

Knowledge and Piety: Michael Moore's Career at the University of Paris and *Collège de France*, 1701-20

LIAM CHAMBERS

I

On 10 October 1701, four representatives of the faculty of arts at the University of Paris entered a formal conclave to elect a new rector.¹ The post of rector was the university's highest office, though by the early eighteenth century it had become a largely honorific position.² Despite the large number of Irish students and masters who attended the university in the seventeenth century, none had attained the university's highest honour, notwithstanding the fact that Irish masters effectively controlled the *Nation d'Allemagne*, one of the four corporations which governed the faculty of arts.³ Only one Irishman was elected rector in the seventeenth century, Michael Moore, a Dublin-born priest and professor at the *Collège des Grassins*, in 1677.

Traditionally, the rector was elected in October and automatically continued in the position for four three-month terms. However, in June 1677 a concerted attempt was made to remove the serving rector, Nicholas Pières. The reasons are unclear, but Moore was elected to replace Pières, putting the Irishman in an awkward situation. He therefore felt compelled to refuse the honour and allow Pières to continue his work.⁴ Moore was not considered again until October 1701, when he was unanimously elected. On this occasion, Moore accepted the

1 My thanks to Dr Thomas O'Connor, who commented on an earlier draft of this paper. The research on which the paper is based was made possible by a Government of Ireland Scholarship and a Daniel O'Connell Postgraduate Fellowship (N.U.I., Maynooth). Original spelling of contemporary documents has been retained. Unless otherwise indicated, all translations are my own.

2 Maxime Targe, *Professeurs et régents de collège dans l'ancienne Université de Paris (XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1902), pp.4-12. For a forceful contemporary argument that the rector had 'une véritable juridiction' see M. César Egasse du Boulay, *Remarques sur la dignité, rang, préséance, autorité et juridiction du recteur de l'Université de Paris* (Paris, 1668).

3 Patrick Boyle, 'Irishmen in the University of Paris in the 17th and 18th Centuries', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, 14 (1903), pp.24-45.

4 'Conclusions de l'Université (ou des nations réunies) 1677-1682', Archives de l'Université de Paris, Registre 33, ff.11v-13.

position. According to the minute book of the *Nation d'Allemagne*: 'He returned thanks in a graceful and polished speech, and even drew tears from some of the heads of the university by his references to the past. Then a most dignified cortege in lengthened file, and all the most distinguished members of the university escorted him to his residence in (the old college) Hubant.'⁵

Michael Moore was the only Irishman to hold the position of rector at the University of Paris, France's premier third-level institution, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁶ Though hundreds of Irish students passed through the lecture halls of the university colleges in the seventeenth century, and a few became professors of philosophy, the émigré Irish struggled to translate their force of numbers into a voice in the institution's power structures.⁷ Irish students found a permanent home in Paris only in the late 1670s, when the vacant *Collège des Lombards* was given to them after intensive lobbying at court.⁸ Moore's election signalled a minor turning point. In the eighteenth century a handful of remarkable Irish clerics would occupy prestigious chairs of theology that had remained out of their compatriots' reach a century before.⁹ Moore himself went on to occupy two important posts in the early eighteenth century. In 1702, he was appointed principal of arts students at the *Collège Royal de Navarre*, where he resided until his death in 1726, while at the height of the Jansenist *cas-de-conscience* affair, in 1703, he was appointed professor of physics (or Greek and Latin philosophy) at the other royal college in Paris, the *Collège de France*.¹⁰

- 5 'Livres des Conclusions. Nation d'Allemagne de l'an 1698 à l'an 1730', A.U.P., Registre 38, f.38v. Translation taken from Patrick Boyle, 'Dr Michael Moore, Sometime Provost of Trinity College and Rector of the University of Paris (A.D. 1640-1726)', *Archivium Hibernicum*, 5 (1916), p.9. See also: 'Conclusions de l'Université 1693-1708', A.U.P., Registre 37, f.103v.
- 6 A full list of rectors during this period is available in Charles Jourdain, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1862), pièces justificatives, cxxxv, 'Liste chronologique des recteurs de l'Université de Paris, au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècles'.
- 7 The 'Affaire des Hibernois' of 1651 provides one example of the collective weakness of Irish students and scholars at the University of Paris. For a recent assessment of this episode see Jacques M. Gres-Gayer, *Jansénisme en Sorbonne 1643-1656* (Paris, 1996), pp.91-5.
- 8 Liam Swords, 'Collège des Lombards' in idem. (ed.), *The Irish-French Connection 1578/1978* (Paris, 1978), pp.44-62.
- 9 L.W.B. Brockliss and P. Ferté, 'Irish Clerics in France in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: A Statistical Study', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, 87C, 9 (1987), p.547; L.W.B. Brockliss and P. Ferté, 'A Prospography of Irish Clerics who Studied in France in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, in Particular at the Universities of Paris and Toulouse', unpublished typescript, Russell Library, N.U.I., Maynooth, 1987; Thomas O'Connor, 'The Role of Irish Clerics in Paris University Politics 1730-40', *History of Universities*, 15 (1997-9), pp.193-225.
- 10 *Prise de possession*, 27 fevrier 1702, Archives Nationales, Paris, Minutier Central, ET/XI/357; 'Provision de professeur en physique au College Royal pour le Sr Morus, a Versailles le 4 juin 1703', A.N., Le secrétariat d'état de la Maison du Roi, 0' 47, ff.89-90.

European universities underwent major institutional and curricular changes in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The increasing availability of printed literature and the establishment of specialised learned academies, for instance the *Académie Royale des Sciences* in 1666, was bound to threaten the traditional authority of the university.¹¹ The early-modern university was not envisaged as a research-oriented institution. Its primary functions were the transmission of knowledge and, increasingly, the 'socialisation' of students. As Raymond Gillespie points out with reference to Ireland: 'The prime responsibility of the educational system was the promotion of social order and stability.'¹²

This was reflected in the reform of universities which, by the eighteenth century, 'were transformed into public institutions serving to create a ruling class.'¹³ While universities adapted to meet the needs of the societies they served, teaching staff also adjusted their curricula in the face of novel intellectual trends. University professors were often slow to react to the Scientific Revolution, but recent work has shown that they were not necessarily hostile.¹⁴ Indeed, across Europe, traditional courses in Aristotelian natural philosophy were gradually replaced in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. The process varied from state to state and institution to institution. Parisian professors largely abandoned Aristotle in favour of Descartes by 1700, while Aristotle remained entrenched in Spain until the middle of the eighteenth century.¹⁵ During his university career, which lasted from the early 1660s to the late 1710s, Michael Moore witnessed and participated in institutional reform, as well as the heated debates about the future direction of natural philosophy courses. For an Aristotelian, this had implications for the entire philosophy curriculum. This article examines Moore's career between 1701 and his retirement in 1720. His career provides a window into the educational ideas and practices of one highly-placed Irishman in the structures of the most important educational centre for

- 11 Kors notes that 'Books opened worlds for [the] newly educated public and, by 1701, there were seventy-five printer-booksellers on the rue St Jacques and neighbouring streets near the University of Paris alone.' Charles Alan Kors, *Atheism in France 1650-1729; I: The Orthodox Sources of Disbelief* (Princeton, 1990), p.288.
- 12 Raymond Gillespie, 'Church, State and Education in Early-Modern Ireland' in Maurice O'Connell (ed.), *O'Connell: Education, Church and State* (Dublin, 1992), p.44.
- 13 Maria Rossa di Simone, 'Admission' in Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, (ed.), *A History of the University in Europe; II: Universities in Early-Modern Europe (1500-1800)* (2 vols., Cambridge, 1996), p.324. See also Willem Frijhoff, 'Patterns' in *ibid.*, p.67.
- 14 For an interesting recent assessment of the relationship between the universities and the Scientific Revolution see Roy Porter, 'The Scientific Revolution in the Universities' in *ibid.*, pp.531-62.
- 15 Brockliss, 'Curricula' in *ibid.*, p.584; J.S. Spink, *French Free-Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire* (New York, 1960), p.189. See also the brief assessment of philosophical innovation in eighteenth-century France in Thomas O'Connor, *An Irish Theologian in Enlightenment France: Luke Joseph Hooke 1714-96* (Dublin, 1995), pp.23-31.

Irish students in the eighteenth century.¹⁶ The article argues that Moore's appeals for the retention of an Aristotelian philosophy curriculum were related to educational reforms inspired by the Counter-Reformation.

II

Moore's election as rector in 1701 signalled a remarkable turnaround in his fortunes. Born in Dublin around 1639, Moore studied in Nantes and Paris in the late 1650s and early 1660s. He acquired a teaching post in philosophy at the *Collège des Grassins*, having gained a master's degree in 1662. After the accession of James II, Moore returned to his native Dublin, by this stage an ordained priest, where he played a prominent role in the brief Catholic restoration.¹⁷ However, he became embroiled in a dispute concerning ecclesiastical jurisdiction with the Jacobite court in Dublin and was forced to return to France in early 1690.¹⁸ Walter Harris colourfully recorded that Moore 'complied as a faithful subject, but hinted at his departure, "that he only went as the king's precursor, who would soon be obliged to follow him"'.¹⁹ It appears likely that continuing animosity from the Jacobite court in exile explains Moore's inability to acquire another university post in Paris. Eventually, probably in 1692, Moore was forced to move again, this time to Rome.

Moore spent the subsequent decade on the Italian peninsula, working first as a censor of books in Rome and, from 1696, at the seminary of Cardinal Marco Antonio Barbarigo in Montefiascone.²⁰ Little is known about his period in Rome, but the time Moore spent at Montefiascone is relatively well documented and his experience there would strongly colour his activities at the University of Paris in the early eighteenth century. Though he may not have realised it at the time, Moore's six-year stay at Montefiascone represented the beginnings of a change in his circumstances following the severe disappointment of Dublin and his failure to find secure employment in Paris. Under the stewardship of the reform-minded Barbarigo, the small, impoverished joint dioceses of Montefiascone and Corneto became a model of Tridentine reform and rejuvenation. Central to Barbarigo's plans, following his appointment in 1686, was the creation of a dynamic and

16 On the Irish student community in Paris see Patrick Boyle, *The Irish College in Paris from 1578 to 1901* (London, 1901); Brockliss and Ferté, 'Irish Clerics in France in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', pp.527-72.

17 For basic overviews of Moore's career see Patrick Boyle, 'Dr Michael Moore', pp.7-16; Colm Connellan, 'Michael Moore (1640-1726)' in Fran O'Rourke (ed.), *At the Heart of the Real: Philosophical Essays in Honour of the Most Reverend Desmond Connell, archbishop of Dublin* (Dublin, 1992), pp.261-70.

18 On this puzzling episode see Liam Chambers, *The Life and Writings of Michael Moore (c.1639-1726)*, Ph.D. (NUI, Maynooth, 2001), pp.87-104.

19 Sir James Ware, *The Whole Works of Sir James Ware concerning Ireland, Revised and Improved*, Walter Harris (ed.) (2 vols., Dublin, 1739-45), ii, p.289.

20 *Ibid.*, ii, p.289.

well-organised seminary.²¹ At some point in 1695 Barbarigo encountered Moore in Rome and asked him to take charge of his growing seminary in Montefiascone. Moore complied with the request and took over as rector in early 1696.²²

As a result of Barbarigo's generous patronage, and under Moore's control, the seminary grew rapidly in the late 1690s. The curriculum and teaching staff expanded to provide full courses in the humanities, philosophy and theology. An impressive library and printing facility were also constructed.²³ By the early eighteenth century the seminary had grown into a community of roughly 200 students, from only sixty in 1696. These included a wide range of international students drawn from the Italian states, France, the Low Countries, England, the Ionian islands (where Barbarigo had previously worked) and Ireland.²⁴ In his diocesan report for 1699 Barbarigo proudly noted that the seminary was the home to a number of Irish students who would be trained in 'piety and science' before returning to Ireland to combat 'heresy'.²⁵ The Irish presence at Montefiascone was obviously a result of Moore's position, since there were no Irish students at the seminary before his arrival.²⁶ In fact, Nicholas Nevil, an Irish student who arrived in July 1696, later became professor of philosophy at the seminary.²⁷

In his capacity as rector, Moore was responsible not only for the academic and physical development of the seminary, but also for the spiritual welfare of the students in his care. At his first diocesan synod, held in 1692, Barbarigo outlined a highly disciplined régime for the seminary, designed to inculcate Counter-Reformation spiritual values.²⁸ Inspired by the models of his relative, Cardinal Gregorio Barbarigo, and the sixteenth-century reformer Carlo Borromeo, Marco

21 Pietro Bergamaschi, *Vita del servo di Dio Card. Marc'Antonio Barbarigo vescovo di Montefiascone e Corneto* (2 vols., Rome, 1919), i, pp.329-466; Antonio Patrizi, *Storia del seminario di Montefiascone* (Bolsena, 1990), especially pp.135-68.

22 Bergamaschi, *Vita del servo di Dio Card. Marc'Antonio Barbarigo*, ii, p.430.

23 *Ibid.*, i, pp.419-20.

24 *Ibid.*, i, p.435; Alunni e convitti del Ven. Semin^o di Montefiascone 1700-1701, Seminario Barbarigo, Archivio, MS 140, ff.1-2v. One of these international students was Richard Howard, grand nephew of the Dominican Cardinal Philip Howard, and younger brother of the seventh, eighth and ninth dukes of Norfolk, the most prominent English Catholic noble family. Patrizi, *Storia del Seminario*, p.166; John Martin Robinson, *The dukes of Norfolk*, (2nd ed., Chichester, 1995), pp.117-65.

25 Diocesan report of Marco Antonio Barbarigo, 21 October 1699, Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Congregazione del Concilio, Relationes Diocesium, 541A, f.344.

26 Diocesan report of Marco Antonio Barbarigo, 16 June 1696, A.S.V., Congreg. Concilio, Relat. Dioec., 541A, ff.340-340v.

27 Archivio della Sacra Congregazione di Propaganda Fide, Acta, 67 (1697), ff.47v-48v; 68 (1698), ff.329-29v, National Library of Ireland, microfilm, p.5156; Patrizi, *Storia del Seminario*, p.165; Bergamaschi, *Vita del servo di Dio Card. Marc'Antonio Barbarigo*, i, p.448.

28 *Synodus dioecesana I, Montis Falisci et Corneti, quam Marcus Antonius Barbadicus S.R.E. presbyter Cardinalis Tit. S. Susannae supradictarum ciuitatum episcopus habuit anno MDCXCII. Innocentio XII Pont.* (Rome, 1693), appendix synodi: 'Dioecesanæ continens regulas seminarii, aliaque ad parochorum commoditatem', pp.33-64.

Antonio Barbarigo promoted reform through “ecclesiastical discipline” and obedience. Piety and devotion accompanied high academic standards. According to the *regole* the daily routine of the seminarians was carefully organised to include prayer and spiritual exercises.²⁹ Moore had previous experience of educational administration. He had been vice-principal of the *Collège des Grassins* in Paris in the 1670s and early 1680s.³⁰ Yet, the holistic vision put into practice at Montefiascone, with its emphasis on the academic *and* spiritual formation of future clergy in a highly organised system, would have a lasting impact on his career.

III

In September 1701, James II died at his court in exile at Saint Germain-en-Laye outside Paris. Less than a month later Moore left Montefiascone and returned to Paris where he was almost immediately elected rector of the university, despite the fact that he did not hold a teaching post.³¹ His official duties included delivering the annual panegyric on Louis XIV on the anniversary of the king’s accession to the throne, a custom instituted in 1685 and continued until Louis’ death in 1715.³² Thus, on 15 May 1702, Moore delivered his panegyric in the *Collège de Navarre*. Those in attendance included local nobility, city officials, university professors and officers and, significantly for Moore, ‘the principals and officers of the most august King of Great Britain [James III]’.³³ His election as rector, and its attendant duties, marked Moore’s rehabilitation at the University of Paris. He was also back in favour at the Jacobite court in exile, which had shunned him a decade earlier. By the time he delivered his panegyric Moore had already taken up his new post as principal of arts students at the *Collège de Navarre*.

29 The *Regole* were printed in 1693, followed by a second edition in 1742. *Regole per il Seminario di Montefiascone, cavate degli atti di S. Carlo Borromeo e tradotte dal Latino d'ordine Dell'Eminentissi, e Reverendissi Sig. Cardinale Barbarigo vescovo di Montefiascone e Corneto, e preseritte allo stesso suo seminario deccate al medismo santo* (Montefiascone, 1742), pp.3-5, 7-34. For an overview see Bergamaschi, *Vita del servo di Dio Card. Marc'Antonio Barbarigo*, i, pp.372-81.

30 He is first noted in this capacity in July 1669. *Collège des Grassins, Annales XVIIe siècle* (c. 1665-72), A.N., MM 447, f.293. On the history of the college, see J. Delteil, ‘Le Collège des Grassins à Paris’, *La vie urbaine, urbanisme – habitation aménagement du territoire*, nouvelle série, 4 (1967), pp.241-66.

31 It would appear that a successor to Moore, Alessandro Mazzinelli, had already been groomed for the post of rector at Montefiascone. Bergamaschi, *Vita del servo di Dio Card. Marc'Antonio Barbarigo*, i, pp.437-8.

32 *Contrat de la ville de Paris avec l'Université pour faire un éloge du Roy le 15 may de chaque année, jour de l'avènement de sa majesté de la couronne* (Paris, 1685).

33 ‘Livres des Conclusions. Nation d'Allemagne de l'an 1698 à l'an 1730’, A.U.P., Registre 38, f.50. Translation taken from Patrick Boyle, ‘Dr Michael Moore’, p.11.

The *Collège de Navarre* was one of the oldest and most prestigious *collèges de plein exercice* in Paris, founded in 1304. Unlike the other colleges it provided education in theology as well as standard instruction in the humanities and philosophy.³⁴ The arts students in Moore's charge were essentially philosophy students, being those who had completed a six-year Latin-based course in grammar, humanities and rhetoric. During his first years as principal of arts students Moore undertook a systematic reform of the student régime, with the co-operation of the principal of grammar students, Arthur Artus. Whether he was appointed with this specific task in mind is not known, but it provided fertile ground in which to implement the ideas with which he had come in contact while at Montefiascone. In the course of his reform Moore encountered entrenched opposition from a group of well-connected students within the college who resisted his attempts to introduce a more centralised and disciplined daily timetable. Fortunately for the historian, this resulted in the production of a series of appeals and counter-appeals addressed to the archbishop of Paris, Louis-Antoine de Noailles, which provides evidence of Moore's educational thinking.³⁵

As early as 1703 Moore's changes gained the attention of contemporaries. One writer commented that 'The *pension* [boarding school] of Mr Moore grows every day, and it is well regulated; the *pensionnaires* [fee-paying students] live with him, as well as the *boursiers* [students in receipt of a grant] like in a little seminary.'³⁶ This arrangement set the tone for Moore's reforms, in which efficient administration was closely connected with the moral and spiritual education of his students. In a memoir written in 1704 Moore and Artus argued that they wanted to maintain 'good order' and that the situation as it existed gave the students so much power that the post of principal was regularly ignored. They also wanted to place control of the arts students in the hands of one principal, thereby undermining the series of under-principal positions within the college.³⁷ Indeed, Moore sought the assistance of his friend, the Irish Jansenist priest Matthew Barnewall, who undertook the role of under-principal around the time

34 René Taton (ed.), *Enseignement et diffusion des sciences en France au dix-huitième siècle* (2nd ed., Paris, 1986), p.153. The faculty of arts simply examined and awarded degrees. Humanities and philosophy teaching was carried out in one of the designated *collèges de plein exercice*. For the relationship between the university and the colleges see L.W.B. Brockliss, *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: A Cultural History* (Oxford, 1987), pp.13-26.

35 The relevant documents are contained in a miscellaneous collection: *Recueil des pièces concernant l'université, XVIIe à XVIIIe siècles*, A.N., MM 242 à 246.

36 Untitled document, avril [?] 1703, A.N., MM 243, no reference number, inserted between pièces 49 and 50.

37 'Memoire concernant la discipline du Collège de Navarre présenté par les principaux du dit collège ... à Mr le Card[in]al de Noailles ... sup[érieur] du Navarre au comencement d'aoust 1704.' A.N., MM 243, pièce 51. Moore and Artus signed the covering letter.

these reforms were implemented, between 1703 and 1706.³⁸ In response the student under-principals at the college argued, in typical *ancien régime* manner, that the elevation of the post of principal would infringe their power and rights. They also cleverly suggested that the proposals would diminish the authority of the most powerful officer in the institution, the 'grand maître' of theology students.³⁹ The counter-petition underlines the significance of Moore's reforms and the impact they would have on the daily life of the college and its students.⁴⁰

In July 1705, Moore outlined his vision of college life in a petition to de Noailles. It presented Moore's ideas on education and the formation of rounded Christian citizens.⁴¹ The opening phrase is particularly telling: 'Knowledge is a vain ornament if it is not accompanied by a solid piety'.⁴² This maxim neatly summed up the connection between academic and spiritual education. Both were essential, but they were not independent from each other. The petition outlined in detail the daily regulation of the students' lives, from 5.30 in the morning when they rose, until they retired for bed at 9.30 at night. Their day was largely composed of prayer, meals, class and study, with some time allowed for recreation (two half-hour periods), all of which was carefully time-tabled. Students were obliged to remain within the terms of the college 'rule' and could expect to be punished for deviating from it. Absence from class, leaving the college without permission, returning late and failure to study would all result in 'chastisement'. The role and authority of the principal was of paramount importance.

However, this system was more than a draconian attempt to keep the lid on unruly students.⁴³ Moore was certainly creating a seminary atmosphere within the college, hence the comments that his *pension* was 'comme un petit seminaire' and, even more importantly, his own argument that strictly speaking the

38 'Interrogatoire du Sr Barneville, 14 juillet 1712', Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Archives de la Bastille, MS 10602, f.137.

39 'Requête des sousprincipaux du Collège de Navarre contre [Moore and Artus]', 6 septembre 1704, A.N., MM 243, pièce 52.

40 Similar reforms at the *Collège d'Harcourt* in 1665 had caused serious problems. L.W.B. Brockliss, *The University of Paris in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Ph.D. (University of Cambridge, 1976), p.88. For an overview of university student life in the early-modern period see Rainer A. Muller, 'Student Education, Student Life' in Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, *A History of the University in Europe, II*, pp.326-54.

41 Untitled petition, Michael Moore to Cardinal de Noailles, July 1705, A.N., MM 243, pièce 54. It should be noted that this system seems to have been intended for *boursiers* only. A later document, probably the work of Michael Moore, argued that all students, *boursiers* and *pensionnaires*, should be united in the same 'cour' under the supervision of the principal. 'Plan de reformation pour le College de Navarre', A.N., S. 6181/8, liasse 7e. It is undated, but it mentions the authority of Noailles, who was created cardinal in 1700 and died in 1729.

42 In this case *science*, or in Latin *scientia*, should be translated as 'knowledge' rather than 'science'. Untitled petition, Michael Moore to Cardinal de Noailles, July 1705, A.N., MM 243, pièce 54. Subsequent comments are based on this petition.

43 Emile Durkheim likened this kind of college régime to 'un monde clos' designed to 'protect' the student from 'his own nature' and the outside world. See Madeleine Compère, *Du collège au lycée*, p.103.

collegiate system was designed for prospective clerics.⁴⁴ The stress on obedience as a pedagogical tool was heavily influenced by Counter-Reformation humanism, specifically as practised by the Jesuits. As Brockliss puts it: 'Evidently, the Jesuits and their imitators saw the *pensionnat* as something other than a prison in which students were incarcerated outside the classroom. On the contrary, it was a vehicle for the promotion of the social, spiritual and intellectual development of the *pensionnaire*.'⁴⁵ Moore and Artus hoped to instil internal values through the promotion of external discipline. Moore's 1705 petition emphasised the importance of honesty among students, while an entrance 'interview' would take into account not only academic capability, but also 'manners and good conduct.'⁴⁶ In Moore's educational outlook, knowledge and piety, academic qualities and religious devotion, were inextricably linked.

The new system at the *Collège de Navarre* strongly reflected the humanist educational trends of the Counter-Reformation. The centrally-controlled model was only slowly adopted in France from the early seventeenth century, largely because the majority of students lived outside the college's jurisdiction while undertaking their studies.⁴⁷ Yet Moore not only drew on his experiences at Montefiascone, which provided the direct inspiration for his activities, his reforms also reflected trends within the French church at the end of the seventeenth century. Seminary training and a disciplined educational methodology became increasingly prominent in the second half of the seventeenth century, spearheaded by the Jesuits in particular.⁴⁸ The centralisation of authority in one man, whether a principal, superior or rector, as Brockliss states, was reflected in a wider sense in the institutions of the absolute state. It would appear that Moore's reforms were successfully implemented. Later attempts to reform the college, in the mid-eighteenth century, dealt not with the curriculum but with the regulation of college business, specifically the college revenues.⁴⁹

44 Untitled petition, Michael Moore to Cardinal de Noailles, July 1705. A.N., mm 243, pièce 54. In practice the students were no longer destined for ordination but, according to Moore, this provision was set out in the college's foundation documents.

45 Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, p.90.

46 Untitled petition, Michael Moore to Cardinal de Noailles, July 1705. A.N., mm 243, pièce 54.

47 Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, pp.82-95; Marie-Madeleine Compère, *Du collège au lycée*, pp.63-132; Dominique Julia, 'Les Institutions et les hommes' in Jacques Verger (ed.), *Histoire des universités en France* (Toulouse, 1986), pp.141-98.

48 Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, pp.30, 62-71, 83-7. For Irish comparisons see Patrick Boyle, 'The Irish College at Bordeaux 1603-1794', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, fourth series, 22 (1907), pp.133-4; idem, 'Glimpses of Irish Collegiate Life in Paris in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, fourth series, 9 (1902), pp.441-5.

49 Later plans for reform at the *Collège de Navarre* can be found in the following collections: A.N., S.6181 7e liasse; S.6546, Collège de Navarre ou de Champagne, 1304-An. X.

IV

Moore's concern for the inculcation of Christian 'civility' in his students was matched by an interest in their academic formation.⁵⁰ His reforms at the *Collège de Navarre* were designed to ensure that the transmission of knowledge, the basic function of the early-modern university, was directly linked to a régime fostering the spiritual and religious formation of the student. For Moore, this was particularly pressing in the uncertain intellectual circumstances of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In June 1700 Moore had delivered a public oration at the seminary in Montefiascone in which he outlined the dangers he perceived posed to Catholicism by the internal threat of Cartesianism and the external threat of Protestantism. His response was to call for a renewal of Catholic scholarship, based on a typically humanist "return to the sources". In practice, this meant renewed emphasis on the study of Greek and Hebrew. Both subjects were successfully taught at the seminary in Montefiascone.⁵¹ Moore's concerns with the dangers of Cartesianism were not new. In 1692, while looking for employment in Paris, he had published his major work on the Aristotelian-Cartesian battle for control of the curriculum in the university, *De existentia Dei*.⁵²

Moore's appointment as professor of physics at the *Collège de France* in June 1703 provided a platform from which to expound his ideas to a new generation of students. The *Collège de France*, unlike the *collèges de plein exercice*, was completely independent from the University of Paris. It had developed from a series of royal professorships established by Francis I in 1530 at the prompting of the humanist scholar Guillaume Budé. By the early eighteenth century, the college's administration was monitored by the court, through its representative, the 'Grand Aumonier', archbishop de Noailles.⁵³ The royal professors had greater flexibility in the courses they taught than those in the *collèges de plein exercice*. In practice, this meant that the courses at the *Collège de France* were more

- 50 On the importance of the concept of 'civility' see Helga Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Preface' in idem, (ed.), *European Universities in the Age of Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (Dublin, 1998), pp.vii-x.
- 51 Michael Moore, *Hortatio ad studium linguae Graecae et Hebraicae, recitata coram eminentissimo D.D. Marco Antonio Barbadico ... a Michaele Moro sacerdote Hiberno* (Montefiascone, 1700), especially pp.13-7, 27-45. A similar argument was made by the influential anti-Cartesian, sceptic and bishop, Pierre Daniel Huet, in his *Concordia Rationis et Fidei* (Caen, 1690). On this see Jonathan I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (Oxford, 2001), pp.487-8.
- 52 Michael Moore, *De existentia Dei et humanae mentis immortalitate secundum Cartesii et Aristotelis doctrinam disputatio* (Paris, 1692).
- 53 On the history of the college see A.P. Goujet, *Mémoire historique et littéraire sur le Collège Royal de France* (2 vols, Paris, 1758); Abel LeFranc, *Histoire du Collège de France, depuis ses origines jusqu'à la fin du premier empire* (Paris, 1893); L.A. Sédillot, *Les Professeurs de mathématiques et de physique générale au Collège de France* (Rome, 1869).

specialised.⁵⁴ As royal professor from 1703 to 1720, Moore taught a range of natural philosophy courses, but three were regularly repeated: those dealing with the 'scientific method', with the principles of physics and with the soul (usually based on Aristotle's *De anima*).⁵⁵ These courses formed the basis of Moore's final two publications: *Vera sciendi methodus* (Paris, 1716) and *De principiis physicis, seu corporum naturalium disputatio* (Paris, 1726).

Moore remained a convinced Aristotelian, trenchantly opposed to the encroachment of Cartesian ideas in the natural philosophy curriculum. However, in the first two decades of the eighteenth century the royal professorships in Greek and Latin philosophy were increasingly filled with thinkers attracted to the mechanical philosophy. Men like Jean-Baptiste du Hamel, Pierre Varignon, Jean Terrasson or Joseph Privat de Molières all rejected some or all of the traditional, qualitative, Aristotelian approach to natural philosophy.⁵⁶ Brockliss has demonstrated that the 1690s were the key decade in the struggle between Aristotelians and Cartesians for control of the philosophy curriculum at the University of Paris. Increasingly after 1700, natural philosophy courses were strongly Cartesian in approach.⁵⁷ Moore's own work contains plenty of evidence of concern regarding the success of Cartesian physics. In *De principiis physicis* he admitted the failure of the college and university, as well as the secular authorities, to protect the pre-eminence of Aristotle.⁵⁸ Brockliss has used Moore's comments in the preface of *Vera sciendi methodus* to suggest that Aristotelian natural philosophy had practically disappeared from the university curriculum by 1716. 'Truly in our schools of physics you will hear of nothing but subtle, spherical and fluted matter, fanciful illusions which have no connections with the nature of things; nor in most cases is our physics anything more than a commentary on Descartes' fanatical fable of the origins of the world.'⁵⁹ None the less, there was strong support for Aristotelianism among some sections of the academic élite. The archbishop of Paris, who was responsible for both Moore's positions at the *collèges royaux*, and some Paris-based theologians actively opposed Cartesianism. They were involved in the attempts to ban the teaching of

54 Brockliss, *The University of Paris in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, pp.78-9.

55 Information based on the printed 'Affiches des Cours' which survive for the years 1711-20 in the Archives du Collège de France. It can be assumed that Moore taught broadly similar courses in the period 1703-10.

56 LeFranc, *Histoire du Collège de France*, pp.383-7.

57 Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, pp.185-227, 337-90; idem, 'Philosophy Teaching in France 1600-1740', *History of Universities*, 1 (1981), pp.131-68; idem, 'Aristotle, Descartes and the New Sciences: Natural Philosophy at the University of Paris 1600-1740', *Annals of Science*, 38 (1981), pp.33-69; idem, 'Descartes, Gassendi and the Reception of the Mechanical Philosophy in the French *collèges de plein exercice*, 1640-1730', *Perspectives on Science*, 3 (1995), pp.450-79.

58 Michael Moore, *De principiis physicis, seu corporum naturalium disputatio* (Paris, 1726), pp.i-iv.

59 translated and cited in Brockliss, 'Aristotle, Descartes and the New Sciences', p.53.

Cartesian ideas in 1704 and 1705.⁶⁰ *Vera sciendi methodus* also evidences continued support for Moore's viewpoint in the faculty of theology at the University of Paris. The book was dedicated to Pierre de Pardailhon de Gondrin d'Antin (1692-1733), a nobleman who was studying at the *Sorbonne*. He received his doctorate in 1718 and was appointed bishop of Langres in 1724.⁶¹

Moore's other text, *De principiis physicis*, was probably the last course of Aristotelian natural philosophy to appear on the market in France.⁶² Nevertheless, many newly converted mechanists continued to regard themselves as Aristotelian and hence had no difficulty in signing anti-Cartesian declarations in 1704 and 1705. They largely retained the notion of substantial forms, at least until 1720, and rejected the idea of plant and animal 'machines'. Furthermore, religious concerns, in particular those regarding transubstantiation, put many off accepting wholeheartedly the Cartesian definition of matter as extension alone.⁶³ Aristotelianism was not replaced by an orthodox Cartesian alternative. Cartesians were much more likely to attack different elements of their founder's theories. Some elements of Cartesian natural philosophy were regarded as highly probabilist, notably the idea of 'subtle matter', which Moore rejected on just such grounds.⁶⁴

Debates about philosophical method were commonplace among early-modern Aristotelians, but took on a much greater significance in the seventeenth century in the light of the work of Francis Bacon and, especially in France, René

- 60 Jourdain, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris*, p.286. The French Jesuits made a concerted attempt to ban Cartesianism and bolster the authority of Aristotle in 1706. Among the banned propositions was that 'There are no substantial forms in bodies of matter.' Moore also strongly opposed materialism in lectures at the *Collège de France*. See Roger Ariew, 'Damned if you Do: Cartesians and Censorship, 1663-1706', *Perspectives on Science*, 2 (1994), p.271.
- 61 *Vera sciendi methodus*, unpaginated; Jean Armand, *Les Évêques et les archevêques de France depuis 1682 jusqu'à 1801* (Paris, 1891), p.228.
- 62 Brockliss has suggested that the last published course of qualitative physics was Gaspard Buhon's *Philosophia ad monem gymnastiorum, finemque accomodata* (4 vols, Lyon, 1723). The last Parisian effort, before Moore, was Jean du Hamel, *Philosophia universalis, sive commentarius in universam Aristotelis philosophiam ad usum scholarum comparatam quaedam recentiorum philosophorum ac praesertim Cartesii propositiones damnatae et prohibita* (Paris, 1705). It was published at the 'promptings' of an anti-Cartesian faction within the faculty of theology, possibly in the wake of the de Montempuys affair in 1704, when a former rector of the university was accused of teaching Cartesian ideas. See Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, p.350.
- 63 Moore, *Hortatio*, pp.15-6; Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, pp.352-4, 357.
- 64 Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, p.377. Newtonianism did not make a serious impact on French universities until around 1740. See *ibid.*, pp.360-71; *Idem*, 'Descartes, Gassendi and the Reception of the Mechanical Philosophy', pp.450-79.

Descartes.⁶⁵ As a result, courses on method were greatly expanded in the University of Paris in the early eighteenth century and Moore's *Vera sciendi methodus* reflects this development.⁶⁶ The basic problem was the production of sure knowledge. Knowledge could not be grounded in innate ideas, argued Moore, since innate ideas did not exist in the mind at birth. If every human being has an innate idea of God's existence, why were there so many atheists in Asia, Africa, America and even among the ancients?⁶⁷ The mind for Moore was literally a *tabula rasa*.⁶⁸ All knowledge, he argued in standard scholastic fashion, was derived from sense experience. The problem was constructing sure knowledge from sense impressions, without falling into the Cartesian trap of universal doubt.

The mind therefore employed 'method' to construct knowledge from the information received through the senses: arranging and dividing ideas, and forming them into logical constructs by joining predicate with subject.⁶⁹ The human mind had to rely on this method since it was by nature imperfect and could not attain the perfect ideas realisable in the mind of God or the angels.⁷⁰ Moore's scholastic method involved definition, division and demonstration, based on the use of a 'perfect syllogism'.⁷¹ Towards the end of his text he summarised the 'modo tradendi scientiam'.⁷² He began with a simple discussion of *scientia*:

D. What is knowledge?

M. Knowledge has to do with the kinds of things which exist from their first principles; thus all natural bodies are of this kind because they exist from their first principles, especially matter and form ... the natural body is the first subject of the physical science through its attributes.⁷³

As well as the two internal 'causes' of the natural body (matter and form), there were two external causes: the efficient and final.⁷⁴ Moore discussed the procedures used to break down what we see into different categories and then to

65 Peter Dear, 'Method and the Study of Nature' in Daniel Garber and Michael Ayers (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1998), pp.147-77; Christiana Mercer, 'The Vitality and Importance of Early-Modern Aristotelianism' in Tom Sorrell (ed.), *The Rise of Modern Philosophy: The Tension between the New and Traditional Philosophies from Machiavelli to Leibniz* (Oxford, 1993), pp.46ff.

66 Brockliss, *French Higher Education*, p.203.

67 Moore, *Vera sciendi methodus*, pp.10, 15.

68 It could be argued that, as was the case with John Locke who also rejected the existence of Cartesian innate ideas, since the mind was a clean slate at birth, education was extremely important in the formation of a rounded individual.

69 Moore, *Vera sciendi methodus*, p.37.

70 Ibid., pp.38-9.

71 Ibid., p.86, and in general, pp.86-98.

72 Ibid., pp.208-22.

73 Ibid., p.208.

74 Ibid., p.211.

present our knowledge through demonstration. But at the root of the discipline of philosophy was a fundamental problem. Moore believed that one had to consider the origin and duration of the world about which ‘all philosophers, Plato, Aristotle, Anaxagoras, Epicurus, Democritus and also the most disgraceful Descartes made a mistake, because nothing could be known to them, but conjecturing and foreseeing as much as [is] easily understood, truly to us ... the world was created from nothing by God.’⁷⁵

Philosophy had a boundary. There was more truth than was available through *scientia*.⁷⁶ This obviously placed a limit on the worth of Aristotelian philosophy itself. For Moore, Aristotle was the first thinker to write accurately about what can be known. However, supernatural truths, concerning the Trinity or the Word Incarnate, were only known through revelation.⁷⁷ The poverty of philosophy was evident even where a rigorous method was utilised. Knowledge was limited to what could be demonstrated, and only certain things could be demonstrated.⁷⁸ Method, where it was properly applied, could produce knowledge, but ultimately it could only produce some knowledge. *Vera sciendi methodus* indicated that Moore’s argument was not with a new experimental “scientific methodology”. Rather, he was concerned with what natural philosophy was; in Aristotelian terms, the acquisition of *a priori* knowledge.

In *Vera sciendi methodus* Moore argued that the Cartesian rejection of the core (scholastic) principles of physics and metaphysics, and the emerging division between the two elements of the philosophy curriculum endangered philosophical discussion of basic Christian doctrines. Devoid of Aristotelian metaphysics, traditional natural philosophy was redundant.⁷⁹ This is a theme Moore returned to in his later work, *De principiis physicis*. For instance, the mathematical basis of Cartesian physics, and the rejection of Aristotle’s final cause, removed the room for divine intervention in the world.⁸⁰ Crucially, Cartesian matter theory rendered transubstantiation inexplicable.⁸¹

The concept of the soul was particularly important for the early-modern Christian philosopher, of whatever ideological standpoint.⁸² Discussion of the concept of *anima*, and especially the immortality of the human soul, runs through all of Moore’s published work.⁸³ The Aristotelian concept of *anima* was

75 Ibid., p.215.

76 Ibid., p.216.

77 Ibid., p.233.

78 Ibid., p.234.

79 This is most obvious in a section entitled ‘Physics and Metaphysics’, *ibid.*, pp.156-63.

80 *Idem.*, *De principiis physicis*, p.xiii.

81 *Ibid.*, p.112.

82 See, for example, Simon Schaffer, ‘Godly Men and Mechanical Philosophers: Souls and Spirits in Restoration Natural Philosophy’, *Science in Context*, I (1987), pp.55-85.

83 Moore, *De existentia Dei*, pp.101-29, 313-31, 345-452; *idem.*, *Hortatio*, pp.13-5; *idem.*, *Vera sciendi methodus*, pp.104-57; *idem.*, *De principiis physicis*, pp.93-108.

dependant on the theory that all substance was composed of matter and form, since matter and form were the first principles of the natural body. The importance of hylomorphism – the theory that substance is composed of matter and form – and its connection with *anima*, was the core point of Moore's *De principiis physicis*.⁸⁴ Form was the essence of a thing; in the case of an animate being, the soul. Therefore, for Moore, the rejection of substance as matter and form necessarily entailed the rejection of *anima*. In 1716 he complained, 'neither does a vestige of the soul remain in the schools, nor do they [the professors and students] know what the soul is.'⁸⁵

Moore reiterated the threefold nature of the soul: vegetative, sensitive and rational.⁸⁶ The operations of the vegetative soul were nutrition, growth and generation. The sensitive soul necessarily included the vegetative operations, but also included perception, the external senses in animals and motion. The external senses were mirrored by internal senses, which received impressions of external objects and discriminated between them.⁸⁷ The rational human soul obviously included the former two, for it could not function without them.⁸⁸ This meant that the human soul was part material, while the intellectual part of the soul was immaterial. This immaterial human soul was the *mens* properly speaking; it was incorporeal, inorganic and form subsisting through itself. It was distinct from the natural body. Thus, the *mens* could be separated from the body but not from existence.⁸⁹ Moore used a standard metaphor to explain the latter point: the example of 'roundness' being inseparable from a circle.⁹⁰

Moore's argument clearly demonstrates the crucial link between the physical theory of substantial forms and the Christian doctrine of the immortality of the human soul. Cartesian physics, based on 'these corpuscles and particles, which they do not see', was mere 'probable opinion' and threatened the rational demonstration of a basic Christian tenet.⁹¹ Natural philosophy was the 'search for the causes of change' and these causes were rooted in substantial forms.⁹² The 'mathematical discipline' could not access these causes, while the rejection of

84 Idem., *De principiis physicis*, pp.1-7, 19-23.

85 Idem., *Vera sciendi methodus*, p.157

86 Idem., *De principiis physicis*, pp.101-2.

87 Ibid., pp.102-4. The denial of an animal or sensitive *anima* generated huge debate in early-modern France. See Leonora Cohen Rosenfield, *From Beast-Machine to Man-Machine: Animal Soul in French Letters from Descartes to La Mettrie* (New York, 1968).

88 Moore, *De principiis physicis*, p.106.

89 Ibid., p.106.

90 Ibid., pp.107-8.

91 Ibid., p.iv; See also idem, *Vera sciendi methodus*, pp.179-90. For an excellent discussion of Descartes' approach to the question of the soul see C.F. Fowler, *Descartes on the Human Soul: Philosophy and the Demands of Christian Doctrine* (Dordrecht, 2000).

92 Adrian Johns, 'Identity, Practice and Trust in Early Modern Natural Philosophy', *The History Journal*, 42 (1999), pp.1126-31.

substantial forms opened the door to materialism, a spectre that worried most seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century natural philosophers.⁹³

V

Educational reform and intellectual orthodoxy, based on the Christian religion and Aristotelian philosophy and erudition, were the hallmarks of Michael Moore's early eighteenth-century career. Both were predicated on prevailing assumptions about the connections between university, religious and political authority in an absolutist state. Moore's relationship with Cardinal de Noailles and his activities at both *collèges royaux* demonstrated an awareness of this academic-religious-political bond. Indeed, Cartesians came under increased pressure from the 1680s onwards to clarify the religious implications of the new philosophy. Moore's hopes for a rejuvenation of Aristotelianism in the early eighteenth century may have been unrealistic, but they reflected a widely held unease concerning the ramifications of Cartesian metaphysics for natural philosophy and the genuine fear that Cartesianism represented the thin end of a Spinozist and materialist stick.⁹⁴ Indeed, Jonathan Israel has recently argued that *L'Usage de la raison et de la foy* (Paris, 1704) by the Cartesian Pierre-Sylvain Régis 'is a notable landmark in the French intellectual crisis of Louis XIV's reign, above all because it marks the virtual withdrawal of Cartesianism from the battle to establish the core elements of religion philosophically, by means of reason.'⁹⁵

Aristotelians like Moore continued to argue that they could fulfil the duties of the Christian philosopher, by providing rational demonstration of basic Catholic tenets such as the existence of God, the immortality of the human soul, divine providence or transubstantiation. This was particularly important in the context of third-level education. Aristotelianism provided a coherent metaphysics and natural philosophy for the classroom and, as Roy Porter has observed, 'The old Aristotelian superstructure of natural philosophy was an integral part of, and indeed propaedeutic to, a wider intellectual scheme which embraced ethics, logic, metaphysics and theology. The validity of the whole depended on the congruence of the parts.'⁹⁶ For Moore, educational reform and intellectual orthodoxy were inextricably linked; hence his suggestion that the principal of the *Collège de Navarre* should have ultimate control over the appointment of the professor of philosophy who would teach the students.⁹⁷

93 There was a huge outcry against the stark materialism presented in La Mettrie's *L'Homme machine*, published in 1747, only two decades after Moore's death.

94 See Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, pp.477-501; Margaret C. Jacob, *The Cultural Meaning of the Scientific Revolution* (New York, 1988), pp.61-9.

95 Israel, *Radical Enlightenment*, p.492.

96 Roy Porter, 'The Scientific Revolution in the Universities', p 556.

97 Michael Moore, 'Plan de reformation pour le College de Navarre', undated, A.N., S.6181/8, liasse 7e.

It is probable that the twin pillars of educational reform and intellectual orthodoxy were especially appealing to an Irish exile. The displacement, and hence the mobility, of Irish Catholic scholars and students post-1691 broadened their horizons and opened them to the variety of academic and educational experiences in Catholic Europe.⁹⁸ Moore took a keen interest in the development of the Irish *Collège des Lombards* after his return from Montefiascone. He acted as a mediator during the election of a new *proviseur* in 1718. More importantly, he donated money to the college and ensured that monies entrusted to him were invested on behalf of the college. Moreover, he willed a large proportion of his estate, including his impressively large library, to the institution.⁹⁹

Moore was obviously influenced by the situation of Irish Catholics in the early eighteenth century. In Ireland, the conflicts of the seventeenth century and the penal legislation of the early eighteenth century meant that the Counter-Reformation made slow progress.¹⁰⁰ On the continent, however, Irish Catholics were able to engage fully with Tridentine reform. Educational reform and intellectual orthodoxy, as championed by Moore, were obviously fundamental to the survival of the Irish church. Moore undertook his reforms at an institution, the *Collège de Navarre*, with strong Irish connections in the eighteenth century.¹⁰¹ While his philosophical outlook cannot be taken as indicative of the ideology of all Irish students or professors in Paris, it is notable that there were no high profile Irish champions of Cartesianism in Paris in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth centuries. Moore exemplifies the dual identity of Irish intellectual émigrés in the universities of Catholic Europe. While he was concerned with establishing himself in the academic, religious and political networks which bound the early-modern French university, his educational and philosophical vision was equally significant for the future of the Irish Catholic church since the University of Paris and similar third-level institutions educated and formed much of the Catholic élite of eighteenth-century Ireland.

- 98 Hilde de Ridder Symoens has pointed out that refugees, like the Irish, were one of the main categories of 'mobile' students, at least before the Grand Tour became popular in the eighteenth century. She also notes that the implications of student mobility for the spread of ideas has not yet been properly explored. Hilde de Ridder Symoens, 'Mobility' in idem, *History of Universities: II*, pp.428-31, 444.
- 99 Liam Swords (ed.), 'Calendar of Irish Material in the Files of Jean Fromont, notary at Paris, May 1701-24 January 1730, in the Archives Nationales, Paris: part 2, 1716-1730', *Collectanea Hibernica*, 36-7 (1994-5), pp.95, 104, 111-3; idem (ed.), 'History of the Irish College, Paris, 1578-1800. Calendar of the Papers of the Irish College, Paris', *Archivium Hibernicum*, 35 (1980), pp.51-2.
- 100 For attempts to introduce the Counter-Reformation in Moore's native Dublin in the late seventeenth century see Alison Forrestal, *Catholic Synods in Ireland, 1600-1690* (Dublin, 1998), pp.192-3; Raymond Gillespie, 'Catholic Religious Cultures in the Diocese of Dublin, 1614-97' in James Kelly and Dáire Keogh (eds.), *History of the Catholic Diocese of Dublin* (Dublin, 2000), pp.127-43.
- 101 Boyle, 'Glimpses of Irish Collegiate Life in Paris in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', p.444.