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Abstract

This thesis investigates the attempts which were made to develop a triangular missionary connection between the Irish Colleges in Rome, the Irish mission, and the West Indies from 1600 to 1669. Structured in seven chapters, this thesis aims to widen the historiography on the Irish missionary activities in and beyond Europe by exploring the complex interplay of factors which led to the planning and development of this missionary networking. This study also seeks to trace the activities and the movement of the clerics who were involved within this missionary channel. At the same time, it seeks to identify and highlight the difficulties which affected their activity throughout the period examined.

The chapters that follow will provide a detailed investigation of how and to which extent the Irish clergy was able to respond to the expansion of ministry outside the Irish mission which, throughout the seventeenth century, was dictated by the growing pastoral needs of the Irish communities in and beyond Europe.
Introduction

On the fifteenth of July 1563, Pope Pius V (1566-1572), together with 235 other churchmen, celebrated the opening of the twenty-third session of the Council of Trent. The Council thus entered its final phase, eighteen years after its inaugural session on the thirteenth of December 1545. One of the principal results of the twenty-third session was a regulation on the future institutional training of Catholic clergy. This stated that ‘all cathedral, metropolitan, and other churches greater than these, shall be bound, each according to its means and the extent of the diocese, to maintain, to educate religiously, and to train in ecclesiastical discipline, a certain number of youths of their city and diocese,’ where ‘[they] shall learn grammar, singing, ecclesiastical computation, and the other liberal arts; they shall be instructed in sacred Scriptures; ecclesiastical works; the homilies of the saints; the manner of administering the sacraments.’

Such institutions were envisaged to be attached to Catholic dioceses, and to form clergy to serve in these sees. Yet, in terms of future reform of clerical standards, there were two fundamental problems: the first was that the Council did not order that all clergy should be trained in these establishments; the second problem was that many dioceses were patently unable to support them due to their inadequate financial provisions. As a result, post-Trent, the process of establishing and developing these institutions was halting and rather haphazard. In France, for instance, the institution of seminaries, as they were known, was protracted and did not follow a steady pattern. Between the 1560s and the 1610s, sixteen seminaries were founded but only one or two of them continued to operate into

---

1 Twenty-Third Session of the Council of Trent, ‘Decree on Reform,’ chapter XVIII, 15 July 1563: ‘singulae cathedrales, metropolitanae, atque his majores ecclesiae pro modo facultatem et diocesis amplitudine certum puorum ipsius civitatis et diocesis,…grammatices, cantus, computi ecclesiastici, aliarumque bonarum atrium disciplinam discet, sacram scipturam, libros ecclesiasticos, homlias sanctorum, atque sacramentorum tradendorum.’
the seventeenth century. There were a number of reasons for this, the most important being the breakdown of ecclesiastical infrastructure and organization during the Wars of Religion (1562-1598). Furthermore, poor episcopal control over the clergy and the difficulties involved in providing resources to the seminaries hampered the process. Clerical rivalry also played its part; since many of the new seminaries looked like the old cathedral choir schools, the cathedral chapters refused to establish new structures which might challenge their educational activity. Similar obstacles were evident in the Italian Peninsula. In the diocese of Novara the poverty of parishes meant that they could barely support their curates and certainly could not contribute to pay a seminary tax. The large number of parishes, 275 in total, did not mitigate this difficulty. In the diocese of Fiesole, the diocesan funds were so scarce that an appropriate sum could not be set aside annually to support a seminary.

A further issue for clerical training is related to the evolving nature of clerical activity in the church and the interplay between political events and religious affiliation. Alternative methods of clerical formation and ministry had to be developed for those regions which could not host and support the establishment of seminaries in their

---


dioceses. One of those regions was Ireland in which, given the fact that it was ruled by Protestant regimes, there was no possibility of establishing dedicated structures for educating Catholic clergy according to the Tridentine instruction. The government-imposed religious changes and the land settlements of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries prevented the establishment of structures which could provide adequate education and training for Catholic clergy on the island.  

Although the Council of Trent did not once mention missions in its decrees, these were an increasingly important element of the resurgence of the Catholic church in its aftermath. Ultimately in 1622, the papacy recognized the significance of evangelization beyond Europe when it founded the Congregation of Propaganda Fide, whose remit was to oversee missionary activity in Protestant and non-Catholic regions worldwide. However, Trent’s ordinance on clerical training raised an acute question for regions, under Propaganda’s scrutiny, like Ireland, which was missionary in need and in which seminaries could not be established because of the political circumstances pertaining. In the last decades of the sixteenth century and the early 1600s, the increasingly repressive anti-Catholic measures and dramatic political changes at home meant that a significant number of Irish Catholics began to migrate to continental Europe. From this movement, a solution to the question of clerical


formation in a missionary environment was proposed in the form of a network of dedicated Irish colleges in France, the Iberian Peninsula, Spanish Flanders and in the Italian Peninsula. The common and key aim of these structures was to train clerics who would return to the Irish mission to fight against Protestantism and to preserve the faith of Catholics.7

In the early seventeenth century, Irish migration also extended beyond continental Europe. During the early 1630s, a growing number of Irish men and women began to migrate and to settle in the West Indies, thus extending the geographical range in which Irish missionaries might be required to serve. It is on the widening scope for mission to the Irish in Ireland and in the West Indies that this thesis focuses. It will do so specifically by investigating the efforts to establish mission links between the Irish colleges in Rome, Ireland and the West Indies from the early seventeenth century to 1669.

II

Irish missionary networking between Rome, Ireland, and the West Indies is an unstudied area to date. The majority of published studies focus on the establishment of continental Irish colleges. Most of the older investigations concentrate on the history of a single college, obscuring the reality that these institutions operated within a network in which there was a constant movement of personnel between colleges on continental Europe and between the continent and Ireland. Another weakness of older studies is that, in most cases, they were written by clerical historians. Their sometimes hagiographical tone makes it difficult to assess the problems encountered by the colleges and their negative impact on the ability of the institutions to recruit, train and repatriate missionaries to Ireland.8

8 Patrick Boyle, The Irish College in Paris, 1578 to 1901 (London: Art & Book Co, 1901); Boyle, “The Irish College at Bordeaux, 1603-1794,” I.E.R. 22 (July-
Since the second half of the 1990s, there has been a significant change within the historiography, thanks to the development of a new approach which fits the activity of the Irish clergy on continental Europe within the broader context of Irish migration to this area during the early modern period. Research on the Iberian Peninsula indicates that in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century it emerged as the primary destination for Irish Catholic exiles who fled from Ireland in rebellion against the Tudor regime. In particular, recent analyses illustrate the complex patchwork of connections which, throughout the early modern period, linked the Spanish monarchy with Ireland. Amongst Irish migrants to the Iberian


Declan Donvey and Julio Crespo MacLennan, eds., Spanish-Irish Relations through the Ages (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008); Enrique García Hernán et al, eds., Irlanda y la monarquía hispánica: Kinsale, 1601-2001. Guerra, política, exilio y religion (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2002); García Hernán, Ireland and Spain in the Reign of Philip II (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009); Óscar Recio Morales, Ireland and the Spanish Empire,
Peninsula, Irish clerics played a crucial role, for they succeeded in acting as intermediaries between their countrymen at home and the Irish migrant communities. Importantly, Patricia O’Connell demonstrates that the Irish colleges favoured the process of integration of the Irish migrants within Spanish society.\textsuperscript{11}

More recent studies have also provided a new understanding of the role played by the Irish clerical communities in France and Spanish Flanders. The analyses of Liam Chambers and Priscilla O’Connor on the Irish Colleges in France demonstrate that these institutions acted as cultural interfaces between the Irish at home and the French society of the ancien régime.\textsuperscript{12} The scholarship has also benefited from the prosopographical material compiled by Laurence Brockliss with Patrick Ferté, and by Alison Forrestal, on Irish clerics


enrolled in the universities of Cahors, Paris, and Toulouse and on the Irish entrants to the Congregation of the Mission respectively, thus providing a better understanding of the range and activity of the Irish clerical population in France during the early modern period.13

Likewise, with regards to Spanish Flanders, the research of Jeroen Nilis has provided new sources to assess the Irish clerical population.14 The essays of Mary Ann Lyons and Thomas O’Connor highlight the role played by the Irish Franciscan College of Louvain within the Irish Franciscan network in continental Europe.15 In the last decade research has also extended to the Irish clerical community of Prague.16 All these studies have added greatly not only to the historiography of the Irish Colleges, but also to that of early modern Irish migration, offering new views of the cultural, political, and religious roles played by the Irish clerical communities across continental Europe.

---


A key feature of the above studies is that the majority focus on the lines of missionary communication and movement which were developed between a single Irish college on the continent and Ireland, even though the evolving nature of Irish migration invited the range of Irish missionary activity to expand even beyond Europe. Relatedly, to date investigations have devoted little space to dealing with two key locations, Rome and the West Indies, for the promotion of mission and missionary activity.

With regards to Rome, the dearth of works on the process of founding two structures for missionary formation in the city leaves plenty of scope for a detailed investigation of their place within the Irish mission. There are two colleges in question, Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College, founded in 1625 and 1628 respectively. For Saint Isidore’s, the hagiographical work of the Franciscan historian Gregory Cleary is still the key reference because it describes the college’s foundation, and profiles the careers of some of the students who entered the college. Yet the weakness of his work is that it is excessively focused on the figure of Luke Wadding, the college’s founder, to the neglect of key analytical questions, notably the capacity of the college to recruit, train and repatriate students, which was intrinsic to its relationship with the Irish mission. The few subsequent examinations of the Franciscan college concentrate on a particular period of activity or illustrate its history through broad overviews. The dearth of studies on Saint Isidore’s and on its ability to establish a clerical channel to Ireland also contrasts with the

---

18 This approach is evident in the works of Millett and Patrick Conlan. More recently Benjamin Hazard has illustrated the artistic significance of Saint Isidore’s as a site of memory, but his analysis does not provide an assessment of the missionary contribution provided by the college to the Irish mission. See Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 1651-1665 (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964); Patrick Conlan, St. Isidore’s College, Rome (Rome: Tipografia S.G.S., Roma 1982); Benjamin Hazard, “Saint Isidore’s Franciscan College, Rome: from Centre of Influence to Site of Memory,” in Redes de nación y espacios de poder, 103-114.
sustained interest of historians in the influential figure of Wadding and especially in his political and theological role in Rome.\textsuperscript{19} Compared to Saint Isidore’s, the historiography on the Irish College is smaller in quantity. Until now, there has been no specific work which deals exhaustively with how this institution was founded, and the extent to which it succeeded in establishing a clerical supply to the Irish mission. The recent collection of essays edited by Dáire Keogh and Albert McDonnell on the Irish College is overwhelmingly dominated by the college’s activity during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and thus devotes little space to the seventeenth century when the seminary laid the basis of its missionary links with Ireland.\textsuperscript{20} Patrick Corish’s essay is the only one that illustrates the Irish College’s foundational phase, during which the secular college passed from Franciscan control to Jesuit management. However, he concentrates on the thorny dispute over control of the institution, and neglects to examine the other key problems which affected the recruitment and repatriation capacity of the college during its formative years.\textsuperscript{21} Compared to Corish’s essay, the overview on the Irish College written by O’Connor provides a better portrait of the historical context in which the college was founded, while at the same time outlining some of the problems


\textsuperscript{20} Dáire Keogh and Albert McDonnell, eds., \textit{The Irish College, Rome}.

which affected its activity throughout the seventeenth century. However, this overview does not identify the difficulties faced by the Irish college in establishing a pool of missionaries, nor does it fully assess the clerical supply to the mission.  

The dearth of studies on the two Irish colleges in Rome repeats in the case of Irish missionary activity in the West Indies. This contrasts with the fact that Irish migration to the West Indies during the seventeenth century has attracted the attention of a series of leading scholars in the field of migration studies, such as Donald Harman Akenson and Louis Cullen. Both analyze the role and impact of Irish migrants in the area, concentrating principally on lay settlement rather than Irish missionary ventures. More broadly, this remains an unfashionable topic for Anglophone historians who have focused their interest on the economic and political dimensions of Irish migration to the region. Thus, until the mid-1980s, study of Irish

---

missionary activity in the West Indies was confined to the few articles written by the Irish Jesuit Aubrey Gwynn, who interpreted its establishment and development hagiographically, portraying the Irish missionaries as martyrs of the Irish Catholic church.25

The scant interest displayed by Anglophone historians in the development of Irish missions in the West Indies has been offset somewhat by the analyses of the Italian historian Giovanni Pizzorusso. His works re-evaluate the role of Irish missionaries by fitting their activity within the broader context of the clerical networks which were developed in the North Atlantic area during that period, a theme that Luca Codignola has been investigating since the 1980s.26 Pizzorusso also stresses the fact that the Irish missionaries played a key role as a source of information for the Congregation of Propaganda Fide which, through their relationes, was informed of the progress of Irish migration in the area. Yet his analysis is mainly focused on the last phase of Irish mission in the late 1660s, and so it


does not provide a complete picture of how and why it began and developed in the early years.  

IV

This thesis aims to overcome the limitations of existing scholarship by examining connections between Ireland, Rome and the West Indies during the period from 1600 to 1669. It does so partly to enable Rome to feature prominently on the historiographical map of continental Irish colleges, through assessing the impact that the colleges in the city made on missionary supplies to Ireland. While this will add greatly to our understanding of the connections between the papal city and the Irish church, it is important also to recognize that Irish migration was in a state of expansion during this period, and neither limited to Europe nor characterized by simple lines of communication and movement between the continent and Ireland. For this reason, the thesis’ range will be triangular in shape, preferring to incorporate the potential for missionary ministry to adapt to these developing patterns of migration, and specifically to the advent of Irish settlement in the West Indies.

A crucial aspect that this thesis will highlight is the fact that the personnel of the two Irish colleges in Rome remained detached from the efforts to moot missionary initiatives to the Irish Catholics in the English West Indies. A further issue unveiled by this thesis is that all the initiatives to establish and develop Irish missions to the West Indies were made by individuals who resided outside of Rome. This crucial point will serve as a way to demonstrate that, despite the

institutional and symbolic centrality of the Holy See, decisions related to missionary activity were taken on a decentralized basis.\textsuperscript{28}

The thesis is structured in seven chapters which analyze the years from 1600 to 1669. These years incorporate successive phases of a complex and lengthy process for the formation of a missionary network connecting Rome, Ireland and the West Indies. Given the fact that there is more material to investigate and assess how the missionary channel between Rome and Ireland was developed, the majority of the chapters, five, are devoted analyzing this aspect. However, the two chapters on Irish missionary activity in the West Indies are also integral sections of the thesis. Indeed their positions within the study correspond to specific periods in which Irish missionary ministry expanded to attempt to meet the demands of Irish migration beyond continental Europe.

The opening chapter covers the first two decades of the seventeenth century, providing a historical survey of the political and religious changes which affected Ireland between the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth century, and detailing the context in which a large number of Irish ecclesiastics moved to continental Europe. During this period, small groups of Irish clerics succeeded in establishing a network of colleges in France, the Iberian Peninsula and Spanish Flanders, dedicated to training clergy for mission in Ireland. The chapter will draw attention to the isolation of Rome, the capital of the Catholic church, from the development of this educational infrastructure, and thus from the evolving supply of missionaries for the Irish mission.

Chapter two explores the years from 1620 to 1635, first assessing whether the foundation of Propaganda Fide in 1622 heralded the beginning of a new era which would encourage greater co-ordination of the Irish mission, and the integration of the Roman congregation

\textsuperscript{28} on this concept of centrality and unity during the early modern period see José Javier Ruiz Ibáñez et al, eds., \textit{Polycentric Monarchies: How Did Early Modern Spain and Portugal Achieve and Maintain a Global Hegemony?} (Brighton: Sussex University Press, 2012).
within the missionary network which linked Irish clerics on continental Europe to the Irish mission. Around the same time, the two colleges were founded and investigation of Propaganda’s involvement in this development is a vital means of establishing whether it operated in this initial phase in parallel or in co-operation with the founders and early governing authorities of these establishments. In examining the details of the colleges’ foundation, the chapter also identifies the financial and organizational differences which early emerged between these institutions. In particular, the chapter sheds light on how the dispute over the Irish College’s management, which passed from the control of the Irish Franciscans to the Jesuits, inhibited the seminary’s organizational firmity. The emerging differences between the two colleges in these domains are helpful in judging how and to what extent they affected the ability of these institutions to recruit and repatriate their first students and thus to develop preliminary links to the Irish mission.

Chapter three covers the years from 1636 to 1643 and it illustrates the development of the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s as institutions of missionary training after their foundation. This chapter significantly expands the issues unveiled in chapter two by investigating how and to what extent the two colleges succeeded in developing and consolidating their links with the Irish mission. By quantifying the number of missionaries deployed and by assessing their activity at home, this chapter explores which of the two colleges was more successful in forging a steady missionary channel to Ireland in the decade which followed their foundational years.

In chapter four, attention moves to the first phase of Irish mission in the West Indies and, therefore, covers the years from 1638 to 1643. As the chapter will explain, the steps to achieve this were in response to the beginning of Irish migration to the area in the 1630s. Since it occurred at the same time as the colleges were established, it was conceivable that these might be envisaged as sources of missionaries for Irish settlements in the region. Yet, as chapters five and six will
investigate, the colleges were pre-occupied by their transitions they were undergoing into secure institutions of formation in these years and in the succeeding years to 1664.

Chapter five addresses the question of how and to what extent the Cromwellian conquest in Ireland and the subsequent persecution of Catholic clergy there had an impact on the activity of the two colleges in Rome, and in particular on their capacity to recruit and to repatriate missionaries to the Irish mission. Chapter six concentrates on the internal processes of transitions that occurred in the two colleges. Both endured shifts in personnel and administration in the mid-1650s, with the Irish College being transferred in the administrative supervision of an Irish rector, rather than Italian; meanwhile, Saint Isidore’s moved to a post-Wadding status, when Wadding died in 1657. The chapter seeks to determine whether these alterations in government had any impact on the quantity and quality of students under the new regimes, and whether the transfers of authority proved influential on the colleges’ roles as producers of missionaries.

Chapter seven covers the years from 1650 to 1669 and explains how the political turmoil of the 1650s in Ireland led to the necessity to widen, once again, the range of Irish missionary activity beyond Europe. It begins by demonstrating how the Cromwellian regime forced a growing number of Irish Catholics to migrate and settle in the West Indies. This prelude is necessary in order to highlight the fact that this forced migration acted as an incentive for the beginning of the second phase of Irish missionary activity in the West Indies. By linking with what has been illustrated in chapter four, this chapter examines the continued detachment of the two Roman colleges from the efforts to develop and support this second phase of Irish missionary activity. It investigates the initiatives taken instead by individuals, and explores the input of Propaganda in the instigation and coordination of these efforts.
V

The thesis draws upon a wide variety of manuscript and published sources. Given that most of the chapters are devoted to the analysis of the development of the missionary links of the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s with the Irish mission, it is natural that a substantial proportion of the sources used come from the holdings of these institutions.

Amongst the Irish College’s holdings which have been recently calendared, there is one specific manuscript source which is particularly valuable, because it provides information on the college’s activity and, in particular, on its recruitment and repatriation process.\(^{29}\) This is the *Manuscript History of the Irish College*, which describes the college’s activity from 1628 to 1678, thus providing specific insights into the seminary’s financial status, the rectors who administered it, and on the students admitted during that period. The greatest strength of the *Manuscript History* is that it provides key details on the student body such as their year of admission, departure and activities after they left the college. Unfortunately it records very little information on the students admitted during the years from 1628 until early 1635, when the college was under the Irish Franciscans’ control. Given this dearth and the absence of an alternative compilation source, it is only possible to trace the activity and movement of a limited number of students admitted during those years.

In contrast to the Irish College, the holdings of Saint Isidore’s have not been systematically calendared nor do they contain as complete a

record of student residence and vocations as the *Manuscript History.*

The discretorium register of Saint Isidore’s for the seventeenth century has been lost, but partial copies of it survive. The absence of the manuscript register is noteworthy because it complicates the effort to analyze the running of the college, its financial status, and in particular its recruitment and repatriation patterns. The best way to overcome this is to rely on the diary of Saint Isidore’s which was written by Francis Harold, Wadding’s nephew, and which was published in 1949. This diary covers the years from 1625 to 1654 and it provides key details such as the year of entry and departure of the students admitted during this period. Unfortunately the diary is affected by two crucial limitations: the first is that it concludes in 1654 and thus it is not possible to learn how many students were admitted in the following years; the second limitation is that information on the students is fragmentary and therefore incomplete.

To overcome these restrictions and gaps in source material, further supplementary sources are used in this study. Some valuable evidence is provided by private correspondence, and in particular by that of Luke Wadding, a good part of which has been edited and published by the Killiney-based Franciscan historians. Given the fact that he was the leading figure at Saint Isidore’s and more broadly of the Irish clerical community of Rome, the correspondence of Wadding presents its own set of difficulties as well as opportunities. Indeed his large number of correspondents and the variety of the issues discussed in his exchanges with them requires meticulous reading in order to find details which shed light on the students of Saint Isidore’s, especially those who were less well-known to

---


Wadding.\textsuperscript{33} Wadding’s correspondence, therefore, must be combined with the \textit{Liber Lovaniensis}. The wealth of information provided in this manuscript is invaluable since it contains all the extant chapter bills held by the Irish Franciscan province throughout the seventeenth century. This enables us to paint a detailed picture on the activity of Saint Isidore’s students who returned to Ireland, and in particular of the locations in which they operated and the roles they fulfilled.\textsuperscript{34}

A common problem which affects the above sources is that they provide very few details on the students’ ordination process. Those details which are provided are sometimes incomplete and inaccurate. To overcome this problem it is necessary to use the material preserved within the Roman Vicariate which provides relevant information on clerics who were promoted to ordination. Identification of Irish candidates has been made possible by the painstaking research of Hugh Fenning. His recent prosopographical study traces the names of Irish clerics who were ordained in Rome from 1597 to 1697, thus permitting cross-referencing of his list with those of the colleges’ students.\textsuperscript{35}

Given the fact that Propaganda oversaw worldwide missionary activity, the use of its records is essential for the purposes of this study. One series which is of particular relevance is \textit{Scritture riferite nelle congregazioni generali} which includes letters, petitions and \textit{relationes} which were sent by bishops, clerical agents, missionaries, and nuncios to the congregation. Because the series is organised on geographical rather than thematic lines, research on Ireland or the West Indies is complex, especially since the congregation’s members had only fragmentary knowledge of the American continent and thus

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34} \textit{LL}.
\end{flushright}
often referred to areas which were in reality far away from their modern location. This difficulty is overcome by use of the Acta which were the decisions taken by the congregation’s cardinals during their meetings. The Acta are chronologically arranged and each decision taken by the congregation refers to a specific problem or request mentioned in the Scritture riferite.

The wealth of information provided by Propaganda is not equally balanced in this thesis. Only a limited part of the congregation’s vast material relating to Ireland provides relevant details on the two colleges’ activities and on their personnel and students for the years covered by this thesis. By contrast, in the case of Irish missionaries in the West Indies, the information provided by the congregation, and in particular the relationes contained within the Scritture riferite, is of primary importance. It offsets the fact that the Irish missionaries did not write and publish accounts of their missionary experiences. A further way to counterbalance the lack of published Irish missionary accounts is also to resort to the printed missionary accounts written by the Dominican Jean-Baptiste Dutertre and the Jesuit Pierre Pelleprat, two French missionaries who operated in the West Indies during the seventeenth century. Both works offer valuable details on the missionary process in the West Indies, but, of the two, Pelleprat’s Relation is the most detailed source for evaluating the impact of the Irish missionary activity in that area. Indeed his Relation devotes an entire chapter to the activity of an Irish Jesuit priest, John Stritch, thus offering a precious case study for examining the difficulties faced by Irish missionaries in a region outside of Europe.36

In sum, the sources for this study are wide-ranging and comprehensive, and every effort has been made to remedy gaps in the records. What follows therefore is an in-depth investigation of clerical networking in the changing environment of Irish mission as the seventeenth century proceeded, and an examination of the extent to which authorities and missionaries were able to respond to its pastoral demands.

Chapter One
Irish clergy in Rome in the early seventeenth century

The political and social consequences of the conclusion of the Nine Years’ War in 1603 were far-reaching. As the Stuart regime was inaugurated, the Tudor conquest was completed and English law and administrative structures extended further over Gaelic lordships. The flight of the Earls in 1607 paved the way for the plantation of Ulster which began in 1610. The same year the plantation scheme was also extended to the Wexford area. This period was also characterized by a strong anti-Catholic policy that Sir Arthur Chichester (1563-1625), the lord deputy of Ireland from 1605 until 1616, implemented in Ulster, with tensions that ensued, heightened by events such as the execution of Cornelius O’Devanney (c.1533-1612), the Franciscan bishop of Down and Connor, and the priest Patrick Loughran, who had been a chaplain of Hugh O’Neill, the second Earl of Tyrone (c.1550-1616), in Dublin in 1612.¹

The strict anti-Catholic measures and the Ulster plantation encouraged a significant number of Irish Catholics to emigrate to the Iberian Peninsula. After the Nine Years’ War, an estimated 800 Irish refugees soon settled in the Galicia region.² This region attracted Irish exiles because of the long-established commercial and fishing relations which linked the ports of Dublin, Galway, Limerick and Waterford with those of Bilbao and La Coruña. Migration was also favoured by financial support provided by the Spanish crown which, by the late 1590s, had developed a system of patronage to integrate Irish soldiers, merchants, and students into Spanish

society. Spanish Flanders was another area of strong Irish migration, and was largely composed of soldiers enrolled in the Spanish regiments, whose overall presence in 1623 was recorded at around 1300 men.

The Spanish authorities proved particularly concerned with the training, in accordance with Tridentine principles, of priests who would return to operate as missionaries in Ireland. This was part of a strategy conceived and promoted by the Spanish crown in order to safeguard Catholicism in Ireland from the Protestant threat. This concern set the agenda for transforming the communities of Irish students, who were gathering in the Spanish universities, into specific colleges. This had already been evident in the final decade of the sixteenth century. In 1590, twenty Irishmen grouped in Lisbon under the protection of Garcia Melho Silvia, together with the strong support of the Irish Jesuit John Howlin (1542-7) and his Portuguese confere Pedro Fonseca, and paved the way for the foundation of the Irish College there. Further establishments sprang up in Salamanca in 1592, Santiago de Compostela in 1605, Seville in 1612, Madrid in 1629, and Alcalá de Henares in 1649. Salamanca was founded by the Irish Jesuit Thomas White, while Santiago de Compostela, Seville, and Madrid were founded by two secular priests: the former by Eugene MacCarthy from Cork, and the latter two by Theobald Stableton (1589-1647) from the Cashel diocese. However the Irish College of Alcalá was founded by a laywoman, Baroness doña Beatriz, widow of the Portuguese Don Jorge de la Paz de Silveira.


6 Patricia O’Connell, The Irish College at Lisbon (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2001), 22-25.


The regulation that linked these colleges was that the students, once admitted, were required to take an oath that bound them to return to Ireland once they had completed their studies. In this, the Irish colleges shared a common purpose with the German College of Rome and the English Colleges of Douai and Rome, founded in 1575, 1568, and 1579 respectively. The core mission of all was to form priests who, after a proper theological training, would be ready to return home to fight Protestantism and promote pious discipline amongst the faithful as the Council of Trent advocated. Once admitted into the colleges, the Irish students initially enrolled in a programme during which they studied arts and philosophy. They then moved on to study theology and canon law. The full length of their formation period was seven years.

This pattern of collegial establishment was repeated in Spanish Flanders. In 1594 Christopher Cusack, a secular priest and possibly the son of Sir Robert Cusack, founded the secular college of Saint Patrick. When this proved insufficient to serve the educational needs of the Irish students, Cusack established two new secular colleges at Antwerp and Tournai, in 1600 and 1616 respectively. His hand was again evident in 1610 when he helped his cousin, the Capuchin Francis Nugent (1569-1635) to establish a seminary at Lille. Meanwhile in France, the first step to found an Irish college was made by Thomas Lee and six clerics. Subsequently Dermot MacCallaghan MacCarthy of Muskerry established the Irish College of


12 O’ Connor, “Irish migration to Spain,” 112.

13 Walsh, The Irish Continental College Movement, 63-64.

14 Patrick Boyle, The Irish College in Paris from 1578 to 1901, with a Brief Account of the Other Irish Colleges in France: viz., Bordeaux, Toulouse, Nantes, Poitiers, Douai, and Lille; and a Short Notice of the Scotch and English Colleges in Paris (London: Art & Book Co, 1901), 9-10.
Bordeaux in 1603, with the strong support of Archbishop François de Sourdís (d.1628), while Gelasius Lurcan founded a college in Rouen in 1612.15

Studies of individual colleges confirm that the majority of the students recruited were Old English from Leinster and Munster.16 For example, the Irish College of Douai favoured the admission of students of Old English lineage from Leinster, thus precluding the entry of Gaelic candidates of Ulster and Connacht.17 In France, until the late 1630s, Munster dominated the provincial background of the students of the Irish Colleges there.18 According to an appeal written by MacCarthy in 1619, 207 Irish clerics had been sustained and trained in the college of Bordeaux since its foundation. The majority were Old-English from the southern provinces, with 147 students being from Munster, and forty-one from Leinster. The Ulster quota was limited to fifteen clerics, while only four were from Connacht.19 Meanwhile, in the Iberian Peninsula, most of the Irish students came from Munster and Leinster, with the majority of these being Old English. This was a deliberate policy which corresponded to the political strategy of the

17 The first studies of individual colleges do not normally indicate whether they recruited from Old English families or from native Irish families. The only exception is John Brady’s examination of Douai College: John Brady, “Father Christopher Cusack and the Irish college of Douai, 1594-1624,” in Measgria Mhichíl Ui Chléirigh: Miscellany of Historical and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Brother Michael O Cleirigh, Chief of the Four Masters, 1643-1943, ed. Sylvester O’Brien (Dublin: Assisi Press, 1944), 104, footnote no.54.
Spanish crown which considered the Old English community more inclined to peaceful relationships with the Stuarts.\(^{20}\)

The preponderance of Leinster and Munster recruits in the Irish colleges was a cause of concern and discontent among some Irish Franciscans, and especially to Florence Conry (Flaithrí Ó Maolchonai, 1561-1629), provincial of the Irish Franciscan order and archbishop of Tuam from 1609 to 1629. Conry, who was a member of a Gaelic family of bardic tradition, arrived in the Iberian Peninsula in 1602, after he followed Red Hugh O’Donnell (1572-1602), who had travelled there to lobby for military support after the defeat of Kinsale in 1601.\(^{21}\) Conry became the first Irishman to fill the role of adviser in Madrid on matters related to the Irish migration, thus acting as an intermediary between the Spanish king, the Irish exiles and the Gaelic community in Ireland.\(^{22}\) Furthermore, Conry was “bilingual”, having been educated at Salamanca,\(^{23}\) and was therefore able to act as a point of contact between the Gaelic world and the Iberian Peninsula, where Gaelic scholars had been studying since 1400.\(^{24}\) In his view,\(^{25}\) the impact of Old-English priests who returned to minister in the


\(^{22}\) Schüller, “Irish Migrant Networks and Rivalries in Spain, 1575-1659,” in Irish Migrants in Europe after Kinsale, 1602-1820, ed. O’Connor and Mary Ann Lyons (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 97; Igor Pérez Tostado, Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008), 51.


\(^{25}\) In the essay of Óscar Recio Morales Conry’s view is explained through his letter to Francisco de Valdivieso, general procurator of the Jesuits: Russell Library Maynooth, Salamanca Archives, 52/9/11, Florence Conry to Francisco de Valdivieso, 1604 ?, document cited in Óscar Recio Morales, “Irish Emigré Group Strategies of Survival, Adaptation and Integration in Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Spain,” in Irish Communities in Early-Modern Europe, ed. O’Connor and Lyons (Dublin: Four Courts Press), footnote no.44, 255 : ’los de las ciudades por falta de la destresa en hablar la lengua vulgar no se oyen en todo lo demas del reyno […] lo que predicen en las tierras fuera de las ciudades sera tan obscuro como prophesia [you can hardly hear those from the cities in all the Kingdom
Gaelic areas of Ireland would be negligible because they would not be able to speak the Irish language.\textsuperscript{26} As a result, he planned, from 1601, to establish a Franciscan college in Spanish Flanders, which would favour the entry of Gaelic students, from Ulster and Connacht, who would be trained with a view to returning to their native regions.\textsuperscript{27} In 1606 the project began to take shape with the granting of 1000 crowns annually from Philip III to allow the Franciscans to study and sustain themselves.\textsuperscript{28} In 1607 Pope Paul V (1552-1621) issued the college’s bull of foundation.\textsuperscript{29}

Like the other secular seminaries, the aim of this college, known as Saint Anthony’s, was to prepare missionaries to operate at home. However, the term missionaries had to be adapted to the unique context of Ireland, which, according to Patrick Corish, had a church and not a mission. His statement is based upon the fact that at the beginning of the seventeenth century the structure of the Catholic Church in Ireland differed from that of the other confessional states ruled by Protestant monarchs.\textsuperscript{30}

\[\text{[Ireland]}\text{ speak Gaelic, as they cannot speak the common tongue [Gaelic] so an Old-English cleric’s sermon outside the cities will be dark as a prophecy].}\]

\textsuperscript{26} Conry was incorrect to suggest so categorically that Old English clergy would be unable to communicate in Irish, as the evidence suggests that some may have been equipped to do so. The best known example is Geoffrey Keating (1570-1644), a member of an Old English family from Tipperary. Educated principally in Rheims, where he obtained his doctorate, in 1603 he was recorded to be theology lecturer in the Irish College of Bordeaux. Keating returned on mission to Ireland around 1610, and was thereafter based mainly in Lismore diocese. A master of Gaelic, he composed four works in the language, the most important of which is \textit{Foras Feasa ar Éirinn} (\textit{Foundation of Knowledge on Ireland}), a Catholic history of Ireland from creation to the arrival of the Normans, which he completed around 1634. But Keating also produced spiritual works in Irish, notably \textit{Tri bior-ghaoithe an bháis} (\textit{The Three Shafts of Death}) and \textit{Eochair-sciath an Aifrinn} (\textit{An Explanatory Defence of the Mass}) around 1631: Geoffrey Keating, \textit{Tri Biorghaoithe an Bháis}, ed. Robert Atkinson (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy 1890); Keating, \textit{Eochairschiath an Aifrinn: An Explanatory Defence of the Mass} around 1631: Geoffrey Keating, \textit{Tri Biorghaoithe an Bháis}, ed. Robert Atkinson (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy 1890); Keating, \textit{Foras Feasa ar Éirinn: The History of Ireland}, ed. D. Comyn and P.S. Dineen (London: Irish Texts Society 1902-14), 4 vols. The standard biography of Keating is Bernadette Cunningham, \textit{The World of Geoffrey Keating: History, Myth and Religion in Seventeenth-Century Ireland} (Dublin: Four Courts Press 2000).


\textsuperscript{28} Philip III to the Archduke Albert, 21 September 1606, in \textit{Louvain Papers}, 1-2.

\textsuperscript{29} Bull of foundation of Paul V, Rome, 3 April 1607, see ibid., 4-7.

\textsuperscript{30} Corish, \textit{The Catholic Community}, 17.
Church in England, the United Provinces or Transylvania was organized along the lines of a mission.31 In the United Provinces, where a significant Catholic minority lived under a Protestant regime, the Catholic Church relied on the authority of the Jesuit Sashout Vosmeer, to whom the Holy See gave the title of vicar apostolic in 1602.32 In England, the disputes between seculars and regulars resulted in the appointment of an archpriest in 1598. Yet his authority was limited to the secular clergy, and disputes continued until 1625 when Richard Smith (1568-1655) was appointed as vicar apostolic of the entire English Catholic mission. The Benedictines continued to challenge his authority, resulting in him having to flee to France in 1631 when the government issued a warrant for his arrest.33 In contrast to the United Provinces and England, Transylvania did not possess a vicar apostolic, but instead a small Jesuit mission which catered for the spiritual needs of the local Catholic community.34

In Ireland, however, due to the preponderance of Catholics, the structure of the Catholic Church resembled that of its established neighbours in Catholic sovereignties.35 Its particularity emerged during the first two decades of the seventeenth century as the diocesan episcopate was reconstructed. After the appointment of David Rothe (1572-1650) to the bishopric of Ossory in 1618, eighteen other episcopal nominations were

made until 1630.\textsuperscript{36} The reconstruction of the Irish episcopate was strongly backed by members of the papal curia, and more specifically by the Sacred Congregation “de Propaganda Fide” which was established in 1622 by Pope Gregory XV (1554-1623), to assume responsibility for oversight of the missionary activity in Protestant and non-Christian regions, and decided the appointments on the pope’s behalf.\textsuperscript{37}

Propaganda was not the only motor behind the reconstruction of the Irish episcopate. The Irish colleges also played a seminal role in the formation of future bishops. Almost all of the nineteen bishops nominated between 1618 and 1630 attended the Irish colleges of Spanish Flanders, France, and the Iberian Peninsula. There they pursued the philosophy and theology degrees offered by the local universities.\textsuperscript{38} Thus, the Irish colleges steadily contributed to the reestablishment of hierarchical structures and discipline in Ireland. Yet the ministries of the priests assumed the tone of a mission, because the pre-existing parish system could be ignored, and they could be posted to places of most need.\textsuperscript{39}

To determine how many students entered each college and how many returned to this unusual environment in Ireland is difficult since comprehensive figures do not survive. According to a list drawn up in 1622, 222 students had been admitted to the Irish College of Douai since its foundation. Of these, forty became Franciscans, thirty-one Jesuits, fifteen Capuchins, three Dominicans, three Augustinians, two Benedictines and a


\textsuperscript{37} Propaganda was officially founded on 22nd June 1622; however the first general congregation of the cardinals was held on 6th January 1622. See APF, Acta, vol. 3, fol. 1, general congregation, 6 January 1622; APF, Miscellanee diverse, vol. 22, fols. 1-4, Gregorio XV, Inscrutabili divinae providentiae, 22 June 1622.

\textsuperscript{38} The only exceptions were bishops Hugh O’Reilly and John O’Molony. O’Reilly did his philosophy and theology studies in Ireland and the universities of Rouen and Paris. O’Molony completed his philosophy studies in Galway under the supervision of Alexander Lynch. Afterwards he pursued his theology degree at Paris and Orléans. See Cregan, “The Social and Cultural Background,” 112-113.

\textsuperscript{39} Alison Forrestal, Catholic Synods in Ireland, 1600-1690 (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1998), 31-34.
In the Iberian Peninsula, between 1592 and 1629, 131 students entered the Irish College of Salamanca. But unfortunately, these lists provide little information on when the students left the colleges, if they returned to Ireland, or in what regions they operated, if they did.

II

In papal circles, there was little sign that the authorities were taking much note of the developing structure of missionary formation that the new colleges provided. Indeed there appears to be no evidence of any reaction to the report that, in 1613, the papal nuncio in Spanish Flanders, Cardinal Guido Bentivoglio (1579-1644) sent to Paul V (1552-1621) on the state of the Catholic religion in Ireland in 1613. According to his estimate, in Ireland there were 800 seculars, 130 Franciscans, twenty Jesuits plus a few Benedictines and Dominicans.

A later report, written in 1623, by Eugene Matthews, archbishop of Dublin from 1611 until 1623, to Propaganda, indicated a growth in the number of the Irish regulars stating that in Ireland there were 800 secular priests, 200 Franciscans and about 100 from other religious orders. Both the nuncio and Matthews did not specify how many clerics had been educated abroad or at home. Yet Bentivoglio remarked that the better clerics were those educated in the colleges outside of Ireland, and specifically mentioned the Irish Colleges of Douai, Bordeaux, Lisbon, and Salamanca. He was however worried by the low educational standard of some of their graduates. Moreover he drew attention to the fact that many Franciscan missionaries were educated in

---

42 ASV, Fondo Borghese, Serie I, vols. 269-272, fols. 89v-92r, Guido Bentivoglio to Pope Paul V, 6 April 1613.
44 APF, SOCG, vol. 294, fols. 15r-22v, Eugene Matthews to the cardinals of PF, [1623].
Ireland, and thus they lacked the requisite qualities for priestly ministry.\textsuperscript{45} Using Matthews’ report, however, Corish estimates that less than thirty percent of the secular clergy was educated in the Irish colleges, although this is difficult to verify.\textsuperscript{46}

Bentivoglio’s report referred to four colleges amongst those which connected Ireland to the Iberian Peninsula, France and Spanish Flanders. There was one notable geographical absence in this map of establishments, and it remained thus until the 1620s. By this decade, the capital of the Catholic Church, Rome, did not possess any college dedicated to the formation of Irish clergy. Two crucial factors discouraged the Irish students from relocating there for their studies. The first was that the city suffered from the absence of an established Irish community like those of the Iberian Peninsula which could provide support to the students. The commercial relations between Ireland and the Iberian Peninsula as well as the presence of Irish regiments in Spanish Flanders also played an influential part in the migratory choices of the students. Most of them belonged to Old-English trading families of Limerick or Waterford. Due to this, they instinctively chose locations where there were already Irish communities with connections with Ireland.\textsuperscript{47} Secondly, the Papal States had only one university, La Sapienza, founded in 1303.\textsuperscript{48} This contrasted with the more extensive academic system of the Iberian Peninsula; by the early seventeenth century, it had thirty-three universities, which might attract Irish students.\textsuperscript{49} Furthermore the teaching methods within La Sapienza may not have been of a high standard. Although made a generation earlier, the observation of the Spanish Jesuit Juan de Polanco (1517?-1576), the personal secretary of Ignatius de Loyola (1491-1556), that the teaching

\textsuperscript{45} ASV, Fondo Borghese, Serie I, vols. 269-272, fols. 89v-92r, Guido Bentivoglio to Pope Paul V, 6 April 1613.
\textsuperscript{46} Corish, \textit{The Catholic Community}, 26.
\textsuperscript{47} Mary Ann Lyons, \textit{Franco-Irish Relations, 1500-1610: Politics, Migration and Trade} (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2003), 167-197.
delivered at La Sapienza was of poor quality, may have retained some taunt.  

However, despite these advantages, in the early decades of the seventeenth century a small group of Irish clerics did settle in Rome. From 1600 until 1625, twenty-nine Irish clerics were recorded within the ordination registers of the city. The majority (twenty-one) were secular priests, while five became Jesuits and three became Franciscans. It is possible that the three Franciscans stayed at the convent of San Pietro in Montorio where Conry resided in 1609 when he was consecrated archbishop of Tuam.

By the end of the 1610s, the total number of Irish Jesuits in Rome was inferior only to those who were in the Iberian Peninsula and in Ireland itself. According to a catalogue of Irishmen enrolled in the Society, in 1609

---

51 Dermot McCarthy of the Cork diocese, ordained priest in 1600; Walter Stanihurst of the Dublin diocese, ordained priest in 1601; John Halpen of Limerick took the tonsure in 1602; Peter Caron matriculated only for the minor orders in 1607; Thomas Rothe of Ossory only matriculated for minor orders in 1608; Robert Lombard of Waterford matriculated for tonsure in 1615; Patrick Quinn/O’Coinne of Armagh diocese took the tonsure in 1615; Eugene Morrison/O’Muirsein, of the Derry diocese was ordained priest in 1615; Patrick Roche of the Cork diocese took the tonsure in 1615; Philip McArdle/MacArdghail of the Clogher diocese was ordained priest in 1616; Patrick Callaghan/O’Ceallachain of the Armagh diocese was ordained priest in 1616; Donatus O’Cahan/O’ Cathain of Derry diocese was ordained priest in 1617; Patrick Fleming of Armagh diocese was ordained deacon in 1618; Patrick Hay of Ferns was ordained priest in 1619; Donatus O’Loan/O’Luain of Derry was ordained priest in 1619; Peter Magennis from Dromore was admitted to the minor orders in 1620, James Tuite of Meath diocese was ordained priest in 1623; David Molloy of Meath was ordained priest in 1623; Bernard Gavan of Clogher diocese was admitted to the minor orders in 1624; Michael Gall of Cork diocese was ordained deacon in 1624; William Connell of Limerick diocese was admitted to minor orders in 1625. The five Jesuits were: Maurice Wyse who was promoted to the subdiaconate in 1599, and entered the Society of Jesus in 1589; Laurence Lee was promoted to minor orders in 1607; William Malone was promoted to minor orders in 1609; John Lombard was promoted to minor orders in 1610; Nicholas Nugent was promoted to minor orders in 1612. The three Franciscans were: Patrick, promoted to the subdiaconate in 1606, Louis, promoted to the subdiaconate in 1616, and Nicholas Stronge, a former student of the Irish College at Bordeaux, who was ordained a priest in 1617. Both Patrick and Louis were cited without their surname. See Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome, 1572-1697,” Arch. Hib. 59 (2005): 8-12; CSPL, vol.1615-1625, 318.
there were twelve Irish Jesuits in Rome, eighteen in Ireland, thirty in the Iberian Peninsula, six in Belgium, two in Germany, two in France, and one each in Austria and Paraguay. The twelve Jesuits in Rome originated from Leinster and Munster with five from the diocese of Meath, three from Dublin, two from Waterford, and two from Kilkenny and Cork respectively. Yet only three of those named in the 1609 catalogue were recorded in the ordination register. Of these two were promoted to minor orders, and one to the diaconate. Within the ordination register there were also two other Jesuits who were not included in the catalogue of 1609. One was promoted to the subdiaconate in 1600, while the other was admitted to minor orders in 1607. This suggests that the majority of the Irish Jesuits in Rome, despite joining the order, were not anxious to be ordained and to return to Ireland, a trend that would continue in the following decades.

Compared to the Jesuits, the provenance of the twenty-one secular candidates was more heterogeneous. While the origin of one cleric is unknown, nine came from Ulster, six from Munster, and five from Leinster. This slight majority of Ulster candidates was due more to the development of events unfavourable to Catholics in that province than to

54 The twelve Jesuits were: John Lombard of Waterford who was born in 1584 and joined the Jesuits in 1604; Thomas Comeford of Waterford who was born in 1583 and entered the Jesuits in 1604; Edward Barnewall of Dublin who was born in 1586 and entered the Jesuits in 1604; George Geraldine of Meath who was born in 1584 and joined the Jesuits in 1604; Robert Neterville of Meath who was born in 1582 and joined the Jesuits in 1604; John Shaw of Kilkenny who was born in 1581 and joined the Jesuits in 1604; William Malone of Dublin who was born in 1586 and entered the Jesuits in 1606; Jacob Morgan of Meath who was born in 1585 and joined the Jesuits in 1608; Nicholas Nugent of Meath was born in 1587 and joined the Jesuits in 1608; Bartholomew Hamly of Meath was born in 1589 and joined the Jesuits in 1608; George Galtrome of Dublin was born in 1590 and joined the Jesuits in 1608; Stephan Gold of Cork was born in 1583 and joined the Jesuits in 1608. Ibid., 229.
55 They were John Lombard, William Malone, and Nicholas Nugent: Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 9-10.
56 They were Maurice Wyse and Laurence Lea: Ibid., 8-9.
58 see above 50n.
the presence of Hugh O’Neill in Rome from 1608.⁵⁹ Fears about the arrival of the Protestant English and Scottish settlers in Ulster influenced the ordination policy that the Holy See adopted towards the Ulster candidates. This was evinced in the fact that seven of them were ordained with the title of missionaries for Ireland.⁶⁰ In 1616 and 1623, two of the nine Ulstermen also enjoyed the benefit of the *per obitum* by which the papacy filled a benefice in an Irish diocese when its incumbent died.⁶¹ For a cleric studying abroad, this benefice was a valuable means of claiming some form of sustenance, and it became customary in Spanish Flanders. However, in the following decades, few other Ulstermen would again obtain it in Rome.⁶²

III

When the first call to establish a college for Irish clerical students in Rome came, it was not made by an Irish individual in the city, as might have been expected. Instead it was Queen Margaret of Austria (1584-1611), wife of King Philip III of Spain, who strongly encouraged the foundation of an Irish college in the city. In 1611 she pleaded with Paul V that more colleges should be provided for the education of Irishmen for the priesthood, justifying her request by explaining that the number of Irish students in the Iberian Peninsula was increasing but that the existing seminaries could only admit a limited number of them. Consequently, she observed, some Irish students were considering travelling to Rome, which, in her opinion, necessitated the foundation of a college there to house and train them.⁶³

The pope did not respond to the Spanish queen’s exhortation, and it was not succeeded by another in the early first two decades of the seventeenth century. This was despite the fact that, during this period, the papal curia
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⁶¹ ASV, Data Ria Apostolica, *Per Obitum*, vol. 1616, fol. 57r; vol. 1623, fol. 61v. These were McArdle and Gavan.
included influential Irish figures, notably Peter Lombard, (1554-1625), the
archbishop of Armagh from 1601 to 1625. A member of an Old-English
family of Waterford, he had graduated at Louvain in 1575, and from 1598,
when he travelled to Rome on university business, he had acted as Hugh
O’Neill’s agent, while also becoming one of the chief theologians in the city.
In 1602, Pope Clement VIII (1536-1605) appointed him as one of the
principal members of the Congregation *De Auxiliis divinae gratiae*.64

During his early years in Rome, Lombard encouraged Clement VIII to
embrace and support O’Neill’s cause. In his *De Regno Hiberniae sanctorum
insula commentarius* (1600), he eulogized the Irish colleges of Salamanca,
Lisbon and Douai in order to prove the fulfilment of a broader prophecy
that indicated that the time for papal intervention in Ireland had come.65
However, beyond using the colleges to serve O’Neill’s cause, Lombard
made no effort to establish an Irish College in Rome. This did not, however,
mean that the archbishop refused to help his fellow countrymen in Rome
because, in the early 1610s, he may have provided some form of assistance
to them. This is suggested in a letter written by Patrick Roche, a cleric from
Kinsale ordained in Rome in 1615.66 This letter, probably completed in early
1615, was addressed to an unnamed Monseigneur.67 In it, Roche thanked
him for requesting the aid of his cousin, Father Malcot, to facilitate his
entry into one of the foreign seminaries in Rome. Roche reported to his
correspondent that Malcot would speak to an ambassador, (he did not
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64 This latter was a congregation established in 1598 by Clement VIII to solve the
theological controversy over divine grace that, since the 1550s, had opposed the
Spanish Jesuit Luis de Molina (1535-1600), and the Dominicans. See Bruno Boute,
“Our Man in Rome: Peter Lombard, Agent of the University of Louvain, at the
Grand Theatre of European Politics, 1598-1612,” in The Ulster Earls and Baroque
Europe: Refashioning Irish Identities, 1600-1800, ed. O’Connor and Lyons (Dublin:
Four Courts Press, 2010), 110-141; Boute, Academic Interests and Catholic
Confessionalisation: The Louvain Privileges of Nomination to Ecclesiastical Benefices
(Leiden: Brill, 2010), 313-422; James D. Crichton, Saints or Sinners? Jansenism and
65 Peter Lombard, *De regno hiberniae, sanctorum insula, commentarius authore illustriiss.
ac reverendiss. domino, Petro Lombardo, hiberno*, ed. Patrick F. Moran (Dublin: J.
Duffy, 1868), 137-139.
66 Roche was officially ordained on 13 May 1615. See Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained
at Rome,”10.
67 Ignatius Fennessy, “Patrick Roche of Kinsale and St. Patrick’s College, Rome,”
specify his name or his nationality), who was close to Cardinal Scipione Caffarelli Borghese (1576-1633), the Secretary of State, in order to obtain financial assistance for him. Malcot, he wrote, had warned him of the difficulty of getting into a seminary, notably the German College which was the best among them but which the Irish could not enter. Roche went on to observe that the Scottish College of Rome, founded in 1600, was in such poor condition that there were few resources available for the students. According to Roche, the only viable solution was therefore to stay in Lombard’s house until he was able to enter a college. As well as this reference to Lombard’s ability to shelter Irish clerics, the letter also had a mysterious inscription which identified Roche as an ‘Irishman, alumnus of Saint Patrick’s College, Rome.’ Saint Patrick’s College may have referred to an informal gathering of Irish students who stayed, at Lombard’s expense, in his house on Strada Gregoriana where he had lived since 1612.

Roche’s letter highlighted key problems faced by the Irish clerics in Rome. The majority did not have ready access to the favour of patrons, and their experiences contrasted to that of the last Irish student accepted into the German College. David Rothe’s nephew, Thomas Rothe, entered the college on 28 July 1607. Thomas Rothe’s admission to the German College was ensured through the assistance of patrons who, as well as his uncle, included Albert VII, archduke of Austria (1559-1621). Indeed the archduke wrote, in support of Rothe’s admission, to Cardinal Borghese (1577-1633) in
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68 Mullett, Catholics in Britain and Ireland, 1558-1829 (Houndmills: St. Martin's Press, 1998), 41, 51.
69 FLK, MS B 33, pp.88-89, Patrick Roche to Monsieur/Monsieur, [before 16 May 1615 ?]: ‘hiberno/alumno Collegij S. Patritij/Romae,’ document cited in Fennessy, “Patrick Roche of Kinsale,” 95; BAV, BL, MS 8928, fols. 37r-38r.
70 He was born in 1584 from a merchant family of Kilkenny. His father was Edward Rothe, while his mother Ellice was daughter and heiress of James Grace, a constable of the Kilkenny prison. He was made acolyte on 29 March 1609. See William Carrigan, The History and Antiquities of the Diocese of Ossory (Dublin: Sealy, Bryers & Walker, 1905), III, 69-70; Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,”9.
71 Prior to him six Irish students were admitted between 1562 and 1580. Details on their names can be found in Alphons Bellesheim, Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche in Irland von der einfuhrung des christenthums bis auf die gegenwart (Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1890-1891), II, 714-715; Rothe took the college oath on 25 April 1610. See Archivio storico Collegio Germanico-Ungarico, Liber iuramentorum 1584-1627, Fondo Historica, ‘Nomina alumnorum Collegii Germanici et Hungarici,’ no.42.
early May 1607. Perhaps making use of contacts established while in the German College Rothe later became a tutor to the son of a German prince, before returning to Ireland in 1621. In that year he was appointed vicar general of his uncle’s diocese, where he died in 1649.

Rothe’s educational experience in Rome illustrates the manner in which patronage could determine not only a potential missionary’s entry to a college, but his subsequent career. His successful experience contrasted with that of Roche, who found himself in a vulnerable position because he had no patrons like Rothe and he struggled to attach himself to other patrons who might offer financial and vocational aid. This was frustrating, for in the conclusion to his letter he revealed that he had personally pleaded his case with an ambassador (whom he did not identify), but pessimistically concluded that he did not know what to expect because ‘the words of those who become Romanized do not always carry much weight; they pretend and promise much but do little.’

Even the help provided by the highest authorities at the papal curia was not necessarily sufficient to guarantee security to a cleric. John White, a student of the Irish college of Douai, wrote to Roche on 16th May 1615, to congratulate him for managing to obtain a contribution to his livelihood from the pope. White hoped that this would maintain his friend until he could gain, through the intercession of a patron, more financial assistance from cardinals. One of these cardinals may have been Marco Aurelio Maraldo, a datary of the Holy See entrusted to supervise the distribution of
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72 ASV, Fondo Borghese, Series II, vol. 70, fol. 70, Albert VII to Scipione Caffarelli Borghese, 8 May 1607.
74 FLK, MS B 32, John White to Roche, 16 May 1615, document cited in Fennessy, “Patrick Roche of Kinsale,” 92.
75 According to the list of 1622, he is mentioned as Ioannes Vitus, doctor of theology. See Brady, “The Irish Colleges in the Low Countries,” 76.
76 FLK, MS B 33, Roche to Monsieur/Monseigneur, [before 16 May 1615 ?]: ‘nam qui sunt Romanisati (ut ita loquas), vix solat ipsoviem verbis pondus messe, stimulant, promittunt multa, pausa faciunt,’ document cited in Fennessy, “Patrick Roche of Kinsale,” 92.
papal favours. It was to him that Roche dedicated a poem of praise which was published in Rome in 1616.\textsuperscript{77} However, in the early 1620s, Roche was forced to adopt this strategy in order to gain support from prominent ecclesiastical figures. In 1621 he published his second poem which was dedicated to Gregory XV.\textsuperscript{78} Then, in 1623 he wrote to Gregory XV to plead that he was ‘in great need’ and had ‘nothing to live on.’ Roche expressly requested that the pope grant him a pension or a viaticum to return home.\textsuperscript{79} The viaticum so needed by Roche was a travelling allowance that covered the cost of secular dress and of the journey back to Ireland. In contrast to Rome, this form of allowance had been, since the early 1620s, a customary practice of the Irish Colleges of the Iberian Peninsula and Spanish Flanders, which enjoyed royal assistance through endowments or annual grants since the reign of Philipp III.\textsuperscript{80} It is not clear whether Roche obtained the viaticum or not, but he was back in Ireland in 1624. In that year, he signed a testimonial written by Daniel Desmond, a doctor in canon and civil law, in favour of the Franciscans who lived in the friary of Kilcrea, close to Kinsale.\textsuperscript{81}

Roche eventually managed to return to Ireland on mission, but his difficulties in Rome were symptomatic of the disadvantages of Roman residence for Irish students in the first two decades of the century. Without a dedicated structure for Irish clergy and for those wishing to train as such, settlement was not easy. Nor were they permitted generally to access training and support in the existing colleges for other missionary regions. The situation was worsened by the fact that they lacked dedicated patrons, spokesmen and protectors who might contribute to alter the existing status quo and this further played heavily against Irish clerics struggling to survive and to progress in Rome. Indeed Lombard’s presence did not


\textsuperscript{78} Fennessy, “Patrick Roche of Kinsale,” 99.

\textsuperscript{79} Roche to Gregory XV, [1623?], in \textit{Wadding Papers}, 72: ‘in magna necessitate quia nihil habet quo posset vivere.’

\textsuperscript{80} Tostado, \textit{Irish Influence at the Court of Spain}, 28.

\textsuperscript{81} Attestations concerning the Franciscans, 1624, in \textit{Wadding Papers}, 63.
hasten the process for founding an Irish College for he displayed no interest in establishing one for his fellow countrymen, and the lodging of some Irish clerics in his house should be interpreted more as a temporary solution rather than the first step to procure a permanent location, and to found an institution to form clergy for missions to the Irish.

Thus, by the time that Lombard died in 1625, Rome remained distinct from places such as Salamanca and Douai, which were already prominently positioned in the landscape of the Irish mission, through their ability to attract significant numbers of Irish ecclesiastics, and to host institutions that specialised in producing clergy to serve in Ireland. It is to the efforts to emulate their progress in Rome that we now turn.
Chapter Two
The foundation of Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College,
1620-1635

I

The 1620s and the early 1630s was a period of major significance for the co-ordination of the Irish clergy in Rome, and especially for the hope that the city could join other locations in possessing a college or colleges which would contribute to the Irish mission. Two crucial developments contributed to the establishment of a process that resulted in the foundation of two colleges. The first of these was the foundation of the Sacred Congregation ‘de Propaganda Fide’ which took an active interest in the Irish mission. As noted in the previous chapter, the congregation was founded in 1622, and at its head stood the pope, under whom there was a board made up of thirteen cardinals, three prelates, and Francesco Ingoli (1578-1649), its first secretary.¹ The establishment of Propaganda represented the climax of the process by which the Holy See reorganized its structure according to Tridentine principles.² In the minds of its founders, the new born congregation would give to the Holy See an increased global control over continental and overseas territories.³

In 1624, Urban VIII (1568-1644), the successor of Gregory XV, decided to appoint a new protector for Ireland to Propaganda who would replace the recently deceased cardinal Fabrizio Verallo (1560-1624). Initially Urban VIII decided to nominate his nephew, Cardinal Francesco Barberini (1597-1679) in 1625. However, between February 1625 and October 1626, when he was absent from Rome on diplomatic missions to Paris and Madrid, Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi (1595-1638), nephew of Gregory XV, acted as his substitute. Then, in 1627, Ludovisi became the official cardinal protector of

Ireland with responsibility for all issues relating to the Irish Church. In theory, the founding of Propaganda seemed to guarantee to the Irish clergy in Rome the support so needed for establishing a proper training institution. However as we shall see, in practice the contribution provided by the Roman congregation would prove minimal and would be limited to grants that it made to students to return as missionaries to Ireland.

Meanwhile, on the Irish side, and perhaps contributing to Propaganda’s new interest in Irish affairs, efforts were also being made to improve Irish ecclesiastical representation in papal circles. This second important development was initiated by Irish bishops and in particular by Eugene Matthews, archbishop of Dublin between 1611 and 1623, who went to Rome in 1622 to request that Gregory XV give financial support for the erection of a secular college in Louvain. On 4 February 1623 he also solicited Propaganda to favour the establishment of an Irish College in Rome, an action that he argued would emulate what Gregory XIII had done for other nations. Although both Matthews and Gregory XV died in 1623, the pastoral college of Louvain was founded in the same year through an allowance of 1000 crowns granted by Urban VIII. To this sum, Propaganda added an annual maintenance grant of 300 crowns in 1625.

While its supporters hoped that an Irish College in Rome would fill an educational vacuum, the proposed college also quickly came to be associated with the question of Irish identity in Rome. According to its

---


promoters, the college would offer a public platform to represent Irish ecclesiastics in Rome. In 1625, an anonymous memoir written for Ludovisi on behalf of a number of Irish bishops argued that the founding of an Irish college would change the negative views of the Irish held by many in Rome, overcoming the prejudice excited against the whole community because of the ambition and ignorance of some.

Behind this petition possibly lay the hand of John Roche (1576-1636) who by this time had become one of the most influential of the Irish clergy in Rome. A secular priest, Roche belonged to the first generation of Irish students educated at Douai, where he was ordained priest in 1600. After six years, during which he was entrusted with supervising the precarious finances of Douai College, Roche came under the patronage of Guido Bentivoglio. He followed his patron to France in 1615, devoting himself to settling the financial problems threatening the Irish college of Paris. His experience as well as his connection to Bentivoglio were decisive factors when, after Bentivoglio’s election to Cardinal in 1621, the Irish bishops sought an influential individual to act on their behalf in Rome. On 14 June 1622 Roche was nominated procurator in Rome of ‘certain Irish bishops,’ amongst whom were David Rothe, Maurice O’Hurley of Emly, Richard Arthur of Limerick, Balthazar Delahyde, (c1564-c1623), vicar general of Armagh, Jacob Talbot, Daniel O’ Drohen, vicar apostolic of Ferns, Robert Barry, vicar apostolic of Ross, and Lawrence Lea, vicar general and dean of Waterford.

However, Roche was not the only Irishman to obtain a key position within the papal curia at this time, and it was in fact an Irish Franciscan
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10 Appointment of John Roche as procurator in Rome for certain Irish bishops, 14 June 1622, in Wadding Papers, 23-24.
who made the first successful effort to establish the proposed college. Four years before Roche’s arrival in Rome in 1622, the Franciscan Luke Wadding had settled in Rome and had quickly risen to prominence. Born on 16 October 1588 to a merchant family of Waterford, Wadding entered the Irish College of Lisbon in 1603. From there he moved in 1604 to the friary of the Immaculate Conception in Matozinhos, in order to join the Franciscan order. In 1613 he was ordained and from then until 1618, taught theology and became involved in debating theological issues within the order, winning the esteem of powerful Franciscan patrons such as Antonio de Trejo (d.1635)- the bishop of Cartagena, and Benigno da Genoa, minister general from 1615 to 1625.12

Wadding’s coming to Rome was the consequence of a patchwork of diplomatic and religious connections between the Iberian Peninsula and the Italian Peninsula. In the autumn of 1618 de Trejo ordered him to participate in the royal commission on the Immaculate Conception, an extraordinary embassy organized by Philip III to petition the pope to define this devotion as a Catholic dogma.13 In addition, Wadding was also charged with a prestigious but challenging role within his own order. In the spring of 1619, Benigno da Genoa ordered the provincials of the Franciscan provinces to collect and send to Rome all of the historical documents related to the order in their areas. The aim was to gather enough material to compile a general history of the order since its foundation. Wadding was given responsibility to collect the documentation and to arrange it in a strict chronological order. This offered him an invaluable opportunity to establish a network of correspondence with
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12 Francis Harold, Vita Fratris Lucae Waddingi, 3rd ed. (Quaracchi: Tip. Barbera, Alfani e Venturi, 1931), cap.I-VII, 1-17. This account of Wadding’s life was firstly published as a prefix to Harold’s work, Epitome Annalium Waddingi ordinis minorum (Romae: ex typographia Nicolai Angeli Tinassij, 1662).

members of different houses and branches of the Franciscan order.\textsuperscript{14} As he declared to Michele Misserotti, the general of the Conventual Franciscans in 1623, he intended to search for all relevant information amongst the Observants, Conventuals and the Capuchins in order to have a full understanding of the complex history of the Franciscan order.\textsuperscript{15}

II

The settlement of both Wadding and Roche in Rome heralded a new era for the Irish clergy in the city. Roche was initially advantaged over Wadding because the Franciscan was politically aligned with the Spanish crown which was then out of favour with the pro-French Urban VIII. This meant that the possibility of establishing an Irish college in Rome lay in favour of a secular foundation. However the situation soon altered to the advantage the Irish Franciscans.\textsuperscript{16} Peter Lombard died in 1625, while Roche was appointed bishop of Ferns in 1624, and in 1627 he travelled to his new diocese.\textsuperscript{17} The Irish seculars were now left without adequate representation, which created an opportunity for Wadding to exert influence. In the early years of his Roman residency, however, Wadding felt little pressure to do this for two main reasons. The first was that the Irish Franciscans residing in Rome could already rely on the hospitality provided by the convent of San Pietro in Montorio, where Wadding lived from 1619.\textsuperscript{18} The second was due to his involvement in the Royal Commission of the Immaculate Conception, which absorbed most of his time. This was a duty to which the Franciscan was devoted full-time. However, in 1621, with the death of Philip III, promoter of the Commission, and the accession to the throne of Philip IV (1605-1665), who was less motivated and interested in the matter,

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} Albert Hugh O’Donnell to cardinal protector, 7 October 1619, in \textit{Wadding Papers}, 19-20.
the entire theological dispute cooled down, resulting in the failure of de Trejo’s mission.  

In 1625, however, Wadding found himself enmeshed in a series of events that would lead him to found the first Irish college in the Italian Peninsula. The origin of these events lay in 1621, when a small group of Spanish Discalced Franciscans arrived in Rome. After the customary petitions to Pope Gregory XV, they obtained a grant to establish a friary in the area of the Pincian Hill. According to their plans, the foundation would also include a church, dedicated to Saint Isidore, a gesture of papal respect for the Spanish community in Rome.

The building of the friary and of the church soon encountered problems due to escalating expense. In addition, the friars were considered as a splinter group within the Franciscan order, which prevented any sort of internal or external support from individuals or institutions. In the solution to this affair, the Spanish crown’s revived ascendancy over Rome proved decisive. On 10 November 1624, King Philip IV wrote to his ambassador in Rome to order the Spanish Franciscans to leave Saint Isidore’s which was becoming a source of conflict. At the beginning of 1625 their place was taken by another group of Spanish Franciscans, of the Regular Observance branch, led by Bernardino da Siena (b.1571), the commissary general of the Franciscans. Yet this change proved

21 Harold, Vita Fratris, chapter XLIX, 63-65.
22 The other three saints canonized were Ignatius of Loyola, Teresa of Avila and Francis Xavier: Thomas James Dandelet, Spanish Rome, 1500-1700 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 106-107.
23 Harold, Vita Fratris, chapters XLVIII-LII, 63-68.
24 Philip IV to Ruizio Gomez de Sylva, 10 November 1624, in Gregory Cleary, Father Luke, 175.
25 The rise of the Regular Observants within the Franciscan order originated in 1368. The official sanction to separate was given on 28 July 1373 by Pope Gregory XI (1370-1378): Moorman, A History of the Franciscan Order, 372.
unsuccessful because the new friars could not tackle the ongoing building expenses, and hence were forced to leave.26

According to the account of events written by the Franciscan Francis Harold, Wadding initially did not display any interest in this matter. It was Benigno da Genoa who invited him to take over the unfinished friary of Saint Isidore’s in early 1625. The general explained that, due to its growing debts, he had only two viable options: refund the sum of 3000 crowns to the creditors or try to complete the structure. He made no specific proposals about the possibility of using the site to establish an Irish Franciscan College. Moreover, according to Harold, the minister general’s decision to contact Wadding was strongly influenced by the fact that the Franciscan had powerful friends who could contribute to clear the debt. For his part, Wadding seemed reluctant to take over responsibility of such a poorly managed property because it would persistently require financial support from different investors. He decided to consult Urban VIII, Cardinal Francesco Barberini, and Ruiizio Gomez de Sylva, duke of Pastrana and the Spanish ambassador in Rome, who agreed to help him. Significantly, it was after these meetings that Wadding began to consider Saint Isidore’s friary as an opportunity to found a college to train missionaries for the Irish province. Thus, possibly in the late spring of 1625, he agreed to the minister general’s request on condition that he was given permission to use the unfinished structure of Saint Isidore’s to establish a college for his confreres.27

Officially, the new Franciscan institution came into being on 13th June 1625 by virtue of the decree of Bernardino da Siena, who had recently succeeded Benigno da Genoa as minister general, and on 20th October of that year Urban VIII ratified the decree.28 The financial support granted to the college revealed the influential networks established by Wadding. From June 1625 to August 1630, almost 20000 crowns were granted to the Franciscan in order to ensure the purchase of the site, the completion of the

26 Harold, *Vita Fratris*, chapter L, 65.
27 Ibid., 64-65.
28 ACSI, Sectio W 4, no.1, no.2.
college’s structure, and the acquisition of the first books for the library. This assistance was provided by Urban VIII, the two Cardinals Barberini, Cardinal Ludovisi, his brother Prince Niccolò Ludovisi (1613-1664), King Philip IV, Cardinal de Trejo, and the Spanish ambassador in Rome.  

The founding documents left no room for misinterpretation of the aim of the new college: Saint Isidore’s was to become a base from which the order could send missionary priests to the persecuted lands of Ireland, England and Scotland. The documentation did not specify any other regions nor forbade missions to them, thus leaving the way open to new ventures if they were deemed necessary. The new foundation was assigned to the Irish Franciscans, but the decree of foundation emphasized that it should maintain strong links with the order’s Spanish province; the minister general was given power to appoint a guardian and to introduce one or two friars from the Spanish province. The visitation of the college was entrusted to the commissary general of the Franciscan family and, in case of his absence, to the procurator of the order at the papal curia.

The statutes of Saint Isidore’s compiled by Wadding and officially approved by the minister general on 16th October 1625 were similar to those of Saint Anthony’s College, which was by then the power-house of Irish Catholic Reformation activities. The guardian of Saint Isidore’s was to be appointed by the minister general from a list of three or four candidates supplied by a group of senior advisers, called the discretorium and composed of lecturers or former lecturers. Their task was to help the guardian in the college’s administration and only the minister general could appoint or replace lecturers. In case if he was absent, this duty was entrusted to the procurator of the order or the commissary, although he required the discretorium’s consent in such decisions. Wadding stressed that teaching at Saint Isidore’s should be based on theology, with particular
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29 Harold, *Vita Fratris*, chapter LIX, 80.
30 ACSI, Sectio W 4, no.1, no.2.
emphasis given to analysis of the Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, and the decrees of the Council of Trent. Students were also to be instructed on the use of rhetoric in public debates. Wadding also included the practice of scholastic disputation in the curriculum, and students were required to complete exercises in it every Friday and Saturday throughout the scholastic year.

As previously noted, the college was to have a guardian and one or two friars from the Spanish province. Even in this case, Wadding’s influence is obvious. He had strong links with the two Spanish friars who worked in Saint Isidore’s in its early years. Juan de Riera acted as guardian from June 1625 to May 1627 when Wadding replaced him. Gaspar de la Fuente was temporary lecturer of theology for a time. Their selection was part of a strategy elaborated by Wadding to attract very skilled scholars of theology through maintaining amicable ties with San Pietro in Montorio. Both de Riera and de la Fuente had resided there before moving to Saint Isidore’s. Wadding appreciated De La Fuente for his expertise on John Duns Scotus (c.1266-1308) of whom Wadding was a fervent admirer, while de Riera was a learned scholar of Raymon Lull (1232-1315), a Spanish Franciscan philosopher.

The early staffing of Saint Isidore’s certainly portrayed a college that was influenced by Wadding’s personal friendships and by a high number of recruits from his own province. The first indication of Wadding’s influence is indicated by the fact that, on 22nd June 1625, Anthony Hichey, a Munsterman born in Thomond, was named as the first theology lecturer. Hichey was educated at Louvain where he joined the order in 1607. Due to his special interest in the order’s history, Wadding invited him to come to
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32 ACSI, Sectio W 4, no.6.
34 FLK, MS C 58, p.3.
38 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 1.
Rome as his collaborator in 1619. Another new lecturer who had been educated in Louvain was Patrick Fleming, born in 1599 in county Louth, and in June 1625 he was appointed first lecturer in philosophy. From 1613 to 1617, the year he joined the order, Fleming had studied humanities at Tournai and Douai under the tutelage of Christopher Cusack, his uncle.

III

In the same year that Wadding orchestrated the foundation of Saint Isidore’s, attempts were made to provide a similar establishment for secular students. David Rothe made a strong exhortation for such to Lombard in September 1625 declaring that ‘now having a new protector that hath a desire to further us with erecting a new seminary in the city (as we hear) it is our part rather to animate him for so good work.’ Rothe was referring to the appointment of Cardinal Ludovisi as protector of Ireland, although it had no effect on Lombard, because he had just died twelve days before. Rothe hoped that Ludovisi could convince Propaganda to grant financial support for the erection of an Irish secular college in Rome. However, in the period immediately following the founding of Saint Isidore’s, the cardinals of the Roman congregation were more worried about resolving the financial problems besetting the Irish Pastoral college of Louvain than about developing a new seminary in Rome. The Louvain College was a pontifical college that depended on the pope. Although he supported it by annual subsidies, the seminary was struggling with impecuniosity and poor resources, two conditions which encouraged the various regular orders, often better funded, to use it as a recruiting ground.

This, in particular, concerned the Irish bishops for whom the original purpose of the secular colleges, to provide diocesan clergy for the Irish
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41 David Rothe to Peter Lombard, 17 September 1625, in *Wadding Papers*, 104.
42 Millett, “Roman Catholic Bishops from 1534,” 337.
44 Ralph M. Wiltgen, “Propaganda is placed in Charge of the Pontifical Colleges,” 495.
sees, was therefore not being met. They thus found themselves exposed because they depended on seminary priests educated in the continental secular colleges to minister in Ireland.\textsuperscript{45} Their exposure worsened when the 1614 brief of Paul V was confirmed by the bull \textit{Piis Christifidelium} on 15 July 1626, for this permitted that the students of each college could be ordained if they agreed to return to Ireland or if they were nominated by their respective rectors. Both documents were issued without any type of recommendation or approval by the Irish bishops, and did not defend their authority over priests ministering in Ireland.\textsuperscript{46}

The desire of bishops to counter practices that snubbed their authority and rendered vain their efforts to oversee the Irish mission and its clergy pervaded their correspondence with the Holy See in the late 1620s. On 14 March 1627 Thomas Walsh, archbishop of Cashel (1580-1654) and cousin of Wadding, wrote to John Roche in order to complain about the Jesuits’ attitude in the Iberian colleges, where he accused them of paying insufficient attention to the requests of the Irish hierarchy. More enthusiastically, Walsh noted with relief that the same selfishness did not occur at Saint Isidore’s, where, according to him, Wadding was dedicating himself to procuring good men for the prosperity of the Irish Church.\textsuperscript{47}

During spring 1627, the bishops’ letters to the Holy See made specific appeals for restoring the Irish secular colleges in Spanish Flanders from financial embarrassment as well as for promoting new diocesan seminaries, especially in Rome. On 4\textsuperscript{th} April 1627, Thomas Fleming, archbishop of Dublin, Rothe, and William Thirry, bishop of Cork, wrote to Ludovisi and urged the cardinal to ‘hasten the erection of a new seminary in Rome.’\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{47} Thomas Walsh to John Roche, 14 March 1627, in \textit{Wadding Papers}, 245-246.
\textsuperscript{48} Letter of Thomas Fleming, David Rothe, and William Thirry, to cardinal Ludovisi, 4 April 1627, in \textit{Wadding Papers}, 247 : ‘altera per erectionem novi docimilii in Urbe nobis accelerandam.’
At the time the bishops wrote this letter, Ludovisi had already begun to conceive a provisional solution for the Irish seculars of Rome. However, the cardinal required the support and advice of members of the Irish clergy, and his choice fell upon Wadding and Roche. The ecclesiastics encouraged the cardinal to erect a seminary, which, like Saint Isidore’s, would educate zealous priests which they could send back to Ireland. Unfortunately, Ludovisi’s finances could not afford this so until the end of 1627, the Irish secular college remained only a proposal, and the Irish students had to study in institutions belonging to other nationalities. According to the account, dated 1630, compiled by Lucantonio Giunti, Ludovisi’s almoner, the cardinal granted an annual provision of 600 crowns from his private revenue to pay for the lodging of a group of six students: two in the English College, two in the Maronite College, and the remaining two elsewhere in Rome.\textsuperscript{49} Like the students of the English College and Maronite College, the Irish students attended lectures at the Collegio Romano.\textsuperscript{50} One student was expelled from the English College for insubordination. At the Maronite College, a student was banished when he threw a knife at a Maronite collegian.\textsuperscript{51} But, despite these failures, in early 1628 Eugene Callanan, later to become the first rector of the Irish College in Rome, was able to request that the Holy Office of the Inquisition should accord the ‘usual faculties granted to the missionaries of Ireland.’ Callanan presented six ‘men of

\textsuperscript{49} However, in practice, the quantity of students may have differed. According to a note of payment, dated November 1625 and signed by Ludovisi, the English College hosted four Irish lodgers. According to an unsigned letter of 1626 presented to Alessandro Vittrico, cardinal assessor of the Holy Office, two Irish students stayed in the English College and two in the Maronite College: ASV, Archivio Boncompagni-Ludovisi, Armadio IX, Lucantonio Giunti, ‘Discorso e informazione sopra la erezione del collegio Ibernes e fatta dal Cardinale Ludovico Ludovisi nella Città di Roma vicino alla chiesa di San Isidoro,’ protocollo 317, parte IV, no.1, fols. 458-465, 1630c; See also footnote no.6, cited in Collegium Hibernorum de Urbe, 55, and the unsigned letter to Alessandro Vittrico in favour of the bishop of Down, 1626, in Wadding Papers, 168.

\textsuperscript{50} ASV, Archivio Boncompagni Ludovisi, Armarium IX, protocollo 317, numero 1, fols. 458-465; Riccardo Garcia Villoslada, Storia del Collegio Romano, dal suo inizio (1551) alla soppressione della Compagnia di Gesù (1773) (Romae: apud Aedes universitatis Gregorianae, 1954), 143.

\textsuperscript{51} ASV, Archivio Boncompagni Ludovisi, Armarium IX, protocollo 317, numero 1, fols. 458-465.
honest life’ who had completed their studies in Rome.\textsuperscript{52} He addressed his request to the Holy Office because, despite the foundation of Propaganda, it still retained authority to grant the spiritual faculties required by each missionary.\textsuperscript{53} The six Irishmen presented by Callanan were likely the first nucleus of the Irish college that had been hosted in the English College and Maronite College, although unfortunately it is impossible to identify their ages or provincial origins. On 4\textsuperscript{th} May 1628 the Holy Office granted the necessary faculties for a period of seven years, without further comment.\textsuperscript{54}

The expulsion of two students forced Ludovisi to find a new solution. According to Harold, Wadding proposed putting all the Irish students in a house of their own under the disciplinary control of an Irish superior, and he stressed that this would not require persistent financial support. He suggested that Giunti rent a house close to Saint Isidore’s, so that the students could attend the lectures there which would reduce costs.\textsuperscript{55} However, Wadding made this suggestion also in order to protect the project from the influence of the Society of Jesus which, by that time, was entrusted with educating the students of the English College and the German College, thus reinforcing its role as a fully fledged teaching order of Roman Catholicism.\textsuperscript{56}

Wadding was possibly concerned by what had occurred in the Irish Colleges in the Iberian Peninsula. There, in 1613, King Philip III handed the Irish college of Santiago de Compostela to the Society of Jesus due to disciplinary problems amongst the student body.\textsuperscript{57} In 1619, a royal order placed the Irish College in Seville under the supervision of the Jesuit

\textsuperscript{52} The students were Peter Briminghan, Nicholas Britt, Iacob Fallagan, Hugh Maguire, Iacob Malachy Fallagan, and Dermot Hanny: ACDF, SO, St. St., SS, vol. 1-c, fols. 791, 794-795, Eugene Callanan to Holy Office, 1628: quibus facultates aliis Hibernia missionaris concedi solitas’…’ viros esse probae vitae.’


\textsuperscript{54} ACDF, SO, St. St., SS, vol. 1-c, fols. 792-793, general congregation, 4 May 1628.

\textsuperscript{55} ASV, Archivio Boncompagni-Ludovisi, Armadio IX, protocollo 317, parte IV, no.1, fols. 458-465.

\textsuperscript{56} Wiltgen, “Propaganda is placed in charge of the Pontifical Colleges,” 483-485.

\textsuperscript{57} Walsh, The Irish Continental College Movement, 51-52.
Richard Conway (1573-1626), one of the most influential Irish ecclesiastics within the Spanish court.\textsuperscript{58} Again the entrusting of the college to the Jesuit authorities was justified by the poor administration of the seculars and by the students’ indiscipline. With the exception of Alcalá De Henares, all the Irish colleges there remained under the Jesuits’ control.\textsuperscript{59}

Wadding may also have feared that, if handed over to the Jesuits, the foundation in Rome would soon undergo the same troubling clashes experienced in the English College. There, until 1624, the Society had recruited the best students and sent the less talented to England. In the spring of that year, Propaganda, alerted by the complaint of William Bishop, vicar apostolic of England and Scotland (1553-1624), began to attempt to mediate a solution. After eighteen months of discussions and debates, it issued a decree on 24\textsuperscript{th} November 1625 which was originally restricted to the English College but then extended to all the pontifical colleges. It stipulated that all present and future students, on completion of their studies, were to return to their native places. Furthermore they should never join a regular order without permission from the Apostolic See. At the close of 1625 Propaganda revised its former decree so that the terms of the oath were restricted to a period of three years after the student’s departure from the college, irrespective of whether he had completed his studies.\textsuperscript{60}

Ludovisi was not fully satisfied by Wadding’s proposal, and was, in particular, unconvinced by two points. He insisted that the students should attend lectures at the Collegio Romano perhaps because he feared that Wadding would depart Saint Isidore’s, or perhaps in order to favour the Jesuits who ran it. More seriously, the cardinal claimed that his limited

\textsuperscript{58} Enrique García Hernán, “Irish Clerics in Madrid, 1598-1665,” in \textit{Irish Communities in Early-Modern Europe}, ed. Thomas O’Connor and Mary Ann Lyons (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2006), 286.


\textsuperscript{60} On the congregation of 29 October Urban VIII added that students, under the age of fourteen years old, entering any Pastoral college were not obliged to take to oath until they had completed their fourteenth year. See APF, Acta, vol. 3, fols. 93, 101v, 104, 108, 126v-127r, 195v-196r, 269r-270r, 276v-277r, 288v-291r, 295v.
On 24th November 1627, however, an arrangement was finally made, and a house was rented on the Pincian Hill. Crucially, the agreement stressed that cardinal Ludovisi would provide a subsidy for the rental of a house on the Pincian Hill, close to Saint Isidore’s, but it made no mention of the establishment of a college. Its terms stipulated that no more than the prescribed six students could be admitted and that any possible arrival or removal would have to be approved by Ludovisi. Wadding was granted power to supervise the institution and Ludovisi granted 600 crowns with which the Franciscan was to provide a rector and a servant, pay a monthly rent of fifty crowns, and furnish the house. The terms reaffirmed that the students should wear a black soutane and ferraiulo, that is, ordinary clerical dress.

The extent of the Franciscan influence in the government of the house was set out in the constitutions which were drawn up by Wadding and approved on 29 January 1628. Wadding outlined a structure which left final decisions on key questions such as the students’ admission or removal as well as the election of the rectors to Ludovisi. However, despite the fact that the rector would be a secular, Wadding established formal methods of procedure to ensure that the Franciscans retained control over teaching and the students’ curriculum. The entire academic and spiritual formation of the students was entrusted to the Franciscans and they were entitled to verify the students’ aptness for the Irish mission through careful examination. Admittance to the secular foundation was reserved to Irish born students, aged fourteen or above, regardless of their regional origin. A crucial point of the constitutions was that, six months after their admission,

---

63 PICR, Liber XXVII, ‘Institutiones Domus Hibernorum de urbe ab Ill.mo et R.mo Ludovicus Card.le Ludovisio S.R.E Vice-Cancellario, ac Protectore fundator primo die anni MDCXXVIII (1628),’ fols. 1r-10r.
the students were to sign an oath which bound them to receive holy orders and to return to Ireland whenever the college’s authorities decided it.\textsuperscript{64}

In January 1628 Wadding chose Eugene Callanan, a secular priest of the Killala diocese, to be the first rector, an appointment that may have been made partially to please Roche and Thomas Walsh, archbishop of Cashel, of whom he was an ally.\textsuperscript{65} On 30 April of 1627, Roche nominated Callanan as his personal agent in Rome, and on 20 June Walsh appointed him archdeacon of Cashel and protonotary apostolic.\textsuperscript{66}

On 1 January 1628 the first group of six students entered the house. Four of the six were from Ulster, while the other two were from Munster.\textsuperscript{67} News about the creation of the Irish College was greatly appreciated by the Irish episcopate, whose hopes were again rekindled. On 20 February 1628 Walsh wrote to Wadding to eulogize the new foundation, wishing ‘a holy competition between this seminary and those that are under the control of the Company,’ a clear reference to the Iberian colleges controlled by the Jesuits.\textsuperscript{68}

For its part, Propaganda showed little interest in the process that resulted in the founding of the Ludovisian establishment, even though its patron was one of its sitting members. It also did not comment on the constitutions compiled by Wadding. Yet the Roman congregation quickly realized that the resources of Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College were insufficient to enhance the supply of missionaries from Rome to Ireland. In the general congregation held on 8\textsuperscript{th} May 1628, the cardinals decided to grant money to both regular and secular students for their journey home, although this was a one-off decision rather than a new policy, and the cardinals did not repeat it for the remainder of this period. Specifically it

\textsuperscript{64} With regard to the ordination procedure, Wadding later succeeded, possibly in the late 1620s', in obtaining from Urban VIII a dispensation which allowed that Irish students could be ordained by the pope’s vicar: PICR, Liber XXVII, fol. 2v.
\textsuperscript{65} ASV, Archivio Boncompagni-Ludovisi, Armadio IX, protocollo 317, parte IV, no.1, fols. 458-465.
\textsuperscript{66} Roche to Eugene Callanan, 30 April 1627 in Wadding Papers, 249; Thomas Walsh to Callanan, 20 June 1627, in Ibid., 250.
\textsuperscript{67} See Appendix One, 210-213; Appendix Three, 258.
\textsuperscript{68} Walsh to Wadding, 20 February 1628, in Wadding Papers, 257-258: ‘una santa emulación entre esse seminario y los que están a cargo de la Compañía.’
granted fifteen crowns to Terence O’Kelly from the Raphoe diocese, who was a student of the Irish College who had been ordained in Rome in 1626.\(^{69}\) Twenty crowns were also destined for two unnamed friars of Saint Isidore’s. Propaganda repeated its support at the end of 1628 through a grant of ten crowns to a friar of Saint Isidore’s referred to as ‘Francisco de S. Cruce.’ \(^{70}\)

Although it is not possible to identify the friars, O’Kelly did repay Propaganda’s trust by going on to mission. His testimonial letters, for entry to the college, had been written by the Franciscan Hugh McCaghwell (Aodh Mac Aingil) (1571-1626), who was appointed bishop of Armagh in 1626.\(^{71}\) The connection with McCaghwell must have favoured O’Kelly, who in 1626 obtained a per obitum benefice for the diocese of Derry.\(^{72}\) Perhaps, also in favour of his promotion was a familial link that he may have in the Derry area where his namesake acted as dean of the diocese. Only one year after he left the Irish College in 1628, O’Kelly returned to Ireland to substitute for Eugene Sweeney, who was nominated bishop of Kilmore, as vicar apostolic of Derry.\(^{73}\)

In Ireland O’Kelly acted as an informer on behalf of the Ulster lords, a role that brought him to the attention of the Protestant authorities. According to two reports written in January 1630 by George Downham, the Protestant bishop of Derry, O’Kelly was ‘a dangerous fellow who brought news of the eagerness of the Irish regiment to invade Ireland under Tyrone’s and Tyrconnell’s son, and of their wish to know the feeling in Ireland.’\(^{74}\) Although Downham ordered his arrest, O’Kelly continued to exercise his functions. In 1631 he participated in a meeting of twenty Derry priests, amongst whom there was another Ulsterman ordained in Rome, to

\(^{70}\) APF, Acta, vol. 6, fol. 55, general congregation, 8 May 1628; Acta, vol. 6, fol. 183, general congregation, 12 December 1628.
\(^{71}\) Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 12.
\(^{72}\) ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Per Obitum, vol. 1626, fol. 97v.
\(^{73}\) Brian Mac Cuarta, Catholic Revival in the North of Ireland, 1603-41 (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007), 105, 107.
\(^{74}\) George Downham, bishop of Derry, to Lord of Justices, 9 January 1630, in CSPI, vol.1625-1632, 511-512.
decide on the lifting of an excommunication against Owen O’Quigg, a layman who brought a Derry priest to court over an unpaid debt.75

Rector Callanan died in the summer of 1629, and, in accordance with the college’s constitutions, Wadding appointed Martin Walsh (d.1634), his confrere, to the post in 1630.76 In the same year Walsh also became the new guardian of Saint Isidore’s.77 Wadding was simply observing the rules that, in exceptional circumstances, provided for the election of Saint Isidore’s guardian as rector of the Irish College.78 According to Patrick Corish and Thomas O’Connor, the appointment of a regular rector to exercise authority over secular students might have been controversial, considering the turbulent relations between seculars and regulars in Ireland during this period.79 However this hypothesis is not supported by any evidence that Walsh’s appointment created tensions amongst the college residents. More important was the death of Ludovisi on 18 November 1632, which provoked disputes that hampered the pace at which the new foundation could progress as a source of missionaries. 80

IV

Despite Wadding’s efforts to safeguard the government and discipline of the new establishment, he could not fully anticipate or control its patron’s decision-making. At first glance the cardinal’s will, dated 11 April 1629, looked as if he intended to reinforce his foundation and to develop it into a proper college. According to Giunti, who compiled the will, Ludovisi decided to improve the resources of the Irish students’ house in order to establish a formal secular college for them. The cardinal’s decision envisaged that his heirs would have to raise the initial endowment from

75 The Ulster cleric ordained in Rome was Donatus O’Cahan: voluntary oath of Owen O’Quigg, taken before Sir Thomas Philipps, on 17 December 1631, in CSPI, vol.1625-1632, 637; Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained in Rome,” 10-11.
76 The evidence of his death come from a letter that Roche sent to Wadding in January of 1630: Roche to Wadding, January 1630, in Wadding Papers, 332-333.
77 PICR, Liber I, fol. 68r; Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 3.
78 PICR, Liber XXVII, fol. 209.
80 PICR, Liber I, fol. 59.
600 to 1000 crowns, and buy the house then rented, to which he also left an estate in Castelgandolfo, near Rome. All this could be but beneficial for assuring the seminary’s future. However, one condition of the will pushed the institution into a storm which would last until the second half of the seventeenth century: the cardinal declared to entrust the government of this college to the Society of Jesus.\footnote{ASV, Archivio Boncompagni-Ludovisi, Armadio IX, protocollo 293, numero 27, fols. 371-404.}

The testament of Ludovisi shocked the Irish Franciscans, above all Wadding, and surprised the seculars because it brought uncertainty over the future government and control of the Irish College. Analysis of the cardinal’s disposition, despite being favoured by a perspective of almost 400 years, allows us to conclude that Ludovisi possibly made his decision on the basis of his long acquaintances with the Society of Jesus.\footnote{Corish, “The Irish College, Rome,” 8.} The worries that Wadding manifested when he was compiling the statutes came to pass. He feared that another secular Irish college would fall under the Jesuits’ control, a common preoccupation amongst the Irish Franciscans, due to what had occurred in the Iberian Peninsula. Like his confrere Florence Conry, who actively opposed the Jesuit strategy to found a university in Spanish Flanders, Wadding’s response to the turn of events was to appeal, in 1633, to Urban VIII to set up a commission of enquiry. As members of the commission, the pope chose four Propaganda cardinals, namely Guido Bentivoglio, Bernardino Spada (1594-1661), Luigi Caetani (1595-1642), Ginetti Marzo (1585-1681), who were to be assisted by three monsignors, Marcantonio Maraldi, Francesco Paolucci and Domenico Cecchino (1598-1656), datary of the Holy See.\footnote{Mario Marefoschi, Relazione della visita apostolica del collegio iberne fatta dall’eminentissimo e reverendissimo signor Cardinale Mario Marefoschi presentata alla santità di nostro signore, Papa Clemente XIV (Roma: M. Pagliarini, 1772), 78-79; APF, Acta, vol. 8, fols. 93-209v, general congregation, 16 March 1633.}

Hopes that the matter would be easily resolved were soon disappointed by the emergence of dissensions caused by the favouritism which seemed to be given to students of particular provinces. Suspicions arose that the Ulster students were subject to a policy of discrimination which barred
their admission to the college. The situation worsened when specific accusations were made against Wadding. An unsigned complaint, perhaps compiled in early 1633, was addressed to Cardinal Antonio Barberini (1607-1671), who succeeded to Ludovisi as the cardinal protector of Ireland in early 1633. It accused Wadding of partiality towards the students of his own province of Munster. It charged that four out of the six students hosted by the college were from that province, while the only Ulster student had unjustly been expelled without any grants and was thus being forced to beg around Rome. The same discriminating policy supposedly repeated at Saint Isidore’s, where no student from Ulster, the province most damaged by the Protestant plantations, was resident.

This controversial dissension, the product of personal grumbles, focused on provincial issues that were already well known in the other Irish continental colleges and were by then, as Aidan Clarke concludes, the product of provincial rather than racial rivalries. At the Irish college of Douai, since its foundation, the admission policy had been orientated to favour the entry of students from the Leinster dioceses. This discontented the other candidates and in 1614 they appealed to Archduke Albert who forbade this partiality. However, his intervention did not alarm the rectors of the other Irish colleges, especially Francis Nugent who continued to adopt an accession policy governed by partiality in Lille. He even succeeded in obtaining a brief from Urban VIII in 1634 which stated that only Leinster students could be admitted.

In 1633, the struggle for the control of the Irish College reached a climax when the Franciscans, with the cooperation of the seminary’s students, asked Urbain VIII to ensure that the controversy remained under the

---

84 He was named cardinal protector in the congregation of 24 February 1633: APF, Acta, vol. 8, fol. 193.
85 APF, SOCG, vol. 14, fols. 74r-75v, anonymous petition to Antonio Barberini, [no date].
scrutiny of the specially appointed commission and was not transferred to the Sacra Rota, the judicial tribunal of the Holy See. They feared that the Jesuits might be advantaged by such a transfer. The students went even further and demanded, around the same time, in the interests of the entire Irish church, that Propaganda maintain the status quo of the college. This request was endorsed by all seven students of the college, amongst whom two were from Ulster. Evidently, Wadding had the support of the students, only three of whom were from his own province.

Neither petition had a positive outcome. Indeed, by the time they were presented, Propaganda had already taken a position directly contrary to their proposal. In the general congregation held on 16 March 1633, the cardinals proved in favour of transferring the Irish college to the Jesuits. However, they agreed that the Franciscans could retain the administration of the seminary, if they demonstrated that a canonical erection had been made during Ludovisi’s lifetime. But this requirement was evidently impossible to meet. The agreement between Ludovisi with Wadding in 1627 explicitly stated that the cardinal did not intend to establish a college. Due to this, Wadding could never proceed to the stage of establishing an institution that could match the proper standards of a secular seminary.

Propaganda’s ability to remain neutral in the affair may have been influenced by two petitions that asked that the institution be placed under Jesuit control. They were submitted around 1633, on behalf of the Irish nobles and clergy and on behalf of the Ulster earls, and addressed to Ingoli

---

89 The early constitution of the Sacra Rota goes back to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was a board of auditors who had authority and competence over ecclesiastical judicial cases. Its role was officially defined by the Code of Canon Law of 1598: New Catholic Encyclopedia, ed. Catholic University of America (London: McGraw-Hil, 1967), XII, 683-685.

90 Marefoschi, Relazione della visita apostolica del collegio ibernese, 78-81.

91 The student who signed the petition were John De Courcey, (Munster), Patrick Walsh (Munster), John Fahy (Connacht), Edmund Gould (Munster), Malachy Rath (Connacht), Philip Cwery (Ulster), and Roger Duierma (Ulster): APF, SOCG, vol. 294, fols. 420, 425 petition of seven students of the Irish College to PF, [1633?]; PICR, Liber XI, fol. 25.

and Antonio Barberini. Of the two, the earls’ request would have made the greatest impact. The high esteem they enjoyed with the Holy See had never dwindled since the late sixteenth century, when appointments to three out of the four Irish archbishoprics were made at the instance of Hugh O’Neill. In any case, despite having on his side Niccolò Ludovisi, the late brother of the cardinal, Wadding was unable to prove the erection of a canonical foundation over which he would have any rights. On 13 November 1634, the Sacra Rota pronounced in favour of the Jesuits, a decision which was published on 19 January 1635.

This legal dispute and resultant tensions threatened to deflect attention from the stated purpose of the new institution which was the preparation of missionaries for Ireland but it is difficult to assess if the accusations made against Wadding were justified. What the documentation indicates is that the Franciscan’s possible favouritism towards the students of the southern provinces was more evident at Saint Isidore’s than at the Irish College. The admission figures for the period 1628-1635, when the Jesuits took over the college, indicate that the seminary accepted twenty-two students of whom eight were from Munster, six from Ulster, five from Leinster, and three from Connacht. The Ulster province could not at all be considered overlooked, being the second representative group. Furthermore, the Ulster students predominated in the first entrant group of 1628, being four candidates out of six. By contrast, the recruitment pattern of Saint Isidore’s betrays an implicit favouritism towards the Munster students. Of the sixty-six students admitted between 1625 and 1635 thirty-

---

93 To these two requests we need to add that put forward by the executors of the will of Ludovisi who were the General of the Society and his assistants: APF, SOCG, vol. 294, fols. 421, 424r, petition to cardinal Barberini presented by Eugene Colgan on behalf of the nobles and clergy of Ireland, [1633 ?]; APF, SOCG, vol. 294, fols. 422r-423v, 429r-430v, petition of the executors of the will of cardinal Ludovisi to cardinal Barberini, Rome, [1633 ?]; APF, SOCG, vol. 294, fols. 428, 431, petition to Ingoli, (probably presented by Colgan), [1633 ?].
96 Marefoschi, Relazione della visita apostolica del collegio ibernese, 81-82.
97 See Appendix One, 210-213; Appendix Three, 259.
three came from Munster. This dominance was a source of concern, as indicated by the letter that the Irish Franciscan Hugh Ward penned to Wadding in August 1630. Ward asked his confrere to accept two Ulster students at Saint Isidore’s stressing that this would ‘pacify some who complain that there are none from Ulster in that college.’ Unfortunately, Ward did not specify who had raised this complaint.

It is also possible that, in Rome, the rows over admissions were diversions by which some ecclesiastics hoped to damage the growing power of Wadding within the papal curia, and especially within Propaganda. In the years 1630-1645, his ability and versatility as a counsellor enabled him to sit on congregations which, besides Irish affairs, dealt with a variety of international questions that went from the difficulties of the Greek Church to the problems encountered by missionaries in Japan. His growing influence was also evident in Saint Isidore’s scholarly activity. In the years 1632-1635, twenty-two theses on the doctrine of Scotus, of which Wadding was a renowned scholar, were defended. Beyond their theological importance, the theses were dedicated to the leading cardinals of the papal curia or to the Spanish ambassadors. In most cases, these were present at the debates, a tangible sign of Wadding’s status and his ability to create and maintain a network of association and potential patronage within the curia.

The shift from the Franciscan to the Jesuit administration of the Irish college was completed on 8 February 1635, when the new rector, the Italian Jesuit Alessandro Gottifredi (1595-1652), undertook the management of the

---

98 Leinster and Ulster had ten students each, Connacht nine. The origin of four students is unknown: Appendix Two, 220-232; Appendix Four, 260.
99 Hugh Ward to Wadding, 9 August 1630, in Wadding Papers, 388: ‘tendré con que satisfacer a algunos que a caso entre dientes lo murmuran que no ay dellos en este collegio.’
102 Ibid., 96-99.
The appointment of a non-Irish rector might have been a source of dissension amongst the students as well as amongst members of the Society of Jesus. In the Iberian colleges under Jesuit administration, the fear that the students might be influenced by a different nationality and culture had obliged the Society to nominate Irish rectors rather than Iberian natives. However, this fear does not appear to have prevailed in Rome, although this may partially have been because of Gottifredi’s short tenure. On 2 December 1635 he was replaced by James Forde, an Irish Jesuit from Dublin.

The beginning of the Jesuit administration did nothing to settle problems affecting the seminary. In the first place, the demand for places outstripped the number available, and each province had a specified number of places available to it. In this regard, the correspondence that Anthony MacGeoghegan, a priest from Meath, exchanged in 1635 with Antonio Barberini is emblematic. MacGeoghegan’s letter is a sketchy but critical insight into the situation of the Irish ecclesiastics who had to reside outside of the Irish College, and who did not enjoy any type of viaticum. Although already a priest, MacGeoghegan declared that he had come to Rome with the intention of studying at the Irish College, but his admission there was refused because the Leinster quota was already full. In his letters, MacGeoghegan stressed that he had been forced to rely on money collected through the celebration of masses, and implored Barberini to procure him a place in the hospital of Santo Spirito, a charitable institution for pilgrims founded in 1198, which, according to him, traditionally hosted two Irish students attending the lectures at the Collegio Romano. He declared that the board at the hospital of Santo Spirito in Sasia or any of the other

---

103 PICR, Liber I, fol. 69.
105 PICR, Liber I, fol. 69v.
Roman seminaries would allow the students to continue to perform masses, the only way for them to collect the necessary funds to return to Ireland.\textsuperscript{108} We have no further evidence if MacGeoghegan was accepted in the hospital of Santo Spirito, but his position did improve, for from the end of 1636 he acted as procurator for some Irish bishops at the papal curia, notably, Roche MacGeoghegan (1580-1644), Dominican bishop of Kildare since 1629 and member of a Gaelic aristocratic family from West Meath.\textsuperscript{109}

A problem which the students of both colleges had to no longer face was the request of missionary faculties. From 1633, students wishing to return to Ireland did not have to request missionary faculties from Propaganda, as it dispensed with this requirement from this year until the 1650s.\textsuperscript{110}

By contrast, a common problem faced by all the seculars living outside the Irish College was the lack of any form of viaticum to pay for their return. A close examination of the financial resources of the Irish college reveals that, during the early 1630s, even the collegians encountered the same difficulty. The Irish college was such in poor financial status that it could not grant viaticum. The figures speak for themselves. When Gottifredi began his office, the college’s treasury held only five crowns, a sum which only increased to twenty when Forde replaced him.\textsuperscript{111}

When travelling to Ireland, the lack of an established Irish trading community in Rome and trade links with it made it difficult for the students to find support for their journey back home. This continued to be a difficulty for the students of both colleges as efforts were made to develop a missionary link between Ireland and Rome. In particular, a constant problem was that of finding passage on a ship, which regularly delayed the students’ return. For instance, Francis Tarpy, a student of Saint

\textsuperscript{108} APF, SOCG, vol. 14, fols. 88-89, 97-98, 106, 109, Anthony MacGeoghegan to cardinal Barberini, [1635?].
\textsuperscript{109} ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 8, fols. 1r-19r; Thomas Flynn, \textit{The Irish Dominicans, 1536-1641} (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1993), 163-165, 175-176.
\textsuperscript{110} Propaganda took this decision, in accordance with the Holy Office, because Ireland enjoyed adequate diocesan organization and in order to prevent further abuses of these faculties from the regulars and seculars: APF, Acta, vol. 8, fols. 315, 325-325, general congregations, 30 September and 15 November 1633.
\textsuperscript{111} PICR, Liber I, fol. 69v.
Isidore’s left Rome to return to the Irish mission in mid-March 1627.\textsuperscript{112} This is revealed by a letter that Roche sent to Wadding from Paris on 28 October 1628. But the letter also revealed that Tarpy was still in France eight months after leaving Rome. Roche declared that ‘I hope we shall soon gett passadge’ to Ireland, but, admitted that they had no concrete plan to do so.\textsuperscript{113}

One of the principal weaknesses of the procedures adopted in the Irish College to establish a pool of missionaries in the first decade of its existence was the fact that, prior, to the beginning of the Jesuit administration, the students were permitted to ignore their obligation to sign the missionary oath. In the years from 1628 until early February 1635 only one student signed it.\textsuperscript{114} A further problem was the oath formula to which the students pledged themselves. As previously noted, the constitutions drafted by Wadding stated that the students had to return to Ireland whenever the college’s authorities ordered it. Thus the formula of the oath taken during the Franciscan administration had the student declare that ‘I am resolved and will always be to take holy orders at the appropriate time and return to Ireland to win the souls of my countrymen, whenever it seems fitting in the Lord to the superiors of this seminary.’\textsuperscript{115} As it was written, the oath was conditional and the return home depended on an order from the rector. The Jesuit management did not succeed in revising the oath formula until 1662, in order to turn it into an imperative with more immediate applicability for students. What instead the Jesuit rectors attempted to do was simply to force the students to take the oath from the spring of 1635.\textsuperscript{116}

The most striking features of student progression during these years are the low number of students who actually proceeded to ordination and the

\textsuperscript{112} Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 2.
\textsuperscript{113} John Roche to Wadding, 20 October 1628, in \textit{HMC Franciscan}, 8.
\textsuperscript{114} The student was Roger Duierma who took the missionary oath in 1633. See PICR, Liber XII, fol. 25.
\textsuperscript{115} PICR, Liber XII, fol. 25, oath of Roger Duierma: ‘quare promitto iuroque omnipotenti Deo, Beassitissime Virgini Mariae et Sancto Patricio me animo paratum esse ac semper futurum ut suo tempore sacros ordines suscitiamo, et in Hyberniam ad proximorum animas lucrandas reperta quandocumque superioribus huius seminarii.’
\textsuperscript{116} PICR, Liber I, fol. 68v.
tiny number of those who returned to Ireland. Only seven out of the
twenty-two admitted became priests.\textsuperscript{117} Of the remaining fifteen, three
became deacons, one was admitted to the subdiaconate, and two were
admitted to minor orders.\textsuperscript{118} Therefore, either the majority of the students
admitted had little interest in being ordained or were considered
unsuitable for priesthood by their superiors, perhaps because as the
manuscript account of the Irish College put it, they were ‘too unstable in
their vocation.’\textsuperscript{119}

The fact that most of the students who were ordained did not take the
oath partially, as well as the difficulties of actually finding the means to
return, explains to a considerable extent why the contribution of the Irish
College to the Irish mission was so moderate by 1635. Between 1628 and
1635, only five students are recorded as having returned to Ireland. One of
them was O’Kelly who was admitted in 1628 but who did not complete his
studies due to his appointment as vicar apostolic of Derry in 1629.\textsuperscript{120}
Another student James Barry, admitted in 1635, left the seminary in late
September 1641 and later joined the Franciscan order.\textsuperscript{121} The available
documentation indicates that in 1645 he was named philosophy lecturer in
the convent of Askeaton, and, in 1650, was appointed guardian of the
Buttevant convent.\textsuperscript{122}

Three other students Clery, Eugene Colgan, and John Fahy succeeded in
completing their studies and returning to Ireland, thus fulfilling the
seminary’s aim. However their activities at home had limited impact. In
the case of Clery, it was of very short duration for he left Rome in October
1640 and was killed by Protestants in 1642.\textsuperscript{123} No dates are provided on
Colgan’s departure from the Irish College. What is sure is that Propaganda
granted Colgan and Andrew Wolfe, a student admitted probably after

\textsuperscript{117} They were O’Kelly, Andrew Wolfe, John Fahy, Philip Clery, Roger Gorman,
Donough Brouder, and James Barry: Appendix One, 210-213.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{119} PICR, Liber I, fol. 81r : ‘parum constants in vocatione.’
\textsuperscript{120} PICR, Liber I, fol. 81r.
\textsuperscript{121} PICR, Liber I, fol. 83r.
\textsuperscript{122} see LL, 18, 36.
\textsuperscript{123} PICR, Liber I, fol. 82v.
1628, viaticum around 1630. Yet, in the early 1630s, both were still in Rome as indicated by the complaint that Wadding sent to Ingoli in 1631 or 1632. The absence of sources prevents us from tracing Colgan’s movements until 1671, when he was mentioned as being the archdeacon of Derry in one of the letters of Oliver Plunkett, the archbishop of Armagh from 1669 to 1681. Colgan continued to operate in the Derry diocese until his death in early September 1673.

In early April 1635 Fahy asked Propaganda for a viaticum which would allow him to return to Ireland. He introduced himself as a good student of honest life and enclosed the testimonies of Wadding and Gottifredi. Despite this, the Roman congregation ignored Fahy’s request, although he did still manage to return home where he operated from 1635 to 1642 under the supervision of Robert Barry, vicar apostolic of Ross between 1620 and 1647. In 1643 he returned to Rome where he entered the Congregation of Missionary Priests of the Most Blessed Sacrament. In 1646 he was appointed procurator of the college at Avignon, and from 1647 until 1650 he acted, following appointment by Propaganda, as vice-prefect of the mission in Sweden. By the early 1660s Fahy was back in Rome where he petitioned Propaganda to appoint him coadjutor to John Burke, archbishop of Tuam from 1647 until 1667.

Three other unordained students were permitted to leave Rome between early September and late October 1635, having petitioned Propaganda to obtain viaticum in the summer. Like Fahy, their requests were rejected on
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124 APF, SOCG, vol. 294, fols. 271, 274, Wadding to Francesco Ingoli, [1631-1632 ?].
125 APF, CP, vol. 18, fol. 76, Oliver Plunkett to Carlo Francesco Airoldi, 19 September 1671.
127 APF, SC, Collegi Vari, vol. 34, fol. 2, John Fahy to PF, 6 April 1635.
128 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datarie, vol. 26, fols. 6v-8v, 15v-16r; 29r-30v, 31r-33v; Millett, “Roman Catholic Bishops from 1534,” 367.
131 These were Edmund Gould, Daniel Hayes, and Mark Quigley: PICR, Liber I, fol. 72.
21 August. This confirms that Propaganda’s decision to financially support the students of Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College had not inaugurated a new policy on its part. Indeed, in the meeting of 21 August, the congregation also agreed that the colleges should encourage the students to support themselves by leaving a certain sum in the seminary’s treasury which would be returned on completion of their studies. This was an established practice in other foreign colleges.\(^{132}\) But Propaganda’s denial of the students’ request was also possibly influenced by the difficult financial situation of the other Irish Colleges under its supervision. Louvain, in particular, continued to be in the storm-centre of this crisis for, from 1633, its deficit was growing at alarming rate.\(^{133}\)

In contrast to the secular seminary, Saint Isidore’s contribution to the Irish mission was slightly better, although it was not equal to that provided by Saint Anthony’s College, which claimed to have sent back thirty-one friars within ten years of its foundation.\(^{134}\) From 1625 until 1635, ten students were recorded as having left Rome to return to Ireland. Their provincial background was thus divided: four were from Connacht, three from Munster, one from Leinster, one from Ulster while one’s place of birth was not specified.\(^{135}\) Of these returnees, two acted as confessors and guardians, while one operated only as confessor.\(^{136}\) Of the ten students, Bernard Conny, a Connachtman who entered in 1625 or 1626, rose to the highest position.\(^{137}\) In 1627 he addressed the Holy Office to obtain the required missionary faculties.\(^{138}\) His request was supported by a letter from Wadding, who testified on 4 September to his maturity and judged him an upright man ‘sufficiently instructed and fit for the mission.’\(^{139}\) On 16 September the Holy Office agreed to grant missionary faculties to Conny
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135 See Appendix Two, 220-232; Appendix Three, 258.
136 Ibid.
137 Ibid., 220.
138 ACDF, SO, St. St., SS, vol. 1-c, fol. 742r, Bernard Conny to Holy Office, 1627.
139 ACDF, SO, St. St., SS, vol. 1-c, fol. 743r, Wadding to Holy Office, 4 September 1627: ‘sufficierunt instructum, missioni idoneus.’
for a period of seven years. According to a standard formula, he could celebrate masses in any place, administer the sacraments, except confirmation, and give apostolic benediction in Catholic churches, where there were neither bishops nor vicars apostolic. By 1644, he was considered sufficiently experienced to be appointed Irish provincial, an office he filled until 1647.

The provision of missionary faculties did not guarantee that missionaries would permanently reside in Ireland. Pursuit of an academic career within a continental college might prove more appealing than the risks of mission. For instance, Tarpy, one of the ten students who left between 1625 and 1635, moved in this direction. After having taught philosophy in 1629 in the friary of Galway for a short time, he moved to Louvain in 1630 where he held the chair of philosophy. From there he transferred to the Irish Franciscan College of the Immaculate Conception of Prague, founded in 1629, to lecture in theology.

Beyond Conny, two other students admitted to Saint Isidore’s during this period rose to prominent positions within the order in continental Europe and in Ireland. The first was Francis O’Sullivan, a Munsterman, who was admitted to Saint Isidore’s in 1626. In 1639 he returned to Ireland where, during the provincial chapter, he was named definitor. In 1646, he was appointed guardian of Ardfert, and in 1649 guardian of Timoleague. During the chapter of 1650 he was elected provincial, an office he held until 1653 when he was killed by Cromwellian soldiers. The other student was Bernardine Barry who was ordained in Rome in mid-September 1635, and who taught philosophy in the convent of Santa Maria Nuova in Naples and the Aracoeli in Rome in 1638 and 1639 respectively. For some time he also

---

140 ACDF, SO, St. St., SS, vol. 1-c, fols. 746-747, general congregation, 16 September 1627.
141 See Appendix Two, 220.
143 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 2; LL, 23, 28.
taught at Saint Isidore’s where, in 1642, he was appointed vicar. In 1647 he moved to Louvain following his appointment as guardian of that college, remaining there until 1652, the year of his return to Rome. From 1652 until 1655 he acted as guardian of Saint Isidore’s and remained there until 1659, when Michelangelo Buongiorno di Sambuca, minister general from 1658 until 1664, named him commissary of the Irish Franciscan colleges in Louvain and Prague. At the chapter of 1666 Barry was named minister provincial, although his election was contested by Mark Brown, the chapter’s president, and it was not confirmed. The reason for this was linked to the fact that Barry had refused to sign the Remonstrance, the statement through which, in 1661, leading Old-English Catholics acknowledged Charles II (1630-1685) as the lawful king, to whom obedience was necessary in all civil and temporal affairs. Brown’s refusal forced the Irish province to appeal to the general curia in Rome which ratified Barry’s election only at the end of September 1668, five months after his death in Louvain.

The teaching experience of Barry demonstrates that the college succeeded in becoming a seminal training centre for the Franciscan order. This is confirmed by the fact that twenty-three of the sixty-six students educated at Saint Isidore’s from 1625 until 1635 subsequently left Rome to teach philosophy and theology in other colleges or convents. The geographical range of their destinations outside of the Italian Peninsula included not only Louvain and Prague, but also Augsburg, Ennis, Lyons, Nancy, Paris, Rouen, Salzburg, Saint-Malo, Segovia, Valladolid, and Wien.

144 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 4, 7, 11.
146 LL, 78, 82, 84-85, 91-95, 100, 102, 107, 110.
Within the Italian Peninsula, they lectured in Barletta, Mantova, Messina, Milan, Naples, Nicosia, Palermo, Patti, Perugia, Siracusa and Trapani. Links quickly developed between Saint Isidore’s and the Franciscan scholarly houses in the southern part of the Italian Peninsula in particular through this activity. In 1629 Wadding invited two Irish Franciscans, James Miles and Paul Molloy, from the Province of Terra di Lavoro, in Naples, where they entered the order, to Saint Isidore’s. On 25 May 1629, Molloy, a native of Drogheda, was appointed instructor of students. In June of the same year, Miles was nominated vicar of the college, but he was soon dismissed because of his unsuitability, and returned to Naples, where he died in 1634.

The capacity of Saint Isidore’s to train lecturers was, however, offset by the fact that only few of the other students admitted from 1625 to 1635 would return to the Irish mission before the end of the 1630s. The available figures indicate that fourteen students returned home after 1635, but the majority of them, nine, would be back in Ireland from the second half of the 1640s. Possibly this delay is due to the fact that six of the nine students were lecturers in various locations before 1645. Of this group, seven acted as guardians, one as guardian and lecturer, and one as confessor. In 1650 three were named definito, an office which one of them would again obtain in 1678; one was appointed custos of the Irish province in 1650. Of the remaining five students, two came back in 1639, one in 1641, and two in 1642. Yet one of these latter two resided only for a brief period in Ireland because he was reportedly teaching theology in Prague in 1644. The available evidence on the other four students indicates that one was named guardian of Clonmel and vicar of the Irish province, respectively in 1641 and 1658, one began to minister in Ireland in 1642, while the other two were respectively appointed guardian and vicar of the Irish province in 1639. This latter was also named guardian in 1646, in 1647, and in 1650.

149 See Appendix Two, 220-232.
150 The date of their entry in the Franciscan order is not specified. See Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,”2-3; Cleary, Father Luke, 82-83.
151 See Appendix Two, 220-232.
The missionary contribution provided by Saint Isidore’s and the Irish college to the Irish mission during the 1630s is best highlighted when compared to the available figures on Irish clergy active at home during that period. The most detailed sources for this period are two lists on the regular and secular clergy active in the Connacht province and Ardfert diocese, in Munster. The first was possibly compiled by Dominic Burke, procurator of the Irish Dominican province, in 1636 and addressed to Propaganda. According to his count, there were four seculars, eighteen Dominicans, seven Franciscans, three Augustinians, and two Jesuits in Connacht. Because Burke identified where these men had accomplished their studies, his list revealed that most of the clerics had been trained at Louvain, the Iberian Peninsula or in France. Only two, Bernard Conny and Joseph Curneen were former students of Saint Isidore’s.\textsuperscript{152} The second list, also possibly compiled in 1636 and by an anonymous author, recorded that in Ardfert there were thirteen seculars, twelve Dominicans, eight Augustinians, eight Franciscans, three Jesuits and one Cistercian active. None of the seculars nor the Franciscans on this list were recorded in the entry lists of the Irish College or of Saint Isidore’s.\textsuperscript{153} The evidence of both lists indicates that Rome had a minor position within the network of Irish colleges on the continent and that the missionary link between the city and Ireland was extremely weak.

By the mid 1630s, however, the Irish clerical community of Rome had aligned with the Irish clerical communities of continental Europe which had dedicated colleges. However, the fact that they were located in the heart of the Holy See did not ease the process to found Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College. At first glance the foundation of Propaganda might seem to be a determinant factor for the foundation of the Irish colleges in Rome because it was hoped that the congregation would put the Irish mission more to the centre of the papacy’s agenda. However, this was not the case because, throughout the years 1620-1635, the support provided by the Roman congregation for the establishment of both the Irish College and

\textsuperscript{152} APF, SOCG, vol. 135, fols. 204rv, 209rv.
\textsuperscript{153} APF, SOCG, vol. 135, fols. 205rv, 208rv.
Saint Isidore’s was inconsistent. Therefore the initiative came from single influential characters such as Wadding and Ludovisi, who, through their leadership, succeeded in overcoming the absence of a practical strategy by the papal curia or by the Irish bishops.

While the establishment of Saint Isidore’s was financially backed by a number of prominent ecclesiastical and lay figures in Rome, the foundation of the Irish College was carried out only through Ludovisi’s personal donations, which were limited. This was imputable to the fact that the cardinal’s original plan envisaged the support of a small group of Irish students in an independent house, and did not include any intention to found a college. Even when, in his will, Ludovisi proceeded to found a proper seminary, the financial resources provided by him were still insufficient to ensure stability. The problem of insufficient resources was further worsened by the accusations made against Wadding that he favoured students from the southern provinces, causing dissensions at the time when the legal dispute for the control of the Irish College reached its climax.

While it is conjecture to claim that the conflicts hindered the seminary’s ability to form missionaries and develop missionary links with Ireland, they certainly did not assist it to develop a firm organizational footing quickly, which was essential to fulfilling these objectives. There is no doubt that the college did not make an auspicious start with these tasks. It was also not helped by the fact that its Franciscan management displayed an evident incapacity for, or disinterest in, obliging the students to sign and fulfil the missionary oath.

In contrast to the Irish College, the first decade of Saint Isidore’s activity was characterized by fewer of the organisational problems that retarded the Irish College’s early development. Compared to their secular fellow countrymen, the students of the Franciscan college who returned to operate in Ireland could benefit from the fact that, during the 1630s, the order at home was in a stage of reconsolidation. The most illuminating example of this phase is the increasing number of friars who passed from the estimated
200 in 1623 to 574 in 1639. The Franciscan college also succeeded in establishing links between the order’s houses in the Italian Peninsula and elsewhere in continental Europe. This allowed the friars to move in an internal network which also facilitated the exchange of information and ideas. During the first ten years of its existence, Saint Isidore’s emerged as a key institution for the Irish Franciscans in southern Europe. Its position in Rome contrasted with the fragile position of the Irish College which had not developed into a proper base for the production of missionaries.

---

Chapter Three
Recruitment of students and repatriation of missionaries to Ireland, 1636-1643

I

In early February 1635, the introduction of the Jesuit management inaugurated a new period in the history of the Irish College. In this period, however, the college encountered many of the same difficulties that it had in its early years, and while the solutions were complicated, the reasons for this were less so: the administration proved unable to train an adequate number of priests and its rectors struggled to place the seminary on a firmer foundation. More broadly, both the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s needed to develop their ability to meet their key objectives of recruiting, training, and repatriating students if they were to secure their positions as institutions from which a new channel of missionary communication and movement between Rome and Ireland would develop. As chapter four will later explore, this was all the more necessary if the colleges were to respond to new missionary possibilities, such as that which arose as Irish settlements were established in the West Indies during the 1630s. If the colleges were to function as training grounds for missionaries, it was conceivable that they might expand their remits to serve the religious needs of the Irish living in the West Indies as well as those in Ireland itself.

An essential prerequisite for developing the colleges’ ability to train potential missionaries was a permanent residence. However the achievement of this proved problematic for the Irish College’s rectors who between 1635-1643 were James Forde, Agostino Garzadoro, William Malone (1586-1656), and Fabio Albergati.1 Of these four rectors, it was Forde who realized that securing a permanent residence should be a top priority. This was dictated by the fact that the house bought on Pincian Hill close to Saint Isidore’s was no longer suitable due to its distance from the

---

1 Forde was rector from 2 December 1635 to the end of February 1637; Garzadoro from the end of February 1637 to 10 December of the same year; Malone from 10 December 1637 to the end of January 1642; Albergati, cousin of cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi, from early February 1642 until 2 February of 1647: PICR, Liber I, fols. 69r-70v.
Roman College where the Irish students began to attend classes after the transfer of the college to the Jesuit management. In 1635 or 1636, Forde obtained permission from Muzio Vitelleschi (1563-1645) to sell that building to Countess Lucrezia Ricasoli di San Secondo for 2250 crowns. But Forde subsequently proved unable to find a new permanent house for the students who reportedly had to move between various residences in Rome.

It was Malone who succeeded in finding a permanent residence, which was situated at the southern base of the Quirinal and bought at the price of 8000 crowns from Girolamo Rosolini in early April 1639. Malone agreed to pay 2250 crowns cash, obtained from Forde’s sale. The outstanding 5750 crowns was to be paid through annual instalments of 400 crowns at an interest rate of four per cent. Malone succeeded in repaying 3800 crowns to Rosolini but his efforts were nullified by the financial incapacity of Albergati, his successor. In early 1642, he interrupted the payment method agreed by Malone by concurring with Rosolini that only interest of 171 crowns should be paid annually, with no obligation to pay off anything from the capital sum. The situation was made more difficult by the fact that he increased the seminary’s expenses by equipping it with more furnishings and by promoting the cultivation of its vineyard. It was not alleviated even by Rosolini’s decision to bequeath the Irish College, a sum worth a quarter of the remaining debt to be paid in March 1643.

A second prerequisite for training and deploying missionaries was a stable financial situation, but this remained, in the case of the Irish College, elusive. Indeed, the college still relied on the 1000 crowns and the Castelgandolfo estate left by Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi in his will. The
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2 PICR, Liber V, fols. 15v-16r.
3 PICR, Liber I, fol. 69v; PICR, Liber VIII, fols. 1r-9v.
4 Before this residence, Malone bought a house in Piazza Morgana in January 1639, but the seminary residents had to vacate the premises soon after its purchase, although the reason for this is unclear: PICR, Liber I, fols. 69v-70v; PICR, Liber VIII, fols. 1r-9v.
5 PICR, Liber I, fol. 70v.
6 PICR, Liber I, fols. 69v-70v.
7 APF, SC, Collegi Vari, vol.34, fols. 6-7.
figures clearly display the effects of this paucity of resources: in 1635 the Irish College was laden with almost 398 crowns of debt while its ready cash was limited to twenty crowns. In 1637 the amount of ready cash was a healthier ninety-three crowns but, in early 1642, it was only twenty-six crowns. To remedy these difficulties, the Jesuit rectors began to admit a number of paying-guest students who paid between eight and ten crowns monthly. The manuscript history of the Irish College has a list of nine paying-guests, seven of whom were Italians, one from Spanish Flanders, and one Irish, though a full list is not extant.

In contrast, Saint Isidore’s enjoyed secure financial status. According to the account registers for the years from 1635 until 1643, the Franciscan college’s budget had a credit balance of 1210 crowns. This allowed the Irish Franciscans to run the college’s finances efficiently, as demonstrated by the register of receipts which indicates that, between 1636 and 1643, the college spent almost 187 crowns, forty more that the overall sum of ready cash available at the Irish College during that period.

II

Despite the limited fiscal resources available to them, the Jesuit rectors of the Irish College sought to build up the intellectual resources available to students, in particular its library holdings. Prior to the commencement of the Jesuit administration, the library consisted of just two trunks of books. The first set of books consisted of forty-eight texts which had been left in 1611 to the Jesuit house of Sant’Andrea by the Irish Jesuit Henry Fitzsimon
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8 PICR, Liber I, fols. 69r-70v.
9 The seven Italian lodgers were: Giovanni Agostino Durazzi, Giovanni Domenico Durazzi, his brother, both from Genoa, Count Giovanni Battista Arconato from Milan, Abbot Giovanni Spinelli from Naples, Count Omodeo and Abbot Omodeo, and their Jesuit teacher Didaco Ucchetto. The lodger from Spanish Flanders was John Calvart who was related to rector Albergati’s family. The last lodger was John Baptist Santion, a Munsterman admitted in 1674 and who left in 1676 to join the group of household servants at the court of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, his patron. The convictors would no longer be accepted after 1675, when Clement X (1590-1676) forbade the keeping of paying-guest students of different nationalities within the national colleges: PICR, Liber I, fols. 68, 86r.
10 FLK, MS C 63, fols. 89-101.
11 FLK, MS C 35.
(1566-1643/45), and were transferred to the Irish College in 1635. The second set of thirty-eight books was bequeathed to the College in 1633 by Malachy MacBrehun (1588-1633), an Irish layman who had been living in Rome since about 1627. Rector Forde began to develop the library in 1635, while his successors to 1642 spent almost eighty-one crowns purchasing and binding books for the library.

The early development of the seminary’s library coincided almost exactly with the first attempts of its students to print works in Rome. It was Philip Clery, admitted in 1632, who made this initial effort when he translated two books of catechism into Irish in 1637, a language for which in 1638 Propaganda approved a specific casting type to use at the polyglot press which it had established in 1626. In spring 1640, Clery petitioned the congregation for permission to print the texts on its press, and in late June Propaganda approved his request on condition that it could examine the books once they were printed. Unfortunately Clery’s publishing plan did not come to fruition because he died in Ireland in 1642. Further, his attempt stood as an isolated effort because it was not succeeded by another in the following years, in contrast with the developments at Saint Isidore’s. There the students benefited from the college’s official support for their scholarship. The accounts for the years 1635-1643 indicate that Saint Isidore’s paid fifty crowns to print and bind theses defended by students on completion of their studies.
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12 PICR, Liber XXI, fol. 236; the full list of books has been published in Hugh Fenning, “Some Irish Donors of Books to the Irish College in Rome, 1611-1678,” in *The Irish College, Rome*, 46-52.
13 PICR, Liber IV, fols. 141-145, 151, 154; Thomas Walsh to John Roche, 14 March 1627, in *Wadding Papers*, 245.
14 PICR, Liber XVIII, fols. 34r-35r.
15 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Per Obitum, vol. 1637, fol. 213v.
18 see chapter two, 74.
19 For a full list of the authorities to whom the theses were dedicated see Brendan Jennings, “Theses Defended at St. Isidore’s College, Rome, 1631-1649,” *Coll. Hib.* 2 (1959): 98-102.
Saint Isidore’s continued capacity to train students to become philosophy or theology lecturers also displayed intellectual vitality there. Two distinct groups of lecturers emerged: those who operated in the Italian Peninsula, who were the majority, and those who taught elsewhere in Europe, including Ireland. The first group was composed of eleven lecturers who taught in Aracoeli (Rome), Bologna, Brindisi, Capranica, Genoa, Milan, Palermo, Stronconi, Tivoli, and Venice. The second group consisted of eight lecturers who, after their departure from Rome, taught in Angers, Clane, Gratz, Kilconnell, Kilkenny, Klosterneuburg, Laibach, Prague, Rosserilly, and Wien. To these groups we need to add two lecturers who both had previous teaching experience in the Italian Peninsula. From the second half of the 1640s one of them went to teach theology in Ireland, while the other was theology lecturer in Prague from 1661 to 1664.20

As well as producing a new generation of lecturers, Saint Isidore’s became a nerve centre of Franciscan culture. Much of the growing scholarly reputation of the Franciscan college was due to, and heavily reliant on, the personal reputation of its most prominent resident - Luke Wadding who by 1643 had published thirteen works and edited four volumes of the *Annales Minorum*.21 In addition, the college’s literary activity was enriched by Bonaventure Baron - a nephew of Wadding and philosophy lecturer in the college where he was admitted in 1633.22 He published two works in 1642 and 1643.23 But it was Wadding who proved the most important representative of Saint Isidore’s in these years. Since the late 1620s, he had been a consultor for the Congregation of the Index,24 a responsibility that put him under growing pressure from confreres outside Rome and who identified him as a potential lobbyist. In 1640, for instance, Remigio della Tripalda, an Italian Franciscan, wrote to Wadding to ask him to ‘do some reflections’ on his book and ‘to express your opinion’ adding that this ‘for

20 See Appendix Two, 233-244.
24 The first indication of this role is provided by a letter written by Thomas Fleming, archbishop of Dublin, in 1629. See *Wadding Papers*, 310-311.
me, will be esteemed truer than the many I will ever hear.’ Tripalda asked ‘your very reverend paternity may favour this effort a lot.’

Between the late 1630s and the early 1640s, Wadding built a network of international contacts that included prominent members of the Franciscan hierarchy. One of these was Juan de Merinero (1600-1663), minister general from 1639 until 1645, to whom Wadding appealed in order to circulate the first comprehensive edition of John Dun Scotus’ works, published at Lyons in 1639. It was to the Iberian Peninsula that in 1639 and 1640 Wadding dispatched the majority of the unbound drafts of the edition to Marinero so that he could oversee the printing process. The volume was so successful that it was out of print within a few years.

The contacts of Wadding extended beyond the Franciscan order. His interest in the history of the ecclesiastical provinces of the Italian Peninsula provided him with the opportunity to approach prominent members of the secular clergy who were compiling extensive histories of dioceses or cities in an annalistic style. One of these was Scipione Agnelli Maffei - the bishop of Casale from 1624 until 1653, whose work on Mantova would be posthumously published in 1675. In early January 1635, in return for the provision of help in Wadding’s search for past bishops of Casale, he asked that the Franciscan could ‘favour more and more strongly my book’ within the papal curia.

---

25 ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.20, Remigio della Tripalda to Wadding, 7 July 1640: ‘ci facci reflessioni’…‘et ci dica il suo parer, e quello da me sarà stimato il più vero di quanti ne potrò mai sentire’…‘Vostra paternità molto reverenda può far assai a favorir questa fatica’…‘alcuna cosa mi cap[ita] la mandarò a vostra paternità subito.’

26 Patrick Conlan, St.Isidore’s College, Rome (Rome: Tipografia S.G.S., 1982), 41.

27 ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.2, Wadding to Laurence Durand, 20 October 1639; ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.17, Juan de Merinero to Wadding, 13 December 1639; ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.18 (1), Merinero to Wadding, 21 December 1639; ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.18 (2), Merinero to Wadding, 13 January 1640; ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.18 (3), Marinero to Wadding, 14 July 1640.

28 Conlan, St. Isidore’s College, 41.

29 Scipione Agnelli Maffei, Gli Annali di Mantova scritti da... Vescovo di Casale e dedicati all’Altezza Serenissima di Ferdinando Carlo Duca di Mantova, Monferrato, Nivers, Umena, Retel etc (Tortona: appresso Nicolò e fratelli Viola, 1675).

Wadding’s activities also caused Saint Isidore’s to become the main point of contact for ecclesio-political relations between the papacy and Ireland in the early 1640s. This connection began to develop in late October 1641 when the Ulster rebellion broke out.\textsuperscript{31} Wadding was the first Irishman in the city to be informed of the outbreak of hostilities on foot of a report forwarded to him by his confrere Hugh Burke at the end of November 1641.\textsuperscript{32} Throughout the winter of 1641-1642, Burke continued to channel information to Wadding who was constantly updated on the military operations of the Irish insurgents.\textsuperscript{33} For his part, Wadding used these reports for a dual purpose; to inform Cardinal Antonio Barberini on the Irish rebellion’s development, and to lobby him to allocate funding to the Irish rebels and to dispatch an agent to Ireland to survey the situation.\textsuperscript{34} The Franciscan’s influence produced a result for, in March 1642, he dispatched 12,000, granted by Cardinal Barberini, to the Irish insurgents for the purchase of artillery and ammunitions.\textsuperscript{35}

The importance of Wadding’s role grew at the same pace as the Irish insurgents evolved into a proper political body. On 7 June 1642, a number of lay leaders and Catholic bishops met in Kilkenny to draw up an oath of association. This paved the way for the formation of the Confederate Catholics of Ireland, the birth of which was officially sanctioned by the general assembly held at Kilkenny from 24 October to 21 November 1642.\textsuperscript{36} The Irish Confederates considered Wadding an essential figure for their

\textsuperscript{33} Burke to Wadding, Brussels, 7 December 1641, in \textit{HMC Franciscan}, 110-111; Burke to Wadding, 27 December 1641, in \textit{HMC Franciscan}, 111; Burke to Wadding, 18 January 1642, in \textit{HMC Franciscan}, 113-114.
\textsuperscript{34} BAV, BL, MS 6484, fol. 4, Wadding to Antonio Barberini, January 1642; BAV, BL, MS 6485, fol. 11r, Wadding to Barberini, February 1642.
\textsuperscript{35} Wadding to Burke, 22 March 1642, in \textit{HMC Franciscan}, 127-129; see also Pádraig Lenihan, \textit{Confederate Catholics at War, 1641-1649} (Cork: Cork University Press, 2001), 51-53.
\textsuperscript{36} Micheál Ó Siochrú, \textit{Confederate Ireland: A Constitutional and Political Analysis} (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), 42-44.
strategies and, on 6 December 1642, they appointed him as their official agent and procurator for their affairs in Rome.\textsuperscript{37}

After his appointment, Wadding’s support towards the Irish rebellion grew, and he updated Antonio Barberini on the Irish rebellion and requested financial assistance.\textsuperscript{38} Moreover, he was instrumental in the appointment of PierFrancesco Scarampi (1596-1656) - an Italian Oratorian priest, as a papal delegate to Ireland in mid-April 1643.\textsuperscript{39} This is indicated by the letter, dated 4 March 1643, that Wadding addressed to Antonio Barberini. In it, the Franciscan recounted that he had contacted Scarampi and invited him to come to Rome in anticipation of his mission to Ireland.\textsuperscript{40}

In contrast to the Franciscan college, none of the residents of the Irish college are recorded to have played any role in Rome for the Irish Confederates, although, from the rebellion’s outbreak, Muzio Vitelleschi (1563-1645), the Jesuit general, took a keen interest in the Irish situation. Indeed, from 1642 he was punctually informed on the Irish rebellion through the reports which were sent to him by the Society’s members active at home and from Matthew O’Hartegan (?-1666), an Irish Jesuit, who operated as the Confederates’ agent in Paris.\textsuperscript{41} The growing importance of Saint Isidore’s in intellectual and political terms contrasted with the isolation of the Irish College. But were these differences in the colleges’ development repeated in the most important of their objectives: the formation of students and the supply of missionaries to Ireland?

\section*{III}

The entry records of the Irish College for the years between 1636 and 1643 indicate that it admitted ten students, twelve less than those accepted

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{37} See Richard Bellings, \textit{Irish Confederation}, II, 117-118.
\textsuperscript{38} BAV, BL, MS 6485, fol. 46, Wadding to Antonio Barberini, 14 November 1642; BAV, BL, MS 6485, fols. 54, 55r, same to same ?, May 1643; BAV, BL, MS 6485, fol. 56r, same to same, May 1643.
\textsuperscript{39} BAV, BL, MS 4886, fols. 1r-48.
\textsuperscript{40} BAV, BL, MS 6485, fol. 47r, Wadding to cardinal Antonio Barberini, 4 March 1643.
\textsuperscript{41} ARSI, Fondo Anglia, vol. 6a, fol. 12, Robert Nugent to Muzio Vitelleschi, 24 March 1642; ARSI, Fondo Anglia, vol. 6a, fol. 14, same to same, 24 April 1642; ARSI, Fondo Anglia, vol. 6a, fol. 17, Matthew O’Hartegan to Vitelleschi, 2 June 1642; ARSI, Fondo Anglia, vol. 6a, fol. 18, O’Hartegan to Vitelleschi, 16 June 1642; ARSI, Fondo Anglia, vol. 6a, fols. 20-24, same to same, 5 August 1642.
\end{footnotesize}
during the period from 1628 until early 1635. It may be concluded that meagre resources and the decision to purchase a new residence made it impossible to admit a large number of new students, and certainly impossible to improve on its early intake. A closer examination of the provincial background of the entrants, however, indicates significant changes compared to the previous period of 1628 – to early 1635. The Munster recruits no longer formed the dominant group because their number had reduced from eight to one. Three students were from Ulster and five from Leinster. While the background of one collegian was unknown, there was no record of any Connacht native entering the college. This may have been due to the troubled situation in that province, where from 1634 the Catholic landholders had been viewed with suspicion by Thomas Wentworth (1593-1641) - the lord deputy of Ireland from 1632. More specifically Wentworth considered their support of the students in the continental Irish Colleges to be an impediment for the advancement of Protestantism. In 1634, he promoted a plantation scheme in Connacht which aimed to place landowners under government control. Although by 1640 this scheme had not been realised in practice, Patrick Corish suggests that the Catholic gentry’s fear of being deprived of their lands may have induced them to halt their support of students studying in the continental colleges.

The Jesuit rectors did not make substantial changes to the procedures designed to link the Irish College with the Irish mission, but they did succeed in obliging the new students to sign the missionary oath. The oath was taken by nine of the ten students, but its effect was weakened by the fact that only a low number of students proceeded to ordination. Only four of the ten became priests, while two were made ostiaries, but they left the Irish College without taking further orders. No details are available on

43 See Appendix One, 213-214; Appendix Three, 258.
45 See Appendix One, 213-214.
four students. Beyond the low number of students ordained, this period also witnessed the arrival of the first ‘miscreant’ that is, a student who did not have any religious vocation, such as James Quirke who was admitted in 1640. Quirke’s name was the first to be included in the college’s list of ‘miscreants,’ which revealed that the student’s admission was encouraged by some unknown patrons who ‘solicited in his behalfe to be receaved to this colledge.’ His stay in the Irish College was very brief because he was transferred to the Jesuit noviciate in late August 1641 before being dismissed in October. After his expulsion, Quirke remained in the city where he supported himself by selling chestnuts. He was subsequently ordained and became a priest. The Jesuit management did not seem to consider Quirke’s admission a big problem because no actions were taken against him.

The low number of ordinands was, however, offset by the fact that almost all of these returned to operate on the Irish mission. Three out of ten students were back in Ireland before the end of the 1640s, with one quickly rising through the clerical ranks there. This was Luke Plunkett, who was admitted to the Irish College in 1638 and left it in 1641 to go to Paris to continue his studies. He may have been ordained there before holding the key positions of principal chaplain of the Confederate Leinster army and protonotary apostolic during the Confederate War (1641-1653). A further indication of Plunkett’s clerical prestige is his participation as the only representative of the Meath clergy in the synod of the Irish Catholic Church held at Jamestown on 12 August 1650. Plunkett was one of the clerics who signed the declaration that sanctioned the excommunication, as well as the refusal to obey, of James Butler (1610-1688) - the first duke of Ormond and Protestant lord lieutenant of Ireland. From 1665 until around 1670,
Plunkett operated as the pastor of Athboy in the Meath diocese, and was also titular abbot of Saint Thomas’ church in Dublin from 1664. At the beginning of the 1670s Plunkett’s career took a further step forward thanks to the help provided by Oliver Plunkett (1625-1681) - the archbishop of Armagh between 1669 and 1681, who was a kinsman of the Fingal branch of the Plunketts, to which Luke belonged. In 1671, he was named metropolitan vicar of Raphoe, and in 1672 Archbishop Plunkett transferred him to Derry, where he acted as vicar general. He was arrested during the Popish Plot (1678-1681), the conspiracy organized by Titus Oates (1649-1705) to kill King Charles II (1630-1685), and transported to London, although by early 1680 he had been released and returned home.

The other two students who returned home were Maurice Ward (b. 1612) and William Bergin (b.1614), who joined the Jesuits after their arrival in Ireland. Their joining may have been partly due to the affection that they had developed for the Society while students. Yet this did not mean that the Jesuits recruited students on the whole for their Society during this period, despite the initial fears that this would happen when they took over the seminary’s management in 1635. The available evidence indicates that Ward entered the Jesuits in 1646 in Kilkenny and took vows in 1648. According to a Jesuit catalogue dated 1654, he was included among the missionaries of the Society then active in Ireland. Another catalogue of 1662 recorded that he carried out his ministry in Galway, and died in 1663. In contrast to Ward, Bergin’s conduct within the Society was less satisfactory. He left the Irish College to return home, around 1648 or 1649, where he entered the Jesuits. In 1650, he was sent to Portugal where he was

exhibentur; Sed etiam plura Regulares generatim sumptos, Clerumque Saecularem, nee non & Res Civiles Hiberniae, atque etiam Magnae Britanniae spectantia, ... inseruntur (Coloniae Agrippinae: ex typographia Metternichiana, 1762), 692-693, 695.

51 John J. Hanly ed., The Letters of Saint Oliver Plunkett, 303.
52 Tomás Ó Fiaich and Desmond Forristal, Oliver Plunkett, his Life and Letters (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1975), 7.
53 For the most recent analysis on the Popish plot see John Gibney, Ireland and the Popish Plot (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
55 PICR, Liber XX, fols. 136r-139v, 141, 147r; Jesuit Archives of Dublin, Catalogue of the members of the third mission of the Society of Jesus in Ireland, unpaginated.
dismissed from the Society for unknown reasons. According to the
manuscript history of the Irish College, he then went to Livorno where he
dedicated himself to converting English Protestant traders. He later died in
that city.\textsuperscript{56}

According to the manuscript history of the Irish College, two other
students of this period became Jesuits while one entered the Franciscan
order. Richard Stafford and Ignatius Teeling entered the Society in the
Italian Peninsula. Stafford died in Puglia while working on behalf of the
Collegio Romano. For his part, after Teeling entered the Jesuits in 1647, he
subsequently taught philosophy in Siena, mathematics in Rome, and
theology in Ingolstadt, Bologna, and Naples. In 1676 he was residing in the
German College of Rome where he acted as a revisor for the German
Assistancy.\textsuperscript{57} He appears to have died in 1699.\textsuperscript{58} The student who joined the
Franciscan order was Matthias Ball who left the Irish College in 1645
without taking holy orders.\textsuperscript{59} In contrast to Plunkett, Ward and Bergin,
one of the above mentioned students returned to Ireland as their oath
required. Their refusal or inability to return home once they completed
their studies may have been due to a variety of reasons. Most obviously,
the poor conditions for the secular clergy and the political instability at
home played against their return.\textsuperscript{60} Perhaps more directly influential was
the fact that the situation was worsened by Propaganda’s decision to no
longer grant viaticum to Irish students after 1635, which reduced the
financial resources on which they might draw upon in making their trip.\textsuperscript{61}

IV

The Irish College was not unique in encountering difficulties relating to
resources and an unfavourable political climate at home. It is possible to
suppose that the limited contribution that the seminary made to the supply

\textsuperscript{56} PICR, Liber I, fol. 84v.
\textsuperscript{57} PICR, Liber I, fol. 83rv.
\textsuperscript{58} Jesuit Archives of Dublin, Catalogue of the members of the third mission of the
Society of Jesus in Ireland, unpaginated.
\textsuperscript{59} PICR, Liber I, fol. 83v.
\textsuperscript{60} O’Connor, “The Irish College, Rome, in the Age of Religious Renewal,” in
Collegium Hibernorum de Urbe, 24.
\textsuperscript{61} See chapter two, 75.
of missionaries for the Irish church might mirror that of similar institutions in the city, notably the English College and the Scots College, founded in 1579 and in 1600 respectively. Long before the Irish College, the English College had already been placed under Jesuit administration, and since 1598 the rector of the college had always been an English member of the Society. Both colleges were familiar with financial restrictions as well as severe disputes between rectors and students.62 However, the two colleges still succeeded in providing missionaries for England and Scotland. Between 1580 and 1642 the English College could boast the formation of 122 missionaries, forty-eight of whom were killed by the Protestant authorities.63 It is more difficult to gauge the missionary contribution of the Scots College because the available figures are limited to one year. Despite this, the number of returning students appears to have been much higher proportionally than the Irish College in the same period. According to its records, in 1643 the Scots College had ten students and by the late 1640s seven of them had returned to Scotland.64

Of course, the best way to highlight the difficulties encountered by the Irish College is to compare it with that of Saint Isidore’s. The differences are striking, from the recruitment of students to the repatriation of missionaries. Saint Isidore’s recruited just as well between 1636 and 1643 as it had from 1625 to 1635. The entry records display that sixty-two new students were accepted, of whom eighteen were from Leinster, twenty-one from Munster, ten from Ulster and five from Connacht. No details were provided for eight students.65 In contrast to the late 1620s and the early 1630s when Munstermen were the outright majority (thirty-three out of sixty-six students), there was a shift during this period so that an almost equal proportion of Leinster and Munster recruits dominated in the

63 Gasquet, A History of the Venerable English College, 123-146.
65 See Appendix Two, 233-244; Appendix Four, 260.
catalogue of entry. In contrast to the Irish College, there was a thin representation of Connachtmen. Possibly their small number might have again been determined by the political conditions previously described in that province. In any case, the dominance of the southern provinces did not bring the Connacht and Ulster students to raise a complaint about provincial favouritism at either college in this period.

Further examination of the student body at Saint Isidore’s reveals that there was a low ordination rate. Indeed only ten students were ordained priests in Rome. Of the remainder, the available information reveals that five were made deacons, one was promoted to minor orders, and one was named exorcist while at the college. Further evidence indicates that three were ordained priests, one made deacon, and one promoted to the subdiaconate in Brussels.\(^\text{66}\) However, in contrast to the Irish College, other students may have already been ordained elsewhere before their arrival in Rome, for the Franciscan training network linked Saint Isidore’s with other Irish Franciscan colleges and Franciscan convents in continental Europe.\(^\text{67}\) Thus, between early February and early April 1636, Saint Isidore’s admitted eleven students - ten of them were called from Saint Anthony’s College of Louvain, while one travelled from the Iberian Peninsula. A further example of this mobility was the decision made by the Franciscan college to admit four students, two from the Iberian Peninsula and two from Spanish Flanders, to admission to its theology course in March 1638.\(^\text{68}\)

Beyond its links to other Franciscan centres on the continent, Saint Isidore’s succeeded in extending its connections with the Irish mission. The records indicate that twenty-four out of the sixty-two students (almost 39\%) admitted in the years from 1636 to 1643 did return to Ireland, even if they were not ordained in Rome. The majority of the students, seventeen,

\(^{66}\) Ibid.
\(^{68}\) See Appendix Two, 233-235, 237.
returned to operate on the Irish mission before the end of the 1640s.\textsuperscript{69} However, almost a third of the students (three out of ten) of the Irish College also returned in the same period so proportionally the rate of return did not differ much between the two colleges. The real difference is in the number of students recruited and in the number of those who completed their training.

It is difficult to present a clear picture of the financial support provided by Saint Isidore’s to the returning students because the evidence is scarce. According to the account register, in late September 1642 the college paid almost four crowns towards ship’s passage for Francis Magruairk (1614?-1665) and Bonaventure Conny (b.1612?) - two Ulster students admitted to study in 1636.\textsuperscript{70} In early April 1644 the college gave almost eight crowns to Thaddeus O’Carraghy and to another friar, simply named as William, for both travel costs and for the purchase of equipment to buy for their journey to Ireland.\textsuperscript{71} The friar named William might be William Meacher, a student admitted on 2 January 1638.\textsuperscript{72} However, it is not certain whether or not he returned to Ireland due to the complete absence of sources regarding his subsequent activity.

Amongst the students of Saint Isidore’s who returned home, Anthony Doherty, rose to prominent positions within the order in continental Europe and in Ireland. Doherty, an Ulsterman, entered the Franciscans in Saint Anthony’s college of Louvain probably in the late 1620s, and was sent from there to Saint Isidore’s to study philosophy in 1636.\textsuperscript{73} In late February 1638 he was made exorcist but there are no further details on his ordination or on his departure from Rome.\textsuperscript{74} The first mention of him in Ireland was at the provincial chapter of 1647 during which he was elected custos of the province. In 1658 Doherty was appointed guardian of Moyne and at the chapter of 1661 he was named provincial, an office he held until 1666. In

\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 232-243.
\textsuperscript{70} FLK, MS C 63, fol. 98r; Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,”5.
\textsuperscript{71} FLK, MS C 63, fol. 102v.
\textsuperscript{72} Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,”5.
\textsuperscript{73} Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 51.
1687 he was named master of novices in the Moyne convent. The last record of him indicates that in 1689 he was appointed as one of the examiners of the friars seeking approval as confessors. Another student who rose to prominent positions was James Darcy, a Leinsterman, who was possibly admitted to Saint Isidore’s in 1642. In 1644 he was made deacon but there is no evidence for his ordination or his departure from Rome. The first reference to him in Ireland was at the provincial chapter of 1658 during which he was appointed guardian of Trim. In 1661, Darcy was named guardian of Stradbally, while he was appointed custos of the Irish province in 1669. From 1675 until 1682 he was guardian of Dublin, and, at the Irish provincial chapter held on 13 June 1683, he was elected provincial.

The sources on the other twenty-two students who returned to Ireland demonstrate that fifteen of them acted as guardians in a variety of locations - eleven of them holding this role in two or three different locations during their career. Further evidence indicates that seven were named as confessors, two were appointed as definitors at the provincial chapter of 1647, one at the provincial chapter of 1675, and four were lecturers. The mobility of these former students was favoured by the fact that the order’s network at home was still in expansion. By 1647, it possessed a total of sixty-one houses, twenty-nine more than recorded by the provincial chapter of 1629.

Between 1636 and 1643, therefore, the development of Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College differed both in pace and achievement. The fundamental difficulty for the Irish College was the continuous paucity of resources. It was also hindered by the absence of a long term strategy that survived changes in personnel. Rectors Forde and Malone focused on their search to find a permanent residence for the Irish College and implemented their plans through careful investments which took account of the seminary’s

75 LL, 14, 184, 189; Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 51-52.
77 See Appendix Two, 233-244.
78 Ibid.
79 LL, 4-6, 20-29.
limited resources. However, Albergati completely nullified their efforts by introducing a method of payment to Rosolino which simply accumulated the college’s debt to him.

The need to find a permanent residence and the perpetual absence of financial stability hampered the seminary’s capacity to recruit a large number of students, as Saint Isidore’s did so successfully, thus consolidating the foundations laid during the previous decade. The Franciscan college was advantaged by the growing intellectual reputation and ecclesio-political stature of Wadding, while the Irish College lacked an equivalent figurehead, who could act as its spokesman and representative and who could use his extensive web of associations to promote it and its students. The college also used the international network of Franciscan institutions to its benefit, with students moving between colleges during their formation and being deployed to serve in the expanding province in Ireland and elsewhere. In Ireland its students proved very active, and far greater in number than the returnees from the Irish College.
Chapter four.
A new dimension to the Irish missions.
The West Indies, 1638-1643

I

By 1643, the Irish church could count on two established colleges in Rome which had as a common aim to train and send ecclesiastics to serve its mission. However, neither of the colleges had formed priests who embarked on the other missionary ventures which characterized the first half of the seventeenth century, nor did the colleges’ authorities suggest that they could or should do so. However, the 1630s witnessed a change in patterns of Irish migration which began to extend beyond continental Europe. More precisely, from the early 1630s, Irish men and women began to settle in the West Indies.¹ This brought a change in the geography of the relationship between Rome and the Irish clergy at home, and raised the prospect that missionaries would be needed to serve Irish Catholics in places other than Ireland or even the continent. This did become a subject of communication between Ireland, Rome and the West Indies where, in 1638, a small number of Irish clerics, regular and secular, initiated a missionary process that eventually concluded in 1669. These years are best distinguished into two phases: the first from 1638 until 1643, and the second from 1650 until 1669.² This dating is dictated by the timing of the missions themselves. Furthermore, the first phase, on which this chapter will concentrate, was defined by two principal characteristics. The first was that it was carried out by two Irish seculars who operated within the narrow geographical area of the island of Saint Christopher between 1638 and 1640. The second was that the mission was the only one directly proposed by an Irish bishop resident in Ireland. Indeed, in neither phases did any of the Irish clerics residing in Rome display any interest in promoting and supporting the missions of their fellow-countrymen in the West Indies.

² Chapter seven will deal with the second phase.
Irish missionary involvement in the Atlantic world developed very slowly and quite late if we consider that the broader Catholic evangelization process traced its origins to the late fifteenth century. Innocent II’s bull *Orthodoxe fidei propagationem*, followed by Alexander VI’s *Inter cetera* bull, urged that ‘the Catholic faith and Christian religion be particularly exalted in our day and everywhere spread and enlarged, so that souls be saved and barbaric peoples be humbled and brought to the faith.’

The geographical discoveries of the Portuguese and the Spanish came to be considered by the Holy See as a sign of a new age of concord during which the eschatological dream to have all men united in a common faith would be realized. The first missionary enterprises outside Europe were spearheaded by the Jesuits, who, through the years 1542-1611, established missions in India, Japan, Brazil, China and on the Atlantic coast of what is today called Canada. In the first two decades of the seventeenth century the French Capuchins founded missions in Egypt, Constantinople, and eastern Brazil.

From its beginning, the Irish contribution to missionary expansion was very limited, with two exceptions. The Jesuits Thomas Field (1549-1625) and Michael Wadding (1591-1644) operated in today’s Brazil and Paraguay.

---


from 1587 to 1626, and in Mexico from 1610 until 1644 respectively. To them we need to add two seculars, notably Achilles Holden and Richard Arthur, who ministered in Santo Domingo and Saint Augustine, in today’s Florida, respectively, the former in 1525 and the latter from 1597 to 1604. The first proposal to enlist more Irish priests came as part of an effort to counter Protestant expansion in the North-West Atlantic area. On 12 February 1634, Alonso de Bonavides, a Portuguese Franciscan who had been a missionary in today’s New Mexico between 1626 and 1629, wrote to Propaganda. He warned the Roman congregation that the Protestant heresy could spread to New Mexico from Virginia where it had been introduced by the English and by Dutch traders, and should be countered by establishing a mission of Irish Franciscans who spoke English, and could engage in converting Protestants as well as natives. On 5 June 1634, Propaganda, who had entrusted Cardinal Cesare Monti (1593-1650) to examine Bonavides’ proposal, decided to send Irish priests to Virginia, and added New Mexico to their missionary jurisdiction, so that they could cover all of the areas within the range of English and Dutch navigators. Despite this decision, the mission did not materialize. In any case, Bonavides’ proposal was based on an incorrect mapping of North America which identified Virginia as an area bordering with New Mexico. This mistake fitted into the pattern of contradictory and inaccurate information

---


7 In 1630 a long and detailed memorial of Bonavides’ missionary experience was published in Madrid and dedicated to King Philip IV: *Memorial que Fray Ivuan de Santander de la Orden de San Francisco, Commissario General de Indias, presenta a la Magestad Catolica del Rey don Felipe Qvarto nuestro Señor. Hecho por el Padre Fray Alonso de Benauides Commissario del Santo Oficio, y Custodio que basido de las Prouincias, y conuersions del Nueuo-Mexico. Tratase enel de los tesores espirituales, y temporales, que la diuina Magestad ha manifestado en quella conuersiones, y nueuos descubrimientos, por medio de los Padres desta serafica Religion* (Madrid: en la Imprenta Real, 1630); Edward E. Ayer, trans., *The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides, 1630* (Chicago: privately printed, 1916).

8 In contrast to this incorrect geographical information, the Spanish friar gave up-to-date details on the presence of the Dutch and English traders in Virginia where they had established mutual commercial relations in the 1630s: APF, SC America, vol. 259, fols. 152v-186v, Alonso Bonavides to PF, 12 February 1634.

that characterized the correspondence between Propaganda’s officials and
their correspondents in North America during the first half of the
seventeenth century. ¹⁰

Bonavides made his proposal during a period which saw the beginning
of an early migratory movement from Ireland to the American continent. In
the case of the West Indies, the first record of an Irish presence dates to
1626-1627, when Anthony Hilton, an English planter, established a
temporary settlement of Irish indentured servants in the western part of
Saint Christopher, which had begun to be settled in 1624. However, in 1628,
a native raid forced the colonists to leave the island and resettle in Nevis. ¹¹

The arrival of these indentured servants formed part of the process of
European expansion in the West Indies. Besides Saint Christopher and
Nevis, the English settled in Barbados and Antigua, in 1627 and 1628
respectively. In 1627 the French established themselves on Saint
Christopher. As a result, the English and the French officially partitioned
the island in two in that year: a central area under English control which
kept the name of Saint Christopher, and two outer French areas renamed
Saint Christophe. Then, in 1635, the French established two new colonies,
Guadeloupe and Martinica, while the Dutch also became involved in the
Caribbean, beginning by settling in Tobago in 1628. From there, they
extended their control over Saint Estatius in 1632, and Curaçao in 1634. ¹²

There is no evidence to suggest that any Irish priests travelled with the
group of indentured servants to Saint Christopher, although other colonial
enterprises led by Irishmen are known to have required Irish priests to
provide spiritual assistance to their fellow-countrymen. This was the case

¹¹ Carl and Roberta Bridenbaugh, No Peace beyond the Line: The English in the
¹² Richard S. Dunn, Sugar and Slaves: The Rise of the Planter Class in the English West
Indies, 1624-1713 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972), 16-20;
Kenneth Gordon Davies, The North Atlantic World in the Seventeenth Century
(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974), 39-45; Cornelis Ch. Goslinga,
The Dutch in the Caribbean and on the Wild Coast, 1580-1680 (Assen: Van Gorcum,
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for the settlement on the river Amazon founded by Philip and James Purcelle, two Irish traders, in 1612. Despite changing fortunes, this colony lasted until 1631, when it was destroyed by a Portuguese expedition. Some efforts were made to request Irish priests who could evangelize the natives, although these had no effect. In the second half of the 1630s, Irish endeavours to settle in the Amazon area continued, but no concrete requests to have Irish priests were put forward.

Irish involvement in Atlantic settlement ventures was limited because Irish investors had less capital available to them than their competitors. Despite this, in the 1630s, the Irish also began to settle in the West Indies. In the years between 1630 and 1700, it has been supposed that this area received 190,000 settlers from the British Isles. Within this migration pattern, Louis Cullen calculates that, from the 1630s, the Irish arrivals numbered around 100 annually. Initially the migrants were composed mainly of merchants from the Galway area and indentured servants who were principally from the Munster province, the location of the oldest and largest English plantation.

The dearth of specific information makes it difficult to depict the religious denomination of these Irish emigrants to the West Indies. The first evidence on this point is in the account written by Andrew White, an English Jesuit (1579-1656), who accompanied Leonard Calvert (1610/11-1634), "An Irish Settlement on the Amazon, 1612-1629," Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, sect. C, 41 (1932): 1-54. For a recent analysis on this settlement see Joyce Lorimer ed., English and Irish Settlements on the River Amazon, 1550-1646 (London: Hakluyt Society, 1989).

Ibid., 74, 398-404.


1647), the son of Lord Baltimore, to Maryland, in 1632, where Calvert’s father had obtained a concession of land located on the north of the Potomac river from Charles I.\textsuperscript{18} White reported that on 26 January 1634 they arrived at Montserrat, where the inhabitants ‘are Irishmen, who were banished by the English, on account of their professing the Catholic faith.’\textsuperscript{19}

White, writing from a clerical perspective, tended to stress the Catholic identity of the Irish and their religious oppression. However, it is possible that these Irishmen were dispossessed Old-English landowners from Waterford who had been sent to Virginia in 1630, where the Anglican elite prevented them from settling.\textsuperscript{20} What is sure is that, by the time of White’s report, Montserrat was in the process of being colonized, and not only by Irish who might have been expelled from Virginia. In 1629 or 1630, a small party of Irish settlers arrived there from the disbanded colony on the Amazon. Between 1631 and 1633, a larger group of Irishmen was brought there by Anthony Briskett, a Protestant trader from county Wexford.\textsuperscript{21}

Officially, Briskett was the first governor of the island thanks to the patent granted to him, during the late 1620s and the 1630s, by James Hay - the first earl of Carlisle (c.1590-1636).\textsuperscript{22}

The official religion of Montserrat was Protestant, as Briskett confirmed in 1636, when he petitioned Charles I to renew his rights on the island. In his appeal he intentionally emphasized the religious conformity of


\textsuperscript{20} David Beers Quinn, \textit{Ireland and America: Their Early Associations, 1500-1640} (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1991), 26; Akenson, \textit{If the Irish ran}, 30-31.

\textsuperscript{21} Briskett was the grandson of Antonio Bruschetto, a Genovese merchant, who, around the 1530s, went to England, where he anglicized his name to Anthony Briskett. In 1582 his father Lodowick Briskett acquired a confiscated estate at Macmine, in County Wexford. On the life of Lodowick Briskett see Henry R. Plomer and Tom Peete Cross, \textit{The Life and the Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett} (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927), 33.

\textsuperscript{22} We have no exact date for the first settlement of Montserrat and neither there are documents on Carlisle’s first concession to Briskett: Gwynn, “Documents relating to the Irish in the West Indies,” \textit{Anal. Hib.} 4 (October 1932): 183-185.
Montserrat where he was ‘erecting a Church of Stone and Bricke, for the glory of God, and your Majesties honor.’ Crucially, however, he did not mention that the church would be served by a minister.\textsuperscript{23} This suggests that, by the time of Briskett’s petition, no Anglican ministers or Catholic missionaries were operating on the island. Matters were no better on the other islands. On Saint Christopher, where in 1637 almost 240 Irish settlers arrived, no Catholic missionaries operated.\textsuperscript{24} On Barbados, White related that there were ‘some few Catholiques there be both English and Irish’, but he did not mention any Catholic or Protestant missionaries.\textsuperscript{25}

The absence of Protestant missionaries in these islands contrasted with the evangelical efforts carried out in the New England colonies. There the extension of Protestantism and the conversion of the natives were the two primary goals of early colonization. A possible explanation for the lack of Protestant ministers in the English settlements in the West Indies might be garnered from the fact that, except for Montserrat, they were under the control of groups of competing London merchants who, despite adhering to the Anglican Church, had no interest in supporting missions on their islands.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} See the petition of Anthony Briskett to Charles I, 1636?, in Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and West Indies [shortened in CSP, Colonial], ed. Noël Sainsbury (London: Longman & Roberts), vol.1574-1660, doc no.23, 240; Akenson, If the Irish ran, 43.

\textsuperscript{24} Public Record Office [hereafter shortened in PRO], High Court of Admiralty, 30/656, document cited in Bridenbaugh, No Peace beyond the Line, footnote no.9, 14-15; Gabriel Debien, Les engagés pour les Antilles (1634-1715) (Paris: Société de l’histoire des colonies françaises, 1952), 90-91.

\textsuperscript{25} Clayton Colman Hall ed., Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684: With a Map and Two Facsimiles (New York: Charles Scribner’s sons, 1910), 37.

The situation on these islands also differed markedly from those under French influence, which passed under the control of the Compagnie des Isles de l’Amérique in 1635. Founded by Cardinal de Richelieu (1585-1642) and Louis XIII (1601-1643), this company, modelled on that of the Compagnie des Cent-Associés, which was established in 1627, sustained a scheme which envisaged colonization and evangelization.\textsuperscript{27} According to the second article of the founding charter, the associates of the Compagnie des Isles de l’Amérique had ‘to do all possible to convert them [the natives] to the Roman, Apostolic, Catholic religion: and for this reason, in every settlement, the so called Associates will support at least two or three clerics to administer the word of God, and the Sacraments to the Catholics and to instruct the Aboriginal people.’\textsuperscript{28} The colonization programme was imbued with a strict religious orthodoxy as indicated by the fourth article of the charter which explicitly stated that only French Catholics would be admitted to the settlements.\textsuperscript{29}

The colonization agenda of the Compagnie des Iles de l’Amérique fitted with the missionary agenda of Propaganda, the main interests of which focused on the Catholic settlers and on the natives. Initially this favoured cooperation between the Roman ministry, the French court and the Compagnie, and resulted in the foundation of the first Dominican mission on Guadeloupe and the first Capuchin mission on Saint Christophe in 1635.


\textsuperscript{28} Jean Baptiste Dutertre, \textit{Histoire générale des Antilles Habitées par les Français Divisée en deux Tomes et enrichie de Cartes & de Figures}, I: Contenant tout ce qui s’est passé dans l’establissement des Colonies Françaises (Paris: Jolly, 1667-1671), 47: ‘lesdits Associez s’y habituans, feront leur possible pour les convertir à la Religion Catholique, Apostolique & Romaine: & pour cet effet en chacune habitation, lesdits Associez feront entretenir au moins deux ou trios Ecclesiastiques pour administrer la parole de Dieu, & les Sacrements aux Catholiques, & pour instruire les Sauvages.’

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 47-48.
and 1636 respectively.\textsuperscript{30} In contrast to French missionary initiatives, Irish Catholic missionaries could not expect to benefit from any help from either the crown or the official local church. This meant that support for any missionary initiatives would have to come from elsewhere, either from the Holy See or from the Irish clergy elsewhere, or from a combination of both.

II

In 1638, the situation changed, albeit unexpectedly and without any intervention from Rome. In the early months of that year, Malachy O’Queely - the archbishop of Tuam (d.1645), penned a letter to Propaganda to inform it that ‘in the island of Saint Christopher and others adjacent to it, in the West Indies, live English, Scottish and Irish.’ The Irish were the majority and lived ‘mixed with the English and Scottish heretics, and are daily exposed to the danger of perversion.’ To remedy this, the archbishop reported that he had sent two priests there, and that these had departed, from Ireland, with many Catholics. The priests had been properly instructed on how to act but they were without missionary faculties. In the final part of his letter, O’Queely advanced two requests. The first was that he should be nominated prefect of the mission, which would in effect give it official status. Second, the archbishop asked for a small financial contribution to supply resources to the two missionaries, for he could not provide for the needs of this mission, which required sacred ornaments and books.\textsuperscript{31}

By the time O’Queely sent his letter to Rome, the Irish settlers seemed to already enjoy some form of religious assistance from the French Capuchins, though it is possible that the archbishop was unaware of this. From 1636,


\textsuperscript{31} APF, SOCG, vol. 399, fol. 84, Malachy O’Queely to PF, [spring of 1638]: ‘insulam Sancti Christophori cum aliis adiacentibus in India occidentali Angli, Scoti et Hiberni inhabitant’...‘mixti viventes cum Anglis et Scotis haereticis, ac proximo periculo perversionis.’
the Capuchins ran a mission on Saint Christophe, in the French part of the island. Although their missionary jurisdiction was officially limited to this area, the Capuchins also secretly operated on Saint Christopher. This was confirmed by a report that Hyacinthe de Longueville, the superior of the mission, sent to Propaganda in the 1650s to inform it of the outcomes of the Capuchin apostolate on the island since 1636. According to de Longueville, his confrères secretly visited the English part of the island, where they provided religious services to Irish Catholics. He added that the Capuchins had also converted a group of 300 Protestants which included some French, English, Irish and Scottish settlers.\(^{32}\)

Outside of the communication established between Rome and Ireland, other Irish clerics, resident in continental Europe, were aware of this colony and may have tried to use it as way to promote ecclesio-political plans. On 14 January 1639, Sir Arthur Hopton (1588-1650), the English ambassador in Madrid, wrote a report to Francis Windebank (1582-1646), the Secretary of state, to inform him that Murtagh O’Grady, an Irish Franciscan, had told King Philip IV (1605-1665) of the Irish settlement on Saint Christopher, where, according to the priest, there lived 2000 Irishmen. Moreover, the friar, had informed the King of Spain that the Irish settlers on Saint Christopher could be considered as a potential group to be recruited for the Spanish army. Hopton claimed that O’Grady was willing to embark for that colony from Bristol.\(^{33}\)

In Rome, O’Queely’s letter was received with a mix of surprise and interest. Francesco Ingoli, the secretary of Propaganda, soon perceived the potential of the enterprise undertaken by the archbishop of Tuam. His concern for this mission is not surprising, as since the early 1620s Ingoli had developed an interest in the missions of the Atlantic world thanks to the correspondence forwarded to Propaganda about Newfoundland by Simon Stock, an English Discalced Carmelite (1576-1652) (born Thomas

\(^{32}\) APF, SOCG, vol. 260, fols. 17-20, Hyacinthe de Longueville to PF, 1 March 1650.

Doughty).\textsuperscript{34} It is striking that there is no evidence to demonstrate that Luke Wadding played a role in the negotiations between O’Queely and Propaganda. This clashed with the fact that, since the early 1630s, the Franciscan acted as a consultor for the congregation on a variety of different issues.\textsuperscript{35} His absence in these negotiations is also noteworthy if we consider that, as the chief compiler of the \textit{Annales Minorum}, he was aware of the missionary activities carried out by his Spanish confreres in Central America and South America.\textsuperscript{36} Conceivably the missionary effort promoted by O’Queely, a fellow countryman of Wadding, might have raised some interest in the Irish Franciscan but he did not intervene.

In Rome the first individual to take the first step was not an Irishman but instead Ingoli, who drafted a response on the reverse side of the document in which he urged that the mission should be authorized quickly and that the prefect should be O’Queely, who was ‘a watchful and prudent prelate.’\textsuperscript{37} Ingoli also made an estimate of the financial support required. From his point of view, the main expenses to anticipate were the shipping of ornaments, chalices, and ecclesiastical books. Additional forms of support would not be required because ‘the missionaries have food on that island.’\textsuperscript{38} However, despite Ingoli’s promptness, Propaganda, needed to acquire more information on the mission before proceeding.

On 20 April 1638, Propaganda agreed to ask Edmund O’Dwyer, O’Queely’s Roman agent, for a detailed report of the Irish mission on Saint Christopher.\textsuperscript{39} At the end of the same month, O’Dwyer replied that ‘in the month of March this year, six hundred Irish of both sexes came to those parts, thanks to a safe and functional communication line, recently

\textsuperscript{34} Codignola, “The Holy See,” 204-205; see id., \textit{The Coldest Harbour of the land}.

\textsuperscript{35} See chapter two, 70.


\textsuperscript{37} APF, SOCG, vol. 399, fol. 84, draft response of Francesco Ingoli: ‘essendo Prelato vigilante e prudente.’

\textsuperscript{38} APF, SOCG, vol. 399, fol. 84v: ‘havendo li missionari in quell’isola il vitto.’

\textsuperscript{39} APF, Acta, vol. 13, fols. 83v-84r, general congregation, 20 April 1638.
established.’ O’Queely had sent ‘two diocesan priests of his diocese, (whose names are Ferdinand Fareissy and David O’Neill).’ As Ingoli did, O’Dwyer asked Propaganda to appoint the archbishop of Tuam as prefect of the mission ‘in Virginia, and on the island of Saint Christopher and in other places where there are English, Scots and Irish.’ The agent stressed that the ‘English and Scots lack Protestant ministers,’ and that this would aid the missionaries in bringing ‘the whole region under the obedience of the Holy See.’

The fact that this mission had been specifically organized by O’Queely rather than by other Irish bishops can be probably imputed to the Connacht origins of the settlers who left for Saint Christopher in 1638. But the organization of the mission was also characteristic of this prelate who was one of the most active members of the Irish episcopate implementing Tridentine diocesan reforms within his diocese. His dynamism brought him to issue a series of decrees which were aimed at improving the quality and the quantity of the diocesan clergy and also oversaw an increase in the number of secular clergy of the Tuam diocese from thirty-four in 1630 to fifty-seven clerics in 1638. However, these figures do not allow us to assess whether the archbishop specifically selected the two priests for the mission or if they spontaneously decided to go.

The data transmitted by O’Queely and O’Dwyer put Propaganda in contact with a complex political and religious reality. The mission on Saint

40 APF, SOCG, vol. 399, fols. 258, 269, agent of O’Queely in Rome [Edmund O’Dwyer], to PF, April 1638: ‘adeo ut mense martio huius anni sexcenti Hiberni utriusque sexus omnes catholici, ad dictas partes inhabitandas discesserint, propter certam et utilem correspondentiam nuper repertam’…‘duos suae dioecesis sacerdotes (quorum nomina Ferdinandus Fareissy et David Onellus)’…‘in insula Sancti Christophori aliiisque locis in quibus Angli, Scoti et Hiberni incolae reperiuntur,’ carenti ministris haereticis’…‘reducendi totam regionem sub obedientia Sedis Apostolicae.’
42 In 1631 he convoked a provincial synod in which it was approved a series of articles related to clerical dress, parish records, restriction of penances, the Eucharist, admission to clerical orders, marriage and catechism. Moreover the synod stressed the non-repeatability of confirmation and stressed the need to disseminate simple doctrinal information among the people of the province. See APF, SC, Irlanda, vol. 1, fols. 171r-181v, decrees and statutes of the provincial synod of Tuam, 9 December 1632; J. Hagan, “Miscellanea Vaticano-Hibernica, 1580-1631,” Arch. Hib. 3 (1914): 84-89.
Christopher developed into a milieu where, in addition to the Irish, there were English and Scottish settlers who professed a different religion. It is likely that the Scots mentioned by O’Queely were a small minority because the Scottish migration to the West Indies during the seventeenth century was not composed of large numbers. According to the census of 1678, there were only about 201 Scottish settlers, in striking contrast with the 3466 Irish reported to live on Saint Christopher, Nevis, Montserrat and Antigua.43

Another striking detail to emerge from the correspondence between O’Queely and Ingoli was that the archbishop did not request any practical support for the two missionaries based in Saint Christopher, with the exception of liturgical equipment. This may imply that he assumed that the two priests would enjoy some form of sustenance from their fellow countrymen on the island. Furthermore the exchange of correspondence reveals the linguistic complexity of the Saint Christopher settlement. Ingoli urged that the missionaries sent should be able to speak at least two or three different languages. Although he did not specify which, these were plausibly English, Irish, and French. This means that the missionaries would have to operate amongst two distinct groups of Irishmen: one composed of Old-English and one of Gaelic settlers. With regard to the French, Ingoli probably considered it necessary because of the political division which existed on the island. Like O’Queely, O’Dwyer had offered vague and inaccurate geographical details, which did not help the cardinals of Propaganda to clarify the possible jurisdiction of the mission. Notably, on the reverse side of O’Dwyer’s letter, Ingoli drafted a response that solicited Propaganda to authorize the mission and argued that it was necessary in order to prevent the spreading of the heresy which could be introduced by the English preachers of Virginia.44 Clearly, Ingoli and the other cardinals of Propaganda had a fragmentary knowledge of the West Indies and of their location in the Atlantic world. This was because they still elaborated their strategies against Protestant activity in North America

44 APF, SOCG, vol. 399, fol. 258v.
using the inaccurate map made in 1625 by Gregorio Bolivar (1580-1631), a Spanish Recollect. Despite the distance between the two areas, Ingoli considered Saint Christopher to be close to Virginia and consequently exposed to the risk of being visited by the Protestant preachers from there. As Luca Codignola correctly explains, their weak knowledge of North America’s geography influenced the cardinals’ decision making. The fact that they were making these decisions about future missions in Rome meant that they were obliged to rely on the correspondence that bishops or missionaries dispatched to them. Of course, this also meant that they exhorted their correspondents to compile accurate reports.\footnote{Codignola, “The Holy See,” 207.}

Thus, on 20 April 1638, Propaganda asked Archbishop O’Queely to produce a second and more precise \textit{relatio} and to inform its members whether he was willing to send more missionaries. When the archbishop sent his report, he most likely confirmed that, in contrast to the expectations of Ingoli, the mission had made little progress and that the situation for the Irish Catholic settlers within the West Indies was gloomy. On Saint Christopher and the other islands under English control ‘the number of the Catholics in those parts exceeds three thousand.’ Yet these were not served by an adequate number of priests. Of the two missionaries O’Queely had sent one had died and ‘the other is not enough for such a multitude of Catholics.’ This dearth of missionaries was becoming more problematic as Protestant ministers arrived from Scotland and England because, according to O’Queely, they ‘can infect the natives of those parts who trade with the said nations.’\footnote{APF, SOCG, vol. 400, fol. 184, [O’Queely ?] to [PF], no date: ‘respondet numerum catholicorum Hibernorum in illis partibus exedere tria millia’…‘mortuus sit, et alius non sufficiat tantae multitudini catholicorum’…‘gentiles idolatras illarum partium qui ex dictarum nationum commercio idolatriam deserunt.’}

There was, therefore, an evident disproportion between the number of missionaries deployed and the number of settlers they had to serve. Two priests were certainly not sufficient to cater for the spiritual needs of the estimated 3000 Irish Catholics that O’Queely reported to live in the English
islands. Due to this inadequate number, the apostolate of the Irish priests focused on the needs of their fellow countrymen. This explains why no efforts were made to begin an evangelization process towards the natives who were relegated to a marginal position throughout the first Irish missionary experience on Saint Christopher.

As previously, Ingoli was to the first to analyze the report and to outline a strategy based on the information therein. With less enthusiasm than previously, he suggested that the archbishop could ‘find some suitable subjects who might know the said languages, and at least one might know one or two and the others the rest.’ Ingoli exhorted O’Queely to appoint two priests, one of whom, rather than he, should be appointed prefect, and to inform Rome of their names and of the viaticum they needed. Ingoli suggested that ‘the missionary faculties will be sent together with some more money for the chalices, paraments, and missals.’ Despite this plan, the sending of more missionaries seemed uncertain, for Ingoli recommended that O’Queely ‘send two missionaries if, by chance, he has the opportunity to find passage.’ However, Ingoli and his fellow cardinals of the Roman congregation evidently did still believe that the Irish mission of Saint Christopher had the potential to continue, even though one of its priests had died. Thus, on 19 December 1639, Propaganda advised that, due to the linguistic skills required and the difficulty of funding the priests, O’Queely should choose two new missionaries from a religious order, because they would be better prepared to adapt to the conditions of the Saint Christopher mission.

By the time that Propaganda gave its blessing to the revival of the mission, the situation had rapidly deteriorated. Eleven days before, O’Queely had left little room to hope for any future development of the mission when he informed Cardinal Antonio Barberini that the second

47 see footnote no.51.
48 APF, SOCG, vol. 400, fol. 184: ‘che trovasse li soggetti a proposito che sapessero le suddette lingue, e ch’almeno uno ne sapesse una o due e gli altre l’altré’...perche colà è impossibile mandar le provisioni; che se li manderà la patente con le facoltà et li viatici, et insieme qualche denaro di più per li calici, paramenti e messali’...che intanto se vien l’occasione di passaggio ne mandi due.’
missionary had also died because of intemperate climate and the roughness of the inhabitants. O’Queely gave no further details on this death, although he hastened Propaganda to send adequate support and the essential missionary faculties quickly.\textsuperscript{50} Despite this disappointing news, on 23 April 1640 Propaganda again decided to solicit the archbishop to send two new missionaries, to whom it conceded the necessary faculties, and, in addition, endowed them with 110 crowns each which covered the viaticum as well as travel expenses.\textsuperscript{51} Even so, in October, O’Queely gloomily replied that the sum awarded was insufficient to establish a new mission, and he abruptly ended this opportunity to further the missionary plan.\textsuperscript{52} For Propaganda, the granting of faculties to the missionaries was a way to legitimize the mission (although it did not establish a prefect), but the delay with which the congregation granted them stressed the difficulty of establishing a missionary channel for the Irish of the West Indies.

\section*{III}

O’Queely’s decision to halt his activity on behalf of the West Indies is difficult to interpret, especially considering that he had been the most enthusiastic promoter of a mission there. He may have distanced himself from the initiative because of the rapid unfolding of events in Ireland which culminated in the outbreak of the Ulster rebellion, in which he held a key role. Indeed he raised a personal army to maintain order in his diocese soon after it began in 1641.\textsuperscript{53} Clearly, the need to concentrate on political developments in Ireland would have curbed his ability to plan a mission elsewhere and, despite Propaganda’s offer, the pressure and urgency of Irish events inevitably reduced his interest in Saint Christopher. In consequence, the communication between Rome and Ireland on this issue was interrupted because Propaganda was left without an individual who

\textsuperscript{50} APF, SOCG, vol. 139, fol. 295, O’Queely to cardinal Antonio Barberini, 8 December 1639.
\textsuperscript{51} APF, Acta, vol. 14, fol. 84, general congregation, 23 April 1640. The sum was thus divided: sixty crowns for travel and fifty for the viaticum.
\textsuperscript{52} APF, SOCG, vol. 295, fols. 116, 123, [O’Queely], to [PF], 6 October 1640.
was ready to organise all of the practicalities of the mission. On the other
hand, the cardinals of the Roman congregation had increased their
knowledge of an area on which, prior to O’Queely’s letters, they had little
information. Despite the mission’s failed outcome, the flow of data
transmitted and collected by Propaganda would be useful should future
approaches be made.

The political upheavals and the wars which engulfed Scotland, Ireland
and England from 1641 also had crucial repercussions for the English
colonies in the Atlantic world. Religious tension soon coalesced with
political tension in the English West Indies, where from 1643 former
governors and English settlers maintained a royalist position and refused
to accept new parliamentary governors. For the Irish Catholics, the
situation progressively worsened after the Ulster Protestants’ massacre, for
it encouraged an aversion towards them which had been growing since the
early 1630s.54

An example of the mounting anti-Catholic hysteria was the law,
although ineffectual, which the authorities of Barbados passed in 1644
against the arrival of any Irish servants.55 On Saint Christopher the
situation was no better. In 1643, Thomas Warner (1580-1645), governor of
the island, decided to expel a party of Irishmen to Montserrat, while
another group of settlers was forced to move to Antigua.56 This expulsion
may have been an element of the persecutions that English planters
reportedly began to carry out against Irish Catholics after 1641.57 In 1643,
Peter Sweetman, an Irish captain and entrepreneur in the West Indies,
presented a proposal to the Portuguese King João IV (1603-1656), that he be
permitted to resettle the colony on the Amazon River by moving 400

54 Pestana, *The English Atlantic in an Age of Revolution, 1640-1661* (Cambridge,
55 Beckles, “A ‘Riotous and Unruly Lot’: Irish Indentured Servants and Freemen
in the English West Indies, 1644-1713,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 3rd series, 47,
no.4 (October 1990): 505.
56 Acts of Assembly, passed in the Island of Montserrat from 1668 to 1740, Inclusive. (An
Abridgment of the Acts of Assembly, etc.) (London: J. Baskett, 1740), 26; PRO, C.O.,
1/9, fol.23, document cited in Bridenbaugh, *No Peace beyond the Line*, footnote
no.26, 145.
Irishmen from Saint Christopher. Sweetman justified his plan by saying that 'he with the rest of his fellow Irishmen [is] harassed by the English heretics on the island of Saint Christopher, [and] are deserving of your Majesty’s protection, to live under you as Catholics and vassals of such a Catholic prince.' Although the King agreed to this request in mid-June 1644 Sweetman did not bring any Irish settlers to the Amazon. Two years later, an identical grant was given to another Irish captain named William Brum who wanted to remove 130 Irish Catholics from Saint Christopher, but it is not clear whether or not they settled in the Amazon area. The requests of Sweetman and Brum emphasized that the Irish settlers of Saint Christopher may have been living in dangerous circumstances in which they could not freely profess the Catholic religion. Unfortunately, due to the lack of precise records, it is not possible to assess the extent to which the persecution was real or just an excuse used to justify the foundation of new settlements.

In early 1643 a new political phase in the Irish conflict began. The Irish Confederates and James Butler, the duke of Ormond and Protestant lord lieutenant of Ireland, began formal negotiations for peace. In these negotiations, Irish clerics on the continent played diplomatic roles in the main continental Catholic courts. One of these clerical agents was both a Jesuit and the nephew of Wadding, Matthew O’Hartegan, who, in March 1643 put forward a new missionary initiative for the Irish of Saint Christopher, but promoted it entirely independently of Propaganda. On 30 March, O’Hartegan penned a letter to Muzio Vitelleschi, the Jesuit general, to report that, five days before, he had received two letters on behalf of ‘20000 Irish in the island of Saint Christopher and adjacent places.’

60 Ó Siochrú, Confederate Ireland, 61.
O’Hartegan explained that the Irishmen, following the suggestion of Philippe Longvilliers de Poincy, the lieutenant general of the French Caribbean Islands and governor of Saint-Christophe, required that ‘two or more Irishmen of our Society should be appointed to go.’  

O’Hartegan’s letter held some points in common with O’Queely’s earlier correspondence. Both stressed the need to bring religious assistance to a distant community of troubled Irish, but did not emphasize the need to catechise the native peoples, considered by the French missionaries as docile and well-disposed to be converted. Furthermore, the Irish correspondents overstated the number of Irish Catholics in the West Indies in order to draw attention and financial support. This latter aspect was particularly evident in the proposal of O’Hartegan. The 20000 Irishmen that the Jesuit reported to live in Saint Christopher was a gross exaggeration, considering that this number was twice the estimated total of settlers who resided in the English Leeward islands.  

Of course, as a proactive Jesuit, O’Hartegan saw his request as an opportunity to embark on a new missionary task. Accordingly, he asked Vitelleschi ‘that you would be pleased to send me there: and one thing favours this, that I shall have shortly completed the work imposed on me by the province of transacting business in this Court.’ He justified his plea on the basis that ‘my constitution is sufficiently strong: I am well skilled in three languages, French, English, and Irish which is commonly used in those parts; and by the grace of God I have an intense zeal for souls, and a


63 The English Leeward islands, a geographical definition that would be officially used from 1671, included Saint Christopher, Nevis, Antigua and Montserrat. According to the population figures elaborated by Carla Gardina Pestana, in the 1640s the Leeward islands had 10.000 European settlers. See Pestana, The English Atlantic, Appendix I, 229-234.

will strongly inclined towards that mission.\textsuperscript{65} The enthusiasm which characterized O’Hartegan’s plea fitted well with the general Jesuit identification of missionary work as a way to do or to glorify the work of God.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, his offer was welcomed by Vitelleschi who, on 23 May 1643, replied to the Irish Jesuit that he was willing to favour his request.\textsuperscript{67}

Beyond the religious significance, this mission had also a political dimension which O’Hartegan revealed to his uncle Luke Wadding in a letter dated August 1643. Officially, the Jesuit penned his note to report some problems of missionary jurisdiction which might thwart his plan. In contrast to what he wrote to Vitelleschi, however, he tended to stress the political relevance of this mission in Ireland. He stated that on Saint Christopher there was ‘a considerable number of Irish, who give themselves out for 20000’, and that ‘This, as an overture of consequence of our country, has been certified home to the Council, who think to advantage the kingdom and weaken their enemy by the opportunity of that place, and number of the Irish there.’ Yet O’Hartegan warned his uncle that, by this time of writing, the Capuchins had procured a decree from Propaganda which would allow only missionaries of that order to operate there.\textsuperscript{68} To avoid it, the Jesuit pleaded with Wadding that ‘you should think

\textsuperscript{65} O’Hartegan to Vitelleschi, 30 March 1643, document printed in \textit{Spic. Oss.}, I/1, 286 : ‘Obtestor et ipse V.P. uti me velit eo mittere: favet vehementer quod brevi defungars imposita mihi rerum in hac aula tractandarum provincia; vires mihi satis firmae; trium linguarum Gallicanae, Anglicanae, et Hibernicae (quarum in illis partibus promiscuous usus) peritia non vulgaris; zelus animarum per Dei gratiam intensus, et prona vehementer in eam aut similem Missionem voluntas.’


\textsuperscript{67} ARSI, Fondo Anglia, vol. 4a, fols. 53v-54r, Vitelleschi to O’Hartegan.

\textsuperscript{68} O’Hartegan’s claim regarding Propaganda’s decree was incorrect, because it dealt with the mission at Saint Christophe located in the French part. Approved at the end of June 1643, it was issued to settle a controversy which pitted the Jesuits against their fellow countrymen, the Capuchins of the Normandy province, over missionary control of Saint Christophe. In this dispute, Propaganda decided in favour of the Capuchins, who could be permitted to retain control over the French part: Codignola, “Pacifique de Provins and the Capuchin Network in the French Colonies in Africa and America,” in \textit{Proceedings of the Fifteenth Meeting of the French Colonial Historical Society. Martinique and Guadeloupe, May 1989/Actes Du Quinzième
it fit to solicit the Congregation for repeal of that decree, I think you will do good service to the Congregation and your country."\(^{69}\)

For his part, Wadding did not reply to O’Hartegan’s request. Moreover, he did not intervene in this issue, because of his position in Propaganda. Any effort from him to promote the interest of his nephew, a Jesuit, was likely to be ignored because of the tense relations regarding missionary initiatives which existed between Propaganda and the Society.\(^{70}\) Wadding may also have remained aloof because, by that time, he was fully engrossed in promoting the interests of the Irish Confederation in Rome. The proposal put forward by O’Hartegan therefore stood as an isolated petition, with no impact. Throughout the 1640s, no further missionary requests to operate in Saint Christopher or on the other English islands were presented by Irish clerics, whether they were based in Ireland or in continental Europe.

Wadding’s failure to support his nephew’s request for a new mission in the West Indies is symptomatic of the fact that, throughout the years 1638-1643, such suggestions raised no interest from the residents within the communities of the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s. The efforts to establish and promote Irish missions in the West Indies were rather piecemeal, uncoordinated, and also largely dependent on individuals such as O’Queely and O’Hartegan, neither of whom had any association with the Irish College or Saint Isidore’s, or with clerics trained there. Furthermore it is apparent that, in Rome, Propaganda’s cardinals, with the exception of Ingoli, played a minimal role in promoting such ventures. When Propaganda did offer support, it was the fruit of O’Queely’s proactive pleas from Ireland. Despite its short duration and few positive results, he was clearly the initiator of this short lived mission and took responsibility for its actualization. In consequence, no missionary network which could link Ireland, Rome and the West Indies was formed during these years. Instead, the link remained limited by the close of 1643 to the lines of

---

\(^{69}\) O’Hartegan to Wadding, 14 August 1643, in \textit{HMC, Franciscan}, 243.

\(^{70}\) Pizzorusso, \textit{Roma nei Caraibi}, 68.
communication, travel, and ministry that were developing between the two colleges in Rome, especially Saint Isidore’s, and the mission field in Ireland itself.
Chapter five
Missionary supply in crisis years: the colleges and Ireland, 1644-1659

I

Matthew O’Hartegan’s proposal to revive the mission on the island of Saint Christopher failed to impress Luke Wadding nor did it raise the interest of any of the personnel of the two Irish colleges in Rome who continued to be pre-occupied with serving the Irish mission at home. It also did not broaden their perspective to include emerging emigrant communities in the West Indies. In any case, from 1644, the emerging mission links between the colleges and Ireland, more solid in any case for Saint Isidore’s themselves, faced substantial threats. Most fundamentally, they were affected by the Cromwellian persecutions against the Catholic clergy in Ireland from 1650. This was compounded by the fact that, from 1654, both colleges underwent periods of internal transitions. Chapter five and six will explore these developments and the transitions which took place in both colleges in order to assess the extent of their impact on the production and movement of missionaries.

A means of gauging the status of the two colleges is again provided by their entry records. From 1644 until 1659 the Irish College admitted nineteen students. More precisely, during the years from 1644 to 1652 the seminary admitted eleven students. A better performance is evident for the years 1653-1659 because, within a shorter period, the Irish College admitted eight students. This figure was no doubt influenced by the flow of Irish clerics who left or were expelled from Ireland following the edit issued on 6 January 1653 by the English Parliament which banned within twenty days all ‘Jesuits, seminary priests and persons in Popish orders’ from Ireland.

Analysis of the students’ provincial background confirms the predominance of recruits from the southern provinces, especially from Leinster, and is similar to the pattern of the previous years. Nine students

1 See Appendix One, 215-218.
were from Leinster, five from Munster, and two from Ulster, while no details are available for three other students.\(^3\) A possible factor explaining the continued scarcity of Ulstermen and the absence of Connachtmen might be the progressive worsening of the economic conditions in those two provinces during the 1640s. According to a report, dated 1647, on the state of Ireland, the economies of Leinster and Munster had improved despite the Confederate war. By contrast, five of nine counties in Ulster were devastated and the same pattern repeated in Connacht where four of five counties lay in ruin.\(^4\) Beyond the basic figures for recruitment, it is clear that the Irish College suffered from a continuation of problems which it had encountered in the previous decade, that is, a low number of students, poor resources and poor management, as well as the worsening of what had been a relatively minor problem until then, the ‘miscreants.’ Between 1647 and early 1656 the seminary’s financial situation, already poor, worsened further due to the poor management of a series of Italian rectors, namely Giovanni Rusco, Gianbattista Bargiacchi and Petronio Ferri.\(^5\) The consequences of their financial incapacity is indicated by the fact that in early February 1647, at the beginning of Bargiacchi’s term as rector, the ready cash available within the seminary counted 140 crowns, a sum which, by early 1656, was just thirteen crowns. In that year the college was laden with a debt of 5071 crowns.\(^6\)

Continued poor recruitment and financial debt combined with a worse problem, the growth of the ‘miscreants’, that is students who entered without any genuine vocation to priestly ministry. A minor problem in the previous decade, it now became more acute: from 1644 until 1658, the Irish College admitted seven students who became ‘miscreants’ namely Thomas

---

\(^3\) See Appendix One, 215-218; Appendix Three, 259.


\(^5\) Giovanni Rusco was rector from 2 February 1647 until 24 February 1650, Gianbattista Bargiacchi from 24 February 1650 until 24 February 1653, and Petronio Ferri from 24 February 1653 until 24 February 1656: PICR, Liber I, fol. 62.

\(^6\) PICR, Liber I, fol. 62.
Luttrell, Thomas Arthur, Bonaventure White, James Stafford, John Creagh, John Plunkett and Gerard Dowdall. The fact that the number of miscreants increased so much reveals that the Jesuit rectors were either unwilling or unable to prevent their admission. The ‘miscreants list’ records that all of these students arrived in Rome without invitation but succeeded in being admitted to the Irish College through the interventions of powerful patrons. For example, Stafford, prior to his admission, studied grammar in Spanish Flanders, where he became a soldier. From there he moved to Florence and entered into the service of an unidentified nobleman who provided him with letters of reference to support his admission to the Irish College. These letters made a positive impression on Prince Niccolò Ludovisi who recommended Stafford’s admission, and he entered into the seminary in early April 1653. Two other students who enjoyed the support of influential patrons were John Plunkett and Creagh. The admission of the first was again backed by Ludovisi, while that of Creagh was encouraged by John Creagh, his uncle and chaplain to Pope Alexander VII (1599-1667) since 1655.

The admission of these students caused a series of problems in the seminary. Fundamentally, some were patently unsuitable to seminary life. White and Stafford were expelled from the college, in 1654 and in 1657 respectively, due to their disruptive behaviour. They were addicted to alcohol and, according to the miscreants’ list, White also used physical violence against other students. Those students who did remain proved extremely reluctant to progress to ordination. Only Stafford was ordained.

---

7 Prior to his admission in the Irish College, Luttrell, in the spring of 1643, successfully petitioned Propaganda to be accepted in the Collegio Urbano to study Latin. He was admitted in early May 1645 and in early October he was transferred to the Irish College: APF, Acta, vol. 15, fol. 32, general congregation, 20 April 1643; Archivio del Collegio Urbano, Registro degli Alunni del Collegio Urbano, vol.VII-1, p.34. I owe this reference to Professor Giovanni Pizzorusso.

8 According to the manuscript history of the Irish College, Dowdall studied in France before arriving in Rome: PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50-51r; John Canon Begley, The Diocese of Limerick in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1927), II, 470.

9 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50-51r; PICR, Liber I, fol. 86v; PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50.
but this was in 1656, one year before his expulsion. Of the other students, only Creagh was promoted to minor orders in 1656, but in 1658 he refused to become a priest and left the seminary. Arthur, Plunkett and Dowdall followed suit.

Luttrell seems to have been the only student whose reason for leaving the Irish College was not due to misbehaviour or refusal to become a priest. The documentation attests that he fell sick after his admission, and had to be sent home in 1648. Despite the college’s scant resources, rector Giovanni Rusco granted him a viaticum of forty crowns, which the student committed himself to refunding upon his arrival in Ireland. However, there is no evidence that he did, and he was accused of having caused ‘great expenses to this college, without any profit to the nation.’

Two others may have done the same. John Young, the rector of the Irish College from late February 1656 to mid-July 1664, forced Creagh and John Plunkett to sign promissory notes to refund the seminary for their maintenance. On 20 October 1658, Creagh agreed to repay 210 crowns which was the cost of his upkeep for two years and ten months. Plunkett signed his note in 1660 and agreed to refund the Irish College the sum of 399 crowns, the cost of his keep for four years and nine months. Again, the documentation fails to indicate whether or not the students refunded the seminary or not. In any case, the rectors continued not to take stringent action against the miscreants and failed to put in place any practical measures to ensure that students repaid the investment the college made in them. From 1654, they simply limited themselves to reporting if a student came to Rome by invitation from the Irish College or not.

12 Ibid.
13 Plunkett and Dowdall left from Rome in 1660. See PICR, Liber XXVI, fols. 50v-51r.
14 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50r.
15 PICR, Liber XIV, fol. 116r.
16 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50r.
17 PICR, Liber I, fol. 62v.
18 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r; PICR, Liber XII, fol. 54r.
19 The first student to be reported as being invited was Maginn. See PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
Miscreant students were a burden to the Irish College and a hindrance to its ability to produce missionaries because they took places and used resources that would have been more appropriately deployed on worthy entrants. Some of these worthy entrants sought support for their entry through Propaganda, but they also benefited from the backing of a powerful patron. Thus, in 1647, when Pier Francesco Scarampi, the papal delegate for Ireland, returned to Rome, he brought five Irish youths for priestly studies. Three students of this group, namely Peter Walsh, John Brenan and Oliver Plunkett, entered the Irish College. Scarampi is therefore the most powerful figure in the patronage of entrants to the Irish College in this period since between 1644 and 1652, almost half of the students’ cohort, three out of eleven, were favoured and promoted by him. This result was the product of his sojourn in Ireland and his own links there. Yet his impact in networking and in creating a link between the Irish mission and the Irish College was indeed unique, a one-off, in regard to the promotion of recruitment in these years.

In September 1647, Scarampi informed the cardinals of Propaganda that three Irish students had come to Rome in May with the intention of studying philosophy and theology and ‘to prepare themselves to serve God and their country.’ Scarampi stressed that the three Irishmen were staying at the Irish College as paying guests until the conclusion of the academic year in 1648. He emphasized that they ‘have no way of paying the usual fee required by the college’, and, that they therefore requested that they be supported for this short period of time by the charity of the sacred congregation.’ Initially, Propaganda dealt rapidly with this plea, agreeing to support it, but the final decision was only taken on 17 February 1648.

---

20 Unfortunately there is no evidence to assess the identity of two students and their subsequent activity in Rome.
21 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v; See John J. Hanly ed., The Letters of Saint Oliver Plunkett, 1.
22 APF, SOCG, vol. 415, fol. 31r, joint petition (in Scarampi’s hand) to the cardinals of PF, [September 1647]: ‘habiltarsi à servir Dio, et alla loro patria’…’non havendo essi il modo di pagare nel Collegio l’ordinaria dozione’…’accioè sostenuti per questo breve tempo dalla carità di cotesta Sac. Congregazione.’
The delay discontented the students who presented a second petition, in their own names, around February asking the cardinals that the expenses for their keep should be paid to Scarampi who had been their continual supporter. This specific financial request was a signal of the difficult conditions that the students faced living in Rome; the cost of their upkeep at the Irish College had been six crowns each per month. This sum only covered their living expenses but ‘not the clothes and the other things which have been provided by Father Scarampi.’ Propaganda did not reply to this appeal which suggests that it simply paid the sums due for three students, who were probably admitted to the Irish College between the second half of 1648 and early 1649.

The overall picture provided by the entry records of the Irish College reveals that its recruitment remained quite static and was characterized by the admission of a growing number of undesirable students. In contrast at Saint Isidore’s, the recruitment of students continued to be far healthier. Analysis of the performance of Saint Isidore’s is hampered, however, by a gap in the entry records, which unfortunately conclude in 1654. The existing figures are enlightening nonetheless. During the period from 1644 to 1654, the Franciscan college admitted sixty-nine new students, fifty more than the secular seminary recruited in the longer period of 1644 to 1659, but only seven more than it had recruited in the previous eight years. In contrast to the early 1640s, when there was an almost equal proportion of Munstermen and Leinstermen, the years from 1644 to 1654 recorded a shift, with entrants from Munster forming the majority. Twenty-four students were from this province, and nineteen from Leinster. Connacht and Ulster had an equal proportion with six students from each province, while the origin of fourteen students is unknown.

24 APF, SC, Visite e Collegi dell’anno 1648, vol. 29, fol. 117r, joint petition to the cardinals of PF, [shortly after the 17 February 1648]: ‘senza il vestire, e senza l’altre spese, delle quali sono proveudti dal sudetto P’re Scarampi.’
25 see footnote no. 1.
27 At first glance the scarcity of Connachtmen and Ulstermen could again be linked to the poor economic conditions of these provinces. However, in the early 1650s, the small representation of students from Connacht and Ulster began to
The Franciscan college also continued to enjoy greater financial stability than the Irish College, as evinced by the account register. Although it concluded in 1649, it then had a credit balance of 1896 crowns, in obvious contrast with the debt accumulated by the secular seminary.\textsuperscript{28} Furthermore, the efficiency of its recruitment system ensured that no undesired students entered the college. Instead the entry records demonstrate that some students were specifically invited to study there, with students from areas as far afield as Majorca, Bologna, and Milan invited to the college between 1646 and 1653.\textsuperscript{29} These invitations provide evidence of the international mobility which continued to be a particular trait of the residents of Saint Isidore’s. As noted in chapter two and three, this mobility did not simply involve the students, but also included lecturers who taught throughout the Franciscan infrastructure of the Italian Peninsula and the remainder of continental Europe.

However, during this period, connections of this sort between Saint Isidore’s and other Franciscan bases weakened, and the number of lecturers trained and deployed by the Franciscan college decreased. Twelve out of the sixty-nine students admitted during this period were trained as lecturers and left Rome, a sharp reduction from the shorter period of 1636 to 1643 when Saint Isidore’s had trained twenty-one lecturers. The lecturers’ range of deployment also decreased, as five of the twelve taught exclusively within the Italian Peninsula. The remaining seven lectured in Enagh (one), in Louvain (one), Prague (three), and Hungary (two).\textsuperscript{30}

Although its production of lecturers declined somewhat, Saint Isidore’s managed to continue to support and promote the scholarly productions of its students. According to the account register between 1644 and 1649, the

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{l}
raise complaints against Wadding by a group of Irish Franciscans. Canice Mooney suggests that the small quantity of Connachtmen and Ulstermen may reveal an unconscious prejudice against recruits from these provinces. This question will be addressed in chapter six, in relation to accusations against Wadding: Canice Mooney, “Was Wadding a Patriotic Irishman?,” in \textit{Luke Wadding}, 73-74; see chapter six, 155-161; Appendix Two, 245-254; Appendix Four, 261. \\
\textsuperscript{28} FLK, MS C 63, fols. 102-122.
\textsuperscript{29} See Appendix Two, 245-254.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid.
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
college paid fifty-eight crowns for printing and binding student theses. This financial support contrasts markedly with the support offered by the Irish College for such activity. The only expense related to the cultivation of intellectual pursuit in the seminary’s register is two crowns used to pay for the binding of some books for its library in the period between 1655-1657.

The capacity of Saint Isidore’s to finance the students’ educational activity contributed to the maintenance of the strong literary tradition that the college had attained, partly thanks to the works written by its students but especially to those of the most prominent resident of the community, Luke Wadding. By 1657, he had composed twenty-three works, eight of which were volumes of the *Annales Minorum*. Wadding’s literary reputation enriched the emerging scholarship of his confreres at Saint Isidore’s: by 1660, seven students educated at the Franciscan college had written and published twenty-five works which dealt with Scholastic theology, philosophy and the Franciscan order’s history. Outside of the Franciscan order, Wadding was still considered the most influential figure of Saint Isidore’s. For example, Giovanni Pietro Puricelli, a secular priest of the Milan diocese, who was compiling a history on the Umiliati, a monastic order founded in 1201, sought Wadding’s support in order to ensure that his manuscript found a positive reception in Rome, and their correspondence between 1644 and 1647 again highlights how significant was the Franciscan’s position and reputation in Rome. In 1644 and 1645, Wadding wrote on several occasions to Puricelli to state that he had done his best to protect his manuscript from any possible criticism made by the

32 PICR, Liber XVIII, fol. 35.
35 The title of the work was *Historia Ordinis Humilitatorum*, but it was never published. Puricelli’s writings on the Umiliati are housed in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. BA, ms D 113 inf and ms D 87; ms C 74 inf. fols. 121v-122r; ms C 103 inf.; Simona Schenone “Frate Mario Pizzi e la decadenza degli Umiliati,” in *Sulle tracce degli Umiliati*, ed. Maria Pia Alberzoni, Annamaria Ambrosioni and Alfredo Lucioni (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 1997), 68-69.
Congregation of the Index.\textsuperscript{36} Ultimately, however, Wadding’s help proved unnecessary because Puricelli never published his manuscript on the Umiliati.\textsuperscript{37}

In contrast to Saint Isidore’s, none of the students of the Irish College wrote or published any works in the years from 1644 to 1660, thus leaving the seminary quite intellectually isolated. This isolation repeated at a political level because this period witnessed no significant changes within the framework of the diplomatic relationships between the papacy and the Irish Confederation, of which Wadding remained the key agent in Rome. The only change unfolded in mid-June 1644 when the Supreme Council of Kilkenny informed the Franciscan that it had decided to give him ‘Dr. Dwyre, to assist you in promoting our affaires in the Courte of Rome,’ a choice made on the basis of ‘an advertisement from you.’\textsuperscript{38} The cleric mentioned in this letter was Edmund O’Dwyer, the Roman agent of the Connacht bishops since the early 1630s.\textsuperscript{39} However, this co-operation must have been short-lived because in spring 1645 O’Dwyer returned to Ireland, having been appointed bishop of Limerick.\textsuperscript{40} O’Dwyer’s appointment stood as an isolated act because no other member of the Irish secular clergy, and especially none from the Irish College, played any role on behalf of the Irish Confederates in Rome.

II

To what extent is the intellectual and political isolation of the Irish College repeated when its repatriation of missionaries is considered in comparison with Saint Isidore’s? At first glance, it is possible to identify a clear discrepancy in the capacity of the two colleges to provide a clerical supply to the Irish mission. During the years 1644-1659, Saint Isidore’s proved extremely successful in maintaining its provision of missionaries to Ireland. Twenty of the sixty-nine students admitted between 1644 and 1654

\textsuperscript{36} BA, ms D 156 inf.21, fol. 83, Luke Wadding to Giovanni Pietro Puricelli, 7 May 1644; BA, ms D 115 inf.13, fol. 15, Wadding to Puricelli, 4 January 1645.
\textsuperscript{37} Schenone, “Frate Mario Pizzi e la decadenza degli Umiliati,” 68.
\textsuperscript{38} Supreme Council to Wadding, 13 June 1644, in Richard Bellings, Irish Confederation, III, 182-183.
\textsuperscript{39} See chapter four, 110.
\textsuperscript{40} ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 24, fols. 29r-36v.
returned home, representing almost 29% of the student body, and fairly comparable to its performance between 1636 and 1643. In the same period, none of the students of the Irish College returned home. However, Saint Isidore’s contribution to the Irish mission should be distinguished into two periods: pre and post-Restoration (May 1660). Only three students (Anthony Carthy, Joseph O’Flynn, and Patrick Seachnesy) returned to operate on the Irish mission before May 1660. It is difficult to assess the extent of the financial support provided to them by Saint Isidore’s. The only available indication is given by a receipt within the account register according to which, in early October 1648, the college paid almost one crown for the passage of Anthony Carthy, a student admitted to study in May 1644. After their return to Ireland, Carthy acted as a philosophy lecturer and confessor in the same location, and was subsequently named guardian in another friary. Joseph O’Flynn was appointed confessor, while the information on Patrick Seachnesy recounts that he was made prisoner in 1653.

The fact that, during the years from 1644 to 1659, only three students returned home is an indication of the difficulties and the risks involved in operating on the Irish mission. From 1649, the Cromwellian soldiers captured and executed members of the Catholic clergy regardless of whether or not they bore arms. The Cromwellian conquest also brought to a halt the expansion which had characterized the Irish province during the 1640s. Most of the infrastructure of the order was destroyed. According to the provincial chapter of 1658, all of the friaries in Munster, except Cashel and Quin, were vacant, making it impossible for the friar missionaries to rely on their support.

Like the Irish seculars, the Franciscans had to cope with the edict of banishment of 1653 which stated that priests refusing to leave were

---

41 FLK, MS C 63, fol. 121v; Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 9.
42 See Appendix Two, 245, 251.
43 Austin Wollrych, Britain in Revolution, 1625-1660 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 676.
44 LL, 66.
outlaws. Seachnesy, one of the three students who returned home, was captured, and according to an anonymous list of 1653 was kept prisoner in Inishbofin. Two other former students of Saint Isidore’s, Bernard Conny and Bonaventure Delahoid, who had returned to Ireland in the 1630s and the early 1640s were also imprisoned during the Cromwellian regime. Conny was captured in 1651, and two years later he was imprisoned on Inishbofin. Delahoid was captured in Galway in the early 1650s, and was sent into exile to Spain in 1653 where, in the same year, he died in the Franciscan province of Castille. Another three former students of Saint Isidore’s, Thaddeus O’Carraghy, Denis O’Nelan and Eugene O’Cahan, were captured between 1651 and 1652, and were immediately executed.

The possibilities of being captured or executed were powerful deterrents to the students to return. Throughout the Interregnum only one student contacted Propaganda in order to obtain missionary faculties for operating in Ireland. This was not because it was impossible to do so, since the Congregation had re-introduced this obligation in 1650. The destruction of the Catholic hierarchy brought by the Cromwellian invasion permitted that the Irish Franciscans and other regular orders could secretly run missions, on a limited basis, each of which, would be headed by a prefect who was placed under the Congregation’s direct control. But the only Saint Isidore’s student who petitioned Propaganda was Thomas Grace, admitted

---

46 LL, 40.
47 Conny was released and may have died in 1663: Anthony Bruodin, Propugnaculum catholicae veritatis, libris X. Constructum, in duasque partes divisum (Pragae: typis Universitatis Carlo-Ferinandae, 1669), 723-724; LL, 40; ACSI, Sectio W 5, no.5, letter of Anthony Docharty to Francis O’Molloy, 16 July 1663.
to the college in 1651. In his petition, submitted around 1658, Grace claimed that he had gone from Rome to Paris upon completion of his studies. His request was endorsed by John Heslenan (b.1615), guardian of Saint Isidore’s from 1657 to 1660, who declared that Grace was an honest friar of adequate learning and in good health. On 1 October 1658, Propaganda examined his request but the cardinals did not make a decision on it and no further documentation exists on this matter.

The risky Irish environment was a problem also for the seculars who, from 1653, had barely any possibility of finding safe refuges at home, and in particular in the houses of Catholics because of spying by informers and house-raiding by soldiers. Moreover, the situation was worsened by the outbreak of an epidemic of bubonic plague in the towns of Connacht, Leinster and Munster, which further complicated the ministry of the priests. More broadly, the dismal rate of repatriation for the two colleges, and especially of the Irish College, corresponded to the breakdown of the Catholic Church’s organization in Ireland which was witnessed by the destruction of the episcopate, the exile of clergy to the continent, the peak of which was reached in 1653, and the absence of synods between 1652 and 1657.

The dangerous situation that awaited the Irish clerics at home unnerved even the most motivated students of the Irish College who were determined to return upon completion of their studies. In consequence, they were required to ask permission to obtain a dispensation from the missionary oath in order to delay or prevent their travel to Ireland. Yet, throughout the years 1644-1659, there is evidence of only one request, made by Oliver Plunkett who in mid-June 1654 petitioned Goswin Nickel (1584-

52 Patrick Conlan, St. Isidore's College Rome (Rome: Tipografia S.G.S., 1982), 222; APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 14, fols. 293r-294v, petition of Thomas Grace to PF cardinals, 1658?
53 APF, Acta, vol. 27, fols. 262v-263r, general congregation, 1 October 1658.
1664), the Jesuit general, for permission to remain in Rome because of the ‘impossibility of returning to Ireland (of which Your Reverence is well aware).’ Plunkett declared that he intended to reside in the Oratorian house located at the church of San Girolamo della Carità. The student concluded his request by stating that he would be ready to return to Ireland at a future date.\textsuperscript{56} Plunkett’s request of dispensation to return to the Irish mission coincided with the climax of the Cromwellian persecution against the Catholic clergy in Ireland where, by 1654, there was a change in government policy which, from that moment, favoured the imprisonment of priests with a view to their eventual deportation to the West Indies.\textsuperscript{57}

Plunkett’s reference to the Oratorian house indicates that he remained under the protection of Scarampi with whom he had arrived in Rome in 1647, and indicates that Scarampi’s role in nurturing potential missionaries was sustained after he sponsored their instalment as students in 1647. Plunkett was fortunate to continue to benefit from Scarampi’s help while he remained in Rome. In 1656 he declared to Virgilio Spada (1596-1662), an Oratorian priest and brother of Cardinal Bernardino Spada (1594-1661), that Scarampi had consistently provided assistance to him since his arrival in Rome.\textsuperscript{58} This may have been because Plunkett was a proactive cleric who devoted himself to visit the sick at Santo Spirito in Saxia, where he ‘employed himself even in most abject ministrations, serving the poor infirm.’\textsuperscript{59} Plunkett’s zeal seemed to be appreciated by Scarampi who considered the Irishman a worthy cleric to introduce to curia circles. On the 4\textsuperscript{th} of October 1656, Scarampi wrote to Plunkett, declaring that he wished to recommend him to his confrere Spada and, more importantly, to one of the two Barberini cardinals.\textsuperscript{60} John Brenan, another student who arrived in

Rome with Plunkett in 1647, also maintained close contact with Scarampi after he concluded his studies in the Irish College. In an undated letter, Scarampi delegated Brenan to ask Propaganda for missionary faculties for James Felan, the chancellor of Kilkenny cathedral who had been expelled from Ireland to France. The document records that Brenan held an ecclesiastical benefice in Rome; he was the ‘incumbent of S. Maria in Via Lata.’

The fact that Plunkett’s request to be dispensed from the missionary oath, which was the only one for the years 1644-1659, may indicate that some students did not bother to seek a dispensation. It may also demonstrate that the students were not wholly under the control of the Irish College’s authorities. More conclusive evidence of the limited control of the Jesuit management manifests itself in the case of the miscreants who represented almost one third of the students admitted between 1644 and 1659. This high rate, combined with the Cromwellian persecutions at home, had a detrimental effect on the Irish College’s capacity to provide a clerical supply to the Irish mission. The evidence on the miscreants’ subsequent activity after dismissal confirms their unsuitability to become priests and to operate as missionaries at home anyway. For example, Arthur and Creagh went to France where they both got married. In 1678 Arthur he was reported to be in Limerick where he practised canon and civil law.

However, in the case of some miscreants, the college authorities proved unable to deter them from actually becoming missionaries in Ireland. Once again patronage proved decisive. Stafford was able to thwart the seminary’s authorities because he possessed the protection of a circle of powerful patrons. Despite his expulsion in 1657, he remained determined to return home, an ambition revealed in a letter that Mario Alberizzi (1609-1680), Propaganda’s secretary from 1657 to 1664, wrote to Rector Young in early December 1657. In his letter Alberizzi informed Young that Stafford had petitioned Propaganda for missionary faculties for Ireland. Alberizzi

61 APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 15, fols. 20r-20Av, Scarampi to John Brenan, [Rome]: ‘beneficiato di S. Maria in Via Lata.’
62 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50v.
63 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
asked him for details on Stafford’s behaviour during his course of studies
in the Irish College, thus revealing that he was completely unaware of his
expulsion from the seminary. While it is not known whether Propaganda
responded positively or negatively to Stafford’s request, within a few years
he was enjoying the support of influential ecclesiastics. According to a later
letter written by Oliver Plunkett, in 1665 Edmund O’Reilly, (1616-1669),
the archbishop of Armagh from 1657 to 1669, recommended that Stafford
be named abbot of Tintern abbey, and he obtained this benefice in Padova
in June of that year. A further indication of the level of support that he
obtained is provided by the letter that Stafford penned to Alberizzi in
October 1665 to inform him of his journey from Rome to Bologna. In
Bologna he had been received with honour by Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, the
nuncio in that city. Stafford was back in Ireland by the early 1670s. There
his behaviour continued to be a source of complaint, especially for Nicholas
French (1604-1678), the bishop of Ferns from 1645. In 1673, the bishop
wrote to Carlo Francesco Airoldi (1637-1683), internuncio in Brussels, to
lament Stafford’s conduct in the diocese of Ferns where he granted
matrimonial dispensations without any faculty and indulged in games.
French suggested recalling Stafford to Rome and forbidding his return to
Ireland.

Other students also frustrated the seminary’s aim to produce reliable
missionaries to serve in Irish dioceses, even though they completed their
studies. John O’Clohessy and Richard Quinn were admitted in 1647 and

64 APF, Lettere, vol. 33, fol. 22v, Mario Alberizzi to John Young, 8 December 1657.
65 APF, SOCG, vol. 438, fols. 261-263r, Oliver Plunkett to Carlo Francesco Airoldi,
2 April 1672.
66 Stafford also recounted that during his journey he stopped in Arezzo, where he
stayed at the residence of Tommaso Salviati, bishop of Arezzo from 1638 until
1671. APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 14, fols. 133r-134v, James Stafford to Alberizzi, 2
October 1665.
67 Millett and Christopher J. Woods, “Roman Catholic Bishops from 1534,” in A
New History of Ireland, IX: Maps, Genealogies, Lists, ed. Theodore William Moody,
Francis Xavier Martin, Francis John Byrne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984),
372.
68 APF, SC, Irlanda, vol. 3, fols. 361r-362v, Nicholas French to Carlo Francesco
Airoldi, 20 August 1673.
1654 respectively. O’Clohessy appeared full of potential; ordained priest in 1651, he was reported to be a ‘trustworthy and pious man.’ However, he did not return to minister on the Irish mission because, after the conclusion of his studies, he held a chaplaincy in the church of San Rocco a Ripetta in Rome for a time. Around 1657, he left for France with Cardinal Celio Piccolomini (1609-1681) who had been appointed nuncio there. He served in Piccolomini’s household, from whom he obtained a benefice in the Lorraine region. The Irish College’s authorities disapproved of O’Clohessy’s activity, arguing that he did no ‘great service to the seminary’s reputation.’ The Irish College authorities made a similar assessment of Quinn’s return on their educational investment in him. After having completed rhetoric in France, Quinn was invited to study in Rome. During his course of studies at the Irish College, the student conducted himself well and, on the 8th of October 1661, the day of his departure from Rome, the college granted him a viaticum of twenty-one crowns. However, once again Quinn disappointed his superiors for he then refused to take the missionary oath. This irritated the college authorities who criticized Quinn because he ‘has spent and continues to spend his time without merit in Italy, especially in Venice.’

Two other two students who did not fulfil the missionary oath were Francis Xavier Madden and Peter Walsh, admitted in 1647 and between the late summer of 1648 and early 1649 respectively. In contrast to O’Clohessy and Quinn, their refusals or incapacity to return to the Irish mission did not seem to bother the Jesuit rectors. After the completion of his studies, Madden entered the Jesuits and taught mathematics for some time in the province of Venice where he died. Walsh was ordained in early January 1654 and, after completing his studies, he joined the Oratorians in Perugia.
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69 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r; PICR, Liber XII, fol. 42.
71 See BAV, BL, MS 4994, fols. 92r, 93v, unsigned and undated letter to cardinal Francesco Barberini.
72 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v: ‘quo exemplo parum de huius collegi fama.’
73 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87: ‘nam in Italia, et praserim Venetiis reliquum a discessu tempus sine laude consumpsit et adhuc consumit.’
where he remained for more than twenty years and where he gained a reputation ‘for great integrity’ and for being ‘a devoted helper of souls.’

Around the end of the 1670s he moved to Rome where he took up his residence at the church of San Giovanni dei Fiorentini.

The information on four students, Peter Peppard, James Gough, Patrick Ledwith and Robert Strange is scarce. Strange entered the college around 1649 and after three years of philosophy and one of theology, he died of fever in late October 1653. Peppard was possibly admitted between 1644 and 1645, Gough in 1646, and Ledwith in 1655, but there are no sources to assess whether or not they returned home. But if we exclude the seven miscreants and the eight collegians discussed above, the Irish College’s missionary contribution was limited to four students who returned to operate on the Irish mission in the early 1660s when the structure of the Catholic Church began to be reconstructed under the Restoration. Proportionally the rate of return was poor, just a fifth of the student body. In contrast, within a shorter period time from 1636 to 1643, three students out of ten had returned home before the end of the 1640s.

The generally limited contribution that the Irish College made to the Irish mission is somewhat alleviated by the fact that the four students who returned home after 1660 did rise to prominent positions. Before their arrival in Rome, Ronan Maginn (b.1629) and James Cusack (b.1643) studied rhetoric, the former in Antwerp and the latter in Lille. Maginn was admitted to the Irish College in 1654, and Cusack the following year. The manuscript history of the college recounted that Maginn, after his ordination as priest in 1660, started to celebrate masses in order to collect money for his viaticum. The income he collected was probably insufficient
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74 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v: ‘fama magnae probitatis, et sedulous animarum adiutor.’
75 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
76 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86v.
77 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r; Liber XII, fols. 39-40.
78 Millett, “Survival and Reorganization,” 1-5.
79 See chapter three, 92-93.
80 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
to pay for his journey to Ireland because the seminary granted him seventeen crowns on the day he departed for Ireland (3rd October 1661).82

The first mention of Maginn in Ireland indicates that in December 1661 he participated in the meeting in Dublin of lay and clergy men who, under the leadership of Richard Bellings (c.1603-1677), former secretary of the Irish Catholic Confederation, drafted the Remonstrance, a declaration of Catholic loyalty to Charles II.83 Further reference to Maginn is found in a letter, dated 22 August 1663, that Edmund O’Reilly (1616-1669), the archbishop of Armagh from 1657 to 1669, penned to Propaganda to provide a list of suitable candidates for the Irish dioceses. According to O’Reilly, Maginn was a good cleric who should be appointed vicar general of the Connor diocese or alternatively of Dromore diocese.84 It was to this latter diocese that Maginn was named vicar apostolic in 1671, an office that he still held in 1678.85

Cusack’s initial period of studies within the Irish College was not easy because, according to the manuscript history of the seminary, he ‘lived a troublesome life.’86 Yet he changed attitude and studied theology, in which he obtained his doctorate. After his ordination in 1658,87 Cusack began to say masses to collect money for his viaticum. Like Maginn, this was not sufficient for his upkeep, so the Irish College gave him fifteen crowns, a sum to which Prince Niccolò Ludovisi, Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi’s brother, added other six crowns to support his return home.88

Unusually, there is some evidence to trace how Cusack’s journey to Ireland progressed after his departure from Rome at the end of September 1661.89 On 22 November 1661, he wrote to Alberizzi to inform him that he had reached Paris after a difficult and long journey, most of it made on

82 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r; Liber XII, fol. 51.
83 Peter Walsh, The History & Vindication of the Loyal Formulary, or Irish Remonstrance, so Graciously Received by His Majesty Anno 1661 (London, 1674), 670.
84 APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 13, fols. 454r-461v, Edmund O’Reilly to PF, 22 August 1663.
85 Millett, “Roman Catholic Bishops from 1534,” 348; PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
86 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v: ‘vixit valde inquietus.’
87 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 22.
88 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v.
89 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v.
foot. Due to his weakness and the severe weather conditions, he declared that he could not travel further. He must have succeeded in getting to Ireland in 1662 because on 10 September of that year he wrote a letter to Alberizzi from Dublin to report on the situation on the island. Cusack carried out his ministry in the Dublin diocese, where he did such ‘great work as pastor of souls’ that in 1665 Oliver Plunkett included him in a list of Irish clerics whom Propaganda should promote to the episcopate or to the office of vicar apostolic. According to the manuscript history of the Irish College, Cusack ‘engaged himself so zealously there in the pastoral ministry’ that, in 1678, Propaganda decided to appoint him as the coadjutor bishop to Patrick Plunkett, bishop of Meath. In November 1679 Plunkett died and Cusack was officially appointed bishop of Meath, an office he would keep until 1688, the year of his death.

The other two students who rose to prominent clerical positions in Ireland were Brenan and Plunkett, although neither of them returned to Ireland until approximately a decade after the fall of the Interregnum when it was fairly safe to do so. It is possible that their delay in returning to the Irish mission might have been due to the fact that they obtained prestigious appointments in Rome. Indeed, in November 1657, they were appointed to lectureships in scholastic theology (Brenan) and philosophy (Plunkett) at the Collegio Urbano of Propaganda. In 1666, Plunkett obtained the chair of controversy, and from approximately 1667 to 1669 he served the Congregation of the Index as consultor.

90 APF, SOCG, vol. 371, fol. 3r, letter of James Cusack to Mario Alberizzi, 22 November 1662.
91 APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 14, fols. 177r-178v, Cusack to Alberizzi, 10 September 1662.
92 APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 13, fols. 128r-129v, Cusack to Alberizzi, 2 November 1662; APF, Fondo di Vienna, vol. 16, fol. 287, Plunkett to PF, 1665 ?.
93 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v; Liber IV, fol. 208r: ‘ilio ab eo tempore tanto cum fructu animarum’; Millett, “Roman Catholic Bishops from 1534,” 351.
95 Within the series of Barberini manuscripts, there are six references to Plunkett’s activity as consultor of the Congregation of the Index from 28 March 1667 until 3 September 1669: BAV, BL, MS 3146, fols. 260r, 261v, 264r, 265v; MS 3147, fols. 3, 4v, 5r, 8v, 19r, 20v, 45r, 47v.
and-coming clerics as lecturers at the Collegio Urbano signalled a significant change within the Irish clerical community of Rome because it was the first time that two former students of the Irish College obtained prestigious offices within the papal curia after the conclusion of their studies. Plunkett remained in Rome until mid-September 1669 when he left to return home following his appointment as archbishop of Armagh in July of that year. Brenan followed the same path when he was named bishop of Waterford and Lismore in 1671, from where he transmitted to Propaganda the first report on the status of his diocese in 1672. In 1677, he was transferred to Cashel, but he was allowed to retain the administration of Waterford and Lismore until his death in 1693.

Like these four collegians of the Irish College, the majority (seventeen) of the students at Saint Isidore’s returned to Ireland after the Restoration, and amongst them some rose to elevated positions within the order in continental Europe and in Ireland. Such were Eugene Callanan, Patrick Tyrrell, and John Brady. Callanan was admitted to Saint Isidore’s in 1648, and was sent from there to work as a philosophy lecturer in Hungary in 1653. In 1661 he was elected as the guardian of Saint Anthony’s college in Louvain. The first mention of him in Ireland was at the provincial chapter of 1666 during which he was elected definitor, an office he held again in 1669. In that year he was also appointed guardian of Meelick, and in 1672 he moved to Kilnalahan following his nomination as theology lecturer there. In 1675, Callanan was named commissary visitor of the Irish province, of which he became provincial in 1678. In 1684 he was appointed guardian of Enagh, where he also held the office of magister of the novices.
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96 There is no exact date for Plunkett’s departure from Rome. His last letter written from Rome is dated 1 September 1669, while the first one written outside the city was sent from Brussels on 15 November 1669: APF, CP, vol. 13, fols. 46r, 48r, Plunkett’s testimonial to PF cardinals, 1 September 1669; APF, CP, vol. 12, fols. 89-92r, Plunkett to Federico Ubaldi Baldeschi, 15 November 1669; APF, SC, Collegio Urbano, vol. 5, fols. 449-453.
98 Ibid., 355.
from 1687. The last mention of him reveals that he was appointed guardian of Clonmel in 1694.99

Callanan’s confrere, Tyrrell was admitted to Saint Isidore’s in 1650. Between the early 1660s and early 1670s he lectured in theology in Naples and Rome. In 1665 he was elected commissary of the Irish province in Madrid. At the chapter of the Irish province in 1671 Tyrrell was appointed definitor while in the early 1670s he was back in Rome, where he acted as Saint Isidore’s guardian from 1671 to 1676. In 1676, Tyrrell was named bishop of Clogher, where he remained until 1689, when he was transferred to Meath. He stayed there until his death in 1692.100 Brady was ordained priest in 1647 and he was sent to Prague to lecture in theology in 1650.101 At the provincial chapter of 1669 he was elected definitor and guardian of Drogheda. In 1672, Brady was appointed commissary of Ulster and three years later was elected minister provincial, an office he held until 1678. In that year he was appointed as confessor and in 1684 was named guardian of Cavan. In 1689, Brady was appointed an examiner of friars to be approved as confessors.102

The sources on the other fourteen students who returned to Ireland reveal that their activity at home was far less varied and that they were less mobile than the group who operated in the pre-1660 period. Ten of them acted as guardians, but only one held this role in four different locations.103 Their lack of mobility may have been due to the damage wrought by the Cromwellian conquest on the infrastructure and personnel of the Irish province during the preceding decade.104 The Interregnum witnessed a drastic decline in the number of friars which, according to the provincial chapter of 1663, numbered about 200 by that year, 374 less than recorded in

100 Ibid., 118-121; Millett, \textit{The Irish Franciscans}, 527, 529, 531-532.
103 See Appendix Two, 244-253.
Further evidence on the fourteen former students demonstrates that eleven of them were named confessors, one acted as president of the provincial chapter held in 1666, and two were appointed definitors in 1675 and in 1689 respectively. Additional sources recount that three of them were named as lector jubilatus, two in 1671 and one in 1687.

It is difficult to gauge the subsequent activity of the other Saint Isidore students who did not return to Ireland because the only available evidence concerns Ludovic Durcan who was invited to go to study at Saint Isidore’s from Bologna in early September 1646, but there is no indication of when he departed from the college. At some stage, he went to Turin to lecture there. In 1666, the nuncio in that city contacted Propaganda to request Durcan’s appointment as prefect of the Franciscan mission in the Lucern valley. On 22 March, the Congregation agreed to this request, but, in mid-April, it decided to suspend Durcan’s nomination due to representations made by the nuncio in Florence in favour of Alberto da Sartiano, an Italian cleric.

Overall, neither the Irish College nor Saint Isidore’s achieved great results in the repatriation of missionaries between 1644 and 1659. The rectors’ poor management of the Irish College’s slender resources nullified earlier efforts by James Forde and William Malone to stabilise and improve them, while a growth in the number of miscreants did little to help to establish a stable regime for the training of students for missionary service. It did succeed in recruiting students, with Scarampi proving the most active patron, but the hope that this would increase the number of returns to Ireland was not realised. Indeed, the link between the College and the Irish mission was broken completely in these years, and none of the students who were admitted are known to have returned to Ireland before the Restoration. Beyond the Cromwellian conquest, a problem which
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played against the return of the Irish College's students was the continuous absence of resources provided by the seminary to the returning students. This, combined with the distance of Rome from the traditional Irish shipping routes, might explain why the college did not succeed to send home any student during this period. A further problem which has to be taken in account for the failure of the Irish College to provide a missionary contribution is that, until early 1656, the secular seminary was under the control of the Italian rectors whose poor management failed to instil discipline among the student body, and thus to force them to respect in full the missionary oath. It must not come as surprise that, given this permissive attitude of the Jesuit rectors, the students were tempted to remain in the Italian Peninsula where they could pursue a career within a safer environment rather than enduring the dangers of the Irish mission.

For Saint Isidore’s too, the wars and Cromwellian conquest had a profound effect on its ability to meet its missionary purpose. Although it retained sound finances and managed to recruit a much larger number of students than the Irish College, it too experienced great difficulty in repatriating them to Ireland in the short term, and there is a distinct disproportion in the number of these who returned to Ireland before and after May 1660. Furthermore, the damage that the Irish Franciscan province suffered to its resources in Ireland during the Interregnum influenced the return of former students well into the 1660s; it was only in the second half of the decade that most of these made the trip back as missionaries. These were the first who were able to benefit from the reconstruction of the order’s infrastructure which was then underway there.110

---

Chapter six
The colleges in transition, 1654-1664

I

Between 1644 and 1659, the Irish Colleges in Rome encountered substantial challenges to their ability to meet their objective of supplying missionaries to the Irish mission. Most seriously, political and military conflict, as well as the breakdown of ecclesiastical structures and communication in Ireland impacted negatively on the ability of the colleges to develop as bases for missionary formation. However, two other new challenges also affected the colleges’ capacity in this domain around this time. During the early 1650s, the two colleges entered into two testing periods of transition, marking for each the end of their founding era and the emergence of new phases in their functioning and in the production of missionaries. While in Saint Isidore’s the transition was characterized principally by the passage of the college from the dominance of Luke Wadding to a post-Wadding era during the late 1650s, it was, in the Irish College, characterized primarily by the tenure of John Young as rector from 1656 to 1664.

In late February 1656, Young began his term as rector of the Irish College.1 At the onset of his tenure, the Irish College’s affairs remained in an extremely poor state, due to the disciplinary and financial problems that continued to beset its stability. The already difficult situation of the Irish College worsened again in the late 1640s when tensions developed between the Irish students and Giovanni Rusco, rector from early February 1647 to late February 1650.2 Soon after Rusco took office, an anonymous complaint against him was presented on behalf of the students to Prince Niccolò Ludovisi, the brother of Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi. It criticized the ‘indiscretion’ of Rusco who did ‘not allow the students to apply [themselves] to virtue or to study.’ The impact was reportedly very serious; one collegian, who was ‘one of the more modest students of the Irish College, went crazy when he had to endure the rector’s ‘tyrannical

---

1 PICR, Liber I, fol. 71v.
2 PICR, Liber I, fol. 71r.
punishments and threats.’ The aggrieved students alleged that ‘we are not listened to by the Superiors of the Society who now want to support this Father.’ In the final part of their complaint, they asked Ludovisi ‘to appoint some impartial person, who has no dependence on the Fathers of the Company, or at least we plead that you obtain an apostolic visitor, to whom we can present our grievances,’ and who would give them satisfaction.3

The complaint against Rusco suggested that the Italian rector was, as the manuscript history of the Irish College agreed, a man ‘not well adapted to managing this college.’4 It certainly inspired Ludovisi to issue a warning about the appropriate practice of authority in the college; he intervened by presenting a claim to his rights of patronage over the seminary to Innocent X (1574-1655) in early 1647. On 22 May 1647, after consulting with Ludovisi, and with Costanza Pamfili, the third wife of Niccolò and niece of the pontiff, the pope issued the brief *Inscrutabilis divinae providentiae*, which declared that the Irish College would remain part of Ludovisi’s patrimony in perpetuity. He and his descendants would therefore retain the right to decide on a student’s admission or, in case of a scandal, on his expulsion from the seminary. Innocent X also specified that Ludovisi and his heirs should maintain as many students as possible using his brother’s endowment. Crucially, the brief also stated that the students were obliged to observe an oath by which they promised to enter the ecclesiastical life and to agree, before their admission, to hand over to the Irish College’s treasury a sum of money which would be given back as their viaticum.5

Innocent X’s brief irritated the Jesuit authorities who saw it as a manoeuvre to undermine their authority, and ultimately to restore the
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3 PICR, Liber XXIII, fols. 128r-129r: ‘dalla di lui indiscrezione, ne li permette applicarsi alla virtù o allo studio’… ‘uno dei giovani più modesti del Collegio dalle sue tiranniche penitenze e minacce diventò pazzo’… ‘non siamo uditi dai superiori della compagnia, i quali ora vogliono spalleggiare questo padre’… ‘si degni di nominare qualche persona imparziale, che non abbia dipendenza dai Padri della Compagnia’… ‘o almeno le supplichiamo ad ottenere un visitatore apostolico, al quale possiamo esporre le nostre doglianze.’

4 PICR, Liber I, fol. 71r: ‘non tamen aptissimus ad huius collegii regimen.’

5 Brief of Innocent X, *Inscrutabilis divinae providentiae*: PICR, Liber I, fols. 170r-175r; a copy of it is found in APF, SOCG, vol. 371, fols. 77r-80v.
status quo ante of the Irish College prior to the decision of the Sacra Rota of 1635. Thus, on 25 September 1647, Vincenzo Carafa (1585-1649), the Jesuit General from 1645 to 1649, declared his intention to defend the Society’s rights against the pope’s decision. However, he did not need to, for the matter did not develop further; although the brief was not revoked, the prince and his heirs, perhaps satisfied that they had reaffirmed their rights, did not insist on them, and the college continued to be administered by Jesuit rectors.

A second dispute that involved the college, somewhat unwittingly, is indicative of its continued financial troubles. In 1647, a former student, Matthias Ball (who had been admitted in 1643 and departed in 1645 without taking holy orders), brought a legal case against the college, claiming that its authorities had appropriated the money that he had deposited there in 1642. In fact, his case had no basis, because the money belonged to his cousin, Henry Sedgrave, who had decided to transfer 168 English pounds to Antwerp via two Irish Jesuits, Richard Shelton and Thomas Quinn. Then, in August 1644, Sedgrave wrote to the former rector of the college, William Malone, to ask for the restitution of the money. On being informed of the request by Malone, the Jesuit general, Muzio Vitelleschi decided that the college should refund Sedgrave in full around 1645.

The college did not repay Sedgrave until 1667, over twenty years after it was formally ordered to do so, and this protracted delay is an indication of the continuously fragile state of its resources. As chapter five demonstrated, between 1647 and 1656 the Irish College’s financial situation drastically worsened due to the poor management of Rusco, Gianbattista Bargiacchi and Petronio Ferri, the three Italian rectors who administered
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the seminary during these years.\textsuperscript{12} The trio did not display great managerial acumen in either financial administration or discipline. According to the manuscript history of the Irish College, Bargiocchi frequently stayed outside of Rome, and devoted a great deal of his time to private business rather than to administering the seminary. Due to his prolonged absences from the city discipline within the college suffered, because the students were accustomed to excessive liberty.\textsuperscript{13} Like Bargiocchi, Ferri had no concern for the seminary’s problems so that the manuscript history of the Irish College portrayed him as a rector who did not know ‘how to dispose himself to the students,’ and was never ‘pleased with the many duties they carried out.’\textsuperscript{14}

II

Despite the continued problems of authority and management in the Irish College, recruitment did improve during these years, although, as chapter five also suggested, this was at least partly due to the pressures applying to clergy and potential clergy in Ireland. However, the installation of Young as rector was of critical importance for the college’s performance in this area because he proved to be an efficient strategist who identified and tackled key points of weakness in the system of recruitment, formation and repatriation. Young introduced a series of decisive alterations to the seminary’s management which improved its performance in student recruitment, but just as importantly in repatriation after ordination.

From the outset, Young targeted two crucial problems which had historically dogged the seminary’s attempts to act as a venue for the formation of missionaries. The first of these was financial instability, which Young began to tackle by repaying 266 of the 546 crowns of debt accumulated by Bargiocchi and Ferri. Although he was not able to pay anything of the capital debt owed to Girolamo Rosolini, he did manage to hand over 500 crowns in order to repay interest to his successor, Philipp Roche, in July 1664.

\textsuperscript{12} See chapter five, 123.
\textsuperscript{13} PICR, Liber I, fol. 71r.
\textsuperscript{14} PICR, Liber I, fol.71r : ‘nec ipse subditis gratificari scivit, nec ipsi grata fuerunt plura quae ab istis sunt repensa.’
The second crucial problem that Young identified was the lack of discipline in the student body.\textsuperscript{15} His determination to improve it did not bring immediate results since the only two students accepted between 1656 and 1658 turned out to be miscreants.\textsuperscript{16} However, in the spring of 1659, Young introduced a stricter code of discipline, with the first measure taken against students who sought the viaticum after the completion of their studies. He contacted Goswin Nickel (1584-1661), the Jesuit general, to modify the rules of the Irish College, which had been written by Wadding and approved in 1628. On 25 May 1659, Nickel approved a change in the regulation relating to the admission of students, decreeing that each new student, before being admitted, had to sign an oath declaring that the Irish College would not owe a viaticum to him on his departure. This alteration brought the college into line with the 1647 brief, because it now simply held the sum that the student deposited for his viaticum on his entry in trust until he left.\textsuperscript{17}

A further key innovation by Young was the revision of the formula with which the students made their missionary oath. Since the Irish College’s foundation in 1628, the formula had never been modified and the oath stated that the return of the students as missionaries to Ireland depended on the decision of the rector. It also did not designate any timeframe for the student’s return, which meant that he could prevaricate should he not wish to fulfil his promise to act as a missionary. Around early 1662 Young contacted Giampaolo Oliva (1600-1681), the new Jesuit general (1661 to 1681), to modify the oath’s formula, which the general agreed to do on 13 May.\textsuperscript{18} The new oath required that the entering student had to now swear that he ‘will take holy orders at the appropriate time and will return to Ireland without delay after I have departed from the college to win the souls of my countrymen: unless the Superior or Vicar General of the Society

\textsuperscript{15} PICR, Liber I, fol. 79r.
\textsuperscript{16} These were John Plunkett and Gerard Dowdall. See PICR, Liber XXVI, fols. 50v-51r.
\textsuperscript{17} PICR, Liber I, fol. 79r; PICR, Liber XXVII, fols. 46r-58r.
\textsuperscript{18} PICR, Liber I, fols. 78v-79r.
of Jesus adjudges in the Lord that this should be delayed for a time.”¹⁹ As it was written, this missionary oath left no room for excuses or misinterpretation because it clearly obliged the students to return home without any delay after the completion of their studies.

The introduction of the viaticum oath in 1659, combined with the revised form of missionary oath, brought positive effects in the longer term. The changes in policy introduced by Young improved the ability of the Irish College to recruit and to repatriate new missionaries. Between 1659 and mid-July 1664, the date of Young’s death, the seminary admitted nine students, amongst whom there was an equal proportion of Munstermen and Leinstermen, with four representatives from each province, (the origin of one student is unknown). Compared to the previous decades, the number of ordinations significantly increased, for five of the nine students were made priests. The information on the other four students indicates that one died of fever in 1664, two years after his admission, one was made acolyte in 1665, while the other two did not complete their formation.²⁰ These latter two, George Fleming and Robert Butler, felt the effects of the new rules introduced by Young and, compared to the experiences of earlier students without vocations, their stays in the seminary were very brief. Fleming was included within the ‘miscreants list’ but he was the only such student admitted in the period from 1659 until mid-July 1664.²¹ This is telling, for it contrasts with the names of the seven miscreants who entered the seminary between 1653 and 1658. It is almost certainly indicative of the success of the disciplinary measures that Young introduced, which aimed to discourage those without a true vocation from entering.

¹⁹ PICR, Liber XII, fols. 21, 22v, Gianpaolo Oliva to John Young, 13 May 1662: ‘me suo tempore sacros ordines suscepturum et in Hiberniam ad proximorum animas lucrandas sine mora postquam ex hoc collegio discessero reversurum: nisi praepositus vel vicarius generalis Societatis Jesu pro tempore differendum id in Domino iudicaverit.’
²⁰ The student who died of fever was Andrew Plunkett. Prior to his arrival in Rome he studied humanities, rhetoric, and half-year of logic in Ireland: PICR, Liber I, fol. fol. 89v; See Appendix One, 219.
²¹ PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 51r.
The repeated failures of Fleming and Butler to succeed in persisting in their training anywhere else suggests that they were unsuited to seminary routines and discipline, and therefore disorderly in the judgment of their superiors. Fleming arrived in Rome in 1659 and for three and half years studied Latin in Saint Peter’s College. In mid-July 1663 he was admitted to the Irish College, but left after four months because its authorities insisted that he had no vocation to be a priest. From Rome he went to Venice, and subsequently to Santiago de Compostela, where he was admitted to the Irish College there. After a short time, he again abandoned the seminary without having received holy orders.\(^{22}\) Butler’s story was similar. He studied humanities as a lodger in the English Jesuit College of Saint Omer before he arrived in Rome in 1664.\(^{23}\) In mid-October of that year he was admitted to the Irish College but, after a few months, asked to join the Jesuits. Young agreed to his request, but Butler never entered the Jesuit noviciate in Rome. Instead, after Easter 1665, he was sent to the English College of Douai and it was only there that he finally decided not to take vows.\(^{24}\)

More compelling evidence for the impact of improved discipline in the seminary, and the most successful aspect of the transition from the tenure of the Italian rectors to the tenure of Young, was the Irish College’s repatriation rate. Of the six students who completed their studies, the majority, four, returned to Ireland without delay. This was a marked improvement compared to the students recruited between 1644 and 1659, none of whom returned to Ireland during that period. Of course, as already explained in chapter five, the Restoration, which brought more favourable conditions in Ireland from the early 1660s, was probably an influential factor in the students’ return.\(^{25}\)

\(^{22}\) PICR, Liber I, fol. 91r; PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 51r.


\(^{24}\) PICR, Liber I, fols. 90v-91r.

From this group, one student rose to prominent positions in Rome and Ireland. This was Peter Creagh, the brother of John Creagh who left the seminary in 1658 before ordination. Peter Creagh was admitted to the Irish College in early November 1660, after having completed his rhetoric studies in France. In contrast to his brother John, he was a dedicated and talented student who defended his theological and philosophical theses ‘with great distinction.’ He was ordained in 1666 and left the Irish College in 1667 to return to Ireland, where he remained until September 1671 when Oliver Plunkett appointed him agent of the secular clergy in Rome. Creagh remained in Rome from early 1672 until mid-May 1676, when he was made bishop of Cork and Cloyne, an office he held until March 1693 when he was translated to Dublin. He remained there until late August 1703, when he fled to France due to the risk of persecution. From that year until his death in July 1705, Creagh resided in Strasbourg where he assisted the local bishop.

Three other students, namely James Stritch, Peter Arthur and James Brenan, returned directly to Ireland after their departure from the Irish College. Stritch, studied humanities in France for four years before entering the Irish College in mid-December 1660. In 1666, he was ordained. He completed his theology and philosophy studies a year later and returned to Ireland, where, according to the manuscript history of the Irish College, he became ‘the most successful labourer in the Lord’s vineyard.’ The information on Peter Arthur recounts that he was a brother of Thomas Arthur who was admitted to the college in 1647 but abandoned his studies when he decided not to become a priest. In contrast, Peter was admitted to the Irish College on 7 November 1660 where he lived ‘quietly and

26 See chapter five, 124.
27 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88v : ‘utrobique egregie.’
28 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89r; APF, CP, vol.18, fol. 76, Oliver Plunkett to Carlo Francesco Airoldi, 19 September 1671.
29 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89r; BAV, BL, MS 2900, fol. 29, translation of Peter Creagh to Dublin, 9 March 1693.
31 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v : ‘utilissimum se ostendit in Domini vinea operarium.’
devoutly’ in the seminary and concentrated on the study of metaphysics and moral theology. At the end of April 1663 he left Rome to return home, and was appointed dean of Limerick in later years.\textsuperscript{32} Before he arrived in Rome, Brenan studied humanities in Spanish Flanders for four years followed by a period studying philosophy for almost two years in Louvain. In early February 1664 he was admitted to the Irish College, where he remained until the end of April 1665, when he departed for Ireland. According to the manuscript of the Irish College, in 1678 Brenan was still alive ‘doing pastoral work in Ireland.’\textsuperscript{33}

Of this group of ‘graduates’, two students, James Reilly and Edward Chamberlain, joined the Jesuits. It is worth noting that neither returned to Ireland, thus not fulfilling the terms of the revised missionary oath which they took in March and December 1663 respectively.\textsuperscript{34} The quality of their intellectual achievements suggests that they may have been recruited by the Jesuits to serve the Society as teachers in various of its institutions. Therefore, while the Irish College was not a major recruiting ground for the Jesuits as had been feared when they first began to administer the seminary, it certainly continued to offer opportunities to cultivate relationships and loyalties that might result in recruitment. Reilly had studied humanities for four years in Lille and philosophy for two years in Paris before his arrival in 1662 in Rome. Admitted to the Irish College in September 1662, he studied metaphysics for one year and theology for four years. In June 1667 Reilly joined the Jesuits, and after sixteen months he was transferred from Rome to Viterbo, where he taught grammar until 1671. In that year he moved to Loreto where he acted as confessor until 1672, when he was transferred to Perugia to teach philosophy. In 1675 Reilly returned to Rome where he acted as prefect of studies in the Greek College for six months before being transferred to the Irish College to act as confessor and prefect of studies there.\textsuperscript{35} The evidence on Chamberlain

\textsuperscript{32} PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v: ‘quietae et pie.’
\textsuperscript{33} PICR, Liber I, fol. 91v: ‘in Hibernia curam animarum agens vivit.’
\textsuperscript{34} Reilly took the missionary oath on 25 March 1663 and Chamberlain on 8 December of the same year: PICR, Liber XII, fols. 63r-64v, 65r-66v.
\textsuperscript{35} PICR, Liber I, fol. 90.
reveals that he was admitted to the Irish College in 1663, after having studied humanities and rhetoric for five years in Tournai. From 1663 until 1666 he studied philosophy, demonstrating ‘exceptional probity’ as a collegian.\textsuperscript{36} In 1666, he joined the Jesuits, and, after completing his novicium in 1668, he taught grammar and humanities in Montesanto and Loreto until 1672. In that year he returned to Rome to study speculative theology until 1676, when he was named confessor in Loreto. At the end of November 1678, Chamberlain left Loreto following his transfer to the Irish College of Poitiers, which had been founded in 1674 and which was administered by Irish Jesuits.\textsuperscript{37} According to the manuscript history of the Irish College, he was sent there in order ‘to be employed in some ministry’, but no further details are provided on his specific duties in Poitiers.\textsuperscript{38} Reilly and Chamberlain’s decision to join the Jesuits might also be imputable to the fact that both students decided to remain in the Italian Peninsula in order to gain a safe position rather than enduring the risks of the Irish mission.

\section*{III}

In contrast to the Irish College, where the arrival of a new authority in the person of John Young resulted in improved discipline and a greater contribution to the Irish mission, Saint Isidore’s struggled in this period to make the transition to a post-Wadding era. Although it remained financially healthy, it was subjected to quarrels that first manifested between early June 1652 and April 1654, when there were two cases of misbehaviour, one involving a member of the teaching staff and the other incident two students. In early June 1652 Wadding reported that at Saint Isidore’s there was a ‘foolish and turbulent’ lecturer, the identity of whom was not revealed but who was not afraid to upset the college’s stability.\textsuperscript{39} More seriously, in April 1654 the college decided to expel Bonaventure Cassin and Joseph Murphy, two students admitted in 1650 following an

\textsuperscript{36} PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v : ‘eximiae probitatis.’
\textsuperscript{38} PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v : ‘occupandus in aliquot ministerio.’
\textsuperscript{39} ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.8, Luke Wadding to Julian Perez, 9 June 1652: ‘moço y inquieto.’
order from Cardinal Antonio Barberini. The reason given for the expulsion was vague, with the authorities revealing only that it was decided ‘on account of certain transgressions’ made by the two students.

During the summer of 1654 the situation worsened, and the tensions within Saint Isidore’s involved Wadding, Julian Perez, the Franciscan procurator in Rome, and two former students of the college, Paul King and Francis Bermingham. King was a Leinsterman who from 1649 to 1652 had acted as guardian of Saint Isidore’s, while Bermingham was a Connachtman who was elected definitor general in 1648. Their disagreement fitted within the context of the wider dissension which split the Irish Franciscan province after the breakdown of the Irish Confederation in 1648. Most immediately, it had an impact on the election of the guardian of Saint Isidore’s, who was, of course, a key authority within the college.

In August 1654 Wadding claimed to Pedro Manero, minister general of the Franciscans, that his authority was being contested by Perez, King, and Bermingham, all of whom who resided at the Aracoeli friary. Wadding claimed that these friars were allied with a ‘group of misled people’ based at the Aracoeli friary, who were launching malignant accusations against him. He concluded his letter defensively, by stating that his work had always been appreciated and respected since he arrived in Rome in 1618, and that ‘all the works I did can testify it for me.’

Wadding’s letter did not provide a clear description of the type of accusations made against him or the reasons for them. However, he did not receive any support from Manero, who did not even reply to his letter. Indeed, in early 1654, Manero blamed Wadding for the dissensions at Saint

---

40 See Appendix Two, 251-252.
41 The information on the subsequent activity of these two students is limited to Murphy who, in mid-July 1654, obtained permission to return home from Cardinal Francesco Barberini. Brendan Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents-II, 1625-1640,” Arch. Hib. 14 (1949): 10: ‘propter certos excessus’; BAV, BL, MS 2126, fols. 88v-89r
43 ACSI, Sectio W 8, no.9, Wadding to Manero, 23 August 1654: ‘una companía de gente desencaminada’…’Opera quae ego feci testimonium perhibent de me.’
Isidore’s, and more broadly in the Irish province, in a letter he sent to Philip IV. He identified two fundamental reasons for discontent. First, there were rumours in Rome about the possible appointment of Wadding as the commissary general at the Franciscan chapter which would be held there in May. Fear that this would lead to a further reduction in the Spanish influence in the city was fuelled further by the apparent hostility of Wadding to the Spanish crown and his Gaelic confreres who deemed him the chief figure responsible for Ireland’s ruin. The second cause of protest was that in 1653 Francesco Barberini had appointed Bernardine Barry, a Munster friar, who had acted as Saint Isidore’s guardian since 1652, as provincial of the Irish province following Wadding’s suggestion. Manero stated pointedly that, like Wadding, Barry was an Old-English with a strong inclination for France.

In mid-February, the minister general wrote to Francesco Barberini to lament that Barry’s election had been widely criticised by his Irish confreres in Spain, France and Germany. Shortly-afterwards, Barberini was also contacted by Perez who identified irregularities in Barry’s election in order to have it overturned. According to him, Barry had succeeded Francis O’Sullivan, a former Saint Isidore’s student, who was also from Munster. This succession ignored the customary rule that required that the position of provincial be alternated between friars from the four Irish provinces. In mid-May, Manero decided to intervene, and replaced Barry with

45 AGS, Secretaria de Estado, Negociaciones de Roma, legajo 3026, seen at the National Library of Ireland microfilm no.461 neg. pos.81, Manero to Philip IV, 1654.
47 He was admitted on 8 April 1626. See Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 2.
Bonaventure Mellaghin, a Leinsterman, who was appointed vicar provincial.49

Linking the letters of Manero and Perez were their regular references to the fact that Wadding was of Old-English stock from Munster. This was used as a way to stress his alleged responsibility for the Irish Confederation’s disunity, and was linked to what had unfolded in Ireland during spring 1648 when the Supreme Council of the Irish Confederates agreed to sign the second Inchiquin truce with the royalist forces on 20 May. This decision had been strongly opposed by Gianbattista Rinuccini (1592-1663), the papal nuncio sent to Ireland in 1644, who decided to excommunicate those who agreed with the peace treaty.50 Amongst the Irish Franciscans only about thirty friars, the majority of whom were Old-English, out of 400 accepted the truce. As the order divided over the issue, some friars resumed the project, first conceived in 1623, to divide the Irish province into two distinct parts, one for the Gaelic and the other for the Old-English members. During the summer of 1648 Pierre Merchant (d.1661), (the Franciscan commissary general of the German-Belgian province, with responsibility also for Ireland), was informed of the project.51 Yet, despite his authority, Marchant was easily manoeuvred by Peter Sweetman, an Ormondist friar, who convinced the commissary to send home Raymond Caron, a theology lecturer in Saint Anthony’s College of Louvain, to supervise the status of the Irish province. Upon his arrival in Ireland in 1649, Caron thus became an instrument in the hands of James Butler, marquis of Ormond and protestant lieutenant of the royalist army,

49 Manero to Bonaventure Mellaghlin, 12 May 1654, in LL, 44-45.
51 Since 1526 the office of commissary general of the German-Belgian province also had responsibility for the Irish and English provinces. It is not possible to identify the year in which the commissary of the German-Belgian province began to exercise his authority on the Irish province: Patrick Conlan, Franciscan Ireland (Dublin: Assisi Press, 1978), 31.
who used the friar to try to bring the pro-nuncio Franciscans under his
control. In February 1649, these reacted by sending King to Rome to
represent those friars who opposed the peace and to request an apostolic
commissioner for the Irish province.

For the pro-nuncio friars, Wadding became suspect, for they believed
him responsible for Caron’s appointment and his arrival in Ireland, on the
flimsy basis that in May 1649 Ormond wrote to him to demand his support
for Caron, a letter to which the Franciscan never replied. The
Commentarius Rinuccinianus included King amongst those in the order who
contested Wadding’s authority within Saint Isidore’s community. As
Benignus Millett suggests, it is possible that the hostility against the
Waterford Franciscan played a role in the election of King as the guardian
of Saint Isidore’s in 1649.

King concluded his period as Saint Isidore’s guardian in December 1652
when he was replaced by Barry whose term ended in early December
1655. Wadding managed the matter of Barry’s succession but seemed to
be guided by the need to settle the division within the college. Thus, at the
end of June 1655, he wrote to Manero to submit a list of four friars who he
considered suitable replacements for Barry. These were Edmund Bray
(d.1676), a former student of Saint Isidore’s, a lecturer in Germany in the
1630s and from 1641 guardian in Clonmel; Maurus Matthews and Daniel
Brouder (b.1608), two other former students of the college who lectured in
Sicily and Prague, and in Bologna and Genoa respectively; Heslenan
(b.1615) who accomplished his studies in Spain and lectured in Palermo. The
provincial backgrounds of the four candidates are notable: Bray and
Matthews were from Munster, and Brouder and Heslenan were from

52 Mooney, “Was Wadding a Patriotic Irishman?,” 36-37.
53 Com. Rin., IV, 53-54.
54 Bodleian Library, Carte Papers, vol.24, p. 461, James Butler to Wadding, 20 May
1649, reprinted in John T. Gilbert ed., A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland,
from 1641 to 1652. Now for the First Time Published with an Appendix of Original Letters
and Documents (Dublin: Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society, 1880), II, 220.
56 Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 119-120.
57 Ibid., 120-121.
Connacht, but Wadding did not suggest any candidates from Leinster or Ulster. With regard to the lack of Ulstermen he simply stated that ‘in future nominations, those who shall be living there at the time will propose some from Ulster, if they find them suitable.’ He did not recommend a Leinsterman because he wished to avoid accusations of favouritism to Old English candidates, and therefore hoped, to assuage sensitive opinions. Wadding affirmed categorically that he wished Brouder or Heslenan to be appointed for two reasons. The first was that there had been a dearth of suitable candidates from Connacht until that time. He then stressed that both Brouder and Heslenan’s nominations were made in order that ‘it will not be said that it was always Munstermen and Leinstermen who governed here.’\(^{59}\) Wadding’s decision not to recommend Leinstermen was an obvious departure from the pattern of guardianship because, from 1625 until 1654, this office alternated between two Leinstermen and four Munstermen, amongst whom Wadding held the role for four terms.\(^{60}\)

Wadding’s suggestion that a Connachtman should be appointed was welcomed by the Franciscan hierarchy who, on 10 September 1656, named Heslenan as the new guardian. Yet he did not take the post immediately, beginning his term only in early May 1657.\(^{61}\) In the meantime, Wadding acted as a temporary guardian. This was a condition allowed by the college’s statutes, although it is not known whether he was elected praeses by the board of discreets or if he independently took the post.\(^{62}\)

The appointment of Heslenan as Saint Isidore’s guardian did not bring to an end to the attacks against Wadding, who was criticised again in 1656, this time by Francis Magruairk, an Ulster friar and a former Saint Isidore’s

\(^{59}\) FLK, MS D 12, Wadding to Manero, 25 June 1655, reprinted in Jennings, “Some Correspondence of Father Luke Wadding, OFM,”Coll. Hib. 2 (1959): 91-92: ‘y para otro nombramiento, los que entonces vinieren propondrán algunos de Ultonia si los uviere a proposito’...’pero por que no digan que siempre han governado aquí Momoniensis y Lagenenses’...’persona calificada, y de authoridad.’

\(^{60}\) Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,”1-10; Conlan, St. Isidore’s College, Rome (Rome: Tipografia S.G.S., 1982).


\(^{62}\) Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 122.
student. He presented a long memorial in Latin to the Spanish king in which he denounced Wadding as the individual responsible in Rome for the Irish Confederation’s defeat. According to Magruairk, Wadding undermined the Irish cause by favouring a papal alliance with France, and opposing a possible Spanish intervention in Ireland. On 17 November 1656, the Spanish council of state discussed Magruairk’s memorial but it agreed to take no further action without consulting Perez, who was contacted by Pedro Coloma, secretary of the council, at the end of November. In mid-December Perez replied to Coloma to state that he could not verify the allegations. For his part, Wadding did not reply to any of the accusations brought by Magruairk, and seemed keen to avoid any further conflict. Another possible reason for his silence was that, between the end of 1655 and early 1656, he was fully committed to expanding the structure of the Irish province in the papal states. He petitioned Pope Alexander VII (1599-1667) to grant to the Irish Franciscans the priory of Our Lady of the Plain near Capranica, a small town in the Sutri diocese which was located thirty-miles north from Rome. Wadding stated that this structure could be used as a noviciate which would house the men who could no longer be professed in Ireland due to the devastations wrought by the Cromwellian regime. He stressed five key conditions which should be met. The first was that this new foundation should be under the minister general’s direct jurisdiction, despite its incorporation into the Irish province, while the second was that only six novices would be admitted in the early stages. Wadding also advocated that only youths of Irish birth or origin should be accepted and that no province should be given preferential treatment to the detriment of another. His fifth point required that the superior should be selected from a

63 See Appendix Two, 233.
64 AGS, Secretaria de Estado, Negociaciones de Roma, legajo 3030, seen at the National Library of Ireland, microfilm no. 461 neg, pos.81, memorial of Francis Magruairk presented to Philip IV, [late September or early October 1656].
65 AGS, Secretaria de Estado, Negociaciones de Roma, legajo 3030, Pedro Coloma to Julian Perez, 28 November 1656.
66 AGS, Secretaria de Estado, Negociaciones de Roma, legajo 3030, Perez to Coloma, 12 December 1656.
list of four names submitted by the guardian and the discreet of Saint Isidore’s.  

During the process of establishing the Capranica friary, Wadding enjoyed the support of prominent figures such as Marcello Anania (d.1670), the bishop of Sutri, Cardinal Francesco Maria Brancaccio (1592-1675), archbishop of Viterbo, and Prospero Fagnani (d.1678), the prelate responsible for matters relating to regular houses. The most decisive favour came from Alexander VII who, according to Francis Harold, highly esteemed Wadding for his studies and activity, and who issued the brief Inter gravissimas on 8 May 1656, which granted the priory to Wadding according to the terms he had requested. Six days later the Irish Franciscans entered their new foundation. In 1660, the Capranica community counted eighteen members, among whom was Maurus Matthew (b.1617), a former Saint Isidore’s student and philosophy lecturer at Bologna in the late 1640s, who was acting as guardian. There were also eight other Irish priests. Only one of the nine novices resident was Irish which indicated that Wadding’s plan to use Capranica as a noviciate for the Irish province had failed.

Wadding’s effort to open a new noviciate suggests either that he wished to establish a new environment for the formation of friars which would be free of the hostility that dogged his influence at Saint Isidore’s, or that he expected the number of Irish novices to expand significantly in the future. In any case, he did not live to see either result, because prior to his death on
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69 Pou, Index regestorum Familiae Ultramontanae, VII, no.51.
70 See Appendix Two, 241.
71 Archivio del comune di Capranica, [now preserved at Archivio di Stato di Viterbo] notarial volume entitled Alceo Cerrini, fols. 200r-201r, 298. The other Irish friars were John Clery, Francis Lot, Bonaventure Golding, Eugene Lucran, John O’Donell, Francis Philbin, Bernard Graneel, Anthony Thiernan. The Irish novice was Patrick Gormly.
18 November 1657, he was succeeded by Heslenan in May. With that, the Wadding era of Saint Isidore’s ended, and tensions within the community decreased substantially. The only exception to this occurred in early January 1658 when Bermingham, one of Wadding’s three main opponents, attempted to become guardian of the college.

Heslenan’s successor as Saint Isidore’s guardian was Anthony Tighe, another Connachtman, whose term lasted from autumn 1660 until the end of 1663. The fact that two Connachtmen were consecutively appointed as guardian signalled a shift in the provincial dominance prevalent in the college until then. However, the dearth of sources for the periods of their guardianship makes it impossible to assess whether, in the longer term, the quarrels that characterized the close of the Wadding era and the transition in authority had any impact on the college’s ability to recruit and repatriate missionaries. Figures only exist for one year, in consequence of an apostolic visitation of all the ecclesiastical establishments of Rome, including Saint Isidore’s, in the spring of 1663. While it is unwise to draw general conclusions from its records, it does provide an insight into Saint Isidore’s community during the 1660s. The Franciscan college then counted forty members, although seventeen of them were from the Italian Peninsula and one from the Iberian Peninsula. This group was composed of one priest who acted as confessor and seventeen lay brothers. The acceptance of non-Irish lay brothers was a condition that was allowed by the college’s bull of foundation, although it also explicitly forbade the acceptance of non-Irish friars. In addition to Tighe who acted as the guardian, the group
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72 Harold, *Vita Fratris Lucae Waddingi*, chapter XCI, 143-144; Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 123.
73 BAV, BL, MS 8626, fol. 89r, John Heslenan to cardinal Francis Barberini, 8 January 1658.
74 Prior to his appointment as Saint Isidore’s guardian he had been named philosophy lecturer in the friary of Kilconnel in 1647. Two years later he was elected guardian of Ballymote: FLK, MS C 31; LL, 18, 29; Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 124, 126.
75 ASV, Miscellanea, Armadio VII, vol. 60, fols. 331-351, 511r.
76 Due to this in early June 1663 the pope ordered the removal of the Italian friar from Saint Isidore’s. See ASV, Miscellanea, Armadio VII, vol. 60, fols. 390r-392r, 511r; Cleary, *Father Luke*, Appendix, document 3, 177-184.
of Irishmen resident was composed of six priests, fourteen students (five of whom were awaiting ordination) and one lay brother. There is little information on the students’ provincial background. The few details that exist indicate that there was one Leinsterman, two Munstermen, and one from Ulster, while the origin of the other ten is unknown. No details on the novice’s origin were provided.

By 1663, it appears that Isidore’s was operating quite well in terms of recruitment and repatriation, and had improved on its performance for the years 1644-1659. Five of the fourteen students (almost 36%) present at Saint Isidore’s in 1663 would return to Ireland, an improvement compared to the overall proportion (almost 29%) of students who travelled back during the years from 1644 to 1659, and almost on a par with the proportion of 1636-1643 (almost 39%). Two other students would become active in England. These, Francis Fitzgerald and Michael Mansell, acted as procurators of the Irish province in London from early 1664 to late 1669. More precisely, Fitzgerald operated as procurator from early 1664 until June 1665 when he was replaced by Mansell. There is no evidence on Fitzgerald’s activity in London, although he possibly died in 1666. In contrast, Mansell’s activity in London is better recorded, thanks to two documents preserved in Propaganda. The first is a petition that Mansell sent to Propaganda, possibly in 1669, in order to gain special missionary faculties. According to this petition, he had converted seventy-five heretics between 1664 and 1669. The second document on Mansell’s activity is provided in a report that Claudio Agretti, the papal agent in London, sent to Rome in 1669. He
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77 They were: Thomas Farrell, Bonaventure Granell, Francis Harold, Francis O’Molloy, Andrew MacVeigh, and John Tiernan: ASV, Miscellanea, Armadio VII, vol. 60, fol. 511r.
78 The lay brother was Philip O’Connell. In Appendix Two, the names of the fourteen students are in italics: ASV, Miscellanea, Armadio VII, vol. 60, fol. 511r; Appendix Two, 255-257; Appendix Four, 261.
79 Ibid.
80 Peter Walsh, The History & Vindication of the Loyal Formulary, or Irish Remonstrance, so Graciously Received by His Majesty Anno 1661 (London, 1674), 562.
81 Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 546.
recorded that Mansell was still ministering in England and was a worthy priest who ‘labours incessantly for the salvations of souls.’

The sources on the five students who returned to Ireland reveal that they returned after some delay. Only one, Mark MacDonnell, was active at home in the early 1670s. In 1672, he was named guardian of Rosserk where he remained possibly until 1684. In that year he was appointed guardian of Rosserly, an office which he would hold again three times in 1689, in 1690, and in 1703. The information on the other four students reveals that three returned to the Irish mission in the early 1680s and one in the late 1690s. Their activity at home continued to be far less varied and they were less mobile than the students who had returned before 1660. Indeed, only one, Francis Philbin, held the role of guardian in two different locations, in 1685 in Moyne, and in 1687 in Galway. He was also the only one to assume different roles such as lector jubilatus in 1682, confessor in 1685 and commissary visitator of the Irish province in 1690. Two of the other three students were named confessors in 1680 and in 1699 respectively, while one became a guardian in 1682.

These figures of student intake and records of their subsequent activities demonstrate that, as the Irish Colleges in Rome entered the mid-1660s, they were marking the end of transitions that began a decade earlier. For the Irish College, the appointment of Young was a major landmark because, not only did he place the seminary on a firmer footing from a financial and disciplinary viewpoint, his changes to the regulations facilitated healthier recruitment and the supply of missionaries to Ireland.

In contrast to the Irish College, the transition of Saint Isidore’s was far rockier. While the college remained financially sound and its students relatively disciplined, Wadding’s influence was challenged to the point where it became untenable. Accusations made against his partiality arose to an extent from the disillusion and discontent which fractured the unity of

---

83 APF, SC, Anglia, vol. 1, fol. 454r, Claudio Aggetti to PF, 1669: ‘fatica incessantemente per la salute delle anime.’
84 LL, 127, 168, 186, 191, 287.
85 Ibid., 153, 173, 176, 180, 194.
86 See Appendix Two, 255-257.
the Irish Franciscan province after the Irish Confederation’s defeat. Ultimately, Wadding’s death inaugurated a new period of stability for the college, characterized less by Munster dominance, but it was itself ushered in by the aged actions of the Waterford Franciscan in his final years. Thus, like the Irish College, Saint Isidore’s appears to have substantially recovered from the years of lower repatriation by 1663.

Overall, however, the transition of the Irish College was perhaps the more successful and impressive of the two, given that it had stood in 1656 in a less advantageous position than its collegiate neighbour.
Chapter 7
Irish missionaries and the West Indies
The second phase: 1650-1669

I

During the 1650s and early 1660s, the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s entered new phases, in which they emerged as institutions which were more ably equipped to supply missionaries to Ireland. In this period, however, political developments in Ireland led to the emergence of new demands in regard to the deployment of missionaries: between 1652 and 1657, the Cromwellian regime forcibly transported 50000 Irish Catholics to the English West Indies to employ them as a labour force in the sugar plantations.¹ This increased the rate of Irish migration to that area where, during the 1650s and 1660s, the Irish were the most numerous of white immigrants.² Their growing number raised the prospect that missionaries would be needed to serve them, and initiated a second period of Irish missionary activity in the English West Indies, where, as chapter four described, it had been interrupted in the early 1640s. This second phase was characterized by an extension of the geographical range in which missionaries would have to operate in order to serve their fellow countrymen; in addition to Saint Christopher, potential for the ministry included Montserrat, Martinica, Guadeloupe, Antigua, and Barbados. This was decided by the settlement of Irish immigrants on these islands. As in the first phase, these missions were focused on the Irish settlers, with neither missionaries nor their supporters and advocates venturing to expand their pastoral services further to non-Irish settlers or the native peoples to any extent.

¹ Sean O’Callaghan, To Hell or to Barbados: The Ethnic Cleansing of Ireland (Dingle: Brandon, 2000), 85-86.
The first Irish mission to the English West Indies, specifically to Saint Christopher, was entirely mooted and directed by an Irish bishop resident in Ireland, Malachy O’Queely, in the 1630s. Yet this was never the case during the second phase, for each effort to resurrect the mission came from individuals and institutions based outside of Ireland. Thus, the first effort to revive the missions in the 1650s was entirely a Jesuit enterprise, and was conceived and carried out without the involvement of other ecclesiastics or organizations. It began in 1650, two years before the beginning of the forced transportation of Irish Catholics, and therefore aimed to care for the needs of the existing settlers. Its initiation was indirectly linked to changes in the missionary pattern in place on the island of Saint Christopher in the late 1640s. In 1646, Philippe Longvilliers de Poincy, the Lieutenant General of the French Caribbean Islands and governor of Saint Christophe, decided to expel the Capuchins of the Normandy province from the island. Their place was taken by the French Jesuits who began to arrive on the island in 1647.3

The Society’s arrival on Saint Christophe represented an opportunity to ensure a Jesuit presence on Saint Christopher and thus to fill a missionary vacuum. As a result, in 1650 Francesco Piccolomini, the Jesuit general (1582-1651), decided to choose English or Irish Jesuits to send to the island. Initially the general selected Robert Buckley, a Welsh Jesuit, and wrote, at the end of April, to Henry Silesdon, provincial of the English Jesuit province from October 1646 to February 1650,4 to inform him that he had decided to approve the departure of Buckley for Saint Christopher, in the hope that this would satisfy the French Jesuits who operated on the French

part of the island. A month later, he wrote to Silesdon to reject the suggestion that an English Jesuit, Francis Matson, should be appointed, justifying his refusal by stating that Matson was not demonstrating enough ‘virtue’ at home.

Buckley, however, never left for Saint Christopher because during the summer the general designated instead another missionary, namely John Stritch, who was an Irish Jesuit housed in Ireland. The biographical details on Stritch reveal that he studied at the Irish College of Bordeaux, where he joined the Society in 1640. At the end of 1648 he left France to accompany his confère Mercure Verdier, visitor for Ireland, to Galway, where he was ordained priest at the beginning of 1649. There is no information available on why Piccolomini decided to select Stritch, but, in September 1650, he wrote to Stritch to inform him that he had been selected for the mission, and to encourage him to confront the dangers of his mission.

The first stage of Stritch’s mission on Saint Christopher is documented in the relatio written in 1655 by Pierre Pelleprat (1606-1667), a French Jesuit who operated on Saint Christophe in the early 1650s. The information provided by Pelleprat on Stritch’s experience offers an excellent case study of the challenges involved in creating a missionary service in the West Indies, and missionary links between this area and bases in Europe. Furthermore, Pelleprat’s account of Stritch’s mission highlights the difficulties faced by an isolated missionary who had to cover a large and

---

rather inhospitable terrain (both in terms of travel and governing authorities), with negligible hope of support from contacts in Europe.

Pelleprat recounted that ‘Father Jean Destriche who was sent to [the Irish settlers’] assistance arrived in the year 1650 at Saint Christophe: there he immediately erected a chapel at Point de Sables, in the French part, fairly close to that of the English, where lived the best part of the Irish.’

Pelleprat stressed the fact that Stritch operated alone on Saint Christopher, which made his task extremely challenging. There were two reasons why Stritch found himself alone in ministering. The first was the paucity of resources and the difficulty of sending men from Europe, which were two problems that affected all of the non-European missions of the Society.

The second reason was that the Jesuit mission on Saint-Christophe and those located on the other French islands were low priorities in the international missionary activities of the Society. In 1653, there were only fourteen Jesuit missionaries, including Stritch, active in the entire West Indies area. This scarcity of personnel was repeated in Maryland and in New France, where there were respectively one and eighteen Jesuits respectively. But, more broadly, the Jesuit involvement in the entire North-West Atlantic area was minimal compared to the overall number of missionaries who operated in Asia or in South and Central America, where there were respectively 149 and 253 Jesuits at this time. Furthermore, in Europe, there were 381 Jesuits active on the continent, 162 ministering in England and Scotland, and nineteen in Ireland.

---


13 Officially the Jesuits active in England numbered 153, while those in Scotland numbered nine: Synopsis historiae Societatis Jesu.
Although he could not benefit from the assistance of other missionaries on Saint-Christophe, Stritch was positively received by the Irish settlers of Saint-Christopher. According to Pelleprat’s account, their reception of the Jesuit was so enthusiastic that they ignored ‘the danger to which they exposed themselves; for they went in great number, and without hiding themselves as [if to see] a man that God sent to their succour.’

Slowly Stritch’s activity began to have a routine somewhat similar to that of parish priests in Europe. During his three month residence at Point-de-Sable, Stritch administered the sacraments of baptism, confession, and the Eucharist. The mission attracted an increasing number of Irish settlers who, according to Pelleprat, numbered ‘almost three thousand Irishmen.’

But this figure is unlikely if we consider that, according to the census of the English Leeward Islands compiled in 1678, the Irish population of Saint Christopher counted 187 settlers.

In any case, Stritch did not prove contented with ministering to the Irish residents of Saint Christopher, and decided to use Saint Christophe as a base from where he visited the Irish settlers of Montserrat. According to Pelleprat, Stritch was aware that the English ‘could not tolerate a priest in their island.’ So, he ‘disguised himself as a merchant, and went there with the pretext of wanting to buy some wood.’ This strategy of camouflage, adopted by other Catholic missionaries in dangerous areas from the early sixteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century was necessary to avoid the risk of capture on an island which, in the 1650s, was affected by political

---

14 Pelleprat, Relation des Missions, 37: ‘leur fit ignorer le danger auquel ils s’exposaient; Car ils alloient en foule, et sans se cacher, comme vn homme que Dieu enuyoit à leur secours.’
15 Ibid., 38.
16 Ibid.,: ‘de près de trois mille persone.’
18 Pelleprat, Relation des Missions, 38: ‘qu’ils souffrieroient pas vn Prestre dans leur isle.’
19 Ibid.,: ‘se déguisa en marchant, et y alla sous pretexte de vouloir acheter du bois.’
instability.20 Roger Osborne, an Irish Protestant appointed as the second governor of Montserrat in 1650, ruled in a despotic way, favoured by the relative weakness of the London government’s authority in the English West Indies.21 In such a risky environment, Stritch had to act with the utmost caution. He began ‘to make himself known to some Irishmen, and through these to all the others,’ and ‘chose a place in the woods, where [he] went every day to say Mass and confer the Sacraments.’22 However, his ministry was not as secret as it seems, for it depended on a type of unwritten compromise that he had with Governor Osborne.23 In 1654, three settlers made depositions to Edmund Sheffield, the second Earl of Mulgrave (1611-1658), in which they stated that Osborne permitted ‘a priest in said island, called Father John, to have said masse. He might stay there as long as he would, as to any restraint putt upon him by said Governor.’24

Stritch’s return to Saint Christophe from Montserrat coincided with the climax of persecutions against the Irish Catholics of Saint Christopher. His mission at Point-de-Sable was no longer tolerated by the authorities of Saint-Christopher who, around 1653, forbade the Irish settlers to visit the French part of the island. The situation worsened when the authorities expelled a party of 125 Irishmen to the deserted Vieques island. This group was composed of ‘the most fervent and most important’ Irish Catholics, and were thus probably regular attendees of Stritch’s services.25

---

22 Pelleprat, Relation des Missions, 38-39 : ‘il se fit connoistre à quelques Irlandois, et par ceux cy à tous les autres’...’choisit vn lieu dans les bois, où le Pere se rendoit tous les iours, pour y dire la Messe et y conferer les Sacraments.’
23 Akenson, If the Irish, 45.
In response to these measures, Stritch decided that the mission at Point-de-Sable had to be moved to another island. Therefore, he contacted Charles Houel, the French governor of Guadalupe, to ask him to accept a group of Irishmen from Saint Christopher. When Houel agreed, he established his new mission there immediately. In addition, from Guadalupe he travelled to visit Irish Catholics on the islands of Montserrat and Saint Christopher. According to Pelleprat, Stritch’s apostolate was so successful that ‘while working for the Catholics, he consistently [won] several Heretics, English and Irish’, so that, by 1655, he ‘had purportedly brought back to the Church more than 400 Heretics.’

The information provided by Pelleprat on Stritch concludes in 1655, the year when Pelleprat’s missionary account was published in France. Thereafter information on Stritch’s activities and movements can be drawn only from his own correspondence with Goswin Nickel, (1584-1664) the Jesuit general from 1652 to 1661. In these letters, Stritch asked whether he could return to Europe to complete his studies, thus fulfilling a vow that he had made before his departure for the West Indies. However, Nickel’s reply was categorical. Twice, in the summers of 1658 and 1659, he denied Stritch permission to return, and reminded him that he had just recently, at the end of June 1658, expressed his wish to remain on Guadeloupe where he would educate young boys. Nickel’s negative response was also influenced by the positive report on the Irish Jesuit’s activity that Henri Duvivyier, Jesuit superior of the Saint Christophe mission, forwarded to Propriétaires des Ant-Isles. De l’Etablissement de la Compagnie Royale des Indes Occidentales: et de son Gouvernement jusqu’à la guerre entre la France & l’Angleterre (Paris: Jolly, 1667-1671), 301.

26 Pelleprat, Relation des Missions, 48.
27 Ibid., 48 : ‘il gagne toujours plusieurs Heretiques, soit Anglois, soit Irlandois’… ‘il a ramené à l’Eglise plus de quatre-cents Heretiques.’
Rome in 1659, and which Nickel cited in evidence to Stritch in justifying his refusal.\textsuperscript{30}

Nickel’s refusal did not discourage Stritch, who, on 5 May 1659, again penned a letter to the General to reaffirm his desire to return to Europe. This time he changed tactic, professing that he wished to return to Ireland in order to help his fellow countrymen, and apparently hoped that Nickel would approve his request on the basis of the Irish mission’s greater priority. After all, it best fulfilled two criteria that determined Jesuit assignments: an insufficient number of ecclesiastics and the persecution of Catholics.\textsuperscript{31} Of course, it is also possible that Stritch wanted to return to Europe because conditions in the West Indies were proving too difficult to endure by the late 1650s. His desire to return to Ireland suggests that he was not disenamoured with missions per se, simply with the specific conditions that he endured in the West Indies. Initially Stritch’s request was again rejected, but in the spring of 1661 Duvivyer gave him permission to return to the Aquitaine province, from where he applied for the Irish mission in 1662.\textsuperscript{32} In 1666 he was mentioned in a catalogue of Irish Jesuits as being active in Limerick, where he taught ‘humanities to some.’\textsuperscript{33} By 1680, he had returned to the Aquitane province, and he died in La Rochelle in 1681.\textsuperscript{34}

It is difficult to judge the impact of Stritch’s mission due to the disputed figures that were presented in evidence. In the first place, the size of his congregation was downsized from 3000 to 1500 people by the Dominican missionary Jean-Baptiste Dutertre (b.1610) in the late 1660s.\textsuperscript{35} However, the figures that were presented in evidence. In the first place, the size of his congregation was downsized from 3000 to 1500 people by the Dominican missionary Jean-Baptiste Dutertre (b.1610) in the late 1660s.\textsuperscript{35} However,
from 1640, Dutertre had ministered on Guadeloupe, and was possibly in competition with Stritch from 1653, so his downgrading of the Irish Jesuit’s mission may be an example of the rivalry over territory and souls that was prevalent between missionaries of different orders.\footnote{Codignola, “A World yet to be Conquered. Pacifique de Provins and the Atlantic World, 1629-1648,” in Canada ieri e oggi. Atti del 6° Convegno internazionale di Studi Canadesi. Selva di Fasano, 27-31 marzo 1985, III: sezione storica, ed. Luca Codignola and Raimondo Luraghi (Fasano: Schena Editore, 1986), 78.} However, even in the Jesuit order, the triumphant figures of Pelleprat on Stritch’s activity were debated. Specifically, it was the number of his conversions which were questioned. Pelleprat asserted that Strich had converted over 400 heretics alone, but in 1661 André Castillon, the Jesuit superior of the Paris province, informed Propaganda that ‘in the island of Montserrat [Stritch] consecrated to the church thirty men, half Irish and half English.’\footnote{APF, SOCG, vol. 202, fols. 87-88, André Castillon to PF, 13 December 1661: ‘In Insula uero Montis-Serrati, triginta viros, partim Anglos, partim Hibernos addixit Ecclesiae.’} This suggests that Pelleprat’s overall figure was a vast exaggeration. Castillon, in addition, may have been referring to Irish Protestants amongst the settlers, who Stritch had converted to Catholicism. Some may also have been settlers who moved more than once between the denominations. Brian McGinn observes that the religious status of the early Irish settlers in Montserrat may have been quite equivocal and flexible, and that some of them may have adhered to the Catholic and Protestant faith, at separate times, or, even simultaneously.\footnote{Brian McGinn, “How Irish is Montserrat? Part 2,” Irish Roots 2 (1994): 16.} Castillon’s remark validates McGinn’s claim.

III

Stritch’s mission was instigated and orchestrated entirely by the Society of Jesus and the absence of agency by either members of Propaganda, the authorities of the Irish Colleges in Rome or Irish bishops is striking. The delay with which Propaganda was informed of Stritch’s mission is not surprising, however, for since its foundation the Roman congregation had had a turbulent relationship with the Society of Jesus, whose authorities wished to maintain independence in its missionary enterprises.
Propaganda was also hampered by difficulties inherent in receiving and collecting accurate information on missions such as Stritch’s, although it was still forced to rely heavily on the patchy reports that missionaries sent. Castillon’s letter would have been welcomed in Rome therefore, because it was sent during a time when it was particularly difficult for Propaganda to collect data on the Atlantic area. This was due to the death of the Capuchin Pacifique de Provins (1588-1648?), its informant on the French West Indies, in 1648, and to the conclusion of the Capuchin mission in Acadia in 1655, both of which gradually dried up the best sources of information for the Roman congregation.39

Neither did Stritch’s mission engage any member of the Irish colleges in Rome, despite the fact that the secular seminary was still under the control of his brethren, and despite the fact that both colleges were dedicated to the production of missionaries. The detachment of their personnel from developments in the West Indies, where the number of Irish was growing, was apparent throughout the 1650s, and is particularly noticeable when it is compared to the initiatives that emerged from other quarters from the mid-1650s. Efforts to establish and maintain missions for the Irish in the West Indies did not always come from the colleges, indeed they did not always even come from the Irish clergy. Notably, in the mid-1650s, an initiative was begun from Paris, and more specifically from two institutions in Paris, the Compagnie Du Saint-Sacrament, and the Société des Missions Étrangères, both of which were representative of the zeal of the French Catholic Reformation after the Wars of Religion. They were also supported by Peter Taafe, the rector of the Irish College in Paris, although he does not seem to have been the primary initiator or material supporter of the missionaries. However, he did prove to be quite knowledgeable about the progress made.

The Compagnie du Saint-Sacrament was founded in 1629 by Henri de Lévis, duke of Ventadour. At its height, in the 1650s, this confraternity had enrolled more than 4000 members, among whom were influential ecclesiastics and socially elevated laymen, including such prominent Dévots as Vincent de Paul (1581-1660), Jean-Jacques Olier (1608-1657), and Friedrich Hermann, duke of Schomberg (1615/16-1690). The Compagnie’s main aims were the moral reform of the clergy and lay Catholics, the provision of assistance and instruction to the poor, and the support of missions abroad.40 In 1639, for example, it backed the foundation of the Société de Notre-Dame de Montréal in New France, which was dedicated to the evangelization of the aboriginal people.41

The Société des Missions Étrangères was established three decades later, between 1659 and 1663. In 1659, when Propaganda issued its approval for the Société’s foundation, its members opened a seminary which was recognized by the king of France and by the Holy See in 1663 and in 1664 respectively. The key aims of the Société were to increase the participation of French clerics and laity in extra-European missionary efforts and to create a native clergy in Indochina.42 The pressure to send Irish missionaries to the West Indies initially came from the Compagnie, and then from the Société, some of whose members were also members of the Compagnie. In 1654, Niccolò Guidi di Bagno, nuncio in France, wrote to Propaganda to recommend two Irish priests, James Taaffe, ‘vicar of the church of Ardie’s Virgin and prior of the Saint John monastery in the diocese of Armagh,’ and James Fougourty, who wished to be sent to

Guadalupe where many Irishmen resided. There, the nuncio reported that the adult Irish settlers only spoke Gaelic, and needed an interpreter to confess. By contrast their sons learned French and were thus accepted by the French colonial community. Di Bagno added that the two clerics resided in the parish of Saint-Sulpice in Paris, where they were supported by the Compagnie. Such assistance to prospective missionaries fitted the Compagnie’s declared purpose, but also demonstrated its particular interest in supporting potential Irish missionaries. It had already provided financial support to other Irish clerics, who resided in Paris, and had contributed to efforts to develop an infrastructure to serve missions by providing funding for the foundation of the Irish College in Toulouse.

It is not apparent whether Propaganda replied to di Bagno and if this project came to fruition. However, in 1659, François Pallu (1626-1684), titular bishop of Heliopolis, reported to Propaganda that two Irish secular priests, John Maddon and Peter Purcelle, had gone to Guadalupe ‘to help their [fellow countrymen] in the American islands.’ He did not reveal when the two clerics left and simply requested that they be granted the necessary missionary faculties. The interest that Pallu displayed in the proposed missionaries is explained by the fact that he was both a founding member of the Société and a member of the Compagnie. Propaganda was only next informed of this mission in 1664, five years later. In that year its cardinals received a report compiled by Taafe. He recounted that the two clerics were sustained by the Séminaire des Missions-Étrangères. He also


stated that Maddon resided for seven years in Guadalupe, where he dedicated himself to the care of his fellow countrymen and to the ‘heretics and to the infidels.’ Maddon’s experience is the only noteworthy case of an Irish priest who also ministered to the native peoples, but the absence of details prevents an assessment of his activity among them. No mention was made of Purcelle’s activity 47.

Taafé’s report did not receive any response from Propaganda which took no action, possibly because of the lack of detailed information on which it could base its decision. In general, the lack of detailed missionary reports which described the Irish clergy’s experience compares poorly to the wealth of French missionary literature which, throughout the years 1640-1655, transferred information from the mission sites to Paris about the natural, political, religious, and social life in the French islands of the West Indies, and contributed to promoting the idea that evangelical success was the key to colonial development. 48 More precisely, the lack of details in Taafé’s relatio contrasts with the detailed report on the religious state of the entire West Indies that the congregation received in 1663. 49 This document was compiled by ‘a Scottish gentleman,’ 50 whose identification still relies on hypothesis, and it was likely presented in Rome by William Lesley (b.1619), another Scottish Catholic, who, from 1657, acted as procurator in Rome of the Parisian promoters of the Société. 51 This document described a place
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49 APF, SOCG, vol. 257, fols. 73-76, ‘Scottish gentleman’ to PF, 23 November 1663.
50 Giovanni Pizzorusso has hypothesized that this ‘Scottish gentleman’ could be Jacques Maubray, former Secretary of State, who, in the early 1650s, resided in Martinica and Antigua. However, due to the lack of further sources, it is not possible to trace whether Maubray ever went to Rome: Pizzorusso, “Un laboratorio seicentesco per la chiesa cattolica: il melting pot caraibico,” in Dagli indiani agli emigranti, 86-87.
where the Irish settlers ‘rarely and furtively see priests, although the
governor of the island [Roger Osborne] is not enemy of our faith.’ It
stressed that Osborne still did not allow the toleration of the Catholic
religion in public due to the presence of English spies who could ensure
that he would be removed from his office.\textsuperscript{52} In contrast to this relatio,
Taafe’s report simply summarized what Maddon did but not how he did it
especially vis-à-vis the Protestants and the natives. There was no
description of the island or of the natives, and no mention of the Irish
settlers’ conditions in the Caribbean.

IV

The attempts of the Compagnie and the Société to support Irish
missionaries concentrated on the French territory of Guadalupe, but, in the
1650s, the geographical scope of potential missions needed to enlarge yet
again, this time to accommodate the islands of Barbados. The need to
provide missionaries for these islands was a consequence of political events
in Ireland where, after the battle of Drogheda in 1649, Irishmen and women
began to be shipped to the English West Indies.\textsuperscript{53} Then, in 1652, with the
completion of the military conquest of Ireland, the Cromwellian
government began to transport to Barbados (which had surrendered to the
Commonwealth in the same year) three categories of the Irish population:
those dangerous to the state, the poor, and vagabonds.\textsuperscript{54} Catholic priests
were deemed to fit within the first category and the edict of 6 January 1653
banned all clergy, regular and secular, from the country within twenty
days. Many were forced into exile on continental Europe.\textsuperscript{55} Others were

\textsuperscript{52} APF, SOCG, vol. 257, fols. 73-76, ‘Scottish gentleman’ to PF, 23 November 1663:
‘vedono sacerdoti molto di rado e furtivamente benché il Governatore dell’isola
non sia nemico della nostra S. Fede.’

\textsuperscript{53} Gwynn, “Cromwell’s Policy of Transportation-Part I,” \textit{Studies} 19, no.76 (1930-
1931): 611.

\textsuperscript{54} Patrick Corish, “The Cromwellian Conquest, 1649-53,” in \textit{A New History of

\textsuperscript{55} Robert Dudley Edwards, “The Irish Catholics and the Puritan Revolution,” in
‘put aboard such Ship or other vessel as shall (with the first opportunity) set sail from thence to ye Barbado-Isles.’

Cromwellian officials in Ireland assumed that priests sentenced for transport to Barbados were to be treated like indentured servants, and in 1655 the Dublin Castle administration sent an order to Daniel Searle, governor of Barbados, which stated that the priests ‘may be so employed as they may not be at liberty to return again into this Nation.’ However, the order had little impact because the number of priests actually transported was tiny; between 1654 and 1657, only nine were officially ordered to leave. In contrast, thirty clerics were sent to continental Europe in 1654, while around 50000 Irish people were transported to Barbados and Virginia between 1652 and 1657.

There was, however, disagreement between the Cromwellian officials and the Barbadian authorities over the actual transportation of priests. In early January 1655, the council of Barbados complained that ‘three Irish priests were landed on this island’, although it took no action to remove them. But, in mid-May 1656, another landing of four Irish clerics provoked a tough response from the council. On 21 May, it ordered the expulsion of ‘Richard Shelton, James Tuite, Robert Eagan, and Richmond Moore, Irish priests’ who ‘have 15 days liberty to seek passage for their departure from this Island to any place without ye Dominions of ye Commonwealth of England.’ The authorities’ stern reaction to the arrival of the priests combined with measures taken by the Barbadian governors against all Irishmen, who were placed under tight military control in order

---

59 O’Callaghan, To Hell or Barbados, 85-86.
60 See Extracts from the minutes of the Council of Barbados, 2 January 1654/1655, reprinted in Gwynn, “Documents relating to the Irish,”233.
to discourage rebellion.\textsuperscript{62} Further, by the end of 1657, Governor Searle, strongly anti-Papist, established a programme which aimed to prevent and repress rebellions of Irish servants against their English masters.\textsuperscript{63} It included permission for English masters to execute Irish servants trying to escape. This paved the way to the establishment in 1661 of the Servant Code, which put the Irish under a strict set of laws which forced them to reside on the plantations and forbade them to hold properties.\textsuperscript{64}

The biographical information on the priests who arrived in Barbados in May 1656 is limited to Shelton, who was the superior of the Jesuit mission in Ireland, and to Tuite, who was a Franciscan friar.\textsuperscript{65} At the beginning of November 1656 Shelton succeeded in returning to continental Europe, and more precisely to Antwerp.\textsuperscript{66} During the 1660s, he operated in Ireland where he took a prominent role in opposing the Irish Remonstrance of 1661 which preoccupied many Irish clerics during the Restoration.\textsuperscript{67} Tuite also returned and was elected guardian of Feorish convent at the Irish provincial chapter of 1661.\textsuperscript{68}

In the case of Barbados, it was the Irish clergy in Ireland who alerted Propaganda to developments. In that sense, in pressuring Propaganda to take an active interest in supporting the pastoral needs of the Irish there, their tactic harked back, for the first time in this period, to their predecessor, O'Queely, who had petitioned the congregation from Ireland in the late 1630s. On this occasion, however, the advocates were not attempting to begin a mission, but rather to gain support for priests who

\begin{footnotes}
\item[63] O'Callaghan, \textit{To Hell or Barbados}, 63.
\item[64] Hilary McD Beckles, “‘A Riotous and Unruly Lot’: Irish Indentured Servants and Freemen in the English West Indies, 1644-1713,” \textit{William and Mary Quarterly} 3rd series, 47 (October 1990): 516-517.
\item[65] McRedmond, \textit{To the Greater Glory}, 84.
\item[66] Shelton’s return to Europe was confirmed by a letter of Nickel, the Jesuit general, who congratulated the missionary on his escape: Gwynn, “Cromwell’s Policy of Transportation-Part II,” \textit{Studies} 20 (1931): 299.
\item[68] \textit{LL}, 66.
\end{footnotes}
were already present there, and who had not been sent there as missionaries.

The first to inform Propaganda of the presence of Irish priests in Barbados and to request missionary faculties for them was James Fallon, vicar apostolic of Achonry since 1631, in 1656.\(^\text{69}\) He asked that faculties be given to counter Protestantism in Ireland, and that these should cover suitable priests, even those in ‘America’, who had to consecrate chalices and portable altars in places where there were no churches.\(^\text{70}\) Although neither Fallon nor Propaganda mentioned Barbados specifically, it is likely that they included its islands under the broader geography of the term ‘America.’ In mid-June 1657, Propaganda agreed to grant the faculties to the priests in Ireland and to those ‘as far as in America.’ The term America was extremely vague but the cardinals of Propaganda presumably referred to Barbados.\(^\text{71}\)

The second request for faculties was made by Bernardine O’Ferrall, the prefect of the Irish Capuchin mission who, on 10 July 1657, petitioned Propaganda to grant missionary faculties to ‘all the Capuchins and other Irishmen that Cromwell sent to America, and the Barbados islands.’ His request revealed some of the problems that faced Catholic priests on the islands. The prefect emphasized that the missionaries should be equipped with faculties ‘to bless and consecrate portable altars, and chalices for the celebration of masses,’ so that they could be of ‘consolation and spiritual help to these poor exiled.’\(^\text{72}\) The lack of further evidence suggests that Propaganda ignored his plea, however. This may have been partly because the requests for faculties, were made by correspondents writing...

\(^\text{69}\) Fallon was elected vicar apostolic on 13 January 1631: ASV, Segreteria dei Brevi, Registra Brevium, vol. 770, fol. 82.
\(^\text{72}\) APF, SOCG, vol. 319, fols. 438-439, Bernardine O’Ferrall to PF, 10 July 1657: ‘a tutti i Cappuccini che con gli’altri Hibernesi vengono mandate da Cromwello all’America, et isole Barbades’…’di benedir e consacrar altari portatili, e calici per la celebrazione delle messe’…’di consolazione et aiuto spirituale a questi poveri esiliati.’
independently of each other, with the result that there was no coordinated campaign to force Propaganda to act. In addition, the requests were completely devoid of details on the number of priests transported, whether they really landed in Barbados, and their activities amongst the Irish there.\(^73\)

Further information on the Irish priests then in Barbados is limited to two brief references. The first was made by the anonymous author of ‘Aliquorum Provinciae Iberniae’, a martyrological history of the Irish Franciscan province written in 1657. The author mentioned that one friar, simply named as O’Kelly, was transported to Barbados where he died, but he did not add any further details.\(^74\) The second reference was contained in the report that Felix O’Connor, an Irish Dominican based in Louvain, compiled on the state of his order in Ireland in the summer of 1658. This document was forwarded by Girolamo de Vecchi, abbot of Monte Reale and internuncio in Spanish Flanders, to Cardinal Antonio Barberini. O’Connor stated that two confreres, ‘after a long squalid imprisonment, have been sent to the Barbados islands, and sold as slaves.’ Again he did not give any indication of the names of the two priests, when they left Ireland, or if they remained permanently in Barbados.\(^75\)

\(^73\) Pizzorusso, *Roma nei Caraibi*, 71.
\(^74\) ACSI, sectio W 28, ‘Aliquorum Provinciae Iberniae Religiosorum Scriptis Illustrium, vita et morte gloriosorum ab anno 1640,’ fol. 19r.
\(^75\) APF, SOCG, vol. 370, fols. 311-313r, report of Felix O’Connor forwarded by Girolamo de Vecchii to Cardinal Antonio Barberini, 31 August 1658: ‘post diuturnum carceris squalorem, ad insulas Barbadas relegati sunt, ibique in servitutem venditi.’
military, political and clerical migrants from continental Europe. The fabric of the Irish Catholic Church gradually began to be reconstructed, especially through the return of the regular clergy who, according to the estimate of Peter Walsh, counted 788 clerics in 1665. However, at first the return of Catholic clergy to Ireland did not bring concrete advantages for the establishment of a mission in the English West Indies. After Stritch’s departure in 1661, no other Irish priests operated on Antigua, Montserrat or Saint Christopher before 1666, and no missionary had travelled to Barbados either. In that year, the first steps to start a new mission were made with the initiative taken once again by an Irish priest based outside Rome. Again, the Irish Colleges’ personnel continued to be isolated from efforts to establish a supply of missionaries. The proposal did involve an Irish priest resident in Rome, but he did not co-operate at all in the venture with members of the two Irish Colleges.

The efforts of Dermot Hederman and William Burgat represent the final attempt to develop a solid and lasting mission of Irish priests in the English West Indies in the seventeenth century. Hederman (b. c.1629) was an Irish secular priest in exile in Paris. Probably originally from the Cashel diocese, he was equipped with a bachelor’s degree in theology from the Sorbonne, and had founded Saint Barbara’s College in Paris around 1661, which provided for the education of twenty students. Burgat, who acted on his behalf in Rome, had been vicar apostolic of Emly from 1657, and was appointed procurator of the clergy of Cashel in Rome in 1662. He arrived there in October 1664.

---

76 Igor Pérez Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2008), 37.
77 Peter Walsh, *The History & Vindication of the Loyal Formulary, or Irish Remonstrance, so Graciously Received by His Majesty Anno 1661* (London, 1674), 575.
In May 1666 Burgat presented two petitions to the cardinals of Propaganda on Hederman’s behalf. In the first, he simply asked for assistance for Saint Barbara’s College which, due to a paucity of resources, could receive only three or four new students per year. He then described the poor spiritual conditions endured by the Irishmen and women deported by Cromwell to the English West Indies, and asked Propaganda to grant a viaticum to any zealous cleric who volunteered to serve in this area. He went on to report that Thomas Grace, a devout Irish priest from Saint Barbara’s community had, in fact, already left for ‘that mission.’

In his second petition, Burgat asked Propaganda to grant the same faculties to Saint Barbara’s college that Urban VIII had given to the rectors of the Irish Colleges in 1626, which authorized them to ordain students and dispatch them as missionaries to Ireland. Burgat then specifically urged the congregation to give viaticum and maintenance to priests of Saint Barbara’s College who travelled as missionaries to the American islands.

The petitions make it clear that interest in beginning a new mission in the English West Indies came from the small college of Saint Barbara’s, which had been founded only five years before. Once again, this contrasts with the silence of those attached to the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s, which were both established structures for training and repatriating missionaries to Ireland by 1666 and which, conceivably, might have made the same plea. On this occasion, also once again, Propaganda was informed of the dispatch of the missionary after he had left. But it was difficult for the cardinals to offer faculties without detailed information on his location, and this may have discouraged them from offering immediate support and endorsement to his mission. Instead, they asked Carlo Vittori Rossetti (d.1681), archbishop of Tarsus and nuncio in France, to provide more

---


82 APF, SOCG, vol. 371, fol. 23r, Burgat to PF, [May 1666?].
information on Grace in the summer of 1666. In mid-October, Rossetti replied that Grace’s first name was John rather than Thomas, and that he was reportedly a good ecclesiastic. Crucially, he concluded by confirming that the priest ‘four months ago, left for Saint Christopher’s island, although without any faculties from the said Sacred Congregation.’

As in previous cases the distance between correspondents as well as between the mission site and Rome manifested, with Propaganda struggling to acquire trustworthy information on which to base its decisions. Propaganda’s cardinals could not check the information forwarded from the English West Indies, but if they wished to develop a formal link with the Irish priest’s mission, they had to grant faculties. On 20 December 1666, the congregation, therefore, appointed Grace as ‘missionary in America for his nation.’ This was the first time that Propaganda issued faculties for an Irish priest to minister by identifying him as a cleric who would operate within a precise and distinct ethnic group, that of the Irish settlers, who were supposed to be all Catholics. Yet, as was evident when Fallon had petitioned Propaganda ten years earlier, the term ‘America’ was rather general, and the congregation did not specify the precise area covered by Grace’s faculties. The only detailed information on where Grace could operate comes from a note which Girolamo Casanate, Propaganda’s secretary from 1666 to 1668, subsequently added to a letter that Burgat sent to Rome in early February 1667. In this note Casanate stated that Grace had obtained faculties for the island of Saint Christopher.

---

84 APF, SOCG, vol. 371, fols. 20-22, Carlo Vittori Roberti to PF, 15 October 1666: ‘sono quattro mesi che partì per l’isola di S. Christoforo, senza però alcuna facoltà di codesta Sacra Congregazione.’
87 APF, SOCG, vol. 257, fols. 87-88, Burgat to PF, [before 8 February 1667].
The initial faculties were therefore very limited in their range and did not take heed of the distribution of the Irish in the West Indies since the 1650s. The area covered by Grace’s faculties had to be soon revised in answer to radical changes in the political pattern of Saint Christopher. Between 1665 and 1667 all of the Leeward Islands were engulfed in the Anglo-Dutch War, with the consequences of the conflict particularly evident on Saint Christopher which, in the spring of 1666, passed to the control of the French, who, allied with the Dutch, had defeated the English in the battle of Point-de-Sable. This shift in the control of the island favoured the Catholic religion, although as a condition of peace, the French agreed to tolerate the private practice of the Protestant religion. French missionaries duly founded four new churches on Saint Christopher. The French permitted the English settlers to stay on condition that they took an oath of allegiance to King Louis XIV, but 500 of them refused to take the oath and were expelled. According to Du Tertre, the French also transported 800 Irishmen to Saint Barthélémy while another 300-400 were sent to Martinica and Guadalupe.

In February 1667 Burgat requested, on Grace’s behalf, that Propaganda extend his missionary faculties to other islands. He also asked that Grace be granted ‘some subsidy, without which it will not be possible to find anyone willing to expose [himself] to such a long and dangerous journey.’ However, Burgat did not identify the specific locations to which Grace intended to travel, and Propaganda delayed making a decision when its members discussed his plea in February 1667. Between then and early March, possibly on the congregation’s order, the procurator clarified his request, penning a letter to Propaganda in which he declared that Grace’s
faculties should be extended to Guadalupe, Montserrat, Saint Patrick, Bermuda and Barbados. As a result, on 1 March 1667 Propaganda gave its assent for the extension of Grace’s faculties, on condition that there were ‘no other missionaries’ on these islands. Furthermore, at the end of the month, the congregation decided to grant to Grace a temporary subsidy of fifty crowns per year, with the expectation that the mission might give satisfactory results.

Grace desperately needed financial support, as demonstrated by the letter that Burgat received from him in early March 1667, and which he forwarded to Rome in early August. Grace recounted that he had landed on Martinica in December 1666 with a group of fellow countrymen from Saint Christopher. In his opinion, the Irish settlers on this island did not ‘acknowledge any benefit from the French,’ and continued to live in extreme poverty. He added that he visited the Irish living on Martinica, Guadeloupe and Antigua, and confessed more than 300 Irishmen, fifty of them on the point of death. The missionary concluded that he could no longer carry on his work without the arrival of more missionaries and financial aid. He revealed that he could not rely on other missionaries to cooperate with him for there were none nearby, that he received no assistance from the secular authorities, and that it was impossible for him to pursue elaborate missionary strategies as a result. Thus, in early 1668, Burgat sought to persuade Propaganda to provide more support for Grace’s mission by sending him a portable altar to celebrate Mass, and he especially stressed the need to send more missionaries. Yet Propaganda did not act.

---
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Grace’s difficulties were compounded by the estimated population of Irish settlers that he had to serve. He confirmed this himself in his first and only letter, dated 5 July 1669, to Propaganda. In it, the priest attached a report on the situation of the Irish Catholics in the English West Indies, and claimed that Montserrat was the only ‘refuge of priests.’ In contrast, the picture which emerged from the other islands was discouraging. Grace stated that the Catholic religion was under constant threat on the English islands where the priests were often expelled by local authorities, so that no one dared to risk his own life to start a mission or to bring religious assistance to the Catholic population. Grace went on to calculate briefly the number of Irishmen on each of the West Indies’ islands. The figure coinciding most closely with the census of the Leeward Islands that William Stapleton, governor of the Leeward Islands, compiled in 1678 is that of Montserrat, where 1869 Irishmen reportedly lived. According to Grace’s estimates, on Montserrat there were 2000 Irishmen. The census of 1678 also revealed that 187 Irishmen lived on Saint Christopher, 800 on Nevis and 610 on Antigua. Grace estimated that 600 Irish lived scattered between Nevis and Saint Christopher, and could only receive the sacraments on the French part of the island. He recorded that Antigua had 200 Irishmen, and the same number resided on Martinica where, despite the linguistic difficulties, they were assisted by French missionaries. In Barbados, the Irishmen were 8000 out of a total population of 40000, and were exposed to persecution by the English authorities. Guadalupe had 800 Irish Catholics, who lived in the most inhospitable part of the island and were rarely visited by the French missionaries. The situation was worse on Tobago, Saint Eustatius, Saint-Martin and Sainte-Croix, where the Irish lived ‘mixed with the heretics.’ Of all the islands mentioned, the Irish priest confirmed that he had operated on five of them, namely Saint Christopher,

100 APF, SOCG, vol. 421, fols. 112-113, 115, Grace to PF, 5 July 1669: ‘asylum clericis.’
102 APF, SOCG, vol. 421, fols. 112-113, 115, Grace to PF, 5 July 1669.
103 CSP, Colonial, vol.1677-1680, doc nr.741, 265-266.
Martinica, Antigua, Guadeloupe and Saint Eustatius and that, even though a lone cleric, he was required to attempt to serve approximately 11000 Irish. In conclusion, Grace informed Propaganda that he was on the point of leaving for Ireland, but that he was still minded to return to the islands.\footnote{APF, SOCG, vol. 421, fols. 112-113, 115, Grace to PF, 5 July 1669: ‘haeretics permixti.’}

By the time that Grace sent this \textit{relatio}, he had already returned to France. Burgat alerted Propaganda to this when he wrote to declare that the missionary was ready to return to the English West Indies to serve ‘ten thousand Irish Catholics so oppressed by the English heretics.’ This was, of course, a description which was designed to evoke Propaganda’s sympathy for the subjugated Irish, and made no distinction between those forced into exile and the free settlers. The procurator concluded that Montserrat was the only safe island to send more missionaries because of the presence of ‘a certain Stapleton, Irish gentleman and Catholic governor.’\footnote{APF, SC, Irlanda, vol. 2, fol. 236, Burgat to PF, 21 and 29 June 1669: ‘10 milia Ibernesi Cattolici angariati assai dagli eretici inglesi’…’un tale Stapletonio gentiluomo Ibernese e cattolico governore di Montserrat.’}

This was William Stapleton, who, since 1668, had acted as governor of Montserrat. There he was managing to find a balance between his loyalty to the English crown and his adherence to Catholicism, thus allowing for some toleration towards priests.\footnote{Akenson, \textit{If the Irish ran}, 102-103.}

Grace’s report offered Propaganda’s cardinals a detailed account of his mission and of the population that he served there, and was therefore the most precious that it had yet received. On the basis of their discussion of it, they decided to follow Burgat’s suggestion that such a mission should receive formal and permanent backing. Not having any potential missionary to whom to grant faculties immediately, the cardinals decided to establish officers to supervise a formal mission, by appointing Burgat as its prefect and entrusting its development to the protection and patronage of Carlo Francesco Airoldi (1637-1683), internuncio in Brussels.\footnote{APF, Acta, vol. 38, fols. 432-434, general congregation, 17 September 1669.} For Propaganda, the appointment of Burgat as prefect and prior to this, the
granting of faculties to Grace, were two ways to legitimize and formalise the mission.

Burgat was determined to realize the mission, and thus tried to maintain close contact with Propaganda. He also attempted to recruit new missionaries in the diocese of Cashel, once he became its bishop in March 1669, but this proved unsuccessful due to the dearth of clerics. In February 1672, Burgat wrote to Airoldi, informing him that he had found only one suitable candidate to date to embark on a mission to the English West Indies. After this letter, the correspondence between Burgat and Rome seems to have dried up, and the next mention of the bishop was made in the summer of 1675, when Propaganda was informed of his death on 27 April 1675. Burgat’s death brought to a complete halt the attempts to develop Irish missionary activity in the English West Indies. No further missionary requests were presented to Propaganda and it, without encouragements, did not press the matter. During the last three decades of the seventeenth century no Irish missionary travelled to the West Indies islands under English, French or Dutch control.

The most notable feature of the second phase of Irish missionary activity in the West Indies is the tiny number of missionaries who actually travelled and operated there. Only four missionaries served in totality, two in the English West Indies and two in the French. Judged by numbers alone, this second phase of mission failed to establish a supply line of missionaries to the growing Irish population in these regions. Behind this failure lay fundamental problems of communication and co-ordination, which inhibited attempts to gather interest in and instigate action on a mission which would link Rome, and specifically Propaganda, and Ireland with the West Indies.

The failure of efforts to send Irish missionaries to the West Indies, as well as to maintain them once they arrived there, may have been a source of dissatisfaction to at least one of Propaganda’s members: in the mid-1670s,

111 Pizzorusso, “Una minoranza cattolica,” in Dagli indiani agli emigranti, 140.
its secretary, Urbano Cerri, saw it as a missed opportunity both to minister to the Irish and perhaps to convert Protestants. In 1677, he presented a *relatio* to the cardinals which discussed the various missions worldwide, remarking that in the West Indies ‘many of the islands and probably the best are occupied by the Dutch and the English.’\footnote{APF, CP, vol. 21, fols. 215-242: ‘molte di esse, e forse le migliori restano occupate dagli Olandesi et Inglesi.’} In 1678, his disappointment became more explicit when he submitted to Pope Innocent XI (1611-1683) the ‘Relazione dello stato di Propaganda Fide’, a manifesto of Propaganda’s ideas for missions and an account of those in existence worldwide. According to Cerri, the situation in the Protestant islands was disappointedly unchanged, so that still the ‘English and Dutch profess their heresies.’\footnote{APF, Miscellanee Varie, vol.XIIIA, unpaginated : ‘Inglesi, et Olandesi si professano le loro Eresie.’}

The missions failed partly because so few missionaries were sent. But they were poorly supported once they arrived, and were not equipped with resources to minister to the Catholics they aimed to serve. In Europe, those who sought to send them, and to establish a mission, operated usually as independent petitioners, and most often failed to inspire Propaganda to lend its formal approval to their ventures. Until 1666, Propaganda’s involvement was minimal, and Cerri admitted that it failed in the efforts it did subsequently make, in 1666-7, and again in 1669, to encourage and improve, indeed to formalise, the deployment of missionaries for the Irish in the West Indies, by issuing faculties to Grace and then appointing a prefect for this missionary territory. Even so, it was more active than either of the Irish colleges in Rome, which remained utterly independent of the efforts to develop Irish missionary links with the West Indies; at no time was any effort made to utilise these institutions to produce missionaries for the region, so that the four men who did travel there had no connection to them at any point previously during their vocations. The establishment of missions was therefore principally a question of ensuring that faculties were put in place for missionaries sent, and, on only one occasion, when Burgat petitioned Propaganda in 1666, was it envisaged that an institution...
that would provide a location to form and deploy missionaries should be the recipient of formal papal support.

Greater co-ordination between petitioners may have roused Propaganda to action sooner, since representations by more than one agent on behalf of a new mission and missionaries were more likely to have drawn its attention, and perhaps to have attracted a champion to patronise the cause within the congregation itself. Even so, the West Indies was just a minor area of interest for the congregation, and the proposals for the formalising of mission to the Irish there competed with reports and petitions for other regions that were far more informative on the specific circumstances for which missionaries, faculties, and resources were required. When Propaganda’s members did on occasion discuss a new plea that invoked the need to supply missionaries to ensure the spiritual welfare of Irish inhabitants of the West Indies, they were reluctant to make decisions without being provided with sufficient details. Thus, few in number, and meagre in results, these pleas did not manage to forge secure links based on the communication of information and deployment of missionaries for the Irish between the West Indies and either Rome or Ireland during this period.
Conclusion

I

In 1901, Patrick Boyle, rector of the Irish College in Paris, asserted proudly that, in the seventeenth century, Rome ‘welcomed Irish students and opened a college for them in the centre of Christianity.’\(^1\) The evidence unveiled in this study, however, debunks his claim as a myth. Although the two colleges were opened, there is no evidence to demonstrate that Rome was a location that was particularly favourable to Irish clerics and their attempts to include the city among the growing continental network of Irish colleges. Boyle’s claim is made from a clerical perspective which assumes that the establishment of the Irish colleges in Rome was the result of an easy and steady process. On the contrary, this thesis demonstrates that Rome offered a fitful welcome to Irish clerical students and that efforts to turn it into a base for their formation as missionaries, through the colleges, were protracted and subject to substantial obstacles. For their part, efforts to expand missionary provision to the West Indies were equally subject to obstacles, and their results were meagre. Furthermore, it is evident that there was no sustained connections between the three locations. This discovery is itself telling, for it points to the limitations of communication, planning, and co-ordination that bedevilled the schemes that were proposed and to the isolation in which particular requests and ventures were made.

The foundation of Propaganda in 1622 to oversee worldwide missionary activity might be thought to herald a new era of co-ordination by it of missions to Irish people. Yet, from the beginning, the congregation’s role in the foundation of the two colleges designated to be missionary establishments was minimal. Thereafter it intervened intermittently. Instead, the foundation of the two colleges was entirely orchestrated by Luke Wadding, Cardinal

\(^1\) Patrick Boyle, \textit{The Irish College at Paris from 1578 to 1901} (Dublin: M. G. Gill and Son, 1901), 1.
Ludovico Ludovisi, and, to a lesser extent, by John Roche, from the identification of sites and resources to constitutional government. This pattern was repeated in every attempt to establish Irish missions in the West Indies. Chapters four and seven have confirmed that the efforts to establish the Irish missions in the West Indies were piecemeal and isolated initiatives made by a series of individuals but not by Propaganda.

Yet the congregation did play a role in the actual pursuit of the missions once they had begun. Propaganda, and in particular Francesco Ingoli during the first mission on Saint Christopher in the years 1638-1640, attempted to coordinate the ventures. Its inability to achieve a great deal in this domain owed to the fact that it was so ill-informed of the missionary locations and activities. It was guided and updated only through a fragmentary and intermittent flow of information, a problem that it faced for all of the missions which were established and developed within the North-West Atlantic area.\(^2\)

Propaganda still faced substantial difficulties in gathering information during the 1650s and early 1660s; then even though the congregation received a series of relationes on missions already in existence as well as a series of requests for missionary faculties, these were so short on details that the congregation was unable to act. When it did succeed in being regularly informed on Irish missions it tried to coordinate them: the missionary ventures organized by Malachias O’Queely in the years 1638-1640 and Dermott Hederman in the years 1666-1669 were legitimized by the congregation through the issuing of missionaries’ faculties and the appointment of a prefect.

Propaganda’s part in the missions should be set against the broad background of its missionary policy for the West Indies, an area where it played only a bureaucratic role, that is, it formalized the

missions rather than initiated them.\textsuperscript{3} The American continent was not an area which was a top priority on the congregation’s agenda. Indeed Propaganda, from its foundation, displayed a far greater interest in other missionary regions, notably the Balkans, the East Indies, Germany, or the Middle East, where it took constantly interventionist stances.\textsuperscript{4}

A noteworthy issue which emerges from the clerical networking examined by this study is the impact of limited financial resources on the institutions which were involved in it. In the case of Propaganda, the financial support it provided to develop the missionary link between the two colleges and the Irish mission was minimal. This was partly offset by its decision to grant some viaticum to the students who returned to the Irish mission during the years from 1628 to 1635. Yet this was a one-off decision rather than a new policy, as demonstrated by the decision taken by Propaganda in 1635 to no longer grant viaticum to the Irish students, a benefit that only a few of them had obtained prior to that date.

It is important to remark that the lack of adequate financial support for establishing missionary links between Rome and Ireland was a problem which began to manifest itself even prior to the founding of Propaganda. Chapter one demonstrated that, during the first two decades of the seventeenth century, the Holy See provided no financial assistance to Irish clerics for founding an Irish college in Rome, with the consequence that the missionary communication between the city and the Irish mission was very limited during that period. The absence of papal support left few choices to Irish clerics, who could only rely on the help of influential patrons who might support their training and assist their returns to the Irish mission. The evidence provided on Thomas Rothe and Patrick Roche, and the comparison made between their experiences, highlighted how


\textsuperscript{4} Codignola, “The Holy See,” 207.
determinant was the factor of patronage for the education of an Irish cleric, and in particular, for his subsequent career and return to the Irish mission.

In contrast to the first two decades of the seventeenth century, the founding of Propaganda in 1622 seemed to be a turning point for the Irish clergy in Rome, for it was expected that the congregation could provide the financial support which was necessary to found an Irish College in the city and to back the development of a missionary link between such an institution and the Irish mission. As detailed in chapter two, there were two factors which seemed to indicate the possibility of Propaganda’s financial involvement during this period: the first was the proactive role played by the congregation in the reconstruction of the Irish episcopate during the years from 1622 to 1630; the second factor was the financial assistance that Propaganda provided in 1623 to Eugene Matthews, archbishop of Dublin, to establish the Irish College of Louvain. Yet, in contrast to Louvain, Propaganda gave no financial support to underpin the establishment of the two Irish colleges in Rome, which instead were founded through grants provided by individuals. This is a feature which characterized the foundation of Saint Isidore’s and the Irish College, although the level of financial support which was provided to these institutions during their foundational phase was not the same. The financial support provided to the Franciscan college revealed the influential contacts established by Wadding, who succeeded in persuading a series of prominent ecclesiastical and lay figures to grant almost 20000 crowns to Saint Isidore’s between 1625 and 1630, thus ensuring a secure financial basis for this institution during its formative years. However, the foundation of the Irish College was backed only by the 600 crowns granted by Ludovisi (later raised to 1000), to which was also added a vineyard following the cardinal’s death in 1632. Ludovisi acted independently of his position in Propaganda. Another possible source, the Irish bishops, did not provide financial support to establish the Irish College, despite the
fact that they had strongly encouraged Cardinal Ludovisi to erect it soon after the foundation of Saint Isidore’s.

The limited financial involvement of Propaganda was a feature which was repeated in the Irish missionary ventures in the West Indies. Throughout the period examined, only in two cases did the congregation decide to provide financial support to Irish missions, notably to the missionary ventures organized by Malachy O’Queely and Dermott Hederman. Given the extremely limited resources which were available to them, neither cleric could guarantee the survival of the missions, and the evidence has demonstrated that the sum granted by Propaganda was insufficient to back the activities of the missionaries. More specifically, the congregation agreed to grant 220 and fifty crowns to O’Queely and Hederman respectively, a sum which was inadequate to support the risks of a mission in the West Indies. The paucity of the sum was compounded by the delay before the congregation granted it; Propaganda provided the financial support after the mission was already concluded, as in the case of the Saint Christopher mission in 1640, or once the missionary had already left, as in John Grace’s case in 1666. Once again, the moderate support provided by Propaganda to the Irish missions in the West Indies must be linked to the fact that this area was not a top priority for the congregation.5

II

In terms of the relationships of the two colleges in Rome to the Irish mission, it was Saint Isidore’s which to the late 1650s, emerged as the leading institution. Four key reasons can be identified for this. The first is the better financial organization which characterized the Franciscan college from the time of its foundation. The greater financial support provided to the college enabled it to enjoy a degree of fiscal stability, which in turn allowed its authorities to pursue its formation and mission objectives more securely. Secondly, these

5 Ibid.
authorities also proved to be better administrators compared to those of the Irish College. There, the Italian rectors, who ran the seminary during the years from early 1642 to early 1656, were evidently unable to balance the budget, so that by early 1656, at the end of Petronio Ferri’s term as rector, the seminary had a large debt of 5071 crowns. The Italian rectors refused to follow through on plans conceived by the Irish rectors to 1642, and in particular by James Forde and William Malone. The decision taken, in 1642, by Fabio Albergati, Malone’s successor, to interrupt the repayment method agreed by the Irish Jesuit and to increase the college’s debt provides a clear example of this pattern of poor government.

Thirdly, Saint Isidore’s recruited a greater number of students than the Irish College. The entry records of Saint Isidore’s reveal that, from 1625 to 1654, it admitted 197 students, a figure to which we need to add the fourteen recorded as being in the college in 1663, thus bringing the overall total to 211 students, which contrasts starkly with the sixty collegians accepted by the Irish College from 1628 to 1664. This difference in the admission figures is linked to the healthy financial status of Saint Isidore’s, which allowed the college to develop an efficient recruitment system from its foundation onwards. Indeed, the college did not recruit only from the Irish province, but also accepted students from Saint Anthony’s College of Louvain, from other Franciscan houses on continental Europe, and, in particular, from those located in the Italian Peninsula, thus demonstrating its capacity to be integrated into the continental Franciscan network. A particular aspect of this international mobility was that all the students recruited from the above locations received specific invitations to study at Saint Isidore’s. This recruitment strategy discouraged the admission of undesired entrants and accordingly, throughout the period examined, there were no significant disciplinary problems amongst the student body. The only exceptions, the expulsions in 1654 of Bonaventure Cassin and Joseph Murphy, stand as isolated cases.
In contrast to Saint Isidore’s, the Irish College faced substantial difficulty in building and developing an efficient recruitment system. Given its scarce resources, it could only admit and support a limited number of students, but a particularly thorny problem which also affected the recruitment system of the secular college was the admission of miscreants who lacked any religious vocation. During the period examined, the Irish College admitted nine such students, with a peak during the years from 1644 to 1658 when seven of them entered the seminary. Their admission had detrimental effects on the college’s activity, reducing the already small quota of places, wasting the college’s meagre budget, and disrupting seminary life. Their admission was favoured and encouraged by powerful patrons such as Prince Niccolò Ludovisi, brother of Cardinal Ludovisi, John Creagh, chaplain to Pope Alexander VII (1599-1667) from 1655, and other figures. The status of such influential patrons may have prevented the rectors from taking decisive action against their admission, and also explains the delay in tackling this problem.

Finally, higher levels of recruitment placed Saint Isidore’s at an advantage when it came to repatriation of its students to Ireland. During the period examined, the Franciscan college deployed seventy-five students to the Irish mission, although the pattern of repatriation was not regular. Recruitment remained quite stable throughout the period covered by this thesis, but the years from 1644 to 1659 did witness a dramatical decline in repatriation with a consequent weakening of the link between the Franciscan college and the Irish mission. The fact that during this period the Franciscan college could repatriate so few missionaries was a direct consequence of the damage wreaked by the Cromwellian regime on the infrastructure and personnel of the Irish province. Thus, for these years, only three of the sixty-nine students recruited returned to Ireland before 1660, while seventeen more did so from the 1660s on.
Previously, a larger proportion had travelled back to Ireland after concluding their studies.  

Analysis of the repatriation pattern of Saint Isidore’s indicates that its returning students enjoyed a certain degree of mobility even prior to their work on mission in Ireland. After their departures from Rome, twenty-two of the returning students acted as philosophy or theology lecturers, and in some cases as guardians, in the other two major continental institutions of the Irish province, Louvain and Prague, and in other Franciscan houses in continental Europe. These connections demonstrate the ability of Saint Isidore’s to belong to two conjoined networks, one dedicated to deploying missionaries and the other dedicated to supplying lecturers, which incorporated Rome, other parts of continental Europe and Ireland. The key actor in the development of Saint Isidore’s academic connections was undoubtedly Luke Wadding who, thanks to his scholarly reputation and his international contacts, contributed to the intellectual development of the college and its rise as the key institution of the Irish Franciscan province in southern Europe.

In contrast to Saint Isidore’s, analysis of the Irish College repatriation record demonstrates that the link between the college and the Irish mission was extremely weak until the end of the 1650s. The figures on the missionaries deployed by the Irish College enable us to identify two distinct phases in its repatriation activity. The first, corresponding to the years from 1628 to 1659, was characterized by the small number of missionaries who returned and by their limited contribution to the ministry of secular clergy at home. Only eight

6 From 1625 to 1635, of the sixty-six students recruited, ten returned to the Irish mission before 1635, six between late 1630s and early 1640s, and ten from the second half of the 1640s; from 1636 to 1643 of the sixty-two students recruited, seventeen returned to Ireland before the end of the 1640s and seven after the 1660s; from 1644 to 1659 of the sixty-nine students recruited by the Franciscan college, three returned to operate in Ireland before 1660, and seventeen after the 1660s; of the fourteen students present at Saint Isidore’s in 1663, one returned to Ireland in the early 1670s, three in the early 1680s, and one in the late 1690s. See Appendix Two, 219-256.

7 See Ibid.
students out of the fifty-one recruited by the Irish College during this first phase returned to the Irish mission, although three of them joined regular orders (two became Jesuits and one a Franciscan) while in Ireland.

During the first phase there were three key persistent problems which affected repatriation and thus the college’s ability to develop this link with the Irish mission. The first, and possibly the most detrimental, was the formula of the missionary oath which was written during the college’s foundation but which was only modified in 1662. The original formula stated that the missionary oath was conditional and the student’s departure for the Irish mission depended on an order from the rector, with the consequence that it did not designate any timeframe for his return. The second problem was the poor financial status of the Irish College, which prevented the seminary from offering any form of support to the returning students. The third problem was the poor conditions for the secular clergy at home, which could not guarantee adequate material support or a robust infrastructure in which to minister. These problems were exacerbated by political instability during the Cromwellian regime. It is unsurprising that, during this first phase, some of the students who completed their studies, but who could not or did not want to return to the Irish mission, sought alternatives, even though there were few options: the joining of a regular order, a choice made by five of them (three became Jesuits, one a Franciscan, and one an Oratorian); gaining a private benefice by serving influential ecclesiastics; simply remaining in the Italian Peninsula without any specific task.

The second phase of the Irish College’s repatriation activity corresponds to the years from 1660 to 1664, which represents a turning point for the college because, during this period, it succeeded in developing a stable connection to the Irish mission. There were two factors, one internal to the college and one external to it, which played a crucial part in its improved repatriation rate. The internal factor was the efficient plan of reforms introduced by rector John
Young, and in particular his revision of the missionary oath which, from 1662, obliged the students to return to the Irish mission without any delay after the completion of their studies. The fact that four of the nine students admitted by the Irish College during the years from 1660 to 1664 returned to Ireland soon after the completion of their studies demonstrates the extent of the impact that the revised missionary oath had on the student body. The external factor which played in favour of the college’s improved connectivity with the Irish mission was the more favourable conditions in Ireland brought by the Restoration. In addition to the above four students, four collegians who had been admitted to the college during the 1650s also returned in this period. Four of the eight returning students rose to prominent clerical positions in Ireland, three becoming archbishops and one a bishop, testament to the strengthening contribution of the college to the Irish mission.

A further element of difference between the two colleges was the degree of mobility of the returning students. In the case of the Irish College, the available evidence proves that the majority of the students, seven out of thirteen, who returned to the Irish mission operated in a diocese located in their native province. This contrasts with the far greater mobility displayed by the returning students of Saint Isidore’s who, assisted by the support provided by the infrastructure of the Irish Franciscan province, succeeded in carrying out their ministries much more broadly while in Ireland.

In contrast, a common feature of two colleges is the fact that the majority of their students were from the southern provinces. For the entire period studied, the Irish College admitted twenty-three Leinstermen, eighteen Munstermen, eleven Ulstermen, and three Connachtmen, while the origin of five students is unknown. For its part, Saint Isidore’s admitted eighty Munstermen, forty-eight Leinstermen, twenty-seven Ulstermen and twenty Connachtmen,

---

8 See Appendix One, 208-218.
while there are no details on the origin of thirty-six students. Overall, the collegians’ provincial background clearly indicates that Rome was a more attractive location for Leinster and Munster students. It is difficult to assess whether this predominance of students from the southern provinces can be linked to any specific form of provincialism. As explained in chapters five and six, the thin representation of Connachtnmen and Ulstermen was possibly a reflection of the poor economic conditions of these provinces which progressively worsened from the 1640s. This favoured the Catholic families of Leinster and Munster who, given the better economic conditions of these provinces, were more equipped to support their sons to study in a distant location such as Rome.

III

During the two phases of Irish missionary activity in the West Indies, Irish missionaries had to operate in circumstances of constant risk and hostility. This contrasts with their counterparts in Ireland who, with the notable exception of the years of the Interregnum, enjoyed a less precarious environment. The evidence which emerges from the *relationes* of O’Queely, Burgat and Grace as well as from Pierre Pelleprat’s *Relation* illustrates that Irish missionaries had to carry out their ministries amidst strong political instability, the risk of persecution, and lack of support from the secular authorities and from other missionaries active in the West Indies. Their responsibilities were thus extremely challenging. They began and developed as a response to Irish migration to the area, and the primary aim of every Irish missionary venture examined in this thesis was to bring religious assistance to the Irish settlers in the West Indies. From the outset, however, there was an evident disproportion between the quantity of missionaries deployed and the number of Irish settlers, since the latter steadily increased during the seventeenth century. That so few Irish missionaries operated in the

---

9 See Appendix Two, 219-256.
West Indies obviously indicates that the supply of clergy to that area was completely inadequate, and recruitment to the cause did not compare favourably to either of the two Irish colleges in Rome.

The evidence unveiled by this thesis on the organization of the missionaries’ travel and ministry demonstrates that their recruitment did not follow the same pattern throughout the period examined. For instance, in the case of the Jesuit John Stritch it was Francesco Piccolomini, the Society’s general, who specifically selected him in 1650, while Grace took the initiative himself when he voluntarily decided to leave for the West Indies in 1666. However, the missionary experiences of both Stritch and Grace were affected by a lack of cooperation between them and the other missionaries in the region. This might appear odd, since they were all fully engaged in pastoral ministry for the welfare of souls, but throughout the West Indies missionaries were often in competition with each other. Furthermore, the West Indies were generally served by a low number of clerics, often physically distant from one another. As remarked in chapter seven, the figures on the Jesuit missionaries active in the worldwide missions demonstrate that the Society’s engagement in the West Indies, and more broadly in the North-West Atlantic sphere, was not equal to its efforts in Asia or continental Europe. Collaboration was often not possible when missionaries were geographically distant. Given the above deficiencies and operational difficulties, it might seem surprising that the mission organizers made no efforts to involve any of the personnel of the two Irish colleges in Rome during the period examined. Yet the evidence found in all the requests for support which were written to Propaganda clearly indicates that none of the organizers contacted or sought help.

from any member of the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s, despite their presence in Rome and their role in producing missionaries. This became particularly clear when O’Queely and Hederman established a communication line with Propaganda by relying on two clerics resident in Rome during the years 1638-1640 and 1666-1669 respectively. These had no association with the two Irish colleges, nor did any of those involved raise the possibility that the students trained by the institutions could be deployed as missionaries to the Irish in the West Indies, thus extending their range of action beyond the mission in Ireland itself. A further example of the utter isolation of the two colleges from efforts to develop an Irish missionary supply for the West Indies is provided by the organization of the Jesuit Stritch’s mission in 1650, the originator of which – Piccolomini, his superior – never contacted any of the members of the Irish College, even though it was under the Society’s control at this time.

The members of the Irish College and Saint Isidore’s remained almost completely unaware of the activities of their fellow countrymen on the far side of the Atlantic Ocean. The only notable exception was in 1643, when Matthew O’Hartegan wrote to Wadding, the most influential Irish cleric in Rome, on the possibility of reviving the Saint Christopher mission, a letter to which the Franciscan apparently never replied, thus showing his lack of interest in the missionary efforts of his fellow countrymen outside of Europe. Significantly, after O’Hartegan’s letter, no further efforts were made to contact Wadding or other members of the two colleges who continued to be isolated from the Irish missionary process in the West Indies. During the period examined, there was never a feasible opportunity to develop a triangular clerical network which might have connected the two colleges in Rome with the Irish mission and with the Irish missionaries who operated in the West Indies. Even clearer demonstration lies in the fact that, during the early 1670s, the efforts which were made to moot new Irish missionary initiatives in the West Indies continued to exclude the possibility of contacting or
involving any of the personnel of the two colleges in Rome, who remained completely detached from any plan to develop a missionary supply to that area. This detachment of the two colleges was possibly dictated by the fact that, in their early history, these structures were asserting their functions in regard to Ireland, and were not in a position to envisage supplying more clergy for a new location despite the presence of an Irish population in substantial religious need there. Both colleges were already hardpressed to fulfill their foundation remits, and thus they had no will to expand their missionary provision. Thus, despite the spiritual needs of the Irish population in the West Indies, their outlook was determined by the geographical boundary that was originally enshrined in their foundation. Thus, it was the island of Ireland which remained their exclusive focus.

The links between the colleges in Rome, the Irish mission and the Irish missionary initiatives in the West Indies should be regarded as two separate phenomena which developed independently from each other, and which never enjoyed any institutional or organizational unity. This contrasts, for instance, with the international Jesuit networks investigated by Luke Clossey. His work demonstrates that, despite problems of communication and deployment of personnel, the Jesuit missionary ventures were closely interconnected with each other. One illustration of this interconnection is provided by the truly global financial network that the Society fashioned, which meant that there was a constant exchange of financial provisions between the missions located in Germany, China, and Mexico. Furthermore, these networks had the benefit of being organized by the Jesuit authorities who employed men who were members of their order, and who had been specifically trained for this purpose in the Jesuit mould. This
meant that co-ordination of information and activities was, although imperfect, much easier to achieve.\textsuperscript{12}

By the end of the period examined in this study, the possibility of widening the range of Irish missionary activity beyond Europe had not concretised. Significantly, by the early 1670s, the two colleges in Rome had emerged as established structures of missionary formation and were incorporated into the clerical network which connected the Irish clergy on continental Europe with the Irish mission. Yet the non-involvement of the colleges’ personnel in Irish missionary endeavours in the West Indies reveals that these structures had not developed a more global missionary outlook. If they had, this would have enabled them to view the ministry in the West Indies in a similar way to ministry in Ireland, and, thus, to consider them both strategically as targets for the delivery of religious assistance to Irish people, rather than as independent geographical units.

Appendices

Four appendices complete this thesis. Appendix One provides biographical information on students admitted to the Irish College between 1628 and 1664, and complements material outlined and analysed in the main text. Appendix Two provides biographical information on students admitted to Saint Isidore’s between 1625 and 1654, and those resident there in 1663, and supplements information outlined and analysed in the main text. Appendix Three and Four instead provide the provincial proportion of the student body within the two colleges through a single series of bar charts.

The biographical categories for Appendix One and Two follow the same format, with one exception. The small number of students in the Irish College permits a full description of individual lives and collective analysis of the student body to be placed in the main text. Saint Isidore’s, however, had a greater number of students, who went on to fill a larger variety of roles after they departed the college. Consequently, the chapters do not contain detailed biographical information of each student, and instead focus on a collective analysis of the student body as a whole. Appendix Two therefore includes an additional category, which describes the ‘Subsequent Activities’ of each student after he left Saint Isidore’s, and it should be read in conjunction with the investigation of the characteristics and activities of the student body as a whole contained in the main text of the thesis.

Abbreviations

A: acolyte
C: confessor
CM: commissary
CON: Connacht
CV: commissary visitator
D: deacon
DF: definitor
E: exorcist
G: guardian
J: Jubilatus
LEI: Leinster
LJ: lector jubilatus
MO: minor orders
MUN: Munster
O: ostiarius
P: provincial
PL: philosophy lecturer
PRT: priest
SD: subdiaconate
TL: theology lecturer
ULS: Ulster
## Appendix One

List of students admitted to the Irish College of Rome, 1628-64

### Students admitted from 1628 to 1635

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Colgan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS ²</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>D in 1631</td>
<td>Derry, 1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John St. Laurence</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS ⁶</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Chamberlain</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS ⁸</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Wall</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN ¹⁰</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence O'Kelly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS ¹²</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>PRT in 1634</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John De Courcy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN ¹⁵</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>MO in 1631</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

² PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
³ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
⁵ APF, CP, vol. 18, fol. 76, Oliver Plunkett to Carlo Francesco Airoldi, 19 September 1671.
⁶ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
⁷ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
⁸ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
⁹ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
¹⁰ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
¹¹ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
¹² PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
¹³ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
¹⁵ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
¹⁶ PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Forde</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI 18</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Archer</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI 19</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Wolfe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN 20</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>PRT in 1632</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Walsh</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN 22</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>MO in 1632</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachy Rath</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON 24</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Gould</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN 25</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>SD in 1634</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Fahy</td>
<td>1605/1606 27</td>
<td>CON 28</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>PRT in 1634</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
19 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
20 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
22 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
24 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
25 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
27 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 26, fols. 6v-8v, 15v-16r, 29r-30v, 32r-33v.
28 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datarie, vol. 26, fols. 6v-8v, 29v-30v, 32r-33v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roger Duierma</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>after 1628?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Clery</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Raphoe, ULS</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>PRT in 1640</td>
<td>killed in 1642 by Protestants in Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Gorman</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>after 1630?</td>
<td>PRT in 1637</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Hayes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>after 1630?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donough Brouder</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>PRT in 1633</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Moriarty</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>D in 1634</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
32 PICR, Liber I, fol. 82v.
33 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 17.
34 PICR, Liber I, fol. 82v.
35 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
37 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
38 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
39 PICR, Liber I, fol. 82v.
41 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80v.
42 PICR, Liber I, fol. 82v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Quigley</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>after 1630</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Archer</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>after 1630</td>
<td>D in 1640</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Barry</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>PRT in 1640</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students admitted from 1636 to 1643**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke Plunkett</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Russell</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>PRT in 1641</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Quirke</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Ward</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>between 1641 and 1642</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>in 1663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Bathe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>between 1641 and 1642</td>
<td>PRT in 1646</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

44 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
45 PICR, Liber I, fol. 80r.
47 Ibid.
48 PICR, Liber I, fol. 83r.
49 PICR, Liber I, fol. 83r.
50 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 31.
51 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86r.
52 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 31.
53 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86r.
54 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 18.
55 In the manuscript history of the Irish College, Quirke’s entry date was 25 November 1640. By contrast, according to an entry in Liber XXVI, he was admitted in 1642: PICR, Liber I, fol. 83r; Liber XXVI, fols. 56r-59v.
56 PICR, Liber XX, fol. 136v.
57 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 32.
58 He took the missionary oath on 6 January 1642: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 32.
59 Jesuit Archives of Dublin, Catalogue of the members of the third mission of the Society of Jesus in Ireland, unpaginated.
60 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 34.
61 He took the missionary oath on 6 January 1642: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 34.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Stafford</td>
<td>1620. Son of Patrick Stafford</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>between 1641 and 1642</td>
<td>PRT in 1646</td>
<td>in Puglia, but no date is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatius Teeling</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>between 1641 and 1642</td>
<td>PRT in 1647</td>
<td>possibly in 1699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Clearnk</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>O in 1644</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bergin</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Livorno in the early 1670s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Ball</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>O in 1644</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

63 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 24, fols. 16r-20v.
64 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 24, fols. 16r-18r; PICR, Liber XII, fol. 35.
65 He took the missionary oath on 6 January 1642: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 35.
67 PICR, Liber I, fol. 83r.
68 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 33r.
69 He took the missionary oath on 6 January 1642: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 33r.
70 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 19.
71 Jesuit Archives of Dublin, ‘Catalogue of the members of the third mission of the Society of Jesus in Ireland,’ (unpaginated).
72 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 38.
73 He took the missionary oath on 25 October 1643: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 38.
74 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 19.
75 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 24, fols. 18v-20v.
76 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 36.
77 He took the missionary oath on 25 October 1643: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 36.
78 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85r
79 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 37.
80 He took the missionary oath on 25 October 1643: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 37.
81 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 19.
### Students admitted from 1644 to 1659

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Peppard</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>between 1644 and 1645</td>
<td>PRT in 1649</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gough</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>MO in 1630</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Luttrell</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Clohessy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>PRT in 1651</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Xavier Madden</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>in Venice, but no date is provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

82 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 39.
83 He took the missionary oath on 5 February 1645: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 39.
84 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 19.
85 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 40.
86 He took the missionary oath in 1646: PICR, Liber XII, fol. 40.
88 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 41.
89 Archivio del Collegio Urbano, Registro degli Alunni del Collegio Urbano, vol.VII-I, p. 34.
90 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 42.
91 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
93 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
94 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Arthur</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walsh</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>late summer of 1648 - early 1649</td>
<td>PRT in 1654</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brennan</td>
<td>1627</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>late summer of 1648 - early 1649</td>
<td>PRT in 1654</td>
<td>in 1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Plunkett</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>late summer of 1648 - early 1649</td>
<td>PRT in 1654</td>
<td>executed in London in 1681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Strange</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1649 probably</td>
<td>MO in 1651</td>
<td>in 1653</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

95 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
96 PICR, Liber I, fol. 85v.
97 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 44.
98 APF, SC, Visite e Collegi dell’anno 1648, vol. 29, fol. 117r.
100 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86r.
101 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 43.
102 APF, SC, Visite e Collegi dell’anno 1648, vol. 29, fol. 117r.
105 According to the Manuscript History of the Irish College, Plunkett was born in 1629. However his official date of birth is usually indicated as on 1 November 1625: PICR, Liber I, fol. 86r; Helena Concannon, Blessed Oliver Plunkett: Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland; Martyred at Tyburn, 11th July 1681 (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1935), XXI.
106 Tomás Ó Fiaich and Desmond Forristal, Oliver Plunkett: His Life and Letters (Dublin: Veritas Publications, 1975), 7.
107 APF, SC, Visite e Collegi dell’anno 1648, vol. 29, fol. 117r.
109 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86r; John Hanly, ed., The letters of Saint Oliver Plunkett, 539-587.
110 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50v.
111 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86v.
112 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 45.
113 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86v.
115 PICR, Liber I, fol. 86v.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Stafford</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI 116</td>
<td>1653 117</td>
<td>PRT in 1656 118</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronan Maginn</td>
<td>1629 119</td>
<td>ULS 120</td>
<td>1654 invited 121</td>
<td>PRT in 1660 122</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Quinn</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI 123</td>
<td>1654, invited 124</td>
<td>PRT in 1661 125</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cusack</td>
<td>1634 126</td>
<td>LEI 127</td>
<td>1655, uninvited 128</td>
<td>PRT in 1660 129</td>
<td>in 1688 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Ledwith</td>
<td>1634 131</td>
<td>LEI 132</td>
<td>1655, uninvited 133</td>
<td>PRT in 1658 134</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Creagh</td>
<td>1635 135</td>
<td>MUN 136</td>
<td>1655, uninvited 137</td>
<td>MO in 1656 138</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

116 PICR, Liber XII, fols. 46r-47v.
117 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 50v.
119 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
120 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
121 Beginning with Maginn, the manuscript history of the Irish College reported whether a student came to Rome on invitation from the College’s authorities or not: PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
123 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
124 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87r.
126 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v.
127 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v.
128 PICR, Liber I, fol. 87v.
130 Millett, “Roman Catholic Bishops from 1534,” 351.
131 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
132 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
133 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
135 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
136 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 52.
137 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Plunkett</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>1656, uninvited</td>
<td>dispensed from ordination</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students admitted from 1660 to 1664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Arthur (brother of Thomas, related to Peter Creagh)</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1660, uninvited</td>
<td>PRT in 1662</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Stritch</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1660, invited</td>
<td>PRT in 1666</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Creagh (brother of John)</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1660, invited</td>
<td>PRT in 1666</td>
<td>in 1705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

139 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
140 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
141 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
142 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88v.
143 PICR, Liber XXVI, fol. 51r.
144 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89r.
145 PICR, Liber XII, fol. 56.
146 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89r.
147 Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 23.
148 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
149 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
150 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
152 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88r.
153 PICR, Liber XII, fols. 57, 60.
154 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88v.
156 PICR, Liber I, fol. 88v; PICR, Liber IV, fol. 208r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Plunkett</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>LEI 158</td>
<td>1662, uninvited 159</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Rome in 1664 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cousin of Oliver Plunkett)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Reilly</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>LEI 162</td>
<td>1662, uninvited 163</td>
<td>PRT in 1666 164</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Chamberlain</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>LEI 166</td>
<td>1663, invited 167</td>
<td>A in 1665 168</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Butler</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>of English origin but born in Ireland 170</td>
<td>1664, invited 171</td>
<td>not ordained</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Fleming</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI 172</td>
<td>before end of July 1663, uninvited 173</td>
<td>not ordained</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Brenan</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>MUN 175</td>
<td>1664, uninvited 176</td>
<td>PRT in 1665 177</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

157 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
158 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
159 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
160 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90r.
161 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90r.
162 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90r.
163 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90r.
158 PICR, Liber I, fol. 89v.
169 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
166 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
167 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
165 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
166 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
167 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
169 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
170 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
171 PICR, Liber I, fol. 90v.
172 PICR, Liber I, fol. 91r.
173 PICR, Liber I, fol. 91r.
174 PICR, Liber I, fol. 91r.
175 According to Fenning, he was from Achonry diocese: Fenning, “Irishmen Ordained at Rome,” 24.
176 PICR, Liber I, fol. 91r.
## Appendix Two

List of students admitted to Saint Isidore’s, 1625-54

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felix Dempsey</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Ireland in 1629</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Punch</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1625</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to lecture in Lyons and Paris in 1648; author of eight works</td>
<td>In 1672 or 1673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis O’Sullivan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>DF in 1639; G of Ardfert in 1646, of Timoleague in 1649; P in 1650</td>
<td>Killed in 1653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence O’Duda (lay)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas O’Gavan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Unless otherwise specified, the information in this column is taken from Brendan Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents-II, 1625-1640,” *Arch. Hib.* 14 (1949): 1-12.
3 Unless otherwise specified, the information in this column is taken from Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 1-12.
4 Unless otherwise specified, the information in this column is taken from Jennings, “Theses defended at St. Isidore’s College, Rome, 1631-1649,” *Coll. Hib.* 2 (1959): 95-104.
5 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 2.
6 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 24, fols. 32v, 35r-36v.
7 Gregory Cleary, *Father Luke*, 84-86.
8 Ibid., 86.
10 Ibid., 38.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Conny</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PRT in 1622 in Spanish Flanders 11</td>
<td>1625? 1626?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1629; G of Louvain in 1639; P in 1644; G of Rosserilly in 1650; imprisoned by the Cromwellian authorities in 1653 12</td>
<td>In 1662 or in 1663 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis MacDonnell</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>PRT in 1625 in Spanish Flanders 14</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Drogheda in 1634; G of Louvain in 1635 15</td>
<td>Louvain in 1636 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Tarpy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PRT in 1623 in Spanish Flanders 17</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Galway in 1629; PL in Louvain in 1630, then TL in Prague 18</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Halpin (lay)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Ibid., 285.
16 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Delahoyde</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>MO in Louvain in 1621 (^{19})</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Louvain in 1628, and then TL in Augsburg and Salzburg; G of Louvain in 1636; vicar of the Irish province in 1639; G of Quin in 1646, of Ennis and Galway in 1647-48 and 1650; expelled from Ireland in the early 1650s (^{20})</td>
<td>Castille in 1653 (^{21})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Boyton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>MO in 1628 (^{22})</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Raynellus</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>MO in 1628 (^{23})</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{21}\) Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 497.

\(^{22}\) Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 2.

\(^{23}\) Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Punch</td>
<td>? brother of John Punch(^{24})</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>MO in 1628</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>Left in 1634 for Spain where he acted as PL in Segovia and TL in Valladolid(^{26})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kennedy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Germany in 1651(^{27})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didacus Barry</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL and TL in Siracusa and Patti in 1628(^{28})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Brouder</td>
<td>1608(^{29})</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PRT in 1630</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>Sent to Sicily in 1634 where he acted as TL in Palermo and Trapani until 1640; from that year TL in Prague and Wien(^{30})</td>
<td>Prague in 1687(^{31})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{25}\) Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 2.
\(^{26}\) Ibid., 10.
\(^{27}\) Ibid., 9.
\(^{28}\) Ibid., 10.
\(^{29}\) ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 20, fols. 320r-326v.
\(^{31}\) Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Shiel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Ireland in 1629; C in 1639; C in Athlone in 1648</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaddeus Daly</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Palermo and Trapani in 1629; G of Saint Isidore’s from 1637 to 1640, and again from 1643 to 1646; consultor of the Sacred Congregation of the Index</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Higgin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Prague in 1650; G of Rosserilly in 1669, and of Ballimote in 1672; DF in 1678</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Mahowny</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1647</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 26, fols. 17v-18r.
35 ACSI, Sectio W 14, no.17; LL, 117, 120, 140.
36 Ibid., 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eugene O’ Cahan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1632 and in 1635</td>
<td>PL in Barletta in 1638; recalled to Saint Isidore’s in 1639; in 1640, sent to Pontoise and then to Ireland to teach philosophy and theology. G of Ennis in 1646, and lecturer there in 1647. G of Askeaton in 1650</td>
<td>Killed in 1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionisius O’Donel</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>In 1630 he went to Jerez de La Frontera where he acted as magister of students.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionisus a Conceptione</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Ireland in 1630.</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

38 Ibid.
40 Ibid., 3; *LL*, 118.
41 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,”3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Bray</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>PL and TL in Salzburg in 1635; G of Clonmel in 1641, and in 1649; custos of the Irish province in 1658. J in 1675 43</td>
<td>Louvain in 1676 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ruark</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Ireland in 1630 45</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob/James Ferrall</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1632 and 1634</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Barnewall</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>PL in Germany in 1637 46</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis O’Nelan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Perugia in 1631; returned to Ireland in 1642 48</td>
<td>Killed in 1651 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44 Ibid.
46 Ibid., 11.
47 Ibid., 3.
49 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ludovicus Wynne   | ?             | MUN    | ?          | ?         | 1632                      | Vicar of the choir and instructor of the young in 1631  
50 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 3.  
51 Ibid.
|                  |               |        |            |           |                           |                                                                                     |       |
| Edmund Galvan     | ?             | MUN    | ?          | 1631      | ?                         | ?                                                                                   |       |
| John O’Molloy     | ?             | MUN    | ?          | ?         | ?                         | Coadjutor for the instructor of the young in 1631  
Ibid., 11  
52 Ibid., 3.  
53 Ibid., 87.  
57 Ibid., 87. |
51 Ibid., 11  
52 Ibid., 3.  
53 Ibid., 87.  
57 Ibid., 87. |
Ibid., 11  
52 Ibid., 3.  
53 Ibid., 87.  
57 Ibid., 87. |
| Patrick Brennan   | ?             | LEI    | D in 1625 in Spanish Flanders  
57 Ibid., 87. |

Edward Galvan

Wynne

O’Molloy

Lee

Arthur

Brennan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick O’Connor</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Ordered to return to Ireland, but retained in Rome at mid June 1631; TL in Nancy in 1634, and then in Rouen</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Comerford</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT in 1632</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>PL in Barletta in 1638</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Gorman</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Quinn from 1639 until 1649</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Baron</td>
<td>Clonmel in 1610</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1634</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>At some stage named PL and TL in Saint Isidore’s; author of twenty-two works</td>
<td>Rome in 1696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cyrin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>PL in Louvain in 1645</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Raricy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57 Ibid., 11.
58 LL, 17, 28, 357.
60 Ibid., 88-99.
61 Ibid., 92.
62 Ibid., 98; Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malachias Corkran</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in 1639 in Milan; from 1646 G of Lisgoole; DF in 1650; G of Monaghan in 1658; from 1669 G of Lisgoole again; J in 1678</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan O’Connor</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>A in 1635</td>
<td>1633</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Went to Louvain in 1638; reported to be in Wexford in 1642; in 1644 he was in Prague where he acted as TL</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Curneen</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Left in 1634 for Ireland where he preached for almost fifteen years; possibly expelled from Ireland in 1649</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

63 LL, 21, 34, 39, 54, 56-57, 64, 67-68, 98, 121, 144, 168.
64 HMC, Franciscan, 194; Cleary, Father Luke, 132-133.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Verdon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1632 and in 1634</td>
<td>From 1635 until 1668, TL in Saint-Malo (^{67})</td>
<td>Between 7 July 1668 and 18 January 1670 (^{68})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Geraldin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left for Ireland in 1634; C in 1647; G of Adare in 1650; J in 1697 (^{69})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columba a S. Maria</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>In early April 1634, it was decided to retain him in Saint Isidore’s (^{70})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Walsh</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1634(^{71})</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1635</td>
<td>PL in Perugia in 1640 and afterwards in Mantova (^{72})</td>
<td>At some stage in Mantova (^{73})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{67}\) Ibid., 364.  
\(^{68}\) Ibid.  
\(^{69}\) LL, 18, 36, 204.  
\(^{71}\) Ibid.  
\(^{72}\) Ibid., 11.  
\(^{73}\) Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip Roche</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1634?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Naples in 1637; At some stage he was recalled to Rome; G of Youghal in 1646, and of Cork in 1650; signed the Remonstrance in London in 1662</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Mede</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1635</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Cork in 1646</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardine Barry</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1635</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Naples in 1638 and Aracoeli (Rome) in 1639; vicar of Saint Isidore’s in 1642; G of Saint Anthony’s in 1647; G of Saint Isidore’s from 1652 to 1654; Vicar provincial in 1653; CM of the Irish Franciscan colleges of Louvain and Prague in 1659; back to Ireland by mid-1660s</td>
<td>Possibly in early May of 1668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

74 Ibid.; *LL*, 16, 22, 36; Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 434.  
76 *LL*, 22.  
77 ASV, Dataria Apostolica, Processus Datariae, vol. 24, fols. 33r-34r.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tullius (lay)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Prague in 1635</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Mally</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Admitted as novice in 1635</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Galbally in 1647</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremias Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>1635?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Naples in 1638; G of Askeaton in 1646; DF in 1650; G of Adaare in 1669, and of Askeaton in 1675; JL and DF in 1678</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 Ibid.
82 LL, 16, 28.
83 Ibid., 16, 23, 28, 34, 39, 116, 123, 133, 137, 141, 145, 161, 163, 182, 189.
## Students admitted from 1636 to 1643

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Tiernan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Claregalway in 1646; DF in 1647 and in 1649; again G of Claregalway in 1650</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Magruairk</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>In Ireland since the early 1640s; embraced Protestantism in England</td>
<td>Dublin in 1665 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Dillon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>D in 1619 in Spanish Flanders 87</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Ballymote in 1650, and in 1669; G of Kilconnell in 1676; J in 1678 88</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dalton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1639 89</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

84 Ibid., 14, 19, 20, 30, 34.
86 Ibid., 251.
88 *I.L.*, 6-7, 34, 120, 133, 138, 144.
89 Ibid., 359.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Dillon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT in 1636 in Spanish Flanders</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Moyen in 1660, and of Ballymote in 1661; one of the signatories of the Remonstrance in Ireland</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael a S. Maria</td>
<td>1609 at Donagh Chidi, Derry diocese</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>SD in 1636 in Spanish Flanders</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>PL and TL in Genoa in 1645</td>
<td>Genoa in 1652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Doherty</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>E in 1638</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Custos of the Irish province in 1647; G of Moyne in 1658; P from 1661 to 1666; examiner of the friars in 1689</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Civers</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the philosophy course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

91 LL, 56, 64, 96, 103.
92 Cleary, Father Luke, 142-143.
95 Ibid., 144.
96 LL, 14, 30, 53-54, 64, 67, 75, 121, 170, 184-185, 189.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Gearnon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the theology course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Dundalk in 1646, and of Drogheda in 1647</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Conny</td>
<td>1612 98</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Louvain to be admitted to the theology course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left for Ireland in 1642; G of Armagh in 1646, and in 1661; DF in 1647; G of Dundalk in 1658, and of Carrickfergus in 1669; J in 1678 99</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Bermingham</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Spain to be admitted to the theology course in 1636</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL and TL in Milan in 1639; DF in 1648; G of Capranica in 1662; author of one work 100</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Maddin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1636?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to France in 1639; G of Meelick in 1648</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardine Daly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1636?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Naples in 1639; PL in Kilconnell in 1646; C in 1647; G of Carrickfergus in 1650, and of Kilconnell in 1661</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Piercy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1636?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Went to Sicily in 1639</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Ruany</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1637?</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Left in 1642</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis O’ Molloy</td>
<td>1606&lt;sup&gt;108&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1637?</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>Left for Germany in 1642; PL in Klosterneuberg in 1645, and then TL in Gratz; author of seven works, and of the first printed Irish grammar, published in Rome in 1677</td>
<td>Rome in 1684&lt;sup&gt;110&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 6; <i>LL</i>, 28, 34, 53, 56.
<sup>104</sup> Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 11; <i>LL</i>, 18, 24, 34, 64.
<sup>105</sup> Ibid.
<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 18.
<sup>107</sup> Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 6.
<sup>108</sup> Cleary, <i>Father Luke</i>, 104.
<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 107.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul King</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1637?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in 1640 for Brindisi, where he acted as TL; PL in Kilkenny in 1646; G of Saint Isidore’s in 1649; author of one work. 111</td>
<td>Possibly in Rome in 1655 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Croch</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1637 113</td>
<td>1637?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

111 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 6, 8; Cleary, Father Luke, 114-118.
112 Ibid., 118.
113 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 5.
114 Cleary, Father Luke, 141.
115 Ibid.
116 FLK, M C 63, fol. 102v.
117 Cleary, Father Luke, 139.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John O’Connor</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1638?</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>PL in Tivoli in 1642, and in Aracoeli in 1644; TL in Naples in the early 1650s</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Falvey</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1638?</td>
<td>1641</td>
<td>PL in Palermo in 1647; during the 1650s he taught in Plasencia; G of Lisglaghtin in 1671, and of Quinn in 1672; J in 1685</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Mihan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PRT in 1636 in Spanish Flanders</td>
<td>1638?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Milan in 1641; named secretary of the procurator general in 1644; G of Louvain in 1650</td>
<td>Louvain in 1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Molloy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles O’Reilly</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1640</td>
<td>PL and G of Saint Bartholomew (in Rome) in 1641; G of Cavan from 1647 until 1649; G of Drogheda in 1650</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

121 Ibid.
122 Ibid.
123 Ibid.
124 *LL*, 14, 26, 35.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Harold</td>
<td>early 1600s. Nephew of Luke Wadding</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1640</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Prague from 1642 to 1645; also lectured in Wien and Gratz; appointed lecturer and librarian of Saint Isidore’s in 1655; at mid April 1655 he succeeded to Wadding as compiler of the <em>Annales</em>; author of thirteen works</td>
<td>Rome in 1685 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Malony (Mahon)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1647 128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio a S. Maria</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 Ibid., 108-112.
127 Ibid., 110.
128 *LL*, 18.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Conry</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Prague between 1650 and 1652; imprisoned in England from 1655 until 1658; in Rome from the summer of 1658 until 1659; back to England in the 1660s; author of one work</td>
<td>Before 1669 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Condon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>Lecturer at Sant Isidore’s, then TL in Angers in the 1650s</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Coppinger</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1635 in Spanish Flanders 132</td>
<td>1639?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Venice in 1642; G of Cork from 1660 until 1661; one of the Franciscans who signed the Remonstrance in Ireland 133</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Forstal</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1640?</td>
<td>Left in 1643 134</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

130 Ibid., 278.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurus Matthews</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1642</td>
<td>1641?</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>PL in Bologna in 1647, and in Genoa from 1650 until 1652; recalled in 1655 to Saint Isidore's where he obtained the chair of theology; G of Capranica in 1657</td>
<td>In 1682 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Darcy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>D in 1644</td>
<td>1641?</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>G of Trim in 1658, then of Stradbally in 1661; custos of the Irish province in 1669; from 1675 until 1682 G of Dublin; elected P at mid-June 1683</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaddeus O'Carraghy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1641?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in April of 1644; C, and preacher in Ennis in the 1640s</td>
<td>Killed in 1651 140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

136 Ibid., 113.
137 Ibid., 138-139; *LL*, 52, 54, 57, 66, 120, 124, 133, 162.
139 Ibid., 150-151.
140 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philipp Kelly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Kilkenny in 1647; G of Kilkenny from 1658 to 1660; from 1661 until 1675 G of Enniscort; G of Wicklow in 1677; and again of Enniscort from 1678 to 1683; G of Wexford in 1684, and of Kilkenny in 1686</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis O'Reilly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1645</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Preacher in Prague in 1653; G of Saint Isidore’s from 1664 until 1666</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Loftus</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1646</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Capranica in 1660</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Turner</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>MO in 1642</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>One of the Franciscans who signed the Remonstrance in Ireland</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Galvan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>D in 1642</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Rothe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT in 1643</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Secretary general of the Franciscan order in Rome in 1660</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

142 Ibid., 70; Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 126, 137.
143 Ibid., 201.
144 Ibid., 435.
145 Ibid., 123, footnote no.89.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bernardine Mede</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN 146</td>
<td>PRT in 1641</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL in Stronconi (Umbria) in 1645 147</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Scallan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>D in 1642</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1649; G of Lislaghten in 1650 148</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Gray</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1644</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Kilcree in 1669; C and G of Youghal in 1672 149</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Gearnon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1642?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Milan in 1645; G of Dundalk in 1647; chaplain in Spanish Flanders in the early 1650s; G of Dublin in the second half of 1650s; DF and G of Drogheda in 1675; signed the Remonstrance in London. Author of one work 150</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146 Ibid., 141.
147 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 11.
148 LL, 30, 36.
149 Ibid., 122, 129-130.
150 Ibid., 15, 132, 134-135, 139-140; Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 279-281, 426.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Connor</td>
<td>1614&lt;sup&gt;151&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>D in 1644</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>In 1648 went to lecture in Bolzen; recalled to Rome in 1650; PL in Prague from 1661 to 1664; author of five works&lt;sup&gt;152&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Haly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>D in 1644</td>
<td>Called from Venice in 1643</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in 1646 for Granada where he acted as magister of students&lt;sup&gt;153&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>151</sup> ASV, Datarii Apostolici, Processus Datariae, vol. 26, fols. 6v-8v.
<sup>153</sup> Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 11.
Students admitted from 1644 to 1654

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Carthy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1645</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>PL and C in Enagh in 1647; G of Kilcree in 1650</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Young</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1644?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>sent to Sardinia in 1647</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Burgatt</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1646</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Gained permission to go on pilgrimage to Loreto in 1646</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Darcy (junior)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT in 1647</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in 1648</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

154 *LL*, 18, 36.
156 *LL*, 18.
158 Ibid., 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Bruodin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1645?</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>LJ and G of Ennis in 1671 (^{159})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony Bruodin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1645?</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>Sent to lecture in the Irish College of Prague; G of several convents; DF of the Bohemian province; in 1671, lecturer in the Irish Franciscan college of Prague; author of seven works (^{161})</td>
<td>Prague in 1680 (^{162})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Daly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1645?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in 1648 to go to Majorca (^{163})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Duffy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1645?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in 1648 to go to Majorca; went to lecture in Sicily at some stage (^{164})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew a Conceptione</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1645?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Left in 1648 (^{165})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{159}\) *LL*, 117-118, 123.
\(^{161}\) Ibid., 136-138.
\(^{163}\) Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 8.
\(^{164}\) Ibid., 8, 12
\(^{165}\) Ibid., 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Tyrrell</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1646?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>At some stage he went to lecture in Prague</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brady</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1646?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Prague in 1650 or 1651; DF and G of Drogheda in 1669; CV of ULS in 1672; P from 1675 until 1678; C in 1678; G of Cavan in 1684; examiner for confessors in 1689</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Brenan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Majorca in 1646</td>
<td>1649</td>
<td>PL in 1649; lectured at Saint Isidore’s from 1649 until 1653; in 1655 taught in the studium generale of the order in Viterbo</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludovic Durcan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Called from Bologna on 11 September 1646</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Possibly went to Turin in early 1650</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

166 Ibid., 7.
167 Ibid., 12.
168 ACSI, MS W 14, ‘Nomina patrum ac fratrum collegii nostri Pragensis ex quatuor Hiberniae partibus,’ no.7; LL, 119-121, 124, 132, 135-136, 140, 144-145, 150, 161, 168, 184, 189-190, 194.
169 Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 8; Cleary, Father Luke, 139.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Ball</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Called from Milan in 1647</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Sall</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Signed the Remonstrance in London in 1662 171</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardine Roche</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Cleary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Kennedy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL in Louvain in 1666; LJ in 1671; DF and G of Limerick in 1675 172</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Callanan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>sent to Hungary in 1653 as PL; G of Louvain in 1661; DF in 1666 and in 1669; G of Meelick in 1669; CV in 1675; P in 1678; G of Enagh in 1684; G of Clonmel in 1694 173</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Baron</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sent to Hungary in 1653 as PL; G of Galbally and C in 1669 174</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

171 Ibid., 434.
172 LL, 104, 118, 132-133, 135, 137.
174 Ibid., 228, 230.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Ordination</td>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Date of defence of thesis</td>
<td>Subsequent activity</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bodkin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>PRT in 1651</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Prague in 1657</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephan Daly</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Roche</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>SD in 1651</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Brown</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>President of the provincial chapter held in Dublin in 1666</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

176 *IL*, 72.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Seachnesy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Prisoner on Inishbofin in 1653 (^{177})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Murphy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>PRT in 1652</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Expelled in 1654; C in Ireland in 1687, 1694, and in 1703 (^{178})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Tyrrell</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>SD in 1654</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>TL at Saint Isidore’s and Naples in the early 1660s and 1670s; CM of the Irish province in Madrid in 1665; DF in 1671; G of Saint Isidore’s from 1671 to 1676; bishop of Clogher in 1676, and, in 1689, bishop of Meath (^{179})</td>
<td>In 1692 (^{180})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Kimoe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1661; G of Wicklow in 1675 (^{181})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{177}\) Ibid., 40.  
\(^{178}\) Ibid., 183, 198, 288; Jennings, “Miscellaneous Documents,” 10.  
\(^{179}\) *L.L.*, 118-121; Millett, *The Irish Franciscans*, 527, 529, 531-532.  
\(^{181}\) *L.L.*, 67, 133.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Cosrinus</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Expelled in 1654</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Junius of St. Mary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1651</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>lecturer at Saint Isidore’s in 1653, and in Naples at some stage</td>
<td>in 1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Patrick</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boetius Egan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Grace</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1661; G of Kilkenny in 1669</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donatus Matthews</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>At some stage he went to lecture in the Roman province of the Riformati</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Connor</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

184 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Conny</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1661 188</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nell (O’Neill)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1675; G of Capranica in 1676; G of Dungannon in 1690; G of Bunamargy in 1699 189</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob/James Vitus (White)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1661; G of Youghal in 1669, of Carrick-on-Suir in 1671, of Clonmel in 1675, and of Waterford in 1678 190</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Barnewall</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Trim and C in 1684; G of Dublin in 1685; LJ in 1687; DF in 1689; G of Dublin in 1693 191</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

188 Ibid., 66.
189 Ibid., 134, 139, 191, 229.
190 Ibid., 66, 116, 122, 129, 133, 137, 141.
191 Ibid., 167, 170, 174, 180, 183, 185, 190, 195.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Geraldine</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN</td>
<td>PRT in 1654</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>G of Inisherkin and C in 1661 (^{192})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure Brady</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>C in Ireland in 1681 (^{193})</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{192}\) Ibid., 65-66.

\(^{193}\) Ibid., 154.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Philbin</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LJ in 1682; C and G of Moyne in 1685; G of Galway in 1687; CV in 1690</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Fitzgerald</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN 197</td>
<td>PRT in 1662</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>procurator of the Irish province in London between 1663 and June of 1665</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Mansell</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>MUN 199</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>procurator of the Irish province in London from June of 1665 to 1669</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

194 Dates of entry are taken from the apostolic visitation made in 1663. See ASV, Miscellanea, Armadio VII, vol. 60, fols. 331r-351v.
195 LL, 230.
196 Ibid., 153, 173, 176, 180, 194.
197 Millett, The Irish Franciscans, 63.
198 Ibid., 63, 319-320, 546.
199 Ibid., 63.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Porter</td>
<td>c.1631-32, Kingstown Meath</td>
<td>LEI</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>LJ in 1678 and in 1684; PL and TL in 1664 and in 1668; G of Saint Isidore’s in 1674; historian to the exiled Stuart court in Rome in 1690; author of seven works</td>
<td>1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gallagher</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ULS</td>
<td>A in 1664</td>
<td>1662</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

201 *LL*, 127, 186, 191, 287.
204 Fennessy, “A Selected Prosopography,” 342; *LL*, 143.
205 Fennessy, “A Selected Prosopography,” 342.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Date of defence of thesis</th>
<th>Subsequent activity</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Dunleavy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>SD in 1665</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

207 *LL*, 149.
208 Ibid., 151.
Appendix Three
Provincial origin of the Irish College's students

YEARS 1628 - 1635

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connacht</th>
<th>Leinster</th>
<th>Munster</th>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 1636 - 1643

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connacht</th>
<th>Leinster</th>
<th>Munster</th>
<th>Ulster</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### YEARS 1660 - 1664

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>N. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connacht</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinster</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### YEARS 1644 - 1659

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>N. Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connacht</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinster</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Four
Provincial origin of the Saint Isidore's students

YEARS 1625 - 1635

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connacht</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinster</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEARS 1636 - 1643

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connacht</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leinster</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munster</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulster</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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