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Please help ...  
find the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland!

Everyone can help **identify & locate** the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland and their direct descendants.

Verified descendants are eligible for legacy admissions status at Georgetown University.

Please send leads to:  **aboutGMP@gmail.com**

This article is not copyrighted. You have unlimited permission to reprint, copy, publish and share this article. No further approval is necessary.

**Please share this article with anyone who might be able to help.**
How do I know ...
if I’m related to the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland?

Important Family Names:
Anderson (Henderson)
Barns (Barnes, Barney)
Blacklock
Blair
Brown
Butler
Campbell
Contee
Coyle
Gamble
Cutchmore (Cutchmore, Cutchmo,
   Cuckumber, Cuss, Cotchman)
Diggs (Digs, Digs)
Dorsey (Dorsi)
Eaglin
Ford
Gough
Greenleaf (Greenleaf, Green)
Hall
Harris
Hawkins
Hill
Jones
Johnson
Kelly
Kercheman (see also Cutchmore)
Langley
Mahoney
Mason
Merrick (Merrick)
Noland (Nolanty, Nolin)
Plowden
Queen (Quin)
Riley
Scott
Sweeten (Sweton, Sweden,
   Sweetum, Sueton)
Ware
West
Wilton
Yorkshire

Here are 5 major clues:

☐ Your family is black or mixed race, with ties to slavery.

☐ Your family has ties to southern Maryland, especially:
   • St. Mary’s County [St. Mary’s City, St. Inigoes, or Ridge]
   • Charles County (Port Tobacco)
   • Howard or Baltimore Counties (Woodstock or Granite)
   • Prince George’s County or Anne Arundel County

☐ Your family is Roman Catholic (or used to be).

☐ Family lore says your ancestors were owned by the Jesuits or Catholic priests.

☐ You have ancestors with surnames listed at left (the more the better).

Next Steps:
These are just clues – not rigid tests or requirements!

If you think you might be related to the Lost Jesuit Slaves, please email us: aboutGMP@gmail.com

Please tell us:
• Your name.
• How we can reach you.
• How you might be related to the Lost Jesuit Slaves.
# Section 1: Introduction & Background

People of Interest

First things first: this article is about the following people:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Age (1838)</th>
<th>Born</th>
<th>Jesuit Plantation</th>
<th>MD County</th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacklock</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1803</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>Nace [Jr.]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell?</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyle</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutchmore</td>
<td>Margery</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diggs</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diggs</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>Regis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison?</td>
<td>Nelly</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins?</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins?</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins?</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins?</td>
<td>Minty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins?</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>Louisa</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>Anny</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1813</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>Geo</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>Nelly</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowden?</td>
<td>Dick</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Abe</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Isais</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott?</td>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott?</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweton</td>
<td>Len</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Benedict</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Biby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>St. Inigo’s</td>
<td>St. Mary’s</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown?</td>
<td>Bill/William</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George’s</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celestia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788-1818</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crissy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788-1818</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crissy Daughter 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crissy Daughter 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td></td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvis/Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitty</td>
<td></td>
<td>1816</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loisa</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788-1818</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltilda Daughter 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltilda Daughter 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltilda Daughter 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788-1818</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Daughter 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Daughter 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788</td>
<td>Bef.</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td>1788-1818</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>20-50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td></td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noble</td>
<td></td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis</td>
<td></td>
<td>1810</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revidy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td></td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teresia</td>
<td></td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>50+</td>
<td>Bef. 1788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td></td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeke</td>
<td></td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td>1806</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Prince George's</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire?</td>
<td>Alexius</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>St. Ingoes</td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Historical Overview**

In 1838, the Maryland Jesuits and Georgetown University sold more than 272 enslaved people from four Jesuit-owned tobacco plantations in southern Maryland to Henry Johnson and Jesse Batey – two plantation-owners in southern Louisiana. Today, these enslaved people are known collectively as the GU272.

About 200 members of the GU272 were actually sent to southern Louisiana in the late 1830s and early 1840s. They were placed on plantations located in Iberville, Ascension, and Terrebonne Parishes. A great many other members of the GU272 remained in Maryland – or perhaps fled (or were sold) to parts as yet unknown.

The [Georgetown Memory Project](https://gmp.georgetown.edu) (GMP), a nonprofit research institute based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, was formed on November 21, 2015 by Richard J. Cellini, a Georgetown University alumnus. The GMP’s mission is to locate all members of the GU272, and trace their direct descendants into the modern era. To date, the GMP has located 211 members of the GU272, and has identified 6,157 direct descendants (living and deceased). The GMP is independent of (and receives no financial or other material support from) Georgetown University and the Maryland Jesuits. The GMP’s research is funded entirely through the generosity of hundreds of individual donors.

---

1 To date, the Georgetown Memory Project has identified 206 members of the GU272 as having been transported from Maryland to Louisiana in connection with the Jesuit slave sale of 1838.

At least one of these 206 individuals was pregnant when she was transported to Louisiana. On November 12, 1838 (literally one day before the departure of the *Katharine Jackson of Georgetown*, one of the slave ships chartered to transport Jesuit slaves from Maryland to Louisiana), Father Peter Havermans wrote a letter from the Jesuit plantation at Newtown Manor to Father General Jan Roothaan in Rome, stating:

> “Provincial Father Mulledy arrived with Johnson, the ex-governor of the state of Louisiana, the master to whom our slaves were sold ...to put them all on a boat .... The slaves with heroic fortitude were giving themselves to fate and with Christian resignation relinquishing themselves to God. One woman more pious than the others, and at that time pregnant most demanded my compassion. She was coming toward me so that for the last time she could greet me and seek benediction, and she observed as she was genuflecting: ‘If ever someone should have reason for despair, do I not now have it? I do not know on what day the birth will come, whether on the road or sea. What will become of me? Why do I deserve this?’ I was saying ‘Trust in God.’ So it was, she agreed....”

(emphasis supplied).

Letter from P. Havermans to JRoothaan dated November 12, 1838, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (“ARSI”), Provincia Maryland 1007, I, 9, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the [Georgetown Slavery Archive](https://slaveryarchive.georgetown.edu).

The November 1838 manifest of the Katharine Jackson lists only a relatively small number of women from Newtown Manor of child-bearing age. The Georgetown Memory Project has not succeeded in identifying the pregnant woman with whom Father Havermans spoke on November 12, 1838. Yet.
In December 2015, the GMP engaged Ms. Judy Riffel of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, to lead the genealogical search for the GU272 and their direct descendants. Judy has been supported in this effort by Ms. Patricia Bayonne-Johnson (herself a GU272 descendant), and a dedicated team of expert genealogists affiliated with the Eastern Washington Genealogical Society, Inc. (www.ewgsi.org). Maryland genealogist, Malissa Ruffner, CG®, has been researching those who appear to have remained in Maryland.

This article is based on extensive genealogical research conducted over a great many months by these distinguished genealogical experts. Richard Cellini contributed the non-genealogical research, analysis and conclusions presented in these pages.

As described in comprehensive detail below, the GMP believes that at least ninety-one (91) members of the GU272 avoided transportation to Louisiana, and were left behind in Maryland or sold to parts unknown. These 91 people are known today as the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland (the “Lost Jesuit Slaves”). All 91 are listed and described in this article.

The ID numbers used in this article were originally assigned by the now-defunct Jesuit Plantation Project (the JPP) to names appearing on a special pre-sale census of Jesuit slaves conducted in early 1838. Although incomplete and now obsolete, these ID numbers have been adopted on an interim basis by the Georgetown Memory Project, and should be used when contacting the GMP about a particular person.

To date, the GMP has identified only five (5) five of the 91 Lost Jesuit Slaves. The names of these five individuals are CAPITALIZED and ITALICIZED in the article below.

The other 86 people remain to be found. Their names (the vast majority of names appearing in this article) are presented below without any special emphasis. These are the people we hope to learn more about in the months and years ahead.

### Research Challenges & Obstacles

Identifying the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland has been difficult – significantly harder than identifying and locating the approximately 200 members of the GU272 who were actually sent to Louisiana in connection with the 1838 Jesuit slave sale. Challenges and obstacles in tracing the Lost Jesuit Slaves can be organized into four (4) main categories:

1. Imprecise record-keeping;
2. Transportation-related delays and uncertainties;
3. Unknown surnames of some GU272 members and their spouses; and
4. Lapse of time between the 1838 sale and the 1870 federal census, when the formerly enslaved people were enumerated for the first time.

Each of these four categories is discussed in some detail below.
(1) **Imprecise Record-Keeping.**

Imprecise record-keeping has made it difficult to determine exactly how many slaves were *actually sold* by the Maryland Jesuits to Batey and Johnson in the mass sale of 1838. Uncertainty at the aggregate level substantially complicates the subsidiary question of how many enslaved people may possibly have been left behind in Maryland.

The fuzziness of GU272 math is caused by, or reflected in, a number of aspects of the 1838 sale, including the following:

(a) **Contemporaneous Sale Documents:**

The primary written documents underpinning the 1838 sale state unequivocally that the transaction involved 272 individuals. Specifically, these documents include:

- an undated census of enslaved people living on the Jesuits’ four Maryland plantations, likely completed just shortly before the 1838 sale was consummated (the “1838 Jesuit Slave Census”).

- an 8-page handwritten agreement dated June 19, 1838, between the Maryland Jesuits and the two Louisiana-based purchasers (the “1838 Sale Agreement”).

In reality, neither of these documents is a particularly reliable source for determining precisely how many human beings were involved in the 1838 sale.

The 1838 Jesuit Slave Census is an oversized ledger sheet containing six columns of names, organized by Jesuit plantation in Maryland. The ledger sheet concludes with a flourish in the bottom right-hand corner that says: “272 in all.” However, the number of people named (or otherwise indicated) on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census does not actually total 272. For a detailed analysis of the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census, please see Attachment A to this article.

Likewise, the 1838 Sale Agreement expressly states in its preamble that: “Thomas F. Mulledy sells to Jesse Baty and Henry Johnson two hundred and seventy two negroes.” Without question, the list of names appearing in the 1838 Sale Agreement was drawn directly from the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. A name-by-name comparison of the list-order in the two documents strongly supports the conclusion that the drafter of the 1838 Sale Agreement (likely William McSherry, SJ) relied directly on the 1838 Slave Census when completing his work (though not without errors or discrepancies). It should not be surprising, therefore, that the number of

---

2 “Census of slaves to be sold in 1838,” Maryland Province Archive (“MPA), Oversize Box 4 (WO 112), Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

3 “Articles of Agreement between Thomas F. Mulledy, of Georgetown, District of Columbia, of one part, and Jesse Beatty (sic) and Henry Johnson, of the State of Louisiana, of the other part, 19th June 1838,” Maryland Province Archives (MPA), Box 40, File 10, Item 3a-h, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.
people listed in the 1838 Sale Agreement doesn’t total 272 either. For a detailed analysis of the 1838 Sale Agreement, please see Attachment B to this article.

(b) Published Historical Accounts:
Historians have embraced the 272 figure as well. But these historians are no more reliable than the original sources upon which they rely.

Almost 180 years have passed since the Jesuit slave sale of 1838. However, to date, no published historian has presented a rigorous, well-documented examination of the total number of persons involved in the sale. As of this writing, the topic has only rarely been identified by academic historians as a live issue – and even then, only in passing.

(c) Invisible in Maryland / Documented in Louisiana:
To complicate matters yet further, some of the Marylanders sold by the Jesuits to Batey and Johnson in 1838 aren’t mentioned on either the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census or the 1838 Sale Agreement. Despite having been born in Maryland prior to the 1838 sale, their names just mysteriously appear in Louisiana (typically alongside their close relations) on a ship manifest and other post-sale documentation. Please see Attachment C to this article for a list of fifteen (15) individuals who were passengers on the Katharine Jackson of Georgetown in late 1838 along with dozens of other members of the GU272, but who cannot be matched to anyone (named or unnamed) on either the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census or the 1838 Sale Agreement.

(d) The HJ Substitutes:
Finally, there is the matter of the “HJ Substitutes.” These are the people who were sold to Henry Johnson as “replacements” for persons originally meant to be included in the 1838 sale (per the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census and the 1838 Sale Agreement), but who for whatever reason were not actually shipped to Louisiana. The GMP believes that the HJ Substitutes were acquired by the Maryland Jesuits (from sources as yet undetermined), and that all of them were shipped to Henry Johnson in Louisiana as late as 1843.

4 See, e.g., J. Zwinge, “The Jesuit Farms in Maryland,” The Woodstock Letters, vol. XLI [41], no. 3, 1912, at p. 282 (“[T]here were 272 in all.”); R. Judge, “Foundation and First Administration of the Maryland Province,” The Woodstock Letters, vol. LXXXVIII [88], no. 4, 1959, at p. 400 (“There were 272 slaves altogether, most of whom were sold.”); P. Finn, “The Slaves of the Jesuits of Maryland” (M.A. thesis presented at Georgetown University, read and approved by the Committee on August 29, 1974), at p. 130 (“The major sale of 272 of the slaves took place on June 19, 1838.”); T. Murphy, Jesuit Slaveholding in Maryland: 1717-1838 (Routledge, New York & London, 2001), at p. 203 (“The price was $115,000 for 272 slaves.”); S. Toole, “Institutional Peculiarity: Jesuit Slave Trading in Maryland” (Th.M. thesis presented to the Faculty of the Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University in May 2015) at p. 1 (“Provincial Thomas Mulledy consigned 272 enslaved persons to a future on Louisiana sugar plantations.”).
To date, the GMP has not yet settled on a total number of HJ Substitutes. To some extent, their names and identities remain a subject of uncertainty as well.

(e) Likely Total Number of People from 1838 Sale:

To summarize, the term “GU272” presents a veneer of quantitative certainty and precision. But in reality, it’s a modern-day catchphrase (probably coined by an undergraduate student protester at Georgetown in late 2015) that loosely describes the entire group of enslaved people whose lives were jeopardized or radically reordered by the Jesuit slave sale of 1838. “GU272” is a label, not an accurate census.

With respect to the total number of individuals involved in the 1838 slave sale, at least one thing can be said with certainty: it was more than 272. This explains how it’s possible that 91 Jesuit slaves remained in Maryland, while 206 were sent to Louisiana.

The Georgetown Memory Project has concluded that the 1838 slave sale by the Maryland Jesuits actually involved at least 297 distinct individuals (i.e., 206 people transported to Louisiana, and 91 people left behind in Maryland). These figures may be adjusted in the future, if and when additional historical evidence comes to light.

(2) Transportation-Related Delays & Uncertainties.

Setting aside the question of how many people were actually sold by the Maryland Jesuits in 1838, it is unclear how many of these were actually transported to Louisiana. Again, this uncertainty substantially complicates the related task of determining how many people may have been left behind in Maryland after the 1838 sale.

It is an absolute certainty that not all of the people sold by the Maryland Jesuits in 1838 were actually transported to Louisiana. As described below, some were spared by unusual quirks in the sale transaction itself. Others escaped when the slave-traders arrived.

(a) “Married Off” and “Married Free”:

With respect to the transaction itself: the 1838 sale was not a simple, straightforward one. Eighteen months prior to the sale (i.e., in late December 1836), the Jesuit Superior General in Rome imposed a set of stringent and unusual conditions on the Maryland Jesuits before approving the sale of the Jesuit slaves.\(^5\) One such condition mandated that husbands and wives not be separated.

\(^5\) “Fr. Roothaan, S.J. lays out the conditions for the sale of slaves, 27 December 1836,” MPA, Box 93, Folder 9, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.
Perhaps unbeknownst to the Father General, some of the Jesuit slaves were married to slaves on neighboring plantations (a practice known at the time as “marrying off”), or were married to free people of color. Please see Attachment D and Attachment E to this article for more information about the members of the GU272 who were “married off” or married to free persons, respectively.

In such cases, the Superior General’s restrictions were interpreted to require either:

- the acquisition of the neighboring spouse from the non-Jesuit owner (and the transportation of both spouses to Louisiana); or
- the sale of the Jesuit-owned spouse to the neighboring plantation, and the acquisition of a suitable replacement who could be sent to Louisiana instead.

In actual practice, both of these outcomes occurred. The onerous nature of the task meant that the some GU272 members were delayed in their departure for Louisiana. In some cases, this delay became permanent.

By December 1838, Henry Johnson had already received an initial shipment of 56 Jesuit slaves, but a second group of 84 slaves purchased by Johnson remained behind in Maryland. Accounts differ as to how many people from this second group were actually sent to Louisiana. It is conceivable that some 69 to 75 of Henry Johnson’s second group of 84 remained in Maryland, for various reasons.

(b) Escapees & “Runaways”:

Cross-plantation marriage was not the only circumstance that saved GU272 members from being transported to Louisiana. Other GU272 members resorted to self-help: they escaped the slave traders who arrived by ship to collect them from the various Maryland plantations in 1838. These individuals have become known as the “runaways.”

Nearly 75 years after the events of 1838, Father Joseph Zwinge, S.J. (the Procurator of the Maryland Province from 1904 to 1921)\(^6\), wrote:

> “When the time came for being transferred to their new master, some of them who dreaded the trip to Louisiana ran away, but only one or two ran far enough to get away.”\(^7\) (emphasis supplied)

Twelve (12) individuals listed in 1838 Jesuit Slave Census have the notation “ranaway” written next to their names. However, the Georgetown Memory Project does not presently believe that these notations indicate persons who fled the arrival of the Louisiana-bound slave ships at the time of the 1838 sale. For a detailed analysis and discussion of the 12 “runaways” identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census, please see Attachment F to this article.

---


To date, neither the GMP nor anyone else can say precisely how many members of the GU272 escaped transportation to Louisiana. Father Zwinge is certainly correct that at least some did. However, few details of these escapees have yet surfaced.

(3) **Unknown Surnames of Some GU272 Members & Spouses.**

Another difficulty in finding the Lost Jesuit Slaves relates to the absence of surnames for at least some of the members of the GU272 and/or their spouses.

To date, the GMP has identified approximately 40 different surnames across the entire GU272 population. However, relatively few of these surnames appears in the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census or the 1838 Sale Agreement themselves. Specifically, the only surnames appearing in either document are (in order of appearance): Queen; Butler; Coyle; Sweetun (or Sweeton); Cusha (or Cush); and Gough.

Surnames for most of the GU272 members actually sent to Louisiana have been located in post-sale, pre-1860 documents, such as ship manifests, mortgage documents, estate appraisals, and re-sale agreements. Some of the surnames of the Louisiana-bound have furnished clues for the surnames of those who remained in Maryland, and this article offers a few tentative identifications based on those clues. However, for the rest of those who remained in Maryland, surnames have remained elusive.

The absence of surnames has made two subsets of the Lost Jesuit Slaves especially difficult to identify:

- GU272 members who were “married off” (i.e., Jesuit slaves who were married to spouses located on neighboring, non-Jesuit plantations); and
- GU272 members who were married to free persons of color.

While it is certain that some (though not all) of these individuals were left behind in Maryland, it is nevertheless difficult to identify these individuals by first and last names.

The 1838 Slave Census contains handwritten, contemporaneous notations identifying a number of individuals as “married off” or married to a free person. Unfortunately, these notations give no indication of the names (let alone surnames) of the off-plantation and free spouses. GU272 women who married free or off-plantation spouses undoubtedly took the surname of their husbands (according to the custom of the times). In the absence of surnames for off-plantation and free husbands, identifying these GU272 women will be exceedingly difficult.

(4) **Lapse of Time (1838-1870).**

A gap of 32 years separates the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census (when the Jesuit slaves were first comprehensively listed and enumerated for purposes relating to the 1838 sale) and the 1870 U.S. Census (when newly emancipated slaves were first identified by first and last name). This 32-year gap presents yet another obstacle to the accurate identification of members of the
GU272 left behind (or thought to have been left behind) in Maryland.

Older GU272 members “left behind” may have died in this intervening period, leaving no trace. Those who were children in 1838 were grown adults in 1870, and not likely to be listed in family groups with their parents and siblings in the records.

Summary of Maryland Research Results to Date

As a result of the foregoing challenges and difficulties, only a handful of the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland have been identified so far, and some of those rather tentatively. DNA tests of some of the living GU272 descendants in Maryland confirm a relationship to GU272 descendants in Louisiana.

DNA is proving to be one tool that may help overcome some of these barriers. The GMP is presently conducting a GU272-focused DNA study through AncestryDNA. Over two dozen confirmed descendants from several different GU272 families have participated in the study so far. Most of these are descended from the Louisiana families. However, a few participants in the GMP’s DNA study descend from those who remained in Maryland.

Anyone with Maryland ancestry who matches one of the Louisiana testers is likely to have common ancestry in Maryland. This, by itself, does not prove that a person descends from one of the GU272, but it is a starting point for further research. Those who have tested with AncestryDNA should look through their matches for kits “managed by Georgetown Project.” Family trees have been uploaded and attached to the DNA results to help in identifying the matching family or families. Additionally, most of the results have been uploaded to GEDmatch, a third-party DNA website. Those results are listed under the e-mail address riffelj@bellsouth.net. Note that not all of the kits managed by this e-mail address are related to the GU272.

It is hoped that this article will help further the research into those who may have remained in Maryland after the 1838 sale.

The remainder of this article is a summary of what is currently known about the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland. Details of their ages, marital status, and a few other identifying characteristics are taken from the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census, which is cited and footnoted in this introduction. In the interest of space, that census and three other frequently cited sources are not footnoted in each entry. Those other three oft-cited sources are:
• Henry Johnson’s written agreement with Thomas F. Mulledy for the purchase of 84 slaves (“Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84”); 

• Henry Johnson’s undated written agreement with Thomas F. Mulledy for the purchase of 11 slaves (“Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11”); 

• Jesse Batey’s written agreement with Thomas F. Mulledy for the purchase of 54 slaves (“Jesse Batey’s purchase of 54”). 

All other sources are footnoted.

---


9 Undated obligation from Henry Johnson to Thomas Mulledy to pay $7,180 for 11 slaves, MPA, Box 40, Document No. 4 of 28, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University. 

10 Purchase of 54 negroes by Jesse Beaty (sic) from Thomas F. Mulledy, 6 July 1839, Conveyance Book H, pp. 293–295, Terrebonne Parish Clerk of Court, Houma, La.
Section 2:
Names of the Lost Jesuit Slaves

To date, the GMP has identified only five (5) of the ninety-one (91) Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland. The names of these 5 individuals are CAPITALIZED and ITALICIZED in the pages below.

The other 86 people remain to be found. Their names (the vast majority of names appearing below) are presented below without any special emphasis.

All 91 people are grouped below by the name of Jesuit plantation in Maryland on which they were located at the time the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census was conducted. ID numbers appear after each name. Please use these ID numbers when contacting the GMP about a particular person.

White Marsh Plantation (Prince George’s County, MD)

White Marsh Plantation (also sometimes called “White Marsh Farm”) was founded circa 1729,\(^\text{11}\) and was officially known within the Society of Jesus as the Mission of St. Francis Borgia.\(^\text{12}\) Other relevant identifying details of White Marsh Plantation include the following:

- **Location:** Mostly in Prince George’s County, Maryland; partly in Anne Arundel County.
- **Adjacent River:** Patuxent River (at White Marsh Branch).
- **Nearest Modern Town:** Bowie, Maryland.
- **Nearest Modern Landmark:** White Marsh Park (City of Bowie, Maryland).
- **Primary Jesuit Church:** Old Sacred Heart (Bowie, Maryland), founded 1741.
- **Approximate Size in 1830s:** 2,000 acres.\(^\text{13}\)

---


\(^\text{13}\) P. Finn, “The Slaves of the Jesuits of Maryland (M.A. thesis presented at Georgetown University, read and approved by the Committee on August 29, 1974), p. 2.
For White Marsh Plantation, the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census contains the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>2 crossed-out entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>0 duplicate entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>89 net entries (i.e., net of cross-outs &amp; dupes)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td><strong>89 proper names</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td><strong>0 unnamed individuals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest group of individuals listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census from White Marsh was the Hawkins family, consisting of: the patriarch, Isaac, aged 65; his four sons, Charles, Patrick, James, and Isaac; his daughter, Nelly; and their families. Other surnames found among the White Marsh group (though not necessarily listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census itself) include: Harrison; Queen; West; Dorsey; and possibly Cutchmore.

Twenty-five (25) people from White Marsh were sent to Louisiana in the first group to depart Maryland via ship. All were destined for Jesse Batey’s plantation in Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana. They departed Alexandria, Virginia, on the brig *Uncas* in June of 1838 and arrived in New Orleans on 26 July 1838. The manifest of the *Uncas* is not extant. However, the agreement documenting Batey’s purchase of 54 (filed in Terrebonne Parish) contains a specific reference to this brig. The dates of arrival were determined from the New Orleans newspaper ship arrival section.14 Five members of the Queen family, however, were noted in Batey’s purchase of 54 as not having been on board and were to be sent later. One of those, Charles Queen, appears on the manifest of the *Isaac Franklin* in December of 1838.15

Twenty-one (21) others from White Marsh were sent to Louisiana onboard the *Katharine Jackson*, which departed Alexandria, Virginia, on 13 November 1838 and arrived in New Orleans 6 December 1838.16 These people were split up between a plantation owned by Jesse Batey in Iberville Parish (near Maringouin), and one owned by Henry Johnson just across the boundary line in nearby Pointe Coupee Parish, Louisiana. Johnson would later move his slaves from Pointe Coupee to Ascension Parish, Louisiana.

Thirty-four (34) people from White Marsh Plantation are believed to have remained behind in Maryland. These people include (but are not limited to) the following:

---

14 *The Daily Picayune*, New Orleans, La., 26 July 1838.
Select People from White Marsh; Organized by Annotations on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married “Off-Plantation”</th>
<th>Married to a Free Person</th>
<th>“Runaways”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billy (ID 32)</td>
<td>Kitty (ID 50)</td>
<td>Charles Hawkins (ID 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Blacklock (ID 48)</td>
<td>Minty (ID 76)</td>
<td>Isaac Hawkins (ID 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Diggs (ID 55)</td>
<td>James (ID 80)</td>
<td>William Digs (ID 56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard (ID 72)</td>
<td>Eliza (ID 83)</td>
<td>Jasais Queen (ID 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garvis/Jarvis/Charles (ID 79)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Queen (ID 64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 people 4 people 6 people

All thirty-four (34) Lost Jesuit Slaves from White Marsh are described immediately below:

**ISAAC HAWKINS (ID 1):** Age 65 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. “Old Isaac” is mentioned in several letters by Fr. Fidele de Grivel, SJ. In November 1838, Father Grivel wrote:

“[O]n the 2d, back to W[ite] M[arsh] I visited all the quarters, saw all, but Joe & his servant oxen – old Isaac is quite cheerful__oh, said, Fr. G. you ought to visit my wife. Br. Kuhn said: She is very large, in deed__How many horses said I did you want to carry her from Baltimore?__a wagon & 5 horses__great laughing of old Isaac, Miss Kitty & all – The fact is, Br. Kuhn had brought to Balt__e some hogsheads of Tobacco, & returning took Isaac’s wife__She is not as big as old Nelly, Joe’s mother. A good well bred woman. They live in a new quarter near the spring going to New design, & near the tobacco house; but the place being rented, they will move. Nelly, old Isaac’s daughter was sick, a very sensible woman.”

In May 1839, Father Grivel wrote:

“There remain in our farms only few old people, well provided for their life times. So old Isaac remained at W. Marsh; his daughter Nelly is gone with her husband Peter, whom Henry Young had sold for the purpose.”

Finally, in May 1842, Father Grivel wrote:

“I was for 3. days at W. Marsh with Fr. Rey who is a distinguished man, fit for every thing in the college & for Trinity Church, teaching preaching etc. & he is very popular amongst all – Old Isaac at 77, can do little, but goes on, living at the

---

17 Letter from Fr. Grivel, Georgetown College, to Fr. Lancaster, 6 Nov. 1838, MPA, Box 66, Folder 3, 212 M 5a.

18 Letter from Fr. Grivel to Fr. Lancaster, 4 May 1839, MPA, Box 66, Folder 1, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the [Georgetown Slavery Archive](http://slaveryarchive.georgetown.edu).
meat house near the kitchen, with his wife. He & all spoke of you, wishing to be remembered..."^{19}

As indicated by the capitalization and italicization of his name above, the GMP has conclusively determined that Isaac Hawkins (ID 1) was living in Maryland at least as late as 15 May 1842. Hundreds of verified descendants of Isaac Hawkins (ID 1) have been identified in Louisiana and throughout the United States. However, the GMP continues to seek information about other aspects of Isaac Hawkins’s life such as: his whereabouts in the years after 1842; his date of death; the location of his burial; and the name of the woman identified as his wife in the second excerpt quoted above.

**CHARLES HAWKINS (ID 2):** Age 40 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Isaac Hawkins (ID 1) (see entry immediately above); also, listed as a runaway on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. The GMP has conclusively determined that Charles Hawkins (ID 2) remained in Maryland after the 1838 sale. He is listed as Charles, aged 40, dead, on an undated document listing slaves remaining on the estate (in Maryland), believed to be ca. 1843.\(^{20}\)

**Isaac Hawkins (ID 20):** Age 26 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the fourth son of Isaac Hawkins (ID 1) (see entry above); also, identified as a runaway on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. Isaac, age 21, purchased for $864, is listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that he was transported to Louisiana).

**Sally (ID 25):** Age 65 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Billy (ID 32):** Age 40 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the second son of Sally (ID 25) (see entry immediately above). Also, identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. He is likely Billy married to Maria, servant of Thomas Macgruder [sic], in 1822. Their child, William, was baptized at White Marsh on 4 March 1822 at the age of 14 days, and his godmother was Nelly Harrison.\(^{21}\) This younger William Harrison is likely one of the substitutes sent to Louisiana in late 1843 and placed on Henry Johnson’s plantation in Ascension Parish.

---

\(^{19}\) Letter from Grivel to Lancaster, 15 May 1842, MPA, Box 67, Folder 7, Item 213 R7a, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

\(^{20}\) List of Slaves Remaining on Estate and Exchanged, no date – perhaps 1839 (more likely 1843), MPA, Box 40, Folder 6, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

\(^{21}\) Register of Baptisms, White Marsh, 1818-1822 (Transcription), Box 3, Folder 4, Maryland Province Collection (“MPC”), Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.
**Nelly (ID 33):** Age 38 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the daughter of Sally (ID 25) (see entry immediately above); also, listed on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census along with a note that says “Alex.” (possibly referring to the Jesuit mission located in Alexandria, Virginia); also, identified on the 1838 Slave Census as the mother of a son John (ID 34), age 5 in 1838 (see entry immediately below). Nelly is not included in any Louisiana purchase records. Her maiden name was likely Harrison.

**John (ID 34):** Age 5 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Nelly (ID 33) (see entry immediately above). Not included in any Louisiana purchase records. Surname is unknown, but mother’s maiden name is likely Harrison.

**Eliza Queen (ID 43):** Age 12 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the daughter of Charles and Sally Queen; also, listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census along with a note that says “Mrs. Sims Lee.” She is included in Jesse Batey’s purchase of 54, but noted as being one of five not sent on board the Uncas. In a letter from Dr. Beatty (sic) to Father McSherry dated 27 June 1838, Batey writes that Eliza had not arrived and the brig needed to clear customs that date. The GMP has conclusively determined that Eliza Queen (ID 43) was not transported to Louisiana, and remained in Maryland at least through 30 July 1840. However, the GMP seeks additional information about Eliza Queen including: her whereabouts in the years after 30 July 1840; her date of marriage (if any); her date of death; the location of her burial; and the names of her spouse and direct descendants (if any).

**Joseph Blacklock (ID 48):** Age 40 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Nelly Blacklock (ID 47); also, listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off”. Joseph Blacklock is included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. He was probably the son of Dick Blacklock and Nelly Winderry, per the 1822 baptism of Nelly at White Marsh Farm. He is noted in 1839 as having remained at White Marsh with his wife Nancy, who belonged to Mr. Grey. In November of 1838, Fr. Grivel wrote that he had not seen Joe on his visit to White Marsh, and commented on the size of old Nelly, Joe’s mother (see the quote above in the entry for Isaac Hawkins (ID 1)). The GMP has found some traces of possible descendants of Joseph Blacklock. The 1921 death certificate of Isabella Randall, born ca. 1848, identifies her parents as Joseph Blacklock and Kittie Hawkins. Additionally, a Gasaway Blacklock, born about 1835, was found in Montgomery County, Maryland, in 1870,


23 Register of Baptisms, White Marsh, 1818-1822 (Transcription), Box 3, Folder 4, MPC, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the [Georgetown Slavery Archive](https://georgetownslaveryarchive.law.georgetown.edu/).

24 Letter from Fr. Grivel to Fr. Lancaster dated 4 May 1839, MPA, Box 66, Folder 1, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the [Georgetown Slavery Archive](https://georgetownslaveryarchive.law.georgetown.edu/).

and a Gas Blacklock, born about 1840, was found also in Montgomery County in 1880.26 Research on these families is ongoing.

**Kitty (ID 50):** Age 22 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as married to a freeman; also, identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the mother of three children: Mary age 6 (ID 51); Sam age 4 (ID 52); and Elizabeth age 1 (ID 53) (see three entries immediately below). All four people (i.e., Kitty, Mary, Sam and Elizabeth) were included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Mary (ID 51):** Age 6 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the daughter of Kitty (ID 50) (see entry immediately above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Sam (ID 52):** Age 4 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Kitty (ID 50) (see entry above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Elizabeth (ID 53):** Age 1 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the daughter of Kitty (ID 50) (see entry above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Polly (ID 54):** Age 60 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**SALLY DIGGS (ID 55):** Age 50 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off”; also, identified in the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the mother of William (ID 56) (see entry immediately below). Sally and William were included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Sally’s husband has been identified as Aaron Diggs, owned by Walter “Bishop” Bowie, and noted in 1839 as having remained at White Marsh because Bowie would not part with Aaron.27 Two Sarahs, one age 38 and the other 43, are listed on the 1839 inventory of Bowie’s estate, along with Aaron age 50, and Aaron age three.28 Aaron Digges, a carpenter, age 70, and Aaron, Jr., age 20, were still enslaved by the Bowie family in 1864, but Sarah or Sallie is not listed.29 Sallie Diggs, age 70, is one household away

---


27 Letter from Fr. Grivel to Fr. Lancaster dated 4 May 1839, MPA, Box 66, Folder 1, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

28 Prince George’s County, Register of Wills, Inventories, PC3: 533, Inventory for Walter Bowie (1839); MSA C1228-35; Maryland State Archives, Annapolis, Md.

from Fr. Charles Bague at White Marsh on the 1870 census. An entry dated 2 December 1878 for “Sarah (Sallie) Diggs, coloured, age about 100, full of years, formerly Sister _____” is found in White Marsh burial records. Based on this information, the GMP has conclusively determined that Sally Diggs (ID 55) remained in Maryland after the 1838 sale. To date, the GMP has not yet identified any direct descendants of Sally Diggs, living or deceased.

**William Diggs (ID 56):** Age 21 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Sally (ID 55) (see entry immediately above); also, identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a runaway. William, age 21, was purchased for $864, and is listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that he was transported to Louisiana). Several William Diggs have been researched, but nothing definitive has yet been found.

**Robert (ID 58):** Age 12 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “an idiot.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Henry (ID 59):** Age 8 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Isais Queen (ID 62):** Age 21 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Harriet (ID 60), who was married to a free man but nevertheless sent to Louisiana (Terrebonne Parish). Also, identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a runaway. His name appears to be “Josais” [sic] on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census, but in other documents the name appears as “Isais” or “Isaias.” He was included in Jesse Batey’s purchase of 54, but noted as being one of five not sent on board the Uncas. Isaias, age 21, was purchased for $864, and listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that he was transported to Louisiana). He may be the same as Isaac Queen, age 34, living with Saml. Dobson, age 22, in Anne Arundel County, Maryland, in 1850.

**Nancy Queen (ID 64):** Age 15 in 1838. Daughter of Harriet (ID 60) who was married to a free man but nevertheless sent to Louisiana (Harriet was sent to Terrebonne Parish). Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a runaway. She was included in Jesse Batey’s purchase of 54, but noted as being one of five not sent on board the Uncas. Nancy, aged 15, was purchased for $594, and listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that she was transported to Louisiana).

---

30 1870 census Prince George’s Co., Md., Queen Anne District, p. 201A, family #105.
31 Prince George’s County Genealogical Society, comp., Early Church Records of the White Marsh Church, Prince George’s County (Bowie, Md.: Prince George’s County Genealogical Society, 2005), p. 74 of Book 4.
32 1850 census, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, District 3, p. 339B, family #58.
Betsy West (ID 67): Age 32 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the mother of Augustin age 15 (ID 68); Adelphia age 10 (ID 69); Henrietta age 7 (ID 70); and Harriet Ann age 4 (ID 71). Also, identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a runaway – notwithstanding the fact that (according to the same 1838 Jesuit Slave Census) she had four minor children living at White Marsh. Betsy, aged 32, was purchased for $594, and listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that she was transported to Louisiana). Betsy’s four children (Augustin, Adelphia, Henrietta, and Harriet Ann) were sent to Louisiana without her. Betsy may have been the sister of Harriet (ID 60) (see entry above), wife of James Queen (a free man living in Maryland, and not a member of the GU272). In November of 1838, Fr. Grivel wrote: “James Quin is a rascal, & is living with Elizabeth a widow sister of his wife Harriet, who knew it, & refused to remain in W[hite] M[arsh] & chose to go [to Louisiana] with her children.”

Richard (ID 72): Age 38 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off”; Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

Margery (ID 74): Age 60 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the mother of Len (ID 75). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Her surname or married name may be Cutchmore, Cutchember, or Cuckumber (all of which are variants or misspellings of a single intended surname).

Minty (ID 76): Age 26 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as married to a freeman; also, identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the mother of Nancy age 5 (ID 77); and Mary age 1½ (ID 78) (see two entries immediately below). All three people (i.e., Minty, Nancy, and Mary) were included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. She may be Minta Hawkins, listed with Nace Hawkins on the 1850, 1860, and 1870 censuses of Anne Arundel County, Maryland.

Nancy (ID 77): Age 5 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the daughter of Minty (ID 76) (see entry immediately above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana.

Mary (ID 78): Age 1½ in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the daughter of Minty (ID 76) (see entry above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana.

33 Letter from Grivel to Lancaster, 15 May 1842, MPA, Box 67, Folder 7, Item 213 R7a, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

34 1850 census Anne Arundel County, Maryland, District 3, p. 354B, family #326; 1860 census Anne Arundel County, Maryland, District 3, p. 816, family #833; and 1870 census Anne Arundel County, Maryland, District 3, p. 600A, family #218.
Garvis/Jarvis/Charles (ID 79): Age 60 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

James (ID 80): Age 50 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as married to a freewoman. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

Bill/William (ID 82): Age 42 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as an “idiot.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

Eliza (ID 83): Age 26 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as married to a free man; also, identified on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the mother of Revidy age 7 (ID 84); Noble age 5 (ID 85); Edward age 3 (ID 86); and William age 1 (ID 87). (See four entries immediately below). All four people (i.e., Eliza, Noble, Edward and William) were included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

Revidy (ID 84): Age 7 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Eliza (ID 83) (see entry immediately above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

Noble (ID 85): Age 5 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Eliza (ID 83) (see entry above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

Edward (ID 86): Age 3 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Eliza (ID 83) (see entry above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

William (ID 87): Age 1 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the son of Eliza (ID 83) (see entry above). William was not included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, although his mother and siblings were included in that purchase record. Surname is unknown.

(Remainder of page intentionally left blank)
St. Thomas Manor (Charles County, MD)

St. Thomas Manor was founded circa 1649,\(^{35}\) and was officially known within the Society of Jesus as the Mission of St. Ignatius Loyola.\(^{36}\) Other relevant identifying details of St. Thomas Manor include the following:

- **Location**: Charles County, Maryland.
- **Adjacent River**: Potomac River (at Port Tobacco River).
- **Nearest Modern Town**: Port Tobacco, Maryland.
- **Nearest Modern Landmark**: Chapel Point State Park.
- **Primary Jesuit Church**: St. Ignatius (Chapel Point, MD), founded 1798.
- **Approximate Size in 1830s**: 4,500 acres\(^ {37}\)

For St. Thomas Manor, the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census contains the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>– 0 crossed-out entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 1 duplicate entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong> 45 net entries (i.e., net of cross-outs &amp; dupes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e. 29 proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 16 unnamed individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the group from St. Thomas Manor, several children are not listed by name, and a few cannot be identified. Surnames found in this group (though not necessarily listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census itself) include: Queen; Butler; Coyle; Harris; Sweton/Sweden/Sweetum; Riley; Blair; and Johnson.

Seventeen (17) individuals from St. Thomas Manor are found listed on board the *Katharine Jackson* in 1838. These 17 people were split up between two plantations owned by Batey and Johnson respectively, both located near Maringouin, LA (i.e, Batey’s located in Iberville Parish; and Johnson’s located just across the border in Pointe Coupee Parish).

Twenty-three (23) people from Saint Thomas Manor are believed to have remained behind in Maryland. These people include (but are not limited to) the following:

---


Select people from St. Thomas Manor; Organized by Annotations on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married “Off-Plantation”</th>
<th>Married to a Free Person</th>
<th>“Runaways”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 people</td>
<td>0 people</td>
<td>0 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All twenty-three (23) Lost Jesuit Slaves from Saint Thomas Manor are described immediately below:

**Benedict (ID 93):** Age 65 in 1838. Not included in any Louisiana purchase records. Surname is unknown.

**John Butler (ID 96):** Age 35 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. In 1826, Rev. Francis Neale, SJ, superior of St. Thomas Manor, contracted to hire John Butler, a free man, to repair and take care of the wind mill on the plantation.\(^{38}\) If this is the same John Butler, he was erroneously included on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census.

**John Coyle (ID 97):** Age 21 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Index searches of federal census records (i.e., 1870 and later) have been unsuccessful in identifying him.

**Len Sweeton/Sweden/Sweetum (ID 99):** Age 50 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. A Noble Sweeden, born ca. 1839–1842, appears in some Charles County records; he served in Company A of the 1\(^{st}\) Regiment, U.S. Colored Troops, died in 1895, and is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.\(^{39}\)

**Daniel (ID 100):** Age 80 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Francis (ID 107):** Age 8 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Stephen (ID 108):** Age 60 in 1838. Described on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “lame.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. This is likely the same Stephen for whom William Feiner, SJ, acting President of Georgetown College, wrote a pass dated 5 July 1827 allowing him to go to St.

---

\(^{38}\) Agreement between Rev. Francis Neale SJ and John Butler, a free man, January 9, 1826, MPA, Box 15, Folder 17, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at [Georgetown Slavery Archive](https://slaveryarchive.georgetown.edu/).

\(^{39}\) FindAGrave.com, Memorial #37755177.
Thomas Manor. At the same time, Rev. Feiner wrote a letter to Rev. Francis Neale explaining that the plans of sending Stephen to Missouri had failed because Stephen’s wife refused to go. Furthermore, according to Father Feiner, the woman advised Stephen to go to St. Thomas and remain there, indicating she did not care much for him. Rev. Feiner added that, on account of Stephen’s bad conduct, there was no hope of finding anyone who would hire him. Therefore, he found it necessary to send him back to St. Thomas Manor.⁴⁰

**Matilda (ID 111) & 3 Daughters:** Age 20–50 in 1838. Listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census with three daughters (no names or IDs). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Margaret (ID 113) & 1 Daughter:** Age 20–50 in 1838. Listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census with one daughter (no name or ID). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Crissy (ID 114) & 4 Children:** Age 20–50 in 1838. Listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census with two sons and two daughters (no names or IDs). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. Crissy may have been married to a slave named Henry owned by Mr. Elijah (also spelled “Elisha”) Boswell, a slave-owner whose name appears in baptismal records from St. Thomas Manor⁴¹:

“1829, July 18. Was married Henry to Christina, with leave from their masters.—Henry belonging to Mr. Boswell, and Christina to St. Thomas Manor.”⁴²

**Celestia (ID 115):** Age 20–50 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Louisa (ID 117):** Age 20–50 in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Teresa (ID 118):** Age “over 50” in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Mary (ID 119):** Age “over 50” in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Mary (ID 120):** Age “over 50” in 1838. Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted

---

⁴⁰ A Pass for Stephen, July 5, 1827, Box 1, Folder 5, Feiner: Georgetown College Letterbook, 1827, 04/01/1827-11/24/1827, Georgetown University manuscripts, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

⁴¹ Father Neale’s Register, St. Thomas, 1827-32, MPA Box 15, Folder 18, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Newtown Manor (St. Mary’s County, MD)**

Newtown Manor (also sometimes called “Newtoune Manor” and “Newtown Plantation”) was founded circa 1668, and was officially known within the Society of Jesus as the Mission of St. Francis Xavier. Other relevant identifying details of Newtown Manor include the following:

- **Location:** St. Mary’s County, Maryland.
- **Adjacent River:** Potomac River (at Bretton’s Bay and St. Clement’s Bay).
- **Nearest Modern Towns:** Leonardtown MD; Newtowne MD; Compton MD.
- **Nearest Modern Landmark:** Newtowne Neck State Park.
- **Primary Jesuit Church:** St. Francis Xavier (Compton MD), founded 1731.
- **Approximate Size in 1830s:** 750 acres

For Newtown Manor, the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census contains the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 2 crossed-out entries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 0 duplicate entries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44 net entries</strong> (i.e., net of cross-outs &amp; dupes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>42 proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>2 unnamed individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surnames found in this group (though not necessarily listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census itself) include: Brown; Greenlief; Hill; Plowden; Scott; and Contee.

Thirty-one (31) persons from Newtown Manor were listed on board the Katharine Jackson. These 31 people were split up between two plantations owned by Batey and Johnson respectively, both located near Maringouin, Louisiana.

Thirteen (13) people from Newtown Manor are believed to have remained behind in Maryland. These people include (but are not limited to) the following:

---

45 P. Finn, “The Slaves of the Jesuits of Maryland (M.A. thesis presented at Georgetown University, read and approved by the Committee on August 29,1974), pp.1-2.
Select People from Newtown Manor; Organized by Annotations on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married “Off-Plantation”</th>
<th>Married to a Free Person</th>
<th>“Runaways”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary (ID 131)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brown (ID 135)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham (ID 136)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary (ID 143)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick (ID 145)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 people</td>
<td>0 people</td>
<td>0 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All thirteen (13) Lost Jesuit Slaves from Newtown Manor are described immediately below:

**Harry (ID 122):** Age 65 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the husband of Dina (ID 123) (see entry immediately below). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is believed to be Scott, based on the 1793 baptism of “Bennet of Harry & Dinah” at Newtown Manor.  

**Dina (ID 123):** Age 68 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the wife of Harry (ID 122) (see entry immediately above). Not included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, although her husband was included in that particular purchase. Married surname is believed to be Scott (see entry immediately above).

**Stephen (ID 128):** Age 49 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the husband of Sarah (ID 129) (see entry immediately below). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. He is believed to be the son of Michael and Beck, baptized at Newtown Manor in 1789.

**Sarah (ID 129):** Age 48 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the wife of Stephen (ID 128) (see entry immediately above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. She is believed to be Sarah “bought of Washington Bowling, wife to Stephen,” in 1835.

**Mary (ID 131):** Age 59 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.”

---

47 Births at Newtown, 1782–1792, Box 44, Folder 4, Item 3, MPA, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

48 Births at Newtown, 1782–1792, Box 44, Folder 4, Item 3, MPA, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

49 Slaves Born at Newtown, 1805–1835, “List of Negro children baptized (1806–1835),” MPA, Box 26:1, Folder 2, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.
Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. She is believed to be the wife of “R. Thompsons Harry,” as noted in the 1796 baptismal record of son Jerry at Newtown Manor.  

**Betty (ID 132):** Age 46 in 1838. Not included in any Louisiana purchase records. Surname is unknown.

**John Brown (ID 135):** Age 31 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana.

**Abraham (ID 136):** Age 27 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. He is believed to be “Abram of Mary & Thompson’s Harry” baptized at Newtown Manor in 1811.

**Mary (ID 143):** Age 23 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Dick (ID 145):** Age 24 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a carpenter and “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. He may be Dick, son of Betsy and Lewellin’s slave named Henry, baptized in 1811 at Newtown. His surname is likely Plowden; however, his siblings in Louisiana later assumed the surname Hill. The GMP has investigated Richard Plowden, age 40, laborer, born in Maryland, found on the 1850 census of Chambersburg (Franklin County), Pennsylvania, but results were inconclusive. Several Richard Hills around the same age as Dick can be found on censuses in the Maryland area, but none have yet been investigated.

**Susanna (ID 155):** Age 14 in 1838. Not found on any Louisiana purchase records. Surname is unknown.

**Unnamed Child No. 1 of St. Thomas Manor (No ID):** Age 1 in 1838. Not found on any Louisiana purchase records. Gender, parent(s) and surname unknown.

**Unnamed Child No. 2 of St. Thomas Manor (No ID):** Age 2 in 1838. Not found on any Louisiana purchase records.

---

50 Births at Newtown, 1782–1792, Box 44, Folder 4, Item 3, MPA, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

51 Slaves Born at Newtown, 1805–1835, “List of Negro children baptized (1806–1835),” MPA, Box 26:1, Folder 2, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

52 List of negro children baptized (1806–1835), MPA, Box 26:1, Folder 2, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.

53 1850 census Franklin County, Pennsylvania, Chambersburg, p. 225B, family #189.
purchasing records. Gender, parent(s) and surname unknown.

**St. Inigoes Manor (St. Mary’s County, MD)**

St. Inigoes Manor (also sometimes called “St. Inagoes Farm” and “St. Inigoes House”) was founded circa 1637,\(^{54}\) and was officially known within the Society of Jesus as *the Mission of the Holy Assumption of the Virgin Mary*.\(^{55}\) Other relevant identifying details of St. Inigoes Manor include the following:

- **Location**: St. Mary’s County, Maryland.
- **Adjacent River**: Potomac River (at St. Mary’s River).
- **Nearest Modern Towns**: St. Inigoes MD; Ridge MD; St. Mary’s City MD.
- **Nearest Modern Landmark**: Patuxent River Naval Air Station.
- **Primary Jesuit Church**: St. Ignatius (St. Inigoes MD), founded 1785-1788.
- **Nearby Jesuit Churches**: St. Joseph’s (Morganza MD), founded 1700; and St. Peter Claver (Ridge MD), founded 1917.
- **Approximate Size in 1830s**: 3,000 acres\(^{56}\)

For St. Inigoes Manor, the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census contains the following information:

| 94 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts. |
|---|---|
| – 3 crossed-out entries |
| – 2 duplicate entries |
| **TOTAL** 89 net entries (i.e., net of cross-outs & dupes) |
| i.e. 84 proper names |
| + 5 unnamed individuals |

Surnames found among the St. Inigoes group (though not necessarily listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census itself) include the following: Butler; Brown; Eaglin; Mahoney; Cush/Cutchmore/Cutchember; Gough; Merrick; Jones; Dorsey; Campbell; Barns; Wilton/Walton; and Yorkshire.

Twenty-seven (27) persons from St. Inigoes (i.e., two large families and six unmarried men)


\(^{56}\) P. Finn, “The Slaves of the Jesuits of Maryland (M.A. thesis presented at Georgetown University, read and approved by the Committee on August 29, 1974), p. 1.
were in the first group sent to Louisiana on board the *Uncas*; and forty (40) more were sent to Louisiana onboard the *Katharine Jackson*. A few others from St. Inigoes are believed to have been sent to Louisiana by an unknown vessel sometime around the end of 1843.

Twenty-one (21) people from St. Inigoes are believed to have remained behind in Maryland. These people include (but are not limited to) the following:

*Select People from St. Inigoes; Organized by Annotations on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married “Off-Plantation”</th>
<th>Married to a Free Person</th>
<th>“Runaways”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regis Gough (ID 202)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Nace Butler [Jr.] (ID 168)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph (ID 208)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold Jones (ID 216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Mahoney? (ID 211)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dick Campbell? (ID 236)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabe Mahoney? (ID 213)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis (ID 244)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter (ID 246)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Queen? (ID 248)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexius (ID 251)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeke (ID 256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henny (ID 258)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 people</td>
<td>0 people</td>
<td>3 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All twenty-one (21) Lost Jesuit Slaves from St. Inigoes are described immediately below:

**Nace Butler [Jr.] (ID 168):** Age 20 in 1838. Presumed (based on his position in the list-order of the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census) to be the son of Nace Butler [Sr.] (ID 167) and Biby Butler (ID 169), both of whom were sent to Louisiana (Maringouin, Iberville Parish) in 1838. Identified as a “runaway” on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. Nace, age 20, was purchased for $864, and listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that he was transported to Louisiana).

In the ongoing search for Nace Butler (ID 168) in Maryland and elsewhere, the Georgetown Memory Project has located an Ignatius Butler, born ca. 1818 and died 1888, and buried at St. Inigoes, MD. In connection with this particular Ignatius Butler, the GMP has also found:

- a photograph of a grave-marker (now missing, but apparently located until circa 2010 in the cemetery of St. Ignatius Roman Catholic Church in St. Inigoes, MD) consisting of an iron cross bearing the words “Pray for the soul of Ignatius Butler, died 1888, age 67”.

---

57 *FindAGrave.com*, Memorial #19458833.
• A page in the 1870 U.S. Census enumerating Ignatius Butler (born 1818), along with his wife Ann and their children (including Thomas, Susan, and their siblings), in District 1, St. Mary’s, MD, St. Ingoes Post Office.

• Two living descendants of Ignatius Butler of St. Ingoes, MD (residing in Maryland and New Jersey) who have taken DNA tests. Unfortunately, the results of these DNA tests have been inconclusive (i.e., have not established a link between either of these two MD/NJ-based descendants of Ignatius Butler buried in St. Ingoes, and verified Louisiana-based descendants of Nace Butler Sr. (ID 167) and Biby Butler (ID 169)).

In view of the foregoing (especially the absence of compelling DNA evidence), the Georgetown Memory Project cannot yet say with certainty that Nace Butler [Jr.] (ID 168) is the same person as the Ignatius Butler buried in the cemetery at St. Ignatius Church in St. Ingoes, MD, and enumerated in the 1870 US Census. The GMP continues to search for information, evidence and descendants that might help prove the link between Nace Butler (ID 168) and this particular Ignatius Butler.

**Biby (ID 187):** Age 5 in 1838. Not found on any Louisiana purchase records. Surname is unknown.

**REGIS GOUGH (ID 202):** Age 28 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” He is likely the same as Regis (ID 88), a carpenter at White Marsh (name marked through on the census). He was included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. The GMP has conclusively identified Regis Gough (ID 202) as Regis Gough, born 1804 and died 1888 in St. Mary’s County, Maryland. Living descendants of Regis Gough have been located, and several have participated in the GMP’s GU272-focused DNA study.

**Joseph (ID 208):** Age 22 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Harry (ID 209):** Age 75 in 1838. Probably husband of Anny (ID 210) (see entry immediately below). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname was probably Mahoney.

**Anny (ID 210):** Age 70 in 1838. Probably wife of Harry (ID 209) (see entry immediately above). Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is likely Mahoney.

**Harry (ID 211):** Age 40 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included in Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana.

58 *Saint Mary’s Beacon*, Leonardtown, Maryland, 19 July 1888.
Surname is likely Mahoney.

**Nelly (ID 212):** Age 38 in 1838. Not found on any Louisiana purchase records. Surname is likely Mahoney. Nelly was mentioned in an 1850 letter in which a priest at Newtown wrote:

> “Since I last wrote to you, I have parted from Nelly to a very good Catholic, near Medley’s Neck Church. He has her for an indefinite period, – no sale ratified, so that if the society should ever choose to be embarrased with her again, it can take her back – not to Newtown necessarily. She went originally from St. Inigoes, where she was born and raised, to Alexandria, from Alexandria to Newtown after leaving Newtown she will be common property again, subject to the Procurator General – who may ratify a sale, or dispose of her otherwise. A first rate Lady has secured her, one with whom you are somewhat acquainted, she is the sister of Mrs. Hammet of St. Nicholas, the tall lady who wanted one in St Nicholas, Ms. Combs. All who have heard of my solution are delighted. - I know her well.”

**Gabe (ID 213):** Age 28 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a blacksmith and “married off.” Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is possibly Mahoney.

**Daniel (ID 214):** Age 25 in 1838. Not included on any Louisiana purchase record. Surname is possibly Mahoney.

**LOUISA MAHONEY (ID 215):** Age 23 in 1838. Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84 and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Louisa Mahoney (ID 215) has been conclusively identified by the GMP as remaining in Maryland after the 1838 sale. Louisa remained enslaved until Maryland’s emancipation in 1864. She married Alexander Mason, and died and was buried at St. Inigoes, 3 July 1909.

**Arnold Jones (ID 216):** Age 38 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as a runaway (even though he is listed the same document immediately above his wife Anny, age 27; his son Arnold, age 7; and his daughter Louisa, age 5. Anny, Arnold [Jr], and Louisa were sold to Henry Johnson’s plantation in Ascension Parish, LA. Arnold, age 38, was purchased for $702 and is listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that he was transported to Louisiana). He may be the same Arnold Jones who ran away with his brother, Moses Bennett, from Thomas Smith of St. Mary’s County, MD, in the fall of 1833; and the Arnold Jones who also ran away from Washington, DC, in July 1836.

---

59 R. Woodley to I. Brocard, Sept. 25, 1850, Box 71, File 10, Item 7, MPA, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the [Georgetown Slavery Archive](http://www.georgetownslaveryarchive.com).


**Dick (ID 236):** Age 40 in 1838. Identified as a “runaway” on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. Dick, age 40, was purchased for $648 and listed in Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11 (but no evidence has yet been found suggesting that he was transported to Louisiana). Surname may be Campbell.

**Regis (ID 244):** Age 28 in 1838. Identified on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Not found on any Louisiana purchase record. Surname is unknown.

**Peter (ID 246):** Age 37 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Michael (ID 248):** Age 33 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown. One possible candidate has been identified; a slave named Michael and his wife were still at St Joseph’s Mission in Talbot County in 1839, described as follows:

“In 1839, after the slaves had been sold on the other plantations, there still remained at St. Joseph’s [Mission, in Talbot County, MD] Old Nancy, Michael and his wife, Ned and his wife, Sam and one or two others; Ned was hired out at $40 a year until 1863.”

An African American family headed by Michael and Emeline Quin (spelled Queen in other records) lived in Talbot County as free people in 1850, and relocated to Delaware County, Pennsylvania, by 1880. Emeline Queen apprenticed three of the Queen children to a “farmer” identified as Charles C. Lancaster (believed to be CC Lancaster, SJ) in 1841, suggesting a close association with St. Joseph’s Mission.

**Alexius (ID 251):** Age 36 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.” Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is likely Yorkshire. On the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census, Alexius appears just below Sally (ID 250), age 56, who appears later in Louisiana records as Sally Yorkshire. They are of appropriate ages to be mother and son. Several death certificates identifying Elexius (and Lexius) Yorkshire as father have been found, as well as a marriage record for a daughter. Preliminary DNA testing on one line matches other members of the GU272 in Louisiana.

**Zeke (ID 256):** Age 32 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off.”

---


63 1850 census Talbot Co., Md., [no district named], p. 22B, family #299; 1880 census Delaware Co., Pa., South Chester Borough E.D. 16, p. 48D, family #467.

64 Talbot Co., Md., Register of Wills, Indentures 5:14–16, Mary Ellen Queen, Josiah Queen, and Isaac Queen; Maryland State Archives (MSA) C1870-7, Annapolis, Maryland.
Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Nathan (ID 257):** Age 64 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as the husband of Henny (ID 258) (see entry immediately below). Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

**Henny (ID 258):** Age 60 in 1838. Identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off” and also as the wife of Nathan (ID 257) (see entry immediately above). Her name is crossed out on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. She is not included on Henry’s Johnson’s purchase of 84, although her husband Nathan (ID257) was included. Surname is unknown.

**James (ID 259):** Age 60 in 1838. Identified on 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “not married.” Included on Henry Johnson’s purchase of 84, and noted as not transported to Louisiana. Surname is unknown.

*****
Primary Observations

Ninety-one people is a lot of people.

It’s significantly more people than anyone has ever before suggested were left behind in Maryland after the 1838 Jesuit slave sale. Indeed, 91 is almost one-third of the total number of people (approximately 297) involved in the 1838 slave sale orchestrated by the Maryland Jesuits.

From the earliest days, the post-1838 chapter of the GU272 tragedy has been told as a story of human enslavement, isolation and abandonment that unfolded in three distinct locations in southern Louisiana:

- Terrebonne Parish
- Iberville Parish
- Ascension Parish

To this post-1838 narrative, we must now add a fourth location as well: the Tidewater region of Maryland. Dozens and perhaps hundreds of families suffered decades of destruction, destitution, and dislocation in southern Maryland as a direct result of the 1838 sale. This was the Maryland Jesuit Slave Diaspora of 1838.

To date, the GMP has been able to confirm that 206 members of the GU272 were actually transported to plantations in southern Louisiana during the period 1838-1843. The remaining ninety-one (91) people are counted among the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland.

For now.
Historical Evidence for the Maryland Diaspora

The historical record offers substantial support for the notion that a large (and perhaps even very large) number of Jesuit slaves stayed behind in Maryland permanently after the 1838 sale. Specifically, this scenario is consistent with Henry Johnson’s own account of the matter, expressed in writing and under oath just a few years after the 1838 transaction.

By 1844, Henry Johnson had fallen behind in his payments on the promisory notes he had given to the Maryland Jesuits in exchange for the enslaved people he purchased in 1838. On February 17, 1844, a settlement agreement of sorts was reached between Henry Johnson and Edmund John Forstall of New Orleans, a duly-appointed agent of the Maryland Jesuits. In this settlement agreement, Henry Johnson made the following declaration:

“The [June 19, 1838 Purchase Agreement for 272 Slaves] was but partly executed ... and ... the number of slaves sold by the said Thomas F. Mulledy was only of two hundred and four...” \(^{66}\) (emphasis supplied).

In the same document, Johnson listed 9 slaves by name and age. Johnson described these slaves with the following words:

“Said [9] slaves being the only slaves transported into Louisiana, out of the Eighty four slaves sold by the aforesaid act of the twenty ninth November Eighteen hundred and thirty eight, the other slaves being dead or having been exchanged by the said Henry Johnson.” \(^{67}\) (emphasis supplied).

Johnson concluded his testimony regarding this matter by stating the following:

“[O]f the Eighty four slaves described as having been imported into Louisiana, by the confirmatory act of the Eighteenth September Eighteen hundred and thirty nine, the aforesaid [nine slaves] only, were truly imported, the others having been disposed of by him the said Johnson in Maryland or by him left there, he affirming that it was verbally understood between himself and Mr. Mulledy, that the said Johnson should be permitted to exchange such of the slaves as were married among the said Eighty four slaves, and whose wives & husbands did not belong to said lot, or otherwise dispose of such so as not to separate man & wife.” \(^{68}\) (emphasis supplied).

---

\(^{65}\) Agreement between Henry Johnson and Edmund Forstall, on behalf of Rev. Thomas F. Mulledy, dated 17 Feb. 1844, Conveyance Book V, No. 479, Iberville Parish Clerk of Court, Plaquemine, La.

\(^{66}\) Id. at p. 1.

\(^{67}\) Id at pp. 23-24.

\(^{68}\) Id. at p. 24.
For his part, Edmund J. Forstall, the New Orleans-based agent of the Maryland Jesuits, declared:

“[H]e [i.e., Forstall] has no knowledge whatsoever of the facts contained in the declaration of said Henry Johnson, [and] that on the contrary all the acts [i.e. legal documents] placed in his hands ... tend to show that the Eighty four slaves had actually been transported to Louisiana....”

Apparently anxious to restructure his outstanding debts to the Maryland Jesuits (and perhaps having no realistic alternative), Henry Johnson acquiesced in the matter as follows:

“Now the said Henry Johnson being about leaving the State [i.e., Louisiana] and it being considered expedient to bring this arrangement [i.e., his contractual agreement to purchase 84 slaves from the Maryland Jesuits] to a conclusion, it is agreed to close it and to carry it into effect as if completed...” (emphasis supplied).

Johnson’s declaration is probably best understood as a statement of commercial expedience rather than historical truth. As Father Zwinge wrote almost 75 years after the fact:

“There is no doubt that there are quite a number of colored people at the present time about our estates, who are descended from our old slaves, that were sold to the neighbors or exchanged in 1838, and from some kind of secret consciousness of the fact, they are attached to the priests....” (emphasis supplied).

**Common Characteristics of the Lost Jesuit Slaves**

The Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland are a diverse group of people. A detailed statistical analysis of this population is set forth as Attachment G to this article.

It may never be possible to fully determine why they were left behind, simply by looking at who they were. Nevertheless, the following statistical observations (among others) stand out:

- Almost two-thirds (64%) possess one or more of the following 3 statuses:

---

69 Id. at p. 24.
70 Id. at pp. 24-25.
72 It is interesting to note that these are the three statuses granted special protection in a letter dated December 27, 1836 written by the Superior General of the Society of Jesus, Father Jan Roothaan, in which he established his conditions for approving the sale of the Maryland slaves. Roothaan to McSherry, 27 December 1836, MPA, Box 93, Folder 9, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive. Of course, whether these people actually received such special protection is a separate matter altogether. The fact that they were left behind in Maryland in 1838 does not, by itself, prove the matter one way or the other.
“Married off” or “married free”
- Elderly and/or infirm (mentally or physically)
- Children (adult or infant) of others left behind

- The majority (54%) were males.
- The majority (also 54%) were in the prime of life (age 18-59).

### Possible Explanations for the Maryland Diaspora

It is difficult to construct plausible scenarios in which nearly one hundred Jesuit slaves stayed behind in Maryland after the 1838 sale. And yet this seems to be precisely what happened as a matter of historical fact.

It’s even more difficult to explain how, where and why this occurred. Some leading scenarios are discussed and evaluated briefly below.

**a) Continued Jesuit Ownership.**

Contrary to assertions made by leading Jesuit historians, Jesuit slaveholding in Maryland did not come to an end in 1838. Ample documentary evidence indicates that the Maryland Jesuits continued to own slaves from 1838 until the years just prior to Emancipation in Maryland in 1864.

Regardless, no evidence has been found to date suggesting that the Maryland Jesuits held anything like 91 slaves in the years and decades after 1838. As noted elsewhere, in May 1839, Father Grivel wrote to the contrary:

“There remain in our farms only few old people, well provided for their life times.” (emphasis supplied).

For this reason, we must dispense with the idea that most or all of the Lost Jesuit Slaves simply remained on the Jesuit estates as servants or tenant farmers once the slave-ships embarked for Louisiana in 1838.

**b) Escape into Freedom.**

Likewise, we must relinquish the idea that nearly one hundred Jesuit slaves somehow escaped into freedom, just a few steps ahead of the Louisiana slave-traders and the local county sheriff. As noted elsewhere, the Lost Jesuit Slaves range in age from 1 year (Elizabeth and William, both

---


74 Letter from Fr. Grivel to Fr. Lancaster, 4 May 1839, MPA, Box 66, Folder 1, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the [Georgetown Slavery Archive](http://library.georgetown.edu/specialcollections).
of White Marsh) to 80 (Daniel, of St. Thomas Manor). In fact, 30% of the Lost Jesuit Slaves were 17 or younger, and at least 24% were over 50. In other words, more than half of the Lost Jesuit Slaves seem unsuitable candidates for flight, owing to reasons relating to age alone.

In any event, as previously noted, Father Joseph Zwinge wrote (albeit nearly 75 years after the events of 1838):

> When the time came for being transferred to their new master, some of them who dreaded the trip to Louisiana ran away, but only one or two ran far enough to get away.\(^75\) (emphasis supplied).

(c) *Multiple Causes.*

The most likely explanation for the Maryland diaspora involves multiple causes. In other words, it’s likely that different Jesuit slaves remained behind in Maryland for different reasons.

The GMP has carefully reviewed the known facts and circumstances of each of the Lost Jesuit Slaves, and made a “best guess” as to why each individual may have been left behind in Maryland. (In a number of cases, multiple reasons may have contributed to the outcome for a single individual. In these instances, to avoid double-counting, we have assigned a “best guess” to the individual left behind). The results of this analysis are presented immediately below:

*Primary Reason for Being Left Behind (GMP Best Guess):*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Circumstances (married off or married free)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of a person “left behind”</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (60 or older) or infirm (mentally or physically)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Runaway” (i.e., not found when census made)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaped arrival of slave-traders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included on lists by mistake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GMP hypothesis yet</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, the “best-guess” approach provides an explanation for why 76% of the Lost Jesuit Slaves may have stayed behind in Maryland in 1838. However, twenty-four percent (24%) defy ready explanation.

---

In any event, even if correct, these “best-guess” explanations are thin at best. Knowing why an individual may have been left behind offers few clues or none into how, when, where and under what circumstances this “disposition” (to use Henry Johnson’s word) may have occurred.

(d) **One More Possibility.**

After reviewing the foregoing explanations, it is possible to imagine a number of different places where one might to expect to find some or all of the Lost Jesuit Slaves in the post-1838 period:

- The original Jesuit plantations themselves (i.e., White Marsh, St. Thomas Manor, Newtown Manor, and St. Inigoes Manor).
- Tenant farms located on the four Jesuit plantations.
- Neighboring plantations and farms operated by non-Jesuit owners.
- Nearby communities of free and escaped black people (located, for example, in Baltimore City, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware).
- More distant locations owned and managed by the Maryland Jesuits (including Jesuit establishments located in Alexandria, VA; Washington, DC; Frederick, MD; and south-eastern Pennsylvania).

Under these scenarios, we would indeed expect Father Zwinge (writing in 1912) to find “quite a number of colored people at the present time about our estates, who are descended from our old slaves.” However, their “attachment to the priests” (real or imagined) would not have required anything like the “secret consciousness of the fact” that Father Zwinge posited. It is far more likely that they simply recalled the horrific events of 1838 – even as those events became forgotten and obscured in the minds of their Jesuit neighbors.

However, another possibility must be considered as well: perhaps at least some of the Lost Jesuit Slaves were forcibly removed from the Jesuit plantations in 1838 along with the rest of the GU272, and then immediately sold in the open slave-auctions of Baltimore or Alexandria (perhaps as a way of raising the ready-cash required to meet the down payment and transportation costs involved in the transaction). Perhaps this is what Henry Johnson meant when he alluded to slaves “having been disposed of by him the said Johnson in Maryland....”

---
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If so, we would expect to look in the following places for mentions and traces of these unfortunate individuals:

- Letters, diaries, account books, and other official papers of the Maryland Jesuits.
- Private papers and letters of Governor Henry Johnson.
- Newspaper advertisements in Virginia and Maryland.
- Slave auction records in Virginia and Maryland.
- Ship manifests for vessels bound from Alexandria, VA for locations other than New Orleans, LA.

**Unanswered Questions & Topics for Future Research**

A great deal of time, money and effort was required in order to simply isolate the Lost Jesuit Slaves within the larger GU272 population, and assemble what little there is to be known about the names, families, and life-circumstances of these individuals. But this work is merely the starting point for the significant research that remains to be done.

The Georgetown Memory Project proposes the following topics as potential areas for fruitful inquiry (beginning with the most obvious and most urgent):

- Names, life-circumstances and direct descendants of the Lost Jesuit Slaves.
- Mentions of the Lost Jesuit Slaves in the sacramental and parish records of the Maryland Jesuits.
- Burial locations of the Lost Jesuit Slaves.
- Names and locations of all slaves owned by the Maryland Jesuits: 1838-1864.
- Names of all slaves owned by tenant farmers of the Maryland Jesuits: 1838-1864.
- Names of all slaves owned by neighbors of the Jesuit plantations: 1838-1864.
- Mentions of the Lost Jesuit Slaves (or their potential close relatives) in the county-by-county Maryland Slave Statistics of 1864.

Further research is necessary.

*****
The 1838 Jesuit Slave Census is an oversized, horizontally-oriented ledger sheet containing six columns of names, organized by Jesuit plantation in Maryland. Without question, the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census was completed shortly before June 1838, and served as the basis for the list of names recited in the 1838 Sale Agreement (signed on June 19, 1838).

The 1838 Jesuit Slave Census ends with a flourish – a handwritten notation in the bottom right-hand corner that reads “272 in all.” However, the number of people named (or otherwise indicated) on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census does not actually total 272. Instead, this document contains:

- 277 separate entries (counting every handwritten identifier appearing on the face of the document – including proper names, crossed-out proper names, duplicate proper names, and references to unnamed persons).

- 7 crossed-out proper names:
  - Nancy age 34 from White Marsh (1838 Census, Column 2, No. 27).
  - Regis age 28 from White Marsh (1838 Census, Column 2, No. 42).
  - Sal from Newtown (1838 Census, Column 4, No. 24) (crossed out in favor of Lucina age 10 from Newtown).
  - Esther from Newtown (1838 Census, Column 4, No. 27) (crossed out in favor of Peg age 8 from Newtown).
  - Barney from St. Inigoes (1838 Census, Column 6, No. 2) (crossed out in favor of Teresa age 42 from St. Inigoes).
  - John age unknown from St. Inigoes (1838 Census, Column 6, No. 23)
  - Henny, Nathan’s wife, age 60 from St. Inigoes (1838 Census, Column 6, No. 34).

- 3 likely duplicative proper names:
  - Regis age 28 of St. Inigoes appears at 1838 Census, Column 6, No. 20. But the following duplicate references to the same individual appears elsewhere in the same document:
    - Regis Gough age 28 from St. Inigoes (1838 Census, Column 5, No. 21);
    - Regis age 28 from White Marsh (1838 Census, Column 2, No. 42). [Note: This particular reference has already been accounted for under the seven “cross-outs” listed above.]

---

79 “Census of slaves to be sold in 1838,” MPA, Oversize Box 4 (WO 112), Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.
- Mary: age unknown from St. Thomas appears at 1838 Census, Column 3, No. 43. But the following duplicate reference to the same individual appears immediately below it:
  - Mary age unknown from St. Thomas (1838 Census, Column 3, No. 44).<sup>80</sup>

- Bill Cusha age 28 from St. Inigoes appears at 1838 Census, Column 5, No. 20. But the following likely duplicate appears elsewhere in the same document:
  - Bill age 28 from St. Inigoes, not married (1838 Census, Column 5, No. 44).

- 267 “net entries” (i.e., net of 7 cross-outs and 3 likely duplicates).
- Of the 267 net entries: 244 proper names (i.e., net of cross-outs and likely duplicates).
- Of the 267 net entries: References to an additional 23 distinct but unnamed individuals.

In summary, the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>277 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 crossed-out entries</td>
<td>7 crossed-out entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 duplicate entries</td>
<td>3 duplicate entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong> 267 net entries</td>
<td>267 net entries (i.e., net of cross-outs &amp; dupes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>244 proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 unnamed individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----

<sup>80</sup> This conclusion is provisional. The possibility that Mary (1838 Census, Column 3, No. 44) is a duplicate of Mary (1838 Census, Column 3, No. 43) is based largely on the fact that the 1838 Sale Agreement contains only one person named Mary (1838 Sale Agreement, Page 2, No. 89) in the spot where one might otherwise expect to find two persons named Mary. It is possible that the drafter of the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census made an error, and included a second (i.e., duplicate) Mary in the list of enslaved people from St. Thomas Manor. However, it is also possible that the drafter of the 1838 Sale Agreement made the error, and omitted a second (i.e., separate and distinct) Mary. The matter cannot be resolved by reference to the two documents alone. In the main body text of this article, the Georgetown Memory Project proceeds on the assumption that the two persons named Mary on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census are indeed two separate and distinct individuals. For now at least, both Marys are counted and included among the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland.
The 1838 Sale Agreement\textsuperscript{81} is an eight-page, handwritten agreement signed and dated 19 June 19, 1838, between Thomas F. Mulledy (for the Maryland Jesuits) and the two Louisiana-based slave-purchasers (Jesse Batey and Henry Johnson). A name-by-name comparison of the list-sequence in the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census and the 1838 Sale Agreement strongly supports the conclusion that the drafter of the 1838 Sale Agreement (likely William McSherry, SJ, based on a close comparison of the handwriting in the 1838 Sale Agreement with the handwriting found in manuscripts and letters bearing McSherry’s signature) relied directly on the 1838 Slave Census when completing his work (though not without errors or discrepancies).

The 1838 Sale Agreement clearly states that the Maryland Jesuits intended to sell “two hundred and seventy two negroes.” However, the number of people named (or otherwise indicated) on the 1838 Sale Agreement does not actually total 272.

The 1838 Sale Agreement actually consists of two separate parts, each of which is analyzed and described in detail below.

\textit{(1) Main Body of the 1838 Sale Agreement.}

The main body of the 1838 Sale Agreement consists of several pages (specifically, 1838 Sale Agreement, Pages 1-4) listing the names of all individuals intended to be included in the 1838 sale. The main body contains the following:

- 271 separate entries (counting every handwritten identifier in the main body of the document – including proper names, crossed-out proper names, duplicate proper names, and references to unnamed persons).

- 1 crossed-out proper name:
  - \textit{Minty} (1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, at Page 2, No. 27). [NB: \textit{Minty} reappears, without any interlineation, at 1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 2, No. 30.]

\textsuperscript{81} “Articles of Agreement between Thomas F. Mulledy, of Georgetown, District of Columbia, of one part, and Jesse Beatty (sic) and Henry Johnson, of the State of Louisiana, of the other part, 19\textsuperscript{th} June 1838,” MPA, Box 40, File 10, Item 3a-h, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University, online at the Georgetown Slavery Archive.
• 1 likely duplicative entry:
  - *James age 60* appears at 1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 4, No. 37. But the following likely duplicate entry appears elsewhere in the main body: *James age 60* at 1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 4, No. 25.

• 269 net entries (i.e., net of 1 cross-out and 1 duplicate).

• Of the 269 net entries: 246 proper names (i.e., net of cross-outs and duplicates).

• Of the 269 net entries: References to an additional 23 distinct but unnamed individuals.

In summary, the main body of the 1838 Sale Agreement consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>271 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 1 crossed-out entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– 1 likely duplicate entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>269 net entries</strong> (i.e., net of cross-outs &amp; dupes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e.</td>
<td>246 proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>23 unnamed individuals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) *Agreement Addendum: A List of 51 Negroses*

The 1838 Sale Agreement contains an addendum entitled “A list of fifty one negroes referred to in the foregoing contract...” (the “Agreement Addendum”). A discussion and description of the names appearing in the Agreement Addendum is included here, primarily for the sake of completeness.

The Agreement Addendum is a double-columned list of names, taking up most of the last two pages of the 1838 Sale Agreement (i.e., 1838 Sale Agreement, Pages 7-8). The final entry on this list is “child [age] 2” (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 8, No. 56), beneath which a neat line has been drawn in black ink. Immediately below this line appears the number “51” (as in “51 in total”).

Once again, the math isn’t quite right. Upon closer examination, the Agreement Addendum is revealed to contain the following:

• 56 separate entries (counting every handwritten identifier appearing in the Agreement Addendum – i.e., proper names, crossed-out proper names, duplicate proper names, and references to unnamed persons).

• 3 crossed-out proper names:
  - *Isaac of White Marsh* (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 7, Column 1, No. 10)
  - *Zeke of St. Inigoes* (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 7, Column 2, No. 10)
o **Joseph of St. Inigoes** (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 7, Column 2, No. 13)

- 1 likely duplicative entry:
  - **Bill Cush, age 28 of St. Inigoes (not married)** appears for the first time in the Agreement Addendum at Page 7, Column 2, No. 9. This first reference to Bill Cush in the Agreement Addendum can be properly matched with corresponding references to Bill Cush in both the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census (see **Bill Cusha, age 28 of St. Inigoes**, 1838 Census, Column 5, No. 20) and the main body of the 1838 Sale Agreement (see **Bill Cush, age 28**, 1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 3, No. 77). However, in addition, the following likely duplicate reference to Bill Cush appears elsewhere in the Agreement Addendum: **Bill age 26 of St. Inigoes (not married)** (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 7, Column 2, No. 12).

- 52 net entries (i.e., net of 3 cross-outs and 1 likely duplicate).
- Of the 52 net entries: 51 proper names (i.e., net of cross-outs and duplicates).
- Of the 52 net entries: a reference to an additional 1 distinct but unnamed person.

In summary, the Agreement Addendum consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>56 separate handwritten identifiers of all sorts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>3 crossed-out entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>1 likely duplicate entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>52 net entries</strong> (i.e., net of cross-outs &amp; dupes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | 51 proper names                                      |
|                                | 1 unnamed individual                                  |

It should be noted that the Agreement Addendum is *not* a list of new individuals, to be added to the ones identified in the main body of the 1838 Sale Agreement. Instead, the Agreement Addendum was intended to function as a mere recapitulation of certain names previously mentioned in the main body of the Agreement.  

For the most part, the Agreement Addendum *does* in fact merely recapitulate names appearing in the main body of the 1838 Sale Agreement (albeit sometimes with slight variations in spelling or age). However, the following less easily-matched names from the Agreement Addendum are noted here:

---

82 Specifically, the main body of the 1838 Sale Agreement states: “It is understood that the … negroes are to be delivered at Alexandria in the District of Columbia, as follows, Fifty one contained in the list annexed, as far [soon?] as practicable, and all the others as such times as may be designated by the purchasers, between the 15th October and the 15th November next....” 1838 Sale Agreement at Page 4.
• **Mary Anne, age 10 from St. Inigoes (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 8, Column 2, No. 1):** Almost certainly a match for *Mary Jane, age 10 from St. Inigoes* (1838 Census, Column 5, No. 14); and for *Mary Jane age 10* (1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 3, No 71).

• **Louisa, age 8 from St. Inigoes (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 8, Column 2, No. 2):** Most likely a match for *Susan, age 8 from St. Inigoes* (1838 Census, Column 5, No. 15); and for *Susan age 8* (1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 3, No. 72).

• **Sally, age 7 from St. Inigoes (1838 Sale Agreement, Addendum, Page 8, Column 2, No. 3):** Almost certainly a match for *Sally Anne, age 7 from St. Inigoes* (1838 Census, Column 5, No. 16); and for *Sally Anne age 7* (1838 Sale Agreement, Main Body, Page 3, No. 73).

All three of these anomalous entries occur one right after another, near the very end of the list contained in the Agreement Addendum. Perhaps these were the result of the list-maker’s distraction or fatigue.

*****
Attachment C: Invisible in Maryland, but Sent to Louisiana Anyway

Fifteen (15) members of the GU272 aren’t listed on either the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census or the 1838 Sale Agreement. Despite having been born in Maryland prior to the 1838 sale, their names just mysteriously appear in Louisiana (typically alongside their close relations) on a ship manifest and other post-sale documentation as well.

Published below are the names of these fifteen (15) people. All of them were listed as passengers on the Katherine Jackson of Georgetown, which departed Alexandria, VA, on November 13, 1838, and arrived in New Orleans, LA, on December 6, 1838. For this reason, none of these individuals are members of the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland.

Because these individuals appear on neither the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census nor the 1838 Sale Agreement, they were never assigned a JPP code. Instead, they have been identified below with an ID code that corresponds to their list-position on the Katherine Jackson manifest.

**Loan Butler (KJ No. 13):** Age 3 months on the KJ manifest. Infant of Biby Butler (age 45; ID 169; KJ No. 2). Born after 1838 Jesuit Slave Census was completed, but before the November 13, 1838 departure of the Katherine Jackson from Alexandria. Originally from St. Inigoes Manor.

**Betsey Hill (KJ No. 35):** Age 45 years on the KJ manifest. Probably the wife of Peter Hill (age 50; ID 127; KJ No. 34) – a conclusion based on sale to Jesse Batey; age; and KJ list-position. Likely originally from Newtown Manor.

**Adeline Queen (KJ No. 39):** Age 11 years on the KJ manifest. One of four children accompanying Anny Queen (age 23; ID 109; KJ No. 37) to Louisiana on the Katherine Jackson. [NB: The 1838 Jesuit Slave Census indicates only three unnamed children of Anny Queen.] Originally from St. Thomas Manor.

**Ned Harris (KJ No. 48):** Age 5 years on the KJ manifest. One of four children accompanying Betsy Harris (age 21; ID 110; KJ No. 44) to Louisiana on the Katherine Jackson. [NB: The 1838 Jesuit Slave Census indicates only two unnamed daughters of Betsy Harris.] KJ list-position suggests that Sam Harris was literally a “babe in arms” at the moment of enumeration (i.e., mother Betsy Harris is KJ No. 44, and child Sam Harris is KJ No. 45). Born after the 1838 Jesuit...
Slave Census was taken, but before KJ departure on November 13, 1838. Originally from St. Thomas Manor.

**Martha Hawkins (KJ No. 51):** Age 3 months on the KJ manifest. Infant accompanying Letty Hawkins (age 30; ID 8; KJ No. 50) to Louisiana on the *Katharine Jackson*. KJ list-position suggests that Martha Hawkins was literally a “babe in arms” at the moment of enumeration (i.e., mother Letty Hawkins is KJ No. 50, and child Martha Hawkins is KJ No. 51). Born after 1838 Jesuit Slave Census was taken but before KJ departure on November 13, 1838. Originally from St. Thomas Manor.

**Harriett Harris (KJ No. 64):** Age 13 years on the KJ manifest. One of three children accompanying Kitty Harris (age 50; ID 112; KJ No. 63) to Louisiana on the *Katharine Jackson*. [NB: The 1838 Jesuit Slave Census indicates only two children of Kitty Harris – both unnamed.] Originally from St. Thomas Manor.

**Joseph Plowden (KJ No. 101):** Age 11 years on the KJ manifest. Probably a child of Bibey Plowden (age 50; ID 130; KJ No. 97). Not listed or otherwise indicated on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. No further information or explanation presently available. Originally from Newtown Manor.

**Elizabeth Plowden (KJ No. 102):** Age 8 years on the KJ manifest. Probably a child of Bibey Plowden (age 50; ID 130; KJ No. 97). Not listed or otherwise indicated on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census. No further information or explanation presently available. Originally from Newtown Manor.

**Lucretia Hill (KJ No. 106):** Age 17 years on the KJ manifest. Lucretia’s siblings (ID Nos. 126, 144, 145, 148, 156, & 157) are identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census, but Lucretia is not. Originally from Newtown Manor. No further information or explanation presently available.

**Nancy Lee (KJ No. 121):** Age 50 years on the KJ manifest. Maryland plantation of origin is unknown. No further information or explanation presently available.

**Nelly Harrison (KJ No. 123):** Age 50 years on the KJ manifest. Maryland plantation of origin is unknown. No further information or explanation presently available.

**John Harrison (KJ No. 124):** Age 6 years on the KJ manifest. Listed with Nelly Harrison above. Maryland plantation of origin is unknown. No further information or explanation presently available.

**George Harrison (KJ No. 125):** Age 2 years on the KJ manifest. Listed with Nelly Harrison above. Maryland plantation of origin is unknown. No further information or explanation presently available.
**Mary Ellen Butler (KJ No. 21):** Age 2 months on the KJ manifest. Listed with her mother, Eliza Butler (age 18; ID 243; KJ No. 20). KJ list-position suggests that Mary Ellen Butler was literally a “babe in arms” at the moment of enumeration (i.e., mother Eliza Butler is KJ No. 20, and child Mary Ellen Butler is KJ No. 21). Undoubtedly born after the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census was completed. Originally from St. Inigoes Manor.

*****
Set forth below is a complete list of all twenty-five (25) members of the GU272 who are identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as “married off” (i.e., married to a spouse who was located on a neighboring, non-Jesuit plantation in Maryland). This list includes the twenty (20) “married off” people who stayed behind in Maryland, as well as the five (5) who were ultimately transported to Louisiana (highlighted in green below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MD Plantation</th>
<th>Ultimate Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nelly Hawkins</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Louisiana (parish unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Joseph Blacklock</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sally Diggs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Garvis/Jarvis/Charles</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Louisiana (Ascension Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Bill Hill</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>Louisiana (Iberville Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>John Brown</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Dick Plowden?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Henny</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Louisiana (Ascension Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Regis Gough</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Harry Mahoney?</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Gabe Mahoney?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Regis</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Michael Queen</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Alexius</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Ginny</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Louisiana (Ascension Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Zeke</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Henny</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>St. Inigoess</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Attachment E: GU272 Members Identified as Married Free**

Set forth below is a complete list of all five (5) members of the GU272 who are identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as being married to a free person. This list includes the four (4) people who stayed behind in Maryland, as well as the one (1) person who was ultimately transported to Louisiana (highlighted in green below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MD Plantation</th>
<th>Ultimate Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Kitty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Harriet</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Terrebonne Parish, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Minty Hawkins?</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Eliza</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****
Attachment F: GU272 Members Identified as “Runaways”

Set forth below is a complete list of all twelve (12) members of the GU272 who are listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census along with the notation “ranaway.” In the modern era, they have come to be known as the “runaways.”

This list includes the nine (9) runaways who stayed behind in Maryland, as well as the three (3) who were ultimately transported to Louisiana (highlighted in green below):

Complete List of Persons Identified on 1838 Census as “Runaways”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>MD Plantation</th>
<th>Ultimate Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charles Hawkins</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Isaac Hawkins</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Charles Queen</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Louisiana (Terrebonne Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Martha Queen</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Louisiana (Terrebonne Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>William Diggs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jasais Queen</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nancy Queen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Betsy West</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Len Cutchmore</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>Louisiana (Ascension Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nace Butler</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Arnold Jones</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Dick Campbell?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>St. Inigoes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, three (3) of the twelve (12) persons identified as “runaways” on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census were in fact sent to Louisiana (either sometime before or sometime after 1838):

- Charles Queen (ID 38), age 45, White Marsh
- Martha Queen (ID 44), age 10, White Marsh
- Len Cutchmore (ID 75), age 38, White Marsh
And conversely, at least one individual known to have escaped just a few steps ahead of the slave traders in 1838 is not identified as a runaway at all on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census.

For these reasons and others, the Georgetown Memory Project does not presently believe that these 1838 Census “runaway” notations indicate persons who fled the arrival of the Louisiana-bound slave ships at the moment the 1838 slave sale was set in motion.

Instead, the GMP suggests that the “runaway” notations were made to indicate persons the Jesuits expected to find on their plantations and available for sale to Louisiana later in the summer and fall of 1838, but who for one reason or another could not physically be accounted for when the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census was actually being compiled prior to the sale. It is possible, for example, that some or all of the “runaways” were “missing” from the Jesuit plantations in 1838 in the sense that they had been swept up in sales occurring prior to 1838 and then simply forgotten – perhaps in one or more of the small sales that occurred in 1835 to be precise. In any event, “runaway” may well have been adopted as a convenient, all-purpose explanation for this unexpected shortfall in saleable “inventory.” Or perhaps it was appended to the names of the missing by mistake (i.e., by someone who simply guessed incorrectly at the reason(s) for their absence from the Jesuit farms in 1838).

On the other hand:

For almost (but not quite) contemporaneous evidence which tends to undercut the GMP view expressed immediately above, see Letter of John McElroy to Jesse Batey dated 18 February 1840, which states in part as follows:

“Immediately after the sale of servants made to the Honble Hy. Johnson on the 10 of Nov. 1838, some servants who were to be sold to him, ran away & he obliged himself by an instrument in writing to take any of them, when consigned to him; at a determined price for each of them, their age being described. Among those was a girl of 12 years of age, for whom was fixed $432....”

The Georgetown Memory Project has identified the “written instrument” mentioned by Father McElroy in the above-quoted letter: “Henry Johnson’s undated purchase of 11.” This undated document lists eleven (11) people, ten (10) of whom are among the twelve (12) people identified on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census as runaways. Set forth below is a side-by-side comparison of the 12 “runaways” from the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census and the members of the “HJ-11”:

---

83 MPA, Box 77, Addendum, Provincial Procurator Letterbook, 1833–1836/1839–1841, pp. 147-49, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University.

84 Undated obligation from Henry Johnson to Thomas Mulledy to pay $7,180 for 11 slaves, MPA, Box 40, Document No. 4 of 28, Booth Family Center for Special Collections, Lauinger Library, Georgetown University.
**Side-by-Side Comparison: 1838 Census “Runaways” vs. HJ-11 Members.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Census “Runaway”</th>
<th>HJ-11</th>
<th>Ultimate Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Charles Hawkins, 40 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Isaac Hawkins, 26 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Charles Queen, 45 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Louisiana (Terrebonne Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Martha Queen, 10 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Louisiana (Terrebonne Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>William Diggs, 21 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Iasais Queen, 21 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nancy Queen, 15 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Betsy West, 32 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Len Cutchmore, 38 (WM)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Louisiana (Ascension Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Nace Butler, 20 (SI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Arnold Jones, 28 (SI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Dick Campbell?, 40 (SI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Nelly Harrison?, 38 (WM)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Left behind in Alexandria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is plainly evident these two lists of people (i.e., the 12 “runaways” from the Census and the members of the HJ-11) are highly, though not perfectly, correlated. This fact alone, however, does not prove the historical truth of Father McElroy’s account. Father McElroy may simply have been incorrect in his understanding of the events and circumstances that led to the creation of the undated instrument signed by Henry Johnson.

In any event, as noted in the chart presented immediately above, two members of the HJ-11 **were** actually delivered to Henry Johnson on or after 1838:

- Charles Queen (ID 38), age 45, White Marsh
- Martha Queen (ID 44), age 10, White Marsh

As for the remaining nine (9) members of the HJ-11, no evidence has yet been found suggesting that they were ever delivered to Johnson or to any other individuals in Louisiana. And, as previously noted above, there is no evidence that nine (9) of the twelve (12) “runaways” listed on the 1838 Jesuit Slave Census were ever transported to Louisiana.

In the absence of any such evidence, it must be presumed (at least as a starting point) that these people somehow managed to stay behind in Maryland.

*****
The Georgetown Memory Project has analyzed all 91 members of the Lost Jesuit Slaves of Maryland along a number of different dimensions (e.g., age, gender, marital circumstances, plantation of origin, etc.), searching for commonalities and clues as to why they might have been left behind. The statistical results are set forth below:

**Primary Reason for Being Left Behind (GMP Best Guess\*)**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Circumstances (married off or married free)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of a person “left behind”</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly (60 or older) or infirm</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Runaway” (i.e., not found when census made)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escaped arrival of slave-traders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included on lists by mistake</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GMP hypothesis yet</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In a number of cases, multiple reasons may have contributed to the outcome for a single individual. To avoid double-counting, we have assigned a “best best-guess” to the individual left behind.

**By Age:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 or younger</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and older</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Age and Gender data show a breakdown of demographics for the Lost Jesuit Slaves, highlighting the distribution among different age groups and genders within the project's analysis.
### By Maryland Plantation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Marsh</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas Manor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Inigoes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown Manor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Special Characteristics Noted on 1838 Census:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married off</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married to free person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runaway (i.e., not found on farm in 1838)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mental infirmity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child of person &quot;left behind&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL (out of 91 = 100%)</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### By Surname:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacklock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutchmore?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diggs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins</td>
<td>Hawkins?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>Mahoney?</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowden?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>Queen?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweeton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By Research Outcome (to date):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusively Identified by GMP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some clues</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No clues yet</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*****
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