

Recognising the archpriest: seeking clarification or fomenting schism?

Thomas M. McCoog, S.J.*

*Spellman Hall, Fordham University, 441, East Fordham Road, New York,
NY 10458, USA. Email: tmmccoog@gmail.com*

Rome's decision to name an archpriest and to erect a highly irregular administrative structure, the archpresbyterate, surprised secular clergy and Jesuits who had advocated the establishment of bishops. Recent tension between Jesuits and secular clergy highlighted the need and importance of an hierarchical, ecclesiological office. But the appointment was made in such a way that some secular clergy questioned its legitimacy and authenticity. Until they ascertained that the decision had in fact been made by the pope, they withheld recognition of the archpriest. As they awaited a reply to their appeal, two Appellants, John Colleton and William Clarke, debated the matter with two Jesuit supporters of the archpriest, Henry Garnet and Edward Oldcorne who apparently failed to see the canonical issue involved, as they perceived anti-Jesuitism as the motivating factor.

Keywords: Archpriest Controversy, Appellants, Elizabethan Jesuits, Henry Garnet, John Colleton, William Clarke, Edward Oldcorne

Seventy years ago, the noted Catholic historian Philip Hughes ruffled feathers when he ventured into an unmarked minefield. He stated clearly what many historians of post-Reformation English Catholicism suspected: 'In the background of all the Catholic activity of seventeenth-century England there is one permanent feature, one endless, and it may be thought somewhat monotonous, overshadowing element, and this is the feud between the secular clergy and the Society of Jesus'. The specific issues changed, but the friction remained. One must recall, as Hughes quickly pointed out 'no side is ever entirely in the right', and that it is never permissible nor proper to indict a community for the behaviour of some members.¹ Despite such nuance the English Jesuit historian Leo Hicks pronounced Hughes's exposition unbalanced, 'tendentious and misleading', implicitly at least anti-Jesuit because he only consulted pro-appellant literature.² Tendentious or not, scholars have generally skirted the issues involved in the Archpriest/Appellant Controversies

* I wish to thank Michael Questier and James Kelly for their comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

¹ *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England* (London: Burns Oates, 1942), 275.

² 'Rome and the Counter-Reformation in England', *The Month*, 178 (1942): 307–21, at 316. I thank Dr. Martin John Broadley, currently researching Philip Hughes, for this information. His completed article 'Phillip Hughes' will appear in his edition *Scholar Priests of the Twentieth Century* to be published by Gracewing in 2015.

with their theological subtleties, outlandish accusations, and *ad hominem* vitriol³ with an acknowledgement of their importance and a reluctance to examine their causes.⁴ I hasten to add, I do not intend to correct this omission in this article. Here I shall simply wish to look at epistolary exchanges between two secular priests and two Jesuits on different sides of the ecclesiastical divide in the months following the initial appointment of the archpriest. It is important to note that, despite disagreements and friction, real and perceived, their paths continued to cross as they interacted within the small, Catholic world of London.

Background

William, Cardinal Allen's death on 16 October 1594 left English Catholics leaderless. As prefect Allen had supervised the mission itself, overseen the continental seminaries, approved secular clergy for work in England, maintained a fragile peace within the Catholic community, and served as Roman agent. Three candidates were considered as his successor: Owen Lewis, sometime head of the English Hospice, Rome, then Bishop of Cassano and executor of Allen's will; the elderly theologian and one-time Jesuit novice Thomas Stapleton; and Allen's controversial Jesuit collaborator Robert Persons. Lewis's death on 14 October 1595 prevented his elevation. Persons, either freely or under pressure, urged friends and supporters to abandon their campaign on his behalf.⁵ Pope Clement VIII summoned Stapleton in 1596 and 1597 presumably to receive the red hat, but the Englishman, arguing ill health, delayed his departure. He never made the trip and died in Louvain on 12 October 1598.⁶

As Rome pondered the next step, secular clergy on the mission worked for the establishment of a voluntary association, an *ersatz* organisation that would, among other things, free them from

³ Michael C. Questier, with customary bluntness, describes the arguments as 'often characterised by the heights of supreme bitchiness of the kind to which only middle-aged clerics can generally aspire', Michael Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 251.

⁴ The most recent detailed, albeit short, analysis is Arnold Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalty in Elizabethan England* (London: Scolar Press, 1979); still the best account is John Hungerford Pollen, S.J., *The Institution of the Archpriest Blackwell* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1916).

⁵ Persons had made his solemn profession on 7 May 1587 (Ital. 4, fols. 98^r, 99^f, Rome, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu [henceforth ARSI]). In so doing he had vowed never to seek ecclesiastical honours and, if possible, to refuse them: 'all the professed should promise to God our Lord never to seek one [prelacy or dignity] and to expose anyone whom they observe trying to obtain one . . .' Ignatius Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, ed. and trans. George E. Ganss, S.J. (St Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), 334; no [817]. Despite the vow, Jesuits were named bishops for different missionary lands and in 1593 Francisco de Toledo became the first Jesuit cardinal.

⁶ Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1589–1597: Building the Faith of Saint Peter upon the King of Spain's Monarchy* (Farnham/Rome: Ashgate/Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2012), 250.

the Jesuit structure. In the absence of a hierarchy, the Jesuit superior was the only ecclesiastical official in England. Secular clergymen, of course, were not bound to him by holy obedience but he, with delegated authority from the mission's prefect, influenced their reception into and distribution throughout England, granted faculties within England, and managed the mission's funds through the Jesuit network. This *de facto* arrangement left the Society of Jesus in control of the English Church with Garnet the only religious authority in England, Persons, rector of the English College and agent at the Roman curia, and Richard Barret, president of the English College, Douai, and widely acknowledged as a fervent Jesuit supporter. This new 'sodality' or association, not overtly intended by all proponents as directed against the Society of Jesus but nonetheless perceived thus by some Jesuits, proposed to elect their own superiors, manage their own alms, settle disputes (presumably among its members), provide mutual assistance (presumably financial and spiritual), and place and move members among acceptable recusant households.⁷ According to John Bossy, this association was 'designed for early conversion into a hierarchy', a return to traditional ecclesiastical governance.⁸ They sought a clear separation of the secular and Jesuit missions. John Mush and John Colleton were the most enthusiastic proponents. Mush had hitherto been friendly with the Jesuits and especially with their superior Henry Garnet.⁹ Nonetheless Garnet queried his and Colleton's motives, and worried that these associations would aggravate relations between secular clergy and Jesuits and in so doing intensify anti-Jesuit sentiment.¹⁰ Persons wondered how any organisation, voluntary and without juridical authority, could survive. Such associations might have provided sustenance and support for its members, but they still did not provide a needed ecclesiastical structure. At best associations could expel members, but had no authority or jurisdiction over non-members and laity.

⁷ Copies of the rules are in Anglia II, 32, London, Archivum Britannicum Societatis Iesu [henceforth ABSI] London, Archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster [henceforth AAW], VI, 77. A note on translations: at ABSI, there is a large collection of transcripts and translations built up over the decades. Many were made by Miss Penelope Renold. I have used these translations but have always compared them with the original document and occasionally made some adjustments.

⁸ John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community 1570–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 45.

⁹ It has been suggested that Mush had once considered the Society of Jesus but I have found no evidence of this. On Mush and Garnet, see *Recusancy and Conformity in Early Modern England*, eds. Ginevra Crosignani, Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., and Michael Questier, with the assistance of Peter Holmes (Rome/Toronto: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu/Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2010), 157–58; Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Trials of Margaret Clitherow* (London: Continuum, 2011), *passim*.

¹⁰ Garnet to Persons, 28 May 1597, ABSI, Coll P II 548.

Persons feared it would foster internal division among the secular clergy, between members and non-members.¹¹ Jesuit unease about the associations turned Mush against them: he denounced ‘the foule dealing of the Jesuits w^{ch} bend them selves thus mightely against our association’.¹² By September 1597, the association in the north had collapsed perhaps as a result of Jesuit opposition.¹³ A month earlier Persons petitioned Pope Clement VIII on the necessity of establishing some form of hierarchical structure within England for the good of the mission. Any discussion thereof, Persons explained, must remain confidential lest the Elizabethan government learn of the plans and disrupt their implementation. Persons preferred the traditional episcopacy, and nothing novel.¹⁴ To prevent further division, he suggested the appointment of two bishops, one resident in England and the other in Flanders. Despite the considerable risk, Persons argued the consolation, the discipline, and the sacramental benefits that would flow from a bishop’s presence in England. He could oversee the distribution of the clergy and in so doing remove a bone of contention between Jesuits and secular clergy. Various archpriests or archdeacons situated throughout the kingdom would assist the bishop. Similarly the bishop in Belgium would have assistants as he funnelled information between Rome and England, examined and approved clergy for the mission, and disciplined difficult clergy summoned from the mission. Neither bishop, Persons advised, should bear the title of an English see lest it increase persecution but instead be *in partibus infidelium*.¹⁵ Other Jesuits, e.g. William Holt, William Weston, and Henry Garnet agreed but with specific reservations.¹⁶

¹¹ Persons’s observations can be found as annotations on the copies of the rules, ABSI, Anglia II, 32 and AAW, VI, 77.

¹² Mush to Christopher Bagshaw, 8 June 1597, in *The Archpriest Controversy*, ed. Thomas Graves Law, 2 vols (London: Camden Society, 1896–1898), 1: 2. It is impossible to pinpoint exactly when and why Mush broke with the Jesuits. Their opposition to the association surely played a role as did Garnet’s reaction to Mush’s attempt to present a more balanced portrait of secular and Jesuit clergy in his correspondence with the recusant layman—and Jesuit supporter—William Wiseman. See Thomas M. McCoog, S.J., “*And touching our society*”: *Fashioning Jesuit Identity in Elizabethan England* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2013), 387–88.

¹³ Garnet to Persons, 10 September 1597, ABSI, Coll P II 596.

¹⁴ Persons to Francisco de Peña, an official of the Rota, Rome, n.d. [August 1597], Lat, 6227, fols. 186^{r-v}, Vatican City, Biblioteca apostolica vaticana; same to Pietro, Cardinal Aldobrandini, n.d. [August 1597], Borghese, serie III.124.g.2, fols. 25^{r-v}, Vatican City, Archivio segreto vaticano [henceforth ASV]. See also Francis Edwards, S.J., *Robert Persons: The Biography of an Elizabethan Jesuit, 1546–1610* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1995), 208–10.

¹⁵ Persons’s proposal, ‘Rationes pro Episcopis duobus Anglicanis’, can be found in Mark Tierney, *Dodd’s Church History of England*, 5 vols (London: Charles Dolman, 1839–1843), 3: cxvii–cxix. Tierney contends that Persons revived an old scheme simply to impede the associations proposed by the secular clergy without advancing any evidence 3:47 n. 1.

¹⁶ Holt’s observations can be found in *The First and Second Diaries of the English College*, ed. Thomas Francis Knox (London: David Nutt, 1878), 376–84 with an English translation in Henry Foley, S.J., *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 7 vols. in 8 parts

The creation of an Archpriest

To the surprise, if not shock, of many, Enrico Caetani, Cardinal Protector of England, reorganised the Roman Church in England on 7 March 1598. Instead of the requested and recommended episcopacy, the cardinal erected as an independent ecclesiastical structure an archpresbyterate, formerly a geographical subdivision of a diocese, and appointed as archpriest George Blackwell, a priest well-known for his pro-Jesuit sentiments.¹⁷ To counter Satan's malicious manoeuvres and to ensure greater unity, Cardinal Caetani, with papal approval, nominated Blackwell as archpriest 'for directing and governing these Priestes of the English Nation that now converse in the kingdomes of England or Scotland,¹⁸ or shall hereafter reside there'. Until the pope or the cardinal erected another type of ecclesiastical government, the archpriest had the authority to assign and transfer secular priests from one residence to another whenever God's glory demanded. He would resolve their doubts, settle their disputes, adjudicate their controversies, and eliminate any friction. The archpriest could summon to his presence any and all secular priests as long as their safety was in no way jeopardised. Whenever there was an assembly or gathering (presumably of secular clergy), the archpriest presided. For the proper exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, he had authority to punish the 'disobedient, unquiet, or stubborn' through suspension or revocation of faculties if previous admonitions had failed to correct the problems. Richard Barret was named Blackwell's principal assistant. Henry Henshaw, John Bavant, Nicholas Tyrwhit, Henry

(Roehampton/London: Manresa/Burns and Oates, 1877–1884), 7/2: 1238–45. For Garnet's and Weston's arguments, see Garnet to Persons, 8 October 1597, ABSI, Coll P II 548–49.

¹⁷ Bossy points out that this office 'was without precedent in the English Church; he did not exercise his functions within a framework of canon law, whose applicability, in some sense to England was a consequence of the Appellant claim to continuity; he has a kind of propulsive power, but no real jurisdiction over the seminary clergy, and none whatever over regulars or the laity', *The English Catholic Community*, 46. This appointment was 'a grave affront' to anyone who believed that the post-Reformation Catholic community was a continuation of the medieval English Church. Appellants were scathing in their characterization of Blackwell. Christopher Bagshaw described him as 'a puppy to dance after the Jesuit's pipe' and 'a chief parasite of the Jesuits, and would be sure . . . never to do anything, that might in any way displease them', cited in Adrian Morey, *The Catholic Subjects of Elizabeth I* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978), 203; Robert E. Scully, S.J., *Into the Lion's Den. The Jesuit Mission in Elizabethan England and Wales, 1580–1603* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2011), 409. On Blackwell's appreciation of the Society of Jesus, see his letter to Cardinal Caetani, London January 10, 1596/7, published in *A Historical Sketch of the Conflicts between Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. Thomas Graves Law (London: David Nutt, 1889), 137–39.

¹⁸ Tom McNally claims that all Scottish secular clergy submitted to the archpriest without any difficulty and remained under his jurisdiction until the appointment of Bishop William Bishop in 1623. According to McNally, the archpriest's influence in Scotland was negligible. See Tom McNally, *The Sixth Scottish University. The Scots Colleges Abroad: 1575–1799* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 163, 178. I recall no mention of the archpriest in any document concerning Scottish Jesuits; moreover the archpriest's authority only extended over English clergy in Scotland, and not over Scottish clergy.

Shaw, James Standish, and George Birkhead (or Birket) were appointed the archpriest's consultors within England. The cardinal allowed Blackwell to select six other consultors 'of auncientnesse, gravitie, and their travailes, but chiefly of their prudence, moderation, and their love of union and concord, not a little also of their authoritie and estimation, which they have in the provinces where they supply your steede and ours'. Semi-annual reports were demanded from each consultor and the archpriest himself. The archpriest had the right to nominate a successor whenever a consultor was captured, left England or died. The cardinal protector had the right to appoint the archpriest's successor, but the senior consultor within the London area would serve as vice-archpriest during the interim.

By means of this structure, the pope and the cardinal protector hoped to maintain ecclesiastical discipline, and to restore 'peace and union of minds' between secular priests and Jesuits. The document exonerated Jesuits from all charges levelled against them and lauded their contributions from their work in the vineyard itself, through seminaries and colleges, and 'by cherishing the needy, and by very many other meanes, but also in England too, they prosecute the same deeds of charity, and this even to the shedding of blood, as the event and deeds have demonstrated'. They neither exercised nor aspired to exercise any jurisdiction over the secular clergy. Thus no one should succumb to the temptations of the enemy by stirring up anger against them. On the contrary, secular priests should manifest affection and reverence. Caetani concluded his letter with an admonition:

If you follow this rule and exhortation of the Apostle, all things shall be safe unto you, and glorious as hitherto. If you suffer your selves to be thrown downe by the wiles of the enemy from this stability of concord; yours and your own countries cause will dash upon great rocks which God avert, and evermore defend you.¹⁹

Separate instructions, dated the same day and forwarded to the archpriest, dealt more specifically with each subject. One concerned relations between the archpriest and the Jesuit superior:

Although the Superior of the said Fathers is not among the consultors of the Archpriest, yet, since it is of the greatest importance, and is the earnest desire and command of his Holiness, that there should be complete union of mind and agreement between the Fathers of the Society and the secular clergy; and as the said Superior, on account of his experience of English affairs and the authority

¹⁹ The letter can be found in Tierney/Dodd, *Church History*, 3: cxix-cxxiii. A contemporary English translation can be found in John Colleton, *A iust defence of the slandered priestes* (n.p. [London], 1602), 5–9; *The Contemporary Printed Literature of the English Counter-Reformation between 1558 and 1640*, eds. Antony F. Allison and David M. Rogers, 2 vols. (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1989–1994) [henceforth *ARCRC*], 2: no. 147; *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*, eds. A.W. Pollard and G.R. Redgrave, 2nd edn. Revised and enlarged W.A. Jackson, F.S. Ferguson and Katherine F. Pantzer, 3 vols. (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1986–1991) [Henceforth *STC*]: 5557.

he has amongst Catholics, may greatly assist all consultations of the Clergy, the Archpriest will be careful in matters of greater moment to ask his opinion and advice; so that everything may be directed in a more orderly manner, with greater light and peace, to the glory of God.²⁰

Ordinarily the Jesuit superior would not be involved in matters pertinent to the secular clergy, but the situation was not ordinary. Indeed, as the instruction highlighted, he was not numbered among the ordinary consultors. However, ‘in matters of greater moment’, the archpriest should seek his advice. The instruction, however, did not insist that this advice be followed. Nor did it clarify the nature of ‘matters of greater moment’. Ironically but not surprisingly this instruction intended to promote union, occasioned considerable controversy because a compliant archpriest made the continued influence of the Society even stronger. Caetani explained to Barret and to the nuncio in Belgium, Mirto Frangipani, that ‘this subordination was made by us according to the will of his Holiness’.²¹ Caetani informed Blackwell of his appointment via Henry Garnet. On 8 May the Jesuit superior promised Caetani that he would meet Blackwell and relay the news to him.²² Garnet rejoiced that the mission finally had some sort of organisation even though all problems had not been resolved, e.g. whether to continue to grant faculties to secular priests.²³

Legitimate doubts?

Blackwell learned of his appointment on 9 May; he summoned John Colleton for a meeting on the 12th. The speed with which Blackwell sent for Colleton suggests that the archpriest anticipated problems and thus wanted Colleton’s immediate recognition. Robert Charnock, whom Blackwell found ‘more temperate and better advised’, accompanied Colleton. Apparently Blackwell urged the two to abandon their campaign for associations as no longer necessary. Neither agreed. Indeed, they questioned Blackwell’s position and authority. So adamantly did Colleton reject what he had read in Blackwell’s letter of appointment that he angered the archpriest who was ‘enforced to leave [his] accustomed temper in speech, and to deal after an austere manner, albeit in way of advice’. Blackwell judged

²⁰ ‘Instructiones pro officio archipresbyteri in Anglia melius exsequendo’, Rome 7 March 1598, London, Inner Temple [henceforth IT], Petyt MSS 538, vol. 38, fols. 389^r–390^v. For the citation, I have used the Victorian Jesuit John Gerard’s translation as quoted in Pollen, *Institution of the Archpriest*, 27. See also Arnold Oskar Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, & Co., 1916), 413–14.

²¹ Caetani to Ottavio Mirto Frangipani, Rome 8 March 1598, published in Knox, *Douay Diaries*, 399–400; Caetani to Barret, Rome 7 March 1598, published in Tierney/Dodd, *Church History*, 3: cxxiii–iv.

²² Garnet to Caetani, suburbs of London, 8 May 1598, ABSI, Anglia II, 35.

²³ Garnet to Persons, 10 June 1598, ABSI, Anglia II, 37.

that Colleton ‘knoweth not himself’. But the archpriest could not tell whether their refusal resulted from their dislike of him personally or their unease with the structure itself. If the former, Blackwell was willing to step down upon orders from his superior; if the latter, the archpriest would not countenance any disrespect shown to Cardinal Caetani. He prayed that God would grant them ‘the spirit of unity’, but feared they would persist and resist.²⁴ By the end of the month Colleton was collecting names for a petition to Rome along with recommendations for priests to serve as their agent.²⁵ Other secular priests supported him because they could not fathom how the papacy would establish something so peculiar. John Mush, for example, dismissed this novel structure as little more than a successful Jesuit ploy to block associations.²⁶ Fuelled by rumours that the arrangement was simply a temporary experiment that would only be established and ratified by Rome after its favourable reception by secular clergy, Blackwell’s opponents blamed Cardinal Caetani for their plight. Yet again he had sided with the Society of Jesus. Many recalled with anger Caetani’s support for the Jesuits during recent disturbances at the English College, for which reason they considered him an enemy. Caetani, they argued, created the archpresbyterate on his own authority without papal knowledge, without papal authorisation, and without papal approval.²⁷ Thus they demanded assurances that the archpresbyterate rested on more solid foundations than Caetani’s personal judgement.

In August the dissatisfied clergy expressed a willingness to acknowledge Blackwell’s authority temporarily until they had received desired clarifications from Rome, but on certain conditions: they wanted Blackwell to choose a certain number of assistants from their supporters, and to recognise the legitimacy of their appeal to Rome by granting William Bishop and Robert Charnock ‘dismissorial letters’, testimonials, for their trip. Blackwell refused both demands, but promised not to impede their journey.²⁸ Shortly thereafter their envoys departed for Rome with their appeal as ‘babes in the woods in the world of Roman officialdom’.²⁹ To their request for a bishop ‘chosen by the Priests themselves: & the Jesuites to have nothing to doe therein’, the protesters added three demands previously mentioned by

²⁴ Blackwell to Garnet, 12 May [1598], ABSI, Anglia II, 52. See also Pollen, *Institution of the Archpriest*, 34.

²⁵ ABSI, Anglia II, 47.

²⁶ See his letters, under the alias John Ratcliffe, to Christopher Bagshaw and Thomas Bluet, 28 May 1598 and 13 July 1598, IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 38, fols. 380^{r-v}, 383^{r-v}, published in Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, 1:63–65.

²⁷ Pollen, *Institution of the Archpriest*, 34–35. See also Charnock’s letters to Bagshaw and Bluet (the first dated 9 August and the other two without dates), IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 298^{r-v}, 301^{r-v}, 302^{r-v}, published in Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, 1:66–72.

²⁸ Colleton, *Iust defence*, 270–72.

²⁹ Pritchard, *Catholic Loyalism*, 123.

Mush: removal of the Society of Jesus from the administration of the English College (a particularly sensitive issue, because Claudio Acquaviva had seriously pondered Jesuit withdrawal because of earlier disturbances);³⁰ a prohibition against the publication of books attacking Queen Elizabeth and her government ‘unles such as the Superiors shall think expedient’; and permission ‘to establish such orders by common consent among themselves, as may bee for the better government of themselves and such other as will condescend to keepe them; & may serve for their more effectuall proceeding in their spirituall warfare’.³¹ The simple request for clarification became but one item in an agenda that included an attack on the English Jesuits and their work especially at the college in Rome. More was at risk than the new structure. The appeal to Rome was no longer simply canonical and ecclesiastical: it had become personal. Thus, understandably, Garnet rallied Jesuits and friendly secular clergy to Blackwell’s defence.³²

Henry Garnet and John Colleton

John Colleton had tried his vocation as a Carthusian in 1573 after he had discussed the possibility with an English Jesuit John Columb³³ then working in Louvain. Apparently the Jesuit directed Colleton through the Ignatian spiritual exercises—no mean feat in that Columb himself was only a Jesuit novice—in order to discern Colleton’s future. The same Columb later recommended that Colleton leave the Carthusians and try another way of life. Colleton studied at Douai and was ordained in 1576. Captured with Edmund Campion at Lyford Grange in July 1581, he avoided execution because he was able to prove that he had not been in the places where he allegedly conspired against the queen, but subsequently spent the next four years in the Marshalsea prison. After his banishment in January, 1585 he met Robert Persons in Rouen. The Jesuit dissuaded him from entering a religious order. The date of his return to England is not known, but he was there by 1591.³⁴ There is no evidence that Colleton harboured any hostility towards the Society of Jesus. Indeed he followed the advice offered by two Jesuits. Nonetheless Colleton

³⁰ See McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1589–1597*, 284.

³¹ Two copies of the petition can be found in SP 12/268/37, 38, Kew, The National Archives [henceforth TNA]; ABSI, Anglia II, 47.

³² On 1 August 1598, Blackwell and his assistants thanked the pope for their appointments and for his concern for the mission (ASV, Borghese, serie II.448a-b, fols 358^{r-v}).

³³ Columb, a Devon native, entered the Society in Louvain in 1573, apparently having already been ordained. See *Monumenta Angliae*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog, S.J. (and László Lukács, S.J., for the third volume), 3 vols. (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1992, 2000), 2: 267.

³⁴ Godfrey Anstruther, O.P., *The Seminary Priests*, 4 vols. (Ware/Durham/Great Wakering: St Edmund’s College/Ushaw College/Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1968–1977), 1: 82–84; Colleton, *Iust defence*, 299–300.

complained to Garnet that some unnamed English Jesuits were damaging his reputation by spreading false rumours and stories. Colleton had initially ignored the slander out of fear that he would be accused of hyper-sensitivity. But the lies not only persisted, but grew more outrageous. He himself had heard some of them repeated. He entreated Garnet to inform him of the particulars for which he was being reproached. How had he in 'word, deede, or demeanour' proceeded against Garnet or the Society in general. He requested a blunt reply 'to leave [no] point untouched, or not amplified to the most, whereof you hold me culpable'. Colleton would rather not remain in ignorance of his sins.³⁵

Within a week Garnet replied by urging him to look towards the future and not linger on the past. He insinuated, without citing anything specific, that Colleton had played some role in the recent dissemination of lies and slanders about Jesuits among English Catholics, but he was willing to forget that now that the Society's reputation has been exonerated, presumably in the letter announcing Blackwell's nomination. There was no need for a vendetta, no reason to pursue the guilty, no desire for vilification. Thus, if Colleton continued to hear of sinister reports about himself, he should examine the veracity of both the reports and the reporters, and not automatically blame Jesuits for preposterous attempts to blacken his name. Protesting that he desired an end to all hostility, Garnet reminded Colleton that the majority of the secular clergy had accepted the archpresbyterate, and suggested that anyone who questioned the structure may be guilty of schism:

It pleased his holliness of late to ordaine a certeine government amongst us. It hath been received wth singuler likinge of the moste and best. God forbid but that I and all my brethren should have been most readye to runne whither charitie and obedience did call us, leas by disobedience we should contemn or Superior, or by schism and division be cut of from the head. Some have refused to acknowledge this heade, much more to obaye him.

Garnet knew that some alleged that Jesuits had devised this ecclesiastical structure in order to impose one of their choosing, their puppet, as superior of the secular clergy, and that they specifically blamed Persons for misinforming the cardinal protector and the pope. To set the record straight, the appellants had dispatched two agents to Rome, but their list of demands, Garnet stressed, included the expulsion of Jesuits from the mission. Many wondered about the secret motivation of these men. Was it ambition or sedition? Did they truly desire only clarification? Or was the question of the archpriest's authority simply a Trojan horse to disguise their anti-Jesuit

³⁵ Colleton to Garnet, 5 November 1598, published in Colleton, *Iust defence*, 243–44. See also Colleton's letter to an unnamed lay person suspected of slandering him, 28 January [1599], 244.

programme? For years the secular clergy had asked for an ecclesiastical order. Now, having received what they wanted, the same men opposed the archpriest. And anyone opposed to the archpriest ‘must of force be consequentlie opposite against us’. The unity that all desired for the English Catholics, Garnet claimed, would only come from the universal recognition of the archpriest as their God-given superior.³⁶

Colleton admitted Garnet’s reply was not what he had expected. His original letter simply raised the issue of his alleged hostility to the Society of Jesus, and thus he requested details regarding the specific wrongs he had committed. Instead of providing the author with details, Garnet diverted the correspondence to other issues. He had heard from Blackwell that the Jesuits ‘had many exceptions’ against him and he simply wanted to know what they were. Colleton had also heard via the clerical grapevine that the Jesuit Robert Jones was spreading a story that he himself had described the Jesuit administration of the English College, Rome, as ‘a Machevilian government or worse’. When Colleton challenged Jones to prove this allegation, he replied that he would be satisfied if Colleton himself refuted statements attributed to him in Robert Fisher’s campaign against the Society.³⁷ Fisher’s statement, Colleton retorted, did not establish his guilt! But Colleton moved to the point of this letter: Garnet’s claim that the archpresbyterate had been set up by the pope. Colleton simply demanded evidence that this was in fact the case. Refusal to accept the archpriest’s authority was not rooted in ambition or sedition: they questioned the order simply because of the lack of documentation ‘because we neither see, nor can heare of any Bull, Breve, or other authentick instrument coming from his Holiness, for attestation and declaration thereof’. For forty years the pope had been the immediate bishop of the secular clergy, and they could not accept any change in this arrangement ‘without expresse certificate of such his Holines pleasure’. Moreover they could not believe that the pope would deny them ‘the choice of our owne Superior, (a freedome and benefite which the Cleargie everywhere else, and by the Canons of holie Church enioyeth) but by imposing also a Superior upon us, without all our understanding, and not with the lest notice of our liking. . . .’. In fact, many recalled a papal promise that he would never nominate an ecclesiastical superior in England until he had consulted and received information from the secular clergy. A provision in the letter appointing Blackwell confirmed their apprehension. A clause

³⁶ Garnet to Colleton, 11 November 1598, ABSI, Anglia II, 43. Law published a copy of this letter in *Archpriest Controversy*, 1:79–82, but erroneously claimed that William Clarke was the recipient. Colleton also published Garnet’s reply in *Iust defence*, 245–48.

³⁷ On Fisher and his campaign, see McCoog, *The Society of Jesus in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1589–1597*, *passim*.

named the senior assistant as acting archpriest upon the death of Blackwell until a new archpriest was appointed by the cardinal protector, not the pope. Thus the appellants concluded that the pope played no role in the establishment of the office and that it was in fact instigated by a cardinal who was partial to the Jesuits. And who had more influence with the cardinal than Persons? No wonder many suspected the Society was behind this. Colleton repudiated Garnet's complaint that the appellants now rejected the hierarchical structure that they had for so long petitioned:

Is the new authoritie good sir, that very thing we sought for? I could wish that writing in a controversie, you would be better advised what you did affirme, & how you did contradict your self: for not seven lines before, you called ours another government from this, as indeede it is, and as different a government, as chalke and cheese, white and blacke. For as chalke and cheese agree in whiteness, and white and black in that they are both colours: so this new authoritie with that we intend, agrees only in the name of a government, and in all other points and properties, most discording and dissonant, as is manifest by comparing them together. Ours constrained none to accept thereof: this inforceth all. Ours communicated benefits: this penalties. Ours was to be instituted by the good liking of all their consents that were to obey: this enacted by whose meanes we know not, other then by the plotting of your Society, unwittingly to us all. Ours a superioritie intreating: this full of commaunds. Ours never to have proceeded, unlesse the following of peace had bin sure by the opinion of all or the most and wisest: this the more unquietnes it moves, the greater variance it stirreth, the stifflier and with more earnestnes it is pursued against the refusers. Ours brought in it selfe consolations to our afflictions, reliefe to our needs, succour to our distresses, severall commodities to our cuntry, spiritual and temporal, and a continuing mutualitie of good offices; not only betweene us, that were of the sodalitie, but between us and our other brethren, and also between the Clergie and the Laitie. . . .

The suggestion that their refusal to acknowledge the archpriest constituted schism especially angered Colleton. Refusal to recognise the archpriest until the return of their agents with authentic testimony was not schism, and Colleton warned Garnet of the gravity of such charges.³⁸ Nonetheless sometime in March of 1599, Blackwell explicitly cautioned him that he might be guilty of schism and, if that were the case, the archpriest would have to take action against him.³⁹

William Clarke and Edward Oldcorne

The secular priest Francis [vere William] Clarke and the Jesuit Edward Hall [vere Oldcorne] discussed the archpriest and his authority initially in private conversations but eventually—and fortunately—in correspondence. Unlike Garnet's exchange with Colleton, Oldcorne

³⁸ Colleton's undated reply can be found in his *Iust defence*, 248–69.

³⁹ Blackwell to [John Colleton], n.d. [March 1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 115^{r-v}, published in Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, 1:85–87.

and Clarke cited recognised casuists and theologians to support their positions. Clarke had studied at the English College, Rome, from September 1589, to his ordination in March 1592. He was sent to England a month later. Oldcorne had also studied at the English College and was ordained in August 1587. In August 1588 he joined the Jesuits and departed immediately for England.⁴⁰ In late 1598 or early 1599, Clarke complained to Blackwell about disturbing rumours that he and his colleagues would be deprived of faculties because of their appeal to Rome. He had asked the archpriest to repudiate these rumours clearly and openly. In another letter along similar lines to Garnet, Clarke mentioned that he had discussed these rumours with Oldcorne, but had found the Jesuit not only unwilling to counteract such gossip but actually anxious to endorse it.⁴¹ Shortly thereafter Clarke asked Oldcorne whether he persisted with the accusation or had in fact changed his mind. If he still held that opinion, Clarke wanted to know the theological and canonical grounds for his contention: 'I pray you to cite me some author, as you affirmed weare of your opinion and resolution, & I will surely consider thereof'. Oldcorne had asserted that Clarke had dismissed the archpriest's authority as '*una cosa da niente*', a trifle, a comment that the secular priest did not recall making at his meeting with the Jesuit, but he nonetheless trusted the Jesuit's memory. Clarke was sure that he had explained clearly that he queried papal approval only because of the lack of demonstrable evidence. Once it had been produced, he was 'redy to submitte & subiecte my self not only to him but to the basest in gods church, puttings not only my hands but my head under his feette if I once should ceartenly knowe that it weare his holynes his pleasure & absolute comandment is should be soe'. Clarke's hesitancy resulted in Oldcorne's pronouncement that he was schismatic, an excommunicant, and therefore deprived of his priestly faculties. Thus, to the detriment of others, his sacraments were 'irregular'. Oldcorne repeated his condemnation at Clarke's departure, and promised to forward 'authorities cited' for his position.⁴²

Despite his professed unwillingness to say or write anything about such an 'unpleasant subject', Oldcorne would elucidate—albeit rapidly because the courier was anxious to depart—reasons for his judgement that Clarke had 'fallen into schisme, & consequentlie had incurred the penalties due thereunto, viz. excommunication, loss of faculties, etc.'. He cited the Jesuit Gregory of Valencia, specifically his *de schismate* in which he demonstrated as common doctrine that a person who 'doth not receive or acknowledg the authoritie of his superior [and] doth

⁴⁰ Anstruther, *Seminary Priests*, 1: 77, 261.

⁴¹ Clarke to [Blackwell], [late 1598/early 1599]; same to [Garnet?], 17 January [1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 286^{r-v}.

⁴² Clarke to Oldcorne, [c. February 1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fol. 287^r.

impugne or oppose himself into him' was a rebellious schismatic.⁴³ Cajetan, the Dominican Thomas de Vio, supported Oldcorne's argument: a refusal to accept the archpriest denied papal authority and ruptured unity within the Church. Anyone separating himself from the authority of a legitimate superior *ipso facto* separated himself from the Church. Oldcorne quoted Cyprian's 'the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop; if anyone is not with the bishop, he is not in the Church' as particularly apt.⁴⁴ To Oldcorne's direct question, Clarke had replied that he refused to admit the authority of the archpriest because of its uncertain origins. Oldcorne retorted the inadmissibility of such doubts because said authority had been disclosed in letters signed and sealed by the cardinal protector. In conscience Clarke was obliged to believe the cardinal's word and the word of the apostolic nuncio in Flanders, both of whom had declared that the archpresbyterate was set up '*ex mandato pontificis*', by the command of the pontiff. In their earlier conversation, Oldcorne mentioned a relevant canon, the existence of which Clarke then denied. For this reason Oldcorne deemed it necessary to cite Pope Gregory IV's prohibition *verbatim*.⁴⁵ Exercising *praeteritio*, Oldcorne refrained from mentioning Clarke's outrageous comments, including the dismissive '*una cosa di niente*' with a snap of his fingers. The Jesuit admitted that his arguments might not have convinced Clarke that he was in fact in schism, but they should at least have planted such seeds of doubt that he would refrain from all sacerdotal ministry until they had been clarified. To resolve them Oldcorne urged him to submit humbly to his gracious superior Blackwell.⁴⁶

⁴³ *De schismate* can be found in *Commentariorum theologicorum*, 4 vols (Venice, 1608), 3: cols. 749–62. Gregory of Valencia does indeed cite numerous authorities that schism is a willful disruption of the unity of the Church, and especially the repudiation of papal authority.

⁴⁴ '*episcopus in ecclesia esse et ecclesia in episcopo et si qui cum episcopo non sit in ecclesia non esse*', Cyprian, epistula 69, 8 ad Florentinum, *Patrologia Latina*, IV, 406A-B. I thank Joseph Lienhard, S.J., for his assistance with the identification of this citation.

⁴⁵ Oldcorne quoted the original *Decretum Gratiani*, dist. 19, c. 5, which can be found in http://geschichte.digitale-sammlungen.de/decretum-gratiani/kapitel/dc_chapter_0_168, accessed 26 February 2015. The English translation is 'It is wrong that anyone try to transgress or be able to transgress the precepts of the Apostolic See or the ministry that we have arranged for Your Charity to perform. Part 2. Therefore, let anyone who would contradict apostolic decrees be cast down to his sorrow and ruin, and let him no longer have a place among the priests. Rather, let him be banished from the holy ministry. And let henceforth have no pastoral care under his authority, since no one can doubt that he has already been condemned by the authority of the holy and apostolic Church for his disobedience and presumption. He is to be cast out through the imposition of major excommunication because the one entrusted with the discipline of the holy Church is not only to appear obedient to the holy Church's commands but also to inculcate them in others lest they perish. Let him who refuses to submit to apostolic precepts also be cut off from every divine and pontifical office' Gratian, *Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law*, vol. 2: *Treatise on Laws* [Decretum DD.102 with Ordinary Gloss] (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2012) ProQuest ebrary. Web. accessed 26 February 2015.

⁴⁶ Oldcorne to Clarke, 8 March [1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 288^r–289^v.

Oldcorne's reply stunned Clarke for its unjust judgment on him and his associates. Without access to any edition of Gregory of Valencia, he could not track down that citation. He therefore had to rely on Oldcorne's summary. The Jesuit's argument rested on the assumption that the archpriest had been duly installed in his office by the pope, and that the appellants, well aware of the legitimacy of this authority, nonetheless persisted in resisting it. This was the crux of the matter, Clarke insisted. If he had been certain of papal approval, without qualm and without delay he would submit. He simply sought that certainty through a clear papal declaration. This desire for clarification could not be equated with rebellion so Gregory of Valencia's teaching was not applicable. Equally irrelevant was Cajetan's analysis of schism, which, Clarke claimed, Oldcorne had cited tendentiously and erroneously.⁴⁷ Clarke differentiated a repudiation of legitimate authority from an anxiety regarding its lawfulness. The former was schism; Cajetan permitted the latter. Henceforth Clarke recommended that Oldcorne 'be more carefull how you alleadge authors so evident against your self'. Regarding the citation from Cyprian, Clarke again insisted that he did not deny the archpriest's authority, but simply desired 'a bull or breief or other papall instrument from his holynes for his approbation' Clarke deferred 'submission untill I weare sufficiently resolved of his authority as lawfull & from his holynes, which will I doe & uppon iuste groundes, as I hope'. In like manner Clarke discussed Gratian's canon.

Oldcorne had advanced letters from the cardinal protector and from the apostolic nuncio as evidence. However, Clarke pointed out that he had not seen these letters, nor indeed had he heard of them. But even if he had, how did he know that they had not been forged? Or that the letters had been signed unwittingly by the cardinal and the nuncio? Or indeed that the cardinal himself was affirming his own authority with a simple assertion that the pope had commanded it? These are all possibilities and thus reasons why the appellants sought clarification. Often assertions claimed to be true were eventually discovered to be false.⁴⁸ Finally, Clarke suggested that the pope may have been misinformed, 'in which case although the authority shoulde come from his holynes, yet I see no reasons whie we may not appeale to his holyness better informed'. In all, Clarke attributed the Jesuit's evaluation as 'uninformed zeal' (*zelum non cum scientia*). Moreover he resented partisan Jesuit involvement: if the secular clergy had some

⁴⁷ Clarke accurately cited passages from Cajetan, *Summula Peccatorum* (Antwerp, 1575), 505. I could not find Oldcorne's citation. I identified a similar but not identical passage on 503. Perhaps Oldcorne was citing an earlier edition. Or Clarke's claim has validity.

⁴⁸ Clarke specified many remarks made by Jesuits regarding Owen Lewis, Charles Paget, William Bishop, and others, including the Jesuit Cardinal Toledo, commonly believed to be anti-Jesuit.

qualms about the legitimate authority of the archpriest, they must resolve the issue without Jesuit interference.

The appellants did not 'divide our selves from a lawfull knowne superior, when as we seeke & have made meanes to knowe whether he be our lawfull superior by his holynes his absolute commande'. Meanwhile he wished that the Jesuits would tend to their own affairs and leave the secular alone but 'as charitable bretheren concurre with us unto one common worke, the conversion of soles, not hinderinge (as you doe) with your politique practicall devises, your owne peace & ours too: assuringe your selves that if your hands had not been intermedled in these our matters, these iarres & discontentments had not growne amongst us'. In conclusion Clarke demanded satisfaction from Oldcorne for his defamation of the appellants and their cause in the presence of lay persons.⁴⁹

Oldcorne, clearly offended by the tone and content of Clarke's letter 'stuff with manie bad wordes & uncivil termes', had expected better. The Jesuit, however, did not respond to Clarke's interpretation of the cited authorities with the exception of Cajetan's argument. But here Oldcorne refused to concede the point and insisted that 'to anie indifferent man manifest, that he concludes in that place the verie same which I inferred (although it pleased you in very bad termes to tell me the contrarie)'. In an extremely short response to Clarke's considerably longer discourse, Oldcorne moved from the pertinent issue of schism to a defence of the Society. Jesuit behaviour towards secular priests, and especially Clarke, made mock of his claim that the Society sought to dominate the clergy. The Society never did him any wrong or injury; instead it had provided him with faculties. But now, as instructed by Garnet, he informed Clarke that these faculties had been revoked. Oldcorne was willing to provide satisfaction once Clarke had produced evidence of intentional wrongdoing. He was confident that other Jesuits, if challenged, could justify their comments.⁵⁰

Clarke opened the final letter in the series with the simple declaration that he had intended no offence in his previous letter, but had tried to compose a quiet, dispassionate explanation. He 'intended noe evill, nor anie reproche, though in plane tearmes I uttered the truthe I conceaved'. He admitted that Oldcorne might have blushed as Clarke pointed out his misinterpretation of Cajetan. At the risk of pressing his point to overkill, he included more citations from Cajetan to back up his earlier claim. Clarke recommended that Oldcorne consult better casuists. Regarding his comments about Jesuits, Clarke was willing to defend his remarks at a

⁴⁹ Clarke to Oldcorne, 27 March [1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 279^r–281^v.

⁵⁰ Oldcorne to Clarke, 3 April [1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 282^{r-v}.

meeting with either Blackwell or Garnet, and warned Oldcorne that he himself must answer some of the charges. Regarding faculties received from Garnet, Clarke renounced them. But, he reminded Oldcorne with more than a touch of irony, revocation of said faculties was not necessary because, if Clarke was an excommunicated schismatic, they had been *ipso facto* forfeited! Meanwhile he would use the faculties that he had earlier received from Dr. Richard Barret.⁵¹

Conclusion

Jesuits Garnet and Oldcorne refused to grant or acknowledge Colleton's and Clarke's distinction between repudiation and recognition, and consistently insisted the appellants were schismatics. Indeed this seems to have been the official position of the Jesuits within England, the definitive statement of which was Thomas Lister's manuscript *Adversus factiosos in Ecclesia* (Against factions in the Church). Lister ends his denunciation with a claim that they were 'no better than soothsayers and idolaters, . . . who have not heard the Church speaking . . . through the Sovereign Pontiff . . . like the heathen and publicans'. But he prayed nonetheless that God would allow 'the power of the streams of grace [to] flow into your spirits, lest you be thrust out with heathen and idolaters to everlasting destruction and pay the unending punishment of this great obedience and scandal'.⁵²

Clarke and Oldcorne supported their positions with proof texts and casuist arguments. In their debate Clarke emerges if not victorious at least stronger. He addresses Oldcorne's repeated assertion that he is a schismatic by distinguishing his appeal from rejection. Oldcorne in turn ignores Clarke's exposition without demonstrating the inappropriateness of the distinction. Moreover, Clarke seems to score points as he cites evidence of Oldcorne's tendentious interpretations and conveniently edited texts. Again Oldcorne dismisses but does not refute Clarke's contention. Garnet and Oldcorne were quick to castigate their opponents as anti-Jesuit and considered appellant opposition to the archpriest as *de facto* antagonism to the Society of Jesus and its efforts in England. Clarke himself complained that Jesuits too quickly identified possible opposition to the archpriest with hostility to the Society.⁵³ Garnet and Oldcorne considered Colleton and Clarke not as conscientious,

⁵¹ Clarke to Oldcorne, [April 1599], IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 283^{r-v}.

⁵² The concluding section was published in Law, *Historical Sketch of the Conflicts*, 143–45. On the work itself, see the note on 85–86. A manuscript copy can be found in IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 86^r–90^v. The treatise itself was first published in [Christopher Bagshaw], *Relatio compendiosa turbarum* (Reims [vere London], n.d. [1601]), *ARCR*, vol. 1, num. 37.1, *STC* 3106, 37–49.

⁵³ Colleton, *Iust defence*, 265.

somewhat scrupulous clergy clearly concerned about the legitimacy of the authority of their superior, but principally as anti-Jesuit agitators anxious to remove the Society from the administration of the continental seminaries and to exclude them from the mission itself. Oldcorne's manoeuvring his debate with Clarke from the archpriest to anti-Jesuitism illustrates this. English Jesuits, apprehensive—and their anxiety was not groundless—that a cabal would restrict their role in the English mission or eliminate it altogether, suffered from an 'hermeneutic of suspicion' as they perceived evil intent in any strategic disagreement and personal conflict. In their aggressive counter-attack against perceived enemies of the Society, Garnet and Oldcorne myopically ignored the issue as articulated by Colleton and Clarke. John Mush at least did not initially endorse the clerical associations as an anti-Jesuit manoeuvre, but their opposition eventually drove him into the opposing camp.

A papal brief on 6 April 1599⁵⁴ confirmed the archpresbyterate. As soon as news of the requested papal confirmation reached England, Colleton, and presumably Clarke, accepted Blackwell's authority. He and the appellants now had what they had desired, specifically proof that the structure had been established with papal authority, and consequently they obeyed. Reconciliation was in the air. At Wisbech, the two groups sat down to dinner together with the hope that all quarrels and unkindness would be forgiven and forgotten.⁵⁵ Blackwell restored faculties to Colleton and others with their acknowledgement of his authority.⁵⁶ Indeed so ecstatic were Colleton and Mush that they confessed to Garnet their affection for him.⁵⁷ On the Monday after Trinity Sunday, i.e. 4 June, at the London residence of the archpriest, Garnet and Colleton 'embraced each other very kindly'. Garnet had agreed to meet Colleton on the condition that they did not discuss the issues, but simply forgot them: his condition was met.⁵⁸ The archpriest and his assistants thanked Pope Clement VIII for his clarification and the end of the dispute.⁵⁹ Everyone appeared to be content—at his time and on this subject.⁶⁰ Other issues remained, e.g. an acceptable

⁵⁴ A copy of the brief can be found in IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fol 146^v.

⁵⁵ T.G. to Garnet, 1 June 1599, ABSI, Anglia II, 56, published in Tierney/Dodd, *Church History*, 3:cxxix-cxxx.

⁵⁶ On 2 February 1599, Cardinal Caetani granted faculties to all secular priests in England who accepted Blackwell's authority. See IT, Petyt MSS 538, vol. 47, fols. 137^{r-v}, published in Law, *Archpriest Controversy*, 1:151–53.

⁵⁷ Blackwell to Persons, 3/13 June 1599, ARSI, Angl. 37, fol. 63^r.

⁵⁸ Garnet to Persons, [c. June 1599], ABSI, Coll P II 542–544. According to Garnet, Blackwell was tremendously consoled by the conformity of the 'Sodalitians' (Garnet to Marco Tusinga [vere Persons], 30 June 1599, TNA, SP 12/271/32).

⁵⁹ London 12 June 1599, ASV, Borghese III.111.a-b, fols. 136^{r-v}.

⁶⁰ For reasons not unrelated to his portrait of Persons, Michael L. Carrafiello ignores this albeit temporary interlude of reconciliation, and asserts that the papal clarification 'did nothing to quell Appellant resentment of Parsons and the Jesuits', *Robert Parsons and English Catholicism, 1580–1610* (Selinsgrove, Pa: Susquehanna University Press, 1998), 91.

Catholic candidate for the English throne, and perceived anti-Jesuitism. Despite Colleton's promise to counter all rumours and allegations about the Society of Jesus, Garnet remained justifiably apprehensive.⁶¹ Peace was not permanent and Blackwell's endorsement of Lister's judgement that the appellants were in fact schismatic resulted in a second appeal. Now more experienced with Roman ways, the appellants solicited French support and received clandestine aid from the Elizabethan government. The second appeal ended more successfully for the appellants in October 1602 as the secular clergy finally achieved their goal of an independent mission freed from Jesuit involvement.⁶² Henceforth secular clergy agitated for a bishop with ordinary authority, a return to traditional ecclesiastical practice in which regular clergy, specifically the Jesuits, were subject to the jurisdiction of the local hierarchy.⁶³

Garnet's and Oldcorne's apparent inability to distinguish disagreement from opposition bordered on paranoia. For them anti-Jesuitism lurked behind every dispute. Anti-Jesuitism, they believed, underlay any attempt to recover a more traditional ecclesiastical structure, any suggestion of collegiate mismanagement, any aspiration for an independent secular clergy. Such an obsession risked the creation of the very monster they sought to slay.

⁶¹ Garnet to Persons, [c. June 1599], ABSI, Coll P II 542–544.

⁶² As Colleton, believing that the Society was instrumental in the establishment of the archpresbyterate and the nomination of the archpriest and his assistants, argued: 'I praye shew the difference that disproveth, and the reasons why you may elect our Superior, and we not yours' *Just defence*, 253.

⁶³ I shall examine both more fully in a forthcoming monograph. Meanwhile, see John Bossy, 'Henri IV, the Appellants and the Jesuits', *Recusant History* 8 (1965–1966): 80–122; and *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead*, ed. Michael C. Questier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 1–15.