



# Barquilla de la Santa Maria

BULLETIN of the Catholic Record Society -  
Diocese of Columbus

---

Vol. XXXII, No. 10

October, 2007

---

## Extracts from Bishop Rosecrans' Lecture on *Quanta cura*

*In February of 1865 Rt. Rev. Sylvester H. Rosecrans, first Bishop of Columbus but then Auxiliary Bishop of Cincinnati, was giving a weekly series of lectures in St. Peter in Chains Cathedral, on piety. He interrupted the series on Sunday the 26th to give a lecture on Quanta cura, the encyclical of Pope Pius IX that had been issued on December 8, 1864. This encyclical condemned sixteen propositions touching on errors of the age. Some of his remarks can be profitably studied today in reference to the attitudes of some of today's Catholics and as indications of how much the general thinking of the American public has changed in the last 142 years. The lecture was published in the Catholic Telegraph of March 1, 1865*

I appreciate, and feel as keenly perhaps, as any of you, the jar which some points of the Encyclical occasion to the mind of the American. If I did not I would not undertake their explanation. You understand, of course, that I would accept it as authoritative teaching, even if I could not know how to reconcile it to my cherished ideas—because the Vicar of Christ is the mouthpiece of Him who has “the words of eternal life,” and besides him I have none “to whom I can go.” But it is a satisfaction to be able, from an intimate knowledge of the precise issue, between the Church and the infidel party of Italy and France, to see that it does not conflict with the notions of genuine freedom and just

government which form the political creed of the American citizen. ...

For ages property has been accumulating in the hands of Religious orders, in the shape of lands, tenements, altar ornaments, pictures, statues, libraries, and the like. Of course each generation of the Religious spent the actual proceeds of their property on their own necessities and those of the poor, but the property remained in fee to the order, and naturally increased, until, as in the days of Henry VIII in England, it is now an item of importance in the eyes of the minister of finance. And this property, including the Papal States, is the practical issue between the Pope and the governments. To seize it, however, by open robbery would be dangerous to the rulers as the people are all Catholics. So the minds of the people must be educated for its seizure, by the promulgation of false doctrines, and that brings us to a statement of the theoretical, or doctrinal issue.

The Church has always defended the right of property in others, and, of course, could not relinquish it in herself. What people had given to God and to the poor she claimed must remain such forever. She might, after the example which St. Paul commends, “suffer the robbery of all her goods with joy;” but she would not allow her children to call it anything else but robbery.

Put the case of the operation of this robbery clearly to yourself in one instance. Your sister or daughter has a religious vocation; that is, desires

to dedicate her life to God, like Anna of old, in a life of seclusion, prayer and good works. You furnish her with a dower from 200 to 2000 dollars, and see her safe within the convent walls. The next morning you read an edict of the government secularizing the house in which you placed her, and seizing upon all its property and revenues for the benefit of the government. Would you not look upon the proceeding as an outrage, and its authors as richly deserving the excommunication pronounced by the Council of Trent against the plunderers of ecclesiastical goods?

The generative element of the government or court theory was the desire in the ministers to get this property, and excuse themselves before a Catholic people for seizing on it.

To this end they laid down a maxim that government has nothing to do with religion or religion with government, and religion could not, consequently, forbid government the robbery. Now, taken by itself, and as we Americans understand it, the sentence government has nothing to do with religion, is a generality which from one point of view is true. What we mean by it is that government has not the right to define for people of various religious views, which they shall adopt; and in this sense it is perfectly true. What they mean by it is, government composed of Catholics, ruling over Catholics, among whom there is but one religious belief, is not bound, in conscience, by the principles of Catholic morality. Observe, there is no issue about the extent of the power of government. The Pope does not claim a wider, and the court a narrower, jurisdiction for the government. There is no question of more or less liberty for the people in the adoption of religious opinions, or maintenance of them. The whole question is on the right of rulers to disregard conscience in their treatment of public affairs. ...

Now, when we speak of the interference of the government with religion as wrong and unwholesome, our idea is, that it is wrong and unwholesome to concede so much power to the

government, by fundamental law. We do not need so much governing; and as our rulers have no better means of knowing the truth than we have, it will be enough for them to find it out, obey it, and save their own souls, leaving ourselves and our pastors to take care of us.

But this is not what is meant in Europe by government interfering with religion. Far from it. The rulers, observe, are all true Catholics, and intend to remain so. They would set a political earthquake in motion that would engulf them did they avow themselves otherwise. They maintain that they have a *right*, as rulers, to interfere in what concerns religion. They claim the right even to keep the Pope's Encyclical, which I am now discussing, from the people, except as they choose to present it, expurgated. They exercise daily the right to dictate what shall be taught in schools, even of philosophy, theology, and ecclesiastical law; to declare what Bishops and Priests shall be permitted to officiate in churches; what books and newspapers shall circulate among the people, and what be suppressed; what days shall be observed as holidays, and what be abrogated. But while claiming all this power and more, they deny that in its exercise they are bound to respect the teaching of the Church, of which they profess to be obedient children; that is, that they are bound by conscience in their public acts. Thus, for example, the Council of Trent, which they believe in, pronounces excommunication against the plunderers of Church property. They maintain, that as rulers, they can plunder Church property, without incurring excommunication, because religion has nothing to do with government or temporal matters. Again, there are laws of the Church, which in homage to God, and in tenderness to the poor, prescribe the cessation of labor on holidays. The temporal rulers claim the right to abrogate these by direct legislation, yet remain all the time good Catholics, because to abstain from work and traffic is a temporal concern, in which the Church has no right to interfere. In other words, they maintain as the

basis of their theory of government, that society—not mixed society, such as we have in America, but a society, painfully compact, like that of France and Italy, where all are of the same blood and one religion, and where government claims the right to interfere with everything—has an end totally distinct from the the end of the individuals composing it, totally independent of the laws which govern them, independent of subjection to God, of obedience to the Church, of regard for right of citizens to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; independent of all things save the material force of the popular will. Let us make the case our own in American society. Individually, we believe that Congress should make no law concerning religion or the free exercise thereof.

Now, could we, as voters, believe and act otherwise without sin? Could we, as legislators, make a law interfering with the rights of conscience, holding all the time as private citizens, that no such law can be just and legitimate? Can any one do as a public man, what as a private man his conscience condemns? Yet he could if society had any aim independent and separate from the aim of the individuals composing it. As a private citizen he could believe in the Bible; and as a legislator he could vote to have all copies of it burned; believe in marriage and vote for “Free Love;” believe in education, and vote to suppress all schools; yet never cease to be an upright and conscientious man all the time!

...But you will say, the Italian anti-Church party advocate liberty of conscience, and of worship as the right of every man; and this is both American and true doctrine. It is true they are one language, but not in our sense. We mean by liberty of conscience, the right of every man to believe what he has proof of, and practice what seems to him to be duty, without interference by the government; that is to say, we simply deny the jurisdiction of the State in matters of belief and conscience. We never dream of saying that any one has the right to take up with any doctrine

he pleases, or following any line of morality or immorality he chooses, even before God. We say a man does wrong who clings to error, or practices impiety. But the wrong is to himself, and the judgment belongs to God. But when they assert liberty of conscience, they are setting forth a corollary of their general theory, not denying the jurisdiction of the civil power. “Conscience is free” means for them not “conscience is out of the jurisdiction of civil courts,” but conscience, that is each man’s notion, is above all law, is law to itself—above God’s revealed law, above what sane men have always admitted as natural law, and of course, above all ecclesiastical and civil law. Hence, whatever a man feels like doing, is right for him. He may speak or write truth or falsehood, he may praise vice or virtue, purity or impurity, he may lie or tell the truth, accuse or vindicate the innocent, and if he only utters what he pleases, he does right and his liberty must be proclaimed and guaranteed by the State. This is the “unbounded liberty,” the “*omnimoda libertas*,” which the Pope calls “frenzy.” Its logic is pantheism. For in pantheism man is God, and God is, of course, law to himself. Again, when they defend what the Pope censures as “the impious and absurd principle of *naturalism*,” they seem to use one language; when they say that “the welfare of the State, and political and social progress, require that human society should be constituted and governed irrespective of religion, just as if it did not exist, or as if no real difference existed between true and false religions,” but they have not one meaning. Our meaning is, taking society as we find it—with us, divided on religious views—it is proper to make one nationality out of what elements of unity we have, and not undertake to legislate where we are without authority, namely in the matter of religion.

Their meaning is, finding society—as they find it—united in the belief of the Catholic religion and in reverence for the ordinances of the Church, it is better to remodel society and legislate as if the popular belief, and their own,

were a delusion. We say, abstain from all legislation in the matter of religion. "Congress shall make no law concerning religion, or the free exercise thereof," because men's minds are divided on the subject, and their consciences must be respected. They say, legislate on that, as on every other subject, and govern as if men had no consciences at all, as if there were "no difference between true and false religion." Thus, for example, all the people, and the rulers, too, unite in respecting the commands of the Church to abstain from meat on Fridays. Yet it would be better, according to their theory, to forbid the sale of any supplies but meat on Fridays; as if religion did not exist. ...

Let the principle be stated of a nation like ours, which is not, in the strict sense of the word, a society, but an aggregate of societies, bound together by many ties, indeed, but not by religion, that it must be governed irrespective of sectarian religion, though not of justice and the fear of God and every Catholic—the Pope first—will subscribe to it most heartily. In the other sense, in which it is said a society of Catholics ought to be ruled as if Catholicism were false, or did not exist, it is manifestly false.

...Another censure of the Encyclical seems to jar with our established notions. I mean the condemnation of the principle that the civil power is not bound to enforce the laws against the violators of the Catholic religion, unless in so far as the public safety requires. This censure does not mean that religion is to be propagated by civil penalties, or that civil penalties must be enacted against non-Catholics, because, as I have said, "Catholic religion" is taken for "Christian religion," and for the system which takes care of souls and saves them. But supposing laws to be in existence against the profanation of churches, plundering of shrines, forcing workmen to labor on Sundays and holidays, and such like, as they do exist in the kingdom of Victor Emmanuel, and supposing the government claimed the right to enforce them, then the government would be bound to execute them, or not, not by

considerations of expediency, but of eternal justice. In other words, rulers are responsible to God for their public as well as their private acts, and will go to hell like other people, if they make white black, evil good, and darkness light. Suppose a jury of twelve men were convinced of the innocence of the party tried before them, could they declare him guilty out of considerations of public expediency without laying perjury on their souls? The case is precisely the same. The King of Sardinia has laws which he considers just, yet he claims the right to execute them or not as policy may dictate.

Another censure is of the proposition that the Church has no right to enforce her laws either directly or indirectly by temporal penalties of any kind. This, an English paper thinks, smacks of the Inquisition. Yet it does not smack of the Inquisition as Americans understand that institution—that is, a fierce, persecuting, bloody, relentless, secret tribunal—which the Roman Inquisition never was. It only claims for the Church the right to be a society, and regulate its own conditions of membership—Every little debating society has its system of fines for non-attendance, disorderly conduct, &c. And this is all the power the Church claims. She has nothing to do with those who are outside. But within she has a discipline, and claims the right of enforcing it by such means as, according to her judgment, are just and efficacious. Thus she deprives delinquent clergymen of their benefices, and punishes disorders among the laity by public censure and excommunication, all of which are temporal penalties. And this seems to me beyond question, just and legitimate. ...

As Archbishop Spalding, in his late able pastoral, well remarked, the Pope, in this Encyclical, stands before the world as the champion of truth and justice. He does not speak as the leader of a sect—the rival of the Episcopalians and the Methodists, who belong to one soil and language. He does not speak as the feeble ruler of a worn-out city and a few dirty villages, an obstruction to Victor Emmanuel's

Prime Minister's ambitious plans, but as Vicar of the King of Kings he talks to the world about him, and so generations unborn; and his testimony, which shall stir the hearts of men when Victor Emmanuel and his kingdom have been forgotten on the earth, is "There is a God who is Master of us all—princes and people, priests and statesmen—whom alone we must adore and serve in public life and private life. There is a kingdom set up by Christ Jesus on the earth, of justice and truth, and this kingdom must and will rule the hearts and lives of men, bearing aloft to salvation those who yield willingly to its sway, grinding to powder those who oppose it."

His testimony is not against rational liberty, or the elevation of the masses, or right progress, or true freedom of thought and speech. It is not against any noble aspiration or pure thought, or kind impulse of any Catholic or non-Catholic on the face of the earth, but it is against open, conscious, reckless infidelity and atheism, which no right minded American cares about defending. That is all. There is no renewal of mediæval ideas in it, no sighing after any state of things that ever

yet existed, but simply and solely a condemnation of infidelity—whether in government, philosophy, legislation, education, social or private life. It would be far wiser in us to heed the warning than to cavil at the monitor. Unbelief, with us, has not the malice it has in Europe. But it is destroying souls, and undermining the framework of society even here. What will fortunes be worth if, a few years hence, the lawlessness prevails generally, among the people, which is used in amassing them?

Ten days ago a Convention assembled in Indianapolis with a view to getting the people of the United States to vote themselves a Christian people. It would be far better to leave out the voting, and labor to make us a Christian people indeed. Let bitterness and hate be laid aside, and the truth be sought in humility and sincerity of heart, not in convention and public meetings, but in study and prayer. Then, as individuals, we will save our souls alive, and as a nation prove the truth of the declaration of Holy Writ: Blessed are the people whose God is the Lord.

## BAPTISMS AT WILLS CREEK, COSHOCTON COUNTY, 1837-1900

(Continued, from Vol. XXXII, No. 8)

1842, continued

same day [June 29] Elizabeth, born Dec. 10, daughter of Jacob Lahna and Rosina Sandel; spon. Jacob Crater and Margaret Walta. [The Lahnas were living in Adams Twp., Muskingum Co. at this time, per Hill's history.]

same day Sarah, born January 13, daughter of George Brilemayer and Magdalena Bordenkircher; spon. David Bordenkircher and Regina Wagly [perhaps Vogel or Vögele].

same day Christiana, born April 7, daughter of John Marter and Magdalena Fright [Frech?]; spon. Michael Heiser and Margaret Frech.

same day Barbara, born May 10, daughter of

Joseph Kessler and Margaret Match; spon. Laurence Jager and Barbara Cous.

same day Ann, born March 12, daughter of Thomas Collopy and Margaret Bulman; spon. John Kelly and Ann Crowley.

same day Elizabeth Susan, born Feb. 10, daughter of Adolph Host and Mary Roof; spon. Barnhard Ruff and Heldical Colip.

same day Catherine, born March 1, daughter of Michael Wagner and Mariann Lösch; spon. George Schue and Agatha Lösch. Fr. Joseph Alemany

October 30 Lawrence, born Sept. 8, son of Anthony Wimmer and Magdalena Schue; spon. Matthias Factor and Elizabeth Lösch.

same day Mary, born Oct. 3, daughter of Jacob

Crater and Magdalena Lösch; spons. Jacob Lösch and Mary Ruff?. Fr. Francis Cubero

### 1843

January 1 Ann, born Dec. 2, daughter of Patrick Crowley and Mary Manneon; spons. Thomas Mullen and Ann Colopey. Fr. Francis Cubero  
same day Jane, born Dec. 19, daughter of John Lennan and Sara, spouses; spons. Joseph Dealy and Margaret Colopy. Fr. Francis Cubero  
December 17 Daniel, born Oct. 24, son of Joseph Wise and Magdalene Persvile; spons. Edolfort and Mary Pitch.  
same day Daniel, born Dec. 13, son of Benedict Bottingkery [Bordenkircher] and Mary Sta\_\_t; spons. Daniel Winter and Catherine Ospeaker [Aschbaker]. Fr. Francis Cubero

### 1844

April 11 Michael, born April 11, son of Thomas Collopy and Margaret Bulman; spons. John Hallassy and Matilda Gab. Rev. D. Galinger Per. Sac.

### 1846

April 26 Francis, born Dec. 24, 1844, son of Samuel Keis and Mary Mullen; spons. John and Catherine Halasey. Fr. J. H. Clarkson, O.P.  
April 27 Catherine Elizabeth, born Feb. 22, daughter of Maurice Trainer and Catherine Smith; spons. David and Mary Miller. JHC  
August 23 Thomas, born Aug. 14, son of Thomas Colopy and Margaret Bulman; spons. Patrick Crowley and Margaret Flagharty. JHC  
[A letter from Father Montgomery of Zanesville St. Thomas Parish to Bishop Purcell stated that there were five baptisms at Plainfield from November 1, 1845 to November 1, 1846, but only the three above could be identified in the baptismal register.]

### 1847

April 25 Edward, born Jan. 21, son of Patrick Crawley and Mary Manion; spons. Thomas and Margaret Colopy. Fr. J. H. Clarkson

### 1848

May 16 Julia, born Dec. 25, 1847, daughter of Maurice Trainor and Catherine Smith; spons. John Hallecy and Helen Magher. Fr. G. A. J. Wilson  
same day Sara Catherine, born March 7, daughter of Samuel Kist and Mary Mullen; spons. Maurice Traener and Catherine Trainer. GAJW  
same day Daniel, born Feb. 29, son of John Hallacey and Catherine Crowley; spons. John Colopy and Mary Keist. GAJW

### 1849

Feb. 29 John, born Feb. 20, son of Sebastian Dollic and Regina Sherer; spons. John Sherer and Anna Maria Henn. GAJW  
same day Mary, born Dec. 1, daughter of James Hallicey and Mary Cullinem; spons. Michael Crawley and Margaret Colopy.  
same day Rose Ann, born Oct. 27, daughter of Michael Wagner and Mary Lieh; spons. George Shoe and Elizabeth Lech. GAJW

### 1851

October 5 John Simon, born Sept. 8, son of Patrick Crawley and Mary Mania; spons. James Hartigan and Mary Hurly. C. P. Montgomery

### 1854

May 21 Michael, born May 16, son of Patrick Crawley and Mary Manien; spons. John and Elizabeth Crawley. C. P. Montgomery.

[From the names of these sponsors as well as the names in other baptisms recorded on the same days, it appears likely that the above two Crawley baptisms took place in Zanesville, not at Wills Creek.]

**Recorded at St. Nicholas Church,  
Zanesville, 1843-1854**

*Fathers Gallinger, Deselaers, and Deiters, pastors of the German Catholic Church of St. Nicholas in Zanesville, recorded the missions at which they administered baptisms. Father Gallinger's records are in German. Since this means the forms actually used by the German-speaking people are obvious, the German form of given names is used in this translation.*

**1843**

- Carl, b. Feb. 24, 1842, bapt. Jan. 27, son of Johann Hem, stone cutter at Wills Creek, and wife, M. A. Westrich, from the Pfalz. Sponsor Wendel Bod—.
- Johann, b. Dec. 17, bapt. Jan. 27, son of John Doll, farmer at Wills Creek, and his wife, Kath. Heinrich. Sponsor Johann Heinrich
- Barbara, b. April 16, bapt. April 19, daughter of Michael Weissenbacher, and his wife Theres[ia] Wessbacher. Sponsors Barbara Genz and Lorens Jäger, at Wills Creek
- Barbara, b. Jan. 17, bapt. April 19, daughter of Michael Wagner and wife, M. A. Lösch, at Wills Creek. Sponsors Elisabeth Lösch and Georg Wagner
- Johann, b. April 3, bapt. April 19, son of Georg Bayer and wife, Barbara Heinrich, at Wills Creek. Sponsors Joh. Heinrich and M. A. Scherer.
- John, b. Jan 10, bapt. April 19, son of John Hales, and wife, Kath. Carle?. Sponsors James Harlehi and Bridget Manai?, at Wills Creek
- Magdalena, b. June 15, bapt. July 25, of Johann Bodenkircher at Wills Creek and wife Kath. Asbacher, from Elsass. Sponsors Wendelin Bodenkircher and Magdalen Asbacher
- Regina, b. June 15, bapt. July 25, son of Daniel Winter at Wills Creek and wife, Katherine Chain. Sponsors Jakob Chain and Regina Aschauer

- Agatha, b. July 1, bapt. July 25, daughter of Joseph Wagner at Wills Creek and wife Amalia Renner, from Baden. Sponsors George Wagner and Agatha Lösch
- Jakob, b. June 4, bapt. Sept. 19, of Jakob Lenier, farmer, and wife Rosina Sandl at Wills Creek. Sponsor Johann Bodenkircher
- Jakob, b. Aug. 18, bapt. Sept. 19, of John Klosson, from Rasko [Roscoe], and wife M. A. Bachmann, from Unterfranken. Sponsors Jakob Hegl and Regina Bodenkircher
- Maria, b. June 17, bapt. Sept. 19, of Andrew Hettl at Wills Creek and wife Elisabeth Stocker, from Hessendarmstadt. Sponsor Maria Balzer

**1844**

- Franz Ludwig, b. Dec. 26, 1843, bapt. Jan. 21, of Adam Kraus, bricklayer, and wife Elisabeth Zimmermann, from Rheinbaiern. Sponsors Franz B. Fix, Wills Creek, and his wife, Anna Maria
- Joseph Albert, b. Dec. 23, 1843, bapt. Feb. 13, of Gregor Wagner near Jacobsport and wife from Elsass. Sponsors Joseph Wagner and Elizabeth Lösch
- Maria Madgdalena, b. Jan. 24, bapt. Feb. 13, of Michael Heuser near Jacobsport and wife Margareth Frech from Elsass. Sponsors Martin Heinrich and Mary Schmidt
- Michael, b. Jan. 21, bapt. Jan 24, of Thomas Culbe [Collopy] and wife Kath. near Jacobsport. Sponsors Hildegard Geb and Joh. Halesi
- Franz Peter, b. Jan. 22, bapt. April 17, of Jos. Mäder near Jacobsport and wife Margaret Fry. Sponsors Hildegard Geb and Jakob Grail
- Michael, b. April 30, bapt. May 29, of Anton Wimert and wife Magdalen Shuh near Jacobsport. Sponsors Michael Heuser and Barbara Weinmann
- Georg, b. June 20, bapt. Aug. 6, of Joh. Aschbacher and wife M. A. Bodenkircher near Jacobsport. Sponsors Jakob Hägl and

Magdalen Brillmayr  
Maria, b. Aug. 28, bapt. Sept. 10, of Georg  
Baier and wife Barb. Heinrich at St. Mary's.  
Sponsors Kaspar Heinrich and Maria  
Scherer

### 1845

Sara, b. Nov 16, bapt. Feb. 11, of Michael  
Wagner and wife M. A. Lösch. Sponsors  
Elisabeth and G. Schuh near Jacobsport  
Maria, b. Dec. 16, bapt. Feb. 11, of Johann  
Doll and wife, Catherine Heinrich. Sponsors  
Barbara Susan[?] and Peter Klein  
Aegid[ius], b. July 10, bapt. July 22, of Joseph  
Wagner and wife Amalia Römer near St.  
Mary's. Sponsors Georg Wagner and Agatha  
Lösch  
David, b. Oct. 9, bapt. Nov. 10, of Joh.  
Bodenkircher and Katherine Aschbacher  
near St. Mary's. Sponsor Wendelin  
Bodenkircher  
Johannes, b. Aug 28, Bapt. Nov. 10, of  
Wendelin Bodenkircher and M. A. Rausch at  
St. Mary's. Sponsors Joh. Bodenkircher and  
A. M. Bodenkircher  
Katharina, b. Aug. 31, bapt Nov. 10, of Jakob  
Hegel and Regina Bodenkircher. Sponsors

Joh. Aschbacher and Magd. Bodenkircher

### 1846

Georg Anton, b. Jan 12, bapt. Feb. 10, of  
Sebastian Dollich and wife Regina Scherer  
near St. Mary's. Sponsors Ant. Scherer and  
Kath. Klein  
Sara Anna, b. March 5, bapt. March 9, of  
Gregor Wagner and Agatha Lösch near St.  
Mary's. Sponsors Joseph Gunther and  
Elisabeth Lösch  
Elisabeth, b. April 21, bapt. May 10, of  
Michael Häuser and wife Marg. Frech in St.  
Mary's. Sponsors Anton Wimmer and Barb.  
Heinrich  
Anna Cecilia, b. Oct. 8, bapt. Nov. 10, of  
Michael Wagner and Maria Lösch. Sponsors  
Georg Schuh and Elisabeth  
(To be continued)

### CORRECTION

With reference to the July *Bulletin*, page 146,  
Father Rodenfels points out that those students  
of St. Francis de Sales High School who attended  
classes at St. James the Less Parish in 1960/61  
were taught by Dominican Sisters, not Sisters of  
Notre Dame. Thank you, Father!