilt, or what in the eyes of many is more dreaded, the imputation of murdering whole millions of the Irish poor, and continue to withhold from them what the law of God and nature prescribe to be given to them at our expense? It is to escape from this difficulty that political economy is perverted . . . 93

Doyle acknowledged that this was declamation but inquired: 'So an Irishman should look unmoved at the systematic murder of millions of his fellow-men!'.<sup>94</sup> The right of the poor to support was indefeasible.<sup>95</sup>

O'Connell for his part still itched to pursue the repeal agitation. Repeal by giving a domestic legislature would supersede an Irish poor law. O'Connell in his letter to Doyle on 29 March gave Anglesey credit for good motives 'though great personal vanity working on a mind of small power necessarily obscures his views'. He held that Anglesey's policy would effect permanent damage in Ireland.<sup>96</sup> The opposition to the great reform bill in the House of Lords caused King William IV to dissolve parliament on 22 April. The calling of a general election was intended to give the whigs an

unbeatable majority in the House of Commons and to push reform through the Lords by the sheer strength of public pressure. Parliamentary reform not repeal was the issue in the general election in the Irish constituencies.<sup>97</sup>

Doyle threw himself into the popular cause with genuine enthusiasm furthering the cause of reform with published writings under his own name and under pseudonyms, completely disregarding his own advice on the 'priest in politics' of the previous year. He produced a £10 subscription for the election expenses of the popular candidates in County Carlow and regretted that he could not contribute a larger sum 'as I deem no sacrifice too great to be made for the attainment of a purpose so salutary as that of restoring to the people of these Kingdoms their due weight in the Legislature'. Doyle addressed a partisan propaganda letter to the chairman of the Carlow Independent Committee. Even allowing for the fervour of an Irish county election Doyle's address contained a strongly worded attack on the reactionary conservatives who had usurped the constitutional power of the king and people:

This oligarchy has by many bad laws abridged the liberty of the subject, retarded the progress of every social improvement, and reduced the industrious and laboring classes of the community to difficulties of distress or to utter destitution; they even attempted lately to cramp the freedom of the press, that the complaints and sufferings of the aggrieved might not be circulated and made known. 98

The Carlow County election was fiercely contested. The sitting M.P.s Colonel Henry Bruen of Oak Park and Thomas Kavanagh of Borris had powerfully entrenched support. The whig-liberal candidate, Walter Blackney of Bellyellen, of an old Catholic family, and the soldier Sir John Milley Doyle, who benefited from bearing the same surname as the bishop and a claimed kinship with him, had popular opinion on their side. Dr Doyle gave every assistance. On 2 May he addressed Sir John for election purposes from his residence, Braganza:

I am sincerely glad of the success which attends your canvass. I continue to give you all the aid in my power; and, though great difficulties are to be surmounted, I feel the utmost confidence that the united exertions of the friends of Reform will be successful. Do not, I pray you, relax in your exertions. You may depend on mine. 99

Bishop Doyle's priests were also very active in the campaign. Indeed the parish priest and curate of Myshall parish were fired on by a member of the yeomanry in the course of their canvass for the 'popular candidates'. Blackney and Sir John Milley Doyle requested the Chief Secretary to send magistrates unconnected with the county to investigate the incident as they had 'not the slightest confidence' in the local magistracy.<sup>100</sup> Blackney and Doyle had much the better of the canvass and both Bruen and Kavanagh retired from the contest. On 11 May 1831 both Blackney and Doyle were returned unopposed as the new M.P.s for County Carlow. Henceforward in some circles these two M.P.s would be known as 'Dr Doyle's Members'. The bishop described the Carlow result as a 'signal victory', 'but when a good cause is well conducted it succeeds in spite of all opposition'.<sup>101</sup> With the ousting of the conservatives in Carlow an important transition of local power had taken place. The unreformed borough of Carlow, however, returned its owner, Lord Tullamore. Doyle supported the return of Sir Henry Parnell in Queen's County and Henry Lambert in County Wexford.

On 26 May 1831 Doyle informed Parnell, now an office holder as secretary-at-war in Grey's government, that he must 'urge incessantly' the state of Ireland. The 'whole machinery of the Government' of Ireland was 'Tory and partial'. Catholics wanted 'proofs not professions' of good intentions. It was clear that Doyle was growing increasingly impatient with the whigs' Irish policies. 'It would be to me', he stated 'the most painful event that could

happen, to be obliged to combat those whom we now, with all our hearts, support and defend; but certainly I should rather die in the last ditch of my country than submit to arbitrary or partial government.'<sup>102</sup>

In June, Doyle was in correspondence with O'Connell who on 16 June informed Doyle that he had had an interview with Anglesey and Stanley:

I can confirm your worst fears. They plan nothing but English domination. They look to Ireland with a secondary intention yet they desire to do good for Ireland provided it be in subserviency to English interest; but as the control of Ireland must be obtained as the primary object, everything Irish is looked at through that medium. <sup>103</sup>

It would appear that Doyle had called on O'Connell to have the 'case of Ireland' fully stated before parliament. O'Connell answered that he would insist on part of the Church Establishment's revenue being allocated to the support of all 'who cannot labour'. It is evident from this correspondence that O'Connell's adhesion to Doyle's position on the merit of an Irish poor law was weakening. He referred briefly to 'the national propensity not to labour if food can be had in idleness'.<sup>104</sup>

Relations between Doyle and O'Connell were on the 'best terms' from the time O'Connell ceased the repeal agitation in March to pursue parliamentary reform.<sup>105</sup> In autumn 1831 when it seemed likely that O'Connell would revive the repeal agitation Earl Grey's government tried to buy him off. Doyle who thought it would be useful to have O'Connell attached to the governing party was used as an intermediary by Parnell in this process. The bishop thought it would be difficult to win over O'Connell who was 'more popular now in Ireland than he ever was' and well recompensed by the Irish people for his political services through the annual O'Connell tribute.

Nonetheless Doyle believed he carried some influence with O'Connell and he undertook to sound him out.<sup>106</sup>

Doyle received a more sympathetic hearing from O'Connell than he anticipated and the two of them agreed that the proposal of office (as Irish attorney-general) should be rejected.<sup>107</sup> The issue went beyond the mere question of office for O'Connell to what changes were to be made for Ireland. While the government delayed providing an answer Doyle was mandated to offer O'Connell a patent of precedence at the bar. But even this was annoyingly delayed. It is clear that what Doyle envisaged was that O'Connell would take office with 'four or five more leading Catholics' with a definite government commitment to reform. This, Doyle believed, would be honourable to O'Connell and beneficial to the country.<sup>108</sup> Doyle recognised that the government might be deliberately procrastinating ('such assurances as were given to me, might be employed to serve a purpose different from that which was avowed'). Doyle hoped that 'whatever the issue of this affair the cause of Ireland will continue to advance . . .'.<sup>109</sup> The difficulty was that no definite proposal reached O'Connell from the government. Doyle felt that he was disposed to act moderately but the delay in making a proper proposal was fatal. Probably the government was unprepared to concede the demand concerted by O'Connell and Doyle. The bishop subsequently gave Parnell his analysis of the affair's impact on O'Connell and its termination:

During this long interval the agitators and the public press assailed him continually. He thought his popularity was escaping from him, and that the Government intended only to delude him. He became ill-tempered, and by degrees ferocious, until urged by his passions, he recanted all he had said of a wish to serve Government, and atoned for his temporary moderation by the most unqualified abuse of friends and foes.<sup>110</sup>

Doyle himself was the recipient of a glancing blow. In late November, early December, he had published a pastoral letter directed against an agrarian terrorist secret society combined under the 'unmeaning appellation' of "Blackfeet" and "Whitefeet" in the Queen's County part of his diocese. This pastoral address was widely published in Ireland and England.<sup>111</sup> In the course of his strictures on these combinations Doyle acknowledged the justice of many of their grievances but denied the legitimacy of their response to them. He stressed that a poor law was an, as yet, untried answer to their poverty. He maintained his support of the tithe agitation by proclaiming: 'as to tithes, employ against this devouring impost all the resources of your wit and talent, with all the means which the law allows'.<sup>112</sup> In this pastoral Doyle praised both O'Connell and Anglesey highly. The fact that Doyle should praise Anglesey displeased O'Connell almost as much as it gratified the Lord Lieutenant. The latter wrote to the bishop from the Phoenix Park (making no reference to tithes):

I cannot allow a moment to pass without addressing to you the high sense I entertain of the eminent service you have rendered to this unfortunate country and to His Majesty's Government, by the prompt and efficacious and energetic course you have pursued in bringing the deluded Peasantry who have been concerned in the late unhappy transaction in the Colliery district, to a sense of their unwise and culpable conduct.

Be assured My Lord, that such a course, so judiciously, so humanely and so manifestly taken by one who is vulgarly supposed to be inveterately hostile to the existing Establishments of the State, and in eager opposition to the Powers that be will only stimulate me more (if any additional stimulus were wanting), to effect every practical benefit to a People labouring under the greatest privations and suffering them with no ordinary patience. <sup>113</sup>

O'Connell was not so pleased. In a speech at the pro-reform National Political Union on 6 December 1831 he lauded Doyle but suggested that in his public praise of Anglesey he had been snared by

the wiles of Dublin Castle. He had lost his judgement through contact with power. He had been deluded by Anglesey.<sup>114</sup> This was the first time O'Connell had publicly criticised Doyle. In reaction Doyle considered a 'public rebuke' but settled instead for a private remonstrance (though as it happened a public controversy between the two men was not long delayed).<sup>115</sup> Doyle appears inter alia to have threatened O'Connell with a withdrawal of priestly support from his movement. O'Connell responded to Doyle 'to assuage or at least to mitigate those angry feelings which I appear to have excited in your mind'. O'Connell professed his regard for Doyle but also his freedom to speak on political matters - 'you ought to believe me when I say that I did not mean any offence'. Secondly, and more significantly, O'Connell wrote to vindicate what he had said in his speech. This he did in a classic statement of the repeal case:

I have arrived at the deepest conviction that Lord Anglesey is an enemy to Ireland, one of the very worst enemies Ireland can have. I know he is not to be relied on, but at the same time I do not believe he is our enemy from hatred or malignity. No, he merely desires to preserve the superiority of England. Anything consistent with that superiority he would do for the good of Ireland but when the good of Ireland clashed with English domination he would with the coldest disdain sacrifice everything dear and sacred to Irishmen. No person knows better than you that the domination of England is the sole and blighting curse of this country. It is the incubus that sits on our energies, stops the pulsation of the nation's heart and leaves not gay vitality but the horrid convulsions of a troubled dream. Lord Anglesey is all smiles and sweetness to the Catholics. The moment they leave him he calls out the Orange Yeomanry and promises them fostering care. <sup>116</sup>

Doyle merely noted that O'Connell's response was 'long and laboured' although that was hardly an adequate appraisal of the significant and important policy difference it raised between the 'Liberator' and the bishop. Doyle advised Parnell that the government should try to reach an understanding with O'Connell when he was in London (away from Irish agitators and the Irish press). He judged accurately that

'without him you cannot in his lifetime govern this country' and he added 'but I can no longer serve you in any negotiation with him'.<sup>117</sup>

In a speech to the National Political Union on 3 January 1832 O'Connell strongly attacked the notion of a legal provision for the Irish poor. His arguments against an Irish poor law contained nothing that Bishop Doyle had not already refuted in his Letter to Spring Rice and which work, O'Connell had announced in a public address to Doyle (as has been mentioned), had converted him entirely on the subject. Doyle now openly and publicly criticised O'Connell for the first time. His formidable and sharp response to O'Connell was published on 10 January. Doyle opened his rebuttal by reminding O'Connell of his inconsistency on the issue of an Irish poor law; that his 'judgement on this matter not only vacillated - and whatever vacillates is weak - but that it has at different times, whilst the subject remained unchanged, determined itself, not in different, but in opposite ways'.

O'Connell therefore was not an authority to be followed. Despairing of his reconversion Doyle wrote firstly 'to prevent, as far as I can, that portion of the public with whom your opinions are paramount from being led into error by you' and secondly to vindicate again the principle of an Irish poor law. Doyle contended that O'Connell left unanswered, because they were unanswerable, the arguments he and others raised in support of a poor law while objecting to imaginary or insignificant aspects of the subject. He contended that when it was proved from the nature of God, the nature of man, and the principles on which all civilized society was based, that the poor were entitled, at the public expense, to be saved from starvation or extreme hardship then it was 'an error against reason



. . . a crime against morality, and an impiety against God, to leave them to perish, or to withhold from them the necessities of life'. Thus to deny an Irish poor law provision, as O'Connell did, by arguments based on human ignorance, frailty or malice was to uphold a position contrary to divine and human law.

Dr Doyle maintained that in presenting the abuses of the English poor law system O'Connell had misrepresented and maligned his plan and purpose which kept altogether clear of the unsatisfactory English arrangement. Doyle's Irish poor law would have been centred on the parish levy organised by the leaders of the parish community: clergymen, leading laymen, owners of property. This would have placed much of the burden on landlords, often absentees. Doyle would have excluded from relief those able to work 'except in times of extraordinary distress'. He also proposed that parishes should assist emigration which would be 'the most natural and salutary relief for our coming superabundant population'.

O'Connell argued that no one had put forward an Irish poor law plan which did not contain some of the abuses which had deformed the English system. Doyle replied that many of these abuses could be easily removed in the wording of an Irish poor law bill. O'Connell rejected the horrors of the poor-house but Doyle's plan certainly did not envisage the erection of workhouses. O'Connell, in particular, held, not for the first time, that an Irish poor law, with its certainty of maintenance, would lead to an erosion of female virtue. But Doyle was unimpressed. He had asked O'Connell how this would occur and had not received an answer. Virtually the only thing they were agreed upon was that tithes should be appropriated for the use of the poor. Doyle could not find any philosophical, religious

or political principles in the arguments O'Connell had advanced. He speculated that O'Connell's speech was simply an improvisation, 'a chance thought'.<sup>118</sup> Doyle's powerful letter was a devastating indictment of O'Connell's stance.

O'Connell acknowledged that he had been assailed in no uncertain terms but he was unrepentant. He stressed his respect for Bishop Doyle, regretted any altercation between laity and clergy but asserted his complete independence of ecclesiastical influence in temporal affairs. He now objected to a poor law not just in details but in principles. If a man received a meal whether he worked or not it was an inducement to him not to work. He maintained that every man had a duty to take care of the poor, the widow and the orphan but denied that the poor had a legal or political claim to be supported by anybody. O'Connell even went so far as to claim that a poor rate would 'injure' the poor. He alleged that Doyle had contradicted himself by stating in his letter to him that the poor had a 'right' to relief which it was a crime to oppose but denying the recognition of this right in law in his Letter to Spring Rice. Whatever inconsistency there was in his position, O'Connell stated, arose from the conflict between his judgement and his feelings; the former convinced him that there should not be a poor law, the latter weakened this resolve. What gave O'Connell's supporters greatest satisfaction was his declaration that his poor law for Ireland was a repeal of the union.<sup>119</sup>

Doyle confined himself to a brief rejoinder. Once more he was forced to complain of O'Connell's 'lack of candour' and he felt obliged to demonstrate that there was no contradiction in his own work. To this end he quoted his own evidence before the Select

Committee on the State of the Irish Poor (on which O'Connell had sat). Doyle indicated that unless the cause was hopeless he would continue to contend for the rights of the poor even against O'Connell. He referred to O'Connell's view of a poor law vis-à-vis repeal of the union: 'I hope for poor laws, I am not so sanguine as to the repeal of the union, on account of the vast impediments placed in the way of that consummation, which, if not extorted by violence, but accorded to the united will of the Irish people, is so devoutly to be wished'.<sup>120</sup> Yet, as Collinson Black has observed 'there was no easier way' in which O'Connell 'could have courted popularity than by championing the cause of poor relief, but his attitude was one of general, though not consistent, opposition to any poor law for Ireland'.<sup>121</sup>

Thomas Finn ('Laicus' of the domestic nomination correspondence) endeavoured to muddy still further the waters of the O'Connell-Doyle controversy with a vitriolic and widely-published attack on Doyle accusing him of political inconsistency. In the course of this diatribe Finn exclaimed: 'I would sooner go to Lapland and be dry nurse to a bear, than live under the temporal dominion of any clergyman in existence'.<sup>122</sup> Although Finn had a family link with O'Connell it seems unlikely that they acted in concert. Doyle left Finn's scurrilous production unanswered.

Throughout 1832 Bishop Doyle's health declined. During the course of the year he publicly and strongly attacked both Anglesey and Stanley on the tithe agitation.<sup>123</sup> The December 1832 general election constituted a sort of last hurrah for Bishop Doyle. The minimalist Irish Reform act of 1832 opened the borough franchise to ten pound freeholders. This meant that a contest for the Carlow

borough was virtually inevitable. In fact from mid-summer 1832 several candidates were in the field, the most important of whom were the liberal Protestant, Nicholas Aylward Vigors, the evangelically-inclined Tory, Francis Bruen, and the Catholic nationalist William Finn, brother of Thomas and brother-in-law of Daniel O'Connell, standing as a repealer. A year earlier Doyle had informed Finn that he would not support him because of his opposition to an Irish poor law. Doyle favoured the candidacy of Vigors, an absentee landlord and gentleman of scientific tastes, who was secretary of the newly-founded Zoological Society in London, but who had the great merit of supporting Doyle's position on a poor law.<sup>124</sup> The Carlow Morning Post reported that at a public meeting in Carlow on 15 September 1832 William Finn launched the 'most wanton tirades, [and] a string of the most ribald abuse upon our Rev Prelate and his unobtrusive clergy'. The paper concluded its report of Finn's speech by stating rather melodramatically that the result of the election would determine whether Catholic clergymen could walk safely through the streets of Carlow 'or be hunted down like demons'.<sup>125</sup> The Dublin Evening Post compared Finn's speech with the 'abominations' of Voltaire and the 'blasphemies' of Paine.<sup>126</sup> In the Carlow Sentinel Finn denied that he had stated that he would drag the mitre into the mire.<sup>127</sup>

Doyle's public letter in support of Vigors's candidacy was published on 13 October. This pointed out that Doyle would not support Vigors' personal opponent because of his position on poor law. And moreover that he would feel 'personally indebted' to every elector who supported Vigors at the polls. He supported Vigors because his views coincided with his own, he would be useful in parliament, and because of his 'personal and hereditary virtues'.<sup>128</sup>

O'Connell, in correspondence with Dr Andrew Fitzgerald, President of Carlow College, felt the necessity of denying that he had dictated the letter published by Thomas Finn attacking Bishop Doyle. O'Connell claimed that William Finn's chances of being elected were being damaged because of their family connection. O'Connell stated that he would not interfere in the borough election. He recognised that his differences with Bishop Doyle on the poor law issue were central to Finn's difficulty. But he did not see why his brother-in-law should suffer by reason of the Catholic clergy's hostility to him.<sup>129</sup>

Dr Fitzgerald informed O'Connell that the hostility of the Carlow clergy to him dated from his reflections on Doyle's late 1831 pastoral and his insinuations on that occasion of close and secret connections between Bishop Doyle and the Marquis of Anglesey. O'Connell acknowledged that in this matter he had 'much to explain and much to regret'.<sup>130</sup> But this correspondence constituted little more than a vain attempt to shore up Finn's candidacy. The damage done was by now irreparable and the cause was hopeless. At the hustings Vigors was proposed by Dr Fitzgerald and seconded by the Quaker Haughton (both of whom had recently been gaoled for their refusal to play tithes). Francis Bruen was proposed by Patrick Finn, brother of William and Thomas Finn, who had turned tory.<sup>131</sup> Vigors defeated Bruen by 145 votes to 120.<sup>132</sup> Finn had actually withdrawn from the contest several weeks earlier to test his appeal with the voters of County Kilkenny from where the family newspaper Finn's Leinster Journal was published. Even there Doyle was determined to prevent his election if he could. In league with Bishop Kinsella of Ossory he offered his support to the powerful Ponsonby family (having

checked that their views on reform coincided with his) in an effort to stop Finn. However this was all to no avail. The Ponsonbys withdrew from the canvass and Finn was returned.<sup>133</sup> Doyle had also cause to regret the Queen's County election where Sir Henry Parnell withdrew from the contest and the repealer, Patrick Lalor, was returned. Doyle felt that to have become involved would have meant a paper war though he might have altered the result. He now seemed to lack the will for such an undertaking. In Kildare More O'Farrell retained his seat as did the whig Henry Lambert in Wexford. Doyle disapproved of the role played by the pro-repeal Bishop Keating of Ferns in the Wexford election. In Waterford city the anti-repeal Thomas Wyse failed to secure election.<sup>134</sup>

In Carlow County the election resolved into a straight fight between the liberals and the tories. On this occasion Bruen and Kavanagh who had retired from the canvass in 1831 brought the contest to a vote. They were opposed by the sitting M.P. Walter Blackney and his running partner Thomas Wallace who replaced Sir John Milley Doyle who stood down having accepted a position in the Portuguese military. After the usual violence of an Irish county election, allegations of intimidation and clerical interference, Blackney and Wallace were declared elected. Remarkably they received exactly the same number of votes, 657, as against 483 and 470 respectively for Bruen and Kavanagh: an outstanding example of voting the ticket indicating just how strong and uncompromising political divisions were.<sup>135</sup> Kavanagh and Bruen petitioned against the return of Blackney and Wallace on the grounds of unwonted political and spiritual interference by the Carlow priests but they were unsuccessful.<sup>136</sup>

Throughout 1833 until his death on 15 June 1834 Bishop Doyle's participation in public affairs was negligible. During this last

eighteen months of his life his health declined rapidly; indeed several contemporary observers remarked that Doyle was visibly dying.<sup>137</sup> Still his interest in Irish public affairs remained unabated even if there were no more public statements from him. O'Connell's agitation of the repeal issue and general public demeanour were a continuing sore disappointment. The dangerous turbulence of rural agitation also deeply affected Doyle and led him resignedly to approve the whigs' draconian Coercion Act of March 1833. His disillusionment with Irish affairs and all parties was complete; witness his letter to Henry Lambert of 1 March 1833 on the Coercion bill:

If, however, we are not to have good Government or wise laws - and I see no prospect of either - I prefer Lord Grey's bill to any less despotic measure. If we are to be subjected to a despotism, let it be the despotism of gentlemen, though but twenty-one years of age, not of the brutal canaille composing the Trades' Unions and Blackfeet confederacies. The honest and industrious people of this country will suffer less and prosper more under the iron rule of the constituted authorities - let these be whom they may - than under the yoke of the impious and seditious, who now torment them and drive them into all manner of folly and excess. I have not busied myself in examining the details of Lord Grey's bill. It is complete of its kind. There is no use in softening it. Let the terror of its intolerable severity prevent the necessity of enforcing it, but when enforced, let it go forth unrestrained. I have been very unwell, and am as yet scarcely better. I do not think the ills of the country affect me, for my health has been declining these last three years. <sup>138</sup>

We do not know how the bishop viewed the Church Temporalities Act (Ireland), 1833, which partially reformed the Established Church in Ireland. By his writings and agitation Doyle had contributed very significantly to that result. But there was still no final solution to the anti-tithe campaign and the poor law question which so deeply interested him made no substantive progress. The personnel of the Irish government changed during 1833: Stanley resigned in March to be replaced by E. J. Littleton (which from O'Connell's point of view was

an improvement). In September Anglesey resigned to be replaced by Wellesley whose interest in Ireland was less than his predecessor and his achievement equally minimalist. Though O'Connell fulsomely praised Doyle as the 'Lion of Judah' at a church ceremony in Kildare town in December 1833 there was now no communication between the two men. Collectors of the O'Connell tribute who had the nerve to call at the bishop's residence were turned away unseen.<sup>139</sup>

In January 1834 the Irish bishops at their annual meeting (which Doyle attended) resolved unanimously that their chapels were not to be used in future for public meetings of a non-religious or political nature and they upheld and renewed their 1830 pastoral address against clerical involvement or participation in politics.<sup>140</sup> Early in the new year Lambert in private correspondence encouraged Doyle to open an attack on O'Connell.<sup>141</sup> Similarly in the press in a public letter to Doyle, the prominent Wexford Catholic, J. E. Devereux, more or less invited the bishop to lambast O'Connell on theological grounds, but in both cases the bishop refused to respond.<sup>142</sup> In private his criticism of O'Connell continued. Writing to Lord Cloncurry on 3 March 1834 Doyle referred to the 'evil genius' which troubled and tormented the country. He was extremely disappointed that middle-class Catholics, from the time of the December 1832 general election, had allowed themselves 'to be deceived, and then bestrode by the basest tyranny that ever established itself for any length of time in these latter ages'. This caused him to doubt whether the community was capable of benefiting from any liberal system of legislation. But he now acknowledged that it was in part owing to his poor state of health that his hopes for the progress of the country were weakened.<sup>143</sup>



The total failure of O'Connell's repeal motion in the House of Commons on 29 April 1834 by 523 to 38 votes undoubtedly confirmed Dr Doyle in his long-held conviction that repeal was impracticable.<sup>144</sup> Had Bishop Doyle lived he would have welcomed O'Connell's alliance with the whigs in the Lichfield House compact which resulted in significant reform measures for Ireland in the period 1835-1840. Whether Doyle would have approved of all these reform measures is a moot point. For instance he would certainly have disapproved of the poor law, 1838, as introduced. But he would have recognised the irony and lamented the delay in O'Connell's decision to adopt the course he had urged from late 1830 as the most beneficial for his country.

### CHAPTER III

#### INTERDENOMINATIONAL RELATIONS

The interdenominational controversies of the 1820s were not generally the result of initial Catholic polemic. More usually they were the consequence of Protestant initiative and Catholic reaction. Bishop Doyle's first entry into print under the thinly-veiled guise of 'A Roman Catholic Prelate' was made in response to a pastoral charge of Dr Thomas O'Beirne, Anglican bishop of Meath, in October 1821.<sup>1</sup> In his charge O'Beirne (who was a convert from Catholicism) claimed that the Catholic clergy anathemised all reading or use of the scriptures unless accompanied by notes or explanations 'which makes it their gospel and not that of the Apostles and Evangelists'.<sup>2</sup> Under his episcopal cloak Dr Doyle responded that this aggression could not be dissembled without seeming to acquiesce in the allegation. He deemed it his 'duty as a Prelate' and the just calls of an offended body to refute O'Beirne's charge.<sup>3</sup> This dispute centred on the fundamental issue of Bible-reading. In three further public letters Doyle complained of the unfair proselytising methods of biblical societies (to which O'Beirne himself was hostile). Doyle's final letter in this sequence, that of 27 December 1821, manifested an awareness of an ecumenical dimension in the history of Catholic-Protestant relations.<sup>4</sup>

These four letters of 'A Roman Catholic Prelate' serve as a foretaste and a prelude to what was to come. They are an indication of Doyle's unwillingness to let public slights on the Catholic faith from any Irish Anglican bishop pass unchallenged; they show the likelihood of Doyle being drawn into prolonged newspaper controversy

especially when responding to the inevitable unfriendly criticisms of his letters in the Protestant press. And as much as Dr Doyle proclaimed his dislike of controversy he soon became the most controversial Catholic prelate in Ireland. Even so the ecumenical awareness in Doyle's writings seems to suggest that if these Anglican challenges to Catholicism had not been made then Bishop Doyle was unlikely to have inspired them (as he subsequently did) by his own pronouncements.

In his primary visitation of St Patrick's Cathedral on 24 October 1822 Archbishop Magee attempted to show in his charge that the Protestant Church was the one genuine Catholic and Apostolical Church. In the process he gratuitously attacked the Irish Roman Catholic and Presbyterian churches respectively in the following terms:

We, my Reverend Brethren, are placed in a station, in which we are hemmed in by two opposite descriptions of professing Christians: the one possessing a Church, without what we can properly call a Religion; and the other possessing a Religion, without what we can properly call a Church: the one so blindly enslaved to a supposed infallible authority, as not to seek in the Word of God a reason for the faith they profess; the other, so confident in the infallibility of their individual judgement as to the reasons of their faith that they deem it their duty to resist all authority in matters of religion. 5

The chapter of St Patrick's Cathedral passed a unanimous resolution congratulating its archbishop on being entitled to the gratitude 'of all who value the interest of pure religion and the safety of the Established Church'.<sup>6</sup>

Bishop Doyle's reply to Archbishop Magee was published under the J.K.L. monogram on 7 November 1822. Doyle condemned the intolerance of Magee's language which he said descended almost to the level of name calling: 'better to abstain from harsh language than to provoke retorts'. J.K.L. rebutted Magee's assertions with his own

serious questioning of the validity of Anglican orders. He challenged the archbishop to produce his claim to the word 'apostolic' and he speculated on why Catholics were always repelling attacks rather than meting them out.<sup>7</sup> John MacHale of Maynooth College and Archbishop Curtis of Armagh were similarly moved to reply to Archbishop Magee. MacHale, writing as Hierophilos, like Doyle, doubted the continuity of succession in the Anglican Church. He found praise for the Presbyterians whom he stated were opposed to the Established Church. He suggested that it would have been prudent for Archbishop Magee to have paused before he insulted the religious feeling of those on whom he depended for his 'splendid revenues'.<sup>8</sup>

Archbishop Curtis attributed a riot against evangelical preachers in his diocese at Ardee to the effect on the public mind of Archbishop Magee's 'unprovoked aggression'. On the day after the Ardee riot a calf's head was placed on the altar of the Catholic chapel in the town. Enthusiasts, he claimed, had taken advantage of Dr Magee's 'scandalous example to pour forth their torrents of abuse'. However he cautioned his diocesan clergy against any public comment on religious controversy without his approval. Public tranquillity, he asserted, must be preserved, regardless of what provocation or injuries Catholics received. Dr Curtis drew a distinction between the 'arrogant . . . aggressor' and the 'moderate apologist' reluctantly bound to vindicate his religious principles when they were attacked. Obviously he saw himself in the latter category. Curtis supposed that the government could not be indifferent to the 'pointed injury' done to Catholics by Magee. He felt that Magee's charge constituted an 'actionable libel' but however much he complained it seems unlikely that he had any

intention of taking such an action against the Anglican archbishop of Dublin.<sup>9</sup>

'No one pities his Grace' wrote Archbishop Murray to Doyle of Magee. Murray's ears had almost been deafened by the shouts of vendors selling the pamphlets of J.K.L. and Dr Curtis in reply to Magee's charge.<sup>10</sup> Satisfaction with Doyle's letter was also expressed by the Maynooth President, Dr Crotty, who told Doyle that his reply was 'an admirable check on the presumption of those good people who think that no treatment can be too bad for the papists'.<sup>11</sup> The pamphlet rejoinder to Bishop Doyle of the evangelical clergyman, Sir Harcourt Lees, led Archbishop Murray to exclaim: 'If ever reason held her seat in the Revd Baronet's noddle, her throne seems to have experienced a decisive shock'.<sup>12</sup> A month after the first edition of J.K.L.'s reply to Magee no less than eight editions of his work had been printed and sold. Two editions, running to five hundred copies each, of Sir Harcourt Lees's pamphlet, had also sold out.<sup>13</sup>

In early December 1822 Archbishop Magee published an authorised version of his charge which again drew responses from his principal Catholic critics who had been led to expect a modified and more moderate version of his pastoral. J.K.L.'s reply appeared on 14 December. Doyle proclaimed that he had never willingly entered into either public or private religious controversy. He allowed that the feelings he brought to his estimation of Magee's explanation of his charge were 'much more subdued' than his first production.<sup>14</sup> Archbishop Curtis for his part, found that Magee's 'proposed remedy' was 'worse if possible than the disease'. He accused Magee, by the audacity of his charge of having let loose a 'phalanx of sycophants and stipendiary scribblers'.<sup>15</sup> Hierophilos contended that anyone

who was familiar with Magee's writings would have known that no change was to be expected from that quarter. For him, Magee's charge remained a 'calumnious libel on the Catholic Church, and on the great majority of the Nation'.<sup>16</sup>

Polemical evangelical writers who now entered the fray attacked J.K.L.'s replies to Dr Magee and also his pastoral letter against Ribbonmen in the deanery of Kilcock which was published between his first and second letters to Magee. In his pastoral Doyle attributed one of the reasons for Ribbonism to the obverse and reverse faces of religious identity: love of Catholicism and hatred of Orangeism. But he insisted that Orangemen were 'our brethren in Christ'; the great Christian precept was 'to love God above all things and your neighbour as yourself for the love of God' and this included all men, even those who differed from Catholics in religious belief.<sup>17</sup> Doyle had difficulty in treating seriously of the belief in prophecies which was evidently widespread as a causative factor in the growth of secret societies in the early 1820s and a contributor to interdenominational discord.<sup>18</sup> In 1822 and again in 1825 it was necessary for the bishop to warn his flock against the influence of prophecies. Belief in prophecies he attributed to the 'excessive credulity of the peasantry and their superstitious attachment to fables a thousand times belied'. For fifty years it had been claimed that King George IV would not reign yet even his visit to Ireland had scarcely dispelled that notion. Instances of heads of families abandoning their home in the vain expectation that great changes were fast approaching were actually known to Doyle. The prophecy most widely disseminated was Bishop Walmesley's History of the Christian Church... which was pseudonymously published as Pastorini's

Prophecies. The Rathangan magistrate, William Evans, reported in 1822 to the Irish under-secretary, William Gregory, that this book 'has got very generally into the hands of the lower classes, who have the fullest conviction and confidence in the fulfilment. . . ' of the prophecy, namely the destruction of the Protestant Church in 1825.<sup>19</sup> Doyle informed his flock that Pastorini dealt with the last book of the New Testament, the Apocalypse of St John the Evangelist, which was at best an extraordinarily difficult text to interpret. In that text Martin Luther imagined that he had discovered that Rome was Babylon and the pope, antichrist. Pastorini alleged that the star which fell from heaven in St John's revelation was an analogy for Lutheranism which would be extinguished after three hundred years. Doyle observed with academic accuracy that Lutheranism and Protestantism were not identical and that the expected demise of the latter was highly unlikely. Realistically he maintained that 'nothing short of a miracle' would produce religious uniformity in Ireland. It was however exactly such a deus ex machina which the millenarian interpretation of the prophecies of Pastorini led a deluded populace to expect. In deprecating Pastorini, Doyle urged his flock to read and study the books available to them in the chapel libraries of their parishes.<sup>20</sup>

Doyle was perhaps anxious to have his thoroughly moderate and ecumenical pastoral of November 1822 counterpointed with Magee's charge thus exposing the Anglican archbishop as a religious enthusiast.<sup>21</sup> Archbishop Curtis complained that Doyle's 'excellent Pastoral Letter' had been 'unworthily mangled, misapplied and impugned, as hypocritical and insincere, by the irreconcilable enemies of all Conciliation, Peace and Concord, as well as of True

Religion'.<sup>22</sup> Relations between Doyle and Dr John Milner had been very poor on the subject of Catholic Emancipation. But now impressed by the forcefulness of Doyle's response to Magee, Milner asked Doyle to continue on his behalf the polemical controversy which raged over Milner's own work, ironically entitled The end of controversy. Milner's appointment of Doyle as his chosen polemical successor was an unusual mark of esteem from that turbulent cleric.<sup>23</sup> As it turned out Doyle was to generate more controversy than even Dr Milner might have anticipated.

Archbishop Magee's open hostility to the Catholic Church was shared by brethren on the episcopal bench such as Archbishop Le Poer Trench of Tuam and Richard Mant of Killaloe and Kilfenora.<sup>24</sup> A somewhat more refined position was adopted by John Jebb, bishop of Limerick. He stated that vis-à-vis Anglicanism, Roman Catholicism was 'a less perfect form of Christianity'.<sup>25</sup> Anglican clergymen ought to maintain the faith uncompromisingly, but he continued amicably: 'the same privilege, we ought on the principles, I will not say of toleration, but of Christian liberty, to allow to our brethren of the Church of Rome; and while we thus honestly agree to differ, we should, with all charity, endeavour to maintain unity of spirit, in the bonds of peace'.<sup>26</sup> Jebb, however, to Doyle's chagrin, was strongly opposed to Catholic Emancipation and argued against it in the House of Lords. In almost direct contrast to Archbishop Magee, the Englishman Richard Laurence, who was appointed archbishop of Cashel and Emly in 1822, was moderate and ecumenical. In his primary visitation charge in September the scholarly former regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford stated that 'as christians we owe to all, who are designated by that blessed name, by which we ourselves are designated, fraternal affection . . .'.<sup>27</sup>



Bishop Doyle's pastoral of June 1823 promulgating a miracle was an extraordinary development which simultaneously captured the spirit of almost millenarian fervour within Irish Catholicism in the mid-1820s and fuelled interdenominational polemic to an intense degree by outraging evangelicals and many Protestants.<sup>28</sup> On 27 June 1823 Daniel O'Connell informed his wife that Dublin was 'ringing with a miracle of Prince Hohenlohe's effected on a Miss Lalor at Maryboro' and authenticated in a pastoral letter published by Bishop Doyle. The miracle would 'create a sensation all over Europe', O'Connell observed 'because Dr Doyle is admitted by the very worst of the Orange faction to be a man of the utmost ability and probity'.<sup>29</sup>

It is necessary to consider the circumstances which caused Doyle to publish a miracle. Prince Alexander Hohenlohe was a young Catholic priest and canon of the cathedral chapter of Bamberg in Bavaria. In February 1821 he recovered from illness apparently in consequence of the prayers of a devout peasant named Martin Michel. Hohenlohe's fame was established when with the help of Michel he was instrumental in effecting the recovery of a German princess who had been paralysed for eight years. As a result Prince Hohenlohe was deluged with requests for his intervention in seemingly hopeless cases of illness from all over the Catholic world. By 1823 he was the recipient of fifty letters a day. He sought the sanction of Rome for his activities and was advised not to attempt public cures. He however continued them in private. His method, in response to correspondents, was to announce a date on which he would pray and say Mass for the afflicted, requiring them in turn to perform religious exercises and penances. Through this means sensational cures, which infuriated evangelicals in Germany, were attributed to his

intercession in continental Europe, England and America as well as in Ireland where Bishop Doyle was the first bishop to proclaim a miracle. Rome did not pronounce judgement on Hohenlohe's cures (nor was one then required under Church teaching) but the fact that he was subsequently made a bishop would indicate good standing in the Catholic Church.<sup>30</sup>

While preaching in Mountrath parish during Lent, 1823, Bishop Doyle was contacted by James Lalor of Cromogue, Roshelton, who was accompanied by Nicholas O'Connor, parish priest of Maryborough. Lalor requested Doyle's intervention with Prince Hohenlohe on behalf of his eighteen-year-old daughter who after a long illness had lost her entire faculty of speech six years and five months previously. Her father had consulted eminent Dublin medical opinion but to no avail. Indeed the girl had been 'electrified' many times in Carlow College.<sup>31</sup> Bishop Doyle duly wrote to Prince Hohenlohe who responded by offering to celebrate Mass in Bamberg for Miss Lalor at nine o'clock on the morning of 10 June 1823.<sup>32</sup> He requested that she undertake a series of religious penitentials for nine days prior to the Mass which should also be celebrated simultaneously in Maryborough. Dr Doyle followed Hohenlohe's instructions faithfully and allowed one hour and twelve minutes for the time difference between Maryborough and Bamberg. He advised Rev Nicholas O'Connor to say Mass shortly before eight o'clock on the day in question.

During the Mass at Maryborough which was attended by a large congregation which had undoubtedly learned of its hoped for purpose Miss Lalor made a complete recovery of her powers of speech. The effect of this happening in stimulating religious fervour throughout the diocese is incalculable but must almost certainly have been

considerable. O'Connor informing Doyle of what had occurred stated that 'as she returned home in the afternoon, the doors and windows in the street through which she passed were crowded with persons, gazing with wonder at this monument of the power and goodness of Almighty God'.<sup>33</sup> Bishop Doyle proceeded immediately to Maryborough to satisfy himself of the nature of the cure. Two weeks later he published a pastoral which began: 'We announce to you, dearest brethren, a splendid miracle . . .'. Doyle was so overwhelmed by the event that he called it, rather overstating the case, 'not inferior in magnitude to the raising of the dead to life'.<sup>34</sup> He welcomed the miracle for its own sake and significantly for the psychological boost it gave to a politically downtrodden Irish Catholic community:

Our religion is traduced - our rights are withheld - our good name is maligned - our best actions are misrepresented - crimes are imputed to us, against which our nature revolts, our friends are silenced, and our enemies insult us, and glory in our humiliation. It is meet therefore, and just, that he for whose name and faith we suffer, should cast upon us a look of compassion, lest we faint in the way, or be overcome by temptation - that he should comfort his people - and renew to them by visible signs, an assurance that he watches over them.<sup>35</sup>

This political strain was challenged by the more perspicacious Protestant writers. One observed of this passage: 'It is the first time and the first place that a miracle ever was supposed to have been performed for a political purpose'.<sup>36</sup>

In his evidence before the committee of the House of Lords on the state of Ireland Doyle was somewhat more circumspect. He was asked and pressed on whether the miracles ascribed to Prince Hohenlohe were

considered by Roman Catholics as evidence of the Divine favour towards that Church? - I was personally concerned in one of them. I have considered that an instance in which the Almighty was pleased to interfere, and show his mercy to the individual

who was affected. - Is it not likewise considered as a proof of the intention of the Almighty to interfere for the recovery of the Roman Catholic Church from its present state of oppression? - As a proof that the Almighty has watched over the faithful of that Church. 37

Daniel O'Connell was among those who requested Bishop Doyle's intervention with Prince Hohenlohe in cases in which they were interested.<sup>38</sup> Hohenlohe received so many applications for his intercession that he decided to offer up Masses, for countries on specified days rather than individuals. These dates were made known well in advance and contributed to a spirit of religious regeneration and enthusiasm in Ireland. 1 August and 1 September 1823 were designated by Hohenlohe as days of prayer for the sick in Ireland. On 1 August, Mrs Mary Stuart, a paralytic nun in the Discalced Carmelite convent in Ranelagh, Dublin, made a full recovery which was credited to the intercession of Prince Hohenlohe. On 19 August, less than two months after Doyle's pastoral, Archbishop Murray of Dublin, issued a pastoral proclaiming the miraculous cure of Mrs Stuart through a 'supernatural agency'. Dr Murray's pastoral was accompanied by many medical testimonials stating that the formerly afflicted person had indeed recovered.<sup>39</sup> Further publicly-known cures in Dublin attributed to Prince Hohenlohe's intercession on 1 September 1823 included those of a Miss Dowell of Merrion Square who had been paralysed for four years and Michael Read, a boot-maker of Coal Quay.<sup>40</sup> The Jesuits of Clongowes Wood in Clane parish sent Bishop Doyle accounts of several cures which took place in the vicinity of their college on 1 September. Miss Mary Scully of Clane made a partial recovery from paralysis on that day. There was nothing miraculous about her cure according to the physician who attended her but lay people familiar with her condition, thought differently,

indeed 'she has been visited by every one for miles around the country and by many from distant places'; 'every one besides the physicians who knew her case (and who did not know it?) is of opinion that it was truly miraculous and extraordinary'. Local Catholics and Protestants agreed, Doyle was informed, that 'the finger of God was there'.<sup>41</sup> A case nearly similar to the foregoing was that of James Kelly, a young man who resided near Clongowes and who had been dismissed from hospital as incurable. He had completely lost the use of his limbs and he was covered with ulcers. He had been lying on a bed of straw on a damp floor - bedridden - 'without ever being able to leave it or being able to move hands or feet'. Kelly 'heard that there were to be great miracles wrought on 1 September and he joined his prayers with the rest confidently hoping that God would restore him. He had no Mass nor did he think of asking for it'. On the day he fell into a deep sleep and woke up with the full use of his body with the partial exception of one of his feet.<sup>42</sup> In the Presentation Convent, Carlow, after extensive preparation for the appointed day, 1 September - on that morning no less than four Masses were celebrated simultaneously in the convent - Sister Mary Paul Ward made a complete recovery from very serious illness. Her recovery was regarded as miraculous by Bishop Doyle and his clergy. According to the convent annals 'a solemn Mass was appointed by the bishop in thanksgiving for the miracle' and a Te Deum was sung in the convent over an eight-day period.<sup>43</sup>

It was cases such as these which Bishop Doyle had in mind when he subsequently wrote in October 1823 that both he and Archbishop Murray had refrained from publishing 'several miraculous cures . . . that they should not give occasion to intemperance of any kind; that

they might not seem to continue the present agitation of the public feeling'.<sup>44</sup> He also stated that the affidavits put forward as proof of the cures were deliberately short and hesitating so that 'no triumphs were given to either party'.<sup>45</sup> Archbishop Curtis was also concerned that the public mind which the Catholic bishops had a duty to restrain and moderate was 'raised to an alarming degree of enthusiasm'. Curtis gave his 'unqualified adhesion to every syllable' of the Murray pastoral but he suggested to Murray that he should use his influence to preclude further episcopal pronouncements of miracles until they had been submitted to Rome and had received the approval of the Holy See. Curtis was afraid that the other bishops would follow the example of Murray and Doyle but without their prudence and discrimination. He feared that without the authority of Rome the promulgation of miracles by members of the episcopal bench would 'always be uncertain'.<sup>46</sup> He, unlike Doyle and Murray, apparently overlooked the fact that the Council of Trent gave every bishop full authority in this area.

The questions and answers which formed part of Doyle's examination before the Lords' committee in 1825 demonstrated Doyle's own cautious almost sceptical approach to the credence to be placed in miracles.

Have these miracles been acknowledged by the court of Rome?

The court of Rome has taken no cognisance of them.

The Roman bishops still feel themselves entitled to receive them as miracles?

The bishop in his own diocese has a right to examine into the fact, and to receive the miracle if his mind is convinced; but his declaration in its favour does not bind any one.

With respect to all miracles now wrought, the right of private judgement is exercised by every individual seriatim?

Of course.

Till they have been acknowledged by the head of the church?

And even then, I think, a declaration of the head of the church on a miracle does not bind the faith of any one; it would be irreverent to doubt it; but it is a matter on which the Pope and a general council might be in error.

But it is a matter in which you believe, and which you would inculcate on those you instruct?

It is not a matter I would inculcate, because I think it unnecessary to do so; it is not a matter which can form a part of such instruction as we give to the people; but I do believe it myself. It is the doctrine of our Church, that miracles are wrought in every country, and in every age, when the Almighty may think it necessary to do so for the relief of any of his creatures, who petition him in the spirit of humility and faith. 47

In England Bishop Doyle's pastoral and correspondence with Prince Hohenlohe was published for profit by Hatchards of London. The hostile publisher's foreward was typical of Protestant reaction at the time:

Those who flattered themselves that the superstitions of the Roman Catholic religion were giving way to the light of truth, will scarcely be able to repress their astonishment that a man of considerable talent and good sense (which Dr Doyle certainly is) could lend the authority of his name to so extravagant a story.

When a Prelate of the Roman Catholic Church gives currency to such a tale, and comments on it in the manner he has done, can it excite any surprise that the wretched uneducated population of Ireland should lend too ready an ear to the prophecies of another Bishop of their Communion (Bishop Walmsley) who has written, under the assumed name of Signor Pastorini, foretelling the total extirpation of the Protestant heresy in the year 1825?

It is notorious to every person acquainted with the present state of the south of Ireland, that the disturbances (little short of rebellion) which exist there, have been mainly exasperated by these prophecies, and it seems quite obvious, that the more the spirit of superstition is encouraged, the more evidence they will obtain - Can Dr Doyle himself believe the truth of the miracle he records? If he does, what are we to think of his judgement? If he does not, for what object has he published it? 48

'A clergyman of the Established Church' in a pamphlet addressed to both Archbishop Murray and Bishop Doyle argued that but for the testimony of these prelates as to the reality of the miracles they would have been regarded 'as one of the idle rumours of the day'. The fact that the miracles were published with supporting documentation, affidavits, etc., was a call to all to either support or reject them.

This anonymous clergyman also attempted to link the miracles to the effects of Pastorini's prophecies:

Prophecies have been circulated among the people, holding forth the expectation that at an approaching period, the hand of God is visibly to interfere on behalf of your Church, and that Protestants are then to be driven away as locusts from the face of the earth . . . The supposed miracles are naturally regarded as the commencement of the expected interference. 49

This was a theme common to all Anglican clerics hostile to the miracles. The Rev Dr William Phelan writing anonymously in Miracles Mooted connected the miracles to the prophecies of Pastorini which he said were widely in the mouths of the lower orders and which predicated the overthrow of Protestantism: 'Doctors Doyle and Murray are . . . preaching, not regeneration but that which must lead to extermination'.<sup>50</sup> Rev Alexander Carson, a Presbyterian minister; was the anonymous author of Remarks on the late miracle... which quickly went through four editions. He also argued that the miracles had a political as well as a religious purpose. Carson was 'fully convinced that the agency of Satan is exerted in favour of the Church of Rome'.<sup>51</sup> The Rev George Stanley Faber, Rector of Long-Newton, suggested that the Devil - 'the man of sin' - was responsible for the miracles.<sup>52</sup> Likewise the Rev Joseph Finlayson detected the imprint of a 'cloven foot' in the Irish miracles.<sup>53</sup> Prominent controversialists such as the Rev Robert Daly, the evangelical rector of Powerscourt, and the like-minded Rev Caesar Otway, curate of Lucan, delivered and published sermons hostile to the miracles in September 1823.<sup>54</sup> Protestant ranks were thrown into some confusion however when a liberal Protestant writing under the pseudonym 'E. Barton' published Miracles a Rhapsody and other works, which though hostile to miracles were well disposed towards Bishop Doyle and not enamoured of the wealth of the Established Church in Ireland.<sup>55</sup> The works of 'E.



Barton' stood in stark contrast with the great majority of Protestant writers on the miracles who were roundly abusive of Bishop Doyle, Archbishop Murray and the tenets of Catholicism.

Sectarian divisions on Catholic-Protestant lines manifested themselves even in the response of Dublin medical practitioners to the miracles. Arthur Jacob, M.D., a leading young specialist, offered a mental or psychological explanation in a quietly reasoned pamphlet published on 25 September 'while the subject had possession of the public mind'. He ascribed the recoveries, alleged to be miraculous, to the influence of the imagination.<sup>56</sup> An anonymous writer, 'A Physician' who came before the public at this time also attempted to attribute the recoveries of Miss Lalor and Mrs Stuart to the nervous enthusiasm of women which could be explained as hypochondria according to natural principles. The miracles were discussed by all and treated according to the religious or more likely political views of the parties 'with levity or awe, with admiration or contempt'. An advertisement for the second edition of this work noted that the miracles were being debated with all the bitterness of religious and political animosity. Harsh shibboleths were commonplace. Catholic believers in the miracles were labelled 'fanatics' or 'imposters' and Protestant unbelievers were labelled 'infidels'.<sup>57</sup>

The pamphlet of 'A Physician' was generally attributed to Dr Cheyne, a leading light of Irish medicine. He had been in attendance on Mrs Stuart and had signed one of the affidavits acknowledging her sudden recovery which had been printed with Archbishop Murray's pastoral letter. However, prodded by the Rev Robert Daly he had subsequently stated that Mrs Stuart's recovery was not miraculous. The Catholic response emanated from Joseph Joy Magee, M.D., in a

public letter to Dr Cheyne. He contended that Mrs Stuart, whom he had also examined, had symptoms of nervous diseases, and an 'apoplectic tendency' but no hysterical affection.<sup>58</sup> Edward Sheridan, M.D., also took Dr Cheyne to task. He argued that it was not true to state that there can be 'nothing miraculous in any thing which can be accounted for on natural principles'. Sheridan stated that the archbishop of Dublin's pastoral 'gave great offence to the domineering faction, as if it were criminal in Dr Murray to do his duty' but that 'many of the reflecting part of the community of every denomination of people, found their minds seriously arrested by the late event at Ranelagh'.<sup>59</sup>

In his Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Irish Catholics published in October 1823 Bishop Doyle vigorously defended the historicity and status of miracles in the Catholic Church. He affirmed how he and Archbishop Murray had merely followed the guidelines laid down by the Council of Trent for dealing with miracles. To guard against falsehoods being declared genuine miracles the Church at Trent decreed that no miracle was to be published unless previously inquired into, ascertained and accredited by the Ordinary of the diocese where the miracle occurred.<sup>60</sup> Doyle favoured public discussion of the miracles which had been published but he was not prepared to soak up the abuse which had been liberally showered on himself and Archbishop Murray. His formidable response inspired by the scale of evangelical polemical vituperation of the published pastorals went far beyond a mere defence of the miracles which had been promulgated and opened out into a scathing critique of the Church Establishment in Ireland.

Catholics, stated Doyle, objected 'not to the Church, but to the Establishment'.<sup>61</sup> This expression is the key to an understanding

of the bishop's public attitude to Protestants and their Church. The notion that Protestant clergymen were 'the pastors of the Irish people' might dupe the English public but would be scoffed at by anyone familiar with Ireland.<sup>62</sup> He attacked the laws which upheld this fictional relationship between the parson and the Catholic flock: 'To found laws on relations which do not exist, is the very extreme of error in legislation; any such laws though written on parchment, can never have a moral existence'.<sup>63</sup> He forecast the eventual abolition of tithes despite 'whatever barriers may be raised against it' in Ireland.<sup>64</sup> Peace or concord would not be re-established in Ireland while the tithe charge remained. Catholics respected the Anglican Church because of its origins in Catholicism but not the Church Establishment which was opposed to all the interests of Ireland. Her clergymen were supporters of a libellous press and were 'uniformly and systematically' opposed to every effort in favour of Catholic Emancipation.<sup>65</sup> They were men with a profession but no occupation who to pass the time became evangelicals or religious enthusiasts distributing Bibles to Catholics who only wanted food and employment.<sup>66</sup> Doyle objected vehemently to the suggestion of Protestant polemicists that Catholics were intent on recovering their Church possessions. Doyle stated that he would never accept tithes no more than he would a regium donum.<sup>67</sup>

Doyle was determined to vindicate Catholicism from the standard accusations of being anti-Christian, superstitious, opposed to the diffusion of education by which was meant Bible-reading, desirous of overthrowing the Established Church and fomenting rebellion against the state. Doyle also rebutted the charge that the Catholic Church was intolerant. Intolerance was a word he found always odious.

Religious intolerance was a species of intolerance distinct in itself. It was one of the first consequences of the idea of divine revelation - the doctrine of exclusion and exclusivity was allied to that of salvation. Therefore the doctrine of exclusive salvation and religious intolerance were in fact synonymous. It was unfair to impute this doctrine to Catholicism alone as it could be found in all the churches originating at the Reformation. Many exceptions to the general rule were admitted by all churches. Catholicism did not hold that sects or heresies could achieve salvation but it did not disallow those who never defiled their baptismal innocence; those whose errors were not wilful; those who did not violate the law of God; and those whom God pardoned at death.<sup>68</sup> The oath and declaration which public servants were required to take against the invocation of the saints, transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass were a 'stain on our jurisprudence as well as a testimony of the religious intolerance' of the time when they were enacted. They should be abolished even though the Oath of Supremacy be retained to ascertain the connection of Catholics with the pope, a security Doyle was prepared to allow.<sup>69</sup>

The bishop drew an important distinction between religious and civil exclusion under the laws which led him to favour the separation of church and state. He stated that where the social conduct of men was 'not in opposition to the law of nature, or to the preservation and well-being of the state their speculative religious opinions should never be taken cognisance of by the law.'<sup>70</sup> It was necessary for Doyle in the Vindication to demonstrate that he was not personally intolerant. From his boyhood, he declared, he had been connected through ties of friendship, affection and blood with

Protestants and he had never distinguished between their creeds. In carrying out his ecclesiastical duties he had never preached a controversial sermon. Moreover in a passage which Bishop Milner found more calculated to soothe Protestants than to edify Catholics Doyle stated that he had never endeavoured to use 'arguments or influence in private, to make proselytes to his creed' even though he had received 'many' individuals into the Catholic faith; 'why we should anticipate the judgement of God, and hate each other for the sake of Christ who died for us all, is to me . . . unintelligible'.<sup>71</sup>

In common with all Protestant writers the author of Complete Exposure of the late Irish miracles... held that J.K.L.'s Vindication could more properly be called an 'assault upon the character and existence of Established Church'.<sup>72</sup> Several hostile writers noticed that the Vindication had received the sanction of the Catholic Association. Rev William Phelan replied to the Vindication under the pseudonym 'Declan' in his work, The Case of the Church of Ireland Stated... . He allowed that Doyle was 'the ablest and most influential man' among the Catholic hierarchy.<sup>73</sup> He also acknowledged his originality: 'there is a felicity in his manner, which almost appropriates everything he seizes'.<sup>74</sup> But for all that Declan attached J.K.L.'s vehement declaration discerning in the Vindication 'the narrowmindedness of the bigot, the abstraction of the schoolman, or the flippant arrogance of the modern demagogue'.<sup>75</sup> Declan's well-written pamphlet discussed the controversy between Catholic and Protestant writers claiming that the primitive Church of Ireland was not as J.K.L. assumed a branch of the Church of Rome. This work was at its best where Phelan discussed J.K.L.'s much-quoted reference to the 'thousand grievances' of the Irish nation:

. . . this union - this mutual implication - of sectarian, of national, and of family spirit, which makes the lower classes in Ireland, at the present moment, objects of such painful - such fearful - interest. In every one of these respects, and in every one alike, they regard Englishmen as invaders - as the despoilers of their Church - the conquerors of their country - and the usurpers of their own estates.

They are humbled . . . but they are not subdued; their claims are dormant, but not extinguished, and it is entirely a matter of fundamental calculation with them, when and how those claims shall be re-asserted. 76

The anonymous parson, author of Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. ... acknowledged that the Vindication was 'hailed with great joy' by Irish Catholics 'as the ablest defence both of their character and their conduct that has for a long time appeared'.<sup>77</sup> This very partisan work attacked J.K.L.'s pamphlet on historical, religious and controversial grounds: 'I do not think I use any exaggeration when I describe its history as misrepresentation, its politics as seditious, its religion as faith without reason, and its controversy as zeal without either knowledge or charity'.<sup>78</sup> Protestants had laughed at the miracles and Doyle in response had allowed his anger to get the better of his prudence. The proclamation of the miracles by the Catholic bishops was seen by Protestant writers as a direct challenge to their belief - that the 'truth' rested with Catholics. The author of Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. ... labelled the claimed miracles as 'one of the marks of the religion on the Antichrist'.<sup>79</sup> This writer clearly recognised that J.K.L.'s Vindication marked a change in the Catholic approach; hitherto Catholics had not provoked but retaliated to attacks upon them but Doyle's aggressive work marked a new departure.<sup>80</sup>

Rev Alexander Carson attacked Doyle in another anonymous and highly abusive pamphlet entitled Strictures on the letter of

J.K.L. ... which once again decried the Church of Rome as the man of Sin. Six million Irish were enslaved by superstition invented by the Devil.<sup>81</sup> Carson contended that J.K.L.'s Vindication 'must be of more use to open the eyes of his Majesty's Government to the imminent danger of the country, than the most intemperate statement and loudest complaints of those who are considered mere alarmists'.<sup>82</sup> The divine Charles Richard Elrington, F.T.C.D. (son of Thomas Elrington, Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns), argued that J.K.L. instead of proving the justice of his cause had 'menaced his opponents with the power of the party to which he belongs . . .'.<sup>83</sup> Elrington in his pamphlet Miscellaneous observations on J.K.L.'s letter ... written under the pseudonym S.N. accused J.K.L. as did others of 'Jesuitical' deviousness.<sup>84</sup> Doyle did not object to the Anglican Church but to its Establishment. S.N. pondered whether such a distinction could plausibly be made. He maintained that it was because of the hostility of such as J.K.L. to the Church Establishment that Protestant objections to giving Catholics greater political power were based.<sup>85</sup>

Although J.K.L.'s Defence of the Vindication published at the end of January 1824 went through five editions from Coyne and was almost twice the length of the original Vindication it is a politically much less important work. The Defence of the Vindication was written to confirm the forceful impression made by the earlier work and to answer the host of critics who had entered the lists attacking miracles. Protestant polemicists attacking the Vindication had isolated the miracle issue as the weakest weapon in J.K.L.'s armoury. In response the Defence of the Vindication was concentrated much more narrowly on miracles than the Vindication had been. The

Church Establishment and the tithe system were treated to a much shorter attack than in the Vindication although they were the recipients of some stinging barbs. Comparing the Church of Ireland bishops of Kildare and Leighlin, Drs Lindsay and Elrington respectively with the Catholic bishop of that diocese, J.K.L. wrote: 'let these collect the fleeces while he superintends the flock'.<sup>86</sup> Tithe proctors were dismissed as 'a race less worthy than those who traverse the field of battle to despoil the dead'.<sup>87</sup> Doyle noticed Miracles Mooted, Complete Exposure, Rhapsody, and Apologetic Postscript as the more consequential of the pamphlet replies to the miracles. But he reserved his most serious criticism for the work of Phelan alias Declan in The Case of the Church of Ireland Stated. J.K.L. was quick to assert that Declan's work could not be compared with William Molyneux's The Case of Ireland Stated whose title it imitated.<sup>88</sup> Phelan was a convert from Catholicism and J.K.L. reminded him that he was 'the advocate of a system hostile to Ireland and to the faith of his fathers'. He accused him of ignorance and of having only a patina of learning on the subjects under discussion. In keeping with the tone of the Defence of the Vindication when compared with the Vindication J.K.L. refrained from treating Declan's work to a full display of his robust critical faculties. Were J.K.L. to retort to Declan by commenting on the scandals 'of what is called a Reformation, I might wound the feelings of many worthy men, but I would not advance the interests of peace'.<sup>89</sup> The Patrician question had long been a battleground between the Churches and it was the main point at issue between J.K.L. and Declan. The legitimacy of succession in the Protestant Church at the Reformation - that much trodden source of interdenominational polemic - was also treated in some detail by the disputants.<sup>90</sup>



Protestant reaction to the Defence of the Vindication was muted. The anonymous parson who rhetorically asked of the Vindication: 'when such are the sentiments of a prelate what must be the feelings of a mob'<sup>91</sup> could yet accept that J.K.L. did not write 'so angrily' or 'so animatedly' in his rejoinder to his critics.<sup>92</sup> Declan in a new edition of his work continued to see deep and hidden meanings in the Catholics' renewal of their pretensions to miracles, prophecies and exclusive salvation 'for a purpose which they do not name'.<sup>93</sup> He also published The Case of the Church of Ireland Stated in a second letter ...<sup>94</sup> The evangelical clergyman, Rev Mortimer O'Sullivan, also published a polite apologia for the Church Establishment critical of J.K.L.'s Defence of the Vindication.<sup>95</sup>

Further evidence of new levels of interdenominational tensions was provided by the Burial bill dispute of 1823-1824. This arose from a sectarian dispute over the religious rites of burying the dead. Historically even after the Reformation Catholics had continued to bury their dead in their parish graveyards (which were usually adjacent to the parish churches) even though these sites were now in the possession of the Reform Church. There was among the Catholic population an understandable indeed natural traditional attachment to the burial grounds of their ancestors particularly an attachment to monastic sites which was upheld in the post-Reformation centuries and indirectly upheld by the fact that Catholics were forbidden in law from consecrating their own burial grounds.

However Catholic burial services did not actually take place in the graveyard. The obsequies were confined to the chapel or more likely the home of the deceased. In the graveyard the Catholic priest merely recited a short psalm with a common prayer as the grave was

about to be closed. If a Catholic clergyman was unable to be present then a member of the laity usually performed this task. Early in September 1823 at the height of the miracles sensation the Anglican sexton of Kevin Street Church in Dublin, apparently acting upon the orders of Archbishop Magee, prevented the Catholic Archdeacon of Dublin, Dr Michael Blake, from reciting a prayer over the grave of a Catholic parishioner.<sup>96</sup> The annoyance of Dr Blake was made plain in a public letter of 23 September 1823 where he rhetorically asked: 'Are the Catholics of Ireland obliged to submit to such debasing, such demoralizing fanaticism?'.<sup>97</sup> Daniel O'Connell ably supported Blake at the Catholic Association. He moved a resolution favouring the consecration of Catholic burial grounds.<sup>98</sup> In consequence of the activity of Archbishop Magee in the House of Lords, a Burial bill was brought forward in April 1824 which O'Connell considered 'pregnant with mischief'. Furthermore, he lamented, as did Doyle, that W. C. Plunket, the sponsor of the 1821 Emancipation bill and Attorney-General, was the chief supporter of the Burial bill through parliament.<sup>99</sup> Archbishop Murray chaired a meeting of his diocesan clergy which rejected Archbishop Magee's statement in the House of Lords that Catholic clergymen never officiated in Protestant graveyards.<sup>100</sup> The Burial act (5 George IV c.25) passed in 1824 made it incumbent on Catholic clergymen to seek the Protestant rector's permission to carry-out a burial in the parish graveyard. The rector was also given the right to fix the time of interment. Catholic clergymen refused en masse to abide by this law which however remained a dead letter on the statute book.

On 17 May 1825 Bishop Doyle consecrated in Naas parish the first Catholic graveyard since the passage of the Burial act. The object,

according to the parish priest of Naas, Gerald Doyle, was to obviate the necessity of complying with the Burial act. The attendance on the occasion included several Protestants and even it was reported some Protestant clergymen.<sup>101</sup> In 1825 Bishop Doyle opined that his priests had generally received kind treatment at the hands of the Protestant rectors in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin. Nonetheless, as Doyle informed the House of Commons select committee on the state of Ireland, within his diocese leave was not sought from any Protestant clergyman for permission to perform the funeral rites. There was only one instance where permission had been applied for and that by the Protestant father of a deceased Catholic. Doyle felt that among Catholic clergymen there was a very strong objection to applying for the rectors' permission which was conceived to be an act of submission to the Protestant clergymen.<sup>102</sup>

Dr Doyle suggested that the Burial act might easily be modified to meet Catholic views. The regulation requiring the priest to seek the rector's permission was very inconvenient because the latter might be absent or might refuse to answer the request. Instead of that requirement, Doyle proposed that the Catholic priest should be required to give a reasonable notice to the sexton of his intention to proceed with a burial. He also suggested that Catholics might not be allowed to proceed with burial during divine service.<sup>103</sup> This seemed at first like a typical example of Doyle's broadmindedness and generosity which won him many admirers and disconcerted more narrow-minded Catholics. But on closer examination what appeared to be a concession by the bishop amounted to very little. He was only suggesting that a de facto reality became a de jure one as it was unknown for interments to take place during divine service. As usual

Doyle was more concerned with realities than with appearances. In Doyle's opinion the act thus modified would be perfectly acceptable to Catholics and would not interfere with the prerogative of the Protestant clergy. He was not prepared to leave any veto in the hands of the Protestant clergymen as he held that all parishioners had an existing right to be interred in their parish churchyard.

Before the Commons' committee Doyle agreed that religious processions should be confined to churches, graveyards and their precincts but not allowed where the denominations were mixed as they might give offence to the religious feelings of one or other denomination.<sup>104</sup> He stated that he consecrated many Catholic graveyards but always, he maintained, 'with reluctance and pain' because he felt he was 'keeping open the separation, which was too wide, between men whom I would be most anxious to see united, both whilst living, and even after death'.<sup>105</sup> The Burial act of 1824 which drew a new line of distinction between Catholics and Protestants was a testimony to worsening interdenominational relations. In 1828, Thomas Spring Rice, Under-Secretary of State for Home Affairs, described the act as one of the 'lesser but still important causes of mischief'. The Burial act, in his opinion, only caused new division by leading to the creation of exclusive denominational graveyards which suggested that 'even in death we fellow Christians cannot bear to be united'. Spring Rice suggested a scheme whereby the danger of religious collision at funerals would be avoided: namely that Protestant burials take place before noon and Catholic burials in the other half of the day. Fearing contention he sought Archbishop Murray's confidential advice stating 'my best chance of success is being able to state that I act entirely and exclusively for and from myself'.<sup>106</sup> Nothing came

of Spring Rice's plan. Two years later in 1830, Thomas Wyse, the newly-elected M.P. for County Tipperary informed Bishop Doyle that he was thinking of moving for the repeal of the Burial act in its entirety. It was typical of the early stages of the post-Emancipation period that Wyse rather over-optimistically concluded that the time was ripe for such a measure.<sup>107</sup> The act remained on the statute book and occasionally even into the second half of the nineteenth century Protestant rectors endeavoured usually without success (and incurring much hostility) to enforce it.<sup>108</sup>

The political dimension of Bishop Doyle's letter on the union of the churches of May 1824 has already been considered. Here we are concerned with an analysis of the interdenominational dimension of this remarkable letter. Therein Doyle maintained that the turbulent state of Ireland was produced not only by the inequality of the laws but still more immediately by the 'incessant conflict of religious opinions'.<sup>109</sup> Doyle himself did not detract from this conflict by stating that the ministers of the Established Church 'are and will be detested by those who differ from them in religion' because of the oppression arising from tithes and Church rates. Moreover not even Catholic Emancipation despite being a great public measure with likely beneficial legislative consequences would cure the evil of the tithe system. Nor would Emancipation 'allay the fervour of religious zeal - the perpetual clashing of two Churches, one elevated, the other fallen, both high minded perhaps intolerant . . .'. Indeed Doyle stated with detachment that 'excessive religious zeal has always characterised the Irish'. If the peace of Ireland and the union with England could not be guaranteed by Emancipation, all would be remedied by a union of the churches which would effect a complete change in the dispositions of men.<sup>110</sup>

How was such a union of the churches to be achieved? Doyle opined that

if Protestant and Catholic divines were summoned by the crown to ascertain the points of agreement and difference between the churches, and that the result of their conferences were made the basis of a project to be treated on between the heads of the churches of Rome and England, the result might be more favourable than at present might be anticipated. 111

According to Doyle the chief points to be discussed by such a conference were: the canons of sacred scripture, faith, justification, Mass, sacraments, authority of tradition, councils, the papacy, celibacy of the clergy, the language of the liturgy, invocation of the saints, respect for images and prayers for the dead.

And in a very striking passage he maintained that

On most of these, it appears to me that there is no essential difference between Catholics and Protestants; the existing diversity of opinion arises, in most cases, from certain forms of words which admit of satisfactory explanation, or from the ignorance or misconception which ancient prejudice and ill-will produce and strengthen; they are pride and points of honour which keep us divided on many subjects, not a love of Christian humility, charity and truth. 112

Doyle added that he would willingly resign his see if by so doing he would further the cause of the union of the churches in any way.

On 7 June 1824 Thomas Newenham, a prominent writer and commentator on Ireland, responded to Doyle's letter exploring the possibility of harmonising the traditions of the churches of Rome and England. He had at first regarded Doyle's letter as 'puerile, visionary, vain and impracticable' but soon changed his mind.<sup>113</sup> In reply Doyle stated that he saw no evidence that the English government was likely to consider the reunion of the churches and he thought discussion of a subject 'so sacred and important' by private individuals could have no other effect than to increase religious dissension, already but too prevalent in both islands. Doyle stated

that he would not publish or write anything further on the subject unless circumstances which he did not envisage obliged him so to do.<sup>114</sup> When Newenham lamented Doyle's unwillingness to enter into discussion - which unwillingness he attributed to 'a few unavoidable prefatory ebullitions of a vexatious nature' - Doyle favoured him with another reply.<sup>115</sup> He reiterated that he was inspired in what he had written by his love for Ireland and his countrymen 'whether heterodox or otherwise'. He would follow up his proposal if he thought that it could be successful. He advised that the correspondence between Bossuet and Leibnitz and the Abbé Molanus should be examined as historical guidelines. The pope and the English government were the only people who could effect the reunion. Private individuals discussing the reunion would only lead to new schisms. Doyle concluded this correspondence by indicating that there was no question-mark over his loyalty to Rome:

. . . I would, with the grace of God, suffer death a thousand times, were it possible, rather than assent to anything regarding faith which would not be approved by the Successor of Peter. I am sure, I am certain that the Pope is the head of the Universal Church, and that the rejection of his just authority is ruinous to religion.<sup>116</sup>

Alexander Knox, a Protestant gentleman of marked theological disposition, informed Newenham that he thought reunion with Rome utterly impossible because of Protestant insistence on the right of private judgement. The purpose of Doyle, as of Bossuet, was to ensure 'substantial submission' by the Church of England to the Church of Rome. Knox disliked the proselytising activity of the controversialists and speculated that efforts to make converts from Catholicism 'are one extreme, while the project of union appears to be another'. He doubted, correctly, whether it would be possible 'to leap at once from the extreme of rigid and impassioned animosity into the diametrically opposite state of coalescence and unity'.<sup>117</sup>

The pamphleteers' response to the union of the churches' letter was mixed though generally unfavourable. It was noticeable however that the letter failed to produce the usual, outraged and highly abusive replies with one exception, that of 'Offellus Hibernus Catholicus'.<sup>118</sup> Rather 'A member of the Established Church' and 'A Christian priest' praised Doyle for his 'valuable document',<sup>119</sup> and his 'christian benevolence' respectively,<sup>120</sup> though the former declined all discussion of the union scheme and the latter felt that in any union the doctrines of the Church of England ought to prevail. 'Biblio-pistos' was tempted to find in Doyle's letter 'an implied confession of error in the doctrines of the Church of Rome'. He indulged in some cheap point-scoring suggesting that Doyle could 'with little hesitation, embrace the reformed doctrines'. He believed the union proposed by Doyle to be 'not impracticable, and politically useful' but it would founder unless it allowed the rights of private judgement.<sup>121</sup> Doyle's plan was too sanguine for 'Selskar' who asked if Catholic-Protestant differences on tradition, supererogation, transubstantiation, celibacy, etc., could be resolved as easily as Doyle seemed to imply.<sup>122</sup>

Faced with Protestant scepticism and private Catholic criticism that he would dilute Catholic doctrine to effect a reunion of the churches Bishop Doyle felt impelled to return to print. In September 1824 a letter under the pseudonym 'E.B.' was dispatched to the Dublin Evening Post in the form of a dialogue between the bishop and a deputation of ecumenically-minded Catholics and Protestants.<sup>123</sup> 'E.B.' reported Doyle as asserting that there was no point in engaging in further correspondence on reunion as no sailor put to sea when the wind was adverse. In this dialogue Doyle took the opportunity to



correct various inaccurate accounts of his position. He rebutted the suggestion that he would compromise the faith in his proposed re-union:

I am too good a Papist to compromise anything; and if I sought to do so, there is not an old woman or a young child in the diocese who would not see my error and abandon it - no good can ever be effected by compromise, and the nature of truth is to be unchangeable and not ally itself with error.

This being the case how could union be effected without compromise?

Doyle described the process as 'exceedingly simple'.

I could frame a Bill, not so long as the Declaration of Rights, which, if passed by Parliament, would effect a Union, and a Union which would be more beneficial to England than were her Unions with Scotland and Ireland.

The object of the bill would have been 'to heal the schism which separates England from the source and centre of unity . . .'. Doyle did not deny that there were essential differences between the churches 'but the articles or dogmas of faith about which we differ are few: they are chiefly matters of discipline, and religious forms, and usages which induce us to quarrel with each other'. Doyle believed that the doctrinal decisions of the Council of Trent could be received by the Church of England 'without any considerable violence being done to the articles of Faith' or the Thirty-Nine Articles. The decrees of the Council of Trent on disciplinary matters might be received as appropriate.<sup>124</sup>

Privately Doyle did not think that the union of the churches was at all likely 'unless by a miracle of Grace' but he did not see why the issue of the great split in modern Western Christendom which every pope from Leo X to Pius VII desired should be healed should not be raised in his own time.<sup>125</sup> Bishop Doyle's letter on the union of the churches can therefore be seen as a kite-flying exercise: an attempt to turn the 'New Reformation' on its head - to convert Protestants to

Catholicism through Church unity. The letter was an attempt to move the discourse of religious controversy on to a new path - to raise the possibility of convergence rather than extending the opportunities for divergence. Overall the letter was largely ignored in a deeply-divided sectarian society.

In August 1824 Archbishop Curtis of Armagh was involved in controversy with landlord John McClintock who had established a proselytising school under a Methodist teacher at Drumcar in his diocese. Curtis forbade Catholic children from attending McClintock's school unless he employed a Roman Catholic teacher.<sup>126</sup> Curtis informed Doyle in late September that several anonymous and illiberal writers had joined McClintock in impugning him; they had sent 'enormous lucubrations' to the editor of the Drogheda Journal, who though a Protestant, had refused to publish them. Curtis however expected these letters to be published by other papers. While not himself prepared to continue the combat he hoped Doyle would enter the fray on his behalf.

I do not mean to reply any more on the subject. But should these new antagonists appear, as I doubt not they will, not on the score of any particular controversy with McClintock [but] on the general heads of Bible-reading, proselytism and the pretended despotism of our clergy. I do not despair that Your Lordship provoked at such ridiculous cant, will take up your pen, and give them, once for all, the coup de grace, for the general good. <sup>127</sup>

J.K.L.'s pamphlet Letters on the state of Education in Ireland; and on Bible societies ... published in mid-November 1824 reinforces the view that the interdenominational polemic of the mid-1820s is the context in which we must judge letters on the reunion of the churches in May, June and September 1824.

In this pamphlet Doyle referred to the 'defection' of the Church of England from the Church of Rome during the 'so-called Reformation'.

Doyle attacked 'the wild superstition which, under the name of Bible reading or Bible distributing, is now disturbing the peace in Ireland, and threatening the safety of the state'.<sup>128</sup> Doyle recounted a story from his own experience which gave almost untold offence to evangelicals. This was of the poor man in County Kildare who when given an Authorised version of the Bible from the wife of his landlord received it with the reverence of a tenant who realised that not to do so might lead to his eviction. But the peasant feared even more for his own salvation and when night came 'lest he should be infected with heresy from the Protestant Bible during his sleep, took it with a tongs, for he would not defile his touch with it, and buried it in a grave which he had prepared for it in his garden'. Doyle well realised that this anecdote would offend Protestant sensibilities, indeed it would be regarded as blasphemous, yet he praised the Kildare peasant for his orthodoxy.<sup>129</sup>

J.K.L. claimed that the biblical societies were propagating an intolerable error by seeking to introduce the indiscriminate reading of the scriptures without note or comment, thus substituting the 'chaos of undisciplined opinion' for the wisdom and order of the church. The labours of the biblicals far from being in accordance with the Christian spirit would actually subvert it by introducing fanaticism or infidelity in its stead. The biblicals would not convert Catholics or infidels but only increase the confusion of the Protestant churches and perhaps ultimately subvert them.<sup>130</sup>

In October and November 1824 Catholic bishops such as John Murphy in Cork and Patrick Kelly in Waterford began to express the same concern as Curtis and Doyle at the interference of the biblicals in Catholic education.<sup>131</sup> They would soon be joined by virtually

all their brethren on the episcopal bench. The challenge was met head-on. Interdenominational debates between divines began to take place publicly in major urban centres - Cork, Clonmel, Kilkenny, Waterford - throughout the country.<sup>132</sup> The proceedings of these debates were almost invariably published. A discussion between three Catholic and three Protestant divines in Carrick-on-Shannon, in early November 1824 was adjudicated privately by Archbishop Curtis to have been won by the Protestant clergymen; the Catholic representatives 'blundering priests, met the just reward of their temerity, in a shameful defeat'. Curtis informed Doyle that he had been in correspondence with the Secretary of Propaganda Fide, Cardinal de Somaglia, but 'you will easily guess, I said nothing of our late shabby fight at Carrick-on-Shannon'. Curtis begged Doyle to use his influence to prevent 'such rash public disputes', 'where we have not every reason to expect a favourable issue, and decided advantage; as the contrary besides the dishonour, may do our people incalculable mischief'.<sup>133</sup>

In mid-November 1824 members of the theological faculty at Carlow College were issued with tickets for a meeting of the Carlow Auxiliary Bible Society. They were placed in a dilemma as these tickets were unrequested. Yet not to accept the invitations would have led to the accusation that they were afraid to attend while to attend as passive spectators would have given credence to the charge that they acquiesced in the proceedings of the meeting. There was only one solution: the priests, no doubt sanctioned by Bishop Doyle, decided to attend and to declare their opposition to the Bible Society.<sup>134</sup>

The Protestant divines agreed to a debate which was held over two days, 18 and 19 November, in the Presbyterian Meeting House

(Scots' Church), Carlow under the chairmanship of the evangelically-minded Colonel Rochfort of Clogrennan and was marked by a very high degree of public interest. The Catholic case was capably made by Edward Nolan, William Kinsella and Patrick McSweeney of Carlow College and by the curates William Clowry, James Maher and Terence O'Connell. The Bible Society was represented by its well-known champions Robert Daly, Richard Pope, Edward Wingfield and the Rev Shaw. Some of the contributions were several hours in length.<sup>135</sup>

The debate centred on the validity and wisdom of the Anglican right of private scriptural judgement. Robert Daly declared that the priests had no right to prevent the exercise of private judgement in the perusal of the scriptures. The pope was not infallible in matters of faith. Likewise the Rev Mr Pope asserted that popes and councils had erred and he used scriptural quotation to prove God's acceptance of private scriptural reading. Rev Mr Wingfield tried to prove that the Roman Catholic Church as a body rather than its ministers as individuals was opposed to the reading of scriptures.<sup>136</sup>

The Catholic clergymen argued strongly against the right of private judgement as the sole basis of human decision-making and for the need for authority in the church. The Catholic response however tended to open out into seemingly unrelated issues. Clowry and Maher referred to England from where the evangelicals drew heavily for financial and moral support and pointed out that the evangelicals had had little impact on the morals of the English female who was usually pregnant before marriage according to contemporary reports.<sup>137</sup> Patrick McSweeney, Professor of Theology at Carlow College, confronted the evangelicals with their forefathers' persecution of the Catholic laity and priests during the penal era. There was not, he stated,

between Catholics and Protestants, despite the amelioration of the 'accumulated injustice of centuries', 'that confidential friendship that banishes all reserve and excludes every suspicion. The embers of the old grudge continue; and you could not take any more effectual way than the distribution of the Bible, to fan them into flame'.<sup>138</sup>

The debate ended when William Clowry issued a challenge which brought the proceedings to a head. He called on the evangelical ministers separately to write down their rule of faith and if any two of them were found to agree he offered to give up the debate. The Catholic priests were to do likewise and if any two of them disagreed he would also concede the struggle. The Protestants offered to undergo the challenge on the following day but the Catholic laity in the audience called on them to meet it there and then. This the ministers refused to do and the meeting broke up in disorder which the Protestant press promptly called an anti-Protestant riot, the ministers allegedly having to scale a wall to make their escape. The Dublin Evening Mail labelled the conduct of the audience that of 'savages' which the Rev Edward Nolan firmly denied; he allowed that there had been 'cheers and uproarious shouting' but no more.<sup>139</sup>

Concern among the Catholic bishops about the extent of the circulation of Bibles by the biblicals led to the issue at the very end of 1824 of a national hierarchical pastoral on that subject. This charged the Catholic laity to be steadfast in the faith and to 'repel with meekness, but with the zeal of God, all the assaults of those who would seduce you . . .'.<sup>140</sup> The pastoral noted that the pope recommended to the observance of the faithful a rule of the Congregation of the Index which prohibited the perusal of the scriptures in the vernacular without the sanction of the church.

The hierarchy quoted the papal remark that 'more evil than good is found to result from the indiscriminate use of them, on account of the malice or infirmity of men'.<sup>141</sup> The bishops took care to forestall at least some of the inevitable evangelical attacks on their pastoral by commenting that the scriptures with notes explanatory of the text 'are read by many of you with edification and advantage' especially when read in families at times of prayer.<sup>142</sup> The pastoral itself was heavily sourced with biblical references. The faithful were warned not to set their judgement on scripture against that of the Catholic Church for such was the way of perdition. This was followed by an important admonition against Bible society tracts:

As to the books which are distributed by the Bible Societies, under the name of Bibles, or Testaments, or Tracts, or whatsoever name may be given to them, as they treat of religion, and are not sanctioned by us, or by any competent authority in the Catholic Church, the use, the perusal, the reading or retaining any of them is entirely, and without exception, prohibited to you. To enter into their merits or demerits is foreign to our purpose; such of them as have come under our observation are replete with errors, many of them are heretical, and generally they abound in calumnies or misrepresentations against our holy religion; as such they are carefully to be avoided; and should any of them happen to be in your possession, they are to be restored to the persons who may have bestowed them to you or otherwise to be destroyed, except only Bibles or Testaments which if not returned to the donors, are to be deposited with the parish priest. It is not without reason, dearly beloved, that we thus exhort and enjoin you to exclude from your houses these pernicious books, as by accepting of them, or retaining them, you would keep in your presence artful and designing enemies, who, sooner or later, might deceive you to your ruin . . . 143

Books such as these, the pastoral continued, had been 'execrated' by the Catholic Church and frequently burned. Indeed this injunction was followed by a brief review of the history of book-burning in ancient Athens, Rome and the early church with a clear implication that Bible society tracts should also be committed to flames. The bishops ordered that their pastoral was to be made known to the faithful by

readings from it on successive Sundays.<sup>144</sup> Bishop Doyle was closely questioned on this pastoral, which was very likely written by him, before the House of Lords committee on the state of Ireland in 1825.<sup>145</sup>

That there was no reference to Bible-reading in the educational context in the pastoral was surprising and led to an angry and revealing letter from Archbishop Curtis to Doyle. Privately Doyle was hostile to Bible-reading among schoolchildren and in September 1824 he had declared his firm opinion to Archbishop Murray:

I deem the reading of the sacred scripture by the weak and ignorant such as children whether with or without comments an abuse always to be deprecated; but such reading of them in this country, at this time, and in the present circumstances, I consider an abuse filled with danger, not only an evil, but an evil of great magnitude and the Apostle says 'They are guilty of death not only when they do evil but they also who consent to the doing of it'.<sup>146</sup>

Archbishop Curtis's difficulty was that in late autumn 1824 he had promised his clergy a statement or rule to be uniformly observed by them in the hierarchical pastoral letter. Ad interim he had allowed his clergy

to permit Catholic children, in such schools, to read the Bible, or hear it read, and explained by Catholic Masters or Mistresses, approved by the Catholic Pastors, and, of course by them also, but by no others - this however, was overruled, and Your Lordship with all the other Prelates insisted, that scripture reading should not be permitted at all, to Catholic children, at school, with or without, the assistance of their Pastors or Catholic Teachers.

Curtis did not immediately acquiesce in this decision as it 'did then and ever will appear, to me, to be wrong, and calculated to convey a prejudice of our hostility to the Scriptures' but for the sake of uniformity he had agreed to its adoption as the position of the Irish Catholic hierarchy. Moreover he had notified his clergy of the rule but he was surprised to find no mention of the issue in the published pastoral to which his name and that of the entire hierarchy was



appended: 'the thing, then so vehemently insisted on has been totally laid aside, or forgotten'. Curtis 'could not help feeling this very pointed neglect'.<sup>147</sup> It would seem that Doyle and probably Murray had decided, without informing Curtis, that to ban the reading of scripture by Catholic schoolchildren would have played into the hands of the evangelical campaign in Ireland.<sup>148</sup>

In 1825 the Hibernian Bible Society was the most prominent and active Bible society in the country. It was well organised in Kildare and Leighlin diocese. There were county auxiliaries in Carlow, Queen's, Kings, Kildare and West Wicklow. Of these only the King's County Auxiliary at Tullamore appears to have had little or no impact within Doyle's diocese. The presidents of the county auxiliaries were usually prominent noblemen and landlords. The secretaries were almost invariably Anglican clergymen. All the county auxiliaries had branches under the patronage of ladies' associations usually chaired by a female member of the local landlord's family.<sup>149</sup>

The Carlow Auxiliary, founded in 1813 (secretaries: Rev Mr Vernon, Rev J. Jameson, Rev R. Fishbourne) had ladies' associations at Carlow under Mrs Rochfort, Fenagh and Myshall under Mrs Bruen, Leighlinbridge, Mrs Bruen, and Tullow, Mrs Cooper. The Queen's County Auxiliary (secretaries: Rev Geo. Hamilton, Rev A. Newcomb) had ladies' associations at Abbeyleix under Viscountess de Vesci, at Portarlinton under Lady Elizabeth Dawson, at Maryborough under Mrs Waller and at Mountmellick. The Kildare Auxiliary which met at Naas (secretaries: Rev John Harrison, Rev Edward Wade) had associations within the diocese at Naas under Lady Louisa Le Poer Trench, at Rathangan under the patronage of Lord H. Seymour Moore and the Lord Bishop of Kildare, and there was a branch in Monasterevin. The West Wicklow Society,

formed in 1823 (secretaries: Rev Wm. Grogan, Rev Jos. Scott, Rev C. Brough) had ladies' associations under the patronage of Lady Stratford at Baltinglass, Stratford and Hacketstown.<sup>150</sup>

From late 1824 these Bible societies experienced interruptions from Catholics objecting to their proceedings at their annual general meetings. The Carlow Auxiliary reported that considerable zeal had been excited in the 'highest orders' and that the poorer classes were generally well supplied with the scriptures. The auxiliary maintained that 'the opposition which manifested itself in so determined a manner' had been productive of beneficial consequences.<sup>151</sup> Subscriptions had increased by one-third with receipts amounting to over £58. This auxiliary issued fifty-three Bibles and forty-four testaments in the period April 1824 to April 1825. The Fenagh and Myshall Association issued thirty-nine Bibles and forty-seven testaments in the same period. No regular return from the Queen's County Auxiliary was received by the parent society in 1825 but a grant of £20 made by it indicated that at least it continued in existence. The Mountmellick Association issued ninety-three Bibles and thirty-one testaments. The County Kildare Auxiliary did not report the number of books it had issued but the Rathangan Association issued forty-two Bibles and testaments and the Monasterevin Association distributed forty-five Bibles and 103 testaments. The return of this latter association stated that its committee attributed the increase and prosperous state of its funds 'to the spirit of enquiry which was stirred up in consequence of the opposition made during the last year to the free circulation of the Word of God'.<sup>152</sup> The West Wicklow Society with the assistance of its ladies' association in Baltinglass issued fifty-six Bibles and forty-six testaments in 1824-1825. This committee was not as sanguine

as the others noting that 'since the late discussions, the people have become almost inaccessible to them'.<sup>153</sup> New branches of the Hibernian Bible Society were founded within Doyle's diocese at Goresbridge, Graiguenamanagh and Edenderry in the course of 1826 as part of a continued drive to enlighten the Irish people.<sup>154</sup>

The evangelicals were generally perceived to have come off worst in the November 1824 Carlow debate. Both sides looked to the 1825 annual meeting of the Carlow biblicals as an opportunity to renew the combat. The Catholic priests, O'Connell, Maher, Nolan, Cahill, Clowry and Kinsella, planned to attend the meeting of the Carlow Auxiliary Bible Society which was scheduled to be held in the town on 27 July 1825. But the priests withdrew from debate when the evangelicals insisted that they should only be allowed to speak after the practical business of the Bible Society was completed. At least this was the main reason given to the public for non-participation but that could have been overcome by some sort of compromise. The real reason for priestly non-participation was Bishop Doyle's belief that further theological controversy would only lead to further dissension and bitterness. However for this to have been stated publicly would have allowed the evangelicals to claim a great victory over Bishop Doyle and his priests who were afraid to meet them openly. The Dublin Evening Post urged the Carlow priests to throw down a challenge of debate to the biblical ministers.<sup>155</sup>

On Saturday 6 August 1825 a meeting of 'persons of whatever religious persuasions' though effectively the Catholic inhabitants of Carlow (because the evangelicals claimed they had hardly any notice of the meeting) was held in the parish chapel to consider the issue of opposing all future proceedings of the Bible Society in the town.

This meeting, attended by Kinsella, Clowry, Cahill, O'Connell, Maher, resolved: firstly, that Catholic clergymen were at all times solicitous that their flocks should read the scriptures but equally anxious that they should avoid private interpretation which was so destructive of the 'unity of spirit in the bond of peace'; secondly, that the scriptures alone were not a sufficient guide in matters of faith but required the authority of tradition to expound their meaning; thirdly, that the right of private judgement which allowed any person to invent a religion had been found in all ages past to be a 'fertile source of fanaticism, error and dissension, and subversive of the peace of society'; fourthly, that Bible societies were totally unnecessary in Ireland and incapable of carrying out their professed object: the education of the poor; fifthly, that the meeting should consider how to end finally the pretensions of Irish biblicals to instruct Irish Catholics in the mysteries of religion; finally, this meeting resolved that any interference by Bible societies with the religious tenets of the Catholic pastors' flocks would be seen as an 'indirect libel' on the Irish Catholic priesthood.<sup>156</sup>

Later in August Dr J. H. Singer, F.T.C.D., an evangelical clergyman, invited the clergy of Carlow to a public controversy. He was responded to by Rev William Kinsella of Carlow College who stated that the Catholic clergy were opposed to any theological discussion which might produce annoyance 'without having some useful object in view'. For that reason the Catholic priests would decline the idle invitation.<sup>157</sup> Both Kinsella and Clowry were very actively engaged in newspaper polemic against various leading evangelical ministers at this time.<sup>158</sup> Undoubtedly perceiving that the Carlow clergy were not anxious for public debate and sensing a propaganda coup the

evangelical ministers Revs Wingfield, Singer, Hamilton, Daly, Urwick and Burnet issued a challenge (towards the end of August) to Revs Clowry, Kinsella, McSweeney, Nolan, Cahill and O'Connell for a public debate in Carlow on 22 September to discuss the circulation of the Bible without note or comment. They had little doubt that the gauntlet thus thrown down would be readily taken up.<sup>159</sup>

The points to be discussed were: (1) that the scriptures contained all things necessary for salvation and constituted the only standard of revealed truth; (2) that the scriptures were the common property of all mankind and that all men had a common and inalienable right to possess and read them; (3) that as every man must give an account of himself before God on the last day then it was 'both right and the duty of every man to exercise his own judgement in the understanding of the Holy Scriptures'; (4) that Christ never instituted nor did there ever exist a permanent infallible tribunal for the interpretation of scripture and the authoritative decision of controversies; (5) that the privilege and blessings which Christ had conferred upon the Church did not belong exclusively to the Church of Rome; (6) that the authorised English translation of inspired scripture was free from dangerous and wilful corruption.

The biblical ministers declared that they addressed the Carlow priests particularly because they had shown themselves 'the most determined, as well as among the most able of the opponents to the free circulation of the Scriptures'. The biblicals also mentioned that the priests could not decline their challenge 'without publicly abandoning the cause you profess to advocate'.<sup>160</sup> On visitation at Edenderry in King's County on 28 August Bishop Doyle issued a public letter to his clergy in Carlow and its vicinity who were formerly

engaged in disputes with members of the Bible society forbidding any future disputation from taking place.<sup>161</sup> Dr Doyle stated the grounds of his action. The character of the Christian religion was peace and its purpose to establish peace and goodwill on earth as the means of preparing men for heaven. The proposed disputation would be directly opposed to such peace. The clergy must not become fond of disputes. But in any case there was no point in debating with members of the Bible society who 'do not admit our creed, nor have they any creed of their own'. Entering into such debates called into question truths already established. The biblicals had 'lately endeavoured, though unconsciously to dissolve the entire religion of Christ into a system of Latitudinarianism approaching to utter infidelity'. No tribunal on earth was competent to try the issue between the biblicals and the priests. Dr Doyle indirectly alluded to his own letter on the union of the churches only to reflect that the time was not auspicious for such a proposal. While avoiding public disputes he urged his clergy to watch carefully for every error that might be disseminated whether by speech or in writing and to expose and refute it wherever it was deserving of notice.<sup>162</sup>

Doyle's public letter to his clergy promptly drew an almost inevitable response from Rev Robert Daly that he had sanctioned a 'retreat'. Daly accused the Roman Catholic clergy of having 'fled from the field which they first deliberately occupied themselves'. He claimed that Doyle had prepared his clergy for the 1824 debate. He was 'the General that conducted the campaign'. As to the grounds on which Doyle justified refusing the challenge Daly asserted that these were not new and that Doyle had stated nothing that would not have had equal force in 1824 when he allowed his priests to debate in

Carlow.<sup>163</sup> Revs Kinsella and McSweeney answered Daly's letter in the columns of the press.<sup>164</sup> All the evangelical ministers were present in Carlow for the meeting of the Auxiliary Bible Society on 22 September but no priests turned out to accept the challenge in deference to their bishop's wishes.<sup>165</sup> There was one unexpected development. Patrick McSweeney, the senior theology professor in Carlow College, was disappointed that the refusal of the priests to meet the biblicals in debate was being trumpeted as a great triumph in England. He decided to take up their challenge and accordingly without consulting Doyle he resigned his chair and removed himself from the bishop's jurisdiction. He then issued a public challenge to debate alone any six representatives of the biblicals to be adjudicated by fifty Protestants and fifty Catholics.<sup>166</sup> From Drogheda Archbishop Curtis reflected that McSweeney's challenge had caused 'a great sensation here'; Curtis suspected that McSweeney had not taken so decided a step without Doyle's permission, particularly after the latter's recent injunction against disputation.<sup>167</sup> But McSweeney had indeed acted unilaterally and Doyle never afterwards considered him judicious. Robert Daly at first accepted McSweeney's challenge but very quickly the biblicals decided to reject the challenge on the grounds that six against one was unfair and that Doyle had stated that no tribunal could adjudicate such a debate. An embarrassed McSweeney was reduced to writing a public letter to the people of England on Bible discussion which he could have done without forfeiting his chair.<sup>168</sup> The energetic newspaper controversialist William Kinsella was promoted to fill McSweeney's chair and Daniel Cahill who would become one of the most famous controversialists of his age filled Kinsella's chair of Natural Philosophy.

The newspaper war continued unabated into 1826. In May and June of that year Bishop Doyle (perhaps feeling obliged to respect his own admonition on controversy) wrote two lengthy letters under the pseudonym 'B.E.' in a futile attempt to mediate in a bitter public disputation between Robert Daly and Daniel O'Connell. Daly challenged the Catholic clergy with not alone hostility to Bible reading but with idolatry when they adored the Holy Communion in transubstantiation. No new ground was broken in this particular controversy which was so typical of the period.<sup>169</sup>

A concerted effort to proselytise Catholics began on the Earl of Farnham's estates in County Cavan late in 1826. The aged bishop of Kilmore, Farrel O'Reilly, was unable to cope with this threat and he called for support from his episcopal brethren. The Irish hierarchy reacted by ordering a committee to Cavan to inquire into the activities of the proselytisers.<sup>170</sup> The Erne Packet newspaper claimed that in a ten-week period between September and December 1826, 252 converts from Catholicism had been made.<sup>171</sup> By late January 1827 Lord Farnham was claiming 450 converts over the previous four months.<sup>172</sup>

The hierarchy's committee consisted of Archbishop Curtis, Bishop Crolly of Down and Connor, Bishop Magauran of Ardagh and Bishop MacHale. They gathered in Cavan town on 14 December 1826, assembled the parish priests of the diocese, warded off a biblical demand for a public disputation, and set about examining the situation. The appointment of a young, active coadjutor bishop was deemed a priority. The reputation of Carlow College was evident in the choice of the parish priests of Kilmore for their new bishop. The former Carlow College professor Patrick McSweeney was named dignissimus on the terna, James Browne, Professor of Sacred Scripture in Maynooth was



nominated dignior and William Kinsella of Carlow was named dignus.<sup>173</sup> McSweeney's resignation of his chair to contend with the evangelicals no doubt appealed to the parish priests but it was deemed injudicious by the hierarchical committee who demoted him to the bottom of the terna.<sup>174</sup> Browne was appointed by Rome.

Concerned by developments in Cavan and the spread of Farnham's example throughout the country Doyle issued a circular letter to his clergy in late December 1826 warning them against the 'great and systematic efforts' being made to subvert the faith especially of youth and the poor:

To discharge our duty as we are obliged at this time we must be more than usually attentive and zealous in preaching the word of God - in visiting and consoling the poor, and in relieving even beyond our means, the sick and indigent, so that those who are on the opposite side may have no evil to say of us. Without a strong religious excitement those who are infirm and pressed on every side by poverty and allured on the other by gifts, may fall from their steadiness, and if any of them should so fall their blood will be required at our hands, unless we shall have done all in our power particularly by preaching in season and out of season, to animate their faith and zeal. 175

Doyle did not underestimate the problem of poverty. Parish priests throughout Kildare and Leighlin informed their bishop that the state of the poor was extremely serious. The parishioners of Allen parish were 'in remarkably poor circumstances' having no employment.<sup>176</sup> Nicholas O'Connor stated that in his parish of Maryborough 'our condition [is] in every respect deplorable'.<sup>177</sup> In Tullow the Administrator and able polemicist William Clowry described the wants of the poor as 'unprecedented'. He had founded a Charitable Society and enrolled landlord Robert Doyne and all the Protestants of the town as members. This society raised £8 a week out of which Clowry fed the destitute. He could not resist informing Doyle that 'in spite of the power of the landlord and the parson the priest is the life and soul

of the institution . . . Our poor would have died in the open street but for this society'.<sup>178</sup> The parish priest of Kilcock, Francis Haly, noted the 'great distress' in his parish. He thanked God that the people were suffering with great patience and there was no disposition to found illegal societies.<sup>179</sup> Patrick Kehoe, Administrator of Graiguenamanagh, described a desperate situation: 'Our tradesmen and labourers here are in greater distress than I ever witnessed even the dearest Summer. This is owing to the great want of employment, and the dearness of provisions'.<sup>180</sup> Laurence Cummins, parish priest of Myshall parish stated factually: 'Our numerous and very destitute poor have inviolably adhered to the faith of Christ'.<sup>181</sup>

The Protestant crusade began in Carlow on 14 January 1827. From this date there were sermons on eight successive Sundays and several controversial discussions mid-week by evangelicals in the town. Police guarded the placards posted throughout the surrounding countryside announcing the crusade.<sup>182</sup> Doyle subsequently described the crusade as a 'little army of itinerant reformers' which 'came to storm the stronghold of popery'.<sup>183</sup> Rev William Kinsella commented ironically and bitterly that in Carlow town where two thousand people were in utter destitution 'it was a prudent speculation for the ministers of a rich Church to search for converts when all about them were perishing for hunger'.<sup>184</sup> From Belfast Bishop Crolly wished Doyle 'a complete victory over the host of hereticks assembled at Carlow'.<sup>175</sup> In neighbouring Kilkenny Bishop Marum sought Doyle's advice on how he should handle the evangelical threat in his diocese.<sup>186</sup> In the province of Tuam the Catholic bishops issued a pastoral address to their clergy on the danger of the 'fanatical spirit that is for some

time abroad'.<sup>187</sup> In the House of Commons James Grattan asserted that a sort of religious crusade had commenced in Dublin: 'in the churches the most vehement abuse was heard of the Roman Catholic faith, the Roman Catholics retaliated in their chapels by attacks equally violent upon the Protestant tenets'.<sup>188</sup>

In his sermons in Carlow parish chapel Bishop Doyle met the challenge the evangelicals posed directly and bluntly and in a manner which did not find expression in his public works (though 1827 did witness a marked exasperation in his published religious polemic). Take, for instance, these remarks from a sermon of the bishop's on 'Christian purity':

. . . wherever the true Church exists, in that Church will be found at every period, many, who observe inviolable chastity in all its perfection. Now if you examine the countless motley sects that pass under the common name of 'protestant' you will find none of them even pretending to profess this fine and sublime morality. On the contrary it is notorious that their spurious systems of religion have been engendered and fostered in the grossest and vilest passions - See their very ministers with their wives and numerous families living in splendour and fattening in idle luxury on what is taken from the bowels of the poor. Were you to know some of their saints (as they are called) as well as I do, you would find them what the Lord called their prototypes 'painted sepulchres' - hypocrites, who under the mask of sanctity conceal the most abominable vices while they strive to convert (it is hard to avoid laughing at the idea) the poor benighted Catholics, who in reality possess the only true religion and the only true morality. As to the great body of those who are separated from us in belief, it is not for me to scrutinize their moral conduct: but this much I may say, that chastity does not seem to be their favourite virtue. And why do I speak in this strain? Is it in a spirit of controversy? No! . . . 189

According to Rev James Maher, one of nineteenth century Ireland's most famous Catholic priests, then a curate in Carlow, the evangelical missionaries made only one female convert in the town. In a letter to the press he painted a revealing and indeed shocking picture of this one convert:

This unhappy woman . . . had some years before been convicted of adultery before the Bishop. Her husband, a poor labouring man had accepted of £20 damages, paid to him by the author of his shame, through the hands of the Rt Rev Dr Doyle and was again reconciled to his unfaithful wife - she returned to her 'accomplice' and has, until lately, lived with him in habits of gross and public delinquency. I myself have sometimes remonstrated with her, and to arrest the scandal arising from her conduct have caused her, to be excluded from the lodging houses of R.Cs. Still persevering in her evil ways she and her guilty paramour have been denounced in our Chapel as public and scandalous sinners, driven as it were from Catholic Society, she professed herself a Protestant nearly two years past - and since that period has placed herself beyond the reach of our censure, by her religious profession . . . such is 'the progress of the Reformation' recruited from the very stews of prostitution. A degraded creature, denounced in her own Church, as a public sinner to be avoided, cut off from all society, is now eagerly sought after to fill the empty aisles of our Protestant Church.<sup>190</sup>

A speech promoting the objects of the New Reformation delivered by Lord Farnham in Cavan on 26 January 1827 drew responses from Bishops Doyle and MacHale and a lively pamphlet controversy ensued. Farnham had contended that the evangelicals needed to make converts because the Catholic claim to Emancipation would have to be conceded if Catholics maintained their numerical strength and as a consequence the Church Establishment in Ireland would fall and ultimately the separation of the two islands would take place.<sup>191</sup> J.K.L. in his reply published on 8 February confined himself to the political questions raised by Farnham and agreed that the Catholic claims could not be withheld in the present state of public opinion and that (as mentioned heretofore) the Church Establishment must fall because its merits were too well known. In likening the Church Establishment to an 'incubus' and a 'Juggernaut' J.K.L. exceeded all his previous criticism. Reform of the Church Establishment he deemed a likely consequence of Emancipation. He warned Lord Farnham that his crusade would be fruitless and would have results widely different from those he expected. The Catholic Church would become 'doubly secure' in Ireland and would gain thousands of converts from Protestantism.<sup>192</sup>

In the first months of 1827 parish priests reported to Doyle on the state of the crusade in their parishes. John Dunne, parish priest of Portarlinton, informed Doyle on 19 February that 'the mania of religious phrenzy has lately manifested itself amongst us, and never were bibles and bibles in such requisition in our town as they are at present. From my exertions to detect them and guard our flock from those wolves in sheep's clothing, death in various shapes is threatened upon me'.<sup>193</sup> John Lawlor, parish priest of Allen, stated that no proselyte had been made in his parish 'although many exertions have been resorted to'.<sup>194</sup> From Graiguenamanagh, Patrick Kehoe noted that 'the same spirit of proselytism that is now abroad, almost in every part of Ireland, is to be found here. The ministers are constantly seeking whom they may deceive, but thanks be to God without the least prospect of succeeding in their unhallowed designs'.<sup>195</sup> Malachy McMahon, parish priest of Suncroft, reported that a 'Ranting Minister' had passed through his parish and 'taught some the exercise of Tongues' but these were Protestants who were in darkness until they were enlightened.<sup>196</sup> James Kinsella, parish priest of Killeigh, feared that landlord Benjamin Digby at Geashill would commence

a system of bribery and should he do so there is still greater cause to apprehend that a people so interwoven between Catholic and Protestant as that has been during these last twenty years and so miserably poor and mean-spirited will not remain proof against such attack. <sup>197</sup>

In Clane parish the Administrator Maurice Kearney had to deal with perhaps the most concerted case of proselytism outside Carlow town carried out under the aegis of the Aylmer family of Donadea Castle:

Sir Gerald Aylmer has scraped up one Mary Reilly and her blind brother (she is a prostitute from Westmeath [and] had lately a bastard by her first cousin after being hunted from her native place and literally [sic] torn by her relation's dog, at whose house she sought an assylum [sic] [Aylmer] has fixed her in his

Lodge removing an old lame decrepid [sic] Catholick widow with her orphan daughter and whose husband was killed in Sir Gerald's father's work. He had fixed up one Bill Breaton a protestant bastard, the mother a travelling card cutter from Kilcock, he a beggar from his infancy now a day labourer at the Castle of Donadea. These with Doherty and Hemmingway from the parish are the only conversions but about ten years back a widow Anderson urged by Lady Aylmer adopted the creed of her strong husband became a caretaker of Donadea Church with a salary of £10. Laundry woman to the parson and now a Gate keeper to Sir Gerald. One Watt Charles a Meath man about the same time embraced the Established Church, became head and confidential manager to Lady Aylmer he has realised some property, but not quite what he expected. Last Spring he began to vaccilate [sic] untill his employer . . . gave him an acre of oats. These were all totted up for Lord Farnham. He has tampered with many distressed persons about here and perhaps the worst and most evil thing he has done is removing the old faithful servants of the family to make room for these wretches. So far the poor may be said with thruth [sic] to be sorely persecuted . . . Tracts of the most noxious kind are issued forth in great quantities but the infamy which hangs about the principle distributors is a kind of antidote against their poison he being a man who some time back received compensation for the adultery of his wife which wife most cordially assists him in the work of distributing. 198

The proliferation of Bibles and tracts from the Bible societies alarmed Catholics. The Catholic Book Society was a direct response by the Irish hierarchy to the perceived evangelical threat in 1827. At Doyle's instigation the hierarchy in February agreed to sponsor the foundation of a 'Catholic Book Society for the diffusion of useful knowledge throughout Ireland'.<sup>199</sup> The object was to furnish Irish Catholics with cheap and useful texts on their religion which would provide 'all classes of persons with satisfactory refutations of the prevailing errors of the present age'. A 'principal object' was to counter the New Reformation threat posed through the dissemination of Bibles without note or comment.<sup>200</sup> Fear of the evangelicals is revealed quite clearly in episcopal correspondence with Archbishop Murray in 1827. Bishop Kelly of Dromore believed that a Catholic society of this kind was 'of paramount importance at these perilous times'.<sup>201</sup> Bishop Egan of Kerry agreed that more than usual

exertions were called for to counteract 'unceasing enemies'.<sup>202</sup> Edmund Ffrench, Warden of Galway, held that the Society was of the 'utmost importance at the present moment'.<sup>203</sup> Bishop Coen of Confert felt that Catholic tracts would guard the flock 'against [the] inclinations of their enemies'.<sup>204</sup> Bishop O'Shaughnessy of Killaloe stated simply: 'something is necessary'.<sup>205</sup>

Doyle returned to the polemical fray in April 1827 with a reply to a charge delivered by Archbishop Magee in October 1826 which had been published in early 1827.<sup>206</sup> J.K.L. stated that Magee still seemed determined 'to exhibit himself from his high station as a rallying point to the insane bigots who infest the country'.<sup>207</sup> He stated that the object of this 144-page work was to repel the attacks of Magee which breathed discord and proclaimed dissension rather than to inflict injury upon Protestantism. J.K.L. prefaced his remarks with a lengthy reflection on the history of Church authority and private judgement of the scriptures; the unifying power of the spiritual prerogative and special jurisdiction of St Peter and the primacy of Peter.<sup>208</sup> J.K.L. refuted Archbishop Magee's proposition that the doctrine of infallibility shut out doubt and extinguished enquiry. Infallibility did shut out doubt but not until enquiry had been made. It was necessary to have infallibility to avoid schism and heresies. Doubt could not co-exist with faith: 'faith is not faith if the believer hesitates in doubt, for he who doubts is already an unbeliever'.<sup>209</sup> J.K.L. rejected the proposition that the Catholic faith was blind and that Catholics persecuted all who differed from them in religion in order to make converts by whatever means. To the first part of the proposition he answered that Catholics had simply to find the 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church' which the world

acknowledged as the deposit of faith and to obey her doctrines. The persecuting spirit of Catholicism was falsely imputed: 'persecution . . . is no portion of our creed, we assail errors but we spare the victims of delusion'.<sup>210</sup>

J.K.L. accused Magee of traversing the ecclesiastical province 'with the torch of religious discord flaming in his hand, casting brands of fire through an inflammable population'.<sup>211</sup> Doyle contrasted Magee's outlook with the 'humane, benevolent and pacific disposition' of Archbishop Laurence of Cashel, though even he had acted 'with less than his usual candour' towards Doyle in a recent speech in the House of Lords.<sup>212</sup> Magee had attacked the alliance of the Catholic Church with the state in continental Europe. Doyle re-echoed in a classic statement views expressed in his Vindication and Defence of the Vindication when he exclaimed: 'The civil liberty and true religion of a country are greatly impaired by any union of the church and the state'.<sup>213</sup> He did not prefer the aggrandisement of what was called 'Church and State' to the happiness of the people. He wished that 'Church and State' alliances on the continent had never been formed.<sup>214</sup>

Although Doyle had expressed his determination not to wound he remarked that the English Protestant Church was 'like a man of low or questionable birth or descent . . . best protected by silence and forbearance'.<sup>215</sup> Furthermore he appended a twenty-page series of extracts which he claimed not only showed 'the present deplorable state of the Protestant Churches throughout Europe, but also that Protestantism, after loosing every moral bond, terminates in infidelity'. A second appendix contained a letter to the Dublin Weekly Register of 4 November 1826 signed M.H., and evidently



written by Doyle which included another series of statute extracts proving the intolerance of Protestantism in Ireland over two centuries.<sup>216</sup>

J.K.L. had drawn attention to conversions to Catholicism in his Letters on the state of Ireland. In 1825 Doyle reckoned that the average number of conversions to Catholicism in Kildare and Leighlin was about two hundred annually. Some of these conversions, he stated, took place in secret, others during the final illness of the convert. (Indeed it was a proverb among the Catholic clergy that for a man to be happy in this world and the next he should live as a Protestant and die a Catholic.) But however the conversions were occurring, taking into account the size of the Protestant population, and emigration among that denomination to North America, it was not insignificant.<sup>217</sup> At the height of the New Reformation crusade in early 1827 parochial returns to Bishop Doyle clearly confirm his accuracy in this matter and demonstrate that converts were being made to Catholicism as much as the evangelicals might claim that they were being made to Protestantism.

The parish priest of Mountrath, Matthew Malone, pinpointed this interesting phenomenon of the New Reformation era when he reported to his bishop on 19 February 1827 that 'the effort made by our opponents to seduce the people from their faith has as yet proved abortive and in some measure has had a contrary effect. We have received eight Protestants into our Church within the last twelve months'.<sup>218</sup> This perception is reinforced by reports from priests throughout the diocese of small-scale conversions to Catholicism without any loss to their flocks from the crusade. James Delany, parish priest of Ballinakill, detailed on 18 February, five converts - four men and

one woman - within the previous twelve months - 'during which period there has not been one killed, wounded, or missing in our ranks'.<sup>219</sup> In Allen parish which had only nineteen Protestants and a staunch Orangeman as minister the parish priest was delighted to be able to announce to his bishop that 'we have got their Clerk [of Church] notwithstanding the great faculties and power their great Dean is possessed of proffering his absolution and a douceur of £10 yearly in addition, if he returned, but all in vane [sic]'.<sup>220</sup> There was hardly any parish in the diocese where there had not been at least one convert to Catholicism. In no parish did the number exceed twenty converts in one year. More usually the number ranged between three and ten. Conversion was a difficult departure for those Protestants who contemplated it; as their relatively privileged position in society vis-à-vis their Catholic neighbours and their good relations with their landlord, his agents and the Anglican minister were dependent in no small degree on their remaining Protestant. Thus to convert to Catholicism certainly did not bring material reward as was sometimes promised to Catholics who converted. Perhaps not surprisingly many conversions were made on death-beds. In some few cases whole families such as the Milroes in Leighlinbridge or the Forbes family in Kill converted to Catholicism.<sup>221</sup> Conversions of children were not unknown where the Protestant parent in a mixed marriage died and the remaining partner was free to raise all the children in his or her religion. Foundlings were also among the converts; there would appear to have been some, and often many, foundlings in virtually every parish and these were obviously very susceptible to pressure from whatever denomination. One could not always tell to what denomination their parents belonged, if they had

been baptised or what pressure had been brought to bear on them. Catholic priests generally acted quietly indeed silently in the matter of converts to Catholicism though one might speculate on how many followed the example of Edward Earl, parish priest of Carbury who informed the bishop on 19 February 1827: 'I have the children of two or three Protestants learning the Catholic doctrine privately, and now and then stealing themselves to Mass'.<sup>222</sup> To draw attention to this development would undoubtedly have been to provoke alarm and reaction from the evangelicals.

Thus it would seem that despite the concerted efforts of the evangelicals of the New Reformation there was a slight trend towards conversions to Catholicism which at least counter-balanced conversions to Protestantism made by them.<sup>223</sup> Rev James Maher stated that in Carlow town there had been ten converts to Catholicism in January 1827 alone.<sup>224</sup> On 2 February Doyle informed his kinsman Rev Martin Doyle then parish priest of Clonegal: 'we are tormented here by those designing, absurd fanatics, but thanks to God, they are defeating their own objects. The converts are nearly all to the Catholic faith'.<sup>225</sup> In the teeth of the Protestant crusade in March 1827 Doyle was exacerbated into announcing that there had been 248 conversions to Catholicism in thirty-seven of the forty-five parishes in the diocese for which he had data during the previous twelve months: 'those converts have not been taken from the sewers of public corruption, but they have abandoned, in many cases, the hopes and support of life, and broken the strongest ties of kindred and affection, to find in the bosom of the Catholic Church that peace and security to which from their birth they had been strangers'.<sup>226</sup> An attempt by Lord Farnham to initiate the New Reformation on his estates on the eastern edge

of the diocese in Clonegal parish was 'signally defeated'.<sup>227</sup> Considering Farnham's crusade Doyle wrote in a letter to the Catholic Association which he subsequently refrained from sending:

Above all things the people should be taught [and encouraged - deleted] not to submit to illegal insult or violence from those men or their hirelings. They should be enabled to discriminate between opposition to the laws and opposition to petty and illegal tyranny [and tyrants - deleted] and that though it be heroic and the very perfection of the Christian law to turn one cheek when we are stricken on the other - to give the cloak also to him who takes our coat yet we are not bound under any penalty divine or human to practice this Christian heroism towards those who so far from relenting by such conduct on our part would only be induced by it to abuse us the more. It is certainly true that to permit an assassin to take away our life, or a robber to strip us of our goods rather than deprive them of existence and precipitate them with all their malice into hell - though it be true that to suffer this loss and forego the right of self defence is an act of the most exalted charity yet it is equally true, that we are not required by any precept of our religion to suffer the assassin to slay us with impunity, or the robber to deprive us of our goods. No we have from the God who gave us a being the right of self defence, and if in the lawful exercise of that right, if in defending our property and person we inflict injury on the unjust aggressor we violate no law - we incur no guilt. So if these hypocrites or the sanctified Lazorine whom they hire to infest the houses of the poor - to calumniate the church, and to profane in the most disgusting manner even within the houses of the faithful the holy word of God, if these hypocrites approach beyond the limits of the law, in place of being borne with in their career of violence, bribery calumny or hypocrisy they should be [seized on and - deleted] without ceremony [sic] or dragged if not for punishment at least for exposure before the tribunals of justice. 228

When the Anglican bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, Thomas Elrington, a former provost of Trinity College, published a visitation charge in October 1827 (which had been delivered in June) the object of which was to instruct the clergy of his diocese on how they should promote the New Reformation he elicited an immediate reply from Bishop Doyle.<sup>229</sup> Elrington attacked Turberville's Abridgement of the Christian Doctrine unaware that Doyle had revised and edited an edition of this work for the use of his Christian Doctrine

confraternities throughout Kildare and Leighlin. Thus Doyle saw Elrington's attack on Turberville's interpretation of scriptural sources as an attack on him. Doyle noted that he had often charged some of his majesty's bishops in Ireland 'with ignorance of their profession' and in this context he accused Elrington of occasionally misrepresenting a sentence or two from his work but never replying to the whole.<sup>230</sup> Doyle's most remarkable claim in this pamphlet response to Elrington was the all-encompassing one that the Reformation had led to 'moral chaos' in Europe and retarded the progress of civilisation. Indeed the leaven of the Reformation was the remote cause of the French Revolution and the infidelity prevalent in Protestant Germany. Civil liberty would have progressed more speedily had the Reformation never occurred.<sup>231</sup>

The most interesting part of Elrington's charge was a footnote reference to the number of converts to Protestantism in his diocese:

The progress which the Reformation has already made in Ireland may be conjectured from the fact that Roman Catholics have read their Recantation publicly in seventeen churches in the United Dioceses of Leighlin and Ferns, averaging in number between five and six in each church. But as the principal persons only in each family came forward, in this way, and as many conformed privately, not connected with those families, the real number of converts must be estimated to be much greater. None were admitted to conform without being carefully examined as to their knowledge both of the doctrines they renounced, and of those which they embraced; and particular enquiries were always made, to ascertain whether they were under the influence of improper motives. <sup>232</sup>

Doyle responded that in the diocese of Leighlin he was confident that 'the number of unfortunate creatures who were guilty of temporary apostasy is extremely small'. He stressed that he was thoroughly familiar with his priests and people throughout Leighlin: 'I solemnly declare that I do not, at this moment, know of a single individual, having a house, family, or character, within the Diocese of Leighlin

who had been a Catholic within the last year, and became a Protestant and remained so'.<sup>233</sup> Doyle claimed that several criminals had turned Protestant in prison in the hope of receiving reduced sentences though he believed these 'without exception' had become Catholics again. There were also some, whom he hesitated to call 'converts' to Protestantism, who were motivated by the despair of 'extreme distress'. These anguished conversions Doyle attributed to the condition of the poor in June 1827 when oatmeal was twenty shillings per hundredweight, potatoes twelve shillings per barrel; farmers had no extra food, there was no employment for labourers, and 'no prospect but famine for the poor'. Thus these 'conversions' were taking place 'when disease and death were devouring the miserable outcasts, whose cries ascended to Heaven to draw down the Divine vengeance on the oppressors of the poor'.<sup>234</sup>

Conway, who published Doyle's reply to Elrington opined that 'half the clerical scribblers of Dublin will be at it for a fortnight or three weeks to come'.<sup>235</sup> Archbishop Murray was uncharacteristically jubilant: 'I am delighted with the drubbing Elrington got'. He urged Doyle not to omit on any account to turn the New Reformation to ridicule.<sup>236</sup> When Elrington published an appendix to his charge Doyle was in the fray again with a reply to the appendix.<sup>237</sup> He rejected Elrington's awkward contention that the number of those who had silently withdrawn from Catholicism was greater than the number of converts to Protestantism which had been publicised. Doyle was certain that there had been no 'silent defection' within his diocese. On the other hand, he contended, Elrington would be 'surprised and mortified' if he knew the number of converts to Catholicism.<sup>238</sup> Doyle naturally took offence to the

statement in Elrington's appendix that the Roman Catholic Church was 'tyrannical, unjust' and 'unchristian'.<sup>239</sup> Elrington had criticised J.K.L.'s 1824 pamphlet on education and the Bible societies but the latter had no hesitation in replying that catechisms or other books were better suited to the religious education of youth than the indiscriminate use of the scriptures. Doyle quoted three favourite authors, Burke, Paley and Locke, in support of his contention against the unregulated reading of the Bible.<sup>240</sup> Once again he was at pains to stress that religious controversy was the greatest curse in Ireland.<sup>241</sup> Erlington replied again to Doyle with another pamphlet-length tract but this time was ignored.<sup>242</sup>

The momentum of the New Reformation campaign visibly waned as the year 1827 wore on. An attempt to revive the crusade in Carlow through a meeting of the 'Reformation Society' on 18, 19 October did not have any long-term consequences.<sup>243</sup> By the end of 1827 Bishop Doyle was firmly of the belief that the New Reformation threat, such as it was, was a thing of the past.<sup>244</sup> The evangelicals of the New Reformation greatly embittered interdenominational relations and succeeded but little in their stated objective. While Catholics allowed that some hundreds of converts had been made by the evangelicals and they themselves never claimed more than a few thousand, if that, these figures are almost immaterial in the context of the reality of Irish religious demography. The well-informed and acute observer Thomas Wyse thought that five-sixths of the six million Irish population was Catholic. Furthermore he suggested that there was an annual Catholic birthrate of seventy-six thousand whereas the Protestant birth-rate was only fifteen thousand per annum.<sup>245</sup> Thus the yearly numerical advantage of Catholics over Protestants was

sixty-one thousand and the actual impact of the evangelicals in terms of conversions was infinitesimal.

We now turn to examine the tithe war which broke out in 1830. Before doing so it is necessary to examine briefly the nature and extent of Doyle's attacks on the Irish Church Establishment in the 1820s which along with the self-indulgent campaign of the evangelicals were contributory elements in the extremely bitter interdenominational war of the early 1830s. Doyle was the outstanding opponent of the Irish Church Establishment in the 1820s. In his widely-read Letters on the state of Ireland, he attacked the Church Establishment with gusto. It was looked upon as the handmaid of the ascendancy; it partook more of a political than a religious establishment. Some of its ministers held 'wild and heterodox opinions'.<sup>246</sup> The Establishment was indifferent to everything but 'the concealment of her rules and the persecution of popery'.<sup>247</sup> Doyle attributed its ministers' hostility to the Catholic Church not to malice but to 'mad enthusiasm or an habitual bigotry and intolerance'.<sup>248</sup> Its ministers were of a respectable class, well-educated and capable of civilised behaviour but in general he had a low opinion of them - their addiction to leisure pursuits, hunting, angling, their attempted proselytism, their activity as magistrates in the collection of tithe, their alarmist reports on the state of Ireland, were aided by 'the most vicious press that ever cursed a country'. J.K.L. correctly foresaw the New Reformation leading to the weakening rather than the strengthening of the Church Establishment - an Establishment 'flushed in her decline'.<sup>249</sup>

In parliamentary committee evidence in 1825 Doyle felt that if the Tithe Composition Act was adopted universally or a compulsory



clause added to it making tithe leviable by an acreable tax then tithe discontent would considerably diminish.<sup>250</sup> On his own rented holding of twelve acres at Old Derrig, Killeshin, Doyle hesitated to turn grassland into tillage because he would in so doing subject himself to a 'heavy tithe'. Such thinking prevailed widely among the farming class and was a distinct disincentive to making improvements. In Killeshin where he resided until 1826 Doyle was tithed by a non-resident clergyman. He complained to the Lords' committee in 1825 that 'in the same year, when I was obliged to spend my last shilling in seeking to support the famishing neighbourhood, he applied to me, and obliged me to pay tithe, which has been doubled within the last year'.<sup>251</sup> Doyle described the rector of Killeshin to the Commons' committee on tithes in 1832 as an absentee who never visited his parish except to fleece his flock. However in Carlow parish where he was resident from 1826 the incumbent - 'a very estimable person' - never troubled Doyle for tithe composition, whereas Doyle's parish priest in Killeshin was continually 'teased' for tithe. In Carlow Doyle lived on terms of familiarity with the parson although he did not agree with everything he did. Consequently the parson enjoyed the goodwill of the people. In fact Doyle described him as 'one of the last clergymen in Ireland from whom his ecclesiastical dues would be withheld' even though these were 'very high'.<sup>252</sup>

Before the House of Lords committee on the state of Ireland Doyle allowed that if Catholics were emancipated their objections to tithes would be 'greatly removed'. He suggested that opposition to the Establishment would be diminished for reasons crucial to an understanding of interdenominational relations in the 1820s:

. . . whilst we labour under the disabilities which now weigh upon us, we find that the clergy of the Establishment, being very numerous and very opulent, employ their opulence and their influence in various ways opposing the progress of our claims; and I do think that if those claims were once adjusted, and the concessions which we desire granted, the country would settle down into a habit of quiet, and that we would no longer feel the jealousy against the clergy of the Establishment which we now feel; because that jealousy which we do feel arises chiefly from the unrelaxed efforts which they have almost universally made to oppose our claims. We would view them, if those claims were granted, as brethren labouring in the same vineyard as ourselves, seeking to promote the interests of our common country. 253

It is incontestable that the opposition of the great body of the Church Establishment in Ireland to Catholic Emancipation contributed greatly to a worsening of interdenominational relations. It certainly exacerbated Doyle's hostility to the Establishment and led to his attacks on Church property. The extent of that opposition was made clear in the anti-Catholic petitions of the Irish Anglican bishops delivered in the House of Commons on 5, 6 March 1827. The archbishop of Armagh, Lord George Beresford (holder of 100,000 acres of church lands), and 110 of his clergy signed a petition stating that 'were all remaining disqualifications abolished, Roman Catholics would enter the House, not as the unshackled and impartial supporters of Protestant institutions and Protestant interests, but as the agents and emissaries of the Priesthood of the Court of Rome'. Dr George de la Poer Beresford, bishop of Kilmore (who was possessed of twenty-eight thousand acres of church lands) and forty-nine of his clergy derided Roman Catholic 'hostility to every system of moral and religious education'. Lord Tottenham, bishop of Clogher (who held twenty-two thousand acres of church lands) was joined by sixty-six of his clergymen in declaring Catholic Emancipation a 'prelude to the overthrow of the Establishment, the substitution of a Popish ascendancy and the consequent dismemberment of the United Empire'.

Similarly the bishop of Meath, Dr Nathaniel Alexander (who had twenty-nine thousand acres of church lands) joined by 111 of his clergy declared that 'any further concession of political power to the Roman Catholics cannot be made consistently with the security of the Protestant Established Church'. The bishop of Cork and Ross, the Honourable Thomas St Lawrence (holder of eleven thousand acres), with ninety-seven of his clergy, implored the House 'to resist and refuse any further concession of power or privileges to persons holding allegiance to the bishop of Rome, or professing the Popish or Roman Catholic persuasion'. Dr John Leslie, bishop of Elphin (possessed of forty-two thousand acres of church lands) with forty of his clergy implored the House 'to restrain the arrogance of Popery'. Doyle's polemical adversaries were of course among the petitioners: Dr Magee of Dublin (holder of thirty-four thousand acres) had 179 signatures of his clergy on his petition. Dr Thomas Elrington of Leighlin and Ferns (twenty-six thousand acres) and 135 of his clergy feared that 'the destruction of the Protestant Church Establishment is the chief purpose for which an increase of political power is sought by the Roman Catholics'. Through his manifold publications and parliamentary evidence Doyle had consistently and with other Catholic bishops disavowed the old prejudices with which they were again confronted in the petitions of these Irish Protestant bishops. Here, said Doyle, was a Church denouncing the nation from which it derived its rank, wealth and even name.<sup>254</sup>

Doyle believed that in strict justice Church property belonged in greater part to the poor and that it should be applied to the ends for which it was originally intended. In his unpublished letter to

the Catholic Association of November 1827 Doyle drew attention to the toll on the population caused by premature deaths from distress and malnourishment whilst the Church Establishment 'the administration of which is the greatest abuse in the country' had been left untouched. Parsons, he wrote, were always active in some numbers on committees for the relief of the poor, but 'they never feel the slightest remorse at appropriating to their own use and the use of their wives and children, and horses and dogs and domestics the property which belonged to those poor and on whose behalf they appeal to the public'. In 1827 Doyle wanted a parliamentary commission to enquire into, ascertain and perhaps administer the Church Establishment. He believed that the revenues of the Church Establishment under the Tithe Composition Act were great enough to pay its clergy and still provide an extensive network of social and educational services throughout Ireland with even a surplus left over to assist the needy at all times.<sup>255</sup> It was not however until his 1831 Letter to Spring Rice that Doyle entered into a full public expression of these ideas. In this pamphlet he insisted in a long historical review of tithes that church property was a trust confided to the clergy of which a quarta pars was originally allotted to the poor. The revenue of the Establishment could be used to improve the country in a great variety of ways. Church revenues could even be used to pay the Catholic clergy.<sup>256</sup>

The causes of opposition to tithe in Mountrath in February 1830 were twofold. Firstly, an increase in the tithe levied consequent upon the appointment of a new rector. Dean Scott, rector of Mountrath, for

forty years before his death in 1827, was an absentee who never visited the parish but levied a sum of £500 which was farmed. His eventual successor Rev John Latouche introduced the Tithe Composition Act in 1829 with the alleged complaisance of an unrepresentative vestry. He levied tithe by the barrel and the ton rather than by the acre. The new levy was £1,500 per annum. Secondly, his curate, Rev Alexander Nixon, during the parson's absence on the continent conceived the idea of building a new church notwithstanding the fact that Mountrath already had a perfectly good church built c. 1800. Part of the reason for this was that money in the form of a grant and a loan was only available from the Board of First Fruits for the building of new churches rather than the improvement and enlargement of existing churches. He received £1,500 from the Board of First Fruits and proceeded to pull down the church of c. 1800 despite strong protests from several Protestant parishioners who objected to attempts to levy a large assessment to repay the money to the Board of First Fruits. These two developments determined the Catholic population not to pay tithe or church cess but to allow distress to be levied which it duly was. Large crowds attended cattle sales in Mountrath but the cattle were not sold but instead shipped from Dublin to Liverpool for sale in England. Further aggravating this bad situation was the fact that Rev Nixon was an active evangelical who was involved with other prominent evangelicals in establishing a 'Society for promoting the religious principles of the Reformation' in early January 1830. As Doyle explained to the House of Commons Tithe Committee

After the reformation bubble had burst, and we were only accustomed to laugh over it as a thing that had been, this man revived it in Mountrath, and undertook to preach sermons there, together with some fellow labourers of his, to convert the Catholics. The consequence was, that the Catholic clergy in the

town opened another theatre of controversy at the other end, and the war continued to rage most violently, till both parties being tired, they desisted from the combat . . . 257

The anti-tithe agitation, in what was to be its final most aggressive phase known with but little exaggeration as the 'tithe war', began in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin with the bishop's own kinsman Martin Doyle parish priest of Graiguenamanagh who refused to pay tithe to the local Protestant minister. As a result his horse was distrained and put up for sale by public auction in early December 1830. The security forces were aware that a large crowd intended to gather to forestall this sale by silently intimidating potential purchasers from making bids. The Leinster Inspector General of Police, Sir John Harvey, requested Bishop Doyle on 9 December to have this planned assembly called off.<sup>258</sup> Doyle informed Martin Doyle that he had 'civilly declined' to co-operate with his 'friend' Sir John. The parish priest had his bishop's full support provided he remained within the law. He urged Martin Doyle to cultivate the magistracy.<sup>259</sup> Throughout the last weeks of December large assemblies of several thousand peasants gathered in parts of Wexford, Carlow, Kilkenny and Tipperary demanding the reduction of tithes. These were joined 'either overtly or covertly' by the farmers.<sup>260</sup> Bishop Doyle foresaw danger arising from the likely actions of the security forces. In early January 1831 he advised the Chief Secretary Stanley that the 'existing excitement was not of a seditious or treasonable nature'; it was taking a peaceable direction and would continue to do so 'unless the poison of religious discord be infused into the minds of the peasantry'. Doyle added that magistrates who were religious and political partisans should not be employed to command local armed forces.<sup>261</sup>

In the House of Lords on 21 February Lord Farnham had no hesitation in stating that in Ireland there was a 'conspiracy against the Established Church' which was in many instances attributable to the Catholic clergy. He held that the Graiguenamanagh parishioners were satisfied with tithe until the arrival of the new Catholic priest, Martin Doyle, 'a relative too, of the celebrated Doctor Doyle'. Lord Farnham accused Martin Doyle of using 'inflammatory language' at an anti-tithe meeting in Graiguenamanagh on 27 November 1830 where he had allegedly threatened anyone who would bid at the forthcoming tithe sale.<sup>262</sup> The landlord of Graiguenamanagh Viscount Clifden presented a petition against the system of collecting tithe in Graiguenamanagh and Ullard on 4 March 1831. He maintained that these disputes would never be ended unless a liberal provision was made for the Catholic clergy.<sup>263</sup>

In March Bishop Doyle recommended to Sir Henry Parnell that the clergy of the Established Church should be 'instructed to make abatements and keep things quiet; but there is a military spirit in the government, which creates the necessity for employing force'. Doyle urged that the Tithe Composition Act be made compulsory. He asserted that a large military or police force would not awe the people into paying tithe.<sup>264</sup> On 26 May Doyle again warned Parnell of the dangers likely to arise from using the security forces:

The country is covered with a military force called police, and I believe in my conscience they are one of the chief causes of discontent and disturbance. The expense of maintaining them is enormous, and every addition made to their numbers is but an addition made to the cause of discontent; they are all of the Orange or ci-devant ascendant party; they must be so while the selection of them is vested in the local magistracy, and few or no Catholics among the officers. Discipline may and does restrain them to a certain extent, but does not remove that distrust or lurking hatred which appears whenever they come into collision with the people. <sup>265</sup>

The major collision which Doyle feared (one of many) finally came on 21 June in Lord Farnham's stronghold of Newtownbarry in County Wexford on the borders of the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin; twelve people were killed when a local magistrate ordered the yeomanry to fire on a crowd attending a tithe sale. Doyle informed Parnell on 8 July that 'the Newtownbarry affair was a certain, if not necessary effect of the proceedings of government with respect to the magistracy, the constabulary, and yeomen'. This Orange constabulary was characterised by a hatred of government and keener to take their orders from Lord Farnham than from Lord Anglesey: 'This armed banditti, urged by their leaders, are at this moment, using every possible exertion to excite the people to insurrection'.<sup>266</sup>

Doyle wrote to Sir William Gosset, under-secretary at Dublin Castle, demanding action against the yeomanry and suggesting that they be immediately disarmed. In reply to Doyle Anglesey demurred from this course of action: 'surely you would not upon reflection consider me justifiable [sic] in prejudging a case'.<sup>267</sup> In further correspondence Anglesey illustrated the dilemma which faced him:

The difficulties with which I am surrounded are little understood. The statement of them would hardly obtain credit. It rarely happens that I receive application for any measure (no matter what) from one Party in the State, that I do not immediately receive some project of the diametrically opposite tendency from another quarter. Thus it is upon the main subject of your letter. By the same post that brought it, I have received a pressing demand for an augmentation of [the] Police Force. <sup>268</sup>

In the House of Lords on 13 July Bishop Elrington attacked Bishop Doyle's pamphlet addressed to Thomas Spring Rice in which he had advised the peasantry against payment of tithes. Lord Farnham accused Doyle of sentiments calculated to lead to 'sedition, rebellion and civil war' and (in discussing the Newtownbarry affray) of being the



'foremost' in the anti-tithe 'conspiracy' in Ireland.<sup>269</sup> In a vigorous response to Lord Farnham published on 28 July Doyle attacked the payment of tithes and the excessive wealth of the Irish Church Establishment as being incompatible with the common good and contrary to natural justice.<sup>270</sup> In itself this riposte provided a further spur to the agitation. F. W. Conway as usual was exuberant in his praise of this 'masterly caustic' letter: 'There is not a tithe hater, nor Catholic in this kingdom who is not glorified'. The Morning Chronicle printed Doyle's reply with the editorial comment that 'Dr Doyle tramples on Lord Farnham, and all those who contend for tithes'. Cobbett's Register also had high praise for the publication.<sup>271</sup> In spite of the fact that Doyle was the outstanding opponent of tithes it is remarkable that the Lord Lieutenant was actually in private correspondence with him and being pressurised by him to decrease the police force which was duty bound to aid in the collection of tithe if so requested. On 26 August we find Anglesey expressing himself as follows to Bishop Doyle:

I am surprised and somewhat hurt at the tone of your letter of the 23d. If a stranger were to read it, he would imagine that you were addressing one, whose love of justice - whose anxiety for the good of Ireland - whose absolute disregard of party feeling, you doubted.

How after the interview and communications I have had with Your Lordship, can you bring your mind to suspect me upon these points? My Lord, if you do, you wrong me. The measure to which you allude, is one which has hitherto been acted upon almost as a matter of course, namely, that when a great majority of the Magistrates of a County, represent that an individual Constabulary force is required for the security of the laws, it is granted.

. . . I do not disguise that I am anxious for your co-operation in soothing and healing the wounds of Ireland. I believe you give me credit for exerting my whole energy in the advancement of her prosperity . . . [I] feel satisfied I could convince you of the justice and propriety of wholly trusting to us. 272

The tithe war was the first major campaign of active non-violent resistance in nineteenth-century Irish history though it was also the occasion of some of its bloodiest episodes as at Newtownbarry and Carrickshock. In February 1832 Doyle was called to give evidence before committees of both houses of parliament on the tithe question. In the course of this evidence Doyle clearly identified the bad feeling produced by the New Reformation campaign as an important factor in aggravating the tithe agitation and in alienating his own mind from the Protestant clergy:

Was there not a time when your opinion was that a compulsory composition would have been satisfactory to the people of Ireland? - In 1825, I believe I gave evidence, or at least I recollect having stated in conversation to Lord Liverpool, that the Tithe Composition Act ought to be put into operation, in order to relieve the small farmers; and I added that if the Catholic Doctrine were then settled, things were likely to go on very smoothly; and I said for myself and the clergy with me, that we should have no personal and professional hostility to the clergy of the Established Church; however, that Catholic Relief Bill was not passed then, and I had scarcely returned to Ireland when the cry of the New Reformation was raised, wherein a great portion of the Established Church took an active part: they exhibited themselves as the ill-tempered enemies of the religion of the people; they joined, I believe not knowingly, in propagating the most ill-founded calumnies of our church, and her doctrines and discipline; they everywhere promoted petitions against the repeal of the penal laws, and they rendered themselves by their whole conduct, from that day to this, so odious to the people, that a settlement which might have been made then could not be made now. 273

Doyle did not think his critical view of the Church Establishment would have been changed by any circumstances but had passions not been raised in the late 1820s he wondered whether he would not have attacked the tithe system.<sup>274</sup>

Doyle was subjected to a demanding cross-examination as the leading Irish proponent of the tithe agitation but he more than held his own in intellectually justifying the agitation. Tackled before the Commons' committee on the excesses of the tithe war, Doyle responded:

. . . it is manifest that though the people may be led into excesses in those cases, they are not the less entitled to proceed in seeking for a remedy for the abuse or the amendment of a bad law; for if we were to hold that because excesses may occur therefore we are to desist from seeking the redress of wrong, we would shake the very foundation of our constitution.<sup>275</sup>

If such a line of argument were adopted, Doyle reasoned in a more expansive answer before the Lords' committee:

we would not only have passive obedience established upon the broadest and firmest basis, but something more than the divine right of kings for we would have a divine right of abuse. In the name of the Lord what improvement has ever happened in this country that has not been effected by men pursuing justice in opposition to the law? I know of none . . . So if we are prevented from pursuing the recovery of right, because in pursuing that right evils may arise, we must abandon ourselves to despotism; and your Lordships will not succeed with me, and I believe the people in general, in so captivating their understandings to the letter of the law as to preclude them from pursuing what they think is right. <sup>276</sup>

As far as Doyle was concerned Catholics were under no moral obligation to pay tithe to Protestant ministers. He revealed a contemptuous attitude when he not alone admitted but proudly claimed before the 1832 Tithe committees that he had taken a leading role in the tithe agitation though he had at the same time 'always guarded every expression used by me with an especial charge not to violate any existing law, or to do any act that would tend to disturb the public peace'.<sup>277</sup> With more than a hint of condescension Doyle informed his hostile interrogators that the famous slogan of the tithe war - 'May your hatred of tithe be as lasting as your love of justice' - was 'a very happy form of expression which occurred to me and which I like exceedingly'.<sup>278</sup> Doyle's evidence before the parliamentary committees constitutes a history of the tithe system in Ireland and his performance, under the circumstances, was a tour de force.

The tithe agitation continued unabated throughout 1832. In June a very critical public letter by Doyle to E. G. Stanley was inspired by a passage misrepresenting the bishop's views in the Second Report of the Select Committee on Tithes of which the Irish Chief Secretary was chairman. In this stinging letter Doyle (who had had fairly good relations with Stanley in 1831) criticised him personally for following in the footsteps of the many statesmen who had misjudged and miscalculated the state of Ireland and for behaving in a partisan manner: ' . . . you have upheld, under the plea of mediation, or of "not giving victory to either party" all the spirit and almost all the power of the ascendancy; you have deprecated in words but upheld in works, the old distinction between Catholics and Protestants . . .'.<sup>279</sup> Stanley, according to Doyle, had but few achievements to his credit in Ireland. Doyle did not take pleasure in his failure but lamented it as he had hoped that Stanley would succeed. Doyle challenged the recommendation of the Select Committee:

. . . when Church Establishments everywhere are either suppressed or reformed; when nearly all civilized nations of the world have decided that governments shall be conducted by the will, and for the interests of the people, and not by the will, or for the interests of individuals or privileged classes, to suppose that now, at this period, the Irish people will permit the Established Church to be reconstructed - to acquire new possessions in the land of their country - to aggravate, under a new form, all its ancient pressure, and legalize, as it were, anew, the plunder of the patrimony of the poor, to suppose that this could now happen in Ireland is not only to be blind to the 'signs of the times' but it portends something - like that fatuity which befalls before-hand on the fore-doomed. . .

In a long and important passage Doyle attacked Stanley for governing the country in the Protestant interest:

There is one great and fundamental error influencing this Report; I believe it has influenced all your conduct and policy towards Ireland; I notice it because until it is removed from the minds of men in power, they will never be able to effect a settlement of this country. You appear to consider Ireland as in a great degree a Protestant country, and you confound her Protestantism with the creed and profession of the Established

Church. You are led into this opinion, because the proprietors of the soil, and nearly all those who hold communication with Government, whether connected with the law, with public office or otherwise, are of that Church. But to infer from this, that the country - its wealth, intelligence, and all its other elements of power are principally Protestant in the above sense, is the error which you seem to share in common with many others.

This, however, is a great and fatal error. There is but a small and very small fraction of the elements of power in the hands of the Protestant of the Established Church in this country. The Catholics, and those Protestants who are wedded to them for better or for worse, possess at least the forty-nine fiftieths of the real resources of a state in Ireland, and of all those things which a Legislature should keep in view in the enactment of laws, and the execution of them. Almost the entire of the commercial capital of Ireland is in the hands of Catholics and of liberal Protestants; I could run over in my mind fifty towns, in each and all of which, this is the case. Then as to land: supposing nineteen-twentieths of the fee of land in Ireland to belong to Protestants of the Established Church, what is the interest derived from that fee when compared with the other interests derived from the soil? Even a farmer, holding at a rack-rent, has, at all moments, in his hands, in the crop and stock of his farm, a possession far exceeding in value the rent payable to the owner in fee. And if this be true at one moment, or at any given time, it is equally true at every moment during the occupancy of the land by the tenant; so that property in land, or attached to land, which forms one of the great resources of the state, whether for the purpose of revenue, or of offensive or defensive war, may apparently belong to the owner in fee, but in reality belongs, not to him, but to the occupant tiller of the soil. These occupants of the soil, the real possessors of property in Ireland, are, with the exception of a few counties, generally Catholics, or Protestants whose feelings and interests are bound up with them. The intelligence, art, industry and physical strength of the country belong to the same classes in a proportion of at least ten to one; I should rather estimate it at twenty to one; and if these facts be such as are here stated, what greater error can a statesman be betrayed into, than to consider Ireland as a Protestant country, or legislate for her as if all the elements of her power belonged to the members of the Established Church? While she is considered in this light, and the chief proprietors of her soil - the churchmen, the public functionaries, the aspirants to office high or low, the petty magistrates, the half-pay officers, and gentlemen at large - while these classes are mistaken for the people of Ireland, and their passions and interests consulted for by the government and legislature, you, Sir, may report to parliament, and labour incessantly in the duties of your office, but you will never settle this country, nor even lay the foundation of her future prosperity and peace.280

This sophisticated letter which stretched the brilliant argument that the Catholics were the possessors of the moral force of the country perhaps too far at least proved that O'Connell's accusation that Doyle had been emasculated by the smiles of the Castle was far from true. While Doyle remained supportive of the whigs as opposed to the tories he was resolutely opposed to government policy on tithes. In July Doyle informed Parnell that Stanley's efforts to uphold the Church Establishment in Ireland would only 'prolong the social warfare' until he was defeated in this end. Doyle added: 'No Englishman should be Secretary for Ireland; for he can neither comprehend the country nor feel for its interest'.<sup>281</sup> This statement, was in effect, to make the case for repeal which O'Connell would have been very pleased to hear. But Doyle's opinion of O'Connell had not changed since their public controversy in January. Doyle felt O'Connell was continuing to do 'immense injury' to the country by 'deceiving the public' on the poor law issue. Not alone that but O'Connell was

insane if he be sincere in his late project of curing the immoralities and providing for the wants of the poor, by furnishing the Catholic clergy with glebes and glebe-houses. I wish he would cease to encumber us with his protection; our Church does not require his care or that of Parliament. Laissez nous faire is all we want; but the poor and the interests of peace and order demand the most speedy and serious attention.<sup>282</sup>

In spite of the efforts of Lord Anglesey to manage Doyle the bishop was unwilling to be complaisant. He was now completely disillusioned with Irish government policy. In August 1832 Doyle addressed a public letter to Anglesey which denounced his policy on anti-tithe meetings and marked a complete break with the Lord Lieutenant. Doyle's letter was in response to a speech of Lord Anglesey's in which he had stated that the 'pernicious doctrine' had gained credence in the popular mind that it was 'compatible with law

by any contrivance to evade the performance of the obligations it imposes and frustrate the means which it provides for their enforcement'. Doyle argued that this statement which was clearly aimed against the tithe agitation was true only where it related to just laws but with regard to unjust and injurious laws it was a duty to evade them and to frustrate the means of enforcing them was an act of 'social or moral virtue'. The greatest misfortune that could befall a country was when unjust laws were foisted upon it for then every man must feel a conflict within himself between due honour of the law and opposition to it for the sake of the common good. The tithe agitation fell into the latter category. Doyle denounced tithe as the 'worst remnant of the penal code'. He fully endorsed the anti-tithe campaign of active non-violent resistance. There was nothing immoral or illegal in ten or ten thousand men refusing to participate in the enforcement of tithe law and refusing to purchase goods for sale under that law. Indeed Doyle went so far as to state that the 'odious name of illegal confederacy may be understood here to designate what is not only legal but praiseworthy'.<sup>283</sup> This was Doyle's last public statement on the tithe agitation which continued until it was largely resolved four years after his death in 1838.

The Doyle work A dissertation on popery, or an analysis of divine faith, addressed to the Protestants of England ... was published posthumously in 1835. This lengthy work was written in late 1828, early 1829 but withheld from publication at that time. The Dissertation was wholly controversial, explaining on scriptural and historical grounds to English Protestants why they should return to the faith of their fathers. The entire object of the work was nothing less than the conversion or return of England to the Roman fold.<sup>284</sup>

The Dissertation can in fact be viewed as the logical consequence of Doyle's famous letter on the union of the churches of 1824. And given that Doyle was the leading opponent of the New Reformation it is perhaps not surprising that the Dissertation should exactly counterpoint that crusade in an Irish Catholic attempt to convert Protestant England to Roman Catholicism. Thus the Dissertation as a final legacy from Doyle marked a fitting conclusion to his contribution to this tense period in interdenominational relations.



## CHAPTER IV

### EDUCATION

It was not until the Kildare Place Society began to expand rapidly as the second decade of the nineteenth century drew to a close that Catholic difficulties with its rules became evident. Daniel O'Connell raised questions of the Kildare Place Society's principles at its annual meeting in 1819 but it was a year later before the decisive break took place. O'Connell was aware of a papal bull of Pius VII in 1818 which 'excludes from Catholic schools the Testament even with note and comment, even though these might be acceptable to Catholics'.<sup>1</sup> Before the Kildare Place Society's annual meeting in 1820 O'Connell applied to the archbishops of Dublin, Drs Troy and Murray, for direction. They consulted their parish priests and framed a statement which O'Connell read to the meeting on 24 February: 'The Scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a schoolbook'. The bishops called on the Society to give aid to those who refused to use the scriptures without note or comment and to remodel its rules to this effect.<sup>2</sup> O'Connell, supported by Lord Cloncurry, claimed before the annual meeting that the use of the scriptures without note or comment was in conflict with the Society's guiding principle of no interference with the religious beliefs of schoolchildren. He had applied for aid for his own schoolhouse in Kerry but the Society required the Bible to be used as a school-text: 'I could not let the Bible be a school-book, and you insisted I should'.<sup>3</sup> O'Connell stated that recent disturbances in Connaught had their origins mainly 'in attempts at school proselytism'. Indeed he continued: 'The spirit of proselytism is abroad; most respectable

persons have formed Bible Societies . . .'.<sup>4</sup> The liberal Protestant William Henry Curran supported O'Connell stating that 'the Catholic clergy and laity have taken alarm, and are deeply impressed with the conviction, that proselytism, that is, persecution in disguise, is a leading object of the Society . . .'.<sup>5</sup>

Defending the Society, John Henry North, a founder member, pointed out that the object of the Society was to unite Catholic and Protestant in one educational system thus diminishing religious prejudices and promoting reconciliation; it was not to provide one education for Catholics and another for Protestants. 'He had no inclination to proselytize, but he would place the Scriptures in the hands of the poor, and let them judge for themselves'.<sup>6</sup> The question at issue, he contended, was 'whether the Bible was for ever to be shut against the peasantry of Ireland'.<sup>7</sup>

A motion that there should not be an inquiry into the possibility of changing the Society's rules to accommodate Catholic difficulties was upheld by eighty votes to nineteen. Thereupon O'Connell declared that he and his friends would no longer be members of the Society.<sup>8</sup> Kingsmill Moore was of the opinion that both sides had approached this meeting as a test of strength.<sup>9</sup> O'Connell promptly published a letter to the Catholic prelates of Ireland, dated 25 February 1820, in which he stated that his stance at the Kildare Place meeting had been 'a duty which I undertook by the authority of some of your Lordships, and with the sanction of others'. The Kildare Place Society was indifferent to the feelings of Irish Catholics. It had, he claimed, become a Bible society. This was hardly cause for surprise as the Society numbered among its members 'some of the bitterest enemies of Catholic rights and of religious liberty'.

Fearful that Catholics would be accused of being hostile to education, because of their stance, O'Connell called on the bishops to establish a 'National Association for Education'.<sup>10</sup>

At a very early stage in his ministry Bishop Doyle became convinced of the necessity of publishing pastoral instructions 'on the subject of those schools which are forming throughout this diocese and wherein books are introduced to which we entertain objections'.<sup>11</sup> Doyle's guidelines for the diocesan clergy were published in the Carlow Morning Post on 31 January 1820 in a letter to Rev John Shea, parish priest of Baltinglass. The directive arose from a request by Shea on what course of conduct he should pursue in Baltinglass where the liberal Irish Chief Secretary, Charles Grant, had made a grant of £200 for the education of the poor to the County Wicklow Education Society on condition that a similar sum was raised within the parish.<sup>12</sup>

Doyle advised the parish priest to co-operate with the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor consistent with Catholic faith and discipline (Doyle at first thought it was the Kildare Place Society rather than the independent County Wicklow body which was involved). The education given should combine or unite religious and literary instruction. If it was proposed that the parents of children or their pastors should instruct them separately in their religion this should be opposed on the grounds that parents in many instances were 'quite incompetent' to teach their children and the Catholic clergy were 'overwhelmed with other duties of their calling'. The only practical alternative was for the schoolmasters to provide an effective and regular religious instruction in the schools. However Catholic clergymen must have a right of visiting schools in

their parishes as often as they deemed it necessary to inquire that the religious instruction of the children was faithfully carried out. As the teacher of one religious faith was 'unfit' to teach those of another the priests should ensure that where a majority of the pupils were Catholic there should be a master or an assistant who was Catholic. If the patron perceived difficulties in finding a competent Catholic master or assistant then the priest should propose to send a youth from his parish for instruction in the school of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in Dublin.<sup>13</sup>

With regard to the books used for instruction in the schools the priests were to adhere strictly to Catholic practice. Clergymen were to 'declare explicitly' to the patrons that no books were to be introduced for the use of the children which did not have the approval of the Catholic pastors. They were to make it known that if a small proportion of the funds of the school were given to the pastors they would provide such books for religious instruction 'as cannot be objected to'. Failing this the priests themselves were advised to provide the religious texts. Any religious book of doubtful doctrinal tendencies found in the schools was to be forwarded to Bishop Doyle for his judgement thereon.<sup>14</sup>

Doyle acknowledged that it was the reading of sacred scripture which was likely to be the source of greatest difficulty in these schools. On this subject he counselled his priests to express themselves decidedly and unequivocally. The Church did not prohibit the reading of scriptures: it merely regulated it. Doyle elaborated that the Catholic Church was not hostile to the reading of the scriptures but to the reading of editions which were not sanctioned by the Church. The Catholic Church objected to the scriptures being used

in the form of a 'reading made easy' for children. This view, Doyle believed, Catholics shared with the most zealous and enlightened pastors of the Established Church. Doyle did however allow lessons from the Douay Bible to be read in class to the Catholic students by the schoolmaster. Priests were urged to avoid controversy among school students of different denominations by introducing tracts on moral and religious duties alone which did not deal with specific dogmas. Such a work was The Imitation of Christ which Doyle regarded as a 'book equally applauded by Luther, Calvin, the late Mr Wesley, and the divines of our Church'.<sup>15</sup>

If the co-operation of the Catholic clergyman was slighted and if the school was intended 'for the vile purpose of proselytism' the priest should endeavour to prevent his parishioners from contributing to the establishment of the school. Where such schools were already established in his parish contrary to the regulations laid down by Bishop Doyle 'you will dissuade the children of our Communion from attending them'. In such cases Doyle instructed his clergy to publicise repeatedly the offers made by them to co-operate in the education of the poor so that they could not be accused of being hostile to education.<sup>16</sup>

Doyle sent copies of the Carlow Morning Post containing his letter to his rural deans advising them to call the attention of the clergy of their respective deaneries to the letter and to ensure that 'they observe exactly the rules which it prescribes'. Doyle believed the letter would 'relieve many of them from the odium they would incur with their neighbouring gentry by disapproving those schools of their own authority, and which they will in a great degree avoid by only discharging a duty prescribed by the Bishop'.<sup>17</sup>

Following Doyle's pronouncement J. W. Greene of Kilranelagh, Baltinglass, a Protestant landlord and a member of the County Wicklow Education Society, forwarded to the bishop the scriptural extracts used in the spelling books in his school for his approbation 'as from the liberal and judicious sentiments expressed in your letter I am convinced the Society would pay every attention to any recommendation coming from its author'.<sup>18</sup> The County Wicklow Education Society's purpose in publishing books with the sanction of clergymen of Catholic and Protestant persuasions was to have books for the use of all children which would be unobjectionable.<sup>19</sup> In reply Bishop Doyle congratulated Greene and his associates in their attempt to educate the poor adding 'how happy would our country be if the same spirit prevailed [in] it generally, to educate the poor is to confer the greatest blessing on them, to make children the channel of proselytism is to excite the religious feelings of the community and to unite them with the prejudices of all parties to disturb the public peace and perpetuate animosities'.<sup>20</sup> He regretted however to notice in some of the Wicklow Society's reports that the New Testament was used as a schoolbook: 'to this the Catholic will always object'. Doyle expressed his willingness to assist the County Wicklow Education Society on the principles laid down in his letter of 31 January 1820.<sup>21</sup>

But Doyle's publication of that date did not pass unchallenged. A Protestant clergyman, named Caldwell, attacked Doyle's position on the Catholic use of sacred scripture in the Carlow Morning Post. Doyle replied that without the authority of the Catholic Church to interpret scripture spiritual anarchy resulted. The Catholic Church's reverence for scripture and anxiety to prevent its misuse 'would

induce her to keep it out of the hands of children, either in or out of school'.<sup>22</sup> Caldwell procured the aid of a T.C.D. fellow and between them they responded to Bishop Doyle in a 'very virulent' letter. Pressure of work delayed Doyle's rejoinder but he confidently predicted 'when our publication appears it will ensure a triumph'.<sup>23</sup>

On 24 March 1820 Bishop Doyle questioned the motives of the Protestant governors of Carlow Public Day School (also known as the Infirmary School) in enlarging their premises. Doyle contended that this was not the most beneficial way of furthering the education of the poor in Carlow. He considered that the male and female Catholic free schools already established in Carlow were sufficient for the accommodation of those willing to attend them. However the children in attendance, especially the boys were in particular want of clothes and stationery. Doyle felt that the Protestant governors would be putting their resources to more fruitful use if they provided funds for that purpose rather than building new school rooms. He maintained that it was only the expectation of receiving clothing which would lead Catholic children to attend the Carlow Public Day School. The reason, he stated, was obvious: Catholic parents would rather their children were taught their catechism and prayers but this could not be done in the Infirmary School where both teachers were Protestants. Furthermore, Doyle put forward another objection, then tolerated, he admitted, for the sake of peace, but which would not be allowed to pass if Catholic numbers in the Infirmary School increased (as the patrons expected), namely the practice of reading the New Testament without note or comment as an ordinary schoolbook. Doyle concluded his letter to Rev Joseph Jameson, Anglican curate of Carlow, by stating that it was 'very desirable' that the 'harmony which so

happily subsists between Protestants and Catholics in this town should not be disturbed'. Doyle clearly foresaw the enlargement of the Infirmary School as the precursor of religious controversy in the schools of Carlow town.<sup>24</sup>

On receipt of Doyle's letter the governors of the school promptly held a meeting on 26 March. Rev Jameson replied that 'it is neither my wish nor that of the Governors of the Carlow Public Day School to interfere with the religious principles of the children of the Roman Catholic Church who may be admitted into it'. The governors saw no reason to change their extension plans for the school but they agreed to a resolution that in future the Catholic children would be dismissed half an hour before the Protestant children so that the scriptures would not be read by the teachers until after the Catholics had left the school.<sup>25</sup>

Dr Doyle responded to the Rev Jameson's reply with an irenical letter stating that he now felt no apprehension of interference with the religious tenets of the Catholic children. He suggested that given the Catholic opposition to the reading of the New Testament as a schoolbook the governors might institute the 'Evangelical Life of Christ' in its place for the use of the Catholic children. He also suggested that when the school was enlarged the governors might consider employing a Catholic assistant who would catechise the Catholic children thus enabling the Catholic pastors of the town to encourage the Catholic children to attend the school.<sup>26</sup>

The two free schools in Carlow town which were effectively Catholic were the Presentation Convent premises for females in Tullow Street which was enlarged in 1820 and the Carlow Free School (sometimes known as the 'Catholic Free School of Carlow') for males in



Chapel Lane.<sup>27</sup> Doyle had sought state funding for the latter school. In 1819 following a request from Irish Catholics made by William Parnell, M.P. for County Wicklow (brother of Henry Parnell, M.P.) parliament established the Lord Lieutenant's Fund to help the poor with the erection of schoolhouses. This fund was administered by three commissioners: Rev James Dunn, J. Digges Latouche and Major Benjamin A. Woodward. In 1819 the fund received £3,250 from parliament; this was raised to £4,333 in 1821, £7,583 in 1823 and £19,833 in 1824.<sup>28</sup> In 1821 Bishop Doyle sought a grant from the Lord Lieutenant's Fund for the Carlow Free School. Repeated applications by him were met by various delaying letters until a hint from Doyle that the matter would be raised in parliament brought the official response that Carlow Free School would not be grant-aided unless it was vested in the local minister of the Established Church who would appoint its teachers. This was completely unacceptable to Doyle and the Carlow Catholics who proceeded with their school without government aid.<sup>29</sup> The Commission of Education Inquiry in 1824-1825 discovered that grants to Catholics had been discouraged by the commissioners of the Lord Lieutenant's Fund who had adopted a printed form of conveyance which made the Established Church minister and churchwardens parties to the school and vested in them the management of the school. A revealing letter from Major Woodward in 1822 (which he subsequently denied having any recollection of to the Education Inquiry) disclosed that the general principle of the fund was that education should be controlled by the clergy of the Established Church and the commissioners very rarely departed from this principle. This was convincingly borne out by the fact that only twelve out of the 431 grants issued by the Lord Lieutenant's Fund had been given to Catholics.<sup>30</sup>

In 1822 Bishop Doyle was president of the Carlow Free School. Both vice-presidents, the secretary and six members of the twenty-two-man committee were Catholic clergymen. All the children in the school were Catholics. Carlow Free School was funded by public subscriptions. Protestant subscriptions were stressed in its reports. Street collections were taken up in the town in Tullow Street, Dublin Street, Castle Street, Burren Street and in Graigue in Killeslin parish where not insignificant sums were collected. The committee of the Carlow Free School also clothed the children attending the school from their funds and special subscriptions. This was found to be a necessity because 'a great number of the children were almost in a state of nakedness', and there was always the unstated danger of at least some few Catholic children attending the better endowed Carlow Public Day School. The second report of the Carlow Free School in April 1822 enumerated a general attendance of 204 boys who studied cyphering, reading, writing and spelling. They also, of course, learned the catechism and were 'remarkable for repeating it correctly and understanding it well'. After two years the school visitors' board noticed that the observance of school duties and punctuality of attendance as well as the habit of cleanliness were improving among the students. The visitors had only one major complaint:

. . . the parents of the children are still so blind to their interests, that they continue to keep them at home, for days and even for weeks on the most frivolous pretences; and although (when a good reason cannot be assigned), the Boys are always punished for their absence, even this is often ineffectual, as some of the parents will not hesitate to invent gross-falsehoods, in order to excuse the Children. If close attendance by the children could be procured there would be every hope of making the school as perfect as could be expected.<sup>31</sup>

The Catholic response to the failure of the Kildare Place Society to meet their demands was an attempt to establish their own

educational institution. On 2 February 1821 at a meeting in the Rotunda, Dublin, Archbishop Troy proposed that the 'Irish National Society for the Education of the Poor' be set up.<sup>32</sup> Six bishops - Troy, Murray, Kelly, Everard, Marum and Doyle - and two noblemen - Lords Cloncurry and Gormanston - were requested to act as vice-presidents. John Finlay, a barrister and the Carmelite, Rev L'Estrange were appointed joint secretaries. The latter was soon replaced by the barrister John Therry. This Society was financially embarrassed from its foundation. Without extensive support from the government it could not attempt to provide a nation-wide alternative to the rapidly-growing Kildare Place Society. By September 1821 the Society had only managed to establish a school for boys at No 4, Lower Abbey Street, Dublin, which was open to persons of every religious persuasion. The guiding principle of the Society was to disseminate the benefits of a moral education without interference with the religious beliefs of the pupils.<sup>33</sup> A total of only £238 had been collected in subscriptions (including £10 from Bishop Doyle) by September 1821 - proof, if proof were needed, of the inability of the Catholic community to fund a centralised educational institution with a nation-wide organisation. Thus the Society if not exactly still-born was certainly in a moribund state soon afterwards. Fully realising that government support was crucial Doyle requested Sir Henry Parnell to present a petition from the Catholic archbishops, bishops and laity on the education of the Irish poor in the House of Commons.<sup>34</sup> Before presenting the petition on 25 May 1821 Parnell sought a statement from Doyle on the extent of Catholic education in Ireland.<sup>35</sup> Doyle's response was remarkably frank and critical:

In the counties of Carlow, Kildare and the Queen's County, very nearly all the Roman Catholic children attend school during the

summer and autumn, are taught reading, writing, and arithmetic, but their masters, in many instances, are extremely ignorant, their schoolhouses are mere huts, where the children are piled on each other, and the sexes promiscuously jumbled together. From the want of space, the Lancastrian plan, or that of Bell cannot be introduced; and if there were space, we have not funds to buy forms, books or to pay a master capable of instructing. In the winter months the children do not attend, generally from want of clothing, fire and a dry schoolhouse. In the towns of the counties referred to, the schools are better and more regularly attended, but the poor are usually very much neglected; and as in the schools established or assisted by the Kidare Street Society the principle adopted in them of using the Bible as a school-book, and the master who is generally a Protestant, undertaking to expound it, it is sufficient to exclude Catholics - hence there is nothing left to assist the poor, unless where benevolent individuals contribute to provide them with education. Of these three counties, I may safely say that nine-tenths of the farmers' children, and all those of the better classes, receive education of a very imperfect kind, and imparted in a very defective way, by men, in most instances, incompetent to teach. The children of the poor in the country are entirely neglected; in the towns many of them are left in complete ignorance; others obtain some little knowledge of reading and writing and arithmetic; and I suppose from a rough estimate made by myself last summer during my visitation, there may be between 12,000 and 15,000 Roman Catholic children in the three counties just mentioned who attend school during the summer months. These counties, I presume might present an average view of the state of Roman Catholic education throughout Leinster and Munster, excepting the great towns of Dublin, Waterford, Cork and Limerick; but in Connaught (which I visited chiefly to ascertain the state of the peasantry) they are buried in destitution, filth, ignorance and misery, I believe that in the North, below Drogheda, their state is not much better. 36

Doyle's view of the hedge school and its master was not characterised by any of the romance which later generations would retrospectively attribute to this era in Irish educational history. In particular a lengthy passage from an unpublished dialogue by Doyle is his locus classicus on the milieu and mentalité of the hedge school master:

Since the repeal of the most odious of the penal laws in the reign of his late Majesty schools have been opened in almost every village, but as you may naturally suppose the schoolmasters were generally not of the best description, their minds bearing the rude traces of that barbarous code from which they have just escaped. Their character is not materially altered in many places to the present day. They have no fixed

abode, no settled maintenance, their support is precarious and they are compelled thro' necessity to stoop to mean offices to associate with the lowest description of the people, so that frequently their conduct is far from being exemplary and their manner of teaching as rude and as absurd as you can well imagine. Under such masters children may learn by the force of genius to read, write and keep accounts but that useful education of morals and manners which is of vastly greater importance cannot be acquired from such teachers. The schoolhouses also or rather the want of them are another great obstacle to the advancement of the children. In general the schoolhouses are the most wretched cabins imaginable, cold damp and obscure. In bad weather the rain enters them in torrents; the aperture which admitted air and light is stopped up to exclude the storm. The stones which were the only furniture and supplied the places of both desks and forms become moist and the children fly from them to assemble in a cloud of smoke and like a group of Indians about a fire kindled in the centre of the room from which however those are partly excluded who have not brought for its composition their contribution of turf. When the weather becomes more severe these houses are altogether abandoned, until the following spring when they undergo a thorough repair by being newly sodded over or covered with mountain heath. The children in the winter return to their respective homes to unlearn as it were the little knowledge they had acquired during summer and autumn. Whilst the master pays them occasional visits of ceremony and partakes over the well spread table of potatoes of the hospitality of their parents. Here he counts over the traditions of the country, tells of the battles which were won and lost in the neighbourhood, of the prodigies of valour performed by some Irish heroes - of the cruelty and perfidy of the English especially of Cromwell and his followers, of Ireton, of Coote, St Leger, etc., of the ghosts which had frequently appeared and with whom he himself had conversed, of the prophecies of Columbkille the originals of which he had perused, the politics of the present day and all that would shortly happen or was to occur in future times. He retires with the younger branches of the family, sons and servants to some place of rest - he inflames their minds anew, and before the rising sun has summoned them to labour, they are perhaps all bound to some mysterious compact by an unlawful oath. 37

Late in autumn 1821 Bishop Doyle tried a new tactic. It was by then evident that the hierarchy's own society, the Irish National Society for the Education of the Poor, was not going to succeed and also that the government was not about to fund Catholic education. The new approach was an attempt to persuade the government to force the modification of the rules of the Kildare Place Society to make them acceptable to the Irish Catholic bishops. To this end Doyle drew

up a manuscript entitled 'Thoughts on education of the poor in Ireland' which was submitted to the Chief Secretary, Charles Grant, by Lord Fingall, Archbishop Troy, Doyle and three other Catholic prelates, for the government's consideration and attention.<sup>38</sup> Doyle began cleverly, implicitly using the need to civilise the Irish argument by submitting that the want of an early religious education was one of the principal reasons why the peasantry were easily induced to take rash oaths and to combine in illegal associations 'to commit those excesses which, for centuries past, as well as at present, have disgraced this country . . .'. The vast majority of the poor children of Ireland were Roman Catholics: 'one half at least are unprovided with any kind of useful instruction in their youth' moreover a great percentage of those who were sent to school did not benefit owing to the lack of a good system of education, proper schoolhouses and well-educated schoolmasters. The Catholic population was unable to provide for the education of its poor children and if the government did not remedy this situation education would hardly advance among them. No material benefit could be rendered to the Catholic children if it was done in a manner adverse to their religious principles or likely to be distrusted by their parents or pastors. Consequently the Kildare Place Society had not been able to carry out the wishes of the legislature when it placed a fund at their disposal for the instruction of the Irish poor 'without religious distinctions'. However Catholics would benefit if the rules of the Kildare Place Society were modified so as to remove their apprehensions.

Doyle suggested that this could be achieved in a number of ways. Firstly the Catholic archbishops of Dublin could be nominated as vice-presidents of the Society and six parish priests in Dublin city or

others suggested by Archbishop Troy and acceptable to the government should be added to the committee. Secondly, the 'Evangelical Life of Christ' or any other anthology of scripture approved by Dr Troy should be submitted instead of the New Testament for the use of the Catholic children. Thirdly, that thereafter no books should be printed for the Society to which three members of the committee objected. And where three or more committee members found objectionable passages in books already printed these should be removed in future editions. These modifications were urged as they did not interfere, it was claimed, with the existing rules of the Society; they would make a religious education available to all without interfering with the religious beliefs of any, consonant with the rules of the Society. Furthermore until the pastors of the Catholics gave their cordial support to the Society parents would not allow their children to attend the Society's schools: 'from a variety of causes the Roman Catholics of the country will always look with distrust to any system of education devised, and conducted exclusively by persons professing a religion different from their own . . .'. The Catholic objection to the reading of the scriptures was that the practice would unsettle the children's religious belief 'by giving occasion to young and ignorant persons to form erroneous judgements of many passages of the scriptures which are hard to be understood, and which have ever been interpreted in different ways by divers persons, and not infrequently to the great detriment of the most venerable institutions in both Church and State'. The Catholic Church held that children should be taught from extracts or compilations suited to their age and capacity and habits.

Doyle claimed in 'Thoughts on Education' that the number of schools receiving assistance from the Kildare Place Society was

'comparatively few'; where these schools were frequented by Catholic children 'the rules of the Society are evaded' or if observed the children were reluctantly allowed by parents and pastors to remain in the school for fear of antagonising the patron, usually the local landlord, to their own disadvantage. Under the persistent expectation that the government was on the point of assisting the education of the Catholic poor financially the Catholic clergy 'overlooked in many instances what they disapproved of, as no duty could be more painful to them than to withdraw children from one school without being able to receive them in another'. Catholic caution with regard to their flocks would increase if their hopes of government aid were frustrated.

Doyle also alluded to the fact that the Lord Lieutenant's Fund for the education of the poor was inaccessible to Catholics. Indeed most Catholics were unaware of its existence. This fund was applied principally, as we have seen, for the building of schoolhouses where the operators of the fund were satisfied that a title to the school was extant and vested in approved trustees usually clergymen of the Established Church or churchwardens. Catholic children generally attended cabin-schools where no title was available. This fund, Doyle contended, could be more beneficially applied in instructing schoolmasters, and in the distribution of stationery, books and slates, and small sums for school improvements. If the Kildare Place Society could not be induced by the government to modify its rules to make them acceptable to Catholics then the assistance Catholics required from government might be given through a separate fund confided to the Trustees of Maynooth College (who were already in receipt of state funds) to be disposed of by them in the above manner with an annual report to the government accounting for their stewardship.<sup>39</sup>



Doyle's 'Thoughts on Education' failed to change the Irish government's support for the status quo. A copy of the submission (without the consent or knowledge of the bishops) came into the possession of the Kildare Place Society which replied to the allegations it contained against them.<sup>40</sup> The Society claimed that far from having comparatively few schools, as Doyle alleged, its numbers had grown as follows: 1816 - 8; 1817 - 65; 1818 - 133; 1819 - 241; 1820 - 381; and 1821 - 513. The Society pointed to the rapid advance in the number of its schools 'notwithstanding the various obstacles which have hitherto impeded their progress'.<sup>41</sup> On this ground the Society denied Bishop Doyle's fundamental charge that it had been unable to fulfil the intentions of the legislature with respect to funding the education of the poor without religious distinction. Moreover the Society argued that the fact that no charge of religious interference was made in any of its schools was sufficient to prove the general inaccuracy of 'Thoughts on Education'. It also pointed to the fact that many Catholic clergymen were managing schools in association with Kildare Place as evidence of Catholic support.<sup>42</sup>

Less satisfactorily the Society's reply to 'Thoughts on Education' stated that any nomination of Catholic clergymen to the committee of Kildare Place was a matter for the members at an annual meeting, but such new members would entertain 'the most opposite sentiments' as to the best means of promoting the education of the poor to the original and current members.<sup>43</sup> Another proposal treated unfavourably was Doyle's suggested modification of the rules of the Society with regard to Bible reading. The 'Thoughts on Education' proposal to replace the New Testament with the 'Evangelical Life of Christ' or any compilation from scripture was unacceptable to the

Society which allowed no works of catechesis on its curriculum apart from the Bible. Its view was that no book ought to be made a substitute for the holy scriptures.<sup>44</sup> This, of course, was the heart of the matter and had it been possible to reach agreement on this issue agreement on all other issues would have been possible.

Doyle drafted a rejoinder to the Kildare Place Society's reply. He focussed on the fact that the Society had received almost £55,500 through grants from the exchequer and from private subscriptions. Yet rules twelve and thirteen of the Society prevented it from furnishing pecuniary aid towards the building of schools or to assist in large measure in their support. The Society did contribute to the cost of furnishings and fittings. Doyle argued that despite the increase in the number of schools associated with the Society it still bore no relation to the wants of the poor in Ireland, or to what might be done with the funds at the Society's disposal if they had the confidence of the Catholics.<sup>45</sup>

In seven years Doyle noted the Society had made only thirty-six grants to schools in Connaught and 108 grants to schools in Munster: two provinces where he reckoned that some seven hundred thousand children required education. Why he wondered was Connaught so neglected? Was it because the population was exclusively Catholic? In Munster the schoolhouses 'for the greater part are the most wretched that can be imagined and entirely destitute of every necessary apparatus'. Doyle asked rhetorically: 'Is it that in these provinces there is not a thirst for knowledge, or persons anxious to promote it, or schools which require assistance?'. He reckoned that in Connaught there were 1,223 schools established under the influence or guidance of the Catholic clergy in general. He gave a figure of 2,117 schools in Munster also established by the Catholic pastors.<sup>46</sup>

The Kildare Place Society was more generous to Dublin and the province of Leinster 'to which their grants had chiefly been confined'. In this rejoinder Doyle again returned to the most damaging criticism of the Society which was that it was unable to fulfil the wishes of the legislature in distributing funds without religious distinction. The Society had claimed that no instance of religious interference had been communicated to it. Doyle replied that priests complained to patrons with reference to obnoxious books and 'if the nuisance be not removed the children are withdrawn. That this has frequently occurred is notorious'. The small number of Catholic students who attended schools in association with the Society was also adduced by Doyle as proof of its infamy for religious interference. On the estate of one (unnamed) nobleman in one part of his diocese 'nearly twenty school-houses [are] now closed up . . . from which children were withdrawn'. In Carlow town upwards of five hundred children were educated in free schools and could not receive any assistance from the Kildare Place Society whilst their rules remained unchanged. While in the one school in Carlow town conducted on Kildare Place principles which was frequented largely by Protestant children alone with a few Catholics Doyle himself intervened with its 'liberal and enlightened' committee to check the interference of the master with the religious beliefs of the Catholics. Doyle also mentioned the similarly 'liberal and enlightened' County Wicklow Education Society wherein the dissent of any one member of its committee to the adoption of any book was sufficient to ensure its omission.<sup>47</sup> Doyle asserted that the Kildare Place Society could not maintain that the modifications suggested by the Catholic bishops in 'Thoughts on Education' which would make the Society acceptable to

them, would entail, if implemented, a departure from the letter of its rules when that rule included the guiding principle 'of not interfering with the religious opinions of any'.<sup>48</sup>

Doyle's exasperation grew throughout 1822 but there were no further public developments. In mid-January 1823 after the annual meeting of the hierarchy Doyle again wrote to Parnell briefing him on current Catholic thinking. He wrote that if the government continued funding the Kildare Place Society 'it will be quite impossible to establish harmony or mutual confidence amongst the different religionists especially of the lower orders'. The parliamentary grants for education, Doyle considered fully adequate to meet the needs of all denominations 'but as they are now employed, they serve to generate discord, heart-burnings, and almost a civil war in every village'. Doyle and other prelates had used their influence to calm the passions thus generated. They had overlooked what they could not approve rather than cause confrontation. Doyle asserted, in a significant pointer to future developments, that he could if he so desired easily defeat the Kildare Place Society with an address calling on his flock to withdraw all their children from their schools but he acknowledged that in so doing the temporal interests of some of his flock would be 'entirely ruined' through eviction by uncompromising landlords.<sup>49</sup>

Doyle devoted almost one-third of the Vindication to a defence of Catholic education and an attack on Bible societies. The charge that the Catholic clergy were hostile to the diffusion of education Doyle refuted with the observation that within his own diocese there was as great a percentage of Catholics educated as in any part of the British empire with the possible exception of some parts of Scotland.

Moreover those Catholics had been educated without benefit of royal bounty, parliamentary grant, or outside aid but by their own 'extraordinary exertions' excited and directed by their clergy in penurious circumstances. On this Doyle reflected 'there are truths so clear, that argument only serves to obscure them, and this appears to be one of them'.<sup>50</sup> Doyle acknowledged that the objections of Catholics to the diffusion of the scriptures without note or comment was compounded with and regarded as hostility to education per se. This imputation, Doyle believed, had influenced some members of the administration to withhold from Catholics the full benefits of the parliamentary grant. In the Vindication Doyle sought to dispel the prejudices surrounding this subject by treating the Marquis Wellesley to a disquisition on the Catholic doctrine and discipline governing the reading of the sacred scriptures.<sup>51</sup> In the course of this Doyle attributed the religious wars of early modern Europe to the unfettered right of private interpretation of the scriptures among the common people.<sup>52</sup> He concluded by re-stating that Catholics far from being hostile to education were its most zealous proponents but they considered the reading of sacred scriptures by children in Ireland at that time as 'an abuse, evil in its principle, and dangerous in its consequences'.<sup>53</sup>

On 9 March 1824 James Grattan, M.P., for County Wicklow, presented a petition of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops on education to the House of Commons. This petition (which was probably written by Doyle) was signed by Curtis, Murray, Kelly, Laffan, Murphy, Magauran, Marum and Doyle. The petition suggested that the Trustees of Maynooth College who were already known to the government should be favoured with a grant for furthering the education of the poor. It was

contended that any system of education incompatible with Catholic Church discipline or taught exclusively by persons of a religious belief different from the vast majority of the population could not possibly be acceptable to the Catholic bishops and must lead not alone to slow progress but to discord and mutual mistrust. The bishops pointed out that the funds appropriated by parliament to education of the poor in Ireland were substantial but they complained that the manner in which they were distributed was at variance with Catholic religious principles, in particular in the indiscriminate use of the Bible which was uniformly insisted upon. Consequently Grattan claimed that the funds of the Kildare Place Society were 'misappropriated excessively'.<sup>54</sup> The Chief Secretary for Ireland, Henry Goulburn, replied that the only restriction on the issue of such grants which had been sanctioned several times by parliament was that the scriptures should be read without note or comment. Furthermore Catholics were availing themselves of Kildare Place Society grants.<sup>55</sup> (The petitioners had alleged that where such was the case the Kildare Place Society's rules were evaded or formulated to suit Catholic principles.) Robert Peel observed that there were two great rules which ought never to be abandoned: firstly 'to unite as far as possible without violence to individual feelings, the children of Protestants and Catholics under one common system of education; and secondly in so doing, studiously and honestly to discard all idea of making proselytes'. He believed the Kildare Place Society to have 'erred in the latter respect although it might have begun its labours without any intention of procuring converts'. This was a most significant admission from the Home Secretary which once admitted would inevitably lead to government reappraisal of the Kildare Place

grant. On 25 March Sir John Newport moved for a royal commission (as opposed to a less easily obtained select committee of the House of Commons) to investigate the state of Irish education and any schools maintained from the public funds and to report on the means of extending the benefits of education in Ireland. Newport's motion was carried and the Commission of Irish Education Inquiry was duly established by the king.<sup>56</sup>

In the House of Commons on 29 March 1824, a Kildare Place founder member and ardent supporter, John Henry North, in a maiden speech declared that until the establishment of the Society in Ireland in 1811 'the whole country in regard to education was in a state of thick and palpable darkness. The Protestant clergy had necessarily no influence over a Catholic population, and the Catholic priests never undertook the task of instructing them'.<sup>57</sup> In early April F. W. Conway drew the attention of the Catholic Association to North's speech and the apparent insult to Catholics.<sup>58</sup> Bishop Doyle was promptly in the field with a letter to the Catholic Association dated 8 April refuting North's mis-statements. Doyle asserted that from his knowledge of Counties Wexford, Carlow, Kildare and the Queen's County a 'vast majority' of the inhabitants under forty years of age could at least read and were 'at least as well instructed in their moral and religious duties as the inhabitants of an equal portion of the British dominions'. Moreover they were not indebted to the Kildare Place Society for these advantages or for hardly any portion of them. Those aged above forty years in these counties were generally though not universally illiterate, but, stated Doyle, 'their moral culture has not been neglected'. He entered into an apologia for the educational achievements of Catholics despite penal harassment: 'To this day, the old people relate the instances of persecution which occurred in their

own time - not the traditions of their fathers, but what they themselves had seen and felt.<sup>59</sup> Doyle's predecessor Bishop Gallagher (who died in 1751) received the fulsome tribute of being 'a man not inferior in mind or virtue to Fenelon'; he had endeavoured to educate youths in his mud hut on the verge of the Bog of Allen. Gallagher's clergy taught the rudiments of learning wherever they could. When Catholics were permitted an education from 1782 priests founded schools in their own homes and churches were frequently used as schoolhouses. Despite being few in number relative to the overall size of the population and also taking into account the multifarious duties and activities of the clergy it had been no small achievement to keep the light of education alive. 'This calumniated order of men have proceeded steadily and perseveringly in the discharge of their duty, and without succour or support, have succeeded in this part of the country, in removing "the thick and palpable darkness" created by a flagitious code of law.' Doyle attacked North's statement that immoral and seditious books were introduced by Catholic priests who connived at their use in schools as a 'gross and unfounded calumny'. He conceded that during the penal era 'many books and rhymes, embodying the popular tales and suited to the deranged taste of a distracted people, were composed and circulated and introduced too often in schools; but they were few in number'. The Catholic clergy had however succeeded in effecting the total removal and suppression of these books before the Kildare Place Society was founded. Moral and historical tracts, such as the works of England and Leadbetter, were daily issuing from the Irish Catholic press in a vast variety. These were the only books used in the Catholic schools of Kildare and Leighlin.



Doyle provided the Catholic Association with a summary of the state of Catholic education in his diocese which could be used to correct the mis-statements of Mr North. In 1823-1824 there were 246 schools in the diocese attended almost exclusively by Catholic children and supported by their parents. Thirty-seven of these could be termed 'free schools' in which the teachers were paid by annual subscription, charity sermons, etc. by the school committee of clergymen and laymen. In some places the Catholic clergy alone supported these 'free schools' and in others not termed 'free' the clergy secretly supported the education of the indigent whose embarrassment would otherwise be revealed or who would not receive any education whatsoever:

Of these 246 schools there are seventeen which receive aid from the Kildare Place Society. There may be others not included in the returns made to me, because not frequented by Catholic children, unless, perhaps, by one or other whose unhappy parents would be driven from their habitation, or excluded from employment, did they not send their children to such schools, for this kind of domestic persecution has, in a few instances, been resorted to in this Diocese.

The reports which have been made to me, of those few schools which receive aid from the Kildare Place Society, state that the masters are Catholics; that the schools are under the superintendence of a Priest; that one day in each week, or some part of every day, is set apart for the religious instruction of the children; that such portion of the New Testament as the priest selects is read by some few of the children, and generally in his own presence, with that religious respect and reverence due to the word of God.

Notwithstanding my abhorrence of the demoralizing and antichristian principle, of committing the sacred Scriptures to the interpretation of every prating Sophist, of every senseless child, of every silly old woman, I have tolerated their introduction into those few schools, where the reading of them was so guarded that no abuse of it could be reasonably apprehended; always prepared, did any such abuse appear, to use my influence, and that of the Clergy, to have the children withdrawn from them; or to exclude the Testament altogether . . .

To this distressing expedient I have sometimes had occasion to have recourse, with regard to schools established, or sought to be established in a manner which did not accord with the principles of the Catholic church. In these cases, the watchfulness of the Clergy had exceeded mine, and the zeal of the people surpassed both . . .

There were only two schools known to the bishop in the whole diocese operating on different principles. One was the Carlow Public Day School in which the governors had ordered that the Catholic children be dismissed before the reading of the scriptures. And in the other school the priest directed by Doyle withheld his sanction until a Catholic assistant was appointed to the master.<sup>60</sup>

Doyle's letter was read at the Catholic Association by F. W. Conway (then acting secretary) and inserted in the minutes. The ever-vigilant Home Secretary noticed the letter. Peel was impressed by Doyle's arguments but doubted his facts: 'Dr Doyle is a clever fellow. I have read a letter from him on the education of the Roman Catholics, giving, I dare say, a very inaccurate account of the state of education, but very ably written'.<sup>61</sup> Richard Lalor Sheil stated that Doyle's letter more clearly revealed the true situation between Catholic education and Kildare Place education than anything he had previously seen. Sheil believed that there were many members of the Kildare Place Society who were not governed by a spirit of proselytism:

It frequently happened, however, that men's motives were not only disguised to the world but also to themselves, and he conceived it almost impossible, that men who evinced such a religious zeal, and who congratulated themselves on being free of the errors of the Catholic religion, should not be anxious to extend the benefits to be derived from a disenthralment from those errors to persons of that religion. <sup>62</sup>

The Catholic Association used the education issue to improve its co-operation with the Irish Catholic Church. In response to the invitation of the Association to the clergy to refute North's speech letters poured into its Capel Street rooms outlining the state of Catholic education in many parts of Ireland. While Doyle led the way from Kildare and Leighlin other bishops detailed what was happening in their dioceses.<sup>63</sup> Bishop Coppinger of Cloyne and Ross addressed a letter to his clergy in

which he reminded them 'of the solemn engagement entered into at our last General Meeting at Fermoy, against a coalescence with the Kildare-street Society, in their wild project of a scriptural education for Roman Catholic children, by the use of Bibles, without note or comment'.<sup>64</sup> Bishop O'Shaughnessy of Killaloe stated that his clergy had 'zealously set their faces against' the Kildare Place Society whose only and chief design was proselytism. He estimated that there were about 280 schools in his diocese of which not more than ten had some connection with Kildare Place:

Notwithstanding the vigilance and exertions of the pastors, the influence and enthusiasm of some Protestant ladies and gentlemen, but particularly the former, [we] have a few schools where the Master is a Protestant, and where the Testament is read, but such Schools are frequented mostly by Protestant children, yet some poor Catholic children, by promises of rewards and dread of persecution go to such schools. <sup>65</sup>

Doyle's neighbour Bishop Keating of Ferns asserted that the Catholic clergy had done more to forward education in his diocese than all the public societies collectively. Although several schools in the diocese were endowed from public funds the Catholic children with few exceptions had been withdrawn because the scriptures without note or comment were used as a text-book and their religious principles were endangered by the 'restless interference' of the patrons of such schools.<sup>66</sup> Bishop McGettigan of Raphoe stated that Catholic education was in a progressive state throughout the parishes of his diocese, supported by clergy and parents without outside aid. A few schools which had been established by Bible societies were now deserted by Catholic children 'as proselytism seemed to be their ultimate object'. As an example he noted that when he went on visitation from his place of residence the children who frequented the Bible school there were obliged to attend Protestant services on three successive Sundays.<sup>67</sup> Bishop Plunkett of Meath stated that there were a few schools in his diocese managed on Kildare Place

principles which were attended by Catholic children 'who are compelled to do so by the influence, and sometimes the threats and persecutions of their landlords'.<sup>68</sup> The Catholic Warden of Galway, Edmund French, maintained that as long as Catholics held the suspicion that an attempt was being made to subvert the religious principles of their children then any professed liberal aid would be rejected. French contended that because of this 'education has suffered materially; and the result has been heartburnings, discontent and in some places persecution'.<sup>69</sup>

The commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry required every parochial clergyman in Ireland to make a detailed return of the state of education in his parish. These returns are no longer extant in their original form. Fortunately Doyle advised his parish priests to supply him with accurate copies of their returns to the commissioners and these invaluable records are extant for his diocese only. An examination of the specific difficulties posed by non-Catholic schools for parish priests throughout the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin in summer 1824 allows us to see the cutting edge of the educational controversies, and the context in which Bishop Doyle's public statements on this issue became more forthright and aggressive. Here we discuss in detail the reaction of individual parish priests to proselytism and the problem of Catholics in Protestant schools before going on to consider schools with parish priests as patrons which were in connection with the Kildare Place Society.

Malachy MacMahon, parish priest of Clane, had allowed Catholic children to attend Donadea Castle school when it opened in May 1823 under the impression that it was intended for the education of Catholics and Protestants without religious distinction. Within a few days 170 Catholic and five Protestant children were in attendance. The school was associated with the Erasmus Smith foundation and the patrons and

superintendents were Lady Aylmer, Miss Aylmer and Rev Whitelaw of the Established Church.<sup>70</sup> MacMahon soon discovered that the school was run on religious principles unacceptable to his Church and he consulted his bishop on his course of action:<sup>71</sup>

The Catholic children were every day obliged to read a portion of the Protestant Bible, or hear it read. The Master and Mistress were Protestants, and the school was exclusively superintended by individuals whose ardent spirit of proselytism was not calculated to receive my confidence or diminish my alarm. Remonstrance with the foundress of the school I deemed quite nugatory, and was thus reduced to the necessity of withdrawing the children from a school the obvious tendency of which was proselytism. The school was thus reduced to about half a dozen after it had existed about three weeks.

One Catholic was compelled by his unhappy father to resist my prohibition. The father, who is a poor aged dependant of Lady Aylmer, has declared to my curate with tears in his eyes that he had reason to dread the loss of his little means of subsistence were he to withdraw his child from a school, where conscience told him he should not send him. The poor child has called on me several times, and declared his determination to resist the mandate of his father rather than sacrifice his religion.<sup>72</sup>

The parish priest refused to administer the sacrament to the parents of this boy.<sup>73</sup>

Parents on the Earl Digby estate in Philipstown parish withdrew their children from a new schoolhouse built for their education in 1824. They withheld their children through 'conscientious motives' although stated the Rev John Murray, parish priest, they were anxious to see their children instructed and they were poverty-stricken.<sup>74</sup> In Killeigh parish Richard Digby had erected nine schools managed on evangelical lines. The parish priest asserted that the number of Catholics attending them was small: 'a few bad Catholics in Geashill still send their children there'.<sup>75</sup> In Newbridge parish, Rev Thomas Nolan, parish priest withdrew the Catholic children from Carnolway school. This school was under the patronage of Robert Latouche, Esq., and was in connection with the Association for Discountenancing Vice which paid the master's salary. Mr Latouche appointed the master and mistress, both

Protestants. The school was superintended by Rev Wade, the Protestant curate and occasionally by the parish priest. The New Testament was read in the Authorised version and the Protestant nature of the school caused the Rev Nolan to withdraw the children.<sup>76</sup>

At Derryaghta and other schools in Monasterevin parish Rev John Bagot of the Established Church was patron of schools in association with the Kildare Place Society from 1823. The Catholic pastors enjoyed rights of superintendence. The scriptures were only read occasionally by the senior classes. In summer 1824 Rev Bagot insisted that the scriptures be read regularly but the parish priest disapproved: 'the consequence will be that in future no Catholic will attend'. Monasterevin parish school founded and under the patronage of the Rev Charles Moore of the Established Church was in connection with the Association for Discountenancing Vice. The patron insisted that the scriptures be read without note or comment in accord with the rules of the Association. The parish priest announced his determination 'to have the Roman Catholic children withdrawn from the school should the reading of scripture be enforced'. There was a substantial decrease in the number of Catholic children attending the school once the patron and the master insisted on the use of the Authorised version of the scriptures; there were only ten Catholics in the school in summer 1824. Rev. Patrick Murphy, P.P., observed:

that though anxious the Roman Catholic clergymen and parents of the children may be for their education, they still look on interference of this nature with distrust, and as an attempt at Proselytism, or at least that it tends to make bad Catholics of their children; and of course, neither can suffer the children to attend, where such attempts are made. 77

Morett school, Coolbanagher in Portarlinton parish was under the patronage of the parish minister Rev Robert Vicars. It had a Protestant master and was in connection with the London Hibernian Society which

supplied the testaments of the Authorised version. In summer 1824 there were fifteen Protestants and twenty-nine Catholic students, all paying. The school was visited at this time by a Mr Frazer of the London Hibernian Society 'who on finding that the Catholic children had not read or committed to memory certain parts of the New Testament ordered that they should be dismissed or pay double the usual sum'. Emo school, under the patronage of the Hon Lionel Dawson, was in connection with both the London Hibernian Society and the Kildare Place Society. There were thirty-five Protestants and seventy Catholics in attendance in summer 1824. An official of the London Hibernian Society who visited this school similarly finding that the Catholic children had not committed portions of the New Testament to memory as required by the rules of the Society 'ordered them to give up their books remarking that it was useless to come there unless they conformed to these rules'. Woodbrook school under the patronage of Jonathan Cope Chetwood, Esq., was in connection with the Board of Erasmus Smith, the London societies and Kildare Place. There were fifteen Protestants and thirty-four Catholics in this school wherein the Authorised version of the Bible was read. The parish priest of Portarlinton, John Dunne, observed in relation to all these schools that he had confined himself to pointing out to his flock at Sunday Mass that the Catholic Church neither sanctioned nor allowed the reading of the scriptures as a schoolbook. But unusually the Catholic clergy of Portarlinton had 'designedly omitted to interfere with the children further'.<sup>78</sup> In Abbeyleix where Michael Kehoe was appointed parish priest in April 1824 he discovered that Viscount de Vesce's school which educated forty-five Protestants and forty Catholics had a Methodist teacher and was in connection with the Association for Discountenancing Vice. In this school the teacher (who was actually a Methodist preacher) taught the scriptures to the

Catholic children without the knowledge of the Catholic clergy. When Rev Kehoe became aware of this:

I made application to Lord de Visci to have this man prevented [from] reading and explaining the scriptures to the Roman Catholic children. To the present, his Lordship has not done so, and refused my repeated application to prevent such interference with the children. However I am determined, if this line of conduct be pursued, to use my endeavours to withdraw the children from the school, and from all schools in the parish where such practices prevail. 79

This situation was brought to Bishop Doyle's attention when he was on visitation in Abbeyleix. However as Viscount de Vesci was then in England, Doyle 'did not like to interfere in his absence with his school' as de Vesci was 'particularly benevolent and kind, and a personage for whom I entertain the most sanguine regard'.<sup>80</sup>

Rev Martin Doyle of Clonegal reported that he had been 'obliged for some time to withdraw the Catholic children from Barnehasck school, in consequence of the fanaticism and indiscretion of Dr Daultin of Newtownbarry . . . . He tried all means to pervert my People and their children but all in vain . . .'.<sup>81</sup> In Nurney and Lorum schools in Bagenalstown the parish priest had withdrawn the Catholic children in consequence of their being obliged to read the Authorised version of the New Testament by the Protestant rector, Rev Crolly. The Catholic clergy feared that Fenagh male parish school was a proselytising school. It was a free school under the patronage of Rev S. Downing, vicar of Fenagh, and in connection with the Association for Discountenancing Vice wherein the reading of the Authorised version of the scriptures was rigidly observed:

I do not know of any open or direct means of proselytism that may have been resorted to in this school, but the entire system according to which the school is regulated seems to have been framed in that spirit.

The parish priest informed the vicar that the Catholic children would be



withdrawn unless the objectionable rules of the Association for Discountenancing Vice were excised.<sup>82</sup>

Daniel Nolan, parish priest of Paulstown, encouraged the withdrawal of Catholic children from Barrowmount and Doninga schools in Goresbridge which were under Protestant patronage in 1824:

The cause of the reduction in the number of scholars attending these last two months is in consequence of the introduction of the Bible and Reading Books - having introduced several Tracts recommended by the Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting the Christian Religion, interspersed with several passages from the New and Old Testament calculated to pervert the Roman Catholic children under the specious name of Instruction or Education; which was the chief cause of my censure and withdrawing the Catholic children from it, and leaving there but one Protestant child, the Mistress's son, and three or four nominal Catholic children, who fearing the vengeance of the Landlord, were terrified into compliance rather than obey the voice of their Catholic Pastor. And when I the Parish Priest considered them as Protestants, the Mistress returned them as Catholics.

Such is the state of Bigotry in this Parish on the part of these two Protestant schools, calculated more for Perversion than Education . . . 83

Mountmellick Free school which was under the direction of a committee of ladies and gentlemen and the clergy of both denominations was established in 1822 and in connection with the Kildare Place Society. Authorised versions of the New Testament were furnished by the Auxiliary branch of the Bible Society. The reading of scriptures, the parish priest remarked: 'we consider an abuse likely to produce bad consequences but which we tolerate at present in the hope of being shortly able to provide a school in which there will be a master of their own profession, and who will teach their own creed'.<sup>84</sup> The Rosenallis parish school was a Protestant school with more Catholic than Protestant children in attendance. It was also in association with the Kildare Place Society and the Authorised version of the scriptures was read. The parish priest, Thady Dunne, used exactly the same formula of words as the Mountmellick parish priest in expressing his disapproval of it.<sup>85</sup>

Ballinakill had a male and female free school established in 1821 under the patronage of the Catholic clergy of the parish. Both teachers were Catholics, the master appointed by the former parish priest, Roger Molony, the mistress by Bishop Doyle in July 1821. She had been educated at the Presentation Convent, Carlow. The parochial clergy held collections for the teachers' salary to which Bishop Doyle generously contributed. There were 175 Catholics and fifteen Protestant children in the school in summer 1824 when a secession of thirteen of the Protestants took place. These went to Ballinakill parish school opened by the rector in July 1824 and which was in connection with the Association for Discountenancing Vice and the Kildare Place Society. Its attendance numbered thirty-eight Protestants and two Catholic children. When the parish priest visited the school he learned that the Bible without note or comment was read on two days of the week for the children. The priest noted that the master subsequently called on him having been instructed by the rector to state that the Bible should be excluded from the school and the reading of it confined to the Church where the Protestant children were assembled twice a week to be catechised. The Rev James Delany commented:

The sentiments and dispositions of the people with regard to the attendance of their children at this and similar schools are wholly dependent on the countenance given them by their clergy, who are unanimous in their opposition to a system, which however plausible and liberal in its profession, is found in the end to be actuated by a spirit of proselytism - a system which insists on having at the head of its schools Masters professing a religious creed differing from that of the vast majority. . . . Indeed, the conduct of the Rev Parson . . . in withdrawing the children of his communion from my school, where they have been in most instances gratuitously instructed, and their progress acknowledged and commended by their Parents, furnished abundant proof . . . of the absurdities and inconsistencies of such a system. 86

In Ballyadams parish at Luggacurra, the Marquis of Lansdowne's school was in connection with the Kildare Place Society and the

London Hibernian Society. The school had 136 Catholic pupils in summer 1824. There were twenty copies of the Douay Testament in the school. The parish priest, Rev Maurice Hart, who had poor relations with his bishop, was one of the school visitors as were inspectors from the societies funding the school. In his observations on the school the parish priest stated: 'The only objection I have to this school is the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the school and the using of it as a school-book; also it being in connection with the London Hibernian Society and the Kildare Place Society'. In Derrinroe School also in connection with the Kildare Place Society the Authorised version of the Bible was read. The parish priest took no steps to have the Catholic children removed from either school.<sup>87</sup> The Protestant parish school in Hacketstown parish read the Authorised version of the Bible and had seven Catholic pupils. A number of other Protestant schools in the parish were similarly circumstanced. The parish priest simply observed that no efforts were made to interfere with the religious principles of the pupils.<sup>88</sup> There is no doubt that in many parishes small numbers of Catholic children attended Protestant schools where there was no interference with their religious beliefs.

The Catholic Patrician and Brigidine teaching orders were established in Mountrath parish. Sir C. N. Coote's school there also enjoyed the support of the Catholic parochial clergy. The male school which had a fee-paying attendance of fifty Protestants and forty Catholics had a Protestant master and a Catholic assistant master. It was managed on the Lancastrian plan and was financially supported by Coote and a committee of subscribers with visiting rights. The school had testaments of both the Douay and Authorised versions, and it was in connection with the Board of Erasmus Smith and the Kildare Place

Society. The female school, with an attendance of twenty-nine Catholics and twenty-nine Protestants, had a Protestant mistress and a Catholic assistant mistress. The number of Catholic children attending the school rose when the Catholic assistant mistress was appointed in June 1824 at the suggestion of the parish priest, Rev M. P. Malone, who commented that 'the strong objection of parents against committing their children to a person of a different religion was in some measure removed'. In Mountrath we can thus see what appears to be a genuine effort aimed at achieving interdenominational co-operation in education yet the parish priest remarked that he could not 'under any circumstances' approve of the scriptures being used as a schoolbook: 'The danger of placing the Sacred Volumes in the hands of children, that require the strongest efforts of more mature minds to understand them, is but too evident from the numerous sects to which the familiar use of them has given birth'.<sup>89</sup>

Stradbally parish school was under the patronage of the Cosby family (a prominent landlord family in the parish) and the Rev H. Johnson, parish rector. It was in connection with the Kildare Place Society. In summer 1824 the average daily attendance was four Protestants and fifty-six Catholics. Both teachers were Protestant. There were sixteen Authorised and twenty-eight Douay Testaments in the school. Patrick Dowling, parish priest from 1775 and vicar general noted resignedly:

The schools are patronized by Protestant gentlemen, and the children of their tenants are influenced by a fear of incurring their displeasure to send their children to them.

I would have withdrawn their children from them, as I disapprove of the use of the Holy Scriptures as a school-book, and would not confide the education of Catholic children to a Protestant, but hitherto have omitted to do so in the hope that the system might be altered, and through a fear of exciting the ill-will of the Patrons against the tenantry.

The people without any exception approve only of such schools as are sanctioned by their Pastors, and necessity alone obliges them to tolerate those above mentioned. 90

Bishop Doyle wrote to Thomas Cosby of Stradbally Hall on 5 September 1824 requesting him to appoint a Catholic master in the school established under Kildare Place Society rules or to appoint a Catholic assistant to the Protestant master, as the children attending the school were nearly all Catholics. In reply Cosby pointed out that as commissioners had been appointed by the king to inquire into the state of education in Ireland 'whether under these circumstances you will adopt any measure which will in the meantime deprive the Catholic children of the district of the advantages of education particularly when I assure you that no attempt whatsoever has been (or ever shall be) made' in his schools 'to interfere with the religious tenets of the children . . . any such interference being totally in opposition to our principles'.<sup>91</sup>

Doyle was apparently insisting on the rule he had laid down in his diocesan regulations of 31 January 1820 namely that in a school associated with the Kildare Place Society either the master or the assistant master should be a Catholic otherwise he refused to permit Catholics to attend such schools. Doyle seems to have taken particular objection to one McCabe, the master in Cosby's school at Timahoe. This master had been educated (in so far as this was possible) in one of the Charter schools which Doyle heartily abominated. Cosby endeavoured to assure Doyle that McCabe was a good teacher: 'In regard to what you say of children educated in Charter Schools . . . McCabe has imbibed no such doctrine as you allude to, nor any hostile feeling whatsoever to the Roman Catholic or any other Religion'. Cosby would not dismiss McCabe from his school 'without his having committed any fault whatsoever'.

Cosby further stated that there was no person more anxious than he was 'to promote every proper feeling of harmony and good will amongst all persuasions'. He informed Doyle that the parish priest of Stradbally was 'perfectly at liberty' to visit his schools whenever he pleased and that 'at stated times' he would have the use of the schools for religious instruction.<sup>92</sup> But this was unacceptable to Doyle who informed the commissioners of education (giving his reasons) that he had ordered the Catholic children to be withdrawn from both Cosby's schools for non-compliance with his 1820 regulation.<sup>93</sup>

In Monasterevin parish the Catholic brewer Robert Cassidy was patron of a school in association with the Kildare Place Society from 1820. This school had forty-eight Catholic and nine Protestant pupils in summer 1824. The teacher was a Catholic trained in the Model School of the Society. The Testament was not read as required stated Rev Patrick Murphy parish priest as that was contrary to Catholic discipline and prohibited by Bishop Doyle. However a 'selection from the Scriptures' published by the Society was in general use. The parish priest allowed the master on certain occasions to read the Douay version of the New Testament to the senior class. Six copies of the New Testament kept in the school were solely to allow the master to claim a gratuity given by the Kildare Place Society to 'worthy' teachers.<sup>94</sup> In Clonegal parish a school at Ballykeneen which was built by and under the patronage of the Bonnar family was associated with the Kildare Place Society from its foundation in 1821. The Catholic master was appointed by the Bonnars and the parish priest, Martin Doyle. There were twenty testaments in the school in summer 1824. Rev Doyle stated that the number of testaments utilised would have been greater if he did not disapprove of their use as schoolbooks.<sup>95</sup> In Graiguenamanagh parish

Viscount Clifden was patron of the major male and female school which was in connection with the Kildare Place Society. All except two of the 220 male and 150 female pupils were Catholics. The Catholic parochial clergy appointed the Catholic teachers and twelve copies of the Douay version of the New Testament were used in the school.<sup>96</sup>

In the diocese four parishes can be identified where the parish priests as patrons of de facto Catholic schools were in association with the Kildare Place Society. How did these priests justify this relationship knowing of their bishop's hostility to the religious principles of the Society? Michael Prendergast, vicar general of Leighlin and parish priest of Bagenalstown had both his male and female free schools in connection with the Kildare Place Society in 1824. Both these fine schools had been built at Catholic expense and the teachers appointed by the parish priest who with his curates regularly visited the schools. The link with the Kildare Place Society was made because the Rev Prendergast was unable to obtain the necessary finance from his parish, on account of the poverty of the year, to buy furnishings and requisites necessary for the schools.<sup>97</sup> On 9 March 1824 Rev Prendergast applied to the Kildare Place Society for financial aid, stating however:

Though I do not consider the Holy Bible fit to be put into the hands of scholars and used as a school book, nor has it been used as such hitherto in the Bagenalstown Free School, yet in the present circumstances, and with a view of obtaining the necessary aid and assistance from the Kildare-place Society, the Douay Bible or Testament shall be used in future in the school, under my direction, without note or comment, written or oral, by all the scholars who have attained a suitable proficiency in reading.<sup>98</sup>

Because these schools were under the superintendence of the Catholic clergy it was felt that the abuse arising from the reading of the scriptures without note or comment (though the Douay version) would be lessened in practice even if the principle remained abhorrent as the parish priest emphasised:

The insisting on this obnoxious arrangement, the pregnant source of dissension in religious subjects, and a method of reading the sacred volumes directly opposed to the spirit of the Roman Catholic Church, form the principal, but not the only objection I have to the system of education adopted by the Kildare Place Society; and I hereby declare that were I possessed of any other means of building, repairing, and furnishing the numerous schools in my Parish, I would never form any other association on such conditions. 99

Trimleston school in Edenderry parish which was under the patronage of James Colgan, parish priest, entered into association with the Kildare Place Society in October 1823. Nonetheless Colgan observed that both he and his parishioners were 'decidedly averse' to the principles of Kildare Place. He could not approve of the scriptures being used as a schoolbook. He admitted that the Education commissioners would thus be surprised to find his principal school in connection with Kildare Place. This connection arose from the circumstances of the school. The parish priest appointed the teachers and visited the school regularly. Passages from the Douay version of the New Testament selected by him were read to the more advanced classes. The children were taught the catechism outside school hours. Without these safeguards, Colgan stated, he would not have applied to the Kildare Place Society for aid.<sup>100</sup>

Kilcock parish had two schools, Kilcock and Newtown, in association with the Kildare Place Society from 1823. The Kilcock school was built in 1806 by public subscription and supported by the parish. The school was governed by a committee of Protestant and Catholic gentlemen whose functions were undefined. Superintendence of the school was left 'almost exclusively to the Parish Priest' Rev Francis Haly, an active educationalist who encouraged full attendance. The master and the mistress were both appointed by the parish priest. Haly applied for a grant to repair and furnish the school on the Lancastrian plan during



the depression of 1823 when public subscriptions were few.<sup>101</sup> Haly was grateful to the Kildare Place Society for the liberal aid he received. He informed the committee of the Society on 12 December 1823 that it had been 'instrumental in diffusing the benefits of a well regulated system of education, accompanied by its usual retinue of blessings, over a tract of country of twenty-five square miles'.<sup>102</sup> Extracts from the New Testament, Douay version, which were purchased by the parish priest were little used in the school. But the Rev Haly stated that had he sufficient resources to repair the school he would not have applied for the grant. He acknowledged that as long as he supported his schools they would have a good attendance. He gave notice that if another school in Kilcock, with a Protestant teacher, entered into association with the Kildare Place Society as mooted, then the Catholic children would be withdrawn from that school. Haly however was clearly grateful for the aid which he had received:

Whilst I object to the obnoxious regulation in the plan of the Kildare Street Society which places the Sacred Scriptures in the hands of the children, I consider it due to the gentlemen who compose the Committee to acknowledge my obligation to them for the readiness with which they have made me liberal grants in aid of the schools under my care. 103

In Rathvilly parish Rev John Gahan had three schools in his chapels at Tyneclash, Englishtown and Rathvilly, all of which were ironically in connection with the Kildare Place Society ('communication with the Kildare Place Society cannot produce evil in a school so situated'). He had addressed the Society on 21 June 1820 stating that if aided he entertained strong expectations that 'the growing generation in this large and thickly populated tract of land, will be rescued from ignorance and immorality'. Gahan was impressed by the aid he received from the Society and he stated on 8 September 1821 that the sums granted to him were 'proofs of the liberality of the laws' by which the Society

was governed. Moreover he elaborated in words which no doubt would later cause him unease if not embarrassment 'that if your regulations were perfectly understood, no reasonable objections could be made to them by any denomination of professing Christians'. And he believed that he himself had removed some local prejudices entertained against the Society. In several letters to Kildare Place this priest reported glowingly on the progress that was being made in his schools - 'progressively advancing towards perfection' - under the Kildare Place Society's patronage. The advantages the peasantry derived from the Society could not be properly understood by any person 'who was not acquainted with the manners and morals of our country people, before the establishment of our schools on the plan of education recommended by the Society'.<sup>104</sup>

The four parish priests directly associated with the Kildare Place Society were among the most progressive educationalists within the clergy of Kildare and Leighlin. Yet while Gahan of Rathvilly was least disposed to complain about the Society's religious rules, Haly of Kilcock and Prendergast of Bagenalstown were motivated solely by the financial restraints on them, caused chiefly by the poverty of their parishioners, to seek Kildare Place aid. Nonetheless their schools wherein the Douay version of the New Testament was read occasionally to the senior classes, were to all intents and purposes Catholic establishments. These schools were working very much to the benefit of Catholics and there could be no question of proselytism in them. Yet episcopal concern over the principle of Bible-reading without note or comment overshadowed the obvious practical advantages which association with the Kildare Place Society bestowed.

In September 1824 the question arose as to whether a Catholic could in concordance with his religion hold a position as a Kildare Place Society inspector of schools. Archbishop Murray of Dublin sought the opinions of several of his brethren. Their responses are quite revealing of the prevailing mood of individual bishops towards the Kildare Place Society. Archbishops Laffan and Kelly and Bishops Marum and Coen were of no doubt that a Catholic could not serve as a Kildare Place inspector. Doyle was most forthright in giving his view: 'I am clearly and decidedly of opinion that it is not lawful for any Catholic to assist or co-operate with the Kildare Place Society in carrying into effect their system of education'.<sup>105</sup> Only Archbishop Curtis took the view that the question 'must depend on circumstances, rather than on any abstract principles' and maintained that a conscientious inspector could do good work.<sup>106</sup> Archbishop Kelly objected to the Kildare Place Society on the grounds that it promulgated 'the sectarian principle of private judgement' without the authority of the Church. Where aid was granted by the Kildare Place Society to Catholic schools, the principles of the Society were 'evaded or departed from, to the knowledge and with the connivance of the Society'. He accused Kildare Place of a want of candour and sincerity in its proceedings. Kelly was particularly worried by the aid granted by Kildare Place to societies such as the London Hibernian, Baptist and others: 'while the Kildare Street Society evade the direct charge of proselytism, they furnish our enemies with powerful arms which are unrelentingly used against us'.<sup>107</sup> The object of Kildare Place according to Bishop Marum was to 'introduce and establish the fundamental principles of the Reformation'.<sup>108</sup> Bishop Coen stated that 'it must appear evident to the most superficial observer that Proselytism and not education is their primary object':

'surely they must have some deep laid scheme in view when no other system of education will satisfy them, but that to which the Roman Catholics have an universal objection'.<sup>109</sup> Archbishop Murray used almost the words of Archbishop Laffan in describing the Kildare Place Society as 'a system which no conscientious Catholic can encourage'.<sup>110</sup>

In his Letters on the state of Education in Ireland; and on Bible Societies ... J.K.L. complained that of all the endowments for the education of the poor in Ireland whether by the state or individual societies there was none for the bulk of the population. Yet it was a duty of the state to provide education:

It behoves . . . the Government of every well educated society, to provide, as far as may be in its power, for each class of its subjects, as much education and of the best kind, as the latter are capable of receiving with advantage to themselves and security to the public interest. <sup>111</sup>

J.K.L. further complained that state educational foundations were turned into sinecures - diocesan and parochial schools were either not held or if held were only available to those who could pay; that Charter schools were 'converted into seminaries of proselytism and their funds embezzled'.<sup>112</sup> With heavy irony Doyle wondered why the Chief Secretary Henry Goulburn when he applied to parliament for votes of money for the public service did not also 'apply for some hundred thousand pounds to stay the decline of Protestantism and suspend the growth of popery, rather than advance this purpose under the name of grants for schools, hospitals, asylums, and education societies'.<sup>113</sup>

The country was being convulsed by sectarian zeal, setting landlord against tenant, and aided by parliamentary misrepresentation of the Catholic position. Irish Catholics were assailed by '... perverse and insulting reproaches of ignorance and immorality', 'by the very men or their immediate descendants who immured them in their mental

bondage'. The framers of the penal code - in whom the 'devil seems to have dwelt corporeally' - attempted to blind the intellect of the Irish people by placing them in bondage.<sup>114</sup> J.K.L. rejected the intrusion of state-funded societies upon the inalienable right of Catholics to educate their children in their own beliefs. Protestants would not confide the education of their children to Catholics. Likewise they should not expect Catholics to confide their own children's education to them.<sup>115</sup> However J.K.L. put forward the proposition that it was necessary that all the children of the same state should be educated together. How was this to be achieved if Catholics determined their school regulations? J.K.L. argued that the interests of the majority should not be made subservient to the minority. Where the population was exclusively Catholic the Catholic clergy should be entitled to superintend and control the children's education. Where the population was mixed the minority population should have an assistant of its own creed in the school or if that proved impossible there should be fixed public rules governing religion in the school, enforced by penalties for non-compliance.<sup>116</sup>

If the funds applied for Irish education were vested in commissioners acceptable to Catholics all these difficulties would be ended. If anti-Catholic zealots were excluded from the schools and men of known and moderate principles placed in control of Irish education then it would be possible to educate children of different creeds together under a system which 'not only will not interfere with the religious opinions of any, but will secure the religious instruction of all'.<sup>117</sup> The Kildare Place Society declared as a fundamental rule of its proceedings that it would provide religious instruction to all without interfering with the religious principles of any but the Society

contradicted this principle by requiring that the scriptures be read without note or comment. Kildare Place members declared repeatedly that the reading of scripture material without note or comment was not an interference with Catholic religious principles despite the constant contradictions of the Irish Catholic hierarchy. Apart from this fundamental difficulty over the reading of the scriptures J.K.L. had no hesitation in declaring that otherwise the system of education employed in the Kildare Place schools was 'excellent' and the books published by the Society for use in the schools were 'unexceptionable'.<sup>118</sup>

But regardless of how good their educational system was, biblical societies had 'no right or title to interfere with the education of the people' when their religious instruction based on the scriptures alone was defective in Catholic eyes and their published compilations from the Authorised version of the scriptures were objected to by the Catholic Church. Indeed, 'no such extracts can be read with propriety by Catholics, unless they are first revised, and if necessary, corrected by the proper authorities'. Catholic and Protestant versions of the scriptures differed in several hundred places and almost on every subject in dispute between the churches. The books of the London Hibernian Society were particularly offensive in this regard. These might appear to be trivial differences but to a Catholic who revered the law in its entirety they could not be regarded as such.<sup>119</sup> Ireland, stated J.K.L., had never generated a heresy yet these societies would introduce Socinianism into the country. Doyle had received a book written on Socinian principles from the agent of a nobleman with an offer to build schools on his extensive estates in the diocese provided this book was permitted for use by the schoolchildren.<sup>120</sup> J.K.L. even went so far as to make the extraordinary claim that Irish Catholics

had 'never borne a persecution more bitter than what now assails us'; 'what we suffer from these societies, and the power and the prejudice they have embodied against us, is more tormenting than what we endured under Anne or the second George'. The tendency of all the biblical societies was, according to J.K.L., the same, namely the subversion of Catholicism, the ancient faith of the Irish, and the substitution in its place of a 'wild and ungovernable fanaticism'. They had been joined in this plan by some liberal and enlightened people, by the bigots who reviled Catholicism, and by members of the Established clergy who were afraid to be seen to be hostile to individual interpretation of scripture.<sup>121</sup>

In his examination before the House of Lords committee on the state of Ireland on 21 March 1825 Bishop Doyle was questioned if he considered it desirable that Catholic and Protestant schoolchildren should be educated together. He responded: 'I see no objection whatever that they should be educated together; on the contrary, if by being educated together the harmony of the different sects in Ireland could be promoted I think it would be a matter to be desired'.<sup>122</sup> Doyle attributed the opposition which had arisen to Catholic children being educated with non-Catholics 'exclusively to the efforts which have been made by persons differing from us in religion to interfere directly or indirectly with the faith of Roman Catholics'.<sup>123</sup> But where there was no suspicion of proselytism Catholics and Protestants were educated quite happily together. This was particularly the case in the hedge schools, which composed the vast majority of schools, and which were not in connection with any educational society. Doyle's assessment of the summer 1824 parochial education returns made to him in Kildare and Leighlin diocese was that 'in three fourths of the schools throughout

my diocese Roman Catholics and Protestants are educated together, without any complaint of proselytism on either side'.<sup>124</sup> Doyle allowed that in many instances Catholic children had been withdrawn from schools since the summer 1824 returns were made to him and to the commissioners of education but only where there was a suspicion or the reality of proselytism.<sup>125</sup> There was a suspicion among evangelically-motivated educationalists that the Catholic hierarchy had ordered a deliberate withdrawal of children from schools in order to strengthen their case for funds before the education commissioners.<sup>126</sup> The reality was that the establishment of the commission and the expectation of change led to forbearance on the part of the hierarchy. Doyle awaited the report of the commissioners before proceeding, if the status quo remained unchanged, to order the removal of children from schools with which he was unhappy.<sup>127</sup>

However subsequent to the appointment of the Education Inquiry, Doyle, during his visitation in autumn 1824 had ordered his clergy to remove Catholic children in attendance in schools connected with the London Hibernian Society. This Society required that children should not only read the testament as a schoolbook without note or comment but actually learn sections of it by heart.<sup>128</sup> In his evidence to the Education Inquiry on 14 April 1825 Doyle stated that he was 'particularly hostile' to schools managed by the London Hibernian Society, the Association for Discountenancing Vice and the Baptist Society.<sup>129</sup> He objected to the schools managed by the Association for Discountenancing Vice on the grounds that it required the scriptures to be read indiscriminately as a schoolbook.<sup>130</sup> He objected because Catholic children in these schools



must be either dismissed without being taught their own catechism, or they must be induced to attend at the teaching of the church catechism, and to their being so dismissed without religious instruction I object, and I object still more strongly to their being obliged to learn the church catechism; I object therefore to all schools connected with the Society for the Suppression of Vice. 131

Doyle believed that there was only one school in his diocese connected with the Association for Discountenancing Vice where Catholics attended.

That school was in Killeslin parish where Doyle resided:

I directed the priest to go among the people and to direct them not to send their children to that school; he did so, and no Roman Catholic children have since attended it, except perhaps a few paupers whom I do not mind, as they often go to get clothes, and afterwards absent themselves, or go in at a time of great distress, that they may be fed; so that with respect to creatures thus circumstanced I do not much trouble myself, knowing that when I have a school prepared, they will attend it without any difficulty at all; besides, they attend catechism on the Sundays [in the Catholic chapel] and there is no danger arising to them; but if it were necessary to withdraw even those few who may linger about such schools in that sort of way I could do it with great ease. 132

Doyle was 'perfectly convinced' that these (above-mentioned) societies aimed at making proselytes among the Catholic schoolchildren in Ireland.<sup>133</sup>

The Kildare Place Society required that the New Testament be read but it allowed the patrons of the schools to select the passages to be read, and to decide at what time they would be read, and did not require that the New Testament should be used as a schoolbook. Therefore the Kildare Place system posed less of an obvious danger to Catholic children than other biblical societies particularly where the patron was a Catholic, the master a Catholic, and where the school was in some degree under the superintendence of the Catholic parochial clergy. The clergyman in such cases deemed it his duty to select the passages of scripture to be read to the children (usually the gospel of the Sunday Mass following) and to govern carefully the interpretation put on

scripture. The Kildare Place Society also allowed for the catechesis of children outside school hours by their clergy. There was however a 'pretty general' feeling among the bishops to oppose the Kildare Place system unless the school involved was under a Catholic patron or the priests did not have access to it.

Archbishop Murray had no doubt about the reality of the Kildare Place Society when he informed the education commissioners:

our objections to the Kildare-street Society have of late greatly increased, since we learned its connection with other societies; the object of which is avowedly to proselytise, and since it has avowed itself to be, though not in name, in reality a proselytising society, by putting forward a principle which we hold to be erroneous, and endeavouring to enforce that principle with Catholic children. In the instruction which it gave to its inspectors, I think last September, one of its fundamental principles is there acknowledged to be, that the sacred scriptures be read in all the schools to which it communicates aid 'that the children who thus read may become acquainted with the principles of the Christian religion' that is, of course, that each child in inspecting the sacred volume, may select such principles of religious faith and practice as he may think fit to discover; and that by private judgement, with an almost total absence of culture of mind, and before his vision has arrived at maturity . . . as long as that principle is affirmed by the Kildare-street Society, so long we must endeavour to oppose its diffusion. 134

Doyle described his position in the early 1820s as not so much objecting to the Kildare Place Society as tolerating it. Nonetheless in autumn 1824 he decreed that Catholics be withdrawn from three schools in association with Kildare Place. These decrees were issued by the bishop on visitation. To have left this unpleasant duty to the relevant parish priests might have led to a rupture in their relationships with the landlords who sponsored the schools.<sup>135</sup> Where Catholics were advised to withdraw from schools disapproved of by Bishop Doyle they did so with alacrity. Indeed Doyle related that they did so 'in more haste sometimes than we would wish; for they very often do it in such a hurried way as to give offence to their landlords, and we should wish they should do it gradually; but the people go before us in our zeal'.<sup>136</sup>

By 1825 Doyle had become convinced that the Kildare Place Society was motivated by proselytism: 'the Kildare-Street Society is the one about whose principles or dispositions I for some time entertained doubts, but doubts which have since been removed'.<sup>137</sup> Kildare Place operated 'more covertly' than other biblical societies but to the same proselytising ends.<sup>138</sup> Doyle was questioned at length by the education commissioners on his objections to the Authorised version of the scriptures being used in the schools.<sup>139</sup> He gave an example to the commission of how a Catholic peasant girl had been misled in reading the scriptures for herself:

there was a daughter of a farming man, in the diocese of Leighlin, who read or had read 'whosoever loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me', or some such passage and she actually left her father's home, and went about the country for several days, to fulfill, as she supposed, the will of God; at length she came to me to get advice, and told me this; when after setting her mind right upon the matter, and composing it, I sent her home to her parents: it is just so with the generality of the peasantry; if they read the more difficult parts of scripture they are liable to understand them in a wrong way, and not having time, or the capability of comparing them with other passages, they may take root in their minds and do them an injury, so that the gross ignorant country people are, in my mind, much better instructed in the morality of the Gospel, by means of religious books . . . 140

The first report of the Irish Education Inquiry dated 30 May 1825 confirmed Doyle's worst fears. The evidence the commissioners unfolded on the origins and progress of societies such as the London Hibernian Society, Association for Discountenancing Vice, Baptist Society and the Irish Society demonstrated that these were indeed proselytising organisations. Fortunately Doyle's personal copy of the report with his marginal annotations has survived. This shows precisely what his reactions were as he read its contents. That reaction, as the following marginal comments indicate was one of hostility and outrage:

A deliberate lie [p. 7]; The abuses of the Charter Schools shocking to humanity - yet continued and fostered by government to this hour [p. 7]; What a humbug [p. 37]; inconsistency [p. 50]; Justification of all our allegations against the Kildare Place Society [p. 56]; subversion of our religion aimed at. Shuffling and contradiction . . . [p. 60]. 141

Some of Doyle's fiercest criticism was reserved for the London Hibernian Society, the proselytising nature of which was proved beyond all reasonable doubt. The Educational Inquiry quoted from an 1808 statement of intent by the Society which read: 'The hope, therefore that the Irish will ever be tranquil and loyal people, and still more that piety, and virtue will flourish among them must be built on the anticipated reduction of popery'. Doyle wrote in the margin: 'no hope of our ever being loyal or tranquil till Popery is reduced'.<sup>142</sup> The 1808 statement continued:

wherever schools are introduced, though by Protestants, Catholics will allow their children to take advantage of them, nor will the establishment of a school by those of their own communion invariably detach them from the former. Comparisons are instituted, and the school of the Protestants has been known to obtain the preference. In such causes, however, Protestants have previously distinguished themselves by prudence and forbearance, as well as other qualifications, that is, whilst they have placed on view the leading principles of religion, they have abstained from invectives against Popery, and from every attempt to make Proselytes. To a certain degree the Society must adopt their precautions, but there will be frequent opportunities of disclosing to the Catholic youth the system of both churches in their amplest extent.

Doyle's note on this reads: 'Prosel[ytism] avowed'.<sup>143</sup> The London Hibernian Society further stated:

On every hand the determination should be to detach, by the power of truth and superior piety, as many as possible from the folds of counterfeit shepherds . . . to make perpetual inroads on the Kingdom of Satan, but by no means to divide and disturb the family of Jesus Christ.

Beside this Doyle wrote 'excellent!!!'.<sup>144</sup> When Doyle found contradictions in the London Hibernian Society's evidence to the Education Inquiry he remarked that they 'disavow here the fundamental

principle of their own institute. Father of lies who are thy children'.<sup>145</sup> Where the Society paradoxically attempted to disavow proselytism Doyle was appalled: 'The most disgusting fanaticism or self love. A very Pharisee'.<sup>146</sup>

The Education Inquiry found that the Kildare Place Society was financially aiding 340 schools of the London Hibernian Society, fifty-seven schools of the Association for Discountenancing Vice and thirty schools of the Baptist Society. The report thus confirmed Doyle and Murray in their understanding of the connection of the Kildare Place Society (and consequently the government through its funding of it) with proselytising societies. Doyle noted that the London Hibernian Society schools also received aid from the Lord Lieutenant's Fund. The inquiry pointed out that where the London Hibernian Society's schools were not associated with other societies they were sometimes mere hovels and their masters were usually from the lowest ranks of the peasantry with but little education themselves. The Inquiry found that the Baptist Society appeared to have the same rules as the London Hibernian Society. It also showed that the Association for Discountenancing Vice admitted 'works of a highly controversial nature' and condemned its connection with the Kildare Place Society.<sup>147</sup>

The report found that none of the existing Irish educational societies provided a system of general education 'suited to the peculiar situation and circumstances of Ireland'. No school system had been established which obtained 'the cordial and general support of all classes'. The commissioners concurred with the findings of the fourteenth report on education in 1812 that children of all religious persuasions should be educated together 'without leaving any grounds to apprehend an interference with their respective religious

principles'.<sup>148</sup> The report decided that Parish schools under the superintendence of the Established clergy would never be likely to be acceptable to Catholics without 'distrust or jealousy'. The Charter schools were objects of 'suspicion and aversion to Roman Catholics'. The schools connected with the Association for Discountenancing Vice could hardly be expected to inspire Catholic or Presbyterian confidence because these were under the immediate superintendence of the Established clergy. Catholics, Presbyterians and other Protestant dissenters thus necessarily viewed the schools of the Association for Discountenancing Vice with 'some degree of distrust'.<sup>149</sup> The London Hibernian Society and the Baptist Society were found to be conducted in such a way as 'to excite a greater degree of distrust on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy, than any of the others'. The employment by both societies of itinerant preachers to expound the Bible only compounded Catholic antagonism.<sup>150</sup> Most significant of all was the report's conclusion that the Kildare Place Society which was liberally grant-aided by parliament 'in the hope that it might provide instruction for all, without interfering with the religious opinions of any has not fully succeeded in affecting that desirable result'.<sup>151</sup> With regard to these and other societies the commissioners noted

an opinion prevails generally amongst all orders of the Roman Catholic clergy, that a combined and systematic attempt was making on the part of several societies to effect the conversion of the Roman Catholics to the Protestant faith. They believe that not only the Bible, Tract and Missionary societies, and the Society for Promoting the Principles of the Reformation, are decidedly aiming at this end, but that the London Hibernian, the Baptist and even the Kildare Place Society, have also the same object in view.<sup>152</sup>

Nonetheless the commissioners could not find a single instance of the conversions of Catholic schoolchildren having taken place as a direct result of the influence of the education societies. However the

commissioners acknowledged that the Catholic authorities did not rest their opposition to the education societies on the fact of proselytism but on the allegation that such was their object.<sup>153</sup> The commissioners discovered abundant evidence of the Catholic Church withdrawing Catholic children from education society schools: 'that they have been to a great degree successful, and will to the utmost be persisted in, we are led seriously to apprehend'.<sup>154</sup> The report judged that the complaint of the Catholic bishops that government funds applied to Irish education were 'not intended to be exclusive' but that it was rendered so by the rules of these societies, was worthy of 'serious attention'.

The commissioners considered whether Catholic educational institutions as managed by Catholic priests, brothers and nuns could be funded directly by the state and not surprisingly decided that they could not. There were many difficulties with such schools. Although Protestants were not excluded few Protestants attended. The scriptures, as opposed to catechisms were hardly ever used. Religion and general instruction were so integrated as to provide a strictly Catholic education.<sup>155</sup> The commissioners saw clearly that if the state funded Catholic education directly then 'two systems of education would be established in the country, in which the children of the two persuasions would be so educated as to be more than ever estranged from each other'.<sup>156</sup> The commissioners declared themselves 'much struck' by the many pay schools (or hedge schools which constituted the vast majority of Irish schools) managed as private speculative ventures, unattached to any particular persuasion or society, in which there appeared to be 'perfect harmony' amongst the children of all persuasions. In these schools the master taught religion separately to all denominations.<sup>157</sup> Doyle was opposed to such a practice.

The commissioners concluded, following the 1812 report, that the optimum mode of education was to unite children of the different religious persuasions for the purpose of instructing them in literary knowledge, and to provide facilities for their separate religious instruction 'where the difference of religious belief renders it impossible for them any longer to learn together'.<sup>158</sup> The commissioners then proceeded to propose their own system for a general and united elementary education. At least one public school was to be established in each benefice in which children of all religious beliefs would be given literary instruction. Two teachers were to be appointed where the attendance was sufficient to justify the expense. Rightly or wrongly Doyle saw an implication in this that the master would be a Protestant and the second teacher or usher would be a Catholic or Presbyterian as appropriate.<sup>159</sup>

On two days of the week the school was to break up at an early hour and separate religious instruction was to be given for the rest of the day. Protestant clergymen were to supervise their students; Presbyterian ministers likewise. Two days in the week were also to be set apart for Catholic instruction. On these occasions, the commissioners elaborated, religious instruction was to be given under the care of the Catholic teacher who would 'read the Epistles and Gospels of the week . . . and receive such other instruction as their Pastors (who may attend if they think fit) shall direct'.<sup>160</sup> Doyle's marginal comment on this plan was: 'The E[stablished] clergy are entitled to agree under the direction of their Diocesans what the R[eligious] Inst[ruction] will be. We are to give that defined for us'.<sup>161</sup> If school attendance was so low as to render a second teacher or usher unnecessary, the master was permitted to instruct the pupils



of the same persuasion as himself in their religious duties. In these cases a teacher of the minority religion in the school might attend for the religious instruction of that communion. The commissioners considered that it might be possible rather than desirable for such a teacher to service several schools in one area. Of this Doyle wrote bitterly: 'Here the master, and the usher a nondescript, no longer a constant guardian but a sort of walking swaddling bible reading stroller'.<sup>162</sup>

Testaments and the Authorised version were to be provided for Protestant children. An edition of the Douay Testament had been submitted to the commissioners by the Catholic prelates. This edition had sixty-three footnotes which the commissioners found of an unexceptionable nature. They recommended that this edition, 'omitting the address thereto affixed' should be supplied to Catholic children in schools established under the system. They declared themselves convinced of the 'importance and necessity' of furthering scriptural education in Ireland 'as a fundamental part of the instruction'.<sup>163</sup> Doyle commented: 'Censors of our books and judges of the necessity of Scriptures being used in the schools. No such necessity. The C[atholic] Ch[urch] has at Nice to Trent opposed error directly and this is one. If it do anything it does it when proper, but never whilst propelled by a hostile force'.<sup>164</sup>

The report proposed that a board be formed which would control the expenditure of public money on education. The board was to have a legal right to the schoolhouse, the right to determine what books should be used in the schools, and the sole right of appointing and dismissing all teachers. Doyle found these proposals unacceptable.<sup>165</sup> The commissioners also considered the fate of public funds already disbursed

to education societies. They recommended that such funds be withdrawn from the Charter schools (leaving them to manage their own funds which they estimated to be in excess of £7,000 per annum). Doyle looked askance at the commissioners' suggestion that it was desirable that Charter school funds should be applied to aid the Association for Discountenancing Vice, that 'most useful auxiliary to the clergy of the Established Church', in distributing religious books and promoting catechetical instruction.<sup>166</sup> The commissioners held that the Kildare Place Society should retain its exemplary publishing division and also its function of supplying school requisites. The Society's Dublin model school was to be maintained as a teacher-training institute.<sup>167</sup> The report requested the Kildare Place Society not to aid schools in connection with other societies. The commissioners hoped that the Kildare Place schools and the schools of the Association for Discountenancing Vice would come under the new system. Private patrons should also transfer their schools to the new authority. Public aid was to be gradually removed from all societies which did not transfer to the new system.<sup>168</sup> Funds for the maintenance of these new schools were to come partly from the state, partly from pupil payments and partly from parochial assessment.<sup>169</sup>

Bishop Doyle went further than writing marginal comments on the report of the commissioners but he withheld from publication a pamphlet-length tract entitled 'Observations on the first report of the Commissioners of Education Inquiry by an Irish Catholic' which was an extremely hostile attack on its contents.<sup>170</sup> This work revealed the full extent of the historical and emotional baggage which Doyle brought to the debate on education in Ireland. It opened with a general overview of the history of Catholic education in Ireland and a brief résumé of the issue in the 1820s:

from the first introduction of the Protestant religion into Ireland, an uninterrupted struggle on the subject of education has been maintained by the Catholic priesthood and people against ministers of the Established Church aided and supported by the Parliament and the Government of the country. 171

Doyle quite clearly saw state-sponsored education in Ireland in the context of the penal laws and proselytism. He elaborated on the felicitous remark of Archbishop Magee that 'religion amongst the Catholics has become politics and politics religion' to state that 'not only politics but education and every right or franchise we possess or claim, is resolved into or connected with our religion'.<sup>172</sup> Doyle committed to paper his poor view of the five Education commissioners. Frankland Lewis he allowed to be of 'high character'. William Grant and John Glassford were unknown to the public. The name of the anti-Catholic John Leslie Foster 'supersedes all necessity of remark upon his principles or public character'. The Catholic Anthony Richard Blake (the most able behind-the-scenes operator in Irish politics until his death in 1849 but not yet a friend of Doyle's) was a 'total stranger' to nearly all the Irish bishops. Blake was selected, wrote Doyle

because he professed the religion of the Irish Catholics, and was supposed to be ignorant of their sufferings, estranged from their feelings and bound by honour and by interest to the administration which had promoted him, whilst the fact of his being a Catholic threw over the Commission an appearance of impartiality and obtained for the Minister - at least with the unsuspecting, credit for a liberality of feeling, totally incompatible with the principles of the existing government. 173

Doyle concluded his analysis of the report thus:

The genius, the essence, the spirit, the letter of the laws and Government are all imbued with, and breathe hostility to our religion. The spirit of the report . . . is the ascendancy of Protestantism and the undermining of Catholicity. The present determination of the influential part of the Government is not to emancipate, but to oppress us as Catholics and to promote, by every possible means, our perversion to Protestantism. 174

Mirroring this mutual antagonism between Catholic and Protestant perspectives was the Irish Chief Secretary Henry Goulburn who wrote

uncomprehendingly to Peel of Catholic attitudes: 'I believe the real object of the Roman Catholic Priesthood to be to maintain their flocks in ignorance. I despair of their willing approval or support of any system of education . . .'.<sup>175</sup>

Although Doyle refrained from publishing his 'Observations' he was unable to refrain from some public comment on the report of the Education Inquiry. On 16 June 1825 he published a public letter to A. R. Blake which was a scathing attack on the report. Doyle regretted that Blake had signed the report: 'I had rather it were the work exclusively, of persons who had been bred up in the old No-Popery system, and amongst whom no gentlemen of honour or integrity had a place'. Doyle pointed out that he had looked through the report for evidence rebutting the allegations of apostasy among Catholic children and of differences between Catholic parents and clergy over the education societies: 'I sought in vain, for evidence, ever so short or pithy, of the violence done to parents or children, in order to compel, by a persecution the most cruel, because domestic, the latter to attend at schools of proselytism'. Doyle anticipated that the Irish Catholic archbishops would lead opposition to the plan of the commissioners whereby Catholic schools would have masters provided or trained by the Kildare Place Society. And he accused Kildare Place of falsifying and enlarging the figures for those attending its schools. Thus complimentary remarks on the Society in the report were unjustified. But he stated that he would await further reports from the commission before deciding 'either to combat it or support it according to the mode in which it may be put into operation'.<sup>176</sup>

The Dublin Evening Post of 18 June while cavilling with some of the tone and particulars of the report deemed that it was more

credit-worthy than the paper had reason to expect. In general Catholic opinion was much more well disposed to the report of the Education Inquiry than Bishop Doyle. Archbishop Curtis informed Propaganda Fide that the first report was 'far more liberal and satisfactory, than we could reasonably expect in such, or almost any circumstances'.<sup>177</sup> The Catholic Association also found the report much more positive than it had reason to hope for. The Association allowed that 'no reasonable objection' could be made to large parts of the report. Indeed the Association willingly acknowledged that the commissioners were 'decidedly complimentary to the zeal and devotion of the Catholic clergy'. Nonetheless the Association was of the opinion that the commissioners' recommendation of a future system of education would not find general acceptance among Irish Catholics unless 'very considerably modified'. In late December 1825 the Catholic Association called on the Irish hierarchy to issue a public response to the education report's conclusions.<sup>178</sup>

A formal response from the hierarchy to the first report of the Education commissioners was provided in their pastoral letter on education of January 1826. The bishops entered into six resolutions: (1) The admission of Catholics and Protestants into the same schools 'may under existing circumstances be allowed' provided sufficient care was taken to protect the religion of the Roman Catholic children, and to furnish them with an adequate means of religious instruction; (2) To secure the protection of the religion of the Catholic children in these schools the bishops deemed it necessary that the master or mistress of each school in which the majority of children was Catholic should also be a Catholic; where the Catholic children formed only a minority a 'permanent' male or female Catholic assistant should be employed, these

Catholic masters, mistresses and assistants to be appointed 'upon the recommendation, or with the express approval of the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese in which they are to be employed'. They were also to be subject to removal upon the representation of the bishop; (3) It was 'improper' that Catholic teachers should be trained 'under the control of persons professing a different faith'. The bishops considered it desirable that male and female model schools be established in each province in Ireland, supported at public expense for training Catholic masters and mistresses; (4) The books to be used in the schools were to be selected or approved by the Roman Catholic prelates. No book for common instruction in literature was to be introduced to which the bishops had an objection on religious grounds; (5) The bishops considered that the vesting of schools in the proposed board 'may be utterly impracticable' because of the nature of the tenure by which the vast majority of schools were held. The bishops felt that many useful schools would be excluded from parliamentary support if the recommendation was implemented. (Their real unexpressed concern here was probably for what might happen at any time in the future to de facto Catholic schools legally vested in the board if a row developed between the board and the bishops.); (6) The bishops concluded that, as guardians of the souls of their flocks, 'we will, in our respective dioceses withhold our concurrence and support from any system of education which will not fully accord with the principles expressed in the foregoing resolutions'.<sup>179</sup> These hierarchical resolutions represented a hardening of the Catholic position, under pressure from the New Reformation, but there was little chance that such resolutions would be acceptable to the government. The state was unprepared to concede such considerable control to the Catholic Church in any state-

funded system of elementary education apart altogether from the likely difficulties it would have experienced from the opposition of the other churches.

In the House of Commons on 20 March 1826 in a debate on the Irish estimates for education Thomas Spring Rice objected to compulsory scripture reading being enforced on Catholics by the Kildare Place Society. He quoted from Archbishop Magee's parliamentary evidence that the distribution of the scriptures without note or comment would lead to conversions to Protestantism. He also quoted from Bishop Doyle that Catholics were not averse to the circulation of the Bible. Spring Rice stated that of 408,065 Catholic schoolchildren in Ireland, 377,007 were educated at their own expense. Of 69,186 children in schools supported by public aid only 31,058 were Catholics.<sup>180</sup> The Chief Secretary of Ireland, Henry Goulburn defended the Kildare Place Society.<sup>181</sup> Frankland Lewis who presided over the Education commission defended both the commissioners and the Kildare Place Society.<sup>182</sup> The Home Secretary, Peel, was desirous of acting according to the 1812 Education report constituting a board of seven or eight members which would control education in Ireland.<sup>183</sup> On 22 March the Commons passed a motion granting £25,000 to the Kildare Place Society for that year. Joseph Hume's motion seeking a reduction in the Kildare Place grant of £4,000 was defeated.<sup>184</sup> In April Sir John Newport informed the Commons that if Catholics were not given educational assistance they would proceed without it. He drew the House's attention to the fact that Dr Doyle among others had already established several schools in his diocese.<sup>185</sup>

In April 1826, perhaps as a direct result of the foregoing debate, there was indeed a noticeable hardening of Bishop Doyle's stance. The evidence confirms that Doyle began ordering his parish priests and lay Catholic patrons who were in connection with the

Kildare Place Society to sever that association. Francis Haly parish priest of Kilcock was one of those affected in spite of the fact that he had an 'enviably good relationship with the Society who liberally grant aided him'. Moreover he gave no impression in his correspondence with the Society that the rule requiring the reading of scripture without note or comment was one to which he objected in principle. On 23 December 1825 he wrote to the Society as follows:

For the satisfaction of the Committee I avail myself of the present opportunity to say, that in no instance that ever came within my observation, have the rules been departed from, which formed the basis of the connexion between these Schools and the Education Society. I never, I declare, for a moment entertained the idea of evading the spirit or letter of the compact entered into with all due solemnity between the Committee and me. If the terms were such as I could not accept, the result would be, that no convention would be made or entered into between the Education Society and me; but having accepted of their terms, I feel bound in honour to see them observed, and the consequence is, I believe there never was any treaty of a private or a public nature more religiously observed. 186

As late as 30 March 1826 Haly applied for further grants for his three schools. On 8 April he was informed that the Society had acceded to his requests. But on 18 April Haly informed the Committee of the Kildare Place Society that

inasmuch as I have come to a determination to discontinue the connexion which has heretofore subsisted between the schools under my care, and the Society for Educating the Poor of Ireland, I must beg leave to decline accepting of the grants which the Committee have been kind enough to make to the Kilcock, Newtown and Tiermoghlan schools. 187

Similarly in Bagenalstown in April 1826 Prendergast the parish priest indicated to a Kildare Place Society inspector that he did not wish to remain in connection with the Society.<sup>188</sup> On 25 April 1826 the Society made a grant to Richard More O'Ferrall, Catholic patron of two schools in connection with the Society in Balyna parish. On 28 April he replied in the following oblique manner: 'Circumstances have occurred which prevent me accepting either of those grants, and as the



Patron . . . I withdraw them from all connexion with the Kildare Place Society. I feel it quite unnecessary to enter into a detail of the reasons which have influenced me to come to this determination'.<sup>189</sup> Gahan, parish priest of Rathvilly had no hesitation in stating why he was withdrawing from the Society in a letter received by the Secretary, J. D. Jackson, on 14 June 1826: 'I am directed by the Right Rev Dr Doyle not to conform to some rules recommended by your Society, in the education of our children, at the schools of Tyneclash, Englishtown, and Rathvilly; therefore I wish to apprise you of my intention of complying with his Lordship's directions'.<sup>190</sup> In August 1826 Doyle published an important pastoral on the education question. This thirty-two-page pastoral included a thorough historical review of recent ill-fated efforts by the hierarchy to secure government support for the education of Irish Catholics. Doyle attacked the fundamental contradiction in the Kildare Place Society's rules which turned it into a Bible society.<sup>191</sup> He noted that this Society was still being supported by the government with a grant of £25,000 per annum from the exchequer. Thus without hope of fair treatment circumstances now dictated that Catholics 'withdraw ourselves and our children from all contact with those Societies and the contagion which is abroad'.<sup>192</sup> Doyle offered an alternative new system of education funded by Catholic parishioners. Each parish should build a spacious schoolhouse (which had already been undertaken in several parishes) during the course of summer and autumn 1826. These were to be built adjoining or near each chapel as a parochial schoolhouse.<sup>193</sup> These schools were to be open to pupils of all denominations and non-sectarian. Religious instruction was to be the basis of education. 'Religion shall not be banished, like some dangerous infection from our schools.'<sup>194</sup>

While these parochial schools were being built Doyle required that in all schools under the superintendence of his clergy his regulations were to be exactly observed regardless of any connections with whatever societies, their inspectors or rules.<sup>195</sup> Wherever Catholic children's religious instruction was neglected or subjected to incompatible rules such as the reading of the scriptures without note or comment they were to be withdrawn 'if other schools of even an inferior description are convenient'. But as soon as the parochial schoolhouses were ready for the reception of children pastors were required to 'suffer no child of our communion to remain in any school wherein the rules of the Kildare-street Society or of any other anti-Catholic society, are observed'.<sup>196</sup> W. V. Griffith, an inspector of the Kildare Place Society, commenting on Doyle's pastoral on 30 August 1826 wrote 'it is in vain to hope that while the Roman Catholic body continues in a delirious fever, anything great or good can be effected in that part of the country where it is predominant'.<sup>197</sup>

In Dublin in December 1826 Doyle saw a copy (for only a 'few minutes') of the Kildare Place Society's report for the year ending 5 January 1826 and he made scribbled notes on their schools in the principal counties of his diocese. (Doyle suggested that it was difficult to obtain a copy of the Kildare Place Society's annual reports as circulation was confined to the friends of the Society.) He was disturbed to find in the report for 1825 that the Society claimed a large-scale adhesion to its ranks throughout his diocese and suspecting fraud he ordered his parish priests to make a complete return to him of the state of education with particular reference to Kildare Place within their respective parishes. Where schools were

named by the Kildare Place Society as in association with them he ordered his priests or their agents to visit these and to ascertain the exact position. Doyle endeavoured to ensure as much accuracy as possible in these returns by stating that the reports given by his priests might thereafter be published in parliament.<sup>198</sup>

The extant parochial returns from thirty-one parishes indicate that in eight parishes Bishop Doyle's request that parochial schools be built to accommodate children to be removed from other schools was being put into effect. In Borris parish where there were two schools, Borris and Ballinmartin, in connection with the Kildare Place Society with far more Catholic than Protestant children, John Walsh, parish priest, planned to build the parochial school at Ballymurphy: 'I will go there and have the stones drawn so that with God's assistance we will defate [sic] the Kildare sistem [sic]'.<sup>199</sup> In Rosenallis school which was in connection with the Kildare Place Society there were only three Catholics in attendance. Thady Dunne, parish priest, remarked that 'if ordered they will not attend any longer'. There was a Catholic usher in the Erasmus Smith school in Clonaslee but no Catholic scholars in attendance. The Catholic parishioners could not agree on where to site the new parochial schools. They were not anxious to have the schools as far apart as Rosenallis and Clonaslee. Dunne recommended that the bishop offer the chapel at Capard as a school.<sup>200</sup> In Clonmore parish there were four schools under the patronage of the Kildare Place Society. In Clonmore school itself there were only four Catholics; in Coolkenno, seven; in Munny, nine; and Aghold school was comprised solely of Protestants. The number of Catholics in these schools was rather small nonetheless John Kelly, parish priest, knowing his bishop's wishes added: 'our exertions shall be unceasing until we have our parochial schools erected'.<sup>201</sup>

In Monasterevin parish there were four schools, Borbawn, Ballynague, Derryaghta and Lorell, in connection with the Kildare Place Society. The masters were all well-conducted Catholics and the testament was not required to be read in them. Indeed Kildare Place tracts were completely excluded. Moreover (as the parish priest reported to Bishop Doyle) 'the Revd Mr Baggot of Fontstown who is patron of all of them, has hitherto left the sole superintendence to me and would not enter any of them for fear the parents might suspect his interfering in any manner with the religious principles of the children'. However the Catholic parishioners aware of the controversy that surrounded the Kildare Place schools were 'not much inclined to send their children to those schools' and only required a 'hint to withdraw their children from them'. The Rev Murphy was endeavouring to build a parochial school in Nurney 'but the people of that neighbourhood are neither generous or spirited in encouraging public institutions of that sort. They are perfectly satisfied with a cheap, humble method of education'. The parish priest had prepared a parochial school in Monasterevin town for female children and he requested Bishop Doyle to send him a teacher. The parishioners had undertaken by subscription to fund this school at about £30 per annum. There was less demand for a male school because there were so many other schools in the town but the parish priest intended to prepare one of his out-offices near the chapel for the boys. He commented: 'I believe my Lord there are very few priests in the Diocese who have expended more on schools these two or three years past than I have'. 202

John Lawlor, parish priest of Allen, reported that he had his 'hands in the mortar endeavouring to build a schoolhouse conformable

to your wishes'. The presence of the bishop was needed, he felt, to speed up the process.<sup>203</sup> The parish priest of Mountrath, M. P. Malone, stated on 19 February 1827 that 'our new school is in a forward state and in a few days will be able to accommodate more than one hundred children'.<sup>204</sup> Edward Earle, parish priest of Carbury, stated on the same day, that he expected 'to have his schools in a state of great forwardness in spring according to Your Lordship's plan'.<sup>205</sup> In St Mullins's parish there was no school in connection with the Kildare Place Society but the landlord Kavanagh was building a school which stated the parish priest 'would be useless, unless given on liberal terms'. The Rev Dowling was negotiating to purchase a piece of land for his parochial school which would be central and which would counteract Kavanagh's school 'should he attempt any opposition'. The parish priest was also engaged in raising a subscription for another parochial school on the chapel ground at Drummond.<sup>206</sup>

The effectiveness of Doyle's insistence that Catholic children should be removed from Kildare Place Society schools where an alternative was available can be seen in a number of parishes. No Catholic child attended the Kildare Place school at the Commons, Mountmellick.<sup>207</sup> In Abbeyleix the Catholic children had been withdrawn from a school associated with Kildare Place about November 1826. Rev Michael Kehoe reported that he turned the school into a huxter's shop and that the 'threat' he held out to the neighbouring gentry had had 'the most salutary effect'.<sup>208</sup> In Leighlinbridge where there were three schools in connection with the Kildare Place Society a Catholic clergyman of the parish informed his bishop on 30 January 1827: 'but not a Catholic child has frequented

them for more than a year'.<sup>209</sup> Rathcoffey school in Clane parish had no connection with the Kildare Place Society from February 1826.<sup>210</sup> In Ballyna parish as we have seen two schools had ceased connection with Kildare Place on 28 April 1826.<sup>211</sup> In Maryborough and Colonbullogue parishes children had also been withdrawn from biblical and Kildare Place schools.<sup>212</sup> Only two Catholics attended the Kildare Place school at Agarvin in Newbridge parish. They lived beside the school and would not have attended but were 'unable to go any distance having lost the use of their limbs; however the parents have withdrawn them, and are determined to send them no longer'.<sup>213</sup> Francis Haly had withdrawn all Catholic children from the Protestant school in Kilcock in 1825. Three Catholic children who were very young and lived beside the school attended it occasionally thereafter. Haly was not aware of their attendance until Doyle drew it to his attention. He replied to his bishop: 'It is not necessary to add that they do not go there now'.<sup>214</sup> In September 1826 the committee of the Graiguenamanagh schools which had received very liberal aid from the Kildare Place Society discussed the propriety of continuing in association. It duly resolved 'never to sanction any connection with that Society, so long as the system of education patronised by it shall be supported according to its present principles and regulations'.<sup>215</sup>

In a number of other parishes only a few Catholics attended Kildare Place schools. Bishop Doyle directed the Rathvilly priest John Gahan to visit Rathvilly school where the teacher stated the school was not under the control of the Kildare Place Society though he admitted receiving funds from the Society. Five Catholics attended this school: of these four were children of the police and the other

of a stranger to the parish.<sup>216</sup> In Clonegal parish where the parish priest noted: 'I have not for years done anything without your advice' there were several schools in connection with the Kildare Place Society. In Ballykeneen school the master was a Catholic and the Douay Testament was read. In Kilbride and Kildavin schools where the masters were Protestants the scholars read the Authorised version. Rev Martin Doyle however expressed apprehension about Barnehasck school which was under the sole control of Lord Farnham. There had been twelve Catholics in this school:

after some public and private harangs [sic] I gave them they are all withdrawn but 4 or 5, I dread this school more than all the rest being in the midst of his tenantry. He Lord Farnham has given no orders to his Catholic tenants to send their children, he has ordered the Bible to be in their hands and herts [sic]. His understrappers however are most importuning, doing all they can with the tenantry. I can, at once anihilate [sic] the other schools. Question how am I to act towards them altogether. 217

In Killeigh parish there was only one school in connection with the Kildare Place Society. The master, a Protestant, acted as an agent to landlord Benjamin Digby of Geashill. Only four Catholics occasionally attended this school which had an average attendance of sixty children. It would seem that the presence of these Catholic children was purchased by the elimination of their parents' rent charges:

The master is a very insinuating person and being a kind of agent to Benjamin Digby who receives rent out of the village of Geashill he passes by those wretched parents who being unable and unwilling to pay rent are held by their neighbours in as much contempt for their abject meanness as for their immoral and irreligious conduct seen to be of no other use than furnishing to this man the means of keeping his school in existence. 218

Lord Downshire's school in Edenderry was the only school in connection with the Kildare Place Society in the parish of that name. Twelve Catholics attended this school in February 1827. James Colgan parish priest informed the bishop: 'We have often admonished the parents of

those children to withdraw them from the school, but privately, as we were loth to quarrel with the Marquis. If it be your Lordship's wish, we will take more decisive measures'. Colgan had ceased to look for aid from the Kildare Place Society for his school at Trimleston early in 1826 and in December of that year he had informed the Kildare Place authorities that all connection between them must cease.<sup>219</sup> Glenmalure and Woodbrook schools which had Catholic children in attendance were both in connection with the Kildare Place Society in Portarlinton parish. Woodbrook was also associated with the London Hibernian Society and the Board of Erasmus Smith. The parish priest, John Dunne, presenting a depressing picture of the problems he faced

The two schools . . . where so many Catholic children attend would have been abandoned by the children of our Church but that in these distressing times we had no specific reasons to adduce that could save the poor tenants from the vindictive fury of the tyrannical landlords who patronise them.

One hopeful sign was that the Kennel school under the patronage of the Hon Lionel Dawson had withdrawn from connection with all societies and was about to be established on liberal principles. The Catholic children could be removed to this school. Schools under Protestant patronage in Portarlinton town presented a special difficulty for the parish priest:

The town schools I have not visited, nor could I, in my mind, without unpleasant results, as within the last month I have been totally obliged to prohibit every child of our communion from attending them, from the avowed hostility of the Biblicals to the profession of Catholicity. <sup>220</sup>

Armed with this thorough information on the connection between the schools in his diocese and the Kildare Place Society Doyle resolved on an attack on the Society's claimed returns which he had briefly perused. He stated that he was 'not a little surprised at the



extent of the fraud which had been practised on the Committee' of the Society and that he was determined to expose the errors which concerned his diocese.<sup>221</sup> He suggested that the qualification expressed in his autumn 1826 pastoral allowing Catholic children to remain in Kildare Place schools until parochial schools were ready for their reception (which had been exceeded by the zeal of the pastors and parents in several cases) was the 'real cause why a few Catholic children are still found to linger in some few schools connected with those obnoxious Societies'. In his public letter to Daniel O'Connell published on 17 March 1827 Bishop Doyle contrasted the Kildare Place Society's returns for schools in Kildare and Leighlin diocese with the actual state of these schools as confirmed by his parish priests.<sup>222</sup>

The Kildare Place Society claimed forty-nine schools in the Carlow, Kildare and Queen's County portion of the diocese in connection in the year ending 5 January 1826. Doyle stated that nineteen of these schools were either closed up or not in association with the Society. A further five schools were 'most probably not' in association. This left twenty-five schools which were in connection. The Society gave figures of 4,005 scholars in attendance in the total number of schools connected with them. Adopting the highest average Doyle alleged that there were no more than 817 bona fide scholars of whom 427 were Catholics. The number of these children who were instructed according to rules prescribed by the Catholic clergy (however the rules of the Kildare Place Society were disposed of), or who would shortly be removed to non-Society schools was 425. This left a very small residue indeed of Catholic children in attendance at Kildare Place Society schools. Doyle alleged that the details and figures supplied by him proved conclusively that the Kildare Place

Society had deceived or imposed upon the public, the commissioners of Education Inquiry, the government and the parliament. Doyle addressed O'Connell in the hope that he would communicate with members of parliament 'who have hitherto interested themselves to so little purpose in the matter of Education in Ireland'. Doyle wrote that he did not expect any good to come of his statement but his object was to convince the discerning public 'that in all our efforts either made or to be made, we are contending with fraud and bigotry, and corruption, and against a faction who consider all things just and equitable, whereby we may be depressed and their own monopoly secured'.

The general reaction of the Kildare Place Society was that Bishop Doyle's letter 'appeared to be so calculated to injure' the Society 'if not repelled'.<sup>223</sup> J. D. Jackson felt that Doyle's letter seemed intended as the basis of an attack in parliament and certainly demanded attention.<sup>224</sup> A public response was decided upon, Isaac Topham writing to Jackson: 'we have been engaged these two days at a counter statement. We expect to make out a good case'.<sup>225</sup> The Society's public reply was published on 24 March 1827.<sup>226</sup> This reply quite reasonably argued that the report attacked by Doyle dealt with the year 1825 (ending early January 1826) whereas his parish priests were asked to assess the Kildare Place schools in their parishes in late 1826 after Doyle's pastoral attacking the Society and advocating withdrawal from their schools, had been published. Therefore the two lists - the Kildare Place Society's and Doyle's - could not be compatible as they did not deal with the same time period.

Doyle's rejoinder appeared on 29 March 1827.<sup>227</sup> He tried somewhat disingenuously to excuse the time disparity between his

parochial returns for the Kildare Place Society's schools and the actual report which he had attacked by stating that his parish priests were in a much better position to know the true state of these schools than the Society's travelling inspector whose visit was expected, whose inspection was cursory and 'whose approbation of what was exhibited to him insured a premium of some pounds sterling to the Master or Mistress of the school to which he paid his annual passing visit'. Doyle concentrated his rejoinder on making another stinging attack on the motives of the Kildare Place Society and its supporters. The Society was labelled 'one of those scorpions with which the Irish Catholics are scourged'. Doyle stated that he could no longer allow his parish priests to remain in connection with a society which was by now 'identified by all that is illiberal and anti-Catholic in the land' - 'a mere branch of the Bible Society'. Their system was 'supremely odious' to Irish Catholics. Catholics had never approved of the 'obnoxious principle' of the Society, namely Bible reading without note or comment. Where Catholics were temporarily associated with the Kildare Place Society it was because they held out hopes that the Society's rules would be altered or that the Education Inquiry would recommend an educational system which Catholics would not find objectionable. Only four hundred Catholics in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin out of a total Catholic school-going population of thirty-six to thirty-seven thousand were educated in schools connected with the Kildare Place Society and even this number was likely to decrease. The proportion of Catholics to Protestants in the diocese was ten to one. And most of the Protestants by virtue of their superior circumstances were educated in schools of a higher order than

the Kildare Place schools.<sup>228</sup> Doyle's rejoinder was less an answer to the Kildare Place Society's response than a more direct assault on what he alleged was the bad faith of the Society.

Doyle drafted the Irish Catholic bishops' annual petition to parliament on education in February 1827. This stated that the Catholic children who attended Kildare Place schools were comparatively few in number; their attendance was the result of 'necessity, hope or fear and in no instance . . . the result of free unrestrained choice'. All reports in parliament that any portion of the Catholic clergy or Catholic people of Ireland were friendly to the Kildare Place system were 'founded in error or misconception'. Doyle's petition urged parliament to heed the reports of the Education commissioners and to make provision for a literary education founded on religious instruction.<sup>229</sup>

James Grattan presented the episcopal petition on 19 March 1827. He contended that proselytism was carried out by way of parliamentary grants and that it was a delusion to vote money to Protestant societies for the education of the poor since it was not fairly applied for that purpose.<sup>230</sup> Henry Grattan contended that 'there existed a fixed determination, to neglect no means of converting the rising generation to Protestantism which would not be successful and only cause further division'.<sup>231</sup> Both Thomas Spring Rice and Sir John Newport attacked the Kildare Place Society.<sup>232</sup> The Home Secretary Robert Peel, gave instances of Catholic clergymen who supported the Society and stated that 'the charges against the Kildare-Street Society were grossly exaggerated'.<sup>233</sup>

One of the most interesting, ecumenical and yet potentially very divisive ideas of the first report of the Education commissioners was

the recommendation, adverted to in the commissioners' conference with the Catholic bishops, that a compilation should be made from the four gospels which would be used during the period of 'united and general instruction' in the schools. The commissioners also recommended that the 'Book of Proverbs, and the work containing the History of the Creation, the Deluge and other important events, extracted from the Pentateuch' should also be used during the period of united and general instruction. The scriptures themselves were to be read during the time of separate religious instruction.<sup>234</sup> Interdenominational agreement on the concept of a scriptural compilation for general usage was seen by the commissioners as an indispensable requirement before they could proceed, as they had been asked by parliament, to the practical implementation of the conclusions of their first report namely the establishment of new schools on a trial basis. During the debate on Irish education in the House of Commons on 20 March 1826 Thomas Spring Rice pointed out that the idea of a religious 'harmony' for general use in the schools was acceptable to Archbishop Murray.<sup>235</sup> Robert Peel who was most encouraged by this concept commented:

It appeared that Dr Murray did not dissent from the introduction of some general religious education, founded on the selection of some approved parts of the Scripture; on some harmonious arrangement of the gospel, by which the grand truths of religion might be communicated, and morality inculcated, without trenching on those doctrines upon which the two sects differed. If this plan could be carried into effect, a sound system of education might be established in Ireland . . .

Peel's contribution to this Commons debate included a revealing insight into his thinking when he stated that 'as the conversion of the Roman Catholics was quite out of the question, it was considered desirable to improve them by education . . .'. He could never consent to patronise any system of education of which the principles of the Christian religion did not form a part.<sup>236</sup> Herein lies the importance

of the 'harmony' concept for Peel. The chairman of the Education commissioners, Thomas Frankland Lewis, was indeed endeavouring to compile a harmony of the gospels which would be acceptable to both Catholic and Protestant persuasions for mixed education. In July 1826 Frankland Lewis submitted to Archbishop Murray a work compiled from the Authorised version of the New Testament under the sanction of the Established Church. Murray's opinion was that as the compilation was taken exclusively and verbatim from the Protestant version of the New Testament it would be open to objections already made by the Catholic archbishops to the commissioners with regard to a similar work. At the same time Murray stated that those objections might in his opinion 'be removed if the matter of the work was abstracted from the Catholic and Protestant versions where they substantially agree without the words being taken literatim from either'.<sup>237</sup> Frankland Lewis requested Archbishop Murray to undertake such modifications as would overcome objections and make the work acceptable in schools.<sup>238</sup> Murray placed Frankland Lewis's request before his fellow prelates. They agreed that the work as submitted to them would not receive their sanction unless 'wholly changed'. The bishops asserted that the Protestant Church would object if a similar work was constructed solely from the Douay Bible. The prelates agreed with Doyle's suggestion that modifications might make the compilation acceptable provided 'such a Book be not put forward as the Scriptures but as a historical view of what is found in same'. This caused Murray to conclude in an amiable spirit of interdenominational compromise that by this method

perhaps a point of union may be found and the only practicable way can be come at, whereby the Prelates of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Church may, without a sacrifice of principle,

be led to agree in the adoption of a book, such as the commission desire for the purpose of general instruction.

The Catholic prelates also scrutinised the 'Christian Lessons', another compilation which was submitted for their approval. This work was taken from the Catholic and Protestant translations of the scriptures where they substantially agreed. It dealt with the subject matter as a historical statement rather than a transcript of scripture. Murray returned a copy of the work to Frankland Lewis with 'some trifling alterations' and the assurance that 'tho' it is not yet all that we could wish, I am instructed to say that the Roman Catholic prelates would not think themselves called on to discourage the attendance of children of the Roman Catholic faith in any school, in which the use of this compilation so amended might be required' provided the regulations of the school concurred with the January 1826 resolutions of the hierarchy.<sup>239</sup>

It would seem that in response to Frankland Lewis's encouragement Archbishop Murray did actually compile his own version of the scriptures as a historical text for mixed instruction. However when Frankland Lewis submitted this compilation to Archbishop Beresford of Armagh for Protestant approval he met with a very negative response. Indeed it was the unanimous judgement of the bishops of the Established Church that Murray's tract was 'unfit to be adopted'. The Protestant bishops were determined to hold to their original version and sought an 'explicit answer' from the Catholic bishops on their willingness or unwillingness to allow 'our compilation in the National Schools'. Archbishop Beresford pointed out that while the Protestant Church possessed the Authorised version

of the Bible the Roman Catholic Church 'has strictly speaking none'. The Protestant bishops nonetheless stated that they were prepared to make the 'largest allowances' for Roman Catholic objections to the Authorised version but they were insistent upon an 'adequate representation of revealed truth being exhibited to the youthful mind'. The bishops concluded with a re-statement of fundamental division which could not be bridged: 'it must be clear to every unbiassed mind that until the principles, upon which our Book is formed, have been recognized, it will be a mere waste of time to enter into a detailed discussion respecting particular alterations'.<sup>240</sup> By April 1827 Archbishop Murray was stating unambiguously to Frankland Lewis that this remarkable experiment had failed and that the commissioners of Education had created 'needless difficulty' by requiring as a matter of necessity that there should be any scriptural compilation. If the religious instruction of children was confined wholly to their respective pastors 'what appears to be the only ground of disagreement would be removed' and the rest of the commissioners' plan could be carried into operation immediately.<sup>241</sup> But having failed to achieve inter-church agreement on a harmony of the scriptures the commissioners, fearing further rebuffs, were deterred from proceeding with the proposed new schools even on an experimental basis.

In a letter to the Catholic Association published on 27 November 1827 Doyle expressed his pleasure that the Association was reported to be considering the establishment of a model school in Dublin. Doyle perceived that Catholic elementary education needed a model school to rival the Kildare Place Society's vehicle for supplying school masters to the country. Doyle suggested that one or more schools should be established on a plan which was broader and more ambitious than that of the Kildare Place Society. He desired to see



besides a large apartment where reading, writing and the elements of whole numbers would be taught in the most improved system, there should be at least two other apartments, in which the theory and practice of design or drawing, abridgement of Natural History, and the elements of the Mathematics - including Algebra, the principles of proportions, something of Logarithms - Geometry with some plain and spherical Trigonometry, even a little of Conic sections, and should I add a tincture of chemistry should be taught . . .

What was greatly required, according to Doyle, was a supply of masters well instructed in the elements of science, especially in mathematics, to teach the 'immense mass of talent' to be found in the middle classes. He was confident that if an attempt was made to erect such an institution in Dublin it would be successful. He stated that if he had five thousand pounds and a fund which would give him an income of five hundred pounds annually then he would erect such an institution in Carlow.<sup>242</sup>

In the original draft of his letter to the Catholic Association there was no mention of a model school but rather of a university. Doyle's objective was actually a university but he had of necessity to be very careful about raising such a subject in the midst of the heated Emancipation agitation. However a private letter to his brother, Rev Peter Doyle, is very revealing in several respects:

I am also engaged as you may observe by the papers in an effort to commence an Irish University under the name of a Model School in Dublin. Doctor Murray will cooperate with me as will O'Connell and they are both very able cooperators. Our ulterior motive must for a time be concealed. . . Perseverance does a great deal and if I be not destined to witness the liberation of my country from British bondage I hope to prepare the way for that event. A scientific education, such as I have begun to look to for the bulk of the people will, if propagated, produce a revolution of some sort in the course of time . . . <sup>243</sup>

At the Catholic Association on 8 December 1827 O'Connell recommended that £1,500 be set aside for establishing a model school in Dublin to counter the proselytising agencies.<sup>244</sup> Resolutions to this end were carried at an aggregate meeting on 19 December, one of which

recommended that 'such model school should be constituted as to be capable of extending scientific education to the poorer classes of Ireland as suggested in the late letter of the Rt Rev Dr Doyle'.<sup>245</sup> Over six months later in May 1828 Doyle expressed his disillusionment to O'Connell over the lack of progress towards a major educational foundation: 'I am quite distressed at the failure of our efforts to establish a system of Education. The blame of this does not rest with you or me. But we have failed and more than once nor do I think there are men to be found in Dublin having leisure disposed or perhaps capable of establishing it'.<sup>246</sup> Doyle's stance may have galvanised O'Connell into action because on 8 June 1828 he laid the foundation stone of the new school at North Richmond Street, Dublin.<sup>247</sup> This school, known as the O'Connell school, was directed by the Irish Christian Brothers and does not appear to have fulfilled the role envisaged for it before the introduction of the national system of education in 1831.

While Doyle regarded the establishment of the North Richmond Street school as a step in the right direction he still envisaged a much more ambitious educational institution. Late in 1828 he put his thoughts on paper in what became a forty-four-page pamphlet published in 1829 under the title Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Esq., on the foundation of a National Literary Institute for the extension of science to all classes of Irish youth. On this occasion 'National Literary Institute' was a euphemism for a university. Even after Emancipation when this pamphlet was published Doyle refrained from spelling out his objective. Doyle acknowledged that the plan of an institution such as was 'hinted at rather than proposed to be undertaken [in November 1827] appeared too large and comprehensive to be freely and willingly embraced'. Although Doyle thanked O'Connell

and Lord Killeen for their support and pointed out that he himself had received numerous assurances of support from a wide variety of eminent persons of all persuasions and political outlook it was clear that his plan had failed to attract support from Dublin's Catholic middle classes.<sup>248</sup>

Doyle's pamphlet entered into a discourse on why a 'National Literary Institute' was desirable for the country. He maintained that one of the reasons - apart from wars and religious animosity - the 'mangled history' of Ireland presented such a mixture of bigotry and prejudice was because of the ignorance of the people. An ignorance created by the penal laws against the education of Catholics.<sup>249</sup> An educational institute would lay the foundation of Ireland's future well-being: 'an educated people will be free'.<sup>250</sup> All the professions must be open to every educated person, however poor.<sup>251</sup> Ireland had only one university when at least four were required. The religious tests and exclusions of the University of Dublin (Trinity College) were a libel on the name of a university. Trinity College was only for a privileged caste more preoccupied with the classics than with science whereas a university should not confine its advantages to any one class.<sup>252</sup> No other country in Europe, Doyle contended, failed to provide a scientific education for its middle classes, apart from Ireland. The Royal Dublin Society established in the eighteenth century had failed in its objective to diffuse a scientific education throughout the country. Doyle wanted an institution which would stress scientific, mercantile and commercial subjects, agriculture and enterprise of all kinds; the cultivation of languages 'dead, foreign or obsolete' would not be a priority.<sup>253</sup>

Doyle ruled out calling a public meeting to establish his 'National Literary Institute' on the basis that the temper of the times was such that it would be impossible to find agreement among the contending parties in Ireland. He suggested that a financial grant should be made available to a committee which would be commissioned to procure a site and erect the necessary buildings. Doyle criticised the Catholic Association for failing to make greater funds available from the Catholic rent for education.<sup>254</sup> Doyle thought that his institute could be funded on an on-going basis through some kind of a share issue, through annual subscriptions and bequests.<sup>255</sup> The institute could be made more attractive by building a classical school or an agricultural school alongside it. Doyle had already given consideration to the formation of an agricultural model school for Munster in response to a circular letter from its sponsors. That project, however, like his own prescient National Literary Institute did not come to fruition.<sup>256</sup>

Despite the completion of no less than nine reports (several of a minor nature) by the commission of Education Inquiry in the period 1825-1827 there seemed to be little political will to put its recommendations into effect. However in April 1828 as the question of Irish education appeared to languish Thomas Spring Rice conceived a means of giving it renewed impetus. He secured a Select Committee on Education in Ireland to examine the reports of the Education Inquiry and to report their findings to parliament with all possible dispatch. As chairman of the Select Committee Spring Rice entered into correspondence in the 'strictest confidence' with Bishop Doyle requesting his opinion on the former's planned recommendations. Secrecy was essential: 'great delicacy is required in the steps that

I take. If it could be thought that my measure was not my own but was procured in communication with others I should lose much of the vantage ground necessary to overcome the opposition with which I have to contend'.

The whole direction of Rice's scheme was to place education under a department of government answerable to parliament. The general principle of the scheme was to require a small payment from the pupils except for free scholars on recommendation from clergy and the school subscribers. Books of general instruction with a certain proportion of school requisites were to be furnished by the state. Doyle was undoubtedly most concerned with Rice's plan for dealing with the intractable religious issue in elementary education. Rice proposed the separation of school and religious instruction altogether. Four days of the school week were to be devoted to moral and literary instruction excluding scripture 'or anything of that description'. The two remaining days were to be given over exclusively to religious instruction on separate days for both Protestant and Catholic children. This religious instruction was to take place under the sole supervision of their respective clergy. Teachers and patrons were excluded from this role. Rice envisaged a power of complaint of interference with the religious tenets of the children and a fine, suspension or dismissal of teachers who offended. The children of both denominations were also to be required to attend at their places of worship on Sundays. Rice was confident that his plan would meet with the approval of 'all but the bigots and saints'.<sup>257</sup>

In May 1828 Rice notified Doyle that it was of the 'most extreme and pressing necessity' that his plan which had been almost

unanimously adopted by his committee should be well received by 'your side' when the report was published otherwise he feared a continuation of the status quo. Rice was still expecting hostility on the grounds that 'we shall be styled Atheists by the Saints for thus separating literary and religious instruction leaving the latter to the Clergy. But I am sure we are right'.<sup>258</sup> Rice also entreated Archbishop Murray to give the report his 'earnest cooperation' adding that while the high Church party might object 'I really think the Roman Catholics will find in this plan all they can reasonably wish'.<sup>259</sup> It may be doubted that either Archbishop Murray or Bishop Doyle was entirely happy with this scheme. Doyle had already made clear that Catholics did not believe in the separation of literary and religious instruction. But Doyle was supportive of Rice's plan for the good reason that he saw no realistically feasible alternative except something even less acceptable. Doyle wrote to O'Connell (who was not privy to the formulation of Rice's plan) giving him details and priming him to be supportive when it was published: 'I think that it would be well if you spoke of it with approbation as the best that could be obtained, for if this report be not adopted, we will be left as hitherto without resources of our own and struggling against a too powerful force. If this system such as I anticipate be adopted we may avail ourselves of it. . .'.<sup>260</sup> Rice's Committee followed the first report of the Education Inquiry in 1825 which in turn followed the fourteenth report of 1812 in declaring that no plan of education should be adopted 'unless it explicitly avowed, and clearly understood, as its leading principle, that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or denomination of Christians'.<sup>261</sup>

Although the object of Rice's Committee was to consider on what future grounds the public grant for Irish education should be made by parliament no action was taken by Wellington's government in 1828. There were a number of reasons why this should be do. Foremost among them was the fact that the Emancipation campaign, then at its zenith, consumed political attention where Ireland was concerned. The introduction of a new system of education would only have complicated matters by most likely inspiring further anti-Emancipation activity among ultra-Protestants. Besides there was no great urgency on the part of Peel as Home Secretary to change the status quo; after all he was the faithful defender of the political and religious establishment.

But however much it went against the grain the evidence shows that - as on the Emancipation question so too on Irish education - Peel conceded gradually and reluctantly that the well-being of the United Kingdom would have to take precedence over his own deeply-held desire to uphold the fundamental Protestantism of the state in all matters. In August 1828 with the administrative efficiency which was his particular forte the Home Secretary entered into a consideration of Irish education in a detailed letter to the new Irish Chief Secretary, the political neophyte, Lord Francis Leveson Gower, who although he had been an active member of Spring Rice's committee, was now in no hurry, indeed reluctant to implement its recommendations.

Peel advised Leveson Gower that the government was not then in a position to form 'any satisfactory decision' with respect to the issue of the public education grants to other objects than they were already voted for. He nonetheless allowed that the government must consider without delay whether any system of education could be devised capable

of more widespread extension than Kildare Place which would give more general satisfaction: 'If it can be devised we are bound to adopt it'. But until there were good grounds for believing that any new system would be a success they should be cautious in interfering with the existing system, 'which effects much good though not all we would wish'.

Peel suggested that the way to proceed was to try a limited experiment of educating Catholics and Protestants together. If it worked it could be extended. He was under no illusions that this subject was one of 'extreme difficulty and delicacy' because of Protestant and Catholic differences on the question of scripture reading. Yet the government could not 'compel' the adoption of any plan of education. The Home Secretary realised that the establishment of any schools on principles objected to by the Protestant Church would lead to the withdrawal of Protestant children. He feared, again correctly, that it would be much easier to cause the withdrawal of Protestant children from schools to which their authorities objected than it was to withdraw Catholic children from schools under the Kildare Place Society. The limited number of Protestants vis-à-vis Catholics and their relatively more comfortable condition of life, would make it easier for them to withdraw. Despite this danger, which weighed heavily with Peel, the principle of joint education could not be 'wisely or safely relinquished'.<sup>262</sup>

The Chief Secretary was asked by Peel to sound out moderate opinion on what changes to the recommendations of Rice's Committee would make that report acceptable. Peel also wanted to know the exact strength of the Kildare Place Society and was not a little put out when the Society failed to oblige. When Leveson Gower



requested Peel's advice on whom exactly he should consult in Ireland the Home Secretary acknowledged a very real difficulty: 'I know no one by whose opinions I would be bound - for on almost every subject in Ireland opinions are in the extreme'. Even so Peel could not but unwittingly reveal his own partialities when he suggested that Leslie Foster and North (although they held 'very decided opinions') were worth hearing.<sup>263</sup>

The advice of Peel to Leveson Gower in September 1828 on how to deal with a petition from the Roman Catholic hierarchy on education is instructive of his general attitude to the Catholics. The bishops' memorial, he stated,

however complimentary is not drawn up in a very conciliatory spirit, with respect to Education - I believe their object to be, to separate the instruction of the Roman Catholic poor from that of the Protestants - and to obtain the effective controul [sic] over any public money, which may be destined to provide education for the Roman Catholics.

I should not be inclined to inform the Roman Catholic Prelates, in reply to their Memorial - what would be the course pursued by the Lord Lieutenant, in his communications with the King's Government . . . If I were to advise the King upon a point of the same nature, I should recommend him to return a very cautious, but a very short answer . . . <sup>264</sup>

Unfortunately no minute book of the annual meetings of the Irish Catholic hierarchy survives before the year 1829. Thus Doyle's role at these meetings can only be surmised. The minute book which does survive for the Doyle years from 1829 gives clear evidence of the bishop's leading indeed predominant role within the hierarchy. His was the crucial intellectual influence moving all the important resolutions, drafting pastorals and petitions to parliament, etc.<sup>265</sup> His dogged persistence on the education question and unremitting hostility to the Kildare Place Society is well illustrated in the minute book. On 9 February 1829 he moved a resolution (seconded by

Bishop Coen of Clonfert) 'that the Prelates in their respective dioceses do issue instructions to their several clergy to prevent by every means in their power the attendance of Catholic children at schools in connexion with the Kildare Place Society'. On 10 February Doyle's petition to parliament on education was adopted by the hierarchy as its own. Archbishop Murray was entrusted with the organisation of its presentation.<sup>266</sup> James Grattan presented the petition in parliament. The petitioners did not seek money for the promotion of education but asked parliament to adopt a system of national education calculated to benefit the community, without interfering with their religious opinions. On this occasion a dispute broke out over whether a petition could be accepted from Roman Catholics calling themselves bishops. It was argued that the title of bishop was not received from the king and the law of Praemunire could be invoked. The Home Secretary however stated that he had no objection to the petition<sup>267</sup> although very shortly thereafter Peel's Emancipation bill would contain strictures on the use of titles by Roman Catholic dignitaries. The subject of the petition was mentioned in cabinet on 24 February but was overshadowed not surprisingly by consideration of the Emancipation bill. As Peel stated: 'we all feel it would be very desirable under existing circumstances not to agitate the Education question'.<sup>268</sup>

By mid-summer 1829 after the Emancipation furore had subsided somewhat Peel was prepared to consider Irish education: 'the time is now come when we must make up our minds and do what we will do . . .'.<sup>269</sup> In a letter to Leslie Foster, Peel pondered what this might be. His letter dated 1 September 1829 was marked 'most private' with good reason. Peel revealed that he had finally turned his back on the

Kildare Place Society. Peel followed the first report of the Education Inquiry (on which Foster had sat) in pointing to a number of faults with the Kildare Place Society. Firstly the Society with its large and fluctuating body of subscribers or members bound only by their own rules could hardly be an adequate state instrument for promoting a system of general education. Secondly the Kildare Place Society did not succeed in its professed objective of making a religious education the basis of its general course of instruction. Thirdly the use of the scriptures in Kildare Place schools was 'frequently a mere matter of form'. Furthermore even if the compromise on which the Kildare Place's religious instruction was based were realised (which it was not) 'no Person would have deemed [it] completely satisfactory'.

In its place Peel suggested constituting a board of seven or nine unsalaried members, with a paid secretary, who would establish a general system of instruction funded by the state. Peel would leave the selection of the number and religion of the school masters to the discretion of this board. On the key scriptural question Peel decided that it was necessary either to make a compilation from the scriptures which Protestant and Roman Catholic children would read daily when receiving united instruction or to give the Authorised version to the Protestant children and the Douay version to the Catholics and to allow all to read their own testament. This should be done without reference to the authorities of either Church thus avoiding 'unavailing and interminable controversies'. Peel followed Rice's report in recommending access on one day of the week to pastors of each Church to give whatever religious instruction they deemed necessary.

The object of Peel's plan was to give education in common to Protestant and Roman Catholic children 'without a view to the conversion of the latter'. The chief advantage of state control of education was 'the education of the children of different persuasions in common - and the preventing a very bad education which probably would be the result if Government did not interfere'. Peel concluded with obvious regret that the Catholics could no longer be proselytised: 'the undertaking to educate Roman Catholic children, with an utter disclaimer of any views of conversion, precludes of itself any thoroughly satisfactory arrangement with respect to their religious instruction':

The very principle on which we set out is opposed to such an arrangement - we may insist on scriptural education - and I do not deny the advantages of insisting on it - even if that advantage mainly consist in the public proof thus given, that the State recognises and upholds the Truths of Revealed Religion but I fear the mere reading from the New Testament, as a lesson Book, without Catechism, and without explanation, gives to a child a very imperfect religious instruction. 270

To make his plan of state elementary education in Ireland palatable to Protestants Peel simultaneously contemplated withdrawing or modifying the Maynooth grant to the Irish Catholic Church.<sup>271</sup> Yet for whatever reason the government failed to act.

On Doyle's motion at the hierarchy's annual meeting on 5 February 1830 five prelates - Murray, Doyle, Crolly, Kelly and Collins - were appointed to prepare a petition to parliament on education.<sup>272</sup> Archbishop Murray presented the petition to the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary for Ireland but had to admit to Bishop Doyle that the response was unsatisfactory: 'neither answer is very encouraging'. Leveson Gower would only present the petition in the Lords on the 'distinct understanding that he would not be obliged to discuss the merits of it'. Murray's reading of the situation was that the

government was desirous 'to leave matters quietly as they are'. In his letter to the Chief Secretary the archbishop had declared that if no improvement in Irish education was planned then 'it would be much better for the country if the education grant were withdrawn altogether' from the Kildare Place Society.<sup>273</sup> Sir Henry Parnell was also involved in this attempt to persuade the Chief Secretary to contemplate reform. He informed Doyle that he had written Leveson Gower 'as strong a letter as I could pen' calling on the government to make a total change in Irish education. Parnell had stated:

I believe, no one, not being a Catholic, knows as I do how great the benefit would be of fully satisfying the Catholic Bishops on this point, and on the other hand how much mischief would be the result, if after passing the Relief Bill, Government, instead of protecting them from the efforts of their old adversaries should allow the public money to be employed in a way that they conceive is nothing short of open hostility to their religion.<sup>274</sup>

Bishop Doyle underwent a close examination on education before the parliamentary Select Committee on the state of the poor in Ireland on 3 and 5 June 1830.<sup>275</sup> Perhaps the high point of this evidence was Doyle's subsequently much-quoted statement on the importance of interdenominational education in Ireland (however much it belied the actual reality of what was happening in his own diocese). His statement was made in the context of a question and answer response:

. . . if a system of common education for children of the different religious persuasions could be adopted with the assent of the different sects, do you consider that that would be more advantageous than a separate system of education for each?

I do not see how any man, wishing well to the public peace, and who looks to Ireland as his country, can think that peace can ever be permanently established, or the prosperity of the country ever well secured, if children are separated, at the commencement of life on account of their religious opinions. I do not know any measure which would prepare the way for a better feeling in Ireland than uniting children at an early age, and bringing them up in the same school, leading them to commune with one another and to form those little intimacies and

friendships, which often subsist through life. Children thus united know and love each other as children brought up together always will; and to separate them is, I think, to destroy some of the finest feelings in the hearts of men. 276

Doyle's 1830 evidence provides a résumé of his educational achievement in Kildare and Leighlin over the previous decade. By 1830 he had succeeded in building solid schoolhouses in every parish in the diocese. The schools were often built beside the parochial chapels thus undoubtedly strengthening their image as Catholic schools. These schoolhouses, though a dramatic improvement on the pay or hedge schools, were still somewhat short of the best description. The Catholic parishes were unable to furnish them properly. Doyle still had 'some difficulty' in finding masters capable of teaching upon an 'improved system'. The Lancastrian system was used with improvements by Pestalozzi.<sup>277</sup> Three schools within his diocese were appointed by the bishop as model schools. Two of these were Carlow Free School and the Presentation Convent, Carlow. Every master or mistress recommended by Doyle for appointment in any parish of the diocese had to have spent at least three months in one of his model schools under an approved teacher and possess a certificate of competency from the latter. Ironically the masters in the model schools were educated at Kildare Place. There were free schools in each of the town parishes because the numbers of the poor were so great. In country parishes pay schools still predominated. Pauper children were paid for privately by the Catholic priests to safeguard these children from the lively class consciousness of their slightly better-off peasant companions.<sup>278</sup>

Doyle was very careful to frame the rules and regulations governing his schools in such a way that Protestants would not be excluded. The teaching of religion was the bishop's first concern in

the education of youth in these schools. Nonetheless he endeavoured 'to exclude all rules that would make a distinction between children on account of their religion and to encourage the union of different religious opinions as such as I could in the same schools'. In the pay schools throughout the diocese Doyle still found Catholics and Protestants 'mixed very much'. In these schools Catholic children never read the Authorised version of the scriptures. Protestant children were allowed religious instruction either before or after the day's classes. In practice however in schools under the management of Bishop Doyle's clergy the religious education of Protestants was not attended to. Protestants of a better class than the generality of Catholics would not deign to send their children to mix with the lower orders in such schools being more likely to employ private tutors for their offspring. In many parishes Protestants were few in number and often given religious instruction by their parents. Protestant children were sent home when Catholic children received religious instruction. Doyle was adamant in 1830 that if Protestant children were left without religious instruction it was not his fault as he would 'go out of my way' to accommodate a Protestant pastor. He was not prepared to go as far as countenancing a common prayer for Catholic and Protestant children; Catholics differed from Protestants on principle and such differences would not be easily overcome.<sup>279</sup>

Doyle was insistent that religious instruction be given by a teacher of the same persuasion as his pupils. The master, assistant teacher or monitor would therefore have to be a Catholic in a school with Catholics in attendance. The master of one religion was not to teach religion to children of another persuasion. For this reason alone Doyle was deeply hostile to the Association for

Discountenancing Vice and the Board of Erasmus Smith which insisted on Protestant masters exclusively in their schools.<sup>280</sup>

In Doyle's schools the masters were exclusively Catholic but not in the schools on the Fitzwilliam estate on the eastern borders of the diocese. Earl Fitzwilliam and his son Lord Milton drew up regulations governing their schools on the estate which were submitted to Bishop Doyle for his approval. The estate contained a greater proportion of Protestant than Catholic tenantry. The Fitzwilliam regulations contained the substance of Doyle's rules for his own parochial schools. They allowed for a Protestant master provided there was a Catholic assistant teacher or monitor delegated to teach religion to Catholic pupils. This arrangement worked well in a good example of interdenominational cooperation.<sup>281</sup> Elsewhere Kildare Place schools in the diocese were attended by 'few or none' of the Catholic school-going population notwithstanding landlord pressure in some parishes. Doyle allowed that where religious differences were disappearing in schools it was largely because of the separation of Catholics and Protestants.<sup>282</sup>

A significant new source of support for Doyle and the Irish bishops emerged in 1830 when the historian of Catholic Emancipation, Thomas Wyse, became one of the first Irish Catholics to be elected to parliament after Emancipation. Wyse quickly set about building a reputation as one of the most important Irish educationalists of the nineteenth century. In correspondence with Doyle on 20 November 1830 (after the change of government) Wyse adverted to his intention of bringing on a motion on Irish education after the Christmas recess. Fundamentally Wyse wanted a more widespread diffusion of education and a better distribution of the parliamentary funds appropriated to



education. He approached this self-appointed task with tenacity: 'I shall pursue it without remission, and, if defeated in the first instance, shall not lose courage, but continue earnestly . . . until something be at last done'. Wyse was however confident that the new administration which he deemed liberal and energetic to a degree which could hardly be expected, was determined to turn its immediate attention to Ireland and the problem of education.<sup>283</sup>

Doyle undoubtedly welcomed Wyse's co-operation. Wyse's perspective on education was almost completely in accord with Doyle's as spokesman for the Irish bishops. Wyse held that if the opinions of the Irish Catholic hierarchy were not understood and accommodated then any new system of education would be unsuccessful. Doyle responded by sending Wyse a copy of his Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Esq., on the foundation of a National Literary Institute for the extension of science to all classes of Irish youth. Like Doyle, Wyse regretted that the funds of the late Catholic Association had not been used to finance an educational establishment such as Doyle proposed; he considered that in this matter 'public faith was broken'. Wyse was also of the same mind as Doyle in believing that more was needed than simply providing a general system of elementary education by redistributing the funds made available to the Kildare Place Society. He was more conservative than Doyle when he stated:

Education, like all other civilisation, ought to proceed downward, and I do not know, whether the very reverse of this principle does not appear in Ireland. The lowest class, proportionate to their position, are better educated than the middle or upper. It is the contrary on the continent. This, as much as anything else, contributes to sustain the marked distinctions between the classes, which is the curse of Ireland.<sup>284</sup>

Wyse shared a mental cosmos with Doyle which attributed Ireland's educational deficiencies to the penal laws. It was only just that

Englishmen should atone for the historically grave injury which they had inflicted. But both Doyle and Wyse went beyond this standard Catholic view in contemplating and actually campaigning for a whole new Irish educational structure. In a letter to Bishop Doyle of 11 December 1830 Wyse argued for a three-tier system - each tier assisting and benefiting the next. There should be first of all a well-arranged system of university education. Secondly there should be Provincial Colleges ('to which you refer') for the middle classes and thirdly a system of elementary parochial schools. In these parochial schools religious instruction was to be placed entirely in the hands of the clergy thus obviating all sources of petty dissension and distrust from all other methods.

Wyse, probably in response to Doyle's initiative, declared that there was no hope of reforming Trinity College Dublin through parliament: '... The Dublin University, is a mere ecclesiastical and I may in some degree add an anti-national institution'. Catholics could enter the lists for awards in Trinity College but they could not carry-off the prizes. Similarly only Protestants could be appointed to the staff of T.C.D. Wyse looked to the continent, where there was hardly a petty state in Germany and Italy without a university. Scotland and England had four universities each. Why not two in Ireland? In the mid-1840s Wyse would still be raising such questions in parliament, but in December 1830 he was very sanguine, from private discussions, that practical and effective measures would soon be under consideration for Ireland.<sup>285</sup>

In January 1831 Bishop Doyle, perhaps inspired by Wyse's optimism, addressed the new Irish Chief Secretary, Edward Stanley, on the educational needs of his diocese to illustrate what the government

would have to consider in dealing with the country as a whole.<sup>286</sup> Doyle provided Stanley with an up-to-date account of the state of elementary education in Kildare and Leighlin. The public money given to the Kildare Place Society and other societies 'professing to promote education' had resulted in the erection of a great number of excellent well-furnished schoolhouses which were well provided with school requisites. However some of these schools were closed and deteriorating. Others were usually attended by a

few Protestant children of the middling or lower classes sometimes of the lowest, such as foundlings, and in a few instances by some very few Catholics, whose parents made in sending them, a sacrifice of their religious feelings to the fear infused by their landlords, or to the hope in obtaining, in return for such compliance, food or raiment for themselves or their children. If in any case these schools are attended by a larger number of Catholics, it is because the rules of the Society with which they happen to be in connection are not enforced; or these children are lent obligingly to the master of the school (when the inspection day approaches), that he may appear to the inspector entitled to the donation usually granted to teachers in a sum proportionate to the number of pupils respectively.<sup>287</sup>

Thus the Catholic children of the diocese were left dependent for their education on the 'narrow resources' of the Catholic community itself. Doyle had endeavoured as much as he could with his parochial clergy and people to provide for Catholic educational needs but he had to acknowledge an unsatisfactory result:

. . . we have been more successful in correcting or removing a bad system of education than in the establishment of a good one. We have within these few years suppressed numberless hedge-schools, and united, often within the place of worship, the children theretofore dispersed. We have built or enlarged sixty-five school-houses of good size; we have provided only a portion of those with good teachers, for we had not wherewith to pay respectable masters. Nearly all our schools are in an unfinished state; few of them are well furnished or sufficiently supplied with requisites, and I may say that in none of them is there a provision sufficient for the maintenance of a respectable master or mistress.<sup>288</sup>

Doyle deemed it impossible, without financial aid to keep his schools on a proper footing or 'to satisfy my own mind that the education provided for the middle or lower classes of the people is such as it could and ought to be . . . '.

Examining what needed to be done Doyle advised Stanley that light government aid would be sufficient to keep the numerous schools established by the Protestant education societies in a healthy state but even in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin where the proportion of Catholics to Protestants was eight to one, a large expenditure would be required to maintain the 'Catholic' schools, 'especially if some means be not devised of uniting the children of the different religious persuasions in the same schools. Could this be done, the school houses now existing, would by a small expenditure, be made to accommodate all'. Doyle had frequently found that in several parishes the number of Catholic communicants among the children of school-going age exceeded the number of actual school-going children. This he attributed to the 'neglect or inability of some parishes to educate their youth, especially the poor; and the general result which forms itself upon the mind is, that a large, a very large number of children in this, I might say favoured section of Ireland, are left destitute of the great blessing of education even in its rudest shape'.<sup>289</sup>

Stanley was pleased to find Doyle expressing sentiments which had been generally made by the Irish Catholic hierarchy

in favour of a system of 'uniting the children of the different religious persuasions in the same schools'. A system which would produce this effect is, I frankly own, the system, and the only system to which I think, under the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, parliamentary aid ought to be applied. I am, in Ireland, opposed to all exclusive education, supported by the State. I do not despair of being able to introduce such a

system, as may, in conformity with the opinions and principles announced by Parliament, carry into effect the combined education of Protestants and Roman Catholics, without, at the same time, neglecting to provide for that which we all consider essential, Religious Instruction. In the attainment of this great National object I feel sensibly how much benefit I may derive from your suggestions. . . . 290

The Chief Secretary invited further thoughts from Doyle on education which the latter readily offered. Doyle expressed his satisfaction with Stanley's views on interdenominational education with a reiteration of his own and a clear indication that more was called for than mere polite words:

I have so often on public occasions, as well as in private, expressed my anxious wish to see the children of the same country of whatever religious persuasion united at school, because there, and perhaps only there, the seeds of mutual confidence and affection can be sown in the hearts of the great mass of the people, that I need not now make any profession or avowal on that subject; but I may be permitted to express the pleasure afforded me by knowing from your letter that a like desire animates those whose good will, unlike to mine, is united with the power of carrying into effect views not more just than useful to this country. I have, indeed, in one respect been somewhat unfortunate, for I have not up to this moment been able to ascertain what the precise difficulty is which impedes Government in establishing here a system of education based on religious instruction, so regulated that each religious description of children might receive the latter at such time and place, and in form or manner as their pastors respectively would prescribe or approve of. Preconceived notions, pride, a spirit of proselytism, self-interest or passion, may raise obstacles to such a system; but a powerful Government, acting justly and impartially before an intelligent public . . . would scarcely find it difficult to surmount such obstacles. 291

Doyle advised Stanley (following Rice's report of May 1828) to establish an educational system for all without social distinctions where religion was left solely to the respective pastors; the system to be managed by a commission made up from and enjoying the confidence

of the different religious persuasions. The commissioners directed by government under the control of parliament were to be left to devise their own rules and regulations. The time and place of literary and religious instruction in the schools should be arranged by the commissioners and the schools on an individual basis. The commissioners should be able to extend aid to existing schools without having the titles of the schools vested in themselves. They should not be limited in the payment of teachers. Finally Doyle urged Stanley when establishing such a model of elementary education (which constituted a virtual blueprint of the eventual national system) to consider also the establishment of a higher level of education and to this end he furnished him with a copy of his pamphlet on the formation of a National Literary Institute.<sup>292</sup>

At first Stanley decided to try a limited experiment on the lines of Rice's Committee's suggestions which he understood to be approved by the Irish Catholic hierarchy. His plan was to appropriate a proportion (exactly how much he did not state but it cannot have been very large) of the grant given annually to the Kildare Place Society for the purpose of experimenting with a plan of combined education for Catholic and Protestant children in some schools without interfering with their religious beliefs. The object of the exercise was to prove the practicality of the system and if it worked well then to extend it.

Stanley must thus have been surprised when he received an angry letter from Archbishop Murray possibly based on a misunderstanding or else Catholic fear that the Chief Secretary was only tinkering with elementary education rather than effecting the desired rapid wholesale

reform. Murray informed Stanley that Catholics would be 'duly warned' against the measure. And he suggested that the bias in favour of the Kildare Place system of education was so strong in the minds of Irish Protestants that the Chief Secretary would be unable to find many who would adopt the proposed system. Stanley for his part felt that once Protestants saw that they had the co-operation rather than the opposition of their Catholic neighbours they would be well disposed towards making the experiment.<sup>293</sup> Murray's speculation in this regard was much nearer to the mark than Stanley's.

Stanley in February 1831 rejected Murray's call for the complete removal of the state grant from the Kildare Place Society (though six months later he would do just that). In February he considered it

not only inexpedient but unjust, at once to withdraw from the Kildare Place Establishment the whole of the support it had been accustomed to receive from Parliament, and thus destroy a machinery which it might be difficult to replace, more especially when serious doubts might be entertained, whether the mode proposed to be substituted would give more satisfaction.

However Stanley reassured Murray that he wished 'to avoid all exclusion systems - to give the benefits of education indiscriminately to children of all persuasions; and to remove any [of] the slightest grounds of a design of proselytism'. The co-operation of the hierarchy was vital to such a measure, he informed Murray, and he was 'most anxious' for Dr Doyle's approval.<sup>294</sup>

Throughout late 1830 and almost the whole of 1831 a very steady and sustained attack was maintained on the Kildare Place Society in parliament. In the House of Lords on 12 November 1830 the former (and future) Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Marquis of Anglesey, presented a petition against public funds being made available to Kildare Place.

Anglesey voiced his unhappiness over the manner in which the Society had committed themselves to spending public funds in his charge during his tenure of office without consulting him. He called for no further public grants to be made to the Society 'without the most minute inquiry'.<sup>295</sup> The pro-Catholic Bishop of Norwich requested a more equitable distribution of the educational grants when he presented a petition from the Roman Catholic inhabitants of Mayo in the Lords on 2 December. In his opinion the petitioners very justly complained that they were still deprived of education in consequence of the religion which they professed disqualifying them from the parliamentary grants.<sup>296</sup>

Petitions to parliament in March 1831 from the north of Ireland urged the continuance of the parliamentary grant to the Kildare Place Society. In this debate O'Connell stated that 'Catholics might justly claim a share of the public money, without it being made a condition that they must renounce their fathers' faith'. He held that the difference between his point of view and that of the supporters of the Kildare Place Society was that 'they asked the Catholics to be educated by Protestants, whilst the Catholics wished to educate themselves . . . There was nothing the Catholics felt to be more degrading than the superiority assumed by Protestants'.<sup>297</sup>

In mid-July 1831 the issue was again joined in a major two-day debate with supporters and opponents of the Kildare Place Society clearly organised for battle. On this occasion Thomas Spring Rice and Richard More O'Ferrall both alluded to the Kildare Place Society's 'proselytism'. Thomas Wyse contented himself with a reference to the Kildare Place Society having connected itself 'with other societies of



a proselytising description'.<sup>298</sup> Taking quite a contrary line Sir Robert Inglis stated that far from thinking the Kildare Place Society 'bigotted or exclusive, he had felt objection to it, because it did not go far enough towards giving a complete and doctrinal religious education on the principles of the National Church'.<sup>299</sup> O'Connell who presented a petition (drafted by Doyle) which was signed by the twenty-six Irish Catholic prelates praying for the discontinuance of the Kildare Place Society grant, stated bluntly: 'the last particle of Orange power was the Kildare Street Society, and he trusted it would be speedily abolished'.<sup>300</sup> The leading evangelical Captain James Gordon attempted to defend Kildare Place without much success from the attacks of O'Connell and others such as Sir Richard Musgrave who volunteered that 'the Kildare Street Society was detested in the part of Ireland in which he resided'.<sup>301</sup>

Education was again raised on 26 July and 23 August 1831 when pro- and anti-Kildare Place petitions respectively were presented.<sup>302</sup> On the latter occasion Thomas Wyse made a plea for the education of the middle class which 'had if possible been more neglected than that of the lower classes'. The benevolent influence which he believed the middle class would have on the lower orders was a key factor in Wyse's stance.<sup>303</sup> O'Connell presented yet another petition from the Irish Catholic bishops in their unremitting pursuit of educational reform. Lefroy the member of parliament for the University of Dublin and a member of the Kildare Place Society accused the Catholic bishops of attempting to gain possession of the funds by which the poor Protestants of Ireland were educated. O'Connell retorted defending

the Catholic bishops: no one 'could fairly impugn their statement as to the evil effects of the Kildare Street Society'.<sup>304</sup>

In autumn 1831 the whig government finally grasped the nettle of Irish education. On 9 September Stanley outlined to the House of Commons what the government proposed to do. This was the inception of the national system of education in Ireland and it was instructive to see from Stanley's speech the extent to which it represented concession to the Irish Catholic Church and defeat for the Kildare Place Society. Stanley identified the original failure in Irish education as the government decision (under Lord Liverpool's administration when Peel was Irish Chief Secretary) to entrust the provision of an Irish national system of education to the Kildare Place Society, a private institution, the rules of which completely excluded Catholics because they did not admit the Bible as their whole rule in matters of doctrine and discipline. The government of the day had failed in adopting and making national a system of education 'utterly unfitted for the Irish people'. It should never have allowed national education to fall into 'hands unqualified for that task'.<sup>305</sup>

It must have been quite a shock for members and supporters of the Kildare Place Society in the House to find the Irish Chief Secretary reproaching the Society for its Bible-reading rule and actually quoting their arch-antagonist Bishop Doyle to support the government's attack on the Society. Stanley stated that the Kildare Place Society's

so-called religious education, purchased as it was by so large an expenditure of money, and by the loss of so much charity and good feeling, which, but for it, might exist, amounted, after

all, to only reading a chapter in the Testament. Was there any member who could call such an education religious education? And yet the efforts of the Kildare-street Society were limited to that. He would ask any sincere Christian, whether he believed that all that was sufficient to the religious education of a child, was to make him read a chapter of the Bible, without any explanation of it further than what his own imperfect mind might afford. Was there any Protestant father in the empire that would dream of putting a child of five years down to the Bible, and leave him to draw his own conclusions? He thought in this respect they would do well to take a lesson from the evidence of Dr Doyle, of whom, whatever difference of opinion, there might be as to his tenets, there could be none as to his earnestness and sincerity. He alluded to the evidence given by Dr Doyle before the Committee of 1830, and he could not better express his own views than by quoting the remarks of that gentleman. 'Are you acquainted,' he was asked with the system on which the Kildare-street Society carry on their schools?' 'Yes,' he replied, 'Tolerably well. I witnessed it as it is exemplified in my own schools every day'. - 'In the schools which are managed under your superintendence, and conducted upon your rules do you consider their system to be applicable to the education of both Protestants and Catholics equally?' - 'Their system, of course, is not; because their rule excludes religious instruction, which we require as an essential part of education. Then, as a substitute for that religious instruction, their system requires the reading of the Sacred Scriptures, by children who have acquired suitable proficiency, without note or comment. There are, in that system, three inconveniences as they regard us: the first is, that it excludes religious instruction in that shape and manner in which we think it necessary to have it given to young and tender minds, namely catechetical instruction by way of question and answer; and, in the second place, it is inconsistent with our notions of conveying Scriptural knowledge to give the Scriptures to a child to read, leaving him to form upon the sacred text what notions he pleases. Therefore as their rule excludes all comment, whether oral or written upon the Scriptures, we who maintain that the Divine Revelation is to be interpreted by the Church, cannot at any time agree with them. Whilst these rules, therefore, exist - the one excluding catechetical instruction, and the other prescribing the reading of the Scriptures without note or comment - their system can never make any progress in Ireland; but if it were freed from those inconveniences, it would be hard to devise a system better calculated to effect good.' - 'Then your objection to that system is not to the reading of the Scriptures as such, but to the mode in which, and the discipline under which Scripture reading is given?' 'Most certainly not to the reading of the Scriptures themselves, for I prescribe that they be read in all our schools; and the various memorials presented by the Catholic Bishops in Ireland to successive Lord Lieutenants there, and the petitions presented on their behalf to Parliament, show, that they have, at all times, wished for religious instruction, as the basis of

education in schools; which religious instruction, in their opinion, should consist, in part, of reading the Sacred Scriptures; so that upon that subject, there can be no doubt what our doctrine and discipline are. We have laboured very much to make it known to every one, and to remove the impression which unfortunately prevailed generally in England, that the Catholic priesthood and prelacy were opposed to Scriptural education - than which no greater calumny was ever sought to be affixed upon the character of men.' Men might more or less confide in the sincerity and truth of the right reverend Doctor, but no man could do more than justice to the indignation with which, in the face of the country, he repudiated the idea of the Catholic clergy being averse from the perusal of the Scriptures.<sup>306</sup>

Stanley announced the state's withdrawal of funding from the Kildare Place Society. He stressed the need for public accountability in education. The state had funded the Kildare Place Society yet the Society was 'altogether irresponsible to the Government' and indeed had rejected government interference in its affairs. Moreover in Ireland where five-sixths of the population was Catholic nearly two-thirds of the whole benefit of Kildare Place funds went to 'Protestant Ulster; while the other three Catholic provinces had only one-third of their share'. This bias was also maintained in the religious affiliation of the teachers produced by the Society. The Chief Secretary stated that state policy would be to draw the Catholic clergy and people into 'amicable and friendly relations with the Government'. But the state would not support partisans of either side by funding separate education. En passant Stanley could not resist pointing up an important truth for one of his critics, the religious zealot Gordon who was very much mistaken 'if he supposed that the Protestant religion was gaining ground in Ireland, either by such discussions as he promoted, or by such proceedings as the Kildare-street Society'.<sup>307</sup>

Stanley announced that the government intended to follow the principles laid down by every committee of the House or royal

commission in reports of 1812, 1824, 1825, 1828 and 1830, all of which concurred with the 1812 report. In this respect, Thomas Spring Rice who was chairman of the 1830 Committee on the state of the poor in Ireland as also of the 1828 Committee has never received the recognition he deserves for his seminal role in shaping the national system. Yet it is clear that Stanley acted on Rice's proposals and in concert with him in government.<sup>308</sup>

The following were the grounds on which the government proposed to submit its estimates to parliament. The £30,000 grant made hitherto to Kildare Place was placed at the disposal of the Irish Lord Lieutenant. The conduct of the schools was to be left to a board, the Chief Secretary stated, 'partly Protestant, partly Catholic; thus he trusted, supplying sources of confidence to both parties'. Teachers would be appointed by the board and the general direction of all government schools would be left in their hands. On the religious question Stanley followed the lead of Rice in proposing that one or more days in the week be set aside for separate religious instruction; on the other days combined literary instruction would take place. 'It was thus anticipated, that both would be led to mix, without animosity or ill will'. If the board failed Stanley was prepared to appoint paid commissioners. He also stated (without elaborating) that 'he proposed, in some degree, to follow the course of education adopted in Dr Doyle's schools, except that, in those the teachers were all Catholics'. The Chief Secretary was ready to adopt from the Kildare Place Society their 'excellent model school' and their plan for disseminating cheap books. But this was small consolation for the total defeat of the Society and the re-organisation of Irish elementary education by the State in a system acceptable to the Irish Catholic hierarchy.<sup>309</sup>

The debate on the government's new departure was desultory. Peel as leader of the official opposition made no contribution. He had already reached most of the same conclusions as Stanley and it seems as if the latter had cleverly incorporated resonances of the former's official letters on Irish education (to which he would have had access). Thus the system as proposed enjoyed a large measure of cross-party consensus within the House with the exception of the ultras.

O'Connell heard Stanley's plan with 'great satisfaction' and welcomed it as the 'commencement of a new era in Ireland'. Thomas Wyse and Richard Lalor Sheil also welcomed the initiative while continuing to condemn the proselytism of Kildare Place. Frankland Lewis obliquely lamented the failure of the Protestant Church to contribute to the 'harmonious union of all classes'. North and Lefroy attempted to defend Kildare Place and the importance of scriptural education but the battle was clearly lost. Few now stood to uphold the Kildare Place method. An irrevocable step had been taken.<sup>310</sup>

It was symptomatic of the divisions which permeated Irish life that the debate on Stanley's proposals - the most important Irish educational innovation of the nineteenth century - should degenerate into a row over Bishop Doyle's use of scripture. The irrepressible Captain Gordon attacked Doyle's edition of the Christian Doctrine prescribed by him for use in the schools of the diocese as a work which 'misquoted, mutilated, and contradicted the word of God'. It taught, he alleged, doctrines which struck at the very root of moral obligation and stigmatised Protestants as heretics. O'Connell condemned Gordon's speech as a 'farrago of bigotry' and

refuted his attack on the 'able and most excellent Bishop Dr Doyle'. O'Connell noted that Bishops Doyle and Elrington had already debated this issue, and continued: 'The hon member had accused Dr Doyle of having mutilated some passages from scripture, and having inserted them in that state in his Catechism. If such a charge could be made out, the streets of Carlow would have been placarded with accounts of it'. The debate ended with Gordon quoting from Doyle's edition from a copy he held in his hand and O'Connell replying to the said extracts.<sup>311</sup> Yet in a very real sense these contributions were not out of place; for this was the heart of the issue over the previous decade - whether the Catholic or Protestant version of the Christian truth would prevail in Ireland.

When however Stanley showed no sign of bringing forward an education bill to give legislative effect to his proposals of 9 September, Thomas Wyse sought to force the matter by bringing forward his own bill. On 6 October Wyse sent Doyle a copy of his bill which had been read once in the House of Commons and which was for a second reading. Wyse's object was to ensure the establishment of a board of education, fairly composed, and its continuation on defined principles. Wyse's bill looked to financing the schools through a tax on the 'rich and comfortable, on the Scotch principle'. The schools were not to be a burden on the state or on the poor who were to be tax-exempted. Wyse expected the Lord Lieutenant, Anglesey, to support his bill but he had a poor view of Stanley's interest in education and suspected despite the latter's declamation against it that he had a 'lurking affection' for the Kildare Place Society:

. . . I doubt much his zeal for popular instruction in any shape and know that he would prefer the vague and experimental manner in which the Grant now lies, to the certainty and permanency of a legislative enactment. <sup>312</sup>

Archbishop Kelly of Tuam found Wyse's education bill 'a jejune unsatisfactory measure'. He disapproved of Wyse's taxing plan on those who were already over-burdened with taxation. Indeed he hoped that Wyse would give up the question and that someone with a more comprehensive and useful view of the subject would take it up.<sup>313</sup> For his part Bishop Doyle fully approved the leading principle of Wyse's bill which assigned to the state the care of educating the people. But Doyle also felt that Irish land was too much burdened with taxes to impose a new burden on it. If the state intended to educate the people then education should become a public charge and should like the expense of managing the army or navy be defrayed out of the public exchequer. If parishes were to be encumbered with the expense of education the state could not in justice make appointments or prescribe or control the mode of education (though it might have the right of inspection). Doyle did not approve of parochial taxation except in building and furnishing schoolhouses. When Spring Rice had previously mooted the same idea Doyle had been equally displeased.<sup>314</sup>

The new system of Irish elementary education finally decided upon in late 1831 was curious in that it was established by official letter (in early November) from the Chief Secretary Stanley to the President of the Board, the duke of Leinster, rather than by legislative enactment. This allowed Stanley and his ministerial successors to change the rules governing Irish education if the experiment failed. The composition of the new board of education excited Archbishop Murray's attention in November 1831. He had heard from A. R. Blake that the Board would consist of the duke of Leinster, Archbishop Whately and Dr. Sadleir representing the Established Church, Rev Montgomery and Counsellor Holmes of the Presbyterian



denomination and Dr Murray himself, Dr Crotty of Maynooth and a layman not yet named (but not Blake) representing the Catholics. This proposed arrangement angered Murray who expressed his annoyance with unusual firmness to Bishop Doyle in a letter which showed just how delicately balanced the whole new departure was:

If such is the constitution of the Board, I think it is better for me to decline having any thing to do with it. Dr Crotty could give no efficient assistance, but perhaps the Catholic who might be thrown in as my assistant would not be inclined to trouble himself much on religious concerns. Sergeant O'Loughlen was offered the post of honour but declined it; of which, by the way, I am not sorry. I think that if people at headquarters meant honestly, I should have been consulted, about the persons who would have the name of watching over Catholic interests at the Board. But I believe that on this point we are not to expect honesty. The omission of Blake's name on such an occasion is a proof of this. He is much and justly incensed. I still can hardly bring myself to think that the Board from which so much is expected will be constituted in the very inefficient and unsatisfactory way that he had heard. But should this turn out to be the case ought I not to decline accepting a place on it? I think I ought. 315

However this problem was soon resolved as Murray had wished. On 26 November he informed Doyle that the education board was formed and that 'our friend Blake is again in his glory'. Murray and Blake constituted the Catholic representatives on the seven-man board. There was no mention of a third Catholic member, which had been mooted earlier in the month. Before the end of the decade attention would be directed to the fact that Catholics were not represented on the board in proportion to the size of the Catholic population. Yet it should be noted that the presence of Archbishop Murray on the board was a considerable historical breakthrough. This was the first appointment of a Catholic bishop to a state board in the modern period. The board also offered the remarkable spectacle of the Catholic and Protestant archbishops actually working together. Murray expressed himself satisfied with initial progress: 'as yet there appears to be great fairness intended, as far as Religion is concerned'.<sup>316</sup> Archbishop

Curtis 'rejoiced' to find Dr Murray and the 'worthy Mr Blake' appointed to the education board. Curtis thought that Archbishop Whately 'would seem to be exceedingly anxious to avoid the petulant rashness' of his predecessor Dr Magee as archbishop of Dublin 'as to have fallen into the opposite extreme, and given people room to ask, as they really do, if he thinks at all'. Curtis decried Whately's entrance into office as a 'fatal sign of the times' discerning latitudinarianism and religious indifference in a period characterised by religious fervour.<sup>317</sup>

At an early stage the board discussed the books to be used for common instruction and Archbishop Murray supposed that if 'Blake's Harmony' was proposed he could hardly object to it 'as it was nearly or entirely approved of by us before'. Murray found that the Presbyterian board member, Rev James Carlile, was 'very anxious to introduce a tone of piety and a moral feeling into the schools by means of the books of common instruction. Well, if this can be effected, I think I should rejoice at it, instead of throwing any impediment in the way of it'.<sup>318</sup> Archbishop Curtis was enthusiastic:

As for Mr Blake's Harmony which we have already approved, and deservedly eulogised, as an excellent Tract, I should think Your Grace would do well to sanction it, if proposed, or even to get it brought forward; and to abound in your former and present sentiments which were always mine also - not to be too squeamish about the Douay terms. For that version is not now in its primitive state, it has been often retouched, without consulting the Irish prelates, and is not exactly the same with [?] Wethanses translation of the Testament that is more esteemed - in a word, we have no English translation of the Bible approved as exclusive - no version in the vulgar tongue is so - nor is that necessary. 319

Non-interference with religious belief was the crucial element of the state's educational initiative in 1831. In Stanley's famous words in his letter to the duke of Leinster it was to be 'a system of education from which should be banished even the suspicion of

proselytism, and which admitting children of all religious persuasions should not interfere with the peculiar tenets of any'.<sup>320</sup> The primary object was to unite children of all denominations in one system. This was dependent on the support of their pastors and the new board was required to look favourably upon applications for aid received jointly from Protestant and Catholic clergy or from any mix of Catholics and Protestant parishioners. Where the application for aid came exclusively from one denomination the board was required to discover why other denominations were unrepresented. Schools were to open on four or five days a week for combined 'moral and literary instruction only'. The remaining one or two days were for separate religious instruction approved by the respective clergy. The clergy of all denominations were also permitted and encouraged to give religious instruction either before or after school hours on any day of the week. The board exercised the 'most entire control' over all books to be used in the schools whether in literary or religious instruction; in religious matters the books to be used by any one denomination were to be decided by the commissioners of that particular faith only. The schools were to be vested in local trustees. Aid given by the board was dependent on local funds being raised to cover one-third of the expense of building the schools, the complete cost of annual repairs and furniture and the salary of the master (appointed by local committee), and half the cost of schoolbooks and requisites.<sup>321</sup>

Bishop Doyle's official response to this new system of Irish national education is found in a clear and succinct letter to his clergy examining the context in which the new system had emerged and explaining how it could be combated in later years if it proved hostile to Catholic principles. The terms of the new system, Doyle

pointed out, had long been sought by Catholics in repeated applications to the government and by petitions to parliament and had at last been obtained after considerable difficulties; 'they are not perhaps the very best that could be devised, but they are well suited to the especial circumstances of this distracted country'.<sup>322</sup>

Doyle acknowledged the rules governing religious instruction of children by their pastors or persons appointed for that purpose on one or two days in the week and hoped that such instruction would be given every day. He noted that the schoolhouse was to be built at the public expense which he deemed 'just' and indeed 'necessary' to guard against 'individual rapacity'. He scrutinised the remit claimed by the commissioners to control the books to be used in the national schools and commented:

This assumption would produce evil if the commissioners sought to corrupt the education of the Irish people. We defy them to do so, even if they were so minded; but they are not. Their purpose is upright, their views are to promote education, religious as well as literary, and to preserve full and entire freedom of conscience. Should bad men succeed to the present commissioners, and attempt to corrupt the education of youth, we are not dumb dogs who know not how to bark; we can guard our flocks, and do so easily by the simple process of excluding the commissioners and their books and agents from our schools. We might, by doing so, forfeit the aid which they would, if the supposition were realized, be entitled to withhold, but in withholding it they would be answerable to parliament, to which we also would have access. <sup>323</sup>

Doyle was very much in favour of the rule that all teachers to be employed under the new system of education should have a certificate of competency from a model school. This regulation would aid the Catholic clergy 'in a work of great difficulty, to wit, that of suppressing hedge schools, and of placing youth under the direction of competent teachers, and of those only'. The power claimed by the commissioners to fine, suspend or remove teachers Doyle found 'rather exorbitant' but potentially useful in dealing with cases where

religious difficulties might arise. Doyle advised his clergy to apply without delay to the commissioners for aid whether to build, furnish or support each of their 'parochial schools'.

During the many years in which education has been in this country a source of religious dissension, our school-houses have been built and generally attached to our places of worship, whilst the school-houses built by Parliamentary aid, have been raised in detached places.

Some years past, it would have been easy to combine education, and have only one school-house in place of two; not so at present, and time only can effect that union, which has hitherto been prevented at great sacrifice and at great expense. I notice this, that you may be enabled in your application or reply to the commissioners to point out the true and very sufficient reason why in these Dioceses, so well supplied with school-houses, few requisitions for aid to assist schools, can as yet be made in that joint manner by Catholic and Protestant clergymen, which the commissioners so justly recommend. 324

This comment made clear that the 'parochial schools' managed by Doyle's parish priests even if in association with the national system would be de facto if not de jure Catholic schools. Thus Bishop Doyle guardedly welcomed the new system of education and urged his clergy to co-operate with it. In retrospect he was hardly likely to do otherwise. The system as outlined in Stanley's letter to the duke of Leinster complied in very many respects with Doyle's public letters, pamphlets, petitions and parliamentary evidence on elementary education. The education of the Irish poor had been transformed in a manner which was satisfactory to the Catholic Church as influenced by Bishop Doyle.

## CONCLUSIONS

Bishop Doyle represents a turning point in the history of modern Irish Catholicism. As a fearless political prelate he elevated the image of the traditionally low profile hierarchy. No other Catholic clergyman or member of the episcopal bench was as remarkably productive in terms of publications across the whole range of Irish public affairs or as politically aggressive. He was a leader who would not be intimidated or cowed. He delighted Catholics with his psychologically important and morale boosting interventions on the public scene. His frequent books and pamphlets went through several editions. His publications in Irish and English newspapers commanded editorial comment and were widely copied. Political opponents of the calibre of Peel remarked on his intellectual acumen. Evangelical critics of consequence acknowledged his worth as a theologian. Doyle was undoubtedly the most important and prolific Irish Catholic apologist of his time.

Between 1820 and 1822 Bishop Doyle moved cautiously within the hierarchy discussing the veto, domestic nomination and securities which might have to be conceded in return for Emancipation. The year O'Connell founded the Catholic Association, 1823, was the year Doyle realised his own strength and rose to prominence as the author of the Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Irish Catholics. This work burned with anger and a sense of the multiple injuries suffered by Catholics. The imposition of the penal laws and their continued effects upon the Irish Catholic population was the powerful well-spring of Doyle's incandescent polemic. This historical mental baggage and the evidence of his own eyes of the degraded status of the Catholics helps to explain Doyle's deep sense

of injustice which motivated virtually all his writings. The Catholic Association immediately adopted Doyle as its chief episcopal supporter and made as much use of his name as possible throughout the Emancipation campaign. Thus without being present Doyle played a very prominent role in the proceedings of the Association. His letters to O'Connell were read into its record and his pamphlets were quoted at its meetings. Especially valuable were Doyle's various letters to public committees in the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin in 1824 supporting the inception of the Catholic rent and urging unremitting though lawful agitation. No other bishop was of such use to the Catholic Association.

J.K.L.'s Letters on the State of Ireland was a classic of its kind which reinforced the impression made by the Vindication. It provided further evidence of the furious sense of injustice which was deeply embedded in Doyle's consciousness. More overtly political than the religio-political Vindication it surpassed the latter in being a more considered work. The Letters on the State of Ireland examined aspects of the Irish question seriatim in sweeping yet controlled and stylish chapters of extraordinary intensity and impact. This book can stand comparison with any other polemical work of nineteenth-century Irish history.

Bishop Doyle's evidence before parliamentary committees of the houses of Lords and Commons in 1825 was widely credited with being an exceptional performance. Supporters of Emancipation gloried in Doyle's self-confident and learned defence of Catholicism before several interrogators hostile to Emancipation who were expected to make short shrift of him. Doyle's stalwart performance had an important impact on a number of his auditors in dispelling notions of

Catholicism as a farrago of superstitious blasphemies. Doyle's gallican (as opposed to ultramontane) ecclesiology certainly helped him make his case before an audience which still saw the pope as a bugbear. The effect of Doyle's evidence on the Emancipation debate (which was taking place simultaneously in parliament) can be gauged from the pages of Hansard. A number of erstwhile opponents of Emancipation acknowledged that Doyle's evidence, particularly where he scorned the likelihood of the temporal interference of the papacy in English affairs, had convinced them that Emancipation could be conceded without threat to the safety of the state.

Others however found grounds for the continuation, indeed the deepening, of their opposition to Emancipation in the writings of Doyle. He was accused of being the father of black and white twins; of promoting a vigorous and hostile agitation in Ireland while being the very soul of goodwill and discretion before the parliamentary committees. This dichotomy was noted throughout Doyle's public life. He countered the charge of inconsistency in 1825 by having a declaration placed on the parliamentary record that there was no contradiction between his evidence before the State of Ireland Committees and the writings of J.K.L. It might be claimed that this was disingenuous of him but Doyle acted as all successful public men must do. Before committees of parliament with Emancipation apparently in the balance a conciliatory approach was called for to help the passage of the bill. In Ireland Doyle contributed to the maintenance of the agitation by writings many of which were manifestly more combative than his parliamentary evidence. Simply put, changing times and circumstances called for pragmatic flexibility. Doyle believed that he acted with integrity and



intellectual fastidiousness at all times and that there was no duplicity in his conduct. He would have held that his basic outlook and concerns remained consistent though the presentation of them varied from time to time as required.

There was a certain pattern in Doyle's reaction to public events. A typical response to an attack on the Catholics was for him to produce (at a single sitting and with little if any re-drafting) a fiery pamphlet seething with an inspirational fluency of indignant outrage. This first reaction was on reflection sometimes suppressed or perhaps published under one of his lesser-known pseudonyms. More often than not anger gave way to political considerations and the eventual response or statement for publication was a much milder version of the original tract if indeed not totally different. Doyle is one of the most often quoted contemporary observers because he was both a participant in and an observer of Irish public life. He was capable of dramatic and surging flights of literary aggression in the best rhetorical tradition while almost simultaneously capable particularly in private correspondence of cold dispassionate reasoning often of a profound and prescient kind. Unusually then, at one moment, violently partisan, the next an unbiassed, almost clinically independent-minded and well-informed witness, his work provides an endless quarry for historians.

When in July 1825 O'Connell suggested that he had been prepared to concede the 'wings' only because the Catholic bishops Doyle and Murray had agreed, Doyle was outraged. O'Connell, who was under considerable pressure from his colleagues in the erstwhile Catholic Association for conceding the 'wings' but not securing Emancipation endeavoured to spread the blame for the failure of his stance by

involving the bishops. There may have been scope for genuine misunderstanding in his dealings with the bishops, and any vagueness in discussion could always be exploited subsequently if things went wrong, but Doyle for his part had taken the greatest care, as he afterwards went to considerable lengths to prove, to make sure that he could stand over the replies he had given before the parliamentary committees on the critical issues. O'Connell's difficulties and the row between the lay and episcopal leader were central to Irish Catholic politics throughout the latter half of 1825. Ultimately it came to a head at the Leinster provincial meeting in Carlow College in mid-December. There Doyle publicly reproached O'Connell thus satisfying his own sense of correct behaviour. There too, O'Connell, by astute use of his supporters, managed to pack the key meeting to secure his continuing tight hold on the leadership of the Irish Catholic campaign.

Perhaps it was inevitable that Doyle and O'Connell should clash for they were in some ways almost mirror images of one another: highly intelligent, ambitious, proud if not arrogant, and profoundly wounded by their status as hereditary bondsmen. On the issues involved in their disputes Doyle usually demonstrated the greater foresight. For instance, Doyle had a more informed concept of civil liberties than O'Connell and a greater insight into the possibilities which further education at all levels would provide for the Irish. However Doyle as bishop could stand above and be largely untroubled by the rough and tumble of active day-to-day politics and yet remain central to the debate and command respect because of his position. O'Connell, on the other hand, as leader of a popular movement, buffeted by changeable and occasionally turbulent winds, had to take

into account the short-term as much as the long-term view, if he wished to survive as undisputed leader.

Doyle was the episcopal conscience of the Emancipation campaign which was essentially a religio-political movement. On an intellectual level, in terms of input, he surpassed O'Connell's contribution. Moreover because he was a Catholic bishop his statements were scrutinised with more care than those of the lay leader by opponents of Emancipation. Doyle not alone contributed extensively to the Emancipation debate but he helped to shape it and to resolve it. The Declaration of January 1826 signed by the entire Irish hierarchy would not have been published without Doyle's backing. His Essay on the Catholic Claims addressed to the prime minister, Lord Liverpool, was again an attempt to persuade and convince the most important anti-Catholic figure in England that his fears of the divided allegiance of Catholics were groundless. That work, like several of his controversial publications, allowed Doyle an opportunity to manifest his able scholarship which never found an outlet in the normal scholarly form.

In 1827 Doyle feared that O'Connell had taken the wrong course in completely toning down the Irish agitation in return for no more than promises. Doyle warned O'Connell of the dangers of being deceived by George Canning's accession as prime minister but his own unrealistic expectations of Goderich's short-lived ministry were unfulfilled. Doyle latched on to the duke of Wellington's idea of a concordat with the papacy in summer 1828 in an effort to promote Emancipation by publishing what was perhaps his most gallican work (although gallicanism was then far from being the issue it would

become as the century progressed). It is more than interesting to find Doyle, a few weeks after his public letter of support for O'Connell in the Clare by-election of July 1828, privately criticising the latter in correspondence with Thomas Spring Rice. One is inclined to the view that the damage done to the Doyle-O'Connell relationship by the 'wings' controversy in 1825 left a mark of suspicion in Doyle's mind towards O'Connell, which was never eradicated, though for the sake of the cause, particularly at critical moments such as the Clare election, Doyle lent firm support to O'Connell. Ultimately Doyle's problem with O'Connell can be reduced to his difficulty with the latter's demagoguery. Doyle looked askance at the way in which O'Connell poured abuse in equal measure on opponents of the Catholics, former friends and potential friends alike. Doyle's private criticism of O'Connell that he preferred the wreath placed around his neck by popular acclaim even when he knew that in achieving this distinction he had acted contrary to the best interests of that same public, was in truth, a damning indictment. Such was Doyle's assessment of O'Connell in December 1828 at a time when he feared the outbreak of civil war in Ireland.

The achievement of Emancipation in 1829 was the culmination of the best part of a decade of unremitting agitation. By his actions Doyle had played within the context of the Irish hierarchy the leading role in ending the penal era. He mistakenly believed that Catholic Emancipation would herald a new, more tolerant, indeed ecumenical era in Irish public life. This was not to be. The mutual antagonism which had been heightened and sharpened over the previous decade of bitter strife was to be prolonged in the O'Connellite politics of succeeding decades. The entrenched position of the

privileged Protestant elite did not disappear once Emancipation was conceded. Doyle hardly believed that it would but his thinking was redolent with the idea that Catholics would, from Emancipation onwards, occupy key positions hitherto closed to them in Irish life. In fact the next century of Irish politics was but an attempt to substantiate the reality of Emancipation in a country where the overwhelming majority was Catholic. It was perhaps an easy mistake to make, or illusion to fall into, to imagine that once Emancipation was passed Irish public life would no longer be determined by the divisive passions of two religio-political factions.

In the 1820s Emancipation had been popularly presented as a panacea for all ills; the goal to which all political issues should be subordinated so that the campaign would not be sidetracked by lesser issues. Doyle contributed to this perception but he also foresaw that Emancipation would not resolve the anomaly of the great wealth of the Established Church or Catholic hostility to tithes. Nonetheless it can be contended that the government would have garnered much Catholic goodwill if immediately after the passage of Emancipation O'Connell had been allowed to take his seat in parliament, without being forced to stand again, and if Catholic barristers or at least pro-Catholic lawyers had been appointed to the great Irish legal offices. The government's failure to do so demonstrated that every concession of right to the Catholics would have to be forced from the state.

When O'Connell began his repeal campaign in 1830, Doyle at first stood aloof. Suggestions that Doyle was hostile to repeal drew from him an elaboration of his position. Doyle was for repeal in principle but did not see how it could be achieved in practice short

of bloodshed. When he contemplated the possibility of physical force he dismissed it because he did not think the Irish could be successful against the forces likely to be ranged against them. He did not see how O'Connell could win repeal. The logical conclusion he drew from this was that O'Connell was wasting his time directing Irish political life into a cul-de-sac in the vain pursuit of repeal when he could be agitating for realisable and effective reform legislation for Ireland.

In 1831 O'Connell did in fact tone down the repeal agitation during the May-June general election. Thereafter there were government attempts initiated through Sir Henry Parnell, using Doyle as an intermediary, to gain O'Connell to the side of the whigs. Doyle agreed with O'Connell that no offer should be accepted unless O'Connell could bring 'four or five' of his supporters into office with him. In the Irish context this would have amounted to almost a revolution in government; a coalition government would have been a dramatic step forward. But O'Connell finding that there appeared to be no firm basis to whig offers concluded that the government was playing games with him and announced that he would have no truck with negotiations. Even Doyle was unimpressed by the conduct of the whigs.

Later in 1831 when O'Connell recommenced the repeal campaign he publicly suggested that Bishop Doyle had been lured by the snares of Dublin Castle when he praised the Lord Lieutenant, the Marquis of Anglesey, in a pastoral address. In correspondence with Doyle O'Connell made the classic anti-repeal case that Irish interests as expressed by Anglesey's government would always be subjugated to English interests no matter how valid the former interests were.

Doyle probably realised the accuracy of O'Connell's remarks but he still chose to press for reform measures. And it should be noted that the whig government did produce beneficial Irish reforms though Doyle expected more from the whigs than they were prepared to deliver.

The dispute between Doyle and O'Connell over an Irish poor law brought their relationship to its nadir. Disapproval of the concept of a poor law was widespread among politicians and economists who believed that it would only promote indolence. Doyle had been a powerful advocate of a well-thought out Irish poor law from 1825 and he gave valuable evidence to a parliamentary committee on the state of the Irish poor in 1830. He failed however to win adherents to his cause. Even Parnell was hostile. O'Connell's public announcement of his concession to Doyle's view of poor law in March 1831 was followed in January 1832 by his statement that his poor law for Ireland was repeal of the union. Doyle's response was to unleash a devastating public attack which exposed O'Connell's lack of credibility on this issue. O'Connell had been temporarily swayed by Doyle's Letter to Spring Rice but in reality it was not a full intellectual conversion and he reverted to his old anti-poor-law position. Doyle was dismayed by O'Connell's lack of intellectual rigour. On the other hand O'Connell could have heightened his popularity among the Irish poor by calling for a poor law but he refrained from so doing.

O'Connell's fruitless pursuit of the repeal chimera throughout 1832, 1833 and early 1834 drove Doyle to despair. He became more and more opposed to O'Connell's domination of Irish popular politics. Doyle's fatal illness, in these years, probably compounded his bleak diagnosis of the health of Irish public affairs. The alliance which Doyle believed O'Connell should have obtained, if possible, in 1830-

1834 was attained by O'Connell (after Doyle's death) in the Lichfield House Compact of 1835 which governed Irish affairs for the rest of the decade.

In the religious controversy which moved pari passu with the political agitation of the 1820s Doyle was the undisputed Catholic champion. It was a period of virtually undeclared war between the Irish churches and Doyle certainly contributed to it, although he did not necessarily set out so to do. He rarely initiated controversy per se but rather responded to the attacks made on the Catholics and was thus urged by episcopal colleagues such as Curtis and Murray. Doyle was not prepared to suffer Catholicism to be impugned without redress. No important slight on Catholicism was left unanswered. This epitomised the new aggressive mood of Irish Catholicism which Doyle represented.

Doyle's replies to the charges of Bishop O'Beirne in 1821, Archbishop Magee in 1822, the attacks of Protestant writers on his integrity and that of Murray for publishing miracles which resulted in the Vindication and the Defence of the Vindication, the pamphlets against Archbishop Magee, Lord Farnham and Bishop Elrington in 1827, were all in response to Protestant denunciations of the Irish Catholic Church. In Ireland Doyle stood at the epicentre of a torrent of fierce polemic. He and his clergy dealt with evangelical challenges in Carlow in 1824 and 1825 and withstood a direct proselytising attempt in 1827. His letter on the union of the churches has been seen by this writer as an attempt to turn the New Reformation on its head. Doyle added a new dimension to this bitter interdenominational controversy by his unrelenting attacks on the wealth of the Established Church in Ireland.



Doyle was the main ideologue or intellectual inspiration of the anti-tithe campaign, better known as the 'tithe war' of the 1830s. His writings, especially that part of his Letter to Spring Rice on the nature and destination of church property were particularly important. Doyle's defence of his stance - that of advising his flock to use all lawful means to avoid paying the obnoxious impost - before the 1832 tithe committees of both houses of parliament was an extremely audacious performance by an Irish Catholic bishop. Doyle's contempt for his interrogators' arguments was clear from his impressive replies to their questions. Thus Doyle did not shrink from the fray once a challenge had been entered upon. His controversial pamphlets and letters are of their time. Though scholarly and felicitous they are largely of the standard post-Reformation interdenominational polemic and they are of little significance except in the context in which they were written.

Doyle played the leading part against the Kildare Place Society and other educational and biblical societies throughout the 1820s. Curiously O'Connell was not particularly active in the education controversies. From the earliest months of his episcopacy Doyle laid down the regulatory guidelines in education to be followed by Catholic clergy, laity and schoolchildren throughout his diocese. These guidelines followed, as might be expected, traditional church teaching recently reinforced by papal warnings against the activities of biblical societies. The attempt to found a national Catholic education society in response to the refusal of the Kildare Place Society to modify its rules quickly failed for lack of funds. The Catholic authorities were then faced with a dilemma. Proselytising biblical and educational societies were seemingly emerging on all

sides to present an apparent threat to the faith of Catholics. The Catholic Church, despite great efforts, did not have the resources to see off this challenge financially (especially where it was supported by local landlords). However the Church had the weapon of moral suasion and this it used successfully where it called on Catholic parents to remove their children from schools which it found unacceptable. Such withdrawals were generally carried out with alacrity. While being totally opposed to schools in connection with the Association for Discountenancing Vice, the London Hibernian Society, and the Baptist Society among others, Doyle tolerated the Kildare Place Society schools in his diocese for as long as possible. In doing so he stated that he was opposed to the use of the Bible without note or comment but he accepted the reality that when the Kildare Place schools were under the control of his parish priests in their respective parishes there was indeed little danger to the children's faith. Doyle questioned the right of the Kildare Place Society to a parliamentary grant claiming that its schools, because of its insistence on the Bible-reading rule were, in effect, exclusive. Thus the grant which was meant for Irish national education inclusively was not being properly administered. This was a strong argument reiterated by Doyle in annual hierarchical petitions to parliament.

When the government eventually moved to meet Catholic complaints by resolving on a royal commission of inquiry into Irish education Doyle was less than pleased with the commissioners' findings in their first (and as it turned out their most important) report. As far as he was concerned this report seemed to suggest that if the existing system was re-modelled and manipulated within

the framework of a government board then the system could be continued. Doyle's pamphlet-length but (then) unpublished commentary plus his annotations on the report itself are utterly revealing of his emotional reaction to the report. He firmly believed that the Catholic Church in Ireland was under threat not just from the educational dimension of the New Reformation but from the machinations of the state itself.

Doyle formulated the hierarchical response to the first report of the commissioners in January 1826. This while seemingly stringent and demanding, in Doyle's case merely reiterated the terms laid down by him in his pastoral guidelines of January 1820. From April and throughout autumn 1826 schoolchildren in Kildare and Leighlin were removed from schools in association with the Kildare Place Society. Doyle's pastoral on education of August 1826 called for this policy and requested the establishment of Catholic parochial schools in all parishes. His flock moved quickly to meet his instructions.

It should be remembered that in the midst of extreme religious controversy throughout Ireland over the nature of alleged proselytising schools that the vast majority of the humble Irish pay schools or hedge schools (which Doyle generally considered educationally unacceptable) were unconnected with any society and in these the great majority of Irish schoolchildren were educated without religious interference. It might be argued that sectarianism in Irish education was a by-product of the evangelical impulse in Irish life in the early nineteenth century. Throughout his episcopacy Doyle expressed a sincere and genuine desire that Catholic and Protestant children be educated together believing that this would help to diminish national animosities and promote civil harmony. It was ironic then that he found the educational societies'

schools so unacceptable that it obliged him to found schools which Protestants, though by no means excluded, did not attend. Doyle believed that Catholic and Protestant children could and should be educated together without religious interference or potential conflict. This view had also emerged in principle from government reports on education in the early nineteenth century, even if politicians such as Peel and Stanley realised with regret that it was the Catholic Church rather than the Protestant Church which would benefit more from it. The difficulty for all governments was how to implement a national system without alienating evangelically motivated Protestants thus effectively giving control to the Catholics. The final product which was eventually forced from the whigs in 1831 was not all, as Doyle asserted, that the Catholic Church might ideally have desired; indeed it was hardly in line with their January 1826 resolutions adopted at the height of the New Reformation, but it did provide an opportunity for trial and safeguards particularly with prominent Catholics as members of an active board. The national system of education established in 1831 was a compromise which satisfied none of the contending parties entirely but which least dissatisfied the Catholics who were no longer financially embarrassed. The failure of most Protestants to participate threw the balance of advantage into the hands of the Catholic Church. Overall the national system of education worked to the considerable benefit of the Catholic Church throughout the nineteenth century.

When Doyle died in 1834 he had been a bishop for almost fifteen years and he had been at the very forefront of the great issues - political, interdenominational and educational - in Irish affairs for most of that time. His early death cut short an outstanding contribution to Irish public life.

## APPENDIX ONE

### IRISH EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENTS, 1829

The problem of the manner in which Irish Catholic episcopal appointments were made was finally resolved to Bishop Doyle's satisfaction in 1829. At their annual meeting from 5 to 12 February in that year a sub-committee of the hierarchy reported to the prelates on a plan to be submitted to the Holy See for the selection of suitable candidates to be recommended to the pope for episcopal elevation. It seems certain that Doyle was a member of this sub-committee as he read its report to the hierarchical bench which adopted it on 12 February.<sup>1</sup> On 17 February three of the archbishops submitted this document to the Holy See (the fourth, Archbishop Kelly of Tuam was in Rome where he sponsored the measure).<sup>2</sup> The document, obviously written under Doyle's inspiration if not indeed composed by him, gave expression to the ideas he had propounded on episcopal appointments since his own elevation. The archiepiscopal letter proposed the selection of suitable candidates by the second order clergy and the bishops of the province, both meeting separately and forwarding their selection to Rome.<sup>3</sup> Propaganda Fide accepted this plan subject to five modifications, the most significant of which were that any communication received from Ireland would simply comment not elect, nominate or postulate to a bishopric; and furthermore that this commendation was informative only, not obligatory on the Holy See.<sup>4</sup> In October 1829 Cardinal Cappellari reiterated these details and issued the decree which settled the method of Irish episcopal appointments.<sup>5</sup>

For the first time since the death of the Old Pretender the voice of Irish Catholics in the selection of Irish bishops had been formally recognised by Rome. This had been the de facto position for some time but it was now finally accepted. The Irish voice was not obligatory on the papacy but it could hardly be overlooked without difficulty. Doyle's anxiety throughout had been to safeguard the independence of the Irish Church from the dangers of English influence at Rome.<sup>6</sup> This anxiety was justified and the defence he had inspired successful. In 1825 Dr Doyle had forewarned the Commons' parliamentary committee on the state of Ireland that if a foreign prelate were appointed to an Irish diocese 'it would be extremely difficult for him to take possession of his jurisdiction, or to administer in it the laws of the church'.<sup>7</sup>

When the see of Waterford and Lismore became vacant in 1829 the British government made strenuous efforts to have Nicholas Foran (a cleric whom Doyle regarded highly) rejected on political grounds in favour of the English nobleman, Bishop Weld, even though the former was dignissimus on the terna. The pope decided that he could not appoint Bishop Weld because of the likely Irish reaction but he was soon rewarded with a red hat. However Rome did endeavour to satisfy the British government. As Cardinal Albani reported to the British minister, Lord Burghersk, a compromise was reached:

. . . if these weighty reasons have made the Holy Father feel the hard necessity of not appointing to the See of Waterford a Bishop recommended to him by the British government, he has not in the meantime chosen the person to whom that government objected. Notwithstanding therefore that Monsignor Foran is the person most desired by the clergy of that church His Holiness has chosen another, from the names however of the recommended, fixing the choice upon that worthy ecclesiastic, Dr Wm Abraham.<sup>8</sup>

Bishop Doyle himself became the subject of British activity in Rome in 1832 when the Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, instructed his agent, Seymour, to inform the Vatican that the British government was desirous of preventing Doyle's accession to the primatial chair of Armagh because of his 'dangerous political principles'. Seymour held discussions with Cardinal Bernetti and Monsignor Capacini. The Foreign Office was badly informed on Irish ecclesiastical affairs as Bishop Thomas Kelly of Dromore had been named coadjutor cum iure successionis to Archbishop Curtis as far back as 1828 (when Bishop Doyle had declined to be a candidate for Armagh).<sup>9</sup> At his last episcopal meeting in 1834 Doyle moved a resolution protecting the 1829 Vatican decree on Irish episcopal appointments from interference of any kind.<sup>10</sup>

## APPENDIX TWO

### **Rules and Regulations for Schools in the Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin Prescribed by the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle**

I. When a School is fitted up with desks, forms, and supplied with spelling and reading lessons, let a Committee of Management be formed for governing it.

II. Let a Master, who has obtained a certificate from the Teacher in one of the Model Schools in the several Deaneries of the Diocese, be employed at a fixed salary, and engaged to conduct the School according to the improved plan which he has learned.

III. Let a Fund, for the payment of the Master and for defraying the current expenses of the School, be formed of the annual Subscriptions paid by wealthy individuals residing in or connected with the district; of the weekly or quarterly payments by the children; and, where necessary, of Collections made at appointed times, by the Clergymen at the Chapel or by the Members of the Committee throughout the town or district.

IV. Let the weekly payments for Paupers be made by the Treasurer (who must be a Layman) out of this Fund; so that by the School-roll all may appear to pay.

V. Let the hours of attendance at School be fixed by the Committee, and all its Regulations enforced by the visitors; whose remarks, written in a book, to be kept by the Master for that purpose, are to be read by the Secretary to the Committee, at their Quarterly Meetings. Those Meetings are to be held on such days as the Committee themselves may appoint.



VI. The religious education of the children is to be thus conducted. In every School there shall be provided, as soon as convenient, and kept carefully by the Master, at least one copy of each of the following books:- The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ; an approved Prayer-Book; Reeve's or Gahan's History of the Bible; Fleury's Historical Catechism; the Evangelical Life of Christ; the Morality of the Bible by Doctor Challoner; Gother or Dorrell on the Epistles and Gospels; the Imitation of Christ; Mrs. Herbert and the Villagers, by Miss Bodenham. On the opening of the School, the Master shall, after the blessing and the invocation of the Holy Ghost, recite aloud with the children assembled, the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, the Creed, the Ten Commandments of God, as given at length in the Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, the Commandments of the Church, with the Acts of Contrition, Faith, Hope and Charity, as found in the form of Morning Prayer. He shall next arrange the Classes, and then (or in the evening, if he find it more convenient) hear, with the aid of his Monitors, the lessons of the Catechism, as committed to memory by the children. The other business to be afterwards proceeded with.

In the evening, after invoking the Holy Ghost, and reciting the General Confession, let the Master, standing with his head bare, and all the children in a like position, read from the New Testament the Gospel or Epistle of the day, as the same is pointed out in the text or appendix; or if there be not a Gospel or Epistle appointed for the day, let him read a chapter of the Gospel or of the Acts of the Apostles, and when he will have done so, and being seated with the children, let him, from Gother or Dorrell, read the commentary upon the Gospel or Epistle which had been read. Should the time employed

in this instruction be considerable, let the Master select a convenient time in the day to have read for the children, by himself, or by a scholar selected by him, a chapter from one or other of the several books above mentioned; and let him also combine with the catechetical instruction, in the more advanced classes, the History of the Bible, especially of the New Testament, from Fleury or Reeve, as well as the study of the Morality of the Bible, out of Challoner, or the other books before mentioned. Let the children, when possible, be provided with copies of those books. The evening exercise to close with a short Act of thanksgiving, the Litany, or the Anthem, "Hail, Holy Queen!" in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

Wherever Protestant children attend, let them not share in the duties of prayer or religious instruction, unless at their own desire, sanctioned expressly by their parents; and where the number of such children will be at all considerable, the Committee if required, should afford time and a place for religious instruction being imparted to them by a person of their own communion, and in the manner prescribed by their own Pastors.

**N.B.** A copy of these rules to be framed and placed in a conspicuous part of the School-room.

## REFERENCES

### PREFACE

- 1 See his Letters on the state of Ireland addressed by J.K.L. to a friend in England (Dublin, 1825), p. 312. Post-Emancipation Doyle advocated the withdrawal of the Catholic clergy from politics though he and his clergy remained active.
- 2 See the present writer's 'The historiography of the papers of Bishop James Doyle, O.S.A. (1786-1834) in the Kildare and Leighlin diocesan archives' in Archivium Hibernicum, XLIII (1988), pp. 85-94; see also this writer's 'Religious renewal and reform in the pastoral ministry of James Doyle, O.S.A., Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, 1819-1834' (N.U.I., Ph.D., 1987). For some reflections arising from the above work see this writer's article 'The Tridentine evolution of modern Irish Catholicism, 1563-1962; a re-examination of the 'Devotional Revolution' thesis' in Recusant History, vol. 20, no. 4 (October, 1991), pp. 512-523.
- 3 For the penal laws still affecting Catholics in the early nineteenth century see Denys Scully, A statement of the penal laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland; with commentaries, 2 vols (Dublin, 1812). The printer of this work which was originally published anonymously was jailed for his part in its publication. See also Henry Parnell, A history of the penal laws against Irish Catholics (Dublin 1808).
- 4 As late as 1830 the radical Joseph Hume estimated that out of 2,800 public offices in Ireland only 264 were held by Catholics. See Hansard 3rd ser., xxiv, 558 (11 May 1830).
- 5 See W. A. Phillips, History of the Church of Ireland from the earliest times to the present day (Oxford, 1933), iii, 336.
- 6 In his Diocesan Book, in K.L.D.A., Doyle estimated the Catholic and non-Catholic population of the diocese at 250,000 and 25,000 respectively in 1827.

## REFERENCES

### CHAPTER I

- 1 D.E.P., 9 January 1821; see also D.E.P., 13 January 1821 for a critical reply to O'Connell from Richard Lalor Sheil and the same paper of 16 January 1821 for O'Connell's rejoinder.
- 2 D.E.P., 22 March 1821. Plunket's 'Bill for removing disabilities affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects' was read a second time on 16 March 1821 in the House of Commons.
- 3 Murray to Doyle, 14 March 1821, File 1821/6, K.L.D.A.
- 4 Doyle to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 84, D.D.A.
- 5 Curtis to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 85, D.D.A.
- 6 Marum to Murray, 18 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 87, D.D.A.
- 7 Kelly to Murray, 17 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 86, D.D.A.
- 8 Doyle to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 84, D.D.A.
- 9 Milner to Murray, 17 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 96, D.D.A.
- 10 Marum to Murray, 18 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 87, D.D.A.
- 11 Doyle to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 84, D.D.A.
- 12 Kelly to Murray, 17 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 86, D.D.A.
- 13 Curtis to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 85, D.D.A.
- 14 Kelly to Murray, 17 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 86, D.D.A.
- 15 Marum to Murray, 18 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 87, D.D.A. He thought it might lead to Rome not allowing many appeals from Ireland but letting the Irish resolve their differences, 'as they ought to be', at home in provincial or national synods.
- 16 Doyle to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 84, D.D.A.
- 17 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 211, H.C. 1825 (129) viii, 173.
- 18 Advertisement in D.E.P., 27 March 1821.
- 19 D.E.P., 3 April 1821.
- 20 Ibid., 7 April 1821.
- 21 Ibid., 31 March 1821.

- 22 Ibid., 3 April 1821.
- 23 Ibid.
- 24 Ibid., 29 March 1821.
- 25 Ibid., 7 April 1821.
- 26 Ibid.
- 27 Ibid., 29 March 1821.
- 28 Ibid., 5 April 1821.
- 29 Ibid., 7 April 1821.
- 30 Doyle to Sir Henry Parnell, 30 March 1821. This letter was written from 41 Cumberland Street, Dublin, the residence of Archbishop Murray. It can be found in the Congleton Papers, 23/4 in Archives and MSS., Southampton University Library. (Charles Stewart Parnell was a grand-nephew of Sir Henry Parnell.)
- 31 Ibid. Archbishop Curtis favoured accepting the bills as they stood if nothing better could be obtained and he urged Murray to go to London to this end. See Curtis to Murray, 15 March 1821, File 30/5 no. 85, D.D.A.
- 32 Doyle to Parnell, 30 March 1821, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Milner to Murray, 1 April 1821, File 30/5 no. 97, D.D.A. There was no compromising with Milner. Almost two years later he was still suggesting melodramatically that 'we ought to imitate More and Fisher and O'Hurley rather than comply' with the oath. See Milner to Murray, 28 January 1823, File 30/7 no. 18, D.D.A.
- 35 Milner to Murray, 9 April 1821 misdated 1820 in File 30/5 no. 24, D.D.A.
- 36 Parnell to Doyle, 17 March 1821, File 1821/7, K.L.D.A.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Lord Donoughmore to Daniel O'Connell, 19 April 1821 in O'Connell Corr., ii, 316-317.
- 39 Parnell to Doyle, 3 April 1821, File 1821/9, K.L.D.A.
- 40 Doyle to Murray, 5 December 1822, File 30/6, no. 15, D.D.A.

- 41 Doyle to Parnell, 6 April 1821, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library. The form of the Oath was still an issue in Murray-Curtis-Doyle correspondence in late 1822. See Curtis to Murray, 5 November 1822, File 30/6 no. 12, D.D.A.; Doyle to Murray, 5 December 1822, File 30/6 no. 15, D.D.A.; Murray to Doyle, 3 December 1822, File 1822/52, K.L.D.A.; Murray to Doyle, 12 December 1822, File 1822/56, K.L.D.A.
- 42 Parnell to Doyle, 14 April 1821, File 1821/11, K.L.D.A.
- 43 Lord Grenville to Parnell, 11 April 1821, Congleton Papers, 15/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.
- 44 Parnell to Doyle, 10 April 1821, File 1821/10, K.L.D.A.
- 45 Hansard, v, 1-3 (3 April 1821).
- 46 Ibid., v, 231-233 (16 April 1821).
- 47 Ibid., v, 351 (17 April 1821).
- 48 Ibid., v, 343-346 (17 April 1821).
- 49 Ibid., v, 219 (16 April 1821).
- 50 Ibid., v, 241 (16 April 1821).
- 51 Ibid., v, 283, 319, 354, 348-350, 248.
- 52 Ibid., v, 281.
- 53 Doyle to Parnell, 19 April 1821, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.
- 54 Parnell to Doyle, 19 April 1821/13, K.L.D.A.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Doyle to Parnell, 22 April 1821, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.
- 58 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, [?] 21 July 1821, File 1821/32, K.L.D.A.
- 59 Undated draft, File 1821/33, K.L.D.A.
- 60 Lord Donoughmore to Murray, 27 July 1821, File 30/5 no. 79, D.D.A.; Lord Donoughmore to Murray, 31 July 1821, File 30/5 no. 80, D.D.A.
- 61 Doyle to Murray, 11 August 1821, File 1821/33, K.L.D.A.

- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 D.E.P., 21 August 1821.
- 65 Lord Donoughmore to Murray, 31 July 1821, File 30/5 no. 80, D.D.A.
- 66 Preston Chronicle, 1 September 1821 in File 30/5 no. 93, D.D.A.
- 67 D.E.P., 23 August 1821.
- 68 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, 3 January 1822, File 1822/2, K.L.D.A.
- 69 Murray to Doyle, 2 January 1822, File 1822/1, K.L.D.A.
- 70 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, 3 January 1822, File 1822/2, K.L.D.A.
- 71 D.E.P., 10 January 1822.
- 72 Ibid., 12 January 1822.
- 73 Ibid., 21 March 1822. Letter of J.K.L. on domestic nomination.
- 74 Ibid. Doyle stated that Quarantotti when conceding the veto in 1814 'was not a faithful interpreter of the will of the Pope (for his rescript was disavowed), and, I believe his information on our discipline was very slender indeed; it is but imperfectly known to most of ourselves'.
- 75 Milner to Murray, 1 April 1821, File 30/5 no. 97, D.D.A.
- 76 Milner to Murray, 26 March 1819, File 30/4 no. 46, D.D.A.
- 77 Milner to Murray, 16 December [1821], File 30/5 no. 102, D.D.A.
- 78 Milner to Curtis, 16 December 1821, File 30/5 no. 104, D.D.A.
- 79 Murray to Doyle, 22 October 1821, File 1821/37, K.L.D.A.
- 80 Ibid.
- 81 Murray to Doyle, 21 November 1821, File 1821/49, K.L.D.A.
- 82 Miler to Murray, 14 January 1822, File 30/6 no. 16, D.D.A.

- 83 This correspondence was published under the title Correspondence between Daniel O'Connell, Esq., Barrister-at-law and Rev Doctor Michael Blake, P.P. of the parish of St Michael and St John, Dublin, on the subject of ecclesiastical securities proposed to be connected with the repeal of the laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland With observations to the Rt Hon W. C. Plunket His Majesty's Attorney General on the Plan (Dublin, 1822). For Blake see M. J. Curran, 'Dr. Michael Blake and the re-establishment of the Irish College, Rome' in Reportorium Novum no. 2 (1956), pp. 434-442. Blake was bishop of Dromore, 1833-1860.
- 84 D.E.P., 24 January 1822. Daniel O'Connell to the Catholics of Ireland.
- 85 Ibid.
- 86 Ibid.
- 87 Ibid.
- 88 Ibid., 7 January 1822. In this letter Hay charged Dr Murray with allegedly conceding the veto in 1817 in return for emancipation and episcopal nomination of the bishops. This drew forth a response from Dr Murray (D.E.P., 9 February 1822) that Hay's statement was 'unsupported by fact' and that 'the public know how to appreciate fully that poor gentleman's reveries'; 'I dismiss the subject for ever'.
- 89 Ibid., 16 February 1822. Reply by J.K.L. to Mr Hay; see Doyle papers, File 19/11, for twenty-four-page manuscript of this letter, K.L.D.A.
- 90 Ibid.
- 91 Ibid.
- 92 Ibid., 21 February 1822. As if stung by Dr Murray's reply Hay published a letter to himself from Daniel O'Connell dated Limerick, 27 July 1817. This stated that Dr Murray was supporting the veto and quoted O'Connell as follows: 'He who compared the Vetoists to Judas. As to Dr Troy, better could not be expected from him - His traffic at the Castle is long notorious'. This was a very embarrassing exposure to public light of a private letter which O'Connell never expected to see in the daily press. However the Dublin Evening Post which published it was engaged in a blazing row with O'Connell at this time holding him to be ill-mannered and too haughty for his own good. On 23 February 1822 the D.E.P., published a letter from O'Connell to Dr Troy apologising for his letter to Hay in 1817 and imploring his Grace's pardon. He had similarly to apologise to Dr Murray.
- 93 Ibid., 7 March 1822 for this letter from Laicus. See also the same issue for Hay's fourth letter on domestic nomination.



- 94 D.E.P., 21 March 1822; see Doyle papers, File 19/12 for surviving fragments of the original manuscript - pp. 4-6, 9-12 only, K.L.D.A. For a further long letter from Laicus see D.E.P., 11 and 18 April 1822.
- 95 Murray to Doyle, 1 March 1823, File 1823/11, K.L.D.A.
- 96 Ibid., 29 March 1823, File 1823/20, K.L.D.A.
- 97 Ibid.
- 98 Doyle to Murray, 31 March 1823, File 30/7 no. 8, D.D.A.
- 99 Ibid.
- 100 See Appendix One.
- 101 Curtis to Murray, 23 April 1823, File 30/7 no. 9, D.D.A.
- 102 Murray to Doyle, 12 December 1822, File 1822/56, K.L.D.A.
- 103 See 'Interdenominational relations' below.
- 104 Ibid.
- 105 F. W. Conway to Doyle, 9 June 1823, File 1823/35, K.L.D.A.
- 106 J.K.L., Vindication, p. 28.
- 107 Ibid., p. 44.
- 108 Ibid., pp. 3-5.
- 109 Ibid., pp. 14, 6.
- 110 Ibid., p. 45.
- 111 Ibid., p. 9.
- 112 Ibid., pp. 29-30.
- 113 Ibid., p. 33.
- 114 D.E.P., 11 October 1823.
- 115 Curtis to Doyle, 22 October 1823, File 1823/45, K.L.D.A. This letter was written in reply to Doyle's letter of 19 October 1823 which is presumed no longer extant. Curtis, at Doyle's request, undertook to have the northern pamphleteers, George Ensor and John Lawless write in support of the Vindication.
- 116 Copy of Murray to Curtis, 18 October 1823 in Fitzpatrick Papers, MS 15495, N.L.I. Murray hoped the Vindication would be 'productive of some benefit . . . I do not pretend to be quite exempt from that feeling that arises from what is usually said to be Solomon misereris [?]'.

- 117 Milner to Doyle, 15 November 1823, File 1823/55, K.L.D.A. In reply to Doyle to Milner, 7 November 1823.
- 118 Quoted in Murray to Curtis, 18 October 1823 in Fitzpatrick Papers, MS 15495, N.L.I.
- 119 James Keating to Doyle, 26 October 1823, File 1823/47, K.L.D.A.
- 120 Richard Lalor Sheil to Doyle, 18 December 1823, File 1823/60, K.L.D.A.
- 121 Quoted in Curtis to Doyle, 22 October 1823, File 1823/45, K.L.D.A.
- 122 Reported in D.E.P., 4 November 1823. See also the same paper for 11 November 1823.
- 123 Fergus O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, p. 42.
- 124 Ibid.
- 125 J.K.L., Defence of the Vindication, p. 3.
- 126 Ibid., pp. 96-97.
- 127 Ibid., p. 97.
- 128 Ibid., p. 111. But as we shall see this would not always be the case.
- 129 See 'Education' below.
- 130 John MacHale also understood allegiance in this sense. See Letter XXIV, Hierophilos to George Canning, 1823, in John MacHale, The letters of the Most Reverend John MacHale, D.D. (Dublin, 1847), pp. 114-119.
- 131 J.K.L., Vindication, p. 25.
- 132 Ibid., p. 28; see also J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland, p. 239.
- 133 This letter was dated Carlow, 13 May 1824 and was slightly over three thousand words in length.
- 134 Brian McNamee, 'J.K.L.'s letter on the union of churches' in Irish Theological Quarterly, 39 (1969), pp. 46-69; D.E.P., 22 May 1824; Belfast Newsletter, 25 May 1824.
- 135 Devereux to Doyle, 24 April 1824, File 1824/20, K.L.D.A.
- 136 Parnell to Doyle, 14 May 1824, File 1824/23, K.L.D.A.
- 137 Doyle to Murray, 21 May 1824, File 1824/24, K.L.D.A.
- 138 For Robertson's remarks see Hansard, xi, 568-569 (6 May 1824).

- 139 Doyle et al., Letters on a re-union of the churches, p. 1.
- 140 Ibid., pp. 1-3.
- 141 Ibid., pp. 3-5.
- 142 Ibid., pp. 3-4.
- 143 Belfast Newsletter, 25 May 1824.
- 144 Ibid.; Dublin Correspondent, 24 May 1824 dismissed the idea. Neither did the D.E.P., 22 May 1824 hold out much hope for a union of the churches. Popularly regarded as Utopian the D.E.P. concluded that the idea in the temper of the times was hopeless. The 'Maynooth Manifesto' (see below) made no reference to the union of the churches.
- 145 Colchester noted the twin political and religious themes of Doyle's letter in his diary entry of 21 May 1824. See Charles, Lord Colchester (ed.), The diary and correspondence of Charles Abbot, Lord Colchester, 3 vols (London, 1861), iii, 325. But in his 'House of Lords' attack he made no reference to the letter's ecumenical content. See Hansard, xi, 828-829.
- 146 Quoted in Bishop Baines to Doyle, 25 June 1824, File 1824/34, K.L.D.A.
- 147 D.E.P., 15, 22 June 1824.
- 148 Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 350-351.
- 149 Doyle to Propaganda Fide, 1 June 1824 (draft in Latin), File 1824/27, K.L.D.A.
- 150 Doyle to Rev Jeremiah Donovan, [early June 1824] printed in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 352.
- 151 Curtis wanted this letter kept private: 'I request your Grace will reserve this letter and my name in particular'. See Curtis to Wellington, 2 June 1824, printed in Wellington (ed.), Despatches, ii, 272-274.
- 152 Bishop Baines to Doyle, 1 June 1824, File 1824/28, K.L.D.A.
- 153 See 'Minutes of the Trustees of Maynooth', p. 99, MS in President's office, Maynooth College, Co. Kildare.
- 154 According to John Healy, Maynooth College - its centenary history 1795-1895 (Dublin, 1895), pp. 360-361.
- 155 D.E.P., 5 June 1824.
- 156 Jeremiah Newman, Maynooth and Georgian Ireland (Galway, 1980), p. 205; John Healy, op. cit., p. 360.

- 157 Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 353. In the early years of Maynooth College French was the main language of the professors' dining table with Irish being spoken at one end. See George Crolly, A life of the Most Reverend Dr Crolly, Archbishop of Armagh (Dublin, 1870), p. xxiii.
- 158 Browne (1786-1865) was appointed coadjutor bishop of Kilmore to combat the progress of Lord Farnham's New Reformation crusade in Cavan. He 'avoided political activity'. See Donal A. Kerr, Peel, priests and politics (Oxford, 1982), pp. 7, 11. See also Donal A. Kerr, 'James Browne, Bishop of Kilmore, 1829-65' in Breifne (1983-4), vol. vi, no. 22, pp. 109-154.
- 159 For McNally (1787-1864) see Donal A. Kerr, 'Charles McNally, Maynooth Professor and Bishop of Clogher' in Clogher Record, X, no. 3 (1981), pp. 364-391. Kerr described McNally in Peel, priests and politics, p. 9 as 'strongly O'Connellite in politics'. Oliver McDonagh depicted him as a 'rabid episcopal repealer' in 'The politicization of the Irish Catholic bishops, 1800-1850' in the Historical Journal, XVIII, 1 (1975), pp. 37-53 at p. 49.
- 160 Quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 446.
- 161 Ibid., i, 353-354.
- 162 Healy, Maynooth, p. 360.
- 163 Doyle to Rev Charles Stuart, 7 June 1824, quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 352.
- 164 D.E.P., 15 June 1824.
- 165 His letter dated 'Old Derrig, Carlow, 6 June 1824' was published in the D.E.P., 8 June 1824. Lord Colchester was not mentioned by name.
- 166 Quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 351.
- 167 D.E.P., 19 June 1824.
- 168 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 236, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1. The 'situation' is not known to the present writer. Doyle took the Oath of Allegiance on 12 February 1824 in the office of the Court of King's Bench, Dublin.
- 169 Blake to Doyle, 27 January 1827. Blake quoted from Sheil's speech at the Catholic Association on 19 January 1827. See File 1827/5, K.L.D.A.
- 170 D.E.P., 31 January 1824.

- 171 Chief Secretary's Office, Registered Papers, Public Record Office, Proceedings of the Roman Catholic Association, Carton 1158 (13 March 1824). For the diplomatic manner in which O'Connell went about circularising the bishops see O'Connell to Archbishop Laffan, 10 March 1824, O'Connell Corr., iii, 51.
- 172 D.E.P., 4 November 1824.
- 173 Ibid., 11 November 1824.
- 174 Ibid., 18 December 1824 (Coen), 16 November 1824 (Curtis). Compare Curtis's letter to Wellington of 2 June 1824 and 6 December 1824 in Wellington (ed), Despatches, ii, 272-274, 361-364.
- 175 For these parochial rent meetings and activity usually under the management of the parish clergy see D.E.P., 2 September (Tullow); 7 September (Carlow); 21, 25 September (Naas); 2 October (Kildare) but see also fn. 176; 16 October (Maryborough); 26 October (Rathangan); 30 October (Philipstown); 30 November (Abbeyleix); 11 December (Ballinakill); 24 December (Portarlinton).
- 176 Wellesley to Goulburn, 7 September 1824 in Goulburn Papers, Accession 319, Box 43, Surrey Record Office, County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames.
- 177 D.E.P., 21 August 1824 for Doyle's letter dated 12 August 1824 to John Fitzpatrick, Secretary, Waterford City Catholic Rent Committee; D.E.P., 2 October for Doyle's letter dated 18 September 1824 to William Dunne, Secretary Kildare Catholic Rent Committee; D.E.P., 23 October, for Doyle's letter dated 18 October to Maryborough Catholics; D.E.P., 30 November 1824 for Doyle's letter dated 22 November 1824 to John Phelan, Secretary of the Abbeyleix Rent Committee.
- 178 D.E.P., 23 October 1824 (Maryborough).
- 179 D.E.P., 2 October 1824 (Kildare).
- 180 D.E.P., 30 November 1824.
- 181 J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland (Dublin, 1825), pp. 364.
- 182 Ibid., p. iv.
- 183 Ibid., Letter 1, see pp. 9-36.
- 184 Ibid., p. 25.
- 185 Ibid., p. 38.
- 186 Ibid., p. 44.
- 187 Ibid., p. 25.
- 188 Ibid., pp. 26-27.
- 189 Ibid., p. 33.

- 190 Ibid. See Letter V, pp. 96-118, especially p. 114. The prime minister referred to Doyle's demographic speculations in parliament indicating that he had at least consulted this work.
- 191 Ibid., pp. 13-14.
- 192 Ibid., pp. 59-60.
- 193 Ibid., pp. 286-287.
- 194 Ibid., p. 89.
- 195 Ibid., p. 49.
- 196 Ibid., p. 229.
- 197 Ibid., p. 272, 279.
- 198 Ibid., pp. 284-285.
- 199 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 25 May 1825, in O'Connell Corr., iii, 181.
- 200 Lord Harrowby to Doyle, 2 March 1825, File 1825/12, K.L.D.A.
- 201 Rev Professor Jeremiah Donovan to Doyle, 8 March 1825, File 1825/15, K.L.D.A.
- 202 The select committee of the House of Commons examined Archbishop Curtis on 22 March; Archbishop Kelly on 22 and 23 March; Archbishop Murray on 22 March and 17 May; Bishop Magauran on 25 March. Archbishop Curtis was examined before the select committee of the House of Lords on 24 March; Archbishop Kelly on 26 April; Archbishop Murray on 24 March.
- 203 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, pp. 173-222, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173; ibid., pp. 223-248; 308-317, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1. This evidence of Doyle's (a total of eighty-three foolscap pages) was delivered by him despite poor health.
- 204 Ibid., p. 180, 210, 221, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 205 Ibid., p. 227, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 206 Ibid., p. 177, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 207 J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland (Dublin, 1825), p. 292.
- 208 See the long letter on this subject from Doyle to [Sir Henry Parnell], 29 May 1824 (copy), File 1824/19, K.L.D.A.
- 209 Doyle to A. R. Blake, 7 April 1825, printed in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 415-416 at p. 416.

- 210 Ibid., i, 415.
- 211 Ibid.
- 212 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 216, H.C. 1825 (129) viii, 173.
- 213 J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland (Dublin, 1825), p. 295. See generally, Letter X, pp. 293-309.
- 214 Ibid., pp. 302-303.
- 215 Ibid., pp. 305-306.
- 216 Ibid., p. 308.
- 217 Hansard, xii, 44 (19 April 1825).
- 218 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, [7 March 1825] in O'Connell Corr., iii, 130-131 at p. 131.
- 219 There is an important retrospective on this in Daniel O'Connell to Pierce Mahony, 17 [and 19] September 1828 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 406-410 at pp. 407-408.
- 220 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 192, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 221 Ibid., p. 190, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 222 Ibid., pp. 190, 211, H.C. 1825 (129) viii, 173. See also *ibid.*, p. 210 for the following: 'we are zealous for the independence of our church, and we do not like that either the Pope should interfere with it beyond what is necessary for preserving the Catholic communion, nor do we like that an interference of the Crown should be established in the appointment of our prelates, which would weaken our influence with the people . . . '.
- 223 Ibid., p. 239, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 224 See *ibid.*, p. 210, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173; *ibid.*, p. 248, p. 235, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 225 Ibid., p. 235, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1; Doyle also quoted this evidence in his Essay on the Catholic Claims (Dublin, 1826), pp. 201-202.
- 226 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 17 March 1825 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 141-142 at p. 142. Doyle's performance under pressure was very self-confident. Quoting a sentence of St. Augustine's in Latin he pointed out that Augustine's Latin was 'very bad'. See Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 245, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 227 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, 12 April 1825, File 1825/21, K.L.D.A.
- 228 Hansard, xiii, 665.
- 229 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, 12 April 1825, File 1825/21, K.L.D.A.

- 230 Ibid.
- 231 Hansard, xiii, 13-29 at 25.
- 232 Ibid., 106-123 at 115.
- 233 Ibid., 43.
- 234 Ibid., 532 (Wetherell); 498 (Inglis); 80 (Binning).
- 235 Ibid., 528.
- 236 Ibid., 553.
- 237 See Daniel O'Connell to Henry Brougham, 12 May 1825 marked 'confidential' in O'Connell Corr., iii, 171.
- 238 D.E.P., 19 July 1825.
- 239 Ibid.
- 240 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 14 May 1825, in O'Connell Corr., iii, 173.
- 241 Hansard, xiii, 60, 74.
- 242 Ibid., 45-50.
- 243 Ibid., 115.
- 244 Ibid., 500. Inglis was legally correct.
- 245 Ibid., 665.
- 246 Ibid., 723-724.
- 247 Ibid., 684.
- 248 Ibid., 747.
- 249 Ibid., 117.
- 250 Ibid., 142. Curiously Lord Liverpool did not consider the coronation oath an obstacle to Catholic Emancipation. See *ibid.*, 750-751.
- 251 Ibid., 77.
- 252 Ibid., 85-106 at 92.
- 253 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 22 April 1825 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 153.
- 254 Ibid., 3 May 1825, 159.



- 255 Norman Gash, Lord Liverpool (London, 1984), pp. 233-235.
- 256 Hansard, xiii, 746. See pp. 741-756 passim.
- 257 D.E.P., 28 July 1825.
- 258 Ibid.
- 259 Ibid., 12 July 1825.
- 260 Ibid.
- 261 Ibid., 19 July 1825.
- 262 Ibid.
- 263 Ibid., 26 July 1825.
- 264 Ibid., 2 August 1825.
- 265 Political Register, 19 July 1825; also published in Dublin Morning Register, 26 July 1825. See Richard Lalor Sheil to Daniel O'Connell, 11 August 1825 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 188-189.
- 266 Morning Register, 22 November 1825. Bishop England's several letters to Daniel O'Connell are reprinted in Sebastian Messmer (ed.), The works of . . . John England, first Bishop of Charleston, 7 vols. (Cleveland, Ohio, 1908), vi, 13-93. See pp. 74-78 where England accused O'Connell of throwing the blame for the 'wings' on Murray and Doyle.
- 267 Fergus O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, p. 108.
- 268 D.E.P., 29 November 1825.
- 269 Minutes of New Catholic Association Meeting, 3 December 1825, pp. 18-19 in Catholic Proceedings, Section 56/2, File vi, D.D.A. O'Connell also stated of Dr Doyle that 'it was impossible to fix a shadow of suspicion on his character'.
- 270 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 13 December 1825 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 212.
- 271 D.E.P., 12 November 1825.
- 272 Ibid., 15 December 1825.
- 273 Ibid.; also printed in Battersby, Doyle, pp. 188-189.
- 274 Ibid., p. 183.
- 275 There is a manuscript (pp. 1-8) of Doyle's speech in his own hand (with audience reaction) in File 19/14, K.L.D.A. This account is faithfully published in D.E.P., 22 December 1825, although Doyle is not acknowledged as the author.

- 276 See Barron's letter in D.E.P., 24 December 1825. See also ibid., 29 December 1825 for H. Lambert's letter admitting the 'general accuracy' of Barron's account of the Carlow meeting.
- 277 Daniel O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 17 December 1825 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 213.
- 278 O'Connell to Rev Jeremiah Donovan, 18 December 1825, in O'Connell Corr., iii, 214-216.
- 279 See Doyle to Lord Donoughmore, 14 December 1825 printed in D.E.P., 12 January 1826.
- 280 Rev Sydney Smith to Doyle, 30 October 1825, File 1825/40, K.L.D.A.
- 281 Peter Waldron to Murray, 11 November 1825, File 30/9 no. 42, D.D.A.
- 282 Robert Logan to Murray, 12 November 1825, File 30/9 no. 44, D.D.A.
- 283 Waldron to Murray, 11 November 1825, File 30/9 no. 42, D.D.A.; Logan to Murray, 12 November 1825, File 30/9 no. 44, D.D.A.
- 284 Charles Tuohy to Murray, 8 November 1825, File 30/9 no. 39, D.D.A.
- 285 Ibid.; Plunkett to Murray, 8 November 1825, File 30/9, no. 37, D.D.A.
- 286 William Coppinger to Murray, 6 November 1825, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 287 Patrick Kelly to Murray, 6 November 1825, File 30/9, no. 35, D.D.A.
- 288 Charles Butler to Murray, 18 January 1826, File 30/9, no 5, D.D.A.
- 289 Curtis to Murray, 6 November 1825, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 290 Rev Sydney Smith to Doyle, 30 October 1825, File 1825/40, K.L.D.A. See also 'Rev Sydney Smith to Doyle, 6 March 1826, File 1826/11, K.L.D.A.
- 291 'Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland' published as an appendix in James Doyle, Essay on the Catholic Claims (Dublin, 1826), pp. 303-312.
- 292 Ibid. This declaration was signed by thirty prelates in Dublin on 25 January 1826.
- 293 Doyle, Essay on the Catholic Claims (Dublin, 1826), pp. iv-v. This was a 294-page work.
- 294 Ibid., p. iii.
- 295 Ibid., passim.

- 296 Ibid., pp. 45-46.
- 297 Ibid., pp. 28, 59, 86, 88.
- 298 Ibid., pp. 95-122.
- 299 Ibid., p. 130.
- 300 Ibid., pp. 136-139.
- 301 Ibid., p. 213.
- 302 Ibid., p. 212.
- 303 Ibid., p. 202.
- 304 Doyle, Essay on the Catholic Claims, p. 199.
- 305 Ibid., p. 244.
- 306 Ibid., p. 233.
- 307 Ibid., p. 234.
- 308 Ibid., p. 235.
- 309 Ibid., p. 227.
- 310 Ibid., pp. 224-225.
- 311 Ibid., p. 227.
- 312 Ibid., pp. 166-182, 257-294.
- 313 Ibid., pp. 95-122, 152-165, 248-256.
- 314 Ibid., p. 294.
- 315 D.E.P., 16 February 1826; Richard Coyne to Doyle, 18 February 1826, File 1826/5, K.L.D.A. For criticism of Doyle's Essay on the Catholic Claims see the anonymous publication, The remedy; a letter to Doctor Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, in reply to a work entitled 'An Essay on the Catholic Claims' (London, 1827). This pamphlet attempted to refute Doyle's assertion that the pope did not claim any temporal influence over Roman Catholic subjects of other states but eccentrically suggested that emancipation should be granted to Catholics nonetheless. An English Catholic barrister, Daniel French, devoted an impassioned pamphlet to an attack on Doyle's slighting reference (quoting Lingard) in the Essay on the Catholic Claims, p. 163 to the alleged mental reservation of the Jesuit Henry Garnet who was executed in England in 1606 for alleged involvement in the Gunpowder Plot. Doyle's reference to Garnet as 'that unhappy culprit' was deemed by French (p. 6) as an 'oblique insult to the whole order' of the Society of Jesus. French also noted (p. 11)

Doyle's references to Pascal and Bossuet - 'perpetual subjects of your Lordship's panegyric' as evidence of his poor opinion of the Jesuits. See Daniel French, A letter to the Right Rev James Doyle, etc. etc. etc. in reprobation of some matter contained in his recent essay on the Catholic claims addressed to the Right Hon The Earl of Liverpool, K.G. (London, 1826).

316 D.E.P., 13 May 1826.

317 Ibid.

318 Parnell to Doyle, 17 March 1826, File 1826/14, K.L.D.A.

319 Hansard, xiv, 1201.

320 Baines to Doyle, postmarked 25 March 1826, File 1826/16, K.L.D.A.

321 See O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, pp. 114-152.

322 Doyle papers, File 19/15, p. 10, dated 23 November 1827, K.L.D.A.

323 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, 2 July 1826, File 1826/30, K.L.D.A.

324 D.E.P., 15 July 1826.

325 Ibid., 9 September 1826.

326 Ibid., 11 November 1826. See 'Interdenominational Relations' and 'Education' below for discussion of the broader issues.

327 Ibid., 2 December 1826.

328 Ibid., 27 January 1827.

329 Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 505-506.

330 Daniel O'Connell to Doyle, 2 January 1827 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 284-285.

331 See D.E.P., 16 January 1827 for Bishop Doyle's letter to the New Catholic Association. O'Connell read letters from Bishops Kelly (Waterford), Egan (Kerry), Kelly (Dromore) and stated that he had had correspondence from two-thirds of the hierarchy apparently in response to a circular letter from him of early January.

332 D.E.P., 27 November 1827: Doyle letter to New Catholic Association.

333 See Doyle papers, unpublished sixteen-page manuscript dated 23 November 1827, File 19/15, p. 9, K.L.D.A.

334 O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, p. 317.

335 Ibid., pp. 154-155.

- 336 Ibid., p. 154; see also A. R. Blake to Doyle, 27 January 1827 in File 1827/5, K.L.D.A.
- 337 Hansard, xvi, 792-793.
- 338 See J.K.L., Letter to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827), passim.
- 339 Hansard, xvi, 796, 804.
- 340 Ibid., 807-809.
- 341 Ibid., 903, 918.
- 342 Ibid., 953-954.
- 343 Ibid., 973-974.
- 344 Ibid., 1009. The vote was Ayes, 272; Noes, 276.
- 345 Doyle to O'Connell, 7 March 1827 in D.E.P., 17 March 1827. This Doyle letter was directed against the Kildare Place Society.
- 346 Norman Gash, Lord Liverpool (London, 1984), pp. 248-249.
- 347 Knight of Kerry to O'Connell, 14 April 1827 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 304-305; D.E.P., 17, 19 April, 3 May 1827. On 5 May 1827 the Catholic Association adjourned for six weeks. See D.E.P., 12 May 1827.
- 348 O'Connell to Knight of Kerry, 28 May 1827 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 315-317; see also his letter to the same individual of 16 [and 18] May in ibid., 312-314.
- 349 Doyle to O'Connell, 8 June 1827 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 318-320.
- 350 O'Connell to Knight of Kerry, 9 June 1827 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 322-324.
- 351 See Doyle's letter to the New Catholic Association, 23 November 1827 in D.E.P., 27 November 1827. For an entirely different version see the original manuscript in File 19/15, K.L.D.A.
- 352 O'Connell to Doyle, 29 December 1827 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 372-373.
- 353 Murray to Doyle, 1 January 1828, File 1828/1, K.L.D.A.
- 354 D.E.P., 27 November 1827.
- 355 O'Connell to Knight of Kerry, postmarked 27 February 1828 in O'Connell Corr., iii, 377; O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, p. 170.

- 356 Doyle in S.P.I. evidence, p. 393, 1830 (654), viii.
- 357 Parnell to Doyle, 5 March 1828, File 1828/10, K.L.D.A. Test and Corporations Act by which all members of corporations had to pass the 'sacramental test' of receiving Communion in the Established Church (Legal indemnities already enabled Dissenters to join corporations without any test).
- 358 Earl of Shrewsbury to Doyle, postmarked 14 May 1828, File 1828/24, K.L.D.A.
- 359 Hansard, xix, 509, 516 (Inglis), 651 (Wetherell).
- 360 Doyle to O'Connell, 23 May 1828, File 1828/27, K.L.D.A. This letter is not in the O'Connell Correspondence.
- 361 Hansard, xix, 1155.
- 362 Ibid., 1190-1193.
- 363 Ibid., 1176 (Bishop of Durham), 1237 (Bishop of Bath and Wells).
- 364 Ibid., 1228-1234.
- 365 Ibid., 1257.
- 366 Ibid., 1246.
- 367 Ibid., 1293.
- 368 D.E.P., 24 June 1828. The Times 30 June 1828 has Doyle's letter and a leading article on it. The Morning Chronicle 28 June 1828 commented: 'Dr Doyle is willing to go as far as any Protestant could possibly wish in the way of security against the Pope'.
- 369 Norman Gash, Lord Liverpool (London, 1984), p. 234; Wellington (ed.), Despatches, ii, 592-607. 'There are two parties in that country, the Protestants and the Roman Catholics' (p. 596); 'As long as the Roman Catholic religion exists in this or any other country out of the control of the crown, it remains a system of secrecy, and concealment, and therefore of danger' (p. 604). It was, Wellington argued, time to consider a mode of settlement with the pope (with the example of other countries in Europe in mind). Wellington also stated that the Irish Church must remain a missionary rather than a national church.
- 370 D.E.P., 24 June 1828.
- 371 Ibid.
- 372 Lord Colchester (ed.), The diary and correspondence of Charles Abbot, Lord Colchester, 3 vols (London, 1861), iii, 578.

- 373 William Wallace (Traquair House, Peebles) to Doyle, 28 July 1828, File 1828/42, K.L.D.A.
- 374 William Wallace to Murray, postmarked 11 September 1828 in File 30/11, no. 5 (1828), D.D.A.
- 375 Richard Coyne, 4 Capel Street, Dublin to Doyle, Maynooth, 26 June 1828, File 1828/36, K.L.D.A.
- 376 D.E.P., 28 June 1828.
- 377 County of Clare Election (Cork [1828]), p. 27 quoted in O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, p. 192.
- 378 Anglesey to Peel, 28 June 1828 quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 73-74.
- 379 Dublin Evening Mail, 30 June 1828.
- 380 Morning Register, 16, 17 July 1828 quoted in O'Connell Corr., iii, 391 fn. 3.
- 381 Thomas Spring Rice to Doyle [20 July 1828], File 1828/39, K.L.D.A.
- 382 Ibid. For O'Connell's misunderstanding with Rice see O'Connell Corr., iii, letters numbered 1431, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1445, 1447.
- 383 Doyle to Thomas Spring Rice, 22 July 1828, in Monteagle papers. MS 13,369 (1), N.L.I. This letter indicates that Doyle had already foreseen the possibility of an O'Connellite alliance with the whigs which was not realised until 1835.
- 384 John Chester to Doyle, postmarked 6 August 1828, File 1828/46A, K.L.D.A.; D.E.P., 7 August 1828.
- 385 There are significant differences between the draft version and the published version of this letter, notably the use of the words 'British subjects' for 'Irishmen'. Compare Doyle to J. Chester, draft [11 August 1828], File 1828/46B, K.L.D.A. and the letter printed in D.E.P., 17 August 1828 which was read at the New Catholic Association and inserted in the minutes. For Spring Rice's description of Doyle's letter as 'the most useful document that could have been given to the public at the present crisis'. See Thomas Spring Rice to Doyle, 31 August 1828 in NLI, Monteagle papers, MS 13,345.
- 386 Doyle to Parnell, 31 August 1828 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 79.
- 387 Doyle (Leamington Spa) to Rev Peter Doyle, 14 September 1828 in File 1828/52, K.L.D.A.

- 388 See Thomas G. McGrath, 'Interdenominational relations in pre-famine Tipperary' in Wm Nolan and T. G. McGrath (eds.), Tipperary: History and Society (Dublin, 1985), pp. 261-264; O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, pp. 212-213.
- 389 See letter of Nicholas O'Connor, P.P., Maryborough in D.E.P., 21 October 1828; Letter of P.M.D. Lalor in ibid., 1 November 1828; ibid., 25 November 1828 for a report of adjourned Queen's County meeting.
- 390 Doyle to Rev Nicholas O'Connor, 29 October 1828 quoted in D.E.P., 22 November 1828.
- 391 D.E.P., 2 December 1828.
- 392 Doyle to O'Connell, draft - December 1828, File 1828/64, D.D.A.
- 393 See D.E.P., 22 November 1828.
- 394 Earl of Shrewsbury to Doyle, 25 April 1828, File 1828/19, K.L.D.A.; and Shrewsbury to Doyle, postmarked 14 May 1828, File 1828/24, K.L.D.A.
- 395 See D.N.B., xv, 1108-1111 at p. 1109.
- 396 J.K.L., Observations addressed to the Rev Henry Philpotts (Dublin, 1828), p. 48.
- 397 F. W. Conway gave notice at the Catholic Association on 2 December 1828 to have J.K.L.'s Observations 'placed in the hands of the English people, and distributed amongst members of parliament', D.E.P., 4 December 1828. For O'Connell's role see D.E.P., 11 December 1828.
- 398 D.E.P., 11 December 1828.
- 399 Doyle to Rev Jeremiah Donovan, [?] 4 December 1828 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 95.
- 400 Ibid.
- 401 Donovan to Doyle, 4 December 1828, File 1828/57, K.L.D.A.
- 402 Report of O'Connell's speech on 6 January in D.E.P., 8 January 1829.
- 403 Report of Sheil's speech in D.E.P., 15 January 1829.
- 404 D.E.P., 8 January 1829.



- 405 Bartholomew Crotty, 'A letter to the Right Hon Lord Bexley in reply to the charges against Maynooth, contained in his lordship's 'Address to the Freeholders of the County of Kent' (Dublin, 1829). Spring Rice wrote to Doyle that 'Dr Crotty's pamphlet is not what was wanting in that cause . . .'. See Thomas Spring Rice to Doyle, 26 April 1829 in N.L.I., Monteagle Papers, MS 13,345.
- 406 Wellington (ed.), Despatches, v, 308-309.
- 407 John Sinclair, Memoirs of the life and work of Sir John Sinclair, Bart., 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1837), ii, 338.
- 408 Wellington (ed.), Despatches, v, 326.
- 409 Curtis to Doyle, 26 December 1828, File 1828/62, K.L.D.A.
- 410 Curtis to Murray, 6 January 1829, File 31/3, D.D.A.
- 411 Wellington (ed.), Despatches, v, 358.
- 412 Ibid., 352-353. See D.E.P., 3 January 1829 for Curtis's letter with a different version, that to urge delay was a 'repetition of the same old pretext so often employed to elude and disappoint their hopes of redress'.
- 413 Curtis to Murray, 1 January 1829, File 31/2, no. 1, D.D.A.
- 414 Anglesey to Curtis, 23 December 1828 printed in D.E.P., 1 January 1829.
- 415 Curtis to Murray, 1 January 1829, File 31/2 no. 1, K.L.D.A.
- 416 Wellington (ed.), Despatches, v, 356.
- 417 D.E.P., 3 January 1829.
- 418 Ibid., 29 January 1829. The meeting took place on 19 January.
- 419 Ibid., 15 January 1829.
- 420 Ibid. An abbreviated version of this letter which omits Doyle's revealing opening remarks is given in O'Connell Corr., iv, 1-2.
- 421 O'Connell to Doyle, 4 February 1829 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 6.
- 422 Hansard, xx, 4-5.
- 423 Ibid., 75, 84.
- 424 See D.E.P., 10, 12, 14 February 1829.
- 425 O'Connell (London) to Mary O'Connell, 6 March 1829 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 20-21.

- 426 O'Connell (London) to Doyle, 6 March 1829, File 1829/15, K.L.D.A.
- 427 O'Connell (London) to Mary O'Connell, 3 March 1829 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 16-17.
- 428 Ibid.
- 429 Doyle to A. R. Blake, 14 March 1829 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 117-118; see also Doyle to Parnell, 14 March 1829 in ibid., ii, 114-115.
- 430 Daniel O'Connor, O.S.A., to Doyle, 13 February 1829 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 108.
- 431 Doyle to Daniel O'Connor, O.S.A., 8 February 1828 in Augustinian Archives, Ballyboden, Co. Dublin.
- 432 Doyle (Dublin) to O'Connor, 16 February 1829, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 108-109.
- 433 Doyle to Rev Daniel O'Connor, 19 March 1829 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 112-113.
- 434 Doyle to A. R. Blake, 14 March 1829 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 117-118.
- 435 Ibid.
- 436 O'Connell to Rev W. A. O'Meara, O.S.F., Cork, 18 March 1829 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 32-33.
- 437 Hansard, xxi, 29; Lord Clifden to Doyle, 5 April 1829, File 1829/4, K.L.D.A.
- 438 Ibid., xx, 1606.
- 439 Ibid., xxi, 508-509. In the House of Lords on 10 April 1829 the earl of Falmouth replied to Lyndhurst who had quoted Doyle acknowledging Protestants as Christians by remarking 'but let him look at his other recorded opinions, and he will see that Dr Doyle has been . . . the father of black and white twins like other people; he had also spoken and written all manner of ways'. Ibid., 674.
- 440 Parnell to Doyle, 18 March 1829, File 1829/20, K.L.D.A.; Parnell to Doyle, 24 March 1829, File 1829/21, K.L.D.A. See also Bishop Thomas Walsh to Doyle, post marked 10 March 1829, File 1829/18, K.L.D.A.
- 441 Doyle to A. R. Blake, 14 March 1829 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 117-118.
- 442 Doyle to Sir John Sinclair, 20 February 1829 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862) ii, 110.

- 443 O'Connell to Edward Dwyer, 14 April 1829 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 45-46.
- 444 D.E.P., 25 April 1829; Lord Gormanston to Doyle, 4 April 1829, File 1829/22, K.L.D.A.
- 445 Doyle to [? Robert Cassidy] 13 April 1829, File 1829/25, K.L.D.A.

## REFERENCES

### CHAPTER II

- 1 Daniel O'Connell, London, to Edward Dwyer, 11 March 1829 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 26.
- 2 This pastoral was published in D.E.P., 7 November 1829; The Times, 12 November 1829.
- 3 'Address of the Roman Catholic Prelates in the year 1830' printed by Coyne in single sheet form. See File 31/2, no. 77, D.D.A.
- 4 See 'Bishops' Minute Book, 1829-1849', MS, D.D.A.
- 5 The Times, 17 February 1830.
- 6 Murray to Doyle, 24 February 1830, File 1830/13, K.L.D.A.
- 7 Freeman's Journal, 7 April 1830.
- 8 O'Connell to the Knight of Kerry, 7 April 1830 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 147-148.
- 9 Dublin Gazette, 27 April 1830. See reference in O'Connell Corr., iv, 161, fn 6.
- 10 Doyle to Thomas Wyse, M.P., 8 November 1830, MS 15024 (1), Wyse papers, N.L.I. Copy in File 1830/45, K.L.D.A.
- 11 D.E.P., 26 October 1830.
- 12 D.E.P., 6 November 1830 (dated Carlow, 27 October 1830).
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Doyle to C. Macauley, Esq., dated Carlow, 5 November 1830 published in Kilkenny Journal, 10 November 1830. Doyle concluded this response by commenting: 'It is gratifying to me that the resolution (a copy of which you honoured me with), should have been moved and seconded by Protestant gentlemen, but this does not surprise me; for besides that with me, as my whole life bears witness, there has not been Protestant and Catholic, high Church and low Church, Whig and Tory but all Irishmen have been as brethren, so now the only distinction here, as in the rest of Europe, should be, and almost is, 'who is of the people', and 'who is of the oligarchy or of its dupes and interested retainers'.
- 15 See John Reynolds to Doyle, 17 November 1830 and Doyle to Reynolds, 18 November 1830 published in Kilkenny Journal, 24 November 1830.

- 16 See D.E.P., 23 November 1830; for Doyle's response see D.E.P., 27 November 1830 (dated, Carlow, 24 November 1830).
- 17 Ibid., 27 November 1830.
- 18 The Times, 4 January 1831.
- 19 See Doyle in S.P.I. evidence, p. 420, 1830 (654), viii.
- 20 O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 20 November 1830 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 228.
- 21 O'Connell to Murray, 26 November 1830 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 236.
- 22 Angus Macintyre, The Liberator (London, 1965), p. 21.
- 23 O'Connell to MacHale, 3 December 1830 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 241-242.
- 24 Doyle to the earl of Darnley, 30 December 1830 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 218.
- 25 Doyle to Darnley, 12 January 1831, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle, (1862), ii, 226.
- 26 Doyle to Darnley, 30 December 1830, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 217-218.
- 27 Doyle to Darnley, 30 December 1830 and 13 January 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 217-218, 225-227.
- 28 The full title of O'Connell's latest organisation was 'The General Association of Ireland for the prevention of unlawful meetings and for the protection and exercise of the sacred right of petitioning for the redress of grievances'.
- 29 Doyle to Darnley, 13 January 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 227.
- 30 Anglesey to Lord Holland, 29 January 1831 quoted in C. C. Trench, The great Dan (London, 1986), p. 192.
- 31 Doyle to Sir Henry Parnell, 12 February 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 240. Macintyre, The Liberator, p. 23 for O'Connell's arrest.
- 32 See Parnell to Doyle, 17, 21 January, 9 February 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 228, 237, 239.
- 33 Doyle to Parnell, 12 February 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 240.

- 34 See O'Connell to Richard Newton Bennett, 7 February 1831 in O'Connell Corr., iv, 269-270; Doyle to Parnell, 8 March 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 246.
- 35 Angus Macintyre, The Liberator, p. 24.
- 36 Hansard, xi, 1006-1009 (28 February 1831).
- 37 Macintyre, The Liberator, p. 24.
- 38 Doyle to Parnell, 8 March 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 246.
- 39 Doyle, S.P.I. evidence, pp. 454, 456, 461, 1830 (654), viii.
- 40 See *ibid.*, pp. 390-430, 445-464, 1830 (654), viii, *passim* for condition of the Irish poor.
- 41 *Ibid.*, pp. 392-393, 1830 (654), viii.
- 42 *Ibid.*, pp. 391-392, 1830 (654), viii.
- 43 *Ibid.*, pp. 394-395, 1830 (654), viii.
- 44 *Ibid.*, pp. 390, 393.
- 45 *Ibid.*, p. 393.
- 46 Carlow Morning Post, 27 December 1821.
- 47 *Ibid.*, 24 June 1822.
- 48 *Ibid.*, 31 October 1822 for the clergy's role in endeavouring to curb the prostitution problem. See also *ibid.*, 4 November 1822 for 'Carlow at night' article re prostitution. And the same paper of 10 May 1821 for details of the Carlow Magdalen Asylum and the problem of prostitution for bread.
- 49 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 207, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173; Carlow Morning Post, 15 July 1822.
- 50 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 205, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173; J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland (Dublin, 1825), pp. 335-336.
- 51 D.E.P. 1 April 1824.
- 52 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 205, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 53 D.E.P., 8 July 1824.
- 54 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 205, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173; see Doyle papers, File 22/6 for Doyle's printed circular letter to his clergy on the use of the potato following Sinclair's plan, dated January 1828 in K.L.D.A.

- 55 D.E.P., 19 August 1826.
- 56 See p. 74 above for Doyle's reference to the 'crowds of poor people who, without exaggeration, are dying in great numbers, of a slow but progressive famine'. See D.E.P., 16 January 1827.
- 57 For the Rev James Maher's letter on Carlow destitution see D.E.P., 8 March 1827. For Carlow town public works see the same paper of 20 March 1827.
- 58 Doyle, S.P.I. evidence, p. 424, 395, 1830 (654), viii.
- 59 Ibid., p. 406.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Ibid., p. 408.
- 62 Ibid., p. 391.
- 63 Ibid., p. 408.
- 64 Ibid., p. 415.
- 65 Ibid., p. 408.
- 66 Ibid., p. 423.
- 67 Ibid., pp. 428-429.
- 68 Ibid., p. 429.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 Ibid., p. 397.
- 71 Ibid., pp. 418-419, 396.
- 72 Ibid., pp. 396, 400.
- 73 Ibid., pp. 402, 454.
- 74 Ibid., p. 418.
- 75 Ibid., pp. 402, 412, 454, 463.
- 76 Ibid., p. 407.
- 77 Ibid., pp. 403, 455.
- 78 Ibid., p. 405.
- 79 Ibid., p. 406.
- 80 Ibid., pp. 404, 414.

- 81 Ibid., p. 410.
- 82 Ibid., pp. 414, 406.
- 83 Doyle, Letter to Thomas Spring Rice, Esq., M.P. etc., on the establishment of a legal provision for the Irish poor and on the nature and destination of church property (Dublin and London, 1831); Doyle, S.P.I. evidence, pp. 390-433, 445-464, 1830 (654), viii.
- 84 Doyle, Letter to Spring Rice, pp. 120-121 and passim.
- 85 O'Connell to Doyle, 29 March 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 258-259. This letter is not in the O'Connell Correspondence.
- 86 Nassau William Senior, A letter to Lord Howick on a legal provision for the Irish poor; commutation of tithes and a provision for the Irish Roman Catholic clergy (London, 1831).
- 87 Ibid., p. 6.
- 88 Ibid., pp. 24-25.
- 89 Ibid., p. 26.
- 90 The Rt Rev Dr Doyle's letter on Poor Laws in reply to Mr Senior of London (Dublin, 1831), p. 4. See also p. 10 where Doyle wrote that no man not bred in Ireland and long conversant with all classes could understand the country; 'there are thousands of men otherwise intelligent, who have kept garrison, as it were, in the country, all their lives and who know less of its state than they do of Hindustan'.
- 91 Ibid., p. 5.
- 92 Ibid., p. 8.
- 93 Ibid., p. 9.
- 94 Ibid., p. 10.
- 95 Ibid., p. 11.
- 96 O'Connell to Doyle, 29 March 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), p. 259.
- 97 Angus Macintyre, The Liberator (London, 1965), p. 15. The elections of July-August 1830 and April-May 1831 were fought by O'Connell on a broad anti-tory front.
- 98 D.E.P., 30 April 1831.



- 99 Doyle to Sir John Milley Doyle, dated Braganza, Carlow, 2 May 1831 published in D.E.P., 7 May 1831. O'Connell campaigned in Carlow for Blackney and Doyle.
- 100 Walter Blackney, M.P., and Sir John Milley Doyle, M.P., to E. G. Stanley, Chief Secretary for Ireland, 16 May 1831, true copy in Doyle papers, File 20/1, K.L.D.A.
- 101 Doyle to his niece, Mary, 26 May 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 269.
- 102 Doyle to Parnell, 26 May 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 270-271.
- 103 O'Connell to Doyle, 16 June 1831, File 1831/29, K.L.D.A.
- 104 Ibid.
- 105 Doyle to Parnell, 8 August 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 298.
- 106 Ibid., 10 October 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 303.
- 107 Ibid., 17 October 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 303.
- 108 Doyle to O'Connell, 10 November 1831, File 1831/54, K.L.D.A. This important letter is not in the O'Connell Correspondence.
- 109 Ibid.
- 110 Doyle to Parnell, 23 December 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 305.
- 111 Published in D.E.P., 1 December 1831.
- 112 Ibid.
- 113 Marquis of Anglesey to Doyle, 29 November 1831, File 1831/58, K.L.D.A. For a letter taking a similar view see Lord Duncannon to Doyle, 5 December 1831, File 1831/59, K.L.D.A.
- 114 Pilot, 7 December 1831. See also D.E.P., 6 December 1831 which stated that Doyle's pastoral letter had been denounced sotto voce in holes and corners for his imprimatur on the Lord Lieutenant.
- 115 Doyle to Parnell, 23 December 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 305.
- 116 O'Connell to Doyle, 18 December 1831, File 1831/66, K.L.D.A.

- 117 Doyle to Parnell, 23 December 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 305.
- 118 Doyle's letter was published in D.E.P., 10 January 1832. R. D. Collinson Black has suggested that 'the occasional wavering in O'Connell's opposition to Poor Laws seems mainly to have been due to a desire to conciliate Doyle and his supporters'. See his Economic Thought and the Irish Question 1817-1870 (Cambridge, 1960), p. 101.
- 119 O'Connell's speech at the National Political Union on 12 January replying to Doyle was reported in D.E.P., 14 January 1832.
- 120 D.E.P., 17 January 1832.
- 121 R. D. Collinson Black, Economic Thought and the Irish Question, 1817-1870 (Cambridge, 1960), p. 100.
- 122 Thomas Finn to Bishop Doyle, published in Carlow Standard, 26 January 1832.
- 123 Doyle's attacks on Anglesey and Stanley are discussed in 'Interdenominational Relations' below.
- 124 Doyle to N.A. Vigors, 9 October 1832 published in D.E.P., 13 October 1832.
- 125 D.E.P., 15 September 1832. There is a report of Finn's speech in a letter to the editor from 'An elector of Carlow'. The Carlow Morning Post was apparently being edited at this time by the Rev Daniel Cahill, a Carlow College professor.
- 126 D.E.P., 15 September 1832.
- 127 Carlow Sentinel, 22 September 1832.
- 128 D.E.P., 13 October 1832. The Vigors' family had given many clergymen to the Established Church in Leighlin.
- 129 Daniel O'Connell to Rev Dr Andrew Fitzgerald, President, Carlow College, 24 October 1832, File 1832/29, K.L.D.A. (copy).
- 130 O'Connell to Rev Andrew Fitzgerald, 7 November 1832, File 1832/30, K.L.D.A.
- 131 Malcolmson, Parliamentary Roll, p. 80; Carlow Sentinel, 15 December 1832. Fitzgerald stated that he had an aversion to politics and had not been on a political platform before.
- 132 B. W. Walker (ed.), Parliamentary election results in Ireland, 1801-1922 (Dublin, 1978), p. 51.

- 133 For Bishop Doyle's involvement with the Ponsonby family in Kilkenny see John G. Ponsonby to Doyle, two letters, 10, 11 December 1832, File 1832/31, 32, K.L.D.A. Lord Duncannon to Doyle, 28 December 1832, File 1832/33, K.L.D.A.
- 134 Doyle to Mary Coney, 17 December 1832 quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 406. See especially Doyle to Thomas Wyse, 11 December 1832 and Doyle to Wyse, 26 December 1832 for valuable insights into Doyle's disillusionment with popular politics at this time. Wyse papers 15025 (1), N.L.I.
- 135 Angus Macintyre, The Liberator (London, 1965), pp. 94-95.
- 136 Malcolmson, Parliamentary Roll, pp. 42-43.
- 137 See for example, Bishop Kinsella of Osorry to Rev Paul Cullen, Rector of the Irish College, Rome, of 5 September 1833, from Maynooth: 'Poor Dr Doyle is very ill indeed! I very much fear that he will not be long in this world. He will be a serious loss not only to his Diocese, but to the Irish Church'. Acta, vol. 196, 333.
- 138 Doyle to Henry Lambert, M.P., 1 March 1833 quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 409-410.
- 139 Henry Lambert to Doyle, postmarked 21 December 1833, File 1833/19, K.L.D.A.; Doyle to Lambert, 23 December 1833 quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 429.
- 140 See 'Bishops' Minute Book, 1829-1849', MS in D.D.A. The bishops earnestly recommended to their clergy 'to avoid in future any allusion at their altars to political subjects, and carefully to refrain from connecting themselves with political clubs - or moving or seconding resolutions on such occasions; in order that we exhibit ourselves in all things, in the character of our sacred calling, as Ministers of Christ and dispensers of the Mysteries of God? (ibid.). This aspiration had little impact on the second order clergy in the succeeding decade and was ignored by many of the bishops themselves. One suspects that Doyle had a large say in its passage because of his disillusionment with contemporary O'Connellite politics and his anxiety to withdraw the clergy from support for O'Connell's then current agitation.
- 141 Lambert to Doyle, 6 January 1834, File 1834/1, K.L.D.A.
- 142 Quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 434-435.
- 143 Doyle to Lord Cloncurry, 3 March 1834, quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 437.
- 144 Angus Macintyre, The Liberator (London, 1965), p. 128.

## REFERENCES

### CHAPTER III

- 1 D.E.P., 13 October 1821. Editorial comment in D.E.P., 8 November 1821.
- 2 Ibid., 6 November 1821. Letter dated 2 November 1821 signed 'A Roman Catholic Prelate'.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 D.E.P., 27 December 1821 for fourth letter dated 18 December 1821 of 'A Roman Catholic Prelate'. See also the second and third letters of 'A Roman Catholic Prelate' published in D.E.P., 15 November, 3 December 1821, dated 12 November and 24 November 1821 respectively. Thomas Lewis O'Beirne became bishop of Ossory in 1795 and was translated to Meath in 1798. He was a prominent pamphleteer. In his 1820 pastoral: A charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Meath, 5 October 1820 [Dublin, 1820] Bishop O'Beirne wrote of an 'anti-Christian spirit' actuating the Catholic clergy. This was manifest he claimed in their withholding the word of life, that is the scriptures 'from those over whom they exercise their spiritual tyranny' (see pp. 8-9). O'Beirne exhorted his clergy 'to keep themselves free from fanatacism as from mere formalism . . .' and to remain 'unsecured by the zeal of our sectaries' (see p. 15).
- 5 D.E.P., 29 October 1822; William Magee, A charge delivered at his primary visitation in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin on Thursday the 24th of October 1822 (Dublin, 1822), pp. 21-22.
- 6 D.E.P., 9 November 1822.
- 7 See D.E.P., 7 November 1822 for J.K.L.'s reply dated 29 October 1822. The original of this letter is in Doyle papers, File 18/17, K.L.D.A. This work was published under the title: A letter to His Grace, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin in consequence of unjust animadversions against the Roman Catholic religion by him in a charge to the clergy of his archdiocese, on the 24th of October 1822, in St Patrick's Cathedral (Dublin, 1822).
- 8 See John MacHale, The letters of the Most Reverend John MacHale, D.D. (Dublin, 1847), pp. 92-97.
- 9 For Archbishop Curtis's Letter see D.E.P., 16 November 1822.
- 10 Murray to Doyle, 22 November 1822, File 1822/47, K.L.D.A.
- 11 See Bartholomew Crotty to Doyle, 2 December 1822, File 1822/51, K.L.D.A.

- 12 Murray to Doyle, 22 November 1822, File 1822/47, K.L.D.A. Sir Harcourt Lees's pamphlet was entitled: Theological extracts, selected from a late letter written by a Popish Prelate to His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, with observations on the same: and a well merited [sic] and equally well-applied literary flagellation to the titular shoulders of this mild and humble Minister of the Gospel; with a complete exposure of his friend the Pope, and the entire body of Holy Imposters (Dublin [1822]). An anonymous pro-Protestant writer described the 'effusions' of Sir Harcourt as 'insane'. See One year of the administration of his Excellency the Marquis of Wellesley in Ireland (London, 1823), p. 92.
- 13 Rev Charles Stuart, O.S.A., to Doyle, 11 December 1822, File 1822/55, K.L.D.A.
- 14 D.E.P., 14 December 1822. J.K.L.'s letter was dated 10 December 1822. This letter was published as a pamphlet under the title: Second letter of J.K.L. a Roman Catholic Bishop in reply to the charge with notes of the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1822). Rev Peter Kenney, S.J., of Clongowes Wood pointed out an historical error in Doyle's letter (see his letter to Doyle of 15 December 1822, File 1822/57, K.L.D.A.). J.K.L. corrected the mistake in D.E.P., 17 December 1822.
- 15 D.E.P., 17 December 1822; for one such writer see Rev George Stanley Faber, Remarks on some parts of a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Dublin and ascribed to Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1823).
- 16 See John MacHale, The letters of the Most Reverend John MacHale, D.D. (Dublin, 1847), pp. 98-103.
- 17 Doyle, Pastoral, Nov. 1822, pp. 11-12.
- 18 See J. S. Donnelly, Jr., 'Pastorini and Captain Rock : millenarianism and sectarianism in the Rockite movement of 1821-4' in S. Clark and J. S. Donnelly Jr. (ed.), Irish peasants, violence & political unrest 1780-1914 (Manchester and Madison, 1983), pp. 102-139; Geoffrey Scott, '"The times are fast approaching" Bishop Charles Walmesley, O.S.B. (1771-1797) as prophet' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36 (Oct., 1985), pp. 590-604.
- 19 Evans to Gregory, 3 April 1822 in State of the Country Papers, carton 138, no. 2368/33, S.P.O., Dublin Castle.
- 20 Doyle, Pastoral, Nov. 1822, pp. 15-20.
- 21 Doyle's pastoral was first published in D.E.P., 23 November 1822.
- 22 See Archbishop Curtis's letter in D.E.P., 17 December 1822.

- 23 Milner to Doyle, 28 January 1823, File 30/7 no. 19, D.D.A. Dr Milner was then aged seventy-one and he foresaw that for him it was time 'to exchange books of controversy for ascetical works'. He died in 1826.
- 24 Archbishop le Poer Trench was the outstanding controversial figure in the west of Ireland and President of the Hibernian Bible Society. Richard Mant described the 'abject condition of spiritual darkness and bondage' of the 'Romish communion' in A charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Killaloe at the primary visitation, 3 August 1820 (Dublin, 1820), p. 9. See also p. 25 where he wrote that 'any conscientious and intelligent Minister of our Church' must exert all his influence 'so far as it can prudently and usefully be exerted in extending the knowledge of pure religion, and contracting the sphere of operation of that corrupt system of Christian faith and practice, by which he perceives the people committed to his charge to be peculiarly beset and entangled'. On p. 37 he wrote of 'another mode of correcting error and diffusing a knowledge of true religion; namely, that of making extensive provision for the education of the lower orders of the community'.
- 25 John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe, A charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Limerick, at the primary visitation in the Cathedral Church of St Mary, on Thursday, the 19th of June, 1823 (Dublin, 1823), p. 35.
- 26 Ibid., p. 44. Jebb held as Bishop Woodward had before him that Protestants should allow Roman Catholics the same privilege of private judgement which the founders of Protestantism claimed for themselves. See p. 45.
- 27 Richard Laurence, A charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Cashel and Emly, at the Primary Visitation, in September 1822 (Dublin, 1822), p. 16. See also pp. 28-29. In his primary triennial visitation of the province of Munster in 1823 Dr Laurence remarked that the public mind had an erroneous estimation of the wealth of the Established clergy but that 'the clamour which has been raised and which has been long daily increasing against us' was not always the offspring of malice. As an Englishman, however, Laurence did not feel at home with the Irish peasantry. He stated that the clerical order 'seems principally to prevent the inferior classes from lapsing into a state of absolute barbarism'. For these references see Richard Laurence, A charge delivered at the Primary Triennial Visitation of Munster in the year 1823 (Dublin, 1823), pp. 1-2, 3, 11.
- 28 Doyle, Pastoral, June 1823. This pastoral was published by at least three Dublin printers in separate editions: Battersby, McMullan, Connolly.
- 29 See O'Connell Corr., ii, 491-492.

- 30 Michael Ott, 'Hohenlohe-Waldenburg-Schillingfurst' (1794-1848) in Cath. Ency., vii, 384-385. For alleged Hohenlohe cures see D.E.P., 27 September 1823 and J.K.L., Defence of the Vindication, p. 38 (Case of Miss Clare Mather in England); in America Bishop John England was involved in the celebrated case of Miss Ann Mattingly of Washington. See D.E.P., 27 May 1824.
- 31 D.E.P., 26 July 1823; J.K.L., Defence of the Vindication, p. 24. Miss Lalor was a niece of Rev Jeremiah Lalor, P.P. of Arles who died in 1821.
- 32 The Doyle-Hohenlohe correspondence was published as an appendix to the pastoral letter authenticating the miracle. See Pastoral, June 1823, pp. 9-13.
- 33 Ibid., pp. 14-16 for Rev O'Connor's letter to Bishop Doyle. For the passage quoted see p. 16.
- 34 Doyle, Pastoral, June 1823, pp. 3-4.
- 35 Ibid., p. 5. A defence by the Rev. Nicholas O'Connor, P.P. Maryborough, was published by the ultra-Catholic publisher and printer W. J. Battersby under the title: Error silenced and infidelity confuted; or a defence of the miraculous cure of Miss M. Lalor, containing seven affidavits in confirmation of it, with a letter from Mr P. Lalor to Doctor Smith (Dublin 1823).
- 36 See S.N. [Rev Charles Richard Elrington, F.T.C.D.], Miscellaneous observations on J.K.L.'s letter to the Marquess Wellesley; on tracts and topics by E. Barton and on the letter to Mr Abercrombie by - (Dublin, 1824) pp. 81-82.
- 37 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, pp. 246-247, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 38 Daniel O'Connell to Doyle, 1 August 1823, File 1823/38, K.L.D.A.; for another Hohenlohe miracle see O'Connell to Mary O'Connell, 14 [and 19] December 1823 in O'Connell Corr., ii, 527. See also Myles V. Ronan, An apostle of Catholic Dublin - Father Henry Young (Dublin, 1944), pp. 102-109. Henry Young was also in correspondence with Prince Hohenlohe.
- 39 Archbishop Murray's pastoral was published in D.E.P., 19 August 1823. It was published by at least four different Dublin printers, Grace, Gannon, McMullan, Coyne, under the title: Daniel Murray, D.D., etc. etc., A pastoral address to the Catholic clergy and laity of the diocese of Dublin announcing the miraculous cure of Mrs Mary Stuart, a religieuse of St Joseph, Ranelagh with certificates of Dr Mills, Dr Cheyne, Surgeon McNamara, and a general statement of three medical gentlemen; with the certificate of Mr Wm Madden, Apothecary; together with the affidavits of Mrs Mary Stuart, Mrs Ann Stuart, Catherine Hosey, Mrs. Margaret Dillon, Mrs Margaret Lynch, Rev John Meagher, and Rev Charles Stuart (Dublin, 1823).

- 40 See D.E.P., 2, 4 September 1823; J.K.L. Defence of the Vindication, p. 25.
- 41 Rev J. O'Connor, S.J., to Doyle, 13 September 1823, File 1823/42, K.L.D.A. Prince Hohenlohe appointed 2 and 10 October 1823 as days on which he would pray for the woman's full recovery. The outcome is not known. See Rev J. O'Connor, S.J., to Doyle, 19 September 1823, File 1823/43, K.L.D.A. 'A Protestant of Celbridge' challenged the facts of Ms Scully's recovery in Important exposure of another miracle in Co. Kildare (Dublin, 1823), first published in Dublin Evening Mail on 8 September 1823. This writer, apparently the Protestant clergyman of Celbridge, acknowledged the huge public interest in the case. See p. 4: 'It is no exaggeration, we understand, to say, that the whole population of the country, for miles around, are in motion to witness this favoured being'. The Rev James Callanan, a Catholic priest of Celbridge, justifying his own conduct denied that he had promised that there would be miracles at his Mass on 1 September. See Letter from the Rev James Callanan of Celbridge to the Right Honourable Lord Cloncurry (Dublin, 1823), passim. Callanan, p. 5 stated that the Dublin Evening Mail reports had 'found their way into the work-shops of the Factory of this town, where the contents were bellowed into the ears of the Catholic workers; and the peace of that establishment in some instances being threatened with danger'. He accused the Protestant clergyman of Celbridge (p. 7) of distributing 'more money to increase the number of his adherents than I do'. But he allowed (p. 10) that 'no cure took place' and that there had been many false reports. For a lengthy and hostile account of the alleged Celbridge miracles consult the second edition of the anonymous Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant professing to be A Vindiation of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Roman Catholics of Ireland (London, 1824). The writer was evidently a parson residing on the north Kildare-Dublin border. Celbridge is in the diocese of Dublin but adjacent to Kildare and Leighlin diocese.
- 42 Rev J. O'Connor, S.J., to Doyle, 19 September 1823, File 1823/43, K.L.D.A.
- 43 Annals, unpaginated, Presentation Convent, Carlow. Correspondence between Bishop Doyle and Prince Hohenlohe was not confined to the Lalor case. See Hohenlohe to Doyle, 26 August 1823, File 1823/41, K.L.D.A. and Doyle to Hohenlohe, 27 February 1824, File 1824/9, K.L.D.A. The Annals, pp. 55-56, of the Presentation Convent, Maryborough, record a cure effected by the prayers of Prince Hohenlohe on 12, 15, 20, 21, 30 August 1829 and another on 17, 25 January 1830. For alleged cures in the convents of the Discalced Carmelites in Dublin, again through Hohenlohe's intercession in 1824 and 1833 see John Kingston, 'The Carmelite nuns in Dublin, 1644-1829' in Reportorium Novum, III, no. 2 (1964), p. 358.



- 44 J.K.L., Vindication, p. 43. Doyle's statement occasioned one Protestant writer to observe rhetorically: 'Miracles are performed but they are not to be published. Where would Christianity be at the present day if the Apostles had acted on this principle?'. This writer continued: 'This is certainly a love of peace to an extreme for which J.K.L. cannot be accused in any other part of his pamphlet. How must Lord Wellesley be flattered and obliged by having the honour of God thus postponed to the convenience of his administration! How grateful should Protestants feel for this considerable suppression of what they must have felt as the death warrant to their system?'. See Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant professing to be A Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Roman Catholics of Ireland (Dublin, 1823), pp. 56-57.
- 45 J.K.L., Defence of the Vindication, p. 28.
- 46 Curtis to Murray, 20 August 1823, File 30/7, no. 12, D.D.A.
- 47 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 247, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 48 See Miracle said to have been wrought by Prince Hohenlohe in Ireland on Monday, the 9th of June, 1823 (London, 1823), pp. iv-v.
- 49 A clergyman of the Established Church, A letter to the Most Rev Dr Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and to the Right Rev Dr Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare, on the subject of their pastoral addresses and the alleged miracles (Dublin, 1823), pp. 22-23. This work is not to be confused with another anonymous tract bearing the same pseudonym: A clergyman of the Established Church, An address to the Protestant gentry of Ireland, being an answer to the letter to the Lord Lieutenant by J.K.L. (Dublin, 1823). This pamphlet was signed Clericus, Carlow, 30 November 1823.
- 50 [Rev Dr William Phelan] Miracles Mooted, an inquiry into the nature and object of Miracles, generally, and of the recent Irish miracles in particular, with observations on the pastoral address of the Most Rev Dr Murray to the Catholic clergy and laity of Dublin, announcing 'the miraculous cure of Mrs Mary Stuart, a religieuse of the convent of St Joseph, Ranelagh' (Dublin, 1823), p. 17.
- 51 [Rev Alexander Carson, A.M.] Remarks on the late miracle; in a letter to Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1823), p. 22.
- 52 Rev George Stanley Faber, B.D., Remarks on the recent miracles said to have been performed by Prince Alexander of Hohenlohe (Dublin, 1823), p. 2.

- 53 Rev Joseph Finlayson, A.M., The voice of facts from the Convent of St Joseph, Ranelagh, Dublin (Edinburgh and London, 1824), p. 108. Finlayson (p. 97) noted a difference in style between the pastorals of Bishop Doyle and Archbishop Murray: 'Towards the conclusion of Dr Doyle's address, there appeared a keenness of expression, a bitterness of feeling, and a strong allusion to [the] political situation, which could not fail to incur severe reprehension. Perceiving this, Dr Murray, in his address, is very smooth and insinuating . . . '.
- 54 Rev Robert Daly, Rector of Powerscourt, A sermon on the Scripture doctrine of miracles preached on Sunday, the 21st of September, 1823, in the Church of Bray, and on Sunday the 28th in the Church of Powerscourt (Dublin, 1823); Rev C. Otway, Curate of Lucan, A lecture on miracles delivered in the Parish Church of Saint James, on Wednesday, the 17th of September (Dublin, 1823); see also Rev Charles Bardin, A. M., Curate of St Mary's Parish, On Miracles. A sermon preached in Saint Mary's Church, Dublin on the 21st and 28th September 1823 (Dublin, 1823).
- 55 E. Barton, Miracles, A Rhapsody (London, 1823); E. Barton, Apologetic Postscript to the Rhapsody (Dublin, 1823); [E. Barton] Recent scenes and occurrences in Ireland or animadversions on a pamphlet entitled 'One year of the administration of the Marquess Wellesley' in a letter to a friend in England (2nd ed., London, 1823). This was a response to a clever apologia for Orangeism. See also E. Barton, Irish tracts and topics; a soliloquy 'part the first' (Dublin, 1824).
- 56 Arthur Jacob, M.D., An essay on the influence of the imagination and passions in the production and cure of diseases; to which is added, a translation of a memoir by Dr C. Ffeufer, superintending physician of the General Hospital at Bamberg, on the cures performed by the operations of the Prince de Hohenlohe (Dublin, 1823), pp. iii-iv. The essential part of Jacob's essay is his statement (p. iii) 'that the power of the imagination and passions extensively influence the ordinary operations of the animal economy; and that the same influence is not only capable of producing diseases but of contributing to their removal'.
- 57 'A Physician', An attempt to explain on natural principles, the cures alleged to be miraculous, of Miss Lalor and Mrs Stuart (Dublin, 1823), pp. 8-9, 3.
- 58 Joseph Joy Magee, M.D., A letter to Doctor Cheyne, on the extraordinary cure of Mrs Stuart, of Ranelagh Convent, in which is included a reply to a Pamphlet, entitled an attempt to explain on natural principles, the cures alleged to be miraculous of Miss Lalor and Mrs Stuart, by a physician (Dublin, 1823), pp. 3, 6-7, 13-14.

- 59 Edward Sheridan, M.D., Dr Cheyne refuted. The cure of Mrs Stuart proved to be miraculous in reply to Dr Cheyne, with Dr Calonne's challenge to him (Dublin, 1823), pp. 9, 6.
- 60 Canons and decrees of the sacred and ecumenical Council of Trent celebrated under the Sovereign pontiffs, Paul III, Julius III and Paul IV (London [1848?]), translated by Rev J. Waterworth, sess. XXV, on the invocation, veneration, and relics of saints, and on sacred images.
- 61 J.K.L., Vindication, p. 9.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Ibid., pp. 30-31.
- 64 Ibid., p. 33.
- 65 Ibid., p. 39.
- 66 Ibid., p. 40.
- 67 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
- 68 Ibid., pp. 14, 6, 45-46.
- 69 Ibid., p. 46.
- 70 Ibid.
- 71 Ibid., p. 49; see Dr Milner to Doyle, 15 November 1823, File 1823/55, K.L.D.A.
- 72 A Rational Christian, A complete exposure of the late Irish miracles being a disquisition on the nature, object, and evidence of Christian miracles, as opposed to the late imposture, in a letter to Doctor Murray, Titular Archbishop of Dublin, to which are prefixed remarks on two recent pamphlets, the 'Rhapsody' and the 'Vindication of the Principles, Civil and Religious, of the Irish Catholics' (2cd ed., Dublin, 1823). This work was said to have been written by a member of the Irish Bar. See the response of 'E. Barton' to this work in Apologetic Postscript to the Rhapsody (Dublin, 1823). See also the pro-Catholic anonymous work entitled Observations on the late miracles and a short reply to a Pamphlet entitled a Complete Exposure of the late Irish miracles (Cork, 1824).
- 73 Declan, The case of the Church of Ireland stated in a letter respectfully addressed to His Excellency, the Marquess Wellesley and in reply to the charges of J.K.L. (Dublin, 1823), p. 82.
- 74 Ibid., p. 45.

- 75 Ibid.
- 76 Ibid., pp. 79-80.
- 77 [Anonymous] Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant professing to be a Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Roman Catholics of Ireland (Dublin, 1823), p. 1. This work was dedicated to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, Henry Goulburn, a staunch defender of the 'Protestant' constitution.
- 78 Ibid., p. 2.
- 79 Ibid., p. 38.
- 80 Ibid., pp. 80-81 in particular.
- 81 [Rev Alexander Carson] Strictures on the letter of J.K.L. entitled A Vindication of the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics; addressed to His Excellency the Marquess Wellesley, K.G., Lord Lieutenant General, and General Governor of Ireland, etc., etc., in a letter to the same Nobleman by the author of 'Remarks on the late miracle, in a letter to Bishop Doyle' (Dublin, 1823), p. 24. See also p. 7: 'that the strongly marked features of the beast are all found in the Church of Rome, is as clear as that God made the heavens and the earth'.
- 82 Ibid., p. 4.
- 83 S.N., Miscellaneous observations on J.K.L.'s letter to the Marquess Wellesley; on tracts and topics by E. Barton and on the letter to Mr Abercrombie by - (Dublin, 1824), p. 80.
- 84 Ibid., p. 12.
- 85 Ibid., p. 13; 'it is upon the declared hostility to the present Establishment of the Church in Ireland, that the objection to giving J.K.L. and those who hold similar opinions, any increase of political power is founded'.
- 86 J.K.L., Defence of the Vindication, p., 52.
- 87 Ibid., p. 64.
- 88 Ibid., pp. 10-11, 77.
- 89 Ibid., p. 115.
- 90 Ibid., passim.
- 91 [Anonymous] Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant professing to be A Vindication of the Religious and Civil Principles of the Roman Catholics of Ireland (2cd ed., London, 1824), p. iii.

- 92 Ibid., p. i.
- 93 Declan, The case of the Church of Ireland stated, in a letter respectfully addressed to His Excellency the Marquess Wellesley, and in reply to the charges of J.K.L. (2cd. ed., Dublin, 1824), p. v.
- 94 [Declan] The case of the Church of Ireland stated in a second letter respectfully addressed to His Excellency the Marquess Wellesley and in reply to the charges of J.K.L. (Dublin, 1824).
- 95 A Munster Farmer, A letter to the Hon Pierce Somerset Butler, occasioned by his speech at the Lisdowney meeting on the subject of tithe, together with observations on J.K.L.'s Defence of his Vindication (Dublin, 1824).
- 96 D.E.P., 9 September 1823.
- 97 Ibid., 23 September 1823.
- 98 Ibid., 4 November 1823.
- 99 Ibid., 13 April 1824.
- 100 Ibid., 24 April 1824.
- 101 Ibid., 27 May 1824.
- 102 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, pp. 181-183; H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173; see also J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland, pp. 28-32.
- 103 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 182, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 104 Ibid., p. 220; *ibid.*, p. 247, H.L. 1825 (181), ix 1.
- 105 Ibid., p. 182, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 106 Thomas Spring Rice to Murray, 6 February 1828, File 30/11 no. 1, D.D.A.
- 107 Thomas Wyse to Doyle, 20 November 1830, File 1830/46, K.L.D.A.
- 108 See Thomas G. McGrath, 'Interdenominational relations in pre-famine Tipperary' in Wm Nolan and T. G. McGrath (ed.), Tipperary: History and Society (Dublin, 1985), pp. 260-261.
- 109 Doyle et al., Letters on a re-union of the churches, p. 1.
- 110 Ibid., pp. 3-5.
- 111 Ibid., pp. 8-9.

- 112 Ibid., p. 9.
- 113 Ibid., pp. 12-18; Thomas Newenham to Doyle, 7 June 1824.
- 114 Doyle to Thomas Newenham, 14 June 1824 in Doyle et al., Letters on a re-union of the churches, pp. 20-21.
- 115 Doyle et al., Letters on a re-union of the churches, pp. 21-22: Newenham to Doyle, 22 June 1824.
- 116 Doyle to Newenham, 29 June 1824 in op. cit., pp. 23-25.
- 117 Alexander Knox to Thomas Newenham, 7 July 1824 in op. cit., pp. 26-31 at p. 31.
- 118 Offellus Hibernus Catholicus, An answer to Doctor Doyle; the sapient J. Robertson, M.P. and the College of Conciliators, who are busy at present agitating the Union of the Churches (Dublin, 1824). This work attacked the Catholic sacraments and the Mass and referred throughout to Bishop Doyle as 'Mr Doyle'.
- 119 A member of the Established Church, Observations on Bishop Doyle's letter to a member of Parliament (Cork, 1824), p. 1.
- 120 A Christian Priest, What is truth? or, Real Conciliation and Union (Dublin, 1824). See preface dedicated to the Right Reverend Dr Doyle which also noted that his offer to resign his see to further the union of the churches was proof of his 'sincerity'.
- 121 [Biblio-pistos] A letter addressed to the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle, R.C.B. on his proposal for uniting the Churches of England and Rome (Dublin, 1824), pp. 5, 12-13.
- 122 Selskar, Remarks on Doctor Doyle's letter, addressed to - Robertson, Esq., M.P. (Dublin, 1824), p. 34. In some ways this was the most interesting Protestant response.
- 123 D.E.P., 14 September 1824.
- 124 Ibid. The manuscript of this important dialogue is in Doyle papers, File 18/20, K.L.D.A.
- 125 See Doyle to Rev Jeremiah Donovan [late May/early June 1824] quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), i, 250.
- 126 D.E.P., 19 August 1824 for long letter from Curtis on the controversy; see also Curtis to Murray, 18 August 1824 in File 30/8 no. 18, D.D.A.
- 127 Curtis to Doyle, 30 September 1824, File 1824/66, K.L.D.A.

- 128 J.K.L., Letters on the state of Education in Ireland; and on Bible Societies addressed to a friend in England (Dublin, 1824), p. 8. This work is discussed in 'Education' section below.
- 129 Ibid., p. 39.
- 130 Ibid., pp. 40-41.
- 131 D.E.P., 14 October 1824 (Bishop Murphy); ibid., 2 November 1824 (Bishop Kelly).
- 132 Ibid., 27 November 1824.
- 133 Ibid., 13 November 1824, for Carrick-on-Shannon meeting; Curtis to Doyle, 17 November 1824, File 1824/74, K.L.D.A.
- 134 Rev William Kinsella to Carlow Bible Society, D.E.P., 23 November 1824.
- 135 The editor of the Dublin Evening Post suggested to Doyle that authorised statements of the proceedings of the Bible debate should be sent to his paper. See F. W. Conway to Doyle, 19 November 1824, File 1824/75, K.L.D.A. The D.E.P., devoted almost a full issue to the subject on 23 November 1824, continued it on 25 November and concluded its coverage with a general supplement on 27 November. The debate was published in book or pamphlet form in both Ireland and England: Report of the discussion at the Carlow Bible Meeting, on Thursday, the 18th, and Friday, the 19th of November, 1824, with the speeches of the Reverend Gentlemen who took a part in the proceedings, revised and authenticated by themselves (Dublin, 1824). The correspondence between Daly and Clowry after the debate which was published in the Carlow Morning Post, copies of which are no longer extant, was published as a supplement in A report of the discussion on the bible which took place at Carlow, in Ireland between Catholic and Protestant clergymen, on the 18th of November 1824, and following day at the Presbyterian Meeting house in that town (London [1824]).
- 136 D.E.P., 23 November 1824.
- 137 Ibid., 25 November 1824.
- 138 Ibid., 23 November 1824.

- 139 See D.E.P., 25, 27 November 1824. See also D.E.P., 30 November 1824 for Robert Daly's letter dated Powerscourt, 22 November 1824. See also letter to D.E.P., 2 December 1824 from William Kinsella, dated Carlow, 20 November 1824 and the letter from William Clowry to R. Daly in D.E.P., 24 December 1824 dated Tullow, 11 December 1824. D.E.P., 4 December 1824: O'Connell proposed that the Catholic Association should counter the activities of the biblicals by sending Catholic missionaries to England. This would soon convince the English people of the real character of the Irish priesthood. To loud and continued cheering he proposed that Bishop Doyle should lead the missionaries.
- 140 The Encyclical letter of Pope Leo the XII with English translation to which are annexed the Pastoral Instructions by the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops to the clergy and laity of their communion throughout Ireland (Dublin, 1824), p. 54.
- 141 Ibid.
- 142 Ibid.
- 143 Ibid., pp. 55-56.
- 144 Ibid., pp. 57-59.
- 145 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, pp. 237-238, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 146 Doyle to Murray, 16 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 147 Curtis to Doyle, 30 December 1824, File 1824/77, K.L.D.A.
- 148 This pastoral, to which the names of the entire hierarchy were appended was probably written by Bishop Doyle, or at least so it would seem from Curtis's letter. For Archbishop Murray's attitude to Bible-reading see Murray to Doyle, 3 December 1822, File 1822/52, K.L.D.A. Therein Murray wrote of the publisher Richard Coyne's request to reprint Challoner's Morality of the Bible. Murray asked Doyle to accede to Coyne's request to make any corrections Challoner's work stood in need of before it went to press. He further commented: 'It is thought that the book, if introduced into our schools, would tend to protect us from some of the aspersions of the Biblemongers [my emphasis]. Mr. Spring Rice thinks that it would be a ready answer to all their objections founded on our disinclination to admit the bible as a schoolbook'.
- 149 See The nineteenth report of the Hibernian Bible Society adopted at the annual general meeting of the Society held in the Rotunda, Dublin, on the 14th of April 1825, with an appendix (Dublin, 1825), passim.
- 150 Ibid.



- 151 Ibid., p. xxv.
- 152 Ibid., p. xxi.
- 153 Ibid.
- 154 The twenty-first report of the Hibernian Bible Society, adopted by the annual general meeting of the Society, held in the Rotunda, Dublin, on the 26th of April 1827 with an appendix (Dublin, 1827), pp. xxiv, xxvi.
- 155 D.E.P., 30 July 1825. For the background to the meeting see the correspondence between the Rev Terence O'Connell, C.C., Carlow and the Rev R. Fishbourne, Secretary, Carlow Bible Society and the letter from the Catholic clergy in the Carlow Morning Post, 28 July 1825 in The advance and retreat of the Roman Catholic priests at Carlow (Dublin, 1825), pp. 5-10.
- 156 D.E.P., 13 August 1825.
- 157 Ibid., 18 August 1825 includes a letter from William Kinsella to the Rev Dr Singer, dated Carlow, 16 August 1825 in reply to his letter in the Weekly Register.
- 158 Ibid., 20 August 1825 published a letter from Rev William Clowry to Rev George Hamilton. Clowry was engaged in public correspondence with Dr Singer and he informed Hamilton that he was too busy in his parish in Tullow to reply to more than one correspondent at a time. See also William Clowry, Controversial letters in reply to Rev Mr Daly, Rev Dr Singer, etc. etc., to which are added the letters signed B.E. (Dublin, 1827).
- 159 Ibid., 25 August 1825; see The advance and retreat of the Roman Catholic priests at Carlow (Dublin, 1825), pp. 13-17.
- 160 Ibid.
- 161 Ibid., 30 August 1825; the original letter is found in Doyle papers, File 18/22, K.L.D.A.
- 162 Ibid.
- 163 Letter from Rev Robert Daly to Doyle, dated 5 September 1825, was published in D.E.P., 8 September 1825. This letter included en passant the following remark: 'I have seen, in the last year, the prints of Prince Hohenlohe and Dr Doyle, ornamenting the wall, and a disappointed cripple occupying the chimney corner of a cabin whilst the blushing owner declared she never believed that her church could make the cripple walk'.

- 164 Patrick McSweeney's letter (Carlow, 29 August 1825) challenging Wingfield, Daly etc., is in D.E.P., 15 September 1825. Rev William Kinsella's newspaper disputations at this time formed the text of his book Controversial letters, in reply to Rev Mr Pope, Rev Mr Daly, Rev Dr Singer and others (Dublin, 1826).
- 165 D.E.P., 24 September 1825.
- 166 See Rev P. McSweeney to Doyle, postmarked 30 September 1825 in File 1825/37, K.L.D.A. McSweeney wanted to know from Doyle if he had 'done wrong'. He explained that he 'was induced by motives so powerful that I could scarcely resist them' namely the biblicals' claim of triumph in the English press because of the failure of the Carlow priests to meet them. McSweeney's challenge appeared in D.E.P., 1 October 1825.
- 167 Curtis to Doyle, 2 October 1825, File 1825/38, K.L.D.A.
- 168 D.E.P., 6, 8, 20 October 1825.
- 169 See ibid., 16 May 1826 (Daly to O'Connell), 20 May 1826 ('B.E.'), 23 May 1826 (O'Connell to Daly), 1 June 1826 (Daly to O'Connell), 8 June 1826 ('B.E.'), 15 June 1826 (Daly to O'Connell). The letters of 'B.E.' were published as an appendix in Rev William Clowry, Controversial letters in reply to Rev Mr Daly, Rev Dr Singer, etc. etc., to which are added the letters signed B.E. (Dublin, 1827), pp. 154-193.
- 170 Ibid., 23 December 1826. The biblical threat was strongest where the Catholic Church was weakest wrote Curtis to Propaganda Fide, 12 March 1827 in Scrittura, vol. 24, 827. See also Scrittura, vol. 24, 809 (for County Clare).
- 171 Erne Packet, 2, 23 November, 14 December 1826 quoted in Donal A. Kerr, 'James Browne, Bishop of Kilmore, 1829-1865' in Breifne, vol. vi, no. 22 (1983-84), p. 122.
- 172 Report of the speeches delivered at the late Reformation meeting held at Cavan, on Friday, the 26th day of January 1827, by the Rt Hon The Earl of Farnham, Henry Maxwell, Esq., M.P., Rev J. Collins, Rev W. Athill, Rev R. T. Pope, J. E. Gordon, Esq., etc., etc., etc., giving a full development of the rise and progress of the Reformation now going forward throughout Ireland (Dublin, 1827), pp. 1-6.
- 173 Donal A. Kerr, 'James Browne, Bishop of Kilmore', pp. 123-124.
- 174 Acta, vol. 190 at 163 for Curtis on Doyle and McSweeney or how the latter lost Kilmore.
- 175 Doyle's circular letter was published in D.E.P., 30 December 1826.
- 176 Rev John Lawlor, P.P., Allen, to Doyle, 6 February 1827, File 1827/13, K.L.D.A.

- 177 Rev Nicholas O'Connor, P.P., Maryborough, to Doyle, 26 February 1827, File 1827/31, K.L.D.A.
- 178 Rev William Clowry, Administrator, Tullow, to Doyle, 16 February 1827, File 1827/18, K.L.D.A.
- 179 Rev Francis Haly, P.P., Kilcock, to Doyle, 22 February 1827, File 1827/29, K.L.D.A.
- 180 Rev Patrick Kehoe, Administrator, Graiguenamanagh, to Doyle, 14 February 1827, File 1827/17, K.L.D.A.
- 181 Rev Laurence Cummins, P.P., Myshall, to Doyle, 2 February 1827, File 1827/12, K.L.D.A.
- 182 See letter from Rev James Maher, C.C., Carlow, dated 30 January 1827 on the progress of the New Reformation in D.E.P., 1 February 1827.
- 183 Doyle, Tithe evidence, p. 336, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xi, 245.
- 184 D.E.P., 8 March 1827. Letter from Rev William Kinsella to Editor.
- 185 William Crollly to Doyle, 10 February 1827. This remark of Dr Crollly's contrasts singularly with the ecumenical occasion which marked his elevation to the bishopric of Down and Connor less than two years earlier. The Northern Whig reported that 250 guests had celebrated Dr Crollly's elevation at Wards Hotel in Belfast. Dr Curtis the primate was present. Toasted were Dr Mant and the Protestant clergy of Down and Connor; Rev McEwen and the Presbyterian clergy of Down and Antrim (Rev McEwen returned thanks); Rev Dr Hanna and the Synod of Ulster; Rev Dr Bruce and the Presbytery of Antrim; Rev McCan and the seceding Synod of Ulster (Rev McCan returned thanks and claimed that the seceders were not inimical to emancipation as generally supposed). Dr Crollly in his speech stated: 'If there should be any Priest tainted by narrow and gross prejudice, I shall send him for his cure to inhale the liberal atmosphere of Belfast'; '... Belfast might well be counted the most liberal and charitable town in any part of Europe'. Quoted in D.E.P., 7 May 1825.
- 186 Kyran Marum to Doyle, 27 January 1827, File 1827/7, K.L.D.A. Marum informed Doyle that the crusade with its biblical orators had also commenced in Kilkenny 'as yet, without any success'. Marum had spoken out 'publicly and strongly' firstly to deter 'our people' from yielding to the 'absurd and criminal curiosity' which prompted Catholics to attend the preaching of the biblicals and secondly 'to expose the real objects which the preachers have in view, under the pretence of benevolence, and zeal for the propagation of truth'. The bishop of Ossory had some idea of delivering a series of controversial lectures on Sundays whilst the biblicals were in Kilkenny 'yet, I am rather inclined to think, that this measure would be

inexpedient; that it would raise these men to a degree of importance and consideration with the Public, which they would not otherwise, attain; and particularly that it would produce a violent public excitement, and an exasperation amongst our own sensitive people, which might, very naturally lead to outrage, and violation of the law'. He sought Doyle's opinion and undertook to be guided by it.

- 187 The Pastoral address of the Catholic bishops of the province of Connaught lately assembled in Tuam, to their clergy (Castlebar and Sligo, 1827), p. 3. This pastoral was dated 1 May 1827.
- 188 Hansard, xvi, 1261 (19 March 1827).
- 189 Doyle Sermon on 'Christian Purity' in Doyle Manuscript Sermons, no. 8, K.L.D.A.
- 190 D.E.P., 1 February 1827.
- 191 Ibid., 3 February 1827; Report of the speeches delivered at the late Reformation meeting held at Cavan, on Friday, the 26th day of January, 1827, by the Rt Hon The Earl of Farnham, Henry Maxwell, Esq., M.P., Rev J. Collins, Rev W. Athill, Rev R. T. Pope, J. E. Gordon, Esq., etc., etc., etc., giving a full development of the rise and progress of the Reformation now going forward throughout Ireland (Dublin, 1827). For MacHale's response to Lord Farnham see D.E.P., 15 February, 1 March 1827; John MacHale, The letters of the Most Rev John MacHale, D.D. (Dublin, 1847), pp. 163-172.
- 192 D.E.P., 8 February 1827; J.K.L., Letter to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827). For Protestant replies to J.K.L. see Rev C. Otway, A letter to J.K.L. on the subject of his reply to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827) and the anonymous To J.K.L. on his Letter to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827).
- 193 Rev John Dunne, P.P., Portarlinton, to Doyle, 19 February 1827, File 1827/22, K.L.D.A.
- 194 Rev John Lawlor, P.P., Allen, to Doyle, 6 February 1827, File 1827/13, K.L.D.A.
- 195 Rev Patrick Kehoe, Administrator, Graiguenamanagh, to Doyle, 14 February 1827, File 1827/17, K.L.D.A.
- 196 Rev Malachy McMahon, P.P., Suncroft, to Doyle, 20 February 1827, File 1827/26, K.L.D.A.
- 197 Rev James Kinsella, P.P., Killeigh, to Doyle, 26 February 1827, File 1827/30, K.L.D.A.
- 198 Rev Maurice Kearney, Administrator, Clane, to Doyle, 13 February 1827, File 1827/16, K.L.D.A.
- 199 See Battersby, Doyle, p. 246; Patrick J. Corish, The Irish Catholic Experience (Dublin, 1985), p. 172.

- 200 First report of the Catholic Book Society (Dublin [1828]), pp. 5, 9, 12.
- 201 Kelly to Murray, 27 February 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 202 Egan to Murray, 23 February 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 203 Ffrench to Murray, 27 February 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 204 Coen to Murray, 2 March 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 205 O'Shaughnessy to Murray, 25 February 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 206 J.K.L., A reply by J.K.L. to the late Charge of the Most Rev Doctor Magee, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin submitted most respectfully to whom the above charge was addressed (Dublin, 1827); William Magee, D.D., F.R.S., M.R.I.A., etc., Archbishop of Dublin, A Charge delivered at his triennial and metropolitan visitation in St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on Tuesday the 10th of October, 1826 (Dublin, 1827).
- 207 A reply by J.K.L. to the late Charge of the Most Rev Doctor Magee, p. 4.
- 208 Ibid., pp. 4-57. Doyle did not treat of Magee's Charge until p. 57 of his Reply.
- 209 Ibid., p. 58.
- 210 Ibid., pp. 72, 78, 86.
- 211 Ibid., p. 87.
- 212 Ibid., p. 105. Doyle was probably here referring to Archbishop Richard Laurence's Charge delivered at the Triennial Visitation of the province of Munster in the year 1826 (Dublin, 1826). In direct contrast to Dr Magee, Laurence's irenical charge pointed out some home truths to his suffragans and clergy. Dr Laurence considered the likely consequences of the Protestant mission to Irish Catholics and asked tellingly: 'Can you flatter yourselves that you could gain a single proselyte?' (p. 12). He allowed that his clergy could carry on the project of private conversions 'temperately as well as firmly' but warned that the Catholic Church was entitled to do the same: '... in this age of unrestricted toleration, would not the clergy of the Church of Rome have the same right, both in reason and in law, to tamper with the faith of Protestants, as you have to tamper with the faith of Roman Catholics?' (p. 13). The denominations, stated the archbishop, should live together as 'brethren and be kindly affectionate one to another; satisfied that we are all worshippers of the same salvation' (pp. 23-24). Laurence concluded this ecumenical charge which ran directly counter to the New Reformation as follows: 'Upon points of faith, where we cannot agree, let us differ in Christian meekness and charity; neither conferring liberality to our own conception of right and wrong, nor excluding from salvation all, who reject the peculiar creed, to which we are attached' (p. 24).

- 213 A reply by J.K.L. to the late charge of the Most Rev Doctor Magee, p. 97.
- 214 Ibid., pp. 89-90. Charles Richard Elrington, D.D., F.T.C.D., called this aspect of Doyle's Reply 'one of the most unworthy artifices in the whole pamphlet' . . . 'got up for the purpose of vilifying the prelates of the Established Church'. See his Remarks upon the reply of J.K.L. to the charge of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1827), p. 84. Elrington acknowledged Doyle as 'this redoubted champion of the Romish Church'. 'The high character, J.K.L. has as a theologian, the fame he enjoys as a controversialist, render it peculiarly dangerous to leave any writing of his that may be injurious (and which is not?) unanswered' (p. 5). Elrington's pamphlet of 104 pages was one of the best and most sustained of all Protestant replies to J.K.L.'s works.
- 215 A reply by J.K.L. to the late charge of the Most Rev Doctor Magee, p. 101.
- 216 Ibid., Appendix 1, i-xx; Appendix 2, Extract from the Dublin Weekly Register, 4 November 1826, xxi-xxxvi.
- 217 J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland, pp. 72-74.
- 218 Rev M. P. Malone, P.P., Mountrath, to Doyle, 19 February 1827, File 1827/21, K.L.D.A.
- 219 Rev James Delany, P.P., Ballinakill, to Doyle, 18 February 1827, File 1827/20, K.L.D.A.
- 220 Rev John Lawlor, P.P., Allen, to Doyle, 6 February 1827, File 1827/13, K.L.D.A.
- 221 See Rev J. Maher, Leighlinbridge, to Doyle, 30 January 1827, File 1827/8, K.L.D.A. and Rev Thomas Nolan, P.P., Kill, to Doyle, 5 March 1827, File 1827/34, K.L.D.A.
- 222 Rev Edward Earle, P.P., Carbury, to Doyle, 19 February 1827, File 1827/23, K.L.D.A.
- 223 Even in Belfast converts to Catholicism were being made. Early in 1827 Bishop Crolly baptised more than twenty adults. See Crolly to Doyle, 10 February 1827, File 1827/15, K.L.D.A.
- 224 D.E.P., 1 February 1827.
- 225 Doyle to Rev Martin Doyle, P.P., Clonegal, 2 February 1827, File 1827/10, K.L.D.A.
- 226 See Bishop Doyle's letter in D.E.P., 17 March 1827.
- 227 Unpublished Doyle manuscript, dated Carlow, 23 November 1827, p. 13 in Doyle papers, File 19/18, K.L.D.A.; for an entirely different version see D.E.P., 27 November 1827.

- 228 Ibid., pp. 13-14.
- 229 Thomas Elrington, A charge delivered at the visitation of Thomas Elrington, D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, in June 1827 and published at the request of the clergy of the United Dioceses (Dublin, 1827); James Doyle, Strictures on the charge of Dr Elrington to his clergy (Dublin, 1827).
- 230 Doyle, Strictures on the charge of Dr Elrington to his clergy, p. 14.
- 231 Ibid., p. 10.
- 232 Elrington, A charge delivered at the visitation of Thomas Elrington . . . in June 1827, p. 35 fn. 7.
- 233 Doyle, Strictures on the charge of Dr Elrington to his clergy, p. 22.
- 234 Ibid., p. 23.
- 235 F. W. Conway to Doyle, 1 November 1827, File 1827/61, K.L.D.A.
- 236 Murray to Doyle, postmarked 1 November 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 237 See Appendix to the Bishop of Ferns' charge, in answer to the strictures of the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1827); James Doyle, A reply to the appendix etc., by the Right Reverend Father in God Thomas Elrington D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns (Dublin, 1827). Elrington had criticised Doyle for not giving him his full title in the Strictures hence the fulsome title of A reply to the appendix.
- 238 Doyle, A reply to the appendix, p. 25.
- 239 Ibid., p. 13.
- 240 Ibid., p. 11.
- 241 Ibid., p. 6.
- 242 See A second appendix to the Bishop of Ferns' charge in answer to the reply of the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1828). In 1828 also Elrington produced a controversial charge on Bible reading, see A charge delivered at the visitation of Thomas Elrington, D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, in August 1828 (Dublin, 1828).
- 243 See Report of the Meeting of the Reformation Society, at Carlow, and the discussion which took place on the 18th and 19th October (Carlow, 1827). This meeting took place in the Methodist Chapel. The earl of Aldborough was in the chair and the well-known evangelical Captain Gordon was the main speaker from the parent society.

- 244 See unpublished Doyle manuscript, dated Carlow, 23 November 1827, *passim*, in Doyle papers, File 19/18, K.L.D.A. See also Rev Giuseppe Murray to Archbishop Caprano of Propaganda Fide from Portarlinton, 27 May 1827, and same to same, from Edenderry, 8 December 1827 on biblicals, the New Reformation and Protestant converts in Scritture, vol. 25, 872-873. Murray was educated at the College of Propaganda Fide in Rome and was apparently serving as a curate in the Kildare diocese during Doyle's episcopacy in the following parishes: Portarlinton, Edenderry, Kilcock, Rathangan, Newbridge, from where he wrote with some regularity to Propaganda Fide in Italian.
- 245 See Thomas Wyse, The political catechism, explanatory of the constitutional rights and civil disabilities of the Catholics of Ireland (London, 1829), pp. 101-102.
- 246 J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland, pp. 68-69.
- 247 Ibid., p. 70.
- 248 Ibid., p. 77.
- 249 Ibid., pp. 75-80.
- 250 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 235, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 251 Ibid.
- 252 Doyle, Tithe evidence, p. 327, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245.
- 253 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 235, H.L. (181), ix, 1.
- 254 D.E.P., 22 September 1827 copying Letter to Editor, the Morning Chronicle on the state of Ireland signed 'A Practical Observer'. There is a strong likelihood in this writer's opinion that the observer in question was Bishop Doyle. The figures on episcopal land holdings in 1831 in D. H. Akenson, The Church of Ireland. Ecclesiastical reform and revolution, 1800-1885 (London, 1971), p. 81, are given here instead of those in the original article which were, in general, somewhat higher.
- 255 Doyle papers, File 19/15, pp. 5-6, 7-8, K.L.D.A.
- 256 Doyle, Letter to Spring Rice, p. 131.
- 257 Doyle, Tithe evidence, p. 327, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245. See also Correspondence between J. E. Gordon, Esq. and the Rev M. P. Malone, P.P. Mountrath with an address to the laity, etc. etc. (Dublin, 1830).
- 258 Sir John Harvey, Kilkenny, to Doyle, 9 December 1830, File 1830/49, K.L.D.A.
- 259 See Doyle to Martin Doyle, P.P., Graiguenamanagh, 28 October 1830 and 19 December 1830 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1880), ii, 222, 231-232.



- 260 Doyle to earl of Darnley, 30 December 1830, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 218.
- 261 Doyle to E. G. Stanley, Chief Secretary, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 230-232 at p. 232. See also Doyle to the earl of Darnley in *ibid.*, ii, 227.
- 262 Hansard, 3rd series, ii, 737-740.
- 263 *Ibid.*, iii, 1-4. Viscount Clifden pointed out that he had received a letter from Bishop Doyle asserting that Martin Doyle was 'not a nephew or a cousin of the right reverend prelate, but a relation so distant, that he was no relation at all'. Farnham's basic intelligence on Bishop Doyle was very poor. On this occasion (p. 4) he referred to Dr Doyle as a 'Catholic Archbishop'. On another he suggested erroneously that Doyle had been made a magistrate. Lord Clifden stated that both Martin Doyle and the Rev Mr McDonnell, Mr Alcock's curate, 'were both clever men, in the prime of life, and of great activity, and it was not perhaps surprising, if they were apt to come into collision'. For an interesting assessment of Rev Martin Doyle see H.O. 100/244, pp. 557-560, Report on Rev Martin Doyle, 18 October 1833.
- 264 Doyle to Parnell, 8 March 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 247.
- 265 *Ibid.*, 26 May 1831 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 272.
- 266 *Ibid.*, 8 July 1831, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 272.
- 267 Marquis of Anglesey to Doyle, 3 July 1831, File 1831/32, K.L.D.A.
- 268 *Ibid.*, 8 July 1831, File 1831/33.
- 269 Hansard, 3rd ser., iv, 1169-1173 (Bishop Elrington); see *ibid.*, 1175-1176 for earl of Farnham on Bishop Doyle.
- 270 D.E.P., 28 July 1831.
- 271 F. W. Conway to Doyle, 2 August 1831 in File 1831/40, K.L.D.A. The Morning Chronicle comment is quoted in D.E.P., 4 August 1831.
- 272 Marquis of Anglesey to Doyle, 26 August 1831, File 1831/42, K.L.D.A.
- 273 Doyle, Tithe evidence, p. 318, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245. See also *ibid.*, p. 100, H.L. 1831-32 (663), xxii, 181 for similar views.

- 274 Ibid., p. 339, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245; also *ibid.*, p. 336.
- 275 Ibid., p. 331, 245.
- 276 Ibid., p. 102, H.L. 1831-32 (663), xxii, 181.
- 277 Ibid., p. 96.
- 278 Ibid., p. 325, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245.
- 279 Doyle to E. G. Stanley, Chief Secretary for Ireland, dated 25 June 1832 was published in D.E.P., 26 June 1832.
- 280 Ibid.
- 281 Doyle to Parnell, 18 July 1832 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1862), ii, 385.
- 282 Ibid.
- 283 Doyle to Marquis of Anglesey, 26 August 1832 published in D.E.P., 28 August 1832.
- 284 Doyle, A dissertation on popery, or an analysis of divine faith, addressed to the Protestants of England, more particularly to the men of Kent . . . to which is added an appendix, containing invaluable papers on tithes, poor laws, and elections written under the signature of B.E. and several important letters written to distinguished individuals (Dublin, 1835).

## REFERENCES

### CHAPTER IV

- 1 Report of the proceedings at a meeting of the Society for promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1820), p. 8. For Doyle's awareness of the papal bull see his 'Diocesan Book' in K.L.D.A.
- 2 Report of the proceedings at a meeting of the Society for promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland (Dublin, 1820), pp. 8-9.
- 3 Ibid., p. 8.
- 4 Ibid., p. 10.
- 5 Ibid., p. 25. Curran stated 'If it is the duty of the Protestants to be liberal and just, it is equally so of the Catholics to be reasonable; and could I suspect that the latter are setting up pretended scruples of conscience for the purpose of illiberal opposition, I would be the last to support or excuse them; but I do not hesitate to acquit them of such unworthy insincerity'. Curran also contributed the remark (p. 26); 'it is from education that the great moral emancipation of the Catholics must proceed'.
- 6 Ibid., p. 29.
- 7 Ibid., p. 28.
- 8 Ibid., pp. 30-31.
- 9 H. Kingsmill Moore, An unwritten chapter in the history of education being the history of the Society for the Education of the Poor of Ireland, generally known as the Kildare Place Society 1811-1831 (London, 1904), p. 77. This work might be deemed a good apologia for the Society.
- 10 Report of the proceedings at a meeting of the Society for promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1820), pp. 33-35 for O'Connell's letter to the Irish Catholic prelates dated 25 February 1820.
- 11 Doyle to Rev Anthony Duanne, Mountmellick, 31 January 1820 in File 1820/6, K.L.D.A.
- 12 This letter is published in Doyle, Pastoral, Lent 1821, pp. 60-64. See p. 60 for the context in which it was written.
- 13 Ibid., pp. 61-62.
- 14 Ibid., p. 62.
- 15 Ibid., pp. 63-64.

- 16 Ibid., p. 64.
- 17 Doyle to Rev Anthony Duanne, 31 January 1820, File 1820/6, K.L.D.A.
- 18 J. W. Greene, Kilranelagh, Baltinglass to Doyle, 8 February 1820, File 1820/10, K.L.D.A.
- 19 J. W. Greene to Doyle, 18 February 1820, File 1820/12, K.L.D.A.
- 20 Draft of Doyle's reply to Greene's letter of 8 February 1820 in File 1820/10, K.L.D.A.
- 21 Ibid.
- 22 Doyle's letter in response to the Rev Caldwell is published in Doyle, Pastoral, Lent 1821, pp. 65-68. See p. 68 for this reference.
- 23 Doyle to - -, 23 March 1820, quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1890), i, 121-122. Unfortunately the Carlow Morning Post is no longer extant for this date.
- 24 Doyle to Rev Joseph Jameson, 24 March 1820, in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1890), i, 122-123.
- 25 Rev Joseph Jameson to Doyle, 28 March 1820 enclosing Resolutions of the Governors of Carlow Public Day School dated 26 March 1820 in File 1820/23, K.L.D.A.
- 26 Doyle to Rev Joseph Jameson, 29 March 1820 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1890), i, 123-124.
- 27 Ibid., 24 March 1820 in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1890), i, 122.
- 28 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, p. 59, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 29 See Doyle papers, File 18/16, pp. 22-23; see also J.K.L., Letters on the state of Ireland, pp. 22-24.
- 30 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, p. 60, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 31 Carlow Morning Post, 1 April 1822. This issue had a report of a general meeting at the schoolhouse on 24 March 1822 published as the second annual report.
- 32 D.E.P., 8 February 1821.
- 33 Ibid., 22 September 1821.
- 34 See Doyle to Parnell, 12 March 1821, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.

- 35 Parnell to Doyle, 19 April 1821, File 1821/13, K.L.D.A.
- 36 Doyle to Parnell, 22 April 1821, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.
- 37 See Doyle papers, File 18/16, pp. 15-16, K.L.D.A.
- 38 'Thoughts on education of the poor in Ireland' in Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library. See Doyle papers, File 18/14 for Doyle's draft of this manuscript in K.L.D.A.
- 39 Ibid.
- 40 See Doyle papers, File 18/15, p. 1 in K.L.D.A. This is an eighteen-page manuscript; pp. 12-18 deal with the Bible-reading issue. Lord Cloncurry read a copy of 'Thoughts' into the record at the general meeting of the Kildare Place Society on 22 February 1822. It was subsequently published in the public newspapers and the Society deemed it necessary to publish a reply which it duly did, dated 23 March 1822. This response to 'Thoughts' was entitled 'Reply to the document read by Lord Cloncurry at the general meeting of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland, held on 22nd February 1822'. It was published as an appendix in the Eleventh report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1823), pp. 91-102.
- 41 Eleventh report of the society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1823), p. 92.
- 42 Ibid., p. 93.
- 43 Ibid., p. 94.
- 44 Ibid., pp. 95-96. In their first annual report published in 1813 the Society declared its determination 'rigidly to adhere to this part of their plan, looking forward to it with confidence, as affording the only true and solid foundation which can be laid for the moral and religious education of the great body of the people of Ireland' (p. 95).
- 45 Doyle papers, File 18/15, pp. 1-2. Page 4 of this manuscript stated that Catholic prelates did not presume 'to impeach the integrity of the Committee or the purity of their administration'.
- 46 Ibid., pp. 4-5. Doyle did not give a source for his figures.
- 47 Ibid., pp. 4-5 and p.11. See also p. 7 where Doyle stated that he visited Carlow Public Day School where the master interfered with the religious opinions of the children by commenting on sacred scripture as it was read. When Doyle asked the master how he interpreted parts of the Bible he did not understand for the pupils he received the reply 'When I come to a hill I pass over it and when I come to a valley therein I dwell!'.

- 48 Ibid., p. 18.
- 49 Doyle to Parnell, 15 January 1823, Congleton Papers, 23/4, archives and manuscripts, Southampton University Library.
- 50 J.K.L., Vindication, pp. 51-52.
- 51 Ibid., pp. 53-71.
- 52 Ibid., p. 65.
- 53 Ibid., pp. 70-71.
- 54 See Hansard, x, 837-847 and D.E.P., 20 March 1824. J. E. Devereux reported to Doyle from London that Grattan presented the petition well but 'others of our friends blanked the question, and other pretended friends openly took part with our enemy the Kildare Place Association'. See Devereux to Doyle [10 March 1824], File 1824/13, K.L.D.A.
- 55 Hansard, x, 838.
- 56 Ibid., 843 (Peel); ibid., 1399-1413 (Newport).
- 57 For North's speech see Ibid., 1479-1484 (29 March 1824) especially p. 1480. North regretted (p. 1483) that the Catholic clergy were not sensible of the advantage which they themselves would derive from being placed at the head of a well-educated, moral and enlightened Catholic population.
- 58 O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, p. 61.
- 59 This letter was published in D.E.P., 10 April 1824 and as a pamphlet under the title A letter from the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, to the Catholic Association, in reply to the mis-statements reported to the House of Commons by Mr North, on the education of the poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1824).
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 Peel to William Gregory, 14 April 1824, in Peel Papers, British Library, 40334, fol. 89.
- 62 D.E.P., 13 April 1824.
- 63 O'Ferrall, Catholic Emancipation, pp. 61-62.
- 64 D.E.P., 13 April 1824.
- 65 Ibid., 27 April 1824.
- 66 Ibid., 18 May 1824.

- 67 Ibid., 25 May 1824.
- 68 Ibid., 8 June 1824.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 Clane parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 71 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry (Appendix), p. 782, 1825 (400), xii, 1. Evidence of Bishop Doyle.
- 72 Clane parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 73 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry (Appendix), p. 782, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 74 Philipstown parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 75 Killeigh parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 76 Newbridge parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 77 Monasterevin parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 78 Portarlinton parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 79 Abbeylax parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 80 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry (Appendix), p. 774, 1825 (400), xii, 1. Evidence of Bishop Doyle.
- 81 Cloncal parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 82 Bagenalstown parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 83 Paulstown parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 84 Mountmellick parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 85 Rosenallis parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 86 Ballinakill parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 87 Ballyadams parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 88 Hacketstown parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 89 Mountrath parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 90 Stradbally parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 91 Thomas Cosby to Doyle, 7 September 1824, File 1824/55, K.L.D.A. This letter is in response to Doyle to Cosby, 5 September 1824.

- 92 Thomas Cosby to Doyle, 12 September 1824, File 1824/57, K.L.D.A.
- 93 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry (Appendix), p. 774, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 94 Monasterevin parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 95 Clonegal parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 96 Graiguenamanagh parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 97 Bagenalstown parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 98 Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1828), p. 145.
- 99 Bagenalstown parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 100 Edenderry parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 101 Kilcock parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 102 Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1828), p. 140.
- 103 Kilcock parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 104 Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland (Dublin, 1828), p. 144. See also Rathvilly parish report on education, 1824, MS in K.L.D.A.
- 105 Doyle to Murray, 16 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 106 Curtis to Murray, postmarked 21 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 107 Oliver Kelly to Murray, 18 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A. See also *ibid.*, 23 September 1824.
- 108 Marum to Murray, 17 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 109 Coen to Murray, 16 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 110 Murray to unnamed Catholic inspector of the Kildare Place Society, draft, 18 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A. Laffan to Murray, 15 September 1824, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 111 J.K.L., Letters on the state of education in Ireland and on Bible Societies (Dublin, 1824), p. 10.
- 112 *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- 113 *Ibid.*, p. 8.



- 114 Ibid., pp. 7-8.
- 115 Ibid., pp. 13-14.
- 116 Ibid., pp. 14-15.
- 117 Ibid., p. 15.
- 118 Ibid., pp. 16-17.
- 119 Ibid., pp. 17-19.
- 120 Ibid., p. 22.
- 121 Ibid., p. 23. Letter II, pp. 25-60, was a direct attack on the theology inspiring the Bible societies.
- 122 See Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 243, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.
- 123 Ibid., p. 244.
- 124 Ibid.
- 125 Ibid., pp. 244-245.
- 126 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry (Appendix), p. 772, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 127 Ibid. See also p. 787 for similar evidence from Archbishop Oliver Kelly.
- 128 Ibid., p. 772.
- 129 Ibid., p. 774.
- 130 Ibid., p. 781.
- 131 Ibid., pp. 781-782.
- 132 Ibid., p. 782.
- 133 Ibid., p. 786.
- 134 Ibid., pp. 772-773.
- 135 Ibid., pp. 773, 782.
- 136 Ibid., p. 774. Bishop Doyle allowed (p. 775) that Catholics had not been withdrawn from biblical schools in the north of Ireland: 'From the depressed state of the Catholics in the north of Ireland, and their inability to have schools wherein their own children can be educated in the manner they would wish, I should think that they might suffer, to a certain extent, abuses which in other countries [sic] we should not look silently at for a day'.

- 137 Ibid., p. 786.
- 138 Ibid., p. 788.
- 139 Ibid., pp. 778-781.
- 140 Ibid., p. 789.
- 141 Doyle's copy of the report, a presentation copy from Thomas Spring Rice, M.P., is in K.L.D.A.
- 142 See First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, p. 66, in K.L.D.A.
- 143 Ibid.
- 144 Ibid., p. 67.
- 145 Ibid., p. 68.
- 146 Ibid., p. 70.
- 147 Ibid., pp. 81-82.
- 148 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, p. 89, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 149 Ibid.
- 150 Ibid., p. 90.
- 151 Ibid., pp. 89-90.
- 152 Ibid., p. 90. The commissioners found that the Catholic clergy 'made little or no distinction between these several societies, although some of them in their character and intentions widely differ from others. This confusion has in some degree arisen from the circumstance, that the same persons in several instances take a prominent and active part in the management of more than one of these societies, and the Roman Catholics have concluded, that their objects are alike in all'. Doyle disagreed. His marginal comment stated: 'silly statement and untrue'.
- 153 Ibid.
- 154 Ibid., p. 91. Doyle's comment reads: 'this a subject of apprehension'.
- 155 Ibid. Doyle commented: 'might not these defects be corrected as well as those intended to be corrected in the Kildare Place Soc[iety] or why not compliment them as are complimented the Ass[ociation] for Disc[ountenancing] Vice. Why not advert here to their unassisted efforts'.

- 156 Ibid.
- 157 Ibid., p. 92.
- 158 Ibid.
- 159 Ibid., pp. 96-97, Doyle's marginal note. Here (p. 96) Doyle remarked: 'There is already an interference with every townland thro' the Church and Police. Let them have the appointment of schoolmasters, and their patronage extends to all. There will be no public liberty left. This the more dangerous when Penal laws are left untouched. For this power will be thrown into the approving side or scale'.
- 160 Ibid., p. 97.
- 161 Doyle's marginal comment is on p. 97.
- 162 Ibid., p. 97 and Doyle comment.
- 163 Ibid., pp. 97-98.
- 164 Ibid. Doyle's remark is on p. 98.
- 165 Ibid., p. 99 and see Doyle remark: 'not admissible'.
- 166 Ibid., pp. 99-100. For Doyle's comment see the margin of p. 99: 'the funds of the Ch[arter] Schools to be given to the Soc[iety] for Discountenancing Vice. As if necessary!! to the Church and as their schools are to be taken away £7000 a yr is to be given to them for bibles etc.'. In 1818 the annual state grant to the Charter Schools (the formal title of which was the 'Incorporated Society in Dublin for Promoting English Protestant Schools in Ireland') exceeded £38,000 but thereafter it declined sharply and ended in 1831. See D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment (London, 1970), p. 32. The First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry contained a devastating indictment of the Incorporated Society.
- 167 Ibid., p. 100. On this Doyle wrote: 'Teachers prepared by Kildare Place people and they are to assist such schools [as] are pleased to continue connected with then. Are they or are they not to get grants for this. Does not the recognition of this war with their declared incompetency? Oh: what contradiction - not admissible'.
- 168 Ibid. Doyle commented ironically: 'these schools gradually to cease when Goulburn is liberal and when jobs cease'.
- 169 Ibid., p. 101.

- 170 'Observations on the first report of the commissioners of Education Inquiry by an Irish Catholic' pp. 1-26, Doyle papers, File 18/21, K.L.D.A. This manuscript was published by W. J. Fitzpatrick under the title An essay on education and the state of Ireland (Dublin, 1880). References here are to the printed work.
- 171 Doyle, An essay on education and the state of Ireland, p. 14.
- 172 Ibid., p. 29.
- 173 Ibid., pp. 19-20. For a similar view of Blake's appointment from O'Connell see D.E.P., 22 June 1824.
- 174 Ibid., p. 46.
- 175 Goulburn to Peel, 19 September 1825, Accession 319, Box 43, Goulburn Papers, Surrey Record Office, County Hall, Kingston-upon-Thames.
- 176 D.E.P., 16 June 1825.
- 177 See Curtis to Rev Michael Blake, 3 July 1825 (this letter was intended for Cardinal Somaglia) in Scrittura, vol. 24, 470.
- 178 See F. W. Conway, Secretary, Catholic Association to Archbishop Murray, 31 December 1825, three-page printed letter in File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 179 These resolutions were published in D.E.P., 24 January 1826 and as an appendix to Doyle, Essay on the Catholic claims (Dublin, 1826), pp. 297-302.
- 180 Hansard, xv, 2-10. For a detailed breakdown of Irish educational statistics see the Second report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, pp. 1-24, H.C. 1826-27 (12), xii, 1.
- 181 Ibid., 10-13.
- 182 Ibid., 13-19.
- 183 Ibid., 20-21.
- 184 Ibid., 81-84, 88-89.
- 185 Ibid., 230.
- 186 Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1828), p. 141.
- 187 Ibid.
- 188 Ibid., pp. 145-146.
- 189 Ibid., p. 142.
- 190 Ibid., p. 145.

- 191 Doyle, Pastoral address on the education of the poor (Dublin, 1827), p. 11.
- 192 Ibid., p. 25.
- 193 Ibid., p. 30. See also Appendix Two.
- 194 Ibid., pp. 31-32.
- 195 Ibid., p. 32.
- 196 Ibid.
- 197 W. V. Griffith to Isaac Topham, 30 August 1826, Kildare Place Society Archives, Part II, Box no. 17, Inspectors Correspondence II no. 36 in Church of Ireland, College of Education, Rathmines, Dublin.
- 198 See D.E.P., 29 March 1827 for Bishop Doyle's reply to the Kildare Place Society for this detail.
- 199 Rev John Walsh, Parish Priest, Borris, to Doyle, 5 January 1827, File 1827/2, K.L.D.A.
- 200 Rev Thady Dunne, Parish Priest, Rosenallis, to Doyle, 11 January 1827, File 1827/4, K.L.D.A.
- 201 Rev John Kelly, Parish Priest, Clonmore, to Doyle, 3 February 1827, File 1827/12, K.L.D.A.
- 202 Rev Patrick Murphy, Parish Priest, Monasterevin, to Doyle, 20 February 1827, File 1827/25, K.L.D.A.
- 203 Rev John Lawlor, Parish Priest, Allen, to Doyle, 6 February [1827], File 1827/13, K.L.D.A.
- 204 Rev M. P. Malone, Parish Priest, Mountrath, to Doyle, 19 February 1827, File 1827/21, K.L.D.A.
- 205 Rev Edward Earle, Parish Priest, Carbury, to Doyle, 19 February 1827, File 1827/23, K.L.D.A.
- 206 Rev T. Dowling, Parish Priest, St Mullins, to Doyle, 3 March 1827, File 1827/33, K.L.D.A.
- 207 Rev Anthony Duanne, Parish Priest, Mountmellick, to Doyle, 26 December 1826, File 1826/51, K.L.D.A.
- 208 Rev Michael Kehoe, Parish Priest, Abbeylax to Doyle, 28 January 1827, File 1827/6, K.L.D.A.
- 209 Rev John Maher, Catholic Curate, Leighlinbridge, to Doyle, 30 January 1827, File 1827/8, K.L.D.A.

- 210 Rev Maurice Kearney, Administrator, Clane, to Doyle, 13 February 1827, File 1827/16, K.L.D.A.
- 211 Rev Michael Flanagan, Parish Priest, Balyna, to Doyle, 17 February 1827, File 1827/19, K.L.D.A.
- 212 Rev Nicholas O'Connor, Parish Priest, Maryborough, to Doyle, 26 February 1827, File 1827/31, K.L.D.A. and Rev John Dunne, Parish Priest, Clonbullogue, to Doyle, 1 March 1827, File 1827/32, K.L.D.A.
- 213 Rev Thomas Nowlan, Parish Priest, Newbridge, to Doyle, 6 January 1827, File 1827/3, K.L.D.A.
- 214 Rev Francis Haly, Parish Priest, Kilcock, to Doyle, 22 February 1827, File 1827/29, K.L.D.A.
- 215 See Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1828), p. 130. See pp. 127-132 for detailed information on the Kildare Place Society's sponsorship of this school and its subsequent attempt to seek financial compensation.
- 216 Rev John Gahan, Parish Priest, Rathvilly, to Doyle, 7 February 1827, File 1827/14, K.L.D.A.
- 217 Rev Martin Doyle, Parish Priest, Clonegal, to Doyle, 31 January 1827, File 1827/9, K.L.D.A.
- 218 Rev James Kinsella, Parish Priest, Killeigh, to Doyle, 26 February 1827, File 1827/30, K.L.D.A.
- 219 Rev James Colgan, Parish Priest, Edenderry, to Doyle, 20 February 1827, File 1827/24, K.L.D.A.
- 220 Rev John Dunne, Parish Priest, Portarlinton, to Doyle, 19 February 1827, File 1827/22, K.L.D.A.
- 221 Doyle to O'Connell, dated Carlow, 7 March 1827, published in D.E.P., 17 March 1827.
- 222 Ibid.
- 223 Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1828), p. 132.
- 224 Joseph Devonshire Jackson to Isaac Topham, 19 March 1827, Kildare Place Society Archives, Part II, Box no. 3, General Correspondence, no. 12, in Church of Ireland, College of Education, Rathmines, Dublin.
- 225 Isaac Topham, to J. D. Jackson, undated, in ibid., General Correspondence, no. 29.
- 226 See D.E.P., 24 March 1827.

- 227 Ibid., 29 March 1827 for Doyle's letter dated Braganza House, Carlow, 27 March 1827.
- 228 Ibid.
- 229 Education petition dated 10 February 1827 in Doyle's hand in File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 230 Hansard, xvi, 1259.
- 231 Ibid., 1261.
- 232 Ibid., 1264, 1266.
- 233 Ibid., 1266.
- 234 First report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, p. 97, 1825 (400), xii, 1.
- 235 Hansard, xv, 8.
- 236 Ibid., 20-21.
- 237 See T. Frankland Lewis to Archbishop Murray, 30 November 1826 where the writer quotes from Dr Murray's letter to him in File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 238 Ibid.
- 239 Murray to Frankland Lewis, 28 December 1826 (in reply to 30 November), File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 240 Copy extract from the Lord Primate on behalf of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland to Frankland Lewis, 22 February 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 241 Frankland Lewis to Murray, 14 April 1827; and draft Murray to Frankland Lewis, 19 April 1827, File 214/1, D.D.A.
- 242 This letter was published in D.E.P., 27 November 1827.
- 243 Doyle to Rev Peter Doyle, 30 November 1827, File 1827/66, K.L.D.A.
- 244 D.E.P., 11 December 1827.
- 245 Ibid., 22 December 1827.
- 246 Doyle to Daniel O'Connell, 23 May 1828, File 1828/27, K.L.D.A.
- 247 See O'Connell Corr., iii, 367-368.

- 248 Doyle, Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Esq., on the formation of a National Literary Institute for the extension of science to all classes of Irish youth (Dublin, 1829), p. 4. Doyle papers, File 18/24 is the manuscript [pp. 38-50] of pp. 34-44 of the published work.
- 249 Ibid., pp. 10-11.
- 250 Ibid., p. 5.
- 251 Ibid., p. 12.
- 252 Ibid., p. 15.
- 253 Ibid., pp. 16-21.
- 254 Ibid., pp. 13-14, 26-27.
- 255 Ibid., pp. 42-43.
- 256 Ibid., pp. 35-36. See Appendix, pp. i-vii for a letter from Doyle to James M. Barry on the formation of an Agricultural School for the province of Munster.
- 257 Thomas Spring Rice to [Doyle] [9 April 1828], File 1827/17, K.L.D.A.
- 258 Ibid., 16 May [1828], File 1828/25.
- 259 Rice to Murray, 16 May 1828, File 30/11 no. 4, D.D.A.
- 260 Doyle to O'Connell, 23 May 1828, File 1828/27, K.L.D.A. In parliamentary evidence in 1830 Bishop Doyle allowed that although there were 'several points' in Spring Rice's report which he did not agree with 'still I was ready to accede to the plan of education proposed in it, if Parliament had been pleased to adopt it'. See Doyle, S.P.I. evidence, p. 430, 1830 (654), viii. See also Thomas Spring Rice to Doyle, 13 September 1829, in N.L.I., Monteagle papers, MS 13,345. Herein Rice wrote that 'The Roman Catholic prelates in adopting as they did last year the principles of my report have in fact relieved the subject from many of its difficulties'.
- 261 Report from the select committee to whom the reports on the subject of education in Ireland were referred, p. 3, H.C. 1828 (341), iv.
- 262 Robert Peel to Lord Francis Leveson Gower, 29 August 1828, marked 'Private and Confidential' in H0 79:8, 'Ireland Private & Secret', Duty Book, pp. 281-289, in P.R.O., Kew.
- 263 Peel to Leveson Gower, 15 September 1828, in H0 79:8, 'Ireland Private & Secret', Duty Book, pp. 297-300, in P.R.O., Kew.



- 264 Peel to Leveson Gower, 5 September 1828, marked 'Private' in HO 79:8, 'Ireland Private & Secret', Duty Book, p. 289, in P.R.O., Kew.
- 265 See 'Bishops' Minute Book', 1829-1849', MS in D.D.A.
- 266 Ibid., 1829.
- 267 Hansard, xxi, 608-612.
- 268 Peel to Leveson Gower, 25 February 1829, marked 'Private' in HO 79:8, 'Ireland Private & Secret', Duty Book, p. 373, in P.R.O., Kew.
- 269 Peel to Leveson Gower, 5 July 1829, marked 'Private & Confidential', in HO 79:8, 'Ireland Private & Secret', Duty Book, p. 373, in P.R.O., Kew. For Spring Rice's writing campaign in favour of educational reform see Thomas Spring Rice to Doyle, 26 April 1829 in N.L.I., Monteaule papers, MS 13,345.
- 270 Peel to J. Leslie Foster, 1 September 1829 marked 'Most Private' in HO 79:8, 'Ireland Private & Secret', Duty Book, pp. 440-449, in P.R.O., Kew.
- 271 Ibid.
- 272 'Bishops' Minute Book, 1829-1849', MS, D.D.A.
- 273 Murray to Doyle, 24 February 1830, File 1830/13, K.L.D.A.
- 274 Parnell to Doyle, 1 March 1830, File 1830/15, K.L.D.A.
- 275 Doyle, S.P.I. evidence, pp. 425-428, 429-433, 445-452, 1830 (654), viii.
- 276 Ibid., pp. 426-427.
- 277 Doyle, S.P.I. evidence, pp. 425-426, 1830 (654), viii.
- 278 Ibid., p. 426.
- 279 Ibid., pp. 426, 432, 446-448.
- 280 Ibid., pp. 431, 452.
- 281 Ibid., p. 447.
- 282 Ibid., pp. 431-433.
- 283 Wyse to Doyle, 20 November 1830, File 1830/46, K.L.D.A.
- 284 Ibid., 11 December 1830, File 1830/50.

- 285 Ibid. For Doyle on the need for four 'Provincial Academies' see Michael Slaterry, P.P., Borrisoleigh to Thomas Wyse, 28 November 1830 quoting Doyle extensively in Winifrede M. Wyse, Notes on education reform in Ireland during the first half of the 19th Century compiled from speeches, letters, etc., contained in the unpublished memoirs of the Rt Hon Sir Thomas Wyse, K.C.B. (Waterford, 1901), pp. 13-14. For Doyle's important posthumous influence on Slaterry as Archbishop of Cashel see the present writer's 'Archbishop Slaterry and the episcopal controversy on Irish national education, 1838-1841' in Archivium Hibernicum, xxxix (1984), pp. 13-31.
- 286 Doyle to E. G. Stanley, 12 January 1831, quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1890), ii, 253-256.
- 287 Ibid.
- 288 Ibid.
- 289 Ibid.
- 290 E. G. Stanley to Doyle, 13 January 1831, File 1831/8, K.L.D.A.
- 291 Doyle to E. G. Stanley, 17 January 1831 quoted in Fitzpatrick, Doyle (1890), ii, 256-258.
- 292 Ibid.
- 293 Stanley to Murray, 25 February 1831, File 31/3, D.D.A.
- 294 Ibid.
- 295 Hansard, 3rd ser., i, 421 (12 November 1830).
- 296 Ibid., 707 (2 December 1830).
- 297 Ibid., iii, 404 (14 March 1831).
- 298 Ibid., iv, 1258 (14 July 1831).
- 299 Ibid., 1259.
- 300 Ibid., 1320 (15 July 1831).
- 301 Ibid., 1325.
- 302 Ibid., v, 325-327 (26 July), 457-460 (23 August).
- 303 Ibid., vi, 457-458 (23 August 1831).
- 304 Ibid., 458-459 (Lefroy), 460 (O'Connell).
- 305 Ibid., 1249-1261 for Stanley's speech.

- 306 Ibid., 1254-1255.
- 307 Ibid., 1256-1257.
- 308 Ibid., 1250.
- 309 Ibid., 1258-1259.
- 310 Ibid., 1261-1305 for the debate. O'Connell's statements are found at p. 1299.
- 311 Ibid., 1292-1293 (Gordon), 1295-1301 (O'Connell), 1302-1303 (Gordon), 1304 (O'Connell).
- 312 Wyse to Doyle, 6 October 1831, File 1831/47, K.L.D.A.
- 313 Kelly to Murray, 24 November 1831, File 31/3 no. 10, D.D.A.
- 314 Doyle to Wyse, 5 November 1831 in Wyse papers, MS 15024 (14), N.L.I.
- 315 Murray to Doyle, 11 November 1831, File 1831/55, K.L.D.A.
- 316 Murray to Doyle, 26 November 1831, File 1831/56, K.L.D.A.
- 317 Curtis to Murray, 27 November 1831, File 31/3 no. 13, D.D.A.
- 318 Murray to Doyle, 26 November 1831, File 1831/56, K.L.D.A.
- 319 Curtis to Murray, 27 November 1831, File 31/3 no. 13, D.D.A.
- 320 D. H. Akenson, The Irish Education Experiment (London, 1970), p. 393. For the text of Stanley's letter to Leinster see pp. 392-402.
- 321 Ibid., pp. 392-402.
- 322 D.E.P., 14 January 1832 for Doyle's letter to his clergy dated Carlow, 26 December 1831.
- 323 Ibid.
- 324 Ibid.

## REFERENCES

### APPENDIX ONE

- 1 'Bishops' Minute Book, 1829-1849' for 1829, MS, D.D.A.
- 2 Archbishops Curtis, Murray and Laffan to Propaganda, 17 February 1829, File 31/2 no. 27, D.D.A.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Cardinal Cappellari to Archbishop Curtis, 20 June 1829, File 31/2 no. 27, D.D.A.
- 5 Cardinal Cappellari to Archbishop Murray, 17 October 1829, in File 31/2 no. 27, D.D.A. (The foregoing three letters are filed together.)
- 6 Doyle, S.O.I. evidence, p. 214, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.
- 7 Ibid., p. 211.
- 8 Cardinal Albani to Lord Burghersk, 31 December 1829, in P.R.O., F.O., 170-23, Copy no. 60102. Foran became bishop of Waterford in 1837. He declined the presidency of Maynooth in 1834, an offer apparently made at Doyle's behest.
- 9 Mr George Seymour to Lord Palmerston, 16 August 1832 marked 'Private' in P.R.O., F.O., 170-23.
- 10 Doyle's motion read as follows : 'That we indeed view with the greatest alarm and would visit with the severest chastisement in our power to inflict, all or any interference of any clergyman or clergymen subject to us, who forgetful of his or their duty, unmindful of the obedience due to the decree of the S.C. bearing the date 17 October 1829, and regardless of the oftentimes expressed sentiments of the Irish prelates, clergy and people, would seek to employ the influence of our own, or any other government in the appointment of persons to vacant Sees in Ireland'. This motion was probably inspired by the vacancy for the archbishopric of Cashel and Emly which was eventually filled by Doyle's friend and protégé, Michael Slattery.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

For an essay on bibliographical sources see the present writer's 'The historiography of the papers of Bishop James Doyle, O.S.A. (1786-1834) in the Kildare and Leighlin diocesan archives' in Archivium Hibernicum XLIII (1988), pp 85-94. This bibliography is arranged in the following manner:

- i Manuscript collections
- ii Parliamentary papers
- iii Contemporary newspapers
- iv Contemporary works, pamphlets, etc.
- v Collections of printed correspondence, memoirs, diaries and biographies
- vi Secondary sources
- vii Works of reference.

### (i) Manuscript Collections

#### Ballyboden, County Dublin

Irish Augustinian Provincial Archives  
Correspondence of Bishop Doyle with Augustinian Provincial

#### Carlow

Kildare and Leighlin Diocesan Archives in Bishop's house  
Doyle papers

-  
Presentation Convent  
Annals

#### Dublin

Dublin Diocesan Archives, Clonliffe  
Papers of Archbishop Troy  
Papers of Archbishop Murray  
Letters of J.K.L. and Edward Hay  
Bishops' Minute Book, 1829-49  
Minutes of New Catholic Association

-  
National Library of Ireland  
W. J. Fitzpatrick papers

William Smith O'Brien papers  
Monteagle papers (Thomas Spring Rice)  
Wellesley papers (on microfilm)  
Wyse papers

### **Rathmines**

Church of Ireland College of Education  
Kildare Place Society Papers

State Paper Office, Dublin Castle  
State of the Country papers, 1819-1834  
Registered papers, 1819-1834

### **Kew**

Public Record Office  
Home Office and Foreign Office papers relating to Ireland

### **Kingston upon Thames**

Surrey Record Office, County Hall  
Goulburn papers

### **London**

British Library  
Liverpool papers  
Peel papers

### **Maynooth, County Kildare**

President's Office, Maynooth College  
Minutes of the Trustees of Maynooth

### **Portlaoise, County Laois**

Presentation Convent  
Annals

### **Rome**

Archives of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide  
Acta Congregationum generalium anni, 1819-1834  
Scritture riferite nei congressi, Irlanda, 1819-1834  
(both on microfilm in N.L.I.)

### **Southampton**

University of Southampton  
Congleton papers (Sir Henry Parnell)  
Wellington papers

## (ii) Parliamentary Papers

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates (new or 2nd series 1820-1830; 3rd series, 1830-)

Fourteenth report of the commissioners of the board of education, in Ireland, H.C. 1812 (744) xi, 144.

Second report from the select committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 173.

Third report from the select committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom, H.C. 1825 (129), viii, 193.

Minutes of the evidence taken before the Lords' select committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom, H.L. 1825 (181), ix, 1.

First report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1825 (400), xii, 1.

Second report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (12), xii, 1.

Third report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (13), xiii, 1.

Fourth report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (89), xiii.

Fifth report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (441), xiii.

Sixth report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (442), xiii.

Seventh report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (443), xiii.

Eighth report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (509), xiii.

Ninth report of the commissioners of Irish education inquiry, H.C. 1826-27 (510), xiii.

Report from the select committee to whom the reports on the subject of education in Ireland were referred, H.C. 1828 (341), iv.

Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee on the state of the poor in Ireland, H.C. 1830 (654), vii, 1.

Copy of a letter from the chief secretary for Ireland to the duke of Leinster, on the formation of a board of commissioners for education in Ireland, H.C. 1831-32 (196), xxix.

Second report from the select committee appointed to inquire into the collection and payment of tithes in Ireland and the state of the laws relating thereto, H.C. 1831-32 (508), xxi, 245.

Second report from the select committee of the house of Lords appointed to inquire into the collection and payment of tithes in Ireland and the state of the laws relating thereto with minutes of evidence and an appendix, and index, H.L. 1831-32 (663), xxii, 181.

Minutes of evidence taken before the Lords' select committee appointed to enquire into the state of the disturbed counties in Ireland, with the immediate causes which have produced the same, and with the efficiency of the laws for the suppression of outrages against the public peace, H.L. 1831-32 (667), xvi, 1.

First report of the commissioners of public instruction, Ireland, H.C. 1835 (45 and 46), xxxiii (1 and 892).

Second report of the commissioners of public instruction, Ireland, H.C. 1835 (47), xxxiv.

A report of the select committee of the house of Lords on the plan of education in Ireland; with minutes of evidence, H.C. 1837 (543-1), viii, pt i.

Minutes of evidence taken before the select committee of the house of Lords on the plan of education in Ireland, H.C. 1837 (543-11), viii, pt. ii.

Report from the select committee appointed to inquire into the progress and operation of the new plan of education in Ireland, H.C. 1837 (485), ix.

### **(iii) Contemporary Newspapers**

Belfast Newsletter

Carlow Morning Post

Carlow Sentinel



Carlow Standard

Dublin Correspondent

Dublin Gazette

Dublin Evening Mail

Dublin Evening Post

Freeman's Journal

Kilkenny Journal

Morning Chronicle

Morning Register

Pilot

Political Register

The Times

(iv) Contemporary Works, Pamphlets, etc.

A Christian,

A letter to a Roman Catholic gentleman on the subject of Prince Hohenlohe's late miracles with an epistle dedicatory to His Grace, Doctor Murray, R.C. Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1823).

A Christian Priest,

What is truth? or, real conciliation and union (Dublin, 1824).

A Clergyman of the Established Church, An answer to a letter written by a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church, to His Grace, the Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1822).

A Clergyman of the Established Church, A letter to the Most Rev Dr Murray, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and to the Right Rev Dr Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare, on the subject of their pastoral addresses and the alleged miracles (Dublin, 1823).

A Clergyman of the Established Church, An address to the Protestant gentry of Ireland, being an answer to the letter to the Lord Lieutenant by J.K.L. (Dublin, 1823) [this pamphlet is dated Carlow, 30 November 1823].

Address of the grand jurors and magistrates of the Queen's County to the Marquis of Anglesey, on the subject of the late Special Commission, His Excellency's answer, and a letter from the Right Rev Dr Doyle to the Marquis of Anglesey (Carlow, 1833).

A few philosophical reasons against Catholic Emancipation; A letter to the Right Hon. Lord Farnham (London, 1827).

A full account of the proceedings, held 9th November, 1824, at Carrick-on-Shannon, Ireland, between Protestants and Catholics; for the discussion of the important questions as to the right of distributing the scriptures among the population of that country (London [?1824]).

A full, accurate, and authentic report of the speeches delivered at a meeting of the Protestant gentlemen of the County of Armagh, on the 5th October, 1826, at a dinner given to Colonel Verner, candidate at the late general election for the representation of that county in parliament (Dublin [?1826]).

A full and authentic report of the proceedings of the first annual meeting of the Brunswick Constitutional Club of Ireland, held in the Rotunda on Tuesday, November 4th, 1828 (Dublin, 1828).

A full report of the evidence produced at the Coroner's Inquest held at Newtown Barry, in the County of Wexford, on the 20th and continued till the 30th June, 1831 (Dublin [1831]).

A letter addressed to the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle, R.C.B. on his proposal for uniting the churches of England and Rome (Dublin, 1824).

A letter to His Excellency, The Marquis of Wellesley, occasioned by various publications which have appeared of late reflecting upon the conduct and character of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1822).

Alley, F. A.,

A reply to the Rev Dr Doyle's letter addressed to Lord Farnham, on the 29th July 1831 (Dublin [1831]).

A member of the Established Church, Observations on Bishop Doyle's letter to a member of parliament by a member of the Established Church with an appendix containing the letter itself (Cork, 1824).

A Minister of Peace,

The Federalist; or a series of papers showing how to repeal the union, so as to avoid a violent crisis, and, at the same time, secure and reconcile all interests (Dublin, 1831).

A Munster Farmer [Rev Mortimer O'Sullivan], A letter to the Hon. Pierce Somerset Butler occasioned by his speech at the Lisdowney meeting on the subject of tithe, together with observations on J.K.L.'s Defence of his Vindication (Dublin, 1824).

An accurate report of the speeches delivered at the meeting for discussion in Derry, on Tuesday, January 9th, 1827, on the comparative merits of Protestantism and Popery, with an address to the Roman Catholics of the diocese of Derry (Dublin, 1827).

An authentic account of what God hath given to the prayers of Prince Alexander Hohenlohe, and those who are united with him in the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Catholic Church in the cure of Miss Clara Mather, residing in Bouverie Street, Fleet St, London, on the 13th of June 1823 (Dublin, 1823).

An authentic report of the discussion which took place in the Roman Catholic chapel at Easby, in the County of Sligo, on the 23rd and 24th Novembr 1824; between three Roman Catholic priests and four Protestant ministers on the indiscriminate reading of the Bible, on the right of private judgement in its interpretation, and on making it the sole rule of faith (Dublin, 1825).

An Irishman [Thomas Spring Rice], Considerations on the present state of Ireland, and on the best means of improving the condition of its inhabitants (London, 1822).

An Irish Member of Parliament [Thomas Spring Rice], Catholic Emancipation considered on Protestant principles in a letter to the Earl of Liverpool (London, 1825).

An Irish Roman Catholic [A. R. Blake], Thoughts upon the Catholic question (Dublin, 1828).

A Physician, An attempt to explain, on natural principles, the cures alleged to be miraculous, of Miss Lalor and Mrs Stuart (Dublin, 1823).

A Rational Christian, A complete exposure of the late Irish miracles, being a disquisition on the nature, object and evidence of Christian miracles, as opposed to the late imposture, in a letter to Doctor Murray, Titular Archbishop of Dublin to which are prefixed remarks on two recent pamphlets, the "Rhapsody" and the "Vindication of the Principles, Civil and Religious of the Irish Catholics" (Dublin, 1823).

A report of the proceedings of three public meetings which were held in the city of Cork; containing the speeches of Mr O'Connell, Mr Sheil and Mr Bric, and of the Rev Mr Falvey, and Mr England, in opposition to the general use of the scriptures; together with the arguments which were advanced in defence of the same; shewing that all mankind have an undoubted right to read the word of God without restriction, published with notes, by order of the Cork Discussion Committee (Dublin, 1825).

A report of the speeches delivered at a meeting held in the town of Sligo, on Tuesday, 18th January, 1825, for the purpose of establishing an auxiliary to the London Hibernian School Society in which the resolutions passed in the Chapel of Sligo, on the preceding Sunday, are noticed (Dublin, 1825).

A report of the speeches delivered at a public meeting called for the purpose of religious discussion at Carlow (Dublin, 1825).

Armacanus, Bibliophilos (author of letters to Hierophilos) unmasked from his own words. II. Remarks on his intemperate letter to Dr Magee. III His unfounded and malignant attacks on the most Rev Dr Curtis and the Rt Rev Dr Doyle, and other defenders of Catholic Principles (Dublin, 1823).

A Roman Catholic Barrister, A letter to His Grace, the Duke of Wellington, prime minster of Great Britain, etc., etc., etc., on the justice and expediency of Catholic Emancipation at the present important crisis, in which is discussed the question of securities (Dublin, 1828).

A statement of the management of the Farnham estates (Dublin, 1830).

A statement of the proceedings of the Western Committee for the relief of the Irish Poor, with an appendix containing reports, correspondence, treasurer's account, and list of subscriptions (London, 1831).

Authenticated report of the discussions which took place at Londonderry between six Roman Catholic priests, and six clergymen of the Established Church; in the diocese of Derry, March, 1828 (Dublin, 1828).

Bardin, Rev. Charles, On miracles. A sermon preached in Saint Mary's Church, Dublin on the 21st and 28th September 1823 (Dublin, 1823).

Barton, E., Miracles, a rhapsody (London, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Apologetic postscript to the Rhapsody (Dublin, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Recent occurrences in Ireland or animadversions on a pamphlet entitled "One year of the administration of the Marquess Wellesley" in a letter to a friend in England (London, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Irish tracts and topics; a soliloquy (Dublin, 1824).

[Battersby, William], A Church not without religion; or a few modest remarks upon the inconsistent charge of His Grace Doctor Magee, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin; proving that the Roman Catholic Church not only has a religion, but that it is exclusively the religion of Christ, demonstrated by affirmative and negative proofs. The first shewing that she has all the divine characteristics, and titles mentioned in the Old and New Testament, as belonging to the true Church of Christ; the other shewing that the Churches of the Reformation are destitute of the same. By W. B. A Catholic layman (2nd ed., Dublin, 1822).

- Calumny and ignorance refuted; or a refutation of Doctor Magee's defence of his late charge with a reply to certain Protestant writers, who have endeavoured to vindicate it, particularly the Rev. Sir H. Lees, "Walsingham", "The Warder", "The antidote" and the "Irish Protestant" containing a vindication of Dr Curtis's and Dr. Doyle's pastoral letters, and of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy against their calumniators; and remarks on the reading of scripture concluding with observations on the manner in which the adversaries of the Roman Catholic Church proceed in religious controversy (Dublin, 1822).
- Baur, Francis Nicholas, A short and faithful description of the remarkable occurrences and benevolent holy conduct of his serene highness, Prince Alexander of Hohenlohe, Domicellar of Olmutz, Vicariat-Counsellor of the See of Bamberg, and Knight of Malta during his residence of twenty-four days in the city of Wurzburg - in twelve confidential letters translated from the German (Dublin, 1822).
- Bibliophilos, Some remarks on the charge of the Most Rev Doctor Magee, Lord Archbishop of Dublin, Primate, etc., by Bibliophilos, the writer under this signature of Letters to Hierophilos, to the late Doctor Stuart, Lord Primate, of Armagh, etc., etc. (Dublin, 1822).
- Brougham, Henry, Practical observations on the education of the people addressed to the working classes and their employees (London, 1825).
- Callanan, Rev James, Letter from the Rev James Callanan of Celbridge to the Right Honourable Lord Cloncurry (Dublin, 1823).
- Carlile, Rev James, The duties of Protestants and Roman Catholics mutually towards each other; in two discourses delivered in the Scots Church, in Mary's Abbey, Dublin (Dublin, 1824).
- [Carson, Alexander], Remarks on the late miracle; in a letter to Doctor Doyle (4th ed., considerably enlarged, Dublin, 1823).

Strictures on the letter of J.K.L. entitled a Vindication of the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics; addressed to His Excellency the Marquis Wellesley, K.G. Lord Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland in a letter to the same nobleman by the author of 'Remarks on the late miracle; in a letter to Doctor Doyle' (Dublin, 1823).

Carson, Alexander,

The right and duty of all men to read the scriptures; being the substance of a speech intended to have been delivered at the meeting of the Carlow Bible Society; containing a refutation of the several parts of a late pamphlet by J.K.L. entitled "Letters on the State of Education and Bible Societies" (Dublin, 1824).

A letter to the Right Hon. William C. Plunket, His Majesty's Attorney General in Ireland, containing strictures on some parts of his late speech on the Roman Catholic question in the House of Commons, touching the Cavan Reformation (Dublin, 1827).

Caulfield, John,

A view of the measures by which Catholic Emancipation may be obtained and an improvement in the condition of the Irish people produced in a letter addressed to the Right Rev Doctor Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin (2nd ed., Dublin, 1827).

Charges of Baron Smith; also addresses presented to him; and his

answers; together with a report of two debates in the House of Commons, upon his case; and an appendix (Dublin, 1834).

Cloncurry, Lord,

Letter from the Right Honourable Lord Cloncurry to the most noble the Marquis of Downshire on the conduct of the Kildare-Street Education Society and the employment of the poor (Dublin, 1826).

Clowry, William,

Controversial letters in reply to Rev Mr Daly, Rev Dr Singer, etc., etc., to which are added the letters signed B.E. (Dublin and London, 1827).

Correspondence between Daniel O'Connell, Esq., Barrister-at-law and Rev Doctor Blake, Parish Priest of St Michael and St John, Dublin, on the subject of ecclesiastical securities proposed to be connected with the Repeal of the laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland - with observations of the Rt Hon. W. C. Plunket His Majesty's Attorney General on the plan (Dublin, 1822).

Correspondence between J. E. Gordon, Esq., and the Rev M. P. Malone, P.P. Mountrath with an address to the laity, etc. etc. (Dublin, 1830).

County of Clare Election (Cork [1828]).

Crotty, Rev Bartholomew, A letter to the Right Hon. Lord Bexley in reply to the charges against the College of Maynooth, contained in his Lordship's "Address to the Freeholders of the County of Kent" (Dublin, 1829).

Curtis, Patrick, Two letters from Most Rev Dr Curtis, Roman Catholic Primate of Ireland, respecting the horrible act of placing a calf's head on the altar of the Chapel of Ardee, and also his answer to the Protestant Archbishop Magee's charge against the Roman Catholic religion (4th ed., Dublin [1822]).

---

The third letter from the Most Rev Dr Curtis, Roman Catholic Primate of Ireland, positively denying that the person who was guilty of placing the calf's head on the altar of the Chapel of Ardee, has been discovered, notwithstanding the exertions of the magistrates. Also further remarks on Dr Magee's unfounded charge against the Roman Catholic religion (Dublin [1822]).

D'Alton, John, The history of tithes, Church lands and other ecclesiastical benefices; with a plea for the abolition of the former, and the better distribution of the latter, in accordance with the tenets for which they were originally given (Dublin, 1832).

Daly, Robert, A sermon on the scripture doctrine of miracles preached on Sunday, the 21st of September, 1823, in the Church of Bray, and on Sunday the 28th in the Church of Powerscourt (Dublin, 1823).



\_\_\_\_\_

A correspondence which arose out of the discussion at Carlow, between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic clergyman, to which are annexed notes and observations (London, 1825).

Declan [Rev William Phelan], The case of the Church of Ireland stated in a letter respectfully addressed to His Excellency the Marquis Wellesley and in reply to the charges of J.K.L. (Dublin, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_

The case of the Church of Ireland stated in a second letter respectfully addressed to His Excellency the Marquis Wellesley and in reply to the charges of J.K.L. (Dublin, 1824).

[Declan], Miracles mooted. An inquiry into the nature and object of miracles, generally, and of the recent Irish miracles in particular, with observations on the pastoral address of the Most Rev Doctor Murray to the Catholic clergy and laity of Dublin, announcing "The miraculous cure of Mrs Mary Stuart, a religieuse of the convent of St Joseph, Ranelagh" (Dublin, 1823).

Declarations of the Catholic Bishops, the Vicars Apostolic and their coadjutors in Great Britain (London, 1826).

Devereux, J. E., Letter to the Roman Catholics of New Ross by J. E. Devereux, in perfect unison with the previous and subsequent resolutions of the County of Wexford in utter reprobation of the wings (Dublin, 1826).

\_\_\_\_\_

Address to the people of the County of Wexford on the repeal of the Union; also a letter on the Right Hon Lord Leveson Gower's Bastardy Bill (Dublin, 1830).

\_\_\_\_\_

Letter to the people of Wexford, on Lord John Russell's Reform Bill, with strictures on France (Dublin, 1831).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Letters addressed to the Most Reverend and Right Reverend the Protestant Bishops of Ireland, and the Very Reverend Moderator, and the Reverend Presbyterian Ministers, and Very Reverend and Reverend the Methodist Ministers of Ireland on Messrs. Stanley and Wyse's Liberal school Education Bills, first published in the Dublin Evening Post with additional matter (Dublin, 1832).

Doyle, James/J.K.L.,

Pastoral instructions for the Lent of 1821, addressed to the Roman Catholic laity of the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin being a brief explanation of the sacrament of penance and the laws of the church, relating to Paschal Communion, with observations on the nature and tendency of illegal associations to which is subjoined on appendix [Pastoral letter on the Lent of 1820] (Carlow [1821]).

\_\_\_\_\_  
A letter to His Grace, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, in consequence of unjust animadversions against the Roman Catholic religion, delivered by him in a charge to the clergy of his Archdiocese, on the 24th of October 1822 in St. Patrick's Cathedral (Dublin, 1822).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Pastoral letter to the Roman Catholics of the Deanery of Kilcock to be read to their respective flocks (1822; corrected ed., Dublin, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Second letter of J.K.L. a Roman Catholic bishop in reply to the charge with notes of the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1822).

\_\_\_\_\_  
The General Catechism edited by Dr Doyle (Dublin, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_  
A second excellent pastoral letter from the Rt Revd Dr Doyle, Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin (Dublin, 1823) [Lent, 1823].

\_\_\_\_\_

Miracle wrought by Prince Hohenlohe in the person of Miss Maria Lalor, of Rosskelton, Queen's County, who recovered the use of speech after more than six years' privation of that faculty through the intercession of James Doyle, D.D., Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin - from the original MSS in English, Latin and French (Dublin [1823]) [Pastoral Letter, June, 1823].

\_\_\_\_\_

A Vindication of the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics in a letter addressed to his Excellency, the Marquis Wellesley, K.G. Lord Lieutenant General, and General Governor of Ireland, etc., etc., by J.K.L. (Dublin, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_

A Defence by J.K.L. of his Vindication of the religious and civil principles of the Irish Catholics (Dublin, 1824).

\_\_\_\_\_

A letter from the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin to the Catholic Association, in reply to the mis-statements reported to the House of Commons by Mr North on the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1824).

\_\_\_\_\_

Letters on a re-union of the churches of England and Rome from an to the Rt Revd Dr Doyle, R.C. Bishop of Kildare, John O'Driscoll, Alexander Knox and Thomas Newenham (Gloucester [1824]).

\_\_\_\_\_

Letters on the state of Education in Ireland, and on Bible Societies, addressed to a friend in England (Dublin, 1824).

\_\_\_\_\_

Pastoral instructions for the Lent of 1825 addressed to the Catholic clergy and laity of the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin (Carlow [1825]).

\_\_\_\_\_

Letters on the state of Ireland addressed by J.K.L. to a friend in England (Dublin, 1825).

\_\_\_\_\_

Preface to William Gahan, Sermons and moral discourses for all the Sundays and principal festivals of the year on the most important truths and maxims of the Gospel, 2 vols. (3rd ed., Dublin, 1825).

An essay on the Catholic Claims addressed to the Right Honourable the Earl of Liverpool, K.G. etc., etc. (Dublin, London, 1826).

Pastoral address to the Catholic clergy and laity of the diocese of Kildare and Leighlin (Dublin, 1826).

Pastoral address on the education of the Catholic poor (Dublin, 1827).

J.K.L.'s letter to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827).

A reply by J.K.L. to the late Charge of the Most Rev Doctor Magee, Protestant Archbishop of Dublin; submitted most respectfully, to those to whom the above charge was addressed (Dublin, 1827).

Strictures on the Charge of Dr Elrington to his clergy, as delivered by him in 1827 (Dublin, 1827).

A reply by the Right Rev James Doyle to the Appendix, etc., by the Right Rev Father in God, Thomas Elrington, D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns (Dublin, 1827).

An abridgement of the Christian Doctrine with proofs of scripture in points controverted by way of question and answer composed in 1649 by H.T. of the English College at Douay, now revised by the Right Rev James Doyle, D.D. and prescribed by him to be used in the united dioceses of Kildare and Leighlin (Dublin, 1828).

A letter to The Duke of Wellington on the Catholic claims (Liverpool, 1828).

Observations addressed to the Rev Henry Philpotts, D.D. Rector of Stanhope, on his letter to an English layman, respecting the Coronation Oath (Dublin, London, 1828).

Letter to Daniel O'Connell, Esq., on the formation of a National Literary Institute for the extension of science to all classes of Irish youth (Dublin, 1829).

\_\_\_\_\_

A letter from Bishop Doyle to the secretary of the New Ross Temperance Society (Dublin, 1830).

\_\_\_\_\_

Dr Doyle on drunkenness. Letter to Dr Harvey, Secretary of the Dublin Temperance Society (Dublin, 1830).

\_\_\_\_\_

Letter to Thomas Spring Rice, Esq., M.P., etc., etc., on the establishment of a legal provision for the Irish poor and on the nature and destination of church property (Dublin, London, 1831).

\_\_\_\_\_

The Rt Rev Dr Doyle's Reply to Lord Farnham, relative to the observations made on him by his Lordship, in the House of Lords (Dublin, 1831).

\_\_\_\_\_

Dr Doyle on poor laws in reply to Mr Senior of London (Dublin, 1831).

\_\_\_\_\_

Church of Ireland, Tithes!!! A most important dialogue between a bishop and a judge (Dublin, 1831). Published anonymously.

\_\_\_\_\_

Letter from Dr Doyle to the Marquis of Anglesey on the Tithe Meetings (Dublin, 1831).

\_\_\_\_\_

Preface to Alban Butler, Lives of the Saints (Dublin, 1833 ed.).

\_\_\_\_\_

Pastoral letter (Dublin, 1834).

\_\_\_\_\_

A dissertation on Popery or an analysis of Divine Faith. Addressed to the Protestants of England, more particularly the men of Kent. A posthumous work. By the late Right Rev James Doyle, D.D. of Kildare and Leighlin. To which is added an appendix, containing invaluable papers on Tithes, Poor laws and elections, written under the signature B.E. and several important letters addressed to distinguished individuals (Dublin, 1835).

\_\_\_\_\_

An essay on education and the state of Ireland [1825]. By an Irish Catholic. W. J. Fitzpatrick (ed.) (Dublin, 1880).

D.P.,

A letter addressed to Most Rev Dr Curtis containing strictures upon certain pamphlets published recently in favour of the Popish Church wherein also, the sentiments advanced by his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, in his Charge delivered at his late primary visitation are vindicated (Dublin, 1822).

Dr Doyle and tithes. An address to the landlords and farmers of

Ireland, proving that though Dr Doyle now denounces tithes, he has sworn as a Roman Catholic prelate, to maintain them; and that they are equally a fair and just as well as legal demand: in reply to Dr Doyle's letter to Lord Farnham (3rd ed., Dublin, 1831).

Dwyer, Rev George,

A view of the evidence on the subject of tithes in Ireland, given before the Committees of the Lords and Commons, in 1832; vindicating the Protestant clergy of that country; exposing the schemes of the agitators; and shewing the necessity of a firm maintenance of the Protestant Church in Ireland, to prevent a dissolution of the Union (London, 1833).

Eighth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1820).

Eleventh report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1823).

Elrington, Charles R.,

Remarks upon the reply of J.K.L. to the charge of His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin (Dublin, 1827).

S.N. [Charles R. Elrington], Misellaneous observations on J.K.L.'s Letter to the Marquess Wellesley; on tracts and topics by E. Barton and on the Letter to Mr Abercrombie by ---- (Dublin, 1824).

Elrington, Thomas,

A charge delivered at the visitation of Thomas Elrington, D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, on June 1824; and published at the request of the clergy of the United Dioceses (Dublin, 1824).

A charge delivered at the visitation of Thomas Elrington, D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns, in June 1827; and published at the request of the clergy of the United dioceses (Dublin, 1827).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Appendix to the Bishop of Ferns' charge in answer to the strictures of the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1827).

\_\_\_\_\_  
A second appendix to the Bishop of Ferns' charge, in answer to the reply of the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1828).

\_\_\_\_\_  
A charge delivered at the visitation of Thomas Elrington, D.D., M.R.I.A., Lord Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns in August 1828 (Dublin, 1828).

Ensor, George,

Letters showing the inutility, and exhibiting the absurdity, of what is rather fantastically termed 'The New Reformation' (Dublin, 1828).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Anti-Union. Ireland as she ought to be (Newry, 1831).

Episcopal epistles: or J.K.L.'s kitchen in an uproar! (Dublin, 1824).

Faber, Rev George Stanley, Remarks upon some parts of a letter addressed to the Archbishop of Dublin; and ascribed to Doctor Doyle (Dublin, 1823).

\_\_\_\_\_  
Remarks on the recent miracles, said to have been performed by Prince Alex. of Hohenlohe (Dublin, 1823).

Fermoy, Colonel Philip Roche, [pseud. Judge Johnston], A Commentary on the memoirs of Theobald Wolfe Tone, Major-General in the service of the Republic of France; in which the moral and physical force of Ireland, to support national independence, is discussed and examined from authentic documents (Paris, 1828).

Finlayson, Rev Joseph, The voice of facts from the convent of S. Joseph, Ranelagh, Dublin (Edinburgh, 1824).

First report of the Catholic Book Society, for the diffusion of useful knowledge throughout Ireland (Dublin [1828]).

Fishbourne, Rev Robert, The Protestant religion is that which was taught by Christ and his Apostles, and the religion of the Roman Catholics is a novelty - A sermon preached in the Church at Carlow on Sunday evening, March 4th (2nd ed., Carlow, 1827).

- French, Daniel, A letter to the Right Rev James Doyle, etc., etc., etc., in reprobation of some matter contained in his recent essay on the Catholic Claims, addressed to the Right Hon. The Earl of Liverpool, K.G. (London, 1826).
- Fry, Elizabeth and Gurney, Joseph John, Report addressed to the Marquess Wellesley, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, by Elizabeth Fry and Joseph John Gurney respecting their late visit to that country (London, 1827).
- Gladstone, William Ewart, The Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance : a political expostulation (London, 1874).
- Glassford, James, Letter to the Right Honourable the Earl of Roden on the present state of popular education in Ireland (London, 1829).
- Gregory, Rev E. Tighe, Ireland in 1830. The second year's administration of the Duke of Northumberland (London, 1831).
- Ireland in 1832; or, the second year of the Marquess of Anglesey's second vice-royalty (London, 1833).
- Halpin, Rev N. J., Authentic report of the speeches and proceedings of the meeting held at Cavan on the 26th January, 1827, for the purpose of forming a society for promoting the Reformation. To which are added, notes and an appendix, containing many interesting documents (Dublin, 1827).
- Hierophilos [John MacHale], A brief reply to the Charge of His Grace William Magee, Archbishop of Dublin; in two letters the first embracing his Grace's Charge - the second his commentaries (Dublin, 1822).
- Important controversial discussion between Rev Mr Pope and the Rev Mr Maguire, on the doctrines of the Church of Rome, which commenced at the Lecture-Room of the Dublin Institution on the 19th of April 1827 (Dublin, 1827).
- Important exposure of another miracle in the Co. Kildare (Dublin, 1823).
- Irenicus, A letter to J.K.L. in reply to his letters on the state of education in Ireland and on Bible Societies (Dublin, 1825).



- J.K.L., See Doyle.
- Jacob, Arthur, An essay on the influence of the imagination and passions in the production and cure of diseases; to which is added, a translation of a memoir by Dr C. Pfeufer, superintending physician of the General Hospital at Bamberg, on the cures performed by the operations of the Prince de Hohenlohe (Dublin, 1823).
- Jebb, John, A Charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Limerick, at the primary visitation, in the Cathedral Church of St. Mary, on Thursday the 19th of June 1823 (Dublin, 1823).
- Johnston, Rev J. Beresford, The danger of adding to, or detracting from the written word of God. A sermon, preached in the Church of St. Mary's Kilkenny, on the evening of the 28th of January, ult (Dublin, 1827).
- Kinsella, William, Controversial letters, in reply to Rev Mr Pope, Rev Mr. Daly, Rev Dr Singer and others. Also remarks on the canons of scriptures (Dublin, 1826).
- Laurence, Richard, A Charge delivered to the clergy of the dioceses of Cashel and Emly, at the primary visitation, in September 1822 (Dublin, 1822).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ A Charge delivered at the primary triennial visitation of the province of Munster in the year 1823 by Richard Archbishop of Cashel (Dublin, 1823).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ A Charge delivered at the triennial visitation of the province of Munster in the year 1826 (Dublin, 1826).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ A Charge delivered at the triennial visitation of the province of Munster in the year 1829 (Dublin, 1830).
- Lawless, John, An address to the Catholics of Ireland by John Lawless, Esq., on Sir Francis Burdett's Bill of Emancipation, with the accompanying wings about to be brought into parliament by Lord L. Gower and Mr Littleton (London [1825]).

Lees, Sir Harcourt,

Theological extracts, selected from a late letter written by a popish prelate to His Grace, the Archbishop of Dublin, with observations on the same: and a well merrited [sic] and equally well-applied, literary flagellation to the titular shoulders of the mild and humble Minister of the Gospel; with a complete exposure of his friend the Pope, and the entire body of the holy imposters (2nd ed., Dublin [1822]).

Letters of Laelius on various topics connected with the present situation of Ireland, as published in the Carlow Morning Post in the years 1822 and 1823 (Carlow [?1823]).

Lewis, Thomas,

A Charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Meath, at the annual visitation, on Thursday, the 25th of July 1822 and published at their desire (Dublin, 1822).

Lloyd, W. F.

Four lectures on poor-laws, delivered before the University of Oxford, in Michaelmas Term, 1834 (London, 1835).

Longfield, Mountifort,

Four lectures on poor-laws, delivered in Trinity term, 1834 [in Trinity College] (Dublin, 1834).

Magee, Joseph Joy,

A letter to Dr Cheyne, on the extraordinary cure of Mrs Stuart, of Ranelagh convent, in which is included a reply to a pamphlet entitled an attempt to explain, on natural principles, the cures alleged to be miraculous of Miss Lalor and Mrs Stuart, by a physician (Dublin, 1823).

Magee, William,

A Charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Raphoe at the primary visitation of that diocese, in the Cathedral Church of St. Eunan, on Wednesday, 17th of October 1821 (Dublin, 1822).

A Charge delivered at his primary visitation in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin on Thursday the 24th of October 1822 (Dublin, 1822).

A Charge delivered at his triennial and metropolitan visitation, in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, on Tuesday the 10th of October 1826 (Dublin, 1827).

Mant, Richard,

A Charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Killaloe at the primary visitation, 3 August 1820 (Dublin, 1820).

The rule of ministerial duty inforced [sic] in a Charge delivered to the clergy of the diocese of Killaloe at the ordinary visitation Wednesday, July the 24th, 1822 (Dublin, 1822).

Mason, Henry Joseph Monck,

Reasons and authorities and facts afforded by the history of the Irish Society, respecting the duty of employing the Irish language, as a more general medium for conveying scriptural education to the native peasantry of Ireland (Dublin, 1829).

McClintock, John,

A letter addressed to the Roman Catholics of the County of Louth (Drogheda, 1826).

McGhee, Rev Robert J.,

A letter from the Rev Robert J. McGhee to Henry Grattan, Esq., M.P. (Dublin, 1831).

Dr MacHale's letter to the Right Hon Earl Grey, with an answer, exhibiting the principles of the Church of Rome, and the reasons why the priests shut up the Bible from the poor (Dublin, 1832).

McGhee, Rev Robert J. and Daly, Rev Robert,

Dr Doyle's letter to Lord Farnham with an answer and a challenge (Dublin, 1832).

Miracle said to have been wrought by Prince Hohenlohe in Ireland, on Monday, the 9th of June, 1823 (London, 1823).

McSweeney, Rev Murtagh [pseud.],

A bold stroke for the Church; or the weight of the seven weighty reasons: being Dr Doyle's private letter to the Roman Catholic priests (Dublin, 1825).

Murray, Daniel,

A pastoral address to the Catholic clergy and laity of the diocess of Dublin announcing the miraculous cure of Mrs Mary Stuart, a religieuse of the convent of St. Joseph, Ranelagh with certificates of Dr Mills, Dr Cheyne, Surgeon McNamara, and a genuine statement of three medical gentlemen; with the certificates of Mr Wm Madden, Apothecary; together with the affidavits of Mrs Mary Stuart, Mrs Anna Stuart, Catherine Hosey, Mrs Margaret Dillon, Mrs Margaret Lynch, Rev John Meagher, and Rev Charles Stuart (Dublin, 1823).

- Newcombe, Rev Arthur, Christ, the only mediator and advocate. A sermon, preached in the Church of Carlow, on the evening of Sunday, February the 11th, 1827 (Dublin, 1827).
- Newland, Rev Henry, An examination of the evidence and arguments adduced by Dr Doyle before the Committee on tithes in Ireland, in defence of the supposed quadripartite or tripartite division (Dublin, 1832).
- O'Beirne, T. L., A charge delivered to the clergy of the Diocese of Meath, 5 October 1820 [Dublin, ?1820].
- O'Brien, William Smith, Thoughts upon ecclesiastical reform with suggestions for the conciliatory adjustment of the tithe question (Dublin, 1832).
- Observations on the late miracles and a short reply to a pamphlet entitled a complete exposure of the late miracles (Cork, 1824).
- Observations occasioned by the letter of J.K.L. to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant professing to be a Vindication of the Religious and Civil principles of the Roman Catholics of Ireland (Dublin, 1823; 2nd ed., London, 1824).
- O'Callaghan, Rev A. Observations on the state of political and religious feeling in Ireland (London, 1827).
- O'Connor, Rev N., Errors silenced and infidelity confuted; or, a defence of the miraculous cure of Miss M. Lalor, containing seven affidavits in confirmation of it, with a letter from Mr. P. Lalor to Doctor Smith (Dublin, 1823).
- O'Croly, David, An address to the lower orders of the Roman Catholics of Ireland; by the Rev David O'Croly, author of "An essay on ecclesiastical finance" with an appendix, containing two letters on the union of the two churches (first published in 1824) one by Dr Doyle, late R.C. Bishop of Kildare, the other by the author himself (Cork, 1835).
- O'fellus Hibernus Catholicus, An answer to Doctor Doyle; the sapient J. Robertson, M.P. and college of conciliation, who are busy at present in agitating the union of the churches (Dublin, 1824).

One year of the administration of His Excellency the Marquess of Wellesley in Ireland (London, 1823).

Otway, Rev C.

A lecture on miracles delivered in the parish Church of Saint James, on Wednesday, the 17th of September (Dublin, 1823).

A letter to J.K.L. on the subject of his reply to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827).

A letter in reply to the strictures of the Right Rev Dr Doyle on the late Charge of the Lord Bishop of Ferns (Dublin, 1827).

Ouseley, Gideon,

Letters to Dr Doyle, on the doctrines of his church, with an easy and effectual plan to obtain immediate emancipation - Being a vindication of five letters to the Rev M. Branagan, P.P. on the divine right of all to read the Holy Scriptures (Dublin, 1824).

A reply to a late speech of the Rev Mr. Clowry, a Roman Catholic priest of Carlow, against the Bible society and Bible reading. II. Observations on the Test Act and Freeholders; tending to unite in one priests and orangemen - romanists and protestants (Dublin, 1826).

Divine truth against error. Letters respecting Dr Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop, on his faith, worship and Church, etc. Dr Elrington, Bishop of Ferns vindicated (Manchester, 1828).

Four letters. I To the Duke of Wellington. II To the Right Hon Robert Peel. III A reply to Professor Kinsella of the Carlow Roman Catholic College. IV An answer to Dr Doyle on the Coronation Oath (Dublin, 1829).

Letters on tithe, etc., in reply to Dr Doyle, shewing to what Church due; also that the state should pay the Roman Catholic clergy (Dublin, 1832).

P's letter to the editor of the Catholic Spectator on the parliamentary commission, about to proceed to Ireland, to inquire into the state of education in that country (London, 1824).

- Parnell, Sir Henry, A history of the penal laws against the Irish Catholics from the year 1689, to the Union (first ed., 1808; 4th ed., London, 1825).
- Parnell, William, An historical apology for the Irish Catholics (Dublin, 1807).
- Pastoral address of the R.C. Archbishops and Bishops to the clergy and laity of their communion throughout Ireland (Dublin, 1826).
- 'Pastorini, Signor', [Charles Walmsley], The general history of the Christian Church from her birth to her final triumphant state in heaven (3rd ed., Dublin, 1800).
- Philpotts, Rev Henry, Letters to Charles Butler, Esq., on the theological parts of his book of the Roman Catholic Church; with remarks on certain works of Dr Milner and Mr Lingard, and on some parts of the evidence of Dr Doyle before the two committees of the houses of parliament (2nd ed., London, 1825).
- \_\_\_\_\_ A supplemental letter to Charles Butler, Esq., on some parts of the evidence given by the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, particularly by Dr Doyle, before the committees of the two houses of parliament, in the session of 1825; and also on certain passages in Dr Doyle's "Essay on the Catholic Claims" (London, 1826).
- \_\_\_\_\_ A letter to the Right Honourable George Canning, on the bill of 1825 for removing the disqualification of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects and on his speech in support of the same (3rd ed., London, 1827).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Letters to an English layman on the Coronation Oath (London, 1828).
- Protestant Layman, Animadversions on Lord Bexley's letter to the Freeholders of Kent (London, 1829).
- Report of the discussion at the Carlow Bible Meeting on Thursday, the 18th, and Friday, the 19th of November, 1824, with the speeches of the reverend gentlemen who took a part in the proceedings, revised and authenticated by themselves (Dublin, 1824).

Report of the discussion which took place at a meeting of the Ballinasloe Auxiliary to the London Hibernian Society on the 10th, 11th and 12th October 1826 (Dublin, 1827).

Report of the meeting of the Reformation Society, at Carlow, and the discussions which took place on the 18th and 19th October (Carlow, 1827).

Report of the proceedings at a meeting of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1820).

Report of the speeches delivered at the late Reformation meeting held at Cavan, on Friday, the 26th day of January 1827, by the Rt Hon. the Earl of Farnham, Henry Maxwell, Esq., M.P., Rev J. Collins, Rev W. Athill, Rev R. T. Pope, J. E. Gordon, Esq., etc., etc., giving a full development of the rise and progress of the Reformation now going forward throughout Ireland (Dublin, 1827).

Ryan, Rev Richard, A letter to the Right Hon. E. G. Stanley, etc., etc., in answer to Doctor Doyle's letter to Thomas Spring Rice, Esq., M.P., on the subject of poor laws, and the nature and destination of Church property (Dublin, 1831).

Scrope, G. Poulett, Plan of a poor law for Ireland, with a review of the arguments for and against it (London, 1833).

Scully, Denys, A statement of the penal laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland; with commentaries, 2 vols (Dublin, 1812).

Selskar, Remarks on Doctor Doyle's letter addressed to ---- Robertson, Esq., M.P. (Dublin, 1824).

Senior, Nassau William, A letter to Lord Howick on a legal provision for the Irish Poor; commutation of tithes and a provision for the Irish Roman Catholic clergy (London, 1831; 3rd ed., London 1832).

Sheridan, Edward, Dr Cheyne refuted. The cure of Mrs Stuart proved to be miraculous in reply to Dr Cheyne, with Dr Calonne's challenge to him (Dublin, 1823).

Sixteenth report of the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland (Dublin, 1828).

- Smith, Rev Sydney, A letter to the electors upon the Catholic question (York, 1826).
- S.N., See under Elrington, Rev Charles R.
- The advance and retreat of the Roman Catholic priests, at Carlow (Dublin, 1825).
- The controversial letters of Rev Robert Daly, of B.E., and of Daniel O'Connell, Esq., on the subjects of Bible Societies, proselytism and the real presence (Dublin, 1826).
- The crisis of the Roman Catholic Church (London, 1825).
- The encyclical letter of Pope Leo the XII with English translation to which are annexed Pastoral instructions by the Roman Catholic Archbishops and bishops to the clergy and laity of their communion throughout Ireland (Dublin, 1824).
- The pastoral address of the Catholic bishops of this province of Connaught, lately assembled in Tuam, to their clergy (Castlebar and Sligo, 1827).
- The remedy; a letter to Doctor Doyle, Roman Catholic Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, in reply to a work entitled "An essay on the Catholic Claims" (London, 1827).
- Therry, R. A letter to the Right Hon George Canning on the present state of the Catholic question - to which are annexed six letters of the Right Hon. E. Burke (London, 1826).
- The second report of the Irish society for promoting the education of the native Irish through the medium of their own language for the year 1819 (Dublin, 1820).
- The twenty-first report of the Hibernian Bible Society; adopted by the annual general meeting of the society, held in the Rotunda, Dublin, on the 26th of April 1827, with an appendix (Dublin, 1827).
- To J.K.L. on his letter to Lord Farnham (Dublin, 1827).
- Villaneuva, J. L., Observations on the answers of the Rt Rev James Doyle, D.D. Titular Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin to the Committees of the House of Commons (London, 1825).



Walsingham's able letter to Dr Curtis, Titular Roman Catholic Primate in reply to his unwarrantable attack upon his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, and calumnious imputation against the Protestants of Ireland [Dublin, 1822].

Wyse, Thomas,

The political catechism, explanatory of the constitutional and civil disabilities of the Catholics of Ireland (London, 1829).

Historical sketch of the late Catholic Association of Ireland, 2 vols (London, 1829).

(v) Collections of Printed Correspondence  
Memoirs, Diaries and Biographies

Aspinall, Arthur (ed.), The formation of Canning's ministry February to August 1827 (London, 1937).

The letters of King George IV 1812-1830, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1938).

The correspondence of Charles Arbuthnot (London, 1941).

The diary of Henry Hobhouse 1820-1827 (London, 1947).

Bamford, Francis and Duke of Wellington (ed.), The journals of Mrs Arbuthnot, 2 vols (London, 1950).

[Battersby, W. J.] The life of the Rt Rev Dr Doyle, compiled from authentic documents by the author of the "Priesthood Vindicated" (Dublin, 1834; 3rd ed., improved and enlarged, Dublin, 1850).

Brougham, W. (ed.). The life and times of Henry Brougham, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1871).

Broughton, Lord, Recollections of a long life, 6 vols. Lady Dorchester (ed.) (London, 1909-1911).

Butler, Charles, Historical memoirs of the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics, 4 vols (London, 1822).

- Cloncurry, Valentine Lord, Personal recollections of the life and times with extracts from the correspondence of Valentine Lord Cloncurry (Dublin, 1849).
- Colchester, Lord Charles (ed.), The diary and correspondence of Charles Abbot, Lord Colchester, 3 vols (London, 1861).
- Comerford, Michael, Collections relating to the Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin, 3 vols (Dublin [1883-1886]).
- Crolly, George, A life of the Most Reverend Dr Crolly Archbishop of Armagh (Dublin, 1870).
- Fitzpatrick, W. J., The life, times and correspondence of the Right Rev Dr Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, 2 vols (1st ed., Dublin, 1861; revised ed., Dublin 1861 [reprinted, Boston, 1862]; 2nd ed., Dublin 1880, reprinted Dublin, 1890).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, The life and times of Lord Cloncurry (Dublin, 1855).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Memoirs of Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin; with a glance at his contemporaries, 2 vols (London, 1864).
- Forster, Rev Charles, The life of John Jebb, D.D., F.R.S., Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe with a selection from his letters, 2 vols (London, 1836).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (ed.), Thirty years correspondence between John Jebb, Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe and Alexander Knox, Esq., 2 vols (London, 1834).
- Gregory, Lady (ed.), Mr Gregory's letter box, 1813-1830 (London, 1898).
- Jennings, L. J. (ed.), The Croker papers: the correspondence and diaries of Rt Hon. John Wilson Croker, 3 vols (2nd ed., revised, London, 1885).
- Law, Edward (Lord Ellenborough), A political diary, 1828-1830, 2 vols., Lord Colchester (ed.), London, 1881).
- McCullagh, W. Torrens, Memoirs of the Rt Hon. R. L. Sheil, 2 vols (London, 1855).

- MacDermott, Brian (ed.), The Catholic question in Ireland and England 1798-1822 The papers of Denys Scully (Dublin, 1988).
- MacDonagh, Michael, Bishop Doyle (Dublin, 1896).
- MacHale, John, The letters of the Most Reverend John MacHale, D.D. (Dublin, 1847).
- McHugh, Roger (ed.), Carlow in '98: The autobiography of William Farrell of Carlow (Dublin, 1949).
- MacSuibhne, Peadar (ed.), Paul Cullen and his contemporaries, 5 vols., (Naas, 1961-1977).
- Mahon, Lord (now Earl Stanhope) and Edward Cardwell, Memoirs by Rt Hon Sir Robert Peel, 2 vols (London, 1856-1857).
- Meagher, William, Notices of the life and character of his Grace Most Reverend Daniel Murray late Archbishop of Dublin with historical and biographical notes (Dublin, 1853).
- Messmer, Sebastian (ed.), The works of the Right Rev John England, first bishop of Charleston, 7 vols (Cleveland, Ohio, 1908).
- Moran, Patrick F., Spicilegium Ossoriense, being a collection of original letters and papers illustrative of the history of the Irish church from the Reformation to the year 1800, 3 vols (Dublin, 1874-1884).
- \_\_\_\_ (ed.), The letters of Rev James Maher, D.D., Late P.P. of Carlow-Graigue on religious subjects with a memoir (Dublin, 1877).
- O'Connell, M. R. (ed.), The correspondence of Daniel O'Connell, 8 vols (Dublin, 1972-1981).
- O'Reilly, Bernard, John MacHale, his life, times and correspondence (New York and Cincinnati, 1890).
- Parker, C. S., Sir Robert Peel from his private correspondence, 3 vols (London, 1891-1899).
- Pearce, R. R., Memoirs and correspondence of the Most Noble Richard Marquess Wellesley, 3 vols (London, 1841).
- Plunket, David, Life, letters and speeches of Lord Plunket, 2 vols (London, 1867).

- Savage, M. W. (ed.), Sketches, legal and political by the late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil, 2 vols (London, 1855).
- Sinclair, John, Memoirs of the life and work of Sir John Sinclair, Bart, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1837).
- Smith, Nowell, C. (ed.), The Letters of Sydney Smith, 2 vols, (Oxford, 1953).
- Stapleton, E. J. (ed.), Some official correspondence of George Canning, 2 vols (London, 1887).
- Torrens, W. M., Memoirs of the Right Honourable William Second Viscount Melbourne, 2 vols (London, 1878).
- Twiss, Horace, The public and private life of Lord Chancellor Eldon with selections from his correspondence, 3 vols (London, 1844).
- Vane, Charles, Marquess of Londonderry (ed.), Memoirs and correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh, second Marquis of Londonderry, 12 vols (London, 1848-1853).
- Wellington, Duke of (ed.), Despatches, correspondence and memoranda of Field Marshal Arthur Duke of Wellington, 8 vols (London, 1867-1880).
- Whately, E. Jane, Life and correspondence of Richard Whately, D.D., late Archbishop of Dublin, 2 vols (London, 1866).
- Wyse, Winifrede, M., Notes on education reform in Ireland during the first half of the 19th century compiled from speeches, letters, etc., contained in the unpublished memoirs of the Rt Hon Sir Thomas Wyse, K.C.B. (Waterford, 1901).

#### (vi) Secondary Sources

- Akenson, Donald H., The Irish Education Experiment. The national system of education in the nineteenth century (London, 1970).
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Church of Ireland : ecclesiastical reform and revolution 1800-1885 (New Haven and London, 1971).

- \_\_\_\_\_ A Protestant in Purgatory : Richard Whately Archbishop of Dublin (Hamden [Conn.], 1981).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Small differences. Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants, 1815-1922 An international perspective (Kingston and Montreal, 1988).
- Anglesey, The Marquess of, One leg : the life and letters of Henry William Paget, First Marquess of Anglesey 1768-1854 (London, 1961).
- Aspinall, Arthur, Lord Brougham and the Whig party (Manchester, 1927).
- Auchmuty, J. J., Sir Thomas Wyse 1791-1862 : the life and career of an educator and diplomat (London, 1939).
- Bartlett, Thomas, The fall and rise of the Irish nation - the Catholic question 1690-1830 (Dublin, 1992).
- Batterberry, Richard P. J., Sir Thomas Wyse, 1791-1862, an advocate of a 'mixed education' policy over Ireland (Dublin, 1939).
- Best, G. F. A., 'The religious difficulties of national education in England, 1800-70' in Cambridge Historical Journal, 12 (1956) : 155-173.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Protestant Constitution and its supporters, 1800-1829' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, 8 (1958) : 105-127.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Evangelicals and the Established Church in the early nineteenth century' in Journal of Theological Studies, 10 (1958) : 63-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The constitutional revolution, 1823-32, and its consequences for the Established Church' in Theology, 62 (1959): 226-234.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Whigs and the Church Establishment in the age of Grey and Holland' in History, 45 (1960) : 103-118.
- Bourne, Kenneth, Palmerston, the early years 1784-1841 (London, 1982).

- Bowen, Desmond J., The Protestant crusade in Ireland, 1800-70; A study of Catholic-Protestant relations between the Act of Union and Disestablishment (Dublin, 1978).
- \_\_\_\_\_  
Paul Cardinal Cullen and the shaping of modern Irish Catholicism (Dublin, 1983).
- Brady, John and Patrick Corish, The Church under the penal code in P. J. Corish (ed.), A history of Irish Catholicism, vol. iv, no. 2 (Dublin, 1971).
- Brenan, Martin, Schools of Kildare and Leighlin, A.D. 1775-1835 (Dublin, 1935).
- Bric, Maurice, J., 'The tithe system in eighteenth century Ireland' in Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy LXXXVI (1987) : 271-288.
- Brock, Michael, The Great Reform Act (London, 1973).
- Broderick, J. F., The holy see and the Irish movement for the repeal of the Union with England, 1829-1847 (Rome, 1951).
- Broeker, Galen, Rural disorder and police reform in Ireland 1812-1836 (London, 1970).
- Brophy, P. J., 'A pioneer Irish educationalist' [Dr Andrew Fitzgerald] in Carlovian (1949) : 19-30.
- Brynn, Edward, Crown and Castle : British rule of Ireland 1800-1830 (Dublin, 1978).
- Burns, R. E., 'The Irish penal code and some of its historians', Review of Politics xxi (Jan., 1959) : 276-299.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
'The Irish Popery laws : a study of eighteenth century legislation and behaviour', Review of Politics xxiv (Oct., 1962) : 485-508.
- Buschkuhl, Matthias, Great Britain and the Holy See, 1746-1870 (Dublin, 1982).
- Butler, Iris, The eldest brother: the Marquess Wellesley, the Duke of Wellington's eldest brother (London, 1973).
- Cannon, Sean, Irish episcopal meetings, 1788-1882; a juridico-historical study (Rome, 1979).

- Chadwick, Owen, The popes and European revolution (Oxford, 1981).
- Coakley, R., J.K.L. A great Irish bishop (Dublin, 1930) [C.T.S. pamphlet].
- Coen, Martin, The Wardenship of Galway (Galway, 1984).
- Connell, K. H., The population of Ireland, 1750-1845 (Oxford, 1950).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Irish Peasant Society : four historical essays (Oxford, 1968).
- Connolly, S. J., Priests and people in pre-famine Ireland 1780-1845 (Dublin, 1982).
- Conway, Thomas G., 'The approach to an Irish poor law 1828-33' in Eire-Ireland, 6 (1971) : 65-81.
- Corcoran, Timothy, State policy in Irish education, A.D. 1536 to 1816 (Dublin, 1916).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Educational systems in Ireland, from the close of the middle ages (Dublin, 1928).
- \_\_\_\_\_, O'Connell and Catholic education (Dublin, 1929).
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Catholic schools of Ireland, primary, secondary, university (Dublin, 1931).
- Corish, Patrick J., The Irish Catholic experience. A historical survey (Dublin, 1985).
- \_\_\_\_\_, The Catholic community in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Dublin, 1981).
- Cullen, L. M., The emergence of modern Ireland, 1600-1900 (Dublin, 1983 ed.).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Catholics under the Penal laws' in Eighteenth-Century Ireland, i (1986) : 23-36.
- Curran, M. J., 'Dr Michael Blake and the re-establishment of the Irish College, Rome' in Reportorium Novum, i, no. 2 (1956) : 434-442.
- d'Alton, Ian, Protestant society and politics in Cork, 1812-1844 (Cork, 1986).
- Daly, Mary and Dickson, David (ed.), The origins of popular literacy in Ireland (Dublin, 1990).

- Davies, G. C. B., Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter (London, 1954).
- Davis, R. W. 'The Tories, the Whigs and Catholic Emancipation, 1827-1829' in English Historical Review, xcvi, no. 382 (Jan., 1982) : 89-98.
- Donnelly, J. S., 'Pastorini and Captain Rock: millenarianism and sectarianism in the Rockite movement of 1821-4' in Samuel Clarke and J. S. Donnelly, Jr. (ed.), Irish Peasants : Violence and political unrest 1780-1914 (Madison, Wisconsin, 1983), 102-139.
- Dowling, Patrick J., The hedge schools of Ireland (Dublin and Cork, 1935; 2nd ed., Cork, 1968).
- Fahy, Mary de Lourdes, Education in the diocese of Kilmacduagh in the nineteenth century (Gort, Galway, 1972).
- Ford, Franklin, L., Europe 1780-1830 (London, 1970).
- Gash, Norman, Lord Liverpool (London, 1984).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Mr Secretary Peel. The life of Sir Robert Peel to 1830 (2nd ed., London, 1985).
- \_\_\_\_\_ Sir Robert Peel. The life of Sir Robert Peel after 1830 (2nd ed., London, 1986).
- Guilday, Peter, The life and times of John England first bishop of Charleston (1786-1842), 2 vols (New York, 1927).
- Gwynn, Denis, 'Bishop Doyle and Catholic Emancipation' in Studies XVII (Sept., 1928) : 353-368.
- Healy, John, Maynooth College - its centenary history 1795-1895 (Dublin, 1895).
- Henriques, Ursula, Religious toleration in England, 1787-1833 (London, 1961).
- Hempton, David 'The Methodist Crusade in Ireland, 1795-1845' in Irish Historical Studies, xxii, no. 85 (1980) : 33-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_ Methodism and politics in British society 1750-1850 (London, 1984).



- \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ and Myrtle Hill,  
Hexter, J. H.,  
Hill, J. R.,  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hilton, Boyd,  
Hinde, Wendy,  
Holmes, Finlay,  
Hoppen, K. T.,  
Inglis, Brian,  
Jenkins, Brian,  
Jones, W. D.,  
Jupp, Peter,  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 'Methodism in Irish Society, 1770-1830' in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, 36 (1986) : 117-142.
- 'Gideon Ouseley : Rural revivalist, 1781-1839' in Studies in Church History, 25 (1989) : 203-214.
- Evangelical Protestantism in Ulster Society 1740-1890 (London and New York, 1992).
- 'The Protestant revival and the Catholic question in England, 1778-1829' in Journal of Modern History, 8 (1936) : 297-319.
- 'The politics of privilege : Dublin Corporation and the Catholic question, 1792-1823' in Maynooth Review, 7 (Dec., 1982) : 17-36.
- 'National festivals, the state and "Protestant Ascendancy" in Ireland, 1790-1829' in Irish Historical Studies, xxiv, no. 93 (May, 1984) : 30-51.
- Corn, cash, commerce : the economic policies of the Tory government 1815-1830 (Oxford, 1977).
- George Canning (London, 1973).
- Henry Cooke (Belfast, 1981).
- Elections, politics and society in Ireland, 1832-1885 (Oxford, 1984).
- The freedom of the press in Ireland, 1784-1841 (London, 1954).
- Era of Emancipation : British government of Ireland, 1812-1830 (Kingston and Montreal, 1988).
- Prosperity Robinson, the Life of Viscount Goderich 1782-1859 (New York, 1967).
- 'Irish M.P.s at Westminster in the early nineteenth century' in J. C. Beckett (ed.), Historical Studies, VII (London, 1969) : 65-80.
- 'Urban politics in Ireland, 1801-1831' in David Harkness and Mary O'Dowd (eds.), The Town in Ireland, Historical Studies XIII (Belfast, 1981) : 103-123.

Keenan, Desmond, J.

Kerr, Donald A.,

Peel, priests and politics. Sir Robert Peel's Administration and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, 1841-1846 (Oxford, 1982).

Kingston, John,

Larkin, Emmet,

McDonagh, Oliver,

States of mind : a study of Anglo-Irish  
Conflict 1780-1980 (London, 1983).

O'Connell. The life of Daniel O'Connell, 1775-1847 (London, 1991).

McDowell, R. B.,

Public opinion and government policy in Ireland 1801-1846 (London, 1952).

The Irish administration, 1801-1914  
(London, 1964).

McGrath, Thomas G.,

'Archbishop Slattery and the episcopal controversy on Irish national education, 1838-1841' in Archivium Hibernicum, xxxix (1984) :13-31.

'Interdenominational relations in pre-famine Tipperary' in Wm Nolan and T. G. McGrath (eds.), Tipperary : History and Society (Dublin, 1985) : 256-287.

'Religious renewal and reform in the pastoral ministry of James Doyle, O.S.A., Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, 1819-1834' (N.U.I., Ph.D., 1987).

- 
- 'The historiography of the papers of Bishop James Doyle, O.S.A. (1786-1834) in the Kildare and Leighlin diocesan archives' in Archivium Hibernicum, xliii(1988) : 88-94.
- 
- 'The Tridentine evolution of modern Irish Catholicism, 1563-1962; a re-examination of the "Devotional Revolution" thesis' in Recusant History, vol. 20, no. 4 (October, 1991) : 512-523.
- Machin, G. I. T., 'The Catholic Emancipation crisis of 1825' in English Historical Review, LXXVIII (1963) : 458-482.
- 
- The Catholic question in English politics 1820 to 1830 (Oxford, 1964).
- 
- 'Canning, Wellington and the Catholic question 1827-29' in English Historical Review XCIX (Jan., 1984) : 94-100.
- Macintyre, Angus The Liberator : Daniel O'Connell and the Irish party, 1830-1847 (London, 1965).
- Malcolmson, A. P. W., John Foster : the politics of Anglo-Irish ascendancy (Oxford, 1978).
- McNamee, Brian, 'The "Second Reformation" in Ireland' in Irish Theological Quarterly 33 (1966), pp. 39-64.
- 
- 'J.K.L.'s letter on the union of churches' in Irish Theological Quarterly, 36 (1969) : 46-69.
- Milne, Kenneth, 'The Irish Charter schools : the grand design in principle and practice' in Irish Educational Studies, vol. 4, no. 1 (1984) : 35-53.
- Mitchell, A., The Whigs in opposition 1815-1830 (Oxford, 1967).
- Moore, H. Kingsmill, An unwritten chapter in the history of education, being the history of the Society for Promoting the education of the poor of Ireland, generally known as the Kildare Place Society (London, 1904).
- Morris, W. B., 'James Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin' in Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 4th series (Jan-June, 1987) : 22-38.

- 
- Murphy, Ignatius, 'Bishop Doyle and his biographers' in Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 4th series (Jan-June 1987) : 289-304.
- 
- 'Some attitudes to religious freedom and ecumenism in pre-emancipation Ireland' in Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 5th series, CV (Feb., 1966) : 93-104.
- 
- Primary Education in Patrick J. Corish (ed.), A History of Irish Catholicism, vol. 5, no. 6 (Dublin, 1971).
- 
- Newman, Jeremiah, Maynooth and Georgian Ireland (Galway, 1980).
- 
- Norman, E. R., Anti-Catholicism in Victorian Britain (London, 1968).
- 
- The English Catholic Church in the nineteenth century (Oxford, 1984).
- 
- O Canainn, Seamus, 'The Education Inquiry, 1824-1826 in its social and political context' in Irish Educational Studies, vol. 3, no. 2 (1983) : 1-20.
- 
- O'Connell, Philip, The schools and scholars of Breiffne (Dublin, 1942).
- 
- O'Donoghue, Patrick, 'Causes of the opposition to tithes, 1830-38' in Studica Hibernica, no. 5 (1965) : 7-28.
- 
- 'Opposition to tithe payment in 1830-31' in Studica Hibernica, no. 6 (1966) : 69-98.
- 
- 'Opposition to tithe payment in 1832-3' in Studica Hibernica, no. 12 (1972) : 77-108.
- 
- O Faolain, Sean, King of the beggars (Dublin, 1970 ed).
- 
- O'Farrell, Patrick, 'Millenialism, messianism and Utopianism in Irish history' in Anglo-Irish Studies, ii (1976) : 45-68.
- 
- O'Ferrall, Fergus, Daniel O'Connell (Dublin, 1981).
- 
- '"The only lever . . ."' : The Catholic priest in Irish politics, 1823-29' in Studies, LXX, 280 (1981) : 308-324.
- 
- Catholic Emancipation. Daniel O'Connell and the birth of Irish democracy 1820-30 (Dublin, 1985).

- O Tuathaigh, Gearoid, Ireland before the famine, 1798-1848 (Dublin, 1972).
- Phillips, W. A. (ed.), History of the Church of Ireland from the earliest times to the present day, 3 vols (London : 1933-4).
- Reynolds, J. A., The Catholic Emancipation crisis in Ireland 1823-1829 (Newport, Connecticut, 1970).
- Ronan, M. V., An apostle of Catholic Dublin - Father Henry Young (Dublin, 1944).
- Rude, George, Revolutionary Europe, 1783-1815 (London, 1964).
- Scott, Geoffrey, 'The times are fast approaching' Bishop Charles Walmesley, O.S.B. (1722-1797) as prophet' in Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36 (Oct., 1985) : 590-604.
- Senior, Hereward, Orangeism in Ireland and Britain 1795-1836 (London, 1966).
- Spater, George, William Cobbett : the poor man's friend, 2 vols (London, 1982).
- Stunt, T. C. F., 'Evangelical cross-currents in the Church of Ireland, 1820-1833' in Studies in Church History 25 (1989) : 215-221.
- Trench, Charles C., The Great Dan (London, 1986).
- Wall, Maureen, Catholic Ireland in the eighteenth century : collected essays of Maureen Wall, Gerard O'Brien (ed.) (Dublin, 1989).
- Ward, Bernard, The eve of Catholic Emancipation 3 vols (London, 1911-1912).
- Ziegler, Philip, Melbourne (London, 1978).

### (vii) Works of Reference

Canons and decrees of the sacred and oecumenical Council of Trent celebrated under the Sovereign pontiffs, Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV translated by the Rev J. Waterworth (London and New York, 1848).

- Carlen, Claudia, The papal encyclicals (1740-1981), 5 vols (n.p. [McGrath Publishing Co., U.S.A.], 1981).
- Catholic Encyclopaedia, 16 vols (New York, 1907-1914) and Supplement, vol. xvii (New York, 1922).
- Dictionary of National Biography, Stephen, Leslie and S. Lee (eds.), (London, 1910-).
- Hyland, Aine and Kenneth Milne (eds.), Irish Educational Documents, vol. i (Rathmines, Dublin, 1987).
- Malcolmson, Robert, The Carlow Parliamentary Roll : comprising lists of the Knights of the the Shire, and members for the Borough of Carlow, from the earliest times to the introduction of the ballott, and of the representatives of Old Leighlin to the period of the Union. With genealogical notes and illustrative extracts (Dublin, 1872).
- Vaughan, W. E. (ed.), A new history of Ireland, v. Ireland under the Union, I, 1801-70 (Oxford, 1989).
- Wakefield, Edward, An account of Ireland, statistical and political, 2 vols (London, 1812).
- Walker, B. W. (ed.), Parliamentary election results in Ireland 1801-1922 (Dublin, 1978).