

## **CONSCIENCE & CONNECTIONS.**

*Marcellus Franckheim (1587-1644) and his contacts  
in the Habsburg World at the eve of the Thirty Years War.*

*‘my soul is not for sale’*

(Marcellus Franckheim to Franz Gansneb Tengnagel, 8 October 1620)

Willemijn Tuinstra  
S1791923  
08-08-2019

# Words: 22.917 (25.968 with Annexes)

Thesis MA History  
Europe 1000-1800  
Prof.dr. J.F.J. Duindam

## **Abstract**

The Dutch glassmaker's son and rector of the Latin school in Zutphen, Marcellus Franckheim (Zutphen 1587- Dunkirk 1644), converted from Calvinism to Catholicism in 1614 and became secretary to Cardinal Melchior Khlesl at the court of the Habsburg Emperor Matthias. He ended his life as councillor to the Spanish King Philip IV in the admiralty of the Flanders fleet. By analysing Franckheim's surviving correspondence and publications, this thesis shows that while Franckheim's life on first sight seems full of unexpected moves and change, there is a remarkable continuity in his faith, his contacts and his opinions. It also shows that the Dutch Gomarist-Arminian controversy during the Twelve Years Truce directly influenced his decision to convert and that a group of engaged Zutphen Catholic citizens connected him to the Counter-Reformation world of the Habsburg courts in Europe. Using Marcellus Franckheim as an exemplary case, this thesis addresses the broader question of how Dutch Catholics in the early seventeenth century, both in the Low Countries and in exile, participated in local and transnational networks to promote and consolidate their faith. It also provides insight in the interconnectedness of the political and religious conflicts in the Low Countries and the Holy Roman Empire, in particular with regard to the ways in which individuals felt involved and tried to influence these events.

*Key words:* conversion, Dutch Catholic engagement, Habsburg courts, Eighty Years War, Thirty Years War, Counter-Reformation, Ordo Militiae Christianae, Sodality of Christian Defence, Society of Jesus.

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
The Calvinist Connection .....	10
1. <i>The Refugee and Merchant Network of Antoine l'Empereur</i> .....	10
2. <i>Marcellus and the world of early modern science</i> .....	14
Conversion .....	19
3. <i>Conflicts in Zutphen</i> .....	19
4. <i>Disconnecting &amp; Connecting</i> .....	22
The Habsburg Connection: serving the House of Austria .....	28
5. <i>Ensuring Crowns: with Ferdinand in Bohemia and Hungary</i> .....	28
6. <i>Confirming Ferdinand's Hungarian Crown: Coronation Carmina</i> .....	32
7. <i>Defending Ferdinand's Bohemian Crown: Fides Bohemo-Palatina</i> .....	34
The European connection: in defence of the Catholic Church .....	39
8. <i>The Military order of the Militia Christiana</i> .....	39
9. <i>Defending the Soldiers of Christ: Adam Contzen SJ</i> .....	49
10. <i>The Zutphen connection, or: the letter from the Emperor</i> .....	54
Conclusion .....	60
Epilogue: on familiar terms with Aubertus Miraeus.....	63
References.....	66
ANNEXES.....	74
<i>Annex I Transcription and Translation Letter Marcellus Franckheim to Franz Gansneb Tengnagel. Caramanzel, 8 October 1619</i> .....	75
<i>Annex II Transcription and Translation Letter Marcellus Franckheim to Franz Gansneb Tengnagel. Mainz, 12 March 1620</i> .....	78
<i>Annex III Transcription and Translation Letter Marcellus Franckheim to Sebastian Tengnagel. Mainz, 12 March 1620</i> .....	81

All dates in this thesis follow the Gregorian calendar, unless indicated otherwise.

## Introduction

Between 1616 and 1618 the Dutch glassmaker's son Marcellus Franckheim (Marcel Francken, Zutphen 1587 - Dunkirk 1644) was secretary to Cardinal Khlesl, the head of the Habsburg emperor Matthias' Privy Council. In this function Marcellus witnessed the coronations of Matthias' successor Ferdinand II as king of Bohemia (1617) and Hungary (1618).<sup>1</sup> A year later he would be travelling Europe with Don Matthias of Austria, a bastard son of former emperor Rudolf II, promoting the *Ordo Militiae Christianae* among the European Catholic nobility and signing his letters with 'Marcellus Franckheim, *Aulae Lateranensis & Sacri Palatii Apostolici Comes, auratus militia Eques* (Order of the Golden Spur), a distinction for special achievements for the Catholic church awarded to him by Pope Paul V.<sup>2</sup>

Remarkably, only a few years before, Marcellus still was Calvinist, rector of the Latin school and teaching Greek in his hometown Zutphen in the Northern Netherlands. He spent his free time making music with the rest of the local intellectual elite in the Zutphen Collegium Musicum and exchanging ideas with natural philosophers and other academic friends in the Republic of Letters. In fact, in modern historiography he is mostly known as 'Marcellus Vranckheim', after his Latinised name 'Vranchemius', having gained some fame as a critical commentator on Galileo Galilei in discourses on the invention of the telescope and experiments with perpetual motion machines and medicine.<sup>3</sup> Given this background, it was not to be expected that he would come into the service of the leader of the imperial Counter-Reformation and immerse himself in Habsburg matters at the eve of the Thirty Years War. Even less was it to be expected that he would spend most of the rest of his life as a councillor to respectively Archduchess Isabella and King Philip IV of Spain in the Supreme Council of the Admiralty of

---

<sup>1</sup> M.M. Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector en zijn Geloof', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Vereniging Gelre* 72 (1981) 93; D. Hoogstraten e.a. ed., 'Francheim of Franckemius, Marcellus' in: *Groot algemeen historisch, ... woordenboek* V (Amsterdam 1733) 136; A. Miraeus, 'Marcellus Franckemius' in: *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Antwerp 1649) 239-240.

<sup>2</sup> M. Franckheim to F.G. Tegnagel, 3 October 1619, Austrian National Library Vienna (ÖNB), Sammlung von Handschriften und Alten Drucken, Commercium Litterarum Cod. 9737s, fol. 85r. <http://data.onb.ac.at/rep/1003C0A6>; J.C.J. de Vegiano, *Suite du Supplément au Nobiliaire des Pays-Bas et du Comté de Bourgogne* 3-4 (Antwerp 1779) 117.

<sup>3</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 83-88; A. Dijkstra, *Between Academics and Idiots: A Cultural History of Mathematics in the Dutch Province of Friesland (1600-1700)* (Enschede 2012); V. Keller, *Cornelis Drebbel (1572-1633). Fame and the Making of Modernity* (Princeton 2008); F.J. Dijksterhuis, 'Magi from the North: Instruments of Fire and Light in the Early Seventeenth century' in: A. Borrelli, G. Hon and Y. Zik ed., *The Optics of Giambattista Della Porta (ca. 1535-1615): A Reassessment* (Dordrecht 2017) 125-143.

the Flanders fleet, ministering the actions of Dunkirk privateers in the Spanish-Dutch Eighty Years War.<sup>4</sup>

Or was it? On first sight Marcellus' life and career path seem to imply a complete shift of his identity and of the communities of which he was part. Indeed, Marcellus Franckheim changed faith, profession, patrons and country; and some of these several times. On top of this, he showed a remarkable social mobility. He married Marie van den Eede, whose brother would become bishop of Antwerp and whose uncle was Aubertus Miraeus (1573-1640), censor and court chaplain to the Archdukes Albert and Isabella.<sup>5</sup> Marcellus' sons would acquire high positions in the Council of Brabant and his daughter would marry Guillaume van Hamme, burgomaster of Brussels.<sup>6</sup>

On the other hand, full of unexpected turns as Marcellus' life might have been, he was no exception among the people of his class and education. For example, Marcellus' correspondence partners, the mathematically gifted Franz Gansneb Tegnagel and the poly-linguistic David le leu de Wilhem, show a similar versatility. Tegnagel played an instrumental role in the publications of the astronomers Johannes Kepler and Tycho Brahe, but spent most of his life as a diplomat on missions for Archduke Leopold.<sup>7</sup> David le Leu de Wilhem, who took degrees in philosophy, law and oriental languages, started his career as merchant in the Levant, brought from his travels the first mummy to Leiden and eventually became councilor and diplomat to Prince Frederick Henry.<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, if the life of Marcellus Franckheim and his correspondents was full of changes and unexpected turns, so was their age. When in 1616 Marcellus left Zutphen never to return again, the Twelve Years Truce (1609-1621) was halfway, which meant that there would be still 27 years of war to go between the Dutch Republic and Spain. The Holy Roman Empire was on the verge of the Thirty Years war (1618-1648) and the French wars of religion were soon to commence again (1621-1629). Many people were on the move, being forced by war,

---

<sup>4</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 93-95.

<sup>5</sup> de Vegiano, *Nobiliaire*, 117; C.B. de Ridder, 'Aubert Le Mire, sa vie, ses écrits: mémoire historique et critique', *Mémoires couronnés et mémoires des savants étrangers, publiés par l'Académie royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* 31 (Brussels 1863) 107.

<sup>6</sup> E. Lejour, *Inventaire des archives de la famille Van der Noot* (Brussels 1954) 67-69, inv. n° 205.

<sup>7</sup> J. R. Christianson, *On Tycho's Island: Tycho Brahe and His Assistants, 1570-1601* (Cambridge 2000) 370.

<sup>8</sup> P. Bayle, 'Wilhem, David le-Leu de' in: *Dictionnaire historique et critique* V (5th edition; Amsterdam 1734) 505-507. The mummy eventually came into the collection of the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden in Leiden.

conflict or persecution to leave their place of birth, family and familiar networks.<sup>9</sup> They lost their families or their business and were forced to build up new connections and start all over again. This was for example also the case for merchant Anthoine l'Empereur, the patron who had made possible Marcellus' academic education. His family had been executed in the aftermath of the iconoclasm of 1566 and he had had to flee from Antwerp. Despite all his loss and misfortune, he was able to build up a whole new business imperium thanks to a family network and a network of other Protestant refugees who had settled in important trade centres in various parts of Europe.<sup>10</sup>

Thus, Marcellus Franckheim clearly was not the only one who had to deal with change in early seventeenth-century Europe. What stands out in his life however, is that he renounced his former faith and academic work publicly and that he deliberately went into exile to seek his fortune elsewhere. While someone like l'Empereur could rely on old contacts and a large web of family connections, Marcellus' conversion from Calvinism to Catholicism meant a breach with a considerable part of his networks. Nevertheless, like l'Empereur he managed to get along and even to secure the career paths of his children at a time in European history when the right connections meant everything for survival.<sup>11</sup> How did he do this?

This thesis focuses on the consequences of Marcellus' conversion for his networks and career. It traces the interlinkages between the different stages in Marcellus' life, including the contacts and networks he could rely upon both in the Low Countries and the Holy Roman Empire. It does so mainly on the basis of Marcellus' correspondence and publications in a crucial period in Marcellus' life, 1611-1620, starting with his appointment as Rector in Zutphen and ending in the year that he would leave the Empire from Mainz to eventually settle in the Southern Netherlands. On the one hand it examines change with regard to Marcellus' faith, patrons, connections and positions in this period. On the other hand, it aims to identify constant factors with regard to these same aspects. In this way, this thesis aims to address the broader question of how Dutch Catholics both in the Low Countries and in exile, participated in local

---

<sup>9</sup> G. Janssen, 'The Exile Experience', in: A. Bamji, G.H. Janssen, M. Laven ed., *The Ashgate Research Companion to the Counter-Reformation* (Farnham 2013) 73-90, here 73-75.

<sup>10</sup> P.T. van Rooden, *Theology, biblical scholarship and rabbinical studies in the seventeenth Century. Constantijn l'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden* (Leiden 1989) 15-21; G. Jongbloet-van Houtte, *Brieven en andere bescheiden betreffende Daniel van der Meulen 1584-1600*. Huygens Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, XIX;XCIX-C. <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/brievenvandermeulen> accessed 27 March 2018.

<sup>11</sup> See L. Kooijmans, *Vriendschap en de Kunst van het Overleven in de Zeventiende en Achttiende Eeuw* [Friendship and the Art of Survival in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Century] (Amsterdam 1997).

and transnational networks to promote and consolidate their faith and to support each other. It also aims to add insight in the interconnectedness of the political and religious conflicts in the Low Countries and the Holy Roman Empire, in particular with regard to the ways in which individuals felt involved and tried to influence these events.

It thus builds on recent scholarship on the active agency of Catholics in the Low Countries to seek ways to profess their faith and on the engagement of Catholic exiles both in the Southern and Northern Netherlands to rebuild Catholic infrastructure in their country.<sup>12</sup> Catholics did not have to fear for life in the Republic, but openly staying or becoming Catholic could have serious social and material consequences. For example, it was not possible to hold a public office in the Dutch Republic when one was openly Catholic.<sup>13</sup> Also, it was difficult to really live a Catholic life, because of a shortage of priests and the need to meet in unusual places at unorthodox times and because in general rituals could only be partly performed.<sup>14</sup> This was especially a problem in the province of Gelderland where anti-Catholic edicts were enforced more actively than in for example Holland and Utrecht.<sup>15</sup>

However, Marcellus's conversion not necessarily had to lead to a breach with his social network and there was no real need to go into exile. Catholics, even in the strict province of Gelderland could still take part in public life normally, as long as they behaved discreetly with regard to their faith.<sup>16</sup> As several authors have shown, in the Dutch Republic there were groups of active Catholic citizens who offered hospitality to priests, provided rooms in their houses to celebrate mass, or provided funds to study for example at Jesuit Colleges in the South or the Empire.<sup>17</sup> Of course, a lot depended on how ardent a Catholic or convert one was and

---

<sup>12</sup> C.H. Parker, *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge MA 2008); G. Janssen, *Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge 2014); J. Pollmann, *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1520-1635* (Oxford 2011);

<sup>13</sup> Parker, *Faith on the Margins* 1-5; C. Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics During Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters* (Cambridge 2013) 130-133.

<sup>14</sup> Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, 9-10; J. Pollmann, 'Burying the Dead Reliving the Past. Ritual Resentment and Sacred Space in the Dutch Republic' in: B. Kaplan e.a. ed., *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands c.1570-1720* (Manchester 2009) 84-102.

<sup>15</sup> Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, 4.

<sup>16</sup> W. Frijhoff, 'Overlevingsstrategieën van katholieken in Zutphen na de Hervorming' in: E. H. Bary ed., *Lebuïnus en Walburgis bijeen: Deventer en Zutphen als historische centra van kerkelijk leven*. Bijdragen van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis 16 (2006) 203-220, here 212-213.

<sup>17</sup> Parker, *Faith on the Margins*, W. Frijhoff, 'Sint Justus' hoofd, Baudartius' bijbel, Franckheims zerk en Spitholts beurs: een Zutphens netwerk tussen Noord en Zuid', *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis* 87 (2004) 285-303. See for the role of Jesuits in the Dutch Republic: J. van Gennip, *Controversen in context: een comparatief onderzoek naar de Nederlandstalige controverspublicaties van de jezuiten in de zeventiende-eeuwse Republiek* (Hilversum 2014) 1-20.

whether one thought that it was better for one's conscience to seek refuge abroad or to stay or return in an hostile environment and try to enforce change from within.<sup>18</sup> Geert Janssen has shown that the experience of exile gave Catholic renewal in the Low Countries an international dimension and made the Counter-Reformation in Northern Europe a 'transnational enterprise'.<sup>19</sup> Liesbeth Corens has highlighted similar interlinkages between the English Catholic Community and the wider Counter-Reformation by analysing the experiences of English Catholics overseas, showing the significance of experiences of expatriate English Catholics beyond their own group.<sup>20</sup> According to her 'recognizing the dynamic lives of members of the English community without borders puts them at the spearhead of the Counter-Reformation.'<sup>21</sup>

By immersing himself in Habsburg politics, through his publications on the state of current political affairs and through his engagement in theological polemics, Marcellus Franckheim clearly also engaged on the European level. By analysing his connections this thesis hopes to shed light on how the local Zutphen dimension connected to the international Habsburg dimension the Counter-Reformation. In that light, the twists in his Marcellus' life might turn out to be less unexpected than they seem.

My analysis mainly will be based on primary sources: Marcellus' own correspondence and publications which for a large part will be analysed here for the first time. I will examine them with regard to Marcellus' faith, patrons, connections and positions in order to detect changes and continuities. Related questions regard causes and consequences of these changes and continuities and how Marcellus dealt with the consequences. The content of his writings provides information on activities, contacts, opinions and motivations, while the chosen form and the language can reveal a lot about the purpose of his writings and who were considered friends and who patrons.

Only a few of Marcellus' letters and publications have survived and can be accessed. Of his private correspondence, I could trace fifteen letters, of which thirteen in manuscript and two only in print (See Table 1). Of the letters in manuscript, ten are kept in the Special

---

<sup>18</sup> A. C. Duke, 'The Search for Religious Identity in a Confessional Age: the Conversions of Jean Haren c.1545-c.1613' in: *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low Countries* (Aldershot 2009) 326-368; C. Kooi, *Calvinists and Catholics*, 132-139.

<sup>19</sup> Janssen, *Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile*, 7.

<sup>20</sup> L. Corens, *Confessional Mobility and English Catholics in Counter-Reformation Europe* (Oxford 2018).

<sup>21</sup> *Ibidem*, 8.

Collections section of the Leiden University Library. Seven of these can be found in the *Bibliotheca Tysiana* in the correspondence of Marcellus' patron, the merchant Athoine L'Empereur. They cover the timespan 1604-1611, thus including Marcellus' time as tutor for L'Empereurs sons and his student time. The series ends with Marcellus' announcement of his acceptance of his post as rector in Zutphen. These letters, which mainly concern Marcellus' academic *peregrinatio* from 1609-1611, have been analysed by the Zutphen City Archivist Mrs. Doornink- Hoogenraad in a publication of 1981 and for the purpose of this thesis I will limit myself to a short discussion only.<sup>22</sup> Three other letters are kept in the Leiden University Libraries' collection of manuscripts, in the correspondence of Marcellus' friend, the orientalist and diplomat David le Leu de Wilhem. These have not been analysed before and are interesting because they date from 1612, 1613 and 1616 and reflect the various stages of Marcellus' short career as Rector in Zutphen: a successful start, trouble in the middle and departure in the end. Three more letters are kept in the Austrian National Library in Vienna in the correspondence of the imperial librarian Sebastian Tengnagel, covering the timespan 1619-1620.<sup>23</sup> These have not been analysed before either. The annex of this thesis contains my transcription and translation of these letters. Actually, two of these letters were not directed to Sebastian Tengnagel but to his cousin Franz Gansneb Tengnagel instead. In the private correspondence of Sebastian Tengnagel also a *Carmina* (praise poem) by Marcellus can be found, directed to Ferdinand II on the occasion of his coronation as King of Hungary (1 July 1618).<sup>24</sup> This is remarkable because it is the single one of this genre in Tengnagel's correspondence. The *Carmina* has not been analysed before either.

The two printed letters were published in the context of early modern scientific discourses. The first was directed to the natural philosopher and alchemist Johannes Burggravius (Johann Ernst Burggrav (~1685-1643)). Marcellus had written the letter from Padua in November 1609. Burggravius published the letter in 1611 as part of the preliminary matter of a book on alchemy and medicine.<sup>25</sup> This letter has been analysed before by science

---

<sup>22</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 75-81.

<sup>23</sup> Ingekomen Brieven Anthoine l'Empereur, Marcellus (Eleutherius) Vranckhemius, 1604-1611, Leiden University Library, Special Collections, Archieven van de Bibliotheca Thysiana en van leden van de familie Thysius en aanverwante families 16de-20ste eeuw, ATH 1036; Brieven van M. Vranckheim aan David le Leu de Wilhem, Leiden University Library, BPL 293A; Marcellus Francheimus ad S. Tengnagel, Austrian National Library, Vienna (ÖNB), Sammlung von Handschriften und Alten Drucken, Commercium Litterarum Cod. 9737s, fol. 185r and fol. 192r-193r [<http://data.onb.ac.at/rep/1003C0A6>].

<sup>24</sup> Marcellus Francheimus, *Carmina ad Ferdinand II*, Commercium Litterarum, ÖNB, Cod. 9737s fol. 152r-v, 153v.

<sup>25</sup> Marcellus Vranckheim, 'Epistola' in: Johannes Burggravius, *Bioychnivm seu Lvcerna* (Franeker 1611) 49-80.

historians Vera Keller and Arjen Dijkstra in their respective discussions of the work of Cornelis Drebbel and Adriaan Metius and I will mostly draw from their analysis.<sup>26</sup> A second published letter, further labelled in this thesis as *Abdicatio*, concerns Marcellus' 'abdication' from his former faith and academic work. Originally, he had written the letter in October 1616 to his Zutphen friend, Arnold toe Boecop. In 1618, the Jesuit Joannes Roberti published the letter to serve in a dispute on hermetic science.<sup>27</sup> Keller has referred to this letter, but did not further comment on it.<sup>28</sup>

Traceable published work of Marcellus furthermore includes his doctoral thesis which earned him his doctoral title in law (Basel 1609) and preliminary matter in works of other natural philosophers all published in 1611 and 1612. This preliminary matter concerns a praise poem (*Carmina*) in a book of the Dutch mathematician Adriaan Metius, and a favourable foreword (*Epicrise*) and praise poem to another book of Burggravius. For the purpose of this thesis I will only discuss these works briefly. Of more relevance are the three works which Marcellus published in the first half of 1620: his own vision on the revolt in Bohemia, *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* ('Bohemian-Palatine faithfulness') under the pseudonym Valentinus Caesarius Austriacus – printed in Vienna; an *oratio* curiously named *Expeditio Sicambro-Batava* ('Sicambrian-Batavan expedition') concerning Marcellus' motivation for his conversion; and a theological work polemising with the rector of the Latin School of Halle, Sigismund Evenius, with the mocking title *Asinus Palmatus* ('the palm ass') – both printed in Mainz. I will mainly analyse Marcellus' dedication letters in these books, because they contain important information on Marcellus' activities and whereabouts as well as on his contacts and whom he considered patrons and friends. They also give insight in his motivations to engage in political and theological discussions. Obviously, a full analysis of these works would provide even more information but would be beyond the scope of this thesis.

I could not trace any letters or publications dated after 1620. According to Marcellus' biographical information published in 1649 in Miraeus' *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, Marcellus still did write after 1620, but part of his work was published under pseudonym. At the time of the publication of the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, another part was still in manuscript, 'ready to

---

<sup>26</sup> Keller, *Cornelis Drebbel*, 153-154;329-330;390-391; Dijkstra, *Between Academics and Idiots*, 141-154.

<sup>27</sup> M. Vranckheim, 'Epistola à Arnoldum à Boecop, 6 october 1616' in: J. Roberti, *Goclenius heautonimorumenos* (Luxembourg 1618) 155-164.

<sup>28</sup> V. Keller, 'Drebbel's Living Instruments, Hartmann's Microcosm, and Libavius's Thelesmos. Epistemic Machines before Descartes', *History of Science* 48 (2010) 39-74, here 52.

be published'.<sup>29</sup> According to the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, one of these manuscripts was a work in three volumes in response on *De iure belli ac pacis* by Hugo Grotius.<sup>30</sup> Whether this manuscript or any of the others were ever published I have not been able to find out. In case Marcellus' manuscripts like Miraeus' manuscripts were inherited and kept by Marcellus' son Jean-Charles Franckheim, then there is a possibility that they got lost in the same fire as Miraeus' manuscripts.<sup>31</sup>

While this thesis clearly distinguishes between the period before and after Marcellus' conversion, the emphasis of the analysis of the sources lies in the period of his conversion and after. The thesis is therefore organised in four parts: the Calvinist Connection; Conversion; the Habsburg Connection and the European connection.

---

<sup>29</sup> Miraeus, *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, 239 – 240.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, 240.

<sup>31</sup> Miraeus' manuscripts, which were inherited by Marcellus' son Jean-Charles Franckheim, got burned when in 1695 the French bombardment of Brussels set the house of the printer Fricx on fire. Supposedly Fricx had been about to print Miraeus' manuscripts. Cf. C.B. de Ridder, 'Aubert Le Mire', 107.

Table 1 Marcellus Franckheim's Correspondence and Publications

*Letters/Manuscripts*

\* A star indicates that the letter or publication is analysed in this thesis.

Recipient	Date	From	To	Language
<i>Antoine L'Empereur</i>	23 April 1604	Zutphen	Utrecht	Dutch
“	25 January 1609	Marburg	Leiden	French
“	26 July 1609	Basel	Leiden	”
<i>(Joannes Burggravius)</i>	24 November 1609	Padua	-	”
<i>Antoine L'Empereur</i>	5 June 1610	Paris	Leiden	”
“	12 February 1611	Franeker	”	”
	13 May 1611	Amsterdam	”	”
“	21 June 1611	Zutphen	”	”
<i>David le Leu de Wilhem</i>	? - ? - 1612 *	“	Amsterdam	Latin
“	11 March 1613*	”	The Hague	“
“	16 Augustus 1616*	”	The Hague	“
<i>(Arnold toe Boecop)</i>	10 October 1616*	”	-	“
<i>Carmina to Ferdinand II</i>	1 July 1618*	Pressburg	-	“
<i>Franz Gansneb Tegnagel</i>	8 October 1619*	Caramanzel (Madrid)	Vienna	“
“	12 March 1620*	Mainz	Vienna	“
<i>Sebastian Tegnagel</i>	12 March 1620*	Mainz	Vienna	“

*Publications (including printed letters)*

Title	Date	Place	Printer	Category
<i>Melatema Quaedam Ad L. XII. C. De Transact</i>	1609	Marburg	R. Hutwelckus	Thesis
<i>Zētēmata quaedam ex u.i. &amp; politica miscellanea</i>	1609	Basel	J.J. Genathus	Doct. Thesis
<i>Arithmeticae et geometriae practica</i> (A. Metius)	1611	Franeker	R. Doyema	Carmen
<i>Biolychnium, seu Lucerna</i> (J. Burggravius)	1611*	Franeker	U. Balck	Letter
<i>Achilles Panoplos redivivus</i> (J. Burggravius)	1612	Amsterdam	H. Laurentius	Epicrise/ Carmen
<i>Goclenius heautontimorumenos</i> (J. Roberti)	1618* (1616)	Luxembourg	H. Reulandt	Letter
<i>Fides Bohemo-Palatina</i>	1620*	Vienna	NN [Gelbhaar]	Pamphlet
<i>Expeditio Sicambro-Batava</i>	1620* (1616)	Mainz	B. Lippius	Oratio
<i>Asinus Palmatus</i>	1620*	Mainz	B. Lippius	Pamphlet

## The Calvinist Connection

### 1. The Refugee and Merchant Network of Antoine l'Empereur

By the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Marcellus' father Peter Marcelisz. 'Glasmaecker', was ruined by the violence of war that had ravaged his city in the years before. The Hanseatic city Zutphen was situated strategically on the river IJssel at the border of the County of Zutphen, in the province of Gelderland, one of the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands. It had been on and off in the hands of Spanish and Dutch troops and only after prince Maurice of Orange's siege in 1591, Zutphen would remain a Dutch garrison town until the end of what would become known as the Eighty Years War (1568-1648).<sup>32</sup> As a city glassmaker, manufacturing and repairing glass windows, Peter Marcelis was relatively well off and a respected citizen. Indeed, after 1591 he was quickly back in business: the city accounts mention that on 13 February 1592: 'Meester Peter Glaesemaker van verscheiden gemacktes und vermacktes glases soe op te Nijstadt in die weem als anders, luit sijner cedelen ontfangen 6 gulden.'<sup>33</sup> Nevertheless, he did not have the means to let his son study. Luckily, he did have contacts who could recommend his son to people who did have this means. In this way, he managed to even a path towards Marcellus' academic development and to open doors to important networks. This would be of importance because Peter himself died in 1604, Marcellus and his mother on their own.

Thus, in 1601, only fourteen years old, Marcellus Franckheim came into the service of the Utrecht-based merchant Antoine l'Empereur. From a letter from Marcellus' father to l'Empereur we know that Marcellus had been 'gerecommandeerd' by 'erwerdyge luyden'.<sup>34</sup> Marcellus would serve as tutor for l'Empereur's sons Antoine junior, Theodosius and Constantijn.<sup>35</sup> Constantijn l'Empereur would later become a favourite student of Franciscus Gomarus and professor of Hebrew at Leiden University.<sup>36</sup> Constantijn l'Empereur also was adoptive father of Johan Thijs, the founder of the *Bibliotheca Thysiana*, the only public library building which was founded in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and still functions as such.<sup>37</sup> It was through this

---

<sup>32</sup> J. I. Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (Oxford 1995) 264; 613.

<sup>33</sup> Stads- en streekarchief Zutphen, 'Rekening van overrentmeester Johannes ten Beem, 1591/1592', in: *De stadsrekeningen van Zutphen over het jaar 1591/1592 inv.no 1153 Oud-archief Zutphen* (Zutphen 2006).

<sup>34</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 74.

<sup>35</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 73.

<sup>36</sup> Van Rooden, *Theology*, 21-22. Marcellus was only slightly older than his 'pupils', he can therefore be supposed to have been rather a 'study buddy' to the boys and a kind of helping hand to the actual teacher(s).

<sup>37</sup> P. Hoftijzer, *Bibliotheca Thysiana. Tot publijcke dienst der studie* (Leiden 2008); E. Mourits, *Een kamer gevuld met de mooiste boeken. De bibliotheek van Johannes Thysius (1622-1653)* (Nijmegen 2016).

connection that the correspondence of Antoine l'Empereur, who administrated his letters carefully and noted on each the date of reception and response, came into the collection of the *Bibliotheca*.

Antoine l'Empereur was a refugee from Antwerp and an orthodox Protestant. His family had had to flee after his father had been executed in the aftermath of the iconoclasm of 1566. After wanderings along various German cities and a stay in the Calvinist exile community of Cologne, he settled in Utrecht. In 1607, the family finally moved to Leiden to enable the sons to study there. The family would live on the Rapenburg, in the house of Antoine's sister-in-law Hester van der Meulen-de la Faille. Her husband Daniël van der Meulen had died a few years before and had been Antoine's business companion.<sup>38</sup> The families van der Meulen and l'Empereur together traded in various goods in the Mediterranean and had connections and trading links all over Europe as well as to the Levant. Antoine maintained a vast merchant network of cousins, nephews and brothers-in-law, many of them also in exile. This network, in which the Frankfort Fair was an important node, was not only a business network: it was also a family network, a refugee network, and a religious network of which the functions overlapped and reinforced each other. Also, it provided Antoine l'Empereur with news and enabled him to send and receive letters all over Europe.<sup>39</sup>

One of the 'erwerdyge luyden' recommending Marcellus in the service of l'Empereur could have been the Zutphen church minister Ds. Baudartius (1565-1640), who was one of l'Empereur's correspondents and like l'Empereur was a refugee from Antwerp. Ds. Baudartius, an orthodox Calvinist, was appointed as minister in Zutphen in 1598 and was one of the 'scholarchen' of the Zutphen Latin school where Marcellus had received his education. He would play an important role in the 'Statenvertaling', the 1637 Dutch Bible translation commissioned by the States General in 1619. Like l'Empereur he kept contact with other orthodox Calvinists from the Southern Netherlands who had found refuge in the North.<sup>40</sup>

It was through the same European transnational community of Calvinists in exile, that Antoine l'Empereur could provide Marcellus with the means to study in Leiden, Marburg and Basel and to visit various other university cities in Europe. Antoine l'Empereur administered the *Stipendium Banos* established by Bertrand de Banos, a Huguenot minister from Bordeaux

---

<sup>38</sup> Van Rooden, *Theology*, 15-21; Jongbloet-van Houtte, *Brieven*, XCIX-C.

<sup>39</sup> Van Rooden, *Theology*, 14-15.

<sup>40</sup> Frijhoff, 'Sint Justus' hoofd', 288.

living in exile in Frankfort. The *Stipendium* enabled sons from Calvinist families to pursue their studies in theology, law and medicine. The *Stipendium* also provided funds for students who came to study in Leiden from elsewhere, making it possible that they lodged with for example Gomarus who knew de Banos from Frankfort.<sup>41</sup>

Marcellus' letters to his patron from this period give us some insight how he used this stipend and the opportunities it provided. Marcellus had sent letters from Marburg, Basel, Paris, Franeker and Amsterdam in the course of 1609-1611. From these we know that he arrived in Marburg in January 1609 and travelled from there to Basel, Venice, Padua, Genoa, Marseille, Lyon and Paris. Marcellus' letters to his patron report on his travels, his study progress and always contain practical matters concerning arrangements for receiving the money or requests for additional funds. Often these letters, as well as their responses together with the money requested, were carried by l'Empereurs cousins and business partners, travelling to the Frankfort Fair. Marcellus left Marburg with a degree in law and dedicated his thesis to the States of the Quarter of Zutphen who also partly had financed his studies.<sup>42</sup> He proceeded to Basel where he obtained a Doctor's degree in Canon & Civil Law (J.U.D, *iuris utriusque doctor*, 'Doctor of both Laws'). Again, he dedicated his thesis to the Deputies of the Quarter of Zutphen as well as to the Magistrate of the city.<sup>43</sup> Marcellus defended the idea that a prince is bound by the law of a country, even if he had been himself the source of that same law.<sup>44</sup> At the end of the summer of 1610 he went back to the Netherlands. He would spend another couple of months at the university of Franeker, where his friend David le Leu de Wilhem (l'Empereur's nephew) studied at the same time.<sup>45</sup> Marcellus was registered again as law student. In his letters to l'Empereur from this time, Marcellus did not comment on his activities in Franeker. As the next chapter will show, from his publications it can be inferred that in any case he spent some of his time with natural philosophers. What he did share with l'Empereur were his plans for his next career step: he was in discussion with the city council in Zutphen about the vacant post of rector at the Latin School in Zutphen.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Van Rooden, *Theology*, 19-20; Jongbloet-van Houtte, *Brieven* LXXI; 235.

<sup>42</sup> M. Vranckheim, *Melatema Quaedam* (Marburg 1609); Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 77.

<sup>43</sup> M. Vranckheim, *Zētēmata quaedam ex u.i. & politica miscellanea* (Basel 1609).

<sup>44</sup> K. Mommsen, *Auf dem Wege zur Staatssouveränität: Staatliche Grundbegriffe in Basler Juristischen Doktordisputationen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Bern 1970), 28.

<sup>45</sup> J. Kok, *Vaderlandsch woordenboek* 31 (Amsterdam 1794) 113.

<sup>46</sup> Franckheim to l'Empereur, 12 February 1611.

Indeed, in June 1611 Marcellus Franckheim reported to l'Empereur that he had accepted the post of rector of the Latin school in his mother town Zutphen.<sup>47</sup> This was not an unexpected step, because as we have seen the Quarter of Zutphen had financed part of Marcellus' studies as well. This had been done under the understanding that he also would come 'ten dienste' (in the service) of the Quarter of Zutphen as was the normal practice.<sup>48</sup> The education of ministers and schoolmasters had a high priority with the States of the Quarter of Zutphen, because of the important role they had to play in the confessionalisation of the region and for this purpose the States reserved funds from the revenues of the spiritual goods, confiscated from the Catholic clergy.<sup>49</sup> In his letter to l'Empereur from Basel, Marcellus had already hinted that he hoped for extra finances from Zutphen and that this was also the reason that he had dedicated his dissertation to the Deputy States of the Quarter.<sup>50</sup> It was on the recommendation of Baudartius that the Quartier of Zutphen consented to provide the extra funds.<sup>51</sup>

From the above follows that Marcellus' studies, his earlier tutorship with the l'Empereur family and his next career step as Rector in Zutphen had been facilitated both by the network of Antoine l'Empereur and by his fathers' earlier contacts in Zutphen. Clearly the existence of a Huguenot and Southern Netherlands Calvinist exile community in the Northern Netherlands and the infrastructure it provided to send letters, money and goods had given a first boost to Marcellus' career, as it enabled him to study and to travel. At the same time, it provided him with important contacts. Marcellus' father had died, but Marcellus had found a powerful benefactor in L'Empereur, and support of the Deputy States and the influential Ds. Baudartius in Zutphen.

L'Empereur and the Deputy States of the Quarter of Zutphen thus can be seen as his most important patrons in this period. The typical patron-client relationship between Marcellus and L'Empereur becomes apparent in the fact that L'Empereur paid the major part of Marcellus' expenses up to his appointment in Zutphen. It becomes also apparent in Marcellus' letters in which he addresses l'Empereur with 'patron' and shows that he is aware that something is

---

<sup>47</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 81.

<sup>48</sup> C. Ravensbergen, 'Authorities and Religious Minorities in the East of the Dutch Republic. The Quarter of Zutphen, 1592–1620' in: H. J. Selderhuis and J. M. J. Lange ed., *Reformed Majorities in Early Modern Europe*. *Refo500 Academic Studies* 23 (Göttingen 2015) 259.

<sup>49</sup> Ravensbergen, 'Authorities and Religious Minorities', 253.

<sup>50</sup> Franckheim to l'Empereur, 26 July 1609.

<sup>51</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 77.

expected from him in return. Marcellus' shows his loyalty towards his other benefactors, the Deputy States of the Quarter, by dedicating his theses to them and indeed by coming back to stay 'ten dienste' of Zutphen. By taking the post of Rector he fully fulfils the Deputy States' expectations with regard to the son of their Zutphen city glass maker.

With regard to Marcellus' spiritual orientation of this period, though it is difficult to say what his own view was, it is clear that the household of L'Empereur provided an orthodox Calvinist environment. Also, his *peregrinatio* allowed him to immerse himself in Calvinist doctrine, as Marcellus himself reported in his letters to his patron. Furthermore, he cannot have missed the dispute between Gomarus and Arminius which took place at his doorstep and was already in full swing in the period that Marcellus was living in Leiden (1607-1609).<sup>52</sup>

## 2. Marcellus and the world of early modern science

Thanks to the Calvinist Network of l'Empereur, Marcellus had been able to make his entrée in the world of early modern science. Though his few publications only cover a short time span and feature exclusively as preliminary matter in books of others, they show that he was an active participant in this network and wanted to let himself heard. And this worked, because that is why the name of Marcellus Franckheim survives in historiography till this day. Historians of science still discuss 'Vranckheims' contribution in the development of early modern science and the 'inventions' and discoveries of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>53</sup> Early modern science blended together empirical and experimental research, instrument making, alchemy, medicine and philosophy, and, as will become clear in this chapter, Marcellus' contributions to the early modern scientific discourse varied accordingly.<sup>54</sup>

Marcellus' scientific publications count only three (or four when one includes the published letter in which he denounced his former faith and scientific activities). The first and also the one which is the one most frequently cited, is a letter to the natural philosopher and alchemist Johannes Burggravius. Marcellus this letter wrote from Padua on 20 November 1609, while traveling on the *Stipendium Banos*. Burggravius would publish this letter in 1611 in Franeker as part of the preliminary matter in the second edition of his book *Biolychum seu Lycerna*, a book on alchemy and medicine.<sup>55</sup> Secondly, Marcellus published a praise poem in

---

<sup>52</sup> See for a discussion on this dispute chapter three in this thesis.

<sup>53</sup> E.g. Dijkstra, *Between Academics and Idiots*; Keller, *Cornelis Drebbel*.

<sup>54</sup> P. Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge. From Gutenberg to Diderot* (Cambridge 2002) 81-115.

<sup>55</sup> Burggravius, *Biolychum*, 49-54.

the *Arithmeticae et geometriae practica* - a book by the mathematician Adriaan Metius (Franeker 1611); and thirdly, by way of introduction and review, an *Epicrise* to the book *Achillus Panoplos Redivivus* - again by Burggravius (Amsterdam 1612).<sup>56</sup>

Rather than the exact content of the scientific discussion in these publications, of interest for this thesis is what they reveal of Marcellus' wider networks and activities and of the way he positioned himself in the world of early modern science. Like mentioned before, in his letters to l'Empereur from that time, Marcellus did not mention anything of his interest in natural philosophy and hermetic science. However, his experiences and the contacts he made in Marburg and Padua during his *peregrinatio academica* which was facilitated by the *Stipendium Banos* enabled him to proceed to Franeker to work with Burggravius as well as with Adriaan Metius.

Around 1607, while studying 'philosophie' in Leiden, Marcellus had got to know the natural philosopher Johannes Ernst Burggrav (Burggravius) (~1685-1643).<sup>57</sup> Burggravius had studied in Marburg and a while in Leiden, travelled to England, France, Germany and the Netherlands and later would move back to the University of Marburg to work with the chemistry and mathematics professor Johannes Hartmann (1568-1631).<sup>58</sup> In 1609, Hartmann had been installed as a professor of 'Chymiatric' by Landgrave Moritz, 'der Gelehrte', (Maurice the Learned) of Hesse-Kassel.<sup>59</sup> Burggravius' network extended to Franeker and it was there that Marcellus would work further with him and Adriaan Metius. Adriaan Metius (1571-1635) was an alchemist, astronomer and a well-known professor of mathematics at the University of Franeker. He had been an assistant to Tycho Brahe (1546-1601) in Denmark who was doing observations with large instruments of the movements of the planets on the Island of Hven near Copenhagen. Later, Tycho Brahe would come as a court astronomer into the service of Rudolph II in Prague.<sup>60</sup> After his stay with Brahe Adriaan Metius would spend some time in Marburg as well. In 1598 he was appointed professor of mathematics in Franeker and would gain great fame as mathematician and astronomer. What Adriaan Metius and Burggravius had in common and were pursuing together were experiments in alchemy and

---

<sup>56</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 79-80.

<sup>57</sup> M. Vranckheim, 'Epistola à Arnoldum à Boecop, 10 october 1616' in: J. Roberti, *Goclenius heautontimorumenos* (Luxembourg 1618) 155-164, there 161.

<sup>58</sup> Keller, 'Drebbel's Living Instruments', 71.

<sup>59</sup> B. T. Moran, *Distilling knowledge. Alchemy, chemistry, and the scientific revolution* (Cambridge MA 2005) 107-112.

<sup>60</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 78-79.

hermetic science, searching for new applications for medicine, as well as for the philosopher's stone.<sup>61</sup>

As appears from Marcellus' letter from Padua, Marcellus and Burggravius kept in contact after leaving Marburg. Marcellus' letter is a reaction on another letter from London from Burggravius which Marcellus had received earlier in Venice. In his letter, among other things, Marcellus commented on the invention of the telescope. According to Marcellus, this invention from 1608 should be attributed to Jacobus Metius from Alkmaar. In the letter, Marcellus also referred to the *Sidereus Nuncius* (Starry Messenger) by Galileo Galilei. This was the book in which Galileo published his observations of Jupiter's moons and the surface of the moon which would make him world-famous. Marcellus suggests that Jacobus Metius deserved at least as much praise as Galileo, because he was the first inventor of the telescope. This invention had made Galileo's discoveries possible in the first place.<sup>62</sup>

Indeed, Galileo had started to work on his own version of the telescope as soon as word and first descriptions of the instrument had reached Italy. According to Marcellus, Galileo just had been better in promoting his inventions and quicker into putting them into practice.<sup>63</sup> Though Marcellus and Galileo were in Padua at the same time and Marcellus could have had the news about Galileo's observations first hand, Marcellus must have added some information later on, while editing the letter for publication. Galileo started his observations in Padua around the same day that Marcellus wrote his letter, but the *Sidereus* was only first published in 1610, so though Marcellus as one of the first could have learned of Galileo's discoveries, he could not have known the *Sidereus*.<sup>64</sup>

Burggravius' book in which Marcellus' letter from Padua was published, discussed the working and possibilities of magnetism and healing on a distance. It presented the working of the blood lamp, a device containing somebodies' blood, from which one could tell the health of that person at a certain moment (even if the blood was collected a long time before that moment). Telescopes in our eyes seem not to be related that much to medicine, but in Marcellus' time they did and his letter functioned in addition to show what kind of discoveries Dutch inventors were capable of. In this way he attached authority to the content of the rest of the

---

<sup>61</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 151-152.

<sup>62</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 141 -143; 146.

<sup>63</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 146.

<sup>64</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 143.

book, which described Burggravius' inventions.<sup>65</sup> For Marcellus and the others in his networks, telescopes, alchemy and medicine did relate, and the telescope was much discussed in the group of alchemists working together in Franeker.<sup>66</sup>

Apart from praising both Jacobus and Adriaan Metius, the letter drew also attention to the work of another inventor, Cornelis Drebbel (1572-1633), engineer at the court of King James I of England and, like Brahe, later into service of Rudolf II. Marcellus discussed Drebbel's *perpetuum mobile*, or *cosmoscope*, working on sunlight, which amongst other things simulated the movements of the planets and the earth. In line with the ideas of hermetic science, Marcellus described the movements of the planets to be caused by a universal spirit, *Anima Mundi*. Contemporary authors and later authors writing about astronomy and Drebbel's *perpetuum mobile*, referred to Marcellus' account of the working of the instrument. Marcellus' letter would become a 'classic'.<sup>67</sup> For example, in his *Dioptrique*, René Descartes attributed the invention of the telescope to Jacobus Metius. He based this attribution on Marcellus' letter.<sup>68</sup> But also one of Tycho Brahe's assistants, David Fabricius (1564-1617) referred to the letter, as did the English alchemist Richard Burton (1577-1640), and even the astronomer Johann Kepler.<sup>69</sup>

Marcellus' other two scientific publications in a way reiterate his praise for the Dutch inventors Metius, Burggravius and Drebbel. The praise poem in Metius' book on mathematics (1611) praises again the work of the brothers Metius. The *Epicrise* in the other work of Burggravius' *Achillus Panoplos Redivivus*, amongst other things on 'electric' weapons and the working of weapon salve, praised again Drebbel (the new Archimedes) and his work, which proved that many useful things would be invented in the future.<sup>70</sup>

Marcellus' publications are typical for dedication letters, praise poems and other introductions used internationally by natural philosophers and other scholars to promote each other's work and to enhance each other's (and their own) international careers.<sup>71</sup> Like many others, Marcellus played his own role in this network and the development of early modern

---

<sup>65</sup> Keller, 'Drebbel's living instruments', 52.

<sup>66</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 152.

<sup>67</sup> Keller, *Cornelis Drebbel*, 497.

<sup>68</sup> Dijksterhuis, 'Magi from the North', 125.

<sup>69</sup> Dijkstra, *Academics and Idiots*, 147-150; Keller, *Cornelis Drebbel*, 490.

<sup>70</sup> M. Frankheim, 'Epicrise', in: J. Burggravius, *Achilles Panoplos redivivus* (Amsterdam 1612). Weapon salve could cure patients on distance by applying the salve on the weapon that had wounded them.

<sup>71</sup> S.J. Harris, S.J., 'Networks of travel, correspondence, and exchange', in: K. Park and L. Daston ed., *Early Modern science*. The Cambridge history of science III (Cambridge 2006) 341-362.

science. He did so, not by publishing about his own experiments like Burggravius, inventing new instruments like Drebbel and the brothers Metius, making new discoveries like Galileo or developing new lines of thinking like Descartes, but by promoting the work of others and spreading the news of new knowledge. Thus, he acted as a typical knowledge broker, disseminating knowledge and advancing knowledge of certain groups of knowledge claimers.

However, science would not become Marcellus main trade. Doing his fellow scholars in the republic of letters a favour by promoting their work (Burggravius, Metius, Drebbel) could have earned him something in return. Having their own networks in universities and at courts all over Europe they could have helped him further in the world of science. Marcellus did not make use of these connections. Instead of pursuing an academic career he became rector at the Latin school in Zutphen and science would remain a side activity. As we will see in the next chapter, once he converted to Catholicism his earlier involvement and publications in hermetic science would even put him in an awkward position.

## Conversion

### *3. Conflicts in Zutphen*

When Marcellus had accepted his post as rector in 1611, he had done so for only one year. Marcellus noted in a letter from 21 June 1611 to l'Empereur that the city council would rather have seen that he had bound himself for a longer time.<sup>72</sup> Instead they agreed that the contract would be extended each year. In an earlier letter to l'Empereur, Marcellus had already mentioned that he would accept the post of rector, but only for the present and as long as there would be no other opportunities.<sup>73</sup>

Despite his reservations, after his installation Marcellus seemed to settle in his new position quite easily. He became member of the Zutphen Collegium Musicum which counted among his members city councillors, magistrates, church ministers and colleagues of the Latin School: the local intellectual elite. The Collegium Musicum was led by the city organist Godfried Oldenraet and met regularly. The members knew each other from outside the Collegium as well, often were friends and served as witnesses at marriages and baptisms, like Marcellus did for one of his colleagues and fellow Collegium Member Henrick Umbgrove.<sup>74</sup> In the meantime, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Marcellus kept corresponding with Burggravius and Metius, but also with his friend David le Leu de Wilhem.

David le Leu de Wilhem (1588-1658) was a relative from Antoine l'Empereur. David's grand-mother Jeanne L'Empereur, was Antoine's' aunt. Like the l'Empereur family, David's parents had had to flee from the Southern Netherlands. David's mother had barely survived the St Bartholomew's night and his grandfather had escaped from prison and had fled to England. David studied together with Marcellus in Franeker and proceeded with his studies in Leiden taking degrees in philosophy, law and Eastern languages. From 1617 on, he travelled extensively in the Middle-east, sending ancient Arabic and Persian texts and even a mummy to the University of Leiden. He married Constantina Huygens, sister of Constantijn Huygens and became councillor of Prince Frederick Henry of Orange, and later on Council of Brabant.<sup>75</sup> In the meantime, he kept corresponding with Constantijn l'Empereur, with whom he shared apart from the family ties his interest in Eastern languages. He also corresponded with Marcellus and

---

<sup>72</sup> Franckheim to l'Empereur 21 June 1611.

<sup>73</sup> Franckheim to l'Empereur 13 May 1611.

<sup>74</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 82.

<sup>75</sup> Kok, 'David le Leu de Wilhem', 93-94, Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, 505-507.

in his surviving correspondence in the library in Leiden there are letters from Marcellus from 1612, 1613 and 1616. As mentioned in the first chapter of this thesis, they mirror the various stages of Marcellus' short career as Rector in Zutphen: a successful start, trouble in the middle and departure in the end.

The letter from 1612 was written in high spirits and indeed just is a letter between friends, which could be written by anybody to any good friend to keep into contact, exchanging niceties and citations of classic writers. In the letter, Marcellus told his friend that finally his doctoral diploma had arrived from Basel (by way of one of l'Empereurs contacts) and discussed some books he had bought. Interestingly, he also remarked that the Zutphen Quarter still had not refunded the printing costs of his PhD thesis. Marcellus ended his letter with greetings to Theodosius l'Empereur and others of the extended family.

However, as soon as 1613, Marcellus was already out of office. Not because he had taken the opportunity to obtain a more attractive position, but because he had been dismissed. Marcellus himself has left no detailed account of the events that had led to this dismissal. However, they have been registered in the minutes of the Zutphen city council and the church-board. Based on these minutes, the Zutphen City Archivist Mrs. Doornink-Hoogenraad has made a reconstruction of the events.<sup>76</sup> For the interpretation below, I rely on her article.

On 19 June 1613, Marcellus was discharged from his post as rector because he would not agree with the doctrine of the Dutch Reformed Church on predestination. Apparently, he had got in conflict with Ds. Damann and Ds. Baudartius who as scholars kept an eye on the orthodoxy of the teachers. That he disagreed himself with the doctrine was not so much the problem but that he also had resolved that he would not teach his pupils the Heidelberg Catechism could not be tolerated.<sup>77</sup> Marcellus' dismissal did not solve the issue however. Marcellus was not planning to keep silent about his religious opinions. In city council meetings in December 1613, Ds. Damman and other witnesses reported that Marcellus had said that he did not believe that people were born 'den eenen tot verdoemenis ende den anderen ter salicheyt', meaning that for the first 'all wat goed dat hy dede en mochte hem nyet helpen aen synder salicheyt' and that the latter 'en coste nyet sondigen all wat quaet dat hy dede.'<sup>78</sup> Thus, he could not believe that somebody could keep doing evil and still would escape punishment

---

<sup>76</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 83-90.

<sup>77</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 83-84.

<sup>78</sup> *Op.cit.* Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 85, witness statement schoolmaster Peter Pallant.

in the hereafter because he was predestined to be saved, while an entirely good person would end up in hell. Marcellus denied that such ideas could be found in the bible.<sup>79</sup>

In the same way, Marcellus had made himself impossible in the Collegium Musicum. At one of the Collegium's regular gatherings at the home of the city organist Oldenraet, he had stated that the Heidelberg Catechism was not reflecting scripture and was the word of men instead of the word of God. He did not want to believe in the 'Heidelbergse God' and predestination, nor pretend to do so, '*pro norma fidei*' (because this was against his conscience and faith).<sup>80</sup> Because he would not keep his thoughts about the doctrine for himself and kept getting into conflict with the others, Marcellus was banned from the Collegium Musicum.<sup>81</sup>

Overall, Marcellus' personal conflict must be seen in the light of a much wider conflict between so called 'Gomarists' and 'Arminians' which at that time tore the Protestant community in the Northern Netherlands apart. As a theological debate it had already been going on when Marcellus still was with the l'Empereur family. By 1613 it no longer was a debate among theologians concerning the doctrine of predestination, but also involved disagreement about whether the church or the city council appointed the clergy and even about whether to resume war with Spain or not after the expiration of the Twelve Years Truce (1609-1621).<sup>82</sup> Marcellus took the view of the Arminians, and thus got in conflict with the Gomarist ministers, Ds. Baudartius and Ds. Damman.

From the reconstruction of Marcellus' conflicts, it can be inferred that the city council and the scholars still more or less functioned as patrons for Marcellus, like they had done in the years before. Still, the matter of his faith and conscience weighed heavier for Marcellus than keeping up the relationships with these patrons. He took the risk to displease and spoke his mind. Marcellus Franckheim emerges here as a self-willed personality, outspoken in his opinions and not making compromises on part of his conscience or principles.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 86.

<sup>80</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 85-86.

<sup>81</sup> Ibidem, 87.

<sup>82</sup> See Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 422-428.

#### 4. Disconnecting & Connecting

Still, all this turmoil did not leave Marcellus unmoved. So much surfaces in the sources of Marcellus' own hand that do survive from this time between the start of the conflict and Marcellus' departure from Zutphen a few years later.

From the letter from 11 March 1613 to David, written around the time of his first conflicts with the scholarchs, it is clear that he does not take pleasure in confronting others. Marcellus first excuses himself that he is writing less often. But that does not mean that his friendship diminishes, for 'what is true love: writing letters?' He also mentions that he 'again has to descend in the arena with that little man', and worries that he will get angry and will not be able to restrain himself.<sup>84</sup> Apparently, he was not looking forward to another confrontation with 'that little man'. He does not specify in the letter who this little man was, but it is quite possible that it is one of the scholarchs, Ds. Baudartius or Ds. Damann. Furthermore, Marcellus is quite aware of the fact that the meeting might escalate not in the least due to his own incapability to hold back. He is quite aware that his own character traits did not always work in his favour.

While this letter to David shows that he was emotionally affected, from his publications it becomes clear that the whole affair had a profound impact on the way he experienced his faith. He would take a radical step. In 1614, the Zutphen Church Board reported to the Classis that Marcellus regularly attended Catholic mass 'with the Jesuits' and in 1615 it was spoken around in Zutphen that in Antwerp a book of Marcellus would be printed against the Protestant faith.<sup>85</sup> Whether this ever happened is unknown, but clear is that Marcellus started to write things down and was taking steps to become a real Catholic. He did so in the *Expeditio* and his *Abdicatio*.

The Papal nuncio Antonio Albersati, Pope Paul V's envoy in Cologne, reported in a letter dated 15 May 1616 that 'Marcellus Franchheim' was making 'good progress in the Catholic faith' and was in the course of putting the motivations for his conversion onto paper. Marcellus did so while staying in Cologne with the Apostolic Institute of the Capuchins, an organization devoted to support people who wanted to convert to Catholicism. The nuncio furthermore noted that probably Marcellus would edit the piece to be published later on.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, the manuscript

---

<sup>84</sup> Franckheim to le Leu de Wilhem, 5 March 1613

<sup>85</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 87.

<sup>86</sup> P. Schmidt, ed. *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, Die Kölner Nuntiatur II, Nuntius Antonio Albergati. 1614–1616* (Munich 2009). I thank Willem Frijhoff and Joseph Wijnhoven for pointing at this letter.

was finished early June 1616 and publication would eventually happen, but not before 1620 and under the title *Expeditio Sicambro-Batava*.<sup>87</sup>

This title, in full *Expeditio Sicambro-Batava ad Fidem & Virtutem Antiquiorem*, is a bit misleading because it has nothing to do with expeditions or old Batavians. ‘Expedition’ could be read here in the sense of ‘quick journey’ or ‘short-cut’, or in the sense of a rhetoric *expeditio* or *eliminatio* which means that the orator comes quickly to his point by eliminating other arguments. Indeed, Marcellus calls his booklet (48 pages) an *oratio*, and according to its content the title should be read as something like ‘Sicambro-Batavian short-cut to Old Faith and Virtue’. Being from Zutphen and staying in Germany, Marcellus would count himself as ‘Sicambro-Batavian’ and in the piece he describes his own path to the ‘Old Faith’ and demonstrates, by eliminating arguments of a whole range of Protestant theologians, in four main points why Catholicism is to be preferred above Protestantism. First, because of its *Antiquitas*, seniority, because it is the oldest and original church, having been continuing from the beginning; second, because of the *Pastorum*, the pastors or popes who have followed up Petrus without discontinuity; third, because of the *Hierarchia*, the organisational system which is the same all over the world, and finally *Unio & Concordia*, the unity and harmony which the church is able to establish.<sup>88</sup> This last one, unity, seems to be the main point for Marcellus because ‘[in the Protestant Churches ] these little ministers (*ministerculi*) never agree among each other, not even about what they know nothing about’.<sup>89</sup> The ‘ministerculi’ seem to echo the ‘little man’ in the letter to David and his frustration about quarrelling ministers in the Gomarist-Arminian dispute. Marcellus further laments that in the Low Countries the air is infested with poison of heretic doctrine and that as a child he couldn’t help breathing it in.<sup>90</sup> In this ‘Calvinistic Augeas stable’ with so many different creeds and all kinds of theological differences Marcellus ‘has been feeling like Theseus in the Labyrinth without Ariadne’s thread’.<sup>91</sup> Luckily ‘he had run into an old friend of rare virtue and character’ who brought him in contact with the Society of Jesus, and Marcellus feels that he has been ‘drifting in a small boat for a long time and finally found a save port in the Catholic faith’.<sup>92</sup> A faith which is ‘one

---

<sup>87</sup> M. Franchem, *Expeditio Sicambro-Batava* (Mainz 1620).

<sup>88</sup> *Expeditio*, 20; 28; 33; 38.

<sup>89</sup> *Expeditio*, 40.

<sup>90</sup> *Expeditio*, 14.

<sup>91</sup> *Expeditio*, 42; 17.

<sup>92</sup> *Expeditio*, 16; 41.

body, one spirit, one heart and one soul'.<sup>93</sup> For Marcellus it was clear that the whole world would be better off, if everybody would unite again in this one creed: it would avoid a lot of discord and strife. From his dedication letter (directed to the Archbishop and Elector of Mainz, Johannes Schweickard) it becomes clear whom he expects to be able to accomplish this: his dedicatee Schweickard and the Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire Ferdinand II.<sup>94</sup>

Interestingly, in his letter to the reader he mentions that of this *oratio* one manuscript is kept in Cologne, and another by Péter Pázmány, the Primate of the Hungarian Church, the Archbishop of Esztergom (Gran). Péter Pázmány was an important figure in the Hungarian Counter-Reformation and amongst many other activities, author of influential Hungarian polemic works.<sup>95</sup> In fact, some of the ideas and arguments in the *Expeditio* reflect Pázmány's arguments in his *Kalauz* (Guide to divine truth), though this is not surprising given that Marcellus' arguments were quite 'standard'.<sup>96</sup> Though seemingly in contrast with his own independent character, the 'standard' nature of Marcellus' arguments align with his longing for 'unity' in matters of faith. He further tells the reader that he had written the piece in Cologne, after which he left from 'Patria Zutvenia' to Upper Germany (the region around Mainz) and Bohemia.<sup>97</sup> Then the piece had remained for years 'hidden in my briefcase', till again somebody had encouraged him to finally publish it.

This publication clearly showed where Marcellus stood and where he came from with regard to his faith. There would be no way back. To return to Zutphen and to go underground was no option. Marcellus was not a man for dissimulation. And he was true to his faith. He really believed in the unity of the Church and it would be hard for him to stay in the 'Augias Stable' of quarrelling ministers, that the Northern Netherlands were. To the contrary, he wanted to actively contribute to promote this one church.

Being true to his faith and keeping with his principles also implied another radical decision: Marcellus had to break with his former scientific activities which he did not feel anymore to be in line with what he believed. A letter from Marcellus 'Vranckheim' that served this purpose

---

<sup>93</sup> *Expeditio*, 42.

<sup>94</sup> *Expeditio*, 7

<sup>95</sup> R. Johnston, H. Louthan and T. Ó Hánracháin 'Catholic Reformers: Stanislas Hosius, Melchior Khlesl, and Péter Pázmány' in: H. Louthan and G. Murdock ed., *A Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe* (Leiden 2015) 195-222

<sup>96</sup> *Cf Ibidem*, 214-215.

<sup>97</sup> *Expeditio*, 8.

was published by the Jesuit Joannes Roberti in the context of a dispute on hermetic science, in the book *Goclenius heautonimorumenos*, printed in Luxembourg in 1618.<sup>98</sup> Originally, the letter had been written to his old friend Arnold toe Boecop in October 1616. Tellingly, Marcellus starts his letter with a citation: ‘He who is silent does not indeed confess, but yet it is true that he does not deny’.<sup>99</sup> With this he meant that if he would not take distance openly from his former natural philosophical work, then people might still think that he adhered to it. This idea was not farfetched, because, as chapter two has shown, his letter to Burggravius had been cited over and over again. Arnold toe Boecop (1586 -1622) had been at school in Zutphen and studied in Leiden around the same time as Marcellus. He later on studied theology with the Jesuits in Trier and in Mainz (1616-1620) and was ordained as a Jesuit.<sup>100</sup> He could very well be the ‘old friend’ who Marcellus mentioned in the *Expediatio* ‘to have run into’. Joannes Roberti had been rector of the Jesuit college of Trier and published widely on history, hagiography and scripture, but also on natural philosophy and medicine.<sup>101</sup>

Roberti got involved in a dispute with the natural and medical philosopher Rudolf Goclenius about healing of wounds on a distance with so called ‘weapon-salve’.<sup>102</sup> According to Roberti, healing on a distance could not be anything else than the work of the devil and in the context of the dispute, research on magnetism and hermetic science got staged as ‘Protestant science’.<sup>103</sup> The issue of the weapon-salve was exactly one of the issues Marcellus had discussed in his letter to Burggravius and which he now took distance from in his letter to Arnold toe Boecop. At the same time, he also denounced his other public statements about moving things on a distance, which also implied a denouncement of what he had written about Cornelis Drebbel’s devices.<sup>104</sup> No other spirit should be discussed than God’s spirit.

The letter in a way served a similar end as other letters of converts which the Society of Jesus published as an example for others contemplating conversion, or just not knowing where they stood. This kind of letters strengthened the Societies’ own fabric set up to fulfil their conversion mission in all kinds of ways. The publication of letters not only presented

---

<sup>98</sup> Joannes Roberti, *Goclenius Heautonimorumenos* (Luxembourg 1618), 155-164.

<sup>99</sup> Vranckheim, ‘Epistola à Arnoldum à Boecop’, 156.

<sup>100</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, ‘Een Zutphense Rector’, 91-92.

<sup>101</sup> J.N. Paquot, *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la principauté de Liège, et de quelques contrées voisines* (Louvain 1765) 531-534.

<sup>102</sup> C. Ziller Camenietzki, ‘Jesuits and Alchemy in the Early Seventeenth Century: Father Johannes Roberti and the Weapon-Salve Controversy’, *Ambix* 48 (2001) 83-101.

<sup>103</sup> G. D. Hedesan, *An Alchemical Quest for Universal Knowledge: The ‘Christian Philosophy’ of Jan Baptist Van Helmont (1579-1644)* (London 2016) 26.

<sup>104</sup> Keller, ‘Drebbel’s living instruments’, 52.

arguments for conversion, by mentioning names it became also clear who had converted, thereby potentially encouraging others to do the same and creating a sense of belonging and binding people.<sup>105</sup> In this case Marcellus' letter served the scientific mission of Johannes Roberti, which was at the same time a religious mission. Marcellus did Roberti a favour, for which a favour could be expected in return.

The letter is of importance, because it appears that Arnold toe Boecop had been urging Marcellus to rethink his natural philosophical work. Marcellus refers in the letter to a book on Superstition from 'a theologian from your Society' that his friend had sent him in April 1615 from Trier. It is clear that this 'theologian' was Johannes Roberti: in 1614 his *Dissertatio de Superstitione* was published in Trier.<sup>106</sup> Marcellus also refers to two letters from toe Boecop, written in 1613, in which toe Boecop had asked critical questions about Marcellus' *Epistola* and the *Epicrise* published 1611 and 1612 in the works of Buggravius. From these references follow two things: Marcellus was already corresponding with Arnold toe Boecop in 1613 and apparently Arnold toe Boecop had quite some influence on Marcellus. It looks like toe Boecop was the first contact stimulating Marcellus to convert. There are no signs of any more contact with Burggravius, while Arnold toe Boecop would remain a further main connection to the Catholic network that boosted his career in the service of Cardinal Khlesl and the Habsburg World.<sup>107</sup> Joannes Roberti would remain an important contact as well. Marcellus would refer to Joannes Roberti again in his *Asinus Palmatus*.<sup>108</sup> Interestingly, Boecop and Roberti published together in the field of hagiography and in a book on Saint Hubertus of 1621, Roberti mentioned Marcellus as having provided him with *vitae* of St. Hubertus located in the imperial library in Vienna.<sup>109</sup>

The *Abdicatio* together with the *Expeditio*, both written in 1616 when Marcellus was 29, thus mark a watershed in Marcellus' life from which there would be no way back, as the rest of his life would show. The letter to David le Leu de Wilhem of 1616 when he was about to leave the country, shows that the farewell was not easy. Marcellus was clearly moved and reacted on a

---

<sup>105</sup> van Gennip, *Controversen*, 60-64.

<sup>106</sup> Paquot, *Memoires a l'histoire litteraire*, 531.

<sup>107</sup> Frijhoff, 'Sint Justus' hoofd', 285-303.

<sup>108</sup> *Asinus Palmatus*, 105.

<sup>109</sup> 'Codex Caesareus Bibliothecae Viennensis habet Hugbertus ut ex eo ad me scripsit Clarissimus I.C. Marcellus Vranckheim.' And 'Habet (...) Codex Caesarius Bibliotheca Viennensis cuius indicium fecit Clarissimus vir Marcellin Vranckheim mihi amicissimus.' Joannes Roberti, *Historia S. Huberti* (Luxembourg 1621) 118;153.

letter from David. ‘I was so happy when I saw that there was a letter from your hand! It was only a pity that I could not get it out of the real hand of this noble young man!’ He was also bitter: ‘These scoundrels and pettifoggers took you and your own from me, or worse: they took me from me and my own’. He realised that their farewell would be forever. ‘Greetings, my very good friend, whom I will not stop loving and whom I have had the privilege to love’.<sup>110</sup> The farewell is heart-breaking but definite.

What this chapter has shown, is that two networks that were extremely important in Marcellus’ early life and for the start of his career, were completely cut off because of his conversion. The connection to the family-, refugee-, business-, and news network of his former patron Antoine l’Empereur, including the high-level contacts and the friendship of David Le Leu de Wilhem, was not available anymore, because Marcellus separated from this network in conflict. From his scientific work including his connections with Burggravius he had taken distance openly and actively himself. At the same time, Marcellus actively prepared the ground to be able to participate successfully in new Catholic networks. Old Zutphen Catholic connections supported him in this. Thomas van Buerlo, a Zutphen nobleman in whose house (clandestine) Catholic masses were celebrated and who maintained Jesuit contacts, helped to sell Marcellus’ house and to arrange his matters when Marcellus ultimately left Zutphen for the Empire.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> Franckheim to David le Leu de Wilhem, 17 September 1616.

<sup>111</sup> Doornink-Hoogenraad, ‘Een Zutphense Rector’, 90.

## The Habsburg Connection: serving the House of Austria

### 5. Ensuring Crowns: with Ferdinand in Bohemia and Hungary

Sources which can inform us about Marcellus Franckheim's activities at the Habsburg Imperial Court under Cardinal Khlesl are extremely scarce. About the path or people through which he arrived at court at all, we have virtually no information. In his *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* of 1649, Aubertus Miraeus relates about 'Marcellus Franckemius' that Cardinal Khlesl noted him because of his *doctrina et industria*, (theological) learning and diligence, and made him *secretis atque Epistolis*, secretary and scribe.<sup>112</sup> Cardinal Khlesl (1552-1630) was head of Emperor Matthias' Privy Council and in fact steered and determined the Emperors' policy.<sup>113</sup> According to Miraeus, under 'increasingly difficult circumstances' Marcellus had made himself useful in the process of the election and coronation of Ferdinand as King of Hungary (1 July 1618 in Bratislava (Pressburg)). Also, he immersed himself in '*rebus Bohemicus*' when Frederick V had taken over the throne of Bohemia (4 November 1619). Miraeus further noted that Marcellus wrote about this himself in the *Fides Bohemo-Palatino*, published under pseudonym in Vienna in 1620.

Indeed, in his letter to the reader of the *Fides Bohemo-Palatino*, Marcellus indicated that he had been two years at the court of Matthias in Prague and Vienna and that he had witnessed both the coronations in Bohemia and Hungary.<sup>114</sup> This means that in any case by June 1617 he was in Prague as Ferdinand was elected on the 6<sup>th</sup> and crowned on the 29<sup>th</sup> of that month. Matthias died 20 March 1619, so if Marcellus had assumed his task at the court two years before, this would have been at the beginning of 1617. This would fit with the information we already have: he wrote his *Abdicatio* to Arnold toe Boecop in October 1616 while he was still in Zutphen.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Miraeus, 'Marcellus Franckemius', 239. 'Doctrine' could mean learning as well as theological doctrine.

<sup>113</sup> See for Khlesl's policies in this period e.g. P. H. Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy. A History of the Thirty Years War* (London 2009) 242-245; 274-275; A recent assessment of his overall activities, including those in the Austrian Counter-Reformation is given by R. Johnston, H. Louthan and T. Ó Hánracháin 'Catholic Reformers: Stanislas Hosius, Melchior Khlesl, and Péter Pázmány' in: H. Louthan and G. Murdock ed., *A Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe* (Leiden 2015) 195-222; For a nineteenth century comprehensive overview see J. Hammer-Purgstall, *Khlesl's, des Cardinals, Directors des geheimen Cabinets Kaisers Mathias, Leben: Mit der Sammlung von Khlesl's Briefen, Staatsschreiben, Vorträgen, Gutachten, Decreten, Patenten, Denkworteln und anderen Urkunden* (Vienna 1847).

<sup>114</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 1.

<sup>115</sup> *Abdicatio*, 164.

Clear is that Marcellus arrived at the Imperial court at an extremely turbulent time, while the period of Marcellus' stay at court was further marked with the transition of the reign from Matthias (1612-1619) to Ferdinand II (1619-1637) as Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. The process of the election of Ferdinand, first as king of Bohemia and Hungary and later as Emperor, was itself one of the sources of unrest in the Bohemian lands. The Protestant estates feared that if Ferdinand would become King and Emperor, this would hamper their privileges and form a serious threat to their faith. Similar resistance existed in Hungary. Though in the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* Marcellus stays silent about his own activities for Khlesl regarding Ferdinand's coronations he mentions Khlesl once, in the context of his defence of Ferdinand II against accusations of the Bohemian estates. Marcellus states here that a lot of their accusations against Ferdinand were unfair, because most of the policies mentioned had been the doing of Rudolf II, Matthias and Khlesl instead.<sup>116</sup> His assessment of Khlesl starts with 'He who would like to describe the life of this Cardinal would need to construct tenfold volumes of Livius'. What follows is a not a too positive assessment 'then we will see and bemoan what Emperor Ferdinand and the House of Austria had to digest that this man had wreaked with his arts.'<sup>117</sup> Whether this assessment reflected Marcellus' opinion about his employer in 1617 and 1618 or whether he just thought it opportune to make quite clear where he stood in 1620 cannot be determined.

Marcellus' assessment from Khlesl fits with the fact that from 1615 on, there had been increasing friction between Khlesl and Ferdinand and especially Ferdinand's cousin Archduke Maximilian of Tyrol (1558-1618), which would eventually lead to Khlesl's downfall in 1618.<sup>118</sup> Khlesl, who also had to negotiate with the Turks to regulate the Turkish-Hungarian border, had turned to follow a policy of reconciliation towards the Protestant princes in the Empire. Ferdinand and his cousin did not agree with this strategy. In general, they found that Khlesl was far too influential and was holding up ongoing negotiations with Spain around the imperial succession.<sup>119</sup> Nevertheless, eventually Ferdinand would follow Khlesl's advice to ensure the Bohemian estates that he would acknowledge the so-called letter of Majesty (issued in 1609 by Emperor Rudolf II and guaranteeing religious freedom). This earned him the

---

<sup>116</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 154-158.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibidem*, 155

<sup>118</sup> R. Bireley, *Ferdinand II, Counter-Reformation emperor, 1578-1637* (New York 2014) 75-80.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibidem* 80- 82.

Bohemian Crown in 1617.<sup>120</sup> The next step would be to ensure the Hungarian crown for the house of Austria too.

A very important role in the election of Ferdinand as king of Hungary was played by the Archbishop of Esztergom (Gran), the Hungarian Primate Péter Pázmány, mentioned in Marcellus' *Expeditio*.<sup>121</sup> Péter Pázmány, who was born Protestant but had converted very young and had entered the Society of Jesus at the age of seventeen, was on very good terms both with Khlesl and with Pope Paul V. Both had supported his appointment as Archbishop in September 1616. The main reason for this appointment had been the potentially decisive role he could play in the election of Ferdinand as King of Hungary. The Roman Curia expected that Pázmány could ensure the vote of the Hungarian Diet for Ferdinand and that this would be a major guarantee to eventually keep the Holy Roman Empire under Habsburg rule and (thus) under firm Catholic reign.<sup>122</sup>

Unfortunately, direct information on the relation between Pázmány and Marcellus is unavailable. The fact that Péter Pázmány held a version of Marcellus' manuscript of the *Expeditio* could tell various things. For example, that Marcellus must have been on good terms with Péter Pázmány because otherwise he would not have left his manuscript in his custody. Or that Marcellus, or someone else had sent it to read by way of recommendation of Marcellus in order to pave the way for other opportunities. In either case it is quite likely that Péter Pázmány and Marcellus knew each other and that the former was familiar with the content of the *Expeditio*. If he did, he would have appreciated its content because he was a famous anti-Protestant polemist himself, praised for his rhetoric skills. Also, he favoured a Counter-Reformation policy of persuasion and discussion.<sup>123</sup>

In the correspondence of Pázmány, Marcellus is mentioned once, and this gives at least a suggestion with regard to the nature of Marcellus' activities for Khlesl. He features in a letter from Thomas Balásfy, Bishop of Bosnia, to Pázmány dated 22 July 1617 Prague, a few weeks

---

<sup>120</sup> Ibidem, 86.

<sup>121</sup> Johnston, Louthan and Ó Hánracháin 'Catholic Reformers', 195-222.

<sup>122</sup> P. Tusor, *Pázmány, the Jesuit Prelate. His Appointment as Primate of Hungary, 1615–1616 (A Micropolitical Study)* (Budapest 2016) 448-456; P. Tusor, 'Dynastic Politics, Diplomacy and the Catholic Church: Péter Pázmány's 1616 Appointment as Archbishop of Esztergom' in: S. Brzeziński and Á. Zarnóckied ed., *A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541-1699 2 – Diplomacy, Information Flow and Cultural Exchange* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2014) 149-182.

<sup>123</sup> Johnston, Louthan and Ó Hánracháin 'Catholic Reformers', 195-222.

after de coronation.<sup>124</sup> In the letter Balásfy relates that he has had an audience with the Emperor as well as with King Ferdinand, who asked to greet Pázmány from him. However, Balásfy was to have more meetings: ‘Yesterday I had breakfast with his Serene highness, together with Slavata, Neacsanzki and the secretary of the Bohemian Court Chancellery, and after that, following the Cardinal’s wish, I disputed about two hours with Dr Garthius, in the house of this doctor, in the presence of Doctor Marcel Franken, sent by the Cardinal, [and of] D. Ferenczffy and D. Georgius Hoffmann.’<sup>125</sup> This is interesting information, because it indicates that Marcellus, as *secretis atque Epistolis* was not just sharpening quills, but was sent to meetings on Khlesl’s behalf. In this case his mission was to take part in a dispute with the Lutheran pastor Dr. Helvicus Garthius (1597-1619). Garthius also served as kind of mediator for the Protestant estates and would have more disputes with the Jesuits in Prague.<sup>126</sup> Laurentius Ferencffy or Ferenczffy was secretary of the Hungarian Court Chancellery and Georg Hoffmann was a Transylvanian nobleman at the Habsburg court who regularly went on diplomatic mission.<sup>127</sup> Apparently, Marcellus moved in these circles as an equal. Unfortunately, Balásfy gives no information on the content of the dispute, which could have been of theological, but as well of a more strategical nature, for example concerning the Habsburg policy towards religious freedom.

I could not verify whether Marcellus was ‘*Il segretario del signor cardinal Clesleio*’ who negotiated in September 1617 with the internuncial Alessandro Vasoli about assistance to the Emperor to settle the issues with the estates in the Hungarian diet.<sup>128</sup> Though for now

---

<sup>124</sup> Thomas Balásfy to Péter Pázmány, 22 July 1617, in: V. Franknói ed. *Pázmány Péter Levelezese 1605-1625: IA,19* (Budapest 1873) 103.

<sup>125</sup> ‘*Heri apud Illustritatem suam pransus sum, cum Illmis Dominis Slavata, Neacsanzki, et supremo Bohemiae Secretario, postquam cum Doctore Garthio, in eiusdem Doctoris aedibus, horis circiter duabus disputaveram, praesentibus Domino Doctore Marcello Frankeo ab Illmo D. Cardinali submisso, Generoso Domino Ferenczffy et D. Georgio Hoffmann, quo ex voluntate D. Cardinalis profectus furam*’

<sup>126</sup> H. Garthius, *Acta et post-acta colloquii Pragensis de missa: das ist Gründlicher Bericht und Antwort vom Colloquio zu Prag von der Meß, zwischen D. Garthio und zweyen Jesuiten P. Kolovvrat und P. Fanino gehalten* (Wittenberg 1618).

<sup>127</sup> F. Federmayer, ‘Laurentius Ferencffy, der Sekretär der Ungarischen Hofkanzlei und seine Familie,’ in: A. Fundárková et al., *Die weltliche und Kirchliche Elite aus dem Königreich Böhmen und Königreich Ungarn am Wiener Kaiserhof im 16.–17. Jahrhundert* (Vienna 2013) 125-146; J. Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches: Bd. 1520-1623* (Budapest 1840), 700.

<sup>128</sup> ‘*Il segretario del signor cardinal Clesleio la settimana passata con occasione di trattar con l’auditore Vasoli della dieta d’Vngaria dopo haver con un lungo discorso rappresentato la necessità, che haveva sua maestà Cesarea di assistere a quella dieta armata per poter terminarla con sua soddisfazione et con tenere in officio la petulanza di quei signori Vngari.*’ Ascanio Gesualdo to Scipione Borghese, 2 October 1617 ASV Fondo Borghese, serie II, vol. 168. Cited in Tumor, *Pázmány*, 290 note 861. Proof for this would ask for an investigation in the Archive of the ASV Fondo Borghese. Cf. Tumor ‘Dynastic Politics’, 178 note 116.

Marcellus' role thus must remain unknown, it is a fact that the vote of the Hungarian diet was won, indeed with the help Pázmány, and that the Coronation of Ferdinand as King of Hungary eventually did take place, albeit delayed by the growing unrest in Bohemia.<sup>129</sup> On 23 May 1618, just a few days after the proclamation of Ferdinand as King of Hungary, the two imperial governors Jaroslav Martinitz and Vilém Slavata together with the Chancellery secretary Filip Fabricius, thus the same with whom Balásfy had had breakfast the day that he met with Marcellus, would be thrown out of a window in Prague. This event, which would become known as the second defenestration of Prague, is generally considered to be the start of the Thirty Years War (1618-1648).<sup>130</sup>

#### 6. *Confirming Ferdinand's Hungarian Crown: Coronation Carmina*

In the end, Ferdinand's Coronation place on July 1 in Bratislava (Pressburg). Marcellus was present and at the same day would write a 'Carmina', a praise 'song' or poem to Ferdinand, which is preserved in the Correspondence of the imperial librarian Sebastian Tengnagel. Tengnagel noted on the manuscript '*Carmina D. Marcelli Franckheimii in inaugurationien Pannonicam Regie Ferdinandi*'. The song is a classical praise poem, fifty-four verses long, written on two pages. It stands in the tradition of Habsburg panegyric poetry which was written for specific occasions in the life-cycle of a prince and his reign, like birth, baptises, marriages, funerals, coronations and other festivities and ceremonies at court.<sup>131</sup> As such, like many other forms of art, panegyric poetry played a role in the wider propaganda for a prince and the legitimization of his rule.<sup>132</sup> As literary genre at the Habsburg court it knew its heydays in the seventeenth and eighteenth century and included longer epic and heroic verses but also shorter poems such as Marcellus' *Carmina* or emblems, pictures with a motto or set of verses intended as a moral lesson. Typically, coronation panegyric would combine classical literal tradition, for example referring to Virgil or comparing the Habsburgs with Trojans, with references to Habsburg genealogy (referring to famous fathers and grandfathers) and Habsburg virtues (like *pietas* and *iustitia*).

---

<sup>129</sup> Bireley, *Ferdinand II*, 88.

<sup>130</sup> P. H. Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy. A History of the Thirty Years War* (London 2009) 269-278.

<sup>131</sup> S. Reisner, 'Die poetische Habsburg-Panegyrik in lateinischer Sprache als historische Quelle' in: J. Pauser, M. Scheut and T. Winkelbauer ed., *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16.–18. Jahrhundert)* (Vienna 2004) 898–915; 900.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibidem*, 898; J. Hone, *Literature and Party Politics at the Accession of Queen Anne* (Oxford 2017) 70.

Marcellus' *Carmina* starts with an address of eight verses to the Virgin Mary as patroness of the Hungarian crown (*D. Virgini Matri Hungaria Coronato Tutrici*). Then Marcellus presents in three more sets of eight verses Ferdinand as a peace bringer, carrying the olive branch (*Ferdinandus sacro dum prodit lotus olivo*) and as a new light that will shine upon the earth (*Rex novus is mundi iam novus Lampas erit*). Ferdinand will be Austria's sun (*Rex iste heroum sol erit Austriadum*) and as ruler of Austria the whole world will love him (*Austriade Princeps totius orbis amor*). Marcellus also seems to anticipate on Ferdinand's inauguration as Emperor: 'the old Rome will rise again' (*Roma resurge vetus*). He furthermore hints to Ferdinand's ancestors whose virtues as well as their decorations and titles will unite in him (*Unius in Ferdinandi animo spectamus avorum et virtus et decora et tituli*) This could mean to include the crown and title of Emperor.

Marcellus' *Carmina* was never published. Whether Ferdinand ever saw or heard the poem, cannot be verified. Among all festivities, banquets, plays, coronation masses, ornamented halls and other artful expressions to honour the new King at the coronation day, this can have been a private expression of joy and high expectations, penned down at a silent moment in a corner. But it could as well be one of many copies that Marcellus had made and handed out to be recited at an opportune moment that day. This would then be a surviving copy that was saved because Tegnagel took it home from the party. In that case the *Carmina* could easily have served to advertise Marcellus' own devotion and support to the new ruler, not only with Ferdinand but also with all other present guests who potentially could be of help in ensuring his position at court.

An advertisement of Marcellus devotion to Ferdinand in one form or the other in any case was opportune because Cardinal Khlesl was definitely going to be out of favour. On the banquet of the coronation there even had been an attempt to assassinate him. A few days upon returning to Vienna, Ferdinand and Archduke Maximilian proceeded to remove Cardinal Khlesl from court. He was arrested on July 20 and taken to a castle in Tyrol. From there he was brought to Rome. He would not return to Vienna for many years.<sup>133</sup> Thus, Marcellus had lost his job as secretary. Whether it was thanks to the *Carmina* or not, in one way or another Marcellus indeed managed to keep contact at court, because a year later he was travelling through Europe with Don Matthias of Austria, legitimated bastard son of former Emperor Rudolf II, as I will show in chapter eight.

---

<sup>133</sup> Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy*, 274-275.

## 7. Defending Ferdinand's Bohemian Crown: *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*

Before turning to Marcellus' adventures with Don Matthias, I will first present another advertisement of his devotion to Ferdinand II, which is more down to earth than the *Carmina* and back to reality and the politics of the day. The *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* (Vienna 1620), in full *Fides Bohemo-Palatina: pro Ferdinando II. Austriaco etc. contra Friderici Comitis Palatini &c. declarationem publicam: cur regni Bohemiae, annexarumque prouinciarum regimen in se susceperit* (Bohemian-Palatine Trustworthiness: in favour of Ferdinand II and against Count-Palatine Frederick's declaration why he took up the crown of Bohemia and the rule of its incorporated territories), can be viewed as part of the many pamphlets, books and other publications and counter-publications that saw the light all around Europe following the troubles in Bohemia and the ascension to the throne by Frederick V on 4 November 1619. The *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* is a direct reaction to a declaration issued by Frederick V at 7 November 1619, immediately following his coronation.<sup>134</sup> This can be derived from the title and from what Marcellus writes himself in the letter to the reader: 'When after my travels in Belgium, Spain and France I had returned to Germany, I received from a man of old faith and virtue a booklet to read, called *Friderici dei gratia Bohemiae regis, comitis palatini rheni, electoris &c. declaratio publica, Cur Regni Bohemiae annexarumque Provinciarum Regimen in se susceperit, 1619*'.<sup>135</sup> The author of this declaration was Ludwig Camerarius (1573-1651), head of the Elector's Palatine privy council of and one of the people who inspired Frederick to aim for the throne in Bohemia.<sup>136</sup> In the declaration Camerarius formulated why Ferdinand had a right to the Bohemian crown. The booklet was issued in several languages and invoked a variety of reactions and counter-reactions.<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> L. Camerarius, *Unser Friederichs von Gottes Gnaden Königs in Böheimb Pfaltzgraven bey Rhein und Churfürsten etc. Offen Außschreiben Warumb Wir die Cron Böheimb und der incorporirten Länder Regierung auff Uns genommen* (Prague 1619). See for a modern edition for this declaration in English: T. Helfferich (ed.) 'Declaration of Elector Frederick V of the Palatinate (November 7, 1619): Frederick, by the grace of God king in Bohemia, count Palatine of the Rhine and elector etc.; our candid announcement of why we took up the crown of Bohemia and the rule of its incorporated territories' in: Idem, *The Thirty Years War: A Documentary History* (Indianapolis 2009) 31-38.

<sup>135</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 1.

<sup>136</sup> F.H. Schubert, 'Camerarius, Ludwig', in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 3 (1957), 105-107 [Online-Version]; URL: <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118666754.html#ndbcontent>

<sup>137</sup> J.H. Gebauer, *Die Publicistik über den böhmischen Aufstand von 1618* (Halle 1892); K. Nolden, *Die Reichspolitik Kaiser Ferdinands II in der Publizistik bis zum Lübecker Frieden 1629* (Cologne 1958).

Though modern historiography and the nineteenth century overviews of pamphlets on the Bohemian Revolt do not refer to the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, from contemporary sources it can be inferred that it was one of the earlier accounts written from a Habsburg perspective from which the European public could draw information about what was going on in Bohemia. For example, a reference to the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* can be found in the 1621 *Anhaltische geheimbe Cantzley*.<sup>138</sup> The *Anhaltische geheimbe Cantzley* can be seen as an early modern version of WikiLeaks because it made public a selection of papers, memoranda and correspondence found in the administration of Christian of Anhalt, Frederick V's Palatine chancellor and leader of the Bohemian campaign. Anhalt's administration had been seized by the troops of Maximilian of Bayern after the battle of the White Mountain, and in the eyes of the Catholic camp contained incriminating information, 'Beweise für enormia crimina', which would prove the Protestant camp treacherous.<sup>139</sup>

The *Anhaltische geheimbe Cantzley* presented a letter from Achatius von Dohna to the Palatine Privy Councillor Georg Lingelsheim. In this letter, von Dohna, who at the time acted as Frederick's ambassador at the Stuart court, had written on 8 June 1620 from London, that 'we only get rarely information on what is going on in Germany [...] [while] 'it would greatly enlighten and instruct the Embassy which has to be sent from England into Germany and which I have to report on to the Governor in Heidelberg [Christian von Anhalt] these weeks. In London everything is perplexed and confused so that it is difficult to decide on the right course. In London one spreads all kinds of publications, sent from Vienna and Brussels, for example the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* and others.'<sup>140</sup> This quote tells us that the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* circulated in Europe with considerable speed because the *Fides* was printed in Vienna in February 1620, while at the beginning of June of the same year already some exemplars had reached London and were commented upon. Apparently, at that time in London, there was not much available from the perspective of Frederick or the Bohemian Protestant estates, because Dohna grudgingly added 'it is high time for a publication on the justification of the Bohemian

---

<sup>138</sup> *Fürstliche Anhaltische geheimbe Cantzley etc.* (s.t 1621) 299; M. Londorp, *Acta Publica: Das ist, Der Römischen Keyserlichen Majestät, Matthiae, hochlöblichsten Andenckens, und der jetzo Regierender Keys. Majestät Ferdinandi Secundi 1 (1617-1629)* (Frankfurt 1629) 265.

<sup>139</sup> The publication would lead to the so called 'Kanzleistreit'. See W. Baumgart, *Quellenkunde zur deutschen Geschichte der Neuzeit von 1500 bis zur Gegenwart* (Leiden 2018) 277; P. Schmidt, *Spanische Universalmonarchie oder "teutsche Libertet": das Spanische Imperium in der Propaganda des Dreissigjährigen Krieges* (Stuttgart 2001) 56. The quote of the 'Beweise für enormia crimina' can be found in A. Petersen, *Über die Bedeutung der Flugschrift, "die anhaltische Kanzlei" vom Jahre 1621* (Jena 1867).

<sup>140</sup> *Gehaimbe Cantzley*, 299.

claims and for other replies.’<sup>141</sup> Indeed, Dohna had already been encouraging anti-Habsburg publications, involving in Palatine propaganda for example the British diplomat Thomas Roe, who favoured the cause of Elisabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia.<sup>142</sup> There are some indications that in later centuries the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* was considered a noteworthy source as well. For example, the German jurist and historian Nikolaus Gundling (1671-1729), one of the first to outline a German Imperial History (*Abriss zu einer rechten Reichs-historie* 1707), and famous for his lectures at the University of Halle on this topic, referred to the *Fides* as a useful reading on the Bohemian events from an Habsburg-perspective.<sup>143</sup>

Marcellus composed the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* as a series of statements representing the view of ‘Bohemian Palatine Trustworthiness’ (*Fides Bohemo-Palatina*) which are each refuted in an *Elenchus*, a refutation or critical comment. *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* refers, as Marcellus explains himself, to *Fides Punica* (Cartagonese trustworthiness) - meaning in fact untrustworthiness or even treachery.<sup>144</sup> To the dialogue Marcellus appended his Latin translation of another document, the edict of Ferdinand II annulling the Bohemian election, which had been issued by Ferdinand just a few weeks before the publication of the *Fides*.<sup>145</sup> In the text the lines of *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* are mostly reduced to citing parts of Frederick V’s (Camerarius’) declaration, giving a punch line for the *Elenchus*, which cites from more sources and inserting considerable parts of other public documents in his argument. For example, Marcellus lets *Elenchus* quote from the *Apologia* of the Bohemian estates justifying the defenestration of the Habsburg officials in Prague (issued 25 May 1619), as well as from Emperor Matthias’ reaction dated a few days later.<sup>146</sup> In his letter to the reader, Marcellus explains why he uses these documents. First he notes that the person who handed him Frederick

---

<sup>141</sup> *Gehaimbe Cantzley*, 299.

<sup>142</sup> N. Akkerman, *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia: 1603-1631 I* (Oxford 2015) 247.

<sup>143</sup> N.H. Gundling, *Abriss zu einer rechten Reichs-historie* (Halle 1707), 354; A. Bock, *Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling 1671–1729 und sein „Entwurf einer Teutschen Reichs-Historie“* PhD-thesis (Düsseldorf 2005).

<sup>144</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 1.

<sup>145</sup> *Der Röm. Käy. May. Ferdinandi II. Edictal Cassation und Anullation, mit angeheffter Protestation, wider die angemassste Neue nichtige Wahl vnd Crönung in Böhem etc.* (Vienna 1620). Marcellus’ latin translation in the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 163-178. See for a modern edition in English: Ed T. Helfferich (ed.), ‘Edict of Ferdinand II Annulling the Bohemian Election (January 29, 1620)’ in: *The Thirty Years War: A Documentary History* (Indianapolis 2009) 39-46.

<sup>146</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 9-12. Marcellus’ version is his own Latin translation from a German version by Pavel Michna, based on the Bohemian original. For and English version see T. Helfferich (ed.), ‘Apology of the Bohemian Estates (May 25, 1618) in: *The Thirty Years War*, 20-30; Marcellus quotes Matthias’ answer in the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 18-23. See for a translation in modern English P. H. Wilson, ‘Emperor Matthias’ Open Letter to the Bohemians, May 1618’ in: *The Thirty Years War: A Sourcebook* (New York 2010) 40-41. Based on Londorp *Acta Publica* II, 445.

V's Declaration had done so 'because he knew that I had been at Matthias' Court in Prague and in Vienna for two years and had been present at the coronation in Bohemia and Hungary of Emperor Ferdinand II'.<sup>147</sup> For this reason Marcellus would be well-equipped to write something on the Bohemian issue. However, Marcellus adds 'because nobody, when he wants to remain true to the cause, can tell so much from memory, [upon my return] I added several public documents which I had carried in my knapsack'.<sup>148</sup> That he would indeed have had all these documents in his knapsack is improbable, but the formulation indicates that he had easily access to them and was considered to be near the fire. The book was printed by the Viennese printer Gregor Gelbhaar.<sup>149</sup> Though not yet official Habsburg court printer, which he would eventually become in 1624, in 1620 Gelbhaar also printed Emperor Ferdinand II's declarations.<sup>150</sup> Gelbhaar is not mentioned on the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, but that the book came from his presses can be inferred from the kind of types that have been used.<sup>151</sup>

Because of Marcellus' choice for a text form of statement-and-refutation larded with official documents, the text did not take the shape of an eye-witness account. Obviously, this had not been Marcellus' intent. However, it means that the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* does not allow for much insight into Marcellus' own role in the events. Nevertheless, even without a thorough analysis of the text, which would have been beyond the scope of this thesis, Marcellus' stand in the events is clear from page one. He defends the Habsburg position and the goal of his publication obviously is to promote Ferdinand's cause. Next to the title, also the choice of his pseudonym 'Valentinus Caesarius Austriacus' sets the stage for a pro-Habsburg account. What is also clear, is that he is very well informed about all events and the people involved. The reason why he writes under pseudonym is less clear, though it is in line with the fact that the dedication letter is also kept 'neutral': the book is dedicated to 'the European Catholics, Emperors, Kings, Electors, Dukes, Princes: all dynasties'.

From the *Carmina* and the *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* Marcellus' urge to express himself favourable about Ferdinand II is quite clear and there is no reason to assume that Marcellus is

---

<sup>147</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, 1.

<sup>148</sup> *Fides Bohemo-Palatina*, x

<sup>149</sup> A. Mayer, *Wiens Buchdrucker-Geschichte 1482-1882* (Vienna 1883) 203.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibidem*, 203.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibidem*, 200.

not genuine in his expression. The *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* can be seen as an attempt to influence European opinion about Ferdinand's claims and is consistent with his assumption in the *Expeditio* that Ferdinand will be able to accomplish unity in European Christianity again. The fact that in 1620 Marcellus published an *oratio* (the *Expeditio*) about his theological views that he had originally written in 1616, proves that through these four years he stayed consistent in his faith as well.

However, who had been his main patrons throughout these years becomes less clear from these sources as we only have the names of Khlesl, Pázmány, Balásfy, Sebastian Tengenagel and Archbishop Schweickard from Mainz. The same counts for the nature of his work for Khlesl and the way Marcellus came into contact with him. Cultural historian Willem Frijhoff suggests a connection with Mainz, on the basis that Marcellus old friend Arnold to Boecop, was studying there.<sup>152</sup> The dedication of the *Expeditio* to the Elector of Mainz suggests a relation with Mainz as well. However, if indeed Marcellus came to work for Khlesl through the Elector of Mainz, then that would have been rather to prevent any longer delay in the elections for the Bohemian and Hungarian crowns. Which means that he would have supported the archdukes Ferdinand's and Maximilian's policies rather than Khlesl's. For at the end of October 1616, the Elector of Mainz had already agreed with Archduke Maximilian that it was necessary to remove Khlesl from court and had consented to seek support from Pope Paul V.<sup>153</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup> Frijhoff, 'Sint Justus' hoofd', 290.

<sup>153</sup> A. Gindeley, *Geschichte de Böhmisches Aufstands von 1618* 1 (Prague 1869) 43-44.

## The European connection: in defence of the Catholic Church

### 8. *The Military order of the Militia Christiana*

In the letter to the reader of the *Fides-Bohemo Palatina* Marcellus mentions that he had started to write the book upon his return from an itinerary to the (Southern) Netherlands, France, Spain and the German lands. This is confirmed by three letters of ‘Marcellus Francheimus’ in the correspondence of the imperial librarian Sebastian Tegnagel that are kept in the Austrian National Library. Sebastian Tegnagel (1563-1636) was imperial librarian in Vienna from 1606 to 1636. He was known and highly esteemed for his knowledge and private collection of manuscripts and books on oriental languages and history. Furthermore, like his predecessor Hugo Blotius, he was an important node in the Republic of Letters and corresponded with scholars all over Europe.<sup>154</sup> Most of this correspondence, kept in the *Commercium Litterarum*, concerns either the acquisition of books for the library, the lending of books to other scholars, the content of the books, or scholarly and practical discussions with regard to translations of texts and research on for example oriental languages and church history. The letters discussed here are of a different character because they concern the actual political situation at that moment. Interestingly, and in spite of what the library catalogue suggests, on closer inspection two of the three letters actually turn out not to be directed to Sebastian Tegnagel, but to his cousin Franz Gansneb Tegnagel.<sup>155</sup>

One of these letters was written from Caramanzel, near Madrid dated 8 October 1619, while Marcellus was ‘waiting for the king’.<sup>156</sup> The other letter was written from Mainz, dated 12 March 1620, and accompanied by the letter to Sebastian himself, dated the same day. Franz Gansneb Tegnagel (1576-1622) originated like Marcellus from the Dutch province of Gelderland. He came from a noble family whose members for example had held the office of burgomaster. His father Otto Gansneb Tegnagel was a military officer who around 1615 commanded the Dutch garrison in Zutphen. Franz Gansneb Tegnagel is now mostly known as the assistant and son-in-law of Tycho Brahe who took care of Brahe’s intellectual heritage. Like Adriaan Metius, Tegnagel studied in Franeker and worked with Brahe at the Uranienburg.

---

<sup>154</sup> J. Stummvoll, *Geschichte der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek I. Die Hofbibliothek (1368-1922)* (Vienna 1968) 139-145; Wien lexicon ‘Sebastian Tegnagel’ <https://www.digital.wienbibliothek.at/wbrobv/content/pageview/1116002>

<sup>155</sup> The literature is rather ambiguous about the family relationship between Sebastian Tegnagel and Franz Gansneb Tegnagel. Stummvoll suggests that their grandfathers were brothers. Stummvol, *Geschichte*, 130.

<sup>156</sup> According to the library catalogue, the letter is dated 3 October, but Marcellus himself dates the letter with 8 October.

In 1599 Tegnagel followed Brahe to the court of Emperor Rudolf II in Prague, where he worked with Kepler on the publication of the *Tabularia Rudolphina*, an inventory of the movement of planets for which Tycho Brahe had collected the data. Furthermore, Tegnagel also had negotiated for Kepler to come to the court of Emperor Rudolf II in Prague.<sup>157</sup> In 1601, Kepler became Brahe's successor as court mathematicus and in 1609 Tegnagel wrote the foreword for Kepler's *Astronomia Nova*, Kepler's most important astronomical work in which he shows that the planets move along an elliptic path around the sun and change speed during their course.

Much less visible in modern historiography are Franz Gansneb Tegnagel's diplomatic efforts for the Habsburgs in for example the conflicts in the Julich-Cleves crisis (1609-1610) and in the Habsburger *Bruderzwist* (1606-1611). From 1604 Tegnagel had been councillor to Rudolf II who valued him very much because of his astronomical and astrological work but also because of his diplomatic talents.<sup>158</sup> From 1608 to 1620 he was chancellor and privy councillor to Archduke Leopold (1586-1632) in Passau for whom he went on many missions, ranging from France and Spain to England and Poland, and in 1620 he was made privy councillor to Ferdinand II.<sup>159</sup> The Julich-Cleves crisis concerned the succession of the (Catholic) ruler of the strategically important territories of the combined duchies of Julich-Cleves and Berg, the right to which was claimed by Protestant princes. In 1610 Tegnagel rode up to Julich with Archduke Leopold in order to secure the keys of its fortress for the Habsburgs. He negotiated for Leopold with Henry IV in Paris concerning the King's neutrality in the Julich-Cleves matter and also discussed strategy with the Spanish King.<sup>160</sup> The *Bruderzwist* concerned the conflict between Emperor Rudolf II and his brother Matthias over the rule of Hungary and Bohemia and ended with Archduke Leopold's (failed) invasion of Prague in 1611 where the Protestant estates had taken the side of Matthias. Tegnagel was taken prisoner and tortured by the Protestant estates.<sup>161</sup> The imperial electors took up this attack on an imperial envoy as such a serious matter, that they issued a statement of disapproval at the Regensburg diet of 1613. The hardships of prison and torture caused Tegnagel health problems for the rest

---

<sup>157</sup> J. R. Christianson, *On Tycho's Island: Tycho Brahe and His Assistants 1570-1601* (Cambridge 2000).

<sup>158</sup> F. Stieve, *Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges in den Zeiten des vorwaltenden Einflusses der Wittelsbacher 7. Von der Abreise Erzherzog Leopolds nach Jülich bis zu den Werbungen Herzog Maximilians von Bayern im März 1610* (Munich, 1870), 396.

<sup>159</sup> Christianson, *On Tycho's Island*, 370.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>161</sup> C. Pecho, *Fürstbischof - Putschist - Landesherr: Erzherzog Leopolds Herrschaftsentwürfe im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Münster 2017) 138-148; 227-271.

of his life. Also, he would spend a lot of time, effort and letters to get compensation for his suffering and to get the instruments for Brahe and the expenses of his diplomatic missions refunded.<sup>162</sup>

How Marcellus got to know Franz Gansneb Tengnagel and whether they ever met before Marcellus came to the Habsburg court remains unclear.<sup>163</sup> In the letters, Marcellus addresses Tengnagel as a patron. Both letters are addressed with 'Patrone' and Marcellus was on a mission for Franz and had to report on this mission. As I will argue below this mission concerned the Military Order of the Militia Christiana for which Marcellus, together with Don Matthias of Austria, one of the bastard sons of the former Emperor Rudolf II, had to recruit new members.

The letters are directed to Vienna because at that time Archduke Leopold was governor while Ferdinand II was on tour through Germany after the Imperial Coronation in August 1619. In the first letter to Franz, sent 8 October 1619 from Caramanzel, Marcellus seems to be on his guard and does not seem to feel free to speak openly or to mention names. In this letter, the whole mission stays obscure and there are not many anchor points even to be able to sketch the context. The second letter was written at a moment that the mission already had ended ('now I have safely returned to Germany from Spain'). Because Marcellus repeats here part of what he had told in the first letter 'in case the former letter has been lost' and because he mentions much more names, with the help of some other sources it has been possible to reconstruct the purpose of the mission and to identify the people involved.<sup>164</sup>

Marcellus starts the first letter with mentioning that he had wanted to write before. Why he was not able to do so 'I do not dare to trust to paper, and if I could, I would rather not be open about it, because it is a cause unpleasant for you and un hoped for and highly disagreeably with me'. His mission was not running smoothly and, as will become apparent below, he was frustrated by his travel companion whose name he does not mention. Their itinerary had brought them to Bavaria and to Besançon in France-Comté. Marcellus mentions an 'order', and letters related to this order which had to be delivered. At the Bavarian court 'the order had been mentioned just once; which was the first time and also the last'. In Besançon, 'All letters which had to be sent to the nobles of the empire have been left or got lost'. Apparently, Marcellus'

---

<sup>162</sup> Ibidem, 293-294.

<sup>163</sup> I could not find proof for a connection via Tengnagel's father Otto in Zutphen or Adriaan Metius' natural philosophers' network.

<sup>164</sup> Franckheim to F.G. Tengnagel, 12 May 2020.

travel companion had already given up the order in Besançon. ‘I admit that I do not know what he has done with the insignia of the order, the cross which he received while swearing the oath on the holy scripture. He might just have taken it off and left it [with his sister] or maybe he has thrown it away. But this I do know, that he left [the order] in his sister’s hands and that he reproaches me for persuading him to take the order upon him’. Clearly, Marcellus did not approve of his companion who never had been committed to the order in the first place: ‘he has accused and blamed me for it more than once, that it was my doing and that I persuaded him to take the Militia upon him.’ and ‘He utters such vain things and fallacies that they are even too shameful to mention’. Also ‘he makes whatever promises and statements and gives words of honour as plentiful as leaves in autumn.’ Furthermore, from his companion’s entourage Marcellus did not hold much either because ‘it has little of virtue or honesty’. Marcellus had done everything for the order which was in his power but would ‘embrace any other assignment’. He did not want to stay with his travel companion because ‘I’m not that vile and my soul is not that cheap’ that he would want ‘to grow old [at court] taking insults and saying thanks.’ Finally, Marcellus passes greetings to the Count of Althan and Bartholomeus Villerius and mentions that ‘we are waiting for the King in this tiny village already for weeks.’<sup>165</sup>

Michael Adolf von Althan (1574-1636) had served Archdukes Leopold and Matthias as field marshal, was member of the War Council of Ferdinand II and later would become imperial general. He had led campaigns in Hungary against the Ottomans and had been taking part in negotiating treaties with the Sultan in 1606 and 1615. He was one of the founders of the military order of the ‘Militia Christiana’.<sup>166</sup> Franz Tegnagel and Althan had been on diplomatic missions together and knew each other well from their time together in the service of Archduke Leopold.<sup>167</sup> Bartholomeus Villerius was confessor of Ferdinand II. Marcellus mentions one other name in this letter: Don Balthasar de Zúñiga (1561-1622), former ambassador of the Spanish king at the courts in Prague and Vienna and after the fall of the Duke of Lerma the most influential of the king’s ministers. Don Balthasar knew Franz Ganzneb Tegnagel well from his earlier diplomatic missions and it was also thanks to his efforts that

---

<sup>165</sup> Franckheim to F.G. Tegnagel, 8 October 1619.

<sup>166</sup> J. Sokoll, ‘Althann, Michael Adolf Graf von’ in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1 (1953) 219 f. [Online-Version] <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd135708524.html#ndbcontent>; T. Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener. Gundaker von Liechtenstein. Ein Österreichischer Aristokrat des Konfessionellen Zeitalters* (Vienna 1999) 134-140.

<sup>167</sup> Pecho, *Fürstbisschof Putschist Landesherr*, 239.

Tengnagel had been released from prison after the Siege of Prague in 1611. Apparently, Don Balthasar was dealing with the problems of Marcellus and his companion, but his role does not become clear in this letter.

Something can be said about the reason why Marcellus and his companion had to wait for the King. Philip III was at the moment of writing travelling back from Lisbon where he had taken the oath to the kingdom of Portugal and had presided the Cortes. Urged by the news of the events in Germany and Bohemia, Philip dissolved the Cortes and on 29 September started his journey back to Madrid. However, on his way he was taken ill and had to recover before being able to proceed his journey. He would not arrive in Madrid before 5 December.<sup>168</sup>

Only in the next letter, written on 12 March 1620 from Mainz, it becomes clear that Marcellus and his companion were waiting in vain, for they would not be granted an audience with the King. In this letter the identity of the companion becomes also clear. For, now Marcellus refers to the companion as ‘this Margrave’. Revealing is a remark which Marcellus makes in the beginning of the letter: ‘If I would enlist everything what has happened to me because of this Margrave, I would be able to write an extended history. Which I consider to do in due course. Then one will see what the difference is between the behaviour of decent and pure men and those *who want to be sons of the Emperor* [my italics].’ Airing his frustration, a bit further Marcellus goes on: ‘What else? Only those who know the Margrave well will believe what I have been going through. [...] Joan Bonaventura Papazoni, the emperor’s chamberlain, knows him and he knows Johan Christoph Ranft.’ In the end of the letter Marcellus finally mentions a name. After having required after how things stand with ‘your order’ he remarks that he has heard that ‘Count Althan’ together with ‘Dominus Homonai’ has left for Poland and Hungary. To this he immediately adds: ‘I would like to know what Don Carolus is doing’ and ‘if he only knew what I know what would be of benefit for him’. Furthermore, he writes ‘I know where Don Matthias errs and trespasses and why he has not been received by the King. But this should not be confided to a letter’.<sup>169</sup> These two names, in combination with those of ‘Ranft’ and ‘Count Althan’, as well as ‘Homonai’ (György III Drugeth of Homonna (1583-1620), an Hungarian nobleman supporting the Habsburgs) are important clues regarding the question who was the companion who had caused Marcellus so much trouble. Moreover, it sheds more light on Marcellus’ mission and on the ‘order’ mentioned in the two letters.

---

<sup>168</sup> P. Williams, *The Great Favourite. The Duke of Lerma and the Court and Government of Philip III of Spain, 1598-1621* (Manchester 2006) 244.

<sup>169</sup> Franckheim to F.G. Tengnagel, 12 March 1620.

The Margraves Don Matthias of Austria (1594-1626) and Don Karl of Austria (1603-1628), were legitimated bastard-sons of the former emperor Rudolf II and his mistress Anna Maria di Strada (1579-1629).<sup>170</sup> They also had a half-sister Doña Carolina, who was living with her husband Franz Graf de Perrenot-Granvelle in Besançon. This was the ‘sister’ whom Marcellus referred to in his letters. Johann Christoph Ranft (1599-1660) was their step-brother. His father Christoph Ranft had married Anna Maria di Strada after Don Karl’s birth in 1603. Don Karl has been reported to have been in Poland with ‘Count Altheim’ around 1619/1620.<sup>171</sup> Letters from Albert from Brussels and Khevenhüller in Madrid confirm that in 1619 Don Matthias of Austria travelled to various places in the Empire, the Low Countries, France and Spain.<sup>172</sup> In Brussels, where Don Matthias arrived in July 1619, he had been received by his Uncle Albert and his Aunt Isabella. In May 1619, Ferdinand had sent a letter of recommendation for Don Matthias to Albert and asked to receive him well. He wrote: ‘des Kaisers Matthias Obrist und mein Kämmerer Don Matthias, Markgraf, reist in Geschäften des neuen ritterlichen Ordens ins Reich’.<sup>173</sup>

This ‘new military order’ must have been the ‘Militia Christiana’ mentioned above. The *Ordo Militiae Christianae*, the order of the Christian Militia was founded by Charles Gonzaga, Duke of Nevers and Rethel (1580-1637), together with count Michael Adolf von Althan and Giovanni Battista Petrucci Sforza (†1621). The order’s purpose was to ‘reconcile Christian Princes among each other and to free Christians oppressed by infidels.’ Though formulated in a general way, the ‘infidel’ meant in particular were the Turks. For the duke of Nevers, the founding of the order fitted in the larger picture of his more ambitious plans to free Hungary, the Balkan and the Peloponnesus from Ottoman rule. His grandmother descended from the last

---

<sup>170</sup> C. Sapper, ‘Kinder des Geblüts – die Bastarde Kaiser Rudolfs II.’, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 47 (1999) 29; 38. Anna Maria di Strada was herself an illegitimate daughter of Ottavia di Strada (1550-1606), whose father was the famous antiquarian Jacopo di Strada.

<sup>171</sup> Sapper, ‘Kinder’, 95.

<sup>172</sup> HHStA, Staatenabteilungen, Spanien, Diplomatische Korrespondenz 16-9, Die diplomatische Korrespondenz des Franz Christoph Khevenhüller 1619 (Georg Graf Khevenhüller-Metsch ed. Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv), 614; HHStSA Länderabteilungen, Belgien, Belgische Korrespondenz 30-2, Korrespondenz zwischen Erzherzog Ferdinand und Erzherzog Albert, 205. Ferdinand II an Albert 21 May 1619.

See also Sapper ‘Kinder’ 64-65.

<sup>173</sup> Ferdinand II to Albert 21 May 1619 [Emperor Matthias’ Colonel, my Chamberlain Don Matthias, Margrave, travels in the Empire for the new military order].

Byzantine rulers and he felt he had the obligation to bring Christian rule back again. The ultimate plan was to raise an army for a crusade and to head for Constantinople.<sup>174</sup>

The Order's constituent meeting was held in Olmütz (Olomouc) in Moravia, on 16 March 1618. On the eighth of March 1619 on its inaugural meeting in Vienna, the first 29 knights, 'viele vornehme Römisch-Catholische Fürsten, Grafen und Herren', took their oaths in the presence of Emperor Matthias and King and Emperor-to-be Ferdinand II. In the *Annales Ferdinandeï*, Franz Christoph Khevenhüller gives an account of the meeting: 'Die haben [...] luyend zween Finger auff ein Evangelisch Buch gelegt und auf die Ordens-Regul [...] geschworen'.<sup>175</sup> They vowed to take effort to bring peace between Christian princes, to work diligently in order to free Christians who were oppressed or captivated by the infidels and to stay loyal and obedient to their own King or Prince. They also promised to always wear the order's insignia, being a cross. Eligible to become member were first those who led a pure life and had no debts. Secondly, they should be of legitimate birth. However, this did not count for everyone: 'doch solten in diesen Kayser, König und fürnehme Kinder ausgenommen werden.'<sup>176</sup>

Among those first knights inaugurated that day were noblemen like Charles Emanuel of Savoy, Margrave of Villars (1562-1630) and Heinrich Duval, Count of Dampierre (1580-1620). But also for example Julius Heinrich, Duke of Saxe-Lauenburg (1586-1665), as well as Radulius (Radu Minhea), Prince (Voivode) of Wallachia and Moldavia (1586 -1626) and many princes of the eastern parts of the Empire. 'Georg Graff von Humanay, Oberster Hofrichter des Königreichs Ungarn' (György Homonnai Drugeth lord chief justice of the Kingdom of Hungary) was on the list. This was 'Dominus Homonai' who was also mentioned in Marcellus' letter. Among the less impressive names on the list we find Marcellus correspondent 'Franciscus Tegnagel' [sic]. This finally makes Marcellus references to an order as 'your order' understandable. Together with Marcellus' references to a cross as insignia of the order and an oath which has to be sworn on the bible, echoing elements of its inaugural meeting, we can

---

<sup>174</sup> D. Parrot, 'A 'Prince Sovereign' and the French Crown: Charles de Nevers (1580-1637)', in: R. Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H.M. Scott ed., *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of Ragnhild M. Hatton* (Cambridge 1997)149-187, here 161f.

<sup>175</sup> F. C. Khevenhüller, *Annales Ferdinandeï; oder Wahrhaffte Beschreibung Käysers Ferdinandi des andern, mildesten Gedächtniss, geburth, Aufferziehung und bisshero in Krieg und Friedens-Zeiten Vollbrachten thaten, geführten Kriegen und Vollzogenen hochwichtigen geschäftten* (Leipzig 1721) 711-713.

<sup>176</sup> Khevenhüller, *Annales Ferdinandeï*, 712.

safely assume that ‘your order’, ‘die neue ritterliche Order’ and the order of the *Christianae Militae* are one and the same.

However, Marcellus’ letters suggest that he was not very successful in his mission for Tengnagel and the order and that he blames Don Matthias for this. He feels that ‘he [the Margrave] has scandalously misused and forsaken me in Spain. Just like he has forsaken your order before.’<sup>177</sup> What had happened in Spain can be reconstructed in detail from the correspondence of the Emperor’s ambassador in Madrid, Franz Christoph Khevenhüller. These letters show that the Margrave had decided that his mission could be combined with a visit to King Philip III in Madrid and to Archduchess Margareta of Austria, (Don Matthias’ aunt) who was living in the Monastery of the *Descalzas Reales*, apparently to present himself and to discuss a potential match with a prospective bride. However, Archduke Albrecht had not known anything of these plans, nor had Don Matthias asked for consent from Ferdinand or the Spanish King. This meant that he had no funds to travel or stay in Spain for this purpose, nor any letters of recommendation. A request to get an audience with the King would therefore lead to embarrassment at the courts in Madrid, Brussels and Vienna. Khevenhüller tried to persuade Don Matthias to leave. Don Balthasar de Zúñiga wrote to Khevenhüller that Don Matthias had made a serious mistake by coming and that he should have made himself useful as soldier ‘or rather as a cleric’ instead. In any case there would have been better tasks for him in Bohemia. By being away he had missed the opportunity to prove himself in the war, and Don Balthasar did not expect the King to take that well. By the second half of October it was clear that the King would not receive Don Matthias and that he should not wait for the King to be back. Nevertheless, thanks to Don Balthasar, the King had agreed to pay the Margrave’s debts made during the stay in Caramanzel (he was traveling with twelve men), and to provide money to travel back.<sup>178</sup> This whole episode would clarify certain puzzling references in Marcellus’ letters, namely references to the Margrave’s *lenonibus* (matchmakers) who had to reconcile with the ‘*assestrix Jovis*’ (Jupiter’s female assistant). Khevenhüller (one of the *lenones*), who had put a lot of effort and correspondence in the preparation of the match with the prospective bride and had to report to the Emperor on the progress in the matter, was greatly frustrated in his plans by Don Matthias’ own initiative and unexpected arrival in Spain. Indeed, afterwards he had to smooth up things with Archduchess Margareta of Austria (the *assestrix*

---

<sup>177</sup> Franckheim to F.G. Tengnagel, 12 March 1620.

<sup>178</sup> Sapper, ‘Kinder des Geblüts’, 66-67.

*Jovis*, assistant to Ferdinand) who had been expected to play an important role in making the match materialise.<sup>179</sup>

Whether Marcellus and Don Matthias had any business in Spain at all concerning the order of the Christian Militia remains unclear. It seems unlikely, because this second letter suggests even more than the first that Don Matthias had given up on the order in Besançon already. In any case, the order was never admitted in Spain on the ground that there were eighty orders already.<sup>180</sup> What is clear from the letters is that Marcellus was making efforts for the Order, which were frustrated by Don Matthias. Whether the Christian Militia as a whole was successful as a network of Christian noblemen depends on the perspective taken. Though the initial plan had been to raise an army for a crusade against the Ottomans, at the moment that the first knights were inaugurated, these plans had already been adjusted. People at court in Vienna had asked the Charles Gonzaga, duke of Nevers whether the soldiers he had boasted to be able to recruit couldn't be deployed in a more urgent matter, namely to prevent the unrest in Bohemia to spread in other parts of the Empire and to push back the heretics and rebels.<sup>181</sup> Indeed, at the end of November 1619, Althan and Homannai managed to raise troops in Poland, mostly Cossacks, to invade Upper Hungary (now part of Slovakia) from the north. Thus, they prevented Gábor Bethlen to take Vienna and forced him to withdraw from Upper Hungary. In the following year troops raised by members of the *Ordo Militiae Christianae* in the eastern parts of Europe would serve anti-Protestant instead of anti-Ottoman purposes, their military operations ultimately leading to the battle of the White Mountain in November 1620.<sup>182</sup> This was a far cry from 'bringing peace between Christian Princes' as the members of the order had vowed in their inauguration. In any case, Marcellus' adventures with Don Matthias would end in Spain. From Spain, Don Matthias would travel back to Brussels, whereas Marcellus would go to Mainz.<sup>183</sup>

In the letter to Sebastian Tegnagel, sent on 12 March 1620 from Mainz, Marcellus only hints on his mission and his difficulties with Don Matthias. He explains that he is not allowed to tell about what happened in the France-Comté but still hints to initiatives for a wedding (*initiae confarreationis*). Like in the second letter to Franz, he refers to letters he has

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibidem, 67-68.

<sup>180</sup> Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener*, 140.

<sup>181</sup> Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener*, 138.

<sup>182</sup> Winkelbauer, *Fürst und Fürstendiener*, 139.

<sup>183</sup> Sapper, 'Kinder', 68.

sent from Spain, but not being sure whether they arrived and because ‘there is many a twist between the cup and lip’ (*multa cadunt inter calicem supremaque labra* – many unexpected things happened since), he writes now again. Like in the letter to Franz he mentions that everything he has experienced with Don Matthias (here calling him *Nothus illus legitimates-* this legitimated bastard) is enough for an extended history.

More than in the letters to Franz, Marcellus uses an amical tone with Sebastian Tengnagel, starting the letter with ‘Look at your returned traveller’ (*Ecce tibi avo’δρομον illum tuum reducum*), thanking God for his safe return and confining to Tengnagel that he always has kept a warm place for him in his heart. The letter is more personal than the letters addressed to Franz Tengnagel, which were rather meant as reports on the progress regarding the order. Though in the letters to Franz Marcellus did not fail to air his frustrations, in the letter to Sebastian he refers more to the emotions that he has gone through personally. ‘If I did not escape the suffering of love and feeling, you should not blame this to my indifference or neglect, but to fortune.’ He also quotes more from the classics, for example from Horace to show that he is thankful that he returned safely from his travels and (amorous?) adventures, sadder but wiser.<sup>184</sup> ‘As for me, the sacred wall with its votive tablet shows that I have hung up my wet clothes in honour of the God who rules over the sea.’ adding that ‘I will not go further into these private issues and it does not make sense to complain’.

Marcellus proceeds with enquiring how things stand with regard to the political developments. Like in the letters to Franz Tengnagel, Marcellus shows that he is well informed about the political and diplomatic efforts taken at that moment. He is happy that there is a truce with Transylvania, but doubts whether ‘this circumcised or this slave from the circumcised can be trusted’, thus referring to the eight-month truce between Ferdinand and Gábor Bethlen agreed on 16 January 1620. Gábor Bethlen was a Transylvanian prince who supported the Protestants in Bohemia but also made deals with the Ottomans. Marcellus depicts him here as an Ottoman client.<sup>185</sup> Marcellus also has news for Sebastian: the Elector of Mainz had left for Mühlhausen just five days before, to meet with the electors of the Empire in order to discuss strategies to prevent the unrest in Bohemia from spreading over the rest of Germany. ‘There is hope that the Lutherans will join the Catholics, though they will make disproportional demands in turn’. Indeed, in the end, eight days after Marcellus wrote his letter, it was agreed in

---

<sup>184</sup> ‘*me tabula sacer votiva paries indicat, uvida suspendisse potenti vestimenta maris deo*’ Horace, Ode I.V.

<sup>185</sup> Wilson, *Europe’s Tragedy*, 292-293.

Mühlhausen that the Electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, though not Catholic, would support the Emperor instead of Frederick.<sup>186</sup>

Marcellus finishes with noting ‘These days I have published an *oratio* (...), and some other piece of mine is in press *in causa publica* under the name *Austriacus*.’ The *oratio* must have been the *Expeditio*, which Marcellus had called ‘an oratio’ in its preface and which had been printed in Mainz in February, just before Marcellus wrote his letter to Sebastian. The piece written under the name of *Austriacus* which still was in print must have been the *Fides-Bohemo Palatina*, which Marcellus also had completed in February. Finally, he passes his greetings to Martin Becanus, Villerius’ successor as Ferdinand’s court confessor since early 1620, and former professor in theology in Mainz and Vienna. Marcellus further asks to pass on some more letters to other people, and to save the *litteraria* (books and/or letters), which he had left in Vienna ‘in the house of Don Matthias.’ ‘Perhaps next fall I will come to Vienna when the times are a bit more tranquil’. The remark about Marcellus’ books in Don Matthias’ house could suggest an earlier connection with Don Matthias when Marcellus still was a secretary to Khlesl. One of Khlesl’s many activities for Emperor Matthias had been to take care of both Don Carolus’ and Don Matthias’ education.<sup>187</sup> It is possible, though there is no proof, that Marcellus also had served as a kind of tutor to them, which might explain why Don Matthias had said that Marcellus had persuaded him to go on mission for the Order.<sup>188</sup>

What is clear, is that almost two years after Khlesl’s fall, Marcellus still was engaged in serving the House of Austria and the Catholic faith. However, it was also clear that he did not want to stay at court at all costs and was looking for other opportunities

### 9. *Defending the Soldiers of Christ: Adam Contzen SJ*

The times would definitely not get more tranquil, because all over Europe princes were gathering war-forces and the Battle of the White Mountain had still to come. In the meantime, in Mainz Marcellus was not sitting still and engaged in war on paper. In May 1620 he published his polemic *Asinus palmatus* (Mainz 1620), in full *Asinus palmatus, seu paedagogus halensis Sigismundus Evenius furens in tyrannide pontificia seculari adversus r.p. Adamum Contzen*. This publication is for several reasons an intriguing one.

---

<sup>186</sup> Wilson, *Europe’s Tragedy*, 298-299.

<sup>187</sup> Sapper, ‘Kinder’, 50-53.

<sup>188</sup> This would ask for further investigation of the records of Don Matthias’ Household in the Hofkammerarchiv in Austrian State Archive in Vienna.

In the first place, the *Asinus Palmatus* through centuries has been listed among the works of the Jesuit author Adam Contzen (1575-1635). The 1739 edition of Foppens' *Bibliotheca Belgica* attributed the work to Contzen, as still did the 1853 edition of the *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus* just like many other biographical handbooks did through the ages.<sup>189</sup> Finally, the 1869 Backer-Sommervogel edition of the *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus* would add a note to Contzen's bibliography: 'Asinus Palmatus (...) à Margello [*sic*] Franckheimio Iureconsulto. C'est à tort qu'on attribue ce livre au P. Contzen.'<sup>190</sup> The authors did not mention however, that the venerable *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu* by their predecessors Pedro de Ribaneira and Philip Alegambe in 1643 had introduced the mistake in the first place, just a few years after Contzen's death and when Marcellus was still alive.<sup>191</sup> Subsequently, all other biographers copied the wrong entry from this source or from each other, without ever checking a real copy of the *Asinus Palmatus*.<sup>192</sup> The mistake is understandable because the cover displays the name of Adam Contzen in much larger font than the author's. However, it means that even Alegambe did not get further than cover of the book or, still more likely, had to rely on a list which was drafted by somebody who had not read the book either. Ironically, this was also the fate of another book on this list: the *Palma Secularis Lutherano-Evangelica* by Contzen's adversary Sigismund Evenius himself. Clearly, the wrong attribution of the two books had not been based on the interpretation of text which might also say something about their impact.

This brings us to the content of the book and Marcellus' defence of Adam Contzen which implied an attack on Evenius. Adam Contzen, Maximilian of Bayern's court-confessor from 1624 till 1635, is now mostly known for his *Ten Books on Politics* (Mainz 1621), a book on statecraft in the anti-Machiavellian tradition, meaning that it started from the premise that successful political activity and Christian moral conduct do not exclude each other in a person's life.<sup>193</sup> Before coming to the Munich court however, Contzen had been professor of

---

<sup>189</sup> J.F. Foppens, *Bibliotheca belgica, sive Virorum in Belgio vitâ, scriptisque illustrium catalogus, librorumque nomenclatura* (Brussels 1739)4; A. and A. Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Liège 1853) 210.

<sup>190</sup> A. Backer, A. Backer and C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Liège 1869) 1366.

<sup>191</sup> P. Ribaneira and P. Alegambe, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (Antwerp 1643) 3.

<sup>192</sup> Other examples are Joseph Hartzheim's *Bibliotheca Coloniensis* (Cologne 1747) 4; Jean Noël Pacot's *Memoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire* (Louvain 1768) 315-317 and Antonio de Posada's *Biografía eclesiástica completa* (Madrid 1851) 133.

<sup>193</sup> R. Bireley, *The Counter-Reformation Prince. Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe* (Chapel Hill 1990) 139.

controversial theology at the Jesuit academy in Mainz, where he had succeeded Martin Becanus. He had authored many polemical works arguing against Lutheran and Calvinistic theologians. Among them were a series of publications on the occasion of the centenary celebration of the Reformation of 1517, one of which was the *Coronis omnium Iubilorum anno seculari Evangelico scriptorium* (Mainz 1619) in which Contzen amongst others reacted on a work by Evenius *Palma Secularis Lutherano-Evangelica* (1618). Sigismund Evenius in turn came with another publication, the *Tyrannidis Pontifictae Secularis demonstratio Apologetica* (1619).<sup>194</sup> In the *Palma Secularis*, like most of his fellow Protestant polemicists, Evenius criticised the Jesuits, called the Pope the Antichrist and the Catholic Church the whore from the Apocalyp but also discussed the atrocities of the Duke of Alba in the Netherlands and the many deaths of the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre (1572). In the *Tyrannidis* he attacked Contzen, playing on the person and calling him names, because of Contzens dismissal of the statements in the *Palma Secularis*.

Sigmundus Evenius, was from 1613-1622 rector at the Latin school in Halle and later on in Magdeburg from where in 1631 he had to flee the atrocities of war. Evenius was known as a notorious polemicist and got involved in various controversies. One of them, a dispute with the Magdeburg preacher Andreas Cramer led to such a flood of publications from both sides that the Magdeburg city council issued a general publication ban on the issue.<sup>195</sup>

In his dedication letter (to the magistrate of Magdeburg, because Evenius had dedicated the *Palma Secularis* to them earlier) Marcellus explains why he calls Evenius 'Asinus Palmatus' 'the palmed ass'. In the *Palma Secularis* Evenius had compared the reformation with the fruit-bringing coconut palm tree, which in Marcellus' eyes was nonsense.<sup>196</sup> With a reference to Job 6 verse 5 in the bible, Marcellus dismissed hollow words that in the end would not feed.<sup>197</sup> In this publication Marcellus uses stronger language than in his other works though he does not attack Evenius in a more severe way than Evenius attacked Contzen. In the letter to the reader on page 25 Marcellus makes clear that he is aware of his 'sharp pen' (*stili mei acumen*) and that he wants to explain the reason for this. To this end, he 'exposes the eyes of the reader to character of the pedagogue of Halle' and his 'falsehood, slandering and lies', so that the reader

---

<sup>194</sup> *Asinus Palmatus*, 6.

<sup>195</sup> C. Nahrendorf, 'Evenius, Sigismund' in: W. Kühlmann et al., ed., *Frühe Neuzeit in Deutschland 1520-1620. Literaturwissenschaftliches Verfasserlexikon 3* (Berlin 2014) 246-251.

<sup>196</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>197</sup> Job 6 verse 5 'Does a wild donkey bray over fresh grass or an ox low over its fodder?' *Asinus Palmatus* 2.

can understand ‘the reason of my heat’. He then lists, without comment, quotes from Evenius’ *Palma Secularis*, including the depiction to the Roman Catholic Church as a whore and the Pope as an Antichrist, but also as ‘crocodile’ and ‘dragon’. In his address to the magistrate of Magdeburg on page four he writes ‘Sigismundus Evenius, your pedagogue from Halle, who I do no once, not trice but completely despise, has created some monstrous lies that he argues with falsehoods and trickeries’.<sup>198</sup> However, Evenius would strike back. In 1621 he published the *Diabolus palmatus*, upgrading Marcellus’ insulting ‘ass’ to a ‘devil’ in turn. The Palma in that case is the Catholic church. Evenius plays here even more on the person, addressing Marcellus on every page, starting with saying that Marcellus is an ass himself and besides that everything else he has insulted Evenius with.<sup>199</sup>

The exchange of insults between Marcellus and Evenius as such is not exceptional and seems to follow the regular pattern of polemic writing and controverse publications of the early seventeenth century.<sup>200</sup> An analysis of the complete texts with regard to exchange of arguments or reasoning followed would be beyond the scope of this thesis. However, the dedication letters and letters to the reader in both works contain useful information with regard to Marcellus’ contacts. In this respect it is interesting to read Marcellus’ motivation to defend Contzen. On page eight of the dedication letter he writes that he took this task upon him so that Contzen himself ‘would not have to get his hands stained’ in order ‘not to be delayed in the publication of his *Politicorum*, of which the types are in the course of being set, so that, with God’s will and to the use of the public, next autumn it will be on the market and be distributed to the right people.’<sup>201</sup> Because Marcellus dated his dedication letter May 1620 in Mainz, we can assume that with the ‘*Politicorum*’ Adam Contzen’s *Ten books of politics* which would be printed in 1621 in Mainz by Balthasar Lippius. The *Approbatio* in the *Ten books* dates from 22 April 1620, which meant that at that moment the book had been read and approved by Contzen’s superiors. Marcellus was thus well informed about the progress of Contzen’s book.

---

<sup>198</sup> ‘ubi non modio neq trimodio, verum tot horreo, monstrosissima effundit mendacia (...) calumniarum et mendaciorum arguit’ *Asinus Palmatus*, 6.

<sup>199</sup> ‘Ergo Marcellus Frankheimus erit ille asinus palmatus suo ipsius penicillo descritpus, onager, bos, homo mendacissimus, autor libelli famosi (...), stultus, petulcum pecus, animal non tractandis literis, sed gestandis clitellis natum.’, *Diabolus Palmatus*, 85.

<sup>200</sup> G. Fritz, T. Gloning and J. Glüer, *Historical Pragmatics of Controversies: Case studies from 1600 to 1800* (Amsterdam 2018) 8-17; Israel, *Dutch Republic*, 438-441.

<sup>201</sup> ‘Suscepi raptim (...) ne ipse Adamus Contzen, cum sacras manus (...) profanaret, tum vel tantillum abrumperet, a relustratione suorum *Politicorum* quae tyopthetae iam sunt tradita, ut, cum bono Deo et utilitare publica, nundinis proximis autumnalibus, ad bonos dimanent.’, *Asinus Palmatus*, 8.

The dedication letter shows that Marcellus was informed about its content as well, for he assures the Marburg magistrate that this book will also have an impact on them, because they too have to deal with public issues.<sup>202</sup> Marcellus could be informed about the content and the progress of the book in several ways. From Marcellus' dedication letter in the *Expeditio Sicambro Batava* we know that he was in Mainz since February 1620. From his letters to the Tengenagels we furthermore know that he stayed at the Jesuit College in Mainz, or at least was in very close contact with the rector of the college Balthasar Hager and with his old friend von Zutphen, Arnold toe Boecop there. Adam Contzen was at that moment himself professor at the theological faculty, so it is likely that they met, but whether they were in close contact and whether Contzen ever asked Marcellus to take work out of his hands, the sources do not tell. Via the printer Balthasar Lippius Marcellus can have been informed about the book as well, because Lippius was also the printer of the *Asinus Palmatus* and Marcellus' *Expeditio* that same year. Thus, Marcellus was near Contzen's fire, though how near cannot be said. Evenius in turn did not miss Marcellus' remark about his writing the *Asinus Palmatus* to enable Contzen not to 'stain his hands' and to work on his books. For Evenius addresses Contzen in his forward in the *Diabolus Palmatus* sarcastically with 'you, with your *Politicorum* most occupied man (...) with your most sacred hands'.<sup>203</sup> He further views the relation between Contzen and Marcellus as a Patron-Client relation, calling Marcellus a 'tool' or 'instrument'.<sup>204</sup>

Whether this last assessment was correct or not, the *Asinus Palmatus* and Evenius' response confirm that Marcellus connections with the Jesuits were strong. He also mentions Johannes Roberti again, 'mihi amiccissimus Ioannes Roberti Societa Theologus'.<sup>205</sup> Finally, Marcellus concludes the *Asinus Palmatus* with a clear statement about his faith and his position with regard to the Society of Jesus, saying that the Jesuits 'by their daily prayer intercede with God for your salvation; in this order is Adam Contzen the excellent Theologian; and though I am not in this order I'm still very much attached to them, and both we dedicate you to God for

---

<sup>202</sup> 'Et as vos etiam, Viri Aplissimi, quos omne id temporis, quod curae popularium subduxeritis, isti operi evoluendo inpendisse, me idoneo hic vobis sponsore, non poenebit.' *Asinus Palmatus*, 8.

<sup>203</sup> *Diabolus Palmatus*, Praefatio.

<sup>204</sup> Ibidem, 84, 'Ipsum autem te insaniae hujus instrumentum Franckheimum animi impotem ad Adamum Contzium Patrono clientem eximium relego (...)'

<sup>205</sup> *Asinus Palmatus*, 105

your eternal blessing, from which there is none outside the Catholic Church.<sup>206</sup> Again, Marcellus was clear where he stood regarding his faith and where his loyalties laid.

#### *10. The Zutphen connection or: the letter from the Emperor*

Not long after the publication of the *Asinus Palmatus* Marcellus would leave Mainz. There is evidence that around the fall of 1620 Marcellus left the Empire for the Netherlands on errand for the Emperor. For in July 1621, while on their way from Zutphen to the Jesuit College in Emmerich, Marcellus' old friends Arnold toe Boecop and Thomas van Buerlo got arrested by the Guelders authorities and were charged with treason and espionage for Spain. They were under suspicion of having collected large sums of money meant for the Spanish garrison in Wesel.<sup>207</sup> Interestingly, one of the questions on the table during the trial had been whether 'Marcellus had brought [Buerlo] letters from the Emperor.'<sup>208</sup> Thomas van Buerlo confirmed this but asserted that this had only happened once and that Marcellus had not been in the country since. In the end, the investigators could not find any evidence for help to the Spanish army and the Arnhem court did not find Boecop and van Buerlo guilty of treachery. Instead, the court sentenced Boecop to pay a fine and to leave the country on the grounds of entering the Republic under false pretence, and of celebrating mass and giving pastoral care to Catholics without permission. Van Buerlo likewise had to leave the country and to pay a fine. In February 1622, after a sickbed of five months, Arnold toe Boecop died in Cologne. According to some of his biographers 'the heretics' had poisoned him, but it is more likely that he was just taken ill while in prison at Arnhem.<sup>209</sup>

In his second letter to Franz Tengnagel, written 20 March 1620 from Mainz, Marcellus added two contact persons to direct responses to. One was Balthasar Hager, the rector of the Jesuit College in Mainz. The other, at the same address, was 'Arnold à Boecop', 'who insists that I add his most obliging greetings. Both will know where I will be in the future'. This phrasing suggests that Marcellus was not planning to stay in Mainz. More importantly, it means

---

<sup>206</sup> 'Deum quotidianis fere precibus, pro vestra salute interpellant: in quorum ordine agit R.P. Adamus Cotzen eximius Theologus; et ego etsi non in illa Societate, tamen eidem multis omnibus deditissimus; uterque votum Deo vovemus pro aeterna vestra felicitate, quae nulla est extra Ecclesiam Catholicam

<sup>207</sup> J. Barten, 'Het Proces van Jr. Arent thoe Boecop, Hagiograaf en Martelaar. Deel II', *Archief van de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke kerk in Nederland* 4 (1962) 41-52; 259-294.

<sup>208</sup> J. Barten, 'Het proces van Jr. Arent thoe Boecop, Hagiograaf en Martelaar. Deel I,' *Archief van de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke kerk in Nederland* 3 (1962) 259-294, here 271.

<sup>209</sup> Barten, 'Proces II', 281.

that Marcellus still was in good contact with Arnold toe Boecop, whom he even recommended as the one who would know about his future whereabouts. Unfortunately, Arnold toe Boecop would not last very long as Marcellus' contact person in Mainz. In September 1620, he would leave for Zutphen, never to return.

Through the centuries, Boecop's biographers have held the view that Boecop had been arrested on false grounds.<sup>210</sup> For this, they rely on Boecop's own representation of the course of events. Modern authors have followed the biographers' account.<sup>211</sup> Especially the Zutphen ministers, ds Damann and ds Baudartius, with whom Marcellus had got into conflict years before, would have wished to have Boecop out of the way and would have orchestrated a smear campaign.<sup>212</sup> While there is no doubt that the zealous ministers wanted to see the Jesuit priest gone, the combination of Boecop's contacts in the Republic and certain developments in the Empire offered grounds for suspicion. Several elements which the investigators addressed in the trial mirror in a remarkable way the ways of operating of the so-called *Sodality of Christian Defence*, which could possibly also explain why Marcellus featured in the procedural documents carrying 'letters from the Emperor'.

The *Sodality of Christian Defence* was founded in 1619 in Vienna by the Hofkammerrat Matthias Arnoldin von Clarstein (who was the father in law of Ferdinand's chamberlain Johan Bonaventura Papazoni mentioned in Marcellus' second letter).<sup>213</sup> Its initial purpose was to raise money to support the Catholic cause in Bohemia. As a treasury councillor, Clarstein knew better than anyone else did that the normal taxes would not suffice to raise an army. In a letter to Emperor Ferdinand II, he proposed that, given the low tax income, it would be better if people would give on a voluntary basis and that for this purpose a sodality could be founded.<sup>214</sup> This sodality at the same time would create broad awareness, commitment and solidarity for the endeavour, uniting Christians in all layers of the population.<sup>215</sup> The members, *sodales*, promised not only to donate money to raise an army but also to say prayers for the conservation

---

<sup>210</sup> H. J. Allard, 'Jhr Arent thoe Boecop S.J. 1586-1622', in: *Jaarboekje Jos. Albertingk Thijm* 55 (Nijmegen 1906).

<sup>211</sup> E.g., Doornink-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense rector'; W. Ludwig, 'Arnoldus a Boecop und ein Band mit Gedenkschriften an Justus Lipsius', *Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies* 48 (1999) 285-298.

<sup>212</sup> Barten, 'Proces I', 287.

<sup>213</sup> A. Duch, 'Arnoldin von Clarstein, Mathias', in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1 (1953), 391 [Online-Version], <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd135718686.html#ndbcontent>, 5 June 2018.

<sup>214</sup> Matthias Arnoldini Clarstein to Ferdinand II, November 1619, in: F. Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II. und seiner Eltern, bis zu dessen Krönung in Frankfurt* 8, (Schaffhausen 1857) 650-655.

<sup>215</sup> Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II.*, 270-271.

of legitimate authority.<sup>216</sup> The first of the statutes of the Sodality, issued in 1621, states that the Sodality aims to maintain princely authority to the glory of God and to defend the Christian world. The second states that the *sodales* will pray every day.<sup>217</sup> All this should be prepared carefully and with the consent of the imperial electors, princes, bishops and prelates. They had to make sure, that everything would be organized and that lists with contributors would be administrated.<sup>218</sup>

Clarstein got consent from the Emperor. At court, he had firm support from the imperial confessor Martin Becanus (Bartholomeus Villers successor) and from Hans Ulrich von Eggenberg, director of Ferdinand's Privy Council. Cardinal Franz von Dietrichstein was appointed as protector.<sup>219</sup> Early 1620, Clarstein started a tour through the Empire to raise interest. First, he visited the Elector Schweickard of Mainz whose reaction was rather lukewarm, on the grounds of not wishing to offend the Protestant estates. However, the other princes were positive and in May 1620 Clarstein travelled on to Brussels to interest the Archdukes as well. Albert reacted enthusiastically, issued letters of approval and took the initiative to introduce the Sodality at court. Now also Schweickard gave in. Through the empire but also in the Southern Netherlands church leaders and local prominent figures took it upon them to administer lists of subscriptions and to collect contributions.<sup>220</sup> For example in Antwerp, Albertus Miraeus, Canon of the Antwerp cathedral and court chaplain of Albert and Isabella, together with Jesuit Father Carolus Scribanus established a list of hundred and fifty-eight subscribers.<sup>221</sup> Together their contributions amounted to over 45.000 florins, equalling a year's salary for 308 infantry soldiers meant for the maintenance of Walloon soldiery in Bohemia.<sup>222</sup>

This course of action does not deviate very much from what Boecop and Buerlo were accused of. The sodality's aim to support the rule of princes and the conservation of legitimate authority were echoed in the interrogations of Boecop and Buerlo in questions with regard to their loyalty to the States and their supposed support to the Archdukes, the Spanish king and

---

<sup>216</sup> L. Duerloo, *Dynasty and Piety: Archduke Albert (1598–1621) and Habsburg Political Culture in an Age of Religious Wars* (Farnham 2012) 483; P. Arblaster *From Ghent to Aix: How They Brought the News in the Habsburg Netherlands, 1550-1700* (Leiden and Boston 2014) 75.

<sup>217</sup> *Statuten für die Societas Christiana*, in: Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II* 8, Beilage IV 655-657.

<sup>218</sup> Clarstein to Ferdinand, 653.

<sup>219</sup> Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II* 8, 274.

<sup>220</sup> Hurter, *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II*, 271-274.

<sup>221</sup> Duerloo, *Dynasty and Piety*, 483.

<sup>222</sup> Arblaster, *Ghent to Aix*, 75.

the Emperor. Furthermore, Boecop was said to have ‘panhandled large sums from prominent citizens in Amsterdam, just like from the nobility in Gelderland, Zutphen and Overijssel’.<sup>223</sup> Rumour had it that a list had been established with names of prominent Catholic contributors in Gelderland and Overijssel, their intermediaries, and the amount and date of their contribution and ‘even the poor had not been spared and were exploited to the bone’.<sup>224</sup> This sounds very much like the kind of list that Scribanus and Miraeus had compiled in Antwerp. In addition, it reflects the idea that low incomes would contribute as well. Finally, Boecop and van Buerlo indeed had visited many prominent noblemen in Guelders.<sup>225</sup> However, according to their own account, this only had been family visits. Interestingly, one of these family members was the burgomaster of Kampen, Boecop’s uncle Reynerus Tengenagel, who was also Franz Tengenagel’s uncle.

Though the timing of Archbishop Schweickard’s consent coincides with Marcellus’ departure from Mainz and Marcellus’ involvement could explain his connection with Aubertus Miraeus, there is no proof that Marcellus’ ‘letter from the Emperor’ was a letter concerning the Sodality. If it was, that would be in line with his efforts for the order of the Christian Militia, which was a similar networking effort to unite Christians through Europe, though targeted at the nobility rather than at the Catholic population in general. However, what this episode does show is that Marcellus was still in contact with Thomas van Buerlo and that he was still on mission for the Emperor. Also, it shows that there was a strong connection between Thomas van Buerlo and Arnold toe Boecop. Finally, it shows that there was a direct connection between Arnold toe Boecop and Franz Gansneb Tengenagel which explains that Arnold toe Boecop had added his greetings to Tengenagel in Marcellus’ letter. Thus, Marcellus still was tied to his Zutphen fellow Catholics in several ways.

More importantly, in a broader context the episode illustrates the variety of activities Dutch Catholics enfolded to make Catholic life in the Dutch Republic possible and how these activities connected them to Catholic life elsewhere in Europe. Even if indeed Boecop and Buerlo had not been on mission for the Sodality, they still had facilitated together their fellow Catholics because Boecop had celebrated mass in Buerlo’s house. Furthermore, according to their own testimony to the Arnhem court they had been in Amsterdam to order paintings from

---

<sup>223</sup> Barten, ‘Proces II’, 40.

<sup>224</sup> Barten, ‘Proces II’, 43.

<sup>225</sup> Barten, ‘Proces I’, 282;292.

the Dutch painter Adriaen van den Bogaert for the Maria altar of the Maria-congregation in Mainz.<sup>226</sup> In his own notes on the arrest and the trial Boecop mentioned that before interrogations commenced, he had managed to destroy some compromising hagiographical documents that he was carrying with him.<sup>227</sup> Also, during the arrest a safe conduct issued by the Archdukes of the Southern Netherlands was found on Buerlo, which he testified to have used to visit Scherpenheuvel.<sup>228</sup> Finally, together with other prominent Zutphen citizens they had signed a petition (Suppliek) to Pope Paul V to establish a Jesuit College in Zutphen.<sup>229</sup> Paintings, lives of Saints, pilgrimages, educational facilities and clandestine masses, all these reflect Buerlo's and Boecop's active engagement across borders to provide infrastructural, material and spiritual basics for Catholics to profess their faith. Basics that would be otherwise hard to get in the Dutch Republic.

That they were not the only ones to do so, proves a letter by Thomas van Buerlo to Ferdinand's confessor Martin Becanus from 20 July 1622.<sup>230</sup> This letter is for several reasons interesting. It concerns a recommendation for the Dutch nobleman Johannes de Huter (de Huyter), who had showed, 'in these difficult times' (*difficilimus temporibus*), 'to have merited himself for the Catholic faith' (*pro fide catholica exposuisse*). For this reason, Thomas van Buerlo asked Becanus to propose to the Emperor that de Huter would be made knight of the Holy Roman Empire. He did this also on behalf of the Catholic Mission in Holland in the person of the Jesuit pater Theodorus van Weeze.<sup>231</sup> Since 1617, Theodorus van Weeze had operated the Jesuit mission station in Zutphen but was often hindered in doing his work. One of the reasons that Arnold toe Boecop had celebrated mass while in Zutphen in 1621 was that van Weeze had been banned out of town for a while.<sup>232</sup> Indeed, Buerlo's and van Weeze's request had effect: already in the same year Ferdinand II made Johannes de Huter knight 'because of

---

<sup>226</sup> Barten, 'Proces I', 293.

<sup>227</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>228</sup> Barten 'Proces I', 275.

<sup>229</sup> Frijhoff, 'Sint Justus' hoofd', 289; F. van Hoeck, 'Suppliek van Zutphense katholieken om pauselijke hulp voor stichting van een Jezuïetencollege, 13 januari 1621', *Archief voor de geschiedenis van het aartsbisdom Utrecht* 71 (1952) 209-213. This College never materialised.

<sup>230</sup> Thomas von Burla [sic] to Martin Becanus, 20 July 1622, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA Wien), Reichshofrat und Reichskanzlei (RHR RK) Verfassungsakten, 1530-1850, Korrespondenz von Beamten der Reichshofkanzlei, des Reichshofrates und Reichshofratsagenten, 1608-1674 3a/1-7 (Korrespondenz 3a/1-7), 7.

<sup>231</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>232</sup> Doornik-Hoogenraad, 'Een Zutphense Rector', 91.

this efforts on behalf of the Roman Catholic faith.<sup>233</sup> Johannes de Huter was member of a family that had always stayed Catholic, hosted a clandestine Catholic church in their castle and offered hospitality to priests. Many family members became Jesuits. Johannes de Huter also had been active in acquiring the relics of the Martyrs of Gorcum for his clandestine church. Thus, Johannes de Huter's activities in many ways resembled Thomas van Buerlo's own activities, who likewise facilitated the celebration of mass at his house, offered hospitality to priests and acquired and 'rescued' relics of saints. For example, Thomas van Buerlo had brought the relics of the Gelderland saints Saint Cunera (Rhenen) and Saint Eusebius (Arnhem) to the Jesuit College in Emmerich.<sup>234</sup> Thomas van Buerlo and Johannes de Huter were thus connected to a Dutch network of active Catholics who did their best for the Catholic cause in the Netherlands and used their international contacts, indirectly via the infrastructure of Jesuit Colleges throughout Europe, or more directly. The link from Thomas van Buerlo to the Viennese Court indeed in this case was direct: his recommendation for meritorious Dutch Catholics went straight to the Imperial confessor, just next door to the Emperor himself.

---

<sup>233</sup> Akte van Ferdinand II, Rooms Keizer waarbij hij Johannes de Huter, met name wegens diens inspanningen ten faveure van het Room Katholicisme, in de adelstand verheft, 1622. Streekarchief Langstraat Heusen Altena. 0155 Heerlijkheid Oudheusden, Elshout en Hulten, 241.

<sup>234</sup> J. Ghesquière, *Acta sanctorum Belgii selecta* (Brussels 1789) 296; A. Hulshof, 'De Legende Van Sinte Kunera', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 10 (1917) 7-17, here 12.

## Conclusion

In his letter to Sebastian Tegnagel from Mainz, 12 March 1620 Marcellus quotes a Latin proverb: *multa cadunt inter calicem supremaque labra*. This translates in English as: ‘there is many a twist between the cup and the lip’ or: ‘many unexpected things happen’. The analysis of the sources in this thesis has shown that indeed many unexpected events happened between the commencement of Marcellus Franckheim’s position as Rector in Zutphen in 1611 and the moment he brought Thomas van Buerlo ‘letters from the Emperor’ almost ten years later.

However, despite his conversion and seemingly complete shift of communities, the sources also demonstrate a remarkable consistency and constancy in his connections, opinions and faith. The fact that he met with Thomas van Buerlo means that throughout the years he had kept contact with the person who had facilitated his departure from Zutphen. Not only he had stayed in contact with van Buerlo, he had also kept corresponding with his other old friend from Zutphen, the Jesuit Pater Arnold toe Boecop, as has become clear from his *Abdicatio* and the letters to Franz Gansneb Tegnagel.

It is true that connections with Anthoine l’Empereur had completely been broken off, which also meant an involuntary breach with his friend David le Leu de Wilhem. It is also true that Marcellus himself broke actively with his former contacts in the world of early modern science. However, given the independency and outspokenness that become apparent in Marcellus’ letters and publications (for example his damnation of Evenius, his dismissal of Khlesl’s policies, his frustration with Don Matthias), even his conversion seems consistent. Predestination was not something that fitted with Marcellus’ independent and self-willed mind. The orthodox environment of the household of Anthoine l’Empereur, his experiences with the Gomarist-Arminian dispute in Leiden which continued in Zutphen where Ds. Baudartius steered the discussion, gave him enough opportunity to make up this self-willed mind. At the same time there was a network and infrastructure of Zutphen Catholics that offered alternative options. These two circumstances in combination with the strong links of both Boecop and Buerlo in the Holy Roman Empire make his move to the Empire logical.

Furthermore, Marcellus breach with early modern science linked him with the Jesuit Robert Roberti, who would remain an important contact as well. Again, Marcellus breach here is consistent with his outspokenness: ‘He who keeps silent does not confess, but indeed does not deny’ he says in his *Abdicatio*. There had been not need to speak out in public: Franz Gansneb

Tengnagel had converted as well and had seen no need to take distance from his magic work, or ‘necromancing’, and still was considered an ardent Catholic.<sup>235</sup> He just went on doing something else. For Marcellus however, it was important to advertise where he stood himself, and, like his *Expediatio*, as such the *Abdicatio* was designed to stimulate others to do the same.

The *Abdicatio* also shows that Arnold toe Boecop played an important role in Marcellus’ conversion and that he could bring Marcellus into contact with wider Catholic networks. Arnold toe Boecop was a link in Marcellus’ local Catholic network in Zutphen, who like Thomas van Buerlo, connected him to the international network of the Society of Jesus. Johannes Roberti was an even more prominent linking pin in a large Jesuit network comprising science-, library-, hagiography- and theology networks, but also connections to courts: his brother Remacle Roberti was in the service of Albert and Isabella in the Southern Netherlands. Marcellus kept in contact with both toe Boecop and Roberti and the broader network of the Society of Jesus while he was to connected to the Habsburg court. In return, Marcellus could provide Roberti and toe Boecop with information from the Imperial Library and after leaving Vienna he could stay with toe Boecop with the Jesuits in Mainz.

Using Marcellus’ story this thesis has aimed to address the broader question of how Dutch Catholics, both in the Low Countries and abroad, participated in local and transnational networks to promote and consolidate their faith and to support each other. This thesis has shown that indeed Thomas van Buerlo, Arnold toe Boecop and Marcellus were connected through such networks. Marcellus had done everything in his power to support and to positively influence the fate of Catholicism in Europe and of the House of Habsburg, which like many people in his time he saw as synonymous. He had been active connecting the nobility in the Militia Christiana and he had published and taken part in the public debate trying to influence the public opinion about the Bohemian Revolt. Van Buerlo and toe Boecop had been doing the same on a local and transnational scale as the episode with Marcellus’ ‘letter from the Emperor’ has illustrated. Paintings, lives of Saints, pilgrimages, educational facilities and clandestine masses, all these reflect Buerlo’s and Boecop’s active engagement across borders to provide infrastructural, material and spiritual basics for Catholics to profess their faith.

---

<sup>235</sup> Cf. an assessment of Balthasar de Zuñiga, 6 March 1608. ‘Es un hombre (...) favorecido del emperador por astrologo y por yerno de un negromantico, muy privado de S.M<sup>d</sup>, el qual ear hereje; y el es nuevo convertido, haze del muy zelante y realmente le tienen por catolico.’ Stieve, *Briefe und Acten*, 396.

What stands out is Marcellus' independence. From his letters it becomes clear that Marcellus Franckheim wanted to remain free and not bound by any of his networks or patrons. Not by the Zutphen city council, not by l'Empereur and not by Khlesl or Don Matthias. Marcellus did not make things easy for himself, because he would not keep his mouth shut or go underground like others. Marcellus' publications make clear that he had a great urge to share his thoughts in public. He was not a man for compromises or dissimulation, even if it would cost him his job or his best friends. Marcellus followed his own conscience and carried a kind of stubbornness. His principles and loyalty towards his new ('Old') Catholic faith were clearly leading. At the same time, he was flexible enough to adapt to new circumstances and new environments. This enabled him to move on when things didn't agree with him. His soul was not for sale.

## Epilogue: on familiar terms with Aubertus Miraeus

None of Marcellus' known surviving publications and correspondence dates from after 1620. What can be said about his faith, patrons, contacts and positions in this time therefore cannot be based on his own words. For his activities and information about his networks after 1620 we have to rely completely on the information provided by Aubertus Miraeus in the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica*, issued in 1649, five years after Marcellus' death. This very publication however, forms in itself a fascinating link with the professional, religious and family network that enabled Marcellus' further career and entrance in the relevant networks of the Southern Netherlands. It even points at some of Marcellus' personal characteristics that may say something about the way he had manifested himself in the years before.

The networks of Aubertus Miraeus (Aubert le Mire (1573-1654) himself come into play here. For Marcellus had married Miraeus' niece Marie van den Eede in 1626. In fact, the lemma about Marcellus *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* itself must have been partly written by Marie's brother, Marcellus' brother-in-law and future bishop of Antwerp, Aubertus van den Eede (1603-1678). Miraeus had died already in 1640 and Aubertus van den Eede took it upon him to complete and eventually publish the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* of his uncle and godfather. This means that Miraeus' (van den Eede's) information can be supposed to be first hand and up to date. Of course, it also means that the information has to be treated with caution, as the van den Eede- le Mire family would have taken care to present their in-law at his best. The family relationship for example would partly explain why Marcellus' lemma takes up half a page, while the succeeding lemma, actually on Joannes Roberti, only gets eight lines and Isaac Casaubon on the same page even only five. That the family ties indeed were strong becomes apparent in the fact that Marie's and Marcellus' son Johannes Carolus (Jean-Charles) Franckheim (†1661) would become Miraeus' universal heir and that Aubertus van Eede was godfather to their second son Franciscus Aubertus (\*1634).<sup>236</sup>

As court chaplain of the Habsburg Archdukes Albert and Isabella and as court librarian, censor, news manager, historian, biographer, hagiographer, diplomat (in two senses of the word), fundraiser and active correspondent in the Republic of Letters, Aubertus Miraeus was the central node and linking pin within a vast array of networks.<sup>237</sup> Marcellus' connection with

---

<sup>236</sup> de Ridder, 'Aubert Le Mire', 107.

<sup>237</sup> de Ridder, 'Aubert Le Mire', *passim*.

the van den Eede-le Mire family through Aubertus Miraeus could have been made via any of these networks. Without further archival research it does not make much sense to speculate on which one or which combinations. The essential fact is that Marcellus had these connections and used them to great effect to ensure a future for himself and his children in the Southern Netherlands. After Marcellus' death in 1644, the van den Eede-le Mire family took care that the children of Marie and Marcellus got good positions or made favourable marriage matches. In 1649 Jean-Charles became advocate in the High Council of Brabant and Philippe-Vincent (1637-1690) in 1659 councillor. Caroline-Francoise (1641-1700) married Guillaume van Hamme (1636-1694), advocate in the Council of Brabant and future treasurer and burgomaster of Brussels.

Still, it is remarkable that the van den Eede-le Mire family allowed him to marry their daughter. Such families usually made a thorough assessment of whom they could marry their daughters to: criteria like wealth, family, position and prestige all played an important role.<sup>238</sup> Most of this Marcellus could not offer: he did not bring in financial capital or possessions, he could not boast of an impressive lineage to the oldest families in Brussels, and had no position to speak of, having come to the Netherlands as *auditor*, advocate-judge for the German troops in the Army of Flanders commanded by the Prince of Chimay, Alexandre de Ligne-Arenberg-Croÿ (1590-1629). Thus, it stays unclear what made him an agreeable marriage candidate. It could be his prestigious connections, the social capital he had won during his adventures in the Empire, it could be his publications. Whether they played a role or not, the lemma in the *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* suggests that Miraeus/van den Eede did not overlook his personal characteristics. Apart from his 'doctrine & industry', according to the lemma, Marcellus had gained 'fama' as advocate-judge: he was 'severe but fair', and of 'extraordinary honesty, uprightness and constancy'. Though the in-laws might have been biased, these characteristics echo in many ways Marcellus' personality as it emerges from the analysis of the other sources. Already in the previous chapters we have seen that Marcellus proved to have a high sense of justice and indeed was straight-forward (not to say single-minded), and rather headstrongly followed his conscience regardless the consequences. As we have seen, this brought him in trouble many times, but also brought him further.

---

<sup>238</sup> J. Vanhoutte, 'Van robins tot très grands nobles'. Carrièreplanning en huwelijksstrategie bij het geslacht Richardot in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden (1540-1701)' in: G. Marnef and R. Vermeir ed., *Adel en macht. Politiek, cultuur, economie* (Maastricht 2004).

It should be noted however, that also contemporaries were somewhat confused by the pedigree of Marcellus' children. In 1690, 74 years old, Philippe-Vincent, wanted to enter the Brussels City Hall to chair a meeting of the Estates of Brabant, acting as vice-chancellor. However, the bailiff did not allow him in because he was someone '*souillé du péché originel de défaut de naissance brabançonne*', tainted by original sin failing to be from Brabant origin.<sup>239</sup> Earlier he had met resistance on his way to become Councillor in the High Council because he was 'too young', but according to cultural historian Willem Frijhoff, this was a pretext for his humble origin.<sup>240</sup> These anecdotes illustrate that despite all continuity and constancy, the position that Marcellus had acquired in the Southern Netherlands indeed was not self-evident.

---

<sup>239</sup> L. Duerloo, 'De beeldtaal van de Staten van Brabant', *Ons Brabant* 3-4 (2013) 22. Philip Vincent was born in Dunkirk (Flanders)

<sup>240</sup> Frijhoff, 'Sint Justus' hoofd', 290.

## References

### *Primary sources*

#### Manuscripts

##### *Leiden University Library*

##### Special Collections

- ATH 1036, Archieven van de Bibliotheca Thysiana en van leden van de familie Thysius en aanverwante families 16de-20ste eeuw, Ingekomen Brieven Anthoine l'Empereur, Marcellus (Eleutherius) Vranckhemius, 1604-1611
- BPL 293A, Brieven van M. Vranckheim aan David le Leu de Wilhem, 1609-1616

##### *Austrian National Library Vienna (ÖNB)*

##### Sammlung von Handschriften und Alten Drucken,

- Cod. 9737s *Commercium Litterarum*, Epistolae Marcellus Francheimus ad S. Tengnagel, fol. 85r, 185r and fol. 192r-193r. [<http://data.onb.ac.at/rep/1003C0A6>]
- Cod. 9737s *Commercium Litterarum*, Carmina Marcellus Francheimus ad Ferdinand II, fol. 152r-v, 153v. [<http://data.onb.ac.at/rep/1003C0A6>]

##### *Austrian State Archive Vienna (ÖStA)*

##### Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv (HHStA Wien)

- Reichshofrat und Reichskanzlei, Verfassungsakten, 1530-1850, Korrespondenz von Beamten der Reichshofkanzlei, des Reichshofrates und Reichshofratsagenten, 1608-1674, 3a/7. Thomas von Burla an Martin Becanus, 20 July 1622.
- Staatenabteilungen, Spanien, Diplomatische Korrespondenz 16-9, Die diplomatische Korrespondenz des Franz Christoph Khevenhüller 1619 (Georg Graf Khevenhüller-Metsch ed. Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv), 614.
- Länderabteilungen, Belgien, Belgische Korrespondenz 30-2, Korrespondenz zwischen Erzherzog Ferdinand und Erzherzog Albert, 205. Ferdinand II an Albert 21 May 1619.

#### Printed primary sources

Backer, A. and A. Backer, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Liège 1853).

Backer, A., A. Backer and C. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Liège 1869).

Burggravius, J., *Biolychnivm seu Lycerna* (Franeker 1611).

Burggravius, J., *Achilles Panoplos redivivus* (Amsterdam 1612).

- [Camerarius, L.] *Unser Friederichs von Gottes Gnaden Königs in Böhemb Pfaltzgraven bey Rhein und Churfürsten etc. Offen Außschreiben Warumb Wir die Cron Böhemb und der incorporirten Länder Regierung auff Uns genommen* (Prague 1619).
- Foppens, J.F., *Bibliotheca belgica, sive Virorum in Belgio vitâ, scriptisque illustrium catalogus, librorumque nomenclatura* (Brussels 1739).
- Franknoi, V. ed., *Pázmány Péter Levelezése 1605-1625* [Correspondence Péter Pázmány] (Budapest 1873).
- Francheimus, M., *Expeditio Sicambro-Batava* (Mainz 1620).
- Franckheimus, M., *Asinus Palmatus* (Mainz 1620).
- Franckheim, M., [Valentino Caesario Austriaco] *Fides Bohemo-Palatina* (Vienna 1620).
- Fürstliche Anhaltische gehaimbe Cantzley etc.* (s.l. 1621).
- Garthius, H., *Acta et post-acta colloquii Pragensis de missa: das ist Gründlicher Bericht und Antwort vom Colloquio zu Prag von der Meß, zwischen D. Garthio und zweyen Jesuiten P. Kolovvrat und P. Fanino gehalten* (Wittenberg 1618).
- Gundling, N.H., *Abriss zu einer rechten Reichs-historie* (Halle 1707).
- Hartzheim, J., *Bibliotheca Coloniensis* (Cologne 1747).
- Hurter, F., *Geschichte Kaiser Ferdinands II. und seiner Eltern, bis zu dessen Krönung in Frankfurt 8* (Schaffhausen 1857).
- Khevenhüller, F.Ch., *Annales Ferdinandeï; oder Wahrhaffte Beschreibung Käysers Ferdinandi des andern, mildesten Gedächtniss, geburth, Aufferziehung und bisshero in Krieg und Friedens-Zeiten Vollbrachten thaten, geführten Kriegen und Vollzogenen hochwichtigen geschäfften* (Leipzig 1721).
- Londorp, M., *Acta Publica: Das ist, Der Römischen Keyserlichen Majestät, Matthiae, hochlöblichsten Andenckens, und der jetzo Regierender Keys. Majestät Ferdinandi Secundi (1617-1629) 1* (Frankfurt 1629).
- Metius, A., *Arithmeticae et geometriae practica* (Franeker 1611).
- Miraeus, A., 'Marcellus Francheimus', in: *Bibliotheca Ecclesiastica* (Antwerp 1649) 293-240.
- Posada, A. de, *Biografía eclesiástica completa* (Madrid 1851).
- Ribaneira, P. de, and P. Alegambe, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu* (Antwerp 1643).
- Roberti, J., *Goclenius heautonimorumenos* (Luxembourg 1618).
- Roberti, J., *Historia S. Huberti* (Luxembourg 1621).
- Stieve, F., *Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des Dreissigjährigen Krieges in den Zeiten des vorwaltenden Einflusses der Wittelsbacher 7. Von der Abreise Erzherzog Leopolds*

*nach Jülich bis zu den Werbungen Herzog Maximilians von Bayern im März 1610* (Munich 1870).

Vrancheim, M., *Meletemata Quaedam Ad L. XIIII. C. De Transact* (Marburg 1609).

Vranckheim, M., *Zētēmata quaedam ex u.i. & politica miscellanea* (Basel 1609).

Universitätsbibliothek Basel, Diss 235:61. <http://doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-21110>, accessed 28 March 2019.

### **Secondary sources**

Akkerman, N., *The Correspondence of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia: 1603-1631 I* (Oxford 2015).

Allard, H.J., 'Jhr Arent thoe Boecop S.J. 1586-1622' in: *Jaarboekje Jos. Albertingk Thijm* 55, (Nijmegen 1906).

Arblaster, P., *From Ghent to Aix: How They Brought the News in the Habsburg Netherlands, 1550-1700* (Leiden 2014).

Barten, J., 'Het proces van Jr. Arent thoe Boecop, Hagiograaf en Martelaar. Deel I', *Archief van de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke kerk in Nederland* 3 (1961) 269-295.

Barten, J., 'Het Proces van Jr. Arent thoe Boecop, Hagiograaf en Martelaar. Deel II', *Archief van de Geschiedenis van de Katholieke kerk in Nederland* 4 (1962) 41-52; 259-294.

Bayle, P., 'Wilhem, David le-Leu de' in: *Dictionnaire historique et critique* V (5th edition ; Amsterdam 1734) 505-507.

Baumgart, W., *Quellenkunde zur deutschen Geschichte der Neuzeit von 1500 bis zur Gegenwart* (Leiden 2018).

Bireley, R., *The Counter-Reformation Prince. Anti-Machiavellianism or Catholic Statecraft in Early Modern Europe* (Chapel Hill 1990).

Bireley, R., *Ferdinand II, Counter-Reformation emperor, 1578-1637* (New York 2014).

Bock, A., *Nicolaus Hieronymus Gundling 1671–1729 und sein „Entwurf einer Teutschen Reichs-Historie“* PhD-thesis (Düsseldorf 2005).

Burke, P., *A Social History of Knowledge. From Gutenberg to Diderot* (Cambridge 2002).

Christianson, J.R., *On Tycho's Island: Tycho Brahe and His Assistants, 1570-1601* (Cambridge 2000).

Doornink-Hoogenraad, M.M., 'Een Zutphense rector en zijn geloof', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Vereniging Gelre* 72 (1981) 69-98.

- Dijksterhuis, F.J., 'Magi from the North: Instruments of Fire and Light in the Early Seventeenth century' in: A. Borrelli, G. Hon and Y. Zik ed., *The Optics of Giambattista Della Porta (ca. 1535–1615): A Reassessment* (Dordrecht 2017) 125-143.
- Dijkstra, A. J. F., *Between academics and idiots: a cultural history of mathematics in the Dutch province of Friesland (1600-1700)* (Enschede 2012).
- Duerloo, L., *Dynasty and Piety: Archduke Albert (1598–1621) and Habsburg Political Culture in an Age of Religious Wars* (Farnham 2012).
- Duerloo, L., 'De beeldtaal van de Staten van Brabant', *Ons Brabant* 3-4 (2013) 1-22.
- Duch, A., 'Arnoldin von Clarstein, Mathias', in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1 (1953), 391 [Online-Version], <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd135718686.html#ndbcontent>, accessed 5 June 2018.
- Federmayer, F., 'Laurentius Ferencffy, der Sekretär der Ungarischen Hofkanzlei und seine Familie' in: A. Fundárková et al., *Die weltliche und Kirchliche Elite aus dem Königreich Böhmen und Königreich Ungarn am Wiener Kaiserhof im 16.–17. Jahrhundert* (Vienna 2013) 125-146.
- Frijhoff, W., 'Sint Justus' hoofd, Baudartius' bijbel, Franckheims zerk en Spitholts beurs: een Zutphens netwerk tussen Noord en Zuid', *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis* 87 (2004) 285-303.
- Frijhoff, W., 'Overlevingsstrategieën van katholieken in Zutphen na de Hervorming' in: E. H. Bary ed., *Lebwinus en Walburgis bijeen: Deventer en Zutphen als historische centra van kerkelijk leven. Bijdragen van de Vereniging voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 16 (2006) 203-220.
- Fritz, G., T. Gloning and J. Glüer, *Historical Pragmatics of Controversies: Case studies from 1600 to 1800* (Amsterdam 2018).
- Gebauer, J.H., *Die Publicistik über den böhmischen Aufstand von 1618* (Halle 1892).
- Gennip, J. van, *Controversen in context: een comparatief onderzoek naar de Nederlandstalige controversepublicaties van de jezuiten in de zeventiende-eeuwse Republiek* (Hilversum 2014).
- Ghesquière, J., *Acta sanctorum Belgii selecta* (Brussels 1789).
- Gindeley, A. *Geschichte de Böhmisches Aufstands von 1618* 1 (Prague 1869).
- Hammer-Purgstall, J., *Geschichte des Osmanischen Reiches: Bd. 1520-1623* (Budapest 1840).
- Hammer-Purgstall, J., *Khlesl's, des Cardinals, Directors des geheimen Cabinets Kaisers Mathias, Leben: Mit der Sammlung von Khlesl's Briefen, Staatsschreiben, Vorträgen, Gutachten, Decreten, Patenten, Denkworteln und anderen Urkunden* (Vienna 1847).

- Harris, S.J., 'Networks of travel, correspondence, and exchange' in: K. Park and L. Daston ed., *The Cambridge history of science III, Early Modern science* (Cambridge 2006) 341-362.
- Hedesan, G.D., *An Alchemical Quest for Universal Knowledge: The 'Christian Philosophy' of Jan Baptist Van Helmont (1579-1644)* (Londen 2016).
- Hoftijzer, P., *Bibliotheca Thysiana. 'Tot publijcke dienst der studie'* (Leiden 2008).
- Hone, J. *Literature and Party Politics at the Accession of Queen Anne* (Oxford 2017).
- Hoogstraten D., e.a. ed., 'Francheim of Franckemius', in: *Groot algemeen historisch, ... woordenboek V* (Amsterdam 1733) 136.
- Hulshof, A., 'De Legende Van Sinte Kunera', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 10 (1917) 7-17.
- Israel, J.I., *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806* (Oxford 1995).
- Janssen, G., *Dutch revolt and Catholic exile in reformation Europe* (Cambridge 2014).
- Johnston, R., H. Louthan and T. Ó Hánracháin, 'Catholic Reformers: Stanislas Hosius, Melchior Khlesl, and Péter Pázmány' in: H. Louthan and G. Murdock ed., *A Companion to the Reformation in Central Europe* (Leiden 2015) 195-222.
- Jongbloet-van Houtte, G., *Brieven en andere bescheiden betreffende Daniel van der Meulen 1584-1600. Huygens Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, XXIX;XCIX-C* <http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/brievenvandermeulen> accessed 27-03-2018
- Kaplan, B. e.a. ed., *Catholic Communities in Protestant States: Britain and the Netherlands c.1570-1720* (Manchester 2009).
- Keller, V., *Cornelis Drebbel (1572 - 1633). Fame and the Making of Modernity*, unpublished doctoral dissertation, (Princeton 2008).
- Keller, V., 'Drebbel's Living Instruments, Hartmann's Microcosm, and Libavius's Thelesmos. Epistemic Machines before Descartes', *History of Science* 48 (2010) 39–74.
- Kok, J., 'David le Leu de Wilhem', in: *Vaderlandsch woordenboek* 31 (Amsterdam 1794) 113.
- Kooi, C., *Calvinists and Catholics During Holland's Golden Age: Heretics and Idolaters* (Cambridge 2013).
- Kooijmans, L., *Vriendschap en de kunst van het overleven in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw* (Amsterdam 1997).
- Ludwig, W., 'Arnoldus a Boecop und ein Band mit Gedenkschriften an Justus Lipsius', *Humanistica Lovaniensia: Journal of Neo-Latin Studies* 48 (1999) 285-298.
- Mayer, A., *Wiens Buchdrucker-Geschichte 1482-1882* (Vienna 1883).

- Mourits, E., *Een kamer gevuld met de mooiste boeken. De bibliotheek van Johannes Thysius (1622-1653)* (Nijmegen 2016).
- Mommsen, K., *Auf dem Wege zur Staatssouveränität: Staatliche Grundbegriffe in Basler Juristischen Doktordisputationen des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Bern 1970).
- Nahrendorf, C., 'Evenius, Sigismund' in: W. Kühlmann et al. ed., *Frühe Neuzeit in Deutschland 1520-1620. Literaturwissenschaftliches Verfasserlexikon 3* (Berlin 2014).
- Nolden, K., *Die Reichspolitik Kaiser Ferdinands II in der Publizistik bis zum Lübecker Frieden 1629* (Cologne 1958).
- Paquot, J.N., *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept provinces des Pays-Bas, de la principauté de Liège, et de quelques contrées voisines* (Louvain 1765).
- Parker, C.H., *Faith on the Margins: Catholics and Catholicism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge MA 2008).
- Parrot, D., 'A 'Prince Sovereign' and the French Crown: Charles de Nevers (1580-1637)' in: R. Oresko, G. C. Gibbs and H.M. Scott ed., *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of Ragnhild M. Hatton* (Cambridge 1997)149-187.
- Pecho, C., *Fürstbischof - Putschist - Landesherr: Erzherzog Leopolds Herrschaftsentwürfe im Zeitalter des Dreißigjährigen Krieges* (Münster 2017).
- Petersen, A., *Über die Bedeutung der Flugschrift, "die anhaltische Kanzlei" vom Jahre 1621* (Jena 1867).
- Pollmann, J.S., *Catholic Identity and the Revolt of the Netherlands, 1520-1635* (Oxford 2011).
- Ravensbergen, C., 'Authorities and Religious Minorities in the East of the Dutch Republic. The Quarter of Zutphen, 1592–1620' in: H. J. Selderhuis and J. M. J. Lange ed., *Reformed Majorities in Early Modern Europe*, Refo500 Academic Studies 23 (Göttingen 2015) 230-265.
- Reisner, S., 'Die poetische Habsburg-Panegyrik in lateinischer Sprache als historische Quelle', in: J. Pauser, M. Scheutz and T. Winkelbauer ed., *Quellenkunde der Habsburgermonarchie (16.–18. Jahrhundert)* (Vienna 2004) 898–915.
- Ridder, C.B. de, 'Aubert Le Mire, sa vie, ses écrits: mémoire historique et critique', *Mémoires couronnés et mémoires des savants étrangers, publiés par l'Académie royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique* 31 (Brussels 1863).
- Rooden, P.T. van, *Theology, biblical scholarship and rabbinical studies in the seventeenth Century. Constantijn l'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden* (Leiden 1989).

- Sapper, C., ‘Kinder des Geblüts – die Bastarde Kaiser Rudolfs II’, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 47 (1999) 29-90.
- Schmidt, P., *Spanische Universalmonarchie oder "teutsche Libertet": das Spanische Imperium in der Propaganda des Dreissigjährigen Krieges* (Stuttgart 2001).
- Schmidt, P., ed., *Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, Die Kölner Nuntiatur II, Nuntius Antonio Albergati 1614–1616* (Munich 2009).
- Schubert, F.H., ‘Camerarius, Ludwig’, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 3 (1957), 105-107 [Online-Version]; URL: <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118666754.html#ndbcontent>, accessed 1 June 2019.
- Sokoll, J., ‘Althann, Michael Adolf Graf von’ in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 1 (1953) 219 f. [Online-Version]; URL: <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd135708524.html#ndbcontent>, accessed 5 May 2018.
- Stads- en streekarchief Zutphen, ‘Rekening van overrentmeester Johannes ten Beem, 1591/1592’ in: *De stadsrekeningen van Zutphen over het jaar 1591/1592* inv. 1153. Oud-archief Zutphen (Zutphen 2006).
- Streekarchief Langstraat Heusen Altena, *Inventaris 0051 Heerlijkheid Oudheusden, Elshout en Hulten* (Heusden s.d.).
- Stummvoll, J., *Geschichte der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek I. Die Hofbibliothek (1368-1922)* (Wien 1968).
- Tusor, P., *Pázmány, the Jesuit Prelate. His Appointment as Primate of Hungary, 1615–1616 (A Micropolitical Study)* (Budapest 2016).
- Tusor, P., ‘Dynastic Politics, Diplomacy and the Catholic Church: Péter Pázmány’s 1616 Appointment as Archbishop of Esztergom’ in: S. Brzeziński and Á. Zarnóczkied ed., *A Divided Hungary in Europe: Exchanges, Networks and Representations, 1541-1699 2 – Diplomacy, Information Flow and Cultural Exchange* (Newcastle upon Tyne 2014) 149-182.
- Vanhoutte, J., ‘“Van robins tot très grands nobles”. Carrièreplanning en huwelijksstrategie bij het geslacht Richardot in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden (1540-1701)’ in: G. Marnef and R. Vermeir ed., *Adel en macht. Politiek, cultuur, economie* (Maastricht 2004).
- Vegiano, J.C.J. de, *Suite du supplément au Nobiliaire des Pays-Bas et du comté de Bourgogne* 3-4 (Antwerp 1779).
- Wilson, P.H., *Europe's Tragedy. A History of the Thirty Years' War* (Cambridge 2011).
- Williams, P., *The Great Favourite. The Duke of Lerma and the Court and Government of Philip III of Spain, 1598-1621* (Manchester 2006).

Winkelbauer, Th., *Fürst und Fürstendiener. Gundaker von Liechtenstein. Ein Österreichischer Aristokrat des Konfessionellen Zeitalters* (Vienna 1999).

Ziller Camenietzki, C., 'Jesuits and Alchemy in the Early Seventeenth Century: Father Johannes Roberti and the Weapon-Salve Controversy,' *Ambix* 48 (2001) 83-101.

## ANNEXES

**Annex I Transcription and Translation Letter Marcellus Franckheim to Franz Gansneb Tengnagel. Caramanzel, 8 October 1619 <sup>241</sup>**

Perillustris Amplissime Consultissime Domine,

Cum ex officio, tum stipulatione inita, fateor non unas vobis deberi litteras. Sed quid calamum inhibuerit, nec sat ausim litteris credere, nec, si ausim, ut rem vobis injucundam, mihi insperatam ac molestissimam, lubens aperuerim. Distuli scribitionem, quia reflexurum me speravi, in melius, Heri ingenium. Sed cum frustra sim hactenus, non possum quin vobis, quid rei sit, insinueri, quod eius quoque parvis-sime, sub fide silentii, pro vestra prudentia. Apud Bavarum, semel ordinis facta mentio; quod primum fuit ac postremum. post id, Crux ordinis insigne, raro nobis affulsit amplius. Vesontione, in Sequonis, litterae illae omnes, quae passim ad Imperii proceres directa erant, relictæ sunt, aut derelictæ. Ac crux, quam verbis conceptis et jurejurato ad Sanctorum Evangeliorum Codicem induit, sitne inibi seposita an deposita, me nescire fateor. Hoc saltem scio et plures mecum, quod sorori suae reliquerit, quodque non semel mihi objectum aut vitio datum, quod auctor ei fuerim ac persuasor militiae illius suscipiendae. Steti pro ordine, ac causam eius egi, in quantum potui quantumque ad me attinet, eandem eius erga me expertus sum constantiam. causam mei demeriti, vel suae indignationis, ut dignaretur mihi aperire, petij respondit suo tempore se dicturum. immo dixit fuites quasdam calumnias, tam ineptas, ut referre pudor sit. E[quidem] nihil causae legitimæ dicturum aut ficturum contendo, quo ad ipse erit et ego ei[...], qui causam meam tueri potero. Virtutis ac probitatis, cum Bono Deo, sat mihi sum conscius, quantam non capit aula illius. Scio quibus artibus Heri ingenium adeo sibi fecerit obnoxium, ac me supplantari, officiosum par fratrum qui homines inter se convenas facere norunt. Quorum alter insignia illius lenoriniae dedit specimina, apud Don Balthasar de Zuniga, uterque edidit hactenus apud Herum suum. Nec dubito, quin uterque cum Isto, parentaturi sint aliquando assestrici Jovis. Sed hac et alia divinae sententiae relinquo. Utinam scire possim quae incrementa alibi interea vester ordo fecerit, cui nihil detrimenti afferet haec unius, quorum dixi facta secessio. si locus ille, mihi aliquando, vestra erga me benevolentia, oblatus vacaret, equidem amplecterer, et qua sti.. quaque opera alia illi propaganda incumberem. Decretum mihi est, quoquo modo [...]illi obnunciare, qui qualiacumque promissa ac stipulationes quaslibet, ut verba honoris habet vel autumnus huius

---

<sup>241</sup> I am highly indebted to Jan Waszink for spending considerable time on checking my transcriptions and translations and saving me from errors. Any remaining mistakes are entirely my own. A [...] indicates a passage in the manuscript that was not readable.

folia. nec tam vilis aut venalis sim animae ut velim, quod vetus quidam aulae cliens fecit, senex fieri, iniurias accipiendo & gratias agendo. Vale mi vir perillustris ac Patrone colendissime, meaque obsequia Illustrissimo Comiti ab Althan unice quiero commenda, itemque optimo Patri Barptolomeo Villerio.

Postridie Nonas Octobres 1619 Ex pago Caramanzil quod una leuca circiter est supra Madrida, in quo pago iam aliquot septimanis delites sumus et adventum Regis praestolamur.

Hui! Longa est fabula. Iterum vale mi vir Perillustris. Cui ego mea obsequia dedico.

Marcellus Franckheimus Juris Consultus

Aula Laterani et Sacri Palatini Apostolici Comes  
aureae militiae Eques.

#### TRANSLATION

Highly distinguished Lord,

I have to admit that by virtue of my task and as agreed in the beginning, I owe you quite some letters. However, what inhibited the pen, I do not to trust to paper, and if I could, I would rather not be open about it, because it is a cause unpleasant for you and unhoped for and highly disagreeably with me. I have postponed writing because I hoped for improvement with regard to His Master's kind. However, because until now I have been unsuccessful, I cannot do anything else than telling you the very little I can, under promise of silence and to your discretion.

With [the Duke of] Bavaria, the order has just been mentioned once, which was the first and last time. After this, the decorative cross of the order rarely shone upon us anymore. In Besançon in Burgundy, all the letters that were to be sent to all nobles all over the Empire got left or got lost. I have to admit that I do not know what has come of the cross that he accepted under oath and swearing allegiance on the Holy Scripture and whether he has put it off or has disposed of it.

This I do know at least, as many do with me: that he left it to his sister and that he has accused and blamed me for it more than once, that it was my doing and that I persuaded him to take the Militia upon him. I have stood for the order, and have done for its cause as much as I could. Moreover, in doing what was within my reach, I likewise experienced [the order's]

constancy towards me. I asked him why I had deserved his disdain that he displayed to me. He answered that he will tell when his time comes.

Instead, he uttered such vain things and false accusations, so impertinent that they are even too shameful to mention. As for me, I will not write or speak any more about the legitimate case, until he will do, and I can defend my case. For God's sake, it is clear enough, that his entourage does not hold much virtue and honesty. I know with which arts His Master's kind has made himself so liable, and how he made me stumble, just like these brothers are wont to do who know how to bring people together. Examples of the latter he gave to Don Balthasar de Zuniga with the matchmaking, and so far, he displayed both to his Master. I do not doubt that both will appease with him, and finally will appease with Jupiter's female assistant. However, this and other things I leave to divine judgement.

If only I knew how in the meantime your Order is doing elsewhere, to which this harm is not done, by him of whom I have said to withdraw. When instead at some point some (other) offer opens, because of your kindness towards me, I would indeed embrace that, and [if there is] other work I throw myself on pursuing it. I have to decide in what way to tell him the bad news, who makes promises and agreements as he likes, giving words of honour like leaves in autumn. I am not of such a vile or corrupt soul that I wish to do like the ancient client at the court: growing old, while taking insults and saying thanks.

Goodbye, my honoured man and most protecting Patron, and I ask to recommend my obedience in particular to the most illustrious Count Althan, and to Father Bartholomeus Villerius as well.

8 October 1619, from the hamlet Caramanzil, which is about one mile above Madrid, where we are hold up already for some weeks, awaiting the arrival of the king.

Ho! this is a long story. Again, good-bye my honoured Lord. To whom I dedicate my obedience,

Marcellus Frankheimus, Juris Consultis

Count Palatine of the Lateran and sacred apostolic palace

Knight of the Golden Sporn

**Annex II Transcription and Translation Letter Marcellus Franckheim to Franz Gansneb Tegnagel. Mainz, 12 March 1620**

Illustris & Amplissime Domine

Quod ex officio ac stipulatione debui, ex Hispania feci; ac litteras sat prolixas dedi, itineris et in eo successus, indices. Quas cum perlatas esse. Sperem, breviores do, quibus significo, me ex Hispania nuper, in Germaniam rediisse incolumem, sed bene nudum. Quod si velim recensere, quid mihi ab illo Marchione contigerit, prolixa mihi scribenda sit historia; quam ego meditabor suo tempore. Et videbit aliquando, cuius interest, quomodo tractemus litterati et candidi homines ab iis qui volunt Imperatorum esse filii. Circa Autumnum proximum spero mihi offerendam occasionem qua possim Viennam excurrere et jus meum prosequi; coram Imperatore, adversus Marchionem illum! Quem ego nunc intus et in cute novi. ut ille me in Hispania turpiter prostituit, ac destituit; sic ordidnem vestrum ante deseruit. quod ut ex Hispania scripsi; sic hic repeto, sub fide silentii pro vestra prudentia moderandi. Apud Bavarum semel omnino vestri ordinis facta est mentio et hoc postremum fuit. Vesontione in Sequonis, litteras illas omnes, quae passim, ad Imperij proceres directae fuerunt, apud sororem seposuit. Crucem ordinis vestri insigne, ibidem apud eandem reliquit. An resumturus iam sit nescio. Hoc saltem scio et Deum testor, quod non semel, caperata fronte mihi objecerit atque exprobrarit me sibi auctorem ac persuasorum fuisse militia illi suscipienda. Item, quod susque deque habito ordine vestro aureum vellus affectaret et triginta quinque aureos Hungaricos dedi Marchioni mutuos; qui qua fide mihi persoluti sunt, ut et meum stipendium dicam suo loco. Quid multis? Nemo, qui Marchionem non bene novit, crediturus est, quid mihi contigerit. Quod nomen in Hispania reliquerit norunt Comites Fuggeri, Marquardus et Marcus Philippus quibuscum Madrigo Bajonam perveni. Novit item Joannes Bonaventura Papazoni, Caesaris cubicularius; qui et Joannem Christophorum Ranft novit. Sed haec et alia divinae sententiae in praesentiarum, relinquo, juxta quam parentabit ille Marchio, cum Suis lenonibus aliquando assestrici Jovis. Caterum aveo scire, quem progressum interea vester ordo fecerit et quo loco res vestrae sint. Intelleximus hic comitem ab Althan, in Polonia et Hungaria fuisse cum Domino Homonai. Cuperem scire non minus; quid agat Don Carolus; qui utinam sciret, quod ego in rem illius fore scio. Novi ego ubi aberrarit ac peccarit Don Matthias et quare non sit a Rege Catholicos susceptus. Sed ista litteris non sunt credenda.

Vale mi vir illustris et me illum habe qui aviternum ero, ubi ubi ero gentium tui observantissimus

Marcellus Franckheimus Juris Consultis

Moguntiarum IV Idibus Martius 1620

Quid ad me placuerit rescribere, dirigat ad

Reverendum Patrem Balthasarem Hagerum Collegii Moguntiae Rectorem

[aut] ad Dominum Arnoldum a Boecop qui salutem iussit adscribi

[Of]ficiosissimam uterque [enim] sciet, ubi ego futurus sum.

#### TRANSLATION

Honoured and esteemed Lord,

What I owed according to my task and according to agreement, I have done from Spain; and I have sent very extensive letters, which pointed to the itinerary and what happened after. I hope they came through. I give a short report from the most important, having returned shortly from Spain in Germany, unharmed but quite deprived.

If I would like to enlist what happened to me because of this Margrave, I would have to write an extended history; what I eventually consider to do. Then, finally those interested will see, how civilised and honest men are treated by those who want to be sons of the Emperor. I hope that around next fall an opportunity is offered which enables me to leave for Vienna and to pursue my right for the emperor's court, against this Margrave! Whom I know now inside and out. That he has scandalously misused and disappointed me in Spain. Just like he has forsaken your order before, as I wrote from Spain, which I will repeat here, for your discrete and prudent consideration.

With [the Duke of] Bavaria your order was mentioned once, and this was the last time. In Besançon, in Burgundy, he has left all letters that were to be sent to all nobles everywhere in the Empire with his sister. The cross, the decoration of your order, he also left with her. I do not know whether he will recover it soon.

However, this I know and attest for God, what he not just once has thrown in my face and has accused me of, that it was my doing and persuasion that he took the Militia upon him. In addition, that despite clothed with your order, he is aiming for the Golden Fleece and that I have given thirty-five Hungarian Guilders on loan to the Margrave, which had been paid to me in trust, as salary at a certain moment.

What more? Only those who know the Margrave well will believe what has befallen me. The Counts Marquard & Marcus Fugger, sons of Philip, with whom I arrived at Bayonne from Madrid, know what reputation he has left in Spain. Joannes Bonaventura Papazoni, the emperor's chamberlain, knows him who also knows Johannes Christophorus Ranft. But this and other things I leave to divine judgement for the present, just like this Margrave with his matchmakers will reconcile with Jupiter's female assistant.

Further, I crave to know, what progress your order has made in the meantime and how things stand with you. We have heard here that Count Althan together with Lord Homonnai went to Poland and Hungary. I desire not less to know what Don Carolus is doing, if only he knew what I know which would benefit his matters. I know where Don Matthias errs and why he was not received by the Catholic King. However, these things should not be trusted to paper.

Good bye, my esteemed Lord to whom I will be always and wherever I am,  
your most observant

Marcellus Franckheimus Juris Consultus

Mainz, 12 March 1620

What you would like to write to me in return, send it to the reverend father Balthasar Hager, Rector of the Jesuit College of Mainz [or] to Arnold toe Boecop who insists that I add his most obliging greetings. Each of them knows where I will be in the future.

**Annex III Transcription and Translation Letter Marcellus Franckheim to Sebastian Tengnagel. Mainz, 12 March 1620**

Clarissimo viro Domino Sebastiano Tengnagel Juris Utriusque Doctor

Χαίρειν καί εὐ δίαγειν

Ecce tibi ἀνοῦδρομον illum tuum reducem, ac bonae mentis valetudinisque, cum Bono Deo compotem: et ab illius manu amicissima salutem hanc officiosissimum, vir clarissime; qui te ubicunque fuit locorum gentiumque, penitior illo sui pectoris sacrario circumtulit tuo equidem merito. Scripsi ex Hispaniis bene prolixas litteras; sed quia in casum illas dedi, et multa cadunt inter calicem supremaque labra e propinquiori ac tutiori alteras etsi breviores submitto; ubi mea no Suetionis fere est in talibus; ne quid praeterrittam officii in conservanda amicitia; cuius ultro citroque inter nos in itae confarreationis constat apud me religio ceu fixa clavo prorsus trabali. Quod saepius non emiserim amoris et affectus stricturas; non meae velim inpuces oblivioni aut negligentia sed fortuna; qua talis fuit, apud Nothum illum legitimatum, ut res sat prolixa foret historia, si eius describendum sit hodoeporicon. me, tabula sacer votiva paries indicet unda vestimenta potenti suspendisse muris Deo: et haec privata non prosequa nil profecturis querimoniis. De publicis quaero; ubi et quo loco res vestra sint: respirasse iam nuper accepimus et inducias esse vobis cum Transsylvano, in festum Diem Michaelis. sed an recutito illi vel recutiti mancipio potestis fidere. Ipsi Nonis huius mensis ivit Elector Moguntius Asschaffenburgo Mulhusium; aderunt ibi Coloniensis, Treverensis, Bavarus, Saxo et Brunsvicenis. Magna spes est Lutheranos in partem Catholicorum ituros: etsi verendum est, immodica fore protestantium illorum postulata. Sed quid facimus? Ea sunt tempora, ut vel iniquum a nobis auferre debeant, ne cum Antirege Bohemia et Antiregiis se consociet et clerus Germania praeda sit plus occupanti. Emisi hisce diebus orationem quandam mea, cuius exemplar misissem, ni intervallum illud absterruisset et aliud scriptum sub praelo est in causa publica cui praefixum nomen Austriacum. quod ubi prodierit, mittam, si Francoforto ad vos non pervenerit.

Interea te valere opto et redamare tui amantissimum. IV. Eidibus Martius 1620 Moguntiarum.

Tuum aeviternum

Marcellus Franckheimus Juris Utriusque Doctor

Salutem adscribo copiosissimam [...] Reverendo Patro Martino Becano.

Et quaero ut litterae, quas inclusi, illis de[tuleris] quibus inscripsi  
tum ut locus det[ineretis] [...] meae litterariae quam reliqui Viennae aedibus Don Matthia.  
Circa autumnum forsean vos excurram, si tempora erunt tranquilliora.

## TRANSLATION

To the esteemed Sebastian Tengnagel, JUD  
(good day to you)

Look at you traveler! who thank God has returned, healthy in body and mind; with the friendliest hand and the most obliging greeting, esteemed man; and who, in whatever place he was on earth, has kept for you a sacred and well deserved place in his heart.

From Spain I have written quite extensive letters, but because I sent them hit-and-miss and because ‘there is many a twixt between the cup and the lip’, I send another one, though a bit shorter and from a nearer and safer place.

I am not allowed to tell about what happened in Burgundy; except what should not be forgotten to keep up friendship, which is fixed as my faith, which is as fixed as the heaviest nails in a house. That I could not escape more often the toils of love and emotion, you should not blame on my neglect or disobedience but on fortune.

What further happened with this legitimated Bastard would be enough for an extended history, if a travelogue would be written. As for me: ‘The votive tablets on the sacred wall indicate that I have hung my wet clothes in honour of the God who rules over the sea’ [thus, I am sadder and wiser: seen it - done it]. I will not go further into these private issues and it does not make sense to complain.

I would like to ask you about the public issues, and about how things stand with your business. Lately, we were relieved to hear that you have agreed on a truce with Transylvania at Michael’s day. Though [I doubt] whether this circumcised, or slave of the circumcised, is to be trusted. The 7<sup>th</sup> of this month, the Elector of Mainz went to Mühlhausen with the Elector of Aschaffenburg. [The Electors of] Cologne, Trier, Bavaria, Saxony and Brunswick will come as well. There is a lot of hope that the Lutherans take the side of the Catholics, if this is the case, this will be under disproportional conditions of these Protestants. But what should we do? These are times in which we have to take unfair shares, in order that the Bohemian anti-king and the anti-kings do not join each other and more German clergy becomes prey to be occupied.

These days, I published a certain sermon of mine, of which I would have sent a copy if the events had not prevented this, and there is another work of me in press about the public case which I have written under the name 'Austriacus'. If it comes out, I will send it, if it does not reach you from Frankfurt.

In the meantime, I wish to greet you and to return love for love,

most loving

Yours eternally,

Marcellus Franckheim, Doctor in both laws.

Mainz, 12 March 1620

I add a most eloquent greeting for the reverend father Martin Becanus.

I would like to ask to forward the enclosed letters to those to whom I addressed them and to keep for me my books which I left in Vienna in Don Matthias' dwellings.

Around next fall, perhaps I will visit you when the times are a bit more tranquil.