In 1989 the *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* published a set of four laudatory testimonials in honour of Patrick O’Reilly who had died in Paris on 6 August 1988 at the age of 88. He had been secretary-general of the Société from 1944 to 1973. Several years earlier, in 1982, it had also dedicated a double issue of the *Journal* to him. These were both well-deserved tributes. They honoured a man whose scholarly labours—and allegedly ‘dictatorial’ management style—had helped make the Société (from its inception a more academically professional operation than its closest analogue, the Polynesian Society of New Zealand) a major force in the nascent area of systematic Pacific studies; and who, through his assiduity in locating and listing published source materials had, arguably, been one of the two main founders of the post–World War II speciality of Pacific history. He cleared so much of the ground for later researchers. The other one of the pair was J.W. Davidson, a protégé of J.C. Beaglehole and Raymond Firth. From 1951 to 1973, with the considerable resources of The Australian National University behind him, Davidson presided over a uniquely dedicated department of Pacific History. That is, one which was designed to train post-graduate specialists in that field (the flow of whom began to trickle forth in 1957), and which has generated a corpus of monographs that continues to underpin what has become a thriving scholarly enterprise.

Warm as they were, though, the tributes to O’Reilly were anomalously incomplete. The items directly concerned with him were rhetorical effusions, fervently appreciative but vacuously generalised. His life was not chronicled, nor, and this seems especially odd in respect of someone whose bibliographies were invaluable tools within a significant academic discipline, were his own publications listed in the *Journal*. Admittedly, in 1988, the Société d’Etudes Historiques de la Nouvelle-Calédonie published an extensive list (234 items) of his Pacific writings. But by not garnering his numerous non-Pacific writings,
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it could not serve as a definitive memorial to his literary labours. Also, by arranging its contents according to the various islands with which his writings dealt, instead of year by year, it does not present him, as Robert Langdon admiringly observed in 1971, as being ‘prodigiously energetic’. That task was eventually accomplished, only in 2002, by the present writer, with a list of 311 items published between 1925 and 1986. This was appended to Sonia Faessel’s artfully contrived biography of O’Reilly, a book in which style tends to obscure substance, although with some effort most of the essential information can be distilled from it.\(^6\)

The list, though, is clear. It illustrates not only a steady rate of productivity, but a broad pattern of evolution within O’Reilly’s outlook and output. It begins with essays on Catholic local history within France, then moves in the 1930s to solidly researched studies of French religious activity in the Pacific. Most of these were published in the *Revue d’Histoire des Missions*, a journal founded in 1924 by the priest–author J-B. Piolot and the Academician Georges Goyau, both of whom were later associates of O’Reilly. Goyau was a distinguished historian who, mindful of traditional links between Church and society, had a particular concern for reducing the gap in mutual sympathy, and in regard for complementary achievement, that had so markedly alienated Catholicism from French national sentiment since the Revolution of 1789.

From the mid-1930s, items concerning the Solomon Islands, and some showing an ethnographic interest also, begin to appear on the publications list, where they were joined in 1940 and 1942 by books about two of O’Reilly’s friends from a Parisian Left Bank literary and bibliophile circle in which he moved. For a decade from the late 1940s, New Caledonia, New Hebrides and Fiji feature prominently in his writings while, from the late 1950s, French Polynesia becomes increasingly conspicuous. All the while he was also producing bibliographies. The first of these, relating to the Marist missions and ranging from the Solomons to Samoa, appeared in 1932. From 1946 to 1963 he published in the *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* annual bibliographies, ranging variously from 30 to 60 pages in length, of writings on the Pacific. During that time he was also working on a volume of bibliography, preceded by an associated dictionary of biography, styled a bio–bibliography, for each of the French territories. These appeared for New Caledonia in 1953 and 1955, New Hebrides in 1957 and 1958, Wallis and Futuna (bibliography only) in 1964, and French Polynesia in 1962 and 1967, the last volume running to over 1,000 pages.

---

‘By his works you shall know him’. Not quite. For the question still remains, what else was there to O’Reilly? Where had he come from? Who was this man who was acquainted with and respected by so many of the band of Pacific historians that began emerging in the 1950s? Not least among them John Dunmore who, in his book (1981) on de Surville’s expedition, acknowledges ‘the encouragement and help over the years [that] has been received from Father O’Reilly of the Société des Océanistes’. This paper is intended to supply an answer.

Patrick O’Reilly (pronounced with a soft ‘O’, an equal stress on all syllables, and a slight ellision of the ‘ll’s) was, as his name suggests, of Irish ancestry. That forebear was James (subsequently ‘Jacques’) Farell O’Reilly of Cork, the son of an Irish sea-captain, and who migrated to Le Havre in 1771 (at the age of about 13) in order, so family tradition has it, to escape religious oppression. If so, as the history of Irish migration to France from the late seventeenth century indicates, he was one among many. But that is another, and very long, story. At Le Havre, James found employment with a merchant named Grégoire and demonstrated such an aptitude for business that in 1784 he set up his own firm, O’Reilly et Cie. It prospered, and continued to do so under his son, Philippe-André. Laurent, the latter’s son, though, preferred a career as a military officer. In 1891, after service in North Africa, he married Jeanne Gautier, the daughter of a wealthy merchant. Patrick, the second of their four children, was born in the garrison town Saint-Mihiel (Meuse) in northern France on 19 May 1900. But his father’s promising career was cut short in 1906 when, rather than submit to the law of Separation of Church and State (passed in 1905), which could oblige soldiers to act contrary to their religious opinions, Laurent resigned his commission and retired to the family estate in Normandy. Still a patriot, though, he returned to the colours when war broke out with Germany in 1914, and was killed three weeks after the outbreak of hostilities.

Meanwhile, after attending boarding schools in Normandy, Patrick came to Paris in November 1918 to study at the Sorbonne, intending to enrol at the Ecole des Chartes. There he stayed at a hostel, the ‘Réunion des Étudiants’, run by the Marist Fathers (Society of Mary) at 104 Rue de Vaugirard, not far from the site (now no. 72) where 95 Carmelite monks were murdered by Revolutionaries on 2 September 1792. But a year later he enlisted for a term

of military service (1920–1922). On completion of that, instead of returning to university, he entered the novitiate of the Marists at La Neylière, near Lyon. He took his vows of membership there in December 1922. Then came six years of study at the Marist seminary at Differt in Belgium, culminating in ordination to the priesthood on 25 February 1928. Apart from his acquaintance with them at ‘104’, O’Reilly’s joining the Marists probably derived also from the convergence of two persuasive influences: that of a youthful, romantic attraction towards the tropics, together with an awareness of the missionary work of that congregation, which had initiated the Catholic evangelisation of the islands of the western Pacific in 1837. One of his early school friends, Gilbert Vieillard, about whose life he would later write, became a missionary in Africa.12 As for O’Reilly himself, health problems seem to have barred him from joining various of his seminary classmates in following the wake of Bishop Pompallier to the Pacific, but his intellectual avocations shaped a complementary career.13

In 1931, following three years of school and parish work he was appointed chaplain at ‘104’. Founded in 1895 to provide assistance and religious guidance for pupils from Marist colleges coming to Paris for higher study, this had quickly become an elite institution with a vigorous intellectual life. Under Alphonse Plazenet, who became director in 1897, it expanded and was soon receiving students from all over France, drawn to study at Saint-Cyr, the Polytechnique, the Faculté de Droit and others of the Grandes Ecoles that constituted the University of Paris. Many of its inmates moved on to notable careers.14 François Mauriac the Nobel Prize-winning novelist and the philosopher Jean Guitton, both of them later Academicians, and who both retained their close links with the place, had preceded O’Reilly there.15 In 1963 Guitton became the first layman to address a modern ecumenical council (Vatican II).16 Among those who came to ‘104’ after O’Reilly, but with whom he became well acquainted, were François Mitterand, student president in 1935 and later president of the Republic (1981–1995), and Edouard Balladur, a minister of economy and finance, and eventually prime minister (1993–1995). Early literary and political writings of Mitterand were published, under O’Reilly’s editorship, in Revue Montalembert. This was a
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12 Patrick O’Reilly, Mon Ami Gilbert l’Africain, Dijon, 1942.
monthly journal published at ‘104’ since 1908. In its title it honoured the memory of a nineteenth century proponent of reconciliation between Catholicism and political liberalism in France, a disciple of Lamennais.17

Residence at ‘104’ also made it possible for O’Reilly to finish his own academic studies. These had come to centre on the Institut d’Ethnologie (within the Ecole Pratique des Haute Etudes) and its founder Marcel Mauss, who had been a protégé of Emile Durkheim (his uncle), and both of whom were seminal contributors to advances in the scientific examination of human society. In 1932 O’Reilly obtained his Licence ès lettres and the diploma of the Institut. While there he also became friendly with another set of people, enthusiasts who shared his Pacific interests. One such was André Ropiteau, whose biography he would later write. Ropiteau had in 1926 embarked on a four-year long voyage around the world in his yacht, in an escapist quest for natural innocence and simplicity. This he found, according to his lights, and the romantic vision of the novelist Pierre Loti, on the island of Maupiti in French Polynesia, where he stayed for two years. Ropiteau was killed in action early in 1940, but he bequeathed his extensive library of writings on Tahiti to O’Reilly, who made it the basis of a notable collection of his own, and the key source for a massive bibliography.18

Buoyed by his new professional status, O’Reilly then became involved in the developing field of missiology, a form of applied ethnology. To this end he was among the founders of the quarterly journal Etudes Missionnaires, which commenced publication in 1933. Unlike the Revue d’Histoire des Missions, which ‘is concerned with the past and seeks to integrate mission history with national and world history’, Etudes Missionnaires was concerned with ‘the actual conditions of spreading the Gospel, the diversity of needs and methods, the relations between missionaries and other agents such as governments and philanthropic associations, and the implications of international affairs’.19 Meanwhile, he had also come to the notice of Paul Rivet, director of the Musée d’Ethnologie du Trocadéro, located near the Eiffel Tower.

In March 1934, at Rivet’s behest, with the approval of his Marist superiors, and with a grant from the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique to cover costs, he was despatched for a year to Australian New Guinea, to the island


of Bougainville, where the Marists were strongly entrenched. The object of the expedition was to collect artefacts for the museum, to record traditions, to describe local customs, and to make a film about them. These ends were all substantially met, especially the first (he collected 4,000 items), but Rivet was deeply chagrined when O’Reilly never produced the doctoral thesis or the major monograph that his harvesting was also expected to yield. Still, he did save much that would otherwise have been lost, as was particularly the case with missionary papers. In 1901 the Marists became the first permanent European residents of Bougainville and, by 1935, their manuscript letters, journals, memoirs and ethnographic notes constituted an unparalleled archival record of the history and culture of the island. In the hope of writing a history of the mission, O’Reilly took them all back to France with him. Again the promised book never appeared, but the predation was soon to be justified by events. Bougainville was devastated by heavy fighting during World War II. Had O’Reilly not acted as he did, and so endowed later enquirers with access to unique documents (as he did when my wife Eugénie and I worked with him at ‘104’ for six weeks in 1967), much of the prewar history of Bougainville would not only have remained unknown, it would have been rendered unknowable.

That O’Reilly so disappointed Rivet is probably not unconnected with the fact that, on returning to Paris in October 1935, he was appointed to succeed Plazenet as director of ‘104’. Here he continued to write articles but the duties of the post and his obligations as a Marist were impediments to accepting additional scholarly responsibilities, especially if, as seems likely, Rivet had been grooming him for a professional position in the new Musée de l’Homme, as the Musée d’Ethnologie du Trocadéro, which had less socially contextualised displays, was reconstituted in 1937.

The outbreak of World War II in 1939 and the German occupation of Paris in 1940 further distracted him from concentrating on a major project, but it seems, in any case, that by temperament he was more disposed to the busy-ness of ordering and organising than to the solitary ruminations of the grand synthesiser. Still, O’Reilly did maintain a close association with Rivet. During the war years he put considerable effort into reorganising the Pacific exhibits of the Musée, and was involved in discussions, especially with Maurice Leenhardt, a former Protestant missionary in New Caledonia (1902–1926) and, in 1940, Mauss’s successor at the Institut d’Ethnologie, on the better ordering of Pacific studies in France. In 1936 a group of enthusiasts, organised by two people who

20 He was out of France from March 1934 to October 1935, and in Melanesia from June 1934 to July 1935. For Bougainville, see Hugh Laracy, Marists and Melanesians: a history of Catholic missions in the Solomon Islands (Canberra: Australian National University, 1976).
21 Faessel, Itinéraires Insulaires, pp. 45–53, 151.
22 Witness to O’Reilly’s ‘rescue operation’ is given in my contributions to Anthony Regan and Helga Griffin (eds), Bougainville Before the Conflict, Canberra, 2005, pp. 123–4, 163.
had had professional experience in the Pacific, Louis Marin and Leon Sasportas, and which included several noted scholars such as Peter Buck, Fritz Sarasin and Felix Speiser formed the Société des Océanistes, and established a bulletin to publish its proceedings. Later, in 1939, within his new Musée de l’Homme, Rivet organised a less formal association known as the Groupe d’Etudes Océaniennes. Clearly such a division of energy and resources was wasteful. O’Reilly and Leenhardt, accordingly, made it their business to amalgamate the two bodies, which occurred at a meeting on 22 December 1944, not long after the liberation of Paris. Like the Groupe, the new organisation was an adjunct of the Musée, but, in a diplomatic concession to the Marin–Sasportas party, it adopted the name Société des Océanistes.\(^\text{23}\) Leenhardt was elected president and O’Reilly secretary-general. In this post, he was not only principal editor of the Journal from 1946 (volume 2), but also director of the Société’s publication series, the first item of which appeared in 1951; and contributed prolifically to both. Indeed, the Journal came to be funded largely from the profits made on the sale of his other publications.\(^\text{24}\)

Extensive as it was, O’Reilly’s work with the Société des Océanistes did not limit his religious activity. Indeed, insofar as from its beginning in 1946 to its demise in 1967 he was intimately involved with Missions des Iles, a popular journal issued monthly by the Marists to publicise their Pacific missions, the two were complementary. That was especially the case after 1951, when he gave up the directorship of ‘104’, although he continued to reside there. When he was in Paris, that is. For in the post–World War II decades he was to make several return visits to the Pacific. The first of these was to Fiji, New Hebrides and New Caledonia in 1948–1949. Particular fruits of this trip, ones combining his interest in the finer points of book production and typography with an appreciation of the importance of the written word in establishing Christianity in the Pacific—a point later expounded by the historian G.S. Parsonson in a classic article titled ‘The Literate Revolution in Polynesia’\(^\text{25}\)—were detailed bibliographies that listed and described the imprints of the Catholic mission presses in New Caledonia and Fiji (forerunners of similar works on the Solomon Islands and Samoa). But there was much more. Among other results in an outburst of eclectic fecundity, were comments on current developments, including the first extended published account of the Jonfrum cult, a religious–political movement that was challenging European authority on Tanna in the New Hebrides.\(^\text{26}\)

Meanwhile, publications based on other phases of research and rumination were also appearing. These included, in 1948, Pirogues au Vert-Galant, an elegantly
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\(\text{24} \) Faessel, Itinéraires Insulaires, p. 154.
written and produced essay on ‘souvenirs’ of the Pacific to be found in the streets and cemeteries of Paris, which he had explored during the four years of German occupation; and, in 1949, a book on the wartime experiences of his Marist confrères in Japanese-occupied Bougainville, written in collaboration with Jean-Marie Sédès.²⁷ O’Reilly, as his publication list shows, was a vigorous recruiter of ‘collaborators’. Then, in the late 1950s, with his main New Caledonia and New Hebrides work behind him, his attention was drawn increasingly eastwards, and found a new and enduring expression there. In 1959, resuming the mantle of ethnologist, he was commissioned by UNESCO to report on the existence of, and prospects for, museums in the Pacific. No ascertainable material results issued from this undertaking, but it was a happy portent. In 1963 the Singer-Polignac foundation, a philanthropic trust, hired him to design and organise a museum at Tahiti dedicated to the painter Paul Gauguin. Given Gauguin’s irreligion and his dissolute ways, it could be seen as an ironical task for a priest to accept, but that France might draw glory from his achievement was a more pertinent—and persuasive—fact to O’Reilly. The museum, located near Pape’ete, where Gauguin had lived in the 1890s, was duly opened in 1965. With that completed, O’Reilly turned his attention to building a museum at La Neylière to commemorate Jean-Claude Colin, the founder of the Marists. This was extended in 1969 into a mission museum, illustrating the history and work of the Society of Mary in the islands of the Pacific.²⁸ O’Reilly made his last major visit to the Pacific in 1971, to attend an important UNESCO-sponsored conference on source materials for Pacific studies held at The Australian National University. At the end of it he undertook an extensive tour, visiting many of his haunts of former years; his journal of which has been edited for publication by Jean Guiart.²⁹

From a survey of the life and works of O’Reilly a clear theme emerges. That is that for him, through the medium of Pacific studies, being Catholic fused with being French. In writing on the Pacific, O’Reilly was both reporting on and celebrating the French presence there. After all, that presence was a given, and his particular imperative, as it was for the bibliophile Ropiteau, was to ensure—and preserve—its knowability, rather than to engage in criticisms or to indulge in misgivings about it. Monocultural his oeuvre may have been, although he did write on a Marist who had founded seminaries and organised an indigenous development program in New Caledonia, and on indigenous artists and on traditional myths. But that characteristic did not diminish its empirical value; other dimensions of the subject could be studied by others. O’Reilly’s task was to record the French imperial/colonial enterprise in the Pacific, not to review

it. At the same time he was concerned to highlight, as an integral part of it, the participation in and contribution to that enterprise of Catholic missionaries. In them piety combined with patriotism. Moreover, they were additionally estimable because they also extended the range of French achievement well beyond the French Pacific as a politically defined entity.

Consonant with such an outlook, indeed, logically following from it, O’Reilly, a cleric who consorted with admirals, artists, antiquarian booksellers, anthropologists, administrators, restaurateurs, and historians, never obscured the fact that he was a Catholic priest. He was rarely seen without his clerical collar; his regular street dress was a soutane and a round, flat-brimmed Roman hat (which gave him the appearance of an eighteenth century abbé) and he was customarily known as ‘Père O’Reilly’. But ‘104’ was not allowed in any way to subvert the Musée de l’Homme. The anthropologist Jean Guiart, a protégé of Leenhardt and later a colleague of O’Reilly, has confessed that in 1945 he and Leenhardt feared that O’Reilly might turn the Journal de la Société des Océanistes into a missionary propaganda organ. They need not have worried. For O’Reilly piety and patriotism, l’église and la patrie, were to be linked by mutual respect and acceptance rather than by the scourges of internecine competition, hostility and partisanship, out of which the Marists had been born in 1836, and which remained prevalent until the 1920s.

Finally, regardless of anything else O’Reilly’s legacy endures. Indeed, in accord with the Latin maxim scripta manent, verba volent (‘the written word remains, the spoken word flies away’) his guides to source materials should permanently endorse his status as a patron of ‘Pacific History’.