



# Barquilla de la Santa Maria

BULLETIN of the Catholic Record Society -  
Diocese of Columbus

Vol. XXXVII, No. 5

May 7: St. Agostino Roscelli

May, 2012



*Archbishop Purcell enthroned in the Ohio General Assembly, in a Thomas Nast cartoon that appeared in the August 28, 1875 issue of Harpers Weekly.*

His his feet are on the constitution. In back of the bishop is a picture of "St. Gaghan," labeled "The Representative of Rome, not of Cincinnati." A picture of the Pope is also displayed with the caption "A Foreign Prince Reigning in the United States." Also in the picture are priests standing under a doorway with a sign above which reads, "Ohio Roman Legislature." The entire cartoon bears the caption "The Established (Foreign) Church in Ohio—What are you going to do about it?"

# Bishop Rosecrans and the Geghan Law

by J. Michael Finn

Since the adoption of the Ohio Constitution, Ohioans have been guaranteed freedom of religion and freedom of conscience. Article I, Section 1.07 of the 1851 Ohio Constitution reads as follows (a similarly worded section was included in the original 1802 Ohio Constitution, Article VIII, Section 3):

All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any form of worship, against his consent; and no preference shall be given, by law, to any religious society; nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the general assembly to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Based on these rights it would follow that state institutions (prisons, orphanages, and asylums) would have the obligation to provide freedom of religion. This seemed to hold true; that is, as long as the religion was not Catholic. Inmates of state institutions in the nineteenth century who were of the Catholic faith were forced not only to conform to the Protestant religion but they often encountered pressure to convert to Protestantism.

The Protestant chaplains in state institutions were paid members of the institution's administrative staff. Many of these men not only disagreed with Catholic doctrine, they strongly and actively opposed any efforts by the inmates to maintain their Catholic beliefs.

Oscar Handlin reflecting upon the treatment of Catholics in public institutions said, "Despite laws to restrict their influence, Protestant chaplains dominated the spiritual life of public institutions, controlling the inmates' reading material and religious services, while Catholic priests found great difficulty in securing access ..."

One of the rules governing chaplains in the Ohio Penitentiary read as follows: "Sectarian doctrines in matters of religious belief shall not be taught. If any prisoner desires communication with the minister or instructor of his particular faith, on proper application to the Warden, and at his discretion, it shall be allowed, under and in conformity with the general regulations of the prison; but such minister or instructor, on such occasions must in all things conform to the rules and regulations for the government of the Chaplain, any infringement or departure from which will debar him from future intercourse with the prisoners."

Freedom may be granted, but only upon "proper application to the Warden, and at his discretion." The institutional chaplain and warden were the gate keepers who controlled the religious freedom that was supposedly "natural and indefeasible." In most cases, this meant that ministers of other religions were either denied access or their access was limited to monitored visitations and often no private facilities or chapels were provided by the institution.

Journals of nineteenth century Protestant chaplains provide ample evidence that the attitude of Protestant chaplains was to save Catholic prisoners from the alleged "errors" of their religion rather than allow them access to it. Reverend James B. Finley, Protestant Chaplain at the Ohio Penitentiary in the 1850s, a paid member of the prison administration staff, told Catholic inmates that priests did not come to see them regularly because they could not get paid for doing so. In his journal Chaplain Finley wrote the following, disdaining the Catholic religion in favor of Protestantism:

Soon after this I held an interesting little dialogue with a Catholic, who was one of the shrewdest of his sect, though he was marked by the same credulity and ignorance of religion which characterize all the rest.

'Ah,' exclaimed the poor fellow, 'if I had been taught to read and reverence this book (the Bible),

which I could have carried with me when going beyond the reach and influence of religious instruction, I think I never should have been in such a place as this; and it is hard to reflect that our early instruction, by making sin so venial a thing that man can pardon it, tends to blind our minds, to corrupt our hearts, and to lead us into the paths of vice. But if I ever get out of this prison, I think I shall try to learn and know things for myself.'

This was the doctrine of private judgment asserted by one whom the opposite doctrine (i.e. Catholic) had greatly injured in body and in soul. This man had a clear head. I asked him if he had begun to pray to Christ for the pardon of his sins. 'No,' said he, 'not yet; but I have prayed to the Virgin Mary, Christ's mother.' I told him that she could not hear him; that she was dead and gone to heaven; and that, if she could hear him, she had no power to forgive his sins. 'You must pray to God,' said I, 'who, for Christ's sake, will forgive you your trespasses.'

Next I fell in with B., a native of the Emerald Isle. He is a Catholic, and, consequently, almost perfectly ignorant of the Bible; but he has some convictions of sin, and an idea of the future state. I addressed him kindly... When I exhorted him to cease praying to the saints, and to make his wants known directly to his God, telling him that his heavenly Father was as willing to hear him as his priest, or even the Pope himself, the idea seemed to astonish him. He, however, appeared to believe it. ...and I was again impressed, as I have often been before, that the true way to reach the Catholic population of our country, and to turn them from the error of their way, is to treat them kindly, and win them to the truth by gentleness and love.

In 1873 the Democrats secured the governorship of Ohio by electing William Allen. In addition, both houses of the Ohio General Assembly held a Democratic majority.

It was clear that Ohio intuitions were not complying with the Constitution and it fell upon the General Assembly to pass laws "to protect every religious denomination." John J. Geghan, a Democratic representative from Cincinnati, introduced a bill to protect inmates of jails or other state institutions from being forced to attend religious

worship or instruction. This bill was introduced in order to clarify the Constitution and provide an enforceable law that would cost the state of Ohio nothing. The bill written by Representative Geghan read as follows:

**Chapter 8028; Section 1:** *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That as liberty of conscience is not forfeited by reason of conviction of crime or by reason of detention in any penal, reformatory, or eleemosynary institution or any house of refuge, work house, jail or public asylum in this state, no person in any such institution shall be compelled to attend religious worship or instructions of a form which is against the dictates of his or her conscience; and it shall be the duty of every director, trustee, superintendent or other person having in charge any such institution, to furnish ample and equal facilities to all such persons for receiving the ministrations of the authorized clergyman of their own religious denominations or persuasions, under such reasonable rules and regulations as the trustees, directors, managers or superintendents shall make, but no such rules shall be so construed as to prevent the clergyman of any denomination from fully administering the rites of his denomination to such inmates; provided, such ministration entail no expense on the public treasury.*

Catholics in Ohio were urged to support the bill by their Bishops and priests. Archbishop John Purcell of Cincinnati was a major supporter of the bill and urged his parishes to support it. The same was true of Bishop Sylvester H. Rosecrans of Columbus. Legislators heard from their Catholic constituents in large numbers.

In an editorial published in the *Catholic Columbian*, Bishop Rosecrans wrote, "Have not the people of Ohio imagined that they were carrying out religious equality ever since the beginning of the Commonwealth? The fact is the whole prison system, in Ohio, both in teaching and excluding religion, has been up to this time a fraud and an oppression. Preachers have thrust themselves into positions actually forbidden by the spirit of the Constitution, and, while there, have exhibited intolerance towards all religious convictions... If the Legislators are not





*Rep. John J. Geghan*

afraid of religious equality let them establish it in the Prisons, Reform Schools, County Infirmaries and Hospitals.”

In a letter that became public while the bill was pending, the Catholic representative John J. Geghan referred to his bill as an act of justice to Catholics and payment of an obligation to Catholics for supporting the Democrats. The letter sparked an immediate and almost hysterical response from Republican politicians and newspapers.

The chief argument from the opposition was that the bill was an example of Catholic domination of the Democratic Party. The Democrats accused the Republicans of using the Geghan bill “to work upon the passions and prejudices of the anti-Catholic and anti-foreign element of our people.”

After public opinion had been whipped up the *Ohio State Journal* observed that, “Instead of being an advantage to the democracy this most unnecessary piece of legislative bunkum has aroused and alarmed the people of the entire State, and is alienating from the Democratic fold hundreds of conscientious voters who cannot submit to sectarian

dictation and will not act with a priest-ridden party.”

Despite Republican opposition, the Geghan Bill was passed on March 30, 1875 and signed into law by Governor William Allen.

Many falsehoods about the new law were spread by the anti-Catholic element. The chief of these was that the law applied to public schools (which it did not). Ridiculous statements circulated that the law was part of the Catholic-Vatican-Jesuit conspiracy to destroy public education. It was also rumored that the law was written by a Catholic priest named Geghan (also not true). So pervasive were the many falsehoods about the law that supporters actually published a copy of the law to prove that that it had no impact on the public schools.

The fear was also expressed that the Catholics would use this opportunity in the institutions to proselytize the Protestant inmates (something the Protestant chaplains had been doing for some time). It was published that the Catholic bishops were lying when they claimed there would be no proselytizing. Bishop Rosecrans’ response to the proselytizing argument was presented in the *Catholic Columbian*: “Now with this spirit in our adversaries what is the use of trying to defend ourselves? If what we say can be distorted into a charge against us, the charge will be framed. If what we say is fair and unexceptionable then we will be accused of lying. Here in Columbus a Catholic priest has been visiting the Penitentiary for the last five or six months, and has never meddled or wished to meddle with the non-Catholics of the prison.”

The bishop also defended the Ohio Penitentiary warden when he purchased \$67.85 worth of Catholic prayer books for use by the Catholic inmates. The *Ohio State Journal* called the purchase an “evil precedent.” The bishop wrote, “There are more than one hundred Catholic convicts in the Penitentiary. These, like the rest, are obliged to remain in their cells all day Sunday, with nothing to break the monotony of their solitude but a Protestant Bible, Hymn Book, or a copy of the *Ohio State Journal*. At eleven a.m. they are marshaled into the Chapel to hear a salaried prayer and an official sermon. At four p.m. they are permitted to go again

to the Chapel to see what the Young Men's Christian Association have got ready for them. All the rest of the day they are alone. Now of course Catholic prisoners have committed crimes; but not being hardened to every crime, they do not relish reading in which their faith is maligned. For this reason the Warden thought he was doing right in furnishing those convicts with a prayer book apiece, as all the Protestant prisoners had a Protestant Bible and hymn book. Whose bull is gored?"

The war of words between the good bishop and the *Ohio State Journal* continued when the newspaper noted that Catholic priests were always welcome at the penitentiary and enjoyed the *privilege* of visiting Catholic convicts. Bishop Rosecrans responded, "The statement that Catholic priests were not only at all times welcome to visit the prison and perform the offices of religion according to their faith is untrue. That they were allowed to hear confessions, with difficulty and under restrictions, is, of course, a privilege not granted to those who do not believe in confession. But to *italicize* this, as a privilege, is simply to say that we have no right to be Catholics. There was one Warden who used to send for a priest in case a convict was dying, but he did not afford any further facilities than access to the sick ward, where the attendants hung about the priest and sick bed so as to make it necessary to give general absolution and extreme unction, without attempting to administer the viaticum. Still he risked so much in doing even this that we never wished to have him compromise himself by doing more."

Bishop Rosecrans was quick to note that there were *privileges* which the *Ohio State Journal* was not aware. "But we know another 'privilege' of which the *State Journal* is ignorant. Last winter and spring there was smallpox in the County Infirmary—a public institution. The Catholic priests of this city enjoyed the *privilege* which no 'preacher' enjoyed,—to breathe the foul air of the Pest House, frequently, to bring comfort and consolation to the afflicted ones, to hear their confessions and touch their plague stricken bodies in administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. Nobody objected

to this *privilege* of Catholic priests,—they were left to enjoy it alone. The *State Journal* was mute on the subject, and in all probability did not know anything of it, as its news gatherer and penitentiary man did not venture in that direction."

Not missing the opportunity to parody the situation when the purchase of Catholic books at the prison was criticized but noting the expenditure of \$10.80 on the *Ohio State Journal* for the penitentiary prisoners, the bishop responded in the style of the *Ohio State Journal*, "This amount is not great, to be sure, but is a beginning of a vast scheme of newspaper publishers to live on the taxes of the people of Ohio. Whatever their motives are, there is the fact! Ten dollars and eighty cents gone for Beecher-Tiltonism, second-hand jokes and anti-Catholic lies! Begin to wake up now, O independent voters, so as to be ready with your rebuke early in October!"

To add more gasoline to the political fire, 1875 was an election year in Ohio. The Republican platform, the Republican candidates for the General Assembly, and the Republican candidate for governor, Rutherford B. Hayes, railed against the Gaghan Law as an example of Catholic domination of the present Democratic legislature and governor. The Republican campaign was distinctly anti-Catholic. Political speeches were made across Ohio in opposition to the so-called sectarian "takeover" of state institutions.

The opponents reasoned if the Sectarians (a code word for Catholics), with the support of the Democrat-Catholic alliance, could take over the state institutions in this fashion it would only be a simple matter before they were taking over the public schools.

Bishop Rosecrans continued to address the political aspects of the debate and the notion that Democrat passage of the bill was a response to Catholic threats not to support the Democratic Party. The bishop wrote, "The thing denounced in the Republican platform was the assertion that Catholics had made any new attack on anything or had any interest in the issue as Catholics. It was the lying statement of Danforth that priests had raised money

to support the Geghan bill, and the mendacious assertion of Noyes that the party had any honest right to drag the Catholic religion into their dirty scramble for office in Ohio. Our opposition to godless education is the same now as it has been for the past twenty-five years—the same as when, during the war, we were called a Republican. We have made no new demonstrations, formed no new expectations, and we view with disgust this rude and wanton assault on our Faith.”

These issues also moved Bishop Rosecrans to attack the business of anti-Catholicism directly. He wrote, “They [the anti-Catholics] clap their hands over the imprisonment of a Catholic Archbishop in Granada, and rejoice when a Sister of Charity is insulted, or a pyx is stolen in Mexico. When three hundred priests and one hundred and eighty editors are either imprisoned or fined, in Germany, they shout, ‘Hurrah for liberty.’ Any blow from any quarter aimed at the faith, the morality, the ecclesiastics of the Catholic Church, is a blow for ‘freedom.’ They are not all thieves, drunkards, atheists, Communists, but their hatred against the Church of Christ associates these anti-Catholics in their cause with whatever is reprobate from the beginning. This is not abusive language—it is simple, plain fact. Everything anti-Catholic in legislation, in history, in literature, is a concession to them. Everything admitting that Catholics have rights in a country they discovered is an attack on them. Therefore when we ask for Catholics the freedom in religious matters, we ask no special privilege. We may ask of public opinion, and law, to curb the tyrannical disposition of those who would deny a priest to a dying Catholic servant, or would saddle upon us, at our own expense, a system of teaching which our conscience rejects. But we shall never ask it as the thralls of any political faction, or the partners of any office-seeking intrigue.”

The Ohio law drew national attention. The August 28, 1875 issue of *Harpers Weekly* ran an editorial cartoon on its front page by noted anti-Catholic and anti-immigrant cartoonist Thomas Nast. The cartoon featured a Catholic bishop (who bears a strong resemblance to Archbishop Purcell) sitting

on a throne in the Ohio General Assembly with his feet on the constitution. In back of the bishop is a picture of “St. Geghan,” labeled “The Representative of Rome, not of Cincinnati.” A picture of the Pope is also displayed with the caption “A *Foreign Prince Reigning in the United States.*” Also in the picture are priests standing under a doorway with a sign above which reads, “Ohio Roman Legislature.” The entire cartoon bears the caption “*The Established (Foreign) Church in Ohio—What are you going to do about it?*”

Another national magazine, *The Republic* offered the following analysis of the Geghan Law. “No Romish Bishops nor Romish press could drive a Republican Legislature into the commission of so foul a shame as that of the Democrats of Ohio during the last winter.”

In a speech in Columbus, candidate for governor Rutherford B. Hayes said the following regarding the new law. “After an examination of the Geghan bill, we shall perhaps come to the conclusion that in itself it is not of great importance. I would not undervalue the conscientious scruples on the subject of religion of a convict in the penitentiary, or of any unfortunate person in any State institution. But, the provision of the constitution of the State covers the whole ground. It needs no awkwardly framed statute of doubtful meaning, like the Geghan bill, to accomplish the object of the organic law. This is the first example of open and successful sectarian interference with legislation in Ohio. If the people are wise, they will give it such a rebuke in October that for many years, at least, it will be the last.”

Although the Hayes language was not as vitriolic as that of many of his supporters on this issue, Hayes did nothing to renounce the anti-Catholic rhetoric of his more bigoted supporters.

In October 1875 Rutherford B. Hayes was elected as the 32<sup>nd</sup> governor of Ohio. Also, as a result of the election a Republican majority gained control of the Ohio General Assembly. Although the Geghan Law was not the only issue in the election, Hayes garnered a national reputation as being the guardian of Protestant-American cultural norms. This popularity would catapult him to the Republican





*Interior of the second-floor Catholic Chapel at the Ohio Penitentiary, built in 1914.  
For the an exterior view, see the Bulletin of April, 2008.*

nomination for President in 1876 and eventually served to put him in the White House.

The new Republican-dominated legislature met on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1876. One of its first proceedings was to pass an act repealing the Geghan Law. Both houses passed the bill, along party lines, and Governor Hayes signed the repeal into law.

Despite the constitution, Ohio's prisons and institutions remained a Protestant stronghold with limited access granted to other religions. In most institutions the process reverted to the Chaplain rules. That is, if the Protestant chaplain and the warden or administrator of the institution were amenable to Catholic participation, greater access and improved facilities were granted. Gradually, this would change as Catholic became a larger part of the population in Ohio.

At the Ohio Penitentiary, Catholic priests designated as chaplains continued to visit the prison and minister to the Catholic inmates. A Church Directory in the November 27, 1875 edition of *The Catholic Columbian* contained the following under Penitentiary Chapel, "Mass at 8:00 AM on Sundays only." This indicates that there may have been a make-shift Catholic Chapel at the Penitentiary as early as 1875. It would not be until 1884 that the Ohio Penitentiary would have its first full-time and

recognized Catholic Chaplain, Father Thomas F. Delaney, as well as a more permanent chapel located in a dingy room above the offices of the Deputy Warden and the Protestant Chaplain.

#### **Note**

*Beecher-Tiltonism*: Refers to the highly publicized scandal known as the Beecher-Tilton Affair, Rev. Henry Ward Beecher was tried on charges that he had committed adultery with Elizabeth Tilton, the wife of his friend Theodore Tilton. The trial began in January 1875, and ended in July when the jurors deliberated for six days but were unable to reach a verdict. The *Ohio State Journal* ran daily transcripts of the sensational trial.

#### **Sources**

- Finley, Rev. James B., *Memorials of Prison Life*, edited by Rev. B. B. Tefft, published by L. Swormstedt & A. Poe, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1853
- Howells, William Dean, *Sketch of the Life and Character of Rutherford B. Hayes*, H.O. Houghton and Company, 1876
- Jordan, Philip B., *Ohio Comes of Age 1873-1900, A History of the State of Ohio, Volume V*, Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1943
- McAfee, Ward M., *Religion, Race and Reconstruction: The Public School in the Politics of*

*the 1870s*, State University of New York Press, Albany, 1998  
 Salyer, J. R., Editor, *Statutes of the State of Ohio, a Complete Analytical Index, Volume IV, 1873-1875*, Robert Clark and Company, Cincinnati, 1876  
 Shaw, Richard Dennis, *Chaplains to the Imprisoned: Sharing Life with the Incarcerated*, the Haworth Press, Binghampton, N.Y., 1995  
*The Catholic Columbian*, Columbus, Ohio: Feb. 27, Mar. 26, Apr. 3, Apr. 10, May 1, June 19, June 26, July 17, July 31, and Nov. 27, 1875  
*The New York Times*, April 16, 1875  
*Harper's Weekly Journal of Civilization*, "The

Established (Foreign) Church in Ohio" (page 1 editorial cartoon by Thomas Nast), August 28, 1875  
*The Republic*, monthly magazine, Volume 4, 1875, "Romish Designs in America,"  
*Ohio State Journal*, Columbus, Ohio (beginning in January, 1875 through the election in October 1875 almost every issue of the *Journal* contains some sort of editorial attack on the Catholic Church, the Geghan Bill, or both).  
*Executive Documents, Annual Reports made to the Governor of the State of Ohio for the year 1862, Part II*, Printed by Richard Nevins, State Printer, 1863

## St. Joseph Parish near Somerset Baptisms, 1834-1850

*We are closing in on a goal of seeing published all sacramental registers within the present limits of the diocese from before the year 1840. The remaining records are the second set of baptisms at St. Joseph Parish near Somerset; marriages at the same parish from 1834 to 1848; marriages at St. Mary Parish in Chillicothe from 1837 to 1846; and the death register of the same parish, from 1838 to 1846. The latter two sets of records are now at St. Peter Parish.*

*The book containing the second set of St. Joseph baptismal records begins with the parish death and interment records from 1815 to 1873 (see the Bulletin of April, August, and October, 1986 and January, 1987). On page 45 the baptismal records begin where they left off in the first book (for the first book see the Bulletin, January 1975 through May, 1976, or the improved recension on our website, [www.catholicrecordsociety.org](http://www.catholicrecordsociety.org)). Pages 122-150 contain the parish marriage register for the years 1834 to 1848. Pages 151-169 are blank.*

*Many of these baptisms were at Perry County mission churches, but only a few are so indicated. Some were farther afield, such as in Columbus, Lancaster, Chillicothe, and even one in Lexington, Ky. The records vary in quality; most include the bare essentials of name, parents,*

*and sponsors; some give less information. Many, however, give exact birth dates. Father Eugene Pozzo often went so far as to identify adult sponsors by recording the names of their parents.*

*The quality of the handwriting and spelling varies widely. Uncertain readings are followed by a question mark. Comments of your editor are contained in brackets [ ].*

page 45

### 1834

- Oct. 2, Margaret, daughter of John Miller and Ann [her nearly illegible name looks like "Iwovs"]; spons. Anthony Doll and Ann Mary Bourgeon. J.B.V. DeRaymaecker
- Oct. 19, Charles Morrahen, son of Thomas and Mary Morrahen (or McGeary), spouses; spons. Charles and Ellenore Cassilly. J. M. McGrady
- Nov. 1, William Patrick Slevin, son of Edward and Bridget Slevin (or Donoughey); spons. Patrick Slevin and Mary McKenney. J. M. McGrady
- Nov. 3, John Baptist, son of Michael Wagener and Magdalene (Studer), spouses; spons. John Studer and Mary Ann his wife. J. B. V. DeRaymaecker
- same day, James, son of [blank] and Elizabeth



(Miller), spouses; spons. the father and mother of the wife. JBVD  
 Sept. 28, Elleanor, daughter of Patrick and Mary Callahan of BucKai near Rehobert. Anthony D. Fahy  
 same day, Catherine, daughter of Mathew and Mary Ring, of the Church of St. Patrick called Jackson Township; spons. Daniel Oharra and Elizabeth McMullen. Anthony Fahy  
 Nov. 19, Thomas Martin, son of James and Margaret Martin (or Patrige); spons. Edward and Elizabeth Brady. J. M. McGrady  
 page 46  
 Dec. 28, James Noble, son of Robert Noble and Mary Thomas; spons. John and Magdalene Carr.  
 same day, Mary Mosey, daughter of Patrick and Ann Mosey (or Maugherin), spons. Thomas and Margaret Mough.  
 same day, James Nugent, son of Patrick and Mary Nugent (or Martin); spons. John McGolerake and Margaret Fielty.  
 same day, Levi Ambrose Diane, son of James and Elizabeth Diane (or Stradfort); spons. John and Lydia Noon. J. M. McGrady  
 page 47

### 1835

Jan. 5, at home because of the intense cold, Catherine Barbara, daughter of John Dittoe and Margaret (Redman); spons. George Redman and Catherine Ann Dittoe. J. B. V. DeRaymaecker  
 Jan. 19, Hugh McKiernan, son of Bartholomew McKiernan and Catherine McCabe; spons. John McCabe and Bridget Walpolle. J. M. McGrady  
 Feb. 1, Rosann McAnally ["M.ANally"], daughter of Henry McAnally and Ann Taggart; spons. Patrick and Mary McCristal. J. M. McGrady  
 same day, Catherine Dittoe, daughter of Jacob Dittoe and Sarah Kane; spons. Jacob Kunts and Mary McFadden. J. M. McGrady  
 Feb. 3, James Walsh, son of Joseph and Mary Kunts [or Keents?]; spons. James Kunts and Catherine Sterner. JBVD

Feb. 28, Elizabeth, daughter of Jacob Sneider and Elizabeth (Steine); spons. John Stickley and Cath. Steine. JBVD  
 Mar. 9, Levi Augustine, son of Michael McFadden and Margaret (Kelly), spouses; spons. William McGarger and Mary McFadden. JBVD  
 page 48  
 [Mar.] 15, John, son of Anthony Fisher and Elizabeth (Bryngarden), spouses; spons. Andrew Fisher and Mary Bryngarden.  
 same day, James, son of Adam Gordon and Helen (Shreiver), spouses; spons. James Gordon and Elizabeth Gordon. JBVD  
 Mar. 22, Thomas Martin, son of John and Mary Landers, near Rehoboth; spons. William Murray and Margaret Felthy. A. Fahy  
 same day, Edward, son of Francis and Grace? Freel; spons. John and Mary Dogherty. A. Fahy  
 same day, Patrick, son of Michael and Mary Redden; spons. Patrick Redden and Catherine Noon. A. Fahy  
 same day, Elizabeth Dean, daughter of Sarah Dean and John Middleberry; spons. Peter and Elizabeth Middleberry. A. Fahy All of the above near Rehoboth.  
 Mar. 25, Elizabeth Ellenor Flowers, daughter of Joseph and Ann (Clarke); spons. James Burgoon and Mary Clarke. JMM  
 Apr. 12, James Hudlett, son of Peter Hudlett and Catherine Klete; spons. James and Catherine Pirong. JMM  
 May 3, Catherine Cooney, daughter of Frederick and Catherine Stikely, spouses; spons. Francis Joseph --erbush? and Catherine Bernard. JMM  
 page 49  
 May 31, Sebastian Dumolt, son of John and Elizabeth Dumolt, spouses; spons. Sebastian Dumolt and Margaret Resener. J. M. McGrady  
 June 14, John McGreavy, son of Timothy McGreavy and Catherine Foley, spouses; spons. John McGreavy and Mary Campbell. J. M. McGrady

July 19, Patrick, son of John Brown and Mary Clarke, spouses; spon. George Redmond and Elizabeth Lynch. F. Tho. Martin

July 23, Mathias, son of George Pase and Catherine Gamble, spouses; spon. Mathias Pase and Theresa. F. Thos. Martin

July 16, in Chillicothe, Caroline, daughter of John Schaeffer and Barbara Schaeffer alias Higly; spon. Joseph Mathis? and Barnard Ward. A. Alleman

July 17, in Chillicothe, Joseph, son of Andrew Baehr and Magdalena Baehr alias Peterman?; spon. Martin Bauman and his wife Ann Maria. A. Alleman

July 26, Mary Ann, daughter of Andrew Fisher and Anna Maria Fisher alias Bourgeon; spon. Anthony Fisher and Mary Ann Bourgoon. Alleman

August 6, Levi August, son of Levi Bourgoon and Ann Bourgoon or Lilly; spon. James Coho and Ann Dior——h. Alleman

page 50

Aug. 22, Suzanna, daughter of James McDonald and Mary Ann McDonald alias Stein; spon. William Stein (abquit) and Lidia Stein. Alleman

Aug. 27, Margaret daughter of Samuel Crossin and Margaret Crossin alias Crossin; spon. Patrick McCristal and Mary McCristal alias Martin? Alleman

no date, Eliz. Catherine Ivers?, daughter of John and Elizabeth Ivers?; spon. Frederick Kintz and Margaret Kintz. N. D. Young

Aug. 30, in Chillcothe, Louis son of Louis Long and Genevieve Long alias Bowman; spon. Ferdinand Riehle and Catherine Marharfer. Alleman

same day, same place, Elizabeth daughter of Mathew Emala and Magdalena Emele alias Emerenz; spon. John Kirn and Rosa Enerenz. Alleman

Sept. 6, Isaac Gordon son of George and Ellenore Gordin (lately White), spouses; spon. Nicholas and Anna Brown. J. M. McGrady

same day, Ann, daughter of John and Mary McGreavy (lately Car), spouses James and Mary M. Bessin. J. M. McGrady

Sep. 30, Thomas, daughter of James Mulrine and Margaret McNulty spouses; spon. Thomas Ivory and Elenor Ivory. F. T. Martin

page 51

Oct. 4, Elizabeth Ann, daughter of Levi Martin Dumolt and Ann Mary Coble, spouses; spon. Sebastian Dumolt and Mary Magdalene Coble. F. Tho. Martin

Nov. 8, Charles, son of Edward and Catherine McShane (or Mackin); spon. Bernard McCabe and Elizabeth McGlaughlin. JMM

Nov. 22, Mary, daughter of Robert and Rosann McDonnell (or Bennett); spon. Daniel and Catherine Clarke. JMM

Dec. 2, John, son of Charles and Mary McFadden (or Murray); spon. Mary Ann Murray. JMM

**1836**, Jan. 21, Catherine, daughter of Frederick Kintz and Margaret Kintz alias Elder; spon. Joseph Walsh and Mary Walsh alias Kintz. A. D. Fahy

**1835**, Nov. 26, Daniel Clement, son of Daniel Kanous? and Ann Margaret Kanaus alias Teagarden; spon. Daniel Lowry and Catherine Lowry or Teagarden. Alleman

Nov. 28, James, son of Michael Hartman and Barbara Hartman or Mohn [perhaps Mohr for Moore?]; spon. Conrad Winter and Barbara Hartman. Alleman

same day, Catherine, daughter of Joseph Philip and Mary Ann Philip or Grignon; spon. Joseph Philip and Regina Philip. Alleman

page 52

Nov. 29 in Lancaster, Mary Antonia, daughter of Valentin Weingartner and Josephine Weingartner alias Lebeth?; spon. Frederick Bibio? and Mary Antonia Hossler alias Wald. Alleman

(To be continued)

Copyright 2012,  
Catholic Record Society - Diocese of Columbus  
197 E. Gay St., Columbus, Ohio 43215  
Donald M. Schlegel, Editor