

THE LONG WAY FROM ATRECHT COLLEGE TO POPE'S COLLEGE:

The Louvain theology professor John Schinckelius before the Jansenist controversy 1611-1639

When in 1597 the Louvain born John Schinckelius, Artes student at Pedagogy the Porc, had to leave the most honourable place of primus to someone else, he was nevertheless predicted a magnificent academic career.¹ After all, being the second best of a group of hundred students is itself a not inconsiderable honour.² During his theological studies, Schinckelius taught for several years at the pedagogy where he lived as philosophy student and where he would stay during his entire career as student. In 1611, still before his doctor's degree, he received the presidency of Atrecht College in succession of John Wiggers who moved Liège College.³ On 25 September 1612, Schinckelius took his doctor's degree, just before Saint Jerome's Day, the day on which doctors in theology were co-opted to the board of the Faculty, the so-called Strict Faculty, and was clearly considered the rising star at the academic firmament.⁴ However, because of tensions

¹ L. CEYSENS, *Schinckels, Johannes*, in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek* (= NBW), t. 3, Brussels, 1968, col. 771-774 focuses on the anti-Jansenist Schinckelius (1581-1646) of the last six years of his lifetime, after 1640. The Schinckelius before the controversy on Jansenism and anti-Jansenism has not been studied yet so far.

² P.F.X. DE RAM and J.F. VAN DE VELDE, *Catalogus omnium primorum in generali et solempni philosophiae et artium promotione ab origine famosissimae universitatis Lovaniensis ab anno 1426 usque ad annum 1797 inclusive*, Louvain, 1824, p. 43.

³ E. REUSENS, *Documents relatifs à l'histoire de l'Université de Louvain (1425-1797)*, 5 tomes, Louvain, 1881-1903, t. 3, p. 160 (We use the tomes 3-5 in an anastatic reprint by the State Archives, Brussels, 1999). In 1596 Wiggers (1571-1639) was appointed for one of the two chairs of philosophy at Pedagogy the Lily. In 1604 he became president of the episcopal seminary at Liège. Three years later he took his doctor's degree in theology at Louvain. In 1609 he took the presidency of Atrecht College. He had much sympathy for the interpretation of Thomas by the Jesuits, cf. L. CEYSENS, *Wiggers, Johannes*, in NBW, t. 9, Brussels, 1981, col. 829-832. E. LEUS, *Johannes Wiggers Diestensis (1571-1639)*, Diest, 1995.

⁴ The members of the Strict Faculty, the regents, formed the board of the Faculty. They made arrangements for education and drew up the decisions taken by the Faculty. They controlled the finances of the Faculty and, after one year as regent, they acted as provisors of the two colleges of the Faculty, Major and Minor College of Holy Spirit, cf. J. ROEGIERS, *De Leuvense theologen en de Verlichting. Onderwijs, wetenschap, polemieken en politiek van 1730 tot 1797*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, K.U.Louvain, 1979, p. 44. The other doctors of the Faculty who taught one course or another formed the Large Faculty.

between the Faculty of Theology and the Louvain city magistrate no one was appointed for the vacant places of John Clarius and John Malderus.⁵ On 17 September 1614, he was appointed by the city magistrates for an ordinarian academic chair.⁶ One year later the *professor ordinarius* was co-opted in the Strict Faculty. Schinckelius had never held one of the highly paid and therefore very desirable royal academic chairs. For a next promotion he had to wait until he was given the presidency of Pope's College in 1639.

The present article wants to study the entanglements in the academic career of Schinckelius – from Atrecht College to Pope's College where in 1639 he was appointed president. Which role did he play during the difficult negotiations on the Visitation of the University by the government and the Holy See in 1617? In which sense did Schinckelius defend the Roman aspirations when the Venetian bishop of Split, Marcus Antonius de Dominis, attacked the primacy of the pope? How was his relationship with the Jesuits who wanted to take down the educational monopoly of Louvain University? What kind of relation did he have with the great academic and after his death so much abused Dutchman Cornelius Jansenius who, next to Schinckelius, came more

⁵ Clarius (1548-1611), doctor in theology since 29 August 1585, was successively president of Standonck College (1571-1589), Major Holy Spirit College (1590-1605) and Liège College (1605-1611). Of his hand several commentaries on Thomas Aquinas and Holy Scripture are preserved, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 3, p. 26, 417. J. WILS, *Les professeurs de l'ancienne Faculté de théologie de l'Université de Louvain (1432-1797)*, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (= ETL) 4 (1927) 338-358, p. 354. J.J. THONISSEN, *Claeren, Jean*, in *Biographie nationale de Belgique* (= BN), t. 4, Brussels, 1873, col. 121-123. In 1594 Malderus (1561-1633) took his doctor's degree and held the newly founded royal academic chair in scholastic theology until his appointment for bishop of Antwerp in 1611. From 1598 until 1611 he was also president of King's College, cf. J. PAQUOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la Principauté de Liège et de quelques contrées voisines*, Louvain, 1763-1770, t. 7, p. 18-29. C. PIOT, *Malderus, Jean*, in BN, t. 13, Brussels, 1894-1895, col. 223-226.

⁶ Since the fifteenth century, the Faculty had five *professores ordinarii*. They were appointed by the city magistrates of Louvain and since 1545 they only taught during six weeks per academic year. In 1546, Charles V founded two new chairs in theology which would be held by royal professors or *professores regii*: a royal professor of Holy Scripture and one of scholastic theology. In 1567, Philip II introduced a royal chair of catechism. In 1596, on demand of the Faculty, archduke Albrecht founded a second chair in scholastic theology. The royal professors of Holy Scripture and scholastic theology taught daily courses. The royal professor of catechism only taught on the Sun- and Feastdays. On the foundation of the different chairs and the development during the first two centuries, cf. E. VAN EIJL, *De Theologische Faculteit te Leuven in de XVe en de XVIe eeuw. Organisatie en opleiding*, in: ID. (ed.), *Facultas S. Theologiae Lovaniensis 1432-1797. Bijdragen tot haar geschiedenis. Contributions to its history. Contributions à son histoire*, Louvain, 1977, 69-153, p. 90-102.

and more to the fore in the battle against the Jesuits and in the defence of Roman authority, two areas on which Schinckelius had already proved himself a man of great merit? Which circumstances, finally, urged the Strict Faculty on 30 September 1633 not to reconfirm Schinckelius as regent after eighteen years of membership?

The main sources for this study are preserved in the *Universiteitsarchief* of the University and the *Rijksarchief* at Louvain, the *Algemeen Rijksarchief* and the *Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België* at Brussels, the *Archivo Segreto Vaticano*, the *Archivo della Congregazione per la Fede o dell' Sant'Uffizio* and the *Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana* in Rome, and, finally, the *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* in Paris.

The involvement of Schinckelius in the deliberations on the visitation of 1617

The archdukes Albrecht and Isabella, who had governed the Spanish Netherlands since 1598, profited from the relative rest after the peace of Vervins in 1598 with France and the Treaty of London in 1604 with England.⁷ They put all their attention to an economic, political, cultural and religious revival in the Netherlands. A reform of the autonomous corporation, as is the University, fitted very well in the national restoration politics which the archdukes wanted to carry out. However, it is not yet known who launched the idea of a visitation of the entire University of Louvain. The University itself was not the initiator.⁸ It is certain that the initiative for the visitation came from the circle around the archdukes and that only later the cooperation of the nuncio was asked. Probably Inigo Brizuela, confessor of Albrecht, and Jean Richardot, delegate of the archdukes to the Holy See, played an important role in this case.⁹ As the University did not let itself easily

⁷ For an overview of the political history of the Spanish Netherlands, see: H. PIRENNE, *Histoire de Belgique*, 7 tomes, Brussels, 1920-1932. M.A. ECHEVARRIA, *Flandes y la monarquía hispánica. 1500-1713*, Madrid, 1998. W. THOMAS and L. DUERLOO (eds.), *Albert & Isabella 1598-1621. Essays*, s.l., 1998.

⁸ In 1609 the University refused to pay for the stay of the commissioners at Louvain. It said *que, sans leur requisition, ladite visitation avoit esté faite, ains bien par ordre et commission de Son Alteze*. Cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 579-580: Van Craesbeeck to Council of Finances, w.d. [February/April 1609].

⁹ After the death of Albrecht on 13 July 1621, Brizuela (1557-1629) returned to Spain. He was appointed president of the Supreme Court of the Netherlands, cf. Q. VAQUERO, T. MARTINEZ and J. GATELL, *Brizuela, Inigo*, in *Diccionario de historia eclesiástica de España* (= DHEE), t. 1, Madrid, 1972, 285-286. Richardot (1573-1614), son of the then chief president Jean Richardot (1540-1609), studied with the

reform, it quickly became clear that the visitation would take long, in line with the visitation of the University of Paris.¹⁰

The visitation was formed on the initiative and by the insights of the archdukes.¹¹ At the beginning of 1607, the archdukes appointed Johannes Drusius and Stefaan van Craesbeeck to execute the visitation of the University. The first was licentiate in theology, abbot of Park Abbey and as such member of the Estates of Brabant, connected to the Court chapel of the archdukes and their adviser in all ecclesiastical affairs.¹² The second had once been professor in law and was now councillor in the Council of Brabant.¹³ It is quite possible that around that time nuncio Diego Caraffa asked the advice of Louvain's theology

Jesuits in Trier and at the University of Salamanca. As member of the Privy Council, in 1600 he was appointed as the first official delegate of the archdukes to the Holy See. In 1604 he was appointed as bishop of Arras. After five years he moved to the archepiscopal see of Cambray, cf. V. BRANTS, *Richardot, Jean*, in BN, t. 19, Brussels, 1907, col. 280-282. L. GOEMANS, *Het Belgisch gezantschap te Rome onder de regering der Aartshertogen, 1600-1633*, in *Bijdragen tot de Geschiedenis, bijzonderlijk van het aloude Hertogdom Brabant* 6 (1907) 3-14, 70-82, 145-153, 228-239, 257-279, 403-416 en 524-532; 7 (1908) 66-84, 181-193, 206-212, 255-270, 350-358, 459-473, 505-518 en 574-580; 8 (1909) 5-11, 88-100, 237-254 en 361-378.

¹⁰ On 1 February 1595, the French king Henry IV composed a commission to submit the University of Paris to a thorough visitation. Only after three years, on 3 September 1598, the commissioners could present to the king a first report which only in 1600 would be published. The text stressed the national character of the institution and papal authority was not mentioned at all, cf. A. TUILIER, *Histoire de l'université de Paris et de la Sorbonne*, t. 1. *Des origines à Richelieu*, Paris, 1994, p. 435-439.

¹¹ The most important documents concerning the visitation have been published in: E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 568-648. The visitation has been studied by: M. VAN WAEFELGHEM, *La visite de l'université de Louvain par l'abbé du Parc Jean Druys sous le règne des archiducs Albert et Isabelle*, in *Analectes de l'ordre de prémontré* 7 (1911) 53-60, 85-116; 9 (1913) 209-216 en 265-322. H. ELIAS, *Kerk en Staat in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de regeering [sic] der Aartshertogen Albrecht en Isabella (1598-1621)*, Antwerp, 1931, 268-287; F. CLAEYS BOUUAERT, *L'ancienne université de Louvain. Etudes et documents*, Louvain, 1956, 7-11. J. ROEGIER, and P. VANDERMEERSCH, *Les archiducs et l'Université de Louvain*, in: W. THOMAS and L. DUERLOO (eds.), *Albert & Isabella 1598-1621*, Turnhout, 1998, 285-290. J. ROEGIER, *Leuven en Rome: zes eeuwen*, in: ID. and I. VANDEVIVERE (eds.), *Leuven/Louvain-La-Neuve. Kennismaken*, Louvain, 2001, 65-76, p. 69-70. B. BOUTE, *Academics in action. Scholarly interests and Policies in the Early Counter Reformation: the Reform of the University of Louvain 1607-1617*, in *History of Universities*, t. 18/2, 2003, 33-89. 'Visitation', with capital, means the organic rule drawn up in 1617 after the 'visitation', with small letter, that took place between 1607 and 1617.

¹² Drusius (1568-1634) was abbot of Park Abbey from 1601 until his death, cf. N.J. WEYNS, *Drusius, Joannes*, in NBW, t. 3, Brussels, 1968, col. 279-285.

¹³ A. GAILLARD, *Le Conseil de Brabant. Histoire-organisation-procédure*, 3 tomes, Brussels, 1898-1902, t. 3, p. 355.

professor Jacob Jansonius on the coming visitation.¹⁴ At the request of the archdukes, Caraffa invested the commissioners with the necessary authority. Caraffa pretended that the initiative for the visitation came from Rome. He considered the University as immediately subjected to the Holy See, which provided it with many privileges.¹⁵

The *Deputatio* of the University allowed the visitation, but warned the commissioners to respect the privileges of the University.¹⁶ It considered the visitation as a papal visitation of an ecclesiastical institution. The University referred explicitly to *Sessio XXV, cap. 2, de reformatione generali* of the resolutions of the council of Trente. Reacting against the obtrusive interference by the government and in line with the nuncio, the University declared itself directly liable to the Holy See and to the papal right of visitation. The pope would take care that it was visited and reformed by his delegates and in the way he thought this necessary.¹⁷ The *Deputatio*

¹⁴ Cf. Archivio Segreto Vaticano (= ASV), Fondo Borghese (=FB), II, 100, f° 135: Caraffa to Borghese, 2 June 1607, cf. L. VAN MEERBEECK, *Correspondance du nonce Decio Caraffa: archevêque de Damas (1606-1607)*, (*Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, Nonciature de Flandre*, 13), Rome-Brussels, 1979, p. 89. An extract in H. ELIAS, *Kerk en Staat*, p. 271. Caraffa was nuncio in Brussels from June 1606 until the end of June 1607. Jansonius (1547-1625), doctor in 1584, president of Pope's College since 1589 until his death, since 1598 professor Holy Scripture and from 1614 dean of the chapter of Saint Peter in Louvain, cf. F. FRUYTIER, *Jansonius, Jacobus* in *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek* (= NNBW), t. 8, Leiden, 1927, col. 673-679. L. CEYSSSENS, *Autour de Jacques Jansonius, professeur à Louvain (1547-1625)*, in *Augustiniana* 22 (1972) 358-397 (*Jansenistica minora*, 12). ID., *Jacques Jansonius (1547-1625) et l'augustinisme à Louvain*, in: M. LAMBERIGTS and L. KENIS (eds.), *L'augustinisme à l'ancienne Faculté de Théologie de Louvain*, Louvain, 1994, p. 283-298. Boute studied the role of Jansonius during the negotiations as part of the visitation, cf. B. BOUTE, *Academics in action*.

¹⁵ E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 569-571: Commission letter, 7 June 1607.

¹⁶ Cf. Rijksarchief Leuven (= RL), Oude Universiteit Leuven (= OUL), 62, folio 308v-309: *Deputatio*, 2 August 1607. The *Deputatio* was led by the rector and formed the governing body of the University. This council with the delegates (the *deputati*) of the faculties – in general the deans – made the most important decisions or prepared the dossiers which had to be settled by the University Council or *Congregatio*. This council acted under chairmanship of the rector as an autonomous body which included all professors and most of the doctors of the Faculties of Theology, Medicine, Civil and Canon Law, the dean of the Faculty of Arts, the regents of the pedagogies and the presidents of the colleges, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 236-242.

¹⁷ G. ALBERIGO, *Les conciles œcuméniques*, t. 2, *Les décrets de Trente à Vatican II*, Paris, 1994, Concile de Trente (=Concile de Trente), *Sessio XXV, cap. 2, de reformatione generali*, p. 785: 'Sed et si aliqua alia in praedictis universitatibus correctione et reformatione digna fuerint, ab eisdem, ad quos spectat, pro religionis et disciplinae ecclesiasticae augmento emendentur et statuuntur. Quae vero universitates immediate summi Romani pontificis protectioni et visitationi sunt subiectae, has sua beatitudo per eius delegatos, eadem qua supra ratione et prout ei utilius visum fuerit, salubriter visitari et reformari curabit.'

therefore really was displeased when, ten years later, it received the Visitation, signed by Albrecht on 18 April 1617. The document – nothing less than a general reform of the University – was drawn up from the standpoint of the archdukes. Bouste indicated the possible contribution to the text by the Spanish doctor of the archdukes, Andreas Trevisius.¹⁸

On 24 July 1617, rector Wiggers sent a triple delegation to the abbot of Park Abbey: the jurist Cornelius Sylvius and the theologians Jansonius and Schinckelius.¹⁹ Through the abbot they wanted to receive more information from the archdukes concerning some obscurities on the jurisdiction of the rector, on the receptors of the colleges, on the city magistrate of Louvain and on the students.²⁰ Yet, the real stake of the negotiations lay elsewhere and dealt with the definition of the jurisdiction claims by the different parties involved in the visitation. During a crucial phase in the difficult negotiations between the University, the government and the Holy See, Schinckelius appeared to be the right hand of the spokesman of the University, Jansonius. Unfortunately, in the archives of Park Abbey no other sources are found which shed more light on the role of Schinckelius in the entanglements of Church and State around the Visitation of 1617.²¹

Schinckelius in competition with Jansonius on the case of de Dominis

The Holy See had not forgotten the attitude of Schinckelius in the difficult negotiations on the Visitation. Later that year 1617, Marcus Antonio de Dominis, apostate archbishop of Split in Dalmatia, had

¹⁸ B. BOUSTE, *Academics in action*, p. 62-66. In 1588 Trevisius (+ 1633) published at Milano his *De causis, natura, moribus, ac curatione pestilentium febrium vulgo dictarum [...] per brevis tractatio et observatio*. He came to the Netherlands in the court of the archdukes and during his whole career he worked at the court in Brussels. He supported the theological Faculty of Louvain in its struggle against the Jesuits, cf. J. ORCIBAL, *Correspondance de Jansénius*, Louvain-Paris, 1947, p. 413, note 1.

¹⁹ RL, OUL, 64, f° 53v. Sylvius (+1620), doctor in Canon and Civil Law and professor, was conservator of the privileges of the University, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 548.

²⁰ RL, OUL, 64, f° 54v.

²¹ As a result of the deliberations, in the preface of the Visitation the *clausula juncta in primis Sedis apostolicae Auctoritate* was inserted. This vague affirmation of papal authority, however, did not mean at all that the visitation was organized *ab utraque potestate* and undoubtedly indicated an essay of the secular authority to increase its jurisdiction on the University.

fallen under the spell of Anglicanism through the ambassador of England in Venice.²² He crossed the Channel to England and took over the ideas of his Anglican friends which found a clear expression in the first part of his *De republica ecclesiastica*, which appeared that year in London.²³

A minimal knowledge of the contents of the four books of the first part is necessary to be able to judge the importance of the discussion that followed. The first book deals with the structure of the Church. The author argues against the Church as a monarchy with the pope as its head and in favour of the Church as an aristocratic republic with all bishops and papal ministry on the same level. The second book describes the bishops as directly dependent on Christ without the intervention of papal jurisdiction. The third book claims that the divine law does not make any difference between the bishops of Christianity. In the fourth book, the author denounced the universal jurisdiction of the pope. He considered the bishops spread all over the world "successors of Saint Peter" in the same way as the pontiff of Rome.

Probably because of its lack of trust in the Faculty of Theology in Paris, the Holy See asked the Faculty of Louvain to protest against the first part of the *De republica ecclesiastica* which had just appeared.²⁴ On the *Feria quinta* of 5 January 1617, the Thursday assembly of the cardinals who formed the Holy Office, Paul V ordered that the nuncio in Brussels had to search for a reaction against the *De republica ecclesiastica*.²⁵ The theological Faculty was very

²² On De Dominis, see H. NEWLAND, *The Life and Contemporaneous Church History of Antonio De Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, which included the Kingdoms of Dalmatia and Croatia; afterwards Dean of Windsor, Master of the Savoy, and Rector of West Ilsley in the Church of England, in the Reign of James I*, Oxford and London, 1859. N. MALCOLM, *De Dominis (1560-1624): Venetian, Anglican, Ecumenist and Relapsed Heretic*, London, 1984. For the reception of De Dominis' doctrine at the theological Faculty of Louvain, cf. T. QUAGHEBEUR, *In luce et theatro totius orbis: The unsuccessful condemnation of De Dominis by the theological Faculty of Louvain 1616-1624* (in *Cristianesimo nella Storia*, Bologna, forthcoming).

²³ The second part also appeared in London (1620), the third part in Hannover (1622). Cf. J. DE LA SERVIÈRE, *Dominis, (Marc Antoine de) (1566-1624)*, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (= DTC), t. 4, Paris, 1911, col. 1668-1675. L. WILLAERT, *Bibliotheca janseniana Belgica. Répertoire des imprimés concernant les controverses théologiques en relation avec le jansénisme dans les Pays-Bas catholiques et le Pays de Liège au XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, 3 tomes, Brussels-Paris-Namur, 1949-1951 (= Willaert, BJB), 1684.

²⁴ J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénisme et Rome*, in: *Actes du colloque sur le jansénisme organisé par l'Academia Belgica. Rome, 2 et 3 novembre 1973*, Louvain, 1977, 27-45, p. 29.

²⁵ Archives of the Roman Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (=ACDF), *Decreta Sancti Officii* (= S.O.), 1617, f° 14. The *Feria quinta* of 19 January 1617

unwilling to involve itself in the controversy evoked by de Dominis but, ultimately, had to accept the charge.²⁶

The Faculty of Louvain divided the task in order to come to a refutation. Four of the eight regents abandoned the project. Schinckelius, Jansonius, Henry Rampen and Guilielmus Fabricius, the eldest regents, sank their teeth into the dossier.²⁷ They divided amongst each other the refutation of the first book of the first part of *De republica ecclesiastica*. Schinckelius was responsible for the refutation of the preface and the first four chapters of the first book. He also took upon himself the redaction of the entire refutation; Jansonius would criticize the following four chapters of the first book and also the ninth chapter which had first been assigned to John Wiggers who had to resign because he was busy preparing his lessons in scholastics. This ninth chapter dealt with the texts on Saint Peter in the Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles. Fabricius would study the last two chapters ten and eleven of the first book. On the proposal of Jansonius, the next books were not divided. Schinckelius would inquire into the second book, Fabricius and Rampen together would examine the third book; Jansonius would check the fourth book.²⁸

In February 1618, Schinckelius sent the refutation of the first four chapters of the first book to cardinal Borghese. Schinckelius said he was delighted to be given the opportunity of serving the pope, claiming that he would lay down his life for Rome.²⁹ Some months

read an intercepted letter by de Domini to his nephew of 7 January 1617. This letter said that on 23 November 1616 de Dominis had taken refuge to England. There he was warmly received by the Dutch, cf. ACDF, *Decreta S.O.*, 1617, f° 32.

²⁶ RL, OUL, 387, f° 83, 87, 116.

²⁷ Since 1615 Rampen (1572- 1641) had been president of the College of Saint Anna. Afterwards he became the president of Minor Holy Spirit College (1625) and of Major Holy Spirit College (1628), cf. Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België (= KB), hs. 22172/III: BAX, *Historia universitatis Lovaniensis*, t. 3, *Sacrae Theologiae Doctores*, f° 298-299. On the Day of Saint Jerome 1615 he was co-opted as regent in the place of the dead Jacobus Baius, cf. RL, OUL, 387, f° 60. In 1594 Fabricius (1553-1628) took his doctor's degree and since 1611 he was president of Major Holy Spirit College, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 3, p. 27.

²⁸ *Bibliothèque Nationale de France* (= BNF), Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 20v-22r: Jansonius to Bagno, 5 September 1621, cf. B. DE MEESTER, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni Francesco Guidi di Bagno (1621-1627)*, 2 tomes, (*Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, Nonciature de Flandre*, 5-6), Brussels, 1938, p. 61. According to us, Ceyssens wrongly considered the refusal of Wiggers as a sign that he was not for one hundred percent devoted to Rome, cf. L. CEYSSENS, *Wiggers, Johannes*, in NBW, t. 9, Brussels, 1981, col. 830.

²⁹ Universiteitsarchief Leuven (= UL), Fund Ghent, (1958), 66: Schinckelius to Borghese, non dated.

later, Morra offered Borghese the refutation by Jansonius of the fourth book. The nuncio did so with mixed feelings for he had asked Jansonius in vain to finish first of all the refutation of all the chapters of the first book.³⁰

The zeal of Schinckelius did not go unnoticed in Rome. Borghese told Morra that he had delivered to the pope Schinckelius' refutation of the first four chapters of the first book. The Secretary of State did not talk about the refutation of the fourth book by Jansonius. Because of Jansonius' old age Borghese thought it was better that Schinckelius and not Jansonius would be responsible for editing of the refutation. Borghese lauded the doctrine and the *virtus* of Schinckelius. Everybody, he said, thought Schinckelius to be the right man to bring the case of de Dominis to a favourable conclusion. The pope's right hand wanted the Faculty to work together and to refute de Dominis completely in a way worthy of it.³¹

As time went on, the redaction of the whole project began to weigh on the shoulders of Schinckelius. In a letter to Bagno, he complained that although he was the youngest doctor of the Faculty and had no experience whatsoever in such matters, he had to do the largest part of the job. As a result, the de Dominis censure did not progress and had only been restarted some five or seven weeks ago.³² Hence, Bagno prompted the professors one by one to finish the refutation.³³ Understanding the situation of Schinckelius very well, the nuncio informed the Secretary of State Ludovisi that not everyone at the Faculty did his part as they should. He stressed that, until then, only Jansonius had completed his part.³⁴

³⁰ ASV, FB, II, 104, f° 31: Morra to Borghese, 8 September 1618, cf. L. VAN MEERBEECK, *Correspondance des nonces Gesualdo, Morra, San Severino avec le Secrétaire d'Etat Pontificale, 1615-1621*, (*Analecta Vaticano-Belgica, Nonciature de Flandre*, 4), Rome-Brussels, 1937, p. 312.

³¹ Algemeen Rijksarchief Brussel (= ARB), Papers of State and Audience, 1468, 11: Borghese to Morra, 10 November 1618.

³² BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 28v-29r: Schinckelius to Bagno, 11 September 1621: '[...] sed otium hoc non ita multo postea mihi excussit negotium difficile et perplexum quod facultati nostrae in aula Serenissimi principis movit provincialis societatis Belgicae, illud enim quia moram nullam patiebatur, magnumque nisi obviaretur praeiudicium facultati nostrae, totique universitati allatum videbatur iussus sum prosequi captamque scriptionem intermittere. Ex quo autem ante menses sex aut septem nonnihil conquievit resumsi cartas [...].' Cf. B. DE MEESTER, *o.c.*, p. 67.

³³ BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 22v: Bagno to Schinckelius, 14 September 1621, cf. B. DE MEESTER, *o.c.*, p. 67. BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 23r: Bagno to Fabricius, 14 September 1621. BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 23v: Bagno to Ramen, 14 September 1621.

³⁴ ACDF, S.O., St. St., E6b: Bagno to Ludovisi, 16 October 1621.

The cardinals of the Holy Office studied the case.³⁵ They drew up a report and sent this to the nuncio in Brussels. Gregorius XV thought it better that the Faculty of Louvain appeared as one voice and that the professors did not publish separately against de Dominis. The pope disapproved of Jansonius' publication because all the books of the *De republica ecclesiastica* had to be refuted simultaneously. The nuncio had to make clear to the theologians that the de Dominis censure would have to appear as one entity. Moreover, the cardinals and the pope did not consider the moment right for publications about papal primacy. The Holy Office preferred Schinckelius over Jansonius as compiler and final editor because the first was very well informed on the dogmas; had an elegant style of writing and was not weakened by age.³⁶

The exhortations of nuncio Bagno seemed to produce the desired results. On 23 March 1622, Schinckelius informed Bagno that his part of the censure would be ready in a couple of days. In his letter Schinckelius renounced the activity of de Dominis. Just as Jansonius, he proposed to edit his part of the refutation for it stood independent of the other books.³⁷ The following day, Fabricius informed Bagno that he had made progress in his part of the refutation.³⁸ The same day, Rampen apologized himself to the nuncio saying that, because of his weak health and many other occupations, he had only been asked to help Schinckelius.³⁹ The latter would never finish the refutation of the second book. In the meantime, in Hanover the third part of *De republica ecclesiastica* appeared.⁴⁰

An unexpected change in the controversy around de Dominis saved the Faculty of Louvain that had still not managed to achieve its censure: de Dominis had retracted his own acts and writings. The Faculty had not come further than the refutation of the first four chapters of the first book and of the fourth book – both of the first part. Saved by the gong and with a sigh of relief, the Faculty could suspend the censure demanded by Rome.⁴¹

³⁵ Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (= BAV), Barberini Latini, 5910, f° 21v: Ludovisi to Bagno, 6 November 1621.

³⁶ ACDF, S.O., St. St., E6b: Holy Office to Bagno, 19 February 1622.

³⁷ BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 141v-142r: Schinckelius to Bagno, 23 March 1622, cf. B. DE MEESTER, *o.c.*, p. 174.

³⁸ BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 142v: Fabricius to Bagno, 24 March 1622.

³⁹ BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 142v: Rampen to Bagno, 24 March 1622, cf. B. DE MEESTER, *o.c.*, p. 175.

⁴⁰ In the first book of the third part the author defends the Protestant principle of the *sola scriptura* and refuses to recognize the Church as unfallible judge in matters of faith. In the second book, de Dominis, abundantly provided of benefices, made a plea for the poverty of the first primitive Church.

⁴¹ RL, OUL, 387, f° 163: Faculty Council, 7 May 1622.

Schinckelius in defence of the academic educational monopoly against the Jesuits

Just as during the negotiations on the Visitation and the preparations of the de Dominis censure which never appeared, Schinckelius played a not insignificant role in the controversy between the Faculty and the Jesuits who, since the last quarter of the sixteenth century, did everything to combat the educational monopoly of the theological Faculty of Louvain in the Netherlands.

Frustration among the Jesuits

When Ignacio of Loyola died in 1556, the Jesuits had around forty six colleges in the whole of Europe. Since 1542 the Society had been settled in Louvain, where it bought a house with support of Michael Baius in 1559.⁴² On 17 January 1556, Paul IV allowed the *Collegio Romano* of the Jesuits to grant academic diplomas, and in the brief *Exponi Nobis* of 19 August 1561 Pius IV also allowed the Society to grant academic titles in its colleges with the exception of the colleges in university cities.⁴³

Very quickly some professors of the theological Faculty at Louvain complained that the Jesuits stole some of their best students. In 1566 the Jesuits of Louvain allowed non-Jesuit students to their classes and granted them different academic degrees. The University protested since the Jesuits thus tried to pull in a large part of the higher education, without accepting the jurisdiction of the rector. The academics feared that Louvain's *Alma Mater* would share the lot of most catholic universities in the German Roman Empire, where in a period of some years the Jesuits had taken over the entire education in philosophy and theology. The University of Louvain appealed to its monopoly on higher education in the Netherlands, which had been officially confirmed by emperor Charles V in 1530 after a controversy with the city magistrates of Tournay who had the same ambition. The Jesuits for their part referred to the (already mentioned) privileges

⁴² A. PONCELET, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les anciens Pays-Bas*, 2 tomes, Brussels, 1926, t. 1, p. 41. *Ibidem*, p. 129. Baius (1513-1589), doctor in 1549, became in that same year royal professor of scholastic theology. At the end of 1552 he was appointed for the royal chair of Holy Scripture. In 1550 he received the presidency of Pope's College, cf. E.J.M., VAN EIJL, *Bay (Baius), Michael de*, in NBW, t. 1, Brussels, 1964, col. 114-129.

⁴³ M. BATLLORI, *Les universités et les collèges jésuites du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle*, in CRE information 72 (1985) 61-73.

assigned to the Society. They claimed the right to teach for free wherever the local university refuted this, to found colleges for humanities, philosophy and theology and to grant academic degrees. The University of Louvain was successful in its reaction. Madrid intervened in its defence. In 1569 Philips II confirmed the education monopoly in the Netherlands of the University of Louvain.⁴⁴

Since 1584, however, the old tensions had come up again. Philips II recognized that all privileges assigned by the popes to the Society had force of law in the Netherlands but he also stressed that these privileges did not deal with academic degrees.⁴⁵ From 1591 Louvain, just like the universities of Padua and Paris, was once at war with the Jesuits.⁴⁶ When the Antwerp bishop Livinus Torrentius founded by testament on 1 February 1595 a proper Jesuit college in Louvain where also theology would be taught, the University was not pleased at all. In the expectation of a complete course in philosophy, a chair in metaphysics and a chair in mathematics were installed.⁴⁷ The Faculty did not wait long to react. It repeated the statutory stipulation that only those who followed the lessons of theology in the Hall could be admitted to academic degrees.⁴⁸ The lessons in scholastic theology organized by the Jesuits, by the monastery of Saint Gertrudis, by the Park Abbey, by the Dominicans and by the Minorites did not lead to any academic title.⁴⁹ At the request of the University of Louvain, Clement VIII prohibited the Jesuits in three consecutive briefs to make use of the educational privileges granted by Julius III, Pius IV and Pius V.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ F. CAMERLYNCK, *L'Université de Louvain depuis le dernier quart du XVI^e siècle jusqu'à la 'visite' des archiducs Albert et Isabelle (1575-1617)*, in: *L'Université de Louvain à travers cinq siècles*, Brussels, 1927, 31-64, p. 38.

⁴⁵ A. PONCELET, *o.c.*, t. 1, p. 341.

⁴⁶ J.P. DONNELLY, *Padua, Louvain and Paris: Three Case Studies of University-Jesuit Confrontation (1591-1596)*, in *Louvain Studies* 15 (1990) 38-52.

⁴⁷ UL, Fund Ghent, (1958), 158: Testament of Torrentius, 1 February 1595.

⁴⁸ E. REUSENS, *Statuts primitifs de la Faculté de théologie de l'ancienne Université de Louvain*, in *Annuaire de l'Université catholique de Louvain* 46 (1882) 380-415, p. 384.

⁴⁹ UL, Fund Ghent, (1957), 243: *Extracta ex libro actorum facultatis theologiae*, 1585-1616.

⁵⁰ It concerns the briefs of Clement VIII to the University of Louvain, to the general of the Jesuits Claudio Aquaviva and to archduke Albrecht of respectively 22 December 1595, 16 March 1596 and 11 October 1596, cf. A. PONCELET, *o.c.*, t. 2, p. 215-226. Aquaviva (1542-1615) was general of the Society from 19 February 1581 until his death on 31 January 1615, cf. C. SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 12 tomes Brussels-Paris, 1890-1960 (= BCI), t. 1, Brussels-Paris, 1890, col. 480-491.

Apart from their failure to break the academic educational monopoly, the Jesuits were also annoyed by the practical organisation of the Faculty and the University. The *Statuta regentium* of the Faculty foresaw the possibility to co-opt members of the regular clergy. By custom a Dominican and an Augustinian were member of the Strict Faculty, but never a Jesuit. The Society had to accept a similar exclusion concerning the incorporations of the monasteries in the University. The incorporated monasteries belonged to the University without being part of the Faculty. Through incorporation acts, mentioned in the *Acta Universitatis*, not in the *Acta Facultatis*, the monasteries benefited from the privileges of the University:⁵¹ the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians (1447), the Calced Carmelites (after 1469), the Crutched friars (after 1491), the Bogards (ca. 1520), the Carthusians (1521), the Celestines (after 1521), the Regular Canons of Augustin (1525) and the Benedictines of Vlierbeek (after 1589) were all incorporated.⁵² Again, the Jesuits were not included.

Finally, the Louvain Lessiuscensure of 1587 highly irritated the Jesuits in the Netherlands.⁵³ The Faculty called the doctrine of the Louvain Jesuits Leonard Lessius and John Hamelius semi-pelagian.⁵⁴ The ensuing controversy illustrated how much the Jesuits and the Faculty differed from each other concerning the way in which both wanted to study and teach theology.⁵⁵ Guelluy showed that the dissension between both schools was largely methodological in nature.⁵⁶ The four-year scholastic study by the Jesuits contrasted with the university programme based on the churchfathers which took more than seven years.

⁵¹ E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 5, p. 1287-1703.

⁵² Later other monasteries would join them: the Irish Recollects (after 1609), the Discalced Carmelites (ca. 1612), the Regular Canons of Augustin of the Congregation of Windesheim (31 May 1619, cf. RL, OUL, 64, f° 125v), the Irish Dominicans (shortly after the foundation on 18 December 1626, cf. E. REUSENS, *o.c.*, t. 5, p. 1621), the Minimes (27 August 1640, cf. RL, OUL, 66, f° 275v), the Oratorians (4 February 1658, cf. RL, OUL, 69, f° 179-180v), the Norbertines (23 September 1658, cf. RL, OUL, 69, f° 211-212) and the College of Villers (27 February 1662, cf. RL, OUL, 70, f° 119-121).

⁵³ F. CLAEYS BOUUAERT, *Les origines de la controverse théologique dite De Auxiliis Divinae Gratiae (1587-1588)*, in ETL 41 (1965), p. 548-560.

⁵⁴ Lessius (1554-1623) taught Philosophy at Douai (1574-1581) and later studied five years theology in Rome where he had Bellarminus among his professors. From 1585 until 1600 Lessius taught theology at the studyhouse of the Society at Louvain, cf. PIBA, t. 2, p. 68. Hamelius (1554-1589) studied together with Lessius in Rome. In 1585 they both returned to the Netherlands and were appointed for a chair at Louvain's Jesuit College, cf. PIBA, t. 1, p. 417-418.

⁵⁵ E.J. M. VAN EIJL, *La controverse louvaniste autour de la grâce*, p. 275-277.

⁵⁶ R. GUELLUY, *L'évolution des méthodes théologiques*, especially p. 135-138, p. 138: 'La distinction entre la scolastique et la théologie positive semble s'expliquer plutôt par la mise en présence de deux manières de travailler, l'une doctrinale, l'autre

This situation was untenable. Louvain's Augustinism, which found clear expression in Louvain's edition of the works of Saint Augustin, dated 1577, and in the Lessius censure, could not count on much sympathy among the Jesuits.⁵⁷

*A scramble with the Jesuits for academic chairs*⁵⁸

In the first quarter of the seventeenth century there was a real jostle for academic chairs in which Faculty and Society trod continuously on each other's toes. Schinckelius was one of the protagonists on the scene who did not fear a collision with the Jesuits.

Towards the end of 1614 the Spanish Dominican Thomas de Torres, professor in scholastic theology at the University of Louvain, left the Netherlands for Spain.⁵⁹ When the Archdukes disallowed the Jesuits in the Netherlands from teaching *usque ad gradum* on 11 August 1615,⁶⁰ the latter tried to pull in the chair in scholastic theology of de Torres and his seat in the Strict Faculty. Jansonius, who was opposed to the scholastic theology of the Jesuits, advised the Strict Faculty to appoint a substitute for de Torres. Undoubtedly Jansonius wanted to prevent a Jesuit from taking the seat of de Torres. On Saint Jerome's Day 1615 nobody else but Schinckelius was co-opted in exchange for de Torres. It was a temporary appointment since it was not yet clear whether the Dominican had definitively left the Netherlands and, hence, given in his place in the Strict Faculty.⁶¹ Until 1639

historique, l'une abstraite et sèche, l'autre plus concrète et parlant davantage au sentiment.

⁵⁷ In 1577 a Louvain critical edition of the works of Saint Augustin was prepared: *Opera D. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis et doctoris praecipui, tomis decem comprehensa: per theologos Lovanienses ex manuscriptis codicibus multo labore emendata, et ab innumeris erroribus vindicata*, 10 tomes, Antwerp, 1577. This edition, printed at Antwerp by Plantijn and based on extensive research of the sources which had started already since 1570, ameliorated the then used Amerbach edition (Basle, 1505-1506) and the Erasmus edition (Basle, J. Froben, 1528), cf. L. CEYSSSENS, *Le 'Saint Augustin' du XVII^e siècle: l'édition de Louvain (1577)*, in *XVII^e siècle* 34 (1982) 103-120.

⁵⁸ Some introductory articles on this theme: A. PONCELET, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus dans les anciens Pays-Bas*, 2 tomes, Brussels, 1926, t. 2, p. 252-297. F. CLAEYS BOUAERT, *L'ancienne Université de Louvain*, p. 128-154.

⁵⁹ In 1619 De Torres (1564-1630) would be appointed for an episcopal see in Paraguay. He died in Lima, cf. J. QUETIF, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis illustrati*, 2 tomes, Paris, 1719-1721, t. 2, p. 468-469.

⁶⁰ A. PONCELET, *o.c.*, t. 2, p. 255.

⁶¹ RL, OUL, 387, f° 60.

the regency of Schinckelius would be dominated by the battle against the aspirations of the Jesuits.

In 1617, the University sent Schinckelius to the bishops of the church province of Malines in order to secure their support in the persistent controversy between the University and the Jesuits.⁶² The Visitation, published in that same year, threw oil on the fire. On 6 April 1618 the Jesuits of Louvain complained to the Privy Council against article 66 of the Visitation which obliged all who wanted to take an academic degree, to follow the lessons in the University Hall on scholastic theology and Holy Scripture. The regular clergy of the incorporated monasteries could follow the lessons at their own studyhouses but had to pass an exam by the Faculty in order to take an academic degree.⁶³ According to the non-incorporated Jesuits this arrangement was an infringement of their privilege to teach *in ordine ad gradus*. The Jesuits did everything to achieve that the lessons at their college could also lead to an academic degree. On the *Deputatio* of 5 July the Faculty of Theology asked for the help of the entire institution in order to prevail upon the Archdukes against accepting a new petition by Scribani, provincial of the Jesuits.⁶⁴ The University sent a note to abbot Drusius of Park Abbey who had done the visitation in 1617. According to the *deputati*, the plan of the Jesuits would ruin the University.⁶⁵

Schinckelius revealed himself as the man who negotiated in name of the Faculty with the Council of Brabant, the Privy Council, the Estates of Brabant and the city magistrate of Louvain against the aspirations of the Jesuits.⁶⁶ The Faculty also delegated Schinckelius to Georgius of Austria, chancellor of the University.⁶⁷ The Faculty argued that, if the Jesuits would grant academic degree, the number of students at the University would increase dramatically since the Jesuits would found theological studia in all the cities. The Faculty therefore asked the chancellor to defend the interests of the University and the Faculty

⁶² L. CEYSSSENS, *Schinckels, Johannes*, col. 772.

⁶³ E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 615.

⁶⁴ RL, OUL, 64, f° 96. From December 1613 until September 1619 Scribani was provincial of the province Flandro-Belgica, cf. PIBA, t. 3, p. 322.

⁶⁵ UL, Fund Ghent, (1958), 57.

⁶⁶ On the activity of Schinckelius against the Jesuits in 1619, cf. RL, OUL, 387, f° 105, 108, 110, 111, 113, 115.

⁶⁷ Cf. UL, OUL, 344: Faculty to Georgius of Austria, 8 March 1619. Since 3 June 1598 Georgius of Austria (+21 April 1619), chaplain at the court of the archdukes, was provost of the Saint Peter's Chapter at Louvain and chancellor of the University. He was the bastard of Georgius I of Austria (1504-1557), prince bishop of Liège from 24 June 1544 until his death, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 392-393. S. BORMANS, *Georges d'Autriche*, in BN, dl. 7, Brussels, 1880-1883, col. 612-618.

with his authority and influence.⁶⁸ In a letter to Malderus, former professor at the theological Faculty and since 1611 bishop of Antwerp, the Faculty demanded to support their delegate Schinckelius, who negotiated at Brussels in its name. The Faculty hoped for his remaining help.⁶⁹ Thanks to the negotiations of Schinckelius the plans of the Jesuits failed.

Yet, the Jesuits changed their strategy and tried to have an academic chair in philosophy instead.⁷⁰ The *Deputatio* of 6 May 1624 sent Schinckelius once more to Brussels to get more information on the plans of the Jesuits.⁷¹ One month later, the University asked Jansenius, president of Pulcheria College and *professor ordinarius*, to inform the Spanish king. Trevisius, doctor of the Archdukes, supplied the needed money.⁷² At first Jansenius excused himself: it was a task too heavy, he declared himself being hardly informed on the affairs of the University.⁷³ This was right. At that time Jansenius had not yet distinguished himself in the battle of the Faculty against the Jesuits as Schinckelius had done. Only on 21 May 1618, six years later than Schinckelius, Jansenius was accepted in the *Congregatio* because of his ordinarian chair. On the other hand, Jansenius spoke fluently French and Spanish; he also had administrative experience;⁷⁴ he was not bound by a specific academic task like Schinckelius who was part of the Strict Faculty.⁷⁵ Finally, Jansenius was prepared to leave.⁷⁶

⁶⁸ UL, OUL, 344: Faculty to Georgius of Austria, 8 March 1619.

⁶⁹ Cf. UL, OUL, 344: Faculty to Malderus, 12 March 1619.

⁷⁰ J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 131 sq.

⁷¹ RL, OUL, 64, f° 409: *Deputatio*, 6 May 1624.

⁷² J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 136, note 42. L. WUILLAUME, *Le 'De controversia janseniana historia' du P. François De Cleyn, s.j. (1645). Les premières années du Jansénisme belge*, Rome, 2001, p. 170: 'Ex iis erat hoc tempore Andreas Trevisius Alberti olim Belgarum Principis et etiam tum Isabellae Clarae Eugeniae Infantis medicus cuius hortatu et praecipue etiam expensis aiunt iter Hispaniense adversus Societatem ab ipso fuisse susceptum.'

⁷³ RL, OUL, 64, f° 412.

⁷⁴ From December 1612 until June 1614 Jansenius was director of a college in Bayonne; since 23 February 1617 he was president of Pulcheria College, cf. J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres (1585-1638)*, Paris, 1989.

⁷⁵ J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 136, note 42. M. LEYDECKER, *Historia jansenismi libri VI quibus de Cornelii Jansenii vita et morte, nec non de ipsius et sequacium dogmatibus disseritur*, Utrecht, 1695, p. 25: 'Sed vehementer repugnabat Jansenius. Itaque primarios in Academia Doctores convenit, ostenditque quae inde secutura studiis Academicis incommoda. Quin etiam iter in Hispaniam offerebat, si assentirentur. Decernitur legatio, urgente Travisio [sic], de quo ante, atque etiam nummos offerente. Abiit ergo Jansenius, tantumque effecit, ut Regio jussu Jesuitis esset tacendum.'

⁷⁶ RL, OUL, 64, f° 413: *Deputatio*, 18 June 1624.

Schinckelius and Jansenius formed a real team in the battle of the Faculty against the Jesuits. Jansenius kept Schinckelius abreast of his entanglements in Madrid, Alcalá and Salamanca, and of his travels between Louvain, Paris and Spain.⁷⁷ Schinckelius informed Jansenius of the different plans of the Jesuits.⁷⁸ In line with the old fox Jansonius, Schinckelius acted as spokesman of the Faculty and the University in many cases. While Jansenius negotiated in Spain, Schinckelius was the leading negotiator in a controversy between the University and the city magistrate of Louvain.⁷⁹ The *Deputatio* would also delegate Schinckelius to negotiate a solution for the difficult financial problems around the Luxemburg College.⁸⁰

Dissension between Schinckelius and Jansonius

It looked like Schinckelius had superseded the old Jansonius. An open split between both protagonists on the scene was bound to take place. In July 1624 Jansonius had insisted to archduke Isabella to give his royal chair of Holy Scripture to Rampen who since 1616 – officially because of illness or a weak health of Jansonius, in reality probably because of his hard work for the visitation – substituted him without fixed income. Schinckelius, dean of the Faculty and in the dossier de Dominis embroiled with Jansonius, protested to the archduke and argued that the free appointment and the advice of the Faculty was in danger. It was unheard of that a professor pointed out his own successor.⁸¹ In a second supply to the archduke, Jansonius pleaded once more that Rampen was the suitable man for the chair of Holy Scripture since, shortly before, the latter had helped him with a commentary on the book Job which he added to his letter.⁸² Jansonius also wrote a third request to the archduke.⁸³

⁷⁷ J. ORCIBAL, *Correspondance de Jansénius*, p. 272-276: Jansenius to Schinckelius, 1 March 1625; *Ibidem*, p. 297: Jansenius to Schinckelius, 14 March 1626; *Ibidem*, p. 323-324: Jansenius to Schinckelius, 1 July 1626; *Ibidem*, p. 324-326: Jansenius to Schinckelius, 5 July 1626. The entanglements of Jansenius in Spain are well known and have been studied elsewhere, cf. J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres (1585-1638)*, p. 131-156.

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 300-303: Schinckelius to Jansenius, 11 May 1626. Schinckelius tells how the Jesuits defended that their privileges did not run counter to Clement VIII, archduke Albrecht, the Spanish king and the Visitation *utraque autoritate ecclesiastica et civili confirmata*. *Ibidem*, p. 304-305: Schinckelius to Jansenius, 19 May 1626.

⁷⁹ RL, OUL, 64, f° 430: *Deputatio*, 26 October 1624.

⁸⁰ Cf. RL, OUL, 64, f° 443: *Deputatio*, 27 December 1624.

⁸¹ ARB, Privy Council, 1281: Schinckelius to Isabella, 5 August 1624.

⁸² ARB, Privy Council, 1281 and RL, OUL, 402: Jansonius to Isabella, 20 August 1624. The commentary on Job by Jansonius is not found.

⁸³ ARB, Privy Council, 1281: Jansonius to Isabella, 26 August 1624.

The Privy Council asked for the advice of the Faculty which lauded Rampen, who was member of the Faculty board, but argued that for the time being the chair was not vacant; and that when it would become vacant, the best candidate had to be appointed. In its consult to the archduke, the Privy Council followed the argument of the Faculty: it was a dangerous precedent to give someone the right of succession without knowing whether or not he was the best candidate.⁸⁴

When the chair of the dead Jansonius became vacant, one year later, on 30 July 1625, the Jesuits tried to pull in this important chair. While dean Wiggers asked the archduke to appoint someone for the chair of the death Jansonius,⁸⁵ the Privy Council informed the archduke of a request by Florent de Montmorency, provincial of the Jesuits, asking for the appointment of a Jesuit to the chair on Holy Scripture or to an extraordinary chair of scholastic theology. The provincial argued that the Jesuits would teach for free, without any gage or pension.⁸⁶ The University complained to Brizuela in Madrid that the Jesuits leered at the chair of the dead Jansonius.⁸⁷ Finally, neither Rampen nor a Jesuit but regent John Paludanus was appointed to the royal chair.⁸⁸

The opposition by Schinckelius and Jansenius against an extraordinary academic chair of scholastic theology for the Jesuits

In their battle against the attempts by the Jesuits to pull in an academic chair, Schinckelius and Jansenius found each other. In a letter of 16 September 1625 to the University and the Faculty, Isabella, in line with a royal ordonnance of 11 May of that year, announced the foundation of an extraordinary chair of scholastic theology, which was reserved for a Jesuit *professor extraordinarius*. Subsequently, the Faculty appealed once more to Schinckelius and Jansenius. To the writing of Isabella, Philips IV added a letter to the dean of the Faculty. The king, on demand of the provincial of the Jesuits, assigned to the Louvain Jesuits an extraordinary academic chair.⁸⁹

⁸⁴ ARB, Privy Council, 299, f°121 rv: Privy Council to Isabella, 21 October 1624.

⁸⁵ ARB, Privy Council, 1281: Wiggers to Isabella, 2 August 1625.

⁸⁶ ARB, Privy Council, 1281: Privy Council to Isabella, 26 August 1625. From June 1623 until September 1627 Montmorency was provincial of the province Flandro-Belgica, cf. PIBA, t. 3, p. 322.

⁸⁷ F. CLAEYS BOUUAERT, *L'ancienne Université de Louvain. Etudes et documents*, p. 147. UL, Fund Ghent, D6: *Registrum secretarii*, 10: University to Brizuela, 5 November 1625.

⁸⁸ ARB, Papers of State and Audience, 1190, 10, f° 165-166: Appointment letter, 6 February 1626.

⁸⁹ RL, OUL, 65, f° 9rv.

Montmorency, provincial of the Jesuits, did not lose time and asked the Faculty to accept a professor of theology of the Society.⁹⁰ The University expressed its protest in an undated *memoriale* entitled *Rationes ob quas Philippus Secundus Hispaniarum Rex Catholicus duas professiones scholasticas divi Thomae quas in Lovaniensi Academia instituit saecularibus doctoribus addixerit*. Undoubtedly, this note was meant for the Privy Council and for archduke Isabella.⁹¹ A reaction from the Privy Council or from the archduke has not been found. On the day that the rector received Montmorency's demand, the *Deputatio* decided to send someone from the theological Faculty to Spain.⁹² Jansenius left for Spain for the second time.⁹³

Schinckelius defended the interests of the Faculty at home. On 3 March 1626 an ultimate attempt at mediation took place between Schinckelius, assisted by Aegidius Baius and Wiggers as delegates of the Faculty, the representatives of the Privy Council, the Jesuits, archduke Isabella, archbishop of Malines Jacob Boonen and archbishop of Cambray Francis van der Burch.⁹⁴ At Louvain the impasse was complete.

In Madrid, thanks to Jansenius, Philips IV decided that the extraordinary chair of theology and the lessons in philosophy at the Jesuit college could only be retained if the Jesuits renounced their complete educational programme in philosophy and theology.⁹⁵ Since the Jesuits did not assent to this statement, the admission was no longer valid. The urgent casus of the extraordinary chair for the Jesuits was ended. The Faculty could rest at ease. Until the end of 1627 the University of Louvain and the Jesuits would keep on pushing pope and king and

⁹⁰ RL, OUL, 65, f° 12: Montmorency to Faculty, 28 September 1625.

⁹¹ RL, OUL, 405.

⁹² RL, OUL, 65, f° 12v.

⁹³ Cf. J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 131-156.

⁹⁴ Boonen (1573-1655) was archbishop of Malines from 26 November 1621 until 30 June 1655. Before that, he had been bishop of Ghent for four years (1616-1621). He supported the University library with a gift of books and a foundation of a yearly interest, cf. L. CEYSSENS, *Boonen, Jacobus*, in NBW, t. 2, Brussels, 1966, col. 74-89. J. ROEGIER, *550 jaar Universiteit Leuven*, p. 165. Van der Burch (1567-1644) was archbishop of Cambray from 8 July 1616 until his death on 23 May 1644. Before that he was three years bishop of Ghent (1613-1616), cf. F. CLAEYS BOUUAERT, *L'ancienne Université de Louvain*, p. 149. M. CHARTIER, *Burch, François van der*, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* (= DHGE), t. 10, Paris, 1938, col. 1226-1227.

⁹⁵ ARB, Privy Council, 1281; UL, Fund Ghent, D6, nr. 66. ARB, Privy Council, 1281. UL, Fund Ghent, (1959), 196: Philips IV to Isabella, 12 October 1626.

searching for support at other universities or friends at Rome and Madrid. Finally, the Jesuits lost the battle and gave up their aspirations. The team Schinkelius – Jansenius had proven too strong.

Schinkelius and Jansenius from their best ultramontane side

The absence of Rome in the controversy between the Faculty and the Jesuits on the educational monopoly was striking. A new book of the Italian Jesuit Antonio Santarelli raised a controversy in which the Faculty and the Jesuits tried to curry Rome's favour. Both parties were very careful not to irritate the Holy See.

The controversy started in 1625 with the publication in Rome of Santarelli's *Tractatus de Haeresi, Schismate, Apostasia, Sollicitatione in sacramento Poenitentiae, et de Potestate Romani Pontificis in his delictis puniendis*.⁹⁶ The text had the *approbatio* of three Jesuits and the general of the Society. It repeated the theory of the two swords expressed by Boniface VIII. In chapters 30 and 31 Santarelli defended the thesis of Bellarmine concerning the indirect papal authority on temporal affairs of kings. The pope had the right to dethrone heretic or schismatic kings and to relieve their subjects from the oath of obedience and fidelity. The Parlement of Paris condemned the book to be burned. The Sorbonne censured the tract with a majority of the votes and called the ultramontane doctrine expressed in it as opposed to the word of God.⁹⁷ This condemnation had to be read at the beginning of each academic year. On the same day Louis XIII approved the censure of the Sorbonne. The University of Paris urged its members to subscribe to the censure. The propositions of Santarelli were also condemned by the theological faculties at Toulouse, Valence, Bordeaux, Poitiers, Bourges and Caen. The Jesuits could do nothing else than

⁹⁶ L. WILLAERT, *Bibliotheca janseniana Belgica. Répertoire des imprimés concernant les controverses théologiques en relation avec le jansénisme dans les Pays-Bas catholiques et le Pays de Liège au XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles*, 3 tomes, Brussels-Paris-Namur, 1949-1951 (= BJB) 1811. At that time Santarelli (1569-1649) stayed at Rome. He would not publish anything else, cf. R. BROUILLARD, *Santarelli, Antoine*, in DTC, t. 14/1, 1939, col. 1101-1103.

⁹⁷ CH. DU PLESSIS D'ARGENTRE, *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus, qui ab initio duodecimi seculi post incarnationem Verbi usque ad annum 1732 proscripti sunt*, 3 tomes, Paris, 1724-1734, t. 2, p. 190-203, 217-220; P. FERET, *La faculté de théologie de Paris*, 7 tomes, Paris, 1900-1910, t. 3, p. 109-121. The arrest of the Parlement of Paris dated 13 March 1626. The censure of the Sorbonne dated 4 April 1626.

dissociating themselves from the book.⁹⁸ No wonder that the nuncio at Paris was very unhappy about the Sorbonne censure and the decrees of the Parlement of Paris.⁹⁹

On his own initiative, without consultation with Rome, the overzealous nuncio at Brussels, Guidi di Bagno, asked the theological Faculty of Douai to draw up a censure against the sentence of the Sorbonne.¹⁰⁰ In the same month, Bagno also addressed himself to the Faculty of Louvain. He argued that the censure of the Sorbonne was illegal since the college had not been gathered legitimately.¹⁰¹ The Secretary of State did not support the action of Bagno. Rome hoped that the Sorbonne itself would withdraw its censure.¹⁰²

Probably because the Faculty of Louvain did not start immediately with deliberations on the censure of Paris, archbishop Boonen of Malines, in name of the nuncio, urged the Faculty to react against the Sorbonne. The Faculty ordered Schinckelius, Rampen and Wiggers to handle the case. Wiggers left the project.¹⁰³ Rampen and Schinckelius had already collaborated in the dossier against de Dominis. Schinckelius took the lead. On his demand, on 11 December 1626, the Strict Faculty deliberated on the archbishop's letter.¹⁰⁴ In his report to Secretary of State Antonio Barberini, Bagno let understand that he did not have great expectations about the answer of the Faculty. He accused the Faculty with opportunism. Depending on the circumstances, the Faculty would set its sail to the wind. One should not even be surprised when the Faculty gave contradictory answers on one and the same subject.¹⁰⁵

In spite of this, the Faculty accepted the commission of Bagno to defend the book of Santarelli. Most probably the Faculty did not

⁹⁸ A. TUILIER, *Histoire de l'université de Paris et de la Sorbonne*, t. 1., p. 513-514. J. ORCIBAL, *Correspondance de Jansénius*, p. 488-490.

⁹⁹ The decrees of the Sorbonne are quoted in C. SOMMERVOGEL, BCJ, t. 7, Brussels-Paris, 1896, p. 579-582.

¹⁰⁰ BNF, Manuscrits latins, 5174, f° 412rv: Bagno to Faculty of Theology at Douay, 4 November 1626, cf. B. DE MEESTER, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni Francesco Guidi di Bagno (1621-1627)*, 2 tomes, (*Analecta Vaticana-Belgica, Nonciature de Flandre*, 5-6), Brussels, 1938, p. 789.

¹⁰¹ UL, Fund Ghent, (1927), 46: Bagno to Faculty, 27 November 1626.

¹⁰² A. CAUCHIE and R. MAERE, *Recueil des instructions générales aux nonces de Flandre (1596-1635)* (*Commission royale d'histoire*, 26), Brussels, 1904, p. 170: Secretary of State Barberini to nuncio Fabio de Lagonissa, 23 May 1627.

¹⁰³ RL, OUL, 387, p. 250: 11 December 1626.

¹⁰⁴ RL, OUL, 387, p. 252.

¹⁰⁵ BAV, Barberini Latini, 6814, f° 391: Bagno to Barberini, 19 December 1626, cf. B. DE MEESTER, *Correspondance du nonce Bagno*, p. 802. In October 1624 Barberini (1569-1646) was created cardinal by Urbanus VIII, cf. A. MEROLA, *Barberini, Antonio*, in *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* (= DBI), t. 6, Rome, 1964, p. 165-166.

want to disappoint Rome again after the dossier de Dominis. Bagno thanked the Faculty and hoped that this affair would be settled as quickly as possible.¹⁰⁶

This time Jansenius prepared the case. In early January 1627, after having expressed his amazement over the censure of the Sorbonne in a letter to Henry Calenus, archpriest in Brussels,¹⁰⁷ Jansenius published in Spain the *Confutatio censurae quorundam Theologorum Parisiensium sub nomine Facultatis Theologiae Parisiensium editae in quasdam propositiones ex R.P. Santarellae libris collectas*. In this document his colleague Guillaume Fabricius, at the nuncio's request, refuted the censure of the Sorbonne.¹⁰⁸ One month later it appeared in the Netherlands, without name or place.¹⁰⁹ The Faculty's official refutation however still had to come.

Since Jansenius was staying in Spain, Schinckelius received from the Strict Faculty the final responsibility to draw up an official answer against the censure of Paris and to send it to archbishop Boonen.¹¹⁰ In the dossier de Dominis, Schinckelius had already profiled himself in an ultramontane sense. At the end of March, the Faculty announced its censure to the nuncio.¹¹¹ For the final redaction Wiggers was replaced by Fabricius.¹¹² Two months later Schinckelius, Rampen and Fabricius finished their refutation so that nuncio Lagonissa could send it to Barberini.¹¹³ The text of the refutation itself has not been found. Although the Louvain censure has no doubt been printed, a printed copy could not be found either.

¹⁰⁶ UL, Fund Ghent, (1927), 48: Bagno to Faculty, 23 December 1626.

¹⁰⁷ J. ORCIBAL, *o.c.*, p. 289-292: Jansenius to Calenus, 13 January 1627. In 1609 Calenus (1583-1653), licentiate in theology, became parish priest in Asse and in 1624 parish priest of Saint Catherine in Brussels and archpriest of the district. He would be one of the executors of the testament of Jansenius and in 1640 he would publish the *Augustinus*, cf. L. CEYSSENS, *Calenus (Calen, Caelen), Hendrik*, in NBW, t. 4, Brussels, 1970, col. 121-125.

¹⁰⁸ J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius et Rome*, p. 30. ID., *Correspondance de Jansénius*, p. 362-363. In 1594 Fabricius (1553-1628) took his doctor's degree and since 1611 he was president of the Large Holy Spirit College, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 3, p. 27.

¹⁰⁹ J. N. PAQUOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la Principauté de Liège et de quelques contrées voisines*, Louvain, 1763-1770, t. 2, p. 293. A copy is not found.

¹¹⁰ RL, OUL, 387, p. 256: Faculty Council, 10 March 1627.

¹¹¹ RL, OUL, 387, p. 257: Faculty to Bagno, 24 March 1627.

¹¹² RL, OUL, 387, f° 258, also 250, 256, 257.

¹¹³ BAV, Barberini Latini, 6815, f° 41v: Lagonissa to Barberini, 5 June 1627, cf. L. VAN MEERBEECK, *Correspondance du nonce Fabio de Lagonissa*, p. 8. Lagonissa was nuncio in Brussels from 13 March 1627 until 28 January 1634.

Schinckelius involved in the "battle of Ath" against the Jesuits

The Faculty's defence of Santarelli's book did not at all result from a sudden growing predilection for the Jesuits. The persistently tense relation between the University and the Society and the pioneering work of Schinckelius became clear once more in the controversy around the college of Ath which the Jesuits wanted to take over.¹¹⁴

On 1 June 1628 the city magistrate of Ath permitted the Jesuits to rule the college of the city. The University, which attracted a lot of students from that college each year, had to react. Ten days later, Trevisius – doctor of the archdukes, defender of the interests of the University and a vehement opponent of the aspirations of the Jesuits in general – arrived at Ath together with the regents of the theological Faculty Aegidius Baius and Guillaume Mercerus.¹¹⁵ Both theologians were born in Ath. The trio promised a subsidy for the local college when the city magistrate would cease his relations with the Jesuits. Since the city magistrate did not agree, the University promised adventitious benefices and subsidies.¹¹⁶

Simultaneously, nobody other than Schinckelius – at that time the most important defender of the faculty's rights – was delegated by the University to the States of Brabant to act against the aspirations of the Jesuits.¹¹⁷ It was not his first time. The case kept dragging for several years.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁴ P. DELATTRE, *Les jésuites à Ath, 1621-1773. Une fondation difficile*, in *Annales du Cercle archéologique d'Ath et de la région* 23 (1937) 1-55. On the role of Trevisius, cf. ARB, Papers of State and Audience, 1468, 6. On the role of the University of Louvain, cf. RL, OUL, 65 (20 July until 25 September 1628) en RL, OUL, 66, f° 8-10: 10, 23 and 31 May 1635; RL, OUL, 387, f° 317 (21 March 1629).

¹¹⁵ Since 1614 Aegidius Baius (1576-1633), second cousin of Michael Baius, was president of Baius College. He died on 3 December 1633, cf. KB, hs. 22172/III: BAX, *Historia universitatis Lovaniensis*, t. 3, *Sacrae Theologiae Doctores*, f° 293. On Saint Jerome's Day 1614 he was co-opted to the Strict Faculty, cf. RL, OUL, 387, f° 50. In September 1605 Mercerus (1572-1639) took his doctor's degree. In June 1611 he became president of Minor Holy Spirit College. In that same year he was appointed for the royal chair of scholastic theology in succession of Clarius. Three years later he was co-opted to the Strict Faculty. In 1625 he became president of Pope's College, cf. P. BERGMANS, *Merchier, Guillaume ou Mercerus*, in BN, Brussels, 1897, t. 14, col. 431-432.

¹¹⁶ RL, OUL, 65, f° 195v: University to city magistrate in Mons, 20 July 1628.

¹¹⁷ RL, OUL, 65, f° 197v: *Deputatio*, 20 July 1628.

¹¹⁸ After the death of Trevisius in 1633 Jansenius took over the process, cf. J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius inédit*, in *Augustiniana* 13 (1963) 226-264, p. 232. However he could not prevent that on 3 June 1634 the Jesuits founded in Ath a separate Jesuit College, cf. P. DELATTRE, *a.c.*, p. 36. On the *Deputatio* of 18 December 1642 the members found that the Jesuits had managed to take over the original municipal college in

Schinckelius in the shadow of Jansenius

Not Schinckelius, president of Atrecht College and still *professor ordinarius*, but Jansenius was granted a great academic future. In a period of some years Jansenius developed from a studax at the Pulcheria College to one of the leading figures of the Faculty and the entire University. His successful action in Spain meant the beginning of a splendid academic career.

Trevisius, who had collaborated indirectly with Schinckelius in defence of the privileges of the University, acted as promotor of Jansenius in the academic world. On 27 September 1628, at Calenus' request,¹¹⁹ the doctor of archduke Isabella addressed himself in Spanish to an anonymous correspondent with the request that the rector of the University would recommend Jansenius for the seat in the Strict Faculty of the dead Fabricius.¹²⁰ Three days later Jansenius was indeed co-opted.¹²¹ It is not known whether or not the rector had recommended Jansenius to the regents. Jansenius was chosen before Christian van Beusecom. Since 1611 the latter had been president of King's College in succession of Malderus and since 1614 he held the royal chair of catechism. Van Beusecom took his doctor's degree on the same day as Schinckelius (25 September 1612), five years earlier than Jansenius (24 October 1617).¹²²

In that same year 1628 Trevisius provided finances to found a "New Sorbonne" around Jansenius. He intended to gather the best theologians in one house.¹²³ Between 1628 and 1631 Jansenius lived together with doctorandus Libert Fromondus in *nova illa Sorbona*, a private house in the city, where they devoted themselves to the study of Greek, Hebrew and patrology.¹²⁴ Schinckelius, who was also asked

agreement with the city magistrate, cf. RL, OUL, 67, f° 256. When on 20 November 1662 the college signed an incorporation act with the University, the Jesuits had already left the college, cf. RL, OUL, 70, f° 203.

¹¹⁹ J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 160.

¹²⁰ ARB, Papers of State and Audience, 1463.

¹²¹ RL, OUL, 387, p. 300.

¹²² For thirty years Van Beusecom (1579-1644) held the non-prestigious royal chair of catechism, cf. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 3, p. 372-373.

¹²³ J. ORCIBAL, *Correspondance de Jansénius*, p. 393 and 406: Jansenius to Saint-Cyran, 31 December 1627 and 26 May 1628. ID., *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 158. L. WUILLAUME, *Le 'De controversia janseniana historia' du P. François De Cleyn, s.j. (1645)*, p. 170: '[...] quare fautorem ac maecenatem se Jansenio prae-buit cumque ex Hollandico collegio is excederet [...] aedes emit illi Fromondoque inhabitandas, [...].'

¹²⁴ On 14 October 1628 Fromondus (1587-1653) took his doctor's degree in theology, cf. L. CEYSSENS, *Froidmont, Libert*, in BN, t. 34, Brussels, 1968, col. 314-321. At that time Fromondus was someone with name and fame at the Faculty of Arts. After his promotion in 1606 he taught for three years philosophy at the Norbertines of Saint

by Jansenius, pulled out at the very last moment.¹²⁵ It is not clear why Schinckelius did not join the project. This, however, did not mean a radical break with coming man Jansenius. At the beginning of 1630 Schinckelius and Jansenius once more formed a team in the preparation of a facultatory condemnation of the *De magnetica vulnere naturali et legitima curatione* published by Jan Baptist van Helmont in 1621 in Paris.¹²⁶

When Paludanus, professor of Holy Scripture, died on 20 February 1630, the Faculty drew up a list of candidates in order of favour: Rampen, Jansenius, Ab Angelis.¹²⁷ Rampen, at that time as president entangled with a scandal around the finances of Large Holy Spirit College,¹²⁸ had once already missed the chair of Holy Scripture when Jansenius had proposed him as his successor and the then dean Schinckelius had opposed this plan. Ab Angelis, doctor since 1616, was president of Viglius College, but did not yet have any academic chair of theology. Jansenius, second man on the list, was appointed for the most important chair at the Faculty, leaving everybody behind him.¹²⁹

Schinckelius in open confrontation with the Faculty

Three years after that the star of Jansenius' academic career had started to rise from the royal chair of Holy Scripture, *professor ordinarius* Schinckelius antagonized the entire Faculty on a trivial appointment question. In this controversy Schinckelius and Jansenius found themselves adversaries for the very first time.

Michael's Abbey in Antwerp. He returned to Louvain and taught for eighteen years rhetorics and philosophy at the pedagogy the Falcon. In that period he published a lot on physics and mathematics which made him very famous in the academic world.

¹²⁵ ID., *Jansenius, Cornelis*, in NBW, t. 9, Brussels, 1981, col. 393-417, kol. 403.

¹²⁶ In 1599 Van Helmont (1579-1644) took his degree in medicine at the University of Louvain and, for a short time, he was the private doctor of Frangipani, nuncio in Brussels. In his *Over de magnetische behandeling van wonden* he criticized the classical vision on medicine, represented by Aristoteles and Galenus. After a condemnation by the theological Faculty on 9 March 1631, on exhortation of Schinckelius and Jansenius, Van Helmont was delivered to the secular judges. It seems that, from that time on, Jansenius was no longer involved, Schinckelius all the more. In March 1634 Van Helmont was put under house arrest and died ten years later, cf. J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius d'Ypres*, p. 164-165. C. HARLINE, *De wonderen van Jezus-Eik. Mirakelverhalen uit de zeventiende eeuw*, Amsterdam, 2003, p. 145-189.

¹²⁷ RL, OUL, 387, p. 330.

¹²⁸ For the controversy around Rampen and the financial bookkeeping of Major and Minor Holy Spirit College, cf. RL, OUL, 534.

¹²⁹ RL, OUL, 387, p. 332.

According to the foundation bull of Eugen IV a professor of theology had to be at least *baccalaureus formatus*. Reforms in the educational programme of the Faculty meant that since 1554 a student could take this degree already after four years instead of eight years. For this reason the Faculty urged that for the function of professor the candidate had to be at least a licentiate. In spite of this, in 1633 the *baccalaureus formatus* Jan Cobbelgiers, tried to be appointed by the city magistrate for the ordinarian chair of the resigning dean Aegidius Baius.¹³⁰ The Faculty, which felt obliged to defend its own regulations, decided that Cobbelgiers had to take his licentiate's degree first. The Faculty called Schinckelius, Wiggers, and Rampen as examiners for the licentiate's exam of Cobbelgiers. Wiggers and Rampen declared Cobbelgiers unsuitable: he had to return after a couple of months for a second exam. Schinckelius, who had already declared himself to the Faculty in favour of Cobbelgiers,¹³¹ wanted to allow his protégé to the licentiate's debates. After a second exam the examiners confirmed their former conclusions. Dean Baius decided not to propose Cobbelgiers to the city magistrate.¹³² Against all expectations, on 27 August 1633 Cobbelgiers was appointed by the city magistrate.¹³³

The University found out that, through a personal action in Brussels, Schinckelius had arranged the appointment of Cobbelgiers. On 6 September the Faculty drew up the proposal for a letter, addressed to the Privy Council. Jansenius had to deliver the letter in Brussels and had to cross Schinckelius in his further plans. Jansenius accepted the commission *post excusas aliquas*.¹³⁴ For the very first time Jansenius and Schinckelius stood against each other. Both were of ultramontane opinion and not good friends with the Jesuits as far as the educational monopoly was concerned; they almost had lived together in *nova illa Sorbona*. Yet the defence of the rights of the Faculty drove a wedge between both academics.

In Brussels the city magistrates of Louvain defended the candidature of Cobbelgiers.¹³⁵ Ten days later archduke Isabella ordered

¹³⁰ In 1677 Cobbelgiers (1606-1685) was appointed president of Houterlee College, cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 3, p. 187-188.

¹³¹ RL, OUL, 388, f° 19v and RL, OUL, 407: Schinckelius to Faculty, 23 August 1633.

¹³² RL, OUL, 388, f° 19v-20 and RL, OUL, 407.

¹³³ J. WILS, *Les professeurs*, p. 348.

¹³⁴ RL, OUL, 388, f° 22r: Faculty Council, 6 September 1633.

¹³⁵ ARB, Papers of State and Audience, 934: Louvain city magistrate to Isabella, 7 September 1633.

Drusius, abbot of Park Abbey, to hear the advice of the Faculty and the city magistrates.¹³⁶ Since the Visitation Drusius was appointed by the government as commissioner for the observance of the stipulations of 1617.¹³⁷ The Faculty immediately reacted with a request to the abbot against Cobbelgiers.¹³⁸ It argued that Cobbelgiers was twice called unsuitable for the academic chair. Moreover, the city magistrate had not asked the advice of the Faculty which made the appointment illegal. Since the Visitation of 1617 this advice had been obliged.¹³⁹ How was it possible that licentiate students could be taught by someone without a licentiate's degree?! The fame of the Faculty was at stake.¹⁴⁰ The Faculty also offered its remarks on a report from the city magistrate of Louvain to the abbot who had given it to the Faculty. The Faculty mentioned the many errors in the presentation of the facts by the magistrate.¹⁴¹

Schinckelius, former spokesman of the Faculty, was now considered as the traitor of the facultatory rights which he ought to have defended as regent. Dean Wiggers forbade Schinckelius to teach any longer.¹⁴² On Saint Jerome's Day 1633 the regents suspended Schinckelius by not renewing his seat in the Strict Faculty.¹⁴³ Drusius called Wiggers. The dean made clear that he had the right of judging upon the suitability of the candidates who had to be appointed by the city magistrates.¹⁴⁴ Who was not declared suitable, could not held an ordinary academic chair. Further, in an other document, probably also meant for abbot Drusius, the Faculty offered seven general reasons why continuation after resignation might never be evident and five more specific motives for the suspension of Schinckelius. They all concerned the scandalous actions in Brussels by Schinckelius who wanted to push through the appointment of Cobbelgiers and Schinckelius' attitude of *Einzelgänger* which threatened the concord in the

¹³⁶ ARB, Papers of State and Audience, 934.

¹³⁷ Cf. E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 635: article 148.

¹³⁸ RL, OUL, 401.

¹³⁹ E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 1, p. 635-636: article 150.

¹⁴⁰ RL, OUL, 407.

¹⁴¹ RL, OUL, 407.

¹⁴² RL, OUL, 415: Suspension decree, 24 September 1633.

¹⁴³ RL, OUL, 388, f° 24. At that time, this was a very drastic measure which in the period 1608 – 1730 was repeated only once when the Strict Faculty waited for some days to renew Gerard Van Werm because of some theses he had let defend shortly before Saint Jerome's Day in 1641, cf. L. CEYSSENS, *Sources relatives aux débuts du jansénisme et de l'antijansénisme, 1640-1643*, (Bibliothèque de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 32), Louvain, 1957, p. 198.

¹⁴⁴ RL, OUL, 388, f° 24v.

Strict Faculty.¹⁴⁵ The promise made by Schinckelius on 5 October to stop litigating about Cobbelgiers and not to interfere anymore in this dossier, brought no change.¹⁴⁶ Three days later Schinckelius sent a notary to the Faculty in order to ask for a copy of the *Acta Facultatis*.¹⁴⁷ One week later Schinckelius requested what was expected from him for having back his seat in the Strict Faculty.¹⁴⁸ Since an answer remained forthcoming, Schinckelius and the city magistrate complained together to the dean of the Faculty.¹⁴⁹ Schinckelius also asked the chancellor of Brabant, Ferdinand de Boisschot,¹⁵⁰ to summon the Faculty.¹⁵¹ The Faculty, effectively summoned by the Council of Brabant,¹⁵² delegated Ab Angelis to act in its name against Schinckelius.¹⁵³

Together with Ab Angelis, the Faculty sent Jansenius to Brussels once more to negotiate on the case Cobbelgiers-Schinckelius with Drusius, archbishop Boonen and Corselius, member of the Privy Council. Jansenius and Ab Angelis convinced Drusius of the irresponsible attitude of Schinckelius. Jansenius behaved that the dossier would be finished within a month.¹⁵⁴ It happened much earlier. On 29 October Jansenius came to an agreement with his former partner Schinckelius in presence of the archbishop and the abbot of Park Abbey. Within eight months Cobbelgiers had to take his licentiate's degree. In the meantime a deservitor would hold the ordinarian chair.¹⁵⁵ On 31 October Jansenius and Ab Angelis were back at Louvain. Two days later the suspended Schinckelius resumed his seat in the Strict Faculty.

¹⁴⁵ UL, OUL, 344: *Deductio rationum pro facultate theologica in causa suspensionis a regentia et legentia eximii domini Joanni Schinckelii*.

¹⁴⁶ RL, OUL, 388, f° 25v.

¹⁴⁷ RL, OUL, 388, f° 25v. Notary act: RL, OUL, 415.

¹⁴⁸ RL, OUL, 388, f° 27, 30rv: Faculty Council, 15 October 1633.

¹⁴⁹ RL, OUL, 415: Schinckelius and city magistrate to Faculty, 17 October 1633.

¹⁵⁰ From 1592 until 1611 Boisschot (+1649) was auditor-general and afterwards ambassador of the archdukes in London until 1615. By his return he was co-opted to the Privy Council and since November 1623 he seated at the the Council of State in Brussels. In October 1626 he was appointed chancellor of the Council of Brabant, cf. J. DELECOURT, *Boisschot, Ferdinand de*, in BN, t. 2, Brussels, 1868, col. 621-624.

¹⁵¹ RL, OUL, 415.

¹⁵² RL, OUL, 415: Council of Brabant to Faculty, not dated.

¹⁵³ UL, OUL, 344: Notary act, not dated. In the years 1640 Ab Angelis would find himself at the side of Schinckelius as spokesman of the first generation of anti-Jansenists, cf. L. CEYSSSENS, *Guillaume ab Angelis, antijanséniste de Louvain, 1583-1649*, in *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* 34 (1964) 69-106.

¹⁵⁴ RL, OUL, 415. J. ORCIBAL, *Jansénius inédit*, in *Augustiniana* 13 (1963) 226-264, p. 238-240: Jansenius to Wiggers, 28 October 1633.

¹⁵⁵ RL, OUL, 415.

It took five more years before the Faculty assigned to its former advocate Schinckelius an important commission. In November 1639 he was appointed for president in succession of the death Mercerus.¹⁵⁶ Schinckelius would never hold a royal chair in theology.

Conclusion

Undoubtedly Schinckelius must have had great theological and organizational qualities: he was responsible for the refutation of the work of de Dominis and frequently acted as a delegate of the University against the aspirations of the Jesuits. Both Schinckelius and Jansenius profiled themselves as ultramontane and as defenders of the academic privileges. In the anti-Jesuit campaign as well as in the ultramontane actions of the Faculty Schinckelius met Jansenius. An unlucky controversy around the appointment of Cobbelgiers placed both academics in opposition to one another. Probably here lies the source of Schinckelius' bitterness and hostility to the latter defenders of Jansenius' inheritance. After 1640 Schinckelius, former friend of Jansenius and opponent of the Jesuits, became one of the most outspoken anti-Jansenists who collaborated with the Jesuits during the last six years of his life.

TOON QUAGHEBEUR

¹⁵⁶ See Walter Stead, Art. "Sola scriptura" in *Dictionary of the Reformation*, eds. Klaus Gertner and Bruno Steiner, trans. Brian McNeil (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964) (based on the *German Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*).

¹⁵⁷ See Anthony N. S. Lane, "Sola Scriptura? Making Sense of a Post-Reformation Slogan", in Philip E. Barntown and David F. Wright, eds., *A Pathway into the Holy Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994) 29-37.

¹⁵⁸ See Walter Kasper, *Quod et Genesius* (Münster: Münster University Press, 1970) 179.

¹⁵⁹ *Super Evangelium S. Iohannis Lectura, Commentary on John 21*.

¹⁶⁰ Bernhard Lohse, *Luther's Theology* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968); Oswald Bayer, *Martin Luthers Theologie: Eine Vergegenwärtigung* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1970) 179.

¹⁵⁶ E. REUSENS, *Documents*, t. 3, p. 207.