BRP

BRILL RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

Pre-suppression Jesuit Activity in the British Isles and Ireland

Jesuit Studies

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.

BRILL

Pre-suppression Jesuit Activity in the British Isles and Ireland

Brill Research Perspectives in Jesuit Studies

Volumes published in this Brill Research Perspectives title are listed at *brill.com/rpjs*

Pre-suppression Jesuit Activity in the British Isles and Ireland

By

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

This paperback book edition is simultaneously published as issue 1.4 (2019) of *Brill Research Perspectives in Jesuit Studies*, DOI:10.1163/25897454-12340004.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019942956

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISBN 978-90-04-39491-9 (paperback)
ISBN 978-90-04-39529-9 (e-book)

Contents

Pre-suppression Jesuit Activity in the British Isles and Ireland

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.
Fordham University, New York, USA
tmmccoog@gmail.com

Abstract

The British Isles and Ireland tested the self-proclaimed adaptability and flexibility of the new Society of Jesus. A mission to Ireland highlighted the complexities and ended in failure in the early 1580s, not to be revived until 1598. The fabled Jesuit mission to England in 1580 conceived in wistful optimism was baptized with blood with the execution of Edmund Campion in 1581 and the consequent political manoeuvres of Robert Persons. The Scottish mission began in December 1581. The three missions remained distinct in the pre-suppression period despite an occasional proposal for integration. The English mission was the largest, the bloodiest, the most controversial, and the only one to progress to full provincial status. The government tried to suppress it; the Benedictines tried to complement it; the vicars apostolic tried to control it; and foreign Jesuits tried to recognize it. Nonetheless, the English province forged a corporate identity that even withstood the suppression.

Keywords

Robert Persons – Edmund Campion – Henry Garnet – Richard Blount – Christopher Holywood – William Crichton – Maryland – John Thorpe – suppression of the Society – restoration of the Society

1 Initial Contact

Hagiography abhors a vacuum almost as much as nature does, and it so often completes historical lacunae. We know from the journal of Ignatius of Loyola (*c*.1491–1556) that he visited London on a begging tour during his student days

at the University of Paris. We know too that he received a considerable sum. But we do not know where he went. Ignatius met the Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540) in 1529 on an alms-searching mission to Bruges. Vives recommended that Loyola expand his begging to England. Loyola crossed the channel in 1531, a tense period as King Henry VIII (1491–1547, r.1509–47) began severing his allegiance with Rome as he sought the appropriate resolution of his marital problems. Ignatius summarized his English experience tersely: "Once he even went to England and brought back more alms than he usually did in other years."[1] Within a few years of his death (1556), his followers Jerónimo Nadal (1507–80) and Juan Alfonso de Polanco (1517–76) had specified London as the site.[2] More recently, at least one historian, Francisco de Borja Medina, S.J., has suggested that Ignatius might have visited Sandwich and Southampton because of his relations with the Castros, a mercantile family.[3]

Some biographers have provided a more detailed itinerary. The Victorian Stewart Rose judged Ignatius's visiting the shrines of St. Thomas of Canterbury and of St. Edward the Confessor as "well-nigh certain" and "more certain still." To these, Rose added a probable visit to the Charterhouse and a prescient vision of the cruel martyrdoms of his followers as he passed Tyburn.[4] Even the more critical historian John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. (1858–1925) suggested that Ignatius had benefited from the fabled hospitality of Sir Thomas More (1478–1535) after their imagined meeting at the Charterhouse.[5] In the 1950s, Dutch Jesuit Willem A. M. Peters (1911–88) explored the possible influence of the Bridgettine monk and author Richard Whitford (d.1543?) on Ignatius and especially on the *Spiritual Exercises*. Peters inferred from the similarities that Ignatius therefore spent most of his English visit at Syon Monastery in

1 There are many good editions of Ignatius's so-called autobiography. I have used Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J., ed., *The Pilgrim's Journey: The Autobiography of Ignatius of Loyola* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1985), 87.

2 See Dionysius Fernández Zapico, S.J., and Cándido de Dalmases, S.J., eds., *Fontes narrativi de S. Ignatio de Loyola et de Societatis Iesu initiis*, 4 vols., Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu (henceforth MHSI), 66, 73, 85, 93 (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1943–65), 2:251, 556.

3 Francisco de Borja Medina, S.J., "Íñigo de Loyola y los mercaderes castellanos del Norte de Europa: La financiación de sus estudios en la Universidad de París," *Hispania sacra* 51 (1999): 159–206.

4 *Saint Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits*, 2nd ed. (London: Burns & Oates, 1891), 124–25.

5 "The First Jesuits in England," *The Month* 102 (1903): 647–52, here 647. On Pollen, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. (1858–1925): The Hues of History; English Martyrs and Jesuit Historiography," in *The Ministry of the Printed Word: Scholar-Priests of the Twentieth Century*, ed. John Broadley and Peter Phillips (Stratton-on-the-Fosse: Downside Abbey Press, 2016), 119–43.

Isleworth, Middlesex.[6] Perhaps. Maybe. But these intriguing possibilities remain simple conjecture.

We have considerably more evidence for the Society's first venture into the British Isles. Pope Paul III (1468–1549, r.1534–49) approved the foundation of the Society of Jesus with *Regimini militantis ecclesiae* on September 27, 1540. Robert Wauchope (*c.*1500–51), former instructor of Ignatius and his early followers at the University of Paris and later archbishop of Armagh, requested two of these companions, Jean Codure (1508–41) and Alfonso Salmerón (1515–85), for a mission to Ireland to ascertain the damage the Catholic Church had suffered under Henry (VIII), lord and not king of Ireland. Various factors delayed the expedition. Salmerón and Paschase Broët (1500–62), equipped with papal and Jesuit faculties, finally departed on September 10, 1541. Their mission is well documented and well known.

The two Jesuits arrived in Edinburgh on December 31, 1541 after a crossing from Flanders so stormy that they twice sought refuge in English ports. Many at the Scottish court tried to dissuade them from continuing on to Ireland. While Broët traveled to Glasgow and western Scotland in search of more precise information about Ireland, Salmerón in some unspecified manner gave the Spiritual Exercises in Edinburgh. So encouraged by what he had learned in Glasgow, the two decided to continue their mission despite the more negative evaluations they had heard at court. King James V (1512–42, r.1513–42) gave them letters of introduction to Irish chieftains. The Jesuits landed in Ulster on February 23, 1542 and remained there for just over a month. They reported the pitiful state of the Irish church: many of the lords who had resisted Henry had capitulated, few Irish bishops remained loyal to Rome, most monasteries and abbeys had been destroyed. The Jesuits noted strong popular sentiment for the Roman Church but feared that it would die out without strong ecclesiastical and temporal leadership. Because hiding in caves and forests was behavior unbecoming for papal agents, the Jesuits returned to Edinburgh and had set out for Rome before the arrival of a papal brief commissioning them to look into the Catholic Church in Scotland.

The Catholic Mary Tudor (1516–58, r.1553–58) succeeded to the English throne in July 1553. She repealed the Protestant legislation of her father and step-brother Edward VI (1537–53, r.1547–53) and restored Roman allegiance. She appointed Reginald, Cardinal Pole (1500–58, in office 1556–58), archbishop of Canterbury. During his time in Rome, Pole met and associated with Ignatius and other Jesuits, especially Nicolás Bobadilla (1511–90). The cardinal was a

6 "Richard Whitford and St. Ignatius' Visit to England," *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* (henceforth *AHSI*) 25 (1956): 328–50.

benefactor and a confidant, so Ignatius's offer of Jesuit assistance in England was not surprising. But Pole's refusal was. Either directly or indirectly (e.g., through Giovanni, Cardinal Morone [1509–80]), Ignatius placed his Society at Pole's disposal. The cardinal politely and consistently declined Ignatius's offer; he preferred instead its prayers. Periodically, scholars ponder why Pole refused Jesuit assistance. Was the cardinal annoyed by the Society's marginalization of his friend Bobadilla? Did Pole disapprove of Jesuit ministries and counter-reformational fervor? Did they disagree theologically? Were Pole and Ignatius not as close as the Jesuit imagined? Because of the paucity of English and Irish members of the Society, did the possibility of even more Spanish clerics working for Catholicism's restoration confound Pole in that it nurtured the "Black Legend" and Catholicism's identification with Spain?[7]

One Jesuit did breach the exclusion: Pedro de Ribadeneyra (1527–1611) sailed for England in the entourage of Gómez Suárez de Figueroa, first duke of Feria (*c*.1520–71), arriving in London in November 1558, shortly before the deaths of the queen and the cardinal.[8] Ribadeneyra, ill for most of his stay, observed the religious changes introduced by the new monarch, Elizabeth I (1533–1603, r.1558–1603), and the demise of dreams of a revived Catholicism. Nonetheless, he did not think it opportune for a papal intervention, because it would destroy any lingering chance for Catholicism's survival. He was back in Brussels by April 1, 1559.

1.1 *Historiography*

Full accounts of the mission of Salmerón and Broët can be found in William V. Bangert, S.J., *Claude Jay and Alfonso Salmerón* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1985); Louis McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory: A History of the Irish Jesuits* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1991). For an analysis of the mission to Ireland and the proposed mission to England, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541–1588: "Our way of proceeding?"* (Leiden: Brill, 1996). Documents pertinent to the Irish mission can be found

7 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Ignatius Loyola and Reginald Pole: A Reconsideration," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996): 257–73; Thomas F. Mayer, "A Test of Wills: Cardinal Pole, Ignatius Loyola, and the Jesuits in England," in *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 2nd ed. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2007), 23–41; Eamon Duffy, "Cardinal Pole Preaching: St. Andrew's Day 1557," in *The Church of Mary Tudor*, ed. Eamon Duffy and David Loades (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 176–200.

8 See Spencer J. Weinreich, ed. and trans., *Pedro de Ribadeneyra's* Ecclesiastical History of the Schism of the Kingdom of England*: A Spanish Jesuit's History of the English Reformation* (Leiden: Brill, 2017) for his ongoing interest in English events.

in Edmund Hogan, S.J., ed., *Ibernia Ignatiana* (Dublin: Societas Typographica Dubliniensis, 1880). All documents from Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (henceforth ARSI) regarding the Irish mission and the proposed English mission can be found in Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., and László Lúkacs, S.J., eds., *Monumenta Angliae*, vol. 3, MHSI 151 (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2000). Mention should also be made of the immense work that went into Henry Foley, S.J., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 7 vols. in 8 parts (London: Burns & Oates, 1877–84), and the general histories of Bernard Basset, S.J., *The English Jesuits from Campion to Martindale* (London: Herder & Herder, 1967), and Francis Edwards, S.J., *The Jesuits in England: From 1580 to the Present Day* (Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1985).

2 Jesuit Nuncios

Despite the Society's absence from England, Scotland, and Ireland, men from these kingdoms entered the Jesuits: the Irishman David Wolfe (*c.*1528–*c.*1578) joined in 1554 and the Englishman Thomas Natale (*vere* Noel or Knowle?) in 1556. They were the only native Jesuits that Ignatius could offer Pole. Sometime dean of Limerick, Wolfe was appointed rector of the Jesuit college in Modena in 1558. Having retained an interest in Irish ecclesiastical affairs, Wolfe observed and complained about the unworthy candidates running to Rome in search of preferment. Rome was so unfamiliar with Irish affairs that their petitions were often granted. Cardinal Morone, cardinal protector of Ireland, recommended Wolfe to Pope Pius IV (1499–1565, r.1559–65). In August 1560, the pope appointed Wolfe apostolic nuncio with authority to examine Irish clergy and the Irish church, to encourage the chieftains to remain faithful Catholics, and to establish schools. Wolfe was warmly received upon his arrival in Cork on January 20, 1561, a reception so enthusiastic that many feared an English reaction. Catholic services were revived and celebrated publicly. English officials sought advice from London on proper procedure. The queen ordered Wolfe's arrest.

Uncertainty characterized Catholic response to Elizabeth during the first decade of her reign. Rome, hopeful of Elizabeth's marriage to a Catholic prince, had not taken a decisive stand against her and had not provided official instruction on Catholic participation in the new, reformed service. English bishops who had resisted the religious changes were removed and imprisoned. Many ecclesiastics in parishes conformed at least publicly or celebrated the traditional Mass and the revised service at different times. In Ireland, parallel hierarchies were instituted and maintained. The crown appointed its bishops, men who usually enjoyed the revenues of the see but not the respect of

the faithful. Their authority did not extend beyond the Pale, and was often ignored within it. Rome appointed its bishops, usually "Rome runners" who were often unworthy and unqualified. Such ecclesiastics, alarmed by the reforms introduced by the nuncio, opposed and shunned Wolfe, who was increasingly isolated from the Catholic hierarchy and on the run from the Elizabethan government. By July 1563, Wolfe was complaining about loneliness and spiritual poverty. Rome sent reinforcements in 1564: Richard Creagh (*c.*1523–86?), recently nominated archbishop of Armagh, and the English Jesuit William Good (1527–86). Good and an Irish scholastic, Edmund Daniel (1542–72), worked in the Limerick area, principally with a school and occasionally with Wolfe as he eluded capture. Creagh, however, was arrested a few weeks after his arrival in Ireland and spent most of his remaining years in various Irish and English prisons, apparently forgotten by the Society of Jesus, which had earlier extolled him as an ideal bishop and encouraged his perseverance in Ireland despite the difficulties and isolation.

Good quickly added his voice to Wolfe's laments about loneliness. In a hostile environment and unable to communicate with many, Good refused to believe that the Society wanted its members exposed to such perils. Superior General Francisco de Borja (1510–72, in office 1565–72) intended to recall the Jesuits because of Good's pleas and because of different rumors circulating regarding Wolfe's relation with *mna bochta* ("Menabochta"), an amorphous organization of pious laywomen.[9] Borja finally decided to recall Good and Wolfe. Because the latter was an apostolic nuncio, the general did not have the authority to recall him. However, Wolfe's powers and authority expired with the death of Pope Pius IV on December 9, 1565. Archbishop Creagh, who had returned to Ireland after his prior imprisonment and escape at the encouraging insistence of the Society, was captured again on March 30, 1567. Wolfe was finally captured later in the same year. Meanwhile, Good, with the assistance of Edmund Daniel, was experiencing such success with his sermons, his teaching, and his other ministries that he no longer longed for release. By then, it was too late: Borja had decided on their recall. Good crossed to England in 1569; he continued on to Flanders in 1570. Good traveled alone. Daniel, protesting that the northern air damaged his health, remained in Ireland with the promise that he would journey to Spain as soon as possible. As the Society was

9 On Good's ministry, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Mourning in Exile: The Irish Ministry of William Good, S.J.," in *From Rome to Zurich, between Ignatius and Vermigli: Essays in Honor of John Patrick Donnelly, S.J.*, ed. Kathleen M. Comerford, Gary W. Jenkins, and W. J. Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 23–39; and Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., and Victor Houliston, "Life in Tudor Limerick: William Good's 'Annual Letter' of 1566," *Archivium Hibernicum* 59 (2016): 7–36.

extracting Jesuits from Ireland, at least one other persistently petitioned to return to the island: Edmund Tanner (*c*.1526–79), later bishop of Cork. Superior General Borja denied the request with the explanation that nothing could be done for Ireland until King Philip II (1527–98, r.1556–98) had resolved the various problems of northern Europe. Borja's letter did not explicitly mention how these problems would be resolved, but the clear implication was through military force. Once this had been achieved, Jesuits would return to Ireland.[10]

By July 1570, Daniel was on the continent, traveling through Portugal to raise money to ransom the imprisoned Wolfe. *Regnans in excelsis*, the bull Pope Pius V (1504–72, r.1566–72) issued on February 25, 1570, too late to elicit support for and justification of the 1569 Northern Rebellion in England but not to rekindle the Geraldine rebellions in Ireland, ended Catholicism's period of uncertainty, declared Elizabeth a "pretended queen," excommunicated her, and deprived her of her crown. If this were not sufficient, the pope absolved her subjects from any oaths of loyalty and fealty they might have sworn, and threatened them with the same punishment if they continued to obey or serve her.[11] Daniel, having collected sufficient funds, returned to Ireland in 1572. Besides the money, he carried a copy of the papal bull addressed to James FitzMaurice FitzGerald (d. *c*.1579), presumably as encouragement for his rebellion. Captured with the bull, Daniel was executed for treason in Cork on October 23, 1572. Wolfe remained in Ireland for a year after his release in September. The Jesuit's association with FitzMaurice, no longer restrained by loyalty to an excommunicated queen, intensified. In September 1573, Wolfe and a young child arrived in Bayonne in southern France. Wolfe explained that the child was the son of FitzMaurice, who, in search of assistance, military and financial, offered his heir as guarantee. Some questioned Wolfe's explanation and suggested that the boy was the offspring of a scandalous relationship between Wolfe and one of his Menabochta. Wolfe traveled around Spain and Portugal in his quest for aid for FitzMaurice. His ministry shocked Portuguese Jesuits who claimed that such involvement in non-spiritual matters clearly violated the Society's Institute. They demanded that the superior general, Everard Mercurian (1514–80, in office 1573–80), forbid Wolfe from further involvement. Spanish Jesuits, on the other hand, insisted that Wolfe be supported by the Society in his efforts to implement the papal bull and restore Catholicism,

10 Superior general to Tanner, Rome, September 23, 1569, ARSI, *Germ*. 108, fol. 9^{r-v}.

11 For an English translation, see Sidney Z. Ehler and John B. Morrall, eds., *Church and State throughout the Centuries* (Westminster, MD: Newman, 1954), 181–83. Everard Mercurian, then provincial in Belgium, informed Borja that the Catholics (presumably English) considered the arrival of the plague, tempests, and floods consequences of the queen's excommunication (Mercurian to Borja, September 18, 1570, ARSI, *Gal*. 83, fol. 139^{v}).

with Spain's support, in northern Europe. Badgered by both to pursue opposite strategies, Mercurian moved cautiously. He too questioned whether Wolfe operated within the confines of the Society's Institute. FitzMaurice and Wolfe met in Rome in late 1576; together they departed in February 1577. A month or so later, Wolfe was dismissed from the Society possibly because he was given an ultimatum by Mercurian: he must choose between campaigning for FitzMaurice and remaining within the Society. He selected the former. The Wolfe affair confirmed the problematic nature of the mission to Ireland and drew attention, for the first time, to the inability to distinguish clearly between religion and politics in the British Isles and Ireland.

The FitzMaurice rebellion continued, aided and abetted by a new pope: Pope Gregory XIII (1502–85, r.1572–85), one of the Society of Jesus's greatest benefactors and one of the most aggressive leaders of the emerging Counter-Reformation. Requests from FitzMaurice to Mercurian via Tolomeo Galli (1527–1607), cardinal of Como and Gregory's secretary of state, that the Society send priests to Ireland and Scotland to stir up Catholics to support the rebellion, the general discreetly refused. Spanish and papal reinforcements sailed with FitzMaurice on his return to Ireland. Accompanied by Nicholas Sander (*c*.1530–81), the papal nuncio, when he landed at Smerwick on July 17, 1579, FitzMaurice unfurled a papal banner and invited the Irish to join with him in a rebellion against the pretended queen. The rebellion was not completely crushed until 1581.

In 1572, Robert Rochford (1541–88), an unordained scholastic, returned to Ireland, perhaps, as was common, for reasons of health and most likely without the superior general's knowledge and approval. In fact, William Good informed Borja that Rochford had traveled to Ireland from France and had opened a school in Wexford.[12] Two other Jesuits, Charles Lea (or Lee) (*c*.1546–86) and David "Irish" (most likely Dymus [1548–?]), returned to Ireland for their health in June 1575 in the entourage of former Jesuit now bishop Edmund Tanner. Upon arrival, Tanner would ordain Rochford but, for some reason, that does not seem to have happened. Lea and Rochford operated a school in Youghal. We know nothing about Dymus except that he left the Society in 1577. David Stackpole (1545/45–86), son of the mayor of Limerick, returned home temporarily in April 1577 to deal with problems concerning his inheritance. During the rebellion, Lea was captured in 1579 and imprisoned in Dublin Castle for five years. He died in Ireland. Rochford escaped to the continent in late 1588. He died on board ship during the Armada.

12 Good to superior general, Leuven, November 1, 1572, ARSI, *Germ*. 141, fols. 1^{r}–4^{v}.

A little more than a year after the pope had nominated Wolfe for the mission to Ireland, he sought another agent to investigate the situation of the Roman Church in Scotland apparently on the verge of eradication. The death of Queen Regent Mary of Guise (1515–60, r.1554–60), widow of King James V, in June; the victory of the Protestant Lords of the Congregation, a victory secured through strong support from England as formulated in the Treaty of Edinburgh in July; and the convocation of the Reformation Parliament in August, tolled the death knell for Catholicism. The young queen Mary Stuart (Mary, Queen of Scots) (1542–87, r.1542–67), widowed in December 1560 by the death of King Francis II of France (1544–60, r.1559–60), returned to Scotland in August 1561. Her private chapel, denounced by John Knox (*c*.1513–72) and his followers, was one of the few remnants of Catholicism. Beleaguered, disoriented, and alone, Mary reigned precariously and carefully, fearful that the smallest error would lose her the throne. To encourage the young queen to steadfastness, and to solicit Scottish representation at the upcoming third session of the Council of Trent (1545–63) scheduled to meet at Easter 1561 but convened in January 1562, the pope desired a Jesuit for the mission. Attempts to shun the honor or to remonstrate the lack of a qualified person did not move the pontiff. Salmerón selected the Dutch Jesuit Nicholas Floris, better known in English history as Nicholas Goudanus or de Gouda (*c*.1517–65), for the mission to the shock of the actual superior general Diego Laínez (1512–65, in office 1558–65), absent in France at the Colloquy of Poissy (1561). "I fail to see how the mission is going to profit from the choice you have made," Laínez complained to Salmerón, "Why, Dr. Goudanus knows no French and is besides a sick man, so much so that I doubt whether he will ever return from Scotland."[13] The Belgian provincial and future superior general Everard Mercurian risked arousing Salmerón's wrath as he delayed de Gouda's departure as long as possible. By that time, Mercurian had secured the assistance of a French Jesuit Jean Rivat (d.1610?) and two Scots (and future Jesuits) who had been studying on the continent: Edmund Hay (*c*.1534–91) and William Crichton (*c*.1535–1617). Crichton went as a precursor to make the proper arrangements. They landed at Leith on June 20, 1562. Rumors of the clandestine arrival of a papal nuncio alarmed the citizens of Edinburgh. Mary was willing to meet with him but would not allow any papal message or letter (e.g., regarding the Council of Trent) to be read publicly. The queen scheduled the meeting for July 24 while court was attending Knox's sermon. Hay served as a translator. De Gouda relayed the pope's request that she send Scottish bishops to the Council of Trent. She hesitated making any decision

13 Laínez to Salmerón, Paris, December 31, 1561, as translated in James Brodrick, S.J., *The Progress of the Jesuits* (London: Longmans, Green, 1946), 188.

until she had consulted her bishops. Whether she consulted them or not, we do not know, but there was no Scottish representation at the council. Moreover, fearing a popular disturbance if news circulated that a papal envoy was distributing letters from Rome to individual bishops, Mary could not guarantee the nuncio's safety. He should not venture outdoors, she advised. A proposed remedy for Mary's situation was the foundation of a college, presumably of the Society of Jesus, "where she could always have pious and learned priests at hand, and where young men, on whom the hopes of the country depended, could be trained in the Catholic religion."[14] The proposal was, at best, impractical and ill-timed. The nuncio had hoped to meet James Stewart, earl of Moray and earl of Mar (*c*.1531–70), illegitimate son of James V and recognized leader of the Lords of the Congregation. The earl had been generating a ruckus over the queen's private Catholic devotions.

The queen instructed Henry Sinclair (1508–65), bishop of Ross, to meet with the nuncio. Despite royal insistence and the nuncio's availability, the bishop, the one cleric on Mary's Privy Council, refused because contact "would bring about the sacking and plundering of his house within twenty-four hours, and would involve himself and his household in the peril of their lives."[15] De Gouda approached William Chisholm (I) (*c*.1498–64), bishop of Dunblane, then visiting Edinburgh. His quick return to Dunblane was probably his way of avoiding the nuncio's pestering. The nuncio resorted to correspondence: he wrote to each of the Scottish bishops. Three replied: William Gordon (1500–77), bishop of Aberdeen; John Hamilton (1512–71), archbishop of St. Andrews; and Robert Crichton (d.1585), bishop of Dunkeld. The first replied somewhat later; the third wrote to the pope. Although the archbishop wrote directly to the nuncio, he refused to meet. Crichton agreed to meet the nuncio for dinner at his island episcopal residence with the nuncio disguised as a bank clerk and the conversation restricted to financial matters. Crichton, Hamilton, and Chisholm were the only episcopal opponents to the new Scottish profession of faith as formulated by the Reformation Parliament. In his report to Laínez, the nuncio noted ironically: "Your Reverence will be at no loss to gather from these particulars, how far the cause of religion is likely to be advanced by negotiations with these good men. So much then for the Bishops."[16] Catholic nobles had little if any access to the queen. Meanwhile, Catholicism was eradicated:

14 De Gouda to Laínez, Mainz, September 30, 1562, ARSI, *Germ*. 144, fols. 32^{r}–37^{v} (published in McCoog and Lukács, *Monumenta Angliae*, 3:418–34; translated in *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI*, ed. William Forbes-Leith, S.J. [Edinburgh: W. Patterson, 1885], 63–79).

15 Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics*, 70.

16 Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics*, 72.

> The monasteries are nearly all in ruins, some completely destroyed; churches, altars, sanctuaries are overthrown and profaned, the images of Christ and of the Saints broken and lying in the dust. No religious rite is celebrated in any part of the kingdom, no Mass ever said in public, except in the Queen's chapel, and none of the sacraments are publicly administered with Catholic ceremonial.[17]

This lamentable state was "hardly surprising if God's flock is eaten up by wolves, while such shepherds as these have charge of it."[18] To reverse heresy and restore orthodoxy, Mary needed Catholic advisors, a strong Catholic husband, zealous and dedicated bishops, a college for better educated clergy, and the military protection of King Philip II of Spain to ward off any threat of English intervention and to control the Scottish Protestants. De Gouda left Scotland on September 3 in the disguise of a sailor.

Mary married Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley (1545–67), not the strong Catholic leader that the nuncio had hoped for, in July 1565. Mary and Darnley, assisted by Catholic nobles, defeated the Protestants whose leaders sought sanctuary in England. Despite high expectations, Superior General Borja refused to send any Jesuits "until arms had done their work."[19] Continued success depended on papal subsidies. Pope Pius V suggested that he send Vincenzo Laureo (1523–92), bishop of Mondovì, known for his rigorous treatment of Protestants, to advise Mary on proper procedure. Borja nominated Edmund Hay as the messenger to deliver the papal recommendation. The Jesuit was received by the queen on January 14, 1567, but refused the recommendation: she would not implement the tactics for whom the bishop was infamous. A few nights before Hay's return to Rome after a failed mission on February 10, 1567, Darnley was killed in the explosion at Kirk o' Field. On May 15, Mary married James Hepburn (*c.*1534–78), earl of Bothwell, in a Protestant service. Two years later, as Hay reflected on these events in a letter to Borja, he begged the general to remember her in his prayers: "It may be someday that things will co-operate

17 Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics*, 72–73.

18 Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics*, 76–77.

19 Borja to William Crichton, Rome, November 26, 1565, ARSI, *Germ.* 106, fol. 42^{v} (translated in John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., ed., *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots during Her Reign in Scotland, 1561–1567* [Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable for the Scottish History Society, 1901], 489). See also Julian Goodare, "Queen Mary's Catholic Interlude," *Innes Review* 38 (1987): 154–70.

for the good of that sinful woman, and that she will become the doer of great deeds who formerly would not consent to sound counsel."[20]

2.1 *Historiography*

David Wolfe merits further study, especially regarding his role, along with Richard Creagh, in the reconstruction of the Irish church, and his challenging the traditional distinction of the "things of God" and the "things of Caesar." Until then, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., *"And touching our society": Fashioning Jesuit Identity in Elizabethan England* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2013), 406–24; Thomas J. Morrissey, S.J., "'Almost hated and detested by all': The Problem of David Wolfe," in *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture 1573–1580*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2004), 675–703; Colm Lennon, *Archbishop Richard Creagh of Armagh, 1523–1586: An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000). Pertinent primary sources can be found in McCoog and Lukács, *Monumenta Angliae*, vol. 3; William Forbes-Leith, S.J., ed., *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI* (Edinburgh: W. Patterson, 1885); John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., ed., *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots during Her Reign in Scotland, 1561–1567* (Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable for the Scottish History Society, 1901); Michael Yellowlees, *"So strange a monster as a Jesuite": The Society of Jesus in Sixteenth-Century Scotland* (Isle of Colonsay: House of Lochar, 2003) is the only extensive history of Jesuit involvement in Scotland for this period. Vera Moynes, ed., *The Irish Jesuit Mission: A Calendar of Correspondence 1566–1752* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2017) should stimulate further research on Jesuit activity in Ireland. The most recent surveys of the historiography of Scottish and Irish Catholicism include Stephen Mark Holmes, "Historiography of the Scottish Reformation: The Catholics Fight Back," and Liam Chambers, "Patrick Boyle, the Irish Colleges and the Historiography of Irish Catholicism," in *The Church on Its Past*, ed. Peter D. Clarke and Charlotte Methuen, Studies in Church History 49 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Ecclesiastical History Society, 2013), 303–16, 317–29.

3 Vocations to the Society

Most historians marvel at the rapid expansion of the Society. From a small group of "friends in the Lord," the Society had grown to one thousand Jesuits

20 Hay to Borja, Paris, January 21, 1569, ARSI, *Gal.* 82, fols. 16r–18v (translated in Pollen, *Papal Negotiations*, 508).

in 1556 and expanded to five thousand in 1580. In 1556, there were thirty-one colleges; in 1580, 134.[21] Few historians, however, fail to note the failure of an infrastructure to handle the expansion. The lack of written constitutions and the absence of a clear definition of this new Society did not deter—and may indeed have encouraged—candidates. Jerónimo Nadal formulated soundbites, pithy expressions that encapsulated the unique quality of the Society in his discourses to various Jesuits in different communities throughout Europe. The preserved *responsae* to the questionnaires that he circulated in each community provide us with a detailed portrait of the first and second generation of Jesuits and, at the same time, demonstrate the absence of a consistent, organizational procedure. The formation of this infrastructure begun by Mercurian was completed by his successor Claudio Acquaviva (1543–1615, in office 1581–1615).[22]

Scottish candidates for the Society accompanied or followed de Gouda to the continent. Besides Hay and Crichton, among others there were Robert Abercrombie (1536–1613); James Gordon (1541–1620); John Hay (1547–1608); William Murdoch (*c.*1539–1616); James Tyrie (*c.*1543–97). Most gravitated toward France; some assumed important positions within the Society; others agitated for a renewed mission to Scotland as they labored in Belgium, Lithuania, and so on.[23] Candidates from Ireland, often sent by Wolfe, entered the Society: Daniel, Dymus, Rochford, Lea, Dermot Geraldine (*c.*1537–?; dis. 1560); Maurice Haley (1546–?; dis. 1603).

There was no de Gouda or Wolfe to attract Englishmen to the Society. Yet they did enter for whatever motive. A Marian priest, Simon Belost (1507–*c.*1570?) entered in Rome in June, 1560. Belost later worked in Belgium, serving as a conduit for English religious refugees to the Society in Rome such as Thomas Langdale (1541–?; dis. 1583), who later apostatized, and Jasper Heywood (1535–98), an English translator of Seneca and son of the famous author John Heywood (1496/97–1578). Edmund Campion (1540–81) was sent to Prague; Thomas Stephens (*c.*1550–1619) to India, perhaps the first Englishman to travel to the

21 William V. Bangert, S.J., *A History of the Society of Jesus*, rev. ed. (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986), 46.

22 On Nadal and the questionnaires, see William V. Bangert, S.J., *Jerome Nadal (1507–1580): Tracking the First Generation of Jesuits*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1992); T. [Thomas] V. Cohen, "Why the Jesuits Joined, 1540–1600," *Historical Papers* (1974): 237–58; Cohen, "Molteplicità dell'esperienza religiosa tra i primi 1259 gesuiti, 1540–1560," *Annali accademici canadesi* 1 (1986): 7–25. On Mercurian, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., ed., *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture 1573–1580* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2004).

23 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "'Pray to the Lord of the harvest': Jesuit Missions to Scotland in the Sixteenth Century," *Innes Review* 53 (2002): 127–88.

subcontinent; John Yates (1552–?; dis. 1601?) to Brazil. For reasons of health and with the permission of the general, Thomas King (*c*.1537–65), another Marian priest, returned to England in 1564 with faculties for the reconciliation of heretics. Advised to keep his head down, he ministered principally in London for more than a year. A Marian priest claiming to be a Jesuit, Thomas Woodhouse (?–1573) was executed on June 19, 1573. Arrested in 1561, he continued his ministry while in prison. He claimed that he requested admission into the Society from the French provincial in 1572 for reasons yet unknown. Subsequently, his behavior became more erratic and reckless, as if he were courting execution. In 1600, the Jesuit Henry Garnet (1555–1606) asked Robert Persons (1546–1610) whether Woodhouse's claims could be verified. Apparently they were.

3.1 *Historiography*

The best introduction to the early years of the Society is John O'Malley, S.J., *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993). On the formation of a distinct Jesuit culture, see McCoog, *Mercurian Project*. On English and Welsh members of the Society, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., ed., *Monumenta Angliae*, 2 vols. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1992); McCoog, "The Society of Jesus in Wales; The Welsh in the Society of Jesus: 1561–1625," *Journal of Welsh Religious History* 5 (1997): 1–29. For Scottish Jesuits, see McCoog, "'Pray to the Lord of the harvest': Jesuit Missions to Scotland in the Sixteenth Century," *Innes Review* 53, no. 2 (2002): 127–88. Unfortunately, there is no comparable, published list of Irish Jesuits. Two lists compiled by Proinsias Ó Fionnagáin, S.J., "The Jesuit Missions to Ireland in the Sixteenth Century" and "Irish Jesuits 1598–1773" are available in the Irish Jesuit Archives, Dublin.

4 Permanent Missions in the Sixteenth Century

Plowshares beaten into arms were a prerequisite for future permanent Jesuit missions to the three kingdoms. The first two acts passed by the English Parliament after the accession of Elizabeth were the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz. I c. 1) and the Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz. I c. 2). The first repudiated the Marian reconciliation with Rome, established the monarch as the supreme governor of the church in England, and forbade recognition of papal spiritual jurisdiction. The second established a new *Book of Common Prayer*, which became the sole basis for all liturgical services. Refusal to use or disruptions during its use or absentees from the services would be punished. In 1571, after the papal excommunication of Elizabeth and the failure of the Northern Rebellion, Parliament declared any refusal to acknowledge Elizabeth as the rightful sovereign or

denunciation of her as a heretic or schismatic as high treason (13 Eliz. I c. 1), and proclaimed as disloyal anyone reconciled to the Roman Church (which included the denial of her jurisdiction over the church [13 Eliz. I c. 2]). To prevent the slow death of Roman Catholicism, William Allen (1532–94), later Cardinal Allen (1587), founded the English College in Douai in 1568 to train priests for ministries in England. The first priest to return was Louis Barlow (*c*.1551–1610); the first to be martyred, Cuthbert Mayne (1544–77). The Jesuits did not administer the college, but its seminarians took classes at the Jesuit college in Douai, and Ignatian spirituality permeated its corridors. In 1579, Pope Gregory XIII ordered the Society to assume control of the English College in Rome. Encouraged by the papal bull and assisted by Persons, Allen advocated Jesuit participation in the mission itself. Superior General Mercurian was less enthusiastic. Because of hostile conditions, he worried that missioners, deprived of the support of religious communities, would be lonely and frustrated. He feared that Jesuit participation would be interpreted as a political and not a religious mission because of the queen's role in the church. The absence of a hierarchy to govern the church and to mediate problems also concerned him. He could easily have cited Jesuit experience in Ireland to illustrate the first two. He rebuffed each argument with promises of prayers until unexpectedly he consented to a Jesuit mission in 1579. The expectations aroused among certain English Catholics and crypto-Catholics (church papists) at the English and French courts who negotiated a marriage alliance between Elizabeth and François, duke of Anjou (1555–84), more than likely played a significant role in Mercurian's changing his mind. Once Mercurian agreed, Allen selected Persons and Campion for the mission. The first had been agitating for greater Jesuit involvement; the second had demonstrated total disinterest as he preached and taught in Prague. Campion and his superiors tried to extricate him from the mission, and his slow progress to Rome exasperated Mercurian. Before their departure, the two Jesuits met the pope. To their question about Pius V's excommunication of Elizabeth in 1570, Gregory replied that, conditions being as they were, Catholics were not obliged to obey it under pain of sin or excommunication. Perhaps as a precaution against clerical friction, Thomas Goldwell (1501–85), sometime bishop of St. Asaph, departed Rome with the traveling band before eventually deciding against crossing into England.

Mercurian's instructions stressed, perhaps naively, the spiritual purpose of the enterprise. Jesuits were exhorted to avoid politics and to live the Society's Institute as well as they could given the circumstances. If the Anglo-French marital negotiations were concluded successfully, their situation, it was hoped, would normalize. Optimism ended when the party learned that a Spanish–papal military expedition (with Sander as the papal nuncio) had landed in

Ireland nearly a year earlier. Consequently, security at English ports was tightened. Historians have debated and wondered whether the Jesuits were as ignorant of the military enterprise as they contended. Gerard Kilroy has argued that Mercurian and Campion knew nothing about this military exercise; Allen definitely knew but had consciously concealed it from the Jesuits. The invasion, the collapse of the marriage negotiations, and the dramatic high-profile Jesuit ministries resulted in more relentless pursuit of Catholics.

Contrary to traditional assertions that recusancy, that is, a total withdrawal from the Established Church, was introduced by the seminary priests and the Jesuits, despite the absence of clear directives from Rome, it had been gaining ground as the only acceptable Catholic response to the government's demands for religious conformity and attendance at Protestant services before their arrival. At the so-called Synod of Southwark in late July 1580, Jesuits and secular clergy (both Marian and seminary) debated recusancy and occasional conformity. They agreed that attendance signified not political loyalty but acceptance of heresy. Persons promised—and delivered—a treatise on the subject: *A Brief Discours Contayning Certaine Reasons Why Catholiques Refuse to Go to Church* (Douai [*vere* East Ham], 1580). As a precaution against the government's release of misleading or false information after the capture of either, Campion and Persons formulated concise statements of the goals and nature of their mission. The premature but possibly non-accidental dissemination of Campion's so-called "brag" intensified the search for the Jesuits. Parliament enacted "Act to Retain the Queen's Majesty's Subjects in Their Due Obedience" (23 Eliz. I c. 1) in early 1581. What Catholics saw as reconciliation to the Roman Church, the government regarded as disloyalty and issued severe legislation accordingly. Henceforth, all recusants must conform at least once a month, and anyone reconciled to the Church of Rome became guilty of high treason, as did the reconciler. Penalties against both saying and attending Mass were increased. Campion was captured in July 1581 and executed on December 1. Persons crossed to the continent shortly after Campion's capture in order to deal with numerous pressing matters with William Allen, the most important of which was the possibility of using Scotland as a refuge for harassed clergy.

More reluctant to approve a Jesuit mission to Scotland than to England, Mercurian granted a request from James Beaton (1517–1603), archbishop of Glasgow and Queen Mary Stuart's ambassador to France, that Scottish Jesuits be stationed in France, ready to return to their homeland once "the divine Majesty [...] [had] reopen[ed] the door to the Catholic faith in that realm."[24]

24 Mercurian to Beaton, Rome, December 13, 1574, ARSI, *Aquit.* 1/1, fol. 34$^{r–v}$.

John Hay, a student of theology in France, returned to Scotland for reasons of health in December 1578. He was back in France by the following November. Hay filed a detailed report of his stay with Mercurian. His limited experience alerted him to the real possibility of the restoration of Catholicism if King James VI/I (1566–1625, r.1567–1625/r.1603–25) could be freed from the control of heretics. The recent arrival of Esmé Stuart, sieur d'Aubigny and later duke of Lennox (1542–83), could provide the means for the king's liberation.

In the spring of 1580, as Campion and Persons prepared for their mission to England, Mercurian approved Abercrombie's journey from Vilnius to Scotland. Abercrombie's trip definitely *post hoc* and probably *propter hoc* Hay's has been interpreted as a fact-finding mission. Regarding the king, Abercrombie's evaluation confirmed Hay's:

> I do not regard him as a heretic, and indeed on account of his youth there can be no question of obstinate heresy; and I do not doubt that, if he had a good instructor, he would become in a year an excellent and devout Catholic Prince; I have this proof of his preference for Catholics that he converses with no one more readily nor more often than with Lord Aubigny; indeed, he does not seem to be happy with all his nobles present if Aubigny is absent; if, when only others are present, he is somewhat silent, he becomes at once merrier as soon as Aubigny enters.[25]

Such glowing reports increased Beaton's requests for Jesuit involvement. Mercurian's death on August 1, 1580 delayed a decision. The Belgian Olivier Mannaerts (1523–1614), vicar general, promised Beaton that James Gordon and Edmund Hay would be sent to Scotland after the general congregation scheduled for early 1581, "if there were no further impediments."[26] This mission to Scotland, as Mannaerts explained to the French provincial Claude Matthieu (1537–87), was independent from and had nothing to do with the mission to England.[27] The congregation elected Claudio Acquaviva in February 1581. By the end of the year, he had decided in favor of a mission to Scotland: he selected Crichton and Hay. England and Scotland may have been conceived as independent missions, but events joined them by the end of 1581, events that would result in Crichton's traveling to Scotland without Hay.

---

25 William James Anderson, "Narratives of the Scottish Reformation, I: Report of Father Robert Abercrombie, S.J., in the Year 1580," *Innes Review* 7 (1956): 27–59, here 36.

26 Mannaerts to Beaton, Rome, August 8, 1580, ARSI, *Franc.* 1/I, fol. 85^{r-v}.

27 Mannaerts to Matthieu, Rome, August 22, 1580, ARSI, *Franc.* 1/I, fol. 87^{r}.

Had Persons heard about Hay's and Abercrombie's visits to Scotland and their reports? Or was his sending the secular priest William Watts (d.1583) to Scotland in the summer of 1581 a coincidence? Watts was sent to explore the possibility of Catholic clergy seeking occasional sanctuary with impunity. By the time he returned with proposals much more extravagant than his initial brief, Persons had departed for the continent. As a result of Watts's visit, Scotland was no longer considered simply a refuge for but indeed the hope of English Catholics because of the possible conversion of King James. William Holt (1545–99), a recent arrival on the Jesuit mission, journeyed as Persons's proxy to Scotland with Watts in December 1581. Instructed by Acquaviva to discuss their mission with Persons, Crichton and Hay met with the Englishman and other Catholic leaders in northern France. Consequent to the meetings, Hay decided against crossing to Scotland, probably because he disapproved of the political turn the mission was taking. The conversion of the king was becoming the first step in the invasion of England and the forcible restoration of Catholicism. On March 7, 1582, Holt and Crichton discussed with Aubigny, now the duke of Lennox, the rescue of Mary Stuart, the conversion of James, and the restoration of Catholicism in the three kingdoms. The enterprise was afoot. For the next six years, different coalitions were formed and various strategies formulated, culminating in the Great Armada of 1588.

The death of Mercurian and the accession of Acquaviva guaranteed the continuation of the mission to England after promising prospects gave way to persecution and martyrdom. Acquaviva urged greater prudence and caution, but authorized more Jesuits. Jasper Heywood and Holt arrived in England in June 1581. Mingling easily with the nobles whom he knew from his time at court, Heywood approached the crown in a manner more conciliatory and less confrontational than did Persons, but the latter, with Allen, eventually considered him "out of step," inappropriate for the mission, and recalled him in December 1583.

The Throckmorton Plot (1583–84) was the first of a number of conspiracies, real, imagined, fabricated, or manipulated, to alert English subjects to Catholic designs on their queen. England was a small beleaguered island resisting the Roman Antichrist. Parliament passed "Act against Jesuits, Seminary Priests and Other Such Like Disobedient Persons" (27 Eliz. I c. 2) that proclaimed as traitors Jesuits and seminary priests who remained within the kingdom forty days after its enactment. Parliament asserted that not only did Jesuits deny the spiritual authority of the queen but also that they recognized the authority of a foreign prince engaged in conspiracies against her. Now even Acquaviva had qualms. More than once Persons and Allen had to calm the general's apprehensions. Yet selecting qualified men was not an easy task. Persons and Allen

judged some unsuitable, while others like Henry Garnet were considered too important for other works and thus not available. John Gibbons (*c.*1544–89) preferred to serve with his pen: *Concertatio Ecclesiæ Catholicæ in Anglica, adversus Calvino-Papistas et Puritanos* (The conflict of the Catholic Church in England against the Calvinist-Papists and the Puritans [Trier, 1583]). Gibbons wanted to open the eyes of all Christians to the deceits of the Machiavellians who "have slaughtered innocent men in the most cruel fashion, but not in the name of religion; rather under the lying pretext of treason."[28] Were recusants traitors or orthodox Christians eager to avoid heresy? William Cecil, Lord Burghley (1520–98), argued the political nature of their dissent (*The Execution of Iustice in England* [London, 1583]); Allen refuted his claims (*A True, Sincere and Modest Defence of English Catholique* [n.p., n.d. (Rouen, 1584)]).

Campion and Persons constructed a network of safe houses, often with residential chaplains. The network began with members and friends of the Vaux family of Harrowden. William Weston (1550–1615), arriving in September 1584, established a common fund to support the clergy. Garnet, eventually conceded to the mission despite protests from the Roman College, arrived in England in July 1586 with Robert Southwell (1561–95). The network expanded further with the arrival of more Jesuits. Weston was arrested in London in early August 1586 and remained in prison until 1603; Garnet succeeded him as superior. In London, Southwell revived the important mission of the written word, but with a difference. Unlike Persons, who had used his clandestine press to denounce occasional conformity and Campion's opponents in 1580–81, Jesuits in England generally eschewed controversial topics and martyrologies in favor of spiritual treatises to console and strengthen frightened believers (e.g., Persons's *The First Booke of the Christian Exercise, Appertayning to Resolution* [Rouen, 1582], and Southwell's *An Epistle of Comfort* [Paris (*vere* London), n.d. (1587–88)]).

The fate and prospects of Catholicism in general ebbed and flowed as different factions and nobles controlled the king. Persons directed both the English and the Scottish missions. He relinquished administration of the former as he left France for Rome in the late summer of 1585. Crichton and James Gordon traveled to Scotland in August 1584. Both were captured: Crichton was imprisoned in the Tower of London until May 1587, but Gordon was released out of fear of his nephew George Gordon, earl of Huntly (1562–1636). Hay and John Durie (*c.*1544–88) followed in 1585, Abercrombie and William Ogilvie (*c.*1560–94) in 1586, and George Durie (*c.*1548; dis. *c.* May 1594) and William Murdoch in late 1587 or early 1588. John Durie reconciled John Maxwell, earl of Morton

28 I have used the translation in Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540–1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 101.

(1553–93); Edmund Hay, his kinsman Francis Hay, earl of Erroll (1564–1631), and Crichton, David Lindsay, earl of Crawford (1547?–1607). The Catholic earls dominated sections of Scotland and pressured the king, angered by the execution of his mother in 1587, but not sufficiently to commit himself to support the Armada.

After the failure of the Armada, Persons departed for Spain to aid Acquaviva against Spanish critics of his governance, and to make sure that Philip II did not forget England amid his dynastic involvement to prevent the accession of the Protestant Henry IV (1553–1610, r.1589–1610) in France. In Spain, Persons secured financial support for new English seminaries in Valladolid (1589) and Seville (1592), and a new college in St. Omers (1593). An English royal proclamation of October 18, 1591 denounced the English colleges in Rome and Valladolid as sites where "dissolute young men, who have partly for lack of living, partly for crimes committed, become fugitives, rebels, and traitors" were instructed in "points of sedition" to advance Spanish ambitions in England.[29] Persons also helped the Irish Jesuit James Archer (1550–1620) with the foundation of the Irish College in Salamanca (1592), and Crichton with the Scottish College in Douai (1594). Irish colleges were also established in Lisbon (1593, Jesuit-run from 1605), Santiago de Compostela (1605, Jesuit after 1611), Rome (1625, Jesuit after 1635), and Seville (1612, Jesuit after 1619).[30] Scottish Jesuits assumed the administration of the migratory Scottish College that finally settled in Douai in 1612, and of the Scottish College, Rome (1600). A third Scots college was established in Madrid in 1627, but it ceased to accept students after 1734.

Few Jesuits ministered in Scotland, but nonetheless they had influence far greater than their number demanded. Ordinarily working within the orbit of the Catholic earls, the Scottish Jesuits suffered greater deprivation, albeit without being martyred, than their English confrères. Some Jesuits (e.g., Crichton and James Gordon) traveled to and from the continent, at times carrying papal subsidies or arranging for mysterious blank documents, as they sought to forge an alliance between Spain and the Catholic earls and/or the Scottish king. As the 1590s ended, James VI plotted his strategy for ascending the English throne. He attracted many supporters, including Catholic princes and a pope, Clement VIII (1536–1605, r.1592–1605), reluctant to augment Spanish influence, with promises made with a "wink and a nod." Could he be trusted to keep his

29 Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin, C.S.V., eds., *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964–69), 3:88.

30 Cathaldus Giblin, O.F.M., "Irish Exiles in Catholic Europe," in *A History of Irish Catholicism*, vol. 4, no. 3, *The Church Under the Penal Code and Irish Exiles in Catholic Europe*, ed. Patrick Corish (Dublin: Gill, 1971), 22.

promise to become a Catholic? Not even the Scottish Jesuits were unanimous on this.

The English mission increased in the 1590s. John Gerard (1564–1637), Garnet, and Southwell worked in the south; Richard Holtby (1552–1640) stayed in the north, and John Bennet (1553–1625) developed a ministry along the Welsh Marches. Acquaviva eventually granted permission to receive secular priests already on the mission in England into the Society, and to allow them to undergo their noviceship *in situ*. Richard Blount (1565–1638) and Richard Banks (*c*.1569–1643) were the first. Some Jesuits, such as Southwell and Henry Walpole (1558–95), were captured and executed; others, men like Weston and Gerard, languished in prison until they were released or, as in Gerard's case, escaped. A surprise raid at Baddesley Clinton, Warwickshire, in 1591 nearly netted all Jesuits in England. Despite the dangers, the Jesuits contrived to hold semi-annual meetings to discuss mission strategy, especially the perennial problem of conformity, and life according to the Society's style.

4.1 *1598*

Allen (a cardinal since 1587) deftly supervised all aspects of the mission and especially monitored relations between Jesuits and secular clergy. Long-suppressed tensions erupted after his death in 1594. Some clergy resented the dominance exercised over the mission by Jesuits who controlled the colleges in Rome and Spain, and provided spiritual direction in Douai. On the mission, they arranged for housing, accommodation, and funds. The Society revealed its true intention when the few Jesuit prisoners at Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, attempted to impose their own disciplines on the secular clergy imprisoned with them. This was not their only grievance. Jesuit political engagement either in the diplomacy aimed at Elizabeth's overthrow or in the selection of her Catholic successor provided real grounds for the government's depiction of Catholics as traitors. The appointment of a bishop, these secular clergy believed, would rein in the Jesuits and prove that the majority of Catholics were loyal subjects. Their petition for a bishop was rejected. Instead, Rome nominated George Blackwell (1547–1612) as archpriest, a surprise decision that some attributed to Jesuit machinations. A secret clause requiring him to consult the Jesuit superior before any major decision rendered their suspicions credible. The so-called "appellants" sent agents to Rome to secure evidence that the appointment of an archpriest rested on papal authority and not on a decision made by a cardinal favorable to the Jesuits. The agents were not well received in Rome, but they returned to England with the desired authentication. Peace seemed to have been restored, but the archpriest with some Jesuit support persisted in referring to the appellants as schismatics with demands

for reconciliation. A second appeal followed, better organized and better supported than the first. With tacit support from the Elizabethan government, the appellants launched a venomous, *ad hominem* attack on English Jesuits and Persons in particular, with insinuations that their Machiavellianism was to blame for the penal legislation. Their withdrawal from the mission would result in *de facto* tolerance. The appellants also obtained the support of the French king Henry IV, eager to reclaim a role in English Catholic affairs, a role lost twenty years earlier because of the religious wars in his kingdom. Persons and his colleagues in Rome frantically tried to discredit the appellant agents. He did preserve Jesuit participation on the mission, but the second appeal resulted in a decision favorable to the appellants in 1602. Henceforth, there would be two missions in England: the Jesuit and the secular. Each would be independent, and the archpriest was no longer required to consult the Jesuit superior. As the controversy raged, the Benedictines, after some delay, initiated a mission to England in 1603. Because of tension between Jesuits and Benedictines at Valladolid, secular clergy anticipated Benedictine assistance in their struggles with the Jesuits. Appellant expectation that the Elizabethan government would treat them more favorably ended with the royal proclamation of November 5/15, 1602. For unfathomable reasons, the appellants believed that their efforts would be rewarded with toleration, but that would "disturb the peace of the church and bring this our state into confusion." The crown conceded to the appellants more time before they too must leave the kingdom.[31] Indignant, the appellants protested their allegiance, but their refusal to repudiate papal spiritual authority did not satisfy the government. Perhaps Elizabeth's successor would be more accommodating.

The archpriest was not the only ecclesiastical novelty introduced in 1598: Acquaviva reorganized the English Jesuit mission into a previously unknown administrative unit called the prefecture. In addition to the Jesuits working in England, the mission now included the colleges in Spain, Rome, and St. Omers. *Officium et regulae praefecti missionum in seminariis quae in Hispaniis et Belgio Societatis regimini subsunt* (The office and rules of the prefect of the mission over the seminaries in Spain and in Belgium under the direction of the Society), regulated relations between local rectors and provincials on the continent, and the prefect, the overall director of the English mission. The prefect would be assisted by two vice-prefects, one at the Spanish court and the other at the Belgian court. Persons was named prefect with Joseph Creswell (*c*.1557–1623) and William Holt his assistants in Madrid and Brussels. The

31 Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 3:250–55.

document would be amended occasionally but not sufficiently to allay the resentment of local provincials.[32]

In Ireland, the Nine Years' War or Tyrone's Rebellion (1593–1603) against English rule now favored the Gaelic Irish. To attract greater support, especially from the Old English, Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone (*c.*1550–1616), labeled his rebellion a "crusade" for the "faith and the fatherland." The Jesuit James Archer, in Ireland to raise money for the Irish College in Salamanca, may have been the inspiration for this campaign. Fundraising was temporarily forgotten as Archer joined O'Neill's crusade. As the situation improved, Acquaviva decided to revive the Irish mission in 1598. He sent Christopher Holywood (1559–1626) to be superior. Captured in England, he remained in English prisons until the accession of James in 1603. The few Jesuits in Ireland debated whether O'Neill's campaign was motivated by religious zeal and orthodoxy or personal gain and revenge. O'Neill's defeat at Kinsale (1601) and his flight (1607) ended the rebellion. In 1604, Acquaviva erected a comparable hierarchy for Irish Jesuits: *Officium et regulae praefecti missionum in seminariis Hybernisis, qui in Hispaniis Societatis nostrae regimini subsunt* (The office and rules of the prefect of the mission over the seminaries in Ireland and in Spain under the direction of the Society).[33] The few Jesuits in Scotland remained dependent on other provinces.

Failure of the Catholic monarchs to agree on an acceptable alternative to James resulted in a surprisingly smooth accession for the Scottish king. James and his agents had courted and cajoled English Catholics and foreign powers since the publication of the controversial but effective R. Doleman's *A Conference about the Next Succession to the Crowne of Ingland* (n.p. [Antwerp], 1594 [1595]). Even Persons, while admitting that he preferred an actual Catholic candidate to one who promised conversion, sought to repair his relations with James. All fears of a contested succession proved groundless as James VI became James I of England in March 1603. Both Catholics and Puritans welcomed the new king with colossal expectations. Who would be disappointed? Catholic ambassadors flocked to London to greet the new monarch. Their reports varied from enthused prospects for Catholics to dire predictions of renewed persecution. Scottish Jesuits accompanied their patrons, including Queen Anne of Denmark (1574–1619), to London where they discussed

32 An English translation of the 1606 revision can be found in Henry More, S.J., *The Elizabethan Jesuits*, ed. Francis Edwards, S.J. (London: Phillimore, 1981), 298–307.

33 There must have been discussion about the transfer of the Irish mission to the jurisdiction of a province, because Nicholas Leinagh (1567–*c.*1623) argued in favor of its continual dependence on Acquaviva alone. See his letter to Acquaviva, "From the Wastelands of Ireland," April 3, 1605, Dublin, Irish Jesuit Archives, MSS A 30.

common policies and procedures, especially on the contested issue of occasional conformity, with English Jesuits. But James did not, perhaps could not, deliver his alleged promises, and discontent replaced hope as the looked-for relaxation of the penal laws did not materialize. On February 22, 1604, James I expelled Jesuits and seminary priests, and dismissed any expectation of a religious change (1 Jac. I, c. 4). Garnet anxiously informed Rome of Catholic discontent and asked for instructions on how to deal with it. The infamous Gunpowder Plot of November 5, 1605, perhaps instigated and at least exploited by Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury (1563–1612), climaxed a series of riots and disturbances. At Garnet's trial, Sir Edward Coke (1552–1634) denounced the Jesuit as "a Doctor of five Ds, as Dissimulation, Deposing of Princes, Disposing of Kingdomes, Daunting and deterring of Subjects, and Destruction."[34] Previous Catholic conspiracies aimed at the assassination of the queen, but the Gunpowder Plot sought to murder the royal family, overthrow the Protestant Church, and destroy the political nation. By thwarting Catholic designs, the Lord Almighty had demonstrated once again his preferences and shown that God, if not an Englishman born, was one naturalized. The Stuart dynasty, as Anne James persuasively argues, had a "founding myth for the new Protestant Britain."[35] The Jesuits quickly accused of being the masterminds of the plot secured an unrivaled post in the English chamber of horrors with their popular identification with treachery and treason.[36] An "Act for the Better Discovering and Repressing of Popish Recusants" (3 Jac. I c. 4) imposed an oath of allegiance whereby Catholics who denied papal power to depose monarchs would be tolerated as faithful and loyal subjects.[37] A royal proclamation of June 10, 1606 ordered the Jesuits out of the kingdom.

---

34 *A True and Perfect Relation of the Whole Proceedings against the Late Most Barbarous Traitors, Garnet a Iesuite, and His Confederates* (London, 1606), sigs. T1^{v}–T2^{r}.

35 *Poets, Players, and Preachers: Remembering the Gunpowder Plot in Seventeenth-Century England* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 134. See also Alexandra Walsham, *Providence in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

36 For a more detailed analysis and interpretation of the plot, see Mark Nicholls, *Investigating Gunpowder Plot* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991); Antonia Fraser, *The Gunpowder Plot: Terror and Faith in 1605* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1996); Francis Edwards, S.J., *The Enigma of Gunpowder Plot, 1605: The Third Solution* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008).

37 For the subsequent debate over the legitimacy of the oath, see Johann P. Sommerville, "Papalist Political Thought and the Controversy over the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance," in *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, ed. Ethan H. Shagan (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 162–84; Michael Questier, "Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English

4.2 *Historiography*

The history of the Elizabethan Jesuits is the stuff of legends and hagiography: clandestine meetings, priest-holes, raids, escapes from the Tower of London, imprisonment, torture and martyrdom. Thus there are many, varied studies of the Jesuit mission to England. Robert E. Scully, S.J., *Into the Lion's Den: The Jesuit Mission in Elizabethan England and Wales, 1580–1603* (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2011); McCoog, *Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England 1541–1588*; McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1589–1597: Building the Faith of Saint Peter upon the King of Spain's Monarchy* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012); McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1598–1606: "Lest our lamp be entirely extinguished"* (Leiden: Brill, 2017); McCoog, *"And touching our society."* Biographies of many but not all significant Elizabethan Jesuits have been written: Gerard Kilroy, *Edmund Campion: A Scholarly Life* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); Francis Edwards, S.J., *Robert Persons: The Biography of an Elizabethan Jesuit* (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995); Philip Caraman, S.J., ed., *John Gerard: The Autobiography of an Elizabethan* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1951); Caraman, ed., *William Weston: The Autobiography of an Elizabethan* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1955); Caraman, *Henry Garnet (1555–1606) and the Gunpowder Plot* (London: Longmans, 1964). The first volume of a projected three-volume *The Correspondence and Unpublished Papers of Robert Persons, S.J. (1546–1610)*, ed. Victor Houliston, Ginevra Crosignani, and Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2017) has been published. Scotland and Ireland are less well served. Many important documents with historical context can be found in Pollen, *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots*; Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI*. The only monograph is Yellowlees, *"So strange a monster as a Jesuite."* For Ireland, Hogan, *Ibernia Ignatiana*; McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*; Thomas Morrissey, S.J., *James Archer of Kilkenny: An Elizabethan Jesuit* (Dublin: Studies "Special Publications," 1979); Lennon, *Archbishop Richard Creagh of Armagh*; Moynes, *Irish Jesuit Mission*.

Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance," *Historical Journal* 40 (1997): 311–29; Questier, "Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England," *English Historical Review* 123 (2008): 1132–65; Stefania Tutino, *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570–1625* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 117–93; Tutino, *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 117–58; Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought*, 314–38.

5 The Early Stuarts and Interregnum

Once the panic that resulted from the Gunpowder Plot had passed, there was little persecution in England. As James explained to the English Parliament on November 9, 1605, four days after the plot's discovery: "For although it cannot be denied, That it was the onely blinde superstition of their errors in Religion, that led them to this desperate device; yet doth it not follow, That all professing that Romish religion were guiltie of the same." Only Catholicism, the king argued, considered it lawful "or rather meritorious (as the Roman Catholicks call it) to murther Princes or people for quarrel of Religion." Yet it did not follow that all Catholics were traitors; some were very faithful and loyal.[38] But how was their allegiance to be demonstrated? The oath of allegiance offered to Catholics contained the statement:

> That the Pope, neither of himself nor by any authority of the church of See of Rome or by any other means with any other hath any power or authority to depose the King, or to dispose any of his Majesty's kingdoms or dominions, or to authorize any foreign prince to invade or annoy him or his countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance or obedience to his Majesty, or to give licence or leave to any of them to bear arms, raise tumult or to offer any violence or hurt to his Majesty's royal person, state or government or to any of his Majesty's subjects within his Majesty's dominions.[39]

Could a Catholic pronounce the oath without implicitly renouncing Catholicism? Theologians debated papal claims that the pope could depose rulers, so it was not an article of faith, not defined. Yet could it be so strongly repudiated? The oath altered the theological debate within the Catholic community. Under Elizabeth, the principal issue had been occasional conformity. Was attendance at a Protestant service an act of religious apostasy or political loyalty? Was it apostasy or a less grievous sin?[40] Under James, the oath of

38 For the complete speech, see James VI/I, *Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 147–57.

39 G. W. [George Walter] Prothero, ed., *Select Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946), 259.

40 On this argument, see Ginevra Crosignani, Thomas M. McCoog, and Michael Questier, eds., *Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2010), and Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity,*

allegiance took center stage and sparked an international, cross-confessional debate.[41]

George Blackwell, the archpriest; Richard Holtby, superior of Jesuits in England after the arrest of Garnet; and Thomas Preston (1566–1647), superior of the Benedictine mission, met to discuss the oath's acceptability. Preston defended the oath and vociferously advocated its pronunciation. Blackwell and Holtby condemned it, but shortly thereafter Blackwell changed his mind, argued that Catholics could take it, and took it himself. The English Jesuits remained resolutely opposed. On September 22, 1606, Pope Paul V (1550–1621, r.1605–21) condemned the oath. A second condemnation followed on August 23, 1607.

Preston's support for the Jacobean oath fueled hostility between Jesuits and Benedictines, especially in England. Angered by the flight of seminarians from the college in Valladolid to the Benedictine monastery, Jesuits opposed the monks' return to England as inappropriate and untimely. Despite Jesuit objections, Pope Clement VIII approved the establishment of a Benedictine mission in 1602; the monks began to arrive in March 1603, around the time of Queen Elizabeth's death. The dispute went to Rome where each side had its powerful friends and cardinals protector. A decision was made on December 10, 1608, a compromise to no one's surprise. Benedictines were forbidden to recruit at English seminaries, and Jesuits could not prevent any seminarian from entering religious life. Both sides must avoid any involvement in political matters, and Benedictines were warned to avoid contact with anyone who supported the oath. Both sides were bound under holy obedience to accept this decision.[42] Benedictines now battled each other over the oath of allegiance.[43]

After the oath of allegiance, the Jacobean parliaments added only two more penal laws: "Act to Prevent and Avoid Dangers Which May Grow by Popish

---

and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England (Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1993).

41 See, for example, Maurice Lunn, "English Benedictines and the Oath of Allegiance, 1606–1647," *Recusant History* 10 (1969–70): 146–64; Lunn, "The Anglo-Gallicanism of Dom Thomas Preston, 1557–1647," in *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, ed. Derek Baker, Studies in Church History 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 239–46; Clarence J. Ryan, "The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance and the English Lay Catholics," *Catholic Historical Review* 29 (1942): 159–83; Sommerville, "Papalist Political Thought"; Questier, "Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England"; Questier, "Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England"; Tutino, *Law and Conscience*, 117–93; Tutino, *Empire of Souls*, 117–58; Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought*, 314–38.

42 See McCoog, *Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1598–1606*, 534–37.

43 On the Benedictines, see David Lunn, *The English Benedictines 1540–1688: From Reformation to Revolution* (London: Burns & Oates, 1980).

Recusants" (3 Jac. I c. 5) and "Act for the Reformation of Married Recusant Women, and Administration of the Oath of Allegiance to All Civil, Military, Ecclesiastical, and Professional Persons" (7 Jac. I c. 6). The first, passed in 1606, closed military service and certain professions to recusants, and threatened them with excommunication from the Established Church with the consequent penalties. Those who failed to have a child baptized in the Established Church were also fined. The second law increased fines for husbands eager to keep their recusant wives out of prison. Only eighteen martyrs suffered during James's reign after the furor of the Gunpowder Plot had passed. The king was more interested in squeezing as much money as possible from Catholics. The English Parliament controlled the purse strings; James sought other sources of income to avoid having to degrade himself by asking for funds.

In May 1606, there were forty Jesuits in England and Wales with more expected because of flourishing vocations. For years, the mission sought its own novitiate to avoid sending novices elsewhere for formation, but for numerous reasons including poor finances, it could not do so. In 1603, Jacques Blaze (*c*.1540–1618), bishop of St. Omer, suggested that the English Jesuits open a novitiate in his diocese. The Spanish noblewoman Luisa de Carvajal y Mendoza (1566–1614) bequeathed a more than sufficient endowment on December 22, 1604. This sum allowed Persons to formulate concrete plans for a novitiate. Before the novitiate was even opened, Belgian Jesuits expressed their disapproval at the provincial congregation in April 1606.[44] Once again, the assembled fathers—one English Jesuit attended the congregation on the basis of seniority—asked that the prefecture be abandoned and that regular service be resumed by placing the novitiate under the jurisdiction of local provincials. One *postulatum* asked *De novitiatu erigendo Lovanii ut in eum recipiantur Anglii non tamen vocetur Anglorum novitiatus* (That the novitiate being established in Leuven in which Englishmen would be received into the Society not be called the novitiate of the English). The establishment of a novitiate for one nation introduced a pernicious national sentiment into an international society. Superior General Acquaviva agreed that the new novitiate, whose foundation he approved, would not be identified as "English" and that he personally would prefer that its community included non-England Jesuits.[45] Extant catalogs provide little if any evidence that this aspiration was realized.

---

44 Provincial congregations consisted of forty or fifty Jesuits. Certain Jesuits attended *ex officio* (e.g., provincial, rectors). Fathers professed of the fourth vow in order of seniority completed the number.

45 ARSI, *Congr*. 51, fols. 219^{r}–221^{r}, 223^{r}, 226^{r}–230^{r}. See also McCoog, *Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1598–1606*, 541–42.

Pope Clement VIII's division of the English mission in 1602 and his prohibition against the archpriest's consulting the Jesuit superior on the affairs and works of the secular clergy created *de facto* two distinct missions. The arrival of the Benedictines a few years later established a third, considerably smaller mission without permanent affiliation with either the seculars or the Jesuits. The first archpriest, George Blackwell, was arrested in June 1607. As noted above, he had initially opposed the oath of allegiance, but imprisoned and pressured, he gave way and pronounced it. Consequently, he was removed from his position. George Birkhead (or Birket [1549–1614]) was named as his successor in February 1608. He resurrected an earlier campaign for the restoration of traditional, hierarchical, ecclesiastical governance. To facilitate this campaign, he dispatched two agents to Rome in March 1609: Richard Smith (1567–1655) and Thomas More (*c*.1565–1625). More's passport was signed by members of James's Privy Council, one of whom was Archbishop Richard Bancroft (1544–1610), who retained an interest in their affairs until his death. The two replaced Blackwell's agent Thomas Fitzherbert (1552–1640) who entered the Society a few years later. Despite the division of the mission, which the pope ratified at the agents' request, many secular clergy still thought that the Society retained a dominant influence. Along with the restoration of a hierarchy, they advocated a total reform of the English College, Douai, the one college not controlled by the Jesuits—not controlled but still under the sway of the Society. These neo-Appellants castigated the quality of education at the college and blamed it for incompetent, unsatisfactory, and superficial clergy. They dismissed the college's president, Thomas Worthington (*c*.1548–1626), as a Jesuit toady. Worthington resigned in 1613. He did in fact die in London as a Jesuit novice, but a toady? Matthew Kellison (1561–1642) pursued a more independent policy as Worthington's successor, and during his administration, the Society's last link with the college—the position of confessor—was severed.

Perhaps in the hope that amiable relations with the Jesuits would aid their mission, the agents called on Persons upon their arrival in Rome. If the visitation inaugurated a period of blissful cooperation, it did not last long. Scurrilous *ad hominem* protests were exchanged as the agents lobbied cardinals for an English hierarchy, and Persons and his associates impeded their efforts. As Persons contended the impossibility of erecting a hierarchy and constructing a parochial structure,[46] Jesuits in England were formulating an alternative

46 Preserved in ARSI, *Angl.* 31/1 are numerous documents with titles such as "Rationes Catholicorum Anglorum contra creationem episcoporum" [Reasons why English Catholics oppose the creation of bishops]; "Quare non expediat Episcopos creare in Anglia" [Why it is not expedient to create bishops in England]; "Admissio episcopi ordinarii impossibilis proper leges Anglicas" [The admission of ordinary bishops is

structure. In 1609, the same year as the agency, Robert Jones (*c*.1564–1615), the superior, appointed an unspecified number of "spiritual prefects" to help govern a mission then numbering around fifty at the request of the superior general. Each prefect assumed some of the burdens of governance: he made sure that each Jesuit had ample opportunity for spiritual direction and advice, for his annual retreat, and for his annual renewal of vows. With authority delegated by the superior, prefects heard annual accounts of conscience, visited the Jesuits at their residences, and handled their personal financial accounts. As a reminder that they were still bound by a religious discipline despite their idiosyncratic living conditions, the superior general insisted that each read the *Formula of the Institute* (a summary of the essence of the Society that serves as an introduction to the *Constitutions*), and the *Regulae Societatis Iesu*, the rules of the Society, during each annual retreat.[47]

Earlier in 1609, perhaps as a preemptive strike, Thomas Fitzherbert and an unnamed Lady Manners, sister of Roger Manners, earl of Rutland (1576–1612), explained the English Jesuit ecclesiastical organization to Pope Paul V. Instead of territorial parishes, the Jesuits organized their "churches" (*ecclesia*) around a prominent Catholic layperson. "A. B." represented the church under the administration of Robert Jones. Among the Catholics in this church were Henry Somerset (1577–1646), Lord Herbert and heir of Edward Somerset, earl of Worcester (1553–1628), the Morgan family, and others. John Percy (1568–1641) oversaw a church referred to as "A. P." that included Edward, Lord Vaux (1588–1661), and his mother, Lady Elizabeth Beaumont Vaux; Mary Mulsho; Lady Digby; and others. In the *Oedipus schedularum*,[48] only seven Jesuits with their churches are mentioned. Where are the other forty Jesuits? Were the Jesuits associated with these "churches" the only stable missioners? The others lived more precariously or traveled more frequently? Or was the list compiled to impress so it only named those Jesuits whose benefactors were noble?[49]

Perhaps Henry More (*c*.1587–1661), the first historian of the English Jesuits, provides a clue in his exposition *Modus vivendi hominum Societatis* (Style

impossible because of English laws]; "An parochi in Anglia institui possint?" [Whether parishes can be established in England?].

47 Instructions to Robert Jones, Rome March 28, 1609, ARSI, *Angl.* 1, fol. 9^{v} (with an Italian copy in ARSI, *Angl.* 36/I, fol. 2^{r-v}); Annual Letter of 1615, ARSI, *Angl.* 31/I, 631–56. The annual letter is translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 7/2:1074–98. The instructions were also sent to Ireland on August 18, 1609.

48 The use of *Oedipus* in this context is perplexing. Claude Pavur, S.J., whose assistance I acknowledge, suggests that has something to do with riddle-solving or decoding. Thus a tentative translation would be "key to the records."

49 ARSI, *Angl.* 36/II, fols. 268^{r}, 317^{r}.

of living of men of the Society), composed around 1616. More distinguished three distinct types of living among the Jesuits, each with distinct advantages and disadvantages. Some Jesuits lived very private lives, "like sparrows on the rooftop," in attics or garrets with little contact with the domestic staff or visitors. Sacramental ministries, ministerial travel, counseling, and so on all took place at night. Outside the specific times of his ministry, this Jesuit was always alone—safe but lonely.

Other Jesuits were whirligig, in constant movement from one locale to another. Out of fear of detection, they stayed nowhere for more than a few days. Traveling by foot or on horseback, they relied on disguises and aliases to conceal their true identity. These missionaries had plenty of company; on the go, they visited other Jesuits, friends, and Catholics regularly on a circuit. But like the Son of Man, they had no place to lay their heads (Luke 9:58), no home for recreation, retreat, and repose. Moreover, on the move, the Jesuits were exposed to discovery and arrest.

More preferred the third type: resident chaplains in households of noble or gentle families "superior, as it were, to the action of the laws." There, Jesuits could live prudently and safely. With discretion, they could also minister to other Catholic families in the neighborhood. More lamented the slow erosion of this type of residence and its gradual metamorphosis into the first.[50] Perhaps the different "churches" delineated in the presentation were organized around the residence of the first family named (generally the most important in the region). There the Jesuit resided but traveled among the other families on a shorter missionary circuit. As the number decreased, the Society had to find some other way to remain mobile.

The English colleges in Spain became more turbulent after Persons's return to Rome in early 1596. The English College, Valladolid, had been bothered in the 1590s by the "defection" of different seminarians to the Benedictines. More still left after Rome approved a Benedictine mission to England in 1607. As we noted earlier, a Roman decision forbade Jesuits' impeding vocations to religious life. Other issues, some caused by the prickly Joseph Creswell as Persons's vice-prefect in Spain, troubled the colleges. Creswell, jealous of his authority, quickly interpreted any query as an affront. In 1604, he believed Francisco de Peralta (*c*.1554–1622), rector of the English College, Seville, had challenged his authority. English Jesuits at the college flocked to Creswell's side. Rumors circulated that Peralta's desire to restrict Creswell's influence and authority lay

50 Archivum Britannicum Societatis Iesu (henceforth ABSI), Anglia IV, 45 (translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 2:3–6). See also McCoog, *"And touching our society,"* 197–226.

behind the most recent modification of *Officium et regulae*. Persons carefully explained that Peralta had nothing to do with the change. More important, he and Acquaviva feared that such a vicious attack on such a highly esteemed and widely respected Spaniard would coalesce opposition to the prefecture. Persons reprimanded Creswell and transferred some of his faction. "Nothing hath more troubled our enemies both hereticks and emulators then our fast union amongst our selves," and by undermining that union, Persons admonished Creswell, he was threatening the mission.[51] Creswell was more than part of the problem. Provincial congregations in Castile and Andalusia in 1603 and 1604 raised questions about different aspects of the governance and practice of the English and Irish colleges. Implicitly, they wanted the end of the prefecture.[52]

Persons died at the English College, Rome, on April 15, 1610. One of his last visitors was Claudio Acquaviva. According to the superior general, Persons was "a martyr" whom he had known "for thirty-five years and [had] always held him for a saint."[53] In 1613, Spanish provincials submitted to Rome a joint memorial against the English prefecture (and perhaps by implication the Irish one, although there was considerably less friction between the Irish and the Spanish). On January 31, 1615, Acquaviva died. Without his protection, would the prefecture and English mission survive?

The Seventh General Congregation convened in Rome on November 5, 1615. A *postulatum* submitted by the Castile province concerned the "more illustrious missions," specifically the independent missions of England and Ireland.[54] Should men belonging to an illustrious mission but not ministering in the mission itself and dispersed through many provinces have their own superior? If so, must that superior be of their nationality? Should these Jesuits in other provinces be exempt from the authority of assistants, provincials, and local rectors? Should they be allowed to open colleges, novitiates, and houses of formation restricted to one nation? For forty years, since the election of Everard Mercurian in 1573 and the consequent facilitation of the return of many

51 Persons to Creswell, Naples, April 9 and 23, 1603, ABSI, Coll. P II, 423–24. See also McCoog, *"And touching our society,"* 261–81.

52 See McCoog, *Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1598–1606*, 537–41.

53 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "New Situations; New Structures?: Claudio Acquaviva and the Jesuit Mission to England," in *Claudio Acquaviva's Generalate (1581–1615) and the Emergence of Modern Catholicism*, ed. Pierre-Antoine Fabre and Flavio Rurale (Chestnut Hill, MA: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2017), 145–64.

54 ARSI, *Congr.* 55, fols. 9r–11v. See also Antonio Astráin, S.J., *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la asistencia de España*, 7 vols. (Madrid: Razón y Fe, 1902–25), 5:8. According to Astráin, Spanish concern for the missions prompted the *postulatum*; he mentioned nothing about England.

Spanish Jesuits to Iberia, some Jesuits denounced a pernicious national sentiment that threatened to destroy the "union of souls, the cornerstone of the entire edifice of the Society."[55]

After serious deliberation—a discussion without English and Irish input, because independent missions did not send delegates to general congregations—the assembly legislated on the issue. The congregation condemned division:

> [The introduction of] a distinction of nationalities [*nationum discrimina*], contrary to the mutual union of hearts and minds [...], it is more advantageous, given the customary acceptance of all nationalities in the Society, to intermix with others of the Society, lest national differences [*nationum discrimina*] be introduced to the great harm of the Society.

The fathers decided that exemptions benefited neither the mission nor the Society in general, for they "were inimical to the customs of the Society and the success of the missions."[56] The newly elected Muzio Vitelleschi (1563–1645, in office 1615–45) should oversee the immediate implementation of the decree. Vitelleschi, who had been twice rector of the English College, Rome (1592–94; 1597), must have realized the tragic implications of enforcement. The mission and its institutions would pass under the control of different provincials more concerned with local needs and colleges. English and Irish Jesuits would be subject to local provincials who need not automatically return them to their kingdoms. The future of these two "illustrious missions" would be precarious. With the repudiation of Acquaviva's *Officium et regulae*, both the occasionally modified English and Irish versions, foreign provincials would have effective control over the two missions. Spanish Jesuits had not succeeded in electing a Spaniard as superior general, but they did abolish the prefectures.

Some anonymous English Jesuit, most likely Thomas Owens (*c*.1556–1618), then rector of the English College, Rome, and prefect of the mission, raised numerous objections to the decree. Despite the absence of specific names, everyone, he contended, knew that the decree was directed principally against

---

55 Francisco de Borja Medina, S.J., "Everard Mercurian and Spain," in McCoog, *Mercurian Project*, 945–66, here 949. See also his "La quiebra del universalismos de la unión de los animos," in Ite inflammate omnia: *Selected Historical Papers from Conferences Held at Loyola and Rome in 2006*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2010), 321–41.

56 John W. Padberg, S.J., Martin D. O'Keefe, S.J., and John L. McCarthy, S.J., eds., *For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty Jesuit General Congregations* (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), 256–57, decree 21.

the English. Justice would have been better served if the English had in fact been named because they then might have had the opportunity to address any objections to its style of governance and prepare a defense. Instead, the mission's detractors waited until Acquaviva had died before they initiated their attack at a general congregation without any delegate knowledgeable enough to speak in the mission's defense. The English mission, he asserted, never insisted that it should be comprised solely of English Jesuits, but simply that it be governed by one of its own. Why should that be objectionable? Provinces were governed by their own members who had the province's best interests at heart. Why should not the same principle apply to missions? The decree also implied that the English had consistently asked to be exempt from the ordinary governance of assistants to the general and local provincials. Not true. Perhaps we could add "false news." The English simply sought a clear delineation of the authority and power of the prefect vis-à-vis local provincials. Finally, the author claimed that the congregation had confused a request by the seminarians that they have some English teachers with a demand that all their instructors be English.[57] But the protest did not alter the judgment. To the points in the anonymous memorial, the fathers (presumably a committee of the congregation) replied that it was simply not expedient for missions to have their own superior, that the mission should be subject to assistants and local provincials, and that they ought not to have their own professors, superiors, colleges, and novitiates.[58] Whoever drafted the brief rejoinder failed to grasp the point of the memorial and refused to authorize any compromise.

Post-congregational anxiety flooded the mission like a tsunami. In late 1616, an *apologia* for the mission was sent to Rome from England, most probably by Blount, then superior of the mission. The *apologia* was more a series of questions about the decree than a defense of the mission. The fundamental question asked whether England was in fact among the condemned missions. The prefecture style of governance had been erected by Acquaviva and approved by Pope Clement VIII. It had been effective—with minor adjustments—for eighteen years. The author could not believe that a congregation would legislate against a mission with such credentials. The "vindicator" conceded that the prefecture was a novel form, but wondered whether novelty was necessarily bad? What other options did the Society have if it wanted to act for the benefit of the mission? More important, the prefecture had worked and had been praised; English Jesuits themselves harbored no secret desire to segregate along national lines, nor did they believe that their prefecture did so

57 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/II, fol. 1r–v.
58 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/II, fol. 2r.

any more than the provinces of Italy, Spain, and France. The mission had its own novitiate and seminaries adequate for the study of the humanities, philosophy, and theology. Despite many obstacles, the mission has supported and sustained these institutions to the applause of English Catholics and without considerable inconvenience to other provinces. England had always differed from other missions in that it had never been dependent on any province. Yet, if one examined the size of the mission, the stability of its institutions, and the quality of its men, the mission was in better shape than some of the provinces (e.g., China). Acquaviva had set up the prefecture for the good of the Catholic Church, the Society, and the mission. The current attempt at dismantlement unwittingly allied the congregation with the English government, the English Established Church, the English heretics, and the anti-Jesuit Catholics. With Jesuit assistance, their goals had been achieved: Jesuits would be withdrawn from England and the mission.[59]

Vitelleschi was caught between Scylla and Charybdis. He could implement the decree as instructed by the congregation with possibly fatal repercussions on the mission. Or he could ignore the decree for the reasons expressed in the memorials and allow the mission to retain its current organization and, in so doing, risk almost certain outrage among the Spanish and Belgian Jesuits. His sympathies lay with the English. In May 1616, Owens explained carefully to Creswell, who was transferred to Belgium as vice-prefect in 1613 because of the hostility of Spanish Jesuits, that he must proceed prudently. Owens hoped that a scrupulous observance of the current instructions as formulated in the different modifications of *Officium et regulae* would benefit the mission. The rights of local rectors and provincials must always be acknowledged and respected but never to such an extent that those of the vice-prefects were diminished. Any concessions to rectors or provincials, Owens warned, would later be cited as precedents. Great care must, therefore, be exercised so that there were no grounds for complaints.[60] Owens later informed Creswell that Vitelleschi had confided to him that the mission could only be preserved if the current structure were retained.[61]

In April 1611, at the last Belgian provincial congregation before the division of the province into Flandro-Belgium and Gallo-Belgium, the assembly recommended that all English houses be situated in the same province even if that

59 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/II, fols. 3^{r}–8^{v}; 479^{r}–85^{v}.

60 Owen to Creswell, Rome, May 7, 1616 and May 21, 1616, Ghent, Rijksarchief Gent, Fonds Jezuieten 74, letters 2 and 3.

61 Owen to Creswell, Rome, July 2, 1616, Ghent, Rijksarchief Gent, Fonds Jezuieten 74, letter 4.

meant a forced migration. St. Omers was in the Gallo-Belgian province and Leuven in the Flandro-Belgian. Moreover, they asked that these English communities be placed under the provincial with the elimination of the prefecture. Acquaviva agreed to the first.[62] Acquaviva emphasized the importance of the English mission to the Society universal, and asked the two provincials to be patient with the English until they had decided in which province English institutions would be situated.[63] The Belgian provincials made their decision after the death of Acquaviva and before the convocation of the general congregation. The Gallo-Belgian province would be the site of English communities. In the summer of 1615, the English mission was transferring novices from Leuven to Liège and eventually to Watten.[64] A few years later, the Gallo-Belgian provincial complained to Vitelleschi that the English mission was still operating outside his jurisdiction by accepting novices without prior consultation with him.[65] In 1617, the German Jesuit Heinrich Scherer (1556–1637) paid an official visitation to both Belgian provinces to see how they had adjusted to the division. The English institutions were included in his brief.[66]

Vitelleschi's dilemma remained. The English were relocating to the Gallo-Belgian province. At Valladolid, the Castilian Jesuits regained the rectorship of the English College after three years under English administration. Local provincials were asserting their authority over English institutions. Henry More, the Jesuit historian previously cited, asserted that Vitelleschi's solution was the elevation of the mission into the more traditional vice-province. As a vice-province, England would be immune to congregational decrees concerning missions.[67]

Shortly after James ascended the English throne, he entered into negotiations with Spain to end the conflict and restore better relations. Catholics once again pinned their hopes to Spanish intercession. Surely toleration would be discussed and included in a treaty. The Treaty of London (1604) contained no such clause, but Spain promised to continue to work for Catholic alleviation. Of course, James did not label himself *pontifex maximus*, but he did consider

62 ARSI, *Congr.* 53, fols. 223^{r}–34^{v}.

63 Acquaviva to the Belgian provincials, Tivoli, April 14, 1612, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 26$^{r–v}$.

64 Ferdinand Alber, vicar general, to John Thompson (*vere* Gerard), Rome, August 29, 1615; same to Joseph Creswell, Rome, August 29, 1615, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 53^{r}; same to Creswell, Rome, October 31, 1615; same to Thompson, Rome, November 7, 1615, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, ol. 55^{v}.

65 Vitelleschi to Gerard, Rome, February 18, 1617, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 69^{v}.

66 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Seventeenth-Century Visitations of the Transmarine Houses of the English Province," in *With Eyes and Ears Open: The Role of Visitors in the Society of Jesus*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 96–125.

67 *Historia anglicanae provinciae Societatis Iesu* (St. Omers, 1660), 436–37.

himself a *pontifex* to bridge the early modern religious divide. James married his eldest daughter Elizabeth (later known as the Winter Queen [1596–1662]) to Frederick V (1596–1632), the Calvinist Elector Palatine. Frederick's subsequent acceptance of the Bohemian crown (1619), his defeat at the Battle of White Mountain (1620), and the subsequent Thirty Years' War (1618–48) intensified English fears of a resurgent Roman Catholicism and increased pressure on James that he aid the Protestant cause of his son-in-law as the king was proceeding with plans for the marriage of his son Charles (1600–49, r.1625–49) with the Spanish princess María Anna (1606–46). Discussion of the "match," which had begun in 1614, became serious in 1618.[68] Especially attractive was a large Spanish dowry. Yet again, Catholics expected toleration to be on the marital agenda. And the possibility of any concessions to Catholics added to the fears of English Protestants.

In the midst of the negotiations, Vitelleschi raised the possibility of the elevation of the mission to vice-provincial status in a letter to the Belgian provincials Charles Scribani (1561–1629) and Jean Heren (1561–1645) in April 1619. The mission, the superior general explained, was larger than other vice-provinces and indeed some provinces. The English considered their houses of formation essential and asked that they be transferred to the new vice-province.[69] I could find no record of Heren's reaction, but Scribani objected strongly to the proposal.[70] Vitelleschi did not rebut each argument: he had consulted his advisers and had made his decision. He hoped that Scribani would eventually see the wisdom of the decision. Until that day arrived, the superior general asked nothing more than he offer up the inconvenience for the good of the Society. Vitelleschi did, however, grant Scribani's request that the last English institution in his province (the house of studies in Leuven) be transferred to the Gallo-Belgian province. But that could not be done immediately.[71] As the superior general explained to English Jesuit John Salisbury (*c*.1575–1626), he was following the earlier examples of China, Japan, Sardinia, and others by converting the mission into a vice-province.[72] In July

68 These negotiations may explain why Archbishop David Kearney (d.1624) of Cashel asked Acquaviva to urge the pope to press for liberty of conscience in the three kingdoms but especially in Ireland. See Kearney to Acquaviva, Cashel, September 30, 1619, Dublin, Irish Jesuit Archives, MSS B 15.

69 Vitelleschi to Heren, Rome, April 27, 1619, ARSI, *Gal. Belg.* 1/I–II, 495–96.

70 Scribani to Vitelleschi, June 7, 1619, ABSI, 46/24/1 (Morris Transcripts), 287–95.

71 Vitelleschi to Scribani, Rome, July 13, 1619, ARSI, *Fl. Belg.* 3, 587–88. See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "The Establishment of the English Province of the Society of Jesus," *Recusant History* 17 (1984): 121–39.

72 Vitelleschi to Salisbury, Rome, September 7, 1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 112^{v}.

1619, England became a vice-province with Blount as vice-provincial. English Jesuits testified to Rome how well received this news was among the Catholics:

> [The news] raised the courage of Catholics at home, at the same time that it gave great annoyance to our adversaries; it has also brought such credit to this Society in the eyes of all ranks in England, that admission into it has never been more eagerly sought by members of the best and most noble families. Hence not a few entirely new friendships have been formed in houses of good position, and the favour has been gained of many who had been alienated from us. So great an impulse was given to the desires both of secular priests already in England, and of some of the most promising students in English seminaries abroad, that they might be admitted into the Society, that since all could not be received, it was very difficult to reject any without giving offence. The new arrangement has, moreover, given fresh energy to those who are struggling with the difficulties of their work in the English vineyard, and gathering in a fresh harvest in spite of the rage of the heretics.[73]

Popular exuberance could not disguise the loss suffered as the prefecture evolved into a vice-province. The English institutions in the Low Countries, specifically St. Omers, Liège, and Leuven, although in flux geographically, remained part of the vice-province. However, the English colleges in Seville, Valladolid, and Rome did not. I know of no satisfactory explanation for their exclusion. If only the two Spanish colleges had been omitted, one could interpret their omission as an expedient price paid to assuage Spanish hostility. But that should have had no bearing on Rome. Perhaps their nature as national colleges administered but not owned by English Jesuits, colleges not necessary for the future vitality of the vice-province, is a more probable explanation.

As the vice-province took shape, Vitelleschi recommended that the English not convene a vice-provincial congregation. Blount argued the opposite: a congregation convened and held demonstrated the discreet freedom the English Jesuits possessed. Fearful that danger continued despite English Jesuit denial, Vitelleschi allowed the vice-provincial to appoint a procurator instead of having one elected at the congregation.[74] Apparently that is what happened. Henry

73 Annual Letter of 1619, ABSI, 46/24/1 (Morris Transcripts), 429–537 (printed and translated in *Letters and Notices* 58 [1878]: 273–88; 59 [1879]: 76–83; and Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:987–99).

74 General to Blount, Rome, August 24, 1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/1, fols. 109^{v}–10^{r}; same to same, Rome, September 7, 1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/1, fol. 111^{v}; same to John Percy, Rome, September 7,

Silesdon (*vere* Bedingfeld [*c.*1582–1659]), procurator of the vice-province, traveled to Rome sometime in late 1620 or early 1621. He carried two memorials, the first from the vice-provincial and his consultors, and the second from the vice-provincial himself. Most of the first dealt with the organization and government of the vice-province. The vice-provincial and his consultors wondered whether some permanent arrangement should be made by which the vice-provincial delegated authority to a vicar in each half of the province, someone who would act in emergencies when the vice-provincial himself was on the other side of the channel. Similarly, they asked whether there should be two sets of consultors, one set on each side of the channel. But the final request was the most important: they asked that Vitelleschi complete the good work that he had started by establishing England as a full province.[75] The private memorial requested Edward Knott (*vere* Matthew Wilson [*c.*1582–1656]) as his socius, and a replacement for Creswell as vice-provincial consultor, because he was too distant to be of much use.[76]

The superior general responded on April 24, 1621. Although no one desired England's elevation to provincial status more than Vitelleschi, he could not grant the petition. With the exception of the college and the houses of formation in the Low Countries, the vice-province had no stable residences in England. The absence of such residences suggested a lack of stability despite protests to the contrary from the vice-province. Until such stability was demonstrated, the general could not grant the request. Moreover, he added almost as an aside, he doubted that the vice-province would be able to convene the required provincial congregations. He did, however, grant the other petitions: he authorized the vice-provincial to designate someone in England to act as his vicar during his absence, illness, or imprisonment. The rector of the English house in Leuven would serve as his vicar in Belgium.[77] Vitelleschi agreed too that there should be two sets of consultors. Regarding the private memorial, the general denied Blount's request for Knott because, Vitelleschi claimed, he

---

1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 112^{r}; same to John Salisbury, Rome, September 7, 1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 112^{v}; same to Richard Banks, Rome, September 7, 1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 113^{r}.

75 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/II, fols. 129^{r}–30^{v}.

76 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/II, fol. 133$^{r–v}$.

77 The English College at Leuven was implicitly at least designated the vice-province's *collegium maximum*, whose rector always acted as vicar unless someone else was clearly designated. See Padberg, O'Keefe, and McCarthy, *For Matters of Greater Moment*, 182, decree 56. The Fourth General Congregation (1581) specified the superior of the professed house as vicar (or vice-provincial). In provinces without a professed house, the rector of the *collegium maximum* would act in that role.

was needed in Rome. As for Creswell, he should be replaced if distance prevented him from playing an active role.[78]

In 1622, as negotiations for the Spanish Match progressed, James demonstrated his intentions concerning tolerance to a suspicious Spain by suspending—not repealing because that required parliamentary approval—the penal laws to the excitement and delight of Catholics and the quasi-apocalyptic anxieties of Protestants. To the shock and anger of many English, instead of assisting his routed son-in-law Frederick to resist Habsburg, Counter-Reformation campaigns, James was preoccupied with the marriage of his son and heir into the same family. As preachers, poets, and playwrights denounced the royal tactics with varying shades of ambiguity, James restricted topics that ministers could treat in sermons.[79]

Within England, the vice-province was divided into eleven distinct missions: London, York, Lancashire, Leicester, Wales, Northampton, Hampshire, Lincoln, Suffolk, Worcester, and Stafford. Each had its own superior. Perhaps future research will disclose the earlier configurations around spiritual prefects evolved thus with the prefects becoming superiors. In the Spanish Netherlands, Archduke Albert (1559–1621, r.1598–1621), after years of opposing English Jesuit efforts to open a house at Watten—perhaps in deference to King James—finally granted permission shortly before his death. The novitiate was transferred from Liège to Watten circa 1623/24; the scholasticate moved from Leuven to Liège in compliance with the earlier promise. Anne Dacre Howard (1557–1630), countess of Arundel and widow of Philip Howard (1557–95), provided a generous endowment for a tertianship in Ghent in 1621. One wonders why this tertianship was set up in Ghent in the Flandro-Belgian province after Scribani's plea that all English houses be transferred? Had the prohibition ended with the close of Scribani's provincialate? Or was the tertianship's residence in Ghent expected to be short term? Once Catholicism had been restored or at least tolerated in England after the marriage, the tertianship would be moved to Carlisle.

Marital discussions proceeded at a snail's pace, especially after the death of King Philip III (1578–1621, r.1598–1621) and the subsequent loss of influence of the Spanish ambassador to England, Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, count of Gondomar (1567–1626), principal proponent of the marriage. The tactic, however, kept England out of the Thirty Years' War. To advance the discussion,

78 The responses are dated April 24 and May 4, ARSI, *Angl.* 32/I, fols. 127^{r}–28^{v}, 135^{r}–36^{r}. See also Vitelleschi to Blount, Rome, April 17, 1621 and April 21, 1621, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fols. 135^{r}–36^{r}.

79 See James, *Poets, Players, and Preachers*, 152–53, 200–1.

Prince Charles and George Villiers (1592–1628), marquis and later duke of Buckingham, embarked on their secret embassy to Madrid under the names of Thomas and John Smith. On July 20, 1623, James and his privy councilors took an oath that they would repeal the penal laws and never restore them. In August, the king agreed to issue a general pardon, under the Great Seal, which any recusant convicted within the past five years could use. Charles was back in England by October.[80]

As the marriage negotiations stalled, changes important for English Catholicism were taking place. On June 22, 1622, Pope Gregory XV (1554–1623, r.1621–23) established the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith with the bull *Inscrutabili divinae*. The congregation exercised general jurisdiction over the Catholic Church's missions, which included England, Scotland, and Ireland. The three kingdoms had formerly been under the Congregation of the Holy Office. In February 1623, Gregory heeded appeals for an English bishop, appeals that intensified after the death of the third archpriest William Harrison (1553–1621) with the appointment of William Bishop as bishop of Chalcedon.[81] Bishop was consecrated in Paris in June and left for England in July. John Williams (1582–1650), bishop of Lincoln, informed Buckingham of the bishop's arrival on August 3:

> Dr. Bishop, the new bishop of Chalcedon, is come to London privately and I am much troubled thereabouts, not knowing what to advise H. M. in this posture as things stand at the present. If you were shipped [with the infanta] the only counsel were to let the judges proceed with them presently, hang him out of the way, and the King to blame my lord of Cantuar. [George Abbot (1562–1633)] or myself for it. But before you be shipped in such form and manner I dare not assent or connive at such a course. It is a most insolent part and an offence, as I take it, against our common law (and not the statutes only, which are dispenses withal) for an Englishman to take such a consecration without the King's consent,

80 For a more detailed treatment, see Glyn Redworth, *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), and the fascinating correspondence regarding the marriage edited by Michael C. Questier in *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics, 1621–1625* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

81 The vicars apostolic, like the archpriests, were given authority over the vestiges of the Roman Church in Scotland, but as Peter F. Anson (1889–1975) observes, "none of them, however, appears to have concerned himself with the religious affairs of the Sister Kingdom" (*Underground Catholicism in Scotland 1622–1878* [Montrose: Standard Press, 1970], 11). The few secular clergy in Scotland protested the nomination of an English man but to no avail.

> and especially to use any episcopal jurisdiction in this Kingdom without the royal assent, and bishops have been in this State put to their fine and ransom for doing so, three hundred years ago.[82]

William Bishop profited from the diplomatic negotiations and fears that any action would rebound on Prince Charles in Spain by organizing the English Roman Catholic Church along traditional lines: in September, he established a chapter of twenty-four canons under a dean, and divided the kingdom into archdeaconries and deaneries. His death in April 1624 prevented further developments.

English Jesuits were also active. In May 1622, John Percy (alias Fisher) engaged in theological debates with Protestant theologians including William Laud (1573–1645), future archbishop of Canterbury, often in the presence of the king. Percy or "Fisher the Jesuit" was reconciling prominent figures to Catholicism, one of whom was Buckingham's mother Mary Villiers, countess of Buckingham (*c.*1570–1632). The discussions were held to prevent the countess's conversion. Both sides, of course, claimed victory in subsequent publications, but the countess did become a Roman Catholic.[83] The debates began almost immediately after the closure of the Jesuit vice-provincial congregation.

The vice-province held its congregation at the residence of the French ambassador in Blackfriars, London, from May 14th to the 18th.[84] Thirty-nine

---

82 As cited in Godfrey Anstruther, O.P., *The Seminary Priests*, 4 vols. (Ware: St. Edmund's College, 1968–77), 1:38.

83 See Timothy H. Wadkins, "King James I Meets John Percy, S.J. (12 May, 1622): An Unpublished Manuscript from the Religious Controversies Surrounding the Countess of Buckingham's Conversion," *Recusant History* 19 (1988): 146–54; Wadkins, "The Percy–'Fisher' Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622–1625," *Church History* 57 (1988): 153–69, and his unpublished doctoral thesis "Theological Polemic and Religious Culture in Early Stuart England: The Percy/'Fisher' Controversies, 1605–41" (Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1988). See also George Tavard, *The Seventeenth-Century Tradition: A Study in Recusant Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 38–44, and Thomas H. Clancy, S.J., *A Literary History of the English Jesuits: A Century of Books 1615–1714* (San Francisco: Catholic Scholars Press, 1996), 56–60.

84 This was also the site of the so-called "Doleful Evensong" during which on October 26, 1623 more than one hundred were killed when the floor of the chapel collapsed during a sermon. See Alexandra Walsham, "'The fatall vesper': Providentialism and Anti-popery in Late Jacobean London," *Past & Present* 144 (1994): 36–87. The novitiate migrated periodically. By February 1627, it was situated in Clerkenwell. In March 1628, it was raided, papers were seized, and Jesuits imprisoned. All were eventually released. See Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 1:109–14; John G. Nichols, ed., "The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1627/8," in *Camden Society Miscellany II* (London: Camden Society, 1853), 21–64.

Jesuits attended—one short of the number specified in the Society's legislation. Four Jesuits, who should have attended, were excused. The congregation elected Silesdon as procurator with John Worthington (*c.*1572–1652) his substitute. After a long discussion, the congregation decided there were no valid reasons for the convocation of a general congregation and instructed the procurator to vote accordingly.[85] The assembly then turned toward the major issue—a petition for full provincial status.[86] Convinced that the general had denied their earlier request for provincial status because he was familiar with the communities and ministries of English Jesuits in Belgium and relatively ignorant of the same in England, they wanted to remedy this with due discretion, of course, because of the need for secrecy. In 1622, the vice-province numbered 240 Jesuits: 199 were priests and fifty-six were professed, that is, Jesuits who had pronounced the fourth vow, with more expected in the immediate future because of the quality of the men recently ordained or in formation. On the continent, in addition to a regular college, the vice-province had opened a novitiate, a scholasticate (combined theologate and philosophate), and most recently a tertianship. Thus it could train and form its own candidates for the Society. The 130 fathers within England and Wales were governed by twelve immediate superiors. Each had jurisdiction for a specific region, some of which encompassed more than one county. These larger regions could be subdivided at some time in the future. For the moment, these regions were simply called "missions" out of fear of detection if anything more specific was named. Yet within each mission, there were residences and houses. The author did not explain the difference between the two, but the former seem to be sites where Jesuits worked and lived on a quasi-permanent basis and the latter, sites visited regularly on a missionary circuit. At some residences, Jesuits educated a small number of children. Every mission included one house, whether owned and operated by the Society is not clear, where the fathers could make their annual retreats and renew their vows. The missions lacked endowments and

85 What say a procurator from a vice-province had in the determination of a general congregation is not clear. The congregation of procurators voted on that issue, but a procurator from a vice-province had not sat in that congregation. He simply explained the state and condition of the vice-province in a personal meeting with the superior general. Perhaps during that conversation he intended to mention the vice-province's vote. On the restricted influence of a vice-provincial procurator, see superior general to Richard Blount, Rome, March 26, 1622, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/1, fols. 154^{v}–55^{r}.

86 ARSI, *Congr* 57, fols. 44^{r}–49^{v}, 52^{r}–54^{v}; ARSI, *Angl.* 32/1, fols. 102^{r}–4^{v} (translated as "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province," *Letters and Notices* 18 [1835–86]: 344–51; Henry More, "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province [Being a Translation of Book X Sections 1, 3, 6 of his *Historia*]," *Letters and Notices* 18 [1835–86]: 407–12).

guaranteed annual income not because of the paucity of benefactors but because of the complicated arrangements that needed to be devised and worked out whereby such benefactions could be protected from confiscation due to English law. Until then, the missions had more than sufficient alms for their support. Arrangements for the transfer of foundations were well advanced for three of the English missions. Given the number, nature, and quality of the institutions, and the number of Jesuits, both ordained and in formation, and, indeed, the ability to convoke a congregation, the vice-province argued that another refusal to elevate it to full provincial status would demoralize the men and discourage future benefactors. Two possible endowments had already been lost, and others, deferred because of an apprehension, created by the Society's enemies, that English Jesuits were not acknowledged as being "true sons of the Society." Moreover, these detractors added, the vice-province was an experiment that most likely would be ended at the next general congregation or at the death of the current superior general. Whoever was the source of these rumors must have known of Scribani's complaints. The donors needed reassurance. The older men working in England under the most difficult circumstances have been denied for too long any say in the election of a superior general and participation at a general congregation.

The previous application for provincial status, the memorial continued, was denied, because the Jesuits seemed incapable of establishing residences in the kingdom itself. Since then, benefactors have offered endowments for three colleges. These donors, despite financial hardships and recusant fines, have been consistently generous toward the Society. Their generosity should not be frustrated but rewarded with a change in status. An increased number of candidates for the Society, the payment of old debts, a more efficient organization, and a congregation followed the mission's elevation to a vice-province. One could only dream of the wonderful consequences that would follow provincial status!

The congregation's other *postulata* were wide-ranging. The fathers petitioned the general to bestow authority on the twelve superiors within England. They also sought permission to open a residence at Spa in the Low Countries. There, they could minister to the English who regularly took the waters there and serve as chaplains to English soldiers. The assembly also expressed some anxieties about the governance of the Spanish seminaries, and asked the general to look into problems. The opposition of the Spanish monarchy prevented the general from nominating Englishmen as rectors. The congregation informed Vitelleschi of the damage being done to the reputation of the Society because of the association of some English Jesuits with the controversial Mary Ward and her efforts to found a religious congregation of women along the

lines of the Society of Jesus.[87] Finally, they asked the general to appoint someone to write a history of the mission.

Shortly after the congregation, the vice-provincial sent to Rome more detailed descriptions of the three recently founded communities. Unnamed benefactors had provided foundations for three houses in England along with furnishing for these houses and their chapels. They recommended that one become a novitiate for secular priests so that they could enter the Society without leaving England, and the other two, schools for students unable to travel to the continent. Surplus revenue could be used to support Jesuit scholastics on the continent. Perhaps in anticipation of the general's reaction, Blount emphasized that the donors would not allow their benefactions to be transferred to houses already established outside the kingdom.[88] A second document explained how the foundations could be hidden and annual revenues protected from the English government. Even during periods of acute persecution, the English Jesuits were able to collect revenues from properties owned by their colleges on the continent. Throughout the Elizabethan period, secular clergy had no difficulty in the collection of their pensions and legacies. In fact, the author asserted that the penal laws themselves could be evaded through the clever use of trusts. Over the years, Catholic lawyers, anticipating their less scrupulous successors with today's shell corporations and offshore accounts, had devised a carefully constructed system of trusts to disguise actual ownership to protect the foundations.[89]

The vice-provincial's arguments convinced the general. Even though he personally preferred that the foundations offered be used to pay off the vice-province's debts, he ordered that letters patent be drafted for the official acceptance of the two colleges and the house of probation. To conceal the identities of the donors to reduce risk of their discovery, Vitelleschi ordered that the letters patent be made out to Ignatius Philopatrum, Aloysius Germanus, and Francis Philopatrum as the founders of the House of Probation of St. Ignatius, the College of Blessed (later Saint) Aloysius, and the College

87 Mary Ward's life, fascinating as it is, is outside the scope of this article. Suffice it to note: "Though some Jesuits assisted her, many others were hostile. Memorials with complaints from the English secular clergy, many of whom were bitterly opposed to the Jesuits and to anyone connected with them, had been reaching Rome since 1622 […]" (Christina Kenworthy-Browne, C.J., ed., *Mary Ward 1585–1645* [Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Catholic Record Society, 2008], xii). See also Laurence Lux-Sterritt, "An Analysis of the Controversy Caused by Mary Ward's Institute in the 1620s," *Recusant History* 25 (2001): 636–47; Questier, *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics*.

88 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/1, fol. 96^{r}.

89 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/1, fols. 109^{r}–10^{v}, 114^{r}–15^{v}. See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "The Creation of the First Jesuit Communities in England," *Heythrop Journal* 28 (1987): 40–56.

of St. Francis Xavier.[90] Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Xavier had been canonized on March 12, 1622, only eight months earlier, so these may have been among the first Jesuit communities named after them. Vitelleschi approved the elevation of the vice-province and named Blount provincial on January 21, 1623.[91] The general's detailed reply to the memorial and the *postulata* followed on February 8.[92] He could no longer deny provincial status to England because of its recent achievements. He granted the ordinary authority due to rectors of colleges and superiors of residences to the heads of the missions. The exact details he left to the provincial. Regarding the requested residence in Spa, he could not grant the requested permission because of the unspecified dangers to morals that might follow permanent residence. But, he granted, fathers could minister there during the season. He similarly opposed an exclusively English community in Brussels. He encouraged their ministry as military chaplains and recommended that the provincial supply as many men as possible for this important work. The chaplains should live in "some respectable lodging in secular dress." The style of dress adapted by English Jesuits on the continent persistently irritated Belgian Jesuits.[93] Vitelleschi lauded the province's concern for the Society's reputation and ratified its hope that its history, a glorious chapter in the annals of the Society, would be written.

Hope for a Spanish match faded as negotiations collapsed. James then turned toward France in his search for his son's wife. Charles married Princess Henrietta Maria (1609–69) in June 1625, a few months after his accession to the throne upon the death of James. By the same year, the English province had twelve colleges and residences within the kingdom: the House of Probation of St. Ignatius (London; later the College of St. Ignatius); the College of St. Francis Xavier (Wales; later subdivided into the College of St. Francis Xavier [South Wales] and the Residence of St. Winefrid [North Wales], *c.*1685);[94] the College of Blessed (later Saint) Aloysius Gonzaga (Lancashire

90 General to Richard Blount, Rome, August 20, 1622, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fols. 161^{v}–62^{r}; same to same, Rome, November 26, 1622, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 165^{v}; ARSI, *Hist. Soc.* 134, fol. 91$^{r–v}$.

91 General to Richard Blount, Rome, January 21, 1623, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fols. 167^{v}–68^{r}.

92 ARSI, *Angl.* 32/I, fols. 125^{r}–26^{r} (translated and published in "Erection of the Vice-Province," 351–53).

93 See McCoog, "Seventeenth-Century Visitations."

94 On this important college and the Society in Wales, see McCoog, "Society of Jesus in Wales"; Hannah Thomas, "Missioners on the Margins? The Territorial Headquarters of the Welsh Jesuit College of St. Francis Xavier at the Cwm, *c.*1600–1679," *Recusant History* 32 (2014): 173–93; Thomas, "The Society of Jesus in Wales, *c.*1600–1679: Rediscovering the Cwm Jesuit Library at Hereford Cathedral," *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 1, no. 4 (2014): 572–88; Thomas, "'Books which are necessary for them': Reconstructing a Jesuit Missionary Library in Wales and the English Borderlands, ca. 1600–1679," in *Publishing Subversive*

and Staffordshire; subdivided into the College of Blessed Aloysius and the Residence of St. Chad [Staffordshire] in 1661 and erected as a college in 1670); the Residence of St. Michael (Yorkshire); the Residence of St. Anne (later the College of the Immaculate Conception, Leicestershire, 1632); the Residence of St. Mary (Northamptonshire and Oxfordshire); the Residence of St. Thomas of Canterbury (Hampshire; later the College of St. Thomas of Canterbury, *c*.1675); the Residence of St. Dominic (Lincolnshire; later the College of St. Hugh, *c*.1675); the Residence of Blessed Francis Borgia (Suffolk, later the College of the Holy Apostles, 1633); the Residence of St. George (Worcestershire and Warwickshire); the Residence of Blessed (later Saint) Stanislaus Kostka (Devon); and the Residence of St. John (Durham).

Christopher Holywood remained superior of Jesuits in Ireland until his death in 1626. In Clonmel in 1604, shortly after his long-delayed arrival in Ireland, he convened a gathering of the Jesuits in the kingdom. Each reported the good work accomplished: cattle rustling stopped in Tipperary, wives were reconciled to their husbands in Limerick where a hospice for the poor was also opened. Jesuits expanded their ministries into Galway, and Connaught. David Galway (*c*.1575–1634) single-handedly conducted a mission in the Inner Hebrides in 1619. With the Flight of the Earls (1607), the mission became less engaged politically and more involved sacramentally: "No politics. No conspiracies. No tramping around with armies or scurrying off to continental courts in search of funds for insurrection. Just priests serving the people in priestly ways."[95] Unlike England, Ireland retained a traditional ecclesiastical hierarchy even if the prelates found the exercise of authority difficult, and often had to hide in undignified settings. At times, they could not prevent tension and conflict among the many religious flooding the island and the diocesan clergy. Persecution rarely extended beyond the Pale, but occasionally Jesuits could not "sleep securely without fear of our pursuers who are hunting for us day and night. […] We are most secure when we are in the mountains, bogs, lakes, caves and such places." Holywood himself explained his long epistolary silence, because he "was obliged to go to remote parts in order to keep clear of the more than usually troublesome presence of our adversaries."[96] By the year

Texts in Elizabethan England and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, ed. Teresa Bela, Clarinda Calma, and Jolanta Rzegocka (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 110–28.

95 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 40–41. The mission's lack of involvement in more political matters might have resulted from Holywood's unwillingness to allow Archer to return to Ireland. See superior general to Holywood, Rome, November 26, 1615, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/1, fol. 56r.

96 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 41–42.

of Holywood's death, 1626, there were forty-two Jesuits in Ireland, organized around regional superiors.[97]

Scots Jesuits assumed the administration of the college in Rome around 1615. The few Jesuits working within Scotland relied on their noble protectors to withstand the wrath of the Kirk. In 1610, Acquaviva asked the Irish Jesuit superior whether the mission could offer a few missionaries for the Scottish Highlands. Two years later, Holywood allowed Galway to work in the Gaelic-speaking Hebrides. Galway's mission was brief; no Jesuit succeeded him.[98] John Ogilvie (1579–1615) was the only Jesuit martyred, although others suffered deprivation, loneliness, and exile. Ogilvie was martyred in Glasgow on March 10, 1615.[99] Despite the presence of some occasionally conforming Catholics in the Scottish government, persecution continued. Around the time that the English mission/prefecture was elevated into a vice-province, the Scottish mission was reorganized. Years later, in September 1633, John Leslie (?–1635) thanked Vitelleschi for saving the mission. Sixteen years earlier, Vitelleschi "founded this Mission, or restored it, or began it anew, when the old one was abolished and had become extinct." As general, he consistently sent missionaries, and strengthened their theological and moral doctrines (we shall return to this).[100] Jesuits did not flood the missionary field. In 1623, as Scottish Catholics also anticipated the benefits of the Spanish Match, there were four Jesuits in Scotland, two in the north and two in the south.[101]

Charles I delayed the opening of Parliament until his marriage had been concluded out of fear that many members would raise strident objections to it. He assured then, more than slightly disingenuously, that he had not promised King Louis XIII (1601–43, r.1610–43) any concessions to Catholics in exchange for the hand of his sister Henrietta Maria. The French Bourbons favored the Jesuits after Henry IV allowed them to return to the realm in 1603, and continued to do so even after many critics blamed the Society for Henry's assassination in 1610. Henrietta Maria, nonetheless, was prevented from including

97 Perhaps in imitation of the earlier English Jesuit practice, Holywood wanted to call these men "spiritual prefects," but Vitelleschi disapproved and wanted Holywood to conform to the Society's Institute by calling them superiors. See superior general to Holywood, Rome, May 25, 1624, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 1^{v}–2^{r}.

98 Hanson, *Underground Catholicism*, 18–19.

99 On Ogilvie, see David MacLeod, "Declining His Majesty's Authority: Treason Revisited in the Case of John Ogilvie," in *Scotland's Long Reformation: New Perspectives on Scottish Religion, c.1500–c.1660*, ed. John McCallum (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 179–201.

100 William Forbes-Leith, S.J., *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), 158, 159.

101 William Leslie to Muzio Vitelleschi, February 4, 1623 as published in Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics*, 348–49.

them among her chaplains when she arrived from France. Instead, Oratorians accompanied her.

An irate Parliament suspicious of the king's religious intentions reduced its subsidies to the king and agitated for the enforcement of the penal laws. An expedition against Cádiz in 1626, organized partly in revenge for the failure of the Spanish Match and partly to assist indirectly his brother-in-law Frederick against the Habsburgs, failed dismally and increased popular and parliamentary outrage against the duke of Buckingham whom they held responsible for the fiasco. Charles impeded impeachment proceedings by arresting two leaders in May and finally dissolving Parliament in June. To reduce expenditure and possibly to reduce the irritating courtly face of Catholicism, Charles dismissed the queen's Oratorians in the summer of 1626. Buckingham led England to a second dismal defeat when his attempt to assist the Huguenots in La Rochelle failed in October 1627. Wishing to avoid another Parliament, Charles raised the necessary funds through "forced loans." The "Five Knights' Case" in November judged that the king's prerogative permitted the imprisonment of individuals refusing to pay these loans. But the funds were not sufficient. In March 1628, Charles called his third Parliament. Two months later, it presented him with its "Petition of Right," which, among other things, demanded that the king admit that he could not impose taxes without parliamentary approval nor imprison without due process. Charles acceded to the petition in June. By the end of the month, he had prorogued Parliament and again levied taxes without Parliament. Buckingham was assassinated in Portsmouth on August 23, 1628. *Post hoc* and probably *propter hoc* the death of Buckingham, relations between the king and queen improved: their first child, Prince Charles James, duke of Cornwall and Rothesay, was born in May 1629 but lived only a day.

Charles reconvened Parliament in January 1629 but first adjourned and later dissolved it in March after further attacks on his policies including a demand for further action against Catholicism. Without Parliament, Charles made peace with Spain and France. Without Parliament, Charles embarked on his eleven-year "personal rule." To satisfy the queen, he allowed French Capuchins to replace the dismissed Oratorians. They arrived in February 1630.

The English province convened its first congregation in London in February 1625, around a month before the death of James and two months before the arrival of Richard Smith, bishop of Chalcedon. Smith, the former agent of the secular clergy in Rome, was consecrated in Paris the previous January. The congregational minutes do not mention the bishop; he became a problem later. Edward Knott (*vere* Matthew Wilson) was elected procurator and instructed to vote against the convocation of a general congregation. With the exception of the perennial problems of occasional conformity and the oath of

allegiance, the assembled fathers were more concerned with internal, domestic issues: the improvement of finances and the condition of the Spanish colleges. Vitelleschi promised to do what he could to improve relations between the English and the Spanish provinces lest the seminaries there deteriorate even further. To the dismay of the English Jesuits, the new Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith had imposed an oath at all pontifical colleges including the English College, Rome. All students promised to return to their country upon the completion of their studies and not to enter any religious order or congregation within three years of their return without papal permission.[102] Vitelleschi commiserated with the English but made it clear that he could do nothing to alter the oath. Hoping to present a united front against proponents of the oath of allegiance and occasional conformity, the provincial congregation asked Vitelleschi to exercise extreme caution in the selection of men for England. He should not allow anyone to enter the kingdom without a prior warning, and presumably a consequent promise, that he must not depart from the provincial consensus on these crucial issues. The general agreed to this.[103] One wonders what prompted this request? Had a non-English Jesuit surfaced in some capacity or other and advocated either the oath of occasional conformity? For reasons not specified in the documents, neither Knott nor his substitute was able to attend the congregation of procurators convened in November 1625. English absence disturbed Vitelleschi. Having exercised his prerogative by establishing the England province, he was annoyed that an English delegate failed to attend the first congregation of procurators to which they had the right of attendance. He anticipated that the procurators of some unnamed provinces opposed to England's provincial status would make much of their absence and employ it in their arguments that the experiment had failed. Vitelleschi hoped that the English would not rue their non-participation.[104]

Almost upon arrival, Bishop Richard Smith ignited a controversy with his demand that all religious priests within England and Wales obtain faculties from him to exercise their priesthood. Smith thus presumed to have the power and authority of an ordinary bishop. But as the religious, especially

102 Scottish Jesuits also protested the new oath, because "it proved an efficient check to […] [their] recruiting activities." As noted above, Vitelleschi preferred to stay out of that battle. On the basis of registers of the Scots colleges, seminarians abandoned their studies before ordination—and thus evaded the oath—and entered the Society. See Malcolm V. Hay, ed., *The Blairs Papers* (*1603–1660*) (London: Sands & Company, 1929), 131–35.

103 ARSI, *Congr.* 59, fols. 111r–21v.

104 General to Richard Blount, Rome, January 17, 1626, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 226r–v; same to John Norton (*vere* Knatchbull), Rome, January 17, 1626, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 226v–27r; same to Edward Alacambe (*vere* Astlow), Rome, January 17, 1626, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 227r–v.

the Benedictines and Jesuits reminded him, he was not. Smith, they pointed out, was a vicar apostolic with authority delegated by the pope. Since the religious already possessed faculties from the pope, they had no need to obtain them from his delegate. Smith questioned the licitity and validity of the confessions heard by clergy without faculties from him. Smith's aspersions moved the dispute from the clerical corridors into the Catholic public forum as lay penitents worried about their sins and their salvation.[105]

Three issues concerned the English Jesuits in early 1628. The first was handled easily and quickly. Maximilian I, duke of Bavaria (1573–1651, r.1597–1651), flush with Catholic victories during the Thirty Years' War, reendowed the financially troubled English college in Liège. The English wanted the universal Society—and not just one segment of it—to express its profound gratitude for the duke's generosity. Vitelleschi did so cheerfully. A few years later, the English province requested a similar letter of gratitude to Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand II (1578–1637, r.1619–37) for the English college that he intended to establish in Osnabrück with monastic properties restored to the Catholic Church but not to their original owners.[106] Around this time, as English Catholics entertained proposals of emigration and colonization, English Jesuits proposed that some accompany them in order to convert the Amerindians. Vitelleschi reacted less enthusiastically than the English had hoped: he did not wish to dampen their zeal but recommended that the provincial and his consultors obtain more information and then discuss the mission. The third issue was the most complicated: what could be done to prevent further deterioration of relations between the province and the bishop. The general did not know how he could improve the situation, but he promised to try.[107]

Pope Urban VIII (1568–1644, r.1623–44) ended the acrimonious conflict with a decision in favor of Smith's opponents in the brief *Britannia* in May 1631. Smith fled England to his patron, Armand Jean du Plessis, Cardinal Richelieu (1585–1642), when some of his opponents intimated that they would aid his apprehension. Once more, England lacked a Catholic bishop but had a cathedral

105 Muzio Vitelleschi feared that the conflict between the vicar apostolic and the religious orders would have repercussions on relations between the Irish bishops and the Jesuits. See superior general to William Malone, Rome, December 25, 1627, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 13^{r}.

106 ARSI, *Congr.* 62, fols. 238^{r}–43^{v}. See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Spoils of War? The Edict of Restitution and Benefactions to the English Province of the Society of Jesus," in *Jesuit Intellectual and Physical Exchange between England and Mainland Europe, c.1580–1789: "The world is our house?,"* ed. James E. Kelly and Hannah Thomas (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 186–209.

107 ARSI, *Congr.* 60, fols. 274^{r}–80^{v}.

chapter of dubious canonical status, for English Jesuits, a problem waiting to happen.[108]

For more than fifty years, anti-popery had become an integral part of the national narrative.[109] God's providence had preserved Queen Elizabeth from plots and conspiracies, and succored his godly people against the Armada, and the combined power of the Roman Church and the Spanish Empire. He too protected James, the royal family, and the political nation during the Gunpowder Plot. Fears and anxieties, however, remained. James's pursuit of a Catholic wife for his son and his refusal to assist his son-in-law Frederick increased popular apprehension. Horrified by Catholic victories on the continent and the dismissal of the latest Protestant champion king Christian IV of Denmark (1577–1648, r.1588–1648) in 1629, Protestants feared the destruction of their church. As evidence, they could cite James's and Charles's preference for and promotion of Arminians such as Richard Montagu (1577–1641) and William Laud, the Catholic court of Henrietta Maria, and the conversion of notables such as Francis, Lord Cottington (*c*.1579–1652), Sir Kenelm Digby (1603–65), Sir Francis Windebank (1582–1646), and Richard Weston (1577–1635), later earl of Portland. Papal agents to the Catholic queen, Gregorio Panzani (1592–1660), George Con (*c*.1600?–1640), and Carlo Rossetti (1614–81), frequented court from 1634 to 1641. As the papal agents tried to convert the king and William Laud, now archbishop of Canterbury, perhaps in exchange for a large papal subsidy, the Benedictine Leander Jones (*c*.1575–1635) recommended the revocation of the papal condemnation of the oath of allegiance, because it alone impeded the reunion of the Catholic and Anglican churches.[110] The Franciscan Recollect Christopher Davenport (1598–1680; his

108 Until a much needed, thorough investigation of this controversy appears, see Philip Hughes, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England* (London: Burns & Oates, 1942), 329–407; Antony F. Allison, "Richard Smith, Richelieu and the French Marriage: The Political Context of Smith's Appointment as Bishop for England in 1624," *Recusant History* 7 (1964): 148–211; Allison, "A Question of Jurisdiction: Richard Smith Bishop of Chalcedon and the Catholic Laity 1625–31," *Recusant History* 16 (1982): 111–45; Allison, "Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents," *Recusant History* 18 (1987): 329–401; *Recusant History* 19 (1989): 234–85; *Recusant History* 20 (1990): 164–206; Allison, "Some Additions and Corrections to Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents," *Recusant History* 20 (1990): 493–94; Michael C. Questier, ed., *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631–1638* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Clancy, *Literary History*, 93–107.

109 See, for example, Jonathan Scott, *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

110 See Gerald Sitwell, "Leander Jones' Mission to England, 1634–1635," *Recusant History* 5 (1960): 132–82.

name in religion was Francis a Santa Clara) also advocated reunion. To make clear to Rome how little the differences between the two churches were, he minimalized how Protestant the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles were.[111] Neither venture enthused the English Jesuits. Perhaps Jesuit indifference to these schemes was a reason for their exclusion from a meeting convened by Panzani in November 1636. Leading secular clergy and representatives from the Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Carmelites reached a compromise on relations and tactics.[112]

Blount had been in office as superior, vice-provincial, and provincial since 1619. As he approached his seventies, he asked to be relieved of the burdens of office. In December 1633, the general asked him to remain in his post until a suitable successor could be named. Blount had recommended Knott, but Vitellschi hesitated because Knott had dirtied—at least temporarily—his copybook because of an unauthorized intervention in some domestic disputes at St. Omers. These indiscretions were not the only motives for the general's reluctance: Knott had not spent much time in England (he arrived in the kingdom in April 1629, was arrested and remained in the Clink prison until he was released through the queen's intercession in January 1632 and banished) and thus was unknown to the province's benefactors and patrons. Moreover, the general wondered whether he had the expertise required to handle the complex financial arrangements. Thus he asked the provincial to deliberate further.[113] More than a year later, the general appointed Henry More England's second provincial.[114] Blount died on May 13, 1638; he was interred in the queen's private chapel at Somerset House. More's brief administration—by 1638, he was asking to be replaced—witnessed the growth of the province in terms of finances and personnel: in 1639, the province numbered 350 men with 193 working in England and Wales. Financially, the province could have supported around a hundred more men. In 1633, the province also initiated a mission to the colony of Maryland.[115] Edward Knott (*vere* Matthew Wilson) was named More's successor in June 1639, his earlier indiscretions apparently forgiven

111 See John Berchmans Dockery, O.F.M., *Christopher Davenport, Friar and Diplomat* (London: Burns & Oates, 1960); Tavard, *Seventeenth-Century Tradition*, 133–57.

112 See Martin Havran, *The Catholics in Caroline England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962), 140–44; Lunn, *English Benedictines*, 126–27; Dockery, *Davenport*, 42–43.

113 ARSI, *Congr*. 62, fols. 244^{r}–45^{v}; ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 387^{r}.

114 General to Blount, Rome, August 11, 1635, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fols. 412^{v}–13^{r}; same to More, Rome, August 11, 1635, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 413^{r}.

115 For a pre-history of this mission, see Luca Codignola, *The Coldest Harbour of the Land: Simon Stock and Lord Baltimore's Colony in Newfoundland, 1621–1649*, trans. Anita Weston (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988).

or at least forgotten. Nonetheless, he remained a controversial appointment. Vitelleschi opposed his earlier nomination, because he was too little known in England. Now he may have been too infamous as a controversialist. Despite imprisonment in the Clink, he played a prominent role in the intra-Catholic debate (mirrored in a comparable conflict among Protestants) over episcopal authority. As other Catholic theologians cuddled up with Caroline divines, he stressed the unique witness of Roman Catholics to the denigration of the Established Church. Archbishop Laud commissioned William Chillingworth (1602–44), sometime convert of John Fisher (*vere* Percy), to refute Knott's arguments. But even before Chillingworth's *The Religion of Protestants, a Safe Way to Salvation* (Oxford, after 1638), Knott had read and refuted it in *A Direction to Be Observed by N.N.* (n.p. [secretly in England], 1636), most likely one of the few cases in which a rejoinder appeared before the attack.[116] Outraged, Laud demanded Knott's expulsion. With the protection of Henrietta Maria and George Con, Knott remained in England until 1639.[117] He was on the continent when his appointment was announced. The king added his voice to the many that complained of Knott's appointment and opposed his return to England. The Jesuit was clearly informed that he would be arrested if he dared to return. Vitelleschi had been blindsided: he had thought that the storm generated by Knott's book had passed after three years and, moreover, that Knott had gained the king's affection because of his support of the Catholic fund to aid Charles in his Scottish wars. Knott was instructed to stay on the continent while More served as his vice-provincial in England. Meanwhile, Vitelleschi asked the Jesuit Jean Suffren (1571–1641) to use his influence with the French queen mother Marie de' Medici (1575–1642) and her daughter Henrietta Maria, to intercede with Charles in Knott's favor.[118] Knott did return to England but years later, in June 1643. He remained in the kingdom for fifteen months as he visited Jesuits throughout the land.

Between 1625 and 1639, only two Catholics were martyred: the secular priest Edmund Arrowsmith (1585–1628) and the layman Richard Herst (?–1628) in 1628. Because of the queen's protection and the presence of papal agents, few Catholics suffered. But ominous signs forecast the end of *de facto* tolerance.

---

116 See Tavard, *Seventeenth-Century Tradition*, 87–89; Clancy, *Literary History*, 61–77.

117 Caroline M. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983), 67–68.

118 General to Knott, Rome, October 8, 1639, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 497^{r}; same to More, Rome, January 14, 1640, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 501$^{r–v}$; same to Suffren, Rome, January 14, 1640, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fols. 501^{v}–2^{r}; same to More, Rome, January 21, 1640, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 502^{r}; same to Knott, Rome, January 28, 1640, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 503^{r}; same to Suffren, Rome, May 5, 1640, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/II, fol. 507^{r}.

The arrival of the dowager queen of France, Marie de' Medici, with "dozens of impecunious courtiers of various nationalities in her wake," among whom was her chaplain Jean Suffren, triggered anti-Catholic sentiment.[119] Charles had not wanted the royal mother-in-law to visit her daughter but capitulated to the queen's appeals. Exiled by Cardinal Richelieu, Queen Marie crossed to England in 1638. She disturbed the tranquility of the court; Suffren disrupted the English province. More devastating and more tragic were rumors that righteous Protestants in Scotland and blood-thirsty papists in Ireland were waging war against Charles I.

During the first two years of Charles's reign, Catholics in Scotland had *de facto* religious freedom. Nine Jesuits worked in Scotland in 1627. The majority lived with nobles (e.g., William Leslie [*c*.1580–1639], the mission's superior, stayed with the earls of Erroll). From these secure bases, they ministered to Catholics in the environment. A few seem to have moved on a missionary circuit without a fixed base.[120] James Macbreck (*c*.1592–1670), who proclaimed his innocence to the unspecified charges leveled against him by English Jesuits in London, proposed a refuge for Scottish Jesuits in France or the Low Countries "where our veteran workers can rest from their labours, and recover their strength, and where the new ones may be instructed for two whole years at least in their final studies, before they descend into the arena" in the annual letter for 1627. Moreover, he recommended serious discussion of the nature and future of the mission, "the most arduous and difficult one in charge of our Society—requires to be maturely considered, that our mission may not remain always, what it has hitherto been, hidden in the dust."[121] In the following year, 1628, John Robbe (1579–1633), who supervised all Scottish Jesuit activities from the continent, visited each missionary station in Scotland. A Walter Baird (fl. 1620s), also known as Wise Walter, predicted 1630 as the year for the demise of Presbyterianism and the restoration of Catholicism. Some Catholics drafted pasquils on this theme and posted them on the doors of churches. This was but one factor that ended the peaceful interlude for Catholics "with so much violence and ferocity, that it is certain that the Roman faith cannot continue to exist in this country, unless it is aided and strengthened by some more than human power." Not surprisingly, the intense persecution resulted in

119 Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot*, 87. On Suffren and other Jesuit royal confessors, see Robert Bireley, S.J., "Acquaviva's 'Instruction for Confessors of Princes' (1602/1608): A Document and Its Interpretation," in *Los jesuitas: Religión, política y educación, siglos XVI–XVIII*, ed. José Martínez Millán, Henar Pizarro Llorente, and Esther Jiménez Pablo, 3 vols. (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2012), 1:45–68.

120 Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, x, 1, 4, 7–8, 14.

121 Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 11–12.

the occasional conformity of Catholics to avoid fiscal destruction. Since 1617, Scottish Jesuits had a reputation for strictness and a refusal to condone such behavior.[122] Leslie explained the disastrous consequences of non-conformity. Recusants in England paid a fine, but in Scotland,

> all who refused to attend the heretic worship were excommunicated by the ministers, with fearful anathemas, devoting their souls and bodies to hell and Satan; they were denounced by name as rebels, their goods confiscated, were turned out of their houses, and the fires extinguished—a part of the custom of this country—and the keys given up to the King's officers.[123]

Thus many avoided Jesuits during the current persecution and refused them hospitality.[124] The year 1630 came without the predicted demise of Protestantism. Nine Jesuits worked in the kingdom, a poor compensation for the non-restoration of Catholicism. Their principal work, according to the annual letter of 1629, "has been exhorting Catholics to constancy, and

122 In 1633, John Leslie informed Vitelleschi: "And we, the Fathers of this Mission, unanimously believe and assert that it may be inferred from this, by clear and evident deduction, and inevitable consequence, that to attend the preaching of the heretics, to have marriage celebrated in the presence of the minister of the parish, and children baptized by heretic preachers, or allow it to be done, amounts in Scotland to an open profession of heresy, and renunciation of the Catholic faith of Christ, which is prohibited by everything holy" (Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 151). The Scottish Jesuits had altered their position. Previously, they were suspected of laxism. See Crosignani, McCoog, and Questier, *Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England*, 285–95; Hubert Chadwick, S.J., "Crypto-Catholicism, English and Scottish," *The Month* 178 (1942): 388–401. In 1633, Leslie admitted one of the advantages the post-1617 mission had over its predecessor was "our mode of teaching, explaining and applying the dogmas of faith and precepts of Christian doctrine, and we frequently hear it objected that we are much stricter than they used to be, and excessively rigorous in our doctrine" (Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 159). By the late 1640s, rumors circulated that recent, secret Scottish converts had received dispensations from various clergymen so that they could continue to attend Protestant services. Their attendance scandalized older Catholics who had suffered much for their faith. In 1649, James Seton argued for strictness: "They uil doe more euil nor good, for the Catholiques in Scotland hath no reason more to dissemble nor in England, uhair they are no more esteemed Catholiques, nor capable of sacraments if they frequent heretique conuenticles." To this, William Christie added: "Let us at al occasion hinder this dangerous opinion seing it is offensiue to God, ruine of soules, discredit to Preests, and our Society, as is obiected." See Hay, *Blairs Papers*, 195–97.

123 Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 71.

124 Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 14–15, 18, 19–21.

administering the Sacraments to them. We have not neglected our general confessions and renewals, vows, and other exercises of the Society, the study of religious obedience and desire of perfection." The number of Jesuits hovered around ten despite the persecution. The living conditions deteriorated and they were short of money as long-time benefactors either died or defected.[125] Charles's attempts to remodel the Presbyterian Scottish Church along the lines of the Laudian, episcopal and liturgical model caused riots in 1637 and the formation of the National Covenant in February 1638. One of the signers was the ex-Jesuit[126] Thomas Abernethy (*c.*1600–post-1660?; dis. *c.*1636).[127] In a letter to the superior general, Macbreck complained that the covenant was "offered to all without exception and those who refuse it are set down as enemies of their country, and of the godless heresy which they call the Reformed religion, and prosecuted with the utmost rigour."[128] With money contributed by Catholics to avoid reconvening Parliament, Charles mustered a small army that he sent north.[129] As he needed more money, the king called Parliament in April 1640 but dismissed it after three weeks (the Short Parliament) after it had revived its earlier attacks on royal authority. Further victories by the Scottish Covenanters resulted in the Treaty of Ripon (October 1640). The Scots occupied Northumberland and Durham, and received a daily tax until peace was restored and the English Parliament convened. With more than seventy-five percent of its members opposed to the king, the Long Parliament met in November. Almost immediately, Parliament began to impeach the king's closest advisers (including Archbishop Laud) and to pass legislation that prevented the king's whimsical dismissal of Parliament.

Robert Nugent (1577–1652) succeeded Christopher Holywood as superior of the Irish mission in 1627. Unlike the English Parliament that excluded Catholics, their co-religionists comprised the majority of the Irish Parliament. Consequently, life for Catholics was less arduous in Ireland than in England.[130]

125 Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*, 43, 44, 118, 152, 154.

126 I shall restrict use of "ex-Jesuit" to those who were dismissed from the Society. Men who were Jesuits in good standing at the time of the suppression will be referred to as "former Jesuits."

127 Alasdair Roberts, "Thomas Abernethy, Jesuit and Covenanter," *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 24 (1991): 141–60.

128 As cited in Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 34.

129 See Caroline Hibbard, "The Contribution of 1639: Court and Country Catholicism," *Recusant History* 16 (1982): 42–60. See also Mark Charles Fissel, *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns against Scotland, 1638–1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

130 See Louis Cullen, "Catholics under the Penal Laws," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an dá chultúr* 1 (1986): 23–36; David Edwards, "A Haven of Popery: English Catholic Migration

Louis McRedmond refers to the late 1620s and the 1630s as an "Indian Summer," the period of the "graces" as King Charles made numerous concessions to Irish Catholics in return for financial contributions.[131] The Society opened chapels, schools, and organized sodalities.[132] For a brief period, a novitiate in Dublin was considered.[133] Nugent requested more men. Vitelleschi offered English Jesuits, an offer that Nugent could and did refuse. In the midst of this, the Irish Jesuits found time to squabble with diocesan priests and other religious orders.[134] One wonders whether Nugent hoped to follow the recent example of the English Jesuits in the orderly ascent from a prefecture to a province.

The crown's failure to translate the "graces" into law was a reason for a revolt by Ulster Catholics in October 1641. Within a year, Irish Catholic nobles, religious authorities, and military officials formed the Confederation of Kilkenny under the slogan *Pro Deo, rege, et patria, Hiberni unanimes* (For God, king, and fatherland, the Irish are united). The evolving conflict between monarch and Parliament provided a convenient distraction as the confederates formed a government and searched for foreign recognition.[135] As the civil war turned against the monarch, Charles commissioned James Butler, earl of Ormond (1610–88), to reach an agreement with the confederates. To assist the confederacy, Pope Innocent X (1574–1655, r.1644–55) sent a nuncio, Giovanni Battista Rinuccini (1592–1653). Royalists and confederates concluded a treaty in 1646

---

to Ireland in the Age of the Plantations," in *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, ed. Alan Ford and John McCafferty (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 95–126.

131 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 51. See also Aidan Clarke, *The Graces 1625–41* (Dublin: Dublin Historical Association, 1968).

132 With the improvement of conditions for Catholics in general, Vitelleschi asked the superior to be stricter, more conscientious, with the observance of all aspects of the Society's Institute. See superior general to Robert Nugent, Rome, April 14, 1629, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 19^{r}; same to same, Rome, November 17, 1629, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 22^{r}–23^{r}. By the mid-1630s, the general was investigating different possibilities. See superior general to Nugent, Rome, April 26, 1635, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 37$^{r–v}$; same to same, Rome, January 8, 1638, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 46^{r}; same to George Dillon, Rome, August 6, 1639, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 47^{r}.

133 The general would not allow a novitiate to be set up in Ireland until Catholics could practice their faith openly. See superior general to Robert Nugent, Rome, June 3, 1628, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 15$^{r–v}$; same to William Malone, Rome, June 3, 1628, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 15^{v}; same to Barnaby Kearney, Rome, April 14, 1629, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 18^{v}.

134 See, for example, Brian Mac Cuarta, S.J., *Catholic Revival in the North of Ireland 1603–41* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007).

135 Perhaps further research will reveal why Robert Nugent warned Superior General Vitelleschi that religious and secular clergy had turned against the Society in Ireland and were harassing it in any way possible with the hope of having it excluded from the mission. See Nugent to superior general, Ireland, May 8, 1642, Dublin, Irish Jesuit Archives, MSS A 78.

whereby the latter would support the king militarily. The nuncio denounced the treaty as insufficient and excommunicated its endorsers. Into this morass in late 1648 Superior General Vincenzo Carafa (1585–1649, in office 1644–49) sent the French Jesuit Mercure Verdier (1603–79) as his official visitor to mend relations between the Society and the nuncio.[136] The visitor was shocked by the public dispute that pitted the Jesuits against the nuncio, and also by the adaptations made by the Irish Jesuits to the demands of the Society's Institute.[137] King Charles I was executed on January 30, 1649. Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658, in office 1653–58) and the New Model Army invaded Ireland in the summer of 1649. The consequent destruction (1649–53) nearly obliterated the thriving Irish Jesuit mission. John Young (1589–1664), sometime novice master in Kilkenny until its destruction, cried out: "It seems that the devil himself wants us to be destroyed, so that there is nothing of us left on earth."[138] The number of Jesuits fell as they sought sanctuary and protection throughout the island.

Carafa debated Knott's successor. His first choice was Henry Silesdon (*vere* Bedingfeld), but he feared that Alethea Howard (1585–1654), wife of Thomas Howard, earl of Arundel (1586–1646), would prevent his taking office by insisting that he remained as her chaplain. His second choice was George Duckett (*vere* Holtby [*c*.1591–1669]). Silesdon, not the countess, protested the nomination. Taking full advantage of his right to represent good reasons against the appointment, Silesdon delayed the announcement and left the superior general in a quandary. In September, he sent letters patent for both men to Knott and allowed the outgoing provincial to decide who would succeed him: Silesdon became provincial in late October 1646.[139]

In 1646, shortly before Carafa's election as superior general in January, Pope Innocent X regulated different aspects of the Society's "way of proceeding" in the brief *Prospero felicique statui*. The new legislation required a general

136 John Young welcomed his arrival and believed that he would exonerate the Irish Jesuits by presenting the total, "naked" truth to the general. See Young to Superior General Caraffa, Kilkenny, February 8/18, 1649, Dublin, Irish Jesuit Archives, MSS A 105.

137 See Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini 1645–1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Ó hAnnracháin, "The Visitation of Mercure Verdier to Ireland, 1648–1649," in McCoog, *With Eyes and Ears Open*, 126–48; McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 74–77. The dress of some unnamed Irish Jesuits and their card and dice playing shocked the superior general. See his letter to Robert Nugent, Rome, June 3, 1628, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 16^{r-v}.

138 As cited in McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 78.

139 General to Knott, Rome, June 2, 1646, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fols. 74^{v}–75^{r}; same to Silesdon, Rome September 1, 1646, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 77^{v}; same to Knott, Rome, September 1, 1646, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 77^{v}; same to Duckett, Rome, September 1, 1646, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 78^{v}; same to Silesdon, Rome, December 8, 1646, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 81^{v}.

congregation every nine years, and restricted terms of office for everyone except the superior general and the master of novices. All rectors and provincials were limited to one three-year term, and must remain out-of-office for eighteen months before being appointed to a similar position.[140] If it had not been for these new restrictions, Knott could have remained in office longer. Silesdon remained apprehensive about his new office and recommended that he serve as provincial for only eighteen months. Knott, having been out of office for the required period, could then be renamed. Carafa rejected the suggestion with an insistence that Silesdon serve a complete term.[141] Silesdon, however, did consult Knott on a politico-theological issue that greeted him upon taking office.

With the king in prison, the New Model Army victorious, and the Independents in control of Parliament, some Catholics, under the leadership of Thomas, Lord Brudenell (c.1583–1663), sought an accommodation with the new order.[142] The terms for limited toleration simply forbade under pain of death writing, teaching, or preaching on "three propositions":

i. That the Pope or Church has power to absolve any person or persons whatsoever from his or their obedience to the Civil Government established in this realm.
ii. That it is lawful by the Pope's or Church's command, or dispensation to kill, destroy, or otherwise injure any person or persons whatsoever because he or they are accused or condemned, or excommunicated for Error, Schism, or Heresy.
iii. That it is lawful in itself or by the Pope's dispensation to break either word or oath made to any of the above-named persons under the pretext that they are heretics.[143]

In a rare demonstration of unity, representatives from secular clergy, Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans, Carmelites, and two Jesuits, Henry More and George Ward (*c*.1597–1654), agreed to the conditions but inserted

140 For the context, see Bangert, *History of the Society of Jesus*, 176–78; John W. O'Malley, S.J., *The Jesuits and the Popes: A Historical Sketch of Their Relationship* (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph's University Press, 2016), 60–61.

141 General to Silesdon, Rome, December 14, 1647, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 97^{r}.

142 For years, there was a tug-of-war between the Independents and the Presbyterian Parliamentarians. To the anger of Cromwell, who sought some sort of religious tolerance, the Presbyterians insisted on the execution of the Jesuit Peter Wright (1603–51).

143 As cited in Thomas H. Clancy, S.J., "The Jesuits and the Independents: 1647," *AHSI* 40 (1971): 67–90, here 76. This article is the only complete investigation of the episode.

on a preface. Innocent, however, condemned the propositions in January 1648. More and Ward both suffered for their respective roles in the affair when the province, or at least the transmarine section, was canonically visited by the future superior general Alessandro Gottifredi (1595–1652, in office January–March 1652).[144]

No accommodation with the new order was considered north of the border. Initially, a fervent Covenanter, James Graham, earl of Montrose (1612–50), switched sides and fought for the Royalists. In this campaign, he welcomed Catholic assistance.[145] James Seton (*c*.1590; dis. 1631), a Scottish Jesuit, met with Montrose in Denmark "to deale wt him for the Catholickes in our cuntrey, towards whome he hath promised very much, if his successe answer his expectation." He assured the earl that he could depend on the Catholics.[146] After initial victories, he was finally defeated and executed in 1650. William Ballantyne (1616–61) was appointed prefect apostolic for the non-Gaelic-speaking area of Scotland in 1653. Jesuits opposed the nomination and later accused him of allowing Scottish Catholics to attend Protestant services.[147]

Despite the tumult of the times, Silesdon's successor Francis Forster (*c*.1602–53) had a rather uneventful administration. That would change with the appointment of Edward Knott (*vere* Matthew Wilson) for a second time. Knott argued against a second term: given his age, he could not administer the province and write controversial treatises against the Anglican Church. He personally preferred the second to the first. The new superior general Goswin Nickel (1584–1664, in office 1652–64) and the provincial convinced him to change his mind.[148]

For the first time since the establishment of the province, the Jesuits could not convene a congregation. Travel to or from England was even more hazardous because of the continuing civil war. Knott therefore appointed a procurator, Thomas Babthorpe (*c*.1598–1656), who fell ill in Munich on his way to

144 See McCoog, "Seventeenth-Century Visitations."

145 James Macbreck noted the presence of many Catholic chaplains among the Irish troops that had allied themselves with the royalists. At least one Scottish Jesuit, Andrew Leslie (*c*.1600–54), worked with them (Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 44, 45).

146 Robert Gall to superior general, January 7, 1650, as cited in Hay, *Blairs Papers*, 20.

147 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 54–55.

148 General to Forster, Rome, October 5, 1652, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 141^{r}; same to same, Rome, December 21, 1652, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 142^{r}; same to Forster, Rome, December 21, 1652, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 142^{r}; same to Knott, Rome, December 28, 1652, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, 142^{r}–43^{r}; same to same, Rome, March 15, 1653, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 144^{v}; same to Forster, Rome, March 22, 1653, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 145^{r}.

Rome. The superior general hoped the province would not suffer because of the lack of a delegate at the congregation of the procurators.[149]

Richard Barton (*vere* Bradshaigh [*c.*1601–69]) succeeded Knott as provincial in early 1656. Later that year, Innocent's brief was temporarily suspended. On November 15, 1659, Superior General Nickel drafted letters patent by which he nominated Robert Stafford (*vere* Stanford [*c.*1593–1659]) as Barton's successor. Stafford, who had been ill, died before the arrival of the letters. The general ordered Barton to destroy the letters and to remain in office until he had decided who his successor would be. In July 1660, Nickel nominated Edward Courtney (*vere* Leedes [*c.*1599–1677]).[150] Courtney initiated a *cause célèbre* with his high papalist attack on the Benedictine Thomas Preston's defense of the oath of allegiance. The manuscript, still unpublished, circulated widely. Courtney was arrested in the autumn of 1634 and remained in prison until his exile in May 1636.[151]

After the execution of the king, his son Charles II (1630–85, r.1649–85) continued the fight until his defeat by Cromwell at the Battle of Worcester in September 1651. He eluded capture by hiding in the Royal Oak at Boscobel House, and later escaped to the continent. He wandered throughout northwest Europe welcomed in whatever country was not then allied with Cromwell, who had been proclaimed lord protector in 1653. Difficulties regarding the governance of Cromwell's son and heir as Lord Protector Richard (1626–1712) resulted in the restoration of the monarchy.

Between 1640 and 1660, the English province declined numerically by seventy men. After some fluctuations, there were 151 Jesuits in England and Wales in 1660 as opposed to 193 in 1639. Death and old age, of course, took their toll, but financial difficulties also played an important role in the diminution. The Thirty Years' War on the continent and the Civil War in England ended a long period of growth and expansion and introduced austerity.[152] Property was lost; money was confiscated; annuities were not paid. The province could not feed its men and depended on the charity of other provinces that temporarily

149 General to Knott, Rome, May 24, 1653, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 146$^{r–v}$; same to same, Rome, November 29, 1653, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 151^{v}; same to same, Rome, August 14, 1654, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 157^{r}; same to same, Rome, September 4, 1655, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 169^{r}; same to same, Rome, November 13, 1655, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 172^{v}.

150 General to Barton, Rome, November 15, 1659, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fols. 216^{v}–17^{r}; same to same, Rome, December 6, 1659, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fols. 217^{v}–18^{r}; same to same, Rome, December 27, 1659, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 218$^{r–v}$; same to Courtney, Rome, July 3, 1660, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/I, fol. 225^{r}.

151 Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Leedes (Alias Courtney), Edward," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6463 (accessed September 24, 2018).

152 See McCoog, "Spoils of War."

accepted English Jesuits into their institutions. Lack of money restricted the number of novices admitted; at times, none were received. Fiscal problems and a paucity of novices undoubtedly instigated the discussion of a joint novitiate for the English, Flemish, and Walloon provinces, a proposal rejected by the general to the delight and relief of the three provinces.[153] As the province contracted, congregations generally ignored controversial subjects such as the oath of allegiance, the authority of the bishop of Chalcedon, and the oath at the English colleges.[154] Instead, the assemblies discussed spiritual and domestic matters (e.g., retirement, an appropriate feast for St. Ignatius, and the privilege of saying three Masses).

During the conflicts that divided the three kingdoms even more in midcentury, it would be rash to conclude that the English Jesuits were staunch loyalists. They, like English Catholics in general, provided financial assistance to Charles by raising money for his Scottish campaign in 1639.[155] During the subsequent war, most Jesuits probably supported the king; some would have done so for royalist reasons; others from the realization that he was the only hope for toleration.[156] That the uneasy alliance between Catholics, including Jesuits, and royalists was one of convenience became clear with the appearance of the Independents.[157] Throughout the interregnum, even after the failure of the agreement between Catholics and Independents in 1647, both Independents and Royalists engaged Spain and the papacy in diplomatic negotiations as each side sought recognition and assistance. Both promised relief for English Catholics in return. The Jesuits, it seems, were political opportunists with practical interests such as the relief of Catholics, and not theoretical matters such as legitimate government and the divine rights of kings. Aware that both Cromwell and Charles sought papal aid and recognition, the Society was ready to take advantage of those desires to win concessions for the Catholics. Individual Jesuits negotiated with the Independents and pleaded for Charles's

153 See McCoog, "Seventeenth-Century Visitations."

154 Concern for the oath resurfaced at the provincial congregation in 1675 (ARSI, *Congr*. 79, fols. 250^{r}–58^{v}).

155 See, for example, Havran, *Catholics in Caroline England*, 154; Francis Edwards, S.J., "Henry More, S.J.: Administrator and Historian, 1586–1661," *AHSI* 41 (1972): 233–81, here 255; Hibbard, "Contribution of 1639."

156 At least one Jesuit, Robert Pugh (*c*.1610–79), was dismissed from the Society in 1645 for aiding Royalist forces without the permission of his superiors. See Anstruther, *Seminary Priests*, 2:258.

157 See Paul Hardacre, *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956), passim; K. J. Lindley, "The Lay Catholics of England in the Reign of Charles I," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 22 (1971): 199–221.

cause.[158] Yet their goal remained the same: the repeal of the penal laws and toleration for Catholics. Both the general and the provincial advised caution and discretion. Not one of the negotiations came to fruition, partly because the Society and the papacy were too cautious and partly because the fortunes of Cromwell and Charles vacillated. It was only when their prospects were low that they sought a papal alliance. Once their fortunes improved, there was no longer any reason for granting toleration.

The mission to Maryland was approved in December 1633. Three Jesuits, Andrew White (*c.*1579–1656), John Grosvenor (*c.*1589–1640), and Brother Thomas Gervase (*c.*1590–1637), escorted the English Catholics to the new colony of Maryland founded by George Calvert, Lord Baltimore (1580–1632). Despite the popular belief that the colony was founded for religious reasons and specifically for Catholics, the majority of the colonists were Church of England. The colony, however, would not have an established church, and there would be religious freedom guaranteed by the Maryland Assembly in 1639. The Jesuits were granted land like the other colonists. Initially, the Jesuits used indentured servants to cultivate the land; later they purchased slaves. Efforts to convert the Amerindians were stopped for various reasons (e.g., contagious diseases and the opposition of the colony's governor Leonard Calvert [1606–47]). The colonies were not totally immune to the political and religious conflicts in the mother country. Some Puritans who had been granted asylum in Maryland allied themselves with the staunch Protestants of Virginia to overthrow the Catholic government of Maryland in 1645. Andrew White and Philip Fisher (*vere* Thomas Copley [*c.*1596–1652]), the mission's superior, were carted back to England in chains. Both were back in Maryland by 1648 when Calvert's government was restored, but the few Jesuits fled again in 1655 when Protestants again overturned the Calverts.

From at least 1640, the few Jesuits had hoped to establish a college, but the few schools that were erected were more rudimentary and short-lived.

158 The intrigues and suspicious maneuvers of the Irish Jesuit Peter Talbot (1618/20–80) have not been sufficiently explored. In the 1650s, he sought to convert Charles to Catholicism as a sure means of gaining Spanish and papal support. There are intimations that he flirted with the possibility of advancing James, duke of York and later James II, to the throne instead of his older brother Charles. Something even more sinister is suggested in his meetings with the Leveler Edward Sexby (1616–58) to assassinate or overthrow Cromwell in 1655. He was dismissed from the Society for these activities in 1659 but retained good relations with the order. Talbot was consecrated archbishop of Dublin in 1669. Imprisoned during the Popish Plot, he died on November 15, 1680 at Dublin Castle. See Terry Clavin, "Talbot, Peter (1618/1620–1680)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26937 (accessed September 24, 2018); Ó Fionnagáin, "Irish Jesuits 1598–1773," 184.

The Jesuits (and there were never more than three or four) operated out of their plantations as they traveled on a missionary circuit. The plantations themselves provided the financial support for the mission. These plantations, however, posed a major constitutional problem to the English province. The plantations provided the missionaries with a regular annual income, an income necessary for their travels and ministry. But the Society's Institute limited guaranteed, regular income to colleges and houses of formation. Residences, houses for professed Jesuits, and missions depended on alms freely given. In 1650, Superior General Francesco Piccolomini (1582–1651, in office 1649–51) adverted to this irregularity. He reminded the English provincial Francis Forster that the Institute forbade the possession of revenues or real estate to missions unless they were incorporated into some college. If the mission had not already become part of a college, the provincial must make the proper arrangements at once. Piccolomini advised Forster to discuss the matter with his consultors and then decide to which college the mission should be attached. That decision is not recorded in the correspondence, but Thomas Hughes, S.J. (1849–1939) argued in favor of the House of Probation (later College) of St. Ignatius (the London region). Colleges could administer the mission's portfolio and distribute the annual proceeds to the mission, but this agreement must remain a promise ("a gentleman's agreement") and not be formulated into a legally binding contract. To do so would grant the mission the right to an income to the detriment of the Institute.[159]

5.1 *Historiography*

Research on the Society of Jesus in whatever kingdom becomes increasingly scarce as we move from the heroic age of the martyrs. Both Basset, *English Jesuits* and Edwards, *Jesuits in England* have brief treatments of engaging personalities and highly charged controversies of the period. Michael Questier's editions of documents from the Archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster provide the documentary basis for important future research: *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead* (Cambridge: Royal Historical Society, 1998); *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics*; *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631–1638*. Clancy's *Literary History* and Tavard's *Seventeenth-Century Tradition* provide helpful introductions to the significant theological writings of the English Jesuits. Useful too are W. B. [William Brown] Paterson,

159 General to Francis Forster, Rome, August 20, 1650, ARSI, *Angl.* 3, fol. 131$^{r–v}$; same to same, Rome, December 24, 1650, ARSI, *Angl.* 3, fol. 133^{v}; Thomas Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America: Colonial and Federal*, Text 2 vols.; Documents 2 parts (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908–17), Text 2:25–26, 239; Documents 1:38–40.

King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Gordon Albion, *Charles I and the Court of Rome: A Study in 17th-Century Diplomacy* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935); Brian C. Lockey, *Early Modern Catholics, Royalists, and Cosmopolitans: English Transnationalism and the Christian Commonwealth* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015); Martin Havran, *The Catholics in Caroline England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962); and Caroline M. Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983). Allison's articles remain the definitive, if pro-Jesuit, treatment of the Chalcedon controversy. For an account more sympathetic to Smith, see Philip Hughes, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England* (London: Burns Oates, 1942). For Ireland, see McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*; Ó hAannracháin, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland*; and *The Jesuits in Ireland before and after the Suppression*, ed. Daire Keogh and Ciaran O'Neill (special issue of *Studies* 103 [2014–15]: 377–602); Moynes, *Irish Jesuit Mission*. Vera Moynes has more recently edited *Irish Jesuit Annual Letters, 1604–1674* (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, September 2019). For Scotland, see Forbes-Leith, *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI*; Forbes-Leith, *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*; Hay, *Blairs Papers*; and Peter F. Anson, *Underground Catholicism in Scotland 1622–1878* (Montrose: Standard Press, 1970). For the Maryland mission, Thomas Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America: Colonial and Federal*, Text 2 vols.; Documents 2 parts (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908–17) remains fundamental. See also Robert Emmett Curran, S.J., ed., *American Jesuit Spirituality* (New York: Paulist, 1988); Joseph Durkin, S.J., Gerald Fogarty, S.J., and Robert Emmett Curran, S.J., eds., *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833* (Baltimore: Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen, 1976).

6 Restoration and the Later Stuarts

In May 1660, Edward Courtney, then the province's procurator in Antwerp but later nominated provincial, met King Charles II as he prepared to return to England with the restoration of the monarchy. There is no record of their conversation, but whatever it was, it enthused the Jesuit and intensified his hopes so much that Superior General Nickel cautioned him against excessive expectation.[160]

160 Nickel to Courtney, Rome, July 23, 1660, ARSI, *Angl.*, 2/1, fol. 225^{r}.

Courtney's optimism most likely rested on the king's desire to improve or eliminate the penal conditions that burdened English Catholics. Charles had in fact issued a month earlier the so-called "Declaration of Breda" in which he promised that

> no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an Act of Parliament, as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us, for the full granting that indulgence.[161]

Surely Catholics would be included. The incumbent provincial Richard Barton (*vere* Bradshaigh) observed the restoration in London. "Scarcely ever in the memory of the Fathers [the Jesuits]," the provincial emoted,

> did a more joyful day for this city [London] and island dawn than the 8th of May last, on which day Charles Stuart, in solemn form, with the most magnificent pomp and incredible applause, was proclaimed King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, and Defender of the Faith. Never at any other time was there shown such great attachment and veneration for a King.[162]

The Scottish Jesuit William Christie (*c.*1590–1665) was considerably less sanguine: "Al doe expect ye King is to be called to Ingland be ye Presbytenianes meanes, greatest enemyes to Catholiques, uho though he be c1ement, they wil tye his handes, yat he can doe nothing. God his wil be done, who easilye can anihilat their attempts […]."[163]

The translation of royal promises into practical religious tolerance depended on Charles's first Parliament, the so-called "Cavalier" Parliament, which convened on May 8, 1661. Instead of the religious toleration so desired by the king, Parliament revived the detested Jacobean oath of allegiance with its offensive clauses regarding the pope, and passed a series of acts known collectively as the "Clarendon Code" for the restoration and protection of the Anglican Church. These laws, directed principally against Protestant non-conformists

161 http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/stuart-england/text-of-declaration-of-breda (accessed September 24, 2018).

162 Barton to superior general, London, May 2/12, 1660, ABSI, Stonyhurst Anglia V, 50 (translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 1:231).

163 Christie to?, Douai, April 6, 1660, as cited in Hay, *Blairs Papers*, 102.

for their role in the civil conflict, reinforced Catholic marginalization. During Parliament's first session, before the numerous episcopal vacancies had been filled, Roman Catholic gentry and nobility petitioned the House of Lords for relief from the penal laws. They argued that Catholics suffered grievously for their allegiance to the monarchy.

History was rewritten as many distanced themselves and their involvement from the events of the past two decades. More and more fingers pointed at Roman Catholics. Richard Baxter (1615–91), a non-conformist minister who associated with the Parliamentary armies but later played a role in the restoration of the monarchy, dedicated a treatise to Protector Richard Cromwell, in which he exonerated non-conformists of any blame for the execution of King Charles I, the Civil War, and subsequent developments. That unhappy state of affairs resulted from papist infiltration. Hiding behind various theological masks, the papists, he contended, successfully fostered discontent and discord among the Protestants. No one but a Roman Catholic would execute a king: such an act "was utterly against the mind and thoughts of Protestants." Baxter advanced "undenyable Arguments that it was the work of *Papists*, *Libertines*, *Vanists*, and *Anabaptists*."[164] True Protestants in fact suffered because of their opposition to regicide. In a more restrained analysis of Roman Catholicism, Baxter reminded readers how a "peaceable spirit," a mark of the true church, was absent in the Catholic Church where "turbulent spirits [...] such as are made of Gunpowder, and speak fire and sword."[165]

To prevent being scapegoated, Roman Catholics asserted their royalism as they exonerated themselves from any responsibility for regicide and civil war. Their arguments conveniently passed over in silence Catholic and papal attempts to reach a *modus vivendi* with Oliver Cromwell. Some secular clergy under the guidance of John Sergeant (1623–1707) (and his fellow members of the "Old Chapter," an influential vestige of Bishop Richard Smith's episcopacy after his departure for France in 1631 that was neither recognized nor repudiated by the papacy) replied to Protestant defamation of Catholics by deflecting their accusations of treason and disloyalty from Catholics in general to Jesuits in particular. Consequently, they proposed terms for toleration that included the expulsion of the Jesuits. Understandably, the Jesuits argued for their inclusion in any tolerance because they too had suffered during the Interregnum as did their students and their penitents.

Martin Greene (*c.*1617–67), who had earlier been assigned the unenviable task of translating and editing a refutation of Blaise Pascal's (1623–62) *Provincial*

164 *A Key for Catholicks* (London, 1659), 323.

165 *Catholick Unity: Or the Only Way to Bring Us All to Be of One Religion* (London, 1660), 157.

Letters (*An Answer to the Provinciall Letters Published by the Jansenists, under the Name of Lewis Montalt against the Doctrine of the Jesuits and School-Divines* [Paris, 1659]), vindicated Jesuits of traditional accusations regarding wealth, regicide, disloyalty, and explicated the popular image of a mythic Jesuit:

> It is a strange thing to see what Character is commonly given the Jesuits. Every Jesuit, say our Pamphlets and Pulpits too, hath a Pope in his belly, a Macchiavel in his head, Mercuries wings on his feet, and the Mysterious feather of Lucian's cocks tail in his hand. […] And if you ask, why Jesuits are never discovered […] it is because the Jesuits have Proteus's bodies.[166]

"The Rebels," he contended,

> preached every where against the Jesuits, and wheresoever they took any of them, they imprisoned and executed them; so that I do not see any need to prove their Loyalty. Certainly if they had any principles of Rebellion in their hearts, they would in these publick revolutions have shewed them at one time or other. Yet though for loyalty I conceive them blameless, I will not say, but that happily the indiscretion of some may have deserved a censure: but I hone that the errours of a few, will not rise in judgment, and countervail the merits of a long tried fidelity in many. […] Yet where sins of blackest malice have found indulgence, I hope indiscretion will not be remembered.[167]

The defense's influence was minimal.

A committee of the House of Lords discussed Catholic relief in the summer of 1661, but failed to introduce any legislation before Parliament adjourned at the end of July. The Old Chapter submitted a proposal that argued in favor of the repeal of anti-Catholic legislation and the banishment of Jesuits.[168] The exclusion of the Society divided Catholic support and contributed to the movement's failure.[169] Attempts to revive the discussion failed when Parliament reconvened in November. Instead, Parliament passed the second act of the "Clarendon Code": the Act of Uniformity (14 Car. 2 c. 4) made use of the new revised *Book of Common Prayer* compulsory. Six months later, on December 26,

166 *An Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine* (n.p. [London], 1661), sig. A 3^{v}–A 4^{r}.

167 *Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine* [sig. A 7^{v}–A 8^{r}].

168 See ARSI, *Angl.* 36/1, fols. 5^{r}–6^{v} for the province's refutation of the chapter's memo.

169 John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1660–1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 98–99.

1662, Charles II's first declaration of indulgence suspended the enforcement of the Act of Uniformity and granted toleration. The king failed in subsequent attempts to entice Parliament to legislate in favor of tolerance. By March 1663, Charles retreated and rescinded his declaration. Catholics now hoped not for toleration but for the non-enforcement of the penal laws.

The campaign against them however continued. The anonymous author of *The Jesuite and Priest Discovered; Or, a Brief Discourse of the Policies of the Church of Rome*, insisted that a Jesuit (unnamed) encouraged antagonism between King Charles and Parliament, provoked a declaration of war, stirred up the "Sons of Belial to stain their Hands with his [Charles's] Sacred Blood," exhorted the people to erect a commonwealth, and then worked for its destruction.[170] Pierre du Moulin (1601–84), an Anglican clergyman and son of the Huguenot Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658), exculpated Protestants from the charge of regicide and repudiated Catholic protestations of their loyalty during the rebellion. Du Moulin recalled the various plots and conspiracies hatched by Catholics against English monarchs, and highlighted conflicts between Jesuits and various princes. Did any Protestant divine ever engage in such activities? Presumably, the answer is "no." But du Moulin would not condemn all Catholics because of the antics of a few. Thus he proposed an oath of allegiance similar to the Jacobean oath that would separate the loyal sheep from the treacherous goats (i.e., Jesuits).[171]

The Great Fire of London swept through the city from Pudding Lane to Pye Corner between September 2 and 5, 1666. The usual suspects were rounded up in the search for scapegoats. The popular English imagination associated Catholics with fire from the Smithfield flames of Queen Mary Tudor to the gunpowder of Guy Fawkes (1570–1606). By the end of the year, a royal proclamation ordered the banishment of all Roman Catholic priests, and the disarming of all Catholics who refused to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance. Suspicion of Catholic involvement persisted, and their guilt was later proclaimed in the inscriptions around the base of the Monument despite the absence of any judgment regarding their responsibility in any of the investigations. More specifically, the finger was pointed at the Jesuits. A "Catholick-Christian" surveyed in considerable detail the inflammatory speech and behavior of the followers of Ignatius of Loyola, whose first name he derived from *ignis*, Latin for fire. The *Pyrotechnica Loyolana, Ignatian Fire-Works; Or, the Fiery Jesuits Temper and*

170 (London, 1663), 11.

171 See *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion in the Point of Obedience to Sovereignes Opposed to the Doctrine of Rebellion Authorised and Practised by the Pope and the Jesuites* (London, 1664).

Behaviour Being an Historical Compendium of the Rise, Increase, Doctrines, and Deeds of the Jesuits (London, 1667) highlighted in capital letters variations on incendiaries, gunpowder, fire brands, fire, flames, burnt in his exposition of Jesuit mastery of the art of making and directing fireballs.

Irish Catholics expected to recover what they had lost during the Cromwellian devastation. In 1652, much of their land was distributed among the victorious Protestants. The Catholics hoped also that Charles II would acknowledge and keep the promises made by his father in the alliance between the confederates and the royalists. But Charles made no blanket decision: each case would be adjudicated separately as the king navigated carefully through the policies of the Cavalier Parliament in England, a Protestant-dominated Parliament in Ireland, and the just demands of the deprived Irish Catholics. To bolster Irish Catholic protestations of greater loyalty than the Protestants, the Franciscan Peter Walsh (*c*.1618–88) and Richard Bellings (1613–77), an Irish lawyer in the court of the Catholic Catherine of Braganza (1638–1705), who had married Charles II in 1662, drafted a quasi-Gallican "Remonstrance" in 1661.[172] In it, they claimed that no papal statement or injunction would impede or jeopardize their allegiance to the king.[173] Irish Jesuits led the refutation of this position.[174] This "Remonstrance" had no more effect on the crown's policies than the protestation of the English Old Chapter.

The Irish Jesuits slowly rebuilt their mission. By 1664, ten residences (Dublin, Drogheda, Kilkenny, Cashel, New Ross, Waterford, Clonmel, Cork, Limerick, and Galway) were reopened. The Jesuits in the residence focused on spiritual work, namely preaching, retreats, and sodalities. Small schools were soon operating in New Ross, Kilkenny, Dublin, and Drogheda. At an unspecified date in the mid- to late 1660s, Stephen Rice (1625–99) successfully resisted persecution for teaching without having subscribed to the required oath of supremacy. Teaching, the Jesuit explained, meant instruction in return for a fee. Since he was not being paid, then what he was doing could not be called teaching! In 1674, the mission opened a school in Poitiers, a school that also served as a refuge for elderly and tired missionaries. In 1674, the mission was again visited

172 Bellings played a major role in Charles's unsuccessful attempt to have Louis Stuart, sieur d'Aubigny (1619–65), a secular priest and almoner at the court of Catherine Braganza, named a cardinal. The Jesuits endorsed the proposal but Pope Alexander VII (1599–1667, r.1655–67) refused. The pope changed his mind, but d'Aubigny died before being ordained vicar apostolic and receiving the red hat. See Miller, *Popery and Politics in England*, 45–46. An unexplored file on d'Aubigny can be found in ARSI, *Opp. NN*. 174/175/G.

173 See Danielle McCormack, *The Stuart Restoration and the English in Ireland* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016).

174 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 90–91.

perhaps because of the complaints of Archbishop Oliver Plunkett (1625–81) that the mission's calamitous state would only be corrected once it had the means to discipline and punish disobedient and "deformed" Jesuits.[175] On this occasion, the visitor was the Welsh Jesuit William Morgan (1623–89). Morgan's visitation did not resolve all the issues, and Superior General Gian Paolo Oliva (1600–81, in office 1661–81) preferred another.[176] The storm of the Popish Plot, admittedly significantly less violent than in England, shook the mission. Rice and others were expelled; William O'Rian (1628–1700), the superior, and others were arrested.[177] The former Jesuit Peter Talbot died in prison, but Archbishop Plunkett was the only martyr. The Popish Plot passed, but throughout the 1660s and 1670s the future of the mission was threatened by proposals to amalgamate it with the English province.[178]

In 1677, Rome sent Alexander Leslie (fl. late 1670s) as canonical visitor of the Catholic Church in Scotland. In a report filed in 1681, Leslie recommended the appointment of an ecclesiastical superior with authority over secular and religious, most of whom were Jesuits, clergy; the allotment of fixed residences for the clergy in different districts despite Jesuit opposition; and the reform of continental Scottish colleges that had become little more than novitiates for the Society of Jesus. Leslie appealed to the Propagation of Faith to implement his findings. The congregation assigned the implementation to the Dominican Philip, Cardinal Howard (1629–94), who had been appointed cardinal protector of England and Scotland in 1679.[179] Implementation did not follow.

Anti-Catholicism and anti-Jesuitism intensified in the 1670s as the political nation's apprehension over the religious sentiments of the monarch and, more important, of his brother and heir James, duke of York (1633–1701, r. as James II 1685–88/1701), increased. By 1671, but probably earlier, three Jesuits were in

175 Plunkett to superior general, Armagh, January 30, 1673, Dublin, Irish Jesuit Archive, MSS B 33.

176 Superior general to Stephen Rice, Rome, December 18, 1674, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 156$^{r–v}$; same to Hugh Thaly, Rome, January 19, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 5a, fol. 157^{r}; same to Ignatius Gough, Rome, July 6, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 159^{v}. Reports on the defects of different Jesuits continued to reach Rome. Some lacked fervor and were more concerned with accumulating monies that with apostolic service. See Charles de Noyelle to Edward Chamberlain, Rome, November 21, 1682, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 178^{v}; same to Thomas Quirke, Rome, November 21, 1682, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 178^{v}–79^{r}; same to same, Rome, November 20, 1683, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 183^{r}; same to James Reilly, Rome, June 29, 1686, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 202^{r}.

177 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 87–89, 92–95.

178 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Resisting National Sentiment: Friction between Irish and English Jesuits in the Old Society," *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 6, no. 4 (forthcoming).

179 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 76–77.

the entourage of Queen Catherine of Braganza: Antonio Fernandes (*c*.1611–1674), her confessor, and his assistant, Brother Juan Fernandes (*c*.1617–?), and the Irishman Hugh Cullen (1627–1705), her preacher. Catherine's court became a center of Catholic activity with its own printing, and chaplains such as Benedictine Serenus Cressy (*c*.1605–74), who dreamed of an "ecumenical" reunion between the Established Church and a reformed English Roman Church.[180] Meanwhile, France had replaced Spain as the terrifying proponent of a resurgent Catholicism after the Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659. Protestant anxiety fixated on King Louis XIV (1638–1715, r.1643–1715), whose armies extended French borders in the northeast. In 1668, a few months after Charles had signed the Triple Alliance of England, Sweden, and Holland to support Spain against France, he was investigating a possible personal alliance with Louis to avenge English defeats at the hands of the Dutch during the war of 1665–67. Representatives of Charles and Louis signed the Secret Treaty of Dover in June 1670. Charles promised to convert to Catholicism, and to support militarily Louis's conquest of the United Dutch Republic. Louis promised an annual subsidy and military assistance if Charles's conversion prompted a rebellion. Charles refused to declare himself a Catholic; instead, he issued a "Declaration of Indulgence" on March 15, 1672. It granted religious liberty to non-conforming Protestants and Catholics, and suspended the implementation of the penal laws. Three weeks later, France declared war on the Dutch; a day later, England did the same. Once the Cavalier Parliament reconvened in February 1673, it forced the king to revoke the declaration (March) and to sign the Treaty of Westminster with the Dutch (February 1674). The same Parliament, whose fears of the duke of York's religious convictions escalated, passed the Test Act of 1673 with a prescribed oath that included: "I, N, do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of the bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever." James's refusal to subscribe to the oath confirmed what many had long suspected: he was a Catholic. Attempts to exclude James from the throne involved proposals for a second marriage for Charles, "proof" that the king had actually married one of his mistresses, or legitimation of one of his offspring. The "Exclusion Crisis" alerted English Protestants of what they could expect if a Catholic succeeded to the throne: a French absolute monarchy, a Roman inquisition, and Jesuit conspiracies.

180 Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community 1688–1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009), 30–31.

Forty Jesuits convened for a provincial congregation at St. James's Palace, London, on April 24, 1678.[181] Under the leadership of the provincial Thomas Harcott (*vere* Whitbread [1618–79]), the Jesuits met in the Chapel Royal. Of the forty men, twelve died as a result of the phantasies and accusations of Titus Oates (1649–1705) and Israel Tonge (1621–80). Oates and Tonge discovered a credulous English public eager to have their fears of absolutism and popery confirmed by the extravagant stories of plots and conspiracies concocted by these two. On September 29, 1678, Harcott and his socius, Edward Harvey (*vere* Mico [*c.*1628–78]), were seized by pursuivants at their lodgings within the precincts of the Spanish ambassador's residence, Wyld House. Throughout the kingdom, other Jesuits were seized. The Jesuit community at Cwm was raided on December 19, 1678 by Herbert Croft (1603–91), bishop of Hereford, and its library confiscated and incorporated into the cathedral's.[182] The Jesuit library at Holbeck Hall (Nottingham) was also carted off and given to Sion College, London.[183] Parliament meanwhile exploited the tales of a "Popish Plot" to push for James's exclusion from the throne. Charles dissolved Parliament in 1681 to prevent its passing the Exclusion Act. John Warner (1628–92) served initially as vice-provincial during Harcott's imprisonment and as provincial after his execution. More preoccupied with the preservation of the Stuart dynasty with his brother's right of succession than with the hysteria generated by the plot, he did little to prevent sixteen Jesuits and twenty-one non-Jesuits (including Oliver Plunkett, archbishop of Armagh, the last Catholic martyr) from being executed or dying in prison. The possibility of gaining some of the fabled Jesuit treasure prompted the emergence from the shadows of numerous reprobates including one Jesuit apostate, John Travers (1616–97), whose previous attempt to abscond with considerable assets failed in a court of law.[184] Richard Langhorne (*c.*1624–78), the province's lawyer, exchanged precise information about Jesuit properties and investments, with questionable permission of the Society, to save his life. Despite the disclosures, he was executed.[185] In 1681, the anti-Catholic inscription on the Monument was amended with

181 The *acta* of this congregation were published by John Gerard, S.J., "The Jesuit 'Consult' of April 24th, 1678," *The Month* 102 (1903): 311–16.

182 See Thomas, "Society of Jesus in Wales."

183 See Hendrik Dijkgraaf, *The Library of a Jesuit Community at Holbeck, Nottinghamshire (1679)* (Cambridge: LP Publications, 2003).

184 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Apostasy and Knavery in Restoration England: The Checkered Career of John Travers, S.J.," *Catholic Historical Review* 78 (1992): 395–412.

185 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Richard Langhorne and the Popish Plot," *Recusant History* 19 (1989): 499–508.

the addition of "But Popish frenzy, which wrought such horrors, is not yet quenched."[186] John Warner deftly managed the situation. In addition to the imprisoned and the executed, many Jesuits fled to the continent: in 1678, there were 128 Jesuits in England and Wales and in 1679, eighty-seven. Jesuits began returning in 1680. The Society of Jesus and the Roman Catholic Church suffered, but James was not excluded from the throne. On February 6, 1685, King Charles II died. Having often promised to enter the Roman Catholic Church, he finally did so on his deathbed, presumably after his wish that poor Nell Gwyn (1650–87) not starve. John Huddleston (1608–98), the Benedictine who had helped Charles escape after the Battle of Worcester, received him. The Jesuit author of the province's annual letter described the event:

> Being in possession of his faculties, [he] expressly abjured that heresy, which long before he had privately condemned in writing, and was received into the Catholic Church, and then fortified by all her holy sacraments; and with every indication of a sincerely penitent heart, he happily expired, affording a most wonderful example of Divine mercy.[187]

But the move to exclude James did not succeed. He ascended the throne without a contest. The following Sunday, to the delight of Roman Catholics, James attended Mass at the Chapel Royal of St. James's Palace. Shortly after his accession, the king summoned Edward Spencer (*vere* Petre [1633–99]), and James appointed him clerk of the closet. Petre was also placed in charge of the recently rebuilt Chapel Royal in St. James's Palace. Later, he would be appointed to the Privy Council.[188] Petre played the role of the insidious, duplicitous Jesuit whose errors of judgment, sins of the flesh, and Machiavellian, papist designs in the post-James propaganda justifying the "Glorious Revolution" (1688).[189]

The Dominicans opened a friary in Lincoln's Inn Fields in February 1687; the Carmelites opened a house in Barge Yard, Bucklersbury, in the city of London in July 1687. There, presumably in full habit, they established the regular pattern of religious life. The Franciscans opened a school in Putney in 1686; in

186 An earlier version of the above appeared as "Setting the World on Fire? Anti-Catholicism and the Great Fire of London," *Thinking Faith*, November 4, 2014; http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/setting-world-fire-anti-catholicism-and-great-fire-london (accessed September 24, 2018).

187 As translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:92.

188 Jesuit Annual Letter, 1685–90, as translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:148, 275.

189 For a curious combination of fact and fiction in anti-Jesuit propaganda, see Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "A Letter from a Jesuit of Liège (1687)?," *Recusant History* 30 (2010): 88–106.

November 1687, they began the construction of a religious house and chapel in Lincoln's Inn Fields. By 1688, there were twenty Franciscans in brown habits and sandals, preaching and teaching catechism. The Benedictines established a residence at St. John's, Clerkenwell, in 1687. By the autumn of 1688, according to John Miller's calculation, there were at least eighteen chapels in London alone.[190]

Lest Protestant London be terrified by the presence of so many Jesuits to the point of rioting, the province decided to convene its congregation at Ghent in July 1685. The major, indeed the sole, topic was the accession of a Catholic king to the delight of the province and, they contended, of the universal Society, both of which would benefit during his reign. And with one voice the congregation asked the provincial to inform the king of their joy and of their desire to be of service.[191] The death of Superior General Charles de Noyelle (1615–86, in office 1682–86) on December 12 necessitated another provincial congregation. This time around the sensitivities of Londoners were not an issue. In April or May, the congregants met in England, most likely in London.[192] At the meeting, the fathers discussed the site and the designs for the new college in the Savoy. King James II extended his personal greetings and affection as he asked a favor: Would the congregation not elect either Edmund Petre or John Warner as a representative at the next general congregation? Both were necessary for James's work in England, the first as a privy councilor,[193] the second, as his confessor. The congregation granted his wish.[194]

On the eve of Pentecost, May 24, 1697, the province took possession of the college in the Savoy, founded with financial assistance from King James and Queen Mary. Auspiciously, the college opened the following day. Here, Jesuits wore what had become the distinctive habit of the Society and observed the domestic order of religious life as formulated in the *Regulae Societatis Iesu*. In late October 1687, the king himself visited the school. The provincial greeted him on the stairs from the river and conducted him on a tour of the chapel

190 Miller, *Popery and Politics in England*, 245n22, 247.

191 General to John Keynes, Rome, June 2, 1685, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 451^{v}; ARSI, *Congr.* 83, fols. 137^{r}–41^{v}.

192 Because of the destruction or loss of the *acta* of all provincial congregations of this year, we know not the precise date or the exact location. What little we do know, comes from the annual letter.

193 James tried to convince Rome that Petre should be made a cardinal. Until a thorough examination of James's promotion of the Jesuit appears, we have to rely on Miller, *Popery and Politics in England*, 231–38.

194 Annual Letter, 1685–90, as translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:264–65; ARSI, *Congr.* 3, fols. 1^{v}–2^{r}; ARSI, *Congr.* 2a, 2–4; Domenico Maria de Marinis, vicar general, to John Keynes, Rome, April 12, 1687, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 472$^{r–v}$.

and the school. James was so pleased with the boys' Latin, Greek, and English speeches that he gave them gowns and proclaimed that henceforth they would be called royal scholars. Through the intercession of Edmund Petre, the province received an annual royal stipend for a second college, which opened at Fenchurch, London, in 1688.[195] Jesuit colleges proliferated: besides the two in London, there were colleges in Wigan, Wolverhampton, Bury St. Edmunds, Lincoln, Pontefract, and Durham.[196] In Scotland, a college was opened in Holyrood Palace, Edinburgh.[197] In Ireland, Jesuits opened a college in Dublin, and planned to establish an even larger one in Athlone.[198] In addition to the new colleges in England and Ireland, there were plans to transfer Trinity College, Dublin, to the Irish Jesuits,[199] and Exeter College, Oxford (a Petre foundation), to the English Jesuits. At court, John Persall (1633–1702) and John Dormer (*vere* Huddleston [1636–1700]) were royal preachers appointed by the king. Edward Neville (*vere* Scarisbrick [1639–1709]) was a preacher to Queen Catherine Braganza; Hugh Cullen, Augustine Laurentius (?–1695), and Benedict de Lemos (?–1700) served as her chaplains. Marco Antonio Giudici

195 Annual Letter, 1685–90, as translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:262–68; Geoffrey Holt, "A Jesuit School in the City in 1688," *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 37 (1981): 153–58. For the rules of the Fenchurch Street school, see John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., "A Jesuit 'Free School' in London 1688," *The Month* 128 (1916): 264–67.

196 Annual Letter, 1685–90, as translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:150–51. Foley mistakenly placed the eighth school in Holywell instead of Pontefract.

197 Advertisements produced for the two London and the one Edinburgh college are extant. The other colleges may have circulated something similar. The three are identical with the exception of a tenth clause that is missing in the first, specifically *The Rules of the Schools at the Savoy* (London, 1687). The other two are *The Rules of the Schools at the Jesuits in Fanchurch-Street* (London, n.d. [1688?]), and *Rules of the Schools of the Royal Colledge at Holyrood House* (n.p. [Edinburgh], 1688). The only mention of the Jesuits is in the title of the second. There is no mention of Roman Catholicism. Each flyer stresses "They shall be Taught *Gratis*" and "altho' Youths of different Professions, whether Catholics or Protestants, come to these Schools; yet in Teaching all, there shall be no distinction made, but all shall be Taught with equal Diligence and Care, and every one shall be promoted according to his Deserts."

198 Once again the establishment of a novitiate in Dublin was discussed. See Vicar General Domenico Maria de Marinis to Hugh Thaly, Rome, April 26, 1687, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 204^{v}–5^{r}; same to James Reilly, Rome, April 26, 1687, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 205$^{r–v}$; Tirso González to same, Rome, October 11, 1687, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 206^{v}–7^{r}; same to same, Rome, December 7, 1687, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 208^{r}.

199 The superior general expressed his thanks to James for transferring Trinity College to the mission, and explained that he would assign some English Jesuits to assist in this ministry. See superior general to Patrick Lynch, Rome, March 25, 1690, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 212$^{r–v}$.

(*c*.1630–1703)[200] and Benedict Ruga (*c*.1640–1715) were chaplains to Queen Mary of Modena (1658–1718). Warner, as the king's confessor, completed Jesuit spiritual dominance at court. With the restoration of Catholicism, Superior General Tirso González (1624–1705, in office 1687–1705) instructed the English Jesuits to abandon the homes of their benefactors and their secular clothing for the appropriate religious dress and daily rhythm of Jesuit life.[201]

James shunned discretion. Proudly and publicly, he professed his Catholicism, totally forgetful of the strong anti-Catholic sentiment that had nearly excluded him from succession. Or, perhaps, he thought that he had vanished this sentiment through his suppression of two rebellions in 1685: Archibald Campbell, earl of Argyll (1629–85), was defeated in June, and the more dangerous James Scott (1649–85), duke of Monmouth and illegitimate son of Charles II, was defeated in the same month. Subsequent prosecution and punishment ("Bloody Assizes") under the direction of Judge George Jeffreys (1645–89) shocked many. James decided to increase the size of his standing army in case there were other threats to his throne. This decision increased the apprehension of many whose support of the new king was lukewarm because of his association with absolutism, the style of government advanced by James's ally, Louis XIV. The French king's revocation of the Edict of Nantes in October 1685 forecasted what was in store for English Protestants. James's use (or abuse) of his royal dispensing power to allow Roman Catholics to hold official positions in the army without pronouncing the oath demanded by the Test Act led to a conflict with a previously sympathetic Parliament. The king prorogued Parliament in November.

In Scotland, James named Catholic nobles, including a few who conveniently converted at the time, to the Privy Council and administrative posts. Occasionally, such appointments demanded the removal of the Protestant incumbent. James found allies among the bishops of the Established Church whose foundations remained shaky in the Presbyterian kingdom. They instructed their clergy to avoid any derisive term for Roman Catholic out of respect for the king. The Chapel Royal at Holyrood Palace became Roman Catholic. In addition to the school, the Jesuits also operated a printing press there.[202]

Episcopal government returned to the English Roman Catholic Church during James's brief reign amid attempts by King James to assert traditional royal

200 Letters from Giudici to the Jesuit superior general can be found in ARSI, *Opp. NN*. 174/175/F.

201 General to Charles Poulton, Rome, March 20, 1688, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 481r.

202 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 78–82.

rights of appointment and Pope Innocent XI's (1611–89, r.1676–89) insistence on his prerogative. Rome appointed John Leyburn (1615–1702) as vicar apostolic in August 1685. After some initial hesitation, the Jesuits and the Benedictines submitted to the vicar's authority at the king's request. In January 1688, three more vicars apostolic were named, one of whom, Philip Ellis (1652–1726), was a Benedictine. Ellis's nomination established a precedent. Henceforth, with only one exception, the vicar apostolic of the Western District was either a Benedictine or Franciscan, until 1850.[203] No Jesuit, however, ever served as vicar apostolic in England. Discussion regarding a bishop for Scotland undertaken secretly to prevent Jesuit opposition had been initiated in 1687 under the direction of Alexander Leslie, now resident chaplain at Gordon Castle. The participants could not agree on a candidate, but their disagreement nearly became hysterical once the name of William Aloysius Leslie (1641–1704), a Jesuit, was introduced. The issue was rendered moot with the flight of James in 1688. Six years later, Thomas Nicolson (*c.*1645–1718) was named Scotland's first vicar apostolic.[204]

Throughout 1686, James advocated the repeal of all penal laws in England, Scotland, and Ireland. Having established the legal basis of his dispensing power through the appointment and removal of judges, in early 1687 James issued his "Declaration of Indulgence," the validity of which rested on this dispensing power. In April 1688, James commanded that the declaration be read from every Anglican pulpit; seven bishops including William Sancroft (1617–93), archbishop of Canterbury, questioned the king's religious policies. Arrested, they were tried for seditious libel to the shock and horror of the Anglican establishment. On June 10, the Catholic dynasty was secured by the birth of James Francis Edward (1688–1766), nicknamed the "Old Pretender." As a son, he took precedence over his older, Protestant half-sisters Mary (1662–94) and Anne (1665–1714). The baby was later dismissed as a foundling, the baby in the bedpan, the child of Petre, and so forth. Whatever the origin of the baby, the opponents shouted, was not James's but a ruse concocted by him and his Jesuit advisers to ensure the restoration of Catholicism by depriving his natural heirs, Mary and Anne, of their inheritance. In June 1688, the famous (or infamous) seven Protestant nobles appealed to William of Orange (1650–1702), husband of Mary, and invited him and his army to England either to control or to overthrow James. On November 5, always an inauspicious day for

203 See Basil Hemphill, O.S.B., *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England* (*1685–1750*) (London: Burns & Oates, 1954), 1–26; Nicholas Schofield and Gerard Skinner, *The English Vicars Apostolic 1688–1850* (Oxford: Family Publications, 2009).

204 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 85–90.

English Catholics, William landed at Torbay. Many Protestant leaders, including Princess Anne, defected to him. After two minor battles, James and his entourage fled to France. Parliament met in January 1689. The "Declaration of Right" pronounced the English throne vacant because of James's flight. Parliament offered it to William and Mary. The Act of Toleration granted religious liberty to Protestant non-conformists but not to Catholics or non-Christians. The Bill of Rights guaranteed and protected the rights and liberties allegedly violated by James II. However, because "it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a papist prince," Catholics were excluded from the succession. The oath of allegiance to the new Stuart monarchs and to their Hanoverian successors included confessional statements offensive to Catholics: the formula ridiculed Catholic devotions and repudiated Catholic doctrine including transubstantiation.[205] The penal laws were enforced more strictly. In 1692, new financial penalties were introduced: in times of war, Catholics could be levied a double land-tax. Four years later, suspected Catholic complicity in the discovery of an assassination plot against William III, whose wife Mary had died in 1694, resulted in the arrest of Catholic nobility and gentry.[206] In 1700, the anti-Catholic laws were gathered together and organized in "An Act for Further Preventing the Growth of Popery."[207]

Popular discontent, fueled by the prospects of William's invasion, had been directed against the Catholics during the two months prior to his landing. In early October, the college at the Savoy was closed. Mobs attacked the Fenchurch Street school and the Lime Street Chapel where they pulled down the pulpit, and broke up the altar. The annual letter recorded the final days of confusion and conflict. Throughout the country, Jesuit preachers were harassed. During the Mass, there were frequent disturbances; at times, the congregations were pelted with stones. Whatever control there was over the wrath of the crowd vanished with the flight of the king. Catholic houses and chapels were attacked and destroyed; the Jesuit schools were torn down and plundered. Scattered and in flight, the Jesuits sought refuge in the woods and the hills.[208] Some clergy escaped to the continent, temporally or permanently as the Stuart court settled at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. Nonetheless,

205 Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, 126.

206 On this plot, see Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

207 Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, 56–57.

208 Annual Letter, 1685–90, as translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:269; "In Supplement of the History of the English Province, or a brief narrative of some events which in that most lamentable overthrow of the State of England, both ecclesiastical and

as Gabriel Glickman observes: "The force of the Revolution had fallen upon the laity, rather than the priesthood of recusant England," a striking difference from prior outbursts of anti-Catholicism.[209]

In the midst of the persecution, rumors circulated that some unnamed enemies of the Society and certain unnamed secular priests had initiated secret negotiations to secure the return of King James on the condition that the Jesuits would be banished from the realm. Again, the Jesuits would be sacrificed—eagerly offered by their enemies as a victim—in return for concessions toward religious liberty. Implied in the discussion was Jesuit responsibility for James's disasters. As the provincial John Clare (*vere* Warner [1640–1705]) reported to the general, these negotiations bore little fruit. The opponents of the Society had urged their followers to swear allegiance to William of Orange, whereas the Society had forbidden its supporters to do so. Clare himself had reported these intrigues to the king, who subsequently promised that he would neither make an agreement nor accept a compromise that in any way would be deleterious to the Society. For the king's sake, the provincial was very discreet about James's attachment to the Society.[210] The province convened a congregation at Watten in June 1690. King James and Queen Mary addressed a letter of appreciation for all that the Society had done for them and promised their continued support.[211]

James fled first to France and then to Ireland. There, despite the assistance of French soldiers, James lost at the Boyne in July 1690 and once again fled, but his cause continued until another defeat at Aughrim in July 1691. During the Williamite War (1688–91), four Jesuit houses were destroyed and many Jesuits arrested. The Treaty of Limerick (October 1691) promised tolerance to Catholics, but new penal laws made life even more difficult after 1695.[212] The Bishops' Banishment Act of 1697 exiled all bishops and religious from the island. All were ordered to depart by May 1, 1698, with a death sentence as a possible punishment for a return. In Scotland, the Holyrood college was attacked and destroyed, but Jacobite support remained strong in the Highlands. Their resistance to William ended with the Glencoe massacre in February 1692.

---

secular at the close of the year 1688 chiefly befell the English Province," as translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 5:152–53.

209 *English Catholic Community*, 24–25.

210 Clare to the general, St. Omers, January 15, 1690, ABSI, Stonyhurst Anglia V, 110.

211 ARSI, *Congr.* 84, fols. 197^{r}–203^{v}; superior general to Clare, Rome, May 27, 1690, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 495^{r}; same to same, Rome, August 5, 1690, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 496^{r}; same to same, Rome, October 14, 1690, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 497^{v}.

212 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 95–98.

Summer ended prematurely when the Protestant winds of November 1688 propelled the fleet of William and Mary to Torbay. During the halcyon days, nearly 140 Jesuits worked in England and Wales; their number fell to ninety-four with the "Glorious Revolution." Until the situation improved, Superior General González instructed the provincial to reintroduce a vice-provincial to govern wherever the provincial was not.[213]

King Louis XIV granted James the royal château of Saint-Germain-en-Laye. Despite King William's insistence that Louis throw James and his followers out of France, the Treaty of Ryswick (1697) only stipulated that France recognize William as king of Great Britain, and abandon military support for James's restoration. The Stuart court was safe in France.[214] Various Jesuits continued to serve at this court in exile. There were ten in 1691: Warner continued as the king's confessor; Ruga, Giudici, and Cullen remained in the queen's service; and Louis Sabran (1652–1732) served as chaplain to the prince of Wales. Five other Jesuits served in undefined roles. Around a dozen Jesuits resided at court until the mid-1700s when the number fell to five or six after the death of James in 1701. Jacobitism, that is, support for the restoration of the ousted Stuarts, attracted strong support from Catholics and Protestant Tories, the non-jurors who could not reconcile loyalty to William and Mary with their sworn allegiance to James.

In 1674, the French Jesuit Jean Pierron (1631–1700) visited Maryland from Canada. His superior Claude Dablon (1618–97) elated Pierron's adventures in an annual letter:

> In Maryland, he found two of our Fathers and a Brother, who are English, the Fathers being dressed like gentlemen and the Brothers like a Farmer; in fact he has charge of a farm, which serves to support the two missionaries. They labor successfully for the reduction of the heretics of the country where there are, in truth, many Catholics, among others the governor.[215]

Around this time, the number of Jesuits on the mission increased from three or four to nine or ten. A decade later, Jesuits ventured from the plantations of southern Maryland into the wilds of Manhattan where a small Catholic

213 Clare to the general, St. Omers, January 15, 1690, ABSI, Stonyhurst Anglia V, 110; superior general to Clare, Rome, March 11, 1690, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 493^{v}.

214 Anson, *Catholic Underground*, 94.

215 As cited in Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., "The Origins of the Mission, 1634–1735," in *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833*, ed. Joseph Durkin, S.J., Gerald Fogarty, S.J., and Robert Emmett Curran, S.J. (Baltimore: Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen, 1976), 27.

community was growing under the protection of the colony's proprietor James, duke of York. In 1682, James appointed Thomas Dongan (1634–1715), a Catholic, governor of the colony. Jesuits accompanied Dongan who established religious liberty in New York. Thomas Harvey (*vere* or alias Barton [*c*.1635–96]) was the first Jesuit listed in the New York mission in 1683. During the reign of James II, three Jesuits worked in New York, most likely in connection with the elementary school opened for Catholics and Protestants. (Did this school produce an advertisement similar to the colleges in London and Edinburgh?) Everything, of course, changed with the fall of James. In 1689, the Calverts were removed from power, and Maryland became a royal colony with the Catholics subject to the same laws as in England. In New York, the Jesuits were evicted (Harvey remained until the mid-1690s). In 1691, the Catholics lost their religious freedom.

6.1 *Historiography*

Jesuits, individually or collectively, are mentioned in any account of the reign of James II. Specific secondary literature is sparse. John Miller's, *Popery and Politics in England 1660–1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) remains fundamental. Stefania Tutino's *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008) treats Jesuits only in passing, but provides a context for an important but under-researched area. Also see Lockey, *Early Modern Catholics, Royalists, and Cosmopolitans*, and Leo Gooch, *Persecution without Martyrdom: The Catholics of North-East England in the Age of the Vicars Apostolic 1688–1850* (Leominster: Gracewing, 2013). For Ireland, see Keogh, *Jesuits in Ireland before and after the Suppression*; Moynes, *Irish Jesuit Mission*; Moynes, *Irish Jesuit Annual Letters*; McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory* provides basic information; for Scotland, Anson, *Underground Catholicism* does the same. For Maryland, Durkin, Fogarty, and Curran, *Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833*.

7 The Eighteenth Century

The Jesuit historian Thomas H. Clancy pronounced the eighteenth century as "a good century for church music but a bad one for Catholic thought."[216] I would go even further: the literary output of the English Jesuits, numerically greater than that of the smaller Irish and Scottish missions, declined after the mid-seventeenth century, perhaps a consequence of the moratorium imposed to silence the Chalcedon controversy. With the exception of the apologetical

216 *Literary History*, 233.

works printed during the brief reign of James II, Jesuit writings tended to be defensive and devotional instead of confrontational and controversial. As Catholics sought to make their peace with the established order, differences were not highlighted—and Jesuits wanted to make sure that they were not sacrificed in the formulation of the terms of accommodation.

English Jesuits slowly recovered from the fall of James. There were 305 members of the province, ninety-four of whom worked in England and Wales, in 1690. By 1700, the province numbered 337 with 131 in the kingdom. In Scotland, ten of the thirty-seven clergy in the kingdom were Jesuits in 1700. A year later, the Jesuits on the Scottish mission submitted to the authority of the vicar apostolic. By this time, Peter Anson suggests, the Jesuit style of life was "virtually the same" as the style of the secular clergy.[217] In 1712, the superior of the approximately twelve Jesuits on the island, Anthony Knowles (1648–1747), lamented the closure of all their chapels and the flight of the pastors. Because the public appearance of a priest was extremely dangerous, the Jesuits remained "in their hiding holes."[218] The crackdown resulted from fear of a Jacobite revolt or invasion.

The death of Queen Anne (1665–1714, r.1702–14) and the accession of the foreign but Protestant Hanoverians with King George I (1660–1727, r.1714–27) triggered the Jacobite rising of 1715. Believing the time ripe, James Francis Edward Stuart, the "Old Pretender," sought the recovery of the throne from the German dynasty. By early February 1716, the uprising was over and the Old Pretender, back on the continent. Within England, the government proposed more legislation against Catholics in order to prevent another rebellion. Fearful that new legislation would totally ruin English Catholicism, Bishop John Stonor (1678–1756), with assistance from Catholic clergy and laity, including the Jesuit James Blake (1649–1728), sought an accommodation with the Whig majority with a more sensitively formulated oath of allegiance. Criticized (or at least questioned) by Thomas Lawson (1665–1750), a Jesuit at James's court, Blake explained that he only sought a "bare oath of living peacefully and quietly" without repudiating any prior oath or seeking any papal dispensation.[219] Lawson's apprehension was well founded: German Jesuits warned their English confrères in Liège that they risked losing Bavarian patronage if they continued to support James. In Rome, Pope Clement XI (1649–1721, r.1700–21) agreed that Catholics could provide King George with the requested submission. Nonetheless, the English Jesuits remained committed to the

217 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 97n100.

218 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 98–99.

219 As cited in Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, 144.

Jacobite cause. The provincial Richard Plowden (1663–1729) ordered English Jesuits to refrain from any involvement in the formulation of an acceptable oath. A Jacobite counter-offensive and the fall of the government temporarily ended the negotiations.[220]

Conditions for Catholics in Ireland improved after the defeat of the Jacobites. The laws remained on the books, but they were generally ignored. Ignatius Kelly (1679–1743), superior of the few Jesuits in Ireland, set up a residence in Galway, and took a more active interest in the Irish college in Poitiers. An anonymous Jesuit in 1747 announced: "Never was a city better provided with learned and zealous instructors than Dublin is at present; we now begin to have vespers sung and sermons preached in the afternoons. You see hereby how peaceable times we enjoy."[221] As Jesuit manpower on the island increased, more became involved in education. John Austin (1717–84) established a school with strong academic credentials in Dublin circa 1750. About twenty years later, with the assistance of James Philip Mulcaihe (1727–1801) and Thomas Bretagh (1738–1811), the school was expanded to include boarders.[222] Three years later, in 1773, the Society of Jesus was suppressed.

Although Scottish Catholics remained excluded from public life, they too enjoyed a period of comparative peace after the failure of the 1715 uprising. That ended with the arrival of Bonnie Prince Charlie, Charles Edward Stuart (1720–88), the "Young Pretender," in July 1745. With strong Highlander support, Charles advanced into England as far as Derbyshire. Instead of pressing on, Charles's councilors decided to return to Scotland in the hope of greater assistance from France and from English Jacobites. On April 16, 1746, Prince William Augustus (1721–65), duke of Cumberland and son of King George II (1683–1760, r.1727–60), defeated and butchered the Jacobite army at Culloden. Among the clergy arrested and imprisoned, whether they were involved in the Jacobite cause or not, were four Jesuits: Alexander Cameron (1701–46) and Alexander Gordon (1702–46), both of whom died in prison; and the natural brothers John (1699–1782) and Charles Farquharson (?–1797), both of whom

220 Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, 131–57. Also see Eamon Duffy, "'Englishmen in vaine': Roman Catholic Allegiance to George I," in *Religion and National Identity*, ed. Stuart Mews, Studies in Church History 18 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982), 345–67; Geoffrey Holt, S.J., *The English Jesuits in the Age of Reason* (Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1993), 39–59; Geoffrey Scott, O.S.B., *Gothic Rage Undone: English Monks in the Age of Enlightenment* (Bath: Downside Abbey, 1992), 51–63.

221 As cited in McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 108.

222 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 100–1, 108–9.

returned to the continent until the suppression of the Society when they apparently went home.[223]

Jesuits were rarely enthusiastic about working with or under bishops; England was no exception. Thus they and the English Benedictines resisted efforts of the vicars apostolic to exert greater control over the activities, clerical and otherwise, of the priests within their jurisdiction. Appeals to Rome initially resulted in decisions favorable to the religious because of Jesuit and Benedictine insistence on the canonical difference between a vicar apostolic with delegated authority and a bishop with ordinary authority. The tide turned in favor of the vicars apostolic during the pontificate of Benedict XIV (1675–1758, r.1740–58). His *Emanavit nuper*, September 2, 1745, judged that all regulars received faculties from bishops or vicars apostolic, who could subject the religious to periodic review and examination. Rome delayed implementation of the bull as the religious orders made their case for exemption. The bull was promulgated in the summer of 1748. The even more damaging *Apostolicum ministerium* (May 30, 1753), better known as *Regulae observandae in Anglicanis missionibus*, ended any hope of a successful appeal. The new bull decreed that all religious required episcopal approval prior to their ministry in England. *Regulae observandae* also formulated desired criteria regarding the character and formation of the missioners. The vicars not only approved new missioners and controlled the faculties of men already on the mission but they could remove religious from the mission without explanation. More important and more distressing for religious morale was the so-called *sexennium* clause: each religious must return to a traditional, established residence of his order every six years for a fifteen-day retreat, and six months of regular, community life. Proof of the completion of the sabbatical was required for the renewal of missionary faculties. Jesuits and Benedictines complained that they were defamed by the bull and sought assurances that their activities and practices were not implicitly condemned. Subsequent demands for dispensations strained even more relations between the vicars apostolic and the religious orders.[224]

In November 1753, the two Scottish vicars apostolic Hugh MacDonald (1699–1773) and Alexander Smith (1684–1766) in their request for coadjutors asked Propaganda Fide to extend to Scotland the new regulations drafted by

223 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 144–46.

224 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "'Libera nos Domine'?: The Vicars Apostolic and the Suppressed/Restored English Province of the Society of Jesus," in *Early Modern English Catholicism: Identity, Memory and Counter-Reformation*, ed. James Kelly and Susan Royal (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 81–101; Scott, *Gothic Rage Undone*, 73–76.

Pope Benedict XIV for England in May. The superior of the Jesuit mission had already promised to comply with them.[225]

The Scottish Jesuit mission, barely able to keep its head above water at the best of times, suffered even more financially. After the 1745 rebellion, as estates of Catholics were sequestered, the mission lost many benefactors. With the expulsion of Jesuits from Portugal, Spain, and France, the mission lost its colleges and assets. As the Jesuit world collapsed, Superior General Lorenzo Ricci (1703–75, in office 1758–73) was unable to provide any assistance. The superior Patrick Gordon explained to the vicars apostolic that the mission could only support five of the Jesuits then ministering in Scotland. The bishops agreed that the fund for the sustenance of secular clergy would furnish the deficit.[226]

The Maryland colony lost its independence with the fall of James II. Henceforth, as a crown colony Maryland was subject to the English penal laws. The colony itself passed its own anti-Catholic laws, but, as Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J., observes: "While the anti-Catholic laws were strict, their actual application appears to have been less so. Priests were arrested, but never imprisoned."[227] Throughout the eighteenth century, the number of Jesuit priests on the mission hovered around fifteen with one or two brothers. With the exception of a church established in Philadelphia in 1732, the Jesuits ministered in rural areas where they were supported by the fruits of their plantations and developed a "distinctive life-style" even by the standards of the English province. Reports of this characteristic way of living reached England. Thomas Parker (*vere* Culcheth [1654–1730]) instructed the mission's superior Thomas Mansell (*vere* or alias Harding [1668–1724]) in 1713 to forbid "keeping of maid servants, playing at cards, and too much treating of secular people, all of which can't be done without expense & perhaps scandal." In the seventeenth century, the Jesuits depended on indentured servants to work the land; in the early eighteenth, they acquired slaves. A decade later, the superior George Thorold (*c*.1671–1742) cautioned the Jesuits against excessive drinking and advised them to avoid laymen who enjoyed their liquor but disliked clergy who had one too many.[228]

225 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 150–51. The superior may have been Patrick Gordon (1703–post-1773).

226 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 164–65.

227 "Origins of the Mission," 22.

228 Fogarty, "Origins of the Mission," 18–24.

7.1 *Historiography*

Old but still extremely valuable for the eighteenth century is Edwin H. Burton, *The Life and Times of Bishop Challoner*, 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, 1909). See also Eamon Duffy, ed., *Bishop Challoner and His Church: A Catholic Bishop in Georgian England* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1981); Geoffrey Holt, S.J., *The English Jesuits in the Age of Reason* (Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1993); Gabriel Glickman, *The English Catholic Community 1688–1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009). For Maryland, see Durkin, Fogarty, and Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*; Robert Emmett Curran, *Papist Devils: Catholics in British America, 1574–1783* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2014); Curran, *American Jesuit Spirituality: The Maryland Tradition, 1634–1900* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987). For Scotland and Ireland, see Anson, *Underground Catholicism*; Keogh, *Jesuits in Ireland before and after the Suppression*; Moynes, *Irish Jesuit Mission*; and McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*.

8 Suppression

In the eighteenth century, the Society of Jesus was on the defensive worldwide. Old foes such as Gallicans and Jansenists received aid from Enlightenment thinkers and centralizing secular monarchs in their battle with Jesuits. We need not go into the details regarding the events leading up to the suppression of the Society in 1773.[229] The Society of Jesus was expelled from Portugal and its empire in 1759, from France in 1764, from Spain and its empire in 1767. The Irish College, Lisbon, initially closed, reopened under the auspices of the Irish hierarchy in 1782. The college at Santiago de Compostela closed in 1767; the college at Seville merged with that of Salamanca under the auspices of the Irish hierarchy. The college in Poitiers closed with the expulsion of the Jesuits from France.[230] The Scots colleges in Madrid and Douai were transferred to the jurisdiction of the vicars apostolic after the expulsion of the Jesuits. The Madrid college was relocated to Valladolid in 1770.[231] The English vicars apostolic

229 See Jeffrey D. Burson and Jonathan Wright, eds., *The Jesuit Suppression in Global Context: Causes, Events, Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

230 See Patricia O'Connell, "The Early-Modern Irish College Network in Iberia, 1590–1800," in *The Irish in Europe, 1580–1815*, ed. Thomas O'Connor (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 49–64.

231 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 169–71; Michael Briody, ed., *The Scots College, Spain, 1767–1780: Memoirs of the Translation of the Scotch College from Madrid to Valladolid* (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2015).

had complained about the mismanagement of the colleges in Valladolid and Seville, and believed, with some justification, that the Spanish Jesuits were intent on the colleges' ruin. The vicars quickly secured possession of the colleges after the demise of the Jesuits. On December 2, 1767, the English Jesuit John Thorpe (1726–92) wondered whether a strong rumor was accurate:

> The Agents here for the Irish Clergy assert that the several seminaries of English, Scots and Irish have at the request of the Bishops and Apostolic Vicars particularly interested, been preserved by his Catholic Majesty from the common calamity of Jesuits houses and that the Spanish Embassador at London has received orders to send Superiors etc of each respective nation to take possession of the Colleges. No one except Secular Priests are to be admitted in any capacity. Is this true?[232]

On the basis of information provided by unnamed but trusted French officials, English Jesuits believed that they would have been able to obtain an exemption so that they could continue the college at St. Omers if it had not been for the duplicity of English bishops and secular clergy. As the English bishops took possession of the college's property and the English Jesuits and their students migrated to Bruges, the Jesuits suspected that more than a simple desire to preserve the collegiate assets for the mission motivated the secular clergy.[233] On the eve of the suppression, there were around 290 Jesuits with 140 working in England and Wales and twenty-three in Maryland. There were nineteen Jesuits on the Irish mission and ten in Scotland.[234] In a series of public humiliations, the Society of Jesus was removed from the administration of the Irish College, Rome, and the Roman College for incompetence after a controversial visitation in September 1772 during which the Society was afforded no opportunity to defend itself. The Irish College and, after the suppression, the English and Scots Colleges were transferred to the jurisdiction of the bishops and the vicars apostolic.[235]

The sword of Damocles finally fell. Pope Clement XIV (1705–74, r.1769–74) dated *Dominus ac Redemptor* July 21, 1773, but it was not executed until August 16th. The Jesuit community at the college of the confessors was disturbed at

232 ABSI, MS. A.III.15, unfoliated.

233 See McCoog, "'Libera nos Domine.'"

234 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 121; Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 172n.

235 See Michael E. Williams, *The Venerable English College, Rome*, 2nd ed. (Leominster: Gracewing, 2008); Daire Keogh and Albert McDonnell, eds., *The Irish College, Rome and Its World* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008); Raymond McCluskey, ed., *The Scots College, Rome, 1600–2000* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2000).

supper. Gathered together in a large hall, the Jesuits listened to an official reading of the brief. John Thorpe, a member of the community, later admitted that he had not heard the entire text "for my attention was lost in the title alone, which had made such impression on my heart, that it could not without bursting, hear more."[236]

During the summer of 1773, the English college that had moved from St. Omers to Bruges in 1762 merged with the former philosophate/theologate of the English province in Liège to form the Académie Anglaise with the permission of the prince-bishop, François-Charles de Velbruck (1719–84). The bishop allowed the former Jesuits to continue their work and to live in community; he demanded little more than the abandonment of the Jesuit soutane and customs in favor of those of his diocesan clergy. John Howard (*vere* Holme [1718–83]), the last Jesuit rector, became the first president of the academy.

Each Jesuit in England, some with a protest, either personally or by letter acknowledged the brief and placed himself under the jurisdiction of the appropriate vicar apostolic. The now former Jesuits remained where they had been working. Each bishop appointed a former Jesuit as a middleman in his relations with the other former Jesuits. This role, presumably, would pass with the death of the last former Jesuit. Efforts by the bishops to secure the real estate and assets of the province were frustrated by former Jesuit threats of *praemunire* if the hierarchy made any attempt to do so. Each residence and college within England formed a separate trust with former Jesuits as trustees. These trusts would support the district and the missioners. It was hoped that the Liège Academy would train seminarians according to the Jesuit mold (as much as possible); once ordained, they would be assigned to a district and perhaps eventually become a trustee. Representative former Jesuits twice met in London to formulate plans for closer collaboration with Liège and within England. No wonder that someone scribbled "Est et non est: wonderful existence of the Society after its extinction."[237] The transfer of the Liège Academy to Stonyhurst, Lancashire, in 1794 because of the advance of the French armies strengthened ties between both branches of the former province but created difficult, canonical problems regarding the ordination of its graduates. The vicars apostolic considered them no different from other seminarians under their authority and jurisdiction. How could they be otherwise, because the

236 As cited in Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "'Lost in the title': John Thorpe's Eyewitness Account of the Suppression," in Burson and Wright, *Jesuit Suppression in Global Context*, 161–80, here 173.

237 See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "'Est et non est': Jesuit Corporate Survival in England after the Suppression," in *Jesuit Survival and Restoration: A Global History, 1773–1900*, ed. Robert A. Maryks and Jonathan Wright (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 162–77.

Society of Jesus no longer existed? Thus there was no guarantee that the graduates of Stonyhurst would succeed the former Jesuit incumbents in the various districts and protect the assets for a future restoration.

News of the survival of the Society of Jesus and rumors that it did so with a papal "wink and a nod" encouraged the former Jesuits in England to request amalgamation. Earlier petitions had been denied, because the authority of Jesuit superiors did not extend beyond the borders of the Russian Empire. In 1801, Pope Pius VII (1742–1823, r.1800–23) explicitly stated this geographic restriction in *Catholicae fidei*:

> We permit and allow you [Vicar General Franciszek Kareu (1731–1802, in office 1799–1802 [1801–2 as general])] and the other priests who live there, or who will arrive in the future, and those who previously joined that congregation or will join it in the future, to be united, brought together and joined in one body and congregation of the Society of Jesus, only, however, within the borders of the Russian Empire and not beyond, in one or several houses as the superior shall determine.[238]

Nonetheless, Kareu's successor Gabriel Gruber (1740–1805, in office 1802–5), encouraged by papal oral approval, granted the requests of the former English Jesuits who renewed their vows in the restored Society. On March 1, 1803, Gruber appointed Marmaduke Stone (1748–1834) provincial of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Oral concessions did not convince the vicars apostolic of the canonical legitimacy of the English province and insisted that the Society remained suppressed. Not even the universal restoration in 1814 satisfied them. They resisted until January 1829 when Pope Leo XII (1760–1829, r.1823–29) instructed them to observe Pius VII's *Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum*, the bull that restored the Jesuits, and to recognize the Society's privileges and rights.

The Jesuits in Scotland submitted to the two vicars apostolic on October 6, 1773. In a letter to Bishop James Grant (1706–78), his coadjutor bishop George Hay (1729–1811) recounted the ceremony:

> They were most ready and willing to comply, and accordingly writ over the Form of the Submission both at once, and then delivered it into my hand, upon which I rose and embraced them with the tenderest affection which they mutually returned, and hoped we should always find them most submissive and obedient; and I assured them they should never

238 As translated in McCoog, *Promising Hope*, 317.

> have reason to complain or regret the change of their Superiors on our part. […] This being finished, we drank tea together, and were very frank.[239]

The absent Jesuits made their submissions later. What funds the mission possessed, the former superior Peter Gordon, according to Peter Anson, "convinced that the Society would soon be restored," were not conceded to the vicars apostolic for almost seven years.[240] Anson may have been mistaken, because Francis Edwards, S.J. (1922–2006) notes that the last pre-suppression Scottish Jesuit, John Pepper (1725–1810), bequeathed a sum of money to the English province for an eventual Scottish mission. It is unclear whether this sum came from the mission's funds or his personal savings.[241] The Jesuits returned to Scotland in the 1850s.

Archbishop John Carpenter of Dublin (1729–86) received written submissions from the eleven former Jesuits working in his archdiocese. The eight former Jesuits outside Dublin did the same.[242] As in England and, presumably, Scotland, the former Jesuits remained where they had been ministering. Despite Carpenter's confiscation of some monies owed to the mission, the former Jesuits maintained contact with an acknowledgment of some undefined status of the last superior of the mission, John Ward (1704–75), who also managed what was left of the mission's assets. The former Jesuits met semi-annually. Ward transferred management of the finances to John Fullam (*c.*1717–93). The extant former Jesuits, pledged to secrecy concerning finances, promised that, if there number fell to three and there was no hope of the Society's restoration, the assets were to be bestowed upon "pious foundations." If the Society were restored, the monies were to be given to the superior general. In the mid- to late 1790s, the remaining five drafted a new agreement. Irish bishops considered pro-Jesuit would be informed of the finances of the former mission. Moreover, the few former Jesuits would initiate discussions with these bishops regarding the use of the mission's assets to endow a school or college for the education of priests to serve in Ireland. Initial episcopal disinterest vanished once the bishops realized how much money was involved. Fullam's successor as procurator, Richard Callaghan (1728–1807), had to protect the funds from the bishops. The college at Stonyhurst provided the former Irish

239 As cited in Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 171–72.

240 Anson, *Underground Catholicism*, 172.

241 *Jesuits in England*, 278–79. Charles Anson, however, claims that James Macgillivray (?–1811) was "the last of the old Jesuits" (*Underground Catholicism*, 299n). Macgillivray did in fact die in Scotland—he had returned home after the suppression—but he was apparently a member of the Gallo-Belgian province.

242 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 121–22.

Jesuits with an alternative for the education of students. Callaghan pronounced vows in 1804 in the restored English province, and entrusted the funds to the provincial Marmaduke Stone for safekeeping until the revival of the Irish mission.[243] On September 30, 1812, Superior General Tadeusz Brzozowski (1749–1820, in office 1805–20) appointed Peter Kenney (1779–1841) superior of the restored Irish mission, a mission dependent on the English provincial. Kenney, fearing that Irish interests would always be considered inferior to English ones, complained to Rome. Brzozowski replied:

> Dear Father, your letter is scribbled; neither revised, nor corrected, and I cannot read it. You should not write like that to me. You say that I seem to be more favourable to the English. A childish remark! Is it that [...] you want me to stop trying to foster intercommunion between you and the English, as though a superior should desist from promoting unioh of harts among his subjects. When you write, dear Father, give more thought to what you write, to whom, and about whom.[244]

Some thought that Kenney wanted it both ways: independence, and yet support, from the English province. In 1814, Brzozowski transferred the Irish mission from the English to the Roman province.

In the early 1800s, thirteen former Jesuits remained in the United States, many of whom wished to end their days in the Society. Through their English contacts, they too knew of the Society's continuation in Russia. Like their English confrères, they retained a corporate identity and protected their financial assets. Marmaduke Stone was obliged to refuse their petitions for readmission into the Society, because his jurisdiction did not extend to former colonies within the empire. In March 1804, Superior General Gruber readmitted the former Jesuits. In June 1805, John Carroll (1735–1815), bishop of Baltimore and a former Jesuit who did not return, nominated Robert Molyneux (1738–1808) as the mission's superior, an appointment confirmed by Brzozowski in February 1806. In October, Carroll opened a novitiate at Georgetown College, founded by him in 1789.[245]

---

243 McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 122–32; Thomas J. Morrissey, S.J., "Ireland, England and the Restoration of the Society of Jesus," in *Promising Hope: Essays on the Suppression and Restoration of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2003), 190–217.

244 As quoted in Morrissey, "Ireland, England and the Restoration of the Society of Jesus," 215.

245 McCoog, *Promising Hope*, 274–75; Joseph F. Durkin, S.J., "II. The Mission and the New Nation: 1773–1880," in Durkin, Fogarty, and Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*, 29–46; Ronald A.

8.1 *Historiography*

Lockey, *Early Modern Catholics, Royalists, and Cosmopolitans*; Gooch, *Persecution without Martyrdom*; Maurice Whitehead, *English Jesuit Education: Expulsion, Suppression, Survival and Restoration, 1762–1803* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013); Holt, *English Jesuits in the Age of Reason*; Geoffrey Holt, S.J., *William Strickland and the Suppressed Jesuits* (London: British Province of the Society of Jesus, 1988); Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., ed., *Promising Hope: Essays on the Suppression and Restoration of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2003); Marek Inglot, S.J., *How the Jesuits Survived Their Suppression: The Society of Jesus in the Russian Empire (1773–1814)*, ed. and trans. Daniel L. Schlafly (Philadelphia: Saint Joseph's University Press, 2015); Jeffrey D. Burson and Jonathan Wright, eds., *The Jesuit Suppression in Global Context: Causes, Events, Consequences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Robert A. Maryks and Jonathan Wright, eds., *Jesuit Survival and Restoration: A Global History, 1773–1900* (Leiden: Brill, 2014). For Scotland, see Anson, *Underground Catholicism*; for Ireland, Keogh, *Jesuits in Ireland before and after the Suppression*; Moynes, *Irish Jesuit Mission*; and McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*; for Maryland, Durkin, Fogarty, and Curran, *Maryland Jesuits*; Curran, *Papist Devils*; Curran, *American Jesuit Spirituality*; Maryks and Wright, *Jesuit Survival and Restoration*.

9 Conclusion

The Benedictine historian Adrian Morey (1904–89) opens his ambiguously titled chapter "Jesuit Invaders" with an honest evaluation: "Distinguished by name from seminary priests in government proclamations and statutes, the Jesuits attracted remarkable attention and odium, to an extent indeed that was out of proportion to their numbers."[246] How disproportionate is difficult to calculate. Historians Patrick McGrath and Joy Rowe examined the data provided in the first volume, the Elizabethan era, of Anstruther's *Seminary Priests*. They concluded that at least 471 seminary priests were active in England during her reign (1558–1603) with a possible 130 more. The number would increase even more if we had some idea of how many Marian priests were still

Binzley, "Ganganelli's Disaffected Children: The Ex-Jesuits and the Shaping of Early American Catholicism, 1773–1790," *U.S. Catholic Historian* 26 (2008): 47–77.

246 *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978), 191.

ministering in England and Wales.[247] Unfortunately, no one has attempted a comparable calculation for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The approximately forty Jesuits who worked on the mission during Elizabeth's reign were, at best, fewer than ten percent of the total number. Yet they dominated the headlines.

Sir Walter Mildmay (1520/21–89) in a carefully prepared address to Parliament in January 1581, slightly more than six months after the arrival of the Jesuits, decried their menace. The pope had sent them to England:

> To confirm them [the Catholics] herein, and to increase their numbers, you see how the Pope hath and doth comfort their hollow hearts with absolutions, dispensations, reconciliations, and such other things of Rome. You see how lately he hath sent hither a sort of hypocrites, naming themselves Jesuits, a rabble of vagrant friars newly sprung up and coming through the world to trouble the Church of God; whose principal errand is, by creeping into the houses and familiarities of men of behaviour and reputation, not only to corrupt the realm with false doctrine, but also, under that pretence, to stir sedition.[248]

The royal proclamation of January 10, 1581 employed the same rhetoric in its denunciation of those who "carry the name of Jesuits under the color of a holy name to deceive and abuse the simpler sort, and are lately repaired into this realm by special direction from the pope and his delegates" to seduce the crown's subjects.[249]

In August 1581, Robert Persons, perhaps with a certain amount of pride, wrote to Alfonso Agazzari (1546–1602):

> There is tremendous talk here of Jesuits, and more fables perhaps are told about them than were told of old about monsters. For as to the origin of these men, their way of life, their institute, their morals and teaching, their plans and actions, stories of all sorts are spread abroad, not only in

247 Patrick McGrath and Joy Rowe, "Anstruther Analysed: The Elizabethan Seminary Priests," *Recusant History* 18 (1986): 1–13, here 2. See also Patrick McGrath and Joy Rowe, "The Marian Priests under Elizabeth I," *Recusant History* 17 (1984–85): 103–20; James E. Kelly, "Conformity, Loyalty and the Jesuit Mission to England of 1580," in *Religious Tolerance in the Atlantic World: Early Modern and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. Eliane Glaser (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 149–70.

248 As quoted in J. E. [John Ernest] Neale, *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1559–1581*, 2 vols. (London: Jonathan Cape, 1953–57), 1:383–84.

249 Hughes and Larkin, *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, 2:483.

> private conversation but also in public sermons and printed books, and these contradict one another and have a striking resemblance to dreams.[250]

Twenty-five years later, the anonymous author of the mission's annual letter reported the evolution of the mythic Jesuit:

> It would be superfluous to set down here the abuse and slander by which the heretics seek to make the very name of Jesuit a bug-bear, yet we may be allowed to furnish a few specimens. We are called the Pope's janissaries; the favourite brood of Antichrist; the sworn slaves of the Pope; the reserve corps of the Catholic Church; the most dangerous enemies of the King and country; the most bigoted advocates for Popery; and the most earnest in maintaining and spreading it. They say that Hell has sent us forth fully equipped with learning and other gifts, both natural and acquired, in order to prop those of the Papacy now tottering to its fall, and to dim the shining of their new fangled "fifth Gospel," as well as to involve the New World in darkness.[251]

The suggestion of Jesuit presence caused a panic.[252] The "Grand Remonstrance" of 1641 alerted King Charles I to the dangers that members of the Society of Jesus introduced into the realm:

> And because we have reason to believe that those malignant parties, whose proceedings evidently appear to be mainly for the advantage and increase of Popery, is composed, set up, and acted by the subtle practice of the Jesuits and other engineers and factors for Rome, and to the great danger of this kingdom, and most grievous affliction of your loyal subjects, have so far prevailed as to corrupt divers of your Bishops and others in prime places of the Church, and also to bring divers of these instruments to be of your Privy Council, and other employments of trust

250 Persons to Agazzari, London/Rouen, August 1581, in Houliston, Crosignani, and McCoog, *Correspondence and Unpublished Papers of Robert Persons, S.J.*, 179.

251 ARSI, *Angl.* 31/I, 587–629, here 624 (translated in Foley, *Records of the English Province*, 7/2:1069).

252 Regarding such panics, see Alexandra Walsham, "'This new army of Satan': The Jesuit Mission and the Formation of Public Opinion in Elizabethan England," in *Moral Panics, the Media and the Law in Early Modern England*, ed. David Lemmings and Claire Walker (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 41–62.

> and nearness about your Majesty, the Prince, and the rest of your royal children.[253]

Jesuit hysteria was not restricted to proclamations and statutes. The saintly John Donne (1572–1631), who had two Jesuit uncles, one of whom, Jasper Heywood, he visited in the Tower of London as a child,[254] portrayed Ignatius of Loyola as a clear threat to Lucifer's domination of hell. Ignatius too feared for his position: he knew that each Jesuit tumbling into hell was as qualified as he to be master.[255]

Robert Burton (1577–*c*.1641) added his contribution to the mythic Jesuit in *The Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621). In his analysis of love melancholia, he lambasted the "company of Hellborne Jesuits" as hypocrites who feign Christian love through their alms and sermons, but demonstrate their true colors in the persecutions for which they have been responsible:

> As so many firebrands set all the world by the eares (I say nothing of their contentious and rayling bookes, whole ages spent in writing one against another, and that with such virulency and bitternesse, *Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro*,[256] and by their bloody Inquisitions[257] that in thirty years, Bale saith, consumed 39 Princes, 148 Earls, 235 Barons, 14,755 Commons worse then [*sic*] those ten persecutions, may justly doubt where is Charity?

Over a thirty-year period, if Burton and Bale are to be believed, the Society was responsible for more than one death a day. Presumably the Bale in question is John Bale (1495–1563). His mathematics is questionable since the guilty Society had not been in existence for thirty years at the time of his death. Later, Burton

---

253 S. [Samuel] R. Gardiner, ed., *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 203–4.

254 On Donne and the Jesuits, see Dennis Flynn, "The English Mission of Jasper Heywood, S.J.," *AHSI* 54 (1985): 45–76; Flynn, *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

255 John Donne, *Ignatius His Conclave*, ed. T. [Timothy] S. Healy, S.J. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969). Donne may have had his tongue firmly in his cheek in what may be a satire on anti-Jesuit hysteria. See McCoog, *"And touching our society,"* 349.

256 The reference is to Horace, *Epistulae*, book 2, letter 2, line 60. *Brioneis* is Bion Borysthenites, third-century BCE Scythian. According to E. C. Wickham, "Horace is concerned with him not as a philosopher but as the reputed author of many pungent sayings" (Horace, *Opera omnia*, ed. E. [Edward] C. [Charles] Wickham, 2 vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891]), 2:368n.

257 Is this ignorance or an intentional confusion of the Jesuits with the Dominicans?

credits Jesuits with a shrewd ability to exploit religious melancholia in their recruitment of co-conspirators in their plots.[258]

Periodical translations of foreign works added exciting new details to the mythic Jesuit. The infamous *Monita secreta* appeared in 1658 in a translation by the Jesuit apostate Pierre Jatrige (dates unknown): *Secret Instructions for the Superiors of the Society of Jesus, Faithfully Rendered out of the Latine* (in *A Further Discovery of the Mistery of Jesuitisme* [London, 1658]).[259] The earlier discovery of the Jesuit "mistery" was, of course, the English translation of Pascal's *Les provinciales; Or, the Mystery of Jesuitisme* (London, 1657). The propaganda surrounding the phantasmagoric Popish Plot (1678) and the triumphal "Glorious Revolution" (1688) provided further evidence of Jesuit machinations and the inquisitorial disaster that James's reign intended to introduce—and from which England was providentially spared.

The defeat of Bonnie Prince Charlie and the subsequent lassitude of Georgian England so undermined the Jesuit threat that Oliver Goldsmith (1728–74) could joke in "The Good Natur'd Man," first produced in 1768: "Indeed what signifies what weather we have in a country going to ruin like ours? Taxes rising and trade falling. Money flying out of the kingdom and Jesuits swarming into it. I know at this time no less than an hundred and twenty-seven Jesuits between Charing-cross and Temple-bar."[260] But events wiped the smile from the faces of the theatergoers. With the expulsion of Jesuits from Portugal (1759), France (1764), and Spain (1767), anxiety was high that many would sneak into England to do the nefarious deeds that one would expect from them. Goldsmith was mocking this "moral panic" as he exploited the hysteria for comic effect. However, laughter did not destroy the myth. Among the viral rumors that generated the Gordon Riots (1780) was one that detailed the sabotage planned by twenty thousand Jesuits hidden in tunnels beneath the Thames, where they awaited orders to flood London by blowing up the banks of the river.[261] The suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 did not reduce the rumor's credibility. But then again, accuracy was not a characteristic

258 Part 3, section 1, member 3, subsection 1; part 3, section 4, member 1, subsection 2, Robert Burton, *The Anatomy of Melancholy: Text*, ed. Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989–94), 3:37, 350–52.

259 On the *Monita secreta*, see Sabina Pavone, *The Wily Jesuits and the* Monita secreta*: The Forged Secret Instructions of the Jesuits* (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005).

260 Act 1, lines 21–25 in *Collected Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Arthur Friedman, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 5:24.

261 Antonia Fraser, *The King and the Catholics: England, Ireland, and the Fight for Religious Freedom, 1780–1829* (New York: Doubleday, 2018), 9.

of the myth-makers. The exclusion of the Society of Jesus—as well as other religious orders—from the full benefits of Catholic emancipation in 1829 illustrates the lingering strength of the myth. Minor clauses of the act forbade wearing religious garb, specifically habits, in public and projected a general suppression of the Society and monastic orders through the registration of its members and a prohibition against novices. Despite its prominence in the British national narrative and literary tradition, no scholar has scrutinized the development of an English variation of anti-Jesuitism despite scholarly interest in anti-popery.[262]

Anti-Jesuitism, real or perceived, has even penetrated the confessional histories written by English Catholics. About a decade ago, the Dominican historian John Vidmar examined several prominent Roman Catholic accounts of the English Reformation.[263] Initially, the historians (or perhaps more accurately controversialists) wondered how Protestantism had gained the upper hand and why their co-religionists were persecuted. Could persecution have been averted? Could a *modus vivendi* with the government have been established? Two interpretations evolved: the first, associated with the Society of Jesus, blamed Elizabeth and her ministers; the second to some degree exonerated the crown and attributed guilt to the political connivance of the Jesuits. Vidmar claims, with considerable justification, "that scenario—Exiles/Jesuits versus Appellants/Diocesan clergy—would remain the historical battleground among Catholics until Catholic Emancipation in 1929, when disabilities against

262 There are admittedly articles and essays on one aspect or person, e.g., John Donne (Stefania Tutino, "La question de l'antijésuitisme anglais à l'époque moderne: Le cas de John Donne," in *Les antijésuites: Discours, figures et lieux de l'antijésuitisme à l'époque modern*, ed. Pierre-Antoine Fabre and Catherine Maire [Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2010], 383–99) or within the wider context of anti-Catholicism, e.g., Carol Z. Wiener, "The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," *Past & Present* 51 (1971): 27–62, but with the single exception of Arnold Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England* (London: Scolar, 1979), 175–91, no one has addressed the myth itself in any way comparable to Róisín Healy, *The Jesuit Specter in Imperial Germany* (Leiden: Brill, 2003). For anti-popery, see Arthur F. Marotti, *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005); Peter Lake, "Anti-popery: The Structure of a Prejudice," in *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*, ed. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (London: Longman, 1989), 72–106; Andrew Milton, "A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism," in *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*, ed. Arthur F. Marotti (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999), 85–115.

263 John Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians and the English Reformation, 1585–1954* (Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2008).

Catholics were almost entirely removed."[264] Emancipation, however, did not end the dueling interpretations.

The victimization of English Catholics demanded a scapegoat. The Society of Jesus was a convenient one. Jesuit policies and strategies had provoked the government with consequent persecution. With the removal of the Society, a compromise could be negotiated. At least twice, as we have seen, a distinct group of English Catholics, usually clerics, proposed the exclusion of the Society of Jesus from the mission in order to obtain tolerance. Both times, the Jesuits withstood the challenge. Denunciations, however, persisted. The secular priest Hugh Tootel (1672–1743), better known by his alias Charles Dodd, campaigned against Jesuit domination of the mission, embezzlement, and disloyalty, initially in *The History of the English College at Doway* (London, 1713) and *The Secret Policy of the English Society of Jesus* (London, 1715), and culminating in *The Church History of England, from the Year 1500, to the Year 1688*, 3 vols. (Brussels [*vere* London], 1737–42). Cisalpine Catholics, clerical and lay, persisted in their denunciation of the ultramontanism of the Society of Jesus as the ultimate cause of persecution. The secular priest Joseph Berington (1743–1827) edited and expanded *The Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani* (Birmingham, 1793) along acceptable cisalpine lines. Despite the universal suppression of the Society, Charles Plowden (1743–1821), a former Jesuit, leapt to its defense with *Remarks on a Book Entitled Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani* (Liège, 1794). Plowden argues that the so-called memoirs were in fact a forgery concocted by Dodd and Berington to advocate Catholic acceptance of an oath of supremacy by discrediting Jesuits (and now former Jesuits), the vicars apostolic, and the pope.[265]

According to Vidmar, the cisalpine torch was passed from Berington to Charles Butler (1750–1832), from one polemicist to another. Butler's *Historical Memoirs Respecting the English, Irish, and Scottish Reformations from the Reformation to the Present Time*, 4 vols. (London, 1819–21) updated some of Berington's works. Like Berington, Butler was not a historian; unlike Berington, Butler was a layman. Perhaps not being a secular priest allowed him to be more tolerant of the Society of Jesus, to the point of conceding that they were unjustly executed.[266] John Milner (1752–1826), vicar apostolic for the Midlands between 1803 and 1826, was present in the chapel at the Gesù when Pope Pius VII restored the Society in 1814. He was the only vicar apostolic favorable to the former Jesuits and their restoration in England. It is perhaps not surprising that he also opposed the cisalpine politicians, especially Butler, whom the

264 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 6.
265 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 29–39.
266 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 40–45.

vicar apostolic suspected was a secret Protestant who wrote apologies for and defenses of the Elizabethan government. In *Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics* (London: Keating and Brown, 1820), Milner exonerated the Jesuits and the papacy of any blame for the penal laws and persecution.[267]

The procession of cisalpine historians continued despite Milner's intervention as one generation passed the anti-Jesuit baton to its successor. John Lingard (1771–1851), the clerical heir to the lay Charles Butler, benefited from access to important archives in Rome and Spain. Unlike his cisalpine predecessors whose historical interest began with the Elizabethan (or occasionally with the Henrician) reformation, Lingard wrote a comprehensive history of England in eight *quarto* volumes: *History of England* (London: J. Mawman, 1819–30). Amid his praise of Queen Elizabeth were scattered complaints about the Jesuits and the secular clergy that followed in their wake because of their endorsement of the papal deposing power. Vidmar argues that Lingard's anti-Jesuit prejudice "simply got the better of him" in that he could not conceive the possibility that the saintly and loyal William, Cardinal Allen, had written the despicable *Admonition to the Nobility and People of England* (1587) in preparation for the Armada. Robert Persons must have been the author.[268]

Catholic emancipation did not end attacks on the Jesuits. Indeed, the clause that restricted all religious orders encouraged further attacks on the Society. The secular priest Mark Tierney (1795–1862), the current holder of the cisalpine torch, planned a new, provocative edition of Dodd's *Church History* with the clear intention of revealing once and for all the designs whereby the Society has "so constantly endeavoured to accomplish their pernicious purposes." English Jesuits, unaware of Tierney's purpose, collaborated with him by lending him important documents. Tierney, in turn, promised a fair, unbiased history to which the Society would not object. His aversion to the Jesuits was, however, not muted. He blamed them, and especially Persons, for the persecution. Their tactics had jeopardized the lives of other priests, and called into question the loyalty of all Catholics. Tierney never completed his edition. He ended *Dodd's Church History of England* (London: C. Dolman, 1839–43) with the fifth volume because of Jesuit opposition.[269]

---

267 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 45–51.

268 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 52–74, here 60.

269 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 75–87, here 80. See also Martin John Broadley, ed., *Bishop Herbert Vaughan and the Jesuits: Education and Authority* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Catholic Record Society, 2010), xxii–xxiv for a comparable censorship of Edmund Sheridan Purcell's *Life of Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster*, 2 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1896).

Not even Edmund Campion was safe from the cisalpine re-fashioning of English Catholic history. In *Edmund Campion*, 2nd ed. (London: J. Hodges, 1896), Richard Simpson (1820–76) portrayed Campion as the proverbial "lamb led to the slaughter," "a victim of the inherent contradiction in the body of doctrine delivered to the English by the missionary priests, a contradiction not of his own making." Campion, like Simpson, did not accept the temporal power of the pope. According to Vidmar, Simpson exploited Campion the martyr "to attack the Ultramontanists (and the Jesuits), who were agitating for more authority in the pope."[270]

The campaign against Persons and the English Jesuits reached its climax (or nadir) in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Ethelred Taunton (1857–1907), diocesan priest and Benedictine wannabe, castigated Persons and the Society for their efforts to dominate the English mission. He first attacked Persons in *The English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, 2 vols. (London: J. C. Nimmo, 1897); he expanded his assault in *History of the Jesuits in England* (London: Methuen, 1901).[271] Two years later, an equally hostile, polemical history appeared: *The Jesuits in Great Britain: An Historical Inquiry into Their Political Influence* (London: G. Routledge, 1903) by the Protestant controversialist Walter Walsh (1847–1912). The author promised to dispel any doubt that "during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Jesuits were a thoroughly disloyal body of men, and the ringleaders in sedition and rebellion."[272] I. T. Foster, author of Walsh's entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, evaluates the history as "a poor book, of no credit to Walsh, which sought to attribute most of Britain's troubles to the Society of Jesus."[273]

Henry Foley (1811–91) launched the Jesuit rebuttal. The title of his first publication set the tone: *Jesuits in Conflict* (London: Burns & Oates, 1873). This served as an *aperitif* for the magisterial *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 7 vols. in 8 parts (Roehampton: Manresa, 1877–84), more a collection of primary source documents in translation (at times carefully edited) than a conventual history. Foley was not a polemicist and apparently believed that the simple presentation of principal documents would demonstrate the mendacity of the Jesuit detractors. John Morris (1828–93), who as a diocesan

270 Vidmar, *English Catholic Historians*, 125–28, here 127, 128.

271 G. Martin Murphy, "Taunton, Ethelred Luke (1857–1907), Ecclesiastical Historian," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-36424 (accessed January 19, 2019).

272 *Jesuits in Great Britain*, vi.

273 I. T. Foster, "Walsh, Walter (1847–1912), Religious Controversialist and Author," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*; http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-47129 (accessed January 19, 2019).

priest before he entered the Jesuits, revived the cause of the English martyrs, and the Victorian John Gerard (1840–1912) as editor of *The Month*, struggled to set the record straight. Gerard contested the nature of the Gunpowder Plot with the noted historian Samuel Rawson Gardiner (1829–1902). Arguably the best Jesuit historian, John Hungerford Pollen defended the province by demolishing the arguments of critics such as Taunton by editing primary documents, and by clear, Jesuit-friendly narratives in *The Month*. In the early years of the Catholic Record Society, Pollen was criticized for using the Catholic Record Society's publications to exonerate the Society of Jesus and especially Persons, and to refute Taunton.[274]

Around forty years ago, early modern English Catholic historians were transfixed by the final version of the Appellant–Jesuit historiographical ebate. John Bossy (1933–2015), whose *The English Catholic Community 1570–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) charted the emergence of the English Catholic community from the English Catholic Church in the 1560s when "the death of the medieval English Church—in the sense of a final recognition that it had ceased to live on the part of those Englishmen who hankered after it most—seems to me a principal condition for the emergence of a viable Catholic community in a non-Catholic England."[275] The midwives for the birth of the English Catholic community were the foundation of the English College in Douai in 1568, the arrival of the seminary priests, the insistence on recusancy as the only authentic Catholic position on the Established Church, and, most important, the initiation of the Jesuit mission.[276] Within a decade, Christopher Haigh challenged Bossy's interpretation. The English Church was not moribund but vibrant, as Eamon Duffy and J. J. Scarisbrick would subsequently demonstrate.[277] The latter explicated his position:

> I am not claiming that pre-Reformation England was a land of zealous, God-fearing Christians (though I suspect that there were many more of them than some recent historians would admit). I *am* saying that,

274 See McCoog, "John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. (1858–1925): The Hues of History"; Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., "Remembering Henry Garnet, S.J.," *AHSI* 75 (2006): 159–88.

275 Bossy, *English Catholic Community*, 11.

276 Bossy subsequently toned down his endorsement of the Society of Jesus and its insistence on recusancy. See his "Afterword," in *Early Modern English Catholicism: Identity, Memory and Counter-Reformation*, ed. James E. Kelly and Susan Royal (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 246–54, here 248.

277 Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, c.1400–1580* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); J. [Jack] J. Scarisbrick, *The Reformation and the English People* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1984).

> however imperfect the old order, and however imperfect the Christianity of the average man or woman in the street, there is no evidence of loss of confidence in the old ways, no mass disenchantment.[278]

Bossy's heroes became Haigh's culprits. Jesuit strategies and tactics resulted in the gradual decline of Catholicism from majority to minority status. In an oft-cited turn-of-phrase, Haigh contended that the seminary priests and Jesuits "inherited, if not a safe seat, at least a strong minority vote in need of careful constituency nursing." And this they failed to accomplish.[279] Heroes or villains? Regardless of the role, the Society of Jesus remained at the center of the blossoming field of early modern English Catholicism.

The Bossy–Haigh debate and the independent but not unrelated research of Duffy and Scarisbrick has been a watershed. Early modern English Catholicism had been the curious and quaint preserve of marginalized family historians and genealogists gathered to lament their status, laud their martyrs, and chant faith of our fathers. *Post hoc* or *propter hoc* the debate, there has been a *désenclavement* of the field. One need look no further than the changes in the title of its journal: *Biographical Studies* to *Recusant History* to *British Catholic History*. The research of Liesbeth Corens, Anne Dillon, Freddy Cristóbal Domínguez, Katy Gibbons, Gabriel Glickman, Jan Graffius, Brad Gregory, Victor Houliston, James Kelly, Gerard Kilroy, Peter Lake, Arthur F. Marotti, Robert Miola, Susannah Monta, Michael Questier, Ethan Shagan, W. J. Sheils, Alison Shell, Stefania Tutino, Alexandra Walsham, Maurice Whitehead et al. has inserted the "Catholic voice" and the "Catholic perspective" into the national narrative. With fresh questions not biased by traditional preoccupations, these researchers have broadened the "little England" mentality to include initially the "three kingdoms" perspective and more recently a European outlook. With essential repositories in Stonyhurst, London, Dublin, and Rome, along with collegiate archives in Valladolid and Rome, and the discovery of confiscated Jesuit material in local, provincial archives, there is still much to explore in British–Irish Jesuit history.

---

278 Scarisbrick, *Reformation and the English People*, 12.

279 "From Monopoly to Minority: Catholicism in Early Modern England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 31 (1981): 129–47, here 132; and "The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation," *Past & Present* 93 (1981): 37–69. Patrick McGrath refuted Haigh's interpretation in "Elizabethan Catholicism: A Reconsideration," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984): 414–28. Haigh's reply was "Revisionism, the Reformation and the History of English Catholicism," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985): 394–405, with a short reply from Professor McGrath immediately following (405–6).

Bibliography

Allison, Antony F. "A Question of Jurisdiction: Richard Smith Bishop of Chalcedon and the Catholic Laity 1625–31." *Recusant History* 16 (1982): 111–45.

Allison, Antony F. "Richard Smith, Richelieu and the French Marriage: The Political Context of Smith's Appointment as Bishop for England in 1624." *Recusant History* 7 (1964): 148–211.

Allison, Antony F. "Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents." *Recusant History* 18 (1987): 329–401.

Allison, Antony F. "Some Additions and Corrections to Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents." *Recusant History* 20 (1990): 493–94.

Anderson, William James. "Narratives of the Scottish Reformation, I: Report of Father Robert Abercrombie, S.J., in the Year 1580." *Innes Review* 7 (1956): 27–59.

Anson, Peter F. *Underground Catholicism in Scotland 1622–1878*. Montrose: Standard Press, 1970.

Anstruther, Godfrey, O.P. *The Seminary Priests*. 4 Vols. Ware/Durham/Great Wakering: St. Edmund's College/Ushaw College/Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1968–77.

Bangert, William V., S.J. *A History of the Society of Jesus*. Rev. ed. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1986.

Bangert, William V., S.J. *Jerome Nadal (1507–1580): Tracking the First Generation of Jesuits*. Edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. Chicago: Loyola Press, 1992.

Binzley, Ronald A. "Ganganelli's Disaffected Children: The Ex-Jesuits and the Shaping of Early American Catholicism, 1773–1790." *U.S. Catholic Historian* 26 (2008): 47–77.

Bireley, Robert, S.J. "Acquaviva's 'Instruction for Confessors of Princes' (1602/1608): A Document and Its Interpretation." In *Los jesuitas: Religión, política y educación, siglos XVI–XVIII*, edited by José Martínez Millán, Henar Pizarro Llorente, and Esther Jiménez Pablo, 1:45–68. 3 Vols. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2012.

Borja Medina, Francisco de, S.J. "Everard Mercurian and Spain." In *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture 1573–1580*, edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 945–66. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2004.

Borja Medina, Francisco de, S.J. "Íñigo de Loyola y los mercaderes castellanos del Norte de Europa: La financiación de sus estudios en la Universidad de París." *Hispania sacra* 51 (1999): 159–206.

Borja Medina, Francisco de, S.J. "La quiebra del universalismos de la unión de los ánimos." In *Ite inflammate omnia: Selected Historical Papers from Conferences Held at Loyola and Rome in 2006*, edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 321–41. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2010.

Bossy, John. "Afterword." In *Early Modern English Catholicism: Identity, Memory and Counter-Reformation*, edited by James E. Kelly and Susan Royal, 246–54. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Briody, Michael, ed. *The Scots College, Spain, 1767–1780: Memoirs of the Translation of the Scotch College from Madrid to Valladolid*. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca, 2015.

Broadley, Martin John, ed. *Bishop Herbert Vaughan and the Jesuits: Education and Authority*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Catholic Record Society, 2010.

Brodrick, James, S.J. *The Progress of the Jesuits*. London: Longmans, Green, 1946.

Burson, Jeffrey D., and Jonathan Wright, eds. *The Jesuit Suppression in Global Context: Causes, Events, Consequences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Burton, Robert. *The Anatomy of Melancholy: Text*, edited by Thomas C. Faulkner, Nicolas K. Kiessling, and Rhonda L. Blair. 3 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989–94.

Chadwick, Hubert, S.J. "Crypto-Catholicism, English and Scottish." *The Month* 178 (1942): 388–401.

Clancy, Thomas H., S.J. "The Jesuits and the Independents: 1647." *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 40 (1971): 67–90.

Clancy, Thomas H., S.J. *A Literary History of the English Jesuits: A Century of Books 1615–1714*. San Francisco: Catholic Scholars Press, 1996.

Clarke, Aidan. *The Graces 1625–41*. Dublin: Dublin Historical Association, 1968.

Clavin, Terry. "Talbot, Peter (1618/1620–1680)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/26937 (accessed January 21, 2019).

Codignola, Luca. *The Coldest Harbour of the Land: Simon Stock and Lord Baltimore's Colony in Newfoundland, 1621–1649*, translated by Anita Weston. Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.

Cohen, T. [Thomas] V. "Molteplicità dell'esperienza religiosa tra i primi 1259 gesuiti, 1540–1560." *Annali accademici canadesi* 1 (1986): 7–25.

Cohen, T. [Thomas] V. "Why the Jesuits Joined, 1540–1600." *Historical Papers* (1974): 237–58.

Crosignani, Ginevra, Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., and Michael Questier, eds. *Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England*. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2010.

Cullen, Louis. "Catholics under the Penal Laws." *Eighteenth-Century Ireland/Iris an dá chultúr* 1 (1986): 23–36.

Dijkgraaf, Hendrik. *The Library of a Jesuit Community at Holbeck, Nottinghamshire (1679)*. Cambridge: LP Publications, 2003.

Dockery, John Berchmans, O.F.M. *Christopher Davenport, Friar and Diplomat*. London: Burns & Oates, 1960.

Donne, John. *Ignatius His Conclave*, edited by T. [Timothy] S. Healy, S.J. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Du Moulin, Pierre. *A Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion in the Point of Obedience to Sovereignes Opposed to the Doctrine of Rebellion Authorised and Practised by the Pope and the Jesuites*. London, 1664.

Duffy, Eamon. "Cardinal Pole Preaching: St. Andrew's Day 1557." In *The Church of Mary Tudor*, edited by Eamon Duffy and David Loades, 176–200. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Duffy, Eamon. "'Englishmen in vaine': Roman Catholic Allegiance to George I." In *Religion and National Identity*, edited by Stuart Mews, 345–67. Studies in Church History 18. Oxford: Blackwell, 1982.

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

Durkin, Joseph F., S.J. "II. The Mission and the New Nation: 1773–1880." In *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833*, edited by Joseph Durkin, S.J., Gerald Fogarty, S.J., and Robert Emmett Curran, S.J., 29–46. Baltimore: Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen, 1976.

Edwards, David. "A Haven of Popery: English Catholic Migration to Ireland in the Age of the Plantations." In *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, edited by Alan Ford and John McCafferty, 95–126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Edwards, Francis, S.J. *The Enigma of Gunpowder Plot, 1605: The Third Solution*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008.

Edwards, Francis, S.J. "Henry More, S.J.: Administrator and Historian, 1586–1661." *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 41 (1972): 233–81.

Ehler, Sidney Z., and John B. Morrall, eds. *Church and State throughout the Centuries*. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1954.

Fernández Zapico, Dionysius, S.J., and Cándido de Dalmases, S.J., eds. *Fontes narrativi de S. Ignatio de Loyola et de Societatis Iesu initiis*. 4 Vols. Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 66, 73, 85, 93. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1943–65.

Fissel, Mark Charles. *The Bishops' Wars: Charles I's Campaigns against Scotland, 1638–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Flynn, Dennis. "The English Mission of Jasper Heywood, S.J." *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 54 (1985): 45–76.

Flynn, Dennis. *John Donne and the Ancient Catholic Nobility*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Fogarty, Gerald P., S.J. "The Origins of the Mission, 1634–1735." In *The Maryland Jesuits, 1634–1833*, edited by Joseph Durkin, S.J., Gerald Fogarty, S.J., and Robert Emmett Curran, S.J., 9–28. Baltimore: Corporation of the Roman Catholic Clergymen, 1976.

Forbes-Leith, William, S.J., ed. *Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI*. Edinburgh: W. Patterson, 1885.

Forbes-Leith, William, S.J., ed. *Scottish Catholics during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.

Fraser, Antonia. *The Gunpowder Plot: Terror and Faith in 1605*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1996.

Fraser, Antonia. *The King and the Catholics: England, Ireland, and the Fight for Religious Freedom, 1780–1829*. New York: Doubleday, 2018.

Friedman, Arthur, ed. *Collected Works of Oliver Goldsmith*. 5 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Gardiner, S. [Samuel] R., ed. *The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625–1660*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

Garnet, Henry. *A True and Perfect Relation of the Whole Proceedings against the Late Most Barbarous Traitors, Garnet a Iesuite, and His Confederates*. London, 1606.

Garrett, Jane. *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Gerard, John, S.J. "The Jesuit 'Consult' of April 24th, 1678." *The Month* 102 (1903): 311–16.

Giblin, Cathaldus, O.F.M. "Irish Exiles in Catholic Europe." In *A History of Irish Catholicism*, vol. 4, no. 3, *The Church under the Penal Code and 3 Irish Exiles in Catholic Europe*, edited by Patrick Corish, 1–65. Dublin: Gill, 1971.

Glickman, Gabriel. *The English Catholic Community 1688–1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2009.

Goodare, Julian. "Queen Mary's Catholic Interlude." *Innes Review* 38 (1987): 154–70.

Haigh, Christopher. "The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation." *Past & Present* 93 (1981): 37–69.

Haigh, Christopher. "From Monopoly to Minority: Catholicism in Early Modern England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 31 (1981): 129–47.

Haigh, Christopher. "Revisionism, the Reformation and the History of English Catholicism." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36 (1985): 394–405.

Hardacre, Paul. *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956.

Havran, Martin. *The Catholics in Caroline England*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962.

Hay, Malcolm V., ed. *The Blairs Papers (1603–1660)*. London: Sands & Company, 1929.

Healy, Róisín. *The Jesuit Specter in Imperial Germany*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Hemphill, Basil, O.S.B. *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England (1685–1750)*. London: Burns & Oates, 1954.

Hibbard, Caroline M. *Charles I and the Popish Plot*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983.

Hibbard, Caroline M. "The Contribution of 1639: Court and Country Catholicism." *Recusant History* 16 (1982): 42–60.

Holt, Geoffrey, S.J. *The English Jesuits in the Age of Reason*. Tunbridge Wells: Burns & Oates, 1993.

Holt, Geoffrey, S.J. "A Jesuit School in the City in 1688." *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 37 (1981): 153–58.

Höpfl, Harro. *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c.1540–1630*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Horace. *Opera omnia*, edited by E. [Edward] C. [Charles] Wickham. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

Hughes, Paul L., and James F. Larkin, C.S.V., eds. *Tudor Royal Proclamations*. 3 Vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964–69.

Hughes, Philip. *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England*. London: Burns & Oates, 1942.

Hughes, Thomas. *History of the Society of Jesus in North America: Colonial and Federal*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908–17.

James VI/I. *Political Writings*, edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

James, Anne. *Poets, Players, and Preachers: Remembering the Gunpowder Plot in Seventeenth-Century England*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Kelly, James E. "Conformity, Loyalty and the Jesuit Mission to England of 1580." In *Religious Tolerance in the Atlantic World: Early Modern and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Eliane Glaser, 149–70. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Kenworthy-Browne, Christina, C.J., ed. *Mary Ward 1585–1645*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Catholic Record Society, 2008.

Keogh, Daire, and Albert McDonnell, eds. *The Irish College, Rome and Its World*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008.

Lake, Peter. "Anti-popery: The Structure of a Prejudice." In *Conflict in Early Stuart England: Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603–1642*, edited by Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 72–106. London: Longman, 1989.

Lindley, K. [Keith] J. "The Lay Catholics of England in the Reign of Charles I." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 22 (1971): 199–221.

Lunn, David. *The English Benedictines 1540–1688: From Reformation to Revolution*. London: Burns & Oates, 1980.

Lunn, Maurice. "The Anglo-Gallicanism of Dom Thomas Preston, 1557–1647." In *Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest*, edited by Derek Baker, 239–46. Studies in Church History 9. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Lunn, Maurice. "English Benedictines and the Oath of Allegiance, 1606–1647." *Recusant History* 10 (1969–70): 146–64.

Lux-Sterritt, Laurence. "An Analysis of the Controversy Caused by Mary Ward's Institute in the 1620s." *Recusant History* 25 (2001): 636–47.

MacCuarta, Brian, S.J. *Catholic Revival in the North of Ireland 1603–41*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007.

MacLeod, David. "Declining His Majesty's Authority: Treason Revisited in the Case of John Ogilvie." In *Scotland's Long Reformation: New Perspectives on Scottish Religion, c.1500–c.1660*, edited by John McCallum, 179–201. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Marotti, Arthur F. *Religious Ideology & Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005.

Mayer, Thomas F. "A Test of Wills: Cardinal Pole, Ignatius Loyola, and the Jesuits in England." In *The Reckoned Expense: Edmund Campion and the Early English Jesuits*, edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 23–41. 2nd ed. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2007.

McCluskey, Raymond, ed. *The Scots College, Rome, 1600–2000*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2000.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Apostasy and Knavery in Restoration England: The Checkered Career of John Travers, S.J." *Catholic Historical Review* 78 (1992): 395–412.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "The Creation of the First Jesuit Communities in England." *Heythrop Journal* 28 (1987): 40–56.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "'Est et non est': Jesuit Corporate Survival in England after the Suppression." In *Jesuit Survival and Restoration: A Global History, 1773–1900*, edited by Robert A. Maryks and Jonathan Wright, 162–77. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "The Establishment of the English Province of the Society of Jesus." *Recusant History* 17 (1984): 121–39.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Ignatius Loyola and Reginald Pole: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47 (1996): 257–73.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. (1858–1925): The Hues of History; English Martyrs and Jesuit Historiography." In *The Ministry of the Printed Word: Scholar-Priests of the Twentieth Century*, edited by John Broadley and Peter Phillips, 119–43. Stratton-on-the-Fosse: Downside Abbey Press, 2016.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Leedes (Alias Courtney), Edward." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6463 (accessed January 22, 2019).

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "A Letter from a Jesuit of Liège (1687)?" *Recusant History* 30 (2010): 88–106.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "'Libera nos Domine'?: The Vicars Apostolic and the Suppressed/Restored English Province of the Society of Jesus." In *Early Modern English Catholicism: Identity, Memory and Counter-Reformation*, edited by James Kelly and Susan Royal, 81–101. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "'Lost in the title': John Thorpe's Eyewitness Account of the Suppression." In *The Jesuit Suppression in Global Context: Causes, Events, Consequences*, edited by Jeffrey D. Burson and Jonathan Wright, 161–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J., ed. *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture 1573–1580*. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2004.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Mourning in Exile: The Irish Ministry of William Good, S.J." In *From Rome to Zurich, between Ignatius and Vermigli: Essays in Honor of John Patrick Donnelly, S.J.*, edited by Kathleen M. Comerford, Gary W. Jenkins, and W. J. Torrance Kirby, 23–39. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "New Situations; New Structures? Claudio Acquaviva and the Jesuit Mission to England." In *Claudio Acquaviva's Generalate (1581–1615) and the Emergence of Modern Catholicism*, edited by Pierre-Antoine Fabre and Flavio Rurale, 145–64. Chestnut Hill, MA: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2017.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "'Pray to the Lord of the harvest': Jesuit Missions to Scotland in the Sixteenth Century." *Innes Review* 53 (2002): 127–88.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Remembering Henry Garnet, S.J." *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 75 (2006): 159–88.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Resisting National Sentiment: Friction between Irish and English Jesuits in the Old Society." *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 6, no. 4 (forthcoming).

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Richard Langhorne and the Popish Plot." *Recusant History* 19 (1989): 499–508.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Setting the World on Fire? Anti-Catholicism and the Great Fire of London." *Thinking Faith*, November 4, 2014. http://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/setting-world-fire-anti-catholicism-and-great-fire-london (accessed January 21, 2019).

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Seventeenth-Century Visitations of the Transmarine Houses of the English Province." In *With Eyes and Ears Open: The Role of Visitors in the Society of Jesus*, edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 96–125. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J. "Spoils of War? The Edict of Restitution and Benefactions to the English Province of the Society of Jesus." In *Jesuit Intellectual and Physical Exchange between England and Mainland Europe, c.1580–1789: "The world is our house?,"* edited by James E. Kelly and Hannah Thomas, 186–209. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

McCoog, Thomas M., S.J., and Victor Houliston. "Life in Tudor Limerick: William Good's 'Annual Letter' of 1566." *Archivium Hibernicum* 59 (2016): 7–36.

McCormack, Danielle. *The Stuart Restoration and the English in Ireland*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2016.

McGrath, Patrick. "Elizabethan Catholicism: A Reconsideration." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 35 (1984): 414–28.

McGrath, Patrick, and Joy Rowe. "Anstruther Analysed: The Elizabethan Seminary Priests." *Recusant History* 18 (1986): 1–13.

McGrath, Patrick, and Joy Rowe. "The Marian Priests under Elizabeth I." *Recusant History* 17 (1984–85): 103–20.

Miller, John. *Popery and Politics in England 1660–1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

Milton, Andrew. "A Qualified Intolerance: The Limits and Ambiguities of Early Stuart Anti-Catholicism." In *Catholicism and Anti-Catholicism in Early Modern English Texts*, edited by Arthur F. Marotti, 85–115. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999.

More, Henry, S.J. *The Elizabethan Jesuits*. Edited by Francis Edwards, S.J. London: Phillimore, 1981.

More, Henry, S.J. "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province." *Letters and Notices* 18 (1835–86): 344–51.

More, Henry, S.J. "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province (Being a Translation of Book X Sections 1, 3, 6 of his *Historia*)." *Letters and Notices* 18 (1835–86): 407–12.

Morey, Adrian. *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.

Morrissey, Thomas J., S.J. "Ireland, England and the Restoration of the Society of Jesus." In *Promising Hope: Essays on the Suppression and Restoration of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 190–217. Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2003.

Murphy, G. Martin. "Taunton, Ethelred Luke (1857–1907), Ecclesiastical Historian." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-36424 (accessed January 21, 2019).

Neale, J. E. [John Ernest]. *Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1559–1581*. 2 Vols. London: Jonathan Cape, 1953–57.

Nicholls, Mark. *Investigating Gunpowder Plot*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.

Nichols, John G., ed. "The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1627/8." In *Camden Society Miscellany II*, 21–64. London: Camden Society, 1853.

Ó hAnnracháin, Tadhg. *Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini 1645–1649*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Ó hAnnracháin, Tadhg. "The Visitation of Mercure Verdier to Ireland, 1648–49." In *With Eyes and Ears Open: The Role of Visitors in the Society of Jesus*, edited by Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., 126–48. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

O'Connell, Patricia. "The Early-Modern Irish College Network in Iberia, 1590–1800." In *The Irish in Europe, 1580–1815*, edited by Thomas O'Connor, 49–64. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001.

O'Malley, John W., S.J. *The Jesuits and the Popes: A Historical Sketch of Their Relationship*. Philadelphia: Saint Joseph's University Press, 2016.

Padberg, John W., S.J., Martin D. O'Keefe, S.J., and John L. McCarthy, S.J., eds. *For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty Jesuit General Congregations*. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994.

Pavone, Sabina. *The Wily Jesuits and the* Monita secreta*: The Forged Secret Instructions of the Jesuits*. St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005.

Peters, Willem A. M. "Richard Whitford and St. Ignatius' Visit to England." *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu* 25 (1956): 328–50.

Pollen, John Hungerford, S.J. "The First Jesuits in England." *The Month* 102 (1903): 647–52.

Pollen, John Hungerford, S.J. "A Jesuit 'Free School' in London 1688." *The Month* 128 (1916): 264–67.

Pollen, John Hungerford, S.J., ed. *Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots during Her Reign in Scotland, 1561–1567*. Edinburgh: T. and A. Constable for the Scottish History Society, 1901.

Pritchard, Arnold. *Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England*. London: Scolar, 1979.

Prothero, G. W. [George Walter], ed. *Select Statutes and Other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*. 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.

Purcell, Edmund Sheridan. *Life of Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster*. 2 Vols. London: Macmillan, 1896.

Questier, Michael. "Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England." *English Historical Review* 123 (2008): 1132–65.

Questier, Michael. "Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance." *Historical Journal* 40 (1997): 311–29; *Recusant History* 19 (1989): 234–85; *Recusant History* 20 (1990): 164–206.

Questier, Michael, ed. *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631–1638*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Questier, Michael, ed. *Stuart Dynastic Policy and Religious Politics, 1621–1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Redworth, Glyn. *The Prince and the Infanta: The Cultural Politics of the Spanish Match*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

Roberts, Alasdair. "Thomas Abernethy, Jesuit and Covenanter." *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 24 (1991): 141–60.

Ryan, Clarence J. "The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance and the English Lay Catholics." *Catholic Historical Review* 29 (1942): 159–83.

Scarisbrick, J. [Jack] J. *The Reformation and the English People*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.

Schofield, Nicholas, and Gerard Skinner. *The English Vicars Apostolic 1688–1850*. Oxford: Family Publications, 2009.

Scott, Geoffrey, O.S.B. *Gothic Rage Undone: English Monks in the Age of Enlightenment*. Bath: Downside Abbey, 1992.

Scott, Jonathan. *England's Troubles: Seventeenth-Century English Political Instability in European Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Sitwell, Gerald. "Leander Jones' Mission to England, 1634–1635." *Recusant History* 5 (1960): 132–82.

Sommerville, Johann P. "Papalist Political Thought and the Controversy over the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance." In *Catholics and the "Protestant Nation": Religious Politics and Identity in Early Modern England*, edited by Ethan H. Shagan, 162–84. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.

Stewart, Rose. *Saint Ignatius Loyola and the Early Jesuits*. 2nd ed. London: Burns & Oates, 1891.

Tavard, George. *The Seventeenth-Century Tradition: A Study in Recusant Thought*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Thomas, Hannah. "'Books which are necessary for them': Reconstructing a Jesuit Missionary Library in Wales and the English Borderlands, ca. 1600–1679." In *Publishing Subversive Texts in Elizabethan England and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth*, edited by Teresa Bela, Clarinda Calma, and Jolanta Rzegocka, 110–28. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Thomas, Hannah. "Missioners on the Margins? The Territorial Headquarters of the Welsh Jesuit College of St. Francis Xavier at the Cwm, *c.*1600–1679." *Recusant History* 32 (2014): 173–93.

Thomas, Hannah. "The Society of Jesus in Wales, *c.*1600–1679: Rediscovering the Cwm Jesuit Library at Hereford Cathedral." *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 1, no. 4 (2014): 572–88.

Tutino, Stefania. *Empire of Souls: Robert Bellarmine and the Christian Commonwealth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Tutino, Stefania. *Law and Conscience: Catholicism in Early Modern England, 1570–1625*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.

Tutino, Stefania. "La question de l'antijésuitisme anglais à l'époque moderne: Le cas de John Donne." In *Les antijésuites: Discours, figures et lieux de l'antijésuitisme à l'époque modern*, edited by Pierre-Antoine Fabre and Catherine Maire, 383–99. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2010.

Tylenda, Joseph N., S.J., ed. *The Pilgrim's Journey: The Autobiography of Ignatius of Loyola*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1985.

Vidmar, John. *English Catholic Historians and the English Reformation, 1585–1954*. Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, 2008.

Wadkins, Timothy H. "King James I Meets John Percy, S.J. (12 May, 1622): An Unpublished Manuscript from the Religious Controversies Surrounding the Countess of Buckingham's Conversion." *Recusant History* 19 (1988): 146–54.

Wadkins, Timothy H. "The Percy–'Fisher' Controversies and the Ecclesiastical Politics of Jacobean Anti-Catholicism, 1622–1625." *Church History* 57 (1988): 153–69.

Wadkins, Timothy H. "Theological Polemic and Religious Culture in Early Stuart England: The Percy/'Fisher' Controversies, 1605–41." PhD diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1988.

Wadkins, Timothy H. "'The fatall vesper': Providentialism and Anti-popery in Late Jacobean London." *Past & Present* 144 (1994): 36–87.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Church Papists: Catholicism, Conformity, and Confessional Polemic in Early Modern England*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press for the Royal Historical Society, 1993.

Walsham, Alexandra. *Providence in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Walsham, Alexandra. "'This new army of Satan': The Jesuit Mission and the Formation of Public Opinion in Elizabethan England." In *Moral Panics, the Media and the Law in Early Modern England*, edited by David Lemmings and Claire Walker, 41–62. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Weinreich, Spencer J., ed. and trans. *Pedro de Ribadeneyra's* Ecclesiastical History of the Schism of the Kingdom of England*: A Spanish Jesuit's History of the English Reformation*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Wiener, Carol Z. "The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism." *Past & Present* 51 (1971): 27–62.

Williams, Michael E. *The Venerable English College, Rome*. 2nd ed. Leominster: Gracewing, 2008.