

Renaissance and Reformation
Renaissance et Réforme



Disciplining Brothers in the Seventeenth-Century Jesuit Province of Aragon

Patricia W. Manning

Volume 37, Number 2, Spring 2014

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1090716ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v37i2.21812>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Manning, P. (2014). Disciplining Brothers in the Seventeenth-Century Jesuit Province of Aragon. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 37(2), 115–139. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v37i2.21812>

Article abstract

This article studies the leave-taking process in the Society of Jesus' Province of Aragon. According to the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and decrees of General Congregation 7, the community could decide to dismiss a Jesuit or an individual could request to depart. Provincial and Roman authorities consulted about leave-takings. Although Ignatius of Loyola favoured immediate dismissal of misbehaving men, by the seventeenth century the process had evolved. As archival references demonstrate, the religious community developed atonement processes, including confinement, for wayward Jesuits in the hopes of reforming poor comportment.

Disciplining Brothers in the Seventeenth-Century Jesuit Province of Aragon

PATRICIA W. MANNING

University of Kansas

This article studies the leave-taking process in the Society of Jesus' Province of Aragon. According to the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus and decrees of General Congregation 7, the community could decide to dismiss a Jesuit or an individual could request to depart. Provincial and Roman authorities consulted about leave-takings. Although Ignatius of Loyola favoured immediate dismissal of misbehaving men, by the seventeenth century the process had evolved. As archival references demonstrate, the religious community developed atonement processes, including confinement, for wayward Jesuits in the hopes of reforming poor comportment.

Cet article analyse le système mis en place de la Compagnie de Jésus concernant les congés et renvois dans la Province d'Aragon. Selon les Constitutions de la Compagnie de Jésus et les décrets de la Congrégation Générale 7, la congrégation pouvait décider de renvoyer un jésuite ou un particulier pouvait faire la démarche de demander un congé de la communauté. Les autorités romaines et provinciales se consultaient au sujet des renvois et congés. Bien qu'Ignace de Loyola préférât le renvoi immédiat des hommes de mauvaise conduite, le système évolua à partir du dix-septième siècle. Comme le révèle les archives de la Société, la Compagnie de Jésus développa des procédures pour l'expiation, parmi lesquels la détention, pour les jésuites réfractaires dans l'espoir de réformer leur mauvaise conduite.

In 1640 in Antwerp, the Society of Jesus published the *Imago primi sæculi Societatis Iesu a Prouincia Flandro-Belgica eiusdem Societatis repræsentata*, a Latin emblem book and history of the religious order to commemorate its centenary. In this printed celebration of the achievements of the Society of Jesus, dismissals from the community figure in both the volume's narrative history and in an emblem "Dimissio è Societate Iesv" (Dismissal from the Society of Jesus).¹ The emblem likens the Society of Jesus to a fertile grapevine and the

1. *Imago primi sæculi Societatis Iesu a Prouincia Flandro-Belgica eiusdem Societatis repræsentata* (Antuerpiae: Ex officina Plantiniana Balthasaris Moreti, 1640), pp. 99–104 and 203. For this text I use English translations provided by a colleague, Charles Augustine Rivera. The volume was also published in a Dutch-language version.

departure process to pruning this vine in illustration and verse, the conclusion of which promises: “You are allowed to cut off whatever bough wherever in its own time: if there is any faith in the vine, it will not give less for that.”² The grapevine imagery links the leave-taking process to the community’s divine mission, as evidenced most notably in the biblical vineyard parable.³

All religious orders dismiss probationary members who prove themselves unsuited for life in the community; however, the level of pride in discharge evident in the *Imago* provides a tantalizing hint of a more complex attitude at play in the Society of Jesus.⁴

Several Jesuit innovations on practices established by other Catholic religious communities contribute to its approach to leave-taking. First, as John W. O’Malley explains, after “two years” in the community “all Jesuits” took “first vows.”⁵ Only later, after a number of years as part of the Jesuit order, did men take “final vows.”⁶ Based on A. Lynn Martin’s research of clerics listed in Mario Scaduto’s *Catalogo dei Gesuiti d’Italia, 1540–1565*, “[t]he average length of time between entry and final vows for these 505 priests was 15.6 years.”⁷ During this time, both the Society of Jesus and each individual had ample time to evaluate their association thoroughly.

Second, in contrast to the rules of “almost all the earlier orders,” the Jesuits’ foundational document, the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, did not

2. *Imago*, p. 203: “Tempore quemque suo reseces licet unidque ramum/ Si qua fides vitiest, nil dabit inde minus.” In order to most accurately represent the content of the text in English, the translator (Rivera) had to sacrifice its poetic form.

3. Matthew 20:1–16. The *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* also employs the image of the vineyard. For one example, see Ignatius of Loyola, *The Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*, trans. George E. Ganss (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), p. 153 [243]. The bracketed numbers reference paragraph numbers.

4. As we will see, a Jesuit could be dismissed by the community, but an individual also could request to leave. Therefore, this article uses the more neutral terms “discharge,” “departure,” and “leave-taking” when referring collectively to both dismissals and voluntary departures. The 1640 emblem and other Jesuit documents at times use dismissal to reference both voluntary departures and those made at the behest of the religious order.

5. John W. O’Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 347.

6. O’Malley, *First Jesuits*, pp. 346–47. Men who had taken first vows were not allowed to leave the Jesuit community without permission. Should an individual do so, he risked being excommunicated (Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 150 [234–36]).

7. A. Lynn Martin, “Vocational Crises and the Crisis in Vocations among Jesuits in France during the Sixteenth Century,” *The Catholic Historical Review* 71, no. 2 (April 1986), p. 209.

detail punitive measures to be taken against wayward Jesuits, as O'Malley also notes.⁸ According to Thomas Clancy's study of accounts from contemporaries of Ignatius of Loyola, when a visitor asked where disobedient Jesuits were incarcerated, Loyola indicated the door.⁹ The early years of the Jesuit community proved that Loyola's action was not a mere gesture, but a philosophy that the order consistently practised.¹⁰ As evidenced by the 1640 emblem, this tradition of leave-taking continued in the seventeenth-century Jesuit community. In point of fact, disciplinary and dismissal procedures were inexorably linked in the seventeenth-century Province of Aragon.¹¹ As General Goswin Nickel specified in authorizing the departure of Brother Joseph Pedrissa after he completed his penance: "[he] is to be dismissed from the Society, this is the greatest punishment that we can give to him."¹²

Finally, the degree of administrative centralization in the Jesuit community differs from the organizational structure of other religious orders.¹³

8. O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, p. 344.

9. Thomas H. Clancy, *An Introduction to Jesuit Life: The Constitutions and History through 435 Years* (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1976), p. 82.

10. According to O'Malley's research, in the first 25 years of the order's existence, "about 35 percent" of those admitted later departed (either of their own volition or at the behest of the community); however, O'Malley concedes "the percentage [of those who left] may well be higher" because of lacunae in this documentation (O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, p. 56).

11. As Jonathan Wright notes, the Jesuit community is organized into "regional" administrative areas ("assistancies") and then "smaller," more local units ("provinces"). See Jonathan Wright, *God's Soldiers: Adventure, Politics, Intrigue and Power: A History of the Jesuits* (New York: Doubleday, 2004), p. 47. The Province of Aragon includes Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, and the Balearic Islands.

12. "[S]ea despedido de la Compañía, que este es el mayor castigo que le podemos dar" General Goswin Nickel to Diego de Alastuey, Provincial, August 24, 1654, Archivo Histórico Nacional Madrid (AHN), Jesuitas (hereafter J), legajo (hereafter leg.) 254, document (hereafter doc.) 109. In transcribing correspondence, I maintain its original and inconsistent orthography. I complete common abbreviations, with the exception of abbreviated courtesy titles. In translating, I maintain the capitalization of the originals, but at times I alter punctuation to conform to English usage. I add necessary written accent marks in my text, but not to direct quotations. If a proper name has a modern spelling, I use it in my text, but I include the original orthography in brackets. In citing correspondents, I include given names and brief titles on the first mention of the individual and surnames in subsequent references. I do not add the courtesy title Father to General, Provincial, and other superiors' titles. All unattributed translations are my own.

13. As O'Malley explains, in contrast to "the General Chapters of the mendicant orders," Jesuit General Congregations "meet rarely—upon the death of the general to elect his successor and for other serious reasons" and leave governance to the General (O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, pp. 52–53).

As Jonathan Wright remarks, the Father Superior General of the Society of Jesus, its “only elected” official, selects other superiors.¹⁴ Moreover, as Markus Friedrich explains: “Because of the centralized governance, the General, and only the General, could make any major decision regarding personnel”;¹⁵ but the General did not do so on his own. Frequent written communication between provinces and Rome ensured dialogue between local Provincials and the General on all aspects of life in the community, including disciplinary matters. Although Ignatius of Loyola’s dictates on the need for obedience to directives from superiors in the hierarchy are well known, other Ignatian sources favour the decision-making powers of local superiors’ detailed knowledge of specific situations over those higher up in the governance structure.¹⁶ This duality inevitably led to dialogue: disciplinary discussions necessarily negotiated the assessments of local and central authorities. Provincial authorities could inform Rome about misbehaving Jesuits, and Roman superiors could request investigations of misconduct and authorize dismissal if reports proved true or the brother in question demonstrated incorrigibility.¹⁷ Since the *Constitutions*

14. Wright, p. 47.

15. Markus Friedrich, “Government and Information-Management in Early Modern Europe: The Case of the Society of Jesus (1540–1773),” *Journal of Early Modern History* 12, no. 6 (2008), p. 547.

16. Ignatius of Loyola, “To the Members of the Society in Portugal,” March 26, 1553, *Letters of Saint Ignatius of Loyola*, trans. William J. Young (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1959), pp. 287–95: here we find an emphasis on the importance of obedience, whereas Loyola to Father Simon Rodrigues, mid 1542, *Letters*, pp. 59–60, signals the significant role of local knowledge. See Ignatii de Loyola, “Sociis lusitanis,” 26 martii 1553, epist. 3304, in *Epistolae et instructiones* IV, Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 29 (Romae: [Apud Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu], 1964), (reprint edition), pp. 669–81; Loyola, “Patri Simoni Roderico,” medio anno 1542, epist. 44, *Epistolae et instructiones* I, Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu 22 (Romae: [Apud Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu], 1964), (reprint edition), pp. 211–12.

17. The term “dimissorial” (*dimissoria*) in the Jesuit community does not refer to a dimissorial in canon law, i.e. a letter from a religious superior that requests powers outside of his own territory, most often composed so that a bishop outside of one’s own diocese can perform an ordination (E. Olivares, “Dimisorias,” in *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús, biográfico-temático*, ed. Charles E. O’Neill and Joaquín María Domínguez, 4 vols. (Roma: Institutum Historicum, S.I. / Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas, 2001), vol. 2, pp. 1126–27). According to E. Olivares, alongside the canonical dimissorial, within the Society of Jesus a “dimissorial letter is the document that certifies dismissal from the Society of Jesus, given by the competent superior to one who has taken his two-year vows, or formed temporal or spiritual coadjutor”; see Olivares, “Dimisorias”: “las [letras] dimisorias es el documento que certifica la dimisión de la C[ompañía de J][esús], dada por el superior competente a quien tiene los votos

of the *Society of Jesus* empowered those making leave-taking decisions to consider “particular circumstances” (*circunstancias particulares*) in their deliberations, superiors frequently did so.¹⁸ Rather than reify the Ignatian philosophy of speedy dismissal, in practice in the seventeenth-century Province of Aragon, the order employed a range of penitential options, including confinement to modify brothers’ behaviour, or to make them atone for misconduct prior to their departure from the community.¹⁹

Since brothers represent a large portion of disciplinary procedures and leave-takings referenced in correspondence between Provincials in Aragon and the General, this paper focuses on them; however, we will refer to disciplinary procedures involving priests when they elucidate the process in general.²⁰ Within the Jesuit community, two categories of men are brothers. First, temporal coadjutors, as Javier Burrieza Sánchez explains, perform “domestic” duties and spend their careers in the community as brothers.²¹ Second, men who have

del bienio o de coadjutor formado, spiritual o temporal.” Also see W. Fanning, “Dimissorial letters,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton, 1908), New Advent (website), accessed 12 January 2014, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04797b.htm>.

18. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 144 [211]. See Ignatii de Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, vol. 2, *Textus Hispanus*, *Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu*, vol. 64 (Roma: Typis Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianae, 1936), p. 317. The *Monumenta* edition maintains the text’s original orthography. As George E. Ganss indicates, the first printed version of the *Constitutions* was a Latin translation of Loyola’s Spanish original (Ganss, “Introduction” in Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 39), so the Spanish text is cited here.

19. While this disregard for the founder’s idea may seem inconceivable, according to O’Malley, flexibility proves so important in the ethos of the Society of Jesus that the community encourages members to follow their own consciences rather than regulations. See John W. O’Malley, “Introduction: The Pastoral, Social, Ecclesiastical, Civic, and Cultural Mission of the Society of Jesus,” in *The Jesuits II: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. O’Malley, Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris and T. Frank Kennedy (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006), pp. xxvi–xxvii. As O’Malley signals, John Bossy made a similar assessment, in Bossy, “Editor’s Postscript,” in H. Outram Evennett’s *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation*, ed. John Bossy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), p. 130.

20. All members of the Society of Jesus were subject to penances if their behaviour merited them. Nickel reminded Provincial Jacinto Piquer of the need to assign penances to those who deserve them, regardless of their rank (Nickel to Jacinto Piquer, Provincial, June 10, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 196). Penitent Jesuit priests could also depart from the community, most often to other religious orders. See Patricia W. Manning, “Repentance and Departure from the Society of Jesus in the Seventeenth-Century Province of Aragon,” *Bulletin of Spanish Studies* 89, no. 5 (2012), pp. 699–723.

21. Javier Burrieza Sánchez, “Retrato del jesuita,” in *Los jesuitas en España y en el mundo hispánico*, ed. Teófanos Egido, Burrieza Sánchez, and Manuel Revuelta González (Madrid: Fundación Carolina, Centro

taken first vows in the Jesuit community and are engaged in study with the goal of eventually becoming priests also are brothers. As we will see, however, most references to brothers studied here do not allow us to distinguish one category of brother from the other. In theory, the Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus should be able to clarify these details for all men associated with the order. In practice, however, this does not always prove to be the case.²² Moreover, as Miguel Batllori documented, Roman records' tendency to translate Catalan names into Castilian²³ can pose significant challenges to locating information for a particular man from the Province of Aragon.

Unfortunately, due to changes in the archival record in the Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus, it is extremely difficult to study penitential practices and leave-takings in the seventeenth century at the level of detail that A. Lynn Martin and Peter J. Togni have done for earlier time periods.²⁴ After 1600, the Roman Archive did not retain all of the General's incoming correspondence; only in exceptional circumstances was this done.²⁵ While some correspondence concerning polemical issues survives in Rome, including especially scandalous reprimands, the analysis of letters deemed unusual enough to be archived does not seem the best approach to understanding the manner in which a policy evolves. This study therefore examines discussions of brothers

de Estudios Hispánicos e Iberoamericanos, Marcial Pons Historia, 2004), p. 42. Spiritual coadjutors have not been mentioned here since they are not relevant to our analysis of brothers. See O'Malley, *First Jesuits*, pp. 345–47 for a thorough discussion of grades in the Society of Jesus.

22. For example, although Charles Van de Vorst found departure papers for Arnold Haventius, this individual did not appear in ledgers of the departed from the Jesuit community. See Charles Van de Vorst, "La Compagnie de Jésus et le passage à l'ordre des Chartreux (1540–1694)," *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu* 23 (1954), pp. 28–29, 32. A. Lynn Martin notes that men who formed part of the Society of Jesus for relatively short periods of time, like brothers who departed early in their formations, left little archival evidence. See A. Lynn Martin, *The Jesuit Mind: The Mentality of an Elite in Early Modern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1988), p. 116, n. 56.

23. Miguel Batllori, *Gracián y el Barroco* (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1958), p. 22.

24. See Martin, "Vocational Crises," pp. 201–21; *The Jesuit Mind*, pp. 116–23; and Peter J. Togni, "Novices in the Early Society of Jesus: Antonio Valentino, S. J. and the Novitiate at Novellara, Italy," in *Spirit, Style, Story: Essays Honoring John W. Padberg, S. J.*, ed. Thomas M. Lucas (Chicago: Jesuit Way, Loyola University Press, 2002), pp. 227–67.

25. Edmond Lamalle, "L'archivio generale di un grande ordine religioso: quello della Compagnia di Gesù," *Archiva ecclesiae: bollettino dell'Associazione archivistica ecclesiastica* 24–25 (1981–82), pp. 96–97.

in the regular correspondence between Generals and Provincials in Aragon.²⁶ Considering that a 1637 *memorial* specifies that particularly serious matters should be treated in ciphered, secret letters, we can conclude that these references are routine.²⁷ For the sake of proper contextualization, it must be noted that the references to brothers studied here form part of longer letters concerning appointments of superiors to Jesuit houses and all manner of details about their functioning, in addition to discussions of men in various stages of the penitential and departure process.

Before turning to the atonement processes for brothers from the Province of Aragon, we first must consider the Jesuits' regulations concerning disciplinary procedures and leave-takings. In the *Constitutions*, a passage concerning the formation of novices embodies the community's approach to remediating faults. The *Constitutions* grant "the superior" (*el superior*) discretion in administering "corrections and penances" (*correcciones y penitencias*) and urge those receiving them to focus on their value in reforming their behaviour.²⁸ Since local authorities mete out these atonements as specified by the *Constitutions*, correspondence from Rome with the Province of Aragon generally does not discuss particular penitential acts for brothers, unless other members of the community must help to enact them, as is the case with confinement and changes of residence from one Jesuit house to another. In 1608, General Congregation 6

26. This paper is based on correspondence from the Jesuit collection (Jesuitas) in the Archivo Histórico Nacional in Madrid. Most of the letters in the *legajos* (boxes of unbound documents) cited here are from Generals to Provincials in Aragon and are usually written in Spanish. From time to time, letters are directed to other provincial officials. A few missives are written in Latin; these generally concern one topic, usually a procedural matter. For example, in a letter composed in Latin, Nickel informed Piquer that the province's assistant asked to leave this office because of his poor health and suggested a replacement (Nickel to Piquer, April 30, 1655, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 136). Despite the fact that the number of letters in the three *legajos* cited in this paper totals 1,299, even before civil unrest, war, and disease roiled Catalonia in the 1640s and 1650s, letters from Generals to Provincials often complained about the loss of correspondence from Aragon. See Manning, p. 707, n. 40 for specific instances of such complaints. Given these lacunae, this article makes no statistical analysis since missing documents make such calculations flawed from the outset.

27. Martín Pérez, Procurator of the Province of Aragon, to General Muzio Vitelleschi, January 4, 1637, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 286. According to E. Olivares, a *procurador de provincia* (procurator of the province) is an agent for the affairs of a province in Rome (E. Olivares, "Gobierno," *Diccionario histórico*, vol. 2, p. 1755).

28. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 160 [269]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 355.

offers additional guidance to superiors; point 6 of Decree 37 asserts: “[v]igorous discipline will promote compliance, as will the use of reprehension and other penances against violators of the rules and those who give no heed to paternal warning [...]” within the boundaries established by the regulations for rectors of Jesuit communities.²⁹ By employing this approach, “subjects may understand that it must finally come to the extreme means of dismissal, if need be, when, after other methods have been tried, nothing is successful.”³⁰

In terms of leaving the Society of Jesus, the *Constitutions* specified a number of reasons for discontinuing the relationship between the community and an individual. If, because of “incommuni[ability] in some passions or vice” (*incommuni en algunas pasiones o vicios*) a man’s presence in the Society of Jesus proved detrimental either to the divine or the order itself, he could depart.³¹ An individual also could leave if his disposition or health did not seem compatible with life in the community.³² Finally, if people outside of the Society of Jesus would suffer unnecessarily if a man remained in the order, he could depart.³³ Martin’s research offers an important caveat to the impression created by the *Constitutions* that most departing Jesuits left in the early years of their association with the order.³⁴ According to Martin’s investigations of sixteenth-century Jesuits mentioned in Scaduto’s catalog, “only 22 percent” of departures occurred during the mens’ probationary period, their first two years in the community.³⁵

29. General Congregation (hereafter GC) point 6, decree (hereafter d.) 37, point 6 in *For Matters of Greater Moment: The First Thirty General Congregations*, ed. and trans. John W. Padberg, Martin O’Keefe, and John L. McCarthy (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), p. 242. See GC6, d.37, point 6, in the *Decreta Congregationvm Generalivm Societatis Iesv* (Antverpiæ: Apud Joannem Meursium, 1635), p. 393: “Promovebit executionem disciplinæ vigor, & usus reprehensionum, & aliarum poenitentiarum, adversus transgressores regularum, & non curantes paterna monita [...]” www.books.google.com.

30. GC6, d. 37, point 6 in Padberg et. al, *For Matters*, p. 242. See GC6, d.37, point 6, *Decreta Congregationvm*, p. 393: “ita ut intelligant subditi; veniendum tandem ad extrema remedia dimissionis, si opus fuerit, quando aliis tentatis nihil proficitur.”

31. Loyola, *Constitutions* 144 [210] and [212]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 317. Twentieth-century canon law supersedes these regulations in the contemporary Society of Jesus. See I. Echarte, “Miembros de la CJ,” *Diccionario histórico* vol. 3, pp. 2664–69, especially p. 2665, for a detailed explanation of current procedures.

32. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 146 [216]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 323.

33. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 146 [217]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 323.

34. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 147 [219]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 326.

35. Martin, “Vocational Crises,” p. 205.

Later departures were possible because of the Jesuits' aforementioned timing of final vows.

In addition to the *Constitutions*, the order continued to refine departure procedures via decrees of General Congregations, particularly in Decree 22 of General Congregation 7 in 1615. Point 1 of Decree 22 stipulated "that all those who are seeking dismissal for no clearly apparent cause but who are judged otherwise fit for the Society" should submit written reasons for departure "to their Provincial," who was to assess them and then forward the documents to Rome.³⁶ Point 6 cautioned: "Those who ought to be dismissed from the Society on account of some serious public fault are not to be dismissed before they are punished in proportion to the gravity of their offense as judged by superiors, even by imprisonment for a time where this practice and custom obtain."³⁷ Local convention in the Province of Aragon makes this a particularly fruitful space in which to examine this question. In 1573, during General Congregation 3, the Province of Aragon asked to establish penitentiary structures for misbehaving Jesuits.³⁸ The "postulatum" also asked that a recalcitrant Jesuit "could be confined to his room, as if he were under guard."³⁹ Although General Congregation 3 did not endorse these requests, by the mid-1600s this practice became an established element in disciplinary procedures in the province after General Congregation 7 permitted them.

When written justifications from men who sought to initiate their own departure were evaluated at the provincial level and then sent on to Rome as specified in Decree 22 of General Congregation 7, Roman authorities decided with some frequency that brothers seeking to leave had no justification to do

36. GC7, d. 22, point 1 in Padberg et. al., *For Matters*, p. 257; GC7, d.22, point 1 in *Decreta Congregationvm*, pp. 425–26: "Eos omnes qui dimissionem petunt, nulla iusta apparente caussa, & idonei alioquin ad Societatem judicantur," and "Provinciali suo" (this point is not numbered but is labelled "Censuit primo" in this edition).

37. GC7, d. 22, point 6 in Padberg et. al., *For Matters*, p. 258; GC7, d.22, point 6 in *Decreta Congregationvm*, p. 428: "Qui ob publicam aliquam culpam gravem è Societate dimitti debent, non prius dimittantur, quam juxta culpæ quantitatem arbitrio Superiorum puniantur, etiam inclusione ad tempus, ubi usus & consuetudo id obtinuit."

38. John W. Padberg, "The Third General Congregation April 12–June 16, 1573," in *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture, 1573–1580*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu; St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2004), p. 70.

39. Padberg, "The Third General Congregation," p. 71.

so, as in the following cases. Brother Juan Sureda's request to sever ties to the Jesuits was denied because "[he] doesn't allege any cause that is justified."⁴⁰ When Brother Martín Cabrera "always urges for his dimissorial, it is advisable to give him to understand that he does not have causes for it and that he is to keep calm."⁴¹

Although many requests to depart initiated by brothers were rejected, correspondence between Rome and the Province of Aragon routinely authorized the issuance of dimissorial papers for brothers that the community decided to dismiss. To mention but one example, "[t]he F[ather] Provincial has given us a document ad dimissionem for B[rother] Pedro Cortés, and another for another B[rother] whom the Father Provincial himself will say; neither of the two is appropriate for the Society so we have resolved that they be dismissed, there is nothing [to do] but to execute it."⁴² As evidenced by Vitelleschi's evaluation of these two brothers, at times this correspondence used general descriptions for brothers whose comportment revealed that they were not well suited to the Jesuits. Similarly broad categories also were employed to evaluate Jesuits in other provinces of the Society of Jesus; Martin's research uncovered comparable wording in assessments of French Jesuits.⁴³ Although letters sometimes described unsuitable behaviour in more detail, this did not prove to be the norm.

Should provincial authorities let a man go without consulting with Rome before taking this action, the General requested that they not do so. In 1633, General Muzio Vitelleschi wished that Provincial Pedro Contiente postponed dismissal for Brother Vicente Ferrer until Rome authorized it.⁴⁴

40. "[N]o alega causa ninguna que sea justificada." Vicar General Giovanni Paolo Oliva to Piquer, Vice Provincial, 1661, AHN J leg. 255, doc. 7. As is evident in the Spanish-language original of this letter and the others cited in this article, this correspondence employs legalistic style and tone. Rather than simplify this complexity in my translations, I maintain it since the dispassionate and judicial assessment of departing brothers in this official correspondence is an important facet of the treatment of those leaving the community.

41. "[I]nsta siempre por su dimissoria, conuiene darle a entender que no tiene causas para ella y se quiete." Vitelleschi to Pedro Gil, Provincial, August 24, 1620, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 110.

42. "El P. Provincial nos ha dado un tratado ad dimissionem del H. Pedro Cortes, y otro de otro H que el mismo P Provincial dira; ninguno de los dos es aproposito para la Compañia assi hemos resuelto, que sean despedidos, no ay sino ejecutarlo." Nickel to Piquer, Provincial, April 13, 1652, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 49.

43. Martin, "Vocational Crises," p. 216; Martin, *The Jesuit Mind*, p. 34.

44. Vitelleschi to Pedro Contiente, Provincial, February 4, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 176.

In 1617, Vitelleschi asks that superiors not convene formal, judicial boards against Jesuits without consultation with Rome, unless the situation proves so egregious that local superiors cannot delay to await a response from Rome.⁴⁵ Rather, Vitelleschi prefers another type of correction: “the paternal charity with which superiors must correct, amend and help their subjects ought to suffice for everything,”⁴⁶ and this is the approach that the correspondence employs. When Vitelleschi receives a report about a brother that troubles him, he makes inquires of Provincial Pedro Gil: “Concerning Brother Juan Alcouer, I am advised that he does not give satisfaction in his way of proceeding; Your Reverence with your great charity is to see what there is to this and to give an order that he be helped.”⁴⁷ Instead of immediately acting on information alleging poor behaviour, Vitelleschi urges that Gil investigate and assist the man. The General asks for similar encouragement for Bartolomé Martínez, who is to receive a caution and support to confirm his vocation.⁴⁸

Such aid also can include more onerous forms of self-improvement, as in the following situation: “It is necessary to put pressure on Brother Juan Bautista [Baptista] if he does not conform more to his obligations [...]”⁴⁹ In addition to compelling brothers to assume their responsibilities, penances also can be employed to modify unsuitable conduct, as in the discussion of Jacinto Bartoli, in which Gil is advised: “[to] go helping with some rather serious penances, taking him away from his studies for a time.”⁵⁰ Should penitential measures and a respite from one’s education or normal employment in order to contemplate one’s action or to seek aid from the divine fail to produce the desired results, the order considers other measures, including punishments and potential dismissal from the community.

45. Vitelleschi to Juan Sanz, Provincial, January 15, 1617, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 23.

46. “[D]euiendo bastar para todo la paternal charidad con que los superiores an de corregir, emendar y ayudar a sus subitos.” Vitelleschi to Sanz, January 15, 1617, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 23.

47. “Del Hermano Juan Alcouer se me auisa, que no da satisfacion en su modo de proceder; VR con su mucha charidad vea lo que ay en esso, y de orden que sea ayudado.” Vitelleschi to Gil, September 22, 1620, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 111.

48. Vitelleschi to Sanz, August 6, 1618, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 64.

49. “Es necesario apretar al Hermano Juan Baptista si no se ajusta mas a sus obligaciones [...]” Vitelleschi to Continente, February 24, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 175.

50. “[I]r ayudando con algunas penitencias algo graues quitandole por algun tiempo de los estudios.” Vitelleschi to Gil, June 20, 1620, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 106.

An individual's reaction to his atonement process could offer important information about his suitability for the order. For example, in reading and rejecting a brother's dismissorial paperwork, General Goswin Nickel outlines a plan to modify the man's comportment that may involve confinement and that ultimately may culminate in dismissal:

since the document ad dimissionem for Brother Lorente has been seen, it has been judged that he does not have cause to leave the Society. He should be helped in spirit, and the obligation that he has to persevere should be declared to him, and not making himself conform with this resolution, Your Reverence should lock him up and should punish him and if nothing aforementioned should suffice, you should dismiss him from the Society.⁵¹

Failure to reform one's behaviour under these circumstances signals incorrigibility.

Brothers who asked to exit the order who initially did not have cause to do so sometimes demonstrated ineptitude by the manner in which they addressed the General, as in this instance: "I also have given an order that Brother Joseph Pedrissa should be dismissed and Brother Francisco Pontalla, although he does not allege sufficient causes, and last month I sent a copy of a letter to Your Reverence that he wrote to me, so that it determine the disposition of this subject."⁵² In earlier correspondence, Nickel maintained that Brother Francisco Pontalla, although he often asked to be released from the Jesuits, did not have justification to do so.⁵³ Although Nickel's personality was characterized as "inflexible and tough" (*inflexible y recio*) by Batllori and "rigid and severe" (*rígido*

51. "[Y]a que sea visto el tratado ad dimissionem del H^o Lorente, se ha juzgado, que no tiene causa para salir de la Compañía. Se le ayudasse en espíritu, y se le declarasse la obligacion que tiene para perseverar, y que no conformandose con esta resolucion le encerrasse y castigasse VR y si nada dicho bastasse, le despidiese de la Compañía." Nickel to Piquer, June 10, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 196.

52. "Tambien he dado orden que fuesse despedido el Hermano Joseph Pedrissa y el H. Francisco Pontalla, aunque el no alega causas suficientes, y el mes passado envie a VR copia de una carta, que me ha escrito, para que haga concepto de la disposicion de este sugeto." Nickel to Alastuey, October 13, 1654, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 112. The use of "este" as the Spanish equivalent of "the latter" suggests that this comment refers to Pontalla. Moreover, as we have seen in the passage attached to note 12, the community already decided to dismiss Brother Pedrissa.

53. Nickel to Alastuey, August 24, 1654, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 108.

y severo) by Evaristo Correa Calderón,⁵⁴ Nickel was not alone in reacting negatively to the attitudes of some correspondents seeking to leave. After mandating that Brother Juan Bautista [Baptista] take up his obligations, Vitelleschi noted that: “the lack of composure of his letters shows the little esteem that he has for his vocation.”⁵⁵ Although Vitelleschi did not detail the precise nature of this brother’s problematic letter writing, it seems likely that Brother Juan Bautista expressed disdain for some aspect of life in the Jesuit community. Nickel’s successor reacted likewise to correspondence with a brother asking to depart. When Brother Lucas requested a dimissorial in order to marry, the petitioner’s attitude so bothered Vicar General Giovanni Paolo Oliva that he requested that Vice Provincial Piquer attempt to diminish Lucas’s “indifference” with “a penance” before dismissing Lucas “as he has deserved this punishment.”⁵⁶ In correspondence with Oliva once he became General, Martiriano Batlla claimed that he suffered from poor health and that his mother found herself in poverty; however, the General mandated a penance for Batlla because of the “insolent manner” in which Batlla wrote.⁵⁷

Great care is taken to ensure that the disciplinary process for a brother fits his transgression. When a misbehaving individual is allowed simply to leave without any additional consequences for his misdeeds, the absence of an atonement process is remarked upon, as in this leave-taking: “I confirm the dimissorial that was given to Bro[ther] Miguel Saluador, but before having given it to him, he ought to have been punished, as he deserved for his great faults.”⁵⁸

In point of fact, considerations of whether an individual should perform penances prior to departure frequently figure in letters between Generals and Provincials. As Manuel Ruiz Jurado explains, the order does not wish to part ways with men at the height of their misconduct, but rather once they possess

54. Batllori, *Gracián y el Barroco*, p. 95; E. Correa Calderón, *Baltasar Gracián. Su vida y su obra*, 2ª ed. (Madrid: Gredos, 1970), p. 83.

55. “[L]a descompostura de sus cartas muestra la poca estima que tiene de su vocacion.” Vitelleschi to Continente, February 24, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 175.

56. “pues tiene merecido este castigo,” Vicar General Oliva to Piquer, Vice Provincial, 1661, AHN J leg. 255, doc. 5.

57. General Oliva to Domingo Langa, Provincial, September 8, 1664, AHN J leg. 255, doc. 100.

58. “Confirmo la dimissoria, que se le dio al Herm. Miguel Saluador, pero antes de auersela dado debia ser castigado, como merecia por sus grandes culpas.” Vitelleschi to Crispín [Crespin] López, Provincial, October 20, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 146.

the “will to lead an ordered life” (*voluntad de llevar una vida ordenada*).⁵⁹ Such a shift often results from penitential contemplation of their actions. For example, in 1635, Vitelleschi authorizes the departure of Brother P. Jayme, but advises Contiente to investigate whether this brother should first perform some penances due to the fact that he has made various admissions in a document he has signed with the name Arsenio.⁶⁰ In writing a pseudonymous confession of his misdeeds, Jayme engages in less than forthright behaviour; the letter does not specify the nature of the transgressions that Jayme admitted. After dealing with Jayme’s confession to misbehaviour, Vitelleschi makes a general observation about those who commit this type of misconduct: “[i]t is necessary to keep watch with these young men, for many and frequent are those who fall into this matter of less honesty.”⁶¹ Considering that the term “honesty” (*honestidad*) denotes both truthfulness and sexuality purity, combined with the reference to the predilection of the young to commit such offenses, this passage strongly suggests that Jayme’s transgression was sexual in nature.⁶² Two years prior to Jayme’s disclosure, Vitelleschi expresses great disquiet about the large number of departure requests he has received from this province; they imply that the young are not being well trained because so many wish to abandon their commitments to the Jesuits.⁶³

In 1631, another seeming procedural oversight that was leading toward a departure also concerned Vitelleschi. The General expressed shock to Provincial Crispín [Crespin] López “that in that Province you would receive Bro[ther] Domingo Ros, being as he is, the son of a gentleman of the Order of

59. Manuel Ruiz Jurado, *Orígenes del noviciado en la Compañía de Jesús* (Roma: Institutum Historicum S. I., 1980), p. 102.

60. Vitelleschi to Contiente, March 20, 1635, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 234.

61. “Necessario es velar con esta gente moça, que son muchas y frecuentes los que caen en esta materia de menos honestidad.” Vitelleschi to Contiente, March 20, 1635, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 234. Although such explicit reference to age is rare, because both superiors know the age of the individual they are discussing, the General pays special attention to complaints about the proper development of young men in the Jesuit community throughout this correspondence, as in Vitelleschi to Luis de Ribas, Provincial, May 28, 1638, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 329.

62. See Sebastián de Covarrubias, *Tesoro de la lengua castellana o española*, ed. Martín de Riquer (Barcelona: Alta Fulla, 2003) for the dual meaning of “honest” (*honesto*), p. 696. I thank one of the readers for *Renaissance and Reformation/Renaissance et Réforme* for reminding me of the possibility of sexual transgression in this situation.

63. Vitelleschi to Contiente, October 20, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 190.

Saint John and of a professed nun.”⁶⁴ Vitelleschi asked that the province better “examine” applicants to the community.⁶⁵ Even more concerning to the General were Ros’s deficiencies as reported to Rome.⁶⁶ Unless Ros improved, “I believe that it must be necessary to dismiss him. Your Reverence is to inform me of whatever may be done, and you are to enclose your written opinion for me, so that I may determine with more correctness whatever may be done.”⁶⁷

As we have seen in the plan laid out for Brother Lorente, confinement could be an option to encourage proper conduct, and Lorente was not alone in this regard. In 1654, Nickel inquired about Brother Joseph [Ioseph] Cervero, who was locked up in Gandía and requested a dimissorial from Nickel.⁶⁸ Since correspondence from Provincial Francisco Franco did not mention this individual, and before deciding the matter, Nickel awaited information from Franco.⁶⁹ Brother Cervero was dismissed without reference to the nature of his transgressions: “I do not say anything about Brothers Bernardo Babiloni, and Ioseph Cervero, because days ago an order was sent that you were to give them dimissorials, and Your Reverence will have given it to them already, as both are so unworthy of being kept in the Society.”⁷⁰

In 1655, Nickel reported to Provincial Diego de Alastuey that a coadjutor of the Jesuit Colegio de Urgel had been locked up; the General ordered that the Rector of the *colegio* dismiss the man.⁷¹ This incident was significant because

64. “[Q]ue en esa Provincia recibiesen al Her. Domingo Ros, siendo como es, hijo de un caballero de habito de San Juan y de una monja professa.” Vitelleschi to López, November 18, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 148.

65. Vitelleschi to López, November 18, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 148.

66. Vitelleschi to López, November 18, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 148.

67. “[C]reo que ha de ser menester despedirlo. VR me informe de lo que ubiere, y juntamente me escriba su parecer, para que pueda yo determinar con mas acierto lo que se ubiere de hacer.” Vitelleschi to López, November 18, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 148.

68. Nickel to Francisco Franco, Provincial, August 30, 1651, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 29.

69. Nickel to Franco, August 30, 1651, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 29.

70. “No digo nada de los Hermanos Bernardo Babiloni, y Ioseph Cervero, por que ha dias se embio orden, que se les diesse dimissoria, y se la avra dado VR ya, pues entrambos son tan indignos de que los conservemos en la Compañía.” Nickel to Pedro Fons, Provincial, April 13, 1652, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 49.

71. Nickel to Alastuey, May 24, 1655, AHN J 254, doc. 124.

a coadjutor was not a new member of the community, but rather a formed individual with a rank who nonetheless was confined prior to dismissal.⁷²

Brothers who fled the community at times faced confinement upon their return to the Jesuits. In October of 1633, Vitelleschi informed Contiente: “Brother Domingo Latrás is returning to that Province with desires of persevering in the Society.”⁷³ Vitelleschi, however, expressed reservations about Latrás’s “way of proceeding” and asked that Contiente “elevate the penances that he will be given, they will tell us what is advisable to be carried out.”⁷⁴ Vitelleschi’s trepidations were well founded; a subsequent letter specified that Latrás deserved punishment.⁷⁵ Then, Domingo Latrás escaped from a penitentiary structure, and the General “will feel sorry that the disgrace, and the manner with which he left, might come to the notice of laypeople.”⁷⁶ This prison could be outside of the Society of Jesus, since most references to confinements in the Province of Aragon refer to locking up men (*encerrarle*), seemingly in a portion of a Jesuit house, without specific reference to “prison.”⁷⁷ Two years prior to Latrás’s confinement, however, the term “prison” (*prison*) was employed to discuss the detention of Father Gaspar Garrigas in a Jesuit house.⁷⁸ Vitelleschi asked Contiente to consider whether Garrigas “may come downstairs to eat with ours, and may come into contact with them in the house.”⁷⁹ This evidence suggests that the vocabulary to define this practice evolved. (The

72. Documents refer to coadjutors still in the formation process as “novicios coadjutores” (“novices [who will be] coadjutors”) as in Nickel to Piquer, July 10, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 195.

73. “El Hermano Domingo Latras se torna a esa Provincia con deseos de perseuerar en la Compañia.” Vitelleschi to Contiente, October 20, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 192.

74. “[M]odo de proceder,” “eleuar las penitencias, que se le dieran nos diran lo que conuiene executar.” Vitelleschi to Contiente, October 20, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 192.

75. Vitelleschi to Contiente, May 30, 1634, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 210.

76. “[S]entira que la desgracia, y el modo con que salio llegasse a noticia de los seglares.” Vitelleschi to Contiente, September 26, 1634, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 223.

77. Martin’s research has found references to “prisons” in French Jesuit communities (*Jesuit Mind*, pp. 118–19; “Vocational Crises,” p. 213).

78. Vitelleschi to Contiente, December 6, 1632, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 170.

79. “[Q]ue vaje con los nuestros a comer, y trate con ellos en casa.” Vitelleschi to Contiente, December 6, 1632, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 170. See Manning, pp. 718–19 for a more detailed analysis of Father Gaspar Garrigas’s penitential process.

forementioned Father Garrigas was to be confined for three years, which the community considered reducing.)⁸⁰

To return to the escaped Latrás, later documents indicated that Latrás was located.⁸¹ Even when such an individual created a scandal, the order still wanted to avoid excessive disciplinary measures. Vitelleschi voiced unease that the atonements imposed on Latrás were too severe and requested that they be moderated; Latrás was to be dismissed once he completed his punishment.⁸²

Another fleeing brother, Onofre Vila, initially was scheduled for confinement and dismissal. After Vila ran away from the Jesuit house in Girona, Vitelleschi mandated that Vila be found and confined: “where he will have space, giving him healthy penances, and although in the last mail I wrote that he is to be given a Dimissorial.” Vitelleschi became concerned that it might be unwise to delay Vila’s departure “until he satisfies the bad example.”⁸³ Vitelleschi’s disquiet did not imply that Vila would not receive any penance, but rather that his penitential process might not be as lengthy as his behaviour merited. As time passed, Vila’s conduct on the run was recounted with increasing alarm, including a report that he had armed himself with “pistols.”⁸⁴ At this point in 1635, Vitelleschi approved Contiente’s suggestion to circulate the notice of Vila’s excommunication.⁸⁵ As attempts to locate Vila continued into the following year, Vitelleschi warned the new provincial that Vila should not be let go prior to communicating with Rome.⁸⁶ Even under these circumstances, the order wanted to investigate the truth of the anecdotes that came to their attention and discuss them with provincial authorities before making a final determination as to disciplinary consequences for Vila. In 1637, Vitelleschi ordered

80. Vitelleschi to Contiente, April 24, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 178.

81. Vitelleschi to Contiente, December 20, 1634, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 228 and Vitelleschi to Contiente, April 16, 1635, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 239.

82. Vitelleschi to Contiente, December 20, 1634, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 228.

83. “[D]onde podra estar de espacio dandole saludables penitencias; y aun que en el correo pasado escribi que se le de Dimissoria.” “hasta que satisfaga el mal exemplo,” Vitelleschi to Contiente, October 20, 1634, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 227. Several references render Brother Onofre’s last name as Villa. Given Batllori’s observation about the preference for Spanish names in these records (*Gracián y el Barroco*, p. 22), I render Brother Onofre’s last name as Vila, since Villa is the Castilian version of the Catalan Vila.

84. Vitelleschi to Contiente, January 24, 1635, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 233.

85. Vitelleschi to Contiente, January 24, 1635, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 233.

86. Vitelleschi to Ribas, July 18, 1636, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 272.

that Vila should surrender to the order at one of the Jesuit *colegios* in Catalonia and then spend two months performing acts of penitence.⁸⁷ By the summer of 1639, documentation specified that Vila had received his dismissorial papers, after marrying and being sought by the Viceroy.⁸⁸

Confinement was not *de rigueur* once fleeing Jesuits returned; the order's reaction to these events depended on the behaviour of the individual brother. The *Constitutions* empowered "the discretion of the superior in whose house or college the person enters" to decide how to treat runaways who returned voluntarily.⁸⁹ In one situation, flight from the community did not result in plans for the brother's expulsion from it. In 1618, Brother Miguel Solà absconded from the Jesuit *colegio* in Calatayud, but he returned and "presented himself" to his rector.⁹⁰ Solà accepted the penances assigned to him, and Vitelleschi affirmed that after completing them, Solà was to be treated "as a son of the Society."⁹¹

Solà's voluntary return proved as unusual as Vila's adventures. In 1631, Brother Vera was about to receive dismissorial paperwork: "[h]aving seen, and consulted the document for the dismissal of Bro[ther] Francisco de Vera be it resolved that Your Reverence is to dismiss him then from the Society and if it may be necessary afterwards you can inform your F[athers] D[irectors] of the Justification, with which proceedings have been initiated in what has been done with him."⁹² Vera, however, was not content to wait for his paperwork to be processed. On May 4, 1632, Vitelleschi specified: "[i]f Brother Francisco Vera has appeared, it is necessary to punish him, as he deserves for his escape, [...] and after he will be dismissed from the Society."⁹³ It is notable that in this situation

87. Vitelleschi to Pérez, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 289.

88. Vitelleschi to Fons, August 20, 1639, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 359, Vitelleschi to Ribas, October 22, 1638, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 335. Vitelleschi to Ribas, March 12, 1638, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 321.

89. Loyola, *Constitutions*, pp. 150–51 [238–39]; "la discreción del superior, en cuya casa o collegio entra," in Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 335.

90. Vitelleschi to Sanz, April 17, 1618, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 52.

91. "como hijo de la Compañia," Vitelleschi to Sanz, April 17, 1618, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 52.

92. "Auiendo visto, y consultado el tratado, para la dimission del Her Francisco de Vera sea resuelto, que VR lo despida luego de la Compañia y si fuere menester despues se les podra dar raçon a sus P.D. de la Justificacion, con que se a procedido en lo que se a hecho con el." Vitelleschi to López, October 20, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 146.

93. "Si el Hermano Francisco Vera ha parecido necessario es castigarlo, como merece por la fuga, [...] y despues sera despedido de la Compañia." Vitelleschi to Contiente, May 4, 1632, AHN J 253, doc. 161.

in which a brother ran away from the community, the General no longer wrote of the need for penance, but rather for outright punishment prior to departure.

In 1634, Jerónimo [Geronimo] Torres fled to Rome from the province; Vitelleschi sent Torres back and urged Contiente to do with him what Contiente thought “advisable.”⁹⁴ In such a situation, superiors would follow the *Constitutions*, which specified that “public” (*públicos*) transgressions deserve “public penance[s]” (*penitencia pública*).⁹⁵ Several Generals reiterated this advice to Provincials in Aragon.⁹⁶ For returning runaways, the *Constitutions* suggested service to the less fortunate in “hospital[s]” (*ospital*) as a suitable measure.⁹⁷ In so doing, both Jesuits and residents of the village or town who saw the fleeing Jesuit also would see him performing these charitable acts upon his return.

In 1654, Nickel requested that Franco make the final decision about another escapee: “[a]bout the dimissorial of B[rother] Vicente Ferrer, I already have advised Your Reverence that if over there it is judged that it is advisable to give it to him, give it to him, having heard the opinions of your consultants, granted, that he already has been given so many penances for his disorders; on this matter I have no more to say.”⁹⁸ As a previous exchange revealed, Ferrer ran away from the community and attempted to make use of the secular courts.⁹⁹ Nickel advised that Ferrer should receive a “severe punishment” for these actions.¹⁰⁰

This reference omits the “de” from Vera’s name.

94. Vitelleschi to Contiente, June 24, 1634, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 214.

95. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 160 [270]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 355.

96. For one example, see Nickel to Piquer, June 10, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 196.

97. The *Constitutions* mentions hospital service as proof of “stability and constancy” and “penance for their past fecklessness” for escapees who return to the community (Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 151 [240]); “stabilidad y firmeza,” and “penitencia de su liuandad pasada” are in Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 335.

98. “Cerca de la dimissoria del H. Vicente Ferrer, ya he avisado a VR que si alla se juzga, que es conveniente darsela, que se la de, oido el parecer de sus consultores, supuesto, que se le han dado ya tantas penitencias por sus desordenes; de esta materia no tengo mas que dezir.” Nickel to Franco, October 13, 1654, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 112. The *consultores* are advisors to the Provincial who are appointed by the Provincial’s superiors (J. Aixelá, “Consultores de provincia y casa,” *Diccionario histórico*, vol. 1, p. 935).

99. Nickel to Alastuey, May 8, 1654, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 99.

100. Nickel to Alastuey, May 8, 1654, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 99. As we have seen, the speedy departure of another Brother Vicente Ferrer in 1633 caused complaint in Rome. Given the commonness of the name Vicente Ferrer in this part of Spain, I am hesitant to connect the 1654 Vicente Ferrer to a reference

Keeping a man in the Jesuit community to make him to atone for poor behaviour prior to dismissal had financial consequences for the community: penitents needed to be fed, housed, and clothed. In July of 1632, Vitelleschi clarified for Contiente that when Jesuits were moved to different houses as punishment, the houses that sent the individuals typically funded their maintenance.¹⁰¹ While Generals more frequently moved ordained men to other Jesuit communities as part of disciplinary processes,¹⁰² on occasion a brother did need to be housed in a different residence for penitential reasons.

In 1658, Nickel chided Provincial Jacinto Piquer over the situation concerning Brother Miguel Monje: “dismissing him promptly it will not be necessary to try to get his foodstuffs to be paid for by the Province, for being so poor the residence [Jesuit house] in Alicante, which should pay for them: moreover it is not reasonable to impose this burden on the Province.”¹⁰³ A later missive further clarified the issues surrounding Monje’s alimentation in Alicante. Although Brother Monje was a “subject” of the Jesuit house at Alicante, he was affiliated with the Jesuit mission in Paraguay, which already paid the travel expenses for his return to Spain.¹⁰⁴ In this context, it is more understandable as to why the Jesuit community at Alicante objected to the expense of feeding the penitent Monje. While Nickel maintained that the Alicante house was obligated to pay for Monje’s needs, he conceded: “and that all the rest the Residence of

from 1652 to a Brother Vicente Ferrer who “pide dimissoria con gran secreto y alega por causa la suma pobreza de su madre y hermanas” (asks for a dimissorial with great secrecy and he alleges as the cause the great poverty of his mother and sisters), Nickel to Piquer, April 13, 1652, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 49.

101. Vitelleschi to Contiente, July 12, 1632, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 163.

102. To mention but one example, when Father Baltasar Gracián was punished for his publications without the requisite permissions of the order, he was removed from his Chair of Scripture in Zaragoza and sent to Graus (Nickel to Piquer, March 16, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 190).

103. “[D]espidiendole presto no sera menester tratar de que sus alimentos los pague la Provincia, por ser tan pobre la residencia de Alicante, que los deve pagar: demas de que no es tratable imponer esta carga a la Provincia.” Nickel to Piquer, March 16, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 190.

104. Nickel to Piquer, November 8, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 206. This document states that “acerca de sus alimentos ya escrivi en Set que pues el P. Simon de Ogeda avia pagado su viatico hasta Valencia, no era razon hazerle pagar mas [...]” (about his food I already wrote in Se[ptember] that as F[ather] Simón de Ogeda had paid his expenses for the journey to Valencia, it was not reasonable to make him pay for more [...]). In 1658, Father Simón Ojeda was the Procurator of the Province of Paraguay; see Enrique Torres Saldamando, *Los antiguos jesuitas del Perú: biografías y apuntes para su historia* (Lima: Imprenta Imperial, 1882), p. 252. Full text available at www.books.google.com.

Alicante, whose subject he was, ought to pay it, but because the aforementioned Residence is poor, I will be happy that Your Reverence will help it with a donation.”¹⁰⁵

A portion of Monje’s transgression was discussed in the March 16, 1658 document: Brother Monje made use of the Bull of the Crusades to confess to an Augustinian.¹⁰⁶ As Nickel detailed, various popes forbade that members of the Society of Jesus employ this bull, and moreover it only applied to a limited number of situations,¹⁰⁷ thus implying that Monje’s circumstances did not meet these criteria. Nickel ordered the province “to punish severely” any Jesuit who “might dare to practice or teach the opposite.”¹⁰⁸ Unjustified recourse to the Bull of the Crusades threatened to undermine discipline in the community. In confessing to a priest other than his assigned confessor, Brother Monje managed to have a transgression forgiven without it coming to the knowledge of his designated spiritual counselor.¹⁰⁹

Brother Monje’s penances and dismissal illustrated another facet of the disciplinary process, namely that Roman authorities favoured dismissing a brother at the first manifestations of incorrigibility. Nickel asserted:

[t]he penances that have been given to Brother Miguel Monje, he is very deserving of them, and with them the dimissorial, which Your Reverence will give to him when in your judgment and that of your consultants he will be sufficiently punished; I am amazed that he has committed so many disorders and that they have not been known before; dismissing him promptly will not necessitate so many disorders [...].¹¹⁰

105. “[Y] que todo lo demas lo devia pagar la Residencia de Alicante, cuyo sugeto era, pero porque dicha Residencia es pobre, me holgare que VR le ayude con alguna limosna.” Nickel to Piquer, November 8, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 206.

106. Nickel to Piquer, March 16, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 190.

107. Nickel to Piquer, March 16, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 190.

108. “se atrevesse a practicar o enseñar lo contrario,” Nickel to Piquer, March 16, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 190.

109. Brother Monje was not the only Jesuit to make use of the Bull of the Crusades. In 1637, Vitelleschi received reports that a group of young Jesuit priests, including Baltasar Gracián, apparently used this bull to absolve their fellow Father Tonda (Vitelleschi to Ribas, May 30, 1637, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 302).

110. “Las penitencias que se le han dado al Hermano Miguel Monje, las tiene muy bien merezidas, y con ellas la dimissoria, que le dara VR quando a su justicia y de sus consultores estará bastantemente

Signs of an inability to accept correction could be in the eye of the beholder. As in any collaborative relationship, opinions on the part of Rome and Aragon did not always coincide on this point. On one occasion, Rome resolved a disagreement between the provincial and central levels concerning the suitability of a brother in its own favour:

[d]espite what Your Reverence and your consultants feel about Brother Miguel Fiol, here we have judged it advisable to dismiss him from the Society and that he who is so free and comfortable that he puts on a costume and goes outside the [Jesuit] house in costume at carnival time is not good for it [the Society] and so Your Reverence is to give him the dimissorial.¹¹¹

While the order was willing to give brothers a chance to reform their negative conduct, apparently by costumed participation in carnival activities, in the General's estimation, Fiol demonstrated incorrigibility.¹¹²

Once the order decides to dismiss a brother as the last step in a disciplinary process, the verdict may be reassessed at the request of the brother himself:

Brother Juan Freges has written to me with much sentiment about the fact that we manage to dismiss him from the Society, and he says that his faults are not of such consideration as they have informed us, and he firmly proposes to remedy them. Your Reverence is to hear him and after you are to take up this business with your consultants and lastly you are to

castigado: estoy admirado, que aya cometido tantos desordenes y que no se ayan sabido antes; despidiendole presto, no sera menester tantos desordenes [...]" Nickel to Piquer, March 16, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 190.

111. "No obstante lo que VR y sus consultores sienten del Hero Miguel Fiol, aca emos juzgado conviene despedirle de la Compañia y que no es bueno para ella quien es tan libre y desahogado que se disfrazza y sale fuera de la casa disfrazado en tiempo de carne tolendas y assi VR le de la dimissoria." Nickel to Piquer, July 6, 1656, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 151.

112. Several decades earlier, Vitelleschi had authorized the departure of Francisco Marigón for an unspecified matter that occurred during Carnival if Provincial Ribas's consultants were in agreement (Vitelleschi to Ribas, January 31, 1636, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 257).

do what you will judge most advisable for the service of the divine and you are to advise me of it.¹¹³

I did not find a subsequent reference to Brother Freges in this correspondence.

In 1631, Brother P. Barberán was on the verge of dismissal: “[i]f the things that Brother P. Barberán has done are such that for them he deserves to be dismissed from the Society, Your Reverence is to produce the document *in ordine ad dimissionem* and send it to me so that I may resolve what must be done.”¹¹⁴ Apparently, this plan shocked Barberán into acknowledging his faults: “I have been made very happy to know that Brother P. Barberán has opened his eyes and recognized what matters for him to persevere in the Society. Your Reverence is to entrust him to his immediate superior so that he may take care of him, and that he may go helping him in spirit.”¹¹⁵ Despite his change of heart, it seemed that Barberán did not ultimately succeed in the Jesuit community.¹¹⁶ Almost one year later, Vitelleschi wrote to Continente: “[w]hen Your Reverence dismisses Brother Barberán send him with his possessions, he will come to an agreement himself with his mother, it is not advisable that the Society involve itself in these cessions [the legal term for the yielding of rights or property to another beneficiary].”¹¹⁷ Per the *Constitutions*, a man departing from the Society of Jesus could take with him “what is found to be his”; however, as the phrase

113. “[E]l Hermano Juan Freges me a escrito con mucho sentimiento de que logramos despedir lo de la Compañía, y dice, que sus faltas no son de tanta consideracion, como nos an informado, y propone firmemente de enmendarlas. VR le oyga y despues trate este negocio con sus consultores y ultimamente haga lo que juzgare, que mas importa al diuino servicio y aviseme de ello.” Vitelleschi to López, November 18, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 148.

114. “Si las cosas que el Her P. Barberan a hecho son tales, que por ellas merece ser despedido de la Compañía, VR haga el tratado in ordine ad dimissionem y embiémelo, para que yo resuelva lo que se a de hacer.” Vitelleschi to López, October 20, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 146.

115. “Heme alegrado mucho de saber que el Hermano P. Barberan aya abierto los ojos y conocido lo que le importa perseuerar en la Compañía. VR lo encomiende a su inmediato superior para que cuyde de el, y lo vaya ayudando en espiritu.” Vitelleschi to López, November 28, 1631, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 149.

116. An intermediary reference also may refer to Brother Barberán, but I do not include it here since it uses a slightly different last name: Berberán de Cuevas (Vitelleschi to Continente, August 29, 1632, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 164).

117. “Quando VR despida al Hermano Barueran le embie con su hacienda, que el se entendera con su madre, que no conuiene que la Compañía se meta en esas cessiones.” Vitelleschi to Continente, December 6, 1632, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 170. This correspondence often interchanges the letters “u” and

“what is found” suggests, the community had discretion regarding “what he may have spent or given to the Society” and “whether something more than what is his ought to be given to him or not, and if more, how much.”¹¹⁸ Neither this policy nor the letter explains how Barberán’s departure would cause a potential legal dispute between mother and son. The most likely scenario, however, was that Barberán turned over an inheritance or property to the Society of Jesus. Although the *Constitutions* preferred that Jesuits’ “goods” (*bienes*) be used to aid the poor, these regulations did allow for the possibility that men assist relatives.¹¹⁹ The community could have awarded some portion of Barberán’s funds to his mother for her support when he entered the community. Perhaps this mother expected that the Jesuits would return this possession or capital (or some portion of it) to her control rather than to that of her son.

A few months later, Barberán left the community: “Your Reverence did well in deferring the dismissal of Barberán until having punished him thoroughly as his fault was great, and scandalous [...]”¹²⁰ Although Vitelleschi conceded that he heard murmurings about the fact that Barberán’s penitential process was overly lenient—“on the contrary some think that it was too abbreviated with him, and that he was given a short penance and that Your Reverence sent him away comfortably endowed when you dismissed him”—Vitelleschi expressed confidence that Contiente did what was best.¹²¹

At least in this venue, after brothers departed, the community bore them no ill will. Even after the amount of discussion and negotiation concerning Monje’s departure and its financial wake, Nickel began a November 8, 1658

“v” due to the fluid orthography of the seventeenth century. In spoken Spanish, the letters “b” and “v” frequently are confused because they produce a similar sound.

118. Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 148 [224]. For “lo que se hallare ser suyo,” “lo que uiesse gastado o dado a la Compañía,” and “si se le ha da [sic de] dar algo más de lo que se halla suyo o no, y si más, cuánto” see Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 327; for “determinar,” “cuánto,” and “con ficción uiesse estado en casa o collegio della,” p. 327. Further latitude was granted to superiors to “decide” “how much” to return in cases where an individual “remained in its house or college through a fictitious statement” (Loyola, *Constitutions*, p. 148 [224]).

119. Loyola, *Constitutions*, pp. 92–93 [54–55]; Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, p. 42.

120. “Bien hizo VR en dilatar el despedir a Barberan hasta auerle bien castigado pues su culpa fue grande, y escandalosa [...]” Vitelleschi to Contiente, April 24, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 178.

121. “[A]ntes algunos piensan que se abreuio con el demasiado, y que se le dio pequeña penitencia y que VR le embio bien acomodado quando le despidió.” Vitelleschi to Contiente, April 24, 1633, AHN J leg. 253, doc. 178.

reference to Monje: “B[rother] Miguel Monje already was dismissed, may Our Lord take him by his hand.”¹²² Such good wishes for departing individuals were not limited to Brother Monje.¹²³

Decisions to part ways with brothers typically were reached through a consultative process between the General and provincial authorities in the Society of Jesus. Should the order need to dismiss a brother as the ultimate punishment, superiors made certain that his atonement process not be excessive, but appropriate to his misconduct. In contrast to Ignatian preference against penitentiary structures in the Society of Jesus, the possibility to make wayward brothers in Aragon atone for their negative behaviour, including via confinement, evolved without order-wide dictates once General Congregation 7 allowed for this possibility. Such penitential practices encouraged brothers to moderate their behaviour, whether prior to dismissal or as part of their careers in the community, and also served as warnings against similar transgressions for other members.¹²⁴

122. “Ya fue despedido el Ho Miguel Monje, Nuestro Señor le tenga de su mano.” Nickel to Piquer, November 8, 1658, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 206.

123. Nickel expresses similar sentiments for other departing brothers, in Nickel to Alastuey, October 13, 1654, AHN J leg. 254, doc. 112.

124. The grain of this idea began years ago. I therefore thank the John Perry Miller Fund at Yale University for funding the archival research cited in this project. More recently, Michael Cornett and John W. O'Malley kindly shared their thoughts on earlier versions. John Waide and Jennifer Lowe generously allowed me to consult an exemplar of the *Imago primi saeculi Societatis Iesu a Prouincia Flandro-Belgica eiusdem Societatis representata* at St. Louis University. I am extremely grateful to Charles Augustine Rivera for his translations of Latin poetry from this volume. Also, I thank Isidro J. Rivera for his help in translating several difficult passages and E. Bruce Hayes and Romain Chareyron for their assistance with the French abstract. Finally, I thank the readers for *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* for their insights.