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Abstract/Executive Summary
Matteo Binasco

The role and activities of the Capuchin, Jesuit and Recollet missionaries in Acadia/Nova Scotia from 1654 to 1755
March 23rd, 2004

This thesis examines the activity of the Capuchin, Jesuit and Recollet missionaries from 1654 until 1755. More specifically it illustrates how the apostolate of these three orders developed in Acadia/Nova Scotia. It tries to give as many details as possible on the individual missionaries who came to Acadia/Nova Scotia as well as on the places where they operated. Particular attention is given to the activity of the missionaries during one of the more complex and troubled periods within the history of this territory. Furthermore, the thesis highlights the competition which existed between the religious orders, and even between different branches of the same order. This study traces missionary activity during a period of Anglo-French conflicts. It assesses the degree to which missions were affected by these tensions, and also the extent to which this varied by time and place.
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Preface

When at mid-November 2000 I defended, at the University of Genova, my first M.A. thesis on the Capuchins in Acadia in the first half of the seventeenth century I felt that my research on the missionary history in this territory was not over. Checking in the religious historiography of Acadia/Nova Scotia I realized that there were still few works dealing with the missionary orders which operated there from 1654 till 1755.

I was particularly interested in this time-frame because, during it, the missionaries had to carry on their activity within the context of a contested territory which was exposed to the pressures coming out of French and English/British imperial interests. This led me to undertake this thesis, which specifically focuses on the activity of the Capuchin, Jesuit and Recollet missionaries in Acadia/Nova Scotia. I decided to fix my attention on these three orders, because, from the time of the Council of Trent, they always held a key position in missionary expansionism around the world. Although only a few pages of the second chapter are dedicated to the Capuchins' apostolate, this is because their missionary experience in Acadia abruptly concluded in 1656, and they would return there only in 1785.

Instead I tried to illustrate all the missionary experience of the Jesuits and the Recollets during almost one hundred years of turbulent imperial conflicts. First of all I tried to give as much biographical information as possible on the missionaries who operated in Acadia/Nova Scotia and, consequently, to reconstruct their experience. This has been particularly challenging due to the fact that, in some cases, biographical details on dates of birth or the provenance of the missionaries were sparse or inaccurate. This was due to the fact that most of the documents preserved in
the archives of these orders were destroyed during the French Revolution. One of the main aims of this thesis was to identify the mission locations, finding out that Port-Royal/Annapolis Royal was, throughout the period of my research, the center which enjoyed, at the level of missionaries’ presence, a certain level of stability. Another aim was to illustrate the lack of cooperation which existed between the various orders. This also occurred within the same order, as in the case of the Recollets of the province of Paris (St.Denys) and those of Brittany, whose dispute over the jurisdiction of the parishes of Île Royale affected their activity there. This was due to the rivalries which existed within the order, but also due to the lack of any clear missionary jurisdiction, notably involving the bishops of Québec.

Another issue that this thesis seeks to bring out is that, during the years 1654-1755, the Sacred Congregation “de Propaganda Fide”, the Roman ministry founded in 1622 by Pope Gregory XV (Alessandro Ludovisi, 1621-1623) for controlling missionary activity around the world, was progressively removed from the missionary matters of North America. This was due to Gallicanism which created a church in France that functioned independently of Rome, and which virtually avoided any intervention of Propaganda from 1654 till 1755.

As a result of the Gallican Church, missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia underwent a shift that made the evangelization of the natives become a less important

---

1 The Sacred Congregation de “Propaganda Fide” was officially founded on 22 June 1622, by Pope Gregory XV with the bull Inscrutabili divinae providentiae. Its main three tasks were: to spread the Catholic religion among the infidels, to defend the Catholics living in Protestant countries, and to achieve the union of the Catholic Church with the Orthodox Church. See Niccolò Del Re, La Curia romana. Lineamenti storico-giuridici, (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1970), p.190; Archives of the Sacred Congregation “de Propaganda Fide” [shortened in APF Acta, vol.3, fol.1rv, General Congregation, Rome, 6 January 1622; APF, Miscellanee diverse, vol.22, fol.1rv-4rv, Gregory XV, Inscrutabili divinae providentiae, Rome, 22 June 1622.

2 The Gallican Church was the consequence of the Gallicanism. This was a French conception imposed by the French King Francis I (1515-1547) in 1516 on the Holy See. It allowed the King to intervene within the religious matters, thus promoting a French church that had to be independent from that of Rome. See Angus Anthony Johnston, History of Catholic Church in Eastern Nova Scotia, vol.1, (Antigonish, Nova Scotia: St. Francis Xavier University Press, 1960), I, p.37.
factor. In the last decades of the 1680s the missionary strategies came to be influenced by the orders coming out from the colonial authorities which wanted, through the missionaries' help, to obtain the natives' support against the British. This has been one of the main themes of this thesis. I gave particular attention to this political role of the missionaries, showing that the Catholic missionaries were identified by the English/British as enemies to fight, or even to eliminate. I specifically stressed the role the missionaries had during the Anglo-French conflict in Acadia/Nova Scotia. However this theme has not been easy to analyze because, up until now, there is only one monograph written on this subject.

All through the writing of this thesis I tried to analyze and bring out how the missionary process developed, with particular attention to the relationships that the missionaries were able to establish with the Acadians, the British and French authorities, and with the natives. Another problem to face has been that most of the reference works have been written by the Jesuit and Recollet historians, whose analyses are based on a partial point of view. Due to this, another aim of this thesis has been to fit the available primary sources into the context of an updated historiography, made up of the most recent works on the colonial history of Acadia/Nova Scotia.

Although in the first chapter, I have taken full account of the contributions of ethnohistorians to the subject of religious history in New France, my main interest has focused on the missionaries and on the way the missionary process began, developed, and, afterwards, concluded in a territory which, throughout, the 1654-1755 period, underwent constant and crucial changes.

---

Chapter I

Historiography
Primary sources: problems & approach

This chapter presents an overview of the available documentation on the missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia. The first part of it specifically focuses on the archives and the printed primary sources that form the main body of documentation to be examined and used. The second part of the chapter outlines an analysis of the historiography of the missionary history in Acadia/Nova Scotia. It considers the changes, the problems and the historians’ approaches that, through the years, have informed the historiography on the Atlantic region.

Analysis of missionary activity in Acadia¹/Nova Scotia in the period, from 1654 to 1827, has, first of all, to be based on the available primary sources. The first approach to this subject is represented by a process of selection of the documents that deal with colonial and religious history in Acadia/Nova Scotia. More specifically the religious history in Acadia/Nova Scotia, from the seventeenth century to the first decades of the nineteenth century, relies on a large number of primary sources, that are preserved in four main archives: the National Archives of Canada, in Ottawa, the Archives of the Archdiocese of Québec, the Archives Nationales of France, in Paris, and the Archives of the Sacred Congregation “de Propaganda Fide”, in Rome.

The only general inventory of the documentary sources relating to the history of Acadia/Nova Scotia was published in 1975 by the Centre d’études acadiennes of the Université de Moncton. This finding aid has a list of all the available primary sources.

¹ Acadia was the name given by Giovanni da Verazzano to the territory, which, approximately, corresponds to the actual Maritime Provinces of Canada: Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.
sources, related to the Acadian history, as well as a brief description of the archives where they are preserved\(^2\).

The archival series named RG1, preserved at the Public Archives of Nova Scotia in Halifax, can be considered the starting point for a careful investigation of the religious and colonial history of Acadia/Nova Scotia. In fact this series covers the period from the first half of the seventeenth century to the first half of the nineteenth century, through numerous transcribed documents, that include the correspondence of the missionaries with local governors, the government of Annapolis-Royal, native affairs, the parish registers, and documents relating to the deportation of the Acadians. Most of the documents preserved in the series RG1 are transcribed copies coming from the Public Record Office, in London, and in minor part from the National Archives of Canada. A detailed, although not updated, description of the documentation preserved at the Public Archives of Nova Scotia is found in the guide written by David Parker, and published in 1913\(^3\).

The main problem related to this series is that the only finding aid has an index of the first 21 volumes, which go from 1614 to 1769, and does not include the period from 1769 to 1827, covered by the documents of the remaining volumes of this series\(^4\). Through analysis of the first volumes, it is possible to come to a considerable amount of information related to the situation of the Catholic Church in Acadia/Nova Scotia, such as the places of the missionaries' activity, their attitude towards the British authorities, and their way of acting before and after the deportation.


A good number of these documents were written by the priests of the Seminary of the Foreign Missions, one of the missionary orders, active in Acadia/Nova Scotia during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Through this different perspective, we can analyse the possible relationships and problems between these missionaries and the Jesuits and Recollets. The perspective of the priests who belonged to the Seminary of the Foreign Missions, is useful because in some documents it gives us the possibility of having comments and reports on the state of the Jesuit and Recollet missions, thus presenting accounts more detached than those written by the missionaries belonging to these orders. The letter of Pierre Maillard, a Spiritan missionary, written from Louisbourg and dated 5 October 1751 is an example, in that the author described the Recollet mission of Louisbourg as being in very bad state.

One of the main themes arising from the analysis of this archival series is the political role played by the missionaries. Several documents written by the British governors and officers in Acadia/Nova Scotia, especially during the first half of the eighteenth century, clearly manifest the position and the feelings of the British towards the missionaries. They considered the missionaries to be the leaders of the Catholic communities living in Acadia/Nova Scotia, but especially as agents provocateurs, on behalf of the French authorities and the Aboriginal people. A letter, dated 26-27 September 1720, written, from Annapolis Royal, by Richard Philipps,

---

5 Pierre Maillard was born in 1710 in France, in the diocese of Chartres, in the actual department of Eure-et-Loire. He was trained in Paris, at the Séminaire de Saint-Esprit. In 1735 he was selected for the missions on Île Royale (the actual Cape Breton island), where he arrived on 13 August of the same year. See George W. Brown et al., Dictionary of Canadian Biography, [shortened in DCE], (14 vols. to date; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966-), III, pp.415-419.

6 Letter of Maillard with some comments, 5 October 1751, Louisbourg, Public Archives of Nova Scotia, [shortened in PANS], RG1, vol.IV, doc nr.48.
the governor of Acadia/Nova Scotia from 1719 to 1749, to the Board of Trade stated that it was not possible to cooperate with the Aboriginal people unless the missionaries operated among them. The main preoccupation of the British governors in Acadia/Nova Scotia was that the missionaries allegedly encouraged the Acadians and the Aboriginal people to rebel and to refuse to submit to the oath of allegiance to the British government, as it is underlined in the letter, dated 3 January 1719, written again by Philipps.

The second archival series that has to be used for analysing the missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia, is designated MG 17 A25, and it is preserved at the National Archives of Canada. This series is extremely important, because it contains transcriptions of documents coming from the Archives of Propaganda. These documents are the best primary sources for analysing the history of the Catholic Church in Canada for the period from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the last decades of the nineteenth century. In fact we have to consider, that the documents coming from Propaganda were mainly written by ecclesiastical members, like missionaries or bishops, thus giving important insights into the development of the Catholic Church in Canada.

Since the end of the 1970s, the scholarship on the documents of Propaganda has been improved by specific and accurate investigations, whose pioneer has been Luca Codignola. This historian has been the first to catalogue and, subsequently, to

---

7 Richard Philipps was born in Pembrokeshire, Wales, in 1661. In 1678 he joined the British army, as a lieutenant. In June or July 1719, he appointed governor of Nova Scotia, commission he held until 1749. He died in London on 14 October 1750. See, DCB, III, pp.515-518.
8 Letter of Richard Philipps to the Board of Trade, 26-27 September 1720, Annapolis Royal, PANS, RG1, vol.VII, doc nr.23.
write the first guide to all the documents preserved in the Archives of Propaganda, relating to the history of the Catholic Church in Canada from the first half of the seventeenth century to the end of the nineteenth century. Codignola's investigation has not been restricted to the Archives of Propaganda, but in the last twelve years it has been extended to the Vatican Secret Archives as well as the other religious archives and libraries of Rome, thus enlarging our knowledge of the Roman sources related to the Catholic history of Canada. Before him, only Lucien Campeau, Carl Fish, and Conrad Morin, had analysed the documentation preserved in the Archives of Propaganda and the Vatican Secret Archives.

The series RG1 and MG17 A25 have to be connected to C11A, C11B, C11C and C11D, at the Archives Nationales in Paris, which provide the basis for an analysis of the relationship between France and its colonies in North America. These series preserve the correspondence between the Ministry of Marine and the French King with the local governors, Catholic missionaries and the military officers in Canada. All the documents, relating to the history of North America, preserved in the series C11A, C11B and MG17 A25, have been catalogued and included in the


A finding aid represented by the National Archives of Canada database, on CD-ROM, made in 1996.

Another interesting compilation of primary sources on the colonial history of Canada and Acadia/Nova Scotia can be found in the Collection de Manuscrits and in the Rapport de L’Archiviste de la Province de Québec, two collections of documents, which both come from the Provincial Archives of Québec. These collections have to be integrated with the Collection de documents inédits, which provides other documents relating to the colonial history of New France.

What is lacking in the documents found in these archival series is a thorough description of the missionaries’ activity among the Aboriginal people. They do not contain accounts that can explain how the missionaries tried to convert the Aboriginal people or the type of methodology they used. Practices and methods of conversion can be examined, however, through a careful reading of the available printed primary sources on the Recollets’ experience in Acadia/Nova Scotia in the seventeenth century, thanks to the reports written by the missionaries such as Chrestien Le Clercq, Gabriel Sagard, and Xiste Le Tac. These accounts can be

---

17 Chrestien Le Clercq was born in 1641, probably at Bapaume, in the department of Pas-de-Calais. He joined the Recollets’ order in 1668, entering the convent of Saint-Antoine de Padoue (in the Artois department). See, DCB, I, pp.438-441; Gabriel Sagard (baptized Théodat), was probably a Recollet in 1604, due to the allusion to him made by his confrères, Daniel Saymond, superior of the monastery of Verdun, in the department of Meuse. In 1614 he was in Paris, working as personal secretary of Jacques Garnier Chappouin, the provincial of the Recollets of Saint-Denis. In 1623 he was appointed to the mission in Canada, and left the monastery of Paris on 18 March of the same year, with Nicolas Viel, another recollet missionary. The two missionaries arrived in Québec on 28 June 1623. On 16 July of the same year, Sagard left Québec in order to reach the Huron. His permanence among the Hurons lasted till May 1624, when Sagard left for Québec, where he arrived on 16 July of the same year. He probably came back to France in the same year. In 1632, Le grand voyage au pays des Hurons, his first account on the Canadian mission, was published, followed, four years later, by
considered more than general surveys of the Recollets' missionary activity, and are the most valuable primary sources for the history of Canada and missionary experience. The work of Le Clercq, published for the first time in 1691, is the most comprehensive primary source, because it is a detailed description, divided into chapters, of all the aspects of the natives' society that lived in the territory called Gaspesia. Through this work, we can understand the perception the missionaries had of the Aboriginal people towards conversion, especially in the chapters dealing with their religious beliefs and superstitions. In 1999, Le Clercq's account was republished in a version edited by the literary scholar Réal Ouellet.

Concerning the Jesuits' experience, we can integrate all the mass of documents preserved in the Archives of Propaganda and the National Archives of France, with the relations left by these missionaries and collected in the multivolume


19 This territory approximately corresponds to the right mouth of Saint Lawrence river, in the province of Québec, and close to the Anticosti Island.


works edited by Reuben Thwaites and Lucien Campeau. On the other hand, we have no relations left by the Capuchins during their activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia in the eighteenth century, because most of the accounts relating to this mission were preserved in the Archives of the Capuchin Province of Paris that was destroyed during the French Revolution.

Analysis of missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia needs to be included in the broad pattern of the Archdiocese of Québec. A report on the state of the Catholic Church in Canada, written by Jean Baptiste de La Croix, Saint Vallier, bishop of Québec from 1687 to 1727, offers a general survey of the situation of the missionaries’ activity at the end of the seventeenth century. Concerning the missionaries’ apostolate in Acadia/Nova Scotia in the first decades of the nineteenth century, further information can be obtained through an investigation of the *Journal des Visites Pastorales de 1815 et 1816*, written by Joseph-Octave Plessis, Bishop of Québec from 1806 to 1819, and Archbishop from 1819 to 1825, as well as the two inventories of his incoming and outgoing correspondence, which respectively go

---


23 Jean Baptiste de La Croix de Chevières de Saint-Vallier was born on 14 November 1653 at Grenoble, France. He entered the Seminary of Saint-Sulpice in Paris, and in 1672 he obtained a licentiate of theology. In 1676 he was ordained, being also appointed as almoner of King Louis XIV. In 1681 he was ordained a priest. In 1685 he left for Canada, being appointed vicar general of Bishop François de Laval, the first bishop of Canada. On 25 January 1688 he was officially consecrated bishop of Canada, taking the place of Laval. He governed the diocese of Québec until 26 December 1727, date of his death. See, *DCB*, II, pp.328-334.


25 Joseph-Octave Plessis was born in Montréal on 3 March 1763. In 1778 he entered the Petit Séminaire de Québec, and in the same year he was elected prefect of the Congrégation de la Bienheureuse-Vierge-Marie-Immaculée. On 11 March 1786 he was ordained a priest, and on 31 May 1792 he was appointed to the cure of Notre-Dame at Québec. In January 1806 Plessis was appointed bishop of Québec, and on 12 January 1819 he was elevated archbishop of Québec. He died on 4 December 1825 at Québec. See, *DCB*, VI, pp.586-599.
from 1797 to 1825 and from 1816 to 1825\textsuperscript{26}. Although it mainly deals with Newfoundland, the collection's letters of the first bishops, edited by the Newfoundland historian Cyril J. Byrne, can enlarge the framework of the Catholic Church in the North Atlantic area within the period that goes from the end of the eighteenth century until the beginning of the nineteenth century\textsuperscript{27}.

**Secondary sources**

It is not easy to fit the subject of this thesis into the spectrum of a defined scholarship. In fact we have to consider that analysis of missionary history in North America, as well as in other parts of the world, has been investigated through different approaches. It is possible, especially for missionary activity in North America, to identify two main historiographical lines, traced by the scholars of the history of Catholic Church and of the colonial period.

The topic of missionary activity in Canada has, through the years, been studied by different historians, thus developing an extensive scholarship. In the last decade of the twentieth century the missionary activity has been put into the broad context of the arrival of Christianity and developing of Catholic Church in North America. The works of Charles Lippy, Mark Noll, and Terrence Murphy\textsuperscript{28} provide a detailed pattern of the efforts, problems, and changes faced by the Catholic Church, and its members since the first geographic explorations until the end of the nineteenth century.


The scholarship on missionary activity in Canada has produced a good number of works on the experience of different orders, although most of them mainly seem to concentrate on the Jesuits’ apostolate, thanks to the studies of Thwaites and Campeau. The documents collected in the works of Thwaites and Campeau have been used by historians such as Louis Pelletier, Marcel Trudel, and Luca Codignola, in the last twenty years, to try to outline the number of the missionaries operating in Canada and Acadia/Nova Scotia. These recent attempts have improved on the previous studies of Cyprien Tanguay and Jean Baptiste Allaire, which were written between the end of the nineteenth century and the first years of the twentieth century.

In the same way as with the primary sources, we need to select the works that directly deal with Acadia/Nova Scotia. The four volumes published by the Centre d’études acadiennes of the Université de Moncton between 1976 and 1991, represent useful and accurate finding aids, through which it is possible to have a list of the books, articles and theses which deal with all aspects related to the Acadian region. The main studies, that can provide a general and useful overview of the development of the missionary activity in Acadia from the seventeenth century to the eighteenth

---


century, were written by Henry Casgrain and Angus Jonhston, respectively published in 1895 and 1973\textsuperscript{32}.

Another short survey on the missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia can be found in the book of Cyriaque Daigle that lists all the Catholic missionaries operating there from the beginning of the seventeenth century to the end of the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{33}. This work has to be considered a simple summary, mainly based on the studies of Tanguay and Allaire, full of errors and without even a minimal investigation of the available primary sources. More specifically the apostolate of the Capuchins, Jesuits and Recollets in Acadia/Nova Scotia has been investigated by few historians, through studies, that focus on definite periods and on a single order, thus never analysing the overall activity of these orders in a single work. Concerning the Capuchins, Candide de Nant, a historian of the order, has written the only monograph on the activity of this order in Acadia/Nova Scotia, but his work, published in 1927, only deals with the first half of the seventeenth century and lacks an updated bibliography\textsuperscript{34}. Little information on the Capuchins in Acadia/Nova Scotia can be found in the two works written by Pacifique de Valigny, another historian of the order, who based his investigation on the oldest churches present in this territory\textsuperscript{35}. Except for the monograph of Candide de Nant, the topic of the Capuchins’ activity in Acadia/Nova

---


\textsuperscript{34} Candide de Nant, OFM Cap, Pages glorieuses de l’épopeée canadienne. Une mission capucine en Acadie, (Gemblioux: Imprimerie J. Duculot, 1927).

\textsuperscript{35} Pacifique de Valigny, OFM Cap, Sainte-Anne au Cap-Breton, (Québec: Société géographie de Québec, 1924); Pacifique de Valigny, OFM Cap, Chroniques des plus anciennes églises de l’Acadie: Bathurst, Pabos et Ristigouche, Rivière Saint-Jean, Memramcook, (Montréal: L’Echo de Saint-François, 1944).
Scotia has been relegated to few pages, in short surveys, as in the case of the articles of Claude Allard, and Alexis de Barbezieux, or in the general overviews on the missionary history of the order, written by its historians, such as Cuthbert of Brighton, Melchiorre da Pobladura and Rocco da Cesinale. The analyses of Cuthbert of Brighton, Melchiorre da Pobladura and Rocco da Cesinale, even if they deal with the Acadian mission in few pages, hold a basic position within the scholarship of this order. In fact, through these works, we can have a detailed description of the creation of this order as well as the ideology that characterized it since its foundation.

The articles of Terrence Murphy, written respectively in 1981 and 1984, have been the most recent analysis, and have improved the scholarship on the Capuchins' activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia between the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century. Through the investigation of the primary sources preserved in the Archives of the Archdiocese of Québec and the Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Murphy has illuminated our understanding of the Capuchin apostolate in Halifax, as well as the relationships that existed between the archdiocese of Québec and the Catholic missionaries operating there. Comprehensive

---


and clear overviews of the situation of the Catholics in Canada and United States in the period between 1780 and 1820 have been made by Codignola, through his three articles, respectively published in 1988, 1989, and 1993\textsuperscript{39}.

Except for these articles the topic of the Capuchins' activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia in the eighteenth century has been relegated to few biographies on the Irish Catholic missionaries, as, in the works of Pacifique de Valigny, Cyril Byrne and Terrence Punch\textsuperscript{40}. Through these studies it is possible to have a pretty fair overview of the character of James Jones, the Capuchin superior of the mission in Acadia/Nova Scotia\textsuperscript{41}, as well as a precise biographical pattern of the Irish clergy operating in Halifax. More generally, the Capuchins' experience in North America, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has been scarcely analysed. In fact we have to remember that, excluding the work of Candide de Nant, there is just one more monograph on the activity of this order, Lawrence Vogel's study of the Capuchins in French Louisiana in the eighteenth century\textsuperscript{42}.

This lack of scholarship on the Capuchins in North America contrasts with that related to their missionary experience in Brazil in the first half of the seventeenth

---


\textsuperscript{41} James Jones was born in 1742 in Dunshaughlin, in the actual Republic of Ireland. He passed some time in the Capuchin convent of Bar-sur-Aube in France, and later on in the diocese of Cork. See, DCB, vol. V, pp.458-459.

\textsuperscript{42} Claude Lawrence Vogel, OFM Cap, The Capuchins in French Louisana (1722-1766), (New York, AMS Press, 1974).
century, that has been extensively analyzed thanks to the works left by Arsène de Paris, Claude d'Abbeville and Yves d'Evreux, three French missionaries, who operated there.

Another problem in the analysis of the Capuchins' missionary experience is that, there is only one biographical dictionary, published by the official library of the order in 1951. It can provide us the biographical references related to the lives of most of the known members, as well as a somewhat detailed census of the order in Europe, but it lacks an updated historical background.

The scholarship on the Recollets during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is more extensive than that on the Capuchins, providing a fair overview of the missionary pattern of this order in Canada and Acadia/Nova Scotia. The best recent reference work on the Recollets in Canada is the dictionary edited by Odoric-Marie Jouve, published in 1996, through which it is possible to have all the available

---


biographical references on all the missionaries, who operated in this country. In addition to this book, further biographical references can be found through the studies of the Franciscan historian Hugolin Lemay, who has been one of the most prolific authors on the missionary activity of this order in Canada. Other information on the Recollets’ experience in Acadia/Nova Scotia can be obtained by piecing together the works of Hervé Blais, Cornelius Jaenen, Pierre Trépanier, Léandre Poirier, Odoric-Marie Jouve, Andrew John Johnston, and Joseph d’Entremont.

As in the case of the Capuchins, the general works on the Recollets deal with the Acadian mission through brief surveys, but they are useful in order to understand the ideology and the philosophy of this order. Till now the best available overview is the work of Lazaro Iriarte, published in 1982, which explains the beginning and the

---

45 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique des Récollets.

conceptual framework of this order. The most recent analysis of the Recollets' activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia has been the work of Johnston, published in 1984, which investigates the religious history, from 1713 to 1758, of the fortress of Louisbourg. This work presents an inner investigation of the missionary pattern of Louisbourg, including a list of all the missionaries, who operated there from 1713 to 1758. Part of his analysis has been used in this thesis, and fitted into the broader context of missionary activity in all Acadia/Nova Scotia.

The scholarship on the Jesuits' apostolate in Acadia/Nova Scotia has suffered from the same lack of monographs that characterizes the experience of the Capuchins in this territory. The main specific study on the Jesuits' activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia, written by Antonio Dragon, does not present an accurate investigation on the topic, but it merely surveys their experience, through a selection of the relations collected by Thwaites.

However, the topic of the Jesuits' missionary activity in Canada has been the object of a great mass of studies, supported by the scholarship on the history of this order that, since the second half of twentieth century, has been progressively ameliorated and enriched. Almost all the general works which deal with the history of the Jesuits present a clear overview of the ideas and the aims that characterized this order since its foundation. Another survey, even if it only deals with the first half of the seventeenth century, is the work written by Elizabeth Jones, who has focused
on the relationships and the dissensions between the Jesuit missionaries and the French authorities, during the first period of the settlement in Acadia/Nova Scotia\textsuperscript{52}.

The historiography on the Jesuits in Canada has been part of a process that began in the second part of the nineteenth century, thanks to the works of Camille de Rochemonteix, Francis Parkman, Smith Goldwin, William Richard Harris, and Thomas Campbell, all of them focused, through the use of Thwaites’ \textit{Relations}, on the impact and the role played by these missionaries in the historical context of New France in the seventeenth century\textsuperscript{53}. All these works are characterised by a general approach, which has progressively been narrowed to specific investigations of one mission, as in the case of the Jesuit mission of Sainte-Marie, in Ontario. The evidence provided by archaeological studies on this site, has been analyzed in the works of Edward James, John Hayes, Wilfrid Jury, and Kenneth Kidd\textsuperscript{54}. This type of approach has also been used for the missionary area around Québec, as in case of the studies of Victor Huard and Dragon\textsuperscript{55}.

Since the 1970s, the topic of the Jesuits’ experience in Canada has been enriched by the approach of the ethnohistorians, such as Francis Jennings, Wilcomb Washburn, and James Axtell,\textsuperscript{56} who reevaluated the role and the values of the

\textsuperscript{52} Elizabeth Jones, \textit{Gentlemen and Jesuits. Quest for Glory and Adventure in the Early Days of New France}, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986).
\textsuperscript{56} Francis Jennings, \textit{The Invasion of America: Indians, Colonialism and the Cant of Conquest}, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975); Wilcomb E.Washburn, \textit{The Indian in America}, (New
Aboriginal people, based on comparative studies of native society. Also, historians such as Bruce Trigger and Kenneth Morrison have further reconsidered and revised the role of the Jesuit missionaries, focusing on the effects caused by their contact with the Aboriginal people and their culture. Ethnohistory has allowed historians to widen their understanding of the Jesuits' missionary pattern, and fit it into two main contexts, respectively represented by the interrelationships between the missionaries and the Aboriginal people and by the spread of the Christianity in North America. Both these contexts are present in the works of Alain Beaulieu, John Hopkins, John Steckley, Robert Conkling, François Gagnon, James Moore, Peter Goddard, Codignola and Allan Greer. Ethnohistory has also influenced the few works that deal with the missionaries' experience among the Aboriginal people of Acadia/Nova Scotia. The studies of Harald Prins, William Wicken, William Cronon and Katherine Brooks focus, in part, on the encounter between all the Catholic missionaries in Acadia/Nova Scotia, and the Mi'kmaq, as well as on the methodology used in order

---


to convert them. Wicken's analysis is the most recent work on the Mi'kmaq society, however only a brief part of it deals with missionary activity.

This issue has previously been investigated, through the broader work of John Webster Grant, who has focused his analysis on the encounter between the Aboriginal people and the missionaries in Canada from 1534 to the first decades of the twentieth century. The theme of the encounter needs to be fitted within the studies, that, in the last thirty years, have focused on the Mi'kmaq, and their relationships with the European colonists. The most comprehensive contributions to this issue have been written by John Lenhart, Jacques Crevel, Harold McGee, Leslie Upton, Frank Speck, Charles Martijn, Davis Stephen, Jennifer Reid and Daniel Paul. Other important contributions, beyond the Acadian region, are those of Cornelius Jaenen, Patricia Olive Dickason and Henry Warner Bowden that underline the conflictual and negative aspects of European settlement and evangelization upon the Aboriginal people of North America.

---


60 John Webster Grant, Moon of the Wintertime. Missionaries and the Indians of Canada in Encounters since 1534, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984).


The historiography on the Jesuits has also been approached from the point of view of the historical geographer, who, as in the case of Nellis Crouse, has emphasised the role and the contribution of this order in the process of geographical discovery of New France\(^{63}\). In the last ten years gender historians such as Eleanor Leacock, Karen Anderson and Naomi Griffiths, have focused their interest on how the aboriginal women faced the different values and conceptions the Jesuit missionaries held about marriage\(^{64}\).

A common denominator for the analysis of the apostolate of the Capuchins, Jesuits, and Recollets is that all these orders played a political role in the historical context of Acadia/Nova Scotia. This is a theme of extreme importance, especially if we consider the events, such as the Acadian deportation, that occurred in this territory during the eighteenth century. This issue has been part of a constant process of analysis that began to be investigated in the studies of Edmé François Rameau de Saint-Père and Francis Parkman in the second half of the nineteenth century. The scholarship on the role of the Catholic missionaries towards the Acadian deportation has been progressively improved by the works of John Bartlet Brebner, Micheline Dumont Johnson, and Geoffrey Plank\(^{65}\). The studies of Jaenen, Trudel and John Moir

---


deal in part with the role of the missionaries in Acadia/Nova Scotia, being respectively more focused on the broader pattern of the relationships between the Church and State in Canada and on the situation of the Catholic Church towards the British conquest.  

Also to be included in the scholarships on the missionary history of Acadia/Nova Scotia are works, which concentrate on specific parts of this territory. The studies of John Macmillan, Wilfrid Pineau and Michael Hennessey have focused on the historical process, through which the Catholic Church arrived and developed in Prince Edward Island.

Analysis of the missionary activity of the Capuchins, Jesuits and Recollets has to be related to the relationships that these orders were able to establish in Acadia/Nova Scotia with other orders of the Catholic Church. The scholarship on the other missionary orders in Acadia/Nova Scotia mainly consists of works that have examined the role of the priests of the Seminary of the Foreign Missions, and, in minor part, on the Sulpicians as well as the Spiritans. Another area of study

---


investigated by the historians of the Catholic Church in Acadia/Nova Scotia has been the analysis, through his letters, of the character and life of Edmund Burke, the first vicar apostolic of Acadia/Nova Scotia. The main historiographical problem related to this subject is the lack of an updated bibliography. In fact the only recent study on Burke is the M.A. thesis of Leonora Merrigan, that revised the works of Robert Stanser and Cornelius O'Brien, and both published in the nineteenth century.

Analysis of missionary activity has to be placed in the historical context of Acadia/Nova Scotia. Among the mass of studies, that have been written, we need to

---

the Spiritan Missionaries in Acadia and North America, 1732-1839, (Pittsburgh, Pa: Duquesne University Press, 1962)

69 Edmund Burke was born in 1753 in Maryborough, (the actual Portlaoghishe, in the Republic of Ireland). He was educated at the Université de Paris, being ordained in 1775 or 1776. After being active for more than ten years in the Country Kildare (in the Republic of Ireland), in 1786 he left for Québec, where he was appointed professor of philosophy and mathematics at the Séminaire de Québec. In 1791 he was appointed to the parishes of Saint-Pierre and Saint-Laurent on the Île d'Orléans, where he stayed until 1794. From 1795 to 1796 he was active in Upper Canada, more specifically at Fort Miamis (the actual Maumee city in Ohio). In 1801 he left Upper Canada for Halifax, having been appointed vicar general of Nova Scotia, under the control of the bishop of Québec. In 1815 he went to Rome in order to promote his request for creating a vicariate apostolic in Nova Scotia under the direct control of the Vatican. In 1816 he came back to Halifax, and his request went into effect in July 1817. On 5 July 1818 he was appointed, by bishop Duplessis, bishop of Sion and vicar apostolic of Nova Scotia. Burke died in Halifax on 29 November 1820. See, DCB, vol.V, pp.123-125.


select the works that in the last twenty years, have put this territory into the context of a North Atlantic History, thanks especially to the analyses of John Reid, Phillip Buckner, Griffiths, and Barry Moody. What is still lacking in the most of the works relating to the missionary history of Acadia/Nova Scotia is a complete and deep analysis of the biographical information on the missionaries, the exact place of their activity, and the real relationships they were able to establish with the Aboriginal people and the Protestants. We have also to underline that most of these works have been written by historians, who belonged to the same order of the missionaries, thus influencing their analysis with personal views linked to the inner perspectives of their orders. The scholarship on the experience of the Capuchins, Jesuits and Recollets in Acadia/Nova Scotia, does not analyze the possible network between these missionaries and Propaganda, thus ignoring a theme, that could improve the whole historiography. We have to consider that, since the beginning of the first geographic explorations, the Catholic Church has always played a fundamental role in the history of North America, and especially in Canada.

The main aim of this thesis is to try to fit the analysis of the missionary activity into the context of a possible and existing network between Europe and Canada, through which there was a flow of men and ideas that, till now, remains a very little known area, as has been underlined by Codignola. Before the end of the


Codignola, “Competing Networks”, p.539.
seventies, all the documentation, preserved in the main religious archives and libraries of Rome, was almost unknown to the Canadian historians, thus ignoring a huge documentary bulk that should represent the starting base for all the investigations related to the history of the Catholic Church in North America.

Another aim of this thesis is to understand the real position the missionaries had within the Catholic communities of Acadia/Nova Scotia, and how much influence they held on its inhabitants, trying to improve the scholarship, that, till now, has never completely enlightened this theme. We have to remember that, till the end of the 1970s, the topic of the missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia also suffered from a lack of interest and of specific contributions of regional scholars regarding the colonial period of this territory, being more interested in the economic issues related to the post-Confederation period.

The article of P. D. Clarke, presented in the autumn 2000 edition of Acadiensis, is a clear and broad synthesis of the problems that have affected Acadian scholarship vis-à-vis Maritime historiography. For Clarke, one of the main causes that, till the end of the 1980s, has kept regional scholars away from the analysis of Acadia, can be identified in their perception of this territory, that was seen as backward and monolithic. The scarce knowledge of the French language has constituted another important barrier, an obstacle, according to Clarke, that has to be imputed to the lack of cooperation between English-Canadian and French-Canadian historians. In fact we have to remind that, excluding the studies of Griffiths, Reid Buckner, and Moody the recent contributions to the Acadian history, have been made by francophone historians such as Michel Roy, Robert Rumilly, René Babineau,
Robert Savageau, Léopold Lanctôt, Nicolas Landry, and Maurice Basque. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, approaches to the Acadian region have been part of a process of change, through which this territory has acquired a key role in the new historiography of the Atlantic world. As Clarke has underlined at the end of his article, Acadian culture remains, till now, a relatively unexplored area.

Analysis of religious history in Acadia/Nova Scotia can be included in this unknown pattern, and be fitted into the new Maritime historiography.

---


Chapter II

The state of the missionary church in Acadia in the years 1654-1659

This chapter considers the state of the missionary activity in Acadia from 1654 till 1669. This period saw the end of the Capuchins' experience in Acadia, and, hence, the interruption of the network that had been established between Acadia and Propaganda. Between 1656, the final year of the Capuchins' apostolate, and 1670, neither Propaganda nor the French court made any efforts to introduce new missionaries to Acadia. From 1659 till 1662 only the Jesuits tried to carry on evangelical activity among the natives of northern Acadia, though with poor results. This chapter analyzes the aims of missionary activity in Acadia, throughout a period when this territory was left in a marginal position vis-à-vis the rest of New France.

In 1654 the missionary church in Acadia felt the effects of the Anglo-French dispute over this territory. This became evident throughout the period from mid-July till the beginning of September 1654, when an English expedition, led by Robert Sedgwick, conquered the French settlements of Fort Saint-Marie, Port-Royal, and

---

79 This expedition, approved by Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) was originally conceived to conquer the settlements of the Dutch colonists in North America. The expedition was the result of the consequences of the war between England and Netherlands, that began on 9 October 1651, date when the Navigation Act was promulgated. This act stated that all the goods coming from the English colonies had to be imported on ships of the same nationality. The Navigation Act was promulgated to combat Dutch commercial activities that had hindered, from 1620 to 1650, the commerce between the English traders and the North American colonies. See Jean Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763, synthèse historique", in L'Acadie des Maritimes. Études thématiques des débuts à nos jours, (Moncton, New Brunswick: Université de Moncton, 1993), p.8; John McCusker and Russell R. Menard, The Economy of British America, 1607-1789. With Supplementary Bibliography, 2nd edition, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991), p.47; Marcel Trudel, Histoire de la Nouvelle-France, vol.III/1, La seigneurie des Cent Associés, 1627-1663. Les Événements, (Montréal: Éditions Fides, 1979), p.89.


81 This settlement was located close to the mouth of the Saint-John River, in New Brunswick.
The weeks that followed the conquest recorded no more conflicts and the Anglo-French relationships seemed characterized by a relative tolerance towards each other.

The lack of conflicts as well as of persecutions against the French settlers seemed to favour the Capuchins\textsuperscript{33}, the only missionary order that, at the moment of Sedgwick's attack, was active in Acadia, where they had been present since 1632\textsuperscript{84}. However the treaty of capitulation of Port-Royal that was signed on 16 August 1654 revealed tensions between the missionaries and the English. The treaty allowed the Capuchins to stay at Port-Royal, although they had to remain from two to three miles away from the settlement. Moreover the English tried to encourage the missionaries to leave Acadia, granting those, who wanted to return to France, a passage on their ships\textsuperscript{85}.

The English conquest can be considered the culminating event that hastened the decay of the Capuchins' apostolate in Acadia. Since the death of the Capuchin leader Joseph de Paris in 1638\textsuperscript{86}, their activity had been conditioned by the inner struggles...
that affected the province of Paris, which had responsibility for the Acadian mission. The civil war that had developed after Isaac de Razilly's death (1635)\(^7\), by which all the Acadian territory was disputed by Charles de Menou d'Aulnay\(^8\) and Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour\(^9\) had been the second factor that influenced the overall Capuchin experience. This had been especially evident after 1650, when d'Aulnay (who had been supported by the Capuchins) died\(^9\). His death enabled Emmanuel Le Borgne\(^9\), a trader from La Rochelle and the main creditor of d'Aulnay, to claim his rights in Acadia. Consequently, in 1652 Le Borgne had sent a military expedition that seized Port-Royal as well as the settlements of La Hèbe\(^2\), Pentagouët, and Saint Pierre\(^3\). This expedition had soon had repercussions on missionary activity. In fact, during the same year, Le Borgne's men had imprisoned and, afterwards, expelled from Port-Royal two Capuchins\(^4\) and Jeanne de Brice (fl.1644-1652), the director of

---


\(^{9}\) Charles de Saint-Étienne de La Tour was born in 1593 at Saint Just, a small town that is located 40 kilometers far from Troyes, in the department of Champagne, zone that approximately corresponds to the department of Aube and Marne. He died in 1663 at Port-Royal. See ibidem, pp.20-21, 180.

\(^{9}\) Emmanuel Le Borgne was born about 1605, and he died on 20 July 1681. The dates regarding him found in the *DCB* are wrong. See John F. Bosher, "The Lyon and Bourdeaux Connections of Émmanuel Le Borgne (c1605-1681)"*, *Acadiensis*, vol.XXIII, no.1 (autumn 1993), pp.128-145; *DCB*, vol.I, pp.433.

\(^2\) The name of this settlement traced its origins to the homonymous river, that, today's, has been renamed La Have, and flows close to Halifax, in Nova Scotia.


\(^4\) The two Capuchins were Côme de Mantes and Gabriel de Joinville. See Ignace de Paris, OFM Cap, to Propaganda [shortened in PF], [1656], Archivio della Sacra Congregazione de "Propaganda Fide" [shortened in APF], Scritture Originali riferite nelle Congregazioni Generali [shortened in SOCG], vol.260, fol.39rv-43rv.
the native girls' college there. After this action, the situation had worsened, and six other Capuchins had decided to leave Acadia.\footnote{Of these six missionaries we know the names of Ignace de Paris, Pascal d'Auxerre, Didace de Liesse, and Félix de Troyes, (these two latters were lay-brothers). See Ignace de Paris, OFM Cap, to PF, [1656], APF, SOCQ, vol.260, fol.39rv-43r.}

Apparently, according to the relation presented, in 1656, to Propaganda by Ignace de Paris,\footnote{The information on this missionary is scarce. We know only that he died in 1662 in the convent of Saint-Honoré, in Paris. See Candide de Nant, OFM Cap, P
ages glorieuses de l'épopée canadienne. Une mission capucine en Acadie, (Gesbloue: Imprimerie J. Duculot, 1927), p.296.} one of the six missionaries who abandoned Port-Royal, Le Borgne's men had acted without a clear reason. However it is likely that the fact that the Capuchins had supported d'Aulnay that led Le Borgne to consider them as obstacles to eliminate. From the Capuchins' viewpoint, Le Borgne's expedition represented a more severe problem than the English conquest itself. Ignace de Paris' relation explicitly stated that “he and his confrères had decided to move away in order to have any contact with these sacrilegious and impure Christians”. Moreover the Capuchins clearly attributed to Le Borgne the main responsibility for the problems that affected Acadia.\footnote{Daigle, "Un pays qui n'est pas fait", in Atlantic Region to, pp.66-67; N. E. S. Griffiths, The Acadians: Creation of a People, (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, c1973), p.15.}

The English conquest opened a complex period that lasted until 1670, during which time, both the English and the French tried to assert their respective claims to Acadia. Nevertheless, the Anglo-Acadian relationships kept peaceful, and Acadian life underwent little changes.\footnote{Léonard de Chartres joined the Capuchin order in 1616, entering, as a novice, into the province of Paris. In 1649 he was appointed superior of the Acadian mission. See Lexicon Capuccinum, p.946; Candide de Nant, "Silhouettes de Missionaires. Le Père Léonard de Chartres", Extrait de la Nouvelle France, vol.X, no.7 (Juillet 1911), pp.316-323.} By contrast, relations between the missionaries and the English soon deteriorated. Indeed, according to Ignace de Paris’ relation, the only surviving record, in the second half of 1654, the English killed Léonard de Chartres, the Capuchins’ superior in Acadia,\footnote{Ignace de Paris. OFM Cap. A PF. [1656]. APF, SOCQ. vol.260. fol.39rv-43rv.} and subsequently decided to expel from Port-
Royal other three of his confrères. A similar action took place between the end of 1654 and the beginning of 1655, when Bernardin de Crépy was expelled from Pentagouët. Within the same period, another four Capuchins decided to leave the Acadian mission to return to France. Because Ignace de Paris’ relation is the only available primary source, it is difficult to establish and prove with precision the reasons that stood on the English decision to expell the missionaries. Another issue that arises from the analysis of the Capuchin mission was the scanty number of missionaries active in Acadia. In 1650, the Acadian mission counted of fifteen members, plus other two missionaries who probably operated in today’s state of Maine, a number that could appear modest by comparing with the state of the order in Europe, where, in the same year and according to the estimates found in the Lexicon Capuccinum, there were 47 provinces, which held 1,428 convents for a total of 21,840 Capuchins.

The events of 1655 essentially ended the Capuchin experience in Acadia. The English conquest and the scant interest shown by the main French authorities towards the fate of Acadia were two decisive elements in the Capuchins’ forced departure from this territory. The survival of the Acadian mission depended on the survival of the colony itself. This aspect was underlined in Ignace de Paris’ relation. According to him, the mission’s chances to continue mainly relied on the restitution of the three occupied settlements to the French. Though the French made
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100 The three expelled missionaries from Port-Royal were Yves de Paris, François-Marie de Paris, Jean de Troyes. With them also two lay-brothers were obliged to leave from this settlement. Instead the four Capuchins that decided to come back were Augustin de Pontoise, Balthazar de Paris, Elzéar de Saint-Florentin, and Félix de Reims (these latter were two lay-brothers). See Ignace de Paris, OFM Cap, to PF, [1656], APF, SOCG, vol.260, fol.39rv-43rv.
101 Codignola and Luigi Bruti Liberati, Storia del Canada. Dalle origini ai giorni nostri, (Milano: Bompiani, 1999), p.58. This work represents the most recent available analysis of the general history of Canada.
102 APF, Congregazioni Particolari, vol.6, fol.275rv, 277rv, 294rv, 296rv, [Propaganda], [Rome], [1650]; Lexicon Capuccinum, p.334.
diplomatic efforts to regain Acadia\textsuperscript{104}, the Capuchin’s suggestion clashed with the reality of a colony that, till that moment, had raised within the French court little interest due its small population and little access to exploitable natural resources\textsuperscript{105}.

Ignace de Paris’ pressing request to rescue the mission did not succeed in attracting the interest of Propaganda or that of the French court, which, in the spring of 1655, agreed to leave the question of the occupied settlement to the determination of a group of commissioners\textsuperscript{106}. In all of this matter the lack of interest both from the French court and Propaganda seems to be the most striking aspect to record. In fact it was the Roman ministry that, in 1630, had conceived, thanks to the information received from Simon Stock, an English Discalced Carmelite\textsuperscript{107}, the idea of, and afterwards exhorted the main Capuchin authorities to found, a mission in North America. Although it originally planned for an unspecified part of New England, the first Capuchin mission in Acadia had been the result of a precise strategy elaborated by Propaganda that aimed to counterbalance the Puritans’ activity\textsuperscript{108}. The French court had been supportive, and Cardinal Richelieu had granted to the Capuchins the revenues of one-fifth part of the rights and concession of the Company of New France\textsuperscript{109} to allow them to open schools for native children in Acadia\textsuperscript{110}.

\textsuperscript{105} Daigle, “Un pays qui n’est pas fait”, in Atlantic Region to, p.67.
\textsuperscript{106} Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, pp.136-137.
\textsuperscript{109} The Company of New France or Company of the Hundred Associates was founded in 1627 by Richelieu. See Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.49.
By 1656, missionary activity of Acadia came down to the efforts of the Capuchin Balthazar de Paris, who, with another unnamed confrère, had returned to Acadia. Lack of evidence makes difficult to know how long these missionaries stayed, or when they died. Though Ignace de Paris’ relation offers some clues related to their activity among the Aboriginal people. In order to achieve some permanent results, some missionaries had accepted to live and operate within the Abenaki and Mi’kmaw. With regards to this, Balthazar de Paris and Gabriel de Joinville appeared to be the Capuchins in obtaining the best result in terms of conversion and capacity to learn the natives’ language. More generally, the chances for a successful renewal of the Capuchins’ evangelical activity depended on the return of the oldest and most experienced missionaries, the only ones, according to Ignace de Paris, that “know the trails and speak the natives’ language”. In his efforts to gain the interest of Propaganda, Ignace de Paris underlined how “all the converted natives were lost if the heretics would have conquered all the Baie Française”\(^{111}\).

Both in Paris and in Rome the warnings of Ignace de Paris were ignored, as well. To renew the mission, the Capuchin even put forward the proposal to introduce his confrères in Acadia wearing the secular habit. In the early spring of 1657 this proposal was again supported, this time by Nicolas d’Amiens\(^{112}\), and Marco Antonio da Carpenedolo\(^{113}\), respectively the provincial of the Capuchins of Paris and the general procurator of the order. Although they asked to send missionaries to the general area of New France, it is almost sure that their attention was directed towards the Acadian mission. However both the two requests were rejected by the Roman
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\(^{111}\) Ignace de Paris, OFM Cap, to PF, [1656], APF, SOCG, vol.260, fol.39rv-43rv.

\(^{112}\) Of Nicolas d’Amiens, we just know that he was elected provincial of Paris in the years 1656, 1662, 1669 and 1674. See *Lexicon Capucinum*, p.1278.

\(^{113}\) Marco Antonio da Carpenedolo was born on 1599, and in 1616 joined the order. During his career he was lector, provincial and, from 1650 to 1662, general procurator. He died in Nice on 27 July 1665. See ibidem, p.1039.
ministry, according to which the Capuchins were not allowed to ask to go as missionaries to territories where they could not wear their regular habit. This refusal contradicted the decisions made in 1650. In that year, Propaganda had authorized two Capuchins, who wanted to extend their missionary range from Acadia to New England, to wear the secular habit. Nicolas d'Amiens and Marco Antonio da Carpenedolo's requests were the last attempts to revive the mission, the ending of which interrupted the missionary work in Acadia. According to the historian John Webster Grant, the end of the Capuchin mission in Acadia and the destruction, in 1650, of the Jesuit mission among the Hurons by the Iroquois represented the closure of the main missionary centres from which Christian influence had begun to radiate in the second quarter of the seventeenth century.

The missionary vacuum created in Acadia brought no reaction from Propaganda. Its main plans by then were shifting from conversion of Aboriginal people towards the needs of the European Catholic population of New France. This became more and more clear throughout the years 1656-1658 when the Roman

---

115 Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, p.155.
117 The first Jesuit mission within the Hurons was founded in 1634. See Codignola, Storia del Canada, pp.58-59.
ministry focused its interest on a project to establish a bishopric in Canada\textsuperscript{121}, which would be put under the direct authority of the Pope\textsuperscript{122}. During that period, this project, which was not new to the officials of Propaganda\textsuperscript{123}, kept on being discussed until the official appointment, on 6 May 1658, of François de Laval de Montmorency\textsuperscript{124} as bishop in partibus\textsuperscript{125} of Petrea and first apostolic vicar of Canada\textsuperscript{126}.

According to the Canadian historian Cornelius Jaenen, Laval’s appointment made the missionary church come of age\textsuperscript{127}. His appointment represented a turning point within the missionary and religious era of New France. The rising number of immigrants that, throughout the years 1650-1660, would have established along the St. Lawrence Valley progressively changed the structure of the church in New

\textsuperscript{121} The term Canada was used to define a territory between the village of Québec and Montréal. On the contrary the term New France identified all this area together with Acadia.


\textsuperscript{124} François de Laval de Montmorency was born at Montigny-sor-Avre, in the actual department of Maine. On 23 September 1645 he was ordained priest, and on 23 September 1653 was appointed Archdeacon of Evreux, in the department of Eure. He died at Québec on 6 May 1708. See Johnston, *History of Catholic Church*, I, pp.23-24.

\textsuperscript{125} The appointment of Laval as bishop in partibus and vicar apostolic corresponded to a specific requirements the Holy See had to face in the seventeenth century. Both the two terms meant the same meaning. In fact a vicar apostolic was also nominated bishop in partibus infidelium that is a diocese not active was assigned to him. Laval had so the title and the dignity of a bishop, although without having a diocese to administer. See Pizzorusso, *Roma nei Cariibi*, pp.287-288.


\textsuperscript{127} Jaenen, *The Role of the Church in New France*, p.21.
Prance. It began to set up on the French system, where the bishops, priests and members of the regular clergy usually administered the sacraments and celebrated mass.128

Acadia was excluded from all of this. Moreover, after 1656 and in spite of Ignace de Paris’ relation, the knowledge that the Holy See and Propaganda had on the Acadian mission was contradictory and unclear. In fact there was a belief that some Capuchins were still active there. The report that, between the end of 1657 and the beginning of 1658, Pope Alexander VII (Fabio Chigi, 1655-1667) sent to Celio Piccolomini, Archbishop of Cesarea and nuncio in France, to acquaint him about the overall state of the Catholic Church in New France, proves this. This document stated that 8 to 10 Capuchins, whose names were not indicated, were active in New France, together with 3 to 4 secular priests and 28 to 30 Jesuits129. The information related to the priests’ number was accurate in the case of the Jesuits as well as of the secular priests130, but not for the Capuchins, after Sedgwick’s conquest had brought an end to their activity.

It is difficult to verify who gave this information on New France to the Pope. What seems certain is that, besides Ignace de Paris’ relation, the Capuchins’ experience in Acadia raised little interest within the order itself. In fact, nothing about it, was written and published, contrasting with the success of the accounts

---

129 [Alexander VII, Pope], to, [Celio Piccolomini, archbishop of Cesarea, nuncio in France], [Rome], [1657-1658], APF, SOCQ, vol.317, fol.119rv, 126rv.
written by Claude d’Abbeville, Yves d’Evreux, and Arsène de Paris, all related to their missionary experience in Brazil. According to Luca Codignola, the silence that wrapped the Capuchins’ experience in Acadia can probably be imputed to two main reasons: that the information on this mission mostly circulated by word of mouth, and the lesser consideration the Acadian mission held compared to those in Asia, Middle East, and France itself.

The end of the Capuchins’ apostolate left Acadia without any regular missionary order. Not until 1785 did the Capuchins return there. Nevertheless, in 1659 the northern part of Acadia again recorded the presence of some Jesuit

---

131 Arsène de Paris entered the Capuchins’ order on 20 June 1599. In 1632 he was appointed superior of the first mission in Acadia. He died on 10 June 1645 in the convent of Saint-Honoré, in Paris. Claude d’Abbeville, in the world Firmin Fouillon, was born at Abbeville, in the department of Somme, in 1574. On 17 August 1593 he joined the order. From 1606 to 1607 he was the Father Guardian of the convent in his hometown. He died in the summer of 1616 at Forges. Yves d’Evreux, in the world Simon Michelet, was born in 1577 at Normanville, in the department of Eure. In 1595 he entered the order, and being ordained on 23 June 1598. In 1607 and 1611 he was respectively appointed Father Superior of the convent of Auxerre, in the department of Yonne, and Father Guardian of the convent of Monfort l’Amaury, in the department of Yvelines. After 1620 we have no more biographical information on this missionary. See Raoul de Sceaux, OFM Cap, Histoire des Frères Mineurs Capucins de la province de Paris (1601-1660), vol.I, (Blois: Éditions Notre-Dame de la Trinité, 1965), pp.295, 349, 416, vol.II, pp.387-388.


134 Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.57; Johnston, History of Catholic Church, I, p.112.
missionaries, the first regular order that, through the arrival in 1611 at Port-Royal of Pierre Biard and Enemond Massé, had been introduced in this territory.

The Jesuits' experience at Gaspé (1659-1662)

The northern part of Acadia was already known to the Jesuits. From 1629 till the summer of 1649, at least nineteen Jesuits had operated there, covering an area that went from today's Cape Breton to the Gaspé Peninsula, including Miscou Island. An anonymous letter, dated 16 October 1659, written from Québec and addressed to the superior of the Jesuit order in France, reported the presence of three missionaries in the northern part of Acadia. The three Jesuits were André Richard, Jacques Frémin, and Martin de Lyonne. Both Richard and de Lyonne had already operated in this area. In fact, from 1634 till 1644, Richard had
been active at fort Sainte-Anne\textsuperscript{142}, and fort Sainte Pierre. During that period, Richard had also spent one year, from 1642 until 1643, at Miscou. There he had been replaced by de Lyonne, who had operated on the island in the years 1646-47, as well as during the summer of 1649\textsuperscript{143}.

It is no wonder that the decision to resume missionary activity there was influenced by the fact that the English were still present in southern Acadia, as shown by the letter itself\textsuperscript{144}. Furthermore the northern part of Acadia seemed to enjoy a relative stability after Nicolas Denys\textsuperscript{145} was appointed by Louis XIV (1643-1715) in 1654 to be lieutenant-general over a territory that included the coasts and the islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence from Canso to Gaspé, as well as Newfoundland. Sedgwick's expedition had not touched Denys' possessions, thus allowing him to build a fort and trading-post at Chedabouctou\textsuperscript{146}.

The apparently quiet context of northern Acadia could play in favour of the Jesuits, whose main two aims were “laboring for the conversion of the Savages on that coast, and for the salvation of the French who are settled there”\textsuperscript{147}. The three Jesuits followed a pattern by which each of them took responsibility for a portion of northern Acadia. Frémin was active along the coasts of Rigibouctou\textsuperscript{148}, while Richard and de Lyonne worked, mainly within the areas of Cape-Breton and Chedabouctou\textsuperscript{149}.

Their task was challenging, especially if we consider the ratio that existed between their number and the breadth of the territory the missionaries had to serve.

\textsuperscript{142} The fort of Sainte-Anne was approximately located on the north-easterm mouth of the Bras d'Or Lake, in Nova Scotia.
\textsuperscript{143} Trudel, Histoire, III/1, pp.106-107.
\textsuperscript{144} JR, XLV, p.59.
\textsuperscript{145} Nicolas Denys was born in 1598, and he died in 1668. See DCB, I, p.256.
\textsuperscript{146} Today's town of Guysborough. See Johnston, History of Catholic Church, I, pp.20-21.
\textsuperscript{147} JR, XLV, p.59.
\textsuperscript{148} In today's province of New Brunswick.
\textsuperscript{149} JR, XLV, pp.61, 65; JR, XLVII, pp.62-65.
Furthermore the choice to operate in Acadia appeared to be less appealing to the Jesuits than the rest of the other missions of New France. In fact only de Lyonne and Richard were active there compared to their sixteen confrères, who, according to a catalogue sent in 1659 by the Society of Jesus to Propaganda, operated along the St. Lawrence River’s area. The catalogue emphasized the Jesuits’ missionary expansionism towards the interior of New France, which spread from the axis of the St. Lawrence River. This is shown by the fact that the four Jesuit residences—respectively Sillery, Trois-Rivières, Montréal, and Sainte-Marie-de-Gannentac—were established along an approximate line that went from the eastern to the western banks of the St. Lawrence River. More generally the catalogue of 1659 had an analogy with that regarding the Capuchins sent to Propaganda in 1650. In fact the Jesuits’ number in New France was small by comparison with the state of the order in Europe which, in the first half of the seventeenth century, could boast 15,544 priests. By that period the Jesuit evangelical activity had spread through continental Europe, Asia, and Central as well as South America. However the missions in New France held less importance than those in continental Europe, where the fight against the Protestant influence had clear priority.

Besides their scanty number, the letter of 1659 reaffirmed all the Jesuits’ difficulties in adapting to living and operating within an Aboriginal milieu. This is shown by the fact that the physical conditions of Frémin, who had spent all the winter of 1658-59 with the Mi’kmaq at Rigibouctou, were very bad, due to famine.

\[150\] Kennedy, Jesuit and Savage, p.38.
\[151\] In today’s province of Ontario.
\[152\] [Society of Jesus], to, [PF], [1659], [Rome], APF, Miscellaneous diverse, vol.20, fol.100rv-106rv.
\[154\] The Jesuits active in continental Europe were 381. Outside continental Europe and besides New France, the Jesuits were thus divided: 154 in England, 62 in Paraguay, 59 each in Mexico and Goa, 43 in Peru and Nueva Granada, 39 in Malabar, 34 in Brazil, 19 in Ireland, 18 in the Philippines, and China, 16 in Syria and Greece, 15 in Japan, 14 in the French West Indies, 12 in Chili, and 9 in Scotland. See Codignola, “Competing Network”, pp.551-552.
and scurvy\textsuperscript{155}, two problems already experienced by his confrères when they had operated among the Hurons. Despite these problems also applied to other missionaries operating in New France, the Jesuits seemed to suffer more from the hard living conditions due to the fact that they came from the elite classes of the French society\textsuperscript{156}.

With regards to their evangelical activity in northern Acadia, the Jesuits achieved varying results. In fact, Frémin was able to convert two natives, respectively a girl and a man, named Redoumanat, who both suffered from hard physical pains at the moment of conversion. According to the letter of 1659, it was Redoumanat that approached the Jesuit and expressly said: "Thou, who hast made everything, they say that everything obeys thee I will believe it, provided that my trouble that has not been willing to listen to the voice of our Demons, will listen to thine. If it obey thee when thou shalt drive it from my body, I promise thee to obey the, myself, and to love the prayer". Apparently the conversion had positive effects on the native, who, promptly quit drinking, considered by the missionary as the "Great Demon" that affected the natives\textsuperscript{157}.

There is a sense in which any understanding of the natives' conversion and their acceptance of Christianity remains difficult to define, because they are part of a personal experience\textsuperscript{158}. Moreover, as the Canadian historian William Wicken has pointed out, the lack of Mi'kmaq sources prevents us from knowing what the natives really thought of the missionaries, forcing historians to rely on European written

\textsuperscript{155} \textit{JR}, XLV, p.59.


\textsuperscript{157} \textit{JR}, XLV, pp.61-63.

\textsuperscript{158} Codignola, \textit{Storia del Canada}, p.65.
records. It is likely that Redoumanat’s conversion was prompted by a desire to find in Christianity a new source of spiritual strength that could protect him from the epidemics caused by the contact with the Europeans. These epidemics were incomprehensible to the Mi’kmaq, so that they began to lose faith in their customary means of curing illnesses. This led the sick natives to ask to be baptized, thus believing that this sacrament could cure their soul as well as their body. However, on the other hand, we have also to consider that Redoumanat, as other natives, conscientiously accepted Christianity, trying to blend it with his own spirituality and structures of his traditional faith.

The fact of being more resistant to the epidemics favoured the Jesuits, who came to be identified by the Mi’kmaq as “white sorcerers”. The Jesuits gradually took the place of Mi’kmaq shamans that seemed powerless vis-à-vis the immunity acquired by the missionaries. Although the effects of the spread of Christianity could vary from place to place and from person to person, the ceremonies as well as the religious objects used by the missionaries influenced the life of the Mi’kmaq. This especially occurred when the Mi’kmaq combated attacks interpreted as the work of evil demons. The letter of 1659 highlights this aspect. In fact it stated that, on one occasion in Cape Breton, some Mi’kmaq tried to free one of their members, named Capisto, from violent convulsions through the use of sacred images, rosaries and crosses. This favoured the Jesuits, who, as in their other missions of New France,

162 Axtell, The Invasion Within, p.123; Prins, The Mi’kmaq, pp.71-72
163 Axtell, The Invasion Within, p.285; Codignola, Storia del Canada, pp.65-66; Prins, The Mi’kmaq, pp.71-72, 82.
165 Grant, Moon of Wintertime, p.43.
166 JR, XLV, pp.63-65.
had been able to substitute the traditional native amulets, like wampum belts and medicine sticks, with traditional Christian amulets such as crucifixes or rosaries.\textsuperscript{167}

The Jesuits’ perception of the Mi’kmaq was somewhat changed from 1611. In fact at that time, Biard had clearly declared that “The nation is savage, wandering, and full of bad habits; the people are few and isolated. They are, I say, savage, hunting the woods, ignorant, lawless and rude.”\textsuperscript{168} Compared to Biard’s comments, the letter of 1659 presented no criticisms of this kind towards the Mi’kmaq. This could be seen as part of the new Jesuits’ missionary policy. In fact, in 1622, the Society of Jesus had adopted, on behalf of Propaganda’s recommendation, the Doctrine of Adaptivity, that stated that the missionaries were not allowed to blame nor attack the Aboriginal customs, and were to avoid any comparison with those of Europe. The missionaries had to “do your utmost to adapt yourselves to them.”\textsuperscript{169}

In spite of the small number of missionaries present, the Jesuits’ efforts in northern Acadia did not pass unnoticed. Bishop Laval, who had arrived at Québec, in June of 1659\textsuperscript{170}, came to visit Acadia, passing through the Gaspé peninsula. The information on this visit is sketchy, so that it makes difficult to know which of the Jesuit missions Laval visited. What is clear is that he gave the sacrament of confirmation to 140 people.\textsuperscript{171}

Through the years 1659-61, Jesuit activity in northern Acadia was affected by the death of missionaries. During that period no new missionaries arrived in northern Acadia. On the contrary, by the time of the letter of 1659, Frémin had already left, the mission for Québec, probably at the beginning of the summer. From there, in the

\textsuperscript{167} Axtell, \textit{The Invasion Within}, p.112.
\textsuperscript{168} JR, I, pp.173, 183.
\textsuperscript{169} Mitchell, \textit{The Jesuits}, p.145.
\textsuperscript{170} Johnston, \textit{History of Catholic Church}, I, p.23.
\textsuperscript{171} JR, XLV, pp.71-73.
mounth of August, he had embarked to return to France. Matters got worse at the beginning of 1661 when de Lyonne was mentioned as the sole missionary operating in the area of Chedabouctou. Despite the lack of other missionaries who could have supported him, the Jesuit tried to devote himself to the spiritual assistance of sick natives. An unspecified but contagious disease that affected the natives soon infected de Lyonne, who, nevertheless, kept up his activity. Richard's health conditions definitively worsened when the missionary fell into a frozen brook. He then contracted influenza, and, already weakened by the disease, died, on 16 January 1661.

After de Lyonne's death, Richard remained the only missionary to operate within northern Acadia. Although he was without any support, the Jesuit continued to carry on the evangelical activity among the Mi'kmaq, and was able to baptize 30 of them. Ironically the news related to the conversions made by Richard came from a letter, dated 13 December 1661, that André Castillon, the Jesuit provincial of Paris, sent to Propaganda, the congregation to which, throughout all the first half of the seventeenth century, the Society of Jesus had been opposed. Propaganda was also aware of de Lyonne's death, through the report, dated 21 October 1661, that Laval addressed to Alexander VII.

Both these two reports helped to keep Propaganda, at least partially, aware of missionary activity in Acadia in a period during which, after the end of the Capuchin mission, most of the Roman ministry's sources on North America progressively

---

172 Frémin returned to Québec in the month of July of 1660. He died there on 20 July 1691. See JR, XLV, pp.107, 157; LXXI, p.148; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.182.
174 It is probable that Castillon had been informed by Jérôme Lalemant, the Jesuits'superior at Québec. See André Castillon, SJ, provincial of Paris, to, [PF], 13 December 1661, Paris, APF, SOCG, vol.202, fol.87rv-88rv; Codignola, “Competing Network”, p.554.
175 François de Laval, bishop of Petrea, vicar apostolic in Canada, to, [PF], 21 October 1661, Québec, APF, SOCG, vol.256, fol.25rv-26rv.
began to dry up. However the way in which the report related to Mi'kmaq conversion had been written raised criticisms at Rome. The document did not specify how Richard had converted the natives, nor if he had been supported by confrères. This met with Propaganda's disapproval, when in General Congregation held on 28 February 1662, it specifically discussed the letter of Castillon. The decision taken by the Roman ministry was that Gian Paolo Oliva, the Jesuits' General, was to be notified that fuller information on the state of religion would have been welcomed by Propaganda.

However Propaganda's warning brought little result. In fact, at the beginning of December 1662, the Roman ministry received another letter from Castillon on the state of the Jesuits' mission in northern Acadia. Compared to the report received the previous year, this one was even more cursory, and simply stated that, at Miscou, a Jesuit, whose name was not cited, had baptized over 50 natives, although several of them had died immediately after the conversion. For its part, Propaganda made no comments. In fact the Roman ministry recorded, as usual, the information received, and, on 23 January 1663, answered Castillon, thanking him for his letter.

That 50 baptized natives had quickly died offers a clue to the Jesuits' conversion policy. As it has been pointed out by the James Axtell, the Jesuits who operated in New France refused to administer mass baptisms as, on the contrary, did the Dominicans or the Augustinians in South America. This had been evident in 1611 when Biard and Massé had severely criticized the behaviour of the secular

---

177 Gian Paolo Oliva was born in Genova, in the Italian region of Liguria, in 1600. In 1664 he was appointed General of the Jesuits. He died in Rome in 1681. See François Xavier De Feller, Biographie Universelle ou dictionnaire historique des hommes qui se sont fait un nom, par leur génie, leurs talents, leurs vertus, leurs erreurs, ou leurs crimes, vol.IX, (Paris: Gauthier et Cie, 1834), p.258.
priest Jessé Fléché (fl.1610-1611), who, from 1610 till 1611, had baptized more than 141 Mi'kmaq without the least instruction in Christian fundamentals. The Jesuits had refused to act in this way, and had decided that the natives should be converted after having received an adequate religious instruction. In all of this the Jesuits' activity within the Mi'kmaq presented the same analogies with that carried out by their confrères within the Hurons. In fact the sacrament of baptism was readily administered to the natives, who, though they had not been instructed, were in danger of suffering pagan deaths.\footnote{181}

Although Castillon's letter made no mention of Richard, we can assume that the missionary cited was him. What seems certain in Castillon's letter is the itinerant character of the Jesuits' apostolate within the Mi'kmaq.\footnote{182} Richard's decision to move from Cape Breton, where he had first operated, created a necessity to stay in a mission that could attract a greater number of natives. Miscou seemed to have this peculiarity, in fact it was described, according to the anonymous writer of the letter of 1659, as "the most populous and the best disposed, and contains most Christians. It comprimes the Savages of Gaspé, of Miramichi, and of Nepigouit."\footnote{183} Moreover Miscou, besides being a mission, was a trading station, where, during their seasonal meetings, the Mi'kmaq met with the French traders to barter furs. The missionaries took advantage of these meetings, so that they could be in contact with the natives who gathered around the trading posts.\footnote{184}

When Propaganda discussed the letter sent by Castillon, Richard's apostolate had already been concluded. According to information found in the Jesuit Relations,
during the winter of 1661-62 Richard had taken part in one of the regular expeditions that, since the 1630s, the Mi'kmaq used to lead in the Gulf of St. Lawrence against the Inuit. During one of these expeditions, the Mi'kmaq captured an Inuit boy, after having killed all his family. Richard was able to baptize the boy, and, afterwards, free him. It is likely that the Jesuit asked for the boy’s liberation to avoid him further pains, due to the fact that he had been wounded. Richard’s successful effort to free the boy was quite surprising, if we consider the fact that the Mi'kmaq practice of taking prisoners, especially the children and women, was a specific way to remedy the losses suffered by their society.

The apostolate of Richard in northern Acadia ended in 1662, although we have no information during which month the Jesuit left this territory. What is sure is that, together with the Inuit boy, he returned to Québec, where they embarked to come back to France. Once in France, the native was put into the Jesuit college of Clermont, where, according to Richard’s observations, “he makes it evident that our little Canadians have hardly less intelligence than our little French boys. He is of a very pliant and docile disposition.” Richard’s comments on the apparent good disposition of the Inuit boy towards his introduction to a completely different milieu were again a reflection of the effects the Catholicism provoked on the natives. As it has been explained before the conversion was a personal experience and its effects were different from one person to another. After conversion, some became fervent Christians, while many approached the Catholic faith only at the point of death in order to have assurance of a future life.

---

183 JR, XLVII, pp.221-233; Prins, The Mi’kmaq, p.112.
184 JR, XLVII, pp.233-239.
185 Upton, Micmacs and colonists, p.9.
186 In the department of Oise.
188 Grant, Moon of Wintertime, p.43.
In 1663 Richard came back to New France. The Jesuit would have but returned to northern Acadia in 1675, although for a brief period. Due the absence of priests, the mission was at an end. However, the lack of missionaries was not the main cause that determined the end of the Jesuits’ experience in northern Acadia. In fact, at the beginning of the 1660s, many Mi’kmaq underwent the degenerative effects of alcohol that was supplied to them by merchants and fishermen. A consequence of it was that the Mi’kmaq lost interest in the missionaries’ preaching. The Jesuits found no possible remedies to face this situation, and realized, according to Denys’ opinion, that “there was nothing more to be done with these people, whom the frequentation of the ships kept in perpetual drunkenness”.

The transition years (1662-1669)

In 1662, the echoes of the Capuchin mission in Acadia still had not faded away. On 10 June 1662, Basile de Paris, the provincial of Paris, reported to Propaganda that his confrères were still active in Acadia. After almost a month, in the General Congregation held on 17 July 1662, Propaganda discussed this report, but had no comment.

There are no further primary sources through which we can investigate the reasons that led Basile de Paris to write to Propaganda about a mission concluded six years before. It is likely that he was unaware of the expedition of Sedgwick.
especially if we consider that, concerning the restitution of the occupied settlements,
the situation had not changed since 1656. In the summer of 1663 Louis XIV
entrusted the Comte de Commenges, his ambassador at London to enter into
negotiations with Charles II (1660-1685), the English king, to regain the settlements.
The French affirmed that Acadia had always been held by them, but negotiations
stalled, thus leaving unsolved the Acadian question at least until the Treaty of
Breda.¹⁹⁶

The years from 1663 to 1669 represented, for New France, a period of great
political and social change that also had effects on the pattern of the Catholic Church.
In 1663 the Compagnie des Cent-Associés¹⁹⁷ was closed by Louis XIV, who
assumed the direct control of the colony¹⁹⁸. According to the crown’s new
perspective, Laval had to become the religious representative of the French crown in
New France. More specifically the Church in New France became an extension of
the Gallican Church.

These changes directly affected Propaganda relationships with North
America. In fact since the end of the Capuchin mission the Roman ministry had
received fewer and fewer detailed reports on missionary activity as well as on the
natives’ conversion, which had now assumed diminishing importance¹⁹⁹.
Propaganda’s relationships with Laval can be considered a clear example of these
changes. It was only in the summer of 1663 that the Roman ministry thanked Laval
for his report of 21 October 1661. This document presented neither comment nor

¹⁹⁶ Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, p.147.
¹⁹⁷ The Compagnie des Cent-Associés was a trading association of the French mercantile marine, that
was officially founded on 29 April 1627 by the Armand Jean Du Plessis, cardinal of Richelieu (1585-
1642). This trading association received the dominion, included the justice’s administration, of New
France. Richelieu also granted to this trading association the monopoly of the commerce and the fur-
trade. From its part, the Compagnie des Cent-Associés engaged itself to settle, within a period of 15
years, 4000 colonists, who had to be French and Catholics. See Archives des Colonies, Série C11A,
¹⁹⁸ Codignola, Storia del Canada, pp.81-82; Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, p.144.
possible suggestions about the natives’ conversion\textsuperscript{200}. This lack of precise information related to the missionary activity vis-à-vis the natives continued to characterize Laval’s correspondence with Propaganda. During the summer of 1663 Laval sent to Propaganda a general report on the state of Catholicism in New France. In it the bishop of Québec only cited Acadia, and a list of places, mainly located along the St. Lawrence River, although without describing them. Moreover he limited himself to affirming, that the land was fertile, and to underlining that there were no heretics and no relationship was maintained with the English\textsuperscript{201}.

In 1663 the royal reform of New France began to take shape. The marquis Alexandre de Prouville de Tracy\textsuperscript{202} became Lieutenant General of the French colonies in North and South America as well as in the Antilles. One of his duties was to control the authority and the power of the clergy\textsuperscript{203}. Tracy’s appointment was part of a precise strategy of the French crown that aimed to reduce the Jesuits’ authority. This is shown by a mémoire written, in 1664, by Jean Baptiste Colbert (1619-1683), the chief minister\textsuperscript{204}, and addressed to Tracy. Colbert underlined how, in Canada, the Jesuits held much authority, and how Laval was devoted to them\textsuperscript{205}. Colbert’s opinion on the authority held by the Jesuits was well-grounded. Since 1647, the superior of the Jesuits had been part of the council that administered the colony’s government\textsuperscript{206}. This council held specific and general powers in the realms of

\textsuperscript{200} François de Laval, bishop of Petrea, vicar apostolic in Canada, to, [PF], 18 August 1663, [Rome], APF, Lettre, vol.45, fol.128rv.
\textsuperscript{201} Besides Acadia, the places mentioned were: Percé, Tadoussac, Québec, Trois-Rivières, Montréal, Beauvire, Beaufort, Notre-Dame des Anges, Sainte-Genéviève, Saint-Jean, Saint-François-Xavier, Sillery, Cap-Rouge, Coulouge, and Île d’Orléans. See François de Laval, bishop of Petrea, vicar apostolic in Canada, to, [PF], [26 August 1664], [Québec], APF, SOCG, vol.256, fol.21rv-24rv.
\textsuperscript{202} Alexandre de Prouville de Tracy was born in 1596 (or 1603), and he died in 1670 in Paris. See DCB, I, p.554
\textsuperscript{203} Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.93.
\textsuperscript{204} Colbert replaced the cardinal Jules Mazarin (1602-1661) in 1661.
\textsuperscript{205} Jean-Baptiste Colbert, to, Tracy, 1664, France, Archives des Colonies [shortened in AC], C11A, Correspondance générale, Canada, vol.2, fol.99-105.
\textsuperscript{206} Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.93.
commerce, police, and war. It is no wonder that, due their position within the
council, the Jesuits had a strong influence over the commercial elite of New
France\textsuperscript{207}. More generally, throughout the years 1632-1657, the Society of Jesus had
enjoyed an almost complete control over the Canadian Church\textsuperscript{208}.

Acadia was excluded from all this, and no plans were conceived to introduce
new missionaries. After Richard's departure only the isolated effort of Pierre
Raffeix\textsuperscript{209} seemed to revive the Jesuits' missionary experience there. However this
Jesuit did no more than reside on Percé Island during the winter of 1666-67, and left
no trace of a permanent mission\textsuperscript{210}.

Three elements played against the Jesuits' return in Acadia. The first was the
difficulty of conducting Anglo-French negotiations over the fate of the region\textsuperscript{211}. The
decline of the fur trade that happened in the second half of the seventeenth century is
the second element to consider for understanding the Jesuits' removal from the
Mi'kmaq after 1662. A good part of their activity among the Mi'kmaq relied on
seasonal meetings that happened each spring and summer, between the French
traders and the natives. The Jesuits were not excluded from the fur trade. In fact they
had a warehouse at Sillery, where they kept the furs till their shipment to France\textsuperscript{212}.

Colbert's policy to try to concentrate all the commercial and human activities along
the St. Lawrence River\textsuperscript{213}, linked to the progressive commercial indifference of the

\textsuperscript{207} Jansen, The Role of the Church, p.43.
\textsuperscript{208} Codignola, "Competing Network", p.553.
\textsuperscript{209} Pierre Raffeix was born at Clermont-Ferrand, in the department of Puy-de-Dôme, on 15 January
1635. He joined the Jesuits on 23 March 1653, and in 1663 he was ordained. He died at Québec on 29
August 1724. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.189.
\textsuperscript{210} JR, XLVII, p.320, note nr 28; JR, L, p.217.
\textsuperscript{211} Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, p.147
\textsuperscript{212} Prins, The Mi'kmaq, p.77.
\textsuperscript{213} Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.86.
French traders towards the Mi'kmaq, can be seen as the third element that stood on the Jesuits' removal from these natives.\(^{214}\)

In 1667 the situation in Acadia seemed to turn in favour of France. In fact, on 16 June 1667, the English and the French signed the Treaty of Breda, which provided for the return of the occupied settlements in Acadia to the French authority. After some delay, the occupied settlements were returned in 1670 to the French.\(^{215}\) The Treaty of Breda opened the way to the birth of some projects, conceived by the French colonial authorities, related to the economic, religious, and social reorganization of Acadia. In 1667 Tracy proposed leaving to the Jesuits all the area along the St. Lawrence River, including Percé Island. Regarding Acadia, Tracy suggested to oblige the Sulpicians\(^{216}\) to send some priests there.\(^{217}\)

Tracy’s proposals remained as such, clashing with some specific problems that affected the reality of the Catholic Church in Canada. In fact, in the same year, Jean Talon, the intendant of New France from 1665-68, and from 1670 till 1672,\(^{218}\) wrote a mémoire on the state of Canada. In the part related to religion, the intendant underlined how some ecclesiastics, whose names were not specified, had more interest in temporal matters than in those spiritual, thus abusing of their authority. According to Talon, one possible remedy was to send back to France one or two of these ecclesiastics. In his opinion, they could be replaced with the introduction of

---

\(^{214}\) Prins, *The Mi'kmaq*, p.77.
\(^{215}\) Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in *L'Acadie des Maritimes*, p.9; Reid, *Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland*, pp.155-156.
\(^{216}\) The Sulpicians were secular priests, who belonged to the Compagnie de Saint-Sulpice, that was founded, in 1641, by the Parisian Priest Jean-Jacques Olier. They arrived in Canada in 1657, and their main task was to establish a seminary. See Codignola, “Competing Network”, p.555; Trudel, *Histoire*, III/1, pp.355-362.
\(^{218}\) Jean Talon was born at Châlons-sur-Marne, and was baptized on 8 January 1626. He died in France in November 1694. See *DCB*, I, p.614.
four new ecclesiastics from France, choosing them among the laymen or the regular clergy\textsuperscript{219}.

The proposal of Talon was received by Louis XIV, who, on 15 May 1699, decided to write to Germain Allart\textsuperscript{220}, the Recollet\textsuperscript{221} provincial of Saint-Denys\textsuperscript{222}, asking him to send some missionaries to New France, who could take care of the spiritual needs of the French colonists\textsuperscript{223}.

In his letter, Louis XIV justified his request in terms of spiritual assistance. There was, however, another agenda. In a letter to Talon of 18 May 1669, the King exhorted the intendant to cooperate with Laval and the Jesuits, while also trying to limit their ecclesiastical authority. With regard to this, Louis XIV said that both the Recollets and the Sulpicians could serve to moderate the Jesuits’ authority. The king also mentioned the previous missionary experience of the Recollets in New France, and their warm welcome by the population\textsuperscript{224}.

As Louis XIV reported in his letter, the Recollets had already been in New France. More precisely, they had arrived in Canada in 1615, remaining there till


\textsuperscript{220} Germain Allart, baptized Théodore, was born at Sézanne in 1618. On 22 February 1637 he joined the order, entering the Recollet province of Saint-Denis. In June 1681 he was appointed bishop of Venice, in the department of Alpes-Maritimes, where he died on 4 December 1685. See Jouve Odoric-Marie, OFM Rec, Archange Godbout, Hervé Blais, and René Bacon, Dictionnaire biographique des Récollets missionnaires en Nouvelle-France, 1615-1645 – 1670-1849, (Montréal: Belarmin, 1996), pp.7-9.

\textsuperscript{221} The Recollets, as the Capuchins, were a branch of the Franciscan order. Their origins can be traced back to the second half of the fifteenth century, when John de la Puebla (d.1495) founded the retiros, convents based on the eremitical life and strict observance of the rule of St. Francis of Assisi, the founder of the Franciscan order. Soon afterwards the retiros came to be identified as a religious order. In the sixteenth century the retiros left Spain to establish themselves in France. In 1595 the Recollet order was founded, and the first statutes for the Recollets of France and Belgium were issued. In 1612 were created the Recollet provinces of France, respectively the province of Saint-Denis, the province of Saint-Bernardin, in Provence, and that of Saint-Antoine, in Artois. See Lazaro Iriarte, OFM Cap, Franciscan History. The Three Orders of St. Francis, (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press), 1982, pp.172-173, 180-181; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.XX.

\textsuperscript{222} The provincial of Saint-Denis was that of Paris.


\textsuperscript{224} Louis XIV, to Talon, 18 May 1669, AC, C11A, vol.3, fol.39-41rv.
1629. From 1615 to 1629, eighteen Recollets had operated in Canada. These missionaries had also been active in Acadia in two different periods, respectively from 1619 to 1624, and from 1630 to 1645. The first Recollet mission in Acadia had recorded the presence of four Recollets, while six missionaries had participated to the second one\(^{225}\). At a distance of forty-one years and twenty-five years, respectively from their apostolate in Canada and Acadia, the Recollets came back to New France for a new missionary experience.

**Conclusions**

The years 1654-1669 represented the end of the first missionary era in Acadia. Sedgwick’s expedition and the abrupt departure of the Capuchins cut off all the links this territory had from the rest of the church in New France, but especially with Rome.

The Jesuits’ apostolate in northern Acadia can be considered the last attempt to continue a type of missionary activity whose main priority was the natives’ conversion. However, since the beginning of their apostolate, the Jesuits had to face evident limits that precluded any chances of establishing a long-term activity. The mission was mainly affected by the absence of a missionary network with Québec that could have guaranteed an adequate number of priests vis-à-vis the extent of the territory served. It is almost certain that the English conquest and the scant

\(^{225}\) The Recollets active in the period from 1615 to 1629 were: Boursier Daniel, Dolbeau, Jean, Duplessis Pacifique, Galleran Guillaume, Girard de Binville François, Guines Modeste, Huet Paul, Jamet Denis, Langlois Xavier Charles, La Bresle Bonaventure de, La Roche d’Aillon, Jean-Joseph de Le Baillif, Georges Le Caron Joseph, Mohier Gervais, Piat Irénée, Pouillan Guillaume, Sagard Gabriel, Viel Nicolas. The Recollets active in the first Acadian mission were: Cardon Jacques, Fontiner Louis, La Foyer Jacques de, Sébastien Joseph. The following missionaries took part at the second Acadian mission: Bigot Nicolas, Dulong François, Ronsand André. There were also three other missionaries, but there is no available information on their names. See Codignola, “Competing Network”, pp.544-545, 557, 572-573, 578.
population of Acadia made this territory appear as a wasteland, where any missionary effort was vain.

Ignace de Paris' relation and the few Jesuit reports were among the last pieces of information that Propaganda would have received on Acadia. Laval's appointment engaged all the interest of the Roman ministry, so that no strategies were elaborated to introduce new missionary orders. Although the Roman ministry could be informed about it, the Jesuits' apostolate in northern Acadia independently developed without Propaganda's support. Moreover Laval's election had a double impact on Propaganda's relationships with North America. If from one perspective, Laval's appointment helped to create the first bishopric in New France, on the other hand all the religious matters would have passed into the hands of the Gallican church.

Due to this, the missionary pattern of Acadia was associated with the problems and the fate of the colony, and, consequently, underwent the effects to be relegated to a marginal condition vis-à-vis the St. Lawrence Valley's area. Another effect of the Gallican church on Acadia, and generally over all New France, was that the missionary strategies would no longer be conceived in Rome, but in Paris, where the economic interest of the colony was more important than the religious.
Chapter III
The return of the Recollets to New France (1670-1672)

The third chapter focuses on missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia from 1670 till 1710, the year of the British conquest of Annapolis Royal. For the sake of clarity it can be divided in two parts: the first, from 1670 till 1686, and the second from 1686 till 1710. The first part especially deals with the apostolate of Chrestien Le Clercq, which can be seen as the last evangelical experience, whose priority was to spread, and, afterwards, maintain, the Catholic faith among the natives. The second part considers the repercussions that Anglo-French conflict in North America had on the missionaries operating in Acadia/Nova Scotia. Moreover it shows how the missionaries' apostolate progressively lost its evangelical features in favour of supporting the political interests of the French authorities.

Although by the spring of 1670, the Recollets had not yet arrived in New France, the conditions for their return were being defined. On 4 April 1670, Louis XIV wrote to Germain Allart and François de Laval de Montmorency. The King respectively asked Allart to leave, with other four of his confrères, for Canada, while Bishop Laval was to support the Recollets, once they had arrived there\textsuperscript{226}. In mid-August 1670, Allart, with five of his confrères, arrived in Canada to begin the new Recollets mission. The missionaries who accompanied the provincial of Paris were: Gabriel de la Ribourde, Hilarion Guénin, Simple Landon, the deacon Luc François, and the lay brother Anselme Bardou\textsuperscript{227}.


\textsuperscript{227}Gabriel de la Ribourde was probably born in France in 1615. On 1 November 1638 he joined the order. He died in Canada on 19 September 1680; Hilarion Guénin was born in France in 1641, and he entered the Recollets' order after 1660. He died at Melun, in the department of Seine-et-Marne on 17
The manner of the Recollets’ return to New France showed how the missionary pattern of the colony was by then dominated by the Gallicanism of the French court. Propaganda was not aware nor informed of the Recollets’ return, even though, throughout the years 1653-54, some members of this order had requested the Roman ministry to be again sent to New France.228

Propaganda received news of the Recollets in North America only through a letter sent, towards the end of February 1671, by Pietro Bargellino, Archbishop of Thebes and nuncio in France229. This letter seemed to give Propaganda the chance to again assert its authority over missionary activity in North America during a period where the influence of the Gallican church was progressively strengthening. Through his letter, Bargellino reported to Propaganda about the voyage made by a converted Dutch captain, Laurens van Heemskerk (1632-1699), who had discovered a new territory. Some Recollets had participated in van Heemskerk’s voyage, although their number and names were not specified. According to Bargellino, the Dutch captain was intentioned to leave again for this territory, and had put forward the request to take four Capuchins, so they could found a mission and a seminary.230


228 The missionary who asked Propaganda to come back to New France was François Dulong. See François Dulong, OFM Rec, to, Propaganda [shortened in PF], [1653-1654], Archivio della Sacra Congregazione “de Propaganda Fide” [shortened in APF], SOCG, vol.268, ff.191rv-200rv.

229 Pietro Niccolò Bargellino was born in Bologna, in the Italian region of Emilia-Romagna, in 1630.. On 15 July 1665 he was appointed bishop in partibus of Thebes. On 8 March 1668 he was also appointed as nuncio in France. He was still alive after June 1693. See *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, vol.VI, (Roma: Società grafica romana, 1964), pp.349-350.

230 During his voyage that lasted from June 1669 till January 1670, Van Heemskerk discovered a new territory that he recalled Northern Florida, where, according to his opinion, the natives were docile and easy to convert. The geographical aspect is, till now, the most known and clear one related to all this matter. In fact what the Dutch captain named as Northern Florida, corresponded to the area of the Hudson Bay, however van Heemskerk never reached this territory. In fact, all the information, he
On 27 April 1671 Propaganda, after having discussed the letter of Bargellino, approved the mission, and passed the matter on the Holy Office. However Propaganda’s assent was moot because the Dutch captain never sailed from Europe, so that no Capuchin mission began. All this reaffirmed the distance that existed between Rome and North America, and how Propaganda’s vision of it mirrored that described by its correspondents such as missionaries, bishops, or nuncios.

Propaganda’s unsuccessful intervention coincided with the end of the English occupation in southern Acadia. In 1670, the occupied settlements had been returned to the French, and in the same year Hector d’Andigné de Grandfontaine had arrived in Acadia, taking possession of this territory in his capacity as governor. However the arrival of Grandfontaine did not improve the economic and social
conditions of Acadia, which during the period of the English occupation had recorded few changes\textsuperscript{235}. Due to the position of this territory, the French remained exposed to any possible type of attack that could be led by the English colonists from New England who also exerted an economic influence over Acadia\textsuperscript{236}.

Religious affairs were no more stable than the economic and social ones, even if, before Grandfontaine’s arrival, one priest had already been active at Port-Royal. According to the report written, in 1671, by Grandfontaine, we know that the governor brought a charge against Alexandre Le Borgne de Belle-Isle\textsuperscript{237}, the son of Emmanuel le Borgne, and a priest, mentioned as, a Cordelier, who had ordered the hanging of a black man and the killing of a native\textsuperscript{238}.

In his report, Grandfontaine did not specify the reasons for his charge. What is sure is that the priest, mentioned as a Cordelier\textsuperscript{239} by Grandfontaine, was Laurent Molins, who, according to the Franciscan historian Hugolin Lemay, served as parish priest at Port-Royal from 1668 to 1674. To this point it has not been possible to investigate Molins’ arrival and departure dates, because all the acts, related to the parish of Port-Royal and compiled before 1702, have been destroyed or lost. The only document related to this missionary is a census of Port-Royal he compiled in

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{237} Alexandre Le Borgne De Belle-Isle was born in 1640 or 1643 at La Rochelle. He died in 1693 at Port-Royal. See DCB, I, p.435.
\textsuperscript{239} The Cordeliers, who no longer exist, belonged to the Observants, the Franciscan branch that was created by the Bull \textit{Ite vos in vineam meam}, dated 29 May 1517, issued by Pope Leo X (Giovanni de’ Medici, 1513-1521). See \textit{Lexicon Capuccinum.Promptuarium Historico-Bibliographicum Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Capuccinorum} (1525-1950), (Rome: Bibliotheca Collegii Internationalis S. Laurentii Brundusini, 1951), p.1134.
\end{flushright}
1671, under the supervision of Grandfontaine. Due to the lack of further primary sources Molins' experience remains wrapped in mystery, thus sharing the same problem that characterized the activity of Bernardino Seyllon, the first Cordelier active in Acadia. Of this missionary we know only that, in 1651, he had operated at Cape Breton, during a mission which is still unknown. The common denominator that linked the experiences of Seyllon and Molins was that both of them had independently begun, and, especially, had acted without the least knowledge and assent of Propaganda or the French court.

It is likely that the task of Molins at Port-Royal was concentrated on the needs of the French settlers. This created a distinction that, in the period from 1661 to 1714, formed two different ecclesiastic groups operating in Acadia: the parish priests, who took care of the Acadians, and the missionaries, who tried to carry on their activity among the natives. Although William Wicken has asserted that no missionaries operated among the Mi'kmaq between 1661 and 1684, the evidence shows on the contrary the Jesuits' experience in North Acadia and the Recollets' apostolate at Isle Percé, which began in 1672, and afterwards expanded to the Gaspé Peninsula.

---

242 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.716-717.
The beginning of the Recollets experience at Gaspé (1672-1675)

After their arrival in New France, the group of the five Recollets remained along the St. Lawrence Valley, where they were involved mainly in the reconstruction of their convent at Québec\(^{244}\).

Although in the summer of 1672 the foundations for the resumption of their missionary activity in Acadia were laid thanks to a decision made by Talon, the main supporter of the Recollet’s return to New France\(^{245}\). It was he who decided to break the domination that Nicolas Denys had built on his grant from the Compagnie des Cents-Associés during the winter of 1653-54\(^{246}\). Out of part of this area, Talon created a seigneury that was assigned to Pierre Denys de la Ronde\(^{247}\), the nephew of Nicolas Denys, and Charles Bazire\(^{248}\). This seigneury included Isle Percé, a tract of coast three miles long, in front of this island, and a half-mile inland from Gaspé bay. Talon’s aim in granting this seigneury was to favour the fishery in this area. This led Denys and Bazire to found at Percé a seasonal fishing station and a trading post that could attract fishermen as well as natives. In all this territorial redrawing the religious aspect was not omitted. In fact both Denys and Bazire envisaged, as did Talon, that the establishment of a mission on Isle Percé would meet the spiritual needs of the fishermen as well as to the conversion of the natives. Moreover it is likely that the establishment of a mission was a way to attract colonists\(^{249}\).

---

\(^{244}\) Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.XLI.


\(^{247}\) Pierre Denys de la Ronde was born on 8 October 1631 at Tours, in the department of Indre-et-Loire. He died on 6 June 1708. See *DCB*, II, pp.178-179.

\(^{248}\) Charles Bazire was born in 1624. He died in 1677. See *DCB*, I, p.84.

All these reasons led Denys and Bazire, in 1672, to propose to Laval the dispatch of a Recollet to establish a mission at Isle Percé. Due to the absence of Laval in France, it was Louis de Buade, Comte de Frontenac, the new governor of New France\textsuperscript{250}, who authorized the mission, choosing, as missionary, Exupère Dethunes\textsuperscript{251}. In the month of May 1673 the Recollet missionary left, with Denys and his family, for Isle Percé\textsuperscript{252}. However, once arrived on the island, he did not succeed in beginning his apostolate. He became preoccupied with being a witness regards the murder of Simon Baston, a merchant from La Rochelle\textsuperscript{253}.

Besides this judicial affair, another problem emerged in the fall of that year. The establishment of the Recollets at Percé was opposed by the Jesuits, who considered this island as part of their missionary territory\textsuperscript{254}. At mid November 1673, Frontenac informed Colbert about his permission to the Recollets to establish at Percé. Frontenac also asked to Colbert to send, for the following year, six missionaries of this order who, according to his opinion, could be employed in different places. Frontenac's request was mainly based on his views that the Recollets were more suited and disinterested than others, thus excluding the Jesuits\textsuperscript{255}. In France, Laval did not oppose this decision, and probably saw it as the

\textsuperscript{250} Louis de Buade, the Count of Frontenac, was born on 22 May 1622 at Saint-Germain, and, in the spring of 1672, he was appointed governor of New France. He died at Québec on 28 November 1698. See DCEB, I, pp.133-135.

\textsuperscript{251} Exupère Dethunes was born in France in 1644. He joined the Recollets in 1665, arriving in Canada on 10 September 1671. He died in the convent of Trie, in the department of Eure, on 26 August 1692. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.353, 367.


best solution to avoid any further conflicts between the two orders.\(^\text{256}\) Again, as had happened during the first half of the seventeenth century, the missionary pattern of New France was characterized by lack of cooperation, and rivalries between the various orders that tried to secure their own jurisdiction over the new missions.\(^\text{257}\)

During the winter of 1674-75 the Recollets began to spread their activity, thus even managing to return to mainland Acadia. On 9 March 1675, the provincial of Saint-Denys reported to Colbert that seven Recollets were active in New France, two of whom respectively operated at Percé and Port-Royal. The provincial of Saint-Denys did not mention the names of his confères. However he specified that he had been aware of this date, through some letters sent from Québec, by Eustache Maupassant, the superior of Québec’s convent and of the Recollets in New France,\(^\text{258}\) during the fall of the previous year.\(^\text{259}\) Concerning the Recollet present at Percé, we can only assume that it was Dethunes, while the other missionary, present at Port-Royal, was Claude Moireau.\(^\text{260}\)

During the summer Dethunes came to be supported by Guénin. The presence of this Recollet was to be imputed to the seasonal characteristics of the settlement at Percé. Only during the fishing season, did the two missionaries work together. During wintertime, due to the scarce presence of settlers living on the island, one of

---

\(^{256}\) Grant, Moon of Wintertime, p.50.


\(^{258}\) Eustache Maupassant was born in France in 1627, and he joined the order in 1647. He arrived in Canada in 1673, where he remained from 1673 till 1676, when he came back to France. He died on 29 June 1692 at Châlons-sur-Marne, in the department of Marne. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.685-690.


\(^{260}\) Claude Moireau was born in 1637 at Montargis, and in 1654 he entered the Recollet province of Saint-Denys. He arrived in Canada on 10 September 1671, and, after few months, he was appointed to the mission of Trois-Rivières, where he remained till 1674, acting as a curate. See Ibidem, pp.707-708.
the two missionaries would move to try to convert the natives of the interior. The presence of Dethunes in the region of Québec in the month of December of 1675 proves that the Recollets' activity on Isle Percé was seasonal. In the same year another Recollet, named Chrestien Le Clercq, arrived in the Gaspé Peninsula. The experience of Le Clercq remains one of the most documented and well-studied facets of the missionary history of Acadia. His account gives much evidence related to many aspects of the native society as well as on the life of the missionaries.

Le Clercq and the Mi'kmaq: the first contact (1675-1677)

The missionary experience of Le Clercq officially began on 15 March 1675, when he was appointed as missionary to Canada. In June of that year he left from La Rochelle, accompanied by three of his confrères. The four Recollets travelled with Laval, who, on 1 October of 1674, had officially been appointed, by Pope Clement X (Emilio Altieri, 1670-1676), first bishop of Québec. The appointment of Laval coincided with the establishment of the new Diocese of Québec, whose limits included all the French dominions in North America.

In mid-May 1675 the Recollets arrived at Québec. Le Clercq's stay there was short, as, on 11 October 1675, Laval authorized him to leave for the mission of

---


262 Lemay, L'Établissement des Récollets à l'îse Percée, p.12.

263 The three confrères were Luc Buisset, Louis Hennepin and Zénober Membré. See DCB, I, p.438.

Percé\textsuperscript{265}. According to the information found in Le Clercq’s account, he embarked on a ship, \textit{Le Lion d’Or}, commanded by a captain Coûturier. The voyage to Percé was not of the best. A violent storm, close to Anticosti Island, threatened the ship’s arrival at Percé. However, on 27 October 1675, thanks to better weather conditions, the ship arrived at its destination, allowing the Recollet to land on the island and began his activity.

In the first pages of his account, Le Clercq underlined how the apostolate of Guénin and Dethunes, during their stay on the island, had been characterized by their pity and their zeal, and that this mission needed to go on. Le Clercq’s task was clear. He recorded that Potentien Ozon, the superior of the Recollet missions of New France\textsuperscript{266}, had appointed him to continue what Guénin and Dethunes had begun. Le Clercq’s first impression of his area of service was not positive. The island was almost deserted, except for three or four people in the service of Denys\textsuperscript{267}. Le Clercq’s comment reflected the reality of a seasonal settlement, whose population, in 1686, would have but counted 26 people\textsuperscript{268}. Le Clercq did not remain for long at Percé. From the start of his stay the Recollet took care of the few permanent settlers who lived on the island, preaching mass each day\textsuperscript{269}. In his account, the missionary did not specify if, during his activity, he was helped by Guénin, although it is likely that this missionary remained at Percé till the spring of 1676\textsuperscript{270}.

What is sure is that the first period of Le Clercq’s evangelization at Percé had few results. Besides the scanty permanent population of the island, the Recollet soon

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[265] Archives de l’archevêché de Québec [shortened in AAQ], 12A, Registre des insinuations ecclésiastiques, vol.I, fol.95, 11 October 1675.
\item[266] Potentien Ozon was born at Montargis in 1627, and in 1645 he entered the Recollets. In 1651 he was ordained priest. He died in Paris on 16 June 1705. See Jouve, \textit{Dictionnaire biographique}, pp.752-736.
\item[267] Le Clercq, \textit{New Relation}, p.335.
\item[269] Le Clercq, \textit{New Relation}, p.335.
\item[270] Jouve, \textit{Dictionnaire biographique}, p.482.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
realized that scripts written in Algonquin language were useless with the Mi’kmaq, who hardly understood it. This led the missionary to take the decision to leave Percé, and follow some Mi’kmaq who lived in the mainland woods. For the Recollet, this was the only way to learn the Mi’kmaq language thoroughly.\(^271\)

Le Clercq’s decision to live with the natives to learn their language was not new; it reaffirmed that in 1675 the missionaries’ strategy had not changed from 1656 when Gabriel de Joinville had similarly followed the natives.\(^272\) Another element that seems to link the experience of the Capuchin and that of Le Clercq was the difficulty in understanding the Mi’kmaq language which was not as easy as had been thought by the Europeans during the first phase of the contact.\(^273\) To understand the Mi’kmaq language the missionaries, as in the case of Pierre Biard, had even accepted to work for the natives in exchange for their teaching.\(^274\) From their side, the few French words the Mi’kmaq knew, before the missionaries’ arrival, derived from fishermen.\(^275\)

Throughout 1676 Le Clercq’s evangelical activity was characterized by continuous movement within an area that approximately went from Percé to Miramichi. In the summer of that year the Recollet went to Ristigouche, remaining there till the fall. During his stay at Ristigouche, Le Clercq noticed that few Mi’kmaq had already been baptized. This did not impress him, being aware of the precedent missionary activity carried out by the Jesuits, who, since 1662, had no more had permanent missions in the Gaspé area. However in the 1670s some isolated
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missionary efforts had taken place. This is shown by the fact that in 1675 André Richard had spent two months among the natives of Gaspé, trying to reactivate his efforts between 1659 and 1662. However the exact location of Richard’s activity and how much time he spent there remain unclear.\footnote{JR, LX, p.270; André Richard concluded his life at Québec, where he died on 21 March 1681. See JR, LXXI, p.140; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p. 189.}

In the fall of 1676 Le Clercq again moved, and left Ristigouche for Nepisiguit, part of the seigneurie of Richard Denys, a cousin of Pierre Denys.\footnote{Richard Denys de Fronsac was the son of Nicolas Denys, and he was born in 1654. He died in 1691. See DCB, I, p.259.} During his sojourn there, the missionary underlined that even this place had previously been touched by the activity of the Capuchins and Jesuits, these latter having built a chapel dedicated to the Holy Virgin.\footnote{Le Clercq, New Relation, pp.369-370.} Le Clercq’s movements were certainly not random, but, were planned in order to stay closer as possible to the trading posts as well as to the old missionary places. Moreover his course followed a line that went from the Gaspé Peninsula to the Miramichi River, one of the areas chosen by the Mi'kmaq for their winter camps.\footnote{Clark, Acadia, p.59.}

At the beginning of 1677, Le Clercq again moved, deciding to reach the trading post erected by Richard Denys, on the bank of the Miramichi River. His aim, going to Miramichi, was “to proclaim the truths of our holy religion”. The voyage to Miramichi, in winter, was extremely hard. According to Le Clercq, the snow and the ice that hid the trails led him and his companions\footnote{Le Clercq was guided by a 55-five-year-old Mik’maq named Ejougouloumouët and his wife. See Le Clercq, New Relation, p.174.} to cover but few miles each day. The voyage was also characterized by scarcity of supplies. Despite all these difficulties, Le Clercq was able to arrive at Miramichi, where he remained till the
spring of 1677, thus being able to come into contact with the natives he called *Porte-Croix*. Miramichi was where Le Clercq's low estimate of the Mi'kmaq beliefs and spiritual conditions emerged. This became more and more noticeable, when, in his account, the Recollet decided to explain the custom of the Miramichi's Mi'kmaq to carry a cross next to the skin and their clothes. From Le Clercq's point of view, this custom could be explained as the result of the evangelical activity carried on by some of the previous missionaries, who had been active at Miramichi. However the Recollet's opinion was soon contradicted. A Mi'kmaq chief affirmed that carrying the cross was a deep-rooted custom in their society, since before contact with missionaries. Moreover it was a specific custom of the Mi'kmaq of Miramichi, who would carry or wear some objects as a way to distinguish themselves from the other natives.

It is no wonder that his extended stay at Miramichi had a pronounced effect on the Recollet, and gave him the opportunity to reflect upon the natives' conceptions and attitude vis-à-vis the Catholic religion. According to his observations, evangelical activity among the Mi'kmaq had but given insufficient, but, especially, unconvincing results. In fact, as the Recollet reported in his account, "a number of our Gaspesians wish at present to be instructed, asking Baptism; and they even seem on the surface pretty good Christians after having been baptized. But it can be said that the number is very small of those who live according to the rules of Christianity, and who do not fall back into the irregularities of a brutal and wild life". A natural insensibility of the Mi'kmaq towards religious matters, alcoholism and superstitions represented the main causes to which Le Clercq imputed the
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283 Grant, *Moon of Wintertime*, p.221.
deceiving results obtained among the natives, and by which he accounted for the Jesuits’ decision to abandon their missions at Cap-Breton, Miscou and Nipisiguit.\textsuperscript{284}

Again, as with the Jesuits, Le Clercq’s comments derive from a particular perspective, and do not offer a reliable insight on the Mi’kmaq thought and reaction vis-à-vis conversion\textsuperscript{285}. It is likely that Le Clercq’s complaint on the converted Mi’kmaq’s attitude to remain attached to their old customs was to be imputed to the real quality and depth of each native’s conversion. As Cornelius Jaenen has argued, the missionaries, with their concepts and values, came to be seen as an enigma by the natives\textsuperscript{286}. Furthermore another issue to consider within the analysis of the natives’ conversion was that of cultural compromise. According to Luca Codignola, natives and missionaries belonged to two different cultures that had little in common. For the natives, conversion, in the missionaries’ sense, could mean erasure of good part of their values, while the missionaries had to accept to live in an extraneous cultural milieu, trying to adapt to it in order to achieve their evangelic efforts\textsuperscript{287}.

An obstacle that prevented the spread of Christianity among the Mi’kmaq was their attachment to their traditional beliefs. This again attracted Le Clercq’s criticism that defined the Mi’kmaq’s beliefs as a vice “natural and hereditary with them”. Evidence of it happened when the Mi’kmaq used to blow on the sick people as a way to expel the evil from their body. Although Le Clercq considered it a joke\textsuperscript{288}, this practice, as the custom to carry the cross, was part of the Mi’kmaq resistance to conversion that the missionaries had to face\textsuperscript{289}. The Mi’kmaq refused to accept the

\textsuperscript{285} Wicken, “Encounters with Tall Sails”, p.350.
\textsuperscript{287} Codignola and Luigi Bruti Liberali, Storia del Canada. Dalle origini ai giorni nostri, (Milano: Bompiani), p.65.
\textsuperscript{288} Le Clercq, New Relation, p.220.
missionary's spiritual primacy, and affirmed that, during the baptism, even the missionaries were used to breathe on the children for throwing out the Devil.

Le Clercq's account allows us to know that the new elements brought by Catholicism came to be merged with old Mi'kmaq traditions. Especially the Recollet noted how the honour and respect, accorded to the missionary's figure, impressed some Mi'kmaq, who, in turn, tried to act as missionaries, hearing, for example, confessions from their fellows. The natives who pretended to act as missionaries, made the other Mi'kmaq believe that their authority was a sort of special gift they had received from heaven^290. A further effect of the Mi'kmaq's contact with the missionaries was the creation of a form of religious syncretism, where the sun and the Grandmother Moon, two Aboriginal divinities, came to be respectively identified as the Father in Heaven and the Virgin Mary^291.

The encounter with the missionaries also seems to have favoured the beginning of literacy, based on a hieroglyphic system, among the Mi'kmaq. Although the origins of this system probably relied on a Mi'kmaq practice^292, Le Clercq was able to turn it at his advantage. Although, according to him, the Mi'kmaq were not able to neither read nor write, they seemed to him capable of learning it. In 1677, during the second year of his mission, the Recollet found a solution through which he could teach the natives how to pray God. In fact he affirmed to have seen that "some children were making marks with charcoal upon birch-bark, and were counting these with the finger very accurately at each word of the prayers they pronounced"^293.

^290 Le Clercq, New Relation, pp. 395-400.
^291 Prins, The Mi'kmaq, p.83.
^293 Le Clercq, New Relation, p.357.
This led Le Clercq to think that the use of some formulary, made up of specific characters, could improve his missionary activity. Accordingly he created some leaflets, based on a hieroglyphic system, through which the missionary tried to explain to the Mi'kmaq some prayers as well as the mysteries of the Trinity, Incarnation, Baptism, Penitence and Eucharist. The Mi'kmaq soon became familiar with these sorts of papers, to which they gave the name of *Oukate guenne Kignatimonoër*. The success of the papers was proved by the veneration the Mi'kmaq had of them. Each time one of these was torn or spoiled the natives took its fragments to the missionary. Le Clercq’s papers did not just spread within the Mi'kmaq of Miramichi, but, according to the missionary, soon came to be known by the natives of Ristigouche that requested them.294

According to Upton, Le Clercq’s invention was useless, because the attention of the Mi'kmaq was more focused on the words and papers created by the Recollet, rather than on their meaning. The natives were attracted more by the characteristics of the missionaries than the values of the Christianism, thus showing that the element of persuasion, combined with persuasion, was stronger than the pure doctrine.295

A comparable attempt, though on a different approach, to that of Le Clercq, had already been made by Jesuits in their mission, established in 1654, among the Iroquois. The Jesuits had created some fearful images that portrayed the figures of God, Jesus and the Devil as warriors to make them understand and respect by the Iroquois. The use of these images relied on the Jesuits’ knowledge of the role of war in Iroquoian society. The Jesuits’ representation of the main Christian figures as

warriors had also been used as a way to present them as beings with superior powers that the Iroquois had to fear.

The second period of Le Clercq at Gaspé (1677-1679)

The missionary activity of Le Clercq for the year 1677 kept on having itinerant characteristics. Except for a two-month stay at Québec, where the missionary met Valentin Leroux, the Recollets’ superior in New France, Le Clercq moved from Miramichi to Ristigouche, and built a chapel there. However, in 1679, Le Clercq seemed to realize that his mission was fruitless. His evangelical activity, after four years, had made little progress, despite all the efforts carried out by him and the previous missionaries. Le Clercq again accused, as he did in 1675, the majority of the converted Mi’kmaq “of whom the majority, notwithstanding the indefatigable labours of so many illustrious and zealous missionaries who had preceded me, were Christians only in appearance.”

All that led Le Clercq to address two letters, respectively dated 15 April and 8 May 1679, to Leroux in order to acquaint the superior with his intention to give up his apostolate among the Mi’kmaq. We do not know exactly, when Leroux answered to the missionary, but his letter is fully transcribed in Le Clercq’s account. What is sure is that Leroux tried to reassure Le Clercq, urging him not to abandon his activity. The superior also granted the missionary the possibility of spending the winter at Québec, on condition that he must first inform Richard Denys, that, till the
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297 Valentin Leroux was born in Paris in 1642, and he entered the Recollets between 1660 and 1661. He died in Paris on 2 August 1708. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.611-620.
spring of 1680, no missionary would have arrived in his settlement for replacing Le Clercq. Leroux justified this condition, declaring that, at Québec, there were just four of his confrères, while other fourteen, included Le Clercq, and were active as missionaries. On the ground of Leroux’s information, Dethunes was at Québec, while Luc Buisset, Louis Hennepin, Zénobe Membre, the three Recollets with whom Le Clercq had arrived in Canada in 1675, and de Laribourde were active at Fort Frontenac in order to prepare themselves for an exploratory voyage.

It is likely that Leroux’s encouragements were prompted more by a practical necessity to maintain a missionary within the Mi’kmaq than by any understanding of Le Clercq’s difficulties. In fact the number of the New France’s Recollets, mentioned in Leroux’s letter, can be interpreted as a complaint of the superior. Again the Recollet missions of New France experienced the same problems, in terms of numerical presence, of the Capuchins and Jesuits that but reaffirmed the scarce support obtained from the order in Europe, where, in 1680, there were 20 provinces, that held 396 houses, for a total of 9,259 members.

Initially the letter of Leroux had a positive effect on Le Clercq, who reaffirmed his will to go on with his apostolate. However the good mood of Le Clercq lasted little time, turning again to disillusion. The missionary stated that the
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300 Luc Buisset was probably born in 1640. He died in 1684 at Parcennes; Louis, baptized Jean, Hennepin was born at Ath, in Belgium, on 12 May 1226, and, in 1643, he joined the order, taking the name of Louis. In 1705 he died in Holland; Zénobe Membre was born at Bapaume in 1645, and in 1668 he was ordained. He died in Louisiana on 15 January 1689. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.66-67, 494-502, 691-703; Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, pp.202, 205.

301 This fort corresponded to the today’s city of Kingston, in the province of Ontario.

302 The exploratory voyage, mentioned by Leroux, was that organized by Robert Cavalier de La Salle (1643-1687), who, on 7 August 1679, left from Fort Niagara to explore the Mississippi River till its mouth. At this expedition took part all the four Recollets present at Fort Frontenac. We can assume that the letter of Le Roux was probably written between the second half of May and the end of July 1679, while, according to Jouve, it was dated 15 June 1679. See DCD, I, p.172; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.LX, 354; Le Clercq, *New Relation*, pp.383, 388.

303 This information is not sure, and it relies on an estimate. See Lazaro Iriarte de Aspurz, OFM Cap, *Franciscan History. The Three Orders of St. Francis*, (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1982), p.229.
nomadic life of the Mi'kmaq represented one of the main obstacles to their conversion. On this subject Le Clercq tried to persuade Richard Denys to grant to the Recollets a tract of land at Nipisiguit that had to be cultivated by the Mi'kmaq in order to make them sedentary. Le Clercq's project was not exclusively concerned on Nipisiguit, but it provided for the establishment of another mission on Cape-Breton, where, as agreed upon Leroux, two Recollets would settle. According to the missionary, Denys was in favour of Le Clercq's project, being able to contact and make the main native chiefs accept it. However his project was never realized, due to the financial problems that struck Denys. The loss of one of his vessels, that sunk, due to a storm, close to Percé, and the delay of two ships, that had to carry the necessary supplies, barred the realization of the plan to establish permanent missions at Nipisiguit and Cap Breton.304

Besides the economic problems that affected Denys, Le Clercq's project clashed with a specific and precise aspect of the Mi'kmaq society. The Mi'kmaq based their life on annual seasonal cycles, according to a pattern that varied from region to region. Some groups of Mi'kmaq, from the end of March to the beginning of October, lived in villages, scattered along the coasts, where they devoted themselves to fishing. From October to February, they left the coastal villages for retiring inland, where they divided in smaller units to hunt and fish along the rivers. Other groups of Mi'kmaq were more sedentary, preferring to have permanent settlements at the mouths of rivers.305 The support of Denys towards Le Clercq's project has to be interpreted within a precise strategy that favoured the commercial aspect through the religious one. In fact, besides the religious aspects, the missionary

305 Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, pp.14-15; Upton, Micmacs and Colonists, pp.2-3
activity was also used as an avenue, through which the traders opened the way for establishing permanent settlers among the natives.\textsuperscript{306}

The spread of the Recollets' apostolate (1677-1685)

The French crown was aware of the Recollets' activity in New France through the general reports on the colony sent by its governors or intendants. The first news of the Recollet apostolate in Acadia arrived in France at mid-November 1679, when Jacques Duchesnau de La Doussinière et d'Ambault, Talon's successor\textsuperscript{307}, addressed to Colbert a report on the state of New France. The document stated that the Recollets operated in Acadia, at Percé and at Fort-Frontenac\textsuperscript{308}, although it did not mention the missionaries' names nor their numbers. At Percé, there was probably still Dethunes, who would have remained on the island till the spring of 1679\textsuperscript{309}. The southern part of Acadia was served by the apostolate of Moireau, who, on 11 October 1675, had been appointed, by Laval, missionary on the Saint-John River\textsuperscript{310}.

By the time of Duchesnau's report, the missionary pattern of Acadia had undergone certain changes. Besides Moireau, Laval had also decided to introduce into Acadia some secular priests. More specifically, on 5 September 1676, the bishop of Québec had entrusted Port-Royal to Louis Petit\textsuperscript{311}, a priest of the Seminary of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[306]{Ibidem, p.25.}
\footnotetext[307]{Jacques Duchesnau de La Doussinière et d'Ambault died in 1696 at Ambrant, near Issoudun, in the department of Indre. See DCB, I, p.287.}
\footnotetext[308]{Jacques Duchesnau, to Colbert, 10 November 1679, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.5, fol.32-70.}
\footnotetext[309]{Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.354.}
\footnotetext[310]{This river has been renamed in St. John River, and it flows in the province of New Brunswick.}
\footnotetext[311]{Louis Petit was born at Belzane, in the diocese of Rouen, in 1629. He was ordained on 21 December 1670, and, on 19 June 1655, he arrived in Canada. See AAQ, Registres des insinuations ecclésiastiques, 12A, vol.I, fol.100, 5 September 1676; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.236.}
\end{footnotes}
Québec. It is likely that Moireau remained on the Saint-John River till 1678, settling at Jemseg, where lived Pierre de Joybert de Soulange, the commandant and administrator of Acadia. However Moireau's stay at Jemseg lasted little time. In fact in 1678 Joybert died, being replaced by Michel Leneuf de la Vallière, who decided to establish his residence at Beaubassin. As seigneur of this settlement, la Vallière personally took care of its religious matters. This is shown by the fact that, on 2 September 1678, he granted to the Recollets a piece of land, with a frontage of six arpents on the river Brouillée, to build a chapel and a residence where Moireau could have exercised his activity.

By contrast with Le Clercq, Moireau left no personal accounts of his missionary experience in southern Acadia. Moreover we have no parish registers, through which we can illustrate his activity prior to 1679. Since that year and according to the available primary sources found in the Archdiocese of Québec, the
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312 The Seminary of Québec was officially founded in 1663 by Laval, who associated it to the Séminaire des Mission Etrangères de Paris, founded on 27 October of the same year. Its main task was to train priests to send to non Catholic countries. See AAQ, Registres des insinuations ecclésiastiques,12A, vol.1, fol.92, 101; Noël Baillargeon, Le Séminaire de Québec sous l'épiscopat de Mgr de Laval, (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1972), pp.17-42; Johnston, History of Catholic Church, I, p.27; Pizzorusso, Roma nei Caraibi, pp.291, 297; Reid, Acadia, Maine and New Scotland, p.165.
313 Jemseg was a fortified trading post, located 50 miles from the mouth of St. John River.
314 Pierre de Joybert de Soulange and de Marson was born in 1641 or 1642 at Saint-Hilaire de Soulange in Champagne, and he was baptized in 1644. In 1677 he was named, by Frontenac, administrator and commandant of Acadia. He died in 1678. See Ibidem, pp.398-399; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.709.
315 Michel Leneuf De la Vallière De Beaubassin was baptized on 31 Oct 1640 at Trois-Rivières, while he died in 1705. See DCB, II, p.409.
316 This settlement approximately corresponded to the today's town of Chignecto, in Nova Scotia.
317 The arpent was an old agrarian measure. Each arpent approximately corresponded to 3000 square metres.
318 This river probably corresponded to the today's Missagush river in Nova Scotia.
319 This concession was accepted and ratified on 4 November 1678 by Frontenac that acted as administrator of the Recollets' estates. See DCB, II, pp.477-478; Le Tac, Histoire chronologique, Appendice, pp.191-192.
320 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.710.
activity of Moireau is officially documented. It began from Beaubassin towards the end of April, when this Recollet celebrated two marriages.\textsuperscript{321}

The presence of Moireau at Beaubassin was connected to the rising importance acquired by this settlement, where groups of colonists, coming from Port-Royal, had settled since 1672. This was due to the feeling of insecurity that affected the colonists, especially after the attack, led by Jurriaen Aernoustsz, a Dutch captain, who, in 1674, had attacked and, temporarily conquered Pentagouët, thus confirming the vulnerability of Acadia to all types of attacks.\textsuperscript{322} Besides the dangers of operating in an unsafe territory, the task of the ecclesiastics active in Acadia felt the effects of their number vis-à-vis that of the population. In 1679 the total of ecclesiastics active within the limits of Acadia was three, in comparison with a colonial population, that in 1670 almost counted 500 people,\textsuperscript{323} so that the approximate ratio was 1 to 160-170.

During that period the activity of Le Clercq lacks precise documentation. We only know that, during the fall of 1679, he was on the Beaupré shore, where, on 30 October of the same year, he celebrated the marriage of Catherine Pelletier,\textsuperscript{324} the sister of Didace Pelletier, a Recollet lay-brother.\textsuperscript{325} More specifically, and compared to Moireau, Le Clercq's evangelical activity in Acadia was limited to one act, a baptism, celebrated on 2 February 1680,\textsuperscript{326} at Côte Saint-Ange.\textsuperscript{327} The little information we have on Le Clercq's activity can be explained by his departure for

\textsuperscript{321} AAQ, Registres des insinuations ecclésiastiques, 12 A, vol.1; copies at the Public Archives of Canada, [shortened in PAC], FM 16, B 2, 1, Beaubassin, pp.33-35.
\textsuperscript{322} Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, p.11; Daigle, "1650-1686. Un pays qui n'est pas fait", in Atlantic Region, p.69.
\textsuperscript{323} Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, p.22.
\textsuperscript{324} DGB, I, p.439.
\textsuperscript{325} Didace, baptized Claude, Pelletier was born at Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré, in the province of Québec, on 28 July 1657, and in 1678 he joined the Recollets, taking the name of Didace. On 3 February 1679 he took the habit, in quality of lay-brother. He died at Trois-Rivières on 21 February 1699. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.761-775.
\textsuperscript{326} PAC, FM 16, B 2, 1, Côte Saint-Ange, 1680, p.1
\textsuperscript{327} Côte Saint-Ange corresponded to Cap-Rouge, in the Gaspé Peninsula.
France in the fall of 1680, where he remained till the summer of 1681, in order to have the necessary authorization for the establishment of a Recollet hospice and a lodgement, respectively at Québec and Montréal.

However his departure did not interrupt the Recollet apostolate in the Gaspé Peninsula, which continued through Moireau, who, in the summer of 1680, replaced Le Clercq at Côte Saint-Ange. The length of Moireau’s stay at Gaspé is unknown, but, in the period between 6 July and 8 July 1680, the missionary baptized eight Mi'kmak.

We have no information to show whether Moireau met or worked with Le Clercq. What is sure is that Le Clercq affirmed, in his account, having forwarded to Moireau the symbolic characters invented by him, and it is probable that his substitute had received them before his arrival at Côte Saint-Ange. The available documentation also suggests that Moireau’s journey lasted approximately one month, the lapse of time that passed from the last sacrament administered at Beaubassin, a marriage on 9 June 1680, and the first baptism, celebrated on 6 July of the same year, at Côte Saint-Ange.

In the fall of 1680 Moireau returned to Beaubassin where he remained, except for a short stay at Jemseg towards the end of May 1681, till the spring of 1684. His activity there focused both on the settlers and the Mi'kmak. The parish registers show that Moireau obtained few results. During his three years at Beaubassin, the
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328 According to the Franciscan vocabulary an hospice was a little convent, that hosted a restricted number of ecclesiastics, and that enjoyed determinate canonical prerogatives. See Candide de Nant, OFM Cap, *Pages glorieuses de l'épopée canadienne. Une mission capucine en Acadie*, (Gembloux: Imprimerie Jean Duculot, 1927), p.139.

329 According to the available information Le Clercq was accompanied by Dethunes. See *DCB*, p.439; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.614; Pelletier, *Le Clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.203.

330 Of four of these natives, Moireau mentioned their age, affirming that three were respectively seven, nineteen and fifteen years old, while one little girl was just five months old. See *PAC*, FM 16, B 2, 1, Côte Saint-Ange, 1680, pp.2-3.


332 *PAC*, FM 16, B 2, 1, Beaubassin, 1679-1686, pp.35-36; Côte Saint-Ange, pp.2-3
missionary baptized only twelve Mi'kmaq\textsuperscript{333}. The activity of Moireau was clearly comparable to that of Le Clercq, being based on the efforts carried out by a single missionary, who had constantly to move within a huge territory.

With regards to Le Clercq, the information on him after his departure for France becomes unclear and confused, so that it is difficult to trace and follow, according to a chronological order, his activity in New France. The missionary arrived at Québec on 29 July 1681, and, in the fall of the same year, he was at Montréal. Between 1681 and 1682 Le Clercq spent the winter at Québec\textsuperscript{334}.

Despite the lack of any precise information in his account, we can assume that Le Clercq returned to Miramichi, where still lived the natives he had called Porte-Croix. However, according to Le Clercq's opinion, their number had progressively reduced in consequence of the diseases caused by contact with the Europeans as well as the war with the Iroquois\textsuperscript{335}. The Recollet's comments reflected reality. The European diseases had caused a decline among the Mi'kmaq, whose total number towards the end of the seventeenth century, according to the anthropologist Philip Bock, would be about of 2000\textsuperscript{336}.

During his stay at Miramichi, Le Clercq came to be supported by another missionary, named Emmanuel Jumeau\textsuperscript{337}, whom he already knew. In fact, as explained in his account, in 1675 Le Clercq had introduced this missionary to the noviciate at the Recollet convent of Arras\textsuperscript{338}, just before his first departure for Canada\textsuperscript{339}. Due to the imprecise chronology found in the account, we can not verify

\textsuperscript{333} PAC, FM 16, B 2, 1, Beaubassin, 1679-1686, pp.4-15, 36-37.
\textsuperscript{334} DCB, 1, p.439.
\textsuperscript{335} Le Clercq, New Relation, p.366.
\textsuperscript{337} Emmanuel Jumeau was born in France in 1655, and in 1680 he was ordained. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.532-535; Pelletier, Le Clergé en Nouvelle France, p.202.
\textsuperscript{338} In the department of Pas-de-Calais.
\textsuperscript{339} Le Clercq, New Relation, p.366; DCB, 1, p.439.
how long the collaboration between the two Recollets lasted, so that the only certitude is Le Clercq’s decision to leave from Miramichi, entrusting the mission to Jumeau. According to Le Clercq, his decision resulted from the desire to visit other natives, whose nation was not specified, who had requested him to preach the Gospel. After his departure the little information on Le Clercq is limited to his presence at Québec, where he resided from the beginning of October till the first week of November 1684. What is sure is that Le Clercq’s apostolate as well as his efforts at Gaspé also came to the attention of the Jesuits. In fact Jacques Bigot, a Jesuit missionary, underlined how Le Clercq had spent most of his time at Gaspé in order to instruct the natives that resided there.

With regards to Percé, the years 1683-84 represented a period of changes that secured relative stability for the Recollet mission on the island. In this lapse of time Dethunes probably left Percé, being replaced by Joseph Denys, the son of Pierre Denys, who was accompanied by Pelletier. The presence of a lay-brother allowed Denys to establish a division between the missionaries and the inhabitants. A lay-brother could take care of the household duties, like cooking, of the Recollets’ residence, and was not obliged to have recourse to the inhabitants of the island.

When Denys and Pelletier arrived at Percé, the structure of the Recollet mission

341 DCB, II, p.439.
342 Jacques Bigot was born on 26 July 1651 at Bourges, in the department of Cher. He joined the Jesuit order, entering the noviciate in Paris, on 9 Sept 1667, being ordained in 1678. He arrived in Canada in 1679. See DCB, II, pp.63-64; Pelletier, Le Clergé en Nouvelle France, p.174.
343 JR, LXIII, p.70.
344 Dethunes left New France in the fall of 1685. He died at Trie, in the department of Eure, on 26 August 1692. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.366-367.
345 Joseph, baptized Jacques, Denys was born at Trois-Rivières on 7 November 1657. He was the son of Pierre Denys de La Ronde and Catherine Leneuf de la Pothérie. On 21 August 1669 he entered the Petit Séminaire of Québec, founded in 1668. On 9 May 1677 he joined the Recollet’s order, taking the name of Joseph, and in 1678 he was sent to France in order to accomplish his theological studies. He was ordained on 19 June 1682. He died at Québec on 25 January 1736. See DCB, II, p.174; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.320-345.
relied on a house and lodging for the missionaries, plus two grants of land. The house and the two land grants had been granted by Bazire and Denys, in the fall of 1676, while the lodging had been built after 1678⁴⁴⁸. One of the main aims of Denys and Pelletier was to enlarge the lodging and to build a church. This could explain Pelletier's presence on the island. In fact this lay-brother, before entering the Recollet order, had been a carpenter⁴⁴⁹.

At the beginning of the summer of 1684 Moireau visited the Minas Basin, thus specifying that he went there to accomplish the mission⁴⁵⁰. Moireau’s statement can be explained because, in the 1680s, Minas, after Port-Royal and Beaubassin, was to become the third most populous area in mainland Acadia⁴⁵¹. There groups of Acadian families had began to settle, coming from the area surrounding Port-Royal in order to search new lands for cultivation that could be less exposed to any possible raids coming from New England. Minas also represented the first of the settlements, through which a part of the Acadian population settled down around the Bay of Fundy, so that Moireau could be identified as the first missionary who operated there⁴⁵².

However Beaubassin remained the center of Moireau's activity. During the summer of the same year the missionary returned there, where he would have resided till the first week of April 1686. Compared to the period from 1681 till 1684, Moireau, during his third stay at Beaubassin, seemed to achieve more results in terms of converted natives. This is shown by the fact that of the thirty-seven acts of

---

⁴⁵⁰ PAC, FM 16, B 2, 1, Minas, 1684, pp.15-17.
baptism he celebrated throughout 1684 and the spring of 1686, twenty-four were concerned with Mi’kmaq, while thirteen belonged to French settlers\textsuperscript{353}.

The presence of Moireau at Beaubassin was also confirmed by a document, of which the author and date are uncertain\textsuperscript{354}, regarding the state of the Recollet missions of New France. This document mentioned Moireau as the sole missionary serving Beaubassin, a mission that must not be abandoned. More generally, the overall state of the Recollet mission of New France appeared critical. The missionaries could exercise their complete functions only in three posts, respectively at Notre-Dame des Anges, where they held a convent, at Fort-Frontenac and Isle Percé. Again the missionary pattern of Acadia and New France suffered from an unclear jurisdiction that prompted disputes among the orders. According to the document, both the Jesuits and the priests of the Seminary of Québec considered the Recollets’ presence at Fort-Frontenac and Percé as interference with their missionary jurisdiction. As a possible remedy, the author suggested sending more missionaries, to be chosen within the province of Saint Denys, and not among those of Saint-Antoine, that had had no responsibility over the missions of New France\textsuperscript{355}. This latter point was confirmed by the fact that, since 1615, both the French crown and the Holy See had assigned to the Province of Saint-Denys overall responsibility and jurisdiction over the mission of New France\textsuperscript{356}.

\begin{thebibliography}{1}
\bibitem{353} \textit{PAC, FM 16, B 2, 1, Beaubassin, 1679-1686, pp.17-29.}
\bibitem{354} It is likely that this document dated from 1685, and was written by Dethune. The copy of this document was transcribed by Le Tac. However, according to Eugène Réveillaud, the editor of this version of Le Tac’s account, the author of it is completely unknown. See Jouve, \textit{Dictionnaire biographique}, p.322; Le Tac, \textit{Histoire chronologique}, Appendice, p.216.
\bibitem{355} Ibidem, pp.216-219.
\bibitem{356} Jouve, \textit{Dictionnaire biographique}, p.XXV.
\end{thebibliography}
The period from 1684 till 1686 was characterized by changes that altered the missionary pattern of the Recollets in Acadia. It is likely that Le Clercq spent the winter of 1684-85 at Ristigouche, while, according to the historians Archange Godbout and René Bacon, he remained at Miramichi. What is sure is that, since late December 1685 till early June 1686, the Recollet was back in France, more precisely at Sorel, where he carried on his sacerdotal ministry. Even Jumeau left the missionary post of Miramichi, although we have no information to prove the reasons for his decision. Jumeau probably left Miramachi and, afterwards, Canada to return to France in the winter of 1684-85. His name is found in a report, dated 14 May 1685, in the Vatican Secret Archives. This document, without author, reported news related to the departure, from La Rochelle, of Jean-Baptiste de Lacroix-Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, the successor of Laval, who, in the course of the same year, had been appointed, by Louis XIV, as Vicar general of Canada. Jumeau was mentioned as one of the seven ecclesiastics, who accompanied Saint-Vallier in Canada. This is the only information on the Recollet from 1685 till the fall of 1688.

The absence of Jumeau from the Gaspé area determined the arrival of the priests of the Seminary of Québec. On 13 August 1685, Richard Denys, acting as his father’s mandatory, granted the Seminary some lands on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, respectively located at Ristigouche, on the Sainte-Croix River, and on Cap-Breton.

---

358 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.572-573.
359 Ibidem.
360 On the biographical information to Saint-Vallier see note nr.25 in the first chapter; Johnston, History of Catholic Church, 1, p.24.
362 According to Bacon, Jumeau did not came back to Miramichi, but he resided in the convent of Notre-Dame des Anges Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.533.
Denys imposed a clear condition. The Seminary had to establish a permanent mission in each of the places included in Denys' concession. Each mission needed to have a church or a chapel, where, at least, one missionary had to reside, whose maintenance was up to the Seminary itself. Denys' condition could be imputed to the kind of priests of the Seminary of Québec, who, unlike the Jesuits and Recollets, did not belong to a religious order. In fact they had to rely on the donations made by the inhabitants of the places, where they operated, or on the support of the French crown.

The year 1686 was characterized by two main events: the end of Moireau's activity in Acadia, and the first visit of Saint-Vallier to this territory. The last information, according to the parish registers, regarding the presence of Moireau in Acadia, is concentrated within the last three weeks of May 1686. During that lapse of time Moireau baptized six people at Mines, and two twin sisters at Beaubassin, respectively on 13 May and 26 May 1686. The incomplete state of the parish registers related to Moireau does not prove if the baptism, celebrated at Beaubassin, was the last act of this missionary in Acadia. What is sure is that Moireau, at the time of Saint-Vallier's visit, could exercise part of his activity in a little chapel. This structure came to be noticed by the bishop of Québec on the occasion of his double visit at Beaubassin, during the summer of 1686. In Saint-Vallier's opinion, the little chapel, built thanks to the inhabitants's support, was made of mud, straw and stones.
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364 Wicken, "Encounters with Tall Sails", p.323.
366 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.711.
According to the Recollet historian Odoric Jouve, in August 1686 Moireau left Acadia to return to Québec. The Recollet historian bases this on the account written by Saint Vallier and regarding to his visit in Acadia. The Vicar General affirmed that, just before his arrival, Beaubassin was served by a Recollet missionary, who had been recalled to Québec to be appointed superior of the convent his confrères had there. The first part of Saint-Vallier’s statement confirms Jouve’s thesis related to Moireau’s departure. However Moireau never held the office of superior during his apostolate in New France. Saint-Vallier probably identified Moireau with Ferdinand Moreau due to the similitude of their names.

During the summer of 1686, at the moment of Saint-Vallier’s visit, Le Clercq was probably back in New France, more precisely at Percé. There he took part to the dedication ceremony of the unfinished church to Saint-Peter. However this church was not the only place of workshops. According to Le Clercq, there was another little chapel on Isle Bonaventure, dedicated to Saint-Clara, whose building had been ordered by Joseph Denys to take care of the resident fishermen.

Between the end of July and the beginning of August 1686, Saint-Vallier visited Percé. During his stay there, Saint-Vallier found irregularities in the way the church had been built, and especially in the behavior of the people who lived or

368 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.712.
370 Ferdinand Moreau was born in 1621, and he died in 1694 at Clamecy. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXXVIII.
371 It was Ferdinand Moireau to hold the office of superior at the convent of Notre-Dame des Anges from 1685 till January 1687. This mistake can also be found in the work of Henry Raymond Casgrain and the Dictionary of Canadian Biography. According to Jouve, Claude Moireau probably returned home in the fall of 1692. In 1696 the Recollet was appointed superior of the convent of Nemours, office he held till 25 March 1698. On 14 October 1703 he died at Nemours. See Henri-Raymond Casgrain, Les Sulpiciens et les prêtres des missions étrangères en Acadie (1676-1762), (Québec: Pruneau & Kirouac, 1897), p.49; DCB, II, p.478; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp. 712-713, 880
372 This island is close to Percé.
374 Ibidem, p.28.
frequented the island. This led him to write two letters, to the inhabitants of the island and to Denys. With regards to the inhabitants, they had to engage themselves to build a larger church that could host a greater number of people, especially during the fishing-season. Besides the size of the church, Saint-Vallier’s letter especially condemned the drunkenness, thefts, and the licentiousness of the inhabitants, whose majority, on Sunday, worked instead of going to Mass.

The letter to Denys held more specific instructions. Saint Vallier expressly exhorted Denys to look after the chaplains, who were present on some of the ships that landed at Percé, whose behavior had to stick to a severe behavior must be appropriate for ecclesiastics. With regards to the missionaries, they had but to take care of spiritual affairs, without any intervention in temporal ones. On the administration of the Sacrament of baptism to the natives, Saint-Vallier was categorical. He allowed no distinction between the young and the old natives, who, according to the rule of the diocese of Québec, could just be baptized at the point of death or extreme necessity. On this point, the Vicar General also required the missionaries to be careful to baptize only those, who were enough instructed on the main mysteries of Christianity, and to interrogate them in order to prove their knowledge. The instructions of Saint-Vallier reflected the problems that arose within the context of a typical seasonal settlement. There the majority of the population resided only during the fishing-season, and law was established by fishing captains.

The first visit of Saint-Vallier also allows us to know that, besides the priests of the Seminary of Québec and the Recollets, other independent missionary groups operated in Acadia, although without any sign of collaboration among them. In the
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375 Mandements, I, pp177-180.
376 Le Tuc, Histoire chronologique, Appendice, pp.233-236.
377 Lemay, L’Établissement des Récollets à l’île Percée, p.32.
spring of 1686, Saint-Vallier reported that, during his visit at Chedabouctou, he met two Penitent Fathers of the Province of Normandy, who tried to take care of the inhabitants, saying Mass each day. The two missionaries were not Recollets, but members of the Third Order Regular of Saint-Francis, also known as *Pénitents gris*, an order that was founded in the seventeenth century, and no longer exists.

Propaganda, compared to its lack of information about the Recollets' apostolate in Acadia, was aware of the Third Order's presence in this territory. In fact in 1686, probably in the first months of the year, the Roman ministry received a report written by Chrysostome de la Passion, provincial of Saint-Yves (Paris). Through it Propaganda was informed of the settlement of Chedabouctou as well as about the fact that, since 1684, Massimiliano Sanvaleriano had been active there, with one or more confrères, and had learnt the native language and baptized many natives. The provincial asked, on behalf of Sanvaleriano and his companion, Propaganda to grant him the status of a missionary apostolic, and said that no other mission nor priests were active in that territory, which was 200 leagues from Québec. In the General Congregation held on 26 March 1686, Propaganda, following its usual procedure, discussed the letter of Chrysostome de la Passion, and entrusted the entire matter to Cardinal César d'Estrées, one of its members. The lack of further primary sources does not allow to know what happened to this mission. What is sure is that the report of 1686 was the last document through which the Roman ministry was informed of Acadia as well as the natives living there. Due to the Gallican church, it was only in the mid-1750s, that Propaganda would have again be informed of the Mi'kmaq.

---

After 1686, the Recollets were no longer present in continental Acadia, and their presence was limited to Percé. The southern part of Acadia was entrusted to the efforts of the priests of the Seminary of Québec and the Sulpicians. Louis-Pierre Thury, a priest of the Seminary of Québec, had arrived at Miramichi in 1685, following the concession of Denys, while at Port-Royal there was Louis Geoffroy, a Sulpician priest. Concerning Beaubassin, Saint-Vallier assigned to this settlement Claude Trouvé, a Sulpician, who began his activity there in 1687.

During the winter of 1687 Saint-Vallier, who was back in France, addressed a letter to Séraphim Georgemé, the superior of the Recollets in New France, who, in the same year, replaced Ferdinand Moreau. Saint-Vallier recommended that Georgemé support Denys with Simon-Gérard de La Place, in anticipation of the departure of Pelletier, once the lay-bother finished the building of the church. According to Saint-Vallier, de La Place was a skilled missionary, who could serve better than any others the mission at Percé. On this missionary post, the Vicar General had not changed the opinion he expressed in 1686. In fact Saint-Vallier defined Percé as a missionary post that could ruin the missionaries, because of the presence of the fishermen and their bad customs. Saint-Vallier’s recommendation
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381 Louis-Pierre Thury was born at Notre-Dame de Breuil-en-Auge, in the department of Calvados, in 1652, and he was ordained on 21 December 1677. See Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.239.

382 Louis Geoffroy was born in Paris in 1661, and he entered the Sulpicians in 1684, being ordained in 1685. He died at Québec on 1 May 1707. See Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.213; *DCB*, II, pp.243-244.

383 Claude Trouvé was born at Tours, in the department of Indre-et-Loire, in 1644, and on 1 December 1665 he entered the order. On 10 June 1668 he was ordained priest at Québec. He died in Acadia in the month of July 1704. See Ibidem, p.216.

384 Daigle, “1650-1686. Un pays qui n’est pas fait”, in *Atlantic Region*, p.76; *DCB*, II, p.244; Johnston, *History of Catholic Church*, 1, p.27.

385 Séraphim Georgemé was born about 1659. From 1687 to 1689 he held the office of superior of the Recollet missions of New France. He died in 1705. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.LXXV, 879.

386 Simon-Gérard, baptized Jean, de La Place was born in 1657 at Rouen. De La Place probably joined the Recollets in 1675, taking the name of Simon-Gérard. He was ordained on 23 September 1679 at Sens, in the department of Yonne. He arrived in Canada on 25 August 1683. See Ibidem, pp.239-240.

387 Le Tac, *Histoire chronologique*, Appendice, p.232. According to Revellaud, the letter of Saint-Vallier is to be dated 1685. However, Jouve upholds the thesis that this document is dated 1687.
was never fulfilled, and de La Place never went to Percé. It is likely that this missionary spent the winter between of 1687 and 1688 in the convent of Notre-Dame-des-Anges. However, according to Xiste Le Tac, in 1689 he left for Anticosti Island, accompanied by Louis Joliet, with the aim of instructing the natives who frequented this island.

The church at Percé was probably completed in the same year as Saint-Vallier wrote. However we have no information related to its dimensions. The only available clue derives from Le Clercq, who defined it as a good structure. It is likely that Le Clercq described the church when he saw it during the summer of 1686. The following year recorded the end of Le Clercq's missionary experience. After twelve years spent in New France, the Recollet came back to France. The conclusion of Le Clercq's experience was followed by the end of Denys and Pelletier's apostolate at Percé in the spring of 1689, when they left the island for Newfoundland to found the first Recollet mission there.
In 1689 the increasing tension between English and French in North-America menaced the religious pattern of Acadia and the French part of Newfoundland. The economic influence of New England in Acadia remained strong, however, and it even came to be favoured by some of the priests. This is shown by a letter, dated 2 September 1689, written by Mathieu de Goutin\(^{392}\), the lieutenant general for justice in Acadia, and addressed to the French chief minister. De Goutin declared that Meneval let the English come to Acadia for trading, favoured by the help of some priests, whose names and number were not mentioned\(^{393}\). Despite de Goutin’s denunciation, the commerce between New England and Acadia was a necessity, especially as the French crown gave little support to Acadia\(^{394}\).

In 1690 the situation along the Atlantic coast of New France turned unfavourable to the French, and this affected the missions of Percé and Plaisance. This was to be imputed to the decision of the English crown to join the League of Augsburg, and consequently to declare war on France in May 1689\(^{395}\). In fact, in February 1690, a small English force left from Ferryland, and arrived at Plaisance, where it seized all the goods present both in the warehouses and habitations of the inhabitants, who were imprisoned into church, being freed after six weeks\(^{396}\). This situation again repeated in Acadia that, at the beginning of May 1690, was attacked left from Québec, landing at Plaisance on 21 June. Denis and Pelletier were probably with Le Tac and Saint-Vallier on the ship, that sailed from Québec. See Lemay, *L’Etablissement des Récollets de la province de Saint Denis à Plaisance en l’île de Terre-Neuve, 1689*, (Québec, 1911), pp.5-9; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.324-325.

\(^{392}\) Mathieu de Goutin (sometimes written as Degoutin, Desgoutins, but he signed de Goutin) was born in France, probably in 1660. He died at Île Royale, the actual Cap-Breton, on 25 December 1714. He arrived in Acadia in 1688. See DCB, II, pp.257-258.

\(^{393}\) Desgoutins to the French prime Minister, 2 September 1689, Port-Royal, PANS, RG1, vol.2, doc nr.42.


\(^{395}\) Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in *Atlantic Region*, p.81.

by a New England expedition, led by Sir William Phips. On 9 May 1690 Phips arrived at Port-Royal, which capitulated two days later, and allowed the members of the expedition to burn the houses, devastate the church, and steal the goods of the inhabitants.

The English raids did not spare Percé, where, in 1690, resided Jumeau, who had probably arrived on the island during the fall of 1689. The effects of the English raid on the island are described in a letter, dated mid-October 1690, written by Jumeau himself and addressed to Le Clercq. At the beginning of August two English ships landed at Isle Bonaventure, and afterwards arrived at Percé. The English remained on the island for eight days, and during that lapse of time they burned the houses of the inhabitants, as well as the church and the Recollets' lodgement. Also the church at Bonaventure was destroyed. On 10 September 1690 Jumeau decided to leave the island, probably anticipating persecution by the English. With his departure, the Recollet activity at Percé was interrupted.

The difficult years of the Jesuits and Recollets in Acadia (1690-1700)

The effects of the English raids were destructive but inconclusive. On 22 May 1690 Phips left Port-Royal, without leaving no garrison in this settlement, so that,
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398 Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.119; Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in Atlantic Region, pp.81-82.

399 According to Jouve, Jumeau came back to France. We have no available information on his activity in France, however the historian Cyprien Tanguay uphold that Jumeau died in the month of December 1707. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.535; Cyprien Tanguay, Répertoire général du clergé canadien par ordre chronologique depuis la fondation de la colonie jusqu'à nos jours, (Québec: C. Darveau, 1868), p.69
after almost one week later, a French officer, with the help of five soldiers, could restablish the control of France over it. Even though the English conquest of Port-Royal was temporary, its effects of it were still felt in this settlement, especially in the winter of 1691. This is shown by an anonymous memoir on the state of Acadia, dated 5 February 1691, which suggested that Petit, the parish priest of Port-Royal, had to be called back to France, because he had been responsible of the loss of this settlement due to his commerce with the British. We need to specify that Petit was not the only priest active at Port-Royal. At the moment of the English attack, at Port-Royal there were also Geoffroy and Trouvé, who was captured and taken prisoner by Phips. With regards to Geoffroy he remained at Port-Royal until 1691, when he definitively left Acadia.

In 1691 no Recollet missionary was sent to Percé or Bonaventure. The English raids on these two islands had caused such economic damage, that the Recollets requested a royal allowance to compensate for what they had lost. In the early spring of 1692, the French crown agreed to grant 500 livres to the Recollets as a refund for the damages suffered by their missions at Percé and Bonaventure. To the
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403 Mémoire on the state of Acadia, 5 February 1691, PANS, RG1, vol.2, doc nr.47.
404 Petit remain at Port-Royal till 1693. In the same year he returned to Québec, where he died on 3 June 1709. See *DCB*, II, pp.521-522, Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.236.
405 From 1686 till 1690 Geoffroy acted as vicar and parish priest of Port-Royal, and also dedicated himself to the building, at his own expense, of schools for the Acadian boys and girls. See résumé d’un lettre de Louis Geoffroy, AC, C11A, vol.24, fol.189v-190, 4 November 1706, *DCB*, II, p.244.
406 Trouvé’s captivity lasted little time, before he was freed, at Québec, by Phips in the month of October 1690. In 1694 he returned to Acadia, thus establishing at Beaubassin. He died in 1704 at Chedabouctou. See *DCB*, II, pp.637-638; Johnston, *History of*, I, p.28.
407 In September 1692 Geoffroy began to operate in the mission of La Prairie de la Magdeleine, where he would inconstantly remain till 1702. He died at Québec on 1 May 1707. See *DCB*, II, pp.243-244; Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.213.
408 The request was presented by Jean Bochart de Champigny, the intendant of New France, on 10 May 1691. See Collection de manuscrits, II, pp.60-61.
Recollets, this amount of money was too modest in that it only covered the expense of the Sacred Vessels stolen by the English.\(^{409}\)

If the Gaspé area had no more missionaries, things were slightly better in mainland and southern part of Acadia, where there were some priests. Joseph Robineau de Villebon, the new commandant in Acadia\(^{410}\), reported their presence in a letter to Louis Phélypeaux, Comte de Pontchartrain (1643-1727), the Minister of Marine from 1690 till 1699\(^{411}\). According to Villebon there were four missionaries operating in Acadia. Beaubassin and Minas were served by Jean Beaudoin\(^{412}\) and Jean-François Buisson de Saint-Cosme\(^{413}\), respectively a secular priest and a priest of the Seminary of Québec, while Thury and Jacques Bigot operated in the southern part of Acadia. More precisely Bigot was on the Kennebec River\(^{414}\), in a zone already known by confrères who had been active there in the years from 1646 to 1647\(^{415}\). No doubt Bigot’s missionary post was not easy. As Villebon stated, it was “nearest to the English, it is one where there is always the greatest trouble”. In his letter, Villebon also put forward a proposal to introduce in Acadia six Recollets, to be supported with the revenues of Port-Royal and Minas. According to him, the
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\(^{409}\) Le Tac, Histoire chronologique, Appendice, pp.238-239.
\(^{410}\) Joseph Robineau de Villebon was born on 22 August 1655 at Québec. On 7 April 1691 he was appointed governor of Acadia. He died on 5 July 1700 at Fort Saint-Jean in Acadia. See DCB, I, pp.576-578.
\(^{411}\) Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.89.
\(^{412}\) Jean Beaudoin was a secular priest, and not a Sulpician, as Johnston has written in his work. This priest was born at Nantes in 1662. He entered the noviciate in 1682, being ordained in 1685. He arrived in Canada in 1687, dying in Acadia in 1698. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.219; Johnston, History of, I, p.28.
\(^{413}\) Jean-François Buisson de Saint-Cosme was born at Pointe-de-Lévis on 31 January 1667, and, on 2 February 1690, he was ordained. He died in Louisiana in 1706. See DCB, II, pp.109-110; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.221.
\(^{414}\) This river flows in the state of Maine.
\(^{415}\) It was Gabriel Drulailles the missionary who was active along the Kennebec river from the summer of 1646 till the half of June 1647. Gabriel Druilletes was born at Garst, in the department of Haute-Vienne, on 29 September 1610. He joined the order on 28 July 1629, being ordained in 1642. He arrived in Canada on 15 August 1643, and, on 8 April 1681, he died at Québec. See Lucien Campeau, SJ, Monumenta Novaë Franciae, vol.8 (1996), Au bord de la ruine (1651-1656), (Rome, Québec, Montréal: Apud Monumenta Hist. Soc Jesu, Les Presses de l’Université Laval, Institutum Historicum Soc. Jesu, Les Éditions Bellarmin, 1967-1996), p.316, doc nr. 94; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.180.
Rocollets "could be distributed throughout Acadia, and these good fathers would bring peace to the country which has need of it." 416

Villebon's proposal was in part fulfilled. At the beginning of October 1693 de La Place and Elisée Crey 417 arrived in Acadia with two different aims. De La Place had to found a mission on the Saint-John River, while Crey remained, as chaplain, at Fort Naxouat 418. It is likely that De La Place was sent to the village of Médoctec 419, a Maliseet community, where he arrived there during the summer of 1693 420. The presence of Crey, as chaplain, at Fort Naxouat was not surprising. This settlement had been the administrative capital of Acadia since 1691, when Villebon moved it from Jemseg to Fort Naxouat 421.

Villebon's desire to use the Recollets to bring peace in Acadia was notional. Both Crey and De La Place found themselves carrying on their activity into a context, that of the borders between southern Acadia and New England, which, in the 1690s, was extremely unsafe due to the Anglo-French conflicts 422. The Jesuits, who, towards the end of 1680s, had returned to be active in southern Acadia, shared the same difficulties as the Recollets 423. It is no wonder that the effects of the Anglo-

417 Élisée Crey was born at Besançon, in the department of Doubs, in 1668. He arrived in Canada in 1692, and, on 1 February 1693 he was ordained at Québec. He died in Paris on 7 March 1743. See Pelleter, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.196; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.241.
418 Le Tac, Histoire chronologique, Appendice, p.25; Webster, Acadia at the end, p.53.
419 The village of Médoctec was located on the western bank of the Saint-John River, at a distance of 40 miles from its mouth.
420 It seems that de La Place had already been active in this area. In fact, according to the thesis upheld by the historian Reuben Thwaites, the editor of the Jesuit Relations, de La Place had begun to operate at Médoctec in 1688. There is another thesis upheld by the Capuchin historian Pacifique de Valigny, according to whom, de La Place was active at Médoctec since 1689. However we have to remember that, according to Le Tac, in 1689 de La Place left for Anticosti island. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.241-242; JR, I, Introduction, p.15; Pacifique de Valigny, OFM Cap, Chroniques des plus anciennes églises: Bathurst, Pabos et Ristigouche, Rivière Saint-Jean, Menunamcook, (Montréal: L’Echo de Saint-François, 1944), pp.49-50.
421 Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in Atlantic Region, p.83.
422 Ibidem, p.81.
423 Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, p.165.
French conflicts had repercussions over the apostolate of the members of both these two orders as well as on the other missionaries. The main consequence of this situation was that the missionaries began to take a more and more active role on behalf of the French against the English.

With regards to the Jesuits, their involvement had begun as early as in 1687 when Jacques Bigot had gone to New England to invite the natives belonging to the Abenaki nation to join the French against the English. The choice to involve these natives was not casual. From 1675, the Abenaki had intermittently fought the English, since King Philip’s war. This conflict had concluded in 1678 when a treaty of peace had been signed. However the Abenaki’s agricultural pattern had felt the effects of this conflict, and their food quantities had undergone a reduction. This had led some groups of Abenaki to move north towards the Saint-Lawrence River, and to establish at Sillery. There they had begun to have a relationship with the Jesuits. The first Abenaki to arrive there must have been perplexed vis-à-vis the fact of being converted. In fact their decision to move to Sillery was mainly to be imputed to their need for security. Despite the scarce support received from the Jesuits, the Abenaki took part in the religious activities. Due to the war, the number of the Abenaki had increased, and in the spring of 1677 the Jesuit mission of Sillery, whose founder was Jacques Vaultier, had been established. In 1681, Vincent

---

425 This conflict saw two main parties fighting: on one side, the Abenaki, helped by the natives belonging to the Pokanoket nation, while, on the other side, there were the English, supported by the Iroquois. In the first phase of the war the situation seemed to turn favourable to the Abenaki and Pokanoket, who attacked the English, respectively on the borders between Acadia and the present state of Maine, and in the province of Plymouth. However the English soon regained the control, defeating the Abenaki and their allied. See Reid, Acadia, Maine, and New Scotland, pp.167-168
426 Ibidem.
427 Jacques Vaultier was born in Paris on 1 July 1646. He joined the Jesuits on 2 September 1661, being ordained in 1672. He died on 25 January 1707 at Orléans. See Pelletier, Le Clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.191.
Bigot and, his brother, Jacques had been added to the Sillery’s mission, thus replacing Vaultier. According to the Jesuit historian Antonio Dragon, throughout the years 1685-91, Jacques Bigot had visited Acadia each year, establishing at Pentagouët, where he had also built a chapel.

The experience of the Jesuit mission at Sillery proves that these missionaries had influence on the natives. This aspect was also evident to the main colonial French authorities, who considered the Jesuits as the ones, who could exercise a greater influence on the natives compared with the other missionaries active in New France. Jacques-René de Brisay de Denonville, the governor of New France from 1685 to 1689, believed that the Jesuits were the best missionaries, who could have some authority and influence over the all native nations, being skilled in their language, skilfulness learnt after a long missionary experience. More generally Denonville affirmed that the English, with whom the French could never have any relationships, identified the Catholic missionaries “as their most cruel enemies, whom they cannot bear together with the Aboriginal people that live with them”. On this point Denonville expressed a clear opinion, that missionaries were integral to French-Aboriginal relationships.

Denonville’s comments underlined a role played by the missionaries that was beyond their ecclesiastical duties. As has been analyzed by the historian Micheline

---

430 Vincent Bigot was born at Bourges on 15 May 1649. He entered the Jesuits on 20 September 1664, being ordained in 1679. He arrived in Canada in 1680. See Pelletier, Le Clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.174.
431 Jacques-René de Brisay de Denonville was born on 10 December 1637. He died on 22 September 1710. See DCB, II, p.98.
Dumont Johnson, the political role of the missionaries, operating in New France, traced its origins back to the first half of the seventeenth century, when the French government had been unable to conceive or accomplish a coherent Aboriginal policy. According to this historian, this had favoured the missionaries, who, unlike the French government, had been able to establish secure relationships with aboriginal inhabitants and to undertake and elaborate a native policy, where, at the beginning, the political aspect was mixed up with that religious 433.

As has previously been underlined the situation, in the 1690s, along the borders of southern Acadia and New England was critical. The decision of Villebon to establish the headquarters of Acadia at Fort Naxouat was part of a clear strategy to attack New England settlements. In his task Villebon was supported by Sébastien de Villieu (fl.1690-1705), a French officer, coming from Québec, who arrived at Fort Naxouat in 1693434.

In this context the missionaries also came to be used for information purposes. Towards the end of the summer of 1694, when Vincent Bigot435 confirmed to the French authorities the existence of some negotiations between Madockawando, an Abenaki leader, and Sir William Phips to promote English-Abenaki peace436. This document does not mention the place where Vincent Bigot operated, but we can assume that he was active at Pentagouët437. In fact, in 1694, the Abenaki living in the

434 Casgrain, Les Sulpiciens, pp.167-178; Reid, "1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions", in Atlantic Region, p.83.
435 Although this document just mentioned the last name, we can assume that the cited Jesuit missionary was Vincent Bigot, because at that time his brother Jacques was not in New France, having left for France three years before. See Dragon, L'Acadie et ses, p.155; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.174.
437 DCB, II, p.64.
villages of Norridgewock and Pentagouët asked to have two permanent missionaries. Owing to this request, Vicent Bigot settled at Pentagouët, while Sébastien Râle, one of his confrères, went along the Kennebec River.

Initially de La Place was not involved in the Anglo-French conflict. Till the beginning of October 1695 the Recollet was stationed at Médocotec from where, during the fall of the same year, he left for Québec to meet his superior. When, in the spring of 1696, de La Place returned to Acadia the tension between the Anglo-French was at the height. This was especially clear among the New England settlers who were exasperated by continued Abenaki raids, and by French privateering expeditions. This induced the Massachusetts General Court to offer bounties for the scalps of any Indian. The French authorities kept on supporting the cause of the war against the English, and, on 28 March 1696, Pontchartrain addressed a letter to Villebon in order to make him aware that the King would continue to support the allied aboriginal forces, thus allowing the governor of Acadia to continue the war against the English. The letter acquainted Villebon with Louis XIV's permission to Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville et d'Ardillières to engage sixty natives in order to use them for an expedition in Acadia. The French crown did not forget the Recollets, and their yearly support came to be raised up of 300 livres. In this document it is not specified if the sum granted by the King concerned all the Recollets of New France, or just those active in Acadia.

---

438 This village approximately corresponded to the today's town of Old Point, Madison, in the state of Maine.
439 Sébastien Râle was born at Pontarrier, close to the town of Besançon, in the department of Doubs, on 4 January 1652. On 24 September 1675 he joined the Jesuit order, being ordained in 1688. He arrived in Canada on 13 October 1689. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.189.
440 Dragon, L'Acadie et ses, p.162; JR, LXVI, p.346, note nr.42.
441 Collection de manuscrits, II, pp.187-190.
442 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.243.
444 Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville et d'Ardillières was baptized at Ville-Marie (Montréal) on 20 July 1661. He probably died at Havana, Cuba, on 9 July 1706. See DCB, II, p.390.
What is sure is that, at the beginning of the summer of 1696, de La Place fully became involved into the French strategies against the English. More precisely, throughout all the summer of that year, the Recollet was engaged in his efforts to coordinate the movements of Aboriginal warriors on behalf of Villieu or Villebon's orders. De La Place did not merely act as mediator, but also had an active role in the expedition, through which the French conquered, on 15 August 1696, Fort William Henry, at Pemaquid. According to Abbé Jean Beaudoin, who took part in the naval expedition led by d'Iberville, de La Place collaborated with Thury, and together with fifty Malecites, participated to the battle to conquer the English fort at great personal risk.

The conquest of Fort William Henry brought a reaction for New England. In the fall of 1696, the Massachusetts government entrusted Colonel Benjamin Church with attacking the main settlements of Acadia. During his raid Church devastated as much as he could, but the worst damages were suffered by Beaubassin, which was burned and pillaged. Even on this occasion, de La Place was revealed as extremely important to the French authorities, as shown by a letter, dated 11 October 1696, through which Villebon made the Recollet aware of the English raids. The governor of Acadia clearly required his assistance in bringing Aboriginal forces to Fort Naxouat as soon as possible in order to face the English. Villebon's letter was effective, because at mid-October de La Place arrived at Fort Naxouat, accompanied by thirty Aboriginal warriors. De La Place had then expressed desire to remain at
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447 Fort William Henry and Pemaquid were located in Maine.
449 Benjamin Church was born in 1639 at Plymouth. He died at Little Compton, in Rhode Island, on 17 January 1717/1718. See DCB, II, p.145.
450 Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, p.21; Flank, "The Culture of the Conquest", p.40; Reid, "1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions", in Atlantic Region, pp.82-83.
Fort Naxouat. His request was easily fulfilled because, during the same year, Crey had returned to Québec.\(^{451}\)

The following year presented no changes. As he did in 1696, during the summer of 1697 de La Place kept on leading Aboriginal forces in accordance with French strategic plans. Towards the end of July and following Villebon’s orders, the Recollet had seventy-two natives move from Fort Naxouat to Pentagouët. In all these transfers there was few signs of collaboration between the various missionaries, and the few exceptions were uncoordinated. This is shown by the fact that, during his transfer to Pentagouët, de La Place met Saint-Cosme, who was leading a group of almost two hundred natives to the same place.\(^{452}\)

At the end of September 1697, the Anglo-French conflict in North America came to an apparent end with the Treaty of Ryswick.\(^{453}\) The peace allowed Villebon to try to strengthen the French presence in Acadia, as well as its relationships with the mother-country,\(^{454}\) although the treaty of Ryswick had few consequences for the missionaries’ activity in this territory. De La Place probably kept on following the Maliseet in their migrations within Acadia, trying to instruct and convert them. The Recollet also carried on his pastoral activity at Fort Naxouat.\(^{455}\)

It was at Naxouat, that de La Place began to have problems that threatened his removal from Acadia. In the fall of 1698, he complained about the behavior of Daniel Robineau de Neuvillelette and René Robinau de Portneuf, the brothers of

\(^{451}\) *Collection de manuscrits*, II, p.243. Crey never came back to Acadia. In fact he began to be active, as curate and, afterwards, superior at Trois-Rivières, moving to Montréal in 1702, where he probably remained till 1707. Till now there is no available information on his return’s date to France. What is sure is that Crey died in Paris on 7 March 1743. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.162-163.

\(^{452}\) *Journal de ce qui s’est passé à l’Acadie depuis le mois d’octobre 1696 à octobre 1697*, AC, C11D, vol.14, pp.214-215; AC, C11A, vol.14, fol.12-17, [1697].

\(^{453}\) Codignola, *Storia del Canada*, p.121; Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in *Atlantic Region*, p.84.

\(^{454}\) Daigle, "L’Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in *L’Acadie des Maritimes*, p.22.

\(^{455}\) Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.244.
Villebon, who, in the missionary’s opinion, was having illicit relationships with young native women. This caused Villebon’s reaction who, in order to defend his brothers, asked for de La Place’s replacement by a secular priest.

After this event, the information on this Recollet is limited to his death, which occurred on 1 January 1699. The influence and the prestige he had acquired during his missionary experience in Acadia, were confirmed, when his body arrived at Québec. According to a letter, dated 1 May 1705, written from Paris by the Recollet Louis-Hyacinthe de La Place, Simon’s brother, and addressed to their mother, Simon’s body arrived at Québec, carried by 400 weeping natives, and was welcomed by more than 4,000 people, led by the governor of New France.

De La Place’s death was not the only one that affected missionary activity in Acadia, for on 3 June 1699, Thury died at Chebucto. However Thury’s death did not prevent the Seminary of Québec from strengthening its presence in Acadia in the years 1697-99. In 1697, it sent to Acadia Jacques-Alexis de Fleury Deschambault. Between 1698 and 1699, other three members of the Seminary, named Antoine Gaulin, Pierre-René Le Boulanger de Saint-Pierre, and Philippe Rageot came to

456 Daniel Robinseau de Neuville was born in 1672 or 1673. He died in 1702. René Robinseau de Portneuf was born on 3 September 1659 at Québec. He died in the night between 3-4 October 1726 at Montréal. See DCB, II, pp.166-167.
458 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.244.
459 Louis-Hyacinthe, baptized Jean-Claude, de La Place was born at Rouen on 2 February 1673. He joined the Recollet order in 1691, being ordained in 1696. He arrived in Canada on 8 September 1710, coming back to France on 28 October 1720. He died on 30 January 1737 at Versailles, in the department of Yvelines. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.197.
460 Archives Franciscaines de Montréal, Fonds Jouve, dossier Simon-Gédard de La Place, pièces 98-99, cited in Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.245.
461 Chebucto approximately corresponded to the today’s city of Halifax, in Nova Scotia.
462 Jacques-Alexis de Fleury Deschambault was born at Québec on 14 August 1672, being ordained in 1694. Antoine Gaulin was born on Île d’Orléans on 16 April 1674, and on 21 December 1697 he was ordained. Pierre-René Le Boulanger de Saint-Pierre was born at Cap-de-la-Madeleine on 12 November 1678. He died at Charlesbourg on 24 June 1747. Philippe Rageot was born at Québec on 11 July 1678. He died at Kamouraska on 21 September 1711. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, pp.223, 228, 231, 237.
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support Deschambault's activity. Deschambault, however, died on 29 August 1698.\footnote{Wicken, "Encounters with Tall sails", pp.324-325.}

We have no evidence of a possible collaboration between the Jesuits and the missionaries, who worked or resided at Pentagouët. What is sure is that, in 1698, Vincent Bigot moved his mission from this settlement to an Abenaki village, named Naurakamig\footnote{This place was approximately located along the right bank of the Pentagouët River.}, where the soil was more fertile, thus being a better location for teaching to the natives agriculture\footnote{JR, LXV, p.262, note nr.10; Camille de Rochemonteix, Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVIIe siècle, vol.III, (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1895-1896), pp.438-439; According to Râle, this village was also cited as Narankamigouk. See Maine Historical Society Collections, vol.IV, (Portland, Maine: The Society, 1831-1887), p.102.}. The apparent facility with which the Jesuits could move the missions' locations among the Abenaki was favoured by the long evangelical activity that had been carried out since the late 1640s. Furthermore the missionaries' activity had clearly been an avenue through which the French had obtained the Abenaki's alliance long before the English could realize any need to have the natives' support\footnote{James Axtell, The Invasion Within. The Contest of Cultures in Colonial North America, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp.247-248.}.

At the village of Naurakamig, the good relationships between the Jesuits and the Abenaki brought results. When, at the beginning of September 1689, Jacques Bigot reached the Abenaki village, and his overall first impression of it was positive. The native inhabitants seemed to him zelous, and anxious to take the Holy Communion and this had to be credited to his brother Vincent. The two brothers began to operate together, and both of them were able to confess and administer communion to more than 200 natives. Some Abenaki even delayed their usual departure for retiring into the woods, a custom that occurred each year at the end of September, in order to be instructed by the two Jesuits. During his stay at Naurakamig, Jacques Bigot had also the opportunity to see an Anglo-Abenaki
exchange of prisoners. The Abenaki’s prisoners, that were fourteen or more years old, could choose to return to New England or remain at Naurakamig, while those who were under fourteen years old were obliged to return. According to Bigot, the majority of the younger English prisoners refused to be exchanged, because they preferred to live among the natives and to pray as the French did. Another reason was their fear of persecution by Protestant ministers

We need to underline that, before his arrival at Naurakamig, Jacques Bigot was already aware of the exchange of prisoners that occurred between the British and the Abenaki in the southern part of Acadia. A proof of it can be found in a letter, dated 2 May 1699, written by Louis-Hector de Callière, the governor of New France, who, in 1698, had replaced Frontenac, and addressed to Pontchartrain. In this document Callière confirmed the existence of negotiations between the Abenaki and the English, on the ground of the information received by Jacques Bigot. Bigot had acquired this information from the Abenaki who lived in the mission of Saint-François-de-Sales.

During the winter of 1699 and 1700, Jacques Bigot returned to Québec in order to inform the governor of New France of Abenaki meetings with the English. The Jesuit did not specify for long time he remained there, but, during the first months of 1700, he tried to come back to Naurakamig. However, weary and afflicted by a fever, he had to return to Québec, where he was ill for five weeks. After Easter

---

467 JR, LXV, pp.86-94.
468 Louis-Hector de Callière was born on 12 November 1648 at Thorigny-sur-Vire, in the region of Normandy. He died at Québec on 26 May 1703. See DCB, II, p.112; Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.106.
470 This mission, that was approximately located on the left bank of the Chaudière river, was established in 1683, when the Abenaki, living at Silley, were moved there, led by Jacques Bigot. See Dragon, L’Acadie et ses, p.158.
Bigot was finally able to leave Québec and return to Acadia, where he continued ecclesiastical duties among the natives. On the contrary, in 1699, after de La Place's death and Crey's departure, there were no more signs of the Recollets in Acadia, although in the fall of that year Saint-Vallier tried to reintroduce some missionaries of this order. More precisely he began to elaborate a plan for a Recollet mission at Port-Royal. The French crown came to be aware of the bishop's plan through two letters, respectively dated 20 and 28 October 1699. In the first letter, Callière acquainted Pontchartrain of Saint-Vallier's intention. Eight days later, Saint-Vallier himself wrote to Pontchartrain in favour of the establishment of a Recollet mission in Acadia. Saint-Vallier also said he was ready to wait for the king's approval, but, in the meantime, he had sent two un-named Recollets to Acadia. Lack of further documentation does not allow us to know who these two missionaries were and if they really went to Acadia.

The only certitude on the missionaries' number in Acadia came from a letter, dated 27 October 1699, that Villebon addressed to Pontchartrain. The commandant noted that were there five priests in Acadia, all of them maintained by Saint-Vallier. One was at Pentagouët, with a young ecclesiastic, who could not yet say mass. Villebon also requested Pontchartrain to send him a chaplain. Villebon also wanted to make the French crown aware that Anglo-Abenaki peace had continued. In fact the governor declared had been informed that Richard Coote, earl of Bellomont, the governor of New England, was disposed to go to the Kennebec for this purpose. With regards to this, Villebon affirmed that he had written to the Jesuits, who 471

operated there, to have them discourage Abenaki leaders from meeting with Bellamont⁴⁷⁴.

Villebon did not mention the names of his sources of information nor those of the Jesuits, active on the Kennebec, even if it is likely, concerning these latter, that he referred to the Bigot brothers and Râle. As in Saint-Vallier's letter, Villebon did not specify the names of the priests. We can assume that four of the five priests mentioned by Villebon were Gaulin, Abel Maudoux⁴⁷⁵ (who, since 1692, had been parish priest at Port-Royal)⁴⁷⁶, Le Boulanger, and Rageot. It is difficult to prove for certain who was the young ecclesiastic cited by Villebon, but it must have either Le Boulanger or Rageot, who respectively came to be ordained on 6 November and 24 July 1701⁴⁷⁷.

Despite Saint-Vallier's support, we have any information on the two Recollets sent to Acadia. Their activity remains unknown, and not until 1702 we have documented evidence of Recollets again operating in this territory.

The last years before the conquest of Port-Royal (1700-1710)

On 9 April 1700, Pontchartrain replied to Villebon, and approved of his having written to the Jesuits. Pontchartrain confirmed one more time that no negotiation or meeting between Bellomont and the Abenaki must be allowed to occur⁴⁷⁸. From his part, Bellomont was by then aware that, while the Jesuits remained among the Abenaki, the English would have difficulty establishing any

⁴⁷⁵ Abel Maudoux was born in France in 1664, and he was ordained on 31 March 1688. See Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.233.
⁴⁷⁸ *Collection de manuscrits*, II, p.334.
relationship with the natives. Due to this, it is not surprising that, in 1700, Bellomont made the New York and Massachusetts assemblies pass laws through which the Jesuits as well as the other Catholic missionaries were outlawed from the English territories.  

Regarding the Recollets’ return to Acadia, throughout 1700 the situation remained unchanged. It was in the summer of 1701 that a Recollet missionary arrived, from Plaisance, at Port-Royal, together with Jacques-François de Mombeton de Brouillan, the new governor of Acadia. It is almost sure that this missionary was Félix Pain, the last Saint-Denys Recollet to have served the Newfoundland mission that, in 1701, was assigned to those of the province of Britain. Despite Pain’s arrival, missionary activity among the Mi’kmaq was very limited. As
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479 Axtell, *The Invasion Within*, p.248.
480 The matter of their reestablishment twice came to be discussed, although with no practical results. The first document was an an estimate of the expenses Louis XIV was disposed to do in Acadia. In it, the French King two sums of money, whose amount was not specified, to Saint-Vallier and to two Recollets, whose names were not cited. The second was a letter of Villeu, who requested to have some Recollets for the garrison of Port-Royal. See AC, C11A, vol.113, fol.151-154v, 1700; Villeu, to, Pontchartrain, 20 October 1700, AC, Nouvelle-France, Correspondance officielle, vol.2, pp.431-434.
481 Jacques-François de Mombeton de Brouillan was born in 1651. In 1689 he was appointed governor of Placentia, office he held till 1701. He died on 22 September 1705 at Chedabouctou. See DCB, II, p.478.
482 Jacques-François de Mombeton de Brouillan to, Pontchartrain, 6 October 1701, AC, C11C, vol.4, fol.142.
483 According to Jou, Félix Pain was born in 1670 in Paris. Instead, in Pelletier’s analysis, his birth-date is in 1668. In 1689 he joined the Recollet order, entering the province of Saint Denys. The beginning of Pain’s missionary activity in New France is, till now, uncertain, in fact, according to Tanguay, Dumont-Johnson, and Bernard Pothier, this Recollet would have been active at Newfoundland or in Acadia since 1694, year when he was probably ordained. See Joue, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.737; Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.206; Tanguay, *Répertoire*, p.77; Dumont-Johnson, *Apôtres ou agitateurs*, p.143; DCB, III, p.541.
484 When Pain left Plaisance, Denis, Le Tac, and Pelletier, the first Recollets to be active there, were no more present at Newfoundland. According to Joue, both Denis and Pelletier left Newfoundland in order to come back to Québec in the lapse of time between the years 1690 and 1692. Le Tac’s stay was even more limited, in fact, some days after 7 September 1689, he left Plaisance for France in order to deliver to Louis XIV some letters of Saint-Vallier, through that the bishop of Québec requested to have more Recollets for the missions of Newfoundland and Acadia. Le Tac never came back to New France, dying on 10 August 1718 in the Recollet convent of Rouen. According to Lemay, on the ground of Denis and Pelletier’s decision to leave this mission and return to Québec, there was probably the exigence to reside in a safer place, that could be less exposed to the risks of the British raids. See DCB, II, p.429; Joue, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp. 326, 765; Lemay, *L’Établissement des Récollets de la province de Saint Denis à Plaisance*, pp.13, 18;
Brouillain reported to Pontchartrain, in late 1701, no other priests were active among the Mi'kmaq.\textsuperscript{485}

By contrast, the Jesuits continued their activities among the Abenaki. New England’s efforts to expel these missionaries had continued, but without success.\textsuperscript{486} Furthermore, in 1701, the Jesuits extended their missionary range to the village of Médoc tec. According to an anonymous list of revenues for the year 1701, among the Abenaki of Acadia and close to the English there were three missionaries.\textsuperscript{487} Although this document did not cite the names of the three missionaries, we can assume that they were Vincent Bigot, Râle, and Joseph Aubery,\textsuperscript{488} who was the probable founder, in 1701, of the Jesuit mission at Médoc tec, thus replacing de La Place.\textsuperscript{489} When this document had been compiled, Jacques Bigot was no longer active in Acadia, because he had been recalled to Québec in 1700. Instead Vincent Bigot would leave Acadia in 1704 to be appointed superior of the Jesuit missions of New France.\textsuperscript{490}

In 1702 the religious pattern of Port-Royal seemed to be stable. In fact, towards the end of October, Pain could begin his activity as parish priest, thus replacing Maudoux. Pain also became the chaplain of the fort of Port-Royal.\textsuperscript{491} However the beginning of Pain’s activity at Port-Royal coincided with a renewed tension that had arisen in Europe between France and England. On 15 May 1702, Queen Anne (1665-1714) declared war on France, thus initiating the War of the

\textsuperscript{485} Brouillain, to, Pontchartrain, 6 October 1701, AC, C11D, vol.4, fol.46, 68.
\textsuperscript{486} Dragon, \textit{L’Acadie et ses}, p.164.
\textsuperscript{487} JR, LXV, p.185.
\textsuperscript{488} Joseph Aubery was born at Gisors, in the department of Eure, on 10 May 1673. On 8 September 1690 he joined the Jesuit order, being ordained at Québec in 1700. See JR, LXV, p.185; LXXI, p.157.
\textsuperscript{491} PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.1-2.
Spanish Succession that would last till 1713. This war had various effects on the Aboriginal inhabitants of Acadia. If a significant number of Mi’kmaq sided with Brouillan, the same thing did not initially happen with the Abenaki, who, in 1703, through their leaders, expressed the desire to remain neutral in the Anglo-French conflict.

From their part, the French authorities made all the possible efforts to avoid any contact or negotiations between the English and the Abenaki, thus relying on the missionaries’ influence over these natives. On 15 November 1703, Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreil and François de Beauharnois de La Chaussaye, respectively the governor and the intendant of New France, to Pontchartrain, jointly wrote to Pontchartrain to acquaint him that, according to the information received from Râle, some measures had been taken against any negotiations between the Abenaki and the English.

If the Jesuits kept on being used by the French authorities to promote their interests within the natives, in 1703, the Recollets were more than ever engaged to consolidate and expand their presence within Port-Royal. This is shown by the fact that, during the same year, Pain was joined by Patrice René who had been appointed as superior of the Acadian mission. The priority of the Recollets at Port-Royal was
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492 Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in Atlantic Region, pp.87-88.
493 Ibidem, p.89.
494 Philippe de Rigaud, marquis de Vaudreil was probably born in the chateau of his family, close to Revel about 1643, and he died in Québec on 10 October 1725. See DCE, II, p.565.
495 François de Beauharnois de La Chaussaye, baron de Beauville, was baptized on 12 October 1671, and died on 12 July 1749, in the parish of Saint-Saveur, in Paris. See DCE, III, p.41.
496 Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreil and François de Beauharnois de La Chaussaye, to, Pontchartrain, 15 November 1703, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.21, fol.5-28v.
497 Patrice René was probably born in 1667, and he joined the Recollet order in 1682. According to Jouve he was ordained in 1688. According to the Recollet historian, René but arrived in New France in 1703, while, according to Anselme Chiasson, he was active there since 1690. We have any available information, through that we can prove when René was appointed superior of the Acadian mission, however we can assume that he got this office from Saint-Vallier. What is sure is that, according to the parish register of Port-Royal, the presence of René, for the year 1703, is attested for two times, respectively on 30 September and 7 October. The proof of René’s office is found in the act of 30 September 1703, in fact, in it, he signed as curate and superior of the mission. René replaced
not limited to take care of its inhabitants' needs. As Saint-Vallier had affirmed through his letter of 29 November 1703, one of the main tasks of the Recollets was the conversion of the natives, as well as administering the Sacraments to the parishioners. The bishop also envisaged that the Recollets could build a convent, through which they could operate on the outskirts of Port-Royal, thus reaching the natives.

The first period of René at Port-Royal seemed to confirm Saint-Vallier's hopes. The activity of the Recollet was intense, and, according to the historian Émile Lauvriere, he devoted himself to founding a school for boys that was probably opened in the fall of 1703. However Pain and René could not by themselves face the increasing duties, so that, in 1704, other two missionaries named Bonaventure Masson and Justinien Durand were added to the mission. It is likely that, during the same year, the province of Saint-Denis sent there another missionary, simply mentioned as Luc, although he died in the month of August.

Three factors played in favour of the Recollets during the first years of their apostolate at Port-Royal. The first of them was the support given by Brouillan, who, on behalf of the French crown, provided to the Recollets a lodgement. According to
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Pain from the office of parish priest of Port-Royal, notwithstanding this latter signed, mentioning this office, just one time, more precisely in the act of 18 June 1703. See DCB, III, p.597; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.823; PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, fol.3-12.


500 Bonaventure Masson was born in France in 1671, and he joined the Recollet order in 1690. He was probably ordained in 1695. Justinien Durand was probably born in 1667, and in 1683 he joined the Recollet order. According to the parish register of Port-Royal, the name of Masson was cited, for the first time, in the dates of 23-24 February, and 2 March 1704, while that of Durand appeared on 24 November of the same year. See PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.12-24; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.407, 676.

501 According to Bacon, it is likely that this missionary was born in 1680, and joined the Recollets in 1698. See Ibidem, p.651.
the governor's plans, this structure would be connected to a new parish church\footnote{Ibidem, p.824.}. Secondly no other missionary order had opposed to the Recollets' establishment at Port-Royal. As Saint-Vallier had declared, the Recollets “had been the only missionaries available he could find to go there”\footnote{RAPQ, vol.1940-1941, p.372.}. The situation of Port-Royal in the early 1700s can be seen as the third factor. According to census, in 1701 Port-Royal counted of 504 inhabitants and was the most populous settlement of Acadia\footnote{Clark, Acadia, p.129.}. Furthermore it had not been touched by the New England raids, that, in 1704, had reached the settlements of Minas and Beaubassin in reply to the French raids against Wells, Saco, Casco Bay, and Deerfield\footnote{Wells, Saco are in Maine, while Deerfield is in Massachusetts.}, which occurred in 1703 and 1704\footnote{Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.183; Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in Atlantic Region, p.89.}.

In 1705, the Recollets began, through Pain, to spread their activity outside Port-Royal. This shown by the fact that, throughout the month of May, this missionary reached the villages of Ouikmacagan, Cap-Sable, Puckmacagan, Mirliguesch, Petite Rivière, and Port Maltois, thus covering an area that approximately corresponds to the southern part of today's Nova Scotia. Pain explained his presence in these places, writing that he “was carrying out his mission in the south and eastern part of the province of Acadia”\footnote{PANS, RG 1, vol.26, register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of the parish of St-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.33-34.}. Pain's decision to go on mission outside Port-Royal probably explains his reluctance to accept the role of chaplain\footnote{Jouve upheld his thesis on the letter, dated 19 May 1705, written by Brouillan, who in that moment was in France, and addressed to the Pontchartrain. Through it, the governor of Acadia reported that he had prayed the Recollet provincial of Saint-Denys to send to Acadia two missionaries, for being engaged in the parishes of Port-Royal and Beaubassin in order to take the places left by those active there, who wanted to go on mission among the natives, a desire, according to Brouillan's opinion, that had not to be obstructed. Concerning the second missionary, we can probably identify him as Masson, because, since the month of May 1705, Durand signed as curate of Port-Royal, while René was its superior. See Brouillan, to, Pontchartrain, 19 May 1705, Paris, AC, C11D, vol.5, fol.115;}. However in all the villages he visited, Pain converted no Mi'kmaq\footnote{Jouve upheld his thesis on the letter, dated 19 May 1705, written by Brouillan, who in that moment was in France, and addressed to the Pontchartrain. Through it, the governor of Acadia reported that he had prayed the Recollet provincial of Saint-Denys to send to Acadia two missionaries, for being engaged in the parishes of Port-Royal and Beaubassin in order to take the places left by those active there, who wanted to go on mission among the natives, a desire, according to Brouillan's opinion, that had not to be obstructed. Concerning the second missionary, we can probably identify him as Masson, because, since the month of May 1705, Durand signed as curate of Port-Royal, while René was its superior. See Brouillan, to, Pontchartrain, 19 May 1705, Paris, AC, C11D, vol.5, fol.115;}. It
is likely that this was a reflection of the Recollet missionary policy that, as happened
the previous periods, expected that all natives should be civilized before being
converted. This aspect was also echoed by the words of Louis-Armand de Lom
d’Arce, Baron de LaHontan, a French colonial officer, according to whom, “The
Rocollets brand the Indians for stupid, gross and rustick persons, uncapable of
Thought or Reflection”.

In the fall of 1705 the Recollets’ activity at Port-Royal was troubled by a
dispute that involved Pain and Bonaventure, the administrator of Port-Royal after
Brouillan’s death in mid-September. The cause of this dispute had its origins in the
relationship Bonaventure had with Louise Guyon, the widow of Mathieu Damours
de Freneuse. This relation had never been accepted by the Recollets, who, through
an undated letter of Pain, had acquainted Pontchartrain of the matter. The principal
civil and religious authorities of New France were already aware of it, and, in 1703,
Saint-Vallier had proposed to remove Mme. Freneuse from Acadia.

Bonaventure did not accept the Recollets’ charge, and, in his turn, he began to
accuse Pain. On 30 November 1705, Bonaventure wrote to Pontchartrain, making
him aware that, at mid-February of that year, Pain had married the captain François
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PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-
Royal, 1702-1728, p.33; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.739.
509 PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-
Royal, 1702-1728, pp.34-38.
510 Prins, *The Mi’kmag*, p.73.
511 Louis-Armand de Lom d’Arce, Baron de LaHontan, was born on 9 June 1666 at Lahontan (in the
512 Louis-Armand de Lom d’Arce, Baron de LaHontan, *New Voyages to North America by the Baron
513 Louise Guyon was baptized on 1 May 1668 on Ile d’Orléans, and died sometime after 1711. From
her relationship with Bonaventure, she had also a child, who was born in 1703. See *DCB*, III, p.681.
514 Mathieu Damours de Freneuse was baptized on 14 March 1657 at Québec, and died in 1696. See
*DCB*, I, p.245.
516 *RAPQ*, vol.1940-1941, p.372.
Du Pont Duvivier to a girl of low conditions, who was already pregnant, thus ignoring a royal prohibition. Bonaventure also accused Pain of having refused to stay at Port-Royal, and instruct the soldiers of the fort, as he had been asked to do. All this was, for Bonaventure, enough to ask to replace Pain with a secular priest, who could serve as chaplain for the fort of Port-Royal, and instruct the young soldiers who lived there. The dispute between Pain and Bonaventure did not go on, and no secular priest took the Recollet's place as chaplain of Port-Royal. However Pain's behavior in regard to Vivier's marriage came to be criticized by Pontchartrain as well as the inhabitants' community of Port-Royal. In all of this, Pain had shown himself to be more concerned with his activity among the people living outside of Port-Royal than with the religious instruction of the soldiers.

The year 1705 also saw the resumption of missionary activity among the Mi'kmaq of the Baie des Chaleurs. With the arrival of Michel Bruslé, who operated at Ristigouche, Miramichi and Nipisiquit, the Recollets were again active in an area, from which they had been absent since Jumeau's departure in 1685.

With the arrival of Daniel d'Auger de Subercase, the new governor of Acadia, the problems of the Recollets at Port-Royal came to be alleviated. According to the instructions written, in the spring of 1706, by Pontchartrain to Subercase, the new governor had to make the Recollets behave following the rules of
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517 François Du Pont Duvivier was born on 5 September 1676 at Sérignac, and died on 31 October or 1 November 1714 in Louisbourg. See DCB, II, p.205.
518 Bonaventure to Pontchartrain, 30 November 1705, AC, C11D, vol.5, fol.168
519 DCB, III, p.541.
520 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.740.
521 Michel Bruslé was born in 1673, and he entered the Recollet province of Saint-Denys in 1689. He was ordained in 1697, and the following year he left for Canada. See Ibidem, p.58; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.194;
522 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.59.
523 Daniel d'Auger de Subercase was born on 12 February 1661 at Orthez, in the department of Basses-Pyrénées. Before being appointed governor of Acadia, he held this office at Newfoundland. He died on 20 November 1732 at Cannes (now Cannes-L'Écluse, in the department of Yonne), See DCB, II, p.35.
the French parishes, and had to leave the inhabitants free to resolve any questions that concerned the parish of Port-Royal. Especially the missionaries had to avoid conflicts among themselves that could damage their relationships with the community of Port-Royal. Subercase’s arrival brought some results, and, on Christmas’ day of 1706, he informed Pontchartrain that at Port-Royal there were two Recollets, respectively a chaplain and a curate, of whom he had a favourable opinion. According to the parish register for the year 1706, we can assume that the curate, mentioned in Subercase’s letter, was Durand, while the chaplain was Pain. Subercase only mentioned two Recollets, so that, excluding René who was the superior, it must be supposed that Masson was stationed outside Port-Royal.

Compared to the Recollets’ experience at Port-Royal, the information on the Jesuit apostolate among the Abenaki in southern Acadia is much more limited. We only know, through a letter, dated 4 November 1706, of Vaudreuil to Pontchartrain, that the governor of New France mentioned having given some orders to Aubery and Joseph Pierre de la Chasse, cited as missionaries to the Abenaki.

In 1707 the Acadian region underwent a new attack from New England. At the end of May of 1707, an expedition composed of 1300 soldiers arrived at Port-Royal. The British besieged the fort, trying, on 17 June, to conquer it, but their effort was vain, in fact, and they had to withdraw from Port-Royal. During their retreat, however, the British were able to burn some of the houses that surrounded
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526 PAS, RG1, vol.26, register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.41-53.
527 Joseph Pierre de la Chasse was born at Saint-Pierre-en-Château, in the department of Yonne, on 7 May 1670. He joined the Jesuits on 14 October 1687, being ordained in 1699. In 1700 he arrived at Québec, however we do not know when he came, for the first time, to Acadia. See DCB, III, pp.329-331; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.178.
529 Since this moment we will use the term British instead of English, because of the union, in 1707, of the crown of England with that of Scotland.
the fort, including the Recollet lodgement. At the moment of the British attack, René was not at Port-Royal, because he had returned to France. According to the parish register, the last act he signed was dated 8 April 1707. Through the parish registers, we also know that, since the act of 3 January 1707, René added to his signature the title of Vicar General of the bishop of Québec in Acadia. We have no information through which we can verify when René obtained this office that had been previously given to Thury and, afterwards, Gaulin.

What is sure is that René arrived in France at the beginning of August 1707, as shown by Pontchartrain’s letter to the provincial of Saint-Denys. Through it, the minister expressly asked to not replace René at Port-Royal with another missionary. Pontchartrain justified his request, affirming that René had acquired much trust among the inhabitants of Port-Royal. Both Pontchartrain’s request and the decision of René to leave Acadia were to be imputed to the Recollets’ conflict with Bonaventure. Towards mid-October 1707 a solution to this conflict was finally found. In fact, on 19 October, Pontchartrain wrote to René to reassure him that the French king had decided to recall M.me Freneuse to France. On this point, Pontchartrain had also sent a royal order to Subercase. The minister concluded his letter by urging the missionary to go to La Rochelle, where there was a ship ready to sail for Acadia.

Despite the absence of René, in the summer of 1707 the Recollets further extended their missionary range, by arriving to serve the parish of Grand-Pré. There,
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530 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.825; Reid, “1686-1720. Imperial Intrusions”, in Atlantic Region, pp.89-90.
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532 Johnston, History of, 1, pp.27, 29.
533 Pontchartrain, to, the provincial of Saint-Denis, 24 August 1707, AC, B, vol.29, fol.54.
534 Pontchartrain, to, Patrice René, OFM Rec, 19 October 1707, AC, B, vol.29, fol.63v; Pontchartrain, to, de Subercase, 19 October 1707, AC, B, vol.29, fol.64.
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on 14 August 1707, Masson began to be active. René probably returned to Port-Royal during the winter of 1707-08. According to the parish register, he was there from 16 April till 29 October 1708, the day when he signed his last act. After that date René disappeared, so that his following activity is completely wrapped in mystery.

After the attack of 1707, the British realized that they needed military support from the mother-country. It was Samuel Vetch, a Scottish trader, who understood that the French, in Acadia and in Canada, could only be defeated through massive use of forces. From 1707 to 1709 Vetch resided in London, trying to obtain the necessary support from the British government for a military campaign against Acadia and Canada. His opinion about the Catholic missionaries' active in Acadia was clear. Vetch asserted that they must be expelled, because they operated on behalf of the French crown. According to Vetch, the expulsion of the missionaries would also allow the British to convert the Aboriginal inhabitants to Protestantism and make them reject their traditional customs. In the spring of 1709, Vetch, supported by Francis Nicholson, succeeded in gaining approval for his project, although it was withdrawn at the last moment.

On the French side, the years of the conflict against the British had progressively weakened the economic and military strength of Acadia. Supplies from France were difficult to obtain due to the presence of the British navy in the North
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536 PANS, RG1, vol.26, register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.66-75.
537 We have no available information related to his departure from Acadia or when he left New France, so that the only certainty is that he died in Paris on 28 November 1742. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.827.
538 Samuel Vetch was born on 9 December 1668 in Edinburgh. He died on 30 April 1732 in London. See *DCB*, II, p.650.
539 Francis Nicholson was born on 12 Nov 1655, and died on 5 March 1728. See *American National Biography*, vol.16, p.402.
Atlantic. Beyond this, the military support of the mother-country was scarce, despite the continuous requests for aid of Subercase.\(^{541}\)

The religious pattern of Port-Royal presented little but significant change in the period throughout the years 1709-1710. After René's departure, Durand became parish priest. The only real change happened on 30 August 1709, when Jean-Baptiste Loyard, a Jesuit missionary\(^{542}\), replaced Durand. Loyard justified his presence, affirming that he was at Port-Royal, doing the parish priest's duties, because of the absence of Durand\(^{543}\). It is difficult to explain the presence of Loyard at Port-Royal, although he may have stayed there during his journey to Médocetc, where he had been assigned to replace Aubery\(^{544}\).

In the spring of 1710 Vetch's project was implemented, although, compared to the original one, the military campaign was limited to Acadia. On 24 September 1710, the British expedition arrived at Port-Royal, thus beginning a siege that lasted till 5 October, when Subercase decided to capitulate. After the surrender, the British troops entered the fort of Port-Royal, that was renamed Annapolis Royal in honour of Queen Anne\(^{545}\). The British conquest opened a new era, where the role and the activity of the Catholic missionaries, active in Acadia, underwent a deep change.

\(^{541}\) Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, p.23.
\(^{542}\) Jean-Baptiste Loyard was born at Pau, in the department of Pyrénées-Atlantiques, on 18 October 1678. On 31 August 1695 he joined the Jesuit order, being ordained in 1706. He arrived in Canada on 14 June 1706. See DCB, II, pp.447-448; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.186.
\(^{543}\) PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.76-90.
\(^{544}\) JR, LXVI, pp.343, 345; Rochemonteix, Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France au XVIIe siècle, III, p.436.
Conclusions

The experience of Le Clercq among the Mi’kmaq can be considered as the culminating point of the first phase of Acadia’s missionary history, where the instruction and the conversion of the natives kept on having the priority. In fact, in his account, we can find all the main characteristics of an apostolate, whose focus was represented by the spread of the Catholic faith among the natives. Le Clercq’s apostolate among the Mi’kmaq can also be considered as the last missionary experience that had something in common with those that characterized the first half of the seventeenth century. Le Clercq tried to carry out his evangelical activity, adapting himself to a different social and cultural pattern, where the acceptance of the Aboriginal values and customs remained the only way for achieving some permanent results.

The second half of the seventeenth century recorded the definitive disappearance of Propaganda from the missionary pattern of Acadia as well as that of North America. An information vacuum about Acadia and its native population developed, that the Roman ministry would have only begun to fill in the second half of the eighteenth century.

In the 1680s, both Jesuits and Recollets were influenced by the changes undergone by the Church in New France as well the events that occurred in Acadia. Compared to the Jesuits, the Recollets carried out a double activity, trying to take care of the spiritual needs of the French settlers as well as to convert the natives. Although, serving as parish priests in the main settlements, the Recollets confirmed that Acadia did not remain excluded from the changes that modified the pattern of the Church in New France in the second half of the seventeenth century.
All the Recollet missions in Acadia, and especially that at Port-Royal, progressively assumed features resembling European parishes, where the religious lived within a community, whose support was basic. A common denominator that linked the Jesuits and Recollets during their apostolate in Acadia was that, between the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, they became, as did all the other Catholic missionaries, one of the key elements in the Anglo-French conflict. The experience of de La Place and that of the Jesuits among the Abenaki confirms the influence and the importance the missionaries had in the relationships between the French and the Aboriginal natives. This was clear to the British, by whom the missionaries were seen as a menace to be erased.

The period from 1670 till 1710 was characterized by the virtual absence of co-operation between the various religious orders that operated independently, without a clear missionary jurisdiction. Another element to consider, concerning the Jesuits and the Recollets, is their scarce number. In fact, from 1670 till 1710, seven Jesuits and fourteen Recollets operated in Acadia, a number that, however, has to be related to the extension of this territory. This aspect can explain the difficulties faced by these missionaries during their apostolate. From 1670 till 1710, Jesuits and Recollets operated in missions, where, except Port-Royal, the French presence was scarce and scattered.

The length and stability of each single mission relied on the efforts of one or no more than two missionaries. This made the missions' stability extremely delicate but, especially, susceptible to any type of changes such as a missionary's death. This could determine the interruption or, in most of the time, the end of the activity. Again Port-Royal was an exception and, from 1668 till 1710, it remained the only center that enjoyed a relative continuity at the level of missionaries' presence.
Chapter IV

The beginning of a difficult cohabitation (1710-1713)

The fourth chapter illustrates the way in which the British conquest altered the missionary pattern of Acadia/Nova Scotia. More specifically it concentrates on the Anglo-missionary relationships which were established at Annapolis Royal and along the borders of Acadia/Nova Scotia and New England. It was exactly this latter area that saw the experience of Sébastien Râle. His activity among the Abenaki provides one of the best examples for understanding the role and the influence the missionaries acquired in Anglo-French conflict in North America.

The first act of the British, after the conquest of Port-Royal (now renamed Annapolis Royal), was to proclaim, on 12 October 1710, that Acadia/Nova Scotia was a territory that belonged to the British crown. However Samuel Vetch, appointed as first governor of Acadia/Nova Scotia, and the military commander Francis Nicholson soon realized that the British forces were superior only at Annapolis Royal, and that they were surrounded by a majority of French settlers.

The news related to the capture of Annapolis Royal spread within New France, and only reached Québec in December 1710. In Newfoundland it was

---


549 Reid, “Imperial Intrusions”, in Atlantic Region, p.91.
Philippe Pastour de Costebelle, the governor of Placentia, who, through a letter dated 6 November 1710, reported to France that Annapolis Royal had been attacked by the British. This document also held a summary of a letter written by Félix Pain. It stated that the British let the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal keep their personal objects, but they wanted no missionaries there.

Pain's warning was connected with the widespread anti-Catholic feeling of the British which pervaded that period. In fact, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Catholic priests were identified as elements who had a negative influence over their parishioners. Nicholson and Vetch had different views on the Catholic missionaries. According to Nicholson, it was necessary to remove them gradually from the French settlers, and introduce Protestant missionaries. On the contrary Vetch's position was the same he had taken before the conquest of Annapolis Royal: that it was necessary to capture and expel all the Catholic clergy operating in Acadia/Nova Scotia.

Despite Vetch's hostility, in the fall of 1710, the Jesuits remained the key element in Abenaki-French relationships. According to Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreuil, New France's governor, the efforts made by Joseph Dudley among the Abenaki had again been vain due to the return at Panouamské of Joseph Pierre de
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550 Philippe Pastour de Costebelle was born in 1661 the French region of Languedoc. He died in 1717 at Louisbourg. See George W. Brown et al., Dictionary of Canadian Biography, [shortened in DCE], (14 vols. to date; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966-), II, pp.509-513.
553 Panouamské was the other name used to define the Pentagouët mission. See Reuben Gold Thwaites ed., The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791, 73 vols., (New York: Pageant Book Company, 1959), LXVI, p.345.
la Chasse. Vaudreil added no further details, but it is likely that the Jesuit exerted his influence on the Abenaki to make them refuse Dudley's proposal.

Furthermore the activity of the Jesuits in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia seemed unaffected by the conquest of Annapolis Royal. On 5 November 1711 Joseph-Louis Germain, the Jesuit superior in New France from 1710 till 1716, wrote to his General to present an overall description on the state of the mission. Regarding Acadia/Nova Scotia, Germain, who probably was as yet unaware of the fall of Annapolis Royal, declared that there were three missions in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia, close to the British and distant about 15 or 20 leagues from one another. They were under the charge of Sébastien Râle, Joseph Pierre de la Chasse and Jean-Baptiste Loyard, who would sometimes visit one other or assemble together. According to Germain, the three Jesuits met together in order to confess one another, or to speak about their doubts or projects related to the spread of their activity among the natives.

By contrast, the activity of the Recollets at Annapolis Royal was directly exposed to the effects of the British conquest. Vetch and Nicholson offered the Acadians the option of leaving the country within a period of two years or remaining, but on condition, that they had to swear the oath of allegiance to the British king. However the Anglo-French relationships at Annapolis Royal soon deteriorated. In
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556 Germain concluded his letter, praying the General to refer the news he gave to the Pope and Propaganda. Although his request was not fulfilled, because neither the Vatican Secret Archives nor Propaganda hold reports on the Jesuit missions of New France for the year 1711. See JR, LXVI, p.206.
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fact in November 1710, the Acadians asked Vaudreil for help to leave the area, where, they claimed, Vetch ill-treated them. As with the Acadians, the condition of the Recollets quickly worsened, and, in January 1711, Vetch had Justinien Durand arrested, with five other inhabitants of Annapolis Royal, during the celebration of Mass. The charge against Durand was specified on 25 April 1711, in a letter of Vaudreil to Louis Phélypaux, Comte de Pontchartrain, the chief minister of Marine. Vaudreil acquainted the French minister that Durand had been captured and, afterwards, sent to Boston, because he had tried to gather all the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal to induce them to refuse the oath of allegiance. Vetch confirmed Durand’s arrest in May, in a letter to the secretary of state, Lord Dartmouth. According to Vetch, this arrest had given few results, as shown by the fact that the other Catholic priests, whose names were not specified, kept on pushing the Acadian population to rebel.

Vetch’s campaign against the Catholic clergy was one of the main causal factors of conflict with the Mi’kmaq. In the late spring of 1711, a British detachment of 64 men was defeated by a mixed force of Abenaki and Mi’kmaq upriver of Annapolis Royal. After the British defeat, this mixed force went to Annapolis Royal, where it came to be reinforced by many inhabitants that besieged, for all the summer of 1711, though unsuccessfully, the British garrison.

The British made no reprisal against the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal, with whom were able to make an accommodation. In all of this, the Recollets were mere
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561 Plank, An Unsettled Conquest, p.60.
observers. On 7 and 8 September 1711, Bonaventure Masson and Pain wrote to Vaudreil to acquaint him of the agreement, although the two letters had a discordant content. Masson’s letter informed the governor of New France that the British would let the inhabitants live in peace, keeping their goods. Moreover the British had promised to free Durand, and leave the Recollet missions in peace. Instead the tone of Pain’s letter was more doubtful than that of his confrère. In his opinion, the British promises seemed suspicious, and he also expected treachery. In the final part of his letter, Pain affirmed that he was ready to leave for his missionary post at Beaubassin, where he would try its inhabitants faithful to the French king.

Despite the absence of Durand, the parish activity of the Recollets at Annapolis Royal could partly continue, thanks to Masson who, from February till mid-April 1711, acted as parish priest. However, after mid-April, no other Recollet exercised the functions of parish priest till the end of 1711, when Durand was released. During a prisoners’ exchange, the British allowed Louis Denys de La Ronde, an officer of the French Navy, to bring Durand back from Boston. On 20 December 1711 the Recollet was at Annapolis Royal, where he could again begin his parish activity.

The return of Durand to Annapolis Royal did not represent a change in Vetch’s point of view about the Catholic missionaries. He always believed that the
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567 Collection de manuscrits contenant lettres, mémoires et autres documents historiques relatifs à la Nouvelle-France, recueillis aux archives de la province de Québec, ou copiés à l'étranger, mis en ordre et édités sous les auspices de la Législature de Québec, avec table, etc, 4 vols, (Québec: Imprimerie A. Côté et Cie, 1883-1885), II, pp.533-539; PANS, RG1, vol.26, Register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, p.103; According to Antoine Gaulin, Durand came to be freed in the month of October 1712. See AC, C11A, vol.33, fol.241-242v, 1 October 1712.
missionaries remained the main cause that prevented the Acadians and natives from submitting the oath of allegiance. On this point, Vetch, while in Boston, sent a letter, dated 26 November 1711, to the Board of Trade, and requested Protestant ministers, able to speak French, to convert the Acadians. Vetch's request was not fulfilled, and the Recollets could carry on their apostolate. For all the year 1712, the parish activity of Annapolis Royal kept on relying on Durand. However the doubts and fears expressed by Pain's letter of the previous September were borne out. On 6 November 1712, Vaudreil wrote to Pontchartrain to report that, based on the information received from Pain, Vetch kept on ill-treating all the French-speaking people, and threatened to despoil them of all their property.

This was just the prelude of what would happen the following year. On 12 April 1713, the Treaty of Utrecht was signed, and determined the end of the War of the Spanish Succession. The effects of the Treaty of Utrecht had important repercussions on the missionary pattern of Acadia/Nova Scotia.

From the Treaty of Utrecht to Île Royale (1713-1714)

According to Article Twelve of the Treaty of Utrecht, France ceded Hudson Bay to the British, along with continental Acadia/Nova Scotia and its part of Newfoundland. After these territorial transfers, the French crown retained the area along the St. Lawrence River, and the two islands of Cape-Breton (renamed Île
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568 Samuel Vetch, to, Board of Trade, 26 November 1711, Boston, PANS, RG1, vol.5, doc nr.21.
569 PANS, RG1, vol.26, register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.103-116.
570 Vaudreil, to, Pontchartrain, 6 November 1712, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.33, fol.50-70v.
571 Luca Codignola and Luigi Bruti Liberati, Storia del Canada. Dalle origini ai giorni nostri, (Milano: Bompiani, 1999), p.184; Reid, "Imperial Intrusions", in Atlantic Region, p.93.
Royale), and Île Saint-Jean. The fourteenth article of the Treaty of Utrecht specifically dealt with the question of the Acadians, to whom it gave a year to decide to leave, taking their goods away. If the Acadians decided to stay, they would keep their land and cattle. However they would have to accept the terms imposed by the British government.

One of the consequences of the Treaty of Utrecht was that the French crown decided to encourage the Acadians to settle on Île Royale. To promote and support the Acadians' migration towards Île Royale, the French authorities decided to engage the missionaries. In fact, on 29 March 1713, Pontchartrain wrote to Antoine Gaulin and Pain to inform them that, after having ceded Acadia/Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, the French King had resolved to establish a settlement at Île Royale. The minister invited the two missionaries to contact Joseph de Brouillan de Saint-Ovide, a French officer and the future second governor of Île Royale, to engage the inhabitants of Acadia/Nova Scotia to move there.

In the spring of 1713 the bases of this project were laid. On 20 March 1713 Pontchartrain entrusted Saint-Ovide with organizing an expedition, through which he had to take possession of Île Royale, as well as choosing a suitable location for the capital of this territory. The expedition had also to carry the first group of settlers to the island. Pontchartrain did not omit the religious aspect of the expedition, and initially, thought of requesting two Recollets, one from Plaisance and Québec. However the chief minister soon changed this idea, fearing that the Plaisance mission
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572 Île Saint-Jean is today's Prince Edward Island. See Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, p.25; Reid, "Imperial Intrusions", in Atlantic Region, p.93.
573 Codignola, Storia del Canada, p.204.
574 Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in L'Acadie des Maritimes, p.25.
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would have had no more chaplains. This led Pontchartrain to advise Saint-Ovide to request two of the Recollets active in Acadia/Nova Scotia\(^{578}\), although doubt remained. On 8 April 1713, anticipating a possible negative answer, he made direct contact with Louis-Hyacinthe de La Place\(^ {579}\), the Recollet superior of New France\(^ {580}\). De La Place designated three missionaries: Dominique de La Marche\(^ {581}\), Jean-Capistran Chevrau\(^ {582}\), and the lay-brother Paschal Martel\(^ {583}\). Chevrau was to accompany the expedition’s military detachment, while de La Marche cared for the settlers. The three Recollets, with all the other members of the expedition left from Québec on 11 August 1713, and reached their destination on 27 August\(^ {584}\).

In the first period of his stay at Île Royale, de La Marche took part in the expedition, led by Saint-Ovide, to make a survey of the island\(^ {585}\). During this expedition, Saint-Ovide proposed to establish the headquarters of Île Royale at Hâvre-à-l’Anglais, which was renamed Louisbourg, the site of the future homonymous, fortress\(^ {586}\). In this first phase, the efforts of the main French colonial authorities to convince the Acadians to leave Acadia/Nova Scotia seemed characterized by a relative optimism, but especially by confidence in the

\(^{578}\) AC, Série B, vol.35, fol.84.
\(^{579}\) Louis-Hyacinthe, baptized Jean-Claude, de La Place was born at Rouen in 1673. He joined the Recollets in 1691, being probably ordained in 1696. In 1709 he was appointed superior of New France, office he held until 1720. He died on 30 January 1737 at Versailles. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.233, 238-239.
\(^{580}\) Pontchartrain to, Louis-Hyacinthe de La Place, OMF Rec, 8 April 1713, AC, Série B, vol.35, fol.36v.
\(^{581}\) Dominique, baptized François, de La Marche was born in 1677 at Mostargis, in the department of Loiret, and in 1694 he entered the Recollet order, taking the name of Dominique. On 26 March 1701 he was ordained, and the following year he arrived in Canada. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.226-227.
\(^{582}\) Jean-Capistran Chevrau was probably born at Plaisance in 1675. He joined the Recollets of Saint-Denys in 1692 or 1693, taking the name of Jean-de-Capistran. He was ordained at Trois-Rivières on 19 July 1699. See Ibidem, p.111.
\(^{583}\) Paschal, baptized Charles, Martel was born in 1688. He died in 1762 in Montréal. See Ibidem, p.LXXVII; Pelletier, *Le Clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.204.
\(^{584}\) AC, C11B, vol.2, fol.42.
\(^{586}\) Ibidem, p.31; Reid, “Imperial Intrusions”, p.96.
missionaries' influence over the inhabitants of this territory. On 8 September 1713, Vaudreil acquainted Pontchartrain that he had again sent instructions to Gaulin, Loyard, and Pain to make these missionaries engage the Acadians to move towards Île Royale\textsuperscript{587}.

However the confidence placed in the missionaries, as well as the confidence of the French colonial authorities that they would resolve this question quickly, met with a situation that was more difficult than expected. Gaulin, and afterwards Pain, reported that the project of moving the Acadians towards Île Royale faced some problems. At mid-September 1713, Pastour de Costebelle informed Pontchartrain that Gaulin had doubted that he could make the Acadians abandon their lands to go to Île Royale\textsuperscript{588}. On 23 September, it was Pain's turn to write to Pastour de Costebelle. The content of the Recollet's letter was clear and it left no doubts about the opinion the Acadians had vis-à-vis the Île Royale project. Pain declared that he had informed Masson and Durand that they must incite the Acadians to move. However the Acadians again refused to move, because, according to information reaching the missionary, they did not want to abandon their houses and lands. Pain added that some of them had already been at Île Royale, where the scarcity of cultivable soils had prompted them to come back. The Acadians had reassured Pain that they would never take the oath of fidelity to the British Queen, and, that they wanted to remain faithful to their country and religion. On this point, if they had been obliged to submit the oath of fidelity, they would have preferred to leave Acadia/Nova Scotia\textsuperscript{589}.

\textsuperscript{587} Philippe de Rigaud de Vaudreil, to, Louis Phélypeaux, comte de Pontchartrain, 8 September 1713, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.34, fol.40-44.
The refusal of the Acadians to move was not only to be imputed to the bad conditions of Île Royale's soils. The efforts of the missionaries especially met with difficulties due to the attitude the Acadians assumed vis-à-vis the British conquest. According to the historian Naomi Griffiths, as in 1656, the British conquest had had little effect on the daily life of the Acadians, who kept on going on with their activities, such as trading, hunting or agriculture. Yet the Acadians' refusal to settle at Île Royale did not constrain the Recollets' apostolate there. According to a letter summarized in 1717 by the Conseil de Marine, de La Marche was at Île Royale during the winter of 1713-14. More precisely this missionary and Chevrau operated in the settlements of Miré and Louisbourg.

However problems soon emerged. In early 1714, the Recollets of the province of Brittany, without the consent of Jean-Baptiste de Lacroix-Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, the second bishop of Québec, began to be active on the outskirts of Louisbourg. In fact throughout the years 1714-16, Eugène Doré, a Brittany Recollet, operated in the settlement of La Baleine. Although his apostolate remains, till now, almost unknown, Doré's presence there could be explained
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591 Today's town of Mira, in Nova Scotia.
592 The choice of de La Marche and Chevrau to begin to operate at Louisbourg and Miré was not causal, because, in the fall of 1713, a group of French settlers, coming from Placentia, had begun to establish there. See AC, CIIB, vol.2, fol.42, 2 March 1717; Johnston, *History of Catholic Church*, I, p.32.
593 Ibidem, p.35.
594 Today's Baleine.
595 Due to a fire, which occurred on 3 December 1726, the parish register of La Baleine were destroyed. The today's registers have been reconstructed on the ground of the information collected within the people who had some forefathers living there. See AC, GI, Registres de l'état civil. Recensements et documents divers, vol.410,1st register, fol.7; Hugolin, Lemay, OFM, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne, missionnaires et aumôniers dans l'Île Royale (1713-1759)", *Mémoires de la Société royale du Canada*, 3rd ser., Vol.XXV, (1931), pp.81, 90.
because La Baleine had been one of the settlements where the settlers from Placentia had been established.596

In the course of 1714, Gratien Raoul, another Brittany Recollet arrived at Île Royale, leading another group of French settlers from Placentia. Raoul resided only briefly at Île Royale, and in 1715 he left to return to France.597 The presence of missionaries from two different ecclesiastical provinces on the same territory seemed not to trouble the French authorities. On 22 March 1714, Pontchartrain informed Costebelle that, the contemporaneous presence of the Brittany and Saint-Denys Recollets would suit both the Acadians and the settlers from Plaisance, because they could keep their existing parish-priests.598 However, neither de La Marche nor Chevrau had been considered by Pontchartrain in his original project.599

If the missionary pattern at Île Royale became complicated with the arrival of the Brittany Recollets, in the fall of 1714 problems also arose within the area controlled by Richard Denys. Since 1705 Michel Bruslé had operated there. In 1694 this area had passed under the control of Pierre Rey-Gallard, the man with whom Françoise Cailletau, the widow of Denys, remarried after the death of her first husband in 1691. In 1713 Rey-Gaillard was obliged, according to a royal edict, to settle his lands, but he seemed more interested in the fur-trade with the Mi'kmaq.600 This provoked conflict between Bruslé and Rey-Gaillard, who, in October 1714, presented to the provost of Québec a denunciation against the Recollet. According to

597 According to the parish register, the first evidence of Raoul at Île Royale was a baptism he celebrated at Gabarie (today's Gabarus), on 5 October 1715. See AC, G1, vol.410, 1st register, fol.1. We have no information on Raoul’s dates of birth and death. Before coming to New France, in 1703 he was appointed professor of theology in the convent of Sainte-Marie des Anges, while, in 1708, he held the office of superior of the convent of Port-Louis. He probably arrived in New France in 1710, the year of his appointment as superior of the Recollets of Plaisance. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.822.
598 Pontchartrain, to, Costebelle, 22 March 1714, AC, B, vol.36, fol.434v.
599 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.114.
600 Ibidem, p.59-60.
Rey-Gaillard, it was Bruslé who devoted his activity to the fur-trade with the Mi’kmaq. Rey-Gaillard based his denunciation on the ground that Bruslé had taken a good part of the furs to Québec\(^\text{601}\). From his side, Bruslé did not immediately rebut this denunciation or present charges against Rey-Gaillard. It was only in 1716 that Bruslé, supported by Gaulin, replied to Rey-Gaillard. Both Bruslé and Gaulin presented memoirs, which were summarized in the spring of 1717 by the Conseil de Marine. The two missionaries affirmed that many people, whose names they could not cite, plied the Mi’kmaq with alcoholic drinks to obtain furs and game\(^\text{602}\).

We have no information about any sentence passed by the provost of Québec, because the acts found in the registers, for the period from 10 January 1710 until 13 November 1716, have been lost\(^\text{603}\). What is sure is that, during that period, contrast of such kind did not occur within the other Recollet missions of Acadia/Nova Scotia. In fact, for all 1714, Pain, Masson, and Durand carried on their respective apostolate at Beaubassin, Minas, and Annapolis Royal\(^\text{604}\). The three Recollets were also engaged to compile a census of the Acadian families\(^\text{605}\).

A complex period (1714-1718)

In 1714 the main problem of the British government of Acadia/Nova Scotia was still how to make the Acadians and natives take the oath of allegiance to the


\(^{602}\) AC, C11B, vol.2, fol.44, 10 April 1717.

\(^{603}\) Ibidem, p.61.

\(^{604}\) PANS, RG1, vol.26, register of the baptisms, marriages and burials of Beaubassin, 1712-1748, fol.37; Charles des Mines à la Grand-Pré, 1709-1748, p.35; Saint-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, pp.125-132.

Queen. However the position the natives assumed vis-à-vis the British presence was clear. According to Leslie Upton, it was influenced by the long missionary activity that favoured the French interests.606

The difficulty of inducing the natives to take the oath became evident in the fall of 1714, when the news of the death of Queen Anne arrived in Acadia/Nova Scotia. Afterwards, British officials began to go through the main Acadian settlements and native villages to try to collect oaths of allegiance to George I (1714-1727), the new king. Moreover, the officers asked the natives to trade only with them and to agree to share their lands.607 This led the natives to set clearly their relationships with the British, and to increase, at the same time, their relationships with the Catholic missionaries, who began to be used as interpreters in the Anglo-natives contacts.608

This was especially evident in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. In an letter, from the St. John river, the Jesuit Loyard reported that Peter Capon and Thomas Button, two British officers, had proposed to five or six Abenaki to submit the oath of allegiance, but they refused.609 In the second letter, probably dated 6 April 1715 and written on behalf of the Maliseet of the Saint-John River, Loyard noted that, after a meeting with Button and Cappon, the Jesuit proposed to the natives to submit the oath of allegiance. However the Maliseet’s answer was negative.610

It is difficult to prove how much influence Loyard had on the Anglo-Aboriginal contacts. What is sure is that the British intentions to assert their ownership clashed with the Abenaki’s refusal of it and their relationship with the

609 Letter of Jean Loyard, SJ, no date, Saint-John River, PANS, RG1, vol.6, doc nr.18, p.1.
According to the historian Kenneth Morrison, in the early seventeenth century, the Catholicism had been a means to the Abenaki communities through which they had reintegrated and regrouped. The success of the missionaries’ activity with the Aboriginal people did not only depend on cultural and social factors. Financial resources were also critical. In fact, the Jesuits, as well as the Recollets, engaged in the missions where they lived among Aboriginal people, needed a larger financial support than the parish priests who, on the contrary, had fixed revenues from their parishioners. The missionaries living among the Mi'kmaq had to face many expenses such as paying for their travels on the native canoes. Bishop Saint-Vallier understood and supported the increase of funds to the missionaries operating in Acadia/Nova Scotia. According to a group of his letters summarized, in 1715, by the Conseil de Marine, Saint-Vallier asked for more funds, whose amount was not specified, to be granted to the Jesuits and Recollets active in Acadia.

The beginning of 1715 recorded the death of Masson, which occurred on 15 February at Minas. However his death did not slow down the activity of the Recollets who kept on being engaged on two fronts. At Île Royale, in the course of 1715, de La Marche and Chevrau operated in two different places, respectively at Port Dauphin and Port Toulouse, following the subdivision made by Pastour de Costebelle and Pierre-Auguste Soubras, the commissaire-ordonnateur of the
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616 Respectively today’s towns of St. Anne’s and St. Peter’s, in Nova Scotia.
617 Pierre Auguste Soubras died on 9 April 1725 at Bordeaux. See *DCB*, II, pp.611-612.
island. However, during the summer of that year, de La Marche left Port-Dauphin for Port-Toulouse for meeting with the representatives of the Acadian families. In fact it was from this place that, at the beginning of September, he addressed to Soubra a memoir about the situation in Acadia/Nova Scotia. This memoir was afterwards forwarded to Saint-Ovide. De La Marche, on the ground of the information received, expressly asked Soubra and Saint-Ovide to support, as had been promised by the French crown, the Acadians' migration. This could make easier the Acadians' transfer towards Île Royale, where, according to the Recollet, the previous year some of them had begun to build houses.

De La Marche’s request shows that the missionaries were more than ever the agents as well as the best informers the French authorities had within the Acadians and natives. According to William Wicken, the close cooperation between missionaries and French authorities was the evidence that Church and State worked together, thus strengthening the power of the Gallican church on the missionary pattern of New France. All the relevant information about the oath of allegiance and the Acadians’ attitude towards the transfer to Île Royale came and passed through the missionaries. This is further shown by a letter of 25 September 1715 from Michel Bégon de La Picardière, the intendant of New France, to Pontchartrain. On the basis of the reports of Durand and Pain, Bégon declared that some of the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal, Minas and Beaubassin who had gone to see the lands of Île Royale, were disenchanted. According to Gaulin, most Acadians were waiting for
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620 Memoir of Dominique de La Place, OFM Rec, to Pastour de Costebelle, and, Soubra, 7 September 1715, AC, C11B, vol.1, fol.259.
622 Michel Bégon de La Picardière was born on 21 March 1667 at Blois. He died on 18 January 1747 at La Picardière. See DCB, III, p.57.
some direction from France to help them decide to leave despite the scarcity of cultivable soils on the island.

In the second part of his letter, Bégon, on the ground of reports given by Loyard and de La Chasse, acquainted the minister about the position assumed by the Acadians vis-à-vis the submission to the oath of allegiance, and on the British efforts among the Abenaki. According to Loyard, at Annapolis Royal the inhabitants had refused to submit the oath of allegiance despite a promise made by Thomas Caulfeild, governor of Acadia/Nova Scotia, to grant them religious freedom. The reaction of the natives of the Pentagouët mission had even been more categorical. According to de La Chasse, they, besides refusing the oath of allegiance, did not want to acknowledge George I nor did they want the British to settle on their lands. On behalf of Loyard and Râle, Bégon asked for funds in order to build two churches, on the St. John River and at Norridgewock. A common request, supported by all the Catholic missionaries, was to sell French goods at low price to discourage the natives from trading with the British. From their side, the missionaries assured that they would always urge the natives not to be hostile to the French. Towards the end, Bégon reported that the British had promised the natives more presents than those they usually received from the French. With regards to this aspect, the intendant of New France recommended to restore the old expenses fund of Acadia/Nova Scotia to make presents to the natives.623

Bégon’s long letter seems to confirm that the main fear of the missionaries as well as that of the main French authorities was to see their relationship and allegiance with the natives compromised by the British presence. The custom of making presents to the natives was part of a strategy that had allowed the French to

establish, and, afterwards, maintain ties with the Mi'kmaq. The French used this policy as a way to acknowledge that they were intruders on the natives’ territory, but, especially, to gain the support of the Mi’kmaq.\(^{624}\)

Concerning the oath of allegiance, the question became more and more delicate. The Acadians did not react to it in a uniform way. The right to have their religious belief respected was one of the main points, within the oath, on which all the Acadians agreed.\(^{625}\) Caulefeld, during the first period of his activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia, tried to make all the Acadians swear allegiance to the British king. This meant in some sense acknowledging the Church of England.\(^{626}\)

Fear of seeing the Acadians obliged to submit an anti-Catholic oath was strong among the missionaries. On 18 January 1715, Durand wrote to Bégon that the oath held many points which made it seem as an abjuration of Catholicism.\(^{627}\) Four days after Durand’s letter, the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal accepted to submit the oath according to a formula of their own: they declared themselves faithful to the British King, till the day they would have remained in Acadia/Nova Scotia. They would be granted the right to leave and take all their goods at the right time, without obstruction.\(^{628}\) No mention of a possible abjuration of Catholicism was made.

According to the historian René Bacon, Durand’s influence determined the way the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal submitted to the oath. Again, according to this historian, this situation repeated at Beaubassin, where Pain influenced the community’s answer to the oath.\(^{629}\) However, compared to Annapolis Royal, the

\(^{624}\) Upton, *Micmacs and Colonists*, p.36.


\(^{629}\) Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.409, 743-744.
Beaubassin inhabitants took no oath, and declared to wait for further developments.\footnote{Collection de documents inédits, I, pp.111-113.}

With regards to Bruslé the only information, during that period, on his apostolate concerned his conflict with Gaillard. At mid-May 1716 it had not yet been smoothed over. On 12 May, the Conseil de Marine discussed a letter, dated 30 October 1715, of Gaillard's wife. In her opinion, Bruslé was monopolizing the fur trade with the Mi'kmaq, and had caused considerable economic damage to her family. This led Cailleteau to ask for replacement of Bruslé.\footnote{AC, C11A, vol.123, fol.310-310v, 12 May 1716.} At mid June the Conseil de Marine entrusted Vaudreil, who was in France, with assessing the charges against the Recollet. Once in New France, Vaudreil tried to interrogate the people who worked for Rey-Gaillard to find some evidence. However he obtained little information.\footnote{Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.52; RAPQ, vol.1947-1948, p.306.} In fall of 1716, Vaudreil wrote to the Conseil de Marine, and simply reported that the people, whose names he omitted, he had met were satisfied with Bruslé.\footnote{Ibidem, p.337.} It is likely that the lack of further documentation regarding this conflict means it was left moot.

What is sure is that Rey-Gaillard's charges did stop Bruslé's activity vis-à-vis the Mi'kmaq. In fact he came to be engaged in the project, conceived by the French authorities, to relocate the Acadians, as well as the Mi'kmaq at Île Royale. This project traced its origins to 1713, and originally envisaged the natives' establishment at Île Saint-Jean. However, due to the Mi'kmaq's refusal, the French authorities had tried to prompt them to regroup close as possible to Île Royale to support the French
Between 1714 and 1716 Bruslé and Gaulin went to Île Royale, where they took part in ceremonies, during which the French distributed some presents to the Mi'kmaq. The French authorities of Île Royale took advantage of the presence of Bruslé on the island. Soubras met with Bruslé and acquaint the missionary with his project. According to Soubras, Bruslé had to gather the Mi'kmaq of the Miramichi mission at Antigonish and assume the direct control of it. On the ground of entrusting the Antigonish mission to the sole responsibility of Bruslé, Soubras wished to replace Gaulin, whose mission's administration had never been appreciated by the commissaire-ordonnateur. On 4 December 1716 Soubras reported to the Conseil de Marine that he had presented his project to Bruslé. At the beginning of April 1717, the Conseil de Marine approved the project, and it was officially ratified by Louis XV (1715-1774) at the end of June of the same year. Despite the royal assent, Soubras' project was not realized due, probably, to lack of funds, so that Bruslé did not replace Gaulin at Antigonish.

Bruslé's presence at Île Royale neither improved nor altered the activity of his confrères there. According to a memoir of de La Marche presented to the Conseil de Marine on 2 March 1717, this Recollet was active at the beginning of 1716 at Port-Dauphin. There he succeeded in building a small chapel. During the summer of that year de La Marche moved from Île Royale to go to Annapolis Royal, where he tried to push the Acadians to transfer. However he obtained no result, and at the end
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638 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p. 64.
of November 1716, he returned to France with Capistran, and Martel. De La Marche’s memoir, besides being an account of his activity, was intended to show to the French authorities the fact that, since 27 August 1713, day of his arrival at Île Royale, until his departure for France, both him and Capistran had obtained no financial support. This meant a lack of adequate building for their missions. Some time later, probably in 1716, the Brittany superior also cited necessary works that were needed for the chapels of Port-Dauphin, Louisbourg and Port-Toulouse. On the ground of both the Brittany superior and de La Marche’s statement there was the necessity to build European styled church, that could be easily distinguished from temporary huts. This was necessary to the missionary activity among the Mi’kmaq. In fact the difference between the missionaries’ huts and those of the shamans was not clear, and led the Mi’kmaq to mistake the two structures.

The return of de La Place and Capistran to France did not interrupt the Recollet activity at Île Royale. The parish register of La Baleine records, during the course of 1716, the presence of François-Célestin Dianet and Bruno Sauvé, two Recollets of Brittany. There is no biographical information on these missionaries to prove when exactly they arrived at Île Royale. According to the parish register of Lorembec, Dianet’s presence was, first, recorded on 15 February 1714. Sauvé, according to the Franciscan historian Hugolin Lemay, likely arrived at Île Royale in 1714.

Besides the comings and goings of missionaries, the religious pattern of Île Royale of the years 1716-1717 evinced the efforts of Saint-Vallier and the main

---

642 Lorembec was close to Louisbourg.
643 AC, G1, vol.410, 1st register, fol.7.
644 Lemay, “Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne”, pp.81, 84; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.367, 848.
French authorities to set clearly the missionary jurisdiction of the Recollet provinces of Brittany and Saint-Denys over this territory. The Conseil de Marine made the first move. On 15 February 1716, it communicated to Vaudreil and Bégon the decision to call back the Saint-Denys Recollets and to leave the Île Royale missions to the control of the Brittany province. Costebelle and Saint-Vallier were afterwards informed of this decision, respectively on 22 April and 16 June of the same year. On 6 April, the provincial of Saint-Denys accepted the Conseil de Marine’s decision.\footnote{AC, Série B, vol.38, fol.259v.}

Between the end of March and May 1716 the Conseil de Marine prepared and granted to the Brittany Recollets the letters patent that allowed them to serve the parishes of Louisbourg and Port-Dauphin.\footnote{AC, C11A, vol.123, fol.141-143, 28 March 1716; AC, C11A, vol.106, fol.411-412, May 1716.} The Saint-Denys Recollets obtained only the right to continue as the parish-priests of Port-Toulouse.\footnote{Conseil de Marine, to, Costebelle and Soubras, 22 April 1716, AC, B, vol.38, fol.261v.} This caused the foreseeable reaction of the Recollets of Saint-Denys, who demanded Saint-Vallier’s intervention. On 25 August 1716 the bishop of Québec decided to leave the parish of Louisbourg to the Brittany province, but gave control of Port-Dauphin and Port-Toulouse to that of Saint-Denys. Saint-Vallier’s order compelled the Conseil de Marine to change the letters patent granted the previous year to the Brittany Recollets.\footnote{Archives de l’archevêché de Québec [shortened in AAQ], 12A, Registre des insinuations ecclésiastiques, vol.C, fol.14r, 25 August 1716, Québec.} At mid-May 1717 it agreed to revise the letters patent in accordance with the bishop’s order, and to share between the two provinces the 1000 livres granted for the support of Île Royale missions.\footnote{The sum was shared in the following way: 650 livres were granted to the province of Saint-Denys, and the remaining 350 went to that of Brittany. See AC, C11A, vol.106, fol.384-385; AC, C11A, vol.123, fol.375-377v; AC, C11A, vol.106, fol.537-539; Johnston, History of, I, pp.35-36.}

Saint Vallier’s intervention put an end to a controversy that had lasted since 1713, but emphasized the conflict between him and the Brittany Recollets. It is likely that Saint-Vallier had prejudices against the Brittany Recollets, probably caused by...
the fact that they had begun to operate at Île Royale without his consent. Saint-Vallier’s prejudices were even noticed by the main colonial authorities. This is shown by a letter, dated 1717, of Pastour de Costebelle to the Conseil de Marine. In his opinion, the letters that Saint-Vallier had addressed to him and the Brittany superior revealed the bishop’s grudge against the Recollets of that province.\(^{650}\)

In the month of August 1717 de La Marche returned to Île Royale. He carried with him letters, dated 30 June 1717, from Conseil de Marine and addressed to all the Recollets of Acadia/Nova Scotia. Through these letters, the Conseil expressed its surprise at the idleness of the Acadians vis-à-vis the transfer towards Île Royale, urging the missionaries to do all they could to convince the Acadians to transfer.\(^{651}\)

Despite the fact that the French colonial authorities still believed in the missionaries’ influence as a means to determine the decisions of the Acadians, the opposition of the British was a force to be reckoned with. According to them, the Acadians’ migration to Île Royale would have strengthened too much the French presence on the island.\(^{652}\) Another problem arose in that period. In the fall of 1717, de La Marche again denounced the lack of adequate religious buildings on Île Royale, and the lack of financing from the mother-country. According to a series of his letters, summarized on 1 April 1718 by the Conseil de Marine, since 1714, at Port-Toulouse there was neither church nor a suitable place to celebrate Mass. Moreover the missionary underlined the insufficiency of the aid from France, and that the sum of 300 livres was not enough to support the activity of his confrères. He also gave sketchy information related to the state of the missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia, reporting that he had sent to Minas a prudent and experienced


\(^{651}\) AC, Série B, vol.39, fol.298.

\(^{652}\) Daigle, “L’Acadie de 1604 à 1763”, in L’Acadie des Maritimes, p.25.
missionary, whose name was not mentioned\textsuperscript{653}. The unnamed missionary sent to Minas was Pain who, at the end of May 1717, had replaced Masson\textsuperscript{654}.

Towards the end of 1717, de La Marche again returned to France, charged by de Brouillan and Soubras to report clearly about the Acadian question\textsuperscript{655}. The summer of that year also recorded the official conclusion of the dispute over Île Royale's missionary jurisdiction. In fact on 9 July 1717, bishop Saint-Vallier agreed, according to the decision of Conseil de Marine, to grant the letters patent to the Brittany Recollets for their establishment at Île Royale\textsuperscript{656}. Saint-Vallier's decision cleared the main problem that affected the missionary pattern of Île Royale. However the situation of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia was more complex. In fact, in 1718, Anglo-Abenaki tension increased, and progressively affected the Jesuits' activity.

From Louisbourg to Norridgewock (1718-1720)

The dispute between the province of Saint-Denis and that of Brittany for the control of the missionary jurisdiction of Île Royale seemed to have had no repercussions on the settlers' community of Louisbourg. In fact the inhabitants of Louisbourg supported the activity carried out by the Brittany Recollets there. When a secular priest, whose name has not been recorded, came to Louisbourg in the fall of 1718, the reaction of the Louisbourg inhabitants was resolute. Thirty people signed a petition, summarized by Conseil de Marine at the beginning of March 1719, urging the governor and Soubras not to replace the Brittany Recollets as parish priests. According to the petitioners, the Recollets were good pastors, whose apostolate had
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been a good example to the community. However, as it has been underlined by the
historian A. J. B. Johnston, the inhabitants’ reaction appeared excessive and their
fears groundless. The available documentation does not show that the secular priest
had arrived to Louisbourg to replace the Brittany Recollets.

Regarding continental Acadia/Nova Scotia, the Jesuits and Recollets’ efforts
kept on being more focused on political matters than those religious. The year 1718
recorded for both the orders the arrival of two new missionaries, respectively Étienne
Lauverjat at Panaouamské, and Vincent Cocuel at Beaubassin. Cocuel’s
activity is almost unknown to us. The only available information comes from the
parish register of Beaubassin which records Cocuel’s presence until the beginning of
February 1722.

However the documentation on Lauverjat allows us to know that from the fall
1718 he began to report to the French authorities about the British activity vis-à-vis
the Aboriginal people of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia, supplementing the letters of
Râle. In fact both missionaries acquainted the main colonial authorities that the
situation in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia was on the edge of turning unfavourable to
the French. This is shown by two letters that Vaudreil and Bégon addressed to
Conseil de Marine. On the ground of the news received from Lauverjat and Râle, the
governor and the intendant of New France declared that the Abenaki of the

---
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Norridgewock mission wanted no British settlements on their territory. Despite the Abenaki’s opposition, the governor of Boston planned the establishment of 1200 families at Pentagouët and on the Saint-John River. Râle promised to incite the Abenaki to tolerate no British settlements on their territory. However the missionary gave a warning. According to him, if the Abenaki decided to side with the British, they would have destroyed all the French settlements along the southern bank of the Saint-John river. Again, according to Râle, “if the British conquered the St. John River, they would be able to defeat definitively the French as far as Québec”

Râle’s warning was connected with events in Britain in that period. There the Whigs, who had taken power 1714, aimed, through the help of prominent members of the Board of Trade, to sustain and encourage Protestant settlement in all Acadia/Nova Scotia, even though the idea of Protestant settlement clashed with the acceptance of the oath of allegiance by the Acadians. By 1718 the British strategy was unchanged, though it had not shown results. John Doucett, the lieutenant governor of Annapolis Royal who had arrived in the fall of 1717, continued the efforts carried out by Vetch and Caufield. At the beginning of December 1717 Doucett wrote to Pain and the inhabitants of Minas, enjoining them to submit the oath or to leave. As at Beaubassin in 1715, Pain replied on behalf of all the inhabitants. However, regarding the oath of allegiance, the missionary assumed a neutral position. According to him, the inhabitants of Minas were enough instructed
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666 John Doucett was probably born in England. He died on 19 November 1726 at Annapolis Royal. See DCB, H, pp.198-199.
667 Jouven, Dictionnaire biographique, p.744.
to decide what they had to do. Pain was not disposed to advise nor influence them in favour or against the fact to submit it.\footnote{Collection de documents inédits, I, pp.116-117.}

It is difficult to verify the reasons that prompted on Pain’s neutral position. It is likely that he acted in that way to avoid the risk of being persecuted by British officials. Pain operated at Minas, a settlement, together with Beaubassin, where missionary activity roused the suspicion of the British. According to them, the influence that the missionaries had over the Acadians and Mi’kmaq in that zone could have led to the creation of an anti-British alliance.\footnote{Plank, An Unsettled Conquest, p.92.}

If the British had reasons to suspect, the main French authorities of New France kept on trusting in the missionaries’ influence over their parishioners. Evidence can be found in a letter that Vaudreil sent to Conseil de Marine at the end of October 1717, in which the governor of New France eulogized Pain’s activity at Minas. In his opinion, Pain had been able to prevent the inhabitants’ submission to the British.\footnote{AC, C11A, vol.124, fol.31, 5 January 1718.}

De La Marche remained in France from 1718 until the beginning of the summer of 1719. During that time, he acquainted the Conseil de Marine on the problems that had prevented the Acadians from moving to Île Royale. In his report, which was summarized on 23 May 1719, de La Marche defended the Acadians from the charge of having been idle. According to the Recollet, the British authorities had obstructed the arrival of the French ships on which the Acadians had to embark with all their goods. Moreover the prohibition on carrying with them their cattle as well as the sorrow of abandoning their houses had prompted the Acadians’ indecision. De La
Marche also underlined how scarce, in material terms, had been the mother-country's support towards the Acadians.  

De La Marche’s report reflected the new strategy of the French authorities. Compared to 1713, the efforts to promote and support the Acadians’ migration had progressively been reduced. According to the French plans, the Acadians could be used in a possible war of reconquest. After 1719, we have sketchy information on de La Marche. It seems that at the beginning of the summer 1719 he returned to Louisbourg. From 1720 until 1726, year of his return to France, he held the office of Recollet superior of the New France missions.

Regarding the British authorities of Acadia/Nova Scotia, the Acadian oath of allegiance remained a complex problem to solve. Neither Richard Philipps, appointed as governor of Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1718, nor the Board of Trade elaborated a clear strategy to clarify the question. Furthermore the position and the role of the Catholic missionaries had not changed for the British authorities, who had never accepted the fact that the missionaries were, at the same time, the pastors of both the Acadians and Mi’kmaq. On 3 January 1719, Philipps wrote to the Board of Trade, and clearly declared that no possible plan of colonial advancement could be developed in Acadia/Nova Scotia till the Catholic missionaries were within this territory. Philipps specifically mentioned that Pain and Cocuelt had behaved like the governors of Minas and Chignecto. According to him, the missionaries’ influence
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over these two settlements was so strong, that their inhabitants had refused to submit the oath of allegiance.\footnote{Richard Philippe, to, Board of Trade, PANS, RG1, vol.7, doc nr.13, pp.183-188.}

From their side, the Jesuits remained the best agents in the hands of the French authorities in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. At mid-March 1719 the Conseil de Marine discussed Lauverjat and Râle's letters of the previous fall, and examined the proposal of Bégon. According to the intendant of New France, it was necessary to send to Acadia/Nova Scotia Joseph Aubery, the only one who could clarify the matter of the limits of this territory. On 23 May, Louis XV wrote to Vaudreil and Bégon to inform them that he had entrusted his ambassador in London to appoint a mixed group of commissioners for setting the clear borders of Acadia/Nova Scotia.\footnote{AC, C11A, vol.124, fol.340-346v, 4 March 1719; Collection de manuscrits, III, p.40.} Bégon's request was well grounded. In 1713 Aubery, who, in 1708, had left Medocetec to establish at the mission of Saint-François, had compiled a memoir with a detailed map related to the limits of Acadia/Nova Scotia. The Jesuit had afterwards forwarded these documents to Vaudreil and the French court hoping to be listened. Despite Vaudreil's support, Aubery had received no answer, so that the question of the limits of Acadia/Nova Scotia had remained as an outstanding matter.\footnote{Vaudreil, to, Pontchartrain, 13 November 1713, AC, C11A, vol.34, fol.45-54; Dragon, L'Acadie et ses 40 Robes Noires, (Montréal: Les Éditions Bellarmin, 1973), map, p.118.} With regard to this, even the British position had been never clear. In fact, in 1712, the Board of Trade had simply declared that Nova Scotia included all what the French called Acadia.\footnote{Vaudreil, to, Board of Trade, 30 April 1712, Board of Trade, to, Henry St. John, 5 April 1712, Public Record Office, CO195/5, 267-269, doc. cited in Reid, "The Conquest of "Nova Scotia", pp.54, 59.}

On 26 October 1719 Vaudreil and Bégon sent a report on the situation of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. Râle's warnings of the previous fall had proved justified. Some 500 British settlers had been established close to Norridgewock.
Despite this, Vaudreil and Bégon underlined that a delegation of Abenaki leaders, sent by Râle, had arrived at Québec and had opposed to the British establishment there. However, they also reported that the governor of Massachusetts planned to establish other 500 people there. Again, the resistance to the British efforts to expand towards southern Acadia/Nova Scotia was tied to the Jesuits' activity. This is shown in the final part of Vaudreil and Bégon's report. Both of them mentioned having acquainted Lauverjat and Râle about the fund granted by the King for the building of two churches at Medoctec and Norridgewock.\footnote{Collection de manuscrits, III, pp.41-42.}

The Jesuits seemed to have understood - more than did the French colonial authorities - the Abenaki feelings vis-à-vis the situation that had been created after the Treaty of Utrecht. This Treaty had allowed the British to seize all the territory of Acadia/Nova Scotia, thus considering the Aboriginal lands as part of it. However, the Abenaki had not accepted the fact that a foreign king could decide the fate of their lands. This had led the Jesuits to affirm and, afterwards, make the Abenaki aware that the British had no rights on their lands.\footnote{Morrison, \textit{The Embattled North-East}, p.179.} According to Micheline Dumont Johnson, the Jesuits were acutely conscious of their political role. From their point of view, it was the only way to preserve the Catholic religion among the Abenaki.\footnote{Micheline Dumont Johnson, \textit{Apôtres ou agitateurs: La France missionnaire en Acadie}, (Trois-Rivières: Le Boréal Express, 1970), p.102.}

\section*{The rise of tension (1720-1725)}

The year 1720 recorded the arrival of Philipps at Annapolis Royal. As with his predecessors, the main problem he had to face concerned the Acadians and the oath of allegiance. However he seemed resolute to put an end to this matter. In fact
on 10 April 1720 he declared that the Acadians had four months to submit the oath. If they accepted it, they would have free practice of their religion. In case of refusal, they would have to leave Acadia/Nova Scotia.\footnote{Collection de documents inédits, I, p.121; Plank, An Unsettled Conquest, p.92.} Philipps decided to use the Recollets to inform the Acadians of his decision. On 20 April 1720 he ordered to Mr. Blin, a Boston trader, to notify Cocuelt and Pain that they must gather the inhabitants of Minas and Beaubassin and make them aware of his declaration.\footnote{Collection de manuscrits, III, pp.42-43.} Durand received Philipps' order before his confrères, and on 30 April he replied to the governor. The content of Durand's letter was similar to that sent by Pain to Doucett in the spring of 1718. The Recollet affirmed having read Philipps' order to the inhabitants of Annapolis, without, however, having influenced them to accept or refuse it. With regard to this, Durand asked Philipps for permission to go to Île Royale, so that he would have not be considered responsible for the Acadians' decision.\footnote{Collection de documents inédits, I, p.121.} As for what had happened to Pain two years before, Durand's neutrality seems difficult to understand and prove. What is sure is that Durand's abrupt departure roused Philipps's suspicion, as he expressly reported in a letter of 14 May addressed to Saint-Ovide.\footnote{Thomas B. Akins, ed., 2nd edition, Acadia and Nova Scotia. Documents relating to the Acadian French and the First British Colonization of the Province, 1714-1758, (Cottonport, Louisiana: Polyanthos Inc., 1972), p.27.} Durand's presence was recorded at Louisbourg in May 1720.\footnote{Collection de documents inédits, I, pp.126-127.} During his stay at Île Royale, the missionary acquainted Saint-Ovide of the situation of the Acadians vis-à-vis Philipps' order. Again his information, as all that received by the other Catholic missionaries, was regarded as being detailed and reliable by the colonial authorities at Île Royale and in France, regarding mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. Relying on Durand's information, Saint-Ovide declared to Pontchartrain that...
Philipps would not allow the Acadians to sell their houses nor to carry their cattle if they decided to leave. According to Durand, the Acadians could not bear this state of affairs, and were ready to retire into the woods. This could also prompt the Acadians to decide to join the Aboriginal people and revolt against the British.\textsuperscript{691}

Durand’s information was accurate. Philipps’ orders aimed to make the Acadians submit the oath, but, at the same time, to avoid a mass exodus to Île Royale. However no solution had yet been found regards the oath, and the issue remained unresolved, at least until 1729-30.\textsuperscript{692} In the fall of 1720 Durand returned to Annapolis Royal. More precisely, his presence is recorded, according to the parish register, on 14 November.\textsuperscript{693} After that date, there is no available information on him until the fall of 1726, the year of his appointment as superior of the Recollets of New France.\textsuperscript{694}

Durand’s departure did not interrupt the Recollet activity at Annapolis Royal, which was continued through Charlemagne Cuvier.\textsuperscript{695} The other Recollet missions in Acadia/Nova Scotia underwent few changes in terms of numerical presence. In fact, except for Durand’s replacement at Annapolis Royal, only Gélase de Lestage\textsuperscript{696} and Lucien Verger\textsuperscript{697} had arrived, as new missionaries, between 1719 and 1721 in Acadia/Nova Scotia. More specifically, according to the parish register of Rimouski,
de Lestage established at Ristigouche to support Bruslé's activity, while Verger served at Minas, from the end of July until the beginning of November 1721.

The period between the end of 1720 and 1722 saw renewed tensions in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. Towards the end of October 1720 Vaudreil and Bégon reported to Pontchartrain that the Norridgewock and Médotec churches had been completed. In their opinion, these churches would encourage the Abenaki to become more attached to these missions. They also acquainted the minister that Rôle kept on inciting the Abenaki to tolerate no British settlements on their lands. In reality, Bégon and Vaudreil's assurances on the stability of the Abenaki missions of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia had a more practical motive. They were more interested in gaining the Abenaki's military support than in caring for the missions per se. However Vaudreil understood that the Jesuits' activity within the Abenaki was the only way to keep them faithful to the French interests. The Jesuits were aware of their role's importance in French-Abenaki relationships, and expressly underlined it. This became evident in a memoir on Acadia/Nova Scotia that, on 29 October 1720, the Jesuit Pierre François Xavier de Charlevoix sent to the Duc d'Orléans. According to him, it was necessary to keep the alliance with the Abenaki, and give them all the possible help in a possible war against the British. Charlevoix emphasized that his confrères were the only ones who could determine the Abenaki's submission to Vaudreil's will.
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Charlevoix’s account conveyed that the Jesuits’ presence and collaboration within the Abenaki were indispensable to the French authorities\textsuperscript{704}. This was also obvious to the New England authorities, who concluded that Râle’s activity had to be eradicated. According to the Massachusetts assembly, the Jesuit’s presence could be tolerated no longer\textsuperscript{705}. Râle’s position also seemed worsened by unsuccessful Anglo-Abenaki negotiations in November of that year. Despite the growing risk to which he was exposed, Râle’s activity was not reduced, and remained the only reliable point of contact between the Abenaki and the French authorities\textsuperscript{706}. Moreover he retained the support of Bégon and Vaudreil who approved the Jesuit’s conduct, although with different emphases. If Vaudreil limited himself to appreciating of the missionary efforts, and assuring him of military aid for the Abenaki, Bégon’s concern was, instead, to warn the Jesuit to act with prudence towards the British. Indeed, Bégon sent de La Chasse to prevent Râle from doing rash actions\textsuperscript{707}. Bégon’s warning could appear justifiable, but had little practical result within the context of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. According to Morrison, Râle had realized which faction of the Abenaki could be favourable to the British, so that he would have been able to combat it in favour of that pro-French\textsuperscript{708}.

In the summer of 1721 Anglo-Abenaki tension was at its height. De La Chasse regrouped at Norridgewock the Abenaki delegations coming from Pentagouët, Médocet and Pemaquid. All the Abenaki afterwards moved, with Râle, and de La Chasse to the British fort of Menaskous to meet with the governor of Boston. However this action gave no results, because the British were not disposed to leave their lands or to free four Abenaki prisoners. This led to the Abenaki’s reply.

\textsuperscript{704} Dumont, \textit{Apôtres ou agitateurs}, p.103.
\textsuperscript{705} Morrison, \textit{The Embattled Northeast}, p.182.
\textsuperscript{706} Ibidem, pp.182-183.
\textsuperscript{707} \textit{JR}, LXVII, pp.55-65.
\textsuperscript{708} Morrison, \textit{The Embattled Northeast}, p.183.
Through a letter written by de La Chasse, they called upon the British to leave their lands within a short time.\textsuperscript{709}

The Abenaki’s menaces only had the effect of causing the hard reaction from the British. The council of Massachusetts reinforced its militia, and clearly requested Râle’s surrender\textsuperscript{710}. In 1722 things worsened. On 14 March, Samuel Shute, the Massachusetts governor\textsuperscript{711}, wrote to Vaudreil, accusing Râle of having stirred up the Abenaki. Shute also suggested that the Jesuit should return to Canada or France, without abusing any more of his authority\textsuperscript{712}. Even Lauverjat was considered as a menace to the British, who, in the spring of 1722, decided to put a price on his head as well as on that of Râle\textsuperscript{713}. The consequences of the deteriorating Anglo-Abenaki relationships soon had serious repercussions on the Jesuits’ missions. In mid-March 1722, Otis Westbrook, commander of a New England force, reported to William Dummer, the Massachusetts lieutenant-governor\textsuperscript{714}, that he had arrived at Pentagouët and found it empty. Despite this, Westbrook decided to burn all the houses of the settlement, including the Jesuit chapel, which he described as being “60 foot long and 30 wide, well and handsomely finished within and without”\textsuperscript{715}. As the year went on, the Anglo-Abenaki conflict embittered. A military expedition, sent by the Massachusetts government, attacked Norridgewock to capture Râle, but did not

\textsuperscript{709} Report of Bégon and Vaudreuil, to, Pontchartrain, 8 October 1721, Québec. See \textit{Collection de manuscrits}, III, pp.57-61.

\textsuperscript{710} Morrison, \textit{The Embattled Northeast}, p.184.

\textsuperscript{711} Samuel Shute was born in London in 1653. He died in England on 15 April 1742. See James Grant Wilson and John Fiske ed., \textit{Appleton’s Cyclopedia of American Biography, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition} (Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1968), vol.V, p.520.

\textsuperscript{712} \textit{Collection de manuscrits}, III, pp.70-72.

\textsuperscript{713} AC, C11A, vol.124, fol.509-511v, April 1722.

\textsuperscript{714} William Dummer was born in Boston in 1677, and died there on 10 October 1761. See Wilson, \textit{Appleton’s Cyclopedia, II}, p.254.

find the Jesuit. However, the British found the correspondence between Vaudreil and Râle and seized it to prove the Jesuit’s role within the Abenaki. 716.

Compared to the Jesuits, the period between 1720 and 1722 recorded few changes for the Recollet missions of mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. Philipps’ mistrust towards the Recollets had been unvarying. The Board of Trade had by then agreed with him on the necessity of removing these missionaries as well as the other Catholic priests from the Acadians. It had also promised Philipps new forces, but he could do nothing without the King’s permission717. More precisely Philipps’ suspicions had concentrated on Pain. This had been evident in 1720, when a British boat had been plundered at Minas. Although the attack had been carried out by some Mi’kmaq, Philipps had accused the inhabitants of Minas as well as Pain of being responsible for it. More generally this had strengthened Philipps’ conviction that without the missionaries the Anglo-Aboriginal coexistence in Acadia/Nova Scotia would have been peaceful718.

During the summer of 1721 the Recollets extended their missionary range to Île Saint-Jean. At the beginning of July, Bruslé, after having left his missionary post at Miramichi, arrived on the island and baptized a four-year old Mi’kmaq719. However Bruslé’s stay at Île Saint-Jean was short, and, towards the end of July, his presence was recorded at Beaubassin720. It is likely that his presence on the island was more a temporary visit than a serious effort to convert the natives that lived there. We also need to remember that, at the moment of Bruslé’s arrival, the island

719 AC, Série G1, vol.411, 1st register, 1721.
720 PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register of Beaubassin, 1712-1748, fol.18.
had already two Sulpicians as resident missionaries\textsuperscript{721}, who had established at Port-
Lajoie since the spring of 1721\textsuperscript{722}. After 1721 Bruslé left Acadia/Nova Scotia to
return to Canada\textsuperscript{723}.

In 1723 no possible solution of peace was found to stop the Anglo-Abenaki
war. The British kept on leading incursions on the Abenaki villages. For his part, in
the fall of that year, Vaudreil tried to negotiate a peace with the governor of
Boston\textsuperscript{724}. However, compared to Vaudreil, the Jesuits were more than ever aware
and worried that an Abenaki defeat could mean the collapse of New France\textsuperscript{725}. The
need to not abandon the Abenaki to their fate became more and more felt within the
Jesuits, notably by de La Chasse, who requested to the French court to grant a yearly
fund of 1000 francs to the Abenaki living in the missions of Saint-François and
Bécancour\textsuperscript{726}. According to him, this would allow the Abenaki to continue their war
against the British\textsuperscript{727}.

Compared to his confrères and despite his direct involvement, Râle did not
exert pressure either on the French court or on the main colonial authorities.
However, throughout 1722-23, the Jesuit devoted himself to the writing of two long
letters, respectively addressed to his nephew and brother in France, through which he
described the Abenaki as well as his personal experience within them. Both the

\textsuperscript{721} These two priests were Charles-René de Breslay and Marie-Anselme de Métivier. Charles-René de
Breslay was born at Mans, in the department of Sarthe, in the month of June 1658. He joined the
Sulpicians in 1689, and was ordained in 1694. He died in Paris on 4 December 1735. Marie-Anselme
de Métivier was born in 1690 in the province d'Orléans, and was ordained in 1714. He arrived in
Canada in 1719. See Pelletier, \textit{Le clergé en Nouvelle-France}, pp.210-211, 214; Wilfrid Pineau, \textit{Le
clergé français dans l'Ile du Prince-Édouard 1721-1821}, (Québec: Les Éditions Ferland, 1967),

\textsuperscript{722} Port-Lajoie corresponded to modern Charlottetown. See John C. MacMillan, \textit{The Early History of
Catholic Church in Prince Edward Island}, (Québec: Evenement Printing Co., 1905), p.5; Pineau, \textit{Le

\textsuperscript{723} In 1724 Bruslé was appointed superior of the Recollet convent of Montréal, where he died on 7

\textsuperscript{724} \textit{Collection de manuscrits}, III, pp.89-91; Morrison, \textit{The Embattled Northeast}, p.185.

\textsuperscript{725} JR, LXVII, pp.121-125.

\textsuperscript{726} The Bécancour mission was close to Sillery. See Dragon, \textit{L'Acadie et ses}, map, p.118.

\textsuperscript{727} Joseph Pierre de La Chasse, SJ, to, Jean Frédéric Phélippaux, comte de Maurepas, 15 October 1722,
letters, dated 15 October 1722 and 12 October 1723, revealed Râle’s affection towards the Abenaki. More expressly, the Jesuit reaffirmed that “The only band which has united them to us so closely is their firm attachment to the Catholic faith”. According to him, the Abenaki thought that any submission to the British would definitively remove them from Catholicism. Râle’s statement was one of the clearest examples of the missionaries’ strategy. According to Dumont-Johnson, the missionaries, to maintain the faith within the Aboriginal people, had introduced themselves to the Aboriginal people as being able to adapt to their customs and way of living. Râle’s experience also proves the fact that the Jesuit had been successful in integrating into the Abenaki social life, but, especially, to remain open to all the new experiences he had faced. His positive relationship with the Abenaki derived from the Jesuits’ ability to assume a shamanistic responsibility. This had allowed the Jesuits to serve the Abenaki, but especially to be considered by them as able to meet the community’s needs. However, Râle’s affection towards the Abenaki clashed with the continuation of a war that had little chances of being stopped. This came to be clear in the fall of 1723, when Vaudreil sent a Mr de La Ronde to Boston to seek a truce. Samuel Shute, the governor of Massachusetts refused it and accused the governor of New France and the missionaries of being responsible for the war’s beginning.

---

729 Dumont Johnson, Apôtres ou agitateurs, p.84.
731 Samuel Shute was born in England in 1653. He died there on 15 April 1742. In 1716 he was appointed as governor of Massachusetts. See James Grant Wilson and John Fiske eds, Appleton’s Cyclopaedia of American Biography, 2nd edition, (Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1968), vol.V, p.520.
732 Collection de manuscrits, III, pp.104-105.
The summer of 1724 saw Râle's death. The news of his killing spread through the reports of Charlevoix, de La Chasse, and Vaudreil. According to de La Chasse's letter of 29 October 1724 to an unnamed confrère, on 23 August of that year the British surrounded, and, afterwards attacked Norridgewock. Râle's death was caused by musket-shots that were fired by the British as soon as they saw him. Besides the Jesuit's death, the British forced the Abenaki to scatter and take refuge into the woods, thus abandoning the mission. Again, as they did at Pentagouët in 1722, the British set fire to the Church.

The destruction of the Norridgewock mission, as well as Râle's death, was seen as good news by the New England authorities. Moreover they also reaffirmed to Vaudreil that his support of Râle's activity among the Abenaki had been a clear violation of their rights. According to them the Abenaki had been and remained subjects of the British king. Yet, despite the unfavourable situation, the Jesuits agreed on the necessity to keep on sustaining the Abenaki. This is shown by the request made by some Abenaki chiefs to Vaudreil, that, in spring of 1725, Bégon forwarded to the French court. The Jesuits' hand in it was evident. The Abenaki demanded to be indemnified for Râle's death, and the rebuilding of the Norridgewock church.

---

734 JR, LXVII, pp.23.3-237
Conclusions

During the first years that followed the conquest of Annapolis-Royal the Recollets suffered more the effects of operating closely with the British. This especially was evident when Vetch tried to interrupt or obstruct their activity there. However, except Durand’s arrest, no other harsh measures were taken against the other missionaries. Vetch’s hostile policy towards the Recollets, and the Catholic missionaries in general, had only contributed to embittering British-Aboriginal relationships. Although they still considered the missionaries as a menace, Vetch’s successors tried, instead, to use the Recollets, as a path, to deal with the Acadians.

It is almost sure that the Recollets tried to prevent the Acadians from submitting to the oath of allegiance. In all this the missionaries played on their influence over the Acadians, helped by the attachment of these latter for the Catholic religion. During the years 1713-1718, the Recollets also became the reliable informers and representatives through whom the French authorities tried to sustain and promote the Acadians’ migration towards Île Royale. There the Recollets had the possibility of operating within the new context of a territory, which was relatively safe from the menace of British attacks. However the missionary jurisdiction of Île Royale was never clearly planned. This favoured the beginning of the conflict between the Saint-Denys and the Brittany provinces which but reinforced the lack of cooperation between the missionaries within the same order.

Compared to the Recollets, the Jesuits, during the years from 1710 till 1718, paradoxically experienced few pressures from the British. This allowed them to concentrate their efforts for supporting their missions within the Abenaki. Yet the fact of their operation along the New England border inevitably conditioned their
apostolate. The correspondence between the Jesuits and Vaudreil as well as with Bégon proves it. Râle and de La Chasse became the spokesman who informed, but, especially, warned Québec, and consequently, Paris of the dangers that the British expansionism in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia would have caused to New France.

Throughout the years 1718-25, the French authorities increased their support of the Jesuits active in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. However the presence of the Jesuits remained scanty, and only Lauverjat was sent there as new missionary. The situation definitively worsened when the British decided to get rid of Râle, whose activity came to be identified by them as a prime cause of Abenaki hostility. Râle's killing eliminated a key - character within the Abenaki-French relationship. Although his confrères remained active, the entire missionary pattern of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia was seriously affected, thus favouring the British penetration.
Chapter V

The troubled activity of the Recollets from 1724 till 1729

This chapter analyses missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia from 1725 till 1755. This period saw the missionaries fully engaged in the Anglo-French conflict, during which the strategies and the interests of the French authorities got the upper hand of any evangelical efforts. Furthermore this period highlighted the internal conflicts that affected the activity of the Brittany Recollets at Île Royale, and which prevented them from spreading the Catholic faith among the natives of the island.

The Anglo-Abenaki conflict had few effects on the Recollet missions of mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. The British government of Acadia/Nova Scotia was supportive of Catholic priests who seemed to cooperate with it. On 5 February 1724, the Council at Annapolis Royal granted to Claude Sanquer, the Recollet superior of Louisbourg, permission for Isidore Caulet to serve the parish of Pigiguit, thus fulfilling the Acadian inhabitants’ request. Despite this concession and the right of free exercise of religion granted to the Acadians, the Council reaffirmed its authority over religious matters. In fact it stated that no Catholic priests

---

738 Of Claude Sanquer we just know that he was appointed superior of Louisbourg on 5 October 1720. According to the parish register of Louisbourg, from 1722 until the end of August 1724, Sanquer also acted as parish priest. See Archives des Colonies [shortened in AC], G1, vol.406, 1st parish register of Louisbourg, 1722-1738, fol.1-6; Jouve Odoric-Marie, OFM Rec, Archange Godbout, Hervé Blais, and René Bacon, Dictionnaire biographique des Récollets missionnaires en Nouvelle-France, 1615-1645 – 1670-1849, (Montréal: Bellarmine, 1996), p.847.
739 Of Isidore Caulet we have no information about the date and the place he was born. We have either no information about when he joined the Recollets or when he was ordained. See Ibidem, p.95.
740 Pigiguit approximately corresponded to today’s town of Windor, in Nova Scotia.
would have the right to come and reside in Acadia/Nova Scotia without the
government’s consent.\textsuperscript{741}

The Council’s decision could assure only a short period of stability in Anglo-
missionary relationships. During the summer of 1724 a mixed group of Mi’kmaq and
Maliseet attacked the garrison of Annapolis Royal, killing two men\textsuperscript{742}, and, as in
previous years, British suspicions fell upon the Recollets. The Council decided to
summon Caulet, Charlemagne Cuvier, and Félix Pain to present themselves at
Annapolis Royal to be examined. Within few weeks, the Council pronounced a
sentence on two of the Recollets. Cuvier – who, in the opinion of John Doucett, the
lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia, had been aware of the natives’ intentions - was
expelled after having been imprisoned for three weeks. Pain, the only one to have not
presented him, was forbidden, for life, to return to Acadia/Nova Scotia. Caulet,
however, who had acquainted the governor of the natives’ intentions to attack
Annapolis Royal, obtained the parish of Minas. By contrast, Cuvier made it clear to
the Council that he was not disposed to risk his life for informing the British
government, and affirmed that he was on the French side. Cuvier’s examination also
allows us to know that the Mi’kmaq had gathered at Minas under Antoine Gaulin’s
guidance, defined by the Recollet as “their missionary”.\textsuperscript{743}

The lack of further primary sources concerning the Recollets’ activity among
the Mi’kmaq makes Caulet’s behaviour difficult to prove. However, except for
Gélase de Lestage, it is likely that the other Recollets operating in Acadia/Nova
Scotia were more concerned with their parishioners’ needs than with evangelical
activity among the Aboriginal people. This also seems to be confirmed by the

correspondence regarding New France, covering the period from 1723 till 1725, that shows Gaulin as the missionary to the Mi’kmaq.

The events of the summer of 1724 reinforced the role of the Council at Annapolis Royal vis-à-vis the Catholic priests. It was through it that the missionaries’ requests or petitions had to pass. This also allowed the British government of Acadia/Nova Scotia to assert some control over the priests’ movements. Of the two banished Recollets, only Cuvier left Acadia/Nova Scotia and went to Île Royale. Saint-Ovide reported towards the end of November 1724 the Recollet’s arrival on the island, and that Charles-René de Breslai had been sent, as his substitute, to Annapolis Royal. There are few details of Cuvier’s stay at Île Royale, but he was recorded to have been in France in 1736. For his part, Pain refused to move. In the fall of 1724, with Saint-Ovide’s permission, he requested to the council of Annapolis Royal to allow him serving at Chignectou. The council refused, and warned the Recollet to leave the country as soon as possible.

Similar measures were taken during the winter of 1724-25, when Ignace-Joseph Flament and Pierre Verquaillie, two Brittany Recollets, established themselves in mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia without the government’s consent. They replaced, in turn, Caulet at Minas, during his absences. However Verquaillie did not

---

745 Plank, An Unsettled Conquest, p.95.
747 Cuvier died on 20 June 1758 in the convent of Corbeil. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.164-165.
748 MacMechan, Nova Scotia Archives, III, pp.77-78.
749 The birthplace and the date of Flament are unknown. Instead of Pierre Verquaillie we know that he was born in France in 1698, and joined the Recollets in 1716. In 1720 he was ordained. He died at Douai, in the department of Nord, on 6 February 1753. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.LXXIV, LXXX; Louis Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France. Étude démographique et répertoire biographique, (Montréal: Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal, 1993), p.207.
limit himself to this, but also became the parish priest of Cobequid. The Council was quick to react, though it treated the two missionaries differently. On 4 January 1725, Flament was summoned, and afterwards examined. He informed the Council that he had been sent by the provincial of Flanders, due to the lack of missionaries within the Saint-Denis' province. More expressly the Recollet declared himself to be unaware of the British government's rules. However, Flament's intention was to inform the Council about his arrival at Chignectou. The presumed misinformation and his apparent will to cooperate played in favour of Flament, to whom the Council assigned the parish of Chignectou. With regards to Verquaillie, the Council decided to not summon him, despite his sending a written request to become the parish priest of Cobequid. On 21 January 1725 the Council decided to banish Verquaillie, and to allow the Cobequid inhabitants to request another missionary. The Council's decisions reflected its strategy. It decided to support or to obstruct the missionaries' activity according to an arbitrary sentence that favoured the cooperative ones. However the order of banishment was ineffective towards some missionaries. This came to be evident in the case of Verquaillie who - albeit irregularly - kept on serving Minas until late April of 1726.

After having officially been banished for the second time, it is likely that Pain spent the winter of 1724-1725 at Île Royale. During the summer of 1725, the Recollet moved to Port-Lajoie, where his intermittent presence was recorded until

751 Flament probably left Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1728. According to Jouve he died at Alexandria, in Egypt, in 1739. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXXIV
752 MacMechan, Nova Scotia Archives, III, pp.84-91.
753 Plank, An Unsettled Conquest, p.95.
755 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.748.
the beginning of March 1726\textsuperscript{756}. Compared to 1721, Pain was alone on the island, due to the departure in 1723 of de Breslay and de Marie-Anselme de Métilvier\textsuperscript{757}. The case of Verquaille, who continued to serve even though under an order of banishment, remained isolated. Moreover it did not prevent Lawrence Armstrong, the lieutenant-governor of Acadia/Nova Scotia\textsuperscript{758}, from concluding, in 1725, an agreement with the bishop of Québec and with Joseph de Brouillan de Saint-Ovide that prohibited the arrival of further missionaries in Acadia/Nova Scotia without the preventive government's consent\textsuperscript{759}.

Despite this agreement, new problems, related to the mission's jurisdiction, emerged in the spring of 1725. Cauêt's establishment in Acadia/Nova Scotia had not been accepted by Jean-Baptiste de Lacroix-Chevrières de Saint-Vallier, the second bishop of Québec. On 1 November 1726, Saint-Ovide reported to the Conseil de Marine that he had sent Cauêt to Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1724, but had to recall him because of Saint-Vallier's intervention. According to Saint-Ovide, the bishop of Québec would not allow the Brittany Recollets to serve missions outside of Île Royale. Of the same tone was a letter of 5 March 1727 that the Brittany provincial sent to Saint-Ovide. According to him, Saint-Vallier had never forgiven Cauêt for his journey to Acadia/Nova Scotia\textsuperscript{760}. Saint-Ovide did not oppose to Saint-Vallier's

\textsuperscript{756} AC, GI, Registres de l’état civil, recensements et documents divers, vol.411, Île Saint-Jean, 1\textsuperscript{er} registre, 1725, pp.123-125.


\textsuperscript{758} Lawrence Armstrong was born in 1664 in Ireland. Armstrong took the advantage of Philipps' absence from Acadia/Nova Scotia, so that on 8 February 1724/25 he was able to be appointed governor of this territory. He committed suicide at Annapolis Royal on 10 October 1761. See DCB, II, pp.21-24.


\textsuperscript{760} Saint-Ovide, io, president of Conseil de Marine, 1 November 1726, AC, C11B, vol.8, fol.38; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.95.
will, and Cauet was recalled to Louisbourg, where his presence began to be recorded
towards the end of July 1725.\footnote{Ibidem, p.95; AC, G1, Registres de l'état civil, recensements et documents divers, vol.406,
Louisbourg, 1st register, fol.15.}

All this reflected problems that had begun to occur at Louisbourg since 1721. In that
year, the Louisbourg authorities had started working at the project of building
a parish church and a priest house. The need for a parish church was more urgent
than ever because the only religious structure of Louisbourg was a chapel, erected in
1713, that had always been used by the Recollets. During the church’s construction
the Recollets had tried to place a copper plaque in the church’s foundation to
mention their order. Both Saint-Ovide and Jacques-Ange Le Normand de Mézy\footnote{Jacques-Ange Le Normand de Mézy was probably born in France. He died in Paris on 23 October
1741. See DCB, III, pp.386-389.},
the successor of Pierre Auguste Soubras, had interpreted the Recollets’ plan as a way
to assert complete control of the church, thus excluding the King’s authority over it.
This had led Saint-Ovide and Mézy to interrupt the works, so that, in 1724, the
chapel had begun to be used as the parish church of Louisbourg. The interruption of
the church’s construction had not been accepted by Saint-Vallier. According to him,
this had been due to the Recollets’ will to be the only one to serve Louisbourg, and
consequently, to resist the arrival of diocesan priests.\footnote{A. J. B. Johnston, Religion in Life at Louisbourg, 1713-1758, (Kingston, Ontario: McGill-Queen’s
University Press, 1984), pp.34-35, 38; Angus Anthony Johnston, History of Catholic Church in
p.36.}

Saint-Vallier’s opinion on the Brittany Recollets worsened between 1724 and
1726. In part this was because of the behavior of Bénin Le Dorz\footnote{We have no information about when and where Le Dorz was born. See Jouve, Dictionnaire
biographique, p.586.}, who seemed to have had a weakness for alcohol. Saint-Vallier warned the Recollet, when he came to
Québec, in 1725 or 1726\textsuperscript{765}, but with little effect. Le Dorz's behavior did not change, and he soon celebrated three prohibited marriages, thus flouting the rules of the diocese of Québec\textsuperscript{766}. Later in 1726 the bishop clearly expressed to Jean Frédéric Phélypaux, Comte de Maurepas, the chief minister of Marine, his dissatisfaction with Le Dorz's conduct\textsuperscript{767}. However Saint-Vallier had already decided to take some measures against the Recollet who, since the summer of 1724, had jointly held the position of parish-priest, Louisbourg-Île Royale's superior, and vicar-general of the bishop of Québec. On 2 September 1726, Saint-Vallier suspended Le Dorz, and appointed Joachim Fornel\textsuperscript{768} and Jean-Baptiste Brault\textsuperscript{769}, two secular priests as his new vicars-general. Fornel was also appointed as parish priest of Louisbourg\textsuperscript{770}. According to Saint-Vallier's plans, the Brittany Recollets would have to leave the Louisbourg's parish to Fornel, and could but continue their activity as military chaplains. He also allowed them to keep on serving the more isolated settlements of Île Royale\textsuperscript{771}.

Of the two priests, only Fornel went to Louisbourg in the fall of 1726. On his arrival, Saint-Ovide and Mézy accepted Saint-Vallier's decision that the Recollets could be no longer the parish priests of Louisbourg. However they refused to accept that jurisdiction over the Louisbourg parish could be handed to other priests without

\textsuperscript{765} Hugolin, Lemay, OFM, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne, missionnaires et aumôniers dans l'Île Royale (1713-1759)", Mémoires de la Société royale du Canada, 3rd ser., Vol.XXV, (1931), pp.92-93.


\textsuperscript{767} Saint-Vallier, to, Maurepas, 10 September 1726, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.48, fol.434-435.

\textsuperscript{768} Joachim Fornel was born in Québec on 17 August 1697, and was ordained on 18 August 1720. He died in France after 1753. See Pelletier, Le Clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.228.

\textsuperscript{769} Jean-Baptiste Brault was born in at Mans in 1702, and was ordained on 16 March 1726. He died in Montréal on 2 March 1737. See ibidem, p.221.

\textsuperscript{770} Saint-Vallier, to, Joachim Fornel, 2 September 1726, Québec; Saint-Vallier, to, Jean-Baptiste Brault, 2 September 1726, Québec, Archives de l'archevêche de Québec [shortened in AAQ], 12 A, Registres des insinuations ecclésiastiques, vol.B, fol.268v-270rv.

\textsuperscript{771} Saint-Vallier, to, Maurepas, 10 September 1726, Québec, AAQ, Copies des lettres, vol.II, pp.268-269.
the King's consent. Fornel understood this and, towards the end of October 1726, seemed to agree to let Le Dorz in charge of the parish until further orders from France. As had happened in the previous years, the debate over the Louisbourg parish showed how the relationships between the main colonial authorities and Saint-Vallier had not improved. These turbulent relationships had begun in 1701, when the French court had appointed the Brittany Recollets to serve the Newfoundland mission, thus replacing the Saint-Denys Recollets. Though since the beginning he had always had a low opinion of the Brittany Recollets, Saint-Vallier had accepted this decision, because he had not found other priests for this mission. Saint-Vallier's decision to introduce the Saint-Denys Recollets to Île Royale can be considered as a way to challenge the absolutism as well as the Gallicanism of the French court over the missionary pattern of New France which had never been reduced.

Once at Louisbourg, Fornel did not wait for further orders, and, at the end of the first Sunday Mass of November, suspended le Dorz from his parish functions, thus replacing him with Caulet. Fornel's decision caused renewed tensions. Caulet refused to be the new parish priest, and Le Dorz threatened to withdraw all the Brittany Recollets from Île Royale. Le Dorz's threat alarmed the inhabitants' communities of Louisbourg, La Baleine, L'Indienne, and Scatarie, which risked having no more parish priests. This led them to present a petition to Maurepas. It was left to Saint-Ovide to solve the question, and he was able to compel Le Dorz to leave the Recollets at their places, as well as to summon Fornel to discuss the entire matter. Saint-Ovide's intervention was successful for the time being, and

---

773 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.XLIX.
774 Johnston, History of, I, pp.35-38.
775 These two settlements approximately corresponded to today's town of Lingan and Scatary Island, in Nova Scotia.
Fornel returned the parish office to Le Dorz. Between 8 November and 1 December Saint-Ovide reported to Maurepas the evolution of these events, as well as forwarding the petition from the above mentioned inhabitants’ communities.

Saint-Ovide’s intervention only temporarily resolved the conflict over the Louisbourg parish. Saint-Vallier again put forward his view that the Brittany Recollets should be replaced by secular priests. He blamed all the missionaries of this province, except Gratien Raoul, of whom he had a good opinion. Even Mézy supported Saint-Vallier’s position. The commissaire-ordonnateur of Île Royale, accused the Brittany Recollets of using the money collected at Louisbourg to support their convents in France. According to him, the Recollets had been able to collect, and, afterwards, send to France 6,000 livres.

From their side the Brittany Recollets were supported by their provincial as well as by the inhabitants of Louisbourg, L’Indienne, and Scatarie. It was these latter who most feared a possible withdrawal of the Brittany Recollets from Île Royale. Especially the Louisbourg inhabitants thought that the Recollets would have forbidden the use of their chapel as the parish church of the entire community.

This aspect was again emphasized by the Brittany provincial, through his letter of 31 January 1727, to Maurepas. He defended his confrères, but, at the same time,

---

776 Fornel came to France in 1726. See DCB, III, p.222.
mentioned the fact that they were ready to replace Le Dorz with Michel-Ange Le Duff\textsuperscript{781}, who, since 1721 had served the parish of La Baleine\textsuperscript{782}.

The provincial's letter and the inhabitants' petitions were effective, so that Maurepas decided to leave to the Brittany Recollets the parish of Louisbourg as well as those of the nearby settlements. In the spring of 1727, Maurepas communicated his decision to Saint-Vallier and Mézy, emphasizing that similar disputes had to be avoided in the future. Maurepas also specified that the situation at Louisbourg did not favor the introduction of secular priests, and, that both Saint-Vallier and Mézy must cooperate with the Brittany Recollets\textsuperscript{783}. Maurepas was supportive of the Recollets, but also urged the Brittany provincial to select only missionaries whose conduct would be exemplary\textsuperscript{784}. Still, Saint-Vallier did not refrain from criticizing Maurepas' decision. At the beginning of October 1727, the bishop expressed to the minister his disappointment with being obliged to leave the Louisbourg parish to the Recollets. According to him, it was their fault that at Louisbourg there was yet neither church nor priests' house\textsuperscript{785}. Before writing this letter, Saint-Vallier had already made a final effort to exclude the Brittany Recollets from Île Royale. The bishop took advantage of the return of Joseph Denys to Louisbourg, according to the historian René Bacon, as superior of the Saint-Denys missions there\textsuperscript{786}. This is shown by the fact that on 6 September Saint-Vallier appointed Denys as his vicar-general, and parish-priest of Louisbourg\textsuperscript{787}.

\textsuperscript{781} Michel-Ange Le Duff was born in France in 1690. We have no information about when he joined the Recollets nor when he was ordained. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.590.

\textsuperscript{782} Dirop, to, Maurepas, 31 January 1727, AC, C11B, vol.10, fol.12; Lemay, "Table nominale des Recollets de Bretagne", p.93.

\textsuperscript{783} Maurepas, to, Saint-Vallier, 16 May 1727, AC, Série B, vol.50, fol.535v-538; Maurepas, to, Mézy, 10 June 1727, AC, Série B, vol.50, fol.588v.

\textsuperscript{784} Maurepas, to, Dirop, 18 February 1727, AC, Série B, vol.50, fol.18-18v.

\textsuperscript{785} Saint-Vallier, to, Maurepas, 9 October 1727, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.106, fol.191-193v, 194v.

\textsuperscript{786} Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.344.

\textsuperscript{787} RAPQ, vol.1941-1942, p.270.
Saint-Vallier's attempt was not successful, and, between 1727 and 1728, the matter of the Brittany Recollets' replacement concluded. At the beginning of November or December 1727, Le Dorz returned to France, and left the Louisbourg parish to Le Duff, who was also appointed superior. On 26 December 1727 Saint-Vallier died. His death contributed increasing the stability within the religious activity of Louisbourg, especially by removing the main opponent the Brittany Recollets had faced since their establishment at Île Royale.

Le Duff spent little time as parish-priest and superior. On 3 November 1727 he asked his provincial for permission to be retired from the Île Royale mission. The content of his letter showed the difficulties the Recollets had to face. Especially, Le Duff complained about the harshness of the climate and the scarcity of food that had affected his activity as well as that of his confrères. The content of Le Duff's letter was not new, and, once more it outlined some of the problems that had always characterized the missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia. What Le Duff had written was almost similar to what Pacifique de Provins, a Capuchin missionary and the superior of the Acadian mission from 1641 until 1648, had reported to Propaganda in the fall of 1641. Although he had never been in Acadia, Pacifique de Provins, on the ground of his confrères' information, had clearly reported that the
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788 Letter of Saint-Ovide dated 15 December 1727, AC, C11B, vol.9; We have no information about Le Dorz's death. The available information on this missionary shows that, from 1733 until 1736, he was superior of the convent of Pontivy. Le Duff began to sign as parish priest and superior since 20 September 1727. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.589; AC, G1, Registres de l'état civil, recensements et documents divers, vol.406, Louisbourg, 1st register, fol.32.

790 Johnston, Religion in Life, p.41.


792 Pacifique de Provins, in life René de l'Escale, was born at Provins, in the department of Seine-et-Marne, on 24 July 1588. He joined the Capuchin order on 16 June 1605. We have no information about his death. According to François Le Gouz de La Boullaye, a French explorer of the eighteenth century, the Capuchin was killed in 1648 by some natives while he was in Guyana. See Pacifique de Provins, OFM Cap, Godfroy de Paris, OFM Cap, and Hilaire de Wingene, OFM Cap, ed., Le voyage de Perse et Brève relation des Îles de l'Amérique, (Assisi: Collegio S. Lorenzo da Brindisi, 1939), pp. IX-XI, XLI-XLII.
land was not enough to provide to the settlers' needs, and the greater part of the territory was uninhabited\textsuperscript{793}.

In 1728 Le Duff's request was fulfilled and he was replaced by Zacharie Caradec\textsuperscript{794} who, according to the parish register, began to operate as parish priest in mid-June\textsuperscript{795}. However it was not until the beginning of September that Caradec was also appointed vicar-general at Île Royale and Louisbourg\textsuperscript{796}. Until Caradec's appointment, Denys probably kept the office of vicar-general until mid-May 1728, but, agreed to leave the parish to Le Duff, before, and Caradec after. Although both Le Duff and Caradec were probably troubled by this situation, no further disputes occurred\textsuperscript{797}. In 1729 Denys left Île Royale to return to Québec, where he remained until 1736, the year of his death\textsuperscript{798}.

A period of transition (1729–1735)

The “ecclesiastical war” of Louisbourg had no consequences on the activity of the Recollets, such as de Lestage and Pain, engaged in the missions outside of Île Royale. From 1725 till 1729, Pain operated at Île-Saint-Jean. This missionary appears to have been the only Recollet to serve the island, with any regularity. The presence of other Recollets was temporary or seasonal. This was evident in the case


\textsuperscript{794} According to Bacon, Le Duff died in 1771 at Cuburien. Of Caradec we have no information about his birth's date, when he joined the Recollets, or his ordination's year. Furthermore no information is available on his death. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.76, 591.

\textsuperscript{795} AC, G1, Registres de l'état civil, recensements et documents divers, vol.406, Louisbourg, 1st register.

\textsuperscript{796} AAQ, 12 A, Registres des insinuations ecclésiastiques, vol.B, fol.280rv, 9 September 1728, Québec.

\textsuperscript{797} Archives Franciscaines de Montréal, Fonds Jouve, dossier Joseph Denys, pièces 26 et 64. Document cited in Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.344; Johnston, Religion in Life, pp.41-42.

\textsuperscript{798} More precisely Denys died on 25 January 1736, See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.345.
of Léonard Pain, who visited the island towards the end of July 1725. Another brief missionary sojourn had been that of Pierre-Joseph de Kergariou, who had wintered at Port-Lajoie and Havre Saint-Pierre from 1726 until 1727. The main reason for these brief or temporary presences was probably that the island was still a marginal colony, whose resident population, according to the census of 1728, counted 297 agricultural settlers and 125 fishermen.

Besides the parish register, evidence of Pain’s activity on the island can be found in correspondence between the authorities of Île Royale and Conseil de Marine that considered the missionary’s activity as a way to attract the Acadians there. A letter, dated 3 November 1728, from Saint-Ovide and Mézy to Maurepas noted that Pain had spent the whole fall of 1727 on the island. Between 1727 and 1728, Pain had incessantly worked at Île Saint-Jean, and this had led the Recollet to demand the building of a chapel. His activity gained the approval of the French colonial authorities, and 500 livres was granted to him to support his activity on Île Saint-Jean. According to the parish register, he remained there until mid-July 1731.

Compared to Pain, the information on de Lestage is sketchy. According to the parish register of Rimouski, the Recollet continued to sign acts as missionary to the

---

799 Léonard, baptized Joseph, was born in France in 1688, and joined the Recollets in 1721. He died at Chaumont 1741. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXXVIII; Pelletier, Le Clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.206.
800 AC, Série G1, Registres de l’état civil, recensements et documents divers, vol.411, Île Saint-Jean, 1st register, p.129.
801 Of this missionary we have no biographical information. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXXII.
802 Today’s town of Saint-Peters, in Prince Edward Island.
Mi'kmaq until the end of 1728. As with Pain, de Lestage's activity was appreciated by the French colonial authorities. This is shown by the fact that, from the end June 1728 until the beginning of October, Maurepas and Charles de Beauharnois de La Boische, New France's governor, had proposed to support the Recollet's apostolate, respectively with 400 and 600 livres. However both the experiences of de Lestage and Pain had been isolated, and had not contributed to expand the Recollets' apostolate, by then centered at Île Royale. In fact we have to consider that after 1726 no new Recollets' arrivals were recorded as arriving in Acadia/Nova Scotia. From late 1726 until 1729, the parish of Annapolis Royal and Minas had continued to be served, respectively by Bieslay and, in turn, Raphael Courtin, Alexandre Noël de Noinville, Gaulin, and Brault. Despite the Recollets' absence, the relationships of the British government of Nova Scotia with the Catholic priests had remained almost unvaried. The priests had maintained their authority among the Acadians, which continued to incite the British governors'.

---

809 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.267.
810 Charles de Beauharnois de La Boische was born at La Chaussaye, near Orléans. On 12 October 1671 he was baptized. In February 1726 he was appointed general governor of New France. He died on 12 July in the parish of Saint-Saveur, in Paris. See DCB, III, pp.41-51.
811 Beauharnois was not the author of the request. In fact he just presented it on behalf of the Saint-Denis' provincial, that had compiled it. See Charles de Beauharnois de La Boische-François Clairambault d'Aigremont, New France's intendant, to, Maurepas, 1 October 1728, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.50, fol.54-56; RAPQ, vol.1941-1942, p.279.
812 According to Cyprien Tanguay, the first name of Courtin, a graduate of the Seminary of Paris, was Michel, and was ordained at Québec in 1724. See Cyprien Tanguay, Répertoire général du clergé canadien par ordre chronologique. Depuis la fondation de la colonie jusqu'à nos jours, 2nd edition, (Montréal: Buèbe Senecal & Fils, 1893), pp.100-101; Wicken, William Wicken, "Encounters with Tall Sails and Tall Tales: Mi'kmaq society, 1500-1760", (PhD dissertation: McGill University, 1994), pp.338-339.
813 On Alexandre de Noinville we just know that he was a graduate from the Sorbonne University in Paris, and the prior of the Minims. See Micheline Dumont Johnson, Apôtres ou agitateurs: La France missionnaire en Acadie, (Trois-Rivières: Le Boréal Express, 1970), p.142; Tanguay, Répertoire général du clergé canadien, p.104.
814 We have no information about the missionaries of Beaubassin, because the parish registers from July 1723 until mid-May 1732 are missing. According to Wicken, Courtin, a graduate of the Paris seminary, had arrived in Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1724. However evidence of this missionary's presence appears from mid-August 1726 at Minas under the name of Joseph Babin Courtin. See PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register de St-Jean Baptiste de Port-Royal, 1702-1728, 1727-1753, pp.227-37; Charles des Mines à la Grand-Prée, 1707-1748, fol.216-239; Wicken, "Encounters with Tall Sails", pp.338-339.
jealousy. The Annapolis Royal council expressed its dislike of Gaulin, whose behavior, according to the British, had always been "insolent". Despite this and his constant support of the Mi'kmaq actions against the British, Gaulin had not been imprisoned nor banished. In fact the British had realized their difficulty in establishing direct relations with the Mi'kmaq. This had led them to establish cooperation with Gaulin, due to the position the missionary had been able to gain among the Aboriginal people.

Concerning the Jesuits, the period following Sébastien Râle's killing, had mainly been characterized by the end of the Anglo-Abenaki conflict in the summer of 1727. Though the treaty, signed at Casco Bay on 21 July 1727, which had ratified the previous treaties of 1725-26, had been a formal admission of the British to settle on their lands, the Abenaki-Jesuit relationships had continued. In fact Étienne Lauverjat had participated, as an interpreter, in the peace negotiations at Casco. Moreover, in the fall of 1727, the Jesuits again petitioned the French court to have an allowance for the Norridgewock mission, so that they could have been able to send a new missionary there, fulfilling the Abenaki's request. This matter persisted until early November 1730. Between late-May 1728 and mid-April 1729 the French court had approved and supported the Jesuits' request. Only in the fall of 1730 a Jesuit missionary was again sent to Norridgewock. In fact, on 6 November 1730, Beauharnois and Gilles Hocquart, the New France intendant, reported to Maurepas.

---

821 Gilles Hocquart was born in 1694 in the parish of Sainte-Croix, Mortagne-au-Perche, France. He was officially appointed intendant of New France in 1731. He died on 1 April 1783 at Paris. See Luca.
having sent Jacques de Sirême\(^{422}\), as missionary, to the Abenaki of Norridgewock. Both of them underlined that they had agreed to send him after the entreaties of the natives. They also clearly declared that replacement of Râle had been suspended for some years, due to the fear of a possible lack of support from the Abenaki. As had happened in the past, Beauharnois and Hocquart considered the Abenaki's affection for Catholicism as a way to keep them on the French side\(^{423}\).

Their statement confirms that the missionaries' activity was still seen as a way of keeping steady the French-Aboriginal people relationships. According to the historian Micheline Dumont-Johnson, the missionaries' collaboration always remained unquestionable and essential to the French colonial authorities, who considered it as the necessary link between the decisions taken in France and their practical achievement in New France\(^{424}\).

More precisely, as Maurepas expressed in his letter of 24 April 1731 to Beauharnois, the French court thought and wished that the Jesuits' activity would prevent the Abenaki from selling their lands to the British. According to Maurepas, the Abenaki's affection for the Catholic faith was a fundamental aspect that the governor of New France had to consider and support\(^{425}\). However, the French court's hopes clashed with the reality of a situation that had undergone some changes. In

---

\(^{422}\) Jacques de Sirême was born in the diocese Bayeux, in Normandy, on 22 October 1695. He joined the Jesuits on 15 September 1712, and was ordained in 1728. According to Pelletier he died on 28 August 1747 at Québec. However, according to the Jesuit Relations, the place of his death is not sure. Sirême could have died at Québec or in present state of Maine on 28 August 1747. See Reuben Goldthwaite ed., *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France, 1610-1791*, 73 vols., 2nd edition, (New York: Pageant Book Company, 1959), vol.LXXI, p.165; Pelletier, *Le clergé en Nouvelle-France*, p.190.


\(^{424}\) *Johnson, Apôtres ou agitationes*, p.103.

\(^{425}\) *Collection de manuscrits*, III, p.154.
fact, after 1725, the Abenaki had begun to be more careful towards the French policy. Even so they had continued to accept the Jesuit missionaries who, according to the ethnohistorian Kenneth Morrison, had come to be considered more as trusted allies than as French agents.  

Between 1731 and 1732 new changes within the Abenaki of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia made Beauharnois and Hocquart prompt some variations on the Jesuit missions’ pattern. During and after the war with the British, the Abenaki had continued to attend and settle at the Saint-François, and Becancour missions. Nevertheless, at the end of the conflict with the British, the French colonial authorities had begun to be afraid of a possible departure of the Abenaki from these missions to return to their old villages in Acadia/Nova Scotia. This worry became evident in the correspondence between the French court and Beauharnois-Hocquart throughout the period from early March 1731 until 1732. In case the Abenaki would have decided to leave the Saint-François and Becancour missions, Beauharnois-Hocquart had, according to a royal order, to retire de Sirême from Norridgewock. However this decision was not taken, and on 1 October 1732 a report, jointly written by Beauharnois and Hocquart, informed the French king that the Abenaki of Saint-François and Becancour were not disposed to return to their old villages. Yet, eleven days later, Beauharnois and Hocquart sent another report in which they reported moving Lauverjat from the Pentagouët mission to that of Médoctec to avoid further conflicts with Joseph d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin (fl.1720-1746), son of Jean-Vincent d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin, and one of his younger brother.

---

827 The Becancour mission was close to Sillery. See Dragon, *L'Acadie et ses*, map, p.118.
829 Jean-Vincent d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin was born in 1652 at Saint-Castin, in the department of Basses-Pyrénées. He died in 1707 at Pau. See *DCB*, II, pp.4-7.
The conflict between Lauverjat and the Saint-Castin family traced its origins to the summer of 1728, when Lauverjat had written to de Joseph Pierre de La Chasse to acquaint him about the brothers’ bad behavior. The Jesuit had accused both the Saint-Castins of operating a trade in brandy that had intoxicated the settlers as well as the natives. Also however the missionary’s main aim in his letter was to prove how the Saint-Castins had never supported him and the natives before or during the Anglo-Abenaki war. Lauverjat clearly declared that both the brothers had done all the possible to prevent the Abenaki from fighting, and even pushed them to make the peace with the British.

Lauverjat’s charge had no practical consequences for the Saint-Castins. Both Beauharnois and Hocquart seemed unworried about the effects that the transfer of Lauverjat could have had on the Abenaki of the Pentagouët mission. Despite the Abenaki’s requests to have the Jesuit back, Beauharnois and Hocquart simply stated that Lauverjat was close to their mission, and, that they could visit him anytime. Furthermore Lauverjat was not alone at Médectec. Jean-Pierre Daniélou was also at this mission, from 1731, to learn the natives’ language, and to replace Jean-Baptiste Loyard, who had died there in the month of June of the previous year.

About the same period of Beauharnois-Hocquart’s document, another report was sent to France. In fact, at mid-November 1732, Saint-Ovide presented an overall description of a visit he had made to at Port-Toulouse and Port-Lajoie. He revealed that missionary activity at Port-Toulouse area relied on Courtin. He was mentioned by Saint-Ovide, during one of his meetings with the Mi’kmaq, as the sole missionary

830 De la Chasse died at Québec on 27 September 1749. See Dragon, L’Acadie et ses, p.211; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.178.
832 Jean-Pierre Daniélou was born at Brest on 15 July 1696. On 9 October 1713 he joined the Jesuits, being ordained in Paris in 1727. See DCB, III, p.163, Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.177.
833 Collection de manuscrits, III, p.162.
who operated within the natives. Due to the lack of further missionaries, Saint-Ovide complained that many Mi’kmaq had led a profligate life.\footnote{Collection de manuscrits, III, pp.163-166.}

Saint-Ovide’s complaint about the lack of missionaries seems difficult to understand, especially if we consider that Courtin was a secular priest active in an area put under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Brittany Recollets. The latter had by then extended their authority over the whole territory of Île Royale. In fact, in the spring 1730 the Saint-Denis Recollets had clearly expressed that they wanted to withdraw from Port-Dauphin, and Port-Toulouse, no longer able to support them. Between the end of June and mid-July 1730 the Conseil de Marine and the Brittany provincial had achieved an outline agreement. Besides Île Royale, the jurisdiction of the Brittany Recollets had also been extended, on the request of Conseil de Marine, to Île Saint-Jean. On 17 July 1731 the question of the Saint-Denis Recollets’ withdrawal had officially been defined, with the issuing of new letters patents for the Brittany Recollets.\footnote{AC, Série B, vol.54, fol.50v; Conseil de Marine, to, Saint-Ovide-Mézy, 17 July 1731, AC, Série B, vol.55, fol.577; Hugolin, "Les Recollets de Saint-Denis and Bretagne", pp.107-110; A.J. B. Johnston, Life and Religion at Louisbourg, 2nd edition, (Montréal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1996), p.46.} According to a letter of Mézy to Conseil de Marine, towards mid-March 1732 the Brittany Recollets had replaced their confrères in the all settlements of Île Royale, with, Paschal Martel, Jean-Capistran Chevrau, and Pain being exceptions. However of these three Saint-Denis Recollets, only Chevrau kept on carrying his pastoral duties on the island. More precisely he remained at Niganiche, where he died in 1733.\footnote{1 Today’s town of Ingonish, in Nova Scotia.} According to Mézy’s letter, Pain had decided to remain due to his age and the fear of the sea. However he was ready to leave in case he would have not found an agreement with the Brittany Recollets. On the contrary Martel was of the opinion to return to Québec. We have no information about Pain’s departure from Île Royale. We just know that in the fall of 1733 he was at Québec, at the Hôpital-Général. From 1734 until 1740 he was superior the convent of Québec, place where he died on 27 November 1741. Of Martel we know that he died on 12 October 1762 at Montréal. See Mézy, to, Conseil de Marine, 17 March 1732, AC, C11B, vol.13, fol.32; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.LXXVII, 116-117, 749-750, 880; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.204.
The fact that the Brittany Recollets had extended their jurisdiction over Île Royale had raised doubts in some quarters. Their presence had led Pierre-Hereman Dosquet, the coadjutor of the bishop of Québec, to put forward proposals to limit their power. On 17 October 1730, he proposed to Maurepas that all the parishes left vacant by the Saint-Denys Recollets should be staffed by their confrères of the province of Saint-André, in Flanders. Dousquet’s proposal was not surprising, as he himself had been born at Liège. Although his proposal was not accepted, on 8 September 1731, Dousquet again wrote to Maurepas. This time he proposed the establishment of a secular priest, as vicar-general, at Louisbourg, whose authority would include Île Royale, Île Saint-Jean, and Acadia/Nova Scotia.

Dousquet’s proposal showed a desire to strengthen the power as well as the control of the diocese of Québec over its more distant areas. Both Beauharnois and Hocquart agreed, in a letter of 4 October to Maurepas, to support Dousquet’s proposal. According to their view, a secular priest as vicar-general could have restored the stability among the missionaries, also being more attentive to the problems of the state than a Recollet. Beauharnois and Hocquart also took advantage of this letter to criticize the Brittany Recollets. Their bad behavior had prevented the authorities from sending more Sisters of the Congregation of the Notre-Dame, responsible for education of girls, to Île Royale. According to Beauharnois and

---

839 Pierre-Herman Dosquet was born at Liège on 4 March 1691. In 1715 he entered the Sulpician seminary of Paris, being ordained in 1721. On 25 May 1729 he was appointed by Louis-François Duplessis, a Capuchin and the third bishop Québec, as his coadjutor. Unlike Duplessis who never went to Canada Dosquet left France for Québec at mid-June 1729. In the fall of 1733 he was appointed bishop of Québec, thus replacing Duplessis. He died in Paris on 4 March 1777. See DCB, IV, pp.220-222.

840 Pierre-Herman Dosquet, the coadjutor of the bishop of Québec, to, Maurepas, 17 October 1730, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.53, fol.382.

841 Dosquet, to, Maurepas, 8 September 1731, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.56, fol.180-181v.

842 Johnston, Life and Religion, pp.46-47.

843 The Sisters of the Congregation of the Notre-Dame were founded in France in the seventeenth century by Marguerite Bourgeois. They were a community of non-cloistered nuns that took care of the girls’ education. See Ibidem, p.91.
Hocquart, the members of this order had no trust in the Recollets of Louisbourg. This lack of trust mirrored what Saint-Vallier had thought about the failure of the education provided by these missionaries to the children of Louisbourg. This had led him to send, in 1727, Marguerite Roy to found a school, which opened in the fall of that year.

Despite the tensions that periodically emerged, the main colonial authorities of New France had never stopped demanding the support of Maurepas for the Recollets' missionary activity outside Île Royale. More precisely, throughout the period from late 1729 until the fall of 1730, the correspondence between Maurepas and Beauharnois/Hocquart shows that there was a common interest in supporting the Recollets' apostolate among the Mi'kmaq of Miramichi and Ristigouche. With regards to Ristigouche, in 1730 Beauharnois and Hocquart had decided, in accordance with Dosquet, to appoint the Recollet Luc Hendrix, as missionary there. They had also requested the building of a chapel, and supported the demand of Donatien Dubois, then, the Recollet superior of New France, who had asked to have 1200 livres for the Miramichi and Ristigouche missions. As Beauharnois/Hocquart had declared to Maurepas in their letter of 10 October 1730, the necessity to reestablish the Ristigouche mission was due to a specific request.

---

844 Beauharnois-Hocquart, to, Maurepas, 4 October 1731, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.54, fol.61-63v.
845 Marguerite Roy was born on 4 July 1674 at Prairie-de-la-Madeleine, today's Laprairie in the province of Québec. In 1689 she joined the Sister of the Congregation, and on 25 June 1698 she took the vows, and on 1 July made her perpetual profession. She died at Montréal on 13 December 1749. See DCB, III, pp.574-575; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.290.
848 Luc Hendrix was born in France in 1692, and arrived at Québec in 1713. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.491.
849 Donatien Dubois was born in France in 1686. He joined the Recollets in 1702, being ordained in 1710. From 1729 until 1731 he held the office of superior of New France. He died at Nantes on 15 August 1750. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXXIII; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.199.
presented to them by the Mi'kmaq during the same year. At mid-April 1731 Maurepas had agreed to support Beauharnois/Hocquart’s request, although, compared to the 1200 livres required, just 800 livres would have been granted. Despite there was a substantial difference between the sum required and that granted, the mission could now be established. This is shown by the fact that at mid-October of that year, the support of the Miramichi and Ristigouche missions had been included in the budget of the estimated expenses for New France for the year 1732.

As for what happened for the Jesuits missions of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia, the main interest of the French authorities in supporting the Recollet missions of Miramichi and Ristigouche was informed by the necessity to gain the Mi'kmaq’s help against the British, and not by the will to spread of the Catholic faith among the natives who lived in that area. The correspondence that Beauharnois-Hocquart had with Maurepas from 1733 until the fall of 1735 seems to prove this. Through these letters, the two main authorities underlined how the Mi'kmaq of Miramichi and Ristigouche kept being faithful to the French.

Due to the lack of accounts written by the missionaries, we have no information, on how Hendrix and de Lestage tried to carry on their apostolate, or on the type of relationships they established with the Mi’kmaq. What is sure is that, according to the available information, from 1734 until 1735, the presence of Hendrix and de Lestage was recorded in the area of the Baie des Chaleurs and Île Royale. With regards to de Lestage, his itinerant activity allows us to know that,


\[851\] Maurepas, to, Beauharnois-Hocquart, 17 April 1731, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.56, fol.35-40v.

\[852\] AC, C11A, vol.113, fol.483-497, 18 October 1731.

Despite Saint-Ovide's complaint of 1732, the situation at Île Royale had remained unchanged, and had continued to record a missionary vacuum among the Mi'kmaq. This became evident in the fall of 1734, when de Lestage, after a few sojourns in the parish of Beaubassin and Minas, recorded between 1733 and 1734, went with Saint-Ovide to visit the Mi'kmaq at Île Royale, Île Saint-Jean and Antigonish. According to Saint-Ovide's letter of 1 November 1734 to Maurepas, the Mi'kmaq clearly asked him to let de Lestage spend the winter among them, because they had been without a missionary for two years. Saint-Ovide reported that he agreed to the Mi'kmaq's request, although he made no mention of the exact location where de Lestage was to winter. Through Saint-Ovide's letter, we also know that the official missionary post of de Lestage was Miramichi that came to be assigned to Hendrix, during his confrère's absence.

After this letter, we have no more information on de Lestage, until 1745. Instead evidence of Hendrix in Acadia/Nova is recorded, for the last time, in a census of 1735. In the fall of the same year, this Recollet left his missionary post for Trois-Rivières. Saint-Ovide's statement about that, since 1732, the Mi'kmaq of Île Royale had been without a missionary corresponded to reality. In fact, in 1733 Courtin had died drowning on the way to go to Île Royale. The departure of Hendrix and the unknown activity of de Lestage again determined the Recollets' absence from the missionary and religious pattern of mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia.

854 More precisely de Lestage had been at Beaubassin at mid-April 1733, while at mid-August 1734 he had been at Minas. See PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register of Beaubassin, 1712-1748, fol.15; Charles des Mines à la Grand-Pré, 1707-1748, pp.13-16.
856 Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.268.
857 In the fall of 1735 Hendrix was the superior of the Trois-Rivières' convent, office he held until 1738. From 1747 until 1749 he held the same office for the convent of Montréal. He died on 24 December 1749 at Trois-Rivières. See Ibidem, pp.493-494, 881-882.
In fact, except for the above mentioned sketchy presences of de Lestage, the parishes of Annapolis Royal, Beaubassin, and Minas had been continued to be served by Brault, de Breslay, and Gaulin. Between 1729 and 1732, the seculars and the Sulpicians’ presence had been strengthened by the arrival of Charles de La Goudalie, Claude de La Vernède de Saint-Poincy, and Jacques Leslache. They were respectively two Sulpicians and a secular priest.

The last years of peace (1735-1745)

After 1735, the interest of the Brittany Recollets seemed to be concentrated more on their parishioners’ needs than on missionary activity among the Mi’kmaq. This was evident throughout the period from 1734 until 1737. In fact, during this lapse of time, Abbé de Saint-Vincent, Pierre Maillard, and Jean-Louis Le Loutre, two Spiritans, arrived, respectively in 1734, 1735, and 1737, at Île Royale with the intention of operating among the Mi’kmaq.

---

In 1732 Gaulin returned to Québec, where he would die on 7 March 1740. See DDB, II, p.238.

Charles de La Goudalie was born in 1678 at Rhodez, and was ordained in 1705. He arrived in Canada in 1707. See DDB, III, pp.342-342.

Claude de La Vernède de Saint-Poincy arrived in Canada in 1729, in quality of secretary of Dosquet. On 24 September of the same year, he was ordained. See Tanguay, Répertoire général du clergé canadien, p.105.

Jacques Leslache was born in 1670, and was ordained at Québec on 7 October 1714. He died at Québec on 31 October 1746. See Ibidem, pp.91-92.

According to the parish register of Minas, in the summer of 1734 Louis Mafils, a secular priest, operated there. However his presence is simply recorded for one time. See PANS, Acadian French Records, parish of Saint-Jean Baptiste of Port-Royal, 1727-1755 (copies from the Archives of Archbishop’s House, Halifax); Beaubassin, 1712-1748, fol.1; Charles des Mines à la Grand-Prèe, pp.251-307, p.12.


Pierre Maillard’s biographical information see note nr.7, chapter one.


The Spiritans belonged to the Seminary and the Congregation of the Holy Ghost that was officially founded in Paris on 27 May 1703 by Claude Francis Poullart des Places. We must specify that, before 1752, the members of this order could but be sent to North America through the agency of the
Before their arrival, the Brittany Recollets had continued to carry on their pastoral duties. However, new conflicts soon arose at Louisbourg. Caradec’s period as parish priest and Louisbourg’s superior had concluded in 1733, when he was replaced by Hippolyte Herp. Despite he had retained the office of Île Royale’s superior and vicar-general until 1734, the same year Caradec had been recalled to France. Yet Caradec’s replacement had not been caused by reasons of health, as in the case of Le Duff, but due to the problems that had arisen between him and the inhabitants’ community of Louisbourg. In fact, throughout the years 1730-33, Caradec had tried to accomplish some adjustments within the parish’s structure, such as the building of a vestry, and the election of further churchwardens. However, the tension had begun to rise when the Recollet had proposed to tax all the fishing crews landing at Île Royale of a quintal of cod per shallop in order to support the parish of Louisbourg. Yet Caradec’s proposal clashed with the fact that the payment of the tithe at Île Royale had always been a donation, and not a compulsory tax. To try to avoid conflict, both Saint-Ovide and Mézy, as well as the latter’s son...
and successor, Sébastien-François-Ange Le Normant de Mézy (fl.1702-1772)\(^{875}\), had kept on writing, from late 1730 until mid-March 1732, to Maurepas to seek a possible solution. In the month of June 1733 the matter had been solved. According to Maurepas, Caradec had no right to assess a tax that had never been issued, and officially approved\(^{876}\).

After Caradec’s replacement, no major conflicts arose during the period of Herp’s activity at Louisbourg. The most serious question he had to face occurred in 1733 when some Basque fishermen requested a priest able to speak their language. This request was not new. In the years 1714-1716, Pontchartrain had even put forward his proposal to send a Basque-speaking Recollet to Île Royale. Despite Pontchartrain’s proposal had not been fulfilled, evidence of Basque secular priests had been recorded in the island, respectively in 1715 and 1716\(^{877}\). It is likely that Herp did not favour the fishermen’s request. Of the same opinion had been Saint-Ovide and Le Normant who, at Mid-October 1733, had reported to Maurepas that a Basque priest’s arrival would but create further conflicts on the island. They added that, at Niganiche and St. Esprit\(^{878}\), there were Recollets able to speak Basque to fulfill the fishermen’s request\(^{879}\). Saint-Ovide and Le Normant’s letter turned out to be effective, and seems to have concluded the matter\(^{880}\). In 1735 Herp’s tenure at Île Royale ended\(^{881}\), and he was replaced by Étienne Le Goff\(^{882}\). Compared to his

---

\(^{875}\) Mézy was recalled in France in 1731. See DCB, III, p.389.


\(^{877}\) Ibidem, p.47.

\(^{878}\) St. Esprit was a settlement approximately located fifteen location from Le Hâvre de Fourché, (today’s Fourchu). See Angus Johnston, History of, p.57.


\(^{880}\) Johnston, Life and Religion, p.48.

\(^{881}\) We have no information about the following activity of Herp or when he died. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXXV, 503.
confrère, who had never been appointed as vicar-general, Le Goff also obtained this title. Moreover his appointment was approved by the Île Royale authorities, who thought that Le Goff was well suited to administer the religious affairs of Île Royale.

The continuous changes within the Brittany Recollets probably represented one of the main causes that prevented the Recollets from organizing and spreading their evangelical activity among the Mi'kmaq of Île Royale. Their absence from the Aboriginal people was compensated by the efforts of Maillard who, since his arrival, had devoted himself to the studying of the Mi'kmaq language. This led Maillard to create, during the winter of 1737-38, a hieroglyphic system of writing, through which he could begin to catechize the natives. Until now, it has not been possible to prove if Maillard used and improved the system invented by Chrestien Le Clercq in 1691. What is sure is that his linguistic skills allowed him to compile a sort of alphabet that had more than 5700 conceptual symbols. The absence of specific reports and accounts written by the Recollets vis-à-vis the Aboriginal people seems to prove the thesis upheld by the historian John Webster Grant. In his opinion, the Recollets, except for Le Clercq, had proved to be unable to organize well-developed missionary activity, and were more at home in operating within and close to the French settlements.

---

882 As for Herp, the biographical information about Le Goff is missing. Before his departure for Île Royale, we just know that on 2 October 1720 he was authorized to confess the secular priests. From 1729 until 1734 he had served Louisbourg, La Baleine, Hâvre Saint-Esprit, and Niganiche in quality of parish priest. See Lemay, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne", p.94; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.595.
883 Lemay, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne", p.94.
886 Koren, Knaves or Knights ?, p.29.

184
It is difficult to verify how much the Recollets’ seeming lack of interest in the Mi’kmaq had repercussions on missionary activity in Île Royale, and mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. Both Le Loutre and Maillard seemed to have ignored it. This is shown by the fact that within the years 1737-38, they agreed to divide their activity in two different areas. Le Loutre had established at Shubenacadie to serve the main settlements of mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. Maillard had to deserve the Mi’kmaq of Île Royale as well as those of the Antigonish mission. Despite this subdivision, the task of Le Loutre and Maillard was made more difficult by the fact that all mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia, throughout the late 1730s and the early 1740s, underwent a shortage of priests. In fact, from 1735 until 1740, just two Sulpicians Claude-Jean-Baptiste Chauvreux, Jean-Baptiste de Gay Desenciaves, and, Nicolas André Vauquelin, a secular priest, would have arrived at Annapolis Royal and Minas.

The relationships of the Catholic priests with the British government of Nova Scotia remained steady until late 1742, with some exceptions. In 1736, Saint-Poncy was expelled because he had celebrated Mass in private homes, and not in the chapel purposely built by the British government. Moreover, Saint-Poincy had refused an order to go to Cape Sable to seek native restitution of some goods taken from a shipwreck. Despite the order, in the fall of the same year, Saint-Poincy returned to Annapolis Royal, and requested to resume his duties. Thanks to a petition submitted

---

890 Claude-Jean-Baptiste Chauvreux was born at Orléans in 1706, and was ordained at Québec on 23 September 1730. See DCB, III, pp.119-121; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.210.
891 Jean-Baptiste de Gay Desenciaves was born at Limoges, in the department of Haute-Vienne, on 29 January 1702. He joined the Sulpician order on 9 October 1724, and was ordained on 15 June 1726. See DCB, III, pp.256-257; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.213.
892 Of Nicolas André Vauquelin we just know that he left Canada in the month of July 1758. See Ibidem, p.240; Tanguay, Répertoire général du clergé canadien, p.122.
by the inhabitants of Annapolis Royal, he was allowed to remain there until 1738, moving afterwards to Beaubassin, where he stayed until 1741. The Anglo-Catholic priests' relationships seemed to improve in 1740 when Paul Mascarene, a French Protestant officer, began to serve as president of the Council of Nova Scotia. From the beginning Mascarene was able to establish with the Catholic priests relationships based on respect and cordiality towards each other. Moreover, throughout the late 1730s and early 1740s, he became engaged with Saint-Poncy in an extended correspondence. Mascarene thought that keeping good relationships with the priests would allow him to use them for promoting the Acadians' conversion to Protestantism. One of the results of Mascarene's policy was that he tried to establish control of the parishes, and required each community to inform the Council of any possible clerical vacancy.

However new problems arose in the fall of 1742, when Mascarene expelled two missionaries who had arrived from Québec without permission. This led him, towards the end of 1742, to demand the separation of Acadia/Nova Scotia from the diocese of Québec. He also requested to the Board of Trade to engage, on his behalf,
some Catholic missionaries from an allied country of Great Britain. Mascarene’s request was in vain due to the outbreak of the War of the Austrian succession.

Throughout the period from 1735 until 1742, the Jesuits’ activity in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia had progressively lost importance. Danielou’s activity among the natives of the Médoctec mission had been relegated to a marginal position by the British government of Acadia/Nova Scotia vis-à-vis the priests operating at Annapolis Royal and Minas. More precisely the Jesuit had been included into a British census, compiled at the beginning of the summer of 1736, of the French settlers living on the St. John River. Even so, the Council had indirectly criticized his presence there. It had agreed to warn the French settlers to submit the oath of allegiance otherwise they would have no missionary. The British warning has to be interpreted more as more routine, than personally directed at the Jesuit. It is likely that, during his missionary experience, Danielou had proved to have lesser leadership qualities than those shown by his previous confrères. Besides this, his apostolate had also been affected by the progressive Acadian establishment in the St. John River Valley, which had led the natives to trade, and consequently to move from Médoctec towards the settlement of Sainte-Anne.

Another factor also affected Danielou’s experience. After Râle’s death in 1724, the Jesuits had founded no more new missions in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. Furthermore, after the 1730s, their missionary interest and range had shifted towards the Great Lakes region, where more priests had been sent. Compared to his

---

901 Mascarene, to, Board of Trade, 3 December 1742, Annapolis Royal, PANS, RG1, vol.18, doc nr.90.
903 Dragon, L’Acadie et ses, p.228.
904 MacMechan, Original Minutes, pp.358-359.
905 Sainte-Anne approximately corresponded to today’s city of Fredericton, in New Brunswick. See DCB, III, p.163.
predecessors, Danielou had few contacts with the authorities of New France. On behalf of the New France’s government, in 1739, the Jesuit had only done no more than to compile a census of the families along the St. John River and to pass on some information about the state of the British garrison of Annapolis Royal, after the brief visit he had made there at mid-May 1737. Danielou’s apostolate ended, with his return to Québec, in 1740.

With regards to Île Royale, the period from 1735 until 1742, had again been troubled by conflicts that risked compromising the Brittany Recollets’ activity. The new problems had officially begun in the first half of 1737, when the Brittany provincial and Maurepas had authorized Caradec to return to Louisbourg. Caradec came back to resume the title of superior, even though, in 1735, Le Normant had been clearly opposed to it. Once arrived at Île Royale, Caradec’s actions had quickly prompted a growing dissatisfaction within the colony. This was partly because he had replaced Le Goff, sending him to Niganiche as parish priest. According to Le Normant, Caradec had also assumed the title of vicar-general without having the necessary authorization. Another reason for the parishioners’ dissatisfaction with Caradec had been his decision to keep on changing the parish priests of Louisbourg. Although Caradec’s presence at Louisbourg was unappreciated, it is not possible, according to the historian A. J. B. Johnston, to prove
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908 PANS, Acadian French Records, parish register of Saint-Jean Baptiste at Annapolis Royal, 1737.
909 Danielou died at Québec on 23 May 1744/45. See DCB, III, p.163; Dragon, L’Acadie et ses, p.228; JR, LXXI, p.164; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.177.
912 Le Goff probably remained at Île Royale until the summer of 1741. From 1742 until 1745 he was provincial of Brittany, office he again held from 1751 until 1754. We have no information about the date and the place of his death. See Jean-Baptiste Le Préost Duquesnel, Île Royale’s commandant, François Bigot, commissaire-ordonnateur, to, Maurepas, 12 October 1741, AC, C11B, vol.23, fol.17; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.596.
how widespread was the popular resentment versus him. What is sure is that Caradec’s presence at Île Royale had not been favoured by Jean-Pierre Roma (fl.1715-1757), the director of a fishing venture on Isle Saint-Jean, with whom Caradec had already disputed before his first return to France. According to a complaint of Roma, in 1737 Caradec had prevented six people from continuing to work on his lands at Île Saint-Jean. The dispute had continued until the month of November 1738, when Maurepas, after having tried to reconcile the parties, had decided to recall Caradec to France, during the summer of 1739.

Caradec’s departure helped to settle the conflicts within the Brittany Recollets, but new problems emerged in 1740. In that year Henri-Marie Dubreil de Pontbriand, the sixth bishop of Québec, appointed Maillard vicar general of Île Royale, and missionary to the Mi’kmaq. On 31 August 1740, Athanase Guégot, Caradec’s successor, obtained the same title, but his authority was to be subordinate to Maillard. Maillard had been favoured by the fact that he could enjoy the support of Maurepas, the bishop of Québec, and Abbé L’Isle de Dieu, his vicar general in France.

In 1742 the Brittany Recollets could no more bear to be under Maillard’s authority. According to Guégot, Maillard interfered in matters that properly belonged

914 Johnston, Life and Religion, p.49.
915 DCB, III, pp.566-567; Johnston, Life and Religion, p.50.
918 We have no information on Caradec’s activity after his return in France. We also do not know when and where he died. See Maurepas, to, Godefroy, 3 November 1738, AC, Série B, vol.66, fol.202; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.79; Johnston, Life and Religion, p.50.
919 Henri-Marie Dubreil de Pontbriand was probably born at Vannes in the month of January 1708. He was officially appointed sixth bishop of Québec on 7 April 1741. He died on 8 June 1760 at Montréal. See DCB, III, pp.192-199.
920 Ibidem, p.416; Angus Johnston, History of I, p.66.
921 There is no biographical information on Athanase Guégot before his departure for Île Royale, where he arrived at the beginning of 1732. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.478.
to the Brittany Recollets. Guégot's complain was soon echoed by that presented by Jean-Baptiste Le Prévost Duquesnel, the Île Royale commandant\textsuperscript{924}, and François Bigot\textsuperscript{925}, the Île Royale financial commissary and Le Normant's successor. They agreed that Maillard should give back the title of vicar general to the Recollets' superior, and added that Maillard, having been appointed vicar-general, had forgotten about his duties among the Mi'kmaq\textsuperscript{926}. This made Maurepas assume a clear position vis-à-vis Maillard's behavior. If the situation did not improve, Maurepas would have Maillard recalled to France\textsuperscript{927}. Maurepas’ intervention led Pontbriand and his vicar general to find, in 1743, a compromise, according to which, Guégot and Maillard would share their duties as vicar-general\textsuperscript{928}. Maurepas accepted this proposal. In the fall of 1744 the situation seemed resolved. In fact, according to a letter of 30 October 1744 of Pontbriand to Maurepas, the Recollets of Louisbourg appeared to be satisfied with the decision taken\textsuperscript{929}.

Information concerning the Recollet activity outside Île Royale before 1740 is sketchy and concerns the Miramichi-Ristigouche area. Although de Lestage and Hendrix had been no longer been active there after 1735, it is likely that evangelical activity among the Mi'kmaq had continued. Throughout the years from 1736 till 1741, the French court never stopped including the missions of Miramichi and

\textsuperscript{924} Jean-Baptiste Le Prévost Duquesnel was probably born in the mid 1680s. He died on 9 October 1744 at Louisbourg. See DCB, III, p.352.

\textsuperscript{925} François Bigot was baptized on 30 January 1703 in the parish of Saint-André, at Bordeaux. He died on 12 January 1778 at Neuchâtel, in Switzerland. See DCB, IV, p.59.

\textsuperscript{926} Maurepas, to Abbé de L'île de Dieu, 2 March 1743, AC, Série B, vol.77, fol.64; Jean-Baptiste Le Prévost Duquesnel-François Bigot, to, Maurepas, 7 November 1743, Louisbourg, AC, C11A, vol.107, fol.76-77.

\textsuperscript{927} AC, Série B, vol.77, fol.66-66v.

\textsuperscript{928} Henri-Marie Dubreuil de Pontbriand, bishop of Québec, to, Maurepas, 20 October 1743, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.80, fol.349-353v.

Ristigouche into the yearly register of the budget expenses of New France. All the documentation made no mention of specific missionaries. However, in 1742 the Recollet Maurice de La Corne began to be cited as missionary of Miramichi. In fact, according to the registers of the king’s warehouses at Québec, in the month of September 1742, 20 livres of gunpowder and 80 livres of bullets were granted to de La Corne to make easier his missionary activity. During the same year, the Recollet also obtained an allowance of 400 livres as missionary of the Mi’kmaq. It is likely that de La Corne ultimately received the gunpowder and the bullets to support the Mi’kmaq actions against the British. De La Corne was not the sole Recollet to operate in that area. In fact, from 1742 until 1743, Antoine Vemet served the Ristigouche mission, with a grant of 400 livres per year. After 1743, evidence of Vemet is no more found in the available documentation.

On 15 March 1744 the War of the Austrian Succession officially broke out between France and Great Britain. The first step was from the French authorities of Louisbourg that, towards the end of May, succeeded to attack and to conquer the settlement of Canseau. The Catholic priests were not excluded from the hostilities, and at mid-July 1744 Le Loutre, with 300 Mi’kmaq, began to besiege Annapolis Royal in order to support the expedition led by the captain François Du Pont.
Duvivier\textsuperscript{938}. Although they did not take part in military actions, the Jesuits were not excluded from Duvivier's expedition. In fact Charles Germain\textsuperscript{939}, the missionary who, in 1740, had replaced Danielou on the Saint-John River\textsuperscript{940}, reported in the month of November 1744, that he had participated in the preparation for the Maliseet force that would join to Duvivier at Annapolis Royal\textsuperscript{941}. Due to the arrival of British reinforcements, the Mi'kmaq force and Le Loutre were forced to retreat. In spite of it, Duvivier continued the siege, but, towards the end of September 1744, the arrival of further reinforcements from Massachusetts obliged him to return to Louisbourg\textsuperscript{942}.

However not all the Catholic missionaries accepted to support the French military efforts. This became evident for Desenclaves, who, according to Maurepas, had informed the British of the proceedings of the French. Moreover he had incited the parishioners to be loyal to the British king, thus attracting the criticisms of Maurepas. Despite this, Desenclaves' decision remained an isolated case, so that in November 1747 the missionary would pass on information about the British activities\textsuperscript{943}.

At Louisbourg the situation seemed steady, and no further conflicts had arisen between the Recollets and Maillard. Maurepas was satisfied about it, and said so in two letters, dated 10 February and 3 April 1745, respectively addressed to the Brittany provincial and Isle de Dieu\textsuperscript{944}. However Maurepas' satisfaction did not last long. In fact, towards the end of May and the beginning of June, a New England
military expedition, composed of 4000 soldiers, and supported by a fleet of 100 vessels started to besiege Louisbourg, forcing its capitulation on 28 June 1745.  

A political missionary activity (1745-1749)

The conquest of Louisbourg stopped the religious activity of the Brittany Recollets, although they returned to Île Royale in 1749. Until the end of July 1745, the parish services continued through Alexis Guillou. This priest and his confrère Angélique Collin were the last Brittany Recollets to leave from Louisbourg to return France. Only one Recollet, Juvénal Adam, did not do so. It is likely that he was at Île Saint-Jean at moment of the conquest of Louisbourg. What is sure is that his presence was afterwards recorded at Québec from 1745 until 1748, the year of his death.

The British occupation of Louisbourg did not contribute to moderating the turbulent relationship that had established between the bishop of Québec and the Brittany Recollets. For two times, respectively on 3 November 1745 and 26 February 1746, Pontbriand, as his predecessors, again put forward the proposal that, in case of a possible return of Louisbourg to the French, the Brittany Recollets should be replaced by some secular priests.

946 Johnston, Life and Religion, p.55.
947 There is no biographical information on Alexis Guillou. We just know that he began to be active at Louisbourg since the end of September 1727. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.488.
948 As for Guillou, we ignore the date as well as the place of Collin's birth. His presence was first recorded at Port-Lajoie since the fall of 1737. He died at Pontivy, in France, on 24 November 1772. See Ibidem, p.129.
950 Of Adam we just know that he was already a priest in the month of April 1725. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.7.
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As had happened in the dispute against Maillard, the Brittany Recollets enjoyed Bigot's support. In 1748 he succeeded in convincing Maurepas to leave matters unchanged953. The conquest of Louisbourg also, in effect, reinforced the activity of missionaries among the Aboriginal people of mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. Here the War of Austrian Succession had embroiled all this territory on an unprecedented scale. Especially the situation had been worsened by the fact that, on 20 October 1744, the government of Massachusetts had officially declared war on the Mi'kmaq. In this context, the Catholic missionaries, and especially Le Loutre, came to play an intermediary role between the French authorities and the Mi'kmaq of mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia954.

Despite, until now, the missionaries' influence on the natives is still debatable955, the available documentation proves that Le Loutre, as well as de La Corne and Germain, came to be engaged by the authorities of New France to support their military actions against the British. This began to be more and more evident from 1745, when the New France authorities decided to launch a second offensive against Acadia/Nova Scotia. In fact, at mid-May 1745, a mixed Aboriginal-French expedition, led by Joseph Marin de La Malgue956, arrived at Annapolis Royal, and began to besiege the settlement. However the siege lasted little time, due to the fact that, at the beginning of June, Marin was forced to leave, having been recalled at Louisbourg957.

Though the expedition was a failure, the missionaries had an active role in supporting the French plans. De Lestage, who in 1745 had returned to the

954 Plank, An Unsettled Conquest, pp.110-111.
956 Joseph Marin de La Malgue was baptized on 5 February 1719 at Montréal. He died in 1744 in the Bay of Antongil, in today's state of Madagascar. See DGB, IV, pp.512-514.
Ristigouche mission\textsuperscript{958}, informed Hocquart about the preparations of the New England's fleet that had to attack Louisbourg. In general, and despite the poor results obtained, the French military expeditions strengthened the network between the Catholic priests in Acadia/Nova Scotia and the authorities at Québec. In fact at mid-September 1745, Beauharnois and Hocquart reported to Maurepas their satisfaction for the behavior of the native bands of the Germain's mission, as well as the Mi'kmaq who lived in the missions of Le Loutre and de La Corne\textsuperscript{959}. Furthermore they also specified that at the Miramichi mission lived 195 Mi'kmaq\textsuperscript{960}. Besides the number specified by Beauharnois and Hocquart, it was clear that, in 1740s, the 2000 Mi'kmaq who lived scattered within the territory of Acadia/Nova Scotia continued, as the other Aboriginal people, to hold a basic position within the French authorities' policy\textsuperscript{961}. Furthermore almost all the Mi'kmaq agreed to support the war against the British in order to assure their survival\textsuperscript{962}.

Although the activity of de La Corne, Germain, and Le Loutre, was eulogized and supported, these missionaries, as well as the others active in Acadia/Nova Scotia, were at considerable risk. Maillard underwent the consequences of this situation, and, at the end of 1745 he was taken prisoner by the British, probably through a betrayal, and sent to Boston\textsuperscript{963}. Le Loutre avoided capture and succeeded in escaping to Québec\textsuperscript{964}. With regard to de La Corne, the British took no measures against him, so he remained at Beaubassin till the end of March 1746\textsuperscript{965}. During that year the missionaries continued to be used by the French authorities to support their strategic

\textsuperscript{958} AC, C11A, vol.83, fol.27.
\textsuperscript{959} Beauharnois-Hocquart, to, Maurepas, 12 September 1745, AC, C11A, vol.83, fol.32.
\textsuperscript{960} Beauharnois-Hocquart, to, Maurepas, 12 September 1745, AC, C11A, vol.83, fol.3-47.
\textsuperscript{961} Stephen E. Patterson, "1744-1763. Colonial Wars and Aboriginal Peoples", in \textit{Atlantic Region}, pp.125-127.
\textsuperscript{962} Plank, \textit{An Unsettled Conquest}, p.111.
\textsuperscript{963} From Boston, Maillard was sent to France, where he arrived at the beginning of 1746. See \textit{DCB}, III, pp.416-417; Johnston, \textit{History of}, I, p.67.
\textsuperscript{964} Koren, \textit{Knives of Knights} ?, pp.38-39.
\textsuperscript{965} PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register of Beaubassin, 1712-1748, fol.1-4, 78.
plans. In fact, this time, the French planned to attack not only Annapolis Royal, but to reconquer Île Royale as well as the entire territory of Acadia/Nova Scotia. A mixed military expedition of New France and French forces, respectively led by Jean-Baptiste-Nicolas-Roch de Ramezay⁹⁶⁶ and Jean-Baptiste-Louis-Fréderic La Rochefoucauld, Duc d’Anville⁹⁶⁷, was prepared to launch a combined attack by sea and land⁹⁶⁸.

According to Beauharnois-Hocquart, the Jesuits and Recollets assumed different tasks during the French campaign in Acadia/Nova Scotia. In mid-May 1746, de La Corne and de Lestage were charged to move the Mi’kmaq of their respective missions to Beaubassin, where they had to join the troops led by Ramezay⁹⁶⁹. During the summer of that year, De La Corne also took part to the French-Mi’kmaq raid, led by Joseph-Michel Legardeur de Croisille et de Montesson⁹⁷⁰, sent against Port-Lajoie, that had been conquered by the British in 1745⁹⁷¹. About the same time, Germain, who had spent the winter of 1745-46 at Beaubassin, took care of the logistical part of Ramezay’s expedition, and informed the French about the transfers of the British troops within Acadia/Nova Scotia⁹⁷².

As in 1745, the French plans were unsuccessful. The naval expedition led by the Duc d’Anville was largely destroyed by the Atlantic storms, and a good part of its remaining strength was decimated by an epidemic. However, at mid-October Ramezay, having taken Beaubassin, decided to attack Annapolis Royal. Due to the lack of reinforcements, the French conquest of Annapolis Royal again failed, and

⁹⁶⁶ Jean-Baptiste-Nicolas-Roch de Ramezay was born on 4 September 1708 at Montréal. He died on 7 May 1777 at Blaye, in France. See DCB, IV, pp.650-653.
⁹⁶⁷ Jean-Baptiste-Louis-Fréderic La Rochefoucauld, Duc d’Anville, was born on 17 August 1709. He died on 27 September 1746 at Chebucto, today’s city of Halifax, in Nova Scotia. See DCB, III, p.356.
⁹⁶⁸ Daigle, “L’Acadie de 1604 à 1763”, in L’Acadie Maritimes, p.35.
⁹⁷⁰ Joseph-Michel Legardeur de Croisille et de Montesson was baptized on 30 December 1716 at Bécancour. He died in 1776 in Pennsylvania. See DCB, IV, pp.446-447.
towards the beginning of October, Ramezay was forced to withdraw to Beaubassin.\footnote{Daigle, “L’Acadie de 1604 à 1763”, in L’Acadie des Maritimes, p.35; DCB, IV, p.447, Rawlyk, Nova Scotia’s Massachusetts, pp.186-188.}

According to Wicken, the activity of the missionaries among the Mi’kmaq during the 1740s was the result of the political conjuncture of that period, and does not prove their influence over the Aboriginal society. Again according to this historian, the adherence to the Catholicism did not mean that all Mi’kmaq accepted the missionaries’ advice to fight against the British.\footnote{Wicken, “Encounters with Tall Sails”, pp.369-370.} However, to counterbalance Wicken’s statement, we need to remind that, according to Dumont-Johnson, the cohesion of two reasons, such as the preservation of Catholicism and the French presence in Acadia/Nova Scotia, made the priests able to prompt growing attention from the colonial authorities towards the Aboriginal people.\footnote{Dumont-Johnson, Apôtres ou Agitateurs, p.107.} What seems clear is that, throughout the available documentation, the activity of de La Corne, and Germain obtained a greater, although one-sided, support from Beauharnois-Hocquart than that shown in the previous years. Evidence of it can be found in the letter that, on 6 October 1746, Hocquart addressed to Maurepas. In fact, the New France’s intendant eulogized Germain and de La Corne for what they had done. With regards to the Recollet, Hocquart clearly said that “in the matter of Port Lajoie and at the head of his Mi’kmaq, he had shown the intrepidity of a soldier.”\footnote{Hocquart, to, Maurepas, 6 October 1746, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.85, fol.354-361v.}

De La Corne progressively became the main point of contact between the authorities of Québec and the Mi’kmaq of Miramichi. This is shown by the fact that at the beginning of October 1746, the Recollet was at Québec to request supplies and clothes for the Mi’kmaq of his mission for the winter season.\footnote{AC, C11A, vol.85, fol.163v; Collection de manuscrits, III, pp.309-310.} It is also likely that
de Lestage had returned to Québec, because, after 1746, his presence was no longer recorded in Acadia/Nova Scotia. De La Corne's request was easily approved by Beauharnois and Hocquart, who tried to organize, as soon as possible, the Recollet's return to his mission. The ease, with which the request of de La Corne had been approved, demonstrated the necessity of having the Mi’kmaq support. On 23 October 1746 de La Corne left from Québec on a boat full of supplies. According to Beauharnois and Hocquart, who had not already been informed of the Duc d'Anville's death, the Recollet had a well defined task. In fact he had to move the Mi’kmaq of his mission to where the Duc d'Anville would have needed them. Furthermore de La Corne was to follow the Mi’kmaq in quality of chaplain.

De La Corne's return to Miramichi corresponded with the embitterment of the Anglo-French conflict. At mid-December 1746, Mascarene, under the pressures of William Shirley, the Massachusetts governor, decided to launch an offensive against Ramezay's troops in the Minas region. For Ramezay, stationed at Beaubassin, this presented an opportunity. However the need to have Mi’kmaq support was essential. On 8 January 1747, he wrote to de La Corne, and invited him to engage as many natives as he could in order to join the French against the British. However Ramezay had no reply from the Recollet, and after mid-January 1747 decided to leave for Minas, where, during the night of 11 February, he successfully attacked the British expedition sent by Mascarene. It is likely that de La Corne had

978 From 1750 until 1757 de Lestage operated within the Québec's area. In 1757 he was the chaplain of the Hôpital-Général de Québec, where he died 18 September of the same year. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.268-269.
982 Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", in *L'Acadie des Maritimes*, p.35.
received Ramezay’s letter later than expected, because at the beginning of February 1747 he was at Beaubassin. At the moment of de la Corne’s arrival, Beaubassin was already served by his confrère Bernardin de Gannes de Falaise, the first Recollet of Acadian origins, who had been active there since mid-December 1746 due to the lack of parish priest.

Although he had not probably taken part to Ramezay’s raid, de la Corne, like Maillard, underwent the consequences of operating in a war zone. At the end of June 1747, he was almost captured by two British ships while he was on a boat eight miles from the Gaspé shore. The missionary was able to escape and again returned to Québec. However, compared to 1746, Beauharnois and Hocquart had to support the Recollet, and also the 200 Mi’kmaq of his mission, who, at the beginning of August, arrived at Québec. The preparations lasted little time, so that on 1 September 1747 the Mi’kmaq group could leave Québec, provided with supplies and ammunitions, but especially with the implicit exhortation to continue their raids against the British. De la Corne left Québec towards the end of the same month. Throughout 1747, Germain kept on sending reports to Québec on the transfers and arrivals of the British troops within the Beaubassin-Minas region.

Compared to the events of the previous year, only Maillard was directly involved

984 PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register of Beaubassin, fol.17.
985 Bernardin, baptized Louis-Joseph, de Gannes de Falaise was born on 29 March 1704 at Annapolis Royal. He joined the Recollets in 1724, and was ordained on 24 September 1729. From 1740 until 1743 he was the superior of the Québec convent. From 1749 until 1752, and from 1765 until 1775 he held the same office in the convent of Montréal, where he died on 20 December 1775. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.206-210, 880-881; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.196.
986 Sketchy presence of this missionary would have been recorded at Beaubassin until the end of May 1747. See PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register of Beaubassin, fol.16, 21-22.
987 Collection de manuscrits, III, p.348.
991 Maillard had returned to Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1746. See DCB, III, p.417; Johnston, History of I, p.68.
in the Minas' raid\textsuperscript{992}. Le Loutre did not take part to it, because, during May 1747, he had embarked on a vessel bound for France\textsuperscript{993}.

On 19 October 1748 the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle closed the War of the Austrian Succession and ended the Anglo-French conflict in Acadia/Nova Scotia for the time being\textsuperscript{994}. Despite the hard protests coming from New England\textsuperscript{995}, the Treaty sanctioned the restitution of Louisbourg to the French. However Anglo-Mi'kmaq conflict continued until 1760. As the historian Stephen Patterson has pointed out, the British had reason to believe and suspect, that, despite the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, the French wanted to continue the war in Acadia/Nova Scotia through their native allies and the missionaries\textsuperscript{996}.

In the summer of 1749 the French could retake possession of Louisbourg as well as the settlements of Île Royale\textsuperscript{997}. Despite this, in that year the situation was again in flux, in ways that would alter the entire missionary pattern of Acadia/Nova Scotia.

The last years before the Acadian Deportation (1749-1753)

The restitution of Louisbourg seemed to reestablish the \textit{status quo ante} that existed before the outbreak of the war\textsuperscript{998}. However the situation had deeply changed within Acadia/Nova Scotia during the Anglo-French conflict. Among the majority of New Englanders there was a widespread fear of the French presence, whose fishery


\textsuperscript{993} Koren, \textit{Knaves or Knights}, pp.40-41.

\textsuperscript{994} Codignola, \textit{Storia del Canada}, p.217.

\textsuperscript{995} Plank, \textit{An Unsettled Conquest}, p.117.

\textsuperscript{996} Stephen E. Patterson, “1744-1763. Colonial Wars and Aboriginal Peoples”, in \textit{Atlantic Region to}, pp.129-130.

\textsuperscript{997} Johnston, \textit{Life and Religion}, p.55.

\textsuperscript{998} Daigle, “L’Acadie de 1604 à 1763”, in \textit{L’Acadie des Maritimes}, p.36.
in the North Atlantic area had progressively increased. This led the Board of Trade to take measures that included, in 1749, the appointment of Edward Cornwallis as the new governor of Nova Scotia. Cornwallis had a specific task to accomplish. He was to establish a Protestant settlement in the harbour of Chebucto. The project began to take shape towards the end of June 1749, when Cornwallis arrived there with more than 2500 settlers and started to build the new fortified settlement of Halifax. According to the British plans, Halifax would counterbalance the French at Louisbourg. More generally, it was designated to become the political and commercial centre through which all Acadia/Nova Scotia would be put under the complete control of the British. This was evident when, after his arrival, Cornwallis moved the capital from Annapolis Royal to Halifax.

The founding of Halifax and Cornwallis’ project to promote and support the introduction of Protestant settlers throughout all Acadia/Nova Scotia clashed, one more time, with the fact that the Anglo-Mi’kmaq relationships remained tense. During the summer of 1749 Cornwallis only succeeded in finding an agreement with a Mi’kmaq band from Chignectou as well as with some Maliseet leaders. Yet the Mi’kmaq of Île Royale refused to negotiate. On 22 September 1749 they wrote to Cornwallis to declare that he had settled on a Mi’kmaq land, and that they refused to make peace with him as long as he remained there.

As had usually happened in the earlier periods, the missionaries’ activity came to be used by the French authorities in attempts to activate the Aboriginal
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999 Rawlyk, Nova Scotia’s Massachusetts, p.193.
1000 Edward Cornwallis was born on 22 February 1712/1713 in London. He died on 14 January 1776 at Gibraltar. See DCB, IV, p.168.
1002 Patterson, “1744-1763. Colonial Wars and Aboriginal Peoples”, in Atlantic Region to, p.129.
1003 Collection de documents inédits, I, pp.17-19.
people. However another problem troubled the New France authorities as well as the missionaries, and concerned the oath of allegiance. Cornwallis was determined to make the Acadians definitively submit to it. Moreover he encouraged their conversion to Protestantism in order to assure a greater loyalty to the British. The French had to face this danger, and, as happened during the War of Austrian Succession, they involved Le Loutre, Maillard, and Germain in their strategy. Although it is likely that Germain never operated, in any direct way, with Le Loutre, the Jesuit agreed on the necessity to preserve the French settlements in Acadia/Nova Scotia from British expansionism. Both of them were by then essential to the French policy regarding the Aboriginal people of Acadia/Nova Scotia. On 9 October 1749 Jacques-Pierre de Taffanel de La Jonquière, the governor of New France for the years 1749-52, wrote to Maurepas. According to him, Le Loutre and Germain had to collaborate with Charles Deschamps de Boishébert et de Raffetot, and Louis de La Corne, two French officers sent in Acadia/Nova Scotia to lead the natives in raids against the British. La Jonquière also added that the missionaries were expected to enlist the Mi'kmaq help to persuade the Acadians to take refuge at Chipoudy, Petitcodiac, and Memramcook.

This latter task of La Loutre and Germain was a reflection of the Anglo-French dispute over the limits of Acadia/Nova Scotia that had never been resolved.
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1006 Jacques-Pierre de Taffanel de La Jonquière was born on 18 April 1685. He died on 17 March 1752 in Québec. See *DCB*, III, p.609.
1007 Le Loutre had returned to Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1749. See *DCB*, IV, p.454.
1008 Charles Deschamps de Boishébert et de Raffetot was born on 7 February 1727 in Québec. He died on 9 January 1797 at Raffetot, in France. See Ibidem, pp.212-215.
1009 Louis de La Corne was born on 6 June 1703 at Fort Frontenac. He was the bother of the Recollet missionary. He died on 15 November 1761. See Ibidem, III, p.331-332.
1010 Today's town of Shepody, in the province of New Brunswick.
1011 Close to the today's town of Hillsbourough, in the province of New Brunswick.
The French mainly wanted to prevent the British from settling west of the isthmus of Chignecto. The missionaries’ influence over the Acadians aimed to make them establish within that area in order to recreate a new Acadia and counterbalance the founding of Halifax. A consequence of this territorial redrawing was that Le Loutre had to move the Shubenacadie mission, and, according to specific orders of Maurepas, settle a new one at Pointe-à-Beauséjour. However this removal raised the fear of the possible British actions against him.1013

Meanwhile, Germain never moved his mission. According to an anonymous description, dated 1748, the Jesuit was mentioned as the missionary of the St. John River, where lived 15 to 20 French families with some Maliseet. Besides giving information on Germain, this document also presented an overall description of the parishes established in Acadia/Nova Scotia. The first of them was that of Annapolis Royal, where lived 2000 inhabitants, served by Desenclaves. The second and the third parishes were those of Rivière-aux-Canards1014, and Minas, with respective populations of 600 and 1000 inhabitants. They were respectively served by Jean-Pierre Miniac1015 and La Goudalie. At Pigiquid1016, where two churches had been built, operated Chauvreulx within a community of 800 people. Jacques Girard1017 was at Cobequid which, with Tatamagouche, formed the fifth parish. The last parish was that of Beaubassin, with 2500 inhabitants, which, since 1744, had no more had a permanent priest. Of the five priests cited, only Chauvreulx and Girard were intended to remain, because, due to health problems, Miniac, La Goudalie, and Desenclaves

1014 Close to today’s town of Canard, in Nova Scotia.
1015 Jean-Pierre Miniac was born at Rennes in 1697. He joined the Sulpician order on 23 December 1717, and was ordained in 1721. See DCB, IV, p.538; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.214.
1016 Today’s town of Pigiquid in Nova Scotia.
1017 Jacques Girard was born in 1712 in the province of Auvergne. He was forced to leave Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1758, thus arriving in France in 1759. He died at Jouarre, in the department of Seine-et-Marne, in the month of January 1782. See DCB, IV, p.295.
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had asked to return to France. The parish of Annapolis Royal was the one that drew the greatest attention. In fact, according to the document, the vacancy place left by the expected departure of Desenclaves was to be filled by a prudent and skilled priest able to deal with the French interests among the British. However this was not to occur, as Desenclaves remained at Annapolis Royal until the spring of 1754. Miniac was the only priest to have his request fulfilled, and was allowed to leave Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1749.\(^{1018}\)

This document highlights the well-established parish structure of Acadia/Nova Scotia, where the approximate ratio between priests and population was, after Miniac’s departure, one to 2200. Also, Le Loutre was cited as the sole missionary among all the Mi’kmaq of Acadia/Nova Scotia\(^ {1019}\), thus emphasizing the distinction that existed between the parish priests and the missionaries\(^ {1020}\). In 1749 this distinction was made more evident by the scarce numerical presence of missionaries among the Aboriginal people of Acadia/Nova Scotia. In fact, except for Le Loutre and Maillard, who operated, primarily within the Île Royale-Chignecto area, in 1749 the Jesuits’ presence in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia was limited.

According to a fuller report of 1749 on the Jesuit missions of New France, Germain, Lauverjat\(^ {1021}\), and Guillaume-Ignace Cohade\(^ {1022}\), whose presence had first been recorded at mid-February 1747 at Beaubassin\(^ {1023}\), were still active there. Meanwhile the entire Abenaki mission relied on few missionaries, as shown by the
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\(^{1018}\) Miniac died on 8 May 1771 at Nantes. See Ibidem, pp.538-539; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.214.


\(^{1020}\) Wicken, “Encounter with Tall Sails”, p.343.

\(^{1021}\) Lauverjat left Acadia/Nova Scotia in 1754 for returning to Québec, where he died on 16 November 1761. According to Pelletier he died there on 16 November 1760. See DCB, III, pp.359-360; Dragon, L'Acadie et ses, p.230; JR, LXXI, p.163; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.185.

\(^{1022}\) Guillaume-Ignace Cohade was born at Riom, in the department of Puy-de-Dôme, on 27 April 1713. He joined the Jesuits on 30 September 1729. He died in the mission of Saint-André on 4 June 1756. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.176.

\(^{1023}\) PANS, RG1, vol.26, parish register of Beaubassin, fol.18-19.
fact that at the Becancour and Saint-François missions operated Aubery, and Pierre-Simon Gounon\textsuperscript{1024}. This numerical deficiency was common to all the Jesuit missions of New France. In fact, of the total of the 51 members present in New France in 1749, only 23 of them were engaged as missionaries and scattered on an area that went from Acadia/Nova Scotia to the Great Lakes, including the Louisiana mission\textsuperscript{1025}. The scanty numbers were mainly due to the lack of funds that affected the Jesuits, which had also caused, in 1738, the closing of their college for native students at Québec\textsuperscript{1026}.

During the years 1749-51 the Anglo-French tension heightened. In fact, throughout this period, the British were more than ever determined to consolidate their presence in all Acadia/Nova Scotia, and therefore established forts at Beaubassin, Minas, and Pigiquid. From their part, the French answered with the foundation of Beauséjour\textsuperscript{1027}, and Gaspareau forts\textsuperscript{1028}. From the spring until the fall of 1750, the area around the Chignecto isthmus confirmed Le Loutre and de La Corne's prominent position within the French resistance to the British expansionism. In fact, during the spring of that year, the British tried to occupy the isthmus through a military expedition led by Charles Lawrence\textsuperscript{1029}. At the beginning of May the British officer arrived on the western bank of the Missaguash River, where he found the settlement of Beaubassin that had been burned by a Mi'kmaq band led by Le Loutre. De La Corne and the Mi'kmaq of his mission were not excluded from the

\textsuperscript{1024} Pierre-Simon Gounon was born at Toulouse on 20 April 1719. On 3 December he joined the Jesuits, being ordained in 1748, and year of his arrival in New France. He died on 3 May 1764 at Cap-de-la-Madeleine. See Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.183.

\textsuperscript{1025} JR, LXIX, pp.74-79; The Louisiana missions was officially established in 1722. See Kennedy, Jesuit and Savage, p.50; on the history of this mission see Jean Delanglez, The French Jesuits in Lower Louisiana (1700-1763), 2nd edition, (New York: AMS Press, 1974).

\textsuperscript{1026} Kennedy, Jesuit and Savage, p.52.

\textsuperscript{1027} Near today's town of Sackville, in New Brunswick.

\textsuperscript{1028} Approximately located to today's city of Port-Elgin, in Nova Scotia. See Daigle, "L'Acadie de 1604 à 1763", pp.36-37; Griffiths, The Acadians, p.43.

\textsuperscript{1029} Charles Lawrence was born in 1709 in England. He died in Halifax on 19 October 1760. See DCB, III, p.361; Mahaffie, A Land of Discord, p.233.
events. In fact on 1 May 1750 the Recollet with 50 Mi’kmaq was sent by Louis de La Corne to Beaubassin to be ready to face the British

The arrival of the Mi’kmaq warriors made Lawrence decide to withdraw from Beaubassin, and retreat to Minas, where, for all the summer of 1750, he kept on receiving reinforcement. Thanks to them, in the month of September, he could sail back to Chignecto, and landed on the eastern bank of the Missaguash River. Compared to the spring, Lawrence faced and defeated a mixed force of natives and French. This time, behind the natives’ attack, there was the hand of Germain. In fact according to the journal compiled by the French officer Louis Leneuf de la Vallière (fl.1713-1782), an account of the main events that occurred in Acadia/Nova Scotia from mid-September 1750 until the end of July 1751, the Jesuit was among the force that tried to prevent the landing of the British.

Due to the French attack’s lack of success, the British succeeded in establishing a fortified establishment, named Fort-Lawrence. Besides being a contested area, the Chignecto isthmus was where the British suspicions of the missionaries’ influence were apparently corroborated. The killing of Edward Howe, a British officer and a trader from Annapolis Royal, in the fall of 1750 was the event that they believed to be proof of it. Till now it is still uncertain if Howe was killed by a Mi’kmaq warrior named Étienne Bâtard, or Jean-Baptiste Cope, the chief of a Mi’kmaq band of Shubenacadie. What is sure is that this action was
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1030 Collection de Manuscrits, III, pp.499-500; Mahaffie, A Land of Discord, p.233.
1031 Ibidem, p.234.
1032 Journal de qui s’est passé à Chignectou et autres parties des frontières de l’Acadie depuis le 15 septembre 1750 jusqu’au 28 juillet 1751, 1751, AC, C11A, vol.87, fol.376-386v.
1033 Edward Howe was probably born in New England in 1702. See DCB, III, p.297.
1034 Étienne Bâtard probably died in Nova Scotia between 1754 and 1760. See Ibidem, p.34.
1035 Jean-Baptiste Cope was probably baptized in 1710 by Gaulin. He probably died between 1758 and 1760 at Miramichi. See DCB, III, pp.136-137; Plank, “The Two Majors Cope: The Boundaries of Nationality in Mid-18th Century Nova Scotia”, Acadiensis, XXV, nr.2 (Spring 1996), pp.18-40.
1036 According to la Vallière’s account, Bâtard belonged to de La Corne’s mission. Instead, according to an anonymous document published in the Rapport de l’Archiviste de la Province de Québec, Le
considered by Cornwallis as “an instance of treachery and barbarity not to be paralleled in history”\textsuperscript{1037}. According to Dumont-Johnson, Howe’s killing can be interpreted as the result of the missionaries’ activity, especially that of Le Loutre and Maillard, that had contributed to heighten, through the use of religion, the anti-British feeling of the Mi’kmaq\textsuperscript{1038}.

In 1751 the British had strengthened their presence on mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. However the western limits of this territory recorded a progressive increase of French forces. Due to this, the isthmus of Chignecto became a sort of unofficial border between Acadia/Nova Scotia and New France\textsuperscript{1039}. It is no wonder that the French strategy of reinforcement along this border included the collaboration and the support of the missionaries. A proof of it can be found in the letter, dated 1 May 1751, that La Jonquière addressed to Antoine-Louis Rouillé, the new minister of Marine. In it, the New France’s governor reported that almost 100 natives coming from the missions of de La Corne, Germain, and Le Loutre had been sent, as reinforcements, to the troops led by Pierre-Roch de Saint-Ours Deschaillons, the successor of Louis de La Corne\textsuperscript{1040}.

In this period the mission of Miramichi also seemed to attract those Acadians, who had decided to leave the Beaubassin area to seek a safer place under French control\textsuperscript{1041}. According to the bishop of Québec, in the fall of 1751, a good number of
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\textsuperscript{1037}See Jow W. gw ; s’esf parse à C/»g»ecfou, AC, CllA vol.87, fol.376-386v; vol.1924-1925, p.103; Akins, Acadia and Nova Scotia, pp.195-196; RAPQ, vol.1924-1925, p.103; Akins, Acadia and Nova Scotia, pp.194-195.

\textsuperscript{1038}Dumont-Johnson, Apôtres ou agitateurs, pp.124-126.


\textsuperscript{1040}La Jonquière, to, Antoine-Louis Rouillé, minister of Marine, 1 May 1751, Québec, AC, C11A, vol.97, fol.15.

\textsuperscript{1041}Daigle, “L’Acadie de 1604 à 1763”, p.37.
Acadians had taken refugee at the Miramichi mission, where they could enjoy the religious services in the Recollets’ church. During that year the Recollets also returned within the northern part of Gaspé. More precisely they established a new mission at Pabos, where, since the end of April 1751, was recorded the presence of Simple Bocquet, that would have remained there until late summer of 1753.

With regard to the Brittany Recollets, in the summer of 1749 they returned to Louisbourg. The group that had come back was composed of six Recollets, among which there was Guégot, who, in 1748, had again been appointed as Île Royale-Louisbourg’s superior. In the course of the same year, the Recollets also re-established at Isle-Saint-Jean. Patrice Lagrée was sent to Port-Lajoie, where he remained until the end of September 1752. The second period of the Recollets’ activity at Île-Royale and Île-Saint-Jean was not exempt from problems. This became evident in the first part of the 1750s, when most of the problems that had affected their first period of activity resurfaced.

In fact, during that period, the way in which the Recollets lived and operated at Louisbourg raised harsh criticisms. Isle-Dieu appeared to be their most obstinate opponent. On 4 April 1750, he wrote to Pontbriand to report that he knew nothing about the Recollets’ number or the places where they exactly operated at Île Royale. With regards to the Recollets’ behaviour, Isle-Dieu clearly declared that he
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1043 Simple, baptized Pierre, Bocquet was born in Paris on 12 July 1703, and joined the Recollets in 1722. On 13 March 1728 he was ordained, and in 1748 arrived in Canada. He died in Montréal on 24 March 1787. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.LXX; Pelletier, Le clergé en Nouvelle-France, p.194.
1045 AC, G1, vol.466, pièce 76, Dénombrement Général de familles, 1749; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.479; Lemay, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne", pp.90-91.
1046 Lagrée probably died before 1780. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.540-541.
1048 Johnston, Life and Religion, p.56.
had little hopes that they would have improved. Isle-Dieu’s criticisms were to continue in the late spring of 1751, when he sent two reports about the Recollets to France, respectively addressed to Pontbriand and Rouillé. In the report to Pontbriand, Isle-Dieu described Guégot as a friar with “no talent, no speaking ability and perhaps also little goodwill”, defects that could be extended all the Brittany Recollets. What Isle-Dieu wanted to underline, besides the fact that the Recollets’ number had remained unchanged since 1749, was that they did not care for their parish duties, and neglected the instruction to the children and the assistance to the sick people. According to his opinion, all the entire Recollet mission of Île Royale should be reformed.

The report that Isle-Dieu forwarded, on behalf of Pontbriand, to Rouillé, was almost of the same content, but added new details as well as a specific proposal. According to it, the Recollets were too few, and at least twelve were needed to fulfill the Île Royale’s religious needs. The poor quality of the priests on the island had affected relationships with the French settlers, who no longer trusted them. According to Isle-Dieu, the Recollets were also not suited to operate among the Mi’kmaq, because they could not understand the native language. The entire situation was worsened by the fact that they refused to acknowledge Maillard’s authority as the bishop’s vicar general, and did not send annual reports on the state of their parishes and missions, thus ignoring a specific request of Pontbriand. All this was enough, for Isle-Dieu, to justify replacing the Brittany Recollets with some secular priests. According to him, the Recollets should only remain as military chaplains in the settlements where there were some French garrisons.
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1050 Ibidem, pp.313-315.
1051 Ibidem, pp.310-313.
Isle-Dieu’s proposal to replace the Brittany Recollets was not new and persisted until 1758, when Louisbourg was finally conquered by the British. It is likely that most of his complaints were determined by the poor conditions of the Recollets’ buildings at Louisbourg. Even though he may have biased, Maillard provided confirmation in October 1751, declaring that the Recollet mission was in bad condition. Maillard’s comment appears to be confirmed by that expressed by the Recollet Chérubin Ropert that, in the month of June 1758, arrived at Louisbourg. According to him, Louisbourg seemed “a place of exile”, and the Recollets’ lodgement was completely dilapidated.

Throughout the fall of 1751 and the spring of 1752, the matter of the Brittany Recollets continued to be discussed in France. Rouillé, on the ground of Isle-Dieu’s reports, contacted the Brittany provincial to acquaint him about the situation of Louisbourg. More specifically Rouillé asked the Brittany provincial to increase the number of the Recollets at Louisbourg, as well as to improve their quality. On 28 March 1752 Isle-Dieu wrote to Rouillé. Compared to the letters he had written in the spring of 1751, this latter was more explicit. In fact he declared that Guégot had to be withdrawn from Louisbourg for his bad conduct, while, within that year, the Brittany Recollets must not fail to send six good new priests there. For Isle-Dieu, the letter was also an opportunity to put forward his proposal to use the Recollets as military chaplains. With regards to this, he reported that two Recollets were needed to serve as many companies on the St. John River.
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1053 Letter of Maillard with some comments, 5 October 1751, Louisbourg, PANS, RG1, vol.4, doc nr.48.
1054 On this missionary there is no information about his birth, ordination’s date, and death. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.832-833.
1056 Rouillé, to, Jacques Abgrall, Brittany provincial, 6 November 1751, AC, Série B, vol.94, fol.179.
At the moment of his letter, Isle-Dieu was not aware that, on 1 February 1752, Guégot had died at Louisbourg. Isle-Dieu's desire to withdraw the Recollet from Louisbourg had no more reason to come true. From mid-February until mid-March 1752 Rouillé and the Le Goff, the then Brittany provincial, agreed to appoint Candide Fournier as the new Louisbourg/Île-Royale superior. Despite Guégot's death, Isle-Dieu did not cease to support the project to introduce some secular priests at Louisbourg. On 26 April 1752 he sent to Pontbriand a letter, in which he declared that the Recollets' quality at Louisbourg was disapproved by Jean-Louis de Raymond, the Île-Royale's governor. We need to underline that in the month of January 1752, Raymond had already complained about the Brittany Recollets, whose "ignorance was too pronounced", thus asking for their replacement from all the parishes of Île-Royale. Neither did the arrival of Fournier, who first went to Québec to meet with Pontbriand seem to calm Isle-Dieu's hostility towards the Recollets. In fact on 24 July 1752 he again reported to Rouillé that Fournier had not yet arrived at Louisbourg. Isle-Dieu wanted to make Rouillé aware that this Recollet was no better than Guégot; in fact Maurepas had obliged the Recollet to leave the colony for his bad behaviour. The lack of further documentation makes
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1058 AC, G1, vol.408, 1er register, 2 February 1752; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.480.
1059 Le Goff had already been Brittany provincial from 1742 until 1745. His second mandate lasted from 1751 until 1754. After 1754 we have no more information on him. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.596.
1060 Of this Recollet we know that, from 1736 until 1738, he served in quality of chaplain at the hôpital du roi at Louisbourg. From late 1738 until the beginning of June 1739 he was the parish priest of La Baleine and Lorembec. See AC, G1, vol.410, 1er register, fol.29; Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, pp.439-440; Lemay, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne", p.90; Johnston, Life and Religion, p.57.
1061 Rouillé, to Le Goff, 13 February 1752, AC, Série B, vol.96, fol.43; Rouillé, to Le Goff, 10 April 1752, AC, Série B, vol.96, fol.73.
1062 Jean-Louis-Raymond was born in 1702. He was appointed as Île-Royale's governor in 1751. He died on 12 October 1771 in the parish of Angoulême, France. See DCB, IV, p.655.
it difficult to prove Isle-Dieu's statement, so that we do not know if Fournier had
really been forced to leave Île-Royale.\footnote{Johnston, \textit{Life and Religion}, p.135.}

The rest of 1752 recorded no more efforts by Isle-Dieu to replace the Brittany
Recollets with the secular priests. On 16 August 1752 Pontbriand appointed Fournier
as his vicar general on Île-Royale/Île Saint-Jean. The bishop also confirmed to him
the title of Recollet's superior and parish priest of Louisbourg\footnote{Pontbriand to Candide Fournier, OFM Rec, 16 August 1752, Québec, AAQ, 12A, Registre des
insinuations ecclésiastiques, vol.C, fol.215r-216r.}, so that at the
beginning of September Fournier could begin to exercise his ecclesiastical
powers\footnote{His signature is first recorded on 6 September 1752. See AC, G1, vol.408, 2\textsuperscript{nd} register, fol.41v.}.

The Brittany Recollets were not the only concern of Isle-Dieu during that
period. In fact, throughout the years 1752-1754, Pontbriand's vicar general became a
point of contact between the missionaries operating in Acadia/Nova Scotia and the
French court. Of all the missionaries operating there, Germain and Le Loutre seemed
to meet most with his approval. In Isle-Dieu's opinion, Germain was "an example of
zeal and disinterest". With regards to Le Loutre, Isle-Dieu was supportive of his
activity, and, consequently, sent him four priests\footnote{One of them was Henri Daudin, a Spiritan priest, who was born in 1709 in the diocese of Blois. At
the beginning of August 1755 he was captured. During the same year he was deported from Halifax to
England, where he obtained permission to return to France. He died in Paris in August 1756. See
\textit{DCS}, III, pp.165-166.} of the Seminary of the Foreign
Missions. This reinforcement was especially needed to fulfill Le Loutre's work,
whose only assistant was Jean Manach, a Seminary Foreign Mission's priest that had
arrived in 1750\footnoteref{Jean Manach was probably born in France in 1727, and was ordained in Paris in 1750. He
remained in Acadia/Nova Scotia till 1761, when the British authorities arrested him. During the
summer of that year Manach was freed, so that he could return to France. In June of 1765 he was
appointed prefect of the islands of Saint-Pierre and Miquelon. He died on 22 January 1766 by sea,
during a voyage from Martinique to France. See \textit{DCB}, III, pp.424-426.}. The other missionaries such as La Goudalie\footnote{There is no information about when La Goudalie decided to return to France. He died there in
1761. See \textit{DCB}, III, p.343;},
and Desenclaves\textsuperscript{1072} had less importance to Isle-Dieu's view, and especially these two latter that were described as "two good missionaries but not bright enough"\textsuperscript{1074}. It is no surprising that Isle-Dieu's statement on these two priests was influenced by the fact that both of them had maintained good relationships with the British officers even after the arrival of Cornwallis, thus attracting the blame of the French authorities\textsuperscript{1075}.

In 1752 the authority and the prestige acquired by Germain had become so high among the main ecclesiastical authorities, that they put forward his candidature to be superior of the New France's Jesuit missions\textsuperscript{1076}. However Isle-Dieu, aware of Germain's importance within the French strategy in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia, convinced Charles-Michel Mésaiger\textsuperscript{1077}, the Jesuits' procurator in Paris, to keep the missionary at his place\textsuperscript{1078}. The choice to leave Germain in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia proved justified. In fact, throughout the year 1753-1754, Isle-Dieu and Ange Duquesnes de Menneville, New France's governor from 1752 until 1755\textsuperscript{1079}, continued to use the information and the reports sent by Germain to keep Rouillé...
updated on the evolving of the events as well as the problems that happened in Acadia/Nova Scotia\textsuperscript{1080}.

Although Germain’s reports were able to create a sort of network between southern Acadia/Nova and Québec-Paris, his way of operating (as well as that of de La Corne), was not immune from criticism by the French officers that were active in Acadia/Nova Scotia. Evidence can be found in correspondence, at the beginning of the summer 1753, between Michel Le Courtois Surlaville, the troop major of Louisbourg\textsuperscript{1081}, and Du Caubet. According to Du Caubet, it was difficult to differentiate the missions of de La Corne, and Germain, in whom he had no trust. In fact Germain had compiled a partial and imprecise census about the natives of his mission, declaring that it was all his memory could offer. According to Du Caubet, this was just a pretext of the Jesuit to not declare the real number of natives at his mission. Germain’s behaviour also raised the criticisms of Le Loutre\textsuperscript{1082}, according to whom, the exact natives’ number could but be revealed to the general governors. With regards to de La Corne, Du Caubet simply declared that he had waited in vain for his mission’s census\textsuperscript{1083}.

The need to have a census of natives from the most important missions was a way to determine the number of men who could be used against the British\textsuperscript{1084}.


\textsuperscript{1081} Michel Le Courtois Surlaville was baptized on 17 July 1714 at Bayeux, in France. He died on 8 January 1796 in Paris. See DCB, IV, pp.443-444.

\textsuperscript{1082} Le Loutre was captured by the British in September 1755, while he was on a ship directed to France. He was released till 1763. On 30 September 1772 he died at Nantes. See DCB, III, p.457.


\textsuperscript{1084} Wicken, “Encounters with Tall Sails”, p.360.
However it is difficult to understand the behaviour of Germain\textsuperscript{1085}, especially if we consider the informative role he had by then assumed during that period. With regards to de Come, it is likely that the reason for his missing census was due to the fact that he had left his missionary post to come back to Québec\textsuperscript{1086}. What appears to be sure is that the French officers ignored the possible support from other missions such as that of Pabos, where, since mid-September 1753, the Recollet Alexis Duburon\textsuperscript{1087} had replaced his confrère Bocquet\textsuperscript{1088}.

**The last conflicts at Île Royale (1752-1755)**

During the period between late 1752 and 1754 the Brittany Recollets were again criticized by Raymond, but especially by Isle-Dieu. The Île-Royale governor, in a letter of 24 November 1752 to Rouillé, again emphasized the inadequate number of the friars in the colony. More specifically Raymond reported that after the death of Fournier, on 8 November of the same year\textsuperscript{1089}, the Recollets were “like bodies without souls”. According to Raymond, there were no possible substitutes to replace Fournier as superior. In fact Caulet\textsuperscript{1090} who acted as military chaplain had no skills for being appointed as superior. The only possible substitute could be Ambroise


\textsuperscript{1086} De La Corne’s presence at Québec was officially recorded since the fall of 1755. From 1756 until 1758 he was superior of the Recollet convent of Québec. In the fall of 1758 he returned to France, where he left the Recollet order to become a secular priest. He died in 1778. See Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.219-221, 880.

\textsuperscript{1087} Caulet died at Louisbourg on 21 June 1754. See AC, G1, vol.408, 2nd register, fol.69v; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.440.

\textsuperscript{1088} PAC, FM16, B2, 1, parish register of Pabos, p.71; Pacifique de Valigny, *Chroniques des plus anciennes églises de l’Acadie*, p.23.

\textsuperscript{1089} AC, G1, vol.408, 2nd register, fol.69v; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.440.

\textsuperscript{1090} On this missionary there is any available information.
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Aubré who, at that moment was the parish priest of Port-Lajoie. However, according to Raymond, this missionary was sick, and had shown little interest in being appointed superior. Again Raymond complained about the shortage of Recollets, and suggested that Le Goff should have, at least, sent eleven more, respectively six at Île-Royale and five at Île-Saint-Jean. Raymond hoped that the new friars would be able to preach and to take care of the instruction. Raymond did not forget to stress the poor quality of the priests operating at Louisbourg, and asked for the recall of two of them, although without mentioning their names.

Raymond's complaints were soon echoed by Isle-Dieu, who declared, in January 1753, to Rouillé that the Recollets should serve only as military chaplains. However they were in charge of all the parishes and the missions, for which, according to his opinion, “they were not enough in number, neither ability nor zeal”. About two months and half later Isle-Dieu reaffirmed his negative view of the Recollets. On the ground of the information probably sent by Maillard, Isle-Dieu wanted to make Pontbriand aware of the bad condition of the Recollets missions. In fact he reported that there were just six Recollets, among whom Lagrée and Paulin Lozach were the ones to recall, that deserved all Île-Royale and Île Saint-Jean. The scanty priests' number did not just affect Louisbourg, but also the other settlements. With regards to it, only Port-Dauphin, Port-Toulouse and La Baleine

Ambroise, baptized Pierre Augustin Olivier, Aubré was born on 27 April 1713 at Saint-Jean de Saint-Méen, in the department of Ille-et-Vilaine. He joined the Recollets on 27 July 1730, and was ordained at Vannes on 31 May 1738. He began to operate at Île Saint-Jean since 1738. See AC, Gl, vol.411, 1st register; Johnston, *Life and Religion*, p.155; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, p.15; Lemay, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne", pp.85-86.

This missionary began to be active at Louisbourg since 1743. Throughout the years 1743-1745, he operated between StEsprit and Louisbourg. From 1749 until 1753 he was respectively active at Louisbourg, La Baleine, and Lorembec. There is no information on his date of birth and death. See AC, Gl, vol.410, 3rd parish register, fol.8; 5th parish register, fol.2; Johnston, *Life and Religion*, p.157; Jouve, *Dictionnaire biographique*, pp.650-651; Lemay, "Table nominale des Récollets de Bretagne", p.95.
could enjoy the services, although negative, of the Recollets. On the contrary the settlements of Niganiche, St. Esprit, L’Indienne\textsuperscript{1095}, Baye des Espagnols, and Labrador, were without spiritual assistance.

According to Isle-Dieu at least three Recollets should serve those areas, respectively one at St. Esprit, one at Niganiche, and one for the entire area of Labrador-Baye des Espagnols. Another one would soon have been required at Mira, where new establishments had been founded. More generally Isle-Dieu was of the opinion that at least twelve Recollets were needed to fulfill all the parishes. Pontbriand’s vicar-general underlined that all the Recollets kept on refusing the authority of Maillard, and had a widespread grudge against the secular priests. Isle-Dieu concluded his report hoping that the Recollets would decide to withdraw from Île-Royale. This would allow the colony to pass under the ecclesiastical authority of the Seminary of the Holy Ghost\textsuperscript{1096}.

Both Raymond and Isle-Dieu’s complaints were worrying to Rouillé, who addressed to Le Goff. Through his letter, Rouillé made the Brittany provincial clear, that if the Recollets had not enough good subjects to send to Île-Royale, they should request to be relieved of duties there\textsuperscript{1097}. Le Goff\textsuperscript{1098} simply replied by appointing, in the summer of 1753, Clément Rosselin\textsuperscript{1099} as new superior. However the problems were not yet over. In fact, Rosselin and his confrères continued to chafe at being under the supervision of Maillard\textsuperscript{1100}, as shows by the letter, dated 5 September

\textsuperscript{1095} L’Indienne, Baye des Espagnols respectively correspond to today’s towns of Lingan, and Sidney in Nova Scotia. Labrador was the old French term used to define today’s inland lake of Bras d’Or. See Angus Johnston, History of Catholic Church, I, pp.53-55, 62, 556.
\textsuperscript{1096} RAPQ, vol.1935-1936, pp.384-386.
\textsuperscript{1097} Rouillé, to Brittany provincial, 29 April 1753, AC, Série B, vol.98, fol.131.
\textsuperscript{1098} We have no information on Le Goff’s death. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.596.
\textsuperscript{1099} Before being appointed as Île-Royale superior, Rosselin had been the superior of the convent of Cuburien from 1742 until 1745. See Jouve, Dictionnaire biographique, p.833.
\textsuperscript{1100} Maillard would remain in Acadia/Nova Scotia till 1762. He died in Halifax on 12 August 1762. See DCB, III, pp.417-418.
In the spring of 1755 the situation seemed to improve. In fact, on 29 March, Isle-Dieu sent a letter to Pontbriand to express his satisfaction that Aubré had been assigned to replace Rosselin. According to Isle-Dieu, Aubré was a good subject, but especially acknowledged Maillard’s jurisdiction. Isle-Dieu’s positive comment of Aubré was due to the friendly relationship he had established with the Recollet, while he was France during the years 1745-48. However Isle-Dieu’s positive comment on Aubré clashed one more time with the evolving of the events. In fact in 1755 the effects of the outbreak of the Seven Years War again involved Acadia/Nova Scotia, where, for the last time, the Anglo-French hostilities commenced at the beginning of June of that year. Again the missionary activity was forced to face the conflict, whose final consequences would have led to the end of an epoch and the beginning of a new one.

Conclusions

Throughout the years 1725-1755 the apostolate of Jesuits and Recollets in Acadia/Nova Scotia underwent radical changes. At the beginning of 1720s, the missionaries were aware that they had to operate within a context where Anglo-French conflict progressively limited their personal initiative. This especially came evident in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia, where, after the killing of Râle, the Jesuits mainly made efforts to keep the Abenaki faithful to the French in order to obstruct British expansion in that area, thus accomplishing to the instructions which arrived from Québec and Paris. The decision of the French authorities to increase material

---

and economic support to the Jesuits was self-seeking. In consequence, the Jesuits operating in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia were used and moved as pieces by the authorities of New France to fulfill French strategies.

A common problem that kept on affecting the Jesuit missionary pattern was the low number of missionaries among the natives. From 1725 till 1755 no more than seven missionaries operated in the missions of southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. It is likely that the risk of being captured or killed by the British hindered the arrival of new missionaries, and, especially, prevented the development of a missionary network between Québec and southern Acadia/Nova Scotia. This did not occur, also because, after Râle’s death, the Abenaki missions began to split into two separate parts. The Jesuits operating within the Bécancour-Sillery missions remained there, and did not succeed in linking their activities with those of their confrères in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia.

Compared to the Jesuits, the first half of the eighteenth century saw the progressive removal of the Recollets from evangelical activity among Aboriginal people. This disinterest towards the natives had already begun to show after the conquest of Annapolis Royal, when the Recollets’ main priority had focused on the need to avoid the Acadians from submitting to the oath. This caused the reaction of the various British governors of Acadia/Nova Scotia, with whom, the Recollets, with a few exceptions, had turbulent relationships. Île-Royale, and especially Louisbourg, contributed to shift the Recollets’ interest to that area from mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. However, as in the 1710s, the internal conflicts and the lack of cooperation between the Saint-Denys and Brittany provinces compromised their activity. The situation improved little after 1731, when the Saint-Denys Recollets left the colony and all the parishes were handed to the Brittany province. After that year, and
considering that the Brittany province could have the complete authority over the missionary jurisdiction of Île-Royale, there was the opportunity to develop an evangelical activity in a territory where the risk of British attacks was remote. However, throughout the entire period of their apostolate at Île-Royale, the Brittany Recollets virtually made no effort to spread the faith among the Mi'kmaq. Their activity concentrated on the needs of the settlers. If some Recollets tried to operate among the Mi'kmaq of Île-Royale, it is likely that, due to the lack of specific accounts, they obtained few or inconsiderable results. The arrival of Maillard as missionary on the island and the absence of Brittany Recollets from Mi'kmaq raids are two further pieces of complementary evidence. Another problem to consider in the analysis of the Brittany Recollets was the poor quality of some friars, and the problematical relationships with the bishops of Québec, and, especially with Isle-Dieu, which risked compromising their parish work.

The War of Austrian Succession was the period that definitively confirmed the political role of the missionaries. It is difficult to establish how many Aboriginal people accepted to share the missionaries' advices and plans. What appears to be clear is that both any Jesuit or Recollet success in gaining Aboriginal support relied more on the ability of single missionaries, such as de La Corne, Germain, Le Loutre, and Maillard, than on the missions themselves.

Râle's death can be seen as the turning point within the missionary history of Acadia/Nova Scotia. After his death, the Jesuits founded no more missions in southern Acadia/Nova, thus stressing the shift from a missionary system to one based on the parishes, where the main duties of the missionaries were directed at the services to the parishioners. Towards the end of the 1730s, this shift was quite evident on Île Royale, and, in mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia. The southern and
northern parts of today's New Brunswick, however, were still based on missions, whose importance was by then more strategic than religious. The yearly support given to the Miramichi and Ristigouche missions, for example, was aimed at using the missionary work as an avenue to increase the Mi'kmaq support to the French resistance against the British.

The years 1710-1755 again recorded the absence of Propaganda from the missionary matters of New France. The Gallicanism of the French court prevented the Roman ministry from intervening in the dispute between the Saint-Denys and Brittany Recollets. Due to the absence of Propaganda, the missionary jurisdiction of all Acadia/Nova Scotia was never carefully planned, so that all the problems related to it came to be discussed between Québec and Paris, with poor results. Gallicanism affected the framework of the entire missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia. Almost all the main decisions were taken by the New France and France authorities who, unlike Propaganda, knew little or nothing about missionary strategies, but tended to place secular interests before spiritual.
Chapter VI

Conclusion

The aim of this thesis has been to analyze the development of missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia throughout a hundred-year period of Anglo-French conflicts. As has been pointed in chapter three, the experience of Chrestien Le Clercq can be considered the chronological divide between the type of missionary activity carried out in the first half of the seventeenth century and that which would develop in the 1690s, and, then, during the first half of the eighteenth century.

After Le Clercq, evangelical activity among the natives ceased to be an important factor. In 1690s the missions, especially those in southern Acadia/Nova Scotia, were no longer places through which, as in the first half of the seventeenth century, the missionaries could establish, and, afterwards, develop relationships with the Aboriginal people. The pressures and the interests coming out of the authorities of New France and France altered the missionary framework. The missions began to be used as headquarters for efforts to regroupe native warriors against the British. Of all the orders which operated in Acadia/Nova Scotia, the Jesuits were the ones who, despite the rising problems, tried to keep up their activity among the Aboriginal people. This also occurred in the rest of New France, and, as outlined by the historian Cornelius Jaenen, masked out the Jesuits as the principal missionaries and diplomats among the natives.²⁰⁴

By contrast, the Recollets, except for Le Clercq’s experience, proved unable to plan and develop their apostolate far from the main Acadian settlements. Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century, the Recollets concentrated on the needs of the Acadian communities and Louisbourg, thus emphasizing the shift from a

missionary activity towards a parish activity, which had elements in common with that in France. As in the first half of the seventeenth century, the missionaries, throughout the period 1654-1755, failed to make the natives become sedentary. Furthermore the disappearance of Propaganda from the missionary matters of North America reinforced the rivalry and the lack of cooperation among the orders, which tried to assert their own missionary jurisdiction. What it is still difficult to prove is the number of natives, who, after the Treaty of Utrecht, accepted the missionaries’ exhortations to fight against the British. From their part, according to the historian John Webster Grant, no missionary could avoid involvement in the Anglo-French conflict. However, only a few missionaries, as Joseph-Charles Germain, Jean-Louis Le Loutre, Pierre Maillard, and Sébastien Râle succeeded in becoming trusted intermediaries in the Aboriginal-French relationships, and participated in the raids against the British. What the documentation seems to bear out is the thesis of Micheline Dumont Johnson, according to whom, the missionaries were but the instruments of the French policy in Acadia/Nova Scotia.

A common element that links the first and the second period of missionary history in Acadia/Nova Scotia was the shortage of accounts written by missionaries and relating to their experiences among the natives. Again Le Clercq’s work is probably the best and well documented primary source of the entire missionary history in Acadia/Nova Scotia. It provides information on the missionaries’ life among the Mi’kmaq which is still difficult to seek out in the remaining documentation. This problem becomes evident in the Jesuit Relations, where, except

\[^{110}^\text{John Webster Grant, Moon of Wintertime. Missionaries and Indians of Canada in Encounter since 1534, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984), p.65.}\]
\[^{110}^\text{Micheline Dumont Johnson, Apôtres ou agitateurs: La France missionnaire en Acadie, (Trois-Rivières: Le Boreal Express, 1970).}\]
\[^{110}^\text{Chrestien Le Clercq, OFM Rec, Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspesie qui contient les moeurs & la religion des sauvages Gaspesiens Porte-Croix, adorateurs du soleil, & d' autres Peuples de l' Amerique Septentrionale, dite le Canada, (Paris: A. Auroy, 1691).}\]
for Râle’s letters, evidence on the missions in Acadia/Nova Scotia was progressively reduced after the 1690s. Another problem to consider is the lack of specific details concerning the methodology of conversion used by the missionaries. The parish registers report the names of the missionaries as well as those of the baptized natives, although no mention is made on how they were converted.

This thesis contains as many biographical references as possible to all the missionaries who operated in Acadia/Nova Scotia. However the apostolate of some of them still remains wrapped in mystery. Especially this is noticeable for most of the Brittany Recollets, on whom, despite the comprehensive work of Odoric Jouve, we have no clue concerning their provenance and their educational background. Even the Capuchins share the same problems of the Recollets, and, till now, we have sketchy information on them. Due to the destruction which occurred during the French Revolution, most of the documentation preserved in the Capuchin and Recollet archives was lost. This makes it difficult to know precisely the departure and the arrival dates of these missionaries. However thorough investigations of the archives départementales of Brest, La Rochelle, Le Havre, and St. Malo, the main French harbours for the ships directed to North America, could lead to the finding of registers, on which there could be inscribed the names of some missionaries, who yearly left for going to New France.

The overall results of missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia came to be affected by four factors: the presence of few natives, the scarce presence of French settlers scattered in far-off settlements, the fear as well as the risk of being killed by the British, and a territory that, compared to the St. Lawrence’s area, had no big
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navigable rivers that could allow the missionaries to establish permanent locations along it.

The subject of missionary activity in Acadia/Nova Scotia has always been relegated to a marginal position vis-à-vis the religious historiography of New France, which has mainly been focused on the St. Lawrence’s region. The few available monographs on the missionary orders operating in Acadia/Nova Scotia are by now outdated. Furthermore they have been written by religious historians as Antonio Dragon, Candide de Nant, and Henry Koren, who were inclined to overestimate the apostolate of the missionaries according to the perspectives of their respective orders.

This thesis is intended to fill this historiographical gap, and to prompt future investigations on the religious history in Acadia/Nova Scotia. Furthermore it wishes to have shown how the missionary process established in Acadia/Nova Scotia, and how the historical context of this territory influenced and conditioned it. Another achievement of this thesis has been to fit missionary history into the context of the new historiography of the Atlantic region, and to prove that it is a fundamental link between colonial and Aboriginal history of Acadia/Nova Scotia.

\footnote{Antonio Dragon, SJ, *L'Acadie et ses 40 Robes Noires*, (Montréal: Les Éditions Bellarmin, 1973).}

\footnote{Candide de Nant, OFM Cap, *Pages glorieuses de l'épopée canadienne. Une mission capucine en Acadie*, (Gembloux: Imprimerie J. Deulot, 1927).}

Appendix 1
List of missionaries active in Acadia/Nova Scotia from 1654 till 1755

Note: besides the available primary sources, this list has been compiled using the four volumes of the Dictionary of Canadian Biography, together with the works of Luca Codignola, A.J.B. Johnston, Henri Koren, Louis Pelletier, Wilfrid Pineau, and Cyprien Tanguay. The box related to the location refers to the places where the missionaries operated in Acadia/Nova Scotia. The status is meant to explain to which order the missionary belonged, and if he was a priest or a lay-brother. The period highlights the length of the missionaries' stay in Acadia/Nova Scotia. For some Capuchins, this goes back to 1639, the beginning year of their second mission in Acadia. Furthermore I tried to give their missions' locations for the years 1652-56, according to the relation of Ignace de Paris. The years' box tries to calculate the effective calendar years of each missionary's stay, thus not accounting their visits to France. The origin and the dates provide, whenever available, the biographical information on the single missionaries. Their birth-places are accompanied by the name of their current French department. Next to Recollets’ names it is specified their ecclesiastical province. An asterisk before the priest’s name means that he is not cited in the chapters.

Table 1
Capuchins, last years in Acadia 1652-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anonymous</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1656-?</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>fl.1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustin de Pontoise</td>
<td>Saint-Pierre (Cape Breton)</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1639-42, 1648, 1652, 1655</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>Pontoise (dept of Val d'Oise), fl.1639-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balthazar de Paris</td>
<td>Nipisiguït/Saint-Pierre</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1648-54/55</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td>Paris (Paris), fl.1648-1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardin de Crépy</td>
<td>Pentagouët</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1648-1654</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Crépy-en-Valois (dept of Oise), fl.1648-54/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côme de Mantes</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap lay-brother</td>
<td>1639-41, 1642-52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mantes-la-Jolie (dept of Yvelines), fl.1639-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didace de Liesse</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap lay-brother</td>
<td>1639, 1648-52</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>Liess-le-Notre-Dame (dept of Aisne), fl.1638-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezéar de Saint-Florentin</td>
<td>Saint-Pierre (Cape Breton)</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1648-55</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>Saint-Florentin (dept of Yonne), fl.1646-7-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Origin, Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Félix de Reims</td>
<td>Saint-Pierre (Cape Breton)</td>
<td>OFM Cap lay-brother</td>
<td>1639, 1652, 1654/5</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>Reims (dept of Marne), before 1639-1658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Félix de Troyes</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1643 ?-52 ?</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>Troyes (? dept of Aube), fl.1643-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François-Marie de Paris</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap lay-brother</td>
<td>1644 ? 1654</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>Paris ?, fl.1644-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel de Joinville</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1642-52</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Joinville ? (dept of Haute-Marne), fl.1640-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignace de Paris</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1641-52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Paris ?, before 1641-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean de Troyes (Desnouse)</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1648-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Troyes (? dept of Aube), fl.1648-54/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal d'Auxerre</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1648-52?</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>Auxerre (dept of Yonne), before 1648-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves de Paris</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Cap priest</td>
<td>1648?-54</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>Paris ?, fl.1648-54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Jesuits in Acadia/Nova Scotia, 1659-1755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aubery Joseph</td>
<td>Médoc tec</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1701-1709</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1673 at Gisors (dept of Eure), 1756 at Saint-François-de-Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigot Jacques</td>
<td>Acadia, New England (Maine), Naurakamig</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1687-91, 98</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>1651 at Bourges (dept of Centre), 1711 in Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigot Vincent</td>
<td>Pentagouët, Naurakamig</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1694-1704 ?</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>1649 at Bourges (dept of Centre), 1720 in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohade Guillaume-Ignace</td>
<td>Beaubassin</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1747- 49</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>1713 at Riom (dept of Puy-de-Dôme), 1756 at Saint-André (mission of Rivière-des-Caps)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielou Jean</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Médoc tec, St. John River</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1731-1740</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1696 at Brest (dept of Finistère), 1745 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Chasse Joseph-Pierre</td>
<td>Naurakamig</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1701?-1719</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1670 at Saint-Pierre-en-Château (dept of Yonne), 1749 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Lyonne Martin</td>
<td>Chedaboucto, Cape-Breton</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1659-1661</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1614 in Paris, 1661 in Chedabouctou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Sirème Jacques</td>
<td>Norridgewock</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1730-1747</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1695 at Bayeux (Normandie), 1747 at Québec or New England (Maine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Origin, Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frémin Jacques</td>
<td>Rigibouctou</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1658-59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1628 at Reims (dept of Marne), 1691 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germain Charles</td>
<td>St.John River, Aukpasque (New Brunswick)</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1740-1762</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1707 in Belgium, 1779 at Saint-François-du-Lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauverjat Etienne</td>
<td>Panaouamské, Médoctec, Norridgewock</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1718-33, 1740-42, 1749-54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1679 at Bourges (dept of Cher), 1670/71 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyard Jean-Baptiste</td>
<td>Médoctec, St.John River</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1709-1731</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1678 at Pau (dept of Pyrénées-Atlantiques), 1731 at Médoctec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffeix Pierre</td>
<td>Percé Island</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1666-67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1635 at Clermont-Ferrand (dept of Puy-de-Dôme), 1724 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Râle Sébastien</td>
<td>Norridgewock</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1694-1705, 1710-24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1657 at Pontarlier (dept of Doubs), 1724 at Norridgewock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard André</td>
<td>Cape-Breton and Chedabouctou, Miscou</td>
<td>SJ priest</td>
<td>1659-1662</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1600 in the diocese of Bourges (dept of Cher), 1681 at Québec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Ricollets in Acadia/Nova Scotia, 1670-1755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Juvenal (BR)</td>
<td>Île Saint-Jean ?, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1735/37, 1745</td>
<td>4 ?</td>
<td>?, 1748 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubre Ambroise (SD)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Louisbourg, Port-Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1739-45, 1749-58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1713 at Saint-Jean de Saint-Méen (dept of Ille-et-Vilaine), ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audren Ignace (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1731-32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?, 1732 at Louisbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocquet Simple (SD)</td>
<td>Pabos</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1751-53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1703 at Paris, 1787 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourdon Urbain (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1737-43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruslé Michel (SD)</td>
<td>Île Saint-Jean, Miramichi, Nipisiguat, Ristigouche</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1705-1721</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1673 ?, 1724 at Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabaret Pierre d'Alcantara (BR)*</td>
<td>La Baleine</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1753-58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caradec Zacharie (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1728-34, 1737-39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caulet Isidore (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg, Minas, Pigiguit, Port-Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1723-27, 1730-45, 1749-54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>?, 1754 at Louisbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Origin, Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevrau Jean-Capistran</td>
<td>Louisbourg, Mira, Niganiche, Port-Toulouse</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1713-33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1698 at Plaisance, 1733 at Niganiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocuelt Vincent</td>
<td>Beaubassin</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1718-22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collin Angélique</td>
<td>La Baleine, Louisbourg, Lorembec, Port-Toulouse</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1736-45, 1751-56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>?, 1772 at Pontivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottin Luc</td>
<td>La Baleine, Lorembec</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1749-57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crey Elisée</td>
<td>Fort Naxouat</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1693-96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1688 at Besançon (dept of Doubs), 1707 in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuvier Charlemagne</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Île Royale</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1720-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1694 ?, 1758 at Corbeil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Gannes de Falaise</td>
<td>Beaubassin</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1746-47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1704 at Annapolis Royal, 1775 at Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Kerrou Pierre</td>
<td>Havre Saint-Pierre, Port-Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1726-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Corne Maurice</td>
<td>Beaubassin, Miramichi</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1742-55</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1714 at Contrecœur (Québec), 1778 in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Marche Dominique</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Port-Dauphin, Port-Toulouse</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1713-16, 1717-18, 1719-20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1677 at Montargis (dept of Loiret), 1738 at Montargis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Place Simon-Gérard</td>
<td>Fort-Naxouat, Médoc, St-Jean River</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1693-95, 1696-99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1658 at Rouen (dept of Seine-Maritime), 1699 in Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Lestage Gélasé</td>
<td>Antigonish, Beaubassin, Île Royale, Île Saint-Jean, Miramichi, Ristigouche</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1719-45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Québec in 1692, Québec in 1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Séguer Joseph-Marie</td>
<td>Île-Royale</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despirac Juan</td>
<td>Île Saint-Jean</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dethune Exupère</td>
<td>Isle Percé</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1673-75, 76-79, 83-84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1644 in France, 1692 at Trie (dept of Eure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dieudonné</td>
<td>Port-Dauphin</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doré Eugène</td>
<td>La Baleine</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1714-16</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duborons Alexis</td>
<td>Port Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulaurens Antoine de Pade</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1752, 55-57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durand Justinien</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1704-20, 1720-25</td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1667 in France, 1746 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flament Ignace</td>
<td>Chignectou, Minas</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1724-28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?, Alexandria (Egypt), in 1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Origin, Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fournier Candide</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Lorembec, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1734-45, 1752</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guégot Athanase</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg, Port Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1732-45, 1749-52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guillou Alexis</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Lorembec, Louisbourg, Port-Toulouse</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1727-45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harel Martial (BR)</strong></td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hendrix (dit Flamand) Luc</strong> (SD)</td>
<td>Baie des Chaleurs, Île Royale, Miramichi, Ristigouche</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1730-35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1692 in France, 1749 at Trois-Rivières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herp Hippolyte</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1733-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jumeau Emmanuel</strong> (SAP)</td>
<td>Miramichi, Percé</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1682 ?,-85, 1689 ?-90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kerriou Calixe</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1744-45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lagreé Patrice</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Île Royale, Louisbourg, Port Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1749-58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Breton Eugène</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Île Royale, Port Dauphin</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1734, 1743-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Breton Jean-Bertrand</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg, St. Esprit</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1733-37, 1741-43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Clercq Christien</strong> (SAP)</td>
<td>Gaspé, Miramichi, Percé, Ristigouche</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1675-80, 1681-86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1641 at Bapaume (dept of Artois), 1700 (probably) in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Dorz Bénin</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1724-27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Duff Michel-Ange</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1721-28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1690 in France, 1771 at Cuburién</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Le Goff Étienne</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Louisbourg, Niganiche, St.Esprit</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1729-41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ledrogoff François</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1723-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lefebvre Hyacinthe</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Port-Dauphin</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1753-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lemoing Gabriel</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg, Port Lajoie, Port-Louis</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1737-44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lepaige Mathieu-François</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>Port-Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1731-37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lozach Paulin</strong> (BR)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Lorembec, Louisbourg, St.Esprit</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1743-45, 1749-53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>? , ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Luc</strong> (SD)</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>OFM Rec lay-brother</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>1680 ?, 1704 in Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martel Paschal</strong> (SD)</td>
<td>Île Royale</td>
<td>OFM Rec lay-brother</td>
<td>1713-16, 1719-33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1688 , 1762 at Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Origin, Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masson</td>
<td>Minas, Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1704-1715</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1671 in France, 1715 at Minas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mezière Chérubin (BR)*</td>
<td>La Baleine, Lorembec, Scatary</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1729-33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moireau Claude (SD)</td>
<td>Beaubassin, Côte Saint-Ange, Jemseg, Minas</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1675-86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1637 at Montargis, 1703 at Nemours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moisson Julien (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1752-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moysan Marcellin (BR)*</td>
<td>La Baleine, Louisbourg, Scatary</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1722-1731</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizan Félix (BR)*</td>
<td>La Baleine, Lorembec, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1734-38, 1744-45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Félix (SD)</td>
<td>Beaubassin, Île Royale, Minas, Port Lajoie</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1701- ?</td>
<td>30 +</td>
<td>1670 in Paris, 1741 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patin Léonard (SD)</td>
<td>Île Saint-Jean</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1725</td>
<td></td>
<td>brief visit during the summer 1688 in France, 1741 at Chaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelletier Didace (SD)</td>
<td>Percé</td>
<td>OFM Rec lay-brother</td>
<td>1683-1690 ?</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1657 at Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré, 1699 at Trois-Rivières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigeon Aubin (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raoul Gratien (BR)</td>
<td>Île-Royale, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1714-15, 1754-58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>René Patrice (SD)</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1703-07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1667 in France, 1742 in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riou Samuel (BR)*</td>
<td>Malpec (Île Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1745</td>
<td>1 ?</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropert Chérubin (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1752-53, 1756-57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosselin Clément (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1753-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sanquer Claude (BR)</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1722-24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauvé Bruno (BR)</td>
<td>La Baleine, Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1716-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servais Martin (BR)*</td>
<td>Île-Royale</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servel René (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg, Port-Toulouse</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1731-34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souben Constantin (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1754-58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varin Narcisse (BR)*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1727-32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>?, 1732 at Louisbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verger (du) Lucien (SD)</td>
<td>Minas</td>
<td>OFM Rec priest</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1692, 1738 at Clamecy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Origin, Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhague Anastase</td>
<td>Port-Dauphin</td>
<td>OFM Rec</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1730 at Port-Dauphin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(BR)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernet Antoine</td>
<td>Ristigouche</td>
<td>OFM Rec</td>
<td>1742-43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Franciscan Cordelier, Pères Pénitents (Third Order Regular of St. Francis), in Acadia/Nova Scotia, 1654-1755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbet-Dudonjon Louis</td>
<td>Île Saint-Jean</td>
<td>Cordelier</td>
<td>1723-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molins Laurent</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>Cordelier</td>
<td>1668-74</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanvaleriano</td>
<td>Chedabouctou</td>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>1684-1686</td>
<td>3+3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massimiliano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Seculars (including priests of the Seminary of the Foreign Missions), Spiritans, and Sulpicians in Acadia/Nova Scotia, 1654-1755

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaudoin Jean</td>
<td>Beaubassin</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>1688-98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1662 at Nantes, 1698 in Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biscaret Jean*</td>
<td>Saint-Pierre-du-Nord (Île Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1753-58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1702 at Mans (dept of Sarthe), 1757 in Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brault Jean-Baptiste</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>1729-32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buisson de Saint-Cosme Jean</td>
<td>Minas</td>
<td>Secular</td>
<td>1692 (or before), 1698</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1667 at Lauson, 1706 on the Mississippi River (Louisiana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne</td>
<td>Île Royale</td>
<td>Secular priest (Irish)</td>
<td>1733-34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mentioned as missionary of the Mi'kmag)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassiet Pierre*</td>
<td>Malpêque, Saint-Louis-du-Nord-Est (Île Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>SME priest</td>
<td>1753-58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1727 at Montaut (dept of Landes), 1809 at Montaut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chauveux Claude Jean-Baptiste</td>
<td>Minas, Pigiquid, Pobomcoup (Pubnico region)</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1735-55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1706 at Orléans, 1760 Orléans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtin Raphael (or Michel)</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Port-Toulouse</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1726-33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1733 at Île-Royale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daudin Henri</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Pigiquid</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1753-55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1709 at Blois, 1756 in Paris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Breslay René-Charles</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Beaubassin, Louisbourg, Malpèque, Port-Lajois</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1720-23, 1724-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1658 at Mans, 1735 in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Medvier Marie Anselme</td>
<td>Île Saint-Jean</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1720-23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1690 in France, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deschambault de Fleury Jacques-Alexis</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1697-98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1672 at Québec, 1698 in Acadia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dosque Bernard-Sylvestre*</td>
<td>Malpèque</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1753-58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>? at Aire (dept of Landes), 1774 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Guay (Le Guet) Sébastien*</td>
<td>Acadia/Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1752?-54</td>
<td>2?</td>
<td>? in France, 1759 in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fornel Joachim</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1726</td>
<td>few months</td>
<td>1697 at Québec, after 1753 in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaulin Antoine</td>
<td>Cape Sable, Mirligueche, La Hève, Minas, Mirligueche, Pentagouët, Shubenacadie</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1698-1732</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1674 at Sainte-Famille, Île d’Orléans (Québec), 1740 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay-Desenclaves-Jean-Baptiste de</td>
<td>Annapolis-Royal, Minas, Pobomcoup</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1739-58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1702 at Limoges (dept of Haute-Vienne), after 1764 in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffroy Louis</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1686-91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1660/61 in Paris, 1707 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girard Jacques</td>
<td>Cobequid, Minas, Pointe-Prime (Île Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>SME priest</td>
<td>1742-58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1712 in Auvergne (France), 1782 at Jouarre (dept of Seine-et-Marne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Goudalie Charles de</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Grand Pré, Île Saint-Jean, St.John River</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1729-40, 1741-54</td>
<td>24 ?</td>
<td>1678 at Rodez, 1761 ? in France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vernède de Saint-Poncy Claude</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1729-1739</td>
<td>10+?</td>
<td>?, ?,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboret (Laurent)?*</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal, Beaubassin, Minas</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1741-46</td>
<td>5 ?</td>
<td>?, after 1757 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Boulanger Pierre-René</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1698/99-?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cap-de-la-Madeleine in 1678, Charlesbourg (Québec) in 1747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Guerne François*</td>
<td>Fort-Beauséjour, Tintemarre (Tantramar)</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1752-57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1725 at Kergrist-Moëllou (dept of Côtes-du-Nord), 1789 at Saint-François-de-Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Loutre Jean-Louis</td>
<td>Île Royale, mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia, Shubenacadie</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1737-46, 1749-52, 1753-55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1709 at Saint-Matthieu (France), 1772 at Nantes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Origin, Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Le Marie François*</td>
<td>Piguqd, Rivière-aux-Canards</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1752-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslaches Jacques</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1670 at Québec, 1746 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch Timothée*</td>
<td>Louisbourg</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maillard Pierre</td>
<td>Halifax, Île Royale, Île Saint-Jean, mainland Acadia/Nova Scotia</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1735-45, 1746-62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1710 at Chartres, 1762 at Halifax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manach Jean</td>
<td>Miramichi, Shubenacadie</td>
<td>CSSp/SME priest</td>
<td>1750-61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1727 (probably) in France, 1766 at sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maudoux Abel</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>SME priest</td>
<td>1692-1702</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>France in 1694, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniac Jean-Pierre</td>
<td>Rivière-aux-Canards</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1742-49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1691 at Rennes (dept of Ille-et-Vilaine), 1771 at Nantes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noinville Noël</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal</td>
<td>OM priest</td>
<td>1729-30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perronnel Jean*</td>
<td>Saint-Louis-du-Nord-Est (Île Saint-Jean)</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1752-55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?, 1758 at La Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petit Louis</td>
<td>Port-Royal</td>
<td>SME priest</td>
<td>1676-93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1629 at Belzane, (diocese of Rouen), 1709 at Québec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ragéot Philippe</td>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1698-?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1678 at Québec, 1711 at Kamouraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Vincent (Abbé de)</td>
<td>Île Royale</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>before 1735</td>
<td>1+?</td>
<td>fl.1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thury Louis-Pierre</td>
<td>Miramichi, southern Acadia</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1685-99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1652 at Notre-Dame de Breuil-en-Auge (dept of Calvados), 1699 at Chebucto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouvé Claude</td>
<td>Beaubassin</td>
<td>PSS priest</td>
<td>1687-90, 1694-1704</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1644 in the diocese of Tours (dept of Indre-et-Loire), 1704 at Chedabouctou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vauquelin Nicolas</td>
<td>Annapolis Royal</td>
<td>Secular priest</td>
<td>1739-41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?, 1758 at La Rochelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizien Philippe-Joseph*</td>
<td>Fort-Beauséjour</td>
<td>CSSp priest</td>
<td>1754-56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?, ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Map of Acadia/Nova Scotia
(from a map of N. Bellin of 1764, preserved at the Public Archives of Canada)
Appendix 4

Map of the Gaspé Peninsula and surrounding areas
(From a map of G. Catalogne of 1723, preserved at the Public Archives of Canada)
Appendix 5

The Recollets Christien Le Clercq and Emmanuel Jumelau evangelize the Mi'kmaq (from Le Clercq, New Relation of Gaspesia)
Appendix 6
Tablets of Mi'kmaq hieroglyphics invented by Christien Le Clercq.
(From Le Clercq, *New Relation of Gaspesia*)
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