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CHAPTER I

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Bernard Bailyn, in his seminal essay on the history of education, claimed:

The forms of education assumed by the first generation of settlers in America were a direct inheritance from the medieval past. Serving the needs of a homogeneous, slowly changing rural society, they were largely instinctive and traditional, little articulated and little formalized. The most important agency in the transfer of culture was not formal institutions of instruction or public instruments of communication, but the family. . . .

What the family left undone by way of informal education the local community most often completed. It did so in entirely natural ways, for so elaborate was the architecture of family organization and so deeply founded was it in the soil of stable, slowly changing village and town communities in which intermarriage among the same groups had taken place generation after generation that it was at times difficult for the child to know where the family left off and greater society began. . . .

More explicit in its educational function than either family or community was the church. . . . It furthered the introduction of the child to society by instructing him in the
system of thought and imagery which underlay the culture's values and aims.

Family, community, and church together accounted for the greater part of mechanism by which English culture transferred itself across the generations. The instruments of deliberate pedagogy, of explicit, literate education, accounted for a smaller, though indispensable, portion of the process. The cultural burdens it bore were relatively slight.¹

While Bailyn's claims may be justified for the preponderance of colonial children, at least one group did not fit within the norm. The history of Catholic education in America, like the history of the Church itself, is one of survival and adaptation, not one of conquering and creation. One of the first acts of colonial Maryland's Governor Seymour in 1703 was to arrest Robert Brooke and William Hunter, two members of the Society of Jesus, for "gaudy shows and serpentine policy."² The priests were saying Mass. A Roman Catholic chapel had been built at St. Mary's City a few miles outside of


present day Annapolis, and the governor and his Council ordered the Papist chapel to be locked.³

As early as 1692, Maryland law books show the establishment of the Protestant religion as the state religion of the province. And throughout the colonial period Catholics were held in fear and suspicion.⁴ As individuals, most lived their lives away from the mainstream in relative seclusion. At various times until the Revolutionary War came, and with it, an independent country, Catholics were denied freedom to worship, to take part in civic affairs, even to educate their children.

While disagreeing widely among themselves on religious matters, Anglicans, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, even Quakers recognized the Papist as the common enemy of freeborn Englishmen.⁵ Under such adverse conditions, some Catholic families found it very difficult to educate their children; that is to say,

³Ibid.


⁵Ibid.
Catholics faced many rigid obstacles in the process of formal transmission of their cultural heritage from one generation to the next.

Purpose

The general purpose of this study is to illustrate how one Catholic family, prominent in colonial Maryland in spite of its popishness, went about educating two of its members who played a significant role in the development of this country. The two primary subjects dealt with are Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the only Irish Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence, and his cousin John Carroll, the first American Bishop of the Catholic Church. While the writer does not claim that the Carrolls were typical of all other Catholic families living in mid-eighteenth century America, she does claim that they were not atypical of wealthy Catholic Marylanders.\(^6\)

Another closely allied claim made in this study is that Catholics saw schooling as their model for education early on; that is, Catholics looked to the

church-run school for the inculcation of those values and attitudes which characterized the virtuous and brave man. In other words, they were concerned, as were the ancient Greeks, with areté.\(^7\) To be sure, one does not view the existence of the church-school as either a necessary or sufficient mechanism by which one attains virtue, courage, and honor; one does, however, perceive that kind of institution as conducive to the development of the man who possesses those traits, all of which rests, for the colonial Catholic, with teaching aimed at developing the good, the knowledgeable, the brave and virtuous Christian. Especially were the post-reformation schools begun by Ignatius of Loyola instituted for the children of those Catholic families who held positions of leadership. The claim here is not that the Jesuit schools transformed students into leaders; rather it is that these schools educated their students to assume those leadership roles which family and circumstance had already awarded. It seems plausible, then, to speculate that the denial of Jesuit schooling to this group, that is, aristocratic

Catholics, was to strike at the core of their educational endeavors and ideals. Accepting this premise, one is not surprised at the lengths to which these families went in order to educate their children. A large part of this study is devoted to relating the way in which these families set about schooling their youth despite rigorous, prohibitive legislation of the provincial government of Maryland.

Scope

The period of time dealt with in this dissertation is 1634 until the beginning of the Revolutionary War. The year 1634 is significant because it was in that year that Father Andrew White and his associates came to Maryland with Cecil Calvert. Almost immediately the Jesuits attempted to start schools. Their efforts throughout the time period will be examined along with the legislation of the Maryland delegates to initiate secular education in the province.

The data gathered, the interpretations made, the conclusions drawn in this study are applicable only to

---

colonial Maryland and are not intended to be sweeping
generalizations about the whole realm of colonial Catholic
education. Nevertheless, it is true that the bulk of the
colonies' Catholic population did reside in that province.

Limitations

Limitations of this study came from various
directions. Most importantly, the problem is that Catho­
ic-colonial education has been largely ignored by
American historians, and hence secondary sources are not
abundant. To illustrate that claim, consider Cremin's
recent tome on colonial education. His references to
Roman Catholics and/or education are few and herein they
follow:

Every church, of course, had its "apostle to
the Indians"—Alexander Whitaker among the
Anglicans, Andrew White among the Roman Cath­
olics, John Campanius among the Lutherans.9

Referring to the Anglicans and Puritans as "committed to
the struggle against Barbarism," he alludes to other
"certain stubborn realities of the colonial situation."10

9 Lawrence A. Cremin, American Education, the
Colonial Experience, 1607-1783 (New York: Harper & Row

10 Ibid., p. 163.
Of the 260 churches in the colonies in 1689, 71 were Anglican, and 116 Congregational; but, in addition, there were 15 Baptist, 17 Dutch Reformed, 15 Presbyterian, 12 French Reformed, 9 Roman Catholic, and 5 Lutheran.¹¹

In the section of the book devoted to Denominationalism, which is eighty-five pages long, he mentions Catholics in only four paragraphs.¹² The Jesuits are mentioned only in relation to enmity of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. That the Catholics interfered with the missionary efforts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel is Cremin's emphasis.

Thus, Cremin's work, the long-awaited scholarly, almost-epic tale of colonial education, virtually ignores schooling efforts of the Catholics.

Another limitation of this dissertation is that it does not deal with attempts of Catholics to Christianize or to educate the Indians. That could be the basis for another study. And, in fact, other historians of Catholic education have done some work in that area.¹³

¹¹Ibid.

¹²Ibid., pp. 342, 355-56.

¹³For information concerning work of the Jesuits among the Indians, see John Gilmary Shea, The Catholic Church in Colonial Days (New York: John Gilmary Shea,
Of course, available materials must be considered when dealing with limitations of a scholarly study, and this one is no exception. Much of the primary source material concerning the education of John Carroll is simply not extant. Early records were destroyed when his childhood home was burned. Later records stored at Bruges were lost during the bombing of World War I, and most of what exists is in the archives of Stonyhurst Jesuit School in England in the Papal Archives in Rome. Some records, however few, are at Georgetown University, which Carroll himself founded, and these were examined.

His cousin, Charles Carroll, has left more educational information, primarily in letters written while he was in Europe. And these infrequent letters provide the base from which much speculation on his educational program is derived. His personal comments, along with the customary Ratio Studiorum of the Jesuits, lead to some conclusions about his schooling.

1886); Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America; John Tracy Ellis, Documents of American Catholic History (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1956).
This work will not attempt to examine every school begun in colonial Maryland. It will not include every newspaper article or advertisement concerning schools or schoolmasters. For a massive amount of statistical data on colonial schools in Maryland, see "Secondary Education in Maryland before 1800," a doctoral dissertation by P. C. Potts. The dissertation consists of little but numerical data except in the last one-and-a-half pages. Repetition of that work here was considered superfluous; however, statistical information therein was used when appropriate.

A final impediment in tracing historical documents pertaining to Catholics at this period of time is that when the provincial government was exceedingly harsh, that is, when anti-popery laws were stringently enforced, many of the records of the Jesuit teachers were lost, plundered, and/or destroyed. Therefore, in the context of what remains, this study is set.

Review of the Literature

This study is based on the Charles Carroll Papers, edited by Thomas O'Brien Hanley, Microfilm no. 1943; the Letterbook of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, 1765-68; the Carroll Papers, 1750-1854; Carroll-McTavish Papers, 1652-1850; Carroll-Harper Papers, 1749/50-c.1896; Carroll Papers, 1702-1782. These papers are collections deposited at the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore, and were invaluable resources. The Maryland Historical Magazine provided the basis for insight into the social life, as well as the political arena. The Maryland Gazette also proved helpful in suggesting how the lives of the provincial Marylanders were conducted in response to the struggles not only within the colony, but in other colonies and in Europe as well. The Gazette was clearly a worthwhile source of information. The Laws of Maryland, 1634-1789, located at the Hall of Records in Annapolis and the Baltimore Sun in recent years had some items of historical significance for this study, were the basis of the study concerning limitations and restrictions on Catholics, as well as the major source for material concerning the establishment, the building, and the financing of schools in colonial Maryland. One of the major
disappointments of the search was *Maryland: A History, 1632-1934* by Richard Walsh and William Lloyd Fox. These men, both having lived in Maryland for more than twenty years, claim it as their adopted state. Both are professors of history; yet in their 906-page tome, they devote part of one paragraph to colonial education, that is, education before the Revolution, and five pages to education between the years 1786 and 1798.\(^{15}\)

The Georgetown University Special Collections were helpful in the search concerning Bohemia Manor. The unpublished manuscripts of E. J. Devitt, S.J., were especially helpful in interpreting issues over Bohemia and the later founding of Georgetown.

Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore was helpful in the search about schooling in that city. Newspaper clippings and journal articles from their file on Baltimore's Centennial shed light on why Baltimore fell behind Annapolis in the establishment of state-supported schools.

The secondary sources which proved useful for this study along with short annotations will follow. In order to study Catholic education in the United States, one must be aware of and look into Thomas Hughes, S.J., *The History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, a four-volume history published by Longmans, Green and Company, 1907-1917. Although this work is a Church history, it deals with the growth of institutions for Catholic schooling in its accounts of the fortunes and misfortunes of that religious community. Hughes discusses Bohemia Manor and speculates an explanation for its hinterland location. Another standard source is John Gilmary Shea, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, New York: John G. Shea, 1888. Shea gives an historical account of the development of the American Church, carefully making his reader aware of the importance the Catholic Church placed on education. He speaks specifically of both John and Charles Carroll. A more recent Church history is Theodore Roemer, *The Catholic Church of the United States*, St. Louis: B. Herder and Company, 1950. He also writes from the point of view that higher education is a significant endeavor for the Church.
John Tracy Ellis, in his *American Catholicism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956, pinpoints certain documents which give added strength to the religious prejudice/persecution of the colonial Protestants of all denominations against the Catholics. In spite of the fact that Ellis devotes only twenty-two pages to Catholic settlements along the Atlantic Coast, his cogent analysis of the political and religious climate is especially helpful and significant.

*American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century*, by Sister Mary Augustine (Ray), New York: Octagon Books, Farrar, Straus, and Geroux, 1974, is a reprinting of the 1936 Teachers College Edition. This thoroughly documented study was invaluable in the area of social traditions and expectations throughout the colonies. The author clearly presents a vast amount of data from which she concludes that the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were dedicated to the maxim, "Keep your enemy in the wrong," that their behavior aided in no small way any political events, both domestic and foreign, built a conception of Popery as the "composite monster reaching
out its tentacles to draw all good Protestants to
destruction."

As far as general histories of Catholic education
in the United States are concerned, only two exist: J. A.
Education in the United States*, New York: Benziger
Brothers, 1937. This is, perhaps, the Elwood P.
Cubberley book of Catholic education, and while respected
in scholarly circles, present-day Catholic historians are
looking for a history which deals with empirical data
based on individual educative experiences. There is,
however, a recent book dealing with Catholic education:
Harold A. Buetow's *Of Singular Benefit: The Story of
Catholic Education in the United States*, published by the
Macmillan Company in 1970. Buetow's work, though, failed
to excite many historians concerned with colonial
Catholic education. He, for the most part, synthesizes
what had already been done. For the purposes of this
particular study, Buetow was another verification that
Catholics simply could not openly educate their children,
and Buetow writes in a pleasant, yet scholarly manner.
Therefore, regardless of the criticism against his work,
it was a useful source for this dissertation.
A very short documentary history on Catholic education is Neil G. McCluskey, S.J.'s Catholic Education in America: A Documentary History, which is part of the Classics in Education Series published by Teachers College, Columbia University. This brief, but significant collection of documents, published in 1964, is prefaced by an essay in which McCluskey discusses the evolution of the Catholic school in relation to the Common School Movement. He sees, as the central problem, the contradiction inherent in the very idea of one common school which would serve a religiously pluralistic society. In light of the evidence, his thesis seems valid and relevant for this study's philosophical base.

Not so much a history, but an important source is John W. Donahue, S.J., Jesuit Education: An Essay on the Foundations of Its Idea. Donahue addresses himself to the educational theory of the Jesuits. His study is an inquiry into the kinds of thinking and the practices behind the Ratio Studiorum. He approaches his topic with a completed product as the goal of education, and then deals with theory and methodology used throughout four centuries by the Society of Jesus to procure that particular product. Since both John and Charles Carroll were
educated by these priests, any information concerning the policies of their community concerning educational activity is, indeed, beneficial to this work.

Among the books on Catholic higher education, two were most helpful. Edward J. Power's *Catholic Higher Education in America*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Corporation, 1972, deals only very briefly with the colonial period, but provides good sources for reference in his documentation. The other work which proved helpful is *St. Omers to Stonyhurst: A History of Two Centuries*, by Herbert Chadwick, S.J., London: Burns and Oates, 1962. This volume gives specific information concerning those European institutions most often used by wealthy Maryland parents as the places of learning for their children.

Biographies also played a significant role in the preparation of this dissertation. Emerson once said that the only true history is biography, and this writer tends to agree with that claim. Several biographies of Charles Carroll of Carrollton have been written, the latest by Thomas O'Brien Hanley, S.J., *Charles Carroll of Carrollton: The Making of a Revolutionary Gentleman*, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University Press, 1970. Father
Hanley's is a rather pedantic work. His careful scholarship and organization are at once visible, but he seems to fail at making his subject a human being, even when he deals with Charles' love affairs. It somehow does not seem plausible for one who was so active in political and social affairs to be so dry and colorless a person.

Ellen Hart Smith in her *Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1942, makes the character of Charles not only more interesting, but, in fact, her less pedantic writing style is easier to follow. The oldest and the standard biography is Kate Mason Rowland's *The Life and Correspondence of Charles Carroll of Carrollton*, 2 volumes, New York: Putnam and Sons, 1898. Rowland was asked by the Carroll descendants to write his biography as an honor to his memory. This she did in a scholarly manner, not sacrificing scholarship or literary credibility in her work. All subsequent biographers have given her the credit for reminding the American public of the contributions to this country of Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

traces the education of John Carroll as precisely as it seems possible to do with the limited amount of primary source material available. And although others have attempted to recreate the life of America's first bishop, Guilday's works stay at the top. Shea, in his history of the Catholic Church referred to earlier, spends a good amount of time discussing Carroll, his education, and his influence on the development of Catholic education in this country. Also, less significant, but worthwhile for this study, is Annabelle Melville's doctoral dissertation, published as John Carroll: Bishop of Baltimore, by Charles Scribner's Sons in 1955. Melville, writing from a more humanistic approach, shows the Bishop as a man deeply concerned with his Church, his personal relationships, and his highest priority, order in all things. Of special interest, although not particularly pertinent to this study, was the relationship between Carroll and Benjamin Franklin. She portrays Bishop Carroll as a person with human frailties, as well as an infallible patriarch of Roman Catholicism in America.

Two extremely relevant dissertations done at Catholic University were A Study of Catholic Secondary Education During the Colonial Period Up to the First
Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1852, by Reverend Edmund J. Goebel, published by Catholic University in 1936, and Church-State Relationships in Education in Maryland, published by Catholic University Press in 1942. Father Goebel provides documented evidence of Jesuit educational activity at Newtown Manor and Bohemia Manor. His work, especially with the Woodstock Letters, is pertinent to this study. Father McCormick has done careful research on legislation affecting Catholic education in colonial Maryland. After having perused many of the same documents used by both Father McCormick and Father Goebel, it is less difficult to begin to see the ways in which the data fall together into a somewhat meaningful entity.

For background information concerning education in ancient times, see Henri I. Marrou's A History of Education in Antiquity, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956. Marrou was especially helpful, particularly in his discussion of the untranslatable areté. E. B. Castle's Educating the Good Man, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1958, was helpful in the discussions through Chapter 8. Particularly are the sections on "Protestant and Catholic Disciplines," "The Eighteenth Century in Europe," and "The Eighteenth Century in England" relevant for this

Three works on colonial cultural life which were used were *Myths and Realities: Societies of the Colonial South*, by Carl Bridenbaugh, New York: Atheneum, 1968; Louis B. Wright's *The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763*, New York: Harper and Row, 1957; and Sidney George Fisher's *Men, Women and Manners in Colonial Times*, reprinted by the Detroit Singing Tree Press in 1969. This book, originally published in 1897 by J. P. Lippincott, is a very informally written but informative book. Fisher gives the most explicit account of politics in the colony. Bridenbaugh's chapter on "The
Chesapeake Society" points out the myth of the wealthy, leisurely planter who had nothing to do but ride his horses and entertain ladies. He contends that most Maryland planters were hard workers, some barely able to keep financially stable. Another study in the Maryland Historical Magazine, "The Planters of Colonial Maryland," gives empirical data for Bridenbaugh's claim. Wright's book, on the other hand, deals with all of the colonies, and his chapters on education, religion, and literary production were helpful.

Another source consulted was Charles M. Andrews' The Colonial Period of American History, a four volume series, published by Yale University Press, 1934-1938. Andrews deals in volume 2 with the settlement of Maryland. His obviously anti-Catholic approach makes it difficult for the reader, but his documented discussions of politics in the colony make the work helpful in the study.

Also, Edgar Knight's A Documentary History of Education in the South Before 1860, published in five volumes, was examined, and although interesting reading, it added no new evidence to contradict or support this research.
Lawrence A. Cremin's book on colonial education, already discussed for its omission of any discussions of Catholic education, is, nevertheless, the current reference for American colonial educational endeavors outside Catholicism. Cremin's treatment of the family as educator comes on the heels of Bernard Bailyn's call for a revised history of American education dealing with educative institutions other than schools themselves. The scholarship demonstrated in this book, despite the major fault already discussed, is without question first-rate. And this writer can only stand in awe of one who undertakes a study of such magnitude.

An interesting and helpful source is the small paperback, Exemplars of the Teaching Method, by Harry S. Broudy and John R. Palmer, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965. Originally prepared as a chapter for the Handbook of Research on Teaching, this book is a collection of essays which concentrate on the teaching methods of a few outstanding teachers. Chapter 6, "Methods of Teaching Classics to Gentlemen: Ascham and the Jesuits," is most significant for this study.

Two books in the American Heritage Series, published by Bobbs-Merrill, are The Great Awakening,
edited by Alan Heimert and Perry Miller, 1967, and
*Theories of Education in Early America, 1655-1819*, edited
by Wilson Smith, 1973. Both are documentary histories
dealing with Protestant sources. The only references to
Catholics are not complimentary. The books, however,
served a purpose; they further illustrated the prejudiced
religious climate of the colonial period.

Volume 1 of a three volume work edited by Robert
Bremner and published by Harvard University Press, 1971,
*Children and Youth in America, 1600-1865*, is an invaluable
asset to any researcher interested in the social or edu­
cational welfare of colonial children. Dr. Bremner has
selected legal documents, newspaper items, excerpts from
novels, and journal articles, as well as photographs to
cover his subject.

Two other books which played an important part in
the writing of this dissertation are *Contemporary Theories
Company, 1971, and *The Public School Movement: A Critical
*Contemporary Theories* is significant, for it is the book
which set this writer to speculate on any theory or
philosophy of education. The chapter on Perennialism,
especially the section on neo-Thomism, motivated her to read and search for material about the Catholic Church and Catholic education—their purposes and methods. The second book by Richard Pratte has an invaluable analysis of education and schooling which will be referred to in a later chapter of this dissertation.

A single volume on the history of education in Maryland is available. Bernard C. Steiner's History of Education in Maryland, Washington, D.C., 1894, was published as a United States Bureau of Education Circular of Information. To this date, nobody has revised Steiner's work. One glaring problem with it, however, is that he documents nothing, and having read the original sources, this writer felt angered.

from the early Catholic Historical Society, June 1906 and June 1913.

Finally, the timely canonization of Elizabeth Ann Seton on September 14, 1975, gave rise to numerous helpful articles in leading publications.

Methodology

In any attempt to write history, one is forced to reconstruct a past he has never known. Not time, nor dedication, nor any amount of research can successfully recreate that past; therefore, the historian is necessarily a subjective observer, no matter if all records bearing on his particular subject are preserved. So he is compelled, as Halborn has said, "to gain objective knowledge of the past through the subjective experience of the scholar."\(^\text{16}\) The method used to carry out that procedure in this dissertation is the historical explanation. This type of explanation is, because it can be no other way, probabilistic in structure; that is to say, the explanation is the outcome of available generalizations about human conduct and behavior in a given

situation. The distinctive feature of probabilistic arguments is that their conclusions are not logically necessary consequences of their premises, even when all the assumptions are explicitly formulated. The paramount consideration to bear in mind, then, when reading or writing history is that one is not writing the past or reading the past, but confronting one individual's interpretation of that past. And, as John F. Kennedy wrote:

The essence of ultimate decision remains impenetrable to the observer—often indeed to the decider himself. . . . There will always be the dark and tangled stretches in the decision-making process—mysterious even to those who may be most intimately involved.

So it is with the historian-observer.

Most historical explanations do, in fact, mention only some of the necessary conditions for a phenomenon's occurrence. So it must be understood that historical explanations do not mention any sufficient conditions for events, but only some of the necessary conditions for


them. Thus, this study will present a gathering of and an analysis of data from original and secondary sources. That is, facts pertaining to both secular and non-secular schooling in colonial Maryland, and the schooling of Charles and John Carroll were recorded and analyzed. Every effort was made to present an accurate, historically fair account of the development of colonial schools in Maryland and the schooling of the two Carrolls.

Organization of the Study

Chapter II will deal with attempts at secular schooling in Maryland during the colonial period. From the time of the first English settlers in the province in the 1630s until the legislature passed an act for the establishment of free schools in 1696, there was no secular or public province-supported school in Maryland. This chapter includes a discussion of the concept of schooling, a description of the schools that the provincial legislature hoped to establish, the kinds of schoolmasters to be employed, and the governing bodies of those schools. Also included is a description of colonial Maryland and its conflicting attitudes, especially
concerning religion, and their impact on the creation of any kind of public schooling system.

Chapter III will be centered around the unsuccessful efforts of Catholics to build schools and to carry on schooling. The anti-papery laws will be discussed in light of the defecting of the Calverts from the Catholic Church to conform to the Church of England. As early as 1694 the Church of England has been designated by the Maryland legislature as the official and established Church. This action led to much conflict and confusion over individual rights. All these matters will be considered in the chapter.

Chapter IV is devoted to the education of John Carroll. Although the initial schooling of these two students was the same, John Carroll followed an ecclesiastical career, pursuing the curriculum of the Society of Jesus throughout his school years. Even though many of the primary sources for this part of the study have been lost or destroyed, enough data are extant to hypothesize with some degree of objectivity.

Chapter V deals with the education of Charles Carroll. First, his Maryland schooling is discussed. Because of the abortive nature of this schooling, most
of the chapter is devoted to the schooling which Charles Carroll received from the Jesuits and from the Inns of Court in Europe. He was sent as a child of eleven years to study at St. Omers under the English Jesuits. From there he went to Rheims, to Paris, to Bourges, back to Paris, and finally to London, returning to Maryland in January 1765, almost seventeen years later at the age of twenty-eight.

The kinds of education he received will be dealt with and the implication for his later contributions will be assessed.

Chapter VI contains a summary and conclusion of the study, as well as recommendations for further research in the area.
CHAPTER II

SECULAR EDUCATION IN COLONIAL MARYLAND

Introduction

Although Maryland was chartered and settled as early as 1634 by Englishmen, interest in the establish­ment of a provincial system of schooling is not apparent until 1671 when the Lower House of the Maryland Assembly passed a bill for the founding and erecting of a school within the province for the education of youth in learning and virtue.¹ Contained in the bill were provisions that schoolmasters be qualified according to the Church of England or that there be two masters, one for the Catholics and one of their own choosing by the Protestants. This arrangement, however, failed to meet the satisfaction of the Upper House; consequently, the scheme was never enacted. The controversies arising over sectarianism were to play a prominent role in

¹Archives of the State of Maryland, Annapolis, 1884, vol. 2, pp. 262-64.
deterring the development of a system of schooling for the province.

Since 1634 and the arrival of Jesuits, with Father Andrew White as their leader, schooling had been considered an important goal in the nurturing of a fledgling colony. But no body politic had acted on behalf of Maryland's scattered population to establish schools for children throughout the province. Not until 1694 did the Maryland legislature pass legislation for the establishment of free schools.

Before one can understand the problems of schools or the lack of such institutions, he must be aware of what is involved in the concept of schooling. The first part of this chapter will deal briefly with "schooling" in a general way, setting the background for the core of Chapter III which is concerned with a particular kind of schooling, Jesuit schooling. The remainder of this chapter will be a short review of supposedly secular colonial schooling, the schoolmasters employed, the textbooks used, specific legislation for colonial schools in Maryland, socio-cultural situations in Maryland, the political changes which were brought about as a result of the Glorious Revolution.
Conflicts which rose between Roman Catholics and Protestants are strategically important because it is they which force Catholics into a situation where they are unable to school their children within the tenets of their religion. Not only were Catholics prevented from schooling their children in the faith, no Catholic could teach anywhere in the province unless he renounced his religion and swore an oath of allegiance to the Church of England. In view of this plight, it is necessary to examine "schooling" and "education" in order to draw some conclusions about Catholics and the availability or unavailability of schooling for them since they traditionally have chosen schooling as their model for education.

Concepts of Schooling and Education

The confusion surrounding the distinctions to be drawn between the terms "schooling" and "education" must be cleared before an intelligent discussion of colonial education/schooling can be carried on. Any consideration of the concept of "education" calls for the realization
that "education" is a polymorphous concept. That is, no specific act or process is associated with that term. Cremin defines education as schooling in this manner:

I shall view education as the deliberate, systematic and sustained effort to transmit knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, and sensibilities, a process that is more limited than what the anthropologist would term enculturation, or the sociologist socialization, though obviously inclusive of some of the same elements.

Other historians of education, as Bailyn, see education as simply a process by which one generation seeks to transmit its culture to another, or more specifically, as the process by which young are inducted into adult social roles. The point to be understood here is that schooling is not a necessary condition for education, and, in fact, societies have come and gone without formal institutions for schooling. But, the more technical, the more complex the society, the more likely it is that the

---


4This writer is well aware of the process-product ambiguity in the term "education."
school will become the central agency for educating the youth of that society.  

But what is "schooling"? What makes schooling different from education? Schooling is the institutionalized relationships process of education; that is, schooling requires a specific teacher to teach, a matter to be learned, and learners to learn that matter under the auspices of that institution we call school. For the twentieth century the educative role of schools has expanded until we have come to identify public schooling with the education of the public. Thomas F. Green explicitly argues that the tendency is to identify the school system as the "educational system" in America.

---


The paramount problem explored in this dissertation is that Catholics in colonial Maryland were neither allowed to school or to educate their children without fear of repercussion by the government.

For some groups education without schools was and is an accepted model for education. But for Catholics schooling had been the accepted model since long before the Reformation. Chapter III will deal with Catholic education, Catholic schooling: what it meant to be a Catholic in colonial Maryland and to go through some kind of educational process, whether it be informal learning at home, or learning under the auspices of a school.

Colonial Schooling

No matter how polar their views on other matters, Reformation churches agreed with Rome in assigning to education/schooling a paramount position in the religious training of their youth. The Protestant Revolt of the sixteenth century tended to strengthen the emphasis of

---

religion on the curriculum. But the "liberty of conscience" too often meant freedom for the Reformers and perfection for others. The so-called public school of colonial times differed in many respects from the non-sectarian institution of today. The fact is that colonial schools were, indeed, parochial schools. Formal catechism, as in the case of the Boston Schools, might have been relegated to Saturday classes, but the opening and closing of the daily program with prayer, daily reading of the Scriptures, appointing of teachers by selectmen, with the approval of the ministers, supervision by these people—all tended to develop a religious, even church-like atmosphere. For New England, Rhode Island excepted, the Congregational clergy was the controlling group. For the colonies where Anglicanism prevailed, teachers were licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, or the royal governor of that particular colony. Heterodoxy was further repelled by legislation. For Virginia the subscribing prospective

---

teacher must give evidence of any one of the following: the Westminster Confession of Calvin, the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Synod of Dort on the tenets of Quakerism.\(^8\) As McCluskey makes clear, despite the differences of dogma and doctrine, all non-Catholics stood allied in the face of their common enemy, the Papist.\(^9\)

Even the texts were religious in character. Hornbooks, primers, readers, arithmetics, even geographies were made the tools of religious indoctrination.\(^10\) Each sect had its own catechism; sometimes printed with or as a primer. Thus, parents could teach their children to obey God and his commandments while at the same time teach them the laws of the state.

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 116.


The colonial child, regardless of which colony he lived in, probably learned to read from a hornbook. And that hornbook was by no means nonsectarian. Almost always the hornbook consisted of a flat piece of wood to which was fastened vellum. On the vellum would be printed the alphabet, a list of syllables, an invocation to the Trinity, and the Lord's Prayer. To protect the vellum or paper, a piece of horn was applied and fastened with a strap of brass. No strangers to colonists, these early textbooks had come from England with them.

The most common primer in the colonies was the New England Primer. For over six generations this book was the backbone of the schoolboy's curriculum. The demand for this text was so great that these books had to be published abroad and imported as well as printed in the colonies, and within 150 years over three million were sold. Much research had been conducted on the history and character of the New England Primer. For the purpose of this study, only one example of anti-Catholic doctrine will be cited. Paul L. Ford, in his The New England Primer: A History of Its Origin and Development, gives this account: on one page is an illustration of a man wearing a crown with various points on his body.
designated as A, B, C, etc., followed by this "Advice to Children":

Child, school that Man of Sin, the Pope, worthy of thy utmost hatred.
Thou shalt find in his Head (A) Heresy, in his shoulders (B), the Supporters of Disorder, in his Heart (C), Malice, Murder and Treachery. In his arms (D), Cruelty. In his Knees (E), False Worship and Idolatry. In his feet (F), Swiftness to shed Blood. In his stomach (G), insatiable Covetness. In his Lyons (H), the Worst of Lusts. 11

Clifton Johnson gives an example of the title page of a colonial textbook printed as in 1715 follows:

The Protestant Tutor, instructing youth and others in the completed method of Spelling, Reading, and Writing, True English: Also discovering to them the notorious Errors, Damnable Doctrines, and cruel Massacres of the bloody Papists, which England may expect from a Papist successor: Printed by and for Thomas Morris and sold at the looking glass on London Bridge. 12

Most of this book consisted of the alphabet, pages of spelling words and easy reading lessons; but the essence of this book was rabid anti-Catholic matter "illustrated with dreadful pictures of persecutions and of heaven,


12 Johnson, Old Time Schools, p. 49.
hell, death and the judgment.¹³ Such were colonial textbooks: the matter of religion was paramount; for after all, the purpose of learning to read was, in fact, to be able to read the sacred Scriptures for oneself.

The Protestant churches were clearly committed to the struggle against Papism and barbarism. It was their plan to win the battle by instituting universal public education in Massachusetts, and as early as the 1630s, seven of her twenty-two towns had taken some public action on behalf of schooling although all had not established viable institutions.¹⁴ By 1647 that colony's legislature had passed what came to be known as "The Old Deluder Satan Act," which provided that each town of fifty householders appoint one person in that town to teach all children who came to him to write and read. His wages were to be paid by the parents of the children, by the inhabitants in general. When the number of families in the town reached one hundred, or there were one hundred householders, a school was to be established and a master employed to instruct youth in order that

¹³Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁴Cremin, American Education, p. 182.
they be fitted for the university. If the town neglected
the order, it was to pay five pounds to the next school
until the requirement was met.

By the 1650s schooling as an institution had been
transplanted to American soil. New England led the way
in the establishment of schools, although there were
attempts at schooling in the middle and southern
colonies. Much research has been done in New England
schools. Patently, when one conceptualizes the "colonial
school," he almost always pictures the dame school or the
Latin Grammar School of New England--and with some
justification. Especially, the southern colonies were
slow to institute schooling as their model for education.
Historians have long argued the plantation myth, the
laziness cult, the chivalric society of the old South. It is not the purpose of this study to dwell on the con-
ceptual framework of the history of the South; but it is
important for the reader of this work to understand some
of the reasons that southern schools did not get started

\[15\] Ibid.

\[16\] C. Vann Woodward, "The Southern Ethic in a
Puritan World," *William and Mary Quarterly* 25 (July
as early—did not, for the most part, succeed after they were begun—and to be aware of the clearly biased laws which prohibited all colonists from sharing equally in the establishing, the building, and the governing of those schools in that province with which this dissertation is concerned, that of colonial Maryland.

**Education in Maryland Before 1689**

Before beginning to look at the history of education in colonial Maryland, it is necessary to have an understanding of the social, economic, and political situation. Maryland was not a typical royal or charter colony. Instead, it was a palatinate which meant that the lord proprietary occupied the same position in the government of Maryland that King did in the government of England. The lord proprietary had the authority to appoint the governor, the judges, any other officers who

17A royal colony was one which was under direct supervision of the English government. A charter colony was one in which the government was set up as a corporation with its own constitution. Finally, a proprietary colony, such as Maryland, was one in which governmental authority had been placed in the hands of a proprietor. Thus, Lord Baltimore was, in fact, a kind of King! Nevertheless, the English government had strong influence over all the colonies, and any other interpretation concerning colonial government is just wrongheaded.
were to function in the provincial government. He had the right to grant land and did so. He was still a resident of England and looked on Maryland as a rather large business investment, keeping most of his social and political attentions there. This type of absentee landlordism was, of course, to weigh heavily on the accessibility of the proprietor to his colleagues or perhaps, subjects of a sort, and cause much uneasiness on the part of Roman Catholics living in the palatinate.

It is true that other wealthy landowners spent time and money in England for both profit and pleasure. It is also true that the wealthy inhabitants looked to England for the education of their children because it was the desire of most families that their children grow up to be civilized and socialized Englishmen. Where else but England could that be learned? The emphasis on learning in the South was different from the emphasis placed on learning in New England; whereas the New Englanders insisted upon their children's learning to read so that they could read the Bible, the local laws, and to, in general, increase their book knowledge, the attitude of many Southerners seemed to be that social connections
and social manners were equally important; therefore, the children went to England.  

But that way of life did not hold for all Southerners, nor all Marylanders. As early as 1634, with the arrival of the Jesuits, attempts were made to establish schools in Maryland. The work of the Jesuits and their attempts to carry on schooling will be dealt with in Chapter III. Nevertheless, some Marylanders were interested in establishing schools, and in 1671 the Maryland Assembly did consider legislation for the "founding and erecting of a school or college within the province for the education of youth in learning and virtue." At this time, however, the Upper House was composed of a majority of Roman Catholics and the Lower House was primarily Anglican. When the Lower House returned the bill to the Upper House, it included the following additions or amendments:

First, that the place where the said college shall be erected shall be appointed

---


19 Archives of the State of Maryland, Proceedings of the Assembly, 1666-1676, pp. 262-64.
by the assembly most convenient for the county.

Second. That the tutors or schoolmasters be qualified according to the Reformed Church of England, or that there be two schoolmasters, the one for the Catholic the other for the Protestant children, and that the Protestants may have liberty to choose their schoolmasters.

Third. That a time be appointed when the work shall begin and be set on foot.

Fourth. That the lord proprietor be pleased to set out his declaration of what privileges and immunities shall be enjoyed by the scholars that shall be taught at such school or college.20

This arrangement failed to gain the support of the Upper House and, consequently, was never enacted. 21

For twenty-five more years Maryland was to be without school laws. The theory was, as Bailyn has said, that the parents should and could be trusted to educate their children.

20 Ibid.

21 The problem in getting any kind of legislation through the Maryland Legislative Assembly was that the two houses were bitterly opposed to each other on any basis. The situation was so competitive--supporters of Lord Baltimore against his opponents--that very little was accomplished during the period from 1670-1690. Charles M. Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History *(New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), vol. 2, pp. 326-79. See also Charles A. Barker, The Background of the Revolution in Maryland (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940) for further discussion of politics in Maryland during the eighteenth century; and Timothy W. Bosworth, "Anti-Catholicism as a Political Tool in Mid-eighteenth Century Maryland," Catholic Historical Review 61:4 (October 1975):539-63.
children in the manner in which they chose. There was in 1663 a law passed concerning orphans and their care which was enlarged in 1671 to say that not only should the children be educated according to their estates, or if their estates were meager, bound out to a master to be trained in some handicraft, but that the children should be committed to "persons of the same religion as their deceased parents." Ten years later the law was updated. Twelve men were appointed to investigate orphans and to determine whether or not they were being educated in some handicraft or trade or merely performing day labor of the unskilled peasant. If a master were found guilty of misusing the child, he was forced to pay the child the value of his work had he been rightly employed and five hundred pounds of tobacco in addition. Moreover, the orphan was assured that he would be placed in the hands of a master who belonged to the same religion as that of his deceased parents. Although no actual schooling law


23 Archives of the State of Maryland.

24 Ibid.
was passed by the provincial assembly until 1696, laws affecting the education of some children were enacted.

Secular Education, 1689-1775

To speak of secular education at any time during the colonial period, or anywhere during the colonial period, is a rather tenuous topic. But one must, in this case, interpret secular to mean simply "state supported" or "community sponsored." Accepting that limitation, one can proceed to point out certain characteristics of that type of schooling and/or education. Of paramount importance to many colonial Marylanders was the Glorious Revolution of 1688. This supposedly bloodless transfer of the crown of England from James II, a Catholic, to his daughter Mary and her husband William of Orange dealt a heavy blow to Catholics. While the majority of Englishmen looked with pride on the political situation as the result of rational and intelligent decision making, the intolerance for Catholicism is evident even in the writings of John Locke, often viewed as the philosopher who gave to the colonists much of their intellectual base for their
decision-making policies. Although neither of these essays was published before the Glorious Revolution, the essay which deals with Locke's thoughts concerning the nature of government was written before that time. The other essay is a response to Patriarcha, a pamphlet by Sir Robert Filmer published 1680, which argued that monarchy was divinely ordained and that Adam represents God's grant of dominion, a prototype monarchy to be followed subsequently. The point is that Locke in his essay, where he sets down that kind of government he sees as most desirable, was not responding to the exit of James II from the throne of England; he was simply laying down those principles which he viewed as essential for good government. The latter seventeenth century was a time in England, Ireland, and the American colonies when religion played a significant role in determining one's life chances.


26 Ibid., p. 58.

27 For a discussion of the term "life chances," see Thomas F. Green, "The Ironies of Educational Growth,"
in Chapter III as Maryland provides a model case of this situation.

Legislation Bearing on Education

In 1694 the political climate of Maryland was such that the capital was moved from Saint Marys to a place more convenient to the center of population, Anne Arundel Town, now Annapolis. Because of the Glorious Revolution, the Lords Baltimore were denied the right to rule although the right to own property was not denied. Their political supremacy ended with the arrival of a new governor, Sir Lionel Copley, who, in 1692, led the Maryland Assembly to pass an Act concerning the services given to God Almighty and the establishment of the Protestant Church. It was not until 1702, however, that authorities in London approved the Act which legally established the Church of England in the colony and granted to it all rights, liberties, and franchises as then were or hereafter to be

Boyd H. Bode Memorial Lecture, The Ohio State University, July 1971. Green discusses schooling in terms of life chances. The claim in this study is that religion was also a significant factor in determining one's life chances.
established by law.\textsuperscript{28} Despite that fact, the Assembly passed, in 1692, a poll tax of forty pounds of tobacco in order to perpetuate the Church.\textsuperscript{29} The legislature was to pass laws concerning religion during almost every year from 1692-1720.\textsuperscript{30}

In 1694 Francis Nicholson, who had been serving as governor of Virginia and had brought about the establishment of the College of William and Mary, was appointed governor of Maryland. One of his first administrative acts was to dispatch a message to the capitol. He proposed "that a way be found out for the building a free-school for the province and a Maintenance for a Schoole Master and Usher and a Writing Master than can cast Accounts."\textsuperscript{31} He also volunteered that he would give fifty pounds sterling toward building the school and twenty-five


\textsuperscript{29}Maryland Law Books, Lib. WH and L, Fol. 1 and Lib. LL, Fol. 2.

\textsuperscript{30}Only in 1693, 1703, 1711, and 1716 were there no specific laws concerning religion passed by the legislature. See Laws of Maryland, Hall of Records, Annapolis, Maryland.

\textsuperscript{31}Archives of Maryland, 19:36.
pounds sterling a year towards the maintenance of the master as long as he was governor. When the subscriptions reached 45,400 pounds of tobacco, the Assembly discussed with the governor plans for building two free schools. One was to be on the western shore at the mouth of the Severn River and the other on the eastern shore at Oxford. On October 18, 1694, the Maryland Assembly adopted "An Act for the Encouragement of Learning and the Advancement of the Natives of this Province." The governor instantly dispatched a letter to the Bishop of London, who was the person responsible for the Marylanders. He wrote:

Under so glorious a reign wherein by God's providence His true religion has been so miraculously preserved, should we not endeavor to promote it, we should hardly deserve the name good Protestants or good subjects, especially considering how noble an example is set before us by their majesties royal foundation now vigorously carried on in Virginia. We have therefore in assembly attempted to make learning a handmaid to devotion and founded free schools in Maryland to attend their college in that colony. We

---

32 Ibid., 19:49.

are confident you will favor our like pious designs in this province, wherein in instructing our youth in the orthodox religion, preserving them from the infection of Heterodox Tenets and fitting them for the service of the Church and State, in this uncultivated post of the world, are our chiefest aim and end.34

But progress toward establishing free schools came very slowly.35 During the remainder of 1694 and throughout 1695 many messages and communications concerning education were carried on within the Assembly, to the Bishop, to the King, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was not until July 1696 that the law which was to be responsible for the actual establishment of a free school in Maryland was passed.36 That act, entitled "A Petitionary Act for Free-Schools," reads as follows:

34 William S. Perry, Papers Relating to the History of the Church in Maryland (n.p.: By the Author, 1878), pp. 1-2.

35 The term "free-school," as it was used in colonial times, probably meant schools which instructed pupils in liberal studies. That is, the word was not a compound noun which as a necessary condition meant gratuitous teaching and/or learning experiences. Rather, the term "free" indicated that the school was not really bound to a particular sectarian standard of instruction, and not public in the twentieth century sense.

And may it be enacted by the King's most excellent majesty, by and with the advice, prayer and consent of this present General Assembly, and the authority of the same, that for the Propagation of the gospel and the education of the youth of this province in good letters and manners, that a certain place or places, for a free school or schools, or place of study of Latin and Greek, writing and the like, consisting of one master, one usher, and one writing master, or scribe, to a school, and one hundred scholars, more or less, according to the ability of the said free school, may be made, erected, founded, propagated and established under your royal patronage. And that the most reverend fathers in God Thomas, by Divine Providence Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, primate and metropolitan of all England may be chancellor of the said schools; and that to perpetuate the memory of your majesty it may be called King William's School.  

The act goes ahead to ask for donations for the financing of the school out of which 120 pounds sterling per annum is for the support and maintenance of the "said first-mentioned free school, master, usher, scribe, and the necessary repairs."

Further, Francis Nicholson, the governor and the donors (Trustees) and the Rectors and the Visitors of school will have full power to sue, to define, and

37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
Section 4 makes explicit that school laws can be in no way contrary to the canons and constitutions of the Church of England by law established.39

Plans for the building of other schools would be pursued on the basis that 120 pounds sterling would be sufficient for each succeeding institution.

For the building of other schools by the colony was to be delayed, and King William's school itself did not begin until 1701. Even then, it was not to become a haven for those in intellectual pursuit. It is not clear why the first appointed schoolmaster of King William did not actually function in that position, but it is known that after his appointment, for some reason, he was placed out as an undermaster at the College of William and Mary. Whether or not he came back to Annapolis as an experienced and willing teacher is not recorded.40

Financing the Schools

In addition to the donations provided for in the 1696 petition, a tax was levied on the exportation of

39See Chapter III for further discussion of Antipopery laws and their effect on education.

40Maryland Law Books, LL, no. 4, Fol. 376.
skins which provided nine pence to three farthings for the skin of bears, beavers, otters, wildcats, foxes, minks, wolves, racoons, elk, deer, and four pence per dozen on muskrats skins. A duty of twelve pence per hundredweight on dried beef and bacon, and twelve pence per barrel on pork and dried beef, was charged when exported by persons who were not inhabitants of Maryland. The way in which the last tax proved beneficial and practical is that ships coming into Maryland ports to collect tobacco found it necessary to buy food and provisions from the provincials for their return trip home.

Other means of financial support came from taxes placed on the importation into the colony of Negroes and Irish servants—the tax placed on Irish Catholic servants higher than that on the others. In fact, from 1703 and the Act to Prevent Popery, the Maryland legislature collected school monies on these new immigrants.41

In 1717 an act for the better security of Mary Smithson, widow and executrix of Thomas Smithson, provided for the payment of debt due from Smithson's estate to free

41 Ibid., LL no. Fol. 386.
schools of Maryland. In 1719 magistrates could set up juries and upon a guilty verdict for the accused, the fine could be divided and one-half given for the support of free schools.

By 1728 when Benedict Leonard Calvert was governor, the Maryland Assembly was very much concerned with schools. Or one would ascertain that the Maryland Assembly was concerned with the establishment and carrying on of schooling. Almost every session devoted part of its time to schooling legislation. The fact is that the reality bore little resemblance to the pages of the legislative record. Legislation providing funds for the education of poor children was enacted as follows:

that the Master of every public school within this province shall and is required to teach as many poor children gratis as the visitors, or the major part of them of the respective schools shall order or be immediately discharged and removed from this trust in the said school, and a new master put in.

---

42 Ibid., chap. 8.
43 Ibid., sec. IV.
44 Act for the Administration of Justice in Testamentary Affairs of an Additional and Supplementary Act to the School, Maryland Law Books.
Section 10 goes on to clarify the law concerning the twenty shilling fine on Negroes and Irish Papists. It clearly states that any ship or vessel bringing into the province one or the other must pay the tax, whether an inhabitant or not.

The next year's legislation provided that if a person died and there were no direct survivors, a portion of the estate went to support free schools. And, in 1732, schools received money from fines levied for keeping hogs, geese, horses, or cows in town unless the animals were incarcerated in some kind of enclosure. The fine per offense was one hundred pounds of tobacco.

From this time until after the Revolution, school legislation plays a very minor part in the workings of the colonial assembly. Few important financial acts were passed. The financial concerns were devoted to dividing already appropriated funds among any new schools which were begun. The Act of 1696 which provided for the establishment of free schools in Maryland continued to be

---

45 Maryland Law Books, chap. 9, sec. 12.

46 See ibid., Lib. BLC, Fol. 56.
the matrix from which a few scattered schools were begun and run until the period of discontent and revolution.

Other Important Legislation Related to Schools

Although King William's School did get started in 1701, it did not flourish and did not set a precedent for the rapid expansion of a Maryland School System. In 1723 an "Act for the Encouragement of Learning and Erecting Schools in the Several Counties" was passed:

> the said rules, laws, and orders be no wise contrary to the royal prerogative, nor to the laws and statutes of England, and acts of assembly by this province, or to the canons and constitutions of the Church of England by law established.\(^47\)

The legislation had important bearing on the development or nondevelopment of the Maryland School System because it limited any persons who were not of the Anglican persuasion in their efforts to have an important voice in the ongoing educational policies of Maryland.

Section VII of this same act specifies the following: The visitors are authorized to buy one hundred acres of land. They are to buy land which will grow

\(^{47}\)Ibid., LL no. 4, Fol. 602, sec. 5.
grain, have pasturage for the encouragement, use, and benefit of the master of such school. The only other money spent should be for firewood, repairing of housing, and fencing already built—if not already built, money should be available for the building. The visitors were charged to be responsible for encouraging good schoolmasters that they shall be members of the Church of England, and of pious and exemplary lives and conversations, and capable of teaching well the grammar, the good writing; the mathematics, if such can be conveniently got, and that they allow every such master for his encouragement for the present (besides the benefit and use of his plantation) the sum of twenty pounds per annum.\textsuperscript{48}

An act further specified that a fine of five hundred pounds of tobacco be limited on any person appointed who refused to serve as a school visitor or who procrastinated and did not discharge his duties to the best of his skill and cunning.\textsuperscript{49} By 1729 a law was passed giving the active visitors the right to approach others to serve in the place of those "obstinately refused" to serve.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., sec. VII.

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., sec. XII.

\textsuperscript{50}Act for Administration of Justice, \textit{Maryland Law Books}, sec. 12.
Other legislation concerning the founding of schools was rather routine. As new towns were settled, attempts to build schools followed. Thus, the legislation did approve requests and appoint visitors. For a list of documented statistical data on where the schools were, who the schoolmasters were, and a list of subjects offered, see the Potts dissertation referred to in Chapter I. 51

Schooling for Poor Children and Negroes

Apparently, interest in free-schoois was not high, for Calvert County School was vacant and teachers and communities were not responding to the need for that kind of schooling.

One school, however, a charity working school for orphans, other poor children, and Negroes is significant. In 1750 the Reverend Thomas Bacon, rector of Saint Peters Parish in Talbot County, decided that something had to be done about these children. The intent, of such a school, he said, "is to rescue a number of poor children from

ignorance, illness, vice, immorality, and infidelity, and enable them to be more useful to themselves and the community they belong to." His plan was to solicit funds from people in the county and to import from England a master "duly qualified." By "duly qualified" Reverend Mr. Bacon meant that a master should be approved by one of the religious societies, he should teach as many poor children as recommended by the trustees, and, more interestingly, to instruct a certain number of Negroes. There were, however, differences as to how Negroes were to be financially maintained and as to what curriculum they were to be taught. The poor children were to be financed by annual subscriptions, casual benefactors, and offerings from Sacrament services, as well as at annual charity sermons. Negro children were to be maintained at the expense of their respective owners. Poor children were to be taught to read, write, account, and to be instructed in the knowledge and practice of the Christian religion as practiced and taught in the Church of England, along with anything else deemed necessary. Negro children

52Steiner, History of Education, p. 34, referring to Alabama Law Books, LL no. 4, Fol. 602, chap. 19, sec. 5. Again, Steiner never once in his history gives the documentation for his data.
were to learn to read and write, and to be instructed in the knowledge and fear of the Lord. 53

Although a very definite distinction was made between poor children and Negroes, it is the case that at least an attempt was made on the part of some colonial Marylanders to make the Negro literate. At least the opportunity for education for selected members of that race was extant for a period. It would be to Maryland's credit if the school had implanted itself more securely. Mr. Bacon must have been the cohesive agent because after his death in 1768, the school passed into oblivion. It had never been incorporated and the lands on which it was built were returned to the trustees of the poor of Talbot County. For the researcher the existence of this school is especially significant in three ways. First, it is the only record of a school specifically for poor children in colonial Maryland; second, it provides the lone empirical datum of schooling designated for Negroes; and third, because of the catechizing and indoctrinating of the children into the tenets of the Church of England, it provided yet another example of inequality of

53Ibid., p. 35.
educational opportunity for poor Roman Catholics. Nevertheless, the Reverend Mr. Bacon should be recognized for giving to Maryland her first school for poor children and Negroes.

Teachers in Colonial Maryland

Despite the fact that public supported schools were slow to start and difficult to keep going, once started, colonial Maryland did have schools, and perhaps almost as significant, did, in addition, have teachers who taught in their own homes. The attitude of the provincial Marylanders toward education and teaching must be gleaned through various avenues including studying schooling legislation. The local newspaper, the Gazette, had many advertisements for teachers, advertisements by teachers, notices of rewards offered for the capture of runaway teachers, even articles on teaching girls. Research has also been done on the "typical colonial schoolmasters" and Maryland had her share of these Scotch-Irish men who taught to enlighten the populace. The next few paragraphs will contain extracts from the Gazette, from articles about Maryland teachers,
and some conclusions drawn about the Maryland teachers before 1775.

Persons offering their services as teachers published such advertisements as these:

At Kent County School in Chestertown, Maryland, young men are boarded and taught the Greek and Latin tongue, writing, arithmetic, merchants accounts, surveying, navigation, and the use of globes by the largest and most accurate Pair in America. Also other parts of the Mathematics.

by Charles Peale

Young gentlemen may be instructed in fencing and dancing by very good masters.54

Another brief advertisement is interesting in that the instructions offered are done so during the evening, which leads one to believe that, perhaps, this would-be pedagogue planned to deal with adults:

At the subscriber's house in Annapolis, every evening, are taught Reading, Writing and Arithmetic.

by John Smith55

Two of the more interesting excerpts are those of Peter Robinson and John Wilmot:

Reading, writing in all hands; arithmetic in whole numbers and fractions, vulgar and decimal, also artifical arithmetic, both

54Maryland Gazette, 3 May 1745

55Ibid., 29 November 1745.
logarithmetrical and logistics with instrumental, either by inspection, rhabdologia, or proportional scales; geometry, both superficial and solid, with measurements of all kinds, either in logometria, plasometria, or sterometry; or surveying, fortification, gunnery, gauging and trigonometry, both plain and spherical; with navigation either in plain, mercator, or circular sailing, also dialling; all sorts and all ways; either arithmetically, geometrically. Projective, reflective, concave or convex, cosmography, celestial or astronomical, and terrestrial or geographical; astronomy, practical and theoretical grammar; merchant's accounts, or the Art of bookkeeping after the Italian manner; algebra: Euclid's element and likewise the description and use of sea charts, maps, quadrants, forestaffs, nocturnal, protractor, scales, coggershalls rule, sector, gauging rod, universal ring-dial, globes and other mathematical instruments. Taught at Upper Marlborough town in Prince Georges County by Peter Robinson Near which place youth may be boarded.56

John Wilmot's announcement is very similar to Peter Robinson's although not quite so long or complete:

Reading, writing in the most useful hands, grammar, arithmetic, vulgar, instrumental, decimal, algebraical, merchant accounts, (Italian bookkeeping) geometry, trigonometry—plain or spheric, with their applications in surveying. Navigation, astronomy, dialling, likewise the use of globes and sundry other parts of the mathematics, are conclusively and expeditiously taught at the Anne Arundel

56Ibid., 26 March 1746.
Occasionally, an announcement seeking a schoolmaster would appear:

Any person qualified for a schoolmaster according to the Directions of an Act of Assembly for the Province . . . upon application to the visitors of the Public School of St. Mary's County may find suitable encouragement. Signed per order

John Llewelin, Registrar

Whether or not a master was found is not known, but the next March, Llewelin was again soliciting applications for a schoolmaster for St. Mary's County.

Another rather interesting announcement occurred in the Gazette August 23, 1745:

Monday, August 5 Talbot County School master--Irish with a brogue, ran away and took with him a Negro man named Nero with two geldings--one gray and the other black--property of the visitors. The master is pockmarked. Reward: 5 pounds.

William Goldsborough, Register

Following this announcement, two months later appeared:

57 Ibid., 10 June 1746.

58 Ibid., 5 July 1745.

59 Ibid., 23 August 1745.
Talbot County School is now vacant, and any person qualified who inclines to be Master, thereof, may upon application meet with all due encouragement from the visitors at the same school.

Signed by order,
William Goldsborough

Background and Social Status of Maryland Teachers

Historical myth depicts the colonial schoolmaster as dim-witted, bean-pole in stature, blubbering, blathering, usually given to eccentricity of behavior. In Maryland before the Revolution, schoolmasters often came as indentured servants from Scotland or Ireland. The legislature, it will be recalled, placed a head-tax of twenty shillings on Irish servants imported into the colony to discourage papistry. In 1731, however, a distinction was made which revoked the tax on Irish Protestant servants. The act read as follows:

any duty or imposition or duty is laid on any Irish servants being Protestants upon or by reason of their importation into the Province shall be and by Virtue of this Act is abrogated and repealed and that no Duty or imposition hereafter shall or ought to be paid for or upon the importation of any Protestant or

60Ibid., 10 October 1745.
Protestants from the Kingdom of Ireland or elsewhere.  

The legislature had previously passed an act to prevent the importation of criminals among whom, no doubt, were many potential tutors trained in Europe or the famous Hedge Schools of Ireland.  

Despite the anti-Catholic legislation, tutors or schoolmasters came from various backgrounds. Some were clerics in training; others, indentured servants; and between 1689 and the severe anti-popery laws, many Irish convicts did come as teachers into the southern colonies. 

Perhaps the best academically qualified were the clerics and the European trained indentured servants. The Maryland Gazette offers various announcements of runaway indentured schoolmasters, one of which claimed that a schoolmaster, of a pale complexion, with short hair who had a very bad case of itch, and sore legs, had escaped and the reward for his return was from ten to twenty pounds sterling.  

62 See Laws of Maryland for 1731. The law passed in 1703 was changed. See also Richard J. Purcell, "Education and Irish Teachers in Maryland," Catholic Educational Review, March 1934, p. 146.  

63 The Maryland Gazette, quoted in Steiner, History of Education, p. 34.
Not all schoolmasters need be classified as either sophisticated or blundersome. There is some evidence which indicates that certain groups fitting neither of these categories were very effective in their mission to educate colonial Maryland.

A group of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians came to the Maryland-Pennsylvania border in the 1740s and 1750s. The four of them decided to establish schools in their newly adopted land. Only one, however, chose to live and teach in Maryland because Pennsylvania was more tolerant of "difference." Dr. Samuel Finley began his school near the village of Rising Sun in 1744. The Scots had come to the new world for three special reasons, according to C. Ross McCenrick, and those were because of their distaste for British royalty, their flair for independence, and their zeal for education. Mr. Finley "kept his school" in a small log cabin until 1761 when he was made President of the College of New Jersey, later to become Princeton. On the other hand, to illustrate the status of education in Maryland in mid-eighteenth century, a

---

Dr. Thomas Chandler, after visiting in 1753, reported to the Bishop of London:

The general character of the Clergy is wretchedly bad. It would really, my Lord, make the ears of a sober heathern [sic] tingle to hear the stories that were told me by many serious persons of several clergymen in the neighborhood of the parish where I visited.\textsuperscript{65}

Examining the literature available, it seems clear that scattered schools existed, scattered good teachers taught, and scattered incompetents abounded.

\textbf{Supervision of Schoolmasters}

It is not the intent here to claim that supervision of colonial teachers would have changed either their image or their behavior. It is, however, essential to point out that the colonial records indicate that very little supervision of instruction took place, and with good reason. It was difficult enough to find qualified schoolmasters, their supervisors notwithstanding. There is an exception, however. The emphasis, if there existed an emphasis on monitoring at all, was on the prevention of Roman Catholics from entering Maryland schools as

\textsuperscript{65}Ibid.
teachers. On the other hand, Roman Catholics had very little chance to become employed as schoolmasters because Maryland law clearly stated that the schoolmaster be a member of the Church of England and swear an oath to that effect. There are some cases of Roman Catholics attempting to teach, but these will be dealt with in Chapter III.

Education for Females

Very little information concerning schooling for or the education of females in colonial Maryland can be found. And when one does fall upon references to female schooling, they are concerned with household arts. For example, an advertisement from the Gazette in 1754 reads as follows:

Mary Salisbury proposes keeping a school in Annapolis, at the house where Mr. Sparrow lived, near the church, to teach young ladies French and all sorts of fine needlework, tapestry, embroidery with gold and silver, and very other curious work which can be performed with a needle, and all education fit for young ladies except dancing.66

Of course there is no elaboration on what "fit for young ladies" means.

66 Quoted from the Maryland Gazette in Steiner, History of Education, p. 37.
There is, however, one exception. In a very early copy of the Maryland Gazette, this researcher found a surprising article. Just as modern day newspapers have Art Buchwald or David Lawrence, the Gazette had its Plain Dealer. The following is taken verbatim from this early eighteenth century newspaper:

I intimated by design of improving the fair sex, by giving some finishing touches to them who are already the more beautiful pieces in human nature; I proposed to divert their minds from useless trifles, and instead therefore to furnish their breasts with valuable knowledge; to point out the blemishes as well as those virtues which are the embellishments of the sex, so as in the end [word not clear] them upon the level in their [word not clear] of reason.

How unmerciful is that custom which for many ages had deprived the most amiable creatures on with the Divine Pleasures of learning and confined them chiefly to the business of the needle! How rarely are they taught or—to think out of the common way and beyond the—of the nursery. They who under proper direction could have acquired the most refined knowledge, are so kept by a silly education, they know little more than their work, a small share of housewifey, and a great deal of gossiping. . . . I certainly would earnestly advise them to read with attention from books they may receive improvements as well as make them lovely, when the—of their faces be buried in wrinkles.

Good writers have in their powers to furnish the reader with charms most lasting than those they derive from beauty.67

67 Maryland Gazette, 10 December 1728.
Plain Dealer goes ahead to recommend that girls read histories and fairy tales. So, at least in early eighteenth century Maryland, one radical educational critic was suggesting the academic education for females. Nevertheless, neither special education for girls nor boys at the colony's expense fared well. The Catholic historian Burns asserts that the quality of work done in the few existing county schools was so poor that by the time of the Revolution they had practically outlived their usefulness. \(^{68}\)

**Higher Education**

No successful attempts at higher education occurred in colonial Maryland unless one counts the short-lived preparatory curriculum of Bohemia Manor discussed in Chapter III. Legends and myths which indicate otherwise are simply legend or myths built on the fantasy of somebody's pipedream. Empirical data indicate that Maryland had no colonial institution of higher education, and any attempt to justify a contrary claim must be rendered hopeless.  

\(^{68}\) See earlier unpublished paper by the researcher, "Secular Education in Colonial Maryland," p. 3.
Summary

Chapter II has been concerned with the schooling legislation and educational endeavors of secular colonial Maryland. It has been shown that both "secular" and "schooling" have very specific or special meanings, and that in order to deal with the matter of education in colonial Maryland, these terms must be understood in their context. A brief discussion of relative legislation, schools established, texts used, schoolmasters, and the cultural conditions of the time were included. These data are necessary background information so that the reader might better understand the problems dealt with in Chapter III on attempts at Catholic education.
CHAPTER III

CATHOLIC EDUCATION IN COLONIAL MARYLAND

Introduction

Thus far attention has been focused on attempts of the provincial government of Maryland to establish and maintain a system of free schools. We have seen that Maryland was not a place where education or schooling received so much active support as was the case in the New England colonies; nevertheless, the legislation concerning schools and education brought before the Maryland Assembly was considerable. Reasons commonly given for this situation were the widely scattered population which made it impractical for many settlers, that some parents considered education their responsibility and were not interested in a structured type of schooling, and that the Catholic population, for the most part, did not participate in schooling because Maryland Laws and the
English Penal Laws required that teachers be Anglican and that students be instructed in the Anglican faith.  

While it is true that some schools succeeded, they were certainly not in abundance, and schooling remained low on the priority list of most colonial Marylanders. This lamentable situation caused a Maryland newspaper editor to speak out on the lack of emphasis on education. He was concerned that Maryland's population were not serious enough about educating their children, and attending the system of schooling already operative in the New England colonies, he states,

> We wish notions as these were prevalent in Maryland. We have thousands of adult white natives of the state, that do not know a letter of the alphabet.  

Undoubtedly, the tension between the religious sects contributed to the slow development of the schools. And it is important to remember that those schools which were established by the provincial government all had one trait in common; that is, they were all pro-Anglican


and anti-Catholic. Therefore, Catholics, in order to school or to educate their children, were forced to work outside the accepted structure for much of the colonial period. This chapter will be concerned with Catholic attempts at schooling from the time of the arrival of the first Jesuits to the shores of Maryland in 1634 throughout the entire colonial period.

Charting the Course to Catholicism

The history of Catholic education in America, like the history of the Church itself, is composed of stories of survival and adaptation. The beginnings of the colony were enshrouded by a sectarian conflict. Moreover, the fact that Maryland was to become a place where Roman Catholics could live and practice their religion has an interesting history which will very briefly be reiterated. George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, occupied a curious position in England. He had graduated from Trinity College, Oxford, made the grand tour of Europe, and become secretary to Robert Cecil, a high secretary

---

under Elizabeth I and Lord High Treasurer under James I. Calvert, apparently, was pleasing to Cecil and the King because he became James I's trusted counselor and, ultimately, his Secretary of State, as well as a member of Parliament. 4

Calvert soon became interested in colonization and, in 1615, obtained a grant for part of Newfoundland, which he named Avalon. What he probably expected was to make a fortune from fishing off the Newfoundland Banks and to establish a colony there for Roman Catholics. The evidence is that he invested a huge sum of money in the venture before he realized the unsuitableness of that place for his family. Two special problems made Avalon unsuitable. The first and, perhaps, more important is that upon his receiving the grant, he announced in London that he had become a Roman Catholic. Whether or not this conversion was concurrent or had taken place in his past is not clear. Most evidence seems to indicate that Calvert had been a practicing Catholic for some years. Shea says that he was received into the Church in 1624

when he resigned his position as Secretary of State and relinquished his seat in Parliament. Whatever the case, George Calvert was named Baron of Baltimore in the Kingdom of Ireland and given the Charter for the land in Newfoundland. Again, historians give different emphasis to his reason for leaving Newfoundland. That he announced his Catholicism before going to Newfoundland is true; that he did not voice about the country his religion heretofore is true. In this period England was rife with religious persecutions—not only was there controversy between Protestants and Catholics, but among the Protestant sects themselves; thus, many English subjects merely kept silent about religion. Nevertheless, religious problems growing from a Protestant minister's suit against him was one reason he left Avalon.

The other reasons are that the weather was extremely severe, and his wife, especially, was unsatisfied with the barren, frigid climate. Calvert, therefore, decided to visit Virginia; whether to gain supplies or whether to explore is not clear. Nevertheless, in 1629,

he did sail to Virginia whereupon he was immediately besieged to sign oath of allegiance acknowledging the supremacy of the Church of England. This he could not do, so, leaving his family in Virginia, he sailed to England to ask for a charter for a new province. Despite opposition from Protestants, the King signed a charter which gave to Baltimore territory south of Virginia. Because of continued remonstrances, this charter was revoked. Charles I, however, ordered that a patent be given to him which granted the territory "north of the Potomac to the fortieth degree, with the portion of the eastern shore of the Chesapeake, lying opposite, and extending to the ocean." Charles I suggested that name Mariana, but Calvert chose Terrae Mariae, Charles' second choice.

The charter which granted religious freedom and encouraged representative government should be recognized as an important milestone in the history of religious and political liberty. Bancroft says of Calvert:

6Ibid., p. 34.
7Ibid.
8Fisher, Men, Women and Manners, p. 154.
Calvert deserves to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent lawgivers of all ages. He was the first in the history of the Christian world to seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice and not by the exercise of power; to plan the establishment of popular institutions with the enjoyment of liberty of conscience; to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian Sects. The asylum of Catholics was the spot where, in a remote corner of the world, on the banks of rivers, which as yet, had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary, adopted religious freedom as the basis of the state.\(^9\)

But George Calvert, Lord Baltimore, was never to see his province. Before the Charter was officially signed, his wife and some of his children were lost at sea on their way from Virginia to London, and Baltimore himself died. However, in February 1632, the Charter was granted to Baltimore's oldest son, Cecil Calvert. In that Charter, different from all other colonial charters, the proprietor was, indeed, a feudal lord. Baltimore was the Proprietor of a colony where his people could worship as they wished and make their own laws without the assent of England.

Cecil Calvert gathered together a group of emigrants, Catholic and Protestant, and set sail in two ships, the *Ark* and the *Dove*, which landed in Maryland in 1634. Although most historians see Lord Baltimore as specifically seeking a refuge for Catholics, it seems clear that he was actually a sociological experimenter who wanted religious freedom for all. Certainly, he felt no compunction to acquiesce to the dictatorial powers of Rome or the Toleration Act which he issued as early as 1694 would have read differently. As it is, the words are as follows:

\[
\text{noe person or persons whatsoever within this Province . . . professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth bee any waies troubled, molestd or discountenanced for in respect to his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof within this Province nor in any way be compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent.}^{10}
\]

The declaration of these principles drew Puritans, Presbyterians, Anglicans, Quakers, and Roman Catholics to the province. Ironically enough, when these Protestants found themselves in the majority, they wrested

---

control of the government away from the Proprietary and persecuted the Roman Catholics periodically until the Revolutionary War came, resulting in a new country with new laws. Once more it was a Marylander who led the fight for religious liberty in this new United States.  

Catholic Education Before 1689

Aboard the Ark and the Dove were Father Andrew White and four other members of the Society of Jesus. Father White had been a renowned scholar in Europe, having entered St. Omers in 1594, studying there, at Douay, and at the seminary at Vallaloid. He had subsequently held the position of Prefect of Studies; Professor of Sacred Scripture, Dogmatic Theology, and Hebrew in the English colleges of Vallaloid and Seville. The Jesuits had a twofold purpose in coming to Maryland: the conversion of the Indians to Christianity and the founding of schools which would follow the traditions of the Ratio Studiorum, the Jesuit educational system so prevalent in

11 See Chapter V of this study, "Charles Carroll: The Colonial Education of a Revolutionary Gentleman."

Europe. No account of the trials and tribulations of the Jesuits among the Indians will be treated in this study, but more than the Indians and their problems, the Protestants in Maryland shattered Jesuit hopes of having an open and viable system of education. But the Jesuits never really abandoned the project of establishing a school and made several attempts to provide the sons of Catholic gentry with Jesuit schoolmasters. Nevertheless, these few schools were very transient and very few records concerning their organization existence are extant. In spite of this dearth of data, we do know that schools of a sort were established and directed by Maryland Jesuits during the colonial period. The first one dealt with is Newtown Manor, begun around the Glorious Revolution; and the second is Bohemia Manor, established nearly a hundred years later.

**Newtown Manor**

The coming to Maryland of Father White and his helpers makes the foundation of the first Jesuit mission

---

within the area of what was to become the United States. As early as 1640 the General of the Society wrote to John Brooke, Superior of the Maryland mission: "the hope of establishing a college which you hold forth, I embrace with pleasure; and I shall not delay my sanction to the plan when it shall have reached maturity."\(^{14}\) As the Jesuit institutions of learning were very much respected and influential in Europe, it is logical to assume that Jesuits coming to the new world would be interested in following the model set by their European predecessors. Whatever their efforts in the direction of establishing a college in the colony, they were unsuccessful, and those who have claimed that Newtown Manor, presently to be discussed, is the real beginning of Georgetown College are wrong.

It does seem certain that around 1640 some kind of school was begun in Maryland under the auspices of the Jesuits. Because of the unfavorable political situation in England, religious toleration in the colony had

lessened and in order to educate children at all, Catholics were forced to do so furtively and in stealth. Data available for this study indicate that the school begun by Ralph Crouch at Newtown was the first educational establishment of the Jesuits in Maryland. Crouch appears to have been an educated layman, but a onetime Jesuit novice, "the first schoolmaster to make his way across the Potomac."\(^\text{15}\) Crouch had been admitted to the English novitiate at Watten in Flanders in 1639, but had left later during the same year to come to Maryland where for "nearly twenty years he was the right hand and solace of the English Fathers in the laborious and extensive mission."\(^\text{16}\) It is claimed that Crouch opened a school for the teaching of humanities, gave catechetical instructions to the poor, and regularly visited the sick. Having joined the order again in 1659, he returned to Europe to complete his novitiate, but he never returned to

\(^{15}\)James A. Burns, "Early Jesuit Schools in Maryland," Catholic University Bulletin 13 (July 1907): 363.

Maryland. He was confessed as a lay brother in 1669 and died in 1679.  

Crouch's school at Newtown was probably an integral part of the Church and community. Burns is of the opinion that the basic concern of the school was to teach the 3R's, but also admits that Latin and Greek were probably taught. If the school were to be patterned after the model of the European Jesuit schools, it seems that Latin and Greek would compose a part of the curriculum. We can assume that Crouch at least would have attempted to adopt the *Ratio Studiorum* if, indeed, the plan was to conduct a Jesuit school. The *Ratio* will be discussed later in relating to John and Charles Carroll's education at St. Omers.

The land patent for Crouch's school reads as follows:

Laid out for Ralph Crouch . . . parcel of land laying on the north side of Potomac


18 Woodstock Letters, Woodstock College, Maryland, p. 269.
River, and bounding on the south and east with the said river, on the west with a line drawn northwest and by north from a well by Potomac River called St. Raphaells well until it fall into a Branch of St. Raphaells Creek, on the north with the said creek and branch, containing and now laid out for four thousand acres, more or less.\[19\]

The date of the patent is October 26, 1649, but there are no direct data to inform subsequent investigators of Newtown as to what really took place in Crouch's school. The very scarce empirical data concerning Newtown have been twisted and turned and pulled by many researchers, and what follows here is a synthesis of the data, and a hypothesis of this writer.

The earliest record concerning a school at Newtown can be found in the will of Edward Cotton, a wealthy and influential planter and member of the Maryland Assembly in 1648, before the disenfranchisement of Roman Catholics. Mr. Cotton left the bulk of his estate consisting of 450 acres of land and many cattle for the endowment of the Catholic school; Ralph Crouch was appointed as one of the executors. Part of the will reads as follows:

I do appoint my Loving friends Thomas Matthews and Ralph Crouch as Executors. ... I doe give all my female Cattle and their Increase for Ever to be disposed of by my aforesaid Executors as they shall Fitt unto charitable uses which may be most to God's honor, the Stock to be preserved and the profit to be made use of to the use of a school, if they shall think it convenient ... my desire is if they shall think convenient that the school be kept at Newtowne, and that the Cattle may be in care of John Warren upon such agreement as my Executors shall make Provided that this is my desire do not hinder them from doing a greater good to the honor of God otherwise which I do leave absolute in their power and to their discretion.20

Burns also claims that this will contains the bequest for education in Maryland, as well as the first in support of Catholic education in all the colonies.21

To make any grandiose claims about the educational institution at Newtown would, it seems, be absurd since there is so little extant information about what did, in fact, happen there. Especially little is known about the school after Crouch returned to Europe. It is unclear whether or not Crouch's school survived and a second school started or if the Newtown School survived. There

20 Ibid.

does seem to have been a school in the colony in the 1670s. Father Goebel gives a confusing account of Newtown in his doctoral dissertation. He uses two documents for his data, but either the arithmetic he uses is faulty or a careless typist is responsible for a serious error in his work. This accusation must be given some justification.

He makes the claim that Newtown School did not open until 1677. To substantiate his claim, he uses the following references: one, the will of Luke Gardner; secondly, a letter of an English Provincial.

Gardner's will reads:

My will is that my 3 sons, John, Luke, and Thomas Gardner be kept at school and such education as this country and their estates will afford them until they successively attain unto the age of eighteen years . . . half of moveables to be divided to the Pastor of Newtown Church.

The problem here is one of chronology. Since the will was drawn in 1673, it seems that Newtown School must have


been in existence before 1677. In addition, if the sons were to be educated until age eighteen, it seems clear that some kind of secondary education was available in the colony. Further, in the Annual Letters of the English Province preserved in Rome, there appears under the date 1681 reference to some kind of preparatory school in Maryland:

The mission in Maryland is in a flourishing condition. . . . Four years ago a school of humanities was opened by our Society in the center of the country, directed by two of the Fathers; and the native youth applying themselves assiduously to study made good progress. Maryland and the recently established school sent two boys to St. Omers who yielded in abilities to few Europeans, when competing for the honor of being first in their class.24

Now, two very interesting problems issue as a result of this letter. First, how could Luke Gardner will that his sons attend the school if there were no school, and second, how could Maryland boys compete for the honor of being first in their class at St. Omer's if they had no previous schooling experience? These

problems, puzzling as they are, can only encourage conjecture, for the essential data containing the answers are not to be found.

We do, however, know that two more members of the society came to Maryland apparently to teach at Newtown. Because of the dangers faced by Roman Catholics, especially Jesuits, these priests often had aliases. This in itself would be sufficient to give the researcher nightmares, but much more study has been devoted to sorting out who is who among these "incognito" priests, and, we are relatively certain that a man, known as Thomas Hathersall or also known as Thomas Slater, came to teach at Newtown. His parents are described by Father Goebel:

The Slaters were a good Catholic Yeoman family. Thomas Slater appearing in a list of non-jurors in 1775, as holding an estate at Grimsargh, adjoining the township of Hathersal.25

Thomas had studied at St. Omers and though he became a Jesuit June 20, 1668, he never became a priest; he stayed a scholastic for thirty years, working as a lay

Brother. Since he was only a scholastic; he could not have said Mass or exercised any of the other functions of a priest; therefore, he probably would have been restricted to teaching duties, and, in fact, reference is made to him between 1683 and 1698 as a teacher of "letters and humanities." The irony of this situation is that the reason he was never ordained is that he suffered from acute headaches and it was feared that he was insane. But he could be a teacher! He died in Maryland at the age of fifty-six.

The last mention of the Newtown School is in the will of Thomas Rosier, April 18, 1687:

My desire is that Mr. Pennington desires to have the education of my youngest sons; that my executors due put him to him. . . . Item 1 I make my wife and five children joint Executors of this my last will and testament desiring them to take the advice of Mr. Pennington and the Honorable Capt. Darnall. 28


The closing of Newtown School was undoubtedly instigated by the political unrest of the times. With the coming of William of Orange to the English throne came the end of the proprietary government in Maryland; thus began an era of persecution more extensively discussed in the next section of the paper. But some mention of the problems here is essential. Anti-Catholic legislation bore heavily on the matter of education. Especially after the defection of the House of Baltimore from the Church in 1713, Catholics were to be excluded from all management of schools; oaths against papal supremacy and the doctrine of transubstantiation were required of all candidates for public office; teachers were in all cases to be Anglicans; similar oppressive measures were passed. Consequently, if the Jesuits were to continue their efforts toward schooling, it was necessary for them to prevent their discovery by the provincial authorities. It is probable that after Hathersall's death, no formal Catholic school was conducted in Maryland for years to come. Perhaps, boys were prepared by tutors in private manor homes, but this speculation cannot be empirically documented.
Before the other important school is discussed, it is necessary to consider legislation against the Roman Catholics from 1689-1740s.

**Catholic Education After 1689**

By 1689 there were very few Jesuits in Maryland. There was now a concerted effort on the part of the Anglican majority to render impossible the establishment of schools or to carry on Catholic schooling at all. The fact that Maryland was made a royal province and was given a crown-appointed governor in 1691 was not by mere accident. The fall of the Stuarts in England had changed the religious and political character of that country and had a profound effect on Maryland. Catholics in Maryland were charged with:

- seizure and apprehending of protestants in their houses with armed forces . . . thence hurrying them away to prisons, etc. We still find all the means used by these very persons and their agents, Jesuits, priests, and lay papists, that art of mallice can suggest to divert the obedience and loyalty of the Inhabitants from their most sacred Majisty's to that height of impudence that solemn masses and prayers are used (as we have very good information) in their Chappells and Oratoryes for the prosperous success of the Papists
forces in Ireland, and the French designes against England.29

It was at this point William of Orange seized Maryland and made her a royal province with Sir Lionel Copley as her first governor.

Legislation Bearing on Catholic Education

This done, Copley summoned a legislature from which all Catholics were excluded. The first two acts of this assembly were to recognize William and Mary as their sovereign, and to pass "an act for the Service of Almighty God and the Establishment of the Protestant Religion, in this Province."30 Religious liberty was at an end.

The legislature sought to aggravate, if not quell, the Catholics. In 1696 the assembly tried to pass a bill making attendance of the Church of England compulsory, but this bill did not become law, because a rider attached

29 Shea, History of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 345-46, quoting Sharf's History of Maryland, pp. 311-13. The charges presented were later admitted to be groundless and malicious, but gave the authorities in England a pretext for their actions.

to it declared that all the laws of England to be in force in Maryland. Nevertheless, the annoyances of the legislature's attempts grew common and sharp. In 1692, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1699 on through the very early 1700s, the Maryland Provincial Government set about harassing her Roman Catholic citizens with laws, customs, and statutes that limited and denied this group right to share equally in the polity of the province. In 1704 an "Act to Prevent the Growth of Popery" was passed. This law was to set the precedent for keeping out Catholics.

Part of the act reads as follows:

Whatsoever popish bishop, priest, or Jesuit, should baptize any child or children, other than such who have papish parents, or shall say mass, or exercise the function of a papish bishop or priest within this province, or should endeavor to persuade any of his majesty's biege people to embrace and to be reconciled to the Church of Rome shall upon conviction pay the sum of 250 pounds and be imprisoned six months.

Other provisions of the act provided that if, after conviction any popish priest should say Mass or exercise any other priestly function within the province,

31 Ibid., Lib. LL, no. 2, Fol. 2.
32 Ibid., Lib. LL 3, Fol. 145.
or if any person who professed to be a Roman Catholic should keep school, or take on themselves the education of youth at any place within the Province, that person, on conviction should be sent out of the colony and transported to England.  

Further, any person professing Catholicism was not allowed to purchase land or to inherit land; and any person sending his child abroad to be educated in the Catholic faith was to be fined one hundred pounds. The irony of the situation makes the reality easy to comprehend. No Catholic could teach; hence, no schools or schooling, but no Catholic could send his child out of the province for religious instruction.

Part of the act was repealed when the legislature reconvened. Catholic priests were allowed to exercise their priestly duties within the confines of a private house for a private family. Hence, from this time on until British rule of the colonies ended, no separate

---

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
Catholic Church or chapel was allowed. The houses of Catholic planters, then, were equipped with private chapels where small groups in secret and stealth could maintain their religious commitments. One such mansion was Doughroregan Manor house which belonged to Charles Carroll of Annapolis, the father of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. According to Bishop John Carroll, "The whole charge of their maintenance, of furnishing the altars, of all traveling expenses, fell on the priests themselves." Had the priests been forced to surrender the lands owned by the Society, priests would have been without homes and food; all other Roman Catholics would have been without priests. This is not to say that all priests were Jesuits; but it is the case that most Maryland priests were Jesuits.

As if the religious conflicts so far mentioned were not sufficient to weaken the Catholics' spirits, they were faced in 1713 with yet another setback. Benedict Leonard Calvert, in order to try to recover control of Maryland, renounced his Roman Catholicism in

---

favor of the Church of England. He survived his father only a short time, never recovering his rights in Maryland, but his infant son, Charles Calvert, Lord Baltimore, was reared as a Protestant much to the disappointment of many Catholic Marylanders.

The effect of this defection of the house of Baltimore on Catholics was pronounced. Not every Catholic in Maryland had the financial wherewithal of Charles Carroll. So the Maryland Assembly was now more powerful and the number of prohibitions placed on Catholics grew.

In 1715 another law was passed to limit the importation of Catholics into the province. A tax of twenty shillings was placed on every Irish papist servant brought into Maryland, and the next year that tax was doubled. Life did not return to the open societal organization as it had been under the first Lord Baltimore, but Catholics managed to survive, to endure, and, with the coming of independence, to prevail in their fight for religious toleration and political freedom.

37 See Chapter IV, introductory part, which explains the Signer's heritage.

38 Maryland Law Books, Hall of Records, Annapolis, Lib. LL no. 4, Fol. 146, chap. 36.
Bohemia Manor

The history of Bohemia Manor is also shrouded with mystery and speculation. Although the Church at Little Bohemia has been restored by a rather active group, much remains to the imagination of researchers to arrive at some plausible explanations as to the daily activities of school there. Bohemia Manor represents the last educational effort of the Jesuits in colonial Maryland, and that the manor was located in that remote section of Maryland where it was raises some interesting questions which will be dealt with in this study.

Father Thomas Mansell, a native of Oxfordshire, England, who had entered the Society of Jesus in 1686, came to Maryland in 1700 and is said to have taken up residence about 1704 in Cecil County near the manor of Augustus Herman. On July 10, 1706, Father Mansell obtained a patent for 458 acres near the junction of the Great and Little Bohemia Rivers. He gave the tract the same Saint Xaverius. Father Mansell had been impressed

by the results of the practical education of Augustus Herman, his neighbor. Herman was a Czech, probably born in Prague, around 1605; he was a member of the Dutch West India Company, a resident of New York, who had quarreled with Peter Stuyvesant and subsequently told to leave that colony. From New York he came to Maryland to live in 1661. He was a skilled cartographer who mapped out the areas of Maryland and Virginia. His goal was to establish a manorial system in Maryland, and in order to reach this aim, he laid out extensive plans, which were never to reach fruition. Herman was the only person Lord Baltimore ever significantly titled. 41

The name of Herman appeared a significant number of times in the research, and becoming curious about the man and his apparent influence on Catholic education in colonial Maryland, this researcher sought to find out just who he was and why he was so important. The facts are these: Augustus Herman and his family were not Roman Catholic at all, but Dutch Reformed. Such advanced ecumenism as Jesuits and Calvinists cooperating to run a

school in the mid-eighteenth century colony was difficult to conceptualize.

Cecil County, in the northeastern corner of Maryland where Bohemia Manor lay, was the most sparsely populated in 1708, while in St. Mary's County at the same time there were 1,238 Roman Catholics in a population of 4,090; in Charles County, 709 among 4,007 colonists. It was in these counties where the Jesuits had first worked. It was in these areas where they owned at least 8,100 acres. Why, then, was the location chosen for a school so far away from the center of population?

Hughes contends that the Jesuits, because of the stringent limitations placed on Roman Catholics by the provincial government, wanted to establish and conduct an institution where they would not be so open to observation, but would be screened by distance from legal prosecution for teaching. Another reason Bohemia may have been chosen is its proximity to Pennsylvania, especially Philadelphia, where the social atmosphere was more open to Roman Catholics. Whatever the reason,

---


43 Ibid.
Maryland's Catholics for a short duration were able to provide some instruction for their own children. The Maryland Gazette shows a need for some kind of schooling in Maryland:

On inquiry it has been found that there are at least one hundred Marylanders in the academy in Philadelphia in the course of being genteely and liberally educated at a cost of fifty pounds sterling for each student. . . . it is evident that if this practice continues for twenty years there must be remitted from Maryland for the benefit of Pennsylvania the round plumb sum of 100,000 pounds sterling. 44

There is some dispute about the date of Bohemia's initial opening as a school. Most historians, however, agree on the mid 1740s. 45 Father Mansell had set up the Bohemia mission shortly after his arrival in Maryland and the granting of his patent. He was followed in his

44 Maryland Gazette, 6 March 1754.

45 Burns gives the date as 1744, "Early Jesuit Schools in Maryland," p. 376; Shea, 1745 or 1746, History of the Roman Catholic Church, p. 404; McGucken, probably 1745 or 1746, The Jesuits and Education, p. 57; H. S. Spaulding, S.J., Catholic Colonial Maryland (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1931), p. 138, claims 1741; Goebel gives no founding date, but quotes a document which shows that the school was in existence in 1745, A Study of Catholic Secondary Education, p. 22. Brent agrees with the 1745 or 1746, Harold A. Buetow, Of Singular Benefit (London: Macmillan & Co., 1970), p. 29. Whatever the exact year, the school must have begun mid-eighteenth century, and, evidence indicates, lasted only a few years.
efforts at Bohemia by eight or nine priests in some succession. The dates for their service are speculative in that the records, again, are disparate. If the school was begun in the 1740s, Father Mansell must have been nearly sixty years old and surely needing help with the school and the mission.

Records indicate that Mansell did have assistance in the form of other Jesuits; the most well-known of these was Thomas Poulton, who, coming to America in 1738, is given most of the credit for actually establishing the school at Bohemia. However, one very interesting fact appears concerning an instructor at Bohemia Manor. His name is on none of the lists of priests who officiated there. Thomas Poulton, nevertheless, is reputed to have supervised the school for most of the time during years it was extant. On the other hand, discrepancies creep in concerning his length of service. Tradition has him buying land in Delaware for the Society in 1753 and other records indicate that he died in 1749.\(^{46}\)

\(^{46}\) Unpublished letter from Robert A. Parsons, S.J., to Bill, a priest researcher, in the Bohemia Manor Section of the Georgetown Special Collections Library, n.d.
The records we have concerning what went on at the school in Bohemia Manor and who attended them are, needless to say, very scant. The following account composes the embryonic information from which historians postulate their judgments and hypotheses. For the year 1745 it is recorded that a Mr. Wayt charged forty shillings for each Latin student that he taught:

Mr. Wayt, the schoolmaster . . . Cr. By school for the 2 Neales and John Carroll, in all for 32 months at 40 shilling per year, each 15.7.47.

The Bohemia Manor Day Book lists the following tuition costs:

February 17, 1745-46. Peter Laply to your Son's board. May 20, Daniel Carroll to your son's board. June 24, Edward Neale to board of your two sons 43.16s.3p [it was progressively cheaper if a family sent more than one boy]. April 22, 1748 Daniel Carroll 2nd time son John Came.—June 8, Jackey Carroll went to Marlboro. August 5, Robert Brent, August 20 Bennet Neale, Archibald Richard, Edward Neale and James Heath went first to school.

All those that learn Latin at 40 currency pound, the rest at 30/ as my agreement this day.48

47 Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Text II, p. 520.

48 Devitt, "Bohemia Manor." The authentic daybook from Bohemia Manor was housed in the Special Collections at Georgetown University until its mysterious disappearance fifteen years ago.
That Mr. Wayt was a lay person teaching Latin is assumed, because Jesuits did not accept money for their work; they made their living on the farm. But that the Jesuits found a lay person capable of teaching Latin or that they themselves did not carry on the task poses an interesting, but puzzling situation for the researcher. Since Mr. Wayt did teach Latin, and since the tuition was more for those who studied Latin, there was an apparent tracking of students into practical and classical curricula. Also, this being the case, one could speculate that Roman Catholics were determined to educate their sons, if it be fitting and proper for their station in life, to become the gentleman; nay, not only a gentleman, but the Christian gentleman, the man of virtue. And if this education were not available in Maryland, as it was not, these parents would sacrifice to have their children present in their homes, sacrifice in order to have a child sent illegally on a long and dangerous voyage to a distant foreign land so that the child could be educated in the classical way by persons of the Roman Catholic faith.

Chapter IV is a model study of what one family did in order that its child receive an education for the
ecclesiastical life. Chapter V is concerned with another person from the same family who wanted an education in laws and letters. But for its time and for its purpose, Bohemia Manor School was an attempt by Roman Catholics who were, in essence, second-class citizens, to instruct their children. Struggling for a classical curriculum, and at the same time utilizing Augustus Herman's ideas of a practical education, those pioneer priests, especially Father Mansell and Father Poulton, must be recognized as important figures in the history of Catholic education in colonial Maryland.

Summary

In this chapter we have discussed the Catholic settling of Maryland, the coming of the Protestant Ascendancy, some limitations placed on the Roman Catholic population, and the two colonial Catholic schools which seem to be the most important and influential. Thus far, the study has dealt with general aspects of education of colonial Marylanders within colonial Maryland. The succeeding two chapters will involve the education of colonial Marylanders outside the province itself.
CHAPTER IV

THE EDUCATION OF JOHN CARROLL

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to a study of the education of John Carroll, the first American bishop of the Roman Catholic Church. From the time he began as a student at St. Omers in France, John Carroll had one goal in mind. And that goal was to be a Catholic priest, a Jesuit, who would, through his teaching, do God's will for his life.

John Carroll was not the only provincial Marylander to attend Catholic seminaries in Europe during this time. In fact, the priest who was to become the second bishop in the United States was Father Leonard Neale, one of John Carroll's childhood friends, whose education followed generally the same pattern. Since there were no seminaries for the education of Catholic

---

priests in the colonies, one of John Carroll's objectives was to establish schools for the preparation of the clergy on this side of the Atlantic within his own country, and to found a school where "several branches of classical learning" would prepare young men for the "Study of the higher sciences in the university of this or neighboring states." Thus was begun the St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore for the final education of men who were to follow the ecclesiastical way and Georgetown University for the education of men in purely liberal arts training. But the focus of this study is not his direction as an educational leader.

It is, however, necessary to recognize that John Carroll was important to the politics of the American Revolution as is demonstrated by his journey to Quebec in 1776 with his cousin Charles and Benjamin Franklin to attempt to gain support of the Catholic Church for the American cause. Although the mission was unsuccessful, John Carroll's influence as a voice of the Church was enhanced.

2 Ibid., p. 143.
It was also John Carroll who encouraged Elizabeth Seton in her conversion from Anglicanism to Catholicism, and later it was Archbishop Carroll who encouraged Mother Seton in the founding of the Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph. This is the same Elizabeth Seton, who has been designated by some as the nucleus from which evolved the American Roman Catholic School System, and the same woman who Pope Paul declared America's first Saint.³

Because his education was typical of those colonial Maryland Catholics who studied for the priesthood, and because of his heavy impact on the lives of succeeding generations of American Catholics, John Carroll was chosen for the subject of this chapter. His background and early education in Maryland will be discussed, his education at St. Omers will be included, as well as his seminary training at Watten, Liege, and Bruges. In order to understand the educational system under which both John and Charles Carroll of Carrollton were taught, it is necessary to describe and explain as briefly as possible the Ratio Studiorum, the basis of Jesuit

³Mrs. Seton, a member of New York City's aristocracy, was a widow with five children who converted from Anglicanism to Catholicism.
education from the inception of the Society of Jesus until this very day, and that discussion is part of this chapter.

**Family Background**

John Carroll was, in fact, a cousin of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the subject of Chapter V of this study. Although many historians cast doubt on the closeness of the relationship between the two, it is obvious from the correspondence of Charles Carroll to his father Charles of Annapolis that the two were not only blood relatives, but close school chums as well.\(^4\) The genealogy chart shows them both to be descendants of Florence O'Carroll, King of Ely, Ireland, who died in 1205. Actually, the family history has been traced to the time of Christ. We do know that John Carroll was born two years before Charles, in 1735, to Daniel and Eleanor Darnall Carroll. Mrs. Carroll was considered one of Maryland's richest heiresses, coming from the family of

colonial Henry Darnall, brother-in-law of Lord Baltimore. Although her own father was not so skillful at holding to or adding to his forty thousand acre inheritance, he provided Eleanor with the very best education France could offer. Of her marriage to Daniel Carroll in 1727, it is said that she chose wisely and well. Daniel Carroll was a merchant whose wealth came largely from his general store in Upper Marlborough, and although his wealth was invested chiefly in land, livestock, and slaves, he probably made his money from the sale and trade of tobacco. Whatever the case, we do know that at the time of his death, Daniel Carroll left six children, and to one son alone lands worth between four and five thousand pounds.5

Blood and marriage linked the leading Catholic families of Maryland. Among this group were the Roziers, Youngs, Darnalls, Brookes, Neales, Brents, Sewalls, and Carrolls.6 It is said that the Carrolls of Maryland


resembled the Lees of Virginia in their contribution of distinguished figures in United States history. And although John Carroll entered the priesthood, thereby denying himself children of his own, his brothers and sisters, in their aristocratic mold, married other Carrolls, Brents, and Youngs, keeping to the first families of the province.

Maryland historians have designated three periods in the province as times of special agitation and excitement: 1722-1732, 1754-1763, and 1770-1773. During the second of the periods, John Carroll and his cousin Charles were completing their studies in Europe and preparing themselves for future careers, John as a priest; Charles as a learned country gentleman. Although both began their studies at Bohemia Manor, the bulk of their education came from the Jesuits abroad. They left Maryland together in 1748 to go to St. Omers, the Jesuit school in French Flanders.

---


It is essential to keep in mind that although it was the custom for wealthy Southerners to send their children to Europe to be educated, that wealthy Protestant Southerners had alternatives. There were in the colonies institutions where students could receive "liberal" educations, educations for the ministry, educations for the law. Harvard College had been founded in 1636, only sixteen years after the Separatists had come and one year after the Puritan migration of 1635. William and Mary in Virginia followed and in turn Yale, Princeton, Brown, Rutgers, and Dartmouth until there were nine colleges in the colonies by the time of the Revolution. But these were Protestant collèges for Protestant students. Only one of these institutions is said to have admitted a single Catholic. Therefore, if the Carrolls were to educate their sons in the way that they wished, that is to say, under the faith of their Church, there was no choice but to endure the hardships involved in sending their children far from home to another continent for their 

9 The University of Pennsylvania is reputed to have accepted one or two Papists.
schooling and education. Thus, the two Carrolls sailed from Maryland in 1748.

Education in Europe

The main body of information gathered concerning John Carroll's education comes from letters which Charles Carroll wrote his father, and, at that, the information is sometimes very oblique, general, and even trivial. This part of the study was, perhaps, the most difficult, because facts are few and speculations, considered as fact, are many. What follows here is a discussion of the Ratio Studiorum as it was in the time of this study, a narrative pieced together from available data, and a brief consideration of the suppression of the Society of Jesus as it affected the education of John Carroll.

The Ratio Studiorum

A Brief History of the Ratio. The first attempt at organizing a uniform course of study for the schooling of Jesuits was drawn up by Ignatius of Loyola himself. But until 1599 when Father General, Claude Aquaviva, issued an amended edition of the Ratio, the provinces within the Society failed to accept the plan. There had been two others submitted, one in 1586 and one in 1591,
but for reasons not explained, they were held unsatisfactory. Now, in 1599, however, Aquaviva's program was accepted; not only was it accepted, it was the general prescription for all Jesuit colleges until the suppression of the Society in 1773.¹⁰

Much in the *Ratio* seems to have been borrowed from, or much seems very similar pedagogically to, the ideas of Johann Sturm.¹¹ But Chadwick explains the similarity by simply concluding that the Humanistic movement had moved west from Rome into Belgium, France, and neighboring countries, and rather than adopt older, traditional methods of teaching practiced in the Middle Ages, Jesuit schools would opt for classical Humanism so compatible with Renaissance thinking.¹² The very theme permeating Jesuit education can be found in the first chapter of Genesis where the writer gives an account of the creation of man:


¹¹Ibid., p. 23.

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.\textsuperscript{13}

That man should have dominion over the creatures of the earth is analogous to the dominion of God over man. The purpose of the creation itself is, according to Ignatius, "that our Lord has created everything in this present life for the service and good of men," and in another place he says, "In this life a thing is good only insofar as it is a help toward life eternal and evil insofar as it is an obstacle to it."\textsuperscript{14} Jesuit education is also humanistic in that mankind is conceptualized as a unity, but also as men in time, making up one entity. That is, the individual man is not ignored; on the other hand, since the purpose of man and mankind is essentially the same, that is, to have dominion over the earth and to praise and revere God, the way to successfully achieve


\textsuperscript{14}These passages are quoted from Letters of St. Ignatius of Loyola, selected and trans. by William J. Young, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1959), pp. 30, 69 in Donahue, Jesuit Education, p. 21.
that end is by displaying behavior consistent with the goal. In other words, Jesuit education is, then, an instrument whereby man learns to live according to that plan set forth by God.

In order to achieve those objectives, to praise and revere God and to order men's lives that the earth itself might reflect the mutual love of God and man, the *Ratio Studiorum* was drawn up. Whether it was influenced by Sturm or by the Brethren of the Common Life or by the Spaniard Vives is uncertain.\(^{15}\) It does seem clear, however, that the universities did influence Jesuit pedagogy.

**The University Influence.** That the university influenced the Jesuit philosophy of education and Jesuit pedagogy should not be surprising, for all the early members of the Society were university men. The institution which probably exerted the strongest imprint was the University of Paris. Ignatius had graduated from Paris and during his stay there had been impressed by the

\(^{15}\) See McGucken, *The Jesuits and Education*, for a discussion of these influences. Also, Alan P. Farrell, S.J., *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1938), for a full account of the evolution of the *Ratio Studiorum*. 
closely structured organization of that system as opposed to the loosely organized universities of Italy. Thus, when he began to organize his thoughts into a methodology for teaching, he looked to Paris for the model. The use of disputations and contests, the adoption of the hierarchical pattern from the rudiments, grammar, humanities to rhetoric—all these came from Paris.  

Influence of Isocrates Through Quintilian. The ability to speak and write Latin according to the Ciceronian form as interpreted by Quintilian became a necessary part of Jesuit schooling. Sixteenth century pedagogues seemed to be persuaded that Quintilian's Education of an Orator exemplified the ideal of instruction. But Quintilian himself was not particularly an original thinker. Most of his methodology came from his Athenian predecessor, Isocrates. Therefore, it is the claim of this writer that Isocrates is really the one to whom the Jesuits owe much for his ideas and educational


17 Donahue, Jesuit Education, p. 37.
practices. Isocrates called for an education that cultivated the whole man, that prepared him for political, intellectual, and moral leadership. He believed in the power and value of example, and set about the education of a student by placing him under the direct guidance and responsibility of a properly qualified person. He saw the aim of education as the cultivation of the whole man so that his conduct in life would always be the right one.  

18 It would, then, seem that Quintilian may have served as a link or have had direct bearings on Jesuit schooling, but that Isocrates was the initiation of the model set forth.

Characteristics of the Curriculum. The curriculum was built around three theses or goals. The first is that there are three aims or values which any Jesuit school should cultivate: growth in intellectual, moral, and social maturity. Secondly, these aims are seen as

interrelated; that is, each is dependent on the other, but the moral purpose is given preference if any one is. And, finally, all elements of the curriculum and the experiences of the whole school life are seen as ultimately instrumental. This single passage from Ignatius is ample evidence:

The end of the learning acquired in this Society is, with the help of God, to aid the souls of its own members and those of their neighbors. This, therefore, is the criterion to be used in deciding, both in general and in the case of individual persons, what subject members of the Society ought to learn, and how far they ought to progress in them. To speak in general, the humane letters of the various languages, and logic, natural philosophy (Aristotelian physics), moral philosophy, metaphysics, scholastic theology, positive theology, and Sacred Scriptures are helpful. These are the branches to which those who are sent to the colleges should apply themselves. They will devote themselves with greater diligence to the parts which are more helpful for the end mentioned above. Furthermore, account is to be taken of circumstances of time, place, persons, and other such factors, according to what seems best in our Lord to him who holds the chief responsibility.

---

19 Donahue, Jesuit Education, p. 130. Also, there seems to be threads of Dewey running throughout concerning character building, not simply acquiring subject matter.

Methodology. What was to take place in the school to encourage the achievement of these goals? The emphasis on moral excellence was so strong that the teacher himself was to be the model for his students to emulate. But the Jesuits systematized every phase of schooling. An example of this is found in the following passage:

If an oration or poem is being explained, first its meaning must be explained, if it is obscure, and the various interpretations considered. Second, the whole method of the workmanship, whether invention, disposition, or delivery is to be considered, also how aptly the author ingratiates himself, how appropriately he speaks, or from what topics he takes his material for persuading, for ornament, or for moving his audience; how many precepts he unites in one and the same place, by what method he includes with the figures of thought the means of instilling belief, and again the figures of thought which he weaves into the figures of words. Third, some passages similar in subject-matter and expression to be adduced and other orators or poets who have used the same precept for the sake of proving or narrating something similar are to be cited. Fourth, let the facts be confirmed by statements of authorities, if opportunity offers. Fifth, let statements from history, from mythology, and from all erudition be sought which illustrate the passage. At last, let the words be considered carefully, and their fitness, their elegance, their number, and their rhythm noted. However, let these things be considered, not that the master may always discuss everything, but that
from them he may select those which are most fitting.21

Because the Jesuits saw the need to counter the Reformation on both religious and intellectual grounds, they realized the need for trained leaders, and, thus, a method for training those leaders presented an irresistible challenge. Jesuit methodology, therefore, was carefully worked out and the method itself became an object of study. Simplistically stated, the methodology was divided into three facets: emulation or prelection, disputation, and competition.

Emulation and Prelection. The chief method of instruction was emulation or prelection. What this consisted of is the teacher's actually studying the assignment orally in front of the class, and the class reproducing his performance as nearly as possible. The master read the text, the argument, and gave an explanation or translation of the difficult passages. The students then reread, re-explained, or translated. A significant part of the system was the continuous review

and repetition of the immediate work, the week's work, the term's work, and the year's work.

Since a command Latin grammar was absolutely essential, students handed in grammar assignments every day but Saturday. However, Saturday was not free day as it is in most twentieth century schools; Saturday was review day. In this extensive review system, students would not only learn but overlearn so that they would not forget.  

Disputation. The disputation was retained from scholasticism. Students were encouraged to argue points with their masters or to participate in formal disputations. The Jesuits were not eager to throw out successful methods of teaching whether they were remnants of the Middle Ages or not. They instead combined the best of available methodologies, and the Ratio represents a compromise between the old learning and the new.  

Competition and Rivalry. Rivalry was instituted in the Jesuit school on every level: between members of a class, between groups within a class, and between

22 Broudy and Palmer, Exemplars of the Teaching Method, p. 91.

classes. The competition could be academic or physical. The boys were divided into armies, and accorded analogous ranks. If in combat, academic or physical, a private bested a student of higher rank, the two exchanged ranks. Perhaps extreme competition and rivalry was the only way young boys could be motivated to learn Latin and Greek lessons which perhaps were not very meaningful to them at the time.

**Discipline.** It is impossible to discuss characteristics of Jesuit schooling without some reference to discipline. Discipline by these priests was, for the most part, brought about very clearly. First and foremost, because emulation or "follow the example of the master" was so instilled in both master and pupil and because competition between students in all phases of schooling was so keen, most boys had enough wit to conform to the wishes of the master and to the rules of the school. Secondly, the Jesuits insisted on separating punishment to be inflicted on students from the educative part of their classroom performance or from any connection with academic excellence. The instructors, themselves, did not administer corporal punishment at all. If, in an extreme instance, corporal punishment was meted out,
somebody other than the instructor was responsible for carrying out that act.\textsuperscript{24}

**Course of Study.** While some discussion has centered on the history of the Jesuit idea of education and on its methodology, little has been said about the actual course of study followed by a student in a Jesuit school. It seems valid to look briefly at a typical course of study, one very similar to that curriculum followed by John and Charles Carroll when they were students at St. Omers. Although the original documents concerning the rules and regulations of St. Omers during this particular time were destroyed in the Sack of Louvain in August 1914, a transcript in the Stonyhurst Archives enables researchers to make some fairly intelligent speculations as to the course of study.\textsuperscript{25} And since Chadwick has written a well-documented history of St. Omers from its inception till its removal to Stonyhurst, England, there is more than mere guess or

\textsuperscript{24}Punishment was absolutely separated from academic instruction.

\textsuperscript{25}Guilday, *Life and Times of John Carroll*, p. 20.
speculation involved in the discussion which is to follow. 26

St. Omers' course of study was based on five schools or classes, sometimes six, forming a graded hierarchy, with each school organized on a performance base. That is, before a student could progress to the next class, he must have mastered all the materials required in the previous one. The lower classes, in the Ratio called the Grammars: Lower, Middle, and Upper, came first. Then the student went on to Grammar, Syntax, Humanities or Poetry, and finally to Rhetoric. Rhetoric was the final class in lower school. At the end of five or six years at the school, the student should have become adept in "eloquentia latina"; but St. Omers expected more. It expected that:

the name "Humanities" has been given to this study because out of such as devote themselves to it intelligently it makes men who are polished, polite, gentle, pleasant, at least in their intercourse. The word "humanes" indeed means all that. 27

26 See Chadwick, St. Omers to Stonyhurst.

27 Ibid., p. 72.
But the Jesuits at St. Omers did not stop here. A pagan could fit that model. The Jesuits at St. Omers made it their main endeavor to produce not only Catholics, but the best of Catholic gentlemen inspired by the love of God.

But what of the actual curriculum? From the beginning the boys were to learn Latin and then Greek. Latin was the school language at St. Omers, and it was against Latin that most students rebelled. After sufficient preparation and progress, students could read and were expected to read the Greek New Testament, Isocrates, Chrysostom and then translate it into Latin. They engaged in disputation, at first on topics announced in advance and, later, extemporaneously.

Apart from the classics, the curriculum seemed empty, unless one counts the games and plays which accompanied later or higher studies. There was, of course, some elementary arithmetic taught younger students, but not much emphasis was placed on mathematics. Both mathematics and science were part of higher studies, usually

28 Charles Carroll himself complained to his father of the noted Latin studies. See Hanley, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, p. 23.
taken the second year of philosophy. Music was also a part of the curriculum as it enhanced both the drama and Mass. But to declare with absolute authority the actual regimen of the course of study at St. Omers is to no avail because of the fires already mentioned. Charles Carroll, in the section of the study which is to follow, comments on his life while a student, and these data are perhaps the most authentic extant. Before ending the discussion on the Jesuit educational model, it is essential that a few further comments be added concerning that model for education.

Critique of the Ratio as a Model. Perhaps the most negative criticism to be leveled against the Jesuit model of instruction is that the curriculum is too teacher centered. On the other hand, it can be argued that in order to meet the previously set objectives, teacher dominance was a necessary means to a desired end. With this criticism is the accusation that the Jesuits

29 Chadwick explains higher studies as the course which comprised three years of philosophy followed by three or four years of theology. "Students in the philosophy course were listed as 'Logici,' then "physici," and finally 'Metaphysici,'" Chadwick, St. Omers to Stonyhurst, p. 77.
leave no room for student creativity or spontaneity, whatever those terms mean. It is true that the master is the guide, the example, the source of control. But the Jesuit model was a product-oriented system. Every step along the educational path, instrumental though it might be, was taken for the particular purpose of a finished product; and that finished product, the cultured, Christian gentleman, was achieved by the combination of instruction and education of a group of men dedicated to their mission. Although the Ratio was never looked on as infallible, it has survived the years, adapting to new needs, new technically assisted methodologies, but the expected end product can be described in the same words as he was in 1599 when the Ratio was adopted for use by the Society of Jesus.

St. Omers

Because the history of St. Omers is given in Chapter V, no large amount of space will be given it here, except to mention that by the time John and Charles Carroll arrived there, the school had been destroyed twice. Thus, it was the third actual physical structure that housed the college where the Carrolls began their
continental education. An interesting, perhaps trivial, fact to point out is that neither of the boys kept any record of his transatlantic journey; or, if he did, it was not preserved. We know, however, that the Carrolls, along with another Marylander, Robert Brent, arrived in Flanders and began their studies.

For John Carroll, life at St. Omers must have seemed strange. For one who had grown up, or at least until the age of thirteen, in relative luxury, many adjustments were necessary. Melville, in her biography, gives a detailed account, not documented, of what daily life was like at St. Omers. She says that the food was "most meagre"; that breakfast consisted of one dish of boiled milk for every six boys with "bread at discretion." In the Jesuit tradition of competition and respect of the intellect, rhetoricians were entitled to a dish much larger than the rest and the envy of the less academically fit. She goes ahead to discuss holiday fare, but again only making specific cases for which must have been generally the case. It is true that St. Omers

---

30 Melville, John Carroll of Baltimore, pp. 11-14.
31 Ibid.
was an inexpensive school. The tuition there was only twenty-four pounds a year! No wonder the food was plain! Peter Guilday also makes some claims about the student daily life at St. Omers. But he quotes from a work published 1667, *The Memoirs of Edmund Mathew*. It should seem that surely daily life had changed over a 150-year period! If we are to believe Melville and Guilday, two of the standard Carroll references, we know that the schoolday was long and hard, that competition in academics and physical sports was fierce, their clothing was uniform, and to complete the picture, drama gave them another emotional and physical outlet.

From the scattered references of his cousin Charles' letters to Charles of Annapolis, we can say with fair certainty that John Carroll was a hard working and academically successful student. And John Gilmary Shea emphasized Carroll's later academic talent:

> Only those who combine great learning, the highest virtue and ability as directors of souls, are admitted to the class of professed Fathers; most of the members of the Society

---


33 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, March, 1750.
John Carroll finished his course in humanities in 1753, and in September of that year he went to Watten to more strictly follow the life he had chosen. Watten was only seven miles from St. Omers, but it was the Jesuit novitiate where John Carroll was to spend at least two years. At Watten were other Americans: Joseph Tryer, Peter Jenkins, George Knight, William Horne, Robert Cole, Joseph Reeves, and Joseph Emmott.35

While at this school John Carroll went through the following procedures. The first ten days he spent acquainting himself with the rules of the novitiate. Then each candidate underwent a brief spiritual retreat, after which, if he were found acceptable, he became a novice and assumed the clerical habit. That day was spent in meditation, prayer, scriptural reading, study, and manual labor; then from time to time each is examined on the rules. The chief test of the novice's character

34 Shea, History of the Roman Catholic Church, pp. 33-34.
35 Ibid., p. 31.
is the thirty days retreat, based on the *Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, and this is held sometime during the youth's first year:

Deeds, not words, are insisted upon as proof of genuine service, and a mechanical, emotional, or fanciful piety is not tolerated. As the novice gradually thus becomes master of his judgment and will, he grows more and more capable of offering to God the reasonable service enjoined by St. Paul, and seeks to follow the Divine Will, as manifested by Jesus Christ, by His Vicar on earth.\(^36\)

The noviceship lasted two years, and, at the end of that time, the novice took vows to become a scholastic. Now he was ready for the three-year term at the scholasticate where he would study philosophy and science. Then the normal procedure for becoming a Jesuit was to spend three or more years teaching in a Jesuit college, after which one studied theology for three more years. At the end of that time, the priesthood is conferred. And, at the end of fifteen to seventeen complete years of preparation, another year is devoted to the second novitiate called the tertianship where the recently ordained Jesuit renews his vows and reorganizes all his studies on the basis of

\(^{36}\)Ibid. Quoted from Pollen, *English Catholics During the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (1558-1580)* (London: n.p., 1920).
the practical utility and their own spiritual and academic life. 37

John Carroll must have been eighteen when he finished his first novitiate. Although we have none of his personal records to testify to his experiences, we can find out what the novice life was like by reading accounts of the Society of Jesus. We know that novices spent their time in self-sacrifice, poverty, and self-denial. Their work was of the most menial type—housework, routine catechizing of the poor, and visiting charity hospitals. But now John was ready for the study of philosophy at Liege; he was a scholastic.

Liege

Liege, a sovereign principality till the French Revolution, provided a buffer zone between Germany, France, and the Low Countries. The college itself was founded in 1614 by Father John Gerard, and its geographical location made it a haven for persecuted English Catholics. In addition to the former rigors of religious

life, John Carroll now followed a course of study in philosophy, rhetoric, literature, natural sciences, and higher mathematics. When he finished his studies in 1758, he may have gone back to St. Omers to teach classics.

Guilday, Shea, Brent, and Melville disagree from this point on concerning the chronology of Carroll's education. Shea contends that he stayed on at Liege to teach philosophy and theology in the scholasticate. Guilday and Brent admit that they do not know what went on during this period in Carroll's life, while Melville agrees to the disagreements and postulates that if Carroll did return to St. Omers to teach, his tenure was short lived. And it is the conclusion of this writer that the documents imply that Carroll was not in St. Omers when the school was closed by the French Parliament on August 6, 1762. Rather, it seems more plausible that he was in Liege. The evidence for this interpretation comes from Charles Carroll's correspondence to his father at the time of St. Omers' closing. In discussing the matter with Charles of Annapolis, John Carroll's name was never mentioned.\footnote{Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 11 November 1762.} It seems logical to this researcher that
if his cousin had been involved, Charles would have at least named him in the letter. Furthermore, in a letter written his father during the next year, Charles does allude to his cousin at Liege. Four months later he wrote about his travels and commented "my cousin Jacky whom I met in Antwerp."  

And, finally, when the Parliament suppressed the Society and closed St. Omers, the boys left St. Omers as if on walking parties, but never returned. They did not go to Liege; they went to Bruges. Whether or not Carroll took part in any flight from St. Omers, his life was affected by what happened there. It was at this very time that he was devoting all his energies to becoming a Jesuit and the government was taking drastic measures to curtail any activity of the Society. Nevertheless, John Carroll was probably in Liege, in 1763, as indicated by his cousin's letter, and was definitely there in 1764.

39 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 29 April 1763.

40 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, August 1763.

41 Letter from John Carroll to Daniel Carroll, 24 May 1764, quoted in Guilday, Life and Times of John Carroll, p. 32.
As to the time of his ordination there is not empirical evidence. Dates given by historians and biographers are speculative. Whatever the date, 1769 or 1771, John Carroll had, indeed, been ordained by the time the Society was overthrown. The problems of the Society which led to its suppression are complex enough to merit a study of their own, and, for that reason, just attention will be given them here. It is imperative, however, to comment briefly on the Society's downfall because of the tremendous effect it had on the life of John Carroll.

The Jesuit Problem

The Jesuit problem was part of a larger struggle. The French government was not alone in its persecution of the Jesuits. From the correspondence of the Charles Carrolls, it is obvious that all of Europe was engaged in a "holy war" of sorts. Needless to say, the "war" was not limited to Europe. Had that been the case, there would have been no need or no basis for this study. The American colonies themselves were also actively persecuting and prosecuting in the name of God. Indeed, religious/political struggles of the day were so
interwoven that it is almost impossible to make distinctions between political and religious issues.

As early as 1759 Charles of Annapolis questioned his son about the cruelties toward Jesuits in Portugal.

Charles wrote back:

Reports on the publicity against the Jesuits in Portugal make me believe that what has been said against the Jesuits is near calumny though at first it seem'd not so destitute of probability. I have lately read a French pamphlet that attributes the Jesuits disgrace in Portugal, ye King's misfortune, the troubles in Paraguay to our 'national debts; this is certainly mounting guilt to ye source A gemino Trojanum bellum on tur ab ovo.\(^42\)

John Carroll, however, far removed from the situation in Portugal, was affected by the shifting attitudes of the French toward the Society of Jesus. At this time, French intellectuals whether Jansenists, Philosophes, or Encyclopedists, were rallying behind the concept of republicanism which, of course, was unwelcome thinking in the minds of the royal family. The Jesuits caught much criticism from these groups for standing in the way of national progress. On the other hand, Madame de Pompadour, King Louis IV's mistress, despised these

\(^{42}\)Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 22 June 1759.
men and, along with the King's minister, was able to persuade Louis IV to assent to the French Parliament's decision to suppress the Society in 1762. With her death in 1764 hopes for better times for the Jesuit were rekindled. John Carroll's brother, Daniel, who visited him shortly after the death of Pompadour, was told:

> it is generally believed by our French brothers (that her death will) occasion some great change in their circumstances. So far it is certain, that they are delivered by this event from their greatest enemy, I mean the most powerful one, and who by her interest and influence over the King of France could more easily than anyone else prevail upon him to view tamely the proceedings against the Jesuits.⁴³

The time wore on and in 1769 Pope Clement XIII died. In addition to the opposition at the political level, Jesuits faced opposition within the ranks of their own Church. Many priests felt that Clement had dealt far too lightly with and extended too many privileges to the Society. It was even rumored that if certain Cardinals were made the new Pope, the Society would be suppressed by the Church itself. And, surely enough, on July 21, 1773, the dissolution of the Jesuits was brought to hand.

---

⁴³John Carroll, quoted in Melville, John Carroll of Baltimore, pp. 21-22.
This action was acknowledged by learned men of all creeds to be a tragic one for the intellectual and spiritual life of the whole western world. Thus, the Society, formed to educate for leadership and Christian virtue was dissolved until the next century when once again the Society of Jesus would become an integral part of the Catholic ecclesiastical organization.

John Carroll, Tutor Priest

After he had become a full-fledged Jesuit, whatever the year, John Carroll was asked by a wealthy Englishman, Charles, Lord Stourton, to accompany his eighteen-year-old son on a tour of Europe. We know that the two left Bruges the summer of 1771 because John Carroll, like many travelers, kept a journal. The problem is that, like many travelers, he apparently tired of his writing tasks and did not write the bulk of the journal until long after the journey was over and he was back home. The only research value one can place on it is that it may perhaps give some idea of what Carroll's personality was like at the time. But if one is interested in the mature Carroll's ideas, the journal would not be the place to go.
Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the education of John Carroll was gained not only from the regimented schooling of the Jesuits, but from this trip he took with young Stourton.

Because the Jesuits were under siege at the time of the tour, Carroll goes under the guise of a layman, a practice common at the time. The education practices of the Protestants in Alsace fascinated him. He found in every parish a schoolmaster who taught the children reading, writing, arithmetic, and surveying. Not that in itself was unusual; what was, however, was that the schooling was carried on with no charge to the parents, and the schooling was compulsory.\textsuperscript{44}

The other matter which concerned him directly was the imminent dissolution of the Society. Never before had he traveled extensively and been aware of the villainies practiced by some in the name of his Society. Instead of the exhilarated feeling he expected upon entering Rome, his heart must have been heavy and his mind disentangled:

\textsuperscript{44}Guilday, Life and Times of John Carroll, p. 34.
He saw sold in the streets without restraint libels on the Jesuits in which the prayers of the Mass were burlesqued, and treaties assailing the Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The overthrow of the Society of Jesus was the common topic, and was expected when Spain declared her will.\textsuperscript{45}


\textbf{The End and the Beginning: Bruges and Home}

In that same month, July 1773, Clement XIV proscribed the Jesuits. John Carroll, working as prefect of the order at the time, wrote his brother of his sorrow.\textsuperscript{46} He was so greatly burdened that he wrote that immediate death would be the greatest blessing God could give him. But realizing the reality of the situation, he saw himself ready to accept whatever God willed to come. On October 14, 1773, the College at Bruges was broken into. Father Carroll and his fellow priests, Fathers Angiers and Plowden, were arrested. It was at

\textsuperscript{45}Shea, \textit{History of the Roman Catholic Church}, pp. 36-37.

\textsuperscript{46}John Carroll, quoted in Guilday, \textit{Life and Times of John Carroll}, p. 53.
this time that all of Carroll's private papers and his correspondence with his mother and relatives in Maryland was confiscated. Never have they been discovered. Again, Carroll was put to flight. This time he went to Liege, where the secularized English Jesuits had begun a college. He did not remain there, however, but accompanied the boys who had to return to England, where he himself spent some time as chaplain to the family of Lord Arundel of Wardour Castle.

Carroll wanted to go home so in the spring of 1774 he set sail. He had left home in 1748 a boy of thirteen; now he was returning, a man of almost forty! By this time the pamphlet war between England and the colonies had already begun. The Intolerable Acts had been instituted; Boston Port had been closed; the Quartering Act had unified the spirit of the colonies. John Carroll was no stranger to conflict. What else had he known during much of his life in Religious Orders? And during his stay in England, he had kept abreast of the political situation in his homeland. He was already geared for the role which lay ahead. He was the first priest in the rebellious colonies to refuse obedience to the last English, Superior Father John Lewis. Carroll
returned home to a field ready for cultivation. The harvest was to come later, after the toil and sweat, after the flight for ecclesiastical as well as political freedom.

John Carroll was to become the leader of the Catholic Church in America. The first step in this direction was taken when he was appointed Bishop of Baltimore, November 6, 1789. Many honors were to fall on John Carroll, but the one accomplishment of which he was most proud was the founding of Georgetown University, which made it possible for Catholics to be educated here in the United States.

Summary

Chapter IV was concerned with the education of John Carroll, the first American Bishop of the Catholic Church. His schooling was discussed from what he was given in a small secretly-carried-on institution at Bohemia Manor in Northeastern Maryland to the renowned Jesuit seminaries of Europe. The Ratio Studiorum, the curriculum and process of teaching of the Society of Jesus, was described and the dissolution of the Society was discussed. Although this study is not intended to be
a biography of John Carroll, it was necessary to use biographical study in order to reach the primary goal—that of studying what the ecclesiastical education of a colonial Catholic was like. Because this paper is not centrally about John Carroll but about his schooling, that is to say, his formal education, his accomplishments as an American Bishop are only mentioned, not extensively described or analyzed. The intent in this part of the study is to show the difficulty and hardships that Catholics faced in training their youth for the religious life.
CHAPTER V

THE COLONIAL EDUCATION OF A
REVOLUTIONARY GENTLEMAN

Introduction

Chapter V will be a model case study of how one Catholic family in colonial Maryland sought to educate its children despite the stringent and unfair laws barring the schooling of Catholics. The education of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the only Irish Catholic signer of the Declaration of Independence and leader in the pursuit of religious liberty in the new government of the United States, is the basis of this part of the dissertation. As has already been indicated, the writer of this study does not make the claim that the education of Charles Carroll of Carrollton was typical of all Catholic colonial Marylanders, but certainly it is not atypical of wealthy Catholic colonists.
Family Background of Charles Carroll

Charles Carroll of Carrollton was born in Annapolis, Maryland, on September 19, 1737. Because Charles Carroll himself was so molded by family tradition, the matter of his background is significant.

Socially, Charles Carroll's background was impeccable. His ancestors in Ireland had, indeed, been Kings! Granted, they had ruled over very small Kingdoms for a king in Ireland was analogous to a clan chieftain in Scotland. Nevertheless, the ancestry of Charles Carroll, the signer of the Declaration of Independence, has been traced to Florence O'Carroll, King of Ely, County Kings, Ireland, in the thirteenth century. (See Genealogy Chart in Appendix A.)

Most biographers state that Charles Carroll's grandfather, usually designated Charles, the Founder or the Attorney General, came to Maryland in October 1688 at the age of twenty-eight. He had been educated in France and was, to be sure, a polished Irish gentleman. He did not enter the new world empty-handed; with him came Lord Baltimore's commission as Attorney General for the Province of Maryland which, in turn, brought him a
salary of twelve thousand pounds of tobacco over and above all manner of Fees, Perquisites, and Advantages whatsoever which do belong or ought to belong unto the said in as large and ample manner as any Attorney General of the Said Province hitherto received or ought to have received the same.¹

Little did the Founder dream that his life as a new world gentleman would take the path it was to follow the next June. William and Mary had taken the throne of England, James was in exile in France, and, since Maryland was not an ordinary colony but a palatinate, the colonists waited for orders from Lord Baltimore as to what steps to take. Nobody knew that Baltimore had sent a messenger with instructions to proclaim William and Mary but that the messenger had died before the news could be delivered. Baltimore himself had not time to send another before the Protestants moved against the capitol and seized control of the Government. Needless to say, King William chose to believe their story and appointed his own governor of Maryland, Lionel Copley, who arrived in the colony in 1691. Although Lord Baltimore continued to receive revenues from Maryland, he was stripped of his

power to govern there. With his fall came the demise of Charles Carroll, Attorney General, and the birth of Charles Carroll, rebel and revolutionary. From 1691-1694 Carroll was in and out of jail for "high misdemeanors" which usually meant irreverent snipings at the provincial government or pro-Catholic propaganda. When the anti-Catholic hysteria of 1688 subsided, Carroll went into law practice and when the capital was moved from St. Marys to Annapolis, Charles Carroll moved, too. In addition to making money at law, he was a storekeeper and planter. Thanks to his patron, Lord Baltimore, he owned about sixty thousand acres of land which he named after family estates back in Ireland. And thanks to his own skill and acumen, he was able to acquire more lands and more money. Accused of extortion and usury, but clever and skilled in the knowledge of law, he managed to prevail.

After the death of William, Queen Anne was in a quandary over who should succeed her. The choices lay between James III, a Catholic, and a distant cousin George of Hanover, a Protestant. In the midst of confusion, Lord Baltimore's son announced that he had seen the error of his ways and conformed to the Church of England. That he would get back the palatinate of
Maryland after his father's death, of course, had an extreme bearing on his decision. So Charles Carroll could hardly lose. If James were crowned king, he would stand to gain rewards for his faithfulness to church and crown in times of stress; if George of Hanover became king, the new Lord Baltimore would get back his father's power. Charles Carroll, the right hand of the old Lord, could only win. Seeing that the time was right, Queen Anne had been succeeded by George, the old Lord Baltimore was dying, Charles Carroll decided to take a trip to England. While he was there, Lord Baltimore died. Carroll acted as the attorney for his widow. Shortly thereafter the new lord died and was succeeded by his son, Charles, a minor. With his ever present craft and cunning, Charles Carroll returned to Maryland armed with an appointment as "chief agent Escheator, Naval Offices, and Receiver General," and was authorized to conduct all of Lord Baltimore's business. In fact, Carroll had permission to all but run the government of Maryland. Thus, Governor Hart was not particularly enamoured of Charles Carroll, the Founder.

But the power was not to be his for long. In 1720, Carroll, stripped of position but not of courage,
died in Annapolis. Ellen Hart Smith considers him the link between two men important beyond the bounds of Maryland. One was Cecilius Lord Baltimore, the author of the Toleration Act, and the other, his own grandson, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who signed the Declaration of Independence, helped establish religious freedom in Maryland, and later for the new United States.²

The founder left behind Mary Darnall Carroll, his second wife and four of their ten children, all of whom were educated in France because of the oppressive anti-Catholic laws which made it impossible for them to receive in Maryland instruction in their own faith. Both parents had made the wearisome journey to visit their children at school. All three Carroll sons were educated at the College of St. Omer, a fashionable school for the sons of wealthy Catholic gentlemen. The eldest son, Henry, who had also studied law in London, died at sea on his way home to Maryland when he was only twenty-two. When the Founder died the next year, 1720, eighteen-year-old Charles took over the family burdens. The youngest son, Daniel, stayed in Europe to complete his education,

²Ibid., pp. 20-21.
while Charles, a fine student, was to remain bitter all 
his life about abortive studies of law and familial 
responsibilities. Late in years he wrote to Clement Hill 
in 1761, "I have from the time I came from school, in the 
year 1720, to the year 1757, been a constant servant of 
my family."

Being a Carroll in eighteenth century Maryland 
was not hopeless even if one were Catholic. Charles 
Carroll of Annapolis, as he was known, had enough money 
to command anybody's respect. True to his Irish 
heritage, like his father, he possessed a talent for. 
antagonizing governors and therefore spent some time in 
jail. But when one is able to amass the greatest fortune 
in all the American colonies by the time he is middle-
aged, one does attract attention. Most of his money 
Carroll made by lending money for exorbitant interest, 
the usury his father had been accused of earlier. His

3 Thomas O'Brien Hanley, Charles Carroll of 
Carrollton, The Making of a Revolutionary Gentleman 
p. 31.

4 From the correspondence during 1761-63 of Charles 
and his father, it is obvious that the older man is an 
usurer.
account books show that at one time or another two-thirds of the population of Annapolis was in his debt.

And Charles Carroll realized that his only weapon was money. The government was becoming more and more hostile to Catholics. During Charles of Annapolis' time Catholics could not vote or hold public office, could not practice law, could not hold church services, or could not instruct children. They were taxed for the support of the Church of England, thereby being responsible for the support of two churches. And because they had their children educated as Catholics, they were liable to exorbitant fines. Wealth was Charles Carroll's only hope for prestige and influence. Charles Carroll of Annapolis had only money, not position or power; whereas his father was an optimist, he was a pessimist. That is, most of the time. Remembering that his father begat ten children, six of whom died before adulthood, Carroll has a massive mansion built in Annapolis for his bride, Elizabeth Brooke. But the house was not to be full; in this house their only child was born on September 19, 1737. They called him Charles after his father and grandfather and later he would be known as Charles Carroll of Carrollton.
Education in Maryland

Charles Carroll's childhood was apparently happy and uneventful as there is no record which indicates otherwise. That is, no documents certify that he, as a child, was made to suffer undue daily hardships because of his religion. But, again, it is essential to remember that the Carrolls were extremely wealthy and, perhaps, better able to elude the stark reality of the penal laws. The one persistent pattern throughout the life of Charles Carroll of Carrollton is that he was considered "puny" by his parents and himself. He was constantly worried about his health as shown in his letters to his parents while he is away at school. His first elementary instruction was from his mother, who, although lacking a French education, was a great reader and an excellent speller. But by the time he was ten his parents realized that he needed the experience of school life and the companionship of other children. Thus, in 1747, Charles Carroll was sent to Bohemia Manor Academy in the Northeastern corner of Maryland. 5

5 Hereafter Charles or Charles Carroll will always refer to Charles Carroll of Carrollton; the Founder, his grandfather; and Charles of Annapolis, Charles' father.
Carroll, America's first Catholic bishop, was a fellow student there. Bohemia Manor Academy was a Jesuit school broader in scope than most schools of the time. Its goals included a practical and useful education. The curriculum consisted of bookkeeping, rudiments of surveying, and navigation, as well as the classics.  

Guilday asserts that the school, although started around 1744, lasted only a very short time because the laws against Catholic education had become so stringent. And it is true that all historians writing about this school and this time conjecture similarly.

At Bohemia Manor, along with John and Charles Carroll were the Neales, Hoxtons, Heaths, and Brents, all sons of wealthy Catholics, all who were adamant that their children be instructed in the faith. At one time it is reported that as many as forty children were enrolled at Bohemia.


8 See Chapter III for discussion of Bohemia Manor.

9 Guilday, Life and Times of John Carroll, p. 15.
But for a Catholic to be educated beyond the simplicities of reading, writing, arithmetic, and a few manual skills, took planning, plotting, sacrificing, and spending. As the cleavage with the Catholic past widened in England, the education of Catholic children was more difficult and an "outlaw race of schools, colleges, and seminaries was begun beyond the sea." Schools in the English colonies were regulated by the same penal code as prevailed in England and Catholic children could enter only at the price of their faith. The Act of 1700 for preventing the growth of Popery read:

Whoever shall be convicted of sending any child or other person beyond the seas, out of the king's obedience to the intent that such child or person shall be educated in the Roman religion, shall forfeit 100# for the sole use and benefit of him who shall discover any person so offending.10

It is, consequently, very easy to understand the precarious position of Catholic parents. It was, as previously stated, treasonable for Catholics to send their children to English Catholic colleges on the continent. If the English Act of 1700 were not enough to stifle

Catholics' education in the colonies, the Maryland law of 1704 for the further prevention of Popery made it illegal for Catholics to carry on schoolwork. Paradoxically, it had been the Jesuits who in 1634, on the arrival of the first colonists, began the establishment of a school system for the colony; little, if anything, was done in the way of public secular education. Now, though, in 1704, it was illegal to hire anyone but a Protestant tutor. If a parent were found guilty of having his child tutored by a Catholic, the fine was forty shillings, and if he were caught sending his child abroad to learn, he was liable to a fine of one hundred pounds. Education was closed to Catholic children unless their own parents could teach them.

Many wealthy Catholics defied the law and sent their sons to Europe under assumed names while others secretly hired Catholic tutors. In any event, the alternatives were not conducive to the development of a Catholic gentleman on this side of the Atlantic Ocean, so to Europe Charles sailed in 1748 to attend a Jesuit school patterned after the *Ratio Studiorum* of Ignatius Loyola.
St. Omers had been founded in 1593 for the education of priests and lay persons. The town itself had a population of twenty thousand and it lay only twenty-four miles from Calais, making it easily accessible to England. Because of the proximity and because English Jesuits controlled the seminary, many wealthy Englishmen sent their sons to St. Omers to be educated. In fact, by the time Charles Carroll and his cousin, Jacky, arrived, wealthy Roman Catholic boys from all over the world were attending school there, not to mention numerous other Marylanders, who were also scholars in exile.

The records concerning Charles' stay at St. Omers consist mainly of letters he wrote to his father in Annapolis and his father's replies. It is probably the case that the Jesuit curriculum was followed, since the institution was run by the Jesuits, and since it was

11 Great controversy surrounds the date of the founding of St. Omers, and 1592 is the date traditionally accepted; however, recent research by Hubert Chadwick, S.J., reported in St. Omers to Stonyhurst: A History of Two Centuries (London: Burns & Oates, 1962), p. 9, and chaps. 1 and 2 cite 1593 as the date.
known as a place for the instruction of Catholic gentry who would occupy places of leadership in society; therefore, it is also probable that Charles Carroll was educated after the manner of that Ratio Studiorum discussed in Chapter IV.

**Student Days of Charles Carroll at St. Omers**

Life at St. Omers must have been confusing for Charles Carroll. Having spent his first ten years in a revolutionary society in Maryland, it was disconcerting to notice the English students seemingly content with the irreversible defeat of 1688. Their main intent seemed to be to keep their faith and their wealth which supported and maintained close family ties. Charles Carroll was not to accept passivity in exchange for civil liberty.

Charles' days at St. Omers began with 5:00 mass, followed by an hour of study and then breakfast. He tried to learn the syntax of Latin and Greek so that he could speak Latin in class. This chore he did not especially like, and neither did many of his colleagues,

---

as shown by their revolt against it in 1754 after which some of the ringleaders were expelled. 13

Another part of his study not pursued with eagerness was penmanship. As he had agreed to write his father twice a year, he grudgingly did so but pleaded an injured arm, saying, "I hope to accomplish my studies to you [sic] satisfaction . . . I hope you and all my friends will excuse me for not writing [sic] for yesterday falling down, I hurt my arm very much." 14 The next letter, however, shows great improvement in penmanship and says, "I can easily see the great affection you have for me by sending me heer to a college, where I may not only be a learned man, but also be advanced in piety and devotion." 15

13 Ibid., p. 23.

14 Letter from Charles Carroll of Carrollton to his parents, 4 September 1749. All letters of Charles Carroll and his family are from the Carroll papers at the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore. Father Thomas O'Brien Hanley has carefully edited the papers and made them available on microfilm. Those quoted in this study have been read both in the original and on microfilm. For the sake of simplicity, all correspondence documentation will mention merely the writer and the addressee.

15 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, March 1750.
He has problems with spelling. "I hope you will not blame me for spelling ill for my cousin Atony [sic] blames me very much for it."\textsuperscript{16} He tells his father that he is ranked fifth in a class of twenty-three boys, that he has an exceeding kind master, and that he is sorry not to have written sooner, but his studies are very demanding. It does seem difficult to believe that two letters per year were too taxing for one's schedule. In the same letter, he sends greetings from Jacky Carroll and Watty Hoxton, two boys who had left Maryland at the same time he did. He also remarks that Jacky is "mighty beloved in the house" and that he will probably make a good scholar, for he was often first in his class.\textsuperscript{17}

One of the recognized strengths of Jesuit Colleges throughout Europe was the way in which their organization made it possible for one cultured adult to exert a personal influence upon a developing adolescent. This was accomplished by having the same Jesuit teacher instruct the same group of boys through grammar, syntax, rhetoric, and poetry. As previously pointed out, competition was

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{17}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 22 March 1750.
emphasized and seemed to be a workable device to inspire learning. Charles Carroll was extremely fortunate, for soon after his arrival in St. Omers he had for his tutor and master his cousin, Anthony Carroll, a descendant of the family who had remained in Ireland. Anthony was only twenty-nine years old and not yet a priest but his influence on Charles was never questioned. Anthony loved French culture and literature, and Charles came to do so. Although there is no extant record to prove when Anthony left St. Omers for preparation for the priesthood at Liege, Hanley suggests that it was probably sometime in 1751. At that time Charles still needed help with arithmetic which he did not like, and he wanted more than just a graceful and easy carriage so he wanted to take formal dancing lessons. Also, since he had become very much interested in reading, he started his own collection of books. When Charles wrote his father in March 1751 this is what he said:

Dear Papa

I embrace this opportunity to write to you by Mr. Henry Carroll, but since I have but little time on account of the fiction I must be short. Cousin Anthony forced me to write to
you. I have very little to tell you only
that I am very well. I am your most dutiful
and obedient son.

Charles Carroll\textsuperscript{18}

Charles Carroll's school life seemed very typical of any
young boy in a Jesuit school. Before he left St. Omers,
however, his father wrote a lengthy letter concerning his
education and the political situation in Maryland. The
letter, which is important because of its bearing on
Charles, is replicated in Appendix B. Charles of
Annopolis warned:

Children learn like parrots; memory and prac­
tice aid them chiefly, but men of sense do
not content themselves with knowing a thing,
but make themselves thoroughly acquainted
with the reasons on which the knowledge is
formed. I beg you will carefully observe
this in your present and future studies.
Memory may fail you, but when an impression
is made by reason it will last as long as you
retain your understanding.\textsuperscript{19}

Charles Carroll, finished with his initial European
schooling, left St. Omers to continue his study at the
French Jesuit College at Rheims. But the years at
St. Omers were those which were to stand out in Charles'

\textsuperscript{18}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of
Annopolis, March 1751.

\textsuperscript{19}Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles
Carroll, 10 October 1753.
mind. As Charles Pise declared in his oration honoring Charles Carroll of Carrollton after his death in 1832:

he had to bid adieu to home and country and seek a foreign shore in order to obtain that education which adorned his person . . . the university of St. Omers—the seminary of martyrs, the school of confessors . . . this College was under the care of the Jesuits . . . to them he attributed all that he knew— to their solicitude he referred all that valued in his acquirements; and particularly that deep and hallowed conviction of religious truth, which was the ornament of his youth, and the solace of his old age . . . when he was very old, Charles Carroll was asked how he was able to rise so early and kneel so long, he answered, "I learned under the Jesuits at the College of St. Omers." 20

The five-and-one-half years at St. Omers had given Charles a disciplined spirit of life from which he was never to depart.

Rheims

The exact date for Charles Carroll's leaving St. Omers is unclear. Hanley sets it in 1754, but other sources, the letters, indicate that it could have been 1756 or late 1755, because no letters are available for

a long period of time, perhaps due to shipwrecks, thefts, and simply no dates on the letters. Consequently, although we set up a framework of the whole time Charles was abroad, we simply cannot specify exactly where he was at all times. The problem is that for almost eight years of his schooling, very few documents are available.

Although Charles of Annapolis had been pleased with his son's progress at St. Omers, he wanted Charles to go to Rheims where his cousin Anthony was. Anthony was to be Charles' tutor for three more years, going with Charles when he left Rheims for Paris. Anthony himself once said that Charles of Annapolis was the only person whom he had heard of who seemed so completely content with his son's tutor. 21

Shortly after his arrival at Rheims, Charles received a letter from his father. In this extremely long letter, Charles of Annapolis exhorted his son to study hard, to realize that "what may become a man in one country may be very ridiculous in another . . . but let your actions be your own, natural and . . . [word is

21Letter from Anthony Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 10 February 1758.
blotted]." Further, he suggests that Charles learn fencing and dancing as they contribute to a "graceful carriage." Also, Mrs. Carroll requested that Charles have his portrait done "about 15 inches long and 10 inches wide." And, she, too, had other recommendations. He should take care of his teeth as well as his hair, since wigs were not particularly stylish at this point. She would, in addition, like an account of his height and weight. Finally, his father lightly reprimanded him:

You have not begun your letters Dr. Papa and Mama as I formerly requested nor wrote to your mother this year, although she is not, I think she has reason to be displease, I attribute it to inattention; but for the future, be more considerate.

Charles studied with the Jesuits at Rheims for a year. His course of study now was poetry, history, geography, and heraldry. He had much more freedom at Rheims than at the restrictive St. Omers, and that he liked. He had his portrait drawn for his mother as she had requested, and, for the most part, he was content there in the shadow of the great cathedral where Joan of

---

22 Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, 30 September 1754.
of Arc had been the moving force of a revolution which had driven Britain out of France.

Paris

By fall 1755 Charles felt academically and temperamentally ready to proceed to Paris for his philosophical studies.23 Again, at this point, historical accuracy cannot be specifically established. Charles, never excelling at arithmetic, beclouds the facts concerning the dates of his European education. The following is his own summarization of his education.

In 1747 I left Maryland to be educated in ye college of English Jesuits at St. Omer, where I continued 5-1/2 years from thence I was removed to a college of French Jesuits at Rheims, from which place after a years residence I went to Louis-le-Grand at Paris, and continued there two years. . . . From Paris I went to Bourges to study ye civil law, or Roman law; in 18 months I returned to Paris, and after ten months stay, set out for London toward ye close of ye year 1758. I live in London near 4 years and embarked on ye 20th of Sept. 1764 at Gravesend for Md.24

It seems obvious to anyone who has even a little more arithmetical skill than Charles Carroll that something

23Hanley, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, p. 31
24Letter from Charles Carroll to Countess Auzouer, 20 September 1771.
is wrong. He wrote his father in March 1750 that he had been in St. Omer eight months and was writing his third letter home. And secondly, if he went to London in 1758 and left in 1764, he was there nearly six years, not four. It is recorded that he did arrive in Maryland in January 1765; Ellen Hart Smith asserts that the contradiction about dates is one of the reasons Carroll's biographers have glided swiftly past his schooldays.\textsuperscript{25} Part of the problem lies in the fact that most college records in France were destroyed during World War I. Another problem is, of course, Charles' inability to or unwillingness to be exact about dates. Nevertheless, we do know that Charles left Rheims after a year's study, whatever the year, and began his education in Paris where he was to be confronted with the ideas of Locke, Montesquieu, and Voltaire, later to become an essential part of the philosophy of Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

Whereas the study of French and the classics had prevailed in Charles' earlier education, now the emphasis lay on the Nationalistic movement of eighteenth century France. His whole last year in Paris was centered around

\textsuperscript{25}Smith, \textit{Charles Carroll of Carrollton}, p. 34.
not only the developing humanism of the era, but also an exploration of new Christian implications in contemporary intellectual horizons and cultural developments.

Although Charles Carroll wanted very much for his father to be present at his comprehensive public defense of philosophy in Paris in 1758, Charles of Annapolis was delayed by business. On his arrival in Paris, Charles of Annapolis disclosed the real reason for his trip to Europe. Certainly, he would like to have been present for Charles' defense, but a grave situation in Maryland necessitated the delay. The following plan was proposed to his son: Charles Carroll of Annapolis had devised a scheme for the relocation of Maryland Catholics in what is now the Southeastern part of Arkansas.

Charles already knew of his father's dealing to help the refugee Acadians displaced by the English in the French Indian War. Charles of Annapolis had been a leading proponent for their relocation, some in Maryland,

26Carroll's biographers, Smith, Rowland, and Leonard disagree with Father Hanley that Charles of Annapolis was present for his son's defense; and they are, indeed, correct. See Appendix B, Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis in London, 26 July 1757. In this letter, Charles discusses his examination.
some in the Louisiana territory. But when his father revealed his new plan for the relocation of the Carrolls, Charles balked. Realizing that the double tax law which had been passed in 1756 was unfair and unjust, agreeing that Maryland's discrimination against Catholics was cruel and unjust, Charles Carroll still wanted to go back to Maryland. He was homesick. After all, he had not seen his mother for almost ten years, he wanted to see the house on Spa Creek, the improvements his father had made at Doughoregan Manor. He merely wanted to read, farm, go to the races and the theater; he had no ambition to practice law or hold public office. He wanted only the leisurely life of a Maryland country gentleman.

For Charles of Annapolis came disappointment and the feeling of failure when French officials refused his request of the Louisiana Land Grant; but for Charles of Carrollton, a challenge. He reminded his father of the very words he had received from him in a time of adversity—that peace and calm are not to be expected by those who pursue an ocean voyage, let alone on the course a minority had to travel. With the close of his father's visit, Charles begged him to let him go home. All over Paris the two argued about whether or not Charles should
go back to Maryland or remain in Europe to study law. But being his father's dutiful son, Charles acquiesced and agreed to go to Bourges to begin the study of civil law.  

Bourges

Charles' trip to Bourges was not at all an enjoyable one. He wrote his father soon after his arrival:

I never in my life made so slow and dull and melancholy a journey. I believe it will be the last time that I shall ever go in a publick coach. My servant seems to be a good and honest boy, but is very awkward and simple.  

It was not only that the trip was miserable and his servant simple; Charles had other complaints, complaints very similar to those of any twentieth century student away from home:

I question very much whether a 100 pounds a year will suffice. There are so many unforeseen expenses that occur. I believe I may do genteely with 100 and twenty, I should be stinted too much with only a 100. However,

---

27 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 10 August 1758.

28 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 1 January 1758.
be assured I shall manage as well as I can and with the best . . . [manuscript is blurred] I am capable of. My journey here cost 78# some sols, my place above and baggage cost 50#. Part of dinner is eat out. There is enough to make in all 26 shirts. The woman takes for making 'em 30 sols a piece. Some of 'em must absolutely have work'd ruffles: for nobody here wears plain ones when he goes into company. I don't as yet know how much that expense may amount to.29

The rest of this letter shows Charles in an even more student-like setting. It deals with his plan to "get on the good side" of his instructor:

The intendent is a man that likes belles-letters and is particularly limited with English books; I know I should do him a singular favor and sensible pleasure in lending him such books: by that means I may be able to insinuate myself into his favor, which is of no little consequence in the place. Each European payes his court to him; he is like a little King; every Sunday and holyday the principal people in town go to pay their respects to him. You may see by this that a person who is favored with all his friendships, must certainly be respected and considered in town. This letter is pretty long and I think capable of letting you see into my present situation.

P.S. I dined yesterday with the Intendent. I had been to carry the Horace I had promised him and he invited me to dine with; there were 16 persons at the table of whom 4 or 5 were ladys; after dinner they

29Ibid.
played at pique, but as there were 2 or 3 others that did not play I excused myself.\textsuperscript{30}

In just one month, Charles writes his father again, still concerned with impressing his intendent, Mr. Champion, and still disgusted with his life at Bourges:

I live quite retired, see little or no company. I have 2 or 3 reasons for acting thus: 1st because there is no instruction to be reaped in those companies when they do anything but play at cards, 2nd because I can't go one night into company without going a 2d, 3d, and 4th and so on the whole week. Company is kept here regularly from 5 to 9 at the clock one night in one gentleman's house, another in another's. If I go to one I shall be invited to another and can't absent myself without committing an impoliteness. Frequenting this company regularly brings on a great loss of time. I went a few days ago to a ball given by the intendent but did not dance. I was a perfect stranger and not well acquainted with their dances. I believe I shall take a dancing master for 4 or 5 months or thereabouts.\textsuperscript{31}

A P.S. says:

I have taken a new servant, my old one had not one good quality excepting honesty and several bad ones. And I shan't neglect your advice concerning merchants accounts and arithmetic;

\textsuperscript{30}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{31}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 4 February 1758.
but all things in good time; he who undertakes too much will do nothing.\textsuperscript{32}

So Charles decided to learn to dance better, which paid off because he soon attended a masqued ball where he danced all evening "with one of the most beautifull [sic] young ladies I ever saw."\textsuperscript{33} He did not like playing cards, as he had told his father, but Charles of Annapolis reminded him that he "must conform to their amusements and learn to play at cards."\textsuperscript{34}

Whether it was to reassure his father that he was, indeed, studying or whether it was to ameliorate a guilty conscience for snobbery, Charles again wrote his father and mother about his life at Bourges:

My chief, nay, my almost only amusement is reading; I find no conversation more agreeable than that of a Horace's, a Virgil's, a Racine's, and their company is instructive and at the same time agreeable. . . . Sometimes I forsake the poets and prefer the mellodious harmony of the muses for the profitable and faithful lessons of history; Here I learn to be wise at the expense of

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{33}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 14 June 1758.

\textsuperscript{34}Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, n.d.
others and to attain to true glory by the example of the great, good and just. 35

Oh, what ecstasy in the ears of a parent! He does, however, engage in other kinds of activity. Traveling around the countryside (he never mentions the mode of transportation, but being aware of his aversion of public coaches, we could speculate that he went by horseback, for he does talk of riding lessons from time to time in his letters), he amused himself. During one of these excursions, he met his first romantic interest, a Miss Alcock, whose father owned a button factory. He describes Mr. Alcock's method of making buttons as curious and interesting, but not half so amusing as his young, pretty, witty daughter. 36 That time, when he returned to school, he said he felt "dull and pensive."

During the summer of 1758, Charles was studying French Civil Law with Mr. Champion. But Mr. Champion did not meet Charles' expectations as an instructor of French Civil Law, and he was the only person in Bourges available. Charles describes him as inferior, and if it

35 Letter from Charles Carroll to his parents, 14 June 1758.
36 Ibid.
were not enough that the only available teacher was inferior, the greatest catastrophe of all occurred. Poor Champion died very suddenly of "a violent pleuricy" and Charles Carroll was forced to quit Bourges and return to Paris. 37

Paris Again

As he had never been caught up in the society of Bourges, Charles was glad to be back in Paris. Father Crookshank, his tutor from philosophy days, greeted him and assisted him with his studies. In the optimism of the Enlightenment, Charles was excited about progress, about the future, and about his own place in that future. The controversy over Voltaire was at its zenith; certainly, Charles did not agree with all that Voltaire said about the Church, because he saw the Catholic Church in Maryland as a channel of freedom. He saw no reason why he could not be both a learned and complete gentleman and a Christian, as well, and he realized his father's concern for his total well-being.

37 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 7 January 1759.
If I practiced what you teach, I should not only be a complete gentleman, but a good Christian, which is much ye most important objective. A good conscience and a virtuous life are certainly ye greatest blessings we can enjoy on earth. I don't aim nor never did at cannonization [sic]; I detest served up devotion, disturbed faces, grimaces, I equally abhor those, who laugh at all devotion, look upon our religion as a fiction, and its holy misteries as the greatest obsurdition. I observe my religious duties, I trust in ye mercy of God not my own merits, which are none, I hope he will pardon my daily offences. I retain as yet that salutary fear of his justice which by ye wisest of men instilled initium sapientiale. I love him tho far less than his infinite goodness deserves and I could wish to do.38

Reflecting on the governments of France and other Catholic countries, Charles became very much frustrated. The situations at hand seem either to be bereft of civil liberty or religious liberty.

He spent his days in Paris observing the French legal system and frequenting bookstalls. At the request of his father, he bought "only the books most noted, Livy, Cicero, Horace, Virgil, and Caesar," and for diversion he also took up painting as he remarked, "I don't

---

38Ibid.
expect ever to be a Michele-Ange or a Raphael. I shall be able to amuse myself and that's all I desire."  

But the study of law was his task for the time being. He wrote his father:

A good insight into ye constitutional law of France would take 3 years hard study; ye administration of justice both civil and moral is different in every province and each has its own customs and each custom is commonly very different . . . an able lawyer in France would make an ignorant one where they follow the Roman law.

And the irony of the situation itself was that since he was a Roman Catholic, Charles could not actually practice law anyway.

Meanwhile, Charles of Annapolis wrote his son that the Carrolls were staying in Maryland in spite of the double tax on Catholics. But Charles of Annapolis moved his fortune away from land, and increased his sterling holdings. He kept his estate at Annapolis and one nearby; two country estates of thirteen thousand acres each. The Baltimore Iron Works was doing well, and it is said that Charles of Annapolis was the leading money lender in all the colonies. Charles Carroll could

---

40 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 22 June 1759.
now look toward going home to Maryland to live his life as a reformer in the gentlemanly fashion he had dreamed of.

**London, 1759-1764**

But first he must go to London to learn English Common Law. His father, as usual, had made arrangements for him. He was to have quarters at the Temple near the Inns of Court. As he had done in Bourges, he would receive private instruction three times a week and devote the remainder of his time to reading the masters of English law. Even if Charles could not be admitted to the Bar, his father reminded him that he could act as a counselor. He wrote:

> I do not send you to the Temple to spend (as many do) 4 or 5 years for no purpose, I send you to study and labour; it is that I expect from you do not disappoint my hopes. You have hitherto done well but all yt ye have done was but a preparation to do this well, finish worthily and apply as if yr whole sole dependances was to be on ye knowledge of ye law.  

In this long letter Charles of Annapolis advised his son not only on the study of law, but of the proper conduct

---

41 Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, December 1759. See Appendix B for letter containing the advice given to Charles Carroll by his father.
toward the proprietary family, toward the school fellows, and toward women. He reminded Charles that marriage without parental consent would not be smiled on and that he should be aware the wiles and whims of young women.

Charles, however, is not convinced that learning law in London is the best place for himself; he wants to get away from religious persecution and other trying situations that life in England presents. He cannot understand his mother's loyalty to such a country, and in the following passage his growing discontent is in evidence:

I can't conceive how any Roman Catholic can consent to live in England or any of the British Dominions, if he is able to do otherwise. Its true we are quiet and unmolested at present, because the reigning King is not prejudiced against us: but the most tyrannical laws are still subsisting they can be put into execution, today, tomorrow, whenever it shall please the King for the Parliament would always readily comply with such a demand. Now where is the man of spirit that can behold the rod lifted up, tremble, and kiss the hand of him that holds it. At this thought and all the wrongs we have unjustly suffered, I would wish with [manuscript is blurred].

Notwithstanding my natural aversion to all such appression, and to an humble, silent,

---

42Ibid.
growing submission. I would even rather bear all this, than be deprived of ye pleasure and comfort of living so happily together.43

And two months later finds Charles still preoccupied with civil and religious unrest:

True happiness on earth is not to be met with. . . . We suffer at present in Maryland for our religion, that same religion exposes us in England to ye very same oppression, which tho not openly even suspended for ye present may brake out anew whenever our government thinks proper. If you repair to France, then you will only exchange religious for civil Tyranny, and in my opinion of ye two ye greatest evils. Civil oppression has nothing to console us; religious persecutions are always attempted with this consultation at least, of not going unrewarded.44

But Charles continued to study law and to enter into London society in order to become astute at the political maneuvers of those who had power in Parliament and in the colonies. He visits Lord Baltimore and questions him about the harsh laws against Catholics in Maryland and reminds Baltimore of the proprietary's inactivity to deter such. He laments the condition of Maryland, but again pleads to come home, stating that he

43Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 10 December 1759.

44Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 30 [sic]. February 1760.
...can read and study in Maryland as well or better than in London, but agrees to abide by his father's will. Nevertheless, Charles was to remain in England. His father reminds him: love guided by reason prompts one to make ye rest of ye life happy, easy and ornamentale by giving you ye best education in my power and in particular by giving you an opportunity of acquiring a perfect knowledge of ye law without which I may say a gentleman is unfinished.

Just as Charles Carroll was apprehensive and disappointed about the political and religious climate, so was his father. He again refers to the cruel and unjust treatment of Roman Catholics and Maryland, and laments his age, reiterating that he would leave Maryland if only he were younger. Convincing Charles to stay on in London, the reply came, as one could expect:

I Must acknowledge the temple to be a more proper place to study the law in than my own home, where business or amusements (too often ye latter) engross our whole attention. Nothing but a sincere love guided by reason, I am persuaded, con'd have kept me so long

---

45 Ibid.

46 Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, 14 July 1760.

47 Ibid.
from you. The education you have given me, the care you have taken, the trouble and expense you have been at, are strong convincing proofs of this well regulated love. If I survive the remainder of my life may be easy and ornamental, but not happy: your remembrance will always be accompanied with grief! how shall I ever be able to think of you without shedding tears due to the memory of the best, the dearest, tenderest parent? But wherefore do I anticipate pains which perhaps I shall never live to feel.48

Now that a year's study had passed, Charles sought to modify his program. He considered placing himself under the more formal program of lectures at the Temple where he would not be bothered by his well-meaning friends' intrusions. At the same time he wanted to keep his independent tutor. Later he saw a need for more lectures based on practical application of the law. He chose Westminster and an arrangement which would provide considerable time for private reading and at the same time studying with Twinyhoe a few times a week. As he entered his second year of legal study in London, he sought to join a practicing law office in order to get

48 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 16 September 1760.
some real on-the-job training. He consulted with his father and Daniel Dulany on this matter.\textsuperscript{49}

But neither Dulany nor his father realized the obstacles in Charles' way. The Disabling Act of 1696 disqualified a Catholic from practicing law and to some extent from full access to training for the profession in England.\textsuperscript{50}

It is well to keep in mind that Charles could not have attended Oxford of Cambridge except for a specific program of lectures because no dissenter would swear the thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church. Why Charles did not attend the special common law lectures is unknown. But he failed to secure the arrangement he had been hoping for in a law office. As a result, he developed his own process of self-education. At Westminster where Parliament convened was the great hall where litigation was transacted by lawyers and judges. Here Charles was free to observe the law in the practical process of resolution. The obstacles placed in his path by institutions served only to clarify his philosophy

\textsuperscript{49}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{50}Hanley, \textit{Charles Carroll of Carrollton}, p. 76.
concerning the study and practice of law. He did not want to resemble one of those whom Cicero described as "an insignificant petty fogger, grubbing all my life in mean but gainful application to all the arts of chicane."\textsuperscript{51}

In addition to his study of law, Charles found time for other intellectual pursuits. The English theater he liked very much; after all, it had been influenced by France and writers like Moliere and Regnard. Still pursuing numbers at his father's request, he engaged a master for mathematics so that he could learn decimals and the Venetian system of bookkeeping which he was to use the rest of his life.\textsuperscript{52}

He also read the controversial literature of the day, especially that concerning denial of civil rights to Catholics. Having realized that he knew very little about Maryland law, he had written his father in April 1760 asking for a complete text of the Maryland laws. Within a year he had an abridgment of the Acts of the Assembly of Maryland, in which he could read the Charter, the early

\textsuperscript{51}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 16 September 1760.

\textsuperscript{52}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 16 December 1761.
Toleration Acts, and the Conditions of the Plantation; two months later he ordered a new edition of the statutes at large.

These provided the framework from which he developed his reform ideas and activities. Charles decided to work for the abolishment of religious oppression. He looked forward to the time when freedom would be restored in Maryland to what it had been before the 1688 revolution.  

Charles began revolutionary activities in London, learning as much as he could from social relations with the proprietary party. He visited often the former governor of Maryland, Mr. Bladen, and was entertained by Baltimore himself. He was determined to use his social acceptability as a means of legal reform. Charles had confidence in the gentry. And the years 1759-1761 saw him change from a dashing young student to a very skilled man of affairs. Without flamboyance or gauche, Charles Carroll carried on his study of law, and his movements toward reform that would one day result in

53 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 16 February 1761.
religious freedom for Maryland and the United States of America.

Although Charles led a full social life in London, he sorely missed his mother. In the fall of 1760 he heard rumors to the effect that his mother's health was not good. He wrote to his father,

Pray don't deceive me in the future. In all your letters you mention her being in good health and she sends me her blessing. Why can't she tell me in her own handwriting?^54

Charles' mother was, indeed, terminally ill. Losing her own mother that winter was especially hard for Elizabeth Carroll. She herself was confined to her bed on December 20, 1760, never leaving her room until her death March 12, 1761.55

It was ten days before Charles Carroll of Annapolis could bring himself to send Charles word of his mother's death. When he did write, he said:

If 4 physicians could have saved her, I wd still be blessed with her. Our loss is as great as such loss can be, to you she was a most tender Mother, to me ye best of wives

54 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 16 December 1761.

55 Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, 22 March 1761.
being a charming woman in every sense, remarkable for her good sense, eveness and sweetness, of her temper. She bore her tedious sickness with great patience and resignation and had all ye spiritual help ye church can bestow in such cases. Hence and from ye regularity of her life we have ye solid comfort of a well grounded hope yt her death was previous in yet sight of God.®6

Charles' father found the death of Eliza so painful that he wrote his son "For ye future let us mention her as seldom as possible, we can never cease to think of her and pray for her."®7

More than ever Charles Carroll longed to go home:

I wish you would permit me to return to Maryland in the next fleet, I am only doing here what I cou'd do as well at home. I am persuaded I can apply as closely to ye law in yr house as in the Temple.®8

But the reply came as Charles anticipated it would.

I endeavor to convince, I would always avoid ye harshness of a command, and I hope you will be persuaded that your welfare, interest, and happiness only induce me against my natural fondness and propensity to see you

®6Ibid.

®7Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, 10 November, 1761.

®8Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, 10 June 1761.
and have you with me, not to alter my Resolution in this respect.\textsuperscript{59}

So Charles dutifully stayed.

Charles of Annapolis had never ceased to warn his son about the wiles of women, but other than on one occasion, Charles had never really needed any advice about how to handle the fair sex. However, his father wrote again in September 1762 warning him of the dangers:

of letting our passion blind our understanding by not letting her know you have at least one designd on her as a wife until you know her, the sex are ye most artfull dissemblers, but nature will show itself.\textsuperscript{60}

The father had little to worry about. "I have never as yet seen the woman I shou'd chuse to marry. I have never been in love and hope I shall never be."\textsuperscript{61}

But Charles was to fall in love or at least become infatuated with seventeen-year-old Louisa Baker, the daughter of a West India gentleman.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{59}Letter from Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll, 29 December 1762.

\textsuperscript{60}Letter from Charles of Annapolic to Charles Carroll, 1 September 1762.

\textsuperscript{61}Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 19 February 1763.

\textsuperscript{62}The dates of the courtship are controversial. Smith asserts that Charles carelessly wrote the wrong
If he did not love Louisa, he acted strange for some reason. He could not keep his mind on law. His friends at the Crown and Anchor Inn made fun of him, and he trailed all over the south of England trying to find Mr. Baker to ask for Louisa's hand. When he did find Mr. Baker, he learned that the Baker fortune was, well, inconsiderable, that Louisa would have no dowry. But both Carrolls were willing to forego the money, for to Charles Louisa was enough in herself. Nevertheless, in April 1764, Mr. Baker told Charles that Louisa was too young, that if he wanted to come around again in five years, he would consider their marriage. Charles Carroll of Carrollton said thanks, but no thanks, gracefully exited and wrote his father that the marriage was off.

---

date on a letter to his father, writing 1761 instead of 1763. Hanley, conversely, notes that if this is true, then he wrote the wrong date more than once. The problem arises out of his mentioning visiting Paris. Smith accords him one visit to Paris from London in 1763 and Hanley says he went there twice, both in 1761 and 1763. Whatever the case, this study will not concentrate on the trivialities of Charles Carroll's unsuccessful courtship of Louisa Baker.

63 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 27 January 1764.

64 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 19 April 1764.
During his final two years in London, Charles involved himself more and more with the politics of his home colony. As the year wore on, his stand for republicanism as idealized by Montesquieu became stronger; he visualized an American republic. He shrewdly fixed his attention on the heart of the controversy which would lead to rebellion, Parliament's restrictions on the American colonies. He sent a copy of the American Act, which made provision for the Stamp Tax on Americans. In April he sent his father Consideration on the Penal Laws Against Roman Catholics. He saw the present Parliament as the same institution which had in 1688 taxed and restricted Catholic dissenters. Religious freedom was also involved in a move for independence from Parliament.

As he summarized his aspirations for the colonies, Carroll said, "America is a growing country; in time it will and must be independent." He boarded the Randolph at Gravesend in July 1764 and reached Baltimore in January 1765. For much too long he had been a scholar in exile.

---

65 Letter from Charles Carroll to Charles of Annapolis, 26 July 1764.
Summary

Chapter V has been devoted to the educational case study of Charles Carroll, a colonial scholar in exile, who became an important member of the American revolutionary movement, and, later, a wealthy country gentleman. The family background of Carroll was brought to light since the family was Catholic and had important bearings on how young Charles was to be educated. His brief entry into colonial education in his own province of Maryland was mentioned, while his European education was dealt with in much more detail. From his introduction to Europe at St. Omers, to his first stay in Paris, to Bourges, back to Paris, and, finally, to London, we followed Charles Carroll in his steps toward becoming a Christian gentleman. His revolutionary activities in London, his love affair with Miss Baker, his pursuit of Voltaire, Montesquieu, and the French theater, as well as his demonstrated devotion to his family and his Church were pointed out. His desire for civil and religious freedom, his pursuit and perseverance all contribute to his stature as a respected American statesman, who, despite seemingly insurmountable obstacles, was able to
get an education and to use that education for the betterment of his countrymen.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Chapter VI will contain the rationale of the study, a summary of previous chapters, conclusions reached as a result of the research, and recommendations for further study.

Rationale

Interest in this study grew from a problem encountered with Bernard Bailyn's claim that the family, the community, and the church were the agencies of education for colonial children. One can accept this claim for the preponderance of colonial children, since the preponderance of colonial children were Protestant. But what about Catholic children? How were they educated? These questions led to the investigation of the ways in which Catholic parents sought to educate their children.
Since Maryland was the colony with the most Catholics, it seemed natural to focus the research on the educative practices of colonial Marylanders.

Because Catholics took schooling as their model for education early on, and looked to the schools to train their youth for positions of leadership which their family situation inherently bestowed, it follows that Catholic schools would have flourished in Maryland. But this was not the case as the English Penal Code, along with Maryland laws, forbade the schooling of Catholics by Catholic instructors. Thus, it became the goal of this researcher to find out how Catholics were educated in colonial Maryland.

It is true that the audience for such a work is not broad and expansive; it is true that no architectonic institutions will rise or fall as a result of one study of one small segment of the population. It is true that neither John Carroll nor his cousin Charles, the two subjects studied in this work, is the most celebrated of American colonials, whether they be ecclesiastical or political. It is true that neither represents the typical American. But it is also true that a study of
their education has important ramifications in the history of education and in American history writ large.

Both are historically important. John Carroll, as the first American bishop of the Catholic Church, set the precedent for American Catholic liberal education with the founding of Georgetown University in 1789. A look at almost any contemporary Catholic High School would provide evidence that the Ratio Studiorum has had an impact on twentieth century Catholic schooling. Also, as was pointed out in Chapter I, it is he who is given credit for the conversion of Elizabeth Seton to Catholicism; and it may be Elizabeth Seton and the Sisters of Charity who set the precedent for Catholic elementary schooling. Not only did John Carroll speak out on religious matters; he was part of the envoy which visited Quebec in 1776 to try to persuade Canadian Catholics to join the rebel cause. Although this mission was considered a political failure, Father Carroll's importance as a person to be respected and reckoned with must be acknowledged. Finally, his insistence on opening Catholic schools to all promoted true religious freedom and liberty in a country which had heretofore not known it. So it is
to the traditions set down by Bishop Carroll that Catholic schooling in the United States is faithful today.

If John Carroll, then, was so important in the history of education and the history of our country, what did his cousin Charles do that merits such a study as this? A flippant answer could be that he was the last of the signers of the Declaration of Independence to die, or that he was the only Irish Catholic to sign the revered document. The truth is that Charles Carroll of Carrollton was an outstanding statesman and businessman in the new republic. His zeal in his struggle for religious freedom and civil liberty demands our attention. Recognized as a conservative, an opponent of Jefferson's egalitarian theories of economics, Charles Carroll became a leading citizen in Maryland, became chairman of the board of the first railroad company in the United States, a leading money lender, wealthy landowner, and, in fact, the country gentleman he had always dreamed of. To say that Charles Carroll is an example of Horatio Alger may be a gross misinterpretation; nevertheless, he, in order to succeed, was forced to overcome grave difficulties and hardships. After all, he was a Catholic in a land where Catholicism was all but outlawed; and, after all, he was,
at the age of eleven, "a stranger in a strange land" because of strenuous laws against religion. All Catholics at the time paid a penalty for their allegiance to the papacy; and Charles Carroll, no matter how wealthy, was no exception. He became the grand old man of those who dared to pledge lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors. This writer claims that his service to his country and the example he set for those who followed are worthy of a study such as this.

From the work it is hoped that a clearer picture of the plight of colonial Catholic families concerned for the education of their children is recognized and appreciated.

In preparing the dissertation, special effort was made to discuss the project with others who have done similar kinds of studies or who are specialists in the area of Catholic historiography or scholars of Maryland history. Careful consideration was given to objectivity, for the fault of many historians is that they set out to prove themselves right. It seems to this researcher that more accurate accounts might be written if the writer sets out to prove himself wrong. Efforts to utilize the existing data were made in visits to the Hall of Records
in Annapolis, the Special Collections Room at Georgetown University, the Maryland Historical Society, and the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore.

**Limits of the Study**

The study was confined in time to 1634 when Maryland was initially settled by the English through the entire colonial period to the time of the Revolutionary War. Further limitations were placed on the study. It deals primarily with the education and/or schooling of aristocratic Catholic children living in colonial Maryland.

Scanty data were a problem in Chapter IV, which dealt with the education of John Carroll. No massive amount of information was found on his childhood or his daily student life. The letters of his cousin, which were brief and infrequent during the early years in Europe, are the main source for speculation on what actually happened. That is, certainty is difficult to assert for much of the personal history of John Carroll's educational program.

One other limitation was the inaccessibility of any documents at the Maryland Historical Society during
the summer of 1975. Because of financial problems, the Society was closed for two months. This limitation was difficult to evade.

Sources

Both primary and secondary sources were consulted and analyzed. The primary sources were the Archives of Maryland, Proceedings of her legislative assemblies, the Woodstock Letters, Special Collections at Georgetown University, Maryland law books, will books, and land records. The main primary source for information on the education of John and Charles Carroll was the correspondence between Charles Carroll and his father. One must consider, however, that letters may or may not present a real situation. In his younger years Charles may have written with a tutor over his shoulder; his letters may have been censored throughout his time abroad. Perhaps letters are not the best and most reliable source of information, but, in this instance, they represent the only extant data available and, therefore, were valuable.

Summary

Chapter I was an introduction to the topic under discussion, its purpose, the methodology employed, and
the literature reviewed for the study. The thesis is that the denial of Catholic schooling to colonial Marylanders made it difficult, if not impossible, for parents to educate their children within and/or by the Church. Another closely allied, and perhaps minor claim, is that since American Colonial Catholics took schooling as their model for education and looked to the schools to train their youth for positions of leadership which their family situation inherently bestowed, Catholics were denied the right of an educated polity.

Chapter II described attempts at secular education in colonial Maryland and reviewed legislations which affected the founding of and maintenance of schools in that colony. The kinds of schoolmasters employed, textbooks used, socio-cultural situations and the political changes brought about as a result of the Glorious Revolution were presented.

Chapter III centered Catholic attempts at schooling from the time of the arrival of the first Jesuits to the shores of Maryland in 1634 throughout the colonial period. The coming of the Protestant Ascendancy and the limitations it placed on the Roman Catholics was discussed, as were the two colonial Catholic schools
which seemed to be most important and influential in Maryland.

Chapter IV traced the meandering path of John Carroll from his initial introduction to school at Bohemia Manor, one of the institutions discussed in Chapter III, through his seminary training in Europe. A description and critique of the Jesuit model for schooling curriculum, the Ratio Studiorum, was outlined since both John and Charles Carroll were to follow that pattern during their schooldays. A brief section of the chapter dealt with the suppression of the Society of Jesus because that act of Pope Clement XIV was a turning point in the direction John Carroll's life was to take.

Chapter V provided a model case study of a wealthy Catholic who had no desire for an ecclesiastical career, but who wanted a Catholic education. Charles Carroll's schooldays are followed from Maryland to Europe and back to the colonies, where he no longer studied formally, but took his place in the leadership of those persons who worked for an independent relationship with England.
Methodology

The method used to carry out this study was the historical explanation. As Chapter I indicated, the historical explanation is probabilistic; that is, the explanation is the result of not only gathering data, but gathering the data, analyzing it, and making worthwhile conclusions based on it. Since it is impossible to recreate the past, the historical subjective point of view cannot be evaded. Nevertheless, every effort was made to present an accurate, historically fair account of the development of schools in colonial Maryland and the schooling of John and Charles Carroll.

Major Findings

1. Colonial Maryland's population had great difficulty in cooperating to pass legislation for the establishment of a provincial school system. Although the province was founded in 1634, it was sixty years before the legislature passed a bill for schooling.

2. Maryland was the scene of political unrest from the time the Puritans controlled England until the Revolutionary War. Although the province had been founded by Lord Baltimore as a refuge for any person who
professed belief in Jesus Christ, political and religious differences among the Puritans, Anglicans, and Catholics caused much strife and little successful schooling. Although a bill for the establishment of provincial schools was passed in 1696, no school was begun for six years, and then only one, which did not prove entirely successful. Marylanders seemed more interested in bickering than in schooling.

3. When provincial schools were established, they were sectarian not secular. Teachers were forced to swear oaths of allegiance to the Church of England and to instruct their pupils in that faith.

4. Despite the lack of a provincial school system, a school for poor children and Negroes existed for a short time in colonial Maryland. The Reverend Thomas Bacon, in 1750, started the school which lasted until his death in 1768. By 1787, however, the school was not used and the land on which it was located was sold.

5. Although Catholics were the first to attempt the establishment of schools, their efforts were thwarted. Especially after the defection of the Lord Baltimore, the enactment of the English Penal Code, the establishment
of the Church of England as the official religion, Catholics could not school children within the law.

6. Two Catholic schools, Newtown Manor and Bohemia Manor, have been identified. Newtown existed from approximately 1673-1687 and Bohemia during the 1740s. Scanty data offer evidence for the existence of these schools, but little information as to exactly what kind of education went on there.

7. Since it was illegal for Catholics to educate or to educate Catholics, many families, under penalty of prosecution, sent their children to St. Omers, a school operated by the Jesuits in Flanders, even though laws in 1700 and 1704 specifically forbade such activity.

8. Despite their Catholicism and because of their wealth and influence, the Carrolls were among those who sent their children to school in Europe. Some families sent their sons under false names in order to protect them from prosecution.

9. After John and Charles Carroll returned to the colonies, they were active in the American Revolution and instrumental in establishing religious liberty in the United States.
10. Teachers of colonial Maryland came from various backgrounds. Among them were indentured servants, farmers, and clerics. They ranged from barely literate to university trained, and no one generalization can be made except that they were an assorted lot.

Conclusions

Because Maryland was founded as a refuge for religious dissidents, it is ironic that religion played a major part in deterring the establishment of a provincial school system; however, political unrest, stemming from religious prejudices, was the main reason that schools were so slow in being built and maintained. So closely woven were political religious attitudes, one could be identified as a member of the Upper House or Lower House by his religion, and, conversely, if one were a legislator, his religion could be told by his seat in the Assembly. Thus, civil strife was not conducive to the development of a provincial school system.

A second conclusion is that, despite the penal code outlawing it, Catholics did establish two schools which are traceable: Newtown Manor and Bohemia Manor, where Charles and John Carroll received their initial
schooling. Since Bohemia Manor was so far away from the majority of the Catholic population, one can conclude that there must have been reasons other than easy access for the location of the school. This researcher agrees with Hughes that the school probably was conducted in secret and in stealth away from the watchful eyes of the provincial governor.

Third, Maryland Catholics had no alternative but to send their children out of the colony for instruction within the faith. An argument often presented is that most wealthy colonial southerners sent their children to Europe to be educated, and since the Carrolls, along with the other Catholic families mentioned, were wealthy, their children would obviously have been given European educations. But that is to evade the point. The claim is that Catholics had no choice. No Catholics could attend Harvard, Yale, or even William and Mary in nearby Virginia. Catholics were locked out of the mainstream of education in the colonies and were forced to go elsewhere for instruction.

The final conclusion reached is that Catholics do not fit within the norms described by Bernard Bailyn because neither the family, nor the Church, nor the
community could legally sanction the education of the colonial Catholic child in traditions of his faith. Until the new government of the United States was formed, Catholic children were denied the educational opportunities open to their Protestant peers.

Recommendations for Further Study

The first recommendation for extensive research is that a new history of education for the state of Maryland must be written. Not since Steiner's book has such a task been undertaken, and Steiner, who wrote his volume for the United States Government, fails to document even the most obvious citation. Other interesting studies could be pursued on the Dutch Reformed Church in Maryland and other minorities which were welcome under Calvert's charter. A comparative study of the educational history of the signers of the Declaration of Independence would provide informative, if not entertaining, bicentennial reading. John Demos' study of the Puritan family might well set the precedent for a similar study of a Catholic colonial family. Another area wanting research is that of the similarities and differences among colonial minorities—politically, religiously,
economically, and socially. Finally, the education of Catholic females during the colonial period needs to be investigated.
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LETTERS
"July 26, 1757

"Dear Papa

"You can't conceive the anxiety your absence causes. Tis with the greatest impatience I await your arrival. I hoped to have the satisfaction of seeing you before this but all my hopes are frustrated. I wait nothing but your arrival to leave the College; my Studies are finished, we broke up school the 21 of this month; the 8th I sustained universal philosophy. I know you are desirous to hear what success I met with: but it would not become me to speak in my own praise, this I can only say that my auditors seem'd to be contented; the rest I leave to others. No man is a judge in his own cause. You may easily imagin that time passes away but slowly since my defense; before I was entirely taken up in preparing myself; occupation serves to make the time pass away agreeably; as I am not so much occupied at present I have more time to reflect at m'corrages as the French say. Tho' I am not so much taken up as before my defense; I am not idle. I pass the greatest part of the time in reading and in studying the French language. . . . I hope you will remember to bring over the books I wrote for last year; you need not buy Mr. Lock's work it will be of no great service to me.

"I am very well. Nothing is wanting to accomplish my happiness but your presence. Pray send the enclosed to my Mama she must be very melancholy since your departure.

"A letter from you and me at the same time will serve to raise up her spirits. I am Dr. Papa your most loving and obedient son.

"Charles Carroll"
Charles of Annapolis to Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

"December 1759

[Admonishes Charles Carroll to study hard.]

"The law in England is not only a road to Riches but to Ye highest honor. How many great fortunes are made by it?

"... It is true that as things now stand you are shut out from ye Bar; but you are not debarred from acting as a Counsellor, yt way many great fortunes have been made. But supposing you shou'd not have so active a turn as to make ye Law a Profession in order to accumulate a fortune yet as I before observed ye Knowledge of it is absolutely necessary to ev'ry private Gentleman of fortune who has the least idea of being Independant. I do not send you to the Temple to spend (as many do) 4 or 5 years to no purpose. I send you to Study and Labour. It is that I expect from you do not disappoint my hopes, you have hitherto done well all yt you have done was but a preparation to do this well, finish worthyly, and apply as if yr whole sole Dependances was to be on ye Knowledge of ye Law....

"When in London I met with one Mr. Twinyhoe at ye Temple. ... he will instruct you how to prosecute yr studies etc. I think all who study ye Law have a Commonplace book. ...

"I understand yt lately in one of our Universities there is a chair Established for a Professor of ye Common Law; this has been long wished for, whether ye Professor or his method answers ye satisfaction of ye publick I know not, but it is certainly worth yr while to enquire whether you may not reap some advantage from it' and to judge yrself. You may in vacation time go to hear him. Books you must buy as you want, let them be good & of ye best Editions.

228
[Tells Charles to renew acquaintances with schoolfellows of "family fortune and good morals."]

"... I would not have you decline or solicit an Acquaintance with Lord Baltimore or his uncle Mr. Cecilius Calvert. If you shud incidentally fall in their way you may when proper let them know yt you are not unacquainted Yt Yr Grandfather came into this Country after a Regular Study of Law in Ye Temple—'He was Honored with ye Posts of Agent, Receiver General, Judge in Land Affairs, Naval Officer, & yt he had ye Appointment of Serval Naval Offices & Land Surveyors of the Province.' Yet after he had served 3 Lord Baltimores for many years with Credit and Reputation, he was deprived by ye late Lord of his posts to gratify a faction whose aim it is to divest ye family of their government, you may also let them know you are not ignorant of the law and of time lately to deprive ye Rom. Catholicks of their Liberties & to distress & vex them. Yt ye memory of ye favours confer'd on yr GrandFather will always incline you to promote ye interest of ye Proprietary family where you can do it with honour & Justice, but remember ye ill treatement yr Grandfather met with after so long a Series of Services remember Ye [manuscript is blurred] of Rom. Catholicks by ye late & present Lord Baltimore and never sacrifice yr own or yr country's just to promote the Interest or power of ye Proprietary family. It is true they have it in their power to confer some places of profit and honour worth acceptance ... I cannot think it worth yr while to pay a court there or show any other Respect than such is due to them in the laws of ye Country where Your fortune lays. You will meet with Several of yr Countrymen in London, with Some of them in Ye Temple or other forms of Court. Treat them politely & with Respect. If you shd mention them in Yr letters let it be to their advantage, but with them as with all others be reserved until you know them."

[Papa]