characterizations are perhaps determined by the available sources, or by the interests of the contributors to the volume, but they make sense in light of the problems that spurred visitations.

In addition to the introductory essay by the volume's editor, Thomas McCoog, S.J., the overview of the institutional history of the office by Robert Danieluk, S.J. is particularly illuminating. Case studies of Peru, France, Ireland, the English houses in Belgium, and Moravia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries examine particular crises that were mediated by visitors who at times acted on their own initiative rather than the orders of superiors general—a fact which reveals the perils of this form of delegation. The essay by Francisco Malta Romeiras on the visit to Portugal at the time of Pombal by Francisco Saldanha da Gama—not a Jesuit, but rather a papal emissary with a visitor's powers—illuminates how the position was appropriated to accelerate the political and ecclesiastical process that led to the suppression of the Society. The visitations examined in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to Maryland, the Zambezi missions, Lower Germany, Australia, and Great Britain further demonstrate the tensions between the local forces that shaped individual provinces and the broader vision of Roman superiors or the impressions of temporary inspectors. In sum, this volume greatly expands the field's knowledge of the role and history of Jesuit visitors, and will hopefully spur further analyses of these important historical figures.

Liam Matthew Brockey

Michigan State University

brockey@msu.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00702012-01

Vera Moynes, ed.

Irish Jesuit Annual Letters, 1604–1674. Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 2019. 2 vols. Pp. xxvii + 1113. Hb, €80.00.

Let the keening cease. For years, many have moaned the absence of serious studies of Irish Jesuits and the Society's activities in early modern Ireland. The occasional thesis never seems to be converted into a monograph. Over the past few years Vera Moynes has, on the one hand, highlighted the absence of such monographs and, on the other, provided a great impetus for the correction of that omission. Two years ago, she edited *The Jesuit Irish Mission: A Calendar of Correspondence 1566–1752* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2017).

Subsidia ad Historiam Societatis Iesu 16, reviewed in *JJS* 6, no. 2 (2019): 340–43 by John McCafferty). In that edition and in this collection, she builds on the strong foundations laid by John MacErlean, S.J.

The importance of correspondence in the early Society has long been acknowledged by the academy but scholars have not always been aware of the purpose of the letters and have thus misconstrued the contents. The letters were initially intended for “ours only,” that is for other Jesuits. They were a means whereby Jesuits dispersed throughout the world informed their brethren of the good works that they, with God’s grace, were accomplishing. Edification was the object. Once published, these letters of edification were distributed to potential benefactors and potential Jesuits. By the seventeenth century, the template for the annual letters dictated the numbers of baptized or reconciled persons; number of general confessions heard; extraordinary “confirmations” of the Catholic faith; reconciliations of long-standing feuds; anything that reflected well on the Society; number of vocations to religious life; assistance to the poor and imprisoned; amount of money received as alms; public good works recognized and acknowledged; and finally anything of historical interest.

If the Irish Jesuits did in fact compose a letter annually, many have been lost. MacErlean and Moynes identified letters (and quasi-letters) from 1604, 1605, 1606, 1608, 1609, 1610, 1611, 1612, 1613, 1615, 1616, 1617, 1618, 1619, 1620, 1621–22, 1641–1650, 1652–53, 1651–54, 1662, 1663–64, 1664, 1665, 1669–74. It is most interesting to note that more than half the extant letters come from the reign of King James I (1603–25) and that after a brief resuscitation with the restoration of the monarchy (1660), the letters peter out and die with nothing from the reign of James II (1685–88) and the eighteenth century.

Given the letter’s template one should not be surprised to find repeated accounts of peace-making, public confession, conversion of heretics, and exorcisms. In 1608, two gentlemen disputing ownership of fields, turned to an unnamed Jesuit for adjudication. At the end said Jesuit “made those gentlemen shake hands in public as a sign of reconciliation and goodwill, to the great joy of all” (106). Two years later, a “certain ecclesiastic,” presumably a Catholic priest and a source of considerable scandal, publicly confessed his sins (170). In the same year, a Protestant minister “with both the worst habits and perverted opinions” became very ill. A Jesuit traveled six miles to his bedside. Under his prayerful direction, the minister repudiated his former life and urged his congregation to follow his example in conversion (167). Another Jesuit exorcized a young girl whose “eyeballs rolled around, when she was seized by the appearance of a specter, and she spoke many words with little coherence

or consistency" (332). In no account, is a proper name provided. Fergus O'Donoghue, S.J., observed that only deceased Jesuits were mentioned by name (as cited on xxi). Many attended country missions with sermons "even up to five hours with such good will on the part of those in attendance" (279). Over three days at Cashel, the Jesuits celebrated the canonization of Saints Francis Xavier and Ignatius of Loyola on March 12, 1622 with a "large amount of music, both for voice and for concerts of instruments" (811). Between 1669 and 1774, the school in Cashel staged a play for Archbishop William Burgat: "It is almost incredible the volume of applause that this play received even from those opposed to the true faith" (969). Apparently, heresy does not blind one to artistic achievement. Marital problems were resolved; dispensations obtained; minor miracles reported; sodalities flourished; missions to Scotland explored; Oliver Cromwell condemned; and Jansenists foiled. An occasional odd detail emerges. Ulster in 1610 observed the Gregorian calendar but the areas around Meath and Dublin still followed the Julian calendar with consequent confusion over feasts (161); in 1616, ribald songs and alcohol disturbed the prayerful serenity of a wake (538). Perhaps future researchers will be able to identify the unnamed persons.

Sixteen translators worked on the twenty-five letters. The editor opted for literal translations, which occasionally make for awkward but accurate reading. With so many translators a certain amount of inconsistency should be expected but I noticed only two: Acquaviva (Italian) and Aquaviva (Latin); the Italian Giovanni Paolo Oliva and not the quasi-Spanish Juan Paolo Oliva.

Moynes also provides a useful glossary of Jesuit terms and expressions. However, two require clarifications. *Noster*, usually seen in the plural *nostri*, refers to any Jesuit and not "usually an ordained Jesuit" (xii). In Jesuit terminology, the opposite of "ours" is "externs." There are, it is true, three probations in the Society. The first is postulancy, a brief period of approximately two weeks, that precedes the novitiate or noviceship proper. Technically first probation, although it may take place in the novitiate building, is distinct from the noviceship as a period of formation. I also found one historical mistake. The English College, Rome, was founded in 1579 and not 1576 (269n224). The errors are few and small; the edition, comprehensive and significant.

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.

Loyola University Maryland

tmmccoog@gmail.com

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00702012-02