

---

# ADAM LOFTUS

---

*Provost 1592–94*

---



*Portrait of Adam Loftus*, artist unattributed, oil on canvas, 121 x 93 cm, Trinity College Dublin Art Collections. Reproduced by kind permission from the Board of Trinity College Dublin.

---

When Queen Elizabeth appointed Adam Loftus as the first Provost of Trinity College Dublin, she chose a man who had been prominent in the campaign for the foundation of the new university. She also chose a man whom she had favoured ever

since his student days in Cambridge, and whose career since first coming to Ireland had been nothing short of meteoric. He was only about twenty-six years old when he arrived in this country, but within three years he was Archbishop of Armagh. From Armagh he went as Archbishop to Dublin and became one of the most influential men in Ireland, both politically and ecclesiastically. Although he was Provost of Trinity for only two years, he nevertheless was one of the prime movers in the foundation of the new College and he occupies an important place in its history.

Trinity College was not the first university in Ireland. One had been established in Dublin in the early fourteenth century centred on St Patrick's Cathedral, and another in Drogheda in 1465. But both of these sank without trace, and the question of a university in Dublin did not surface again until Archbishop Browne of Dublin in the 1540s promoted the idea of using the lands and monies of St Patrick's Cathedral to establish a new university. Archbishop Brown never saw his plans to fruition, but his initiative led to several similar schemes, and Sir William Cecil in the 1560s reactivated Browne's idea of requisitioning the resources of St Patrick's to fund a new university. In this he had the support of Loftus, who was then Archbishop of Armagh, and the Government was persuaded to go ahead with the scheme. Archbishop Curwen of Dublin strenuously opposed it, however, and this plan too came to nothing, as did a proposal by James Stanihurst (an MP in the Irish House of Commons) that was taken up by Lord Deputy Sidney in 1569, who suggested financing a new university with privately raised funds.<sup>1,2</sup> Nothing more happened until 1584, when the new Lord Deputy, Sir John Perrot, reopened the question and revived the idea of sequestering the assets of St Patrick's Cathedral to finance the new university. But this time Loftus changed his tune. He had now left Armagh and was Archbishop of Dublin, and he vigorously opposed any scheme that involved the confiscation of St Patrick's resources. There were complicated undertones to his opposition. His detractors claimed that he had manipulated the finances of St Patrick's so to his own advantage that he could ill afford to allow the cathedral monies to be diverted to university building. It was whispered that when he was Dean he had leased cathedral lands to his own relations on especially favourable terms.<sup>3</sup> So there may well have been an element of self-interest in the opposition of Loftus to any confiscation of the cathedral assets, even though as Archbishop he argued quite reasonably that it would be wrong to seize monies that rightfully belonged to the Church. A bitter feud developed between him and Perrot. Loftus was not opposed to a university in Dublin, but he was opposed to using cathedral money to finance it, and in the event he won the day. The assets of St Patrick's

Cathedral were preserved, Perrot ended up in the Tower of London, and Loftus ended up as Provost of the new College that was to be founded a few years later in 1592.

Adam Loftus was born in 1533/34 in Swineside in the parish of Coverham in Yorkshire, as the second son of Edward Loftus. His father was employed as a monastic bailiff, but died when Adam was only eight years old. Nevertheless the young Loftus went on to enter Trinity College, Cambridge, where legend has it that he appeared in a public performance before the young Queen Elizabeth. He was supposed to have ‘so engaged Her Majesty’s approbation of his early abilities, joined to a comely person and address, that she encouraged him to proceed in the course of his studies, by a gracious promise of his speedy preferment’.<sup>4</sup> But while this story is of doubtful provenance, the young Adam Loftus did indeed seem to have the gift of attracting the notice of rich and influential people, and clearly he was also a young man of uncommon ability. He was ordained, and is believed to have been rector of St Clements, Outwell, in Norfolk, as well as vicar of Gedney in Lincolnshire. His great opportunity, however, came when he moved to Ireland in 1560 as chaplain to Thomas Radcliffe, 3rd Earl of Sussex, who was returning to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant. In Ireland, Loftus was appointed as chaplain to Bishop Craik of Kildare, and he was instituted as rector of Painstown (Paynestown) in Meath on 8 October 1561.<sup>4,5</sup> But then, dramatically, in less than three years after his arrival in this country, he was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh on 2 March 1563 by command of Queen Elizabeth. There is an interesting technical point here. His exact birth date is unknown and it is questionable as to whether or not he had reached the canonical age of thirty at the time of his consecration.<sup>6</sup>

In Armagh, the job of Loftus was to have been the furtherance of the religious reform policies of Elizabeth. He found, however, that he had little scope for his talents, for this was a wild area in which the influence of the Dublin government was minimal, and in which the dominant power was that of Shane O’Neill, whom Loftus found a ‘disagreeable neighbor’.<sup>7</sup> Soon the two of them were locked in a bitter quarrel, with Loftus being denied access to his cathedral in Armagh and forced to live for the most part in the Primate’s Castle in Termonfeckin, near Drogheda, or else in Dublin. Matters came to a head when O’Neill burned down the cathedral in Armagh in 1566, and Loftus in turn excommunicated him, although there is little evidence that O’Neill was in the least discomfited by this ecclesiastical censure.

As Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland, Loftus was the senior churchman in the country, but he felt grossly frustrated in his position. Firstly, he was

unable to make progress in furthering the cause of the Reformation and in coping with the general unrest in the area. But secondly, and possibly more importantly to him, the emoluments he received as Archbishop of Armagh were meagre, even though Queen Elizabeth had granted him the Deanery of St Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, in order to augment his income. Loftus nurtured ambitions in other directions. The Archiepiscopal See of Dublin was inferior in rank to that of Armagh, but greatly superior in power, influence, and emoluments, and Loftus set his sights on moving to Dublin. His motives may have been mixed. He may have had genuine concerns over the incompetence of the incumbent Dublin Archbishop, Hugh Curwen. But it is hard to avoid a suspicion that he also saw an opportunity for his own advancement, and he had no qualms in offering himself for the position. He was never averse to a little lobbying on his own behalf, nor was modesty one of his virtues. In a letter written to Lord Burghley he pressed his cause 'for Iesus Chryste his sake',<sup>8</sup> and lest this should not be reason enough, he went on to plead for the removal of Archbishop Curwen. Loftus wrote 'when in open Judgem<sup>t</sup> (lothe I am to say yt, and I saye yt not but constrainedlie); when, I saye, in open Judgem<sup>t</sup> he will sweare terrible, and y<sup>t</sup> not ones or twyse, I besече yo<sup>r</sup> hono<sup>r</sup>, is it not tyme, and more than tyme, that suche a one be removed?'<sup>8</sup> Curwen was a 'Known Enemy' who 'laboured under open Crimes' of which Loftus was 'almost ashamed to speak'.<sup>9</sup> And so the aging Archbishop, 'the Old Unprofitable Workman',<sup>10</sup> was in the event translated to Oxford, Loftus got the job in Dublin, and became Archbishop of that diocese in 1567. He had hoped to be able to retain the Deanery of St Patrick's as well, and had written to Burghley 'I humblye therefore besech yo<sup>r</sup> honor, yf it be yo<sup>r</sup> pleasure to be a meanes for my p<sup>r</sup>ferment to that Busshopprick, to be a meane also that I may haue *in comendam* the Deanery of S<sup>t</sup> Patricks in suche sorte as I haue it with the Archebushopprick of Armaughe.'<sup>11</sup> But this shameless appeal profited him nothing, and he was obliged to resign his Deanery. He was still in his thirties, however, was now Archbishop of Dublin, and his further advancement both in power and wealth was inexorable.

It is fair to say that his translation from Armagh was welcomed in the corridors of power in Dublin,<sup>12</sup> although Fuller writing in 1662 was more scathing. He referred to the move of Loftus to Dublin in the following lively passage. 'Wonder not that he should desire his own degradation, to be removed from Armagh (then Primate of Ireland) to Dublin, a subordinate Archbishoprick, seeing herein he consulted his safety (and perchance his profit) more than his honour, Armagh being then infested with Rebels, whilst Dublin was a secure city.'<sup>13</sup> Be that as it may, Loftus was to remain as

Archbishop of Dublin for the rest of his life. He also became Lord Chancellor of Ireland in 1581, was at various periods co-Lord Justice, as well as Lord Keeper of the Seal of Ireland, and was heavily involved in various powerful government commissions. In 1566 he was conferred with a DD degree by Cambridge University. He was churchman, lawyer, politician, administrator – all at the highest level. Ball wrote of him that all things considered ‘he must be admitted to have towered above everyone domiciled in Ireland during the sixteenth century’.<sup>6</sup>

Along with his power Loftus accumulated much wealth, and he was heavily criticised as a corrupt money grabber and manipulator, using his position to enrich himself and his family. He had many enemies and it is not difficult to find damning statements that paint him in the worst possible light. Lord Deputy Perrot wrote, for instance, of ‘the ungodly gain that this archbishop doth suck out of that church to pamper up himself, his children and friends’ and accused him of feathering his nest at the expense of both church and state.<sup>14</sup> A little later, when he was on trial for treason, Perrot declared that he had been ‘withstood by the said Archbishop because he and his children received by said cathedral church 800 marks a year’.<sup>15</sup> In similar vein, Harris wrote that ‘The great qualities of this Prelate were something tarnished by his excessive Ambition and Avarice. For besides his promotions in the Church, and his publick employments in the State, he grasped at everything that became void, either for himself or family.’<sup>16</sup> Edmund Spenser in his satirical poem ‘Mother Hubberds Tale’ gives us an idea of the sort of reputation that Loftus must have had. Herron has argued<sup>17</sup> that in this poem the Fox is a caricature of Loftus, as in the following verse.

All offices, all leases by him leapt,  
 And of them all whatso he likte, he kept.  
 Justice he solde injustice for to buy,  
 And for to purchase for his progeny  
 . . . . .  
 He fed his cubs with fat of all the soyle,  
 And with the sweete of others sweating toyle.<sup>17</sup>

It is unfair to judge Loftus solely on the basis of statements such as these, written by his detractors. Nevertheless, there does seem to be a consensus that he acquired much of his fortune by methods which if not corrupt were certainly questionable. He became rich enough to build Rathfarnham Castle between 1583 and 1585 and to fit it out luxuriously, including basins of pure silver.<sup>18</sup> The Castle remained in the Loftus family until 1723 when it was sold to Speaker Connolly. It passed back to the Loftus family

later that century, when it was completely restored by Henry Loftus, who also built the triumphal arch that still today stands forlornly on the banks of the Dodder just below Braemor Park in Churchtown. The Castle was sold again in the nineteenth century, was owned by the Jesuits from 1913 to 1986, and was finally bought by the state in 1987.<sup>18–20</sup>

In c. 1560 Loftus married Jane Purdon, from Co. Louth, and there is no reason to think other than that it was a happy union. It was certainly a productive one, for Jane bore no less than twenty children, although eight of them died before reaching adulthood. Most of the others either went on to make favourable marriages, or had successful careers, or both. The eldest son was Sir Dudley Loftus, who inherited Rathfarnham Castle. The influence of this extended family reached out through Dublin society, carefully fostered by Loftus himself, so much so that he was wide open to the charge of nepotism, as in the two quotations given above from Perrot<sup>14,15</sup> and Harris.<sup>16</sup> As Robinson-Hammerstein pithily observed ‘the marriages were always alliances of carefully assessed interest’.<sup>21</sup>

In his churchmanship Loftus was firmly on the puritan side, and in this he set a precedent for Trinity which leant towards puritanism for much of the seventeenth century. He supported the anti-vestment side in the great vestiarian controversy of the 1560s, when on the one hand it was argued that liturgical vestments had their proper place in the church, while on the other it was felt that they were unnecessary and merely reflected ‘corrupt’ Roman Catholic practice. The issue aroused huge emotions, men went to prison for their principles, and the wearing of surplices in Trinity chapel was to cause great controversy under several of the Provosts who followed Loftus. Loftus himself took the puritan line. For him, vestments were not necessary for salvation, although he disapproved of the government’s action in sacking clergy who refused to wear them. It was not right, he said, ‘to thrust owt of ther livings and ministry so many godly and learnid preachers, only for this, that they will not be lyke the papistes, the professid ministers of Sathan and Antichrist, in superstitious and wickid order of apparell and owtward sheawe’.<sup>22</sup> In general policy on the other hand, Loftus tended towards coercion rather than tolerance as he sought to promote the Reformation in Ireland, particularly in his later years. Observing how the people persisted ‘in the Romish religion, with such willful obstinacy’,<sup>23</sup> he attributed this to the fact that ‘they are not by law compelled to resort unto the Church’.<sup>23</sup> He recognised that while bringing a horse to water cannot make it drink, if it is not brought to the water in the first place, then it can never drink, and he wrote to Burghley, ‘The sword

alone without the Word is not sufficient, but unless they be forced they will not once come to hear the word preached.<sup>24</sup> As Archbishop, Loftus was attempting to establish the Reformation in Ireland (not very successfully). A full treatment of this aspect of his life and work cannot be undertaken here, however, and for a proper assessment of his contribution to Irish history the reader is referred to the work of Robinson-Hammerstein,<sup>25-27</sup> Ford,<sup>28</sup> Bradshaw,<sup>29</sup> Murray,<sup>30</sup> and other historians of the period.

Policy of coercion or not, the famous case of Archbishop Dermot O'Hurley was very much to the discredit of Loftus. O'Hurley was a distinguished man whom the Pope appointed Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cashel. He was said to have been involved in the work of the Inquisition and in the plots of the exiles and rebels against Queen Elizabeth,<sup>31</sup> but even if this were true it does not excuse the horrendous treatment that was meted out to him.<sup>32,33</sup> Some time after his arrival in Ireland O'Hurley was arrested and lodged in Dublin Castle. At first he was well treated by Lord Justices Loftus and Wallop, but when he stoutly declined to renounce Rome, things took a nastier turn. Loftus and Wallop reported back to Walsingham in London that 'they have neither rack nor other engine of torture in Dublin Castle to terrify Dr Hurley'<sup>34,35</sup> and they took (perhaps reluctantly) Walsingham's instructions on how to handle him, 'which was to toast his feet against the fire with hot boots'.<sup>34,35</sup> Eye-witnesses described how 'The executioners placed the Archbishop's feet and calves in tin boots, filled with oil; they then fastened his feet in wooden shackles or stocks, and placed fire under them. The boiling oil so penetrated the feet and legs that morsels of the skin and flesh fell off and left the bone bare.'<sup>36</sup> Although the case against him was flimsy, O'Hurley was sentenced to death, and to avoid public disorder he was hanged privately in the early hours of 19 June 1584 on a gallows in Hoggin Green. His body was buried at the nearby St Kevin's Church. Many accounts of what happened to O'Hurley were published by partisan writers,<sup>36,37</sup> and the bishop rapidly acquired martyr status. But even though some sought to cast doubt on the accounts of torture,<sup>38,39</sup> it is clear that O'Hurley was subjected to appalling treatment and the whole shameful affair reflected little credit on Loftus.

Returning to the role of Loftus in the foundation of Trinity College, we have already noted how the efforts of Lord Deputy Sir John Perrot to promote a new university in Dublin at the expense of St Patrick's Cathedral were 'defeated by the warm and zealous applications of the lord chancellor Loftus'.<sup>40</sup> The unfortunate Perrot shortly afterwards returned to England, was accused of treason, lodged in the Tower of London, tried, found guilty on questionable evidence, sentenced to death, but died of natural causes

in the Tower in 1592. His fall did not mean that the university plan was abandoned, however, for a university in Dublin was of importance both politically and religiously, and Loftus was to play an important role in the eventual foundation of Trinity in 1592, although the real significance of his contribution has been the subject of dispute. The sequence of events that led to the foundation of the new College is well established, although there is considerable confusion with some of the dates, partly arising from a failure to distinguish between ‘old’ and ‘new’ styles and partly from errors by some of the earlier authors.<sup>41,42</sup> This problem is not discussed here, and the dates given below are new style and are the ones accepted by most modern authors.

In the early 1590s a group of prominent citizens, including Luke Challoner, Henry Ussher, and Archbishop Loftus, spearheaded a drive to have a new university founded in Dublin, and Loftus made two speeches in 1590 at the Tholsel, where the Corporation of Dublin met.<sup>3,43,44</sup> He pointed to the prosperity enjoyed by the cities of both Oxford and Cambridge because of their universities. He argued that just as the central government administration brought wealth to Dublin, so would the presence of a university also enrich the city. He extolled the advantages to Irish parents who would not have to send their children abroad to be educated. And finally, he suggested that in view of all this the Corporation might consider the ‘free granting of a fitting place whereon to found a College’.<sup>45</sup> So were these powerful speeches the prime motivation in moving the Corporation to grant a site for the new College? Early historians certainly gave Loftus full credit. Sir James Ware, writing in the seventeenth century, as translated by Harris, said that Loftus was ‘a most zealous promoter, and a happy instrument of founding another University, that which is now in the City of Dublin, by employing his Interest and good Offices in that behalf with Queen Elizabeth, and with many Men of Power in England’.<sup>3</sup> According to Ware it was Loftus who persuaded the Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of Dublin, to offer the old Monastery of All Hallows as a site for the new College.<sup>3</sup> Fuller included Loftus in his famous book *Worthies of England* first published in 1662, and said that ‘he was a profitable Agent in, yea, a principall Procurer of, the Foundation of the University and Colledge of Dublin’.<sup>13</sup> But was Loftus merely stealing the glory by lending the prestige of his name and office to the new project while others really deserved the credit? Mahaffy was scathing in his disparagement of the role of his praepositorial predecessor, and referred to Challoner and Henry Ussher as the ‘real founders’,<sup>46</sup> and Murphy writing in 1904 agreed when he pointed out that the members of the Corporation were not immediately bowled over by the case put by Loftus.<sup>44</sup> On the

other hand, Boran<sup>47</sup> suggested more recently that perhaps the Corporation's seeming reluctance was because, having heard about Cambridge, it was wary of introducing 'town and gown' tensions to Dublin, and modern writers have reached a more balanced view than that of Mahaffy, giving Loftus due credit for his role as a major player in the foundation of the new university.<sup>12,26,48</sup> For example, Murray in his article on Loftus in the Dictionary of Irish Biography refers to Loftus as the 'prime mover' in the foundation of Trinity.<sup>49</sup>

Whatever about these considerations, in January 1591 Mayor Devenish and the Corporation passed the historic resolution in which they 'herby agree and order that the scite of All Hallowes and the parkes thereof shalbe wholly gyven for the erecōn of a Colledge there'.<sup>50</sup> Armed with this promise, Henry Ussher, Archdeacon of Dublin, probably accompanied by Luke Challoner, travelled to London to present a petition to the Queen. According to Harris it was Loftus who 'dispatched Henry Ussher' to petition the Queen,<sup>43</sup> or as he put it in his translation of Ware, Loftus 'employed' Henry Ussher to present a petition to the Queen for her royal charter.<sup>3</sup> Mahaffy on the other hand, who consistently downplayed the role played by Loftus, argued that the Archbishop's role in promoting Ussher's visit was a minor one.<sup>51</sup> Whatever about this dispute, it seems as if Ussher's mission to London was not all plain sailing, even though it was ultimately successful. In his church history of 1656 Fuller notes that Henry Ussher 'took a journey with much danger into England, and with more difficulty procured the Mort-main from Queen Elizabeth, who graciously granted it'.<sup>52</sup> In responding favourably in December 1591 Elizabeth had her own reasons, for at the time her suzerainty in Ireland gave her much cause for concern, and without a university she was troubled with the dangers involved in young Irish gentleman having to go abroad for their education. Her letter included the famous lines that have been quoted so often in connection with the foundation of Trinity. 'Many have usually heretofore used to travaile into ffrance Italy and Spaine to gett learning in such forreigne universities, whereby they have been infected with poperie and other ill qualities, and soe became evill subjects'.<sup>53</sup> Not wanting her loyal young subjects in Ireland to be so infected, she granted a royal charter for the new College, dated 3rd March 1592 and the first stone of the new buildings was laid by Thomas Smith, Lord Mayor of Dublin, on 13 March 1592. Four hundred years later, on 13 March 1992, this event was commemorated by a formal visit to Trinity by the Lord Mayor and Corporation of Dublin, complete with their robes, when the Mayor planted an Irish Oak tree and unveiled a plaque. (This tree died, and its replacement together with the

plaque had to be moved to make way for the present Hub building. As of writing, both tree and plaque are in temporary storage until a final resting place is determined.)

Under the terms of the charter, the new College was to be called ‘The College of the Holy and Undivided Trinity near Dublin founded by the most serene Queen Elizabeth’. At that time the city was centred on Dublin Castle and Christ Church Cathedral. The site on which the new College was to be built was formally gifted by the Corporation on 21 July 1592, and comprised the lands of an old disused monastery called All Hallows which had lain derelict for some sixty years, and which was situated about half a mile eastwards of the old city of Dublin. All Hallows monastery had been closed by Henry VIII, and had been given to the Corporation of Dublin, which was therefore able to present it as the site for the new College. Heron writing in 1850 gives a good impression of what the area must have looked like. He paints a desolate scene. But from these dismal beginnings developed over the succeeding centuries the splendid College that today sits at the heart of Dublin city.

In the year 1590, there was a certain marsh, called in Saxon language Hoggin Green, adjacent to Dublin city, on the seaward side. In the centre, which was slightly elevated above the surrounding sands and pools, stood an old building, half in ruins, still surmounted by the cross that showed its sacred character, but now almost deserted by all, save the cattle which flocked thither for shelter from the storm, or for protection from the overflowing spring-tides of the Anna Liffey. The scene exhibited a mournful decline from the ancient prosperity of those ruined towers.<sup>54</sup>

Queen Elizabeth may have been generous in granting a charter for the new university in Dublin, but she ‘had only given a Charter full of fair words’,<sup>55</sup> and her generosity stopped there, for she contributed not a penny towards putting up the new buildings, and the money had to be raised by Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam and the Privy Council, who circulated a letter throughout Ireland appealing for funds for the new university. Archbishop Loftus contributed £100. The famous Irish chieftain, Turlough O’Neill, whose native language was Irish, and who could speak hardly any English, contributed another £100. Sir Francis Shane, ‘a mere Irish man, but good Protestant’ subscribed liberally and ‘kept this infant-foundation from being strangled in the birth thereof’.<sup>56</sup> Money came in from all over the country, building work began on 13 March 1592, and on 9 January 1594 the new College opened for students with a Chancellor, a Provost, three Fellows and three Scholars. Fuller relays the legend, and seems to believe it, that just as it rained only during the night during the building of Herod’s temple, so it ‘hath been avouched to me by witnesses above exception, that the same happ’ned

here from the founding, to the finishing of this Colledge; the officious Heavens always smiling by day (though often weeping by night) till the work was completed'.<sup>57</sup>

The new College comprised a small square situated roughly on the southern half of where the present Front Square is, and it incorporated a chapel, a library, a hall and kitchens, as well as residential chambers for the Fellows and Scholars. The only edifice preserved from the old monastery was the tower, which was built into the northern wall of the new College square. All these buildings have long since disappeared. Interestingly, however, when in 1998 a trench was being excavated to accommodate a new water pipe, five skeletons were unearthed near the present campanile, as well as the remains of what may have been a medieval wall, artefacts that probably dated all the way back to the old monastery. For an account of these artefacts of All Hallows Monastery, and of the early College buildings, see Simpson,<sup>58</sup> and also Budd.<sup>59</sup>

We have already noted that several writers have questioned the importance of the role played by Loftus in the founding of Trinity. Certain it is that having seen the new foundation off the ground, he troubled himself little with its future development, and it has often been said that in the first few years of the College's existence, although Loftus was the Provost, Luke Challoner was the *de facto* Provost. In fairness to Loftus it must be remembered that he was at the same time Archbishop of Dublin and Lord Chancellor of Ireland, so that it is not surprising that he was never able to be in any sense a 'hands on' Provost. As he explained to the Fellows, he would willingly have continued as Provost, 'had I not been too heavily surcharged by the weight of other more public administrations inconsistent with the duty of that office'.<sup>60</sup> But be that as it may, in those early days the College was effectively run by Challoner, to whom it owes an enormous debt. He was one of the first three Fellows named in the charter and an account of his life was published by Newport White, based on a Trinity Monday Discourse delivered by him in 1908.<sup>61,62</sup> White suggested that without the support of Challoner it is doubtful if Loftus could have persuaded the Corporation to grant a site for the new College, and once the fledgling Trinity had come into being its survival was due in large measure to Challoner and not to Loftus. Challoner served under the next three Provosts, namely Travers, Alvey, and Temple, and he kept the College going during the frequent absences of these men in England. He was a 'shrewd and careful business man'.<sup>63</sup> It was Challoner who was prominent in collecting funds. It was Challoner who seems to have undertaken most of the administration of the new College. It was Challoner who estimated that in order to supply the Provost, ten Fellows, and forty Scholars with 'a good diet dayley' the College would have to

purchase 320 sheep and 54 cattle *per annum*, the animals to be ‘a mutton alive with the wool at 26½ d, the pece’, and ‘a befe large and fatt alive at 16s the pece’.<sup>64</sup> The woolly mutton and the large fat live beef may have been supplied from Challoner’s farm, for he was also a part-time farmer, with a large farm in Finglas that he leased from Loftus.<sup>65,66</sup> Challoner was born in Dublin of an English family, was an undergraduate at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was in Holy Orders. He was a learned man, although perhaps not an outstandingly distinguished scholar. We still have some of his notebooks, from which we learn of his prodigious energy as a preacher. By 1608 he had preached no fewer than 1,428 sermons, of which nearly 400 were on the book of Genesis.<sup>65</sup> This took him seven years, preaching mainly on Fridays, and he then spent another five years preaching 245 sermons on Deuteronomy. And after that, on Sunday afternoons, for yet another five years he preached 210 sermons on St Matthew’s Gospel. One source tells us that he was a ‘very painful preacher of the Gospel’.<sup>67</sup> But although this might seem appropriate to us today as a description of Challoner’s efforts in the pulpit, the word ‘painful’ is used here in its old positive sense, meaning painstaking and thorough. Challoner lectured in theology and it has been suggested by Boran and others that he should be considered as the first Professor of Divinity in Trinity.<sup>68</sup> The College Record volume names James Ussher as the first holder of this post.<sup>69</sup>

Challoner loved books, and he had a large private collection which he lent freely to his colleagues,<sup>68</sup> and when the College Library was established he and James Ussher made at least two journeys to London to buy books for it. There they met Dr Bodley, who was buying books for his library in Oxford. They all collaborated and became good friends, and Bodley mentioned Challoner’s sister several times in his correspondence. She was apparently a bookseller in Oxford. Right from the start it was clear that the College considered a library to be of fundamental importance. But also right from the start the College was impoverished, so where did it find funds for purchasing books? In his sermon at the funeral of Archbishop James Ussher in 1656, the Very Rev. Dr Bernard mentioned that after the victory at the Battle of Kinsale in 1601 ‘the Officers and Commanders of the Army gave at once 1800 l. to buy books for a Library to the Colledge of Dublyn (then souldiers were for the advancement of learning.) The ordering of the mony for that use, was committed to Doctor Challoner.’<sup>70</sup> This story was repeated by many of the later historians of the College,<sup>71</sup> although the amount given was usually smaller, at £700–800.<sup>72–74</sup> Unfortunately there is no direct evidence for the authenticity of this attractive tale of the generous soldiers

in Kinsale. Mahaffy noted that the College's book of benefactions does indeed refer to a gift of about £700 contributed in 1601 'by several persons of quality, and especially souldiers and officers then in H.M. service'.<sup>75</sup> But based on a reading of other documents, he suggested that this was money promised by army officers much earlier, in 1591, although not actually received until 1601, and that it had nothing to do with Kinsale. Murphy quotes several contemporary documents supporting this interpretation,<sup>76</sup> and Mahaffy's version of events is now the generally accepted one. There hangs on the landing at the Western end of the Long Room in the College Library a large oil painting of the Battle of Kinsale. But sadly there is no known connection between it and the story of the gift of money for books by the army.

When Challoner died in 1613 his daughter Phoebe erected a monument to his memory in the Chapel. The inscription on it was in Latin and has been translated as

*This Tomb within it here contains,  
Of Chalnor the sad Remains.  
By whose prayer, and helping hand,  
This House erected here doth stand.*<sup>56</sup>

But students of yesteryear showed a spirited lack of respect for their College mentors. On a wall of the chapel built by Provost Marsh in 1684 was found inscribed a more homely translation.

*Under this staircase lies Challoner's sad carcass,  
By whose prayers and intreaties this House now so great is.*<sup>77</sup>

Later still the memory of Challoner was more shamefully treated, for when Marsh's chapel was pulled down and replaced by the present chapel in 1798, Challoner's monument was moved outdoors and set in the little graveyard nestling in a corner beside the present chapel. Here the alabaster effigy dissolved slowly over the next 170 years in the increasingly acid rain of Dublin. Older readers may remember it on its tombstone slab, looking like a collection of white stalagmites, with no longer any semblance to a human form. It was brought indoors again in 1968, although too late to rescue any traces of its original profile. But the tombstone on which the effigy rested still remains, snugly secure in the little graveyard in the centre of Trinity, keeping alive the memory of Luke Challoner to whom the College owes so much.

After leaving Trinity in 1594 Loftus lived for a further eleven years. He retained his posts as Archbishop and Lord Chancellor until he died on 5 April 1605, in the Archbishop's medieval palace of St Sepulchre (the present Garda station), beside St Patrick's Cathedral. He would have been about seventy-one years old. His wife had

predeceased him in 1595. He was buried within the altar rails in the cathedral, to the right hand side of the massive monument of the Earl of Cork, which originally stood behind the altar, but which now stands down at the back, near the West door. Nothing remains today of the Loftus family vault.

In his constitutional history of the University of Dublin, published in 1847 and therefore not in any way coloured by Mahaffy's notions, Heron describes Loftus in the following terms: 'In the year 1590, Adam Loftus was in Dublin, a politic priest from Yorkshire; educated beyond the age; clever; somewhat unscrupulous; ambitious of distinction; rapacious of high office; gifted with fair powers of oratory, a splendid voice, strong and melodious; so graceful in gesture and carriage of person that he seemed made for the forum – all together possessed of that combination of various qualities, which constitutes a man of the world'.<sup>78</sup> This seems not a bad evaluation of Loftus the man, although perhaps it emphasises his weaker points. He was indeed clever and highly educated. He was generally accepted to be a preacher of distinction. And there were certainly grounds for believing that he could be unscrupulous, ambitious, and rapacious of high office. But on the other hand Robinson-Hammerstein has argued that his puritanism was genuine and that it informed many of his decisions as a public figure.<sup>79,80</sup>

The College possesses seven portraits of Loftus; for most of them the artist and date are unknown.<sup>81</sup> One of them may be seventeenth century, but the others are later and are probably copies. Four of the portraits are full length, showing a man in a long black cloak or gown, with black cap and white ruff. He stands against a dark background, and holds in his hand a large square ornately embroidered object which is probably the Chancellor's purse, used to hold the matrix of the Great Seal of Ireland. The face is finely featured, with a long pointed beard (forked in some of the pictures) and a moustache. The black eyes stare out at the viewer, neither friendly nor hostile. Simon Loftus, who recently published a new book on the Loftus family based on a hitherto unpublished manuscript in his possession, describes Loftus in one of the portraits as having 'a guarded watchful gaze'.<sup>82</sup> Is this the face of an unprincipled carpetbagger, or of a distinguished man of integrity and principle? The face in the portraits cannot tell.