



**UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)**

**An eloquent enigma: the dramas of Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca (c. 1580 - c. 1628) and their contexts**

Gruijters, R.J.

[Link to publication](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Gruijters, R. J. (2010). An eloquent enigma: the dramas of Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca (c. 1580 - c. 1628) and their contexts Eigen Beheer

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

## CHAPTER ONE

### ‘LUMEN BELGARUM’: A BIOGRAPHY

The life of a Benedictine monastic could take interesting turns, if he decided to look beyond the walls of his abbey. Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca (c. 1580 - c. 1628) did just that. In the early seventeenth century, at a time when the Southern Netherlands managed to regain some of its political, economic and cultural momentum, Lummenaeus joined in with the most influential scholars and writers of his time. A gifted man of letters, the Ghent Benedictine used the vast network of Lipsius’ successor in Louvain, Erycius Puteanus, to climb the socio-cultural ladder. His exceptional tragedies and eloquent orations bought him a seat at the table of international Christian humanism. But it came at a price. How did this man, who was once hailed as the new Seneca, who had brought the Muses from Italy to Ghent, eventually end up in the margins of history?

#### *Status quaestionis*

The life of Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca has been discussed in various publications. The earliest studies have been provided by Antonius Sanderus and Valerius Andreas, already during Lummenaeus’ life.<sup>1</sup> Both, however, focused primarily on bibliographical matters and provided hardly any personal details. J.N. Paquot, in the late eighteenth century, was the first to deliver a brief study that attempted to be more than a bibliography adorned with a mere touch of *biographica*.<sup>2</sup> In the nineteenth century, Emile Varenbergh, working on the archives of St. Peter’s abbey in Ghent, collected a register of correspondence related to Lummenaeus. His merits lay primarily with having published almost all of these letters in full, though erroneous the transcriptions sometimes are. In the resulting biographical article, Varenbergh focused mainly on the period from which the correspondence dates (1620-1628), and gave only few details on Cornelius’ earlier life.<sup>3</sup> It seems Varenbergh only marginally included Lummenaeus’ extant publications in his research and thus missed out on the factual clues

---

<sup>1</sup> Sanderus, *De Gandavensibus*, 60-61; Andreas, *Bibliotheca Belgica* (ed. 1623), 215.

<sup>2</sup> Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir*, III, 49-50.

<sup>3</sup> Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’. The article in the *Biographie Nationale*, 12, pp. 567-572 has also been written by Varenbergh, and is mainly a concise presentation of his earlier research.

(e.g. dates, locations) that can easily be gathered from there. This omission was partly corrected by Ferdinand Vanderhaeghen, who drew up an extensive bibliography of Lummenaeus' work, as well as a concise biography that not only made use of Varenbergh's archival efforts, but also paid due attention to some of the factual evidence that can be gathered from Lummenaeus' publications: dates, locations, contacts, etc.<sup>4</sup> Thus, some of the most obvious errors were soon exposed and several gaps filled. Most other biographical articles, like Foppens, Van der Aa and the Benedictine bibliography, have been based on the information provided by one or more of the above-mentioned authors.<sup>5</sup>

In the early twentieth century more archival material surfaced. Johannes Orbaan provided in outline or published in full a large number of relevant letters that have been preserved both in Milan and Rome.<sup>6</sup> Albert Pasture drew up invaluable registers to Vatican archives, that, too, yield many results for our research.<sup>7</sup> Bernhard de Meester, in providing outlines of the correspondence of the papal nuncio in Brussels, has added even more to the ever growing collection.<sup>8</sup> But no one bothered to mutually combine these sources, since most focused primarily on presenting only their own findings and none of these researchers were exclusively focused on Lummenaeus.<sup>9</sup>

There is a reason, however, that most (semi-)biographies provide hardly any details on the early period of Lummenaeus' life: there is apparently not much to be found. Archival research has yielded only few

---

<sup>4</sup> Vanderhaeghen, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, III (s.v. Lummene; pp. 1151ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Foppens, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, I, 213; Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, 12, pp. 175-176 (s.v. Marck); and François, *Bibliothèque générale des écrivains de l'Ordre de Saint Benoît*, II: François apparently thought the *orator* and the tragedian were two different persons, since he created two separate entries on Lummenaeus; the first (p. 85, s.v. Lumenaeus) on his work as an orator, the second (p. 159, s.v. Marck) on his work as a tragedian. James Parente ('The Paganization of Biblical Tragedy', 213) has noted that Lummenaeus was no longer remembered as a dramatist by the compiler of this *Bibliothèque générale*, since he had found only the former entry. There are many more biographical articles on Lummenaeus, which are all clearly based on one or more of the aforementioned publications, e.g. De Seyn, *Dictionnaire des Écrivains Belges*, 2, pp. 1927-1929; Hofman Peerlkamp, *De vita ac doctrina omnium Belgarum*, 265; Hoeyff, *Parnasus Latino-Belgicus*, 101-102; Hofer, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, 31-32, pp. 246-247; Baillet, *Jugement des savans*, 124-125 (as one of the *poètes modernes*); Sweertius, *Athenae Belgicae*, 191-192.

<sup>6</sup> Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo'; id., *Bescheiden in Italië*.

<sup>7</sup> Pasture, 'Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini'; Pasture, *Inventaire du Fonds Borghèse*.

<sup>8</sup> De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*.

<sup>9</sup> Still, the information that *has* been combined and presented, still remained ignored. It is somewhat disturbing to find James A. Parente jr., who has been the only one to recently provide a brief, but analytical study of Lummenaeus' works and life, connect to Varenbergh's biographical presentation without even noting the logical corrections proposed by Vanderhaeghen (whose entry on Lummenaeus he has otherwise thoroughly used). Cf. below, p. 77nt244.

details on Lummenaeus' pre-1608 life, the year in which his first work was published. The published and unpublished correspondence of Erycius Puteanus, as we will come to see, provides some details mostly on the 1608-1613 period. But for the rest, this biographical presentation will rely mainly on meticulously combining the evidence from the various studies I have referred to above and from Lummenaeus' printed works.

But the present biography, too, will necessarily be far from definite, and that for several reasons. First of all, many sources, which could yield tiny but precious scraps of information, I have necessarily left untouched: there are still many archives (municipal, regional, national, ecclesiastical, etc.) which I have not consulted; many libraries which may hold relevant printed material or manuscripts; private collections that are yet unknown or accessible only with the greatest of difficulty. But what's even more important: the sources which I *have* been able to use in order to reconstruct Lummenaeus' life, pose many difficulties. Often, one feels like overhearing a constantly interrupted, one-sided telephone conversation; like attempting to construct a building without knowing which side is up; or like putting together an incomplete puzzle without an example to follow. Matters are complicated even further by the fact that nothing of Lummenaeus' personal archive seems to have survived; at best, we have access to minutes preserved elsewhere. In the Ghent State Archives no (copies of) letters directed *to* Lummenaeus have been preserved,<sup>10</sup> which increases the risk of my presentation of Lummenaeus' relationship with his abbot to be even more coloured. But what is perhaps most surprising: Lummenaeus is also absent from the extensive collection of letters directed to Puteanus preserved in Brussels, while the Louvain professor had himself written and even published many letters directed to *and* about Lummenaeus. Also, someone's life did not consist solely of publications and letters, and any presentation based on these sources alone will necessarily be biased at the very least, if not to say perhaps completely distorted. Finally, there is the constant awareness that correspondence through letters – already a relatively slow means of communication – may have been easy to manipulate (for instance, how can we be sure that any claim of letters not having arrived is true?). Lummenaeus may very well have used these circumstances to 'gain time' whenever he so pleased, as we will come to see.

All in all, these are only some of the *caveats* that apply, and it is thus with the greatest reserve and hesitation that I have drawn up this biographical presentation, fully aware that other researchers may well come to other conclusions, and newly found information, though tiny the scraps may be, can just as well confirm or reject my present results. It is, however, a comforting thought that even through the publishing of tentative results, progress may be achieved.

---

<sup>10</sup> Except the one written by Antonius Sanderus in 1620, discussed below. Cf. p. 50.

This chapter is divided in chronologically ordered sections, describing different phases of Lummenaeus' life. Surely they were not felt as such by the person under investigation, but they will in any case allow us a better grip on the pieces of the puzzle. I have chosen not to delve too deep in bibliographical details: I gladly refer to the extensive and ever valuable *Bibliotheca Belgica* by Vanderhaeghen.<sup>11</sup> The transcriptions provided in this chapter are based on original documents whenever possible, thus eliminating the often erroneous, but still more than workable transcriptions published by various scholars. Whenever relevant, I will refer to omissions and/or errors in earlier studies.

### *Pre-1600: Origin, youth, and family*

Cornelius de Marcke, or Van Lummene alias Van Marcke, is said to have been born in Ghent around the year 1570, a date first produced by Paquot in the late eighteenth century and reproduced ever since.<sup>12</sup> It proves to be only the first biographical difficulty. Unfortunately, about the many years from young Cornelius de Marcke to the Benedictine humanist who would make a name for himself as Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca, there is not much to tell: neither the archives nor Cornelius himself have (yet) revealed much about his birth, childhood, education and early life as Benedictine or man of letters. In fact, the earliest archival evidence of Cornelius dates from 1600, and thus we are faced with an awkward gap of perhaps some thirty years – half a man's life, if he was lucky. Biographers in Cornelius' days, it seems, were hardly interested in the personal facts of men of letters, unless status dictated the provision of such facts, or if these facts had substantially been of influence on someones (literary) production. In order, then, to make at least an educated guess not only at Lummenaeus' early life but also at something as essential as his year of birth, we will have to resort to other sources, of which there are only few, and most of those highly circumstantial.

One of the most valuable sources of relevant information has come down to us through Cornelius' brother, Ludovicus à Marca. Ludovicus, born in 1584 in Courtrai, was a high-ranking Jesuit with an impressive trackrecord in all sorts of positions of responsibility. At the start of his career, the *album noviciorum* provides information regarding Ludovicus' entrance in the Society

---

<sup>11</sup> Vanderhaeghen, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, III, 1151ff. Appendix one provides a concise bibliography of Lummenaeus' published works and manuscripts, with some additions that have escaped Vanderhaeghen's attention.

<sup>12</sup> Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir*, III, 49.

of Jesus in 1601, while simultaneously offering valuable clues about his family background.<sup>13</sup>

I, Ludovicus van Lummene alias van Marcke, from Ghent, legitimately born in 1584 to my father Carolus van Lummene alias van Marcke, procurator for the Council of Flanders, and to mother Lucia de Munick, both still alive. I have studied grammar and literature in Ghent for five and a half years, but studied philosophy in Douai for two years and was there created *magister artium*. I have been admitted to the Society of Jesus by the Reverend Father Bernardus Oliverius of the Belgian province, in Ghent. I came to the noviciate in Tournai on 23 November, 1601.

Truthfully, Ludovicus van Lummene alias van Marcke<sup>14</sup>

Already the earliest biographers had indeed noted that Cornelius was born to father Carolus à Marca, or Charles de Marcke.<sup>15</sup> Legitimately wedded to Lucia de Munick,<sup>16</sup> as confirmed in Ludovicus' entry, he had with her at least four sons and one daughter: Cornelius, Ludovicus, Viglius, Charles and Marguerite.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> As a rather centralized order, the Jesuits – as opposed to Cornelius' own Benedictines – kept extensive records of newly created novices in *alba noviciorum*, as well as detailed necrologies. The Dutch Jesuit Archive in Nijmegen (ANSI) holds copies of many important documents preserved at the Royal Library and State Archives in Brussels regarding the history of the Jesuits and the *Missio Hollandica*. I sincerely thank Paul Begheyn SJ of the Jesuit Archive for his advice and assistance. For a comprehensive guide to the history of the Jesuits in the Netherlands with an extensive bibliography, cf. Begheyn, *Gids voor de geschiedenis van de jezùieten in Nederland*.

<sup>14</sup> *Ego Ludovicus van Lummene alias van Marcke Gandensis natus 1584 ex legitimo thoro patre Carolo van Lummene alias van Marcke procuratore in Consilio Flandriae, matre Lucia de Munick utroque superstite. Gram[maticis] et Hum[anioribus] Literis operam dedi Gandavi per quinquennium cum demidio, philosophiae vero Duaci per biennium ibidemque art[ium] mag[ister] creatus fui. Admissus fui in Soc[iet]t[ate] Jes. à R[everendo] P[at]re Bernardo Oliverij provincialis Belgii Gandavi. Veni ad dom[um] prob[ationis] Torn[acensem] 23 Nov[embris] 1601. / Ita est Ludovicus van Lummene alias van Marcke. (ANSI, OS 131, *Album Noviciorum 1584-1612*, p. 422).*

<sup>15</sup> Sanderus, *De Gandavensibus*, 27.

<sup>16</sup> Lucie de Munick, or Monck, was, as some have noted, from English descent. Cf. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir*, III, 49. Hoefler, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, t. 31-32, 246-247 (s.v. *Lumene van Marcke (Charles)*), notes that she was related to the famous English general who went by the same name.

<sup>17</sup> The university library of Ghent holds several genealogical manuscripts regarding the genealogy of the Van Marcke family (mss 11762 and G.3844<sup>4</sup>) as does the Royal Library in Brussels (e.g. Fonds Houwaert de Grez). In the nineteenth century, Gaillard published a genealogy on the Van Marcke family (cf. Gaillard, *Bruges et le Franc*), which recently received valuable corrections and additions through the work of De Kerckhove, published in *Le Parchemin*. De Kerckhove signals how through Carolus' other son Charles

Cornelius' father Carolus à Marca, still alive in 1601,<sup>18</sup> was procurator at the Council of Flanders.<sup>19</sup> Nonetheless, Antonius Sanderus appears to be saying that Carolus could have been of even more use to the State, had he been more decisively willing to do so.<sup>20</sup> In any case, Carolus was an educated man of letters, and as such the Muses must have come naturally to the Van Marcke-offspring: Carolus is said to have written a tragedy in Greek on the Biblical theme of Judith and Holophernes, as well as some minor Latin occasional poetry.<sup>21</sup> All we have from him today, however, is a Latin elegy in commendation of Ioannes Garetius' anti-Protestant *De Sanctorum invocatione*, published in 1570 by the Ghent printer Gislenus Manilius.<sup>22</sup> Carolus had perhaps been born around 1520, either in Ghent or Oudenaerde, which he then would have left for Ghent to become a procurator.<sup>23</sup> In any case, Sanderus lists the 'Van Maerckes' among the noble

---

(Cornelius' brother) his descendants can be traced to this day. However, the present chapter adds significantly to the limited (and partly erroneous) information provided by De Kerckhove especially with regard to Cornelius and Ludovicus (for instance, there is no evidence of Ludovicus having been 'missionnaire en Angleterre', though he had twice been superior of the *Missio Hollandica*; cf. below, p. 19).

<sup>18</sup> And perhaps also still in the early 1620s, cf. below, p. 22nt41. In 1624, Sanderus (*De Gandavensibus*, 27) does not say Carolus had by then died, contrary to e.g. the entry on Vrancx.

<sup>19</sup> The Council of Flanders moved from Ghent to Douai in 1579, and returned to Ghent in 1584. Cf. Sanderus, *Gandavum sive Gandavensium*, 211. However, according to Buntinx, *Inventaris van het archief*, 10, the Council fled Ghent in 1580 – after several sessions had been disrupted and councilors had been attacked, insulted, imprisoned, and even hanged –, only to return in 1585.

<sup>20</sup> *Carolus à Marca, Iacobi Cornelii Lummenaei à Marca pater, vir indole et eruditione praestanti, atque si vero virtutem pretio aestimemus, non minus propriis animi dotibus, quam liberorum fama clarus, ac magnorum, si aequo semper iure munia in Rep[ublica] donarentur, capax* (Sanderus, *De Gandavensibus*, 27).

<sup>21</sup> Sanderus, *De Gandavensibus*, 27. Varenbergh ('Lummenaeus à Marca', 8) seems to suggest that the tragedy had been printed: 'Son père, Charles de Lummene de Marcke, connu en latin sous le nom de Carolus à Marca, consacra toute son existence à l'étude des belles lettres anciennes; on a de lui une tragédie en grec: *Judith ou la mort d'Holopherne*, beaucoup de poésies légères en latin et une élégie latine imprimées en tête de l'ouvrage de dom Jean Gare, *De invocatione sanctorum* (Rouen, 1676, in-fol.). Dans le même ouvrage de Jean Gare, imprimé à Gand en 1570 chez Manilius, se trouve également la tragédie de Charles de Lummene.' In Garetius' *De invocatione sanctorum* (Ghent, 1570) Charles' *elegy* is indeed printed (cf. nt22); Varenbergh's other references are untraceable, and he is probably mistaken.

<sup>22</sup> The full text of this elegia can be found in appendix five.

<sup>23</sup> The date of birth provided by Paquot ('vers 1520') seems a mere guess; the same goes for Cornelius ('vers l'an 1570'), as we will come to see. These dates, initially provided as estimates by Paquot, have gradually become current, but have never been substantiated. De Kerckhove, 'Corrections à la généalogie', 350 (2004), p. 82, does not give a date of birth for Carolus.

families of Ghent,<sup>24</sup> and members of their family, as well as their coat of arms, can be found all over Flanders.<sup>25</sup> Cornelius' brothers Charles and Viglius both managed to procure rather respectable positions in Ghent and Bruges: Charles, initially a solicitor in Ghent, at some point became secretary of the city of Ghent ('eerste secrectaris der stede van Ghendt'), while Viglius (or Vigile) became pensionary ('eerste pensionaris vande griffie') of the Liberty of Bruges ('Brugse Vrije') in 1608 and secretary ('griffier') in 1631.<sup>26</sup> In 1633, he was sent as a delegate for Flanders to the States-General of the Northern Provinces.<sup>27</sup>

Ludovicus would make a name for himself most notably as superior of the *Missio Hollandica* (using, for security reasons, a pseudonym (Ludovicus Caroli), as Jesuits operating in the *Missio* commonly did),<sup>28</sup> though he had

---

<sup>24</sup> Sanderus, *Gandavum sive Gandavensium*, II.6 ('Enumeratio quarundam nobilium Familiarum Gandensium').

<sup>25</sup> De Kerckhove has included many such references. References can also be found e.g. in Dhont-De Wapenaer, *Quartiers généalogiques*, 148-149; 252; 403-405; 459; and Blommaert (e.a.), *Graf- en gedenkschriften*. Some also exist in manuscript, cf. e.g. KBBr, ms 16901 (*Inscriptions sépulchrales qui se trouvent dans les églises de Gand et dans les paroisses des environs, avec des armoiries peintes en couleur, transcrites dans la première moitié du XVII siècle*), ff. 65; 73; 141; 194; 253; 300; 301.

<sup>26</sup> De Kerckhove, 'Corrections à la généalogie', 350 (2004), p. 82. The municipal archives of Ghent (SAG) hold three registers with papers from the Van Marcke-family (FP 3990), which include many items related to Charles (a.o. his personal 'landcijsboekje') and Viglius. De Kerckhove notes that Viglius died in 1638, though the SAG-papers seem to contain evidence of Viglius ('Viglius van Lumene gheseyt van Marcke zone van Charles by Jonckvrauwe Lucie de Monick') still working as secretary in 1640. The RAG holds a copy of an antenuptial contract ('contract van huwen tusschen Charles van Maercke en Marie van Ombeke, 7bre 1613') between Charles de Marcke and Marie van Ombeke (RAG, 172 734). For Charles, cf. also De Potter, *Petit Cartulaire de Gand*, 205. For Viglius, cf. Beaucourt de Noortvelde, *Jaer-boeken van den lande van den vryen*, 200; Van der Vynckt, *Nederlandsche beroerten*, 290; Van Aitzema, *Verbael van de Nederlandsche vreedde handel*, 128. Both Charles and Viglius are referred to as parties in legal disputes in the registers to the archives of the Council of Flanders. Cf. Buntinx, *Inventaris van het Archief*, VIII, 366 (s.v. Marcke). In one case, Viglius is charged by a bookbinder from Bruges regarding a debt related to the purchase of books (II, p. 215 / no. 11558). It appears father Charles is also registered as having filed a lawsuit in 1608 (II, p. 65 / no. 9317): 'Charles van Lummene gezegd van Marcke (Gent) c. de wed. van Michiel van Haute (Gent): lijfrente'. If the entry is referring to father Charles, and not to his son (who is otherwise referred to as 'Charles van Marcke, eerste secr. van de schep. van de Keure van Gent'), this would mean he was in any case still alive in 1608.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Deplanche, *Un légiste anversois au service de l'Espagne*, 49; 54; 63.

<sup>28</sup> Ludovicus à Marca was superior of the *Missio* from October 1634 to 1638, and again from 1642 to 1645. From 1646-1648 he is listed as *consultor* and *admonitor* to the *missio's* superior. Cf. Begheyn, *Catalogi Missionis Hollandicae*, 14 and 22; Begheyn, *Gids voor de geschiedenis*, 42. Jesuits who were active in the risky *Missio* usually adopted a pseudonym. Cf. Van Hoeck, *Schets van de geschiedenis der Jezüieten*, who lists Ludovicus Caroli as the pseudonym of Ludovicus à Marca in appendix VIII, p. 395 ('Dubbelnamen van Jezüieten in de Hollandsche Missie'). The Utrecht Archives preserve several letters from Ludovicus



also been sent to Rome as procurator somewhere between 1638 and 1642, and again as a delegate to the 10<sup>th</sup> General Congregation of the Society of Jesus, held in Rome in 1652.<sup>29</sup> He had also been *rector* of the Jesuit College in Ypres in the early 1630s.<sup>30</sup> When he died in 1662 after having suffered a stroke, his eulogy was composed, in which many aspects of his life are highlighted. Like the entry in the *Album noviciorum*, the text again provides valuable clues for his family background:

‘Father Ludovicus a Marca, from Ghent, his forefathers stemming from Limburg, as he used to recount, was born on August 29, 1584 in Courtrai, where earlier his parents had retreated, because at the time the treacherous heretics disrupted the city of Ghent with fierce uproar and the overthrowing of sacred places, pillaging the houses of the noble and of other Catholics who were loyal to their king. After his fatherland had been restored to king and religion, he went to grammarschool there at the Jesuit gymnasium as a boy, then studied philosophy for two years in Douai, after which he was accepted as a novice in Tournai in November 1601, etc.’<sup>31</sup>

According to this eulogy, Ludovicus, ‘from Ghent’, used to recount that his family originated from the province of Limburg.<sup>32</sup> However, he was born in

---

as superior of the *Missio* (1003 (Apostolische vicarissen van de Hollandse zending), no. 125: Brieven van Ludovicus Caroli a Marca S.J. (6)).

<sup>29</sup> The 10<sup>th</sup> General Congregation was held from 7 January to 20 March 1652 in Rome. Cf. Begheyn, *Gids voor de geschiedenis*, 39.

<sup>30</sup> Most information stems from the eulogy, of which the full text can be found in appendix three. In Waldack, *Historia Provinciae Flandro-Belgicae*, 71nt1, Ludovicus makes his appearance as *magister* in Douai, teaching *poësis* and *rhetorica*. Ludovicus is listed in the *Menologium van de Sociëteit van Jezus*, I, p. 247, as well as in Poncelet, *Nécrologe des Jésuites*, 82. Audenaert, *Prosopographia Iesuitica*, II, 102 provides an overview of various references to Ludovicus.

<sup>31</sup> P[ater] Ludovicus a Marca Gandavensis, majoribus e Limburgia, uti referebat, oriundis, anno 1584 29 Augusti natus Cortraci, quo parentes antea secesserant quod heretici perduelles civitatem Gandavensem tum insolitis tumultibus perturbabant in aedibus optimatum, aliorumque regi suo fidelium Catholicorum grassantes, ac rerum sacrarum direptione. Patria regi ac religioni restituta, ibidem puer litteras perdidicit in Gymnasio Soc[ietatis] Jesu, tum philosophiae per biennium Duaci operam dedit, deinde Tornaci anno 1601 Novembris tyrocinium ingressus est, etc. KBBr, ms 6485, ff. 503-504, a copy of which is also held at the Dutch Jesuit Archives in Nijmegen (ANSI), registered as OS 160. A full transcription of this highly interesting eulogy I have provided in appendix three.

<sup>32</sup> The town of Lummen (Lumey) is indeed located in Limburg. It has been suggested that the Van Marckes might have been related to the family of William de la Marck, Lord of Lumey, the admiral of the sea-beggars, and responsible for the execution of the martyrs of Gorcum, who, after having been banned from the Northern provinces, retreated to his estate near Liège. Cf. Flament, ‘Nogmaals Lumey’, 281. Interestingly, Lummenaeus’ fellow tragedian, Nicolaus Vernulaeus (for whom Lummenaeus wrote a

Courtrai in 1584, because his parents had fled Ghent due to the treacherous heretics who had looted churches and the houses of not only the nobility, but also of all those who supported the Catholic cause. Ludovicus, as he had himself already noted in the *Album noviciorum*, received his primary education at the Jesuit College in Ghent after the family had returned there, and had continued his studies in Douai, at the time an important Catholic academy, alongside Louvain. This, then, might very well also have been the path followed by his brother Cornelius.<sup>33</sup> In 1610, the Ghent poet Justus Rycquius (Joost de Rycke; 1587-1627) recalled that Cornelius had once been his *συμμαθητής*, his co-disciple.<sup>34</sup> Rycquius had been educated in his native Ghent, before moving to Douai to study philosophy, as so many of their generation did.<sup>35</sup> Like Ludovicus, Rycquius had attended the Jesuit College in Ghent.<sup>36</sup>

Rycquius' remark, however, may provide a clue also for Cornelius' year of birth. If Cornelius was indeed born in or around 1570, this would mean that he would have been studying in his late twenties or early thirties with a *very* young Rycquius in the late 1590s. Though this is not entirely impossible, it seems not unreasonable to contemplate a somewhat later date of birth for Cornelius, which would perhaps bring him closer to his brother Ludovicus and Rycquius. However, in the case of Rycquius, who died at the age of forty, his death has understandably been called premature;<sup>37</sup> for Cornelius we can only recall, for what it's worth, the words of his good friend Antonius Sanderus: 'What more could have been expected from the divine genius of this man, if only God had granted him a longer life?'<sup>38</sup> If he was born around 1580-1585, his death in 1628 – a year for which I will argue below – would also have been fairly premature; nowhere, however, is it referred to as such. What is more, there is a letter from Sanderus to Lummenaeus from 1620 that touched upon Cornelius' monastic behaviour,

---

preliminary poem on the occasion of his *Divus Eustachius* (Louvain, 1612)), stages the admiral as 'Lumnius Comes à Marca' in his tragedy *Gorcomienses* (Cologne, 1610). Could the close resemblance between their names have rung a bell with contemporaries?

<sup>33</sup> Varenbergh notes that Cornelius had received his education in Ghent, but this seems to be a mere assumption. Cf. Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 7.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Rycquius, *Epistolae*, 113: *De Iephthe Corneli a Marca, συμμαθητοῦ quondam mei, laetum omnino fuit* (Epistola XXXIII, to Simon van Kerckhove, dated from Rome, 5 September 1610).

<sup>35</sup> For instance, Lummenaeus' good friend, Antonius Sanderus, had also studied philosophy in Douai (Saint-Genois, *Antoine Sanderus et ses écrits*, 11-12).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the title of one of his poems: *Ode IV. Reverendis Societatis Iesu Relligiosis, inventutis meae institutoribus εὐχαριστική* (Rycquius, *Poematum libri II*, 50-54). For more detailed biographical information on Rycquius: Andreas, *Bibliotheca Belgica* (1643), 604-605; *Biographie Nationale*, 5, 689-691; Hoefler, *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, XLI-XLII, 943.

<sup>37</sup> Andreas, *Bibliotheca Belgica* (1643), 604-605 (*praemature diem supremum obiit*).

<sup>38</sup> *Quid non amplius tamen a divino viri ingenio expectandum erat, si longiorem illi vitam Deus concessisset?* (Sanderus, *S. Andreas Corsinus Carmelita*, 6). Cf. also below, pp. 84-85.

his approach to patronage and funding. This letter's tone can justifiably be called somewhat presumptuous and one cannot help but wonder whether or not this is how a younger man – Sanderus was born in 1586 – addressed a respected, much older friend?<sup>39</sup>

On the other hand, in the emotional funeral oration for his good friend, the Ghent town secretary and *poeta laureatus* Maxaemilianus Vrientius (1559-1614), Cornelius declared:

‘This is surely only a small thing, most illustrious Maxaemilianus Vrientius, which I have willingly offered to our friendship and the prayers of our friends, whose requests it was easy for me to heed: that I would attach this symbol of our love to your merits, a testimony of my sincere affection, that has never offended you in any respect. For we, nearly born under the same stars, imbued with the same vigor, initiated in the same rituals, fed indeed by the same breast, we worked on the mysteries of Mount Parnassus [i.e. literature], contending for one and the same laurel, though always without any jealousy or evil emulation, that usually leaves its mark even on the greatest of efforts and ruins the splendor of true virtue.’<sup>40</sup>

Does this mean they were born not long apart, or were they rather, metaphorically, both born as or destined to be children of Apollo and the Muses?

Having reviewed these scanty and somewhat contradictory clues, it seems not unreasonable to suggest a time frame of 1575-1585 as Lummenaeus' year of birth. Therefore, I will refer to his birth as having taken place ‘c. 1580’. It is in any case more plausible than Paquot's apparently unfounded suggestion of ‘vers l'an 1570’. As a consequence, his father Carolus à Marca's year of birth (suggested by Paquot as ‘vers 1520’) may as well have to be reconsidered.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> However, in the same letter Sanderus also wrote: *Scolarem tuum me vocas et discipulum*, ‘You call me your student and pupil.’ These words may indicate that Lummenaeus must at the very least have been a *bit* older than Sanderus. Cf. appendix six (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 20. Varenbergh has published this letter only in part).

<sup>40</sup> *Exiguum sane hoc est, clarissime Maxaemiliane Vrienti, quod amicitiae nostrae, et precibus amicorum libenter condonavi, qui non difficulter a me id impetravere: ut hoc amoris symbolum meritis tuis impenderem, sinceri mei adfectus testimonium, qui in te nunquam peccavit. Etenim paene eodem sidere nati eodem [ed. eodum (?)] succo imbuti, eisdem orgijs initiati, unius certe mammae collectei, Parnassi mysterijs operati sumus ad unam eandemque lauream contendentes, sine invidia tamen vel prava aemulatione, quae plerumque magnis conatibus ut naevus quidam affundi solet, et genuinae virtutis splendorem infuscare (Corona Virginea, homilia XII, 178).*

<sup>41</sup> A reference in the registers to the archives of the Council of Flanders seems to suggest that father Carolus was still alive in 1608. Cf. above, p. 18nt18. Lummenaeus addressed a

In any case, Cornelius' youth would have taken place in a period and an environment marked by civil war and religious strife, of which Ghent would bear the scars for years to come. As noted in Ludovicus' eulogy, his parents had in fact left Ghent for Courtrai sometime during the years of the Calvinistic Republic (1578-1584). Such events must have made an enormous impression on the inhabitants of Ghent, and Cornelius, even if he would not have lived through those time of turmoil himself, would at least in his later life be surrounded by those who had felt the fury of the Calvinists first-hand, not only his parents, but also men like his close friend Maxaemilianus Vrientius (forced in exile and incarcerated upon his premature return<sup>42</sup>), and his future abbot at St. Peter's abbey, Cornelius Columbanus Vrancx. The latter was one of the most fervent writers of anti-Calvinistic treatises, and saw his books and goods burned out on the street. St Peter's abbey itself – which Cornelius was to enter in 1600 – would bear the marks of the Calvinistic destruction long after 1584.<sup>43</sup> Its reconstruction got thoroughly underway only under the abbot Arsenius Schayck (1615-1631), of whom we will come to speak in more detail below. In short, a whole generation would grow up amidst a city scarred by conflict and in a society that was literally torn apart by the substantial exodus of Protestant sympathizers, intellectuals and craftsmen, after Catholic rule had been restored by Alexander Farnese in 1584. Those left behind, though rather quickly setting about restoring their city and their faith (especially after 1607, when an armistice signalled the arrival of the 1609 treaty) would surely not have been fully able to shed their traumata.<sup>44</sup>

There is one last reference to Cornelius's life prior to his entry as a Benedictine *frater* in St. Peter's abbey in 1600. Apparently, as is recalled several times by his abbot Arsenius Schayck in copies from letters dating from the 1620s (which will be addressed in more detail below), Cornelius had first joined the Capuchins, before entering the Order of Saint Benedict. This event, if true, must in any case have occurred before his admission to St. Peter's in 1600, but only after 1589, when, starting in Ghent, the

---

poem in the 1613 *Opera omnia* to his father and brother, both named Charles/Carolus. Was his father still alive when the work was printed in 1613? Cf. also the words of abbot Schayck, who claimed that Lummenaeus' parents advised against him going to Italy (cf. below, p. 57): this might suggest that his parents were still alive in the early 1620s, which would render Carolus' suggested year of birth (c. 1520) infinitely more unlikely, though still not entirely impossible. I would say that 'c. 1550' constitutes a better – though still a – guess.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir*, II, 352-353; *Biographie Nationale*, t. 5, 869-871 (s.v. *De Vriendt, Maximilien*).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. chapter three (also regarding Vrancx), as well as *Benedictus en zijn monniken in de Nederlanden*, II, 220-222.

<sup>44</sup> Chapter three of this thesis will discuss the Calvinistic Republic of Ghent (1578-1584) and any possible echoes in Cornelius à Marca's work in more detail.

Capuchin Order was first established in the Southern Netherlands.<sup>45</sup> Schayck happily refers to this episode three times – for, as we will come to see, it suited his argument quite well –, using similar, though slightly different phrasings: ‘I deeply regret that among my monastics there is one, who, though of bright mind, has been thrown even from the Capuchins’ nest, *etc.*’<sup>46</sup> In another letter, Schayck adds ‘even before his profession’.<sup>47</sup> Either way, Cornelius’ flirtation with the Capuchins seems not have lasted very long, and it has been eagerly used by Schayck as a telltale sign of Cornelius’ rampant behavior as a Benedictine monastic. There are, however, two sides to each story: the relationship between Schayck and Cornelius will be addressed in full detail below.

*1600-1615: from Ghent Benedictine novice to international man of letters*

In 1600, then, Cornelius de Marcke was admitted as a *frater* in St. Peter’s abbey on the *Mons Blandinius* (Blandijnberg), in those days near, but today in Ghent. The State Archives in Ghent, which preserve the archives of the abbey, hold a register containing the abbey’s *pronunciations de voeux*. Cornelius’ handwritten and personally signed vow, dated 11 November 1600, reads:

‘In the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, Amen

In the year of our Lord 1600, I, brother Cornelius de Marcke, of the Ghent diocese, take the vows of stability, conversion of life, and obedience according to the Rule of St Benedict, openly to God and all the Saints, especially those, whose relics are kept in this monastery of St Peter-in-Blandinium, in the presence of the Reverend in Christ the Lord my father, abbot Mr.

<sup>45</sup> De Moreau, *Histoire de l’église en Belgique*, 393. It is perhaps noteworthy, that in 1603 the Ghent Capuchin Franciscus de Lummene died on 4 August (cf. Blommaert (e.a.), *Graf- en gedenkschriften*, (Tweede reeks: Kloosterkerken. Gent: deel 1), *Catalogus omnium mortuorum fratrum sancti patris Francisci Capucinatorum: De Lummene, Franciscus, filius Domini de Marke et Catharinae d’Hembyze (Mansuetus, Gandensis), praedicator, vestitus 27 aprilis 1592, obiit 4 augusti 1603, religionis 10, aetatis suae 41*).

<sup>46</sup> *Dolebam vehementer me inter caeteros unum tantum habere Religiosum ab ordine et[iam] Capucinatorum excucullatum, praeclari quidem ingenii*, etc. RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 / Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 27-29. Letter (copy) from Schayck to Nuncio Guidi di Bagno (cf. below, p. 57). The same line can be found in (the copy of) an undated letter directed possibly to Gaspard Scioppius: RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, s.d.; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 36-38 (cf. below, p. 57).

<sup>47</sup> *Dolebam vehementer me inter caeteros unum tan[tum] habere Religiosum ab ordine etiam Capucinatorum ante professionem suam dimi[ssum]*, *praeclari quidem ingenii*, etc. Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1<sup>ro</sup>-2<sup>ro</sup> (cf. Pasture, ‘Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini’, 119, no. 739); accurately published in full by IJsewijn, ‘Rome en de humanistische literatuur’, 54-56. The letter is dated 24 April 1624.

Columbanus, and the monks of the said monastery. In confirmation hereof, I have personally written and signed this petition or vow on the eleventh day of the month November.

[Signed] Brother Cornelius de Marcke<sup>48</sup>

When *frater* Cornelius was priested, we do not know. In any case, it must have taken place before January 1607, when he is no longer listed as *frater* but *dominus*.<sup>49</sup> It is perhaps striking that we know fairly little about Lummenaeus' life as Benedictine. Only as late as 1608, his tracks become somewhat easier to follow, though rather as a man of letters than a Benedictine monastic. Around that year, Lummenaeus enters the humanist network that spread

---

<sup>48</sup> *In nomine domini nostri Ihesu Christi, Amen / Anno a nativitate eiusdem millesimo sexcentesimo ego frater / Cornelius de Marcke diocoesis Gandensis promitto stabilitatem / meam, et conversionem morum meorum, et oboedientiam secundum / regulam Sancti Benedicti coram deo et omnibus Sanctis, / praesertim eis, quorum reliquiae habentur in hoc monasterio divi Petri / in Blandinio, in praesentia Reverendi in Christo Patris / mei domini, domini Columbani Abbatis, et monachorum / eiusdem monasterii. Ad cuius rei fidem hanc petitionem seu / professionem manu propria scripsi die undecima mensis Novembris / et propria manu subscripsi. / [signed] Frater Cornelius de Marcke (RAG, S.P. 34 II 104; dated 11 November 1600).*

<sup>49</sup> In or around that month, a survey was held under the monastics of St. Peter's regarding the nomination of a *coadiutor* to the administratively somewhat unable and already ageing abbot, Cornelius Columbanus Vrancx (c. 1530-1615; abbot 1597-1615; cf. Van der Haeghen, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, V, 765, touching briefly upon Vrancx' mismanagement of the abbey's worldly affairs). The survey is entitled 'Een enquete gehauden om te maecken eenen coaiutor van dit clooster onder den abt Columbanus audt alsdan 74 jaeren. 1607' (RAG, S.P. 34 II 108). We find Cornelius under number twenty: *D[omin]us Cornelius a Marca interrogatus ut sup[ra] respondet in verbo sacerdotis libera concessa facultate postulandi etiam extraneum ratum se tenere priorem suam depositionem nec desiderat habere extraneum. [signed] D. Cornelius A Marca*. The appointment of Schayck as *coadiutor* was not uncontroversial, since many, Vrancx included, had rather welcomed someone else to the position. Cf. Berlière e.a., *Monasticon Belge*, VIIa, 140. Cornelius seems here to have agreed to Schayck's appointment, which he perhaps would come to regret later. Interestingly, Cornelius de Marcke had by now Latinized his name to A Marca, as his father Carolus and brother Ludovicus had also done. The addition *Lummenaeus* we find, at least in his own printed work, for the first time in the dedication to Borromeo of the *Opera omnia*, but not on the title page. The dedicatory poem in Puteanus' *Epistolarum Bellaria* (1612) is signed with 'Iacobus Cornelius Lumineus A Marca' (f. †1<sup>vo</sup>). He must have been using it before that year, since we already find it in earlier correspondence. Cf. e.g. Puteanus, *Epistolarum Apophoreta*, 108-109 (epistola 95; January 1611): *Lumineum nostrum*; see also Lummenaeus' letter to Borromeo of March 1611: *Cornelius Lummenaeus dictus a Marca* (Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, ff. 198<sup>ro-vo</sup>). In later years, he would often publish his works, and almost always sign his correspondence, with his full, Latinized name: Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca. One indeed gets the impression that he actually preferred using this impressively lengthy name in international contexts, as Orbaan noted ('Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 36). I have not come across the Latinized addition *Lummenaeus* in reference to Carolus or Ludovicus.

from Ghent to Brussels and Louvain, and even far beyond the borders of the Spanish Netherlands.

In the year 1608 Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca suddenly makes his first appearance on the world stage.<sup>50</sup> Just before his first publication, the Biblical tragedy *Iephthe* (1608/9), we can trace Lummenaeus' first steps as a man of letters not only through two preliminary poems published in 1608 (cf. appendix one), but most notably through the correspondence of Erycius Puteanus (Hendrick van den Putte / Eryck de Put; 1574-1646<sup>51</sup>), who had succeeded Justus Lipsius as professor of Ancient History and Latin at the University of Louvain in 1606. Thus, in 1608 Lummenaeus' star as a skilled tragedian – even before his first work was published – was already rising. While residing in St. Peters Abbey on the *mons Blandinius*, he was actively establishing a social network of intellectuals, where he found ample opportunity to distribute his work both in manuscript and in print. In a letter dated 1 July 1608,<sup>52</sup> Puteanus apologizes for the belated response to Lummenaeus' overwhelmingly friendly letter and praises one of his tragedies (most likely the *Iephthe tragoedia sacra*<sup>53</sup>) as *aemula Antiquitatis*, as competing with Antiquity. He thanks his age and fatherland for producing such a man, thanks to which 'we will read and see the riches of his (i.e. Lummenaeus') divine genius.'<sup>54</sup> He advises Lummenaeus furthermore to provide in print also his second tragedy,<sup>55</sup> so that the people

---

<sup>50</sup> Throughout the biographical section, I will profoundly explore the correspondence of and published by, Erycius Puteanus, who, especially between 1608-1613, corresponded frequently with Lummenaeus, but also – which is even more interesting – with others *about* Lummenaeus. Earlier biographers have not yet done this. However, the image that might surface from this careful exploration will at least be biased and one-sided, but nevertheless the collection of *epistolae* currently constitutes the best, and virtually only, source for this unexplored period of Lummenaeus' life.

<sup>51</sup> For Erycius Puteanus, cf. Simar, *Erycius Puteanus*; Alphonse Roersch, 'Puteanus (Erycius) ou Eeryck de Putte', in *Biographie Nationale*, 18), col. 329-344; Manders, *Erycius Puteanus*; Sacré (ed.), 'Acta Puteanae: proceedings of the International Colloquium Erycius Puteanus (1574-1646). Puteanus' appointment as successor to Lipsius was not entirely uncontroversial: his attempts to actively create a network of learned and gifted men (emphasized by his correspondence being published as early as 1612) and the rapid and incessant publication of a wide variety of literary works, was doubtlessly part of his offensive to gain recognition. Lummenaeus was only one of many in Puteanus' network: cf. for instance Werner Waterschoot's article on Puteanus and Justus de Harduwijn.

<sup>52</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Bellaria*, 63-64.

<sup>53</sup> Lummenaeus, *Iephthe* (1608/9). Printing probably started in late 1608 according to the dates given on the title page and in the preliminary works, only to finish in 1609, as attested by the printers mark on K3<sup>vo</sup>.

<sup>54</sup> (...) *legemus et spectabimus hunc divitis ingenii tui censum*.

<sup>55</sup> Possibly Puteanus is talking about the *Carcer Babylonius*, first published in 1610. The letter is discussed also by Demmy Verbeke, in light of the controversies surrounding Puteanus' *De conviviorum luxu epistola* (1608). Cf. Verbeke, 'Condemned by some', 359.

absent will have a chance to see it as well (*quam absentes quoque spectent*<sup>56</sup>). A copy of the *Dives Epulo*, a tragedy that would appear with two others – *Iephthe* and *Carcer Babylonius* – in the 1613 *Opera Omnia*, will be handed to Matthaeus Sanderius and Phillipus Wannemakerus.<sup>57</sup> Even though he and Puteanus are not yet on familiar terms, as in later letters, Lummenaeus had sent or in any other way shown samples of his tragic oeuvre to Puteanus. In any case, even when taking into account the rather customary humanist politeness, Puteanus is highly enthusiastic about what he's read or seen, and the stage appeared set for more frequent contact. This letter of 1608 constitutes, together with the two preliminary poems of 1608 (cf. appendix one), the first trace of Lummenaeus as a man of letters.

Late 1608, or even early 1609, Lummenaeus' *Iephthe* formally appeared at the printing house of Hiëronymus Verdussen in Antwerp.<sup>58</sup> While the tragedy itself will be addressed in more detail in the fourth chapter of the present work, here I would like to address the many preliminary letters and poems that indicate in itself the care with which Lummenaeus had prepared his maiden publication through an evolving social and professional network:<sup>59</sup> the booklet itself (it numbers around 78 pages *in-4<sup>o</sup>*) is dedicated to the abbot of St. Peter's, Cornelius Columbanus Vrancx, who was himself a productive author of dogmatic and anti-Calvinistic treatises, which were also published, among others, at the house of Verdussen.<sup>60</sup> Two long

---

<sup>56</sup> Puteanus twice refers to 'seeing' the plays (*spectare*, perhaps opposed to *legere*, to read, though the word may have been used metaphorically), even though in later times his dramas are generally referred to as having been written for private reading. Cf. chapter two of this thesis.

<sup>57</sup> *Sanderium et Wannemakerum magis etiam tua causa amo, et huic Epulonem tuum ferendum trado*, p. 64. For Wannemakerus, cf. below, p. 32.

<sup>58</sup> The title page (A1<sup>ro</sup>) gives 1608, but the printer's mark on the last page is dated 1609 (K3<sup>vo</sup>). The printing process perhaps started in 1608, only to finish in 1609. The dedicatory poem by David Lindanus is dated September 5, 1608 (p. 10 / B1<sup>vo</sup>). The *approbatio* by Laurentius Beyerlinck (K3<sup>vo</sup>) is not dated.

<sup>59</sup> A letter by Puteanus (*Epistolarum Apophoreta*, LIX) gives the modern reader a wonderful insight in the reciprocal workings of a humanist network: following the publication of Puteanus' *Caecitatis Consolatio* (discussed below), Lummenaeus seems to have asked Puteanus to provide him with a poem in turn, probably intended as a preliminary work to his upcoming *Carcer Babylonius*. Puteanus' answer: *De carmine, experiar an Musa velit: quis favor et furor sit Apollinis, tu optime nosti*, 'About the poem, I will wait and see what the Muse has in store for me: you of all people know very well what makes Apollo tick!' Apparently Puteanus' Muse did not have much in store for him at the time, for there seems no trace of a preliminary poem by Puteanus in Lummenaeus' early publications. At least in some cases, preliminary poems were actually requested by the author of the soon-to-appear publication.

<sup>60</sup> One gets the impression that it might have been at least partially thanks to Vrancx that Lummenaeus was able to get his first work published and, as we have seen, Puteanus also encouraged him. For an overview of the published works of Cornelius Columbanus Vrancx, see Van der Haeghen's *Bibliotheca Belgica* and *Bibliographie Gantoise*. As we will



preliminary poems are next, the first by David Lindanus, the second by Antonius Sanderus, both honouring Lummenaeus' literary qualities. Several shorter anagrams and epigrams follow, by Nicolas Creuxius, Bernardus Bauhusius, someone whose initials are A.a.M. from the Society of Jesus,<sup>61</sup> and the well-known Ghent humanist Maxaemilianus Vrientius. Surprisingly, Puteanus is absent from this list.

In 1609, the relationship between Puteanus and Lummenaeus had already evolved: here for the first time we see Lummenaeus being addressed as *amicus suavissimus*, very dear friend.<sup>62</sup> The stream of manuscript poetry was flowing ever more copiously: Puteanus had obtained, through Lummenaeus or otherwise, a copy of several *Lessus*, poetic lamentations, which he had very much enjoyed and sent to some of his friends, who remain unnamed but apparently were of the same opinion.<sup>63</sup> Also, Puteanus would like to receive an early transcript of Lummenaeus' upcoming publication, the tragedy *Carcer Babylonicus* (sic). Thus, Puteanus' admiration *and* adhortation of Lummenaeus' literary production ('et hic stimulus sit, ut pergas')<sup>64</sup> rapidly

come to see, it will be relevant to note that not a few of Vrancx' *and* Lummenaeus' works were also printed by the Ghent printer Gaultier Manilius.

<sup>61</sup> A.a.M. S.J. A.A.: perhaps one of Lummenaeus' relatives (A. à Marca?), even though we currently have no information on one whose name starts with an A. It may be that it refers to a vernacular variation of his brother Ludovicus' name, Aloys, but it has not been preserved elsewhere. The letters A.A., it has been suggested to me by Paul Begheyn SJ of the Dutch Jesuit Archives (ANSI), *may* indicate 'amicus aspirans', but cannot commonly be found elsewhere as such. Ludovicus was priested on 24 August 1610 (cf. the eulogy of Ludovicus, appendix three). In the 1613 reprint of the *Opera omnia*, the name is again printed. If above suggestion is correct, the designation A.A. would by then already have been out of date.

<sup>62</sup> Letter from Puteanus to Lummenaeus, dated 2 January 1609 (*Epistolarum Apophoreta*, epistola LXVII).

<sup>63</sup> However, Lummenaeus appears to have had some doubts regarding the censorship involved in the publication of these works. He is soon comforted by Puteanus: *De censura iam desine: ebur atramento non candefacio, et qui novo torno aut cothurno carmina ista comparat, is mihi non Apollo, sed Marsyas*, 'No more about the censorship: I cannot make ivory white with black ink, and he who assimilates these poems to a new polished or elevated style, I hold as Marsyas, not as Apollo' (echoing Plautus' *Mostellaria*, 259: *ebur atramento candefacere postules*). Puteanus' irritated attitude toward bookcensors – Laurentius Beyerlinck, who approved of Lummenaeus' *Iephte*, in particular – is aptly illustrated by Demmy Verbeke, 'Condemned by some', 357-358.

<sup>64</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Apophoreta*, LIX, 72-73. Puteanus had already spent many years with Federico Borromeo in Milan, where he had been appointed professor of Latin at the Palatine school. Cf. Simar, *Étude sur E. Puteanus*, 1909; Verbeke, 'Condemned by some', 355. This letter, from mid-1609, appears to have been some sort of formal first introduction for Lummenaeus, for Puteanus describes Borromeo as 'the archbishop of Milan', while he will later be referred to solely as cardinal Borromeo or *Princeps* (the lord), both by Puteanus and Lummenaeus. Furthermore, the Louvain professor here takes ample time to illuminate Borromeo's qualities and erudition (*Vir eloquentia, doctrina et virtute magnus est, et cui placere gloriosum putes. Serius in his Litteris nostris est, qui in omni Scientia*

paved the way for the Ghent Benedictine to publish even a preliminary poem in one of Puteanus' own works, *Caecitatis Consolatio* (1609), a consolation for the blindness of the chancellor of the Sovereign Court of Gelderland, Willem Crip or Guilelmus Cripius, in which Lummenaeus himself offers a beautiful poetic consolation to the grieved *cancellarius* as well.<sup>65</sup> Through Puteanus, Lummenaeus' network swiftly finds international expansion: from Mattheus Sanderius the Louvain professor had obtained several copies of the *Iephthe*, one of which he sent to the influential maecenas of fine arts in Milan, cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564-1631), Archbishop of Milan, who, Puteanus is sure, would definitely be moved by the tragedy.<sup>66</sup> An answer from Milan seems to have come in the form of a poem – written *ex nutu Cardinalis Borromaei*, by order of cardinal Borromeo – by Benedictus Sossagus<sup>67</sup> and was printed as a preliminary poem in the 1610 edition of *Carcer Babylonius*.<sup>68</sup> One of the verses goes as follows: *meum canamus Principem atque adeo tuum*, 'let us celebrate in song our lord, mine as much as he is yours'. The seeds for international patronage had been successfully planted. It is thus through Puteanus, as the following will make clear, that Lummenaeus established contacts in Milan and was eventually able to visit this North-Italian city in 1622.

### *The Palaestra Bonae Mentis*

Through Puteanus, our attention is also drawn to another aspect of Lummenaeus' rising star, of which we had hitherto not heard, his qualities as a gifted and eloquent orator: 'I have heard about your speech, and I have no reason to doubt its outcome: let me be the first to congratulate you on your fame and eloquence on that sacred stage.'<sup>69</sup> Apparently, the word about

---

*singularis*), which he was less likely to have done if Lummenaeus had previously been in contact with, or had seriously spoken with Puteanus about, the cardinal.

<sup>65</sup> Puteanus, *Caecitatis consolatio*, 152-153. This poem probably dates from around March 1609, when the accompanying dedicatory letter by Puteanus was written. For a discussion of Puteanus' *Consolatio* and its relation to Constantijn Huygen's *Ooghentroost* (1647), cf. De Landtsheer, 'Erycius Puteanus's *Caecitatis Consolatio*'.

<sup>66</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Apophoreta*, LIX, 72-73, dated 29 May, 1609. For cardinal Federico Borromeo as patron of the arts, cf. Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana*. He was the founder of the Ambrosiana in Milan, a tripartite institution, comprising a library (founded 1607), an art museum (founded 1618) and an art academy (active ca. 1613; founded in 1620). Cf. Jones, *id.*, 39.

<sup>67</sup> Benedetto Sossago (†1623) was a Latin poet who became, like Puteanus, a doctor at Borromeo's *Bibliotheca Ambrosiana* in Milan.

<sup>68</sup> *Carcer Babylonius*, A2<sup>vo</sup>. It is not dated, but while the title page of the *Carcer Babylonius* gives 1610, it most likely antedates the *approbatio* of 17 December 1609.

<sup>69</sup> *De oratione tua audivi, de eventu nullus dubito. Ac jam gratulari famam tibi et eloquentiam incipio in Sacris his rostris*. Puteanus, *Epistolarum Apophoreta*, LIX, 72-73 (29 May, 1609).

Lummenaeus' virtues as an orator had already spread. But with such incentives, it is not surprising that after the publication Cornelius was at that time preparing – the *Carcer Babylonius* –, his next work would include much more material than just the two tragedies he had made available in print up to that moment. The *Opera omnia, qua poetica, qua oratoria, qua historica*, which appeared in 1613 at the printing house of Philip van Dormael in Louvain, contained, as the title indicates, oratorical and historical works as well. This substantial collection makes clear that Lummenaeus must have been an active writer for many years already, perhaps even well before 1608.

Puteanus seems to have been especially fond of Lummenaeus' rhetorical abilities. Around 1610-1611, the Louvain professor established a school in Louvain with the sole purpose of studying the art of rhetoric. He called it *Palaestra Bonae Mentis*, a 'training ground for the good intellect'. In it, he saw a place for Lummenaeus: with men like him, Puteanus tried to put the *Palaestra* on the social-intellectual map. From a letter Puteanus wrote to Petrus Rosaeus<sup>70</sup> on 30 December 1610, we receive inside-information on how the Louvain professor envisioned his newly founded academy to function: 'In my *Palaestra* I train youths. I think you know this institute of mine, don't you? (...) The whole group of athletes is divided in two:<sup>71</sup> the *Ordinarii* and the *Honorarii*. The first are those that are able and are still moulded on the anvil; the second group, as the name indicates, constitutes those who surely have distinguished themselves, be it in age, dignity or doctrine and are, as it were, the supporting, even honouring mentors of the others. See: I have the courage to ask you if you want to be affiliated as well, and be counted among the *Honorarii*. Several distinguished gentlemen have complemented their number already, among them *our* Lummenaeus, that famous priest of the Muses and the Graces.'<sup>72</sup> Since Puteanus mentions only Lummenaeus, he must have constituted one of his best 'arguments' for

<sup>70</sup> Pieter Roose (1586-1673), at the time lawyer in Brussels, would become president of the Secret Council in 1632 and in that role he would exert a considerable influence on the politics of the Southern Netherlands, cf. Wauters, *De controverse rond de jurisdictie van de nuntius*, 49; Israel, *Conflicts of Empire*, 81. Roose's life and work are discussed in detail in Delplanche, *Un légiste anversois au service de l'Espagne*, and Vermeir, 'Les limites de la monarchie composée'. He was buried in Brussels' St. Goedele-church. Cf. Jacobs, *Een geschiedenis van Brussel*, 192.

<sup>71</sup> Puteanus is sticking with the wrestling-metaphor, in a phrase echoing the opening line of C. Iulius Caesar's *De Bello Gallico* (I.1: *Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres* and Puteanus' *Athletae omnes ... divisi sunt*; see below), thus creating a battle-like atmosphere. Cf. in this respect also Puteanus' use of the term 'sclopus', the *arma*, or rhetorical weapons his pupils are using to fight each other with (Puteanus, *Epistolarum Reliquiae*, XI).

<sup>72</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Reliquiae*, III, p. 4: *Atque in Palaestra Bonae Mentis inventutem exerceo. Nosti opinor, institutum. Aut fallor, aut mox erunt, qui ore et stilo Eloquentiae litabunt. Athletae omnes in Ordinarios et Honorarios divisi sunt: illi praesentes, et in incude adhuc versantur; hi, ut nomen indicat, aetate, dignitate, doctrina proveciores, et tanquam fulcra, imo ornamenta aliorum. Vide, quid agam: rogare te quoque audeo, ut dare nomen velis, et inter Honorarios censer. Insignes aliquot viri jam numerum hunc auxerunt; inter quos et Marcanus noster, clarus ille Musarum Charitumque mysta.*

getting Rosaeus to join the pack, or at least the best argument he had to offer at the time. In any case, it underlines Cornelius' name and fame (cf. 'our' Lummenaeus), as well as his qualifications as an orator, rhetoric being the main discipline of the *Palaestra*.<sup>73</sup>

Lummenaeus' position in the *Palaestra* is further illustrated by a letter Puteanus sent from Louvain to a former pupil in Brussels, Frederic van Marselaer (1584-1670),<sup>74</sup> which is dated 4 January 1611: 'What is it that you say? That our Lummenaeus was present there? He should have come to see us as well, to show in how much esteem he holds the *Palaestra*! It is amazing how the sight of such people can light up those youthful spirits! Since he has joined us, he has done what his name indicates: he has illuminated us and lifted the spirits of many. Here, I wrote him a letter, and I ask you, my friend, to hand it over to him.'<sup>75</sup> Possibly Lummenaeus had been present either in Brussels or Louvain and Van Marselaer had seen him there. Clearly he did not go to see Puteanus. But Lummenaeus' presence at the *Palaestra* was definitely much sought after, for he constituted a very illuminating example for the young men who attended.

A short letter from Puteanus to Borromeo, kept in Milan's *Bibliotheca Ambrosiana*, dated 29 April 1611, confirms Lummenaeus' participation in the *Palaestra*: except for the mere customary humanist politeness, the letter consists essentially of only one sentence: 'Marcanus, too, has committed his name to the *Palaestra*, and has been willing to demonstrate in front of everyone to what extent those who study the *artes meliores* unite the Muses with piety, elegancy with doctrine, and honour the very personification of this ambition, Federico Borromeo.'<sup>76</sup> But not only does this letter give testimony of Lummenaeus' abilities as a gifted orator, who enthusiastically dedicated his art and rhetoric talent to his Christian faith, it also demonstrates how Puteanus was willing to send a letter all the way to Milan, containing not much else except the above. It probably worked both ways for Puteanus as well: he was thus able not only to advertise Lummenaeus' loyalty towards the cardinal, but also his own, for it was he who had brought in and taken up Lummenaeus. It fits perfectly in the early efforts of

<sup>73</sup> For more detailed information on Puteanus' *Palaestra Bonae Mentis*, cf. Simar, *Étude sur Erycius Puteanus*, 143-149.

<sup>74</sup> For Van Marselaer – who was a magistrate and burgomaster of Brussels for many years during the first half of the seventeenth century – cf. Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek*, XII, p. 292ff. (s.v. Marselaer, (Frederik van)).

<sup>75</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Apophoreta*, XCV, 108-109: *Quid ais? Lumineum nostrum adfuisse? visere nos quoque debuit, & ostendere quanti Palaestram faciat. Mirum, quàm conspectu talium juvenus excitetur! Sed ille, postquam in numero nostro coepit esse, fecit quod nomen indicat; lumen intulit, & multorum animos accendit. Litteras has scripseram; ut transmittas, amicè te rogo.*

<sup>76</sup> *Etiam Palaestrae Bonae Mentis nomen Marcanus dedit, et ante omnia testari voluit, quantum qui meliores sectantur artes, et pietati Musas jungunt, doctrinae elegantias, summum rerum istarum exemplum et decus Fred[ericum] Borromaeum venerentur.* Puteanus then adds: *Quem ego colo, omnes suspiciunt; quem omnes colunt, ego – fas sit dicere – adoro* (Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, ff. 204<sup>ro</sup>).

Puteanus to obtain a position for Lummenaeus within Borromeo's circle of patronage.

Lummenaeus' attested activities in the *Palaestra* underline his ability and reputation as a public speaker, which seem to have skyrocketed hand in hand with his reputation as a tragedian. Though he must have been active as an orator for some time, the first occasion, now known to us, at which Lummenaeus publicly appeared as an orator was during the combined celebration in 1610 of the grand jubilee of the Blandinian abbey (thought to have been founded in 610) and the celebration of abbot Vrancx' fifty-years priesthood. The text of the speech has been preserved, and will also be discussed in part elsewhere in this thesis.<sup>77</sup>

### *Spreading his wings*

The humanist circles of Flanders were at the time seriously oriented towards the maecenas of fine arts in Milan, cardinal Federico Borromeo, whose reputation was boosted more than a little by the popularity of his elder cousin Carlo Borromeo (1538-1584), canonized by Pope Paul V in 1610. As noted above, Lummenaeus' stepping-stone to the world of international humanism was Puteanus, who had spent some time in Milan with Federico Borromeo, and, despite having returned to Belgium in 1606 to occupy the chair at the University of Louvain left vacant by the death of Justus Lipsius, was named among the founding members of the Ambrosiana in 1611.<sup>78</sup> There is a fascinating piece of literature that throws an interesting light on the coming to existence of the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana and the Flemish humanists involved, which, long neglected, has recently received ample attention in an article by Dirk Sacré:<sup>79</sup> in Philippus Wannemakerus' *Triumphus Litteratorum in quo Borromeianae virtutis imago*, printed in Milan in 1611, Lummenaeus, too, makes his appearance, among many other prominent humanists of Flanders.<sup>80</sup>

In March 1611 Lummenaeus sent a letter to cardinal Borromeo himself. After having been introduced by Puteanus, having some of his

---

<sup>77</sup> See chapter two, pp. 161-162. Cf. *Opera omnia*, 302ff., as well as Sanderus, *Gandavum sive Gandavensium*, 335, who actually mentions the occasion and this speech. It has in the past been used to verify the abbey's founding year. Cf. De Busscher, *L'Abbaye de Saint Pierre*, 5.

<sup>78</sup> Simar, *Étude sur Erycius Puteanus*, 189-190. The Ambrosiana was inaugurated in 1609. Cf. Jones, *Federico Borromeo and the Ambrosiana*, 41. For a concise overview of the history of the Ambrosiana, cf. Paredi, *A History of the Ambrosiana*.

<sup>79</sup> Sacré, 'A forgotten *Somnium*'.

<sup>80</sup> Which lead Orbaan to erroneously suppose Lummenaeus was actually in Milan at the time. Cf. Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 37. Lummenaeus and Wannemakerus must have been fairly well acquainted, as is suggested by Puteanus' letter discussed above (*Epistolarum Bellaria*, epistola 63, cf. above, p. 27). Cf. also Sacré, 'A forgotten *Somnium*', 147nt26.

work sent to Milan, and having received the poem written by order of Borromeo, Lummenaeus probably thought the time right to initiate a direct correspondence. With the letter, the earliest yet found from Lummenaeus to Borromeo, he had sent him another example of his fine poetry – a manuscript of the *Lessus sive suspirium Amaryllidis* – still in possession of the Ambrosiana today.<sup>81</sup> About half a year later, Lummenaeus sent another letter to Borromeo, in which he complained about the mailmen, who instead of having delivered Borromeo's answer in mid-summer, had delivered it only when autumn had come to its full blossoming.<sup>82</sup> A collection of *Lessus*, including the one mentioned above, would soon be published under the auspices of Borromeo, so Lummenaeus wrote. Indeed, some – including the one sent in manuscript to Milan – were to be published in the *Opera Omnia* of 1613, but the collection was not complete, since some had been stolen whilst being prepared for publication at the printer's office.<sup>83</sup> In any case, Lummenaeus' boldness with regard to obtaining patronage seems to have grown by the day. Before having even himself established a close, personal bond with Borromeo, he took the opportunity to commend someone else into the cardinal's care. The letter, in which Lummenaeus requested the cardinal's permission to dedicate the *Opera omnia* to him, was delivered to Borromeo by a young Flemish nobleman, Richard van Pottelsberghe.<sup>84</sup> Thus, without having even been to Italy himself, Lummenaeus assumed the role of a rather world-wise man of letters, in the position to put forward such requests. In any case, Borromeo responded positively, both to his request with regard to the dedication, and to his commendation of the Flemish youngster.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> The letter is Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, ff. 198<sup>ro-vo</sup>, dated 6 March 1611; the *Lessus* is Ambrosiana, S99sup, ff. 357<sup>ro</sup>-361<sup>vo</sup>. Its handwriting appears similar to the *Iephte*-manuscript preserved in Arras (cf. p. 37). The handwriting and signature of the letter seem to differ from other specimens that have been preserved. It is signed 'Cornelius Lummenaeus dictus a Marca', which is rather unusual as well. In 1615 he would send a letter to Borromeo which – as is noted *in margine* – he had dictated to a friend. This may also have been the case here.

<sup>82</sup> The letter is dated 31 October 1611 (Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, ff. 200<sup>ro</sup>).

<sup>83</sup> Lummenaeus mentions the theft in the dedicatory letter to Borromeo (*Opera omnia*, 183-184). Puteanus, too, bewailed the loss of these lamentations in a letter to Lummenaeus (printed in Lummenaeus' *Opera omnia*, 187-189, and in Puteanus' *Epistolarum Reliquiae*, XCII, 117-119).

<sup>84</sup> *Ut has vero ad Illustrissimam Dominationem tuam exararem, causam dedit nobilis Iuvenis, D. Richardus van Pottelsberghe, doctrina et natalibus apud nos conspicuus, qui Illustrissimae D[ominationi] T[uae] has in manus consignat et ad genua Tua provolvitur, gratiam et benedictionem efflagitans. Clericus est, Romam videre optat, et in ea Sanctae Matris Eccl[es]iae fastigium venerari; si ab Illustrissima D[ominatione] T[ua] commendari merebitur, voto illius satisfactum erit, et meo desiderio abunde* (Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, ff. 194<sup>ro</sup>).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, ff. 195<sup>ro</sup> (printed, with some minor modifications, in *Opera omnia*, 184-185). Cf. also below, p. 34nt91; 40nt113.

Despite this direct correspondence between Lummenaeus and Borromeo, the truly diplomatic connections with Milan were still running through the sophisticated Puteanus in Louvain, who had a much larger network at his disposal than the Benedictine monastic. Instead of directing a letter directly to Borromeo, Puteanus in early 1612 approached someone whom he probably knew intimately from his own time in Milan, and who apparently operated within the inner circle of Borromeo. In this letter to a certain Raphael Montorfano,<sup>86</sup> dated 3 February 1612, he could not have been more straightforward: 'Please tell me, my dear Montorfano: what has the honourable cardinal Borromeo in fact decided regarding Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca? Has he already summoned him, or will he summon him? To this day, I do not know why his friends have been promising him this, and which urges to see Italy they have given this excellent and very learned man. We, in any case, will truly miss this genius of Belgium; surely we don't want this jewel to be carried off to some foreign gold, to a foreign land this tree that will even outgrow an oak.'<sup>87</sup> Like many humanists, Lummenaeus wanted to see Italy, and Puteanus launched him with great alacrity onto the path that was to lead him there.

In fact, the entire episode between 1608 and 1613 seems to have been geared toward a process that was supposed to find its apex in Lummenaeus travelling to Milan, as some thought he did in 1614. The building of a humanist network, the hesitant steps set on the path of (foreign) patronage, letters that are finally sent directly from Lummenaeus to Borromeo, the preparations actually being made, and the dedication of the *Opera omnia* in 1613 all point in that direction. Furthermore, a letter printed in Puteanus' *Epistolarum Atticarum centuria* (1625), dated 5 June 1612 and addressed to Lummenaeus' abbot, Columbanus Vrancx, is entirely dedicated to this

---

<sup>86</sup> This Raphael Montorfano is described in a letter by Puteanus to Max. Plouvier as 'Il S. Raffaello Montorfano, coadjutor della Contrascrittoria nel Magistrato Straordinario di Milano' (KBBr ms 6523, f. 38, dated 3. id. aug. 1608). I have found no other biographical references to this person.

<sup>87</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Reliquiae*, LXXV, 91-92: *Sed heus tu, mi Montorfane: quid omnino de Cornelio Lumineo Marcano Illustrissimus Cardinalis Borromaeus statuit? Vocavit, an vocabit? Hactenus nescio quid amici promiserunt, et quos stimulos optimo huic Doctissimoque Viro subjecerint Italiae visendae. Nos quidem tali ingenio Belgae illubentes carebimus; imo inviti transferri patiemur in alienum aurum hanc gemmam, in alienam terram hanc arborem, quae vel quercum illam Marianam vincet. Puteanus continues his praise for quite a bit: Sed tamen si Phoebus ipse ejusmodi sibi alumnum deposcat, refragari non licet. Alii, velut surculi aut plantae, in Italiam veniunt: hic jam perfectus et robustus est, et pansis ramis studiorum fructus uberrimos repraesentat. Plane non e plebe est, aut qui communiter debeat vocari. Et tamen jamâ Illustrissimi Cardinalis excitatus, credere potuit, quicquid ab amicis perscriptum fuit; imo sic inductus (ut tanti benignitatem aestimaret Principis) ad iter se comparavit. Nunc igitur priusquam Diis Vialibus se committat, omnino scire cupit, quid in re sit, quâ spe aut fiduciâ veniet. Tu explora, et simul expende, quam arduum sit e benigno Patriae sinu emigrare. Summa haec est: Vocatus, sed ab ipso Antistite, Italiam et conditionem aestimabit: sin minus, hic tamen operam suam Bibliothecae Ambrosianae impendet. Nihil melius, aut suavius hoc viro: germen Musarum est, et inter paucos ostendere potis, quid ingenis Belgicis tribuendum sit.*

cause.<sup>88</sup> In it, Puteanus pleads with the abbot for Lummenaeus – who at the time resided in Louvain, as we will come to see – and asks Vrancx to let his talented monastic depart for Milan. Borromeo, he writes, ‘*evocat aestimatque*’ Lummenaeus. What follows is a nifty piece of rhetorical trickery: when the Italian patron will get to see the genius nurtured and fostered by the Blandinian abbot, the Ghent Benedictine will consequently also spread Vrancx’ fame in Italy. In fact, ‘in order for your [sc. Vrancx]’ kindness to shine even more: send him instead of letting him go; command him rather than allowing him to go.’<sup>89</sup> In a letter to Borromeo of August 1612, Lummenaeus also seemed to refer to his firm intention to go to Milan as soon as possible,<sup>90</sup> and Borromeo’s answer pointed to a swift arrival in Milan as well.<sup>91</sup> Those close to Borromeo furthermore stimulated Lummenaeus to make his way to Milan as soon as possible: the letters of both Giambattista Sacco (secretary to the Senate of Milan) and Benedetto Sossago reveal a warm friendship, based first and foremost on a mutual love for the *bonae litterae*.<sup>92</sup>

It seems, however, that Lummenaeus did not see Italy until 1622, though Varenbergh argued differently: ‘A correspondence concerning his stay in Rome, now at the State Archives in Ghent – where I have copied it while researching the documents that concern St. Peter’s abbey – mentions him being there on January 25, 1615 as having been there for some time already. On that date, cardinal Barberini wrote to the abbot of St. Peter’s, asking him to financially assist Lummenaeus, in order to facilitate the latter’s return to his monastery.’<sup>93</sup> The letter, to which Varenbergh is here referring,

---

<sup>88</sup> The full text of this letter can be found in appendix four.

<sup>89</sup> (...) *ut magis vero humanitas tua [i.e. Vrancx] splendeat, mitte [sc. Cornelium] potius quam dimittas; iube potius quam sinas ire.*

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, f. 194<sup>ro</sup>: *Haveo enim videre Illustrissimam Dominationem T[uum] et genua illa stringere.*

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, f. 195<sup>ro</sup>: *quando te propediem affuturum scribis.* The letter has also been printed in Lummenaeus’ *Opera Omnia*, 184-185, with slight variations. Cf. also below, p. 40nt113.

<sup>92</sup> These letters are printed in the 1613 *Opera omnia*, 53-56. Sacco (December 1611) mentions their mutual friendship with Puteanus that initially brought them together, since the Pythagorean law dictates that *omnia amicorum (...) communia. Itaque cum tu illi [sc. Puteano] vetus sis amicus, cui et ego sum, iamdudum amicus meus esse debuisti.* Benedetto Sossago (January 1612) also urges Lummenaeus to hurry, so they can study together: *fac tantum ut Mediolani sis, tuumque matures expectatissimum adventum, animorum ut coniunctione, iisdemque studiis una fruamur, hoc Mediolanensibus universis nihil poterit esse incundius.*

<sup>93</sup> ‘Une correspondance relative à son séjour à Rome, qui se trouve aux archives de l’État à Gand, où nous l’avons copiée en recherchant les documents qui concernent l’abbaye de Saint-Pierre, fait déjà mention de lui le 25 janvier 1615 comme y étant depuis un certain temps. A cette date le cardinal Barberini écrit à l’abbé de Saint-Pierre, pour lui demander des secours pécuniaires en faveur de Lummenaeus, afin de faciliter à ce religieux le retour dans son monastère’ (Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 19). The correspondence



is in fact dated 22 *January 1615*. However, its contents, as we will come to see, fit perfectly in the correspondence waged between 1622-1625 about Lummenaeus' journey to Italy. This, oddly enough, seems to have been Varenbergh's opinion as well, since, when he comes around to transcribing the letter, he marks it 22 *January 1625*.<sup>94</sup> He initially failed to notice, it seems, that the addressee on the RAG-original is 'Adm[odum] Rev[erendo] P[a]tri D[omino] Arsenio Abbati S. Petri in Monte Blandinio ad Gandavum'. Arsenius Schayck was only appointed abbot after the death of Columbanus Vranx on 15 August 1615, and could thus not have been addressed as such in January of 1615. The minutes of this letter, kept in the Vatican, indeed prove that the correct date is in fact 22 January 1625.<sup>95</sup>

This, however, does in itself not prove that Cornelius did *not* go to Italy in 1614, but various other letters might throw some light on the issue. In a letter to Puteanus from 1620, the above mentioned Sacco writes that nothing would be dearer to him than to finally see Lummenaeus with his own eyes, whom he had been seeing in his mind for so long already.<sup>96</sup> The words seem to imply that Lummenaeus had not yet been to Italy. A clearer marker can be found in a letter he wrote to cardinal Borromeo on 24 September 1615, in which he briefly elaborates upon the matter.<sup>97</sup> Apparently, his health, which was notoriously weak,<sup>98</sup> had prevented him

Varenbergh is here referring to is RAG, register S.P. 34 II 1224, which also includes the letter from Barberini to Schayck. The register will be discussed below in full detail.

<sup>94</sup> Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 139-140.

<sup>95</sup> Vat.Barb.Lat., 1988, ff. 25-26 (*Romae, die 22 Januarii 1625*). Francesco Barberini was only made a cardinal after his uncle Maffeo had been elected pope. Cf. below, pp. 68-69.

<sup>96</sup> *Quid enim optatius mihi contingere posset, quam eum virum oculis cernere, quem ego iampridem animo ipso contemplor, et tamquam numen adoro, ex divinis illius scriptis, de quibus item Cardinalis idem iudicium facit* (KBBR, ms 19112-2).

<sup>97</sup> Ambrosiana, G.257, f. 275<sup>ro-vo</sup>. Cf. below, p. 45, where I have also provided a partial transcription.

<sup>98</sup> When the winter of 1609-1610 was drawing near, Lummenaeus was not doing very well. A letter from Puteanus, dated 24 November 1609 (*Epistolarum Reliquiae*, epistola IX, 11-12) informs us that Lummenaeus had recently been very ill. This time, Lummenaeus recovered well, but many had been worried: *Ac sane boni omnes solliciti in hoc periculo tuo erant*, 'definitely all the good men were concerned about this grave danger you were in,' Puteanus wrote. Again in April 1612, Lummenaeus had been very sick, as can be understood from Puteanus' letter to the nobleman Hermannus à Burgundia (Puteanus, *Epistolarum Reliquiae*, LXXVIII, 94-98). Cornelius' good friend, the famous Ghent humanist Maxaemilianus Vrientius even wrote an epigram on his illness, entitled 'On the fever of the venerable Cornelius à Marca' (*In Febrim R. Corneli Marcani*): 'The theatre grieves, with fever Marca burns; / Melpomene sighs, sad utterings she will vow. / It is *Epulo's* and *Iephtes'* worry: if *he* not returns, / To the Muses who will dedicate them now?' (*Aestuat a febre Marcanus, scena laborat, / Melpomene tragico murmure m[a]esta gemit, / aegrescunt Epulo et Iephtes, nam nemo litare, / aut Musis epulum qui dare possit, erit.*), Vrientius, *Epigrammatum libri IX* (1627), 107-108. Vrientius died in 1614, so this epigram must have been written before that date. But since the author perhaps implies that the *Dives Epulo* and *Iephte* still have to be formally presented (i.e. published?), the epigram may refer

from going.<sup>99</sup> It is striking that some years later, it would be *precisely because of his health* that Lummenaeus claimed the need to go to Italy. But possibly there were also other factors involved in 1613-1614, now unknown to us. Still, however, archival evidence is mostly lacking for 1614: at Christmas Eve 1613 we find him delivering a homily at the *Mons Blandinius* in Ghent;<sup>100</sup> next, the dedicatory letter to his tragedy *Bustum Sodomae* (printed in Ghent, 1615), was written on 29 November 1614, *e musaeo meo*. Unfortunately, it does not say which *musaeum* (or library/study) Lummenaeus is referring to, though (his cell at) the abbey in Ghent, where the work was published, seems plausible. As already mentioned above, Cornelius also delivered the funeral oration for Vrientius, who died on 27 December 1614, on an unspecified date in 1615. It might be that he spoke at an official memorial service held sometime after the burial, or at the actual funeral; in both cases, if the given date of 1615 is correct, it would have taken place more than five days after Vrientius' death.<sup>101</sup> In any case, the archival evidence leaves a gap of at least eleven months in 1614. Taking into account that a journey to Italy could take up to several months and was quite an undertaking that – as will be illustrated below in the light of his 1622 journey – would perhaps not easily

---

either to the period of 1608/9 (when the *Iephte* was first printed), or of 1613 (when both plays were (re)printed in the *Opera omnia*); the poem may thus have been written somewhere between these years. It has to be noted that this epigram, nor any other epigram regarding Lummenaeus, appears in the first edition of Vrientius' *epigrammata* in 1603, even though Cornelius appears over five times in the second, augmented (posthumous) edition. The Augustinian monk Ignatius Dyckerus apparently states in a poem (published 1637) that Cornelius was (or had been) suffering from *podagra*, or gout (cf. Dyckerus, *Epigrammatum sacrorum libri tres*, no. 96, p. 213). Maxaemilianus Vrientius, too, suffered from gout, and both men are complimented for their perseverance by Dyckerus in poem no. 97, pp. 213-214. The poems probably antedate 1614, the year Vrientius died.

<sup>99</sup> Puteanus' letter to Vrancx, discussed above, does not mention any health problems, unless he means as much when he says: *videat Italiam noster Cornelius, fruatur paullisper beato illo caelo; sed suo iterum aspectu nos beet.*

<sup>100</sup> *Corona Virginea*, 35 (*Homilia II. / dicta in Monte Blandinio in Vigilia Natalis Domini, Anno 1613*).

<sup>101</sup> The text of the oration makes clear that he is actually standing next to the deathbed, or funeral monument of Vrientius, with the latter's relatives present in grave mourning: *apud funereum hunc lectulum, qui nunc lacrymis tuorum extremum irrigatur*. Burial of the dead, at least in major cities in contemporary Europe, usually seems to have taken place within three days, not seldom already by the end of the second day after death. The company could then reassemble some time afterwards for the service and funeral oration. Cf. Harding, *The Dead and the Living*, 187-188. Vrientius was buried in the church of the Dominicans ('Predikheerenkerk') in Ghent. Cf. Blommaert (e.a.), *Graf- en gedenkschriften* (Tweede reeks: Kloosterkerken. Gent, deel 1), 64: no. 114, Witte steen, *Maximiliani Vriendi, quod condi poterat spe resurrectionis hic jacet. Obiit vigesima septima decembris 1614.*

go unnoticed, both the tight timeframe and the lack of evidence seem to argue against such a journey in 1614.<sup>102</sup>

### *Literary activities up to 1615*

Before moving to the post-1615 period of Lummenaeus' life, let us again briefly return to the preceding years. So far I have mainly discussed the highly interesting way in which Cornelius established his humanist network and how it developed. His sudden appearance in archives indeed coincides with the time his star as a man of letters started to rise.

As noted above, Lummenaeus' first (extant) publication in 1608/9 was the tragedy *Iephte*, which will be considered in more detail elsewhere in this thesis. A manuscript of the play has also survived: it is now at the public library of Arras, but was originally in the possession of the abbey of St. Vaast, near Arras. According to Johan Merlevede, who drew up a synoptic edition of the extant *Iephte*-editions, including the manuscript, the Arras copy seems to predate the 1608 publication.<sup>103</sup> This might very well be so, especially since the document is dedicated to the abbot of St. Vaast, Philip de Cavarel (†1636), who visited St Peter's abbey in Ghent in 1607 as *visitor OSB monasteriorum exemptorum per Belgicam*.<sup>104</sup> This would have constituted an excellent opportunity for Lummenaeus to present the abbot with his gift. In later years, too, De Cavarel would find himself the dedicatee of many a work by Lummenaeus.<sup>105</sup>

The instance of handing out a manuscript is also a fine illustration of an apparently fairly common practice. We find many examples in Lummenaeus' letters of manuscripts that have been presented to potential patrons, who in turn often stimulated our author to have it published, for

---

<sup>102</sup> For what it is worth, Hofman Peerlkamp noted that Lummenaeus '*semel tamen Romam visit*,' i.e. only once. Cf. Hofman Peerlkamp, *De vita ac doctrina*, 265. Coincidentally, Lummenaeus' brother Ludovicus had been ambushed by robbers on his way to Italy, which only further demonstrates the difficulties posed by such long distance travels in early modern Europe. Cf. Ludovicus' eulogy, appendix three.

<sup>103</sup> The manuscript is registered in the Bibliothèque Municipale d'Arras as number 476. Cf. Merlevede, *Het Iephte-drama van I. Lummenaeus à Marca*, 15-18.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Loriquet and Chavanon, *Archives départementales*, 64-65. For the *congregatio exemptorum*, cf. below, p. 79nt251. De Cavarel died at St. Vaast in 1636. Cf. Weldon, *Chronological notes*, 174-178.

<sup>105</sup> The 1622 tragedy *Abimelechus*, printed in Douai while Lummenaeus passed through that town on his way to Italy, has been dedicated to De Cavarel. Since Douai lies only some 25km from Arras, he probably delivered a copy of the *Abimelechus* to the abbot personally. However, another hand has added on f. 2<sup>vo</sup> of the *Iephte*-manuscript: *Bibliothecae Vedastinae Atrebatensis, 1628, R1*. Could Lummenaeus have handed it to someone at St. Vaast when he was residing in nearby Douai in 1628, at which time it was added to the library's collection? Or was it perhaps transferred there *after* Lummenaeus' death in – as I will argue below – 1628?

everyone to enjoy.<sup>106</sup> Several such manuscripts have survived, e.g. the *Diarium Sanctorum*, dedicated to Pope Urban VIII (Maffeo Barberini)<sup>107</sup> and the above mentioned *lessus* dedicated to Federico Borromeo, but, as the references in Lummenaeus' correspondence indicate, many more must have been in circulation all over Europe.

After the publication of the *Iephte*, which was dedicated to his abbot, Vrancx, the *Carcer Babylonius* was published in 1610. With a dedication to Archduke Albert of Austria, Lummenaeus was seeking higher grounds for patronage. As we have seen, the contacts established between Milan and Ghent eventually resulted in Lummenaeus' *Opera omnia* being dedicated to Federico Borromeo. In my view, the publication must have been a fairly pretentious undertaking. Could someone present a 'complete works' so early in his career as a public man of letters? If anything, the next fifteen years would certainly prove that this collection would be far from complete. Nonetheless, the work seems to have generated quite an audience, since it is the one work that is best available in libraries across Europe. Though the title is somewhat ambitious – *Opera omnia qua poetica, qua oratoria, qua historica*, or poetry, speeches and historical works – it did include fine examples of all of these genres, even if the *opera historica* were represented merely by a history of the dukes of Burgundy.<sup>108</sup>

While *Iephte* had been printed in Antwerp, at the printing house of Verdussen, the *Carcer Babylonius* appeared with Gaultier Manilius in Ghent. Both printers had previously printed several works by Cornelius' abbot, Vrancx, which perhaps gained him easier access to these publishing houses.<sup>109</sup> The third publication, the 1613 *Opera omnia*, appeared in Louvain, with Philip van Dormael, most likely a result of the time Lummenaeus had spent in Louvain at the nearby abbey of Vlierbeek. A letter (or rather testimonial), printed in the 1617 *Pleias sacra, sive septem homiliae sacrae*, a collection of seven *homiliae*, refers to a semester spent at the abbey of Vlierbeek:

'By this letter, we announce that the outstanding and venerable gentleman Mr. Cornelius à Marca, monastic of the Order of Saint Benedict, from the abbey of S. Peter's in Ghent, has spent an entire semester of the present year in our Academy, and meanwhile – to which the most noble men of this academy and city have conclusively testified – not only lived decently, but

<sup>106</sup> I have already referred to several such instances. Cf. e.g. above, p. 33.

<sup>107</sup> Vat.Barb.Lat., 1941, ff. 104-110 (cf. Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 302, no. 296).

<sup>108</sup> This history can sometimes be found as a work separately bound. Therefore it is also separately considered in Vanderhaeghen's *Bibliotheca Belgica* (III, 1157), even though the subtitle of the *Opera omnia* indicates that it surely belonged to the work.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. a.o. Vanderhaeghen, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, V, 764-788; and id., *Bibliographie Gantoise*, index, VII, p. 319 (s.v. 'Vrancx').

also modestly and without any complaint with the monastics of his Order in the abbey of S. Medardus in Vlierbeek, but also provided in word and in writing, publicly and privately, many specimens of his excellent learning and eloquence, by which he secured for himself not only the love, but also the admiration of all the learned men of this Academy.<sup>110</sup>

During the year 1612, Lummenaeus spent some time in and near Louvain. While there, he not only delivered his speeches – to great applaud, so it appears – at the University of Louvain (and probably Puteanus' *Palaestra*), but also at the abbey of Vlierbeek.<sup>111</sup> Lummenaeus remained at Vlierbeek at least until June, 1612, as we learn from a letter from Puteanus to Justus Rycquius (dated 5 June 1612): *Marcanus adhuc apud nos est, sed abiturit.*<sup>112</sup>

Lummenaeus used his time well in Louvain: we learn from a letter to Borromeo, dated 10 August 1612, that the manuscripts of the *Opera omnia*, that were to appear at the printing house of Dormael in 1613, were already sent to the printer, and for which he now sought the cardinal's approval. This, the actual dedication shows, he received.<sup>113</sup> We find Lummenaeus back in Louvain for – perhaps a continuous – four- to five-month period in 1613, overseeing the printing of the *Opera omnia*, which must have been ready somewhere mid-1613.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> (...) *Hinc notum omnibus per hasce litteras facimus, egregium et venerabilem virum D. Cornelium à Marca Benedictini Ordinis in monasterio S. Petri Gandavensis Religiosum, in hac Academia nostra toto semestri praesentis anni resedisse, et interea, prout primorum huius Academiae et civitatis virorum testimonio facta nobis est fides, non solum probe, modesteque et sine cuiusquam querela inter sui Ordinis Religiosos in Abbatia S. Medardi Vlierbacensis versatum esse, sed eximiae etiam suae doctrinae ac eloquentiae plurima specimina, publice, privatimque qua dicendo, qua scribendo edidisse, quibus doctorum omnium virorum huius Academiae non solum amorem sed et admirationem sibi conciliavit (...), (Pleias sacra, pp. 93-94).* The letter is written by Conrardus Silvius by order of the rector of the University of Louvain, Joannes Massen. It is dated 27 October 1612.

<sup>111</sup> At Vlierbeek he delivered at least three speeches, namely no.'s 5-7 of the *Opera omnia* (323-368). The seventh is in fact also dedicated to Godefriedus Lemmens, abbot of Vlierbeek.

<sup>112</sup> Puteanus, *Epistolarum Atticarum*, epistola XII, 19-21.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Ambrosiana, S.P. II 124, f. 194<sup>ro</sup>: *Opuscula mea omnia, qua poetica, qua oratoria, qua historica typis quotidie promoventur in ijs Illustrissimae Dominat[ionis] T[uae] auspiciis primo loco eminere volui.* To this letter Borromeo replied on 21 October 1612: *Quod nomen meum operibus ac monumentis placuerit praefigi tuis gratias referimus singulares, eas referre in tuum adventum differimus, quando te propediem adfuturum puto.* The letter is printed in *Opera omnia*, 184-185, where it differs slightly from the original minutes kept in the Ambrosiana (S.P. II 124, f. 195<sup>ro</sup>). Cf. also above, p. 35, where I quote from the minutes.

<sup>114</sup> The dedication of the *Lessus*, to Borromeo, is dated 28 March 1613 from Louvain (cf. *Opera omnia*, 184-184), and the main dedicatory letter, also to Borromeo, is dated 10 July 1613, from Louvain as well (cf. *Opera omnia*, ff. \*2<sup>ro</sup>-\*3<sup>ro</sup>). The *Miscellanea*-section of the *Opera omnia* is dedicated to his brother, Viglius à Marca, in a letter (pp. 211-212) dated from Louvain, 11 April 1613. From a letter by Puteanus to Maximilianus Plouvierius we learn that Lummenaeus was probably still in Gent by the end of 1612: *Hanc ad Marcanum*

It largely remains a guess who financed the printing of Lummenaeus' works. However, the abbatial archives hold a receipt that may throw some light on these matters. It reads:

'Printed by me, Gaultier Manilius, at the expense of the *coadiutor* of St. Peter's, a hundred copies of the *carmen* made by Mr. A Marke, honouring the Reverend Bishop of Ghent.

The sum for printing: 3 guilders.

Additionally, for a sheet of calve-parchment: 20 five-cent pieces.

In sum: 4 guilders.'<sup>115</sup>

The printer Manilius charged the abbey for printing one hundred copies of a poem written by Cornelius à Marca in honour of the bishop of Ghent, Carolus Masius,<sup>116</sup> none of which seem to have survived. It has also not been recorded in the *Bibliographie Gantoise*, even though similar entries are included.<sup>117</sup> It is probably the same poem that is printed in the *Opera omnia* of 1613 (pp. 226-228), written on the occasion of the inauguration of bishop Carolus Masius.<sup>118</sup> The instance proves, in any case, that the abbey did pay for this specific publication. Whether or not it was granted to Cornelius as some sort of loan, which could be reimbursed by sales revenue, is unclear.

The reason I mention such a construction of loan and reimbursement through sales revenue is because it seems to have been used in 1628, as is suggested in a letter from Lummenaeus to Schayck, dated 20 May 1628, written from Douai:

---

*epistolam ut obsignes, et Gandavum mittas, te rogo.* Cf. KBBr, ms 6523, f. 161<sup>ro-vo</sup>, dated 20 November 1612.

<sup>115</sup> *Gbedruckt by my Gaultier Manilius / met laste van myn beere den Coadiuteur van Ste Pieters / een hondert exemplairen / vande Carmen ghemaect by myn heer A Marke / ter eeren van Eerw Bisschop van Ghend / comt voor drucken – 3 guld. / Nog ghegheven voor een vel calveren schrijf franchijn – 20 stu. / Tsamen – 4 guld.* (RAG, S.P. 34 II 330). The receipt went from Manilius to Schayck and the abbey's treasurer (Mr. Lake), and then back to Manilius for the actual payment: *Mons. Lake ontfangher vande quitancie sult betalen aen der voorn. Manilius vier guldens ter causen boven verhaelt nemende hier aff quitancie, torconden desen xi febr. 1611 / [signed] Arsenius Coadiuteur van Ste Pieters neffens Gendt.* Manilius received the total sum of four guilders and signed it off as correct: *Ontfaen. by my onderschreven van mons. Lake ontfanger van quitantie de somme als boven, desen xiiiden februa. 1611 / [signed] Gaultier Manilius.*

<sup>116</sup> Karel Maes / Carolus Masius (1559-1612; bishop of Ghent 1610-1612).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. e.g. Vanderhaeghen, *Bibliographie Gantoise*, I, 262 [no. 434; Gautier Manilius]: 'Carmen gemaect by den docteur Broeder Pieter de Backere, ter eeren van mynheer de voorschepen ende t'magistraet vander Keure in may 1600.'

<sup>118</sup> It is entitled: *Reverendiss[imo] Domino D. Carolo Masio Episcopo Gandavensi, cum throno inauguraretur.*

‘The *Ephemerides sacrae*, or *Diarium Sanctorum* that I have published under auspices of your Reverence, I now send to you from Fampoux’s printing office. (...) To the printer I have paid a hundred florins for overseeing the printing process; he is still entitled to 188 florins for ~~eighteen~~ sixteen *folia*, to a total of 600 copies on the finest paper, as agreed; I would like the sum to be sent with the next shipment, in order for him to continue the work on the publishing of my tragedies more swiftly, of which he has already completed a substantial part. I do not doubt, that by the sales of the copies (which, I hope, will find many a buyer) a large part of the costs, if not all, can shortly be redeemed, etc.’<sup>119</sup>

Lummenaeus, the letter makes clear, had paid a hundred florins to the printer, Jean de Fampoux, for overseeing the – now finished – printing process, but the costs of the materials were still due, which he requests to be sent to Douai as soon as possible: 188 florins for 600 copies of sixteen<sup>120</sup> *folia* of high-quality paper. He is fairly confident that the *Diarium sanctorum* will find many buyers, so that most of the costs, if not all, could soon be reimbursed to the abbey. It is possible that such a construction was also used for (some of) Lummenaeus’ earlier works, but there is no conclusive evidence. It is also possible, however, that this particular construction might have had something to do with the fact that the *Stemmata et Flores sive Diarium Sanctorum* was dutifully dedicated to abbot Schayck.<sup>121</sup>

### 1615-1622: The ‘history of our time’ and the preparations for Italy

Towards 1613, Lummenaeus’ position within the humanist network of Flanders had gradually solidified. But in the following years, some things went wrong. The journey to Borromeo in Milan, so meticulously prepared, did not take place. Years of correspondence, the tireless efforts of so many friends and colleagues, and Cornelius’ own literary pursuits are testimony to

<sup>119</sup> *Ephemerides sacras, sive Diarium sanctorum sub auspiciis Amplit[udinis] T[uae] in lucem datum, ex typographeio Fanpousiano transmitto. (...) Typographo ad auspicia typographica centum florenos numeravi, restant ei pro [octode litura] sedecim foliis ad numerum 600 impressis in optima charta, ex pacto illo, 188 floreni, quos velim per proximum tabellionem mitti, ut alacrius pergat, in tragicis meis excudendis, quorum iam notabilem partem absolvit. Non dubito fore, ut ex distractione exemplarium (quae, ut spero, plurimum emptorem invenient) maxima pars sumptuum, immo in totum omnes sumptus brevi restituantur etc.* (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; the letter has been published by Varenbergh (‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 144-145), though he has made some mistakes in the transcription and failed to mention the strike-through). Cf. also below, p. 81.

<sup>120</sup> *Octode[cim]*, eighteen, has been stricken through and replaced with *sedecim*, sixteenth. The *Stemmata et flores* indeed consists of sixteen *folia* (A-Q, excluding J).

<sup>121</sup> Cf. *Stemmata et Flores, sive Diarium Sanctorum*, A2<sup>ro-vo</sup>.

the gradual buildup of contacts and benevolence that was to set the Ghent Benedictine on his way to international success. Whatever caused him eventually not to go, be it bad health or other complications, it may very well have been *force majeure*: One does, however, get the impression that there is more to it than can be distinguished through the haze of some 400 years. One of our best sources for the period, the published and unpublished correspondence of Puteanus, sheds only limited light on the issue, due to interpretational problems inherent to research based on such one-sided correspondence. Take, for example, a letter from Puteanus to Maximilian Plouvier.<sup>122</sup> In it, Puteanus quotes part of a letter written to him by Raphael Montorfano, with whom the Louvain professor had earlier made inquiries about Borromeo's decision regarding Lummenaeus' invitation to Milan.<sup>123</sup> Puteanus would have included the actual letter, were it not for the fact that 'in it there are some things that need to be read to Father à Marca today'.<sup>124</sup> It is undated, but the letter from Montorfano possibly constituted the answer to the question posed by Puteanus on 3 February 1612 (discussed above, p. 34): will Borromeo call Lummenaeus to Milan? Montorfano's answer we shall perhaps never know. Or consider e.g. another letter from Puteanus to Plouvier (also undated but in view of the chronological ordering of the collection perhaps from somewhere in 1612), which gives as a postscript: 'About Lummenaeus, I will personally tell the honorable Robertius what I had to write. But he is already destined for the abbey of Geraardsbergen, through the intercession of friends. That's between you and me.'<sup>125</sup> Lummenaeus, so Puteanus had been told confidentially, was destined for the abbey of St. Adriaan, in Geraardsbergen, some forty kilometers southeast of Ghent. Shrouded in a veil of mystery, the letter makes clear that there was much more going on than can now be

---

<sup>122</sup> KBBr, ms 6523, f. 298<sup>ro</sup>. Maximilianus Plouvierius, or Plouvier († after 1626) was the secretary to the Count of Emden, and afterwards prior of the Cartusian monastery in Antwerp. He is buried at the Cartusian cemetery in Brussels. Cf. KBBr, ms 6523 (title page); Tournoy, 'Puteanus, Casaubon', 383; Scholtens, 'De kartuizers te 's-Hertogenbosch', 179nt5.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. above, p. 34.

<sup>124</sup> (...) *inesent quaedam, quae hodie Patri à Marca praelegenda sunt de Cardinale Borromaeo.*

<sup>125</sup> *De Marciano coram dicam Ampliss[ismo] Robertio, quae scribere debui. Sed is jam ad Abbatiam Gerardimontanam, amicorum votis, destinatur. Hoc inter nos.* KBBr, ms 6523, f. 308<sup>ro-vo</sup>. Robertius is most likely Remacle Robertius, prefect of the army's provisions, to whom Lummenaeus in May 1613 dedicated the *orationes* of the *Opera omnia* (cf. *Opera omnia*, pp. 265-266). Gilbert Tournoy notes that he was the brother of the well known Jesuit Jean Roberti (1569-1651), and a correspondent of Lipsius. Cf. Tournoy, 'Puteanus, Casaubon', 382. What business Puteanus had with Robertius regarding Cornelius à Marca is not clear, though it might have been related to Puteanus' efforts in furthering Lummenaeus' cause with abbot Vrancx (cf. above, p. 34f.). Robertius is also portrayed in Puteanus' 1623 depiction of Archduke Albert's funeral procession, as one of the 'Conseilliers et Maistres ordinaires' of the 'Chambre des comptes'. Cf. Puteanus, *Pompa funebris*, plate LXII.



distilled from the scanty evidence.<sup>126</sup> Whether this remark is referring to an official position at the said abbey (in 1613, Gaspard Vincq was appointed abbot<sup>127</sup>), or to one of the attempts by St. Peter's *coadiutor* Schayck to transfer Lummenaeus to another monastery, is unclear.<sup>128</sup>

But the year 1615 marked the start of a new phase in Lummenaeus' life, for several reasons. At the end of 1614, as we have seen, the grand old man of Ghent humanism, Maxaemilianus Vrientius, died rather prematurely. The funeral oration, probably in early 1615, was delivered by his good friend Lummenaeus. With Vrientius Ghent lost its renowned *poeta laureatus*, who was a mentor to Ghent's younger generation of literati – Lummenaeus, Antonius Sanderus, Justus Rycquius, Jacobus Zevecotius and Justus Harduynus –, but who also seems to have been an important link between this circle of rising stars and international heavyweights like Daniel Heinsius.<sup>129</sup> But 1615 also saw a change of the guards at the St. Peter's abbey

---

<sup>126</sup> Puteanus' letter to Lummenaeus of November 1609 (*Epistolarum Reliquiae*, epistola XI, 11-12) also provides an excellent illustration of the difficulties posed by the investigation of such correspondence. Consider the following line: *Hem! De me sic nonnulli censent? Rumorem sparsum tu quidem me auctore corriges: evocatus non sum*, 'Ah, is that how some people think about me [i.e. Puteanus]? You say that I have spread the rumour, but I was not called to court.' Why had Lummenaeus blamed Puteanus of spreading stories about him? Was it about his illness, or perhaps something more serious? In any case, his Louvain friend thus pleas innocent: *Ivit in Hispaniam Matthaeus Sanderius meus, ante paucos dies, illi comes Schepperus. Ab his originem (nisi fallor) haec fama traxit*, 'My friend Matthaeus Sanderius went to Spain several days ago, accompanied by Schepperus. It is through them (if I'm not mistaken) that this story has spread.' It is hard to tell exactly what went on here: from this one letter, we just can not tell.

<sup>127</sup> *Monasticon Belge*, VII.2, 110. The archives of the St. Adriaan's abbey contain a register on the abbatial elections of 1606 and 1624, but apparently none of 1613. Cf. Verschaeren, *Inventaris van het archief van de Sint-Adriaansabdij*, vi.

<sup>128</sup> The 1624 letter of Schayck to cardinal Barberini seems to suggest as much: *Nam quotiescumque illum in hac patria diversis in locis tum ob rebellionem, tum ob simulatum saepe morbum collocaverim, nunquam nisi oboeratus ad Monasterium reversus est* (Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2; cf. above, p. 24nt47). The troubled relationship between Lummenaeus and Schayck will be addressed in more detail below.

<sup>129</sup> From a letter to Puteanus, with whom Heinsius maintained a frequent correspondence, it becomes clear that Vrientius was rather close to Heinsius, especially during the latter's stay in Geraardsbergen in 1610: *Nam cum nuper obiter Gandavum viderem, expectari ibi te e Vrientio nostro intellexi: qui adventum tuum certo me sperare jussit. Imo dubitare vetuit. Non dicam dolo: exilij, et hunc unicum itineris mei fructum putavi; videre te, amplecti, et qua' diu pressi in amico isto animo deponere et sinu. Patere ut et hoc addam. Etiam nunc in opinione ista esse Vrientium; hominem quem omnes Musae amant'* (KBBr, ms 19109, f. 77<sup>ro</sup>). The letter is dated 27 August 1610, from Geraardsbergen. Heinsius had recently been to Ghent – had he also met Lummenaeus? Apparently not: in a letter to Lummenaeus, dated 20 April 1616 from Leyden (printed in Lummenaeus' *Rosarium* (1623) A2<sup>vo</sup>), Heinsius thanked Lummenaeus for sending him some of his work (perhaps the *Opera omnia* (1613) or the tragedy *Bustum Sodomae* (1615)), which he greatly admired, even though he had not (yet) met

in Ghent. Columbanus Vrancx, aged 84, died on 15 August and was succeeded by Joachim Arsenius Schayck. While Vrancx and Cornelius à Marca seem to have been fairly close – both were public men of letters, Lummenaeus dedicated his first publication, *Iephthe*, to him, delivered an oration at his jubilee in 1610 and was the author of his epitaph<sup>130</sup> – his relationship with Schayck, that came to define the sequence of events in the following years, proved to be a lot tenser. Schayck, it has been noted, was notorious for his fierce strictness in observing monastic discipline, even before his appointment as *coadiutor*.<sup>131</sup> Both men would soon find themselves on a collision course.

The letter written by Lummenaeus to cardinal Borromeo on 24 September 1615 aptly illustrates this turn of events. Unfortunately, Cornelius writes, it is through a friend that he now once again comes knocking at the cardinal's door; rather he had come himself:

‘I would rather have come forward myself to openly worship Your Eminence, if not my health had caused problems, by which I have been heavily afflicted for almost the entire year; furthermore, even our reverend prelate seemed more unwilling to let me go, to whom my health looked all the more suspicious. I let it go, ascribing it to his old age: maybe I will see Italy some other time.’<sup>132</sup>

---

Lummenaeus: *necdum visum te amavi, nondum adhuc notum de facie amplexus sum*. Heinsius calls him a *patriae meae ornamentum*, a ‘credit to my [native Ghent]’.

<sup>130</sup> Slightly different versions of this epitaph have been recorded by Vanderhaeghen (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, V, 765 (s.v. Vrancx)) and Sanderus (*Gandarum sive Gandavensium*, 334-335). The latter gives: *Cornelius iacet hoc sub marmore Vranxius, annis / Obsitus, ingenio floridus, et meritis / Candidus, et simplex, et prudens sensibus; ac cui / Plus aliquid niveae simplicitatis erat. / Desine, qui miseris turbas haec busta querelis; / Si vis inferias condere, da violas*. ‘Under this marble lies Cornelius Vrancx, of old age, but of youthful nature, pure of merits, honest and wise of mind, and who had a bit more bright sincerity. You, who are disturbing this tomb with your sad laments, stop it! If you want to make a sacrifice, give violets [i.e. a symbol of humble modesty].’

<sup>131</sup> Cf. above, p. 25nt49.

<sup>132</sup> (...) *Libentius ipse excurrissem Purpuram Tuam coram veneraturus, nisi valetudo me intricasset, quae me fere toto anno graviter adflixit; tum etiam Reverendus Praelatus noster morosior esse videbatur, quam ut me dimittere vellet, utpote cui valetudo mea suspecta nimis esse videretur. Detuli itaque hoc senectuti eius, et supersedi: fortassis alia occasione Italiam visurus.(...)*. Ambrosiana, G.257, f. 275<sup>ro-vo</sup> (Orbaan, ‘Kardinaal Federico Borromeo’, 84, who erroneously provides a date of 24 October; the article contains many more of such inaccuracies). The letter has been dictated by Lummenaeus to a friend, but signed by himself (cf. the postscript remark: *Ignosce, Ill[ustrissi]me D[omine] imbecillae valitudini, quae amici manu in exarandis hisci, uti coegit, ‘Forgive me, illustrious lord: my weak health forced me to use a friend’s hand for writing this letter’*).

This passage throws some light on the circumstances of 1614 and 1615. The former abbot of St Peter's, Vrancx, had died about a month earlier, but, as noted above, Schayck had been his *coadiutor* for about seven years already, and may have been the one making the decisions; in any case, he exerted a considerable influence. During the larger part of 1615 Lummenaeus had experienced a sustained period of illness, which may not only have prevented him from going to Italy, but which also seems to have been a cause for Vrancx' and/or Schayck's dire suspicion. Apparently, Cornelius reconciled himself with the situation, hoping that he would get to see Italy some other time. The situation, however, seemed to precipitate the events ahead, as we will come to see.

But the letter also gives testimony of Lummenaeus' perseverance in pursuing his goals and ambitions. In this respect, the year 1615 did not mark the end of his dream, but rather provided new opportunities and a fresh start. His efforts to obtain patronage from Borromeo are immediately continued with even greater commitment and enthusiasm: 'It is especially you, my illustrious lord, whom I even consider more important than Italy and all its tempting delights'.<sup>133</sup> With the letter he included one of his works (likely the tragedy *Bustum Sodomae*, which appeared in 1615), and he would have sent more, if only his letter-bearing friend could have carried a heavier load. He also mentions – as he had already done in 1611, cf. above – his efforts to write a panegyric for Carlo Borromeo, the work on which, already underway for quite some time, would be a lot easier if the cardinal would be so kind as to send him an actual relic of his elder cousin.<sup>134</sup> The cardinal apparently responded not unwillingly to this request – if we can believe Lummenaeus' own words on this matter –, by sending him a little sponge, drenched in the blood of S. Carlo.<sup>135</sup> It is in this respect noteworthy, not to say rather surprising, that Puteanus and the brotherhood of S. Carlo

<sup>133</sup> (...) *te imprimis, Illustrissime Domine, quem Italiae etiam praepono et caeteris delitiis, quae me eo rapiunt.* Ibidem.

<sup>134</sup> (...) *Ut vero alacrius pergam nihil magis in votis mihi est quam ut aliquod saltem brachium Beatissimi Viri penes me habeam, Benedictio[ne] tua conservatum: quod saepius hic deosculer, et laborem scribend[um] mitiget. Audebo Munificentiae Tuae hanc symbolam exspectare, quae me vero felicem reddere postest (...).* Ibidem.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. the first homily, an encomium for Carlo Borromeo, in the collection *Pleias sacra*, pp. 11-12: *Magni praesulis Hierothecium, hoc est, maximi omnium Antistitis sacra lipsana, S. Caroli Borromaei (assurgite et plaudite Auditores) nobiles exuviae, quas dono et liberalitate Ill. Principis, Patruelis eius, Cardinalis Federici nuper accepi, sane non sine magna animi mei voluptate, non sine peculiari gaudio et quadam veluti cordis exultatione. Iterum repeto, Auditores, iterumque et iterum pronunciare gestio; S. Caroli Borromaei exuviae istae sunt. (...) Spongiolae nimirum particula ea est, immo vero, audebo dicere, divinae cuiusdam aerae particula. Spongiolae, inquam, illius, quae statim a morte sanctissimi Principis, visceribus eius inserta, teste eodem Federico Cardinale Borromaeo, sacrum eius cruorem penitus hausit, et quicquid humidum et vegetum ibi fuit, largiter potavit, ut in hoc brevi tomento totum quodammodo Carolum nobis repraesentaret. Quaesivit intra viscera pii Praesulis morum eius proximus aemulator, et purpurae haeres Federicus Borromaeus, quod mihi imprimis atque adeo toti Belgio donaret (...).*

Borromeo in Louvain had had to go to great lengths in order to acquire a relic of S. Carlo, while Lummenaeus apparently obtained the requested item rather quickly.<sup>136</sup>

From 1615 to about 1619 – when we again become witness to several direct attempts to receive invitations for a journey to Italy –, Lummenaeus' literary activities intensify to an enormous extent. Not only have his extant publications provided testimony of this, but also his correspondence. He once again sets about creating a solid ground for patronage by sending letters adorned with gifts, requests and announcements. In early 1617, Cornelius sent a copy of the recently completed *Pleias sacra*, a collection of seven homilies, to both cardinal Borromeo in Milan and to cardinal Scipio Borghese in Rome, thus extending his hunting grounds.<sup>137</sup> And more would soon be on its way: both letters refer to *Hyas sacra*, another collection of seven homilies, which would soon turn out from the printing presses, and which Lummenaeus sought to dedicate to Borghese.<sup>138</sup>

By the end of 1619, Lummenaeus again addressed Borromeo, this time, however, through Giambattista Sacco, secretary to the Senate of Milan,

---

<sup>136</sup> With regard to Puteanus' efforts, who received a relic in 1620, cf. Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 35; Simar, *Étude sur Erycius Puteanus*, 22. Lummenaeus must have received the little sponge somewhere after his request of 24 September 1615, and well before the publication of the *Pleias sacra*, of which the dedicatory letter is dated 15 October 1616.

<sup>137</sup> Respectively Ambrosiana, G.257, f. 314<sup>ro</sup> (Cf. Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 84) and Fondo Borghese III, 4a, f. 254<sup>ro</sup> (Cf. Pasture, *Inventaire du Fonds Borghèse*, 100). In the letter to Borromeo, Lummenaeus announced that the *Corona Virginea* (1618) had been dedicated to cardinal Federico (*Coronam Virgineam nunc adorno, id est, Duodecim stellas in capite Reginae Virginis, quas purpurae tuae auspiciis consecravi*). Oddly enough, the work is actually dedicated to Borghese – or, to be precise, *some* copies are dedicated to Borghese; others are dedicated to Jacob Boonen, the bishop of Ghent. There also exist two different versions of the tragedy *Saul*: one dedicated to cardinal Ludovisi, another to Claude d'Oignyes. In order to please several patrons, Lummenaeus probably created different versions. Antonius Sanderus actually warned him not to do so: cf. Sanderus' letter of 1620, published in full in appendix six (RAG, SP 34 II 1224; partly published by Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 20). For a more detailed description of these different versions, see Vanderhaeghen, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, III, pp. 1158-1159 (*Corona Virginea*); 1160 (*Saul*).

<sup>138</sup> Since this work – mentioned by Valerius Andreas (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, 215 (ed. 1623), as having appeared at the printing house of Cornelius Marius; 159 (ed. 1643)), but not by Sanderus – has not come down to us, it has often been thought not to have existed, or to have been a misreading of [*Ple*]ias sacra. But these letters in fact indicate that an edition was actually contemplated and physically prepared; it may very well have been circulating in manuscript. Cf. Ambrosiana, G.257, f. 314<sup>ro</sup>: *Hyas sacra sub presso est, id est, septem aliae omiliae sacrae, quae fortasse disertioris Suadae famam merebuntur*; and Fondo Borghese III, 4a, f. 254<sup>ro</sup>: *Hyadem typi mox dabunt, id est, alias septem homilias sacras, quibus radium ab auspiciis Ill[ustrissi]mae celsitudinis V[estrae] quaero*. The laborious and clever reasoning provided by Vanderhaeghen (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, III, 1154) about the supposed mix-up involved in Valerius Andreas' information, can thus be ignored almost in its entirety.

whom he requested to communicate his sorrows to the cardinal. A personal approach through someone close to the designated patron, Lummenaeus must have thought, would probably work best.<sup>139</sup> This update on his heartfelt sorrow that he wanted to be communicated to their mutual patron, has also been preserved:<sup>140</sup> exhausted by persistent illness and worries, Lummenaeus dreams of Milan whenever possible, if only to escape the suffering caused by working and living under an abbot who does not appreciate his fine arts. Lummenaeus' intense pain leaves him no other option than to ask directly for patronage: 'I truly and pressingly ask of you, in as much as you please to take up my case with the cardinal, if, with grace and authority, I can find shelter for one or two years in the monastery of S. Simplicianus, of our Order; and with me one of my fellow brothers, with whom I have thus far shared the load of my studies and who has been through so much trouble for me, that I cannot do without him.'<sup>141</sup> Cornelius then explains in a more detailed manner what caused his request. First, as noted, there is his bad health: due to hypochondria<sup>142</sup> and an infection to the spleen, the medical doctors of Douai University have urged him to move to a better climate, lest he die. But what appears to be even worse: he is now having serious trouble with his abbot, who already hated his literary activities even before Cornelius was priested, and still does. The post-script is perhaps illustrative to their deteriorating relationship: 'When you please to answer me (which, I pray, you will do as soon as possible), will you please safely

<sup>139</sup> *Amplissimus Saccus, amicus meus, cordolium meum, in sinum Illustrissimae Celsitudinis Vestrae infundet et lacrymas meas commendabit. Audi, obsecro, hominem et sic aures ei commodo, ut me ex nomine Illustrissimae Celsitudinis Tuae proxime consulatur.* Ambrosiana, G.256, f. 56<sup>ro</sup>. A complete transcription of this letter, dated 4 November 1619, has been published by Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 84-85, though with some minor inaccuracies.

<sup>140</sup> Ambrosiana, G.256, ff. 58<sup>ro</sup>-59<sup>ro</sup>. The transcription has also been published by Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 87-88, but similarly with a few errors. The letter itself contains a date (10 November), but no year. In view of the letter to Borromeo, it can be dated 1619. Orbaan gives 1620 and suggests the letter is directed to Borromeo. However, it addresses an *amplissimus et praestantissimus vir*, while the cardinal is usually addressed as *Illustrissimus Princeps* (as in the letter dated 4 November 1619, cf. above nt139). Furthermore, Lummenaeus speaks of the cardinal in third person, and asks the addressee to intervene with the cardinal on his behalf, precisely as he had indicated in the letter to Borromeo. Since this letter is dated only several days after the letter to Borromeo, it appears to be the one Lummenaeus is referring to. If the letter was not addressed to Sacco but to someone else at the court of Borromeo – however unlikely –, the problems addressed must have been similar to those Sacco was supposed to report to his patron.

<sup>141</sup> *Rogo vero te et vehementer obtestor, quatenus mihi patrocinari digneris apud amantissimum mei principem Borromaeum, ut cum bona gratia et auctoritate ipsius liceat mihi ad unum atque alterum annum hospitari ad Sancti Simpliciani in monasterio nostri Ordinis, adjuncto mihi uno ex confratribus meis, quicum studiorum meorum laborem hactenus divido et qui mihi sic operam navat, ut eo carere non possim.*

<sup>142</sup> From the Ancient Greeks up to the seventeenth century, the term *hypochondria* referred to a type of physical, but elusive chest or abdominal pains, rather than a mental illness. Cf. Berrios, 'Hypochondriasis: History of the Concept', 5-6.

direct your letter to the outstanding Puteanus, through whom they can be handed to me; I ask the same to be done with the letter of the illustrious Cardinal, if he so pleases to answer me, (...) so no one of us here can intercept the letters.<sup>143</sup>

Thus it happened. Though Sacco's response to Lummenaeus has been lost, we know that he dutifully directed his answer to Puteanus. In a letter to the Louvain professor, dated 1 January 1620 – about seven weeks after Cornelius had sent his request – Sacco concludes: *Ad R[everendum] P[atrem] Cornelium à Marca adiunctas litteras, quaeso, dirige*, 'Please forward the letter I have attached to the Reverend Father Cornelius à Marca.'<sup>144</sup> Though this letter is lost, Sacco again elaborates upon the matter in another letter to Puteanus, dated 4 February 1620:<sup>145</sup>

'The ever Reverend Father, our Cornelius, torments me with his letters, which are otherwise very dear to me, like a precious gift. Nevertheless, he torments me, for I can not obtain for him what he wants from our illustrious Cardinal. The difficulty is, that the cardinal has already for a long time been contemplating something, which he does not want to go into detail about, and we cannot fill in the gaps. I am inclined to think he may be contemplating Rome. But I know this: that many, very important duties are summoning him to Rome for quite some time now. Do know, however, that I guess at these things, rather than actually know them.'

The letter illustrates the loving care with which Sacco advocates Lummenaeus' cause, and his disappointment at his own failure to provide his Belgian friend with that which he requests. But furthering Cornelius'

---

<sup>143</sup> *Cum respondere dignatus fueris (quod oro, ut quamprimum fiat[ ]) litteras tuas excellētissimo Puteano tuto destinabis, mihi in manus per illum consignandas; Quod et de litteris Ill[ustrissi]mo Cardinalis, si omnino dignabitur respondere, fieri rogo (...) ne hic a n[ost]ris intervertantur etc[etera].*

<sup>144</sup> KBBr, ms 19112-2 (letters from Sacco to Puteanus; *folia* not numbered). But the answer apparently failed to provide what the Ghent Benedictine had desired, or Sacco perhaps advised Lummenaeus to send a letter directly to the cardinal: in any case, on 5 February 1620 Lummenaeus addresses a letter directly to Borromeo, containing roughly the same details he had earlier communicated to Sacco. Cf. Ambrosiana, G.256, f. 57<sup>ro-vo</sup> (Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 88-89; erroneously dated February 9 by Orbaan, and containing some errors in the transcription).

<sup>145</sup> *Torquet me R[everen]dus admodum Pater Cornelius noster litteris suis, quae mihi alioquin carissimae sunt, instar muneris pretiosi. Torquet autem, quoniam non possum illi id, quod cupit ab Ill[ustrissi]mo Cardinali nostro effectum dare. Difficultas est in eo, quod Cardinalis nescioquid iamdiu animo versat quod neque ipse explicare vult, neque nos coniectura assequi possumus. In eam tamen sententiam inclino, ut existimem illum forte Romam cogitare. Hoc quidem scio, multa, eademque gravissima negotia iampridem eum illuc vocare. sed puta me hoc potius ariolari, quam scire.* KBBr, ms 19112-2 (letters from Sacco to Puteanus; not numbered).

cause no longer seems to have been in Sacco's hands: Borromeo is contemplating something, but Sacco does not know precisely what it is. He suggests it might be Rome.<sup>146</sup> In any case, the cardinal no longer seems particularly interested in the cause of Father à Marca.<sup>147</sup> But Lummenaeus seemed no longer willing to cope with monastic discipline at home, as Sanderus' letter from April 1620 made clear.<sup>148</sup> Lummenaeus, Sanderus wrote, should just learn to adapt to his monastic position, abstain from accumulating debt, and dedicate his work to one patron only. It may well be that Lummenaeus' eagerness to leave Ghent had an adverse affect on his monastic discipline and position both within and outside the abbey, most notably in the eyes of his abbot.<sup>149</sup>

But whatever Borromeo's mindset towards the Ghent Benedictine, and whether or not it changed in his favor, we find Lummenaeus in preparation for his Italian journey by the end of 1620, at which time he sent the first letter of a series of three, in which he requested an affirmation of the cardinal's benevolence towards him – perhaps a prerequisite for obtaining his abbot's permission to leave –, and some funding as well. Borromeo's written approval would, in turn, have been a guarantee for Schayck that *he* would not be the one having to provide for Lummenaeus. Though our Benedictine eventually went to Milan, there is no trace of such a confirmation actually having been provided: a persistent squabble about money and responsibility would eventually be the sad result.

### *History-in-the-making*

Probably the single most interesting event of those years seems to have been the assignment given to Cornelius à Marca at the instigation of the bishop of

---

<sup>146</sup> Perhaps to become Pope? It was not until the following year that Paul V Borghese would die, in January 1621.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. also another letter from Sacco to Puteanus (KBBBr, ms 19112-2, not numbered; it is not dated, but probably dates from around March 1620): *nempe ut me semel excuses apud Magnum Patrem Cornelium à Marca; qui per singulos tabellarios litteris suis me urget, ut aliquid conficiam apud Card[ina]lem nostrum de eius evocatione. Id quod ego sane non minus cuperem, quam ipse cupit, si in me esset. Quid enim optatius mihi contingere posset, quam eum virum oculis cernere, quem ego iampridem animo ipso contemplor, et tamquam numen adoro, ex divinis illius scriptis, de quibus item Cardinalis idem iudicium facit, et reliqui omnes qui vident. Sed iam satis Cardinalis ipse et mihi per signa quaedam, et Montorphanis disertis verbis mentem animi sui hac de re declamavit.* Sacco very briefly touched upon the same issue in another letter to Puteanus (KBBBr, ms 19112-2, not numbered; dated *die divo Bernardino sacro* 1620, i.e. 20 May).

<sup>148</sup> RAG, SP 34 1224 (Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 20). Cf. appendix six.

<sup>149</sup> In fact, it seems Cornelius was displeased with the fact that his friend Justus Rycquius had been promoted, while he had not. But Sanderus warns Lummenaeus not to be too ambitious: it would take more than just literary talent to climb the ecclesiastical ladder. He would have to work hard to earn people's respect, and at the moment he seemed not willing to do so. Cf. appendix six.

Ghent. Following Cornelius' own, handwritten request in Latin, an archducal ordinance of 19 June 1615 dictates the following:<sup>150</sup>

“The Archdukes,

To all abbots, rectors of universities, bailiffs, sheriffs, mayors, burgomasters, aldermen, and all our other upholders of justice, officials, and officers of the law of our cities in The Netherlands, hail to you. On behalf of Jacques Cornille [*sic*] de Lummen dit de la Marca it has been brought to our attention that he is said to have been requested by the bishop of Ghent to write a Belgian history of our time and that he, to this end, would desire to have access to libraries, archives, ... books, documents and acts [that are of use?] for his intention, ... he has modestly requested if it pleases us to grant him such access, and to send him the letters from us that are necessary in such matters.

For this cause and according to our wish to endow the supplicant of such a commendable enterprise so he can execute his plan with more assurance and to facilitate and observe in all matters the punctuality that is necessary in accordance with the truth of things, so that his work can thereafter contribute to the wellbeing of posterity – we request you all, and specifically each of you whom aforementioned supplicant will run across for this cause and activity described above, to be willing to provide him with the documents and notes you possibly have, that may be of service to the history of our time that he intends to write and to publish at the instigation of the bishop of Ghent, as said

---

<sup>150</sup> Both documents are preserved in the State Archive of Brussels (Conseil privé Espagnol, 1276 nr. 357). Cf. Soenen, *Inventaire analytique*, 49. The archival copy of the ordinance is a rough draft that is quite difficult to read, since it contains many deletions and insertions; the original must have been in the possession of Lummenaeus and is now lost. Lummenaeus' handwritten request reads: *Amplissimi et Illustris Domini. Supplicat cum omni reverentia et submissione Amplissimis et Illustribus DD. VV. Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca litteras patentes sub nomine et sigillo serenissimorum Archiducum sibi indulgeri, quarum vi et auctoritate liber accessus sibi pateat ad communes totius Belgicae bibliothecas et scrinia, ex quibus depromere possit quae sibi ad historiam Belgicam, ex nutu R[everendissi]mi Gandavensis conscribendam, usui et instructioni esse possint: tum et hoc rogat in iisdem litteris expresse declarari, sibi munus illud ab eodem R[everendissi]mo Gandavensi commendatum fuisse; et si quid praeterea Amplissimae et Illustris DD. VV. in favorem dicti supplicis decernere voluerint; et post haec omnia diu expectatam expeditionem implorat. Quod si feceritis etc.* The request itself is not signed or dated. In the top-left margin of the letter it is noted, in a different hand, what has or will be put in the ordinance: *fiat acte, contenant recommandation favorable a toutes villes, universitez et abbayes qu'ilz assistent le suppl[ian]t des memoires et remarques qu'ilz peuvent avoir servants a l'histoire de n[ost]re temps qu'il entend écrire et mettre en lumiere a ce meu et incité par le Rever[endissi]me évesque de Gand. fait a Bruxelles le 19. de Juing, 1615.* I sincerely thank Katell Lavéant for patiently going through the French manuscripts with me.



before, accommodating the aforementioned supplicant in the cause described above with proof of all favourable assistance.

Signed in our city of Brussels in our name, and personal seal, ...  
June 19, 1615.

By order of their Illustriousnesses.<sup>151</sup>

The above ordinance, now at the State Archives in Brussels, provided Lummenaeus with free access to whichever abbey, library, state institution, etc., he thought could provide him with the information needed for accurately describing the ‘histoire belge de notre temps’. It must have constituted the ultimate opportunity for Lummenaeus to regularly leave the abbey and travel around and beyond Flanders.

Both the ordinance and Lummenaeus’ request make clear that the initiative for writing this history lay with the bishop of Ghent, at the time Frans van den Burch (1613-1616).<sup>152</sup> This, it seems, is inconsistent with Lummenaeus’ own words on the subject some ten years later, in a letter to the papal nuncio in Brussels, Guidi di Bagno. There, it is noted in an outline of this letter provided by Bernhard de Meester, Lummenaeus says that Archduke Albert had charged him with writing the history of the troubles in the Netherlands. However, the subject had been difficult, complex and delicate, and he therefore rather preferred to write a local history of the Holy Virgin, similar to the ones written earlier by Lipsius and Puteanus.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>151</sup> *Les Archiducqs / A tous Abbez, Recteurs d'Universitez, Baillyz, Escoutettes, Maires, Bourgm[estr]res, Eschevins, et tous autres noz justiciers, officiers, et Gens de Loy de noz villes de pardeca, salut et dilection. De la part de Jacques Cornille de Lummen dit de la Marca nous a esté remonstré que il auroit esté requiz par l'evesque de Gand d'escrire l'histoire Belgicque de n[ost]re temps et qu'a ces fins il desirerait d'avoir acces aux bibliothecques, archives, ... livres, memoires et munimens ... [utiles?] a son intention, ... nous a bien humblement supplié qu'il nous pleust luy permettre les acces, et de ce luy faire despescher noz l[ett]res en tel cas neces[sair]e. / A tous pour ces causes et le desir qu'avons de gratiffier le supp[lian]t en une si louable entreprinse enfin qu'il puist accomplir son intention avecq plus d'assurance et faciliter et observer en tout la punctualite necessaire selon la verite des choses, a ce que ses labeurs puissent cy apres servir au bien de la posterite, vous requerons et a ch[ac]un de vous en particulier que lors que led[it] supp[lian]t se trouvera par devers vous a la cause, et effort que dessus, le veuillez assister des memoires et remarques que pourriez avoir servans a l'histoire de n[ost]re temps qu'il entend escrire et mettre en lumiere a ce meu et incite par l'evesque de Gand, co[m]me dict est, acco[m]modant led[it] supp[lian]t en ce que dessus avecq demonstrance de toute favorable assistance. / Donne en n[ost]re ville de Bruxelles soubz n[ost]re nom, et cachet secret cy ... le xix<sup>e</sup> de juing, l'an xvi<sup>e</sup> et quinze. / Par ordonnance de leurs al[tess]es ser[enissi]mes.*

<sup>152</sup> It has been suggested that Lummenaeus was granted the assignment because of the history he had written of the Dukes of Burgundy, printed with the *Opera omnia*. Cf. Vermaseren, *De katholieke nederlandse geschiedschrijving*, 214. Cf. also appendix one to this thesis. Lummenaeus considered Van den Burch one of his patrons: he dedicated the first homily of the collection *Pleias sacra* (1617) to the Ghent bishop. Cf. A4<sup>vo</sup> / p. 8.

<sup>153</sup> A summary of this letter has been provided by De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 768-769, but he does not provide the actual text. The

But even though the Archdukes had had to give their permission, the text of the request and the ordinance suggest that it was ultimately not at *their* orders that Lummenaeus should have gone to work. B.A. Vermaseren, basing himself on De Meester's outline of Cornelius' letter to Bagno, understandably assumes that the Archduke himself had given the historical assignment to Lummenaeus, but the archival evidence suggests otherwise.<sup>154</sup> Therefore, Vermaseren's hypothesis that the Archduke was anxiously trying to initiate a full Catholic account of the troubles – at the time non-existent –, that could serve as a counter-weight against the history books from the northern provinces, should perhaps be somewhat modified.

Whether or not Cornelius initially set out to work on this history, we can not be sure. In 1624, while in Rome, he does mention his plan of publishing a history on the Dukes of Burgundy and the Archdukes Albert and Isabelle shortly (perhaps an extended version of his 1613 *Duces Burgundiae*, or a follow-up), which – according to Lummenaeus – Albert had once ordered him to write. Whether Lummenaeus is here referring to the 'history of our time', we do not know.<sup>155</sup> As to the reason why he never finished it, even though the necessary paperwork had already been arranged, we can only guess. Advancing from his not entirely correct hypothesis, Vermaseren suggests that Lummenaeus was perhaps forced into a direction he disliked and therefore gave up the assignment. After all, those books that *were* published on the subject in 1623 and 1630, had been banned.<sup>156</sup> Perhaps, however, the assignment or funding was cancelled when Van den Burch was succeeded as bishop of Ghent by Jacob Boonen in 1617. One can only guess at what would have been when Lummenaeus *had* actually written this

---

letter (dated 25 August 1626 from Ghent) is today preserved in the archive of the Guidi di Bagno family at the Castello di Torriana di MonteBello (Rimini, Italy), which I have not been able to consult. I sincerely thank Simona Brunetti and Marco Prandoni for their help in locating and accessing the Bagno-archive.

<sup>154</sup> Vermaseren, *De katholieke Nederlandse geschiedschrijving*, 214; 222-223.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Lummenaeus' dedicatory letter of 7 June 1624 from Rome to Rodericus Gomez de Sylva, councillor to the king of Spain and legate to Pope Urban VIII: *Prolixior ero, cum Duces Burgundiae, et successive Austriae Principes, Belgarum meorum Dominos, sive res eorum gestas (quas apud me adfectas habeo) sub auspiciis Excellent[iae] T[uae] proxime in lucem vulgabo. Decreverat mihi olim hanc Provinciam Sereniss[imus] Albertus, Princeps meus, instante Illustrissimo, et Reverendissimo Cameracen[si] Archipr[ae]sule, diplomate suo, super hoc, ad me misso, paulo antequam e vivis apud nos excederet (Praesepe Domini, A2<sup>ro-vo</sup>)*. Lummenaeus' interest in historiography is further illustrated by a reference in Raphael de Beauchamps' history of the abbey of Marchiennes (near Douai). Apparently, Lummenaeus had provided him with an old document that was of great importance for the abbey's history: *Vetus nempe membranula Blandiniensis Ecclesiae, situ, et squalore obsita, quam prosa et metro clarus Benedictinae familiae Alumnus, et per digne Asceta R[everendus] Dom[ini] Iacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca, mihi id genus solidos inquirenti thesauros arte typographica in lucem producendos, ne alioqui edaci intereant ipsa vetustate, officiose exhibuit in haec verba excipiendam, et opportune luci tradendam, etc.* Cf. De Beauchamps, *Historiae Franco-Merovingicae synopsis*, 491.

<sup>156</sup> Vermaseren, *De katholieke Nederlandse geschiedschrijving*, 223.

work, since it would most likely have generated the interest of a much broader audience than could be reached just by his Biblical sermons and tragedies; it would, given the subject, probably have had difficulty in staying clear from North-South controversies, and may thus have initiated reactions and/or polemics. Unfortunately, we will perhaps never know.<sup>157</sup> It seems, in any case, that not much publicity was given to the assignment, and that Lummenaeus started preparing anew for an Italian journey soon afterwards. We should not forget that his own words on the matter – that the subject was too delicate and complicated – stemmed from some ten years later, and were perhaps mainly employed to justify his earlier decision not to complete this particular assignment, in order to procure another one.

Nonetheless, several other works did make it to the printer's office in the years 1615-1621. Besides many preliminary poems published in friends' work,<sup>158</sup> Lummenaeus had a total of four works published at the printing house of Cornelius Marius in Ghent: two tragedies (*Bustum Sodomae* (1615) and *Amnon* (1617)) and two collections of *homiliae* (*Pleias sacra* (1617) and *Corona Virginea* (1618)). These collections of sermons also make clear that Lummenaeus not only delivered his speeches in Ghent (at the *Mons Blandinius*, as well as with the Dominicans and the Jesuits), but also in Bruges.<sup>159</sup> It is likely that *Hyas sacra*, another collection of seven homilies – discussed above, p. 47(nt138) – was also set to appear at the printing house of Marius in 1617 or 1618. It may be that the edition got reworked and extended, and was eventually to appear as the 1618 collection of twelve homilies, *Corona Virginea*, though both works are mentioned separately by Valerius Andreas as having appeared with Marius.<sup>160</sup> Furthermore, another collection of hundred religious speeches, entitled *Hecatombe*, was announced by Lummenaeus.<sup>161</sup> It is also mentioned by Sanderus in 1624, followed by a list of some seventeen homilies which Sanderus had personally read, most of which would eventually be printed separately or in other collections.<sup>162</sup> The

<sup>157</sup> Did the assignment perhaps create animosity between Lummenaeus and Puteanus, since the Louvain professor was the official royal historiographer?

<sup>158</sup> Cf. Vanderhaeghen, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, III, 1166, and appendix one to this thesis.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. e.g. *Corona Virginea*, homilia IX (delivered in Bruges with the Dominicans on 8 August 1613), and homilia X (delivered in Bruges with the Augustinians on 28 August 1617).

<sup>160</sup> Andreas, *Bibliotheca Belgica*, 215 (edition 1623); 159 (edition 1643). The *Hyas sacra* is also listed by Lipenius, *Bibliotheca realis*, 37 (*Iac. Corn. Lummenaei Hyas Sacra s. VII. Homiliae sacrae. Gandav. 1617*). The entry may simply have been copied from Andreas.

<sup>161</sup> *Hecatomben meam sacram Ill[ustrissi]mo Heroi n[ost]ro [i.e. Borromaeo] inscriptam, tum etiam sacros aliquot threnos Amplit[udini] V[est]rae nuncupatos brevi, ubi typis exierint, videbis*. Letter to Sacco in Milan, Ambrosiana, G.256, ff. 58<sup>ro</sup>-59<sup>ro</sup> (as above, p. 48).

<sup>162</sup> *Habet [sc. Lummenaeus] et prae manibus Hecatombem, sive Homilias centum, de variis religionis Christianae mysteriis. Quas ex iis homiliis ego legi, hae sunt etc.* Cf. Sanderus, *De Gandavensibus*, 60-61. The entry has been copied to Andreas' 1643 edition of the

substantial *Hecatombe*-collection as such seems not to have made it to the finishing line.<sup>163</sup>

*1622-1626: The Italian deception?*

At the instigation of, among others, the papal nuncio in Brussels, abbot Schayck granted Lummenaeus permission to depart for Italy, be it – as becomes clear from Schayck’s response to nuncio Bagno – reluctantly:

‘I would nevertheless dare to assure you that if Borromeo would actually have seen the man, so obese and fat, full of harmful fluids and round as a ball, that he would surely agree with me and judge that he, carrying his body as such a heavy load, would definitely not be able to endure or withstand the difficulties and hardships of such a long journey, across so many rocky outcrops and snowy mountains, without the evident danger of death, even according to others.’<sup>164</sup>

The journey would not be without danger – as his brother Ludovicus would come to experience as well –, not only because of mountains and snow, but

---

*Bibliotheca Belgica*, 159: *Meditabatur editionem Hecatombes, sive Homiliarum centum, de variis Religionis Christianae mysteriis.*

<sup>163</sup> Sanderus (*De Gandavensibus*, 60) also mentions two other tragedies, which have apparently not survived: *Absalon, seu miseranda exitu clausa in patrem Davidem Absalonis filii rebellis*, as well as *Anastasius, sive perfidia fulminata*. Both works are not mentioned by Valerius Andreas. Angelus Gryllus also refers to the *Absalon* tragedy in his letter dated 28 June 1622 (printed in *Musae Lacrymantes*, I3<sup>vo</sup>). It may have been circulating in manuscript and was perhaps never printed. Vanderhaeghen (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, III, 1161-1162) insists that the perioche preserved at the University library of Ghent (sign. G6144<sup>2</sup>) of an *Absalon* tragedy, performed at the Jesuit college in Ghent in 1625, is Lummenaeus’; James Parente (‘The Paganization of Biblical Tragedy’, 216) convincingly argues against it: the Jesuit piece consists of three acts only and has apparently much more dialogue than is customary in Lummenaeus’ plays. Additionally, contrary to Lummenaeus’ other plays, the play has been divided into many separate scenes, up to six per act. It may, ofcourse, have been an adaption of Lummenaeus’ piece. He himself, it may be noted, had at the time (March 1625) not yet returned from Rome. The perioche is entitled: *Tragoedia Absalon Exhibenda a Poësius studiosis Collegii Societatis Iesu, Gandavi Martii, 1625* (Ghent: Ioannes Kerckhovius, 1625).

<sup>164</sup> (...) *Ausim tamen affirmare ut si [Borromaeus] vidisset hominem tam obesum et crassum, corruptis humoribus penitus repletum et instar globi quasi rotundum, mecum haud dubie sentiret ac iudicaret illum cum tam ingenti corporis mole tanti itineris difficultates ac molestias, per tot rupes et nivosos montes, sine evidenti mortis periculo aliorum etiam iudicio minime sufferre ac sustinere posse.* (...), BNFr, Mns. Latins 5174, f. 119<sup>vo</sup>; 5175a, p. 395 (De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 158). The letter is dated 16 February 1622.

also because the routes in itself might be unsafe.<sup>165</sup> And they were already so for a healthy man, let alone for someone in bad health, obese and fat, swollen with fluids like a ball. Lummenaeus' humanist friend Jacob van Zevecote addressed the undertaking in a long elegy, him, too, underlining the dangers that his friend would have to face, and the hardships he was going to have to endure.<sup>166</sup> Though Van Zevecote does not mention any physical ailments, the journey is nonetheless not going to be easy:

‘Ah, each time cold will scorch your palms,  
 You shall wish you were back at your paternal fireplace.  
 Ah, each time you will see rocks towering over you,  
 You shall desire to see your Blandinian home again.  
 And when winds will constantly torture your weary face,  
 You shall continuously bear these things with real anguish.  
 Oh what have I done? What dementia ordered me,  
 Fool that I am, to stray this far from my ancestral shores?’<sup>167</sup>

As an elegy, the poem does not congratulate the addressee with his travel plans, and it has clearly not been written in a cheerful mood. Rather, the poet appears truly worried about Lummenaeus' undertaking, provides him with a crash course in geography, advises him which routes to take, which certainly *not* to take, and how to avoid being captured and carried off as a prisoner:

‘Ah, let such an impressive poet not fall into the Turc's hands,  
 Or become a victim of crime at the Tyrrhenian sea.  
 But rather overcome the dire rocks of the Alps  
 Through the neighbouring kingdom of Savoy,  
 And safely cross the farmlands of Piedmont,  
 And the safe fields cultivated by the rich Insubrian.  
 May thus the desired kisses of your patron touch you,  
 May thus the cloudless days be full of happiness for you.’<sup>168</sup>

<sup>165</sup> Cf. also below with regard to Lummenaeus' return route, when he decided not to go by Basel.

<sup>166</sup> Zevecotius, *Poemata* (1622), elegia III.5, p. 57ff.; Id., *Poemata* (1623), II.14, p. 207ff. The elegy is partly published in Nauta's *Schets van de geschiedenis der Latijnsche dichtkunst in Nederland* (p. 32) in order to illustrate Zevecotius' dexterity in writing Latin poetry.

<sup>167</sup> *Ab quoties lassas urent dum frigora plantas, / Optabis patriis rursus adesse focis. / Ab quoties capiti dum saxa minantia cernes, / Blandinii cupies tecta videre tui. / Dumque frequens fesso flatu trepidabit in ore, / Talia non ficto saepe dolore feres. / O ego quid feci? quae me dementia inssit / A patriis miserum tam procul ire plagis?*

<sup>168</sup> *Ab cave ne tantus Turcae servire poeta, / Tyrrhenive scelus debeat esse freti. / Sed magis invicti per proxima regna Sabaudi, / Alpini supera tetrica saxa iugi. / Et Pedemontanos securus perge per agros, / Tutaque quae dives Insuber arva colit. / Sic tibi contingant optati Praesulis ora, / Sic tibi felices sint sine nube dies.*

On this brief, wishful note the poem ends. Not only Lummenaeus' friends, but also his family had attempted to discourage him from the undertaking, if we can believe Schayck's words in this respect:

‘(...) until finally – though even his parents, brothers and friends did not want him to go and gravely advised against the undertaking – he extorted permission from me by sickening force, to leave for Milan (and not further), to the aforementioned illustrious cardinal Mr. Borromeo, where my letter of permission allowed him to go. (...)’<sup>169</sup>

All in all, it appears that his departure was ill-advised in the eyes of many, be it for different reasons.<sup>170</sup> Nonetheless, on 1 March 1622 Lummenaeus received his abbot's permission to leave Ghent for Federico Borromeo in Milan. Whether or not this permission was limited to Milan is essentially what the squabble would be all about. The actual text reads:<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>169</sup> (...) *donec tandem invitis et reclamantibus etiam parentibus, fratribus ac amicis, per vim et aegre veniam [sc. Cornelius] extorqueret ut Mediolanum, et non ulterius, ad praefatum Illustrissimum Dominum Cardinalem Borromaeum concederet, prout Dimissoriales meae sonabant (...)*. Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2 (cf. above, p. 24nt47). This is one of those three letters with similar content written by Schayck. One variation reads: *Praeterea oportet scire illum hinc (extorta per importunitatem licentia, invitis etiam fratribus et consanguineis suis) discessisse Mediolanum ad Ill[ustrissim]um D[ominum] cardinalem Borromaeum*, etc. (cf. Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 36-38; RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 (no. 2; not dated)); the third omits this passage (cf. Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 27-29; RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, 17 February 1623).

<sup>170</sup> Puteanus wishes Lummenaeus a successful journey: *Videbunt te Itali et lumen Belgarum dicent. Ut prosperum iter sit, voveo* (printed in Lummenaeus' *Rosarium* (1623), A2<sup>vo</sup>).

<sup>171</sup> *Nos Joachimus Arsenius, Dei et Ap[osto]licae sedis permissione, Abbas monasterii S. Petri iuxta Gandavum, ord[inis] S[anc]ti Benedicti, sedi Ap[osto]licae immediate subiecti, et exemptorum monast[er]iorum eiusdem ordinis per Belgium visitator, concessimus D[omin]o Jacobo Cornelio Lummenaeo a Marca, religioso presbytero dicti n[ost]ri monasterii, licentiam proficiscendi Mediolanum ad Illustrissimum D[ominum] cardinalem Borromaeum a se iam saepius evocato ac invitato. Quare universos et singulos, ac imprimis D.D. praelatos eiusdem n[ost]ri ord[inis] rogamus, ut si quando ad eos dictum nostrum religiosum divertere contigerit, ipsi auxilio et consilio adesse non dedignentur. Idem humanitatis ac charitatis officium reciproce a se commendatis (quando occasio sese obtulerit), semper praestare parati sumus. In cuius confirma[tio]nem, haec propria manu et sigillo munivimus. / Actum in d[ic]to n[ost]ro monast[er]io S[anc]ti Petri ipsis calendis martiis 1622.* RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224. All letters in this register have been published in full by Varenbergh (‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, passim), except the letter by Antonius Sanderus from 1620 (Varenbergh, ‘id.’, 20; cf. appendix six). Although Varenbergh's transcriptions are sometimes rather inaccurate and, especially to modern editing standards, far from flawless, the edition for the most part does the job of proficiently presenting the letters' contents. Due to limitations in the available time, as well as the purpose of this biographical presentation, here is not the place for a new edition of the RAG-letters, nor of the letters preserved in other collections throughout Europe. Where applicable *and* noteworthy, I will quote passages and refer to specific errors. The transcriptions here provided are all based on the original documents, unless otherwise stated.

‘We, Joachim Arsenius, by permission of God and the Apostolic See abbot of St. Peter’s near Ghent, of the Order of S. Benedict, immediately subjected to the Apostolic See, and *visitor* of the exempt monasteries of the same Order in Belgium, grant permission to Mr. Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca, monastic and priest of our aforementioned monastery, to depart for Milan to the Illustrious cardinal Mr. Borromeo, by whom he has been summoned and invited already more than once. Therefore, we ask of all and each, prelates of our own Order in particular, when it happens that our said monastic should turn to them, that they will readily come to his assistance with aid and advice. This task of humanity and charity we are always prepared to return to those who are commended by him (if the opportunity should have presented itself). In confirmation of this, I have personally sealed and signed this attestation.

Signed in said monastery of St. Peter’s, on 1 March 1622.’

The letter granted Lummenaeus permission to leave for Milan, but one could argue that, strictly speaking, it is not *limited to* Milan. As we have seen, Schayck would later certainly be much more explicit in limiting the permission that had been granted. The idea, however, is probably that, since such permission at least in the *dimissoriales* is not specifically granted, it was simply not allowed for Lummenaeus to travel elsewhere, on which the two men had perhaps verbally agreed.

It is here that Emile Varenbergh picks up on Lummenaeus’ trail, describing his Italian journey by means of the letters directed to abbot Schayck, now preserved at the State Archives in Ghent. Based on this in itself fairly extensive collection of correspondence, Varenbergh constructs a rather miserable image of dire poverty, sickness and hardship, which ultimately led to Lummenaeus’ impoverished return to Belgium. In different libraries through Europe, however, there is still more correspondence to be found with regard to this period. Orbaan, Pasture and De Meester have diligently gone through many collections of manuscripts, and have registered numerous interesting items related to Lummenaeus’ adventures in Italy. Varenbergh, however, had had to limit his biographical presentation to the letters preserved in Ghent. As a result, he was only able to sketch a limited picture and lost track of Lummenaeus in 1625, only to pick up the trail again in 1628. In this section, we will again trace Lummenaeus’ steps, retelling the story already told by Varenbergh, but this time adorned with archival material that, though long since available and registered, has not yet been combined and duly interpreted. Several letters from abbot Arsenius Schayck

to various Italian dignitaries provide a valuable reservoir of background information and, by throwing a different light on events, form an excellent *repoussoir* for a more balanced reconstruction of the Italian journey of 1622-1625, for which most information otherwise derives only from Lummenaeus himself.

### *Arrival in Milan*

With the permission finally granted, Cornelius – with a servant<sup>172</sup> – immediately set out for Milan, even though Borromeo seemed ever more unwilling to receive him: March 5 we find him in Courtrai, heading south; March 18 he is in Douai, and on April 8 in Paris.<sup>173</sup> Already on the 18<sup>th</sup> of May, 1622, he is in Milan, at the monastery of S. Simplicianus. On this date, Lummenaeus wrote a letter to Borromeo, by whom – the letter makes clear – he had already been received in audience. Soon afterwards, however, Lummenaeus had become ill and – though treated well at Simplicianus – was unable to again make his appearance at Borromeo’s court. But because of his long journey and unexpected expenses, he was by then already forced to ask his patron for money to pay off a debt of twenty gold pieces he had attracted while waiting for a bill of exchange from his abbot. But Lummenaeus had sent the request only reluctantly: ‘Necessity is too crude a weapon, which has forced me this far, to the point of becoming disrespectful.’<sup>174</sup> It may have been necessity that forced him to beg for money with his Italian patron, but the impudence deployed would soon prove no exception. Most letters that have come down to us, from this particular one onward, are usually at least partly about his lack of money and

---

<sup>172</sup> References to this servant (*famulus*) – apparently the, otherwise unknown, son of Johannes Schoondonck –, can be found a.o. in letters from Lummenaeus to Schayck of 17 August 1622 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 no 6; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 24-25); of 5 August 1622 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 no 5; Varenbergh, *id.*, 23-24); of November 11 1623 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 no 16; Varenbergh, *id.*, 43-44); of 9 December 1623 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 no 18; Varenbergh, *id.*, 134-135). In the case of Hugo Grotius, ‘famulus’ was the word used for his private secretary. Cf. Nellen, *Hugo de Groot*, 170. It is unclear what exactly Lummenaeus’ *famulus* was meant to do.

<sup>173</sup> March 5 in Courtrai: letter from Lummenaeus to nuncio Guidi di Bagno (De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 158nt4); March 18 in Douai: dedicatory letter to Ph. De Cavarel (*Abimelechus*, A2<sup>ro</sup>-A3<sup>ro</sup>; *ante projectionem meam Italicam, quam nunc adorno ad amantissimum mei principem Card. Borromaeum*); April 8 in Paris: letter to Grotius, cf. below p. 61.

<sup>174</sup> *Nimirum durum telum necessitas, quae me huc compulit et paene impudentem fieri coegit.* Ambrosiana, G.256, f. 79<sup>ro-vo</sup> (Orbaan, ‘Kardinaal Federico Borromeo’, 94-95).



contain fairly bold requests. Thus, the first tangible evidence of Lummenaeus' stay in Italy would prove a clear marker of what lay ahead.<sup>175</sup>

But already in this early stage of his journey there appear to be some discrepancies in the information that has come down to us. As we have seen – and will come to see over and over again – Lummenaeus' main (publicly expressed) reason for traveling to Italy was his poor health. Therefore, his Abbot finally granted him permission to leave for Milan. But already from the start there may have been some (deliberate) misunderstandings between Cornelius and his superior. The latter, in fact, wrote in his letter of 24 April 1624 to cardinal Fr. Barberini: 'But alas! Apparently, his actual presence diminished his fame, since he had been sent away not long after, and placed there in the monastery of S. Simplicianus.'<sup>176</sup> Schayck supposed that Lummenaeus had been unexpectedly stored away by the cardinal at S. Simplicianus. However, it had all along been Lummenaeus' intention to find residence at the aforementioned monastery, as we learn from his letter to Borromeo of 21 November 1621: 'I long to enjoy the friendliness and goodwill of your illustrious Highness and therefore now gladly accept the invitation, which your illustrious Highness has offered me not once, in the monastery of S. Simplicianus, with the religious brothers of my Order: there will be nothing more welcome or pleasant to me than their company.'<sup>177</sup>

There is, however, yet another, perhaps more important issue that has remained unnoticed. Schayck, in his various letters, underlined the fact that Lummenaeus was not supposed to leave Milan and to travel elsewhere. But Cornelius nevertheless moved quite a bit around the northern parts of Italy, before eventually ending up in Rome. He himself claimed that he was forced to move around in order to procure a decent living, and he communicated as much to his abbot: if cardinal Borromeo could not provide him with at least the bare necessities, and the monastics of S. Simplicianus refused to

---

<sup>175</sup> Saccus, too, revealed as much to Puteanus already on 18 May 1622, shortly after Lummenaeus' arrival in Italy: the cardinal seemed unwilling to harbour the Ghent monastic, the Benedictine congregation was unable to harbour him, and he was constantly short of money, of which – according to Sacco – he had simply not brought enough. Cf. KBBr, ms 19112-2 (15 kal. Jun.).

<sup>176</sup> *Sed eheu! Ut apparet, minuit praesentia famam, quia non multo post dimissus, in Monasterio S. Simpliciani ibidem collocatus fuit (...).* Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2 (cf. above, p. 24nt47).

<sup>177</sup> *Frui itaque desidero humanitate et benevolentia Illustrissimae Celsitudinis Vestrae atque adeo libenter nunc accipio hospitalem tesseram quam non semel obtulit Illustrissima Celsitudo Vestra in monasterio Sancti Simpliciani apud religiosos confratres ordinis mei, quo sane contubernio nihil mihi gratius aut jucundius accidere potest.* Ambrosiana, G.232, f. 219<sup>ro-vo</sup> (Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 93-94). Lummenaeus' earlier letter of 10 November 1619 to Sacco in Milan (quoted above, cf. p. 48) had also specifically included the request for a stay at S. Simplicianus: *Rogo vero te et vehementer obtestor, quatenus mihi patrocinari digneris apud amantissimum mei principem Borromaeum, ut cum bona gratia et auctoritate ipsius liceat mihi ad unum atque alterum annum hospitari ad Sancti Simpliciani in monasterio nostri Ordinis, adjuncto mihi uno ex confratribus meis, quicum studiorum meorum laborem hactenus divido et qui mihi sic operam navat, ut eo carere non possim.*

harbor him for an extended period of time due to restrictions set to their hospitality, he would try his luck elsewhere. But Lummenaeus may have had a hidden agenda, and seemed to have been planning an ecclesiastical equivalent to a humanist *peregrinatio academica* all along. Already in a letter to the famous Dutch humanist Hugo Grotius from Paris on 8 April 1622<sup>178</sup> the Ghent Benedictine revealed his plans: ‘I am now in Paris, and I am enthusiastically heading for Italy, to my dearest lord cardinal Borromeo. From there, when the heat of summer has mostly passed, I will continue to Rome, to the Illustrious Borghese, my Maecenas and singular patron as well. Ah, if only Rome can come up to my expectations!’<sup>179</sup> In retrospect, Cornelius had all along been setting the stage for his visit to the Eternal City. Already his letters, gifts and dedications from 1617-1621 to the Rome-based cardinals Scipione Borghese and Ludovico Ludovisi can be considered his early preparations.<sup>180</sup> And thus, immediately after his arrival in Milan, he started preparing to set out for Rome. He sent out two almost identical letters,<sup>181</sup> adorned with gifts, to the cardinals Maffeo Barberini and Ludovisi

---

<sup>178</sup> Grotius, having escaped from imprisonment in Holland, had arrived in Antwerp at the end of March 1621, and departed for Paris on 3 April, where he would receive Lummenaeus’ letter in 1622. Cf. Nellen, *Hugo de Groot*, 258-261. Had they perhaps personally met, either in Antwerp or Paris?

<sup>179</sup> *Lutetiae Parisiorum nunc sum et magnis animis in Italiam tendo ad amantissimum mei Principem Card. Borromaeum, ut porro adulta aestate, cum deseruerit calor, Romam proficiscar ad Ill[ustrissi]mum Burghesium, Maecenatem item meum et Patronum singularem; atque o utinam talem Romam inveniam, qualem opto!* The letter has been published by Vanderhaeghen (with the wrong date of 6 April) and was at the time in the possession of the library of Ghent University, which had perhaps acquired the letter at an auction in Amsterdam in 1882 (cf. [Muller], *Catalogue de la collection importante de lettres autographes*, 45, no. 312 (Correspondance de Grotius): [lettre de] *Lummenaeus* (sic) *à Marca, Gand 1622*). According to the transcription of Vanderhaeghen, it was dated from Paris, not from Ghent. The letter is also recorded in the edition of Grotius’ correspondence (Grotius, *Briefwisseling van Grotius*, no. 739a, pp. 196-197). The original currently appears to be lost.

<sup>180</sup> Cf. e.g. the letter from cardinal Borghese printed in *Corona Virginea* (1618), dated 26 August 1617, in which he renders thanks for a copy of (probably) *Pleias sacra* (1617); or cf. the dedication of *Saul* (1621) to Ludovisi (A2<sup>ro</sup>-A3<sup>ro</sup>).

<sup>181</sup> Respectively Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 168 and Vat.Barb.Lat., 6510, f. 73. Both Pasture (‘Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini’, 110) and Orbaan (*Bescheiden in Italië*, 364, no. 347) mixed up the addressees of both letters. Proof of the addressee of the letter to Ludovisi (ms 6510, f. 73) is not only provided by the actual address on the letter’s verso ( (...) *Card. Ludovisio, S.R.E. Camerario etc. Domino et Patrono meo colendis. / Romam*), but also by the reference to the dedication of the tragedy *Saul* (*Interim Abimelechum Tragoediam sacram mitto, et doleo imprimis, quod rescire hactenus non mereor, quo vultu Saulem alteram tragoediam nuper acceperit, quam Ill[ustrissi]mae Celsit[udinis] V[estrae] patrocínio libens merito consecravi*). The *Saul* (or at least some copies of it, cf. above) had indeed been dedicated to Ludovisi (5 September, 1621).

in Rome, both dated May 19 1622. In these letters he asked directly for an invitation to come to the *Urbs* and to be received in their patronage.<sup>182</sup>

His arrival in Rome, however, was still a long time coming. It seems that lack of money withheld Lummenaeus from actually moving anywhere. Apparently, both Schayck and Borromeo did not provide the Ghent Benedictine with the funds he needed. On the 23<sup>rd</sup> of June 1622, Lummenaeus sent a letter to the papal nuncio in Brussels, who had, earlier in the year,<sup>183</sup> already successfully intervened with Schayck at Lummenaeus' request. Once again his help in this matter was sought, and Cornelius would like him to persuade his abbot to send more funds to Milan.<sup>184</sup> Whether or not nuncio Guidi di Bagno actually did as requested, remains uncertain.<sup>185</sup>

Funded or not, Lummenaeus decided he had waited long enough and was preparing to leave Milan. It was, however, mid-summer, and his friends persuaded him to wait until at least mid-August, when temperatures would ease.<sup>186</sup> On 5 August, Lummenaeus wrote a letter to Schayck – apparently, he had written to Ghent several times before, but he had not received an answer –,<sup>187</sup> saying he had arrived in Milan, where he benefitted greatly from the favorable climate. Other than a request for money – it seems the letter to Bagno had not (yet) produced the desired effect – Lummenaeus indirectly

---

<sup>182</sup> Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 168, to Maffeo Barberini: *Utinam porro Romam videre mihi liceat, et purpuram Ill[ustrissim]ae Cels[itudin]is V[estrae] coram honorare, quam absens amplector; nam post sacra altaria, illud huc imprimis me invitare potest, ut genua Ill[ustrissim]ae Celsit[udinis] V[estrae] liceat mihi coram venerari;* cf. also Vat.Barb.Lat. 6510, f. 73, to Ludovisi: *Utinam porro Romam videre mihi liceat, et purpuram tuam coram amplecti, quam absens veneror; suspirabo tantisper, dum mihi liceat in clientela Ill[ustrissim]ae Celsit[udinis] V[estrae] Urbem principem adorare.*

<sup>183</sup> Cf. above, p. 55.

<sup>184</sup> De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 214 and 214nt1-2. I have been unable to consult these letters referred to by De Meester, since they are preserved in the private archives of the Guidi di Bagno family, and I therefore rely on the summary he provided (cf. above, p. 52nt153).

<sup>185</sup> Bagno, according to De Meester (*Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 214nt2), asked Schayck for ample funds on behalf of Lummenaeus in February 1623, to which Schayck (in June 1623) responded that he had already sent 300 florins. However, it seems unlikely that this correspondence constitutes the direct answer to Lummenaeus' original request of June 1622, since already more than half a year had passed.

<sup>186</sup> Letter (dated 28 July 1622) to Antonio Olgiati, prefect of the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana (Ambrosiana, G.256, f. 80<sup>ro</sup>; Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 95): *Decreveram ab aliquot diebus Mediolano discedere et Illustrissimo cardinali heroi nostro valedicere et gratias habere, sed quia passim mihi suadet ut ante medium Augustum nihil moveam, nisi velim certum valetudinis periculum incurrere, statui supersedere et aliam coeli temperiem expectare.* For Olgiati, see also Andreas, *Imagines Doctorum Virorum*, D5<sup>ro-vo</sup>.

<sup>187</sup> RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 (no. 5); Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 23-24. Lummenaeus had already been in Milan for about three months, so it would indeed be odd if the letter of 5 August would be his first. Whatever the case, this letter is the earliest to have been preserved in the archives of St. Peter's abbey; it may be that earlier letters had simply not arrived.

announced the possibility of him travelling to Rome.<sup>188</sup> This, as we have seen, had long since been his plan, and it seems that his communication to Schayck may not have been completely frank.

Well before he could have received an answer from his abbot, the next letter to Ghent was already on its way. On 17 August 1622 Lummenaeus reported to Schayck that he was truly comforted by the letter his servant had received from Joannes Schoondonck, his father: apparently, Schayck was willing to come to Lummenaeus' aid. In the meantime, however, Cornelius had borrowed some money from a Belgian merchant, Adriaan Peninage, and he would like his abbot to refund the sum.<sup>189</sup> Nonetheless, Schayck's financial aid did not arrive, and it wouldn't take long before Lummenaeus' perpetual quest for money once again brought him knocking at the door of Borromeo.

It proves difficult to reconstruct the manner in which Lummenaeus was received by Borromeo. The correspondence seems to make clear that he was granted an audience with the cardinal only a couple of times. Earlier however, at the end of July, Lummenaeus had requested to deliver a speech in the presence of cardinal Borromeo at the annual feast of the Assumption, on 15 August.<sup>190</sup> It appears the request was granted,<sup>191</sup> which in turn encouraged Lummenaeus to petition for extra funding once again. This time, however, he specifically asked the cardinal to keep those requests quiet, lest he feel ashamed.<sup>192</sup>

After some four months in Milan, where Lummenaeus seems to have spent most of his time at the monastery of S. Simplicianus preparing publications and apparently not, as Schayck may initially have supposed, as an 'employee' at the *Bibliotheca Ambrosiana*, Lummenaeus moved on. It was already October, and the blazing heat of summer had started to fade: 'I am now in Padua, near the springs of mount Aponus, very famous everywhere and wholesome especially to those, who suffer from hypochondria,<sup>193</sup> and which the most experienced physicians have urgently advised and prescribed

---

<sup>188</sup> *Impertire aliquid obsecro, et si nihil hactenus de rore coeli mereor, de pinguedine terrae aliquid condona, vel in gratiam Ill[ustrissi]morum Cardinalium Patronorum meorum, Ludovisii, Bevilacqua, Burghesii, Farnesii, Barberini, Cobellutii, qui mihi Romae omnia pollicentur, et adeo saepiuscule et singulis fere septimanis, humanissimis suis litteris me intervisunt.* In fact, Lummenaeus continues, his patrons might also be of great use to Schayck and the abbey, should the occasion present itself. RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 (no. 5); Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 23-24.

<sup>189</sup> RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 6; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 24-25.

<sup>190</sup> Such was his request to Olgiati, prefect of the Ambrosiana library, in his letter of 28 July. Cf. above, p. 62nt186.

<sup>191</sup> This homily may well have been the *Triumphus Virginis, id est homilia sacra in festo Assumptae virginis dicta*, printed separately in Rome, 1623.

<sup>192</sup> *Ill[ustrissi]mae Celsit[udinis] S[uae] symbolam cum fiducia expectabo, sic tamen secreto fieri supplico, ut iterum atque iterum non erubescam.* Ambrosiana, G.256, f. 81<sup>ro</sup> (Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 96). The letter is dated 23 August 1622.

<sup>193</sup> For the use of the term hypochondria in early modern times, cf. above, p. 48nt142.

to cure the infection of the spleen, which had almost caused my death when underway.<sup>194</sup> No word on his intentions of travelling to Rome; rather, on his doctor's advice he now resided in Padua.<sup>195</sup> But the financial pressure was seemingly increasing, and he once again asked for cardinal Borromeo's assistance in convincing the abbot to provide assistance to his expatriate monastic, preferably through the intervention of the bishop of Ghent.<sup>196</sup> It may well be that Borromeo slowly grew tired of the troublesome Benedictine – or perhaps his presence was no longer desired to begin with, as Lummenaeus' repeated requests for confirmation in late 1621 and Sacco's letters to Puteanus might already have indicated. In any case, from this moment onwards Lummenaeus' eyes are fixed upon his patrons in Rome, and his letter to Borromeo, sent from Padua on 19 November 1622, is the last letter containing such a request. Surprisingly, he actually asks for ample funding to enable his return to Belgium.<sup>197</sup>

Whether he received the travel sum which he had requested or not, he was in any case not going to return to Ghent any time soon.<sup>198</sup> On the

---

<sup>194</sup> *Patavii nunc dego apud fontes montis Aponi, toto orbe celeberrimos et salubres imprimis iis, quos hypochondria obruunt, qui proinde a peritissimis medicis mihi consulti et decreti sunt, splenis adfectionibus, qua me poene ad extrema in itinere deduxerant, percurandis.* This letter to Borromeo is dated from Padua, 1 October 1622 (Ambrosiana, G.235, f. 189<sup>ro-vo</sup>, not recorded by Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo').

<sup>195</sup> While in Padua, Lummenaeus had many of his homilies printed in Venice (cf. the bibliography, appendix one). He dedicated his work to illustrious men like cardinal Scipione Cobelluzio, and sent his work to e.g. cardinal Farnese in Parma; the Ghent Benedictine was clearly extending his hunting grounds. Cf. e.g. *Rosarium* (1623), A2<sup>ro</sup> (Farnese), pp. 5-6 (Cobelluzio); or *Musae lacrymantes* (1628), Dd1<sup>ro</sup> (Farnese; 31 July 1622).

<sup>196</sup> At that moment, Lummenaeus was still waiting for some money said to have been sent by his superior to Venice. However, he himself is residing in Padua: he requested Borromeo's answer to be directed to the Paduan monastery of S. Justina, so Lummenaeus could pick it up there. In other words, he appears not to have been able to actually reside there, though Lummenaeus' follow-up to this letter (cf. above, nt194) suggests that Borromeo at least seems to have tried to commend the Ghent Benedictine in the care of the abbot of S. Justina, who was unfortunately absent at the time: *Litteras Ill[ustrissi]mae Celsit[udinis] S[uae] accepi, et solito obsequio ori, pectori, et oculis admovi. R[everen]dus Praelatus S. Justinae impraesentiarum a domo abest, neque brevi admodum reditum polliceri videtur. Interim in angustiis hic sum, atque adeo veluti in catena sedeo, et suspiro; et quomodo iterum purpuram Ill[ustrissi]mae Celsit[udinis] T[uae] audebo vellicare?* etc. ('I have received Your Highness' letter, and I have adored it as usual. The reverend prelate of S. Justina is momentarily absent, and probably does not return home anytime soon. In the meantime, I am in dire need of everything, and I am, as it were, chained, and gasping for air; and how shall I again dare to beg with Your Illustrious Highness?'). The letter is dated from Padua, 29 October 1622 (Ambrosiana, G.256, f. 84<sup>ro</sup>; Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 96-97).

<sup>197</sup> Ambrosiana G.256, f. 92<sup>ro</sup>; Orbaan, 'Kardinaal Federico Borromeo', 98. The letter has been written from Padua, *in hospitio seu potius ergastulo meo*, 'from my guesthouse, or rather: prison camp'.

<sup>198</sup> According to a letter from Schayck to cardinal Francesco Barberini, dated 24 April 1624, Lummenaeus had used the money he had received from Borromeo not to return

contrary: by the beginning of March 1623, Lummenaeus' tracks lead us to Rome. He may have used any funds that had been provided to get him to Rome, or perhaps he had truly received none and, having paved the way for patronage by several dignitaries, tried his luck anyway. In any case, on 4 March 1623, he wrote from Rome to his abbot in Ghent: 'I am now in Rome, truly sick of mind and body, and in need of everything, if not the Illustrious cardinals, my patrons, willingly look after me, and promise me every favor. But honestly, I am truly ashamed to beg, and I do not want to be in their debt, as long I can have my fair share in my Blandinian abbey. For the financial assistance granted to me (as I understand from friends' letters) I sincerely thank your Reverence and I commend me in the strongest terms.<sup>199</sup> The illustrious Carrarius – the papal chamberlain,<sup>200</sup> and my most dedicated friend and patron – is currently arranging access to the Pope for me, whose Holiness I will gladly worship also in your reverend name.'<sup>201</sup> Though Lummenaeus arrived in Rome in fairly poor health, he argues that he *can* get the money he needs, but prefers not to beg for it. Besides: friends have told him that Schayck will soon provide the money he requested. To strengthen his case with the abbot, he remarks rather obliquely that, when granted an audience with the Pope, he will make sure to worship His Holiness also on Schayck's behalf.

But it would not make any difference. The relationship between Lummenaeus and Schayck – not the best of friends to begin with – seems to have been deteriorating rapidly. Already on 17 February 1623, Schayck sent one of his infamous letters (probably addressed to nuncio Bagno in Brussels) in which he denounced Lummenaeus' loyalty and piety.<sup>202</sup> The abbot is

---

home, as he was supposed to, but rather to initiate further travels throughout Italy, without Schayck having granted him permission to do so. Cf. Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2 (as above, p. 24nt47). It may just as well be, however, that Lummenaeus never actually received any funding from Borromeo.

<sup>199</sup> *de meliore nota*: cf. Curius Cic. ep. ad fam. 7.29.

<sup>200</sup> I have found no other references to this Carrarius (Carrario/Carriero?).

<sup>201</sup> *Romae nunc sum, vere aeger animi et corporis, et in angustiis rerum omnium, nisi quod Ill[ustrissi]mi Cardinales patroni mei benigne me respiciunt, et favorem omnem pollicentur. Ego vero (ingenue et candide dico) mendicare erubesco, neque in aere eorum esse volo, quamdiu in Blandinio meo partem et tunicam habere possum. Pro decreto mihi subsidio aliquo pecuniario (sicut ex amicorum litteris intelligo) gratias Amplit[tudini] T[uae] refero et me de meliore nota commendo. Ill[ustrissi]mus Carrarius, Palatinus pontificius, amicus et patronus mihi deditissimus, ad S[ancitissimum] D[ominum] N[ostrum] molles aditus nunc mihi pandit, cuius purpuram R[everend]ae item tuae nomine libenter venerabor.* RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 8; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 29-30.

<sup>202</sup> The minutes of this letter are kept in RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, and have been published by Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 27-29. The latter supposed that it was directed to cardinal Borromeo, whom he erroneously designated as cardinal of S. Susanna, which was, in fact, Scipione Cobelluzio (cf. Lummenaeus' dedication of *Rosarium* (1623), pp. 5-6). Still, however, the letter mentions the cardinal of S. Susanna as patron of the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana in Milan, which indicates that the erroneous designation of Borromeo as cardinal of S. Susanna was, in fact, Schayck's. Nonetheless, the text makes

highly surprised that *he* should be the one providing Lummenaeus with funds, since the latter was supposed to be set to work in the Ambrosiana. Furthermore, now that the Ghent Benedictine, contrary to his superior's permission, had left Milan and S. Simplicianus, squandering his budget by traveling to and fro throughout Italy – why then should the abbey provide him with even more money, which he would only use for traveling even further? Schayck also seized the opportunity to elaborate upon Lummenaeus' long record of monastic rebellion, impudence and impiety: several times before had he transferred his monastic to different places in Belgium, only for him to return completely penniless. But when Lummenaeus did stay at the abbey, he feigned sickness, so he did not have to join in with the others during mass or collective meals. In short – according to Schayck – Lummenaeus was a rebellious stumbling block for the other monks, who was, surprisingly, healthy enough to receive friends in his cell, to party and drink like a pig, and ignore Schayck's warnings. Such a man, though of bright mind, was not suited for the secluded life of a monastery: no wonder he had already been tossed from the Capuchins' nest earlier. Though Schayck's negative tone is striking, in the end it all boiled down to this one question: who was going to pay for the monastic's adventures? Granted permission to leave, Lummenaeus had solemnly vowed *not* to burden the abbey in the future. If he stayed in Ghent, he could have lived like the others, but it was he himself who had decided to leave.<sup>203</sup> The abbey, Schayck concluded, simply did not have enough money to support such *immorigeros, incorrigibiles ac vagabundos religiosos* abroad.<sup>204</sup> And even if there would be any money left, the parsimonious abbot – living up to his reputation as restorer of St. Peter's abbey – would rather spend it on the restoration of his institute.<sup>205</sup> Surely, this Herculean enterprise would have

---

clear that it could impossibly have been addressed to Borromeo *or* Cobelluzio. Rather, in my opinion, the letter constitutes the answer to the papal nuncio in Brussels, Guidi di Bagno, who had written to Schayck on 8 February 1623 upon Lummenaeus' request. Cf. De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 214nt2, and above (p. 62nt185). The original copy of this letter of February 17, not mentioned in De Meester's overview of Bagno's correspondence, may simply not have been preserved.

<sup>203</sup> (...) *sed eius potius sumptibus et impensis nutriendus, cuius obsequiis sese [sc. Lummenaeus] dedicavit, praecipue cum hinc discedens, se nunquam amplius quidquam petiturum a Monasterio nostro sancte promiserit, qui si hic nobiscum viveret secundum regulam S[anc]ti P[atris] Benedicti, haberet quoque ut caeteri, qui hic degunt.* As previous note.

<sup>204</sup> Slightly different details are contained in the two extant variations of this letter (one possibly to Gaspard Scioppius, RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, s.d.; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca, 36-38; the other to cardinal Fr. Barberini, Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2; as above, p. 24nt47) will be addressed separately, where applicable.

<sup>205</sup> This remark can be found not in the letter of February 17, but as a variation in Schayck's letter to Fr. Barberini of 24 April 1624 (Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2; as above, p. 24nt47). For Schayck's role in solving the – material and disciplinary – problems the abbey of St. Peter faced in the late sixteenth, early seventeenth century, cf. e.g. Berlière, 'La congrégation Bénédictine des exempts de Flandre', 442-444.

demanded an all-out effort and may have been the cause of a low tolerance towards those who did not join in.

Whoever the addressee of Schayck's letter, the abbot's thoughts on Lummenaeus were slowly seeping through to our monastic, if only because an answer to his many letters failed to come.<sup>206</sup> 'I surely wonder,' Lummenaeus wrote from Rome to Schayck on 29 April 1623, 'how one can sink this low with someone, that he can this easily forget about his own people. The year has already passed, and so many months run by, in which, after so many letters from me, I have received not one word from your Reverence.'<sup>207</sup> While his patrons – both in Milan and Rome – had all highly praised his work, they did not provide him with sufficient funds. The monastery of S. Simplicianus had been so kind as to harbour him for several months, but since the rules of their congregation actually forbade them to accomodate monastics from other congregations for any extended period of time, they had had to excuse themselves after a while. Unfortunately – for he probably knew very well what he and the abbot had (privately) agreed upon –, it was thus on Schayck that he now had to rely. However, it had come to his ears that there were some who had been calumniating him with Schayck, with ridiculous accusations, 'which can not even come near the truth'.<sup>208</sup> Therefore, Lummenaeus sent out a clear warning to his abbot. He had made some powerful friends: 'What, if I am forced to bewail my faith in the bosom of our Holy Father, and relieve my feelings? He, in any case, has recently looked upon me with happy eyes and a willing nod. Maybe he would like to be of some assistance to my cause, if I so wished.'<sup>209</sup> His message is clear: he needs money urgently, and Schayck is going to provide it. If forced to, he would not hesitate to seek the Pope's advice in this matter, with whom he had earlier been granted an audience.<sup>210</sup>

<sup>206</sup> It is striking, indeed, that no minutes of letters sent to Lummenaeus directly seem to have been preserved at the RAG.

<sup>207</sup> *Miror sane, in cuiusquam animum et pectus descendere posse, ut tam facile suorum possit oblivisci. Annus iam evolutus est, et tot menses currunt, ex quibus post tot litteras meas, ne uno quidem nutu ab Amplitudine T[ua] mereor recreari.* RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 11; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 30-32.

<sup>208</sup> (...) *quae ne speciem quidem veri habere possunt* (ibidem).

<sup>209</sup> *Et quid, si in sinu S[anctissimi] D[omini] N[ostri], fortunam meam deplorare cogar, et totum cordiolum [ms. cordolium] excutere? Qui me sane laetis oculis et benigno nutu nuper adspexit, et diu et libenter sermocinantem audivit, et fortassis aliquid in causa mea praestare volet, si ita velim* (ibidem). Lummenaeus had dedicated the *Triumphus Virginis* (1623) to Gregory XV, and it had even been printed at the papal printer's office in Rome.

<sup>210</sup> The letter makes clear that there was an account of expenses attached originally. Lummenaeus had spent a total of 100 florins (which had apparently been sent to him by Schayck for his return to Ghent, cf. the latter's undated letter in Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 36-38; RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 no.2) on solving his debts and on ordinary costs for living. He now requested another 400 florins. The costs for living may indeed appear high, Lummenaeus noted, but that they are so, especially in Rome, can be verified – if Schayck wished to do so – by comparing it to a similar account sent from



To this end, Lummenaeus had in the meantime been making preparations by activating his network of friends and supporters, among whom cardinal Ludovisi. The latter – not only by his own accord, but also by papal orders (at the time Gregory XV, his uncle Alessandro Ludovisi) –, urged Schayck in May of 1623 to send the funds required by Lummenaeus, and charged the papal nuncio in Brussels, Guidi di Bagno, to ensure his orders would be followed through.<sup>211</sup> When Pope Gregory XV died on 8 July of that year, he was succeeded, on 6 August, by Maffeo Barberini (as Urban VIII), with whom Lummenaeus had already been in contact as well.<sup>212</sup> The Ghent Benedictine was quick to dedicate a manuscript of the *Diarium Sanctorum* to the newly elected Pope on 8 August.<sup>213</sup> Soon thereafter, Maffeo made his nephew Francesco Barberini a cardinal, whom Lummenaeus succeeded in creating an advocate of his cause as well. The course of these events was exactly as Lummenaeus had not only wished for, but about which he had also forewarned his abbot on 15 July 1623, when the papal seat was still vacant: ‘Maybe one of my patrons, the cardinals, will ascend to the papal throne, now that the Holy See is vacant. Maybe he will then take me in.’<sup>214</sup> These events, he seems to have hoped, would make sure that his fellow-monastics in Ghent would no longer falsely regard him as the ‘cancerous tumor of our Order’.<sup>215</sup>

Though joyfully he may have looked upon the current events, all was not well for Cornelius. He had been working hard, in Milan as well as in Padua and Rome, – of which his published works still provide perpetual testimony – and his health had deteriorated rapidly. Already in May of 1623, as we have seen above, Lummenaeus wrote that he had arrived in Rome, sick and weary; sadly, the situation was not about to improve anytime soon. Fortunately, he found a doctor from the Southern Netherlands, Jean de

---

Rome by the son of the baron of Auweghem, Nicolaas Triest. To the latter (†1629) Lummenaeus would also address the 1628 edition of the tragedy *Sedecias*. Cf. *Musae Lacrymantes* (1628), Cc4<sup>ro</sup>.

<sup>211</sup> RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 14; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 34-35.

<sup>212</sup> In a letter of 30 June 1623 (Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 174; Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 320, p. 336), Lummenaeus apologized to cardinal Maffeo Barberini – soon to be Pope – for not writing to him more often. The letter is written *ex hospitio meo, in aedibus Brixianis*, which would seem to indicate that he was at the time in Brescia. However, we find him in Rome on 14 May (as attested by a letter to Borromeo, Ambrosiana, G.239, f. 199<sup>ro</sup>; Orbaan, ‘Kardinaal Federico Borromeo’, 99) as well as on 15 July (letter to Schayck, RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 39-40). It seems therefore unlikely that he was in Brescia, which lies some 600 kilometers north of Rome, on 30 June. *In aedibus Brixianis* may therefore indicate some place in or near Rome.

<sup>213</sup> Vat.Barb.Lat., 1941, ff. 104-110 (cf. Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 302, no. 296).

<sup>214</sup> *Fortassis aliquis patronorum meorum Cardinalium, hoc vacantiarum tempore summum illud ecclesiae tribunal ascendet, qui me propius intueri volet*. Letter from Lummenaeus to Schayck, dated from Rome, 15 July 1623 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 39-40).

<sup>215</sup> (...) *regulae nostrae carcinomata*. As previous note.

Rogiers, who had in the past also provided assistance to the former abbot of St. Peter's in Ghent, Columbanus Vrancx. De Rogiers could not find it in his heart to let Lummenaeus wander around Rome like that, especially since the man had received ample praise from both Barberini (now Pope) and Ludovisi. The latter, De Rogiers noted, had actually tried to find a place for Lummenaeus at St. Paul Outside the Walls; there, unfortunately, similar restrictions applied to accommodating monastics of other congregations for any extended period of time.<sup>216</sup>

After having provided shelter and medical assistance to Lummenaeus already for several months, De Rogiers in November 1623 received a letter from Schayck. The contents shocked both the medical doctor and Lummenaeus, for both wrote a reply to the Ghent abbot on the same day.<sup>217</sup> From these letters, and Schayck's answer to De Rogiers of 23 December 1623, the course of events can be fairly accurately reconstructed.<sup>218</sup> De Rogiers apparently thought he was doing Schayck a favour by providing assistance to his stray monk, who had shown him the documents permitting him to travel within Italy. These, Schayck would reply in December 1623, actually did not permit Lummenaeus to leave Milan, and if they did, he had probably shown De Rogiers forged documents. In any case, almost all the money which Schayck had sent to Lummenaeus (300 florins) at the request of both Ludovisi and the papal nuncio in Brussels (cf. above), had been given to De Rogiers in order to cover his expenses. But the amount was not nearly enough, and the physician was shocked to hear that Schayck would send no additional funding, especially since De Rogiers had already informed the superior of Lummenaeus' stay with him quite some time ago. But the abbot assumed no responsibility: upon De Rogier's initial request, he had ordered an assistant to notify De Rogiers of his intentions *not* to provide any more funding. This notification, it seems, never made it to the Douai doctor in Rome.

From Lummenaeus' own response to Schayck it becomes clear that the abbot had painted a rather negative picture of Lummenaeus, in which the latter did not recognize himself: 'That your Reverence (...) has only recently disgraced me with my host to such an enormous and unworthy extent, I can not resignedly bear. He calls me disobedient, rampant, a

---

<sup>216</sup> As the abbot of St. Paul Outside the Walls also himself indicated in his letter to Schayck: *Volueram ego semper R[everen]dum Lummenaeum nostrum apud me fovere, nisi decreta congregationis nostrae Cassinensis obstitissent, quibus exacte cavetur ne religiosi alterius congregationis diutius apud nos hospitentur, quae causa fuit, quod idem religiosus longius apud nos Mediolani commorari non potuerit*, etc. (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 141-143; the copy is dated 23 January 1623). Cf. p. 79nt251 regarding the congregational structure of Benedictine monasteries.

<sup>217</sup> Both letters are dated 11 November 1623 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 16 and 17; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 41-44).

<sup>218</sup> Minutes from Schayck's letter to De Rogiers, dated 23 December 1623 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 20; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 136-137).

wanderer, and nothing less than a fugitive and apostate, and who, except the habit and tonsure, does not care about monastic strictness and discipline. (...) This is all pure calumny, and I do not know who has given your Reverence these thoughts.<sup>219</sup> Lummenaeus claimed to have informed his abbot up to five times about his intentions and the medical necessity, but never to have received an answer. Once again, he threatened to call upon the Pope to set things right, now that even his host (i.e. De Rogiers) seemed unwilling to harbour him any longer. Even though Schayck's letter to De Rogiers, to which Lummenaeus is here responding, is lost, the contents were probably quite similar to the other letters in which Schayck denounced Cornelius' discipline and loyalty, from which I have already quoted above.

It may well be that Schayck's animosity had partly been aggravated by an unfortunate mistake. Even though he had been assured that Lummenaeus never defamed his superior and always thought the better of Schayck's measures,<sup>220</sup> the interventions of many Italian dignitaries surely made it clear to Schayck that his monastic was not just spreading positive news about him. But what is more, Varenbergh has published a letter – or at least what is left of it; it has been severely damaged – that seems to have been erroneously delivered to St. Peter's abbey in Ghent. Though Varenbergh noted that the letter has been written to 'un haut personnage qui s'intéressait à lui [i.e. Lummenaeus], et dont nous n'avons pu trouver le nom', he apparently does not wonder why it has then been preserved in the archives of St. Peter's. In fact, though badly damaged, the addressee on the letter's *verso* can still be deciphered: *Amplissimo et perillus. Domino D. Abbati S. Petri Aldenbu[r]g . . . . . [pa]trono meo . . .*<sup>221</sup> The letter has actually been addressed to the abbot of St. Peter's abbey of Oudenburg (near Bruges),

---

<sup>219</sup> *Quod Reverentia Tua (...) nuper admodum apud hospitem meum tam enormiter atque adeo indigne me prosciderit aequo animo ferre non possum. Vocat me inobedientem, vagum, instabilem, et nihil minus quam fugitivum et apostatam, et cui forte praeter habitum et tonsuram nihil monastici rigoris et disciplinae cordi sit (...) Calumniae merae sunt, et nescio quis Reverent[iae] T[uae] id potuerit persuadere.* Lummenaeus' letter to Schayck, dated 11 November 1623 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 16; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 43-44). Lummenaeus noted that Schayck had actually called him a *Sarabaita* and *Gyrovagus*, both of which terms derive from the first chapter of the Rule of Saint Benedict – *De generibus monachorum*, on the (four) different types of monks –, where they are used to describe the third and fourth types of monks respectively. Needless to say, monastics of these types are rather negatively described, and the use of these terms indicates the seriousness of Schayck's accusations.

<sup>220</sup> Such are the words of the abbot of St. Paul Outside the Walls, Angelo Grillo, in his letter to Schayck: (...) *non potui satis unquam mirari talem animi aequitatem in tantis angustiis, qualem in illo semper notavi, ut qui tot molestiis lacessitus, nunquam nisi bene senserit et locutus fuerit de praelato suo, et voluerit semper iniuriam sibi hactenus ab illo factam mitius interpretari* (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 141-143; the copy is dated 23 January 1623).

<sup>221</sup> Cf. RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 10; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 33. The letter is dated 11 May, 1623. It seems Varenbergh did not even bother to check the address on the letter's *verso*.

Maximilien d'Enghien (c. 1583-1662), to whom Lummenaeus had also dedicated the fifth homily of *Pleias sacra* (1617).<sup>222</sup> The fact that the address had also been damaged may have caused it to be delivered to the wrong St. Peter's abbey. Schayck would not have been pleased by its contents: 'I [sc. Cornelius] am in dire need of everything, for I have been forsaken by my abbot, who is quite uncordially (if I may say so) and unchristian, by taking care of his monastics in this manner, etc.'<sup>223</sup> In the eyes of Lummenaeus' superior, it was not he, but Lummenaeus who was at fault, and being accused, behind his back, of negligence and unchristian behaviour probably went down badly with Schayck. The event surely must have made things worse.

Nonetheless Schayck, as we have seen, had already been forced to give in to the demands of Ludovisi and Bagno. Even though Lummenaeus had not been doing well physically and had been unable to procure a decent living for himself, his offensive was showing at least some results, in which the newly created cardinal Francesco Barberini had a rather important role to play. Apparently, the latter had ordered Schayck to send sufficient sums for Lummenaeus to return to Ghent, but the abbot replied, in one of his infamous letters, to be neither willing or able to do so, for reasons we have already discussed above: 'These things (I hope) will have to move your illustrious Lordship in order to request the Holy Father's assistance (which I beg of you in the name of our Savior), so that he can give a place to said Cornelius à Marca in some monastery, or at least in the Vatican library (for his return to Ghent would be a ludicrous, rather than a welcome event), in order to put an end to him pestering us, etc.'<sup>224</sup> Schayck implored Francesco Barberini to persuade his uncle, Pope Urban VIII, to give Lummenaeus a job in the Vatican library, or to place him in a monastery somewhere; it seems that anything would do, as long as Lummenaeus did *not* to return to Ghent.

---

<sup>222</sup> *Pleias sacra* (1617), 58: *Amplissimo et reverendo admodum domino D. Ioanni Baptistae Maxxaemiliano, d'Engien. Abbati S. Petri Aldeburgen[sis] Domino meo pium hoc monumentum et sacrum pignus offero.* For a short history of the abbey of St. Peter's in Oudenburg (some fifteen kilometers east of Bruges) and abbot d'Enghien, cf. Berlière, e.a., *Monasticon Belge*, III (Flandre Occidentale). D'Enghien had previously been a monk at the abbey of St. Vaast near Arras. Lummenaeus might therefore have known d'Enghien through his contact with St. Vaast's abbot, De Cavarel (cf. above).

<sup>223</sup> *In angustiis sum, quippe a Praelato meo destitutus, qui sane parum cordate (liceat mihi dicere) et Christiane id agit, quod sic domesticorum suorum curam gerit,* etc. Cf. also the second rule of the Rule of St. Benedict, which concerns an abbot's duties and responsibilities.

<sup>224</sup> *Haec (ut spero) Illustrissimam Dominationem Vestram movere debebunt quatenus Sancti Domini Nostri opem implorare dignetur (quod per viscera Salvatoris nostri etiam facio), quo praefato Cornelio a Marca ibidem in Monasterio aliquo provideatur, aut saltem in Bibliotheca Vaticana (eius enim reditus illusorius potius hic esset, quam gratus), ut nos molestandi finem aliquando faciat,* etc. Letter from Schayck to cardinal Fr. Barberini, dated 24 April 1624 (Vat.Barb.Lat., 6795, ff. 1-2; as above, p. 24nt47).

But the offensive was closing in on Schayck. Cardinal Barberini charged nuncio Bagno in Brussels – as Ludovisi had done earlier – to take up Lummenaeus’ case with Schayck. Bagno did as he had been told, and Schayck reluctantly gave in to the requests. The nuncio in turn acknowledged Schayck’s gesture, and even lent a willing ear to the latter’s arguments for not having provided any more assistance to Lummenaeus earlier.<sup>225</sup> Perhaps, however, the funds promised by Schayck did not arrive at all, or not quickly enough. In any case, cardinal Barberini was far from pleased with the situation and intervened with Schayck himself. The opening of his thundering letter reminds us of a Ciceronian speech, designed to impress and intimidate: ‘I never thought that I would have to write so many letters to your Fatherliness about the dire needs which have overwhelmed father Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus.’<sup>226</sup> Thus, Barberini continued to speak in defense of Lummenaeus, who, according to the cardinal, traveled to Italy for reasons of health alone and accumulated such large debts only out of sheer necessity. Barberini emphasized that Schayck should not doubt a cardinal’s words; nonetheless, he wished to add that the Pope’s involvement in this matter would surely convince the stubborn abbot: ‘I have decided to seek the Pope’s advice in this matter, in order for your Fatherliness to speed up his handling of this case. Therefore, it is the Holy Father’s opinion – who is fully convinced of the justice of this cause – that your Fatherliness should make funds available without any delay, with which Father Jacobus can repay all his debts, and that he can use an appropriate travel sum, with which he can return to his monastery. If your Fatherliness (as is reasonable) will at once have done as the Pope requests, then there will be no need to take more stringent measurements, *etc.*’<sup>227</sup> Almost simultaneously the bishop of Ghent delivered to Schayck copies of letters sent to him by the abbot of St. Paul Outside the Walls in Rome, Angelo Grillo, and Ioannes Baptista

<sup>225</sup> The letters from Bagno to Schayck are dated 6 and 30 September 1624 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 137-138).

<sup>226</sup> *Nunquam equidem fore putabam, uti de angustiis, quibus Pater Jac. Cornelius Lummenaeus premitur, toties ad P[aternitatem] V[estram] dandae mihi essent litterae.*

<sup>227</sup> *Aperienda tamen mihi est S[ancitissimi] D[omini] N[ostri] ea in re voluntas, ut alacriorem P[aternitas] V[estram] in illa exequenda se [ms: sae] praebeat. Itaque S[ancitatis] S[uae] cui penitus huiusce causae patet aequitas, ea mens est, uti P[aternitas] V[estram] nulla interposita mora pecunias curet, quibus P[ater] Jacobus et nomina, quae contraxit, omnia expungat, et viatico uti commodo possit, quo ad suum istud monasterium se recipiat. Si pontificiae voluntati (ut par est) primo quoque tempore P[aternitas] V[estram] morem gesserit, nec locus erit asperiora perquirendi remedia, etc.* The original is kept in RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224, no. 1; Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 139-140. The minutes of this letter are kept in the Vatican: Vat.Barb.Lat., 1988, ff. 25-26; cf. also Pasture, ‘Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini’, 60. The original in Ghent erroneously provides a date of January 22, 1615; the minutes give the correct year of 1625. It is on this error that Varenbergh based Lummenaeus’ presence in Rome in 1614-1615 (cf. above), even though, when providing the transcription, he gives the correct date of 1625 and correctly places the letter in the 1625 context, without further clarification.

Laurin,<sup>228</sup> containing similar warnings with regard to the Pope's involvement in this matter: the latter's warnings have until now been like a slight drizzle, but will turn into a fierce thunderstorm if Schayck dared to disobey His Holiness' direct orders.<sup>229</sup> Beleaguered from all sides, Schayck was bound to give in sooner or later.

It seems that Lummenaeus – who actually conveys the impression of to some extent deceiving not only his abbot, but also his patrons in Milan and Rome – had by now grown tired of constantly begging for money. Even a Belgian merchant who had previously been willing to assist him financially, had withdrawn his support.<sup>230</sup> Without doubt it would by now have become clear to him that no one was going to let him live generously in Italy just like that, and he actually wished to return home. Even so much so, that, having heard the news of cardinal Francesco Barberini having been appointed legate in France, he decided to contact the latter's secretary, Hieronymus Aleander (Girolamo Aleandro), with a remarkable request. Having congratulated the latter with his patron's appointment, he continued: 'Fortunate are those, who get to see cities and the ways of so many men while accompanying such a Lord, who honors every virtue! I myself would like to ride in the last carriage, and, even if not in his direct company, would travel home in his retinue. Perhaps I could achieve this much through the grace and patronage your Reverence?'<sup>231</sup> What Cornelius is in fact doing here, is literally trying to catch a ride home, or at least to Paris, since that is where the delegation would be heading.

But it seems he did not catch that particular ride. The envoy had already settled near the French king's quarters in Fontainebleau, when Lummenaeus – healthy, but exhausted – arrived in Paris somewhere in June 1625. The journey from Rome to Paris had been costly and perilous: when he had reached Milan from Rome, he attempted to find an escort that could guide him through the Alps and to Basel, Switzerland. However, he did not succeed and decided to take a detour through the Savoy, since troops of

---

<sup>228</sup> Laurin was the author of the 1625 *Theatri Romani orchestra*, which also referred to Lummenaeus' presence in Rome. Cf. below, p. 75.

<sup>229</sup> Both letters are dated 23 January 1625 (RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224; Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 141-144).

<sup>230</sup> Letter to Girolamo Aleandro, dated 18 February 1625 (Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 172; Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336). The letter contains a Greek quote from Menander's *Gnomai Monostichoi* (or: *Sententiae*), 1.74: 'A life that lacks life, is no life.'

<sup>231</sup> *Felices illi, qui cum tanto Principe, virtutum omnium antesignano, mores hominum multorum et Urbes videbunt! Vellem ego in ultimo epirhedio sedere, et si non in contubernio, in comitatu saltem illo, domum versus peregrinari. Et quid, si favore et patrocinio Rever[endissi]mae Amplit[udinis] T[uae] id impetrare possim?* Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 170. Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336, gives a date in February 1623, but the letter is actually dated 1625. In fact, Francesco Barberini would only be created cardinal in October 1623, after his uncle had been elected Pope.

Kozacs were roaming the Alps and he did not dare travel there alone.<sup>232</sup> The small travel sum he had received in Rome for getting to Paris he had used up almost completely. Weary and broke, he arrived in Paris, where he was staying in some inn. In a letter to Girolamo Aleandro, who accompanied Barberini, he now not only requested some money (*ne hic in portu naufragium faciam*, so I will not fail at the last hurdle), but, having heard about Schayck's grievance towards him and thus sensing the welcome he would get when arriving in Ghent, also asked for a final intervention of cardinal Barberini on his behalf: 'In the meantime, I would like a response to be sent to my reverend abbot (please forgive my impudence), so that he will respect the Pope's wishes, and then abstain from impeding me; that he otherwise will cause grievances with His Holiness, and that he, if he will be of the same opinion, will from now on look after my interests in a different way.'<sup>233</sup> He furthermore would like the cardinal to recommend him into the care of the nuncio in Brussels, so he can reside there until the dust at St. Peter's abbey – 'the abbot would like to crush me, if he could'<sup>234</sup> – had settled.<sup>235</sup> The cardinal did as requested. He wrote to Schayck saying he had appreciated his efforts to help his monastic in Rome, but that he had now heard that Schayck had done so only reluctantly. However, 'I do not doubt, that those who spread such rumours, are either ignorant of your clemency, or have been wanting to joke with the man. (...) The Holy Father would be far from pleased to hear that his authority in handling Lummenaeus' case, or something else, however small, would be contested.'<sup>236</sup> All the cardinal now asked of Schayck, is to again accept Cornelius as a loving father.

---

<sup>232</sup> The poetic advice given to Lummenaeus by his friend Van Zevecte had clearly been appropriate. Cf. above, p. 56.

<sup>233</sup> *Interim vellem rescribi (deprecor molestiam, si importunus sum) ad R[everen]dum Abbatem meum, ut postquam voluntati Pontificiae morem gessit, caveat sibi deinceps a vexatione mea, alioquin S[ancitissimum] D[ominum] N[ostrum] aegre laturum, et si aliquid simile intellexerit, alia porro ratione promi[s]surum in caussa mea* (Vat.Barb.Lat. 2184, f. 175, cf. below, nt235).

<sup>234</sup> (...) *calcare me velit, si possit*. As previous note.

<sup>235</sup> Two letters from Paris to (probably) Girolamo Aleandro: one is dated 21 June 1625 (Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 175; Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336); the other one (Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 178; Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336) is damaged but reads '... Jul. 1625', which could indicate a date between 18 Kal. Jul. (14 June) and Id. Jul. (15 July).

<sup>236</sup> *Mihi non est dubium, quin sermones istos qui ferunt, aut pietatis tuae sint ignari, aut iocari cum homine voluerint. (...) Haud enim aequo animo laturus esset S[ancitissimus] D[ominus] N[oster] si ultro a se interpositam in Lummenaei negotio auctoritatem vel tantillum illi officere nosset*. Minutes of a letter from Barberini to Schayck, dated 27 June 1625 (Vat.Barb.Lat., 1988, ff. 40-41; Pasture, 'Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini', 60).

*Literary activities*

While in Italy, Lummenaeus continued to work diligently on his literary production. Passing through Douai on his way there, he had already published the tragedy *Abimelechus* at the printing house of Pierre Auroy in 1622. On the other side of the Alps, Lummenaeus focused mainly on speeches: he published several homilies in Venice (*Bonus pastor*, *Rosarium* and *Caverna Maceriae* (all in 1623)), probably while staying in Padua, and several in Rome (e.g. *Triumphus Virginis* (1623) and *Praesepe Domini* (1624)). The *Triumphus Virginis* is actually dedicated to Pope Gregory XV (Ludovisi), and printed at the papal printer's office. The Roman publishing house of Iacobus Mascardus also published a reworked edition of the tragedy *Iephthe*, 'doubtlessly', according to IJsewijn, 'following a performance', even though there is no such evidence.<sup>237</sup> The Roman *Iephthe* had been dedicated to cardinal Francesco Barberini, who would eventually, as we have seen, become one of Lummenaeus' most fervent supporters. All in all – despite his weak health and financial problems – Lummenaeus managed to make quite a name for himself in Rome. In the autumn of 1623, he is listed among *nonnulli viri docti Romae degentes* ('several learned men residing in Rome'), praised as a tragedian and hailed – according to some – as a new Seneca.<sup>238</sup> In J. Laurin's *Orchestra Theatri Romani* of 1625, edited by Justus Rycquius, Lummenaeus' work as a tragedian is also mentioned.<sup>239</sup> Cornelius was furthermore able to have a preliminary poem published in an encyclopedic work on rare plants that grew in the Farnesian gardens in Rome, which, like his *Iephthe*, appeared at the printing house of Mascardus in 1625.<sup>240</sup> Is it

<sup>237</sup> IJsewijn, 'Rome en de Humanistische Literatuur', 56. Parente ('The Paganization of Biblical Tragedy', 216-217nt15) concludes furthermore that the *Sampson* had been performed in Rome, basing himself on a letter from cardinal Borghese from January 1622, printed in *Musae Lacrymantes*, 92, ahead of the edition of the tragedy *Sampson: Tragoediam tuam sacram, e plaustro tragico ad Romanas nunc prodeuntem scenas, et mihi a vestra Paternitate humaniter dono missam*, etc. Since the letter is dated 1622, it is more likely that Borghese is here referring to the *Saul* of 1621. If the *Saul* had actually been performed in Rome, then Lummenaeus himself would in any case not have been present, since he only arrived there in 1623. The words used by Borghese may very well constitute a theatrical metaphor rather than a reference to an actual performance. Lummenaeus himself often used similar metaphors, cf. e.g. the dedicatory letter to cardinal Barberini (*Iephthe*, Rome: 1624): *Iephten paludatum, et misera fortuna crudelem in viscera filiae suae, plaustro tragico in scenam vebo*. It proved a favorite metaphor also in his various sermons. Cf. also p. 203nt108.

<sup>238</sup> *Jacobus Corn. Lummenaeus latine optime p[ar?]ibus t... tragoedias iis luminibus ornatas conscripsit, typisque commisit ut novus Seneca nuncupari quorundam iudicio queat* (Vat.Barb.Lat., 2645, f.90r; Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 344 (no. 327)).

<sup>239</sup> Laurin, *Theatri Romani orchestra*, 55.

<sup>240</sup> The work is entitled *Exactissima descriptio rariorum quarundam plantarum, quae continentur Romae in Horto Farnesiano: Tobia Aldino Cesenate auctore illustrissimi et reverendissimi Principis Odoardi Farnesii medico chimico et eiusdem horti praefecto* (Rome: Iacobus Mascardus, 1625). Even though Tobias Aldinus is named as the author on the titlepage, Lummenaeus'



possible that Lummenaeus financed his literary activities with the allowance granted to him by Schayck and/or his patrons in Italy?

Lummenaeus' travels to Italy have – understandably – caused some speculation as to the purpose of his visit. It has been assumed that Lummenaeus was sent to Rome as representative of his Order for the grand Jubilee of 1625.<sup>241</sup> Having traced his steps, this can hardly be true. Not only did he leave Ghent already in 1622 and did he return home before the year 1625 was out; but also his permission, as we have seen, was 'extracted' rather than willingly granted. Others have, furthermore, supposed that our Benedictine must have had something to do with the design of the new church of Ghent's St. Peter's abbey, the building of which commenced in 1629.<sup>242</sup> This church, which still dominates St. Peter's square in Ghent today, had been designed by the famous Jesuit architect Pierre Huysens (1577-1637), who was in Rome around 1625. The supposition seems to stem from a manuscript preserved in the university library in Ghent, *Le livre des jours* by Milon François Malingié, monastic of St. Peter's at the end of the eighteenth century.<sup>243</sup> On page fifty, it is written that Schayck's plans materialized in Rome, 'par l'intervention de son savant Religieux Cornelius à Marca, qui l'an 1626 restoit à Rome, et y jouissoit d'un grand credit.' It is not impossible that Huysens and Lummenaeus had met – but would we not have at least found a trace of Cornelius' supposed involvement in such a major project in the correspondence that has been preserved?

---

preliminary poem *ad auctorem eruditissimum* (ff. +3<sup>ro-vo</sup>) is in fact an acrostic, which reads *PETRVS CASTELLVS ROMANVS*. Lummenaeus had earlier dedicated a poem to (probably) this Castellus (cf. *Opera omnia*, p. 241), as had his good friend, Justus Rycquius (cf. Rycquius, *Poematum libri II* (1614), pp. 34-35).

<sup>241</sup> Hoefler, *Nouvelle biographie générale*, 31-32, p. 246: 'En 1625, il fut envoyé à Rome comme député de sa communauté'; Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek*, 12, pp. 175-176; De Busscher, *Notice sur l'Abbaye de Saint Pierre*, 50nt2.

<sup>242</sup> Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 148-149; De Busscher, *Notice sur l'Abbaye de Saint Pierre*, 50. On abbot Schayck's involvement in the process of restoring and rebuilding the abbey, and the design of the new church, cf. Lievois, 'De Sint-Pietersabdij van 1584 tot haar opheffing', 88-89.

<sup>243</sup> University library Ghent, ms G.011201: Malingié, *Le livre des jours, ou Relation de tout ce qui s'est passé de remarquable dans l'Abbaye de St. Pierre lez Gand et des principaux évènements arrivés dans les Pays-Bas autrichiens depuis le 13 août 1779 jusqu'à 1786*. Varenbergh ('Lummenaeus à Marca', 148) quotes Malingié's diary, but refers to it as the *Remarques inédites* (1781) of Gudwald Seiger, last but one abbot of St. Peter's (1760-1788). Malingié adds: 'Jusqu'ici je ne sçais pas bien la raison de son [sc. Lummenaeus] séjour à Rome; lorsque je la sçaurai, j'en ferai mention dans la suite'. Apparently – since he does not return on the matter – Malingié did not find any additional information.

1625-1628/9: Return to Belgium and the final years

Lummenaeus probably returned to Ghent somewhere in the second half of 1625. His tragedy *Sampson* was printed in Louvain in 1625, and Lummenaeus most likely supervised the printing process personally.<sup>244</sup> The work itself is, perhaps surprisingly, dedicated to abbot Schayck. It would be the first of a series of four dedications to Schayck: *Musae Lacrymantes* (1628), *Stemmata et flores* (1628) and *Vulnera Iesu* (1629) followed suit. Some assume that this means Lummenaeus had returned in grace at the abbey of St Peter's, especially when considering the opening lines of the dedicatory poem to *Sampson*:

‘Blandinian father, the only hope for our Muses,  
Oh father! Oh prime jewel of our house!’<sup>245</sup>

Schayck, who was only slightly earlier considered to be *amusus* and intolerant of the *bonae litterae*, had suddenly become the only hope for Lummenaeus' Muses? The opposite holds true. The words of this dedicatory poem have an ironic ring to them, and justifiably so: it would not be long before Lummenaeus would again be sending out letters to ecclesiastical dignitaries regarding his relationship with the abbot. Lummenaeus' Italian journey may formally have ended by his return to Ghent; its aftershocks were clearly still felt. In this light, as we will come to see, the many dedications of his work to Schayck form nothing more than an elusive paradox, perhaps in an attempt to keep up appearances and gain funding. In reality, nothing had changed.

The *status quo* is aptly illustrated by Lummenaeus' letters to Barberini and Aleandro of January 1627.<sup>246</sup> In the letter to Aleandro, the Ghent

---

<sup>244</sup> It seems that he had already been preparing the publication just before his journey to Italy, since the dedicatory letters, as well as one of the *approbationes*, are dated 1622. Varenbergh assumed that Lummenaeus had died in Douai while on his way home from Italy in 1628. However, the evidence of Lummenaeus having returned to Ghent already in 1625-1626 is plenty, as we will come to see. His return to Ghent had already been noted by Vanderhaeghen (*Bibliotheca Belgica*, III, 1153-1154), though Vanderhaeghen incorrectly assumed a return date of 1628. But his remark is in itself correct; still, it had not been noted by James Parente, who otherwise made ample use of the biographical entry.

<sup>245</sup> *Blandinii Pater, et nostris spes unica Musis / Oh Pater! o nostrae gemmula prima domus* (*Sampson* (1625), A2<sup>ro</sup>).

<sup>246</sup> Lummenaeus sent two letters to Rome, one addressed to cardinal Francesco Barberini, one to Aleander. The first one, to Barberini, was merely intended to announce that Aleander would be addressing him on Lummenaeus' behalf. The letter to Aleander in turn contains what the latter is supposed to address Barberini about. A similar construction, we may recall, Lummenaeus had used in the case of Borromeo and Sacco. The letters are registered as Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, ff. 180 and 181 (Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336): f. 180 is addressed to *princeps* (Barberini), f. 181 to *domine*, which is most likely Aleander, since he is the designated newsbearer, as announced in f. 180 to Barberini

Benedictine is rather straightforward: ‘But about me, if you ask about my prime feeling: I am miserable, and I can not yet give thanks for a benevolent fate. My abbot treats me as of old, and favors me and my creditors equally. (...) And after sending so many petitions and just requests, at the Roman court, where I count as my patrons so many distinguished men, under the rule of Lord Urban, once my most fervent admirer, the most righteous luster of all, I requested to obtain permission to move to a different monastery, to be assigned to a different abbot and obtain a new home for my Muses elsewhere; to move in any case within the Low Countries, where I shall safely live according to the Rule of my Order, and praise God and the Muses. (...) And if you can, in any way: please be of assistance to me with your Lord [sc. Barberini].’<sup>247</sup> Abbot Schayck’s attitude towards Lummenaeus and his creditors had not changed, and Cornelius actually requested permission to be transferred to another monastery. During the past few years, it seems Lummenaeus had failed to heed the words of advice given to him by his good friend Sanderus in 1620: to exercise constraint in matters of social and ecclesiastical ambition and to submit himself first and foremost to monastic discipline.<sup>248</sup>

Before he could reasonably have received an answer from Rome, another set of letters was directed to Barberini’s court, of roughly similar content.<sup>249</sup> Again, Barberini is informed that Aleander will address him in Lummenaeus’ name; again, Lummenaeus requests to be transferred, this time along with one of his fellow-monastics, who remains unnamed but is probably the same as the one for whom he requested permission to join him on his journey to Italy earlier.<sup>250</sup> His attitude towards Schayck he expressed in a similar way, though this time even somewhat fiercer: ‘I toil here under the rule of an abbot who is most hostile to me, who treats me all the worse, because he belongs to those Exempts, who rule over their clergy with all too much liberty [...], under the law of the Exemption, which is unsupervised.

---

(*Caetera, ne prolixa scripione molestus sim, Rever[en]dus vir Hieronymus Aleander tuus, cum mollior erit opportunitas, meo nomine exponet, etc.*). Both letters are dated 19 January 1627.

<sup>247</sup> *De me vero, si aliquid primato adfectu requiris, miser sum, et fortunae obsequenti nondum litare possum. Abbas meus antiquum obtinet, et mihi et creditoribus meis in aequo favet. (...) Et quantum erat, post tot libellos supplices et iustas quiritationes meas, in Aula Romana, ubi tot Proceres patronos numero, sub Urbano Principe, mei olim studiosissimo, praetextu omnium iustissimo, obtinere licentiam mutandi locum et Abbatem (heu! quam mihi semper infestum!) et alio Musarum mearum sedem, vel intra hoc Belgium transferendi, ubi sub eadem norma et Regula, secure degam, deoque et Musis canam. (...) et si qua potes, apud Heroem tuum [sc. Barberinum] me iuva.*

<sup>248</sup> Cf. appendix six.

<sup>249</sup> Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, ff. 184 and 185 (Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336). The letter to Barberini is dated 7 February 1627; to Aleander, 9 or 11 February (the date is somewhat blurred: it seems to give either 3. *Id. Febr.* or 5. *Id. Febr.*).

<sup>250</sup> This time, however, Lummenaeus is somewhat more specific: *Cum uno ex confratribus meis mihi longe carissimo, qui mihi a manibus et studiis esse solet, et vel eo nomine invidiam incurrit, quod me amare videatur.* Cf. p. 48.

They wield their power as a perpetual dictatorship.<sup>251</sup> These words, we can be sure, are not characteristic of a good relationship between Schayck and Lummenaeus; rather – besides criticizing the organizational flaws of the congregation – they indicate a continuing *status quo*. Cardinal Barberini intervened with Schayck one more time, though perhaps not in the way Lummenaeus had wished for. As we have seen, the Ghent Benedictine complained to Barberini about Schayck's attitude towards himself *and* his creditors. The cardinal, who thought that the scores between Schayck and Lummenaeus' creditors had already been settled after his latest intervention, now decided to intervene *only* on behalf of a creditor in Rome. On 10 March 1627, Barberini issued a clear warning to Schayck, who apparently had refused to repay a loan of 250 écus that was granted to Lummenaeus: 'Therefore, all the money your abbey has available, even the slightest amount, and which does not hamper the illustrious income of your monastery, you have to spend on this cause without any hesitation. This is what our Holy Father wants, this is what he commands, which I have now considered to be your last warning, so you will not allow him to take more severe measurements that will be rather unpleasant to you.'<sup>252</sup> Thus, whatever the abbey could spare had to be immediately provided to Lummenaeus' creditor. This, Barberini added, was not only the Pope's wish: it was His Holiness' command.

Cardinal Barberini thus did not intervene to alleviate Lummenaeus' attested misery, but merely to make sure the latter's creditors were properly repaid. But this did not mean Barberini had become unsympathetic to the Ghent Benedictine. On the contrary: when Lummenaeus in August 1627 sent his tragedy *Sampson* to the cardinal, accompanied by a rather brief letter in which he commended its bearer – an unnamed young Carmelite – in the cardinal's care, he requested for himself only an introduction with Bagno's successor as apostolic nuncio in Brussels, Fabio de Lagonissa, Archbishop

---

<sup>251</sup> *Laboro sub imperio aemuli mihi Abbatis, qui tanto severius mecum agit, quia de Exemptorum illorum numero est, qui hic nimia libertate dominantur in clerico ..., quo Exemptionis iure, nulli censura subiecti, perpetuam dictaturam gerunt.* St. Peter's abbey in Ghent had, together with a.o. the abbey of St. Vaast in Arras, created the Benedictine *Congregatio Exemptorum*, the congregation of exempt monasteries of Flanders. For a brief history of the – sometimes rather complicated – structures of Benedictine monasticism in the Netherlands, cf. *Benedictus en zijn monniken in de Nederlanden*, 7-21. See also Berlière, 'La congrégation Bénédictine des exempts de Flandre'.

<sup>252</sup> *Itaque tuum erit id quidquid est pecuniarum, perexiguum nimirum aes, quodque nihil incommodet tam luculentos istius monasterii redditus, omni prorsus abiecta cunctatione dependere. Id vult S[anctiss]imus D[ominus] N[oster], id iubet, quod nunc postremum duxi te monendum, ne remediis ut asperioribus ita parum tibi gratis manum admovere sinas.* Vat.Barb.Lat., 1988, ff. 81-82 (Pasture, 'Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini', 60). The Vatican holds the minutes of this letter; the original has apparently not been preserved in the archives of St. Peter's abbey.

of Conza.<sup>253</sup> He received a rather personal answer from Barberini, who surely recalled Lummenaeus' hardships and seems truly glad that things were finally improving:

‘To Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca, Benedictine monk,

From your *Sampson*, which was brought to me together with your letter, I see that you have agreeably found peace in your Muses, and I am happy that your health and your occupations grant you so much time, that you can now give to light some of your studies every day. The booklet was very welcome to me, and so was the man of faith of the Carmelite family who brought it to me. I have gladly received him, and in addition I have promised my aid, if there is anything I should be able to do for him. In the meantime, since you wish to be commended to the Papal nuncio, I have diligently done so in the letter which you find attached.

I wish you all the best (11 December [1627]).’<sup>254</sup>

Lummenaeus sent the letter of recommendation, which Barberini had included with his amiable letter, to the newly appointed nuncio, whose enthusiastic reply has been printed in *Stemmata et flores, sive Diarium Sanctorum* (1628). Though highly praised by his Italian patrons, so Fabio wrote, Lummenaeus is apparently ignored by his own abbey; when he recently visited the Blandinian abbey, no one even mentioned Lummenaeus or his outstanding reputation. But since the nuncio knew that Barberini would like to see A Marca's works published, he attached a letter to be delivered to abbot Schayck, which would enable Lummenaeus to have his works published either at the University of Louvain, or of Douai.<sup>255</sup> It may be that

---

<sup>253</sup> Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, f. 188<sup>ro</sup> (Orbaan, *Bescheiden in Italië*, 336). Francesco Guidi di Bagno had been succeeded as the papal nuncio of Flanders by Fabio de Lagonissa, Archbishop of Conza, in 1627. Lummenaeus requests an introduction with the newly appointed nuncio, so the latter can in turn commend him into the care of the Archduchess, Isabella.

<sup>254</sup> *Jac. Cornelio Lummenaeo à Marca Monacho Benedictino, / Ex Sampson tuo, qui tuis cum [itte]ris perlatus ad me est, video te in sacris tuis Musis iucunde conquiescere, et gaudeo equidem tantum tibi otii sive a tua valetudine, sive a negotiis concidi, ut aliquid elucubrationum emittere in dies possis. Libellus mihi quidem pergratus fuit, sed et Religiosum virum Carmelitanae familiae, qui libellum reddidit, libenter sum complexus, operamque insuper si quid illi usu venerit, prompto animo sum pollicitus meam. Interim quoniam tu Ap[osto]lico Nuntio commendari optas, id hisce [itte]ris diligentissime praestiti, quas fasciculo adiectas reperis. / Vale xi Decembris.* Vat.Barb.Lat., 1988, f. 159 (Pasture, ‘Inventaire de la Bibliothèque Barberini’, 61). Minutes.

<sup>255</sup> *Stemmata et flores*, A3<sup>vo</sup>. The letter is dated 24 February 1628. There is, surprisingly, no mention of Lummenaeus or Schayck in Van Meerbeeck's *Correspondance du nonce Fabio de*

Lummenaeus had actually requested the nuncio to persuade his abbot to lend the money necessary for publication in a – now lost – accompanying letter. In any case, a similar loan construction (as I have already noted above, cf. pp. 41-42) had been used in the case of the *Stemmata et flores*, the first work to be published after the *Sampson* of 1625, and was perhaps extended (or at least requested to be extended) also to the collection of tragedies, *Musae lacrymantes*. Both *Stemmata* and *Musae lacrymantes* were published by Jean de Fampoux in Douai.<sup>256</sup>

### *The final scene*

We possess only little information on the final years of Lummenaeus' life, especially when compared to the relatively well-documented Italian adventures. It seems that Lummenaeus resided at the abbey in Ghent from 1625 to 1628, despite his repeated requests to be transferred.<sup>257</sup> However, in May of 1628 he was in Douai, where he remained at least until August, overseeing the printing of his work.<sup>258</sup>

The final, direct evidence of Lummenaeus dates from 24 August 1628. On that date, he again directed a letter from Douai to his abbot.<sup>259</sup> It is the last one we know of. The letter indicates that the relationship between Lummenaeus and Schayck, despite the many dedications, had not improved: 'I am highly surprised, that until now I am not deemed worthy to get an answer to the two or three letters that I have sent.'<sup>260</sup> The words have, unfortunately, a familiar ring to them. But the main reason why Lummenaeus is disappointed is not because he himself needs help. Rather, he has taken up the case of Mr. Heylinc, 'whom I until now retain here with me, so he, deserted by all, does not seek ill advice with persuasive

---

*Lagonissa, Archevêque de Conza (1627-1634)*, which provides outlines of Lagonissa's correspondence.

<sup>256</sup> The Douai engraver Martinus Baes had created two allegories for the *Stemmata* and *Musae Lacrymantes*. Cf. Caullet, *De gegraveerde, onuitgegeven en verloren geraakte teekeningen*, 13nt2. This not only indicates that Lummenaeus wanted these publications to be attractive, but also that extra money was spent to achieve this goal.

<sup>257</sup> Lummenaeus was in Ghent at least in February 1626 (letter to Bagno; De Meester, *Correspondance du nonce Giovanni-Francesco Guidi di Bagno*, 768), in January/February and August 1627 (letters to Aleander and Barberini; Vat.Barb.Lat., 2184, ff. 180-188), and in February of 1628 (letter to Schayck; *Stemmata et flores*, A2<sup>ro-vo</sup>).

<sup>258</sup> Cf. the dedicatory letters to Schayck in *Musae lacrymantes*, A2<sup>ro-vo</sup> and *Vulnera Iesu Christi*, A2<sup>ro-vo</sup>; as well as two letters to Schayck, RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 (Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 144-147). On 20 May, as we have seen, Lummenaeus directed a request for money to Schayck from Douai, in order to procure payment for Fampoux. Cf. above, pp. 41-42.

<sup>259</sup> RAG, S.P. 34 II 1224 (Varenbergh, 'Lummenaeus à Marca', 144-145). Varenbergh provides the wrong date of 23 August.

<sup>260</sup> *Non possum satis mirari, quod ad binas vel ternas litteras nullum hactenus responsum mereor.*

impatience, from where he could not easily be recalled. I have communicated this plan of mine to the abbot of St. Vaast, when he came to see me here in his role as the most reverend *visitor*, and he approved of my useful and honest plan. For, in any case, our Rule teaches us well enough how to deal with a weak brother.<sup>261</sup> This Mr. Heylinc may have been a fellow-monastic of Ghent's St. Peter's abbey, since Antonius Sanderus in 1624 listed a *Placidus Heylinck* among the *religiosi* of the abbey.<sup>262</sup> In any case, the event is rather ironic, since Lummenaeus was – at least in his own eyes – badly treated by his abbot when he was himself in need of aid. That he, of all people, now pointed the abbot's responsibilities out to Schayck must have been like pouring salt into a wound, and it thus comes less as a surprise that the Ghent Benedictine did not receive an answer to his letters. The event may have brought a vengeful smirk on Lummenaeus' face.

The abbot, as Lummenaeus pointed out, had again been calumniating his monastic, this time with the afore mentioned *visitor* from St. Vaast, saying that Cornelius was 'dwelling there longer and against the will and permission of [abbot Schayck], and that [he] piles one delay on another.'<sup>263</sup> However, the letter continues, Lummenaeus knew for sure that nothing had been ordered with regard to his return to Ghent, only that he would first finish his work in Douai, and, in as far as he could, oversee the printing process. And that is exactly what he was diligently doing. Is it another case of (intentional?) miscommunication? A recurring pattern? However, Lummenaeus continued: 'I am shortly preparing my return, and I will gladly free myself from this treadmill, as soon as I will have received the travel sum and the little money needed to get me through the brief period that I have still to spend at the printer's office.'<sup>264</sup> A hundred florins, he added, for the remainder of his stay and his return to Ghent would surely suffice, and should be sent to Douai by return of post. After his return, he would

---

<sup>261</sup> (...) *quem hactenus hic apud me retineo, ne forte destitutus ab omnibus, impatientia suada, ad prava consilia defluat, unde facile revocari non possit. Communicavi consilium id meum, cum Domino Priore Vedastino, hic me, ex parte Reverend[issi]mi Visitoris, intervisente, qui illud ut utile et honestum mecum comprobavit. Nam quae circa infirmum fratrem agenda sint, ex regula item satis docemur.*

<sup>262</sup> Sanderus, *Gandavum sive Gandavensium*, 336. This D. Heylinc is not among those interrogated in 1607 with regard to the election of a coadiutor (RAG, S.P. 34 II 108; cf. above, p. 25nt49). Lummenaeus' 1617 *Pleias sacra* includes a preliminary poem by an otherwise unidentified 'Ioannes Heylinckus' (cf. f. A2<sup>vo</sup> / p. 4). It may very well be the same person whose unfortunate situation he is here discussing.

<sup>263</sup> (...) *intelligo, me hic praeter voluntatem et indulgentiam Reverend[issi]mae Amplit[udinis] T[uae] diutius haerere, et moram ex mora intricare.*

<sup>264</sup> *Brevi admodum reditum paro, et ex pistrino isto libenter me emancipabo, ubi viaticum accepero, et pauculas pecunias ad reliquum temporis transigendum quod hic, ad breve intervallum apud operas typographicas mihi restat.*

account for his expenses: ‘For the amount spent and received after my last calculation, I will provide a balance, when I will have returned to Ghent.’<sup>265</sup>

Whether he received, and ultimately accounted for the funds, we do not know. In the letter to Schayck, Lummenaeus briefly mentioned the completion of the collection of tragedies, *Musae lacrymantes*, and the near-completion of five homilies on the passion of the Christ, both dedicated to Schayck.<sup>266</sup> This collection of *homiliae* would be printed as *Vulnera Iesu Christi, sive homiliae quinque Christo passo dictae*, and appear not at the house of Fampoux, but at Marcus Wyon’s printing house, also in Douai. Wyon would also print Lummenaeus’ final production, a single homily entitled *Parthenii flores, sive homilia in festo missus dicta*. Apparently, then, not only was funding provided for the collection of homilies, but there was also money available for yet another publication. It seems that all would be explained upon his return in Ghent, which Lummenaeus claimed to be already preparing himself for in August of 1628.

But he would never return home. It is often said that in Douai in 1629 the curtain fell for Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca. The year 1629 may have derived from the fact that in that year the *Vulnera Iesu Christi* formally appeared in Douai, along with a separately published homily, *Parthenii flores*, and no one heard from him thereafter. But the Ghent State Archives hold three obituary lists of St Peter’s abbey that have recorded the death of Lummenaeus.<sup>267</sup> The first notes that ‘Cornelius à Marca died in Douai and was buried in the church of the new Benedictines’, on an unspecified date in 1628.<sup>268</sup> The second notes that ‘Mr. Cornelius Luminaeus à Marca, a man mellifluous both in prose and in verse, died in Douai where he was diligently working on the editing and printing of books; he is buried there with the English’, on an unspecified date in 1632. To this entry a recent hand added, in pencil, 1629.<sup>269</sup> The last one gives ‘Cornelius à Marca died in Douai’, in November, 1628.<sup>270</sup> Ignoring the pencil addition of later date, the obituaries provide us with 1628 (twice) and 1632. All say that he died in Douai. Is it perhaps possible to provide a more reasoned date of death?

The publications delivered by Marcus Wyon both appeared in 1629. The *Vulnera* contains a dedicatory letter to Schayck, dated from Douai on 9

<sup>265</sup> *Accepta et expensa pecunia ab ultimo computu, exactam rationem dabo, cum Gandavum rediero* (as nt259).

<sup>266</sup> *Interim tragica mea hic finem habent, et pathetica, sive homiliae Christo passo dictae, coronidem brevi admodum expectant. Omnia sub auspiciis Reverend[issi]mae Amplit[udinis] T[uae]* (as nt259).

<sup>267</sup> RAG, S.P. 34 II 99.

<sup>268</sup> *Cornelius Amarca obiit Duaci, ibiq[ue] sepultus in novorum benedictinorum eccl[esi]a; 1628 [novorum con.: noborum (?) ms].*

<sup>269</sup> *D[ominus] Cornelius Luminaeus a Marca vir qua soluta qua ligata oratione mellifluus obiit ubi edendis libris et prelo incumbibat ibidem sepultus apud anglos; 1632.* He must have been buried on the cemetery or in the church of the English College at Douai.

<sup>270</sup> *Cornelius Amarca obiit Duaci; 1628; in novem.*



August 1628, so *before* Lummenaeus' final letter of 24 August, discussed above. It has two *approbationes*, one dated 15 August, the other 29 October 1628.<sup>271</sup> The *Parthenii flores* has, contrary to Lummenaeus' usual practice, no dedication, no letters or other preliminary work. It contains only an undated *approbatio* by Guilelmus Arents, bookcensor in Ghent: *Erudita ac pia homilia est. Imprimi potest*. If Lummenaeus died in November of 1628, it may be that he had prepared both editions himself, but that the actual printing process was finished posthumously in 1629. He might have just finished the editing work on the *Vulnera* (cf. above), but perhaps not on *Parthenii*, which could explain the absence of any preliminaries. This way, November 1628 makes a possible date of death, and it may thus be that he was buried shortly thereafter in the church of the (English) Benedictines in Douai.

There is, however, also the short *eulogy* on Lummenaeus by his dear friend Antonius Sanderus, in a dedicatory letter to the successor of Schayck (who died in 1631), Abbot Gerard Rym. The letter is printed in the panegyric *S. Andreas Corsinus Carmelita, Episcopus Fesulanus* and is dated 1 January 1633. Part of it reads:

(...) When I was a boy, the most delightful abbot Cornelius Columbanus Vrancx fostered my studies with his munificence after the fortune of my parents had been diminished almost entirely by war. The abbot Arsenius [Schayck], who has done so well for the Blandinian abbey, has also been favorable to me. And though I have always experienced there the favorable goodwill of many of the ascetics who piously fostered their belief in God under the Rule of St. Benedict, the company of Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca (whom the divine benevolence, I hope, has recently called to the kingdom of heaven) has been the most pleasant to me up until his death. How much luster that man possessed! How much righteousness! How much knowledge of both the sacred (although some growling theological quacks are not of that opinion, who limit their erudition to some trivial matters of Binsfeld and Navarrus;<sup>272</sup> and when they are called to the test by the favor of leadsmen inexperienced of the sacred militia, they despise the truly learned men, who are all seasoned in either ecclesiastical or literary work. Those are mere youngsters, with a fiery nature and eager because of their friendship with some lords) and secular literature! How pleasantly he wrote poetry; how flourishing his prose was! May his writings have eternal fame,

---

<sup>271</sup> *Vulnera Iesu Christi*, A3<sup>vo</sup>.

<sup>272</sup> The German bishop and theologian Peter Binsfeld (c. 1545-1598) and the theologian Martin de Azpilcueta, of Navarra (1492-1586).

and may it all be worth the preserving cedar-oil. What more could have been expected from the divine genius of such a man, if only God would have granted him a longer life? (...) <sup>273</sup>

Would Sanderus refer to the death of a close friend as *nuper*, recently, when he in fact died some three to four years ago? Possibly: the warm memories of their true friendship may have resuscitated his grief while writing the eulogy. But it could also be that Lummenaeus actually died in 1632, as one obituary stated. If so, he seems to have left no traces after August 1628, even though the rate at which his publications appeared indicates that this was one of his most productive periods. Nonetheless, although no decisive conclusion can be satisfactorily drawn I would say that November 1628 currently seems our best guess – when he would have been an estimated 48 years of age.<sup>274</sup> It is, however, based on an *argumentum ex silentio*, rather than factual evidence. But even if he had actually lived to see the year 1632, the traces of his life in any case vanish somewhere in the second half of 1628.

If we review Lummenaeus' activities in the final – traceable – stages of his life, there seems little cause to follow Varenbergh's conclusion, which he drew on the scanty evidence available to him, but which nonetheless constitutes the view that still prevails today: 'The misery, grief and work had considerably affected his health, which had already been quite frail for several years; and shortly after he announced his return to Ghent his illness

---

<sup>273</sup> (...) *Cum puer essem, candidissimus Blandinii Praesul Cornelius Columbanus Vranxius, fortunis parentum per bella fere attritis, sua munificentia studia mea promovit. Favit et de Blandinio meritissimus Praesul Arsenius: et cum multorum istic sub D. Benedicti Regula Deo pie militantium Ascetarum pronam in me semper voluntatem expertus sim, tum cum Iacobo Cornelio Lummenaeo à Marca (quem nuper ad caelestia regna divina, spero, benignitas evocavit) ad extremum vitae diem iucundissima mihi consuetudo fuit. Et quantus in illo viro candor! quanta innocentia! quanta sacrarum (ut non illud opinentur et obganniant Theologastri quidam, qui eruditionem omnem ad quaestiuunculas aliquot Binsfeldii et Navarri contrahunt; et cum ad examina Tyronum sacrae militiae favore Praesulum vocati sunt, viros eruditissimos, quosque vel Ecclesiasticus vel litterarius labor fregit, despectui habent. Iuvenes illi nimirum, calore sanguinis fervidi, et Antistitum quorundam amicitia animosi) quanta saecularium litterarum cognitio! quam vincta suavis, quam soluta floridus oratione fuit! Ac licet famam habitura sint et perennitatem, quae scripsit, neque quidquam non cedro dignum aestimetur: quid non amplius tamen a divino viri ingenio expectandum erat, si longiorem illi vitam Deus concessisset? (...), pp. 5-6 (A3<sup>ro-vo</sup>). It is interesting to note that Sanderus seems to be referring to certain theological disputes that involved Lummenaeus. I have found no other proof of, or references to such events. In the case studies of this thesis, I will also discuss the extent to which some of Lummenaeus' plays may have touched upon certain (topical) debates. Perhaps an in-debt investigation of his oratorical oeuvre, which lies beyond the scope of this thesis, could provide more clues regarding the theological debate to which Sanderus is here referring.*

<sup>274</sup> François (*Bibliothèque des écrivains*, vol. 2, p. 159; s.v. Marck) notes that 'Dom Marck vivoit encore en 1644', possibly – if he had based himself on Andreas' *Bibliotheca Belgica* – an *argumentum ex silentio*, since Andreas does not mention Cornelius' death in his 1643 edition. The same probably goes for Baillet, *Jugements des savans*, 124: 'mort vers l'an 1644 ou 1645'.

deteriorated rapidly and caused his death in early 1629. On his way home, he had found shelter with the English Benedictines in Douai, and he has been buried in their church.’<sup>275</sup> ‘Though we have seen that after 1625 Lummenaeus had several times attempted to escape the strict rule of the Blandinian abbot and that his health – at least before he went to Italy – had on several occasions been fairly bad, there is no indication that he was living the final years of his life in dire misery. On the contrary: his stay in Douai – after having initially returned to Ghent, as I have shown above – enabled him to write and to publish, exactly as he had been wishing for. It may be, however, that he had been staying in an inn, rather than – which might have been more comfortable – with the English Benedictines, which can’t be concluded from the available evidence.’<sup>276</sup> The obituaries indeed seem to indicate that he had been *buried* in their church, but he himself never even mentioned as much as a visit to their abbey.<sup>277</sup> Still, his correspondence of 1625-1628 no longer reveals any health problems – in fact, he may have been in rather good shape after his return in Ghent, since the *absence* of any references to his physical condition is striking. For all we know, the abbot’s assumption – that he was deliberately trying to prolong his stay in Douai – had been correct, and Jacobus Cornelius Lummenaeus à Marca may actually have died a happy man.

---

<sup>275</sup> ‘La misère, le chagrin, les travaux, avaient considérablement altéré sa santé, déjà fort chancelante depuis plusieurs années; et peu après le moment où il annonçait son retour au mont Blandin, la maladie l’étreignit plus violemment et l’emporta au commencement de 1629. Il avait reçu asile à son passage à Douai, chez ses confrères les Bénédictins anglais, et c’est dans leur église qu’il fut enterré.’ Varenbergh, ‘Lummenaeus à Marca’, 147.

<sup>276</sup> Cf. his letter of 24 August 1628: *ex pistrino isto libenter me emancipabo* (as nt259).

<sup>277</sup> The English Benedictines in Douai moved back to England and settled at Downside abbey, in Bath, after the French revolution. Its seventeenth and eighteenth century archives seem to have been destroyed during or after the Revolution, though there might still be something available locally in Douai.