CHAPTER 9

The Distinctiveness of the Society of Jesus’s Mission in Pedro de Ribadeneyra’s Historia ecclesiastica del scisma del reyno de Inglaterra (1588)

Spencer J. Weinreich

“Two more private and particular considerations encouraged me in the work. The first, that I am a Spaniard; the second, that I am a priest of the Society of Jesus.”1 Such was the explanation offered by the priest and scholar Pedro de Ribadeneyra (1526–1611) for the production of the Historia ecclesiastica del scisma del reyno de Inglaterra (henceforth, the “Historia”), his polemical account of the English Reformation. Troublingly, virtually all scholarship on the Historia has concentrated on the former factor, to the detriment of our appreciation of the latter. This chapter, and my larger project of an annotated translation of the Historia, is an attempt to rectify this imbalance.

First published in Madrid in 1588, the Historia was an immediate success, seeing another Madrid edition and printings at Valencia, Barcelona, Zaragoza, Lisbon, and Antwerp within the same year.2 Ribadeneyra’s work grew out of a prior Latin text, Nicholas Sander’s (c.1530–81) De origine ac progressu schismatis...
Anglicani (henceforth, “De origine”), published in Cologne in 1585, four years after the author’s death. Characterizations of the relationship between the two texts have varied: in 1935, the Australian church historian Thomas McNevin Veech (1907–82) classed the Historia among the translations of De origine, while more recently Fátima Cid Morgade, working in a more literary vein, has highlighted the substantial changes made by Ribadeneyra, shifting the emphasis from England to Spain. The historian Freddy Cristóbal Domínguez has further nuanced this account by clarifying that Ribadeneyra worked from the 1586 edition of De origine, and thus many of the alterations highlighted by Cid Morgade originated with the subsequent editors to Sander’s text, Edward Rishton (1550–85), Robert Persons (1546–1610), and William, later cardinal, Allen (1532–94). Both the recognition of Ribadeneyra’s actively creative role and a more realistic picture of the textual history are, of course, developments much to be welcomed. Yet, the analyses of Cid Morgade and Domínguez leave something to be desired, for they neglect the importance of the quidditas jesuitica—the uniquely Jesuit “way of proceeding”—that is our subject.

I believe this to be the consequence of examining—as most scholars have—the Historia solely in the context of anti-Elizabethan polemic, without reference to the rest of Ribadeneyra’s oeuvre. Domínguez, for one, is explicit in his focus on what he calls “Spanish Elizabethans,” more specifically on “spaniolized” Englishmen. Both Domínguez and the literary scholar Victor Houliston (1954–) draw direct textual genealogies from Sander to Rishton, Persons, and Allen to Ribadeneyra, without much discussion of the fact that, unlike the other three, Ribadeneyra was neither English nor an exile, and had interests beyond the state of Christianity in England.

Scholars of Ribadeneyra’s other works, by contrast—among them the historians Jodi Bilinkoff (1955–) and Jonathan Edward Greenwood and the Latinist Claude Pavur (1952–), S.J.—have stressed the utter centrality of the Society to

---


4 Veech, Nicholas Sanders, 237.


6 See Freddy Cristóbal Domínguez, “‘We Must Fight with Paper and Pens’: Spanish Elizabethan Polemics 1585–1598” (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2011), Chapters 2 and 3.

his thought and writings. As the historian Rady Roldán-Figueroa has concisely put it, Ribadeneyra “wrote as a Jesuit and with Jesuit interests in mind.” Pavur has insightfully observed of The Life of Ignatius of Loyola (1572) that it is “not just a biography, nor a ‘life and times,’ nor an institutional history, but also an apologia—an explanation, a justification, and an argument for the Society of Jesus,” at a time when the Society and its institute were under attack in Spain and elsewhere. The same can be said of the Historia, and reading it alongside such texts as the Life of Ignatius of Loyola and the Flos sanctorum (1599) reveals a consistent set of tropes and literary strategies, aimed as much at the promotion of the Society of Jesus as at the degradation of English Protestantism. I argue that we must consider the Historia as part of a larger project on Ribadeneyra’s part, spanning several decades, to construct textual foundations for a Jesuit identity—both for members of the Society and for those among whom they moved.

As an initial matter, it is noteworthy—as a matter of emphasis, if nothing else—that the Historia opens with the Society, even though the narrative must traverse nearly thirty years to reach the foundation, and a further forty to reach any significant Jesuit involvement in English affairs. In his letter to the reader, Ribadeneyra writes of the Society, “God our Lord has instituted it and sent it into the world in these wretched times to defend the Catholic faith and to combat heretics.” (Compare Pavur’s judgment that the Life of Ignatius of Loyola

---


9 It must of course be acknowledged that reference to Ribadeneyra’s other works does not, ipso facto, guarantee recognition of the Historia’s concern with the Society. The art historian Gabriela Torres Olleta, for one, has used Ribadeneyra’s theological and political writings to examine the Historia’s representations of morality and power, but does not acknowledge any special position for the Jesuits among the story’s large cast of Catholic characters. Gabriela Torres Olleta, “Imágenes del poder en el Siglo de Oro: La visión del P. Ribadeneyra en el Cisma de Inglaterra,” in La voz de Clio: Imágenes del poder en la comedia histórica del Siglo de Oro, ed. Oana Andreia Sămbrían, Mariela Insúa, and Antonie Mihail, 70–81 (Craiova: Editura Universitară Craiova, 2012), 71, 78–79.

10 See Rady Roldán-Figueroa, Chapter 8, this volume.

11 Ribadeneyra, Historia, 9: “Dios nuestro Señor la instituyo y embio al mundo en estos miserables tiempos, para defender la Fê Catholica, y oponerse a los hereges.”
seeks to demonstrate “that this ‘novel’ institution of the Society of Jesus was indeed fashioned and confirmed by God and designed especially for the exigencies of the day.” Ribadeneyra adds that it is God’s “special grace” to the Society that

taking as his instrument Elizabeth, queen of England and daughter of King Henry and Anne Boleyn (the germ of this lamentable tragedy, the source and root of such grievous disasters), who, following in the footsteps of her parents, while augmenting their methods, persecutes our holy Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman faith with extraordinary cruelty and ferocity, and butchers those who profess and teach it, torturing them, abusing them, and murdering them with the most hideous sorts of punishments and executions—and by this means rendering them the greatest good they could possibly wish for.

He continues:

the foremost among those who have perished for their faith during Elizabeth’s reign have been certain English fathers of our Society, who chose to be persecuted, tortured, tormented, and murdered, rather than separate themselves by so much as a hair from the confession of Catholic truth. And this is so wonderful and so magnificent a gift of our Lord that every son of this little Society is obliged to acknowledge and to serve him, to wish to follow our brothers in giving our lives for him.

---

13 Ribadeneyra, *Historia*, 9v–10r: “la merced tan señalada [...] tomando por instrumento a la Reyna de Inglaterra Isabel, hija del Rey Enrique y de Ana Bolena (que fue la levadura a esta lamentable tragedia, y la fuente y rayz de tãtas y tan graues calamidades) la qual siguiendo las pisadas de tales padres, hinchendo la medida dellos, con extraordinaria crueldad y tryania persigue nuestra santa Fê Catolica, Apostolica, y Romana, y haze carniceria de los que la professan y enseñan atormentandolos, descoyuntandolos, y despedaçandolos con atrocißimos linages de penas y muertes, y haziendoles por este camino los mayores bienes que ellos podian dessear.”
14 Ibid., 10r–10v: “Entre estos que han muerto por la Fê en tiempo de Isabel, los principales han sido algunos Padres de nuestra Compañia, Ingleses de nacion; los cuales quisieron ser antes apuros tormentos descoyuntados y muertos, que apartarse un pelo de la confesión de la verdad Catolica. Y este es beneficio tan grande y regalado del Señor, que nos obliga a todos los hijos desta minima Compañia a reconocerle y seruirle, y a desear seguir à nuestros hermanos, y dar la vida por el.”
I have reproduced these two passages at length because they serve as prologues to the rest of the Historia. The themes of chosenness, providential mission, and martyrdom recur throughout, and find ready parallels in Ribadeneyra’s other works, as proofs of the Society’s rightful role in early modern Catholicism.

Recent scholarship—particularly the pioneering work of historian John W. O’Malley (1927–), S.J.—has critiqued the longstanding perception of the Society of Jesus as a Counter-Reformation order ab initio. True though this may be of Ignatius of Loyola (c.1491–1556) and others among the first companions, it does not apply to the Historia’s depiction of the founding. Not only is the Society instituted as a response to Protestantism, but God himself intends it thus; in the words of Sander:

For, at the time that in Germany by the blaspheming tongue of Luther, and in England by the unheard-of cruelty of this tyrant, it seemed that the ideals of a perfect, monastic life had been discarded, all obedience and honor to the vicar of Christ had been so neglected and abandoned that the name of the pope […] was abhorred by the wicked, at this very moment, I say, he raised up with his Holy Spirit the soul of Ignatius of Loyola and his holy companions.15

In fact, the Society’s providential power goes beyond mere reaction: “With these works, their new vow and obligation, they undid the impiety of Luther and the savagery of Henry.”16 Ribadeneyra quotes all this approvingly, and himself adds, to put the finest point on the matter, “in the same year that the English orders were eradicated, which was the year 1540, the Society of Jesus was founded and approved by the Holy See at Rome.”17 This sense of providential mission vis-à-vis the Protestants also appears in the Life of Ignatius, where book II, chapter xviii, “God’s Plan in Founding the Society,” is a long disquisition on how the ravages of Luther set the stage for the creation of the Society.

15 Ibid., 143r–143v: “Pues en el mismo tiempo que en Alemania por la lengua blasfema de Lutero, y en Inglaterra por la crueldad nunca oydo deste tyrano, estaba ya como desterrada la profesion de la vida religiosa, y perfeta, y la obediencia, y reuerencia al Vicario de Christo tan desarraygada, y perdida, que el nombre del Papa […] era aborrecido de los malos. En este mismo tiempo, digo, excitó con su diuino espíritu el espíritu de Ignacio de Loyola, y de sus santos compañeros.”
16 Ibid., 143v: “deshaziendo con obras, y con esta nueva promeśa, y obligacion la impiedad de Lutero, y la tyrania de Enrique.”
17 Ibid., 144v: “porque el mismo año que se acabaro[n] las religiones en Inglaterra, que fue el de mil y quinientos y quare[n]ta, comenzó, y fue confirmada de la sede Apostolica en Roma la Religion de la Compañia de Iesus.”
We can see the same theme in Ribadeneyra’s unpublished history of the Society, where he describes it as “an order of succor, which has as its mission [instituto] putting the heretics to flight.”

On an institutional level, throughout his work Ribadeneyra emphasizes the second papal bull authorizing the Society, *Exposcit debitum* (1550), rather than the first, *Regimini militantis Ecclesiæ* (1540)—the latter omitting the key clause concerning “the defense and propagation of the faith.” It is to *Exposcit debitum* that the *Historia* refers as confirmation of the Society’s mission: “so says the vicar of that same God in the bull of its confirmation.” It is *Exposcit debitum* that is reproduced verbatim in the *Life of Ignatius*.

In keeping with this more aggressive positioning for the Society, we find Ribadeneyra very fond of describing it in military language. The German College and the Roman Seminary, for example, become “two impregnable fortresses.” The *Life of Ignatius* is utterly suffused with similar tropes. To take but one rather sustained example:

It is the mission of this order to help the valiant leaders and soldiers of the other religious orders fight energetically for the faith […]. Where there are no garrisons of others, its mission is to send its own armed soldiers to prevent the enemy from making further progress, and to break their furious attack.

It is perhaps worth pausing for a moment to consider whence comes this vision of the Society, a greater emphasis on non-Catholics of all sorts—Jews, Protestants, pagans—than appears among the very first companions. Ribadeneyra’s position bears striking similarities to that of his contemporaries Jerónimo Nadal (1507–1580) and Antonio Possevino (1533–1611). Nadal was famously fond of the metaphor of the ministries to Protestant Germany and the pagan Indies as the Society’s two “wings,” unified by the Society’s mission “to gain souls for Christ.” Possevino, an enthusiastic proselytizer, believed that…”
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18 *Arsi, Hisp. 94*, 1r: “vna religion de socorro que tiene por instituto ahuyentar a los Hereges.”
“the purpose of the Society of Jesus is the salvation of all nations.” 26 His career included a stint as preacher to the (literally) captive Jewish audience at the Confraternity of the Holy Trinity in Rome (securing fourteen conversions in the first six months) and the compilation of a bibliography of Catholic authors who had written against the Jews. 27

This similarity in outlook may be generational: several decades younger than Ignatius, Nadal, Possevino, and Ribadeneyra (born in 1507, 1533, and 1526, respectively) came of age in the world of the Reformation, in which the troubling success of non-Catholic religious groups was the problem for the church. 28 Alternately, Robert Aleksander Maryks (1967—) has offered a compelling explanation drawn from the three men’s shared Jewish ancestry. 29 Living in the heyday of the Iberian inquisitions (and amid no small criticism of the Society for its domination by New Christians), 30 these men may have proactively sought to be “more Catholic than the Catholics,” compensating for their suspect ancestry with exemplary, vigorously orthodox zeal. 31 (We might observe here Ribadeneyra’s vicious—and disingenuous—repetition of Sander’s slur on the reformer Martin Bucer (1491–1551) as “greatly inclined to combine the dogma

27 Ibid., 5–7.
28 “The discovery of the New World, the urgency of the Turkish threat to Europe, and the defection into Protestantism of much of northern Europe awakened a new awareness of the need for evangelization.” O’Malley, “Nadal,” 12.
31 The author is indebted to Robert Maryks and Emanuele Colombo for thought-provoking conversations on this question.

Some Jesuits of Jewish heritage took this attitude a step farther and turned against their fellow conversos. The superior general of Portugal, Simão Rodrigues (1510–79)—probably a descendant of the New Christian Acevedo family—issued instructions not to accept conversos into the Society. The famed Jesuit philosopher Francisco Suárez (1548–1617) was vocal in his support for the Fifth General Congregation’s exclusion of conversos from the Society; Maryks argues that this was an attempt to conceal his own Jewish lineage. The same dynamic can be observed in those of morisco descent, such as the fervently anti-converso Nicolás Bobadilla (1531–90). Maryks, Synagogue of Jews, 72, 91–93, 108.
of Zwingli with that of the Jews—for he was of their race."\textsuperscript{32} Scholars have long noted that Jesuits of Jewish ancestry were particularly active in the foreign missions.\textsuperscript{33}

Appropriate to this militant vision of the Society, the concrete manifestation and symbolic vindication of its mission is martyrdom—the bloodier the better. In the late sixteenth century, England held a special place in Counter-Reformation thought, as “the only European country in which Catholic martyrs were being made.”\textsuperscript{34} But Ribadeneyra himself points out, “as that glorious Doctor, Saint Augustine, says most solemnly, it is not the pain, but the cause, that makes the martyr.”\textsuperscript{35} He is therefore careful to specify that “they have offered glorious witness to the truth and sacrificed their lives for it and the confession of the faith of Christ.”\textsuperscript{36}

Less directly, Ribadeneyra repeatedly interweaves Jesuit martyrdom with more established exemplars of sanctity, lending the former a sort of “contact-holiness.” Describing the foundation of the Society as the undoing of Luther’s devastation, he exclaims, “Blessed be the Lord who has given us another son in the place of Abel, slain by his brother Cain,” quoting Genesis 4:25.\textsuperscript{37} In relating the last words of Edmund Campion (1540–81), Ribadeneyra quotes the Bible verse (1 Corinthians 4:9) in Latin, offers a Spanish paraphrase, and then adds, “these are the words of Saint Paul,” lest anyone miss the parallel.\textsuperscript{38} We might here note the insistence of Nadal—whose similarity in outlook to Ribadeneyra has already been mentioned—on the “apostolic” character of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Ribadeneyra, \textit{Historia}, 179v: “Bucero mucho se inclinaua a juntar con la doctrina de Zuinglio la de los Iudios, porque era de casta dellos.”}

There is no evidence that Martin Bucer had any Jewish background, and he could be virulently anti-Semitic. At the same time, at least one satire did describe him as “by character a Jew, a false Christian.” Martin Greschat, \textit{Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times}, trans. Stephen E. Buckwalter (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004), 157–58, 204.


\footnote{Ibid., 144r: “han dado ilustre testimonio a la verdad, y ofrecido sus vidas por ella, y por la confesion de la Fé de Christo.”}

\footnote{Ribadeneyra, \textit{Historia}, 317v: “como grauissimamente dize el glorioso Doctor san Augustin, no haze martyr la pena, sino la causa.”}

\footnote{Ibid., 144v: “Bendito seas el Señor que nos ha dado otro hijo en lugar de Abel, a quien mató Cain su hermano.”}

\footnote{Ibid., 293v: “estas son palabras de san Pablo.”}
\end{footnotes}
Jesuit spirituality. A more sustained pattern is to integrate the Jesuit martyrdoms into the longer history of the church; a bid, to quote Pavur once more, to prove “that this ‘novel’ institution of the Society of Jesus was indeed fashioned and confirmed by God.” In chapter 34 of book 11, “How the Queen and Her Ministers Claimed That the Holy Martyrs Did Not Die for the Sake of Religion, but Rather for Other Crimes,” alone, Ribadeneyra invokes the Christians martyred by Nero, Julian the Apostate, and Theodora, as well as Tertullian, Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Basil, Silverius, and Pope John I (r. 523–526) as comparanda. Indeed, he asserts, “Yet in all these, there is no more perfect image of this sort of cunning wickedness than the misbelievers of our own day, especially in the English atrocities of which we are speaking.” Alexander Briant (1556–81), for one, seemed “one of those valiant, unconquerable martyrs of the times of Nero, Decius, or Diocletian.”

Greenwood has observed that “Ribadeneyra incorporated into his [hagiography] collection, the] Flos sanctorum Jesuit ‘saints’ amongst early modern Catholic cults of saints,” so that figures like Ignatius, the Jesuit missionary par excellence Francis Xavier (1506–52), and the Italian nobleman Luigi Gonzaga (1568–91) were included in a list that began with none other than Christ himself. In the Life of Ignatius, he compares the providential role of the Society in combating Luther to how God “set Simon Peter, the prince of the Apostles, against Simon Magus, Vigilantius against Jovinianus, Jerome against Helvidius, Augustine against Mani and Pelagius.” Towards the end of the Life, Ribadeneyra’s account becomes ever more hagiographic, with Ignatius (while still alive) invoked for divine healing. Ribadeneyra’s procedure in the Historia is, I argue, precisely the same: an attempt to assimilate Jesuit martyrdoms into the greater pantheon of Catholic martyrdom.

This notion of legitimacy as historicity is characteristic of the Reformation, where aspersions of novelty or innovation were slurs of choice. Few taunts were as wounding to Protestant ears as the Catholic demand, “Where was your

40 Ribadeneyra, Historia, 300v: “Como la Reyna y sus ministros publican que los santos Martyres no mueren por la Religion, sino por otros delitos.”
41 Ibid., 302v: “Pero en todas ellas no se hallara pintada tan al biuo esta artificiosa maldad, como en los hereges de nuestros tiempos, y particularmente en esta persecución de Inglaterra que vamos tratando.”
42 Ibid., 298r: “parecia vno de aquellos valerosos è inuencibles Martyres de los tiempos de Neron, Decio, ò Diocliciano.”
43 Greenwood, “Readers, Sanctity, and History,” 64.
44 Ribadeneyra, Life of Ignatius, 119.
45 Ibid., 332.
church before Luther? Yet aspersions of novelty might be cast upon the Jesuits, with equal—greater, even—justice: the Society was several decades younger than Luther’s Reformation. In 1548, for example, Francesco Romeo (d.1552), master general of the Dominican order, circulated a letter to his order warning lest they, “misled by the novelty of this Institute, should perhaps by mistake attack your own fellow soldiers.” Ribadeneyra incorporates Romeo’s letter into the \textit{Life of Ignatius} in its entirety; there and elsewhere, he has a distinct predilection for reprinting important documents—statements of support from various orders, papal bulls, and so on. He claims to find precedent in the Council of Toledo for the Society’s idiosyncratic practices regarding the novitiate. The \textit{Historia} includes numerous letters from Persons, Campion, and other Jesuits stationed in England. Ribadeneyra’s penchant for documentation has been seen as part of a “modern” approach to history, but it seems to me rather a thoroughly early modern preoccupation with the historical and institutional \textit{bona fides} central to his polemic agenda. Above all, it should be noted that the copious use of direct quotations from primary sources was the innovation and hallmark of Eusebius of Caesarea’s (c.260–c.340) \textit{Ecclesiastical History} (early fourth century), a model Ribadeneyra, like most

\begin{flushright}


48 Ibid., 231.


\end{flushright}
other early modern writers of ecclesiastical history, deliberately sought to imitate.  

Over and above staking a claim to a symbolic imprimatur, what work was the Historia intended to accomplish? Ribadeneyra is quite forthright about its didactic purposes, asking in his conclusion, “And so, what are we to take from this? What are we to learn? What do these examples teach us, but to look well where we put our feet, and whom we follow, and whither we wander.” But was its mission solely restricted to shaping the future king’s moral and political sensibilities? I suggest that the Historia also models the correct attitude toward the Society. Scholars in different corners of Jesuit studies (as well as outside it) have noted the early modern Society’s tendency to emphasize what Jasper Heywood (1535–98), among others, called “big fish”: members of the social, economic, and political elite. In the Life of Ignatius, Ribadeneyra takes a positive delight in listing the Society’s notable patrons, from the early support of distinguished prelates like Alfonso de Fonseca (1475–1534), archbishop of Toledo, to the later generosity of grandees like “Lady Maria Manrique de Lara, daughter of the Duke of Nájera, most famous for the nobility of her family,” foundress of the college at Barcelona. Prominent in this regard in the Historia is Gómez Suárez de Figueroa (c.1520–71), count and subsequently first duke of Feria, one of the text’s minor protagonists. In the same sentence, the duke is praised as a man of “notable influence, fortitude, and prudence,” and as “so zealous for our holy


52 Ribadeneyra, History, 266r: “Pues que auemos de sacar de aquí? que aremos de aprender? que nos enseñan estos exemplos? sino que miremos bien donde ponemos el pie, y à quien seguimos, y por donde andamos.”


54 Ribadeneyra, Life of Ignatius, 56, 276.
religion, and so devoted to the Society of Jesus.” 55 Similarly, Mary, queen of Scots (r.1542–67)—who dominates the last portion of the Historia and who is painted in the most glowing colors by Ribadeneyra—writes to Edmond Auger (1530–91), declaring, “For I, for my own part, will offer my prayers to God, simple and unworthy as they are, for the preservation of your sacred Society in his service.” 56 Perhaps, then, the duke and the queen of Scots are intended as models for the Historia’s dedicatee, the future Philip III (r.1598–1621) to follow? 57 Certainly, Ribadeneyra had experience of Spanish royalty’s wariness of the Society: in 1553, he had been dispatched to petition for the support of Philip’s “Jesuit-averse” father (then still only prince). 58

Much closer to home, Ribadeneyra closes his epistle to Prince Philip with the following prayer: “May God keep Your Highness, as all your realms desire, and as your servants and devoted be EDM[an]ces of the Society of Jesus, continually beg him.” 59 One cannot help but wonder at this insistent protestation of loyalty (recall Ribadeneyra’s first reason for undertaking the Historia: “that I am a Spaniard”). There is a similarly nationalistic note in the Life of Ignatius, when Ribadeneyra lauds Philip II (r.1556–98) as “a wall for God’s house,” who “has defended the Catholic faith with the impressive devotion long practiced in his family, his supreme prudence, and his incredible vigilance.” 60 Again, these seem to be responses to the suspicions harbored by many concerning the young Society, fears that its close relation with the pope and internationalized hierarchy would lead Jesuits to betray their homelands. The Life of Ignatius is full of royal, ecclesiastical, and municipal stakeholders dubious of—or openly hostile to—the Society’s mission. These were certainly common accusations in England, where Protestant interrogators forced seminarians

55 Ribadeneyra, Historia, 245v: “Y como el Duque era tan zeloso de nuestra santa religion, y tan deuoto de la Compañia de Iesus, quiso que yo le aco[m]pañasse como vno della, y despues que murio la Reyna residió algunos meses en Londres, representando la persona del Rey su señor, con grande autoridad, valor y prudencia.”

56 Ibid., 335v: “Porque yo de mi parte ofrecere a Dios mis oraciones, aunque simples è indignas por la conservacion de vuestra santa Compañia en su servícuo.”

57 The references to Philip II, as well as the dedication to his son, take on a particular aptness in light of the elder Philip’s years as king of England through his marriage to Mary Tudor (r.1553–58).

58 Maryks, Synagogue of Jews, 45.

59 Ribadeneyra, Historia: “Guarde Dios a V.A. como todos estos Reynos lo han menester, y estos sus siervos y deuotos capellanes de la Compañia de Iesus, continuame[n]te se los suplicamos.”

60 Ribadeneyra, Life of Ignatius, 135.
through labyrinthine hypotheticals about whom they would support in the event of a Catholic invasion of England.61

Yet to whom is this apologia really directed? To be sure, the Historia did reach its dedicatee: as Domínguez informs us, “it would remain a favorite among Philip II’s books and would serve to educate his own son.”62 At the same time, however, we must recall the most important and most obvious change Ribadeneyra made to De origine: to translate it into Spanish, or, as he put it (rather acutely) “to write it in our Castilian tongue.”63 The first edition of the Historia, published in Madrid by Pedro Madrigal (d.1604), is hardly the sort of volume one would present to a prince. Bound in octavo format, with no more than a few elegant, but utterly commonplace illustrated capitals, this is a book for the common reader. Indeed, the many reprints and translations Ribadeneyra’s Historia enjoyed in the following decades indicates that it found a readership far beyond Habsburg court circles. The book historian Irving A. Leonard (1896–1962) furnishes one rather picturesque fact: that the Historia is to be found among the titles carried by sailors on Spanish ships.64 It may be fanciful to imagine that the Historia made its way to the soldiers and sailors of the Armada, then preparing for action, but it is not inconceivable.65

In any case, the Historia must be seen as directed, at least in part, to a broader, less educated public. Throughout his career, Ribadeneyra shows a marked interest in making his work available to the non-Latinate reader. The Life of Ignatius oscillated back and forth between Spanish and Latin editions,66 while the Flos sanctorum, its title notwithstanding, was entirely in Spanish. Domínguez, drawing a textual genealogy from the 1585 and 1586 editions of De origine through to the 1588 publication of the Historia, posits that Ribadeneyra was trying to carry the polemical battle against English Protestantism to a Spanish audience, with the particular aim of spurring Spain to military action. He asserts, “the Scisma stands out as a document of particular import for its role in launching the Grand Armada of 1588.”67 Houliston is similarly emphatic: Ribadeneyra “undertook to tell the story of the schism in Spanish to rouse the spirit of that Catholic nation, under its most Catholic king, to come to the aid

63 Ribadeneyra, Historia, 8v: “escriuir en nuestra lengua Castellana.”
65 Certainly, Christophe Plantin’s (c.1520–89) press in Antwerp had copies ready by the time of the Armada. Houliston, “Missionary Position,” 19.
66 Ribadeneyra, Life of Ignatius, xvi–xvii.
of the suffering English.” That this was the goal of Rishton and Allen in reworking the *De origine* of 1585, I do not deny; that Ribadeneyra supported Spanish intervention is incontestable (“The honor shall be no less for Spain for casting the devil out of England than for having exiled him from the Indies”). Moreover, Claudio Acquaviva’s (1543–1615) suggestion of a translation was explicitly to help form an “English party” in Spain. Yet I find the theory that this was the exclusive, or even primary, objective of Ribadeneyra in writing the *Historia* somewhat more arguable. A mass-market Spanish translation would seem a touch surplus to requirements: after all, the question of intervention was hardly going to be put to a vote of the Spanish populace.

I suggest the *Historia* is also an attempt to convey Ribadeneyra’s *apologia pro Societate sua*—if we might paraphrase Cardinal Newman—to the Spanish people. A history of the English schism offered a perfect vehicle, given Ribadeneyra’s vision of the Society as providentially linked to the fight against heresy. If the text encouraged Catholic resistance to Protestantism, all to the good. If it helped bring about a more aggressive policy against England, all the better. But in the light of Ribadeneyra’s other writings, we find the *Historia* operating in dimensions other than anti-Elizabethan polemic, with links to a hitherto-unexplored network of texts and discourses.

69 Ribadeneyra, *Historia*, 372v: “No seria de menos honra para España si echas el demonio de Inglaterra, que lo es auerle desterrado de las Indias.”
70 Houliston, “Missionary Position,” 19.