

THE LATER LIFE AND WRITINGS OF JOSEPH CRESWELL, S.J. (1556-1623)

by A. F. ALLISON

Until comparatively recently there existed no biography of Joseph Creswell that did justice to the important part he played in the English Counter-Reformation or even described with accuracy the events of his strenuous and crowded life. This defect has been largely remedied in the last fifteen years by the work of Fr Albert Loomie, S.J., who devoted a chapter to Creswell in his book *The Spanish Elizabethans* (1963), and has since contributed several monographs on him to learned periodicals, the most substantial being an impressive piece of documentary research entitled 'Guy Fawkes in Spain' (*Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, Special Supplement no. 9). Taken together these studies supersede the sketchy and inaccurate accounts of Creswell given by earlier writers even though they do not cover the whole of his life with equal thoroughness.

Fr Loomie gives most of his attention to what was undoubtedly the crowning achievement of Creswell's career: the organization and administration of the English mission in Spain after the departure of Fr Persons in 1597. For sixteen years he strove successfully, in spite of crippling poverty and fierce political opposition, to maintain the English seminaries at Valladolid and Seville, and before he finally left Spain in 1613 had almost completed the negotiations leading to the establishment of the seminary at Madrid. Fr Loomie's work on Creswell's activities in Spain, based on careful research in Spanish and other archives, is unlikely to be superseded for a long time, if at all. About Creswell's later life, however, he tells us very little. After leaving Spain Creswell was sent by his superiors to Flanders where he remained until his death in February 1623. It would be a mistake to think of these last years of his life as a period of retirement devoted to mainly spiritual duties. A number of documents have survived, including some of his own letters, that show that he continued to play an active part in the direction of the English mission right up to the time of his death. As administrator, as politician, as propagandist for the Catholic cause, he was no less active in Flanders than he had been in Spain. The purpose of the present article is to put together the scattered information available concerning this period of his life. I shall take as a starting point his departure from Spain in November 1613.

1. RECALL TO ROME, 1613

In ch. 6 of *The Spanish Elizabethans* Fr Loomie describes the political events leading to the Jesuit General Acquaviva's decision to remove Creswell from Spain. The English government, determined to frustrate Creswell's attempt to found an English seminary at Madrid, had

persistently, through its ambassador, spread reports about him calculated to undermine Philip III's confidence in him. A powerful faction at the Spanish court, led by Philip's favourite, the Duke of Lerma, was also opposed to the project and did its utmost to wreck it. It seems that Lerma distrusted the English Catholic exiles, considering them capable of double-dealing whenever it suited them. Though Creswell never entirely lost Philip's confidence, the accusations of disloyalty and misbehaviour levelled against him by his enemies made his position extremely difficult, and after much hesitation Acquaviva decided in the late summer of 1613 that it would be best to remove him from Spain. He instructed him to go to Flanders but allowed him time, if he needed it, to clear his good name before leaving.

It is possible to add a little to Fr Loomie's account of the causes of Creswell's removal. Lerma's hostility was probably not entirely due to suspicion of the motives of the English exiles fostered by James I's propaganda. Creswell had been a friend of the German Jesuit, Richard Haller,¹ confessor to Philip III's queen, Margaret of Austria. Haller had been at the centre of the opposition to Lerma that formed itself round the person of the Queen, and though both Haller and Margaret were now dead it was probably Creswell's former association with the German Jesuit that lay at the root of Lerma's enmity. Another important issue in the affair was Creswell's quarrel with the Spanish Jesuits. Much of the difficulty he experienced in directing the English mission from Spanish soil was caused by the local Provincials. A statement of the Spanish Jesuits' case drawn up in 1613, complained that although the General had ruled that the English seminaries should have Spanish Rectors, he had placed overall control of them in the hands of the English Vice-Prefect of the mission who was not answerable to the Spanish Provincials, and in consequence neither the Provincials nor the Rectors could take any important decision concerning the administration of the seminaries without the Vice-Prefect's consent.² Creswell was not the most compliant of men. Quarrels ensued, adverse reports on his behaviour were sent to Rome, he replied to the charges. Up to the middle of 1613 the General took no decisive action, but at that point, according to a defence of himself that Creswell compiled at Rome early in 1615,³ events took a dramatic turn. Certain of the Spanish Jesuits, he said, and in particular Fr Hernando Lucero, Provincial of Toledo, finding that they were making little headway on their own, entered into collusion with Lerma's faction at court in order to have him removed from Spain. Lucero, he said, acting through Fr Nicolas Almazán, Assistant at Rome for the Spanish provinces, accused him to the General not only of mishandling the administration of the English seminaries but also of political offences. It was then that the General decided, for the sake of peace, to remove Creswell from Spain and send him to Flanders, while allowing him time to clear his good name in Spain before his departure. Unfortunately for Creswell, in the autumn of 1613 Acquaviva was taken ill and for a time overall authority over the Spanish provinces lay with Almazán, who decided to recall Creswell to Rome to face an enquiry. King Philip

and other patrons and friends were unwilling that he should go, but he was bound by religious obedience. The King appears to have been genuinely distressed at the prospect of losing him: in a last gesture of affection he gave orders that all his needs for the journey should be paid for out of the public purse.

Creswell's defence of his management of the seminaries does not directly concern us here, but it is important to see his account of the attack on him by the Spanish Jesuits against the background of the general history of the order at this period. Whatever the merits of this particular case, Creswell seems to have been a pawn in a much wider struggle concerning two closely related issues: the rights of Provincials in relation to the authority of the General, and the desire of the Spanish provinces to regain their dominating influence within the order which had suffered when the Italian, Claudio Acquaviva, was elected General in 1581. On Acquaviva's death in 1615, the Spanish Jesuits appear to have gone to extreme lengths to prevent the election of another Italian, employing methods not dissimilar to those used against Creswell.⁴ When the seventh General Congregation elected the Italian, Mutio Vitelleschi, by thirty-nine votes to thirty-six, the Spaniards led a powerful lobby within the Congregation to limit the General's power to superimpose on the Provinces missionary structures directly dependent on himself. We shall return to this later.

Creswell set out on horseback on or about 25 November 1613, taking the road to Barcelona via Alcalá and Zaragoza. From Alcalá he sent Philip in MS. a long account of the relations between English Catholics and Spain since the beginning of Queen Mary's reign, which he had intended to give to Gondomar.⁵ On the way to Barcelona he composed in Spanish a small book of meditations on the rosary, which he had printed when he reached Barcelona. He sent copies of this to King Philip and his two brothers in memory of his last meeting with them at Madrid when he took his leave. No copy of this little book has so far been found⁶ but an English translation of it was printed at the College press, St Omer, six years later. The English version, headed 'Pious meditations upon the beades', forms part of a small collection of spiritual writings which takes its title from the first item in it, St Francis Borgia's *The practise of christian workes*, printed at the College press in 1620.⁷ At that time Creswell was himself living at the College. Discovering to his amazement, as the book was going through the press, that the meditations he had composed in Spanish for a purely private intention six years before had been translated without his knowledge and were now about to appear in print in English, he annexed a prefatory note:

These considerations or points of meditation were conceived and written in Spanish in the year 1613 for entertainment of the way between Madrid and Barcelona, and there printed, and from thence sent to Don Philip, Prince of Spain, and to his two brethren Charles and Ferdinand, for tokens in respect that the Author, when he took his last leave, left them saying their beads all three together, and coming after by some accident into England and there translated by a devout person were sent to be printed in Flanders and by

chance brought to be viewed, before the printing, by the same person that wrote them in Spanish six years before, he little thinking then that they were to be published in any other language, which he had written for private devotion of those princes. But by the success it seemeth that God of his holy providence would have something written for the instruction of such as shall read them where the use of the beads is not known to all. And in this conformity he addeth these few lines with desire that devotion be increased in the faithful people and God Almighty glorified. . . .

He appears to have remained at Barcelona for the rest of the winter, much to the annoyance of his superiors at Rome. He later excused this delay on the grounds that it was now midwinter and his health was poor.⁸ While at Barcelona he prepared for the press a work in Spanish that he had evidently begun some time previously: a devotional treatise based on a celebrated course of retreats directed by Fr William Bathe, S.J., the Rector of the Irish College at Salamanca. So efficacious had Bathe's course been in converting the worldly and the indifferent that Richard Haller, the Queen's Jesuit confessor with whom Creswell was on friendly terms, had encouraged Creswell to publish in Spanish the *schema* of the course together with notices of some of the persons whose lives had been changed by it. The title of Creswell's work, which he published under the pseudonym Pedro Manrique, is *Aparejos para administrar el sacramento de la penitencia*.⁹ The story of how it came to be written is told by Daniel Frolich in his dedicatory epistle to a Latin translation, entitled *Sacra Tempe*, published at Ingolstadt in 1622:

The booklet was first written in Spain and then published in Milan; it was then issued in an Italian translation at Bologna and now deservedly sees the light in Germany because the first person who encouraged the writing of the booklet was a German. For Fr Richard Haller, S.J., once President of our Congregation and Rector of the College at Ingolstadt, who had a great reputation for virtue and wisdom and was a most distinguished administrator, when he saw so many benefits accruing to Spanish youth and nobility through the work of Fr William Bathe, an Irishman with a reputation for sanctity celebrated among the Spaniards, conceived the plan that Dr Pedro Manrique should take upon himself the task of putting down in writing and publishing whatever outstanding examples of a changed life he might see or hear about, with, in addition, the whole retreat course that Fr Bathe had used. . . .¹⁰

Frolich evidently did not know that Pedro Manrique was really Creswell. The authority for the identification is Alegambe.¹¹ Creswell wrote the preface to the book before leaving Spain: it is dated Barcelona, 25 January 1614. At the end of the winter he went to Milan, no doubt taking the sea route as far as Genoa. His main reason for making this detour was probably to consult his old and close friend, Cardinal Federico Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, before going to Rome to face his accusers. While at Milan he had the *Aparejos* printed by the court printer, possibly at the Cardinal's expense. The last section of the book is dated from Milan, 20 April 1614.

The date of Creswell's arrival at Rome is not known but it was probably some time in the spring or early summer of 1614. Acquaviva then

instituted a process in which all parties to the dispute over Creswell's conduct in Spain could be heard. Creswell began to prepare a detailed defence¹² in which he explained his management of the seminaries, answered the accusations made against him and revealed the tactics employed by his enemies to get rid of him. The matter was still *sub judice* when, in January 1615, Acquaviva died. Creswell submitted his defence to the Vicar-General, Fr Ferdinand Alberus, Assistant for Germany, who decided to discontinue the case and to exonerate him. Meanwhile Creswell had been busy with other affairs. He had been negotiating with Madrid over the institution of the English seminary which had not yet been finally approved, and he had been preparing, with Fr Thomas Owen (who had succeeded Fr Persons as Prefect, at Rome, of the Jesuit mission to England), for the new task for which Acquaviva had designated him when he first instructed him to leave Spain: the direction of the affairs of the mission in Flanders. There is a reference to Creswell's activities in this connection in a letter of 14 September 1614¹³ from Matthew Kellison, President of the English College at Douai, to Thomas More, the Agent at Rome of the English secular clergy, in which Kellison speaks of a conference between More, Owen and Creswell to discuss disagreements between the Jesuits and the secular clergy over the handling of the mission in general. As far as we know, this conference came to nothing. It was during these months at Rome that Creswell must have cultivated a friendship that was to stand him in great stead in the years to come: that of Pope Paul V's Secretary of State, Cardinal Scipio Borghese. It is clear from Borghese's correspondence that he came to have a quite exceptional regard and affection for Creswell, though he was not blind to his failings. To four successive nuncios at Brussels he wrote letters of commendation for him that went well beyond the requirements of normal diplomatic protocol. In one of them (to Lucio Sanseverino, dated 19 October 1619) he describes Creswell as a man 'of great zeal and my dear friend (*mio amorevole*)'¹⁴; in another (to Lucio Morra, dated 16 March 1616) he tempers his praise of Creswell with a gentle word of caution: 'I hold him a priest of great zeal and I shall be pleased if you will receive him and listen to him freely, but this does not prevent my saying to you that he is considered to be rather ardent (*un poco ardente*), as you will best discover in dealing with him; but nothing more is required than that I should simply commend this to your prudence'.¹⁵ From the moment when Creswell arrived in Flanders until the beginning of 1621, when Borghese ceased to be Secretary of State, there was constant communication between them, both directly by personal letter and indirectly through the nuncio. Writing (on 25 April 1621) to congratulate Pope Gregory XV on his election, Creswell would refer to Borghese as 'one to whom I am well known and through whom I received many benefits from your predecessor of blessed memory, Paul V'.¹⁶

After his exoneration by the Jesuit Vicar-General, Creswell lost little time in taking up his duties in Flanders. He left Rome in February taking with him a papal brief obtained for him by Borghese in which Paul V recommended him to the Archduke at Brussels. Borghese himself

LATER LIFE OF JOSEPH CRESWELL

wrote him letters of commendation to the nuncios at Brussels, Cologne (because the nuncio there had jurisdiction over Liège) and Paris (where Creswell was planning to make a visit).¹⁷

2. VICE-PREFECT IN FLANDERS, 1615-19

When Creswell went to Flanders, the Jesuit mission to England had not yet been constituted a Province or Vice-Province of the Society, but enjoyed nevertheless semi-autonomous status and had its own chain of command which depended directly on the General at Rome. Its organization was based on recommendations made by Fr Persons in 1596 and it was governed by rules laid down by the General, Claudio Acquaviva, in 1598.¹⁸ At its head, coming directly under the General, was the Prefect of the Mission who was stationed at Rome and combined his office with that of the rectorship of the English College. In 1612, two years after the death of Fr Persons, Fr Thomas Owen succeeded to this position which he occupied until his death in 1618. Responsible to the Prefect were two Vice-Prefects, one in Flanders and the other in Spain. In April 1615, Fr John Blackfan, who had been Vice-Prefect in Flanders for the previous three years, went to Spain to become Rector of the seminary at Valladolid, and Creswell succeeded him in the Vice-Prefecture of Flanders, a post that he retained until 1619 when the mission was reformed as a Vice-Province of the Society under the command of Fr Richard Blount. Creswell's old position as Vice-Prefect in Spain was occupied by Fr Anthony Hoskins until his death in 1615 and after that by Fr Michael Walpole. In addition to the two Vice-Prefects, there was a Superior in England.

At this period there were three English Jesuit establishments in Flanders.¹⁹ The largest, the college at St Omer in the southern province of Artois, was a school for English Catholic boys that also fulfilled the function of a junior seminary. On completing his course at the college, a boy proceeding to the priesthood with the intention of working on the English mission would be sent to one of the English seminaries under Jesuit direction at Rome or in Spain, and if he wanted to join the Society and was accepted, would afterwards go to the English novitiate at Liège. The College also served in some degree as a school of English Jesuit writers with its own printing press for the publications of works of controversy or instruction for the mission. At Louvain, occupying a building originally acquired for the novitiate, was the scholasticate, consisting of older Jesuit students preparing their philosophy and theology. When Creswell arrived in Flanders, the novitiate, which up till then had been at Louvain, was in course of moving to Liège. Although a house had long been designated for it at Watten, five miles from St Omer, all attempts to move the novices there had been frustrated by the English government, which had put pressure on the over-timid Archduke Albert to withhold his consent. The Jesuits had found a temporary solution to the problem

by acquiring property at Liège which lay outside the Archduke's dominions. The novitiate was to remain there until after Albert's death, which occurred in 1621. In 1623, it finally moved to Watten and, at the same time, the scholasticate was transferred in part to Liège from Louvain. In 1620, there was added a fourth establishment to the three just mentioned: a house of tertians where, after a number of years in the Society, the fathers did their third and final year of noviceship before taking their solemn vows. Before 1620, the English fathers did their tertianship in the novitiate at Liège.²⁰

It will perhaps be useful at this point to provide a brief sketch of Creswell's movements, as far as they can be determined, throughout the eight years that he spent in Flanders up to the time of his death. He left Rome soon after 7 February 1615. No details of his journey appear to have survived. After his arrival he spent several months between Louvain and Liège overseeing the move of the novitiate. In late June he left Flanders for a few weeks to go to Paris, for reasons that we shall discuss later. He was back at Liège sometime before 25 August when he wrote from there to Cardinal Borromeo at Milan saying that the new novitiate was now open.²¹ By the end of the month he was at Brussels for on 30 August William Trumbull, King James's Agent at the court of the Archduke, reported to England: 'Creswell the Jesuit hath been two or three months at Louvain and Liège but is now here. Some say the affronts done him in Spain hath made him humble'.²² By 20 January 1616, when he wrote 'Relacion de la mision de Inglaterra' (see p. 87), he had settled at the College at St Omer. In June 1616, Fr Thomas Fitzherbert²³ arrived at Brussels from Rome, with several companions, to take over some of the duties of the Vice-Prefecture, and seems to have set up a permanent office in the capital. The exact division of functions is not clear but the documents that have survived show that Creswell both retained the title of Vice-Prefect and continued to carry out some of the more important tasks. Fitzherbert remained at Brussels until the end of 1618, when he returned to Rome to become Prefect of the Mission and Rector of the English College on the death of Thomas Owen. Creswell stayed at St Omer until about the middle of 1618, when he went back to the novitiate at Liège for several months: all the minutes of letters to him recorded in the General's letter-book between 30 June 1618 and 27 April 1619 are addressed to Liège. His movements in the early months of 1619, however, are difficult to plot with any certainty for we find references in other sources to his being from time to time at Louvain and Brussels, and also back at St Omer and Watten. In April 1619, Trumbull reported from Brussels that Creswell was preparing to cross over to England, apparently to meet Gondomar whose return to London was expected; but nothing seems to have come of this, presumably because Gondomar's return was deferred until the following year. Creswell's duties as Vice-Prefect ceased in the autumn of 1619 when the mission was re-formed as a Vice-Province of the Society under Fr Richard Blount. From August 1619 until September 1620, the extant correspondence shows that he was again living in the college at St Omer. In September 1620, he was made

Rector of Watten, at this period simply a residence but destined to accommodate the novitiate when it moved there from Liège in 1623. He remained at Watten until about the beginning of November 1622²⁴ when he went to Ghent to take up his appointment as Master of Tertians at the new foundation. He died at Ghent on 19 February 1623.²⁵

Creswell's duties as Vice-Prefect covered three main areas: personnel, finance, relations with local superiors. Our chief source of information about his responsibility for personnel is a series of letters written to him from Rome by his superior, Thomas Owen. Eight letters are extant, dating from October 1615 to July 1618.²⁶ They show that he was responsible for such matters as finding suitable priests to fill administrative posts in Flanders and Spain; removing from office those who had proved unsuitable or were too old; dealing with complaints; admonishing the wayward; and dismissing the recalcitrant. Above all, he was concerned with the enormous practical problems of moving men from one place to another between Flanders, Rome, Spain and England, providing for their maintenance and, as far as lay in his power, their safety. As these letters were unknown to Foley when he compiled his *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus* it is perhaps appropriate to cite one or two extracts that not only illustrate the nature of Creswell's duties but also supply hitherto undiscovered data about some of the men who were working with him. For example, very little is known about the early career of Fr Michael Freeman, who later rose to high office in the Society. From Owen's letters we learn that in 1616 Freeman was at Brussels in charge of the accounts of the mission. When Creswell moved to St Omer in that year he wanted Freeman to join him there but Owen insisted 'that it is not convenient that he depart from Brussels till another be placed in his room and until he hath yielded up to him all his books of account there'. In fact, as we learn from another letter by Owen, Freeman did join Creswell at St Omer when Fitzherbert arrived at Brussels in June and Fr Alexander Baker took over the accounts. Baker, about whose career very little is known, was evidently held in high esteem by his superiors, for Owen recommended that he should be sent to Seville as Minister or Prefect of Studies if a substitute could be found for him at Brussels: 'There is great need of some English father for Minister or Prefect of Studies at Seville, I see not whom we have fit but only Fa: Baker. If you can find a coadjutor for F: Fitzherbert to help him to write and to keep accounts'. But Fr Baker was not sent to Seville. Two years later it seems that Creswell wanted to put Fr John Curtis in his place at Brussels, but Owen wrote (14 July 1618): 'Fa: Baker cannot be changed with Fa: Curtis or any other without the knowledge of the Pope and the Cardinals of the Inquisition', and he advised Creswell to send Fr Richard Gibbons to Seville. We do not know why Baker could not be moved without the Pope's knowledge. Of Ven. Brian Cansfield (here referred to by his alias of Christopher Benson) we learn from Owen that he was in Spain in 1616 and that he left the country in that year to make his way to England via Flanders. Creswell was to make the necessary arrangements for his crossing to England: 'Fa: Christopher Benson I understand is departed

from Malaga in Spain to Flanders; I pray you, as soon as he arriveth set him forward in his journey towards England without expecting any other letters from thence or hence.' Examples could be multiplied. On 21 May 1616, Owen wrote that Fr Peralta, the Spanish Rector of the English seminary at Seville, 'expecteth ten alumni from you, amongst the which he demandeth that Fr Francis Hargrove's brother be one; wherein I pray you satisfy his demand; he demandeth also to have some musicians'. In the same letter Owen told Creswell that Fr George Bamfield was coming to Flanders from Spain, with the intention of proceeding to England: '... but first he must recollect himself in the noviciate, for as Fa: Blackfan [the Rector of Valladolid] writeth he hath some need of it ... and so Fa: Tomson [John Gerard, Rector of the Noviciate at Liège] is to be advertised thereof. And by that recollection I do not only mean the spiritual Exercises but a month or two of the common practice as part of a third year'. Finally, mention may be made of an incident concerning discipline that is of particular interest because it illustrates the ever-present danger to the Society of being too lenient with offenders. In 1616, Owen wrote about a student named Anthony Pole (or Poole), who had joined the Society in 1614, been sent from Seville to Flanders by Fr Anthony Hoskins, in spite of bad reports on his character, and treated with kindness by Fr John Gerard at Liège, in spite of further adverse reports. Owen wrote sternly to Creswell: 'Antony Poole sent down to Flanders by Fa: Antony Hoskins to be a coadjutor although imprudently, yet since, although it may be more imprudently, through the affection of Fa: Tomson [Gerard] towards him, hath been thought fit to be a scholar although all others from whence he came did then write the contrary to me, and now after some proof made of him, it is confirmed again, that he is not fit for at least in that degree. I pray you look to it, that no man's affection hinder our mission herein'. Foley tells us nothing of this and practically nothing about Pole's later career. Events were to prove Owen right. Pole was dismissed from the Society in about 1623, functioned for a time as a secular priest in England under the alias of Antony Smith, lived scandalously and repaid Fr Gerard's mistaken kindness by spreading false tales about him in connection with the Gunpowder Plot.²⁷

Owen's letters tell us little about the finances of the houses in Flanders but several other documents have survived that help to fill out the picture. These show that as soon as Creswell settled at St Omer at the beginning of 1616 he plunged into an energetic campaign to raise funds. The college at St Omer was then deep in debt and the other houses were also desperately in need of money. He immediately compiled a report describing the functions and importance of the three houses and stating the sources and amount of their income. Written in Spanish and headed 'Relacion de la mision de Inglaterra', it was intended as an appeal for alms to wealthy friends in Spain.²⁸ It is dated from St Omer, 20 January 1616, and begins: 'I have here under my care (among other things) three houses or communities, all over-full. . . . ' These, he continues, are the scholasticate at Louvain, the novitiate at Liège and the college at St Omer. Of Louvain he says that it is the theological training-ground for

priests destined for England and it also has on its strength learned priests who by their writings confute the works of the heretics. The scholasticate occupies rented accommodation. It was founded by a gentleman (Thomas Sackville, son of the Earl of Dorset)²⁹ who gave 40,000 escudos to be invested for its upkeep, but the dividends from the investment are not sufficient to support all the community and help is badly needed. Of Liège Creswell says that it is here that the future missionary is schooled in mortification and virtue in preparation for a calling in which he will have to face hardship, suffering and perhaps even death. For the upkeep of the novitiate money was bequeathed by Doña Luisa de Carvajal,³⁰ and the income from this, after certain other commitments specified in her will have been met, amounts to 6,000 escudos a year. To this Bishop Blaise of St Omer adds 8,000 escudos a year from rents on the property at Watten. The house at Watten, which the Bishop has made over to the Jesuits, is large and has a church attached to it and would be worth double the rents received if they could only occupy it, but they are prevented from doing so by King James who continues to put pressure on the Archduke. At Liège, an imperial city governed by the Elector of Cologne, they have acquired property on which they are building a new house at a cost of 8,000 escudos, but over and above the cost of building there is the maintenance of the novices which at present cannot be fully met, and so postulants are being turned away. St Omer Creswell describes as essentially the school where those who proceed to the seminaries at Rome or in Spain do their preliminary studies. King Philip II of Spain gave money for its foundation in 1593 to counter Queen Elizabeth's proposed legislation to remove Catholic children in England from their parents so that they might be brought up in heresy.³¹ The college is only one day's journey from England and has become, he says, a principal refuge for English Catholics fleeing from persecution; and for this reason the house had had to be enlarged so that it can serve as a hospice. On his arrival here he has found the house in debt to the sum of 20,000 escudos and sheltering seventy persons more than it can maintain. English Catholics, robbed of their possessions by successive penal enactments, can no longer afford to support the College; in any case, a new law passed last year has blocked the supply of certain funds that it used to receive from England, and the community has now been forced to try to obtain a mortgage to supplement the small income that it has for its ordinary sustenance.³² He then speaks of other expenses that have to be met out of the revenues of St Omer: supporting priests who have been sent into exile from England, providing accommodation for priests on their way to England from Rome and Spain, paying for the embarkation of those crossing to England, together with all the other expenses of their journey, including elaborate security precautions, publishing Catholic books for the mission. He concludes with a moving appeal: we trust in God, he says, to give us the means to further his work, but at the same time we do not neglect 'to make known the necessity to persons whom we may reasonably consider abler and more disposed to respond to such occasions, so that we may not seem to be trying to force God to work

miracles. Whosoever heeds us, we shall understand that he does so moved by God, and whosoever does not, we shall understand that he does not because the Lord has other good works for him to do, for the world is governed by his providence, without which there falls not a single leaf from a tree'.³³

Creswell's next step was to move Bishop Blaise³⁴ of St Omer to write a personal letter to King Philip III commending the college and its work. The Bishop's letter, dated 3 February 1616,³⁵ begins by telling the King that Creswell, who has come to live at St Omer, has said that Philip would be interested to have news about the seminary which his father founded and which Philip himself is continuing to support. The Bishop gives a glowing account of the state of piety and studies at the college and then speaks of the difficulties the Jesuits are encountering over their novitiate because of King James's interference. He adds a deft touch, calculated to rouse Philip's deepest feelings, by pointing out that the ambassador (Edmondes) who originally put pressure on the Archduke at James's behest to prevent the establishment of the novitiate at Watten, on the grounds that the English Catholics were disloyal subjects, has since been busy in France stirring up the Huguenots against their rightful sovereign.³⁶ There will be no peace in Christendom, he says, so long as James continues to behave in this way. The Bishop avoids making any overt appeal for additional alms, but the intent of the letter is perfectly clear.

Just over a week later, on 12 February 1616, Creswell wrote from St Omer on the same subject to an unidentified correspondent,³⁷ who, it appears, had urged him to go to Spain in person to seek alms. This, Creswell says, is not possible at present. Speaking of friends who may be able to help him, Creswell refers in this letter to Antonio Zapata, formerly Bishop of Cadiz and later successively Bishop of Pamplona and Archbishop of Burgos, whom he knew in Spain and considered one of the most capable and energetic prelates in the country. Zapata always promised him that he would be ready to help the English mission in every way he could and wherever he might be. He is now living at Rome and will do what he can, and he has many friends in Spain who will help. It seems hardly fair, Creswell says, that Spain should be asked to shoulder the whole burden like this, but the English Catholics have been so stripped of their wealth by the penal laws that they can no longer give much financial support. Little can be expected from Flanders. There are some prelates and princes at Rome and elsewhere in Italy who might be asked to help. He concludes with a eulogy of the college at St Omer and the work it is doing for the faith. Some of the leading personages of Flanders are so impressed by the English students, he says, that they would like to send their own sons to be educated there, but 'if the gate were opened wider it would make control more difficult, and it would not be well to mix with our students those who have not the same intentions and who have not passed through the persecution that mortifies human passions'.³⁸ On 2 March 1616, in a letter to Cardinal Borromeo,³⁹ Creswell adds a few further details about the state of the finances at St Omer. He refers to the recent generosity of Thomas Sackville towards the Society in

supporting the scholasticate at Louvain and then mentions that the Bishop of St Omer has written to the King of Spain in the hope of obtaining further help for the college there. The King, he says, already provides an annual subsidy of 4,000 escudos,⁴⁰ and to this the Archduke at Brussels adds another 2,000 escudos, but the expenses to be met amount to 13,000 or 14,000 escudos annually and Creswell has made all the economies he possibly can.

With all these appeals for alms went stringent reductions in expenditure at all the houses. At St Omer, on the General's instructions, building was temporarily halted and no further students were accepted whose maintenance had to be borne in whole or in part by the college itself.⁴¹ At Liège, work on the new building was slowed down and a firm rein applied to the admission of novices. Owen wrote to Creswell on 14 July 1618: 'And because our noviceship is behindhand, we must be very hard in receiving any other than choice subjects and . . . very free in dismissing out of the noviceship whom we find unfit'.⁴² About the response to Creswell's appeals for alms we have no information, but his efforts presumably met with some success, for the mission continued to flourish and the numbers of students and of vocations to increase. On 25 September 1617, he could write to Borghese from Brussels: 'by the grace of God the houses of the Society that we have here for the English are flourishing in all piety and good letters: likewise the seminary of St Omer'.⁴³ If the publication of books by the College press, which, as Creswell pointed out, was one of the charges on the College funds, may be taken as a barometer of its solvency, we may note that the output remained at a steady average of some six to eight editions a year between 1616 and 1620 and then took a sharp upward turn during the period when the Anglo-Spanish marriage negotiations led to a temporary relaxation of the penal laws in England.⁴⁴

The third area for which Creswell was responsible, the relationship between the English Jesuits and the superiors of the two Belgian provinces, figures prominently in Owen's letters. As we have seen, Creswell had been removed from Spain partly because of the hostility of the Spanish Provincials who resented the semi-autonomous status of the English mission. After the death of Acquaviva, in January 1615, there was increasing pressure within the Society to have the constitutions which he had approved for the mission annulled and the existing English houses on foreign soil closed down. The intention, it seems, was to bring all missions under the direction of a special Assistant to the General who would carry out the necessary operations through the Provincials in whose territories they were organized. Thus, in the case of England, effective control of the mission would pass into the hands of the Spanish and Belgian Provincials, who would be answerable only to the Assistant at Rome. The matter came to a head in the seventh General Congregation of the Society which sat from 5 November 1615 to 26 January 1616. Owen informed Creswell of the situation in a letter written on 21 May 1616:

I do now understand for certain . . . that in the General Congregation there hath been great dealing against our mission, not by name in particular, but

in general against all great missions, but so that it may manifestly appear that under the name of great missions in general was intended chiefly our mission in particular, by those which chiefly concurred to the procuring of a decree by the which it is recommended to Father General, that hereafter all great missions shall be under an Assistant, and that they shall have no colleges nor noviceships of their own.⁴⁵

The new General, Mutio Vitelleschi, elected in the same Congregation on 15 November 1615, had rejected this demand and decided that the English mission should continue to be organized and governed in the manner laid down by his predecessor. It was essential, Owen said, if disaster were to be avoided, that the English superiors should obey the General's instructions to the letter. Local Provincials had certain rights, which the General had clearly defined, in relation to the English houses on their territory, and these must be respected. On the other hand, we must 'do nothing nor permit anything to be done contrary to our privileges and orders' and must avoid the mistake of asking the Provincials to do things that are ours by right, for they will use this as a precedent. The English superiors must at all times exercise firm discipline in their houses and give no just grounds for complaint to the Provincials: there must be no disturbances or scandals.

A point on which Owen lays great emphasis is the need for tact in dealing with the Provincials: 'We must behave ourselves humbly and modestly, and be diligent and careful to defer unto them all that is due according to our orders and to challenge nothing to ourselves *actu signato* but only *actu exercito*'. It is very important that we should not annoy the Provincials by seeming to disregard them. In a letter of 7 May 1616, Owen congratulates Creswell on having discussed with Jean Herrenius, Provincial of the Gallo-Belgic Province, his plans for making improvements at the college at St Omer. Creswell's tact appears to have impressed Herrenius, for on 30 July 1616 Owen wrote again to Creswell telling him that he had received a letter from the Provincial saying: 'Fr Joseph Creswell has been working in the seminary at St Omer; he is ordering many things or rather he is more often having the things that I have ordered put into execution'. Nevertheless, serious friction existed, and Owen's letters contain many references to it. On 2 July 1616, he wrote about difficulties Creswell had experienced with Herrenius about economizing on the entertainment of guests at Watten:

When Father General reads in your letters how the Provincial first omitted to forbid the charges of receiving strangers in Watten and afterward forbid it, but in such terms that all the envy thereof fell upon you, I told him that in the same manner for the time past, all the envy was cast upon me, and therefore his Paternity might judge how that seminary now could stand if there were no Prefect nor Vice-Prefect to procure all kind of remedy and means to help it; and the Provincials that with all our importunity do fail to assist, what would they do, if the matter were wholly in their hands. He answered it was most manifest that the mission could not stand but in the same manner as now already it is settled.

Another subject of dispute with Herrenius was the proposed sale of a piece of land (known as Holke) attached to the property at Watten. As this particular land was unprofitable to them (apparently because of quit-rents imposed on it) the English Jesuits had decided, with the consent of Bishop Blaise of St Omer who had given it to them, to put it up for sale. The late General Acquaviva had given his permission subject to certain conditions which had been met, and since Acquaviva's death the Vicar-General, Fr Alberus, had urged that the sale should go ahead, but Herrenius, according to Owen, had blocked the proceedings for reasons of his own. Creswell must make himself acquainted with the history of the whole business and take it up with the Rector of St Omer, Fr Schondonck. In a letter of 30 July 1616, Owen writes in extremely forceful terms about it, saying that he is collecting examples of this kind to 'make it so known to Father General and these his Assistants, how the Provincials would use us if we should wholly depend of them, that hereafter we may the better defend ourselves'.

There was also trouble during Creswell's tenure of office with the Provincial of the Flandro-Belgic province, Fr Charles Scribani, in whose territory Louvain and Liège were situated. In 1617, the Provincial tried to force Fr Henry Silisdon, the Rector of Louvain, to reveal information about persons who might be connected with the publication of *Corona Regia*, a work attacking King James printed at Louvain in 1615.⁴⁶ As far as is known, the English Jesuits had nothing to do with this work. The General, Vitelleschi, was informed about the Provincial's action and appears to have been satisfied that Silisdon himself had no connection with the publication. Vitelleschi also expressed the opinion, according to Owen, that Scribani ought not to have pressed Silisdon to reveal information about others. The next year, the Provincial instituted a visitation of the house at Louvain, and Owen's letters reveal that Creswell had informed him that the Visitor was showing marked hostility towards the English fathers. This may have been another reflection of the trouble caused by *Corona regia*, for King James was still applying strong diplomatic pressure at Brussels to have the circumstances of its publication investigated and the author discovered and brought to book. It seems that the General was convinced of the innocence of the English and told Owen to pass on a word of comfort to them. On 23 June 1618, Owen wrote to Creswell: 'Father General bid me comfort all our fathers that he [the Visitor] is to end in August'.

3. THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE—I. FRANCE AND ENGLAND

One of Creswell's first actions when he settled at St Omer at the beginning of 1616 was to see through the press an English translation of a speech made by Cardinal Du Perron at the assembly of the Estates General at Paris the year before. The translation, with a long introduction by the translator, was published by the College press some time before the end

of April 1616 under the title: *An oration made on the part of the lords spirituall, in the chamber of the third estate . . . vpon the oath (pretended of allegiance) exhibited in the late generall assembly*.⁴⁷ The translator may have been Creswell himself, though we have no proof of this. The reason for publishing the speech in English was that it had an important bearing on the Oath of Allegiance in England which the government was making the principal instrument of its campaign to break Catholic resistance. The English Oath required the subject to reject as 'heretical and damnable' the theory that either Pope or commonwealth could in any circumstances depose the king. In spite of papal condemnation of the oath, the government had been aided in its campaign by the Benedictine priest, Thomas Preston,⁴⁸ who had publicly maintained that Catholics could take it with a clear conscience. Preston, who used the alias Roger Widdrington, was technically a prisoner for the faith in government hands, but he enjoyed many privileges and published his numerous books at government expense. One of the main planks of his argument was that the traditional Catholic teaching on the deposing power of Pope and commonwealth was theologically only a 'probable' opinion rejected by a number of reputable theologians, especially in France. From this it was but a short step to argue that, if the Roman position was not *de fide*, the king's subjects were at liberty to state their sincere belief that it was wrong. It was being openly claimed in England that, if the King of France required such an oath of his subjects, the French church would not object. Du Perron's speech put the French position in its true perspective. At the assembly of the Estates General which opened in October 1614, the Third Estate had proposed, with strong backing from the Parlement of Paris, an oath of allegiance very similar to the English Oath, condemning as utterly false the theory of the deposing power and claiming that the King of France and the Church of France owed their authority to God alone. The First Estate (Clergy) rejected the article containing the proposed oath and invited Cardinal Du Perron to plead against it in the other two estates. The Second Estate (Nobility), after hearing him, also rejected it. With a majority of two chambers to one, there was now no danger that it would become law, but Du Perron decided nevertheless to plead before the Third Estate in order to scotch the evil at its source. He made his plea on 2 January 1615.

The gist of Du Perron's argument⁴⁹ was that the proposed oath denied the fundamental principle that only the universal Church could define doctrine, and the universal Church had never pronounced on the question of the power of the Pope in temporal matters. The contrary opinion to that enshrined in the article had once been held in all or most parts of the Church and was still held in many parts of it, including Rome. The Church of France, therefore, had no right to declare it wrong: indeed, to do so would be not only unjustifiable but ridiculous, for the French Church had itself been among those that once tacitly accepted the jurisdiction of the Pope in temporal affairs. It is clear enough that Du Perron's argument applied with equal force to the English Oath, but what gave his speech a special relevance to the situation in England was that he roundly accused King James's government of being behind this move by

the Third Estate. The real instigators of the proposed oath in France, he said, were the Huguenots, intent on sowing division in the French Church, aided and abetted by the agents of James I who were exploiting the situation for their own ends. Of James he says frankly: 'Holding the religion he doth, he thinketh to do what he ought, when he essayeth to bring in a schism, and division in ours'.⁵⁰

Du Perron's position was broadly representative not only of the French higher clergy but also of the Sorbonne which, since the expulsion of Edmond Richer in 1612, had adopted a relatively moderate attitude in the matter. The absolutist opinions of the Paris Parlement and the Third Estate, which were politically inspired, received only limited support among the clergy. In this diagnosis of the cause of the trouble, Du Perron was certainly correct. This action by the Third Estate was the one positive response that James I received to his much-vaunted appeal (published with his *Apologia pro iuramento fidelitatis*)⁵¹ to the Christian powers of Europe to unite with him against the Pope. For some years James had been using the Huguenot leader, Pierre Du Moulin, to further his designs in France. Immediately after Du Perron made his speech and it was published in Paris, James invited Du Moulin to England and paid him substantial sums of money out of ecclesiastical benefices to write a reply to it. In his posthumously printed autobiography Du Moulin admits⁵² that he was the real author of *Declaration . . . pour le droit des rois*⁵³ which was published as a reply to Du Perron's speech in 1615 under King James's name, and reveals the payments that were made to him.

The introduction to the English translation of Du Perron's speech points out its relevance for English Catholics exposed to the mendacious propaganda of their government concerning opinion in France, propaganda that received encouragement from a former French ambassador to England [La Boderie].⁵⁴ For the benefit of English readers who may have little knowledge of France, it describes the composition of the three estates. The Third Estate, it emphasizes, must not be imagined to resemble in any way the English House of Commons: its members, with a few exceptions, are not representative of the freeholders of France, who are among the most devout Catholics in the country, but almost entirely of the lawyers and minor crown officials whose faith, if it exists at all, is no more than lukewarm. Their aim is to establish a system of state absolutism in which they themselves would wield the effective power. The other two estates, i.e. the clergy and the nobles, notwithstanding that they both depend on the authority of the king to a degree unparalleled in other countries, are strongly opposed to the oath. English Catholics should see Du Perron's speech as a warning of the sinister motives of those who promote measures of this kind.

It was probably to this translation (the only book of a political character known to have been printed at the College press in the first half of 1616) that Creswell was referring when he wrote in a letter to the Duke of Lerma on 30 May 1616: 'I sent to the King of England by an individual who will give it to him a book newly printed here which will afford him some disillusionment, if he cares to read it, and even if he does not, at least the

cause of God is justified before him'.⁵⁵ A month later, on 24 April, in a letter to an unnamed Cardinal (probably Borghese) he had spoken of the translation as a useful antidote to a publication called *God and the King*, a justification of King James's Oath of Allegiance that was being widely circulated in both Latin and English and used as a text in schools in England on the King's orders:

Some days ago I received the enclosed book printed by command of the King and ordered by him to serve as a Latin text in schools and, in its English version, to be purchased by every householder. They pay one real per book which is a big profit for the author. Seeing what a frivolous thing it is I did not think it worth the postage of sending it to anyone, and so long as the damage remained confined to England there was an easy remedy: to send over an antidote to this poison, which is now done, and is continuing to be done, by distributing in the kingdom the oration of Cardinal Du Perron, printed in the English language, with a dedicatory epistle and notice to the reader in which (with solid reasons and the authority of the saints and of Holy Scripture) the fooleries of this and similar works are undone; and for England this might suffice.⁵⁶

Published by royal command, *God and the King*⁵⁷ bears no author's name but is generally attributed to Richard Mocket, the Warden of All Souls College, Oxford. Versions in English and Latin were published simultaneously in 1615 and, within the next two years, no less than eight editions appeared in English and four in Latin. On 8 November 1615, James issued a proclamation⁵⁸ enjoining the use of the Latin version as a school text. The register of the Privy Council of Scotland records in 1616 that the English version was converted into a catechism to be learned by heart in schools, that ministers were required to preach on it, and that every member of a family who could read must possess a copy.⁵⁹ As the effects of James's propaganda at home and abroad made themselves felt, Creswell came to see that something more than the translation of Du Perron's speech was needed in order to counteract them. A reply was accordingly prepared with the same title as James's tract and imitating it as closely as possible in method and presentation. Creswell himself almost certainly had a hand in this reply, although the early Jesuit bibliographers ascribe it to his colleague at St Omer, Fr John Floyd, S.J. It was written in English and then a Latin version was made by Fr Thomas More, S.J.⁶⁰ The text was in the hands of the local English Jesuit censors before 26 July 1617 when Creswell wrote as follows to Cardinal Borghese:

We are also examining for censorship here a third book, which is to be transcribed under the hand of an amanuensis so that it may be sent to you at Rome, for it is a work of the sort that must not be published before the Holy Father has been consulted, though it is asked for most vehemently by English Catholics so that it may serve as a commentary and exposition on the book entitled *God and the King*, which, by royal edict, is ordered to be bought by all householders and taught in all Latin classes so that the tender minds of boys and the ignorant masses are filled with errors. But I hope these are detected in the little book, similar in style, similar (as far as possible) in title,

and similar in everything else that does not encompass error, so that it will be safe for every Catholic to have the book in his possession, and the enemy will light upon Catholic truth before he realises it, and thus perverse artifice is defeated by honest artifice.⁶¹

Borghese acknowledged this letter on 30 September 1617, telling Creswell that he was doing right in sending the text of the book, as the Pope had ordered that anything written on this subject should be submitted to Rome for censorship.⁶² Meanwhile, on 25 September, Creswell had forwarded to Borghese, via the nuncio at Brussels, a package containing a copy of the printed Latin version of King James's tract, a copy in manuscript of the Latin version of the Catholic reply, the approbation of the Catholic reply granted by the Bishop of St Omer, and a covering letter by himself.⁶³ In this letter he makes several further observations about the reply. It is to be bound, he says, at the back of copies of the King's pamphlet so that it 'may be used more safely by Catholics, and others may come upon the antidote unawares, which they would not accept if they knew about it'.⁶⁴ Presumably the plan was to carry out this part of the operation when the printed sheets had been smuggled into England. He tells Borghese that the English version is being held at St Omer, and will be corrected from the Latin when the Pope has decided on any alterations that must be made. It is important, he says, that the English government should not know where the book is printed: he would like the Latin to be printed secretly in Italy as soon as the approved text is ready, 'and from thence transported into other regions so that the English, after it has been corrected by reference to the Latin, may be similarly printed in secret and scattered without warning throughout England, Ireland and Scotland'.⁶⁵ He concludes with an eloquent plea for haste because King James's pamphlet is doing great harm to the Catholic cause:

The sooner both versions can be put in hand the more effectively will truth be manifested and scandal to the weak removed. To this end a reply to the pamphlet has long been desired by Catholics. Delays in answering books of this kind have the unfortunate consequence that the pestilence advances and everywhere the poison is swallowed disguised with honey, and meanwhile nothing appears that shows up the wicked deceit, and the heretics like braggarts sing their triumph before gaining the victory. If Catholic truth could be published with the same diligence as iniquity is published, expedited as it is by royal authority, our enemies would soon cease writing. . . . As we see happening every day, once the Catholic answers have been published the books of these people remain unsold in the shops.⁶⁶

In spite of this appeal for haste, just over a year was to pass before the revised Latin text was sent to the printer. On 25 January 1619, Creswell wrote to Borghese from Liège: 'At last I have sent to Cologne to the printer the reply to the pamphlet *God and the King*, emended and with everything seen to as I was told in my instructions, and I hope it will be to the great benefit of Catholics, so that they may know what they should and may reply to the sophistries of the heretics'.⁶⁷ When the book appeared it

bore the following title and imprint: *Deus et Rex siue dialogus, in quo agitur de fidelitate . . . Iacobo Regi in regnis suis praestanda*,⁶⁸ Coloniae, sumptibus Authoris 1619. Typographical evidence suggests that it was printed at one of the presses associated with the publishing house of Bernhard Wolter of Cologne.⁶⁹ The words *sumptibus Authoris* in the imprint suggest that Creswell may have obtained the money to pay for the printing by an appeal to his wealthy friends. One of the donors was possibly Cardinal Borromeo to whom, on 20 October 1617, Creswell had sent a copy of the manuscript of the Latin version with a letter mentioning the lack of funds available for publishing works of this kind. He did not want Catholics in England to subsidize the printing, he told the Cardinal, and so he was trying to raise a fund from charity.⁷⁰ The English version was printed the next year with the following title and imprint: *God and the King. Or a dialogue wherein is treated the allegiance due to . . . King James within his dominions*. Printed at Cullen, 1620.⁷¹ The Cologne imprint is a blind; the typography shows that it was printed at the College press, St Omer. The title page bears the statement 'Translated out of Latin into English', probably in reference to the fact that this is not the original English text but a re-translation from the corrected Latin version.

King James's *God and the King* is written in the form of a dialogue between Theodidactus, the mouthpiece of the King, and Philaethes, who acts as his foil. The Catholic reply follows the form of the original very closely but here the dialogue is between two other characters, Aristobulos and Philanax, both Protestants, who confess themselves troubled by certain questions raised by Theodidactus but not satisfactorily answered. Their main concern is whether King James's Oath of Allegiance is the best means by which to safeguard the legitimate authority of kings. They discuss different opinions concerning monarchy, including that traditionally held by Catholics. Gradually, and with great skill, the Catholic position is made to appear not only more reasonable and solidly based than any other but also more capable of fostering true allegiance in the king's subjects. As the reply embodied emendations required by the Roman censors, it may be taken as broadly representative of Roman opinion on the subject at this period.

The basic claims of King James's *God and the King* are those underlying the Oath of Allegiance: kings receive their authority directly from God, i.e. independently of the Church and the commonwealth; they have no superior on earth to punish them for crimes they may commit; neither apostasy, nor heresy, nor tyranny in the king can release his subjects from their allegiance to him; even if a king destroy or oppress the Church or the commonwealth, he cannot be deposed and must not be resisted. In the Catholic reply, Aristobulos confesses himself alarmed at the possible effects of these claims on ordinary people whose loyalty has never been in question. By laying exaggerated emphasis on tyranny, which is really a most uncommon thing, they indirectly serve the ends of the Puritans and other sects holding republican opinions. He observes that the Catholic view follows a middle course, favouring neither the cruelty of tyrants nor the unthinking reactions of the common people which

can be so easily exploited. Catholics hold that the king is the superior of the whole commonwealth and has authority to take all the measures necessary for its protection, even though they may be contrary to established laws, liberties and privileges. In this he himself is the sole judge of what is necessary. Thus, according to Catholic teaching the king has far ampler powers than the Puritans, for instance, allow. Secondly, Catholics believe that kings are above the law and cannot be punished for ordinary and personal offences or deeds injurious only to a few. This again is contrary to Puritan belief. Thirdly, they hold that a king, even though a manifest and incorrigible tyrant, cannot be deposed, much less killed, without public sentence passed upon him and a juridical release of his subjects from their allegiance. This principle is enshrined in the condemnation of Wyclif by the Council of Constance. Fourthly, though Catholics hold, in common with many Protestants, that a king can be deposed for exorbitant crimes threatening the destruction of the commonwealth, they insist that the sentence of deposition must be made publicly by the whole, or at least the greater part, of the magistrates and nobility of the country. And finally, Catholics maintain that a Christian commonwealth may not proceed against its king in this way without the advice and consent of the Pope. In this they take a most mature course, for it removes the lives of kings from the risk of intemperate or malicious action by their subjects.

Aristobulos then makes two further points of the greatest importance for a true understanding of the Roman position. The first is that a king, rightfully deposed for the reasons and in the manner just stated, must not be arraigned before a court of justice, for the commonwealth, though empowered to protect itself, has no right to punish the king. It may not put him to death unless this is the only way in which it can protect itself from him. Moreover, a king, even when deposed, retains a certain right to the crown, and if he later shows repentance for his crimes and gives security that he will rule moderately if reinstated, should be restored to his throne. The second point is that the decision to depose a tyrant, though it requires the sanction of the Pope, is a decision of the commonwealth: the Pope of himself cannot depose him. A king excommunicated by the Pope for heresy or apostasy is not deposed, and his subjects are not released from their allegiance, until the commonwealth, acting through the magistrates and nobles, puts the papal sentence into effect, and this it may decide not to do for good reasons. In this way kings are protected from papal actions that may be grounded on temporal interests or be in some other way less than just. On this point Aristobulos cites Bellarmine and Du Perron.

After discussing these general principles the two speakers proceed to examine the Oath of Allegiance. Here again, their position is that of Protestants concerned mainly about the security of the king and the commonwealth. The writer of the tract neatly turns the tables on Preston who had appealed to the principles of 'probabilism' to justify taking the Oath. Aristobulos carries the argument a stage further. Theologians, Protestant as well as Catholic, he says, are divided on the question of the

right of the commonwealth in certain circumstances to depose the king. Both opinions are therefore, in the theological sense, 'probable'. How can one swear with a safe conscience to an opinion that is not certain? To swear to a 'probable' opinion is to call God to witness to something that may be false, and is, therefore, just as much perjury as swearing to something that is certainly false. Preston and his followers think to get round this difficulty by twisting the meaning of the Oath. They say that they do not swear to the thing itself but only to their belief in it. But in this case the Oath has no power to bind them, for if their belief is grounded only on a 'probable' opinion they can change it on better advice. Liberty to change is necessarily implied in a 'probable' assent. Secondly, coming down from principle to practice, theologians teach that it is permissible to act on a 'probable' opinion even though it may command less weighty authority than the contrary. There would therefore be nothing to prevent a man from taking the Oath in one sense (i.e. against the deposing power) and acting in the contrary sense (i.e. in favour of it). Thus the whole point of the Oath, which is supposed to be to make the king more secure, is defeated. The Oath is tendered in vain, for the swearer may change his opinion later or, while retaining his opinion, may follow the contrary in practice.

Aristobulos concludes that taking the Oath is no guarantee whatever of loyalty to the king. Catholics who scruple to take it because of the spiritual dangers implicit in it are much more likely to be loyal and honourable citizens than others who have no such scruples. Potential traitors will have no qualms about perjuring themselves in order to conceal their wicked intentions. It is perfectly clear that the promoters of the Oath are not really concerned about the public good so much as their own private interest, being men who profit from the ruin of Catholics. The *furor* over tyrannicide has been artificially created. The question of the papal deposing power would never have left the realm of theological debate if it had not been brought into the public domain by interested parties. In Spain, where theologians may freely discuss the question, there is no threat whatever to the king's security. It is in France and England, where the topic has been dragged into the political arena in order to bolster anti-papal policies, that the position of the king is, ironically, much less secure.

Whether the Catholic pamphlet made the impact that Creswell hoped it would is doubtful. Copies of the Latin version are not common and the English is one of the rarest of recusant tracts. It is possible that the reason for its rarity is that most of the copies became worn out with use, in the same way as manuals and primers, but it is more probable that they were systematically seized and destroyed by the English government. No copy of the English version has so far been found bound with a copy of King James's tract.

4. THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE—II. THE AFFAIR AT DOUAI COLLEGE

Paris and Douai

Soon after his arrival in Flanders, in the spring of 1615, Creswell made a brief visit to France. He had prepared his plans for this before leaving Rome, for he took with him a recommendation from Cardinal Borghese, the papal Secretary of State, to the nuncio at Paris, dated 7 February.⁷² Borghese asked the nuncio to give Creswell all the help he could at the French court in his efforts on behalf of the English Catholics. The nuncio, Ubaldini, wrote to Borghese on 2 July saying that Creswell had just been to see him.⁷³ As the only business specifically mentioned in either letter is help for the English Catholics now suffering renewed persecution, it is possible that Creswell was hoping to persuade the Queen Regent, Marie de Medici, to intercede with King James, as she had done on a previous occasion.⁷⁴ But this was not the only reason for his visit. He also wanted to inform himself about moves that were being made at this time by some of the leaders of the English secular clergy at their house of study, Arras College, at Paris, to replace several of the professors at the seminary at Douai with priests from among their own number. Papal permission to found Arras College had been granted in 1609 after earlier plans to institute a seminary at Paris had fallen through. The original intention of the Appellant party among the secular clergy had been to found a seminary dedicated to the training of priests who would not come under Jesuit influence and who might therefore prove acceptable to the English government. The priesthood of the new missionaries was to be, in the words of a contemporary intelligence report, 'no treason, they being among the Queen's friends'⁷⁵ Although this plan came to nothing, the foundation of a house of study at Paris provided the successors of the Appellants with an alternative means of achieving the same object by filling the teaching posts at the existing seminary at Douai with priests trained in Gallican principles at Paris.

We have no further details of Creswell's brief visit. He was back in Flanders by 25 August 1615 and evidently reported to Owen on what he had found. On 3 October, Owen wrote to him about the matter, saying that he had also seen a memorial by Dr William Singleton, one of the anti-Gallican professors at Douai whose position at the college was now threatened. As Douai was on Spanish soil and partly supported by Spanish alms, Owen pointed out, the matter was of concern to the King of Spain whose ambassador at Rome had seen and approved Singleton's memorial and was ready to dispatch a copy to Madrid as soon as he had received official confirmation from Juan de Mancicidor, the Spanish Secretary of State at Brussels. Creswell should see that this was expedited. He should also take the question up with the nuncio at Brussels, making it plain to him that the priests threatened with expulsion from Douai had always shown themselves loyal to the Holy See while those at Arras College had not:

This will be easy for you to dispatch, for certainly it seemeth a great absurdity for his Catholic Majesty to permit all his affectionated English doctors and

priests to be put out of his college and to permit to be put in for officers and seniors all his opposite, who always have professed to be of the French faction, and by the help of the French to oppugn the others under the name of the Spanish faction. And if you think good to deal thereabout with the nuncio, it seemeth you have no less advantage to show how all those that are put forth have been faithful in defending the See Apostolical both in writing and in common speech. Contrarily, they that are to take their places have been unfaithful both in writing and talking, and in all their endeavours.⁷⁶

In a later letter, dated 7 May 1616, Owen commented on the pressure that the priests at Arras College were putting on Matthew Kellison, the President of Douai, in order to achieve their object, and referred indirectly to Creswell's journey to Paris the previous year: 'I am sorry the priests of Paris are so perverse: but I am glad you discovered their devices, and do not doubt but that you have credit enough to prevent and discredit them as much as shall be necessary for God's glory'. He went on to say that he wished it were possible to install at Paris Fr Thomas Fitzherbert or some other capable English Jesuit to watch over the interests of the mission, but that was something that must wait for the moment.⁷⁷ In the end, the whole plan to infiltrate Douai with priests from Paris came to virtually nothing. Four years after Creswell's visit to Paris, Anthony Champney left Arras College to become Vice-President at Douai, but that was all. The issues that lay behind the plan, however, plunged Douai into one of the most serious crises in its chequered history. In this crisis Creswell, with the support of Cardinal Borghese, played a leading part. Before describing it we must look briefly at the background.

Arras College numbered, at this period, six priests: William Bishop, Richard Smith, Anthony Champney, William Rayner, William Smith (*alias* or *vere* Wright) and Richard Ireland.⁷⁸ Of these only Bishop, Richard Smith and Champney need concern us here, for they were the acknowledged leaders and set the tone for the whole group. They had already distinguished themselves as theologians and controversialists. Bishop and Champney were doctors of the Sorbonne, Smith a doctor of Valladolid. All three were later to occupy positions of importance on the English mission: Bishop was to be appointed bishop for England in 1623; Smith, the protégé of Richelieu, would succeed Bishop in this office on the latter's death which occurred in 1624; Champney was to hold the office of Vice-President of Douai College from 1619 to 1628 and that of Dean of the Chapter of the secular clergy from 1637 until his death in 1644. They achieved their rise to high office in the face of strong opposition. Until the death of Pope Paul V in 1621 they were *personae non gratae* at Rome because of their Gallican views. Bishop and Champney had caused offence to the Pope in 1603 by signing the declaration of loyalty to Queen Elizabeth in which they effectively renounced the doctrine of the papal deposing power, and Smith had been delated to the Holy Office in 1609 for publishing what were considered to be unsound opinions on the same subject in his book *An answer to Thomas Bels late chaleng*.⁷⁹ Champney owed his appointment as Vice-President of Douai in 1619 partly to the intense pressure applied by those who were backing him and

partly to the fact that there was no other suitably qualified candidate available at the time. William Bishop's appointment as bishop for England had to wait for the change in the climate of opinion at Rome that occurred under Gregory XV.

In their attitude towards papal authority Bishop, Smith and Champney were moderate Gallicans or—to use the expression they applied to themselves—'Sorbonists'. The term 'Gallican' can have different meanings according to the context in which it is used. Here we shall restrict its application to certain opinions on the limits of papal authority in relation to (1) the temporal powers of kings, and (2) the rights of local churches. These opinions broadly represent the point of view dominant in the Sorbonne in the years immediately following its condemnation of Richerism in 1612. They are not to be confused with the radical separatism of the Parlement of Paris and of the Third Estate expressed in the proposed French Oath of Allegiance of 1614-15. As Du Perron justly emphasized, the Sorbonne rejected the proposition of the Third Estate. For broadly the same reasons as those advanced by Du Perron, the English priests of Arras College rejected the Oath of Allegiance of King James I. They themselves denied that the Pope had any authority, direct or indirect, over kings in temporal matters, but they had to allow that the contrary opinion had never been condemned by the universal Church and that many reputable theologians defended it; they had no right, therefore, to proclaim it false and heretical as the English Oath required. The priests of Arras College also followed the Sorbonne in their views on the limitations of papal authority over local churches. Fundamental to their position was the belief that a local church, once firmly established with its own hierarchy, derived its authority, by virtue of apostolic tradition, directly from Christ and not indirectly through the Pope. The English Church, they maintained, had never ceased to exist in spite of the persecution: though it had passed temporarily under the yoke of heresy, it preserved the remains of an apostolic tradition of which the secular clergy was the legitimate custodian. The Pope, they maintained, was bound in justice to restore its hierarchy at the earliest opportunity. Here again they had to tread carefully because the universal Church had never pronounced on this matter and many reputable theologians held the contrary opinion.

In their opposition to Rome the English Gallicans worked, for the most part, indirectly, concentrating their attack on the main instruments of current papal policy: the regulars, and, in particular, the Jesuits. Against the Jesuits they waged an unrelenting campaign, seizing every opportunity that presented itself. Two examples of the tactics employed may be cited from the career of William Bishop, the most senior of the priests of Arras College. As a prisoner in London in 1611 he had been interrogated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, and proffered the Oath of Allegiance which he had refused to take, giving two reasons. He said first that he could not take it with a clear conscience because 'in the Oath a man must abjure a certain proposition as heretical which to be heretical he doth not find that any Council hath yet declared'. To this he added that since the theory of the papal deposing power was still deeply entrenched

at Rome, to take the Oath would destroy his credit there and prejudice his chances of wresting control of the English colleges on the continent from the Jesuits and putting it into the hands of the secular clergy. On being pressed about this second reason, he went on to argue at some length that if the secular clergy had had its way and had not been prevented by the Jesuits it would probably have been able to dissuade Rome from adopting its present intransigent attitude towards King James, 'and, as he thinketh, the Oath of Allegiance had never been called in question'.⁸⁰ Neither Abbot nor James appears to have been convinced by this claim, though they took no further action against Bishop. The following year, writing to the Pope from Paris to defend himself against accusations that he favoured the oath, Bishop said that, when it had been tendered to him by Abbot, he had refused it absolutely and 'impugned it with many arguments'.⁸¹ He did not add that all the arguments save one had been aimed at forming an alliance between the secular clergy and the English government against the Jesuits. Another example of Bishop's opportunism is related by Edmond Richer in this posthumously published *Testament*. Richer had been expelled from the Sorbonne and there is no reason to think that Bishop shared his more extreme views; nevertheless, Richer has left it on record that, at the time of his own controversy with the Paris Oratorians, Bishop wrote to him imploring him to desist from his attacks and to make common cause with the Oratorians and the English priests of Arras College in their fight against the Jesuits.⁸² It seems that the English Gallicans envisaged a semi-autonomous local church tolerated by the government in return for the exclusion of the Jesuits and rejection of some of the papal claims. In their campaign to achieve this, personal ambitions and jealousies undoubtedly played some part.

At Douai, the principal figure in the crisis we are about to describe was the President, Matthew Kellison. He was already a distinguished theologian and an experienced administrator. He had been professor of theology at Douai from 1589 to 1601, and from 1601 onwards regius professor at the University of Rheims. From 1606 to 1613 he had been chancellor of the University of Rheims. In 1613, the papal nuncio at Brussels, Guido Bentivoglio, had strongly recommended him for the presidency of Douai in succession to Thomas Worthington, praising him for his intellectual and administrative abilities and his zeal for religion coupled with a peaceful and conciliatory disposition.⁸³ On the questions concerning papal authority that were dividing the leaders of the clergy at this time, Kellison occupied a middle position. His views on the rights of local churches tended to be Gallican, as his part in the Chalcedon controversy a few years later was to show, but in the matter of the papal deposing power he was firmly anti-Gallican, basing his opinions largely on the Jesuit theologians Bellarmine and Suarez. In 1614, he had written (but not published) an answer to Thomas Preston entitled *The right and jurisdiction of the prelate and the prince* in which he defended the doctrine of the indirect power of the Pope over kings in temporal matters. Early in 1615, just before Creswell appeared on the scene, Kellison had made arrangements

with the English Jesuits to print the book at their press in the college at St Omer, a fact of which Creswell seems to have been completely unaware. The reason why it was not, in the end, printed there was that the Bishop of St Omer, to whom the Jesuits submitted for approbation all books printed at their press, refused his permission on the grounds that it would cause too great offence to King James.⁸⁴ It was eventually printed at Douai, without Kellison's name, in 1617 and again in 1621.⁸⁵

Kellison clearly disapproved of some of the views of the priests of Arras College, and also of their tactics. This is shown by an incident recorded in the correspondence of the nuncio, Bentivoglio, early in 1615. On 31 January, Bentivoglio wrote to Cardinal Borghese saying that Kellison had drawn his attention to a passage in a recent book by William Bishop that he thought ought to be altered. The book was Bishop's *A disproofe of D. Abbots counterproofe*, printed at Paris in 1614,⁸⁶ of which stocks were now in Flanders awaiting transport to England. In the passage in question Bishop had assured Archbishop Abbot that Bellarmine held the doctrine of the Pope's power to depose kings to be no more than a 'most probable' opinion, i.e. that many reputable theologians had defended it but that it was not *de fide*. As Kellison pointed out to Bentivoglio, this statement was quite incorrect and would cause a storm at Rome unless it were altered. He did not want it to be known, however, that it was he who had written to the nuncio about it and asked for his name to be kept secret, *per buoni rispetti*.⁸⁷ When Bishop learned that a complaint had been made against the passage he thought it originated with the Jesuits and was extremely angry. Eventually, 'to satisfy some friends' (of whom one was Kellison himself), he consented to re-write the passage and to have a paste-over slip printed while the stocks of the book were held up in Flanders.⁸⁸

Kellison was also opposed to the move to infiltrate Douai with priests from Arras College. This is shown by a letter written by Dr Henry Mayler, one of the professors of theology at Douai. Mayler, writing in February 1615 to Edward Bennet in England, said that he found the Gallican principles of the priests of Arras College irreconcilable with loyalty to Rome, and that the President was in agreement with him:

For the Parisienses removing hither we both of us [Kellison and himself] jump in one opinion. 16 months sithence I dealed effectually with Dr Champney to that purpose, alleging amongst many other reasons, that hardly they could satisfy both Rome and France and conscience. It hath proved true of late. Dr Bishop hath made Cardinal Bellarmine to be of verdict, that the Pope's authority in *temporalibus* is only a most probable opinion, and but an appendix of the Pope's authority: how conformable this is to the Cardinal all the world conceiveth: how welcome to Rome each one may guess: especially seeing that Widdrington [Preston] granteth as much as the Doctor. In case he would not, or could not avoid it, he might have been liberal to speak in the Cardinal's person.⁸⁹

Kellison himself seems to have been free from the personal hatred of the Jesuits that is such a marked feature of some of the other leaders of the

secular clergy. Nevertheless, his insistence on the role of the seculars as the custodians of the inalienable rights of the English Church frequently brought him into conflict with the Society. He resented what he considered its intrusion into things that did not concern it, even when it was acting on decisions taken by the Pope. For example, when Creswell arrived in Flanders in 1615, Kellison was agitating for the removal of the Jesuit confessor to the College and his replacement by a priest of the secular clergy. Though the papal visitors of 1612 had recommended the retention of the Jesuit confessor and their recommendation had been approved by the Pope, Kellison considered this an infringement of the seculars' rights.

Kellison's greatest weakness seems to have stemmed from the peaceful and conciliatory disposition for which Bentivoglio had commended him. In a report on his suitability for the presidency that Bentivoglio sent to Rome in September 1613, the nuncio commented on certain criticisms that had been communicated to Borghese by the English Jesuits.⁹⁰ They said that Kellison was too conciliatory by nature, too anxious to please all men, and this had shown itself consistently in his behaviour in times of crisis. During the Appellant controversy, they said, though he had not sided with the Appellants he had not opposed them; in the internal crises that had occurred at Douai during his earlier tenure of office as a professor the College had suffered because of his failure to apply firm discipline; in the present dispute over papal authority, though he was not a Gallican, he was on friendly terms with the priests of Arras College and would not openly repudiate them. Bentivoglio reacted indignantly against these criticisms and even went so far as to accuse the Jesuits of decrying Kellison in order to secure the appointment of someone more friendly towards themselves. But the opinion that Kellison was too conciliatory was later to find an echo in other quarters, and even at Douai itself among priests who were by no means disposed to friendship with the Jesuits. Henry Mayler, in the letter from which we have already quoted, put his finger on the same weakness:

Dr President will find it at length to be true, that overmuch seeking to please all, will be the occasion of neither pleasing, nor profiting any. For my true counsel, which is somewhat sharp, I am cashiered from the number of his counsellors and friends. My comfort is, that I have foreseen and forewarned what will be our downfall, and showed the best, not the sweetest, means to prevent it.⁹¹

Mayler was referring specifically to the internal administration of the College but his remarks had a wider application. In the crisis at Douai that came to a head in 1616, the desire at all costs to conciliate was to force Kellison, under pressure of circumstances, to say and do things that were inconsistent and even contradictory.

The characters and careers of two other protagonists in the struggle at Douai, Drs Weston and Singleton, men of strongly papalist views who were eventually forced to leave the College, will be considered when we come to examine the campaign that was waged against them.

Douai and the Oath of Allegiance

Creswell's attitude towards Douai was to a large extent conditioned by his opinion of some of the leaders of the secular clergy who, he believed, were having an unhealthy influence on the College. He saw some of them as ambitious careerists who put academic distinction and ecclesiastical office before the true needs of a missionary church under persecution. He profoundly distrusted their Gallican principles and suspected that they were prepared to compromise, in greater or less degree, over the Oath of Allegiance. He believed that Preston had his followers and sympathisers among the professors and students at Douai, as he had among the English Benedictines. Cardinal Borghese had asked Creswell to hold a watching brief over the College and to keep him informed. Creswell expressed his opinions in two letters written early in 1616: one, dated 4 April, to the nuncio at Brussels, Ascanio Gesualdo, the other, dated 24 April, to an unnamed Cardinal who was probably Borghese himself.

Creswell began his letter to the nuncio by commenting on Preston's *Appendix ad Disputationem de iuramento fidelitatis*, a copy of which he enclosed:

I received three days ago from England the enclosed book which I have read through quickly with much sorrow. . . . The intention is to stir up France with this same poison, and the reason for publishing it now, as they have long planned, to weaken if they can the universal authority of the Holy See. I find on p. 160 of the *Appendix* the names of certain priests who made their first profession of loyalty to Queen Elizabeth. May God forgive them, for from that has derived this Oath of King James which now troubles the Church. I am sorry the President of Douai is led astray by men of this kind. He has two great friends at Paris [Bishop and Champney], the leaders of the rest, and [others?] now in England who, in turn, are said to communicate their opinions to the author of this book. If this is true there ought to be a careful scrutiny and examination of the doctrine of those who profess scholastic theology at the English College and at the English Benedictine house at Douai. For I hear that there are some there that favour the pernicious doctrines of that book.⁹²

He went on to speak about the question of Jesuit influence at Douai and of Kellison's efforts to have the Jesuit confessor replaced by a secular priest. He had been to Douai himself to discuss this with the President. Kellison had rebuked the Society for insisting on keeping the Jesuit confessor, saying that it was 'putting a sickle into someone else's harvest'. In reply to this Creswell said that he had made three points: (1) The College had been maintained by pensions from Spain and Rome which Jesuits had obtained for it; (2) it was the Pope who had ordered that the Jesuit confessor should be retained, on the recommendation of the visitors of 1612; (3) before a Jesuit had been appointed as confessor, moral education had been so neglected at the College that Creswell had had to refuse to accept students from Douai in the seminaries in Spain. In spite of this, he had said to Kellison that, if the matter had rested with himself, he would have conceded the point. But now, he told the nuncio, reading Preston's book had made him change his mind:

'I consider very well founded the opinion of certain distinguished Catholics, that it is important that men should be put in charge of that seminary who are entirely untouched by any dealing with people who introduce books of this kind, and indeed that pensions should be withdrawn and the seminary dissolved rather than that it should become a school of opinions of this sort'.⁹³

In this letter Creswell had some cautious remarks to make about Kellison:

The President, when he lived under my charge twenty years ago in the Roman College, was sufficiently alien to ideas of this kind. . . . But office reveals a man and sometimes even changes him. Nevertheless, I judge him to be led and moved by motives forced upon him rather than by motives of his own.⁹⁴

He concluded the letter with a reflection on the ideals of piety, humility and devotion to duty that the college should strive to foster in its students and with a bitter comment on the harm that had come to the mission through ambition and pride:

The origin of all this evil was the untimely introduction of temporal ambition into this mission. Our political enemies have taken advantage of this and are continuing to do so, exploiting the human weaknesses of certain priests who have made some progress in learning but too little in the cultivation of humility.⁹⁵

In this last sentence he is clearly alluding to the priests at Arras College.

In his letter of 24 April, to Cardinal Borghese, Creswell went over much of the same ground again but added some further observations. The letter includes a description, based on reports recently brought over from England, of the privileges granted by the English government to Preston and his followers:

Preston lives in an open prison, better accommodated, I am told by those who come from there, than he would be in any monastery of his order; he has a well-stocked library and a servant and a housekeeper who cooks his meals and cleans when he wishes. Previously I have been told that some priests in prison who share his opinion and approve the Oath go out to see plays; and others, their companions, who are free, have secret passes, and when the constables and pursuivants see these they spare these priests and hold them up as an example in any Catholic house in the street.⁹⁶

By these means, Creswell said, the government was sowing confusion among Catholics and thereby causing more harm than it could inflict by torture and death. He believed the needs of Douai to be a thorough screening of all prospective candidates for the priesthood before they entered the College, firm discipline throughout their course, and the cultivation of virtue, and especially piety and humility, rather than academic distinction. To the secular clergy in general he paid warm tribute, saying that it consisted of 'holy men and worthy of all honour except for the few ambitious ones who seek honour out of season. For we have not

even finished the psalm *Miserere*, and these want to sing the *Gloria Patri*.'⁹⁷

In the last paragraph of this letter Creswell looked forward to the day when the Catholic Church would be fully restored in England. He seemed to see that day as being not too far distant, and it is possible that he was thinking of the changes that might come about as a result of the proposed marriage treaty with Spain, for which preliminary plans were already under way. Catholics loyal to the Holy See and priests who had preserved their true vocation, he said, would not be unhappy if the Pope should then appoint as bishops for England foreigners who were already bishops in their own countries and 'know the customs of the Church and are proved and recognized as good pastors and holy men'. He himself thought that this would be a way of avoiding the difficulties that would otherwise occur because of the ambitions, rivalries and disloyalty to the Holy See of the leaders of the English clergy. He added a personal recommendation: 'And for Archbishop of Canterbury we have a prelate here, the Bishop of this city [Jacques Blaise, Bishop of St Omer] whom, if it lay in my hands, I would ask our Lord to honour with the highest ecclesiastical dignity, that others might follow his example'.⁹⁸ If these reflections should seem premature, he observed, at least the fear that this is what could happen might serve as a warning to the ambitious priests among the English clergy and cause them to humble themselves.

The gist of Creswell's letter of 4 April to the nuncio soon became known at Douai. On 24 April, Dr John Redman, canon of St Omer, wrote to Kellison that rumours were current at St Omer and had reached Brussels that there were some in the College at Douai who favoured the Oath of Allegiance. Kellison reacted swiftly. He called together his Assistants and seniors (priests and students of theology), read out Redman's letter and ordered them under obedience to declare to him their views on the Oath and on Preston's opinion 'concerning the power of the Supreme Pontiff in deposing kings', and to say whether they knew of anyone in the College who favoured these.⁹⁹ He himself took the occasion to declare his utter detestation both of the Oath and of Preston's opinion. All except Drs Weston and Singleton followed his lead and said that they knew of no one in the College who held opposite views. Weston and Singleton, though they were known to be opposed to the Oath and Preston's opinion and said privately that they knew of no one in the College who favoured these, declined to make a public statement. Those who had made their opinions public subsequently signed a solemn declaration to the effect. Kellison had an account of the affair inserted in the College diary. This set out verbatim the answers given by the Assistants and seniors to the President's questions. It referred to Redman's letter but did not mention Creswell by name.

Kellison's dramatic move had the desired effect of publicly clearing the good name of the College. He wrote to the nuncio at Brussels telling him what he had done, and the nuncio passed the information to Rome. Though Creswell's name was nowhere mentioned, it must have been common knowledge that it was he who had sent the accusation to Brussels.

Now it had been shown that he was misinformed or had misinterpreted what he had heard. The case could be considered closed, as the entry in the College diary clearly intended that it should be. But for the historian certain questions remain unanswered. Why did Kellison appear so shocked that anyone in the College should be suspected of favouring the Oath? There is plenty of evidence that support for the Oath was growing among English Catholics at this time of renewed persecution and that some of the leaders of the clergy were justifying it. Within a few months of this incident, for example, reports were reaching the nuncio at Brussels that the Archpriest's Assistant for Lancashire, John Mitchell, was advising Catholics in his district that they might take the Oath to save themselves from the penalties of the law.¹⁰⁰ Kellison gives the impression of being over-anxious. And why did Weston and Singleton, two professors who had always shown themselves uncompromising in their opposition to the Oath, refuse to associate themselves with the others in publicly repudiating it? The answer to these questions may be that, although Creswell had missed the mark, he had not missed it by very much. As William Bishop had shown, it was quite possible to reject the Oath in its existing form while accepting the principles on which it was based, and the acceptance of those principles did not necessarily imply assent to Preston's opinion. Kellison was clearly anxious to remain loyal to Rome and yet not to antagonise his Gallican friends at Paris and in England. Unfortunately, certain documents that would have thrown light on the matter seem to be no longer extant. After the incident, Singleton and Weston sent their own account of it to the nuncio, giving the reasons for their behaviour, but their letter has not been found.¹⁰¹ Another document that has disappeared is an 'information' against Kellison that Singleton was said to have drawn up at this time. There is a reference to it a few weeks later in a letter to Kellison written by Dr Caesar Clement, dean of St Gudule at Brussels, reporting a conversation he had recently had with the English Jesuits at Louvain. The Jesuits maintained, according to Clement, that if the accusations made by Singleton were impartially examined they would be found to be true.¹⁰²

The explanation suggested above receives support from the immediate sequel to these events. The old controversy on whether the doctrine of the papal deposing power was *de fide* now exploded with full force at Douai. Caesar Clement, in the letter to which we have just referred, spoke of the anger felt by the English Jesuits at Kellison's ambivalent attitude: 'In the late purge about the Oath of Allegiance, though you seem to call Widdrington's opinion erroneous, yet you do not positively set down that you hold the contrary to be *de fide*'. Creswell himself paid a visit to Douai in May 1616 and reported to the nuncio at Brussels that two of the President's four Assistants held the doctrine to be *de fide*, while the other two maintained the contrary, and that Kellison wanted to keep the latter and dismiss the former. We shall return to the campaign against the two papalist Assistants in due course. Creswell pointed out to the nuncio that the issue was far from academic and could have grave consequences for the English mission, for if the doctrine were not *de fide* the position

of the Gallicans was theologically unassailable, however much Rome might try to insist on loyalty: 'If they have been teaching that it is not *de fide*, which is indeed a temerarious thing to say, Catholics holding this opinion will not uphold the authority of the Holy See in England with sacrifice of their possessions, which priests and laymen now do with loss of their lives'.¹⁰³ The implication is perfectly clear. The credibility of the case against the Oath really depended on the doctrine of the papal deposing power: if that were not *de fide* the one valid theological objection was that raised by William Bishop himself, and Catholics were unlikely to be willing to sacrifice their possessions and liberty, let alone their lives, for that.¹⁰⁴

The whole controversy was soon to be given the *coup de grâce* at Rome. The nuncio had forwarded Creswell's letter of 4 April, together with the copy of Preston's *Appendix* that Creswell had sent him, to Cardinal Borghese, and Borghese had passed both to the Holy Office. On 1 June the Holy Office decided that Preston's book was to be banned and that Borghese should write to the nuncio for a further report on the contents of Creswell's letter. If it should seem opportune, the nuncio might go himself to Douai and apply whatever remedies appeared necessary. Above all, total silence was to be imposed on the controversy concerning the deposing power. No pronouncement was made on the merits of the controversy.¹⁰⁵ From this point onwards the extant accessible records appear to contain no further reference to the affair.

To appreciate the significance of this decision it is necessary to recall the delicate situation in which Rome was placed at this time. The Roman theologians still held firmly to the doctrine of the Pope's authority over kings in temporal matters, but political considerations made it inadvisable any longer to insist on it. Paul V's bitter experience at the hands of Venice and the threat currently posed by France had forced him to adopt a cautious policy. The Holy Office, it should be remembered, performed a dual function at this period: it was not only the highest ecclesiastical tribunal in matters of faith and morals but also a supreme advisory court to the Pope in important questions of policy. When the two functions were in conflict, as they plainly were here, priority would often be given to the political demands of the moment if it could be done without positive sacrifice of principle. This usually required that silence should be imposed on discussion of the theological issues involved. In the present instance, by simply shelving the doctrinal question and ordering silence all round, the Holy Office was making it possible for the Pope to escape, without compromising himself, from a situation that was becoming increasingly embarrassing to him. Rome would never repudiate the doctrine of the authority of the Pope over kings in temporal matters, but on the other hand she would never again assert it.

The Campaign against Weston and Singleton

Although Kellison was opposed to any large-scale infiltration of Douai by priests from Arras College, he was determined to get rid of his two papalist Assistants, Drs Weston and Singleton, and to replace them by priests more acceptable to the English government. His main reason, as we shall see, was that these two had made themselves particularly obnoxious to King James by their published writings and this was threatening some of the sources of revenue on which the College depended. It was not a reason that Kellison could make public or mention in his requests to Rome for permission to remove them: he had to find others. As the two doctors appear to have allowed their opposition to his policies to carry them to extremes of non-co-operation, he could claim, with some justice, that they were undermining his authority and harming the College, and this was the charge that he brought against them at Rome. In pressing it, however, he treated them with less than justice, even making use of allegations against their characters for which, as far as we can judge, there was no foundation. We must now look briefly at the earlier careers of the two men.

Edward Weston (1565-1634+) was a doctor of Turin, a distinguished theologian and the author of several substantial works of controversy. At an earlier period (1592-1602) he had enjoyed a great reputation at Douai. An English government spy, John Fawether, who had secretly gained entry to the College, reported to England in April 1602: 'Mr Doctor Weston is to come over shortly, a proper man of person and for all sort of knowledge and learning they make the comparison betwixt him and Campion to be equal'.¹⁰⁶ Weston was professor of theology at the College from 1596 to 1601 when (as the College diary records) he resigned to devote himself to private study and publishing his books, the first of which, *De triplici hominis officio, ex notione ipsius naturali, morali, ac theologica*, was printed at Antwerp at the end of 1602.¹⁰⁷ In spite of Fawether's statement that Weston was about to leave for England in April 1602, he remained at Douai until February 1603 when he left for Paris where he was going to stay.¹⁰⁸ His departure for Paris may have been connected with the abortive move by William Bishop, Christopher Bagshaw and others to set up an English seminary there: an intelligence report reaching England late in 1601 had named Weston as one of the four priests designated as governors of the proposed establishment.¹⁰⁹ Sometime after this, he crossed to England. After the appointment of George Birkhead as Archpriest in 1608, Weston, though never an Assistant, appears to have been one of his friends and advisers¹¹⁰ and to have lived with him for a period at Lord Montague's house at Cowdray in Sussex. In about 1609 he put his name to a list of priests desiring the appointment of a bishop for England compiled by Birkhead for submission to Rome.¹¹¹ On 5 February 1610, he wrote from London to the cardinals of the Holy Office defending Richard Smith against the unnamed persons who had delated passages in his book *An answer to Thomas Bels late chaleng*.¹¹²

Weston's letter to the cardinals in 1610 is of particular interest because

it reveals that, in spite of his wish to exculpate Smith, he himself was far from being in the Gallican camp. After paying tribute to Smith's virtue and learning, he asked the cardinals to remember that, when Smith published his book (1605), he was living in England and anxious not to provoke the magistrates by any indiscreet remarks about the deposing power. For this reason he should not be judged harshly. Weston then went on to say that he himself could not help feeling angered at seeing Catholic pastors and doctors everywhere showing inordinate timidity about asserting the rights of the Church in the temporal sphere. If the theologians would speak out clearly and unequivocally it would be less easy than it was at present to maintain that the authority of the Pope over princes in temporal matters was no more than a 'probable' opinion unconfirmed by the judgment of the universal Church. It is not difficult to see the reason for the opposition to Weston that was building up in certain Catholic circles in England. Two years later he was forced to leave the country because of his determined opposition to the Oath of Allegiance. He described the circumstances in the foreword to his *Iuris pontificii sanctuarium*, 1613.¹¹³ Referring to the year 1611, in which Preston's *Apologia* was printed, he said that many of his fellow-Catholics in England, partly out of fear of the government and partly confused in mind by the uncertain counsels of their priests, were either taking the Oath of Allegiance or were inclined to favour it, in spite of the Pope's prohibition. A certain nobleman friend had written asking him to send him his opinion in this grave matter, and this he had done, not with the intention of refuting Preston's *Apologia* but simply to satisfy his friend and also to provide himself with a handy text for helping other people who came to him for advice. But the manuscript he had sent his friend came into the hands of Preston who, after consultation with the Protestants, had it printed at London with his own comments on it. When it became publicly known that a Catholic priest in England had written in support of the Pope and against King James, the hue and cry was out. Catholics were afraid to take him into their homes and he was forced to wander the streets. Twice he was turned away at the door of a Catholic house because of his repudiation of the Oath. Finally, through the influence of certain sympathetic persons, he had succeeded in leaving the country. The part played by Preston in this story can be readily corroborated. Weston's work against the Oath was incorporated by Preston in his *Responsio apologetica*, printed with a false imprint in London in 1612.¹¹⁴ Weston reprinted it in his *Iuris pontificii sanctuarium*, printed at Douai in the following year. Weston's nobleman friend was probably the young Lord Vaux who was arraigned before the Privy Council in March 1612 and tendered the Oath of Allegiance, which he refused. Some time before his arraignment Vaux had been interrogated privately by Archbishop Abbot who, finding him unconvinced by arguments in favour of the Oath, had sent him to confer with Preston. When Abbot afterwards demanded to know what had passed between them, Vaux told him that Preston had not tried to persuade him to take the Oath, at which Abbot accused Preston of treachery both to the King and to the Pope.¹¹⁵ If, as seems likely, it was Weston's manuscript pamphlet that had

strengthened Vaux in his resolve, this would help to explain the ferocity with which Abbot was later to attack Weston. It would also explain why Preston took the trouble to print and answer an unpublished pamphlet: he had to do something to placate Abbot, and presumably the King as well, after failing to bring pressure on Vaux to take the Oath.

Weston left England and went to Douai, arriving at the English College on 31 September 1612.^{115a} Through the good offices of the nuncio at Brussels, Guido Bentivoglio, who recommended him to Cardinal Borghese, he was made professor of theology and one of the Assistants to the President, an appointment requiring papal approval. We do not know the exact date of his appointment but he was in office before 5 March 1613 when, with John Knatchbull and William Singleton, he signed a report on the internal discipline of the College.¹¹⁶ On 15 May 1613, he wrote to Cardinal Borghese saying that he had posted him a copy of *Iuris pontificii sanctuarium*, his work on papal authority which he had dedicated to the Cardinal in gratitude for favours received.¹¹⁷ The appearance of this work in print was the signal for a concerted attack on Weston in England. William Trumbull, King James's Agent at Brussels, was instructed to make the strongest possible representations at the court of the Archduke to have the book suppressed, copies were sent to Paris with the object of provoking the French government to issue a condemnation, Preston wrote a reply which he included in his *Disputatio theologica*, 1613, published at London at the government's expense, Abbot opened a campaign of personal vilification against the author.¹¹⁸ Abbot called Weston, among other things, 'a filthy fellow', accusing him of immoral living. Although general accusations of this kind were fairly commonplace in the controversies of the period and would not normally merit much attention, Abbot cited two specific instances of alleged misbehaviour by Weston that came from Catholic sources, and we must consider these for a moment because of their bearing on the course of events that we have to describe. Weston, Abbot claimed, had been forced to leave Douai in 1603 after having been disgraced in the College for committing fornication with his laundress; he had then come to England where he had continued to lead a disreputable life and had been dismissed from Lord Montague's household at Cowdray for homosexual acts with a pageboy. It was a Catholic priest, Abbot said, who had informed him about the second episode, and the boy himself had later confessed under examination.¹¹⁹ These stories were undoubtedly based on malicious gossip that had been exploited for political ends. The first is hardly compatible with John Fawceter's remarks quoted above, and neither is consistent with what we know of Weston's career. No importance can be attached to the pageboy's reported confession for this could easily have been extracted by threats or promises of reward. In any case, Weston's enemies made the mistake of trying to prove too much. It would be difficult enough to accept that a priest of his background and reputation indulged in either of the practices attributed to him; that he should have indulged in both would imply a degree of depravity, and of cynicism, that goes well beyond the bounds of credibility. The stories, in fact, reflect far more faithfully the character

of Weston's enemies, Catholic as well as Protestant, than they do that of Weston himself. Why, it may be asked, did certain Catholics pass this scandalous gossip, even if they believed it to be true, to Archbishop Abbot, that relentless persecutor of those who refused the Oath of Allegiance, when the correct procedure would have been to report it to their own superiors? A month or two after Abbot was spreading these tales, Weston was proposed as a rival candidate to Matthew Kellison for the Presidency of Douai College, left vacant by the departure of Thomas Worthington. In September 1613, the Brussels nuncio, Bentivoglio, having sounded the opinions of English Catholics in Flanders as he was bound to do, reported to Rome on the relative merits of the two candidates. He recommended that Kellison should be appointed because of his long experience of government which rendered him eminently suitable for the position and because he enjoyed the support of the majority of the secular clergy. Of Weston, Bentivoglio gave his opinion that he had not the administrative ability or the experience necessary for the post; he was primarily a scholar, and to govern well required more than a talent for writing. Bentivoglio gave no other reasons for considering Weston the less suitable candidate. Of the moral defects attributed to him by Abbot his report makes no mention.¹²⁰ The importance of this will be apparent when we come to consider the events of three years later.

William Singleton (15—1620), a doctor of Trier, had been appointed professor of theology at Douai in 1609. He had earlier (1590-1606) been on the mission in England and in 1598 had been made one of the Assistants to the Archpriest, Blackwell. He had consistently supported Blackwell against the Appellants and had advised the Pope against the creation of bishops for England in the circumstances prevailing at the time.¹²¹ After his appointment as professor at Douai he became one of the principal objects of attack by the Gallican element among the leaders of the secular clergy. In 1612, at the time of the visitation of the College, a determined effort was made to have him removed from office, but the visitors, after examining the accusations against him, rejected them as groundless.¹²² His enemies then carried on a campaign of vilification against him that appears to have influenced the judgment of otherwise trustworthy persons. The nuncio, Bentivoglio, in his report to Rome of September 1613 on possible candidates for the Presidency, spoke very harshly of Singleton, calling him 'a man quite unfit to govern, and so changeable that in many things he sometimes contradicts himself and gives the impression of being insincere and untruthful, in character not at all sweet and peaceful, and very easily moved to contest anything, a man, moreover, whose own teaching is obscure and confused, for which reason it has never succeeded in being acceptable to the College'.¹²³ Though this judgment may contain a certain element of truth, it is important to note that Bentivoglio had only spoken to Singleton on two brief occasions and that his opinion of him was necessarily based on reports received from others, some of whom were undoubtedly hostile to him for political reasons.

In 1613, Singleton published at Mainz a work maintaining the doctrine

of the authority of the Pope over kings in temporal matters: *Discussio decreti magni Concilii Lateranensis . . . de potestate ecclesiae in temporalibus*.¹²⁴ In it he took up and developed arguments brought by Bellarmine and Suarez in their works against King James, to prove that the doctrine of the deposing power was *de fide*, the main ground being that it was necessarily implied in an enactment of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. This was one of the books attacked by Preston in his *Appendix* of 1616. Preston believed that the real author of the book was not Singleton but the eminent Jesuit theologian, Leonardus Lessius of Louvain, using Singleton's name as a cover. This belief, in fact, had been current from the moment when the book appeared in 1613, but it was incorrect. In August 1613, Bentivoglio, on Cardinal Borghese's instructions, interviewed Singleton about this book, and Singleton assured him that it was entirely his own work and that all the Jesuits had done was to revise it for censorship and see it through the press. It was printed, he said, under the supervision of Martin Becanus, professor of theology at the Jesuit house at Mainz.¹²⁵ After publication it was suppressed on orders from Cardinal Borghese because it had never been submitted to Rome for censorship. This, it seems, was due to a misunderstanding for which Singleton was not responsible.¹²⁶

Kellison began to campaign for the dismissal of Weston and Singleton within a few months of his appointment as President at the end of 1613, but at first he made little headway at Rome. By November 1614, he was writing to Thomas More, the Agent there of the English secular clergy, saying that he was considering resigning the Presidency if nothing were done about the matter. In this letter he named Anthony Champney, of Arras College, and Joseph Haynes, formerly of Douai and now in England, as his choice of replacements for Weston and Singleton.¹²⁷ In February 1615, he wrote to More again, saying that he had now heard from the nuncio, Bentivoglio, that the Cardinal Protector (Odoardo Farnese) had consented to his request: the order for Weston's removal had already come and that for Singleton's would follow shortly.¹²⁸ Kellison added, in this letter, that he had asked Bentivoglio to obtain Edward Kenyon as a replacement for Weston. As Kenyon was not in any way associated with Arras College, it seems probable that Kellison had had to drop his request for Champney because of objections at Rome. But the whole operation came to nothing. Kenyon declined the invitation,¹²⁹ and the move to oust Weston and Singleton was blocked by the Jesuits, apparently with the tacit consent of Cardinal Borghese. On Borghese's instructions Bentivoglio entrusted the final decision on the timing and manner of the dismissals to Creswell, and Creswell postponed the decision indefinitely.¹³⁰ In September 1615, Kellison wrote again to More, saying that he was pressing the nuncio and trying to obtain replacements who must be sound men 'and yet none against whom exception has been taken'.¹³¹ This last phrase shows clearly that Rome was determined not to allow a Gallican take-over at Douai.

The months passed and still nothing happened. In February 1616, Kellison was writing to More again, in much the same frustrated tones

as before. Bentivoglio had now left Brussels, and so Kellison was going to see the new nuncio to ask him whether he could have the Cardinal Protector's order for the dismissals put into effect. He also intended, he said, to write to the Pope to offer his resignation unless Weston and Singleton were removed. Edward Kenyon's name has by now disappeared from the extant correspondence. In this letter Kellison asked More to press 'for Dr Smith's admission, or some others who are fit and faithful'.¹³² Richard Smith, of Arras College, though not one of the priests who had signed the declaration of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth, was scarcely *persona grata* at Rome since his unsuccessful mission to obtain bishops for England in 1609, and it is surprising to find Kellison asking for him at this delicate juncture. Smith also had a rooted antipathy to the Jesuits. Creswell had already got wind of the proposal to bring him to Douai and had written to Kellison in January expressing his objections. Kellison's reply was conciliatory in the extreme:

You may assure yourself that whosoever depart hence, or come in their places (who shall be no other than the Protector shall first approve), I will, as I have often said, look to it that here be no opposition against you; but that everyone do his office for the good of the College, and not to meddle with other men's affairs. Or if any should prove troublesome, and would not be ruled, I should be the first that should inform against him; for I desire nothing more, as God knoweth, but that we may live and die friends, and take away the scandal and discomfort which comes by these jars.¹³³

On 5 May 1616, Kellison wrote his promised letter to the Pope.¹³⁴ He described at some length the frustration he had suffered at the hands of Weston and Singleton and implored the Pope to order their removal. He drew an extremely unflattering picture of both of them. Concerning Weston he made a veiled allusion to the scandalous stories we have already examined and said that he considered his presence in the College dangerous: 'Besides being known to all for his excessive indiscretion, levity and impetuosity, he labours under another vice, well-enough known to your Holiness's above-mentioned nuncios, to the extent that his presence in this your College is extremely dangerous'.¹³⁵ The nuncios referred to were Bentivoglio and his successors at Brussels. Unfortunately, any correspondence there may once have been on the matter in the Nunziatura di Fiandra or among the voluminous surviving papers of Cardinal Borghese seems to be no longer there. The relevant documents, if any were sent, would have been passed to the Holy Office, but we should expect to find at least some reference to the affair in the nunciature correspondence. Possibly Kellison had approached the nuncios about it but they had not reported it to Rome for lack of evidence. Of Singleton, Kellison presents an even less sympathetic picture: 'I know of no one who can more subvert students by crafty conversation, detract from the honour of the College by spreading rumours and malicious reports, molest and disturb the peace and quiet of all of us, and whose only pleasure and aim is in doing things of this kind'.¹³⁶ Behind this outburst we can perhaps detect Kellison's anger at Singleton's having circulated an 'information' concerning things that Kellison did not want made public.¹³⁷

Early in May 1616, Creswell went himself to Douai to try to get to the bottom of the trouble. He had talks with Kellison, with Weston and Singleton, and with others at the College. Before returning to St Omer he wrote a letter to the nuncio telling him what he had been able to find out. This letter is of the greatest importance for an understanding of the true situation and must be quoted at some length. Creswell wrote as follows:

I came to Lille on some business that I had to attend to with Father Provincial of the Society and there the President of Douai College met me. On the basis of our old friendship I discussed many matters with him concerning a reconciliation with the two doctors [Weston and Singleton]. He said that he himself was agreeable, but that it was not acceptable to others that they should remain at the College; he did not sufficiently explain the reason. We went to Douai so that I could try to get to the root of the trouble. Many times in the late evenings I met doctors Singleton and Weston who freely offered to do everything the President might justly expect of them. The President I wanted to draw to a reconciliation, and at the same time I desired that both sides should come together and put forward proposals for what they considered would serve the cause of greater harmony. But the President refused, on the grounds that, if they reached entire agreement, this might serve as the occasion for keeping them [Weston and Singleton] longer in the Seminary, which would not be approved by others (without doubt, English friends) who, he said, were not prepared to send alms to the College so long as those doctors remained here. He gave no explanation, but I heard it from another person who took it (so it is said) from his own lips: namely, that alms cannot be sent, without offence to the English state, to a college where persons are maintained who have written against the rights of the King. The President seems to be afraid of a reconciliation lest it should be held against him as a fault by his friends. Finally, it has been settled that, as long as the doctors remain in the College at the will of superiors, they should be treated humanly. They, in their turn, solemnly promise to respect the President, and it was not their fault that the roots of discord were not removed. Concerning the past, they wished to give an explanation and to hear the objections of the President, and as far as I can judge they are acting honestly and sincerely. The President depends upon the counsels of others and I do not know whether they make for peace. I cannot write more in detail, suffice it that I hope they will proceed amicably and peacefully until something is decided about the affairs of the College by your Lordship. But a closer watch is called for. I seem to see the direction in which things are tending and there is need of a timely remedy, lest this should become a seminary of sedition. I see some moved by others, and these by yet others who employ too much familiarity with our enemies.¹³⁸

This letter was written only nine days after Kellison sent his diatribe against Weston and Singleton to the Pope. To appreciate its significance it is necessary to recall that Douai, always badly in need of funds, had previously depended on an annual pension from the King of Spain. That pension was now several years in arrears, partly, if not entirely, because Philip III disapproved of the way the College was being run and of its increasingly close ties with Paris. From the time he took up office Kellison had been desperately trying to put the College on a sound financial footing. Early in 1615 the situation had become so grave that it was seriously proposed to dismiss all but the best students. Talk of

organising an appeal for funds in France and Italy appears to have come to nothing.¹³⁹ Now, it seems, the College was dependent on benefactors in England. We have no names, but they were clearly persons determined not to offend King James and it would seem that they were acting with the connivance of the government. The whole plan was threatened by the continued presence at the College of Weston and Singleton, both of whom were anathema to the King because they had published books defending the doctrine of the papal deposing power.¹⁴⁰ The irony of the situation was that Kellison himself had written a book defending the doctrine and it would by now have been in print but for the cautiousness of the Bishop of St Omer who thought it would cause too great offence to James. Kellison was walking a very tight rope indeed. It was perhaps to salve his conscience that, shortly after this, he published, albeit anonymously, a little volume containing accounts of the martyrdom of four Douai priests who suffered in 1616 after refusing the Oath of Allegiance.¹⁴¹ Creswell's opinion of Weston and Singleton, after long talks with them, was that they were honest and sincere and had been unjustly treated, though he seemed to allow that they had not accorded the President the respect that was his due. One of the most valuable features of the letter is the negative evidence it provides about the accusations of immorality and dishonesty that had been made against the two doctors. Of these accusations, Creswell, in all his conversations at Douai, appears to have heard not a word.

A week before Creswell wrote this letter, the Brussels nuncio, Ascanio Gesualdo, wrote to Rome saying it would be advisable to remove Weston and Singleton from the College 'for the sake of peace,' but their replacements must be men of sound doctrine who would keep a close rein on the President if he allowed himself to be too much influenced by his friends at Paris, as the Jesuits feared he might. Gesualdo added, however, that he himself knew none of the English secular clergy and so must leave the choice of suitable replacements to Rome.¹⁴² Nothing was done for another year. Finally, in August 1617, Weston was summoned to Rome by Cardinal Millini, the Vice-Protector.¹⁴³ Some time before 1614 he returned to Flanders, evidently exonerated from any serious charges against him, and was made a canon of St Mary's at Bruges.¹⁴⁴ He seems to have spent the rest of his life at Bruges, writing books and from time to time delivering an opinion on disputed questions of theology and canon law.¹⁴⁵ Among those who sought his opinion in matters of conscience during the 1620s was Viscount Montague of Cowdray, from whose household, if we were to credit the scandalous story circulated by Archbishop Abbot, he had earlier been expelled in disgrace.^{145a} Weston died sometime after 1633.¹⁴⁶ Singleton was not removed from Douai till August 1618. The culminating incident in his stormy career at the College was a row that he provoked by his objections to the philosophy course given by a newcomer, the young Thomas White, whose later teachings were to bring him into conflict with Rome.¹⁴⁷ Singleton died in 1620 in the Jesuit house at Liège to which he was taken in his last illness.¹⁴⁸ Weston and Singleton were not officially replaced. The campaign to bring in Smith continued, but he was asked for as Vice-President, to take

the place of Dr John Knatchbull who left the College voluntarily in October 1616. Rome continued to hesitate. In August 1617, the Archpriest Harrison and his Assistants signed a joint petition with Kellison to the Cardinal Protector asking for Smith to be appointed.¹⁴⁹ Still no action was taken. Nearly two years later, another petition was sent to Rome, but this time asking for Champney. The Protector, perhaps weary of the whole business, gave his consent, and in April 1619, Champney took up his new office.¹⁵⁰ With his arrival at Douai there began a new chapter in the history of the College, but Creswell, who ceased to be Jesuit Vice-Prefect of the Mission a few months afterwards, was no longer directly concerned.

5. THE ANGLO-SPANISH MARRIAGE NEGOTIATIONS

In the sphere of European politics a cause into which Creswell flung himself soon after he arrived in Flanders in 1615 was the proposed treaty of marriage between England and Spain for which preliminary negotiations had been started the year before. King James's principal motive in seeking the hand of the Infanta Maria for his son, Prince Charles, was to provide himself with money, in the form of a handsome dowry supplied from the wealth of the Indies, that would help to make him independent of Parliament. For Spain the proposed match offered a guarantee of English neutrality in the event of renewed hostilities by the Dutch in Flanders. Creswell had always pinned his hopes for stability in Europe on Spain's power to contain the Protestant threat from the north, and he welcomed the proposals at least partly for this reason, but the consideration that outweighed all others for him was the promise of immediate relaxation of the penal laws against Catholics in England with the possibility of the full restoration of Catholic faith and practice at a later date. He knew from his earlier experience in Spain, that there were serious difficulties to overcome and that the negotiations must be handled with great skill. Not only was the alliance that James was seeking bitterly opposed in the English Parliament; it was also incompatible with James's own policy of crushing those English Catholics who refused to renounce their allegiance to the Pope. Creswell made it his first object, as he had done on previous occasions, to bring home to Philip III and the Spanish nobility the hollowness of James's pretence that Catholics in England were not persecuted for their faith. In the earlier months of 1616, four priests and a layman were put to death after refusing the Oath of Allegiance.¹⁵¹ Creswell obtained eyewitness accounts of their trials and executions, translated these into Spanish, had them printed at the College press, St Omer, and sent them to the King and others in Spain. On 26 July 1616, he wrote to a cardinal (?Borghese): ' . . . these relations are most accurate. I have translated them into Spanish because I am sending them to the good King so that he may prod his ambassador and receive satisfaction'.¹⁵² The title of the pamphlet, of which only one copy is known to have survived, is *Relacion de cinco martyres en Ynglaterra este año de 1616*.¹⁵³

It has no imprint but the typography shows that it was printed at the College press. It does not contain Creswell's name. Whether Philip acted on Creswell's advice and used this little tract to 'prod his ambassador and receive satisfaction' from James is not known. James certainly saw a Latin version of the same text printed at Douai later in 1616 and probably sent to him from Flanders, for he complained about it to Gondomar and handed him a copy which is still among the ambassador's papers.¹⁵⁴

Formal diplomatic exchanges concerning the proposed marriage were opened in 1617, and Creswell took the opportunity to write a long letter of advice to Philip. This letter, dated 10 March 1617,¹⁵⁵ provides a valuable insight into Creswell's understanding of the situation. First, he said, Philip should not forget that James was the petitioner in this affair: both the honour and the political advantage resulting from the marriage would be greater for England than for Spain. A further advantage of the marriage for James was that it would strengthen his claim to the English throne, which, at present, many constitutional lawyers believed defective.¹⁵⁶ Philip was, therefore, in a very strong position to state his terms plainly and insist on their being met. The only sure foundation for the success of the proposed marriage, Creswell said, was a satisfactory settlement of the religious question. So long as the laws against Catholic faith and practice remained on the statute book in England there would be no security for the interests of Philip and his daughter. Spain had made a great mistake at the peace treaty of 1604 in trusting to promises of toleration made by James without adequate guarantees, for James had afterwards been able to renege on them with impunity.¹⁵⁷ This time Philip should insist on firm guarantees. James and his ministers would probably prevaricate, saying that the English people and Parliament would not tolerate any return to Catholicism, but Philip should not be deceived by such excuses. Parliament was not an insuperable obstacle for, as at present constituted, it was far from representative of the English people. The continuing persecution in England was proof that the people wanted to return to the Church and were being prevented by force. If James were to summon a parliament truly representative of the people, in which the members of the Commons were freely elected by the cities and provinces, as was done before Henry VIII sought to strengthen his position against the Pope by illegally imposing the oaths of supremacy and uniformity on all its members,¹⁵⁸ thereby effectively excluding Catholics, it is certain that Catholics would form a majority and James would be able to obtain what was asked. Let James begin, therefore, by summoning a truly representative parliament. That was the essential first step.

It was not necessary, Creswell continued, that in this first parliament anything should be done to restore Catholicism beyond abolishing the unjust and tyrannical laws that had been introduced since Henry VIII's time and the oaths that had been devised with the deliberate object of reducing all wealthy Catholics to penury. Philip should not make the mistake of demanding that the kingdom return to the public profession of the religion of its ancestors, as Queen Mary had done in the previous century. It was true that, if James wanted to do that, it would be easier

for him than it had been for Mary, for he had no powerful adversaries such as she had had, and Protestantism, which had then been in the ascendant, was now on the wane, comprising for the most part 'conformists who recognize no God but their King and will not lose their comforts or their wealth for any religion, which is the usual conclusion of heresy'. But still, it was better to proceed with tact and tolerance. All that Philip should insist upon was that anyone in England who wanted to become a Catholic should be free to do so and should be allowed to practise his religion privately in his own home without incurring any prejudice to his fortune, reputation or career. This was precisely the situation that now existed in France and Germany where the King and the Emperor employed both Catholics and Protestants in their service, 'leaving the consequence to God'.¹⁵⁹ If toleration could be granted to Protestants in those two countries where Protestantism was still a novelty, how much stronger was the claim of the Catholics in England to be allowed to practise the religion of their ancestors. If matters could be arranged this way, without rushing, it would probably lead later on to the complete conversion of England, for in the end truth would prevail. On the other hand, to insist straight away on the public profession of the Catholic faith would provoke distrust and enmity and probably lead to disaster.

Creswell's warning to Philip not to press for the public exercise of the Catholic religion in England as a pre-condition of the marriage was consistent with his earlier thinking on this matter. Some fifteen years before, while still in Spain, he had written to Philip:

It is obligatory that a Catholic ruler . . . never resort to violence in matters of religion but only proceed . . . by the path of reason and gentleness. The majority of Englishmen who walk in the error of heresy are born to it. The fault is in the leaders rather than in private beliefs. Thus it is wrong to act as they do now in Spain, and as they once did in England in the days of Queen Mary, against heretics who have left the Church.¹⁶⁰

As Fr Loomie points out, this was a courageous stand to take in the face of the prevailing climate of opinion at the Spanish court which was largely opposed to any concessions.¹⁶¹ It is true that Creswell's opinion was shared by Gondomar, Philip's ambassador to London, but Gondomar had a first-hand knowledge of England that was denied to most of Philip's other counsellors. Creswell sent his letter to Philip in March through the good offices of the Archduke Albert at Brussels. Four months later he dispatched a copy of it to Cardinal Borghese at Rome with a covering letter (dated 26 July) asking the Cardinal to make its contents known to the papal court when the diplomats representing the different parties to the proposed marriage came to Rome to petition for the Pope's dispensation.¹⁶² He was clearly concerned lest the Pope, likewise, should make the mistake of demanding from James either too little or too much.

Whether as a result of Creswell's advice or not, Philip insisted, as a prior condition of the marriage, that James should pledge himself to secure the repeal of the penal laws, but did not ask for the public exercise of the Catholic religion. The English Ambassador, Digby, returned from

Madrid to London in May 1618 to inform James that Philip would grant a marriage-portion of £600,000 on condition that James would promise an act of parliament abrogating these laws.¹⁶³ But James would not commit himself. Instead, he offered to do what he had promised on previous occasions, namely to alleviate the sufferings of the Catholics as far as possible by the liberal exercise of the royal prerogative of mercy. Negotiations hung fire. Gondomar, who had been taking part in parallel discussions in London, returned to Madrid in July 1618. James, who had no wish to close the door, made gestures of goodwill, one of which was to allow Gondomar to take with him on his journey as far as Flanders an unprecedented number of priests released from prison for the occasion.¹⁶⁴ The heavy responsibility of providing maintenance for these priests after their arrival in Flanders fell on Creswell. He appealed for help to the Archduke who issued an order authorising alms for their support. During Gondomar's absence from England, Creswell corresponded with the Ambassador's Dominican chaplain, Diego de la Fuente (generally known as Padre Maestro), who had remained in London. Only a fragment of this correspondence appears to have survived: a single letter from Fuente to Creswell, dated 13 December 1618, congratulating him on his efforts on behalf of the recently exiled priests and thanking him for his various letters which had been a great comfort to him. As for the proposed royal marriage, Fuente said, negotiations were continuing but there was fierce opposition to it from the extreme Protestants.¹⁶⁵ In 1619, Gondomar was expected back in England and, though in the event his return was delayed until early 1620, reports of his impending arrival were current from about April 1619 onwards. On 22 April, Archbishop Abbot, writing to Trumbull at Brussels, referred to a report he had received from the latter that Creswell had crossed over to England: 'I will do what I can to light upon Creswell, but he is an old and subtle fox and understandeth how to shift for himself. He comes hither to meet Gondomar. That ambassador hath a catalogue of all Englishmen in Europe fit to be employed for his King's service, and among them Creswell is a principal person.'¹⁶⁶ This report was probably mistaken: even if Gondomar's return to England had not been postponed he would almost certainly have passed through Flanders on his way and Creswell would have had the opportunity to talk to him there. On 23 July 1619, Secretary Naunton wrote to Trumbull from London to say that he had heard that Creswell had gone to Brussels to see Van Male, the Archduke's Agent at the English Court, who had just returned to Flanders.¹⁶⁷

Events in central Europe in 1619 forced James to step up his negotiations with Spain. The rash decision by his son-in-law Frederick, Elector Palatine, to accept the crown of Bohemia (16 August 1619) following upon the Protestant revolt of the year before, posed a new and urgent problem for James. The main object of his foreign policy now was to prevail upon Philip III to restrain his cousin Ferdinand, whom the Bohemian Protestants had deposed, from destroying Frederick. Ferdinand, now Emperor, was preparing to invade Bohemia. On 17 February 1620, he issued at Vienna a manifesto in Latin giving an account of the Bohemian revolt

and calling on all Catholic princes to support him. An English translation of this was printed at the College press, St Omer, in the same year, probably within a few weeks of the appearance of the original.¹⁶⁸ Creswell, who was living in the College at the time, was almost certainly behind the publication and may well have been the translator. The ostensible object of publishing it was to demonstrate to English Catholics the justice of Ferdinand's cause, but there was undoubtedly another motive, namely to play upon English fears for the safety of the King's daughter and son-in-law and thereby overcome opposition to the full-scale resumption of the marriage negotiations with Spain. Gondomar arrived back in London in March 1620. On 14 May, Creswell wrote to Borghese from St Omer, expressing his hopes and fears:

Count Gondomar has almost every day talks with the King alone and without interpreter, and has high hopes. I am expecting every hour a certain messenger from him who will bring all the news, as letters I received three days ago promised. Meanwhile, we are taking care that he should not be deceived by the blandishments and promises of others. The hearts of kings are in the hands of God and we must await God's decision as to whether any good may come to the Church from one direction or another.¹⁶⁹

James failed in his efforts to save his son-in-law, who paid for his rash move with the loss not only of Bohemia but of the Palatinate itself, but the marriage negotiations dragged on for another three years, mainly because of James's need of money. They finally collapsed in the autumn of 1623 just over six months after Creswell's death. What part, if any, Creswell played in them after 1620 is not known. There is practically no documentation for the last two years of his life, i.e. after the death of Pope Paul V (28 January 1621), when Cardinal Borghese, whose papers provide so much of our information about him up to this point, ceased to be Secretary of State.

In his letter to Philip III of 10 March 1617, which we have already summarized, Creswell made incidental mention of a natural affinity existing, in spite of the present differences of religion, between Spaniards and Englishmen, and of the need to foster cultural relations between the two peoples. He promised to send Philip a memorial on this theme. Unfortunately, no trace of any such memorial has so far been found, but it is pleasant to record that Creswell himself made one small but noteworthy contribution in this sphere. In 1618, he published at the College press his translation into English of the work entitled *Quis dives salvus?*, a meditation on poverty and wealth written in the fifth century by Salvianus of Marseille.¹⁷⁰ As he explained in the preface, his intention was to offer this as a consolation in adversity to the English Catholics reduced to penury by the penal laws. He then prepared a Spanish translation with the purpose of impressing on Philip III and the nobility of Spain the other lesson taught by Salvianus: the duty of the rich to help the poor. This was printed at the College press in 1620.¹⁷¹ In his letter to Cardinal Borghese of 14 May 1620, with which he enclosed a copy of the Spanish, Creswell wrote: 'Many splendid things are suggested by Salvianus in the enclosed

book which has already, in an English translation, been of benefit to many in England: now it has crossed into Spain and is being rubbed by the hands of the King and the princes, I hope not without fruit'.¹⁷² But Creswell had another reason for putting the work into Spanish. As he explained in his dedicatory epistle to the Infanta, which replaced the preface to the English Catholics, the English version had met with an appreciative response and a number of people in King James's household and court, and also elsewhere, had asked for a Spanish version to help them learn Castilian now that relations between England and Spain had become so close:

And because many principal persons in the household and court of the King of England, and in the whole kingdom, since the question of establishing close relations and firm friendship with Spain first arose, have applied themselves to the study of the Castilian language, those who have enjoyed hearing Salvianus speak in their native English have requested that he also be translated into Castilian so that they can learn the language together with the salutary doctrine taught in this book.¹⁷³

6. CRESWELL AS EDITOR AND PUBLISHER. CATHOLIC REPLIES TO M. A. DE DOMINIS. POLITICAL TRACTS BY VERSTEGAN

One of the tasks, apparently self-appointed, that absorbed much of Creswell's time and energy during the last years of his life was preparation for the press of books for the English mission. He spoke of the importance of this work in his letter to the Duke of Lerma of 30 May 1616:

Great care is devoted to Catholic books which are continually being sent into England from this College where we have an excellent press. The opposition does what it can to prevent their entry into the kingdom but caution and money work a great effect. The heretic merchants and sailors themselves transport them and distribute them among the Catholics for a profit, and the books that are misdirected and lost, when they come at times into the hands of people who are being deceived, are the cause of conversion of those whom we should never think of as believers.¹⁷⁴

But many of the poorer people were deprived of the benefit of Catholic books because the merchants charged extremely high prices to compensate themselves for the risks they ran. In 1617, Creswell opened a campaign to obtain subsidies for the College press so that certain books could be distributed free of charge in England. He wrote to Cardinal Borromeo at Milan on 20 October 1617: 'I could wish that Catholic books be no longer bought and sold in England but distributed free. . . . Because of the adverse laws and the penalties merchants in England sell Catholic books at an extortionate price, for which reason they do not come into the hands of those who most need them. This evil we are now, albeit rather late, trying to remedy, if God will send us the means.'¹⁷⁵ He had already written to Cardinal Borghese appealing for help. In a letter to Borghese

of 25 September 1617, he said: 'I send the enclosed statement which you ordered to be sent concerning the expenses of the press, so that Catholic books may be distributed free. I think the expenditure would be most useful and most pleasing to God'.¹⁷⁶ Unfortunately, neither the statement about the expenses of the press nor the other letters that must have passed between Creswell and Borghese on the matter appear to have survived. Three years later, on 14 May 1620, writing to Borghese about his translation into Spanish of *Quis dives salvus?*, Creswell said that he had made an arrangement with English Catholics by which certain books printed at the College press were to be distributed free:

That sentence *Gratis accepistis, gratis date* which is prefixed signifies by agreement among English Catholics that books of this kind are to be distributed free and cannot (without violating justice) be sold, so that the greed of the merchants, which cannot be overcome by other means, may be repressed, for they are accustomed to demand payment extortionate beyond all measure for Catholic devotional books that they sell. Whence most of those who most need them are deprived of them.¹⁷⁷

It seems doubtful, however, whether the funds available allowed Creswell to operate his plan at all widely. Only three books printed at the College press have so far been found bearing the words: 'Gratis accepistis, gratis date':¹⁷⁸ Sweet's *Monsigr. fate voi*, 1617; Creswell's English translation of Salvianus, 1618; and his Spanish translation of the same work, 1620.¹⁷⁹

In this same letter to Borghese Creswell spoke of the responsibility he felt for ensuring the supply of Catholic books to England and the urgent need to find new patrons. Books, he said, did what priests alone could not do: they 'find an entry where priests are excluded and in the end . . . open the way for priests and the sacraments'. This was a lesson from which the heretics had already profited. Throughout the Catholic world heresy was making headway by means of books printed privately by Protestants at their own expense, and this was happening not only in countries such as France where heretics were in some measure tolerated, but also in the dominions of the King of Spain where they were not. Calvin's *Institutes* and a perverted text of the Bible had been translated into Spanish and distributed in Spain itself, the East and West Indies, and even among Spanish prisoners of the Moors in North Africa.

This impious fraud of the Devil and wickedness of perverse men . . . fills me with shame and also fear lest in the sight of the divine Majesty we be more dilatory in defending the truth than they are in spreading lies. Wherefore, among the very great difficulties of exile and persecution, and notwithstanding the very serious debts under which I labour because of the other necessary expenses of preparing workmen for that rich harvest, I am forced to carry out this task as well.¹⁸⁰

He trusted that God would find new patrons who would voluntarily support 'this holy and necessary work which far exceeds our strength'. It would make no difference, he said, whether they were Englishmen or foreigners, for 'the spirit of God bloweth where it lists, with Whom there

is no distinction among nations save one: that between the elect whom He places in glory and the reprobate whom He expels to punishment'.¹⁸¹

If the difficulty of providing the mission with devotional works was great, that of producing prompt answers to Protestant attacks was still greater. The publication of any book or pamphlet that touched upon sensitive areas in theology or politics could be held up for months or years, or even be completely suppressed, for a number of reasons. Local ecclesiastical authorities in Flanders sometimes made difficulties or tried in other ways to interfere. Civil governments, Catholic as well as Protestant, might exert pressure on the Archduke at Brussels to have a book suppressed before it could be distributed. The Pope insisted that, on certain subjects, all books, after satisfying the local censors, must be sent to Rome for final approval before they were issued. We have already seen how this last requirement delayed the publication of *God and the King*. Another controversy in which the Catholic contributions were delayed for the same reason was that concerning the defection from the Catholic Church of M. A. de Dominis in 1616. Here, Creswell appears to have made some attempt to by-pass the normal channels in order to speed up the publication of a book that was urgently needed. In doing so he incurred the wrath of his General, Vitelleschi, but he had special permission, apparently, from Cardinal Borghese.

Marco Antonio de Dominis, former Archbishop of Spalato in Dalmatia, fled to England in 1616 and was rewarded by King James with high office in the Anglican Church.¹⁸² He published at London in the same year a vindication of his action entitled: *M. A. de Dominis suae profectionis consilium exponit*¹⁸³ (generally known simply as the *Consilium*). In 1617, he published at London, in two volumes, the first six *libri* of his *De republica ecclesiastica*,¹⁸⁴ an attack on the papal primacy that he had partly written before leaving Italy. The defection of a Catholic archbishop was of immense propaganda value to James, and prompt answers to the two books were urgently called for by English Catholics. The immediate danger of de Dominis's writings was that, coming in the wake of Preston's, they would help to sway the uncommitted into accepting the Oath of Allegiance. Two replies to the *Consilium* were written by English Jesuits early in 1617, one in Latin, the other in English: John Floyd's *Synopsis apostasiae Marci Antonii de Dominis*, printed at Antwerp,¹⁸⁵ and John Sweet's *Monsigr. fate voi. Or a discovery of the Dalmatian apostata*, printed at the College press, St Omer.¹⁸⁶ Publication of Floyd's work was delayed for a while because of well-intentioned but ill-advised interference by Fr Scribani, Jesuit Provincial of the Flandro-Belgic Province, as Creswell explained in a letter to Borghese of 26 July 1617:

I thought you would have received with my last letter *Synopsis apostasiae Marci Antonii de Dominis* which I left in the press when I set out from Antwerp. But as the Provincial of the Society for the Province of Flanders, who lives there, had received, I do not know from where, some information about the life and morals of the apostate that we had deliberately said nothing about, the Provincial (otherwise prudent and learned, but little experienced in English affairs) had things that ought not to have been included inserted in an

LATER LIFE OF JOSEPH CRESWELL

unsuitable place and only told us at the last moment. So it was necessary to reprint one or two leaves in order to cut out those things that had been added contrary to the author's scope and intention which was not to persecute the wretched man but to reduce him, if possible, to a sound state of mind.¹⁸⁷

The passage inserted by Scribani was removed and another, less offensive and better documented, put in its place.¹⁸⁸ The book was issued sometime in the second half of 1617. An English translation by Henry Hawkins, S.J., omitting the inserted passage altogether, was printed at the College press, St Omer, before the end of the year.¹⁸⁹ The MS. of Sweet's *Monsigr. fate voi* was in the hands of the local English Jesuit censors when Creswell wrote his letter to Borghese. Certain passages, he said needed correction before it was printed:

I have another book of almost the same argument, learnedly written in England and sent to me to be printed, which I have briefly read and handed over to the censors so that it may be approved as soon as possible but with certain things omitted or toned down which (as in the other book) a laudable zeal has dictated but which, for the same reason, should be moderated.¹⁹⁰

Sweet's work dealt not only with De Dominis's *Consilium* but also, by anticipation, with his *De republica ecclesiastica*, for Sweet included in his answer a brief examination of the whole notion of an ecclesiastical republic on which de Dominis's position against the papacy was known to be based. For this reason Creswell hoped, as he told Borghese, that Sweet's work would be ready for issue at the same time as the *De republica* which was known to be in the press at London. In the event, the *De republica* was in print before the end of October 1617, while *Monsigr. fate voi* was issued soon after 10 November.

Paul V's instruction that all works dealing with de Dominis should be sent to Rome for censorship arrived in Flanders too late to affect the publication of either the *Synopsis* or *Monsigr. fate voi*. Borghese wrote to Creswell to tell him about it on 30 September 1617¹⁹¹ but this letter would not have been received until after the first had been issued and the second set up in type. Several letters from Borghese to the Brussels nuncio, Lucio Morra, do indeed show that, between October and December 1617, Creswell was sending to Rome printed proof-sheets of a Latin reply to the *De republica* of de Dominis, but Borghese does not cite the title and the work cannot now be identified.¹⁹² It might be tempting to think that it was perhaps a Latin version, now lost, of *Monsigr. fate voi*, but this is hardly possible. The English has an unsigned prefatory epistle, probably by Creswell himself, which was evidently prefixed to the text just before the book was issued, and this is dated 10 November, i.e. over a month before all the proof-sheets of the unidentified Latin book had been received at Rome. It is inconceivable that Creswell would have risked issuing the English while a Latin version of the same work was still being examined for censorship at Rome. It is more likely that the proof-sheets were those of an early draft of part of a work by John Floyd which we must now consider.

The book that brought Creswell into trouble with Vitelleschi was Floyd's *Hypocrisis Marci Antonii de Dominis detecta, seu censura in eius libros de republica ecclesiastica*, printed, under Creswell's supervision, at Antwerp in 1620.¹⁹³ As Floyd explained in his prefatory epistle, this had grown out of something that he had originally intended simply as a preface to a fuller answer that he was in course of writing to the first part of *De republica*. For reasons that he was not prepared to discuss, publication had been delayed: 'This work . . . is published later than I intended, and it is nothing to the purpose that I should state the causes of the delay'.¹⁹⁴ The preface had now grown so large that he had decided to publish it as a separate book which would be followed by the rest of his answer in another volume shortly afterwards. What had happened since the autumn of 1617, when Creswell sent Borghese a copy of *De republica* and printed proof-sheets of what may have been an early version of part of Floyd's reply to it, is far from clear. The next we hear of the matter is over a year later. On 31 May 1619, Creswell sent Borghese the MS. of the *Hypocrisis* and told him that the second part of Floyd's answer to *De republica* was now being examined by the local censors and transcribed for dispatch to Rome.¹⁹⁵ In the same letter he emphasised the inconvenience and expense of sending books to Rome for censorship and the harm that was done to the Catholic cause by delay in answering attacks on the Church: 'Though it is a consolation and a safeguard to us that things that are written should be corrected at Rome, it has a certain drawback: namely, that in the meantime the heretics boast, and after long delay works that have been deferred are less avidly read; and this is quite apart from the expense to which we are put in having copies transcribed and conveyed by post'.¹⁹⁶ After this we find no further reference to Floyd's answer either among Borghese's papers or in the nunciature correspondence. The *Hypocrisis* was printed at Antwerp early in 1620, with an approbation given by the local diocesan censor on 2 November 1619 and a privilege granted at Brussels on 20 December 1619. Floyd's authorship was not revealed in it. For the sequel we have to turn to letters written by Vitelleschi to Floyd and Creswell between June and December 1620.¹⁹⁷ From these it appears that, when the printed text reached Rome some time in the first half of 1620, the Holy Office found a passage in it to which it took strong exception. It pronounced a severe censure on the passage in question, ordered the book to be suppressed until alterations were made, and in June, wrote to Creswell, whom it thought to be the author, admonishing him. Floyd then wrote to the Holy Office to say that the work was really his and submitted an 'Apologia'. Vitelleschi severely admonished Creswell for bringing trouble and discredit upon Floyd and, indirectly, on the whole Society. As the book had been printed, he said, without having first been sent to Rome for censorship, contrary to the Pope's express command, it would be extremely difficult to persuade the Holy Office to lift its censure. Vitelleschi was particularly incensed because he himself had never been shown the book, though he understood that leaves from it had been circulated to outsiders some time before. If by any chance, he said, the printer had distributed copies before the corrections

required by the Holy Office had been made, it was essential that none of these should find their way to Rome, or the censure, which until then had been private, might be pronounced publicly.

There seems to have been an extraordinary muddle over the whole affair. Creswell, as we have seen, had sent the MS. of the *Hypocrisis* to Borghese on 31 May 1619, with an urgent request that permission to print it should be expedited. Borghese, together, it seems, with some others, made a direct appeal to the Pope to allow it to be printed without going through the slow and cumbersome machinery of the Roman censorship. The Pope had given his consent and Borghese had sent Creswell permission to go ahead. But of all this Vitelleschi evidently knew nothing. The Holy Office itself seems to have been kept in the dark. When Creswell informed Vitelleschi about what had happened, the General demanded to see a copy of the permission which Creswell then sent him. On 5 December 1620, Vitelleschi acknowledged receipt of it:

I was extremely pleased to see the copies of the letter of the cardinals in which permission was given to print the book of Fr John Floyd before it had been read at Rome, not only because I can see from it that nothing was done without the consent of the sovereign pontiff but also because it will be [useful?] to me if, by chance, anyone mindful of the earlier wish of the sovereign pontiff, and either ignorant or forgetful of the permission, should try to reprehend the action.¹⁹⁸

Perhaps this particular muddle was a reflection of more general confusion reigning at Rome as the long pontificate of Paul V drew to its close. We do not know to what passage in the *Hypocrisis* the Holy Office objected, nor whether the correction called for was ever made. Some twenty copies of the book are known to be extant: none of those examined by the present writer shows any obvious signs of cancellation. Vitelleschi, though mollified on receiving Creswell's explanation, remained unmoved by appeals that he had made for haste: 'Concerning the difficulties and inconveniences which you show to arise when the books of the heretics are answered too late, I do see that what you write is true, but in spite of this it is also to be considered that they are answered soon enough if they are answered well enough. So all [care] is to be taken that reply is made in such a way that haste does not impair the solidity of the argument.'¹⁹⁹ The second part of Floyd's answer to *De republica* evidently went through the approved channels: under the title *Monarchiae ecclesiasticae . . . demonstratio*, it was eventually printed at Cologne in 1622, three years after it had been sent to Rome for censorship and five years after the publication of the work to which it was a reply.²⁰⁰

In his letter to Borghese of 31 May 1619, to which we have already referred in connection with Floyd's *Hypocrisis*, Creswell also spoke about a work on a different subject that he had previously sent to the Cardinal and that had met with the latter's approval. He did not name the work, but it evidently concerned the political crisis in central Europe. The Latin original, which Creswell had personally sent into Germany, had already

created a good impression among the Catholic German princes, and an English translation was now being prepared at St Omer:

I am glad you were pleased with the pamphlet which, as you may learn from the enclosed letter of the Duke of Bavaria, written in his own hand, to whom (as to a close friend) I sent some copies to be distributed among the German princes and their counsellors, has proved useful in Germany. We are now translating it into English and we shall see that it is distributed in that kingdom.²⁰¹

Unfortunately, this pamphlet has not so far been identified. If the English translation was printed, as Creswell clearly intended, no copy appears to have survived.

In spite of the sparsity of documentation from 1620 onwards there seems little doubt that Creswell concerned himself with the publication of books for the English mission right up to the time of his death. From September 1620 until about November 1622, he was rector of the residence at Watten, only about five miles from St Omer, from which he could easily continue to exercise direction of the College press. His time at Watten coincided with the publication by the press of five anonymous political tracts dealing with the affairs of England, Spain, the Netherlands and the Palatinate since the outbreak of war in Europe following upon Frederick's acceptance of the crown of Bohemia. These were:²⁰² (1) *Observations concerning the present affaires of Holland*, 1621; (2) *Londons looking-glasse*, 1621; (3) *The copy of a letter . . . concerning the present business of the Palatinate*, 1622; (4) *Newes from the Low-Countreyes*, 1622; (5) *Observations concerning the present affaires of Holland*, enlarged edition, 1622. These tracts, fiercely anti-Calvinist, anti-Dutch and favouring a firm Anglo-Spanish alliance, can be shown from internal evidence to have been written by Richard Verstegan, Fr Persons's former agent in the Netherlands who had been living for many years at Antwerp. Nos 1 and 4 are translations of pamphlets that Verstegan had already published elsewhere in Flemish.²⁰³ In no. 4 the translation is not by Verstegan himself but probably by an English Jesuit: it has an unsigned foreword by the translator saying that he has been moved to put this work, which is not his own, into English because it provides an effective answer to the charge of favouring tyrannicide so often levelled against the Society. 'Hereupon', he says, 'I resolved to enforce so much time out of my other affairs, as to translate it into English.' This sounds very like Creswell. Unfortunately, no documents have so far been found that would throw light upon Creswell's dealings with Verstegan. There is a strong piece of circumstantial evidence, however, that serves to link Creswell with the publication of the tracts. In the second half of 1622, Richard Blount, Provincial of the newly-formed English Province of the Society, sought permission from the General to remove Creswell from the vicinity of St Omer. Blount's letters on the subject have not survived and the General's replies provide no details, but the latter do reveal that Blount was finding Creswell's presence at Watten increasingly embarrassing and that he thought it necessary to remove him.²⁰⁴ It could well be that one of Blount's reasons was that

Creswell's use of the College press to print political tracts that King James could hardly fail to find offensive threatened to endanger rather than help the delicate negotiations concerning the proposed marriage with Spain. It is surely significant that, after Creswell's departure from Watten in the late autumn of 1622, the publication of political tracts by the College press ceased abruptly. Another pamphlet by Verstegan, *A tounge-combat . . . between two English soldiers*, covering much of the same ground as those printed at St Omer, was published at Mechelen in 1623.²⁰⁵ Creswell may have played some part in its preparation before he left Watten and during the three months that he spent as rector of the house of tertians at Ghent, but by the time it appeared in print he was dead. After this Verstegan published nothing more in English and very little more controversial work in Flemish. A year later, on 9 May 1624, he was writing to Cardinal Barberini at Rome, asking for a papal pension to enable him to continue to publish works against the Calvinists, but his request does not seem to have been granted.²⁰⁶

7. EPILOGUE

The portrait of Creswell that emerges from our study of his activities in Flanders is that of a man of integrity, devout, humble and self-effacing, with a sense of divinely-ordained mission that made him impatient of all secondary considerations, and with a tendency to let his zeal outrun his discretion. To the cause for which he was fighting he devoted a quite exceptional energy and ardour which reveal themselves tellingly in incidents not always directly related to the major themes that we have just been discussing. Anything prejudicial to the interests of the English mission stirred him to immediate and vigorous action. For example, in September 1616, we see him rushing back to St Omer from Liège, partly, as he explained in a letter written shortly after his arrival, to be nearer the centre of English affairs again, but also to be closer to Brussels where he intended to tackle the Provincial of the Capuchins about the behaviour of some of the Capuchin friars at Liège who had, apparently, encouraged the populace to vandalise the new building of the English Jesuit novitiate.²⁰⁷ We do not know the outcome of this incident. Towards those who had benefited the mission in any way he gave unstinting help when it was needed: in July 1616, for example, he secured from a cardinal the promise of financial support for the elder James Wadsworth whom he himself had converted to Catholicism while in Spain and who had since devoted himself to the service of the mission there.²⁰⁸ On occasion his zeal overflowed into areas that had no close connection with the English mission, as, for example, when he complained to Borghese in February 1616 that the reforms ordered by the Council of Trent were not being properly observed by the Church in Flanders.²⁰⁹ Borghese, it is interesting to note, far from being annoyed by this indiscretion, instructed the nuncio at Brussels to look into the matter and report to him on it.

In all Creswell's activities, it is impossible not to be struck by his capacity to inspire deep affection and unquestioning trust. The list of patrons to whom he could turn in time of need is impressive: Philip III himself and his ambassador Gondomar, Cardinal Zapata, Cardinal Borromeo, Bishop Blaise of St Omer, Cardinal Borghese through whom he could reach Pope Paul V—to name only some of the more eminent. Of them all, the most important to him was Cardinal Borghese without whose powerful influence he would have been unable to achieve much of what he did. The affection and high regard in which Borghese held him was undoubtedly one of Creswell's greatest assets. On the other hand, it is clear that Creswell was not an easy person to work with. He evidently had a reputation for being difficult among his fellow English Jesuits, as is shown in a letter written at the beginning of 1614 to Owen at Rome by Fr John Blackfan who had known Creswell at an earlier period in Spain. Commenting on the recent decision to recall Creswell from Spain, Blackfan wrote: 'God give him safe arrival, and you a good head with him when he cometh thither, that he return not back as he did last time [i.e. in 1606] to the disturbing of all'.²¹⁰ It is only fair to add, however, that Blackfan was writing from Brussels, where he had been living for at least a year, and he can have known little about the particular circumstances of Creswell's departure from Spain in 1613-14. With Vitelleschi, who was appointed General of the Society in 1615, Creswell's relations were sometimes distinctly strained. The reason was undoubtedly Creswell's tendency to by-pass the established channels of command within the Society and appeal direct to powerful patrons to obtain what he wanted. We have seen this in the case of the publication of Floyd's *Hypocrisis*. Another instance occurred in 1619, when he appears to have tried to persuade Bishop Blaise's successor at St Omer to obtain the replacement of the Belgian Rector of the English College by an Englishman. The indiscretion naturally annoyed Vitelleschi, who had already made it plain that he considered the time was not yet ripe for such a move.²¹¹

In judging the value of Creswell's work in Flanders it is necessary to distinguish between his activities in the practical sphere and his interventions in matters of higher policy. In the practical sphere, the day-to-day administration of the Jesuit mission, the handling of finances, the direction of the work of the printing-press, it is clear that he achieved considerable success, though it must be recognized that he owed much to the help of others, both patrons and fellow-labourers in the field. But what of higher policy: the exclusion of Gallicans from positions of authority in the English Church, the conditions of the proposed Anglo-Spanish marriage treaty, the means to be employed to bring England back to the Church? In all this he fought a losing battle, but are we therefore to conclude that his advice was misconceived and impracticable? The question does not admit of a simple answer. On the Gallican issue, Rome soon yielded to *force majeure*, appointing first William Bishop and then Richard Smith bishop for England. The consequences were scarcely happy: the actions of Bishop and Smith in office left scars on the Church in England that have remained until modern times. But Rome was not in a position to act

differently without alienating France which was giving powerful backing to the Gallican candidates for the post.^{21 2} As for the Spanish marriage, Creswell's belief that it could lead to the return of England to the faith was based on his firm conviction that the country was still Catholic at heart and that the electorate would return a Catholic majority to the Commons if members were not required to take the oaths of supremacy and allegiance. Whether this conviction was well-founded or not is impossible to say, for the evidence necessary to prove or disprove it does not exist, but it should not be dismissed out of hand. Although Creswell had not lived in England for many years himself, he was no romantic dreamer dwelling in the past but a man of affairs whose views on this matter would certainly be based on current opinion among Catholics in England communicated to him by those passing through St Omer. Creswell's thoroughly practical approach to the question of England's conversion is evidenced by his warnings to Philip III about the need to proceed cautiously and by degrees. King James, it is true, told Philip that the English people, and not merely Parliament, would never stand for the return of Catholicism, but James needed an excuse to conceal his true intentions in refusing to make concessions to the Catholics. He never dared to put his claim to the test.

ABBREVIATIONS

Quotations in languages other than English are given in the original spelling. In the references I have adopted the following practice: For documents that I have seen myself (either in the original or in a photocopy) I give the reference to the original first, followed by any note of copies or transcripts, e.g. RA Gent, *Jezuïeten*, 74, ff. 249-51 (microfilm at APSJ). For documents at the Vatican that I know only from the Roman Transcripts at the Public Record Office, London, I give the transcript reference first, e.g. PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 145-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). The following abbreviations are used:

A&R	A. F. Allison and D. M. Rogers, <i>A Catalogue of Catholic Books in English printed abroad or secretly in England, 1558-1640</i> , 1956.
AAW	Archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster.
Alegambe	P. Alegambe, <i>Biblioteca scriptorum societatis Jesu</i> , 1643.
Anstruther	G. Anstruther, <i>The Seminary Priests. A dictionary of the secular clergy</i> , vols 1, 2 [1968], 1975.
APC	Public Record Office, London, <i>Acts of the Privy Council</i> , 1890, etc.
APSJ	Archivum Provinciale Societatis Jesu (i.e. the archives of the English Province at 114 Mount Street, London W.1).
ARSJ	Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu (i.e. the Jesuit General Archives at Rome).
AV Borgh	Vatican Archives, Borghese Collection.
AV NF	Vatican Archives, Nunziatura di Francia.
Belvederi	R. Belvederi, <i>Guido Bentivoglio diplomatico</i> , 2 vols, 1949. Vol. 2, pp. 113-381, prints <i>in extenso</i> the documents preserved in 'Registro di lettere che contengono le notizie d'Inghilterra per tutto della nunziatura di Fiandra di M.r Guido Bentivoglio' in the Biblioteca Comunale di Ferrara.
BV Barb	Vatican Library, Barberini MSS.
C	University Library, Cambridge.
Cal. SPD	Public Record Office, London, <i>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</i> , 1856, etc.
Cal. SP Milan	Public Record Office, London, <i>Calendar of State Papers . . . Milan</i> , 1912.
Chadwick	H. Chadwick, <i>St Omers to Stonyhurst, a history of two centuries</i> , 1962.
Chant	Bibliothèque s.J., Les Fontaines, Chantilly.
CRS	<i>Publications of the Catholic Record Society</i> , 1905, etc.
D	Trinity College, Dublin.

LATER LIFE OF JOSEPH CRESWELL

DAI	Douai Abbey, Woolhampton, Berkshire.
DD3	<i>The Douay College Diaries. Third, fourth and fifth, 1598-1634</i> , 2 vols, 1911 (CRS 10, 11).
DE	Downside Abbey, Stratton-on-the-Fosse, Somerset.
Dodd	C. Dodd, <i>pseud.</i> , <i>The Church History of England, from 1500 to . . . 1688</i> , 1737, etc.
E	National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh.
EMVP	English Martyrs Vice Postulate, 114 Mount Street, London, W.1.
Foley	H. Foley, <i>Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus</i> , 1877, etc.
Guilday	P. Guilday, <i>The English Catholic Refugees on the Continent 1555-1795</i> , vol. 1 only published, 1914.
Hicks	Fitzherbert. L. Hicks, <i>Letters of Thomas Fitzherbert 1608-1610</i> , 1948 (CRS 41).
HMC Downshire	Historical Manuscripts Commission, London, <i>Report on the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Downshire</i> , 1936, etc. Vols 2-4 comprise calendars of the papers of William Trumbull the elder, James I's Agent at the Court of the Archduke at Brussels, from 1605 to August 1614.
HMC Purnell's Transcripts	Historical Manuscripts Commission, London: E. K. Purnell's unpublished transcripts from the Downshire MSS. These supplement the printed calendar of the Downshire MSS. from August 1614 onwards.
HP	Heythrop College, Cavendish Square, London W.1.
L	British Library (British Museum Library), London.
L ²	Lambeth Palace Library, London.
L ²⁵	Middle Temple Library, London.
Loomie	<i>Spain and the Jacobean Catholics</i> . A. J. Loomie, <i>Spain . . . 2 vols</i> , 1973, 1978 (CRS 64, 68).
Loomie	<i>Spanish Elizabethans</i> . A. J. Loomie, <i>The Spanish Elizabethans. The English exiles at the court of Philip II</i> , 1963.
Madrid	Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid.
Meerbeeck	L. van Meerbeeck, <i>Correspondance des nonces Gesualdo, Morra, Sanseverino . . . 1615-1621</i> , 1937 (<i>Analecta Vaticano-Belgica</i> , ser. 2, vol. 4).
Milan ²	Brera Library, Milan.
O	Bodleian Library, Oxford.
OBA	Archives of the Old Brotherhood of the Secular Clergy (housed with AAW).
Paris	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
Petti	A. G. Petti, 'A Bibliography of the Writings of Richard Verstegan' (RH, April 1963, pp. 82-103).
PRO 31/2	Public Record Office, London, Milan Transcripts.
PRO 31/9	Public Record Office, London, Roman Transcripts.
RA Gent	Rijksarchief, Gent.
RH	<i>Recusant History. A journal of research in post-Reformation Catholic history</i> , 1951, etc.
SP 14/63	Public Record Office, London, State Papers Domestic, James I.
ST	Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, Lancashire.
STC	A. W. Pollard and G. R. Redgrave, <i>A Short-title Catalogue of Books printed in England, Scotland & Ireland and of English Books printed abroad, 1475-1640</i> , 1926. (Second edition of letters I-Z, 1976).
TD	<i>Dodd's Church History of England . . . with notes, additions, and a continuation by . . . M. A. Tierney</i> , 1839, etc.
Uriarte	P. J. Eug. de Uriarte, <i>Catálogo razonado de obras anónimas y seudónimas de autores de la Compañía de Jesús pertenecientes a la antigua asistencia española</i> , 1904, etc.

NOTES

¹ For Haller's earlier career in Germany see B. Duhr, *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge* (1907), etc., Bd. 1 and 2 *passim*. For the opposition between the Queen and Lerma see L. von Ranke, *Fürsten und Völker von Süd-Europa* (edition of 1836), Bd. 1, pp. 197, *et seq.*; C. Pérez Bustamante, *Semblanza de un monarca* (1950), pp. 84-92; M. J. Pérez Martín, *Margarita de Austria* (1961), pp. 89, *et seq.* Pérez Martín also cites some contemporary references to Haller's influence on the Queen (*op. cit.*, pp. 203-04); for another contemporary reference see the report of the Venetian ambassador, Francesco Priuli, in 1608, printed in N. Barozzi and G. Berchet, *Relazioni degli stati europei* (1856), etc., ser. 1, vol. 1, pp. 423-4. Further light on Haller's relations with Lerma is provided by Haller himself in a report

LATER LIFE OF JOSEPH CRESWELL

summarised in A. Astrain, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús de la Asistencia de España* (1902), etc., tom. 3, pp. 637-53.

² RA Gent, Jezuieten, 74, ff. 51-54. 'La causa de la partida de Joseph Cresuelo del' España',

³ ARSJ, Anglia 31, I, 453 (microfilm at APSJ, film 26). Copies at Stonyhurst (Anglia A.V. 9); APSJ (formerly Stonyhurst Anglia A.V. 10); RA Gent, Jezuieten, 74. The document is headed: 'Ex responsione ad calumnias contra P. Josephum Creswelum, scripta ab ipso P. Creswelo'. It is addressed to the Vicar General of the Society after the death of the General, Claudio Acquaviva, which occurred on 31 January 1615. Creswell explains that he had intended to draw up this defence of himself before leaving Madrid but had been prevented by his summons to Rome.

⁴ For their use of diplomatic pressure and their attack on the character of Vitelleschi, see J. Créteineau-Joly, *Histoire . . . de la Compagnie de Jésus* (1844), etc., tom. 3, p. 178.

⁵ ARSJ, Anglia 31, II, 513, 515 (microfilm at APSJ, film 31). Alcalá is eighteen miles north-east of Madrid on the road to Zaragoza. We learn from the 'Responsio' (see note 3) that the horse was a present to him from his old friend Juan de Idiáquez, Comendador of León.

⁶ It is possibly Uriarte no. 6218, *Breve modo de rezar el rosario de Nuestra Señora*, 1613, pliego en folio. Uriarte does not himself appear to have seen a copy of this pamphlet which he describes from an entry in a MS. history of the 'Colegio de Montesion'.

⁷ A&R, 334. STC, 11315.

⁸ Creswell mentions this in the 'Responsio' (see note 3).

⁹ Copies at: Milan², Paris, Chant.

¹⁰ There is a copy of *Sacra Tempe* at Chant. A modern edition, with introduction by H. Watrigant, s.j., has been published in *Collection de la Bibliothèque des Exercices de Saint Ignace*, no. 26 (1910). I have not seen the Italian translation mentioned by Frolich.

Libellus primum in Hispania scriptus, tum Mediolani editus; tum Italice versus Bononiae evulgatus, nunc in Germania merito lucem aspicit; quia eius libelli scribendi suasor primus & hortator Germanus fuit. Nam R.P. Richardus Haller Societatis Iesu olim Congregationis nostrae praeses & Collegii Ingolstadiensis Rector magna & virtutis & sapientiae opinione, rebusque gestis clarissimus, cum ex illo secessu videret in Hispanicam iuventutem ac nobilitatem tot emolumenta redundare, industria P. Guilielmi Bathei Hiberni viri sanctitatis fama apud Hispanos celebris, auctor fuit, ut Doctor Petrus Manrique eum laborem sumeret, quaequae vidisset aut cognovisset insigniora mutatae vitae exempla totamque adeo rationem, qua P. Batheus usus fuisset, litteris consignaret atque evulgaret.

¹¹ In his entry under Bathe.

¹² This is the 'Responsio' (see note 3).

¹³ Printed in TD, vol. 5, pp. cxcvii-ix.

¹⁴ AV Borgh, II, 403, f. 36v. (Photocopy in APSJ. French summary in Meerbeeck, p. 412)

¹⁵ AV Borgh, II, 428, ff. 236v-237r (microfilm in APSJ. French summary in Meerbeeck, pp. 25-26).

. . . ho per Pre di buon zelo et sara caro che sia veduto et ascoltato volentieri ma non si resta di dire a V.S. che si ha per Pre un poco ardente como ella scoprirà meglio trattando con lui et mi basta pero haver solamenti accennato questo alla sua prudenza.

¹⁶ PRO 31/9, 128, ff. 184-5 (from BV Barb. Lat. 8618).

. . . cui sum notus, et per quem a praedecessore vestro felicis recordationis Paulo Quinto multa beneficia accepi.

¹⁷ For the text of the letters to the nuncios at Brussels and Cologne, see AV Borgh, I, 914, ff. 186r-187r. Both letters are dated 7 February 1615. Borghese mentions the papal brief in his letter to the nuncio at Brussels. For a reference to the letter to the nuncio at Paris, also dated 7 February, see the nuncio's acknowledgment in AV NF, 56, ff. 227v-228r.

¹⁸ For Acquaviva's regulations, see Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, p. 129. Biographies of the individual office-holders named here will be found in Foley, but I have silently made good mistakes and omissions in Foley by reference to the General's letters and other primary sources.

¹⁹ There is a general account of them in Guilday, ch. 5. This should be corrected and supplemented by reference to Chadwick, chs 1-5.

²⁰ For this see Creswell to Cardinal Borromeo, 25 August 1615 (note 21 below).

²¹ PRO 31/2, 1, ff. 100-01. Cal. SP. Milan, p. 652, no. 1048.

²² HMC Purnell's Transcripts (from Downshire MSS., Misc. 2, 97).

²³ For Fitzherbert's career, see Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, pp. 1-3. That Creswell remained Vice-Prefect after Fitzherbert's arrival in Flanders is abundantly clear from Owen's letters to Creswell. James Wadsworth the younger, who arrived at St Omer in 1618 when Creswell was living in the College, says in *The English Spanish Pilgrim*, 1629, that Creswell lost the position of Vice-Prefect in 1619 when the mission became a Vice-Province.

²⁴ The first letter from the General to be addressed to him at Ghent is dated 5 November 1622 (ARSJ, Epist. Gen. Anglia I, 1. Photocopy at APSJ).

²⁵ Foley, vol. 7, p. 182, citing the Jesuit Necrology.

²⁶ RA Gent, Jezuieten, 74, ff. 167-8, 192-3, 204-06, 189-91, 183-6, 222-3, 247-8, 249-51 (micro-

film at APSJ). I also have typescripts made from the originals kindly given to me by Professor W. Schrickx of the University of Ghent.

²⁷ See A. F. Allison, 'John Gerard and the Gunpowder Plot' (RH, April 1959), pp. 43-63.

²⁸ PRO 31/9, 131A, ff. 134-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). CSP Milan, p. 653, no. 1050.

²⁹ Thomas Sackville (1571-1646) was the fourth son of Thomas Sackville, first Earl of Dorset, Lord Treasurer (C. J. Phillips, *History of the Sackville Family* [1930], vol. 1, pp. 242-5). He appears to have spent much of his early life abroad. The Jesuit annual letters for the English Mission, 1614, refer to his having been recently imprisoned in England at the instance of Archbishop Abbot and then sent into exile (Foley, Vol. 7, pp. 1068-9). From May 1614 to April 1615 he was at Brussels where his advice on English Catholic affairs was welcomed by the Nuncio, Guido Bentivoglio (Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 327, 347-54). Matthew Kellison, the President of Douai College, reporting in October 1622 to the Nuncio, Guido del Bagno, on the English colleges in Flanders, said he had been told that Thomas Sackville had given 70,000 florins to found the Jesuit scholasticate at Louvain (DD3, p. 201), a figure that agrees well enough with that of 40,000 escudos (about £11,000) mentioned by Creswell. For conversion tables see Loomie, *Spanish Elizabethans*, p. 240.

³⁰ For the Spanish noblewoman, Luisa de Carvajal (1566-1614), who devoted the later years of her life and much of her fortune to helping the Catholic cause in England, see C. Abad, *Una misionera española en la Inglaterra del siglo XVII. Doña Luisa de Carvajal* (1966).

³¹ For this proposed legislation and the gift of Phillip II see Chadwick, pp. 11-13, and Loomie, *Spanish Elizabethans*, pp. 99-100.

³² The 'new law' to which Creswell refers was the royal proclamation of 23 March 1615, '... against sending over of children and relief to seminaries' (STC, 8512), which included a prohibition against sending money to the colleges abroad on pain of Star Chamber proceedings. Creswell gives no details of the mortgage that the College had found itself compelled to try to obtain: "... de yr tomando un censo sobre la poca renta que tienen para su sustento ordinario". Owen, wrote to Creswell on 21 May 1616: "If Fa. Silisdon can find means to sell the censo which he hath upon the Seminary of St Omers [i.e. obtain a loan against the security of the College property] I pray you assist him therein, for so at least our College shall be the more secure, although we bind ourselves de evicione by way of surety for the Seminary" (RA Gent, Jezuieten, 74, ff. 204-06).

³³ Reference as for note 28.

... no dexando (con este) de descubrir la necesidad a las personas que podemos razonablemente pensar sean mas capaces y dispuestos para semejantes ocasiones por no parecer que queremos obligar Dios a milagros. Quien acudiere entenderemos que lo haze movido de Dios y quien no acudiere entenderemos que no lo haze porque el Señor la reserva otras buenas obras pues el mundo se gobierna por su providencia y sin ella no cae sola hoja del arbol.

³⁴ Jacques Blaise (Blaseus), c. 1540-1618, Franciscan Recollect, Guardian and Professor of Theology at Douai and Provincial of his order. Bishop of Namur, 1597, and of St Omer from 1601 until his death. He was a great friend and benefactor of the English Jesuits. (*Biographie nationale ... de Belgique* (1866), etc., tom. 2, cols. 462-4.)

³⁵ Cal. SP Milan, p. 656, no. 1051. The letter was published by Francisco Peralta, the Rector of the English College at Seville, in *Relacion que el P. Francisco de Peralta ... escrivio ... en que se da cuenta del estado que oy tienen las cosas de la religion catolica de Ynglaterra* (Sevilla, 1616 [of which the only known copy is at Madrid, pressmark R-Varios, 59-98. Photocopy at EMVP]).

³⁶ James I consistently based his appeal to Catholic governments abroad not to show favour to the English Catholic exiles on the plea that these exiles were disloyal subjects. It was on these grounds that Sir Thomas Edmondes, James's ambassador at Brussels, 1605-09, had applied pressure on the Archduke to disallow the move of the Jesuit novitiate to Watten (see p. 84 of this article, and Chadwick, pp. 50-51). But, as Bishop Blaise points out, this was hardly consistent with James's own attempts to subvert the legitimate government in France in the years following the murder of Henri IV. The extant documents bear out his accusation. On 27 September 1614, the Privy Council instructed Edmondes, now ambassador at Paris, to encourage the Prince de Condé, leader of the rebel factions that included the Huguenots, to 'assume his rightful place in the conduct of French affairs' in opposition to the Queen Regent, Marie de Medici, whose policy of maintaining a close Franco-Spanish alliance was obnoxious to James (British Museum. *Catalogue of the Stowe Manuscripts*, [1895], p. 230). Edmondes's instructions made it plain, however, that he was to be careful to conceal the fact that the move was instigated by James. In the autumn of 1615 Marie de Medici complained to James, through her ambassador in London, that Edmondes's house in Paris was the 'ordinary resort of all the malcontents and ill-affected persons of the state' (*ibid.*, p. 229). On this, see also *Mémoires concernant les affaires de France sous la régence de Marie de Medicis* (1721), tom. 1, p. 175. After the Treaty of Loudun (5 May 1616) which terminated the hostilities begun by Condé, James made another about-turn, commending Edmondes for not asking for Condé's release from prison, on the grounds that the rebellious factions

in France were threatening the safety of the state (*Catalogue of the Stowe Manuscripts*, p. 238).

³⁷ PRO 31/9, 1, ff. 116-21 (from Bibl. Ambrosiana, G. 222, Inf. fo. 185). Cal. SP. Milan pp. 657-9, no. 1052. The MS. in the Ambrosiana (which I have not seen) would appear to be a scribal copy, mistakenly naming Cardinal Zapata as the addressee. Creswell's remarks about that Cardinal in the text show clearly that it was not Zapata to whom he was writing. Antonio Zapata y Cisneros (c. 1550-1635), Archbishop of Burgos, was created cardinal in 1604, made Cardinal Protector for Spain in 1606, lived for a number of years in Rome, was appointed Viceroy of Naples in 1620, and later returned to Spain and became a Minister of State and President of the Council of the Inquisition. There was no other Cardinal Zapata at this period. (*Hierarchia catholica*, vol. 3, p. 216, vol. 4, pp. 7, 123, 271; J. M. Pou y Martí, *Archivo de la Embajada de España cerca de la Santa Sede*, vol. 2 [1917], p. 6; J. P. Migne, *Dictionnaire des cardinaux* [1857], col. 1698). The provenance of the MS. suggests that this is a Spanish translation of a letter originally written to Cardinal Borromeo in Latin.

³⁸ Quoted from the English translation in Cal. SP. Milan, pp. 657-9, no. 1052. The calendarist accepts that Creswell is writing to Cardinal Zapata, but see note 37 above.

³⁹ PRO 31/2, 1, ff. 122-4 (from Bibl. Ambrosiana, G. 222, Inf. fo. 189). Cal. SP. Milan, p. 659, no. 1053.

⁴⁰ Philip announced his intention of making this annual grant in 1600. See Loomie, *Spanish Elizabethans*, pp. 200-01. Creswell's statement seems to imply that it is being regularly paid.

⁴¹ See Chadwick, pp. 55-56.

⁴² RA Gent, *Jezuïeten*, 74, ff. 249-51 (microfilm at APSJ).

⁴³ PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 145-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

Florent (per Dei gratiam) in omni pietate et bonis literis quae hic habemus collegia Societatis pro Anglis, et seminarium Audomarense.

⁴⁴ These are the figures for editions of which copies can now be found (as recorded in A&R).

⁴⁵ This and the following quotations from Owen's letters are from RA Gent, *Jezuïeten*, 74, folios cited in note 26.

⁴⁶ STC 4744. A bitter personal satire against King James, it was published with a false London imprint and a false attribution in the title to Isaac Casaubon. For James's efforts to trace the author and printer, see SP 14 (Flanders) and the Downshire MSS. from 1615 onwards. See also the references in Meerbeeck, p. 44, footnote.

⁴⁷ A&R 287. STC 6384. STC's attribution of the translation to A. Estienne is an error.

⁴⁸ On Preston, see W. K. L. Webb, 'Thomas Preston . . . alias Roger Widdrington' (RH, January 1954), pp. 216-68; M. Lunn, 'The Anglo-Gallicanism of Dom Thomas Preston', *Studies in Church History*, vol. 9 (1972), pp. 239-46.

⁴⁹ For a detailed analysis of Du Perron's oration, see P. Feret, *Le Cardinal du Perron, orateur, controversiste, écrivain* (1877), pp. 110-31.

⁵⁰ *Oration*, p. 116.

⁵¹ STC 14401, etc.

⁵² He was rewarded with a prebend at Canterbury worth £200 a year, with a fine house, and a prebend in Wales worth the same. On this see D. H. Willson, 'James I's Literary Assistants', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 8 (1944), pp. 50-51. Willson cites Du Moulin's autobiography.

⁵³ STC 14367.

⁵⁴ Antoine Le Fèvre de la Boderie, Ambassador to England 1606-09 and (as Ambassador Extraordinary) 1610-11. His personal friendship with King James and his anti-papal sentiments were well known. On his opinions see especially his letters to Puissieux, 1 July and 14 July 1609 (*Ambassade de Monsieur de la Boderie en Angleterre . . . 1606-1611* (1750), vol. 4, pp. 387, 399-400).

⁵⁵ Quoted in Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, vol. 2, p. 73.

⁵⁶ PRO 31/9, 121A ff. 146-50 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). In Spanish. The addressee is not named but the form of address is that for a cardinal. For the identification of the addressee as Borghese see note 96. The Spanish is possibly a translation of a letter written originally in Latin.

Dias ha que recebi de Inglaterra el libro incluso, impresso por orden del Rey: y que enseñe en las escuelas en latin y que cada padre de familia lo comprasse en lengua Inglesa, y pagan un real por libro, que es grande garancia al autor. Visto quan frivola cosa es, no me parecia que era degna del porto de embiarle a nadie: y mientras quedava el danno en solo Inglaterra, el remedio era facil alla con embiar contrayerva a esta ponchona [?] que ya esta hecho y se va haziendo, con repartir en el reyno la oracion del Cardinal de Perona, impressa en lengua Inglesa, con dedicatoria y advertencias al lector, adonde (con razones substanciales y authoridad de los Santos y de la Sagrada Escritura) se deshazen las noñerías deste, y de semejantes libros: que para Inglaterra pudiera bastar.

⁵⁷ STC 14415, etc.

⁵⁸ STC 8531. See Sir W. Greg, *A Companion to Arber* (1967), pp. 157-61.

⁵⁹ D. Masson, *The Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, vol. 10, pp. cvii-cix, 530-1.

⁶⁰ The English is A&R 325 (not in first edition of STC). Copies of the Latin are at L²⁵, O, HP, C, E and elsewhere.

⁶¹ PRO 31/9, 121 B, ff. 141-4 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

Tertium etiam hic absolvimus librum, qui est sub manu ammanuensis transcribendus, ut Roman mittatur ad Illustrissimam Dominationem vestram, nam eiusmodi opus est, quod non debeat inconsulto Sanctissimo Domino Nostro prodire, quamquam vehementissime petatur a Catholicis Anglis: ut deserviat loco commentarii et expositionis illius libelli, qui inscribitur Deus et Rex: quem edicto regio, iusserunt emi ab omnibus patribus familias, et doceri in omnibus scholis latinitatis, ut teneri animi puerorum et imperitum vulgus praeoccupentur erroribus. Sed spero ita detectos esse brevi opusculo, simili stilo simili (quoad fieri poterat) titulo, similibusque caeteris, quae non continebant errores: ut tutum erit Catholico cuivis habere apud se librum: et adversarius incidet in veritatem Catholicam priusquam animadvertat: sicque ars prava honesta deluditur arte.

⁶² AV Borgh, II, 403, f. 180v (photocopy at APSJ).

⁶³ PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 145-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). The Nuncio forwarded them on 30 September (AV Borgh, II, 137, f. 127r, photocopy at APSJ).

⁶⁴ . . . quo tutius possit a Catholico servari, et alii incidant in antidotum priusquam animadvertant.

⁶⁵ . . . et inde in alias regiones transmitti, ut anglicanum exemplar (postquam fuerit simili modo correctum ad latinum) possit etiam simili secreto imprimi et per Angliam Hiberniam et Scotiam ex improvviso spargi.

⁶⁶ Quo citius autem expediri utrumque opus possit, eo consultius ad manifestandam veritatem, tollendumque scandalum infirmorum. Quo nomine responsio aliqua ad hunc libellum valde etiam diu a Catholicis desideratur. Hocque habent incommodi delatae responsiones ad similes libros, quod grassetur pestis, et hauriatur passim venenum oblitum melle, interim dum nihil apparet quod detegat dolum malum. Atque ut sunt jactabundi haeretici, ante victoriam triumphum canunt. Quod si eadem diligentia Catholica veritas prodire posset in lucem qua, regia autoritate expedita iniquitas publicatur, deficerent statim a scribendo adversarii . . . Uti fieri videmus quotidie, ipsorumque libros manere apud bibliopolas, postquam Catholicorum responsa in lucem prodeunt.

⁶⁷ PRO 31/9 122B f. 31 (AV Borgh, ref. not given in the transcript).

Tandem misi ad Coloniam ad prelum Responsionem ad libellum Deus et Rex, emendatum et omnibus servatis quae accepi in mandatis, et spero fore in magnum beneficium Catholicorum, ut sciant quid respondere debeant et possint captiosis quaestionibus haeticorum.

⁶⁸ See note 60.

⁶⁹ The ornamental initial S on sig. A2r of *Deus et Rex* is found (in considerably fresher state) on sig. B4r of A. D. Floccus, *L. Fenestellae de magistratibus sacerdotisque Romanorum*, Coloniae, sumptibus Bernardi Gualtheri (1607). For Wolter, see J. Benzing, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet* (1963), p. 234.

⁷⁰ Cal. SP Milan, p. 660, no. 1054.

⁷¹ See note 60.

⁷² See note 17.

⁷³ AVNF, 56, ff. 227v-228r.

⁷⁴ See Ubaldini (Paris Nuncio) to Borghese, 18 June 1613, and Borghese to Ubaldini, 6 July 1613 (AV Borgh, I, 594, f. 127r, and I, 896, ff. 150v-152r).

⁷⁵ Cal. SPD Add. 1580-1625, pp. 410, 412.

⁷⁶ RA Gent, Jesuieten, 74, ff. 167-8 (microfilm at APSJ). Singleton's memorial has not so far been found.

⁷⁷ See note 76.

⁷⁸ They put their names on behalf of the College to a document dated 10 January 1617, William Smith signing himself William Wright (AAW B24, no. 103). On Arras College, see A. F. Allison, 'Richard Smith, Richelieu and the French Marriage' (RH, January 1964, pp. 148-211) especially pp. 167-8.

⁷⁹ A&R 771-2. STC 22809. On this incident, see Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, pp. 122-3, and T. H. Clancy, 'English Catholics and the Deposing Power, pt. 2' (RH, April 1962, pp. 202-27) especially pp. 208-9.

⁸⁰ SP 14/63 no. 74. The Examination of W. Bishop. 4 May 1611.

⁸¹ William Bishop to the Pope, 31 July 1612 (PRO 31/9, 131, ff. 5-6, from BV Barb. Lat. 8623).

⁸² Edmond Richer, *Histoire du Syndicat d'Edmond Richer*, 1753, pp. 246-7.

⁸³ Bentivoglio to Borghese, 31 August 1613 (Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 299-302).

⁸⁴ Bentivoglio to Borghese, 7 March 1615 (Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 344-5).

⁸⁵ A&R 427-8. STC 14910-11.

⁸⁶ A&R 113. STC 3094.

⁸⁷ Belvederi, vol. 2, p. 338.

⁸⁸ For Bishop's true feelings, see his letter to More, 25 July 1615 (AAW, A. 14, no. 150).

For the way the matter was handled, see Bentivoglio to Borghese, 31 January, 1 August and 22 August 1615 (Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 338, 368, 373).

⁸⁹ Mayler to Bennett, 9 February 1615. (AAW, B. 24, no. 99).

⁹⁰ Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 309-13. This is a follow-up to Bentivoglio's letter to Borghese of August (see note 79).

⁹¹ See note 89.

⁹² PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 135-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

Accepi nudiustertius ex Anglia adiunctum librum, quem percurri festinanter non sine dolore . . . Consilium est turbare Galliam hoc eodem veneno, et haec causa nunc divulgandi id, quod conceperunt diu, ut enervent, si possint universam auctoritatem Apostolicae Sedis. Invenio pagina 160 appendicis nomina quorundam sacerdotum, qui primam fecerunt professionem fidei suae Elizabethae. Ignoscat illis Deus, nam inde desumptum est hoc iuramentum Iacobi Regis, quod nunc turbat Ecclesiam. Doleo Praesidem Duacensem abduci huiusmodi hominibus. Duos reliquorum antesignanos habet amicissimos Parisiis, et [alios?] nunc in Anglia, qui vicissim dicuntur communicare sua consilia cum auctore huius libri. Quod si verum sit diligenter observanda et examinanda est doctrina eorum, qui scholasticam theologiam profitentur, sive in Collegio Anglicano, sive apud Benedictinos Anglos Duaci. Nam audio quaedam, quae nonnihil favent perniciosis opinionibus huius libri.

For the attitude of the English Benedictines to the oath, see M. Lunn, 'English Benedictines and the Oath of Allegiance' (RH, October 1969), pp. 146-75.

⁹³ . . . existimo . . . non esse sine gravi fundamento insignium quorundam Catholicorum opinionem, expedire ut praeficiantur illi Seminario viri, qui omnino sint immunes ab omni commercio istorum, qui huiusmodi libros indunt, vel certe auferantur pensiones, et dissipetur Seminarium potius, quam sit schola huiusmodi opinionum.

⁹⁴ Praeses, dum ante XX annos viveret sub mea cura in Seminario Romano, erat ab huiusmodi cogitationibus satis alienus . . . Sed magistratus ostendit virum, et nonnunquam etiam mutat. Nihilominus existimo illum potius duci et moveri motu impresso quam suo.

Kellison was at the English College, Rome from 1582 to 1589. Creswell was Rector of the College from 1588 to 1592.

⁹⁵ Origo totius huius mali fuit importuna admissio temporalis ambitionis in hanc missionem. Hac enim abusi sunt adversarii politici et nunc abutuntur nixi infirmitatibus humanis quorundam sacerdotum, qui profecerunt non nihil in litteris parum in studio humilitatis.

⁹⁶ PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 146-50 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). This is the letter already cited in note 56. Although the only copy that appears to have survived is in Spanish, it is almost certain that Creswell's correspondent is Borghese. It was Borghese who had authorised him to investigate the situation at Douai and Creswell would hardly have sent this highly sensitive report to any other cardinal. Further confirmation is provided by Creswell's remark at the end of the letter that he has written at such great length because the information is of special concern to the Pope.

Preston vive en libro carcel mejor acomodado segun me dizen los que vienen de alla que estubiera en ningun monasterio de su orden, tiene una libreria copiosa y un criado y un ama que le guisa la comida, y sale quando quiere. Antes me dizen que algunos sacerdotes presos de los que son de su opinion y aprueban el juramento salen a veer las comedias . . . y que los otros companeros que andan libros tienen salvaguardas secretas las quales viendo los alguaziles y pursuivantes les evitan luego predicandolos en alguna casa en la calle.

⁹⁷ . . . clero santo y digno de toda honra fuera de los pocos ambiciosos que pretenden honra fuera de sazón. Porque no avemos aun acabado il Psalmo Miserere, y estos quieren cantar el Gloria Patri.

⁹⁸ Y para Arzobispo Cantuariense tenemos un prelado aqui, obispo de esta ciudad que si estubiera en mi mano le pidiera a nuestro Senor que le honrasse con la mayor dignidad ecclesiastica para de espectar otros prelados a seguir su eje [mplo].

For Bishop Blaise see note 34.

⁹⁹ The details are given in the account contained in DD3, pp. 127-30.

¹⁰⁰ Gesualdo to Borghese, 25 June 1616 (PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 38-39. From 'Carte di Paolo V').

¹⁰¹ The Nuncio, Gesualdo, sent it to Borghese with a letter of his own on 7 May 1616. Gesualdo's letter is known only from a Roman summary of it (PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 27-8. From AV Borgh, II, 448).

¹⁰² This letter, dated 26 June 1616, is printed by Dodd, vol. 2, p. 449.

¹⁰³ Creswell to the Nuncio at Brussels, 14 May 1616 (RA Gent, Jezuieten, 74, ff. 218-9. Holograph. Microfilm at APSJ).

Si docuerint non esse de fide, quod revera temerarium est dicere, hanc opinionem qui admisserint Catholici, non tuebantur auctoritatem Sedis Apostolicae in Anglia iactura bonorum suorum, quod nunc faciunt scindio vitae sacerdotes et laici.

¹⁰⁴ It appears to have been the opinion of the celebrated Jesuit theologian, Leonardus Lessius, that they would be under no grave moral obligation to do so. See ARSJ, Anglia 31, I, no. 509, APSJ film 26.

¹⁰⁵ The information about the decision by the Holy Office is provided by Borghese's notes written on the verso of Creswell's letter of 4 April to the Brussels Nuncio (see note 92 above) which the latter had forwarded to Rome.

¹⁰⁶ DD3, p. 570.

¹⁰⁷ Copies at L.O.C., and elsewhere.

¹⁰⁸ See DD3, p. 47.

¹⁰⁹ Cal. SPD, Add. 1580-1625, pp. 410-12.

¹¹⁰ See Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, pp. 44-46, 105. For Weston's being at Cowdray we have Abbot's statement (see note 119). See also the list cited in note 111 bracketing Weston's name with that of Birkhead and others in Sussex in c. 1609-10.

¹¹¹ OBA I, 26. There are two lists under this reference, both undated but probably drawn up in 1609 or 1610 for Smith's use at Rome (see 'Narrative of Dr Smith's Agency in Rome' in Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, pp. 102, *et seq.*). In the first (which, according to a note by M. A. Tierney, is in Birkhead's hand) the order appears to be roughly by seniority: Weston's name comes twelfth, following those of Birkhead himself, nine assistants, and William Harrison who was later to be Arch-priest in succession to Birkhead. Further down the list we find 'D. Westonus junior', i.e. Edward Weston's younger brother Roger. The second list is arranged by counties. Here Roger (referred to as 'Mr Weston') appears under Yorkshire, Edward (referred to as 'Dr Weston') under Sussex in a group apart comprising the Arch-priest Birkhead, Smith, More, Weston himself, and Robert Pett. Anstruther's statement that Edward Weston 'worked in the Durham district' (vol. 1, p. 376) appears to be entirely without foundation.

¹¹² AAW A9, no. 13. And see note 79.

¹¹³ Copies at L.C.E. and elsewhere.

¹¹⁴ A&R 674. STC 25597.

¹¹⁵ See G. Anstruther, *Vaux of Harrowden*, 1953, pp. 399-401.

^{115a} DD3, p. 116.

¹¹⁶ PRO 31/9, 131, ff. 9-11 (from BV Barb. Lat. 8623). Weston signs with the alias by which he was known at the College: 'Edouardus Williamsonus', and is described as 'Assistens'

¹¹⁷ PRO 31/9, 131, f. 18 (from BV Barb. Lat. 8623). It is clear from this letter that the principal favour that Borghese had obtained for him from the Pope, on the recommendation of Bentivoglio, was his appointment as Professor of Theology and Assistant to the President at Douai. Weston expressed similar sentiments in the dedicatory epistle to Borghese in the book itself.

¹¹⁸ See W. Schrickx, 'An Early Seventeenth-Century Catalogue of Books from the English Jesuit Mission in Saint-Omer', *Archives et Bibliothèques de Belgique* (1975), pp. 592-618, especially pp. 598-600, citing documents at Brussels. Preston's *Disputatio theologica* is A&R 667, STC 25602. For Abbot's letters to Trumbull on the subject see HMC Downshire, vol. 4, pp. 113-14, 194, and HMC Purnell's Transcripts (from uncalendared Downshire MSS. vol. 1, no. 20).

¹¹⁹ Abbot to Trumbull, 9 September 1613 (HMC Downshire, vol. 4, p. 194); same to same, 25 May 1615 (HMC Purnell's Transcripts, from uncalendared Downshire MSS., vol. 1, no. 20).

¹²⁰ Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 309-13.

¹²¹ See Anstruther, vol. 1, p. 318; Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, pp. 23-24. Hicks is mistaken in thinking that Singleton remained in his post at Douai till 1620.

¹²² TD, vol. 5, p. 40.

¹²³ Belvederi, pp. 309-15.

... huomo inabilissimo al governare, e tanto incostante, che tall' hora apertamente si contradice in molte cose, che riesce poco sincere e verace, d'ingegno non punto dolce, e pacato, e molto facile a moversi ad ogni investigatione, essendo oltre a cio la sua dottrina oscura, e confusa, per il qual rispetto non e mai riuscita grata al Collegio.

¹²⁴ Copies at L, D, ST and elsewhere.

¹²⁵ Bentivoglio to Borghese, 31 August 1613 (Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 298-9). Bentivoglio reported that he had interviewed Singleton twice: on the first occasion Singleton had been evasive but on the second he had spoken quite openly. The reason for his initial evasiveness was clearly, as the report shows, that he wanted to communicate with Becanus before revealing information that concerned the Jesuits.

¹²⁶ It seems that Singleton had been given to understand that the Pope's permission to publish the book had been obtained privately through the good offices of Thomas Fitzherbert at Rome. This, it appears, was not the case, though the book had, in fact, been shown to the Pope shortly before it was issued. It is not known how the misunderstanding arose, but Singleton can hardly be blamed for what happened after he had parted with his manuscript to Becanus. See Bentivoglio to Borghese, 31 August 1613 and (-) September 1613 (Belvederi, vol. 2, pp. 298-9, 316-17), and Borghese to Bentivoglio, 21 September 1613 (AV Borgh, I, 914 f. 621 r-v).

LATER LIFE OF JOSEPH CRESWELL

- ¹²⁷ Kellison to More, 3 November 1614 (printed in TD, vol. 5, pp. cc-cci).
- ¹²⁸ Kellison to More, 11 February 1615 (printed in TD, vol. 5, p. cci).
- ¹²⁹ Kellison to More, 8 September 1615 (printed in TD, vol. 5, p. ccii).
- ¹³⁰ This is stated by Kellison in his letter to More of 9 February 1616 (see note below).
- ¹³¹ Kellison to More, 8 September 1615 (see note 124).
- ¹³² Kellison to More, 9 February 1616 (printed in TD, vol. 5, pp. cciii-iv).
- ¹³³ Kellison to Creswell, (-) January 1616 (printed in TD, vol. 5, pp. ccii-iii).
- ¹³⁴ Printed in TD, vol. 5, pp. cciv-vii.
- ¹³⁵ . . . praeterquam quod ab omnibus pro nimia indiscretione, levitate, et animi praecipitatione, notetur, alio insuper vitio laborat, Illustrissimis vestris Nunciis praefatis satis noto, usque adeo ut eius in hoc Collegio vestro praesentia valde periculosa sit.
- ¹³⁶ . . . quo etiam . . . novi neminem qui subdola conversatione plus possit alumnis insidiari. Collegii honori apud alios detrahere, susurrationibus et sinistris informationibus nostrorum omnium pacem et quietem infestare ac perturbare, cuius in similibus officiis unica est felicitas et opera.
- ¹³⁷ See note 102.
- ¹³⁸ Creswell to the Nuncio at Brussels, 14 May 1616 (RA Gent, Jezuieten, 74, ff. 218-19). Another extract from this letter has already been quoted (see note 103).
Veni Insulas ad quaedam negotia peragenda cum P. Provinciali Societatis ubi me convenit Praeses Collegii Duaceni. Ex antiqua amicitia egi cum illo pluribus de concordia cum doctoribus. Se paratum esse dixit sed non probatum ab aliis quod manerent in Collegio: causam non satis docuit. Processi usque Duacum ut fundum controversiarum capesserem. Pluribus conveni doctores Singletonum et Westonium sero vespere qui ingenue sese obtulerunt ad omnia quae ab illis iuste posset expectare Praeses. Illum volui ad concordiam adducere atque ut simul convenirent et exponerent utrimque quae possint deservire ad maiorem unionem animarum. Sed Praeses abnuit ne forte si omnino convenirent esset occasio de tenendi illos diutius in Seminario quod ab aliis (nimirum Anglicanis amicis) non probatum iri dixit qui eleemosinas non missuri erant Collegio quamdiu illi doctores hic manerent. Rationem non reddidit, quam aliunde audivi ab ipsius (ut dictum est) ore, quod non possent eleemosinae sine offensione status Anglicani mitti ad Collegium ubi alerentur ii qui scripserint contra iura Regis. Timere videtur Praeses concordiam ne illi vitio vertatur ab amicis. Hoc postremo effectum quod quamdiu Doctores ex arbitrio superiorum manserint in Collegio sit illis usus humaniter. Illi vicissim spondent omnem Praesidi observantiam et per illos non stetit quo minus omnes discordiarum radices extirparentur. De praeteritis cupiebant rationem reddere et audire obiecta Praesidis: et quoad possum animadvertere sincere agunt et ex animo. Praeses ab alienis consiliis pendet qui nescio an propendeant ad pacem. Non possum singula scribere satis est quod spero sint amice et pacifice victuri, interim dum aliud de rebus Collegii per Illustrissimum D.V. statuatur. Sed perfectior cura esse debet. Video prospicere quo res tendent et remedio opportuno opus est: ne fiat seminarium seditionis. Video alios ab aliis moveri et hos ab aliis qui nimia familiaritate utuntur cum adversariis.
- ¹³⁹ These measures are referred to by Henry Mayler in his letter to Bennet of 9 February 1615 (see note 89).
- ¹⁴⁰ In spite of all this, the alms received by the College in the years immediately following were inadequate and, in October 1617, Kellison had an appeal printed and circulated among Catholics in England calling their attention to the desperate plight of the College (see DD3, p. 139).
- ¹⁴¹ *Exemplar literarum a quodam sacerdote Collegii Anglorum Duaceni quondam alumno ex Anglia ad idem Collegium transmissarum. De martyriis quatuor eiusdem Collegii*, Duaci, typis Petri Auroi, 1616. Copies at DAI, DE. This edition was followed by others printed at Douai and at Ingolstadt. The approbation to the first Douai edition is dated: 15 September 1616, i.e. several months after Creswell had translated the same narrations into Spanish and printed them at St Omer (see notes 152 and 153).
- ¹⁴² Gesualdo to Borghese, 7 May 1616. Only a summary of the letter appears to have survived (see note 101).
- ¹⁴³ DD3, pp. 136-7.
- ¹⁴⁴ He is so described on the title page of his later books. He had already settled at Bruges by 1624 when he published there *The repaire of honour* (A&R 884), in support of the Jesuits John Percy and John Sweet, in their controversy with Daniel Featley.
- ¹⁴⁵ On 4 December 1627 he gave his opinion that Richard Smith was exceeding his authority in requiring the Regulars in England to obtain his approbation for hearing the confessions of the laity (AAW A21, no. 1); on 29 August 1629 he pronounced an adverse judgment on the Oath of Allegiance (ARSJ Anglia, 33, II, nos 35 and 39. Microfilm at APSJ film 43).
- ^{145a} See *An apologeticall answere of the Viscount Montague vnto sundrie important aspersions*, p. 106. (Holograph MS. in C.R.S. archives.)
- ¹⁴⁶ Anstruther, vol. 1, p. 376.
- ¹⁴⁷ DD3, pp. 142-3, 145.

LATER LIFE OF JOSEPH CRESWELL

¹⁴⁸ See Hicks, *Fitzherbert*, p. 24.

¹⁴⁹ 28 August 1617. AAW, B47, no. 2.

¹⁵⁰ April 1619. DD3, p. 149.

¹⁵¹ Thomas Atkinson (11 March); John Thules (18 March); Roger Wrenno (layman, 18 March); Thomas Maxfield (1 July); Thomas Tunstal (alias Helmes, 13 July). See note 141.

¹⁵² PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 167-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). The PRO transcript indicates that the letter is addressed to Borghese. As the text is in Spanish this may be a copy of a letter originally written to Borghese in Latin or possibly a copy sent to him of a letter written in Spanish to someone else.

Estas relaciones son muy ciertas, las traduxe en Romance: por que las embio al buen Rey, para que anime a su Embaxador, y reciba gusto.

¹⁵³ ARSJ Anglia, 32, I, where it is bound up among the MSS. (item no. 9). Microfilm at APSJ, film 33.

¹⁵⁴ See Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, vol. 2, p. 73 (also note 141 above).

¹⁵⁵ PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 131-6 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). In Spanish. This is a copy sent by Creswell to Borghese.

¹⁵⁶ See Helen G. Stafford, *James VI of Scotland and the Throne of England* (1940), pp. 26-40, 193-5. Henry VIII in his will (acting on the provisions of the Succession Act of 1534) had devised the crown, failing issue to his three children, Edward, Mary and Elizabeth, on the descendants of his younger sister Mary (the Suffolk line), to the postponement of those of his elder sister Margaret of Scotland (James's great grandmother), thus overriding the hereditary principle. The Succession Act of 1604 reversed the former Act, declaring James's title valid on the grounds of heredity alone. Although the Act of 1604 firmly rejected the claim of the descendants of the Suffolk line on the grounds of technical illegitimacy (arising from Catherine Seymour's marriage without royal consent), James's concern for his own title is evidenced by his fury over the clandestine marriage of William Seymour, the Suffolk heir, to James's first cousin Arabella Stuart.

¹⁵⁷ See Loomie, *Spain and the Jacobean Catholics*, vol. 1, p. xx.

¹⁵⁸ Creswell appears to have had in mind the Oath of Supremacy incorporated in Henry's second Succession Act of 1534 (26 Henry VIII, c. 2), but as far as we know this was never consistently imposed on members of the Commons. The situation described by Creswell really began to take shape with Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy, 1563. On this see Sir W. Holdsworth, *A History of English Law* (1903), etc., vol. 10, p. 551: 'Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy (5 Eliz., c. 1) required members, before they took their seats, to take the oath of supremacy before the Lord Steward or his deputies; and in 1610 they were also required to take the oath of allegiance and abjuration (7 James, I, c. 6). Till these oaths were taken the person elected had no status as a member of parliament . . . and they effectively debarred Roman Catholics from membership of the House till the law was changed in 1828.' Members were not required to take any oath of uniformity.

¹⁵⁹ For the situation in France in the years following the Edict of Nantes of 1598, and for that in Germany after the Emperor Rudolf II's Letter of Majesty of 1609 granting limited toleration to Protestants in Bohemia (including Moravia and Silesia), see J. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation* (1960), vol. 2, pp. 147-55, and vol. 1, pp. 285-6.

¹⁶⁰ Quoted in Loomie, *Spanish Elizabethans*, p. 196.

¹⁶¹ See note 160.

¹⁶² PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 141-4 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

¹⁶³ See S. R. Gardiner, *Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage* (1869), vol. 1, pp. 110-11.

¹⁶⁴ Twenty-six are named in the Privy Council order of 26 June (APC 1617-19, p. 197).

¹⁶⁵ PRO 31/9, 122A, ff. 147-8 (from AV Borgh, but no volume no. given).

¹⁶⁶ HMC Purnell's Transcripts (Downshire MSS. vol. 1, no. 40).

¹⁶⁷ HMC Purnell's Transcripts (Downshire MSS., vol. 33, no. 18).

¹⁶⁸ A&R 303. STC 10809.

¹⁶⁹ PRO 31/9, 123, ff. 213-6 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

Comes de Gondomar quotidie fere prolixos sermones habet cum Rege, solus sine interprete, et bene sperat. Expecto ab eo in horas nuntium certum qui omnia referet; ut promittunt literae nudius tertius acceptae. Interim curamus ne decipiatur blanditiis et promissis aliorum. Regum corda in manu Dei sunt: et ab ipso expectandum si quid boni hinc vel aliunde sit accessurum Ecclesiae.

¹⁷⁰ A&R 748. STC 21676.

¹⁷¹ *Quis diues saluus. Como vn hombre rico se puede saluar*. Emprimido en Flandes, en el colegio de los Yngleses de Sant Omer, el ano de M.DC.XX. Por Ricardo Britanno impressor. The only copy so far found is in the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid (pressmark 3-10704). 'Ricardus Britannus' was a Welsh employee at the press, Richard Floyd, who was afterwards dismissed. See C. A. Newdigate, 'Notes on the Seventeenth Century Printing Press of the English College at St Omers' (*The Library* [1919], pp. 179-90, 223-42), p. 186. See also HMC Purnell's transcripts (Downshire MSS., vol. 37, nos 115, 116).

¹⁷² Ref. as for note 169.

Praeclara multa suggeruntur a Salviano in libello adiuncto, quod in Anglico idiomate iam multis profuit in Anglia: nunc ad Hispanos transiit, Regisque et Principum manibus teritur, atque ut spero, non sine fructu.

¹⁷³ Y porque muchas personas principales en la casa y corte del Rey de Inglaterra y en todo el reyno, despues que se trata de estrechar mas la comunicacion y buen amistad con España: se han dado al estudio de la lengua Castellana; los mismos que han gustado de oyr a Salviano hablar en su vulgar Ingles, han hecho instancia que se bolviesse tambien en la Castellana, para poder aprender la lengua juntamente con la doctrina saludable que en este libro se enseña.

¹⁷⁴ The letter cited in note 55.

¹⁷⁵ Cal. SP. Milan, p. 660, no. 1054.

Nollem remandari ultra in Anglia libros Catholicos, sed gratis distribui . . . Propter leges adversas et poenas vendunt in Anglia mercatores Catholicos libros rigurissimo praetio unde non perveniunt ad illorum manus qui illis maxime indigent. Huic malo licet tardius nunc tandem mederi conamur, si Deus opem tulerit.

¹⁷⁶ PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 145-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). This is the letter already cited in note 63.

Mitto adiunctum scriptum quod Illustrissima Dominatio Vestra mitti iussit de expensis typographiae, ut libri Catholici distribuuntur gratis. Ego puto fore utilissimas expensas et gratissimas Deo.

¹⁷⁷ PRO 31/9, 123, ff. 213-6 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

Sententia illa *Gratis accepistis, gratis date*, quae praefigitur, significat ex conducto cum Catholicis Anglis, eiusmodi libros gratis distribuendos esse, et non posse (salva iusticia) vendi: ut coerceatur avaritia mercatorum, nullo alio modo superanda, qua extorquere solent supra omnem modum rigorosissimam solutionem pro libris piis et Catholicis, quos vendunt. Unde plerumque illis carent iis quibus maxime essent usui.

¹⁷⁸ The instruction 'Quod gratis accepistis gratis date' is taken from Rule 27 of the summary of the Jesuit Constitutions. I am indebted to Mr M. Walsh, librarian of Heythrop College, for calling my attention to this.

¹⁷⁹ See notes 170, 171, 186.

¹⁸⁰ Ref. as for note 177.

Impia haec diaboli fraus, et perversorum hominum nequitia . . . mihi investit tum pudorem tum etiam metum, ne in conspectu Divinae Majestatis segiores essemus ad tuendam veritatem, quam illi sunt as serenda mendacia. Quare inter maximas angustias exilii et persecutionis, et in gravissimo aere alieno quo laboro, propter alias expensas necessarias, alendis operariis pro illa copiosa messe, coactus sum hoc etiam subire onus.

¹⁸¹ Dei spiritus ubi vult spirat. Apud quem non est alia nationum destinatio, praeter unam: electorum quos disponit ad gloriam, et reprobatorum quos expectat ad poenam.

¹⁸² For the life and the theological position of de Dominis, see J. H. Crehan, 'The Dalmatian Apostate' (*Theological Studies*, vol. 22, no. 1, March 1961).

¹⁸³ STC 6996.

¹⁸⁴ STC 6994.

¹⁸⁵ Copies at L.O.C. and elsewhere. Floyd concealed his identity under the pseudonym. Fidelis Annosus Verimentanus. The local approbation and privilege are dated 5 May 1617 and 8 May 1617 respectively.

¹⁸⁶ A&R 803. STC 23529.

¹⁸⁷ PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 141-4 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). This is the letter already cited in note 162.

Putabam Illustrissimam Dominationem vestram accepturam fuisse, cum postremis meis Synopsim Apostasiae Marci Antonii de Dominis, quam discedens Antuerpia reliqui sub prelo. Sed cum Provincialis Societatis Provinciae Flandricae qui illic habitat, accepisset, nescio unde, aliquas de vita et moribus Apostatae quae nos consulto tacueramus, vir alioqui prudens et eruditus, sed in rebus Anglicanis minus versatus, curavit (nobis sero consultis) inseri importuno loco quae non erant ponenda. Quare necesse fuit unum aut alterum folium recudere, ut omitterentur ea quae fuerant addita contra scopum et propositum authoris, qui non volebat miserum hominem exagitare, sed reducere (si posset) ad sanam mentem.

¹⁸⁸ See the printer's note: 'Typographus Benevoli Lectori' on sig. I6v. The substituted passage begins on p. 48, l. 6.

¹⁸⁹ A&R 331. STC 11116.

¹⁹⁰ Ref. as for note 187.

Alium etiam habeo, eiusdem fere argumenti, erudite scriptum in Anglia atque ad me transmissum ut typis excudatur, quem cursim legi et tradidi iam revisoribus, ut quam primum absolvatur, omissis tamen vel limatis quibusdam, quae (ut in superiori libro) laudabilis zelus dictaverat, sed eodem consilio videntur moderanda.

¹⁹¹ AV Borgh, II, 403 f. 180v (photocopy at APSJ).

¹⁹² Borghese to nuncio at Brussels, 18 November, 25 November and 23 December 1671 (AV Borgh, II, 428, ff. 42r-43v, 49v-50r microfilm at APSJ). The MS. is decayed and in parts illegible. A very brief summary is given in Meerbeeck, pp. 196, 198, 211.

¹⁹³ Copies at L, O. and elsewhere. Floyd again uses the pseudonym Fidelis Annosus.

¹⁹⁴ Hoc opus . . . serius voto meo prodest in lucem, nec huius morae causas attinet dicere.

¹⁹⁵ PRO 31/9, 122B, ff. 41-42 (from AV Borgh, II, 448).

¹⁹⁶ Nobis magno solatio est, et securitati, ut quae scribuntur Romae corrigantur, sed habet aliquid incommodi, quod interim haeretici gloriantur, et post diuturnam moram minus avidè leguntur quae fuerant diu dilata, praeter expensas exemplariorum, quae necesse duplicata esse debent, et vectura per tabellarium.

¹⁹⁷ See Vitelleschi to Creswell, 13 June, 19 September, 5 December 1620; Vitelleschi to Floyd, 20 June, 15 September 1620 (ARSJ Epist. Gen. Anglia, I, pp. 120-1, 125-6, 129 [Photocopies at APSJ]).

¹⁹⁸ Reference as for note 197, letter to Creswell of 5 December.

Gratissimum mihi fuit videre illa exempla literarum Illustrissimorum Cardinalium quibus facultas data fuit excudendi librum P. Ioannis Floidi antequam is Romae lectus esset non solum quod ex iis videam nihil sine facultate Summi Pontificis factum fuisse verum etiam quod haec mihi/utilia?/ futura sint si quis forte memor prioris voluntatis Summi Pontificis et huius facultatis nescius aut oblitus factum reprehendere tentare.

¹⁹⁹ Ceterum quod attinet ad difficultates et incommoda quae R.V. oriri ostendit cum tardius libri haeticorum a Catholicis refutantur, video quidem vereresse quae R.V. scribit sed illis non obstantibus cogitandum etiam sat cito illos refutari si sat bene. Ideoque [one word illegible] adhibendum ut ita cito respondeatur ut celeritas soliditati responsionis non officiat.

²⁰⁰ Copies at L², O, D, and elsewhere.

²⁰¹ Reference as in note 195.

Gaudeo etiam, libellum non displicuisse, quem Illustrissima Dominatio vestra intelligat fuisse non inutilem Germanis, ex adiunctis literis Serenissimi Ducis Bavariae propria manu, ad quem (utpote amicissimum) aliquot exemplaria misi, inter Principes Germanos distribuenda. Vertimus iam in linguam Anglicam, et in illo regno distribuendam curabimus.

²⁰² A&R 579 (STC 13576); 559 (STC 18327); 260 (not in first edition of STC); 566 (STC 18443); 580 (STC 13577). The evidence for Verstegan's authorship of these tracts will be given in a forthcoming note in *Recusant History*.

²⁰³ (1) *De spiegel der Nederlandsche elenden*, 1621 (Petti 21a & b). (4) *Anatomie van Calviniste calumnien*, 1622 (not recorded by Petti; copy at Amsterdam University, photocopy at L).

²⁰⁴ See especially Vitelleschi to Blount, 8 October 1622, in which the General says he agrees that Creswell should be removed from Watten because of complaints about his exercise of office there (ARSJ Epist. Gen. Anglia I, 1, p. 163).

²⁰⁵ A&R 560. STC 22091.

²⁰⁶ See A. G. Petti, 'A New Verstegan Letter' (RH, October 1974), pp. 250-3.

²⁰⁷ Creswell to Borghese, 19 September 1616. PRO 31/9, 121B, ff. 188-90 (from AV Borgh, III, 45).

²⁰⁸ Creswell to a cardinal, 19 September 1616. PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 167-8 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). This is the letter already cited in note 152. It adds several details to those provided by the account of Wadsworth in DNB.

²⁰⁹ Creswell to Borghese, 22 February 1616. PRO 31/9, 121A, ff. 144-5 (from AV Borgh, II, 448). For Borghese's instructions to the Brussels nuncio, see Meerbeeck, pp. 25-26.

²¹⁰ Blackfan to Owen, 2 January 1614. Transcript at APSJ from ARSJ Anglia, vol. 37. Suppl (Bartoli's Collection, 1579-1624), f. 132v.

²¹¹ See Chadwick, pp. 98-99, 102.

²¹² On Smith's appointment, see A. F. Allison, 'Richard Smith, Richelieu and the French Marriage' (RH, January 1964), pp. 148-211. The evidence for the French political backing for William Bishop will be given in a future article in this journal.