Barquilla de la Santa Maria
BULLETIN of the Catholic Record Society-
Diocese of Columbus

Vol. XXXXI, No. 25 May 10: Baptism of S. H. Rosecrans May, 2016

Bishop Rosecrans and the Civil War: Comments on a Recent Book

by Donald M. Schlegel

A book titled *For the Union and the Catholic Church: Four Converts in the Civil War*, by Max Longley, was published in 2015. After an introductory chapter, four chapters of this book are devoted, one each, to the backgrounds and early lives of the four converts of the title: William Starke Rosecrans, army general, Rt. Rev. Sylvester H. Rosecrans, auxiliary bishop of Cincinnati and later first Bishop of Columbus, Father James Healy, chancellor of the Diocese of Boston, and Orestes Brownson, editor of *Brownson's Quarterly Review*. Chapter 3 is a skillful interweaving of historical events on the broad stage with Sylvester Rosecrans's journal, quoted from our *Bulletin* of the 1970s.

The rest of the book, except the concluding chapter, is a fascinating tour of the Know-Nothing and Civil War eras, showing the parts played by the four converts, along with many other Catholics, and explaining the cross-currents on many levels of Church and state, not only in the United States but in Italy and elswhere. If one likes detail, it is here. One possible concern is that too much detail is presented regarding the twists and turns of Brownson's philosphical and political thought, as represented in the pages of his *Review*.

Longley's thesis or conclusion regarding the four converts is: "The war brought about what Catholic leaders had tried to avoid for their Church—division. Those like Brownson, the Rosecrans brothers, and Fr. Healy supported emancipation at the hands of Union troops—while others opposed emancipation."[1] (By "emancipation," Longley here means immediate, forced abolition of slavery.) With regard to Archbishop Purcell and Bishop Rosecrans he states, "...Rosecrans...helped the...archbishop, John Purcell, with his duties. The duties, as the two hierarchs saw them, included support for the Lincoln administration's war efforts and its emancipation policies. [They]...were fervent union supporters..."[2]

Unfortunately, given the wide scope of this work, Longley had to depend on secondary sources. An examination of primary sources shows that the Bishop is included among the four converts only by assumption, accusation, or insinuation. There is no evidence that he took a divisive role in the Church during the national conflict.

Longley's Statements

The Political Campaign of 1862

Longley writes, "Purcell and Sylvester brought the Church into the political arena in support of the Northern war effort." A new Union Party supported the war and generally endorsed President Lincoln's policies. In 1861 this party captured the Ohio statehouse. "The new governor, David Tod, and the legislature called for the unconditional defeat of the Confederates. The unionists' 1862 campaign for congressional seats and some state offices focused on rallying citizens on the home front to back the commander-in-chief. Archbishop Purcell and Bishop Rosecrans supported the Union Party and promoted

its fortunes in the *Telegraph*."[3] To support this, Longley cites pages 226, 238, and 230 of George Henry Porter's *Ohio Politics During the Civil War Period* . However, this book nowhere mentions either Archbishop Purcell or Bishop Rosecrans.[4] By the time of the 1862 political campaign, Rosecrans was no longer on the staff of the Cincinnati Archdiocesan newspaper, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, having left it in March of that year, prior to his consecration as bishop and his taking up new duties as auxiliary to Archbishop Purcell.[5]

Archbishop Purcell's Slavery Stance

Shortly after the consecration of Bishop Rosecrans in March, 1862, Archbishop Purcell went to Europe for the canonization of the Japanese Martyrs and left Rosecrans to handle the sacramental life of the archdiocese. (V. Rev. Edward Purcell was Vicar General.) The Archbishop returned in August. According to Longley:

> At the beginning of September...Purcell gave a speech on the war. Until then the *Telegraph*...was skeptical about emancipation, but now, perhaps at Sylvester's urging, Archbishop Purcell tore into slavery. Part of the reason for the war, Purcell suggested, was the South's failure to come up with a plan for gradual emancipation. ...the timetable of freedom should be accelerated: the Union, as a war measure, ought to free the slaves, thus bringing the war to end within three months....[6]

Longley gives five sources for this paragraph, but none of them seem to support any involvement of Bishop Rosecrans in the Archbishop's supposed new position. Longley himself only says that "perhaps" the Archbishop acted at Rosecrans's urging.

In addition, the Archbishop's speech may have been mischaracterized. He was reporting what he had heard in Europe, primarily England. His remarks regarding slavery were nominally under the heading of "the argument which it was the Unionist's place most frequently to use in vindication of the Union...the enumeration of the wrongs committed on us by the South..."[7] However, the forcefulness of the remarks on slavery seems to indicate that the Archbishop did support them personally. He had taken a position against slavery as early as 1838 in Mallow, Ireland. The Delaware, O. *Gazette* reported these as the Archbishop's own remarks, but said that he was following the example of Archbishop Hughes of New York. Hughes and Purcell had voyaged back from Europe together[8] and Hughes immediately gave what the papers called a "War Sermon." Hughes is more likely than Rosecrans to have influenced Archbishop Purcell in taking a forceful stance.

Father Hilary Tucker's Diary

On June 17, 1862, Bishop Rosecrans was in Boston and preached at the dedication of the new St. Francis de Sales Church on Bunker Hill.[9] Longley writes[10] of Father Hilary Tucker of Boston, a native of Missouri, who retained "slave state attitudes." "On July 4, 1862, he wrote in his diary...favorably impressed by a sermon that Bishop Sylvester Rosecrans delivered in Boston—Sylvester's commitment to the Union cause did not cloud Fr. Tucker's judgement in the matter..." Langley's source is James Hitchcock, "Race, Religion, and Rebellion: Hilary Tucker and the Civil War." Hitchcock's words are:

> When Auxiliary Bishop Sylvester H. Rosecrans of Cincinnati, who was an editor of the *Telegraph* at the time of its *anti*-abolitionist editorials, preached in Boston, Tucker praised his sermon. He did *not* allude, if he was aware of it, to the fact that Rosecrans' brother was the Union General William S. Rosecrans, a devout Catholic one of whose sons later became a priest and a daughter a nun and who, on the eve of the battle of Lookout Mountain in 1863, was rumored to have telegraphed to the Catholic clergy of the North asking prayers for victory.[11]

So Tucker's diary provides no indication that, somewhere, there was evidence that the Bishop had influenced the Archbishop or Father Purcell to actively espouse the Union or the abolitionist cause, or indeed that he took any public position.

The 1863 Election for Governor of Ohio

The 1863 election for Governor of Ohio pitted Peace Democrat Clement Valandingham against Republican

John Brough. The Wheeling *Daily Intelligencer*[12] noted that during this campaign the *Telegraph* did strong and powerful service to the Union cause. While other Catholic papers followed after the "Democratic gods," the *Telegraph* exhorted its readers to do their duty to their country by upholding its rulers and overthrowing its enemies.

Longley states, "the archdiocese went into action to support the Republican candidate, John Brough. Bishop Sylvester Rosecrans in particular worked to promote Brough among skeptical Catholic voters."[13] His sources are two works by Frank L. Klement, *The Limits of Dissent: Clement L. Valandingham and the Civil War* and "Catholics as Copperheads During the Civil War". The first of these says:

> The efforts of the Purcells in behalf of Brough [1863] received the enthusiastic support of Purcell's coadjtor, Bishop Sylvester H. Rosecrans. Perhaps the fact that the bishop's brother, Major General William S. Rosecrans, sought honor on the nation's battlefields, accounted for the enthusiasm for the Union cause which characterized the archbishop's office.[14]

It refers to Anthony Deye, "Archbishop John Baptist Purcell and the Civil War," (M.A. Thesis, University of Cincinnati, 1944.) The second Klement source says:

> In the days and months that followed, the Catholic hierarchy of Cincinnati and the Catholic editor of the *Enquirer* waged a war of words for the minds and hearts of the Irish and German Catholics of the area. Archbishop John Purcell and his brother Edward, who edited the *Catholic Telegraph*, led the attack against both slavery and Civil War dissent. They were ably assisted by Bishop Sylvester Rosecrans, Purcell's coadjutor and brother of General William S. Rosecrans—both of the brothers were German-Americans and converts to Catholicism.[15]

This is the only mention of Bishop Rosecrans and no source is given for him or how he assisted the archbishop in opposing slavery or dissent. These two sources give only unsupported assertions of Bishop Rosecrans's views and political actions. How much, if any, real impact Bishop Rosecrans had on this policy is unknown.

The *Cincinnati Commercial* stirred up trouble by reporting that "the venerable Catholic Archbishop Purcell, accompanied by Bishop Rosecrans, appeared at the polls in that city at the late election, for the first time in twenty-five years, and voted the Union ticket."[16] Other papers reported that the Archbishop and Bishop "both attended the polls of their respective precincts" and labored for the whole Union ticket.[17]

Bishop Rosecrans never seems to have uttered or written a word about these reports. Archbishop Purcell, however, on the evening of November 1 gave a lecture in Mozart Hall in which he defended his actions in voting for the Republican ticket. He and Bishop Rosecrans "had been charged with standing at the polls all day, with hands full of Union tickets, exerting their influence among Catholic Democrats" against Mr. Valandingham and his companions. "This, he said, is utterly false. He did not go to the polls with Bishop Rosecrans; he had gone quietly there alone, and deposited his unconcealed suffrage—a suffrage which his conscience approved, and for which he was answerable to God. He voted as he did out of fear 'that if Valandingham were elected the attempted withdrawal of Ohio soldiers in the field—with [General] Rosecrans—would ensue, and that the State of Ohio would be tossed with revolutionary opposition to the war policy. He feared that raids would be invited, the parallel of which might be found in Quantrell's barbarous and inhuman invasion of Kansas.'" Further reasons were threats that the Southerners would never extend the hand of friendship and trade if they succeeded in separating from the U.S. and his wish to see every man free. "The Catholic Church has ever been the friend of human freedom. It was Christ's mission to set men free, and Christian people disregard his precepts and example when they seek to uphold and perpetuate involuntary human servitude."[18] This may have represented Bishop Rosecrans' thinking as well, but he never articulated such a position in public or, as far as we know, in private.

The Proposed Provincial Council of 1864

Archbishop Purcell attempted to convene a council of the Cincinnati province in 1864, but did not succeed. In connection with this, Longley again implicates Bishop Rosecrans as a "militant" unionist:

> Archbishop Purcell scheduled a provincial council for the archdiocese for April 24, 1864. ...the letter of convocation, prepared by Sylvester, seems to have triggered [Peter P. Lefevere] the Detroit bishop's sensitive antennae. By implication, given Purcell and Sylvester's militant unionism and antislavery views, Bishop Lefevere seemed to fear the two heads of the archdiocese would turn a local church council into something like a Republican meeting. Purcell wrote Lefevere on February 19 that he and Bishop Rosecrans were shocked at Levefere's letter. There was no intention to bring politics into the provincial council's deliberations. Of course, opposition to slavery was not politics! Anyone who wanted to say that Catholic criticism of slavery was political would have to denounce some important Catholic figures, whom Purcell cited.[19]

The sources cited are three letters for which summaries are available in the on-line calendar at the University of Notre Dame Archives website. These are: Jan. 16, 1864, Bishop Frederick Baraga of Sault St. Marie to Purcell; Feb. 12, 1864, Purcell to the Bishops of the Province; and Feb. 19, 1864, Purcell to Bishop Lefevere. Bishop Lefevre's letter to Purcell is calendared at February 17.

These sources to not support Longley's assertions regarding Bishop Rosecrans. The letter from Bishop Baraga has nothing to do with the question at hand. Bishop Lefevere's letter is addressed only to Purcell and does not mention Bishop Rosecrans. Archbishop Purcell mentions Rosecrans only in that he sent the letter suggesting the council at Purcell's request. Lefevere objects to the clause in this letter that mentions bringing an end to the war; it does not mention slavery. Slavery is not mentioned until Archbishop Purcell's reply to Bishop Lefevere. There is no implication anywhere in these letters regarding Rosecrans's views.

Original Source of the Accusation

In the early pages of Longley's book we find reference to the original source of the accusation, namely Bishop Martin John Spalding of Louisville:

> Spalding insinuated that Purcell was led into his political views by Bishop Rosecrans, who in turn was influenced by his general-brother. The latter was probably aiming at pleasing the powers that be in order to get a promotion (although General Rosecrans's hostile letters to his superiors militate against Spalding's interpretation).[20]

Longley's source is David Spalding, "Martin John Spalding's 'Dissertation on the American Civil War'".[21] There we find:

> Spalding was also concerned over the avowed partisanship of the Archbishop of Cincinnati, John Baptist Purcell, of his brother, Father Edward Purcell, and of his auxiliary, Bishop Sylvester Rosecrans, who had, in Spalding's opinion, transformed the Cincinnati *Catholic Telegraph* into a political journal advocating the immediate eradication of slavery.[22]

David Spalding writes further:

> When a brief notice appeared in the Cincinnati *Catholic Telegraph* (February 17, 1864) that the archbishop had been the recipient of an autograph letter of His Holiness urging peace, Spalding wrote to [Cardinal] Barnabò [at Propaganda Fide] complaining that the letter itself had not been published. "Many think," he observed, "and even state it in the secular Newspapers, that he [Purcell] has been in these affairs under the influence of his Auxiliary R[osecrans], who has a brother [General William Rosecrans] who, having changed his political principles to please the party which for the moment is in power, has been promised the position of General of a division." For Spalding this was the only logical explanation for the curious political views of the Cincinnati prelates.[23]

So it is Bishop Spalding's unsupported statements in his letters to Archbishop Kenrick and Cardinal Barnabò that are at the root of the accusations that Bishop Rosecrans was behind the views and efforts of Archbishop Purcell. But that "many think"

something does not make it so, especially if their thinking is driven by the media. We will see what other materials are extant that indicate not Bishop Rosecrans's opinions, which he kept to himself, but his words and actions—or lack thereof.

(To be Concluded)

NOTES

1) Max Longley, *For the Union and the Catholic Church: Four Converts in the Civil War* Jefferson, N.C., McFarland & Co., 2015, page 254
2) Longley, p 10
3) Longley pp 170-171
4) Boston: Columbia University, 1911; available on https://books.google.com
5) *The Catholic Telegraph*, March 19, 1862
6) Longley pp 179-180
7) *The Catholic Telegraph*, Sept. 3, 1862
8) David J. Endres, "Rectifying the Fatal Contrast: Archbishop John Purcell and the Slavery Controversy among Catholics in Civil War Cincinnati": *Ohio Valley History* 2, no. 2, (fall 2002), 23-33, on page 24. Hussey, M. Edmund, *A History of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati*, Strasburg: Éditions du Signe, 2000, p. 46. *The Delaware Gazette*, Sept. 12, 1862. The New York *Evening Express*, Aug. 12, 1862.
9) *The Catholic Telegraph*, June 25 and July 2, 1862
10) Longley pp 190-191
11) James Hitchcock, "Race, Religion, and Rebellion: Hilary Tucker and the Civil War" *Catholic Historical Review* 80 No. 3 (July 1994), 497-507; citing pp 497-498, 502, 504, 507. The quotation given here is from pages 504-505, with emphasis added. Hitchcock refers to Tucker's Diary, June 17, 1862
12) Wheeling *Daily Intelligencer*, Nov. 11, 1863
13) Longley pp 13-14
14) Frank L. Klement, *The Limits of Dissent: Clement L. Valandigham and the Civil War* Lexington, University Press of Kentucky, 1970, p 237
15) Frank L. Klement, "Catholics as Copperheads During the Civil War" *The Catholic Historical Review* 80 No. 1 (Jan., 1994) p. 40
16) Lewisburg, Pa., *Union County Star and Lewisburg Chronicle*, Nov. 3, 1863
17) for example the *Fremont Journal*, Fremont, Ohio, Oct. 30, 1863
18) *The Alleghanian*, Ebensburg, Pa., Nov. 12, 1863, reprinting a report from the *Cincinnati Commercial* of Nov. 2
19) Longley p 223
20) Longley p 11
21) David Spalding, "Martin John Spalding's 'Dissertation on the American Civil War'" *Catholic Historical Review* 52 No. 1 (April 1966) 66-85. Quotation is from page 67.
22) Spalding's source is Archives, Archdiocese of Baltimore, 37-D-33 and 34, Spalding to Kenrick, Louisville, April 14 and 22, 1863
23) Spalding, *op. cit.*, pages 68-69, citing APF, Ser. rif., A.C., Vol. 20, fols. 725r-728r, Spalding to Barnabò, n.p.,March 8, 1864.

The Only Catholic in Westerville

by Alan Borer

St. Paul the Apostle, Westerville, is the largest parish in the Diocese of Columbus. With more than 16,000 registered members, a large elementary school, and almost more ministries than can be counted, it is practically a city within a city. But the city it is within was once known as a bastion of a different faith tradition.

Westerville was first settled in 1806 by members of the Westervelt family. Incorporated in 1858, Westerville was the national headquarters of the Anti-Saloon League. The largely religious leadership of the League was instrumental in passing the 18th Amendment to the Constitution, making Prohibition the law of the land. Lasting less than fifteen years, Prohibition was an unsuccessful religious experiment.

More successful was Westerville's other religious expression, Otterbein University. Founded

in 1847, the college was chartered by the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and was intended as a training ground, in part, for the UBC ministry. Although never exclusively that, Otterbein University, in its early days, was made up of United Brethren faculty and students. Local United Brethren pastors guided college-bound members of their flocks to Otterbein. Campus life revolved around daily chapel exercises. Many graduates retired to Westerville, giving the town a religious air. Not surprisingly, the local United Brethren congregation was, at least symbolically, the most important church in town.

So Westerville, by the last quarter of the nineteenth century, was a predominantly United Brethren town, where the college and the village were entwined. But on April 1, 1870, a young man with a foreign accent began taking classes at Otterbein University. His name was Michael Aloysius Mess and, without fanfare, he became the only Catholic to attend Otterbein University, and the only Catholic in Westerville.

That is, at least, according to his story, which he wrote down in 1922 as part of Otterbein's 75th anniversary celebration:

> The people of Westerville (I knew them all) were very good to me. Being the only Catholic in the College and in the town, there was more or less good natured badinage at times, but nobody in college or village exhibited any antipathy toward me on that account. The social life and intercourse of the students, while reserved, was not strained…..

Michael Mess was born January 26, 1852, in Strasburg, Alsace, France. Strasburg was a free city, a French city, and a German city at various points in the nineteenth century, but has had a majority Catholic population whether ruled by Napoleon, Bismarck, or other conquerors. Not long after graduating fromOtterbein in 1875, he married an American-born German, Anna Kloeb, of Piqua, Ohio. They had eight children. Mr. Mess died in 1932 and is buried in Montgomery County, Maryland.

Mess had a full and colorful career after graduating from Otterbein. He taught school in Brookville, Indiana, eventually becoming superintendant. He graduated from the National University Law School in 1890 and was admitted to the bar of the U. S. Supreme Court the same year. In 1887 he taught German at Georgetown University while also doing federal service with the General Land Office. In his own words, he "resigned as professor to make new enrollments for U. S. Interior Department, of Winnebago Indians of Wisconsin, adjust their homesteads, and pay their annuities for 1895-96-97." He also worked fraudulent soldiers' claims while at the Land Office. In 1919 he joined the private firm of W. E. Moses Land Scrip and Realty, a company that dealt extensively in western land grants.

It is not clear why Michael Mess and his family came to America. His parents, Joseph (1813-1891) and Magdalena (1810-1891) Moess (as the family recalled its original spelling) are buried in Piqua, where Michael doubtless met his future wife. Without going too far out on a limb, it can be surmised that Michael Mess spent at least a part of his youth in Piqua. How he chose Otterbein University is unknown.

It is hard to know just what kind of faith life Michael Mess had while living in Westerville. His later life showed him to be a devout believer: a member of the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Knights of America. But in his youth in Westerville? St. Paul the Apostle mission was founded many years later, in 1913. Did Mess visit parishes in Columbus? Or did he visit Piqua, where the parish of St. Mary dates back to 1843? We will probably never know. But we do have his own statement, that from 1870 to 1875, he was the only Catholic in Westerville.

SOURCES

Michael Mess's account of himself is in the Walter G. Clippinger Presidential Papers, Otterbein University Archives, Westerville, Ohio.
Other sources include Genealogy.com, Find-a-Grave.com, the Federal Census for various years,and *Who's Who in the Nation's Capital 1921-22* (Washington, 1921), p. 266.

St. Dominic Parish, Beaver, Noble County
Baptisms 1832-1852

(Continued, from Vol. XXXXI No. 4)

1842, continued

same day [May 1] William son of John & Elizabeth Polton; spons. Christopher Gallagher & Elizabeth Gallagher.

same day Rosanna E. daughter of Edmund & Ann Gallagher; spons. John & Margaret Gallagher
James McCaffrey

May 6 Sebastian son of John & Barbara Hill; spons. Sebastian & Margaret Hohman.

same day Adam son of John & Margaret Wamer [Warner?]; spons. Adam & Elizabeth Sheffer.

same day Casper son of Anton & Eve Crass; spons. Casper & Catherine Garst.

same day John son of Philip & Elizabeth Snider; spons. John & Barbara Miller.

same day Martha daughter of Enoch & Hanna Archer; spons. William & Hanna Archer.

same day Mary A. daughter of Andrew & Beata Harpst; spons. Mary A Shockling.
James McCaffrey

page 64

June 22 John son of John & Ann Timmony; spons. John Dillehay & Elizabeth T—.
Charles D. McCallion

June 26 Henry son of Henry & Barbara Hubman; spons. Henry Joseph Miller & Barbara An— CDM

same day Elizabeth daughter of Michael & Catherine Blake; spons. Elizabeth Dimmerling. CDM

June 28 James son of John & Polly McCune (noncatholic); spons. Philip Harkins. CDM

June 29 Jeremiah son of Josue Bond (noncatholic) and Catherine; spons. Terence McCune & Rachael Ha[rkins]. CDM

July 10 Michael son of Peter & Catherine Horn; spons. Michael Weisend & Mary Howeiler. CDM

same day Simon Peter son of Michael & Mary Spangler; spons. Simon Dorr & Barbara Spangler. CDM

same day Barbara Weisend daugher of Jacob & Catherine; spons. Barbara Weisend. CDM

same day Catherine daughter of Joseph & Mary Marshal; spons. William Sheel & Elizabeth Pollscraff. CDM

same day Barbara daughter of Ado & Mary M. Risbeck; spons. Philip & Barbara Yunkos. CDM

July 11 Esther or Hester, daughter of Daniel & Mary Daugherty; spons. Hugh & Susan McManamy. CDM

same day Daniel son of Arthur & Elizabeth McCune; spons. Richard Kein. CDM

July 17 Benjamin Francis son of James & Elizabetrh Foster; spons. Pat. Gallagher & Alice Reynhart. CDM

page 65

July 18 James son of Samuel & Mary Cath. Cleigg; spons. Jacob Greiner & Mary Catherine Wall. CDM

July 31 Catherine daughter of Matthew & Sara Daugherty; spons. Hugh & Susan McMenamy. CDM

same day Andrew Elijah son of Thomas & Elizabeth Arnold; spons. John Harron & Sara Judge. CDM

same day Henry son of Patrick & Rosanna Reynalds; spons. John & Rebecca Harron. CDM

Aug. 1 Eleanor daughter of John & Julianna Daugherty; spons. Edward & Sara Daugherty. CDM

Aug. 2. Margaret about five years old (sponsor Eunice Judge) and James Lynn, two years old (sponsor James Judge) children of Charles & Margaret Pool, noncatholic. CDM

Aug. 4 Rosanna daughter of James & Ann Reynolds; spons. Thomas & Elizabeth Reynolds. CDM

Aug. 7 Sara J. and Mary A. daughters of John & Sara Miller (noncatholic); spons. John &

Elizabeth Delong. CDM

Aug. 11 Henry son of Michael & Rachael Creighton (noncatholic); spons. John McCoy & Elizabeth Brady. CDM

Aug. 21 William P. son of John (noncatholic) & Bridget Keener; spons. Hanna Archer. CDM

Aug. 28 Adaline daughter of Absalom & Rhoda Archer; spons. Sebastian Hohman & Matilda Archer.

same day George son of Isaac & Cynthia Archer; spons. Abraham Archer.

same day Ann Jane daughter of Elijah & Margaret Archer; spons. Hanna Archer.

same day Sara Hupp, about 17 years old, daughter of Daniel & Ann Hupp; I myself was the sponsor. CDM

page 66

Sept. 4 John and Joan Geisey about two and four years old, children of Peter Geisey (noncatholic) and Henrietta; spons. Rosanna Summers. CDM

Oct. 12 At the town of Hillsborough, Charles Gabriel son of Neal & Isabell Boyle; spons. James Farley & Ann McHugh.

Oct. 19 Cecilia daughter of Nicholas Gallagher & Margaret (noncatholic); spons. Robert & Rosanna Gallagher

Oct. 20 Edward son of James & Sara Kerr; spons. John & Catherine Gallaugher.

Oct. 23 Ann Margaret daughter of Joseph & Barbara Hohman; spons. Sebastian & Margaret Hohman. CDM

Nov. 17 Louise [Eloise?] daughter of John & Elizabeth Armbruster; spons. Simon Rapp.

Nov. 18 William Henry son of William & Elizabeth Sheffrey; spons. Anthony & Catherine Armbruster.

Nov. 27 Elizabeth daughter of Francis & Mar Epert; spons. Elizabeth Miller.

same day Mary Kungunda daughter of August & Elizabeth Dimmerling; spons. Kunigunda Michael.

same day Joseph P. son of William Beymer & Eve Shepner; spons. Leonard & Elizabeth Shipner. CDM

Dec. 4 Patrick son of Michael & Bridget Brown; spons. Patrick Deady & Isabel Hughes. CDM

Dec. 5 William Dunbar Sharkey son of James & Margaret Sharkey; spons. Hugh & Lucinda Sharkey. CDM

Dec. 8 Seth Edward son of Michael & Caroline Bennet; spons. John Cunningham. CDM

same day Elizabeth Harriett (sponsor John Bennett) and Catherine (sponsor Caroline Bennet) and William (sponsor [page 67] Mary Bennett), children of Edward (deceased) and Amelia Bennett. CDM

Dec. 10 John son of Benedict & Lucinda Lowe; spons. Susan Dillehay. CDM

same day Margaret daughter of Stephen Wilfred Dillehay & Catherine his wife; spons. Ann Lowe. CDM

Dec. 12 Mary Ann daughter of Joseph & Mary Bauchman; spons. James Spangler & Rosanna Rittenbeck. CDM

Dec. 18 Mina Frances daughter of John F. & Lizette Susan Bidenharn; spons. Nicholas & Rosanna Gallaugher for Francis Benninghause & Mina Lamping. CDM

Dec. 27 Catherine daughter of Jacob & Mary Shott; spons. Laurence Bargman & Catherine Shott. CDM

Dec. 30 Leonard Peter son of John D. & Matilda Hill; spons. Leonard & Elizabeth Shipner. CDM

1843

Jan. 2 Charles son of James & Sara Delong; spons. John & Rosanna Gallaugher.

Jan. 6 Elijah son of James & Rachael Archer; spons. Simon & Matilda Archer. CDM

Jan. 15 [blank] Rucker, adult convert; spons. John Delong. CDM

Jan. 20 Peter son of Peter & Ann Mulrine; spons. James Hughes & Mary Rhinehart.

(To be continued)

Copyright 2016,
Catholic Record Society - Diocese of Columbus
197 E. Gay St., Columbus, Ohio 43215
Donald M. Schlegel, Editor