
Spring 1987

John Timon and the Succession to the See of Baltimore in 1851

Leonard R. Riforgiato C.M.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://via.library.depaul.edu/vhj>

Recommended Citation

Riforgiato, Leonard R. C.M. (1987) "John Timon and the Succession to the See of Baltimore in 1851," *Vincentian Heritage Journal*: Vol. 8 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <https://via.library.depaul.edu/vhj/vol8/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Vincentian Journals and Publications at Via Sapientiae. It has been accepted for inclusion in Vincentian Heritage Journal by an authorized editor of Via Sapientiae. For more information, please contact digitalservices@depaul.edu.

John Timon and the Succession to The See of Baltimore in 1851

by
Leonard R. Riforgiato

In the nineteenth century the archbishopric of Baltimore held a special position within the American church. As the first diocese and metropolitan see, its archbishop was accorded a position of honor among the hierarchy, despite the fact that by mid century other cities had eclipsed it as centers of American Catholicism. The death of Samuel Eccleston, fifth archbishop of Baltimore on 22 April 1851 set in motion a struggle for the succession to the premier see that reveals much about the divisions among the hierarchy in antebellum America.

Archbishop Eccleston's death was not unexpected. He suffered a nervous disorder of sorts in 1843 which caused "hallucinations of persecution."¹ Two years later "he was thrown from his carriage and suffered severe head injuries."² At best Eccleston was never a strong leader. In illness he left a power vacuum into which Bishop Francis P. Kenrick of Philadelphia rapidly moved. Kenrick, who was Irish born, had studied for the priesthood at college of the Propaganda, where his brilliance won him many Roman connections and friends. When complaints reached Rome of Eccleston's incompetence in office, Kenrick was dispatched to investigate. He reassured the Vatican that Eccleston was recovering, but that he had pressured the archbishop into accepting a coadjutor, at least in

¹John Peter Marschall, C.S.V., "Francis Patrick Kenrick, 1851-1863: The Baltimore Years" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1963), 30. ε

²Ibid.

principle. Indeed, he specified the candidate he thought best suited for the post, Father John Timon, the provincial superior of the American Vincentians. Eccleston, however, refused to be pinned down to any particular candidate, most probably because of the pressure Kenrick was applying to get him to do so.

Kenrick was not the first to suggest that John Timon be raised to the episcopacy. Timon's background, intelligence, and leadership qualities made him a natural for the position.

Timon was born in Conewago, Pennsylvania, on 12 February 1797 of Irish immigrant parents from County Cavan. When he was three years old, the family moved to Baltimore, where his father, James, achieved some success and prosperity as a merchant. In 1811 John Timon was enrolled at Saint Mary's College in Baltimore as a day student. Upon graduation he entered the family firm. In 1818 the Timons moved to Louisville, where they opened a short-lived general merchandise store. The following year they relocated to Saint Louis. There Timon met the Vincentian missionary, Reverend Felix de Andreis, and decided to join the Vincentians himself. He studied at Saint Mary's of the Barrens in Perry County, where he was ordained in 1826.

For nine years Timon labored in the missions of Missouri and Illinois. Suddenly, in 1835, he was much in demand for the episcopacy. Three bishops -- Joseph Rosati of Saint Louis, Simon Bruté of Vincennes, and John Dubois of New York -- asked Rome to appoint him as coadjutor. All three admired his indefatigable missionary zeal and insatiable appetite for work. It was John Dubois, however, who recognized a most important quality that would make Timon an important ecclesiastic: he was of Irish ancestry but native born. As Dubois pointed out in a letter to Bishop John Purcell of Cincinnati in 1835, the appointment of Timon would satisfy two disparate and hostile groups within his diocese: native born Americans and Irish.

I wish to gratify the Irish as much as possible - strangers to our missions will not do - *verbum sapienti* - Irish not educated in this country will seldom be acceptable to the Americans. At least they are rendered obnoxious to them by the fanatic sectaries & the local politicians combined together. By presenting Mr. Timon of an Irish family & born in this country, we reconcile both parties, Irish & Americans; at least we silence them. Fanaticism both Religious and Political has carried so far that moderate Protestants tell me that their opposition to our church is as Irish not as Catholic.³

In a second letter to Purcell, Dubois begged him to support his claim to Timon to spare him from persecution by his own Irish flock. "You know the clannish disposition of the Irish for their country men how worthless so ever they may be. I pointed out to you the necessity of sparing that propensity by the appointment of an *Irish name* and at the same time the importance of having that *name* corrected by American habits and education."⁴ Unfortunately for Bishop Dubois and the others, the Vincentians forestalled this episcopal frenzy by organizing their mission in America into a separate province and appointing John Timon the first visitor or provincial (1835).

Rosati, however, refused to be thwarted. In 1839, at his insistence, Rome named Timon coadjutor of Saint Louis. Timon refused, suggesting that Rosati nominate Peter Kenrick instead. This, however, did not get him completely off the hook, for Rome then appointed him prefect apostolic of the Republic of Texas, a post he was to hold along with his other responsibilities. After negotiating a settlement of church property with the republic, Timon convinced Rome to raise Texas to a vicariate apostolic and appoint a fellow Vincentian, John Mary Odin, as vicar apostolic in 1841. After the death of

³John Dubois to John B. Purcell, from New York, 2 July 1835, University of Notre Dame Archives (hereafter cited as UNDA).

⁴Dubois to Purcell, from New York, 29 September 1844, UNDA.

Rosati in 1843, Francis Kenrick emerged as Timon's episcopal champion. As early as 1843 he was pressuring Eccleston to accept the Vincentian as his coadjutor. Bishop John Chanche of Natchez remarked on this to Bishop Anthony Blanc of New Orleans, rejoicing that these efforts appeared to have failed, for he thought "Mr. Timon is not what he was. He is prematurely old, he would be ineffective."⁵ Kenrick's lobbying efforts finally bore fruit when the Sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1846 recommended that Timon be consecrated coadjutor to Celestine de la Hailandière, Bishop of Vincennes. Kenrick was not completely satisfied with the outcome for, as he confessed to Bishop John Purcell of Cincinnati, "I have no wish to see him at Vincennes, where he would be as a light under the bushel."⁶ To his brother, Peter Kenrick, then Bishop of Saint Louis, he suggested "it may be necessary to repeat [our] recommendation of the V. Rev. Mr. Timon as the most worthy to reflect honor upon the episcopal office, or even that he should be the next to occupy the metropolitan see."⁷ Kenrick's actions enraged Bishop Guy L. Chabrat, coadjutor to Bishop Benedict J. Flaget of Louisville, who, now almost blind, was in Europe urging the nomination of Timon as his own replacement.

To everyone's consternation, Timon was not appointed to Vincennes as the Council and Propaganda had recommended but, evidently at the personal initiative of Pius IX, was named instead to the newly created see of Buffalo. That diocese, it

⁵Chanche to Anthony Blanc, from Natchez, 30 October 1844, UNDA.

⁶Francis P. Kenrick to Purcell, from Philadelphia, 30 December 1846, UNDA.

⁷Francis P. Kenrick to Peter R. Kenrick, 28 December 1846, in Francis E. Tourscher, ed., *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence: Letters Chiefly of Francis Patrick Kenrick and Marc Anthony Frenaye, Selected from the Cathedral Archives, Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1920), 244.

had been expected, would go to Andrew Byrne, bishop of Little Rock, a former New Yorker and acceptable to John Hughes of New York City, out of whose diocese the see of Buffalo was being carved. Timon accepted his bulls for, as a Vincentian provincial consultor, Francis Burlando, explained to the superior general, Jean Baptiste Étienne, he feared that refusing Buffalo he would be appointed to Louisville "which he wouldn't have liked because there's slavery in the state of Kentucky."⁸

Presumably John Hughes was none too pleased to have Timon in his newly erected province. Hughes was a sensitive man who never forgot nor forgave a slight, imaginary or real. John Dubois's refusal of his first efforts to enroll at Mount Saint Mary's instilled in him a strong dislike for the aged Frenchman that explained Hughes's inconsiderate treatment of Dubois when Hughes was Dubois's coadjutor in New York. It is doubtful that Hughes would take kindly to a man who had been Dubois's own first choice for the New York coadjutorship. Moreover, Hughes and Kenrick had been on bad terms ever since they had served together in Philadelphia, Hughes as a priest and Kenrick as coadjutor. Hughes would see Timon as a Kenrick man. In fact, Timon and Hughes never got along. To his astonishment the archbishop of New York discovered that his suffragan in Buffalo was fully as autocratic as he was and invariably followed his own mind. No sooner had Timon settled in western New York than he crossed Hughes by staunchly defending the temperance crusade of Father Theobald Matthew, despite Hughes's strong objections to Matthew's appearance before nativist and antislavery organiza-

⁸Francis Burlando, C.M., to Jean-Baptiste Étienne, C.M., from Saint Louis, 20 September 1847, Archives of Saint Mary's Seminary, Perryville, Missouri, Bayard Papers.

tions. Given Timon's implacable opposition to alcohol, his actions are understandable. He himself used it only for medicinal purposes. On one memorable occasion, the bishop of Buffalo, suffering severely from erysipelas, or cellulitis as it is now called, bathed his feet in whiskey to ease the pain. He then conducted holy week services in the cathedral, all the while emitting a decidedly strong odor of liquor from his person, which caused his priests, in Father Robert McNamara's words, "to look at each other with a wild surmise."⁹ It was Timon who informed Francis Kenrick that he suspected that John Hughes had a drinking problem, news that Kenrick cheerfully passed along to Rome when the Vatican was once again considering elevating Hughes to the cardinalate.

Upon Eccleston's death, Kenrick saw another chance to promote John Timon's career. As will be seen, however, his motives might not have been altogether disinterested.

Despite Baltimore's preeminent position, New York City, with its vast Catholic population and energetic, ever visible bishop, was now viewed as the premier see, at least so far as public perception was concerned. At the Seventh Provincial Council of Baltimore in 1849 Kenrick was the moving spirit behind the hierarchy's petition to Rome that the archbishop of Baltimore be accorded primatial status, a decision which Rome deferred. Meanwhile, Kenrick had successfully lobbied to elevate Saint Louis, a see occupied by his brother, to archiepiscopal rank before that honor was accorded to other older sees. Kenrick appears to have been roundly denounced for this act of nepotism. He petulantly defended himself to his brother by claiming that the charges were misdirected. "It

⁹Anecdote related by Reverend Robert F. McNamara, Rochester, New York.

would be more just perhaps if they charged me with favoring the promotion of the Bishop of Buffalo.”¹⁰

In 1850 Cincinnati, New York, and New Orleans also became archbishoprics. Now Kenrick was alarmed that with added dignity equal in fact to that of Baltimore, the energetic Hughes would become de facto primate of the American church, for he appeared to be a favorite in Rome. His worst fears were realized in 1851 when Purcell informed him that Hughes would probably become a cardinal. Kenrick, in return, expressed his strong opposition to any such move. “I think it inexpedient to have any Cardinal in the United States. You may express this sentiment in my name to the Cardinal Prefect, or to His Holiness.”¹¹ Kenrick had expressed his feeling that should anyone be given a red hat, it should be the archbishop of Baltimore. By this he meant whoever held the see, though not necessarily the current occupant. The day after this letter to Purcell, Eccleston died. It is possible that Kenrick now seized the opportunity to thwart Hughes by using John Timon as a stalking horse to obtain for himself the metropolitan see.

In the minds of many, it was imperative that Baltimore should be occupied by a native born American. There were, however, only nine members of the hierarchy who qualified: John McCloskey of Albany; William Tyler of Hartford; John Chanche of Natchez; Richard Miles of Nashville; Richard Whelan of Wheeling; John McGill of Richmond; Ignatius Reynolds of Charleston; John Fitzpatrick of Boston; and, of

¹⁰Francis P. Kenrick to Peter R. Kenrick, 24 May 1848, in Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, 278-79.

¹¹Francis P. Kenrick to Purcell, 21 April 1851, in Hugh J. Nolan, *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851* (Philadelphia, 1948) 421.

course, Timon. By backing Timon, Kenrick, inadvertently or not, created a set of circumstances that led to his own nomination. First, he incurred the hostility of John Hughes, who determined to block the accession of his suffragan to the see of Baltimore. Secondly, he split native born bishops. Some of the southern bishops viewed Kenrick's actions as a power play by the northern hierarchy to place one of their own in a southern see. Certainly this was the opinion of John Chanche, who had aspired to the position himself. As he explained to Purcell, "Natchez for Baltimore would certainly have been an honourable and comfortable change - but it was hardly to be expected. The North had too many claims ... What will be the next episcopal move? ... But we little people of the South have no business to think of such things."¹²

Actually, in view of the importance of Baltimore, an episcopal translation was likely. If so, the most obvious candidate, should a native born be chosen, was someone with close ties to the see, that is, Timon, Chanche, or Whelan, who had spent much of their lives there. By backing Timon, the most divisive of all, Kenrick, in effect, blocked the appointment of a native born.

Bishops Michael O'Connor of Pittsburgh and John McGill of Richmond were the only Baltimore suffragans to join Kenrick at Eccleston's funeral. As the senior of the three, Kenrick pressured the others to join him in recommending Timon as Eccleston's successor, which they did in a joint letter to Rome, dated 26 April 1851. Kenrick, the author of the letter, praised Timon for his piety, zeal, and knowledge and pointed out that "he was acceptable to the clergy and people, born in the state of Pennsylvania, educated in Baltimore, and

¹²John Chanche to Purcell, 9 October 1851, in Nolan, *Kenrick*, 246-47; 247, note 214.

has labored throughout the United States.”¹³ Because Eccleston had left no list of possible successors, Kenrick had requested that one of his vicars general, a Sulpician Francis L’homme, submit names of diocesan priests worthy of consideration. Stating that none were, L’homme suggested Timon.

Bishop McGill, however, for reasons never stated, was unenthusiastic about Timon. Though he was himself native born, he persuaded Bishop O’Connor to join him in recommending Kenrick for the see. This they did in a letter dated 27 April, giving for their reasons Kenrick’s great piety and learning. Because Baltimore was of such antiquity and prominence and because the archdiocese encompassed the nation’s capital, they felt it best to appoint the most learned of the hierarchy to the position, and that was Kenrick. Timon, however, was acceptable as a second choice.¹⁴

Some time later, Eccleston’s list of preferred successors was found. In it he listed as his first choice John Chanche, with Richard Whelan second and either Vicar General Henry B. Coskery or Reverend Gilbert Raymond, a Sulpician who had served as president of Saint Mary’s College, as third choice. Kenrick communicated this to Rome but rejected all four men. Coskery he dismissed as a good priest who lacked episcopal qualities. Raymond, a Frenchman, would not do because he spoke heavily accented English. Kenrick could not support Whelan because of his persistent opposition to the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. He saved his heaviest criticism for Chanche, whom he “totally opposed,” for “a few years ago his mind was seriously affected — he is full of national prejudices — little esteemed for learning and zeal.”

¹³Francis P. Kenrick, Michael O’Connor, and John McGill to Propaganda, 26 April 1851, Propaganda Fide Archives (hereafter PFA) and UNDA.

¹⁴McGill and O’Connor to Propaganda, 27 April 1851, PFA and UNDA.

Two of the most logical choices for Baltimore, Chanche and Whelan, were thus torpedoed on charges Rome would take seriously, dementia and heterodoxy respectively. Finally, Kenrick could not resist taking another poke at Hughes. "My heart rejoices," he wrote,

that at Rome the project of making an American cardinal has been abandoned. It would serve only to render relations with the Holy See less frequent. The endowments of the Archbishop of New York are many and respectable: of supreme and singular talent: in the public eye his reputation is great and spotless. He lacks however a solid ecclesiastical education. His elevation would not be a service to himself or to religion. And being a citizen only by adoption, America could be less than gratified by his promotion.¹⁵

Meanwhile McGill and O'Connor had sent copies of their letter nominating Kenrick to the Baltimore suffragans as well as all the archbishops. Kenrick was fully aware of activity on his behalf as he indicated to his brother, "The Bishop of Richmond indeed hesitated [over the choice of Timon], but yielded to the reasons given by the Bishop of Pittsburg [*sic*]. But later on the Bishop of Charleston objected strongly saying that I should have been named."¹⁶

Rome was now deluged with conflicting advice on the succession. Bishop Ignatius Reynolds consistently supported Kenrick, arguing that the fact that he was foreign born should not prevent his nomination. Chanche, Whelan, and Timon, he pointed out, were each born of immigrant parents and therefore only in the first generation. Besides, Kenrick's thirty-year residence had americanized him.¹⁷ Bishop Whelan of Wheeling supported Timon, while Francis X. Gartland, newly

¹⁵Francis P. Kenrick to Propaganda, 14 May 1851, PFA and UNDA.

¹⁶Francis P. Kenrick to Peter R. Kenrick, 15 May 1851, in Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, 317.

¹⁷Ignatius A. Reynolds to Propaganda, 1 May 1851, PFA and UNDA.

appointed Bishop of Savannah, backed Kenrick. Timon and Chanche were his second and third choices respectively.¹⁸ Archbishop Anthony Blanc notified Propaganda that he and his suffragans endorsed Kenrick's nomination of Timon. Yet it appeared evident that Blanc really favored his second choice, Chanche, for he spent most of the letter praising him. Especially compelling to Blanc was the fact that Chanche was a native of Baltimore and, because Natchez was an unimportant see, it could be more easily filled than Buffalo. At first Blanc listed Kenrick as his third choice but later wrote Rome substituting Whelan instead.¹⁹ Archbishop Purcell followed Blanc's example, endorsing Timon as first choice but concentrating most of his letter on his second choice, Chanche, whose Baltimore connections admirably qualified him for the post.²⁰

The confusion deepened when Michael O'Connor suffered his third change of heart. In a long letter to Propaganda, dated 14 July 1851, O'Connor commented on Eccleston's preferences. Of Chanche he said, "my lord of Natchez is a virtuous and quite affable man, but in saying this I believe all has been said." Both Whelan and Chanche, he felt, were also opposed by the clergy and people of Baltimore. Their spokesman, Vicar General L'homme, had specifically requested Timon, asserting that after the impotent reign of the sickly Eccleston, they needed "a man of vigor who was powerful in act and word." O'Connor argued that Timon best suited this need and regretted that he had ever acceded to McGill's insistence on Kenrick. He now supported Timon for "it is said ... and not, I

¹⁸Richard V. Whelan to Propaganda, May 1851; Francis X. Gartland to Propaganda, 2 May 1851, PFA and UNDA.

¹⁹Blanc to Propaganda, 7 May and 27 May 1851, PFA and UNDA.

²⁰Purcell to Propaganda, 3 June 1851, PFA and UNDA.

think, without reason, that one of American birth should be nominated to Baltimore." Timon, American born and Baltimore bred, best suited.²¹ By implication O'Connor also denied that Kenrick was capable of providing vigorous leadership.

Archbishop John Hughes, who was in Paris at the time of Eccleston's death, learned of Kenrick's activities through Reverend Joseph Carrière, superior general of the Sulpicians. Writing at length to Cardinal Fransoni on 19 May 1851, Hughes proposed four reasons for his strong opposition to Timon's appointment. In the first place he did not agree with the practice of translating bishops which, he claimed, would create instability and cause harm to the church. Secondly, he argued that the circumstances of American bishops were different. Unlike their European counterparts they held debts and property in their own names. Transference of these to a successor would cause difficulties. Thirdly, he asserted that Timon was indispensable where he was. Buffalo was destined to become greater and more important than Baltimore anyway. Finally, Hughes strongly objected to the way the nomination had been pushed through, rapidly and without due consultation among all the bishops. He asked the Holy See to delay filling the see until such consultation could take place and hinted that he had a secret candidate of his own to propose. Hughes did not reveal his identity except to say that he was a Jesuit priest who did not belong to Hughes's own diocese.²²

On 24 June 1851, Hughes wrote to Kenrick to inform him of his response to Propaganda and repeat his objections to Timon. He indicated that he could support Chanche but would prefer Kenrick himself if translation of a bishop was neces-

²¹O'Connor to Propaganda, 14 July 1851, PFA and UNDA.

²²Hughes to Cardinal Fransoni, 19 May 1851, PFA and UNDA.

sary. Since one of his arguments to Kenrick against Timon's transfer was that Buffalo was too important to take second place to Baltimore and Timon too essential to be replaced, presumably he wished to convey Philadelphia's unimportance and Kenrick's non-essentiality. Finally, Hughes expressed his preference for a priest for the post and told Kenrick about his secret candidate, whose name he would reveal should Kenrick visit New York.²³

Eventually Rome ended the confusion by appointing Kenrick to the archbishopric. Blanc wrote Purcell on 15 November 1851 that he had learned from Bishop Odin that Timon had almost made it. "The Pope meditated a good deal, in regard to the appointment of the Abp. of Baltimore. He seemed much inclined for the appointment of Bp. Timon but at last, he sided for the present learned and pious incumbent."²⁴

As for Kenrick, he was elated by the appointment and expressed his joy to his brother. "It is right and fitting that you before all others should be informed about the new honors which have been conferred upon me: that with me you may marvel at the mysterious designs of God, and pray that I prove myself worthy of them. I ask myself frequently in my thoughts: "Who am I, and what is my house, that thou givest such things to me?"²⁵

Others were not so enthusiastic. Bishop Chanche expressed to Archbishop Blanc his suspicions that Kenrick and his Irish colleagues had pulled a fast one.

²³Hughes to Francis P. Kenrick, 24 June 1851, in Nolan, *Kenrick*, 423-24.

²⁴Blanc to Purcell, 15 November 1851, UNDA.

²⁵Francis P. Kenrick to Peter R. Kenrick, 19 September 1851, in Tourscher, *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence*, 319.

Well we have the news of the appointment of the Bishop of Philadelphia to the See of Baltimore. From the moment I knew that his name was on the list, I was satisfied of the result. How it occurred will be a little mystery, with which we will not be acquainted till we reach the next world. In a letter which I received from Archbp. Purcell, he tells me that M. Timon was the choice of the Suffragans. That [the] Archb. of New York would have no translation. You & Archb. Purcell named the same one. How does it happen that Bishop Kenrick has got the head of them all? It looks like occurrences to which unfortunately we are somewhat too well acquainted — Four Irish Archbishops in the country — well — it will all turn out as it ought I hope in the end.²⁶

It would seem, then, that the struggle over the succession to the see of Baltimore in 1851 reveals a great deal about the attitudes of the hierarchy towards each other.

In the first place it would appear possible that Kenrick did use Timon as a stalking horse to get the appointment for himself. He would have known that Hughes would block the transfer of his suffragan without his prior approval, even more so as Timon was a protege of Kenrick, for whom Hughes had no love. Certainly, had Kenrick sincerely wanted the post for Timon and not for himself, he could have remonstrated to Rome and attempted to remove himself from consideration as John McCloskey did in 1864 over the succession to New York. This he never did. Kenrick also knew that general sentiment favored the appointment of a native born American to that post. By effectively eliminating the only other logical contenders, Chanche and Whelan, he would open the way for a foreign born compromise candidate, himself. Achieving the primordial see, he would equal or outrank Hughes in dignity.

Hughes, on the other hand, probably objected to Timon's appointment for personal reasons -- the inability to accept the elevation of a subordinate above him, especially one he did not

²⁶Chanche to Blanc, from Natchez, 11 October 1851, UNDA.

get along with. Besides, the vigorous and domineering Timon was a match for Hughes, as the scholarly and retiring Kenrick was not. Raised from the relative obscurity of Buffalo to the eminence of Baltimore, Timon, not Hughes, would dominate the American church. Hence Hughes found Kenrick preferable to Timon as archbishop, though Hughes never supported Kenrick to Rome.

The native born bishops stymied themselves in their struggle against Irish domination by failing to unite around any one of their number. In effect, Timon and Chanche canceled each other out. There is evidence, moreover, that in 1851 the sectional differences that would erupt into civil war ten years later were beginning to appear among the American hierarchy.

As for Rome, it is intriguing to speculate on why Pius IX hesitated before choosing Kenrick. Certainly Timon's leadership qualities, the strength of his character, and vigor appealed to the pope. That is probably also what ruled out Timon. Throughout his priestly life, even in his episcopate, Timon wandered throughout the United States giving missions, raising funds, mediating disputes, and consulting bishops. Archbishop Blanc, on refusing Timon's invitation to attend the consecration of Saint Joseph's cathedral in Buffalo, wryly commented that "he must have supposed me endowed with the fullness of his own natural travelling taste & disposition to have entertained any hope of my consent to it."²⁷ The Roman legate, Archbishop Bedini, in his recommendations after his American trip, suggested that Timon spend more time in his own diocese. In effect, Timon was functioning as de facto head of the American church by his ubiquitous presence and far-flung contacts. Anxious about the emergence of

²⁷Blanc to Purcell, 24 May 1855, UNDA.

national churches, an anxiety increased by American pressure for a primate, Rome could hardly appoint the strong minded, native born Timon to Baltimore. In the end it rejected both Timon and the primacy.

In effect, however, Timon did continue to exercise enormous influence on the church. Kenrick might have viewed Timon as a protege, but it is evident from available correspondence between the two that the practical Timon dominated the scholarly Kenrick, as he did his successor Martin J. Spalding. Perhaps, as Bishop Chanche hoped, things did turn out all right in the end. Surely they turned out differently, for had John Timon become archbishop of Baltimore, it is possible that the primacy might have been effected in fact, if not in name.



We must make it our maxim never to be surprised at present difficulties, no more than we are at a wind that passes, since with a little patience we shall see an end of them. Time changes all things.

Saint Vincent de Paul