Peter Lake and Michael Questier

All Hail to the Archpriest: Confessional Conflict, Toleration, and the Politics of Publicity in Post-Reformation England. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. Pp. xx + 312. Hb, \$45.00.

Anyone tracking the publications of this dynamic duo—from “Puritans, Papists, and the ‘Public Sphere’ in Early Modern England: The Edmund Campion Affair in Context,” *Journal of Modern History* 72 (2000): 587–627, to their Doobie-esque “Taking it to the street?: The Archpriest Controversy and the Issue of the Succession,” in *Doubtful and Dangerous: The Question of Succession in Late Elizabethan England*, ed. Susan Doran and Paulina Kewes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), 82–83—will not be surprised that they have finally tackled one of the most convoluted and acerbic episodes in early modern English Catholicism. The so-called Archpriest Controversy in the hands of Lake and Questier ceases to be an arcane, intra-Catholic dispute of little significance for the wider political nation and its historians:

For all its personal and libelous aspects, [it] was actually about some of the most pressing and significant, both practical and theoretical, issues of the day. In theoretical terms, it was about the origins and nature of political authority, the right to resist, elective versus free hereditary monarchy; the relations between religion and politics, Church and State; and about tolerance and toleration. In practical terms, domestically, it was about the succession and the religious composition of the English post-Reformation polity. It was also about the nature and legitimacy of the politics of “popularity” and how best to manage the politics of *de facto*, if not (yet) *de jure*, religious pluralism (276).

The debate was not always refined, polished, or academic. In pamphlets and treatises, snide, sarcastic, *ad hominem* salacity seasoned syllogisms. Contrary to W. H. Auden, “Private faces in public places” are not always nicer and wiser. By laying bare before the English public, internal, domestic disagreements, both sides demanded recognition that theirs was the authentic voice of English Catholicism, the voice that offered better prospects for survival and success. After an opening that includes mini-biographies of the major players and a succinct timeline, Lake and Questier get down to business.

After William, Cardinal Allen’s death in October 1594, any organization within the English mission was provided by the Society of Jesus. Jesuits administered the English colleges in Rome, Valladolid, and Seville; Jesuits arranged

for the reception and distribution of incoming clergy; Jesuits managed the common purse. Secular clergy, totally dependent on the Society, feared that the mission into which they had invited the Jesuits, would be totally dominated by them. Attempts to provide some fundamental governance of seculars by seculars resulted in conflicts with the Jesuits. Seculars repudiated a voluntary religious daily order at Wisbech prison as covert Jesuit dominance of the mission. The curtailment, if not the elimination, of Jesuit dominance demanded a cohesive ecclesiastical order, preferably a hierarchy. Jesuits had also favored the establishment of an episcopacy but to control unruly secular priests and to curb anti-Jesuit sentiment. In March 1598, Pope Clement VIII through the agency of Enrico, Cardinal Caetani erected an idiosyncratic archpresbyterate instead of the desired episcopacy. Critics blamed the decision on the machinations of the wily English Jesuit Robert Parsons (Persons) despite his earlier arguments in favor of bishops. Lake and Questier seem to side with Parsons's foes and attribute the innovation to him. I am not as sure: his *post factum* justification should not be mistaken for *a priori* endorsement.

Incredulous that Rome would so flagrantly disregard their petitions, some secular clergy, the so-called Appellants, questioned whether the archpriest's appointment was a papal decision or one made by the pro-Jesuit Caetani. Until the conundrum's resolution, they withheld recognition and appealed to Rome. The first appeal resulted in papal ratification of the archpriest as the agents roamed the Roman corridors like the proverbial babes in the woods. The second appeal is the stuff of which Lake and Questier monographs are made. With passports from the Elizabethan government, encouragement from Richard Bancroft, bishop of London, and strong support from King Henry IV's France, the second appeal washed Catholic laundry in "in the most public of all contemporary media, that is to say, in print" (133). The second appeal succeeded in dividing the mission into two. The archpriest ruled one; the Jesuit superior the other no longer was the archpriest obliged to confer with the superior on all important matters. By aiding the Appellants was the government motivated by a sincere desire to accommodate loyal Catholics carefully distinguished from Jesuit traitors and their associates or simply undermine and disrupt the Catholic community?

Having laid down the narrative in the first section, Lake and Questier proceed to probe and tease the polemical writings, secret histories, myths, flash mobs, and vicious *ad hominem* accusations to reveal their wider significance. In their attack, the Appellants were aided by a popular image of the Society of Jesus generated by three decades of anti-Jesuit literature. The intrigues and plots of the Machiavellian Jesuits caused the bloody persecution as the government, understandably, attempted to unearth seditious traitors. Purging the Jesuits would restore the kingdom's health because only Catholics faithful

to Rome and loyal to the crown would remain. Repudiation of the Society demanded revisiting various issues including the forbidden topic of succession. Nothing was safe if the lords of disorder interested only in their aggrandizement retained influence. In this regard at least Jesuits and Puritans were two sides of the same coin. As the controversy played out in the public sphere, the Appellants pinned their hopes on the conviction that one spectator, the Scottish king James VI, would smile favorably upon the right sort of Catholic on his accession to the English throne. Despite official collaboration that left the Appellants susceptible to Jesuit denunciations as quisling collaborators, their gambit failed with both the old queen Elizabeth and the new king James.

Lake and Questier shout “all hail to the archpriest,” but the victor’s laurels are worn by Robert Parsons. Lake and Questier successfully validate their claim that the issues raised and discussed in this controversy transcend the confessional nature of the debate, and in so doing highlight yet again the historical importance of this Jesuit.

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

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00702012-03

Karl A.E. Enenkel and Jan de Jong, eds.

Artes apodemicae and Early Modern Travel Culture, 1550–1700. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
Pp. 339 + xix. Hb, \$149.00.

The dawn of the early modern period ushered in a world that became interconnected in new and fascinating ways. Travel—often the consequence of commercial exchange, war, slave trade, religious pilgrimage, among just a few—brought disparate cultures closer and compelled societies to grapple with difference and interrogate its implications for their own worldviews. Concomitant with this process of going out and seeing the world was the increased interest to reflect on the world. And the historiography thus far has tended to constellate mostly around travel accounts, that is, texts produced by travelers wherein they discussed what they saw and what they did.

However, as this excellent collection of essays demonstrates, travelers’ reflections were not the only early modern writings related to travel. Rather, the proliferation of texts known collectively as *artes apodemicae*—travel advice literature—illustrates that, while many traveled for the reasons mentioned above, other early modern individuals aimed to “discover how [travel] could be optimized as a means of generating knowledge” (1). In this sense, the editors