

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/4015>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

The Society of Jesus in England, 1623-1688:
An Institutional Study

by

Thomas M McCoog, S.J.

This dissertation is submitted to the
Department of History of the University
of Warwick in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy

May 1984

From the Society of Jesus' first appearance in England in 1580, various political treatises, literary works, and theological discourses have attributed legendary plots, exploits, and malice to its members. For nearly two hundred years, the Jesuits were consistently portrayed as seditious regicides who would sacrifice all to regain England for Rome. Although modern scholarship has revealed the true nature of the myth of the evil Jesuits, few historians have attempted to explicate the reality. There have been biographies of individual sixteenth century Jesuits and studies of the Society's conflicts with the English secular clergy and of their pretended plots against the government but there has been no investigation of the English Jesuits as members of an international religious order. The Society of Jesus had a "pathway to God" in its Institute (that is, its Constitutions, decrees, and rules) which became more complicated throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Could it be adapted to the special conditions of England? Were the practices of the Jesuits there harmonious with those prescribed in the Institute? Or was England so singular that dispensations and concessions left the Society there scarcely recognizable as such to other Jesuits? Centring on the period from 1623 to 1688, from the initial enthusiasm at the erection of the province to the debacle of James II's collapse and flight, this thesis will consider the English Jesuits in the context of the Society's Institute.

Not bound by any monastic vow of stability, the early Jesuits were dispersed throughout the world. The preservation and the confirmation of union among such members was a constant concern of St Ignatius Loyola and the early Society. Out of this concern evolved much of the Society's Institute and its ordinary manner of government, which are topics of the first chapter.

Although the mission was opened in 1580, England did not become a fully constituted province until 1623. During the intervening forty-three years, the mission survived on the institutional fringe of the Society. It was the Society's first independent, permanent mission and, as such, was an exception to the customary style of government. Condemned as a novelty, the mission withstood the threats and objections of other provinces. Once erected, the English province was remarkably resilient in its adjustments to the vicissitudes of the English political scene.

As the number of Jesuits increased, "colleges" and "residences" were established in England. The precise meaning of both terms has long eluded recusant historians and can only be understood fully if seen in the context of the Institute. Although most Jesuits lived with recusant families, there was a consistent effort to have a specific Jesuit house within each college and residence.

Restricted by the Society's teachings on poverty and threatened by the penal laws, the province had to be very careful about its financial arrangements. The Society's Institute placed serious restrictions on the provincial institutions. Working within those limitations, the province was able to protect most of its capital and much of its real estate against theft, confiscation, and apostasy through lay trustees and a complex system of interlocking trusts.

Contents

Introduction		1
Chapter I:	The Society of Jesus in the 16th and 17th Centuries	
	A. The Institute	18
	B. Organization and Government	22
	C. Letters and Catalogues	34
	D. Conclusions	47
Chapter II:	The Establishment and the Administration of the English Province	
	A. The Establishment of the English Province	
	1. The English Mission	49
	2. The English Vice-Province	94
	3. The English Province	102
	4. Conclusions	113
	B. The Administration of the English Province	115
	1. Richard Blount, 1623-1635	116
	2. Henry More, 1635-1639	123
	3. Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 1639-1646	126
	4. Henry Silesdon (vere Bedinfeld), 1646-1650	131
	5. Francis Forster, 1650-1653	135
	6. Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 1653-1656	137
	7. Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 1656-1660	138
	8. Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 1660-1663	143
	9. John Clarke, 1664-1667	144
	10. Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 1667-1671	144
	11. George Gray, 1671-1674	145
	12. Richard Strange, 1674-1678	145
	13. Thomas Harcott (vere Whitbread), 1678-1679	149
	14. John Warner, 1679-1683	150
	15. John Keynes, 1683-1689	153
	16. John Clare (vere Warner), 1689-1693	158
	17. William Montford (vere Mumford), 1694-1697	160
	18. Conclusions	163
Chapter III:	The Jesuit Colleges and Residences in England	
	A. Jesuit Communities	166
	B. Communities in England	183
	C. Organization	206
Chapter IV:	The Finances of the English Province:	
	1. Introduction	213
	A. Jesuit Teachings on Poverty	215
	B. The Penal Laws	229

Chapter V:	The Finances of the English Province:	
	2. 1580-1639	
A.	The English Mission and Vice-Province: 1580-1623	234
B.	The English Province: 1623-1639	260
	1. The House of Probation of St Ignatius	264
	2. The College of Blessed Aloysius	277
	3. The College of St Francis Xavier	281
	4. The Residence of St Anne/The College of the Immaculate Conception	290
	5. The Residence of Blessed Francis Borgia/ The College of the Holy Apostles	297
	6. The Residence of St Dominic	304
	7. The Residence of St Thomas of Canterbury	304
	8. The Residence of St John	305
	9. The Residence of St Michael	305
	10. The Residence of St Mary	306
	11. The Residence of Blessed Stanislas	306
	12. The Residence of St George	307
	13. Liège College	308
	14. The Novitiate at Watten	312
	15. The Tertianship at Ghent	314
	16. The English College at St Omers	315
	17. The English Province	316

Chapter VI:	The Finances of the English Province:	
	3. 1640-1700	
A.	The English Province: 1640-1678	322
	1. The House of Probation/The College of St Ignatius	325
	2. The College of Bless Aloysius	327
	3. The College of St Francis Xavier	333
	4. The College of the Immaculate Conception	337
	5. The College of the Holy Apostles	338
	6. The Residence/College of St Chad	353
	7. The Residence of St Dominic/The College of St Hugh	354
	8. The Residence/College of St Thomas of Canterbury	357
	9. The Residence of St John	362
	10. The Residence of St Michael	363
	11. The Residence of St Mary	363
	12. The Residence of Blessed Stanislas	363
	13. The Residence of St Goerge	363
	14. Liège College	374
	15. The Novitiate at Watten	378
	16. The Tertianship at Ghent	382
	17. The English College at St Omers	384
	18. The English Province	387
B.	The English Province: 1678-1700	394
	1. The College of St Ignatius	399
	2. The College of Blessed Aloysius	403
	3. The College of St Francis Xavier and the Residence of St Winefrid	409
	4. The College of the Immaculate Conception	415

5.	The College of the Holy Apostles	419
6.	The College of St Chad	421
7.	The College of St Hugh	423
8.	The College of St Thomas of Canterbury	423
9.	The Residence of St John	426
10.	The Residence of St Michael	427
11.	The Residence of St Mary	428
12.	The Residence of Blessed Stanislas	431
13.	The Residence of St George	432
14.	Liège College	434
15.	The Novitiate at Watten	435
16.	The Tertianship at Ghent	437
17.	The English College at St Omers	438
18.	The English Province	440
Conclusions		449
Appendices		
1.	The General Congregations and the Congregations of the Procurators in the 16th and 17th Centuries	463
2.	The Annual Letters of the English Province	464
3.	The Catalogues of the English Province	468
4.	Superiors of the English Mission	472
5.	Provincials of the English Province in the 17th Century	473
6.	Number of Jesuits in the Province	474
7.	Financial Catalogues of the 17th Century	477
Abbreviations		495
Bibliography		496

INTRODUCTION

Indeed what signifies what weather we have in a country going to ruin like ours? Taxes rising and trade falling. Money flying out of the kingdom and Jesuits swarming into it. I know at this time no less than an hundred and twenty-seven Jesuits between Charing-cross and Temple-bar.¹

Oliver Goldsmith's The Good Natur'd Man was first produced in 1768. By that date, the popular image of the plotting Jesuit had become material for a comedy. Croaker's fears of "guilt and double guilt, a plot, a damn'd jesuiticall pestilential plot" were not only the cause of much of the play's humour but also an essential ingredient in the work's comic development. By 1768 an English audience could laugh at such an image of a Jesuit - and at those who still believed in it. By 1768 the Jesuits, one of the classic bête noir of English literature, had become the subject matter for comedies.

The emergence of the myth of the evil Jesuit as a topic for comedy was in sharp contrast to its earlier role in English literary and political history. Previously the Jesuit had been one to be feared, not to be derided. His plots were real; his malice, infamous; his powers and exploits, almost superhuman. Throughout the nearly two hundred years between the arrival of the first Jesuits and the production of The Good Natur'd Man, the perfidious activities and the praeternatural powers of the Society of Jesus were a favourite theme with English authors.

In January 1581, barely seven months after the arrival of Edmund Campion and Robert Parsons, the Jesuits made their first

1. Act I ll.33-7 in Poems and Plays of Oliver Goldsmith, edited by Tom Davis (London, 1975).

appearance in a royal proclamation. The debut was ominous and set a tone for all subsequent literature. The proclamation of 10 January 1581 stated that

her majesty, being further given to understand that there are divers of her subjects that have been trained up in the said colleges and seminaries beyond the seas, whereof some of them carry the name of Jesuits under the color of a holy name to deceive and abuse the simpler sort, and are lately repaired into this realm by special direction from the pope and his delegates, with intent not only to corrupt and pervert her good and loving subjects in matter of conscience and religion, but also to draw them from the loyalty and duty of obedience and to provoke them, so much as shall lie in them, to attempt somewhat to the disturbance of the present quiet that through the goodness of Almighty God and her majesty's provident² government this realm hath these many years enjoyed.²

In the same month, in a carefully prepared speech before the House of Commons, Sir Walter Mildmay warned of the dangers that could be expected from the Pope:

To confirm them [the Catholics] herein, and to increase their numbers, you see how the Pope hath and doth comfort their hollow hearts with absolutions, dispensations, reconciliations, and such other things of Rome. You see how lately he hath sent hither a sort of hypocrites, naming themselves Jesuits, a rabble of vagrant friars newly sprung up and coming through the world to trouble the Church of God; whose principal errand is, by creeping into the houses and familiarities of men of behaviour and reputation, not only to corrupt the realm with false doctrine, but also, under that pretence, to stir sedition.³

Both the Queen's proclamation and Mildmay's speech made the same accusation: the Jesuits had been sent into England by the Pope to "corrupt" the religion and to "disturb" the government. In 1585, these sentiments were formulated into law: "An Act against Jesuits, seminary priests and such other like disobedient persons" (27 Eliz. I,

2. Tudor Royal Proclamations, edited by P.L. Hughes and J.F. Larkin, II (New Haven, 1969) p. 483.

3. Quoted in J.E. Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1559-1581 (London, 1953) pp. 383-384.

c.2). Still some members of Parliament were not satisfied.

Thomas Digges condemned the act for its leniency. "These hellhounds," he wrote

cladding themselves with the glorious name of Jesus, and such wretched souls as they bewitch with their wicked doctrine, are indeed the only dangerous persons to her Majesty . . . They are fully persuaded her Majesty's life is the only stay why their Roman kingdom is not again established here. They also teach their disciples that it is not only lawful in this case to lay hands on God's anointed and to murder schismatic and excommunicate princes, but meritorious also: yea, they assure them Heaven for it . . .

Within six years of their arrival, the Jesuits had been depicted in laws and parliamentary discussions as devious, ingratiating hypocrites who condoned and blessed regicide in their attempt to restore the Roman Church. The discovery of the Gunpowder Plot in 1605 proved that the understanding of the Jesuits and their mission expressed in the Elizabethan debates, proclamations and laws, had been accurate. The myth of the evil Jesuit had now become history; the facts had been found to substantiate the interpretation. The country had narrowly escaped a national catastrophe, one engineered by the Society of Jesus. With a service to commemorate the frustration of the Plot and the popular bonfires, the image of the evil Jesuit passed into folk custom.⁵

The dissemination of the myth was not just left to the politicians

4. Quoted in J.E. Neale, Elizabeth and Her Parliaments 1584-1601 (London, 1957) p. 44.

5. For a more detailed discussion of late Elizabethan and early Jacobean anti-Catholicism and anti-Jesuitism, cf. Carol Z. Wiener, "The Beleaguered Isle. A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," Past and Present 51 (1971) 27-62 and Arnold Pritchard, Catholic Loyalty in Elizabethan England (London, 1979) pp. 175-191.

For the controversy over the oath of allegiance, cf. J.P. Sommerville, "Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance" (unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1981). Cf. also Caroline Hibbard, "Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions and Re-revisions," Journal of Modern History 52 (1980) 1-34 for an exposition of the current state of Stuart recusant studies.

and the theologians. Even the poet John Donne, the nephew of a Jesuit, contributed to it. Using the literary device of prophetic ecstasy, Donne had the vision of a hell in which Ignatius Loyola had an especially close relationship with Lucifer. Ignatius, as the mediator between Lucifer and those who sought his aid, held a powerful position. He was "a subtile fellow, and so indued with the Divell, that he was able to tempt, and not onely that, but (as they say) even to possesse the Divell." Because all Jesuits were equally qualified for Ignatius' position, he had to be wary of his own followers: "He was content they should be damned, but not that they should governe." Lucifer always listened to the advice of Ignatius and preferred him to all other contestants for the role, including Machiavelli. The Florentine had only written The Prince; the Basque had put it into practice! But, in the end, Ignatius' power had become so great that Lucifer even feared for his own throne.⁶

In 1621 Robert Burton, in his analysis of love melancholia, labelled the "company of hell-born Jesuits" hypocrites. They have feigned Christian love through their alms and sermons but their true colours have been revealed in the persecutions for which they have been responsible:

as so many firebrands set all the world by the ears (I say nothing of their contentious and railing books, whole ages spent in writing one against another, and that with such virulency and bitterness, Bioneis sermonibus et sale nigro), and by their bloody inquisitions, that in thirty

6. Ignatius His Conclave, edited by T.S. Healy (Oxford, 1969) p. 15. In the Introduction to the satirical polemic, A Game at Chess, Thomas Middleton placed similar thoughts in the mouth of Ignatius. Having been reminded by Error that the Jesuit's suggestion was against the rules of the game, Ignatius replied: "Push, I would rule myself not observe rule. . . . I would do anything to rule alone, 'Tis rare to have the world reigned in by one (lines 1171, 1173-1174).

years, Bale saith, consumed 39 princes, 148 earls, 235 barons, 14,755 commons worse than those ten persecutions, may justly doubt where is charity?

If the tree were judged by the fruit, the real nature of the Society of Jesus would be seen. In a later section, Burton claimed that the Jesuits were very adept at the exploitation of the religious melancholia of others, transforming them into suitable instruments for their plots and conspiracies.⁷

The court Catholicism, the increase in the number of prominent converts and the growing stress of the Laudian Church on ritualism and clericalism intensified popular terror towards the Jesuits during the reign of Charles I. The Grand Remonstrance of 1641 focused the King's attention on the dangers which the Jesuits had brought into the kingdom:

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

The Jesuits, and those in their train, opposed the laws of the land as obstacles in their attempt to change the religion of England. By fomenting discontent between the King and his people, between the King and his Parliament, the "Jesuited Papists" hoped to gain an influence

-
7. The Anatomy of Melancholy, Part 3, Section 1, Member 3 and Part 3, Section 4, Member 1, Subsection 2.
 8. S.R. Gardiner, editor, The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660, 3rd edition (Oxford, 1979) pp. 203-204.

over the King so as to achieve their religious goals.⁹

After the execution of Charles, the Jesuits returned to their more familiar role of regicides. According to William Prynne, the Jesuits, having first influenced the King, had then infiltrated the army and were responsible for his death. Had not the Society of Jesus always taught the morality of deposing and killing kings? Had not the Jesuits continually opposed Parliament and the laws of the land? The Jesuits had tried to destroy the first and to change the second through their control of the King. After this approach had failed, the Jesuits changed their tactics and worked, through the army, for the death of the King.¹⁰

Despite the generally more tolerant spirit of the age, the Restoration did not introduce an era free from anti-papal and anti-Jesuit sentiment. Samuel Butler, in Hudibras that delightful burlesque of puritanism, could still blame the Society of Jesus for the division and strife of the English Civil War. It was they who invented the feud and fomented it with their evil advice and, thus, risked "our liberties, our lives, / The Laws, religion and our wives."¹¹ With these

-
9. Ibid., pp. 206-208. Cf. also the recent study of the historical basis for many of these fears, Caroline M. Hibbard, Charles I and the Popish Plot (Chapel Hill, 1983).
10. Cf. John Miller, Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688 (Cambridge 1978) pp. 67-90 for a discussion of Prynne and the anti-Catholic tradition. Cf. also Robin Clifton, "The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution," Past and Present 52 (1971) 23-55; "Fear of Popery" in The Origins of the English Civil War, edited by Conrad Russell (London, 1978) pp. 144-167; and the unpublished D.Phil thesis, "The Fear of Catholics in England 1637 to 1645" (Oxford University, 1967) for an analysis of anti-Catholicism during the Civil War.
11. Hudibras, The First Part, Canto I, lines 727-728.

accusations, Butler joined hands with the very men that Hudibras spoofed.

The myth of the evil Jesuit was now firmly established in the literary and political tradition. More importantly, it was an influential factor in religious and political affairs. The Jesuits were masters of disguise, proficient at assassinations, and experts in intrigue. Contrary to Machiavelli, the Society not only theorized about regicide and the overthrow of governments but actually had attempted to put their theories into practice. Literary works and political pamphlets repeatedly reminded the people of the past Jesuit atrocities and aroused their fears through the prediction of future ones. In the last half of the seventeenth century, the Oates Plot and the reign of James II proved yet again the disloyalty and iniquity of the Society.

The English Jesuits were well aware of the emerging myth. A year after his arrival, Robert Parsons informed both Pope Gregory XIII and Father Agazzari, the rector of the English College in Rome, of the proliferation of stories about the Society. In August 1581, Parsons wrote to Agazzari that

There is tremendous talk here of Jesuits and more fables perhaps are told about them than were told of old about monsters. For as to the origin of these men, their way of life, their institute, their morals and teaching, their plans and actions, stories of all sorts are spread abroad, not only in private conversation but also in public sermons and printed books, and these contradict¹² each other and have a striking resemblance to dreams.

By 1607, Richard Holtby, the author of the Jesuit Annual Letter from the English mission for that year, believed that the Society had

12. Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, S.J., edited by L. Hicks, S.J. (London, 1942) CRS 39, p. 83. Also cf. pp. 66-67.

"passed through the dark mist of slander and atrocious charges" with its integrity and character intact.¹³ Holtby's auspicious judgement was ill-founded. According to the Annual Letter for the following year, 1608, the Society had gained many friends in England despite the assaults of its "jealous rivals." Instead of replying to the accusations of its enemies, the Society had turned the other cheek and has maintained its reputation for "not returning evil for evil to its gainsayers and slanderers, but, on the contrary, overcomes evil by good."¹⁴ The silent conquest of evil must have been a slow process because the slanders continued. In the Annual Letter of 1614, the author presented a detailed portrait of the mythic Jesuit:

It would be superfluous to set down here the abuse and slander by which the heretics seek to make the very name of Jesuit a bug-bear, yet we may be allowed to furnish a few specimens. We are called the Pope's janissaries; the favourite brood of Antichrist; the sworn slaves of the Pope; the reserve corps of the Catholic Church; the most dangerous enemies of the King and country; the most bigotted advocates for Popery; and the most earnest in maintaining and spreading it. They say that Hell has sent us forth fully equipped with learning and other gifts, both natural and acquired, in order to prop those of the Papacy now tottering to its fall, and to dim the shining of their new fangled 'fifth Gospel,' as well as to involve the New World in darkness.¹⁵

One can almost detect a note of pride in this unknown author's inventory of the traits and attributes of the mythic Jesuit.

-
13. ARSI, Anglia 31II, ff. 334-335 translated in Henry Foley, Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus (Roehampton and London, 1875-1883) 7 vols. in 8, VII/2, 984. Henceforth, this shall be cited as Foley, Records with the appropriate volume and page.
14. ARSI, Anglia 31I, ff. 345-346 translated in Foley, Records VII/2, 987.
15. ARSI, Anglia 31I, ff. 587-629 translated in Foley, Records VII/2, 1069.

The first serious refutation of the myth was Martin Grene's An Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine published in 1661. Two years earlier, Grene had been assigned the task of preparing the English response to the recently translated Provincial Letters.¹⁶ In the preface to An Account, Grene delineated the major characteristics of the mythic Jesuit:

It is a strange thing to see what Character is commonly given the Jesuits. Every Jesuit, say our Pamphlets and Pulpits too, hath a Pope in his belly, a Macchiavel in his head, Mercuries wings on his feet, and the Mysterious feather of Lucian's cocks tail in his hand
 . . . And if you ask, why Jesuits are never discovered,¹⁷
 . . . it is because the Jesuits have Proteus's bodies.

The presence of the pope in their belly filled the Jesuits with malice. Having mastered the principles of Machiavelli, the Jesuits were able to manipulate and manoeuvre with impunity. Mercury's wings enabled a Jesuit to move from place to place in a flash. Lucian's cockfeathers were the keys that opened all closets and secrets to the Society. Because of their Protean bodies, the Jesuits could change roles and disguises easily. Throughout this short vindication of the Society, Grene replied to a few of the more common accusations levelled against the Jesuits; their fabulous wealth, their disloyalty, their acceptance of regicide. How successful the vindication was, is hard to say. It did, however, have considerable influence on two

-
16. Anthony Hunter to the general, 24 September 1658 SC., Anglia V, 42. Les Provinciales: or The Mysterie of Jesuitisme appeared in two editions: the first was in 1657 and the second, in 1658. Grene's reply was both a translation and an adaptation of the response of the French Jesuits to the original French edition and was titled An Answer to the Provinciall Letters published by the Jansenists, under the name of Lewis Montalt against the Doctrine of the Jesuits and School-Divines (Paris, 1659) Wing N 1414.
17. (Martin Grene), An Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine (n.p. (London)) A3v-A4r, Wing G 1825. Cf. also An Answer to the Provinciall Letters, A3v.

people, the Duke and the Duchess of York:

When I presented to his Serene Highness, the Duke of York, a book for his casual reading, which many years ago had been written by a certain Father Grene, in English, and which treats admirably of our institute, life and doctrine, the prince and his wife were so taken with reading it, that they wished me, as I had only that copy, to have another published, asserting that he would take care that so excellent and important a book,¹⁸ especially for these times, should be reprinted.

Apparently the general public was not as impressed with Grene's defence and the book was not reprinted. Fuelled with the perjuries of Titus Oates and the suspicions regarding the Jesuits that surrounded James II, the myth of the evil Jesuit was more powerful throughout the 1680's than it had been at any other time since the Gunpowder Plot in 1605.

England, of course, is not unique with its literary and political image of the Jesuit. It would be easy to trace a similar presentation in the literature of many other European countries.¹⁹ Nonetheless, there have been few serious attempts to submit the myth, in both its genesis and its development, to rigorous historical scrutiny. One work that has examined the various legends is Bernhard Duhr's Jesuiten-Fabeln.²⁰ Duhr, however, did not tackle the far important issue: an explanation of the myth's origin and dissemination. Why did a new religious order so quickly assume legendary proportions and become the centre of a developed myth? A complete answer is beyond the scope of this chapter but a few observations may be in order.

18. James Forbes, superior of the Jesuits in Scotland, to the general, 10 April 1680 SC, MSS A.II.3(85) translated in Foley, Records, III, 494.

19. Cf. J.C.H. Aveling, The Jesuits (London, 1981) pp. 18-48 and A Lynn Martin, Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians (Geneva, 1973) passim.

20. (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1891).

The myth of the Jesuits predated the arrival of the Jesuits in England. The premature release of Campion's Brag prompted a number of polemical and theological responses. Two of the first volumes off the press were English translations of continental anti-Jesuit works: Christian Francken, A conference or Dialogue discovering the sect of Iesuites: most profitable for all Christendome rightly to knowe their religion (1580) and Pierre Boquin, A Defence of the Olde, and True Profession of Christianitie, against the new, and counterfaite secte of Iesuites, or fellowship of Iesus (1581).²¹ It can hardly be doubted that the government was eager to discredit the new arrivals. Here were members of a new religious order, one unfamiliar to the English, one already the centre of polemical literature, one with triumphs and successes on the continent, one whose arrival coincided with a papally sponsored enterprise in Ireland, one now in our midst unrecognized. The real fear of the English government should not be discounted. The government was not alone in its judgement that the English Jesuits were seditious Hispanophiles. The English secular clergy, in the internecine battle that began with the Wisbech Stirs, contributed to the anti-Jesuit literature. Like the government, the secular clergy had mixed motives. Peter Holmes has paralleled the anti-Jesuitism of the French secular clergy with that of the English. Some of it sprang from envy; some from the need for a scapegoat for the Roman Catholic political and diplomatic activity; and some from an attempt to transfer Protestant antagonism away from all Catholics to the Jesuits.²²

21. STC 11325 and 3371.

22. "The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics" (unpublished PhD thesis, Cambridge University, 1975) pp. 299-309.

The Jesuits themselves should not be exonerated from any responsibility for the myth. Their theological discussions, associations with the Spanish King and the Holy Roman Emperor, and with the French King and the Catholic League, their roles as confessors to the mighty and the influential provided the material that was shaped and exaggerated into the Jesuit myth. Besides their activities, there was also, it seems, a certain arrogance in some of the early members of the Society. These men appropriated the prophecies of Joachim of Fiore for the Society. The Jesuits were that new order of men, designated by the name of Jesus, perfectly able to imitate the life of the Son of Man. The Jesuits were the ordo monachorum, the intermediary between the world and the contemplative life, with the duty to evangelize the world.²³

Although an interesting feature on the literary, political and religious landscape, the myth of the evil Jesuit must not be confused with reality. The literature and the polemics of the period reveal a stereo-typed image of the Jesuit, an image created and nurtured by years of propaganda and fed occasionally on readily interpreted facts. The myth provided the age with a handy hermeneutic, a consistent, heuristic structure with convenient scapegoats for any misfortune or malady: the Civil War, the execution of the King, the Great Fire of London. The myth should be appreciated both for the literary creation that it is and for the powerful role that it played in the nation's politics. But what is the reality behind the myth? Who were the English Jesuits? How many were there? Where were they? How did they live? How were they organized? How were their activities

23. Cf. Marjorie Reeves, The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism (Oxford, 1969) pp. 274-290

financed? The myth provided its answer: they were too numerous to count; they lurked in shadows and hid behind many masks; they filled their coffers with money from Spain and Rome; they plotted and schemed to overthrow laws and governments in order to establish their own kingdom dependent on Rome. So answered the myth. But what do the records say?

In "The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism," John Bossy juxtaposed the difficulties faced by the secular priests because of the absence of an hierarchical structure, and those encountered by the Jesuits who were "relatively immune from this difficulty, since they had behind them the support of a religious order whose organization could without great change be adapted to the conditions of work in England."²⁴ Here Bossy has raised an important issue that too many historians ignore: the English Jesuits were members of an international order and bound by its constitutions, rules and decrees. How harmonious the life, practices and structures of the English Jesuits were with those presented in and mandated by their Institute is an area that has never been explored. Could the Institute of the Society be adapted to meet the exigencies of England, as Bossy stated, or was England so singular that the number of dispensations and special permissions that the Jesuits there required left them scarcely recognizable as members of the same Society? Studies of the English Jesuits are few. Individuals, usually the martyrs such as Edmund Campion, Robert Southwell, Henry Garnet et. al., have merited their own biographies. The possible involvement of Jesuits in the many plots against the lives of Queen Elizabeth and King James I have been

24. Past and Present 21 (1962) 52.

extensively researched and debated. Fewer still are the studies of the English Jesuits as members of the Society of Jesus. Approximately one hundred years ago, Brother Henry Foley gathered together much, still largely undigested, information into his Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. Although still invaluable for its wealth of detail, Foley's Records need a thorough revision in light of recent scholarship. Published at the turn of the century, Ethelred Taunton's Jesuits in England purports to be an investigation of the Society's role in the Roman Catholic Church in England.²⁵ It is, however, little more than an extensive polemic against the English Jesuits, especially insofar as they have followed the example set by Parsons. The book is really a continuation of the Jesuit/secular battles of the 16th and 17th centuries. Early in this century, the various provinces of the Society began to implement the 21st decree of the 24th General Congregation (1892) that they write their own histories.²⁶ John Hungerford Pollen prepared a detailed history of the English province and had nearly completed a volume that continued from where he had left off in The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to the end of her reign before he died in 1925.²⁷ Since then only Bernard Basset has attempted a provincial history.²⁸ As the title of the book suggests, and like Brother Foley, Basset was

25. (London, 1901)

26. Henceforth all references to decrees and General Congregations will be given as GC and d, for example GC XXIV, d 21. All these decrees may be found in Institutum Societatis Iesu (Florence, 1893) Vol. II.

27. (London, 1920). The manuscript for the uncompleted volume is in ASJ, 46/5A/1.

28. The English Jesuits (London, 1967).

more concerned with stories of individual Jesuits than with the history of the Society in England. As yet no one has studied the English province as a corporate institution.

In the introduction to The English Catholic Community 1570-1850, John Bossy congratulated John Aveling for his major role in the shift in Catholic historical studies from the national to the local: "In deciding to investigate the history of the Catholic community in Yorkshire from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the relief act of 1791 rather than, as he might presumably otherwise have done, the history of the English Benedictine congregation, Aveling gave a decisive shift to the subject."²⁹ After such praise, I hesitate to embark on a thesis that reshifts the focus to the national and, indeed, the international. Yet it is important to do so. This is not, however, a denigration of local history but a re-emphasis of the significance of the larger units. The two explain, illustrate and need each other. Thus in the case of Aveling's Yorkshire studies, a lack of familiarity with the national and international structures of the Society resulted in a misunderstanding of the Residence of St Michael, the Jesuit community in Yorkshire.³⁰

This thesis hopes to penetrate the myth and to examine the English Jesuits according to the international standards of the Society. In

29. (Oxford, 1976) p. 3.

30. Cf. Post Reformation Catholicism in East Yorkshire, 1558-1790 (York, 1960) p. 32; "The Catholic Recusants of the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1558-1790," Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society 10 (1963) 240; The Jesuits, pp. 160, 205.

the work I rely primarily on material in the Jesuit archives in Rome (ARSI), in London (ASJ), and at Stonyhurst College (SC). As a result of the number of raids and discoveries suffered by the English Jesuits and the suppression suffered by the whole Society, important Jesuit material has ended up in other libraries. In my attempt to locate as many pieces of the puzzle as I could, I have consulted the major manuscript collections in the Bodleian Library (Bodl), the British Library (BL), the State and the Treasury papers at the Public Record Office (PRO), the Petyt manuscripts at the Inner Temple Library (IT), the Westminster Archdiocesan Archives (AAW), and John Warner's Letter-Book in the Cambridge University Library (CUL). By no means has that exhausted the archival material. Centring on the period from 1623 to 1688, from the initial enthusiasm at the erection of the province to the destruction and devastation of the Glorious Revolution, I shall consider the English Jesuits in the context of the Institute of the Society. For that period, there is ample material in the archives. Nonetheless the province did not just appear ex nihilo in 1623. Nor were the effects of James' fall, of course, restricted to the year 1688. A thorough investigation of the history of the English province must include the slow and impeded growth from the small mission of 1580 to the large province of 1623. Similarly the repercussions of James' fall on the province must be followed beyond 1688. The thesis begins with a presentation of the Institute of the Society, the international organization and government of the Jesuits, and the purpose and nature of the catalogues and letters, two important sources for much of this thesis. The second chapter deals not only with the evolution of the English province but also with the subsequent administrative difficulties. The local Jesuit communities, the colleges and the residences, will be the subject of the third chapter. The fourth,

fifth, and sixth chapters are concerned with the finances of the province. Each chapter begins with an exposition of the Society's teaching and regulations and continues with a presentation of the English practices. Because of the inter-relatedness of many of the Society's decrees and laws, many questions and issues will re-appear throughout the work. There will, therefore, be many cross-references and frequent postponements of discussions.

Chapter I
THE SOCIETY OF JESUS IN THE 16th AND 17th CENTURIES

A. The Institute

The supreme authority in the Society of Jesus, in a sense its Rule, is the "Formula of the Institute". The result of the deliberations of Ignatius Loyola and his first followers in 1539, the Formula was presented to Pope Paul III for his approval which he gave, viva voce, on 3 September 1539. A year later, on 27 September 1540, the Formula, with a few alterations, was encased in Paul III's Regimini militantis Ecclesiae, the bull that gave formal approval to the Society. After some more revisions, the second and definite Formula was approved in Pope Julius III's Exposcit debitum, on 21 July 1550. The Formula established the basic structures of the Society, its organization, apostolates and manner of living, all of which were explicated and developed in subsequent writings, the sum total of which is called the Institute of the Society of Jesus.

The first version of the Formula promised that the new order would produce its own constitutions. That task was delegated to Ignatius Loyola and Jean Codure on 4 March 1541. Codure died the following August. Ignatius was so involved in the government of the rapidly increasing Society that he had little time to work on the project. Thus, it remained in abeyance until 1547 when Ignatius received the able assistance of Juan de Polanco, his secretary. He and Polanco completed a first draft which they presented to a

congregation of the professed fathers¹ in 1551. After a few modifications suggested by the congregation had been incorporated, the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus were promulgated for experiment in 1552. They were subsequently ratified at the First General Congregation in 1558.²

In Jesuit literature the term Constitutions is employed in two distinct ways. Usually it is used in a comprehensive sense to refer to four separate treatises: the General Examen, a summary of the life and structure of the Society intended for those seeking admission; the Declarations on the Examen, authoritative explanations of certain passages in the Examen; the Constitutions proper, the core of the statutes of the Society; and the Declarations on the Constitutions, again authoritative elucidations and clarifications of certain passages in the Constitutions. The term may also refer simply to the third treatise. Throughout this thesis, I shall usually use the term in its comprehensive sense. Whenever I use it in the more limited sense I shall underline the word.³

-
1. St Ignatius provided for two types of final membership in the Society. The priests who were conspicuous for virtue and learning pronounced solemn vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience plus a fourth vow of special obedience to the pope in matters of missions. They were the professed fathers. The remaining priests, the spiritual coadjutors, took three simple vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Cf. L. Lukács, "De graduum diversitate inter sacerdotes in Societate Iesu," Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu (henceforth cited AHSI) 37 (1968) 238-317; and John W. O'Malley, "The Fourth Vow in its Ignatian Context: A Historical Study," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 15 (1983) 1-59.
 2. GC I, dd 78, 79 (after the election).
 3. For a more thorough discussion, cf. George E. Ganss' Introduction to his edition and translation of The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus (St Louis, 1970) pp. 35-59.

Besides the Formula and the Constitutions, the Society's Institute included a number of other works: the Apostolic letters that confirmed or approved the Society, its organization and its works; a compendium of the Society's graces and privileges; the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola; the decrees of the general congregations; the formula of the congregations, that is, the regulations for the different types of Jesuit assemblies; the Ratio Studiorum, the principles of Jesuit education; a collection of letters from different Fathers General to the whole Society; the rules of the Society; and the ordinances and instructions of the Fathers General.⁴ These last three differ from each other in matter and scope.

Although Ignatius was eager that the Constitutions be complete, clear and brief, he also realized its limitations. The Constitutions discussed the more important issues, those that were "unchangeable and ought to be observed universally." Other ordinances more particular and specific, more adapted to "time, place, and persons in different houses, colleges, and employments of the Society" were required as supplements. Since Ignatius did not think that the Constitutions was the appropriate place for the formulation of these rules, he simply concluded his discussion with the exhortation that everyone obey these common rules "when he happened to be in a place where they were observed." Besides the common rules, Ignatius suggested that specific guidelines, a job description, be written for each office so that the incumbent knew exactly what was demanded of him and did not

4. For a more detailed exposition of the Institute, cf. Augustus Coemans, Breves Notitiae de instituto, historia, bibliographia Societatis (Rome, 1930) pp. 16-45.

interfere with the business of another.⁵ The composition and, perhaps, the subsequent abrogation of these rules rested with the General.⁶ Within a short time, three distinct types of regulations had developed: the regulae, the ordinationes, and the instructiones. The regulae defined the daily order and the style of life common to the whole Society and the precise responsibilities of each office and position within the Society. The rules were drawn up by the General usually in response to a directive from a general congregation. Some of the rules were ratified by subsequent congregations that later ordered that they be collected into one volume.⁷ Ordinationes were prescriptive regulations that dealt with specific issues. Written by the General on his own authority and not ratified by general congregations, the ordinances were morally, but not legally, binding.⁸ Instructiones were exhortations from the General to certain courses of action.⁹

Publication of the first edition of the entire Institute was begun in 1635 and completed in 16 octavo volumes. General Mutius Vitelleschi had asked the St Omers press to undertake the printing. St Omers was unable to do so itself but, instead, supervised its printing by Meursius

-
5. In Ganss' edition of the Constitutions, each paragraph is consecutively numbered. In this, and subsequent references, I shall use these numbers. Cons. 136, 395, 428, 654, 811.
 6. Cons. 736, 765.
 7. GC I, d 133 (after the election), GC II, dd 28, 57 (after the election).
 8. GC I, d 143 (after the election), GC IV, d 19; GC VII, dd 72, 76.
 9. GC VII, d 81.

of Antwerp.¹⁰ As the sheer volume of the Institute increased, the fathers at the Twelfth General Congregation (1682) authorized a shorter collection of the different laws scattered throughout the Institute. In 1689, the first edition of the Epitome Instituti Societatis Iesu appeared.¹¹

B. ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT

Pope Paul III formally approved the Society of Jesus on 27 September 1540 with the bull Regimini militantis Ecclesiae. This same bull, however, restricted the size of the Society to sixty professed men, a limitation that resulted from a compromise worked out with Cardinal Bartolomeo Guidiccioni. The Cardinal was not only opposed to the establishment of new religious orders but also would have preferred the reduction of all present ones to four: the Dominicans, the Franciscans, the Benedictines and the Cistercians. He would not give his approval to the Society. Moved, perhaps, by the fervent prayers of Ignatius and his followers and by the glowing recommendations submitted to the Pope by various influential people throughout Italy, Cardinal Guidiccioni finally agreed but with the stipulation that the size of the new order be restricted. Four years later, Paul III lifted the restriction with his bull Iniunctum nobis. The Society of Jesus was formally confirmed

-
10. Cf. Charles A. Newdigate, S.J., "The Printing Press of the English College at St Omers," Letters and Notices 38 (1923) 13-16; Michael J. Walsh, "The Publishing Policy of the English Jesuits at St Omer, 1608-1759," Studies in Church History 17 (Oxford, 1981) pp. 239-250.
11. GC XII, d 56. In the British Library there are two manuscript volumes entitled Regulae Societatis Iesu. They are not rules in the Society's sense but seem to be an early attempt at an Epitome: BL Harl. 4603 and Lansd. 384.

by the bull Exposcit debitum of Pope Julius III on 21 July 1550.¹²

Because of Cardinal Guidiccioni's condition, the initial growth of the Society was slow. With its removal, expansion was rapid. The Society numbered ten men in 1540; by Ignatius' death in 1556, there were over a thousand Jesuits throughout the world. By 1580, there were more than five thousand. The Society's organization and administration were forced to expand as the numbers increased. The Society's government, at times given only seminal treatment in the Constitutions, developed into an organization that had to deal effectively, understandingly and spiritually with men dispersed throughout the world. At the head of the Society was the Superior General elected for life by a general congregation.¹³ Once elected, the general had full authority in the Society for he was the "head from whom descends to all of them [the individual Jesuits] the impulse necessary for the end which the Society seeks. This it is from the general as the head flows all the authority of the provincials, and from the provincials that of the local superiors, and from that of these local superiors that of the individual members."¹⁴ The general appointed the provincials and the rectors, accepted the colleges offered by the Society's benefactors, made sure that the Institute was observed, and granted dispensations "in particular cases which require such dispensation, while he takes account of the persons, places, time and other circumstances." He should however use

12. Cf. William V. Bangert, A History of the Society of Jesus (St Louis, 1972) pp. 21-22 for more information on the problems with the establishment of the Society.

13. Cf. Part IX of the Constitutions for an explanation of the role of the general.

14. Cons. 666.

his power "with the discretion which the Eternal Light gives him, meanwhile keeping his attention fixed on the purpose of the Constitutions, which is the greater divine service and the good of those who live in this Institute."¹⁵ In order to facilitate communication between the general and the other members of the Society, Ignatius wished the general to live in Rome, the place best suited for maintaining close contact with the other Jesuits. Though the general was based in Rome, Ignatius wanted him, nevertheless, to visit his subjects throughout the world. Rarely did the general himself do so but he periodically delegated his authority and sent a vicar, a visitor, to individual Jesuit houses and provinces. His task was the visitation of the specified areas and the formulation of an accurate picture as possible of the spiritual and material state, its organization and administration, and the resolution of all disputes and the removal of abuses. All important matters that demanded the general's immediate attention were forwarded to him. Ordinarily he could accept novices, appoint rectors, and establish any practices that he thought would further the goals of the Society.¹⁶ Because the visitor's authority was delegated, it expired with the death of the general.¹⁷

Certain offices were established to assist the general in his work: a procurator for the Society's business affairs, a secretary, a personal admonitor, and four consultors. The secretary, the

15. Cons. 746. Cf. also Cons. 736-765 and John Carroll Futrell, Making an Apostolic Community of Love (St Louis, 1970) for a discussion of the role of superiors in the Society of Jesus.

16. Cons. 513, 668, 669, 765. Cf. also Josef Franz Schütte, Valignano's Mission Principles for Japan. Volume I, From His Appointment as Visitor until His First Departure from Japan (1573-1582) Part 1: The Problem (1573-1580) (St Louis, 1980) pp. 47-48.

17. GC IV, d 3.

admonitor, and the four consultors were elected by the general congregation; the procurator was appointed by the general.¹⁸ The consultors advised the general on the universal affairs of the Society. For more efficient government, Ignatius suggested that each consultor be assigned a specific area for which they would be responsible: "One, for example, could observe the affairs of the Indies, another those of Spain and Portugal, another those of Germany and France, another those of Italy and Sicily, and so on successively as the Society spreads into more regions."¹⁹ The First General Congregation (1558) implemented that suggestion.²⁰ The Jesuit world was divided along linguistic lines into four assistancies: Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and German. Each consultor assumed special responsibility for one of the areas and became known as an assistant. In 1608, a fifth assistancy, France, was added.²¹ This addition introduced some confusion into the internal government of the Society. The Constitutions had decreed that the general have four consultors and suggested one way that the work could be divided among them. When the First General Congregation created assistancies and placed the general's consultors over them, it established the precedent for future assistancies. Whenever a new assistancy was established, its assistant was elected by the general congregations and became the general's consultor. The number of consultors, therefore, increased beyond the constitutional four. The Thirtyfirst General Congregation (1965) finally resolved

18. Cons. 770, 806, 807 and the rules for admonitors, secretaries, and assistants in Formulae Congregationum (Rome, 1616) and Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu (Brussels, 1690) pp. 417-440.

19. Cons. 803. Cf. also Cons. 779, 780, 781, 805.

20. GC I, d 80. Cf. also dd 81-90.

21. GC VI, dd 1, 14.

the problem by distinguishing between the four consultors decreed by the Constitutions and the regional assistants. Henceforth only the four consultors would be elected at the general congregation; all other advisors, i.e. the regional assistants, would be appointed by the general.²²

Assistancies were composed of missions, vice-provinces and provinces. Neither missions nor vice-provinces were discussed in the Constitutions. Both were post-constitutional adaptations occasioned by the exigencies of rapid expansion, the peculiarities of the missionary lands, and the administrative difficulties of large provinces.

Even though a mission as an administrative unit was unknown, the theme of mission permeated the Constitutions. In two documents written in preparation for the Constitutions, the Constitutiones circa missiones (1544-5) and the Declarationes circa missiones (1544-5), a Jesuit's life was one of almost continual movement. Neither document mentioned a stable residence for members of the Society, although there had always been one in Rome. The men needed no fixed residence because they were missionaries who had been sent.²³ According to the vision of Ignatius and his first followers, the Society of Jesus had placed itself at the disposal of the Pope "to go anywhere His Holiness will order, whether among the faithful or the infidels, without pleading an excuse and without requesting any expenses for the journey, for the sake of

22. GC 31, d 44. The decrees for this congregation can be found in Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations of the Society of Jesus, edited by John W. Padberg (St Louis, 1977).

23. These two documents can be found in Constitutiones Societatis Iesu, vol. 1 (Rome 1934) 159-164. Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 63.

matters pertaining to the worship of God and the welfare of the Christian religion."²⁴ Soon the Society realized that the Pope could not be responsible for each assignment. So, a few years later (1542 or 1543), the Society asked the Pope to allow the general to send his men wherever he thought that it would serve the greater glory of God. It was understood that the men would nonetheless remain at the disposal of the Pope. Paul III granted the requested permission on 18 October 1549 in Licet debitum.²⁵ The general now had the authority to send any Jesuit to whatever place he thought beneficial, to "the faithful, even though it be in the Indies, or among the unbelievers, as in Greece or elsewhere."²⁶ At first, when the missions were primarily among Roman Catholic believers, they were pastoral tours during which Jesuits, either individually or in teams, travelled from town to town, from parish to parish, where they taught, preached, instructed and administered the sacraments. The purpose of the mission was, in co-operation with the parish priest, the re-vivification of the religious life of the parish. During the tour the Jesuits were forbidden to accept any stipends but they were permitted to receive alms for their expenses.²⁷ Once the Society became involved in the conversion of non-Christian countries, the concept of mission changed. No longer a circuit, a

24. Cons. 7.

25. Cf. Gervais Dumeige, "Obedience to the Pope and to the Superior of the Society," in The Formula of the Institute (Rome, 1982) 76-78.

26. Cons. 621. Cf. also Cons. 618, 750.

27. Cf. the rules for priests on the missions in Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582) and the instructions for missionaries in Instructiones ad Provinciales et Superiores Societatis (Antwerp, 1635).

mission began a geographic entity in which the Society took responsibility for the conversion and the religious instruction of the people. The commitment made by the Society was more permanent than that made by the itinerant missionaries and, as we shall see, had radical repercussions on Jesuit communal life. The manner in which the men were sent on the missions, was left to the discretion of the general. He could either send the men himself and thus keep the mission immediately under his jurisdiction or he could delegate the mission to one of the provinces whose provincial would be responsible for the mission.²⁸ The former were called independent, and the latter dependent, missions. But no matter which alternative had been chosen, the general had complete authority over the acceptance and the continuation of all missions.²⁹ Jesuit missions were governed by superiors appointed either by the general or the provincial of the mother province.

Like missions, vice-provinces were either independent or dependent. Ordinarily they were established in the missionary lands such as Japan, China and the Philippines, but occasionally they were semi-autonomous sections of larger provinces, a half-way house to complete independence. They were governed by vice-provincials appointed either by the general or by the provincial of the mother province in whose place they stood.³⁰

The province was the most important geographical and administrative unit. The general had the authority to erect new provinces wherever he thought it appropriate and necessary. The provincial was appointed by the general and had certain well-defined, constitutional rights and

28. Cons. 620, 666, 752.

29. Cons. 749-752.

30. For the powers of the vice-provincial, cf. GC XII, d 53.

powers, the most important was the ex officio representation at general congregation.³¹

Despite the multiplication of rules, ordinances and instructions nowhere did the Institute explicitly delineate the prerequisites for the orderly progression from one administrative unit to another. We know that only the general had the authority to accept and to continue a mission and to erect a province, but little else. It is, however, possible to deduce some of the factors that must have influenced the general's decisions regarding the continuation of missions and the creation of provinces from a consideration of the successful and unsuccessful missions in the 16th century. They were adequate finances or sources of income; sufficient manpower and a steady supply of priests either from local vocations or from other provinces; suitable facilities for the formation and education of younger Jesuits; and results sufficient to justify the endeavours.³² In brief, the general's decisions on the status and progress of a given area was based on that area's self-sufficiency and stability. Once a mission had demonstrated that it possessed both, the general would erect it a full province if such an establishment were in the best interests of the Society. Vice-provincial status was an intermediary stage of semi-autonomy.

31. Cons. 682. For the government of a province, cf. Cons. 622, 674, 719, 790, 792, 797, 820; GC I, d 108, GC II, d 36 (after the election), GC IV, d 6 and the rules for the provincials in Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582) and the pertinent section in the Epitome Instituti Societatis Iesu (Brussels, 1690).

32. For the history of the early missions, cf. Bangert, A History of the Society of Jesus, and Horatio de la Costa, The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1768 (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).

Throughout this chapter mention has been made of general congregations, one of the three different types of Jesuit assemblies. Since all three congregations play a vital role in the government of the Society and will, therefore, be mentioned throughout this thesis, a preliminary exposition is necessary.³³

General congregations were convened to elect a new general upon the death of the incumbent. Although the general was elected for life, he could be removed from office because of serious offences or gross negligence.³⁴ Another congregation would then be called to elect his successor. The general might also decide to summon a general congregation after the triennial congregation of procurators had advised him that there were matters of sufficient weight and importance to merit it.³⁵ The vicar general, the assistants, the provincials and two delegates from each province attended a congregation for the election of a general. These Jesuits had "active voice", that is, the right to vote in the general's election. The general's procurator and the secretary were admitted to the congregation after the election. Because of the great distance, the provinces outside of Europe were not obliged to send any representatives to the congregation.³⁶ If, by chance, their procurators were present in Rome at the time of a congregation, they were admitted after the election. If a general congregation had been convened for reasons other than the election of a general, the Jesuits who would, ordinarily, have been admitted after the election would be in attendance from the beginning.

33. The following analysis is based on the regulations in the Formulae Congregationum (Rome, 1616) and Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu (Brussels, 1690).

34. Cons. 774-777, 782-785.

35. Cons. 677-718.

36. Cons. 682.

Only provinces had the right to send delegates to a general congregation. The first vice-province, Sardinia, requested and received special permission from the Third General Congregation (1573) to send a representative chosen by the vice-provincial and his consultors. The delegate, however, did not have active voice. Representation at the congregations was extended to all vice-provinces in 1687.³⁷ Until then, dependent vice-provinces and missions could only participate in the general congregations through their mother provinces whose congregations they attended. Independent vice-provinces and missions were not represented.

Provinces convened their congregations to elect the two delegates to the general congregation or to elect the procurator to the congregation of procurators. After the election, the assembled fathers formulated postulata, their concerns or questions that were taken to Rome and submitted to the congregations. The topics of the postulata ranged from merely provincial concerns to universal constitutional issues. The provincial congregations, however, were forbidden to discuss the "essentials" of the Institute. The precise definition of the "essentials" was not clear. If there were some doubt, the congregation could proceed with the discussion and present it as one of the postulata. Provincial congregations could be summoned for matters other than the election of the delegates. The general could instruct the provincials to convene them to discuss pressing issues.

The composition of the provincial congregation varied according to its purpose. Forty fathers attended a congregation for the election

37. GC III, d 48; GC XIII, d 6.

of a procurator; the provincial, the prefects of the professed houses, the rectors of the colleges and as many of the professed fathers, in order of seniority, to complete the total.³⁸ Fifty fathers attended the congregations to elect the representatives to the general congregation. More of the professed fathers were invited to raise the total. After the election of either the delegates or the procurator, the remaining professed fathers in the province could be admitted for the discussion of the postulata. In all ballots every Jesuit had one vote. The elections of the delegates and the procurator were exceptions to this regulation. In these elections the provincial had two votes.³⁹

Because of the difficulties with travel, the non-European provinces held congregations less frequently. Unlike their European brethren, the procurators from the Asian and the American provinces were required to visit Rome only every four or six years.⁴⁰ Non-professed Jesuits were allowed to attend the congregations of these provinces, a concession probably dictated by the fact that few of the non-European provinces had enough professed fathers to comprise the total of forty or fifty. If, for various reasons, any province was unable to convene a congregation, the provincial, in conjunction with his consultors, could select the procurator. However before the provincial could appoint the two delegates to attend a general congregation, he had to obtain the explicit permission of the general or the vicar-general.

38. This data was used by John Warner in his refutation of Titus Oates in Concerning the Congregation of the Jesuits held at London, April 24th 1678, which Mr. Oates calls a Consult (n.p.d.) Wing C 5695c. This pamphlet was printed in Foley Records, V, 63-64. On p.62, footnote 68, Brother Foley stated that the pamphlet was Harleian MSS 860 $\frac{1}{2}$, 12. This is an error. Warner's own copy of the pamphlet is in the British Library with the catalogue number 860.i.12(2).

39. Cons. 692.

40. Cf. de la Costa, The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1768, p. 253.

The Constitutions required each European province to send a procurator to Rome every three years to inform the General of the state of the province.⁴¹ The Constitutions, however, did not demand that all the provincial procurators come to Rome at the same time. That stipulation was added by the Second General Congregation (1565). The newly elected General Francis Borgia wished general convocations to convene on a regular basis. At first the congregation agreed with him but strong interventions later forced a compromise. It was decided that the provincial procurators would come to Rome at the same time. There they would meet the general and his consultors to discuss common issues and the possibility of a general congregation in the immediate future. Although the independent vice-provinces and missions sent procurators to Rome triennially, they did not attend the congregation. In the decision regarding the general congregation, the procurators and the assistants had a vote each and the general had two votes.⁴² Later a specific date was set for the congregation of the procurators: the fifteenth day of November in the third year after the dissolution of the last general congregation. The congregation of the procurators discussed any problems that the Society faced and that could be solved through industry and hard work, the implementation of the Institute, the means for achieving greater spiritual union, the nature of religious discipline, and the desirability of a general congregation.

Provincial congregations and the congregations of the procurators,

41. Cons. 679.

42. GC II, d 19 (after the election). I am grateful to Father William Bangert, S.J. for the information on the origin of the congregations of the procurators.

therefore, met every three years. Originally there was no prescribed time for the summoning of a general congregation. In 1646, however, Pope Innocent X, in the bull Prospero felicique statui, ordered that general congregations be called every nine years. Both the Eleventh and the Twelfth General Congregations petitioned the pope to rescind the requirement but without success. Pope Benedict XIV finally abrogated the decree in 1746 with Devotam Maiori.⁴³ Nevertheless wars and general inconvenience prevented the Jesuits from meeting as often as they should have.⁴⁴

C. LETTERS AND CATALOGUES

In the eighth part of the Constitutions, a section that treated the relationship between the individual members of the Society and the general, Ignatius Loyola suggested different ways by which the individual Jesuits, spread throughout the world, could remain united with the general and with each other. This union was necessary for "the Society cannot be preserved, or governed, or, consequently, attain the end it seeks for the greater glory of God unless its members are united among themselves and with their head."⁴⁵ Two aids for such union were correspondence and catalogues.

Ignatius considered correspondence extremely important. Through the exchange of letters, the individual Jesuits learned about each other and the great work that was being done for the Lord throughout the world. Besides the personal correspondence of friends, each

43. Cf. John W. Padberg, S.J., "The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief History," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 6 (1974) 23, 26.

44. Cf. Appendix I for a table of the dates of the general congregations and the congregations of the procurators in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

45. Cons. 655

Jesuit had the right to write a soli letter to either the provincial or the general, a letter completely private and confidential to be read and answered by the recipient himself. Other correspondence was obligatory: all local superiors, rectors and masters of novices were required to communicate regularly with the general and the provincial, who, in turn, was obliged to write to the general. The Constitutions stipulated that the local superiors, rectors and novice masters write weekly to the provincial, who was required to write to the general with the same regularity, "if facilities for this exist." If the distances between them was so great that communication was difficult, a monthly letter was sufficient.⁴⁶

The demand for weekly letters placed quite an onus on the various superiors. To alleviate that burden, Diego Laynez, the second general of the Society, reduced the requirements. Provincials were required to write to the general only once a week; rectors, novice masters and local superiors, every third month. The latter were still required to write to their provincials every week.⁴⁷ The Second General Congregation (1565) confirmed Laynez's alterations.⁴⁸

Although the Constitutions and the subsequent congregations legislated the frequency of the letters, they said nothing about the contents. It was the Formula Scribendi, compiled by Eduard Mercurian and Claudio Acquaviva, two successive generals, that dictated the contents of these ex officio letters.⁴⁹ Rectors, novice masters and

46. Cons. 662, 673, 674.

47. Ladislaus Lukács, editor, Catalogi personarum et officiorum provinciae Austriae S.I. (Rome, 1978) p. 11. Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 117.

48. GC II, d 54 (after the election).

49. Cf. the Formula in Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582).

local superiors should inform the provincial and the general on the state of their community and the spiritual and apostolic lives of the men under them. The provincial would supplement the above letters to the general and add his own, more detailed analysis of the state of the province. The Formula Scribendi introduced a new obligation for all consultors. Provincial consultors were obliged to write to the general twice a year, in January and July. Domestic consultors were required to write to the provincial every January and July, and to the general every January. The nebulous norms established by the Formula Scribendi gradually became more specific. Among the papers confiscated in the Clerkenwell Discovery in 1628 was a list of ten topics to be treated in the semi-annual letters of the provincial consultors to the general. The consultors commented on the formation of the novices; the training of the scholastics; the spiritual life and the virtues of the men in the province; the domestic discipline and the observation of the vows and the rules of the Society; the academic progress of the Jesuits and the other students in the schools; the different apostolic ministries and their fruits; the government of the superiors of the province; financial assets and liabilities; the implementation of the Ordinationes; any scandal that should be remedied; and the relationship between the Jesuits and the princes and prelates of the land.⁵⁰ Few examples of such ex officio letters are, alas, extant. Nonetheless, a full appreciation of the general's responses, as preserved in his letter-book, demands a knowledge of their style and content.⁵¹

50. PRO, SP 16/99/1K. For an example of such a letter, cf. PRO, SP 16/99/2.

51. The general's letter-book can be found in ARSI, Anglia 1-3. In future references to it, it shall be abbreviated to Epp. Gen. I-III.

Besides the letters from rectors, provincials, novice masters, consultors and local superiors, there was much more comprehensive reporting from each house and province. Again the Constitutions required that one man from each house or college write a letter to the provincial every fourth month. Edification was the primary purpose of the letter. There were to be two versions, one in Latin and the other in the vernacular. The author was to send two copies of each to the provincial who would forward one of each to the general. Before the provincial had relayed the copies to the general, he should add any noteworthy or edifying story that may have been omitted. The general would then distribute copies of all the letters that he had received to the other provinces.⁵² The Second General Congregation (1565) reduced the frequency from every four months to every year.⁵³ A later congregation, the Fourth in 1581, decreed that the annual letters from all the provinces should be edited into one long letter for the whole Society and published.⁵⁴

According to the Formula Scribendi, all rectors and local superiors should select the most consoling and edifying events of the past year for their annual letter. These they would send to the provincial who would arrange the letters from all the communities under his jurisdiction according to a set formula. The province's annual letter would begin with statistics on the number of men in the province, the number of priests, scholastics, and brothers and their distribution among the different colleges and residences. Besides the number of admissions and dismissals for the year, the letter would also eulogize

52. Cons. 675.

53. GC II, d 37 (after the election).

54. GC IV, d 38 (after the election). Cf. also GC VII, d 19.

the members of the province who had died since the last annual letter. After the provincial news, each house, college and residence would be treated separately. Among the topics to be treated in each community's description were the number of people who had either been baptized or reconciled to the Church; the number of general confessions heard; any extraordinary 'confirmations' of the Catholic faith; any notable conversions; the resolution of any long-standing personal feud by a Jesuit; any events beneficial to the Society; the number of men and women whom the Society had directed to seminaries and other religious houses; the assistance that the Society had rendered to the poor and to Catholic prisoners; any good example that either the Society or its friends had given both in life and in death; the amount of money that the Society had collected in alms; the esteem with which people held the Jesuits; and, finally, anything of historical significance.⁵⁵

Besides these general topics, the English Jesuits had their own specific ones. Their annual letter should relate how many Catholics the fathers had dissuaded from attending Anglican services and from pronouncing the oath of allegiance, and how intense the persecution was.⁵⁶ Because of the risk that the letters might be intercepted by the government, the English Jesuits had to be especially careful about the use of names.

The composition of the annual letters was three-staged. Each house had its own historian who compiled a brief account of the community's year according to the above criteria. Someone on the provincial staff, usually the socius to the provincial, then edited

55. Cf. the Formula Scribendi, and SC, MSS A, V, 1(8).

56. PRO, SP 16/99/1L. In CSPD 1628-1629, this document is listed as missing. It is not. The list was also published in Foley, Records, I, 127-128.

these letters into one letter from the whole province. This letter was sent to Rome each January. There the letters from all the provinces were again edited but now into one annual letter for the whole Society. Many of these were published.⁵⁷ The Ignatian stress on correspondence has resulted in a large number of Jesuit letters, letters that vary considerably in content and importance, in the different archives.

The importance of the ex officio and the annual letters is shown by the repeated references to them in the general's letters. He carefully noted their submission, admonished the negligent, castigated the careless, and threatened the recidivist with penalties. Often he asked the provincial to find out why the required letters had not been sent to Rome. At other times, he complained that the letters were either to jejune or not sufficiently edifying, or so long and obscure as to be of little value. The letters were not a meaningless formality and the general insisted that all the instructions be upheld.⁵⁸

In the strongly centralized government of the Society, the general himself made the more important decisions that concerned the

57. In Appendix II, I have compiled a list of all the annual letters of the English houses and of the English province that I have found in my research. To this I have added a list of the published annual letters having specified the volumes that I have seen and any relevant material.

58. For examples, cf. Robert Parsons to Thomas Talbot, 16 May 1609, SC, Anglia III, 94; General to Michael Freeman, 31 May 1631, Epp. Gen. I, f.333v; same to Henry More, 14 August 1638, Ibid., f.477; same to same, 28 May 1639, Ibid., f.492; same to same, 6 August 1639, Ibid., f.495; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 20 April 1641, Ibid., f.518; same to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 4 April 1643, Epp. Gen. II, f.14; same to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 30 March 1658, Ibid., f.199v; same to same, 18 January 1659, Ibid., f.207.

welfare of the Society and its individual members. To assist him in this regard, he needed to know as much about his men and their communities as possible. Although the official letters contained the required information, it very quickly became obvious that the more important personal data had to be extracted from the letters and presented in a regular, clear and easily consultable manner. The chosen format was the catalogues.

In 1545 Diego Laynez compiled a catalogue of the Jesuit scholastics at Padua. In it Laynez noted each scholastic's origins, health, age, quality of judgement, education, virtues, and the amount of time remaining in his formation. Two years later, in 1547, Juan Polanco, at the request of Ignatius Loyola, asked all superiors to submit the personal data for each of his subjects according to Laynez's model catalogue. The superiors were also asked to append lists of the dead and the dismissed. Later the Constitutions demanded this practice. It prescribed that each house or college send to the provincial every four months lists of all members of the community, with a short account of the traits of each member, and of those who had either died or had been dismissed. The provincial was instructed to forward this information to the general to assist him in the better government of the Society.⁵⁹ To facilitate the general's administration, he was also to have access to the more important information about each province. Thus, along with the above lists, the provincial was also instructed to send a list of all houses and colleges of the province with their revenues.⁶⁰ As with the letters, this requirement was

59. Cons. 676.

60. Cons. 792.

later reduced to an annual obligation.⁶¹ The Second General Congregation (1565) left it to the general to decide what material should be collected in the catalogues and the recently elected Francis Borgia issued an instruction on the matter. He asked that each man's name and office, his entrance date into the Society, the date of his vows, and the positions for which he has shown some promise, be included in the annual catalogue. The catalogue should also include any information about the man's virtues and faults but, to ensure confidentiality, no names were to be given with the latter information only numbers. A cipher enabling the numbers to be turned into names was to be sent to Rome separately.⁶² Out of Borgia's distinction between the public and the confidential information evolved three types of catalogues that were prescribed for the whole Society in the Formula Scribendi in 1579.⁶³

The Catalogus Primus contained the name, the birthplace, the age, the state of health, the date of entrance into the Society, past and present ministries, education, grade in the Society, and the date of vows of every Jesuit. The Catalogus Secundus described the talents and the traits of every Jesuit, specifically his character, judgement, prudence, experience, intellect and temperament. In the light of these, the compiler would then pass judgement on the works for which this man was especially qualified. The Catalogus Secundus was still without names and was numerically co-ordinated with the Catalogus Primus. Both catalogues were compiled triennially by the local superiors and rectors and forwarded to the provincial. They were

61. GC II, d 48 (after the election).

62. Cf. Laszlo Lukács. "Le catalogue-modèle du Pere Lainez (1545)," AHSI 26 (1957) 57-66 and Catalogi personarum et officiorum Austriae S.I., pp. 14-21.

63. Cf. the Formula in Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582).

then taken to Rome by the province's procurator when he went to the congregation.

The Catalogus Tertius, the brevis catalogus, appeared annually. The local superiors and rectors annually submitted supplementary information to the Catalogi Primi et Secundi, along with the names and the ministries of their subjects, to the provincial. The socius added lists of the new novices, the newly ordained, the dead, the dismissed, the recently vowed, and the names of those who had either entered or left the province, and sent the completed catalogue to Rome each January along with the annual letter. After 1648, as a result of Pope Innocent X's restriction of the terms of all provincials, rectors and local superiors to three years, the catalogues included the dates of their appointments.⁶⁴

A fourth catalogue, the Catalogus Tertius Rerum, was introduced in 1589. Despite the constitutional requirement and a subsequent instruction from the general in 1579, many provincials neglected the lists of the province's houses and colleges with the details of their income. To remedy this General Acquaviva ordered that these lists be sent triennially to Rome along with the Catalogi Primi et Secundi.

A second copy was to be sent to the assistant. In many ways the information contained in the new catalogue duplicated that in the annual letter. It began with a short account of the number of men in the province, the number of admissions, dismissals and deaths since the last catalogue, the names of all residences, houses and colleges, and the number of people supported in each. The gross and net incomes, the ordinary expenses, the debts and credits of each community were also given. General Acquaviva supplied all provincials with a

64. Cf. letter of General Carrafa, 8 August 1648, SC, MSS A, V, 1(7)

catalogue of a few of the Roman houses to serve as a model.⁶⁵

Although these catalogues were the official statements on the personnel of the province and thus our best source of knowledge about the English Jesuits, they are not without inaccuracies.⁶⁶ Rarely do the triennial catalogues and the annual catalogue coincide. More often than not the triennials reflected simply the previous year's composition of a college or a residence. A careful perusal of the catalogues has revealed a number of other errors, more specifically, repetitions and omissions. Because of the relatively secret movements of the men, the difficulties with communication and the need for confidentiality, that should not be surprising. Although the annual catalogues should have been sent to Rome in January, there was no specified date by which the rectors and superiors had to submit their lists to the provincial. As long as all the lists had been received to meet the January deadline the provincial did not complain. But, different colleges and residences may often have sent in their lists at different times. That would explain the

65. "de catalogis" in Ordinationes Praepositorum Generalium
(Rome, 1617)

66. In Appendix III, I have provided a list of all extant catalogues of the seventeenth century. These catalogues, especially the Catalogi Secundi, have been virtually ignored hitherto by historians. Although Henry Foley had transcribed the English catalogues in the Jesuit archives in Rome, he did not transcribe the Catalogi Secundi. Indeed, he wrote on the first page of many of them: "Not to be copied." Since most subsequent research has been based on Foley's Records and the archives at Farm Street these catalogues had remained unknown until I obtained microfilm of all the seventeenth century catalogues in the Jesuit archives in Rome. These microfilms have been deposited in the English province archives at Farm Street, London.

duplications: during the intervening months, a few men could have moved from one community to another and thus been named twice in the catalogue. Examples of such duplication appear throughout the catalogues: Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb) was said to be at both St Omers and Liège in 1621/2; Francis Rogers was listed at both Holy Apostles and St Thomas in 1641; Richard Strange appeared at both St Ignatius and St Mary in 1653; in 1682, Basil Langworth was given as the rector of Holy Apostles and the minister/consultor at St Omers.

More frequent than the duplications were the omissions. Occasionally a Jesuit who had resided in a given community for a number of years vanished for a year or two, to re-appear at the same community in a later catalogue. Thomas Bradford was at Ghent in 1641 and 1643 but was omitted in 1642. William Pelham, although a member of the College of the Holy Apostles in 1653 and 1655, was forgotten in 1654. Albert Babthorpe re-appeared at the College of St Aloysius in 1683 after he had been omitted from the catalogue in 1682. Explanations for the omissions are not easy. Had the Jesuit been so out of touch with his superior that he had been forgotten? Had he been a chaplain in the household of one of the more wealthy Roman Catholics and been travelling extensively with him? Or was there simply clerical error? It is not possible to say.

Other Jesuits vanished from the catalogue as they moved from one community to another. John Cooper, who moved from St Dominic in 1641 and arrived in Maryland in 1643, was omitted in 1642. John Pansford was stationed at St. Aloysius in 1656, vanished in the following year and re-appeared at St Mary in 1658. John Richardson was at Watten in 1685 and at Liège in 1687; the catalogue of 1686 did not name him.

These Jesuits were between communities; no longer belonging to one but not yet belonging to the other, they were listed in neither.

The most significant omissions were the English Jesuits who resided outside the houses of the English province. In the English catalogues only the men who belonged to the houses in England, the English communities in Belgium, the Maryland mission, and the procuratorships in Paris, Rome, Antwerp, Brussels, and Madrid were named. Before 1681, the names and destinations of all the Jesuits who had moved from the province were given but these men were not mentioned again until they returned to the province. Thus the catalogues were silent about William Talbot from his departure for Paris in 1628 until he returned to St Ignatius in 1642; John Rishton (vere Farrington) who went to Portugal in 1644 and returned to the catalogues as a military chaplain in 1655. After 1681, in the supplementa to the Catalogus Tertius, lists of the names and locations of the English Jesuits who resided outside the province were appended.

A few of the catalogues omitted even entire groups. The Maryland mission was forgotten in 1647. No first year novices were mentioned in the catalogues of 1665, 1667 and 1690. The catalogues of 1630, 1632 and 1690 omitted the procurators. Indeed, the catalogues for 1669 and 1690 failed to mention the provincial staff!

With the notable exceptions of Father Jean Suffren, the confessor of Queen Marie de Medici, the mother of Queen Henrietta Maria, and his laybrother socius, Jean le Cocque, who were in England in 1638 and 1639, no foreign Jesuits were named in the English catalogues until 1672. After this date, they were omitted only in the catalogues of 1675, 1678 and 1679. Nonetheless it can be shown that there were a

few Jesuits at the court of Queen Catherine of Braganza before their first appearance in the catalogues. In May 1662, George Gray, the socius to the provincial, wrote to the general that the provincial had met the Portuguese fathers who had come in the retinue of Queen Catherine. In 1665 and 1666 the Board of Greencloth paid the Queen's confessor and his laybrother socius 12s a day in lieu of diet. Neither Gray's letter nor the warrants to the Board of Greencloth specified the Portuguese Jesuits in question but they were Antonio and Juan Fernandes. Their names appeared for the first time in official documents in 1671. The "Establishment of Her Majesty Queen Catherine, Consort of King Charles II" named the personnel of her court and its costs from the feast of St Michael Archangel in 1671 to the same feast the following year. At that time, there were three Jesuits in her court: Antonio Fernandes, the Queen's confessor; his socius, the laybrother Juan Fernandes; and the Irish royal preacher, Hugh Cullenan.⁶⁷ In the light of the presence of these three Jesuits in England before their names were recorded in the catalogues, it is possible that there were other foreign Jesuits, probably at one of the embassies in the years before 1672.

Annually the province's socius compiled a catalogue of the

67. SC, Anglia V, 61 translated in Foley, Records, IV, 278; PRO, SP 44/22/pp. 268-9; 44/23/p. 10. The "Establishment" was printed in Registers of the Catholic Chapels and of the Portuguese Embassy Chapel, 1662-1829, edited by J. Cyril Weale (London, 1941) CRS 38, pp. xxix-xxxii. Although it is not mentioned in the volume, the original document is in SC, MSS A, I, 29(4). A similar account for 1677-1678 can be found in BL, Add MSS 15897, ff. 33-36. A description of the Queen's confessor may be found in Bodl, Clarendon MS 78, ff. 194-5.

Jesuits of that province. Although the list was official, it should not be considered infallible. There were more Jesuits in the English province than were named in the catalogues. Nonetheless, however inaccurate the totals may be, the catalogues are the only documents that furnish such detailed information. Thus they must be the foundation of any analysis. But the weakness of that foundation must be acknowledged.

D. CONCLUSIONS

Towards the end of Lent in 1539, Ignatius Loyola and his early followers were faced with a major decision. These men had dedicated themselves to Christ and had placed themselves at this disposal of the Pope to serve wherever he thought best. Now the imminent departure of Paschase Brôet and Simão Rodrigues for Siena raised questions about the future of the brotherhood. Should they formalise their union so that no physical separation could ever divide their hearts? Or was such an arrangement undesirable? Should the absent brethren remain the object of concern and affection or should their separation remove them from the fraternity? The fathers deliberated the issues and decided that they ought to confirm and strengthen their bond of union. As a result the fathers decided to vow obedience to one of their number in order to maintain the union. Through obedience, distances could be overcome and absent members could remain united with their brothers in the pursuit of their apostolates.

68

68. Dominic Maruca, ed., "The Deliberations of our First Fathers," Woodstock Letters 95 (1966) 325-333. Cf. also Miguel A. Fiorito, S.J., "St Ignatius' Intuitions on Obedience and their Written Juridical Expression," Woodstock Letters, 95 (1966) 137-142.

From the beginning superiors were integral to the preservation of the Society's union. Their role was to renew and to strengthen this union through the ordering of the lives and the activities of their companions.⁶⁹ Congregations also were an instrument for union. The whole Society, as far as possible, was convoked to a general congregation. Ideally all professed members of the Society should exercise their right to participate but apostolic commitments and the Society's expansion made that impossible. Thus they settled the matter by election.⁷⁰ Letters, both annual and ex officio, developed as a means for the further preservation of the union; the rules, instructions and ordinances regulated the concrete expression of this union.

Concern for union remained a constant throughout the Society's history. The first fathers feared that their human frailty and their national and cultural diversity could destroy the bond that the Lord had created among them. Thus they began the quest, continued by their successors, for different ways to confirm and strengthen this bond.

69. For a full discussion of the superior's role, cf. John Carroll Futrell, Making an Apostolic Community of Love.

70. Cf. Jozef de Roeck, "Du sens de la Congrégation général dans la Compagnie de Jésus d'après les Constitutions," AHSI 35 (1966) 212-231.

Chapter II
THE ESTABLISHMENT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ENGLISH
PROVINCE

For administrative reasons the Society of Jesus was subdivided into assistancies, provinces, vice-provinces and missions. In 1580, there were four assistancies, twenty-one provinces, and one vice-province, along with a number of small missions sponsored either by the general or by a province. In that year, the English mission was added to their number.

A. The Establishment of the English Province
1. The English Mission

Part VII of the Constitutions, the first section written by Ignatius, stressed obedience, both to the pope and to the general, as a constitutive element in the life of the Society and in the exercise of its apostolates. Jesuits were men on a mission, sent either by the pope or the general. From its foundation, the Society had expressed its desire to go anywhere and to engage in any activity that the pope had ordered. His command was final and each Jesuit was forbidden to make any attempt to influence the pope. If the general had some doubts about either the extent or the reliability of the pope's information, he might volunteer data but the final decision must be left to the pope. If the pope selected a specific man for the mission, that Jesuit should respond freely and generously without any requests for provisions and support. At most, the prospective missionary could request clarifications on the goals of the mission and the manner of his support during it, viz. was he to earn his keep either "by living on alms and by begging for the love of God our Lord, or in some other manner"? If the pope had not designated a specific Jesuit, the general could select the missionary. No matter who was sent, it was imperative that he received complete

instructions that explained the mission, the pope's intentions, and the expected results. These instructions, either written or oral, could be supplemented by further instructions from the general. Finally, if the pope had not stipulated the length of the mission, the Constitutions stated that it should ordinarily last about three months but might be lengthened or shortened "in proportion to the greater or less spiritual fruit which is seen to be reaped there or is expected elsewhere, or in accordance with what seems most expedient for some universal good."

Ignatius Loyola had originally hoped that all missions would be received from the pope but he and his followers, as early as 1539, realized that the pope could not decide everything and that some initiative on the part of the Society was necessary. As has been seen¹ within a few years the Society had requested papal permission for the general to send men to work among the faithful. The bull Licet debitum, promulgated on 18 October 1549, permitted the general to send his subjects anywhere --- not just among the faithful --- and to recall them at his discretion. Well aware that many petitioners would now bombard the general with requests for the Society's assistance, Ignatius suggested different criteria that should be considered before the general accepted any mission. He urged the general to ponder the place of the mission, its goals, the missionaries, the conditions under which the men would work, the style of their religious and apostolic life, and the duration of the mission. Even though the general might approve a mission to any place, he should especially ponder whether he should send his subjects to non-Christian countries. As the general

1. Cf. supra, pp. 26-28.

surveyed the possibilities, he should also consider the "disposition of the people". By this Ignatius did not simply mean a general, favourable inclination towards the Society and its works but also the availability of "important and public persons" with whom the Jesuits could work. In fact, assistance to such people ought to be preferred "since it is a more universal good." Further, the Society too had obligations to aid the areas from which it had received some support. Whether the conditions of the country would permit a properly religious life must be included in the deliberations. So too should the fruits of their labours and the length of the mission. Finally, the Society should prefer those places "where the enemy of Christ our Lord has sown cockle," where the insidious tentacles of heresy have tried to strangle the Church. Special preference should be given to the more important countries. In brief, the general's major concern should be the greater service of God and the universal good of the Church.²

England was not a mission undertaken by the Society at the express command of the pope. The Society's involvement there was the result of a long, serious and careful deliberation by the general. As early as 1577, some Englishmen had hoped that their order would become involved in the re-conversion of their country. In that year alone, about twelve men had entered the Jesuits with the hope that they would eventually "visit the afflicted English vineyard" and labour there.³ This possibility was first discussed with Father General Everard

2. Cons. 603-617; 618-632. Cf. also Dumeige, "Obedience to the Pope and to the Superior of the Society."

3. J.H. Pollen, ed., "The Memoirs of Father Robert Parsons" in Miscellanea II (London, 1906) CRS 2, p. 78.

Mercurian in 1578.⁴ Fearing that the acceptance of the mission would only extend an already over-reached Society, Mercurian was very reluctant to embark on it. More men were needed for the order's existing commitments in India, Japan, the West Indies, Poland and Syria and there was none to spare for this new venture. His hesitancy was re-inforced by the recent troubles between the English and the Welsh students at the English Hospice in Rome. Any possibility of the Society undertaking a mission to England seemed to be dashed by yet another example of the troublesome nature of the English.⁵ Originally wary of the mission, Robert Parsons later became convinced of its importance and wrote to William Allen to seek his aid in winning the general to the cause.⁶ During his visit to Rome to settle the disturbances at the English Hospice, Allen raised the issue with Mercurian.

The work in England was necessary and important, Allen argued, and the seminary priests already engaged in it needed the comfort and the assistance of the Society. Moreover the lay Catholics eagerly desired Jesuit aid. Indeed, Allen contended, the Society had been especially raised up by God at this time to fight heresy. This could be done in England --- a country geographically nearer and spiritually needier than India. It was, Allen thought, better to preserve the unity of Christendom than to convert new areas. More Englishmen had joined the Society than any other order and their very presence was a sign from God

4. It is possible that Jesuit involvement had been discussed earlier. An undated paper of William Allen, probably from 1575/6, suggested certain points to be discussed with the general in hope of obtaining the Society's co-operation. This was printed in Patrick Ryan, S.J., ed., "Some Correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85" in Miscellanea VII (London, 1911) CRS 9, pp. 62-69.

5. Cf. Robert Parsons to William Good, 19 March (?) 1579 in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 5-28.

6. Robert Parsons to William Allen, 30 March 1579 in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, p. 4.

that he wished them to be in England. There, the Society that had trained the English priests in the seminaries could continue to teach them through their example. It would also be better for a new religious order to assist the secular clergy because they could not be suspected of trying to recover their pre-Suppression lands and possessions. Involvement now would open new doors for the Society: once the present confusion had been resolved, the English would likely turn to those who had aided them during their troubles. Finally Allen drew a parallel between the Benedictines and the Jesuits. Shortly after the institution of the Benedictines, that order was sent to England by Pope Gregory the Great to convert the Saxons. Now another Pope Gregory wished to send a new order to work for the re-conversion of England. He hoped that the results would be the same.

Perhaps under the guidance of Parsons, Allen had organized his arguments according to Ignatius' criteria. With the exception of the faltering and gratuitous comparison between the Benedictines and the Jesuits, each claim argued along the lines suggested by the Constitutions: the disposition of the people; the needs of the Church; the obligations to, and the importance of England; the conquest of heresy; and the permanent fruits of the mission. The general and his consultors, although appreciative of Allen's presentation, were particularly worried about one point ignored by the future cardinal: the conditions in England. The dangers of the English mission were too great to be ignored. Although the work there was necessary and important, could the general knowingly and willingly send his men into such perils? Many, perhaps attracted by the dangers and the possibility of martyrdom, would volunteer for the mission. Yet would the good gained by their labours outweigh the loss of these men? Mercurian feared that the English government would seize upon the missionary expedition

and depict it as a political enterprise. In so doing the government would make the Jesuits odious and their actions suspect -- perhaps not to the wiser but certainly to the greater part of the people. Finally, once in England, the Jesuits would not be able to live according to their religious Institute. The general did not see how it would be possible for them to observe "their religious discipline of prayer, exhortations, meditation, conference and other such like helps." Moreover without a bishop, the general worried how so many priests could live in peace and harmony.

During the subsequent conferences between the general and his consultants, Oliver Manare, the German assistant, and Claudio Acquaviva, the Roman provincial, two of the five Jesuits with whom the general discussed the issue, convinced Mercurian that the English mission was so important that the Society should take the risk. These two were subsequently appointed as the mission's organizers. After Pope Gregory XIII had given his approval, Robert Parsons was named the superior.⁷

Mercurian's objections were not dismissed even though the mission was accepted. The inclusion of Thomas Goldwell, the bishop of St Asaph, allayed his concern about clerical discontent. The general dealt with the other two objections in the instructions that he gave to Robert Parsons and Edward Campion, instructions that were required in the Constitutions so that all missionaries knew the purpose, methods

7. Pollen, "The Memoirs of Father Robert Parsons," pp. 194-195; Robert Parsons, "Of the Life and Martyrdom of Father Edmund Campion," Letters and Notices 11 (1877) 328-332; Basset, The English Jesuits, pp. 33-34.

and goals of their projects.⁸ In the instructions, Mercurian stressed the religious nature of the mission to refute any government claim to the contrary and urged the implementation of as much of the Society's Institute as possible.⁹

The English mission had a twofold objective: it was to strengthen the Roman Catholics in their faith and to recover those who had left the Church out of ignorance or temptation. Because the Jesuits would be surrounded by enemies of "outstanding talent, skill and malice," the mission would be most difficult. The general recommended two tactics for the accomplishment of their goals: extraordinary virtue and prudence. The conscientious observation of the Society's style of life, insofar as the conditions in England would allow, would preserve the virtue and piety of the missionaries. Since circumstances precluded the complete observance of the Jesuit life, "their chief aid will be a right intention, and a combination of distrust in them themselves with a firm confidence in God to whom alone they can look for grace and light." Frequent and fervent prayer and the examination of conscience were required for the formation of the "right intention." Prudence must be exercised in everything but especially in any decisions regarding the people, the procedures and the issues with which they should deal. At all times, there must be temperance in food. Indeed, it would even be better if the Jesuits had their meals in private. Although the fathers could not wear the customary dress of the Society

8. Cons. 612-614. Cf. also William J. Young, S.J., ed., The Letters of St Ignatius Loyola (Chicago, 1959) pp. 51-52, 93-96, 212-214, 267-269, and 365-367 for examples of instructions given by Ignatius to early Jesuit missionaries.

9. There are two slightly different versions of the instructions. The first is SC, MS A, V, 1(1); the second, ARSI, Instit 188, ff. 293-294. The first was printed in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 316-321. Cf. those pages for a discussion of the differences between the two manuscripts.

and were forced to dress as laymen, their clothes should be modest and sober. Since a communal life was impossible, the men should visit each other as often as possible for advice and spiritual assistance. If the Jesuits had to have contact with strangers, it should be with the upper classes. Not only were the upper classes better able to protect the priests but also their conversion would have a far greater effect on the mission. In any disputation with the Elizabethan ministers, the general advised the men to be temperate with their arguments and to refrain from name-calling and bitter wrangling. Parsons and Campion were also told to avoid familiar conversation with women and boys.¹⁰ In order to elude even the slightest suspicion of avarice and greed, the fathers should neither beg for nor accept alms. If they needed money, they should ask one or two of their most loyal friends for assistance. Finally, Campion and Parsons were admonished against any political involvement. They were forbidden to discuss political matters in their letters, to speak against the Queen and, indeed, to tolerate such talk in others.¹¹

Robert Parsons was designated the superior of the mission.¹² To him the general granted all the privileges, faculties, and favours

-
10. Missioners were always advised to hear the confessions of women and young boys in open, visible spaces lest there be an occasion for gossip. Cf. Instructiones ad Provinciales et Superiores Societatis (Antwerp, 1635) p. 62.
11. The Roman version of the instructions qualified the prohibition. It permitted the fathers to discuss the Queen with those of proven faithfulness and trustworthiness but only for serious reasons. Cf. Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, p. 318, footnote 19. For an analysis of the meaning of the prohibition, cf. J.H. Pollen, "The Politics of the English Catholics during the Reign of Elizabeth," The Month 99 (1902) 293-294.
12. According to the directives for missioners in Instructiones ad Provinciales et Superiores Societatis (Antwerp, 1635), the man named first in the letters patent was always the superior.

"in the internal forum" that he could grant. "In the external forum," Parsons received all the powers ordinarily bestowed on provincials and rectors.¹³ After the missionaries had established themselves in England, they should advise the general as to what province the mission should be attached. If Campion and Parsons thought that more men were required for the mission, they should direct their request to the general only.

The brief but explicit instructions clearly set forth the purpose of the mission: the Jesuits were in England to work among the Roman Catholics to strengthen their faith and to win back the lapsed. Theirs was not a job of conversion. In that their task was similar to the work done by the Jesuits who worked the missionary circuit in Europe. In any work of spiritual renewal, even the hint of scandal must be avoided. In every aspect of their lives, the men must give concrete religious witness. That would be even more difficult in England where the men lacked the support of a religious community. Though feigning secular behaviour, the Jesuits must observe their Institute as far as possible if the mission was to be successful.

Subsequent instructions were given to Jaspar Haywood and William Holt in 1581, William Weston in 1584, Henry Garnet and Robert Southwell in 1586, and William Holt and Joseph Creswell in 1588.¹⁴ These instructions revealed a gradually more realistic and nuanced understanding of the English mission. Because the instructions presented to Campion and Parsons remained the foundation, there was no need to repeat in detail the purpose of the mission and the virtues

13. In the Roman version, the phrase "provincialibus Societatis" was written in the margin. Thus, according to Hicks, such provincial powers were not originally granted to Parsons but were added later. Cf. Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, p. 317, footnote 8.

14. Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 317, footnote 6; 318, footnote 19; 355-357; 361-363.

required for its accomplishment. The subsequent instructions modified the original in light of the Society's experience there. The prohibition against the collection of alms was lifted and the Jesuits were permitted to collect and to distribute as much money as necessary, not only to subsidize their activities, and the activities of the secular priests, but also to assist the impoverished Catholics. Other dispensations from various religious and Jesuit obligations were eventually granted because of the singular difficulties in England. Some penitents must have given money to their confessors as restitution. What should they do with it, especially if the confessors were not sure to whom restitution should be made? Some priests must have worried about their presence at the executions of the Catholics and feared that it resulted in an irregularity that affected their ministry. Who could lift the penalties?¹⁵ Living in secrecy and in constant danger, the priests could not always celebrate Mass. Therefore, they received a dispensation from the obligation of a weekly Mass. The paucity of Jesuits resulted in a dispensation from the obligation of having a fellow-Jesuit as a confessor. In order to carry out their work more effectively, the fathers were also given permission to publish dogmatic and spiritual pamphlets.¹⁶

The early stages in the evolution of the Jesuit organization were evident in the instructions. As the first superior of the mission, Parsons had received all the privileges, faculties and favours that the general could grant "in the internal forum"; "in the external

15. Cf. John Gerard, "Contributions towards a Life of Henry Garnet, S.J.", The Month 91 (1898) 122.

16. For other faculties granted cf. ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 720/A/II/2; Claudio Acquaviva to William Allen, 14 October 1581 in Ryan, "Some Correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85," pp. 81-85.

forum," he was first granted all the privileges and faculties of a rector, in the first draft of the instructions, and then of a provincial, in the second version of the instructions. Originally, Parsons had rectoral powers and would have been under the provincial of the province to which, if the general's wishes had been followed, the mission would have been attached. Once it became clear that the English mission would remain independent, the superior assumed the powers of a provincial. It is not possible to date precisely that change but it had taken place before Garnet's and Southwell's journey to England in 1586. The early bestowal of provincial powers and privileges differed considerably from the Philippines where the early superiors had no comparable authority. Since the Philippines was not an independent mission, its superiors had the authority of a rector and not that of a provincial.¹⁷ The English superior was instructed to choose two consultors from the senior members of the mission and to designate the senior of the two as his admonitor.

In a country without bishops, the superior was even more important. Without him there was no one in England to whom the missionaries could turn for advice, permissions, and dispensations. Thus, if the mission were to succeed, its organization must be maintained. Because of the omnipresent dangers of imprisonment and execution, exceptional but necessary arrangements had to be made for that maintenance. Ordinarily the general named a successor upon the death, resignation, or the completion of the term of the incumbent. To name not only the successor but to establish a line of succession as the general did in his instructions to Holt and Creswell in 1588 was most unusual. But the dangers of the English mission demanded such provisions.

17. Cf. de la Costa, The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1768, pp. 119-120, 222 for the powers of the superior.

Robert Parson retained the overall direction of the mission until his flight to France in 1581. From Rouen, he wrote to Jaspas Haywood and nominated him superior of the mission.¹⁸ Despite this, relations between Parson and Haywood were not always exemplary. Later Haywood bitterly complained to the general about Parsons' style of procedure.¹⁹ Haywood remained the superior of the small contingent of Jesuits until 1584. With his apprehension in that year, he joined his three subjects in prison: James Bosgrave in the Tower; Thomas Pounce and Thomas Mettam in Wisbech. With all the Jesuits in England in prison, the future of the whole mission was in doubt. A few of the general's consultors advised against sending any more men into England because of the severity of the persecution. The French provincial, Odo Pigenat, wrote to the general along the same lines. Indeed, at the time, Parsons himself had even advised against sending more men.²⁰ After a consultation with Allen, however, Parsons changed his mind and argued against any delay. This mission, Parsons insisted, must not be abandoned at its greatest crisis "for now more than ever is there need of one or two men in London to steer the barque and keep the others to the course."²¹ The general's reply to Parsons' letter asked for more information on the manner by which the men were sent into England, the living conditions there, and their chances of administering to the Catholics without

-
18. Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, xl.
19. Haywood's complaints may be found in ARSI, Anglia 30I, ff. 118-123.
20. Pollen, "The Memoirs of Father Robert Parsons," p. 129.
21. Robert Parsons to Claudio Acquaviva, 11 June 1584, in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, p. 204. Cf. also Parsons' letter to the General on 23 July 1584 in Pollen, "The Memoirs of Father Robert Parsons," p. 149.

discovery. It was not sensible, Acquaviva argued, to send more men into England to edify the faithful by their martyrdom when their very presence in England increased the persecution. But Parsons' letter apparently convinced Acquaviva of the necessity of maintaining the mission. On 15 July 1584, Father Acquaviva informed Pope Gregory XIII of Parsons' and Allen's advice, and of the desire of the English Catholics for more Jesuits. The pope approved the proposal to send more and the general assigned William Weston and Thomas Marshall.²² Weston became the superior of the mission upon his arrival, a position he retained despite his capture in 1586. Garnet succeeded him in 1587 because his transfer to Wisbech rendered him inaccessible. In the early years of the mission, the superior was the only Jesuit office in England. In 1588, Garnet was instructed to add two more. He was told to name two consultors, chosen from the more experienced missionaries, to advise him, one of whom would be his admonitor.

Throughout the 1590s Jesuit involvement in the English mission increased. A steady flow of missionaries arrived in England²³ and seminaries, governed and staffed by the English Jesuits were founded on the continent. Even before Campion and Parsons had initiated the mission, the Society had assumed control of the newly erected English College in Rome. As a result of the long and bitter struggle between the students and the administration, the very battle that Parsons had feared would destroy any chance of the Society's assistance in England, Pope Gregory XIII dismissed Morus Clynnog, the first rector, and asked the Society

22. Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, lxxv-lxxvi. Marshall did not accompany Weston because Parsons did not consider him suitable for the mission.

23. The internal organization of the mission will be discussed in the next chapter.

to take control of the college. Alfonso Agazzari was installed as rector shortly before the bull of foundation, dated 1 May 1579, reached the college.²⁴ Through the intercession of Parsons other seminaries were later founded at Valladolid and Seville. In 1588, Dr Barrett, the president of the English college at Rheims, sent three of his students to Spain at the request of Parsons and with the hope of establishing another seminary. After a series of captures and escapes that rivalled the picaresque novels, the students arrived in Valladolid in 1589. Parsons, meanwhile, had obtained an order in council that authorized him to found a college or seminary there and to solicit alms for its support. The Duchess of Feria, the former Jane Dormer, and Sir Francis Englefield provided the money for the immediate needs. The generosity of many local nobles and prelates had so effectively established the seminary by 1591 that the authorities asked for papal confirmation. On 25 April 1592, Pope Clement VIII confirmed the seminary. It was placed under the immediate protection of the Holy See, its government was placed in the hands of the Society of Jesus, and Cardinal Allen was assigned a role similar to that of the cardinal protector at the English college in Rome.²⁵ A year earlier, on 18 September 1591, Pope Gregory XIV had appointed Cardinal Allen the prefect of the English mission and had instructed the English Catholics to obey him.²⁶ Thus the position assigned to Allen at Valladolid was in keeping with his new

24. Cf. Michael E. Williams' recent history, The Venerable English College Rome (London, 1979) for a more detailed presentation.

25. Allen never became the Cardinal Protector of England. Cardinals protector were curial officials specifically designated to act for a certain country, college or religious order whenever they had business in Rome. Many of their powers and duties were taken over by the Congregation de Propaganda Fide created on 6 June 1622. Cf. J.H. Pollen, "The Origin of the Appellant Controversy, 1598," The Month 125 (1915) 462.

26. The bull was printed in Thomas Francis Know, ed., The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen (London, 1882) pp. 335-336.

office. At the time of the confirmation, the rector was Rodrigo de Cabredo, the fourth Spaniard to hold the office; the Englishman, William Flack, was the minister.²⁷

As early as 1590 there were hopes for the establishment of a second seminary in Spain. Parsons, however, thought it wiser to secure the Valladolid foundation before he embarked on a new venture. From contributions provided by the local clergy and nobility, the city and the townsfolk of Seville, a seminary was opened there on 25 November 1592. Francis de Peralta was the first rector. A Spanish Jesuit, Father Juan de Munnez, was the students' confessor; two Englishmen, Charles Tancred and Joseph Creswell, were appointed minister and procurator respectively. In a bull that followed that of 1592 almost verbatim, the pope confirmed the Seville seminary on 15 May 1594. It too was placed under the immediate protection of the Holy See with its government committed to the Society and with Cardinal Allen in his role of quasi-protector.²⁸

In the early 1590s various proposals were discussed in the English Parliament to reduce "disloyal subjects to obedience." One suggested that young children be taken from their parents at the age of seven and placed in Protestant households where they would be raised in the established religion at their parents' expense. So outraged was Parsons by this possibility that he sought to found a college for English Catholic boys. He obtained the approval of King Philip II who assigned an annual rent to 1920 ducats for the support of sixteen

27. Leo Hicks, "Father Parsons, S.J. and the Seminaries in Spain," The Month 157 (1931) 497-506.

28. ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 1606/6/3/1-3; Hicks, "Father Robert Parsons, S.J. and the Seminaries in Spain," 143-152. Cf. Peter Guilday, The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795 (London, 1914) pp. 130-140 for an evaluation of the contributions made by these seminaries.

boys. Because of the Flemish authorities' considerable hesitation over the presence of so many Englishmen near the frontier, the King insisted that the Jesuit rector of the college be a Belgian. In March 1593, Parsons asked the general to urge Oliver Manare, one of the first proponents of the English mission, to make the necessary arrangements for the new seminary before he left for the general congregation in Rome. Manare only had to nominate a rector. The English Jesuits, Henry Broy and Nicholas Smith, would be the minister and the prefect of studies; William Flack, recently arrived from Spain, would oversee the spiritual life of the college and William Holt would act as liaison between the college and the royal court in Brussels. Manare nominated Jean Foucart as rector and the general approved him on 21 June 1593. Because Foucart served as the socius to the vice-provincial while the Belgian provincial attended the general congregation, he was not able to take office immediately. Until he did so, William Flack was the acting superior. Foucart remained rector until 1601.²⁹

Robert Parsons was personally responsible for the foundation of three seminaries in the early 1590s. Although the two seminaries in Spain, along with the English College in Rome, were administered by the Society, they were not owned by the Jesuits. The bulls that named Allen the overseer of the seminaries at Valladolid and Seville appointed Parsons as his delegate. In this role Parsons had the powers of presentation and visitation to the chaplaincies of the church of St George, built and endowed in 1517 by the English colony at San Lucar de Barrameda.³⁰ St Omers was the first college owned

29. Leo Hicks, "The Foundation of the College of St Omers," AHSI 19 (1950) 146-180; Hubert Chadwick, S.J., From St Omers to Stonyhurst (London, 1962) pp. 10-42.

30. Hicks, "Robert Parsons, S.J. and the Seminaries in Spain," The Month, 158 (1931) 31-34, 149.

by the English Jesuits and Cardinal Allen had no quasi-protector role in its affairs. Because of royal insistence, the rectors of Valladolid, Seville and St Omers had to be from the provinces in which the seminaries were located. The English Jesuits usually provided a few members of the staff. With Foucart's appointment to St Omers, the anomaly of Parsons' position was evident. Although he had acted as the head of the English Jesuits negotiating with royal and papal authorities, sending men to new positions in Spain and the Spanish Netherlands, arranging for novices to be accepted into the novitiates of different provinces, selecting missionaries for England, and maintaining contact with those already there, his authority was more moral than constitutional. In September 1594, Parsons informed Father General Acquaviva that there had been some slight problems at St Omers regarding letters and financial accounts. Earlier, when Parsons had intervened in similar matters, he had been asked on what authority he had done so. He requested, therefore, that the general inform St Omers "that it is your pleasure that they should listen to what I have to say by way of assisting that seminary and keeping it united to the seminaries here [Spain] for the greater good of the whole and in order to carry out the intention of the king and of your Paternity." Whatever instructions the general sent to the rector, Parsons asked for a copy. The general approved Parsons's suggestion on 24 October.³¹ Meanwhile Cardinal Allen's death on the 16th of that month altered the entire issue.

Allen's death was a watershed in English Catholic affairs. For

31. Hicks, "The Foundation of the College of St Omers," 174-175.

the Society, it revealed the complicated, constitutional entanglement in the Spanish seminaries and, for the English Catholics, it removed the one man able to maintain harmony between the two increasingly hostile groups on the mission. The establishment of colleges and seminaries either owned or administered by Jesuits from one province or mission in the territory of another province, with rectors from the host province, created a confusing hierarchical structure.³²

How much authority did any superior of the English mission have in English houses in a foreign province with foreign rectors responsible to foreign provincials? Who would mediate any conflict between the interests of the mission and those of the host province? The English often complained that the foreign provincials and rectors understood neither the English character and temperament nor the English religious and political situation. Parsons was in the process of defining his authority vis-à-vis St Omers. Allen's quasi-protector position allowed him to prevent any disagreement at either the Spanish seminaries or the English College in Rome from becoming too serious. No one possessed comparable authority after his death. Meanwhile in England the disturbances at Wisbech Castle erupted in February 1595. After a temporary reconciliation, hostilities began again. Now united with anti-Jesuit groups in Rome and Flanders, a secular faction decried the Jesuit domination of the mission and pleaded for the

32. For the details of some of the problems, cf. Basset, The English Jesuits, p. 162; Philip Caraman, Henry Garnet 1565-1606 and the Gunpowder Plot (London, 1964) pp. 172-173; David Lunn, The English Benedictines 1540-1688 (London, 1980) pp. 19-21.

appointment of an English bishop.³³

In an attempt to find a solution for these problems, Parsons was called to Rome from Spain in 1597. In a letter to William Holt, Parsons explained the reasons behind the trip: he had been called to Rome to settle all the problems that related to the support and the maintenance of the seminaries and the mission. He asked Holt to forward to him any suggestions that he might have regarding faculties, privileges, finances and government. While Parsons was in Rome, he also hoped to quell the disturbances at the English College.³⁴ Once in Rome, Parsons petitioned the pope for the appointment of two English bishops, each with a staff of archpriests. One bishop would reside in England and the other in Belgium. This plan was rejected. Parsons then proposed an alternative plan that established an archpriest for England. This was adopted. On 7 March 1598, George Blackwell was named the archpriest with jurisdiction over the English secular clergy.³⁵ On 16 April 1598, the general regularized the Jesuit situation with the publication of Officium et Regulae Praefecti missionum in Seminariis quae in Hispanis

-
33. The full story of the Wisbech Stirs and the Archpriest Controversy is much too complicated for a thorough discussion here. For the details, cf. T.G. Law, A Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuit and Secular in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1889); T.G. Law, ed., The Archpriest Controversy, 2 vols. (London, 1896, 1898) *The Camden Society* ns. 56, 58; Pritchard, Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England, J.H. Pollen, "The Origin of the Appellant Controversy, 1598," 461-475; J.H. Pollen, "The Opposition of the Archpriest Blackwell, 1598-1600," The Month 125 (1915) 576-590; J.H. Pollen, "The Appellant Controversy," The Month 126 (1915) 141-155, 256-271, 480-495; P. Renold, ed., The Wisbech Stirs (1595-1598) (London 1958) CRS 51.
34. Parsons to William Holt, 15 March 1597, SC, Anglia II, 24. There is another copy in AAW, VI, 17. Cf. also Parsons' letter to Oliver Manare, 10 January 1597, AAW, VI, 4.
35. The original bull and the instructions for the office are in IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 38, ff. 385, 389-390.

et Belgio Societatis regimini subsunt.³⁶ Within five weeks the English mission was totally re-organized with the introduction of the archpriest and the prefect.

Officium et Regulae began by explaining the many issues that had daily arisen and demanded prompt solution. Unfortunately, neither the provincials nor the rectors, since they were not English, were equipped for their resolution. Issues such as the best means for the recruitment of young men in England, the arrangements for their journeys to the continent, their recognition upon arrival, their transfer from one seminary to another, their subsequent return to England, their viaticum, and, indeed, the general direction of the mission required someone with a special knowledge of, and a special concern for, the English scene. Despite the kindness and the interest shown by the provincials and the rectors, the general thought that the English Jesuits should share their load. He exhorted the provincials and the rectors to accept the new arrangement and to seek the advice of the English and to share their responsibilities with them. The general then detailed the guidelines for the new arrangement.

The recruitment of young men and the preparations for their arrival would be a major concern of the new prefect. To do this most effectively, he should familiarize himself with the methods of his predecessors and learn the names of the English Catholics who could be relied on for assistance. Once the students had arrived, they should be carefully inspected in order to flush out any spies. Once they had matriculated in one seminary, no student could transfer to another without letters patent from the prefect.

36. ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts III, ff. 368-377.

In the exercise of his office, the prefect should do everything possible to promote harmony and respect between the English and the foreign Jesuits. Impartial in his judgements, he should eliminate any grounds for contention and rivalry and he should prudently resolve any difficulties between the different nationalities. In important matters, he should warn the provincial of any alterations.

The prefect, appointed by the general, was subject to no provincial but immediately dependent upon the general. Yet whenever the prefect stayed in one of the provinces, he was that provincial's subject in all personal and domestic matters. He was not, however, subject to any provincial in anything that pertained to the prefect's duties and responsibilities. Similarly, the prefect was not a subject of any rector. He must nevertheless show the rector proper respect and grant him precedence in his college. The prefect was forbidden to interfere in the daily administration of the seminary. If he noticed something that demanded reform, he should discuss it privately with the rector of the provincial and in such a way that the rector's authority might not appear to be challenged. For their part, neither rector nor provincial should make any major decision about the seminaries without prior consultation with the prefect. If the prefect objected to their plans, they must now proceed without the general's consent.

The prefect must be especially vigilant about the finances of the mission and the seminaries. The rectors must submit regular confidential reports on the financial state of the college. He should also provide information about receipts and expenses if the prefect requested it. If the rectors neither complied with the above nor followed the prefect's advice, the prefect must then discuss the issue with the provincial, who would provide the required remedies.

The continuation of the seminaries and, indeed, that of the mission depended considerably on royal favour. Thus the prefect might be required to visit the Spanish court often. He should even consider whether it might be more beneficial if either he himself or some procurator, acting on his behalf and approved by the general, resided at either the Spanish or the Belgian court. Any expenses that either the prefect or his procurator might incur in their transactions with the royal courts would be divided among the seminaries on whose behalf they acted.

The prefect received the general's permission to distribute any alms that he had collected. He could use this money to assist anyone and not just his fellow Jesuits. If the alms were not adequate, he had the authority to take something from the ordinary income of the seminaries. This money, he could entrust to others, keep himself or invest.

In order to build the proper spirit of union, the prefect should assign a few English Jesuits to each seminary. Since these men would play an important role in the preparation of the seminarians for the mission, they must be suitable. The prefect should also supervise the activities of the residences at San Lucar and Lisbon and ensure that they were adequately staffed. Although not subject to any of the seminaries, these residences were important to the work of the mission.

As a result of Acquaviva's Officium et Regulae, the English mission assumed a more developed structure. With his appointment as the prefect, Parsons' position as the head of the mission was recognized and regularized. He, and subsequent prefects, held that office in tandem with the rectorship of the English College in Rome. Shortly after the promulgation of the document, two offices, incipient in the

decree, developed. Officium et Regulae had stressed the importance of the royal favour and the need for procurators at both courts. Two procurators, Joseph Creswell for Spain and William Holt for Belgium, were later named and to them the powers and authority of the prefect were delegated. Each vice-prefect, as the procurators were called, should discuss any important matter with the rectors of the seminaries under their jurisdiction. All serious issues and major difficulties should be forwarded to the prefect for discussion with the general. While he awaited a response, the vice-prefect should do nothing. Amongst other things, the vice-prefect should be especially concerned with the acquisition and construction of new buildings, the transfer of Jesuits from one house to another, and the introduction of new procedures and customs.³⁷

The prefectural structure established by Acquaviva was a radical innovation in the Society of Jesus. Using the authority granted to him in the Constitutions, the general had authorized a style of government that had hitherto been unknown in the Society and was foreign to the Institute as then practised. He had, in effect, established "peculiarities" largely exempt from the jurisdiction of the local provincials. Since there had been no previous experience with this form of government in the Society, there were no rules, instructions and ordinances either to define the authority, power and responsibility of each office or to determine its proper relationship with the already existing provincial order. Acquaviva realized that time and experience would spotlight the weaker areas and show where changes and modifications were needed. Within two years, the first clarifications were issued under the name

37. ARSI, Anglia 31I, f. 143.

of the general, although Parsons was the author. Many of the items were intended to bring the practices of the prefecture into line with those of provinces. At the beginning of each year, the rector was instructed to send the prefect, via the vice-prefect, a list of all the students in each seminary with a brief description of their age, class, studies and abilities. A duplicate list was to be sent to the vice-prefect for his own records. The rectors had also to include a succinct summary of the economic and spiritual conditions of each seminary. The list of students and the financial data were to be written on two separate pieces of paper which would later be inserted in the appropriate volume in the prefect's office in Rome. Moreover each January the rectors and the English priests were to write a short account of the principal events of the year just completed, letters that should contain data on the number of students needed in each seminary and on the number of priests ready for the mission, along with their traits and talents. Although Officium et Regulae had explained the procedures for admission, experience had demonstrated the need for some clarification. No student was to be accepted by any rector of any seminary without the prior consent of either the prefect or the vice-prefect. Similarly, the prefect alone had the authority to transfer students from one seminary to another. The prefect would make such decisions with the advice of the rector and would be responsible for all the travel expenses.³⁸

Neither Officium et Regulae nor the 1600 additions completely solved the difficulties. The seminary at Valladolid had long been a dormant volcano. A few tremours portended a major eruption. A few years earlier, the admirable Spanish rector, Rodrigo de Cabredo, was

38. SC, Coll P, ff. 418-419.

saved from a faction of English Jesuits by Parsons himself.³⁹ His successor, Gonzalo del Rio, had been such a disaster that he had lasted only one year in the office. Disagreements between the Spanish and the English Jesuits were common and public. Creswell, always a difficult man, seemed totally unable to maintain amiable relations with either his Spanish or his English colleagues. In the midst of the fraternal battles, there was a major eruption. In April or May 1599, John Bradshaw left the seminary to join the Benedictines. Over the next few years he was followed by others. Their departure only intensified the English Jesuits' antagonism towards the prospect of a Benedictine mission to England. Parsons and others had long opposed any move to permit the return of the Benedictines. Monastic orders, they argued, had no role to play in the re-conversion of England. The country needed active, missionary orders and not contemplative, monastic ones. For that reason, the Society considered the departure of the seminarians as defections. Joseph Creswell, the vice-prefect, and Pedro Ruiz de Vallejo, the rector, appealed to the Spanish King to order their return. Tempers flared still higher. Among the Benedictines, rumours abounded that the Society planned to usurp all former monastic lands and possessions for the use of their own colleges and seminaries. These fears hastened their negotiations with the papacy for an English mission. On 5 December 1602, Pope Clement VIII approved the return of the Benedictines and granted ordinary priestly

39. In a letter of 26 June 1600 to Joseph Creswell, Parsons reminded him that over the years, many, including Creswell himself, had noted the frequency with which the young English Jesuits, new in the Society and inexperienced in government, formed factions for or against the rectors. He recalled one incident in which three Jesuits opposed Father Cabredo. Parsons broke the faction by sending the three men away from the seminary. Father Cabredo wept for joy at his delivery. SC, Coll P., ff. 338-339.

faculties to them. He granted them special faculties on 20 March 1603. Provoked by this permission, the Spanish rector accused the pope of being the source of all the trouble because he had authorized the return of the Benedictines. The nuncio promptly had him imprisoned. In order to prevent further leakage to the Benedictines, Parsons insisted that William Weston retain his position as confessor at the college, despite Creswell's angry demand that he be moved, because Weston "is a very spiritual man." A peace was finally imposed on 10 December 1608. Under threats of excommunication and complete expulsion from the mission, the Jesuits and the Benedictines accepted the Roman guidelines. Among other conditions, the Jesuits were forbidden to prevent their students from becoming monks. On the other hand, the Benedictines were forbidden to solicit students to join their ranks.⁴⁰

Hitherto relatively peaceful, the Seville seminary exploded in 1604. Here, however, the issue had nothing to do with the Benedictines but was a violent clash between the vice-prefect Joseph Creswell and the rector, Juan de Peralta. The rector was a Jesuit highly esteemed in his own province and generally considered to be favourable towards the English mission.⁴¹ Nonetheless his government antagonized some of the students and a few of the English Jesuits. Creswell intervened and,

40. Lunn, The English Benedictines 1540-1688, pp. 11-36, 57-89; Edwin Henson, editor, Registers of the English College at Valladolid: 1589-1862 (London, 1930) CRS 30, xix-xxi; PRP, SP 94/20/45-54; CSP Milan 1385-1618, pp. 615-646; ARSI, Anglia 31I, ff. 125-126; Anglia 36II, ff. 479A-480; Fondo Gesuitico 446, ff. 629-631; SC, Anglia VI, 74; Parsons to Creswell, 12 September 1604, Coll P., ff. 458-9; HMC Salisbury 21 (1609-1610) p. 45.

41. Parsons referred to Peralta as a "vir magna charitate morum suavitate." Cf. J.H. Pollen, ed., "Fr. Robert Parsons, S.J. -- Annals of the English College at Seville, with Accounts of Other Foundations at Valladolid, St Lucar, Lisbon, and St Omers," in Miscellanea IX (London, 1914) CRS 14, p. 7.

without consultation with either the general or the prefect, took steps for Peralta's removal from office. Both the general and Parsons defended Peralta and instructed Creswell on the proper exercise of his office. On 12 September 1604 Parsons fraternally admonished Creswell for his factious dealings with the rector. The English fathers must be careful, Parsons wrote, not to alienate the Spanish Jesuits because that would result in the ruin of the mission. He asked the vice-prefect to be more circumspect in his administration. The English Jesuits had many enemies from whom the pope had received a number of complaints, so great care had to be taken.⁴² Parsons again wrote to Creswell in April 1605. By this stage of the dispute, Creswell had counted Parsons among his adversaries. No longer able to treat the issue by correspondence, Parsons asked Creswell to come to Rome to discuss the rift. Parsons had heard that various rumours were circulating among the Spanish seminaries. He now heard that factions were forming. Some English Jesuits declared themselves for Parsons; others for Creswell. The union on which the English Jesuits had prided themselves was threatened. In May Parsons repeated his request. Since some Jesuits had seized upon the dispute between Parsons and Creswell as an excuse to dismantle the prefecture and to transfer the authority to the provincials, it was even more urgent that they meet. The general had even hinted that the English risked to lose everything if the dispute continued. So the rift must be healed. Parsons intended to write to Richard Walpole at Valladolid and to the English Jesuits at Seville and charge them, in the general's name, "to unite themselves in all sincerity, love and subordination to you as to myself. I hope they will performe as religious men ought to doe, and that you will treatte them again in all charity and patience." William Warford,

42. SC, Coll. P., ff. 458-459.

apparently, did not submit as a good religious should and, for the sake of peace, he was removed from Seville to Cadiz. In October, Creswell left for Rome.⁴³

As the English and the Spanish Jesuits battled over the seminaries, a different type of warfare raged in England. The institution of the archpriest did not bring about a lasting peace. Indeed, opposition to the Society hardened. The anti-Jesuit faction considered the archpriest the Society's puppet and his creation, a thinly disguised manoeuvre for retaining control of the mission. The complete expulsion of the Society was the only way of liberate the church from its clutches and to restore the proper ecclesiastical government. In the waning years of Elizabeth's reign, both Charles Paget⁴⁴ and the appellants worked for that expulsion. For a time, they had hoped to win the French King, Henri IV, to their cause. Even after that ploy had failed, their efforts continued.⁴⁵ The movement gained momentum after the Gunpowder plot. Even the papal nuncio in Brussels was willing to sacrifice the Society in return for toleration. Since the papacy would soon conclude a similar deal with Venice, the Society's enemies held on to their hope.⁴⁶

-
43. Parsons to Creswell, 23 April 1605 and 31 May 1605, SC, Coll P., ff. 423-424, 427; same to Warford, 18 October 1605, SC Coll P., f. 427; cf. also Albert J. Loomie, The Spanish Elizabethans (London, 1963) pp. 217-219.
44. For more on Paget, cf. Leo Hicks, S.J., An Elizabethan Problem: Some Aspects of the Careers of Two Exile Adventurers (London, 1964).
45. PRO, SP 12/267/67; 12/271/74; SC, Anglia VI, 22 (printed in Renold, The Wisbech Stirs); IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 38, ff. 200, 292 (both printed in Law, The Archpriest Controversy I); John Bossy, "Henri IV, the Appellants and the Jesuits," RH 8 (1965-6) 80-122; Holmes, "The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics," pp. 307-309.
46. PRO, SP 15/34/45; John Larocca, "English Catholics and the Recusancy Laws 1558-1625: A Study in Religion and Politics" (unpublished PhD thesis, Rutgers University, 1977) pp. 234-235.

The number of Jesuits continued to rise despite the opposition and the persecution in England. In 1598, the year of the re-organization of the mission, there were only eighteen Jesuits in England. Four of them were in prison. Henry Garnet remained their superior until his execution on 3 May 1606. By that time, the total number of Jesuits on the mission had increased to more than forty.⁴⁷ Vocations to the Society were flourishing. More and more secular priests sought admission, most of whom were permitted to take their noviceship in England so as not to disturb the mission. The other novices entered the novitiate of the Belgian province. Oliver Manare, the Belgian provincial, restricted the number of English admitted each year. Even if the native Belgians had not filled all their positions, he would not allot any more places to the English.⁴⁸ Garnet begged the general to do something to correct this problem. In December 1604, a Spanish noblewoman, Doña Luisa de Carvajal, bequeathed 12000 ducats as a foundation for the mission's novitiate, a place to serve not only as a house of formation for the younger men but also as a refuge for the older, tired men. Acquaviva suggested that the novitiate be located in Louvain. In 1606 Parsons obtained a large house that had formerly belonged to the knights of Malta and the novitiate opened in February 1607 with six priests, two scholastics and five brothers as novices under the direction of Thomas Talbot. After the addition of Jesuit students who attended lectures in philosophy and theology at the university in 1614, plans were formulated for the transfer of the novitiate.⁴⁹ Originally the mission

47. Henry Garnet to the Pope, 30 October 1598, SC, Coll P, f. 560; ARSI, Anglia 31I, f. 122 (printed in Foley, Records, VII/1, lxvii-lxviii); Garnet to Acquaviva, 29 May 1605, Fondo Gesuitico 651/624.

48. In 1599, the allotment was one novice per year. Cf. Garnet to Mark Tusinga (vere Robert Parsons), 30 June 1599 PRO, SP/12/271/32. Cf. also Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 104, 165, 172-173.

49. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 318-319; Garnet to Acquaviva, 29 May 1605, ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 651/624; ARSI, Hist Records, VII/1, xlvi-xlvii.

had hoped to move the novitiate to Watten, to a house given to the English Jesuits by Bishop Blaise of St Omers. Pressured by the English government, Archduke Albert withheld his consent and thus frustrated the move. Liège was the next site considered. For a time it was uncertain whether the novitiate or the scholasticate would be moved. Since a case could be made for either, the mission left the ultimate decision to the general. He chose the novitiate. Throughout the summer of 1614, negotiations took place. As the English Jesuits in Belgium solicited the required permissions from the Elector of Cologne, the city of Liège and the two Belgian provincials,⁵⁰ Thomas Owen, Parsons' successor as prefect, discussed the matter with the general. Sir William Stanley⁵¹ and the future lay-brother, William Brown, the third son of Sir Anthony Brown, provided the money for the purchase of the buildings. By 3 October all the permissions had been received and the houses had been secured in Sir William's name so the novitiate moved into its new accommodation by the end of the year.⁵²

With the departure of the novitiate, the remaining scholasticate was left without any foundation for its support. The new college needed a benefactor and it found a generous one in Thomas Sackville, a son of the Earl of Dorset. He granted the college £200 immediately and provided it with a capital fund of 40000 ducats, approximately £9000,

50. The Belgian province was divided in 1612. Louvain was in the Flandro-Belgian province; St Omers and Liège in the Gallo-Belgian.

51. Cf. Loomie, The Spanish Elizabethans, pp. 129-181 for his life.

52. Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld) to Thomas Owen, 5 July 1614, SC, Anglia IV, 9; John Nelson (vere Gerard) to Owen, 9 August, 19 September and 3 October 1614, SC, Anglia IV, 14, 22, 24. Cf. also A.F. Allison, "The Later Life and Writings of Joseph Creswell, S.J. (1556-1623)," RH 15 (1979) 84-89.

that generated £100 (sic) annually.⁵³

The English mission was in a unique state when Creswell left Spain for his summit conference with Parsons. Vocations had increased. So had the number of Jesuits in England. Yet the English Jesuits were threatened on all sides. The appellants demanded their expulsion; the Spanish Jesuits urged the termination of the prefecture. Union was essential if the mission were to withstand the attacks. Parsons and Creswell discussed the mission and were reconciled. Creswell retained his post as vice-prefect and returned to Spain in April 1606. As a result of the reconciliation, the general resisted the Spanish pressure and confirmed the prefecture. On 15 May 1606, he issued a revised Officium et Regulae. Although most of the revisions had come from Parsons' additions of 1600, some were new.

General Acquaviva began the revised edition with a long explanation of the importance of the mission. The persecution of Catholics had continued longer than had been expected and the Holy See had done everything it could to sustain them during their tribulations. For many years and with considerable fruit, the Society has worked in England. Its need for some type of stable government had long been obvious. Therefore the general had decided that it should be governed after the fashion of a province. However, because of the dispersal of its men throughout many provinces, it was impossible for one superior to govern them properly. Thus the prefect, the general's lieutenant for the efficient administration

53. John Nelson (vere Gerard) to Owen, 19 September 1614, SC, Anglia IV, 22; Allison, "The Later Life and Writings of Joseph Creswell, S.J. (1556-1623)," 84-89; CSP Milan 1385-1618, pp. 653-655. The annual revenue of £100 must be a mistake: it is much too low a rate of return. In SC, Anglia IV, 46 there is a certificate of an unknown benefactor that Acquaviva had consented on 13 October 1612 to accept his offer to found a college where the Jesuits could be trained to fight heresy. Was this anonymous benefactor Sackville?

of the mission and the seminaries, needed the assistance of the two vice-prefects and the superior. Adding to the earlier duties of the prefect, the 1606 edition made the prefect, after consultation with the rector and his advisors, responsible for the content and the quality of all courses at the seminaries, and for the number and qualifications of the students admitted. Finally, the general reminded all of the importance of a uniform and proper system of subordination of authority within the prefecture.⁵⁴

Three days after the publication of the revised Officium et Regulae, the general issued specific instructions to the prefect and the vice-prefects. In order to avoid future dissension, the vice-prefects and the superior in England must be subject to the prefect in all things and execute all his orders. No sign of disagreement or dissent must ever be evident to anyone. The vice-prefects must forward all important business to the prefect and await his decision. If there was a danger in delay, the vice-prefect might provide a temporary remedy. The vice-prefect must never make any decision regarding the transfer of men or the changes of office without the permission either of the prefect or of the general. Vice-prefects and rectors were also forbidden to interfere in the exercise of the offices of the prefect and the provincial. Regarding money, the vice-prefect should be careful not to provide any grounds for suspicions and calumny. In order to protect his poverty, the vice-prefect should submit annual statements of his accounts. Finally, if the prefect ever found fault with any aspect of the mission and ordered it changed, the vice-prefects and the superior must do it immediately and cheerfully.⁵⁵

54. ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts III, ff. 387-400. An English translation of most of the 1606 edition is in Francis Edwards' edition and translation of a number of chapters of Henry More's Historia Provinciae Angliae Societatis Iesu (St Omers, 1660) entitled The Elizabethan Jesuits (London, 1981) pp. 298-307.

55. Rijksarchief Gent, Fonds Jezuieten 74, ff. 88-90 (a microfilm of this is at ASJ).

In these instructions, through the continual insistence that the vice-prefect was a subject of the prefect and had only delegated power, the general had hoped to remove any basis for further clashes between the two offices.

Although the revised Officium et Regulae had resolved specific issues, discontent remained. The students at Valladolid complained of their Spanish rectors; the Spanish rectors objected to Creswell's interference.⁵⁶ No matter what adaptations were made, permanent peace remained elusive. The Spanish provincials forwarded a detailed protest against the prefecture to the general in 1613. Although, according to Officium et Regulae, the English seminaries were to have Spanish rectors, the same document gave the overall control of the seminaries to the vice-prefects and the prefect who were independent of the Spanish provincials. Neither the provincials nor the rectors, therefore, could make any important decision regarding the seminaries without prior consultation with, and the consent of the prefect. The general did nothing in reply to the memorial until, in mid 1613, the Spanish assistant, Nicholas Almazán, accused Creswell not only of administrative incompetence but also of political offences. That was the proverbial final straw. For the sake of peace, the general ordered him to Flanders and replaced him in Spain with Anthony Hopkins. Acquaviva became seriously ill in 1614. During that illness, Almazán had full authority over the Spanish provinces and he summoned Creswell to Rome for an enquiry into the charges. The case was sub iudice when Acquaviva died in January 1615.

56. Cf. Henson, Registers of the English College at Valladolid 1589-1862, pp. 90-95; Edwin Henson, ed., The English College at Madrid 1611-1767 (London, 1929) CRS 29, ix-xi; A.C.F. Beales, Education Under Penalty (London, 1963) pp. 149-151; Johannes Blackfan, Annales collegii S. Albani in oppido Valesoleti, edited by J.H. Pollen, (London, 1899) pp. 16-17; Loomie, The Spanish Elizabethans, pp. 219-220; HMC Downshire 4, pp. 47-48.

Later the vicar-general, Ferdinand Alberus, exonerated Creswell.⁵⁷

Although Creswell and the English mission had weathered another storm, the most turbulent one was yet to come. But before we proceed to that controversy, a brief review of the structure and administration of the prefecture may be in order.

With the promulgation of Officium et Regulae, the administration of the English mission became more complex. The head of the quasi-provincial hierarchy was the prefect.⁵⁸ His duties were threefold: they covered personnel, finances, and public relations with the general, the provincials, the rectors, and the secular rulers. To assist him there were two vice-prefects, one in Spain and one in the Spanish Netherlands, to whom he delegated much of his authority. The vice-prefects were responsible for all matters that related to the mission in their respective areas. Since their authority was delegated, they had to consult the prefect in all major decisions.

Parsons remained the prefect until his death in 1610. Before the general named a successor, he solicited the opinions of the leading English Jesuits. For some unknown reason the appointment was delayed until 30 January 1612, on which date Thomas Owen was named the new prefect. He retained the office until his death in 1618. During his final illness, the mission's consultors had asked him to designate Richard Blount as his coadjutor, apparently with the hope that Blount would be his successor.⁵⁹ That, however, did not occur. Thomas

57. Allison, "The Later Life and Writings of Joseph Creswell, S.J. (1556-1623)," 80-84; General to Anthony Hopkins, 26 January 1613, Epp. Gen. I, f. 31v; same to William Weston, 26 February 1613, Ibid., f. 32v.

58. Cf. Appendix IV for a list of the prefects, vice-prefects and superiors of the mission.

59. General to Robert Anselmo (vere Jones), 1 May 1610, Epp. Gen. I, f. 13v; SC, MSS A, III, 3(6); Anglia IV, 54.

Fitzherbert became the third and final prefect.⁶⁰ In Spain Creswell was the vice-prefect until he was ordered to Flanders in 1613. Anthony Hopkins left Belgium for Spain in early 1613 and succeeded Creswell as the vice-prefect there. After his death in 1615, John Blackfan was ordered from Belgium as his replacement.⁶¹ The vice-prefects in Flanders changed more frequently than they did in Spain. Indeed, the work there must have been easier without the opposition of the Spanish Jesuits. William Holt was the first vice-prefect and he had held office barely a year when he died in 1599. William Baldwin followed him and remained in the office for eleven years until his seizure and forced return to England in 1610. Anthony Hopkins and John Blackfan, who held the office for two and three years respectively, relinquished it when they were transferred to Spain. Joseph Creswell was the final vice-prefect.

Superiors, consultors, and admonitors, although now subject to the prefect, continued to provide the basic constitutional structure for the Jesuits in England. After the erection of the prefecture, a new office developed: a procurator who supervised the financial matters. Henry Garnet had been the superior from the transfer of William Weston to Wisbech in 1587 until his own execution in 1606. Upon his capture, Garnet had named Robert Jones as the acting superior. Jones, however, did not wish to be the superior of the mission and asked the general to appoint Richard Holtby instead. This was done on 8 July 1606.⁶²

60. I have concluded that Fitzherbert succeeded Owen because of his assumption of the rectorship of the English College in Rome. During the prefecture, the two positions went together.

61. General to Anthony Hopkins, 26 January 1613, Epp. Gen. I, f. 31v; same to John Blackfan, 7 November 1615, Ibid., f. 55v.

62. Robert Jones to the General, May 1606, ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 651/632; General to the Jesuits on the mission, 8 July 1606, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 3v-4.

Despite his reluctance to become superior, Robert Jones was chosen as Holtby's successor on 28 March 1609. With the appointment, Jones was instructed to name Richard Blount as his socius and admonitor and to insure that Blount and the four consultors, William Wright, Anthony Hopkins, Michael Walpole, and Richard Holtby, were all easily accessible.⁶³ Jones retained the title but resigned the exercise of the office to his designated successor, Michael Walpole, on 24 November 1613.⁶⁴ With Jones' death in 1615, Walpole assumed full authority which he retained until 1617 when Richard Blount became the last superior of the mission.⁶⁵

Officium et Regulae was concerned solely with the internal administration of the Society and the regulation of the affairs of the English Jesuits who were in charge of the seminaries in Spain and Belgium, and the foreign Jesuits who were the provincials and the rectors.⁶⁶ From the very beginning, the Spanish Jesuits resented its introduction and frequently protested against its continuation. Their opposition to the

-
63. General to Robert Jones, 28 March 1609, Epp. Gen. I, f. 9; Instructions to Robert Jones, 28 March 1609, Ibid., f. 9v; same to Richard Holtby, 28 March 1609, Ibid., f. 9.
64. General to Michael Walpole, 17 August 1613, Epp. Gen. I, f. 38; ARSI, Anglia 37, f. 311ef.
65. General to Augustino Grissano (vere Michael Walpole) 7 November 1615, Epp. Gen. I, f. 56.
66. The presence of foreigners as rectors in the English seminaries has often been misunderstood. Charles Plowden, in Remarks on a Book entitled Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani (Liège, 1794) p. 93, claimed that Parsons "always preferred foreigners in the government of his seminaries, in order to spare the few English Jesuits for the great work of the mission." Aveling erroneously argued that Parsons had staffed the small seminaries "in part with friendly colleagues borrowed from the Belgian, Spanish and Italian provinces." (The Jesuits, p. 160).

prefecture must be seen as but a small part of the larger problem that they had created for the Society. Some members of the Spanish provinces had attempted to alter radically the Society's Institute. They agitated for the restriction of the general's powers, including those to appoint provincials and rectors, and the establishment of provincial chapters with the right to these appointments. As they attacked the extent of the power of the general, it was no wonder that they resented a structure that was rooted solely in that power. As the Spanish sought to increase the authority of the provincials, the prefecture restricted it.⁶⁷

Acquaviva had consistently sided with the English." He had approved modifications, confirmed the structure and reminded provincials of the rights and duties of the prefect and the vice-prefects.⁶⁸ As long as he lived the English could expect a favourable hearing. The reaction came with his death.

On 31 January 1615, Claudio Acquaviva died. The relationship between him and the Spanish provincials had long been turbulent. As a non-Spaniard, he personified the diminution of the Spanish influence in the Society. His imposition on the Spanish Jesuits of an alien missionary structure only aggravated the problem. With his death, the Spanish could hope to elect another Spaniard, regain their influence, and overthrow the missionary organization. When the Seventh General Congregation convened to elect a new general, the problems between the Spanish and the English Jesuits became an issue that concerned the whole Society.

67. Cf. Bangert, A History of the Society of Jesus, pp. 98-102, 110-113.

68. General to the Provincials of the two Belgian Provinces, 14 April 1612, Epp. Gen. I, f. 26. Francis Flerentius, the provincial when the Belgian province was divided, left a description and an explanation of the prefecture for his two successors (SC, Anglia VII, 33).

The provincial congregation of Castile submitted a postulatum to the general congregation that concerned the "more illustrious missions," viz. the independent missions.⁶⁹ Should men belonging to one mission but dispersed throughout many provinces have their own superior? If so, must he be of their nationality? Should the missionaries so dispersed be exempted from the assistants, provincials and local rectors who have authority over the area in which they resided? Should such missions be permitted to establish their own novitiates and colleges and have their own teachers and superiors? After serious deliberation, the congregation decreed that there should be no separate superior for those members of a mission that lived in another province. To have one would not only introduce a new type of government into the Society but would also lead to discrimination along national lines to the detriment of the spiritual union of the Society. Henceforth, all missionaries must be subjects of the assistants, provincials and rectors of the area. The congregation also forbade missions to establish colleges and novitiatives for the exclusive use of their own nationalities. It has always been the custom of the Society, the assembled fathers argued, to mix people from different nations and not to discriminate against one nation or in favour of another. Moreover in those cities in which the Society had already established one college, Jesuits from another nation could not demand their own teachers and superiors. This too was contrary to the custom of the Society. Thus the congregation gave a negative answer to the questions in the postulatum from Castile. The fathers believed that an affirmative answer would have had adverse effects on the whole Society, the Society's Institute, and

69. Antonio Astraín, in his brief discussion of this decree, made no mention of the specifically anti-English nature. The questions stemmed, he claimed, from the Spanish concern for the missions. Cf. Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la asistencia de España (Madrid, 1912-1920) V, 8.

the success of the mission. Finally, the congregation instructed the general to implement the decree.⁷⁰

The structure - indeed, the very existence - of the mission was threatened. If the decree were implemented, it would be a complete rejection of Acquaviva's Officium et Regulae. If the decree were implemented, the Spanish and Belgian provincials would have effective control over the mission and its future. The Spanish had not succeeded in their attempt to have a Spaniard elected general but they had apparently been more successful in their desire to abolish the English missionary structure.

Since England was a mission, it had no representation at the general congregation. Thus there was no one immediately involved in the mission to act in its defense. However some unknown Jesuit came to its aid. Questioning the motives behind the postulatam, he raised a number of objections to the decree. Many realized that, despite its avoidance of specific names, the decree was directed against the English mission.⁷¹ It would have been more just, he asserted, if the mission

70. GC VII, 6 21.

71. Much of the decree also pertained to the Irish mission. The Jesuit mission to Ireland was the first undertaken by the new Society outside of continental Europe. Paschase Broët and Alfonso Salmeron travelled to Ireland in 1540; David Wolfe and Charles Lea worked there from 1564 to 1586. The Jesuits became a permanent feature in 1598 when Christopher Holywood was named the superior of the mission. Father Corcoran claimed that the Irish mission was always independent. It is hard to prove the validity of that claim for the years prior to 1604. In that year the Irish mission assumed a structure similar to, but not as developed as that of the English mission with the promulgation of Officium et Regulae praefecti missionum in seminariis Hybernicis (ARSI, Anglia 39, pp. 241-243 and Anglia 41, ff. 33-35). For the early history of the Irish mission, cf. Timothy Corcoran, The Clongowes Record 1814-1932 (Dublin, n.d. [1933]); Timothy Corcoran, "Early Irish Jesuit Educators," Studies 29 (1940) 545-560; 30 (1941) 59-74; Fergus O'Donoghue, The Jesuit Mission in Ireland: 1598-1651 (unpublished PhD thesis, Catholic University of America, 1981). The Scots mission still has not found its historian so it is not possible to say whether it too would have been included in the congregational condemnation.

had been clearly named. If it had been, the congregation could have addressed to it any questions that it might have had regarding its unique style of government. The apologist then noted how the mission's detractors had waited for the death of Acquaviva before they had made their move. Now, at a general congregation without English representation, there was no knowledgeable person to speak in the mission's defence. Never, he continued, had the English mission ever claimed that it should be comprised solely of Englishmen. It had only asked that the mission be governed by its own members. And why should anyone object to that request? Provinces were governed by their own members who had its best interests at heart. Why should not the English request the same? The decree's implications that the English had consistently asked to be exempted from the ordinary authority of assistants and provincials were also untrue. Finally, the congregation had confused two issues. The mission had often asked that the seminarians have Englishmen for their teachers; it did not demand that all the teachers be English. The courageous vindication had little effect. To the points raised, the fathers simply replied that it was not expedient for a mission to have its own superior, that missions should be subject to assistants and provincials, and that they ought not to have their own teachers, superiors, colleges and novitiates.⁷²

Rumours concerning the fate of the mission quickly circulated. In early 1616, Joseph Creswell asked the prefect, Thomas Owen, about the stories that he had heard in Brussels. The prefect replied that he knew for certain that the congregation had passed certain decrees against the mission but he was still not sure of their content. Although England had not been specifically mentioned, Owen had no doubt

72. ARSI, Anglia 32II, ff. 1-2.

against whom the decree was directed. He had heard that all independent missions would be denied their own novitiates and colleges and placed under the control of one of the assistants.⁷³ In July, Owen wrote to Creswell that the prospects were bleak. Owen had tried to convince the general that the seminaries would not survive without the prefect and the vice-prefects. The foreign provincials, even with their limited authority, had consistently failed to assist the seminaries. Once they had full authority over them, the seminaries were doomed. Owen then suggested to Creswell that the mission prepare a memorial to defend the status quo, to respond to the charges laid against it and to demonstrate the effect that foreign control would have on the mission.⁷⁴

The English Jesuits speedily reacted to Owen's suggestion. An anonymous document, probably written by Richard Blount, was sent from England to Rome in late 1616. The apology was more a series of questions about the congregational decree than a defence of the mission. The first and the fundamental question asked whether England was included among the condemned missions. The prefecture form of government by which it has been governed for eighteen years had been established by Father Acquaviva and approved by Pope Clement VIII. Conceivably the congregation could not condemn a mission with such credentials. Although, the "vindicator" granted, the prefecture was a new form of government, was that necessarily bad? What alternative did the Society have if it had the good of the English mission at heart?

73. The decree itself said nothing about a new assistant for the missions. Owen's remark may reflect either a congregational suggestion for the implementation of the decree or their insistence that the individual institutions of missions such as the English, that were situated in different assistancies, be subject to the assistant of the area in which they were located.

74. Owen to Creswell, 21 May 1616, 2 July 1616, 30 July 1616, Rijksarchief Gent, Fonds Jezuieten 74, letters, 3, 4, 5 (microfilm at ASJ).

More importantly, the prefecture had worked and had been praised. The English Jesuits themselves never had any desire to segregate along national lines and they did not believe that their prefecture did so any more than did the provinces in Spain, Italy, and France. The mission has a novitiate and seminaries adequate for the study of the humanities, philosophy and theology. In spite of the many obstacles that the mission had encountered, it had been able to support and to sustain its institutions to the applause of the English Catholics and without considerable inconvenience to the other provinces. England had always differed from the other missions in that it had never depended on any other province. Yet, if one considered the men and the institutions, it was in better condition than some of the Society's provinces, viz. China. For the good of the Church, the Society and the mission, Father Acquaviva had erected the prefecture. In the present attempt to dismantle it, the fathers unwittingly allied themselves with the English heretics and the anti-Jesuit faction who worked for the expulsion of the Society from England.⁷⁵

A second document, again anonymous, defended the mission against the criticism voiced during the congregation. The Society's main concern should be the good of the mission and not the novelty of the administration. Whatever style of government best enabled the mission to pursue its goals should be introduced and developed. Experience has shown the prefecture to be the best suited for the mission, the conversion of England, and the glory of God, the Church and the Society. Contrary to the implied accusations, the mission had never excluded other nationalities. As a matter of fact, the mission would happily admit

75. ARSI, Anglia 32II, ff. 3-8, 479-485v.

any foreign Jesuit who could be properly employed and supported. A knowledge of English was, of course, required.⁷⁶ The apologist concluded that it had always been the custom of the Society that the men destined for a mission should be the subjects of the superior of that mission and not of the local provincial. If that practice were now changed, it would lead to the disruption and possible termination of the mission. And that would be disastrous both for the Church and for the Society because the mission has long been praised for its work in the face of persecution. To avert such a catastrophe, the author asked the general to confirm the prefecture so that the provincials could not even hope to change it. In the confirmation, the prefect's jurisdiction over the men and the possessions of the mission should be stressed. In the execution of his office, the prefect should be neither impeded nor slandered. If any problems should arise, they should be referred to the local provincial who, as Officium et Regulae

76. Early in its history, the English mission had specifically asked for foreign Jesuits. On 5 August 1580, Parsons wrote to Father Agazzari, the rector of the English College in Rome, to ask his assistance in a petition to the pope and to the general for more men and, if possible, a Spaniard and an Italian to be among them. Parsons repeated this plea in another letter to Agazzari on 17 November 1580 and in a letter to the general on 21 October 1581. Throughout 1581 and 1582, the request re-appeared in the letters. Acquaviva, in his response of 5 June 1583, was not convinced of the need for a foreign Jesuit. If the priest had to remain shut up in the Spanish embassy, it was not worth sending him. On the other hand, if he travelled around the country, his presence would be dangerous not only to himself but also to the Spanish ambassador and, perhaps, all Catholics in England. Cf. Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 46, 59, 105 footnote 28, 114; and Leo Hicks, "Cardinal Allen and the Society," The Month 160 (1932) 435-438. The request re-appeared yet again in a letter from Garnet to Parsons on 6 September 1594 (SC, Anglia I, 81; cf. also Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, p. 297). Cf. Acquaviva's letters to Allen, 28 May and 14 October 1581 in Ryan, "Some Correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85," pp. 79-85 and J.H. Pollen, ed., "Father Parsons' Memoirs" in Miscellanea IV (London, 1907) CRS IV, p. 89.

ordained, would discuss them with the prefect or the vice-prefect. Together they would remedy the situation.⁷⁷

The English realized their precarious situation. Hoping that scrupulous observance of the present rules would end the discontent, Thomas Owen instructed the English superiors to follow all regulations carefully and diligently. The rights of the local rectors and provincials must always be respected but never to such an extent that those of the vice-prefects were diminished. Any concessions to the rectors or provincials, Owen warned, would later be cited as precedents. Great care must, therefore, be exercised that there were no grounds for complaints.⁷⁸ Despite Owen's exhortations, friction remained. Creswell had a few disagreements with the Gallo-Belgian provincial, Jean Herrenius, over entertainment at St Omers and the proposed sale of some property at Watten. At the same time he had some trouble with Charles Scribani, the Flandro-Belgian provincial, over the identity of Englishmen connected with the publication of Corona Regis, a polemical work directed at King James I.⁷⁹ Each new incident presumably brought with it a plea for the implementation of the decree.

Father General Vitelleschi was caught in a dilemma. He could either implement the decree as instructed by the congregation, despite the repercussions that that would have on the mission; or he could ignore the decree because of the reasons expressed in the memorials and allow the mission to retain its present organization and, in so doing,

77. SC, Anglia VII, 32.

78. Thomas Owen to Joseph Creswell, 7 May 1616 and 21 May 1616, Rijksarchief Gent, Fonds Jezuiten 74, letters 2 and 3 (microfilm at ASJ).

79. Allison, "The Later Life and Writings of Joseph Creswell, S.J. (1556-1623)," 91-92.

risk almost certain outrage. From the beginning, Vitelleschi tended to favour the English. After Owen had outlined the dire predicament of the seminaries if Vitelleschi enforced the decree, the general confided to him that it was very clear that the mission could only survive in its existing form.⁸⁰ Some time between 1616 and 1619, Vitelleschi did more than simply acknowledge the importance of the present structure for the preservation of the mission, he confirmed certain aspects of that organization in his approval of proposals submitted to him by the English Jesuits. Although the Formulae Congregationum did not authorize representation from the missions, the general promised that, in the future, an English Jesuit could take part in any discussion of the missions at general congregations. The representative would be chosen from the men who had worked in the mission so that he would be personally aware of the conditions in England and the most beneficial style of government. He reminded the mission that no one could either enter or depart England without the approval of the vice-prefect. In England, the men must always be subject to their superior. The vice-prefects, consultors and the superior must write to the prefect and the general with the frequency prescribed in the Formula Scribendi for similar officials in the provinces. Finally, although the rector of St Omers might be from another nation, he must be devoted to the mission and its apostolates.⁸¹

Far from cutting the Gordian knot, Vitelleschi's concessions to the mission only complicated the problem. The more he ratified the prefecture, the greater the chance that he would encounter the wrath of the Spanish at the next congregation of procurators scheduled for

80. Owen to Joseph Creswell, 2 July 1616, Rijksarchief Gent, Fonds Jezuiten 74, letter 4 (microfilm at ASJ).

81. ARSI, Anglia 33I, pp. 803-804.

November 1619. According to Henry More, the province's first historian, the general resolved his dilemma by transforming the English mission into a vice-province.⁸² As a vice-province England would no longer be bound by the congregational decree on the missions.

2. The English Vice-Province

The general's proposal to create a vice-province, first raised in early 1619, was not enthusiastically welcomed by all. Charles Scribani, the Flandro-Belgian provincial, vehemently objected to the proposal. If England were made into a vice-province, their colleges and houses of probation on the continent would be subject to a superior who resided outside of the areas in which these communities were located. This would introduce yet another new style of government into the Society. One might cite examples such as the Spanish College in Naples as precedents but, Scribani insisted, upon closer examination, that would not be the case. As for the Belgian provinces, they had been plagued with problems because of a separate superior for the English. Even Father Acquaviva had originally wanted to subject the English to the local provincial, as had been the Society's custom, but the English resisted. Since then it had been impossible to create and to maintain a structure with a superior independent from the local provincial. The earlier problems in Spain were a witness to this impossibility. If the vice-province were created, there would be a number of small concrete problems. Where would the vice-provincial reside? In England? Too dangerous. In Rome? Too distant. In one of the Belgian provinces? Impossible. It would be unthinkable to have two independent superiors within one province, in one city. To which

82. Historia Anglicanae Provinciae Societatis Iesu (St Omers, 1660) pp. 436-437.

provincial congregation would the vice-provincial, the rectors and the professed fathers go? To one of the Belgian congregations? That would not be permissible since they were not subjects of the Belgian provincials. To none? That was against the custom of the Society. The presence of two superiors within one province would cause any number of problems. There would be confusing and dangerous differences in the style of administration and government, in the requirements for admission and ordination, etc. Two separate superiors could even impede any serious negotiations between the Society and the secular rulers. There was also the threat of war between England and Spain that could further complicate the situation. If England became a vice-province, there was the danger that several small houses would be established under the pretext of ministering to the English soldiers in Holland. These new houses would probably be opened in cities that already had houses of one of the Belgian provinces. That would not only be inconvenient for the Belgian provinces but also would be contrary to the congregational decree. Under whom would the English fathers in Brussels and Mechlin be -- the new vice-provincial or under the local rector? If the former, there would be more problems since those men would no longer be at the disposal of the Belgian provincials. Nonetheless, Scribani concluded, if the general approved the vice-province, he had one request: that the one English house in the province be transferred out of it. All the other English houses in Belgium were in the Gallo-Belgian province. It would be more convenient for all concerned if all the English houses were located in the same province.⁸³

83. Charles Scribani to the General, 7 June 1619, ASJ, Morris Transcripts, pp. 287-295.

Father Vitelleschi answered Scribani's letter on 13 June 1619. Thanking the provincial and the other fathers who had written about the proposal, the general had decided in favour of the vice-province, at least temporarily (saltem ad tempus) despite their objections. The English mission had so grown in size that it could no longer be governed as a mission. So it was time to institute a form of government that was in accordance with the Society's customs, Constitutions, and decrees, as had been done previously with the other major missions, most recently with China. Fearing that Archduke Albert would not permit an English vice-provincial to exercise any jurisdiction in his domain, Vitelleschi did not think that the Archduke would approve the proposal. But, to Vitelleschi's delight, the Archduke had given his permission. Ever though there would be some problems as he worked out the exact arrangements, the general asked Scribani to bear with them for the good of the Church and of the Society. The general, perhaps to pacify the Flandro-Belgian provincial, accepted one of Scribani's suggestions: the English house at Louvain would be moved. That, however, could not be done immediately. Until the move, Vitelleschi asked Scribani to treat the English Jesuits with no less charity and benevolence that he had done formerly.⁸⁴

The English mission became a vice-province in July 1619.⁸⁵ The Jesuits in England rejoiced at the news. Thomas Sackville conveyed to the general the gratitude and appreciation of the English Catholics for his recent decision.⁸⁶ The annual letter of that year recorded the

84. General to Charles Scribani, 13 June 1619, ASJ, Morris Transcripts, pp. 423-427.

85. Epp. Gen. I, f. 108.

86. General to Thomas Sackville, 12 November 1619, Epp. Gen. I, f. 116v.

reaction of the English Catholics in greater detail. The news that England had become a vice-province

raised the courage of Catholics at home, at the same time that it gave great annoyance to our adversaries; it has also brought such credit to this Society in the eyes of all ranks in England, that admission into it has never been more eagerly sought by members of the best and most noble families. Hence not a few entirely new friendships have been formed in houses of good position, and the favour has been gained of many who had been alienated from us. So great an impulse was given to the desires both of secular priests already in England, and of some of the most promising students in English seminaries abroad, that they might be admitted into the Society, that since all could not be received, it was very difficult to reject any without giving offence. The new arrangement has, moreover, given fresh energy to those who are struggling with the difficulties of their work in the English vineyard, and gathering in a fresh harvest in spite of the rage of the heretics.⁸⁷

Richard Blount, the designated vice-provincial, and other Jesuits predicted rich harvests as a result of the change in status.⁸⁸

The joy of the English Jesuits should not disguise the fact that the transition from mission to vice-province was not without some loss. The English mission had been comprised of the Jesuits in England, the English College in Rome, the seminaries and residence in Spain, and the novitiate, scholasticate and the college in Belgium. The vice-province included only the Jesuits in England and the institution in Flanders.⁸⁹ Unlike the prefect, the vice-provincial had no jurisdiction over the Spanish seminaries and the English College in Rome, although both had been integral parts of the mission. England still continued to provide

87. ASJ, Morris Transcripts, pp. 429-537, printed and translated in Letters and Notices 58 (1878) 273-288; 59 (1879) 76-83 and Foley, Records, V, 987-999.

88. General to Richard Blount, 24 August 1619, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 109v-110; same to John Percy, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 112; same to John Salisbury, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 112v; same to Richard Banks, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 113.

89. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 24 August 1619, Epp. Gen. I, f. 110.

the rectors for the English College in Rome but the college itself was subject to the Italian provincial. Although the English rectors at the College of St George in Madrid were often referred to as vice-prefects, they no longer had any such authority. The English seminaries and the English Jesuits in Spain had no superior except the provincials and the rectors in whose provinces and colleges they resided.⁹⁰ The decision to erect a vice-province had all the hallmarks of a compromise that left the English Jesuits constitutionally stronger but at the sacrifice of the controversial Spanish seminaries. We have noted how surprised Vitelleschi was when the Archduke Albert gave his permission. He and his wife, the Archduchess Isabella, joined the Elector of Cologne and the Prince of Liège in permitting an English vice-provincial to exercise authority over houses in their territories. The Archduke's permission was probably even more surprising because the King of Spain had not made comparable concessions for the English seminaries in Spain. As we have seen, Vitelleschi was not reluctant to act against a provincial's preferences. Assuming that the Spanish provincials were as opposed to the proposal as Scribani was, their resistance would not have prevented the general from including the seminaries in the vice-province unless they had received the support of the Spanish King. Presumably the king would not permit an Englishman to exercise vice-provincial jurisdiction over the communities. The general therefore transferred total control over the seminaries to the Spanish provincials.⁹⁰

The vice-province eliminated the new and disputed form of government that had been introduced by Acquaviva and replaced it with the now somewhat common vice-provincial structure. The vice-provincial

90. General to Pedro de Alarcon, 25 February 1623, in Henson, The English College at Madrid, pp. 212-213.

had full authority over the communities in the area under his jurisdiction. No longer, therefore, did he have to consult with the Belgian provincials on certain issues. He also had the right to nominate candidates for the rectorships of the different colleges. In the exercise of his office, the vice-provincial would be operating along accepted institutional principles and could not be accused either of introducing a new, unconstitutional form of government or of practicing national discrimination. The English vice-province, however, remained different in that it was independent, subject only to the general. With the creation of the vice-province, England had the security and the constitutional support that it had desired. And the Spanish had finally attained control over the English seminaries within their provinces.

Throughout the latter half of 1619, the general slowly and tentatively translated his decision into actions. At first, the general advised the vice-provincial against holding a congregation and sending a procurator to Rome. Until the time when the vice-province could safely and conveniently convene a congregation, the general preferred the English Jesuits to continue to attend the congregations of the provinces in which they lived -- one of the very points to which Scribani had most objected.⁹¹ Blount was not happy with that advice. He thought just the opposite: the new vice-province should hold its own congregation, if not in England then in

91. The Jesuits in England had held congregations throughout the later years of the sixteenth century. That congregation elected procurators to go to Rome but they did not take part in the deliberations of the congregation of procurators. His task was, simply, to inform the general of the state of the mission. On the continent, the English Jesuits had attended the congregations of the provinces in which they resided. Cf. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, p. 222; Father Scribani to John Blackfan, 12 March 1615, SC, Anglia IV, 36.

Belgium, and send a duly elected procurator to Rome. The general finally conceded a procurator but insisted that no congregation be held: it was far too dangerous to meet in England and it was impossible to hold another congregation in Belgium since there had already been one there for the Belgian Jesuits. He gave his permission, therefore, for the vice-provincial to appoint a procurator.⁹²

Because the vice-province was divided in two by the English Channel, the general thought that some arrangement should be made for the efficient administration of one half while the provincial was in the other half of the vice-province. The general chose Richard Banks to act as the vice-provincial's vicar in England and to deal with any emergencies there during Blount's absence.⁹³ In the event of any urgent business in Belgium while the vice-provincial was in England, the English rectors there should consult with the provincial of the Gallo-Belgian province.⁹⁴

The vice-provincial had a staff of two: a priest who served as his socius and admonitor, and a laybrother who assisted with the clerical work. A procurator, usually a resident in the London area, oversaw the business affairs in England. There were other procurators in foreign cities who supervised the financial investments and the vice-province's concerns there. The vice-provincial also had four

92. General to Richard Blount, 24 August 1619, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 109v-110; same to same, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 111v; same to John Percy, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 112; same to John Salisbury, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 112v; same to Richard Banks, 7 September 1619, Ibid., f. 113.

93. General to Richard Banks, 7 March 1620, Epp. Gen. I, f. 118v.

94. General to John Floyd, 26 October 1619, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 114v-115; same to John Thomson (vere Gerard), 26 October 1619, Ibid., f. 115v.

consultors to advise him on important matters. The first four, appointed by the general on 7 September 1619, were Richard Banks, John Salisbury, Thomas Anderton (vere Strange), and John Fisher, who was also the socius and the admonitor. If Fisher was unable to meet frequently with the others, the general allowed Blount to choose someone else.⁹⁵ Less than a year later, the general instructed the vice-provincial to establish four consultors both in England and on the continent so that, wherever he was, he could seek the advice of approved men.⁹⁶

After thirty-nine years, the English mission finally became a vice-province in the summer of 1619. In that year the mission numbered 212 men, 100 of whom were in England. The mission had proper facilities for the education and formation of its men in the continental houses. The endowments of these communities, along with donations and alms that the missionaries received, gave the mission financial stability. If we compare the situation of the English mission with that of the Philippines, we see immediately that its evolution was not as smooth. England had better educational and formational facilities and greater financial stability. There were more Jesuits in England than there were in the Philippines. Indeed, England, having a steady stream of domestic vocations, was not dependent on other provinces for its men. Yet the Philippines became a vice-province in 1595. If vice-provincial status had been based solely on self-sufficiency, England should have been created

95. General to Richard Blount, 7 September 1619, Epp. Gen. I, f. 111v.

96. General to Richard Blount, 2 July 1620, Epp. Gen. I, f. 122.

one earlier. Of course, the spectre of persecution had long left the ultimate stability of the mission in doubt. Because of his efforts to impress the Spanish ambassador and to secure a marriage treaty with Spain, James I was more lenient towards the Catholics in 1618/19. Nonetheless, James could not promise the repeal of the penal laws, so there was no guarantee of either complete tolerance or the mission's permanence. It was the congregation's condemnation of the prefecture and the general's subsequent entanglement that forced the issue. They were the catalysts without which the elevation to vice-provincial status would not have taken place.

3. The English Province

Within two years of the creation of the vice-province, Richard Blount petitioned for full provincial status. Some time between late 1620 and early 1621, Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld) was sent to Rome as the vice-province's procurator. He brought two so-called memorials with him. The first was from the vice-provincial and his consultors; the second, from the vice-provincial alone. Most of the issues raised in the first memorial pertained to the organization and government of the vice-province. The vice-provincial and his consultors wondered whether some permanent arrangements should be made by which the vice-provincial delegated authority to one man in each half of the vice-province to act in any emergency during the vice-provincial's absence. In case of imprisonment or execution, the memorial continued, these vicars could temporarily assume authority. Similarly the memorial asked whether there should be two sets of consultors, one set in each half of the vice-province. Finally, and most importantly, the fathers asked the general to complete the work that he has begun and elevate

England to full provincial status.⁹⁷ In the second memorial, a private one, Blount requested Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson) as his socius and asked whether he should name a new consultor since Joseph Creswell lived too far away to be of much assistance.⁹⁸

The general replied to both memorials on 24 April 1621. Although, he assured the vice-provincial, no one desired provincial status for England more than he did, the request could not be granted. With the exception of the houses in Belgium, the vice-province had no stable residences. Thus the general did not think that the vice-province had attained sufficient stability to grant the request. Besides, the general doubted that the English would be able to hold the required provincial congregations. Nevertheless the general granted the other requests. He authorized the vice-provincial to name someone in England to act as his vicar during his absence or possible imprisonment. The rector of the English College at Louvain would play the same role on the continent.⁹⁹ Because of the division of the vice-province, Vitelleschi thought it best - as he had earlier instructed the vice-provincial - to have two sets of consultors.¹⁰⁰ Regarding the private memorial, Father General denied Blount's request for Knott: the general needed his assistance too much in Rome to permit his return to England. As for Creswell, if the distance was so great that he was not able to participate in the consultors' conferences, Blount should appoint someone else.¹⁰¹

97. ARSI, Anglia 32II, ff. 129-130v.

98. ARSI, Anglia 32II, f. 133.

99. The English College at Louvain was the collegium maximum of the vice-province. Its rector always acted as the provincial's vicar unless someone else was clearly designated. Cf. GC IV, d 56.

100. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 127-128; Epp. Gen. I, ff. 135-136.

101. ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 135; Epp. Gen. I, f. 136.

Throughout the early 1620's, the vice-province continued its growth and opened still more houses on the continent. Archduke Albert had long opposed all efforts of the English Jesuits to establish a community at Watten on the property that they had received from Bishop Blaise. In 1621 he withdrew his opposition and the vice-province established a residence with Joseph Creswell as the superior. In 1623/4 the novitiate was transferred from Liège to Watten. In the same year, in compliance with Scribani's request of 1619, the scholasticate was moved from Louvain to Liège. A second new residence was opened in 1621 in Ghent. Michael Alford (vere Griffiths) was the first superior. The vice-provincial had planned to convert the Ghent residence into the tertianship. In April 1621, the general approved the proposal and instructed the vice-provincial to seek an endowment for its support. Anne Countess of Arundel provided that foundation. She endowed the tertianship with an unspecified capital sum that generated 1500 scudi (£375) annually.¹⁰² At St Omers the vice-provincial was still unable to secure the approval of the Archduke and the city magistrates for an English rector. Although the general had approved William Baldwin as the rector, it was not known whether the secular authorities would accept him. Vitelleschi suggested to Blount that he appoint a Belgian to act in Baldwin's name until they had obtained the required permissions. However, by January 1621 the authorities approved Baldwin's appointment and within a month he was installed as rector.¹⁰³ The English province now had achieved complete autonomy. Englishmen were rectors

102. General to Richard Blount, 17 April 1621, Epp. Gen. I, f. 135; ARSI Hist Soc 134, f. 91.

103. General to Richard Blount, 24 April 1621, Epp. Gen. I, f. 136v; same to same, 21 August 1621, Ibid., f. 143; same to same, 6 November 1621, Ibid., f. 147v; same to same, 4 December 1621, Ibid., f. 148v; same to William Baldwin, 8 January 1622, Ibid., f. 150; same to Richard Blount, 5 March 1622, Ibid., f. 152v.

and superiors throughout the vice-province and the English rector of Louvain, and later Liège, had replaced the Gallo-Belgian provincial as the vice-provincial's vicar in Belgium.

Besides being a period of expansion for the English vice-province, the early 1620s were an euphoric time for all English Catholics. Although negotiations between England and Spain for a marriage treaty between the Spanish Infanta and the Prince of Wales had been going on for some time, discussions had become more serious in 1619. In that year Frederick the Elector of Palatine and James I's son-in-law accepted the Bohemian crown and, in so doing, inaugurated the Thirty Years War. Now the negotiations became more urgent and more complex. James hoped to regain his son-in-law's lost territory and electoral rights through the treaty. Spain, on her part, hoped to win toleration for the English Catholics. In the treaty James agreed that the Catholics could worship freely and openly. On 23 July 1622 he ordered the Lord Keeper to free all recusants on bail. On the 25th he ordered that any security be accepted as bail for their release. Spain persistently pressed its demands that James suspend all penal laws and that the King, the Prince of Wales and the Privy Council swear never to re-impose them. James and the Privy Councillors took the oath on 20 July 1623. In August the king agreed to issue a general pardon, under the Great Seal, which any recusant convicted within the past five years could use.¹⁰⁴

104. The whole history of the Spanish match is far too complex for a thorough discussion here. For more information, cf. Gordon Albion, Charles I and the Court of Rome (London, 1935); Conrad Russell, Parliament and English Politics 1621-1629 (Oxford, 1979); Godfrey Davies, The Early Stuarts 1603-1660 (Oxford, 1959) *The Oxford History of England* 9; Roger Lockyer, Buckingham (London, 1981); Charles Carlton, Charles I: The Personal Monarch (London, 1983); and Larocca, "English Catholics and the Recusancy Laws 1558-1625: A Study in Religion and Politics."

In the midst of the marriage negotiations important changes were taking place in the English Catholic Church. On 22 June 1622 Pope Gregory XV created the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith by the bull Inscrutabili Divinae. The new congregation was given general jurisdiction over the church's missions, among which was England. Formerly England had been under the Congregation of the Holy Office.¹⁰⁵ In the same month the pope finally granted the persistent request of the English secular clergy for a bishop. William Bishop was appointed in February 1623 with the title of Bishop of Chalcedon.¹⁰⁶ Meanwhile the Jesuits deliberated a site for their first vice-provincial congregation. The general had left the choice to Richard Blount who, knowing the situation at first hand, could better decide whether England or Belgium was safer. Interestingly the fact that the two Belgian provinces would be convening congregations at the same time no longer deterred the English from considering the Belgian houses as possibilities. In his instructions for the congregation Father Vitelleschi simply reminded the vice-provincial

-
105. For more on the structure and duties of the Propaganda, cf. Peter Guilday, "The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide (1622-1922)," Catholic Historical Review 6 (1922) 478-494; Raphael H. Song, The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (Washington, D.C. 1961) Canon Law Studies 420; Ludwig von Pastor, The History of the Popes, Vol. 27 (London, 1938) pp. 129-196.
106. On the appointment of the bishop and the subsequent struggles, cf. Philip Hughes, Rome and the Counter-Reformation (London, 1942) pp. 271-430; Thomas Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America. Text Vol. 1 (London, 1907) pp. 202-232; A.F. Allison, "Richard Smith, Richelieu, and the French Marriage. The political context of Smith's appointment as bishop for England in 1624," RH 7 (1964) 148-211; Maurus Lunn, "Benedictine Opposition to Bishop Richard Smith (1625-1629)," RH 11 (1971) 1-20; A.F. Allison, "A Question of Jurisdiction. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, and the Catholic Laity, 1625-1631," RH 16 (1982) 111-145.

of the restricted authority of a procurator from a vice-province.¹⁰⁷

The vice-province held its first congregation in London, at the residence of the French ambassador in Blackfriars, from 14 to 18 May 1622. Thirty-nine Jesuits attended -- one short of the number specified. Four fathers who should have attended had been legitimately excused. Henry Silesdon was elected the procurator and John Worthington was chosen as his substitute. After a long discussion, the congregation agreed that there were no sufficient reasons for the convocation of a general congregation and instructed the procurator to vote accordingly.¹⁰⁸ Then the assembly turned towards the major issue -- a petition for provincial status.¹⁰⁹

The English Jesuits believed that they had been denied full provincial status because the general was familiar only with their communities and ministries on the continent and was relatively ignorant of their work and style of life in England. This was, they hastened to add, understandable because of the required secrecy. Nonetheless the congregation hoped to remedy this and, in so doing, to remove any argument against the creation of a province.

In 1622 there were 240 men in the vice-province, 190 of whom were priests. Of the priests, 56 were professed of the four vows -- a number that would shortly increase because of the number of worthy men. On

107. General to Richard Blount, 26 March 1622, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 154-155.

108. What say a procurator from a vice-province would have had the determination of a general congregation is not clear. The congregation of procurators voted on that issue and a vice-provincial procurator did not sit at that congregation.

109. ARSI, Congr 57, ff. 44-49, 52-54; Anglia 32I, ff. 102-104 (translated and printed as "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province," Letters and Notices 18 (1885-6) 344-351; Henry More, "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province," (being a translation of Book X Sections 1, 3, 6 of his Historia), Letters and Notices 18 (1886) 407-412, Basset, The English Jesuits, p. 165.

the continent the vice-province had a theologate/philosophate, a novitiate, a tertianship, and a regular college. The 130 fathers in England were governed by twelve immediate superiors. Each superior had under his jurisdiction several counties of the kingdom. Some of these areas were so large that they should be divided in the near future. The twelve districts had been called "missions" because of the danger of detection if a particular place and a specific house were named. Yet within each mission, there were residences and houses. In some of them a small number of children were educated. Every mission had one house in which the fathers were able to make their annual retreats and renew their vows. Although these houses had no endowments which generated a regular income, that was not because of lack of resources or paucity of benefactors. It was simply because of the lack of proper arrangements. Until such could be worked out, the Jesuits there received alms adequate for their support. With three houses, however, the proper arrangements had been made and benefactors offered to endow them with enough annual income to support their members.

This was the condition of the vice-province. It had a large number of men, many professed of the four vows, houses for formation and education on the continent, and stable residences in England. It had even demonstrated that it was capable of holding a congregation - something that had not been done by any other vice-province. Throughout its development, England had been independent and had not needed the assistance of any other province. What it had achieved, it had achieved on its own. To continue to refuse the request for promotion to full provincial status, the congregation argued, would have deleterious effects on both the mission and the men. Many

older Jesuits had been deprived of their right to elect a general and to vote on matters important to the Society. It was unjust to continue to deprive missionaries who had worked under the most perilous conditions of that right. Further delays could result in the loss of financial support. So far two potential foundations had been completely lost; others had been deferred and might be lost. Many potential benefactors had been disturbed by the rumours spread by the Society's enemies that the English Jesuits were "not considered as sons of the Society; that the Vice-Province had been granted only as an experiment, and would speedily come to an end -- if not before, certainly in the next General Congregation, or at least at the death of our Rev. Father General." They needed assurance that the Society was not going to abandon England. A previous application for provincial status had been denied on the grounds that the English Jesuits neither had nor seemed able to have residences in the country. But benefactors have since arranged for the establishment of Jesuit houses in England and provided money for three foundations. Despite the financial hardships, risks and recusant fines, the donors had been very generous to the Society. Neither they nor other possible benefactors should be disappointed. The creation of the vice-province resulted in increased applications, payment of debts, more efficient organization of the mission, the convocation of a vice-provincial congregation and numerous conversions. Who could predict the great results that would come from the creation of a province?

The rumours spread about England against the Society were interesting. Whoever disseminated them was obviously aware of the precarious position of the vice-province. As we have seen, Vitelleschi told Father Scribani that he had decided in favour of the vice-province at least temporarily. Its creation was an

experiment with no guarantee of permanence. The Society's enemies were apparently aware of the attacks on the English mission at the general congregation and were confident that the experiment would end at the next congregation. Whoever was the source of the rumours had an insider's knowledge of the problems of the English Jesuits.

The other postulata submitted by the congregation covered a wide range of issues. The vice-province asked the general to bestow authority on the twelve superiors of the missions which the vice-provincial had established in England. Then his permission was sought for the establishment of a residence at Spa to serve the English who regularly took the waters there and for chaplaincy work among the English soldiers in Flanders. The Spanish seminaries remained a concern of the vice-province even though it no longer had any jurisdiction over them. The fathers also informed the general of their attempts to preserve the good name of the Society in the controversy, which need not detain us here, that surrounded Mary Ward. Finally, they asked the general to appoint someone to write a history of the mission.

During the months immediately following the congregation, the vice-provincial forwarded to Rome explanations and descriptions of the three newly-founded communities. Unnamed benefactors had offered endowments for three houses in England. Besides the capital funds that would generate 1000 scudi (£250), 800 scudi (£200) and 600 scudi (£150) annually, the donors had already supplied the furnishings for both the houses and the chapels. They suggested that one house become a novitiate for secular priests so that they could enter the

Society without leaving England; and the other two, schools for students unable to go to the continent. All three houses would also provide sites for days of recollection, annual retreats, and short breaks for the missionaries in the neighbourhood. If one of the three did become a novitiate, the founders hoped that it would be converted into a college when the persecution finally ended. They then requested that any surplus from the annual revenues be used to aid the other missionaries and to support the scholastics at Louvain. And under no circumstances would the benefactors allow the foundations to be transferred to houses already established outside the kingdom.¹¹⁰

110. ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 96. A basic tenet in John Bossy's interpretation of Stuart Catholicism is "a shift in the balance of power in the community from the clergy . . . towards the nobility and the gentry." Noting the Jesuit desire to cultivate the gentry, Bossy argues that the Jesuit acceptance of gentry domination was a consequence. During the period of the English mission, all alms and monies collected were placed in one fund for the use of the entire mission. Later, large benefactions were "tied to areas of particular interest to the testators." As a result, the money was no longer available for the whole mission: "Largely for this reason the organisational structure of the Jesuit mission as it emerged during the reign put more stress on the local bodies known as 'districts' or 'residences' than on the centre; and this distribution was not really altered when between 1619 and 1623, the process was completed by the erection of the mission, along with its supporting establishments abroad into a full province of the Society, with Richard Blount as its first provincial." ("The English Catholic Community, 1603-1625," in Alan G.R. Smith, ed., The Reign of James VI and I (London, 1973) 91-105 and The English Catholic Community, pp. 234-235.) Bossy has misunderstood the institutional movement. The stress on local bodies was not the result of the gentry's domination of the clergy. Colleges and residences were the usual units of government in the Society. They were established in England both for reasons of more efficient government and for the stability needed for provincial status. As we shall see, the Society's Institute permitted colleges a regular source of income for the support of the students. The Jesuits outside the colleges were to live from alms. Contrary to Bossy's assertion, the founders of the first three colleges, and, indeed, the subsequent colleges also, did not restrict the revenue to specific areas but requested that any surplus be used for the other missionaries and the scholasticate at Louvain.

An accompanying document explained to the general how it was possible both to possess houses in England and to collect the revenues, be they rents or pensions, of the foundations. There was little difficulty with acquiring property. Even in Henry Garnet's day the Society had purchased a number of houses throughout England. So far there had also been no problems with either the collection or the distribution of revenues. Various English houses on the continent, including some of the Jesuit communities, had investments in England and they had been able to collect the revenues. And even during the periods of acute persecution, the secular clergy had always been able to collect their patrimonies. The penal laws themselves could be evaded through the use of trusts. Over the years Catholic lawyers had devised a system of trusts to hide actual ownership and thus to protect the foundations.¹¹¹ Convinced that funded Jesuit communities were possible, the general agreed to accept the three foundations. Even though he would have preferred that the proposed foundations be used to pay off the vice-province's debts, he ordered the drafting of the letters patent for the acceptance of the two colleges and the house of probation. To protect the donors' identities, the letters were made out on 29 November 1622 to Ignatius Philopatrum, Aloysius Germanus, and Francis Philopatrum as the founders of, respectively, the House of Probation of St Ignatius, the College of Blessed (later Saint) Aloysius, and the College of St Francis Xavier.¹¹² St Ignatius Loyola and St Francis Xavier had been canonized only on 12 March 1622, so these were two of the earliest Jesuit communities dedicated to them.

111. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 109-110v, 114-115.

112. General to Richard Blount, 20 August 1622, Epis. Gen. I, ff. 161v-162; same to same, 26 November 1622, Ibid., f. 165v; ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91.

General Vitelleschi conveyed his approval of the creation of the English province and named Richard Blount the first provincial on 21 January 1623.¹¹³ His more detailed response to the memorial was dated 8 February 1623.¹¹⁴ In view of the information submitted to him, he could no longer deny provincial status to England. He also decided that the authority ordinarily granted to rectors and superiors be given to the men who headed each mission. The exact details he left to the provincial. Because of the dangers to morals, he did not grant permission for a permanent residence at Spa but the fathers could minister there during the season. Even though Vitelleschi opposed the opening of an exclusively English house in Brussels, he encouraged the fathers there to work as chaplains among the English soldiers. He suggested that the provincial send as many men to Brussels as the work required and that they live in "some respectable lodging in secular dress." The permission to wear secular dress was a constant source of irritation to the Belgian Jesuits. Vitelleschi highly approved of the vice-province's regard for the reputation of the Society and fervently desired that the provincial appoint someone to record the history of the mission, a glorious chapter in the annals of the Society.

4. Conclusions

The long arduous progress from mission to province ended in 1623.

-
113. Epp. Gen. I, ff. 167v-168. In Appendix V, I have given a list of the English provincials in the seventeenth century.
114. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 125-126 (translated and published as "The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province," 351-353).

For forty-three years, the English mission had survived somewhat precariously on the institutional fringe of the Society. It had been the Society's first permanent independent mission and, as such, an exception to the customary style of government. After its re-organization into a prefecture, the mission had been condemned as a novelty but had endured the criticisms, the objections and the threats of the other provinces -- which were potentially more damaging to the mission's organization and future than anything done by the English government. Its survival in the face of fierce Spanish opposition testified to the Society's fidelity to Ignatius' insistence on the priority of the apostolate. The English Jesuits had demonstrated their self sufficiency and stability -- and in a religious and political situation more dangerous than that in any other province. The English Society was more alive and vibrant when it became a province than the Philippines had been. Despite possessing fewer men, only one college, limited facilities for formation and a strong dependence on other provinces for men, the Philippines became a province eighteen years before England. England had to wait for external events, the death of Cardinal Allen, the congregational condemnation, and the prospects of a Spanish match, to shape its institutional future. But that was past. 1623 was a year of hope. The long-anticipated marriage between the Spanish Infanta and the Prince of Wales had been arranged. The creation of the province, we are told, brought joy to many Catholics and an increase of alms to the Society.¹¹⁵ With two colleges and one novitiate already in England and preparations for the transfer of the tertianship from Ghent to

115. General to Richard Blount, 29 April 1623, Epp. Gen. I, f. 173; same to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow), 27 May 1623, Ibid., f. 173v; same to William Saville (vere Whichcott), 27 May 1623, Ibid., f. 174v.

Carlisle afoot,¹¹⁶ the English Jesuits were prepared to take full advantage of all the opportunities that would result from the marriage.

B. The Administration of the English Province

The English province anticipated few problems with its government since hopes of toleration were running high. Once the penal laws had been revoked, the English would be able to implement the Institute as carefully and as conscientiously as any other province. Their hopes were apparently frustrated when the Spanish marriage treaty was broken but negotiations for a similar treaty with the French immediately replaced those with the Spanish and once again King James and the Prince of Wales promised to grant their Catholic subjects complete freedom from persecution. However, despite the marriage between Prince Charles and Henrietta Maria in 1625, the penal laws were back in force in 1626. That changed the province's prospects. Without toleration, the daily administration of the province would be difficult, perhaps impossible. Could the province function in the face of the penal laws and popular anti-Catholicism of seventeenth century England? For the remainder of this chapter, I shall focus on two aspects of the ordinary administrative life of the province to see how well it was able to operate amidst the religious and political changes. The aspects chosen are the appointment of provincials and their use of delegates and vicars during emergencies, and the convocation of provincial congregations, their location, and their concerns, that is, the postulata that they submitted to the general. As we shall see,

116. General to William Saville (vere Whichcott), 12 August 1623, Epp. Gen. I, f. 178; same to Richard Blount, 12 August 1623, Ibid., ff. 179-180; same to same, 9 September 1623, Ibid., ff. 181-182; ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91.

these postulata varied considerably in importance, ranging from the oath of allegiance to the celebration of feasts. The rest of this chapter will be subdivided into provincialates. In each subdivision, the above mentioned topics will be discussed.

1. Richard Blount, 1623-1635

The province convened its first congregation in 1625. Forty Jesuits assembled in London and met from 7-11 February.¹¹⁷ Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), a man who will re-appear often in the administrative history of the province over the next thirty years, was elected the procurator and John Salisbury his substitute. At the congregation of procurators, he was commissioned to vote against a general congregation. The major issues that concerned the province were finances, which will be treated in a later chapter, the Spanish seminaries, the new oath at the English College, and "schismatic behaviour" in England.

To begin with, the fathers pleaded with the general to do all he could to improve the relations between the English and the Spanish provinces lest the English seminaries suffer. Vitelleschi promised to do all he could in that regard. For reasons that need not detain us, in 1625 the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith imposed a new oath on all students at pontifical colleges. In addition to a promise to return to their country after the completion of their studies, the seminarians were to pledge not to enter any religious order or congregation within three years of their return without papal permission.

117. The provincial, Richard Blount, had decided that it was not safe for John Gerard to come to England for the congregation and declared that he was legitimately impeded and, thus, excused. Angered by that decision, Gerard complained to the general. Vitelleschi advised him to accept Blount's judgement (General to John Thomson (vere Gerard), 26 April 1625, Epp. Gen. I, f. 217.

Although the general commiserated with the England, there was nothing that he could do to alter it. The oath of allegiance and attendance at Protestant services remained two important and controversial issues that divided the Catholic community.¹¹⁸ The English Jesuits were strongly opposed to both. Hoping to retain their united front, the congregation asked the general that he allow no Jesuit to come to England without a prior warning that he must not depart from the province's views on these issues. Presumably the fathers intended this instruction for foreign Jesuits because the provincial would have been capable of monitoring the views of his subjects. The general agreed to the request.¹¹⁹

For unspecified reasons, but clearly ones unacceptable to the general, neither the procurator nor the substitute was able to get to Rome for the congregation of procurators in November 1625. Apparently neither Knott nor Salisbury was able to leave England. Having exercised his prerogative by establishing the England province, the general was annoyed by the failure of the English to attend the first congregation of procurators to which they had the right of attendance. Vitelleschi expected that their absence would further the opposition of some of the procurators to the establishment of the province and hoped that the English would not have any cause to regret their

118. For much of the controversy that surrounded the oath of allegiance, cf. Maurice Lunn, "English Benedictines and the Oath of Allegiance, 1606-1647," RH 10 (1969-1970) 146-164; "The Anglo-Gallicanism of Dom Thomas Preston, 1557-1647," in Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest, edited by Derek Baker (Cambridge, 1972) Studies in Church History 9, pp. 239-246; Clarence J. Ryan, "The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance and the English Lay Catholics," The Catholic Historical Review 29 (1942) 159-183; Thomas Clancy, "English Catholics and the Papal Deposing Power 1570-1640," RH 6 (1961-1962) 114-140, 205-227; 7 (1963-1964) 2-10.

119. ARSI, Congr 59, ff. 111-121.

absence.¹²⁰

The second provincial congregation gathered in London from 3-6 February 1628. Because the Belgian rectors and many of the professed fathers in the Belgian houses had been excused, a number of professed fathers from the vicinity had been invited to raise the total to forty. Because of the absence of so many, the congregation worried about its validity. Could the provincial and his consultors judge that so many men, and indeed so many rectors, were legitimately impeded and, thus, excused from the congregation? After the explanation of the absence of so many, the congregation accepted the provincial's decision and declared itself legitimate. Edward Knott, one of those absent in Belgium, was again elected the procurator and Laurence Anderton was his substitute. As regards a general congregation, the English Jesuits argued that there were no grounds for convening one. The provincial congregation simply submitted three postulata for the general's consideration. Father Vitelleschi was asked to write to the Duke of Bavaria to thank him for his recent endowment of the college at Liege. This the general did happily. Although the general appreciated the province's zeal in its desire to embark on a mission to convert the natives in America, in response to the second request, he suggested that the provincial and his consultors explore the venture more thoroughly before they made any decision. Thirdly, the English Jesuits asked the general to do all he could to heal the present scandalous dispute between the Bishop of Chalcedon and the regulars. Although Vitelleschi did not know what else he could do,

120. General to Richard Blount, 17 January 1626, Epp. Gen, I, f. 226; same to John Norton (vere Knatchbull), 17 January 1626, Ibid., f. 226v; same to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow), 17 January 1626, Ibid., f. 227.

he promised to continue his efforts.¹²¹

Worried that the English delegate might again fail to appear at the congregation of procurators, Vitelleschi forbade Knott to visit England until his substitute had safely arrived in Belgium. Thus if the procurator were captured, the substitute was still safe and could replace him.¹²²

To the congregational postulata, the procurator attached a private memorial regarding provincial congregations. Should the province convoke congregations less frequently, i.e. every five years, to avoid unnecessary risks? Would it be permissible to hold the congregations in either October or November because, during those months, many came to London from all parts of England and the Jesuits could gather together in one place without arousing suspicion? Since the Institute did not specify the dates of provincial congregations, Vitelleschi replied, there was no reason for a dispensation. The provincial could designate any date for the congregation. If it were more convenient to call them for October or November, the provincial could do so. If the Province, he continued, wished to hold the congregation less frequently, the provincial should submit a more detailed memorial to that effect.

The province did not pursue Knott's request for less frequent congregations and continued to follow the regulations laid down in the Formulae. Only thirty-four Jesuits attended the next congregation held in London from 8-11 November 1630. To raise the total to the prescribed forty, six professed fathers from the vicinity were called.

121. ARSI, Congr 60, ff. 274-280.

122. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 22 April 1628, Epp. Gen. I, f. 272v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 22 April 1628, Ibid., f. 273.

John Worthington, the procurator, and Alexander Fairclough, the substitute, were instructed to vote against a general congregation. No postulata were sent to Rome. The fathers simply asked the general, in the name of the whole Society, to thank the Holy Roman Emperor for the new séminary which he proposed to bestow on the English province.¹²³

One of the many victims of the Thirty Years War was the proposed English seminary at Osnabrück. In 1629, the Emperor Ferdinand II issued the Edict of Restitution which ordered the restoration of all ecclesiastical property appropriated by the Protestants since 1552. Even before the edict was promulgated, the Catholics began to bicker among themselves over the disposal of the land. The old orders, to whom the land had originally belonged, insisted on its return to them. The new orders, especially the Jesuits, thought that some, if not all, the property should be used to endow new colleges and seminaries. Father Lamormaini, the emperor's Jesuit confessor, was one of the latter. He foresaw an extensive transfer of property to the Society to be used for the establishment of the Jesuit colleges that he considered essential for the re-conversion of Germany.¹²⁴ It was probably through the influence of Father Lamormaini that the English province became the beneficiary of the monastery. Father Vitelleschi first informed the English provincial of the emperor's intention to assign to the English Jesuits a former monastery at Osnabrück in October 1630 and suggested that Blount appoint someone to make the proper arrangements. Robert Stafford (vere Stanford) worked on the project for six months and was succeeded by Henry Silesdon in 1632. Plans for the seminary were

123. ARSI, Congr 62, ff. 238-243.

124. For a more thorough exposition of the Edict and the battle for the restored land, cf. Robert Bireley, S.J., Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counter-Reformation. Emperor Ferdinand II, William Lamormaini, S.J., and the Formation of Imperial Policy (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1981), pp. 133-150.

drawn up. It was to be organized along the same lines as those in Spain. The seminary would be under the jurisdiction of the provincial in whose territory it was located but with a rector and staff of the nation it served.¹²⁵ The intervention and the subsequent success of King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden negated all the plans.

Throughout the tenure of his office, Richard Blount resided in England. Because of the earlier instructions, he had to designate someone to act as his vicar in Belgium. Ordinarily it would have been the rector of the collegium maximum but Edward Knott had been the vice-provincial in Belgium since the creation of the province. In the spring of 1629, Knott crossed into England to consult with Blount. Captured at port as he attempted to enter England in April, Knott was imprisoned in the Clink until January 1632 when he was exiled to Belgium through the intercession of a Monsieur Bescarit, an agent of the King's mother-in-law. By February 1632, Knott had reclaimed his office from Michael Freeman, who had replaced him as the vice-provincial during his imprisonment.¹²⁶ Throughout the summer and autumn of that year, the general consulted the provincial over possible successors and on the present arrangement of a provincial in England with a vice-provincial in Belgium. During the discussion, it was very clear that the most likely candidate for provincial was Edward Knott. He had the experience and the talent but problems in the Belgian houses prevented him, at least temporarily, from assuming office. Shortly after Knott had returned to his vice-provincial office, an unspecified

125. General to Richard Blount, 16 October 1630, Epp. Gen. I, f. 319v; same to Robert Stafford (vere Stanford), 5 April 1631, Ibid., f. 329v; same to same, 26 April 1631, Ibid., f. 331v; same to same, 19 July 1631, Ibid., f. 334; same to Blount, 19 July 1631, Ibid., f. 335v; same to same, 3 January 1632, Ibid., f. 343.

126. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 28 April 1629, Epp. Gen. I, f. 293v; same to Richard Blount, 21 July 1629, Ibid., f. 297; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 10 April 1632, Ibid., f. 347v; same to Blount, 10 April 1632, Ibid., f. 348v; ~~16/140/59; 16/210/59.~~

domestic dispute broke out at St Omers. Knott intervened and reversed the rector's ruling. Factions quickly formed. In May 1633, General Vitelleschi ordered Blount to reprimand Knott for his imprudence and to visit St Omers to restore order. The general clearly placed all responsibility for the disturbance at Knott's feet and hence had some doubts about his suitability for the office of provincial.¹²⁷

The province held another congregation in the spring of 1633 but nothing is known of its location and concerns because of the loss of its acts. The only extant record is the general's response to the memorial brought by the procurator, John Worthington, to Rome in November 1633. The memorial dealt primarily with the search for a new provincial. Blount had asked to be relieved of his office and, despite the troubles in Belgium, still thought that Knott should succeed him. In the response of 17 December 1633, the general asked Blount to remain in office for a little longer until he could find a suitable replacement. The general then confessed that he had some hesitations about Knott because, besides his indiscretions at St Omers, Knott was apparently not well known to the Society's patrons in England and had no competence in the financial aspects of the job.¹²⁸ He therefore asked Blount and his consultants to reconsider the matter.

127. General to Richard Blount, 23 October 1632, Epp. Gen. I, f. 359v; same to Robert Stafford (vere Stanford), 12 March 1633, Ibid., f. 367v; same to Blount, 2 April 1633, Ibid., f. 368v; same to same, 28 May 1633, Ibid., f. 370; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 11 June 1633, Ibid., f. 373v same to Blount, 11 June 1633, Ibid., f. 374; same to same, 3 September 1633, Ibid., f. 379v; same to Gabriel Freeman (vere Richard Banks), 1 October 1633, Ibid., f. 380v; same to Stafford, 29 October 1633, Ibid., f. 381.

128. ARSI, Congr 62, ff. 244-245; Epp. Gen. I, f. 387.

Meanwhile he agreed with them that there was no need to maintain a vice-provincial in Belgium as long as the provincial was able to visit the houses there annually.¹²⁹ More than a year later, Henry More was named the second provincial.¹³⁰

2. Henry More, 1635-1639¹³¹

In early 1636, there was considerable doubt throughout the Society as to the feasibility of convening a congregation of procurators that November. By March, however, the general had decided that it would be possible to hold one. The advent of a provincial congregation in preparation for the congregation of procurators raised the issue of the Jesuits in Belgium. To the distress of these men, the provincial and his consultors had judged that they were legitimately impeded and thus excused from attendance. Uncertain about the justice of this procedure, More sought the general's advice. Had the provincial and his consultors the authority to decide whether any professed member of the province and any rector were legitimately prevented from attending a congregation or could only the congregation decide the issue? By confirming that a provincial and his consultors had the authority, the general quelled More's fears.¹³² More then decided that, for reasons of expediency and safety, the fathers in Belgium were excused from the congregation that met in London from 15-18 May 1636. The fathers elected Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow) the

129. General to Richard Blount, 28 January 1634, Epp. Gen. I, f. 392.

130. General to Richard Blount, 11 August 1635, Epp. Gen. I, f. 412v; same to Henry More, 11 August 1635, Ibid., f. 413.

131. Cf. Francis Edwards, S.J., "Henry More, S.J.: Administrator and Historian, 1586-1661," AHSI 41 (1972) 233-281 for a more detailed analysis of certain aspects of his career.

132. General to Henry More, 15 March 1636, Epp. Gen. I, f. 432v.

procurator and Michael Alford (vere Griffiths) the substitute, and voted against a general congregation. Alacambe protested his election and submitted a number of reasons why he should not represent the province but the congregation rejected them all and insisted on the validity of his election.¹³³ Of the postulata, the most important pertained to finances and this will be discussed in a later chapter.

The Belgian fathers were again excused from the congregation that met in London from 18-22 January 1639. The total number of Jesuits in attendance was forty-one -- the Queen Mother's confessor, Jean Suffren, was the extra man. Indeed, his very presence became an issue. As the congregation approached, Henry More did not know whether or not to admit him. He had written to the general for his advice but, because of the troubles in Scotland, he had to move forward the date of the congregation and had not received a reply to his query. The provincial and his consultors, then, decided to invite Suffren but denied him active voice. As it happened, the general had written to More to inform him that Suffren had no right to attend the English congregation but, since the letter had not arrived in time, Vitelleschi accepted More's explanation and declared the congregation valid. Michael Alford (vere Griffiths) and Christopher Greenwood were elected procurator and substitute respectively. Again the assembly voted against a general congregation. The Spanish seminaries remained a continual worry and a number of postulata concerned them. No matter what happened, the general reminded More, he could not appoint an Englishman rector over the seminaries because of the opposition of the Spanish King.¹³⁴

133. ARSI, Congr 65, ff. 465-496.

134. ARSI, Congr 66, ff. 225-247v; 289-290; General to Henry More, 29 January 1639, Epp. Gen. I, f. 484v; same to same, 12 March 1639, Ibid., f. 487v.

More had petitioned the general in 1638 to be relieved of his office but the general had urged him to stay on while the consultors discussed a successor. To no one's surprise, Edward Knott was declared the new provincial in June 1639.

* * * * *

Even though their hopes for complete toleration had been frustrated, the English Catholics enjoyed considerable freedom from persecution between the later years of James I and 1640. Between 1625 and 1640, only three Catholics were executed and thanks to the protection of the Queen and the presence of a Roman agent few other Catholics suffered for their religion. Indeed, many agreed that the Catholics had not fared so well since the reign of Queen Mary. Throughout this period the English province was dynamic and active. The Society was consistently able to gather forty Jesuits together in London with impunity, even though the Jesuits stationed in Belgium were ordinarily excused. So confident was the provincial that he could travel to Belgium annually that the post of vice-provincial for Belgium was abolished in 1634. Between the creation of the province in 1623 and the end of More's provincialate in 1639, the province had grown by more than one hundred men, from 242 to 350¹³⁵ and the number of Jesuits working in England had risen from 138 to a remarkable 193. This was a time of optimism and expansion as the province searched for new opportunities. Just as hopes for a new seminary were being crushed under the marching feet of the Swedes, new vistas opened in the west when the mission to Maryland was approved in December 1633. However there were also problems. The Spanish seminaries were a continual

135. Cf. Appendix VI for a list of the total number of Jesuits in the province and in the mission. The list is based on the provincial catalogues.

cause of worry and the province frequently asked the general to protect them. The oath of allegiance and the claims of the Bishop of Chalcedon continued to divide the English Catholics. The English Jesuits also considered the new missionary oath required at the pontifical seminaries insulting and unwarranted. And though these issues could be resolved, other clouds were forming. Hints of popish plots and Catholic intrigues aroused the populace; and Charles I's mounting troubles with Scotland would eventually affect more than just the date of the provincial congregation.¹³⁶

3. Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 1639-1646

A competent theologian and an able administrator, Edward Knott dominated the English province in the middle of the seventeenth century. His controversial works were so effective that Archbishop Laud commissioned William Chillingworth, a one-time convert of the Jesuit John Fisher (vere Percy), to refute them. But even before Chillingworth's The Religion of Protestants appeared in 1637, Knott had replied to it with A Directive to be Observed by N.N. in 1636. In this work Knott's assertion that the Laudian appeal to patristic evidence paved the way for eventual reunion with Rome so outraged the Archbishop that he demanded Knott's expulsion. With the protection of Queen Henrietta Maria and George Con, the papal agent, Knott was able to remain in England until 1639.¹³⁷

Knott was out of the country when he was chosen to succeed More as provincial. The appointment was not an universally popular one.

136. For the increasing fears of the Catholics and the part that they played in the drift towards civil war, cf. Hibbard, Charles I and the Popish Plot, and Anthony Fletcher, The Outbreak of the English Civil War (London, 1981).

137. Hibbard, Charles I and the Popish Plot, pp. 67-68.

A number of lay people were disturbed by it because of Knott's outspoken role as a controversialist and the king was especially opposed, threatening to enforce the penal laws against Knott if he should attempt to return to England. General Vitelleschi was caught off guard and surprised by the reaction. He had been aware that Knott's books had infuriated both Charles and Laud but, as three years had elapsed since the offending book's publication, the general had assumed that the storm had passed. Indeed, Vitelleschi had even thought that Knott had won the king's favour because of his support for the collection taken among the Catholics to alleviate the king's expenses in the Scottish wars. Knott meanwhile was advised to remain in Belgium and to allow Henry More to act as the vice-provincial in England. The general asked Jean Suffren, the Queen Mother's confessor, to use his influence with both her and her daughter, Henrietta Maria, to intercede with the king in Knott's favour.¹³⁸

The province began its preparations for a congregation in March 1642. Because the political tensions in England added extra dangers, the provincial decided to convene the congregation in Belgium. This inverted the perennial problem of attendance. Would the fathers in England be judged legitimately impeded and excused as the Belgian fathers had been in the previous congregations? Prompted by Henry More, the general instructed Knott to set aside a few places for those fathers from England who could attend.¹³⁹ The congregation gathered at Ghent from 31 July to 6 August 1642 with Henry More and a few other Jesuits from England in attendance. Henry More was, in fact, elected

138. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 8 October 1639, Epp. Gen. I, f. 497, same to Henry More, 14 January 1640, Ibid., f. 501; same to Jean Suffren, 14 January 1640, Ibid., f. 501v; same to More, 21 January 1640, Ibid., f. 503; same to Knott, 28 January 1640, Ibid., f. 503; same to Suffren, 5 May 1640, Ibid., f. 507.

139. General to Henry More, 15 March 1642, Epp. Gen. II, f. 3v; same to same, 23 August 1642, Ibid., f. 7v.

the procurator and Robert Stafford (vere Stanford) the substitute. The fathers voted against a general congregation and submitted a number of postulata on domestic and institutional issues. They had some doubts as to the proper constitution of a provincial congregation. One section of the Formulae stipulated that forty or fifty Jesuits were required for provincial congregations, the exact number depending on the purpose of the congregation; but another section implied that a congregation was valid as long as two-thirds of the prescribed number attended. Which was correct? How many, the congregation asked, were needed to make a valid congregation? What would happen if, because of war, storms, etc, fewer than twenty-seven Jesuits with active voice, that is two-thirds the required number, could attend a congregation? The general replied that, although such congregations would be incomplete, they were still valid even if there were fewer than twenty-seven Jesuits with active voice. In those cases, the English persisted, when a congregation could not be convened and the procurator was appointed by the provincial and his consultors, did all the consultors have a say in the decision or only those consultors who would have had active voice if a congregation had been held? Only those with active voice should be consulted, the general replied. Regarding provincial congregations, the general further informed the province that, although superiors must accept any suggestions from their communities for topics to be discussed at the provincial congregations, the superior was not obliged to forward these suggestions to a substitute if one were sent in his place.¹⁴⁰

Shortly after the close of the congregation the provincial announced his intention of returning to England. It was his duty, he

140. ARSI, Congr 69, ff. 315-328.

argued, to visit the men regardless of the dangers involved. The general, however, had some hesitations about the trip and insisted that Knott secure the approval of his consultants before he crossed the channel. Around 16 June 1643 Knott arrived safely in England and remained there for fifteen months. Using London as his base, he visited the Jesuit houses throughout the country. As a precaution, however, Henry More had written to the Queen about Knott's return. It is not known whether she relayed the information to her husband. By September the provincial was back in Belgium.¹⁴¹

Father General Mutius Vitelleschi died on 9 February 1645. For the first time in its twenty-two year history, the English province held a congregation to elect delegates to a general congregation. Ghent was again the site for the assembly, which lasted from 6-13 July. Henry Silesdon and Henry More were chosen to accompany the provincial. Francis Forster, Thomas Babthorpe and Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb) were the substitutes. The plight of many provinces, including the English, torn by wars, was the concern of many of the postulata. Could the general find some way by which the wealthier provinces could share their assets and thus alleviate the sufferings of other Jesuits? To do so would strengthen the union of the Society and increase its esteem among non-Jesuits. Other provinces raised similar questions, with the result that the general congregation passed a number of decrees to deal with the problem.

141. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 4 October 1642, Epp. Gen. II, f. 9; same to same, 4 April 1643, Ibid., f. 14; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 18 July 1643, Ibid., f. 21; same to same, 1 August 1643, Ibid., f. 21v; same to Henry More, 26 September 1643, Ibid., f. 27v; same to Knott, 20 February 1644, Ibid., f. 36; same to same, 18 June 1644, Ibid., f. 41; same to same, 24 September 1644, Ibid., f. 50.

Another issue raised by the English and other provinces pertained to the fourth vow. The congregation was asked to tighten the requirements for profession: and the congregation did so. Since the general congregation judged the Institute clear, it did not consider it necessary to pass new regulations in response to England's request for an explication of the grounds for dismissal. Other postulata were given to the new general, Vincent Carrafa. Among them was the request that the English Catholics who had died for their faith over the past hundred years be declared martyrs. Before the process for beatification could be initiated, the general reminded the province, more was needed than a simple request. If the province wished to begin the proceedings, the general would be willing to act. He awaited further instructions. Since I have found no subsequent reference to this petition, the province apparently did not forward the requested instructions.¹⁴²

Edward Knott designated Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow) the vice-provincial in his absence at the general congregation. While Alacambe was serving in that capacity, he died on 6 February 1646. Francis Forster replaced him until the return of the provincial.¹⁴³

During the general congregation, Pope Innocent X issued the bull Prospero felicique statui, which severely restricted the ordinary government of the Society. We need not consider the reasons here, suffice it to say that henceforth the Society was required to convene general congregations every nine years and to restrict the terms of

142. ARSI, Congr 70, ff. 120-128.

143. General to Francis Forster, 24 March 1646, Epp. Gen. II, f. 73.

all superiors, with the exceptions of the general and novice masters, to three years. Furthermore, eighteen months must have expired before a man could be re-appointed to another position as superior. Because of the new regulation, the majority of the province's incumbents had to be replaced. Henry Silesdon was the general's first choice as Knott's replacement but he feared that the Countess of Arundel would not relinquish him as her chaplain.¹⁴⁴ If she would not, the second choice was George Duckett (vere Holtby). When Silesdon had been informed of the general's selection, he availed himself of his right to represent to the general his reasons for opposing the appointment. But since the papal bull forced Knott to resign his office before the issue had been resolved, the latter appointed George Duckett (vere Holtby) vice-provincial in August. He was to remain in that position until a definite decision had been made. The general remained in a quandary: he could not decide whether to insist on Silesdon or to accept his plea and appoint Duckett. In September Carrafa sent letters patent to Knott for both men and asked Knott to decide between them. Henry Silesdon became provincial in late October.¹⁴⁵

4. Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 1646-1650

Silesdon's reluctance to take over as provincial did not abate after his appointment. Travelling to England shortly after the attempt of a few Catholics and Independents to reach a modus vivendi had exploded into controversy, Silesdon brought Knott with him as his

144. This is but one illustration of a wider problem of secular involvement in the Society's affairs, a topic that will be covered briefly in the conclusions.

145. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 2 June 1646, Epp. Gen. II, f. 74v; same to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 1 September 1646, Ibid., f. 77v; same to Knott, 1 September 1646, Ibid., f. 77v; same to George Duckett (vere Holtby), 1 September 1646, Ibid., f. 78; same to Silesdon, 8 December 1646, Ibid., f. 81.

adviser on the subject.¹⁴⁶ At this time, Silesdon suggested to the general that he remain in office for six more months and then resign in favour of Knott, who would by then have been out of office for the prescribed eighteen months. Carrafa adamantly rejected the suggestion and informed Silesdon that he must serve a complete term.¹⁴⁷

In 1648 the English province had its first official visitation.¹⁴⁸ General Carrafa designated Alexander Gottifredi as visitor to the Belgian provinces and to the "cismarine" English houses. Originally the general intended to send Henry More as the visitor's socius for the English houses but More's involvement in the recent, controversial agreement between certain Catholics and the Independents, an agreement condemned by the Papacy, resulted in Knott being chosen instead. The socius, the general emphasized, must accompany the visitor to the English houses only; he was not to go to the Belgian communities. Since Silesdon was still in England, Carrafa urged him to do all he could to cross over into Belgium to meet the visitor. He finally did so in December 1648.¹⁴⁹ Once there, the provincial discussed a number of administrative details with Father Visitor: the next rectors for a number of colleges, possible successors to the provincial, and the number of novices to be accepted. The issue, however, that sent shudders down Silesdon's spine was the visitor's suggestion that the English and the Belgian provinces should open a common novitiate.

146. Cf. Thomas H. Clancy, S.J., "The Jesuits and the Independents, 1647," AHSI 40(1971) 67-90 for the complete story.

147. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 14 December 1647, Epp. Gen. II, f. 97.

148. His instructions can be found in ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 1441/5/3.

149. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 29 February 1648, Epp. Gen. II, f. 101v; same to Henry More (cancelled), 29 February 1648, Ibid., f. 102; same to Silesdon, 30 January 1649, Ibid., f. 117.

The general himself became interested in that proposal and solicited the views of the three provincials involved. Once the general had their replies, he himself would make the final decision. As the province awaited the general's decision, it prepared for the next provincial congregation. Because of the conditions in England, Silesdon did not think that even a small number of the Jesuits stationed there would be able to attend. The general advised him to consult with the visitor on the practicality of a congregation and to follow the visitor's suggestion. As the different parties deliberated the two distinct issues, General Carrafa died on 8 June 1649. His death and the consequent general congregation made the convocation of a provincial congregation even more important, as the vicar-general explained to Silesdon. The visitor's powers expired with the death of the general so, to Silesdon's relief, the province had nothing to fear about a joint novitiate; and because of the general's death the vicar general asked for, and received, a papal indult that allowed rectors and provincials to remain in office beyond their three-year term until the election of a new general. So Henry Silesdon was compelled to remain in office even longer.¹⁵⁰

The provincial congregation met at Watten from 9-15 September 1649. Despite the original fears to the contrary, fifty Jesuits,

150. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 6 March 1649, Epp. Gen. II, f. 118v; same to Francis Forster, 27 March 1649, Ibid., f. 119v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 27 March 1649, Ibid., f. 119v; same to Silesdon, 17 April 1649, Ibid., f. 120v; same to same, 24 April 1649, Ibid., f. 121; same to same, 15 May 1649, Ibid., f. 121; same to same, 22 May 1649, Ibid., f. 122; vicar general to Silesdon, 19 June 1649, Ibid., f. 123v; same to Henry Stafford, 19 June 1649, Ibid., f. 124; same to Silesdon, 31 July 1649, Ibid., f. 125; same to Forster, 15 August 1649, Ibid., f. 125; same to Silesdon, 21 August 1649, Ibid., f. 125v; same to Henry More, 21 August 1649, Ibid., f. 125v; same to Forster, 28 August 1649, Ibid., f. 125v.

including a number from England, were able to attend. Michael Alford (vere Griffiths) and Thomas Babthorpe were the elected delegates with Francis Forster, Robert Stafford (vere Stanford) and Edward Courtney (vere Leedes) their substitutes. The postulata dealt with some of the complexities of the Institute. The fathers asked the general congregation to clarify the criteria for eligibility to represent the province at either a congregation of procurators or a general congregation. As a result of the query, the general congregation passed a decree on the matter. Even though England, along with other provinces, had petitioned the general congregation to ask the pope to declare the feast of St Ignatius a double feast for the entire church and the feast of St Francis Xavier at least a semi-double for the whole church,¹⁵¹ the general congregation did not discuss this because it had come up in the previous congregation. Worried about the sheer bulk of the Institute, the English province asked both that the less important decrees be eliminated and that an index be compiled. It was not possible to do the former, the congregation replied, but an index was ready and would be sent to all the provinces shortly.¹⁵² Other questions regarding finances that were raised in a private memorial to the general, will be treated in later chapters.

The general congregation opened on 13 December 1649. When Silesdon had begun his journey to Rome in late November, he delegated

151. A double feast is the rank of the more important festivals of the liturgical calendar, so called because the antiphon is doubled for each psalm, i.e. repeated in full before and after each psalm. A semi-double is not as important. In the office on those feasts the antiphon is not read in full.

152. ARSI, Congr 72, ff. 356-364.

Francis Forster the vice-provincial until his return. He had not travelled far before he came down with a serious illness and was forced to return to St Omers. Francis Forster, the first substitute, was sent to Rome in his place. While the general congregation was still in session, the newly-elected Francis Piccolomini appointed Forster the new provincial.¹⁵³

5. Francis Forster, 1650-1653

Shortly after the new general had established himself in his office he named Florence Montmorency, a former provincial of both the Gallo- and the Flandro-Belgian provinces, to complete Gottifredi's visitation of the Belgian houses. Like his predecessor, Montmorency was not authorized to visit the houses in England.¹⁵⁴ Since there were no complaints mentioned in the general's letters, the visitation must have passed uneventfully with no suggestion of a joint novitiate.

General Piccolomini died on 17 June 1651 and the English province planned its congregation for late September. The civil disturbances in England and the many problems with travel prevented most of the eligible English Jesuits from crossing to Ghent for the assembly that lasted from 27 September to 2 October. Instead of the customary fifty, there were only forty Jesuits in attendance. Edward Courtney (vere Leedes) and Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb) were the chosen delegates and William Talbot, Robert Freville (vere Jenison) and Thomas Compton were the substitutes. Two postulata were submitted. Yet again the English complained about the multiplication of rules,

153. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 15 January 1650, Epp. Gen. II, f. 127v; same to same, 7 February 1650, Ibid., f. 128.

154. General to Francis Forster, 25 June 1650, Epp. Gen. II, f. 130; same to same, 9 July 1650, Ibid., f. 130.

regulations and decrees, and asked that something be done about it. The present frequency of general congregations only exacerbated the problem. If there were fewer congregations and if a time limit were imposed on them, there would be, the English suggested, fewer decrees. The committee that reviewed all postulata before they were presented to the congregation did not submit this one to the whole congregation because they did not think that any particular remedy could be applied to correct the situation. Secondly, the province urged the general congregation to work for the restoration of the Society in Venice. The general congregation promised to act on this and hoped that, in the near future, the province would flourish again.¹⁵⁵

The former visitor to the Belgian houses, Alexander Gottifredi, was elected general on 21 January 1652. Before the congregation had adjourned, he had died. Five days after his death, on 17 March 1652, Goswin Nickel was chosen general.

Forster's three-year term was rapidly expiring. The search for the new provincial began after Forster's safe return to England in September 1652. The candidate suggested most often by the provincial's consultors was the former provincial, Edward Knott. At first Knott asked to be excused from the position. There were a number of theological works recently written by Anglicans to which he wished to write a Catholic rejoinder. Given his age (Knott had been born in 1582) he could not both carry out his provincial duties and compose theological treatises. By February 1653, General Nickel and Forster

155. Vicar General to Francis Forster, 26 August 1651, Epp. Gen. II, f. 137; same to same, 28 October 1651, Ibid., f. 138, ARSI, Congr 73, ff. 251-258.

had persuaded Knott that it was more important for him to be provincial.¹⁵⁶

6. Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 1653-1656

Knott spent the first few months of his second term in Belgium. He crossed over to England in the autumn of 1653 and remained there until the following summer. The situation in England continued to make any Jesuit travel to the continent hazardous. Knott therefore decided against a provincial congregation in 1655 and appointed Thomas Babthorpe as the procurator. Babthorpe took ill in Munich on the journey to Rome. Deciding that he was too sick to continue with the trip, he entrusted the catalogues and the postulata to the Flandro-Belgian procurator and sent George Cotton as his substitute. Babthorpe's absence disappointed the general who nevertheless promised that the province's interests would not suffer as a result of it.¹⁵⁷ Edward Knott died in London on 11 January 1656. The general's last letter to him, which would have arrived after Knott's death, ordered him to return to Belgium for his own safety and announced that Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh) was to succeed him. Until Barton was able to conclude his procuratorial work in Paris, John Clarke, the rector of Liège, acted as vice-provincial.¹⁵⁸

-
156. General to Francis Forster, 5 October 1652, Epp. Gen. II, f. 141; same to same, 21 December 1652, Ibid., f. 142; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 28 December 1652, Ibid., f. 142v; same to Forster, 28 December 1652, Ibid., f. 142v; same to Knott, 28 December 1652, Ibid., f. 143; same to same, 15 March 1653, Ibid., f. 144v; same to Forster, 22 March 1653, Ibid., f. 145.
157. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 24 May 1653, Epp. Gen. II, f. 146; same to same, 29 November 1653, Ibid., f. 151v; same to same, 15 August 1654, Ibid., f. 157; same to same, 4 September 1655, Ibid., f. 169; same to same, 13 November 1655, Ibid., f. 172v. I have looked for the postulata among the Flandro-Belgian papers but without success.
158. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 29 January 1656, Epp. Gen. II, f. 175v; same to John Clarke, 26 February 1656, Ibid., f. 177.

7. Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 1656-1660

The extra pressure imposed on all Jesuit superiors by Pope Innocent X's bull was alleviated in late 1656 by its temporary suspension.¹⁵⁹ The Society was no longer required to note carefully the dates of the appointment of superiors and to calculate precisely the time between assignments. Forgoing arithmetic, the general and the provincials now had to consider only a man's qualities and capabilities for office.

As the date for the provincial congregation approached, Barton asked the general where it should be held. Unable and unwilling to judge the English situation from the distance of Rome, Nickel told Barton to decide that issue for himself. The general did, however, suggest to Barton that the province postpone the congregation until July or August so that the provincial had enough time to consider the possibilities. In a second letter the general reminded Barton that a congregation should be convened even if circumstances prevented forty members from attending.¹⁶⁰ With the general's guarantee of the congregation's legitimacy despite the possible paucity of members, the provincial announced that the congregation would be held in London from 7-9 August 1658.

Only twenty-eight Jesuits were able to travel to London for the congregation. Many of the senior professed, both in England and in Belgium, had pleaded to be excused because of their fear of persecution. Others pleaded illness, exhaustion, difficulties with travel, etc. All excuses were accepted. Because of so many absences, the congregation

159. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 14 October 1656, Epp. Gen. II, f. 185v; same to John Clarke, 28 October 1656, Ibid., f. 186; same to Henry More, 28 October 1656, Ibid., f. 186.

160. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 27 April 1658, Epp. Gen. II, f. 201; same to same, 1 June 1658, Ibid., f. 203.

worried about its validity until the provincial read to them the general's letter of 1 June 1658. That dispelled all doubts. William Talbot was elected procurator with Charles Thompson as the substitute. With one voice the fathers voted against a general congregation.

For the consolation of the Jesuits on the mission and the people whom they served, the congregation asked that all the indulgences which the chapels in Jesuit colleges and professed houses enjoyed -- specifically the plenary indulgences on the feasts of St Ignatius Loyola and St Francis Xavier -- be granted to all the missionaries in their private residences. The general had delayed his response to this postulatum until June 1659 in the hope of obtaining the necessary concession from the pope. But he had had no success.¹⁶¹ As many older Jesuits wanted to retire to a Belgian college for their twilight years, the assembly asked the general to recommend to the provincials and the rectors that no obstacles prevent the fulfilment of these desires. The third postulatum asked that the privilege of saying three Masses a day granted to missionaries in England be extended to all Jesuits who had worked in England for ten years even though they were subsequently living elsewhere. For reasons left unspecified, the general did not grant this request at this time.¹⁶²

In November 1659 Robert Stafford (vere Stanford) was named as Barton's successor. The letters patent for the appointment were sent to Barton on 15 November. By that date Barton had already written to the general to inform him that Stafford was seriously ill. Stafford subsequently died on 18 November before the arrival of the letters patent. General Nickel ordered Barton to destroy the letters and to

161. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 7 June 1659, Epp. Gen. II, f. 211v.

162. ARSI, Congr 74, ff. 245, 269-271, 278-279.

remain in office until he had decided upon another successor.¹⁶³

Edward Courtney (vere Leedes) was named in July 1660.¹⁶⁴

* * * * *

Between 1640 and 1660 the English province declined in size by seventy men. The reduction in the number of Jesuits working in England was not as sharp. After some fluctuations, there were 151 Jesuits in England in 1660, as opposed to 193 in 1639. Finances were the major reason for the decline. After a long period of growth and expansion, the trend was reversed because of the Thirty Years War and the Civil War in England. As we shall see in a later chapter, property was lost, money was confiscated, annuities were not paid. So desperate had the province become that it had to accept the charity of other provinces and to send men to them for support. The lack of money so restricted the number of novices that, at times, none were admitted. Thus, there were few new vocations to replace the dying. As the province contracted, the concerns of the provincial congregations became less controversial and universal and more spiritual and domestic. No longer was the general asked to intercede in the dispute with the bishop of Chalcedon and to urge the revocation of the oath at the English College. With an increasingly large number of older men, the issues were now retirement, an appropriate feast for St Ignatius, and the privilege of saying three Masses. Despite rebellions and executions, the congregations remained strikingly apolitical.

163. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 15 November 1659, Epp. Gen. II, f. 216v; same to same, 6 December 1659, Ibid., f. 217v; same to same, 27 December 1659, Ibid., f. 218.

164. General to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 3 July 1660, Epp. Gen. II, f. 225.

Although the Annual Letters and the correspondence resounded with tales of persecutions, doubts about the possibility of holding congregations and the dangers of travel, it would be rash to conclude that the English Jesuits were staunch loyalists. The Jesuits, like the English Catholics in general, supported the King by raising money for Charles' Scottish war in 1639.¹⁶⁵ During the subsequent Civil War, the majority of Jesuits probably supported the King. Some would have done so for Royalist reasons;¹⁶⁶ others from the realization that he was the only hope for toleration. That the uneasy alliance between the Catholics, including the Jesuits, and the Royalists was one of convenience became clear with the appearance of the Independents.¹⁶⁷ Throughout the Interregnum, even after the failure of the agreement between the Catholics and the Independents in 1647, there were almost simultaneous discussions between the Independents, Spain and the Papacy, and the Royalists, Spain and the Papacy. Both Royalist and Independent sought papal and Spanish recognition and support. Both promised relief for English Catholics. The Jesuits, it seems, were political opportunists. Their interests were practical, such as the relief of Catholics, and not theoretical matters such as legitimate government and the divine rights of kings. Aware that both Cromwell and Charles sought papal aid and recognition,

165. Cf. Martin Havran, The Catholics in Caroline England (Stanford, 1962) p. 154; Francis Edwards, "Henry More, S.J.: Administrator and Historian, 1586-1661," 255; and Caroline Hibbard, "The Contribution of 1639: Court and Country Catholicism," RH 16 (1982) 42-60.

166. At least one Jesuit, Robert Pugh, was dismissed from the Society for joining the Royalist forces without the permission of his superiors. Cf. Godfrey Anstruther, O.P. The Seminary Priests II (Great Wakering, 1975) 258.

167. Cf. Paul Hardacre, The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution (The Hague, 1956) passim; K.J. Lindley, "The Lay Catholics of England in the Reign of Charles I," The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 22 (1971) 199-221.

the Society was ready to take advantage of those desires to win concessions for the Catholics. Individual Jesuits negotiated with the Independents and pleaded for Charles's cause. Yet their goal remained the same: the repeal of the penal laws and toleration for Catholics. Both the general and the provincial advised caution and discretion. None of the negotiations came to fruition, partly because the Society and the Papacy were perhaps too cautious and partly because the fortunes of both Cromwell and Charles changed often. It was only when their prospects were low that they sought a papal alliance. Once their fortunes improved, there was no longer any reason for granting toleration.

By February 1660, the relative peace that the Catholics had experienced under the two Cromwells had vanished. Once again the Presbyterians were in the ascendancy and the Catholics were threatened. The Restoration, however, ended the anxieties of the Catholics. "Scarcely ever in the memory of the Fathers," Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh) wrote

did a more joyful day for this city and island dawn than the 8th of May last, on which day Charles Stuart, in solemn form, with the most magnificent pomp and incredible applause, was proclaimed King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, and Defender of the Faith. Never at any other time was there shown such great attachment and veneration for a King.¹⁶⁸

The increased persecution during the final days of the Interregnum and Charles' promise that "no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in the matter of religion which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom"¹⁶⁹ made the Restoration a joyful event

168. [Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh)] to General Nickel, 2/12 May 1660, SC, Anglia V, printed in Foley, Records, I, 231.

169. "The Declaration of Breda, 4/14 April 1660," in J.P. Kenyon, ed., The Stuart Constitution (Cambridge, 1978) pp. 357-358.

for most Jesuits and Catholics. Indeed, Edward Courtney, the Jesuit procurator at Antwerp, met the King before he left Belgium for England. Unfortunately, we do not know all that was discussed during the interview but Courtney later wrote to the general that the conversation was satisfactory and that his expectations were high. The general hoped that he would not be disappointed.¹⁷⁰ Even the re-introduction of the old oath of allegiance shortly after the Restoration did not affect the expectations raised by Charles' promise. No one blamed the king for the return of the oath; they ascribed it to the enemies of Catholicism.¹⁷¹

8. Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 1660-1663¹⁷²

Because of Pope Innocent X's decree, a general congregation was scheduled for 9 May 1661. Although the acta of the provincial congregation held in preparation for the general congregation have been preserved in the Roman archives of the Society of Jesus, they have been withdrawn from public inspection until some damages can be repaired. Thus it is not possible to say anything at present about the province's concerns during the early years of the Restoration. The two delegates chosen for the general congregation were Joseph Simons and Richard Barton. With the provincial, they left for Rome in late March. At the suggestion of the general, Henry More was appointed the vice-provincial.¹⁷³

170. General to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 3 July 1660, Epp. Gen. II, f. 225.

171. [Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh)] to General Nickel, 15/25 June 1660, SC, Anglia V, 52 printed in Foley, Records, I, 231.

172. From 1660 to the end of the century, there are fewer references in the generals' letters to the appointment of provincials and the convocation of congregations. Thus, the subsequent sections will be much shorter.

173. General to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 12 February 1661, Epp. Gen. II, f. 234v; same to George Grey, 16 April 1661, Ibid., f. 236v.

The search for the new provincial began in July 1663. Although many in the province wrote to the general and asked that Courtney be permitted to remain in office, the general decided against it and named John Clarke as the new provincial with letters patent dated 1 December 1663. Clarke assumed office in January 1664.¹⁷⁴

9. John Clarke, 1664-1667

A provincial congregation convened in London from 12-15 June 1665. Because many of the more elderly professed fathers had been legitimately excused, their places were filled with younger professed Jesuits from the London area. The forty Jesuits argued that there were no good reasons for calling a general congregation and cast their vote against one. John Turner was elected the procurator and George Grey, his substitute. The congregation forwarded only one postulatum and that was a repetition of the 1658 congregation's request that the priests who had served in the missions for ten years retain the privilege of celebrating three Masses a day even after they had moved out of England. The general finally conceded this request on 26 December 1665.¹⁷⁵

Six months before the conclusion of Clarke's term, the general began to solicit the opinion of the English consultors regarding a new provincial. He decided in favour of Joseph Simons in October 1667.¹⁷⁶

10. Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 1667-1671

Despite some early fears that England was too dangerous, a congregation met in London from 10-13 May 1669. All forty of the

174. General to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 28 July 1663, Epp. Gen. II, f. 258; same to same, 1 December 1663, Ibid., f. 261v; same to same, 8 December 1663, Ibid., f. 262.

175. ARSI, Congr 76, ff. 220-225.

176. General to John Clarke, 5 March 1667, Epp. Gen. II, f. 296; same to same, 1 October 1667, Ibid., f. 302v.

professed fathers in attendance were from England; those from Belgium had been prevented from attending by storms. The assembly elected George Grey as procurator and Charles Darcy (vere Thompson) as his substitute. Not only did the congregation vote against a general congregation but the single postulatum asked that the present, papally imposed nine-year requirement for general congregations be lifted and the previous practice restored. The general assured the province that he had tried, always unsuccessfully, to have that rule abrogated.¹⁷⁷ Although George Grey protested against the decision, he was named Simons' successor and took office in March 1671.¹⁷⁸

11. George Grey, 1671-1674

The general's letters contain little information on the provincial administration of George Grey. Although the province convened a congregation in the Spring of 1672, the volume containing its acta has been withdrawn from circulation for repairs. Until its return, we must pass the congregation over in silence. Grey was succeeded by Richard Strange in late 1674.¹⁷⁹

12. Richard Strange, 1674-1678

Only thirty-three Jesuits attended the provincial congregation called at Ghent from 17-20 June 1675. Although some pleaded that conditions in England, age and distance prevented them from crossing over to Ghent, twenty Jesuits were able to leave the country. The congregation elected Anthony Terril (vere Boville) as procurator with John Cary as his substitute. The fathers voted against a general congregation. One

177. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 6 April 1669, Epp. Gen. II, f. 315; ARSI, Congr 77, ff. 109-111.

178. General to George Grey, n.d. [late March 1671], Epp. Gen. II, f. 334.

179. General to Richard Strange, 3 November 1674, Epp. Gen. II, f. 357.

postulatum asked the general to obtain faculties for the priests of the province both to celebrate the Mass, and to recite the office, of St Ignatius once a week, with the exceptions of Advent and Lent, on any day that was neither a double or a semi-double feast. The Spanish Jesuits already enjoyed this privilege and the English asked that it be extended to them. The general promised to investigate the matter but I have found no subsequent reference to it. After fifty years, the oath at the English College re-appeared among the postulata. The oath, the fathers contended, harmed everyone and should be removed. The general replied that Anthony Terril, the procurator, had discussed the oath with the Cardinal Protector and that he himself would continue to press for its abrogation but could promise nothing. A third postulatum requested that the general empower the provincial and his consultors to grant imprimaturs for publications. It was urgent that someone in England be authorized so that heretical books could be answered speedily. The general granted this request.¹⁸⁰

In February 1678 Strange and his consultors forwarded to the general their nominees for his successor. A month later Thomas Harcott (vere Whitbread) was appointed.¹⁸¹

* * * * *

The Restoration of the monarchy could have proved embarrassing to those Jesuits who had engaged in the different negotiations with Cromwell and the independents. However, they were never reproached for these discussions. The Jesuit apologist, Martin Grene, made a few oblique references to them but hoped that they would not be remembered:

180. ARSI, Congr 79, ff. 250-258.

181. General to Richard Strange, 19 February 1678, Epp. Gen. II, f. 382v; same to Thomas Harcott (vere Whitbread), 12 March 1678, Ibid., f. 383.

. . . the Rebels preached every where against the Jesuits, and wheresoever they took any of them, they imprisoned and executed them; so that I do not see any need to prove their Loyalty. Certainly if they had any principles of Rebellion in their hearts, they would in these publick revolutions have shewed them at one time or other. Yet though for loyalty I conceive them blameless, I will not say, but that happily the indiscretion of some may have deserved a censure: but I hope that the errours of a few, will not rise in judgment, and countervail the merits of a long tried fidelity in many . . . Yet where sins of blackest malice have found indulgence, I hope indiscretion will not be remembered.¹⁸²

Greene's wish was granted: the indiscretions of a few Jesuits have been forgotten.

The first twenty years of Charles' reign were ones of frequent religious vacillation. Throughout 1660, Charles favoured liberty of conscience for the non-conformists and, implicitly, for the Roman Catholics until a synod could decide the structure and nature of the Established Church. In 1661 a concerted effort was made by the English Catholics for official toleration. A number of Roman Catholic gentlemen petitioned the House of Lords for relief from the penal laws.¹⁸³ In the subsequent discussion, the Dean and Chapter of the secular clergy drew up a statement for the Lords' committee. In it they argued for the repeal of all the penal laws and the removal of all penalties connected with the oath of allegiance. None of this, however, was to apply to the Jesuits, who were to be banished from the kingdom.¹⁸⁴

182. An Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine, no pagination but A7^v-A8^r.

183. An annotated copy of this petition dated 21 June 1661 and entitled "Motives humbly offered by the petitioners for repeals of the penall laws in force against the Roman Catholiques and answers to them by Mr Tewkes," can be found in Bodl, Carte MSS 81, f. 183.

184. The Society's defence, the reasons why it should not be segregated, is in ARSI Anglia 36I, ff. 5-6.

The exclusion of the Jesuits split the Catholics and the bid for toleration failed.¹⁸⁵

Six months after the Act of Uniformity had regularized the religious life of the nation, that statute was suspended in favour of toleration on 26 December 1662. But by March 1663 the Commons had forced the king to retreat from the declaration. A second declaration of indulgence issued on 15 March 1672 did not last much longer. Again the Commons insisted on its cancellation and the king revoked it on 7 March 1673.

The religious and political vicissitudes had minimal effect on the size of the English province. There were 287 members of the province when King Charles returned to England in 1660. Of these, 151 were in England. In 1678, although there were 289 men in the province, the number of men in England had fallen to 128. As a result of the small number of vocations during the Interregnum, there were fewer men who had completed their studies to replace those who had died in England. The frequent proclamations, anti-Catholic campaigns and anti-Jesuit propaganda had little impact. Indeed, the political climate rarely deterred the province from convening its congregations in London. However, the freedom that the Society had experienced from external political and religious events cruelly ended with the appearance of Titus Oates.

185. Cf. Miller, Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688, pp. 98-99; T.A. Birrill, "English Catholics Without A Bishop," RH 4 (1957-1958) 142-178; George R. Abernathy, "Clarendon and the Declaration of Indulgence," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 11 (1960) 55-73; R.S. Bosher, The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians 1649-1662 (Westminster, 1957); and I.M. Green, The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663 (Oxford, 1978).

13. Thomas Harcott (vere Whitbread), 1678-1679

Harcott had been in office only a few months when the provincial congregation, later defamed by Titus Oates, convened. Forty Jesuits met at St James's Palace in London from 24-26 April 1678. The fathers elected John Cary the procurator with John Keynes as the substitute. Yet again the assembly decided that there were no sufficient reasons for the convocation of a general congregation. Two postulata were discussed and submitted to the general. In order to avoid unnecessary danger, the province sought the general's permission to shorten future congregations from the required three days. The general readily granted this request. Secondly, the fathers asked the general to persist in his efforts to obtain the suspension of the oath at the English College. Again the general promised to do so.¹⁸⁶

On 29 September 1678 Harcott and his socius, Edward Harvey (vere Mico), were seized by pursuivants at their lodgings within the precincts of the Spanish Ambassador's residence, Wyld House. As a result of the provincial's imprisonment, the general appointed John Warner, the rector of Liège, the vice-provincial. If possible, the general instructed Warner, he should consult the provincial on all important matters and receive his consent. If that proved to be impossible, Warner had the authority to make the decisions himself.¹⁸⁷

Of the forty men at the provincial congregation, twelve died as

186. ARSI, Congr 80, ff. 192-199. Most of the congregation's acta was printed in John Gerard, "The Jesuit 'Consult' of April 24th, 1678," The Month 102 (1903) 311-316.

187. General to John Warner, 24 December 1678, Epp. Gen. II, f. 388v; same to same, 11 February 1679, Ibid., f. 389v; same to same, 25 February 1679, Ibid., f. 390.

a result of Oates' accusations:¹⁸⁸ Thomas Harcott (vere Whitbread), William Waring (vere Barrow), Charles Baker (vere David Lewis), Edward Harvey (vere Mico), Anthony Turner, and William Ireland were executed; Francis Neville (vere Cotton) died at the hands of the pursuivants; Thomas Mumford (vere Downes) died in the Gatehouse prison, and Thomas Jenision died in Newgate. Three others, Francis Parker, Francis Simons (vere Bruning) and William Harcourt (vere Aylworth), died from the hardships that they had endured. The provincial was executed on 20/30 June 1679. The province began its search for a successor in September. Until a final decision could be made, Warner stayed on as the vice-provincial and Edward Spencer (vere Petre) acted as his vicar in England.¹⁸⁹ Unsurprisingly John Warner was chosen provincial in October. His excellent administration of the province during the chaos that resulted from the Oates Plot convinced the general that Warner had all the skills and qualifications required for the position.¹⁹⁰

14. John Warner, 1679-1683

Throughout his first year and a half of administration Warner was primarily concerned with the devastating effects of the Oates Plot. As more and more Jesuits fled to the Continent for safety, the provincial himself was unsure about the proper tactics. Should he order the Jesuits in England to remain there? Should he withdraw still more men for their own protection? Or should he send new men into England to replace those

188. Cf. J.P. Kenyon, The Popish Plot (Harmondsworth, 1974) for a more detailed analysis.

189. General to John Warner, 2 September 1679, Epp. Gen. II, f. 396v; John Warner to Edward Spencer (vere Petre), 18 October 1679, CUL MS Ll. 1.19, f. 80; same to same, 4 November 1679, Ibid., f. 80v; same to same, 16 December 1679, Ibid., f. 83v.

190. General to John Warner, 4 November 1679, Epp. Gen. II, f. 398; same to same, 25 November 1679, Ibid., f. 398v; same to same, 2 December 1679, Ibid., f. 399.

who had fled? Throughout 1679, Warner refused to send any new Jesuits into England and did not prevent any Jesuits who wanted to leave from doing so. But in early 1680, he changed his policy. He now asked the general's permission to send more priests to the mission after special precautions had been taken to prevent the dates of their departure and arrival from becoming known. The general approved and in late summer 1680 the Jesuits slowly and cautiously returned.¹⁹¹

As the date of another provincial congregation approached, Warner debated whether one could be convened. The present dangers were so great that he wondered whether he should risk the lives of his men even more. Since there were about twenty men in England who should attend the congregation, their absence would greatly reduce the number there. Could they all be legitimately excused? Would their absence invalidate the gathering? The general assured Warner that the men in England were validly excused and that their absence should not be a source of worry. As long as two-thirds of the prescribed number attended, the congregation was valid. For obvious reasons, the Jesuits could not assemble in England, so they met in Ghent from 1-5 July 1681.¹⁹²

Because of the persecution in England and the consequent dangers, and with the approval of Father General, all the fathers in England were excused from the congregation. As a result only twenty-eight men attended. The fathers voted against a general congregation and elected John Keynes as the procurator with William Morgan as his substitute.

191. General to John Warner, 30 March 1680, Epp. Gen. II, f. 400v; same to same, 27 April 1680, Ibid., f. 401; John Warner to the General, 21 July 1680, SC, Anglia V, 97.

192. John Warner to the General, 4 March 1681, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f. 31v; General to John Warner, 5 April 1681, Epp. Gen. II, f. 409v; same to same, 7 June 1681, Ibid., f. 413.

Four postulata were formulated. The fathers asked that the "glorious athletes" who had suffered in the recent persecution for their faith and for the Society be properly eulogised; and that the general obtain the necessary permission for the fathers to recite the offices of the Holy Name of Jesus and of the Blessed Virgin Mary regularly. The general assented to the first and promised to examine the second. The other two postulata, both of which deal with finances, will be discussed in a later chapter.¹⁹³

One week after the congregation of procurators had ended, on 26 November 1681, Father General Paul Oliva, who had succeeded Goswin Nickel in 1664, died. Consequently all the provinces were obliged to convene a second provincial congregation within a year. All the fathers in England were again excused and only twenty-four men, four fewer than in the previous year and fewer than half the customary number of fifty, attended the assembly at Ghent from 31 January to 5 February 1682. John Keynes and William Morgan were elected delegates. Thomas Stapleton, Anthony Lucas and Edward Simeon were the substitutes. Along with Jesuits from other provinces, the English pleaded for the abrogation of Pope Innocent X's decree on congregations. The province also asked that the Society restrict the days for solemn profession to certain liturgical feasts, viz. the feasts of the Purification of Mary and the Assumption. The final two postulata discussed ecclesiastical law. The Constitutions demanded that each Jesuit should know canon law but it did not specify the degree of competence that was required. The congregation asked for more precise norms and suggested that the recent

193. ARSI, Congr 81, ff. 165-171; Congr 82, f. 204; General to John Warner, 10 January 1682, Epp. Gen. II, f. 417v.

Compendium Iuris Societatis be examined, augmented, and distributed throughout the whole Society. Because the general's responses to the postulata were not included among the congregation's acta, we do not know whether any action was taken on any of these requests save the first: the general congregation asked for the retraction of the papal decree but without any success.¹⁹⁴ On 5 July 1682, the general congregation elected Charles de Noyelle general.

In the spring of 1683 Father General de Noyelle instructed Warner to initiate the search for his successor. After discussions with his consultors, Warner submitted a short list, a terna, of three candidates to the general. For the next provincial, two votes had been cast for Charles Palmer (vere Poulton) and one each for Edward Spencer (vere Petre) and John Keynes. The general was not obliged to choose the preferred candidate and could either appoint one of the other two or ask for a new list. In this case, de Noyelle chose John Keynes, who assumed office in July 1683.¹⁹⁵

15. John Keynes, 1683-1689

On 16 February 1685, King Charles II died. Having often promised to enter the Roman Catholic Church, he finally did so on his deathbed. The author of the Annual Letter described Charles' conversion thus:

being in possession of his faculties, [he] expressly abjured that heresy, which long before he had privately condemned in writing, and was received into the Catholic Church, and then fortified by all her holy sacraments; and with every indication of a sincerely penitent heart, he happily expired, affording a most wonderful example of Divine mercy.¹⁹⁶

194. ARSI, Congr 82, ff. 195-203v.

195. John Warner to the General, 9 April 1683, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f.47v; General to John Warner, 15 May 1683, Epp. Gen. II, f. 428.

196. Annual Letter 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, f. 149 translated in Foley, Records, V, 92.

On the same day the Roman Catholic Duke of York was proclaimed King James II. The following Sunday James attended Mass at the Chapel Royal of St James's Palace to the delight of the Roman Catholics and the shock of the Anglicans. Shortly after his accession the king summoned Edward Spencer (vere Petre), the former vice-provincial for England and a past candidate for provincial, to court. James appointed him Clerk of the Closet and placed him in charge of the newly rebuilt Chapel Royal in St James's Palace. Later Petre became a member of the Privy Council.¹⁹⁷

The Society nonetheless moved at a moderate pace, so much so that Keynes decided to hold the provincial congregation in Belgium lest the presence of so many Jesuits in London antagonize a hesitant populace.¹⁹⁸ Thirty-eight Jesuits gathered at Ghent from 7-11 July. Not surprisingly, the major topic -- indeed the only topic -- was the accession of James. The fathers expressed their confident delight in the new king. They believed that the whole Society, and especially the English province, would benefit greatly during his reign. And with one voice the congregation asked the provincial to inform the king of their joy and their desire to be of service. Thomas Stapleton was elected the procurator and Anthony Lucas the substitute. There were no good and valid reasons for summoning a general congregation so the assembly voted against one. No postulata were sent to Rome.¹⁹⁹

Father Charles de Noyelle's death on 12 December 1686 occasioned a general congregation. In late spring and early summer, the various

197. Annual Letter 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, ff. 150, 151 translated in Foley, Records, V, 148, 275.

198. General to John Keynes, 2 June 1685, Epp. Gen. II, f. 451v.

199. ARSI, Congr 83, ff. 137-141.

provinces convened their congregations to elect the delegates. Unfortunately the acta for all the provincial congregations have been lost. Our only information about the English congregation comes from the annual letter. The congregation met in England, most likely in London, in either April or May. During the meeting, the fathers approved the site and the plans for the new college in the Savoy. During the congregation, the King extended his royal friendship and sent his special greetings to the province. At the same time he asked a favour: would they please not elect either Edward Petre or John Warner to the general congregation? The former was the Clerk of the Closet and a member of the Privy Council; the latter, the King's confessor. The King insisted that he needed their assistance in his work and could not afford their loss. The fathers promised to grant the request and elected William Montford (vere Mumford) and Christopher Anderton. For some unexplained reason, the provincial, John Keynes, did not accompany the delegates to the general congregation in Rome. Perhaps he too was considered too important for the King's designs to leave the kingdom. Anthony Lucas, the rector of Liège, attended the congregation in his place.²⁰⁰

James' request not to elect Petre and Warner was not a small favour but active interference in the internal affairs of the province. As we shall see later, the Society promulgated many decrees and issued numerous instructions throughout the seventeenth century to restrict lay involvement in the government of the Society. The English Jesuits were especially vulnerable, as this case makes obvious.

200. Annual Letter 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, f. 155 translated in Foley, Records, V, 264-265; ARSI, Congr 3, ff. 1v-2; Congr 2a pp. 2-4; Vicar-General to John Keynes, 12 April 1687, Epp. Gen. II, f. 472.

On the eve of Pentecost, 24 May 1687, the province took possession of the Savoy college. It opened the following day. The English province now began to exert itself. Throughout the country, the province either purchased or built large houses in which the Jesuits could live in community. They opened chapels where they celebrated Mass and preached to large congregations. Besides providing more informal catechetical instruction, the province had opened eight schools by 1688: there were two in London, the Savoy college and a second in Fenchurch Street, and one in Wigan, Wolverhampton, Bury St Edmunds, Lincoln, Durham, and Pontefract.²⁰¹ The province played a vital role in the Catholicism of the Court. John Persall and John Dormer (vere Huddleston) were royal preachers appointed by the King. Edward Neville (vere Scarisbrick) was a preacher to the Dowager Queen. Three other Jesuits, Hugh Cullenan, Augustine Laurentius and Benedict de Lemos, were chaplains to Catherine of Braganza. Mark Anthony Galli and Benedict Ruga were Queen Mary's chaplains. With the appointment of John Warner as the King's confessor in 1687, the Society consolidated its hold on the most influential chaplaincies at court.²⁰²

The high expectations shared by most Catholics at the accession of James ended tragically on 5 November 1688 when William of Orange landed at Torbay. Popular discontent, fuelled by the prospects of William's invasion, had been directed against the Catholics during the

201. Annual Letter 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, ff. 153-154 translated in Foley, Records, V, 150-151. Foley mistakenly placed the eighth school in Holywell and not at Pontefract. A.C.F. Beales listed twelve Jesuit schools in England at this time but the Annual Letter only mentioned eight (Education Under Penalty, p. 249). For the rules of the Fenchurch Street school, cf. John H. Pollen, "A Jesuit 'Free School' in London 1688," The Month 128 (1916) 264-267.

202. Annual Letter 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, f. 154 translated in Foley, Records, V, 263; General to John Warner, 19 April 1687, Epp. Gen. II, f. 472v; Foley, Records, VII/2, 817.

two months immediately preceding his landing. In early October, the Jesuit College at the Savoy was closed. The mobs attacked the Fenchurch Street school and the Lime Street Chapel where they pulled down the pulpit and broke up the altar. The final days of confusion and discontent were recorded in the Annual Letter. Throughout the country, Jesuit preachers were harassed. During the Mass, there were frequent disturbances; at times, the congregations were pelted with stones. Whatever control there was over the wrath of the crowd vanished with the flight of the King. Catholic houses and chapels were attacked and destroyed; the eight Jesuit schools were torn down and plundered. Scattered and in flight, the priests sought refuge in the woods and the hills.²⁰³

John Keynes had resided at the Savoy college until the invasion. Then he was expelled to St Omers. In July 1689 the general sent him letters patent that named William Morgan the next provincial. The letters were promulgated in early September and Morgan assumed the office.²⁰⁴ Three weeks later Morgan was dead. John Clare, as the rector of Liège, automatically became the acting vice-provincial. On 22 November 1689, the general elevated Clare to full provincial status.²⁰⁵

-
203. Annual Letter 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, f. 176 translated in Foley, Records, V, 269; "In Supplement of the History of the English Province, or a brief narrative of some events which in that most lamentable overthrow of the State of England, both ecclesiastical and secular at the close of the year 1688 chiefly befell the English Province," ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts III, ff. 241-242 translated in Foley, Records, V, 152-153; HMC Le Fleming, pp. 213-215; BL, Add MS 36707, ff. 47-48; Add MS 38175, f. 140.
204. General to John Keynes, 2 July 1689, Epp. Gen. II, f. 488; same to same, 8 October 1689, Ibid., f. 489.
205. General to John Clare (vere Warner), 8 October 1689, Epp. Gen. II, f. 489v; same to same, 22 November 1689, Ibid., f. 490.

16. John Clare (vere Warner), 1689-1693

The disruption caused by the fall of King James II prompted Father General Tirso González, who succeeded de Noyelle in 1687, to suggest that Clare re-introduce a vice-provincial for that section of the province from which the provincial was absent. Edward Ingelby (vere Tidder) was named the vice-provincial for England in 1690.²⁰⁶ In the midst of all the persecution that the province had undergone some of the Society's enemies and certain unnamed secular priests had initiated secret negotiations to secure the return of King James to the English throne, but on the condition that the Jesuits would be banished from the realm. As the provincial reported to the general, these negotiations bore little fruit. To create a proper climate, the Society's opponents had urged their followers to swear fidelity to William of Orange; the Society had forbidden its supporters to do so. Clare himself had informed King James of these intrigues and the king promised that he would neither make any agreement nor accept any compromise that would be deleterious to the Society. Nonetheless, for the king's sake, the provincial had to be very discreet about James' attachment to the Jesuits.²⁰⁷

As the date of the provincial congregation approached, Clare worried whether the province would be able to convene one since it still shook from the tremors of the revolution. Although Clare would have preferred to have chosen a procurator, the general thought differently. The general wanted the English to hold a congregation. If this were impossible, he would then accept an appointed procurator. So a congregation was called for Watten from 18-24 June 1690. Since the

206. John Clare (vere Warner) to the General, 15 January 1690, SC Anglia V, 110; General to John Clare (vere Warner), 11 March 1690, Epp. Gen. II, f. 493v.

207. John Clare (vere Warner) to the General, 15 January 1690, SC Anglia V, 110.

turbulence in England prevented the attendance of many Jesuits stationed there, they were all legitimately excused. Only twenty-five Jesuits attended the congregation. Electing Michael Constable the procurator and John Dormer (vere Huddleston) his substitute, the fathers commissioned them to vote against a general congregation. Dormer, the rector of Liège, asked to be excused from his position as substitute both on the grounds of health and because of the need to complete certain important projects at Liège. Nonetheless, the assembly would not grant him his release. The King and Queen of England sent a letter of appreciation to the province for its work and continued support. Although no formal postulata were sent to Rome, the congregation expressed its worries about its bleak financial state and forwarded please for assistance to Rome.²⁰⁸

Anthony Lucas was chosen Clare's successor on 21 March 1693, he still had not assumed office by 21-24 June when the next congregation convened at Watten. In fact, the presence of both the provincial and his designated successor raised a question of their roles. Did Clare still possess the ex officio active voice with its two votes? Or had that already passed to his appointed successor, Lucas? After some deliberation, the congregation decided that both held the active voice. The lingering disturbance in England prevented the fathers there from crossing over to Belgium. Thus only twenty-two men -- three fewer than the last congregation -- were at Watten. For the first time, the provincial congregation instructed its procurator to vote in favour of a general congregation. As we have seen, the English provincial congregations had consistently voted against the convocation of a general

208. General to John Clare (vere Warner), 27 May 1690, Epp. Gen. II, f. 495; same to same, 5 August 1690, Ibid., f. 496; same to same, 14 October 1690, Ibid., f. 497v; ARSI, Congr 84, ff. 197-203.

congregation. There were no problems, the fathers often argued, that the general himself could not handle. More frequent congregations only resulted in more legislation -- something that the English very much wanted to avoid. This provincial congregation went against tradition in the hope that a general congregation would heal the present rift between the general and his assistants over the moral issues involved in probabilism.²⁰⁹ Louis Sabran was elected the procurator with Matthew Wright as his substitute. Two postulata were submitted: the general was asked to commend the needs of the province to the whole Society and his permission was sought for the ordination of Jesuits after they had completed only three years of theology so that they would have the priestly experience of the fourth year before they left Liège for England.²¹⁰

Shortly after the provincial congregation, Anthony Lucas became provincial. He held office for the summer of 1693 and died on 3 October. Again John Clare became the acting vice-provincial, an office that he retained until the letters patent for William Montford (vere Mumford) were promulgated on 16 February 1694. Edward Ingelby (vere Tidder) remained as the vice-provincial in England.²¹¹

17. William Montford (vere Mumford), 1694-1697

Some time during the summer of 1694, the provincial crossed over

209. For the details of this controversy, cf. Bangert, A History of the Society of Jesus, pp. 274-279.

210. General to John Clare (vere Warner), 21 March 1693, Epp. Gen. II, f. 527v; ARSI, Congr 85, ff. 199-205v, 287.

211. General to William Montford (vere Mumford), 21 November 1693, Epp. Gen. II, f. 534; same to John Clare (vere Warner), 21 November 1693, Ibid., f. 534; same to same, 5 December 1693, Ibid., f. 534v; same to Montford, 13 February 1694, Ibid., f. 535v; same to Clare, 27 February 1694, Ibid., f. 535v.

into England and left John Persall, the rector of Liège, as the vice-provincial for the Belgian communities. Montford remained in England for a number of years. On 11 February 1696, the provincial announced that the next congregation would be held at Ghent from 20 May. At that time, he anticipated no special problems in crossing the channel for it. But James II's move to Calais in February and the abortive plot to assassinate William of Orange, whose discovery William himself announced to Parliament in the same month,²¹² made any attempt to cross extremely dangerous. As 20 May drew near, Persall wondered what to do. Could the congregation convene without the provincial? Unsure about the number that would be able to attend, he asked how many were needed to constitute a valid congregation? At first the general simply advised Persall to postpone the congregation in the hope that the situation would improve and that the provincial would be able to leave the country. After a month the general told him that he should not delay any longer. If the provincial still had not come to Belgium, Persall should act in his place. In the circumstances, the general reminded Persall, any number was sufficient for a valid congregation. Not only was Montford unable to attend the postponed provincial congregation but fears for his safety prevented him from travelling to the continent to join Louis Sabran and Matthew Wright at the general congregation. John Persall went in his place.²¹³

212. Cf. Jane Garrett, The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot 1696 (Cambridge, 1980) for an account of this attempt on the life of the King.

213. General to William Montford (vere Mumford), 31 July 1694, Epp. Gen. II, f. 541; same to same, 31 March 1696, Ibid., f. 556; same to John Persall, 21 April 1696, Ibid., f. 556v; same to same, 30 June 1696, Ibid., f. 557v; ARSI, Congr 3, ff. 71v-72v. The acta for this congregation are not extant.

Henry Hall (vere Humberston) succeeded Montford on 19 December 1697. He governed the province until 1701. Since he resided in Belgium throughout his administration, James Blake, the priest who succeeded him in 1701, acted as the vice-provincial in England.²¹⁴

* * * * *

In 1678 the English province consisted of 289 men, 128 of whom were in England. The persecution that resulted from Oates' accusations reduced those totals to 270 and 87 respectively in 1679. For the next two years, the province was under severe pressure. Government was difficult and, for the first time since the Civil War, a vice-provincial was re-introduced. The province weathered the storm. The number of Jesuits began to increase in 1683 when the hysteria caused by the Plot had subsided. New attempts to revive anti-Catholic hostility met with indifference and failure. Some Jesuits had returned to England and the number there had grown to 110. The numbers continued to increase through the last years of King Charles II and the reign of King James II, to fall again with the invasion of William of Orange. Throughout the last decade of the seventeenth century the province was able to increase the number of its men in England but was still so unsure of the conditions that it re-introduced a vice-provincial for the men there. Twice within ten years, the province suffered sever blows to its fortunes. And twice it withstood and slowly recovered from the attacks. Through the use of vice-provincials and delegates, the province adapted its ordinary government to the different emergencies with relative ease.

214. General to William Montford (vere Mumford), 10 August 1697, Epp. Gen. II, f. 566v; same to same, 1 February 1698, Ibid., f. 572v.

17. Conclusions

The administrative positions of the vice-province were retained when the English province was established in 1623, with the exception that the vice-provincial became a provincial with all the canonical rights and privileges of that office. Ordinarily the provincial, appointed by the general, served a term of three years. Ignatius had imposed that restriction for very practical reasons: if a man served well, the limitation was no problem because the term could be lengthened; if the man was a failure, he could be relieved of his office at the end of the term without public humiliation. As assistants, the provincial had four consultors, a socius, an admonitor and a procurator. Occasionally more than one office was handled by the same person. Although the provincial was obliged to consult with his advisers on all important matters, the final decision was his.²¹⁵

When the province was established, a Jesuit had been specifically designated as a vice-provincial for the houses in Belgium. The continual threat of persecution and the considerable distance between the two sections of the province made such a precaution necessary. While the provincial was in residence in one of the Belgian communities, there would be a vice-provincial for the houses in England. Unless a specific person had been named to these posts, either the rector of Liège or the senior professed father in England would automatically assume the role. In 1634, after consultation with the provincial and his advisers, the general decided that such an arrangement was no longer necessary. As long as the provincial was able to visit the continental houses annually there was no need for a vice-provincial. However, in times of severe

215. Cons. 666, 757, 810, 811; Epitome Instituti Societatis Iesu (Brussels, 1690) p. 458; BL, Lansd 384, f.118; BL, Harl 4603, p.347.

strife, when the provincial was not able to cross between the two sections of the province freely and conveniently, the province resorted to the vice-provincial to facilitate government.

As we have noted, the Constitutions decreed that the ordinary term of office for provincials was three years. The early English provincials did not observe that restriction. The first provincial, Richard Blount, served the longest term, from the institution of the province in 1623 until 1635. His successor, Henry More, held the office from 1635 to 1639; Edward Knott, from 1639 to 1646. After the promulgation of Pope Innocent X's Prospero felicique statui -- and, indeed, after its revocation -- the provincials ordinarily served terms of three or four years.

Provincials, procurators, admonitors, and consultors all had definite functions in the Jesuit administrative hierarchy.²¹⁶ After England had been erected into a province, there were always Jesuits assigned to these positions. Thus, throughout the seventeenth century, the English Jesuits maintained the full administrative structure of a province. At first, because of the geographical division of the province into two parts, the Society relied on a vice-provincial to govern that section in which the provincial was not resident. Even though the office disappeared in 1634, it could be re-introduced in emergencies. Whenever it was, separate consultors were named for both sections.

Once the province was erected it showed itself to be remarkably flexible and resilient, very able to adjust to the vicissitudes of the English political and religious scene. Throughout the checkered

216. Cf. Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582) for the rules for admonitors, consultors and procurators.

history of the seventeenth century, there was a continuous sequence of provincials, with or without vice-provincials, with consultors, admonitors and procurators to govern and oversee the affairs of the English Jesuits. Not even the execution of the provincial seriously threatened the administration of the province. With a clear line of succession in case of emergencies, the province could not only survive the execution but continue its work. With rare exceptions, the province convened the required congregations. Various factors often forced the provincial to hold them in one of the Belgian communities and since most of the senior professed fathers were stationed in England, there was always some question about the validity of the congregations in Belgium because of the absence of many. Even that difficulty was handled. As the total number of Jesuits in attendance fell well below the prescribed forty or fifty, the general consistently re-assured the provincial that the congregations were still valid and legitimate. When the vice-province first petitioned for full provincial status, Father General Vitelleschi denied it. He had feared that England would never be able to function as a province. The subsequent history of the province showed how justified his fears were. One aspect, however, that Father Vitelleschi did not consider was the flexibility of the Institute. Through a careful and judicious adaptation of the ordinary means of government and the constitutional requirements for congregations, the English province survived and thrived.

Chapter III
THE JESUIT COLLEGES AND RESIDENCES IN ENGLAND

A. Jesuit Communities

Most students of the English Jesuits have been puzzled by the titles "residences" and "colleges" that have been used to describe the Jesuit establishments in England. What was the difference between the two? Did the Jesuits actually conduct schools in England in the midst of the penal laws and the sporadic persecution? Or did "college" have a non-educational meaning? Was a Jesuit college simply an "organized body of persons with shared functions and privileges" as defined in The Oxford English Dictionary? If so, how did it differ from a residence? According to Brother Foley, the establishment of colleges and residences in England resulted from Richard Blount's, the first provincial's, attempt to model the new province as much as possible on the Institute of the Society. Foley often referred to the colleges as "ideal" because, at the time of the creation of the province, it was impossible to have real ones. Each of the designated colleges was given a source of income which, it was hoped, would provide the financial basis for a real college upon the restoration of the Catholic Church.¹ But were the colleges simply an anticipation of, a nest-egg for, a future real college? If that were so, the districts designated as colleges should have been the areas in which schools were opened during the reign of King James II. That, however, was not the case. Even if Foley's explanation were accurate, it would still not solve the entire problem. Why were some areas chosen to be colleges and not others?

1. Charles Plowden, "A General Account of the Origins, Progress and Present Status of the Jesuit Missions in England" transcribed in ASJ, Foley MSS, I, f. 149v; Foley, Records II, 1; VII/1, xii.

Bernard Basset has suggested that the difference between a residence and a college was size; a residence was "a name used for localities with fewer Catholics, smaller endowments and not so many priests."² This explanation is also insufficient. The number of Jesuits had little bearing on the status of a Jesuit community. In 1633, the Residence of Blessed Francis Borgia became the College of the Holy Apostles. The number of Jesuits there increased from 6 to 17. In the previous year, when the Residence of St Anne became the College of the Immaculate Conception, the number of Jesuits had actually dropped from 17 to 16. When St Chad became a college, the number of priests rose from 7 in 1669 to 8 in 1672. The Residence of St Dominic became the College of St Hugh and the Residence of St Thomas of Canterbury became a college in the years 1672 and 1676. In both 1675 and 1676 there were only 7 Jesuits in St Dominic/St Hugh; during the same period the number of Jesuits in St Thomas fell from 11 to 9.

Occasionally a change in status brought an increase in the number of Jesuits. Of the five changes given above, only two involved increases in the number of Jesuits. A community's status was not based on the number of Jesuits. If that had been so, one would be faced with the incongruity of residences that were actually larger than the colleges. In the 1670s the Residence of St Mary was consistently larger than the College of St Francis Xavier. If status were based on size, St Mary should have been a college.

Similar conclusions can be drawn from a consideration of the size of the Catholic population in the area. According to Bossy's analysis of the distribution of Roman Catholics in 1641/42, the percentage of

2. The English Jesuits, p. 164. A similar judgement was made by Hubert Chadwick in St Omers to Stonyhurst, p. 102.

recusant households in the Residence of St Michael was 11-20% and that in the College of the Holy Apostles, only 0-5%. Yet Holy Apostles was a college. Durham and Northumberland also contained a high percentage, 11-20%, but St John remained a residence.³ A community's status, therefore, was not the result of the size of the Catholic population.

In Basset's explanation residences also had smaller endowments. This relationship between funds and status was a far more significant one than that of size or of population. Bossy noticed this relationship between funds and status in his comment on the necessity of erecting a "fictitious" college in order to preserve religious poverty. However, he neither explained that necessity nor developed his remark on the northern regions which "possessed no funds at all, and had therefore not been constituted as colleges." Once residences such as Chad, Thomas and Dominic/Hugh came into possession of adequate funds, they became colleges.⁴

There was a correlation between funds and status but, nonetheless, that correlation is not the complete explanation of the difference between residence and college. Ultimately, that explanation is found in Blount's attempt to model the new province on the Institute. The Society's laws permitted only colleges, either for Jesuits and/or laymen, and houses for the formation of Jesuits regular sources of income from endowments. Other Jesuit communities were to rely on alms for their support. If the English mission wished to establish financially independent communities, they would have to be either colleges or houses of formation. The original colleges in England were truly educational institutions, colleges in the strict sense, and bases for missionaries who

3. The English Catholic Community, p. 404.

4. Ibid., pp. 234-238.

travelled throughout the region. Later, by mid-seventeenth century, the colleges became "fictitious", that is, they ceased to operate schools but, as Bossy has so shrewdly observed, retained the collegiate title in order to preserve religious poverty. But, to confuse the matter still further, some Jesuit communities, although not technically designated as colleges, conducted schools, e.g. there was a school at the Residence of St Anne long before it was erected into a college. Apparently, these schools were more informal, ad hoc institutions. Thus, in England, there were colleges with schools, "colleges" that once had schools, "colleges" that never had a school, and schools that were not colleges.

* * * * *

Ignatius and his early followers realized the necessity of education for the men who intended to join their fellowship.⁵ In the discussion about poverty that was expressed in the First Sketch of the Institute of the Society of Jesus (1539), the fathers decided that it would be permissible to acquire civil rights to property and revenue for the education of the seminarians.⁶ Although there was some fear that such a concession would, in truth, compromise the strict poverty that the fathers envisaged for the Society, the colleges were permitted endowments and a regular source of income from rents or investments to support the students because Ignatius had learned from his own experience

5. Much of the following presentation is based on Ladislaus Lukács, "De origine collegiorum externorum deque controversiis circa paupertatem 1539-1608," AHSI 29 (1960) 189-245; 30 (1961) 3-89. George Ganss edited and translated the article as "The Origin of Jesuit Colleges for Externs and the Controversies about their Poverty, 1539-1608," Woodstock Letters 91 (1962) 123-166, reprinted in Thomas Clancy, An Introduction to Jesuit Life (St Louis, 1976) pp. 283-326.

6. Clancy, An Introduction to Jesuit Life, p. 53.

that the daily search for alms interfered with study.⁷

The first Jesuit colleges were halls of residence established near major universities without private instruction. Besides the Jesuit students, a few formed priests resided there. In their priestly ministries, however, the fathers were only to serve the Jesuit students and were not to involve themselves in the sacerdotal activities that were characteristic of the professed houses, the second type of Jesuit community. In the professed houses, the formed Jesuits lived and worked as priests in service to the Church. These houses were not allowed a regular source of income and were forbidden any endowments. The fathers there lived exclusively on alms. According to the original intentions of the first Jesuits, the young men, once their training had been completed, would be transferred to a professed house. The colleges were seminaries in the true sense in that they were the seed-beds that provided the professed houses with men.⁸ Pope Paul III confirmed the two types of Jesuit communities in the bull Regimini militantis Ecclesiae (1540).

Whilst the Jesuits gathered together in Rome in 1541 to elect a general for the Society, they compiled a document on the nature of the Jesuit college, Fundacion de collegio. In it the fathers stated explicitly and significantly that they were willing to make any adaptation in the nature and structure of the colleges that would be beneficial to the Church at any given time and place. Through all subsequent changes, the Society could appeal to this document for legitimation.

-
7. The Society's teachings on poverty will be discussed throughout the next three chapters.
8. The Formula of the Institute, 5.

By 1545, when Ignatius revised the 1541 formula for the foundation of colleges, the Society had seven colleges at different universities. The earlier formula had required only that the founder's endowment be sufficient for the support of the rectors and the college administrators. In the revised formula, there had to be ample income to maintain a few teachers. By 1545 the Jesuit college had progressed to a second level. The Society had noticed the infrequency of pertinent lectures at the various universities at which their colleges were located. To compensate for that deficiency, the colleges gave their own in-house lectures. To do so, the colleges needed their own teaching staff. Once the colleges had initiated their own series of lectures, there were requests for admission from non-Jesuit students. In this way, the Society moved into what was to become its major and most important apostolate.

The Duke of Gandia, the future Jesuit general and saint, Francis Borgia, founded a Jesuit college in Gandia. Since there was no university in the town, the Society was responsible for all the teaching. Moreover, the Duke stipulated that all classes be open to non-Jesuits, especially to the recent converts to Christianity who populated the region. Ignatius' acceptance of Borgia's benefaction approved the admission of non-Jesuits into colleges endowed for members of the Society. This change in the nature of the Jesuit college was approved by Pope Paul III's Licet debitum (1541). The earlier bull permitted the Society to build colleges near universities; the new bull allowed the Jesuits to lecture on theology, or on any other subject, anywhere. The final stage in the evolution of the Jesuit college came with the constitutional introduction of colleges founded "not only of our own members but even more especially of those from outside the Society."⁹

9. Cons. 440.

Quickly, within ten years, a Jesuit college had developed from a simple hall of residence for the Society to universities for laymen.

The Constitutions often discussed the financial nature of the colleges. Over and over Ignatius stressed that only colleges and houses of probation could possess fixed revenues in order to support the scholastics. Houses of probation were considered branches of the colleges because "in them those who will later be stationed in the colleges are received and tested for a time."¹⁰ The Constitutions not only restricted the possession of endowments to colleges and houses of probation but also limited the use to which the annual income could be put. Neither could use any income from its endowment to support any professed house. The Constitutions also forbade the general to apply any of the collegiate income to himself, to his relatives, or to the professed Society. Collegiate revenues were intended to support the seminarians and were not to be used for any other purpose. The income, however, could be used to favour those "who advance the work of these colleges," e.g. teachers, administrators, confessors etc. The income could also be used to bestow hospitality on visitors and to give a small viaticum to Jesuits who passed through the college.¹¹ Only the colleges themselves were to be supported by the income from their foundations. If that income was sufficient for the maintenance of twelve men, the college was not permitted either to beg or to accept any alms. If the income was not sufficient, the college could accept but it could not ask for alms. Only the exceptionally poor colleges were allowed both to beg and to accept alms.¹²

10. Cons. 6. Cf. also Cons. 5, 79, 554, 557.

11. Formula of the Institute 5, Cons. 5, 326, 330, 419, 557, 774, 776.

12. Cons. 331.

The non-collegiate Jesuit communities, i.e. the professed houses and the churches, were forbidden any fixed, regular income and the possession of "stable goods," that is, revenue-generating objects. They were permitted "movables," such as money, books, things connected with food and clothing, and a house and a villa for convalescence and retreat. Aside from these, the Jesuits in the communities were to rely on God, whom they served, and to trust in his providence. Individual founders whose generosity had built the professed houses and the churches could establish a separate foundation whose income would be employed for the maintenance of the building but the Society was not to be in charge either of the fund or its revenues.¹³

The general had the right to accept any college freely offered to the Society but Ignatius cautioned him to be wary of conditions laid down by the founder. He should not accept any endowment if the obligations heavily burdened the Society and impeded the education of the scholastics. Light conditions might be accepted if there were sufficiently good reasons but they were not to involve a curecy of souls. Once a college had been accepted, it could be suppressed only with the permission of a general congregation. Besides accepting the college, the general appointed the rector, its head,¹⁴

The Constitutions maintained the distinction between a college and a professed house. Subsequently, houses and colleges, domus et collegia, became technical terms in the Society. Ignatius' original expectation that most of the Society would reside in the professed houses with the colleges in a secondary role had been abandoned even in his own lifetime. Once lay students had been admitted, there was a

13. Cons. 555, 556, 561, 562, 563.

14. Cons. 309-325, 680, 743, 762, 763.

rapid proliferation of Jesuit colleges throughout Europe. At the same time, professed houses played a decreasing role because few donors were interested in them. As the colleges multiplied, more and more fathers resided in them who exercised the spiritual ministries that were proper to the professed houses. Ignatius did not consider that their presence in the colleges violated the Constitutions. Far from being anxious about the constitutionality of their presence, Ignatius adapted his aspirations to the practical realities and actively encouraged the foundation of colleges. By Ignatius' death in 1556, there were forty-six colleges and only two professed houses throughout the Society.

Because the number of colleges had increased so rapidly, there were not always enough Jesuits to staff them. Thus the First General Congregation (1558) increased the requirements for a collegiate foundation and introduced new guidelines for their acceptance. The Constitutions had decreed that a foundation had to generate sufficient income for the support of twelve men; the congregation increased that number to fourteen.¹⁵ In each college, there should be two or three priests to serve as such, four or five teachers, two laybrothers, and a number of scholastics. The Second General Congregation (1565) increased the requirements still further. One of its decrees outlined four different types of colleges, depending on size, the number of courses, and the subjects taught. The smallest college required only twenty Jesuits. By raising the requirements, the Society had hoped to reduce the number of foundations offered to it. Existing commitments overstretched the Society already so the congregation urged the new general, Francis Borgia, to be moderate in his acceptance of new colleges. The fathers also insisted that the colleges should not

15. GC I, d 73 (after the election).

contain more men than could be supported by the annual income and any extra alms. Before new colleges were accepted, the present ones should be strengthened and poorer colleges perhaps suppressed. Colleges for laymen without an adequate income might be retained on the condition that income from the foundation was added to the original endowment and re-invested until enough income was generated for the support of the Jesuits. Meanwhile the fathers were not to touch the capital and were to live on alms.¹⁶

The Third General Congregation (1573) worried about the lack of professed houses and wished the new general, Everard Mercurian, to do everything possible to erect such houses in all the major cities. With some justification the fathers feared that the mendicant poverty of the professed houses would disappear and that the monastic poverty of the colleges would become the only type in the Society.¹⁷ Mercurian's efforts met with little success, even after a founder had been found, real problems remained: some houses would have to collect enough alms to support thirty or forty men. It would have been impossible to beg enough money every day to support such a number. Furthermore, the professed houses were becoming superfluous because of the presence of priests, performing the spiritual ministries, in the colleges.

The issue of colleges with insufficient endowments re-appeared in the Third General Congregation. Throughout the Society there were colleges unable to exercise their proper function, i.e. the education of Jesuit scholastics, usually because they had not been sufficiently endowed or because they were still in the process of establishment. The congregation labelled such colleges "incomplete," inchoatum.

16. GC II, dd 8, 71 (after the election) and the "Formula acceptandorum collegiorum" (printed after the decrees).

17. GC III, d 17 (after the election).

Until they had been "completed", the general would decide whether the men there should live on the returns from the investments or off alms.¹⁸ The decision to allow men to live off the income from the endowment was a modification of a decree of the Second General Congregation. The congregation also modified the prohibition on seeking and accepting alms by the colleges. As has just been said, only the insufficiently endowed colleges, the "inchoate" colleges, could accept and only the truly poor colleges could beg for alms. The assembled fathers now empowered the general to interpret this ruling liberally and even to dispense from it in certain circumstances.¹⁹

In 1588, Father General Acquaviva composed a new formula for the acceptance of colleges. Worried by the rapid increase in the number of colleges (there were 163 in 1579) and unsure of the legality of the colleges for laymen, the general wished to halt the multiplication as much as he could. Acquaviva thought that all Jesuit colleges should be seminaries for the Society. Otherwise they would be unable to provide for the replacement of their staff and would burden the entire Society. Each college should be able to support scholastics either at the college itself or at some other institution. So Acquaviva increased the minimum requirements concerning the size of a college to fifty men for a small college and to one hundred and twenty for a large one. It was hoped that the new requirements would reduce the number of proposed foundations. The Indies and the transalpine regions were explicitly exempted from the higher requirements.²⁰ The Fifth General Congregation

18. GC III, d 43 (after the election).

19. GC III, d 25 (after the election).

20. "Formulae acceptandorum collegiorum anno 1588" in G.M. Pachtler, ed., Ratio studiorum et institutiones scholasticae Societatis Iesu (Berlin, 1887) 337-340. Monumenta Germanicae Paedagogicae 2.

(1593) examined and revised Acquaviva's formula. As a result, they reduced the numbers from fifty to thirty for a small college, and from one hundred and twenty to one hundred for a large college. The congregation retained Acquaviva's exemption for the Indies and the transalpine regions.²¹ The congregation shared Acquaviva's anxieties about Jesuit colleges. Many were worried by the constitutionality of formed priests living in the colleges and benefiting from their fixed revenues but not involved in the work of the colleges. Others queried the legality of the colleges with fixed incomes but without scholastics. Because anxiety that both practices seriously violated the Constitutions and the Institute of the Society had increased over the years, the congregation referred the issue to the general for further study.

As the general investigated these matters, he introduced a new, a third, type of Jesuit community into the Society. The purpose of the residences, the new communities, was to establish bases from which the missionaries could operate. Since there were so few professed houses, the only community in which the missionaries could reside was the college and, as we have seen, their presence in the colleges was very much at issue. Acquaviva, in his letter "De modo instituendarum missionum" of 1599, suggested to the provincials that they choose two or three locations in their provinces where there were no colleges and there establish residences. These communities would be governed by a superior and would have at least eight Jesuits. The residences were temporary; it was hoped that a benefactor could be found and, with his assistance, the residence would be converted into a professed

21. GC V, dd 25, 69.

house.²²

Assembled at their triennial congregation in 1600, the procurators asked for the establishment of more residences in which professed fathers who were not needed in the colleges could reside. The fathers realized that the true reason behind the infrequent foundation of professed houses was the lack of benefactors interested in such houses and not, as many Jesuits had argued, the proliferation of colleges for non-Jesuits. The congregation, therefore, confirmed the new type of community.

Acquaviva's letter and the report of the procurators both stressed that the residences would be supported by alms only, in that way they were similar to the professed houses which the residences were to become. But there was another anonymous document (whose author, Lukács thinks, may have been Acquaviva) that even allowed the residences a fixed income if there were not sufficient alms for the support of the community.²³ In a sense, the opinions contained in the document remained a minority view that did not reappear in any subsequent discussion of the residences. Nonetheless, that view played a role in the history of the Jesuit residences.

The Sixth General Congregation (1608) finally resolved the controversy of Jesuit colleges for non-Jesuits. To eliminate any doubt in the future, the congregation decreed

22. Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium (Antwerp, 1635) p. 287. Also cf. Acquaviva's "Quomodo rerum temporalium incommodis providendum" in G.M. Pachtler, Ratio studiorum et institutiones scholasticae Iesu (Berlin, 1890) III, 5-8 (Father General Oliva's 1665 revision of the "Quomodo" can be found on pages 105-108); Bullae, Decreta, Canones Ordinationes Instructiones Epistolae & quae Instituti Societatis Jesu ab 1636 (Antwerp, 1665) p. 476.

23. This document is printed as an appendix to Lukács, "De origine collegiorum externorum deque controversiis circa naupertatem 1539-1608," 75-77.

Not only the colleges where there are such seminaries, but also others, in which the pursuit of learning is carried on and schools have been opened for the benefit of our neighbor, are in accordance with our Constitutions and Institute. Furthermore, the professed and formed coadjutors, about whom it was easier to doubt (for about the other members there can be no scruple), who even as operarii are necessary or useful for colleges of this type, can be maintained in them without any scruple However, all care should be taken to perfect the inchoate colleges, in order that some of our scholastics should be maintained either in them or, if it be more profitable to the Society, in some other seminaries through contributions.²⁴

This decree clarified the confusion about the legality of colleges which either had professed fathers in residence who were not involved in the collegiate apostolate, or were without scholastics. Different popes had conferred upon the Society the right to explicate doubtful matters. In the decree, the Society was exercising that right. Even though colleges for non-Jesuits were constitutionally acceptable, all efforts were to be made to see that they contributed something to the support of Jesuit scholastics. Since these scholastics would one day join the collegiate staff, the colleges were to assist in their maintenance.

The Seventh General Congregation (1615-1616) addressed a question regarding perpetual income for professed houses. Was it a violation of the Society's Institute to allot a portion of the annual revenue generated by a college's foundation to a professed house? Yes, it was. The congregation declared that such practices were contrary to the Institute and a serious violation of the purity of the Society's poverty.²⁵

Throughout the mid-seventeenth century, financial problems continually plagued the Society. Thanks to the disasters of the Thirty

24. GC VI, d 18 translated in Ganss, "The Origin of Jesuit Colleges for Externs and the Controversies about their Poverty, 1539-1608," 165 and p. 325 respectively.

25. GC VII, d 50; cf. GC XI, d 20.

Years War and the economic decline of Spain, few provinces remained unaffected. Vocations into the Society outdistanced the resources to support the new candidates. Many communities were saddled with heavy debts; some faced bankruptcy. The Eighth General Congregation (1645) discussed the financial plight of the Society. For financial reasons, the congregation suppressed a few small colleges, three in the Roman province and six in the Neapolitan,²⁶ and abrogated the Fifth General Congregation's formula for the acceptance of colleges. Reversing the trend, the fathers lowered the requirements for a college to twenty men with exemptions for the Indies and the transalpine regions.²⁷ The motive for this reduction was not to multiply the number of Jesuit colleges but to find some constitutionally acceptable remedy for the financial troubles. It was hoped that lowering the minimum requirements would attract more benefactors. The more colleges founded, the more men who could be supported by their resources and the fewer who would have to rely on alms. Other remedies were sought by the fathers. The provincials were instructed to admit only as many novices as they could afford and to restrict the number of lay brothers in each province. Members of the poorer communities were to be distributed among the other, wealthier houses. Finally, the provincials were to demand a more conscientious and explicit account of the income and expenses of the various colleges.²⁸

The Ninth General Congregation (1649-1650) made further decisions

26. GC VIII, dd 4, 5. Cf. also GC, XI d 16.

27. GC VIII, d 27.

28. GC VIII, d 60: "Pro remediis sublevandae domorum et collegiorum inopiae." Cf. also GC VII, d 82 and Father General Vincent Carrafa's "Instructio pro administratione rerum temporalium Collegiorum ac Domorum Probationis S.J.," in Bullae, Decreta Canones Ordinationes Instructiones Epistolae & quae Instituti Societatis Jesu ab 1636 (Antwerp, 1665) pp. 372-390.

about "inchoate" colleges. There was still some confusion throughout the Society about which communities were in this category. Were the residences, whose superiors apparently had the right to vote at the provincial congregations among them? The congregation replied that only a college established by the general with the hope of becoming a full college, no matter how much money was needed to complete its foundation, and with a rector appointed by the general, was "inchoate". Superiors, i.e. those who governed the residences, were appointed by the provincial. Thus, residences were not "inchoate" colleges and their superiors did not have the right to vote in the provincial congregations.²⁹ The clarifications made by the congregation were important. Some residences, although they had supported themselves on alms, had probably gathered together a small endowment which they tried to increase in the hope of becoming a college. They justified their activity by referring to themselves as an "inchoate" college. The congregation stressed that "inchoate" colleges were expressly named as such by the general himself and that no other community could claim the status.

By the mid-seventeenth century, therefore, three distinct types of Jesuit community had emerged: the college, the professed house, and the residence. The nature of the college had changed since the foundation of the Society. Originally intended as halls of residence for Jesuit scholastics, the colleges had developed into a major educational network throughout Europe. There were few Jesuit colleges that were now simply halls of residence; there were fewer colleges exclusively for Jesuits. By the mid-seventeenth century, the overwhelming majority were for Jesuits and lay people, or for

29. GC IX, d 18.

lay people only. Colleges had become the backbone of the order and one of the Society's greatest contributions to western culture.³⁰

A curious anomaly was the "inchoate" college. Without Jesuit scholastics, there was indeed something incomplete about any college. Ideally each Jesuit college should support and educate the Jesuits who would later serve in that college. But, with the increase in the number of colleges, there were not enough scholastics. Repeatedly the congregations stressed that the "inchoate" colleges must be completed: their endowments should be increased until they were sufficient for the support of a few scholastics either at the college itself or elsewhere. Professed houses played an ever-declining role in the work of the Society. Throughout the seventeenth century, they were few in number and never had the significance intended by Ignatius.

The introduction of the residence was an important revision in the constitutional organization of the Society. The residences first arose in the Indian missions where there were no donors for colleges and inadequate alms for a professed house. These the missionaries were obliged to live on whatever income they had regardless of the resulting constitutional problems. Father General Aquaviva corrected the irregularity in 1599. He permitted the provinces to erect two or three temporary communities in areas convenient for the fathers' work but without colleges. Originally, the general had hoped that they would be converted into professed houses; later he permitted them to be transformed into colleges.³¹

30. Adrien Demoustier, "The Pedagogical Import of the Spiritual Exercises in the Society in the 16th and 17th Centuries" in The Exercises: Their Milieu and Foundation (Rome, 1982), pp. 22-24.

31. BL, Harl 4603, p. 62; Lansd 384, f. 23.

B. Communities in England

As the Society and the seminaries sent more men into England, a system by which they could be received and integrated into Catholic life had to be established. At his arrival in England, Robert Parsons had been met by the wealthy Catholic layman George Gilbert. With great expenditure of both money and energy, Gilbert facilitated the missionary movements of the fathers by arranging and financing their journeys with alternative emergency routes in the event of discovery. Gilbert explained his system in "A Way to Deal with Persons of all sorts so as to Convert them and Bring them back to a Better Way of Life -- Based on the System and Method Used by Fr. Robert Parsons and Fr. Edmund Campion."³² The missionaries were divided into two categories: the majority, who travelled from house to house to minister to the Catholics in the area; the others, who were stationed in the houses of some of the gentry as if they were a "relation, friend or steward, or in some office of dignity but little work, so as not to interfere with his own calling." Besides caring for the family with whom he resided, the latter was also to undertake the spiritual charge of an area around his residence. The first Jesuits in England would have lived according to one of these modes. With no house of their own, the priests would either have resided in a country house of a gentleman or have travelled on a missionary circuit. On his travels, each priest would have a gentleman as a guide to lead him around the different homes. The original network was rather limited and only included East Anglia, the Thames Valley, the Sussex-Hampshire border and the counties of Northampton, Leicester, Stafford, Worcester and Warwick.

32. Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, S.J., pp. 331-340.

Within ten years the organization founded by Gilbert had deteriorated. In 1589 Garnet explained to the general the disorder that he had found in England. There was no adequate system for the reception and transfer of newly arrived and disguised priests. As a result, many priests wandered about the countryside in search of a dwelling.³³ So, on Gilbert's foundations, Garnet and Southwell built a new network. Stationed in London, at Lord Vaux's house in Hackney, Southwell welcomed the incoming priests. Meanwhile Garnet, operating either from Lord Vaux's house in Northampton or his daughter's in Leicester, established centres throughout the country where the new men could be sent.³⁴ Garnet's plan was this: the experienced men would establish local centres where the newly arrived priests would live and work while the experienced priests used the centre as a base for their work throughout the countryside. So successful was Garnet that, on 16 April 1596, he could write

When the priests first arrive from the seminaries, we give them every help we can. The greater part of them, as opportunity offers, we place in fixed residences. This is done in a very large number of families through our offices. The result now is that many persons, who saw a seminary priest hardly once a year, now have one all the time and most eagerly welcome any others no matter where they come from.³⁵

Often Garnet had to lodge the new priests at one of his London dwellings until the proper arrangements could be made. Occasionally he even had to pay for their room and board in the households where they resided. Garnet paid these expenses out of a common purse.

33. Garnet to the General, 12 September 1589, SC, Anglia I, 41.

34. Christopher Devlin, The Life of Robert Southwell: Poet and Martyr (London, 1956) p. 116.

35. SC, Anglia II, 16 and ARSI, Anglia 31I, f. 129; Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 44-45, 88.

In two important articles published over the past few years, Christopher Haigh has scrutinized Gilbert's methods and, indeed, the Society's strategy. According to Haigh, the Catholic community inherited by the seminary priests and the Jesuits was "if not a safe seat, at least a strong minority vote in need of careful constituency nursing." If the success of the seminary priests and the Jesuits was judged by "their ability to maintain party allegiance," theirs was not a missionary triumph but a failure. A major factor in this decline was the distribution of priests. There were large sections of the kingdom, e.g. Wales and the Far North, where there was fervent Catholic sentiment but few, if any, priests to nourish it. Despite attempts by Parsons and Garnet to direct the newly arrived priests to the neglected areas, maldistribution remained a problem throughout Elizabeth's reign. The concentration of the clergy in certain parts of the country was also a result of the attention paid to the gentry in the South. These were the families whose residences formed Gilbert's missionary network. Haigh asserts that the traditional argument that the priests needed the protection of the gentry was fallacious. If safety had been their concern, they would have fled to the North or the West or have sought refuge among the Catholic peasants. No, the emphasis on the gentry was a matter of policy not of urgency. Through their close co-operation with the gentry, the clergy eventually abandoned the population beyond their patron's family. George Gilbert had hoped that the priests, although a resident in a gentleman's house, would use that house as a base for his missionary work in the surrounding neighbourhood. But such was not the case. More and more gentlemen refused to permit their houses to be used as missionary centres. As a result, the priests became simple domestic chaplains. Consequently, the Catholic population rapidly faded into minority status. According

to Haigh's interpretation, those whom the tradition had considered the heroes were actually the culprits.³⁶

That the desire for close co-operation with the gentry was not simply a consequence of the penal laws but a conscious policy of the Society throughout the world cannot be denied. Because of the Society's conviction that "the more universal the good is, the more it is divine," it concentrated on princes, nobles, magistrates, justices, prelates, and professors. As we have seen, Ignatius argued in the Constitutions to prefer the areas where such people would be receptive to the Society's teaching and advice because any spiritual aid given to them would be mediated through them to others under their guidance and influence.³⁷ As long as the influential were able to exercise their position in order to implement what they had received from the Society, Ignatius' paradigm might have worked. But in a country where a Catholic magnate's influence was restricted by the presence of an Established Church and the constant threat of the penal laws, his religious views would not have automatically filtered down through the social pyramid. Nonetheless there are instances throughout the kingdom where the local squire's influence protected and preserved Catholic enclaves. In these cases, the Jesuit policy was successful. In the other cases, tactics that stemmed from a constitutional policy coincided with necessity. What had been a policy decision for the work of the Society throughout the world had become a matter of necessity for the Jesuits in England.

36. Christopher Haigh, "From Monopoly to Minority: Catholicism in Early Modern England," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series, 31 (1981) 129-147; "The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation," Past and Present 93 (1981) 37-39.

37. Cons. 622d, e.

Strategy and expediency had merged. In a brief response to Haigh's original lecture on which the earlier article was based, Francis Edwards has pointed out how Haigh, like many of the post-Bossey historians, has lost sight of the effectiveness and impact of the persecution:

"Certainly, outside the houses of the great, the priest missionaries could not have found any kind of safe cover for very long."³⁸ As is so often the case in this field, the resolution of the problem revolves around the issue of persecution. Was it "ruthless and continual" or was it selective and sporadic? Investigations of the implementation of the penal laws, such as those done by Francis Walker and John Larocca,³⁹ must be better examined and considered before any definitive answer can be given. Similarly, besides the reality of persecution, the psychological impact of the continual threat of persecution should be studied. The penal laws might not have been implemented fully and consistently but their very presence in the lawbooks constituted a serious threat under which the Catholics had to live.

Even though the English Jesuits' courtship of the gentry was deliberate policy, they did not desert the common people. In his reply to Fisher's Memorial, Henry Garnet repudiated a similar charge made by the Appellants. "As for the cottages of the poor," he assured the general,

we have never neglected them, but the real concern of our critics is perhaps that we should not visit the towers of the rich. Such visits we never pay (to meet them on this charge too) unless hope of fruit, and this to the divine glory, appears possible. If we may on such occasions win spiritual gain, we will gladly leave to them the temporal gain.⁴⁰

38. Chaplain's Weekly, no. 1898 (17 June 1982) p.4.

39. Francis Xavier Walker, "The Implementation of the Elizabethan Statutes against Recusants, 1581-1603" (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London, 1961); Larocca, "English Catholics and the Recusancy Laws 1558-1625: A Study in Religion and Politics."

40. ARSI, Anglia 30II, ff. 364-366 (printed in Renold, The Wisbech Stirs,

Haigh does not give sufficient recognition to the continuing efforts of the Society not only to minister to all people but also to extricate itself from the ever-tightening embrace of the gentry. Although a percentage of the Jesuits, exactly how large it is impossible to say, resided with families, the Society did not abandon the common people. Throughout the late 16th and the 17th centuries, there were consistent attempts to establish Jesuit houses out of which the priests could operate without lay interference. Similarly, there was a consistent stress on the importance of the missionary circuit.

During the superiorship of Henry Garnet, the Society began to rent its own houses. The first was a small garden cottage in Finsbury Fields in 1588. There Garnet took refuge from the dangers and pressures of his work until the house was discovered and raided in 1591. He had acquired a second house, in Golden Lane in Holborn, by 1591. He lived there while he searched for another suburban house to replace the discovered one in Finsbury Fields. In 1594, he located a house about four or five miles from London. Around the same time, the Golden Lane house was discovered.⁴¹

By 1596, Garnet had moved into a house, managed by the Vaux sisters, Anne Vaux and Eleanor Brooksby, near the hospital at Spitalfields from which he could minister to the dying.⁴² This house was a favourite of Garnet. There he had the complete freedom to assemble a small community of Jesuits and to receive as many visitors who cared to call. Scarcely a day passed, Garnet wrote to the general, but someone visited him. At times, there were two or three callers. The house, to which

41. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 68, 123-126, 185-187.

42. Ibid., pp. 242-243.

there was free and easy access, was always open to visitors who could remain as long as they desired for rest, study, spiritual direction, or medical examinations. The frequency of visitors laid an extra financial burden on Garnet but it was essential that anyone should feel free to call.⁴³ In a long letter, Garnet explained the arrangements which made this house so safe and secure. The only known residents were a lady and her servants who lived there under the pretext of being near London for medical treatment. The reputed owner was a schismatic who had rented the house to his relations. Since the house was on the road to London, any number of explanations could be given for the number of visitors, e.g. friends or relatives who were going to London for medical or legal reasons. Garnet only feared "false brethren" and he exercised special cautions at all times. He was very careful about whom he permitted to enter the house and he frequently changed the names of the servants. In 1599, Parsons and Father General Acquaviva urged Garnet to abandon this residence. Among the extant material, I have found no full explanation for this insistence. From Garnet's letters, however, it is clear that he believed that the Appellants were behind it. Motivated by jealousy, they directed numerous accusations at Garnet and exhorted the general to remedy the problem. If, Garnet insisted, he conceded to his superiors and moved, it would be necessary for him to reside with some well known Catholic. There he would not only be in continual danger of discovery but he would also lose his independence. His apostolate would be curtailed and he would no longer be able to receive other priests and laymen as his guests. Garnet concluded his plea to remain in Spitalfields with a fascinating anecdote about his previous residence. Garnet had rented his last

43. Henry Garnet to the General, 16 April 1596, SC, Anglia II, 16 and ARSI, Anglia 31I, f. 129ff; Garnet to [Robert Parsons (?)], 20 May 1598, SC, Coll P, f. 551.

house in the name of one Morgan, "a man who was never in the land of the living," and hired a husband and wife, both schismatics who were later received into the Church, to look after the property as servants of Mr. Morgan. The Jesuits lived there secretly. They even had access to a small enclosed garden for their exercises. Eventually the neighbours became suspicious. They had often noticed a number of visitors but yet they never saw anyone whenever they called at the house. They had also noticed large amounts of food brought into the house. They finally mentioned their suspicions to the authorities. A friend of the Society managed to prevent a surprise search. Garnet quickly hired other schismatic couples to pretend to be the Morgans and their servants, and to stop at the house for a few days. On that Sunday, with a great display of pomp and considerable fanfare, the Morgans went off to church where the minister received them respectfully. This charade destroyed any suspicions that the neighbours had about the house and its occupants. The Jesuits remained there for three more years before they moved to Spitalfields. Now Father General Acquaviva forced them to move again. Reluctantly Garnet followed Acquaviva's orders and prepared to leave a house "such as its like we shall never be able to have again."⁴⁴

While Garnet resided at Spitalfields he rented a second house, Morecrofts, owned by Robert Catesby. Located near Uxbridge village about twelve miles from London on the Oxford road, Garnet used it both as a refuge from the city and as a centre for arriving priests. The house was raided shortly after Garnet rented it in 1598.⁴⁵

44. Henry Garnet to Robert Parsons, 28 April 1599, SC, Coll P, f. 552; same to [Parsons(?)], 19 May 1599, ASJ, 46/12/2.

45. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 260, 262-263.

After his departure from Spitalfields, and with the assistance of the Vaux sisters, Garnet found a new house, White Webbs, on Enfield Chase about ten miles northwest of London. Anne Vaux rented it under an assumed name from a Dr. Henwick. By 1605 Garnet feared that White Webbs was under surveillance so he rarely visited it. Instead, he rented another house, the manor house at Erith, a small Kentish town near Dartford. Around the same time he rented a third house in Thames Street near the Tower of London.⁴⁶

All of Garnet's rented or purchased houses, as far as we know, were in the London area. There the need was greatest because the presence of the pursuivants made it increasingly difficult to rely on the London residences of the known Roman Catholics. A safe house had to be conveniently situated in the London area so that Garnet could receive the newly arrived priests and hold the clergy meetings there. With the exception of the house in Spitalfields, the continual flow of visitors aroused the attention of the religious authorities and the houses were eventually raided no matter how remote the site. Garnet himself had a few close escapes; Nicholas Owen, John Gerard and Robert Southwell were not so lucky.

In the counties, Garnet continued to use the country homes of the gentry as the basis for his network. There he placed the majority of the priests. Garnet tried as much as he could to place the men in households whose masters were eager to further the religious activities of the priests and who would allow the Catholics to gather there and the priests to go out to work among the Catholics in the area. At

46. Ibid., pp. 264, 319.

various centres throughout the country, Garnet assembled small libraries of theological books for the use and consultation of the missionaries. These centres were probably the most secure and most conveniently situated houses in the area.⁴⁷

Some time in the early 17th century, Garnet had even considered the possibility of establishing a Jesuit college in England with the Spanish King Philip III as the founder. As we shall see in a later discussion of the Residence of St Anne, there was a small school under the Society's auspices at this time. Garnet might have intended that that school become a fully constituted Jesuit college by means of the Spanish endowment. But it is impossible to say how seriously this proposal was considered. In a letter to someone in Spain, Garnet, however, claimed that it would be glorious for the English Catholics if the King did found the college "for why should not a blessed Tower of David be built in the midst of the heretics by him who is bearing against them such temporal arms."⁴⁸ But nothing came of the plan and England had to wait nearly twenty years before the first Jesuit college was erected there.

The best exposition of the style of life experienced by the priests on the mission in the early 17th century is "Modus vivendi hominum Societatis" by Henry More. According to More there were three different styles of life open to the men; each had its own advantages and disadvantages. The first mode was private and lonely. The

47. Ibid., p. 215; Garnet to [?], 24 November 1602, ARSI, Anglia 38II, f. 178; Garnet to the General, 16 April 1596, SC, Anglia II, 16 and ARSI, Anglia 31I, f. 129ff.

48. Garnet to [?], 29 August [1604], ASJ, 46/12/2. At this time, in the casuistry classes in the English seminaries, the students were taught that it was not lawful to found colleges in England at the present time and that it would be better to use the money for Catholic students abroad. Cf. P.J. Holmes, Elizabethan Casuistry (London, 1981) CRS 67, pp. 57-58, 118-119.

priest was secluded in an upper story or attic of a Catholic's house and practically a prisoner in his own room. He must always be exceptionally careful of being seen or heard by any of the domestic staff except the most trusted. Aside from the daily Mass and possible visits from children for religious education, the missionary had nothing to do except pray and study. Those who lived in this way rarely saw another Jesuit except when the superior visited. This style of life brought safety and protection but, for that, one sacrificed mobility and companionship. The second mode was more public but less secure. Spending most of his time on a missionary circuit, the priest was continually on the move. As he travelled from station to station, the priest spent one night at each place. Usually there was one house on the circuit where he could safely reside for a few days. At each station a congregation would gather for Mass and the sacraments. On the journeys, the priest had ample opportunities to see his superior and other Jesuits but he had little time for rest and prayerful solitude. The third mode, and the preferred one, combined considerable freedom with a stable residence. The Jesuit resided with a man influential and powerful enough not to be burdened by the law. Here the priest could live discreetly but not fearfully. Through his tenants and servants, the head of the household was always warned of any approaching danger so that the necessary precautions could be taken. The superiors usually resided in such houses and were thus able to visit their men and to receive them as guests.⁴⁹

A curious cipher from 1609 illustrated more concretely the

49. SC, Anglia IV, 45 translated in Foley, Records, II, 3-6. Although the handwriting is Henry More's, from internal evidence the document was probably written about 1616. If so, that date may make the document too early to have been written by More so he may have copied the document for his history from the original.

missionary arrangement of the third mode. This cipher contained the code by which individual "churches" cared for by specific Jesuits were known. In future correspondence with the general, the letters A.B. would represent the church in the care of Robert Jones. Among the chief Catholics in this church were Lord Herbert, the first born son of the Earl of Worcester, the Morgan family, and others. John Percy's church was known by the letters A.P. Under his care were Lord Vaux and his mother, Lady Digby, Lady Waynman, the Simons and Farmer families, among others. Among the flock of Michael Walpole's church, known as C.D., were Lord Mordent, the eldest son of Lord Arundel, Thomas Sackville with his sister, Lady Knollys and others. Anthony Hoskins cared for the eldest son of Lord Petre, Lady Fortescue, and others. His congregation was known by the letters H.A., while G.V. represented the church under the care of Thomas Abercrombie. Lord Lumley was one of his congregation. Richard Blount's church N.O., included the Earl of Arundel and his mother, Lord William Howard with the entire family of the Countess of Worcester, the most illustrious Lady Windsor and the Winter family. Under the care of William Wright was the church known as W.G. and which included the Countess of Rutland and the Earl of Rutland's sister.⁵⁰

Each Jesuit named in this curious cipher was responsible for a "church". Significantly, the church was not defined geographically but according to families. Under the care of each Jesuit were a few prominent, named families and "others" --- unspecified and probably less noteworthy. Presumably the priest resided with the family entered at the head of the list and placed apart from the subsequent names. With the freedom provided by the patron's position, the Jesuit could

50. ARSI, Anglia 36II, f. 325.

operate out of his residence to minister to the other families. There were nearly fifty Jesuits in England at this time; only seven were named in the list. Where were the other forty? One may conclude that they lacked a powerful patron (hence their omission from the previous list) and lived according to one of the other modes. By 1613 a number of Jesuits on the mission lacked fixed residences. When Robert Jones wrote to the general about this, he complained about the lack and argued that fixed residences were "much desired". Nonetheless the priests without them did good work as they travelled from place to place.⁵¹ The situation had changed still further by 1616. By then few had the luxury of the third style; fewer people were willing to take the risks. More and more Jesuits were forced to retreat to the solitary confinement of the first mode where they "sit like sparrows upon the house top."⁵²

Throughout the Elizabethan and early Jacobean period, the Jesuits outside London lived and worked according to three different styles. The third, that combination of stability and freedom, was the preferred but the least common. Some Jesuits continued to travel throughout the country from mission station to mission station, to say Mass and to bring the sacraments. Their life was far from the secure comforts of a domestic chaplain. Robert Jones, the Jesuit superior in England, did not approve of this style and hoped that stable residences could be found for the safety of the missionaries. By 1616, it seems that Jones' wish was granted. Now most men had their fixed residences but these were of that first type, i.e. More's "sparrows". Henry Garnet, in his plea to remain in Spitalfields, predicted that he would lose his freedom if he

51. Robert Jones to the General, 3 November 1613, SC, Anglia IV, 2 translated in Foley, Records, IV, 385.

52. SC, Anglia IV, 45 translated in Foley, Records, II, 3-6.

moved in with a well known Catholic family. That prediction came true for the mission. To retain their apostolic freedom and their missionary mobility, the Jesuits had to retain their independence. As Garnet had discovered, the only way to do this was to rent and to live in one's own house. We shall return to the issue of Jesuit houses shortly, but first we should consider the development of the internal organization of the mission.

As a mission, the English Jesuits were organized as one body under one superior who, with the publication of the Officium et Regulae, was subject to the prefect of the mission. At first there was no other internal organization than that which we discussed in the previous chapter: a superior, two or three consultors, an admonitor, and a treasurer/procurator. As the number of Jesuits in England increased and as they became dispersed more and more throughout the country, the superior's tasks became almost impossible. The annual visitation of each man, the annual account of conscience from each, the preparations and the arrangements for the annual retreats and the renewal of vows became too great a job for one man. So, the general instituted new positions and authorized spiritual prefects, (praefecti spiritus) throughout the country to assist the superior. Each prefect assumed many of the responsibilities of the superior and oversaw the spiritual and religious lives of the men under him. He made sure that each Jesuit had ample opportunity for spiritual direction and advice, for his annual retreat and for his renewal of vows. Each also had the delegated authority from the superior of the mission to hear the annual accounts of conscience, to visit the houses in his area and to handle the personal financial accounts. In order to keep the religious discipline fresh in the missionaries' minds, the general ordered that the Formula of the Institute and the Regulae Societatis Iesu be read

during the annual retreat.⁵³

Spiritual prefects were introduced in the English mission in 1609; the cipher discussed above, Oedipus Scedularum, came from the same year. The Jesuits designated in the latter were probably the spiritual prefects appointed by the superior at the instruction of the general. I have not found any listing of the spiritual prefects so it is not possible to prove conclusively that they were the same. Nonetheless, the Jesuits named in the Oedipus Scedularum were among the senior professed members of the mission and thus the ones most likely to be appointed to such spiritual tasks.

With the creation of the vice-province, Richard Blount, the vice-provincial, re-shaped the English mission. He divided the kingdom into eleven mission areas: London, Yorkshire, Lancashire, Wales, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Hampshire, Lincolnshire, Suffolk, Worcestershire and Staffordshire. Though each mission consisted of more than the county designated in the title, the county concerned was probably the centre of Jesuit activity. The areas were called county missions because of the fear of detection if more precise names were given. Further alterations came in 1622. In the Catalogus Primus sent to Rome by the vice-provincial congregation of that year, the London mission had become the House of St Ignatius with the London and Kent missions; the Wales mission, the House of St Francis Xavier with the Wales mission; the Staffordshire and Worcestershire missions, the House of Blessed Aloysius with the Staffordshire and Worcestershire missions. Surprisingly, Worcester also remained as a separate mission. A twelfth

53. Instructions to Robert Jones, 28 March 1609, Epp. Gen. I, f. 9v; ARSI, Anglia 36, f. 2; Annual Letter of 1615, ARSI, Anglia 31I, pp. 631-656 translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1077.

mission, Devon, was added. The same congregation requested provincial status for England and constitutional powers for the spiritual prefects. With the general's permission, the Jesuits who had been the spiritual prefects of the missions became their superiors with full canonical authority over their subjects.⁵⁴

In the last chapter, we discussed the evolution of the English province. Father General Vitelleschi had denied the vice-province's first petition for provincial status in 1620/21 for two reasons: the lack of stable residences in England and the vice-province's inability to convene the required congregations. By stable residences the general meant Jesuit communities comparable to those on the continent, that is, colleges adequately funded or professed houses or residences in the technical, Jesuit sense. The next year, 1622, the vice-province convened a congregation, opened houses in England and re-submitted its request. In order to clarify the English situation for the general, the congregation forwarded various documents to explain its internal organization. The vice-province was divided into twelve missions. Each was a collection of individual houses and mission-stations. In three of them, the vice-province had acquired and opened its own house which would be converted into colleges if the general approved and accepted the founders' benefactions. The founders allowed the vice-provincial to decide where those colleges would be located and only stipulated that they be within the kingdom. Probably for reasons both practical (the ease with which suitable houses were found) and pastoral (the presence of a large number of Catholics) Richard Blount decided to erect the colleges in London and somewhere in Wales and Staffordshire.⁵⁵

54. ARSI, Congr 57, ff. 52-54; SC, MSS A, V, 1(3); A,V,1(4); Bodl, Rawl MS D 1351, f. 117v; PRO, SP 16/99/1I.

55. The location of these colleges, along with their finances, will be examined in chapters five and six.

Although the other nine missions had no endowments, the fathers insisted that that was the result of the lack of proper arrangements and not due to the paucity of benefactors. Until these arrangements could be made, the Jesuits in these missions depended on alms for their support. Nowhere have I found a detailed explanation of what the fathers meant by "proper arrangements." Was it that the fathers in those missions were unable to assume control of any foundation because they were unable to circumvent the penal laws, or that they had been unable to locate a safe, convenient house? Alternatively, were these "generous benefactors" simply unwilling to transfer capital funds to the Society for a foundation? I would suspect the last. The donors were willing to commit themselves to regular alms but they did not wish to relinquish control over the capital. In the accompanying documents, the vice-province explained to the general how it was possible both for the Society to possess its own houses and for the vice-province to collect any revenues from endowments. Since the Society could collect any revenues through the use of trustees, the first explanation of "proper arrangements" has been eliminated. Shortly we shall see how the missions soon found suitable houses but yet received no foundations. This eliminated the second explanation. It seems most likely, therefore, that the missions might not have lacked benefactors but that there was a shortage of founders, i.e. benefactors who transferred to the Society legal right over funds and/or property. Despite the lack of foundations for nine missions, the general approved the proposal and created England a province.⁵⁶

The province began with three Jesuit communities in England, one novitiate and two colleges, at which a small number of boys was educated, and nine missions. The former were governed by rectors appointed by

56. For a more detailed exposition of the memorials sent to the general, cf. supra pp. 107-113.

the general chosen from a list of names submitted by the vice-provincial and were supported by the annual revenues from their foundations. The House of Probation of St Ignatius opened its doors to its first novices in 1622; students began to attend the two colleges in 1622/23. Although there were no Jesuit scholastics at either college, they were not "inchoate" because both contributed to the support of the scholastics in the Belgian colleges. In 1624, Worcester ceased to be part of the mission of the College of Blessed Aloysius and was replaced by Lancashire which then ceased to be a separate mission. In the same year, a new mission, Durham, was added.

In 1624, the province finally succeeded in locating and opening houses in different counties throughout the kingdom. There the fathers came for business, retreats, and rest from their labours.⁵⁷ Now that the province possessed its own buildings, each mission was dedicated to a patronal saint and converted into a residence. In the catalogue of 1625, all the missions assumed the title "the residence of . . . with the mission of . . ." The different missions became the Residence of St Michael with the Yorkshire mission; the Residence of St John the Evangelist with the Durham mission; the Residence of St Dominic with the Lincoln mission; the Residence of St Anne with the Leicester mission; the Residence of St George with the Worcester mission; the Residence of St Mary with the Northampton mission; the Residence of St Thomas of Canterbury with the Hampshire mission, the Residence of Blessed Stanislas with the Devon mission, and the Residence of Blessed Francis Borgia with the Suffolk mission. Residences, according to the Institute, were not permitted a regular income; the Jesuits there

57. Annual Letter of 1624, ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 238 translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1101.

were to support themselves by alms alone.⁵⁸ The residences abided by this regulation until a serious depression throughout the Society in the 1640s and 1650s brought on some changes. The successive provincials continued Henry Garnet's efforts to establish libraries in the principal houses of each college and residence.⁵⁹

Throughout the 17th century, there were further changes in the internal organization of the province: new residences were established, some residences were elevated into colleges, and the geographic boundaries of a few of the missions were altered. Two new residences were added: St Chad, with the mission of Stafford, was created out of the College of Blessed Aloysius in 1661; and St Winefrid, with the mission of North Wales, from the College of St Francis Xavier in 1666/7. Neither college had grown substantially in numbers during the years immediately preceding the divisions. So the desire to make the communities smaller for more efficient administration could not have been the motivation. The probable reason for the division was not an increase in men but their distribution throughout the counties. More and more men ministered to the Catholics in Staffordshire and North Wales respectively. Of the 25 men in Blessed Aloysius in 1660, at least 11 of them were active in Staffordshire. There were 14 men in St Francis Xavier in 1665, at least 5 of whom were in North Wales. With the greater concentration of men in certain areas, it was more efficient to have the local superior more accessible. The new residences were formed because of the number of men active in a given

58. The general reminded the vice-provincial of this in 1621 when he decided against a residence for the English Jesuits in Antwerp. Residences were to exist on alms alone and were not to possess any stable foundations. General to Richard Blount, 16 January 1621, Epp. Gen. I, f. 131v.

59. Philip Caraman, Henry Morse: Priest of the Plague and Martyr of England (London, 1962) p. 49.

area had increased to such an extent that it was more convenient to establish them as a separate community with their own superior than to maintain contact with a distant rector.

The status of six houses was changed in the 17th century. In 1669 the House of Probation of St Ignatius became the College of St Ignatius. In the other five cases, residences became colleges. The Residence of St Anne became the College of the Immaculate Conception in 1632. The Residence of Blessed Francis Borgia was elevated into the College of the Holy Apostles in 1633. The Residence of St Chad was erected into a college in 1670. The Residence of St Dominic was transformed into the College of St Hugh in 1672. The Residence of St Thomas of Canterbury was elevated into a college in 1676. These residences were transformed into colleges as soon as they had acquired a large enough foundation that generated enough annual income for the support of the community. Usually, there was one major donor, e.g. Charles Shireburne in Immaculate Conception and Lord Petre in Holy Apostles. At other times, the foundation resulted not from one person but from many whose smaller benefactions made a sufficient total. In chapters five and six we shall study each college and residence separately so I shall postpone further discussion until then.

Besides the creation of new residences and the elevation of residences into colleges, there were some alterations in the names of the missions served by a few of the communities. The Residences of St Mary and of St Anne underwent some interesting changes in their titles. Until 1664, the name of the former was the Residence of St Mary with the Northampton mission. In 1664 its mission area became Northampton and Oxford. The order of the counties was reversed in 1667 and Northampton was dropped completely in 1672. When the

Residence of St Anne became the College of the Immaculate Conception the mission area changed from Leicester to Nottingham and Derby. In 1672, the mission of the college was confined to Derby alone.

The geographic revisions in the titles probably reflected a change in the concentration and the distribution of the Jesuits. Since the mission covered more counties than those designated in the title, the county named was singled out for some reason. It was probably the most important county within the boundaries of the mission because there was the mission circuit worked by the Jesuits. If so, then the changes in the names of the mission reflected changes in both the major house and the scene of Jesuit apostolic work. Oxford and Derby became more and more important to their respective communities and Northampton and Leicester, less so. After 1685 the descriptive clause "with the mission of . . ." began to disappear from the catalogues. Was its occasional omission simply clerical laziness? Long familiar with the missions of the colleges and residences, the Jesuit curia in Rome no longer had to be informed of their location. Or was the omission more significant? Had the fathers truly ceased to be missionaries and become domestic chaplains. To answer this question would require an investigation of the catalogues of the 18th century to see whether the omissions persisted.

After the creation of the English province the Jesuits there were organized into a number of colleges and residences. Throughout the 17th and the 18th centuries, there never was a professed house in the province. In each mission there was usually one house either owned or rented by the Society and a number of country houses in which individual Jesuits resided, and mission stations at which the priests stopped on their missionary circuits. Both colleges and residences must be understood according to the Society's Institute. As we have

seen, colleges and houses of formation were the only institutions permitted by the Society's Institute to receive a regular income from its foundation. Colleges had a financial stability that was denied the other communities which were to rely on providence and on the generosity of the faithful for their support. From the beginning of the province until the Interregnum, there were a few Jesuit colleges, i.e. schools within the kingdom. However, there were also schools which did not rank as colleges because no endowment had been forthcoming. Presumably such schools were informal and lived from hand to mouth. Thus there were students at the Residence of St Anne well before it was raised to collegiate status and there were also students at the Residence of St George which never became a college. Collegiate status had more to do with finances than with apostolates.

In the midst of the development and re-organization of the English province, the priests did not abandon their missionary activity. Henry More had mentioned three styles of life that were open to the missionaries. By 1616, he was worried that too many priests were suffering the isolation and confinement of the first mode. With the opening of Jesuit houses, the priests had a fourth style: they could live quietly and secretly in Jesuit houses, possibly with a few other Jesuits. Freed from the imprisonment of their attics, they could continue their ministries. Although many Jesuits remained the exclusive chaplains of different noble families, many others travelled within specific areas in their work among the Catholics. In his analysis of a list found among the Towneley papers, Godfrey Anstruther concluded that, in Lancashire in 1639, the secular clergy usually resided within the parishes assigned to them and that the religious, both Jesuit and Benedictine, were itinerant. Responsible for people in more than

one parish, the religious travelled among them.⁶⁰

The English provincial Edward Courtney (vere Leedes) sent two reports to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1662. Although his account was mostly concerned with the Maryland mission, it is also very instructive about the style and standard of Catholic life in England at the time. Aside from London, few Catholics lived in the cities. The greater part of them resided in their country houses and on their estates where they could exercise their religion more securely. For this reason most of the Jesuits who lived outside of London resided in the houses of the gentry. There, they posed as tutors or relatives. If the family was completely Catholic, however, they did not disguise their priesthood. Each day they celebrated Mass, presided at vespers and read the Martyrology. On Sundays there was a sermon to which Catholics from the area were invited. The fathers also taught Christian doctrine and instructed the new converts. However, not all the missionaries lived in the houses of the gentry. A number of them moved around the countryside working with the poor, distributing alms, and receiving converts into the Church.⁶¹ The author of the Annual Letter of 1671 compared the missionaries to soldiers in an army "which, although under the command of the same general, and all proposing to themselves the same end, the glory of God and salvation of souls, nevertheless occupied each his several posts." Some of the fathers worked as chaplains among the families of the nobility and the gentry. Others, the "skirmishers," traversed country and villages where they visited the Catholic houses at stated periods to bring the sacraments and to teach. Still others engaged the ministers of the Established

60. "Lancashire Clergy in 1639. A recently discovered list among the Towneley Papers," RH 4 (1957-1958) 38-46.

61. Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America, Text II, pp. 69-71.

Church in controversy to uncover their falsehoods and to demonstrate the truth of the Catholic Church.⁶² The activities changed; the style of life varied. But the Society of Jesus continued its ministry to the English Catholics, both poor and rich, throughout the 17th century.

C. Organization

All the authority in, and the administration of a college was vested in the general. It was he who accepted the foundation in the name of the Society and who was responsible for its continuation. The general, however, always delegated its maintenance to the rector, appointed by himself. For various reasons, the general could grant the right of appointment to the provincial but, if he did, the general must still confirm the candidate.⁶³ The Constitutions had not specified a set term of office for rectors. The Second General Congregation (1565) discussed the matter but decided to leave the terms without specifications.⁶⁴ The Fifth General Congregation (1593) confirmed the decree of the Second but strongly recommended to the general that rectors not remain in office for too long.⁶⁵ In 1646 Pope Innocent X ordered the Eighth General Congregation to alter the regulations. The papal bull Prospero felicique statui, decreed that general congregations meet every nine years and that provincials, rectors and superiors (indeed, novice masters were the only exceptions) should hold office for three years and that eighteen months must elapse before they could be appointed

62. Annual Letter of 1671, ARSI, Anglia 34, pp. 767-777 translated in Foley, Records, II, 573-574.

63. Cons. 421, 422, 423, 424, 740, 743, 745, 757, 759.

64. GC II, d 68 (after the election).

65. GC V, d 35.

to a similar office.⁶⁶ The new bull impeded the good government and administration of the Society. No matter how successful a rector was, he was forced from office at the end of three years and prevented from holding any position of authority in the Society for another year and a half. The Eleventh General Congregation unsuccessfully begged the pope to revoke the bull in 1661.⁶⁷ Pope Alexander VII finally lifted the restrictions in 1663 with Debitum Pastoralia officii but a three-year term remained the norm.

In the following consideration of the terms of office of the rectors in England, we shall divide the whole period into three sections, from 1623 to 1647, from 1647 to 1664, and from 1664 to 1700. I have chosen 1647 and 1664 as the dividing points because those dates inaugurate and conclude the period during which Pope Innocent X's restriction was technically in operation. I stress "technically" because the restriction had been suspended in late 1656.

Until the introduction of three-year terms, the rectors of the Jesuit colleges in England ordinarily held office for long periods. Between 1623 and 1647, the House of Probation of St Ignatius had five rectors. Their terms ranged from two to eight years, the longest being Richard Banks, the first rector. The College of St Francis Xavier had four rectors, one of whom, Charles Browne, held office from 1629 to 1645. One man, John Worthington, served as the rector of the College of Blessed Aloysius from 1623 to 1646. Immaculate Conception became a college in 1632. Between that date and 1647, it had three rectors, one of whom, Michael Alford (vere Griffiths) served eleven years. Between 1633 and 1647, the College of the Holy Apostles had

66. Padberg, "The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus," 23; Chadwick, St Omers to Stonyhurst, p. 146; GC VIII, d 43.

67. GC XI, d 12.

two rectors, one of whom, Henry More, held office for twelve years.

Between 1647 and 1663 the terms of office were considerably shorter. Of all the rectors of the various colleges in England, only two men, John Stafford, the rector of the College of the Immaculate Conception from 1654 to 1659, and Thomas Clovell (vere Thorold), the rector of the House of Probation of St Ignatius from 1654 to 1659, held office for more than the prescribed three years. But significantly, the suspension of the bull allowed them to stay on as rectors. During the ten years whilst the restriction was in force, England followed the pope's instructions and obeyed his limitations on the rector's office.

After the papal bull had been revoked, the pattern of office again changed. The overwhelming majority of the rectors served terms of moderate length, i.e. up to five years. Some served longer: Nathaniel Stafford, 1689 to 1696 in the College of the Holy Apostles; William Blackwell, 1678 to 1685 and Thomas Eccleston, 1692 to 1699 in the College of Blessed Aloysius; Thomas Percy, 1686 to 1696 and William Busby, 1696 to 1708 in the College of the Immaculate Conception; James Richardson, 1687 to 1696 and Roderick Roberts, 1696 to 1708 in the College of St Francis Xavier; George Webb, 1683 to 1696 and Peter Hamerton, 1685 to 1692, and Francis Shelley (vere Theodore Lewis), 1680 to 1691 in, respectively, the Colleges of St Chad, St Hugh and St Thomas of Canterbury.⁶⁸ Since all the longer terms of office occurred during the **last twenty years of the 17th century**, they were probably meant as stabilizing measures in the midst of the disturbances caused by the Oates Plot and the fall of James II.

68. In the 1648 catalogue, probably as a result of Pope Innocent X's regulation, the dates of the beginning of the terms of the rectors, superiors, and provincials were recorded. Cf. also Father General Vincent Carrafa's letter of 8 August 1648, SC, MSS A, V, 1 (7).

The Constitutions provided for a relatively large staff to assist the rector. There was to be a minister who would supervise the domestic order, regulate the style of life, and manage the running of the house. A syndic would observe the different members of the community as to their decorum and propriety. Similar to the syndic but concerned with spiritual matters was the spiritual father. The rector had a personal admonitor to keep him aware of the duties of his office and his manner of execution. A procurator was assigned to each college to manage the business affairs and the college's endowment. Finally, each rector had, at most, four consultors to advise him on all important matters and each college had at least one man designated as the confessor for the other fathers.⁶⁹

The rector, and the same was also true for superiors of residences, bore the responsibility for the spiritual and the apostolic life of the men under him. His job was to prescribe, to encourage, to advise, to direct and finally to watch over all lest anything foreign to the Institute be done and the rules of the Society ignored. He should see to the observation of the three vows of each of his men, the three days of annual recollection, the annual eight-day retreat in solitude away from the cares of the world. He should keep the men busy with the administration of the sacraments, the giving of the Spiritual Exercises, teaching, disputing, writing and serving as many as he could.⁷⁰

69. Cons. 271, 329, 431, 490, 503-507, 591, 810, 811, 820; BL, Lansd 324, f. 118; BL, Harl 4603, p. 347; Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu (Brussels, 1690) pp. 526-539; the rules for admonitors, consultors, ministers, and procurators in Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582); Ordinationes Praepositorum Generalium (Antwerp, 1635) pp. 45-46, 49-54, 63-66, 94.

70. ARSI, Anglia 11, f. 145.

From the institution of the province, the colleges in England listed most of the above offices, with the exception of the syndic, in the catalogues. The first provincial catalogue listed rectors, ministers, procurators, confessors, admonitors, consultors and spiritual fathers for the two colleges and the house of formation. More often than not, one man would combine two or three of the positions, i.e. the same Jesuits would be the minister, the procurator and one of the consultors. Between 1690 and 1683 few English colleges listed ministers, procurators and consultors, etc. in the catalogues. Omissions such as these were ordinarily, but not always, during periods of domestic strife. Apparently during those times the compiler of the catalogues was not informed of the identities of the officials and thus could not record them in the catalogues. However, no matter how great the disruption, one man in each college was always singled out as the rector or the vice-rector.⁷¹

Residences were governed by superiors who were appointed by the provincial with the general's approval.⁷² When the residences first appeared in the English catalogues, the superior was the only official named. Gradually other positions were added. In 1648, consultors (usually two) and admonitors were listed in the residences.⁷³ Confessors first appeared in the residences in 1653 and procurators in 1663. Since the procurator's task was the supervision of the investments and the

-
71. Whenever there was a delay in the appointment of a rector, the provincial could name a temporary vice-rector. For some of the problems and procedures, cf. Edward Courtney (vere Leedes) to the general, 18 May 1663; John Warner to the general, 11 March 1683; and John Keynes to the general, 23 September 1683, SC, Anglia V, 64, 103, 106.
72. Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu (Brussels, 1690) pp. 548-549; "Status provinciae Anglicanae Societatis Iesu ab eius constitutione usque ad initium Februarii 1646," ARSI, Anglia 34, ff. 70-72 and SC, Anglia V, 22 translated in ASJ, Foley, MSS I, ff. 138-145.
73. BL, Lansd 384, f. 118; BL, Harl 4603, p. 347.

business affairs of the community, there was no need for such an official in the residences until they acquired endowments. As we shall see, that was some time in the 1650s. Ministers and spiritual fathers were mentioned only sporadically in the catalogues. The administrators of the residences, like those of the colleges, would often be omitted from the catalogues. As with the colleges, these omissions were usually, but not always, during times of persecution and strife.

The lengths of the terms of office of the superiors varied less than those of the rectors. From 1623 to 1647 the majority of the superiors served terms of four or five years. Six superiors diverged from that pattern: William Wright, 1623 to 1634 in St Anne; George Angers (vere Ann), 1629 to 1646 in St Michael; Richard Holtby, 1623 to 1632 in St John; Francis Berry (vere Corker), 1634 to 1647 in St Dominic; John Price, 1623 to 1645 in St George; and Alexander Fairclough, 1628 to 1645 in St Mary. The papal bull reduced the terms from 1647 to 1663. Only five superiors served terms longer than the prescribed three years: Robert Neale, 1656 to 1661 or 1662 in St Dominic; John Spencer, 1659 to 1666 in St George; Thomas Pickford, 1656 to 1662 in St Mary; Christopher Simpson, 1656 to 1673 in St John; and Thomas Whitfield, 1656 to 1661 in Blessed Stanislas. Like the rectors in the colleges, the superiors' terms became longer only with the suspension of the decree. The revocation of the restriction caused a slight increase in the superiors' terms. Now they served terms of, at most, six years. The exceptions to this practice were John Martin, 1683 to 1696 in Blessed Stanislas; Thomas Collingwood, 1673 to 1680 in St Michael; John Lovell, 1666 to 1674, and Henry Warren, 1683 to 1696 in St Mary; and William Blackwell, 1662 to 1674 in St Dominic/Hugh.

The stability of the organization and the administration of the English residences and colleges are astounding. Rarely were the

Jesuits permitted a communal life yet they maintained the structure of that life. The majority of the offices that should exist in any Jesuit college could be found in the colleges in England. Although some of the catalogues occasionally omitted many of these offices, that omission was usually the result of domestic persecution and disorder, such as the Cates Plot and the fall of James II. But no matter how severe the persecution, some one was always designated as superior, rector or vice-rector.

The English province established the organizational and administrative structures of the colleges and residences as outlined in the Society's Institute outside the security of a Catholic country and without the protection of a Catholic monarch. At first, the colleges educated young men and the house of probation served as a novitiate for secular priests who had entered the Society. That achievement should not be under-estimated in light of the anti-Catholic and anti-Jesuit hysteria. Later, as we shall see the actual date varied for each institution, the novitiate ceased to act as such and the individual colleges were forced to close their schools. By mid-century all the colleges in England had become "fictitious" but they retained their titles in order to keep their endowments and contributed to the support of the scholastics at the Belgian colleges. Throughout the period, the province received no special privileges or dispensations. Even the inconvenience caused by Pope Innocent X's limitation on the terms of all superiors was reluctantly accepted and the papal instructions implemented. So Richard Blount's attempt to organize the new province according to the Society's Institute must be judged a success.

Chapter IV
THE FINANCES OF THE ENGLISH PROVINE :
1. Introduction

Christopher Hill's Economic Problems of the Church from Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament¹ has long been the standard work on the financial composition of the post-Reformation English church. So dominant had it been that subsequent works tended to be simply developments and explanations of different chapters. Over the past fifteen years, however, historians have taken a second look at the material covered by Hill and have begun to formulate new questions about it. Historians such as Felicity Heal and Rosemary O'Day² have led new investigations into the economic conditions of the English church. No one, however, has tackled the more difficult subject of recusant finances. Here is a world hidden behind aliases and secret trusts and one that remains almost completely unexplored. With only the crudest maps, I venture into it.

* * * * *

A frequent criticism of the Society of Jesus, and one which Martin Grene was especially eager to refute, was the possession of immense wealth. Grene's rebuttal began with a distinction between an individual Jesuit and a Jesuit institution. The former was forbidden to accept any financial compensation for his apostolic services. What he did, he did freely. Grene stressed that the work was done by the Society gratuitously and simply for the love of God. The Jesuits

1. (Oxford, 1956).

2. Rosemary O'Day, The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558-1642 (Leicester, 1979); Felicity Heal, Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate (Cambridge, 1980); Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal, eds., Princes and Paupers in the English Church 1500-1800 (Leicester, 1981).

sought no reward but relied on the providence of God "who exciteth devout people to supply their [the Jesuits'] necessity out of pure charity."³ The alms of the faithful supported the Society. Through its dependence on charity, the Society hoped to avoid all semblance of avarice and simony.

Despite valiant attempts to avoid the appearance of greed, some critics still decried the institutional wealth of the Jesuits. Even if such accusations were true, Grene argued, the possession of wealth was no crime; its improper use was the fault. But, Grene hastened to assure his readers, the complaints were without foundation. The Jesuits were very poor. Indeed "they are not so well furnished as commonly the poorest of all the Clergy." The awe-inspiring beauty of the Jesuit colleges and churches were not demonstrations of Jesuit wealth but manifestations of the generosity and devotion of the founders. There were few Jesuit colleges throughout Europe whose income averaged more than £20 per man each year.⁴

Stories about large, concealed fortunes abound in Jesuit mythology. In 1623/4, a Francis Smith, formerly a servant of the Archbishop of Canterbury, reputedly confided to a Mary Johnson that the Jesuits had a treasure hidden in England. He claimed that this fortune was for the support of the English students in Rome. Mary's betrayal of the confidence led to an investigation.⁵ At the height of the Popish Plot in 1679, many Londoners dug for the Jesuit treasure believed to have been buried at the Savoy. As late as 1697 astrologers were still disclosing the exact location of the Savoy fortune and many persisted in their

3. An Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine, p. 58.

4. Ibid., pp. 82-83.

5. PRO, SP 14/142/3; SP 14/159/82.

quest for it.⁶ Popular belief in the hidden treasures of the Society continued long after the appearance of Grene's refutation.

Any examination of the Institute and the institutions of the Society of Jesus with a claim to thoroughness must explore the finances of the order. The investigation not only involves the constitutional development of the Society and the legal entanglements of the penal laws in England but also the spiritual exhortations of poverty as an evangelical counsel and a religious vow. First and foremost, the English Jesuits were religious men bound by the vow of poverty. As Jesuits they were forbidden any reward for their service. As we have seen, the nature and understanding of Jesuit colleges underwent some alteration. So too did the understanding and the implications of the vow. The focus of this and the following two chapters will be the finances of the Jesuit institutions. This chapter will examine the Society's teachings and the dangers of the penal laws as an introduction to a more thorough investigation of the income of the Jesuit communities, their financial composition and the repercussions of the anti-Jesuit activity that surrounded the Popish Plot and the fall of King James II.

A. Jesuit Teachings on Poverty

Ignatius Loyola perused The Life of Christ by the Carthusian Ludolph of Saxony and the lives of the saints, The Golden Legend, by the Dominican Jacopo de Varazze, during the long convalescence after his leg had been shattered by a cannonball during the battle of Pomplona (1521). Animated by the ideals presented in the two books, Ignatius resolved to imitate Christ with a fervour and devotion that would rival

6. PRO, ADM 77/1/33; HMC 5th Report, p. 386; Narcissus Luttrell, A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, 1678-1714 (Oxford, 1857) I, 9.

the earlier saints. The imitation of Christ became an essential element in the Ignatian spirituality. He, and later his followers, wished "to clothe themselves with the same clothing and uniform of their Lord because of the love and reverence which He deserves, to such an extent that where there would be no offence to His Divine Majesty, and no imputation of sin to the neighbor, they would wish to suffer injuries, false accusations, and affronts, and to be held and esteemed as fools (but without their giving any occasion for this), because of their desire to resemble and imitate in some manner our Creator and Lord Jesus Christ, by putting on His clothing and uniform, since it is for our spiritual profit that He clothed himself as He did."⁷ Poverty was a piece of that clothing. Christ had emptied himself, had become poor for humankind (Phil 2:6-11). A true follower would imitate his master.

The pivotal "Meditation on Two Standards" in the second week of the month long Spiritual Exercises presented poverty as a characteristic of the standard of Christ. All whom Christ had called to serve him and his Kingdom were invited "to the highest spiritual poverty, and should it please the Divine Majesty, and should he deign to choose them for it, even to actual poverty."⁸ Not only had Jesus emptied himself out of love for all but he also invited others to do the same: to sell what they had, give the money to the poor and "come, follow me" (Mk 10: 17-22; Mt 19:16-22; Lk 18:18-23). Poverty was a response, made in faith and trust, of a disciple called by a poor Lord.⁹

7. Cons. 101.

8. Translated by Louis J. Puhl, S.J. (Chicago, 1951) p. 62.

9. Cf. Michael Kyne, "Poverty and the Exercises," Supplements to The Way, 1 (1965) 28-38.

The poverty envisaged by Ignatius was much more than simple indifference and spiritual detachment.¹⁰ Loyola's location of poverty in the context of a radical response to Christ's call and the choice of his Standard revealed a desire for actual poverty. Ignatius' ideal was a type of mendicant poverty, a poverty that trusted in God's providence, that permitted no superfluties, that demanded some sacrificial hardship even with the necessities of life, and that was recognizable as poverty by ordinary people. That was the ideal and that was also the practice of Ignatius. However, he realized the difference between one individual and a large movement. His personal experiences had demonstrated to him that one person could survive on alms. But could -- indeed, would -- society support another mendicant order? Moreover, would the Society of Jesus be able to rally to the Standard of Christ with the mobility and the flexibility that Ignatius demanded if it had to devote considerable time and energy to begging? If the Society were to pursue its goal "to devote itself with God's grace not only to the salvation and perfection of the members' own souls, but also with that same grace to labor strenuously in giving aid towards the salvation and perfection of the souls of their fellowmen,"¹¹ the pure mendicant ideal was too restrictive.

Among the pre-Reformation religious orders, there were two types of poverty: the mendicant poverty of the friars and the monastic poverty of the monks. The former forbade any regular income to all individuals and institutions. The order was to depend totally on alms and had to beg for support. The latter forbade the possession of any income to

10. Much of the following discussion is based on the research of Günter Switek, In Armut predigen (Würzburg, 1972) and David B. Knight, "St Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 4 (1972) 1-37.

11. Cons. 3.

the individual monks but an abbey or monastery was allowed income. Once Ignatius recognized that his own personal ideals of poverty were not expedient, he began to fashion a unique, third type, a poverty in which monastic practices tempered the mendicant stringencies.

The Formula of the Institute extolled a religious life removed as far as possible from all infection of avarice and as like as possible to evangelical poverty. Such a life was "more gratifying, more undefiled, and more suitable for the edification of our fellowmen." The Formula expressed confidence that the Lord would provide his servants with all the food and clothing that they needed. All Jesuits therefore would vow perpetual poverty "in such a manner that neither the professed, either as individuals or in common, nor any house or church of theirs can acquire any civil right to any produce, fixed revenues, or possessions or to the retention of any stable goods (except those which are proper to their own use and habitation); but they should instead be content with whatever is given them out of charity for the necessities of life." As we have seen, what was denied the professed houses and the churches was permitted to the colleges and the houses of probation for the support of the students.¹² The mendicant ideals, still clearly seen in the Formula of the Institute, were tempered to meet the exigencies of training. The colleges and houses of probation, in the tradition of monastic poverty, were allowed a regular source of income.

Aspirants to the Society were instructed to dispose of their temporal goods in favour of the poor. If they wished, they could give all or part of their possessions to the Society. If they decided to grant them to the Society, it was a matter "of greater perfection, self-dispossession, and abnegation of all self-love" if the candidate did

12. Formula of the Institute, 5. Cf. also Cons. 4, 555.

not specify to what use the Society should put his possessions. That decision should belong to the general. However, if there were a preference, the candidate should inform the general who would consider and possibly grant it.

Dispossession was not immediately required of all candidates to the Society. One could retain possession for one year after admission if the novice promised to relinquish his belongings at any time his superior told him to do so during the period of probation. Once that year had elapsed, the goods had to be given up. The constitutional decrees were very precise in their delineation of what had to be renounced upon admission into the Society. Candidates were to resign both the goods already in their possession and also any goods that they might expect to receive. Neither they personally nor the community in which they resided was to be the beneficiary of any inheritance. Although not required to renounce any goods that were "far away in houses or other properties," candidates should be willing to do so if their superior thought this wise. So the stress was not on ownership but on use of possessions. Novices could retain the ownership of their belongings that were some distance away since they would not be able to enjoy the use of them. After final vows, however, all Jesuits renounced both the use and the ownership of their possessions.

Every Jesuit should be content with what he has received from the common fund. He was forbidden to have his own peculium, his own savings, in either his possession or in the hands of some friends. Any money was either to be put to pious uses or given to a designated person in the community, who would record all sums given to him. Anything submitted to the minister by a novice would be returned if he left the Society.¹³

13. Cons. 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 254, 255, 256, 258, 259, 570, 571, 572.

Individual Jesuits were also forbidden to "accept any stipend or alms for Masses, sermons, lectures, the administration of any of the sacraments, or for any other pious function." All ministries were to be undertaken out of love of the Lord and out of a desire to serve him. Stipends and alms could be accepted, nonetheless, if they were offered out of a similar love of the Lord and not as an exchange for services rendered.¹⁴ Within the colleges, education was to be provided without any charge for tuition. The prohibition against tuition was continued until 13 January 1833 when Pope Gregory XVI, in Accipiendi Minervalia in Collegiis Americae, Angliae, et Hiberniae, directed the Congregation for the Propagation for the Faith to issue a dispensation for tuition charges in the Jesuit schools in these countries.

All Jesuits who resided outside the colleges and the houses of probation were to live off the alms they collected. Although a few men were especially designated to solicit the alms, each Jesuit should be ready to beg if the need arose. Ignatius insisted that all alms must be freely given. Thus each member of the Society was expressly forbidden to persuade any donor into the bestowal of perpetual alms upon the Society. However, should a person decide to bequeath such alms, it must be done in such a way that the Society acquired no civil right to them. Even though the alms were perpetual, they must remain the free gift of the donor. Similarly the Constitutions forbade the Society to retain any stable possessions not required for the habitation and use of its members. If the Society received any such possessions as gifts or bequests, they were to be sold at a convenient time for the relief of the poor both within and outside the Society. The general was empowered to dispose of anything that was left to the Society.

14. Cons. 4, 565, 566, 816.

He could retain, sell or apply goods to a specific work or location as he saw fit. To prevent the modification of the constitutional decrees on poverty, each professed Jesuit promised that he would do nothing, either alone or in congregation to change these rules.¹⁵ Not surprisingly the precise interpretation of this prohibition became an issue in the history of the Society.¹⁶

The Constitutions carefully preserved Ignatius' mendicant poverty as regards the individual Jesuit. Each novice was to relinquish all money and use of any nearby possessions. Although complete dispossession was preferred, the candidate could retain ownership for a specified period of time. Once in the Society, no one was to have any money in his possession or any source of income. Stipends were forbidden. No house could retain any superfluous stable possession. The Constitutions did all that it could to eliminate all possible sources of income for the individual Jesuits and for the non-collegiate and non-probational communities, with the exception of alms. And even the alms had to remain the free gift of the donor. Only the colleges and the house of probation were allowed any fixed income: they were the monastic exceptions to the mendicant rule.

The practical difficulties involved in the implementation of the constitutional decrees were worked out in the general congregations. The instructions for the distribution of one's personal goods were the first issue that merited serious congregational discussion. If the applicant had decided to bestow his possessions upon the Society and, with the desired indifference, had left their disposal to the general, the Second General Congregation (1565) decreed that the said goods

15. Cons. 554, 562, 564, 569, 744.

16. Cf. footnote 4, p. 252 in Ganss' edition of the Constitutions.

must be employed in that province. If, however, the candidate did not have the desired disposition and insisted on giving his possessions to a specific Jesuit institution, that institution could be the beneficiary, with the general's approval, if it was within the province. If the stipulated institution was not within the province, the candidate was to be informed that the Society would not accept his bequest unless he placed his goods at the disposal of the general. In the discussion of the distribution of the candidate's possessions, the fathers requested the compilation of a compendium of the constitutional teachings on this issue. The decrees were scattered throughout three distinct sections of the Constitutions and the congregation asked that they be gathered together into one book and explicated.¹⁷ The same congregation discussed over-zealous solicitation of alms. Despite the Society's reliance on alms, no Jesuit should persuade any layperson that the Society was a more worthy recipient of his gifts than any other charity. The Society should be content with alms that were given to it out of love for God and should not campaign for them. A Jesuit should do no more than present the needs of the Society to a potential benefactor.¹⁸

On 7 July 1571 Pope Pius V, in the bull Dum indefessae, declared that the Society of Jesus was a mendicant order (Ordo ex Instituto mendicans). According to the Institute, confirmed by apostolic authority, the Society was forbidden the possession of "stable" goods and exhorted to live from uncertain (incertis) alms, dependent on the assistance and the kindness of the faithful. The bull declared that the Society was to be numbered among the mendicant orders and to share in the graces and the privileges that have been granted to them.

17. GC II, dd 24, 41 (after the election).

18. GC II, d 56 (after the election).

The Third General Congregation convened in 1573. Decree 23 of the previous congregation had stated that the general must distribute the goods of a novice in eadem provincia. The fathers, however, did not specify which province was intended. Was it the province in which the novice entered or the province in which the goods were located? The lack of a more precise formulation had caused considerable confusion, so the assembly legislated that the province in question was that in which the goods were located. The congregation granted the general the authority to dispense from this obligation in order to relieve the financially needy Roman houses. Thus, if an applicant wanted to bestow his possessions upon one of the Roman seminaries even if those goods were not in the Roman province, he could. The general could issue similar dispensations for other seminaries. The Fourth General Congregation (1581) confirmed this decree.¹⁹

The question whether the acceptance of stipends or alms for spiritual services was a violation of the Society's poverty and Institute was animatedly debated for several days at the Fifth General Congregation in 1593/4. The fathers were reluctant to issue a precise, defined decree on the subject. Instead, they urged that all follow the constitutional decrees strictly for the greater edification of all and for the purity of Jesuit poverty. No one, not even the general, could dispense from the constitutional prohibitions.²⁰

The issue of the disposition of goods reappeared in the Sixth General Congregation (1608). A postulatum asked that the authority,

19. GC III, d 16 (after the election). The decree granting the dispensing authority to the general was not inserted into the acts of the congregation but was placed separately in the archives. It was printed in the Institute after the decrees of the congregation. The same was true for the Fourth General Congregation's confirmation.

20. GC V, d 29.

granted to the general by previous congregations, to dispense from the restriction on the disposition of goods in order to assist the indigent Roman colleges, be extended. The congregation was asked to extend that authority to include the seminaries of the province in which the aspirant entered. The congregation conceded that permission for the seminaries within the kingdom of Spain specifically and also within other countries.²¹

The curious specification of Spain revealed the real issue behind the request. Within that kingdom were many of the seminaries of the English, Scots, and Irish missions. These colleges were always in need of more money and it was practically impossible for candidates to any of the three missions to relieve their penury. According to the decrees of the Third General Congregation, anything given to the Society by a candidate must go to the province in which the possession was located. Although the general could temporarily dispense any seminary from this restriction, only the Roman colleges enjoyed complete exemption. Thus any property or goods that were located in a province different from that in which the seminary was situated, could not be granted to the seminary on a regular basis without the general's dispensation. If the goods were in the same province as the seminary, the aspirant could specify that his possessions be assigned to that college. The English Jesuits were in an anomalous position. Were the English colleges in Spain in a Spanish province or in the English mission? If they were in a Spanish province, the candidate required the general's dispensation to bequeath his possessions upon them. If they were in the English mission, similar permission was required to grant the seminaries any goods or possessions outside the geographical boundaries

21. GC VI, d 8.

of the mission. The constitutional cul-de-sac was caused by the novel structure introduced by Officium et Regulae. The only solution was to empower the general to grant to any seminary of one province the goods and possessions of a candidate to that province no matter where those goods were located. In so doing, the congregation avoided the complex issue of provincial jurisdiction over colleges and seminaries of separate missions.

Subsequent congregations concentrated on a previously neglected aspect of the dispossession of goods, The Constitutions had permitted the retention of possessions by a novice for a specific period of time. The Seventh General Congregation (1615/6) was asked to clarify the constitutional decrees and to provide clear guidelines for both the renunciation and the possible administration of worldly possessions. The congregation confirmed the instructions laid down by Father General Acquaviva and developed some of the issues treated therein.²² Even though the Constitutions did not demand all aspirants to renounce everything, they should be willing to abandon them if asked to do so by a superior. They were required to do so only at final vows. If the novice decided to retain ownership, he was to relinquish administration upon entry into the Society. The provincial would designate someone to administer the estate for four years; during that period, the owner could neither touch the income nor allow other Jesuits to do so. He was also forbidden to donate that income to either his community or to any college. With the provincial's approval, he could donate the income as alms to local charities. For serious reasons, the general could extend the four-year period. If such extensions were granted, all income from the estate had to be given to

22. Ordinationes Praepositorum Generalium (Rome, 1617) pp. 12-13.

the charities chosen by the provincial. At any time the novice had the right to terminate the arrangement and to renounce completely the ownership of the estate. If he decided to do so, he should not be prevented from giving that estate to any charities outside the Society. The congregation concluded with an insistence that all candidates to the Society be informed of these practices before their admission so that there would be no grounds for a later plea of ignorance.²³ The Tenth General Congregation (1652) ratified the decree and asked that the appropriate formulae be drawn up.²⁴

The Twelfth General Congregation recapitulated much of the previous legislation during its sessions in 1682. Confirming both the 17th decree of the Seventh General Congregation and the 2nd decree of the Tenth, it recommended that the general implement both. On the topic of finances, the fathers raised the issues of pensions, legacies, and stipends. Was it permissible for a Jesuit to be the recipient of a pension from either his parents or his relatives and could he be the beneficiary of a will? Or had he renounced all this when he entered the Society? The congregation decreed that, although no Jesuit could personally receive any pension, legacy or annuity, his community could accept them. The superior of the community was responsible for the collection and use of the pensions. No individual Jesuit was permitted the free use of his pension. The congregation decided that any legacy from a testator wishing to remain unknown to all but the beneficiary must be refused. Regarding stipends the assembly reaffirmed the constitutional and congregational decrees. It asserted that no superior, not even the general, could grant a dispensation from the prohibition against remuneration. The particular case of

23. GC VII, d 17. Cf. also GC XI, d 15.

24. GC X, d 2.

a Jesuit preacher was discussed in more detail. If a preacher had been invited to another parish, he was not permitted to accept any money offered as recompense for the sermon. If the money was offered as alms for the preacher's community, he could accept it in the name of the superior. After the preacher had turned the money over to the minister of the community, the superior would deduct the preacher's expenses and return the remainder to the donor unless the donor had insisted that the excess be retained as alms for the use of the residence or college. The congregation finally forbade the private possession of any money and the use of any money held by others. Only superiors, and only under certain conditions, were permitted to have money in their possession.²⁵

The Society's teachings on poverty were not organized in the Constitutions in any neat, systematic fashion. Dispersed throughout three separate sections, the decrees were later collected, reconciled and interpreted in the congregations of the 16th and 17th centuries. The tension introduced by Ignatius' combination of mendicant poverty and monastic poverty continued. In keeping with the mendicant ideals, individual Jesuits were repeatedly denied private property and private sources of income. Although the retention of personal property upon admission into the Society instead of immediate relinquishment became more and more frequent, the novice did not have the use of the fruits of his estate. After four years the distribution of any income from these estates was left to the provincial. Nothing prevented him from assigning the money to one of the Society's apostolates. Individual Jesuits were not allowed to receive any annuities, legacies and annual pensions but the community was permitted their acceptance. Similarly,

25. GC XII, dd 36, 37, 78, 39, 40, 41, 42.

stipends also remained forbidden to the individual Jesuit but his superior, in the name of the community, could accept them as alms.

Monastic poverty permitted income to abbeys and monasteries but forbade it to the individual monks. Although the Constitutions insisted that the professed fathers rely on God's providence and the alms of the faithful, it permitted an annual source of revenue to colleges and houses of formation. Despite the evolution in the understanding of a Jesuit college throughout the late 16th and early 17th centuries, that concession did not change. Indeed, the Society occasionally feared that the poverty of the colleges, the monastic poverty, would eclipse that of the professed houses, the mendicant poverty, and become the only type within the Society. As the number of colleges increased and professed houses decreased, there were grounds for this anxiety.

In no discussion about poverty was anything said about the larger institutional units: the province, the vice-province, and the mission. Apparently, they were denied any regular source of income because they were not directly involved in education and formation.²⁶ For their expenses they relied on alms, contributions and gifts. Presumably the provincial could apply the revenues from the estates of individual Jesuits to meet the province's expenses. The general expenses of the province were also met through a provincial tax levied upon all formed members of the province. However, if the professed houses and residences were too poor to contribute, the colleges were then responsible for the

26. The 32nd General Congregation (1974/5) decreed that "provinces, vice-provinces, and missions dependent and independent, as distinguished from communities and apostolic institutes, are capable of possessing even revenue-bearing capital and of enjoying fixed and stable revenues" within certain limits established by the same decree. Cf. Padberg, Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregations of the Society of Jesus, pp. 498-499.

provincial expenses.²⁷ The provincials understood this tax as alms because the individual communities were under no legal or constitutional obligation to pay the charge. The provincial could only exhort and plead; ordinarily he had receptive hearers.

B. The Penal Laws

Along with the exhortations to poverty and the restrictions on the possession of different types of goods that were common to the universal Society of Jesus, the English Jesuits had the added concern of the penal laws. Francis Walker and John Larocca, among others, have demonstrated the Damoclean nature of these laws.²⁸ Although always binding, they were irregularly implemented and often executed only by royal proclamation. No matter how infrequent or how lenient their execution was, their very existence was an ever-present threat with which the Catholics had to deal. The recusants explored different ways and means to circumvent them. The Jesuits were no exception. As Catholics, they were liable to persecution; as priests, they faced fierce punishment.

According to the Act of Uniformity of 1559 (1 Eliz, c 2), anyone absenting himself from the services of the Established Church was punishable by a fine of one shilling.²⁹ Subsequent acts (23 Eliz, c 1; 3 James I, c 4; 7 James I, c 6) levied a fine of £20 for four weeks'

-
27. de la Costa, The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1768, pp. 272, 278. For an English illustration of this, cf. Francis Forster to Thomas Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 26 March 1649, SC, Anglia V, 31.
28. "The Implementation of the Elizabethan Statutes against Recusants 1581-1603" and "English Catholics and the Recusancy Laws 1558-1625: A Study in Religion and Politics."
29. The following exposition is derived from J.A. Williams' study, "English Catholicism under Charles II: The Legal Position," RH 7 (1963-1964) 123-143.

continuous absence and empowered the monarch to confiscate all the offender's goods and two-thirds of his lands, with the exception of his principal house, in lieu of the fine.

Several alterations were made to the penal laws as a result of the Gunpowder Plot. No longer was the government satisfied merely with the requirement to attend the established services, now the law demanded that all take the sacrament once a year. Failure to do so resulted in a £20 fine the first year, £40, the second, and £60 thereafter. Full implementation required the assistance of informers who were rewarded with half the fines. The same statute permitted the tendering of the oaths of supremacy and allegiance not only to convicted recusants but also to the indicted. A second refusal of the oaths could, for men, result in the penalties of praemunire: life imprisonment and the loss of all property (3 James I, c 4).

The Act against Jesuits and Seminary Priests (27 Eliz, c 2) ordered all priests ordained after 24 June 1559 out of the kingdom. Those who remained after the 40 days grace, those who left the country but later returned, and those who failed to return from abroad and conform within six months could be executed as traitors.

Further legislation was aimed at the prevention of a Catholic education for the laity. The Act to Retain Subjects in due Obedience (23 Eliz, c 1) fined any employer of a tutor who refused to attend the established services £10 per month. The tutor himself could be imprisoned for a year. Four years later, 1585, a statute (27 Eliz, c 2) imposed a fine of £100 on all parents who sent their children out of the country for their education. This law, originally in effect only during the lifetime of the Queen, was made permanent by a Jacobean statute (1 James 1, c 4). The Jacobean amendment also demanded a

license for all educators who taught neither in a recognized school or university nor in the household of a gentleman who conformed to the Established Church. The Anglican bishops issued the licenses. Failure to obtain the required license could result in a fine of 40 shillings for every day of the offence. Half of the fine was awarded to the informer. A Caroline law (3 Charles I, c 2) increased the penalties for sending children beyond the seas for their education. The first offence rendered the parents unable to sue at law, to act as executors, and to hold any office in the realm. They could be deprived of their property for life as a result of a second conviction. The children themselves suffered similarly: the loss of their inheritance and the deprivation of their lands and revenue if they did not conform within six months of their return to England.

The acceptance of the spiritual authority of the pope was forbidden in the Act of Supremacy (1 Eliz, c 1). The penalties for recognition were, for the first offence, the loss of property and life imprisonment and, for the second, death. A later Act for the Assurance of the Queen's Royal Power over all Estates and Subjects within her Dominions (5 Eliz, c 1) imposed the same penalties upon those who had refused to take the oath of supremacy.

Recusants were liable to prosecution in the ecclesiastical courts. Found guilty, they would be excommunicated. Under the ban of excommunication, they were forbidden to plead a case in court and to transact any legal business. The excommunicate could neither serve in a jury nor appear in court as a witness. He was also forbidden to initiate any legal action to recover his debts.

Although the Chantries Act (1 Edward VI, c 14) was not, of course, directed against the recusants, it and its subsequent development in

the Elizabethan Act against Jesuits and Seminary Priests (27 Eliz, c 2) had direct relevance to the finances of the recusants. Any grant, gift or legacy of both real and personal estate made to Popish and superstitious uses was forbidden and would result in forfeiture of the gift to the Crown.

If one suspected that various estates, real and personal, were secretly devoted to superstitious uses, it was fairly easy to move the Great Seal to obtain a commission of inquiry which was usually granted to private individuals willing to underwrite the legal expenses of proving the Crown's title in return for a share of the recovered estate. The commission met in the relevant county and heard witnesses before a local jury. Both the commissioners and the jurors could be chosen by the man who had originally petitioned for the commission. Even though the commission's proceedings could serve as the basis for future litigation, there was no legal obligation to inform the defendant that an investigation into his possessions was being held. Since one man could control the commission, the jurors and the witnesses, abuses were common. Perjurers were easily found and their tales of papist and Jesuit machinations fell on gullible ears. The commission's findings were later forwarded to Chancery for record and to the Exchequer for further proceedings.

The Statute of Frauds (29 Charles II, c 3), however, had a significant impact on the fortunes of recusants. Passed shortly before the Popish Plot, the act required all trusts, conveyances and other important contracts to be put into writing and signed by all parties or their agents. In a court of law, as a result of the act, any "discoverer", anyone revealing suspected property or estates devoted to superstitious uses was obliged to provide documentary evidence in

order to gain his moiety. This greatly reduced mischievous informers and opportunities for perjury. Hence Jesuit losses were surprisingly small throughout the turmoil of the Oates Plot and the fall of King James II -- because the spoilers were unable to obtain the written records necessary for a conviction.³⁰

Throughout the 17th century, various proclamations either called for the full exercise of the penal laws or added certain new, emergency measures. For our purposes, the most important was the proclamation of 12 November 1679 "for the more effectual Discovery of Jesuits, and of all Estates belonging to them, or to any Popish Priest, Colledge Seminary, or other Popish and Superstitious Foundation." It reminded the nation of an earlier proclamation (20 November 1678) that promised a £20 reward for the apprehension of any priest or Jesuits and increased the bounty to £100. It also promised that "whatsoever shall Discover an Estate, Real or Personal, belonging to any Jesuit or Jesuits, or Colledge, or Seminary of Jesuits, or to any Popish Priest, Colledge, Seminary, Covent, or Nunnery of Popish and Superstitious Foundation (Except the same be issuing out, or part of the Estate and Estates of Sir Thomas Preston, Sir John Warner, Two thousand five hundred pounds Charge upon the Estate of Henry Nevil Esquire, and fifteen hundred pounds in the hands of Augustin Hungate, which are already Discovered, and now under Examination before the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury) shall have on full Moiety thereof." ³¹

The promise of a moiety opened a floodgate of "discoveries". Fervour and greed motivated many to step forward to seek the benefits of loyalty. Betrayed by false friends, the English religious and clergy found sanctuary in the Statute of Frauds.

30. Cp. P.A. Hopkins, "The Commission for Superstitious Lands of the 1690s," RH 15 (1980) 265-282.

31. PRO, SP 45/12/p. 395.

Chapter V
THE FINANCES OF THE ENGLISH PROVINCE:
2. 1580-1639

A. The English Mission and Vice-Province: 1580-1623

The initial expenses of the Jesuit mission were met by the papacy. When Pope Gregory XIII approved the mission, he granted it a subsidy that was presumably deemed sufficient for the ordinary expenses of travel and the anticipated costs of settlement in England. According to Father Acquaviva's instructions, the missionaries were neither to seek nor to accept any alms unless their need became extremely urgent. In words that echoed the Constitutions, the general urged the missionaries to avoid "even the suspicion of avarice and greed." Surprisingly, the instructions said nothing about the manner by which the missions should support themselves. The papal subsidy would not last forever. Once it had gone, the priests had no alternative but to ask the English Catholics for financial assistance. Need must have arisen quickly because the Jesuits soon turned to George Gilbert for aid. He set up the printing press and defrayed all expenses. In a letter of introduction for Gilbert, Parsons told the Cardinal Protector how Gilbert had

welcomed us to his houses, he sheltered us and kept us from cold and hunger. He made us many friends, opened to us many houses, has constantly been at our side as counsellor, companion, servant, patron; and finally, after selling part of his patrimony for our support, he put himself and all that he had, even his very life, to frequent hazard in defence of the Catholic faith.¹

Upon his departure for Rome in 1581, Gilbert had bequeathed to Parsons seven horses for the priests and a large sum of money for the mission's expenses. Later, in his account of the missionary tactics of Campion and Parsons, Gilbert advised all priests, upon entering an heretical country, to seek out a laymen who would provide him with advice and

1. Robert Parsons to the Cardinal Protector, 14 June 1581, in Pollen, "Father Parsons' Memoirs," pp. 13-15.

money. Gilbert contended that the missionary would be more independent if his expenses were paid by a single person or a small group of patrons whom the missionary could trust. If the priest did this, he would not have to worry about an over-demanding host or an angry penitent severing his income. With his own needs met, the priest could then invite the Catholics to assist the destitute and to finance other priests.²

Even though Gilbert had bequeathed part of his patrimony to the Society, his departure left the fathers without a financial base in England. Gilbert had urged reliance on one or two laymen in order to preserve the independence of the missionary. But that proposal made the mission no less dependent, since it relied upon the generosity of a limited number. Gilbert's departure left the mission without the financial assistance of any laymen. By December 1581, Father Acquaviva admitted the desperate state of the mission to William Allen. Nonetheless, he was reluctant to raise the matter with the pope. Instead, the general borrowed 200 crowns which he forwarded to Rheims. He hoped that the pope would repay the debt. If he did not, Acquaviva promised Allen that he would find some way to do so.³ Shortly, thereafter, on 21 January 1582, Pope Gregory XIII recommended the needs of the English Catholics to the faithful throughout Europe. His brief Omnipotens Deus exhorted all Catholics to assist the needy English and called for special collections. These collections began in Rome and spread first to the other Italian cities and then throughout Catholic

-
2. "A Way to Deal with Persons of all Sorts as to Convert them and Bring them back to a Better Way of Life -- Based on the System and Methods used by Robert Parsons and Fr. Edmund Campion," in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 331-340.
 3. General Acquaviva to William Allen, 23 December 1681, in Ryan, "Some Correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85," pp. 85-87.

Europe. In Rome, different prelates and nobles, accompanied by a number of students of the English College, dressed in liturgical vestments, were designated to visit various parishes and to collect their offerings. In Italy alone, the Catholics gave 500 gold pieces.⁴ General Acquaviva forwarded specific instructions about the collection to all Jesuit provincials. Sending each a copy of Parsons' De Persecutione Anglicana, the general explained the dire condition of the Rheims seminary and the English Catholics. Although the pope provided some assistance to the seminary, it relied very heavily on the English Catholics for financial support. The recent persecution left the Catholic impoverished and increased vigilance made it even more difficult to send out of England the little money collected there.⁵ Therefore, the general asked all provincials to bring the collection to the attention of their superiors and preachers, and to urge them to do all that they could to promote the project. Any money collected, he advised them, was to be deposited with the local ordinary so "that ours [fellow Jesuits] may incur no suspicion." The bishops would later transfer the totals to a Tiberio Cerli, a Roman merchant, designated as a trustee for the project. The English Privy Council, incidentally, knew of the collection. On 26 April 1582, the Council instructed Lord Cobham, the English ambassador to France, to persuade

-
4. Relevant documents are printed in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 340-347. For a description of the collection in Rome, cf. the Annual Letter of the English College, 1582 in Foley, Records, VI, 82-83.
5. The Catholics did manage to get some money out of the country. Lord Cobham wrote to Walsingham on 30 January 1581/2 that 400 crowns had arrived from London for the seminary. The benefactors were "Mr Roper of King's Bench, Hopkins of London, Dr Smith the physician, of London, one Burgen of Hertfordshire, and one Bustern of Oxfordshire" and others whose names were not known to Lord Cobham (PRO, SP 78/7/17).

the French king to forbid the collection with his kingdom.⁶

George Gilbert died a Jesuit novice on 6 October 1583. What was left of his inheritance, 800 crowns, he left to Sant' Andrea, the Jesuit novitiate in Rome. Father Acquaviva, however, would now allow the novitiate to accept it. Writing to Allen on the 10th, the general informed him that he would transfer the entire sum to the service of the English Catholics. He left Allen to decide how the money could best be used.⁷

The Rheims collection and bequests such as Gilbert's provided much needed assistance to the seminary and to the English exiles but they gave little relief to the Catholics still in England. Parsons complained to Father Agazzari, the rector of the English College, that over the past three years his begging had produced nothing except the 500 scudi left by Gilbert on his departure for Rome and the 200 crowns that the general had borrowed. Over the same time Parsons had spent 4000 crowns on vestments, missals, chalices and books of devotion and controversy for the Catholics in England. He did not think that he would ever be repaid for them. As if that debt was not large enough, he had given more than 88 crowns to needy priests over the last forty days.⁸ Expenses were mounting. A reliable source of income had to be found. In April 1585 William Weston, then the superior of the Jesuit mission, met some wealthy Catholic laymen at Mr Wylford's

6. PRO, SP 78/7/63.

7. Acquaviva to Allen, 10 October 1583, in Ryan, "Some Correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85," pp. 91-95. By this time, reports had already reached Walsingham that the "Governor" of the Jesuits was furnishing some financial support to the Catholics both in England and in exile (PRO, SP 78/8/123; 78/9/68).

8. Parsons to Agazzari, 23 July 1584, in Hicks, Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, pp. 216-217.

house in Hoxton to discuss the mission's finance. At the meeting, Lord Vaux, Sir Thomas Tresham, Sir William Catesby and Mr. Wylford each agreed to donate 100 marks for the mission's support. Others present promised smaller amounts. Lord Vaux was chosen to administer the fund; his son, Henry, to launch a wider appeal. Father Weston became the intermediary between Lord Vaux and the needy priests.⁹

Aware of the financial plight of the mission, Acquaviva lifted the restriction against soliciting alms and allowed the next two Jesuits, Henry Garnet and Robert Southwell, "to receive and distribute money in England as shall seem expedient in the Lord." Upon the arrest of Weston, Garnet assumed the financial responsibilities. Even if the Catholics had diligently kept their promises, the fund established by Lord Vaux would have soon proved inadequate so Garnet sought to supplement it with the patrimonies of the Jesuit novices. As we have seen, a candidate to the Society could either dispose of his possessions upon entry or he could, for a time, retain their ownership but relinquish their use. If he decided to bestow his estate upon the Society, it was preferred that the aspirant leave to the general any decision about its use. Although the acceptance and use of a candidate's estate was constitutional, Garnet hesitated. There were a number of Englishmen eager to join the Society but their desire was frustrated either by their inability to leave the kingdom or the lack of accommodation in the novitiate. So convinced were these men that their future was in the Society that they were anxious to hand over their money and possessions even before they had been formally admitted. Although the money was

9. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 45-46. One of Walsingham's spies attended the conference and, within one month, the Secretary knew of the plan (PRO, SP 12/178/39; 12/178/72 both of which are printed in John Morris, ed., Two Missionaries under Elizabeth (London, 1891) pp. 155-156, 158-159). Lord Vaux had earlier been involved in the transfer of letters and monies to the continent (PRO, SP 78/7/17; 78/7/50).

greatly needed, Garnet did not wish to deprive a candidate of his estate without giving him some guarantee that he would eventually be admitted into the Society. Because Oliver Manare, the Belgian provincial, restricted the number of Englishmen admitted into his novitiate each year, many, who had fled to Belgium at great risk, found the doors of the novitiate closed to them. Garnet begged the general to admonish Manares on the proper treatment of the English novices. Further, he asked that the English novices be maintained without cost to the mission. The mission's purse was empty, Garnet complained. The need remained great but the ability of English benefactors to continue their gifts diminished. The mission could not afford to pay for its novices. Most of the mission's present income came from the patrimonies of two novices but Garnet was reluctant to use it too liberally until he had received the general's advice and approval. That arrived by 1596: the general permitted Garnet to devote the patrimonies of any English novices to the mission. If there was a surplus, Acquaviva suggested that the money be sent to the seminary at Rheims. The general said nothing, however, about Garnet's petition for free board for the English novices and his request that Manares be admonished.¹⁰ The situation did not really improve until the mission opened its own novitiate in Louvain in 1606.

The patrons of a number of Jesuits on the mission came to its assistance with contributions. Robert Southwell's patroness, the Countess of Arundel, became one of the most generous benefactors that the English Jesuits had. Edward Walpole, the heir to the Houghton estate, presented £100 to Southwell for the use of the Society.

10. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, pp. 45-46, 104, 165, 172-173; Garnet to Acquaviva, 13 May 1593, 10 June 1593, and 15 August 1594, ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 651/624; same to same, 16 April 1596, SC, Anglia II, 16 and ARSI, Anglia 31I, f. 129.

Through John Gerard, the Society received assistance from the Wisemans, the Drurys and the Fortescues. Jane Wiseman, while she was still in prison, sent half her annual income to Gerard. Later, Thomas Wiseman would settle his estate upon the Society and would provide Garnet with more than 11000 florins for the support both of the Jesuit novices and the seminarians in Rheims. Henry Drury made over half of his property to the Society; Isabel Fortescue donated 400 florins annually. One unnamed benefactor contributed another 1000 florins each year. A second anonymous donor gave 1000 florins annually until Gerard left England. Through Henry Garnet, the Society received considerable assistance from the sisters Anne Vaux and Eleanor Brooksby.¹¹

Throughout the last decade of the sixteenth century, the money administered by Garnet came from three sources: the fund established by Weston's friends at the Hoxton conference; the patrimonies of the Jesuit novices; and the gifts and donations from the patrons of individual Jesuits. The use of this money, however, was not restricted to the Society and its works, but also went to aid impoverished Catholics, educate new priests and support Catholic prisoners.

After William Weston's capture, Henry Garnet had control over the mission's funds. After Weston had been transferred to the prison at Wisbech, he was placed in control of the common purse. The "Wisbech Stirs" began when Christopher Bagshaw and Thomas Bluet questioned Weston's use of the common fund and demanded a financial account of all the monies received for the support of the prisoners. Henceforth, the Society's control of the mission's finances remained a contested point.

11. Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, p. 173; Devlin, The Life of Robert Southwell: Poet and Martyr, pp. 114, 221; John Gerard, The Autobiography of an Elizabethan, translated by Philip Caraman, (London, 1951) pp. 25, 27, 52, 180; PRO, SP 14/19/16; 14/216/200.

More and more stories about the Jesuit abuse of alms collected from the English Catholics circulated. The Society, the appellants contended, used the alms for seditious designs and extravagant living. The seculars complained that the Jesuits diverted a large part of the English College's revenues for banquets and feasts¹² and misappropriated for themselves 40000 crowns. When the seculars had collected the alms, they continued, the prisoners and the destitute were supported. Now the Jesuits spent everything on "maintaining men and horses and brave coaches." Formerly the colleges were solvent. Now they were in want. Formerly aid went to the Catholics in exile. Now the money went to traitors and the makers of sedition.¹³

Compelled to defend the Society against the accusations of greed and avarice, Garnet explained the financial arrangements to Father Acquaviva. In England, many turned to the Society in their need. And the Society did not ignore them but assisted them to the best of its

-
12. Cardinal Sega's report of 1596, although it exonerated the Jesuits of the charges, complained of the chaotic state of the college's accounts. He cited areas in which greater economy could be practised. One was a curtailment of the fine dinners given on recreation days (Foley, Records, VI, 65).
13. AAW, V, 22, 29, 30 (all printed in Renold, The Wisbech Stirs); IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 38, ff. 333, 337, 347, 379, 391 (printed in Law, The Archpriest Controversy vol. 1); "Historical Narrative of John Bennett, Priest 1621," edited by Raymund Stanfield, in Miscellanea XII (London, 1921) CRS 22, p. 140; PRO, SP 12/262/66; 12/269/27; 15/34/39. For a more detailed presentation of the accusations and the rebuttals, cf. Christopher Bagshaw, A True Relation of the Faction begun at Wisbech in Law, A Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, pp. 100-102, 115; and Leo Hicks, ed., The Letters of Thomas Fitzherbert 1608-1610 (London, 1948) CRS 41, p. 131 footnote 41. Many of the appellant accusations continued well into the seventeenth century. Indeed, the Venetian ambassador believed that the Bishop of Chalcedon was introduced into England in order to take certain collections out of the hands of the Society (CSP Ven 1626-1628, pp. 408, 622).

ability. It was able both to furnish some aid and also to accommodate and equip the newly-arrived clergy because of the patrimonies of the novices. Around this time, Garnet tried to secure William Weston's patrimony for the mission. Before Weston had entered the Society, he had assigned all his property to Douay College. Garnet hoped to obtain what was left for the use of the mission. There were, Garnet admitted, canonical difficulties to this but he left it to the theologians to decide how the decrees of the Council of Trent affected such cases. Whether Garnet had any success remains unknown. Garnet insisted that he did not pursue Weston's patrimony out of greed but out of need: "What need have we to lay up treasure, who came here to practice poverty, and who, if we happen to be sent into exile, have so large a kindred to see to our wants." As a rule, Garnet assured the general, the collection of alms was undertaken by laymen. Besides the lack of safety that the collections entailed, the clergy did not have the leisure to devote to money matters and to the solicitation of alms from the wealthy. What money he received, he distributed as best he could. The demands were many: the expenses of the laymen who assisted the priests; subsidies to support the poorer mission stations; the board of the priests and the laymen who visited Garnet; the seminaries; the exiled Catholics; and the imprisoned. It was impossible to satisfy all from such a small sum but Garnet gave precedence to the more urgent and had "never expended any sum unless before God and my conscience, and after taking the advice of others where possible, there seemed to be a compelling reason." The most comprehensive rejoinder to the accusations was Garnet's reply to Fisher's memorial. There the Jesuit superior claimed that the Society in England rarely begged. When they did, it was out of necessity. Any money that they had received on the mission had been devoted to the relief of Catholics and the needs of

the incoming priests. Indeed, the Society had spent more money in the service of religion than it had received in alms. Thus the mission was in debt, which debt would have been even greater if it had not been for the patrimonies of the Jesuit novices. Garnet added that he spent more money each year on the seculars than he did on the Jesuits. William Blackwell, the future Archpriest, confirmed Garnet's claim about the charitable use to which the novices' patrimonies had been put and exonerated the Society from all charges. William Weston too defended his name and his behaviour. He had never, he stressed in a letter to the general, misappropriated any money from the common purse. Moreover he had given to the needy the money that he himself had permission to use. Often, Weston claimed, he had no money because he had given everything to others. As the two sides exchanged accusations and apologies, the financial state of the mission deteriorated. By 1598 the difficulties of the times had made any collections impossible. What little money was received, was devoted to the costs of the recent arrivals.¹⁴

The Wisbech Stirs and the subsequent Archpriest Controversy badly disrupted the English mission. Although the archpriest was to co-operate with the Jesuit superior and to consult him on all important issues, the allegations, counter-charges and suspicions left a deep rift that resulted in the complete separation of the Jesuit and secular missions in 1602. The halcyon era of harmony between the Jesuits and

14. Garnet to Acquaviva, 10 December 1596, SC, Anglia II, 19; Weston to Acquaviva, 27 March 1598, ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 651/624; Garnet's reply to Fisher's Memorial [March 1598], ARSI, Anglia 30II, ff. 364-366 (all three published in Renold, The Wisbech Stirs); Law, A Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth, pp. 138-139; Garnet to the general, 16 April 1596, SC, Anglia II, 16 and ARSI, Anglia 31I, ff. 129-132; same to same, 11 June 1597, SC, Anglia II, 29; same to Robert Parsons, 18 March 1598, SC, Coll P, f. 597; same to [Parsons?], 20 May 1598, SC, Coll P, f. 551; same to [?], 9 September 1598, ARSI, Anglia 38II, f. 182.

the seculars, the days in which the Jesuit provincials would organize a collection for the seminary at Rheims, was over. Periodic confrontations between the two forces in the seventeenth century rivalled the Catholic/Protestant battles in intensity and slowly divided the Catholic community into two camps.

The reorganization of the mission that followed the institution of the archpriest resulted in a number of important concessions. Officium et Regulae empowered the prefect to solicit and to distribute alms. With the money collected, he could assist non-Jesuits and exiled Catholics if he considered it expedient. If the donations to the mission were not sufficient to meet the expenses, the prefect could take something from the ordinary income of the seminaries. The seminaries would pay the viaticum for the Jesuits as they travelled to England. Officium et Regulae permitted the prefect "to entrust money to others, keep it himself, or distribut the same at his discretion, especially those gifts which donors have made to him at his request."¹⁵

The financial condition of the mission, always dire, was more so after the separation of the missions. The Jesuits and the seculars sought alms for their support from an increasingly impoverished laity. Unlike colleges, the Jesuit missions were not permitted a regular source of income from investments and endowments. Missioners had to depend on alms from the faithful whom the Society served but what if the alms were not sufficient? Should missions like England be permitted to wither and die? In Officium et Regulae, the general granted an important concession: the mission in England could use some of the regular income of the continental seminaries to support itself. This

15. ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts III, 375. This was repeated verbatim in the 1606 revision (III, 395).

dispensation was a precursor to, if not a precedent for, the English province's use of collegiate revenues for the expenses of the mission, as we shall see shortly.

Constitutionally, the rectors maintained and administered the temporal goods of a college. More often than not, they did so with the assistance of a procurator. The Constitutions carefully delineated the purposes to which the college's revenues could be put to use. The revenue was meant to support the seminarians only and the professed fathers could not avail themselves of it. The professed could visit the colleges but they could only reside there for long periods if they contributed to its work. Colleges, however, were permitted to give some money to travelling Jesuits as they passed through as alms. Although the general was forbidden to apply a college's possessions "to his own use or that of his relations or of the Professed Society," he could distribute alms from the revenues at his own discretion and for the greater glory of God.¹⁶ The prefect, according to Officium et Regulae, had the right to draw money from the collegiate revenues but this money was not simply alms to meet minor expenses of the professed fathers but large subsidies for their missionary work. Nowhere did the general stipulate that the money drawn for the support of the mission had to be from the colleges' surplus. Apparently, the colleges and the mission had equal rights to the revenue. The colleges' income and any alms collected on the mission were placed totally at the prefect's disposal. He could invest it, use it, distribute it in any way that he saw fit. Such freedom with money was rare in the early Society. Although the concessions concerned all the seminaries of the English

16. Cons. 5, 326, 330, 419, 557, 774, 776, Formula of the Institute 5.

mission, the one in which the dispensations in Officium et Regulae were implemented was the English College in Rome. Because of the rector's role in the financial affairs of a college, close co-operation between the prefect and the rector was essential. The continuous friction in the Spanish seminaries made the arrangement there somewhat tenuous. Co-operation was assured at the English College because the rector there and the prefect of the mission were the same man. After 1598, the English College became the financial centre of the mission. No longer were there any references to Rheims or any exhortations to forward surplus income there. The financial state of the college, however, was not all that strong at the creation of the prefecture. Cardinal Sega's report of 1596, two years before the creation, explained some of the college's finances. The revenues came from three major sources: the monastery of St Sabinus at Piacenza and the priory attached to it; the rents on some real estate owned by the college and the interest on loans made by the college; and annual donations. The gross annual income was 6205 scudi (£1551). After the deduction of the ordinary annual expenses, the net income was 4900 scudi (£1,225). The college had a debt of 8642 scudi (£2161).¹⁷ In 1596, the college was unable to support itself on the annual income from its endowment without incurring debts. Now that same income was expected to provide some support to this mission.

Henry Garnet was the channel through whom the monies were conveyed to Rome. The complex financial dimension of Garnet's apostolate can be seen in his letters, a number of which have been preserved in the Public Record Office. The earliest record of Garnet's involvement in international finance was June 1598. In a letter to Parsons he

17. Foley, Records, VI, 64.

instructed the recipient on the payment of different accounts. He had already forwarded £130, most of which belonged to others, to Rome via William Baldwin in Belgium.¹⁸ That the letters discussing financial matters dated from the institution of the prefecture may be coincidental. On the other hand, it may demonstrate that Garnet's quasi-banking apostolate did not begin until after Officium et Regulae.¹⁹

Among the letters in the Public Record Office, the first two were written on 30 June 1599. Although both were addressed to Italians in Venice, that was a ruse. The letters were written in English and were intended for English Jesuits on the continent. Robert Parsons hid behind the alias of Marco Tusinga and William Baldwin, behind Guilio Piccioli.²⁰ The extensiveness of Garnet's activity was revealed in these letters. Garnet had earlier sent 400 ducats "that is, as I take it £120," and asked if Piccioli had received them. Included with the letter was a list of the individuals to whom Piccioli was instructed to pay specific amounts. One Frederick at Douay was to receive 23s; George Henry, whose health was inquired after, received £5. Garnet told Piccioli to give £10 to Bekinsall to repay a debt of William Cornwallis. That £10 was to be deducted from the account of Richard Cornwallis. Much of the money sent through Garnet was allowances either to relieve relatives in exile or to support students at one of the continental colleges. Little of the money forwarded to Rome was the Society's. Garnet remained disappointed in his expectation of

18. Garnet to Parsons, 10 June 1598, SC, Anglia II, 37.

19. Father Hicks thought that some of the accusations about the misappropriation of alms resulted from a misunderstanding of the money that Garnet sent abroad (The Letters of Thomas Fitzherbert, p. 133 footnote 41). That may be so but I have found no letters that predated the accusations.

20. Ibid.

aid and exceedingly in debt.²¹

Garnet's second letter to Tusinga related the developing controversy between the English Jesuits and the secular priests. The latter were annoyed that Garnet placed the new arrivals and was responsible for the common purse. Both offices, Garnet confided in Tusinga, he would gladly resign. In a section written in cipher, Garnet asked about a certain Thomas 178 (Darbyshire?). His father had left him a large legacy to be bestowed upon the religious order that the son had entered (if the order were permitted to receive it). If Garnet could produce either a letter from Thomas or some other authentic testimony that the beneficiary was either alive in the Society or had died therein, Garnet would be given the estate. He therefore asked Tusinga to obtain confirmation of Thomas' status from Claud (Acquaviva). Although he did not know the exact amount of the legacy, any amount could be put to good use to pay off some of the expenses in England. Garnet wrote of another benefactor, again in cipher, who was determined to bequeath to the Society a large amount of money. Garnet had given the donor reason to hope that a college would be erected from the money as soon as the deeds of conveyance could be drawn up. The benefaction would not only pay for the construction of the collegiate buildings but also create a capital endowment that would generate a large annual income. Unfortunately, all the totals were in cipher.²² In 1600, Garnet informed Parsons of a second large legacy. The Society has been named the heir of a man long dead. After the death

21. PRO, SP 12/271/31, 32.

22. PRO, SP 12/271/105. Among the Petyt MSS, there is an unsigned letter to Giulio Piccioli of the same date. The letter, probably by Garnet, contained instructions on the payment of debts (IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, f. 199).

of one other person, his bequest would pass to the Society. The sum was sufficient for the establishment of a good college. No more was reported about either legacy. Apparently, they were two of the foundations considered lost by the vice-provincial congregation in its petition for full provincial status in 1622. Although those two might have been lost, the Society received other, smaller legacies in England. One "yeoman" had bequeathed to the Jesuits his property with annual returns of £30 after the death of his wife. Another promised the Society £20 annually forever.²³ The prospects of the mission brightened because of these donations and other pensions.

On 9 March 1604 Garnet wrote to both Ottaviano Marini (vere Baldwin) in Venice and Thomas Lancaster (vere Worthington). Garnet had previously sent Marini £270 and now instructed him to pay a number of outstanding debts of divers English Catholics with that amount. In this letter, Garnet hinted at a project of which he had formerly had great hopes but now realized it would cost nearly £800, and hence had little chance of success. The letters are silent about the exact nature of this enterprise also. But could it have been a house that Garnet had proposed to construct or even the college that he had hoped that the King of Spain would establish in England? The rest of the letter dealt with financial concerns: Garnet had ordered that "the young men" be paid 40s for their expenses; and one of his "factors," i.e. a Jesuit, had £50 for Lancaster, which would be delivered to an agent.²⁴

In an interesting letter of 29 August 1604, Garnet told of the financial problems that he, Creswell and Baldwin had. All three were

23. Garnet to Parsons, 22 October 1600, SC, Coll P, f. 536.

24. PRO, SP 12/287/48, 49.

in debt. He had recently received word that it would be permissible to accept pensions from the Spanish government but they remained unpaid. Nonetheless, Garnet entertained the possibility that the King of Spain would endow a Jesuit college in England: "For why should not a blessed Tower of David be built in the midst of the heretics" Hopes for toleration must have, indeed, been high if the prospects of a Spanish foundation in England were seriously considered.²⁵

With Garnet's arrest in 1606, Richard Blount supervised the mission's finances.²⁶ Yet, even in goal, Garnet kept abreast with the finances. In letters to Anne Vaux he inquired after the Society's money and wanted to know how much of it Blount still held. If Blount had any money belonging to the Society, any of the "grocer's money" or any of the £100 that had been given to Garnet, Garnet wished to be informed. He also wondered if all his debts had been paid and if there was any surplus money to purchase beds for three prisoners. A month later he informed Miss Vaux "that all that is out for annuities I always meant to be yours." If I understand that correctly, Anne Vaux was the owner of all the money that had been farmed out by the English Jesuits. Garnet hoped that she would leave to the mission whatever she could at her death. Meanwhile she could do as she wished with the money. Over the years Garnet had deposited £400 at St Omers and asked that £40 more be sent there. As a result of Garnet's different financial arrangements, he left the Society with some obligations. He reminded Anne Vaux of these and asked that she make sure that they were kept: the Society must pay £20 annually to Mrs

25. Garnet to ----, 29 August [1604], ASJ, 46/12/2.

26. Earlier Garnet had some assistance, from a layman, Richard Fulwood, who took charge of Garnet's London business whenever Garnet was out of the city (Caraman, Henry Garnet and the Gunpowder Plot, p. 105).

Mary Grene and "the like to a certain gentleman, a bachelor, whom you call uncle" [George Perkes?]. There were debts of £4-2s to be paid to the sister of Thomas Wintour and Mr Yates was still owed for a horse.²⁷

Garnet had appointed Richard Blount to supervise the collection and the distribution of the Society's money after his imprisonment. Blount later received the assistance of Richard Holtby, who worked throughout the north of England. The money they collected was forwarded either directly or indirectly, via Brussels, to Rome for investment at the English College. Between August 1607 and July 1609 Holtby had received £1400 from a Mr Mallet. This he sent to William Baldwin, who relayed the money to Thomas Owen, Parsons' assistant, in Rome for investment. Anne Countess of Arundel gave £2500 to Blount in 1612 on condition that, during her life, the interest received be added to the original capital investment. After her death, the interest could be used for the support of the English Jesuits. Other wills, at times with stipulations similar to the Countess' and similarly without explanation of motivation, left smaller amounts.²⁸ In 1613 Laurence Anderton reconciled James Anderton of Lostock, Lancashire, to the Catholic Church on his deathbed. The dying man delivered to a William Crumpton, a servant of Cuthbert Clifton, the sum of £1500 to be used for the support of priests and Jesuits. Crumpton took the money to Therlem Castle, the residence of Lady Gray,

27. Garnet to Anne Vaux, 3 March, 3 April, n.d. [April?], PRO, SP 14/216/242; SP 14/20/11; SP 14/216/245. All three were published in Foley, Records, IV, 103-105, 107-108, 109.

28. SC, Anglia IV, 38, 58, MS A, III, 3(21) and (41). William Trumbull reported to Sir Thomas Edmondes on 8 November 1609 that Baldwin received £7000 annually from the Catholics (HMC Downshire II, 173-174). Reputedly, Jane Shelley demised lands and left them to the Society in 1611 (PRO, SP 14/65/45).

and Laurence Anderton was entrusted with its distribution. The Justices of the Peace for Lancashire, having brought the matter to the attention of the Privy Council, were bidden to investigate the matter further. The lack of any further reference among the official papers suggests that the government's attempt to confiscate the money failed.²⁹

The English Jesuit financial network was complex and perilous. An honourable person, usually a layman, was secretly chosen by the Catholics to collect the alms and the bequests from the wills. Before October 1602, the total amount was delivered to Garnet for distribution. After the complete separation of the Jesuit and the secular missions, Garnet and Blackwell served as the distributors for their respective missions. Henceforth two different organizations managed two distinct collections. Whether there were two equally distinct lay camps to which the collectors appealed has not been determined. Formerly Rheims was the recipient of all the English money. Now the English Jesuit money went to the English College in Rome and, as we shall see, the English secular money continued to go to Rheims/Douay College. All Jesuit money not immediately needed for the expenses of the mission was forwarded to Rome for investment through the English College. The above mentioned Mr Mallet's money was invested at an annual rate of 5.5% in 1610. With other donations, Thomas Owen loaned different amounts to individual Italians at unspecified rates of interest and also purchased a number of houses and vineyards as investments. Four houses were purchased in Rome in 1613 for the English College under the name of George Talbot, the Earl of Shrewsbury. Twenty-four years

29. Acts of the Privy Council 1613-1616, pp. 338-339. Cf. also A.F. Allison, "Who was John Brereley? The Identity of a Seventeenth-Century Controversialist," RH 16 (1982) 17-41, especially footnote 19.

later, his nephew and heir, John Talbot, testified that his late uncle had not owned the said properties but had only allowed his name to be used in their purchase.³⁰ How much money was transferred from England to Rome in the early seventeenth century and how it was invested are questions whose answers would require a more thorough investigation of the relevant archives. The evidence at Stonyhurst suggests that the amount collected was considerable and that it was invested in various ways.

Throughout this period Spain played an important role in the mission's finances. As fines and taxes increasingly crippled the Catholics, the Society looked more and more to Spain for assistance. In a letter to King Philip II circa May 1605 Parsons suggested that the King should institute a pension for the archpriest and his twelve assistants, and for the superior of the Jesuit mission. The money could be paid monthly from the payroll of the Spanish ambassador.³¹ Although Philip did not act on Parsons' suggestion, Jesuit letters and monies were enclosed in almost every packet of correspondence between the Spanish ambassador and the continent.³²

30. SC, MS A, III 3(6); Talbot's declaration is in Foley, Records, VI, 538.

31. This letter was published in Spain and the Jacobean Catholics, A.J. Loomie, ed., vol.1 (London, 1973) CRS 64, pp.66-69. Cf. also "A Report on the Catholics in England," circa December 1610, pp. 179-181 in the same volume.

32. Annual Letter of the English Province 1619, ASJ, Morris Transcripts, p. 429 (translated in Letters and Notices 58 (1878) 282); Joseph Creswell to Cardinal Capatan, 12 February 1616, CSP Milan 1385-1618, pp. 657-659; Cornwallis to the Privy Council, 9 January 1607 and same to Salisbury, 10 January 1607 in Edmund Sawyer, ed. Memorials of State in the Reigns of Q Elizabeth and K James I (London, 1725) [Windwood's Memorials] II, 365, 368-369; CSP Ven 1610-1613, pp. 419-420; CSP Ven 1629-1632, p. 271.

The English mission reaped many financial rewards when it was erected into a vice-province in July 1619. One anonymous benefactor gave the Jesuits 400 gold pieces; another left them a legacy of 1600 crowns. A certain noblewoman donated 400 crowns to the new vice-province and promised that she would name the Society as her heir.³³ The vice-provincial had full control over all gifts and donations given to the English Jesuits and was ultimately responsible for all financial affairs. He was obliged, however, to inform his consultants of all important financial matters and to make his decisions with their advice. The English College remained the financial centre of the vice-province but the separation of the offices of the rector of the college and of vice-provincial, made the arrangements more awkward.³⁴ Since the creation of the prefecture no effort had been made to distinguish clearly between the assets that belonged to the English mission/vice-province and those that were the property of the college. One Hieronymous Bussius had bequeathed all his goods and possessions to the English mission in 1614. Everything went to the English College.³⁵ The college, however, kept only one set of financial records. So Bussius' bequest, although intended for the mission, was not kept separate from the actual possessions of the college. As long as the mission and the college were practically combined, there was no problem. Difficulties only began with the creation of the vice-province. Although the vice-province continued to invest its money through the college, institutionally the two were moving apart. Despite the money

33. Annual Letter of the English Province, 1619, ASJ, Morris Transcripts, pp. 429-431 (translated in Letters and Notices 58 (1878) 282).

34. General to John Salisbury, 20 March 1621, Epp. Gen. I, f. 133v; same to Richard Blount, 24 April 1621, Ibid., f. 135. Cf. also Williams, The Venerable English College Rome, pp. 36-37.

35. ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 457, ff. 56-59.

deposited at the English College by the mission, the college was in debt by 1621; so the vice-province loaned money to the English College even though it was itself in debt to Douay College. Threatening ecclesiastical censures, the general ordered the vice-province to cease lending money to the English College and to pay its debt to Douay even if it had to borrow the money at exorbitant interest rates.³⁶

The general's concern for the debt to Douay College requires some explanation. Douay College was not in a strong financial position. In a circular letter sent to the English Catholics, Matthew Kellison, the college's president, informed them that the college was in debt because the King of Spain had not been able to pay his annual pension. The English Catholics aided Douay via the archpriest William Harrison. Harrison promised more money on the condition that the money

should be applied and spent on the College, not to the advantage of others, that is, of the regulars, but of the body of Clergy for which it was instituted. For unless the Jesuits are altogether removed so that the College may be allowed to live independently of them even in spiritual matters, according to its original institution, we have decided never to send anything there again, and whatever has hitherto been sent is a debt or loan to be repaid³⁷ by the College to the Clergy whenever it is demanded.

There was nothing nebulous about Harrison's letter. He threatened Douay not only with the withdrawal of all support but also with a revision in the understanding of the amount already given. Unless the Jesuits were completely removed from the college, the archpriest would

36. General to Richard Blount, 29 May 1621, Epp. Gen. I, f. 137v; same to same, 27 November 1621, Ibid., f. 148v; same to same, 5 March 1622, Ibid., f. 152v; same to same, 5 March 1622, Ibid., f. 153v; same to Joseph Creswell, 26 March 1622, Ibid., f. 156; same to same, 9 July 1622, Ibid., f. 160; same to Blount, 30 July 1622, Ibid., f. 161.

37. Edwin H. Burton and Thomas L. Williams, editors, The Douay College Diaries, vol. 1 (London, 1911) CRS 10, p. 384. Cf. also pp. 369-370.

consider all money given to Douay as a loan repayable on demand. In the light of this type of blackmail, the general's urgency was understandable. Unless the financial accounts between Douay and the English Jesuits were balanced and closed, the college risked much. The vice-provincial often worried about the money that he needed to pay off debts, such as those to Douay, and to continue the support of the vice-province's own institutions. Alms relieved many, but not all, of the financial difficulties.³⁸ The vice-province was so in debt that the general wondered if it would not be more prudent to use the money offered by the vice-province's benefactors not for the endowment of three colleges in England but for the payment of all debts.³⁹

In the spring of 1621 Henry Silesdon delivered to the general a memorial from the vice-province. It was a request for provincial status. Because Father Vitelleschi doubted that the conditions in England would permit the establishment of any permanent communities, he refused the request. A year later the vice-provincial congregation sent a second request. Once again the bearer was Henry Silesdon, but this time he brought proof that, contrary to the general's doubts, collegiate foundations were possible in England.

The experience of the Jesuits and of the other clergy had shown that it was possible both to possess houses in England and to collect any revenues from rents and pensions. After all, Garnet himself had purchased a number of houses in the kingdom. So far various English foundations on the continent which had investments in England had had no problem with the collection and distribution of their revenues.

38. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 11 June 1622, Epp. Gen. I, f. 158v; same to Owen Shelley, 30 September 1622, Ibid., f. 162v.

39. General to Richard Blount, 20 August 1622, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 161v-162.

And even during periods of acute persecution, the secular clergy had been able to collect their patrimonies. The threats of the penal laws themselves could even be evaded through the use of trusts which Catholic lawyers had devised in order to hide the rightful owners and thus protect the foundations from confiscation.⁴⁰

A trust, of course, was a business relation between three parties, one of whom, the trustee, held money or property from the second, the trustor, for the benefit of the third, the beneficiary. For all practical purposes, the trustee appeared to be the absolute owner. Needless to say, it was incumbent upon the trustor to demonstrate that the trustee was just that and not the actual owner. After the Statute of Frauds, written declarations of trust were required as proof. Before that act trusts could be established through simple, verbal agreement. The trustor frequently protected himself against fraud and ensured the survival of the trust by the appointment of a number of trustees. There was safety in numbers and especially so when the trustors wished to conceal the existence and nature of the trust. If the trustor wished to confound the issue still further, he would instruct the trustees to alienate the property again to a second trust.

To prevent the loss of any estate, real or personal, a number of recusants had already employed trusts. Lord Vaux had transferred his estates to trustees who were friendly and honest. In so doing, Lord Vaux made it more difficult for the government to prove his ownership and thus less likely that his property would be seized.⁴¹ The English

40. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 96, 109-110v, 114-115.

41. Godfrey Anstruther, Vaux of Harrowden: A Recusant Family (Newport, 1953) p. 395.

Benedictines, too, employed trusts. Their superior, eager to have an assured source of income less dependent on the goodwill of the gentry, accumulated endowments which he then deposited in the hands of the same gentry from whom he had sought financial independence, at a rate of interest between 4% and 6%.⁴² On the recommendation of Catholic lawyers, the Jesuits in England now planned to do the same.

The English vice-province became a province on 21 January 1623. Its financial prognosis was not auspicious. There had been, it is true, three new foundations in England. Nonetheless, most of the province's income was entangled with that of the English College in Rome. To make matters worse, the financial stability of the colleges at St Omers and at Louvain was in doubt. Barely three months after the creation of the province, a dispute arose between the province and the English College over money. The casual financial records now haunted the college. It was almost impossible to distinguish who owned what and who owed what.⁴³ The first provincial congregation (7-11 February 1625) discussed the province's debts in Rome. Fearful of the possibility of litigation and of the exaction of the payment of the debts, the fathers asked the general to seek the pope's assistance in their attempt to prevent the confiscation of their assets in Rome. If, the congregation further petitioned, neither the pope nor the general was able to prevent the loss of the province's goods, could the province apply the legacy left to it by Roger Baynes to pay the debts? The general promised to do all that he could to save the province's Roman possessions and hoped that the difficulties could be settled without handing over the Baynes

42. Hugh Aveling, "The Catholic Recusancy of the Yorkshire Fairfaxes," RH 6 (1961-1962) 38-39.

43. General to Richard Blount, 8 April 1623, Epp. Gen. I, f. 169v; same to John Norton (vere Knatchbull), 29 April 1623, Ibid., f. 172.

legacy.⁴⁴ The confusion over the English College's records was not settled until 1630. In that year the general commissioned William Risdon, the procurator of the province, and Nathaniel Southwell, the procurator of the college, to settle the matter once and for all.⁴⁵ They went through the accounts carefully and divided all sources of income and all obligations between the college and the province.

Besides the financial quagmire in Rome, there were two of the Belgian houses for the provincial to worry about. The college at St Omers was deeply in debt because of the failure of parents to pay for the support of students. The provincial, Richard Blount, instructed all superiors in England to solicit payment of the college's fees semi-annually from the families that resided in their districts. Either the superior himself or someone especially designated by him should collect the fees for the current year and for any other years that remained unpaid. To prevent similar lapses in the future, the provincial asked the superiors to make definite arrangements with families in which the methods of payment were clearly spelt out. The Jesuit scholasticate in Louvain relied on any money that the provincial could send to it for its support. Blount therefore asked each English Jesuit, if he were able to do so, to send £5 in alms to the college. Those who did so would be entitled to the prayers stipulated for collegiate founders and benefactors.⁴⁶

44. ARSI, Congr 59, ff. 114-117v. Roger Baynes was Cardinal Allen's secretary and major-domo. After Allen's death, he lived in Rome until his death in 1623.

45. SC, MS A, III, 3(33). Many of the papers consulted by the procurators are contained in this volume. For related information, cf. Anglia III, 124; IV, 38, 54, 48, 63, 65, 66; VI, 88; VII, 68, 69.

46. Richard Man (vere Blount) to [a Jesuit superior], 19 July 1623, PRO, SP 16/99/1M (printed in Foley, Records, I, 128-129).

English Jesuit hopes were high in 1623. The three new foundations in England strengthened the province both financially and psychologically for the extensive work that would result from the marriage of the Spanish Infanta and the Prince of Wales. In view of the plight of the continental institutions such ebullience was unrealistic. The financial bases of both St Omers and Louvain were shaking. The provincial assets in Rome were threatened with confiscation and the controversy between the province and the English College appeared unresolvable. As a new dawn broke over England, clouds cast dark shadows over the province's continental institutions and investments.

B. The English Province: 1623-1639

From the creation of the province throughout the seventeenth century the province periodically submitted a financial statement to the general for his use and inspection. As we have seen in the first chapter, this report, the Catalogus Tertius Rerum, was introduced in 1589 as a triennial catalogue sent along to Rome with the Catalogi Primi et Secundi. Like many ecclesiastical records, these catalogues have the illusion of accuracy. One must therefore be very cautious in using them. They did not record the actual income of the provincial institutions and were not compiled to present a true balance of income and expenses. Their object was the calculation of the income normally due to the college (i.e. what it ought to have received) and the ordinary expenses paid by it.⁴⁷ How great the discrepancy was between the ideal and the actual is not always easy to calculate because of the lack of data. Nonetheless, I shall attempt to do so with whatever

47. For more information on this style of bookkeeping, cf. Heal, Of Prelates and Princes, pp. 50-51; and Lawrence Stone, The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965) pp. 279-280.

information I have culled from various other sources.

The Catologus Tertius Rerum presented the finances of each of the provincial institutions according to a set pattern. The categories were income, ordinary expenses, net income, the number of men that the net income could support, the number of men that the income actually did support, debts, and credits. In the case of a college, the income was usually divided into the annual revenue that was generated by its endowment and any alms donated to the community. The nature of the endowments varied. Usually it was a capital sum which the college either invested or farmed out for others' use. Beginning in the mid-sixteenth century, the censo, whereby landowners pledged a piece of their property as security for a loan and assigned specified sums from revenues of their estates to meet interest payments, became very popular on the continent. In this arrangement, if the borrower failed to keep up payments, the creditor had the right to seize the property.⁴⁸ As we shall see throughout the next few chapters, many of the Jesuit colleges in England invested their money in this way, i.e. by lending capital to Catholics and holding real estate as security. At other times, the endowments were houses, tenements, and pieces of property whose rents provided an annual income. The alms accounted for in a community's income were always "certain" or "ordinary" alms and never "precarious" alms. We have seen how Ignatius insisted that all alms remain the free gift of the benefactor and forbade the Society to accept perpetual alms in such a way that it obtained a legal right to them. Benefactors might promise to bestow specified sums upon the Society at designated intervals but they could not commit themselves to doing so in any legally binding way. These were "regular" and "ordinary" alms.

48. Geoffrey Parker, "The Emergence of Modern Finance in Europe, 1500-1730" in Carlo M. Cipolla, ed., The Fontana Economic History of Europe: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Glasgow,

The Society expected these alms and budgeted for them. But it could not demand them. "Precarious" alms were totally unexpected and completely gratuitous; they were never included among the totals in the catalogues. Regular alms were listed until 1642, after which date, for no specified reason, they disappeared. Included as revenue were any pensions or annuities received by members of the community from family, friends and patrons.

The onera, the ordinary expenses, were the regular financial obligations of the community. Besides rents, fees, taxes and salaries, they included annuities paid by the community to a benefactor. Occasionally a layman would bequeath all or part of his estate, either real or personal, to a Jesuit community in return for an annual pension at an agreed rate for a fixed period of time. There were three types of annuities: perpetual, those continuing until redemption by the donor, and those for the life of the donor. The size of the annuity depended on the period of payment, about 5% on perpetuals, 5%-10% on redeemables, and 10% on life annuities.⁴⁹ Of the three, the life annuities were the most common in the Jesuit accounts.

The net income, of course, was the difference between the gross income of the community and its regular expenses. This was the amount on which the community budgeted its life. Considered together, the revenue, the ordinary expenses, and the net income, were called the status habitualis of the community. The net income was sufficient for the support of a given number of Jesuits. Naturally, the per capita expenses varied from community to community and from year to year, and I have been unable to determine any pattern among the fluctuations.

49. Ibid., p. 567.

Most often the actual size of the community differed from the number that the community's income could theoretically afford to support. If the actual size was smaller, there should have been a surplus; if larger, a deficit. Deficits were either met from precarious alms or became a debt. The precarious alms sometimes came from the surplus of another community or even from the provincial himself. If a house had a surplus, it aided other, poorer communities or gave it away in alms. Although each Jesuit in the community was included in the reckoning, not every member was always supported by the community's revenue. Some priests were domestic chaplains and supported totally by their patrons. It did not, therefore, cost the same amount to support each man. Expenses varied and depended on the work and the living conditions of the individual Jesuit.

The debts were the amount of money that the community owed; the credits, the amounts owed to the community. Often unpaid pensions and uncollected alms were included among the credits.

As we have seen in the earlier presentation of the nature and purpose of the catalogues, they contained frequent omissions and inconsistencies. The Catalogi Tertii Rerum are no exception to this. These catalogues were concerned only with provincial institutions, that is, the colleges and the residences. They provide no information about the expenses of the Maryland mission and the provincial procurators in the various continental cities. Indeed, they say nothing about any fund that the provincial might have had at his disposal for the payment of his own expenses and for the assistance of the poorer houses. Despite their limitations, the catalogues furnish the basic information on the financial composition of the provincial communities.

1. House of Probation of St Ignatius

One of the original subdivisions of the English vice-province, London was the first Jesuit mission in England to receive an endowment. The new institution took the name of the House of Probation of St Ignatius with the London mission. In the acceptance of the House of Probation of St Ignatius, and also with the Colleges of Blessed Aloysius and St Francis Xavier, General Vitelleschi had an unique, initial problem. How could he, the general complained, draw up letters patent to the founders of the two colleges and the house of probation when their very names were withheld from him. Satisfied by the vice-provincial's insistence on the need for secrecy because of the dangers to the founders if their identities were known, the general drew up the letters patent on 29 November 1622 and addressed them to a curious alias, Ignatius Philopatrum and his associates.⁵⁰ The vice-province received an unspecified foundation whose annual income would be 1000 scudi (£250). The precise location of the novitiate was left to the discretion of the general and he could establish it anywhere as long as it was within the boundaries of the kingdom. The founders requested that, when the Catholics had gained religious freedom, the novitiate should be transformed into a college. The House of Probation, the donors hoped, would serve many purposes. The novices, especially those who had been secular priests, could undergo their first probation in the Society there and the missionaries from the surrounding areas withdraw to it for their annual renewal of vows and days of recollection. If there was any surplus from the annual revenue, the benefactors wished it to be used to assist the missionaries throughout the country and to help defray the costs of the formation of the scholastics.⁵¹ The novitiate's

50. General to Richard Blount, 20 August 1622, Epp. Gen. I, ff. 161v-162; ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91.

51. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91; General to Richard Blount, 26 November 165v.

endowment consisted of an unspecified capital sum, which it could invest in a number of ways, and of rents from properties. We can not tell from the documents whether the novitiate owned the properties from which it received the rents or whether the rents were simply pledged as security for capital loans or were assigned to the novitiate. Unnamed trustees, probably the benefactors themselves, held the endowment in trust and each year turned the revenues over to the community. What precise arrangements had been made for the collection and the distribution of the income, I do not know. But some time in the early 1630s, Father General Vitelleschi altered the arrangement and decided that the English foundations should be managed by the provincial himself and not by the rectors and the procurators of the colleges. As we shall see, the only college that apparently heeded the decision was Holy Apostles. It seems most likely, therefore, that the novitiate's rector and procurator managed its financial affairs. They received the income from the trustees and transferred any surplus revenue to the provincial for his distribution.

The building in which the original novitiate community was situated was a "sanctuary," but not in a canonical or an ecclesiastical sense. The building was under titled protection and no armed men, with the exception of the king, his heralds and his councillors, could enter without the express order of the king. Ordinarily such commands were given only during rebellions. Thus the novitiate was safe in the event of future persecution. There were two other buildings in the neighbourhood, both "sanctuaries," to which the Jesuits had free and easy access if the need arose. About ten or twelve Jesuits could reside at the novitiate; around the same number could work throughout the district as missionaries. The missionaries were obliged to visit the novitiate periodically for spiritual conferences, the renewal of their vows, etc.

Meanwhile, the Jesuits within the novitiate would live a communal life as prescribed in the Society's Regulae in comparative security.⁵²

The members of the London mission abandoned their rented rooms and isolated dwellings and moved into the new novitiate shortly before the feast of St Ignatius, 31 July 1622. The House of Probation officially opened on the feast of its patron. From the very beginning domestic order was observed. Bells signalled the start of the different exercises and chores that made up the novices' day. The Regulae of the Society and Father General Acquaviva's letter on spiritual renewal (1583) were read aloud during the meals. In their zeal, the novices prayed more than was required, practised daily mortifications, often requested the discipline, and frequently sought personal admonitions from the superior. Father Rector gave frequent exhortations to the community and they were very well received. The novitiate organized and convened conferences on Christian doctrine and the Jesuit Institute. Within two months of its opening, the vice-provincial visited the novitiate and was delighted with what he had seen. Allegedly, the practices and the life were so exemplary that he could desire nothing more.⁵³

Among the papers discovered and confiscated at Clerkenwell in March 1628 were the instructions for the rector, the minister the master of novices, and the entire community.⁵⁴ All the instructions

52. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 114-115.

53. Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow) to the General, 27 October 1622 and Richard Blount to the General, 14 September 1622, ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 144.

54. PRO, SP 16/99/1F. For the story of the Clerkenwell raid, written by Attorney General Sir Robert Heath, cf. PRO SP 16/99/1 and BL, Add MS 5506, ff. 1-5v. These accounts were published in Foley, Records, I, 109-114 and "The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1627/8," edited by John G. Nichols in Camden Society Miscellany II (London, 1853) pp. 21-30.

stressed the need for secrecy regarding the location of the novitiate. And the secret was kept. From a distinction made in the Catalogi Tertii of 1623, 1624, 1625 and 1626, we know the size of the communities. Their location is another matter. We do not know the exact location of the "sanctuary" into which the Jesuits moved on 31 July 1622. Nor do we know how long they resided there. Because of the Clerkenwell papers, our definite knowledge begins only in January 1624. Nonetheless we may conjecture about the location of the original novitiate. Throughout the early 1620s, the English Jesuits had close contact with the French embassy and especially with the ambassador the Count de Tillier. The Count had permitted the vice-province to convene its congregation in his residence, Hunsdon's House in Blackfriars, in May 1622. Apparently the Society continued to use the house and especially its chapel for sermons and services until October 1623. On the afternoon of Sunday 26 October, in the middle of a sermon by the Jesuit Robert Drury, the floor of a large upper room in Hunsdon's House gave way. The preacher, another Jesuit, and nearly one hundred members of the congregation fell to their death at the "Doleful Evensong."⁵⁵ Possibly Hunsdon's House was the Jesuit novitiate. In view of the protection that the embassy could offer and the continued apostolic activities in the Blackfriars area, it is more than simply possible that the novitiate was situated there. The Jesuits lived safely under the protection of the French ambassador until the tragedy of the "Doleful Evensong", which destroyed the building and forced the community to move. By January 1624 the novitiate had found an appropriate building in Edmonton.

55. Foley, Records, I, 76-78; [Joseph Agius], "Memorable Sites in London," Letters and Notices 52 (1937) 292-303.

The Annual Letter of 1624 related how many of the fathers, having worked on the mission, withdrew to the novitiate for rest, conferences and retreats. We are told that, in both their missionary endeavours and their prayerful retreats, the priests provided the novices with good examples and edification. The novices were engaged in the Spiritual Exercises, the study of the Constitutions and various apostolic works throughout London.⁵⁶ Even though the men who entered the London novitiate were usually older and already ordained, their virtue and diligence were without rival. Throughout 1624, while the novitiate was in Edmonton, the community consisted of 16 Jesuits. For no apparent reason, unless it was the demand for a larger dwelling, the novitiate moved from Edmonton in December 1624.

The surviving monthly accounts begin just after the provincial visitation to Edmonton in January 1624. The ledgers specifically note the visitation because the examination of the financial records was one of the provincial's tasks during his stay. The accounts, witnessed and attested each month by Richard Banks, the novitiate's rector, give us a glimpse into the everyday life of an "underground" religious community in Caroline England. The expenses for sustenance were ordinary. In 1624 the novitiate spent £22-13-6 on bread and beer; £11-18-4 on wine; £57-14-0 on meat; £23-10-4 on wood and coal; £44 on rent; £18 on wages; £9-3-10 on spice and sugar; £6-7-2 in alms and for the upkeep of the chapel; £17-15-3 for candles, salt, etc.; £8-15-1 for horses and furnishings for the house. In March, June, September and December the novitiate paid the servants and the quarterly rent on the building. There was one extraordinary and intriguing

56. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 238-240 translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1101-1102.

expense for November: £7-15-8 "in subsidium pecuniarum pro rogo (or rege?)". The all-important final word can be read either way. Was it a payment for a funeral or a subsidy to the king? The author of "The Discovery of the Jesuits' College in Clerkenwell," Sir Robert Heath, thought the latter and I am inclined to agree. When the English monarchy turned from Spain to France in its quest for a marriage treaty, the Duke of Buckingham planned to conclude an Anglo-French alliance and to travel to France to bring back Henrietta Maria. Money was scarce and it was rumoured that Prince Charles had borrowed £20,000 in late November 1624 to pay the Duke's expenses.⁵⁷ It was definitely to the advantage of the English Catholics in general, and to the Jesuits in particular (because of their friendship with the French embassy) to conclude the treaty. Thus the novitiate may well have helped to defray the expenses of Buckingham's enterprise.

The novitiate's expenses for 1624 were £227-13-2.⁵⁸ During the same year it received £119 -- £44 from a certain Mr Hayes and £75 from "our Lodgers." The accounts referred to only one lodger -- a gentlewoman -- but neither she nor Mr Hayes was identified. The latter was probably a trustee who passed to the novitiate the annual income from its endowment and from the lodgers, i.e. the boarders whose rents were paid to the novitiate. The revenue collected by the novitiate, some £119, was considerably less than the community's expenses. Money from the previous year's surplus and the alms from a "Mr Stanhope" (possibly Richard Banks, the rector for "Stanhope" was one of his aliases) allowed the novitiate to balance the books.⁵⁹

57. Lockyer, Buckingham, p. 212.

58. The ledgers erred in its computations: the expenses do not add up to this total.

59. PRO, SP 16/99/1D, Eii.

There seems to have been no established novitiate between December 1624, when the community moved out of the Edmonton dwelling and May 1625, when the Society rented a house in Camberwell. The novitiate remained there until January 1627. During the intervening period, there were once again, attested monthly accounts for the ordinary expenses of the novitiate. The subsidy to the king vanished from the ledgers and an account for fish, eggs, milk and butter was added. The rents and the servants were paid semi-annually at Camberwell. During the twenty months of the Camberwell novitiate, the expenses were £38-17-10 for bread and beer; £21-0-0 for wine; £83-1-8 for meat; £43-10-3 for wood and coal; £21-10-3 for fish, eggs, milk and butter; £45 for rent; £27 for Wages; £17-13-6 for spice and suger; £9-7-6 for alms and the maintenance of the chapel; £23-19-2 for candles, salt, etc.; £15-16-3 for horses and household furnishings; and £137-11-5 for all expenses between May 1626 and January 1627. During the same twenty months, the community's only income was £250 from Mr Hayes. For some unknown reason the income generated from the foundation between May 1625 and May 1626 was not collected. The receipt of only £250 left the novitiate with a deficit, most of which had been wiped out by precarious alms so that, by 23 December 1626, the novitiate had overspent by only £9-9-5.⁶⁰

Included among the Clerkenwell papers were notes used in the compilation of the novitiate's records for the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1625. The novitiate's foundation returned 1000 scudi (£250) annually. It also received 600 scudi (£150) in regular alms. The House of Probation's net income was 1600 scudi (£400). There were no financial obligations. If we compare this information with that in the catalogue itself, we notice only one difference: the catalogue gave

60. PRO, SP 16/99/1D, Eii.

the regular alms as 800 scudi, an increase of 200 scudi. An analysis of the actual income explains the increase. During the calendar year 1625 the actual income of the novitiate was £513-10, £113-10 higher than anticipated. The income came from five sources: £13 surplus from the previous year (a curious entry because the accounts for 1624, as discussed above, did not mention a surplus); £35 profit from sales unspecified; £250 from the endowment; £200 from regular alms; and £15-10 from a loan. The novitiate had received all its rightful revenue from the endowment but the alms actually totalled £50 more than expected. Because of the increase, the community adjusted the total in the Catalogus Tertius Rerum. Instead of 600 scudi (£150) the House of Probation now expected to receive 800 scudi (£200) annually in regular alms.

The Jesuits remained at Camberwell until January 1627. Just before the move to the new house in Clerkenwell the rector compiled a short statement of the financial condition of the novitiate. By this date the revenue from the endowment had increased by £20. The novitiate had saved £250 that it had received in precarious alms and had invested it in some unknown way at an annual return of £20. The regular income for 1626 had been £369: £250 generated by the original endowment of the novitiate; the £20 from the recent investment; £75 collected from the lodgers, the same amount that they paid in 1624; and £24 from the provincial.⁶¹ The ledgers gave no explanation for the sum received from the provincial. Perhaps it was a contribution towards the expenses of the provincial staff who were supported by the novitiate.

61. PRO, SP 16/99/1D.

Sir Robert Heath explained that the death of Mrs Joan Milberie, the woman from whom the Society had rented the building in Camberwell, was the cause of the move to Clerkenwell. That, however, was not the case. There are two documents in the Public Record Office both from 1627 and both concerned with Mrs Milberie, which make not the slightest suggestion that she had passed away. The actual reasons for the move were more complicated.

Joan Milberie made her first appearance in the official records in 1623 when she attempted to smuggle some popish pictures and books into the country. The articles were confiscated, but, at the request of Lord Wallingford, the goods were returned to her. Her second appearance was much more significant. An iron chest and various trunks had been stored in the house of a Christopher Neighbour in Long Acre in September 1626. Neighbour had often served as a liaison between the English Catholics and Queen Henrietta Maria and arranged for the baptism of Catholic children in the Queen's chapel.⁶² Neighbour's brother-in-law, a man by the name of Southwell, became suspicious of the trunks and reported them to the authorities, whereupon Sir John Coke issued a warrant that resulted in their confiscation on 22 September. Four days later the trunks were opened and their contents inventoried. Among the articles contained therein were two chalices and patens, one in silver and one in gold, popish books both in Latin and English, vestments, Mass articles, approximately £200 in gold and £120 in silver plate, Jesuit prayerbooks, Sodality prayersheets, and financial data regarding the estate of Mrs Milberie's late husband. Almost immediately Mrs Milberie petitioned the Privy Council for the return of the goods and the papers that she had left with the Neighbours. She was especially anxious to recover the material that concerned her husband's

62. PRO, SP 16/229/134; Alan Dures, English Catholicism 1558-1642 (Harlow, Essex, 1983) p. 59.

estate. On the 6th and the 12th of October, first Christopher Neighbour and then his wife were questioned. Mr Neighbour denied that he had ever heard of a Mrs Milberie and claimed that the trunks had been left at his house by a Monsieur Garniere, a servant of the Queen, as a pawn for a child named Nall Forster who had also been left with the Neighbours. Mrs Neighbour also denied that she knew a Mrs Milberie but she had heard it said that that widow had a house in Camberwell. The day before the confiscation of the trunks, Mrs Neighbour continued, a mysterious woman stopped by their house. This woman, who was short, plump, somewhat old and wore a black gown with a veil to cover her face, asked to see the trunks. Mrs Neighbour escorted her to the room in which the trunks were stored and left her there to examine the contents. Mrs Neighbour did not know what the woman did with the trunks but she recalled hearing the ironchest being unlocked. Mrs Neighbour thought that the trunks belonged to a "Mr Vincent alias Worthington", whom she had not seen since the King had ordered the departure of the French members of the Queen's retinue from her court at Somerset House the previous August. Mrs Neighbour claimed the trunks had been left with them because they had consented to nurse Nall Forster.

The investigation into Mrs Milberie and the mysterious trunks continued. Sir John Coke, having been informed that Mrs Milberie had taken a son of Sir William Forster as her heir, the very son now being nursed by the Neighbours, and was raising him as a Catholic, looked into the woman's religious affiliation. Attorney General Heath wrote to the clerk of the Exchequer, the clerk of the Assizes and the clerk of the Peace in Surrey to certify the stories that Mrs Milberie was a convicted recusant. All three replied in the negative. Two weeks later the clerk of Peace in Surrey wrote in more detail. Although

Mrs Milberie had been neither presented nor indicted for recusancy, there was some information against her. While the investigation was being pursued, a few notables rallied to Mrs Milberie's cause. Henry Earl of Holland added his voice to those of the Marquis of Dorset and of the Earl of Salisbury to urge that favour be shown to Mrs Milberie. All three were English favourites of the Queen. Holland asked for the restitution of all the confiscated goods that concerned Mrs Milberie and her fortune. The government could keep all the popish material. In late October the widow filed a second petition for the return of her possessions. The second petition was distinguished from the first by the issue of recusancy. It argued that her trunks had been confiscated because she was a convicted recusant. Since that she was not, as the certificates from the three clerks clearly showed, she demanded the return of all her goods. She filed her third petition on 12 January 1627. Again she claimed that there was no proof that she had ever been convicted of recusancy and demanded the return of her possessions. The third petition finally succeeded. The money, the silver plate and the financial papers were returned on 13 January. The copes, the vestments and the Mass furnishings were defaced and distributed among the pursuivants as rewards for their services.

During the investigation of Mrs Milberie there was a similar, and perhaps related, incident that involved Mary Roper, Lady Teynham. Pursuivants had invaded Lady Teynham's Camberwell house in early October. There more trunks were discovered, trunks that allegedly belonged to an agent for priests and Jesuits, who conveyed Catholic children to the schools beyond the seas. A few of Lady Teynham's servants were examined but their statements have not been preserved among the State

Papers.⁶³

With the above data we can reconstruct the entire incident. The Jesuit novitiate was located at Mrs Milberie's house in Camberwell. For reasons of security, she had deposited some trunks at Somerset House under the protection of some of the French attendants on Queen Henrietta Maria. In the trunks were vestments, liturgical goods, gold and silver plate, money and, most importantly, deeds and financial information. The trunks, along with a small boy, were transferred to Neighbour's house after the French attendants had been expelled from England. Neighbour had long been known to the French because of his liaison work between them and the English Catholics. Neighbour's brother-in-law, perhaps unaware of the former's connections with the Catholics, reported the trunks to the authorities. They were then confiscated and, shortly thereafter, Lady Teynham's house was raided. There was a connection between these two events. The authorities knew that Mrs Milberie had a house in Camberwell. Why then did they not visit it while they were investigating her religious beliefs? Or did they raid it and discover that it actually belonged to Lady Teynham? The latter is probably the case. Mrs Milberie ran the household of the novitiate but the Society rented the Camberwell house from Lady Teynham. The Jesuits stored one chest, in which several important financial papers were preserved, at Somerset House. If discovered, these papers could have incriminated the novitiate's trustees. After the expulsion of the French attendants, the iron chest and the other trunks were stored with the Neighbours. Their subsequent confiscation resulted in a panic. Lady Teynham's house was raided and other trunks

63. PRO, SP 14/151/24; 16/36/58, 59, 61; 16/37/1, 36, 58, 59, 60, 72; 16/38/43, 69, 83; 16/40/71; 16/49/7, 26; 16/68/8; 16/525/14, 15, 84; PC 2/35/ff. 227, 360.

were seized but a more dangerous and frightening prospect was the use of the information contained in the papers for future raids and litigation. Mrs Milberie and the Society rallied all the influential friends they could in an attempt to regain the papers. They finally did in early 1627. But the raids in Camberwell had made that area unsafe. No one was captured when Lady Teynham's was surprised by the raid but the Society could not take such luck for granted. In January 1627 the novitiate moved from Camberwell to Clerkenwell.

The new house in Clerkenwell was owned by and rented from George Talbot, the Earl of Shrewsbury, a longtime friend and benefactor of the English Jesuits.⁶⁴ For fifteen months the novitiate was located there quietly and peacefully. The tranquillity ended in March 1628. The neighbours, whose suspicions had been aroused by large quantities of food and supplies that were carried into the house, reported the proceedings to the authorities. On the 14th of March, as the novitiate prepared for a vow day, the pursuivants raided the house. Seven Jesuits were captured and all papers and furniture confiscated. The seven Jesuits were conducted to different prisons and tried. Only one was sentenced to death because he was unable to conceal the fact that he was a priest. Nonetheless, all were eventually released. From Ignatius Day, 31 July 1622 until 12 March 1628, with the possible exception of one five-month period, a Jesuit community thrived in London. Amazingly, the priests were able to live the regular daily routine, to make their retreats and to meet for conferences despite the continual threat of the penal laws and a possible raid by the pursuivants. For nearly six years novice priests gathered in different sections of London for their introduction to the Jesuit life. All

64. On the exact location of the Clerkenwell novitiate, cf. [Joseph Agius], "Memorable Sites in London," Letters and Notices 54 (1939) 47-51.

that ended with the Clerkenwell raid. Although St Ignatius retained the name of a house of probation, never again did the novices reside there. The Clerkenwell raid marked the end of Jesuit communal life in London. It was only after the glorious sun of York ended the winter of discontent that the London Jesuits again emerged from the underground.

Although the Clerkenwell discovery ended Jesuit communal life in London, it had no deleterious effects on the novitiate's income. The revenue from its endowment steadily increased from 1200 scudi in 1628 to 1304 scudi in 1633 to 1404 scudi in 1636 to 1607 scudi in 1639.⁶⁵ Alms also increased from 900 scudi in 1628 to 1440 scudi in 1633 to 1560 scudi in 1636. In 1639, regular alms fell to 1400 scudi. Even though St Ignatius assumed its first financial obligation in 1633, the net income in 1639 showed an increase on 1100 scudi over that reported in the first catalogue in 1625. The size of the community also increased and the net income was forced to support more men than the community could actually afford. Since there were no debts, the Society balanced its books through precarious alms.

2. The College of Blessed Aloysius

The second foundation accepted by Father General Vitelleschi on 29 November 1622 was the College of Blessed Aloysius. The letters patent were addressed to Aloysius Germanus and his associates, the aliases employed by the college's founders. Their endowment consisted of a capital sum and rents and returned 800 scudi (£200) annually. Along with the foundation, the benefactors gave the necessary furniture.

65. In Appendix VII, I have reproduced the financial charts from the triennial catalogues.

for both the house and the chapel. Like the House of Probation of St Ignatius, this college could be transferred, at the general's discretion, to any other location but, the founders insisted, the college must remain within the borders of the kingdom. According to the letters patent, the college would not only be an educational institution for the young men of the region but also a centre for the missionary activities of the Jesuits. The actual building, situated somewhere in Staffordshire, was both a "sanctuary," i.e. under titled protection, and "secure", i.e. equipped with priest holes and other security measures. At that moment the revenues could support about fifteen Jesuits but the size of the community could be increased if desired. The house itself could accommodate eight to ten Jesuits. In fact the building was far better equipped for the daily order of religious life than was the novitiate in London.⁶⁶

The College of Blessed Aloysius, as originally constituted, had nothing to do with the county of Lancashire. When the English vice-province was first divided into distinct missions, there were three separate missions for the counties of Worcester, Lancashire and Staffordshire. With the establishment of the college, Staffordshire and Worcestershire became its mission. Lancashire and Worcestershire (again) remained as two independent missions distinct from the college. In 1624 the college's missions were reorganized and encompassed the counties of Cheshire and Westmorland as well as Staffordshire and Lancashire, the last two being the counties named in the college's title. Significantly, the catalogues continued to designate a superior for the Lancashire mission for two years after its incorporation into the College

66. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91; Anglia 32I, ff. 96, 109-110v, 114v-115.

of Blessed Aloysius. Since the former Lancashire mission retained its own superior for two years after the merger, the college's rector, on whom the superior depended constitutionally, resided elsewhere, viz. Staffordshire. Exactly where in Staffordshire remains unknown. We know only that the house was under titled protection, was secured, and was large enough for a community of eight to ten Jesuits, along with a number of lay students. The Catalogus Tertius of 1626 listed nine Jesuits as residents: John Worthington, the rector; Edward Neville, the minister, procurator and a consultor; William Shackleton, a consultor; Henry Holland, the spiritual prefect and confessor; William Lacey, a teacher of grammar; the scholastic John Herbert, a teacher of Greek; a missionary, Francis Johnson; and two laybrothers, Thomas Cuthbert the buyer, cook and tailor, and John Smith, the steward, janitor and "morning caller" (excitator). The community still resided in this building in 1630. The Annual Letter for that year reported that the college had a fixed residence in which the rector, the minister, the procurator, the spiritual prefect, a teacher and a scholastic lived along with several students. The remaining members of the college were distributed throughout the district in the country homes of the gentry and nobility, where they taught and tended to pastoral and religious needs. The fathers in the Lancashire area found a convenient, well-situated house in 1636. There they were able to assemble for retreats, conferences, and their annual renewal of vows without arousing the slightest hint of suspicion.⁶⁷ At first the new community complemented the older establishment and provided a centre for Lancashire activities. Around 1642 the college's emphasis shifted from Staffordshire to Lancashire. After that date, Lancashire assumed

67. Annual Letters of 1630, 1636, and 1639, ARSI, Anglia 33I, pp. 147, 681, 814 translated in Foley, Records II, 6-7.

priority in the order of missions in the college's title. Whether the Staffordshire house was closed or the collegiate administrators had moved to Lancashire is impossible say, because the sources are silent.

The college continued its school despite the shift from Staffordshire to Lancashire. Founded to provide an education for the English Catholic young men, the college numbered teachers among its staff from its erection until 1647. Usually there was only one teacher but the Catalogus Tertius specified two in 1626 and, according to the Catalogus Tertius Rerum, there were four in 1639.

The annual revenue of the College of Blessed Aloysius, as reported in the letters patent and the other early documents, was 800 scudi (£200) but according to the first triennial report in 1625, the annual revenue generated by the foundation was only 600 scudi (£150). Probably some of the investments did not generate as much as had been expected. Regular alms brought in another 300 scudi and the net income of 900 scudi was sufficient for the support of the fifteen men in the community.

There were 19 Jesuits in the college in 1628. Of the 16 priests, one taught grammar and the others travelled throughout the countryside as missionaries. Alms went up to 500 scudi; the revenue, to 730 scudi. The net income of 1230 scudi could support the community. By 1633, there were 23 Jesuits in the community, including one teacher of grammar. The Catalogus Tertius Rerum for that year declared the college's endowment to be worth 2400 scudi (£600). Over the past year it had generated an income of 824 scudi, a nice 34% return. Alms continued their upward movement and added another 920 scudi to the coffers of the college. Nowhere, according to the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of

1636, were the missionaries more vigorous and active and nowhere were they in greater demand than in this college. Despite the demands, one man still found the time to teach grammar. A small increase in alms resulted in a slightly higher income of 1764 scudi. The college could support its 23 men. However, the income of the college, having increased steadily since its creation, experienced a setback in 1639 when the annual revenues fell to 800 scudi and there was a serious reduction in the regular alms from 940 scudi to 680 scudi as a result of the troubles in Scotland. Among the 21 Jesuits in the community, there were two teachers of rudiments and two of grammar. For the first time, the college contained more men than it could afford.

3. The College of St Francis Xavier

Wales and the Welsh Marches had been an important mission of the Society since the late Elizabethan period. With the internal re-organization of the mission as a result of the creation of the vice-province, Wales became one of the subdivisions. Its continued importance resulted in its erection into the third foundation accepted by Father General Vitelleschi on 29 November 1622. The Wales mission became "the College of St Francis Xavier with the Wales mission." The college included the counties of Hereford and Gloucester besides the principality of Wales.

The college's founders, under the aliases of Francis Philopatrum and his associates and "motivated by religious zeal and a desire to further the education of Catholic youth," provided an endowment that returned 600 scudi (£150) annually. The college, to be established in a place designated by the general, was to be the centre for the Society's activities in the region. Some Jesuits could teach the

young men of the neighbourhood and others serve as missionaries.

At the discretion of the general the college itself could be transferred anywhere as long as it remained within the kingdom. As with the House of Probation of St Ignatius and the College of St Aloysius, any surplus income from this foundation could be used for the formation of the young Jesuits and for the support of the other missionaries in England.⁶⁸

In his account of the erection of the college, Foley quoted an important document preserved in the archives of the English Province: "A Relation Concerning Missionary Monies in North and South Wales" signed by Humphrey Evans, the rector of the college, and dated 6 August 1666.⁶⁹ According to it Father Robert Jones and later Father John Salisbury had collected large sums of alms from various Catholics throughout Wales. Salisbury rented Upper Cwm with a portion of the alms. The rest of the money provided the foundation of the college so that "the revenues and foundations were merely of alms that were gathered by him [John Salisbury] and Father Jones, without any other particular founder." Father Evans did not tell the complete story. As we have seen, the letters patent were made out to a Francis Philopatrum and his associates. The benefactors, the recognized founders of the college, lurked behind the aliases. The man who hid behind the nomenclature of Francis Philopatrum was, in all probability, the Marquis of Worcester. The privileged position of Henry Somerset, Earl and later Marquis of Worcester, is evident in a few of the general's letters. The general

68. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91v; Anglia 32I, ff. 96, 109-110v, 115.

69. Foley cited this document as being in the Catholic Presbytery in Hornby, Lancashire. It is no longer. Now it can be found in ASJ, Correspondence Relating to St Omers and to North Wales 1666-1781, ff. 1-3. It was printed in Foley, Records, IV, 333-336.

wrote to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld) on 9 February 1647 about his grief at the death of the founder of St Francis Xavier and ordered the usual suffrages to be said for his soul.⁷⁰ Henry Somerset had died on 18 December 1646. In a later letter the general permitted an English Jesuit to accompany Lord Henry Somerset, the grandson and heir of the founder, on his trip to the continent.⁷¹

The endowment of St Francis Xavier, a combination of capital fund and rents, was secured in the same way as the foundations of St Ignatius and Blessed Aloysius, i.e. by using trustees. The annual revenues could support ten men but that number could be increased. The building itself was neither a sanctuary nor "under protection". Yet its security was even better than it would have been if it were a so-called sanctuary. Having been specially constructed by the Society, the house had enough hiding holes to accommodate forty men. So far, no uninvited person had penetrated past the servants and into the house. The location was most apt for religious life and, in case of dire emergency, there were two or three residences in the vicinity to which the priests could flee for refuge.⁷²

The property described in the memorial to the general was Cwm, a dwelling house in the isolated parish of Llanrthothal on the Hereford side of the river Monnow. Cwm, or Combe, part of the Somerset estate, was divided into an "Upper" and "Lower", each a house with a walled

70. Epp. Gen. II, f. 83v.

71. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 11 May 1647, Epp. Gen. II, f. 87; same to same, 28 March 1648, Ibid., f. 102v.

72. ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 115.

court in the front and with land valued at £60 per annum. Both had been the home of William Griffith, the third son of Hugh Griffith of Penmarc, Glamorgan, both of whom were recusants. After John Salisbury had taken a lease of Upper Cwm, both the house and its lands, it became the centre of the Society's mission activities in the region and the site of the periodic meetings for conferences and the renewal of vows. Shortly after Salisbury's death in 1625, Father Charles Brown (vere Gwynne) purchased the inheritance of the lease of the Upper Cwm and the whole farm of the Lower Cwm.⁷³ The management of the estate was later entrusted to a local Catholic, Peter Pullen.⁷⁴ Cwm remained secure and unviolated until the Oates Plot in 1678, even though the existence of a Jesuit community there had long been known to the government and had at least twice, in 1663 and 1671, been singled out as a cause of the increase of Popery.⁷⁵

The community moved into Cwm in December 1622. The fathers, seven in number, immediately assumed the spiritual discipline and the daily order of the Institute. With the exception of one infirm priest who was excused, the men lived the prescribed religious life of the Society. They held spiritual conferences and gave exhortations to each other. Periodically the Jesuits dispersed throughout the

-
73. A letter dated 15 February 1628 from an Arthur Sanders to Edmund Parr (vere Henry More) told of some difficulty with Cwm and an inheritance. Could the letter be referring to this purchase? (PRO, SP 16/99/17 printed in Foley, Records, I, 135-136).
74. Cf. Geraint Bowen, "The Jesuit Library in Hereford Cathedral," Bulletin of the Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries no. 20 (February, 1965) 13; and Mary Margaret O'Keefe, "The Popish Plot in South Wales and the Marches of Hereford and Gloucester" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University College, Galway, 1969) p. 28.
75. Bodl, Carte MS 81, ff. 309-310, 318.

mission returned to the college for the regular, religious life.⁷⁶

A later rector, Charles Brown (vere Gwynne) testified to the continuation of such domestic discipline in 1635.⁷⁷

A distinction made in the Catalogus Tertius of 1626 showed the exact number and the identities of the residents at Cwm. That year there were nine Jesuits in residence: John Clare, the vice-rector; John Harris, the minister, procurator, and a consultor; William Flexney, a consultor; Edward Roffe, a consultor; Thomas Pennant, the spiritual prefect and confessor; Thomas Jeffreys, a teacher of grammar and of Greek; Richard Whitley, a teacher of grammar; Brother John St Edmunds, the janitor, dispensator and excitator; and Brother William Putney, the buyer and the cook. We can not be sure of the exact number of residents at Cwm after 1626, but I would assume that the number remained approximately the same as before.

The college was established for the education of the young men of the area and, from the beginning, the college numbered teachers among its staff. Richard Banks, one of the provincial consultors reported in his ex officio letter to the general that, although there were few students at both the College of Blessed Aloysius and the College of St Francis Xavier because of the difficulties of the times, they worked hard and to great advantage.⁷⁸ From the information in the different catalogues, St Francis Xavier had at least one and at times two teachers between 1623 and 1646. After that date, no Jesuit

76. John Salisbury to the general, 2 January 1623, ARSI, Anglia 32II, f. 150.

77. Charles Brown (vere Gwynne) to the general, 24 July 1635, SC, Anglia IV, 99 (translated in Foley, Records, IV, 400-401).

78. R.B. [Richard Banks] to Rector [General], 19 January 1625 PRO, SP 16/99/2.

was especially designated as a teacher in the catalogues. Either the college had ceased to sponsor a school or the catalogues simply failed to record the teachers. The former was more likely the case. Education may have continued but the Jesuits were now simply domestic tutors. It was not sheer coincidence either that two scholarships were created at St Omers for Welsh students, one from North Wales and one from the South, around the time that formal schools had ceased to operate in the college. The scholarships were attempts at compensation for the demise of the schools.⁷⁹

Besides the school at Cwm, another school had been opened by the college in North Wales, at Greenfield Abbey near St Winefrid's Well. Basengwerke, otherwise known as Greenfield Abbey, was the seat of the Honorable George Petre, the 12th child of William, the second Lord Petre. Opened some time before 1626, the school occasioned another argument between the Jesuits and the seculars. Edward Bennet, under the alias of Richard Sarras, had protested to the English provincial, Richard Blount, about the school. As the Vicar General for Wales and the West of England, Bennet had himself received a complaint from the Catholic archdeacon of the area. The archdeacon was afraid that the continuation of the school would attract the attention of the authorities and result in the strict enforcement of the penal laws. He therefore asked that the Society close the school. The Jesuits ignored the request, so the archdeacon appealed to Bennet. The Vicar General beseeched the provincial to order the closure.

79. "A Relation Concerning Missionary Monies in North and South Wales," ASJ, Correspondence Relating to St Omers and North Wales 1666-1781, ff. 1-3 (printed in Foley, Records, IV, 333-336); Geoffrey Holt, S.J., "Free Places at the English College of St Omers and Bruges and the Liège Academy," AHSI 52 (1983) 120.

It was impossible, he insisted, to keep the school a secret; sooner or later the neighbouring justice of the peace would hear of it. Once he did, he would have his long desired excuse for troubling the Catholics.⁸⁰ Apparently the province did not heed the request.

This history of the early investments of the college was written up in the above-cited "A Relation Concerning Missionary Monies in North and South Wales." This document, along with a number of extracts from letters and deeds that accompanied it, was compiled around the time of the separation of North Wales and its incorporation as the Residence of St Winefrid. The finances of the college were surveyed and investigated in order to ascertain how much of the portfolio should be written over to the new residence. Practically all of the properties mentioned went to St Winefrid. But we are jumping ahead of ourselves. The Relation began before the erection of the college and ended in the 1650s, and explained the financial composition of the college for the first twenty years of its existence.

Robert Jones, the superior of the Jesuit mission in the early seventeenth century, had received into the Church Lady Francis Morgan, the fourth daughter of the Earl of Worcester and the sister of Henry, the fifth Earl and the founder of St Francis Xavier. With her assistance, Jones later received her sisters into the Church. Lady Francis and her husband William Morgan decided that they should make

80. A copy of Mr Sarras' letter to Blount, 27 January 1626, AAW, XIX, 111. I am grateful to Mr Antony Allison for bringing this letter to my attention and for the information on the real identity of Mr Sarras. The Annual Letter of 1642/3 (ARSI, Anglia 33I, p. 896 translated in Foley, Records, IV, 535-536) related an episode that bore more than a slight resemblance to this. Some adversaries feared that continual Jesuit presence at a newly built house for pilgrims at St Winefrid's Well would exasperate the Protestants. They, thus, denounced the entire enterprise to the authorities.

some sort of reparation to the Church because most of the Morgan wealth was derived from former Church lands. They therefore decided to subsidize four Jesuits, two in the north and two in the south. They promised to begin their payments once the Morgan estate had passed into William's hands, i.e. at the death of his father. Lady Francis and her husband drew up their will to that effect. Father Jones, however, died in 1615 before the Morgans received their inheritance. Thomas Conway (vere Pennant) succeeded him as the spiritual confidante of Lady Francis and she and her husband confirmed their pledge with him. Their eldest son, Edward Morgan (created a baronet in 1642), assented and subscribed to the agreement. Lady Francis died before her father-in-law. Her husband promised to honour the agreement nonetheless. After William's death, his son and heir faithfully executed the agreement until the death of Father Conway in 1638. Edward then became somewhat slack and negligent with his payments. Fathers Charles Brown (vere Gwynne) and Humphrey Evans, the author of the account, frequently reminded Edward of his duty. Edward did not deny the obligation; he was simply reluctant to pay or to provide any security as a guarantee of future payment. For nearly ten years Edward Morgan avoided payment. Throughout that time, Brown and Evans laboured strenuously for some type of security. After the former's death in 1647, the latter persisted on his own. Evans finally had some success. Sir Edward obliged himself to the annual payment for the support of the four missionaries in a bond of £1200 to a trustee named by Evans. After Sir Edward's death in 1653, the trustee claimed payment for the £1200 debt from the estate and then handed the total over to the college. The sum was invested in some unknown way and the revenue used for the support of the four missionaries.⁸¹

81. ASJ, Correspondence Relating to St Omers and North Wales 1661-1781. ff. 1-3 (printed in Foley, Records, IV, 333-336).

Charles Brown (vere Gwynne) invested considerable sums of the college's money in real estate during his rectorship. We have already seen how he had purchased the Upper and the Lower Cwms. He later bought the adjoining farm, Langunvill, valued at £25 a year. Shortly thereafter he purchased yet another farm at an undisclosed location in south Wales. This farm had an annual revenue of £30. Perhaps as a security for a loan, Brown also received the mortgage of a second farm in south Wales with an annual revenue of £20. Both farms in south Wales were lost to the Society after Brown's death in 1647. The report offered no explanation for this. Throughout this period, the college often farmed out large sums of money to different laymen for investment and interest. With the profits, the rector purchased a farm near Monmouth with a return of £45 annually.⁸²

According to the letters patent, the original foundation of the college should have returned 600 scudi annually. By 1625, the endowment was generating 800 scudi (£200). Ordinary alms contributed another 160 scudi. The net income was considered sufficient for the support of the 16 Jesuits in the college. By 1628 the annual revenue rose still higher, to 920 scudi. Regular alms also went up to 190 scudi. The net income of 1110 scudi was sufficient for the 24 Jesuits.

The Catalogus Tertius of 1633 briefly explained the college's foundation. The founder, a true friend of the Society, had put aside 4000 scudi (£1000) as the endowment. Although the college collected 920 scudi in revenues, only 800 scudi, a 20% rate of return, came from the endowment. The other 120 scudi came from pensions and annuities paid to members of the college. The regular alms had increased considerably since 1628 and had risen to 640 scudi. Since the college

82. Ibid.

had assumed its first financial obligation, the net income was 1528 scudi. Although this was an increase of more than 400 scudi, only 18 men could be supported by it, six fewer than the smaller income of 1628 had maintained. At the time there were only 16 men in the community, so there should have been more than enough income.

The Jesuits in the college worked among and were friendly with many poor families, according to the triennial report of 1636. Whether the pupils at the schools came from these same poor families was not clear. The revenues remained the same but an increase in the amount of alms collected, resulted in a net income of 1640 scudi. Twenty men could be maintained on that income; there were twenty-one in the college. The catalogue for 1639 simply repeated the information in the 1636 catalogue.

4. The Residence of St Anne/The College of the Immaculate Conception

The Leicester mission was an original subdivision of the English vice-province. With the internal re-organization of the English province in 1625, it became the Residence of St Anne with the Leicester mission. The residence had a substantial income from regular alms in both 1625 and 1628. The 700 scudi in 1625 and the 890 scudi in 1628 were not only the largest sums reported by any residence but were also larger than the income generated by some of the collegiate foundations. With such assured income, it was only natural that the transformation of the residence into a college be considered. This was first proposed in 1631 and finally accepted by the general on 15 June 1632. Because of the size of the package and the dangers in travel caused by the Thirty Years War, the general had to wait more than a year before he could send the diploma to the founder, known to us as "Charles

Shireburne."⁸³

Unlike the three earlier foundations, this college was not originally given a patronal name. In both the letters patent and the marginal references in the general's letterbook, the new foundation was simply called the Leicester college. It was not until its first appearance in the Catalogus Tertius of 1633 that it took the name of the College of the Immaculate Conception with the mission of Nottingham and Derby. There were no explanations why Immaculate Conception was chosen as the title or why the mission shifted from Leicester to Nottingham and Derby. I would assume that the location of the principal residence and the wishes of the founder had much to do with these decisions. A further change was made in the college's title in 1672: the college's mission became Derby alone.

The true identity of Charles Shireburne was a mystery to the general and has remained one to subsequent historians. The mystery was eventually solved for the general; we have not been as lucky. In his condolences to Henry More on the death of Richard Blount, the general clearly indicated that he took Blount to be the founder of the College of the Immaculate Conception under an assumed name. More's reply clarified the matter. Unfortunately, that reply has been lost. In the general's next letter, he expressed gratitude for, but said nothing about, the clarification. Shortly thereafter the general admitted to the rector of the college, Michael Alford (vere Griffith), the necessity

83. General to Richard Blount, 1 November 1631, Epp. Gen. I, f. 339v; same to same, 15 May 1632, Ibid., f. 351; same to same, 14 August 1632, Ibid., f. 356; same to same, 23 July 1633, Ibid., f. 374v. In The English Catholic Community, p. 233, Bossy asserts that the founders were Eleanor Brooksby and Anne Vaux. Although their importance cannot be denied -- and the recognition of the support of the latter can be seen in the very name of the residence -- there is no proof that either or both were Charles Shireburne.

of concealment but he urged that he, at least, be informed of the true identities of the founders.⁸⁴

There were important alterations in the form and style of the letters patent that accepted this foundation. The donor endowed the college with a capital sum of 28000 scudi which yielded 2500 scudi annually to be used for the education of "Catholic young men both in knowledge and in virtue." Unlike the three earlier foundations which could have been erected anywhere within the kingdom, this college was to be established in the county of Leicester. Nothing was said about any restrictions on its transfer to another county or out of the kingdom. Since the benefactor had already transferred the foundation to the provincial, Father General Vitelleschi simply approved the establishment of the college.⁸⁵ None of the earlier letters patent had said anything about the provincial's acceptance of the foundation. This college, it seems, established a controversial precedent: the provincial himself exercised control over the collegiate foundation. We have already noted this irregularity in passing and shall examine it in detail in the following discussion of the College of the Holy Apostles. Unlike the earlier letters, this one did not explicitly permit the collegiate revenues to be used for the formation of the scholastics and the support of the missionaries in other parts of England. There was probably no need to do so because the provincial, having control over the revenues, could distribute them as he saw fit.

The Residence of St Anne was involved in the education of Catholic

84. General to Henry More, 10 July 1638, Epp. Gen. I, f. 473; same to same, 18 September 1638, Ibid., f. 480; same to Michael Alford (vere Griffith), 4 December 1638, Ibid., f. 482v.

85. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 123v.

young men even before its metamorphosis into the College of the Immaculate Conception. The Annual Letter of 1624 told of a school in the Leicester mission where the fathers supervised the education of approximately twenty young men "both in religious and moral training, as also in letters and the cultivation of talent."⁸⁶ Although the Letter did not specify the school's location, it was at Stanley Grange, Derbyshire. Earlier the fathers had educated young men at Kirby Hall and Great Ashby. After 1615, the school was at Shoby where it remained until its move to Stanley Grange after the death of Eleanor Brooksby.⁸⁷ When the Privy Council appointed commissioners to investigate popish activities in Derbyshire in 1625, they visited Stanley Grange. One of the commissioners, Sir Francis Coke, sent a report to his brother, Sir John Coke of the Privy Council, on 17 November 1625. He detailed his visits to a number of recusant households, including Stanley Grange. At first the doors of Stanley Grange were shut to the commissioners. After they had finally been admitted, the commissioners only found two women in the house. The women admitted that the house belonged to Mrs. "Vause" (Anne Vaux). In the tour of the house the commissioners were astonished at the number of rooms that such an apparently small house contained. There were two adjoining chapels; in each there was a crucifix above the altar and religious paintings. In the other rooms there were enough beds and furniture "to lodge 40 or 50 persons at least."⁸⁸ The significance of the discovery seemed to have been lost

86. ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 246 translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1113.

87. Anstruther, Vaux of Harrowden: A Recusant Family, pp. 243-244, 388, 461-462. We can identify three boys educated at these schools: John Mulsho, John Sweetnam, and Henry Killinghall (cf. Henson, Registers of the English College at Valladolid, pp. 69, 81, 85).

88. HMC Cowper I, 227. This report was published in J.C. Cox, Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals (Lincoln, 1890) I, 284. Incidentally, Stanley Grange was rented by Anne Vaux from Mary Powtrel.

on the commissioners. Marvel they might at the number of chambers in a small house; but they failed to realize that they had stumbled upon a Jesuit school.

The Annual Letters of 1632, 1633, 1634 reported the continuation of the school. In 1633, twenty boys were being instructed in doctrine, music, morals, and virtue. Many of the pupils boarded at Stanley Grange. A few Jesuits also resided in community there.⁸⁹ Stanley Grange had survived one surprise raid; in 1635, it survived its second. A former student at the school, a Mr Lumley, disclosed its existence and location to the Privy Council. After Lumley had returned home from the school he had been forced into conformity. As a demonstration of his zealous acceptance of his new church, Lumley gave the information about the school to the Council. He reported that there were ten or eleven students resident there, among whom were Lord Abergaveney's grandson and a son of Mr Forsiter.⁹⁰ A warrant was issued on this evidence. The pursuivants were ordered to search the house and to seize all documents and any suspicious person. Any Jesuit or pupil apprehended was to be sent to London for examination. If the children had dispersed, the pursuivants were to ascertain "by the best ways and means you can" their parentage, how long they had been enrolled in the school and their present location. All books, papers, and popish articles were to be sent to London in a sealed

89. ARSI, Anglia 33I, p. 480; 33II, pp. 335, 378. A curious insight into the communal life of the college can be gained from a letter from the general to the provincial on 24 February 1635 (Epp. Gen. I, f. 405v). The general had received some complaints that the housekeeper had too much authority and that William Wright, although no longer the rector, took the presiding chair at the table. The general instructed Blount to do something about this.

90. I wonder if this was the baby Nall Forster left at the Neighbours in 1626.

trunk.⁹¹

The Jesuits were quickly informed of Lumley's denunciation and had enough time to send the students away and to conceal themselves. The pursuivants found an empty building on their arrival. No further action was taken against Stanley Grange school. The Annual Letter of 1635 claimed that King Charles himself had prevented any follow-up to the raid.⁹² The fathers wasted no time in the re-establishment of the school after the precautions taken for the raid regathering the students, albeit a smaller number, in a hidden yet convenient place. Having had two narrow escapes at Stanley Grange, the college decided to move the school and not to take any more chances with the old location. Three priests lived with the students; the rest were distributed in various locations throughout the district. Although the demand for admission into the school was great, the fathers prudently refused to increase the enrolment. The rejections, along with the understandable reluctance of a few of the priests to return to their former missions after narrow escapes during the recent persecutions, resulted in an unusual amount of hostility towards the Society among the Catholics in the district. However, the college's friends rallied to its support, so the Jesuits did not suffer either physically or materially; and the resentment abated over the next two years.⁹³

The Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1633 reported the worth of the college's endowment to be 4000 scudi (£1000) with an annual return of

-
91. PRO, SP 16/294/74; 16/299/36. Both are printed in Foley, Records, II, 316-317.
92. ARSI, Anglia 33I, p. 630 translated in Foley, Records, II, 311-312.
93. ARSI, Anglia 33I, pp. 682-683, 724, 765-766 translated in Foley, Records, II, 312-313.

1952 scudi (£488), nearly a 50% rate of return. There is something wrong with those figures. According to the letters patent for the college, the foundation was valued at 28000 scudi (£7000) with an annual revenue of 2500 scudi (£625), which is a rate of 11%. Apparently the compiler of the catalogue erroneously recorded a foundation of 4000 scudi instead of the more accurate 24000 scudi. The regular revenue of 1952 scudi would then have been the more reasonable 12% rate of return. Nonetheless both the foundation and the annual revenues were still less than those stated in the letters patent. The commentary in the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1633 reported that the college, because of divers problems, had not been completed. By this the author meant that it had not received its entire foundation, so the annual revenues would be less than expected. The net income was sufficient for the support of twenty-five men, but there were only sixteen in the community. By 1636 the college's endowment had been completed and the regular income had risen to 2500 scudi. Regular alms contributed another 560 scudi. One of the college's benefactors was an unnamed "noble-woman". Besides keeping two Jesuits in her house, she had sent the rector 800 gold crowns and hoped to be able to send 1200 more in the immediate future.⁹⁴ Fourteen men, among whom were two teachers of grammar, found themselves with a net income of 3060 scudi, an amount sufficient for thirty-seven men. Although a fall in regular alms from 560 scudi to 520 scudi reduced the net income to 3020 scudi in 1639, the revenues could support a community of almost thrice the size of the existing one.

94. ASJ, Foley MSS IV, f. 63.

5. The Residence of Blessed Francis Borgia/The College of the Holy Apostles

With the reorganization of the province in 1625, the Suffolk district became a residence dedicated to Blessed Francis Borgia who had been beatified in 1624. The residence covered the counties of Suffolk, Norfolk, Cambridge, and Essex. To judge from the financial accounts in the Catalogi Tertii Rerum of 1625 and 1628, the residence was not wealthy. It had collected a mere 360 scudi in regular alms in 1625 and 400 scudi in 1628. Of the residences, only St Thomas of Canterbury collected less.

Plans for the erection of the residence into a college were first seriously discussed on 27 August 1632.⁹⁵ Richard Blount wrote to the general of the religious zeal of Baron Cephagini (vere William Lord Petre) and of his fervent desire to found a Jesuit college. Petre was prepared to provide the college with a capital fund of 16000 scudi (£4000), which would bring in an annual income of 1000 (£250), a rather low rate of 6%. Once the benefactor had provided for his youngest son, he promised to increase the endowment. Petre had asked that the college be placed in Chelmsford, "the capital of his own county" and a place most convenient for the Society's ministries. He asked too that the new foundation be dedicated to the Holy Apostles. John Bossy, noting the change in the title, argued that the original name reflected "an international, contemporary and often aggressively Jesuit flavour" and that the new titles of "local or historical patriotism" replaced the earlier ones as the gentry's influence in the mission grew.⁹⁶ But in his choice of Holy Apostles as the title of the new college, Lord Petre was perhaps not so much reacting against

95. Richard Blount to the general, 27 August 1632, SC, Anglia IV, 95 translated in Foley, Records, II, 396-398.

96. The English Catholic Community, p. 417.

Jesuit values as prompted by self-esteem. In his choice of an alias, we saw Lord Petre's punning use of Baron Cephalini. Cephas became Peter; Lord Petre became Baron Cephalini. It would have been too obvious and thus too dangerous to name the college in honour of St Peter. Choosing all the apostles for the college's patrons was a much safer alternative. To facilitate accommodation in Chelmsford, Lord Petre donated The Red Lion to the Society.⁹⁷ Blount begged the general to accept this very generous offer especially because Lord Petre had long been a good and trusted benefactor who had given the province 1000 scudi annually. Petre finally hoped to hand over to the Society an Oxford college founded by his ancestors whenever England returned to the Roman Church. Because of a violation of the terms of the charter, Petre considered the Oxford college to have reverted to himself. The evil times prevented him from asserting his claims but if the Petre family ever succeeded in its recovery, Lord Petre intended to bequeath it to the Society in a codicil to his will.⁹⁸

Lord Petre promised to make over the funds for the school in

97. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 96.

98. Brother Foley thought that the college in question was Wadham College, Oxford. Dorothy Wadham, one of the college's co-founders, was a Petre and an aunt of William Lord Petre. I do not think that Wadham College was the one intended in Petre's bequest. Rather the college was Exeter College. Lord Petre's grandfather, Sir William Petre, is considered the second founder of that college because of his many bequests. Sir William himself, his son and his grandson all attended Exeter College. Once Roman Catholicism had been re-established in England, Father Edward Petre made an attempt to implement Lord Petre's promise. Exeter College became involved in a legal dispute with Father Petre "in a business of so great importance that if the college had been overcome in the Suit, that whole Society must soon have been abandoned to Popery" (Bodl, MS Eng hist e 178, f. 10). Unfortunately, I have not found any more information on this dispute.

Chelmsford as soon as the general approved. Eager to accept Lord Petre's donation, the general instructed Blount to ask Petre to send him (the general) the customary letter in which the benefactor officially offered his foundation to the Society. If the patron was hesitant about putting such delicate information in a letter, he could write just a brief note to the general to inform him that his gift had been handed over to the Society. Once the general had received word that the foundation had been transferred into the Society's hands, he would order the drawing up of the letters patent. Assurances had been received by 28 May 1633. In a letter of that date the general informed Blount that he had ordered the drafting of the letters patent.⁹⁹ The College of the Holy Apostles was accepted on 1 September 1633.¹⁰⁰ The original letters patent were made out to William Cephalini. William was the true name of Lord Petre and not the alias that he had requested. Because the first diploma never reached England, the general drew up a second in 1634. Blount noticed the error in Cephalini's name when he received the diploma in December. The general then sent a third diploma with the alteration in the name. Blount forwarded the diploma to Lord Petre, who acknowledged its receipt in a letter to the general on 3 April 1635.¹⁰¹

The foundation of the College of the Holy Aspostles, like that of the College of the Immaculate Conception, differed significantly from those of the three earlier colleges. The two recent colleges

99. General to Richard Blount, 20 November 1632, Epp. Gen. I, f. 361v; same to same, 2 April 1633, Ibid., f. 368v; same to same, 28 May 1633, Ibid., f. 371.

100. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 125; ARSI, Anglia 33II, p. 445.

101. General to Richard Blount, 9 September 1634, Epp. Gen. I, f. 399v; same to same, 16 September 1634, Ibid., f. 400; same to same, 13 January 1635, Ibid., f. 403; same to same, 27 January 1635, Ibid., f. 404; Guido Cephalini to the general, 3 April 1635, SC, Anglia IV, 98 translated in Foley, Records, II, 398-399.

specified the location: Charles Shireburne named Leicester and Lord Petre Chelmsford. Neither Immaculate Conception nor Holy Apostles said anything about future movements either within or outside the kingdom. Neither of the two recent colleges explicitly permitted the use of the college's revenues for the formation of the scholastics and the support of the other Jesuit missionaries in England. In an important departure from the Society's usual practice, both founders entrusted their endowments to the provincial who assumed control of the foundations and oversaw the collection and the distribution of the annual revenues. Such a departure did not pass without some protest. The provincial, Henry More, a man instrumental in securing Lord Petre's bequest,¹⁰² sent a memorial to the general on this subject in 1636, to which memorial we shall turn briefly.

Although the general agreed to Petre's designation of Chelmsford as the college's site and the Society accepted The Red Lion, it is not known whether a Jesuit community was ever established there. The Annual Letter of 1634 mentioned a small school where two boys even boarded with the fathers but it said nothing about its location.¹⁰³ Wherever this school was, the college found it too small and moved into a larger building by 1638. That move delighted the general because the new house had adequate facilities for the practice of religious discipline, for retreats and for the renewal of vows.¹⁰⁴ The new residence was most likely at Thorndon where five sets of vestments given by Lady Petre and a library purchased by Henry More for £200

102. Cf. Francis Edwards, "Henry More, S.J. Administrator and Historian, 1586-1661".

103. ARSI, Anglia 33I, pp. 473-474.

104. General to William More (vere or alias Brooksby), 26 June 1638, Epp. Gen. I, f. 472v.

were kept.¹⁰⁵ When the Jesuits moved to Thorndon, the school went with them. Usually one, but occasionally two priests taught religion and rudiments in the college's school until 1651.¹⁰⁶

According to both the original letter from Richard Blount to the general and the letters patent, the endowment of the college was 16000 scudi with the annual return of 1000 scudi.¹⁰⁷ But the first Catalogus Tertius Rerum has different totals. That catalogue valued the endowment at 6000 scudi with an annual return of 1480 scudi. With the 680 scudi collected in regular alms, the net income of 2160 scudi was more than sufficient for the seventeen Jesuits in the college. Nonetheless the discrepancy remains: a small endowment provided a larger revenue than the original diploma stated. It seems that Lord Petre did not turn over the entire endowment to the provincial despite Blount's assurances to the general that he had received it. By 1636 Petre had transferred 5600 scudi more to the college. Besides this amount, which the college still had not invested, its revenues increased by a further 350 scudi which more than offset a 40 scudi decrease in regular alms. The net income of 2472 scudi could have supported thirty Jesuits: there were only sixteen in the college.

Henry More replaced Richard Blount as provincial in 1635. Shortly thereafter More found £1000 in Blount's desk among the provincial papers. Amazingly More expressed no surprise at the

105. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 96. This library remained at Thorndon until the Suppression of the Society when it was sold by Lord Petre.

106. Annual Letter of 1638, ARSI, Anglia 33I, f. 759 translated in Foley, Records, II, 566.

107. In a letter to the Bishop of Chalcedon on 19 May 1637, a Roberts (vere George Leyburn) told of Lord Petre's death. It was rumoured that he had left £15000 to the Society and only £500 to the secular clergy (AAW, XXIX, 21).

discovery of such a large sum of money. He simply added it to the endowment of Holy Apostles.¹⁰⁸ That college had more than enough money already to support the Jesuits within it; there were poorer colleges that could have used the £1000. More probably deposited the money in the endowment of Holy Apostles because he had some control over that foundation and could use its revenues for provincial needs. Nonetheless, the addition of £1000 to the college's endowment had no effect on the totals of the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1636. It was not until 1639 that the addition resulted in higher revenues.

The new provincial Henry More quickly raised the issue of the irregular control of a collegiate foundation by the provincial. He did not understand the reasons for it and asked the general for an explanation. Why was it necessary, he asked, that the rectors of some of the colleges in England should remain ignorant of the source and the size of their foundations? The general answered that question at length. Because of obvious dangers, the English foundations must be strongly safeguarded. Their discovery would not only increase the royal treasury but also involve the donor in subsequent litigation. Under provincial control, the pious intentions of the donors could be better observed. Well aware that the Jesuits in England relied on alms from their hosts, the benefactors wished that these men also benefit from the endowments. The founders had expressly asked that the annual revenues be at the provincial's disposal so that, once the Jesuits in the college in question had been cared for, the surplus could be used for the needs of the province and the formation of the scholastics. This could be better executed if the provincial handled the money.

108. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 96.

By keeping the foundations under the control of the provincial, the interests of poverty were also served. With a limited budget set by the provincial, the rectors and their communities would live more frugally. Finally, the provincial procurator was more adept and astute in business matters than the local rectors. Since most of the endowments were in cash, the money had to be invested periodically. The provincial procurator could supervise the flow of the money with greater skill and certainty than could the rectors.¹⁰⁹

The general's response revealed and clarified the financial arrangements of the English colleges. At some time in the past (probably in the early 1630s around the date of the erection of the College of the Immaculate Conception because the letters patent for that college were the first to specify the provincial as the recipient of the foundation), the general had decided that the provincial should be responsible for collegiate endowments. Even though the revenues of the three early foundations could be used for the support of other works and members of the province, no practical details had been devised by which the surplus money would pass from the colleges to the provincial. Perhaps some colleges even resisted and refused to turn over their excess. Perhaps they over-estimated the living expenses of the community so that there would not be a surplus. These problems could be solved by provincial control. Henceforth each college received not the complete income from its foundation, which remained unknown to it, but a percentage set by the provincial. The rest of the income subsidized the missions and the formation of the scholastics. The general's clarification temporarily satisfied More. Ten years later the issue re-emerged.

109. ARSI, Congr 65, ff. 472, 479, 485.

By 1639, the annual revenues from the college's endowment had increased by almost 450 scudi to 2280 scudi. Alms, too, had increased to 680 scudi. The college had a net income of 2960 scudi, an amount that was sufficient for twice the number of Jesuits that were in the community. The college also had 4000 scudi in hand (the £1000 that More has added to the Petre endowment) for investment.

6. The Residence of St Dominic

Lincoln, another of the original missions of the vice-province, was created a residence under the patronage of St Dominic in 1625. Throughout the first decade of its existence, the Catholics in the region had provided a steady supply of alms for the support of the priests there. The residence had collected 360 scudi in alms in 1625. By 1636, the total had increased to 800 scudi. Around that time, the residence acquired a house in which three Jesuits resided. The remaining members of the residence were dispersed throughout the county. Financially, the tide began to turn against the residence and the regular alms started to decline. In 1639 the Society had collected only 552 scudi in regular alms.

7. The Residence of St Thomas of Canterbury

The Hampshire mission became a residence under the patronage of St Thomas of Canterbury in 1625. It covered the counties of Hampshire, Wiltshire, Sussex and Dorset but it was the first county that was consistently specified in the residence's title. For the first decade St Thomas was the poorest residence in England. It had collected only 246 scudi in 1625, 200 scudi in 1628, and 400 scudi in 1633. Its fortunes changed by 1636. Between 1633 and 1636 the alms collected

more than doubled. The period of prosperity was unfortunately brief and by 1639 the alms had begun to decline.

8. The Residence of St John

Originally part of the Yorkshire mission, the Durham mission (consisting of the counties of Durham, Cumberland, and Northumberland) was separately established in 1624. The following year it became the Residence of St John with the Durham mission. The residence had collected 360 scudi in regular alms in 1625. The total rose to 500 scudi in 1628 and 1633 but fell back to 300 scudi in 1636. With the loss of 200 scudi in alms, the residence was supported more by Providence than by its own resources. Yet the Jesuits there, according to the Catalogus Tertius Rerum, continued their work among the poor. The situation was worse in 1639. By then the residence had no regular alms. The fathers, in their travels, were housed and fed by the Catholics. The battles and the disorder caused by the invasion of the Scots left the residence totally dependent on precarious alms.

9. The Residence of St Michael

One of the earliest missions of the English Jesuits and one of the first subdivisions of the vice-province, Yorkshire was transformed into a residence under the patronage of St Michael in 1625. Most of the Jesuits in the residence had no fixed abode but journeyed throughout the countryside and stayed with various noble and gentle families.¹¹⁰ Like its northern neighbour, St John, this residence was never one of the more wealthy ones. The Jesuits collected between 450 scudi and 575 scudi in regular alms between 1625 and 1636. The income of St

110. ARSI, Annual Letter of 1624, Anglia 32I, f. 245 translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1111.

Michael's soared to 792 scudi in 1639. The catalogues give no explanation for this unexpected rise made more surprising because that was the very year in which the bottom had fallen out of the regular alms of the neighbouring St John's because of the Scots invasion.

10. The Residence of St Mary

Northampton was an original mission of the vice-province. Dedicated to Mary, it was erected into a residence in 1625 and covered the counties of Oxford, Buckingham, Bedford and Northampton. We have already noted the variations in the residence's name over the next fifty years. Beginning as the Residence of St Mary with the Northampton mission, it ended the century as the Residence of St Mary with the Oxford mission; these changes probably reflected shifts in patronal support and concentration of Jesuits. The income that the residence received from regular alms steadily rose between 1625 and 1636. The 1000 scudi collected in 1636 made St Mary's the wealthiest residence. That year, however, was to be the pinnacle of the residence's finances. By 1639, the alms had fallen to 800 scudi. Throughout subsequent catalogues, there would be a steady decline.

11. The Residence of Blessed Stanislas

The Devon mission, initiated in 1622, covered the counties of Devon, Cornwall and Somerset. It was converted into a residence under the patronage of Blessed Stanislas Kostka in 1625. The missionaries there were employed among the gentry families, "instructing them in piety and religious matters."¹¹¹ The first Catalogus Tertius Rerum recorded the residence as the recipient of 432 scudi in regular alms.

111. Annual Letter of 1624, ARSI, Anglia 32I, f. 244v translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1111.

Over the next fourteen years the residence's alms fluctuated considerably from 730 scudi in 1628 to 628 scudi in 1633, 356 scudi in 1636, 500 scudi in 1639.

12. The Residence of St George

Worcestershire was an early and important centre for the Society's missionary activities. One of the original subdivisions of the vice-province, Worcester was listed twice in the Catalogus Tertius of 1623 — as a separate mission and as part of the College of Blessed Aloysius. In 1625 the Worcestershire mission, covering the counties of Worcester and Warwick, was created into a residence and named after the patron saint of England.¹¹² According to the first Catalogus Tertius Rerum, the residence gathered 600 scudi in regular alms in 1625. Of all the residences, only St Anne had collected more. The alms rose steadily to a peak of 828 scudi in 1636. The fall to 600 scudi in 1639 began a steady decline.

The Annual Letter of 1636 related a surprise raid on a Jesuit school in this residence. This was the school in a certain Mr Leuson's (or Levison's) house outside Wolverhampton. That location poses a few difficulties. Wolverhampton was within the College of Blessed Aloysius and not within the Residence of St George. Brother Foley, perhaps confused by this, considered the same raid under two headings.¹¹³ In neither discussion did Foley refer to the other and in both discussions he cited the same sections of the Annual Letters as his source. Having

112. For a brief survey of the history of this residence, cf. T.G. Holt, S.J., "The Residence of St George: Jesuits in Warwickshire and Worcestershire in Penal Times," Worcestershire Recusant 20 (1972) 45-78.

113. Foley, Records, II, xiv-xvi; IV, 25-27.

consulted the said letters, I found nothing about a raid on a school in the College of Blessed Aloysius. There was, however, a raid reported in the Residence of St George.¹¹⁴ But why was this school conducted by Jesuits from St George? Why was this school not mentioned in any of the provincial catalogues? The Annual Letter told of the teacher's capture and his transport to London. Who was this teacher? At no time was anyone in the catalogues designated as a teacher for this residence. We are not even able to deduce the teacher's identity through the movement of men: no member of the residence had been transferred to St Ignatius in London. The difficulties remain unsolved. We know that the residence ran a school that went unrecorded in the catalogues. We know that the school was situated at a Mr Leuson's near Wolverhampton. We know that the fathers again gathered together a number of boys in a school in 1637.¹¹⁵ But we do not know why the fathers conducted a school outside their district, who the teachers were or the length of time the residence was involved in education. The silence of the records prompt us to conclude that this school was ad hoc and informal.

13. Liège College

The English novitiate was moved from Louvain to Liège in 1614 and remained there until 1624. In that year it moved again, this time to Watten, and Liège became the site of the province's philosophate and theologate. In 1623/4 the rectors of the English College at Louvain, Liège and Watten worked out the financial details of the moves, which required a just distribution of the Louvain foundation and adequate

114. ARSI, Anglia 33I, pp. 640-641 translated in Foley, Records, IV, 25.

115. Annual Letter to 1637, ARSI, Anglia 33I, pp. 739-740 translated in Foley, Records, IV, 27.

compensation for the Liège property among the three communities.¹¹⁶

Despite their efforts, the arrangements remained a source of contention between Liège and Watten for a number of years.

According to the first Catalogus Tertius Rerum, the college's endowment generated 3913 scudi (£978) annually. Because of a large number of financial obligations, the net income was only 2244 scudi (£561). The rector estimated that the income should support 30 men. The actual size of the community was 44. The college was in debt. Liège's destitution was remedied on 20 May 1627 when Father General Vitelleschi accepted an endowment offered to the college by Elector Maximilian of Bavaria and his wife Elizabeth. The Prince had set aside a capital fund of 6000 scudi (£1500) with an annual return of 2813 scudi (£703) which he promised to hand over to the college each year in perpetuity.¹¹⁷ The size of the gift gave rise to many rumours. Large as the benefaction was, the rumours made it larger still. Owen Shelley, the rector, worried about the exaggerations and the effects that they might have on other potential benefactors. The general advised him to ask the provincial to explain the actual situation to all the present benefactors of the province in order to quell any temptation that they might have to withdraw their pensions and gifts.¹¹⁸ An undated letter from the provincial, Richard Blount, to the Nuncio in Paris was

116. ARSI, Fondo Gesuitico 446, ff. 711-712v.

117. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 103v. The provincial congregation of 1628 asked the general to write to the Prince Elector to thank him for his endowment in the name of the entire Society. This the general did with pleasure (ARSI, Congr 60, ff. 279-280).

118. General to Owen Shelley, 6 March 1627, Epp. Gen. I, f. 252v; same to Richard Blount, 6 June 1626, Ibid., f. 239; same to Shelley, 20 June 1626, Ibid., f. 239v; same to Blount, 26 December 1626, Ibid., f. 249; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 3 March 1629, Ibid., f. 290v.

probably written at this time. The letter, concerned with the ongoing controversy with the bishop of Chalcedon and the complaints made against the Society, specifically replied to criticisms of the finances of the province, which have interesting parallels with those raised earlier by the appellants. Blount insisted that, far from dissuading Catholics from giving alms to the secular clergy, the province, either through himself or through others, had forwarded very generous gifts to the seculars. At the same time, the Society had received almost nothing from the seculars. If the accusers could demonstrate that specific Jesuits had persuaded anyone from giving alms or legacies to the secular clergy, the provincial would see that that man was punished and that the money would be turned over to the seculars. Blount knew of no Jesuit guilty of such actions but he could name several of the secular clergy who had persuaded potential donors that they should not bestow gifts or legacies on the Society. The provincial had no desire to enter into a name-calling exercise; he wished simply to point out that many of the secular clergy had spread exaggerated stories about the wealth of the Society and the poverty of the seculars. Both God and the Father General to whom the provincial submitted annual accounts knew the financial difficulties of the province. Blount concluded with a promise that he could name five or six secular priests whose possessions and income from alms exceeded what the Society in England had for its support. He pledged that, if the said clergy wished to exchange their wealth for that of the province, he would not hang back because the transaction would be greatly to the Society's advantage.¹¹⁹

Because of the new endowment, Liège's annual revenues soared to

119. Vatican Library, Barberini MSS xxxiv. 10, f. 269. I am grateful to Mr Antony Allison for his transcript and partial translation of this letter.

8813 scudi in 1628. The net income of 6601 scudi could support fifteen more men than the college held. The collegiate debts fell slightly and the credits more than doubled. Between 1628 and 1633, the size of Liège College increased from 60 to 92 Jesuits. Even with the new endowment, the annual revenue was not large enough to support a community of that size. In order to balance the books, the college relied on precarious alms and the collection of most of the money owed to it.

Between 1634 and 1635 a dispute broke out between Liège and Watten over the Bavarian pension. Once before, in 1629, the general had had to settle the issue. Again in 1634 he was forced to intervene. It seems that, in the light of the large income of Liège in 1628, some of the Bavarian pension had been transferred to the novitiate at Watten where the need was greater. Now that the size of the community at Liège had grown so much that the annual revenues were no longer sufficient, Liège wished to retain for its own expenses the amount that it had agreed to pay to Watten. The general decided that the original agreement still stood and that Liège should give the promised amount to Watten. Because of its own shaky financial state, Liège quickly turned to the Prince Elector for more assistance but until the Prince Elector was able to provide more, the college had to depend on the provincial for aid. A few years later the Prince Elector bestowed larger sums upon the college.¹²⁰

120. ARSI, Anglia 39, pp. 39-40; General to Richard Blount, 1 May 1621, Epp. Gen. I, f. 136v; same to same, 28 July 1629, Ibid., f. 298; same to Robert Stafford, same to Francis Wallis, same to Blount, 24 June 1634, Ibid., f. 396v; same to Wallis, 19 August 1634, Ibid., f. 399; same to same, 17 March 1635, Ibid., f. 408v; same to Blount, 28 April 1635, Ibid., f. 410v; same to Wallis, 19 May 1635, Ibid., f. 412v; same to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 1 September 1635, Ibid., f. 417; same to Wallis, 20 October 1635, Ibid., f. 418v; same to Silesdon, 23 February 1636, Ibid., f. 431; same to same, 1 March 1636, Ibid., f. 431; same to same, 22 March 1636, Ibid., f. 433v; same to same, 3 May 1636, Ibid., f. 436v.

By 1636 the college recorded an annual revenue of 8000 scudi, 6000 from its endowment and 2000 from some unspecified sources in England and in Rome.¹²¹ The net income was 6669 scudi, a sum sufficient for the support of 83 men. Since there were then 94 Jesuits in the college, the college went deeper into debt. The college's finances deteriorated still farther in 1639. Besides the return of 6000 scudi from its endowment, Liège received 1492 scudi from its investments and properties in Rome and in Louvain. It also expected 1600 scudi from the rents of the properties that it owned in England. The payment of the English rents, however, was less certain than the others. The net income of 7883 scudi was only adequate for 78 men. Paradoxically, the net income for 1639 was an increase of 1200 scudi over that of 1636 but the higher income could support only a total of six fewer men. The college was even deeper in debt as the result of a number of loans contracted because of the irregular payment of some of the pensions. Among the college's credits were these outstanding pensions.

14. The Novitiate at Watten

Watten became the site of the province's novitiate in 1624. Its annual revenue from its endowment was 2939 scudi in 1625. The deduction of the ordinary expenses of 132 scudi reduced the net income to 2807 scudi. Since it was estimated that that total could support 34 men, the novitiate was forced to borrow money in order to support the 36

121. John Stonor, who had retired to Louvain in exile, left a considerable legacy to the English College at Liège. Perhaps these unspecified sources of income in England stemmed from that legacy (Annual Letter of 1626, ARSI, Anglia 32II, f. 312v translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1179; HMC 10th Report, Appendix 4, pp. 194-196; R.J. Stonor, Stonor (Newport, 1951), pp. 268-269.

Jesuits there. Although the novitiate had debts of 322 scudi, it also held credits worth 1282 scudi. By 1628 Watten's net income had fallen to 2420 scudi. Thirty men could be supported on that income; thirty-nine actually were. The gap between the size of the community and the number that the endowment could adequately support was widening. Unless the novitiate wanted to increase its debts, it would either have to find another source of income or reduce the number of novices. As we have seen, Watten sought assistance from Liège by claiming a share of the Bavarian pension.

The Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1633 explained the sources of Watten's income. The community received 2147 scudi that would be paid to it in perpetuity from the novitiate's endowment. Annuities brought in another 320 scudi and an annual gift, perhaps Watten's share of Liège's Bavarian pension, another 400 scudi. Liège's gift increased the net income of the novitiate but not significantly enough to make any real difference. The novitiate went deeper into debt as the actual size of the community outdistanced by ten men the number that the endowment could support.

Despite the general's decision in favour of Watten, the novitiate's finances deteriorated still further in 1636. The absence of a life annuity among the novitiate's income suggests that the donor had died. The net income had fallen by slightly more than 300 scudi and the debt increased to 1600 scudi. The novitiate continued to support nine more men than its income could afford. Because of the decline in the income of the novitiate and the increase in the number of novices, the provincial congregation of 1636 asked the general if the province could seek some support from the parents for their sons in the novitiate.

The soliciting of support from parents was forbidden by the Society's poverty, the general replied, but the province could accept as alms any money freely and spontaneously offered by a family.¹²² However, whatever alms the parents may have offered were not sufficient. By 1639, the net income had fallen by 300 scudi as a result of the absence of the annual gift of 400 scudi from Liège. Although the novitiate had cleared its debts, the community was still one larger than the endowment could support.

15. The Tertianship at Ghent

The tertianship at Ghent was founded by Anne Countess of Arundel on 23 August 1623. Its unspecified endowment would return 1500 scudi (£375) annually.¹²³ For some unknown reason the annual income was only 1200 scudi in 1625. The net income of 1197 scudi could support more than twice the number of men in the community. In 1628 the net income fell slightly to 1164 scudi but that was still more than enough money to maintain the seven Jesuits there. Ghent's revenues jumped unaccountably by nearly 900 scudi in 1633.¹²⁴ The net income of 2039 scudi could support 25 men; there were only 14 men in the community. Surprisingly, the tertianship had contracted a debt of 600 scudi. The catalogue, incidentally, explained Ghent's small annual expense: it was a token fee for the use of a bridge. This period of prosperity was brief as the income fell by nearly 300 scudi in 1636 and the tertianship, for the first time, had more men than it could afford. Ghent's income fell still further in 1639 but a reduction in the size of the

122. ARSI, Congr 65, f. 487v.

123. ARSI, Hist Soc 134, f. 91.

124. The general congratulated William Flack, the rector, on the substantial increase in the tertianship's revenues (General to William Flack, 10 April 1632, Epp. Gen. I, f. 347).

community kept the tertianship out of debt.

16. The English College at St Omers

In 1625, the College at St Omers had a net income of 14,346 scudi (£3586) which was able to support the 180 Jesuits and students who resided at the college. Because the pensions from the Spanish king were often irregularly paid, the college had a large debt but, if the king ever compensated the college for the missed payments, its credits of 38,198 scudi would more than offset the debt of 25,110 scudi. Meanwhile, the rector, William Baldwin, was forced to seek other sources of income. In 1624, without the permission of the general, he sold one of the college's houses and built another. The general reprimanded him for that and reminded him that he might have incurred ecclesiastical censure because of the sale. Father Vitelleschi urged him to pay off St Omers' debt but to do so within the framework of canon law.¹²⁵ By 1628 the net income of St Omers had fallen by nearly 1000 scudi to 13407 scudi. Because of a drop in the size of the college, the smaller income was more than sufficient for the 155 Jesuits and students. Since there was a large reduction in both the credits and the debits, the arrears of the Spanish pensions must have been paid.¹²⁶

According to the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1633, the college's annual income came from two pensions: one from the Spanish king; the second from an unspecified source. Their combined worth was 6880 scudi per annum. Students' fees for room and board brought in a further 12000 scudi. The college had financial obligations of 947 scudi:

125. 21 September 1624, Epp. Gen. I, f. 203v.

126. On 11 December 1627, the general congratulated William Baldwin because he had not increased the college's debt (Epp. Gen. I, f. 263v). Not only had he not increased the debt but he had drastically reduced it!

876 in perpetual annuities and 71 scudi in life annuities. The net income of 17933 scudi was sufficient for 220 men, 20 more than there were in the college.¹²⁷ St Omers received the same amount from its two pensions and from the students' fees in 1636 as it did in 1633. A slight rise, however, in the ordinary expenses resulted in a reduction in the net income to 17884 scudi. With that income, the college was able to maintain 50 more men than it contained. Surprisingly, the college was deeply in debt. The erratic payment of the Spanish pension had forced the college to borrow money to meet its high expenses. If the Spanish king ever paid the back pensions, there was no cause for worry; if he did not, serious measures were needed to prevent further debt. Although the college's debt had been reduced to 12000 scudi in 1639, its prospects were ominous. Net income had fallen by more than 3000 scudi to 14004 scudi. That should have been enough to support the 132 men, along with a few servants, but the continued failure of the Spanish pension prevented the college from eradicating its debt.

17. The English Province

The institutions of the English province had a combined net income of 28252 scudi (£7063) in 1625. It was estimated that that amount could maintain 380 men, 8 fewer than the actual population of the province, at an average expense of 74.3 scudi per man. Although the communities had a debt of 29306 scudi, they held more than enough money in credits to offset it. Within three years the combined net incomes had risen by more than 5000 scudi. That income could support 440 men, 24 more than the province contained. The estimated per capita expense went up slightly to 75.2 scudi. Both debts and credits had been

127. In 1629, St Omers' income had fallen because of a reduction in the Spanish pension (General to William Baldwin, 24 November 1629, Epp. Gen. I, f. 305v). It must have returned to its previous level by 1633.

reduced but the latter were still greater than the former.

The impact of the Thirty Years War was first noted in the catalogue of 1633. In late 1631 thirteen German Jesuit refugees sought shelter in the English continental houses.¹²⁸ Until conditions allowed them to return to their own provinces, the English colleges supported them. The English province was in an exceptionally strong condition in 1633. The annual ordinary expenses had fallen by more than 900 scudi. The gross and net incomes had risen by approximately 10000 scudi. Although the estimated per capita expense went up by 5 scudi to 80.5, there was income sufficient for the support of 543 men, 23 more than there were in the province. The province still had some debts and they were slightly higher than the credits it held.

In 1633, there were two interesting illustrations of the Society's teachings on poverty. Richard Newport, a Jesuit laybrother, was stationed at the English College in Seville. He received an annuity of 800 crowns from England and he wished to bestow the allowance on the Seville college. The general objected at first because of the congregational prohibitions against the transfer of funds from one province to another. Upon further consideration, Vitelleschi decided that the prohibitions did not apply. The Seville college did not belong to the Society; it was a seminary of the English secular clergy. Since the prohibitions only forbade the assignment of goods to Jesuit houses outside of the province in which the goods were located, they did not apply to non-Jesuit uses.¹²⁹

128. General to Richard Blount, 24 January 1632, Epp. Gen. I, f. 344v; same to Robert Stafford (vere Stanford), 10 April 1632, Ibid., f. 346v.

129. General to Richard Blount, 28 May 1633, Epp. Gen. I, f. 371; same to same, 3 September 1633, Ibid., f. 379v. Cf. also Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America Colonial and Federal, Text vol. 2, p. 68, footnote 7.

Around the same time, the general was asked to decide on the question of the patrimony of Edward Courtney (vere Leedes). His father, Sir Thomas Leedes, K.B. and Lord Lieutenant of Sussex, had become a Catholic and had retired to Belgium. Throughout the 1630s the family fortune slowly evaporated. When Edward had entered the Society, he had retained the rights to but not the use of his patrimony. Courtney could renounce his ownership at any time before his final profession. At final profession he would be obliged to relinquish the use and the ownership. As he prepared for his final vows, he sought the provincial's permission to bestow his patrimony upon his suffering family. The provincial granted the request and he bestowed part of his patrimony upon them. The general concurred with the provincial.¹³⁰

The income of the provincial institutions continued their rise. The net income increased by slightly more than 1300 scudi between 1633 and 1636. With a net income of 45,086 scudi, the province estimated that it could maintain 567 men. There were only 514 in the various communities. The per capital expense, surprisingly, fell by one scudus to 79.5 scudi. Both debits and credits had increased by over 10,000 scudi but the latter were still greater. At the provincial congregation of 1636, the provincial, Henry More, addressed a personal memorial to the general in which he asked that certain faculties that had been conceded to his predecessor be granted to him. Among the faculties requested by

130. General to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 29 October 1633, Epp. Gen. I, f. 382; Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America Colonial and Federal, Text vol. 2, p. 68, footnote 7. Among the papers of the Caryll family (BL, Add MSS 28224-28253) are the accounts of Sir Edward Francis and Sir John Caryll as trustees for Sir John Leedes of Wappingthorne, Sussex for the years 1618-1625/6. Among the payments were the annuities settled by Sir Thomas Leedes on members of his family. Edward, the Jesuit, received £40 annually in two instalments on Lady Day and Michaelmas (BL, Add MS 28241, ff. 81-130). I am grateful to Mr Antony Allison for bringing these accounts to my attention.

More and granted by Vitelleschi was the permission to accept any goods renounced by aspirants to the Society or by members of the Society, and to dispose of them in such a way so as to relieve the needs of the province.¹³¹ Indirectly, More raised an issue that will surface again throughout the seventeenth century. Since provinces qua provinces were denied a regular source of income by the Society's Institute, the provincial was forced to rely on alms and contributions from the various institutions to meet his expenses. Often the expenses were greater than the receipts and the provincial was always on the lookout for new means to balance the books. One customary way was the use of the money and possessions renounced by novices and other members of the Society. But, before the provincial could apply such goods to the province, he needed the general's permission because it was he that had full authority over their disposal.

The Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1639 boded ill for the province. The net income had fallen by more than 3000 scudi. At an estimated per capita expense of 80.5 scudi, the revenues could support 518 men, 68 more than there were in the province. The province was still solvent but the fall in revenues and the large increase in both debits and credits were not auspicious signs. The general was again asked to decide on questions regarding pensions and patrimonies. The general permitted Thomas Carwell (vere Thorold) to draw up an agreement with his brother regarding his patrimony. Carwell was given permission to dispose of his patrimony as he wished, to his brother or to anyone else, but Father Vitelleschi reminded him that the provincial would decide how

131. ARSI, Congr 65, f. 493.

to use any share that Carwell might assign to the Society.¹³² The general also wrote to Henry More, the provincial, about pensions. Any pension paid to a Jesuit either by his family or his friends or his patrons had to conform to the Society's teaching on poverty. The Jesuit himself might not accept the pension; it had to be paid to the superior of the community in which the Jesuit resided. Vitelleschi cautioned More to see that these regulations were observed throughout the province.¹³³

* * * * *

Because of the concessions granted in Officium et Regulae, the finances of the English province were entangled with those of the English College in Rome. Because of this, the instability of a couple of the continental colleges and a large number of debts, the financial prospects of the province were not favourable in 1623. That had changed by 1625. If the province had been able to collect all that was owed to it, it would have had more than enough to pay off its remaining debts and to support its men. Throughout the 1620s and the 1630s, the province's finances steadily improved so much so that it could offer hospitality to Jesuit refugees from Germany. By 1639 incoming clouds were first sighted. The invasion of the Scots had deprived the Residence of St John of all its regular alms. With the exceptions of the Colleges of the Holy Apostles and of St Francis Xavier, all the Jesuit communities in England reported a decrease in alms collected. Perhaps the Society's usual patrons contributed so much to the collection for the king that they were unable to donate their regular amounts. In many different ways, the years of the personal rule of Charles I were strong ones for

132. 20 June 1637, Epp. Gen. I, f. 454.

133. General to Henry More, 15 September 1638, Epp. Gen. I, f. 480; same to same, 19 March 1639, Ibid., f. 488.

English Catholicism. Amidst Laudian ritualism, Puritan cries of "No Popery," and vain dreams of Anglican-Roman reunion, the English province grew both in money and in men. By 1639, the province's net income could maintain 68 more men than there actually were in the institutions. The Scots invasion was but the first sign of the end of an era.

Chapter VI
THE FINANCES OF THE ENGLISH PROVINCE;
3. 1640-1700

A. The English Province: 1640-1678

During the first seventeen years the English Province had achieved remarkable stability, though it was not without its problems, anxieties and special difficulties. Individual families such as the Morgans, the Petres, the Talbots and the Somersets had made generous endowments of various institutions. These foundations were necessarily covert and so successfully disguised by a complex network of trusts and conveyances that it is often impossible today to discover exactly what had been given and when -- and, in the case of lands, where. Besides the annual revenues from the endowments there was considerable income from alms of various kinds, which indicate the extent of lay support for the Society and its missions throughout England.

Thanks to this income and the comparatively tolerant attitude of the authorities the province had four colleges, a novitiate and seven residences in England. On the continent, it had a tertianship, a novitiate, a theologate, and a college. The colleges in England were real schools (although it is difficult to know how large) providing the English laity with a Catholic education for their sons. On the other hand, the novitiate in England had not accepted any novices since the Clerkenwell raid in 1628. Many Jesuits lived mainly, of course, in the private houses of Catholic gentry but they visited the major house of the residence or the college to which they were attached occasionally for retreats, spiritual conferences etc. After 1640, as we shall see, the situation changed. The English province hitherto spared the wars that had affected the provinces in Europe was itself threatened by

political crisis and civil war. These brought many difficulties. Indeed, as early as 1641 Father General Vitelleschi was writing to the English provincial urging him to practice strict economy throughout the province. Careful measures, one of which was the reduction in the number of novices, had to be taken to prevent a complete collapse of the already deteriorating finances. Until the financial emergency had passed the province should admit few men, the others were either to be deferred or sent to the seminaries.¹ Presumably this letter was occasioned by news of the disturbed political situation. Yet worse was to come. For the rest of this chapter we will illustrate the financial history of the English province during the 1640s and 1650s and thereafter (up to the end of the century) by considering -- as before -- the changing fortunes of the individual houses. And, as before, we usually will give figures for income and expenses in scudi, the exchange rate being four scudi to one pound, as the records themselves do.

Before turning to detail, however, some general remarks about the financial history during these decades may be in order. The province, despite the ups and downs, managed the increasingly complex finances fairly well. As we shall see, it continued to receive many generous gifts and bequests some of which, however, also occasioned squabbles and even litigation. Many of these gifts were large sums of money which the Society could invest in a variety of ways. It could buy buildings and lands, often using lay trustees to whom it might make fictitious loans to provide the purchase money. There are many examples of benefactions thus invested which thereafter yielded considerable income in rents for the province. The Society also

1. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 24 August 1641, Epp. Gen. I, f. 523.

provided genuine loans to its lay friends such as the Eyres and the Talbots, as well as to humbler Catholics, and charged interest thereon. Some benefactors made over to the Society income in rents or tithes of impropriated livings rather than lump sums. Many made large down payments in return for annuities. Hence, though it is difficult to construct a clear picture of the machinery which all this required, it is clear that the province had acquired considerable real estate and a wide variety of income. Such sophisticated financial and property matters not surprisingly required the help of expert lawyers and we shall meet several laymen who regularly acted as the province's lawyers when wills were in dispute or litigation was pending. Finally two important notes before we embark on the survey of the triennial catalogues of the last sixty years of the century. First, as we have seen, the colleges in England had actually operated schools for Catholic students. At different dates throughout the 1650s, these schools were closed probably as a result of the political situation. Nonetheless the colleges preserved their titles, and new colleges were later founded without any educational prospects, because of the teachings of the Society's Institute on institutional poverty. Second, after 1645 the triennial catalogues omitted alms from its tabulations. With the removal of ordinary alms, the reported income of the provincial institutions fell tremendously. The commentaries mentioned whenever the different communities had received alms, even amounts were specified, but these totals were no longer included in the financial accounts. Although this change was never explained, it presumably had something to do with the province's desire to know the exact income to which it had a legal right.

1. The House of Probation/College of St Ignatius

The novitiate's financial decline was first reported in 1642. Its revenues had fallen to 1404 scudi. Nonetheless it had enough money to support the community because of the addition of regular alms of 800 scudi. The decline in the novitiate's annual revenue had something to do with the mysterious return of 1200 scudi to the capital fund. The novitiate had earlier loaned out this amount and had collected interest on it. With its repayment the novitiate lost the interest. By 1645 the net income (of 1308 scudi) was not sufficient for the maintenance of the community. To relieve its penury, the novitiate had borrowed 400 scudi (from whom we do not know) which it hoped to repay once it had collected the 1400 scudi owed to it. Other remedies employed for financial relief were constitutionally questionable as the general reminded the province, the regulations that forbade rectors from keeping deposits of money in their own possession were still in effect. No matter how desperate the situation became, no Jesuit was either to have any money for his own use or to convey any money from one house to another.² We can conclude from the general's admonition that the novitiate was engaged in such practices.

Although the novitiate again reported an annual revenue of 1404 scudi in 1649, the compiler confessed that it would be difficult to collect most of the money. The community also mentioned the collection of 240 scudi in regular alms but this sum, as we have already noted, was not included in the accounts. The novitiate held credits of 1600 scudi and debts of 600 scudi. The latter was an outstanding bill that the

2. General to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow), 26 March 1644, Epp. Gen. II, f. 38v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 3 September 1644, Ibid., f. 48v; same to same, 24 September 1644, Ibid., f. 50.

community had thought that it had paid; recently, the procurator had been informed that it was still unpaid. Nearly 2200 scudi of the capital fund had been returned and made available for re-investment. After many years the novitiate had also recovered 3200 scudi from its fund that it had given up as lost. It too had been returned and awaited re-investment. Throughout the 1650s the novitiate was scarcely able to collect any of the revenues from its foundation. Without this income it was only the precarious alms from the faithful that kept the community out of debt. In 1658 there had been some hope that the income could be augmented. Francis Lord Cottington, who had died at Valladolid in 1652, had bequeathed his estate to the English province but his heir, his nephew, contested the legacy. The dispute began in 1654. For two years the heir fought the Society's claim to the estate. The general, of course, advised the provincial and his procurator to do all they could to secure the bequest. Surprisingly, the Valladolid College where Cottington had died had not forwarded a copy of the will to the English procurator. In late 1656 the general promised that he would order the rector in Valladolid to do so.³ Henceforth no more was heard of the legacy so we must presume that, once the province had obtained the will, it realized it had no legally defensible right to the bequest and the matter was dropped. All in all, this was a curious incident.

The novitiate's income fell considerably between 1658 and 1672,

3. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 17 October 1654, Epp. Gen. II, f. 159; same to Thomas Clovell (vere Thorold), 28 November 1654, Ibid., f. 160v; same to same, 29 March 1655, Ibid., f. 164; same to George Gray, 29 January 1656, Ibid., f. 176; same to Clovell, 12 February 1656, Ibid., f. 176; same to Knott, 12 February 1656, Ibid., f. 176v; same to Clovell, 11 March 1656, Ibid., f. 178; same to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 9 December 1656, Ibid., f. 187; same to same, 30 December 1656, Ibid., f. 187.

from 1404 scudi to 848 scudi. I have found no explanation for this loss. I would assume either that St Ignatius had lost track of some of the capital that it had farmed out for investment or a trustee (or his heir) had proved to be untrustworthy and had denied Jesuit ownership. Nonetheless, it is surprising that the novitiate could have lost so much money without even a hint in the general's letters. About this time the provincial petitioned the general for a change in the status of the novitiate. Since there had been no novices there for years, in fact since the Clerkenwell raid, the provincial asked that the institution be changed into a college. The general approved on 28 December 1669.⁴

2. The College of Blessed Aloysius

In 1642 the fortunes of the college had recovered from the slight depression that it had experienced in 1639. Its endowment again increased its return to a high of 960 scudi. Regular alms also rose to 800 scudi and the college was again able to support all its men. The 1642 Catalogus Tertius Rerum was the last to include regular alms in its reports. With their omission, there was, of course, a large decrease in the recorded incomes of all the colleges. With regular alms no longer recorded, the college's income was reported as merely the 960 scudi from its endowment. That could support only 12 men; twice as much was needed to support a community of 24. The annual revenue was again reported as 960 scudi in 1649. However, even that amount was not in fact collected. The counties served by the college were among the poorest in England and the precarious alms collected within them barely supported the priests. In fact, the provincial

4. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 28 December 1669, Epp. Gen. II, f. 319.

was obliged to supplement the alms with some assistance from his own funds. To make matters worse, the college procurator, because of his fear of the approaching army of Parliamentarians, had hidden some money and died before he had a chance to reveal the hiding place to anyone. As a result, the college had to borrow money. For some reason these debts were not included in the catalogue. Hence the 1651 catalogue duplicated verbatim the figures and the commentary of the catalogue of 1649.

It is possible that, around this time, the college acquired either through gift or purchase the extensive Southworth (or Croft) estate. I stress "possible" for it is difficult to pinpoint the estate's entry into the college's financial ledger. A Penyston Whalley, among others, sold and conveyed Southworth and all its appurtenances to one Roger Bradshaigh and others on 5 September 1654. The purchasers held the estate in trust for a certain Richard Gerard. On 2 March 1674 the estate was sold again. Roger Bradshaigh (now Sir Roger because of his services to King Charles I), Richard Gerard and Thomas Gerard conveyed Southworth to Thomas Eyre of Hassop, Darbyshire. He undoubtedly purchased it in trust for the Society.⁵ But it is here that confusion enters. Even though Thomas Eyre was the trustee after 1674, the college continued to refer to the estate as Richard Gerard's and to list him as the trustee. Whether it was habit or ignorance that continued to associate Gerard's name with Southworth need not detain us. What matters is Gerard's role as a trustee. Had he held the estate in trust for the Society from the beginning, i.e. from the initial purchase from Whalley in 1654, or was Thomas Eyre the first trustee for the

5. ASJ, Foley MSS III, 310-311; Correspondence Relating to St Omers and to North Wales 1666-1781, ff. 9-12; College of St Aloysius: Bedford Leigh to Formby, Croft.

Society? I think the former: if Eyre had been the first trustee, there would not have been the persistent use of Gerard's name. These estates remained in the Society's hands until the 1820s when they were sold for £29774.

The acquisition of the Southworth estate did not bring immediate benefits to the college. In fact, the college's revenues fell by 800 scudi to 160 scudi in 1655 and even the collection of that small amount was uncertain. Owing to the destruction of the fortunes of the local Catholics, alms were meagre and unpredictable. They were just enough for food and clothing. The 1658 catalogue reported the annual revenue to be still 160 scudi. This had to be supplemented by alms in order to support the 22 Jesuits in the college. The catalogue explains this large drop in revenues. The procurator, after he had concealed all the information about the college's incomes and investments, had been captured and imprisoned. He died in prison and no one knew where he had hidden the documents containing the college's finances.

This was not the end of the college's problems. There was also a dispute between it and the College of the Immaculate Conception concerning the very large sum of 4000 scudi which had been lent some time before to Sir George Wintour who had died in 1657.⁶ Both colleges claimed that the 4000 scudi that he had borrowed from the Society was owed to them. The dispute continued until August 1661. Both sides pleaded their cases to the general who, in turn, searched the archives for the pertinent documents. Finally, he committed the question to the provincial and his consultants: they decided that, when repaid, the

6. General to Thomas Clovell (vere Thorold) 13 July 1658, Epp. Gen. II, f. 204.

4000 scudi should be distributed between the two colleges.⁷ However, as we shall see in a later discussion of the relationship between the Wintours and the Residence of St George, that sum was never paid.

The College of Blessed Aloysius was also indirectly involved in litigation in 1667/8. Colonel Richard Gerard, probably the same Richard that we mentioned earlier, had petitioned the king for a grant of a rent charge of £80 per annum that issued from the manor of Ince in Lancashire. The Petitioner claimed that a Thomas Gerard, Esquire (not the abovementioned Thomas Gerard) had granted the rent for 1000 years to one John Biddulph in return for £1000. The agreement was made by an indenture of 20 January 1637/8. That £1000, Colonel Gerard asserted, really belonged to the Society of Jesus for whom Biddulph served as a trustee. As a reward for this discovery, Gerard requested a grant of the rent charge.

This was, in fact, a collusive action. The Jesuits had indeed been the source of that £1000 with which Biddulph purchased the rents. The money came from John Worthington, the Jesuit rector, who had used Biddulph as an intermediary in a business transaction of a kind very familiar to English recusants in general and religious orders in particular. Finding himself with £1000 to invest (and we do not know

7. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 22 May 1660, Epp. Gen. II, f. 224; same to John Turner, 22 May 1660, Ibid., f. 224; same to Barton, 12 June 1660, Ibid., f. 224v; same to Turner, 4 September 1660, Ibid., f. 226v; same to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 4 September 1660, Ibid., f. 227; same to Peter Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 6 November 1660, Ibid., f. 228v; same to Courtney, 8 January 1661, Ibid., f. 233; same to Thomas Neville (vere Appleton), 26 March 1661, Ibid., f. 235v; same to Henry More, 16 April 1661, Ibid., f. 236v; same to Turner, 10 April 1661, Ibid., f. 236v; same to Courtney, 20 August 1661, Ibid., f. 237v.

where that large sum came from) but, for good reasons, not wanting to invest it openly himself, the rector had turned to Biddulph and "lent" him the money with which to purchase the rents nominally for himself but really on the Society's behalf. The rector had then required the annual payment of £80 as security for the "loan". In fact Biddulph had acquired the rents in trust for the Society and used the Society's money for the purchase. Thereafter he would make over to it the annual income.

At Biddulph's death his son and heir inherited this trusteeship. However in the early 1660s, the tenants of the property concerned (another Mr Gerard and a Mr Stoughton) refused to pay their rents any longer. They alleged that their rents went to the Jesuits and begged Colonel Gerard to inform the king of the situation and to seek a grant of the rents to himself. The Colonel accordingly filed the petition and a commission met at Wigan on 22 July 1667 to examine the accusations. The commissioners judged that the original money had indeed belonged to the Jesuits and that the rents were thus forfeited to the Crown. A Treasury Warrant of 14 March 1668 authorized Sir Thomas Ingram to pay the rents to Colonel Gerard.⁸

There is something suspicious about this whole affair. The Gerards had long been a recusant family and were especially close to the Society even, as we have seen, acting as trustees. Why would the Colonel "discover" Jesuit involvement in the purchase of the rents? Was it a simple act of treachery for profit? Neither Mr Gerard nor Mr Stoughton profited by the proceedings. They were still required to pay the £80 rent but now to Colonel Gerard. The only difference for them was the

8. PRO SP, 29/229/134-136; 29/233/135; 44/30/f. 16; T 51/37/p. 80.

recipient of their money. And this, I think, is the detail that is the key to the whole affair.

According to the indenture, Thomas Gerard was to pay the rents to John Biddulph. He, in turn, would forward them to the college. From the Catalogi Tertii Rerum, we know that the college's income had fallen considerably during the Civil War because of the death of the procurator. Perhaps the papers concerning the Ince manor rents were among those hidden by the procurator before his death. Because all the original parties were now dead and there were no financial records, the college had no proof that the Ince manor rents belonged to the Society and that Biddulph's heir was simply a trustee. Perhaps the heir was reluctant to accept their word and to part with the £80 annual income. Mr. Gerard and Mr Stoughton could do nothing: the indenture required them to pay Biddulph. If the trustee did not relay the rents to the college, there was no way that either of them could compel him. All that either Gerard or Stoughton could do was to withhold the rents. This they did but such a move was only a temporary solution. Sooner or later Biddulph could apply legal pressure to make them pay. The only way for the Society to secure its income was, ironically enough, by appealing to the penal laws. Anyone who "discovered" popish legacies, investments and bequests received a moiety. Often the discoverer, if he was influential or in favour, received not a moiety but the entire amount. Neither Mr Gerard nor Mr Stoughton stepped forward as the informer. Instead, they went to Colonel Richard Gerard, a man very much in favour, and asked him to petition the Crown. Colonel Gerard was rewarded the rents and able to use them as he wished. As the next triennial catalogue shows, by 1672 the college had recovered its lost investments. It would seem that the Colonel had become a trustee for the Society and had turned over

the rents. Thus could even the savage penal legislation designed to destroy collusion be turned by dexterous lawyers to popery's advantage.

In 1672, the college supported twelve priests. The gross income had returned to its earlier level of 960 scudi. The net income of 560 scudi, supplemented by ordinary alms, provided enough money to support fourteen Jesuits, two more than the actual number there.

3. The College of St Francis Xavier

The Civil War had its first impact on the finances of this college in 1642. Alms, which had been steadily rising, fell by more than 500 scudi to 304 scudi. Although the income from the endowment remained at 800 scudi, the drastic reduction in alms left the college with a net income of 1104 scudi. That could only maintain 15 men. The actual size of the college was 25. With the elimination of alms from the catalogue in 1645, the only recorded income of the college was its annual revenue of 800 scudi. That could only support 10 men out of the 25 in the college.

Even though the college had lost two farms valued at £50 annually at the death of Charles Brown (vere Gwynne) in 1647, no such loss was registered in the catalogue of 1649. The financial report still recorded an annual revenue of 800 scudi. The college also collected 160 in certain alms; they, too, were not recorded in the catalogue. The next income of 960 scudi could only support 10 men, not the 20 men in the college. The 1651 catalogue repeated that of 1649.

In a previous section on the finances of this college, we mentioned the £1200 bond obtained by the college from Sir Edward Morgan via a trustee in 1653. That sum should have doubled the size and the return

of the college's foundation. Yet there was no change in the annual income of 1655. The 20 members of the college still received only 800 scudi. Alms, though uncertain, contributed enough so that the community could support itself without debt. The college's dependence on alms increased. Although St Francis Xavier was still entitled to 800 scudi in 1658, the rents, pensions, interest etc. were so badly paid that the 14 Jesuits had to rely on alms to balance the books.

The financial condition of the college, barely solvent in 1658, improved shortly after the Restoration. The Petre family again came to the aid of the Society. With their assistance, the Society continued to invest its money in land.⁹

In 1614 a William ap Robert of Flint sold certain lands around Caerwys, Dymerschion, and Tre'r Graig to a Peter Ellis for £21. Ten years later, Ellis conveyed the properties to John Pennant of Holywell and William Mostyn of Flint to be held in trust for him. In 1653, the daughter and heiress of Peter Ellis, Elizabeth Lovett and James, her husband, of St Andrew, Holborn, conveyed the use of the lands to Mary Thomas (née Pennant), Julius Caesar and William Griffith for £100, £40 and £64 respectively. Nine years later, in 1662, the Lovetts sold the estate to Thomas Walpole of Staple Inn, London and John Wolfe of London for £246. These two were acting for the Society of Jesus. Less than two years later, Walpole and Wolfe conveyed the premises to George Walker of London and Thomas James of Greenfield without consideration. George Walker was probably a Jesuit laybrother.

The estate of Llanvechan was comprised of what had earlier been

9. ASJ, Correspondence Relating to St Omers and North Wales 1661-1781, ff. 4-8, 15-20, 24-31; Foley MSS V, ff. 330, 336-337.

smaller parcels of land. By 1629, the Reverend Foulk Price, D.D., the parson of the area, had acquired various fields either by direct purchase or by mortgages. The estate passed to his son, John Price, M.A., after whose death the property was divided between his two daughters. Less than a week after the deed of partition, on the 25th and the 26th of September 1674, one of the two daughters, Mary, and her husband John Lloyd conveyed their half to Christopher Turberville of Powis Castle and Edward Conway of Holywell as security for a loan of £500 (whether this is another fictitious loan, we can not say), with its interest, but subject to future redemption. Turberville survived Conway and in 1678 he assigned the £500 mortgage to Thomas Price of Llanwyllen, Richard Clough of Myndtown, Salop, and George Pierson of London. By a deed of 4 July 1682, Price bought the equity of the estate for £70 and, subject to redemption, he became the sole owner. Turberville, Conway, Price, Clough and Pierson were trustees for the Society. Turberville himself might have been a Jesuit. Thomas Price (the son of the above?) transferred the land to William Plowden of Plowden Hall in 1746. Plowden gave a declaration of trust for the property to Father Sebastian Redford (vere or alias Exton), the superior of St Winefrid.

The property of The Star Inn, Holywell came into the hands of the Jesuits from the Petres of Greenfield.¹⁰ Julius Ceasar had leased certain tenements, with a dwelling house and a garden, in Holywell to George Petre in 1639 for £44. In that same year, Petre leased other tenements in Holywell from Jennett ux Thomas and his son and heir, Edward Williams. On 4 July 1643, George and Anne Petre conveyed the property to George's brother, the Honorable John Petre, for £400. Ten years later, for the same sum, John Petre conveyed it to Hugh Lewis

10. Cf. also Foley, Records, IV, 530.

of Gray's Inn and Robert Gray of London. Gray was probably the Jesuit laybrother who was the socius to the provincial. In another transaction of 1639, George Petre had leased some property from a Richard Davenport for 42 years. That property, also in Holywell, was valued at £6-13s-4d per annum. In 1668/9, George's wife, Anne Petre, and Thomas James of Greenfield purchased the rented tenements. The property amounted to two acres and included a messuage, a garden, and a house probably used as a stable. The premises were then conveyed to William Vavasour and George Walker both of London, both of whom were either agents or trustees for the Society. Both Walker and James had been involved in the Caerwys, Dymerchion, and Tre'r Graig transactions.

The Residence of St Winefrid was formed out of the College of St Francis Xavier in 1666/1667.¹¹ Much of the above discussed property, viz. Dymerchion, Caerwys, Tre'r Graig, Llanvechan, and Holywell, became part of the portfolio of the new residence. Nonetheless, the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1672 registered hardly any change. Since the six residences were supported by alms and from a common fund and were not specifically discussed in the catalogue, we know nothing definite about the income of St Winefrid. The annual return from the endowment of the college was a slightly higher 806 scudi. The heavy ordinary obligations of the college, 555 scudi, resulted in a meagre net income of 251 scudi. Even that could not be used to support the seven Jesuits in the college because the money was required for repairs, wages and farming expenses. The community was supported by alms and, so far, it had stayed out of debt.

11. Included among the notes on the confiscated financial ledgers and records of John Fenwick (vere Caldwell), the procurator of St Omers, was an entry regarding a letter to Mr Fenwick, dated 1667, which told of a £6000 gift from Lady Mordant to the Residence of St Winefrid (HMC Fitzherbert, pp. 115-117). If that exceptionally large benefaction had actually been given to the residence, I have found no trace of it.

4. The College of the Immaculate Conception

The College of the Immaculate Conception recorded 2500 scudi in annual revenues and 520 scudi in alms in 1642. These were the same amounts that the college had collected in 1639. That net income of 3020 scudi, however, could now only support 35 Jesuits, two fewer than in 1639. With the disappearance of regular alms from the triennial catalogues in 1645, the revenues of 2500 scudi should still have been more than sufficient for the fourteen Jesuits in the community. By 1649, although the college should have received the same amount from its endowment, most of it could not be collected because of the difficulties caused by the civil strife. On the income that it had received, the college could just about support its seven members. Surprisingly, the college collected so much in precarious alms that the rector was able to increase the capital fund by 1200 scudi from the surplus. Despite the increase, the revenues remained only the same in 1651. By 1655 the college was able to collect barely one quarter of the annual revenue. With the aid of alms, the community of one brother and nine priests supported itself without incurring debt. In 1658 the plight of the Catholics in the area prevented the complete payment of the 2500 scudi that the college was owed annually from its endowment. The amount that it could collect, about 600 scudi, and precarious alms kept the community out of debt.

Some time in the middle of the seventeenth century, Holbeck Hall, Nottinghamshire, became a centre, perhaps the centre of the college's activities. By March 1679 the Society had acquired a library of approximately 500 volumes valued at £1000, which it deposited there. During the Oates Plot the library was seized and carried off to London by the pursuivants.¹²

12. PRO, PC 2/67/f. 74; Bodl, Rawl MSS A 135, p. 174; Foley, Records,

Many of the college's financial transactions involved the Eyres of Hassop.¹³ Between 1666 and 1668 Rowland Eyre purchased a number of closes, formerly part of Ashbourne Park, from the Cockaynes. He paid £2478 in all and rented out the land for £124 per annum. In this transaction Eyre was acting as a trustee for the Society. Around the same time Eyre borrowed £500 from the Jesuits to supplement the dowry of his daughter, Mary, who married William Blundell of Crosby in 1668. As security for the loan, Eyre turned over to Richard Langhorne, the Society's lawyer, the deeds for Litton near Tideswell in Derbyshire and Blyth Meadow in Staffordshire. According to the agreement made between Eyre and the Jesuits - Francis Pole and John Weedon (vere Turner) - the money was to be repaid either to them or to their successors with interest calculated at 6% per annum. Thomas Eyre, Rowland's heir, repaid the loan and redeemed his property in 1675/6. Nonetheless, the gross income of the college dropped to 1352 scudi in 1672. That could support thirteen or fourteen men; there were only seven in the college. The community had contracted debts of approximately 400 scudi; it held assets worth 2400 scudi but most of this sum could probably not be collected. Neither the catalogues nor the general's letters offered any explanation for the decline in the income of this college.

5. The College of the Holy Apostles

The annual return from the endowment of the College of the Holy Apostles remained at 2200 scudi but a decline in alms reduced the net

13. Cf. Rosamond Meredith, "A Derbyshire Family in the Seventeenth Century: The Eyres of Hassop and their forfeited estates," RI 8 (1965) 12-77; "The Eyres of Hassop, and some of their connections, from the Test Act to Emancipation," RI 9 (1967-1968) 5-52, 267-287; Richard Clark, "Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire 1603-1730" (unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1979) pp. 266-268.

income by 80 scudi to 2880 scudi. That was still considered adequate for the maintenance of 35 men, more than double the then size of the community. In the 1639 catalogue the college reported that it had 4000 scudi which it had not yet invested. For some reason, that 4000 scudi was now listed as a debt. With the disappearance of alms in 1645, the net recorded income of the college was the 2280 scudi generated by the endowment. The annual revenue was still able to support more than twice the number of men in the community.

Earlier we discussed the financial arrangement by which the provincial supervised the endowment of this college. When Henry More questioned the general regarding the motives for this, Father Vitelleschi explained his reasons. That clarification satisfied the province for ten years. Around 1648, the college's rector, John Parker (vere Heaton), complained to Father General Carrafa about the administration of the funds of Holy Apostles. Carrafa re-affirmed his predecessor's, Vitelleschi's, decision that the value of the endowments be kept a secret from the local rector and remain under the control of the provincial. He promised, nonetheless, to admonish the provincial on the proper use of the revenue. The income from the foundation should be used, in the first instance, to support the Jesuits in the college. Only then could the surplus be devoted to other uses. The general informed the provincial, Henry Silesdon, of the complaints that he had received and instructed the provincial to make sure that the members of colleges enjoyed the revenues of their endowments before the money was allotted to other uses. The letter contained a strong admonition that the provincial should better maintain the purity of the Institute by making sure that the province enjoyed no fixed income. The admonition surely sprang from the general's fear that the provincial was using collegiate revenues to

meet the province's expenses.¹⁴

The effects of the Civil War were first felt in 1649. The college's endowment still generated 2280 scudi annually. Because of the perilous times, scarcely any of it could be collected but the college hoped to remedy that. The 4000 scudi that the college had had at its disposal had been invested outside England. Hopefully, a further 2000 scudi would be invested in a safe and secure location. By 1655 only 320 scudi could be collected from the revenues owed to the college. Precarious alms were needed to avoid debt. Need rekindled the controversy about the administration of the foundation and this became one of the many criticisms directed at John Haydon, the province's procurator. Many Jesuits complained that both the provincial and the procurator had too much to do and too little time to devote so much attention to one specific problem. They therefore urged the general to correct the irregularity and to allow the rector to administer the college's portfolio. However, the general was reluctant to overturn a ruling of a previous general without good reasons.¹⁵ The provincial's socius, George Gray, drew up a memorial on the issue of 21 November 1655.¹⁶ Centring on the controversy over the endowment of the College of the Holy Apostles, the memorial revealed some of the mechanics behind the administration of the collegiate funds in England. Because of Father General Vitelleschi's decision, the size of the foundations of the colleges

-
14. General to John Parker (vere Heaton), 11 April 1648, Epp. Gen. II, f. 103v; same to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 11 April 1648, Ibid., f. 104.
15. General to John Parker (vere Heaton), 11 September 1655, Epp. Gen. II, f. 169; same to Henry More, 11 September 1655, Ibid., f. 169v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 11 September 1655, Ibid., f. 170; same to Robert Stafford (vere Stanford), 18 September 1655, Ibid., f. 170v; same to William Talbot, 9 October 1655, Ibid., f. 171; same to John Haydon, 13 November 1655, Ibid., f. 172; same to Knott, 20 November 1655, Ibid., f. 173.
16. ARSI, Anglia 34, pp. 565-568.

in England and their revenues were concealed from the rectors and managed by the provincial. At the foundation of the College of the Holy Apostles the provincial and the college's rector agreed that the college itself would receive 400 scudi annually from its revenues. The remainder was to be spent on the needs of the province. All went well until 1642, after which year the provincial no longer transferred the agreed amount to the college. Now in 1655 the provincial himself was able to collect only a small percentage of the annual revenue. Over the past few years the decreasing revenue had been the cause of considerable contention between members of the province. Gray urged that the situation be rapidly corrected lest the dispute become a source of scandal. The controverted issues were four: where, or in whose hands, a missing portion of the capital fund, specifically an amount that generated 448 scudi annually, was to be found; whether the college had any onera; whether the college had any debts; and whether the portfolio should be managed by the rector, as was the case in the other English colleges, and throughout the Society. From the data at his disposal, Gray did his best to provide the general with answers. No one knew the location of the missing sum. One Jesuit claimed that it had been assigned to St Omers; another thought that it had gone to Liège; a third believed that it had been lost completely. If the money had either been lost or had been absorbed into the foundation of another college because of the provincial's carelessness, Gray argued that some reparation should be made. As to the financial obligations, the onera, the provincial, who alone knew the college's income, affirmed that there was none. He cited the Catalogi Tertii Rerum of 1642, 1645, 1649, and 1651 as proof. Although the provincial procurator insisted otherwise, the same catalogues confirmed the absence of any debts. If it should be discovered that there were debts, the college thought

that the provincial should be responsible for their liquidation. Finally, Gray thought that the rector should be given control over the college's foundation and he advanced a number of reasons for this view. Administration by the rector was the usual practice in the Society and in the other English colleges and there had been no problems. But problems there had been with the present anomalous arrangement. The present difficulties were all caused by it. The provincial had enough work in the conscientious administration of the province and was unable to give his complete attention to fiscal matters. The result has been the loss of some of the endowment and a dispute over financial obligations and debts. A solemn consultation was held in London in 1653 to discuss the matter. The provincial, the consultors and the province's procurator agreed that changes were necessary.

The memorial answered some of the objections that the general might raise against any changes. If the general had some hesitation about reversing a previous decision, Gray drew his attention to the fact that the decision had never been fully implemented. Vitelleschi had instructed that the incomes of all the colleges in England be managed by the provincial. Only the College of the Holy Apostles observed that mandate. The same decision insisted that the provincial alone could manage the foundation. Why then had the task been delegated to the procurator? If the demands of the provincial office demanded delegation, why had the provincial not named the rector of the college for the task? The need for secrecy was clearly the reason for the decision. The college's investments were better protected from discovery if only the provincial was privy to the exact financial details. Now some of those very funds whose protection demanded such secretive precautions had been lost. The founders had desired as much

secrecy as possible in order to protect the foundations, and themselves, from detection. They had feared that the endowments would be confiscated and that they would be prosecuted under the penal laws. The provincial conceded their fears and agreed to manage the foundations. Now the founders were dead and thus out of danger. Not even an heretical government would prosecute a child for the sins of his parents. The dangers had passed; the irregular practices were no longer needed.

The general left the ultimate decision to the provincial and hoped that Richard Barton would settle the matter as soon as he assumed office. In mid 1656 the new provincial polled thirteen professed fathers for their views and promised to base his judgement on the results. The provincial finally agreed in favour of the rector; the general ratified the decision.¹⁷ As a result of the various protests and the provincial investigation, the financial practices of the college were normalized. Trustees, both Jesuits and lay, held the college's endowment in trust for the college. The rector, assisted by the procurator, managed the investments and oversaw the collection of the revenues. However normalization did not improve the financial state of the college. Although there should have been an annual income of 2280 scudi in 1658, the college was still only able to collect 320 scudi because of the continued situation in England. The alms of the faithful supported the priests. The college lost a further 200 scudi when the rector was seized and imprisoned. At his capture, the attackers broke into his desk and stole the money. This once wealthy college was on the brink of ruin at the Restoration. Monies had been lost, misplaced, and

17. General to George Gray, 4 March 1656, Epp. Gen. II, f. 177; same to John Parker (vere Heaton), 8 April 1656, Ibid., f. 178v; same to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 30 July 1656, Ibid., f. 182v; same to same, 30 December 1656, Ibid., f. 187.

confiscated. By 1660 most of the capital sum left to the college by Lord Petre had been lost.¹⁸ Luckily the Honorable John Petre, the fifth son of the college's founder and the brother of George Petre, the benefactor to the College of St Francis Xavier, replenished the fund.

John Petre had intended to establish another Jesuit college in England. The general was, however, reluctant to accept it because of the financial obligations that acceptance would entail. Nonetheless, the general left the final decision to the provincial and his consultors.¹⁹ The provincial decided to accept the gift but, instead of using it as the endowment for a new college, he incorporated it into the fund of the nearly bankrupt College of the Holy Apostles. John Petre gave the college an endowment with an annual revenue of 1200 scudi for the education of the children of the area. He planned to bestow a further 4800 scudi in the near future. The money, which was subject to interest during Petre's life, was paid over and a deed of trust drawn up. Most of the annual revenue came from real estate; his bequest included Newnham Abbey and other lands in Bedfordshire, and some estates in Bawdsey. The Bedfordshire lands carried the stipulation that the college assumed responsibility for their debts and paid an annuity to the donor. Despite threats, discoveries and seizures, the college retained the ownership of the Bedfordshire property. The Abbey and the other houses, never a good investment because they rarely returned more than half the rents, were sold in 1767 for £6000. The Bawdsey lands, with an annual revenue of £60, were sold in 1719 for £1030.²⁰

18. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 96.

19. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 14 January 1668, Epp. Gen. II, f. 304.

20. ASJ, Foley MSS IV, f. 149v; College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 87v.

The death of John Petre in 1669 left the college more financially secure than it had been in years. But the knavery of John Travers almost ended that.

The son of a Protestant minister and the older brother of Walter Joseph Travers who became the Carmelite Father Bede of St Simon Stock, John Travers was born in Devon in 1616.²¹ John Travers, or by the name that he employed in England, John Savage, had entered the Watten novitiate as a priest in 1642. Professed of the four vows, he was appointed as rector of the College of the Holy Apostles on 28 April 1668.²² Around the turn of the year 1671/2, Travers embezzled the College's foundation and apostatized. The entire story was told in the Annual Letters of 1671 and 1672.²³

About a fortnight before Christmas 1671, Travers approached the provincial Joseph Simons with some scruples regarding the validity of his baptism. There were three reasons for his concern: a statement made by his father's clerk when Travers was a child; the words "non recte" written next to his entry in the baptismal register of his parish; and a handwritten declaration from his father that he had been baptized with the formula "John, I baptize thee in the name of thy Father, and of my Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Having consulted the Queen's confessor, the Jesuit Antonio Fernandes, Travers was determined to be baptized again. He first discussed the situation with the provincial and asked for

21. George Oliver, Collections illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire and Gloucester (London, 1857) p. 423; Godfrey Anstruther, The Seminary Priests, II, 324; "Autobiography of Father Bede of St Simon Stock" in B. Zimmerman, Carmel in England: A History of the English Mission of the Discalced Carmelites, 1615 to 1849 (London, 1899) p. 172.

22. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 28 April 1668, Epp. Gen. II, f. 305.

23. ARSI, Anglia 34, pp. 772-773, 782 translated in ASJ, Foley MSS IV, ff 142v-143v

assurances that he would be re-admitted into the Society without a second novitiate. He urged the provincial to obtain the required faculties from the pope. Letters were thus dispatched to Rome with the first courier. John's brother, Walter, "re-baptized" him on Christmas Day 1671 in London. While Travers was in London he executed his plans for the fraudulent confiscation of the college's fund.

Earlier in this section, we considered John Petre's benefaction to the college. Under his direction a deed of trust was drawn up. One part of the duplicate deed was deposited in the hands of a "certain knight," (Sir Henry Bedingfeld, the trustee for the Society); the second part, in the custody of two gentlemen, Humphrey Weld and Jerome Stafford, the trustees for the donor.²⁴ Travers successfully acquired all the pertinent papers and the donor's declaration. Seizing an opportunity when all the trustees were in London, and claiming to act in the name of the provincial, Travers insisted that all three sign two documents. One directed the sale of property valued at 4800 scudi to Travers. Not suspecting any fraud, the three trustees signed the documents. Once Travers' apostasy became public knowledge, the trustees demanded all financial papers and documents from him. Travers refused and denied that the property in question belonged to the Society of Jesus. The real estate and the money had been given to him personally by the founder, he insisted, and he would not relinquish any of it. Here the account in the Annual Letter of 1671 ended. The Letter for the following year reported the conclusion of the scandal: "By the singular goodness of providence," a decree of the Court of Chancery compelled Travers to give up the property and money, and to turn over all documents and writings.

24. The knight and the two gentlemen were not identified in the Annual Letter. Their identification, although tentative, is based on various references in the account ledgers of the college.

An undated document among the State Papers casts some light on the means by which the Society regained the Petre benefaction. The document, a petition to the king from Humphrey Weld, claimed that the estate of the Honorable John Petre had been put to illegal, i.e. superstitious, uses. The rectory of the dissolved monastery of Newnham and several messuages, lands, and tenements in Bedford Goldington and Cardington in Bedfordshire, and large sums of money, all of which had been the estate of Petre, was now in the hands of "Mr John Sauvage alias Travers." It was the declared intention of the benefactor that the income from the above be devoted to popish and superstitious uses and Travers was to make sure that the income was put to these uses. All of Petre's estate, therefore, should be forfeited to the Crown. Weld himself was willing to initiate legal proceedings, at his own expense, in order to establish the king's right to it. In return, he asked the king to grant him the said estate, both real and personal, upon recovery.²⁵

We can reconstruct the scenario from the petition. Once Travers absconded with the bequest, the Society turned to a trusted friend, Humphrey Weld. He shrewdly initiated proceedings in Chancery not on the question of fraud or theft or even against John Travers but on the superstitious uses to which John Petre had given his estate. That gift was a violation of the law and thus should be forfeited to the Crown. Weld promised to undertake a prosecution of the king's right if the king promised to grant the estate to him. Apparently the king did so. One wonders how aware the king was of the true nature of the suit. Weld won the case and received the forfeited estate as his

25. PRO, SP 29/442/163.

reward. He returned it to the Society. Once again the penal laws were used to good advantage by the Society. Travers was defeated but not vanquished. Waiting for an opportunity for revenge, he returned to the limelight during the Oates Plot as we shall see. For the moment, we shall leave him in the shadows.

The impact of Travers' knavery can be seen in the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1672. The gross income of the college was 684 scudi, a serious decline of 1596 scudi from the revenues of 1658. The net income of 484 scudi, with the assistance of certain alms, was sufficient for the maintenance of 17 Jesuits. There were no debts.

In the 1670s the college purchased and sold various pieces of real estate. Property known as the Milton estate was sold in 1675 for £600. When the college acquired the land, from whom they received it, and how much it returned are unknown. The Society's lawyer, Richard Langhorne, was active in the sale and received a fee of £13-17s-4d for his services.²⁶ Rents from the Yaxley estate, probably given to the college by Mr Yaxley of Yaxley Hall, Suffolk, first appeared in the college's ledgers in 1674. By 1683 the rents were £51 annually. Held by the college until 1849, the estate was sold for £2462-1s-9d.²⁷ The college also acquired a few tenements in Bury St Edmunds that returned £6 annually.²⁸

Besides the rents from the different properties, there were other sources of income. Mary Harman gave the college £30 on 5 August 1682. The gift, however, was conditional: the college had to return the money if she ever needed it and would only assume full ownership on her death.

26. ASJ, Foley MSS IV, f. 149v; College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 8.

27. ASJ, Foley MSS IV, f. 150v; College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 91v.

28. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 91v.

While she lived, the college could invest it and profit therefrom. A similar arrangement was made by Elizabeth Rockwood of Bury St Edmunds on 25 May 1682. She deposited £50 with the college. During her lifetime, the college could have any interest generated by it. In return, the college was obliged to pray for her in such a way that the rector deemed suitable. The £50, upon her death, was either to be distributed among the Jesuits who had prayed for her, or to be kept by the college for investment. That decision was left to the rector. If he chose the second, she was to receive the suffrages of a benefactor. Pensions received by individual Jesuits, e.g. Stephen Wright's £6 annually, were another important source of income for the college.²⁹

Another important document - perhaps from the point of view of the college's finances the most important document - preserved in the provincial archives is a list of benefactors. Charles Palmer (vere Poulton) compiled this list about 1682, perhaps to ascertain the damage done to the college during the Oates Plot. Many of the college's benefactors were listed under aliases. Fortunately the annotations made by James Dennett, the rector of the college in 1758, and incorporated into Foley's notes provide the real names.³⁰ Few of the benefactions were dated so we can not be certain of the date of their acquisition. We have already noted the foundations of William Lord Petre and his son, the Honorable John Petre, and the gifts of Lady Petre and Henry More, so we can ignore their entries. The Jesuit James Bardwell (vere Francis Denny) donated £1000 to the college. He stipulated that £12 of the annual return from his gift be given to provide a Jesuit to live at Redlingfeld House and work amongst the Catholics in the neighbourhood.

29. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, ff. 7v, 13.

30. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 96; Foley MSS IV, ff. 147v-149.

Bardwell did this as a gesture of gratitude to Mr Bedingfeld for his unexplained assistance in the recovery of nearly £1000. Bardwell's sister Frances left the college £300 with the request that the college pay an annuity of £8 to her step-brother Robert. On his death, forty years later, he bequeathed the college lands, partly in freehold and partly in copyhold, that brought in £10 annually in rents. Before the college could take possession of that bequest it had to pay off the benefactor's debts of £70. Brother Foley thought, probably rightly, that the Bardwell gifts dated from the late 1630s.³¹

The Poultons were generous benefactors of the college. John Poulton left his four Jesuit sons an impropriation that returned £200 annually upon his death in 1641. The brothers later sold it to their nephew Ferdinand for an annuity. John's widow Frances, afraid that the penal laws would prevent her sons from claiming their father's inheritance, set aside £500 worth of real estate for their use. The rents from this land supported the sons while they were in England. With their death (the youngest Charles died in 1690) the property and its income passed to the college.

The Bedingfelds contributed to the coffers of the college. John Bedingfeld of Swatr-hall left £50 to the college with the request that £4 of its income go towards the support of a missionary to work in the district around Swatr-hall. Susan, the wife of Captain William Bedingfeld who was the brother of Sir Humphrey Bedingfeld, bequeathed the Society £100 in cash and two houses with a value of another £100 in the 1680s.³²

31. Cf. Foley, Records, I, 150; ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, f. 10. The saga of the Bardwell inheritance was told to Nathaniel Phillips (vere Stafford) in 1683 by a Mr. Brown.

32. Cf. Foley, Records, V, 568.

Sir John Warner left two impropriations valued at £60 per annum when he entered the Society in 1665. He requested that £50 be put to the following uses: £10 for the Carthusians, £20 for the support of one student at St Omers, and £20 for a Jesuit missionary in east Suffolk. All this was, alas, lost but neither Poulton's list nor Dennett's emendations explain the manner by which it had been lost. Like so many others, it was probably a victim of the Oates Plot. Sir John and Lady Warner were received into the Roman Church by the infamous John Travers in 1664.³³ The couple agreed to separate and to enter religious life. Lady Warner entered the Poor Clares and Sir John the Society of Jesus. Before Sir John's departure for the continent he settled his estates on his brother Francis. He then left London. Dr Edward Warner, Sir John's uncle and one of the king's physicians, thinking that his nephew had already departed for the continent, tried to gain control of the estate. He petitioned the king and the Privy Council under the pretext of keeping the estate out of the hands of the Society of Jesus. The Society, he asserted, had not only perverted Sir John from the Established Church but had also persuaded him into bestowing his estate upon them. At first the king jokingly dismissed the doctor's petition but, in face of his persistence, ordered the attorney general to investigate the matter. As soon as Sir John heard of his uncle's machinations he returned to London. In disguise, he arranged a meeting with his uncle at a tavern near Covent Garden. Sir John proved to his uncle through deeds and other papers that the estate had been settled on Sir John's brother and not on the Society. Dr Warner promised to cancel the suit and not to bother either brother again about the matter. Francis drowned in 1667 and Sir John was forced to return to London yet again to draw up the appropriate papers to settle the estate on his surviving

33. For the full story of their conversion, cf. Foley, Records, II, 459-474; VII/2, 816-819.

brother Edward, a London merchant.

Despite Sir John's assurances that the estate was secure and had not been settled upon the Jesuits, sections of it had been set aside for religious uses.. Some time before 1679, someone "discovered" this to the government. I have not found any data about this case in either the State Papers or the Treasury Papers save the single reference in the proclamation of 12 November 1679. As we have seen, that proclamation had promised a reward to anyone who revealed Jesuit or popish properties. Certain estates were exempt because they were already under examination before the Treasury Lords. Sir John Warner's was one. Perhaps his benefaction to the College of the Holy Apostles was lost during that investigation.

Other donors were a Michael Hare and the Vaux family. The former left a piece of land that was later sold for £300. Some of the profit from the sale was set aside for the missionaries in Suffolk and Norfolk. Since the arrival of the first Jesuits in England, the Vaux family had been steadfast friends and generous benefactors. Henry Lord Vaux alone had given more than £300 to the college. He, along with Mrs Ann Fetter, Mrs Amy Townsend, Robert Rosse, James Pratt and Mary Lambert, contributed £350 to the college's capital fund. This was among the monies stolen by Travers.

Having considered a few of the disparate sources of the college's income, we can consider briefly some of its expenses that have been preserved in the account ledgers from 1666 to 1700.³⁴ The handwriting of the accounts changed periodically. Thomas Harcourt kept the books

34. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, ff. 3-28, 83-87, 97-106. Cf. also Foley MSS IV, ff. 146-150v where much of the data was discussed.

from 1666 to 1674. On the 24 September he resigned his rectorship and handed over the accounts to his successor Charles Palmer. Pursued by a vindictive Travers, Poulton was forced to flee during the Oates Plot. He transferred the accounts to Nathaniel Stafford who kept them until 1694/5. Anthony Bruning oversaw the books for the remaining years of the century.

Amidst a wealth of details, one can only select a few to illustrate the ordinary expenses of the college. From the kitchen accounts of the major house we can see the diet of the men between December 1666 and September 1667. Eggs and turkeys cost 2s. The house spent a further 3s on oranges and salt. Other foods purchased were vinegar and mustard seed (1d), honey, barleymeal, wine (1s a bottle), mutton, fish, oysters (3s), and aniseed water (2d). Other accounts testified to the amount of travelling done by the Jesuits as they visited the Catholics in various sections of their mission. Most of the missionaries had a horse valued at £5, with saddles, breeches, saddle bags, spurs, etc at £1-10s. The accounts had frequent references to repairs for the equipment, horseshoes (2d), and carriage rentals (2s and 5s8d). A few other expenses were maps, postage, tobacco (2s6d), periwigs, books, hospitality, holy oils, chapel furnishings, and alms. In 1684/5, the college had donated £10 to St Omers for its new buildings. One final category encountered in the accounts was the annuities paid by the college, e.g. Thomas Gavan received £6 and the Widow Wright £9 annually.³⁵

6. The College of St Chad

Very little is known about the finances of the College of St Chad. Staffordshire was separated from the College of Blessed Aloysius and

35. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, ff. 17, 83v-85v.

created a distinct residence in 1661. It was erected into a college on 4 October 1670.³⁶ John Bossy suggested that the creation of the new residence was the final resolution of the dispute between the Colleges of Blessed Aloysius and the Immaculate Conception over the £1000 loaned to Sir George Wintour. He even concluded that the disputed money had come either from the Gerards or the Fitzherberts.³⁷ I have found no evidence to support that conclusion. We have already noted the manner by which the disagreement was solved: the money was divided between the two claimants. The college's endowment, according to the Annual Letter of 1670, was comprised of contributions from each of the fathers. Each Jesuit gave the share he had received either from alms, donations or from his own annuity.³⁸ Judging from the catalogue, the contributing Jesuits were Francis Neville (vere Cotton), William Atkins, Francis Fitton, Peter Walker (vere Giffard), Francis Derby (vere Fitzherbert), Francis Eure, Robert Williams (vere Petre), John Gavan and Edward Leuson. The Fittons, Giffards, Fitzherberts, and Leusons were Staffordshire families and it is very likely that they donated most of the money. The endowment was small. In 1672 it generated only 400 scudi, the smallest income of any of the colleges. With the assistance of alms, eight Jesuits could be supported without debts.

7. The Residence of St Dominic/The College of St Hugh

The regular alms collected by the Residence of St Dominic went up by nearly 300 scudi to 842 in 1642. Nonetheless, the larger amount actually supported two fewer Jesuits than the 1639 revenue did. After

36. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 4 October 1670, Epp. Gen. II, f. 328.

37. The English Catholic Community, p. 238.

38. ARSI, Anglia 34, p. 753 translated in Foley, Records, II, 193.

1642, the residences reported no regular alms. The Jesuits there depended on God's providence and on assistance from the faithful.

The Annual Letter of 1649 described the house in which the fathers had resided for nearly 29 years, so Jesuit occupation pre-dated the first mention by nearly fifteen years. The building, of "mean appearance", was conveniently situated but well concealed. Many, especially poor Catholics, resorted to it for the sacraments and for spiritual advice. Eventually the Parliamentarians, ever vigilant for Catholics and Jesuits, located the house. They raided it several times but, before 1644, they discovered nothing. In that fateful raid, they noticed a loose rope while they searched an unused room. One man pulled on it and a trap door opened. Inside he found the Jesuit John Hudd and the altar furniture. Hudd was 74 years old and was probably unable to escape before the arrival of the soldiers. The search continued until the invaders discovered the residence's library. Hudd was imprisoned, the altar furniture confiscated and the library either destroyed, burnt or stolen.³⁹

Even though the letter gave no specific details, the residence's location can be fairly well established. It must have been Kingerly Manor, the seat of the Catholic family, the Youngs, with whom the Society had close ties. Although the Society had been there for years, the province did not acquire any property there until it took out a mortgage on some of the property in 1638. Kingerly Manor, originally a Roman encampment, was built on a high mound and encircled by a moat and ditches.

39. ARSI, Annual Letter of 1635, ARSI, Anglia 33I, p. 640; Annual Letter of 1649, ARSI, Anglia 34, p. 136 translated in Foley, Records, II, 641; Francis Berry (vere Corker) to the general, 22 May 1646, SC, Anglia V, 23 translated in Foley, Records, II, 635-636.

The building itself contained a chapel and a number of priest holes. Such a site protected the Jesuits and allowed them to watch for the approach of any strangers.⁴⁰ After the raid on the Manor and the arrest of John Hudd, the Society retained it as its chief house until at least 1649. After that date the sources tell us nothing.

The Catholics in Lincoln remained loyal to the Society throughout the early days of the Civil War. In 1642 the residence collected 842 scudi in alms, the largest amount received by any residence. But that ended shortly thereafter. Francis Berry (vere Corker), the residence's superior, in his first ex officio letter to the general in 1646 explained that the Parliamentary devastation of Lincolnshire had resulted in the loss of all regular alms. In fact, the Society had not received any regular alms since 1643. Precarious alms were just enough to keep the residence solvent.⁴¹ How long this continued we do not know but the residence also had some of its property confiscated in 1656.⁴²

The general gave his permission for the elevation of the residence into a college on 19 November 1672 but he insisted that the college have sufficient funds for the support of twelve Jesuits before it submit its application. The residence could meet this requirement either by increasing its present income through alms or by reducing its expenses through economy.⁴³ Until then, the general withheld the charter. By 1675, the residence's finances had satisfied the general and he appointed Thomas Harcourt (vere Whitbread) the first rector of the new College of

40. Cf. Foley, Records, I, 624-629; II, 651-652.

41. 22 May 1646, SC, Anglia V, 23 translated in Foley, Records, II, 635-636.

42. General to Francis Berry (vere Corker), 8 April 1656, Epp. Gen. II, f. 178v.

43. General to George Gray, 19 November 1672, Epp. Gen. II, f. 343.

St Hugh on 16 February.⁴⁴ The college took its name after the popular local saint. St Hugh was a fictitious college, as already explained, i.e. established only because of the permanent endowment and not for education.

8. The Residence/College of St Thomas of Canterbury

The Residence of St Thomas of Canterbury began to feel the effects of the Civil War in 1642 when regular alms fell by more than 200 scudi to 554 scudi. In subsequent years the residence was dependent on precarious alms for their support. The Jesuits themselves were often deprived and frequently in flight throughout the war but they still did all they could to assist others. The estates of many of the Catholics on whom the Jesuits (among others) had depended financially, were sequestered. Consequently these former benefactors could barely support themselves, let alone aid others. Somehow the residence found the means to assist these friends in their distress and to continue their alms to the poor. According to Thomas Curtis, the residence's superior, the Society distributed £16-12s to the poor and the distressed throughout the district in 1648 alone.⁴⁵ With the Restoration, the finances improved. The superior and his consultors petitioned the general for collegiate status in 1676. They claimed to have an annual income certain and sufficient for the foundation of a college. The general instructed the provincial, Richard Strange, and his consultors to examine the request thoroughly. If the data were true, the general would approve the foundation.⁴⁶ The claim was verified and the residence was created

44. General to Richard Strange, 16 February 1675, Epp. Gen. II, f. 359; same to Edward Harvey (vere Nico), 13 April 1675, Ibid., f. 360; ARSI, Annual Letter of 1675, Anglia 34, p. 824.

45. Thomas Curtis to the general, 25 January 1649, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts I, f. 212 translated in Foley, Records, III, 409.

46. 15 February 1676, Epp. Gen. II, f. 365.

the College of St Thomas of Canterbury in the Spring of 1676.⁴⁷ This too was a fictitious college in the way already described.

As corroboration to the residence's petition for collegiate status, Anthony Hunter compiled a catalogue of the residence's benefactors on 25 February 1675.⁴⁸ The majority of the benefactors dated from the final years of the Interregnum and the first decade of the Restoration. Their assistance explains the dramatic change in the finances of the residence.

A Mrs Eleanor Fine left a bequest of £100 to the residence. She stipulated that the sum be invested and that the income be distributed as follows: 20s to the provincial and 20s to the superior, and the rest to four or five other Jesuits. Mrs Margaret Carew left an identical amount when she entered religious life in 1658. In her will dated 13 October 1658, she left £100 and a parcel of £600 due from Edmund Plowden of Shiplake, Oxon to Anthony Bruning of Woodcott, Hampshire. Bruning was requested to pay the yearly income from the £100 to Thomas Bennett (vere Blackfan) of Katrington, Hampshire, the superior of the mission, and his successors. The money was to support one Jesuit.⁴⁹ There were a number of other women benefactors: Lady Caryll, Mrs Thimelby of Guscup, Mrs Leigh of Preston, Mrs Hillyard, and Old Alice Corbie who gave, respectively, £50, £25, £10, £25 and £5. All the above donors lived in and about Canford and asked that some of the profits from the £315 be given to support a Jesuit missionary in that neighbourhood.

Different donors left different directions for the use of their

47. Epp. Gen. II, f. 366I; ARSI, Annual Letter of 1676, ARSI, Anglia 34, p. 830.

48. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, ff. 129-130; Foley MS IV, ff. 449v-450.

49. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, f. 83; Foley, Records. IV. 410-411.

gifts. Old Mr Caryll gave £600, the profits of which could be used throughout the district. Sir Garrett Kempe left £228-11s-6d to support one Jesuit in Slendon and Canford. The capital sum was in Brussels and the Society was able to obtain only £100 of it. Sir Garrett's will demanded that the capital be divided into seven parts: the district received four of the seven parts, i.e. £57. A further clause required the residence to pay £5 annually to the Jesuit who resided with the Kempe family so that he had enough money to travel throughout the neighbourhood to visit the other Catholics.

Joseph and Francis Barber conveyed their rights to land and a cottage at Stapehill to their brother John on 12 April 1667. The conveyance had one restriction: there must be rooms kept in the cottage for Joseph and his three sisters as long as they remained single. Eleven days later, John Barber conveyed his newly acquired rights to Sir John Webbe of Canford, Bart., for £37-17s. The restriction was enlarged. John not only requested rooms for himself, his brother, and his sisters but also an annual allowance of 40s for his labours in improving the cottage and the lands. Sir John Webbe gave the property and the obligations to the residence.⁵⁰

The residence had borrowed £300 from a Mrs Dorothy Stamford to purchase some land in Milton, Cambridgeshire. By a deed of 27 June 1670, she exonerated the Society from its obligation to repay the debt. She donated the sum to the residence in return for an annuity of £18 and as many Masses and prayers upon her death as the superior of the residence deemed equitable.⁵¹

50. The Society had a man at Stapehill as far back as 1617. A Rebecca Edwards had bequeathed £100 the interest of which was to support a priest (ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, ff. 102-103).

51. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, f. 85.

The college benefited greatly from the legacy of a Dr Lewis, a Protestant clergyman and Master of the Hospital of St Cross, Winchester, to his son Theodore (alias Francis Shelley). The heir made everything over to the Society. Unfortunately, another son John succeeded in alienating some of the estate (the library, valued at £1500) before the college was able to get to it. John also obtained a small farm in Montgomeryshire, with an annual income of £10, that should have gone to his brother Theodore. The true heir had greater success with some Hampshire property. Theodore inherited a farm and rectory at Itchen Stoke and two farms at Stoke and Hampeth. He sold the first to his brother for an annuity of £25. The other two farms, both of which were copyheld by the Duke of Bolton, were valued at £2500 with an annual revenue of £230, which later fell to £200. The college invested large sums of money in the renovation and improvement of the farms. It spent nearly £400 in 1682 alone. In the same year the college purchased John Lewis' interest in the farms for £576 with an £80 annuity for himself and a £5 annuity for a sister.⁵²

In return for an annuity of £3, the Widow Crocker donated £50 on 15 July 1672. A Mrs Oglethorpe received a £6 annuity for the £100 she gave to the Society. She was dead by 1675. A Mr Middlemore had given £150 to the college on 2 June 1678. Both he and his wife, in return, received annuities of £9. The college had also loaned Middlemore £100 for repairs to his house. If he did not leave the said house to the Society in his will, his heir would be responsible for the repayment of the debt. The £100 that the college had loaned to Middlemore had been a gift from a Mr Bluet who bequeathed a further £74 upon his death in the early 1680s. Through the mediation of Father Edward Petre, Sir Charles Shelley presented the college with £300 in the 1680s. Mrs

52. Cf. Foley, Records V, 792 and ASJ, Foley MS, IV, ff. 452v-453.

Englefield of Catherington requested that the interest from her gift of £100 support a missionary in Hampshire. Mr and Mrs Cotton each left the college £20 at their deaths. An annuity was paid to the widow Catherine Tichborne for her gift of £20. Other legacies brought the college £25 from Mr Bruning, £50 from Mr Baker, £20 from Mr Thompson, and £30 from Mr Cresswell. Robert Halser gave the college an unspecified amount of money in 1682. The sum was invested in the purchase of some property near Southend called Furzeley. The annual rents were £8. The lands were sold in 1774 and the proceeds invested in a fund that generated £18 annually.⁵³

Throughout the 1670s and 1680s, the college had a number of dealings with two prominent local families: the Cuffauds and the Wells. The Cuffauds were a family well connected with the landed gentry in Sussex and Hampshire. A number of them entered the Society in the seventeenth century but the Cuffaud that appeared most frequently in the college's ledgers was the layman Matthew. An old boy of St Omers, Matthew became an estate agent for the college. In 1674, 1675 and 1679 the college purchased lands from him. The three parcels cost £500, £560 and £500 and returned £22, £28 and £25 annually. At the same time, Francis Shelley (vere Theodore Lewis) granted Cuffaud a loan of £160 interest free for the first three years and rented him a farm valued at £112 at a token rate. Francis Shelley made a note for his successor in 1691 that Matthew Cuffaud's rent of 10s for one and a half years was due at Michaelmas. The exceptionally low rent was probably a reward for his services.⁵⁴

The Society had deposited £570 of its capital in the hands of Mr

53. ASJ, Foley MS, IV, f. 452.

54. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, f. 135; Foley MS, IV, f. 447.

Charles Wells of Brambridge, Sussex. His investments returned £34-4s to the college each year. Mr Wells also borrowed substantial sums from the college. In debt to the Society to the amount of £204, he borrowed a further £100, at 6% interest, on 20 October 1689.⁵⁵

As each superior drew up his final balance sheet to hand over to his successor, he made a list of the residence's capital. When John Cary stepped down in May 1672, the capital worth of the residence was £3095. Assuming that there was at least a 6% return on the investments, the annual income should have been £185-14s or 743 scudi. Significantly, St Thomas was still a residence in 1672 and, as we have often noticed, residences were forbidden regular incomes and permitted only alms. Because of the financial depression that the Society experienced in the mid-seventeenth century, the teachings on income to residences were modified as we shall see at the end of this section. According to the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1672, the residences held one capital fund in common whose income supported the missionaries. Apparently the £3095 would represent St Thomas' share of the fund. Under Cary's successor, Anthony Hunter, the college's assets increased to £3526-8s on 9 June 1677.⁵⁶

9. The Residence of St John

Throughout the Civil War and the Interregnum, the residence depended entirely on divine providence and provincial assistance. In 1666 there was some discussion about the elevation of the residence into a college. Charles Palmer, the rector of the College of the Holy Apostles, wrote to the general about this possibility but the general

55. ASS, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1639, f. 135; Foley MS, IV, f. 447.

56. ASS, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1639, f. 135, Foley MS, IV, f. 447.

foresaw grave difficulties with the foundation offered by the Honorable John Petre.⁵⁷ As we have seen, Petre was dissuaded from funding a college and his bequest replenished the depleted foundation of Holy Apostles. By 1672 St John's shared in the same fund that supported the missionaries in all the residences.

10. The Residence of St Michael

Like its northern neighbour, St John's, the Residence of St Michael relied on precarious alms and provincial subsidies throughout the Civil War and the Interregnum. By 1672 it too shared in the common fund that supported the missionaries.

11. The Residence of St Mary

As with the other residences, the Civil War and the Interregnum deprived it of all regular alms and forced it to rely on providence and the precarious alms from the faithful. The establishment of a common fund for all the residences enabled it to support its missionaries.

12. The Residence of Blessed Stanislas

The Residence of Blessed Stanislas had no regular alms after 1642. The support of the missionaries depended entirely on the precarious alms given by the Catholics, a condition that was remedied by 1672 with the creation of a common fund for the residences as we shall see.

13. The Residence of St George

The Residence of St George collected 480 scudi in regular alms in 1542 after which year it, too, suffered from the political situation

57. General to Charles Palmer (vere Poulton), 3 April 1665, Epp. Gen. II, f. 286v.

in England. Although the residence reported no income in the subsequent catalogues, various financial enterprises continued. There is more extant information about the financial arrangements and the business transactions of this residence than of any other college or residence in England. The documents vary greatly in importance but all testify to an active and diverse financial network between the Society and a number of Catholic families, e.g. the Wintours, the Talbots, the Carringtons, and the Walsteads. Prominent families appeared often but all levels of society were represented in the ledgers.

The custom of lending money to set up worthy individuals in life or to assist them through temporary crises had long been a feature of parish life. Parochial funds were dispensed either by churchwardens or other parochial officials at lower rates of interest than one would find in the wider money market. Occasionally the parishes preferred to place their savings at the disposal of provincial attorneys who acted as their brokers. According to strict theological teaching, a lender was guilty of usury if he asked for more in return than he had originally given to the borrower but it was commonly accepted that anyone who had lost an opportunity of making a legitimate profit elsewhere because of the loan could claim some compensation from the borrower. The amount of compensation depended on the risk involved.⁵⁸ The Residence of St George, and probably other Jesuit communities in England, continued this tradition. An account book kept by the Oates martyr Anthony Turner reveals the extent of the financial network of the residence in

58. Parker, "The Emergence of Modern Finance in Europe, 1500-1730," 537-538; B.A. Holderness, "The Clergy as Money-Lenders in England, 1550-1700" in O'Day and Heal, Princes and Paupers in the English Church 1500-1800, 195-209.

1673.⁵⁹ William and Thomas Darrell had borrowed £50 on 15 December 1627. They should have repaid the loan on 25 March 1628 to Mr John Typper of Tibberton, Gloucestershire. The Widow Griffith of Beverley still owed the £10 she had borrowed in 1670 and the 24s that her late husband had borrowed in 1667. Vick the tailor owed the residence 12s. Thomas the ostler was a witness to the loan. John Talbot Earl of Shrewsbury had borrowed £100 from the Jesuit "Mr Brooks" at Grafton. The £100 had been left to the residence by a Ralph Appleton.⁶⁰ Shrewsbury then loaned the money to the Earl of Worcester and promised to repay the Society for the money that he had taken. Lady Katherine Windsor, according to a bond dated 25 March 1654, owed Robert Wolman of Bromsgrove, or his executors, £40. She had pledged to repay the loan by 29 September 1654.

Many of the entries in the ledger specifically named either the residence or an individual Jesuit as the lender. Most of those named, however, were individual Catholics laymen who were acting as agents or trustees for the Society. The case of William Knatsford illustrates the residence's use of such agents. Knatsford repaid a loan of £73 on 30 August 1671. He had acquired the money through the agency of Francis Finch and Thomas Russell in 1667. Knatsford repaid the money to Anthony Turner who deposited £50 of it with Rowland Taylor and William Hughes, both of Worcester, for future investment. The residence employed many different agents and farmed out their money to them for loans and investments. Borrowers were many and they came from all social levels, from Vick the tailor to the Earl of Shrewsbury. Some loans were riskier than others. Some, too, despite all precautions,

59. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 77-82v. Most of this was published as "A Jesuit Account Book," edited by Aileen M. Hodgson, Worcestershire Recusant 4 (1964) 18-34.

60. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 19-20.

would never be repaid. A list of desperate debts followed Turner's accounts.⁶¹ He calculated that the residence's debts that were long overdue totalled £581-17s. Among them were the above-mentioned loans to the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lady Katherine Windsor, and the Darrells of Scotney Castle.

Some time around the middle of the century, the residence purchased some property at Redditch. In 1666 it invested a further £320 in the construction of a house and other improvements. That £320 had come from Charles Lord Carrington.⁶² This Redditch property was an investment made by the residence. As we have often noted, the Jesuit Institute forbade sources of regular income to residences. At first glance St George's possession of this property seems to be a gross violation. At the end of this section on the province's finances between 1660 and 1678, we shall consider how St George, along with other residences, was able to remain faithful to the Society's teachings and yet to possess such sources of income. By 1681 there was some confusion about the collection and the distribution of the rents of the Redditch property. The purchase of the property had been a joint venture between the residence and Miss Mary Talbot who owned two-thirds of the property. There had been some misunderstanding between the Society and Mary Talbot over each's share of the rents. Miss Talbot had collected slightly more than £17 of the Redditch rents. Of that amount, she had forwarded £4-16-10 to John Harvey, a Jesuit in the residence, gave £1-7s to a Mr Hall, and retained the rest. Harvey wrote to a Mr C. Wallis, who was either a lawyer or a financial adviser, in 1681, for his evaluation of this arrangement and his judgement on the responsibilities of the partners. Wallis concluded that the Redditch property actually

61. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, f. 93.

62. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 50-53.

belonged to Miss Talbot since she owned two-thirds of it. Even though she had promised to devote a portion of her share to the Society and to the poor in the district, she still held the majority share; and it was the responsibility of the residence's agent, Wallis reminded Harvey, to collect the rents and to see that they were properly distributed.⁶³

There are also interesting records from the early 1680s of the receipt and dispersal of large sums of money by the residence's lay agents. The Jesuit Anthony Turner farmed out £200 to John Russell, £30 to Philip Higgins and £6 to Mr Williamson. A Mr Marshall had bequeathed to the residence the £50 owed him by the Earl of Shrewsbury in 1639. That sum was in the hands of a Mr Middlemore. A £100 gift from Richard Bode of Grafton was invested with Robert Wolmar of Bromsgrove. The second Lady Carrington, formerly Anne Herbert daughter of the first Marquis of Powis, donated £400. Her husband, Francis Viscount Carrington, held it in trust for the Society; as security, in this remarkable arrangement, the Society held the mortgage of Lady Carrington's estate at Shottery. Lady Percy's gift of £50 was invested with Rowland Hughes at 5% interest. Mr Markham had given £20 to the district in 1668, £6 was deposited with Lord Carrington and £14 with the Widow Markham. Anne Taylor's donation of £50 in 1677 was first farmed out to the Earl of Shrewsbury and then to John Walstead. Not all the transactions were as clearly and as conscientiously recorded. A Mary Street had donated £300 and the bookkeeper had to confess that he had no idea where that money was. A final benefactor whose gifts were many and frequent was the Honorable Gilbert Talbot. In the first six months of 1678 alone, he forwarded sums of money ranging from £8-8s to £106 to the residence. Since he was often a trustee for the residence, the payments were not only gifts but

63. John Harvey to the provincial, 5 November 1681, ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, f. 152; Foley MS, V, ff. 24-25.

also revenues from the lands and other investments that he held in the Society's name.⁶⁴

A major figure in the finances not only of the Worcestershire Jesuits but of all the Catholics in that area was the recusant lawyer John Walstead. The Catholic family with whom he was especially involved was the Wintours. In his own right Walstead was a man of some property and wealth. He owned a number of houses and small estates in and around Worcester. A few of these - Wooden Farm, a small estate in the parish of Wichanford near Worcester, and two houses in Worcester (one near the Bishop's Palace and the other in the High Street in the parish of St Helen's) - found their way into the portfolio of St George's. Walstead had given the Society a third part in the Wooden Farm estate and the two houses in Worcester as security both for the money entrusted to him for investment and for the money that he had borrowed from the residence.⁶⁵

The most frequently cited family in the ledgers of St George was the Wintours.⁶⁶ Indeed, much of the extant material concerned a controversial legacy left to the Society by Sir George Wintour in 1657. A second Wintour legacy came from his aunt, Miss Helen Wintour of Cooksey; she left the residence the large estate at Evesleuch in the parish of Tibberton about five miles outside of Worcester. The Wintour family had long owned the Evesleuch estate. Robert Wintour had arranged in his will of March 1600 that his son John and his male heirs would inherit that estate. If John had no children, the estate would pass to

64. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 20, 118-135, 138-139; Foley MS, V, f. 22.

65. Cf. ASJ, Foley MS, V, ff. 26v-30.

66. Cf. ASJ, Foley MS, IV, ff. 30v-54v.

Robert's brothers, Thomas and John, and their male heirs. If these too lacked sons, the estate would descend upon the daughters of Robert, in the first instance, and then to the daughters of his son John, in the second instance and, finally, to the daughters of Thomas and John, in that order. Robert, Thomas, and John Wintour were attainted by an act of Parliament for the Gunpowder Plot and executed in 1605. The Evesleuch estate, along with the others, was forfeited to the Crown.

Robert left four children: the one son John, and three daughters, Helen, Mary, and Katherine. Mary and Katherine died childless. John had one son, Sir George Wintour of Huddington, who purchased the forfeited estates in 1643/4. The two surviving Wintours were Sir George and his Aunt Helen. Both played major roles in a complicated drama that continued long after their deaths.

Sir George Wintour wrote his own will on 13 March 1657. Amongst the many conditions and stipulations and contingencies, Sir George bequeathed the whole manor of Huddington (with all its appurtenances), the manor of Cooksey and the Droitwich lands to Francis Talbot, the Earl of Shrewsbury, and his male heirs. This bequest, it is important to note, assumed the deaths of Sir George's wife, Mary, and his Aunt Helen, and the absence of any children. If either Mary or Aunt Helen was still alive or there were any children, the estate would pass to them. Lady Mary and Aunt Helen Wintour would hold the estate for their lives. If there were no children at their death, the estate would pass to the Earl of Shrewsbury. At this point the will became even more complicated. If Francis Earl of Shrewsbury had no male heirs, the estate would pass to his brother, the Honorable Gilbert Talbot, and his male heirs. If Gilbert too had no sons, then the estate would pass to the Society of Jesus. If either Talbot had a son to whom the Wintour

estate would pass, the will required the Talbots to pay a number of legacies to a variety of Catholic uses, including £4000 to the Jesuits.⁶⁷ So no matter what happened, the Society would profit from Sir George's will: they would either inherit the manors of Huddington and Cooksey, and the Droitwich lands, or receive £4000 from the Talbots.

Legally, Sir George's will was extremely unsatisfactory. The settlement of his estate, depending as it did on so many contingencies and conditions, provoked much controversy. Lady Wintour strongly protested against the will and planned to contest it.⁶⁸ She complained that her husband had not bequeathed any estate formally and explicitly either to his wife or to his aunt. Since both of Sir George's children had preceded him to the grave, Lady Mary and Aunt Helen were the only Wintour heirs to Sir George's estates. Unquestionably Sir George had intended both his wife and his aunt to inherit the estates for their lives before they passed on to the Talbots. The Society too consulted a lawyer, Edward Walpole, about the validity of their share in the Wintour inheritance. Since both the Earl of Shrewsbury and his brother Gilbert had sons, it was unlikely that the Society would inherit the entire estate upon the deaths of the Talbot brothers. The Jesuits would, instead, receive £4000 from the Talbots. Walpole concluded from his perusal of the relevant documents that the Society had a right

67. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 28-30; Foley MS, V, ff. 31, 37.

68. Throughout 1657, there were several references in the general's letters to a lawsuit brought against the provincial, Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), and the procurator, John Haydon, by a "perfidious and treacherous" matron. The provincial was scheduled to appear in court in January, 1657 but, to the general's relief, he was able to stand by proxy. The general cautioned against unnecessary risks because their lives were more important than money. The woman in question was Lady Wintour. Cf. General to Barton, 24 February 1657, Epp. Gen. II, f. 189; same to Thomas Clovell (vere Thorold), 10 March 1657, Ibid., f. 189v; same to same, 9 June 1657, Ibid., f. 191v; same to same, 28 July 1657, Ibid., f. 192v; same to Barton, 28 July 1657, Ibid., f. 192v; same to Clovell, 4 August 1657, Ibid., f. 197.

to the £4000 but there was some confusion as to when it should be paid. Should the Talbots pay the £4000 now since they knew that the estates would eventually pass to them? Or should the legacy be paid after the estates had come into the Talbot family, that is, after the deaths of Lady Wintour and Miss Helen Wintour? Walpole was unable to answer that question.⁶⁹

Walpole gave his opinion in late April 1662. Two months later the provincial, Edward Courtney, commissioned Fathers John Tyrwhit and Francis Cotton to negotiate the issue with the Talbots.⁷⁰ Accordingly an agreement was reached on 10 October 1662: the two Talbots pledged themselves to give the Society £1000 within two years of the Wintour estates passing to them. I have found no explanation -- nor I can offer one -- why the Society settled for £1000 when Sir George had left them £4000 and their lawyer had decided that they had a good claim to that money. Other considerations might have been involved.

In 1667, before the estates had passed to the Talbots, the Earl of Shrewsbury was killed in a duel with the Duke of Buckingham. Charles Talbot, his son and heir, and later Duke of Shrewsbury, even conformed to the Established Church in 1679. Aunt Helen Wintour died in 1671 and Lady Mary Wintour passed away in 1696. With her death, the estates finally passed to the Talbots. At the time, the Talbots in question were the Anglican Duke of Shrewsbury and the two sons of the Honorable Gilbert Talbot, i.e. Gilbert and George. All three were bound by their fathers' pledges to pay the Society £1000 within two years. Gilbert, the elder son, renounced his property in favour of

69. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, f. 37.

70. ASJ, Foley MS, V, f. 38a. Cf. also SC, Anglia VI, 111. Tyrwhit, and perhaps Cotton, had already been involved in similar negotiations with the Abingdon family.

his brother George and entered the Jesuits in 1698. George, on his part, promised to observe and fulfil all clauses contained in Sir George Wintour's will. Still nothing was done; no money was paid to the Society. The Protestant Duke died in 1718. The Jesuit Gilbert Talbot succeeded to the earldom and George to the family property. Still the agreed £1000, let alone the entire bequest of £4000, had not been paid. George Talbot must have been reluctant to pay the money since another dispute arose. The two brothers agreed to refer all questions regarding Sir George's will to the arbitration of John Talbot Stonor, later Bishop Stonor. On 16 January 1719/20, Stonor awarded the £1000 to the Jesuits on condition that the money became the basis for a fund to support a priest to work among the poor in Huddington and Cooksey. Instead of the £4000 left to the Society by Sir George Wintour, the Jesuits received only £1000 in two instalments in May and November 1720 and the use of that money was restricted.⁷¹

The confusion caused by Sir George's will was compounded by his debts to the Society. As we have seen, Sir George had borrowed £1000 from the Society in 1652 and the Colleges of Blessed Aloysius and Immaculate Conception argued about which should receive the repayment. Wintour had secured the loan with a statute. Upon his death, the statute devolved on his aunt, who continued to pay the interest on the loan. She died before she was able to discharge the debt. She had specifically set aside certain lands at Cooksey whose rents were to pay off the loan of £1000. In fact, Miss Wintour wanted to raise £3000 for the Society: the £1000 owed by her nephew and a £2000 gift to compensate for the money promised by Sir George but not granted to the Jesuits by his beneficiaries.

71. ASJ, Residence of St George 1640-1902, ff. 93-98; Holt, "The Residence of St George: Jesuits in Warwickshire and Worcestershire in Penal Times," 55-57.

For a few years after the death of Helen Wintour, the Society received neither the capital nor the interest. The Jesuits consulted their lawyer, John Walstead, on what to do. Should they execute the statute and force payment from Lady Wintour? Walstead examined the case and concluded that the Society had every legal right to execute the statute and to claim the mortgaged land but he doubted that it would be discreet to do so. He suggested an understanding between Lady Wintour and the Society. If Lady Wintour paid the rents left to the Society by Helen Wintour, the Society promised not to execute the statute during her lifetime. Both parties agreed to this.⁷² Nonetheless, the debt was never paid and the Society eventually lost the £1000.

For a consideration of the final estate bequeathed to the residence by the Wintours, we must return to the earlier will of Robert Wintour. The Evesleuch estate passed to his daughter Helen because his grandson, Sir George Wintour, died without heirs. As the sole surviving member of the family, Helen willed the estate to the Society. George Gray recalled his being summoned by Helen Wintour to Cooksey in 1668. There she told him of her desire to settle the Evesleuch estate in Tibberton upon the residence. At the time the estate returned £30 annually but Helen Wintour thought that the rents would double within a few years. Gray informed the provincial Joseph Simons of the benefaction. Simons named two trustees for the settlement: Henry Fermour of Tusmore and Thomas Eyre of Hassop, Derby. In a letter to Helen Wintour on 24 October 1668, Richard Langhorne advised her to specify the residence, college or apostolate she wanted to benefit from the rents. She named the Residence of St George. Walstead drew up her will, which was witnessed on Candlemas Day, 2 February 1670. She bequeathed Evesleuch

72. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 232-233; Residence of St George 1640-1902, ff. 91-92, 196; Foley MS, V, ff. 44v-45v.

to three trustees, John Caryll, Henry Fermour, and Richard Langhorne. For some reason, Thomas Eyre was not chosen. Helen died the following 5 May.

As had become customary with Wintour bequests, this one soon aroused controversy. Again Lady Wintour protested the settlement. The Society sought affidavits from the different parties involved to demonstrate the legitimacy of their claims. Their case was vindicated. Eight years later, the three trustees conveyed the estate to Viscount Carrington. His widow Anne acted as the Jesuits' agent for many years before she conveyed the estate to a Mr Broughton in 1725. A year later he conveyed it to Thomas Berkeley of Spetchley.⁷³

Finally, Helen Wintour left some other lands in and near Cooksey to the Society. Humphrey Weld, Richard Caryll, and William Gawen held them in trust for the residence. The three trustees made over £10 annually to the residence for the support of a Jesuit missionary in the neighbourhood. Lady Wintour disputed this settlement also but, again, nothing came of her actions.⁷⁴

14. Liège College

Even though Liège once again had problems with the Bavarian pension -- so much so that the provincial considered appointing a permanent procurator to Munich to supervise the payment⁷⁵ -- in 1642 its net income had risen by more than 200 scudi to 8134.40 scudi. Yet the debts of the college

73. ASJ, Residence of St George 1640-1902, ff. 92, 197; Foley MS, V, ff. 39v-40v, 51.

74. ASJ, Residence of St George 1640-1902, ff. 91, 92, 196; Foley MS, V, ff. 61v-62.

75. General to Henry More, 16 March 1641, Epp. Gen. I, f. 514v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 31 August 1641, Ibid., f. 524; same to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 31 August 1641, Ibid., f. 524; same to Knott, 19 October 1641, Ibid., f. 525.

also mounted and now exceeded the credits by almost 13000 scudi. By 1645 the pensions from the Prince Elector of Bavaria were arriving with unprecedented regularity but there was still cause for concern.⁷⁶ The college's debt, although it had been reduced by 100 scudi, was still enormous and outdistanced the income (most of whose collection, the compiler thought, was doubtful) by nearly 12000 scudi. The prospects were not auspicious: the net income was not sufficient for 93 men so the college feared that it would go deeper into debt. A reduction in the size of the college in 1649 allowed the community to survive on the net income of 8354 scudi with some surplus which, it was hoped, would reduce the debt. Although the college's debt remained at 39523 scudi, the credits were greater by 20000 scudi. The general advised the English provincial, Henry Silesdon, that Liège should continue to economise, even though there had been some signs of recovery, so that it could repay the money that it had borrowed from the Jesuits in England.⁷⁷

The Prince Elector's fidelity to his commitment to Liège was not long-lasting. By 1650 Liège was again worried about the pension. At the request of the provincial, Francis Forster, and the rector, James Mumford, the general promised to ask Father Vervaux, the Elector's Jesuit confessor, to plead Liège's case. Father Vervaux used his influence well and the Elector ordered 8000 scudi to be paid to Liège in 1650. The Jesuit confessor also promised to remind the Elector periodically of his obligations towards the college. By July 1650, the college had received 6000 of the promised 8000 scudi. Even though the amount received was less than that promised, the general instructed the

76. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradsheigh), 14 June 1642, Epp. Gen. II, f. 5v; same to same, 28 February 1643, Ibid., f. 12v.

77. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 9 February 1647, Epp. Gen. II, f. 83v.

provincial to thank both the Elector and his confessor.⁷⁸ None of this was reflected in the triennial catalogue of 1651. The only change between the catalogue of 1649 and that of 1651 was the addition of four men to the community.

Despite Father Vervaux's promise to represent the interests of Liège to the Prince Elector, payment of the pension was still infrequent. More and more the college feared greater debts and hoped that a large payment from the Elector would stave off penury. The provincial visited the Elector in Munich as he returned from the general congregation in Rome in 1652. If the visit had any effect, it must have been minimal because the pension was still irregular. In August 1653, the general instructed the retiring rector of the English College in Rome, Thomas Babthorpe, to call on the Prince Elector as he travelled to Belgium. Throughout the efforts to gain the pension, the general recommended patience. The Prince Elector had many financial obligations, including half-pensions to the Jesuit colleges in Cologne and in Bavaria. By September 1654 the pension was paid on schedule and continued to be so through the first half of 1655. In July the saga began all over again. The general advised the new rector, John Clarke, to inform the Elector of the debts that the college had contracted in the expectation of the pension and desperately needed the Bavarian funds.⁷⁹

78. General to James Mumford, 26 March 1650, Epp. Gen. II, f. 128v; same to Francis Forster, 28 May 1650, Ibid., f. 129v; same to same, 30 April (sic July?) 1650, Ibid., f. 130v; same to Forster, 1 October 1650, Ibid., f. 132; same to same, 4 February 1651, Ibid., f. 133v; same to Mumford, 11 March 1651, Ibid., f. 133v.

79. Vicar-General to James Mumford, 13 April 1652, Epp. Gen. II, f. 138v; same to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 30 November 1652, Ibid., f. 141v; same to same, 30 August 1653, Ibid., f. 149v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 30 August 1653, Ibid., f. 149v; same to Thomas Babthorpe, 3 January 1654, Ibid., f. 152; same to Simons, 5 September 1654, Ibid., f. 157v; same to same, 20 March 1655, Ibid., f. 163v; same to John Clarke, 31 July 1655, Ibid., f. 166v.

In 1651, Liège College numbered 48 Jesuits. By 1655 this total had fallen to 45 but by 1658 it had soared to 63 -- a rise of 28 men. However, the net income had fallen to 6857.4 scudi, a sum that was considered sufficient for only 59 men. The college had reduced its debts considerably but included among them was the money that the college still owed to the province. To ease the college's financial worries, the province had assisted it with unspecified sums of money. Hitherto the Liège rectors had considered the money as a gift. Now the provincial corrected that misunderstanding and informed the rector that the money was a loan that must be repaid.

The Bavarian pension remained a persistent thorn in the financial side of Liège. Because the pension had not been fully paid in 1659, the general permitted John Stephens to plead Liège's case to the Prince Elector as he passed through Munich on his way to Rome. Personal intercession again brought some success: the pension was paid in full by May. As late as 1661 regular payments were still reported. Nonetheless the general still worried about Liège's finances and encouraged the rector to do all he could to improve them.⁸⁰

Between 1658 and 1672, Liège's gross income had fallen by 1200 scudi to 6584. Although the catalogue did not explain the reasons for the decline, it was probably the result of the Elector's failure to pay his pension. Nonetheless, the net income fell by only 438 scudi to 6419, a sum sufficient for the support of 74 Jesuits (5 more than there

80. General to Edward Worsley, 8 March 1659, Epp. Gen. II, f. 208; same to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 22 March 1659, Ibid., f. 209; same to Worsley, 31 May 1659, Ibid., f. 211v; same to same, 1 November 1659, Ibid., f. 216; same to Barton, 31 January 1660, Ibid., f. 219v; same to same, 3 April 1660, Ibid., f. 221; same to Worsley, 22 January 1661, Ibid., f. 233v; same to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 19 November 1661, Ibid., f. 239v; same to same, 3 December 1661, Ibid., f. 240; same to Worsley, 3 December 1661, Ibid., f. 240.

were in the college), because of a significant reduction in the college's ordinary expenses. In 1672 the college had more than enough income to support the community and had cleared its ledgers of all debts. It seemed that financial recovery had begun.

15. The Novitiate at Watten

Between 1639 and 1642 the gross and net incomes of the novitiate at Watten went up by 400 scudi. Nonetheless, the size of the community was too great for even the increased revenue. Watten held seven more Jesuits than it could afford. To balance its books, the novitiate was forced to borrow money. So the community was back in debt; but fortunately its credits were greater.

Disaster struck the novitiate in early 1644 when an invading French army seized its buildings and possessions and drove the Jesuits from their home. Such was the disorder that the novitiate could report an income of only 320 scudi that year. Its hopes rested on recovering its lost property and belongings. The provincial congregation of 1645 asked the general to use all his powers and influence to protect the confiscated buildings from further destruction and both Father General Vitelleschi and his successor Vincent Carrafa promised to seek the assistance of the French Jesuits in the province's attempts to regain Watten. Meanwhile Francis Forster, the novitiate's rector, embarked on a personal mission to the French court.⁸¹ Until the situation improved and the novitiate's

81. ARSI, Congr 70, ff. 126-128; General to Thomas Port (vere Layton), 27 February 1644, Epp. Gen. II, f. 36v; same to Francis Forster, 5 March 1644, Ibid., f. 37; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 16 April 1644, Ibid., f. 39; same to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow), 6 August 1644, Ibid., f. 44v; same to Knott, 6 August 1644, Ibid., f. 45; same to Alacambe, 20 August 1644, Ibid., f. 46v; same to Forster, 3 September 1644, Ibid., f. 48; same to Knott, 24 September 1644, Ibid., f. 50; same to Forster, 1 October 1644, Ibid., f. 50v; same to Knott, 1 October 1644, Ibid., f. 51; same to same, 22 October 1644, Ibid., f. 51; same to Forster, 12 November 1644, Ibid., f. 53; same to same, 17 December 1644, Ibid., f. 53v; same Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingeld), 11 March 1645, Ibid., f. 59v.

endowment generated more income, the general instructed the province to accept only as many novices as they could afford.⁸²

Francis Forster's quest to regain Watten's buildings and possessions was successful. The general both congratulated the vice-rector, Henry Stafford, on his house, rising phoenix-like from its ashes and cautioned him to refrain from any large-scale rebuilding and to restrict his activities to necessary repairs.⁸³ The congratulations were premature: there was further devastation in 1647. The French occupied the premises, fortified it, and converted it into a military post. In the light of this, the general advised the province to retain their restrictions against too many novices. Of course, candidates were important for the future of the province, the general conceded, but the novitiate must be able to support them. Arrangements had been made with other provinces so that a few candidates from England could be accepted into their novitiates. It was in this context that Father Visitor had suggested a joint novitiate for the two Belgian and the English provinces.⁸⁴

The French abandoned their military post in late summer of 1648.

-
82. Even though a number of candidates promised to contribute to their own support for a few years, the provincial refused to accept any novices whom the province could not afford to maintain. The general concurred with the provincial's decision. Cf. General to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow) 20 August 1644, Epp. Gen. II, f. 46v.
83. General to Henry Stafford, 22 December 1646, Epp. Gen. II, f. 81v.
84. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 8 June 1647, Epp. Gen. II, f. 88v; same to same, 22 June 1647, Ibid., f. 89; same to same, 3 August 1647, Ibid., f. 91v; same to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 3 August 1647, Ibid., f. 91v; same to Silesdon, 30 May 1648, Ibid., f. 107; same to Henry Stafford, 19 September 1648, Ibid., f. 112; same to Silesdon, 10 October 1648, Ibid., f. 112v; same to Stafford, 26 December 1648, Ibid., f. 115v; same to Silesdon, 6 March 1649, Ibid., f. 118v; same to same, 27 March 1649, Ibid., f. 120.

In October the community returned to their ruined property. A year later, in September, the provincial congregation was held at Watten. The fathers complained about the restriction on the number of novices that they were permitted to accept. Over the past seven years, they reminded the general, about seventy members of the English province had died. Yet, during that same period, they were only allowed to accept fewer than twenty candidates. As a result, the province was shrinking; England was deprived of the missionaries that it needed so badly and the Belgian colleges were unable to fulfil the demands of their founders, demands that included the support of novices, scholastics and tertians. The province has been unable to remedy the problem because of the restrictions imposed by the general. Presently, the consent of all the provincial consultors was required before the limits could be exceeded. The fathers therefore asked that those limits be lifted so that the provincial and his consultors could accept all those whom they have deemed suitable as was the case in the other provinces. The general suggested a compromise in his reply: the provincial and his consultors could decide on the number to be accepted each year but they must refer that to the general for his approval.⁸⁵

Watten's progress was reflected in the financial report for 1649. Its gross income had risen to 2960 scudi. The net incomes could support only 23 men. With the present restriction on the number of novices, that amount should have been sufficient. The novitiate had incurred debts of 444 scudi, relatively low given its recent history, and had credits of 2800 scudi.

The number of novices remained a cause of concern. Despite pleas

85. ARSI, Congr 72, ff. 356-364.

from Henry Stafford, Watten's rector, the general insisted that the province maintain some control over the numbers admitted so that it did not overstretch its limited resources.⁸⁶ With the exception of an increase in the size of the community, the Catalogi Tertii Rerum for Watten were identical in 1649 and 1651.

The general continued to supervise the number of novices the English province accepted. He usually allowed only five candidates each year but the extreme poverty of the novitiate made even more serious reductions possible. To avert such a drastic move, John Clayton, the rector of Watten, asked the general about the permissibility of parental support for their sons in the novitiate. It was contrary to the Institute, the general replied, for provinces to demand support from "parents" but, in the light of the present difficulties, the provincial might ask the parents to provide some aid but he could not demand it.⁸⁷ In 1655 the novitiate numbered 28 Jesuits, one more than the previous report. The annual revenue had fallen by 1200 scudi to 1702 scudi. Because of some unspecified increased agricultural expenses, the net income was only 742 scudi, enough for 10 men, so the novitiate relied on the alms of the novices' parents to cover expenses.

With the exceptions of an increase in the size of the community from 28 to 31 and an addition of debts of 1100 scudi, Watten's statement for 1658 was identical with that of 1655. The revenues were still sufficient for only ten men, so the novitiate relied on the benevolence of their friends in England. Again the novitiate was ravaged by war. So great was the damage that basic repairs alone would cost 8000 scudi.

86. General to Henry Stafford, 11 December 1649, Epp. Gen. II, f. 127v; same to same, 26 March 1650, Ibid., f. 128v; same to Francis Forster, 20 May 1651, Ibid., f. 135.

87. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 24 May 1653, Epp. Gen. II, f. 146; same to same, 25 October 1653, Ibid., f. 151; same to John Clayton, 29 November 1653, Ibid., f. 151v; same to same, 21 February 1654, Ibid., f. 153v.

Meanwhile many of the community sought refuge at St Omers.⁸⁸

By 1672 Watten's fortunes had taken a slight turn for the better. The net income had increased to 1062 scudi, a rise of slightly more than 300 scudi, and the novitiate had paid off all its debts. Since the net income was still not sufficient for a community that size, the novitiate still had to exercise some control over the number of candidates accepted and to rely on alms and provincial assistance to balance the books.⁸⁹

16. The Tertianship at Ghent

In 1642 the tertianship's revenues remained at 1706 scudi. Because of a slight reduction in the community's onera, the net income had increased by 9 scudi. The community consisted of more than twice the number that it could afford and, as a result, this traditionally financially strong house was in debt for the first time. Throughout 1644 and 1645, the general commiserated with the community over the deprivations that were forced upon them and advised the new rector, Robert Freville, on the strong economic measures that should be introduced. The general reminded the Jesuits at Ghent of the hardships suffered by their brothers in India and reported that some Jesuits much closer to home, i.e. in Germany, were forced to go without breakfast.⁹⁰ Ghent's income from its endowment remained steady at 1703 scudi in 1645. In 1642 that sum was enough for 16 men; now it was estimated that 20

-
88. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 12 August 1656, Epp. Gen. II, f. 183; same to same, 2 September 1656, Ibid., f. 184; same to same, 10 November 1657, Ibid., f. 196v; same to John Clayton, 15 December 1657, Ibid., f. 197v.
89. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 15 June 1669, Epp. Gen. II, f. 314.
90. General to Thomas Babthorpe, 31 December 1644, Epp. Gen. II, f. 55; same to Robert Freville, 14 January 1645, Ibid., f. 56v; same to William Anderson (vere Anderton), 14 January 1645, Ibid., f. 56v.

could live off it. The actual size of the community, including the provincial staff, was 30. Its debts had increased by 400 scudi, approximately the same amount by which the credits had decreased. By 1649 Ghent had reduced its size to 14 Jesuits, 6 fewer than its income could maintain. With this surplus the tertianship paid off its debts. The Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1651 repeated that of 1649.

In 1655 the tertianship numbered 12 Jesuits, among whom were the provincial and his staff. The addition of other ordinary expenses reduced the net income to 1684 scudi, sufficient for 19 Jesuits. Much of Ghent's endowment was invested at the Monte di Pietà in Rome.⁹¹ Its ministers were responsible for the investment of Ghent's capital and the collection of the revenues. At the present time, they were experiencing special difficulties with the revenues and even resorted to litigation to collect the sums. For this reason the tertianship was forced to borrow money but once the community collected the 3912 scudi owed to it, the debt would be paid.

Because of the return of the provincial and his staff to London, there were only 8 Jesuits at Ghent in 1658. The endowment still returned 1706 scudi and the net income of 1683.6 scudi could maintain 16 people. The community was able to pay its debts with the surplus and formulated plans for the construction of a new building. The general reminded the rector, Thomas Port (vere Layton), that the Holy See's permission was necessary before he could alienate the present property and construct a new house. The general himself approved the builders' plans but the Roman authorities did not give their approval

91. The Monti di Pietà developed in order to protect the poor from usurers. The monti lent money at the lowest possible rates of interest. The larger monti also served as investment agents. Cf. Parker, "The Emergence of Modern Finance in Europe, 1500-1730," 534-536.

until the end of June 1658.⁹² By 1672 Ghent's gross income had inexplicably fallen by 600 scudi to 1100. The net income was sufficient for 13 Jesuits, the actual size of the community, so the tertianship was able to stay out of debt.

17. The English College at St Omers

The net income of St Omers had risen by 1200 scudi from 1639 to 1642 and, with that income, the college estimated that it could support 133 Jesuits and students. Hence, in order to maintain its actual community of 150 the college was forced to borrow money. Thus its debt increased by 500 scudi to 12500 scudi. St Omers' temporal problems became acute in 1643 and the college saw no way out of them. An England torn by war could not come to their assistance. Nor could other provinces which suffered from the effects of the Thirty Years War be expected to provide aid. There was no alternative but to do something very unusual - to dismiss some of the students completely and to transfer some to other Jesuits colleges. Of course, the rector tried to dismiss as few as he could and the general promised to urge the rectors of Valladolid and Seville to accept those transferred. In order to retain as many students as possible, the rector, Thomas Port (vere Layton) reduced the number of Jesuits in the college by seventeen. He did so by combining jobs and assigning more than one task to each man. Although the general would have preferred otherwise, he allowed Jesuit teachers to double as confessors for the students. Other extraordinary measures to save the college were considered. It had been suggested that some of the possessions of the tertianship at Ghent be sold in order to relieve the college. That proposal was abandoned when the general

92. General to Thomas Port (vere Layton), 4 May 1658, Epp. Gen. II, f. 202; same to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 4 May 1658, Ibid., f. 202; same to Port, 29 June 1658, Ibid., f. 204.

informed the rector that the explicit permission of the Holy Office would be required. The general, however, did approve the rector's request that the 40 crowns annually paid by the college as "tax" to the province be waived.⁹³

By October 1644 there was some hope that St Omers would survive, the net income had fallen by more than 9000 scudi to 6040 scudi in 1645 - and that was adequate for the greatly reduced community of 50, 12 of whom were Jesuits. However, the college's debts had more than doubled, presumably as a result of the attempt to balance the books without dismissing any students, and the eventual payment of the 54100 scudi owed to it was in doubt.

Throughout 1646 the situation at St Omers remained unstable. The general insisted that the college retain its strict economies - and even recommended that the college cut back on the expenses of their theatrical events and use that money for more essential items such as food. The college's financial worries intensified as rumours spread that the Spanish king planned to cancel his pension. Father General Carrafa soothed the rector with assurances that such stories lacked foundation and reminded the rector that the college was still able to do good work despite fewer students. By 1647 the situation had so improved, thanks to the advent of peace and the regularity of the Spanish pension that the general could write to the new rector, Edward Courtney, of his delight at the recovery of the college's fortunes and at the increase

93. General to Thomas Port (vere Layton), 14 March 1643, Epp. Gen. II, f. 13; same to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow), 21 May 1644, Ibid., f. 40v; same to Port, 16 July 1644, Ibid., f. 43; same to Alacambe, 30 July 1644, Ibid., f. 43v; same to Port, 30 July 1644, Ibid., f. 44; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 30 July 1644, Ibid., f. 44v; same to Port, 13 August 1644, Ibid., f. 45v; same to Alacambe, 20 August 1644, Ibid., f. 46v; same to Knott, 22 October 1644, Ibid., f. 51.

in the number of students.⁹⁴ Since the last triennial report in 1645 the net income went up by nearly 3000 scudi and the size of the community had been increased to 120 men. Just as important, the college reduced its debt from 26820 scudi to 1840 scudi. Since there was an even larger reduction in the college's credits, most of them, despite the scepticism in 1645, must have been paid. By 1651 the school had grown to 140 and the net income to an adequate 10560 scudi.

Nonetheless the college was not able to balance its books for long. By 1655 the net income had fallen by 1000 scudi as the number in the school rose by 22. So, once more, the college was forced to borrow money.

In 1658 the College of St Omers supported 157 men: 136 lay students and 21 Jesuits. The net income had surprisingly increased by 2110 scudi to 11670 scudi despite the non-payment of the Spanish pension for two years. Because the college could afford only 117 men, the debts continued to increase and the college owed 4000 scudi. But it held 4479 scudi in credits.

St Omers' fortunes changed yet again with the Restoration. By 1672, the college's net income had risen to 16924 scudi, a sum sufficient for the support of 169 men, 11 more than there were in the school. By that year, however, the college had also paid off all its debts, presumably from the money that was owed to it. Despite numerous ups and downs, the college again attained some financial stability by the mid 1670s.

94. General to Thomas Port (vere Layton), 23 September 1645, Epp. Gen. II, f. 70; same to same, 16 December 1645, Ibid., f. 72; same to same, 10 March 1646, Ibid., f. 72v; same to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 9 March 1647, Ibid., f. 85; same to Francis Forster, 6 June 1648, Ibid., f. 107v; same to Courtney, 5 September 1648, Ibid., f. 111.

18. The English Province

Between 1639 and 1642, the net income of the provincial institutions went up by only 87 scudi. Interestingly, that slightly higher sum could support only 442 men, 76 fewer men than the lower total of the previous catalogue. Because of considerable increase in the estimated per capita costs, the province supported more men than it could afford for the first time since 1625. For that reason so many debts were contracted that they exceeded the credits by 1678 scudi.

The province's depression deepened in 1645. The recorded net income had fallen by 17534 scudi. Some of that decline is explained by the absence of regular alms from the catalogues. But the province now had 130 more men than it could afford and the Civil War was taking its toll. The debts continued their upward movement and rose by more than 9000 scudi. The credits too had increased, but their payment was very uncertain. 1645 was not a good year for the province. The English Civil War had made it impossible for the Society's friends to provide any regular alms. Revenues had been reduced. Watten had been confiscated. One of the postulata submitted by the provincial congregation to the general congregation in 1645 dealt with the province's predicament. The English province pointed out that many areas had suffered in respect of either temporalities or spiritualities and needed assistance. In the interest of greater unity, it asked the general congregation to consider how those provinces with sufficient assets could henceforth support and employ a select number of men from the poorer provinces so that "the Institute may be preserved and the Society's estimation among externs increased."⁹⁵ Other provinces proposed similar plans so the general congregation passed a number of decrees

95. ARSI, Congr 70, ff. 124, 127.

to ease the financial burdens that almost universally plagued the Society. Many of these we have considered in the exposition of the Society's teachings on poverty. Besides these universal injunctions the general sought more concrete and immediate relief for the English province's problems. Once again the idea of displacing some of the English Jesuits was mooted. Just as the English province had taken into its Belgian communities German Jesuits displaced by the battles of the Thirty Years War, Edward Knott hoped to place some English Jesuits temporarily in other provinces. He proposed sending about 80 men into other provinces until the financial situation of his own province improved. The general however doubted that he would be able to find accommodation for so many: Germany was too hard pressed herself to take men from other provinces but France, Spain and Portugal were willing to take a few. The general hoped that he would be able to persuade Italy and the Irish mission to assist also. By the end of 1645, the general had been able to locate thirty-eight positions for English Jesuits: 13 in France, 13 in Italy, 8 in Spain, 2 in Portugal, and 2 in Belgium. The province's financial plight not only forced it to send thirty-eight men to other provinces to be supported but also, yet again, raised the issue of the acceptance of novices. Because of the province's present inability to accept many novices, the candidates could apply to other provinces but, the general emphasized, if they were accepted by other provinces, they were to remain as members of these provinces.⁹⁶

There were slight signs of recovery in the triennial catalogue of

96. General to Edward Alacambe (vere Astlow), 6 August 1644, Epp. Gen. II, f. 44v; same to same, 20 August 1644, Ibid., f. 46v; same to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 17 December 1644, Ibid., f. 54; same to same, 4 March 1645, Ibid., f. 58; same to Thomas Port (vere Layton), 11 March 1645, Ibid., f. 59; same to Knott, 11 March 1645, Ibid., f. 60; same to same, 1 April 1645, Ibid., f. 61; same to same, 13 May 1645, Ibid., f. 62v; same to same, 19 August 1645, Ibid., f. 68.

1649. The net income had increased from 24265 scudi to 29689 scudi. Probably because of the economic measures taken throughout the province, the estimated per capita expense had been reduced by 8.5 scudi to 91.4 scudi. Thus the net income could support 324 Jesuits. The province still contained more men than it could afford but not as many as in 1645. The provincial institutions had also reduced both their credits and debts. Three English communities - the Residences of St Michael and St John and the College of Blessed Aloysius - received subsidies from the provincial. Since the catalogues never provided data about the source or size of the provincial's fund, we know very little about it except what we can gather from the odd references and from the hints in the general's letters. We know that the provincial was able to dispose of candidates' possessions, some of which were probably used to meet the financial needs of the province; and that there was a provincial "tax", from which St Omers had once asked to be dispensed because of its own financial problems. We also know that the provincial was also the recipient of alms given to him to support the works of the province. The fund of money at the provincial's disposal was, it seems, comprised of the possessions of the candidates, the province tax and alms. We do not know how large this fund was but different provincials, especially John Warner, repeatedly complained that it was not sufficient.

With the general's permission, the provincial, Henry Silesdon had allocated some of the pensions of the Belgian houses for use among the needy houses and missionaries in England. Unfortunately the letter that contained the general's approval was not explicit in its details about the pensions. We know not whether the pensions in question were those of the Spanish king, the Bavarian Elector or those of the individual Jesuits in one of the Belgian communities.⁹⁷ Presumably,

97. General to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 4 May 1647, Epp. Gen. II, f. 86.

once the Belgian communities began to feel the monetary crunch, they terminated the arrangement.

Some time between 29 February 1648 and 3 June 1649, during his appointment as Visitor to both Belgian provinces and to the cismarine houses of the English province, Alexander Gottifredi investigated and gave rulings on the practices of the English province as regards their acceptance of annual pensions. After final vows, no Jesuit, the visitor decided, could accept any annual pension. That was a violation of the total renunciation of the final vows and, thus, a violation of the Society's Institute.⁹⁸ Apparently, there were some English Jesuits who had continued to receive their pensions after their final vows. It was this practice that the visitor condemned. I would assume that he would not have found the superior's acceptance, in the name of the community, of a subject's pension objectionable. The Society did not resolve the whole issue of pensions and poverty until the Twelfth General Congregation in 1682.

Although Maryland had been a mission of the English province since 1634, its finances rarely appeared in the triennial catalogues. There were, however, some decisions regarding that mission and its investments that affected the whole province. Since the Jesuits in Maryland had been granted large estates, most of which they had rented to others, the missionaries there were recipients of an annual fixed income. In 1650 Father General Piccolomini adverted to such financial irregularities. The mission had acquired title to these estates and it was not constitutionally competent to do so. In a letter to Francis Forster, the English provincial, the general reminded him that the Institute forbade the possession of revenues or real estate to missions unless

98. ARSI, Anglia 32I, ff. 489-490.

the said missions were incorporated into some college, such as the colleges in England which had their own distinct mission. If the mission had not already become part of a college, the general instructed the provincial that he must make the proper arrangements at once. Piccolomini advised Forster to discuss the matter with his consultors and to decide with them to which college the mission should be attached. There is no record of the college chosen but Thomas Hughes suggested that the House of Probation of St Ignatius as the most likely one.

The significance of the Maryland case lay in the advantages taken by individual colleges of their constitutional privileges to administer the finances of other communities. Even though, as we have seen, the colleges in England ceased to operate schools (to be colleges in a technical sense) at different times in the 1650s, they maintained the title for constitutional reasons. These colleges, now fictitious, administered funds, monies and real estate bequeathed by divers benefactors for uses and purposes beyond the collegiate. The college retained full ownership of all gifts and oversaw their investment but was obliged to transfer the fruits of the investments to the specified cause. The college was forbidden to touch the revenue without the explicit permission of either the general or the provincial. Significantly, the general insisted that the obligation to transfer the income be a mandate of charity and not a legal contract. Colleges might promise to give missions (and residences) specific sums of money annually but were forbidden to put that commitment into a legal contract because, to do so, would bestow on the mission or residence the right to the income to the detriment of the Institute. In this way the Maryland mission was able to retain its property. In this way, too, the provincial could obtain some money for the needs of the province. So new was this approach

that the general had to dispel the provincial's hesitations.⁹⁹

The provincial totals, including the errors, for 1651 were copied out of the catalogue of 1649. Because of the recent increase in the revenue at St Omers and the changes in the size of the communities at Immaculate Conception, St Omers, Liège, and Watten the totals were more inaccurate. By 1655 the net income had fallen a further 3901 scudi to 27388 scudi. Even though the province was not financially strong, it had recalled most of its members who had been sent to other provinces and shared its own limited resources with Jesuit exiles from Poland and Lithuania.¹⁰⁰

The English province showed signs of recovery in the catalogue of 1672 although not as much as one might have expected. One would have thought that a return to stability, prosperity and relative religious freedom would have resulted in a greater increase in revenues than the 1145 scudi registered in the catalogue. The net income was 1327 scudi higher than that of 1658. The province still contained more men than it could afford but it had reduced both its debts and its credits.

One of the issues discussed with the general by the province's procurator George Gray in November 1669 concerned the estate of Father John Dormer (vere Huddleston). Dormer had earlier renounced all his possessions in favour of the province, which received £28 or 112 scudi annually from them. Dormer's sister now wished to enter a convent in Paris. The procurator wanted to know whether it would be permissible to make over to that convent some of Dormer's renounced property as a

99. General to Francis Forster, 20 August 1650, Epp. Gen. II, f. 131; same to same, 24 December 1650, *Ibid.*, f. 133v; Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America Colonial and Federal, Text II, pp. 25-28, 239; Documents I, pp. 38-40; SC, A, V, 1(7).

100. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 6 November 1655, Epp. Gen. II, f. 171v.

dowry. If so, could the provincial do this or did he need the consent of the Holy See - because he was alienating ecclesiastical property?¹⁰¹ Unfortunately the general's response is not preserved. Nonetheless, the very question has a twofold interest: first, it showed the willingness of the Society to consider the requests of its members to employ what was formerly their property to aid their families; and secondly it revealed the canonical problems that surrounded such petitions. Without the required permission, any alienation of ecclesiastical property involved the culprit in various penalties and censures. Of course, before any penalties were incurred, the alienated property had to exceed a certain value. Whether the amount in this case involved surpassed the limits was a question that troubled the provincial.

In 1672 the eight residences in England were supported by alms and by the income from a common fund. As we have often noted, residences were not permitted any regular income to which they had a legal right. We have just seen in the case of the Maryland mission that the finances of a mission or a residence could be administered by a college which transferred the revenue generated by the mission's or residence's portfolio to it for its own use. In 1669 the general recommended the interests and needs of the residences to the provincial Joseph Simons. Formerly the residences had adequate support and flourished. Now they lacked both men and money and the general urged Simons to correct the problem.¹⁰² Perhaps this letter prompted the establishment of a common fund for all residences, a fund that would have been administered by one of the colleges in England. The introduction of a fund restored some stability to the residences and freed them from the debilitating

101. ARSI, Anglia 34, pp. 751-752.

102. General to Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb), 7 September 1669, Epp. Gen. II, f. 316.

dependence on alms.

In 1642, as civil unrest spread throughout Great Britain and wars ravaged the continent, the fortunes of the English province began to deteriorate. Between 1639 and 1642 the gross income had fallen by almost 20200 scudi. Throughout the 1640s and 1650s the province was desperate, seeking new sources of income and different ways to balance the accounts. Despite all economies, the reduction in the number of novices, and the temporary transfer of thirty-eight Jesuits out of the province, the province never completely recovered from the losses that it had suffered during this period. Just as it seemed that it had turned the corner and begun to climb out of its depression, the Popish Plot and the Glorious Revolution dealt it two severe blows.

3. The English Province: 1678-1700

The Oates Plot triggered a wholesale assault on the assets of the English province. Oates' tales of the Society's wealth fired the imagination of the populace and prompted searches for hidden treasure. The royal proclamation of 12 November 1679 added monetary inducements and rewards. As a result, various searches and investigations plagued the province for the remaining years of the reign of Charles II.¹⁰³

By the end of 1679 the pursuit for the fabled Jesuit wealth was in earnest. The Annual Letters of 1681 and 1682 reported an almost continuous attack on the province's resources. Despite what the rumours asserted, the province's resources were in reality so limited that they could barely support 100 men; the province was forced to rely on alms to support the others. Over the previous few years most

103. For a detailed discussion of the Plot, cf. Kenyon, The Popish Plot, and Miller, Poverty and Politics in England 1600-1680.

of the province's property had been threatened and much of it would probably be lost. The Society's adversaries, "stimulated as usual both by hatred of the Catholic religion and by the love of plunder (which are twin sisters)", so intimidated the Society's trustees that they were afraid to retain their office. Having frightened off the trustees, the "vultures" then attacked the property itself. According to the Annual Letters, the Jesuits patiently endured their hardships and offered up their sufferings: "We confide in the goodness of God, and the piety of the faithful; so long as we sow spiritual things, we may hope to reap the temporal."¹⁰⁴

One of the first to emerge from the shadows to volunteer his assistance in the attack on the Society was John Travers. Claiming to know all the secrets of the clergy in England and the location of their estates and money because he had been nominated as their procurator, "Trevor a Jesuit" had met Sir Joseph Williamson, the Secretary of State, on 28 September 1678.¹⁰⁵ As it happened, Travers' assistance was ignored and he was allowed to slip back into the shadows for another eighteen months. By his next appearance, however, the government was ready to listen and eager to act. In late January 1680, John Travers petitioned the king for a pardon "for all treasons, misprisions of treasons, concealment, offences, evil deeds, contempts and transgressions of what nature soever by him committed against common law or statute law." The king granted the petition on 11 February. Pardoned from all the offences involved in his former status as a member of the Society of Jesus and thus protected against counter-claims and self-incrimination, Travers began his revelations. The first disclosure was an act of revenge;

104. ARSI, Anglia 35, pp. 157-158, 167 translated in Foley, Records, V, 85-86.

105. PRO, SP 29/406/182.

greed came later. William Petre, a relative of Lord Petre, had once told Travers that the Jesuit, Charles Poulton, hid in the home of the Dowager Lady Petre.¹⁰⁶ Travers reported this to the authorities. Having set the hounds on Poulton, Travers then turned his attention to money. He and Richard Graham received permission to search the chambers in the Inner Temple of Richard Langhorne, the Society's lawyer who was executed for the Popish Plot, for any papers concerning a mortgage made out to the Jesuits by Edward Wray and any information whatsoever about the Jesuit property in Queen Street, London, and Newnham Abbey, Bedford.¹⁰⁷ As we have seen, Travers had already made an earlier attempt to gain Newnham Abbey. He probably knew of Wray's mortgage and the Queen Street houses from his previous position as rector.¹⁰⁸

A commission was then established to examine the allegations that certain tenements and houses in the city had been left to superstitious uses. Its findings became the basis for the prosecutor's case at the Exchequer bar. The Exchequer court passed its judgement in June 1682: fourteen houses in and near Queen Street, two houses in Holborn Conduit, the mortgages of two houses in Fleetbridge and a mortgage belonging to Barlings Abbey in Lincolnshire were forfeited to the Crown. John Savage and an accomplice Samuel Butler were awarded £240-11s-11d as their moiety. The reward money was to come from the rents of the forfeited properties.¹⁰⁹

106. PRO, PC 2/68/p. 385; Bodl, Rawl MS A 135, pp. 402-403.

107. PRO, PC 2/68/p. 461; 2/69/pp. 62-63. An Edward Harrison had already filed a petition for a moiety of Newnham Abbey. He claimed that he had discovered it to Lord Maynard in January/February 1679 (PRO, T 27/5/p. 347).

108. A counter-claim for a moiety of Wray's mortgage was submitted in November 1681 by his daughter-in-law, Dorothy Fane. She argued that Travers lied with his pretence at first discovery (PRO, T 4/1/p. 407).

109. PRO, C 205/19/1; T 52/9/pp. 28, 30; T 53/3/p. 14; T 60/39/p. 16; ADM 77/2/37; HMC Kenyon, p. 126.

Success aroused the envy of other scavengers. Samuel Oates and Titus Oates petitioned the Lords of the Treasury on 18 November 1682 and 8 January 1683 - the first claiming that he had been a co-discoverer with Travers and Butler and should be awarded accordingly, the second arguing that he had been the first to reveal to the government the Jesuits' ownership of the Queen Street houses and the use of Langhorne as a trustee in their transactions. Travers and Butler, Oates asserted, had not filed their discoveries and what information they had had been received from him. Both petitions were submitted to Richard Graham for consideration. He judged that Travers and Butler had been the original discoverers of the property in question and that only they deserved the reward. They had informed the government of their suspicions in January 1680 and had found the necessary proof when they searched Langhorne's chambers.¹¹⁰

Travers soon realized the great difference between an award and its collection. He still had not received his moiety in 1685 and twice petitioned for it in that year. He bitterly complained that he had devoted seven years of his life to the search for hidden Jesuit money at the request of King Charles II and with his promise of a share. He had even been forced to borrow money to continue the task. The Crown had profited handsomely because of his discoveries. All he asked in return was what he had been promised. Finally on 17 April 1686, he received £96-16s-8d.¹¹¹

The Crown's possession of the London properties was brief. Soon after James II's accession, in March 1686, warrants were delivered to Richard Graham with orders to turn over to a certain Richard Allison

110. PRO, T 1/1/45; SP 29/422/33.

111. PRO, T 27/9/p. 54; T 4/3/pp. 23, 220; T 52/9/p. 288; T 53/4/p. 366; T 53/6/p. 285; T 60/1/p. 105; T 60/39/p. 136; T 61/4/p. 170.

and Edward Ingelby ¹¹² all the deeds and papers relating to the Queen Street houses and Edward Wray's mortgage of the Lincolnshire lands. The London properties were then granted to Francis Viscount Carrington and William Brent. ¹¹³ Both were trustees for the Society.

Travers does not seem to have been as fortunate in his efforts to regain Newnham Abbey. The only references to this suit that I have found have been among the financial ledgers of the College of the Holy Apostles. The college received £72 in annual rents from the abbey until June 1680 when Travers' intervention prevented further payment. Throughout the 1680s, there were frequent entries in the accounts for lawyers' fees and other matters connected with the suit and the college even spent 18s on 28 September 1682 in alms for those who prayed for success in the case. Charles Palmer made frequent trips in conjunction with the college's legal defence of the property against Savage's claim. He even needed an extra £1-5s for a periwig on a trip to London. Legal fees were paid to a Mr Slater (£1), Mr Stafford (£1-10s), and Sir Henry Bedingfeld (£14-5s) for their assistance. By 1686/7, the college had recovered its revenues from Newnham Abbey: Richard Graham had been ordered to turn over all relevant documents to Edward Ingelby on 8 March 1687. ¹¹⁴

On 27 July 1680, the Treasury ordered the King's Remembrancer to prepare a commission under Exchequer and to inquire into Jesuit estates, the personal estates of individual Jesuits and any estate set aside for superstitious uses. Many informers now stepped forward. Few of the allegations could be proved, so the Exchequer did not profit as much

112. Was this the procurator of the province Edward Ingelby (vere Tidders)?

113. BM, Add MS 15897, f. 50; PRO, SP 44/336/p. 412.

114. ASJ, College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844, ff. 10v, 15, 16, 17, 18v; PRO, SP 44/337/p. 227.

as had been hoped. An Edmund Warcupp was granted £300, the first instalment of a £1500 reward, for his part in the detection and the prosecution of Jesuits. His bounty was to come from the forfeited estates. John Wood of Melling in Lancashire claimed that the late John Woodward had bequeathed £300 to the Society of Jesus and other superstitious uses. Elizabeth the Countess of Anglesea petitioned the Treasury for a moiety of the Jesuit property that she had revealed. William Fanshaw, having successfully fought off Titus Oates' counter-claim, received a moiety for his disclosures. William Howell asked for a share of the £80 annuity of Richard Petre, S.J. and held by William Petre. Howell's petition was filed in 1679. Five years later, perhaps as an attempt to protect the annuity, William Petre himself sought a share of the £80 annuity that was divided between the two Jesuit brothers, Richard and Robert Petre.¹¹⁵

1. The College of St Ignatius Loyola

Despite the difficulties of the Oates Plot, the college's revenues had increased slightly to 903 scudi by 1685. Supplemented by alms, the net income could support the 18 men in the college. The Jesuits in the college were distributed throughout London in the houses of many private families.¹¹⁶ But plans were made for the establishment of a new community with the accession of King James II. The provincial purchased a large building by the river in the Savoy and the King and the Queen donated almost 3400 scudi for its complete renovation into a residence, a school and a chapel. On the eve of Pentecost (24 May) 1687, the Jesuits moved into their new community. The original members were

115. PRO, T 4/1/pp. 71, 94, 277; T 4/2/pp. 28, 55; T 27/6/pp. 426-427; T 53/1/pp. 201-202; T 53/3/p. 103; T 54/8/pp. 291-292; T 60/38/p. 229; PC 2/68/pp. 284, 407, 423-424; PC 2/69/p. 133.

116. Annual Letter of 1676, ARSI, Anglia 34, p. 830.

John Keynes, the provincial; William Mumford, the socius; Charles Palmer, the rector "qui nullam ante sedem fixam habuerat;" Thomas Green (vere Wright), the minister; Edward Tidders, the province procurator; John Persall, a preacher at the Chapel Royal; Edward Hall (vere Humberston) and Andrew Poulton, teachers. Two other teachers were later added: the priest, Thomas Parker (vere Culcheth) and the Scholastic, Richard Plowden. In the Savoy school the Jesuits wore the habit of the Society and observed the domestic order as ordained in the Regulae Societatis Iesu. In late October 1687, the king himself visited the school. He was met on the riverstairs by the provincial who conducted him on a tour of the chapel and the school. King James was apparently so pleased with the boys' Latin and Greek and their English speeches that he gave them gowns and announced that they should be called royal scholars. A second school was opened in the city in 1688. A residence was established at the school with a superior appointed by the provincial and dependent upon the rector of the college. Father Provincial named as the first superior Charles Petre, the brother of Edward Petre through whose intercession the Society had obtained this school from the king who allotted an annual stipend of 1680 scudi for its support.¹¹⁷

On the general's orders, the rector of St Ignatius, Charles Palmer, gathered into both school communities all the Jesuits in the London area who could, without offense, leave the homes of their patrons. Once

117. Annual Letter of 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, ff. 155-160. The same letter can be found in ARSI Anglia 35, ff. 102-113. Much, but not all, has been translated in Foley, Records, V, 262-268. Cf. also HMC Downshire I, 272-273; Gregory MacDonald, "The Lime Street Chapel," Dublin Review 180 (1927) 253-265; 181 (1927) 1-16; Ruth Clark, Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal (Cambridge, 1932) p. 159; Sister Marion Norman, "John Gother and the English Way of Spirituality," RH 11 (1972) 306-319; T.G. Holt, "A Jesuit School in the City in 1688," Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society 37 (1981) 153-158.

inside the communities, they too would assume the religious dress of the order and enter into the practices of religious life.¹¹⁸

Both communities were shortlived. The College of St Ignatius' houses, the schools and chapels in which the Jesuits had live, taught and preached and which had been either purchased or constructed specifically for that purpose, were destroyed during the 1688 Revolution. Since 1685 the college had lost more than 200 scudi in annual revenues. Its houses, farms and pensions had returned only 695 scudi. After the deduction of the onera of 102 scudi, the net income was only 593 scudi. Between 1689 and 1690, the college had actually received a mere 505 scudi in cash and 126 scudi in goods. Its expenses for the same period were 944 scudi. The college was, therefore, in debt. The credits held by the college amounted to 963 scudi but their payment was much doubted.

The Savoy school was in ruins. About 23 February 1692, Thomas Addison, one of the commissioners for sick and wounded seamen and the exchange of prisoners of war, petitioned the Treasury for the use of the college and the chapel in the Savoy for Irish prisoners. Repairs would be needed because, although the Jesuits had put the property into good order, the lead and the glass had been stolen and nothing now kept out the elements.¹¹⁹ Apparently the petition was granted.

In 1693 there were 22 Jesuits in the College of St Ignatius including the provincial staff. The foundation returned 800 scudi, an increase of 105 scudi over the previous report. But, of that nominal revenue, the college was barely able to collect 410 scudi. Of that, it had spent 200 scudi for the support of the Jesuits who had no alms

118. General to Charles Poulton, 20 March 1688, Epp. Gen. II, f. 481.

119. PRO, T 1/17/43.

and 100 scudi for letters and medical bills. The faithful had contributed 680 in alms to the college. With such small actual receipts, the college did not think that it could support any more men. St Ignatius owed 228 scudi in debts and was owed 1300 scudi, much of it probably would not be paid.

The College of St Ignatius still consisted of 22 Jesuits in 1696. Its rents, pensions and investments still returned 800 scudi annually but there were ordinary expenses of 100 scudi. Because of the loss of deeds and the college's inability to find proof of ownership in the recently plundered provincial archives, the college could collect only 410 scudi. The faithful aided the penurious Jesuits with 600 scudi in alms. The debts and credits remained at 228 scudi and 1300 scudi respectively.

In January 1699 that Thomas Addison claimed that he had been the first "discoverer" of the Jesuit ownership of the Savoy buildings. In the interim, he said, he had spent much in their repairs. He therefore petitioned the Crown for a grant of title. Two months later, however, the ex-Jesuit John Travers contested Addison's claim. Although the property was in the possession of Addison, Travers asserted that he had been the first discoverer. Accordingly, the Great Seal was moved for a commission to investigate their claims on 27 June. Shortly thereafter, on 10 July, the commission, meeting in Middlesex, judged that "several houses, halls and chambers within Savoy demised to certain Jesuits after the manor [sic] of a Jesuit college" were forfeited to the Crown - and awarded them to Thomas Addison.¹²⁰

The once-thriving finances of the College of St Ignatius were in

120. PRO, T 4/7/p. 311; T 27/16/pp. 96, 135; T 29/11/p. 150; C 205/19/21.

disorder. The hopes that had animated the men as they moved into their new novitiate on their founder's feast in 1622 were now in ruins. The school in the Savoy, furnished with money from the Royal Family, had been a symbol of the new era that was dawning for the English province. Now the buildings, stripped of anything of value by an angry mob, had to be repaired to accommodate Irish prisoners of war. The Savoy was not the only loss suffered by the college. The loss of deeds and financial records left it unable to collect the rents it was due. Not surprisingly, the century ended with the college's revenues falling well below the totals of the 1630s.

2. The College of Blessed Aloysius

Legal difficulties plagued this college in the 1670s. Sir Thomas Preston, Bart., the second son but heir of Sir John Preston, entered the Society in 1674 after the deaths of his second wife and his only son.¹²¹ Shortly before his departure for the novitiate Preston made an agreement with Francis Lord Carrington and Richard Walmesley of Dukenhalgh, whereby the latter, in return for a token payment of 5s, received control for one year of the Furness monastery with its iron mines and other properties in the north of England. Taken together, the properties generated between £400 and £500 annually. Another deed dated 6 May 1674 between Preston, Carrington, and Walmesley on the one hand, and Humphrey Weld on the other, declared that Carrington and Walmesley would put the premises to whatever use Weld should direct. Weld himself in a deed poll of 11 May 1674 declared that the said premises were held in trust by him during his life and that thereafter they should be put to whatever uses Edmund Plowden and his heirs should direct. Carrington and Walmesley held the

121. Cf. Michael Galgano, "Iron-Mining in Restoration Furness: The Case of Sir Thomas Preston," RH 13 (1976) 212-218. I owe most of the following exposition to Galgano's account.

properties in trust for the poor of the parish of Dalton in Lancashire and for other "Pious and Charitable Uses," i.e. the Society of Jesus. The Society's share of the revenues went to the College of Blessed Aloysius. However, almost before the college could enjoy the fruits of Preston's bequest, there were problems.¹²²

On 29 January 1680 Sir Thomas Preston's cousin, Thomas Preston of Holker, esquire, petitioned the king for the estates in question.¹²³ The petitioner, a Deputy Lieutenant and a Protestant, claimed that his cousin's estates had been given to superstitious uses and were forfeit to the Crown. He asked that these estates, either whole or in part, be given to him. Fearful that his trustees would lose the estates, Sir Thomas Preston established a second trust, and designated Caryll Viscount Molyneux and Robert Dalton, along with Lord Carrington and Richard Walmesley, as trustees. These four were to manage the manor of Quernmore and other Lancashire properties until his daughter Ann attained maturity in 1685. The property covered by this, the second trust, was not seized; the property of the first trust was not so fortunate.

Between 30 May 1682 and 24 February 1683, the Preston case was heard before the Court of Exchequer. Ironically the three most damaging depositions were from Catholics, especially harmful was the deposition of George Hilton, Sir Thomas' former chief agent. The court judged that the initial trust had been for superstitious purposes and instructed Lord Carrington and Humphrey Weld to convey to the Crown the legal estate vested in them. The king received the estate from Carrington and Weld

122. General to Richard Strange, 1 February 1676, Epp. Gen. II, f. 365; same to James Waites, 8 February 1676, Ibid., f. 365.

123. A copy of the petition can be found in PRO, PC 2/67/ff. 31v-32. There must have been another petition filed earlier because Sir Thomas Preston's estate had been discovered before the promulgation of the proclamation of 12 November 1679.

by an indenture dated 24 February 1683. The lands were then leased on 18 June 1683 to the plaintiff for seven years at £400 per annum.¹²⁴ Both the poor of Dalton and the Society of Jesus thereby lost an important source of annual revenue.

The saga, however, did not end with the seven-year lease to Thomas Preston. He himself had to protect his winnings from the talons of other claimants. Attracted probably by the wealth of the estate, Titus Oates insisted that he had been the first to discover the superstitious nature of Sir Thomas Preston's arrangements. Oates' allegations were examined - but rejected - in May 1683.¹²⁵ An attempt made by Francis Plowden to gain the estate was more successful. Francis Plowden, the son and heir of Edmund, petitioned King James II for the estates of Sir Thomas Preston on 7 April 1687. In the petition Francis recited the procedure by which the estate had been conveyed through a series of trustees ending with his father and his heirs. A few years previously, Francis reminded the Crown, the Exchequer had ordered the trustees to convey the property to the king. Neither Sir Thomas Preston nor Edmund Plowden were involved in that action. Plowden carefully pointed out a fine legal distinction: Carrington and Weld conveyed the estate to the Crown but the estate had not been forfeited to the Crown because of superstitious uses. Now that both Humphrey Weld and Edmund Plowden were dead, the petitioner had the inherited right to direct the uses to which the trust was put. He therefore requested that the king return the manor and premises to him, the rightful owner. Plowden received the estate, subject to the payment of certain fees and rents, from the Crown by letters patent of 3 June 1687. Thomas Preston continued to rent the

124. PRO, T 4/1/pp. 281-282; T 27/6/pp. 470-471; T 52/9/pp. 183-187; T 54/9/pp. 115-116, 123.

125. PRO, T 27/7/p. 142; T 1/1/46.

land but he now paid the money to Francis Plowden. At first Preston refused to pay Plowden the rents but he was later commanded to do so.¹²⁶ Through Plowden, the college regained the Preston estate. Yet again that possession was short-lived. With the fall of James II, the tables were again turned. The grant of the estate to Francis Plowden was declared void because the revenues went to the relief of the Jesuits and to other superstitious uses. The Crown then assumed ownership of the estate in 1689.¹²⁷

While the college was involved indirectly in the legal battles over Sir Thomas Preston's estates, it was also the recipient of a share in the annual tithes of corn and grain from certain lands in West Leigh. Robert Trappes had conveyed the manor of West Leigh, which held the rectory and the parsonage of Leigh and the advowson of the vicarage of Leigh, to Roger Bradshaw of Aspull in 1599. Edward, the son and heir of Roger Bradshaw, conveyed the estate to a John Urmston on 10 April 1656. Richard Urmston inherited the property from his father John. Richard had four daughters. Two are important for the history of the tithes: Ann, who married Thomas Mossock, and Frances, who married Richard Shuttleworth. On the death of Richard Urmston in 1661, Ann received a portion of the manor house, the demesne lands of West Leigh and the tithes of grain and corn as her inheritance. By deeds of 6 and 7 August 1682, she conveyed the tithes to Sir William Gerard, Thomas Eccleston, and Thomas Culcheth for £250. However, the truth was that these three held them in trust for the Society. Thomas Eccleston, the surviving member, conveyed the tithes to Sir William Gerard, the son of the original trustee, and to Thomas Culcheth, the

126. PRO, T 4/5/pp. 51, 180; T 27/11/p. 217; T 52/12/pp. 110-114; BL, Add MS 15897, f. 50v.

127. PRO, T 27/12/p. 41; C 205/19/10.

grandson of the trustee, on 12 April 1702.

Ann Mossock conveyed the use and the distribution of the West Leigh tithes to the trustees for the college, but retained the ownership, of course. By a will dated 25 June 1697, she bequeathed the tithes to her nephew, Richard Shuttleworth. Ann died in 1699. Alas this last conveyance and the bequest led to a legal dispute between Mrs Mary Culcheth, the widow of Thomas, and Richard Shuttleworth after he conformed to the Established Church. Mary Culcheth acted as agent for the college and collected the tithes until 1716. Between 1715 and 1716, the Commission for Superstitious Uses met at Preston. The widow Culcheth was very worried that Richard Shuttleworth would disclose the nature of the financial arrangements in order to gain the tithes for himself. In order to protect the tithes, she, in collaboration with a John Chadwick, turned informer. As a reward for their discovery, they won a grant of a quarter of the tithes and a low rent lease for the whole estate. But Shuttleworth did not abandon hope. In 1725 he filed a suit in Chancery to regain the tithes. This he also lost. To dissuade him from any further action, Shuttleworth was paid £120 on 29 August 1749 to withdraw any claims to the tithes.¹²⁸

The annual revenue of the college had fallen by 170 scudi to 791 scudi in 1685. The reduction was probably caused by the loss of the Preston estate. After the onera of 377 scudi had been deducted, the net income was 414 scudi. With the assistance of alms, the net income could support the 16 Jesuits in the college.

The newly constructed school and chapel in Wigan were destroyed by the mob in 1688. Nonetheless, the college did not suffer as much

128. ASJ, Foley MSS II, ff. 311v-314; College of St Aloysius: West Leigh Tithes 1656-1933; Foley, Records, V, 336-337.

financially. It expected to collect 779 scudi in revenues from its houses, lands and rents. That represented a decrease of only 12 scudi since 1685. The ordinary expenses were still high (431 scudi) and the net income was 348 scudi. Over the past year, the college had actually collected 1153 scudi in cash. Its expenditures were 1122 scudi in cash and 5236 scudi in other goods. There remained only 13 scudi in goods. The college had a large debt of 1353 scudi but it also held credits of 2493 scudi.

Throughout the early 1690s, perjurers and informers attacked the estates of several known recusants in Lancashire, some of whom served as trustees for the Society.¹²⁹ However, despite all accusations and claims, the financial composition of the college showed signs of improvement. The college numbered 23 Jesuits in 1693. There were so many Catholics within the borders of this college that each Jesuit was responsible for at least 300, at times 600, of the faithful. Although the annual revenue had increased to 900 scudi, the onera had also risen to 500 scudi, so the net income was only 400 scudi. But over the past year, the college had actually collected 1300 scudi. Its expenses of 1140 scudi left the college with 200 scudi (sic) in cash. The college had also collected a further 300 scudi in alms. Because of the increase in the income and the payment of much of the money that was owed to it, the college was able to reduce its debts.

The 21 Jesuits in the college in 1696 had greater freedom of movement than elsewhere in England. Each missionary, besides his work with the non-Catholics, was responsible for approximately 300 Roman

129. Cf. Hopkins, "The Commission for Superstitious Lands of the 1690s."

Catholics. The college's returns for 1696 were identical with those of 1693: a gross income of 900 scudi, ordinary expenses of 500 scudi, net income of 400 scudi, debts of 1200 scudi, credits of 1300 scudi and alms of 300 scudi. The seventeenth century ended with the college financially strong despite the loss of Sir Thomas Preston's estate. The college had weathered the storms of Oates and Orange and emerged with large onera but a foundation still well intact.

3. The College of St Francis Xavier and the Residence of St Winefrid

The furore of the Oates Plot blazed through the College of St Francis Xavier and the Residence of St Winefrid in 1678/9. In December 1678, John Browne, the Clerk of the House of Lords, sent a warrant to Dr Herbert Croft, the Bishop of Hereford. Having been informed that there was a Jesuit residence for five or six Jesuits at Cwm, with an annual income of £300, the Lords recommended that the Lord Bishop, with the assistance of as many justices of the peace as needed, investigate.¹³⁰ Armed with this authorization, Bishop Croft led a raid on Cwm on 19 December 1678. There are two different accounts of the discovery and raid but with no significant variations between them. The first, written by Herbert Croft himself, was published in 1679; the second, written by John Scudamore, a member of the posse, was never published.¹³¹

A description of the location of Cwm and a history of its ownership began Croft's narrative. Both Cwms had lands valued at £60 annually.

130. Printed in Foley, Records, IV, 463.

131. A Short Narrative of the Discovery of a College of Jesuites, at a place called Come, in the County of Hereford (London, 1679). Preserved among the Carte MSS are two manuscripts copies: Bodl, Carte MS 81, ff. 442-443, 642-643. It was also printed in Foley, Records, IV, 464-467. Scudamore's account can be found in BL, Lansd 846/73, ff. 229-230; Bodl, Carte MS 81, ff. 440-441.

Formerly the lands belonged to Henry Somerset, the Marquis of Worcester, who leased them to William Morton, on whose death they passed to Robert Hutton. Hutton, along with William Ireland, the province procurator, John Fenwick (vere Caldwell), the procurator for St Omers, and John Grove, a Jesuit laybrother as witnesses, leased the Lower Cwm to one William Williams for 21 years at £41 per annum. Management of the estate was entrusted to Peter Pullen on 27 April 1678.

One house contained six bedrooms, each with a separate study. There were several other rooms besides these. The second house was "a good country house" with several bedchambers and studies, many of which were connected with secret passages. Most of the furniture had been removed and the captured servant would not reveal its location. The size of the houses can be grasped by their combined number of chimneys: 21. The houses were situated at the bottom of a wooded and rocky hill. Among the rocks, there were several hiding places and there was also a hidden passage from one of the houses into the woods.

In one of the houses a well-concealed door led into the library. Most of the books dealt with controversial theology and the Institute of the Society of Jesus but there were also some catechisms both in English and in Welsh. The pursuivants also found documents, manuscripts, letters and personal financial papers in the room. Throughout the other rooms, the searchers found crucifixes, statues, relics, sanctus bells, eucharistic wafers and liturgical vestments. The altar itself had been taken down and carted away. Only the altar stone remained. Croft concluded, probably correctly, that the Jesuits had been warned that a warrant had been sent from the House of Lords. They had therefore had ample time to remove any incriminating objects and, indeed, to cut out the pages containing the recent accounts from the financial ledgers. It was

obvious that the Jesuits had begun to transport the books because some had been found hidden in a pig's cote.

The Jesuit agent Peter Pullen was examined. He confessed that he not only managed the estate but that he also received the rents from estates called Amberley and Langunvillin in Monmouth.¹³² The annual rents were £20 and £18 respectively. Part of the rents Pullen used to deray the house's expenses; the rent, he turned over to the designated Jesuit.

Immediately after the discovery, the distribution of the spoils began. Less than two weeks after the raid, on 30 December, Dr Croft solicited the assistance of the Bishop of London, asking him to use his influence both to insure the publication of the narrative and to present a petition to the king for the confiscated books. The request for the library was granted in February 1679. In the letter in which the Privy Council informed the bishop of the grant, the Council asked him to forward all papers, deeds, manuscripts and financial reports to the Treasury. These papers have long since disappeared.¹³³ A few months later, under the over-zealous leadership of John Scudamore, a concerted effort was made to discover and seize the priests and Jesuits in Herefordshire and the border counties.¹³⁴

One of the conclusions of Mrs O'Keeffe's thorough study of the

-
132. These two farms were probably the ones purchased by Charles Brown (vere Gwynne).
133. PRO, SP 29/408/111; PC 2/67/ff. 59v-60; T 27/5/p. 379. For a list of the confiscated books, cf. Geraint Bowen, "The Jesuit Library in Hereford Cathedral." Around the same time, the Bishops of Peterborough and Llandaff made similar requests for the Popish books taken in their dioceses (PRO, T 27/5/p. 379; PC 2/67/f. 39v).
134. Scudamore's authorization came from the Privy Council on 12 May 1679 (PRO, PC 2/68/p. 30). The results of his efforts can be seen in the book written by himself and John Arnold, An Abstract of Several Examinations taken upon Oath, in the Counties of Monmouth and 1680).

Popish Plot in South Wales is the role that the Plot had played in the destruction of the Catholic Church in the region. The Plot totally disrupted the Church's organization and reduced even more the number of Welsh-speaking clergy. That reduction left many areas without any. The financial ruin of many of the patrons left the priests without protection.¹³⁵ Nonetheless, the finances of the two Welsh communities did not suffer as much as one might have expected. The College of St Francis Xavier's gross income had fallen slightly to 769 scudi, a paltry decline when one recalls the destruction of Cwm. Perhaps the judicious cutting of the current statements out of the ledger saved the foundation since it deprived the pursuivants of the written evidence needed for successful litigation. Because of a significant reduction in the onera, the net income for 1685 was higher than that of 1672. The net income of 533 scudi could support five men adequately. There were only three Jesuits in the college. The Residence of St Winefrid made its first appearance in the catalogue of 1685. Made from the "rib" of St Francis Xavier's, St Winefrid's was financially strong. The residence of six Jesuits had a gross income of 944 scudi from rents and pensions, a total that was greater than that of St Francis Xavier's. The deduction of onera of 376 scudi left a net income of 568 scudi. St Winefrid's future was made even brighter with the grant of King James II and his Queen Mary Beatrice of the shrine at the famous well.¹³⁶

The College of St Francis Xavier lost many houses and much property during the persecution that followed the fall of James II. Two priests from the college and two more from the residence had been

135. O'Keefe, "The Popish Plot in South Wales and the Marches of Hereford and Gloucester," p. 356.

136. Printed in Foley, Records, V, 935.

arrested. By 1690, the two from the college had been released on bail. The Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1690 included no information about the finances of St Francis Xavier because none was available. In the same catalogue, the income of St Winefrid's fell. From its farms, houses and pensions, the residence should have had a net income of 533 scudi but over the past year, it had actually received only 183 scudi. Its expenses for the same period were 180 scudi. Although the difference was 3 scudi, the community reported a cash surplus of 81 scudi. There were debts of 469 scudi and credits of 2413.

The invasion by William of Orange resulted in a second assault on recusant property. In August 1689 the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Henry Lord Delamere, petitioned the Crown for an investigation into certain lands in Monmouth, Hereford and Gloucester. Lord Delamere, an anti-Catholic Whig, claimed that these lands were owned by the Society of Jesus. The petition was forwarded to the Attorney General who established a commission in September. The inquisition was financed by Lord Delamere. At meetings held at Monmouth on 4 October, Abergavenny on 4 November and Harewoods Inn, Hereford on 14 November, the commission concluded that much property and money was secretly owned by the Society. Among the properties were a messuage in Monmouth valued at 46s; land in Langunvillin valued at £28; an estate in Amberly worth £35; three gardens in Monmouth town with returns of 30s; four messuages and 250 acres in Llantillio-Crossenny valued at £45-9s-4d; a messuage and 95 acres in Llanvihangel with an annual return of £18; a messuage and 320 acres in Lower Cwm and a messuage called Upper Cwm both worth £44; 60 acres in Garway, Hereford worth £10; three acres in Llanrothall valued at £15; and £300 in the hands of Hugh Lewis. All the above, along with other properties and monies, amounted to lands with an annual

value of £459 and a capital sum of £310. All this was granted to Lord Delamere on a 31 year lease for a rent of £5 on the condition that he was able to prove the Crown's title in a court of law if anyone contested the commission's findings. That was not as easy as Lord Delamere had expected. The Duke of Beaufort, although he had been out of power since the Revolution, financed the defence of the above mentioned properties and monies. Beaufort had so much success with his defence that Lord Delamere, now the Earl of Warrington, protested in 1693 that he still had not received any financial benefits. The Earl died in January 1694 and his son continued the suits. Once he realized the strength of Beaufort and the costs of long litigation, he abandoned them.¹³⁷ A similar commission was established in 1690 under the leadership of Sir Richard Bulkeley to investigate possible recusant lands throughout Wales.¹³⁸ Here too the expectations of success were frustrated.

The different commissions and suits affected each Jesuit community differently. In 1693, the College of St Francis Xavier again reported an habitual income of 800 scudi. After the deduction of onera of 230 scudi, the net income should have been 570 scudi. However, hardly anything had been collected over the past four years. The college's only income was the 80 scudi it collected in alms. The Residence of St Winefrid, composed of three Jesuits, showed signs of financial improvement. Its annual income increased from 933 scudi to 1120 scudi. Over the past year, the residence had actually received only 304 scudi and had spent 400 scudi. Even though the expenses exceeded receipts, there remained

137. Cf. Hopkins, "The Commission for Superstitious Lands of the 1690s," PRO, SP 44/235/p. 436; SP 44/236a/p. 122; T 27/12/p. 92; T 52/14/pp. 321-344; T 54/13/p. 123; C 205/19/7-8 (printed in Miscellanea II [London, 1906] CRS 2); Bodl, MS Dep c 233, f. 127.

138. PRO, T 27/12/p. 323.

143 scudi in cash. The debts totalled 108 scudi. Owed 4502 scudi, the community doubted that it would receive any of it because it was in the hands of some Catholics who, because of the troubled times, were unable to pay.

There were five Jesuits in the College of St Francis Xavier in 1696. The Catalogus Tertius Rerum still recorded an annual revenue of 800 scudi with onera of 230 scudi. The college was still able to collect only a small amount of it. The 80 scudi in alms was all that the college had for its support. There were two Jesuits in the Residence of St Winefrid. Once again the residence had an annual income of 1120 scudi. Its ordinary expenses were 300 scudi. During the past year, the community was able to collect less than 300 scudi in rents. The debts amounted to 120 scudi and the credits totalled 452 scudi.

Protected by the Statute of Frauds, the Jesuits survived Bulkeley's and Delamere's commissions and litigation, because of the lack of written proof. The communities thus retained the ownership of their properties and investments, as can be seen in the triennial catalogues. But, the persecution, suspicion and litigation made the collection of the rents almost impossible. The century ended with the college and the residence in possession of their foundations but unable to enjoy their annual fruits.

4. The College of the Immaculate Conception

During the Oates Plot, George Busby, the college's procurator, was captured in the house of Mr Powtrell at West Hallam on 17 March 1681. He had a number of deeds and writings with him. Henry Gilbert, the justice of the peace of Locko, read through the documents and returned them to a desk drawer. The next day the papers had mysteriously disappeared. However, Gilbert could recall enough data from his reading

to request, and to receive, an Exchequer commission to investigate the property which, he alleged, had been given to superstitious uses.

The commission first met on 6 May 1681. Intermittently, the commissioners heard testimonies during the next fifteen months. Most of the testimonies were non-committal. Proof finally depended on one William Hurd, Thomas Eyre's bailiff. The verdict went against Eyre (who had been accused of being a trustee for the Society) on 9 October 1682 and the commissioners ordered that the lands of both Rowland and Thomas Eyre that had been assigned to superstitious uses be seized and forfeited to the Crown. Luckily for Thomas Eyre, he had already redeemed the mortgages for Litton and Blyth Meadows or they too would have been included among the forfeited lands.

Despite the commissioners' judgement, the estates were not seized. Although I have not found any record in the Public Record Office, the Eyres probably initiated litigation in order to prevent the confiscation. The successful recovery of the business papers from the drawer left the prosecution with no written proof of Jesuit ownership. Thomas Eyre conveyed the property to his lawyer brother-in-law, Edward Bedingfeld, during the reign of James II. However, after the Glorious Revolution, the lands were lost completely by some means unknown to us. They were rewarded to a Francis Street, a professional informer, and were subject to an annual charge of £50 to be paid to the Vicar of Newark-on-Trent.¹³⁹

As if the litigation over the Ashbourne lands were not enough, the college had other problems over money it had invested with Henry Neville of Holt, Leicestershire. Shortly after the outbreak of the Oates Plot,

139. PRO, C 205/19/3A; T 52/15/pp. 453-455. Street had earlier petitioned for a share in 1679, 1684 and 1685. The petitions were referred to the Lord Treasurer but nothing came of them (PRO, PC 2/68/p. 284; 2/70/p. 201; T 4/2/pp. 77-78; PC 2/71/pp. 85-86).

many Catholics sought, and received, permission to absent themselves from England. Henry Neville received his pass in January 1679 on condition that he left £300 as security against his placing his children in popish seminaries and schools on the continent.¹⁴⁰ Having had one brush with the anti-Catholic fanatics, Neville probably thought that it was much safer outside the country. An informer had claimed that Neville's estate had been mortgaged to the Society as security for a £2000 loan. Thus the accuser claimed, the money was properly forfeited to the Crown. The Lords of the Treasury ordered Neville to present himself for an examination. Neville did so. The Treasury Lords found nothing and Neville was given his pass to go abroad.¹⁴¹ Despite this apparent exoneration, the investigation continued. Neville's deeds were carefully studied and a bill was prepared in Exchequer to entitle the king to the money borrowed from the Jesuits. That sum was now £2500. To prevent the confiscation of the money, counter-bills were filed by many who claimed that the money was actually theirs and not the Society's. Although the court listened to all the claimants, the government suspected the Society to be behind all these attempts to prevent forfeiture.¹⁴² In early 1681, Henry Neville petitioned for leave to return to England to clear up the confusion. He requested the permission via the Duke of York on the grounds that he had to defend in the Exchequer the £2500 which Oates swore Neville held for the Jesuits.¹⁴³ The legal proceedings continued for two years. The counter-claims, whether they had been instigated by the Jesuits or not, served their purpose by slowing down the process. Although Neville mentioned Titus Oates as the discoverer in his petition to the Duke of York, the actual discoverers were Thomas

140. PRO, SP 29/411/2-4; PC 2/67/f. 2.

141. PRO, PC 2/68/pp. 79, 193.

142. PRO, SP 29/417/217; T 27/5/p. 66; T 54/8/p. 35.

143. PRO, SP 29/417/216; PC 2/69/p. 219.

Hughes and William Smith. But they had to defend themselves against the rapacious Oates. Because of the length and the cost of the litigation, Smith and Hughes were in desperate need of money and turned to the Treasury Lords for a loan to allow them to continue their prosecution. They promised to repay them from their moiety of the forfeited money.¹⁴⁴ The court passed its judgement in late 1682/early 1683 and decided that the money had indeed been lent to Neville by the Jesuits and that he had mortgaged his house as security. The Privy Council decided that Hughes' and Smith's share would be £500, which the Treasury Lords were ordered to pay on 16 June 1683.¹⁴⁵

As a result of the attacks on the college's investments, it had no income to report in the catalogue of 1685. Until the college was able to recover its sources of income, the Jesuits were forced to depend on alms for their support. Whether the college was able to recover its investments during the reign of King James II, we cannot say. Unlike many other colleges, there were no major renovations and constructions here during James' reign. Neither schools nor public chapels were opened. This singular lack of activity was due to the lack of money. In the chaos after the fall of James, one of the priests of the college was arrested and imprisoned under a suspended sentence of death. The Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1690 contained no data about the college.

There were three Jesuits in the college in 1693 and the community had recovered some of its sources of income. Its habitual income from the capital fund and from the properties in London was 600 scudi but barely 30 scudi had been collected over the past year. Regular alms

144. PRO, SP 29/417/121; T 4/1/pp. 523-524.

145. PRO, PC 2/69/pp. 609-610, 695-697; T 54/9/pp. 197-198; T 52/9/p. 177; T 53/4/p. 207; T 60/39/p. 81.

had contributed 40 more scudi. The rectors support came from an annual pension of 80 scudi from his parents. The habitual income had increased by 150 scudi to 750 scudi in 1696. The college of five Jesuits also collected 160 scudi in alms. The money that the college had actually received over the past year just covered expenses.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the once wealthy College of the Immaculate Conception had fallen on hard times. Most of the foundation had been lost or stolen. The income that its investments had generated had fallen to 750 scudi in 1696, most of which could not even be collected. Not surprisingly, the college hoped for better times; until they arrived, the men had to rely on alms to balance their accounts.

5. The College of the Holy Apostles

With the recovery of the estate, real and personal, that had been stoken by John Travers, the college's finances had improved by 1685.¹⁴⁶ Since the last financial catalogue, the gross income had risen by nearly 1400 scudi. The college now had enough income to support 19 Jesuits, ten more than there were. During the reign of King James II, Bury St Edmunds became the centre of the college's activities. The Society had purchased a house there in August 1682 for £80. Over the next twenty years, there were numerous references to it in the college's accounts. Money was spent on alterations, chapel furnishings, water closets, and hospitality for Jesuit visitors. The college was also in possession of some of the former abbey lands. Whether those lands were identical with those purchased in 1682 is not known. At Bury the fathers opened a public chapel and a school during James II's reign and many of them lived near the abbey ruins. The Benedictines were more than slightly apprehensive of the Society's acquisition of former monastic lands.

¹⁴⁶. John Warner to the General, 18 February 1683, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f.43v.

Dom Joseph Johnston, O.S.B., in a near-contemporary account, explained the fears of the lay owners of the suppressed abbey at Bury St Edmunds on the accession of James II. The owners had proposed to sell the land to the Benedictines. Fearing that such a sale would have a disastrous reaction, the king advised the Benedictines not to buy it. They acquiesced. To their astonishment, the Jesuits bought the land: "how different a view they presented his Majesty of it being properer & safer for them to make such purchases than us, is more than we are able to conceive or comprehend. Religious Societies, of all people w^t ever, ought not to forget y^e great fundamental maxime of Christianity Not to do to another what they would not have done to themselves." By the end of 1686, the Benedictines feared that the Society planned to annex even St Alban's - and other former monastic sites.¹⁴⁷

In early 1681 the college was involved in a joint investment with the other Jesuit colleges in England. The Society purchased a number of houses in Aldgate, London. Individual colleges contributed a share of the total investment of £3000.¹⁴⁸ Holy Apostles paid £800 and held 4/15 of the investment. On its share, the college collected £40 in annual rents. When the houses were eventually sold in 1783, the college received slightly less than £400 for its share.¹⁴⁹

The invasion of William of Orange ended the days of hope. The

147. "Collections for a History of James II," BL, Add MS 10118, f. 394; J.C.H. Aveling, The Handle and the Axe (London, 1976) p. 236.

148. John Warner to the General, 10 December 1681, CUL, MS Ll. 1. 19, f. 37.

149. ASJ, Foley MS IV, f. 150v; College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1884, f. 18. Brother Foley has confused two distinct properties in his discussion: the Queen Street houses owned before the Oates Plot and the Aldgate houses that were purchased in 1681.

crowds destroyed the chapel and the school in Bury and the net income from the college's houses, farms, and pensions fell to 657 scudi in 1690. The actual income received was slightly higher: the college collected 947 scudi in cash and goods valued at 183 scudi. There remained 171 scudi in cash. The college had debts of 666 scudi and credits of 665 scudi. There were 12 Jesuits scattered throughout the college in 1693. Their habitual income had increased by 142 scudi to 900 scudi but the college had been prevented from collecting almost all of it. In fact, the college had received only 290 scudi of its income. Alms contributed 240 scudi more. Both debts and credits had risen over the three year period: the debts from 666 to 1300 scudi and the credits from 665 to 1600 scudi. The college was not able to support any more men since it had already exhausted some sources of its income in attempts to find enough money to support the 12 Jesuits already there. Nonetheless there were three more Jesuits stationed there in 1696; and the presence of three extra men stretched the limited resources still farther. The college was again forced to dip into its capital to support these men. Moreover by the end of the century, the College of the Holy Apostles had nearly lost two distinct endowments. Its habitual income had fallen by more than half and it could not collect what survived. The prospects were not bright: lack of money prevented the expansion of the mission and demanded the expenditure of capital to balance the books.

6. The College of St Chad

Peter Walker (vere Giffard), the college's procurator, was captured during the Oates Plot. Apparently all his ledgers and financial papers were confiscated at the same time. The Treasury Lords ordered all the papers and books forwarded to London and a commission for superstitious uses was set up in March 1681 to investigate the allegations about popish

investments in Staffordshire. The committee judged that sums of money in the hands of John Moore, of Kirlington, Notts., Herbert Aston of Bellamere, Staffs., Charles and Thomas Giffard, and Richard Biddulph of Staffordshire had been illegally employed for superstitious uses.¹⁵⁰ Despite the investigation the college's income increased by 126 scudi in 1685 but the assumption of a large number of financial obligations actually resulted in a decrease in the net income.

Under the leadership of the Marquis of Winchester, a commission was set up in 1689 to examine recusant lands in Middlesex, Worcestershire and Staffordshire. They returned the decision that Warston Farm and other lands in and near Ranton, Staffs. were held in trust for the Jesuits both in Staffordshire and at St Omers. For some reason, perhaps a reluctance to take on an expensive suit, Winchester did not immediately act on the commission's findings. In 1693, the Lords of the Treasury were still asking for particular details that would provide clear grounds for the forfeiture of the estates.¹⁵¹

By 1690 the college was deeply in debt. In an attempt to balance the books, the college had even spent 1000 scudi of its capital. Although it continued to record an annual income of 220 scudi, the Jesuits had lost the title to part of their foundation -- whether this was Warston Farm we can not be sure -- in the persecution and had received no income from it in years. The financial prospects remained bleak for the final decade. By 1696 the college had a debt of 1200 scudi and the Jesuits were forced to survive on alms, parental assistance and borrowed money.

150. PRO T 27/6/p. 184; C 205/19/3b; SP 28/414/156. The last document, dated 17 December 1680, was entitled "A discovery of the lands, tenements and hereditaments of diverse papists within the county of Staffordshire" and probably was a preliminary report that served in the commission's investigation.

151. PRO T 27/12/p. 141; T 54/14/p. 241; C 205/19/9.

7. The College of St Hugh

The new college reported its first annual revenue in the catalogue of 1685. Its income was 720 scudi, not as high as its pre-Civil War alms, but enough to support seven Jesuits. Either the general rescinded his demand that the income be sufficient for twelve men or this college lost much during the Oates Plot. Since there were never twelve Jesuits in this college, the former was more likely.

During the reign of James II, the college purchased a large house in Lincoln which it converted into a school and a public chapel. The mob destroyed it all in 1688/9. Two of the priests, having been thrown into prison, were released in 1690. The absence of any information for this college in the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1690 makes precise knowledge of the losses impossible.

There were six Jesuits in the college in 1693. The annual income from its farms and capital fund was 1300 scudi, almost double its 1685 revenues. The ordinary expenses were 550 scudi. But over the past year, the college had actually collected a mere 240 scudi from its revenues. There was a further 60 scudi in alms. The large investments in a public chapel and a school resulted in debts of 4200 scudi. There were credits of 1200 scudi. By 1696 the income had been eroded considerably. The college had lost many of the sources of its income. Revenues had fallen to 130 scudi. In the previous year, the college was only able to collect 80 scudi in alms and 240 scudi from its investments. The debts and credits remained the same.

8. The College of St Thomas of Canterbury

Despite the Oates Plot, the college's worth continued to increase. When Thomas Edwards (vere Edward Petre) relinquished the ledgers on 25

March 1681, the college's value was £4858.¹⁵² With such assets the income for 1685 is more understandable. In that year St Thomas's recorded a gross income of 966 scudi. Of the various colleges and residences in England, only the College of the Holy Apostles reported a larger income. Onera, the annuities, rents, and pensions, reduced the net income to 650 scudi - sufficient for the support of the ten Jesuits there.

St Thomas's was involved in the provincial investment in the Aldgate houses in London. It paid its portion, £400, in March 1685 and held 2/15 of the investment for which it gained £20 annually in rents. When the houses were sold in 1783 the college's share was £192-11s.¹⁵³

The College of St Thomas of Canterbury did not suffer as greatly as the other colleges and residences in England after the fall of James II. Perhaps their caution saved them. Unlike the other communities, they had opened neither schools nor public chapels. Two of the community who had been captured, were released on bail in 1690. The college had an annual income of 1100 scudi in 1690, a remarkable increase of almost 150 scudi over the revenues of 1685. Over the previous year the college had collected only 333 scudi and had spent 400 scudi. There were debts of 163 scudi and credits of 1533 scudi.

The college's capital increased still further under the rectorship of Francis Shelley (vere Theodore Lewis). When he closed the books on 29 October 1691 the college's assets totalled £6945-17s-8d. Most of the difficulties that the college had experienced with the collection of its rents had been resolved by 1693. There were eleven Jesuits in the college whose habitual income had risen to 1300 scudi. The net

152. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, f. 135; Foley MS, IV, f. 447.

153. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, f. 139v; Foley MS, IV, f. 453.

income was actually 600 lower than that of 1690 because of an increase in the onera. Over the past year, the college had collected 1200 scudi and had spent 1000 scudi. Ordinary alms amounted to 420 scudi. There was a surplus of 200 scudi. The college had debts of 220 scudi and credits of 1400 scudi.

The college numbered 13 Jesuits in 1696. Its annual revenues had fallen by 100 scudi to 1200 scudi and after the deduction of the ordinary expenses, the net income was 520 scudi. The college had collected a further 400 scudi in alms. Actual receipts of the previous year were 1100 scudi and expenditures were 980 scudi. There was a surplus of 120 scudi. The century ended with this college financially secure. Although its ordinary obligations were very high, the college was able to collect the various returns from its investments and thus support its men.

Having examined many of the sources of the college's income and a few of its ordinary obligations, it might be of interest to conclude the section with a sample of its expenses.¹⁵⁴ Throughout the 1680s the "factors," (i.e. the members of the community) received £60 to pay for their basic needs. Extraordinary expenses were treated separately. The usual charge of £6-11s for a horse, saddle, etc. appeared regularly throughout the accounts. In 1681 one of the Jesuits spent four months in London with his patron. That cost the college £25. A two-month stay in London in 1683 cost £16. No London stays were recorded in 1682 but £12-3s-4d was spent on a trip to that city. The Jesuit involved must have travelled first class because a trip to Ghent in the same year only cost £6! A glance at the other accounts revealed that

154. ASJ, College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839, ff. 135-149.

the college spent £1-11s-9d on books, £1-19s-10d on letters, £7-11s-9d for journeys, messengers and letters, £5-12s-8d for gifts and presents sent to London, and £2-0s-6d for wine at a profession of vows. There were also a number of entries for charitable causes. In 1682 the college sent £5 to the Poor Clares of Gravelines and to Lady Clare, the wife of the Jesuit Sir John Warner, who had entered the convent in Dunkirk. The Jesuit prisoners in Newgate and in Derby received £5 in 1682 and 1684. Finally, the college sent £5 annually to the provincial's office in London to defray expenses of the province.

9. The Residence of St John

Without Petre's proposed foundation, the residence had an income of only 100 scudi in 1685. The seven Jesuits there were compelled to rely on precarious alms for their sustenance. With the accession of a Catholic king, the residence constructed and opened a school in Durham. It was destroyed and one priest was taken prisoner in 1688. In 1690, however, the residence was still able to collect its income. The habitual income from the farms, houses and residences was 150 scudi. The net income was 139 scudi. Over the past year, the residence was actually able to collect much more - 256 scudi - and had spent 197 scudi. There was a surplus of 59 scudi. With no debts, the residence held credits of 83 scudi.

St John's began to feel the effects of the fall of James II in 1693. There were twelve Jesuits scattered throughout the district in that year. Each served between 200 and 300 Catholics. The residence's farms and houses returned 240 scudi annually, an income 90 scudi higher than that of 1690. Since most of the property had been confiscated during the persecution, the residence had collected only 40 scudi in revenue and 210 scudi in alms over the past year. The debts totalled

220 scudi; the credits, 400 scudi. The residence also had 80 scudi in ready money. The 1696 catalogue duplicated that of 1693. The century ended with St John's entitled to a reasonably high annual income but prevented from collecting it because of the confiscation of its lands.

10. The Residence of St Michael

After the Oates Plot the residence recorded a small annual income of 180 scudi from rents and produce in 1685. Alms were needed to support the seven Jesuits there. Despite the precarious monetary situation, the residence sank large sums of money into a public chapel and a school during the glorious days of King James II. The chapel in York was later found to be too small and too inconveniently sited so it was transferred to Pontefract. There religion thrived. Father Henry Hamerton, already busy with confessions, sermons and instructions, opened a school for about 60 pupils. Unable to be always present himself, he employed a secular priest who had been educated in Jesuit schools. The schoolmaster received fees from the students and a salary of 66 scudi from Hamerton. The Society also paid for the books, catechisms, etc. from the alms that they had collected. The students made such progress with their education and the fame of the school became so great that many Protestants sent their children there.¹⁵⁵ But the fall of James destroyed all Catholic works in its wake and the residence was left with a large debt. The residence had neither revenues nor ordinary expenses in 1690 but its benefactors rallied to its need with unprecedented gifts. St Michael's received 1666 scudi in cash and another 105 scudi in goods. Since it spent only 166 in cash and 105 scudi in goods, there was a 1500 scudi surplus. The residence had neither credits or debts.

155. Annual Letter of 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, f. 163 and ARSI, Anglia 35, p. 231 translated in Foley, Records, V, 727.

Francis Street, who had already profited for his discovery of concealed lands in Derbyshire, claimed in 1693 that he could make a similar disclosure in Yorkshire. He requested a commission of inquiry for the county. Two months later a commission was established under the chairmanship of Thomas Lord Fairfax. On 29 July the commission judged that the manors of Westnewton and Marton had been settled by the Viscount Dunbar in trust for certain Jesuits. Using the story of a secret meeting of Catholics in 1686 as the basis for his accusations, a certain John Taaffe told the commission about Viscount Dunbar's gifts. Taaffe hoped that the Viscount, having enough problems with an unfaithful wife, would offer no resistance. Accordingly, Street requested that the discovered estates be given over to what he called true piety.¹⁵⁶

Whether Viscount Dunbar and others forfeited their estates, we do not know. But, judging by the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1693, the Society does not seem to have lost anything. The eight Jesuits in the residence had an annual income of 300 scudi. Although the residence was able to collect only 120 scudi over the past year, the prospects were good because the residence had obtained regular sources of income. Ordinary alms contributed a further 38 scudi and there were no debts. On the other hand the community held 1300 scudi in credits of which there was little hope of payment. The residence again reported an annual revenue of 300 scudi in 1696 but only 120 scudi had been gathered by the six Jesuits there. Alms totalled 80 scudi. There were no debts and the 1300 scudi in credits had been written off as lost.

11. The Residence of St Mary

By 1685 the residence had acquired an annual revenue of 197 scudi.

156. PRO PC 2/75/p. 144; T 1/28/43; T 27/14/p. 106; C 205/19/15; cf. Hopkins, "The Commission for Superstitious Lands of the 1690s."

A large number of financial obligations left the residence with a net income of only 81 scudi. Alms enabled the residence to make ends meet.

The Society was intimately involved with the religious policies of King James II, especially at Oxford. One of the Jesuits there received John Massey, the Dean of Christ Church, into the Catholic Church. Massey established a Catholic chapel in the college, possibly in the Deanery itself, and took a Catholic chaplain. Anthony à Wood named the chaplain as a Mr Ward and indiscriminately referred to him as a Jesuit and as a secular priest.¹⁵⁷ Mr Ward was, however, not a Jesuit. We know this because Henry Pelham (vere Warren), after the destruction of the Glorious Revolution, surveyed the many activities of the Jesuits in Oxford in a letter to Father General González. He informed the general that, although Dean Massey had been received by a Jesuit, there had been no Jesuit at Christ Church.¹⁵⁸

The Master of University College, Obadiah Walker, became a Catholic and named a Jesuit, Joseph Wakeman, as his chaplain. Wakeman, whose services in the chapel attracted large crowds, held the revenues of a fellowship but he did not have the title.¹⁵⁹

James' principal religious efforts were directed towards Magdalen College. One of the fellows imposed upon the college was the Jesuit Thomas Fairfax (alias Beckett). Fairfax was appointed professor of philosophy and also had an expertise in Oriental languages. Shortly after the accession of James the provincial, John Keynes, thought it

157. Life and Times, edited by Andrew Clark (Oxford, 1891-1900) Oxford Historical Society, III, 215, 260, 285.

158. 2 May 1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, f. 184 translated in Foley, Records, V, 956-957.

159. Life and Times, III, 276, 298.

wise to petition the general for permission to send qualified men to take D.D. degrees. Such credentials would be necessary to fill the academic posts that, it was presumed, would soon be available. The general permitted three Jesuits to pursue degrees at Trèves, one of whom was Thomas Fairfax.¹⁶⁰ Once at Magdalen College, Fairfax did not neglect the religious opportunities that arose. On 25 April 1688 he preached the St Mark's sermon. Wearing a simple surplice, he delivered the sermon, not from the pulpit, but from the middle of the choir. Anthony à Wood, who had not been in attendance, reported that the sermon was dull.¹⁶¹

The hopes built on James II and a Catholic succession tottered and fell. The chapels were closed; Thomas Fairfax was attacked; other Jesuits were pursued. One was arrested but later released. Surprisingly the effect on finances was slight. The residence still received 178 scudi from the pensions and farms. Ordinary expenses of 140 scudi left the residence with a net income of 38 scudi. Over the previous year, the residence had actually received 667 scudi in cash and 514 scudi in goods. There were cash expenditures of 515 scudi and there remained 666 scudi in cash. There were no debts and the residence held credits of 748 scudi. By 1693 there was an even greater improvement. The gross annual income had increased by 62 scudi to 240 scudi and the onera totalled 70 scudi, half that of 1690. Over the past year the residence had spent 720 scudi. There were no debts and the credits were worth 1600 scudi. In 1696 the six Jesuits in the residence again reported an annual income of 240 scudi and a net income of 170 scudi. Over the previous year 600 scudi had been collected and

160. Annual Letter of 1685-1690, ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts II, ff. 173-174 and ARSI, Anglia 35, pp. 238-239 translated in Foley, Records, V, 821-822, 954-956.

161. Life and Times, III, 265.

the expenses were 700 scudi. The residence held credits worth 1600 scudi though, true enough, payment was uncertain.

12. The Residence of Blessed Stanislas

Around 1682/3, in an attempt to evaluate the extent of the damage caused by the Oates Plot, Alexander Keynes, the superior of the residence, drew up a long description of his community's state.¹⁶² Once a thriving residence, there now remained only three Jesuits, one for each county that the residence served. The financial resources had decreased with the number of Jesuits. Keynes had found bonds among the residence's ledgers of nineteen Catholics for sums of money that totalled between £700 and £800 but there were no hopes for their repayment. The residence's resources were few. Mr Cary of Tor Abbey in Devon held a bond for £300 and a John Martin of Balstonborough, Somerset had another £100. A Protestant in north Devon paid £6 interest on a loan from the residence, a loan secured with his property. Other loans to various individuals amounted to nearly £40. The residence had deposited two or three thousand books and three sets of liturgical vestments in various places in Devon. Nonetheless, in the catalogue of 1685, the residence had no income to report and had to rely on alms for its support. Why a residence with £400 farmed out capital and £46 in annual interest on loans recorded no income in the catalogue is a mystery.

There is no information about this residence in the 1690 catalogue. In 1693 and 1696 the three Jesuits there had no annual income. They received about 40 scudi in alms each year but after the death of an 83 year-old man who had named the residence as beneficiary the residence expected to receive either 400 scudi in cash or an annual pension of 29 scudi. The century ended with no regular income; the community

162. ASJ, Cardwell Transcripts I, f. 73 printed in Foley, Records, V, 968-969.

subsisted on 40 scudi annually in alms and hopes for future legacies.

13. The Residence of St George

Despite all the loans, investments, bequests and estate transactions in which this residence was involved, it received only the humble sum of £16-14s for an unspecified year in the early 1680s.¹⁶³ The Catalogus Tertius Rerum reported a slightly higher gross income in 1685; 97 scudi or £24-5s. Alms supplemented the net income of 77 scudi to support the seven Jesuits. The annual income increased significantly during the early years of the reign of King James II. By 1687 the annual revenue was £93 with onera of £18-13s. Included in the £93 was £50 given by the provincial. A note explained that the £50 was the result of an agreement made between the provincial and the superior of the residence on 25 June 1687 whereby the provincial and his successors promised to pay the residence £50 annually but nothing was said about either the length of time during which payment would be made or the reasons behind the agreement.¹⁶⁴ It would seem most likely that some unnamed benefactor had given a source of income to the province with the request that some of the revenue generated by it be used to support the missionaries in Worcestershire. Because the donor specified neither the amount nor the percentage of the income that should be forwarded, the provincial and the superior had to work out an equitable agreement.

Despite that brief period of hope, the residence compiled a list of its literacy and ecclesiastical possessions scattered throughout the district. The Earl of Shrewsbury kept the major library of the residence at his home in Grafton. Other books were stored with the Berkeleys at Ravenshill, at Sir Isaac Gibson's house in Worcester and at

163. ASJ, The Residence of St George 1635-1695, ff. 138-139.

164. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, f. 169.

Gubberhill. Vestments and alter supplies were kept at Ravenshill, at Sir Isaac's and with "young Mr Berkeley" (at Spetchley?).¹⁶⁵

With the Glorious Revolution, the annual revenues from the residence's houses, farms and pensions amounted to 73 scudi, a fall of 24 scudi since the last catalogue and a fall of £75-15s over the sums reported in 1687. The ordinary expenses of 42 scudi reduced the net income to 31 scudi. The residence, however, had not collected any rents for two years and had received only 50 scudi in alms over the past year. Its expenses were 55 scudi. The debt stood at 110 scudi; the credits at 76 scudi. There were nine Jesuits in the residence in 1693. By this time the community's fortunes showed some signs of improvement: the gross income had risen by 107 scudi. After the deduction of the regular expenses of 20 scudi, the net income was 160 scudi. Over the previous year, the residence had actually received 500 scudi in revenue and 230 scudi in alms. There had been expenses of 520 scudi. St George held 900 scudi in ready cash and had debts of 50 scudi and held credits of 33 scudi. The Society, having been named a beneficiary, hoped to inherit a capital fund of 16000 scudi, with an annual income of 240 scudi. This was Sir George Wintour's legacy which, as we have seen, was given to the Society.

The annual revenue and the onera remained at 180 and 20 scudi respectively in 1696. The nine Jesuits had received a further 230 scudi in alms. The debts had increased to 520 scudi and the credits, to 900 scudi. The residence's ready money was reduced to 500 scudi. Hope for the £4000 legacy was still high.

165. ASJ, Residence of St George 1635-1695, f. 170.

14. Liège College

Liège's financial position remained precarious. The annual revenue continued to fall and was only 6191 scudi in 1685. After the deduction of the ordinary expenses, the net income of 6118 scudi could only support 74 of the 82 Jesuits in the college. The provincial came to Liège's assistance with a subsidy of 800 scudi and Queen Catherine of Braganza and the Duchess of York each donated 200 scudi to the college.¹⁶⁶ Nonetheless, there was only slight improvement by 1690. Because of a reduction in the college's ordinary expenses, the net income of 6176 scudi was 58 scudi higher than that of 1685. Over the previous year, the college had actually collected 8854 scudi in cash and had spent 7405 scudi. Besides 1149 scudi in cash, there remained goods valued at 224 scudi. The debt was 6630 scudi; the credits totalled 3368 scudi.

The habitual income of Liège changed very slightly between 1690 and 1693. From its Bavarian pension, the Roman vineyards, rents and investments the college received slightly more than 6187 scudi. The deduction of the ordinary expenses left a net income of slightly more than 6014 scudi, adequate for the support of 75 Jesuits. There were 81 Jesuits in the college. Over the past year, the college had actually collected a little more than 10120 scudi and had spent just under 9545 scudi. The college held credits valued at 3533 scudi and was in debt to the amount of 8478 scudi. By 1696, the net income had risen by slightly more than 900 scudi to 6954 scudi. The catalogue said nothing about debts and credits.

166. John Warner to the General, 4 April 1681, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19 f. 32v; same to same, 9 April 1683, Ibid., f. 47v.

15. The Novitiate at Watten

Because of the shortage of funds, the province again restricted the number of novices that the novitiate could accept. As we have seen, in previous periods of monetary depression the general had permitted the novitiate to accept some aid from the novices' parents but he would not allow the province to demand support. In 1684 the provincial, John Keynes, again requested the general's permission to accept any assistance that parents might offer. This time the general denied the request. Deprived of parental relief, Watten's financial burden was increased. The provincial forwarded 600 scudi to Watten from his own fund and assigned some of Charles Palmer's (vere Poulton's) annuity to it.¹⁶⁷ In 1685 the gross income from Watten's portfolio was 3980 scudi, an increase of 1700 scudi since 1672. The regular financial obligations had increased by a similar amount so that the net income of 1132 scudi was only an increase of 70 scudi. There were 39 Jesuits at the novitiate, nearly twice the number that the income would support.

Watten's slow financial recovery was set back by the fall of James II when its need became so great that the general reversed his earlier decision and permitted the province to accept assistance from parents and relatives for the support of the novices.¹⁶⁸ In 1690 the net income had increased by 90 scudi to 1222 scudi but, over the previous year, the novitiate had actually collected much more: 9443 scudi, 3752

167. John Warner to Father Richard Strange, 22 April 1679, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f. 77; same to Charles Palmer (vere Poulton), 30 September 1679, Ibid., f. 79v; same to general, 4 April 1681, Ibid., f. 32v; General to John Warner, 22 July 1684, Epp. Gen. II, f. 440; same to John Keynes, 22 July 1684, Ibid., f. 440v. Cf. also Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America Colonial and Federal, Text I, p. 68 footnote 7.

168. General to John Keynes, 20 September 1687, Epp. Gen. II, f. 476; same to Francis Sanders, 29 July 1690, Ibid., f. 496; same to John Clare (vere Warner), 15 October 1690, Ibid. f. 497v.

in cash and 5691 in other forms, e.g. produce, wood, etc. Included in this total was the parental support for the novices. The novitiate's expenses were 6398 scudi, 3722 in cash and 2676 in other forms. There remained 30 scudi in cash and 3018 (sic) scudi in other forms. Watten had contracted debts of 3475 scudi but held credits of 2803 scudi.

In order to restore some balance to the financial ledgers, the novitiate continued to accept some monetary assistance from the novices' parents and to restrict the number of candidates accepted.¹⁶⁹ The net income generated by the novitiate's endowment fell slightly to 1191 scudi. Because of the sums contributed by the novices' parents, the novitiate had actually received 7968 scudi in cash and 5977 scudi in goods over the past year. Its expenditures were 6085 scudi in cash and 2613 scudi in goods. There was a surplus of 1883 scudi in cash and 3364 scudi in goods. The community, comprised of 38 Jesuits, had reduced its debt to 573 scudi and had increased the credits to 3754.

In 1696 there were 33 Jesuits at the novitiate. Its annual revenue had increased by 21 scudi to 4333 scudi but an increase in the ordinary expenses had reduced the net income to 1054 scudi. The debts amounted to 1747 scudi and the credits totalled 3467 scudi. Over the past year, the novitiate had actually received 5572 scudi and had spent 5503 scudi. There was a surplus of 69 scudi. The novitiate had also invested 1467 scudi in sheep and 4100 in horses and cows, and employed 24 labourers to look after the livestock and to farm the estate. The novitiate still relied on the support provided by the novices' parents.

169. General to John Clare (vere Warner) 17 February 1691, Epp. Gen. II, f. 501v; same to same, 1 September 1691, Ibid., f. 506v; same to same, 22 March 1692, Ibid., f. 514; same to same, 6 December 1692, Ibid., f. 524.

16. The Tertianship at Ghent

Since 1672, Ghent's gross income from rents and investments had fallen slightly to 963 scudi. The deduction of 66 scudi for the regular expenses left a net income of 897 scudi, sufficient for 10 men. Besides the tertians, there were 8 men in the community. In order to support the tertians, the provincial aided the community with subsidies.¹⁷⁰ In 1690 the net income had fallen slightly to 888 scudi but, over the previous year, the community had collected 2176 scudi in revenues, subsidies, and alms, and had spent 910 scudi. There remained 1525 scudi (sic), 1349 in cash and 176 in goods. Ghent was not only able to stay out of debt but also to hold 2674 scudi in credits.

There were six Jesuits in the tertianship in Ghent in 1693. Their revenues from the endowment had risen by 19 scudi to 950 scudi. The net income was 896 scudi. During the past year, the tertianship had actually collected 2562 scudi and had spent 2063 scudi. Again, there was a surplus of 499 scudi and the community remained out of debt. For some unspecified reason, the upward swing of the community's finances was reversed by 1696. Although the annual revenue from the endowment had increased by 94.5 scudi to 1044.5 scudi, 344 scudi of that had not been paid for years. Between June 1694 and August 1696, the community had actually collected 4566 scudi and had spent 4719 scudi. The community was forced to borrow money in order to balance its books and had accumulated debts of 3300 scudi. Although Ghent held credits of 13000 scudi, it despaired of collecting them.

170. John Warner to the general, 4 April 1681, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f. 32v.

17. The English College at St Omers

In 1679 France acquired the city of St Omers as part of the Treaty of Nymegen. The Spanish pension to the English College ceased with the loss of the city. The French, however, promised to compensate for the loss. King Louis XIV promised 6000 livres annually but he was no more conscientious with the payments than the Spanish kings had been. Moreover, whenever the pension was paid, the amount varied. Fluctuations in the exchange rate also affected the real value of the pension.¹⁷¹ Although the college's patron changed, financial instability remained. Fears concerning the future of the college were aggravated by the Popish Plot. The revival of the penal law that forbade, under pain of death and the confiscation of all property, the sending of Catholic youth to the continent for education reduced the number of students. The obloquy raised against the college by Oates exacerbated the situation. In the light of the penal threat and anti-Catholic feeling, many considered it foolish to keep the school open. It was rash, they argued, to maintain a school of nearly 200 students in a foreign country that itself has been exhausted by recent wars. The college had few certain sources of income and there was little hope of collecting pensions from the students' parents in England. Closure was prevented by the appearance of many benefactors. As the Annual Letter of 1679 explained, "The Divine Goodness, out of the abundance of His mercy, was pleased to remove the difficulty by raising up benefactors abroad, and exciting the solicitude of parents at home, so that the Seminary was actually supplied with more and even better scholars than at any former period."¹⁷² The number and the quality of the scholars might have improved but the

171. Cf. Holt, "Free Places at the English College of St Omers and Bruges and the Liège Academy," 115.

172. Annual Letter of 1679, ARSI, Anglia 35, pp. 45-46 translated in Foley, Records, V, 70-71.

fiscal crisis remained. There was still a real danger that the school might be closed unless there was a subsidy.¹⁷³ By 1685 the college's gross income had fallen by almost 8000 scudi to 9420 scudi. The net income of 9072 scudi was adequate for 200 men. There were 206 members of the college. Even the accession of a Catholic king did not brighten St Omers' prospects. In late 1685 a fire destroyed most of the college. The construction of an even better building began almost immediately. The college's annual revenue was reduced by 230 scudi because of the termination of a pension formerly paid by the state of Artois. Despite the cancellation of the pension and the costs of construction, St Omers remained out of debt. By 1690 the annual revenue from the college's pensions and properties was 2082 scudi. The ordinary expenses were 435 scudi; the net income, 1647 scudi. Between 1689 and 1690 the college had actually received 12397 scudi. That total came from rents, pensions, students' fees and alms. The annual expenses were 10731 scudi and there remained 1666 scudi. The college had no debts. Although it held many credits, their payment was doubted. In 1693 the college received 12100 scudi from its pensions, the students' fees and its investments. Over the previous year, because of the alms that the college had received, it had actually collected 14000 scudi. Its expenses were 20300 scudi. Once again the college went into debt. Although it held credits of 6666 scudi, the debts totalled 6300 scudi. By 1696 the net income had fallen to 10309 scudi. The college had almost reduced its debt by half to 3873 scudi and its credits had increased to 12673 scudi, but the community was still dependent on alms for its support and to balance the books.

173. Thomas Stapleton to [John Warner?], 20 January 1679, SC, Anglia V, 90.

18. The English Province

The repercussions of the Popish Plot on the finances of the province were considerable. The English Jesuits lost much property and money during the persecution. In an attempt to prevent further losses, individual Jesuits apparently farmed out money to laymen, often without the permission of their superiors or the advice of the consultors. The provincial congregation discussed this matter in 1681 and formulated it into one of the postulata submitted to the general. The fathers asked the general to decree that no rector or superior in England be permitted to farm out any money without first informing at least two other colleges or residences, and that no individual Jesuit be allowed to do so without first obtaining the permission of his superior. The general agreed and all Jesuits in England were forbidden to entrust any money to laypeople without their superior's approval, lest, as often happened in the past, that money be lost to the Society. Moreover, the general instructed that all money be turned over to the superiors so that the needs of the individual Jesuits and the demands of their apostolates could be met.¹⁷⁴

During the persecution, the lack of funds at the ready disposal of the provincial was a consistent problem. The flight of a number of Jesuits from England to the continent overcrowded the colleges there, and many of the communities could not afford the extra members. The general asked other provinces to aid the English Jesuits in the emergency and both the Gallo- and the Flandro-Belgian provinces volunteered to take a few of the English. Meanwhile, the provincial sought donations and bequests to subsidize the continental communities and to assist the men that remained in England. In 1681 Warner was able to send aid to Liège, Ghent and Watten. Both the Queen and the

174. ARSI, Congr 82, f. 204.

Duchess of York gave 200 scudi apiece to Liège and the provincial's fund in 1683. The provincial had also used all the annuities and the pensions received by members of the province to meet the needs of the province and to assist the poorer communities. The Twelfth General Congregation (1682) threatened that policy. As we have seen, that congregation decreed that individual pensions and annuities might be accepted, not by the individual himself, but by his community. Thus the new provincial, John Keynes, feared that such pensions could no longer be used by him to meet the province's needs. He thus asked the general if the province might be dispensed from that requirement and continue its practice of collecting the pensions of the professed fathers for the payment of provincial expenses and for distribution among the poorer houses. In view of England's needs, the general agreed.¹⁷⁵

The provincial totals clearly demonstrated the reduction in the province's fortunes. The net income had fallen by 5626 scudi to 23702 scudi. Not all the communities had reported their estimated per capita expenses so we cannot determine how many men the net income should have supported. The catalogue also says nothing about debts and credits.

The most serious issue posed by the 1685 catalogue was the appearance of "annual revenue" for residences. We have noted that, by 1672, there was a common fund whose annual revenues were distributed among the residences. I suggested that this fund was operated according to the "Maryland model" in order to remain within the restrictions set by the Institute. But now we seem to have gone beyond those restrictions.

175. General to John Warner, 15 April 1679, Epp. Gen. II, f. 329v; John Warner to Anthony Lucas, 15 December 1679, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f. 83v; John Warner to the general, 4 April 1681, *Ibid.*, f. 32v; general to John Warner, 26 July 1681, Epp. Gen. II, f. 413v; John Warner to the general, 9 April 1683, CUL, MS Ll. 1.19, f. 47v; same to same, 27 May 1683, *Ibid.*, f. 50v; general to John Keynes, 20 November 1683, Epp. Gen. II, f. 432v.

Though constitutionally denied any right to regular income, each residence, with the exception of Blessed Stanislas, was the recipient of such revenue. This income was not regular, ordinary alms but returns (reditus) from the residences' real estate and investments. Whether or not this practice was in direct violation of the Society's Institute, the English province was not the only one whose residences possessed a regular income. According to the Catalogus Tertius Rerum Austriae of 1651, the majority of the residences of that province had some type of regular income.¹⁷⁶ Of the eight residences in the Austrian province, two were attached to colleges and shared in the collegiate foundations; one received revenues both from a college's foundation and also from the returns of a capital fund administered by a laymen; a fourth depended solely on alms; the fifth had uncertain income; and the remaining three had incomes from rents and investments. The existence of endowed residences in Austria shows that the practice, whether a violation of the Institute or a development of it, was not limited to England. The possibility that the practice was a violation of the Institute can be dismissed quickly. If it had been a flagrant disregard for the Constitutions, the English and the Austrian provinces would not have been so open about it. If they were so grossly ignoring one of the principles of the Institute, they would not have presented it so clearly in the catalogue for the general and all the procurators to see. If they had, they would have received some reaction from the general. We have often noted admonitions from the general on questionable practices and his advice on the maintenance of the purity of the Institute. I have found no comments in the general's correspondence about the residence's regular income -- nor, on the other hand, have I found any

176. Bodl, MS Rawl. C 693.

letter or instruction that permitted it. Could the explanation of this anomaly be a combination of historical necessity and constitutional interpretation? The devastation of war, especially the Thirty Years War itself, had weakened several of the European provinces. We have also seen how the English Civil War had damaged the English province. The residences in England were on the brink of collapse with the disappearance of the alms on which they depended. Presumably the other provinces had similar problems. To ensure the continuation of the residences and their works some way had to be found to escape from total dependence on alms. Regular income, in some form, was the only solution. In the "Maryland model" that we discussed earlier, the residences freed themselves from their dependence on alms and yet remained within the practices permitted by the Institute. Why was this model no longer satisfactory? Why did the residences receive their annual revenue themselves without the constitutionally acceptable mediation of the colleges? To this, I can only offer a tentative answer. In the "Maryland model," a college administered the residence's funds; its procurator oversaw the portfolio. Could the residences have become dissatisfied with the arrangement because of the unavailability and/or the incompetence of the procurator? A procurator's main priority was the investments of his college; those of the residence were of secondary importance. Besides, the procurator did not reside within the residence. Indeed, he might have lived some distance away and had been unable, in times of emergency, to attend to the residence's needs. One cannot ignore the possibility of fiscal incompetence. The procurator's lack of interest, unavailability, and inefficiency might have resulted in a loss of income. In the controversy over the administration of the funds of the College of the Holy Apostles, one of

the issues was the loss of part of the foundation through mismanagement. The residences might have wanted more local control over the investments and a clear distinction between their and the colleges' portfolios for this reason. But how could this be done without violating the Institute? By trustees. Lay trustees could do what the colleges had been doing. They would own the properties, oversee their use, and forward the revenues to the residences. The residences would then have an income but without the ownership of the endowment and without a legal right to the profits. In this way the Institute was preserved.

Between 1685 and 1690 the hopes and prospects of the English province were first buoyed up and then sunk. The accession of King James II inaugurated an era of promise for all Catholics. The Society opened a number of schools and discussed the transfer of the colleges from Belgium to England. The Jesuits moved above ground and, with money saved and borrowed, constructed new chapels and residences. These expenditures were investments in a glorious future. By 1690 James was in exile. The chapels, schools and residences had been destroyed and Jesuit property had been confiscated. John Clare (vere Warner) kept the general informed of the turmoil in England. Edward Ingelby (vere Tidders), the vice-provincial in England, had written to Clare that there were at least four lawsuits against the Society and that the Jesuits would probably lose all four - and, with them, most of the province's money and property. He feared that the province would be forced to borrow money to support those in prison and those without patrons. Indeed, there were more Jesuits now without patrons since fear had prompted many to dismiss the priests. A year later Clare again complained about the province's finances. The province had lost so much in the persecution and the income of all the residences and colleges was so uncertain that each community was obliged to turn to the provincial

for assistance. Clare, of course, did all he could with his own limited resources.¹⁷⁷ During the provincial congregation of 1690, the provincial asked the assembled fathers for suggestions for the improvement of the bleak financial condition of the province. Among the recommendations were proposals to refuse to accept novices for a few years; to send as many of the priests from the Belgian houses into England in order to relieve those communities of their financial burden; and to ask the general to commend the needs of the province to the procurators of other provinces. Only the third was accepted and adopted.¹⁷⁸

The absence of any financial reports from the Colleges of St Francis Xavier, Immaculate Conception, St Hugh and the Residence of Blessed Stanislas, and the omission of any estimate of the students' fees in the revenues of St Omers deflated the totals for 1690 and makes any comparison between them and the totals for 1685 impossible. Without any adjustments to compensate for the said omissions, the gross income had fallen by 10537 scudi. If we assume that the four omitted communities would have had the same income in 1690 as they had in 1685, the decline would have been by only 9048 scudi. If the students' fees had been included, the loss would have been reduced even further. Many of the communities had debts and most of them held large numbers of credits because of uncollected rents.

The triennial report of 1693 began with a brief description of the English province. According to the catalogue, the Jesuits in England, whose work was described as consisting of administering the sacraments, converting the Protestants and catechizing the Catholics, were dispersed

177. John Clare (vere Warner) to the general, 15 January 1690 and 9 April 1691, SC, Anglia V, 110, 111.

178. ARSI, Congr 84, ff. 197-203.

among the houses of the nobility and the gentry. Many of the fathers received their support from the families with whom they resided; others lived off the college's revenues. The latter, financially independent of any lay patron, had greater freedom in their apostolate. By 1693, the gross and net incomes of the provincial institutions had increased by 14169 scudi and 13545 scudi respectively. But we have seen how deceptive these figures were. Many of the rents had not been collected in years; much of the property had been confiscated. On paper the finances were strong; in reality the province's position was shaky. The debts had rocketed to 24077 scudi. Although the credits exceeded the debts by 5742 scudi, much of that money would never be collected. Thus the provincial congregation of 1693 once again asked the general to commend the needs of the province and its many men displaced by the troubles to the greater charity of the other provinces of the Society.¹⁷⁹

The totals in the catalogue for 1696 confirmed the continuing financial crisis of the province. The gross income had fallen by 483 scudi; the net income, by 1556 scudi. Throughout the catalogue, the compiler commented on how little of the revenues the Jesuits were able to collect. But despite the genuine need of the province, the provincial could nevertheless permit a scholastic, Henry Widdrington, to concede half his annual pension of £100 to his younger brothers. His family, because of recent financial losses, had requested a loan. Instead, the provincial gave them half the pension.¹⁸⁰ Great as the province's need was, it did not forget that others were needier.

179. ARSI, Congr 85, ff. 199-205v.

180. General to William Mumford, 29 May 1694, Epp. Gen. II, f. 539v; Cf. also Hughes, History of the Society of Jesus in North America Colonial and Federal, Text I, p. 68 footnote 7.

Throughout the last half of the seventeenth century, the English province never regained the financial stability that it had enjoyed during the reign of King Charles I. The English Civil War eroded much of the financial base; henceforth the province had to struggle for its support. The Oates Plot and the fall of King James II dealt further blows to the province. Attracted by offers of a moiety of any disclosed Jesuit wealth and property, former friends and former Jesuits led the pursuivants in their confiscations. But Jesuit losses were not just the result of rebellion and persecution. Compelled into secrecy by the penal statutes, the Society lost money, hid money, forgot where the money was invested and argued over the rightful ownership of funds. Despite theft, lawsuits, confiscations, apostasy, mismanagement, incompetence and impending financial ruin, the colleges and the residences persisted. The English laity were singularly loyal to the Society and their generosity sustained the province through all the turmoil and the changes. Surprisingly, the province's financial practices were in harmony with the regulations established by the Society's Institute. At times there were reprimands and admonitions; at other times there were concessions and exemptions. Generally, however, the province upheld the Institute.

* * * * *

Before we conclude these two chapters on the finances of the English province, I would like to return briefly to the accusations with which the investigation began. Rumours had it that the province was very wealthy. Legends reported hidden buckets of Jesuit gold. But just how wealthy was the province? Were the stories about its treasures justified? It should be clear from this investigation that there were no buckets of gold and that the rumours of vast wealth were manifestly

exaggerated. As we have often seen, the triennial catalogues were limited and flawed: they recorded the habitual and not the actual income, and ignored most of the alms that the communities received. Yet within the clear perimeters of the catalogues, it was only during the 1630s that the province could even be considered wealthy because it had an income larger than it needed for the support of its men. After 1642 the province never had that luxury again in the seventeenth century. After 1642 the province struggled and economized: men were sent to other provinces; the number of novices was restricted. The province never recovered from the English Civil War. Expansion was over. Thereafter the province struggled to maintain its position. When the English province began there were high prospects of an Anglo-Spanish marriage. It was a time of hope and enthusiasm. Seventy-five years later, when the century ended, the province was smaller and poorer and tied to a gradually fading Jacobite dream.

Conclusions

The end of this Society is to devote itself with God's grace not only to the salvation and perfection of the members' own souls, but also with that same grace to labour strenuously in giving aid toward the salvation and perfection of the souls of their fellowmen.¹

The purpose and goal of the Society were twofold: the salvation and sanctification not only of the individual Jesuit but also of his fellow men and women. Moreover, the entire thrust of Ignatian spirituality in both the Spiritual Exercises and the Constitutions was the consideration of the first insofar as it advanced the second. Every Jesuit was a member of a Society chiefly founded "for the defense and propagation of the faith and for the progress of souls in Christian life and doctrine."² The means by which he should propagate the faith were, primarily, sermons, "lectures", the Spiritual Exercises, education and hearing confessions. They were to receive priority and Ignatius urged that all the ordinary practices and customs of religious life should be considered in the context of these apostolates and either executed or modified insofar as they advanced the goals of the Society. The Society was primarily an apostolic religious order, one in which everything should be "essentially apostolic" and nothing ought to be directed exclusively to personal sanctification.³ Ignatius intended the Society to be an instrument of service and thus gave it a flexible, adaptable structure. In his pursuit of total availability, Ignatius eliminated the monastic practices that had become common to religious life. The Constitutions prescribed neither choral recitation of the divine office, common religious exercises, regular and obligatory

1. Cons. 3.

2. Formula of the Institute, 3.

3. Miguel A Fiorito, "Ignatius' Own Legislation on Prayer," Woodstock Letters 97 (1968) 200.

corporal austerities nor vows of stability. In this Ignatius freed the Society from the medieval concept of religious life and adapted it to the demands of a new world.⁴

The exigencies of the apostolate made Ignatius singularly flexible about the devotional and ascetical practices, and the style of life, of his followers. Although he laid down specific instructions for those Jesuits in formation, he said precious little about the requirements of for the formed. He did not think it expedient to formulate a general rule for "what pertains to prayer, meditation, and study and also in regard to the bodily practices of fasts, vigils, and other austerities or penances." Each Jesuit simply followed "discreet charity" and the advice and counsel of his own confessor. The Constitutions laid down only one principle: "the members should keep themselves alert that the excessive use of these practices may not weaken the bodily energies and consume time to such an extent that these energies are insufficient for the spiritual help of one's fellowmen according to our Institute; and on the other hand, they should be vigilant that these practices may not be reduced to such an extent that the spirit grows cool and the human and lower passions grow worse."⁵

Ignatius demanded that his followers critically examine everything, including their devotions and mortifications, in the light of the apostolic goals of the Society and to choose only those that furthered these goals. In 1561, five years after the death of Ignatius, Jerónimo Nadal, Ignatius' collaborator who had exercised a significant influence on the spiritual and constitutional development of the Society, summarized the Jesuit spirituality thus

4. Robert E. McNally, "St Ignatius: Prayer and the Early Society of Jesus," Woodstock Letters 94 (1965) 112.

5. Cons. 582. Cf. also Cons. 300-302.

Do all for the greater glory of God. Love the Institute. Love the end [of the Society]. Love and desire to work for that end. Perfect obedience. Prayer which is practical and carried into execution. Simplicity. Love of mortification. Love of suffering. Modesty in speech coupled with edification. Love to be despised. Diligence in daily observances. Walk before God and always in His presence. Practice the acts of the theological virtues, especially of charity. Develop the habit of an ever-activated love of God, in such a manner that this love may always be the motivating force in all one's actions, and that it may be the form of₆ all the virtues and give them the supreme value of charity.

As the Society grew and spread throughout the world, the demand for clearer requirements and regulations increased. Ignatius' constitutional exhortations and Nadal's spiritual summary were too nebulous. The demand for clarity resulted in a plethora of legislation. During the fifty years after the death of the Society's founder, the daily spiritual, apostolic and communal life of his followers became more regularized. Many have seen the introduction of different regulations and the installation of a regular daily order as movements away from the fundamental insight of Ignatius and towards the monastic confines that he had sought to avoid. Whether the legislation that proliferated during the generalates of Mercurian, Acquaviva and Vitelleschi was development or corruption is, luckily, an issue that we may avoid. For our purposes, it is sufficient to note that there was internal tension in the Society in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the period during which the English mission was conceived and nurtured, between those who wished to stabilize the Society and those who claimed to be remaining faithful to Ignatius. The clash between these two perspectives could be seen in the debate regarding the establishment of a Jesuit mission to England. As we have seen, Father General Mercurian was apprehensive about such a mission because he feared that the Jesuits

6. Quoted in Joseph de Guibert, The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice (Chicago, 1964) pp. 204-205.

would not be able to live the Society's Institute. After careful consideration, the general and his consultors concluded that the importance of the mission outweighed any possible concessions to the Institute. Mindful that the Institute was made for the apostolate and not vice versa, the general granted the necessary permission and urged the missionaries to adapt the demands of the Institute to the realities of an "underground" existence. Throughout this thesis, we have considered their consistent attempt to obey Mercurian's instructions. The attempts were not without problems, some of which revolved around interpretations of the Institute. The perennial dispute between the English and the Spanish Jesuits over the government of the seminaries was but one example of that internal tension in the Society. The English mission was a pioneer in the Society. Never before had a permanent mission remained independent. Never had a mission been governed by a prefecture. In order to further its work, the general was even willing to permit the mission to use the regular income of the English College for its support. Once the English vice-province and province had been created (thanks not least to a constitutional entanglement and the dreams of a Spanish match), the English practices came more into line with those of the Society universal.

The province was governed by a provincial who, like his European and Asian counterparts, occasionally delegated his authority to a vice-provincial for reasons of efficiency. Within the province, there were colleges, houses of formation and residence. Unlike most other provinces, England did not have a professed house. All the English communities had the administrative structure common to the Society, though they at first changed their rectors and superiors a little less regularly, but later

they did so with the required frequency. With the exceptions of the provincial's control of a few collegiate foundations and of the use of collegiate revenues for other missions, the English financial practices were harmonious with those prescribed. The English province, however, was more than just an institution; it was a society of religious men. Too often the spiritual side of the English Jesuit mission has been neglected. Despite plans to the contrary, space demands that that oversight be perpetuated.

Nonetheless, this final chapter can briefly discuss one problem that plagued not only the Society but all the priests in England and had potentially serious effects on their spiritual lives: their relationship with the gentry. This relationship was a double-edged one. On the one hand, the gentry provided the clergy with the protection and the support that they needed for their mission. With that, on the other hand, came the danger of domestication. Would the patron impose restrictions on the apostolic activities of the priest either because of fear or because of jealousy? Would the patron take advantage of his position and demand that the priest involve himself in occupations inappropriate for a religious? Would the voice of the immediate patron replace the voice of the distant superior as the vox Dei? Enconced in a manor house, the clergy lived a style of life that was, at least superficially, alien to their religious vocation. The temptation to ape the behaviour and style of their hosts would be ever present. And it was all too easy to justify any extravagance and wordly comfort in apostolic terms: the need for a disguise and the requirements of a role. Granted that the demands of the English mission and the need for concealment required the clergy to pose as soldiers, stewards and gentlemen, where did the necessity end and self-indulgence begin? Could the priests work in such conditions without assimilating to the role that they had adopted and without

corrosion of religious fervour and apostolic zeal? The disguises and the roles provided professional anonymity that was potentially dangerous.

Almost from the beginning the Jesuits were accused both of playing up to the gentry and of adopting an expensive life-style. The fathers reputedly used their influence to have the secular priests evicted from the comfortable houses that they themselves coveted. Again and again, especially in the more vicious literature of the Archpriest Controversy, these charges appeared. As we have seen, it cannot be denied that the Society did cultivate the wealthy and the powerful. The Jesuits were well aware of the advantages that would accrue to their apostolate from close co-operation with men of rank and position. The latter's influence would either promote or retard the mission's progress. This, however, set the mission on a turbulent course. With a strong religious community or an ecclesiastical structure to support him, a priest could safely co-operate with the gentry; on his own, close co-operation could lead to suffocation.

The first problem to emerge from the unique living situation concerned poverty. The general warned the English Jesuits in his letter of 9 January 1607 of the temptations inherent in their domestic arrangements. Since the missionaries would not always be able to practice external poverty, the general urged them to develop an interior poverty, a spiritual indifference to created things. Close contact with their patron's family could also result in a number of temptations against chastity. The fathers should therefore avoid all familiarity and be very circumspect about their conversation and behaviour.⁷ Because of their

7. SC, Anglia III, 75; Coll P, ff. 479-482; Bodl, Rawl MS D 1351, f. 110; PRO, SP 14/24/33 printed in More, Historia Provinciae Anglicanae Societatis Iesu, pp. 350-355.

separation, the missionaries could not resort to their superiors whenever they needed money. Thus every Jesuit was permitted to manage his own finances. Private possession of money was often condemned as a violation of the Institute's teaching on poverty. In order to monitor the use of all money, each missionary had to send periodic accounts to his superior, who would make sure that the expenses stayed within the limits of poverty.⁸

The vice-provincial congregation of 1622 issued a number of instructions on possible problems in the missionaries' style of life. Since most Jesuits resided with families, they might find themselves in the midst of marital and domestic arguments and called upon to side with one party or another. Each priest should do everything possible to stay out of such disputes. In the priest's daily contact with a large number of people, many of whom were ignorant of his true identity, over-familiarity could be a danger. As a result of these encounters, there might be invitations and offer of hospitality. Only those that could not be avoided should be accepted. Any doubtful case should be referred to the vice-provincial for his decision. The casual visitation of laymen was forbidden and could only be undertaken with the superior's permission. No one was allowed to travel to London without the explicit permission of the vice-provincial, unless the immediate superior judged it too great an emergency to wait for the vice-provincial's consent. In that case, the superior must later explain in writing the reasons for the urgency. Trips to London involved considerable expense and could be a source of disedification if made frequently. The memorial reminded the vice-province that the choice of food and clothing should

8. Instructions to Robert Jones, 28 March 1609, Epp. Gen. I, f. 9v and ARSI, Anglia 36, f. 2; Annual Letter of 1615, ARSI, Anglia 31I, pp. 631-656 translated in Foley, Records, VII/2, 1077.

be dictated by the vow of poverty. Each man must keep careful records of all monies that he had either received, borrowed or spent lest such transactions violated his vow of poverty. Every three months he was obliged to forward these accounts to his superior, who, in turn, would forward them to the vice-provincial every six months. Both wine and tobacco were expressly forbidden.⁹ Tobacco could be taken only for medicinal reasons and then only after other remedies had failed and the superior had granted his approval.¹⁰

Decree 24 of the Eighth General Congregation (1645-1646) expressly prohibited non-Jesuit involvement in the administration of the Society. Father General Vitelleschi had earlier forbidden all Jesuits from asking their powerful lay friends to intervene in the internal affairs of the Society. The general congregation now ratified Vitelleschi's injunction. The new decree caused special problems in England where patronal intercession was fairly common.

During the provincialate of Richard Blount, Henry More had suggested to the general that some of the fathers stationed in England should be considered for the rectorships in the Belgian communities. Thanking him for the suggestion, the general replied that that had not been done previously because he had feared that their patrons would object to the

-
9. Smoking had been introduced into England early in the reign of Elizabeth. Although its price varied, it rarely cost less than £1 a pound during the reign of James I (Keith Thomas, Religion and the Decline of Magic [Hammondsworth, 1978] p. 23).
10. Richard Blount to Richard Stonhope (vere Banks), 8 September 1622, PRO, SP 16/99/1G; same to the superior of the York mission (William Holtby), 8 September 1622, Bodl, Rawl MS D 1351, f. 116v; Memorial for all Superiors after the Vice-Provincial Congregation, SC, MS A, V, 1(3) and PRO, SP 16/99/1I and Bodl, Rawl MS D 1351, f. 117v; Instructions for Superiors of Specific Missions, SC, MS A, V, 1(4) and Bodl Rawl MS D 1351, f. 116 and Archives Generales du Royaume Bruxelles. Province Gall-Belgique, Archives Jesuitiques, Carton 32. (microfilm at ASJ).

loss.¹¹ The general thought that his hands were somewhat tied in his choice of rectors and superiors because of the effect that those decisions might have on the province's patrons. In an earlier chapter, we considered the problem surrounding the choice of Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld) as Edward Knott's (vere Matthew Wilson's) successor as provincial: the general feared that the Countess of Arundel would not relinquish Silesdon for the job.

The provincial congregation held at Watten in 1649 addressed itself to the restrictions imposed by decree 24 of the Eighth General Congregation. Because of the unique situation in England, it was impossible, the congregation insisted, to prevent lay people from interceding with superiors on behalf of specific fathers and from intervening in their favour. Many members of the province feared that they had consistently violated the congregation decree. In fact, they were afraid that their very presence in the houses of lay patrons made them liable to further infringements. The congregation thus petitioned the general to relax the decree for the English province. In his reply, the general thanked the fathers for their explanation and promised the province special considerations. What these considerations were went unspecified.¹²

Although the general appreciated the English predicament, he did not completely suspend the decree. General Nickel wrote a strong letter against a role widely assumed by a number of English Jesuits: that of travel companion for the sons of nobles. This issue had arisen earlier on a much smaller scale. In 1638, the general had permitted William Talbot to escort the son of the Viscountess Purbeck to Italy on the

11. General to Henry More, 23 October 1632, Epp. Gen. I, f. 359v.

12. ARSI, Congr 72, ff. 356-364.

following conditions: that Talbot visit only cities in which there were Jesuit communities, that he always stay in those communities, and that he wear clerical garb. The general placed great stress on the importance of clerical dress and often reminded the men that he did not always have the authority to dispense from that requirement. In 1648, John Turner requested permission to travel with Lord Talbot and to do so in secular clothes. The general replied that he could not grant the request for lay attire. For that, Turner had to apply either to the Nuncio in Paris, where Turner was stationed, or to the Holy Office. A week later, the general discussed Turner's request in a letter to the provincial, Henry Silesdon. Turner had continued to wear lay clothes even though he had not received the proper authorization. The general insisted that Turner either assume the garb of the Society or apply for permission through the proper channels. The general went further and expressed his disapproval of Jesuits acting as guides and companions during the Grand Tour. That office would be much better performed by laymen.¹³ By 1653 a number of Jesuits were escorting their patrons around the continent, many of whom were refugees and Royalist exiles. Nonetheless, the general was not happy with the situation. He had heard that many Jesuits, dressed in secular clothes and posing as guardians and agents, travelled with the sons of nobles. He vehemently protested. Jesuits should only take on such roles for very serious reasons. And the general insisted that his permission be obtained first.¹⁴ In 1658 the general's permission was sought for a Jesuit to accompany the son of an unnamed marquis from England to France. The general refused to commit himself until he had

13. General to Henry More, 9 January 1638, Epp. Gen. I, f. 464; same to John Turner, 16 May 1648, Ibid., II, f. 105v; same to Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld), 23 May 1648, Ibid., f. 106v.

14. General to Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson), 24 May 1653, Epp. Gen. II, f. 146; SC, MS A, V, 1(7).

more information. He reminded the provincial, Richard Barton, of two things: only very grave reasons would be sufficient to excuse a Jesuit from staying in Jesuit houses in Catholic countries; and permission to wear lay dress must be obtained either from the Congregation in Rome or from the Nuncio in the country in question.¹⁵

Difficulties with lay involvement in the Society persisted. The general wanted to appoint Robert Stafford the rector of the College of Blessed Aloysius in 1651. He feared, however, that the assignment would give offence to Stafford's patron, probably the Earl of Arundel. If Stafford were able to obtain his patron's permission, the general wanted him to take up the post as soon as possible. If the patron would not allow the move, the general instructed the provincial to name Stafford as rector and to appoint a vice-rector to do the work.¹⁶ Apparently, the patron did not approve. According to the Catalogus Primus of 1651, Stafford was the rector of the college. By August 1652 he was out of the college and back in London as the rector of the House of Probation of St Ignatius. It was always difficult to refuse the favours asked by the powerful on whose benevolence the province continued to depend. In 1662 the general did not see how Edward Worsley could be denied to an Antwerp benefactor. He was, accordingly, transferred from Liège to Antwerp to act as the procurator for the province. At the same time John Clarke replaced George Gray as the socius to the provincial. Gray was assigned to Baron Arundel who had asked for him.¹⁷ The ties

15. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 5 January 1658, Epp. Gen. II, f. 198.

16. General to Robert Stafford (vere Stanford), 8 July 1651, Epp. Gen. II, f. 136; same to Francis Forster, 8 July 1651, Ibid., f. 136.

17. General to Edward Courtney (vere Leedes), 21 January 1662, Epp. Gen. II, f. 242v.

between some Jesuits and their patrons had become so tight that the general feared that nothing short of an earthquake could move them to a different assignment.¹⁸

Edward Courtney issued a revised and comprehensive set of instructions on 31 December 1663.¹⁹ The provincial noted that apostolic mobility was seriously lacking in some of the missionaries. They had so attached themselves to a certain work and/or household that they were practically immobile. The provincial exhorted his men to remedy that. No one should so commit himself to a particular family that the provincial was unable to appoint him to a different position. The instructions reminded the men of the congregational decrees and ordinances from the general that had forbidden the entreaties of laymen on behalf of specific Jesuits because they impeded the governance of the province. Jesuits must never solicit the aid of their patrons in the internal affairs of the Society. Instead of pursuing their own preferences, the men should pray for that true detachment that would allow the provincial to send his men anywhere, to the continent, to the Maryland mission, or to the other colleges and residences in England.

The instructions contained new regulations on various financial matters. The superiors and the rectors were forbidden to farm out the collection of the annual revenues. They were also denied the authority to loan any money without the advice of their consultants and the notification of the province procurator. Each Jesuit was exhorted to take an annual inventory of his books and possessions which he should

18. General to Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh), 26 August 1656, Epp. Gen. II, f. 183v; same to same, 2 September 1656, Ibid., f. 184.

19. "Memoriale pro Superioribus," SC, MS A, V, 1(11). There is another copy in AAW, XXXII, 87.

give to his superior at the annual renewal of vows.²⁰ There were special regulations regarding horses: no Jesuit was either to buy, sell, or exchange horses without the permission of his superior. Previously the general had condemned cards and dice. The new instructions realized how impossible it was to forbid all forms of gambling. At times it might be necessary to engage in such activities in order either to maintain a disguise or to satisfy a patron. On such occasions the Jesuit should be mindful of poverty and seek his superior's advice on the amount of money that he could invest in gambling. Both profits and losses were to be classified as alms in his personal financial statement.

To the usual admonitions against involvement in secular affairs and domestic quarrels, new restrictions on public behaviour were added. No Jesuit was permitted to attend the theatre even though he knew for certain that the play was clean and moral. No one was to appear either at public racetracks or in public houses even in the company of the most moral and the most noble. And no matter what the customs of country gentlemen were, no Jesuit was ever either to allow a woman to ride behind him on his horse or to walk arm in arm with a woman. Finally the public use of tobacco was again forbidden. If tobacco was needed for medical reasons, it should be taken secretly and out of the view of others. Each year, the superior should inform the provincial of those who, despite the prohibition, continued to smoke, so that they might be admonished and, if necessary, castigated by the provincial.

20. The only inventory that I have seen is a catalogue of the possessions of the Jesuits at Holywell, dated 12 March 1664. Among the items, was a large, lending library of more than 100 titles (AAW, XXXII, 99).

* * * * *

Still further, let any such person take ^{care} as long as he lives, first of all to keep before his eyes God and then the nature of this Institute which he has embraced and which is, so to speak, a pathway to God; and then let him strive with all his effort to achieve this end set before him by God -- each one, however, according to the grace which the Holy Spirit has given to him according to the particular grade of his own vocation.²¹

The pathway, which is the Institute, became more difficult with each congregation. Ignatius had placed great emphasis on the mortified, discerning men capable of judging all ascetical and spiritual practices in terms of the apostolate. Universal regulations were few. Subsequent generals and congregations altered that. More and more, daily spiritual requirements and annual obligations became part of the mainstream of Jesuit spirituality. The Institute that Ignatius urged all Jesuits to keep before their eyes became multi-volumed. The Jesuits in England valiantly tried to implement the increasing number of regulations. To judge from the limited evidence, their attempt was successful. There were comparatively few complaints about the overtly spiritual life of the missionaries. The perennial problems stemmed not from a failure to pray, make retreats, etc but from their domestic situation. Hidden in an anonymous world of aliases and disguises, the missionary was forced to abandon the conventual expression of religious life. What he substituted became problematic. How far could a religious trespass into the secular world without losing his bearings and getting lost? The problem faced by the English missionaries was new and demanded a new solution. Occasionally even other Jesuits could not comprehend what was happening. Throughout the seventeenth century, the English province, in close conjunction with the general, developed both a style and an expression that was faithful to the demands of the Institute and the peculiarities of England.

21. Formula of the Institute, 3.

APPENDIX I

The General Congregations and the Congregations of the Procurators in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries compiled from John W Padberg, S.J., "The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 6 (1974) 1-125 and Augustus Coemanns, "Synopsis Historica Omnium Congregationum Procuratorum," Memorabilia Societatis Iesu 3 (1927-1930) 523-549.

1558	General Congregation I	19 June - 10 September
1565	General Congregation II	21 June - 3 September
1568	Congregation of Procurators I	2 - 6 October
1571	Congregation of Procurators II	? June
1573	General Congregation III	12 April - 16 June
1576	Congregation of Procurators III	17 - 22 June
1579	Congregation of Procurators IV	2 - 5 November
1581	General Congregation IV	7 February - 22 April
1584	Congregation of Procurators V	16 - 19 November
1587	Congregation of Procurators VI	16 - 19 November
1590	Congregation of Procurators VII	23 - 26 November
1593	General Congregation V	3 November - 18 January 1594
1597	Congregation of Procurators VIII	23 - 26 November
1600	Congregation of Procurators IX	6 - 9 June
1603	Congregation of Procurators X	16 - 19 November
1606	Congregation of Procurators XI	16 - 19 November
1608	General Congregation VI	21 February - 29 March
1611	Congregation of Procurators XII	16 - 19 November
1615	General Congregation VII	5 November - 26 January 1616
1619	Congregation of Procurators XIII	16 - 19 November
1622	Congregation of Procurators XIV	16 - 19 November
1625	Congregation of Procurators XV	24 - 27 November
1628	Congregation of Procurators XVI	21 - 24 November
1633	Congregation of Procurators XVII	16 - 19 November
1636	Congregation of Procurators XVIII	17 - 20 November
1639	Congregation of Procurators XIX	16 - 19 November
1642	Congregation of Procurators XX	21 - 24 November
1645	General Congregation VIII	21 November - 14 April 1646
1649	General Congregation IX	13 December - 23 February 1650
1652	General Congregation X	7 January - 20 March
1655	Congregation of Procurators XXI	16 - 19 November
1658	Congregation of Procurators XXII	21 - 24 November
1661	General Congregation XI	9 May - 27 July
1665	Congregation of Procurators XXIII	16 - 19 November
1669	Congregation of Procurators XXIV	16 - 19 November
1672	Congregation of Procurators XXV	17 - 20 November
1675	Congregation of Procurators XXVI	18 - 21 November
1678	Congregation of Procurators XXVII	18 - 21 November
1681	Congregation of Procurators XXVIII	16 - 19 November
1682	General Congregation XII	22 June - 6 September
1685	Congregation of Procurators XXIX	18 - 21 September
1687	General Congregation XIII	22 June - 7 September
1690	Congregation of Procurators XXX	16 - 19 November
1693	Congregation of Procurators XXXI	16 - 19 November
1696	General Congregation XIV	19 November - 16 January 1697
1700	Congregation of Procurators XXXII	16 - 19 November

APPENDIX II

The Annual Letters of the English Houses and the English Province

1605	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1607	The English Mission	ARSI Anglia 31II ff. 334-335
1607	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1608	The English Mission	ARSI Anglia 31I ff. 345-346
1608	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1609	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1610	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1612	Novitiate at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1613	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1613	English College at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1614	The English Mission	ARSI Anglia 31I ff. 587-629
1614	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1614	English College and Novitiate at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1615	The English Mission	ARSI Anglia 31I pp. 631-656
1615	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1615	English College at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1616	English College at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1617	English College at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1618	English College at Louvain	ASJ Morris Transcripts
[1618	<u>Historia missionis Anglicae 1617</u> <u>subscripta a P. Richard Blount</u> <u>28 February 1618</u>	ARSI Anglia 32I ff. 41-52]
1619	The English Vice-Province	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1620	The English Vice-Province	ASJ Morris Transcripts
1620	College of St Omers	ASJ Caldwell Transcripts
1621	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1624	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 32I ff. 237-253
1624	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1625	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 32I ff. 255-267
1626	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 32II ff. 308-313
1630	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 145-158
[1631	Excerpts from the Annual Letter of the English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 187-188]
1632	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 32II pp. 329-364
1633	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33II pp. 365-412
1634	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 465-518
1635	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 617-667
1636	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 673-703
1637	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 709-754
1638	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 759-789
1639	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 807-831
1640	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 833-854
1640	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1641	College of St Omers	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1641	Novitiate at Watten	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1642	Maryland Mission	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 865-871
1641-1644	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 33I pp. 891-917
1645	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 34 ff 97-99
[(1623-1645)	Selections from the Annual Letters	ARSI Anglia 33II pp. 125-140]
1648	College of the Holy Apostles	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1648/9	Residence of St Thomas	ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
1645-1649	The English Province	ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 99-151

- [(1623-1649) Excerpts from the Annual Letters ARSI Anglia 32I ff. 173-235]
- 1650 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 459-482
- 1651-1653 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 545-548
- 1653 The College of the Holy Apostles ARSI Anglia 34 p. 581
- 1653 College of St Omers ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
- 1654 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 549-558
- 1655 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 559-564
- 1656 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 583-587
- 1658 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 619-620
- 1669 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 747-749
- 1670 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 757-766
- 1671 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 767-777
- 1672 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 779-790
- 1673 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 791-802
- 1674 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 807-818
- 1675 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 819-826
- 1676 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 827-833
- 1676 College of St Omers ASJ Cardwell Transcripts (twice)
- 1677 The English Province ARSI Anglia 34 pp. 835-844
- 1679 The English Province ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 1-48 and ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
- 1680 The English Province ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 149-156
- 1681 The English Province ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 157-164
- 1682 The English Province ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 167-170
- 1682 College of St Omers ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
- 1685 The English Province ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 197-204
- [1688 Brevis Narratio (Supplement to the History of the English Province) ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 249-274 and ASJ Cardwell Transcripts]
- [1688 Narratio Rerum a Wilhelmo Henrico Principe Auriaco ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 277-286 and 289-299]
- 1685-1690 The English Province ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 221-243 and ASJ Cardwell Transcripts
- 1695(?) The chaplains who operated from Ghent and worked with the English soldiers ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 339-358
- 1695/6 The Novitiate at Watten and the Colleges of Liège and St Omers ARSI Anglia 35 pp. 329-338

Published Annual Letters

- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1581 (Rome, 1583)
The English College, Rome pp. 24-27
The English Mission pp. 205-211
BL 4785.c.14
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1582 (Rome, 1584)
The English College, Rome pp. 15-20
BL 4785.c.11
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1583 (Rome, 1585)
The English College, Rome, pp. 16-23
BL 4785.c.7
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1584 (Rome, 1586)
The English College, Rome pp. 14-19
BL 4785.c.7(2)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1585 (Rome, 1587)
The English College, Rome pp. 25-29
BL 4092.b.46

- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu duorum annorum 1586-7 (Rome, 1589)
 The English College, Rome pp. 13-14
 BL 4785.c.11(2)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1588 (Rome, 1590)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1589 (Rome, 1591)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu annorum 1590-1 (Rome, 1594)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1592 (Florence, 1600)
 The English College, Rome pp. 9-12
 The English Mission pp. 12-13
 BL 4785.c.10(1)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1593 (Florence, 1601)
 The English College, Rome pp. 19-25
 The English College, Seville pp. 318-320
 The College of St Omers p. 125
 BL 4785.c.10(2)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu annorum 1594-5 (Naples, 1604)
 The English College, Rome pp. 21-24
 The College of St Omers pp. 301-303
 The English College, Seville pp. 570-573
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 595-596
 BL 860.c.2
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1596 (Naples, 1605)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1597 (Naples, 1607)
 The College of St Omers pp. 282-283
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 373-375
 The English College, Seville pp. 401-406
 All the Roman Colleges pp. 580-603
 BL 4785.c.10(3)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1598 (Lyons, 1607)
 The English College, Rome pp. 30-31
 The College of St Omers pp. 239-240
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 459-460
 The English College, Seville, pp. 499-502
 BL 4785.c.10(4)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1599 (Lyons, 1607)
 The English College, Rome pp. 13-15
 The College of St Omers pp. 291-292
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 513-514
 SC DD9/104
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1600 (Antwerp, 1618)
 The English College, Rome pp. 23-26
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 201-206
 The English College, Seville pp. 241-242
 The College of St Omers p. 531
 BL 4785.c.12(1)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1601 (Antwerp, 1618)
 The English College, Seville pp. 273-275
 The College of St Omers pp. 716-717
 BL 4785.c.12(2)

- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1602 (Antwerp, 1618)
 The English College, Seville pp. 194-195
 The College of St Omers pp. 684-686
 BL 4785.c.13 mislaid 24-8-82
 SC DD9/107
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1603 (Douay, 1618)
 The English College, Seville pp. 173-174
 The College of St Omers pp. 588-589
 BL 4785.c.15
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1604 (Douay, 1618)
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 165-169
 The English College, Seville p. 204
 The College of St Omers pp. 679-683
 BL 4785.c.16
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1605 (Douay, 1618)
 The English College, Seville pp. 297-300
 The College of St Omers pp. 877-878
 BL 4785.c.17
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1606 (Mainz, 1618)
 The English College, Seville p. 165
 The College of St Omers pp. 643-651
 BL 4785.c.9
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1607 (Mainz, 1618)
 The English College, Seville pp. 131-133
 The College of St Omers pp. 356-360
 BL 4785.c.9
- Litterae Annuae Societatis Iesu anni 1608 (Mainz, 1618)
 The English College, Seville pp. 849-851
 BL 4785.c.9
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1609 (Dillingen, n.d. [1612?])
 BL 4785.c.18(1)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1610 (Dillingen, n.d. [1612?])
 BL 4785.c.18(2)
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1611 (Dillingen, n.d. [1615?])
 The English College, Seville pp. 724-725
 BL 4785.d.1
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1612 (Lyons, 1618)
 The English College, Seville p. 49
 The English College, Valladolid pp. 89-90
 The English House of Probation, Louvain pp. 370-372
 BL 4785.d.2
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu annorum 1613-1614 (Lyons, 1619)
 The English College, Louvain pp. 293-299, 321-326
 The English College, Seville pp. 645-646
 BL 4785.d.3
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1650 (Dillingen, 1658)
 The English Province pp. 27-47
 BL 4785.d.4
- From then to the end of the published annual letters, the works are subdivided according to topics and not to houses.
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1651 (Dillingen, 1658)
 Irish Mission 1651-1654 pp. 166-172
 SC DD9/117
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1652 (Prague, n.d. [1659?])
 SC DD9/118
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1653 (Prague, n.d. [1659?])
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu anni 1654 (Prague, n.d. [1659?])
- Annuae Litterae Societatis Iesu annorum 1653-1654 (Prague, n.d. [1659?])

APPENDIX III

The following is a list of all the extant catalogues of the seventeenth century in the ARSI. For each year I have given the various catalogues that remain. If more than one catalogue appeared or if there is more than one copy of the catalogue, I have noted whether or not they are identical. The third column refers to the manuscript volume in which the catalogue can be found. The fourth is the roll number of the microfilm at ASJ on which the catalogue can be found. Besides the more formal catalogues, a few lists of English Jesuits from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries have been preserved. I have included all such lists that I have seen.

1593	List of English and Scots Jesuits (printed in Foley, <u>Records</u> , VII/1, lxvi-lxvii)	Anglia 31I, f. 121
1596	English Jesuits in Belgium	Anglia 31I, ff. 123-124
1598	Jesuits on the English Mission (printed in Foley, <u>Records</u> , VII/1, lxvii-lxviii)	Anglia 31I, f. 122
1555-1600	List of Englishmen entering the Society from 1555 to 1600	Anglia 38/II, f. 166
1555-1600	Names and works of Jesuits from England 1550-1590 and admissions 1590-1600	Anglia 14, ff. 74-87 (film 2)
1609	Catalogus	Anglia 13 film 2
n.d. (1609/10)	Catalogus	Anglia 13 film 2
1610	Catalogus	Anglia 13 film 2
	Catalogus I	Anglia 13 film 2
1611	Catalogus	Anglia 13 film 2
1613	Catalogus	Anglia 13 film 2
1621	Catalogus I	Anglia 13 film 2
	Catalogus III	Anglia 10 film 1
	Catalogus III is dated 1622/3. That is inaccurate; it should be 1621. The two catalogues are not identical.	
1621/2	Catalogus III	Anglia 13 film 2
	Supplements to Catalogi I, II (Belgian houses only)	Anglia 13 film 2
	This is inaccurately dated as 1623 in the catalogue	
1622	Catalogus I	Anglia 13 film 2
1623	Catalogus III	Anglia 10 film 1
	This catalogue is given twice; they are the same.	
	Supplements to Catalogi I, II (English houses only)	Anglia 10 film 1
1624	Catalogus III	Anglia 10 film 1
	Supplements to Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10 film 1
	The supplements are given twice	
1625	Catalogus I	Anglia 13 film 2
	Supplements to Catalogi I, II	Anglia 13 film 2
	Catalogus III Rerum	Anglia 13 film 2
	Catalogus III	Anglia 10 film 1
	Supplements to Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10 film 1
	Catalogus III Rerum	Anglia 10 film 1
	Catalogi I and III are not identical.	

1626	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
	There is another copy of this catalogus in ARSI Fondo		
	Gesuitico 634C		
1628	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 13	film 2
1629	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
1630	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
1631	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
1632	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 11	film 1
	The catalogues are identical		
1633	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	These two are identical.		
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 13	film 2
	The Catalogi I and II are not the same		
1634	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
1635	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
1636	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogi I and II are not the same		
1638	Catalogus III	Anglia 10	film 1
	Supplements to		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 10	film 1
1639	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 14	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 10	film 1
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 14	film 2
	The copies are identical		

1641	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1642	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 13	film 2
	The catalogues are not identical		
1643	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	There is another copy in ARSI Fondo Gesuitico 634C		
1644	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1645	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 14	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 14	film 2
	Catalogi I and III are not identical		
1646	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1647	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1648	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1649	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogus I	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 13	film 2
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 14	film 2
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 14	film 2
	Catalogi I and III are identical		
1651	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 15	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 15	film 3
1652	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1653	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1654	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1655	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 15	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 15	film 3
	There are two slight differences between the Catalogi I and III		
1656	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1657	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1658	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 15	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 15	film 3
	Catalogus III	Anglia 15	film 3
	The catalogues are identical		
1659	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1660	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1661	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1663	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1664	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1665	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 16	film 3
1667	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1669	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 16	film 3
1672	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 16	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 16	film 3
	Catalogi I and III are not identical		

1673	Catalogus III	Anglia 16	film 3
1674	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1675	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 16	film 3
1676	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1678	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 17	film 3
1679	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1680	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
1681	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogu I, II	Anglia 18	film 3
	They are not identical		
1682	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	The second catalogue is incorrectly dated 1683		
	The two copies are not identical		
1683	Catalogus III	Anglia 11	film 1
	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	There is one slight difference between the two		
1684	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1685	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 19	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 19	film 3
	The two are not identical		
1686	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1687	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	There is another copy in ARSI Fondo Gesuitico 634C		
1689	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1690	Catalogui I, II	Anglia 20	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 20	film 3
1691	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1692	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1693	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	They are different		
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 21	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 21	film 3
	The Catalogi I and III are different		
1696	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 22	film 3
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum	Anglia 22	film 3
	The catalogues are different		
1697	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1699	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
1700	Catalogus III	Anglia 12	film 1
	Catalogi I, II	Anglia 23	film 4
	Catalogus III		
	Rerum (for Belgian houses only)	Anglia 23	film 4
	The catalogues are different		

APPENDIX IV

The English Mission

Superiors of the English Mission

Robert Parsons	1580-1581
Jaspar Haywood	1581-1584
William Weston	1584-1587
Henry Garnet	1587-1606
Richard Holtby	1606-1609
Robert Jones	1609-1615
Michael Walpole	1615-1617
Richard Blount	1617-1619

Prefects of the English Mission

Robert Parsons	1598-1610
Thomas Owen	1612-1618
Thomas Fitzherbert	1618-1619

Vice-Prefects of the English Mission

Spain

Joseph Creswell	1598-1613
Anthony Hoskins	1613-1615
John Blackfan	1615-1619

Spanish Netherlands

William Holt	1598-1599
William Baldwin	1599-1610
Anthony Hoskins	1610-1612
John Blackfan	1612-1615
Joseph Creswell	1615-1619

APPENDIX V

English Provincials in the Seventeenth
Century

Richard Blount	1623-1635
Henry More	1635-1639
Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson)	1639-1646
Henry Silesdon (vere Bedingfeld)	1646-1650
Francis Forster	1650-1653
Edward Knott (vere Matthew Wilson)	1653-1656
Richard Barton (vere Bradshaigh)	1656-1660
Edward Courtney (vere Leedes)	1660-1664
John Clarke	1664-1667
Joseph Simons (vere Emmanuel Lobb)	1667-1671
George Grey	1671-1674
Richard Strange	1674-1678
Thomas Harcott (vere Whitbread)	1678-1679
John Warner	1679-1683
John Keynes	1683-1689
William Morgan	1689
John Clare (vere Warner)	1689-1693
Anthony Lucas	1693
William Montford (vere Mumford)	1694-1697
Henry Hall (vere Humberston)	1697-1701

APPENDIX VI

The Total Number of Jesuits in the English Province

The following list provides the number of Jesuits both in the English province and on the English mission for each year of the seventeenth century for which there is a catalogue. For a few of these years I have had to choose between differing totals in the Catalogi Primi and the Catalogi Tertii. In all decisions I have followed the latter. I have also included a margin of error for each catalogue. This margin was calculated in a manner crude but, hopefully, accurate. Having read the brief biographies in both parts of Foley's Records, VII, I extracted the names and the details of all those who were members of the English province in the seventeenth century. I then read through the catalogues to see if there were any Jesuits listed in the catalogues but not, for some reason, in Foley's biographies. There were 95 such omissions. The majority of these were novices, men whose stay in the Society was brief, but there were a few glaring omissions such as John Travers. Beginning with the earliest catalogue, I compared the names given in the catalogue with the individual record cards on which I had entered the biographical information from Foley. I knew from Foley who should be in the catalogues. For the men not mentioned by Foley, I had to be more careful. For some, their admissions and dismissals were recorded in the catalogues so I knew the exact duration of their stay in the Society. For others there were no such entries. Unless there were evidence to the contrary, a man's first appearance in the catalogue, even if that was not at the novitiate, was considered his entrance into the Society. Those whose dismissal date I did not know, I have treated in the following way: if a man suddenly and without explanation vanished from the catalogue and did not later re-appear, I assumed that he had left the Society. Since such departures take time, I have considered him as one of the missing for three years after his final appearance. The decision to consider him a member for three years was completely arbitrary but, nonetheless, was a serious attempt to take the time factor into consideration. If a man vanished and then re-appeared later, I have assumed, unless there was evidence to the contrary, i.e. that he had left the Society and later re-entered, that he had been a member during those intervening years. In this way, I was able to compare a list of all those who should have been in the catalogues with those who were actually named therein. The difference between the two is the margin of error. To illustrate: in 1621/22, there were approximately 12 Jesuits who should have been in that catalogue because they had been named in the previous catalogue and were, to the best of my knowledge, still in the Society; for 1622, the margin increases to 16 men who had been named in the two previous catalogues but were omitted in that year. The margin of error is the number that should be added to the total given in the catalogue to obtain a more accurate number of English Jesuits. The margin is, and I stress this, an approximation because of the possibility of some confusion over different aliases used and the arbitrary decision about three years. There is considerable fluctuation in the margin of error. In some years greater numbers of Jesuits were omitted. Usually they were men who resided outside the province, e.g. the totals for the late 1640s and the 1650s. In other years, the margin increases because certain groups, e.g. novices, were forgotten. After 1683, The English Jesuits in foreign provinces were included in the catalogue. Because of this the margin of error fell. It remained low

during the reign of James II but the chaos caused by his fall resulted in an increase in the number of the catalogue's omissions. Of the totals, the higher number is the number of men in the province; the number in the brackets is the total number of men in England.

Year	Totals	Margin of Error
1621	207 (104)	--
1621/22	218 (112)	+12
1622	233 (116)	+16
1623	242 (138)	+25
1624	259 (140)	+20
1625	269 (146)	+23
1626	275 (152)	+20
1628	290 (156)	+22
1629	316 (160)	+27
1630	318 (157)	+23
1631	325 (164)	+23
1632	345 (168)	+19
1633	360 (166)	+22
1634	368 (171)	+24
1636	359 (188)	+29
1638	347 (190)	+31
1639	350 (193)	+20
1641	357 (178)	+24
1642	352 (185)	+27
1643	356 (187)	+22
1644	345 (193)	+30
1645	289 (181)	+68 *
1646	268 (161)	+76
1647	265 (160)	+71
1648	262 (164)	+61
1649	264 (161)	+55
1651	271 (158)	+46
1652	260 (161)	+49
1653	282 (164)	+33
1654	284 (162)	+31
1655	282 (164)	+22
1656	281 (155)	+15
1657	278 (151)	+18
1658	289 (153)	+16
1659	283 (144)	+18
1660	287 (151)	+19
1661	282 (147)	+16
1663	281 (146)	+22
1664	266 (135)	+34
1665	260 (139)	+34
1667	253 (122)	+39
1669	258 (124)	+32
1672	285 (139)	+22
1673	281 (129)	+22
1674	283 (125)	+24
1675	275 (124)	+26
1676	297 (128)	+17
1678	289 (128)	+23

* Of this total, 38 were listed as out of the country and 30 were missing

1679	270 (87)	+38
1680	279 (90)	+22
1681	271 (95)	+30
1682	291 (95)	+23
1683	313 (110)	+ 5
1684	309 (109)	+ 4
1685	311 (117)	+ 5
1686	309 (124)	+10
1687	317 (139)	+ 7
1689	337 (104)	+10
1690	305 (94)	+32
1691	316 (102)	+29
1692	319 (109)	+22
1693	309 (110)	+20
1696	329 (131)	+ 5
1697	327 (130)	+12
1699	333 (131)	+ 9
1700	337 (131)	+ 5

APPENDIX VII

In the following charts I have reproduced the financial tables provided in the triennial catalogues. My reasons for doing so were twofold: first, there is much more information contained in the catalogues than I have extracted for my presentation, information that should, I think, be more readily available; second, the use of the charts has reduced the tedious repetition of set financial formulae. Foley's Records, VII/1, contained some of the data and a few of the commentaries from many of the catalogues. To correct the many errors and omissions would be almost endless; I only caution against the naive use of the printed versions. In the following reproductions, I have presented the charts as they were in the catalogues -- including their mathematical errors. Any corrections and additions, such as the calculations of the estimated per capita expense, are added in brackets.

From 1645 onwards regular alms were not included in the charts provided in the catalogues even though exact amounts were often mentioned in the catalogue's commentaries. I do not know whether their omission was common to the whole Society or unique to England. I would suspect the former. Throughout the 1640s, the Society experienced severe financial setbacks. Perhaps, as an attempt to ascertain the true value of each institution, the Roman curia insisted that only that income from endowments, the income to which the Society had a legal right, should be included in the financial statements. All alms, regular or precarious, would, therefore, be omitted.

Beginning with the Catalogus Tertius Rerum of 1655, the style changed. The catalogues were no longer presented in the form of a chart with an introductory commentary. The subsequent four catalogues, those for the years 1655, 1658, 1672 and 1685, were commentaries without charts; the last three, those for 1690, 1693 and 1696 were different still. For clarity and consistency, I have extracted the data from these catalogues and presented it as a chart. It should be noted in advance that few of the communities estimated the number of men that they could support from their revenues.

1625

1625

478

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
Liège	3913	1669	2243 (2244)	30	44	3874	2993
Francis Xavier	revenue: 800 alms: 160	nothing	960	16	16	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	revenue: 600 alms: 300	nothing	900	15	15	nothing	nothing
Watten	2939	132	2807	34	36	322	1282
Ignatius	revenue: 1000 alms: 800	nothing	1800	22	22	nothing	nothing
Ghent	1200	3	1197	15	7	nothing	nothing
St Omers	16080	1734	14346	180	180	25110	38198
Michael	alms: 420	nothing	420	8	8	nothing	nothing
Dominic	alms: 360	nothing	360	6	6	nothing	nothing
Anne	alms: 700	nothing	700	11	11	nothing	nothing
George	alms: 600	nothing	600	10	10	nothing	nothing
Mary	alms: 520	nothing	520	8	8	nothing	nothing
Thomas	alms: 246	nothing	246	4	4	nothing	nothing
Stanislas	alms: 432	nothing	432	8	8	nothing	nothing
John	alms: 360	nothing	360	7	7	nothing	nothing
F. Borgia	alms: 360	nothing	360	6	6	nothing	nothing
TOTALS	31790	3538	28252	380 (74.3)	388	29306	42473 a large part uncertain

1628

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solventa
Liège	8813	2212	6601	75	60	3800	7200
Francis Xavier	revenue: 920 alms: 190	nothing	1110	24	24	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	revenue: 730 alms: 500	nothing	1230	19	19	nothing	nothing
Watten	2524	104	2420	30	39	218	200
Ignatius	revenue: 1200 alms: 900	nothing	2100	40	40	nothing	nothing
Ghent	1167	3	1164	14	8	nothing	nothing
St Omers	14880	1473	13407	167	155	1120	880
Michael	alms: 570	nothing	570	8	8	nothing	nothing
Dominic	alms: 430	nothing	430	6	6	nothing	nothing
Anne	alms: 890	nothing	890	13	13	nothing	nothing
George	alms: 720	nothing	720	11	11	nothing	nothing
Mary	alms: 610	nothing	610	8	8	nothing	nothing
Thomas	alms: 200	nothing	200	4	4	nothing	nothing
Stanislas	alms: 730	nothing	730	7	7	nothing	nothing
John	alms: 500	nothing	500	8	8	nothing	nothing
Francis Borgia	alms: 400	nothing	400	6	6	nothing	nothing
TOTALS	31838 (36874)	3792	23392 (33082)	440 (75.2)	418 (416)	5138	8280

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
Ignatius	revenue: 1304 alms: 1440	16	1424 (2728)	34	37	nothing	nothing
Holy Apostles	revenue: 1480 from a foundation of 6000						
Francis Xavier	alms: 680 revenue: 800 pensions: 120 alms: 640 revenue: 824 from a foundation of 2400	nothing	2160	26	17	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	revenue: 824 from a foundation of 2400	32	1528	18	16	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception	alms: 920 revenue: 1952 from a foundation of 4000	nothing	1744	23	23	nothing	nothing
Liège	gift: 8335	nothing	1952	25	16	nothing	nothing
Watten	gift: 400 life pensions: 320 perpetual: 2147	1674	6661	83	92	323	1767
Ghent	perpetual: 2147	153	2714	33	43	1320	nothing
St Omers	2 pensions: 6880 from students: 12000	1	2039	25	14	600	nothing
Michael	alms: 560	perpetual: 876 life: 71	17631 (17933)	220	200	5032	5337
John	alms: 500	nothing	560	7	9	nothing	nothing
Dominic	alms: 580	nothing	500	6	8	nothing	nothing
George	alms: 800	nothing	580	7	8	nothing	nothing
Mary	alms: 808	nothing	800	11	11	nothing	nothing
Thomas	alms: 400	nothing	808	11	12	nothing	nothing
Stanislas	alms: 628	nothing	400	6	9	nothing	nothing
TOTALS	46558	2823	42129 (43735)	545 (543)	520 (80.5)	5032 (7275)	5337 (7104)

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
Ignatius	revenue: 1404 alms: 1560	96	2868	36	39	nothing	nothing
Holy Apostles	revenue: 1832 alms: 640 ad hoc exponenda scuta 5600	nothing	2472	30	16	nothing	nothing
Francis Xavier	revenue: 800 alms: 840	nothing	1640	20	21	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	revenue: 824 alms: 940	nothing	1764	23	23	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception Liège	revenue: 2500 alms: 560 revenue from foundation: 6000	nothing	3060	37	14	nothing	nothing
Watten	other: 2000 perpetual: 2140 gift: 400	1331	6669	83	94	2000	nothing
Ghent	revenue: 1756	136	2404	30	39	1600	960
Omers	2 pensions: 6880 fees: 12000	5	1751	20	24	nothing	nothing
Michael	alms: 422	996	17884	223	174	14000	20000
John	alms: 300	nothing	422	7	10	nothing	nothing
Dominic	alms: 800	nothing	300	4	11	nothing	nothing
George	alms: 828	nothing	800	10	10	nothing	nothing
Mary	alms: 1000	nothing	828	11	11	nothing	nothing
Thomas	alms: 868	nothing	1000	15	13	nothing	nothing
Stanislas	alms: 356	nothing	868	13	9	nothing	nothing
TOTALS	47650	2564	45086	567 (79.5)	514	17600	20960

1639

1639

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
----------	---------	-------	---------------------------------	------------------	----------------	------------------------	-----------------------------

Ignatius	revenue: 1607 alms: 1400	96	2911	35	40	nothing	nothing
Holy Apostales	revenue: 2280 alms: 680 ad hoc exponenda 4000	nothing	2960	35	17	nothing	nothing
Francis Xavier	revenue: 800 alms: 840	nothing	1640	20	21	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	revenue: 800 alms: 680	nothing	1480	20	21	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception Liège	revenue: 2500 alms: 520 from foundation: 6000 other: 1492 less certain: 1600	nothing	3020	37	13	nothing	nothing
Watten	perpetual: 2240	1209	7883	78	85	29473	26464 this includes income from the foundation unpaid
Ghent	revenue: 1706	136	2104	26	27	nothing	nothing
St Omers	2 pensions: 6600 fees: 8400	12	1694	20	13	nothing	nothing
Michael	alms: 792	996	14004	174	132	12000	16000 mostly uncertain
John	no certain alms	nothing	792	13	11	nothing	nothing
Dominic	alms: 552	nothing	552	12	11	nothing	nothing
George	alms: 600	nothing	600	10	10	nothing	nothing
Mary	alms: 800	nothing	800	15	12	nothing	nothing
Thomas	alms: 772	nothing	772	12	16	nothing	nothing
Stanislas	alms: 500	nothing	500	11	11	nothing	nothing
TOTALS	46731 (44161)	2449	44282 (41712)	540 (518)	450	41473	42464

(80.5)

582

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
Ignatius	revenue: 1404 alms: 800	96	2108	30	28	1200 from the capital fund	nothing
Holy Apostles	revenue: 2280 alms: 600	nothing	2880	35	15	4000 from the capital fund	nothing
Francis Xavier	revenue: 800 alms: 304	nothing	1104	15	25	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	revenue: 960 alms: 800	nothing	1760	25	25	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception	revenue: 2500 alms: 520	nothing	3020	35	15	nothing	nothing
Dominic	alms: 842	nothing	842	10	8	nothing	nothing
George	alms: 480	nothing	480	6	12	nothing	nothing
John	no certain alms	nothing			10	nothing	nothing
Michael	alms: 400	nothing	400	7	11	nothing	nothing
Mary	alms: 640	nothing	640	9	9	nothing	nothing
Thomas	alms: 554	nothing	554	7	12	nothing	nothing
Stanislas	alms: 416	nothing	416	8	8	nothing	nothing
Liège	perpetual: 7794.80 life: 1695.20	1355.60	8134.40	81	78 and 7 servants	39625.60	26779.20
Watten	2640 revenue	136.40	2503.60	25	32	465.80	940.60
Ghent	1706 revenue	3	1703	16	33	1012.40	706
St Omers	revenue: 16600	1346	15254	133	150	12500	28700 but uncertain
TOTALS	44736	2936.80 (2937)	41799.20 (41799)	442 (94.5)	478 (468)	69603.80 (58803.80)	57125.80

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
Ignatius	1404	96	1308	10	19	400 and 1200 from the fund	1400
Holy Apostles	2280	nothing	2280	28	12	4000 from the capital fund	nothing
Francis Xavier	800	nothing	800	10	25	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	960	nothing	960	12	24	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception	2500	nothing	2500	30	14	nothing	nothing
Michael					12		
John					10		
Dominic					7		
George					10		
Mary					19		
Thomas					17		
Stanislas					12		
Maryland					5		
Liège	perpetual: 7804 life: 1560	perpetual: 597 life: 413	8354	83	93	39523	27913
Ghent	1706	3	1703	20	30	1418	308
Watten	2 pensions: 320	nothing	320		14		
St Omers	7200	1160	6040	50	50	26820	54100 uncertain
TOTALS	26534	2269	17405 (24265)	243 (99.9)	335 (373)	68161	83721

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
Ignatius	1404	96	1308	10	25	600	1600
Holy Apostles	2280	nothing	2280	20	16	nothing	nothing
Francis Xavier	800	nothing	800	10	20	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	960	nothing	960	12	19	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception	2500	nothing	2500	27	7	nothing	nothing
Michael					9		
John					9		
Dominic					6		
George					9		
Mary					17		
Thomas					14		
Stanislas					7		
St Omers	10160	1200	8960	120	120	1840	3796
Ghent	1706	3	1703	20	14	nothing	nothing
Liège	perpetual: 7804 life: 1560	597 413	8354	83	44	39523	47954
Watten	2960	136	2830(2824)	23	21	444	2800
TOTALS	32134	2309 (2445)	23055 (29689)	324 (325) (91.4)	349 (357)	42407	56150

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
Ignatius	1404	96	1308	10	25	600	1600
Holy Apostles	2280	nothing	2280	20	16	nothing	nothing
Francis Xavier	800	nothing	800	10	20	nothing	nothing
Aloysius	960	nothing	960	12	19	nothing	nothing
Immaculate Conception	2500	nothing	2500	26	7	nothing	nothing
Michael							
John							
Dominic							
George							
Mary							
Thomas							
Stanislas							
St Omers	11760	1200	10560	140	140	1840	3796
Ghent	1706	3	1703	20	14	nothing	nothing
Liège	perpetual: 7804 life: 1560	597 413	8354	83	48	39523	47954
Watten	2960	136	2830(2824)	23	27	444	2800
TOTALS	32134 (33734)	2309 (2445)	23055 (31289)	324 (344)	349 (387)	42407	56150

(91)

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
Ignatius	1404	96	1308		31		
Holy Apostles	2280	nothing	2280		19		
Francis Xavier	800	nothing	800		20		
Aloysius	1600	nothing	160		23		
Immaculate Conception	2500	nothing	2500		10		
Seven Residences							
St Michael					7		
St John					8		
St Dominic					5		
St George					9		
St Mary					13		
St Thomas					11		
St Stanislas					5		
St Omers	11760	2200	10560 (9560)		162	1840	3796
Ghent	1706	22	1684	19	12	894	3912
Liège	perpetual: 7804 life: 1560	597 413	8354	83	45	39523	47954
Watten	1702	960	760 (742)	10	28		
TOTALS	31676	4288	28406 (27388)		408	42257	55662

1658

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
Ignatius	1404	96	1308		30		
Holy Apostles	2280	nothing	2280		19		
Francis Xavier	800	nothing	800		14		
Aloysius	160	nothing	160		22		
Immaculate Conception	2500	nothing	2500		12		
Residences					53		
St Omers	12685	1015	11670	117	157	4000	4479
Ghent	1706	22.4	1683 (1683.6)	16	8		
Liège	7789.6	932.2	6857.4	59	63	170	2400
Watten	1702	960	760 (742)	10	31	1100	
TOTALS	31026.6	3025.6	28001		409	5270	6879

1658

1672

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
St Omers	17192	268	16924	169	158		
Ghent	1100	40	1060	13	8		
Liège	6584	165	6419	74	69		
Watten	2245	1183	1062	13	32		
Ignatius	848	32	816	20	16	nothing	
Holy Apostles	684	200	484	17	18	nothing	
Francis Xavier	806	555	251	7	7	nothing	
Immaculate Conception	1352	nothing	1352	13/14	7	400	2400
Aloysius	960	400	560	14	12	2400	1600
Chad	400	nothing	400	8	8	nothing	
Residences					57		
TOTALS	32171	2843	29328	348/9 (84/84.3)	392	2800	4000

1672

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
St Omers	9420	348	9072	200	206		
Watten	3980	2848	1132	20	39		
Liège	6191	73	6118	74	82		
Ghent	963	66	897	10	8		
					(without tertians)		
Ignatius	903	nothing	903		18		
Holy Apostles	2070	93	1977	19	9		
Francis Xavier	769	236	533	5	3		
Aloysius	791	377	414	16	16		
Immaculate Conception	nothing	nothing	nothing		3		
Chad	526	246	280	3	3		
Dominic (sic)	720	nothing	720	7	7		
Thomas	966	316	650	10	10		
Winefrid	944	376	568	6	6		
Michael	180	nothing	180		7		
John	100	nothing	100		7		
George	97	20	77		7		
Mary	197	116	81		4		
Stanislas	nothing	nothing	nothing		2		
TOTALS	28817	5115	23702		437		

John Clare (vere Warner), the compiler of the 1690 Catalogus Tertius Rerum, added a note that the financial account was superficial because of the troubles in England and the disruption of all correspondence. In an attempt to fill in the financial gaps, a different type of report was included within the catalogue. The form followed by this report, and the form followed by the catalogues of 1693 and 1696, was established by Father General Vincent Carrafa in his "Instructio XXI. pro administratione rerum temporalium Collegiorum ac Domorum Probationis S.J. of 1646." Because of the universal financial crisis, the general requested that a brief exposition of the financial state of each college be sent to Rome by the provincial. He neither specified the frequency of the report nor its relation to the triennial statements. From the information given in the form itself, it can be deduced that the report was annual and that it included not just the regular, habitual income but the actual income also. The new annual report had two sections: the status habitualis and the status actualis. The information contained in the former was similar to the data in the triennial catalogues: a community's annual income from investments and endowments, and the ordinary expenses. The latter detailed the amount of money actually received and spent. Receipts and expenditures were divided into two groups: cash, and other possessions. The status actualis also listed the community's debts and credits. For the charts for 1690, 1693 and 1696, I have only given the data from the status habitualis and the debts and credits from the status actualis.

Status habitualis Collegii N.

Habet in pecunia numerata singulis annis scuta		1090
In aliis redivitibus ex praediis ac fundis scuta		400
	Summa sc.	1490
Onera ordinaria sunt sc 330		
Itaque proventus purus est	sc.	1160
Ex quot possunt alii socii 20		

Status actualis

a die 20. Maji 1647. usque ad 30. Aug. 1648

Percepta pecunia numerata	sc.	900
In aliis proventibus	sc.	480
	Summa sc.	1380
Consumta in pecunia numerata	sc. 800	
In aliis proventibus	sc. 430	
	Summa sc.	1230
Remanent in pecunia	sc.	50
in tritico, vino, oleo	sc.	100
		150
	Summa sc.	1380

1. Bullae, Decreta Canones Ordinationes Instructiones Epistolae & quae Instituti Societatis Iesu ab 1636 (Antwerp, 1665) pp. 372-390.
The form is reproduced below.

1690

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
St Omers	2082	435	1647		166	nothing	much
Watten	4182	2960	1222		48	3475	2803
Liège	6183	7	6176		81	6630	3368
Ghent	931	43	888		10	nothing	2674
Winefrid	933	400	537 (533)		3	469	2413
Holy Apostles	758	101	657		9	666	665
St Mary	178	140	38		6	nothing	784
St Chad	236	110	116 (126)		4	620	1499
St John	150	11	139		10	nothing	83
St Ignatius	695	102	593		17	313	963
St Thomas	1100	316	333 (784)		10	163	1533
St George	73	42	31		6	110	76
St Aloysius	779	431	348		17	1353	2493
St Michael	nothing	nothing	nothing		5	nothing	nothing
(Francis Xavier)					3		
(Immaculate Conception)					4		
(St Dominic)					4		
(St Stanislas)					3		
TOTALS	18280	5098	12725 (13182)		406	13799	19354

1690

492

1693

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis-solvenda
St Ignatius	800	???	800		22	228	1300
Holy Apostles	900	nothing	900		12	1300	1600
St Thomas	1300	700	600		11	220	1400
St Chad	220	nothing	220		3	1200	1200
St Aloysius	900	500	400		23	1200	1300
St Francis Xavier	800	230	570		3		
St Hugh	1300	550	750		6	4200	1200
Immaculate Conception	600	nothing	600		3		
St Mary	240	70	170		7		1600
St George	180	20	160		9	50	330
St Michael	300	nothing	300		6		1300
St John	240	4	236		12	220	400
St Winefrid	1120	300	820		3	108	4502
St Stanislas					3		
St Omers	12100	???	12100		31 SJ	6300	6400
Liège	6187-73	173-25-4	6014-47-2	75	81	8478-17-1	3533-19-4
Ghent	950	54	896		6		
Watten	4312	3121	1191		38	573	3754
TOTALS	32449-73	5722-25-4	26727-47-2		279	24077-17-1	29819-19-4

1693

493

1696

Collegia	Reditus	Onera	Quid supersit deductis oneribus	Quot possit alat	Quot modo alat	Debita, quae contraxit	Quid habeat ad dis- solvenda
St Omers	11681	1372	8661 (10309)		142	3873	12673
Watten	4333	3279	1054		33	1747	3467
Liège	7128	173-25	6954-75		81		
Ghent	1044-50	67-70	976-80		18	3300	13000
St Ignatius	800	100	700		22	228	1300
Holy Apostles	900	nothing	900		15	1300	1600
St Thomas	1200	680	520		13		
St Chad	220	nothing	220		3	1200	
St Aloysius	900	500	400		21	1200	1300
St Francis Xavier	800	230	570		5		
Immaculate Conception	750	nothing	750		5		
St Hugh	130	nothing	130		7		
St Michael	300	nothing	300		6		
St Mary	240	70	170		6		1600
St George	180	20	160		9	520	900
St John	240	4	236		12	220	400
St Winefrid	1120	300	820		2	120	452
St Stanislas					3		
TOTALS	31966-50	6795-95	23522-55 (25170-55)	403	13708	36692	494

ABBREVIATIONS

AAW	Archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster
AHSI	<u>Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu</u>
ARSI	Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu
ASJ	Archives of the Society of Jesus, London
BL	British Library
Bodl	Bodleian Library, Oxford
Clar	Clarendon Manuscripts
Cons	<u>The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus</u>
CRS	The Catholic Record Society
CSPD	<u>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</u>
CSP Milan	<u>Calendar of State Papers Milan</u>
CSP Ven	<u>Calendar of State Papers Venetian</u>
CUL	Cambridge University Library
Epp. Gen.	Epistolae Generalium (ARSI, Anglia 1-3)
Foley, <u>Records</u>	<u>The Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus</u> , edited by Henry Foley
GC	General Congregation. The decrees can be found in the <u>Institutum Societatis Jesu II.</u>
Harl	Harleian Manuscripts
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
IT	The Library of the Inner Temple
Lansd	Lansdowne Manuscripts
PRO	Public Record Office
Rawl	Rawlinson Manuscripts
RH	<u>Recusant History</u>
SC	Stonyhurst College Archives
STC	<u>A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640</u> , edited by A.N. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave (London, 1926).
Wing	<u>Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America and of English Books Printed in Other Countries, 1641-1700</u> , edited by Donald Wing (New York, 1945-1951). A second edition is in the process of publication. So far, two volumes (New York, 1972 and 1982) have appeared.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Manuscript Sources

A. London

Archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster, Archbishop's House (AAW)

Vols. V, VI, XIX, XXIX, XXXII Series A.

Archives of the English Province of the Society of Jesus, Farm Street (ASJ)

- MS 2/1 Correspondence Relating to St Omers and to North Wales 1666-1781.
- MS 2/2 College of St Aloysius: Bedford Leigh to Formby.
- MS 2/2 Residence of St George 1635-1695
- MS 2/4 College of St Aloysius: West Leigh Tithes 1656-1933.
- MS 2/4 College of the Holy Apostles 1667-1844.
- MS 2/4 Residence of St George 1640-1902.
- MS 2/4 College of St Thomas of Canterbury 1613-1839.
- MS 46/5A/1 Uncompleted History of the Roman Catholics in the Last Half of Queen Elizabeth's Reign by John Pollen.
- MS 46/5A/2 Transcripts of Jesuit material in the Belgian Archives by Richard Cardwell (Cardwell Transcripts).
- MS 46/12/2 Transcripts of the Letters of Henry Garnet.
- MS 46/24/1 Transcripts of Jesuit material in the Belgian Archives by John Morris (Morris Transcripts).
- Shelf 937 The manuscripts of Henry Foley's Records of the English Province (Foley Manuscripts).

British Library (BL)

- Harleian MS 4603 Collectio amplissima, et labore summo compilata, a Jesuita quodam, de regulis Ordinis sui.
- Lansdowne MS 384 Regulis ordinis Jesuitarum.
- Lansdowne MS 846/73 John Scudamore's Account of a College of English Jesuits discovered at the Combe in Herefordshire, with the particulars of the library of Popish books.
- Additional MS 5506, ff. 1-5 The discoverie of the Jesuits College at Clerkenwell.
- Additional MS 10118 A rough first draught of the History of England's late most holy and most glorious Royal Confessor and Defender of the true Faith, King James II . . . By Joseph Johnston, Prior of the English Benedictines of St Edmunds in Paris. 1706.
- Additional MS 15897 The Original Correspondence and Official Papers of Lawrence Hyde: Papers Relating to Pensions, Establishments of the Court, Army, etc.
- Additional MSS 28226-28253 Letters and papers of the family of Caryll of West Grimstead, Sussex.
- Additional MS 36707 Letters addressed to James Harrington, many of them from Oxford, during the reign of James II and the Revolution.
- Additional MS 38175 Correspondence and Papers of Sir Kenelm Digby.

Inner Temple Library (IT)

Petyt Manuscripts 538, vols. 38, 47.

Public Record Office (PRO)

ADM 77/1, 2 Admiralty: Miscellanea Newsletters, Originals
 C 205/19 Special Commissions, Lands Given to Superstitious
 Uses.

PC 2/17, 35, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75 Registers of the Privy Council
 SP 12/178, 262, 267, 269, 271, 287 State Papers. Domestic, Elizabeth
 SP 14/8, 19, 20, 24, 65, 142, 151, 159, 216 State Papers Domestic
 James I.

SP 15/34 State Papers Domestic, Additional.
 SP 16/36, 37, 38, 40, 49, 68, 99, 139, 140, 210, 294, 299, 525
 State Papers Domestic, Charles I.

SP 29/229, 233, 406, 408, 411, 417, 442. State Papers Domestic,
 Charles II

SP 44/22, 23, 30, 235, 236a, 336, 337 State Papers: Entry Books
 SP 45/12 State Papers Various

SP 78/7, 8, 9 State Papers Foreign, France.
 SP 94/20 State Papers Foreign, Spain

T 1/1, 17, 28 Treasury Board Papers
 T 4/1, 2, 3, 5, 7 Treasury Letters: Reference Book.
 T 27/5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 Treasury Letters: General
 T 29/11, 12 Treasury Letters: Minute Book
 T 51/37 Treasury Miscellanea: Warrants, Early.
 T 52/9, 12, 14, 15 Treasury Miscellanea: Warrants, King's.
 T 53/1, 3, 4, 6 Treasury Miscellanea: Warrant Relating to Money.
 T 54/8, 9, 13 Treasury Miscellanea: Warrants not Relating to
 Money.

T 60/1, 38, 39 Treasury Miscellanea: Order Book.
 T 61/4 Treasury Miscellanea: Disposition Book.

B. Cambridge

Cambridge University Library (CUL)

11. 1. 19 John Warner's Letter Book.

C. Oxford

Bodleian Library (Bodl)

MS Carte 81
 MS Clarendon 78
 MS Eng hist e 178 Notes on James II's attempts to introduce
 Popery into Oxford and Cambridge by Robert
 Wattan, vicar of Little Gilding, Hunts.
 MS Dep c 233 Letters and Papers of Edmund Gibson, Bishop of
 London.
 MS Rawlinson A 135 Orders and Examinations about the Popish Plot
 taken out of Council Papers 1678-1679.
 MS Rawlinson C 693 Catalogus collegiorum et domium undetriginta
Societatis Jesu in provincia Austriae (1651).
 MS Rawlinson D 1351 Miscellaneous theological tracts and fragments.

D. Stonyhurst, Lancashire

Stonyhurst College Archives (SC)

MSS Anglia I-VII
 Collectanea P
 MS A. I. 29 English Catholic Affairs, 1600-1800.
 MS A. II. 3 De rebus Scotiis.
 MS A. III. 3 De Bonis Societatis Iesu, Romae etc.
 MS A. V. 1 Various Papers Concerning the History of the
 Society of Jesus.

E. Rome

Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI)

Anglia 1-3	Epistolae Generalium 1605-1769 (Epp. Gen.).
Anglia 10-24	Catalogues of the English Province.
Anglia 30, I-II	<u>Anglia Historia I, 1550-1589.</u>
Anglia 31, I-II	<u>Anglia Historia II, 1590-1615.</u>
Anglia 32, I-II	<u>Anglia Historia III, 1616-1627.</u>
Anglia 33, I-II	<u>Anglia Historia IV, 1628-1644.</u>
Anglia 34	<u>Anglia Historia V, 1645-1678.</u>
Anglia 35	<u>Anglia Historia VI, 1679-1761.</u>
Anglia 36	<u>Anglia Historia VII Monum hist, 1587-1697.</u>
Anglia 37	<u>Anglia Hist suppl I-VIII, 1579-1624.</u>
Anglia 38	<u>Anglia Hist suppl II-IX, 1568-1664.</u>
Anglia 39	<u>Fundationes collegiorum.</u>
Anglia 40	<u>Hist do Watten 1611-1711.</u>
Anglia 41	<u>Historia Hiberniae 1599-1692.</u>
Congr 2a	<u>Acta Congregationis Generalis IX-XIII.</u>
Congr 3	<u>Acta Congregationis Generalis XIII-XVI.</u>
Congr 57, 59, 60, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 76, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85	<u>Acta Congregationum Provincialium.</u>
Hist Soc 134	<u>Patentes acceptationum collegiorum, 1548-1649.</u>
Instit 187, 188	<u>Instructiones 1536, 1596.</u>
Fondo Gesuitico 446	
Fondo Gesuitico 457	
Fondo Gesuitico 634c	Catalogues of German assistancy.
Fondo Gesuitico 651	<u>Epistolae selectae ex Anglia.</u>
Fondo Gesuitico 720/A	<u>Missiones in Europa.</u>
Fondo Gesuitico 1441	<u>Collegia F-G, Gallo-Belgian.</u>
Fondo Gesuitico 1606	<u>Collegia Seviglia</u>

Vatican Library

Barberini XXXIV (transcript in the possession of Mr Antony Allison.)

F. Brussels

Archives Generales du Royaume

Province Gall-Belgique, Archives Jesuitiques Carton 32 (part of which is on microfilm at Farm Street).

G. Ghent

Rijksarchief Gent

Fonds Jezuieten 74 (on microfilm at Farm Street).

2. Collections of Documents etc.

Under the name of the editor, except in the case of Calendars, etc.

Acts of the Privy Council 1613-1614

Burton, Edwin H. The Douay College Diaries (London, 1911) CRS 10.

Calendar of State Papers Domestic Charles I 1628-1629.

Calendar of State Papers Milan.

Calendar of State Papers Venice 1610-1613.

Calendar of State Papers Venice 1626-1628.

Calendar of State Papers Venice 1629-1632.

Caraman, Philip.

(Foley, Henry).

The Autobiography of an Elizabethan (London, 1951)

"The Erection of the Vice-Province of England into a Province," Letters and Notices 18 (1886) 344-353.

- Gardiner, S.R. The Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution 1625-1660, 3rd edition (Oxford, 1979).
- Gerard, John. "The Jesuit 'Consult' of April 24th, 1678," The Month 102 (1903) 311-316.
- Henson, Canon Edwin. The English College at Madrid: 1611-1767 (London, 1929) CRS 29.
- _____ Registers of the English College at Valladolid: 1589-1862 (London, 1930) CRS 30.
- Hicks, Leo. Letters and Memorials of Father Robert Parsons, S. (London, 1942) CRS 39.
- _____ Letters of Thomas Fitzherbert, 1608-1610 (London, 1948) CRS 41.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission. Fifth Report
- _____ Tenth Report, Appendix Four: Stonyhurst Manuscripts.
- _____ Cowper I.
- _____ Downshire I, II, IV.
- _____ Fitzherbert.
- _____ Kenyon.
- _____ LeFleming.
- _____ Salisbury XXI.
- Hodgson, Aileen M. "A Jesuit Account Book," Worcestershire Recusant 4 (1964) 18-34.
- Holmes, P.J. Elizabethan Casuistry (London, 1981) CRS 67.
- Hughes, P.L. and Larkin, J.F. Tudor Royal Proclamations, vol. II (New Haven, 1969).
- Kenyon, J.P. The Stuart Constitution (Cambridge, 1978).
- Knox, Thomas Francis The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen (London, 1882).
- Law, T.G. A Historical Sketch of the Conflicts Between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1889).
- _____ The Archpriest Controversy. 2 vols. (London, 1896, 1898) The Camden Society, n.s. 56, 58.
- Loomie, Albert J. Spain and the Jacobean Catholics. 2 vols. (London, 1973, 1978) CRS 64, 68.
- Lukács, Laszlo "Le catalogue-modèle du pere Lainez (1545)," AHSI 26 (1957) 57-56.
- _____ Catalogi personarum et officiorum provinciae Austriae S.I. (Rome, 1978) Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 117.
- Maruca, Dominic. "The Deliberations of Our First Fathers," Woodstock Letters 95 (1966) 325-333.
- Matthews, J.H. "Enquiry as to Lands given for Catholic Purposes 1689," in Miscellanea II (London, 1906) CRS 2.
- Morris, John. Two Missionaries Under Elizabeth (London, 1891).
- Nichols, John G. "The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell in March 1627/28" in The Camden Miscellany II (London, 1853) The Camden Society, o.s. 55.
- _____ "A Supplementary Note to 'The Discovery of the Jesuits' College at Clerkenwell'" in The Camden Miscellany IV (London, 1858) The Camden Society, o.s. 73
- Pachtler, G.M. Ratio Studiorum et Institutiones Scholasticae Societatis Jesu. 3 vols. (Berlin, 1887, 1890) Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica 2, 5, 9.
- Parsons, Robert. "Of the Life and Martyrdom of Father Edmond Campion," Letters and Notices 11 (1877) 219-242, 308-339; 12 (1878) 1-68.

- Pollen, J.H. "The Memoirs of Father Robert Parsons" in Miscellanea II (London, 1906) CRS 2.
- _____ "Father Parsons' Memoirs" in Miscellanea IV (London, 1907) CRS 4.
- _____ "Fr. Robert Parsons, S.J. -- Annals of the English College at Seville, with Accounts of other Foundations at Valladolid, St Lucar, Lisbon, and St Omers" in Miscellanea IX (London, 1914) CRS 14.
- Renold, P. The Wisbech Stirs (1595-1598) (London, 1958) CRS 51
- Ryan, Patrick. "Some Correspondence of Cardinal Allen, 1579-85; From the Jesuit Archives" in Miscellanea VII (London, 1911) CRS 9.
- Sawyer, Edmund. Memorials of Affairs of State in the Reigns of Q Elizabeth and K James I. 3 vols. (London, 1725)
- Stanfield, Raymund. "The Archpriest Controversy" in Miscellanea XII (London, 1921) CRS 22.
- Weale, J. Cyril. Registers of the Catholic Chapels Royal and of the Portuguese Embassy Chapel 1662-1829 (London, 1941) CRS 38.
- Young, William J. The Letters of St Ignatius Loyola (Chicago, 1959).

3. Other Primary Printed Sources

Mainly early printed books or the foundational writings of the Society of Jesus.

- Arnold, John and Scadamore, John. An Abstract of Several Examinations taken upon Oath, in the Counties of Monmouth and Hereford (London, 1680) Wing A 120.
- Blackfan, Joannes. Annales collegii S. Albani in oppido Valesoleti, edited by J.H. Pollen (London, 1899).
- Boquin, Pierre. A Defence of the Olde, and True profession of Christianitie, against the new, and counterfaite secte of Iesuites, or fellowship of Iesus (London, 1581) STC 3371.
- Croft, Herbert. A short narrative of the discovery of a College of Jesuits, at a place called Come, in the County of Hereford (London, 1679) Wing C 6977.
- Edwards, Francis. The Elizabethan Jesuits (London, 1981) (being a translation and edition of the first six books of More's Historia).
- Francken, Christian. A conference or Dialogue discovering the sect of Iesuites (London, 1580) STC 11325.
- (Grene, Martin). An answer to the Provinciaall Letters (Paris, 1659) Wing N 1414.
- _____ An Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine (n.p. [London], 1661) Wing G 1825.
- Ignatius Loyola. Constitutiones Societatis Jesu. Vol. 1 (Rome, 1934) Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu 63.
- _____ The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, translated, with an introduction and a commentary by George E. Ganss, S.J. (St Louis, 1970)
- _____ The Spiritual Exercises, translated by Louis J. Puhl, S.J. (Chicago, 1951).
- Luttrell, Narcissus. A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, 1678-1714. 6 vols. (Oxford, 1857).
- More, Henry. Historiae Provinciae Anglicanae Societatis Iesu (St Omer, 1660)

- _____•
 "The Erection of the Vice-Province into a Province," Letters and Notices 18 (1886) 407-412 (a translation of a section of the Historia).
- Padberg, John W., ed., Documents of the 31st and 32nd General Congregation of the Society of Jesus (St Louis, 1977).
- Pascal, Blaise. Les Provinciales: or The Myserie of Jesuitisme (London, 1657) Wing P 643 and (London, 1658) Wing P 644.
- Plowden, Charles. Remarks on a Book entitled Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani (Liège, 1794).
- (Society of Jesus). Canones Congregationum Generalium (Rome, 1581).
 _____• Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1582).
 _____• Regulae Societatis Iesu (Lyons, 1606).
 _____• Regulae Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1607).
 _____• Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium (Rome, 1615).
 _____• Compendium privilegiorum et gratiarum Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1615).
 _____• Formulae Congregationum (Rome, 1616)
 _____• Canones Congregationum Generalium Societatis Iesu (Rome, 1616)
 _____• Ordinationes Praepositorum Generalium (Rome, 1617)
 _____• Litterae Apostolicae (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Decreta Congregationum Generalium Societatis Iesu (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Instructiones ad Provinciales et Superiores Iesu (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Formulae Congregationum (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Canones Congregationum Generalium (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Ordinationes Praepositorum Generalium (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Epistolae Praepositorum Generalium (Antwerp, 1635)
 _____• Regulae Societatis Iesu (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Instructio pro Superioribus ad augendum conservandumque spiritum in Societate (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Industriae pro Superioribus eiusdem Societatis ad curandos animae morbos (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Compendium Privilegiorum et Gratiarum Societatis Iesu (Antwerp, 1635).
 _____• Bullae, Decreta Canones Ordinationes Instructiones Epistolae &c quae Instituti Societatis Iesu ab 1636 (Antwerp, 1665).
 _____• Epitome Instituti Societatis Jesu (Brussels, 1690)
 _____• Institutum Societatis Jesu. 3 vols. (Florence, 1893).
- (Warner, John). Concerning the Congregation of the Jesuits held at London, April 24th. 1678, which Mr Oates calls a consult (n.p.d. [London, 1678/9]). Revised Wing C 5695c.
- Wood, Anthony. The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, edited by Andrew Clark. 5 vols. (Oxford, 1891-1900) Oxford Historical Society 19, 21, 26, 30. 40.

4. Secondary works
- Abernathy, G.R. jr. "Clarendon and the Declaration of Indulgence," The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 11 (1960) 55-73.
- (Agius, Joseph). "Memorable Sites in London," Letters and Notices 52 (1937) 292-304; 53 (1938) 215-224; 54 (1939) 47-67, 100-120, 213-222.
- Albion, Gordon. Charles I and the Court of Rome (London, 1935).
- Allison, A.F. "Richard Smith, Richelieu and the French Marriage. The political context of Smith's appointment as bishop for England in 1624," RH 7 (1964) 148-211.
- _____ "The Later Life and Writings of Joseph Creswell, S.J. (1556-1623)," RH 15 (1979) 79-144.
- _____ "Who was John Brereley? The Identity of a Seventeenth Century Controversialist," RH 16 (1982) 17-41.
- _____ "A Question of Jurisdiction. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, and the Catholic Laity, 1625-31," RH 16 (1982) 111-145.
- Anstruther, Godfrey. "Lancashire Clergy in 1639. A recently discovered list among the Towneley Papers," RH 4 (1957-1958) 38-46.
- Anstruther, Godfrey. Vaux of Harrowden: A Recusant Family (Newport, 1953).
- _____ A Hundred Homeless Years: English Dominicans 1558-1658 (London, 1958).
- _____ The Seminary Priests I Elizabethans (Durham, n.d. [1968]); II Early Stuarts (Great Wakering, 1975); III Late Stuarts (Great Wakering, 1976).
- Astrain, Antonio. Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la asistencia de España, 6 vols. (Madrid, 1912-1920)
- Aveling, Hugh. "The Catholic Recusants of the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1558-1790," Proceedings of the Leeds Philosophical and Literary Society 10 (1963) 191-306.
- _____ "The Catholic Recusancy of the Workshire Fairfaxes" RH 3 (1955) 69-114; 4 (1957) 61-101; 6 (1961-1962) 12-55, 95-113.
- _____ Post-Reformation Catholicism in East Yorkshire, 1558-1790 (York, 1960).
- _____ Northern Catholics: The Catholic Recusants of the North Riding of Yorkshire 1558-1790 (London, 1966).
- _____ Catholic Recusancy in the City of York, 1558-1791 (London, 1970).
- _____ The Handle and the Axe (London, 1976).
- _____ The Jesuits (London, 1981).
- Bangert, William V. A History of the Society of Jesus (St Louis, 1972).
- Basset, Bernard. The English Jesuits (London, 1967).
- Beales, A.C.F. Education under Penalty: English Catholic Education from the Reformation to the Fall of James II (London, 1963).
- Bireley, Robert. Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counter-Reformation. Emperor Ferdinand II, William Lamormaini, S.J., and the Formation of Imperial Policy (Chapel Hill, 1981).

- Birrell, T.A. "English Catholics without a Bishop," RH 4 (1957-1958) 142-178.
- _____ • Catholic Allegiance and the Popish Plot (Nymegen, 1950).
- Bosher, R.S. The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians 1649-1662 (London, 1957)
- Bossy, John "The Character of Elizabethan Catholicism", Past and Present 21 (1962) 39-59.
- _____ • "Rome and the Elizabethan Catholics: A Question of Geography," Historical Journal 7 (1964) 135-142.
- _____ • "Henri IV, the Appellants and the Jesuits," RH 8 (1965-1966) 80-122.
- _____ • "The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe," Past and Present 47 (1970) 51-70
- _____ • "The English Catholic Community, 1603-1625" in The Reign of James VI and I, edited by Alan G.R. Smith (London, 1973) 91-105.
- _____ • The English Catholic Community 1570-1850 (London, 1976).
- Bowen, Geraint. "The Jesuit Library in Hereford Cathedral," Bulletin of the Association of British Theological and Philosophical Libraries no. 20 (1965) 13-34; no. 21 (1965) 16-27.
- Butler, Charles. Historical Memoirs respecting the English, Irish and Scottish Catholics. 2 vols. (London, 1819).
- Caraman, Philip. Henry Morse: Priest of the Plague and Martyr of England (London, 1962).
- _____ • Henry Garnet (1565-1606) and the Gunpowder Plot (London, 1964).
- Carlton, Charles. Charles I: The Personal Monarch (London, 1983).
- Chadwick, Hubert. St Omers to Stonyhurst: A History of two Centuries (London, 1962).
- Clancy, Thomas. "English Catholics and the Papal Deposing Power 1570-1640," RH 6 (1961-1962) 114-140, 205-227; 7 (1963-1964) 2-10.
- _____ • "The Jesuits and the Independents: 1647," AHSI 40 (1971) 67-90.
- _____ • Papis Pamphleteers (Chicago, 1964).
- _____ • An Introduction to Jesuit Life: The Constitutions and History through 435 Years (St Louis, 1976).
- Clark, Ruth. Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal (Cambridge, 1932).
- Clifton, Robin. "The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution," Past and Present 52 (1971) 23-55.
- _____ • "Fear of Popery" in The Origins of the English Civil War, edited by Conrad Russell (London, 1978) 144-167.
- Coemanns, Augustus. "Synopsis Historica Omnium Congregationum Procuratorum," Memorabilia Societatis Iesu 3 (1927-1930) 523-549.
- _____ • Breves Notitiae de Instituto, Historia, Bibliographia Societatis (Rome, 1930).
- _____ • Introductio in studium Instituti et annotationes in Formulam Instituti (Brussels, 1937).
- Corcoran, T. The Clongowes Record 1814 to 1932 (Dublin n.d. [1933]).
- _____ • "Early Irish Jesuit Educators," Studies 29 (1940) 545-560; 30 (1941) 59-74.

- Cox, J.C. Three Centuries of Derbyshire Annals. 2 vols. (London, 1890).
- Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts 1603-1660 (Oxford, 1959) The Oxford History of England.
- de Guibert, Joseph. The Jesuits: Their Spiritual Doctrine and Practice (Chicago, 1964).
- de la Costa, Horatio. The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1768 (Cambridge, Mass., 1961).
- Demoustier, Adrien. "The Pedagogical Import of the Spiritual Exercises in the Society in the 16th and 17th Centuries" in The Exercises: Their Milieu and Foundation (Rome, 1982) 11-32.
- de Roeck, Jozef. "Du sens de la Congrégation général dans la Compagnie de Jésus d'après les Constitutions," AHSI 35 (1966) 212-231.
- Devlin, Christopher. The Life of Robert Southwell: Poet and Martyr (London, 1956).
- Duhr, Bernhard. Jesuiten-Fabeln (Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1891).
- Dumeige, Gervais. "Obedience to the Pope and to the Superior of the Society" in The Formula of the Institute (Rome, 1982).
- Dures, Alan. English Catholicism 1558-1642 (Harlow, 1983).
- Edwards, Francis. "Most Incomparable Lady: English Catholics and the French Marriage of 1625," The Month 210 (1960) 164-178.
- _____ . "Henry More, S.J.: Administrator and Historian, 1586-1661," AHSI 41 (1972) 233-281.
- Fiorito, Miguel A. "St Ignatius' Intuitions on Obedience and their Written Juridical Expression," Woodstock Letters 95 (1966) 137-142.
- _____ . "Ignatius' Own Legislation on Prayer: Ignatian and Post-Ignatian Concepts," Woodstock Letters 97 (1968) 149-224.
- Fletcher, Anthony. The Outbreak of the English Civil War (London, 1981)
- Foley, Henry. Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. 7 vols. in 8 (Roehampton and London, 1875-1883).
- Futrell, John Carroll. Making an Apostolic Community of Love (St Louis, 1970).
- Galgano, Michael. "Iron-Mining in Restoration Furness: The Case of Sir Thomas Preston," RH 13 (1976) 212-218.
- Ganss, George E. "The Origin of Jesuit Colleges for Externs and the Controversies about their Poverty, 1539-1608," Woodstock Letters 91 (1962) 123-166. This was reprinted in Clancy, An Introduction to Jesuit Life, pp. 283-326.
- Garrett, Jane. The Triumph of Providence: The Assassination Plot 1696 (Cambridge, 1980).
- Gerard, John. "Contributions towards a Life of Father Henry Garnet, S.J.," The Month 91 (1898) 6-21, 121-130, 238-245, 356-367, 458-467, 603-610.
- Green, I.M. The Re-Establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663 (Oxford, 1978).
- Guilday, P. "The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide (1622-1922)," The Catholic Historical Review 6 (1921) 478-494.
- _____ . The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1558-1795 (London, 1914).
- Haight, Christopher. "From Monopoly to Minority: Catholicism in Early Modern England," Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series 71 (1981) 129-147.

- Haigh, Christopher. "The Continuity of Catholicism in the English Reformation," Past and Present 93 (1981) 37-69.
- Hardacre, Paul. The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution (The Hague, 1956).
- Havran, Martin. The Catholics in Caroline England (Stanford, 1962).
- Hay, M.V. The Jesuits and the Popish Plot (London, 1934).
- Heal, Felicity. Of Prelates and Princes: A Study of the Economic and Social Position of the Tudor Episcopate (Cambridge, 1980).
- Hibbard, Caroline. "Early Stuart Catholicism: Revisions and re-Revisions," Journal of Modern History 52 (1980) 1-34.
- _____ . "The Contribution of 1639: Court and Country Catholicism," RH 16 (1982) 42-60.
- _____ . Charles I and the Popish Plot (Chapel Hill, 1983).
- Hicks, Leo. "Father Parsons, S.J., and the Seminaries in Spain" The Month 157 (1931) 193-204, 410-417, 497-506; 158 (1931) 26-35, 143-152.
- _____ . "Cardinal Allen and the Society," The Month 160 (1932) 342-353, 432-443, 528-536.
- _____ . "The Foundation of St Omers," AHSI 19 (1950) 146-180.
- _____ . An Elizabethan Problem: Some Aspects of the Careers of Two Exile Adventurers (London, 1964).
- Hill, Christopher. Economic Problems of the Church (Oxford, 1956).
- Hilton, J.A. "The Catholic Ascendancy in London and the Home Counties, 1685-88," London Recusant 5 (1975) 78-83.
- _____ . "The Catholic Ascendancy in the South-West, 1685-88," London Recusant 7 (1977) 68-72.
- _____ . "The Catholic Ascendancy in the Worcester Region, 1685-88," Worcestershire Recusant 26 (1975) 3-7.
- _____ . "The Catholic Ascendancy in Wales and the Marches, 1685-88," Worcestershire Recusant 30 (1977) 3-8.
- _____ . "The Catholic Ascendancy in the Eastern Counties, 1685-88," Essex Recusant 20 (1978) 15-17.
- _____ . "The Catholic Ascendancy in the Midlands, 1685-88," Staffordshire Catholic History 18 (1978) 15-18.
- Holderness, B.A. "The Clergy as Money-Lenders in England, 1550-1700" in Princes and Paupers in the English Church: 1500-1800, edited by Rosemary O'Day and Felicity Heal (Leicester, 1981) pp. 195-209.
- Holt, Geoffrey, "The Residence of St George: Jesuits in Warwickshire and Worcestershire in Penal Times," Worcestershire Recusant 20 (1972) 45-78.
- _____ . "A Jesuits School in the City in 1688," Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archeological Society 37 (1981) 153-158.
- _____ . "Free Places at the English College of St Omers and Bruges and the Liege Academy," AHSI 52 (1983) 115-126.
- _____ . The English Jesuits 1650-1829: A Biographical Dictionary (London, 1984) CRS 70.
- Hopkins, P.A. "The Commission for Superstitious Lands of the 1690s," RH 15 (1980) 265-282.
- Hughes, Philip. Rome and the Counter-Reformation (London, 1942).
- Hughes, Thomas. History of the Society of Jesus in North America Colonial and Federal. 2 vols. Text and 2 vols. Documents (London, 1907-1917).
- Kenyon, J.P. The Popish Plot (London, 1972).

- Knight, David. "Saint Ignatius' Ideal of Poverty," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 4 (1972) 1-37.
- Kyne, Michael. "Poverty and the Exercises," Supplements to The Way 1 (1965) 28-38.
- Lindley, K.J. "The Lay Catholics of England in the Reign of Charles I," The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 22 (1971) 199-221.
- Lockyer, Roger. Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham 1592-1628 (London, 1981).
- Loomie, Albert J. The Spanish Elizabethans (London, 1963).
- Lukács, Ladislao. "De origine collegiorum externorum deque controversiis circa eorum papertatem," AHSI 29 (1960) 189-245; 30 (1961) 3-89.
- _____ "De graduum diversitate inter sacerdotes in Societate Jesu," AHSI 37 (1968) 238-317.
- Lunn, David M. "English Benedictines and the Oath of Allegiance, 1606-1647," RH 10 (1969-1970) 146-164.
- _____ "Benedictine Opposition to Bishop Richard Smith (1625-1629)," RH 11 (1971) 1-20.
- _____ "The Angli-Gallicanism of Dom Thomas Preston, 1567-1647" in Schism, Heresy and Religious Protest, edited by Derek Baker (Cambridge, 1972) Studies in Church History 9, pp. 239-246.
- _____ The English Benedictines 1540-1688 (London, 1980).
- MacDonald, Gregory. "The Lime Street Chapel," The Dublin Review 180 (1927) 253-265; 181 (1927) 1-16.
- McGrath, Patrick. Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I (London, 1967).
- McNally, Robert E. "St Ignatius: Prayer and the Early Society of Jesus," Woodstock Letters 94 (1965) 109-134.
- Martin, A. Lynn. Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians (Geneva, 1973).
- Meredith, Rosamund. "The Eyres of Hassopp, 1470-1640," Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society Journal 84 (1964) 1-51; 85 (1965) 44-91.
- _____ "A Derbyshire Family in the Seventeenth Century: The Eyres of Hassopp and their Forfeited Estates," RH 8 (1965) 12-77.
- _____ "The Eyres of Hassopp and Some of Their Connections from the Test Act to Emancipation," RH 9 (1967-1968) 5-52, 267-287.
- Miller, John. Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688 (Cambridge, 1973).
- _____ James II: A Study in Kingship (Hove, 1978).
- Morey, Adrian. The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I (London, 1978).
- Neale, J.E. Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1559-1581 (London, 1953).
- _____ Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments 1584-1601 (London, 1957).
- Newdigate, Charles A. "The Printing Press of the English College at St Omers," Letters and Notices 37 (1922) 82-97, 209-221, 339-344; 38 (1923) 13-16, 204-215, 308-311, 456-471.
- Norman, Marion. "John Gother and the English Way of Spirituality," RH 11 (1972) 306-319.
- O'Day, Rosemary. The English Clergy: The Emergence and Consolidation of a Profession 1558-1642 (Leicester, 1979).

- O'Day, Rosemary and Heal, Felicity, eds. Princes and Paupers in the English Church: 1500-1800 (Leicester, 1981).
- Oliver, George. Collections towards Illustrating the Biography of the Scotch, English, and Irish Missions of the Society of Jesus (London, 1845).
- _____ . Collections illustrating the History of the Catholic Religion in the counties of Cornwall, Devon, Dorset, Somerset, Wilts and Gloucester (London, 1857).
- O'Malley, John W. "The Fourth Vow in its Ignatian Context: A Historical Study," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 15 (1983) 1-59.
- Padberg, John W. "The General Congregations of the Society of Jesus: A Brief Survey of their History," Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits 6 (1974) 1-125.
- Parker, Geoffrey. "The Emergence of Modern Finance in Europe, 1500-1730" in The Fontana Economic History of Europe: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, edited by Carlo Coppedè (Glasgow, 1974) pp. 527-594.
- von Pastor, Ludwig. The History of the Popes. vol. 27 (London, 1938).
- Pollen, John H. "The Politics of the English Catholics during the Reign of Elizabeth," The Month 99 (1902) 43-60, 131-148, 290-305, 394-411, 600-618; 100 (1902) 71-87, 176-188.
- _____ . "The Origin of the Appellant Controversy," The Month 125 (1915) 461-475.
- _____ . "The Opposition of the Archbishop Blackwell," The Month 125 (1915) 576-590.
- _____ . "The Appellant Controversy," The Month 126 (1915) 141-155, 256-271, 480-495.
- _____ . "A Jesuit 'Free School' in London 1688," The Month 128 (1916) 264-267.
- _____ . The English Catholics in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1920).
- Pritchard, Arnold. Catholic Loyalty in Elizabethan England (London, 1979).
- Reeves, Marjorie. The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism (Oxford, 1969).
- Reynolds, E.E. Campion and Parsons (London 1980).
- Roberts, Frank. "The Society of Jesus in Staffordshire," Staffordshire Catholic History 3 (1963) 1-23.
- Russell, Conrad. Parliaments and English Politics 1621-1629 (Oxford, 1979).
- Ryan, Clarence J. "The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance and the English Lay Catholics," The Catholic Historical Review 28 (1942) 159-183.
- Schutte, Josef Franz. Valignano's Mission Principles for Japan. Vol. I. From His Appointment as Visitor until His Departure from Japan (1573-1582) Part 1: The Problem (1573-1580) (St Louis, 1980).
- Simpson, Richard. Edmund Campion: A Biography (London, 1896).
- Song, Raphael H. The Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (Washington, D.C., 1961). Canon Law Studies 520.
- Stone, Lawrence. The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965).
- Stonor, Robert Julian. Stonor (Newport, 1951).
- Switek, Günter. In Armut predigen (Würzburg, 1972).

- Taunton, Ethelred. Jesuits in England (London, 1901).
- Tavard, George H. The Seventeenth Century Tradition: A Study in Recusant Thought (Leiden, 1978).
- Thomas, David. "Saint Winifred's Well and Chapel, Holywell," Journal of Historical Society of the Church in Wales 8 (1958) 15-31.
- Thomas, Keith. Religion and the Decline of Magic (Harmondsworth, 1978).
- Tierney, M., ed. Dodd's Church History of England. 5 vols. (London, 1839-1843).
- Trimble, W.R. "The Embassy Chapel Question, 1625-1660." Journal of Modern History 18 (1946) 97-107.
- Underdown, David. Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660 (New London, 1960).
- Walsh, Michael J. "The Publishing Policy of the English Jesuits at St Omer, 1608-1759" in Religion and Humanism, edited by Keith Robbins (Oxford, 1981) Studies in Church History 17, pp. 239-250.
- Wiener, Carol Z. "The Beleaguered Isle. A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," Past and Present 51 (1971) 27-62.
- Williams, J. Anthony. "English Catholicism under Charles II. The Legal Position," RH 7 (1963-1964) 123-124.
- _____ . Catholic Recusancy in Wiltshire 1660-1791 (London 1968).
- Williams, Michael E. The Venerable English College Rome (London, 1979).
- Zimmerman, B. Carmel in England: A History of the English Missions of the Discalced Carmelites, 1615 to 1849 (London, 1899).

5. Unpublished Theses

- Clark, Richard. "Anglicanism, Recusancy and Dissent in Derbyshire 1603-1730" (Oxford, DPhil, 1979).
- Clifton, Robin. "The Fear of Catholics in England 1637 to 1645. Principally from Central Sources" (Oxford, DPhil, 1967).
- Hibbard, Caroline. "Charles I and the Popish Plot" (Yale, PhD, 1975).
- Holmes, Peter John. "The Political Thought of the Elizabethan Catholics" (Cambridge, DPhil, 1975).
- Larocca, John Joseph. "English Catholics and the Recusancy Laws 1558-1625 A Study in Religion and Politics" (Rutgers, PhD, 1977).
- O'Donoghue, Fergus Michael. "The Jesuit Mission in Ireland: 1598-1651" (Catholic University of America, PhD, 1981).
- O'Keefe, Mary Margaret Cusack. "The Popish Plot in South Wales and the Marches of Hereford and Gloucester" (National University of Ireland at University College, Galway, M.A. 1969).
- Sommerville, Johann Peter. "Jacobean Political Thought and the Controversy over the Oath of Allegiance" (Cambridge D Phil, 1981).
- Walker, Francis Xavier. "The Implementation of the Elizabethan Statutes against Recusants, 1581-1603" (London, PhD, 1961).