Resisting National Sentiment: Friction between Irish and English Jesuits in the Old Society

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.
Loyola University Maryland
tmmccoog@gmail.com

Abstract

Pedro de Ribadeneyra, first official biographer of Ignatius of Loyola, showered praise upon him and his companions for abandoning immoderate sentiment “for particular lands or places” in their quest for “the glory of God and the salvation of their neighbors.” Superior General Goswin Nickel praised a Society conceived in Spain, born in France, approved in Italy, and propagated in Germany and elsewhere. Out of diversity Ignatius had forged unity. Ribadeneyra prayed that nothing would ever threaten this union. His prayers were not heard: the Society’s internal unity was often endangered by national sentiment despite congregational attempts to curtail and eliminate it. This article does not purport to be an exhaustive study of localism versus internationalism—although such a study is needed—but an investigation of relations between Irish and English Jesuits principally in the seventeenth century. Individual Jesuits did in fact cooperate, but there were limits. A proposal in 1652 that the independent Irish mission become part of the English mission was that limit.

Keywords

Irish Jesuits – English Jesuits – John Young – national sentiment – Muzio Vitelleschi – Gian Paolo Oliva – general congregations

1 Introduction: the Internationalism of the Society of Jesus

In the spring of 1539, Ignatius of Loyola (c.1491–1556; in office, 1541–56) and his companions deliberated their future. Should they attempt to retain some union, a corporate identity, despite their being sent in different directions on

various missions? Or should they acknowledge the end of their brotherhood? The official account of these discussions admits a variety of views, not surprising because “some of our group were French, others Spaniards, still others Savoyards or Portuguese.” Yet despite linguistic and cultural differences they agreed “to discover the gracious design of God’s will within the scope of our vocation.” They decided to remain together: the “Lord had seen fit to assemble and bind us to one another—we who are so frail and from such diverse national and cultural backgrounds—we ought not to sever what God has united and bound together.”¹ At this juncture, as if to illustrate the problem, Paschase Broët (1500–62), Simão Rodrigues (1510–79), and Francisco de Strada (1519–84) left the consultations on a mission to reform a monastery in Siena.

Pedro de Ribadeneyra (1527–1611), first official biographer of Ignatius, lauded how the Society could create such wonderful unity amidst such heterogeneity:

Having put aside their feelings for particular lands or places, having cast aside an immoderate attachment to those with whom they live, they seem to look only to the glory of God and the salvation of their neighbors. Let us recognize the grace of God, my brethren, and let us be graceful.²

Let us hope, Ribadeneyra prayed, that such union would prevail always.

Ignatius of Loyola turned to the same theme of unity in diversity in his explication of the Jesuit fourth vow, the special vow of obedience to the pope regarding missions. “For those who first united to form the Society were from different provinces and realms and did not know into which regions they were to go, whether among the faithful or the unbelievers,” Ignatius explained, “to avoid erring in the path of the Lord, they made that promise or vow in order that His Holiness might distribute them for greater glory of God.”³ In his exposition of the meaning of this vow, John W. O’Malley, S.J., accents the international dimension of the Society. Unlike other new religious orders such as the Theatines and Barnabites, Jesuits “were not localized by Italian nationality or perspective.” An international group with an international perspective,

1 “The Deliberation of Our First Fathers,” trans. Dominic Maruca, S.J., *Woodstock Letters* 95 (1966): 325–33, here 327, 328. See also Joseph F. Conwell, S.J., *Impelling Spirit: Revisiting a Founding Experience: 1539 Ignatius of Loyola and His Companions* (Chicago: Loyola Press, 1997), 83–88.

2 *The Life of Ignatius of Loyola*, trans. Claude Paur, S.J. (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2014), 430.

3 Ignatius of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, ed. George E. Ganss, S.J. (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), 268, num. 3.

they placed themselves at the disposition of the universal pastor. Where and how individual Jesuits would be sent or missioned depends on decisions of the pope or, more often, of their religious superiors. The principal criterion for the selection is the greater glory of God with the pope as the person best qualified to advance the *magis*.⁴ Important, indeed essential, for the Society's mission, according to Ignatius, was indifference, an impartiality that refuses to prefer "one side or another among Christian princes or rulers, but in its stead a universal love which embraces in our Lord all parties (even though they are adversaries to one another)."⁵ This constitutional decree served as the basis for an important common rule (rules binding on all members of the Society of Jesus) that dates back to the governance of Ignatius (1541–56) and first formulated during the administration of Diego Laínez (1558–65): Jesuits should

be on their guard against that attitude of mind which leads some of one nationality to speak ill of those of another. Rather, they should esteem and bear a special love in our Lord for those of other nations. Hence no one at the expense of charity should make wars or dissensions between nations the subject of their conversations.⁶

Such precautions were required lest localism corrode or destroy internationalism. One joined the Society of Jesus and not a specific province, which was a mere administrative unit. In the initial years of the Society, even as its numbers increased in Spain and Portugal, there remained only one superior—Ignatius of Loyola in Rome. Simão Rodrigues was named the first provincial, with delegated authority, on October 25, 1546. In July 1547, Ignatius observed the importance of a local superior to treat difficulties, financial and spiritual, among the Jesuits at the inchoate college in Gandía. Indeed, he allowed them to elect one of their own: they selected Andrés de Oviedo (1518–77), future patriarch of Ethiopia.⁷ Ideally, Spaniards could be sent to Poland; English, to India; Irish,

4 See "The Fourth Vow in its Ignatian Context: A Historical Study," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 15, no. 1 (1983): 1–59, here 26.

5 Ignatius of Loyola, *Constitutions*, 337, num. 823.

6 *The Rules of the Society of Jesus* (Woodstock, Md.: Woodstock College Press, 1956), 34–35. See also Manuel Ruiz Jurado, S.J., "De las *Constituciones S.J. al Epitome*," 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), 129–47, here 141–42.

7 Ignatius to the Jesuits of Gandía, Rome, July 29, 1547, in *Ignatius of Loyola: Letters and Instructions*, ed. Martin E. Palmer, S.J., John W. Padberg, S.J., and John L. McCarthy, S.J. (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2006), 195–201; John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 351–52.

to Latin America. The Latin language common within Jesuit culture provided each man with the necessary linguistic tools; the Spiritual Exercises provided the strength and fortitude.⁸

The Society's lofty internationalism was not easily implemented in an era of rising national sentiment.⁹ In 1542, King Francis I (1494–1547; r.1515–47) evicted all Spanish subjects of Charles V (1500–58; r. in Spain. 1516–56; in Holy Roman Empire, 1519–56), with whom he was at war, from the University of Paris. Eight Jesuits were among the refugees: they settled in Louvain (now Leuven) where they established the Society's sixth community in Europe.¹⁰ Indeed, perception that the Society of Jesus was a foreign institution transplanted onto French soil lay behind much of the opposition to the Society's foundation in the kingdom.¹¹ Jesuit freedom to send anyone anywhere was increasingly restricted by secular rulers whose royal patronage controlled the foreign missions (the *padroado* and *patronato* in Portugal and Spain). Dynastic alliances and wars determined who was acceptable for the Spanish, Portuguese, and later French missions. Missionary aspirations were often quashed by monarchs who could select and reject missionaries. The missionaries need not be Spanish or Portuguese but

- 8 Brian C. Lockey contrasts Jesuit internationalism or "cosmopolitanism" with the insular, provincial perspective of the majority of the clergy, religious and secular. See *Early Modern Catholics, Royalists, and Cosmopolitans. English Transnationalism and the Christian Commonwealth* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 1, 7, 29, 37, 61–63. Jesuit preference for a transnational papacy instead of a local episcopacy can be cited as further evidence of Lockey's argument. Perhaps we should expand Felicity Heal's observation that certain Protestant reformers "consciously promoted the pursuit of pan-European religious harmony through correspondence, formal debate, and mission" (*Reformation in Britain and Ireland* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003], 7) to include the Society of Jesus.
- 9 For the purposes of this article, I agree with David A. Bell's distinction between national sentiment and nationalism: "More than a sentiment, nationalism is a political program which has as its goal not merely to praise, or defend, or strengthen a nation, but actively to construct one, casting its human raw material into a fundamentally new form" (*The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001], 3).
- 10 Paul Begheyn, S.J., "Jesuits in the Netherlands, 1573–1580," in *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuits Culture 1573–1580*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Rome/St. Louis, MO: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu/Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004), 115–43, here 119. See also Philippe Lécrivain, S.J., "The Struggle for Paris: Juan Maldonado in France, in McCoog, *Mercurian Project*, 295–321.
- 11 The perception was not without some foundation. According to A. Lynn Martin's calculations based on correspondence with Rome, only about thirty-seven percent of Jesuits within France were French. See *The Jesuit Mind: The Mentality of an Elite in Early Modern France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988), 2.

nonetheless required a royal *imprimatur*.¹² In the late sixteenth century, Philip II (1527–98; r.1556–98) forbade Spanish Jesuits to leave Spain;¹³ in the early seventeenth century, Henry IV (1553–1610; r.1589–1610) insisted that all Jesuit superiors within the kingdom be his subjects or at least have his explicit approval.¹⁴

Even within the Society the Ignatian ideal was threatened. Contemporary historian A. Lynn Martin narrates French Jesuit resentment of the presence of so many foreign colleagues, and foreign Jesuit feelings of discrimination at the hands of their local superiors in the 1560s–70s. In 1569, Francisco de Borja (1510–72; in office, 1565–72) ordered Everard Mercurian (1514–80; in office, 1573–80), who would be his successor as superior general, as visitor “to eliminate this humor.” Three years later, Antonio Possevino (1555–1611) confessed to Jerónimo Nadal (1507–80) that “the humor of nationalism could not be so quickly eradicated from these northern souls.”¹⁵ More than twenty years ago, the Spanish Jesuit historian Francisco de Borja de Medina highlighted the insidious introduction of national concerns at the Third General Congregation (1573) convened for the election of a new general upon the death of Borja. Preoccupation with national or socio-religious origins, e.g. new Christians, or perceived Spanish dominance of the still young Society of Jesus resulted in damage to the Society’s “seamless universality” and a consequent corrosion of the “union of souls, the cornerstone of the entire edifice of the Society” because of papal insistence that the next general not be a Spaniard.¹⁶ Efforts by the Society to keep this destructive sentiment out of the Society were failing despite frequent exhortations and the occasional congregational decree. Indeed, it seems as if the Society itself was guilty of the same crime: after Mercurian’s election fewer Spaniards held positions of authority within the Society’s governance. Previous occupants from rectors in Rome to provincials in eastern

12 See Luke Clossey, *Salvation and Globalization in the Early Jesuit Missions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

13 See the instructions given by Father General Claudio Acquaviva to Robert Persons, Rome, October 31, 1588, ARSI, *Tolet.* fols. 41^r–42^r.

14 Eric Nelson, *The Jesuits and the Monarchy: Catholic Reform and Political Authority in France (1590–1615)* (Aldershot/Rome: Ashgate/Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2005), 77ff.

15 Cited in Martin, *Jesuit Mind*, 115.

16 “Everard Mercurian and Spain,” in McCoog, *Mercurian Project*, 945–66, here 949. See also his “La quiebra del universalismos de la unión de los ánimos,” in McCoog, *Ite inflammate omnia*, 321–41. Esther Jiménez Pablo touches on this problem in “The Evolution of the Society of Jesus during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries: An Order That Favoured the Papacy or the Hispanic Monarchy?,” in *Papacy, Religious Orders and International Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Massimo Carlo Giannini (Rome: Viella, 2013), 47–65.

Europe were invited to return home. Among them were worthies such as Ribadeneyra. Officially, he returned to Spain for medical reasons. But as Medina observes, “many believed that the true reason was a decision to remove Spanish influences from the Jesuit curia. Perceptions may be wrong, but Mercurian could not have been unaware of them.”¹⁷ Twenty years later, at the Fifth General Congregation (1593–94), the Society shamefully reversed and repudiated its earlier policies by decreeing that “no one will hereafter be admitted to this Society who is descended of Hebrew or Saracen stock.”¹⁸

A thorough examination of national sentiment within the Society of Jesus and its effects on the Society’s globalization is much needed. This article, however, will be restricted to relations between Irish and English Jesuits, members of the same global religious order, formed in the same spirituality, instructed in the same theology and philosophy, bound by the same *Constitutions* and “ways of proceeding” that advocated the *magis* and the greater good, and gathered into the same “imagined community.”¹⁹ How did they interact as “friends in the Lord,” to employ a sacrosanct Jesuit expression? With suspicion? With affection? Of course, there is evidence in the extant correspondence of occasional cooperation between Jesuits of both kingdoms, e.g. Irish Jesuits using the more secure and dependable English Jesuit network for communication with Rome, English Jesuits facilitating Irish access to the Spanish court, and Irish Jesuits enjoying hospitality in England, but there are also intimations of hesitation and possible friction. But could they move beyond cooperation to collaboration or indeed consolidation, put aside animosity for the “greater glory of God”?

2 Anglo-Irish Jesuit Tension in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries

2.1 *The Irish College, Valladolid?*

Henry More (c.1587–1661), the first historian of the English province, narrates the foundation of the English College, Valladolid, in a straightforward but

¹⁷ “Everard Mercurian and Spain,” 962.

¹⁸ *For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty Jesuit General Congregations*, ed. John W. Padberg, S.J., Martin D. O’Keefe, S.J., and John L. McCarthy, S.J. (St. Louis, MO: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), 204, decree 52. See also Robert A. Maryks, *The Jesuit Order as a Synagogue of Jews: Jesuits of Jewish Ancestry and Purity-of-Blood Laws in the Early Society of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

¹⁹ See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (rev. ed., London: Verso, 2006).

simplistic way that ignores Anglo-Irish tension. More and more young English and Irish Catholics had left their homelands for the continent during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I (1533–1603; 1558–1603). In the late 1580s, English and Irish students matriculated at the university in Valladolid. Initially ecclesiastical authorities in the city suggested that one college be established for both. According to More's account, the English Jesuit Robert Persons (1546–1610) did not favor this type of mixed college so "he made over to the Irish the whole of the site which the city had given them, and then bought another property."²⁰ (I add parenthetically that More published his Latin history of the province in 1660. Thus he was writing it, as we shall see, during an extremely difficult period for the Irish mission that included discussions of a merger with the English province. Perhaps More allowed contemporary concerns to color his historical analysis. He would not have been the first—nor the last.) The Irish-born, English Jesuit historian Leo Hicks, S.J. (1888–1968), asserts that Persons's opposition to a shared college resulted from the conflict at the English College, Rome, between English and Welsh seminarians: "Rather than risk a repetition of this by a similar combination, which in itself would hardly have been fair to the Irish students, he held out for a separate establishment."²¹

All students of early modern British Catholicism know of the Welsh-English disturbances at the English College, Rome, most recently discussed in Mark Netzloff's "The English Colleges and the English Nation: Allen, Persons, Verstegan, and Diasporic Nationalism"²² and Jason A. Nice's "Being 'British' in Rome: The Welsh at the English College, 1578–1584." Expatriate communities formed according to ethnic and national lines and not confessional ones.²³

20 *The Elizabethan Jesuits*, ed. and trans. Francis Edwards. S.J. (London: Phillimore, 1981), 206–7. Thomas O'Connor, with characteristic gentility observes: "Although exiled English, Irish, and Scots Catholics sometimes shared accommodation, they preferred to run their own collegial institutions" ("The Domestic and International Roles of the Early Modern Irish Diaspora," in *Early Modern Ethnic and Religious Communities in Exile*, ed. Yosef Kaplan [Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017], 341–61, here 351).

21 "Father Persons, S.J., and the Seminaries in Spain," *The Month* 157 (1941): 497–506, here 501.

22 In *Catholic Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Ronald Corthell, Frances E. Dolan, Christopher Highley, and Arthur F. Marotti (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 236–60; Jason A. Nice, "Being 'British' in Rome: The Welsh at the English College, 1578–1584," *Catholic Historical Review* 92 (2006), 1–24.

23 Tragic images of contemporary refugees may have inspired the current interest in refugees and exiles, religious or otherwise. Relevant examples would include Katy Gibbons, *English Catholic Exiles in Late Sixteenth-Century Paris* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001); *Religious Refugees in the Early Modern World*, ed. Nicholas Terpstra (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Kaplan, *Early Modern Ethnic and Religious Communities in*

International Catholicism and a common Britishness and religious exile rarely trumped national differences and residual antagonism. The recreation of a Catholic England with its proper ecclesiastical history, liturgical calendar, and national saints in its plays provided little religious consolation to the non-English students in Rome.²⁴ Richard Verstegan (or Richard Rowlands, c.1550–1640) may have disseminated martyrological details about the sufferings of English Catholics

so that you who are a member with us of the same body of Christ and of the Church may sympathize with us, your afflicted brethren, and may join your prayers with us [...] to still this tempest and soften their hearts of the persecutors, and move them to accept the Faith they have rejected,

but compassion did not always translate into practice.²⁵ For instance, Irish students at Valladolid, despite More's assertion, did not take possession of any territory provided by Persons in Valladolid. Thomas White (1558–1622), an Irish priest and future Jesuit, gained access to King Philip II, admittedly through the intercession of Persons. His appeal secured royal support for a college for Irish students but with a major condition: the Irish college could not be established in Valladolid but must be set up in Salamanca. Why was Valladolid not large

Exile; Forming Catholic Communities: Irish, Scots and English College Networks in Europe, 1568–1918, ed. Liam Chambers and Thomas O'Connor (Leiden: Brill, 2018); *College Communities Abroad: Education, Migration and Catholicism in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Liam Chambers and Thomas O'Connor (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2018).

- 24 In *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Geert H. Janssen highlights the major role played by Jesuits and their sodalities in the spiritual formation of an "international Catholicism" among Catholic émigrés from different kingdoms in cultural hubs such as Rheims, Douai, and St. Omers. Lest we think exile a religious idyll, Janssen points out evidence of friction between English, Irish, and Scottish exiles, many of whom were obsessed with national identities. He cites Clare Walker's evaluation, "many women [in the English convents] saw themselves primarily as members of the English Catholic community, and only secondly as members of the universal Catholic church" but argues that reliance on evidence of this sort results in a distorted portrait. Other documents demonstrate how much they saw themselves as part of the Church Universal (109–10). But, on the other hand, one could counter that ignoring the evidence advanced by Walker and others because it can not be accommodated in one's thesis, equally distorts the portrait. Janssen finds particular fault with British historiography, which has consistently examined its religious exiles "through the lens of a national religious culture" that emphasizes distinction and difference (8).

- 25 As translated in A. [Anthony] G. Petti, "Richard Verstegan and Catholic Martyrologies of the later Elizabethan Period," *Recusant History* 5 (1959): 64–90, here 73.

enough for both English and Irish colleges? Persons assisted the Irish by using his influence with Philip to secure an endowment, but he was not willing to sanction English and Irish seminarians in the same institution or in the same city. Perhaps he did anticipate friction as students of both seminaries sought alms from the same potential benefactors, or outright hostility as the situation in Ireland deteriorated, at least from an English perspective, and the Nine Years' War (1593–1603) loomed. Father General Claudio Acquaviva (1543–1615; in office, 1581–1615), whose friendship with and esteem for Robert Persons, some believed,²⁶ affected his judgement, later decided that a second mission could not erect a college under Jesuit auspices in a city where another mission had already established one. Thus English Jesuits promised not to establish a college in Lisbon as long as the Irish Jesuits stayed out of Seville.²⁷ A few years later, Acquaviva cautioned Thomas White against an Irish college in Seville. If the archbishop wished to establish one and to nominate its rector, the Society was to have nothing to do with it lest the English Jesuits have justifiable grounds for a complaint.²⁸ This restriction apparently died with Acquaviva: his successor Muzio Vitelleschi (1563–1645; in office, 1615–45) approved the foundation of an Irish College in Seville.²⁹ A few years later, he facilitated the discussion of an Irish College in the Low Countries.³⁰

2.2 *A Jesuit Visitor for the Three Missions*

During the Nine Years War, Hugh O'Neill (c.1550–1616), Earl of Tyrone, petitioned Rome for a nuncio presumably to validate his claim that his conflict with England was in fact a crusade for “faith and fatherland” and thus merited

26 On Persons and Acquaviva, 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. The Scottish Jesuit William Crichton later complained to George Duras (c.1548–1607), Acquaviva's assistant, that eventually the superior general would realize that “all human opinions need verification even those of Robert Persons” (Crichton to Duras, Louvain, August 2, 1598, ARSI, *Germ.* 178, fols. 195^r–196^v). Acquaviva himself had earlier observed to Persons that Crichton “is a little excessive in his zeal for his country,” presumably a flaw he did not find in Persons (Acquaviva to Persons, Rome, February 11, 1596, ARSI, *Cast.* 6, fols. 237^v–238^r).

27 Acquaviva to Richard Conway (1572–1626), Rome, December 6, 1611; same to Thomas White, Rome, December 6, 1611, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 23^r.

28 Acquaviva to White, Rome, February 24, 1614, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 41^r.

29 Vitelleschi to Conway, Rome, December 3, 1619, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fol. 90^r.

30 Vitelleschi to Thomas Lawndaeus (*vere* Christopher Holywood), Rome, November 19, 1621, ARSI, *Angl.* 1/I, fols. 95^v–96^r.

papal support. Thomas H. Clancy, S.J. (1923–2009), observes that many Irish exiles believed their English Catholic confrères to be, at best, lukewarm in their application of papal deposing power to Ireland. English Catholic justifications for the overthrow of the Elizabethan regime were not extended to the Irish. Nor were the Irish involved in any strategies or designs for Elizabeth's removal. Sympathy they may have had for the sufferings endured by Irish Catholics but, according to Clancy, English Catholic perception of Ireland and the rebellion "was not notably different from that of other Englishmen of their day."³¹ Pope Clement VIII (1536–1605; r.1592–1605) did in fact name a nuncio but not the person requested by O'Neill. Instead the pope nominated a Sicilian Jesuit, Ludovico Mansoni (1547–1610), in November 1600. Claudio Acquaviva then designated him official visitor to the Jesuit missions in Ireland and Scotland. The Irish mission had been re-booted in 1598, but its superior, Christopher Holywood (1562–1626), languished in an English prison. Four of five Jesuits worked on the island; four or five Jesuits also worked in Scotland. The English mission, which numbered approximately twenty Jesuits, was not included in his brief. As Mansoni awaited departure in Spain, the Scottish Jesuit William Crichton (c.1534–1617), frequent critic of Robert Persons and occasional sympathiser with the anti-English-Jesuit secular clergy and Persons's opponents, recommended that the nuncio travel to Scotland to negotiate directly with King James VI and I (1566–1625; r. (Scotland) 1567–1625, (England) 1603–25). Crichton promised to make the necessary arrangements for the nuncio's reception and accommodation.³² He also advocated, clearly in anticipation of

31 *Papist Pamphleteers: The Allen-Persons Party and the Political Thought of the Counter-Reformation in England, 1572–1615* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964), 74. More recently David Edwards made a similar observation: "Many English Catholics wanted the removal of Elizabeth but few were willing to join an Irish rebellion to facilitate it" (David Edwards, "A Haven of Popery: English Catholic Migration 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, here 111). Approximately two centuries later, Robert Edward, Lord Petre (1742–1801) believed that he and his fellow English Catholics "should avoid all political connection with the Irish [in the campaign for Catholic emancipation] because the *views* of the two bodies were different [...]. It is our obvious policy therefore to keep ourselves as separate as possible from the Irish Catholics" (as cited in Antonia Fraser, *The King and the Catholics: England, Ireland, and the Fight for Religious Freedom, 1780–1829* [New York: Doubleday, 2018], 132).

32 Even before his active involvement in negotiations surrounding the release of Mary, Queen of Scots, and succession to the English throne, Crichton was criticized in 1577 because of his interest in worldly matters: "[Father rector] [...] is the first to propose discussions on the affairs of wars, of this kingdom, and of that province, and we almost never speak of things appropriate to us" (as cited in Martin, *Jesuit Mind*, 217).

James's succession to the English throne, the consolidation of the English, Scottish, and Irish missions for the good of the Roman Church and the Society. Mansoni never traveled to Ireland; Crichton's proposal was never discussed let alone implemented. Another Scottish Jesuit, Alexander MacQuhirrie (c.1557–1606), pondered the implications of James's recent accession of the English (and Irish) throne (1603). He too recommended that the three distinct missions be consolidated into one. If that proposal proved unacceptable, he suggested at the very least better coordination.³³

In early 1605, someone—the scanty sources do not provide even a hint as to his identity—recommended that the Irish mission be joined to an unnamed province but not to the English mission. The Irish Jesuit Nicholas Leinagh (1567–c.1623), writing “from the wastelands of Ireland,” countered the proposal with a plea to Acquaviva that the mission remain independent and directly under the supervision of the general.³⁴ In this desire for independence, the Irish did not differ from the English: they feared their ministries would suffer if they were subject to a superior who neither understood nor appreciated the sacrifices and dangers involved.

2.3 *Independent Missions*

In 1598, Acquaviva established an unusual, unprecedented style of governance for the English Jesuits. The men in England hitherto were governed by a superior who was directly responsible to the general without the customary mediation of a province on which the mission would depend. With the establishment of colleges on the continent administered, e.g. colleges in Rome and in Spain, or owned by the English Jesuits, that is St. Omers, greater coordination between the mission itself and these institutions was needed. Acquaviva's *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) established a superior (called a prefect) for the mission who would coordinate the ministries and work of his vice-prefects in Belgium and Spain, and of the local superior of the Jesuits on the mission itself.³⁵ The prefect and his

33 MacQuhirrie to Acquaviva, London, August 24, 1603, ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 651/635.

34 Leinagh to Acquaviva, “wastelands of Ireland,” April 3, 1605, Dublin, Irish Jesuit Archives [=IJA], *MS A*, 30 (published in *Ibernia Ignatiana*, ed. Edmund Hogan, S.J. [Dublin: Societas Typographica Dubliniensis, 188], 161–62). See also Andrew O'Morony (1564–1629) to Acquaviva, Ireland, April 3, 1605, IJA, *MS A*, 31 (published in Hogan, *Ibernia Ignatiana*, 161).

35 An English translation of the 1606 revision can be found in More, *Elizabethan Jesuits*, 298–307.

assistants would have considerable say in the administration of the seminaries and colleges, a say that had to be negotiated and re-negotiated in subsequent official documents because local provincials claimed these concessions, which in a sense established ecclesiastical peculiars, threatened or undermined their authority. In 1604, Acquaviva established a similar structure for the Irish mission but less complicated because the Irish Jesuits administered fewer colleges, and owned none: *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 Irish seminaries in Spain, which are under the direction of the Society).³⁶ Subsequently, the general made adjustments—especially for the English—but retained the prefectures despite an increasingly clamorous chorus of complaints and disapproval.

The Scottish Jesuit mission never achieved comparable autonomy. Because of the Society's expulsion from sections of France in the 1590s, supervision of the Scottish mission passed from the French to the Belgian province. (Belgium as a state did not exist but the Jesuit province was called Belgium.) In 1604, Acquaviva presented the mission with a choice: would the Scots prefer a union with the English, or a return to French administration. The auld alliance triumphed: MacQuhirrie believed subordination to the French less cumbersome than unification with the English.³⁷

3 The Rise of National Sentiment?

The Jesuits assembled at the Seventh General Congregation (1615), convened to elect a new general upon the death of Acquaviva, were exhorted to promote within the Society a universal religious spirit that would root out pernicious national sentiments.³⁸ Neither English nor Irish Jesuits were represented at the general congregation—representatives from missions or prefectures did not attend these assemblies—thus they could not defend their missions against attacks in which they were not explicitly mentioned. English insistence (English Jesuits, specifically Robert Persons, were considerably more outspoken than the Irish on this) on anomalous structures such as prefectures, separate colleges rooted in ethnic identity, and dependence on a superior of their own kingdom betrayed the desired universal spirit. Lurking behind lofty admonitions

36 ARSI, *Angl.* 39, fols. 111^r–112^v; *Angl.* 41, 33^r–35^v (printed in Hogan, *Ibernia Ignatiana*, 151–55).

37 John Burnet (*vere* Alexander MacQuhirrie) to George Duras, Tusculanum 7 idus Sep. [September 7] 1604, ARSI, *Angl.* 42, fol. 181^{r-v}.

38 ARSI, *Congr.* 1a, fol. 177^v.

that the Society not succumb to national sentiment were Spanish resentment of their marginalization within the Society, and their disapproval of the centralization of government under Acquaviva and especially his introduction of novel administrative structures. 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,” the decree insisted, “to intermix with others of the Society, lest national differences [*nationum discrimina*] be introduced to the great harm of the Society.”³⁹ The subsequent legislation threatened the independence considered necessary for the success of the missions by the English and Irish as demonstrated in the appropriate versions of *Officium et regulae*. The English mission evaded the dire consequences of the legislation with its elevation first into a vice-province (1619) and then to a province (1623). Ireland’s administrative status was not changed and it seems somehow to have retained its independence through the protection of the new general Vitelleschi who understood if not forgave Irish difficulties in providing Rome with the required paperwork, specifically catalogues, annual letters, etc. Because the Irish mission had no novitiate and no houses of formation, Vitelleschi, perhaps employing the universal spirit argument articulated by the congregation, persuaded various provinces to accept and support one Irish and one Scottish novice annually.⁴⁰ He did not want to accept too many novices from either mission in Rome because the climate there had deleterious effect on their health.⁴¹

3.1 *Prayers for the Dead*

The Third General Congregation (1573), the one that elected Mercurian, codified “the ancient custom of offering suffrages for those who die in the province.” Each priest in the deceased’s community should say three Masses and each brother, three rosaries for the repose of the soul. Priests and brothers in the other communities of the province should say two Masses or two rosaries.⁴² At some unspecified time, the Irish Mission was twined to the Roman province regarding prayers and Masses for deceased benefactors and deceased Jesuits. Irish Jesuits and Roman Jesuits had been praying for each other’s benefactors, deceased members despite the fact there were more of the latter than

39 Padberg et al., *For Matters of Greater Moment*, 256–57, decree 21.

40 Fergus O’Donoghue, S.J., “The Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651” (unpublished PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1981), 156–57; Vitelleschi to Jean Heren (1561–1645), Rome, June 11, 1616, ARSI, *Gl. Belg.* 1, 223–24.

41 Vitelleschi to Conway, Rome, July 2, 1616, ARSI, *Angl.* 1, fol. 46r.

42 Padberg et al., *For Matters of Greater Moment*, 148, decree 40.

the former. In 1624, Muzio Vitelleschi, at the request of the English provincial Richard Blount (1565–1638), severed this connection and unilaterally twined the mission with the English province. Henceforth the Irish superior should inform the English provincial as soon as one of his men died, and vice versa.⁴³ If the new arrangement did not appeal to the Irish, Vitelleschi promised to restore the former practice.⁴⁴ Hollywood, superior of the mission at the time, preferred to retain the connection with the Roman province that Vitelleschi restored by 1627⁴⁵ because, as Fergus O'Donoghue, S.J., explains, “the looser the formal attachment to the English Province, the lesser would be the danger of political embarrassment for the Mission.”⁴⁶ Weight of numbers did not favor the Irish: there were more members of the Roman province than of the Irish mission. The Irish objected to saying more than twice the number of Masses for the Romans than the Italians said for the Irish. Nonetheless, Vitelleschi wanted the arrangement to continue, but some adjustments were made subsequently.⁴⁷ The arrangement was finally abrogated in 1647.⁴⁸ But the issue did not fade away: in 1662, the general decided that the Roman Jesuits would pray for the Jesuits that died in Ireland regardless of whether the Irish returned the favor.⁴⁹

4 Securing the Irish Mission

In 1628, King Charles I (1600–49; r.1625–49) made numerous concessions to Irish Catholics, the so-called “Graces.”⁵⁰ Simmering anger because of the

43 Vitelleschi to Thomas Lawndaeus (*vere* Christopher Hollywood), Rome, August 26, 1624, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 2^v–3^r.

44 Vitelleschi to Thomas Lawndaeus (*vere* Christopher Hollywood), Rome, August 23, 1625, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 5^v–6^r.

45 Vitelleschi to Robert Nugent, Rome, April 10, 1627, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 11^r–12^r; same to William Malone (1586–1656), Rome, September 18, 1627, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 12^v; same to same, Rome, November 13, 1632, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 30^v–31^r.

46 O'Donoghue, “Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651,” 143n43. Whether the influx of English Catholics into Ireland to avoid the penal statutes in their homeland affected a desire for closer collaboration among Jesuits in both kingdoms remains a topic for further exploration. On the arrival of English Catholics, see Edwards, “Haven of Popery.”

47 Vitelleschi to Robert Nugent, Rome, September 29, 1629, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 20^v–21^r.

48 Vincenzo Carafa to Edward Clare (1580–1649), Rome, April 20, 1647, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 68^r–69^r.

49 Goswin Nickel to Nathaniel Hart (1611–71, *vere* Richard Shelton), Rome, March 4, 1662, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 113^v; same to Andrew Sall Fitz Bennet (1612–86), Rome, October 13, 1663, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 116^v–117^r.

50 See Aidan Clarke, *The Graces 1625–41* (Dublin: Dublin Historical Association, 1968).

English government's failure to translate this *de facto* religious tolerance in Ireland into *de iure* toleration, an anger fanned by the forward Protestantism of the Long Parliament (1640) erupted into rebellion in Ulster in October 1641. Under the banner "Pro Deo, Rege, et Patria, Hiberni Unanimes" (For God, king, and fatherland, the Irish are united), Irish Catholic religious authorities, nobles, and military officers formed the Confederation of Kilkenny in 1642. With royalists and parliamentarians providing unintended distractions from Irish affairs, the confederates established a government as they sought foreign recognition of an independent Ireland. In June 1644, in the midst of the English Civil War (1642–51), an embattled King Charles I authorized James Butler (1610–88), earl of Ormonde, to negotiate with the confederates. Pope Innocent X (1574–1655; r.1644–55) assisted the confederacy by sending a nuncio, Giovanni Battista Rinuccini (1592–1663).

Anticipating great fruit in Ireland because of the confederation, Robert Nugent (1597–1652), the Jesuit superior, asked Vitelleschi to send home more Irish Jesuits then dispersed throughout the continent. Instead of rounding up Irish Jesuits, Vitelleschi advised Nugent to accept an offer twice made by the English provincial. The civil war had made it even more difficult and dangerous for English Jesuits to return home. Vitelleschi believed that the English provincial would appreciate any assistance that the Irish superior could provide in this regard. England had men eager to work; Ireland had the opportunities. If the superior assisted the provincial in this way, perhaps, Vitelleschi opined, the provincial it would return the favor in the future. Nugent, wondering how he could use the English and whether they would be more a burden than a benefit, did not enthuse over the offer. He hesitated "as he always did," according to O'Donoghue, "to any attempt to involve Irish and English Jesuits in the same apostolates." Vitelleschi's efforts to increase Jesuit presence in the kingdom "foundered, therefore, on the rock of local sentiment."⁵¹ Two years later, Nugent did take in five English Jesuits out of compassion for the financially weakened province. Three had their own work but the other two were kept close to Dublin because they did not speak Irish. The mission was itself too poor to support more.⁵²

51 O'Donoghue, "Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651," 302.

52 Vitelleschi to Nugent, Rome, June 8, 1643, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 54^r; same to same, Rome, August 6, 1644, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 58^{r-v}; same to same, Rome, December 17, 1644, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols 58^v–59^r; same to Henry Plunkett, S.J. (1599–1649), Rome, December 17, 1644, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 59^r; same to Nugent, Rome, December 24, 1644, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 59^v; same to Nugent, Rome, September 16, 1645, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 62^r; Nugent to Vicar General

After prolonged and considerable discussion, the royalists and the confederates agreed to peace in the summer of 1646. Together they would defend the monarch against the parliamentarians. With the consent of many, but not all, bishops and religious superiors, the nuncio repudiated this treaty as insufficient, excommunicated its supporters, and placed under interdict specific areas of Ireland. The Irish Jesuits had endorsed the treaty. Rinuccini, educated by the Jesuits in Rome and generally considered a friend of the Society, now treated them as his principal opponents.⁵³ In late 1648, Father 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.⁵⁴ The subsequent invasion of Ireland by Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658; r.1653–58) and the consequent destruction (1649–53) nearly obliterated the thriving Irish mission.

John Young (1589–1664), novice master of the novitiate in Kilkenny until its destruction by Cromwell, decried the devastation: “It seems that the devil himself wants us to be destroyed, so that there is nothing of us left on earth.”⁵⁵ To prevent the total eradication of the mission Young was sent to Rome in the summer of 1651 in the hope of retrieving the money owed to the Irish mission by the papal nuncio, a difficult and complicated task made more so because Young had not supported the nuncio.⁵⁶ Robert Nugent had named Young the mission’s procurator with authority to act in the mission’s name throughout Europe.⁵⁷ Most likely on the basis of this authority, Young also submitted a *postulatum* to the general congregation that convened in January 1652 to elect

Carlo Sangro (1568–1655), Kilkenny, September 15, 1645, IJA, MS A, 89 (partial copy in ARSI, *Angl.* 6a, fol. 28^r).

53 O'Donoghue, “Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651,” 317–24; Tadhg Ó Hannracháin, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini 1645–1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 208, 239–44.

54 The general had allowed the provincial of Aquitaine, Gilbert Rousseau (c.1585–1664), to select the visitor (Carafa to Rousseau, Rome, September 8, 1648, ARSI, *Aquit.* 3/I, fol. 106^r). The visitor’s reports of February 11/21 1649, April 7, 1649, April 21, 1649, and May 17, 1649, IJA, MS A 106, 108, 109, 110 (with copies in ARSI, *Angl.* 6a, fols. 45^r–50^v, 53^r–56^r, 57^r–58^r, 59^r–70^v). Louis McRedmond discusses the visitation in *To the Greater Glory: A History of the Irish Jesuits* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1991), 72–77. Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin’s more recent “The Visitation of Mercure Verdier to Ireland, 1648–1649” can be found in *With Eyes and Ears Open: The Role of Visitors in the Society of Jesus*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 126–48.

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

56 Vicar General Goswin Nickel to Nugent, Rome, July 1, 1651, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 83^v.

57 O'Donoghue, “Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651,” 351–52.

a successor to Francesco Piccolomini (1582–1651; in office, 1649–51) who had died on June 17, 1651. Young remained in Rome, principally at the Irish College, where he served as rector from 1656 until his death on July 13, 1664.

5 The Future of the Irish Mission, 1652

The *postulatum* is not signed, but Young is the most probable author because of his presence in Rome, and because of similarities between the *postulatum* and later documents written by him.⁵⁸ In preliminary discussions, the fathers assembled at the Tenth General Congregation lamented the continual growth of a “national spirit” (*spiritus nationalis*) that excluded foreign Jesuits from working within the boundaries of other provinces.⁵⁹ In a privately printed brochure presumably presented to all delegates before the election of the general, the anonymous author, possibly the vicar general Goswin Nickel (1584–1664; in office, 1652–64) praised a Society conceived in Spain, born in France, approved in Italy, and propagated in Germany and elsewhere. The Society discriminated against no nationality in its election of a general. (The insistence of Pope Gregory XIII [1502–85; r.1572–85] at the Third General Congregation [1573] that the next general not be a Spaniard was a convenient oversight.⁶⁰) Amidst the confusion that followed the Tower of Babel, the Society strove to speak the universal language of the faith to a linguistically fractured world.⁶¹ Young’s *postulatum* exhorted the congregation to put into practice this universalism.

Young appealed to the congregation to assist a mission initiated by the Society’s founder Ignatius of Loyola, a mission that struggled strenuously in the Lord’s vineyard until its near total destruction the previous year by the English parliamentarians. In the devastation, eight colleges and six residences have been lost; all possessions, confiscated; and Jesuits, captured, killed, or exiled. The victorious parliamentarians moreover threatened with exile anyone receiving or succoring a Jesuit in any way. Thus the mission implored the congregants, as representatives of the universal Society, for assistance so that

58 The original *postulatum* can be found in ARSI, *Congr.* 20e, fol. 382^{r-v}. A copy can also be found in the Archives of the Irish College, Rome, *Liber* XXI, fols. 123^r–124^v. The copy in the Irish College is dated February 17, 1652.

59 ARSI, *Congr.* 20e, fol. 332^r.

60 See John W. Padberg, S.J., “The Third General Congregation, 1573,” in McCoog, *Mercurian Project*, 49–75.

61 ARSI, *Congr.* 9, fols. 179^r–183^v, specifically 180a^v, 182^v. The brochure can also be found in ARSI, *Congr.* 20e, fols. 324^r–329^v.

Jesuit ministries could continue, ministries albeit dangerous but necessary for the salvation of thousands in Ireland. Thirty-five years earlier, Young reminded the fathers, Vitelleschi had commended the Irish mission and its needs to the Seventh General Congregation (1615), which promptly endorsed the request. Vitelleschi, at various times in 1618, reminded the provincials of their commitment in different circular letters.⁶²

Specifically, Young asked that each European province annually admit into its novitiate one Irish candidate deemed qualified and capable of the Jesuit way of life. The host province would support this novice financially as he progressed through formation at the end of which he would be sent to Ireland, if God has restored it to a better state, or to other works. A second request concerned *viaticum*, the travel expenses of Jesuits returning to Ireland. Because the trip was long and dangerous, numerous expenses were involved. Because the mission lacked money, Young sought subsidies from the provinces. Young also reminded the congregation, Irish seminaries had been established by generous benefactors in various provinces of the Society. Formerly, they had produced a large number of priests extremely qualified for perilous ministries in the vineyard. But more recently, the quality and quantity of secular clergy had diminished. Young feared a continued decline might result in the scandalization of many, the defamation of the Society, and the alienation of friends and benefactors. Thus Young asked the Society to ascertain the causes of this problem and to provide a remedy. Finally, Irish Jesuits no longer had residences where they could live comfortably, but were driven by necessity to live “in forests, mountains, and deserted places.” Because the mission had no houses outside the kingdom, the elderly and the exhausted had no place to catch their breath and to recover. Young therefore sought hospitality for them in the European houses of the Society. On February 17, 1652, the congregation addressed the *postulatum* and granted Young’s requests. The superior general Alessandro Gottifredi (1595–1652; in office, January–March 1652) approved.⁶³

62 The copy in the Irish College archives does not contain the concluding sentence about Vitelleschi and the Seventh General Congregation. I looked through the *acta* of the congregation, and the register of Vitelleschi’s correspondence without finding any general letter to the Society regarding the Irish mission. Young may have had Vitelleschi’s letter to Heren in mind: Vitelleschi to Heren, Rome, June 11, 1616, ARSI, *Gl. Belg.* 1, 223–24. Perhaps further research will discover other letters. O’Donoghue touched on this at the end of his dissertation: “Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651,” 357–58.

63 ARSI, *Congr.* 2, fol. 27^v; ARSI, *Congr.* 2a, 206–7; ARSI, *Congr.* 15, fol. 105^{r-v}; ARSI, *Congr.* 16, fol. 99^{r-v}. *Actio* 36, the decision regarding this *postulatum*, is not recorded among the published congregational decrees.

6 The *status quo*

The Eleventh General Congregation convened in May 1661. The Jesuit province of France, which comprised the Île de France and much of northern France, submitted a *postulatum* regarding Irish and Scottish Jesuits undergoing their formation in the institutions of other provinces. The *postulatum* asked who was their superior during that period? The provincial in whose province they were being formed? Or the superior of the mission in which they would later serve? Since no other mention of either mission can be found in the *acta* of the congregation, this apparently simple request for clarification initiated a discussion of the Irish mission and whether it would be better governed if it were amalgamated to a province. No particular province was specified; perhaps England was taken for granted. The Society's secretary, the English Jesuit Nathaniel Southwell (*vere* Bacon, 1598–1676), informed John Young, now rector of the Irish College, Rome, of the discussion, and asked him to write out any objections to a union. Young explained that he had labored for years in Ireland, and thus with all due respect and in humble obedience, he submitted for the congregation's consideration reasons against any union.

Ireland, he began, was the Society's oldest mission in Europe. Founded by Loyola, the mission was nurtured by successive generals, Laínez, Borja, and Acquaviva (the omission of Mercurian's name is interesting and perhaps significant because of his distress that the turn the Irish mission had taken once David Wolfe [c.1528–c.1578] became involved with the Fitzgerald rebellion in the 1570s),⁶⁴ who drafted various ordinances and instructions. The Apostolic See had granted Jesuits on the mission different privileges, faculties, and indulgences. To this day, they have ministered in the kingdom and on the surrounding islands (Scotland) with tremendous fruit. The mission had eight colleges, well founded by generous benefactors, and six residences, which other generous benefactors planned to endow as new colleges. The mission was progressing to full provincial status. Unfortunately, the rage of the English and Scottish heretics during the Cromwellian destruction, the same rage that decapitated

64 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 McCoog, *Mercurian Project*, 675–703; 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.

their king, destroyed the mission's institutions, and imprisoned or exiled many Jesuits. Young reminded them how the Tenth General Congregation (1652) had come to the aid of the mission, and how different, unnamed provinces assisted the mission as it awaited better times. Young passed over in silence developments in Ireland that could threaten the mission: some Catholics drafted a quasi-Gallican declaration of allegiance to the monarch in their attempts to recover land confiscated in the 1650s and granted to Protestants. Would this result in the sacrifice of the Jesuits similar to the proposals of English Catholics in their contemporaneous search for toleration?⁶⁵ But to the matter at hand.

Young enumerated five reasons often advanced in favor of amalgamation. Some feared that Irish Jesuits dispersed among many provinces with local variations and idiosyncrasies did not possess a common outlook, a common *mentalité*. Products of formation in different provinces, they lacked a desired uniformity.⁶⁶ Once the mission was united with a province, all would be formed by the same standards and norms of that province. In this context, Young explicitly mentioned the English province. On the other hand, Young retorted, that the Society of Jesus has forged a certain spiritual unity and uniformity among members from various countries with a respectful, charitable acceptance of differences. The Irish mission did the same on a smaller scale. Young cited the “mind and sense” of decree 21 of the Seventh General Congregation that prohibited the restriction of novitiates, missions, etc. to one nationality. He quoted the *actio* of the previous congregation that authorized the dispersion of the Irish. On a more practical level, he doubted the English province could afford to accept and train the many Irish candidates. Now these candidates were so carefully distributed throughout Europe in order to prevent their education from becoming a financial burden to any one province. Once the mission was united with the province, the English would have to handle

65 See Stefania Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008); Danielle McCormack, *The Stuart Restoration and the English in Ireland* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2016); and Christopher P. Gillett, “Probabilism, Pluralism, and Papalism: Jesuit Allegiance Politics in the British Atlantic and Continental Europe, 1644–50,” in *Jesuit Intellectual and Physical Exchange between England and Mainland Europe, c.1580–1789*, ed. James E. Kelly and Hannah Thomas (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 235–60.

66 Vitelleschi had earlier worried about the lack of uniformity on the mission, an unfortunate consequence of formation in different provinces with different styles and traditions. Individual Jesuits occasionally justified their apparently idiosyncratic practices as the custom of the province in which they were formed. See Vitelleschi to James Everard (1598–1648), Rome, June 3, 1628, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 16^r; same to same, Rome, November 17, 1629, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 22^r–23^r; O'Donoghue, “Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651,” 225.

the costs of formation. And that would be a major financial burden. Young also predicted that the mission would attract fewer candidates because many interested in religious life would not want to live under English jurisdiction. He did not elaborate on this; perhaps it was not necessary.

Supporters of consolidation also argued that the mission lacked an institution to which individual Jesuits could be sent to recuperate from spiritual, moral or physical problems, a retreat, a refuge, a safe house. One could not expect other provinces to provide *gratis* accommodation for the mission's sick or problems. Such hospitality for Irish Jesuits should not be considered a financial burden, Young emphasized, but, as decreed in the Tenth General Congregation, such generosity demonstrated the universal charity of the Society. Consolidation with the English province, moreover, might damage relations with the bishops and prelates of Ireland. This may have been an allusion to the province's earlier conflicted relations with the English vicars apostolic.⁶⁷ The hierarchy had held the Society in high esteem until twelve years ago when Queen Henrietta Maria (1609–69), through her procurator in Rome, advocated the appointment of English secular clerics to Irish sees. The Irish bishops believed—without any justification—that the Jesuit mission supported this offensive proposal. Convincing the bishops of Irish Jesuit innocence was not easy. Association with the English Jesuits, Young argued, could revive that rumor and result in the expulsion of the Society from Ireland.

Because Ireland was neither a vice-province nor a province, it could neither convene a (vice) provincial congregation nor be represented at a general congregation. Moreover, Irish Jesuits could not hold any major office in the Society because they do not belong to a province. Consolidation would correct this omission. But, Young explained, Irish Jesuits working in other provinces could in fact attend their provincial congregations if they held the appropriate office

67 Unfortunately, this remains an area in need of further exploration. For an account sympathetic to the bishops, see Phillip Hughes, *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England* (London: Burns Oates, 1942). Antony Allison provides the most extensive and pro-Jesuit analysis in a series of articles that should be collected into a monograph: "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; "A Question of Jurisdiction: Richard Smith Bishop of Chalcedon and the Catholic Laity 1625–31," *Recusant History* 16 (1982): 111–45; "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; "Some Additions and Corrections to Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents," *Recusant History* 20 (1990): 493–94.

or seniority in religious life.⁶⁸ If the poor mission could not even pay the expenses for a provincial's visitation, how could they find sufficient funds to send men to congregations outside the island? He cited as an illustration the frequency with which the English province held congregations in Flanders. Would the inability to hold offices of rector and provincial be corrected through consolidation? Young doubted that any English Jesuit would want or accept an Irishman for provincial or rector of a major house for various, unspecified reasons. The appointment of an Irishman to a prominent position within the English province might arouse suspicion, alienate English Catholics, or even occasion new persecution. Moreover other religious orders in Ireland—and there were many—would exploit the occasion to defame the Society and impede its ministries by turning the people against it.

As the mission was currently constituted, some claimed it was “headless” (*acephala*), a “body without a head.” This arrangement, he contended, was inconvenient and unusual for the Society. Young denied the premise that the mission lacked a head: it was subject to a superior general who nominated the superior with letters patent similar to those naming provincials. On the mission, there were local superiors whose authority and method of government were similar to those of rectors. The mission has thus been governed for forty years without any problem. In Ireland, Jesuits taught, preached, gave the Spiritual Exercises to clergy and laity, and supervised congregations and sodalities that furthered the piety and devotion of many. Other regions, Young ruefully pointed out, with fewer Jesuits and fewer institutions had been constituted as provinces, but not Ireland. Young also wondered whether a foreign provincial would be able to exercise his authority in Ireland. According to the Society's regulations, provincials must visit each residence and mission annually. The visitation of Ireland would be difficult and dangerous. Would the provincial be able to visit all houses in England and on the continent as well as Ireland and possibly Scotland? (Young does not explain why Scotland was introduced into the argument.) And at what cost? Father Carafa had sent a Jesuit visitor to resolve tensions between the mission and the nuncio. He had traveled to Ireland from Bordeaux, not a considerable journey but it had cost the mission 480 *scudi*. The mission could not bear the expenses of an annual visit.

68 Rectors, provincials, and prefects (superiors) of professed houses were *ex officio* members of provincial congregations. Other Jesuits with the fourth vow completed the total on the basis of seniority of profession (either forty or fifty depending on the reason for the provincial congregation).

Finally, some complained that the mission did not submit to Rome annual catalogues, *informationes* (evaluations) for promotion or for governance as demanded by the Society's regulations. Consequently, the general knew next to nothing about the mission.⁶⁹ This argument is interesting: a consistent failure to provide the desired paperwork for good governance, an omission that may have had many possible explanations.⁷⁰ Equally curious was the assumption that amalgamation with a province would correct the omission. Young admitted that the wars and confusion in Ireland explained but did not excuse this oversight. But was association with England the only way to correct it? Would not exhortations, reprimands, and, perhaps, penances be more effective? Other remedies should be tried before the mission lost its independence. Irish and English Jesuits lived well together; the Irish often enjoyed the charity and kindness of the English. But, Young feared, incorporation would arouse suspicions, cause alienation and division, and result in bitterness and hostility.⁷¹

Was Young's protest effective? The congregation did not proceed with any discussion nor did the superior general pursue the matter with the English provincial. Nonetheless, the Irish superior Richard Shelton (1611–71) remained apprehensive that the mission would lose its independence for unwanted incorporation into the French or English province. The general assured him that neither province had even hinted at a desire to add the mission. However, he continued, the mission's consistent failure to provide the required and desired catalogues, annual letters, and official correspondence increased the likelihood of the mission's amalgamation with some province for better administration and governance.⁷² But nothing was done. Did someone brief the general on Young's arguments? Or was it French or English disinterest?

The issue did not go away. Ten years later the Irish mission was again under review. In January 1673, Oliver Plunkett (1625–81), archbishop of Armagh, informed Superior General Gian Paolo Oliva (1600–81; in office, 1661–81), of the calamitous state of the Irish Jesuit mission. The archbishop himself had already initiated a conversation with the superior Stephen Rice (1625–99)

69 Vitelleschi excused Ireland of the obligation to write annual letters. See O'Donoghue, "Jesuit Mission in Ireland 1598–1651," 164.

70 See Markus Friedrich, "Governance in the Society of Jesus 1540–1773: Its Methods, Critics, and Legacy Today," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* 41, no. 1 (2009): 1–42. This article almost serves as an English summary of *Der lange Arm Roms?: Globale Verwaltung und Kommunikation im Jesuitenorden 1540–1773* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2011).

71 A companion document, "De Hiberniae et Scotiae missionibus gubernandis" (IJA, MSS A, 133) was most likely prepared at this time.

72 Goswin Nickel to Nathaniel Hart (*vere* Shelton), Rome, June 3, 1662, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 114^{r-v}.

and others on what was needed for the mission's recovery. At the moment he believed the mission's survival required, on the one hand, the acceptance of and training of novices in Ireland, and on the other—and this seems to be the crux—the punishment of disobedient and wayward professed Jesuits.⁷³ The archbishop could not be referring to the apostasy of Andrew Sall (1624–82), which occurred a year later. Perhaps further research will unearth the details between these tantalizing hints.⁷⁴ The letter, not surprisingly, revived proposals regarding the mission's consolidation with an unnamed neighboring province.⁷⁵ Unfortunately, the Irish arguments presented at this time against consolidation have apparently not been preserved—or at least have not been identified. Nonetheless, Father Oliva dismissed their arguments against union with the English province as insignificant. In a second letter written on the same day, the general cautioned Rice about specific practices that must be corrected and eliminated for the benefit of the mission. He explicitly asked that “a national spirit” (*spiritus nationalis*) be rooted out. Had the general concluded that this national spirit was the principal motive against consolidation?⁷⁶ A few months later, he explained the meaning of “national spirit” in a letter to the Jesuit William Long (1617–85), the mission's procurator, in Dublin. Rice must have circulated, at least among his officials in Dublin, Oliva's admonition against national sentiment. Long twice wrote the general in July. Neither is extant. In one, he questioned the meaning of national sentiment. Somewhat surprised by Long's claim that he had never previously heard the phrase “national affection” (*affectus nationalis*), Oliva moved the discussion from language to reality: he wanted the reality signified by the word banished. National sentiment was “a sentiment for the province where one was born, where one dwells and works.” Note: the general said nothing about moderate sentiment or excessive sentiment. Such a sentiment, presumably even a modicum, was “contrary to the Society's norms and regulations.”⁷⁷

Concern over “national spirit” might have influenced Oliva's decision to send another visitor to Ireland. He selected the Welsh Jesuit William Morgan

73 Plunkett to Oliva, n.p., January 30, 1673, IJA, *MS B*, 33.

74 One wonders whether some of the customs to be rooted out and destroyed were traditional Irish ones no longer acceptable in a society becoming more and more English. The early seventeenth-century Ulster poet Fear Flatha Ó Gnín bhemoaned Ireland becoming “a new England in all but name.” See Jane Ohlmeyer, *Making Ireland English: The Irish Aristocracy in the Late Seventeenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 475.

75 Oliva to John Ussher (1613–98), Rome, October 30, 1673, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 146A^v.

76 Oliva to Stephen Rice, Rome, January 26, 1674, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 148^r; same to same, Rome, January 26, 1674, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 148^{r-v}.

77 Oliva to William Long, Rome, September 8, 1674, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 152^{r-v}.

(1623–89) on December 15, 1674 because of his “virtue, prudence, and dexterity.” Morgan was especially encouraged to examine the style of life of Irish Jesuits, and their proposals to set up a residence in France. Nothing was explicitly said about a union with the English province.⁷⁸ Why Morgan? Born in Flintshire (Wales) and educated at Westminster Grammar School and Trinity College, Cambridge, Morgan fought for the royalists and was taken prisoner after the battle of Naseby in June 1645. Banished by the end of the year, he entered into the service of Spain and became a Catholic. He was accepted into the English College, Rome, on October 16, 1648 and on September 30, 1651 he entered the Society at Sant’Andrea al Quirinale. Oliva was his rector. Morgan remained in Rome at the English and Greek colleges after his ordination c.1657 until c.1661. At the Liège scholasticate, Morgan taught philosophy, Hebrew, etc. through the 1660s. In 1670, he was sent to the Residence of St. Winefride in north Wales and was named superior in 1672. Subsequent to his visitation, he was *socius* to the provincial, rector of the English College, Rome, and provincial. He died on September 28, 1689, five weeks after his appointment as provincial. Presumably Morgan and Oliva remained in contact as long as the former was in Rome.⁷⁹

Various letters from the general mentioned internal disputes and discord, all of which would be resolved by the visitor. But to Oliva’s surprise and annoyance, Morgan suddenly and inexplicably left Ireland and returned to Wales apparently without completing his assignment.⁸⁰ His long-delayed report finally reached the general by June 22, 1675.⁸¹ Oliva understood, apparently reluctantly, the reasons advanced by Morgan for his departure, but was not satisfied with the final report.⁸² Morgan did recommend James Ford (1603–76) as the mission’s superior. He was appointed in August 1675 but died in January 1676.

78 Oliva to William Morgan, Rome, December 15, 1674, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/11, fols. 358^v–59^r.

79 Henry Foley, S.J., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 7 vols. in 8 parts (Roehampton/London: Manresa/Burns and Oates, 1877–84), 7/1:523–24; Geoffrey Holt, S.J., *The English Jesuits 1650–1829: A Biographical Dictionary* (London: Catholic Record Society, 1984), 170.

80 Oliva to Morgan, Rome, May 18, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/11, fol. 360^v.

81 Oliva to Hugh Thaly (1639–1711), Rome, January 19, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 157^r; same to Stephen Rice, Rome, January 19, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 157^r; same to John Ussher, Rome, January 26, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 157^v; same to Rice, Rome, April 1, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 158^r; same to Ignatius Browne (1630–80), Rome, April 13, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 158^{r-v}; same to Rice, Rome, April 27, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 158^v; same to Thomas Leary (1624–91), Rome, April 27, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 158^v; same to Rice, Rome, May 18, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fols. 158^v–159^r.

82 Oliva to Morgan, Rome, July 20, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/11, fol. 361^v; same to same, Rome, August 5, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/11, fol. 362^{r-v}.

William O'Rian (1628–1700) succeeded him. Oliva, now addressing Morgan as “clarissimus vir” (most illustrious man) kept him informed of subsequent developments in Ireland.⁸³ Morgan said nothing about amalgamation, but Oliva himself had not dismissed the possibility, despite the Irish superior's anxiety that assimilation went against the common good: he had simply deferred a decision.⁸⁴ Oliva, dissatisfied by the incompleteness of Morgan's report, pondered sending another visitor.⁸⁵ But he did not. Tirso González (1634–1705; in office, 1687–1705), taking advantage of the ascent of the Catholic James II (1633–1701; r.1685–88/1701), planned to send a visitor but the curtain dropped on the Catholic interlude before he could act.⁸⁶

Inexplicably, the discussion ceased. No more was heard about a possible amalgamation. Perhaps the overthrow of James II in 1688, his defeat at the battle of the Boyne in 1690, the reign of William of Orange (1650–1702; r.1689–1702) and Mary II (1662–94; r.1689–94), and the ascendancy of staunch Protestants with revived hostility towards Catholics, so disrupted and destroyed the Irish mission and the English province that the question was shelved. Perhaps as a sign that the issue was not completely dead c.1700 a plan for the unification of the English, Scots, and Irish colleges in Rome under one Jesuit rector was nearly implemented. The problem, according to the historian Mark Dilworth, O.S.B. (1924–2004), concerned the quality of the foreign Jesuit rectors of the Scots and Irish colleges: they tended, according to the seminarians, to be tyrannical. The rectors were changed but the problem remained. Apparently, the superior general González proposed the amalgamation. The merger may have been more economic, and the administration, easier, but the proposal did not sit well with the constituents. *Circa* 1704, a group of Irish laymen appealed to Pope Clement XI (1649–1721; r.1700–21) against any such union; James Gordon (1665–1746), later a bishop in Scotland, petitioned cardinals to impede the merger; the Scottish Jesuit James Forbes (1626–post 1706) blamed unnamed Italian Jesuit intrigue for the chaos in the college. The proposal remained dormant for a few years. In 1714, James Francis Edward Stuart (James III [1688–1766]), the Old

83 Oliva to Morgan, Rome, March 7, 1676, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fols. 365^v–366^r; same to same, Rome, March 14, 1676, ARSI, *Angl.* 2/II, fol. 366^r.

84 Oliva to Stephen Rice, Rome, June 22, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 159^r.

85 Father General to Ignatius Gough (1624–93), Rome, July 6, 1675, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 159^v.

86 González to Nicholas Nugent (1629–post 1688), Rome, March 13, 1688, ARSI, *Angl.* 4a, fol. 209^r.

Pretender, asked Cardinal Giuseppe Renato Imperiali (1651–1737) to intercede against the proposal. The plans were dropped. No more was heard.⁸⁷

Approximately twenty Jesuits were working in Ireland when the Society of Jesus was suppressed in 1773. Each submitted to the local bishop. The mission's last superior John Ward (1704–75) managed finances and arranged the semi-annual meetings of the former Jesuits. By the late 1790s, the five former Jesuits wanted to use their fund to endow a college for the education of priests, and approached the hierarchy to receive its approval. The bishops were more eager to obtain the fund for their own use than to devote it to education. Richard Callaghan (1728–1807), Fullam's successor as procurator, protected the fund from the bishops. In 1804, Callaghan pronounced his vows in the restored English province. He judged the college at Stonyhurst an appropriate alternative for the education of future priests, and entrusted the funds to the English provincial Marmaduke Stone (1748–1834) until the revival of the Irish mission. Peter Kenney (1779–1841) was appointed superior of the Irish mission by Superior General Tadeusz Brzozowski (1749–1820; in office 1805–20) on September 30, 1812. Because the mission remained dependent on the English province, Kenney complained, he feared that the interests of the Irish would be secondary to those of the English. Brzozowski transferred the mission from the English to the Roman province in 1814.⁸⁸

7 Conclusion

As Irish Jesuits fought off attempts to subordinate their mission to another province, French Jesuits, specifically François de la Chaize (1624–1709), confessor to King Louis XIV (1638–1715; r.1643–1715) questioned the extent and nature of Jesuit obedience. Torn between their vow of obedience to the general and their natural obedience to their monarch, French Jesuits wondered how to proceed when the king forbade any communication with the general. De la Chaize

87 Mark Dilworth, O.S.B., "Beginnings 1600–1707," in *The Scots College, Rome, 1600–2000*, ed. Raymond McCluskey (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2000), 19–42, here 35–37; McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory*, 144–45.

88 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.

argued, according to historian Jean-Pascal Gay, that “obedience due to the king trumped all other.”⁸⁹ The Frenchman wrote:

The obedience we owe the King is the most ancient and strongest of our obligations. It is the most ancient because it obliges us from the birth of the Monarchy. The vow our ancestors have made of it by oath constrains their posterity which contracts everyday new obligations by the oaths of allegiance that the Magistrates of the Kingdom pronounce and renew often in the name of the people.⁹⁰

Louis XIV’s push for a distinct French Society of Jesus with its own vicar general or a schismatic Society, eventually failed. Nearly a century later in the early 1760s, as French Jesuits explored ways to weather the tempest caused by the failure of the commercial activities of Antoine Lavalette (1708–67) and prevent their expulsion from the kingdom, they considered repudiation of the authority of a superior general in Rome, the acceptance of episcopal control, and the endorsement of the Gallican articles. Neither Pope Clement XIII (1693–1769; r.1758–69) nor Superior General Lorenzo Ricci (1703–75; in office, 1758–73) approved such drastic, constitutional changes. “I will not govern any Order,” Ricci contended, “except the one I have inherited from St. Ignatius and his successors.” The superior general discussed the affair with the pope. At the meeting one—and there is not agreement on who this was—asserted “aut sint ut sunt aut non sint” (they must exist either as they are or not exist). Adhering to the internationalism of the order, Ricci refused to capitulate to this manifestation of national sentiment. The Society was suppressed in France in 1764 and worldwide in 1773.⁹¹

Thomas Worcester, S.J., author of the entry “Nationalism, Nations, Nation-States” and general editor of *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, underlines membership in the universal Society of Jesus as opposed to local communities or provinces. But such an “international vision, in which the companions of Jesus are expected to put that companionship ahead of national

89 *Jesuit Civil Wars: Theology, Politics and Government under Tirso González (1687–1705)* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), 47.

90 As cited in Gay, *Jesuit Civil Wars*, 48.

91 See D. Gillian Thompson, “French Jesuits 1756–1814,” in *The Jesuit Suppression in Global Context*, ed. Jeffrey D. Burson and Jonathan Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 181–98 and Owen Chadwick, *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 355–59.

identities and allegiances” had not been without discord and conflict.⁹² How could a Jesuit be a member in good-standing of an international order and a loyal subject/citizen of his kingdom/nation? The conundrum became greater as national sentiment morphed into nationalism. The *Gott mit uns* may not be the *Deus of ad maiorem Dei gloriam*.

92 *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Jesuits*, ed. Thomas Worcester, S.J. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 548–49.