

THE EARLIEST PHASE OF THE JANSENIST CONTROVERSY AMONG THE FLEMISH CAPUCHINS

p 2: Part II:

the cases of Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch and Fulgentius of Maaseik*

Abstract

The last and most thorough treatment of the Jansenist controversy among the Capuchins of the Flandro-Belgian Province was published in 1951/1957 by Hildebrand of Hooglede (O.F.M.Cap.). The present article, which consists of two parts and is based on a large selection of unedited or previously neglected documents, assesses Hildebrand's methodology and (some of his) conclusions.

The first part (which was published in the previous issue of this journal) showed that Hildebrand's account of the controversy depends to a high extent on the apologetic discourse that was used by one of the parties involved in the controversy and that is best illustrated by the *Compendiosa et historica enarratio miserrimi status Prouvinciae Flandro-Belgicae fratrum Minorum Capucinatorum* by Michael of Oudenbosch and Angelus of Antwerp (1700). In addition, it was shown that by using a purely formal definition of Jansenism, Hildebrand managed to deny the existence of any 'real' Jansenist among his predecessors of the 17th and 18th centuries. A detailed analysis of some works by Eugenius of Bruges (1680s) proved that the use of this purely formal definition has lead to historically untenable conclusions.

The article's second part now examines a claim by Silvester of Hasselt in his *Ad enarrationem compendiosam et historicam responsio fidelis et sincera* (1700), according to which Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch and especially Fulgentius of Maaseik were the first to propagate Jansenius' teaching within the Flandro-Belgian Province. It is shown against Hildebrand that the anti-Jansenist decree that was issued by Provincial Patricius of Hazebroek in 1668, had indeed been provoked by Fulgentius of Maaseik's theological course at Antwerp during the years 1665-1668. Just like his disciple Eugenius was to do in the 1680s, Fulgentius championed the doctrines presented in the *Augustinus*, the consequence being that Silvester of Hasselt and other anti-Jansenists, who were convinced that Jansenius' book was rightly condemned by Innocent X and Alexander VII, did have serious theological (and not only personal or political) motives for accusing him of having been a Jansenist heretic.

4. Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch

Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch was born Walram Loemel in 1609/1610 and took the habit in 1629. He was ordained priest in 1636 and died in the convent of Maastricht in 1688.¹¹⁰ According to the above quoted fragment from Silvester of Hasselt's *Ad enarrationem compendiosam et historicam responsio*, Augustinus was the first Jansenist in the Flandro-Belgian Province (see *Augustiniana* 61 [2011] pp. 172-173). This picture is confirmed by other sources, though it should be mentioned that, just like the text of Silvester, they all expound an anti-Jansenist point of view.

According to a document written in 1657 by the anti-Jansenist Franciscus Vlemincx and edited by L. Ceyssens after the publication of Hildebrand's account of the controversy, Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch had signed in 1654 a document *in fauorem doctrinae Jansenii* together with 300 other persons.¹¹¹ Through the Brussels Internuncio Girolamo Di Vecchi, the declaration of Vlemincx reached the Cardinal Secretary of State Giulio Rospigliosi, who subsequently ordered Di Vecchi to make the necessary inquiries about the persons mentioned in the document. According to Ceyssens, this investigation explains why Augustinus was expelled shortly after from the Spanish

* I thank Ernest Persoons, Toon Van Houdt, Michel Van Meerbeeck and Anthony Dupont for their comments on a first draft of this article. In what follows, the 10 volumes of the *De Kapucijnen in de Nederlanden en het prinsbisdom Luik* by Hildebrand of Hooglede (Antwerpen 1945-1956) will be referred to as Hildebrand I, II, III, etc.

¹¹⁰ See Hildebrand VII, pp. 98-99 (n° 578a).

¹¹¹ See Arch. Vat., *Nunziatura di Fiandra* 41, f. 443. Dutch translation: L. Ceyssens, *Jansenistische strubbelingen in Asse rond 1650-1660*, in: *Eigen schoon en de Brabander* 45 (1962) pp. 418-430. Latin edition: L. Ceyssens, *La fin de la première période du jansénisme. Sources des années 1654-1660. II. (1657-1660)* (Bibliothèque de l'Institut historique belge de Rome 13, Bruxelles-Rome 1965) p. 168 (n° 772): *Hac 3^a Septembris 1657, comparuit Franciscus Wingaerde, incola Ascanus, qui declarauit quod circiter a tribus annis post publicatam constitutionem Sanctissimi Domini Innocentii X contra doctrinam Cornelii Jansenii Episcopi Iprensensis quidam Pater Capucinus, nomine Augustinus, natus in Campinia in Maioratu Siluaeducensi, domi suae pernoctauerit et mane in ecclesia officium legerit et diu manserit in sacristia cum pastore dicti loci, D. Theodoro Hubraken, et quod ipse deponens interrogauerit dictum Patrem Augustinum ubi tandiu fuisset? Qui respondebat se occupatum fuisse in sacristia cum praedicto pastore et quod ibidem signare debuisset quandam chartam, in qua habebantur plures signaturae diuersarum personarum ascendentium bene ad trecentas personas, quae omnes signauerant in fauorem doctrinae Jansenii, paratae eam doctrinam defendere, sicut et ipse Pater asserebat quod paratus erat se igni tradere pro ueritate dictae doctrinae, et illam chartam hic a dicto Capucino signatam sibi seruabat pastor praedictus, quem ipse deponens scit semper stetisse pro defensione Jansenii.*

Low Countries.¹¹² Earlier, Hildebrand had related this expulsion with the fact that Augustinus had spread Pascal's *Provincial letters* among his friends.¹¹³ In this, Hildebrand was following Silvester of Hasselt, whose account tells us nonetheless much more concerning Augustinus' supposed Jansenist sympathies than Hildebrand does:

[...] eius [= Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort] nostrique aduersarij, quorum antesignanus fuit P. Augustinus Buscoducensis, qui sub annum 1656. infames istas litteras Prouinciales, erroribus Jansenianis scatentes, et postmodum a S. Sede damnatas, tanta partialitate distribuit tantumque strepitum causauit, ut ideo dicatur ex mandato Reuerendissimi tunc Domini Internuntij dimissus extra ditiones Regis Catholici; quamuis postea intercessione P. Constantini Bruxellensis¹¹⁴ sub emendationis promisso, licentia eiusdem Illustrissimi Domini Internuntij reuersus, nec tamen emendatus; utpote coram PP. Marcello Menenensi¹¹⁵ et Antonino Antuerpiensi¹¹⁶ non ueritus dicere (ut postea Mechliniae in pleno Definitorio repetijt et confessus est) quod haberet omnem suam notitiam et scientiam ac doctrinam de libertate et gratia ex Augustino Jansenii, libro toties haereseos conuicto et damnato; imo interrogatus de bullis Innocentij X. et Alexandri VII contra Jansenium editis, non ueritus illas, etsi absolutas, facere condicionales: interrogatus enim a P. Antonino Mechliniensis conuentus uicario ob rationes quomodo illas acceptet, respondit intrepide: 'Si uere habeantur illae propositiones in Jansenio et si uere in sensu ab ipso intento sint damnatae, illas [sc. bullas] accepto'; adeo suam fidem faciens conditionalem [...]. (f. 1')

Antoninus of Antwerp, who is mentioned twice in this quotation, tells us an almost identical story at the end of a long letter which he wrote in 1683 on some Jansenist propositions that had been spread by *lectores* who used the works of Laurentius Neesen for the preparation of their theological courses (*Doghmata ex plurimis aliqua quae manant per Prouinciam nostram ex libris R. D. Laurentij Neesen, qui non sine oppositione*¹¹⁷ *jam ab annis octo*¹¹⁸ *nobis praelecti fuerunt et*

¹¹² See L. Ceyssens, *Jansenistische strubbelingen* [n. 111] p. 430. See also L. Ceyssens, *De Capucijnen van en te Asse*, in: *Ascania* 9 (1966) pp. 36-41 (esp. p. 38).

¹¹³ See Hildebrand VI, p. 352.

¹¹⁴ See Hildebrand V, p. 66; VII, p. 194 (n° 1284).

¹¹⁵ See Hildebrand VII, p. 461 (n° 3278).

¹¹⁶ See Hildebrand VII, p. 76 (n° 423).

¹¹⁷ For the anti-Jansenist opposition against the works of Neesen, see Hildebrand VI, pp. 368, 372 and 387.

¹¹⁸ Neesen's first handbook (*Theologia moralis Christiana de actibus humanis*) appeared at Mechelen in 1675. See É. Amann, *Neesen Laurent* [n. 47] c. 61.

adhuc hodie praeleguntur, non obstante etiamnum eorum grauissima inhibitione):

Primus et causa totius mali V. P. Augustinus predicator et jubilarius Busceducensis. Iste ita feruet et excedit pro suo Jansenio, cui uacauit annis amplius .40., ut non uereatur dicere – ego audiui¹¹⁹ – quod omnem suam scientiam de gratia quam habet, debeat Jansenio. Et quod ex ipso didicerit quomodo debeat orare, antea dicit: ‘Non debebam orare pro gratia sufficiente, quia illam semper ad manum credebam.’ Hic bonus Pater ab annis .25. de mandato Illustrissimi Internuntij Bruxellis resedentis pulsus est extra terras Regis nostri Catholici. Ego uidi abeuntem. Alia ratio inueniri non poterat quam quod excesserat in lectione et distributione quarumdam infamium epistolarum aduersus PP. Jesuitas, quas deinde damnauit Alexander 7. ut scatentes erroribus Jansenianis. Annis aliquot post praefatus P. Augustinus intercessionem R. P. Guardiani¹²⁰ et hac lege ut se emendaret, permissus est redire. Sed emendatus in peius: nam deinde semper conatus fuit lectores (expertus loquor)¹²¹ trahere in suum spiritum et sensum. Et sic ante annos .20. V. P. Fulgentium Masecanum lectorem tunc Antuerpiae, cuius qualitates dignosci merentur. (ff. 5^v-6^r)

The facts related by Silvester and Antoninus are also attested to in *FN* (see *Augustiniana* 61 [2011] pp. 166-168). In this list, Augustinus’ confession that he adhered to the teaching of Jansenius, is linked with a quotation from a homily which he held in the neighbourhood of Mechelen on the feast of Saint Andrew in 1684. Unlike Saint Andrew, Augustinus is told to have said, he himself would not be able to keep up the Faith under torture, since he had not yet received the necessary *gratia efficax*. According to Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort, this declaration implied that Augustinus subscribed to the first of the five propositions condemned by Innocent X and Alexander VII. This was only natural, the accuser added, since Augustinus once affirmed that not only his knowledge about grace and free will, but also his religious zeal had been inspired by Jansenius’ *Augustinus*.¹²² Moreover, the Capuchin

¹¹⁹ Compare the fragment from *FN* that is quoted in n. 123.

¹²⁰ Viz. Constantinus of Brussels, who was Guardian of the convent in Brussels in 1658-1661 (see Hildebrand V, p. 66). The intervention of Constantinus is also mentioned in the previous fragment.

¹²¹ Antoninus was *Sacrae Theologiae lector* at Mechelen in 1667-1671: Hildebrand VIII, p. 534 (n° 43).

¹²² According to Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort, Augustinus’ position with regard to divine grace was also manifest in the following thesis regarding the difference between the Holy Virgin and a sinner (*FN*, cap. I [In materia de gratia et libero arbitrio], n° 27): P. August. Buscod. ‘Sola gratia distinguit inter Diuam Virginem et hominem pessimum.’ Hanc sustinuit P. August. Buscoduc. contra P. Norbertum

friar was said to have plainly uttered around 1680: *Ego sum Jansenista*.¹²³

Fulgentius' list of accusations also contains information regarding Augustinus' attitude towards the condemnation of the five propositions. According to the list, Augustinus declared in 1681 in Mechelen in the presence of his Guardian that he condemned the propositions *in sensu Pontificis*, but not *in sensu Jansenii*.¹²⁴ The difference between a condemnable and an orthodox meaning of the five propositions is also made in the following fragment on a certain Norbertus of Hasselt, who is said to have adhered to the position of Augustinus and the *doctores Louanienses*:¹²⁵

'P. Norbert. Hasselens. Antuerpiae. 'P. Augustinus Buscoducens. et doctores Louanienses intelligunt bene aliter propositiones Jansenij. Et ego quoad 2^{am} propositionem etiam illam non sic teneo. Imo Cardinalis De Bona dixit: Vtinam essent plures tales isti Jansenij in Ecclesia.' Haec a quadriennio dixit P. Francisco Buscoducensi, dum inter se loquerentur de doctrina damnata Jansenij, prout hic postea deposuit coram Diffinitione, sed R. P. Michael etiam pro tunc Prouincialis omnia fere excusauit.¹²⁶

Lyran. tanquam assertam a D. Guilielmo Huygens, addens sese aliquando praedicasse: 'quod si maximus peccator accepisset tantam gratiam quantam accepit B. Maria Deipara, [quod] esset aequae sanctus atque illa.' Satis conformiter ad sua principia de gratia (for Guilielmus Huygens, see R. Aubert, 2. Huygens (Guillaume), in: *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 25 [Paris 1995] cc. 487-488). According to FN, Augustinus also warned against exaggerated devotion towards the Holy Virgin. See FN, cap. VI (*De ueneratione sanctorum ac sacrarum imaginum*).

¹²³ See FN, cap. I (*In materia de gratia et libero arbitrio*), n° 30: P. August. Buscod. Extant apud me quatuor diuersorum litterae de hoc dicto. Praedicauit in festo S^{ti} Andreae 1684 in quodam pago Wallem prope Mechliniam haec uerba: 'S. Andreas debuit habuisse magnam gratiam ad spernenda ista tormenta. Si autem ego constitutus essem inter Turcas et subeundum esset martyrium, negarem fidem meam, quia mihi deest gratia efficax.' An hoc differat a 1^a. propositione Jansenij? Neque mirum. Dixit enim aliquando PP. Marcello Menenensi et Antonino Antuerpiensi 'quod omnem suam scientiam de gratia et libertate, imo et deuotionem haeserit ex Augustino Jansenij', prout ipsi sancte testantur. Quod amplius est, iam a quinque annis dixit disertè D. Du Thot consiliario regio Mechlin.: 'Ego sum Jansenista', prout iste mihi et P. Leonardo socio meo narrauit. [...]

¹²⁴ See FN, cap. V (*In materia decretorum ac bullarum necnon Baij ac Jansenij*), n° 2: P. Augustinus Buscoduc. Maechlin. 1682. Cum ille P. Felicissimo Antuerpiensi ibidem tunc Guardiano diceret 'sibi suisque sufficere quod suae sententiae non essent condemnatae', replicuit P. Felicissim. 5^a propositiones Jansenii satis aperte esse condemnatas in sensu authoris, ad quod respondit P. Augustin. 'se illas condemnare in sensu Pontificis'; numquam uere uoluit dicere se illas condemnare in sensu Jansenij.

¹²⁵ See Hildebrand VII, p. 506 (n° 3640).

¹²⁶ See FN, cap. V, n° 9.

The last sentence of this fragment also incriminates Michael of Oudenbosch, who was Provincial of the Flandro-Belgian Province during the years 1678-1681, 1684-1687 and 1690-1695,¹²⁷ and who was accused of fostering Jansenist sympathies at other places in *FN*.¹²⁸ The same insinuating association of Augustinus and Michael of Oudenbosch is made in two other fragments of *FN*. In a first fragment, Fulgentius accuses Augustinus of having received and spread Jansenist publications during his stay in the convent of Lier in 1674, when Michael was that very convent's Guardian.¹²⁹ Augustinus had used these publications for the preparation of some homilies he pronounced in the neighbouring nunnery of Nazareth:

*P. Augustin. Buscoduc. Lyrae ab 11 annis. Ille Pater habitans Lyrae sub moderno R. P. Prouinciali ibidem Guardiano saepius recepit Bruxellis fasciculos libellorum noui sensus, ut uocant, pro quibus tum per syndicam, tum per aliam deuotam dictam 'Domicella Thas' iubebat solui pecunias, dicens illos esse pro sorore sua, cum essent ut plurimum linguae Latinae. Illos porro libellos distribuebat pastoribus suae doctrinae sectarijs. Quin imo eosdem perlegebat uel ex eisdem praedicabat e cathedra ad monachas in Nazareth prope Lynam, prout quidam laicus mihi scripsit, qui haec eadem uidit et audiuit.*¹³⁰

According to a second fragment, Augustinus had claimed shortly before the compilation of *FN* that initially he had only few disciples among the Flemish Capuchins, but that their number had been increasing ever since and by the mid 1680s even included the entire *Definitorium* to the exception of one member,¹³¹ the latter probably being Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort, who belonged to the Provincial *Definitorium* from 1674 until 1687.¹³²

¹²⁷ See n. 45.

¹²⁸ See n. 45.

¹²⁹ See Hildebrand V, p. 105.

¹³⁰ See *FN*, cap. V, n° 8; Hildebrand VI, p. 367 n. 2. *FN* contains still other accusations at the address of Augustinus, which I have not taken into account here: cap. II (*De charitate et relatione operum in Deum*), n°s 13 and 14; cap. III (*De attritione et contritione atque confessione*), n°s 14, 15, 20 and 50; cap. IV (*De Summo Pontifice*), n° 15.

¹³¹ See *FN*, cap. I (*In materia de gratia et libero arbitrio*), n° 30 [see also n. 123]: [...] *Addebat etiam 'quod ab initio pauci fuerint suae doctrinae sectarij in nostra Prouincia, sed quod modo multi sunt, etiam tota Diffinitio, excepto uno.'*

¹³² See n. 42.

5. Fulgentius of Maaseik

Fulgentius of Maaseik (secular name: Petrus Vos) was born in 1627, took the habit in 1647 and died in Maaseik in 1705.¹³³ He was *philosophiae lector* in Antwerp during the years 1663-1665 and *Sacrae Theologiae lector* in the same city during the years 1665-1668.¹³⁴ According to Silvester of Hasselt's *Ad enarrationem compendiosam et historicam responsio*, Fulgentius had been strongly influenced by the thought of Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch, but it was mainly through Fulgentius' theological teaching that Jansenist views first spread throughout the Flandro-Belgian Province. This, in turn, had provoked the first anti-Jansenist actions of his peer and namesake of Nieuwpoort.¹³⁵ Moreover, at the end of his theological course in 1668, several friars had opposed his teaching in the convent of Brussels, the result being that the provincial *Definitorium* issued a decree that prohibited the teaching of several Jansenist propositions:

Tandem ille P. Augustinus inter alios ad suum sensum abduxit P. Fulgentium Moscanum, qui sub annum 1665 in conuentu nostro Antuerpiensi S. T. lector publice in scholis nostris prelegit et disseminauit dogmata eiusmodi noua et uisa non sana, quibus est turbata Prouincia, cuius mali principio obuiare conatus fuit P. Fulgentius Neoportanus, affectans manutenere Prouinciam in sua pristina constitutionum Apostolicarum sincera obseruantia. [...] Cum enim finito cursu theologico P. Fulgentij Moscani in conuentu nostro Bruxellensi anno 1668. contra doctrinam ab ipso traditam nonnulli sese opposuissent, Definitorium nostrum uidens ex doctrina eiusmodi Prouinciam turbari, debuit expresso decreto monere lectorem et studiosos, ut non docerent aut tenerent certos damnatos Jansenismos expressos in decreto quod incipit Propter justas causas. (f. 1^v)

In spite of all this, Fulgentius of Maaseik was reappointed *philosophiae lector* in 1668, a function he exercised in the convent

¹³³ See Hildebrand VII, p. 304 (n° 2114).

¹³⁴ See Hildebrand VIII, p. 534 (n° 40).

¹³⁵ The early lives of both Fulgentii ran almost parallel. Fulgentius of Maaseik (°1927) took the habit in 1647 and was *lector* in the years 1663-1670 (1663-1665 [philosophy, Antwerp]; 1665-1668 [theology, Antwerp]; 1668-1670 [philosophy, Ghent]). Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort (°1628) took the habit in 1651 and was *lector* in the years 1663-1669 (1663-1666 [philosophy, Mechelen]; 1666-1668 [theology, Ghent]; 1668-1669 [theology, Brussels]). See Hildebrand VII, pp. 304 (n° 2114) and 305 (n° 2118); VIII, p. 534 (n°s 40-41 and 45).

of Ghent until 1670.¹³⁶ At the end of this philosophical course, however, he was not appointed *Sacrae Theologiae lector*. Instead, he became Guardian of the convent at Hasselt,¹³⁷ where, according to a fragment in *FN*, he came into conflict with the convent's confessors because of his rigorist views on the sacrament of penance. As a consequence, Fulgentius was deposed at the Intermediate Chapter of 1671.¹³⁸

Other anti-Jansenist sources, such as the already mentioned *Dogmata ex plurimis aliqua quae manant per Prouinciam nostram ex libris R. D. Laurentij Neesen* by Antoninus of Antwerp (18 April 1683), offer a comparable sketch of Fulgentius and his role in the diffusion of Jansenist views throughout the Flandro-Belgian Province. To this sketch, Antoninus also adds a short list of Fulgentius of Maaseik's most zealous disciples: Franciscus of Weert, Eugenius of Bruges, Reginaldus of Oudenaarde and Hubertus of Sint-Truiden.¹³⁹

¹³⁶ See Hildebrand VIII, p. 534 (n° 45).

¹³⁷ See *FN*, cap. 3 (*De attritione et contritione atque confessione*), n° 28: *Exemplo sit P. Fulgentius Masecan., qui priuatus suo lectoratu secundo ab annis 14. ob suos excessus in materia doctrinae et honoris gratia factus Guardianus Hasseleti [...]*.

¹³⁸ See the continuation of the fragment quoted in the previous note: [...] *ibidem dixit coram fratribus 'quod ex mille confessionibus uix una ualeret et ex centum confessariis uix unus saluaretur.'* Vnde factum fuit quod confessarii nollent amplius excipere confessiones in illo conuentu et R.^{di} Pat. compulsi fuerint ipsum Capitulo intermedio subsequente deponere a Guardianatu. Sed modo habetur a nostris tamquam apostolus. Compare also Hildebrand V, p. 398; VI, 366; *Acta Capitularia (Archium Capucinatorum Belgii III, 1006, p. 651)*.

¹³⁹ See *Dogmata ex plurimis* etc. (in the file *Archium Generale O.F.M.Cap. G.22.13.2. Prou. Flandro-Belgica. De Jansenismo: propositiones edoctae, prouisiones superiorum. 1668-1717*), f. 6^r: *Nam deinde <Augustinus Buscoduncensis> semper conatus fuit lectores (expertus loquor) trahere in suum spiritum et sensum. Et sic ante annos .20. traxit V. P. Fulgentium Masecanum lectorem tunc Antuerpiae, cuius qualitates dignosci merentur. / V. P. iste Fulgentius est qui ante annos .16. publice in nostris scholis prelegit et uehementer inculcauit has doctrinas tam nouas, suspectas et male olentes. Adeo in istis excessit ut eius studio theologico jam absoluto et examine facto, RR. Patres debuerint monere et alios lectores per decretum, quod et ego accepi, ne teneant uel doceant uarios Jansenismos et baianismos ibi specificatos et per Pontifices saepius damnatos. / Discipuli uero huius lectoris magis feruentes et zelosi pro doctrina sui magistri sunt V. P. Franciscus Weertensis nunc Guardianus Masecae, P. Eugenius Brugiensis concionator (hic solebat pingere imagines Jansenij et dare extraneis; propter excessus in suis concionibus fuerunt saepius depositae quaerelae, etiam a PP. J. Societatis, contra quos, ut sibi et doctrinis suis maxime aduersarios, semper inuehitur, tantis passionibus ut ausus fuerit, occulto quidem nomine, illos describere ut Pelagianos in nupera sua quadragesima habita Louanij). Est et P. Reginaldus Aldenardensis (qui ita ardet pro istis doctrinis ut correspondentiam teneat per litteras cum famoso illo Arnaldo Gallo Jansenistarum principe et coriphæo; saepius fuit etiam per patres correctus, sed nihilo melior); item P. Hubertus Trudonensis. Compare also *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii I, 1374, pp. 1-2* and*

In a report on the situation in the Flandro-Belgian Province, which he submitted at the General Chapter of 1698 (*Status Prouincię Flandro-Belgicę, signanter quoad Capucinos etc. coram R. A. P. Generali ac Definitoribus Generalibus representatus per f. Juuenalem Ananiensem Exdefinitorum Generalem in Capitulo Generali a° 1698*), the Tyrolean Juvenalis of Nonsberg, who governed the Province as *Commissarius Generalis* during the years 1695-1697,¹⁴⁰ mentioned that Fulgentius was still among the living in 1698, albeit in a mentally deplorable state. He had been removed from the convent in Maastricht in 1696, since it was feared that he would take refuge in Holland or even commit suicide by drowning himself in a pit. All this had happened, according to Juvenalis, in punishment for the central role which Fulgentius had played together with his spiritual mentor Augustinus of 's Hertogenbosch in the spreading of Jansenist teachings among the Flemish Capuchins.¹⁴¹

5.1. The anti-Jansenist decree of 1668

The anti-Jansenist decree referred to by Silvester of Hasselt was issued in the convent of Brussels by the Provincial Patricius of Hazebroek and his entire *Definitorium* at the Intermediate Chapter of July 1668. It has been preserved in several documents, the most important being the *Acta Capitularia* of the Flandro-Belgian Province (*Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* III, 1006, pp. 636-637). Next to these *Acta*, there are copies in the *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* and the *Archium Generale O.F.M.Cap.* in Rome.¹⁴² The following edition of the decree

Hildebrand VI, p. 354, who only mention Franciscus of Weert, Eugenius of Bruges and Reginaldus of Oudenaarde as Fulgentius' major disciples.

¹⁴⁰ See Hildebrand VI, pp. 439-441.

¹⁴¹ See Hildebrand VI, pp. 440-441; *Status Prouincię Flandro-Belgicę etc.* (in: G.22.13.2 Prou. Flandro-Belgica. De Jansenismo: propositiones edoctae/prouisiones Superiorum. 1668-1717), f. 1^r: [...] inueni prouinciam istam [...] nunc a 36 annis circiter occasione quorundam placitorum doctrinalium Vniuersitatis Louaniensis per quemdam P. Augustinum Syluëducensem, deinde per alium Fulgentium Mosëcanum (qui ultimus ut lector ea docere inter Capucinos cepit) mirum in modum conuulsam, diuulsam ac in partes miserabiliter conscissam fuisse. Et signanter notandum est quod ille P. Fulgentius Mosëcanus, qui talia primo docuit, in hunc diem superstes, at fere ad delirium redactus, ne ad Hollandos fugeret, ut quidam suspicabantur, aut ex capitis perplexitate se in puteum præcipitaret, ut alij pie cauebant, a loco Trajectensi ante biennium mutari debuerit, quod in penam delicti euenisse credo.

¹⁴² See the documents referred at in nn. 156 and 160 as well as the second text discussed in §5.3. Next to these, see also the following document in *Archium Generale O.F.M.Cap.* G.22.13.2. Prou. Flandro-Belgica. De Jansenismo: propositiones edoctae,

is based on the *Acta Capitularia*, in which the decree is presented as the last decision taken at the Intermediate Chapter of July 1668 (pp. 633-637).

Postea propter iustas causas iudicarunt Reuerendi Patres expedire ut admonerentur Venerandi Patres lectores et studiosi nostri ne quis doceat uel teneat haec sequentia:

1. Quod ad peccandum uel bene agendum non requiratur libertas a necessitate, sed sufficiat a coactione in statu naturae lapsae, quia damnata est talis propositio ab Innocentio X. tamquam heretica¹⁴³. Hinc nemo doceat uel teneat quod homo necessario peccet uel necessario bonum agat, aut non possit dissentire gratiae Dei si uelit, aut non possit euitare peccatum si uelit, quia est expresse contra Tridentinum¹⁴⁴. Et recordentur quod similiter sequentes propositiones damnatae sint a Summis Pontificibus:
 - *Quod uoluntarie fit, etiamsi necessitate fiat, libere tamen fit*¹⁴⁵ et *Sola uiolentia repugnat hominis libertati naturali*¹⁴⁶.
 - *Interiori gratiae in statu naturae lapsae numquam resistitur*: ut heretica ab Innocentio X^o¹⁴⁷. Similiter haec ut falsa et heretica: *Semipelagiani in hoc erant heretici quod uellent eam gratiam* (scilicet necessariam ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei) *talem esse cui uoluntas humana posset resistere uel obtemperare*¹⁴⁸.
- Vnde patet esse secundum sanam doctrinam hominem posse gratiae Dei resistere uel obtemperare.¹⁴⁹

prouisiones superiorum. 1668-1717: Prouisiones factae a Superioribus Prouinciae Capucinatorum Flandro-Belgicae circa sequentes propositiones. anno. 1668.

¹⁴³ Cf. 3rd of the 5 propositions condemned in *Cum occasione* (Innocent X; 1653); H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2003. For the condemnation as heretica, see *Cum occasione*, censura, prop. 3 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2006).

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Sess. 6 *de iustificatione*, can. 4 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1554).

¹⁴⁵ 39th of the 79 propositions condemned in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (Pius V; 1567); H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1939.

¹⁴⁶ 66th proposition condemned in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1966.

¹⁴⁷ 2nd proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2002. For the condemnation as heretica, see *Cum occasione*, censura, prop. 2 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2006).

¹⁴⁸ 4th proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2004. For the condemnation as falsa et heretica, see *Cum occasione*, censura, prop. 4 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2006).

¹⁴⁹ The first prohibition regards the third proposition condemned in *Cum occasione* as well as the principles on which the latter proposition was based, viz. the doctrine of the *delectatio uictrix* and the identification of what is free with what is done voluntarily (see the synthesis in J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] cc. 490-491). In the wake of the third proposition of *Cum occasione*, five other propositions involving

- 2.° Nemo teneat hanc propositionem: *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata, similiter nec istam: et philosophorum uirtutes sunt uitia*, quia utraque est damnata; unde nec contorqueat ad alienos sensus¹⁵⁰.
- 3.° Non teneat aut doceat quis saltem in publico quod Pontificis iudicium fallibile sit extra concilium uniuersale.
- 4.° Nemo teneat seu doceat crude siue sine debita explicatione: 'Christus non est mortuus uel non fudit sanguinem pro omnibus hominibus', propter propositionem hanc damnatam ut falsam, temerariam et scandalosam, imo et balsphemam et hereticam: *Semipelagianum est dicere Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum esse aut sanguinem fudisse*.¹⁵¹
5. Nemo doceat uel teneat quod Deus positue uelit (et non solum negative) multos paruulos non fieri saluos et directe uelit exclusos et quod Deus ordinet causas secundas non libere agentes in interitum puerorum antequam sint baptisati, ad quorum interitum sequitur damnatio, et quidem quod Deus illud sic ordinet in illum finem ut impediat quo minus ad salutem necessaria perueniant.¹⁵²
- 6.° Tandem nullus dicat *aliqua Dei praecepta esse hominibus iustis uolentibus et conantibus secundum praesentes quas habent uires, impossibilia. Et deest quoque ipsis gratia qua possibilia fiant*¹⁵³, quia damnata fuit ab Innocentio decimo. Sic enim ait: *temerariam, impiam, blasphemam, anathemate damnatam et hereticam declaramus et ut talem damnamus*.¹⁵⁴

Ita factum de consilio et assensu Reuerendorum Patrum Diffinitorum Joannis Landensis, Constantini Bruxellensis, Felicissimi Duacensis et Francisci Bellioliensis. Subsignatum f. Patritius Minister Prouincialis indignus.¹⁵⁵

the same principles are prohibited as well (*homo necessario peccet* etc. and the propositions identified in the four preceding notes). All six propositions are condemned as being contradictory to the fourth canon of the sixth session of the Council of Trent. The first prohibition comprises these six propositions in all preserved copies of the decree, except in *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1374, p. 1, where the first prohibition has been split up into five separate prohibitions (the 4th proposition of *Cum occasione* has been eliminated from the version of the decree preserved in *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1374, p. 1), which together with the remaining five form a series of ten instead of six prohibitions. See also Hildebrand VI, p. 353 n. 1.

¹⁵⁰ 25th proposition condemned in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1925.

¹⁵¹ 5th proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2005. For the condemnation as *falsam, temerariam et scandalosam, imo et balsphemam et hereticam*, see *Cum occasione*, censura, prop. 5 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2006).

¹⁵² Compare Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 3, cap. 20. For more details, see n. 211 of this article.

¹⁵³ 1st proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2001.

¹⁵⁴ *Cum occasione*, censura, prop. 1 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2006).

¹⁵⁵ Patricius of Hazebroek led the Flandro-Belgian Province together with Joannes of Landen, Constantinus of Brussels, Felicissimus of Douai and Franciscus of Bailleul in the years 1666-1669. See Hildebrand VI, p. 561 (n° 45). All six prohibitions of

The version of the decree in the *Acta Capitularia* only focuses on the condemned propositions and does not mention the name of Fulgentius of Maaseik. This is not the case, however, in other copies of the decree, which explicitly link it with Fulgentius' teaching. The latter documents mostly date from the 1680s/1690s and aimed at proving that Jansenist teaching had been circulating among the Flemish Capuchins since more than a decade and that severe measures had to be taken in order to prevent their further spread: (a) According to *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1374, which dates from 1693¹⁵⁶ and offers an overview of several anti-Jansenist measures taken in the Flandro-Belgian Province, the provincial Definitors had discovered during the final exams of Fulgentius' *studium*, which took place in the convent of Brussels at the occasion of the Intermediate Chapter of 1668,¹⁵⁷ that some of the *lector*'s students adhered to suspected propositions.¹⁵⁸ The same document tells us that the decree was sent to all *lectores* of the Flandro-Belgian Province in order to avoid further troubles, but remained partially ineffective, since several of Fulgentius' disciples (Reginaldus of Oudenaarde, Eugenius of Bruges and Franciscus of Weert) continued to spread their teacher's beliefs from the pulpit.¹⁵⁹ (b) In a document from the

1668 were almost literally integrated in the more comprehensive anti-Jansenist decree that was issued on 22 January 1674 by Minister General Stephanus of Cesena during his visitation of the Flandro-Belgian Province (see nos 3/4 [prohibition 1], 9 [prohibition 2], 10 [prohibition 3], 8 [prohibition 4], 6 [prohibition 5] and 2 [prohibition 6]). For the decree of Stephanus, see Hildebrand VI, pp. 357-359. After 1674, Rome repeatedly insisted on the strict observance of Stephanus' decree: Hildebrand VI, pp. 382 (1682), 386-387 (1683), 392 + 394-396 (1685) and 398 + 412 (1686-1687). For Flemish resistance against the decree, see Hildebrand VI, pp. 382 (1682), 392-396 (1685) and 404-405 (1678).

¹⁵⁶ See *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1374, p. 2: [...] *Franciscus Weertensis Guardianus Traiecti hoc anno 1693 publice communicans cum Jansenistis* [...]. Franciscus of Weert was Guardian of the convent at Maastricht in 1692-1695 (see Hildebrand V, p. 382).

¹⁵⁷ Since candidates were in principle examined by the entire *Definitorium*, the exams often coincided with an official meeting of the provincial Definitors. See Hildebrand VIII, p. 524.

¹⁵⁸ Compare the title of the decree in *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1374, p. 1: *Decretum RR. Patrum Patritij Haesbruckani et Diffinitorum conditum Bruxellis 1668 in Capitulo intermedio ex certa notitia quam ibi acceperant per examen studij P. Fulgentij Masecani Theologij lectoris quorundam doctorum Louaniensium discipuli fidelis, contra excessus in materia doctrine*.

¹⁵⁹ The text of the decree is followed by the following words in *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1374, pp. 1-2: *Illud decretum sic factum missum fuit ad omnes Prouincię lectores et jussum obseruari, sed precipue studiosis istis, et ista conditione facti sunt concionatores, quorum principales fuerunt P^r Reginaldus Aldenardensis, qui, prout ex actis scriptis et concionibus constat, publice cum scandalo totius*

early 1680s, which I will edit below in section 5.3. and which presents the decree together with another important text from 1668, it is said that Fulgentius was interrogated by the provincial *Definitorium* immediately before the final exams of 1668 and that the *Definitorium* had been obliged to issue the decree, since Fulgentius manifestly adhered to Baianist, Jansenist and even Calvinist doctrines. However, in the opinion of the anonymous compiler of the document (Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort?), the *Definitorium* had been too compliant, the result being that the decree was not in proportion to the gravity of the problem posed by Fulgentius' teachings: *tunc ex obligatione officij et conscientia compulsi fuere condere decretum [...], quamquam in eo remissius egerint, cum aduersus huiusmodi proscriptos errores omni efficacia procedere oporteat nec dissimulare*. These words possibly refer to the fact that the decree had not explicitly mentioned Fulgentius' name, that no measures seem to have been taken against the *lector* personally and that some of the prohibitions had been formulated in a way that seemed to ask for further problems: 3.^o *Non teneat aut doceat quis saltem in publico quod [...]*, 4.^o *Nemo teneat seu doceat crude siue sine debita explanatione [...]*. (c) The two preserved copies of Silvester of Hasselt's *Ad enarrationem compendiosam et historicam responsio* (1700) are both provided with a long list of *probationes*, in which the decree is quoted in second place (*Litt. B*). Again, the quotation of the decree serves to illustrate the impact of Fulgentius' teaching on the minds of his fellow brothers.¹⁶⁰ In first place (*Litt. A*) are quoted the per-

prouincię Jansenistarum partem defendit ideoque per R. P. Arsenium de Fontibus Commissarium Generalem Bruxellis poena carceris fuit mulctatus, et P^r Eugenius Brugensis, qui per suos 5 libellos famosos a se compositos et editos declaratus est Romę apertus Jansenista. At illi nunc duo obierunt. Etiam M. V. P. Franciscus Weertensis Guardianus Traiecti hoc anno 1693 publice communicans cum Jansenistis et antimonachus, quod omnibus constat, et passim habetur pro uno ex primariis nostris nouatoribus. / Nota hic primo quam infecta ab illo anno 1668 fuerit prouincia, ut RR. PP., uidentes bullas Urbani 8, Innocentij X et Aleandri 7 iam non sufficere, coacti fuerint damnatas in Luthero, Caluino, Baio et Jansenio hereses et errores iterum et de nouo suis subditis strictissime prohibere. / Nota 2^o quod multi ex illis prefatis studiosis, sic admoniti et correcti, adut concionatores dispersi per prouinciam non se emendarint, sed sua preconcepta dogmata adeo feruenter disseminarint – non sine Superiorum contemptu et publico scandalo – ut R^mus P^r Stephanus a Cesena Generalis six annis post – nempe a^o 1674 uisitata tota prouincia et celebrato Capitulo – debuerit prouidere per rigorissimum decretum tenoris ut sequitur: [...]. Compare the document entitled *Dogmata ex plurimis aliqua quae manant per prouinciam nostram ex libris R. D. Laurentij Neesen etc.*, f. 6^r (quoted in n. 139).

¹⁶⁰ See the following documents in *Archium Generale O.F.M.Cap. G.22.13.2*. Prou. Flandro-Belgica. De Jansenismo: II^{us} et III^{us} recursus ad S. Sedem.

sonal testimonies of Felicissimus of Antwerp and Silvester himself, which state that Fulgentius personally upheld (most of) the propositions mentioned in the decree.¹⁶¹

According to Hildebrand, who aimed at minimizing the influence of Jansenist thought on the Flemish Capuchins, it is nowhere said that Fulgentius of Maaseik actually taught all propositions prohibited by the decree of 1668. In his view, the decree had only been issued at the occasion of the final exams of Fulgentius' *studium*.¹⁶² This claim, however, seems to overlook two important texts that, together with *FN* (5.2.), offer us a sketch of the *lector*'s teaching that corresponds in many aspects with the propositions prohibited by the decree: a list of 18 suspected *propositiones* ascribed to Fulgentius, each followed by an apologetic *responsio* by the *lector* himself (5.3.), and a sympathizing synthesis by Eugenius of Bruges of his master's teaching concerning divine grace (5.4.).

5.2. The testimony of Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort (*FN*)

Apart from the already mentioned statement about the *lector*'s rigorism with regard to the sacrament of penance,¹⁶³ all fragments regarding Fulgentius in *FN* concern the five propositions and the question of papal (in)fallibility. They stem from two sources: Fulgentius' *dictata theologica* and a so-called *Apologia pro doctrina*, which

1701-1702: *Ad enarrationem compendiosam et historicam responsio fidelis et sincera* etc. (version 1, f. 1^v; version 2, f. 1^v) and *Probationes contentorum in responsione ad compendiosam et historicam enarrationem* (version 1, f. 1^{rv}; version 2, f. 1^{rv}).

¹⁶¹ See *Probationes contentorum in responsione ad compendiosam et historicam enarrationem* (version 1, f. 1^r [basis of following text]; version 2, f. 1^r): *Ego infrascriptus attestor quod P. Paulus Teneramundanus praedicator Capucinus et quondam discipulus P. Fulgentij Mosecani S. T. lectoris (cuius doctrinae ille P. Paulus sese multum et diu opposuerat) mihi dixerit in mense Decembri anno 1683. quod iste P. Fulgentius omnes propositiones a RR. PP. Bruxellis 22. Julij anno 1668. prohibitas docuerit et tenuerit, excepta forte illa de paruulis, et quod maxime uenenum propinauerit explicando. Ita est. Erat signatum: f. Felicissimus Antuerpiensis Capucinus indignus. // Ego infrascriptus attestor quod P. Reginaldus Aldenardensis Prouinciae nostrae Flandro-Belgicae ff. Minorum Capucinator defunctus, quondam discipulus P. Fulgentij Mosaecani mihi Antuerpiae studenti circa annum 1681. dixerit quod praefatus P. Fulgentius docuerit plures propositiones a Superioribus nostris suppressis. Datum in conuentu Bruxellensi 17. Augusti 1700. Erat signatum: f. Siluester Hasselensis Minister Prouincialis Commissarius Generalis indignus.*

¹⁶² See Hildebrand VI, p. 353: 'Deze beslissing werd genomen ter gelegenheid van Fulgentius' onderwijs; doch nergens wordt gezegd, dat hij al deze veroordeelde leringen voorstond.'

¹⁶³ See n. 138.

must have counted several pages,¹⁶⁴ but has not been preserved to our knowledge.

According to a first fragment, Fulgentius of Maaseik sustained in his *dictata* that Jansenius' *Augustinus* had nothing in common with the 5 propositions ascribed to him by Alexander VII or, more precisely, that the bishop of Ypres did not understand the propositions *in sensu damnato*. Moreover, the *lector* is said to have adduced 5 passages from the *Augustinus* which contradicted the five propositions in the condemned sense, a strategy that had already been tried by Antoine Arnauld in his *Quinque propositiones ab Innocentio X damnatae et propositiones Jansenii Ypresensis Episcopi damnatis contrariae* (1654), which he published in reply to the *Cauilli Jansenianorum* of François Annat (1654).¹⁶⁵

*P. Fulgent. Masecan. in dictat. suis theologicis. Ostendit ibi 'quod Jansenius Ipresensis in sua doctrina nihil habeat commune cum 5^e propositionibus ipsi per Alexand. 7^{um} adscriptis et damnatis, nec eas intellexerit in sensu damnato.' Ad hoc probandum adducit 5^e. loca ex Jansenio quae uidentur contrarium dicere. P. Antonin. Antwerp. et P. Francisc. Buscoduc. dederunt in scriptis sese illa in dictatis ejus legisse. Sed numquid iste non est dicendus Jansenista?*¹⁶⁶

According to two other fragments, the *Apologia pro doctrina* stated that the five propositions had been erroneously ascribed to Jansenius¹⁶⁷ and that those attributed to Baius in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*

¹⁶⁴ See the title of FN, cap. IV (*De Summo Pontifice*), n° 2: *In Apolog. p. doctrina P. Fulgent. Masec. pag. 12. parag. notandum*. The fragment is quoted in its entirety at the end of this paragraph.

¹⁶⁵ See *Œuvres de Messire Antoine Arnauld* 19 (Paris 1778) p. 228-229; L. Cognet, *Le jansénisme* [n. 2] p. 64 (on Arnauld's writings of 1654 against Annat): 'En ce qui concerne la présence des propositions dans l'*Augustinus*, il établissait péremptoirement le fait déjà connu des spécialistes: seule la première s'y trouvait textuellement, à quelques mots près; les autres ne pouvaient, en toute hypothèse, être présentées que comme des résumés de la pensée de Jansénius. Arnauld s'efforce de montrer ensuite que la première proposition se trouve dans un contexte qui la rend entièrement orthodoxe [compare the position of Eugenius of Bruges described in the first part of this article], et que les passages allégués par le P. Annat pour attribuer à Jansénius les quatre autres correspondent entièrement à la doctrine de saint Augustin; en corollaire, il lui est facile de tirer du texte complexe de l'*Augustinus* cinq phrases, reproduites celles-là *ad uerbum*, nettement contraires aux propositions condamnées. D'où il concluait que, si le pape avait justement condamné les Cinq propositions au sens hérétique, ce sens n'était nullement celui de Jansénius [...].'

¹⁶⁶ See FN, cap. V (*In materia decretorum ac bullarum necnon Baij ac Jansenij*), n° 3.

¹⁶⁷ See FN, cap. V, n° 6: *Apolog. pro doctrina P. Fulgentij masecan. § notandum bene. 'Quinque propositiones famosae ordinarie imputatae Rdiss.^{mo} Corn. Jansenio*

(1567) were only heretical *in sensu Caluini ac Lutheri*. Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort concluded from this that his namesake of Maaseik did not accept the end of the latter bull, in which it was explicitly said that the propositions in question were condemned *in sensu ab authore seu authoribus intento*:

Ibidem [in the *Apologia pro doctrina*]. 'Recte prohibentur propositiones Baianae aut saltem Baio imputatae, sed in sensu Caluini ac Lutheri sumptae, qui liberum arbitrium quasi totaliter destruunt.' Sed damnatae sunt in sensu ab authore seu authoribus intento, uti habet bulla Pij 5.ⁱ in terminis.¹⁶⁸

The last sentence of this fragment, which was added by Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort as a comment on the quotation from the *Apologia pro doctrina*, refers to the famous ending of *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, which Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort clearly punctuated as most anti-Jansenists used to do, viz. with a comma after *possent* and not after *intento*: *Quas quidem sententias stricto coram nobis examine ponderatas, quamquam nonnullae aliquo pacto sustineri possent, in rigore et proprio uerborum sensu ab assertoribus intento haereticas, erroneas [...] damnamus.*¹⁶⁹

Whereas the above fragment on Alexander VII's mistake concerning the presence of the five propositions in the work of Jansenius implies that the Pope is fallible in questions of fact, two other fragments, one containing a quotation from the *dictata*, the other a sentence from the *Apologia pro doctrina*, go a step further. According to the former, the *dictata* explicitly affirmed the Pope's fallibility in questions of Faith and morals:

Idem ibidem [= in *dictatis theologicis*] *consequitur*. *Asseritur ibidem* 'Pontificis fallibilitas in materia fidei et morum, etiam quando loquitur ex cathedra.' *Ex quo ibi infertur*: 'Dato quod Pontifex ut talis damnet aliquam conclusionem tamquam haereticam uel dicat aliquem doctorem sensisse haereticæ, non sequitur certo conclusionem illam esse haereticam uel authorem istum haereticæ sensisse.'¹⁷⁰

Ipremsium Episcopo falsissime ipsi imputantur, ut ostendit et ad oculum demonstrat quidam liber Gallicus, cujus breuissimum compendium curiosi ueritatis amicis facile procurari et accommodari potest, si habere desiderent.' Ecce uti procurant, legunt, laudant atque distribuunt libros prohibitos, conscriptos in defensionem Jansenij.

¹⁶⁸ See FN, cap. V, n° 7.

¹⁶⁹ For this punctuation, that was preferred by anti-Jansenist authors, see H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1980 n. 1 as well as n. 237 of this article.

¹⁷⁰ See FN, cap. V, n° 4.

According to the second fragment, the *Apologia pro doctrina* claimed that Christ had promised the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit to the Church, but not to individual Popes, as is shown by the fact that several of them had been heretics:

In Apolog. p. doctrina P. Fulgent. Masec. pag. 12. parag. notandum. 'Dominus Jesus Christus infallibilem Spiritus s.^{ti} assistentiam promisit Ecclesiae, contra quam portae inferi non praeualebunt, non autem Pontificibus singulis, cum aliquos ex illis constet fuisse haereticos.' Allegat autem auctoritatem doctorum aliquot Louaniensium ac Parisiensium necnon Gersonis.¹⁷¹ Sed si bene legisset iste apologista controuersias Syluij¹⁷², aliter deberet sentire et loqui.¹⁷³

We may thus conclude that, according to *FN*, the *dictata* as well as the *Apologia pro doctrina* did not restrict their denial of papal infallibility to questions of historical facts alone.¹⁷⁴ This would imply that Fulgentius subscribed to the position that was prohibited by the third prohibition of the decree of 1668. With regard to prohibitions 1, 4 and 6, which all concerned propositions condemned by *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (1567) and *Cum occasione* (1653), *FN* suggests that Fulgentius accepted the condemnation of these propositions, without however admitting that they had been condemned in the sense of Baius or Jansenius.

¹⁷¹ For Gerson and the conciliarist tradition, see F. Oakley, *The conciliarist tradition. Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church 1300-1870* (Oxford 2003) pp. 60-110.

¹⁷² Reference to the *Libri VI de praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controuersiis cum nostris haereticis* (1638) of the Douai theologian Franciscus Syluius (1581-1649) and, more precisely, to lib. IV, quaest. II, art. 8, where Syluius advocates the Popes's infallibility in matters of Faith *siue cum generali concilio, siue sine illo*: [...] *fide certa est Romani Pontificis iudicium in rebus fidei determinandis esse infallibile, ita ut quando ex cathedra definit, siue quando ut Pontifex proponit Ecclesiae quidpiam fide credendum, nullo casu possit errare, siue cum generali concilio definiat, siue sine illo* (quoted according to *Operum F. Syluii* [...] *tomus quintus* [Anuerpiae 1714] p. 313). It should be noted that the works of Syluius had been recommended to the *lectores* at the Provincial Chapter of May 1677. Compare Hildebrand VI, p. 368; *Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 1399; III, 1006, p. 688: *Quoniam autem plerique petiuerunt nominari aliquos theologos quos legere et in praxi tuto sequi poterunt, aestimant Reuerendissimi Patres Diffinitionis tales esse sanctos Patres, Summam diui Thomae, Resolutiones et Commentaria Syluii in Summam diui Thomae, Siluestrum, Wiggers, Nauarrum, Bonacinum, Binsfeldium cum annotationibus Syluii, quamuis nec damnemus nec censuremus alios.*

¹⁷³ See *FN*, cap. IV (*De summo pontifice*), n° 2.

¹⁷⁴ Against Hildebrand VI, p. 353 n. 3, who claims – precisely with regard to the two fragments quoted above: *FN*, cap. IV, n° 2 and cap. V, n° 4 – that Fulgentius of Maaseik only rejected papal infallibility *in factis historicis*: 'Er zal wel sprake zijn van de onfeilbaarheid "in factis historicis".'

5.3. *The list of 18 propositiones and responsiones*

Two documents preserved in the file *Archivum Generale O.F.M.Cap. G.22.13.2. Prou. Flandro-Belgica. De Jansenismo: propositiones edoctae, prouisiones Superiorum. 1668-1717* contain a list of 18 suspected *propositiones* that are ascribed to Fulgentius of Maaseik and of which each is followed by an apologetic *responsio* by the *lector* himself. According to the title of one of both documents, Fulgentius had been presented with the 18 *propositiones* just before the final exam of his *studium* at the convent of Brussels in 1668: *Propositiones seu doctrinae quas V. P. Fulgentius Masecanus Sacrae Theologiæ lector a 16 annis tradidit suis discipulis, eiusdem responsiones ad singulas dum illae ipsi exhiberentur a RR. PP. Prouinciali et Diffinitoribus immediate ante examen sui studij Bruxellis*. In both documents, the list is part of a larger whole that was compiled with anti-Jansenist intentions during the 1680s. This, however, does not alter the fact that the list itself – and especially the series of *responsiones* – allows us to have a close look at some of Fulgentius' thoughts.

A first document (*Q*) was compiled in Rome after 2 September 1683, when the *Specimina moralis Christianae et moralis diabolicae* of the Bogard *lector* Gilles Gabrielis¹⁷⁵ were condemned for the second time ([...] *cuius liber dictus Specimina moralis Christianae et diabolicae [...] bis hic Romae est damnatus [...]*).¹⁷⁶ The document counts 4 pages written by a single hand and sheds further light on the circumstances in which the list of 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* came into being, as well as on its relation with the *Apologia pro doctrina* mentioned in *FN*. In the following edition, the list itself has been skipped, since it will be edited below on the basis of the second document, which pays much more attention to the content of the *propositiones* and *responsiones* than the first.

In nomine Domini. Amen.

Propositiones partim edoctae, partim dictae a religiosis nostrae Prouinciae Capucinorum Flandro-Belgicae, quae causa fuere dissensionum,urbationum et scandalorum eorum quae modo adhuc in eadem perseuerant.

¹⁷⁵ See L. Ceysens, *Gilles Gabrielis à Rome (1679-1683). Épisode de la lutte entre rigorisme et laxisme*, in: *Antonianum* 34 (1959) pp. 73-110; *Gabrielis (Gilles)*, in: *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques* 19 (Paris 1981) cc. 580-582.

¹⁷⁶ See J. M. De Bujanda, *Index librorum prohibitorum* [n. 65] pp. 366-367.

Praecipuus uero horum author fuit P. Augustinus Buscoducensis, qui ob suas exorbitantias in materia doctrinae aliquando a D. Internuntio Apostolico fuit ablegatus e ditionibus Regis Catholici (de quo uaria assignabimus suis respectue locis specimina) quique infecit P. Fulgentium Maseicanum lectorem eiusque studiosos, contra quos hae sequentes propositiones ad Diffinitionem Prouincialem anno .1668. delatae fuerunt et ab eadem datae, ad quas respondit prout ad singulas patebit ex subunctis.

[...] ¹⁷⁷

Occasione huius doctrinae et contra ipsam ediderunt RR. PP. Prouincialis et Diffinitores decretum .21. Julij ¹⁷⁸. 1668. quod incipit: *Propter justas causas* etc. Sed nec lector, nec discipuli eius destitire a suis praeconceptis dogmatibus, sed clamauerunt illa esse Louaniensium et ab iisdem approbari. Imo uero confecerunt Apologiam pro defensione suae causae et doctrinae, in qua pagina I.^a haec uerba habentur: 'R. P. Patritius tunc Prouincialis tradidit illico P. Fulgentio Masecano cartam in duas compilatam columnas, quarum una continebat puncta ipsius doctrinae tanquam intollerandae et haereticae accusatoria, altera reservata erat pro ipsius defensorio responso. Hanc autem ut accepit, Venerabilem P. Gabrielis PP. Bogardorum Bruxellis insignissimum et fundatissimum lectorem adiit ac desuper consultauit. Qui candide confessus est 18. illas accusatorias obiectiones – demptis calumnijs – esse ipsissimam nudam et crudam rei theologicae ueritatem, quam ante ingressum religionis ipsemet per aliquot annos continuos Louanij ex ore doctorum ac lectione bonorum authorum perceperat, ac idcirco pro tali agnoscendam, sustinendam ac defendendam esse, licet duriuscule ab aduersa parte expressam. Iuxta huius aliorumque uirorum consilium fecit P. Fulgentius Masecanus, ut ex ipsius totidem patet responsis.'

Vbi notandum I^o. quod ille et illi aestimauerint semper, laudauerint et consultauerint praefatum P. Gabrielis aliosque eiusdem farinae et doctrinae, uirum nimirum cuius liber dictus *Specimina moralis Christianae et diabolicae* (quem tanti fecerunt et commendarunt) bis hic Romae est damnatus. Notandum .2^o. quod P. Fulgentius Masecanus illum super propositionibus sibi obiectis consultauerit, antequam ad singulas respondisset et ex illis quatuor ¹⁷⁹ negasset, et quod ille responderit illas esse ipsissimam nudam et crudam rei theologicae ueritatem etc., et quod deponit suas responsiones formauerit iuxta huius aliorumque consilium. Vnde patet quod illas sic docuerit prout jacebant, ¹⁸⁰ et quod de istorum consilio aliquas negauerit, alias uero exposuerit ad euadendam inuidiam propositionum erronearum aut damnatarum. Imo P. Paulus Teneramundanus, qui fuit ex eodem studio, adhuc

¹⁷⁷ The list of 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* has been skipped here.

¹⁷⁸ Junij Q (cf. n. 239).

¹⁷⁹ quatur Q.

¹⁸⁰ It is not clear to me how the sentence *patet quod illas sic docuerit prout jacebant* naturally follows from what preceeds (as it is suggested by the relative adverb *unde*).

pridem dixit P. Felicissimo Antuerpiensi quod easdem propositiones docuisset, prout erant ei obiectae, nisi forsan excipiendo illam de paruulis.¹⁸¹

The above edition allows us to reconstruct in greater detail what happened in Brussels during the Intermediate Chapter of 1668. When Fulgentius of Maaseik was accused of having acquainted his students with some dubious teachings of Jansenius, the Provincial Patricius of Hazebroek immediately presented a sheet of paper to his *lector*, on which the latter had to write down a reply to the 18 suspected propositions that were ascribed to him. Fulgentius did this, however, only after having consulted Gilles Gabrielis, a Bogard *lector* who was often accused of fostering rigorist and Jansenist sympathies.¹⁸² The latter claimed that, apart from a few calumnies, the 18 propositions reflected, albeit in a rather harsh wording, the perfectly orthodox teaching he had received at the University of Louvain. This claim, it is said, inspired Fulgentius' reply and we will see below that his *responsiones* indeed rejected a few propositions as slanderous, but accepted most of them as orthodox (whether or not in a modified version). It was for this reason that Patricius of Hazebroek and his Definitors issued the six prohibitions which I have edited above. The *Apologia pro doctrina* was compiled by Fulgentius and his disciples only after these measures had been taken.

The second document containing the 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* counts 8 pages and has been written by a single hand, to the exception of the last two lines, which have been added by a second writer, who declares that he had handed over the list of propositions and replies to the Austrian Definitor General Ildefonsus of Carlshoven, when the latter visited the Flandro-Belgian Province as *Commissarius Generalis* in June-September 1682 (*Propositiones hasce omnes cum earundem refutationibus tradidi R. A. P. Ildefonso*).¹⁸³ The document consists of the following three sections:

* pp. 1-5: the list of 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* (title: *Propositiones seu doctrinae quas V. P. Fulgentius Masecanus Sacrae Theologiae lector a 16 annis tradidit suis discipulis, eiusdem responsiones ad singulas dum illae ipsi exhiberentur a RR. PP. Prouinciali et Diffinitoribus immediate ante examen sui studii Bruxellis*).

¹⁸¹ For this testimony of Paulus of Dendermonde and Felicissimus of Antwerp as its mediator, see the first quotation in n. 161.

¹⁸² See L. Ceyskens, *Gilles Gabrielis à Rome* [n. 175]; *Gabrielis (Gilles)* [n. 175].

¹⁸³ For the visitation by Ildefonsus, see Hildebrand VI, pp. 379-383.

* pp. 5-7: four considerations concerning the list of propositions and replies by the anonymous anti-Jansenist compiler of the whole document: *Ecce propositiones et responsiones P. Fulgentij Masecani, super quibus (cum eas exscripserim precise pro ut habeo in transumpto ad me misso) nota primo [...]. Nota 2° [...]. Nota 3° [...]. Nota 4° [...].*

* pp. 7-8: a copy of the decree of 1668: *Decretum quod RR. PP. Prouincialis et Diffinitores fecerunt 21 Julij 1668 contra prefatas doctrinas et explicationes V. P. Fulgentij Masecani.*

The text written by the first hand ends in the formula *Actum Bruxellis in Capitulo intermedio de consensu RR. PP. Diffinitorum 21 Julij 1668 / Erat subscriptum / f. Patritius Minister Prouincialis indignus*, which has led a Roman archivist to conclude that the tripartite document was compiled during the provincialate of Patricius of Hazebroek (3 September 1666-13 September 1669).¹⁸⁴ This conclusion, however, is contradicted by the title of the first section, which says that Fulgentius of Maaseik taught the listed propositions *a 16 annis*. Since Fulgentius was *Sacrae Theologiae lector* from 1665 until 1668,¹⁸⁵ the whole consisting of three sections must have been produced in the years 1681-1684, when a compiler linked the list and the decree of 1668 by means of four reflexions on the list's content. The compiler must have been an anti-Jansenist (Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort?), since his reflections on the *propositiones* and *responsiones* heavily criticize Fulgentius' views as 'Calvinist, or Jansenist, or at least Baianist' (*fere omnes illas propositiones sapere uel Caluinismum, uel Jansenismum, uel ad minus Baianismum*) and present the decree of 1668 as a justified reaction against Fulgentius' views (*aliquas etiam aperte contrariari Concilio Tridentino, qua propter etiam RR. PP. tunc ex obligatione officij et conscientia compulsi fuere condere decretum quod infra*). If all this is correct, the closing formula at the end of the document (*Actum Bruxellis [...] f. Patritius Minister Prouincialis indignus*) only relates to the third section (the decree) and not to the whole, which seems to be confirmed by the fact that other copies of the decree of 1668 end in the same formula.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ For these dates, see Hildebrand VI, p. 561 (n° 45). In the right upper corner of p. 1, a later hand has dated the whole document to 21 June 1668. This suggestion was taken over by the historian Fredegandus of Antwerp in his handwritten notes that are preserved in *Archium Capucinarum Belgii* III, 1068, sectio VI.15.192, p. 14v: 'Ms. latin non paginé de 8 pages – copie – signée par le P. Patrice min. Prov. – Fut soumis au Visit. gén. P. Ildephonse.' (my italics)

¹⁸⁵ See n. 134.

¹⁸⁶ Compare the above edition of the decree on the basis of the *Acta Capitularia* as well as some of the witnesses of the decree mentioned in n. 142.

In the following edition of the second document containing the 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* (R),¹⁸⁷ I have adapted the punctuation to modern standards (except in the case of the long quotation from *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* in *Nota 4°* [see n. 237]). The footnotes do not aim at exhaustivity, but only offer a first contextualization of parts of the document. They may suffice, however, to demonstrate the high extent to which Fulgentius' views depended on the teaching of Augustine as it was interpreted by Jansenius.

Jesus

Propositiones seu doctrinae quas V. P. Fulgentius Masecanus Sacrae Theologiæ lector a 16 annis tradidit suis discipulis, eiusdem responsiones ad singulas dum illae ipsi exhiberentur a RR. PP. Prouinciali et Diffinitoribus immediate ante examen sui studij Bruxellis.

1a propositio. Liberum est quod aduertente ratione a uoluntate uel ad imperium uoluntatis incoacte fit coinciditque cum uoluntario perfecto, quod est illud quod fit a principio intrinseco cum perfecta cognitione finis¹⁸⁸. Itaque nulla indifferentia requiritur qua homo hic et nunc stantibus iisdem prærequisitis possit non peccare, ad hoc ut libere peccet¹⁸⁹, sed satis est quod aduertat deliberate se malum facere, licet hic et nunc non possit aliter facere. **Responsio.** Liberum est etc. Hanc liberi definitionem, quæ Louaniensium est, existimo esse bonam. Itaque non requiritur illa philosophica indifferentia, qua homo qui peccat sic est indifferens ut stantibus omnibus prærequisitis possit non peccare, id est laudabiliter peccatum euitare, actualiter et in sensu composito,

¹⁸⁷ The first document containing the list of *propositiones* and *responsiones* (Q) offers a rather corrupted version of the text. Some interesting variant readings are: *prop. 3* sola³] uiolentia *add. Q* | *prop. 5* actionis] uirtuosae *add. Q* | *prop. 8* sanctificante] justificante *Q* | *prop. 10* saluare] liberare et *praem. Q* | *resp. 10* medium] remedium *Q* | dicere] et quod oppositum non nisi imprudens iudicabit *add. Q* | *prop. 14* parum] parui *Q*

¹⁸⁸ Fulgentius has integrated the Thomistic concept of the *uoluntarium perfectum* (I^a-II^aae q. 6 a. 2 co.: [...] *ad rationem uoluntarii requiritur quod principium actus sit intra cum aliqua cognitione finis. Est autem duplex cognitio finis, perfecta scilicet et imperfecta. Perfecta quidem finis cognitio est quando non solum apprehenditur res quae est finis sed etiam cognoscitur ratio finis et proportio eius quod ordinatur ad finem ipsum. Et talis cognitio finis competit soli rationali naturae. [...] Perfectam igitur cognitionem finis sequitur uoluntarium secundum rationem perfectam, prout scilicet apprehenso fine aliquis potest, deliberans de fine et de his quae sunt ad finem, moueri in finem uel non moueri*) in a Jansenist denial of the Molinist *libertas indifferentiae*.

¹⁸⁹ Rejection of the Molinist claim *Illud agens liberum dicitur quod, positis omnibus requisitis ad agendum, potest agere et non agere* (see R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Prédestination*, in: *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 12.2 [Paris 1935] cc. 2809-3022 [esp. cc. 2968-2969]). Compare also Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 7, cap. 11 (*Error pelagianus est requiri ad libertatem indifferentiam ad bonum et malum*).

ad hoc ut libere peccet (sic ut aliquando uerum sit dicere: 'Homo peccat et positus omnibus pręrequisitis non peccat'), sed non tantum satis est, uerum etiam aliquando superfluum quod aduertat deliberate se malum facere formaliter (id est ut aduertat ad¹⁹⁰ malitiam actus), licet hic et nunc non possit peccatum laudabiliter euitare in sensu composito, ita scilicet ut aliquando fiat quod sic euitet.

2a propositio. Verba Concilij Tridentini quibus ad propositum dicit quod hominis arbitrium cooperetur assentiendo Deo excitanti et possit dissentire si uelit¹⁹¹, non sunt sic accipienda quasi homo posset stante influxu gratię efficacis dissentire, sed hoc modo, scilicet quod eandem gratiam, postmodum interueniente tentatione diabolica aut concupiscentia ualidiore insurgente, abijcere possit.

Resp. Verba Concilij Tridentini etc. non sunt sic accipienda quasi homo posset stante influxu gratię efficacis dissentire actualiter et in sensu composito, uidelicet respectu illius effectus ad quem proxime ex Dei intentione datur (sic ut uerum sit aliquando dicere: 'Stat influxus gratię efficacis et homo non operatur bonum'), sed hoc modo, scilicet quod eandem gratiam, postmodum interueniente tentatione diabolica aut concupiscentia ualidiore insurgente, abijcere possit actualiter et in sensu composito, id est ut sepe fiat quod illam abijciat.¹⁹²

¹⁹⁰ ad ad R

¹⁹¹ Cf. Sess. 6 de iustificatione, can. 4 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1554).

¹⁹² Note the structural parallel between *resp.* 1 and 2. It is stressed that the freedom of the human will is not abolished by the fact that a sinner necessarily sins when he sins (*resp.* 1) and that God's efficient grace never fails to produce the effect for which it has been given (*resp.* 2). For the distinction between *posse in sensu diuiso* and *posse in sensu composito*, on which both *responsiones* are based, see J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] cc. 426-427; P. Sellier, *Pascal et Saint Augustin (Bibliothèque de l'évolution de l'humanité 12, Paris 1995 [= 1970])* p. 332. For *prop.* and *resp.* 2, see especially Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 8, cap. 4 (*Conciliatio gratiae Christi quam Augustinus docuit, cum libero arbitrio iuxta principia scholasticorum*): *Et ipsa Scriptura sacra de renato ex Deo loquens*: Qui natus est ex Deo peccatum non facit &c. et non potest peccare [1 John 3:9]. *Sicut ergo in sensu composito uerae sunt huiusmodi phrases quibus uoluntas acta per diuinam gratiam dicitur non posse resistere Deo, non posse dissentire ab eo quod per eam uult operari Deus, non posse declinari, non posse superari, ita e contrario in sensu diuiso uerae sunt quibus dicitur posse declinari, posse superari, posse dissentire. Eodem igitur modo locus Concilij Tridentini quo dicit quod liberum arbitrium à Deo motum & excitatum possit dissentire si uelit [Sess. 6 de iustificatione, can. 4; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1554], itemque quod inspirationem recipiens illam & abijcere potest [Sess. 6 de iustificatione, cap. 5; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1525], non difficulter ab eis & a nobis solui potest. Concilium enim in sensu diuiso, inquit, loquitur, quo significatur ita hominem recipere Dei inspirationem & motionem & excitationem istius delectationis aut praedeterminationis (addo, si libet, etiam actuale ipsius uoluntatis consensionem ac motum) ut nihil auferat ejus uoluntati potestatem dissentendi, si uelit, quamuis actualis dissensus cum illis pręsuppositis componi nequeat. Potestas enim dissentendi non repugnat isti excitationi aut delectationi aut praedeterminationi aut ipsi etiam consensui actuali uoluntatis, sed tantum dissensus actualis; quemadmodum cum paries albus uere dicitur esse posse niger, non hoc significatur quod albedine permanente simul in eo nigredo reperiri possit, sed quod simul cum albedine sit in eo potentia ut fiat niger.*

3a prop. *Condemnatio horum duorum articulorum a tribus Pontificibus*¹⁹³: *Quod uoluntarie fit, etiamsi necessitate fiat, libere tamen fit*¹⁹⁴, item: *Sola uiolentia repugnat libertati hominis naturali*¹⁹⁵, nihil contra præallegatam liberi coincidentis cum uoluntario perfecto definitionem, cum probabilius sit quod prima sententia, pro ut in bulla damnatur, accipienda sit uniuersaliter (ut sensus sit: 'Omne quod uoluntarie etc.'), sed negata indifferentia ad oppositum¹⁹⁶; datur ad saluationem bullę manifesta instantia in pueris, item in motibus uoluntatis primo primis etc.¹⁹⁷ Quantum ad secundam: *Sola uiolentia* etc., non sola, sed et indeliberatio repugnat libertati¹⁹⁸.

¹⁹³ Pius V: *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (1567; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n^{os} 1901-1980); Gregory XIII: *Prouisionis Nostrae* (1579); Urbanus VIII: *In eminenti* (1642).

¹⁹⁴ 39th of the 79 propositions condemned in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (Pius V; 1567); H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n^o 1939.

¹⁹⁵ 66th proposition condemned in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n^o 1966.

¹⁹⁶ In *prop.* and *resp.* 1 and 2, Fulgentius rejects the Molinist conviction that human freedom implies an *indifferentia* that makes man capable at any moment to chose autonomously whether he will perform a (bad/good) act or not. The *indifferentia* referred to in *prop.* 3, on the other hand, is a kind of indifference that was also recognized by Jansenius. It was the latter's conviction that post-lapsarian man was subject to a struggle between two opposite delectations – a *delectatio coelestis* and a *delectatio terrena* – and that he *necessarily* consented at any moment with the delectation that currently had the upper hand. For Jansenius, this necessity did not exclude human liberty, for it implied that the human will was not determined by blind, deterministic mechanisms. This conviction is expressed in Jansenius' *indifferentia* concept: 'La liberté humaine actuelle n'est que l'exemption d'une nécessité volontaire immuable. Durant toute notre vie, il y a conflit entre les deux délectations qui peuvent successivement triompher, suivant la prédominance de l'une ou de l'autre, dans la volonté qui consent toujours et nécessairement à la délectation la plus forte; par suite, la volonté de l'homme ici-bas n'est point fixée et confirmée dans un état, comme celle des bienheureux dans le bien et celle des damnés dans le mal. Elle peut changer, ou, plus exactement, elle peut être changée. En cela consiste son indifférence et cela est la condition suffisante pour qu'il puisse mériter ou démeriter.' (J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] c. 487) Fulgentius subscribes to the papal condemnation of the proposition *Quod uoluntarie fit, etiamsi necessitate fiat, libere tamen fit*, if the proposition is applied to every act of the will (*prima sententia, pro ut in bulla damnatur, accipienda sit uniuersaliter* [...]) and simultaneously presupposes the denial of the *indifferentia* that has just been described ([...] *sed negata indifferentia ad oppositum*). In that case, the human freedom spoken of by the proposition (*libere tamen fit*) would be reconcilable with a blind, deterministic necessity that does not involve the *indifferentia* that Jansenius saw as a sufficient condition for post-lapsarian man to merit or demerit.

¹⁹⁷ If the 39th proposition of *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* is given a universal meaning ([...] *ut sensus sit: 'Omne quod uoluntarie etc.'*), the proposition implies that even acts of the will that are not accompanied by a *perfecta cognitione finis* (e.g. acts of little children or the indeliberate movements of the will [*motus uoluntatis primo primi*]) are free. Fulgentius rejects the proposition, if it is interpreted in this universal sense, and thus sees no contradiction between the proposition's condemnation in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* and his own definition of the *liberum* in *prop.* and *resp.* 1.

¹⁹⁸ Compare Fulgentius' interpretation of the condemned meaning of both propositions with Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 6, cap. 36 (*Explicantur propositiones*

Resp. Explicationes horum duorum articulorum non uidentur mihi incongruę. Notant hic aliqui doctores in bulla Baiana propositiones multas non aliqua speciali censura esse censuratas, seu tamquam hereticas aut scandalosas aut piarum aurium offensus etc. nec posse omnes ut hereticas condemnari, cum aliquę ex ijs habeantur apud S. Augustinum.

4a prop. Damnatio huius articuli omnem huius quęstionis altercationem tollens¹⁹⁹, ut quondam aiebat Innocentius X contra Jansenium: *Ad merendum et demerendum in statu nature lapsę non requiritur in homine libertas a necessitate, sed sufficit libertas a coactione, parum curatur*²⁰⁰.

Resp. Damnatio huius articuli: *Ad merendum uel demerendum* etc. multum curatur et aliud calomniöse dicitur.

5a prop. Scripturę illę Deuteronomij: *Mandatum quod ego præcipio tibi hodie, non est supra te, sed iuxta te, ut facias illud*²⁰¹, item: *Testes inuoco cęlum et terram, quod proposuerim uobis uitam et mortem; elige ut uiuas*²⁰², non aliud fere continent quam exhortationes et incitamenta ad bonum et auocamenta a malo. Quibus ut locus sit, non est necesse quod homo possit idem facere et omittere stantibus ijsdem pręrequisitis, sed satis est quod actionis²⁰³ ęque capax sit, cum gratia Dei, ac uitiosę. Quo posito non est inutile eum moneri et increpari, cum hę admonitiones sepe proxime uel remote suppeditent ea quibus tam ad bonum exercendum quam a malo abstinendum indiget.

6a prop. Scriptura illa de Eccli 15: *Reliquit Deus hominem in manu consilij sui; ante eum uita et mors, bonum et malum; quod uoluerit, dabitur illi*²⁰⁴, de homine solum ante lapsum intelligenda est.

Resp. ad 5 et 6 propositionem. Explicationes scripturarum Deuteronomij et Ecclesiastici non uidentur mihi etiam incongruę. Pro posteriori citatur D. Thomas, S. Augustinus et Louanienses.²⁰⁵

ex bulla Pij quinti: Quod uoluntarie fit etc. et Sola uiolentia etc.): Constat enim huiusmodi improuisos uoluntatis motus esse uoluntarios & sine uiolentia ex uoluntate fluere, nec tamen etjam illo sensu esse liberos. Deest illis quippe id quod præcipuum est, quia non sunt in hominis potestate, non sumus eorum Domini, fiunt sine plena rationis aduertentia, profluunt inuita repugnanteque uoluntate; quae singula essentialiter repugnant libertati. Amplius ergo sine dubio requiritur, quam esse uoluntarium & sine uiolentia, ut sit liberum. Hoc Pontifices stabilire uoluerunt, ne tales spontanei necessarij motus liberi putarentur [...].

¹⁹⁹ tollentis R

²⁰⁰ 3rd of the 5 propositions condemned in *Cum occasione* (Innocent X; 1653);

H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2003.

²⁰¹ Deut. 30:11 and 14.

²⁰² Deut. 30:19.

²⁰³ Actionis standing for *actionis bonae*. Cf. *infra* (Nota primo aliquas mendas esse commissas [...]). See also n. 187.

²⁰⁴ Eccli. 15:14 and 18.

²⁰⁵ Augustine and Thomas did not restrict Eccli. 15:14 and 18 to Adam's state *ante lapsum*. Compare, e.g., Aug., *gr. et lib. arb.* 2, 3, where the verses are quoted as biblical proof for the existence of human free will in general. The exegesis proposed

7a *Justi non habent auxilium gratiæ semper ad manum, qua dici possint, si uoluerint, in iustitia perseuerare; et Deus iuste ipsis potest rogantibus pro maiori auxilio in ualida tentatione exurgente denegare et subtrahere gratiam, qua negata et subtracta necessario, uere tamen peccant.*

Resp. Existimo quod omnes *justi non habeant auxilium gratiæ semper ad manum, qua dici possint, si uoluerint, in iustitia perseuerare actualiter* (sic ut ipsum perseuerare dependeat ex mero beneplacito ipsorum liberi arbitrii cum gratia perfecte sufficienti, quæ illis semper adest et quam possunt reddere efficacem, dum uolunt). Ad 2am partem: quod Deus iuste possit ipsis rogantibus, remitte et non sicut oportet, pro maiori auxilio in ualida tentatione exurgente denegare gratiam efficacem, qua negata ineuitabiliter, uere tamen peccabunt.

8a prop. Verba Concilij Tridentini (quæ contraria huic assertioni uidentur, dum ait: *Si quis dixerit iustificatum uel sine speciali auxilio Dei in accepta iustitia perseuerare posse uel cum eo non posse, anathema sit*²⁰⁶): *Deus namque semel sua gratia iustificatos non deserit, nisi primo deseratur*²⁰⁷, hoc

by Fulgentius was defended, however, in the pseudo-Augustinian *Hypomnesticon*: *Quid est autem, Et reliquit illum in manu consilii sui, nisi: Dimisit eum in possibilitate liberi arbitrii sui? In manu enim possibilitas intellegitur. Ipsa est prima gratia, qua primus homo stare potuisset, si seruare Domini mandata uoluisset. Hac ergo per inoboedientiam desolatus, Deo iudice iusto, factus est serpenti, id est diabolo, cui maluit oboedire quam Deo, captiuus* (Responsio 3, 2; J. E. Chisholm, *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians*. I [Paradosis 20, Fribourg 1967] pp. 155-156 and II [Paradosis 21, Fribourg 1980] pp. 119-120, ll. 30-35). It is also implied in Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 9, cap. 25: [...] *non esse jam liberum arbitrium in eo statu in quo, quando condebatur ab auctore suo, institutum fuit [...]. Nam quamuis uerissimum sit aequum esse ut creaturae rationalis felicitas & infelicitas, bonum ac malum ab ipsius proprio arbitrio suspendatur & ante eum posita uita & morte, bono & malo, quod placuerit ei detur illi, postquam jam tamen in manu consilii sui positus alterutrius partis electionem semel fecit, non est aequum ut in istam iterum boni ac mali indifferentiam reuocetur, sed potius ut istius electionis bonitatem aut malitiam praemium aut supplicium consequatur. Nam hoc est ipsissimum illud quod scriptura tangit, dum dicit: quod placuerit ei dabitur illi, uita scilicet, aut mors, bonum aut malum, quibus nihil aliud significatur quam praemium aut poena istius electionis quam manus consilii in quo homo ab initio constitutus est, propria sua libertate fecit. Est autem proprium praemium electionis bonae & malae ut arbitrium in eo quod sibi delegit utrimque firmetur atque hoc ei stabiliter diligendum detur quod sibi diligendum eligendumque iudicauit. It should be noted that the exegesis of Eccli. 15:14 and 18 proposed by Fulgentius is explicitly rejected in the *Theologia uniuersa ad usum Sacrae Theologiae candidatorum* of the Capuchin friar Thomas a Charnes (originally published in 1751): *Eccli 15. Deus ab initio constituit hominem, et reliquit illum in manu consilii sui [...] Eo loci, uera exprimitur libertas a necessitate, etiam simplici et uoluntaria; atqui hic locus non debet restringi ad Adam ante lapsum, ut restringitur a Caluino [...]* (quoted from the Augsburg edition of 1780, vol. 4, p. 79).*

²⁰⁶ Sess. 6 de iustificatione, can. 22 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1572).

²⁰⁷ Sess. 6 de iustificatione, cap. 11 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1537).

sensu accipienda sunt, scilicet quod Deus neminem priuet sua gratia sanctificante et habituali, nisi homo prius peccarit; ex quo non conuincitur quod Deus non possit prius gratiam suam actualement subtrahere, qua subtracta homo necessario peccat, Deum derelinquit et gratia justificante priuatur.

Resp. Explicatio uerborum Concilij Tridentini: *Si quis* etc. non uidetur mihi omnino incongrua, licet forte melior explicatio dari possit.

9a prop. Ista ab Innocentio damnata opinio predictæ²⁰⁸ conformis: *Aliqua Dei præcepta hominibus iustis uolentibus et conantibus secundum præsentis quas habent uires, sunt impossibilia: deest quoque ipsis gratia qua possibilia fiant*²⁰⁹, ad instar prioris nihili fit.

Resp. Ista ab Innocentio damnata etc. *Aliqua Dei præcepta* etc. ad instar prioris magni fit et ab alijs calumnia nobis infertur.

10a Verba illa D. Augustini quibus ait: *Multos paruulorum non fieri saluos, non quia ipsi nolunt, sed quia Deus non uult*²¹⁰, in sensu positiuo, non negativo sunt accipienda, ac si dicat: 'Multos paruulorum perire, non quia ipsi (quippe incapaces) uoluerunt libere perire, sed quia Deus ipsos positue et directe uult exclusos, ordinans ad eum finem sic causas secundas, ut impediunt quo minus ad salutis necessaria perueniant.'²¹¹ Vnde uerba illa: *Christus*

²⁰⁸ See *prop.* and *resp.* 4.

²⁰⁹ 1st proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2001.

²¹⁰ Cf. *ep.* 217 (*ad Vitalem*), 6, 19.

²¹¹ In *ep.* 217, 6, 19, Augustine rejects the use of 1 Tim. 2:4 (*Deus omnes homines uult saluos fieri*) as an argument in favour of the claim that 'all human beings would receive grace if those to whom it is not given would not reject it by their own will.' This claim is mistaken, Augustine says, since children 'who do not have a will opposed to it', also die without baptism, even when 'their parents desire it and hasten to it'. Reason why they do not receive grace, is not that they would reject it by their own will if it were given to them, but simply that God does not want to give it to them: *Quo modo dicitur omnes homines eam fuisse accepturos, si non illi quibus non datur, eam sua uoluntate respuerent, quoniam Deus uult omnes homines saluos fieri, cum multis non detur paruulis et sine illa plerique moriantur, qui non habent contrariam uoluntatem, et aliquando cupientibus festinantibusque parentibus, ministris quoque uolentibus ac paratis, Deo nolente non detur, cum repente, antequam detur, expirat, pro quo, ut acciperet, currebatur? Vnde manifestum est eos qui huic resistunt tam perspicuae ueritati, non intellegere omnino qua locutione sit dictum quod omnes homines uult Deus saluos fieri, cum tam multi salui non fiant, non quia ipsi, sed quia Deus non uult, quod sine ulla caligine manifestatur in paruulis.* According to Jansenius in a chapter on the right interpretation of 1 Tim. 2:4, Augustine claims in *ep.* 217, 6, 19 (and other passages) not only that God does not have the will to save all children, but also that He does not want to save certain children in spite of the efforts of their parents to bring them to baptism and this because He has excluded them from the Kingdom: *Haec igitur considerans Augustinus non solum negat habere Deum istam omnium paruulorum saluandorum uoluntatem, sed etiam saepius exsertis uerbis docet, hominibus uolentibus quosdam paruulos saluos facere, nolle Deum ut salui fiant, quos iusto iudicio à regni sui felicitate secluit* (Augustinus, tom. 3, lib. 3,

*pro omnibus mortuus est*²¹² etc. *Deus uult omnes homines saluos fieri*²¹³ hoc aut simili modo intelligenda sunt: *pro omnibus*, id est pro aliquibus ex omni genere hominum, uel *pro omnibus*, id est pro omnibus qui salui fiunt, uel rursus *pro omnibus*, id est quantum ad sufficientiam sitam in eo quod mors in se tanti ualoris sit quod pro omnibus omnino saluandis satis esset, si fuisset omnibus applicata uel per eam omnes uoluisset saluare²¹⁴; quæ interpretationes an non repugnent huic damnato ab Innocentio articulo: *Semipelagianum esse dicere Christum pro omnibus hominibus mortuum esse aut sanguinem fudisse*²¹⁵, prudens iudicet.

Resp. Existimo posse dici quod pueri morientes sine baptismo non habeant proprie medium sufficiens ad salutem (1) et quod Deus ordinet causas 2^{as} non libere agentes in interitum puerorum, antequam sint baptisati, ad quorum interitum sequitur damnatio propter peccatum originale.

Explicationes hae²¹⁶ uerborum S. Scripturæ existimo quod non tantum prudentes, sed etiam uiri sancti iudicent non esse incongruas aut repugnare huic damnatæ ab Innocentio X.: *Semipelagianum est dicere*.

11a prop. Gratia status naturæ integræ a statu naturæ lapsæ in eo distinguitur quod illa dabat posse, nostra autem absolute semper facere, adeoque omnis gratia nostra est efficax, nec est admittenda diuisio gratiæ in sufficientem et efficacem pro moderno statu²¹⁷.

Resp. Gratia status naturæ lapsæ uidetur mihi quod sit semper efficax ad eum finem ad quem proxime datur ex Dei intentione, licet non sit semper efficax ad eum finem ad quem ex natura sua tendit²¹⁸; nec admittendum puto pro

cap. 20). Compare the paraphrase by J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] c. 398: '[...] Dieu ne veut pas à la lettre sauver tous les hommes. Saint Augustin dit même que Dieu ne veut pas sauver certains enfants, malgré les efforts des hommes qui voudraient les sauver et cela, parce que, par un juste jugement, il les a exclus positivement de son royaume.' (my italics) Following Jansenius, Fulgentius interprets ep. 217, 6, 19 as implying that God has positively excluded certain new born children from His Kingdom.

²¹² 2 Cor. 5:15.

²¹³ 1 Tim. 2:4.

²¹⁴ For these interpretations, see Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 3, capp. 20-21 (*Exponitur locus Apostoli: Deus omnes homines uult saluos fieri etc. + Quomodo Christus sit redemptor omnium, pro omnibus crucifixus & mortuus*); J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] cc. 397-399; L. Cognet, *Le jansénisme* [n. 2] pp. 55-56.

²¹⁵ 5th proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2005.

²¹⁶ *Has* would have been preferable. Cf. *infra* (*Nota primo aliquas mendas esse commissas [...]*).

²¹⁷ See Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 3, cap. 1 (*Tangitur natura adiutorii sufficientis & ostenditur nullum dari post lapsum quin simul efficax sit. Hoc enim repugnat multis principiis Augustini & Ecclesiae*).

²¹⁸ Compare A. Arnauld, *Vera S. Thomae de gratia sufficiente et efficaci doctrina dilucide explanata*, art. 23, n° 5, in: *Œuvres de Messire Antoine Arnauld* 20 (Paris 1778) p. 74: *Etsi auxilium omne Dei mouentis semper efficax sit alicujus*

moderno statu diuisionem gratiæ in sufficientem et efficacem (sufficientem scilicet complete et perfecte, qua scilicet liberum arbitrium sic expeditum est, ut ex mero ipsius arbitrio pendeat quod actus ponatur uel non).

12a prop. Verba illa Actorum (et similia, tum Veteris tum Noui Testamenti) quibus S. Stephanus aiebat Judæis: *Dura ceruice et incircumcisis cordibus uos semper Spiritui sancto resistitis*²¹⁹, item illa Prouerbiorum: *Vocaui et renuistis, extendi manum meam et non fuit qui aspiceret*²²⁰, tantum de externa uocatione externisque gratiæ oblationibus sunt accipienda.

Resp. Verba Actorum etc. possunt etiam de internis gratiæ oblationibus intelligi.

13a prop. Per illa uerba Isaiæ 5 ubi conqueritur Dominus dicens: *Quid est quod debui ultra facere uineę mee et non feci? An quod exspectaui ut faceret uuas, fecit autem labruscas?*²²¹ solum uult Deus quod tam multa beneficia, item signa externa populo suo²²² exhibuisset, tam patienter ipsos sustinuisset et longanimitate cum eis processisset, ut humano modo loquendi nihil amplius quis facere posse uideatur, ut quis animum alicuius sibi rebellem lucraretur; non quod reuera Deus uelit quod omnia necessaria absolute eis subministrasset quibus bonum facere et instar optime uineę in dulces fructus pullularet iustitię.²²³

Resp. Ad uerba Isaiæ non habeo quod contradicam illorum explicationi.

14a prop. Damnatio huius articuli ab Innocentio X: *Interiori gratiæ in statu naturę lapsę numquam resistitur*²²⁴, per quam omnis in contrarium suspicio funditus sublata apparet, parum momenti reputatur.

Resp. Damnatio huius articuli etc. magni momenti reputatur.

effectus, ejus nempe ad quem efficiendum diuina uoluntate destinatur, ut fatentur omnes S. Thomæ discipuli; ei tamen interdum resistitur, respectu alterius effectus ad quem ex natura sua refertur. Vt cum peccatorem Deus ad pie uiuendum excitat, efficit quidem semper illa gratia ut secundum mensuram donationis Christi aliquam habeat ille peccator pie uiuendi uoluntatem, qua ratione gratia illa efficax est. Sed non semper tanta est illa uoluntas, etiam per gratiam inspirata, ut resistentem sibi peccati delectationem superet & ad piam uitam peccatorem reipsa perducatur, qua ratione illi resistitur.

²¹⁹ Acts 7:51.

²²⁰ Prov. 1:24.

²²¹ Is. 5:4.

²²² The Jews.

²²³ Fulgentius rejects the exegesis of Is. 5:4 according to which God gave to the Jews everything that is necessary for conversion. For, if God had given them everything that is necessary for conversion, they would also have received the grace that infallibly brings about conversion. For this reason, Fulgentius proposes an alternative interpretation, according to which God's claim in Is. 5:4 is considered a hyperbole: God just wanted to say that He did so much for the Jews that, speaking in human terms, nobody seems to be able to do more in order to win over a reluctant mind.

²²⁴ 2nd proposition condemned in *Cum occasione*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2002.

15a prop. *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata; nec contrariatur huic damnatę propositioni: Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata et uirtutes philosophorum sunt uitia*²²⁵.

16a prop. Quia salua manet bulla in bonis uolitionibus et desiderijs quę ante conuersionem Spiritus²²⁶ infidelibus immittere solet.

Resp. ad 15. et 16. prop. Existimo quod omnia opera perfecte infidelium sint peccata, quia non referuntur in Deum, ad quem omnia opera ex p̄cepto referri debent; per perfecte infideles intelligo illos qui nondum diuinitus incipiunt illuminari²²⁷.

17a prop. Pontificis iudicium non solum in ijs quę sunt facti, sed et alias extra concilium generale est fallibile.

Resp. Pontificis iudicium in ijs quę sunt facti, existimo esse fallibile; in ijs quę sunt iuris, extra concilium generale, dum ex cathedra loquitur, teneo esse infallibile, licet hoc non uideatur esse de fide²²⁸.

18a prop. Indulgentię non uidentur prodesse nisi ijs qui parati sunt, quantum in ipsis est, diuinę iustitię satisfacere, cum non appareat nisi amor proprius, qui non est modus conueniens relaxationem obtinendi.

Resp. Indulgentię etiam prosunt ijs qui parati non sunt, quantum in ipsis est, diuinę iustitię satisfacere, licet Altisiodorensis, Paludanus et Caietanus apud Estium teneant contrarium²²⁹. Existimo tamen illos non tam amplas indulgentias lucrari quam istos qui parati sunt, quantum in ipsis est, diuinę iustitię satisfacere.

²²⁵ 25th proposition condemned in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1925.

²²⁶ *Spiritus sanctus*. Cf. *infra* (Nota primo aliquas mendas esse commissas [...]).

²²⁷ See n. 268.

²²⁸ The addition *licet hoc non uideatur esse de fide* may be compared with the words *saltem in publico* in prohibition 3 of the decree of 1668: *Non teneat aut doceat quis saltem in publico quod Pontificis iudicium fallibile sit extra concilium uniuersale*. Both Fulgentius and the decree express their adhesion to the doctrine of papal infallibility in questions of Faith and morals, but avoid presenting it as a dogma. Compare also the opinion formulated by Arsenius of Fuentes at the end of his visitation of the Flandro-Belgian Province (Hildebrand VI, p. 412).

²²⁹ See Willem Hesselszoon van Est, *In quartum librum Sententiarum commentaria*. Tomus IV (Parisiis 1638 [first edition: 1615]) p. 292: *Porro praeter haec nonnulli putant indulgentiarum thesaurum nec illis prodesse qui quamuis in gratia constituti, negligunt tamen per seipsos satisfacere, sed iis duntaxat qui solliciti sunt ut integre in hac uita satisfaciunt pro peccatis, atque ob id aut imponi sibi petunt satisfactiones condignas, aut saltem eas sponte assumunt, easdemque implere curant. Caeterum qui quam minimam petunt sibi poenitentiam imponi, & praeter eam, quam minimam esse sciunt, non curant amplius de satisfaciendo, sed magis post hanc uitam contenti sunt luere in purgatorio, existimantes sibi sufficere, si euadant infernum: non esse cur tales sperent sibi per indulgentias subueniendum. Ita sentit & docet Caietanus tract. 10. de suscipientibus indulgentias, post Altisiodorensem & Paludanum.*

Ecce propositiones et responsiones P. Fulgentij Masecani, super quibus (cum eas exscripserim precise pro ut habeo in transumpto ad me misso) nota primo aliquas mendas esse commissas uel primo scribendo uel in transcribendo. Propositione enim 5 desiderari uidetur absolute li *bona*, ut sensus sit: *sed satis est quod actionis bonę eque capax sit, cum gratia Dei, ac uitiosę*. Item propositione 8: *nisi primo deseratur*; sic habet textus Concilij: *nisi ab eis prius deseratur*²³⁰. Item in responsione ad quęstionem seu propositionem 10: li *explicationes hę uerborum* debet ad constructionem sic uerti: *explicationes has uerborum*. Item in 16 propositione: ad li *Spiritus* addendum uidetur *sanctus*, u.g. *Spiritus sanctus*.

Nota 2° P. Fulgentium non nisi tres propositiones absolute negare, reliquas uero explicare seu potius torquere iuxta suam opinionem et sola sua existimatione seu electione ductus, dicendo fere ubique: 'mihi uidetur', 'existimo', aut quid simile, et non nisi semel allegando D. Thomam, bis terue D. Augustinum, et subinde suos DD. Louanienses, qui licet ipsum plurimi faciant atque extollant tamquam unum e præcipuis suis inter Capucinos sectarijs, consulti tamen a R. P. Joanne Landensi²³¹ super prædictis propositionibus ac responsionibus responderunt illas nimis esse crudas nec sese ita audere docere. Cum autem omnes istę propositiones uel ex eius dictatis uel saltem doctrina in schola tradita fuerint extractę et (uti quidem arbitror) a P. Paulo Tenere-mundano (qui fere solus inter studiosos illis aduersabatur)²³², credendum est illas a P. Fulgentio fuisse traditas pro ut iacent,²³³ et non pro ut ab ipso fuerunt negatę uel explicatę, quia alioquin tantummodo debuisset RR. Patri-bus exhibere sua dictata ad sui purgationem et ex ijs demonstrare oppositam doctrinam. Absit uero ut hoc faceret; quinimo, postea dicere non est ueritus doctores Louanienses non eo modo fuisse locutos de suis propositionibus ac responsionibus quo R. P. Joannes eos referebat locutos.

Nota 3° fere omnes illas propositiones sapere uel Caluinismum, uel Janse-nismum, uel ad minus Baianismum; aliquas etiam aperte contrariari Concilio Tridentino, qua propter etiam RR. PP. tunc ex obligatione officij et consci-entia compulsi fuere condere decretum quod infra subiungetur, quamquam in eo remissius egerint, cum aduersus huiusmodi proscriptos errores omni effi-cacia procedere oporteat nec dissimulare, eo quod experientia a seculis constet talibus imbutos uel numquam uel rarissime huiusmodi decreta curare et a cęptis suis erroribus respiscere et resilire, sed e contra illos uel negare, uel

²³⁰ *Sess. 6 de iustificatione*, cap. 11 (H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1537).

²³¹ For Joannes of Landen, see n. 44.

²³² For the testimony of Paulus of Dendermonde, see n. 161.

²³³ Compare the words *patet quod illas sic docuerit prout jacebant* in the first document containing the 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* (see n. 180). Apparently, it had not been possible for Patricius and his Definitors to consult Fulgentius' *dictata* themselves.

defendere, uel subdole et ambigue explicare aut interpretari, et interim alijs instillare, pro ut et hic a nostris factitatum fuit.

Nota 4° P. Fulgentium impegissem tum in bullam Pij 5., Gregorij 13. atque Urbani 8. contra Baium²³⁴, tum in bullam Alexandri 7ⁱ contra Jansenium²³⁵, in quarum prima hæc formaliter habentur: *quas quidem sententias stricto coram nobis examine ponderatas, quamquam nonnullæ aliquo pacto sustineri possent, in rigore et proprio uerborum sensu ab assertoribus intento, hereticas, erroneas, suspectas, temerarias, scandalosas, et in pias aures offensionem immittentes*²³⁶, respectiue, ac quæcumque super ijs uerbo, scriptoque emissa, presentium autoritate damnamus, circumscribimus, et abolemus; deque eisdem et similibus posthæc quoquo pacto loquendi, scribendi, et disputandi facultatem quibuscumque interdiciamus. Qui secus fecerint, ipsos omnibus dignitatibus, gradibus, honoribus, beneficijs, et officijs perpetuo priuamus, ac etiam inhabiles ad quæcumque decernimus. Vinculo quoque anathematis eo ipso innodamus, a quo nullus Romano Pontifice inferior ualeat eos, excepto mortis articulo, liberare²³⁷. Hæc habet bulla a B. Pio 5 primo emanata et a Gregorio 13 postea ac tandem ab Urbano 8 confirmata ac renouata. Bulla autem Alexandri 7ⁱ contra librum Cornelij Jansenij, qui Augustinus intitulatur, sic habet in fine: *ac eundem librum sepe dicti Cornelij Jansenij, cui titulus Augustinus, omnesque alios tam manu scriptos quam typis editos et si quos forsan imposterum edi contigerit, in quibus eius Cornelij Jansenij doctrina ut supra damnata defenditur uel astringitur, uel defendetur uel astringitur, damnamus itidem atque prohibemus, mandantes omnibus Christi fidelibus ne predictam doctrinam teneant, predicent, doceant, uerbo uel scripto exponant uel interpretentur, publice uel priuatim, palam uel occulte imprimant, sub penis et censuris contra hereticos in iure expressis ipso facto absque alia declaratione incurrendis*²³⁸. Sic bulla Alexandri 7.ⁱ

²³⁴ Pius V: *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (1567; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n°s 1901-1980); Gregory XIII: *Prouisionis Nostræ* (1579); Urbanus VIII: *In eminenti* (1642).

²³⁵ Alexander VII: *Ad sacram* (1656; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n°s 2010-2012); *Regiminis Apostolici* (1665; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 2020). For the full text of both documents, see Carolus du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum* [n. 17] pp. 281-282 and 314-316.

²³⁶ immittentes R

²³⁷ See *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 48 [1953] p. 775). I have retained the punctuation of R for the whole quotation. In the first sentence, R has a comma after both *possent* and *intento*, the most important evidently being that after *possent*. For the problem of the so-called *comma Pianum*, see H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1980 n. 1; T. Quaghebeur, "Sed illud intactum reliquerit". Une virgule mal biffée: le comma pianum, la bulle *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* du St-Office et la lecture du cardinal de Lugo, in: *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 98 (2003) pp. 61-79 (with further bibliography).

²³⁸ See *Ad sacram* (Carolus du Plessis d'Argentré, *Collectio iudiciorum* [n. 17] p. 281).

**Decretum quod RR. PP. Prouincialis et Diffinitores fecerunt 21 Julij²³⁹
1668 contra præfatas doctrinas et explicationes V. P. Fulgentij Mascani²⁴⁰**

Propter justas causas iudicarunt RR. PP. Minister Prouincialis et Diffinitores huius Prouincię Flandro Belgicę expedire ut admoneantur V. Patres concionatores, lectores et studiosi ne quis teneat uel doceat sequentes propositiones: [...]²⁴¹

Actum Bruxellis in Capitulo intermedio de consensu RR. PP. Diffinitorum 21 Julij²⁴² 1668

Erat subscriptum

f. Patritius Minister Prouincialis indignus

[Propositiones hasce omnes cum earundem refutationibus tradidi R. A. P. Ildefonso]²⁴³

Comparing the above statements of Fulgentius of Maaseik with the decree of 1668, one may conclude that the latter – pace Hildebrand – did regard essential aspects of the *lector*'s theological thinking, even if the latter was prepared to condemn (a certain interpretation of) the propositions that were prohibited in the decree.

Prohibition 1 and 6: According to the compiler of the above document, only three of the *propositiones* ascribed to Fulgentius were completely and unambiguously rejected by the *responsiones* (*Nota 2° P. Fulgentium non nisi tres propositiones absolute negare*).²⁴⁴ These probably are *prop.* 4, 9 and 14, which deny the importance of the condemnation of 3 propositions in *Cum occasione*. The propositions in question were equally prohibited in the decree of 1668:

- | | | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Prop. 4 | <i>Ad merendum et demerendum</i> etc. | <i>Cum occasione</i> prop. 3 | prohibition 1 of 1668 |
| Prop. 9 | <i>Aliqua Dei praecepta</i> etc. | <i>Cum occasione</i> prop. 1 | prohibition 6 of 1668 ²⁴⁵ |
| Prop. 14 | <i>Interiori gratiae</i> etc. | <i>Cum occasione</i> prop. 2 | prohibition 1 of 1668 |

²³⁹ Junij R (cf. n. 178)

²⁴⁰ mascani R

²⁴¹ At this place, the document offers a copy of the 6 prohibitions of 1668, which I have edited above on the basis of the *Acta Capitularia* of the Flandro-Belgian Province.

²⁴² Junij R

²⁴³ This line was added by a later hand.

²⁴⁴ According to the first document containing the 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones*, Fulgentius' replies denied four of the propositions. See n. 179.

²⁴⁵ The words *Ista [...] damnata opinio* in *prop.* and *resp.* 9 can be interpreted as a dominant participle construction, meaning the same as the words *damnatio huius articuli* in *prop.* and *resp.* 4 and 14.

In each case, Fulgentius' *responsio* states that, contrary to what is said in the proposition, the condemnation in question did have its importance. In this sense, one could be tempted to conclude that (part of) the prohibitions 1 and 6 of the decree of 1668 did not affect Fulgentius' teaching. However, these three *responsiones* are limited to a lapidary affirmation of the importance of the condemnations in question, but do not offer any further specification with regard to what Fulgentius thought to be the sense in which each of these propositions had been condemned by Innocent X. Moreover, if one considers – as the *Definitorium* of 1668 probably did – the three condemned propositions to be the expression of Jansenius' doctrines of the absolute necessity of God's efficient grace for Adam's descendants to obey God's precepts (*Aliqua Dei praecepta* etc.) and the irresistibility of efficient grace (*Interiori gratiae* etc.), as well as of his conviction that the necessity by which one either sins or fulfils God's commandments, does not abolish the freedom of the human will (*Ad merendum et demerendum* etc.),²⁴⁶ their prohibition by the decree of 1668 did affect Fulgentius' teaching, for all three doctrines are implied in some of the *propositiones* et *responsiones* edited above (necessity does not abolish freedom: *prop.* and *resp.* 1, 2, 7 and 8; absolute necessity of God's efficient grace: *prop.* and *resp.* 11; irresistibility of efficient grace: *prop.* and *resp.* 2). The presence of these doctrines also explains Fulgentius' criticism of the Molinist concept of sufficient grace in *prop.* and *resp.* 7 and 11.

According to *prop.* and *resp.* 3, Fulgentius also condemned the two propositions from *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* that were forbidden by prohibition 1 in the decree (*Quod uoluntarie fit, etiamsi necessitate fiat, libere tamen fit* and *Sola uolentia expugnat hominis libertati naturali*). However, Fulgentius condemned both propositions in a sense that does not contradict his own claim in *prop.* and *resp.* 1 and 2 that human freedom is not abolished by the fact that fallen man necessarily sins when he sins and that he can not resist God's efficient grace.

We may thus conclude that if the propositions affected by prohibitions 1 and 6 of the decree are interpreted as expressing some key doctrines of Jansenius, their prohibition did affect the teaching of Fulgentius, even if the *lector* condemned these propositions himself. The latter can be explained by the hypothesis that Fulgentius did not interpret the condemned propositions in a way that affected his views on

²⁴⁶ For these interpretations of the first three propositions condemned in *Cum occasione*, see J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] cc. 479-491.

human freedom and efficient grace. This is certain for the two propositions from *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (see *prop.* and *resp.* 3) and highly probable for the propositions from *Cum occasione*, since – at least if we may give credit to *FN* – Fulgentius claimed that the condemnation of the five propositions by Innocent X did not affect Jansenius' *Augustinus*.

Prohibition 2: According to *prop.* 15, Fulgentius subscribed to the proposition forbidden by prohibition 2 of the decree (*Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata et philosophorum uirtutes sunt uitia*). The reply to *prop.* 15 and 16 shows, however, that Fulgentius only subscribed to this proposition if the *infideles* in question are interpreted as being complete infidels (*perfecte infideles*) and, by consequence, do not include those unbelievers who have already received a first, elementary illumination from the Holy Spirit. For this reason, *prop.* 16 states that the condemnation of the sentence *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata* in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* is pertinent, since its universal character (*omnia opera infidelium* etc.) is contradicted by the fact that the acts of *imperfecte infideles* are not necessarily sins. This means that Fulgentius adhered to an attenuated version of the proposition *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata: Existimo quod omnia opera perfecte infidelium sint peccata*. This version, however, still excluded the possibility of good acts committed by people who had not been illuminated, either fully (as *fideles*) or elementarily (as *imperfecte infideles*), by the Holy Spirit. Moreover, Fulgentius does not seem to have felt the need of modifying his position regarding the sentence *uirtutes philosophorum sunt uitia*. We may thus conclude that, if the second prohibition of 1668 was issued on the basis of the conviction that without grace fallen man can still accomplish morally good acts, even if the latter do not lead to eternal life,²⁴⁷ the second prohibition directly reacted against the teaching of Fulgentius, even if the latter rejected the proposition *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata* in its universal sense.

Prohibition 3: We saw above that, according to *FN*, Fulgentius' *dictata* and the *Apologia pro doctrina* both claimed that the Pope's judgment is fallible not only in questions of fact, but also in questions of Faith and morals. The *lector* is ascribed the same opinion in *prop.* 17, but he contradicts it in the corresponding reply: *in ijs quę sunt iuris, extra concilium generale, dum ex cathedra loquitur, teneo esse infallibile [...]*. This contradiction, however, is immediately followed

²⁴⁷ For this position, see J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] c. 360.

by a further qualification: [...] *licet hoc non uideatur esse de fide*. We may thus conclude that prohibition 3 of 1668 was directed against the position which Fulgentius advocated according to *FN* in his *dictata* and the *Apologia pro doctrina*, and that the *lector*'s denial of this position in the list of *propositiones* and *responsiones* is explicitly presented as not being a point of Faith.

Prohibition 4: If prohibition 4 of 1668 was directed against the denial that Christ died for all mankind – and I see no reason to suppose it was not – it can be considered a reaction against Fulgentius. On the basis of three very specific interpretations of the words *pro omnibus* in 2 Cor. 5:15 (*Christus pro omnibus mortuus est*), which he probably knew from Jansenius' *Augustinus* (*pro omnibus* meaning 'for some out of all classes of mankind', 'for all who are saved' or 'for all human beings in the sense that the power of Christ's resurrection would suffice to save all mankind if He wanted it'),²⁴⁸ Fulgentius was even able to neutralize the latter verse as well as 1 Tim. 2:4 (*Deus uult omnes homines saluos fieri*) as biblical proof in favour of the belief that Christ did die for all mankind.

Fulgentius' words regarding the fifth proposition of *Cum occasione* remain somewhat ambiguous: *Explicationes hae* [= the proposed interpretations 2 Cor. 5:15 and 1 Tim. 2:4] *uerborum S. Scripturę existimo quod non tantum prudentes, sed etiam uiri sancti iudicent non esse incongruas aut repugnare huic damnatę ab Innocentio X. <sententiaę>*: Semipelagianum est dicere <Christum pro omnibus hominibus mortuum esse aut sanguinem fudisse> (*rep.* 10). (a) If one considers the words *huic damnatę ab Innocentio X. <sententiaę>* an example of the dominant participle construction,²⁴⁹ Fulgentius says that his interpretation of 2 Cor. 5:15 and 1 Tim. 2:4 is in accordance with Innocent's condemnation of the fifth proposition. In that case, he probably accepts the condemnation by projecting the above three interpretations of *pro omnibus* on to the words *pro omnibus hominibus* in the condemned proposition. According to that interpretation, the thesis *dicere Christum pro omnibus hominibus mortuum esse aut sanguinem fudisse* can impossibly be Semi-Pelagian, which implies that the fifth proposition in its entirety is false, even for a disciple of Jansenius.²⁵⁰ (b) If one does not

²⁴⁸ See n. 214.

²⁴⁹ Compare my interpretation of the words *Ista [...] damnata opinio in prop. and resp. 9* in n. 245.

²⁵⁰ For this interpretive strategy, see also P. Sellier, *Qu'est-ce que le jansénisme (1640-1713)?* [n. 18] p. 70: 'Nous disposons déjà de toutes les nuances nécessaires pour comprendre comment les augustinien pouvaient condamner la cinquième Proposition: "Il est sémi-pélagien de dire que Jésus-Christ est mort et a répandu son sang pour tous

consider the words *huic damnate ab Innocentio X. <sententiae>* an example of the dominant participle construction, Fulgentius simply states at the end of both *prop.* and *resp.* 10 that he upholds the fifth proposition in spite of its condemnation by Innocent X.

Prohibition 5: The doctrine affected by the fifth prohibition of 1668 can be read in the *Augustinus* of Jansenius²⁵¹ and is defended without any reserve in *prop.* and *resp.* 10.²⁵²

5.4. *Eugenius of Bruges on Fulgentius' teaching on divine grace*

In June-September 1682, Definitor General Ildefonsus of Carlshoven visited the Flandro-Belgian Province as *Commissarius Generalis* by order of Minister General Bernardus of Porto Maurizio († 1684), in order to verify to what degree the anti-Jansenist decree of Stephanus of Cesena (1674) was being observed.²⁵³ On 28 July, he received in the convent of Bruges a charge against Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort and Marcellus of Menen, who were accused by Eugenius of Bruges of having caused troubles within the Flandro-Belgian Province through their false charges against fellow Capuchins. A copy of this charge was integrated by Eugenius himself in a later charge against Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort and Marcellus of Menen, which he addressed on 18 August 1683 to the Cardinals of the Holy Office.²⁵⁴ This later charge has been preserved in two copies in the *Archivum Generale O.F.M.Cap. (G.22.11. Dimissiones, processus. 1683-1925)*.²⁵⁵

In the charge of 28 July 1682, Eugenius makes the same claim as Michael of Oudenbosch was to make in 1700 and Hildebrand in the 20th century, viz. that the charges by Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort lacked all justification. He illustrates this by referring to the case of Fulgentius of Maaseik, from whom Eugenius had received his theological

les hommes sans exception." Pour eux, affirmer que le Christ est mort pour tous sans exception pouvait en effet avoir un sens catholique, précisé par Augustin, Prosper et beaucoup d'autres, dont l'auteur de l'*Apologie pour les saint Pères* [= Antoine Arnauld]: soit quant à la suffisance de la Rédemption, soit parce que le Christ a sauvé la nature humaine. Une fois de plus la rédaction de la condamnation demeurerait imprécise.'

²⁵¹ See n. 211.

²⁵² Against what is suggested in the already quoted testimony of Paulus of Denendermonde. See n. 161.

²⁵³ For this visitation, see Hildebrand VI, pp. 379-383.

²⁵⁴ For the charges of 28 July 1682 and 18 August 1683, see Hildebrand VI, p. 415.

²⁵⁵ It is said at the bottom of both documents that a copy of the charge was sent to the Cardinal Conprotector Giacomo Rospigliosi on 16 March 1684 (and not in 1687, as suggested by Hildebrand VI, p. 415 n. 2).

formation. It had been at the instigation of Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort, Eugenius says, that Patricius of Hazebroek and his entire *Definitorium* interrogated Fulgentius of Maaseik in 1668 (Eugenius mistakenly says 1667) with regard to 18 suspected propositions. Without mentioning that an anti-Jansenist decree had been issued almost immediately after this interrogation, Eugenius stresses that no measures had been taken against Fulgentius of Maaseik himself. This was only normal, he says, since Fulgentius of Maaseik was a faithful disciple of Augustine and, by consequence, could impossibly have been a heretic.²⁵⁶ Eugenius subsequently proves this by offering a synthesis of his master's views on divine grace, which is larded with explicit references to the works of the bishop of Hippo. This synthesis (together with the introduction to the charge of 28 July 1682) is edited below on the basis of both copies of Eugenius' charge of 18 August 1683 (A = doc. 1, ff. 1-1^v; B = doc. 2, ff. 1-3^r).²⁵⁷ In both copies, most quotations from the Bible and the works of Augustine are identified by means of marginal notes, the visibility of which emphasizes the orthodoxy of Fulgentius' views. I have integrated all marginal notes in the text, but preserved their visibility by using the bold typeface. Next to these notes, the footnotes identify quotations that Eugenius has left without explicit identification. The division in paragraphs is mine.

[...]

Hac die 28. Julij 1682. in conuentu nostro Brugensi ego Fr. Eugenius Brugen-
sis sacerdos Capucinus propono coram uobis, R. ad.^m P. Ildephonse Austriace
Diffinitor ac Commissarij Generalis, per specialem commissionem R. ad.^m P.
Bernardi a Portu Mauritio Ministri Generalis Ordinis Capucinatorum²⁵⁸ iudex
nobis delegate, contra RR. PP. Fulgentium Neoportanum et Marcellum Mene-
nensem, Prouinciae Flandro-Belgicae Diffinitores, non animo calumniandi, sed
Prouinciam meam ac præcipuos eius et integerrimos doctrina et pietate uiros a
nota hereseos ac infamibus calumnijs uindicandi, quod iidem ipsi sint qui iam-
dudum eandem Prouinciam sub pretextibus plane chymericis perturbauerint ac
etiamnum perturbare non desinant, quod sub pœna talionis probare polliceor

²⁵⁶ In a document of 1669 (*Archium Capucinatorum Belgii* I, 4930) on the virtues of Justinus of Brussels († 1655; Hildebrand VII, p. 416, n° 2939), Fulgentius highly praises Justinus' love for the teachings of Augustine.

²⁵⁷ There are some striking parallels between Eugenius' synthesis of Fulgentius of Maaseik's teaching and the exposition of his own Augustinian convictions in the letter to Van Hecke that we have discussed above in paragraph 3. See *Vltima uox* [n. 65] pp. 45-59.

²⁵⁸ Bernardus of Porto Maurizio was Minister General of the Capuchin Order during the years 1678-1684.

atque hanc litem prosequi usque in finem; et peto ut secundum jura et canones supradicti patres ut perturbatores publicae quietis ac factiosi puniantur.

2. Vt ueritas in hac causa magis innotescat, sciendum est perturbationem hanc, quae Prouinciam nostram miserrime dilacerat atque in partes scindit, per eundem P. Fulgentium iamdudum coeptam esse, scilicet ab anno 1667., quando se quoad doctrinam formaliter opposuit Ven. P. Fulgentio Masecano lectori. Cuius potissimum opera etiam factum ut per R. P. Patritium Hasbroucanum Prouincialem proponerentur 18. propositiones quibus idem lector iubebatur respondere, quarum aliquae uidebantur expressis terminis conceptae, ut eundem incautum illaquearent. Ipso autem simplici responsione ad singulas se faciliter extricante idem P. Fulgentius Neoportanus non cessauit doctrinam praefati lectoris omnibus modis hucusque persequi sub omnino friuolis ac plerumque falsis allegationibus. Vt autem innotescat tam odiosa facta doctrina, illam paucis uerbis proponam.

3. Hec docet: quod *per unum hominem peccatum intrauit in hunc mundum et per peccatum mors*, quae in omnes homines pertransijt, in quo omnes peccauerunt [Rom. 5.12.]. Item quod reatu peccati originalis per regenerationis lauacrum sublato eiusdem reliquiae tamquam pœnae remaneant, scilicet ignorantia in intellectu et concupiscentia in uoluntate: illa per legem et doctrinam potest auferri, hæc autem non nisi gratia medicinali superari potest. Interrogante enim apostolo, qui accepit *ministerium uerbi a Domino Jesu testificari euangelium gratiae Dei* [Act. 20.24.]: *Infelix ego homo, quis me liberabit de corpore mortis huius* (scilicet captiuante eum in lege peccati)? [Rom. 7.24.], ipsemet respondet: *Gratia Dei per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum*²⁵⁹. Cui adstipulatur fidelis eius discipulus, ipsius Ecclesiae in materia gratiae defensor irrefragabilis S. Augustinus dicens: *A concupiscentiae dominatu non liberat nisi 'gratia Dei per Jesum C. D. N.'*²⁶⁰ *dono Spiritus S.^{ti} per quem 'diffusa charitas in cordibus nostris'*²⁶¹ *uincit concupiscentias carnales, ne consentiamus eis ad male faciendum, sed potius bona faciamus* [l. 1. retract. c. 23.]²⁶². Hanc autem medicinalem Christi Saluatoris gratiam se scire dicit idem²⁶³ S. Doctor *ad singulos actus dari* [e. 107 ad Vital.]²⁶⁴, ex quo elici posse uidetur nullum actum esse indifferentem in indiuiduo²⁶⁵.

²⁵⁹ Rm. 7:25.

²⁶⁰ Rm. 7:25.

²⁶¹ Rm. 5:5.

²⁶² Aug., retr. 1, 23, 1.

²⁶³ dicit om. B

²⁶⁴ Aug., ep. 217 (ad Vitalem), 2, 4 (before the Maurist edition of Augustine's letters, the present ep. 217 bore the number 107; see PL 33, c. 978, n. a). This letter is quoted also in prop. and resp. 10 (cf. supra).

²⁶⁵ Compare Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I^a II^{ae}, q. 18, a. 9, co. (*Vtrum aliquis actus sit indifferens secundum indiuiduum*): [...] *necesse est omnem actum hominis a deliberatiua ratione procedentem, in indiuiduo consideratum, bonum esse uel malum*. The Thomistic thesis is based here on Augustinian principles: individual deliberate acts can not be neutral, since they are the effect of either divine grace (good) or concupiscence (bad).

4. Et quod Ecclesia de Spiritu S.¹⁰ uere canat: *Sine tuo numine nihil est in homine, nihil est innoxium*²⁶⁶, non tamen inde recte inferas *omnia opera infidelium esse peccata*²⁶⁷, quia actus indeliberati, item omnia opera ad Christianismum disponentia (quae gratiae per 2. Concilium Arausicanum ascribuntur [2. Conc. Araus. c. 25. in fin.])²⁶⁸ non possunt esse peccata. Virtutes autem philosophorum non sunt proprie uitia, sed ab ipsis philoso-

²⁶⁶ Verses 16-18 of the medieval sequence *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, which the Catholic Church sang at Pentecost since 1570. See G. M. Dreves-C. Blume, *Ein Jahrtausend Lateinischer Hymnendichtung. II. Hymnen unbekannter Verfasser* (Leipzig 1909) p. 160; P. W. Tax, *Zur Verfasserschaft und Entstehungszeit der Pfingstsequenz 'Veni, Sancte Spiritus'*, in: *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur* 135 (2006) pp. 13-20.

²⁶⁷ 25th proposition condemned by Pius V in *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (1567); H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1925. It is the 15th proposition ascribed to Fulgentius in 1668.

²⁶⁸ The text probably refers here to deliberate acts of the *imperfecte infideles*, whom Fulgentius implicitly hints at in his reply to prop. 15 and 16: *Existimo quod omnia opera perfecte infidelium sint peccata, quia non referuntur in Deum, ad quem omnia opera ex praecepto referri debent; per perfecte infideles intelligo illos qui nondum diuinitus incipiunt illuminari*. The *imperfecte infideles* can be identified with more precision thanks to Eugenius' marginal reference to the end of the 25th – and last – canon of the second Council of Orange (529). Eugenius does not seem to refer to the 25th canon itself, but to the *definitio fidei* that immediately follows it and ends in a reference to the gift of Faith which makes people strive for baptism and which God also gave to the good robber of Lk. 23:43, to the centurion Cornelius in Acts 10:3 and to the tax-collector Zachaeus in Lk. 19:6: *Hoc etiam salubriter profitemur et credimus, quod in omni opere bono non nos incipimus et postea per Dei misericordiam adiuuamur, sed ipse nobis nullis praecedentibus bonis meritis et fidem et amorem sui prius inspirat, ut et baptismi sacramenta fideliter requiramus et post baptismum cum ipsius adiutorio ea quae sibi sunt placita, implere possimus. Vnde manifestissime credendum est quod et illius latronis quem Dominus ad paradysum patriam reuocauit et Cornilii centurionis, ad quem angelus Domini missus est, et Zacchei, qui ipsum Dominum suscipere meruit, illa tam admirabilis fides non fuerit de natura, sed diuinae gratiae largitate donata* (CCSL 148 A, p. 63, ll. 213-223). Compare Jansenius' remarks on the centurion Cornelius in his discussion of the *opera infidelium* (Augustinus, tom. 2, lib. 4, cap. 5: *Sancti Augustini loca explicantur, quibus asserere uidetur opera moraliter bona in infidelibus*; J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] c. 361): *Nunc soluenda sunt nonnulla Augustini testimonia, ex quibus probari putant, in infidelibus esse posse nonnulla opera uere bona. In primis proferunt Augustini loca de Cornelio centurione, quibus libro de praedestinatione sanctorum cap. septimo, & libro primo de baptismo capite septimo, & libro quarto capite uigesimo primo (error enim in citationes irrepsit) eleemosynas Cornelii, antequam in Christum crederet, & iustitiam appellat, & donum Dei esse dicit. At certe impium est dona Dei inter peccata deputare [Bellarminus, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, lib. 5, cap. 9]. At certe ista nimis est somnolenta Augustini lectio, ut ex huiusmodi locis probetur sine fide fieri posse opera nonnulla bona. Testatur enim Augustinus in ipso illo loco de Praedestinatione sanctorum qui citatur, & in alijs pluribus, Cornelium nullo modo fuisse infidelem, sed fide iam diuinitus infusa in Deum credidisse, & ex ea fide orasse Deum, in quem crediderat, & eleemosynas erogasse, quamuis in Christum Iesum sibi non annunciatum necdum credidisset.*

phis in se ipsis de illis et non in Domino gloriantibus uitiantur. *Possunt enim aliqua bona fieri non bene facientibus a quibus fiunt*²⁶⁹, et de talibus operibus non in Domino gloriari solus impius negat esse peccatum [I. 4. con. Iulia. c. 3.]²⁷⁰.

5. Hanc uero Christi gratiam ad singulos christianę uirtutis actus necessariam dicit idem gratiæ doctor Augustinus: se scire *non omnibus hominibus dari et quibus datur, misericordia Dei gratuita dari; quibus autem non datur, iusto iudicio Dei non dari* [e. 107 ad Vital.]²⁷¹. Vnde satis evidens est gratiam sufficientem, quam omnibus hominibus, etiam obduratis et excecatis, generaliter dari – imo dari debere – aliqui²⁷² tam pertinaciter sustinent et pro sententia²⁷³ ipsius Ecclesiæ mundo obtrudere conantur, non esse gratiam illam quam tanquam ueram Christi gratiam tam operose contra hęreticos defendit D. Augustinus.

6. Cum autem idem dicat uoluntatem nostram non posse *in medio ita consistere, ut nec bona nec mala sit* [I. de pecc. mer. et remiss. c. 18.]²⁷⁴, nihil autem esse bonam uoluntatem quam charitatem [de grat. Christ. c. 21.]²⁷⁵, et *inspirationem dilectionis, ut cognita per legem sancto amore faciamus, proprie gratiam esse* [lib. 4. ad Bonif. c. 5]²⁷⁶, quid mirum igitur quod ad salutarem attritionem (ad quam omnes et bonam uoluntatem et gratiam necessariam esse contendunt) charitatem aliquam requiramus²⁷⁷, non autem per-

²⁶⁹ Aug., c. Iulian. 4, 3, 22. Compare Jansenius, *Augustinus*, tom. 2, lib. 4, capp. 2/6-11/16; J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] cc. 359- 364; P. Sellier, *Pascal et saint Augustin* [n. 192] pp. 260-265.

²⁷⁰ Aug., c. Iulian. 4, 3, 30.

²⁷¹ Compare Aug., ep. 217, 5, 16 (*sententiae* 4-6). For the number 107 in Eugenius' marginal note, see n. 264.

²⁷² Viz. the partisans of Molinism.

²⁷³ *sentiam B*

²⁷⁴ Aug., *pecc. mer.* 2, 18, 30.

²⁷⁵ Compare Aug., *grat. pecc.* 1, 21, 22.

²⁷⁶ 15 B. See Aug., c. Pel. 4, 5, 11.

²⁷⁷ According to the Council of Trent, the *attritio* which stems from the fear of future punishment, prepares the penitent for the forgiveness of sins in the sacrament of penance, if together with the hope for forgiveness it excludes the will to sin. This *attritio* is called a *contritio imperfecta*, for it is considered a gift of God that makes the penitent approach justification: *Illam uero contritionem imperfectam, quae attritio dicitur, quoniam uel ex turpitudinis peccati consideratione uel ex gehennae et poenarum metu communiter concipitur, si uoluntatem peccandi excludat cum spe ueniae, declarat non solum non facere hominem hypocritam et magis peccatorem, uerum etiam donum Dei esse et Spiritus sancti impulsu, non adhuc quidem inhabitantis, sed tantum mouentis, quo poenitens adiutus uiam sibi ad iustitiam parat. Et quamuis sine sacramento poenitentiae per se ad iustificationem perducere peccatorem nequeat, tamen eum ad Dei gratiam in sacramento poenitentiae impetrandam disponit* (Sess. 14 de sacramento poenitentiae, cap. 4; H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion* [n. 17] n° 1678). Fulgentius calls this *attritio/contritio imperfecta* an *attritio salutaris*, which is not limited to fear for future punishment, but also includes a *bona uoluntas* that depends on a divinely given *imperfecta caritas*. Compare Jansenius' interpretation of the *contritio imperfecta/attritio* in *Augustinus*, tom. 3, lib. 5, capp.

fectam, sed imperfectam²⁷⁸? Numquid enim (ut bene dicit Augustinus) *mox ut nascitur charitas, iam prorsus perfecta est? Vt perficiatur, nascitur; cum fuerit nata, nutritur; cum fuerit nutrita, roboratur; cum fuerit roborata, perficitur* [tract. 1. in epis. Joan. circa med.].²⁷⁹

7. Dicimus præterea ignorantiam juris naturae, quamvis a tanto, non tamen a toto excusare²⁸⁰, quia iuxta eundem Augustinum *in ijs qui intelligere noluerunt, sine dubitatione peccatum est; in ijs autem qui non potuerunt, pena peccati. Ergo in utrisque non est iusta excusatio, sed iusta damnatio* [e. 105. ad Sixt.].²⁸¹ Alias enim ista ignorantia non esset pena peccati, sed eiusdem potius singulare beneficium; nec amplius suspirare deberemus ad Dominum: *Illumina tenebras meas* [ps. 17. 29.], sed potius: 'Illas adauge', directe contra orationem Ecclesiastici: *ne adincrescant ignorantiae meae et multiplicentur delicta mea et peccata mea abundant* [eccl. 23.3.].²⁸²; imo nec docere ignorantes amplius inter opera spiritualis misericordiae computari deberet, sed potius pro summa habendum esset iniuria, cum per illud homines peccati delicijs absque reatu frui impedirentur.

26-27/34-35; J. Carreyre, *Jansénius* [n. 2] cc. 410-411; P. Sellier, *Pascal et saint Augustin* [n. 192] pp. 321-327, esp. p. 323: 'Selon lui [= Jansenius], l'attrition définie à Trente est une véritable contrition, car elle inclut un certain amour de Dieu, si faible soit-il; en effet une attrition simplement servile ne saurait engendrer le ferme propos de ne plus pécher.'

²⁷⁸ Fulgentius' concept of an *imperfecta caritas* probably goes back to Aug., gr. *et lib. arb.* 17, 33, where Augustine defines the *caritas imperfecta* as a gift of divine grace that makes one will to fulfil the law, but does not yet give the strength to actually fulfil it. This *parua et imperfecta caritas* makes possible a *bona uoluntas* that is only *parua et inualida*: *Qui ergo uult facere Dei mandatum et non potest, iam quidem habet uoluntatem bonam, sed adhuc paruam et inualidam; poterit autem, cum magnam habuerit et robustam. Quando enim martyres magna illa mandata fecerunt, magna utique uoluntate, hoc est, magna caritate fecerunt [...]. Ipsam caritatem apostolus Petrus nondum habuit, quando timore Dominum ter negauit. Timor enim non est in caritate, sicut ait Ioannes euangelista in epistola sua, sed perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem* [1 Ioh. 4, 18]. *Et tamen quamuis parua et imperfecta, non deerat, quando dicebat Domino: Animam meam pro te ponam* [Ioh. 13, 37]: *putabat enim se posse, quod se uelle sentiebat. Et quis istam etsi paruam dare coeperat caritatem, nisi ille qui praeparat uoluntatem et cooperando perficit quod operando incipit?*

²⁷⁹ Eugenius' marginal reference is slightly mistaken: he is quoting Aug., *ep. Io. tr.* 5, 4 and not *ep. Io. tr.* 1.

²⁸⁰ Thomistic thesis (cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Super Sent.*, lib. 2, d. 22, q. 2, a. 2, co.: *ignorantia uniuersalis* [= *ignorantia iuris*] *excusat peccatum sequens non ex toto, sed a tanto*), which Fulgentius bases on a purely Augustinian argumentation. The same Augustinian argumentation is developed by Jansenius in *Augustinus*, tom. 2, lib. 2, capp. 2-6 (especially cc. 4-5). Compare J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme* [n. 2] cc. 351-353; P. Sellier, *Pascal et saint Augustin* [n. 192] pp. 265-268.

²⁸¹ Aug., *ep.* 194 (*ad Sixtum*), 6, 27 (before the Maurist edition of Augustine's letters, the present *ep.* 194 bore the number 105; see *PL* 33, c. 874, n. a).

²⁸² Eccl. 23:3.

8. Contra tam apertas D. Augustini sententias aliqui se uidentur opponere, quas tamen tantus Ecclesiae Doctor dicit ad fidem catholicam pertinere. *Imo in causa duorum hominum* (Adae scilicet et Christi), *quorum per unum uenundati sumus sub peccato, per alterum redimimur a peccatis*, asserit *proprie fidem christianam consistere* [de pecc. orig. c. 24.]²⁸³.

[...]

In the above description of Fulgentius' teaching, nothing is said concerning the irresistibility of God's efficient grace (prohibition 1 in the decree of 1668), papal (in)fallibility (prohibition 3), God's positive will to damn certain children (prohibition 5) or the question concerning the fulfillability of God's commandments (prohibition 6). However, it is clear from Eugenius' text that Fulgentius supported the doctrines that were forbidden by prohibitions 2 and 4.

Prohibition 2: In §4 of Eugenius' account, Fulgentius explicitly rejects the propositions condemned by the second prohibition (*Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata et philosophorum uirtutes sunt uitia*), but implicitly supports them in a restricted sense, that must have been equally unacceptable for the Superiors who issued the decree of 1668. Fulgentius condemns the sentence *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata* in its most universal application, since some *opera infidelium*, he believes, can impossibly be sins, viz. the unbelievers' indeliberate acts (compare *prop.* and *resp.* 3) as well as acts that some of them perform under the influence of divine grace (compare the reply to *prop.* 15 and 16).²⁸⁴ However, since deliberate acts are said to be either good or bad (§§3 and 6) and the former can only be performed under the guidance of divine grace (§§3 and 5), deliberate acts of infidels who totally lack the gift of Faith must clearly be considered sins (compare the reply to *prop.* 15 and 16: *Existimo quod omnia opera perfecte infidelium sint peccata* [...]; *per perfecte infideles intelligo illos qui nondum diuinitus incipiunt illuminari*). With regard to the sentence *philosophorum uirtutes sunt uitia*, Fulgentius accepts its condemnation in §4 on the condition that it means that the virtues of the philosophers are vices in themselves (*proprie*). He adds, however, that the virtues of the philosophers indeed become vices, when exercised by someone who puts pride in his own forces and does not believe that real virtue is a gratuitous gift of God. Fulgentius thus seems to have denied in the case of both sentences the possibility of

²⁸³ Aug., *gr. et pecc. or.* 2, 24, 28.

²⁸⁴ See n. 268.

good acts performed by people who totally lack the Christian Faith, whereas prohibition 2 of 1668 to all probability meant to safeguard this very possibility.

Prohibition 4: Eugenius' portrait makes Fulgentius claim that the form of grace that is necessary for every single act of Christian virtue (§5: *Hanc [...] Christi gratiam ad singulos christianę uirtutis actus necessariam [...]*), is not given to all (§5: [...] *non omnibus hominibus dari*). Fulgentius thus denied that God gives his saving grace to everyone (compare *prop.* and *resp.* 10) against the conviction that must have been at the base of prohibition 4 of 1668.

At the end of our analysis of Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort's testimony concerning the teaching of his namesake of Maaseik (5.2.), the 18 *propositiones* and *responsiones* of 1668 (5.3.) and Eugenius' synthesis of his master's Augustinian doctrine of divine grace (5.4.), we may safely assume – I think – that Fulgentius of Maaseik's teaching had caused the promulgation of the decree of 1668 and that the *lector* championed the doctrines implied in the propositions forbidden by the decree's six prohibitions, even if he was prepared to condemn a certain interpretation of the propositions in question.

6. Conclusion

During the years following on the publication of the *Augustinus* (1640), several Flemish Capuchins – among others the Provincial Casianus of Geldern (1641-1644) – were prepared to testify to the orthodoxy of Jansenius' book. They considered the work to offer an adequate interpretation of the teachings of the bishop of Hippo. This conviction persisted among the Flemish Capuchins after the condemnation of the *Augustinus* by *Cum occasione* (1653) and *Ad sacram* (1956) as well as by two decrees of the Order's General *Definitorium* (1650/1656). In the present article, I have tried to illustrate this persistence on the basis of an analysis of some texts written by Fulgentius of Maaseik, *Sacrae Theologiae lector* at Antwerp during the years 1665-1668, and his disciple Eugenius of Bruges, who published several tracts against Molinism and the Jesuit Order during the 1680's. From the point of view of Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort and other anti-Jansenists, who were convinced that the *Augustinus* had been rightly condemned by Innocent X and Alexander VII, authors such as these had to be considered Jansenist heretics, although they would have preferred to be called 'Augustinians' themselves. Even if Hildebrand was right in claiming that Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort and his companions tried to enhance their personal position

within the Order by accusing fellow brothers such as Fulgentius of Maaseik and Eugenius of Bruges, this does not alter the fact that the latter advocated the doctrines of Jansenius and by doing this offered a theological occasion for protest to those who championed Alexander VII's claim that the five propositions condemned by Innocent X in *Cum occasione* perfectly rendered the teaching of Jansenius.

Hildebrand's claim that there never was a genuine Jansenist among the Flemish Capuchins and that the accusations of Fulgentius of Nieuwpoort and others only were a means of self-promotion, was based on a narrow and purely formal definition of the word 'Jansenist', according to which being a Jansenist equals not condemning the five propositions. Through this definition Hildebrand turned Jansenism into a phantom, since most of Jansenius' followers – including Fulgentius of Maaseik and Eugenius of Bruges – were prepared to condemn the five propositions, but simultaneously sustained that their condemned sense did not reflect the teaching of the *Augustinus*. Anxiously trying to exclude the influence of Jansenism on his predecessors of the 17th and 18th centuries, Hildebrand thus paradoxically fell back on a strategy that in a way was already deployed by Jansenius' followers themselves. It was also the strategy by means of which some 17th-century Flemish Superiors – especially the Provincial Michael of Oudenbosch (1678-1681, 1684-1687 and 1690-1695) – tried to prove the impertinence of several anti-Jansenist measures that had been imposed by the Roman authorities on the Flandro-Belgian Province.

Gert PARTOENS

Latin Literature, Faculty of Arts

History of Church and Theology, Faculty of Theology

K.U. Leuven