Colonial Catholicism in British North America: American and Canadian Catholic Identities in the Age of Revolution

Author: Michael G. Coughlin

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/bc-ir:108063

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2017

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Colonial Catholicism in British North America:
American and Canadian Catholic Identities in the Age of Revolution

Michael G. Coughlin
Thesis
Licentiate of Sacred Theology
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

André Brouillette, S.J., Ph.D., S.T.D.
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

Maura Jane Farrelly, Ph.D.
Brandeis University

Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to better understand American colonial Catholicism through a comparative study of it with Catholicism in colonial Canada, both before and after the British defeat of the French in 1759, in the period of the American Revolution. Despite a shared faith, ecclesiastical leaders in Canada were wary of the revolutionary spirit and movement in the American colonies, participated in by American Catholics, and urged loyalty to the British crown. The central question of the study is as follows: why did the two groups, American Catholics (the Maryland Tradition) and Canadian Catholics (the Quebec Tradition), react so differently to British colonial rule in the mid eighteenth-century? Developing an understanding of the religious identities of American and Canadian Catholics and their interaction during the period will help shed light on their different approaches to political ideals of the Enlightenment and their Catholic faith. This, to my knowledge, is an under-explored area of study and will contribute to the field of American church history.

Our examination will proceed in three stages. In Chapter I, we will examine the topic of post-Reformation Catholicism in England and how the environment produced a unique Catholic identity that then lay the groundwork for the Maryland Tradition of American colonial Catholicism. In Chapter II, we will similarly study post-Reformation Catholicism in France and the foundations for the Quebec Tradition of Canadian colonial Catholicism. Then, in Chapter III, we will consider how these catholic identities arrived at divergent responses to British colonial rule, with the Quebec Act of 1774 serving as a watershed moment.

From the outset, we must briefly mention one topic that, though certainly worthy of consideration in a study of Catholic identity in colonial North America, is outside the limited

scope of this thesis: post-Reformation Catholicism in Spain and the Southern Tradition of American colonial Catholicism. Since the question before us concerns Quebec, Maryland, and their roots in France and England, respectively, a consideration of colonial Spanish Catholic identity in the future United States will have to wait for a future project.

Chapter I: English Catholicism and the Maryland Tradition

I.A. The Backdrop: Post-Reformation Catholicism in England

The religio-political situation of mid-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century England helped shape a distinctive form of post-Reformation English Catholicism, an understanding of which will be helpful in furthering our understanding of colonial American Catholic identity. While this is a vast topic, we will focus on four aspects of English Catholicism in this period. First, the tumultuous and back-and-forth political environment from the relatively moderate religious reforms of Henry VIII through the more radical implementations of Edwardian policies in the reign of Elizabeth, with the interim Catholic restoration in the Marian period, created a climate of "lived" religious continuity despite drastic political shifts in emphasis on religion, exceptions being made for the outer limits toward both more reformed or traditional extremes, respectively. Second, upon the intimate identification of church and state in the Elizabethan period, Catholic responses can be organized into three distinct yet over-lapping categories, that of conformist, "church papist," and recusant, that demonstrate a flexibility and variety of ways of identifying as Catholic. Third, the recusant church, of necessity, drew heavily on clergy educated in continental Europe, both diocesan priests and members of the Society of Jesus, and concentrated their resources on ministering to upper-class gentry in southeastern counties rather than middle-class communities in more traditionally Catholic regions. Fourth, these aspects came to converge in the Jacobean period of the early seventeenth-century to form a distinct form of post-Reformation Catholicism that was practiced successfully by the Calverts and provided them the opportunity to charter the North American colony of Maryland in 1632.

Before continuing on to these four aspects, however, we will begin with a brief note clarifying what we mean by "post-Reformation" Catholicism. To speak of "post-Reformation" English Catholicism is not to suggest there was one, singular event of reform, nor that what happened in England during the sixteenth-century was simply an application of other reformations going on contemporaneously in continental Europe.[1] There were, in fact, several concurrent and sequential smaller reformations occurring that, while related in a way with the other religious-reformation movements inspired by Luther, Calvin, and the like, were, nevertheless, distinct and not historically inevitable.[2] There were three waves of political reformations interrupted by two political restorations: Henry VIII's political reform between 1530 and 1538, which he largely reversed in the subsequent period until his death in 1547; the political reform instituted by the regency of Edward VI between 1547 and 1553, which was reversed in the reign of Mary; and the political reform of Elizabeth upon her accession in 1559 which, as a whole, was permanent.[3] Happening alongside these multiple political reformations was the religious reformation we more frequently think of when we think of the term, marked by a deep devotion to, and study of, Scripture in the vernacular, personal conversion through preaching, and a rejection of the perceived onerous traditions that had accumulated in the church, such as the sacraments, the saints, prayers for the dead, and religious images.[4] The narrative of one, defining "Reformation," although common in some *a posteriori* accounts of the period, is both misleading and inaccurate because, during these upheavals, nobody was aware of their presence in such a monumental and effective event; instead, the magnitude of the changes were

[1] See Christopher Haigh, *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 12.
[2] See Haigh, *English Reformations*, 12-13.
[3] Haigh, *English Reformations*, 14.
[4] See Haigh, *English Reformations*, 14.

the totality of decisions made in countless smaller circumstances.[5] Nothing was inevitable and the categories of Protestant and Catholic we have the privilege of seeing in hindsight developed, in reality, gradually and, at times, imperceptibly in the period. With an understanding of these complexities, however, it is still useful to refer to "post-Reformation" Catholicism as that traditional religion in union with the Bishop of Rome that was especially defined in contrast with the Protestant Church of England during and as a result of the sequence of numerous religio-political reformations mentioned. We are now in a better position to consider four aspects of post-Reformation Catholicism in England.

I.A.1. Continuity Amongst Tumult

The first aspect of post-Reformation English Catholicism is that, despite all the religious and political turmoil of the Henrician through Elizabethan regimes, the "lived religion" of the people remained, by-and-large, the same. Although this period culminated with Elizabeth's religious settlements of 1559 and 1563, establishing the Church of England and unifying public practice in it, measured by attendance at services in a local parish and the swearing of an Oath of Allegiance to the ecclesial headship of the English monarch, with loyalty to the monarchy and thereby uniting religion and the state, this era also saw a fracturing of personal religious identity between public and private expression.[6] The political consequences of how one worshipped in public and the corresponding questions of national allegiance and identity created a dynamic that parsed out individual and private belief from that public worship. In brief, public religious expression changed depending on the religious views of the monarch of the time and the

[5] See Haigh, *English Reformations*, 14-18
[6] See Diarmaid MacCulloch, *The Reformation: A History* (New York: Penguin Books, 2003), 287-291.

legislation enacted to support those religious views, but public conformity did not necessarily mean any change from traditional religious belief.

During the late medieval and early modern period in England, traditional religion, what Eamon Duffy defines as "the general character of a religious culture which was rooted in a repertoire of inherited and shared beliefs and symbols, while remaining capable of enormous flexibility and variety," was very much alive and formative in the popular religious mindset.[7] The religious scaffolding of traditional religion was flourishing and not dying out from the crushing burden of superstition, as is sometimes held.[8] Although the religious reformation was indeed a sharp and intentional break with this rich tradition, many of the elements of reformed religion in England were built on the foundations of this shared religious past.[9] The "lived religion" of the people, as reflected in documents such as wills and parish registers, suggests a strong continuity of belief and practice throughout all the change and turmoil, despite external accommodations in accord with changing laws in the three political reformations mentioned.[10] Complying with contemporarily current law does not of necessity imply agreement with the principles of reformed religion but, rather, gives further evidence of the complexities of national-religious identity of the period.[11]

Take, for example, the post-Edwardian church in 1553. In the previous six years of Edward's reign, dramatic changes had been implemented: images in churches were taken down, two versions of the Book of Common Prayer replaced Catholic ritual with Protestant reforms, clergy were permitted to marry, the episcopacy was remodeled and pastors were replaced with

---

[7] See Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 3-4.
[8] See Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 4.
[9] Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 4.
[10] See Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 5.
[11] See Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 5.

those enthusiastic for these changes.[12] Popular sources of devotion and worship, chantries, were outlawed and parish altars were replaced with communion tables, clearly showing the abolition of the Mass called for in the Uniformity Bill of 1549.[13] These religious reforms were summarized in the Forty-Two Articles of 1553, giving theological expression to the liturgical revolution.[14] By the end of the reign, parishes, by-and-large, complied with these demands from the Crown, although they were less often in compliance with the positive demands to purchase new Bibles and prayer books.[15] However, underneath this external compliance is the suggestion of a deeper continuity with the traditional religion.

Parish records show the voluntary sale of religious items prohibited under the new religio-political regime, especially those relating to the cult of the saints, the cult of the dead, or the Eucharist, all points of contention in the Protestant reform movement.[16] While some of these transactions might certainly have had to do with shifting beliefs, the more likely reason was first, to promote the financial viability of the parish in tremendously difficult times by covering the expenses for renovations and repairs, and, second, to avoid confiscation of these objects by the government with no hope of recuperation of loss.[17] As the Henrician government closed monasteries and chantries and confiscated their property throughout the 1530s and 1540s, a precedent was established for seizing valuables that were suddenly condemned.[18] Theft of parish goods appeared to become a legally sanctioned activity and, "moreover, the polemic of the reformers against the very notion of sacred objects, the ritual changes of Edward's reign and the formal desacralizing they involved, removed any religious restraint that thieves might have

[12] Haigh, *English Reformation*, 168.
[13] Haigh, *English Reformation*, 173-174.
[14] Haigh, *English Reformation*, 180-81.
[15] See Haigh, *English Reformation*, 181; see also Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 493.
[16] See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 482.
[17] See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 483-489.
[18] Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 487.

felt."[19] What seemed to be theft, however, was at times the reappropriation of gifts to the parish made by local gentry.[20] At other times, items sacred to the traditional religion were hidden away, out of sight and off the books of the parish register.[21] During the Marian restoration of Catholicism, some parishes were loaned books and Mass vessels and vestments from local parishioners, pointing to this practice of removing the prohibited items from the church itself but keeping them around in the event they were needed once again.[22] This is not to say that these external reforms had no impact whatsoever on the lived religion of the parish, for a mindset so steeped in ritual cannot help but be affected by a change in that ritual, but, rather, that external compliance was rooted in obedience to political loyalties and national identity rather than to deep-rooted conviction in the religious reform.[23] Once the Marian restoration took place, parishes enthusiastically committed to the renovation of their churches and the returned traditional practice of sacraments and devotions despite the high cost of doing so.[24] Any delay in these efforts was likely due more to the time and resources it takes to rebuild, rather than any internal resistance to Protestant reforms.[25] A continuity of belief throughout all these changes shows that external conformity was acceptably separable from internal religious commitment.

I.A.2. Variety of Catholic Responses to Reform

A second characteristic of post-Reformation Catholicism in England is the variety of responses to navigating the unification of religion and governmental allegiance in the

[19] Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 487.
[20] Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 489.
[21] See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 490-491.
[22] Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 490.
[23] See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 493.
[24] See Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 546-550.
[25] Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, 546.

Elizabethan period that was the Church of England, namely the categories of conformist, “church papist,” and recusant. While the Edwardian church aligned more closely with other Protestant reform movements throughout Europe, Elizabeth’s church was more conservative, related, no doubt, to her own outward conformity to the Catholic Church during Mary’s reign.[26] Although instituting a return to Edwardian policies against traditional religion, the practice “on-the-ground” in parishes remained, largely, continuous as under the previous regime.[27] It was not that far-fetched to think that the Elizabethan restoration of Protestantism might not itself be short-lived and Catholicism brought back under a future ruler; it had happened several times in the previous few decades.[28] The religio-political atmosphere became progressively more anti-Catholic in the 1580s and 1590s, with legislation passed calling for extreme punishment for those who did not participate in state-sponsored religion through worship at a local parish.[29] The situation was complicated further by the relationship with Rome of both Elizabeth and her government and the Catholic population. After Catholic plots to overthrow Elizabeth were discovered and the facilitators were caught, convicted, and executed, the people as a whole experienced greater unity around the queen and her church.[30] Although public opinion toward Catholics was turning more negative as a result, Pope Pius V added fuel to the fire in issuing the papal bull *Regnans in excelsis* in 1570 which condemned Elizabeth as a heretic and, therefore, denied any allegiance or loyalty owed to her by Catholics in England.[31] This created a clear statement from a foreign power that to be a Catholic and to practice the faith was a direct

[26] See MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 290, 382.
[27] See Haigh, *English Reformations*, 252.
[28] See Haigh, *English Reformations*, 252.
[29] See MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 385-386, 392.
[30] MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 333-334.
[31] MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 334.

challenge to the rule of Elizabeth; the Elizabethan government subsequently became more aggressive in rooting out Catholic treason.[32]

This climate in the 1570s inspired a variety of responses by those who were in-heart Catholic, reflecting a range of practical approaches to living Catholicism in Elizabethan England.[33] At opposite poles were the conformists, who for all intents and purposes embraced the reformed worship of the Book of Common prayer under the organization of the Church of England, on the one hand, and the recusants, who refused to conform and continued to openly practice their Catholicism by not openly practicing Anglicanism, on the other. Between the two was the group of "church papists" who continued with their practice of Catholicism, but pragmatically conformed to the Church of England at times as a means of survival in dangerous times, sometimes, for example, attending services but not receiving communion.[34] This was especially an option for wealthy gentry families, so that the head of the household would attend Anglican services to satisfy the family's obligation to the state, while the rest of the family remained at home and practiced Catholicism to satisfy their personal obligation to conscience and, ultimately, God. This middle category of church papist was probably the largest group, although most historians of the period emphasize the recusant-block of post-Reformation Catholicism.[35] Strong polemical writing from the period that urged radical separation from the Church of England suggests that the number of both conformists and church papists was probably large and, therefore, worthy of so much persuasive effort to adopt a more hardline response to religious compromise.[36] Moreover, according to a dated but interesting source, there

[32] MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 334.
[33] See Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 256.
[34] See Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 256.
[35] See Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: The Boydell Press, 1993), 5-7.
[36] See Walsham, *Church Papists*, 49.

is documentary evidence that a majority of the population was Catholic before the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, after which there is no such evidence.[37] This points to broad membership in the fluid category of church papist.

The identity of the "church papist" came into greater clarity and focus as the term "recusant" came into use and the two positions could be contrasted.[38] "Belated governmental recognition of these crystallising distinctions came in 1593, when statute law sharply differentiated between 'recusants' and 'papists': that all-purpose pejorative 'papist' now narrowly defined persons who had either thus far complied with the regulations, or had yet to be formally convicted of infringing on them."[39] This distinction is key because, since the Elizabethan settlement of religion in 1559, outward conformity as demonstrated by attendance of services at a local parish on Sundays and holy days was the mark of loyal citizenry.[40] To not carry out this responsibility was an act of rebellion and punishable by the state through the imposition of progressive penalties, most usually financial.[41] Church papists, therefore, performed their responsibilities out of obedience to national identity, even if the deepest reason was, understandably, financial and actual survival. Recusants, on the other hand, were treasonous in their refusal to offer this minimal test of obedience to the state and were subject to increasingly hostile legislation throughout the 1580s that targeted them rather than church papists to encourage conformity.[42]

---

[37] See Brian Magee, *The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survival and the Operation of the Recusancy Laws* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne LTD, 1938), 36.
[38] See Walsham, *Church Papists*, 10.
[39] Walsham, *Church Papists*, 10.
[40] See Walsham, *Church Papists*, 11.
[41] Walsham, *Church Papists*, 11.
[42] Walsham, *Church Papists*, 11.

I.A.3. Ministerial Strategy

A third characteristic of the Catholic community in post-Reformation England is the reliance of clergy trained at missionary seminaries on the Continent and the allocation of ministerial resources to gentry families in the recusant church. Already with the accession of Elizabeth and the consequent outlawing of Catholicism in 1559, the Catholic leadership in England reacted strongly against these changes.[43] Unlike the political reformations under Henry and Edward, those enacted by Elizabeth were swift and sudden, and Catholic bishops and pastors were relieved from their posts, confined in prison or house arrest, and replaced with reformed ministers, while many Catholic academics fled England for the Continent, especially to Louvain and Rome, respectively.[44] The Catholic community of English exiles in Louvain formed an operating base for church governance from abroad, and both communicated with Catholics still in England and made efforts to influence the Elizabethan government in favor of Catholic causes.[45] They also engaged in theological discourse with Protestant rivals through the means of writing, publishing around fifty Catholic theological works in English by the mid-1560s.[46] Some of the academics, led by former Oxford-don William Allen, settled at Douai in modern-day France and founded an English college with the goal of forming the future leaders of Catholics in England.[47] Despite the financial difficulties of the college, many students left the English universities to study at Douai and, by 1576, over two-hundred students were enrolled there.[48] The clergy trained at Douai and other similar English colleges in continental Europe would

[43] See Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 253.
[44] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 253.
[45] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 254.
[46] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 254.
[47] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 254.
[48] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 254.

provide the sacramental and ministerial needs to try to restore the Catholic population in the mid-Elizabethan period.

Other Catholic leaders who did not flee to Europe transitioned to serve as private chaplains to Catholic gentry families and, from these relatively safe positions, organized the pastoral care of other Catholics in the surrounding area.[49] Particular priests would often encourage their flock to non-conformity, if possible, and the issue became an important matter of conscience.[50] By the mid-1570s there was an organized recusant church based in local communities operating separately from the Church of England.[51] The future viability of these Catholic cells was threatened, however, by the continuing conformity of church papists and the shortage of priests to minister to them, since the priests ordained in the Marian period were then dwindling without being replaced by new clergy.[52] At just this time the college at Douai was able to begin supplying priests to fill the ranks, with the first three sent to England in 1573, and more following them each year.[53] In return, these priests inspired others to study at Douai and regenerate the body of English Catholic clergy.[54] English seminaries were formed at Rome and in Spain, also, to provide ministers to recusant communities and, in total, around six-hundred priests who studied at these English seminaries were sent back in the period up to 1603.[55]

The stated mission of these priests was not to engage and convert Protestants but, rather, to serve as pastors and to sustain already existing Catholic communities.[56] In 1580 and upon the request of William Allen, the Society of Jesus joined the secular clergy in the mission to England

[49] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 254-256.
[50] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 260.
[51] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 261.
[52] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 261.
[53] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 261.
[54] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 261.
[55] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 261.
[56] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 261-262.

with the sending of Edmund Campion and Robert Persons from Rome.[57] The rhetoric of both groups of clergy was toward resistance and recusancy for the people.[58] The so-called recusancy laws of the 1580s were enacted to make the crime of recusancy more severe, responding to the influx of new Catholic priests.[59] Their presence in the community made it even more dangerous and called for a choice of either treason or apostasy and, in 1585, it even became a treasonous offense for a priest trained abroad to enter England.[60] Executions of clergy became more frequent and, in the period between 1581 and 1603, nearly one-hundred and fifty priests suffered this fate.[61] With the international conflict with Catholic Spain coming to a head in the late 1580s, a large number of Catholics conformed to the Church of England.[62]

In the early Elizabethan period, resistant Catholic communities were made up of both middle and upper class citizens.[63] After the turmoil of the 1580s and the natural death of native-clergy ordained in the Marian period, the majority of the new priests were sent to the wealthier communities.[64] This was an intentional strategy to nourish the Catholic faith of nobles so that, in the present, they could offer protection to other Catholics who might work in their household and, in the future, when Catholicism was restored throughout England, there would be a ruling class prepared for a smooth transition.[65] The domestic-shape (as opposed to the communal parish) of post-Reformation Catholicism grew up around travel patterns organized in this period to keep priests from arrest through a network of gentry families in south-eastern English counties

[57] Francis Edwards, *The Jesuits in England: From 1580 to the Present Day* (Tunbridge Wells, Kent, UK: Burns & Oats, 1985), 17.
[58] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 262.
[59] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 263.
[60] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 263.
[61] See MacCulloch, *The Reformation*, 392.
[62] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 263.
[63] See Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 264.
[64] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 264.
[65] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 264.

who were close associates with the Jesuits.[66] Although English Catholic populations were historically strongest in the northern counties, the majority of newly-arrived priests were sent to serve as chaplains to wealthy families in the region closest to France.[67] This resulted in a demographic and geographic shift in the English Catholic community. "It was perhaps unavoidable that the attentions of the seminary priests would focus primarily on the gentry of southern England; most priests came in from France, and they needed the material support which the rich could more easily provide. But the consequences were the collapse of Catholicism among the lower orders, and its decline in the north, west, and Wales."[68] The former recusant communities of these parts who no longer had clergy to serve them tended to shift from the church papist model to more clear conformity to the Church of England.[69]

I.A.4. Towards a post-Reformation English Catholicism

The fourth characteristic of post-Reformation Catholicism in England we will consider is that at the start of the seventeenth-century in the reign of James I, a Catholic family such as the Calverts could exercise such influence that, despite their faith, they were able to utilize the political climate to achieve their own goals and purposes. Two popular interpretations of Catholicism in post-Reformation England can be equally misleading.[70] The first is that the Catholic population rapidly shrank and became limited to the domestic churches organized

[66] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 264.
[67] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 265.
[68] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 265.
[69] Haigh, *The English Reformations*, 265-266.
[70] See Michael C. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 19-20.

around a gentry household with a priest to minister the sacraments.[71] The second interpretation is that the majority of the population, although conforming to Protestant worship in an Anglican parish, were not converted to Protestant belief and instead continued to hold to traditional religion despite not having access to the sacraments.[72] The chief reason these interpretations are misleading is that they mark 1603, the accession of James to the throne of England, as the effective end of recusant Catholicism; since a Catholic monarch did not succeed Elizabeth, the Protestant reform was complete in England.[73] However, if the horizon is extended beyond 1603 and considers the influence of Catholic seigneurial networks in sustaining the faith well into the seventeenth-century, a different picture comes into view.[74] One such family is that of the Calverts, led by George and, eventually, his descendants, Cecil and Charles, Lords Baltimore, and future patrons of the Maryland colony, who were able to successfully integrate their identities as both loyally English and loyally Catholic. "It was not easy, but some English Catholics beat the system and flourished. Families like the Calverts, who willingly risked practicing their faith openly while pursuing public goals, helped to keep the Catholic religion alive in England and in America."[75]

Some accounts of the founding of Maryland suggest that George and Cecil Calvert were responding to oppressive anti-Catholic laws in England and sought to found a safe-haven for Catholics in the New World, emphasizing the victimhood of Catholics in the Jacobean period and their consequent desire for religious freedom.[76] This, however, fails to account for the motivations of the Calverts for a number of reasons, including the fact that the Calverts did not

---

[71] Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 19.
[72] Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 19.
[73] Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 19-20.
[74] Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England*, 20.
[75] John D. Krugler, *English and Catholic: The Lords Baltimore in the Seventeenth Century* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 4.
[76] Krugler, *English and Catholic*, 3.

have *only* religious reasons for chartering the colony; George Calvert had a strong and committed English identity, and the tremendous political and social influence he needed in order to secure such a charter.[77] Another narrative is that of Calvert the entrepreneur, founding Maryland purely for economic opportunity; this perspective, too, fails to account adequately for the Calverts' motivation.[78] One account that does, however, take into consideration the realities and complexities of George Calvert's and his successors' dual Catholic and English identities is that of triumph, because both religious and economic goals were joined in an effort to promote Catholic causes and English causes concurrently.[79] "The Calverts' decision to maintain allegiance to Roman Catholicism is central to understanding what they attempted. English Catholicism both restricted and amplified opportunities for those who professed the faith. . . . Those who lacked influence did indeed fall victim to the repressive efforts to enforce religious uniformity. . . . The Calverts demonstrated that some English Catholics could function within a culture that all too frequently proclaimed its hostility to their religion."[80]

These four characteristics of post-Reformation Catholicism in England helped lay the foundation for the Maryland tradition of American Catholic religious identity. An understanding of English post-Reformation Catholic identity in the recusancy period is fundamental to understanding the type of Catholicism the Calverts and early Maryland colonists brought with them to the New World and, therefore, the foundational identity for American colonial Catholicism. Therefore, we now turn to that topic.

---

[77] Krugler, *English and Catholic*, 3.
[78] Krugler, *English and Catholic*, 3.
[79] Krugler, *English and Catholic*, 6.
[80] Krugler, *English and Catholic*, 9-10.

I.B. The Maryland Tradition of American Colonial Catholicism

American Catholic identity in colonial America grew up in the contours of the Maryland Tradition. Influenced by the experiences and characteristics of post-Reformation English Catholicism, the Maryland Tradition of Catholicism proved foundational for later American Catholic identity. Beginning with the foundation of the Maryland colony in 1632, the Maryland Tradition developed several distinct and meaningful traits that would influence American Catholics throughout the colonial period. We will identify and focus on five characteristics of this tradition. First, the Maryland Tradition is deeply rooted in religious toleration, expressed most clearly in the 1649 Act of Religious Toleration, and the separation of church and state, even in the midst of political turmoil throughout the seventeenth-century. Second, the role of the Society of Jesus in the American colonies was essential for colonial Catholicism. Third, the American church lacked clearly defined ecclesiastical oversight, resulting in the growth of the unique and largely autonomous tradition distinctive to the region. Fourth, a form of "Maryland" spirituality developed that, due to geographical expanse and limited clergy, emphasized personal and private devotion in the home. Fifth, although Catholics were a minority population in Maryland, many Catholic families possessed wealth and influence in the colony, continuing the English tradition of a gentry-based Catholicism. By referring to the term "Maryland Tradition" of colonial Catholicism, we must also acknowledge the off-shoot branches of this tradition that developed in other colonies, especially Pennsylvania and New York, and were influenced by their own specific environments, although in this chapter we will focus solely on elements of the tradition in the Maryland colony itself.

I.B.1. Religious Toleration

The first characteristic of the Maryland Tradition of American Catholicism is the emphasis on religious toleration and the separation of church and state. The priorities of these principles stem from the chief catalyst for the founding of the colony, George Calvert, and the experience of post-Reformation Catholicism in England. Calvert was born around 1580, an age of religious conflict between the English monarchy and the Catholic community highlighted by progressively severe anti-Catholic legislation against the recusant church, in Yorkshire County, part of the traditionally more "Catholic" region of northern England that, at this time, was losing clergy through the death of priests ordained in the Marian period.[81] Calvert was likely raised a Catholic, but his family, like so-many others in the 1590s, conformed to the Church of England and practiced the official religion of the state.[82] Calvert entered public service and was made secretary to the main minister of King James I, Sir Robert Cecil, in 1606, and made an impression on the king, receiving knighthood in 1617 and rising to serve as one of two Secretaries of State.[83] By 1624, Calvert made public his conversion to Roman Catholicism and, as a result, resigned from his government post and, upon the accession of King Charles I in 1625, lost his seat on the Privy Council because he could not, in good conscience, swear the required oaths.[84] Due to his faithful service to King James during periods of religious turmoil, however,

[81] See Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1985): 71.
[82] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 71.
[83] John Tracy Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America* (Baltimore: Helicone, 1965), 324; see also Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 71.
[84] James Hennesey, *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), 38.

Calvert was elevated to the title of Baron of Baltimore and was granted estates in Ireland, to which he retired and focused on his interest in colonization.[85]

George Calvert's interest in colonization was long-standing. He was in his twenties when the colony at Jamestown was founded in 1607 and became a member of the Virginia Company in 1609, also becoming involved with the New England Company for a time.[86] The Separatist Pilgrims founded the colony at Plymouth to pursue religious liberty for themselves apart from the seeming Catholic-compromises of the Church of England while maintaining their English national loyalties.[87] A similar proposal for Catholics was made at the beginning of the Jacobean period by Thomas Arundel. However, his suggestion was not well-received because it came in the year of the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 and a corresponding wave of anti-Catholic sentiment.[88] This earlier proposal is at least note-worthy, however, because George's eldest son, Cecil, married the daughter of Arundel; a colony where religious toleration might be the norm, Catholics included, was therefore part of the greater-Calvert family lineage.[89]

Calvert's involvement with colonial endeavors brought him to membership on the Newfoundland Committee and, in 1620, he acquired a property on its southeastern peninsula, called Avalon, and sought a charter to found a colony there.[90] Although this project proved unsuccessful, both financially and because of the harsh winter-climate of Newfoundland, the type of charter sought proved important for the subsequent Maryland venture.[91] Calvert wanted to establish a proprietary colony where all authority was granted to an individual, the proprietor,

---

[85] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 71-72.
[86] Thomas O'Brien Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties: The Beginnings of Religious and Political Freedom in Maryland* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1984), 62; see also John Tracy Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 325.
[87] Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 62-63.
[88] See Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 63.
[89] See Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 63.
[90] Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 63.
[91] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 72; see also Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 63.

and his family in perpetuity, with the ability to do all that was necessary to carry out the colony's mission, namely, financial gain.[92] A local assembly would be erected to help advise the proprietor and give assent to legislation.[93] This colonial model was attractive to settlers who were part of disadvantaged populations, such as religious minorities, because there was the possibility that laws in the proprietorship might be more advantageous than in England. When Avalon failed, Calvert turned south to a more temperate climate but was refused entry to Virginia because he would not swear the required oath to the King's supremacy in all temporal and spiritual-ecclesiastical matters.[94] Calvert returned to England to petition King Charles I for a new charter for a colony north of Virginia.[95] Although George Calverts died before its issuance, Charles granted a charter to Cecil Calvert, second Lord of Baltimore, in 1632 for Maryland, named after the King's Catholic French wife, Queen Henrietta Maria.[96] The charter granted for Maryland was largely the same as the proprietary charter granted for the colony at Avalon.[97]

The Charter of Maryland grants tremendous authority to the proprietor but is also intentionally vague.[98] The proprietor Cecil Calvert, who is described as "being animated with a laudable, and pious Zeal for extending the Christian Religion, and also the Territories of our Empire," was given the power, with regard to religion, to build, control, and convey property to churches and religious groups.[99] The use of the term "Christian Religion" is significant, because it broadly includes both Catholics and Protestants and captures the spirit of religious toleration

---

92 Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 63-64.
93 Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 63-64.
94 Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 38.
95 Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 38.
96 Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 325.
97 Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 38..
98 Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 326.
99 *The Charter of Maryland* (June 20, 1632), II, IV. Accessed at http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/ma01.asp.

that would permeate the early-days of the colony.[100] Paragraph IV of the charter grants all authority that "any Bishop of Durham . . . in our Kingdom of England, ever heretofore hath had, held, used, or enjoyed, or of right could, or ought to have, hold, use, or enjoy."[101] This reference is important because the historical prerogatives of the Bishop of Durham, though limited in the time of Henry VIII, modeled the level of autonomy George Calvert thought necessary for the success of the colony, so far-removed geographically from England.[102]

With the charter granted, the next step was to recruit colonists to make the transmarine voyage to Maryland and settle there. The main attraction was a significant grant of land; each "adventurer" who paid for the passage of five men between sixteen and fifty years old received two thousand acres.[103] A second enticement was the promised religious toleration, especially for Catholics in a colony with a Catholic proprietor.[104] Despite these opportunities, very few Catholics enlisted in the Maryland venture.[105] During the reign of Charles I, Catholics experienced a relatively peaceful period free of the persecution of prior (and later) ages.[106] Catholic Queen Henrietta Maria was influential in naming appointments to key positions and elevated some leading Catholics, and there was even hope that Charles himself might convert to the traditional religion.[107] "Convinced that they could not merely survive in England, but survive well, these court Catholics showed little interest in colonization."[108] Catholic gentry in the countryside also had little interest in leaving the comforts of their social position, and Catholic workers were dependent on jobs provided by these gentry land-holders, so they were tied to

---

[100] See Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 68-69.
[101] *The Charter of Maryland*, IV.
[102] Hanley, *Their Rights and Liberties*, 66.
[103] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
[104] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
[105] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
[106] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
[107] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
[108] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.

those who stayed.[109] Moreover, the post-Reformation Catholic community in England lacked a clear, central communication network and was largely dispersed in local enclaves, so successful advertising of the Maryland colony proved challenging and largely unsuccessful.[110]

When all was said and done, some two to three hundred passengers boarded the *Ark* and the *Dove* that landed in Maryland on March 25, 1634.[111] The group included sixteen "gentlemen-adventurers," most of which were Catholic, two Jesuit priests (Frs. Andrew White and John Altham) and one Jesuit brother (Thomas Gervase), and a majority of Protestant laborers and workers.[112] With this mixed-group of majority Protestants with a minority of Catholics in authority, proprietor Cecil Calvert, though remaining in England, left detailed instructions to his brother, Leonard, who was to serve as governor of the nascent colony, with regard to promoting an atmosphere of religious toleration.[113] Cecil Calvert cautioned that the leaders of the Maryland expedition be "very carefull to preserve unity and peace amongst all the passengers" and that "no scandall nor offence . . . be given to any of the Protestants."[114] The Catholics in the party were to practice their religion as privately as possible and to avoid engaging their Protestant colleagues in religious dialogue.[115] These directives from the proprietor himself show the deep commitment to religious toleration present from the founding of Maryland.[116] They also show a commitment to the separation of church and state where it would be possible for this type of religious toleration to take root and flourish.

---

109 Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
110 Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
111 Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 327-328.
112 Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 73.
113 Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 327-328.
114 Cecil Calvert, "Instructions to the Colonists by Lord Baltimore (December 13, 1633), 1." In Hall, ed., *Narratives of Early Maryland* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), 16.
115 Calvert, "Instructions to the Colonists," 1.
116 Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 328.

The crowning legislative act embodying the religious toleration envisioned by the Calverts came with the passing of the 1649 "Act Concerning Religion" by the Maryland Assembly. After Puritan revolts in both England and Maryland in the 1640s that resulted in the trial and execution of Charles I in 1649 and the loss of the Maryland proprietorship in 1646, respectively, the proprietary regime was restored in 1647 and sought to legislate what had been the practice up to that point in Maryland, namely religious freedom.[117] "In the seventeenth century, religion was so bound up with politics that it could not remain a purely private affair. Thus, specific legislation had to be enacted that would prevent religion from becoming a socially disruptive force. For Lord Baltimore and the Maryland Assembly, the best way to achieve this was to guarantee the toleration of religion."[118]

The Act indicates what religious toleration was understood to be by outlining specific acts that were outlawed.[119] Anyone who would "blaspheme God, or shall deny the holy Trinity . . . shall be punished with death and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her lands and goods to the Lord Proprietary and his heires. . . ."[120] In other words, the Act applied to both Catholic and Protestant Christians, but excluded people of non-Christian religions, such as Judaism, and the harsh tones were reflective of the severity of the Puritan uprisings.[121] Abusive language against the Blessed Virgin Mary or the Apostles and other saints was forbidden, as was the use of polarizing name-calling "relating to a matter of Religion."[122] The Act reflects a practical wisdom learned through the horrors of religious wars when it holds that "the inforceing of the conscience in matters of Religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous Consequences in those

[117] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 335-336.
[118] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 76.
[119] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 76.
[120] "Maryland's Act of Religious Toleration (1649)," in Mark Massa with Catherine Osborne, eds., *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2008), 18.
[121] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 76; see also Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 337.
[122] "Act of Religious Toleration," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*, 18.

Commonwealths where it hath been practiced" and, therefore, no one in Maryland "professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall in henceforth bee any waies troubled, Molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion nor in the free exercise thereof . . . nor any way compelled to the belief or exercise of any other Religion against his or her consent, soe as they may not be unfaithful to the Lord Propriatory, or molest or conspire against the civill Government. . . ."[123] Freedom of conscience, necessary for religious toleration, is also necessary to ensure loyalty to the government; if a citizen is forced to act contrary to their conscience, they will likely be less invested in the current political regime.

The history of seventeenth and eighteenth-century Maryland is one of turmoil, centered around religious and social conflict.[124] The economy that developed in the colony quickly became based on tobacco and, therefore, depended on slavery as an institution to consolidate the wealth of a few families.[125] Conflict from an authoritarian proprietor such as Calvert, also, was inevitable, as was the influence of political developments in England on the events in the colony.[126] The lives of Catholics in Maryland depended in large part on the various governments in the colony during the seventeenth-century: from the proprietor rule that lasted from its founding until the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England, with various Puritan uprisings throughout, until Maryland became a colony ruled directly by the crown at the end of the seventeenth-century, before being returned to the proprietorship of the Calverts in 1715, albeit to the recently converted Protestant fourth Lord of Baltimore.[127] By the second-decade of the eighteenth century, the Church of England was the established religion in Maryland, Catholics

[123] "Act of Religious Toleration," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*, 18-19.
[124] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 40.
[125] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 40.
[126] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 40.
[127] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 40-42.

could only worship in private religious services, and they were denied the right to vote.[128] This was the era of the penal-code enshrining in legislation a strong anti-Catholic sentiment common in the American colonies during the period.[129] However dark these times seemed, the Maryland Catholic community was prepared for these harsh conditions by their experiences as a persecuted minority sect in post-Reformation England.[130] This community memory was absorbed by the Maryland Catholic community and formed part of its identity amidst the religious persecution and turmoil of the seventeenth and eighteenth century, and the majority of Catholics maintained their faith.[131] The ideals of religious freedom and the separation of church and state found in the Maryland Tradition form the early basis of the free exercise and nonestablishment clauses of the First Amendment of the future U.S. Constitution.[132]

I.B.2. Role of the Jesuits

A second characteristic of the Maryland Tradition of colonial Catholicism was the pivotal role of the Society of Jesus, especially from the English Province. From the landing of the *Ark* and the *Dove* in 1634, Jesuits were present and active in colonial America, operating out of Maryland and ministering to Catholics in the surrounding region and colonies. In the period from the founding of Maryland in 1634 until the American Revolution, over one hundred Jesuit priests and around thirty Jesuit brothers served Catholic communities in Maryland and Pennsylvania,

---

[128] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 84-85.
[129] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 344.
[130] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 90.
[131] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 90.
[132] See James Hennesey, “Catholicism in an American Environment: The Early Years,” *Theological Studies* 50, no. 4 (Dec 1989): 662.

with most of them being English.[133] During this period, forty-one American-born members joined the Society, the first being Robert Brooke in 1684, and twenty from this group later served in ministry in their homeland.[134] The largest number of priests at any-one-time in the Maryland and Pennsylvania region during the colonial period was twenty-three, in 1773, the same year the Society was suppressed throughout the universal church.[135]

Both George and Cecil Calvert requested the assistance of the Jesuits in their colonization endeavors, and prior to leaving for Maryland in 1633, Fr. Mutius Vitelleschi, Superior General of the Society of Jesus, gave permission to Richard Blount, Superior of the English Province, to send Jesuits with the Maryland contingent if he saw fit.[136] To be consistent with the emphasis on religious toleration and separation of church and state, however, it was clearly understood that the Jesuits were joining the settlement as fellow "gentlemen adventurers" like the other colonists, not chaplains, and would be required to support themselves financially, as there would be no support from the established government.[137] Their own purpose in coming was to, first, serve as missionaries to the Native American peoples in the region and, second, to minister to the Catholic population among the settlers.[138] Since Frs. Andrew White and John Altham were responsible for bringing thirty men with them on the initial voyage, they were able to acquire land under the "Conditions of Plantation" of August 1636 which granted two thousand acres for every five able-bodied workers brought to the colony that became properties such as at Saint Mary's City, Saint Inigoes Plantation, and Saint George's Island.[139] By bringing more settlers and applying for more land under this program, the Jesuits came to possess over nine thousand

---

[133] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 43.
[134] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 43.
[135] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 43.
[136] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 327.
[137] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 327.
[138] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 329.
[139] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 329.

acres by 1727. These farms and plantations supported the Catholic ministry throughout the colonial period. The underside of this, however, was that like their lay counterparts, the Jesuit economic system in Maryland depended on the institution of slavery.[140] Although there is evidence that Jesuits and Catholics shared their faith and sacraments with the slaves who brought them wealth, there was little to no indication that anyone, cleric or lay person, judged slavery to be a moral evil during the colonial period.[141]

Managing large land-holdings and farms required tremendous attention from the Jesuit fathers and, as the pastoral demands of the people increased, they focused more on their ministerial responsibilities.[142] The Jesuit farm was not only the economic center for Catholic activity in the colony, but it also became the spiritual center for Catholic community and worship.[143] Each plantation had a chapel and Sunday Mass was offered for the people in the surrounding area at least twice-a-month.[144] Since it was usually quite a long trip for the people to come to the plantation for Mass and they followed the strict demands of fasting before receiving Communion, the Jesuits often provided a community meal and opportunities for socialization during the day on Sunday.[145] By Sunday evening and during the week, however, Jesuit priests were riding the mission circuit, often times alone and with limited supplies, visiting different Catholic communities who did not have access to a priest or to the sacraments, sometimes riding as far as fifty or sixty miles in a given day.[146] These "circuit riding" priests would usually spend a few days to a week in a community, celebrating the sacraments, visiting the infirm, and

[140] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 43.
[141] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 43.
[142] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88.
[143] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88.
[144] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88.
[145] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88.
[146] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88.; see also Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 44.

teaching the faith, before moving on.[147] By the middle of the eighteenth-century, Jesuit farms and the pastoral circuits the priests visited began to stabilize and to take on the character of parish communities.[148] This marked a movement from privatized, domestic religion to more public, communal expressions of Catholic identity.[149]

Although the Catholic intellectual infrastructure in colonial Maryland was limited, it is not surprising that the Jesuits were behind the efforts that were possible. With regards to education, the Jesuits ran a small school attached to their property at Newtown during the 1650s which was run by Ralph Crouch, a former seminarian for the Society, and provided a grammar curriculum, the first cycle in Jesuit education, open to students from all religious backgrounds.[150] The momentum of the school was interrupted for a few years, but by 1677 the school at Newtown was offering courses in the humanities, the second cycle of Jesuit schooling.[151] The only other school operated by the Jesuits during the colonial period was at Bohemia Manor, which opened around 1745 and provided the elementary education for a number of leading Catholic families and future Catholic leaders, including Charles and John Carroll, respectively.[152] With the advent of the penal code of anti-Catholic legislation, it became illegal for Catholics to operate schools or to send their children abroad to Europe to study at Catholic institutions.[153] Those Catholic families who could afford it, however, ignored this prohibition and sent their children, both boys and girls, to such schools in Europe.[154] One such school, St. Omer in French Flanders, provided continuing education for the Bohemian Manor graduates, Charles and John

[147] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88-89.
[148] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 88, 90.
[149] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 90.
[150] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 349; see also Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 45.
[151] Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 43.
[152] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 349.
[153] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 349.
[154] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 349.

Carroll.[155] Another source of intellectual formation was access to libraries and, unfortunately, there were no large libraries available in the colonial period.[156] Wealthy families, such as the Carrolls, had small personal libraries, and the Jesuits also lent out the scarce books they were able to while traveling in their ministry.[157]

I.B.3. Effective Autonomy of the American Church

A third characteristic of the Maryland Tradition was a high degree of autonomy within the Catholic community due to the lack of clear, ecclesiastical oversight. First, as was previously mentioned, there was a shortage of ordained Catholic clergy throughout the colonial period. Although the Catholic population was always small, estimated at about 2,000 Catholics in Maryland in 1700, the number of clergy was still always proportionately small.[158] Second, there was no clear and established ecclesiastical structure for Catholics in America or in England.[159] When the Catholic monarch James II took the throne in 1685, albeit for a short reign, the first Catholic bishop to function openly in England in over a hundred years, John Leyburn, was consecrated and sent to London.[160] Bishop Leyburn possessed jurisdiction over Catholics in Maryland on paper, but in reality did not exercise it.[161] Despite the deposition of James II and the restoration of Protestantism in the reign of William and Mary, Leyburn continued on with his work as Catholic bishop until his death in 1702.[162] His successors, serving with the title of Vicar

---

[155] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 349.
[156] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 349-350.
[157] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 350; see also Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 82.
[158] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 87.
[159] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 342.
[160] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 343.
[161] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 343.
[162] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 343.

Apostolic of the London district, did occasionally correspond with the church in America and grant faculties to priests to those who requested them but, by-and-large, there was very minimal interaction.[163] What little ecclesiastical oversight there was ended with the American Revolution and, in this hierarchical vacuum, the Maryland Tradition developed an autonomous character out of necessity.[164]

I.B.4. Spirituality of the Maryland Tradition

A fourth characteristic of colonial Catholicism in the Maryland Tradition is the particular spirituality that developed in this context. As was previously mentioned, the center of colonial Catholic worship was the Jesuit farm. The Jesuits were the only Catholic clergy in Maryland, and they were successful in gaining some converts to the faith, drawn by the strong-knit community of Catholic life centered around the Jesuit manor, if near one, or around the special visit of a priest when he reached their region.[165] A local, rural community in the seventeenth-century Maryland might consist of between fifteen and twenty families who lived within a few miles of each other, having close relationships and a high level of familiarity.[166] The high-point of prayer and worship was devotion to the Mass on Sundays and feasts, when possible, and, if a priest was not readily available, they would devote time in private prayer as individuals or families, often times out of popular devotional manuals.[167] Even when present at Mass, private devotions such as praying the rosary, were a common practice.[168] An important part of attendance at Mass was

[163] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 343.
[164] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 343.
[165] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 81.
[166] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 82.
[167] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 92.
[168] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 92.

the worthy reception of Holy Communion, prepared for by both fasting and frequenting confession.[169] Related to fasting, the mother of the family who, during the time period, often was the principle teacher of the faith to the children and provided meals for the family, made sure that fast days were properly observed and took on a critical role in colonial Catholicism.[170]

Jay Dolan identifies three qualities of the Catholic community in the Maryland Tradition.[171] First, the spirituality was rooted in a personal relationship with God without intermediary and a deep personal responsibility for moral conduct.[172] Second, colonial Catholicism was highly disciplined, with regular time devoted to prayer each day, and communal worship, if possible, each week on Sundays and holy days, as well as the discipline required in fasting.[173] Third, spirituality in the Maryland Tradition was marked by a simple and serious quality of sobriety centered around the family in a domestic setting, quite different from Catholic practice in the Spanish Southwest and Quebec, for example.[174] By the mid-seventeenth-century, however, we have seen how the Jesuit farm and missionary network was beginning to regularize into quasi-parish communities, and this change had an impact on religious practice.[175] With a shift in focus from private, domestic practice to more public, communal form, these qualities of the spirituality of the Maryland Tradition began to give way to the new parish setting.[176]

---

[169] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 92.
[170] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 94.
[171] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 94.
[172] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 94.
[173] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 94.
[174] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 83, 94.
[175] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 83, 94.
[176] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 95.

I.B.5. Demographics of Maryland Catholics

The fifth and final characteristic of the Maryland Tradition we will mention is the demographic make-up of the Catholic community, based in the upper-class economic and social elites of the colony.[177] Those who travelled to Maryland as the "gentlemen adventurers" came from the gentry-class in England and continued that tradition of wealth and political influence, largely because of close relationships with the Calvert family.[178] Leading Catholic families in Maryland included the Darnalls, the Brookes and the Carrolls.[179] Even during the penal period of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries when Catholics were denied basic civil rights such as the ability to hold public office or to vote, several Catholic families were unimpeded in economic matters and were able to amass significant fortunes that carried through the Revolutionary era.[180] Charles Carroll, father of Patriot Charles Carroll, acquired vast amounts of land and became one of the wealthiest persons in the American colonies, largely through tobacco crops.[181] Although a minority of the population, Catholics were able to exercise tremendous influence through the wealth and political connections of its upper-class members.

The Maryland Tradition of American colonial Catholicism, formed as it was by the experience of the post-Reformation Catholic community in England, developed a distinct identity that would impact the Catholic community and beyond in the future United States into the Revolutionary period. The particular Maryland Tradition of English Catholicism, centered on wealthy land-owners in largely pastoral settings and the Jesuit missionaries who served the Catholic population, grew up alongside the other non-Catholic colonists and, despite popular

---

[177] See Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 79.
[178] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 79.
[179] Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, 79-80.
[180] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 348.
[181] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 350.

anti-Catholic sentiments in the colonies, forged a new meaning for what it meant to be Catholic apart from England and in the newly developing American culture.

Chapter II: French Catholicism and the Quebec Tradition

II.A. The Backdrop: Post-Reformation Catholicism in France

The experience of the political and religious Reformations in sixteenth and seventeenth-century France was unique. Post-Reformation Catholicism in France operated from a position of majority and cultural dominance. Despite this strength, however, there remained tremendous turmoil in this period, both politically and religiously, often with each dimension impacting the other interconnectedly. In light of this uniqueness, we will consider four characteristics of post-Reformation Catholicism in France. This chapter aims to introduce the environment of post-Reformation French Catholicism and, in doing so, to identify characteristics of it that will be helpful in understanding the Quebec Tradition of colonial Catholicism. First, early modern French society was one of tremendous diversity with repeated efforts to channel that diversity into unity by the monarchy through the means, largely, of religion. Second, an expression of religious diversity in the sixteenth-century were the so-called "Wars of Religion" of the latter half of the century, marked by both violence and, surprisingly, cooperation beyond confessional boundaries. Third, the passage of the Edict of Nantes in 1598 and the rule of Henry IV brought a measure of uniformity, for a time, to the diversity through pacification of Protestantism and recognition of a pluralistic religious landscape. Fourth, religious diversity once again took shape within Catholicism in the seventeenth-century regarding the question of how to properly relate the Church in France to both the state and to the Pope, respectively, in the *dévot* and, later, Jansenist movements. Special mention will be made of the role of the Society of Jesus in this period.

II.A.1. The Diversity of French Society

The first characteristic of post-Reformation Catholicism in France we will consider is the broader social reality of diversity. Early modern French society was regional in character and, therefore, diverse, lacking a monolithic day-to-day culture suggested by the use of the term "France." Although united under a single kingdom and, in a way, politically justifying the use of the term, regional diversity was the norm in such *ancien régime* societies.[1] This diversity found a variety of expressions. For example, the French language, spoken by the king and his inner circle, was not shared by a majority of the people, who instead spoke their regional dialects of Brittany, Picardy, and the like.[2] French was limited to the social elite and, though established as the language to be used in official acts, still competed with Latin for use in some government documents, creating a barrier in understanding between both the center of power and the common people and, also, between the common people across regions.[3] Practical measurements such as weight varied even within provinces and might differ from town to town, complicating matters of business and trade.[4] The promulgation of law, too, was diverse, with the southern provinces, influenced by the Roman custom, codifying legal codes in writing, whereas the northern provinces maintained the tradition of oral custom.[5]

---

[1] Bernard Cottret, "Religious or Secular? The Edict of Nantes, Reformation and State Formation in Late Sixteenth-Century France," in *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, ed. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003), 108.
[2] Janine Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France, 1438-1598*, trans. Richard Rex (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 5.
[3] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 5.
[4] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 5.
[5] Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 5.

A further expression of the diversity of early modern France, especially in the fifteenth and sixteenth-centuries, was administrative. Remnant rights belonging to local people and institutions stemming from the Middle Ages created a diffusion of power in authority between the monarch and the people, through these local administrative means.[6] For the average person, the town and its officials, which had near autonomous power, had more immediate power over daily life than the monarch, and identity was defined locally, by parish, town, and diocese, rather than more broadly as a citizen of the Kingdom of France.[7] This administrative diversity was reinforced by the tremendous difficulties of communication between monarch and court on the one hand, and the local centers of power in the provinces and towns on the other.[8] Local aristocrats continually viewed rebellion against the central power of the king as a real possibility, and the union of the kingdom was in a regular state of threat.[9]

Sixteenth-century France also experienced a powerful religious diversity. Within the Catholic Church, there were movements of reform, inspired by the humanism of Erasmus and the like, that paralleled similar internal reform movements throughout Europe.[10] Within the Protestant Reform movement, the character in France was distinct because, unlike in Germany or England, for example, there was no singular figure or event that marked a split from the traditional religion.[11] Unlike in Germany, there was no central figure like Martin Luther that served as a principle catalyst in breaking from the Catholic Church. The main figures in the French religious Reformation, notably John Calvin, operated from exile. Unlike in England, the monarchs did not impose a change from traditional religion through a top-down approach to

---

[6] Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 5-6.
[7] Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 6.
[8] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 6.
[9] Cottret, “Religious or Secular?,” 109.
[10] See Cottret, “Religious or Secular?,” 109.
[11] Cottret, “Religious or Secular?,” 109.

political reforms and the Protestant communities in France always remained a minority population. When the Catholic Church, including its reformers, encountered the more radical expressions of reform by Protestants, such as iconoclasm and the so-called "Placard Affair," they were met with severity in punishment, producing the first wave of French Protestant martyrs.[12] The Catholic response was marked by a ritualistic effort to not only root out heresy, but to placate heaven, and included devotions such as religious processions.[13] The most influential figure in French Protestantism, John Calvin, had to flee Paris in 1533 and operated from exile due to increasing persecution of "Lutherans," a term broadly and improperly used to apply to all Protestants without distinction.[14] Eventually settling in Geneva, Calvin was joined in exile by numerous French Protestants who left their homeland to escape the threat of martyrdom.[15] Although always a minority, the Protestant population in France did grow to reach between five and ten percent of the total population by the 1560s, by some estimates.[16] The Protestant population was most heavily centered in the northern provinces and the so-called "Huguenot crescent" across southern France.[17] The most frequently adopted Protestant theology in France was of the reformed Calvinist variety, rather than that of Luther.

In the midst of this diversity, especially with regard to the administration of power, the French kings sought to impose unity in their kingdom, from the reign of Louis XI in the late fifteenth-century, to the death of Henry II in 1559.[18] One of the main vehicles for this unity was the Roman Catholic faith of the monarch, a faith shared by the people throughout the provinces

---

[12] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 109-110; see also Mark Greengrass, *The French Reformation* (New York: Blackwell, 1987), 24-27.
[13] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 111.
[14] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 112; see also Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 11.
[15] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 114.
[16] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 114.
[17] Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 43-44.
[18] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 6-7.

in the early modern period.[19] Emphasizing the priestly-character of kingship received in royal anointing, the French monarchy made great efforts to appear in person to the people as a concrete expression of the quasi-sacred role as ruler.[20] Rich symbolism and pageantry was utilized the dull the bonds of local provincial ties to a stronger tie between king and subject grounded in the common faith of Catholicism and a call from God.[21] The sacred symbolism was coupled with the image of king as warrior to forge a focal point of unity to harness the diversity present across early modern French society.[22]

II.A.2. The Wars of Religion

A second characteristic of post-Reformation Catholicism in France was the series of conflicts in the latter half of the sixteenth-century that became known as the "Wars of Religion." These conflicts involved religious disputes between Catholics and French Calvinists, or Huguenots, but were also centered around dynastic rivalry among aristocrats and international concerns in the broader European landscape.[23] Although traditionally divided into eight periods of alternating conflict and peace, the Wars of Religion are divided into three stages by some scholars.[24] The first stage, spanning from the death of Henry II in 1559 to the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre of 1572, was marked by failed efforts to create a national church in France that would include all Christian faiths, both Catholic and Protestant.[25] The second stage, from 1572 to

---

[19] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 7.
[20] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 7.
[21] Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 7.
[22] See Garrisson, *A History of Sixteenth-Century France*, 7.
[23] See Anthony D. Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism, 1629-1645: 'The Parting of Ways'* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 7-8.
[24] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 116.
[25] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 116.

1584, saw the further division of France along these sectarian lines.[26] The final stage, from 1584 until the passage of the Edict of Nantes in 1598, was a period of reconquest by Henry III and Henry IV, the last Valois king and first Bourbon, respectively, in re-asserting the authority of Catholicism around a renewed unification centered on the monarchy.[27] These collective wars were marked by both violence and efforts of cooperation from its Catholic and Protestant participants.

Spontaneous and extreme acts of violence were perpetrated on both sides during the Wars of Religion. From the Catholic perspective, Calvinist theology and practice polluted the sacred realm and, therefore, called for the severe purgation of heresy.[28] From the Protestant side, Catholic ritual and imagery became the target of attack because they were seen as a corruption of true Christianity.[29] The more these Protestant attacks struck objects of Catholic devotion, however, the more they stirred the latent yet powerful loyalty to traditional religion held by the majority population.[30] Moreover, the violence employed in these conflicts can be interpreted as a concrete expression of religious faith.[31] For example, Dennis Crouzet identifies four phases of Calvinist violence during this period, each reflective of their reformed faith.[32] During the first phase, ranging the broad time-frame from the 1520s to 1560, violence took the form of attacks against symbols of deformed religion in a way parodying the execution of justice, for example, by beheading statues of the saints as a sign that this corrupt practice was an affront against the

---

[26] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 116.
[27] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 116.
[28] See Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 76.
[29] See Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 77.
[30] Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 77-78.
[31] See Dennis Crouzet, "Identity and Violence: French Protestants and the Early Wars of Religion," trans. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, in *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, ed. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003), 73.
[32] See Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 73.

true will of God.[33] Violence during this first period tended to be more secretively carried out than in later times.[34] During the second wave of Calvinist violence, the iconoclasm of 1561 and 1562, mobs acted both spontaneously and under the leadership of ministers in breaking images according to a strict interpretation of the Second Commandment.[35] The third phase, following closely and briefly on the heels of the second, was marked by a joining of iconoclasm with victory in war, as a sign of divine favor in bringing about a purer religion than the perverse practices of Catholicism.[36] In the fourth and final stage of violence, beginning in the summer of 1562, a more direct, bloody, and personal violence was unleashed as a means to the radical elimination of traditional religion.[37] "Cold, calculating violence, the opposite of the supposedly divinely inspired violence of the Catholics, was designed to terrorise, and to break the dynamics of the Catholic reaction by demanding an eye for an eye."[38] In this variety of violence, Calvinists were caught between the hope of influencing the monarchy on the one hand, and the desire to completely subvert the social and political structures of the regime on the other.[39]

Even in the wake of this violence, however, the Wars of Religion also served as occasions for cooperation across confessional boundaries in hopes of quelling the violence and creating peace. Although ignored as insignificant by many scholars, the numerous examples of local initiatives of pacification throughout the period from 1560 to 1580 are evidence of efforts to cooperate beyond religious differences to foster an environment free of violent conflict.[40]

---

[33] See Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 73.
[34] See Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 73.
[35] See Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 73.
[36] See Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 73-74.
[37] Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 74.
[38] Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 74.
[39] See Crouzet, "Identity and Violence," 90-91.
[40] See Olivier Christin, "'Peace Must Come From Us': Friendship Pacts Between the Confessions During the Wars of Religion," trans. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, in *The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, ed. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003), 92-93, 96.

These agreements between Catholics and Protestants in towns such as Annonay, Caen, and Montélimar, for example, sought compromise on their own initiative and without coercion from a specific authority, set down these compromises in writing, with the objective of forming an environment of co-existence among the sects, an explicit recognition of pluralism.[41] These documents contained language of friendship and shared citizenship that transcended religious identity, creating a space of communal living free of religious consequence, and were brought about by all levels of local-society, from magistrates to farmers, and everyone in between.[42] These results were in contradiction to the widely-held principles that a kingdom could not exist peacefully with subjects of divided religious loyalties.[43] Despite the violence of the wars of religion, these pacification pacts show the efforts to end the Wars of Religion coming from the common will of members of the community.[44]

II.A.3. Uniformity in Diversity: The Edict of Nantes and Henry IV

A third characteristic of Catholicism in post-Reformation France we will consider is the uniformity brought by Henry IV after the diversity of the Wars of Religion and the passage of the Edict of Nantes in 1598. At the start of the 1590s and as the Wars of Religion were winding down with fatigue of violence, the prime candidate for the French throne, Henri de Navarre, decided that his claim to the crown would be strongest if he abandoned his Huguenot faith in favor of a return to Roman Catholicism, an important step in being recognized by the majority

[41] See Christin, "'Peace Must Come From Us,'" 93-94.
[42] See Christin, "'Peace Must Come From Us,'" 97-98, 101.
[43] See Greengrass, *The French Reformation*, 69.
[44] See Christian, "'Peace Must Come From Us,'" 102.

Catholic population in France.[45] This return to Catholicism was marked both by a public recognition of forgiveness by the French bishops in 1593 but also, after considerable political maneuvering counteracting the influence of Spain, a formal reconciliation of France by the papacy in 1595 through Henri's representatives.[46] Through this act, France remained Catholic by way of its new Catholic monarch, Henri IV, but, in doing so, tied the Bourbon line to both papal recognition and to the Catholic faith.[47]

Henri received the support of a moderate-bloc in France, sometimes referred to as the *politiques*, who valued peace over constant conflict, even allowing room for religious plurality, and saw Catholic identity as a part of broader French identity, and therefore not beholden to, nor dependent on, the recognition of the Bishop of Rome.[48] This position, in turn, absolutized the power of the French monarchy over and against any power of the Pope and, during the two-year period between Henri's reconciliation with the French bishops and then with the papacy, fostered a sense of autonomy for French Catholicism.[49] This "Gallican" revival emphasized both the authority of the state and Catholic identity within French self-understanding.[50] In general, Gallicanism refers to a collective of positions on proper church-state relations that held the following three beliefs: first, the supreme authority and independence of the King of France in world affairs; second, the supreme authority of the Church as residing in an ecumenical council rather than the papacy; and, third, the limited power of the pope to intervene in both

---

[45] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 9.
[46] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 9.
[47] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 9-10.
[48] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 10.
[49] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 10.
[50] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 11.

ecclesiastical and political affairs within France.[51] Gallicanism was then, in a word, a form of French nationalism in both church and state.

Henri's reign marked the first instance of successful integration of the religious and secular dimensions of kingship and was, as Bernard Cottret holds, the founder of absolute monarchy.[52] Although the term "absolutism" was not formally and technically used in French until the period of the French Revolution in the late eighteenth-century, the concept can still be applied retroactively to monarchs such as to Henri IV, as is held by Cottret.[53] In such late sixteenth-century writers in France such as Jean Bodin and François de Gravelle, the understanding of an absolute ruler was not seen as unlimited, but rather as equated with and subject to both civil and divine law; Henri became the embodiment of this ideal.[54] Ironically, even his assassination in 1610 at the hands of an ultra-conservative Catholic cemented the sacral dimension to Henri's kingship by making him a Christ-like figure.[55] The disharmony in France rampant in the decades of the Wars of Religion was often compared to the diseases of the body; disunity in religion wreaked havoc on the kingdom.[56] The absolute monarch was one who could bring health to the body, and Henri was often portrayed as such a healer, strengthening his link to Christ in the popular mind.[57] This association is important for understanding the deep reverence and respect for the role of the monarchy as a key figure in God's providential plan for governing the world present in the French Catholicism of the period. A key element in the expression of

[51] "Gallicanism," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online* (June 18, 2009). Accessed July 5, 2017, https://www.britannica.com/topic/Gallicanism.
[52] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 108.
[53] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 120.
[54] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 121-122.
[55] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 123; see also Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 12.
[56] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 123.
[57] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 123; see also Mark Greengrass, "An Edict and its Antecedents: the Pacification of Nantes and Political Culture in Later Sixteenth-Century France," in *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, ed. Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003), 133-137.

this royal absolutism and healing was the peaceful co-existence of religious diversity after the Edict of Nantes, a peace that could only be achieved through the strength of the French king.[58]

The final statements of peace in 1598 between France and Spain, often included collectively under the umbrella of the specific Edict of Nantes, included allowance for real, although limited and narrow, freedoms for the Huguenot minorities according to the will of the crown throughout the kingdom of France.[59] Although peaceful co-existence of religiously diverse communities was achieved in local settings during the late sixteenth-century period, mentioned above in the context of cooperation during the Wars of Religion, Nantes built on these traditions and extended their scope to all of France.[60] It was, before all else, a treaty to forge peace, and effort was made to link it to these earlier precedents of peace.[61] All atrocities committed during the decades of conflict were remitted by the king and were to be forgiven by the people, as a means by which "the past could be mastered by the present for the future."[62] The text of the edict makes clear, however, that the allowance of non-Catholic religious practice was seen as a short-term allowance necessary for immediate peace rather than as an ideal state intended to be the perpetual norm going forward: "'But as it has not yet pleased him to permit them to have a single form of worship and religion, let it be at least with the same mind, and with such order as to prevent all disturbances and troubles between them . . . thereby removing the roots of all the evil and disturbances engendered by religion, which has always been a most thorny and pervasive issue.'"[63] The long-term solution was to form a national church under

[58] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 108.
[59] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 11.
[60] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 116.
[61] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 116.
[62] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 122; quote from Greengrass, "An Edict and its Antecedents," 129.
[63] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 117, quoting Bernard Cottret, *L'Edit de Nantes, 1598 : pour en finir avec les guerres de religion* (Paris: Perrin, 1997), 362.

which all Christians could be included, after the continual and successful reformation of French Catholicism.[64]

In fact, what the Edict of Nantes did was grant freedom of conscience but not freedom of worship.[65] Every person in France could hold to the religion of their choice in the inner sanctum of conscience, but were limited in their outward expression of this faith in worship; for example, Protestant worship sites were limited to certain areas and numbers.[66] Although Huguenots were not obliged to attend Catholic worship in the Mass, they were forced to pay taxes to support the Catholic clergy.[67] The Protestants became a recognized minority in France through the Edict, but nonetheless remained a clear minority and had to accept this status.[68] The goal of the legislation was to create and preserve peace, and it utilized toleration of Protestantism as the means toward this goal: "they had to be accepted for want of a better solution. But they were expected one day to adopt the religion of the king."[69] Toleration in this sense, however, does not necessarily have the same meaning as the modern liberal value held as essential to current democracies, which usually means an integration of religious diversity within a national unity.[70] The Edict itself does not use the term, but instead embeds temporary religious pluralism into all facets of life in France, grounded in the absolutism of Henri IV.[71] The pacification measures were further enforced by the court preaching of figures such as François de Sales, who urged obedience to the

---

[64] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 117.
[65] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 118.
[66] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 118.
[67] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 118.
[68] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 119.
[69] Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 119.
[70] See Greengrass, "An Edict and its Antecedents," 129.
[71] See Greengrass, "An Edict and its Antecedents," 129.

king as the prime duty of the nobility, especially following the instability of the latter sixteenth-century.[72]

The recognition of a religiously-plural France challenged the theory of uniformity of religion that had been operative in France for centuries.[73] The relative peace it brought in the period between its passage and its eventual revocation in 1685, is the surest sign of its success. However, the concessions made by the *politiques* in supporting the converted Catholic Henry VI and his seizure of the throne in the 1590s were not universally accepted by the more uncompromising wing of the French Catholics, who wanted a monarch free of any "contamination" of Protestantism.[74] Religious disputes moved from the threats external to the Catholic Church, as against the Huguenots in the Wars of Religion, into the internal life of French Catholicism itself and the question of reform, a topic that will be addressed in the next section.[75] Despite the liberties granted to minority Protestants by the Edict and the near-century of peace it brought, it could not have been implemented without the supreme authority of Henri IV, and the uniformity he brought to the kingdom through this absolutism after the decades of tumult in the Wars of Religion.[76] This is important in that the monarchy was seen as a vehicle of divine order and stability and, without it, the hard lesson of violence, disorder, and the perpetual potential of chaos, was all too familiar to the popular memory.

---

[72] See Jason Sager, "François de Sales and Catholic Reform in Seventeenth-Century France," *Dutch Review of Church History* 85 (2005): 281.
[73] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 11.
[74] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 11.
[75] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 11.
[76] See Cottret, "Religious or Secular?," 120.

II.A.4. *Dévot* and Jansenist Movements

The fourth and final characteristic of post-Reformation Catholicism in France we will consider is the continued diversity within the uniformity of Catholicism in the seventeenth-century, as expressed in the *dévot* and later Jansenist movements. These movements arose in the uncertainty of monarchical transition. Specifically, this diversity was over the question of political and religious loyalties to the papacy and to the state in France. Key players in these controversies were the Society of Jesus.

Upon the death of Henri IV in 1610 and during the minority of his successor, Louis XIII, French Catholic identity became more open to the influence of the papacy in encouraging pro-Catholic interests throughout Europe, rather than focusing solely on the best-interests of France.[77] This position in favor of international Catholic bonds was in marked contrast with a nationalistic Catholicism that viewed both the papacy and the Holy Roman Empire as threats to French autonomy.[78] However, the violence and upheaval from the Wars of Religion remained in the public consciousness and efforts of reform within the Church, in the spirit articulated at the Council of Trent, held at least a positive hope of cooperation between the French episcopacy and Roman leadership.[79] However, although the Council concluded in 1563, its decrees had not been formally received by the French Church even at the time of Henri IV's assassination.[80] While implementation of the Tridentine doctrinal decrees were resisted because they would highlight the difference between Catholic and Huguenot beliefs, even the disciplinary decrees of the Council were difficult to put into effect because they contradicted long-standing rights of French

[77] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 12.
[78] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 12.
[79] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 13.
[80] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 13.

clergy, including the right of clergy to challenge discipline imposed by superiors by bringing it before a civil court.[81] The Society of Jesus became a focal point for those concerned about papal interference in French affairs.[82] In fact, prior to this period, the Jesuits faced hostility within the kingdom and, due to a failed assassination attempt on the king in the 1590s in which they were alleged by their enemies to have been involved, the Society was exiled from most parts of France until 1603 when they were allowed to return by Henri IV.[83] In other words, the Jesuits were both loyal to the papacy and dependent on the French monarchy for their existence in France.[84]

The early *dévot* movement was marked by a similar attachment to the papacy and local episcopacy on the one-hand, and yet loyalty to the French monarchy and state on the other. This found two important expressions of Catholic reform in the figures of Pierre de Bérulle and Jean-Jacques Olier, respectively. Bérulle, influenced by the example of Philip Neri, founded the French Oratory in 1611 as a grouping of secular priests living together in community that would mimic some aspects of religious life. However, a benefit of this novel model was that these communities were not canonical religious orders, therefore they avoided some of the points of conflict that plagued the relationship of the traditional orders with the local diocesan bishop.[85] Olier established the seminary at Saint-Sulpice to help spiritually form secular priests and, therefore, contributed to the internal reform of the Church.[86]

Although the broad term *dévot* included individuals from a variety of contexts, including such reformers as Bérulle, Olier, and even François de Sales, a shared influence to a large

[81] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 15.
[82] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 16.
[83] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 16.
[84] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 17.
[85] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 20.
[86] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 21.

number of the movement during the 1620s was the figure of Saint-Cyran.[87] He served as a facilitator of contacts among members of the movement and was involved in a number of institutions.[88] He was also, however, interested in what was happening in the Netherlands and maintained regular correspondence with Jansenius, a Dutch theologian.[89] The most important work of Jansenius, the *Augustinus*, was not published in France until the 1640s and centered around a theological divergence from traditional Catholic understanding of the issue of grace.[90] By this point, the common goal of internal reform of the Catholic Church became subordinated to a difference in theology and belief, and its practical consequences, creating a more radical branch of the *dévot* movement.[91]

Saint-Cyran strongly opposed the activities of the Jesuits in France and the new branch adopted this character and took root at the community at Port-Royal, under the Arnauld family, who similarly shared a tradition of hostility to the Jesuits.[92] The Port-Royal version of the *dévot* movement, associating opposition to the French foreign policy exercised by Richelieu (namely, working with Protestants to battle Catholic Spain) with strong anti-Jesuit sentiment, formed a separate movement that later would develop into Jansenism through attachment to the *Augustinus* text published in 1641 but, already at this earlier stage, having a distinct identity.[93] "French Jansenism, whatever its original intentions or prolonged protestations, would develop an increasing opposition to the exercise of papal authority and accordingly find repeated, even if not

---

[87] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 185.
[88] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 185.
[89] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 185.
[90] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 185-186.
[91] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 186.
[92] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 186.
[93] See Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 186-187; see also Henry Phillips, *Church and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 197.

total or permanent, defence mounted by Gallican forces."[94] The rigorist moral and sacramental life of Jansenists prioritized the individual over society, emphasizing personal conscience and, not surprisingly, helped create an "outsider" status for them vis-a-vis the broader French social scene.[95]

As is often the case, the boundaries of Jansenism were more clearly defined amidst controversy as debate over Jansenius's work was waged between the institutional and hierarchical Church and the Port-Royal community, creating a specific identity that the latter could become the target of prolonged hostility.[96] The Gallican and radical religious dimensions of Jansenism experienced a popularity in segments of France, with the assistance of bishops who were sympathetic to their positions.[97] Although the 1713 papal bull *Unigenitus* was intended to end the controversy, reaction to it within France showed the divisions that existed between parts of the French Church and the papacy.[98] This is to show that, despite the uniformity and peace brought by Henri IV and the Edict of Nantes that existed at the start of the seventeenth-century, the diversity of French religion, first boiling up in the Wars of Religion, still found expression within these inter-Catholic conflicts over the proper relationship between political and religious allegiance.

These characteristics of post-Reformation Catholicism in France formed the backdrop of the religious life and identity of those who would settle and put down roots in Quebec. Amidst the diversity and controversy that marked this period in France, Catholicism developed a strong sense of identity with French nationalism and, most importantly for the Quebec Tradition, a pro-

---

[94] Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism*, 187.
[95] See Phillips, *Church and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France*, 197.
[96] See Phillips, *Church and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France*, 190.
[97] Phillips, *Church and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France*, 190-191.
[98] Phillips, *Church and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France*, 300-301.

monarchical stand as an expression of God's will for government. We now turn our attention to this Quebec Tradition.

II.B. The Quebec Tradition of Canadian Colonial Catholicism

France launched colonial endeavors to the New World in the sixteenth-century and, along with the financial investment in trade in goods such as fur, exported their Catholic faith. The Quebec Tradition of Catholic identity grew up amidst the particular circumstances of Canada, the central part of the colony of New France.[99] We will identify five characteristics of the Quebec Tradition. First, the missionary roots of the colony accompanying the business venture, and the clergy that undertook the missionary project. Second, Canadian Catholicism during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth-centuries was largely formed by strong episcopal figures, especially Laval and Saint-Vallier, the first and second bishops of Quebec, respectively. Third, the Quebec Tradition was marked by the cooperative relationship between church and state that, eventually, prioritized the state that the church depended upon. Fourth, the presence of women religious communities were an essential aspect of Catholic life in colonial Canada, undertaking such critical social services as medical care, education, and helping the poor. Finally, the lived religion of the people, shared by both laity and clergy alike, suggests a rich faith-life involving devotion to saintly relics, miracles, and communal festivals on Holy Days and, therefore, the high degree to which Catholic identity was central to the people of Quebec.

[99] A note on terminology: "New France" refers to the French colony as a whole, of which "Canada" was a portion that roughly corresponded with the colonial Province of Quebec. For our purposes, use of the term "Quebec" refers to the entire province, and is therefore synonymous with Canada, and "Quebec City" refers to the city.

II.B.1. Missionary Roots

The first characteristic of the Quebec Tradition we will consider is the missionary roots of the colonial endeavors, interwoven with the clear business opportunities of the New World. Voyages of exploration to the territory that would become part of New France unfolded gradually over more than a century, beginning, from the English perspective, with the journey of Giovanni Caboto in the late fifteenth-century.[100] By the time of Jacques Cartier in the 1530s and the start of French exploration, Christianity was an important element of interaction with the indigenous peoples, with Cartier himself gaining a reputation as a healer who would recite the beginning of the Gospel of John and make the sign of the cross over the sick who came to him for treatment.[101] Since the main purpose of these early ventures was the prospect of financial gain in finding new and faster trade routes, however, establishing permanent settlements and spreading Christianity were not yet priorities.[102] With the successes of Portuguese and Spanish enterprises in South America, France began granting monopolies on trade in North America to companies in exchange for establishing colonies by the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries and, after a number of failed attempts, the first permanent settlement was made at Quebec City in 1608 under the leadership of Samuel de Champlain.[103] With the tumult of the Wars of Religion coming to a close in France and the passing of the Edict of Nantes in 1598, the religious landscape in France became, at least on the surface, pluralistic.[104] The older belief, however, that there should be one established religion in one kingdom did not go away and the

[100] Terry Crowley. "The French Regime to 1760," in *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada*, eds. Terrence Murphy and Roberto Perin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1.
[101] Crowely, "The French Regime to 1760," 1-2.
[102] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 2.
[103] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 2.
[104] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760)," 3.

New World colonies, especially at Quebec, became a place to emphasize a reformed but fervent Roman Catholicism in the early decades of the seventeenth-century.[105] This was especially contrasted with the practice of Huguenot colonists who emphasized only business contacts with the native populations and did not initiate systematic efforts at evangelization.[106]

An interesting component of this very early period of settlement was the presence of lay and secular clergy leadership and initiative in bringing the Gospel to the indigenous peoples, adventurers who saw themselves as soldiers of God and apostles in a New World.[107] In Acadia, for example, the colony led by Jean de Poutrincourt sought to form a trading monopoly alongside evangelization efforts to the local populations.[108] A secular priest, Jessé Fléché, performed the first sacrament in what would become the nation of Canada when he baptized the leader of the Micmac people and a number of his family, although Fléché could not provide instruction to the baptismal candidates because he did not know their language.[109] When two Jesuit priests, Pierre Biard and Énemond Massé arrived in 1611 at the invitation of the wife of the governor of Paris, they were appalled that baptism had occurred without any catechesis and reported Fléché's actions to the theological experts at the Sorbonne who concurred with this judgment.[110] In response to this approach, Massé opted to live with the Micmac and learn their language and customs so he could more appropriately instruct them in the Christian faith.[111] After a raid by English Protestants from Virginia in 1613, the upstart mission to Acadia all but ended.[112] As a result of this controversy, all missionary activity to the non-European population was reserved to

---

[105] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 3.
[106] See Terence J. Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics: Gallicanism, Romanism, and Canadianism* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002), 6.
[107] See Dominique Deslandres, *Croire et faire croire* (Paris: Fayard, 2003), 289.
[108] See Deslandres, *Croire et faire croire*, 41.
[109] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 4.
[110] Crowely, "The French Regime to 1760," 4.
[111] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 4; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 5-6.
[112] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 6.

the religious orders and, while the laity was welcome to participate in this work, leadership was left in the hands of the orders.[113]

Champlain's settlement at Quebec City quickly became the central hub of the colony covering a lot of territory with a sparsely distributed population.[114] Champlain returned to France to promote the Quebec colony and to secure both financial support and increased interest of potential settlers.[115] As a fruit of this campaigning, in 1615, four Recollects, a reformed branch of the Franciscan family of orders, arrived in New France to minister to both the French colonists and the indigenous population and they spread out over a large territory.[116] Although there were many compatible and parallel points of belief between the religions of the native populations and Christianity, such as belief in an afterlife, respect for the dead, and a high-value placed on the interpretation of dreams, there were also direct and incompatible contradictions, such as in their understanding of the relationship between humans and the rest of nature, and also between the individual and community.[117] After one year of ministry, the Recollects decided that the culture of the indigenous population was so foreign to Christianity that it would have to be changed in its entirety for the people to receive baptism and the Christian faith successfully.[118] As a means to this, the French colonists and native peoples were to live together in an intentional community modeled on the missionary system of the reductions practiced in South America, so that French-European culture could be absorbed by the native peoples, making them French as a prerequisite to making them Christian.[119] By 1620, the Recollects obtained enough funding to construct a residence in Quebec and opened a school to aid in the cultural assimilation of non-European

---

[113] See Deslandres, *Croire et faire croire*, 42.
[114] Deslandres, *Croire et faire croire*, 204.
[115] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 4.
[116] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 6; see also Crowley, *The French Regime to 1760*, 4.
[117] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 5-6.
[118] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 6.
[119] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 6; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 6.

children, although the school only lasted a few years.[120] A number of Jesuits joined the Recollect project in 1625, including Énemond Massé, Charles Lalemant, and Jean de Brébeuf, but all had to return to France in 1629 after yet another assault by English Protestants on the colony.[121] A key development occurred in the meantime, when, in 1622, Rome removed responsibility for leading missionary work from the royal heads of state and established the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to direct all missionary efforts, through the means of the religious orders.[122]

When the French regained control of Quebec in 1632, the Jesuits were granted exclusive rights to direct religious operations in Canada.[123] Although this decision was supported by Rome, granting such authority to the Jesuits, who were polarizing, was controversial.[124] Those opposed to this involvement feared the Jesuits threatened the rights of the French church in favor of Roman control.[125] Recall the topic of Gallicanism, discussed above, and how the Jesuits were under suspicion in France of promoting the interests of the papacy at the expense of French interests, both ecclesiastical and political. Similar factors were at play in the New World colony.

With their return to Canada, the Jesuits formed a four-part plan for evangelization: first, to learn the various languages of the native peoples; second, to build schools to immerse indigenous children in French-Christian culture, like the Recollects did a decade before; third, to run hospitals that would be a persuasive expression of Christian care for the suffering; and fourth, to settle those native peoples who were nomadic on specific land so they could form

---

[120] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 7.
[121] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 7-8; see also Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 7.
[122] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 7.
[123] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 8.
[124] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 8.
[125] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 8.

parish communities and take up farming, both seen as essential parts of adopting Christianity.[126] Over time, the Jesuit strategy changed, for instance, when upon seeing the reverence and authority of elders within a native community, they shifted their focus from children to this more influential group.[127] They shifted from the older model of evangelization through French culture to a model of cultural adaptation.[128] For example, the Jesuits attempted to communicate the Catholic faith in terminology already present in the various indigenous languages rather than by using French words, when possible.[129] Even beyond the translation of terms, they tried to explain their meaning by analogy to the lived experience and culture of the native peoples.[130] With their methods proving successful through conversions to Catholicism, the Jesuits "felt freer to allow the natives some latitude in building bridges to Christianity from their own customs."[131] The method cultural adaptation employed by the Jesuits was later adopted by some of the women religious communities in their ministries, as will be mentioned below.

During this period, the church spent most of its resources and efforts in bringing the Gospel to the native peoples although, of course, the French population was not totally neglected and, in fact, the ratio of priest to lay person was quite high.[132] Throughout these efforts of evangelization, the indigenous people were viewed by the missionaries in a positive light, as both capable of salvation and free from the moral contamination of European culture suffered by the

[126] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 8.
[127] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 12-13.
[128] See James Axtell, *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 108-10.
[129] Axtell, *The Invasion Within*, 108.
[130] Axtell, *The Invasion Within*, 109.
[131] Axtell, *The Invasion Within*, 111.
[132] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 12, 15-16.

French.[133] This contrasts sharply with the more negative view held by the English Puritans in their colonies to the south of Canada.[134]

The annual reports of the Jesuits to their superiors in France, the *Relations*, were in part an effort to increase interest and financial backing for the work being done in Canada.[135] One project influenced by the *Relations* was the founding of the settlement of Ville-Marie on the island of Montreal in 1642 by the Société de Notre Dame de Montréal at a central point in commercial trade.[136] This settlement was to be an intentional community modeled on apostolic times and with the goal of evangelizing the local native populations. The Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement, from which the Société de Notre Dame de Montréal grew, was composed of devoted Catholics with financial resources who were influenced by the missionary work going on in New France described in the *Relations*.[137] Although gifted with funding, by the 1650s the community at Ville-Marie was short on personnel and on the brink of failure when it received an infusion of settlers from France.[138] In 1657, four priests from the Society of St. Sulpice, founded by Olier, arrived in Montreal to support the slim number of clergy, setting the stage for potential ecclesiastical conflict and rivalry between the religious orders active in the region.[139]

II.B.2. Episcopal Figures

The second characteristic of the Quebec Tradition we will consider is the role of strong episcopal figures in the seventeenth-century, namely François de Laval and Jean-Baptiste de La

---

[133] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 12.
[134] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 12.
[135] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 11.
[136] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 15-16.
[137] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 12.
[138] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 18.
[139] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 19; see also Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 18-19.

Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, the first and second bishops of Quebec, respectively. These two figures helped shape the identity of Canadian Catholicism as the church developed formal structures and negotiated its relationship with both the state and the various segments within the church.

Laval came from one of the most noble families in France, with roots going back to pagan Gaul and to those baptized with Clovis at the end of the fifth-century.[140] Although rich in lineage, Laval's immediate family was not rich in material goods or fortune, and young François was chosen for service to the church, possibly with the hopes of securing income for the family status.[141] He was sent to study at the Jesuit college at La Flèche and received the first minor order on the long road to priesthood at the young but customary age of eight-and-a-half years old.[142] In 1637, in the midst of his ten years of study at La Flèche, François was named a cathedral canon for the diocese of Èvreux by the bishop, his uncle, which allowed him to continue to finance his studies after the death of his father in 1636.[143] His time at La Flèche inspired in Laval both a strong commitment to piety and to missionary work through exposure to his Jesuit formators.[144] Completing his studies there, he moved on to another Jesuit institution in 1641, the Collège de Clermont in Paris, to study theology, though he had to interrupt his studies upon the death of his two older brothers in 1644 and 1645, respectively, to attend to family affairs.[145] Laval inherited the responsibilities of being head of the family and took the title of

[140] André Vachon, "Laval, François de," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (Toronto: University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003), accessed March 16, 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/laval_francois_de_2E.html.
[141] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[142] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[143] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[144] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[145] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."

Abbé de Montigny.[146] Once matters were settled at home, he returned to complete his studies and was ordained a priest in May 1647, developing a genuine passion for ministering to the marginalized, including the infirm and children.[147]

During Laval's formation and early priesthood, momentum was growing to provide a bishop for New France.[148] The Archbishop of Rouen claimed jurisdiction over the colonies because individuals and ships from his diocese had embarked for the New World but, for practical reasons of governing women religious communities in a territory so far away, by 1649 he delegated some of his authority to the Jesuits.[149] When the Sulpicians were sent to Montreal, however, they, too, were granted a share of his authority by being made his vicar-general.[150] The Sulpician superior, Gabriel de Thubières de Levy de Queylus, took this as a license to oust the Jesuits from their continued pastoral works in Quebec.[151] After being made aware of the abuses of authority, the Archbishop of Rouen agreed to limit the Sulipician's oversight to Montreal, but this dispute between the Sulpicians and Jesuits flared up again over the issue of a bishop.[152] According to the long-standing rights of the church in France, the king maintained the right to nominate candidates for ecclesiastical office, but the pope maintained the power to appoint them.[153]When in 1657 the Associates of Montreal proposed Queylus as a candidate for bishop, with the support of the French clergy, the Jesuits balked at the choice and had the support of the queen mother, Anne of Austria, in doing so.[154] Refusing an offer from Anne that a Jesuit candidate be put forth, the Society recommended François de Laval, their former student, and he

---

[146] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[147] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[148] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[149] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 18.
[150] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 18.
[151] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 18.
[152] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 19.
[153] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 19.
[154] See Vachon, "Laval, François de"; see also Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 19.

was approved for the position by the crown.[155] The Jesuits intended, moreover, to have Laval appointed as part of a broader plan that would ultimately separate the church in Canada from dependence on Rouen and make it a particular church answerable only to Rome.[156] The Roman authorities feared that Laval's closeness with the Jesuits would spark an independence from the recently formed Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith.[157] A compromise was reached where a vicariate and not a diocese would be established in New France, and Laval would be named vicar apostolic with the faculties of a bishop but without the title, and therefore the church in Canada would no longer be under the oversight of Rouen but still be subject as a missionary territory to the Roman Congregation.[158] The thirty-five year old Laval was ordained in secret on December 8, 1658 by the papal nuncio in a monastic chapel in Paris outside the ecclesial-jurisdiction of the Kingdom of France and set off for Canada a few months later, in April 1659.[159] Laval was only made bishop of Quebec in 1674 when the diocese was officially established.[160]

The church in Canada to which Laval arrived was quite humble by any measure.[161] The population of French settlers was around two thousand, unevenly divided between Quebec, the largest settlement with nearly sixty-percent of the population, and two smaller settlements at Trois-Rivières and Montreal, respectively.[162] The number of clergy available for ministry was even more humble, with seventeen Jesuits, four Sulpicians, and six secular priests and lay

---

155 See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
156 See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
157 See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
158 See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
159 See Vachon, "Laval, François de"; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 22.
160 Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 23.
161 See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 19.
162 See Vachon, "Laval, François de."

religious brothers.[163] Laval brought his piety and zeal to the new assignment, and wished to establish his authority and to spread devotions popular in France upon the people.[164] These efforts brought him into several conflicts in church-state relations, and we will touch on some of them in the following section. One of the main pastoral innovations of Laval's tenure was the establishment of the Séminaire de Québec in 1663 which he saw as the center of the church's life and mission in Canada.[165] Laval's goal was to create a community of priests who were formed, educated, and lived at the seminary as a home operating base, and then were sent on assignment to minister to different communities in a missionary structure, always returning to the seminary at the end of the assignment.[166] This would be a solution to the problem of limited clergy, on the one hand, and to the fear of moral laxity of clergy that can come with living in parochial isolation, on the other.[167]The faithful would be charged a tithe that would go to support the seminary and the mission of its clergy.[168] Members of the seminary would renounce their own individual property and pool it together to care for all and, in return, they would be supported by the seminary for life.[169] Although membership was not compulsory for secular priests, it was practically impossible for anyone not to join and to expect to minister in Quebec.[170] This structure provided a means for direct control of church activity by Laval and also for providing regular sacramental and ministerial service to the people. By its nature, however, it was a provisional structure so long as the colony was mission territory without self-sufficient parishes

[163] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[164] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 24.
[165] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 20.
[166] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 20.
[167] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 20.
[168] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 20.
[169] Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[170] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."

in place.[171] By the end of his time as bishop, the number of clergy in Canada had grown to around one hundred, with a similar number of women religious.[172]

Laval's successor, Jean-Baptiste de La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, ultimately unraveled the established plans of Laval centered on the seminary. Also coming from a noble family, Saint-Vallier studied at the Jesuit college in Grenoble and served at the court of King Louis XIV, being ordained a priest in 1681.[173] Despite numerous opportunities to indulge in the worldly aspects of curial life, Saint-Vallier doubled-down in his austerity and exercised a devoted commitment to doing the corporal works of mercy.[174] A Jesuit friend, Le Valois, approached Saint-Vallier in 1681 about possibly filling the vacancy in Quebec if its bishop, Laval, retired as he was rumored to be considering.[175] Although on the fast-track to a lucrative ecclesiastical career in France, Saint-Vallier accepted the challenges that came with the church in Quebec with a truly apostolic and missionary spirit.[176] When Laval finally did offer his resignation in 1685, he recommended Saint-Vallier to succeed him and the nomination was approved by the king.[177] However, due to conflicts between the monarch and the papacy, the episcopal ordination was delayed and Saint-Vallier was sent to Quebec with the title of vicar general.[178] Saint-Vallier's zeal, unfortunately, frequently found expression in an authoritarian and domineering style, refusing to heed the counsel of advisors and spending large sums of money.[179] The priests at the seminary wrote to Laval describing their reservations concerning

---

[171] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 24; see also Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[172] Alfred Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 2 (Toronto: University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003-), accessed March 16, 2017, http://biographi.ca/en/bio/la_croix_de_chevrieres_de_saint_vallier_jean_baptiste_de_2E.html.
[173] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[174] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[175] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[176] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[177] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[178] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[179] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."

Saint-Vallier, and Laval even asked him to resign.[180] Saint-Vallier refused and received the support of Louis XIV who even, for a time, banned Laval from travelling to Quebec so he would not be seen as a threat to Saint-Vallier.[181] Finally, in 1688, the required approval came from Rome and Saint-Vallier was officially ordained bishop and, having this clear authority, soon requested a lifting on the ban of Laval.[182]

Saint-Vallier's ministry focused on re-shaping the recently formed diocese of Quebec along the lines he judged most appropriate.[183] An obvious target of this reshaping was Laval's seminary, which Saint-Vallier saw as an outdated model in a period of diocesan growth and also a threat to his authority.[184] The dismantling had already begun in 1679 when the king ordered that the tithes be paid to individual priests rather than to the seminary, and Saint-Vallier seized on this momentum to create new parishes with new boundaries and resident pastors.[185] Saint-Vallier succeeded in separating the parishes from the seminary in 1692 and finally unwound the great project of Laval.[186]

In addition to his polarizing personality and governing style, Saint-Vallier also produced three books, one a history of the church in New France and the other two a catechism and ritual book, respectively.[187] The numerous conflicts during his tenure led him to travel frequently to plead his case before King Louis the XIV in France which, naturally, meant his absence from his diocese.[188] On a return trip to Canada after four years in Europe, Saint-Vallier's ship was captured by the English in 1704 and the bishop was taken prisoner in England and offered as

---

[180] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[181] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[182] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[183] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 37-38.
[184] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 25.
[185] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 34; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 25.
[186] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 34.
[187] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 36.
[188] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholicism*, 25.

ransom for prisoners held by France.[189] After five years in England, he was returned to France where Louis XIV kept him as a prisoner-of-sorts for an additional four years for fear of a resumption of ecclesiastical disputes in Canada.[190] Bishop Laval functioned in his place until his own death in 1708 while Saint-Vallier was detained in Europe.[191] Finally in 1713, after a thirteen-year absence, Saint-Vallier returned to Quebec.[192] During his exile, however, he underwent a profound change and, where before he brought conflict and discord, upon his return he brought reconciliation and simplicity.[193] He shunned his previous life of luxury and lived in austerity, and reconciled with the religious orders he had previously alienated.[194] Saint-Vallier provided the foundational structures for the church in Quebec and strong leadership up to his death in 1727.[195]

These first two bishops of Quebec, Laval and Saint-Vallier, were extremely significant because of the duration of their episcopacies, spanning nearly seventy years, during which they fought for the rights of the Canadian church vis-a-vis the crown, and the brevity and absence of their next several successors.[196] The next bishops either never stepped foot in Canada (Louis-François de Mornay) or had extremely short tenures of residence in the colony (Pierre-Herman Dosquet resided there for only two years and François de Lauberivière for only twelve days).[197] During this period of episcopal absence, the French crown exercised greater control over the church in Canada.[198]

---

[189] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[190] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26; see also Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[191] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[192] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26.
[193] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26.
[194] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26.
[195] See Rambaud, "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de."
[196] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26.
[197] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26.
[198] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 26.

II.B.3. Church and State

A third characteristic of the Quebec Tradition was the close relationship between church and state during the seventeenth-century and the eventually subordination of the church to the state in the early eighteenth. There are a number of issues that could be discussed under this topic, but we will briefly identify three circumstances of conflict.

The first issue was Laval's establishment of a separate ecclesiastical court distinct from the colonial courts for matters pertaining to church personnel and issues when he first arrived in Quebec in the 1650s.[199] In the wake of the dispute surrounding his appointment, Laval prioritized the establishment and recognition of his authority in an effort to defend against potential encroachment by the state, conduct that he had witnessed already in France.[200] Although the establishment of an *officialité* most properly belonged to a diocesan bishop and, therefore, in the current context exceeded the power of a missionary see and its apostolic vicar, Laval took these extraordinary steps to prepare himself for any opposition that might come from civil authorities.[201] Up to the time of Laval's arrival, practices in New France had developed that were not necessarily in keeping with the civil customs in France, and Laval sought to take a strong stand against these movements of the state before they were even more entrenched.[202] The governor resisted the establishment of a parallel juridical structure but, in the end, yielded.[203]

[199] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 19-20.
[200] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[201] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[202] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."
[203] See Vachon, "Laval, François de."

The second issue of conflict between church and state was the dispute over the lucrative but destructive trade in brandy with the native populations.[204] Although practically outlawed since the earliest period of the colony from the time of Champlain, a royal decree affirmed this position in 1657 and Queylus, the vicar general in Canada for the Archbishop of Rouen at the time, added a religious dimension to prohibition by declaring it a mortal sin to sell brandy to indigenous persons.[205] Laval further added the penalty of excommunication to anyone found guilty of this crime.[206] Although the civil government cooperated with this position at first, by 1662 Governor Davaugour insisted that the sale of brandy was a commercial necessity in order to keep Quebec as a trading outpost with the local peoples.[207] Laval's position was affirmed by the theological experts at the Sorbonne and he appealed the matter to King Louis XIV.[208] The governor was recalled from New France and the crown recognized Laval's authority over the church in the colony through the erection of the new diocese of Quebec.[209] This concession can be seen as part of an overall plan by the monarchy to shift control of Quebec from the trading companies to royal control, and having a bishop who swore loyalty to the king would further the desired absolutism.[210] In 1663, Quebec was officially established as a royal colony that would be similar in governance to other provinces of France and no longer under the management of the trading companies.[211] A Sovereign Council was created to govern the colony, and Bishop Laval

---

[204] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 21.
[205] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 21.
[206] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 21.
[207] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 21; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 24.
[208] See Vachon, "Laval, François de"; see also Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 21-22.
[209] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 22.
[210] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 22.
[211] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 22.

was made a member, along with the royal governor, responsible for military and foreign relations, the intendant, charged with finance, justice, and policy, and five other colonists.[212]

The third issue of conflict in church-state relations we will consider is the effort by Bishop Saint-Vallier to take over social welfare programs from the state.[213] A trend in mid seventeenth-century France was to establish publicly funded institutions to care for the impoverished that were run by religious orders.[214] Saint-Vallier, who we have already seen prioritized his vision of the church in Quebec, wanted to compete and surpass the efforts of the state in serving the poor through church initiated and church run projects.[215] This led him into regular conflicts with the civil authorities throughout the 1690s in trying to find state-recognition of these new religious initiatives.[216] As time wore on into the eighteenth-century, the church became more and more subsumed in the promotion of state authority as an arm of the absolute monarch, promoting such virtues as obedience to the crown and civil authority and, in return, received great support from the state.[217]

II.B.4. Religious Communities of Women

A fourth characteristic of the Quebec Tradition is the presence and critically important role of women religious communities in colonial Canadian Catholicism. When the Society of Jesus returned to Quebec in the 1630s, they called upon women religious communities to assist

---

[212] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*," 23; see also Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 22.
[213] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 34.
[214] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 34.
[215] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 34-35.
[216] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 35-36.
[217] See Crowly, "The French Regime to 1760," 46-47.

them in critical aspects of their mission, including education and caring for the infirm.[218] In the efforts at promotion of the Canadian mission embodied in the *Jesuit Relations* and an invitation for sponsors to found a convent at Quebec, Marie-Madeleine de Chauvigny de La Peltrie, a young widow, and Marie de l'Incarnation, a member of an Ursuline community in France, answered the call.[219] They arrived at Quebec in 1639 with a handful of assistants and opened a school for girls, teaching at first a majority of native children with a few French students.[220] Marie de l'Incarnation adopted the position, along with the Jesuits, that the best chance of successfully bringing the Gospel to the indigenous people lay not in making them French, but in immersing themselves in the local culture and evangelizing through it.[221] She studied the indigenous languages under Jérôme Lalemant, SJ, and became proficient in Algonquin and Iroquois, even producing dictionaries in these languages to aid future missionaries.[222]

While the Ursulines became intimately involved in educational efforts in Quebec, another religious community of women, the Augustinian Hospitallers arrived, at the same time and became essential providers of medical care.[223] Sponsored by a wealthy patroness, Marie-Madeleine de Vignerot, three sisters from the Augustinian Hospitallers arrived on the same ship as the Ursulines and promptly were greeted with an outbreak of smallpox in the local native population at Sillery, near Quebec City.[224] After raids from rival indigenous groups, they relocated to Quebec City and founded the Hôtel-Dieu, the first hospital in New France.[225]

---

[218] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 9.
[219] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 11.
[220] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 9.
[221] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 9.
[222] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 9.
[223] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 9.
[224] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 11.
[225] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 9.

By the early eighteenth-century, although religious vocations of men were decreasing, religious vocations of women were growing.[226] By 1725, there were over two-hundred and fifty women religious in New France, and most of them were born in the New World.[227] The most popular community was the Congrégation de Notre-Dame, a non-cloistered teaching community that operated largely in Montreal.[228] Their schools charged tuition and the scope of education was narrow by modern standards, but the fact that the literacy rates of some women in colonial Quebec outpaced their peers in France suggests the high-degree of effectiveness these teaching communities had.[229] The Quebec Tradition in the colonial period was strongly shaped by the efforts of women religious communities in education, medical care, and other areas essential to everyday life.

II.B.5. Lived Religion

The final characteristic of the Quebec Tradition we will briefly mention is the rich lived religion of the people. Inspired by the rigorist spirituality of the Catholic Reformation, there was an intense religious atmosphere in mid-seventeenth-century Canada that can be described as "austere," emphasizing aspects of mysticism and committed self-denial.[230] Religious processions involving the entire community marched through the streets on holy days and there was a deep devotion to the relics of saints, to the point of exhuming the corpses of recent martyrs such as

---

[226] Crowly, "The French Regime to 1760," 44.
[227] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 44.
[228] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 44.
[229] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 44-45.
[230] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 16; see also Nive Voisine, André Beaulieu, and Jean Hamelin, *Histoire de l'Église catholique au Québec (1608-1970)* (Montreal: Éditions Fides, 1971), 19.

Jean de Brébeuf and Gabriel Lalemant in 1650.[231] Magic and religion were seen as remedies to forces in nature beyond explanation, the first in an effort to manipulate nature and the second a belief in its intelligibility and accountability to a Creator-God.[232] The church was careful to distinguish between authentic supplications to God through prayer on the one hand, and superstition, or worse, witchcraft, on the other.[233] It is interesting to note, however, that only five cases of witchcraft were brought to trial in Quebec, and only one of these cases ended in execution, a contrast with the famous Salem Witch Trials of 1692 in the English colonies to the south.[234] Other aspects of the lived religion of the people included belief in the divine power associated with some images and the important role of miracles, such as the miraculous intercession of St. Anne on the St. Lawrence River at Beaupré on which a shrine and chapel were built.[235] These beliefs were shared by laity and clergy alike, although the beliefs of clergy became less superstitious and more regulated by institutions such as Laval's seminary.[236] Church sanctioned devotions such as novenas and membership in confraternities helped channel religious devotion in Quebec.[237]

The parish did not become a significant aspect of religious life in Quebec until the early decades of the eighteenth-century.[238] Some parishes were located in such isolated areas that they were difficult to reach, and even in the 1730s around eighty-percent of the parishes in Quebec did not have a priest in residence.[239] When it finally did take root, however, it became the very

[231] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 16.
[232] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 26.
[233] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 26-27,
[234] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 29-30.
[235] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 28.
[236] Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 29.
[237] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 31.
[238] See Voisine, *Histoire de l'Église catholique au Québec*, 19.
[239] See Crowley, "The French Regime to 1760," 42.

center of social life and was the hub of religious, civil, and even military administration.[240] The parish provided a place to ritualize life through the celebration of the sacraments, from birth and baptism to death and the funeral Mass.[241] The parish was operated on a semi-democratic model, a small but meaningful experience of unlike any other in French Quebec, where the wardens were elected by parishioners and helped the priest manage the parish finances, pay its bills, and produces yearly accounts, all subject to the bishop's approval.[242] This model worked in part out of necessity, because of the limited number of clergy and the need to involve laity in the life of the parish, and partly by design as an arm of the state which permitted the erection and territorial scope of the parish.

With an understanding of these aspects of the Quebec Tradition of colonial Canadian Catholicism, especially the central Catholic identity intertwined with French culture and respect for strong monarchical and episcopal leadership, we are in a better positon to understand the Canadian response to the period of British conquest ending French rule and the independence movement of the American colonies.

---

[240] See Voisine, *Histoire de l'Église catholique au Québec*, 19-20.

[241] See Voisine, *Histoire de l'Église catholique au Québec*, 20.

[242] See Voisine, *Histoire de l'Église catholique au Québec*, 20.

Chapter III: Divergent Responses to the Quebec Act and British Rule

After exploring colonial American and Canadian Catholic identities and their respective roots in England and France, we now turn to the central question of this study: why did the two groups react so differently to British colonial rule in the final third of the eighteenth-century, with the Quebec Act of 1774 serving as a defining moment? This chapter will attempt to lay the groundwork for an answer through considering the perspectives of both sides.

We begin with eighteenth-century Canadian Catholics by considering four key topics. First, we consider the British conquest at the end of the Seven Years' War and the resulting "problem" of Canada for British rule. Second, the decade-long background to the Quebec Act of 1774 and the figures who played a significant role in terms of its significance for Canada, namely Governor James Murray, Bishop Jean-Olivier Briand, and Governor Guy Carleton. Third, the text of the Quebec Act itself, its purpose in British colonial policy, and reasons for its large-scale acceptance by Canadian Catholics. Fourth, the corresponding views from Canada on the growing revolutionary movement in the southern American colonies. We will conclude the chapter with a fifth section where, given the response of Canadian Catholics in support of England and against the American revolutionary movement, we will try to understand how American Catholics were so able to join in the rebellion with their political and cultural confreres but not with their coreligionists in Quebec.

III.1. The British Conquest

The international conflict between England and France known as the Seven Years War, officially begun in 1756, quickly found expression in their North American territories in New England and Canada, respectively.[1] Three key moments marked the British Conquest of Canada: the fall of Quebec City in 1759, the fall of Montreal in 1760, and the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763, marking the formal transfer of New France to England. The time period between the fall of Quebec City and the Treaty of Paris was especially concerning for the roughly seventy-thousand French Canadian Catholics suddenly under Anglican British rule: how would life be under not only a foreign power speaking a foreign language but, also and perhaps most importantly, of a non-Catholic faith?[2] Memories of the exile of their Catholic confreres from Acadia by English forces remained fresh in the Canadian mind and fears of a similar fate were neither unfounded nor unreasonable.[3]

The answer to the question was, surprisingly, quite favorable to the Canadians. British Governor James Murray, who we will deal with more in the following section, quickly settled on a policy of respect and tolerance toward the French Canadians, especially with respect to the practice of their religion, laws, and customs.[4] This approach characterized the period until the war was formally ended and resolved by the Treaty of Paris which, in officially transferring authority and possession of Canada from France to England, threatened the very identity of

[1] Gilles Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," trans. James MacLean, in *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada*, ed. Terrence Murphy and Roberto Perin (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 56.
[2] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 56.
[3] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 29.
[4] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 56-57.

Canadian Catholics.[5] With ties cut to France and, consequently, the only political leaders, military support, and economic system they had known since the earliest days of colonization, Canadians were left with only one institution that bridged the gap between French and English rule: the Catholic Church and their religious leaders.[6] Catholicism was therefore recognized as a defining aspect of French Canadian identity.

The life of the Canadian church as an institution during this period, however, was at a crossroads. The number of ordained priests, for example, declined from 196 in 1759 to 137 in 1764, a thirty percent drop.[7] Although a majority of this decline was due to the death of priests without adequate replacements, twenty priests left Canada to return to France.[8] On the other hand, the loyalty and affinity of the Canadian laity for their clergy was strong.[9] In sweeping terms, the clergy in the cities tended to be from France and included the religious orders, whereas the clergy in more rural areas tended to be Canadians and were secular priests.[10] Although the levels of religious commitment continued to erode from the beginning of the century and through the end of French rule, a trend mentioned in the previous chapter, Catholic faith and devotions were an important aspect of daily life for the people of Quebec.[11]

Moreover, the character of the Canadian people was formed by their collective experiences in a century and a half of colonial life in the New World and, therefore, became distinct from contemporaries in France.[12] The principal difference was, according to Gustave

---

[5] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 57.
[6] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 57.
[7] Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 57.
[8] Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 57.
[9] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 63.
[10] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 63.
[11] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 63.
[12] See Gustave Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution, 1774-1783*, trans. Margaret M. Cameron (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, & Co., 1967), 3-4.

Lanctot, the strong independent spirit of the Canadian.[13] Without the highly-stratified social categories of France, the Canadian people developed a natural sense of equality which became even more evident in the English period, an independent streak that was even sometimes exercised in their relationship with local clergy.[14] After generations spent in Quebec, very few Canadians thought of leaving upon the British conquest; although heavily influenced by their French ancestry, they were, as a product of their experiences, a distinct people.[15]

From the perspective of the English, the "otherness" of French Canadian identity was a constant and potential threat to peaceful rule by a Protestant British minority. Recall that at this time, the public practice of Catholicism was outlawed in England. This concern was at the forefront of policy formation from the capture of Quebec in 1759, where the "Articles of Capitulation" clearly foresaw the British role as that of steward of the Quebecois, not that of imposing tyrant.[16] The terms of surrender provided "free exercise of the Roman religion, safeguards granted to all religious as well as to the bishop, who may exercise freely and with propriety the functions of his office until the possession of Canada be decided between His Britannic Majesty and His most Christian Majesty."[17] In the face of military conquest, the English were aware they were surrounded by French Canadian culture.[18] However, despite toleration for the Catholic majority, it was emphasized that the religion of the new regime in Canada was to be, in fact, Protestant.[19] A year later, the terms for the surrender of Montreal built

---

[13] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 4.
[14] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 4-5.
[15] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 1.
[16] See Peter M. Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity: Imperial Anglicanism in British North America, 1745-1795* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000), 82.
[17] "Articles of Capitulation" dated September 18, 1759, in Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 82.
[18] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 83.
[19] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 83.

on the precedent of those for Quebec City, albeit with greater attention to detail.[20] Finally, with the Treaty of Paris, England decided they would retain Canada and now had to decide how to address the issue of cultural and religious difference of their new subjects on a more stable and permanent basis.[21] The Treaty of Paris dealt with the question of religion in the following terms: "His Britannic Majesty agrees to grant the inhabitants of Canada the freedom of the Catholic religion; consequently he will give the most precise and effective orders in order that his new Roman Catholic subjects may practice their religious worship according to the rites of the Roman church as far *as the laws of Great Britain permit*."[22] This last phrase, of course, is not as generous an allowance as it seems at first glance because it refers to the official laws in England banning the practice of Roman Catholicism, discussed earlier in this thesis. Peter Doll comments that "[b]y this clause in the treaty, the English negotiators intended to allow only a bare toleration to the Roman Catholics" out of political necessity.[23] A letter of instruction to Governor Murray to guide the implementation of the terms of the Treaty emphasized that the religious freedoms were to be narrowly interpreted.[24] Interestingly, the treaty permits only the use of Catholic forms of worship, but does not mention Catholic governance, religious orders, nor other Catholic concerns or issues.[25]

It is important not to anachronistically apply contemporary twenty-first century understandings of "tolerance" as effectively "indifference" onto colonial British policy in

[20] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity,* 84.
[21] See Karen A. Stanbridge, *British Catholic Policy in Eighteenth-Century Ireland and Quebec* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1998), 94.
[22] "Treaty of Paris" dated February 10, 1763, in Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 89 (emphasis added is my own).
[23] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 89.
[24] Stanbridge, *British Catholic Policy*, 95.
[25] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 89.

Canada.[26] The English government feared continued ties between defeated France and the Canadians through the means of the Catholic Church, but had to balance this fear with the practical necessity of governing its new Catholic citizenry.[27] The long-term solution to the problem understood in this period was always viewed as gradual conversion to the Church of England.[28] In this context, then, tolerance was seen as a means toward assimilation into broader English culture and society, which included religion and membership in the Anglican church.

Into this French Canadian context, a small group of English-background immigrants accompanied the new British government in the mid-1760s.[29] Some came from Europe, but others, upon the invitation of a British military leader, came from the southern English colonies of Massachusetts and New York.[30] Mostly merchants, this group was never large in numbers (some two hundred in total by 1764, with only around ten percent being American) but was influential nonetheless in asserting their rights as British citizens.[31] Among the American segment, especially, democracy was the prime value and any threat to it in the form of an established hierarchy was resisted.[32] This resistance found targets in both the military regime of the government and the Catholic faith of the French Canadian population.[33] This group is important in that they will become a natural audience for the American Continental Congress to attempt to ally with in joining the revolutionary movement.

A more permanent and satisfying solution to the "problem" of Canada remained to be found. On the one hand, the British wanted to assimilate the Canadian people into their empire

---

[26] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 93.
[27] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 90.
[28] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 90.
[29] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 10.
[30] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 10.
[31] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 12.
[32] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 12.
[33] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 12-13.

through language, culture, and ultimately, religion. On the other hand, the practical necessity of winning their trust and loyalty called for a measure of tolerance in allowing their different customs in law and religion to continue for a time. The efforts to balance these priorities formed the background to the Quebec Act of 1774, to which we now direct our attention.

III.2. Background to the Quebec Act and Key Figures

To best understand the background to the Quebec Act in the period between the Treaty of Paris in 1763 and its passage in 1774, it will be helpful to focus on three key figures who were significant in shaping its contours: Governor James Murray, Bishop Jean-Olivier Briand, and Governor Guy Carleton.

Murray was a career soldier and commanded an important unit in the battle on the Plains of Abraham that resulted in the capture of Quebec in the autumn of 1759.[34] After also being involved with the battle leading to the fall of Montreal, Murray was placed in charge of the military regime in Quebec and then, after the Treaty of Paris established a civil government in 1763, was made governor of the entire province of Quebec, which also included Montreal and Trois-Rivières.[35] Despite the title of governor, however, Murray lacked sufficient authority over both civil and military matters to govern effectively due to the separation of these command structures.[36] The governance plan gave civil command to Murray and military command to Ralph Burton, although the tradition in Quebec was to unite civil and military power in the

[34] G.P. Browne, "Murray, James," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. 4*, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003--, accessed April 18, 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/murray_james_4E.html.
[35] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[36] See Browne, "Murray, James."

governor.[37] This proved a point of contention and difficulty for Murray in his role that eventually led to his recall to England in 1766.[38]

Murray's chief concern in the early years of British conquest of Quebec was security and the question of how to maintain control and safety of a population who was non-English, when a revolt of the Canadians nor an effort to recapture the colony by France could definitively be excluded as possible.[39] His main strategy for preserving the peace was to create an atmosphere of loyalty: the Canadians would be far less likely to rebel against a ruling government that treated them well and gained their loyalty.[40] Although the terms of surrender did not assure the continuance of French laws and customs in Quebec, Murray saw this as an important element in winning over the Canadian population.[41]

The role and place of the Catholic Church was also a critical aspect of security concerns in Quebec.[42] At first, Murray was suspicious of priests and their potential to undermine British rule.[43] In fact, he forbade any priest to come to Quebec from France and did not permit the Jesuits nor the Recollects, both of which he was especially distrustful, from accepting new members.[44] Gradually, however, he came to see the role of secular priests as pivotal in making British rule possible through their influence in the community at the parish level and he provided financial assistance in exchange for this support.[45] Murray favored native-Canadian clergy over foreign imports in an effort to win them over and, over time, slowly transform the Canadian

[37] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[38] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[39] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[40] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[41] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[42] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[43] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[44] See See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 57-58.
[45] See Browne, "Murray, James."

Catholic Church into something resembling the Church of England.[46] Murray permitted the continued work of the religious communities of women, likely because their social services in health care and education were desperately needed, but heavily regulated them, while effectively abolishing the religious orders of men in a plan of gradual assimilation.[47]

When Bishop Pontbriand of Quebec died in the summer of 1760, the problem of episcopal succession and the continued provision of Catholic clergy became urgent.[48] Murray did not support the presence of a Catholic bishop who, in his view, would be a continual threat to British authority, but did endorse a "Superintendent of the Romish Religion" who would be elected by the Quebec clergy, approved by England, and finalized by the papacy.[49] Through Murray's support, the vicar general of Quebec, Jean-Olivier Briand, was eventually elected and consecrated bishop in 1766.[50] The relationship between Briand and the English governor, which we will discuss further below, was essential in creating space for Canadian Catholics in the British regime.

With the passage of the Treaty of Paris in 1763 and the shift from military to civil rule, a policy of clear Anglicization was originally intended.[51] English settlement through immigration was to be encouraged and, with it, promotion of the Church of England, and the Canadian Catholic subjects were to be weaned from their French heritage, both legal and religious.[52] English criminal and civil laws were to be enforced, and an assembly council was to be

[46] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 100.
[47] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 58; see also Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 100.
[48] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[49] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[50] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[51] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[52] See Browne, "Murray, James."

appointed by Murray in the English model.[53] Moreover, the status of Catholics was itself in question, since English law denied such liberties to Catholics as holding office and casting votes.[54] If that were indeed put into effect, then the radical minority of British Anglican residents of Quebec, numbering approximately 200 households in 1764, would govern the majority Canadian Catholics, about 70,000 total in population.[55] This was a tremendous threat to the future security of the colony and the dire circumstances invited mutual cooperation between both Murray and the Canadian Catholic community.[56] Murray tempered this policy of Anglicization in favor of a more gradual assimilation. He refused to summon a British assembly and continued to rely on a council sympathetic to Canadian interests, incorporating the continuation of the French legal tradition within the English structure.[57] He refused to relegate the Catholic Church to an inferior status and continued to cooperate with the Catholic clergy and Quebec *seigneurs*, often in conflict with English merchants.[58] This gained him the admiration and support of the Quebecois and made him a sort of target to the English, eventually leading to his removal from office.

Even as the British were establishing control in Quebec, they were losing it in their American colonies to the south.[59] Murray's strategy of loyalty through accommodation was, therefore, intimately related to promoting security through both protecting the religious traditions of Canadians on the one hand, and protecting the colony from American influence on the other.[60] As Terence Fay writes, "The English government was genuinely concerned that, in granting the

[53] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[54] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[55] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[56] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 59.
[57] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[58] See Browne, "Murray, James."
[59] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 30.
[60] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 30.

exercise of Catholicism, it might be seen as a benevolent conqueror. The government also wished to protect the habitants from the ideology of American republicanism."[61] In fact, whatever political unrest there was during this early period of British government can be traced to efforts of American propaganda within the merchant class arguing for representative governing institutions that disallowed Catholics from serving in office.[62]

The second key figure in shaping the relationship between English rule and the Canadian population as a background to the Quebec Act was Jean-Olivier Briand, already mentioned briefly. A missionary from France, Briand left to serve the Catholic Church in Canada in 1741 as secretary to Bishop Pontbriand.[63] This early period of Briand's time in Quebec were marked by quiet devotion and hard work that led him to an unrivaled knowledge of the administration and needs of the Canadian Church.[64] During the siege of Quebec in 1759, Bishop Pontbriand appointed Briand vicar general of the diocese and entrusted Quebec City to his care, before withdrawing himself to Montreal.[65] Briand provided for the spiritual needs of those within the embattled areas of Quebec, both French and English alike.[66]

With the death of Pontbriand and the precarious situation of the church, cut off as it was from any ecclesial connection with France, Briand effectively exercised governance over, and leadership of, the Canadian Church.[67] He quickly appreciated the delicate situation of relating to a ruling, foreign power of a faith hostile to Catholicism.[68] Almost from the start, Briand adopted an approach of moderation and conciliation in dealing with the British, identifying and holding

---

[61] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 30.
[62] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 14.
[63] André Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 4, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003--, accessed January 31, 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/briand_jean_olivier_4E.html.
[64] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[65] See Vacon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[66] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[67] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[68] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."

to those issues that were essential for Catholics and cooperatively working with the rulers on those issues that were secondary.[69] In doing so, Briand was simply following the instructions left to him by Pontbriand, who advised that respect and obedience were due to the ruling nation, even if that nation and its king were not themselves Catholic.[70]

Briand continued this posture and encouraged the clergy to similar obedience, even including prayers for King George III in the celebration of Mass.[71] With his astute understanding of the situation of the church vis-a-vis the British, Briand reasoned that he needed to generate interest in the life of the church to gain and maintain the favor of the government.[72] To do so, he allowed interference by the British government in unimportant areas in order to create good will between the institutions and to avoid future interference in more important matters.[73] For example, he permitted Governor Murray to become involved in some parish personnel matters, and even consulted him on occasion, in order to gain trust.[74] The strategy worked, because eventually Murray considered Briand a critical advisor and would not act on religious matters without consulting with the vicar general, and when he did act would not do so in areas of church teaching or worship.[75]

Briand emphasized the distinct spheres of authority between the ecclesiastical and the political, both with mutual duties and responsibilities yet free of interference from the other.[76] To carve out a realm of autonomy for church affairs while also maintaining cordial relationship with the government, Briand applied two practical principles in support of his diplomatic

[69] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[70] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[71] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[72] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[73] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[74] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[75] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”
[76] See Vachon, “Briand, Jean-Olivier.”

philosophy.[77] First, he dealt with the civil governor directly and not through intermediary representatives, as head of the ecclesiastical sphere to the head of the political sphere.[78] Second, he took civil interests very seriously and sought to further them whenever possible, while showing loyalty to the English king and colonial government and urging his clergy to do the same.[79] Briand used these principles to secure the best future possible for the Canadian church.[80]

Winning election by the clergy through the support of Murray in 1764, Briand returned to France by way of England in order to receive ordination to the episcopacy and the fullness of holy orders.[81] As mentioned above, Murray hoped for a native-born Canadian clergy to help transition the Catholic Church in Quebec to a nationalist church that met the security needs of the English regime.[82] Murray respected Briand's directness and trustworthiness and, if there was to be a Catholic bishop in Quebec, saw Briand as one who would further his goal.[83] Pope Clement XIII officially signed the documents making Briand bishop of Quebec in January 1766 and he was ordained in March by three French bishops in private and without attention.[84] When he finally returned to Quebec in June 1766, he was greeted with tremendous hope and joy by both the Canadians and the British, a testament to his reputation among both parties.[85] This was seen as a victory by the Canadian Catholics because their most identifiable institution now had an official face, and Bishop Briand became the chief representative for their interests in relations with the British regime.[86] After all, the Catholic Church was the transmitter of French Canadian

---

[77] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[78] Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[79] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[80] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 121.
[81] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[82] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 59.
[83] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 59.
[84] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier"; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 31.
[85] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[86] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 60.

identity in a time of transition and potential crisis.[87] In the same way, it was the one institution the British regime could use most effectively to reach the majority population.[88] As Chaussé summarizes, "In the absence of their former political leaders, who had returned to France, the bishop became the people's sole representative with the British authorities."[89]

The Diocese of Quebec encompassed all of North America except Louisiana, Newfoundland, and the American colonies.[90] Despite the celebrated welcome, Bishop Briand took on a number of problems in shepherding his diocese as its bishop. First, the church faced financial challenges after the destruction of war and the accruement of debt.[91] Over twenty percent of parishes were in physical ruin due to the British conquest and there were no longer subsidies from the French crown to make ends meet.[92] Second, the clergy numbers were diminishing without a reliable source of replenishment, dropping nearly a quarter between 1758 and 1766.[93] Third, the general attitude of the population seemed to change since the British conquest to one of unrest and rebellion to church authority in the parishes and a desire for more lay involvement and control, although Briand's view of his people softened after two pastoral visits through his diocese.[94] Moreover, after worsening health and a number of conflicts including over his desired cathedral church, by the late 1760s Briand was resigned to the reality of his retirement and he sought a coadjutor bishop who would have the right of succession to his office.[95] After receiving permission from the Holy See to select a candidate, Briand also sought to permission of the royal governor Guy Carleton who, after delaying for a number of years,

---

[87] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 34.
[88] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 121.
[89] Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 60.
[90] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 65.
[91] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[92] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 32.
[93] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[94] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olliver."
[95] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."

proposed a candidate, Louis-Philippe Mariauchau d'Esgly, who was five years older than Briand himself.[96] Following his own policy of sticking to primary goals and being more compromising on secondary details, Briand judged that having a successor bishop was more important than who that successor bishop was, though he was pleased that d'Esgly was a sound priest with a good reputation.[97] Not wanting to delay the question even further, Briand proposed d'Esgly to the papacy and, upon his approval, ordaining him in the summer of 1772.[98] This was the first ordination of a bishop in North America.[99]

It was at this point of relative calm and expansion of the Canadian church that the American Revolution broke out and threatened the situation in Quebec.[100] We will discuss this issue more later on in this chapter, but suffice it to say for now that Briand recommitted his loyalty to the English crown and government and urged his fellow Catholics to do the same, resisting pulls toward revolution.[101]

The third key figure in the period between the British conquest and the passage of the Quebec Act is Murray's successor as governor, Guy Carleton. Similarly a career military officer, Carleton was named Lieutenant Governor of Quebec in 1766 although, with Murray's absence from the colony due to his conflict with the merchant class and the need to defend himself in England, he effectively served as governor before officially being granted the title in the spring

[96] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[97] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[98] Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[99] Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 34.
[100] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."
[101] See Vachon, "Briand, Jean-Olivier."

of 1768.[102] What Carleton lacked in administrative experience in civil government he made up for in political connections: King George III himself helped guide his career.[103]

Sharing the concern of his predecessor, Carleton's priority as governor was security.[104] The threats of a French effort of reconquest, a Quebecois rebellion against the British, or spread of dissent from the American colonies were constant realities.[105] Quite logically, if the Canadian population was not comfortable with their status under the British, they would be more likely to ally with other subversive groups, be they France, the American colonies, or both.[106] Moreover, the demographic impracticalities of ruling a French Canadian population numbering almost 75,000 with a British population of under 2,000 led Carleton to adopt a policy of conciliation and amelioration toward the Canadians.[107] Carleton quickly judged that waves of English immigrants were unlikely to alter the population balance, so Canadian loyalty must be won for continued stability and security.[108] Specifically, he continued the cordial relationship with the Catholic Church and Bishop Briand, even securing his preferred candidate, d'Esgly, as coadjutor bishop with right of succession, as mentioned above.[109] After all, the Church was the singular most influential institution in Quebec culture.[110] However, Carleton also imposed limitations on ecclesiastical policies, such as continuing the strategy of permitting only native-Canadian clergy and refusing to allow new recruits for the main male religious orders, such as the Jesuits.[111]

---

[102] See G.P. Browne, "Carleton, Guy, 1st Baron Dorchester," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol. 5*, University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003--, accessed April 18, 2017, http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/carleton_guy_5E.html.
[103] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[104] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[105] Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[106] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 129.
[107] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[108] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 15.
[109] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[110] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 70.
[111] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 130.

Continuing the precedent of Murray, Carleton, too, sought to delay the implementation of Anglicization.[112] Unlike Murray, however, Carleton did not believe a gradual reformation of the Canadian church into a more Anglican body was necessary or even desired.[113] A central component of Carleton's approach resisting Anglicization was through legal structures and the maintenance of French law and custom.[114] These views, however, were not without criticism, especially from the pro-American British merchants who had conflicts with Murray.[115] Carleton himself travelled to London to report on the situation in Quebec to government officials in England and to account for his policy of toleration and cooperation with French Canadian Roman Catholics.[116] In making his case, he argued that the goals for negotiating the British Conquest in the wake of the Treaty of Paris in 1763 did not fit the security needs of reality and that more accommodating policies that brought the French Canadian population into the fold rather than making them explicit outsiders from the start were more conducive to long-term English interests and, therefore, urgently necessary.[117]

The three figures of Murray, Briand, and Carleton were pivotal in determining the relationship between the English minority and Canadian majority in Quebec after the Seven Years War. Their interactions and policies of mutual cooperation helped lay the ground work for an official policy response by the English legislative process. That response came in 1774 with the Quebec Act.

[112] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[113] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 70.
[114] Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[115] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 16.
[116] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 71.
[117] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 71.

III.3. The Quebec Act of 1774

The political debate and dealings behind the passage of the Quebec Act, although interesting, is largely outside the scope of this study.[118] It is sufficient to say, however, that procedurally the government planned to frame the act on broad principles and to leave the details of implementation to more specific instructions to the royal governor.[119]

That being said, the Quebec Act itself was first introduced for consideration in the House of Lords in early May 1774, passed quickly through the legislative process, and was signed by King George III in late June 1774, to take effect in May of 1775.[120] The Act finally provided a legislative solution to the question of governing Quebec with security and stability. It did so in terms of three key areas: geographic boundaries, legal structures, and religious policy. Doll notes that the key framework of the Act was to preserve English criminal law while restoring French civil law, with religion being a later addition, not entering into the text until the third draft.[121]

First, the Act restored the provincial boundaries of Quebec as they were before the Proclamation of 1763, from the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in the west to Labrador and Hudson Bay in the east.[122] This was an encroachment on territory claimed by the ambitious American colonists. Second, in terms of legal structures, the Act permitted the returned application of French civil and property law, including the seigniorial system, while maintaining English criminal law, since a tradition of its used had become accepted over an "Experience of more than

[118] For a brief yet thorough account, see Philip Lawson, "An Elastic Spirit in Our Constitution: Differing British Views on the Passage of the Quebec Act in 1774," in *Imperial Challenge: Quebec and Britain in the Age of the American Revolution* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989), 126-145. See also Karen Stanbridge, "The Quebec Act," in *British Catholic Policy in Eighteenth-Century Ireland and Quebec* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1998), 94-194.
[119] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 146.
[120] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 17-18.
[121] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 146.
[122] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 18.

Nine Years."[123] It also provided for a Council of Affairs with limited taxing power and a requirement of royal approval for any ordinance passed with a quorum of a majority.[124] This was a significant departure from the legislation at the Conquest in 1763, which provided for an assembly; in the new Council, everything from membership to the proposal of bills was subject to the governor.[125]

The third key area of the Quebec Act, and most important for our purposes, is that regarding religious policy. The law embodied the practical religious approach already operative in the governorships of Murray and Carleton, namely Catholic toleration. Those in Quebec "professing the Religion of the Church of *Rome* . . . may have, hold, and enjoy, the free Exercise of the Religion of the Church of *Rome*, subject to the King's Supremacy. . . ."[126] Moreover, Catholics in Quebec no longer were "obliged to take the Oath required by the said Statute passed in the First Year of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*. . ." but were instead provided an alternative oath that did not inherently contradict Catholic faith.[127] The lifting of the Elizabethan oath requirement effectively meant that Catholics were now allowed to hold office in Quebec, as swearing the oath was a requirement that previously barred them.[128]

The overall aim of the Quebec Act was to address the security concerns in the region by cementing the loyalty of the Canadian Catholic population to the British government and, in doing so, to draw them further away from the American colonists who were fomenting revolution.[129] The warm reception Governor Carleton received upon returning to Quebec after

---

[123] See "Text of *The Quebec Act*," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 233-34.
[124] See "Text of *The Quebec Act*," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 235-36.
[125] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy."
[126] "Text of *The Quebec Act*," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 232.
[127] See "Text of *The Quebec Act*," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 232.
[128] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 18.
[129] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 149.

the passage of the Act was an indication of its positive reception.[130] Its religious provisions were to be temporary; the long term goal was "to have a native clergy subject to the financial control not of private individuals but of the ruling authority. The church was to be catholic in polity, national in scope, and subject to royal authority."[131] These details were made clear in the instructions provided to Governor Carleton on the Act's implementation, in which the authority of any Catholic leader was made subject to the royal governor.[132] Carleton intentionally resisted all efforts at Anglicization, as far as possible, and overlooked any instructions that threatened the security and stability achieved by the Act that was so central to English interests in North America.[133] By cutting off relations with Rome and surrounding Canadian Catholics with Anglican clergy and culture, however, the very religious identity of Canadian Catholicism was under threat of attrition and gradual reform to a more Protestant strand.[134]

III.4. Canadian Views on the American Revolutionary Movement

A majority of the Quebec population opposed the American Revolutionary movement. The most vocal group, unsurprisingly, was the Catholic hierarchy, and Bishop Briand was very clear in his support of the British and encouraged loyalty from Canadian Catholics to King George III and his government. This was not insignificant, because the Church, as we have seen, was the single institutional voice of the Canadians within British Canada. While it is true that some of the population was sympathetic to Enlightenment sentiments taking political shape in the American colonies, the numbers of this group were quite small, perhaps only a few hundred,

---

[130] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 19.
[131] Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 150.
[132] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 152.
[133] See Browne, "Carleton, Guy"; see also Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 35.
[134] See Doll, *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity*, 153.

and were drawn mostly from the merchant class. As for the majority of the French Canadian Catholic population, though at first they resisted the idea of cooperating with the British they came to appreciate their rights gained under the Quebec Act. While the fact that Bishop Briand saw it necessary to address letters to the people against joining the Americans does suggest this was a real threat, the reality was that most of the population simply enjoyed the peace and stability that cost only obedience to the crown.

That peace and stability were the prime objectives of the Quebec Act, as discussed above, and the fear of insecurity that formed the context of the legislation was not unfounded. The so-called "Boston Massacre" of 1770 and "Boston Tea Party" of 1773 were two signs of growing hostilities between the American colonists and the British presence, to the point of violence and outright rebellion.[135] For the Americans, overwhelmingly Protestant and hostile to "papism," the Quebec Act was seen as a hazardous concession of King George III to Catholicism and the last straw in an already long list of grievances against him.[136] The English population of Quebec shared these same concerns with the legislation and unsuccessfully sought to overturn it, arguing that the Quebec Act, while appearing to grant freedoms to Canadian Catholics, in fact secured their control.[137] Some Americans travelled throughout Quebec, from Montreal to Quebec City, through networks of these supporters, meeting in small coffee houses and personal homes, to give news of the movement to those sympathetic with the rebellion and to encourage its growth.[138] Not every settler of English descent in Canada, however, joined in on these meetings and some preferred to stay out of the plotting.[139] The French Canadian population largely refused assisting these groups, because of the positive treatment they experienced from the ruling British

---

[135] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 71-72.
[136] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 72.
[137] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 72.
[138] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 30.
[139] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 30-31.

and, practically, due to wide unfamiliarity with the actual text of the Quebec Act; a translation in French was not published until some four months after the English version.[140]

Representatives from the American colonies, meeting in Philadelphia in October 1774, drafted a letter to the people of Quebec inviting them to join them in their movement against the English and even to send representatives to the next Continental Congress in May 1775.[141] Written in a persuasive manner, this letter spoke out in clear terms against the Quebec Act as denying fundamental rights of the people and reducing them to nothing short of slavery.[142] The letter even addressed the religious difference between the Catholic Canadians and largely Protestant Americans in a flattering manner: "We are too well acquainted with the liberality of sentiment distinguishing your nation, to imagine, that difference of religion will prejudice you against a hearty amity with us. You know, that the transcendent nature of freedom elevates those, who unite in her cause, above all such low-minded infirmities."[143] However, the persuasiveness was not effective because another letter, drafted by the Continental Congress in the very same week of October 1774 and sent to the people of Great Britain, was leaked.[144] This document spoke in disparaging terms of the Canadians, especially of their Catholic faith, and showed the diplomatic and political strategy of playing both sides employed by the American colonists.[145] The language used of Catholics in this letter mirrored the language used in the strongly anti-Catholic Suffolk Resolves adopted by the Continental Congress as its own in September.[146] American propagandists did succeed, however, in spreading modern political ideas as they rode

[140] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 32.
[141] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 72.
[142] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 72.
[143] Continental Congress, "To the Inhabitants of the Province of Quebec," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 255.
[144] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 72.
[145] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 72.
[146] See Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 392.

their promotional circuit, planting postures of opposition to paternal authority, whether of an unrepresentative law making body or related to ecclesiastical institutions.[147] "This active and persistent propaganda made 'a deep impression on the minds of the country people.' . . . For the first time Canadians could be heard discussing constitutional and political questions and talking of liberty and the rights of the people."[148]

At just the moment the French translation of the Quebec Act became available and could be assessed first-hand, Canadian leaders, namely from the church, were able to refute these attacks from the American advocates on the true benefits of the Quebec Act and to show that life for Catholics in Quebec was stable under the British regime.[149] Bishop Briand was aware of the approach by the Americans and cautioned his flock not to fall prey to it.[150] Committed to forming a relationship of trust with the British government in order to secure maximum rights for the Canadian Catholic population legislatively embodied by the Quebec Act, Briand saw it his duty to prevent sympathy or, worse, cooperation with the revolutionary movement.[151] "[I]n restoring the use of our laws and the free practise of our religion and in allowing us to enjoy all the privileges and advantages of British subjects," the English monarch deserved loyalty and obedience from the Canadians.[152] This response was not only optional but necessary as flowing from Catholic commitments. "Your religion and the oaths which you have taken impose upon you an indispensable obligation to defend to the utmost your country and your King. Close your ears, therefore, dear Canadians, to the voices of sedition which seek to destroy your happiness by stifling the sense of submission to your lawful superiors graven in your hearts by your education

---

[147] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 33-34.
[148] Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 34.
[149] See Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 35.
[150] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73.
[151] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73.
[152] Jean-Olivier Briand, "Mandate Concerning the Invasion of Canada by American Forces, May 22, 1775," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 257.

and your religion."[153] To rebel against a legitimate ruler was to violate the divine order, through which God grants authority through the church to the ruler.[154] Briand was also suspicious that offers of American friendship were an attempt to dominate Quebec in the future.[155] Montgolfier, the vicar general of Montreal, also sent a letter urging support of Governor Carleton and the British.[156] The Canadian people, however, were not enthusiastic about unwavering loyalty to the British and of promoting English interests, much to Briand's disappointment and surprise.[157] When American forces invaded Quebec in the fall of 1775, native Canadians tended toward indifference and even tacit passivity.[158] Some, largely from the merchant class, were inspired by democratic Enlightenment ideals and saw both the church and the British monarch as relics from the past.[159] However, despite this posture, very few actually joined the ranks of American colonists in battle, less than five hundred in total.[160] After the failure of the American militia's attack on Quebec City in December 1775, the Canadian neutrality turned to ever increasing distance with the American revolutionary movement.[161] The Canadian Catholics were largely pleased with the concessions granted by the Quebec Act, which provided the freedoms they had longed for since the British Conquest.[162]

The lack of obedience on behalf of Canadian Catholics to the requests for supporting the government and ecclesiastical hierarchy marked a subtle but significant turning point in Canadian Catholic identity. Although they did not overtly join with the American revolutionary

---

[153] Jean-Olivier Briand, "Mandate Concerning the Invasion of Canada by American Forces, May 22, 1775," in Lanctot, *Canada and the American Revolution*, 257.
[154] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 36.
[155] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73.
[156] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73.
[157] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73.
[158] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73.
[159] See Fay, *A History of Canadian Catholics*, 38.
[160] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 73-74.
[161] See Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 74.
[162] See Marcel Trudel, *La Révolution Américaine: Pourquoi la France Refuse le Canada (1775-1783)* (Sillery, Québec: Les Éditions du Boréal Express Ltée, 1976), 269.

movement due to the benefits enjoyed under British rule, the people of Quebec were not unaffected by the rebellion. As Chaussé writes, "After this episode Bishop Briand could no longer be considered the undisputed leader of the nation. The gulf between the clergy and the people had widened, even if the latter had not intended to call into question their adherence to Catholicism. A breath of freedom had touched them."[163]

III.5. American Catholics and Independence

On the American side, we have already discussed their reasons for strong opposition to the Quebec Act and their efforts to diplomatically and persuasively gain Canadians to their cause. What remains to be considered is why and how, despite the benefits won for Catholics in Quebec by British rule and the reasons of Canadian Catholics for their views against revolution grounded in the Catholic faith, American Catholics were co-leaders of the independence movement alongside their Protestant brethren. To do so, we will consider both the religiously plural environment that arose in the American colonies and its role in the American Catholic identity and also the roles of leading Catholics, such as Charles Carroll of Carrollton, in contributing to the revolutionary movement on the broader American stage.

Recall that Catholic education in the American colonies was largely non-existent, and the children of Catholic families with means, mostly from Maryland, were sent abroad to continental Europe to be schooled at such institutions as St. Omer's in Flanders. This formative experience not only enshrined a strong sense of Catholic identity, but also their ties and identity as citizens

[163] Chaussé, "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840," 75.

of Maryland, different and distinct from other classmates from England.[164] This dual identity as Catholic-Marylanders was significant because some of these students returned home to Maryland to places of public prominence in the revolutionary generation.[165] Theirs was a Catholic identity different from that of Catholics in Europe because, in the American colonies, to be Catholic was a constant and intentional choice in the face of strong opposition, with a high personal "cost."[166] This engendered a sense of ownership and existential rootedness of their Catholicism. "They had to take responsibility for their religious identity in a way that was utterly foreign to their contemporaries in predominantly Catholic countries where the faith was supported by the state."[167] This intentional Catholic identity, coupled with the limited number of clergy, made an especially strong impact on the laity.[168] The clergy that were present, moreover, were unwaveringly dedicated to serving the people; even after the worldwide suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773, to which most Catholic clergy in the American colonies belonged, there was no mass migration of priests returning to Europe, a sure sign of their commitment to their communities.[169] Largely cut off from Rome and therefore effectively autonomous for nearly a century and a half, Catholics in Maryland worked with their clergy to find a *modus vivendi* that fit their lived circumstances; they breathed the same air of democratic self-determinism that permeated the rest of the American colonies.[170]

These Catholic leaders in Maryland engaged in campaigns to combat anti-Catholic legislation throughout the mid-eighteenth century and, in doing so, discovered more common

---

[164] See Maura Jane Farrelly, *Papist Patriots: The Making of an American Catholic Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 186.
[165] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 186.
[166] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 186.
[167] Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 186-87.
[168] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 187.
[169] See also Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 388-89.
[170] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 187; see also Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 386.

ground with their fellow Maryland citizens who happened to be Protestant than might have been expected.[171] They also became acquainted with challenging legal authority, which would prove an essential posture in supporting independence and which was a trait lacking by-and-large in the Catholics of Quebec.[172] Through increasingly more hostile legislation by the British Parliament, including the Stamp Act and other Intolerable Acts of the 1760s, England came to be seen more and more as the common enemy for all citizens of Maryland, rather than Catholics or Catholicism in and of itself.[173] "When anxieties about English identity were the fuel that fed anti-popery, it made sense that Maryland's Catholics should find themselves penned-in by the inferno. . . . But after the passage of the Stamp Act in 1765, the line between tyranny and English identity became blurry."[174] Anti-Catholic language was still used by Maryland Protestants, but the object of the attacks shifted from Maryland Catholics themselves, to the oppressive regime of George III.[175]

Charles Carroll of Carrollton, member of one of the leading Catholic families of Maryland and cousin to the future first American Catholic bishop, was instrumental in applying the experience and wisdom of the Maryland Catholic tradition to the greater colonial experience vis-a-vis England in arriving at the daunting and world-shifting decision of independence.[176] Carroll won widespread fame and respect in a written debate published in the *Maryland Gazette* between January and July 1773 in which he, writing as "First Citizen," took on the Tory lawyer, Daniel Dulaney, Jr., over the nature of the British constitution and the collecting of salaries for

[171] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 187.
[172] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 187.
[173] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 187.
[174] Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 217.
[175] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 217.
[176] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 218.

ministers in the Church of England.[177] Carroll spoke for the American people against the over-reach of the British government and he became an accepted and leading voice for American interests. "For the Catholics, the significance of the episode lay in the fact that one of their proscribed minority had for the first time since the advent of the penal laws been accepted by the general populace as the champion and spokesman of a popular political cause."[178] Although this momentum was interrupted by outrage over the Quebec Act, Carroll was able to maintain his place in the intellectual leadership of the revolutionary movement and help re-focus the source of corruption on the English crown and not on religion. Since the King and Parliament became seen as the common oppressive force of the American colonists, both Catholic and Protestant alike, opportunities for religious pluralism became not only possible but reality. A common goal, independence, required a cohesion that transcended confessional boundaries, something foreign to the Church of England. "One cannot escape the impression of a growing esteem for tolerance during the revolutionary period in Maryland and at least a minimal desire to develop it. . . . To do so required that men recognize and respect the fact and right of differences in religious belief and opinion."[179]

By the time of the Quebec Act and the other events of the 1770s, the Maryland Catholic community was well-formed in the independent spirit that was becoming inevitably necessary for the American colonists as a whole and the consequences that would come from a break with England.[180] Maryland Catholics shared the desire for independence with other American Protestants, but they had been living out its effects as far back as the colony's existence, and

---

[177] See Hennesey, *American Catholics*, 57-58; see also Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 390-91.
[178] Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America*, 391.
[179] See Thomas O'Brien Hanley, *The American Revolution and Religion: Maryland: 1770-1800* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1971), 197.
[180] See Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 256.

even further back to the persecution of the English Reformation.[181] "The independence movement's emphasis on liberty and freedom, and its insistence on the separate nature of the colonies' constitutions resonated with a population that had been self-consciously defining itself for several generations and had experienced first-hand the negative consequences of being tied politically to England."[182] As a consequence of the Catholic experience in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries and the tradition that took root in Maryland, centered on intentional commitment to their faith in the face of persecution and numerous obstacles, the Carrolls and other Maryland Catholics were already American rather than English and were prepared to risk every effort to follow its logical consequence in revolution.

[181] See Hanley, *The American Revolution and Religion*, 171.
[182] Farrelly, *Papist Patriots*, 256.

Conclusion

We have covered a lot of ground in this study. The central question we began with was: why did the two groups, American Catholics (the Maryland Tradition) and Canadian Catholics (the Quebec Tradition), react so differently to British colonial rule in the mid eighteenth-century? The entire study helps to provide an answer to this question, but we are now able to give a succinct response by looking to the most important factors.

The proximate reason for Canadian Catholics' opposition to the movement of the American Revolution and maintaining loyalty to the English crown was the benefits and acceptance won through the Quebec Act. Overt conflict between their political loyalties and their Catholic and French identity were no longer unresolved, and the stability of their status within the province of Quebec, especially after the violence and tumult of the British Conquest and the intervening ten year period of uncertainty. Moreover, Canadian Catholics had the experience of strong episcopal figures, including Laval and Briand, who cooperated with the ruling civil government in order to secure the best situation for the Catholic Church. More remote reasons for their response, stepping back into the earlier history as post-Reformation Catholicism in France, were both the acceptance of the absolute power and role of the king in God's plan for political order, and the violence and persecution that flows from political disorder painfully learned during the Wars of Religion. Canadian Catholics were distinct from French Catholics of the period, and yet their distinct identity as both French and Catholic were legislatively recognized in the passage of England's Quebec Act, therefore they achieved the status of legal recognition they desired and wanted to maintain that status through loyalty to England.

American Catholics, on the other hand, were co-leaders of the American Revolution because, proximately, they shared a common aggressor with their fellow Americans who were Protestant, namely King George III and Parliament, and their religious differences were, in the context of the period, less urgently important matters they were able to put aside for the moment while the issue of independence was addressed. Rooted in the communal experience of post-Reformation English Catholicism, they knew the brutality of religious persecution at the hands of the government and yet committed to living their faith in a lethally hostile environment in the face of these threats, regardless of the costs. This inspired a spirit of self-determination and ownership of their Catholic identity that was only strengthened by increased personal cost; in a context where it is not easy to be Catholic, those who strive to live the faith are doing so out of a deep personal decision and drive, and not because it is easy or socially or politically advantageous. The American Catholic community lacked a strong connection with the hierarchical church throughout its history and, with the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773, the clergy was even more formally cut off from Rome. In this environment, the self-determined Catholic identity sharpened out of necessity, because American Catholics had to personally commit all the more to their religious identity without a visible and public leader, such as a bishop.

Both communities, in the Quebec Tradition and Maryland Tradition of colonial Catholicism in British North America, took their faith and religious commitments seriously and yet arrived at divergent responses to the Quebec Act and British rule. Through our study, we have arrived at a better understanding to explain the reason why.

Works Cited

Axtell, James. *The Invasion Within: The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Browne, G.P. "Carleton, Guy, 1st Baron Dorchester." *In Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. 5*. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003. Accessed April 18, 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/carleton_guy_5E.html.

------. "Murray, James." *In Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. 4*. University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003. Accessed April 18, 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/murray_james_4E/html.

Calvert, Cevil. "Instructions to the Colonists by Lord Baltimore (December 13, 1633)." In *Narratives of Early Maryland*, edited by Clayton Colman Hall, 16-25. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Chaussé, Gilles. "French Canada from the Conquest to 1840." Translated by James MacLean. In *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada*, edited by Terrence Murphy and Roberto Perin, 56-107. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Christin, Olivier. "'Peace Must Come From Us': Friendship Pacts Between the Confessions During the Wars of Religion." Translated by Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter. In *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, edited by Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, 92-103. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003.

Cottret, Bernard. "Religious or Secular? The Edict of Nantes, Reformation and State Formation in Late Sixteenth-Century France." In *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, edited by Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, 107-127. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003.

Crouzet, Dennis. "Identity and Violence: French Protestants and the Early Wars of Religion." Translated by Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter. In *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, edited by Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, 73-91. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003.

Crowley, Terry. "The French Regime to 1760." In *A Concise History of Christianity in Canada*, edited by Terrence Murphy and Roberto Perin, 1-55. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Deslandres, Dominique. *Croire et Faire Croire: Les Missions Françaises au XVIIe Siècle (1600-1650)*. Paris: Fayard, 2002.

Dolan, Jay. P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1985.

Doll, Peter M. *Revolution, Religion, and National Identity: Imperial Anglicanism in British North America, 1745-1795*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000.

Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c.1580*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

Edwards, Francis. *The Jesuits in England: From 1580 to the Present Day*. Tunbridge Wells, Kent, UK: Burns & Oats, 1985.

Ellis, John Tracy. *Catholics in Colonial America*. Baltimore: Helicone, 1965.

Farrelly, Maura Jane. *Papist Patriots: The Making of an American Catholic Identity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Fay, Terence J. *A History of Canadian Catholics: Gallicanism, Romanism, and Canadianism*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2002.

Garrisson, Janine. *A History of Sixteenth-Century France, 1438-1598: Renaissance, Reformation and Rebellion*. Translated by Richard Rex. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Greengrass, Mark. "An Edict and its Antecedents: the Pacification of Nantes and Political Culture in Later Sixteenth-Century France." In *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, edited by Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, 128-146. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2003.

------. *The French Reformation*. New York: Blackwell, 1987.

Haigh, Christopher. *English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hanley, Thomas O'Brien. *The American Revolution and Religion: Maryland 1770-1800*. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1971.

------. *Their Rights and Liberties: The Beginnings of Religious and Political Freedom in Maryland*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1984.

Hennesey, James. *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

------. "Catholicism in an American Environment: The Early Years." *Theological Studies* 50, no. 4 (December 1989): 657-75.

Krugler, John D. *English and Catholic: The Lords Baltimore in the Seventeenth Century*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.

Lanctôt, Gustave. *Canada & the American Revolution, 1774-1783*. Translated by Margaret M. Cameron. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1967.

MacCulloch, Diarmaid. *The Reformation*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

Magee, Brian. *The English Recusants: A Study of the Post-Reformation Catholic Survivial and the Operation of the Recusancy Laws*. London: Burns Oates & Washbourne LTD, 1938.

Massa, Mark with Catherine Osborne. *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader*. New York: New York University Press, 2008.

Phillips, Henry. *Church and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Questier, Michael C. *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c. 1550-1640*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Rambaud, Alfred. "La Croix de Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, Jean-Baptiste de." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, *Vol. 2*. Toronto: University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003. Accessed March 16, 2017. http://biographi.ca/en/bio/la_croix_de_chevrieres_de_saint_vallier_jean_baptiste_de_2E.html.

Sager, Jason. "François de Sales and Catholic Reform in Seventeenth-Century France." *Dutch Review of Church History* 85 (January 1, 2005): 269-282.

Stanbridge, Karen A. *British Catholic Policy in Eighteenth-Century Ireland and Quebec*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1998.

Trudel, Marcel. *La Révolution Américaine: Pourquoi la France Refuse le Canada (1775-1783)*. Sillery, Québec: Les Éditions du Boréal Express Ltée, 1976.

Vachon, André. "Briand, Jean-Olivier." *In Dictionary of Canadian Biography, Vol. 4.* University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003. Accessed January 31, 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/briand_jean_olivier_4E.html.

------. "Laval, François de." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, *Vol. 2*. Toronto: University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2003. Accessed March 16, 2017. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/laval_francois_de_2E.html.

Voisine, André Beaulieu, and Jean Hamelin. *Histoire de l'Église catholique au Québec (1608-1970)*. Montreal: Éditions Fides, 1971.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, UK: The Boydell Press, 1993.

Wright, Anthony D. *The Divisions of French Catholicism, 1629-1645: 'The Parting of the Ways.'* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.