



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MACERATA

DIPARTIMENTO DI STUDI UMANISTICI

CORSO DI DOTTORATO DI RICERCA IN
HUMAN SCIENCES – FILOSOFIA, STORIA DELLA FILOSOFIA E SCIENZE UMANE

CICLO XXIX

TITOLO DELLA TESI
ADAM BOREEL (1602 – 1665): HIS LIFE AND THOUGHT

RELATORE

Chiar.mo Prof. FILIPPO MIGNINI

DOTTORANDO

Dott. FRANCESCO QUATRINI

COORDINATORE

Chiar.mo Prof. GUIDO ALLINEY

ANNO 2017

Adam Boreel (1602 – 1665): His Life and Thought

Index

Introduction.....p. 5

Table of acronyms.....p. 16

Part I: The Life of Adam Boreel and his writings

- Chapter I: 1602 – 1627.....p. 17
 - Boreel’s childhood and his first studies at the University of Leiden.....p. 17
 - The first trip to England and Ziegler’s case.....p. 27
- Chapter II: 1628 – 1638.....p. 36
 - Boreel’s second enrollment at the University of Leiden.....p. 37
 - 1632: a new trip to England? A discussion about Schneider’s biography and the first contacts with the Hartlib Circle.....p. 42
- Chapter III: 1639 – 1654.....p. 53
 - The vocalized edition of the Mishnah and the interests in Jewish people.....p. 55
 - The first works of Adam Boreel.....p. 71
 - The College of Amsterdam.....p. 79
 - Boreel’s scientific interests and his financial problems.....p. 103
- Chapter IV: 1655 – 1665.....p. 112
 - Boreel’s stay in London.....p. 113
 - The writing of the Jesus Nazareus Legislator.....p. 124
 - The translation of the Mishnah and the “Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate”.....p. 135
 - The Amsterdam College.....p. 145

- The illness, the last will, and the death of Adam Boreel.....p. 166
- Chapter V: The Bibliography of Adam Boreel.....p. 168
 - Boreel’s published works.....p. 169
 - The writings published in the «Scripta Adami Borelii Posthuma».....p. 172
 - Boreel’s manuscript writings.....p. 177

Part II The thought of Adam Boreel

- Chapter I: Boreel’s criticism of ecclesiastic authority and his Church of Connivance.....p. 178
 - The “radical reform” against the ministers of modern churches.....p. 179
 - Boreel’s critical argumentations against ecclesiastical authority.....p. 194
 - The Church of Connivance.....p. 200
- Chapter II: The Church of connivance: Scriptures, Toleration and Freedom of Speech.....p. 205
 - Two centuries of struggles for freedom of speech and religious toleration.....p. 207
 - Boreel and the Holy Scriptures as the cornerstone of public religion.....p. 227
 - Toleration and freedom of speech within the Christian religion.....p. 232
- Chapter III: The truth of the Holy Scriptures.....p. 240
 - The proofs of Sozzini and Grotius for the truth of the Christian Religion.....p. 242
 - The Jesus Nazarene Legislator: an unfinished work.....p. 258

▪	The proof of the New Testament: a necessary step to show that Christ is the only Legislator of mankind.....	p. 262
•	Chapter IV: The rational fundamentals of Christian religion.....	p. 271
▪	Truths necessities and non-necessaries to salvation: the centrality of “communia fundamentalia” of Christianity.....	p. 272
▪	Veritas, certitudo e Lex Christi in the thought of Boreel.....	p. 288
▪	The rationality of the Christian religion and the “communia fundamentalia”.....	p. 293
•	Chapter V: Christ Legislator: The Relationship between Church and State.....	p. 305
▪	The relationship between Church and State in the thoughts of Sebastian Castellio and Dirck Coornhert.....	p. 307
▪	Christ as legislator of mankind.....	p. 315
▪	Christ as Legislator: Boreel’s universal State based on the Church of Connivance.....	p. 321
•	Chapter VI: The union between man and God.....	p. 327
▪	The “radical reformation” and the path towards God.....	p. 330
▪	Boreel’s threefold way towards God.....	p. 342
	Conclusion	p. 358
	Bibliography	p. 372

Introduction

In 1896 K.O. Meisma published his work about Spinoza and the circle of his friends and acquaintances, which can still be regarded as a cornerstone for the studies concerning Spinoza and the historical background in which he lived.¹ In this work it is possible to find a whole chapter concerning the Collegiants, a Christian movement that was founded in the Dutch Republic at the beginning of the 17th century.² In particular, Meisma focused on the Collegiants from Amsterdam. After he had given some information related to this group of Collegiants, their meeting-places, and the kind of assemblies they held, Meisma wrote: «bij deze mannen was het dus, dat Spinoza zich in den loop van het jaar 1654 of in den aanvang van 1655, aansloot. Het kon wel niet anders of de jeugdige wijsgeer moest er spoedig op prijs gesteld worden. Zijne groote en grondige kennis van de Hebreeuwsche taal, zijn onbevangen oordeel over al hetgeen Joodsch, en meer nog, over hetgeen Christelijk was, dwong achting en waardering af onder menschen, die zich meestal met rationalistische Schriftverklaring bezig hielden».³

The suggestion that Spinoza got in touch with some Christian groups living and working in 17th century Amsterdam, after he was banished from the Jewish congregation, is an idea that has fascinated scholars from the 20th and 21st centuries. For instance, in 1938 Henry J. Cadbury published an extract of a letter of William Ames, the Quaker leader of the mission in Amsterdam, where he had informed Margaret Fell, one of the leaders of the Quaker movement, that he had met a Jew that had been banished from his congregation in Amsterdam and that this Jew had offered to translate into Hebrew some of the pamphlets that the Quakers had written for Jewish people.⁴ Shortly after, William Hull published the whole letter in his work

¹ K.O. Meisma, *Spinoza en zijn Kring. Historisch-kritische Studiën over Hollandsche vrijgeesten*, 's-Gravenhage, 1896.

² Chapter 4 is entitled «De Collegianten». See: Meisma, *Spinoza en zijn Kring* (see above, n. 1), pp. 94-124.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 102.

⁴ Henry J. Cadbury, «Spinoza and a Quaker Document of 1657», in *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 1938, pp. 130-132.

concerning the Quaker mission in Amsterdam.⁵ Starting from this letter, during the 1980s Richard Popkin was able to find a copy of a Hebrew translation of a Quaker pamphlet and he argued that Spinoza most likely was the translator.⁶ Furthermore, in the same period a series of works and articles concerning the Dutch “Christians without a Church”, their relationship with Jewish people, and in particular the relationship between Christian dissenters and Spinoza, were published.⁷

In particular, Richard Popkin was a prolific author in such topics. He was the major advocate of the idea suggesting that Spinoza joined the non-confessional Christians of Amsterdam for a short time, after leaving the Jewish community. For instance, he wrote: «a close friend and personal acquaintance of Spinoza, Henry Oldenburg, not only knew the text, and apparently had a copy, but was anxiously trying to get the leader of the Dutch Collegiants, Adam Boreel, to write a refutation of both the Heptaplomeres and an early form of Les trois Imposteurs, at the very time Spinoza was living in the Collegiant world».⁸ A few years later, he again wrote: «Boreel was at the time the leader of what Kolawkoski has labelled Chrétiens sans église. He was an Oxford graduate, and a or the leading Dutch Hebraist. He had worked with two of Spinoza’s teachers, Rabbis Jacob Judah Leon and Menasseh ben Israel, on the Hebrew vocalized edition of the Mishna of 1646. He was a

⁵ William I. Hull, *The Rise of Quakerism in Amsterdam, 1655-1665*, Swarthmore, 1938.

⁶ Richard H. Popkin and Michael A. Signer (ed.), *Spinoza's earliest Publication The Hebrew Translation of Margaret Fell's: A Loving salutation to the seed of Abraham among the Jews, where they are scattered up and down upon the face of the earth*, Assen, 1987.

⁷ For instance, see: Richard Popkin, «Spinoza and the conversion of the Jews», in C. de Deugd (ed.), *Spinoza's Political and Theological Thought. International Symposium under the Auspices of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences Commemorating the 350th Anniversary of the Birth of Spinoza*, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 171-183; Leszek Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans Église. La Conscience Religieuse et le Lien Confessionnel au XVII^e Siècle par Leszek Kolakowski. Traduit du Polonais par Anna Posner*, Paris, 1987; Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, *De Mystieke Chiliast Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) en zijn Wereld*, Dordrecht, 1987; J. van der Berg and Ernestine G.E. van der Wall (ed.), *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century. Studies and documents*, Dordrecht, 1988; Yosef Kaplan, Henry Méchoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, *Menasseh ben Israel and his World*, Leiden, 1989; Richard Popkin, «Spinoza and the Three Imposters», in Edwin Curley and Pierre-François Moreau (ed.), *Spinoza. Issues and Directions. The Proceedings of the Chicago Spinoza Conference*, Leiden, 1990; David S. Katz and Jonathan I. Israel (ed.), *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews*, Leiden, 1990.

⁸ Richard Popkin, «Could Spinoza have known Bodin’s Colloquium Heptaplomeres?», in *Philosophia*, 16(3-4), 1986, pp. 307-308.

central figure among the Millenarian non-confessional thinkers in Holland and England, involved with Mennonites, Quakers, Jews and such chiliasts as John Dury, Samuel Hartlib, Jan Amos Comenius and Peter Serrarius. In 1655-56, when Menasseh ben Israel was negotiating with Cromwell for the readmission of the Jews to England, Boreel was in London, and entertained Menasseh along with Robert Boyle and Oldenburg. Boreel raised problems that may have led to the disintegration of the negotiations. He left London shortly after receiving Oldenburg's Letter, and set to work in Amsterdam when Spinoza was excommunicated, and no doubt knew of his reception into the small Collegiant group on the outskirts of the city. The Collegiants were often called the 'Boreellists' after their leader».⁹

Adam Boreel had been already mentioned by Meisma as one of the founders of the Amsterdam College, together with Daniel van Breen and Galenus Abrahamsz.¹⁰ However, the Dutch scholar gave little information about Boreel, which he had mainly drawn from Van Slee's masterpiece, «De Rijnsburger Collegianten».¹¹ In Van Slee's work about the Collegiant movement it is possible to find various references to Boreel and thus it is a precious source of information about his life. However, on closer inspection it is evident that Van Slee had added no new information about Boreel's biography, but he had summarized and critically analyzed the assertions that we can find in the works of Christopher Sandius,¹² Gottfried Arnold,¹³

⁹ Popkin, *Spinoza and the Three Imposters* (see above, n. 7), p. 349. See also: *ibid.*, p. 347.

¹⁰ See: Meisma, *Spinoza en zijn Kring* (see above, n. 1), pp. 94-102.

¹¹ Jacobus Cornelis van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten*, Haarlem, 1895.

¹² Christopher Sandius, *Bibliotheca Anti-trinitariorum, sive Catalogus Scriptorum, et succineta Narratio de Vita eorum Auctorum, qui praeterito et hoc seculo, vulgo receptum dogma de tribus in unico Deo per omnia aequalibus personis vel impugnarunt, vel docuerunt solum Patrem D.N. J. Christi esse illum verum seu altissimum Deum. Opus Posthumum Christophori Chr. Sandii. Accedunt alia quaedam Scripta, quorum seriem pagina post praefatione dabit. Qua omnia simul juncta Compendium Historiae Ecclesiasticae Unitariorum, qui Sociniani vulgo audiunt, exhibent*, Freistadii, 1684, p. 144.

¹³ Gottfried Arnolds, *Unparteiische Kirchen-und-Ketzer-Historie vom Anfang des Neuen Testaments*, Frankfurt, 1700, p. 540. In following editions, Arnolds added new information. See: Gottfried Arnolds, *Unparteiische Kirchen-und-Ketzer-Historie vom Anfang des Neuen Testaments. Beftehend in Beschreibung der noch übrigen Streitigkeiten im XVIIIden Jahrhundert. Nebst den Supplementis und Emendationibus über alle vier Theile*, Frankfurt, 1715, pp. 67-68.

Hoogstraten,¹⁴ Luiscius,¹⁵ De la Ruë,¹⁶ Moreri,¹⁷ and Van Nijmegen.¹⁸ Furthermore, it is also clear that the information we can find in these authors and in Van Slee is not sufficient to give a full account of Boreel's life and thought.

In 1911 the German scholar Walter Schneider published his dissertation concerning Boreel's life and works.¹⁹ This biography is very important for many reasons. First, Schneider discusses the first above-mentioned biographers, showing their main errors. Second, he offers the first bibliography of Boreel's works. Finally, he uses new sources, like the papers from Boreel family's archives and pamphlets from the 17th century. On the other hand, Schneider's work clearly has some gaps. First, even though he has given an account of Boreel's thought, sources and influence, he has not published it. In Schneider's writing, it is possible to find only a brief analysis of Boreel's first work, «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium». Furthermore, in many parts of the biography, Schneider draws conclusions that have no solid bases. This is the reason why some of his assertions must be questioned. Finally, thanks to new evidence found in more recent years, it is possible to show that Schneider's bibliography of Boreel's works is not very accurate.

After Schneider's work, for many years no one dealt with Boreel's life or thought. New studies were carried out in the 1970s and 1980s. First, we should mention Kolakowski. In his work concerning the Dutch "Christian without a Church", the Polish scholar dedicated some pages to Boreel's life, even though his account relied on Schneider and did not add any new information. On the other hand, Kolakowski briefly examined Boreel's

¹⁴ David van Hoogstraten and Mattheus Brouerius van Nidek, *Groot Algemeen Woorden-boek, zo Historisch, Geographisch, Genealogisch, als Oordeelkundig*, vol. II, Amsterdam, 1725, p. 322.

¹⁵ A.G. Luiscius, *Het Algemeen Historisch, Geographisch en Genealogisch Woordenboek*, vol. II, s'-Gravenhage, 1725, p. 55

¹⁶ Peter de la Ruë, *Geletterd Zeeland, verdeeld in drie Afdeelingen, bevattende in zig de Schryvers, Geleerden en Kunstenaars, ut dien Staat geboortig, met bygevoegd Levensverhaal der Voornaamsten onder dezelve*, Middelburg, 1741, pp. 27-29.

¹⁷ Louis Moreri, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique ou le Mélange Curieux de l'Histoire Sacrée et Profane*, vol. II, Amsterdam, 1740, p. 355.

¹⁸ [Elias van Nijmegen], *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering*, Rotterdam, 1775, pp. 91-95.

¹⁹ Walther Schneider, *Adam Boreel. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften*, Giessen, 1911.

«Concatenatio Aurea Christiana» and so he labeled his thought as an «attempt of rational mysticism».²⁰ Second, we must refer to the fundamental articles published by Ernestine van der Wall, where she published some letters written by Boreel and by his closest friends.²¹

Some years later, other scholars published a few articles regarding Boreel. In 1996 Rob Iliffe took into account Boreel's manuscript «Jesus Nazarenus Legislator» for the first time.²² In 2005 Ruud Lambour published his study about Galenus' interests in alchemy, where he summarized Boreel's will.²³ Finally, in 2006 H. van 't Veld published a new biography of Boreel in the «Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme», in which he took into account all new information concerning Boreel's life.²⁴

All these studies have been extremely useful to cast new light on the historical figure of Adam Boreel. However, by reading such articles and works it is evident that many events of Boreel's life were not yet clear, while many other were still unknown. In 1987 Ernestine van der Wall suggested the need to have a full account of Boreel's life and activities, but so far no one has committed to such a task. Furthermore, besides Kolakowski's brief account of the «Concatenatio Aurea Christiana» and Iliffe's brief analysis of the «Jesus Nazarenus Legislator», no one has yet dealt with Boreel's thought. These are the main reasons why we have decided to examine the historical figure of Adam Boreel, to write an updated biography, and to give a full account of his ideas and beliefs.

²⁰ Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans Église* (see above, n. 7), pp. 197-199.

²¹ See: Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, «Without Partialitie Towards All Men': John Durie on the Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel», in Van der Berg, *Jewish-Christian Relations* (see above, n. 7), pp. 145-149; Richard Popkin and Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, «Samuel Hartlib, John Worthington and John Durie on Adam Boreel's Latin Translation of the Mishna (1659-1661)», in Van der Berg, *Jewish-Christian Relations* (see above, n. 7), pp. 155-159; Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, «The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel and the Mishnah Project. Six Unpublished Letters», in *LIAS*, 16, 1989, pp. 239-263.

²² Rob Iliffe, «'Jesus Nazarenus Legislator': Adam Boreel's defence of Christianity», in Silvia Berti and Richard Popkin (ed.), *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and free-thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe: Studies on the Traité des trois imposteurs*, Dordrecht, 1996.

²³ Ruud Lambour, «De alchemistische wereld van Galenus Abrahamsz (1622-1706)», in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 31, 2005, pp. 93-168.

²⁴ H. van 't Veld, «Boreel, Adam», in *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme*, vol. 6, 2006, pp. 44-46.

As for Boreel's biography, we have decided to mainly rely on letters written by Boreel himself, by his friends and acquaintances, and by other people too, on official documents from the 17th century and on a few pamphlets from the same time. This is the reason why in our biography there are very few references to the studies made in the 20th and 21st centuries, even though the above-mentioned articles and works must be regarded as the starting points of this dissertation. So, the correspondences of Boreel, of John Dury, of Samuel Hartlib, of Henry Oldenburg, and other people, play the major role in the writings of the biography here proposed. Many of these letters have been already published, such as the correspondence of Henry Oldenburg, of John Worthington, and some Boreel's letters. On the other hand, in the following pages we make use of many letters of John Dury and Samuel Hartlib that had not been published before and that are preserved in the collection of the Hartlib Papers. Furthermore, we make use of documents such as the accounts of the councils of the Reformed Church of Amsterdam, which have been useful in writing a brief history of the Amsterdam College during Boreel's life. Besides some references in Meinsma's work, these accounts had not been published before either. The quotations of such reports made in this biography have been taken from the original manuscripts preserved in the Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief. Furthermore, in order to make a full account of Boreel's biography, we also make reference to some pamphlets written during his life. However, these pamphlets were often written against Boreel. So, if the information taken from them is not backed up by other sources, we have emphasized that we must be careful in accepting them as true.

As for Boreel's thought, it has been already said that there are no studies about it, apart from Kolakowski's and Iliffe's analyses. So, in order to give a full account of Boreel's ideas and beliefs, we have analytically examined his works, in order to describe the concepts he expressed in them in detail. We divide Boreel's thought in six chapters, each dealing with different subjects. Furthermore, we try to show that during his life Boreel held pretty much the same ideas and thus that there are no contradictions in his various works. On the contrary, we argue that the ideas we examine in the last chapters complete those we have analyzed in the first ones. Each chapter

dealing with Boreel's opinions is preceded by a brief and general account of some authors from the 16th and 17th centuries, who had expressed similar beliefs in their works. Such an account is useful to show some of the sources of Boreel's thought and to place his ideas in their historical context. Of course, this account cannot be regarded as sufficient to fully understand the sources of Boreel's beliefs and the influence that he could have exerted on other people, but rather it must be considered as the starting point to make further studies. In this dissertation, we decide to put more emphasis on Boreel's ideas, since a full account of his thought was lacking.

So, the following dissertation consists of two main parts, each one divided into various chapters. In the first part, which is divided into five chapters, we propose Boreel's biography and bibliography, while in the second part, which consists of six chapters, we give the account of Boreel's thought.

The first chapter of Boreel's biography examines the years between 1602 and 1627. We show that he was born in Middelburg in 1602 and that in 1619 he enrolled at the University of Leiden for the first time, as «litterarum studiosus». Furthermore, we argue that between 1625 and 1626 he went to England, where he became a follower of Philip Ziegler, an alleged Rosicrucian prophet. The second chapter covers the years between 1628 and 1638. In 1628 Boreel again enrolled at the University of Leiden, as a «optimarum scientiarum studiosus». Furthermore, in 1632 he had some discussions with one of his professors of theology, André Rivet, concerning ecclesiological ideas that in later years Boreel expressed in «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium». Since between 1632 and 1638 Boreel seems to have left no trace of his life and activities, in this second chapter we consider Schneider's biography, showing that the biographical information he had given concerning the years following 1632 is erroneous.

Starting from 1639, in the letters of Boreel and of his friend it is possible to find a lot of information concerning his life and activities. However, these data are often fragmentary and they do not provide a full chronological account of Boreel's life. This is the reason why the third and fourth chapters of Boreel's biography are divided into sections, each one

dealing with a separate subject according to Boreel's main activities at that time.

The third chapter deals with the years between 1639 and 1654. The first section describes Boreel's interest in Jewish people and traditions, showing the role he played in the vocalized edition of the Mishnah published in 1646 by Menasseh ben Israel and other Jews. Because of this edition and of his expertise in Hebrew, Boreel became a prominent figure in the Hartlib Circle. The second section deals with Boreel's first published work, «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium». After this publication, he was involved in a dispute with Samuel Desmarets and Johannes Hoornbeeck. The third section begins the history of the Amsterdam College, which Boreel founded in 1646. Boreel was a major figure among the Collegiants of Amsterdam, so much so that sometimes they were referred to as Boreelists. However, he began to lose his prominent role in 1654, when he left Amsterdam and went to England. Finally, the fourth section takes into account Boreel's interests for alchemical experiments and optics.

The fourth chapter covers the years between 1655 and 1665, when Boreel died. The first section describes Boreel's stay in London, where he lived for almost four years. The second section traces a brief history of the writing of the «Jesus Nazareus Legislator», a work that Boreel began to write after of Oldenburg's suggestion. The third section deals again with Boreel's interests in Jewish people and traditions, since between the end of the 1650s and the beginning of the 1660s he started to work again on the Mishnah. The fourth section ends the history of the Amsterdam College, by showing that during the 1650s Galenus Abrahamsz had become one of the major figures among the Collegiants. The fifth section, examines Boreel's will and his death, which occurred on June 20, 1665.

The fifth and last chapter of the first part describes Boreel's bibliography and it is divided into three sections. The first one describes Boreel's published works. The second section takes into account Boreel's writings published in the «Scripta Adami Borelii Posthuma». Finally, the third one deals with Boreel's manuscript works.

The first chapter of the second part deals with Boreel's critical argumentations against ecclesiastical authority and with his ideas concerning the "Church of Connivance". The first section examines the thoughts of people like Dirck Camphuysen, Petrus Serrarius, Galenus Abrahamsz, Sebastian Franck, Caspar Schwenkfeld and Dirck Coornhert, who in their works gave voice to critical argumentations against modern churches. The second and third sections take into account Boreel's works, showing that he believed that in modern times no one is endowed with divine authority and that it is necessary to find a new way of leading religious life, which he called the "Church of Connivance".

The second chapter examines the main characteristics of Boreel's "Church of Connivance". The first section examines the ideas concerning religious toleration and freedom of speech in religious matters that were conceived by authors from the 16th and 17th centuries, such as Dirck Camphuysen, Jeremy Taylor, Sebastian Castellio and Dirck Coornhert. The second and third sections examine Boreel's conception, showing that he believed that only the Holy Scriptures should be used in public religion, that all Christians should enjoy religious toleration, and that everyone should be able to freely speak about religious matters in private meetings.

The third chapter analyzes Boreel's argumentations to prove the truth of the New Testament. The first section takes into account two works that undoubtedly Boreel used as sources: the «De auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae» of Fausto Sozzini and the «De veritate religionis christianae» of Hugo Grotius. The second section shows the structure of Boreel's «Jesus Nazarenus Legislator», the work in which he would have proven the truth of the New Testament, while the third section examines the argumentations that Boreel believes would be useful to prove such a truth.

The fourth chapter deals with Boreel's reflections concerning the rationality of the Christian religion and of its fundamentals. The first section gives an account of authors who conceived the «communia fundamentalia» of Christinity in their works, such as Sebastian Castellio and Dirck Coornhert. The second and third sections show that Boreel believed in the existence of a minimum creed that all Christians could have shared. These fundamental

doctrines are those that are necessary to attain salvation, while all other dogmas and doctrines must be regarded as indifferent to a true religious life.

The fifth chapter describes Boreel's theological-political beliefs. The first section examines Sebastian Castellio's and Dirck Coornhert's thought, in regard to the relationship between civil power and religion. The second section shows that from the «Jesus Nazareus Legislator» Boreel's ideas concerning such relationship are not clear. However, the third section takes into account a letter that he wrote to John Dury, showing that he believed that civil power must not meddle with religious matters.

The sixth and last chapter examines Boreel's opinions about mankind's highest purpose, that is, reaching God. The first section gives an account of the thoughts of Petrus Serrarius, Galenus Abrahamsz, and Dirck Coornhert, who had expressed similar ideas concerning the union between man and God. The second section examines Boreel's threefold path towards God. He believed that every man can rationally understand that God is his highest purpose and how He can be reached. Furthermore, he who decides to walk the rational path towards God can easily recognize that the best way to achieve his highest purpose is to follow Christ's example. Finally, if someone lives according to Christ's precepts, God will permeate his faculties and will show him the right path towards Him. So, Boreel concludes that he who tries to reach God through natural reason, Christ's example and divine internal experience, will achieve that «aeternam nempè atque beatam illam vitam, in qua Deus omnia erit in omnibus».

I want to thank prof. Filippo Mignini, who has been the tutor of this dissertation and who has guided me since the first year of my academic studies, and prof. Omero Proietti, who has been the co-tutor of this dissertation and whose suggestions have always been helpful. Furthermore, I want to thank prof. Piet Visser. Our conversations in Amsterdam have been most fruitful. Special thanks go to prof. Gary Waite. Not only has he helped me in correcting Boreel's biography, but he has also always supported my research. Here I must also mention and thank dr. Adriaan Plak, who has greatly helped me during my research in the Mennonite Library of Amsterdam. Moreover, I want to thank prof. Wiep van Bunge, for our

conversation in Rotterdam concerning Boreel, Spinoza and the Collegiants, and prof. Ernestine van der Wall, for our conversation in Leiden. Special thanks go to Matteo, one of my long-life friends who helped me with the English writings. Finally, I want to thank Marta, the muse of my reflections. I was able to fully understand Boreel's thought because of her support and of the conversations we have had many times.

Table of the acronyms of the works of Boreel

In the present dissertations we refer to works written by Borrel we made use of by using the following acronyms.

- ALAT: Ad Legem et ad Testimonium, sive erotematica propositio et deductio quorundam conscientiae casuum; praecipuè de publico Novi Testamenti cultu; aliisque, Christianismo vel necessariis, vel utilibus: exhibita Christianorum ecclesiis et coetibus illis, qui solam Veteris et Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei et morum canone profitentur.
- ASM: Ad Samuelem Maresium, authorem Mantissae libelli, cui titulus, Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore Sacri Ministerii in Ecclesiis Reformatis; opposita libello Ad Legem et Testimonium. Protrepticon.
- AN: Alloquium ad humanam creaturam universam necessarium.
- SG: Scriptum Generale de tutissima ad Deum via; fide; verbo fidei, medio ad illam; cultu: praecipuè quoad hodiernos cognitos ecclesiastas, ac populum iis addictum.
- QHC: Quoad hodiernos cognitos coetus, solam S. Scripturam pro fidei et morum canone profitentes.
- PR: Probatio religionis per naurales rationes, et Christianos cum ea eatenus consensus.
- DCSS: Demonstratio certitudinis Scripturae Sacrae.
- PEP: Pacis ecclesiasticae propempticon.
- SRC: De scopo religionis christianae, et mediis ad eam conducentibus.
- TL: Three letters that Boreel wrote in 1653.
- JNL: Jesus Nazarenus Legislator.

Part I: The Life of Adam Boreel and his writings

Chapter I: 1602 – 1627

Boreel's childhood and his first studies at the University of Leiden

Adam Boreel was born on November 2, 1602,²⁵ in Middelburg, the capital city of Zeeland. He was the son of Jacob Boreel, lord of Duinbeke,²⁶

²⁵ It is possible to say that Adam Boreel was born on November 2, 1602, thanks to the biographies written by Pieter de la Rue and Walther Schneider. Boreel's first biographers did not know Boreel's date of birth. Usually, they believed that he was born in 1603. In the *Geletterd Zeeland* De la Rue was the first to show Boreel's true date of birth. In his brief analysis of De la Rue's biography, Schneider says that the Dutch biographer belonged to the same aristocratic circles of Boreel's family and so it is most likely that he was able to have access to evidence that other biographers could not have seen. In particular, we cannot exclude that De la Rue had access to such evidence as the papers that are preserved in Boreel's family archives. As a matter of fact, in the *Familieboek* of Boreel's family Jan Boreel wrote that our author was born in 1602. While De la Rue did not reveal the sources of his assertions, in his work Schneider mentioned some papers from Boreel's family archives, which he called *Familienregister*. However, among the papers preserved in this archive I did not find anything that can be identified with the *Familienregister* mentioned by Schneider. I only found the *Familieboek* written by Jan Boreel, where it is only written Boreel's year of birth. However, since both De la Rue and Schneider said that Boreel was born in November 2, 1602, and since he was baptized in November 10, it is possible to argue that this is Boreel's true date of birth. It is surprising that in some biographies from the 20th century Boreel's date of birth is still incorrect, even if there are two different sources, dated 1741 and 1911, which had already established when Boreel was born. For instance, in the *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme* we can read that Boreel was born in November 2, 1603. We can assume that this is just an oversight concerning the year of birth. However, this is the same date that Van Slee wrote in *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* in 1895. Hence, we can wonder if that error is just an oversight, or if the author did not read Schneider's biography and he relied just on Van Slee's assertions. See: Jacobus Cornelis Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten. Geschiedkundig onderzoek door J.C. van Slee. Met inleiding van Dr. S.B.J. Zilverberg*, Utrecht, 1980, p. 138; Van 't Veld, *Boreel, Adam* (see above, n. 24), pp. 44-46. For an analysis of De la Rue's biography, see: Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 9. For the sources of Boreel's date of birth, see: *Familieboek, geschreven door Jan Boreel Wt. (1691) en met een belangwekkend aanhangsel voorzien door zijn zoon Adriaan z.d. I deel*, in The Netherlands Nationaal Archief, Inventaris Van Het Familiearchief Boreel 1443-1931, Deel I: 17E En 18E Eeuw, MS 1.10.10 (from now on I will refer to this papers as NNA, MS 1.10.10); De la Rue, *Geletterd Zeeland* (see above, n. 16), p. 27; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19) p. 32.

²⁶ In the previous biographies, there is some confusion about the title of "lord of Duinbeke". Some biographers ascribed such title to Jacob or Jakob Boreel, while others to his son Adam. It is possible to find the first reference to this title in *Het algemeen woordenboek* written by Luiscius, where Jacob Boreel is described as «heer van Duinbeke en Westhoven», two castles near Middelburg. De la Rue too uses the same title in his biography of Jacob Boreel. After them, also Jan Wagenaar in *Amsterdam in zyne opkomst, aanwas, gesschiedenis* ascribed this title to Adam Boreel's father. However, something happened in the XIX century, when some biographers started to confer the same title also to his son Adam. The first were A.J. van der Aa in the *Biografisch woordenboek den Nederlanden* and F. Nagtglas in the *Levensberichten der Zeeuwen*. After them, Van Slee in the *De Rijnsburger Collegianten*, C.B. Hylkema in the *Reformateurs*, and H.V. Visscher and L.A. van Langeraad in the *Biografisch woordenboek van protestantsche godgeleerden in Nederland* wrote that Adam Boreel was lord of Duinbeke. Therefore, Schenider, who mainly relies on the biographies written by Nagtglas, Van Slee, Hylkema and Visscher, says that Adam Boreel was «Herr von Duijnbeke». However, I believe that these biographers from 19th and 20th centuries did not have new evidence to make this assertion. Moreover, we have

and Maria Gremminck, his second wife. Adam was baptized in the same city on November 10. Everaerd Becker, Friederich Muntinch and Christina Jolijt were the baptism witnesses.²⁷

Boreel's family belonged to the Dutch aristocracy of Zeeland. Some historians believed that the origin of this family dates back to the ancient Boreel or Borel family that lived in Catalonia around the 9th and 10th centuries. Here it is possible to provide only a little information about Boreel's family shortly before Adam Boreel's birth.²⁸ His grandfather, Pieter Boreel, embraced the reformed religion and he was forced to leave Zeeland because of the persecutions of the Catholic Spanish kingdom. He sought refuge in England.²⁹ However, a few years later Jacob or Jakob Boreel, father of Adam, and his brothers went back to the Dutch regions and in 1574 they fought the Spanish army together with William I, Prince of Orange. In the following years, Jacob Boreel lived in Middelburg and fulfilled some political position in the Dutch Republic. In particular, in 1613 he went to England with Hugo Grotius as an ambassador. In England king James I bestowed upon Jacob Boreel the title of baronet.³⁰ At that time Hugo Grotius had a close

to take into account that Adam was the fifth son of Jacob Boreel, and that his older brothers Willem and Jacob had children. So, it is most unlikely that Adam Boreel became lord of Duinbeke after his father. We can assume that this title, at first only ascribed to Jacob, afterwards was erroneously conferred to Adam Boreel too. See: Luiscius, *Het Algemeen Historisch, Geographisch and Genealogisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 15), vol. II, p. 47; De la Rue, *Geletterd Zeeland* (see above, n. 16), pp. 27 e 29; Jan Wagenaar, *Amsterdam in zyne opkomst, aanwas, geschiedenissen, voorregten, koophandel, gebouwen, kerkenstaat, scholen, schutterye, gilden en regeeringe*, vol. VIII, 1763, p. 43; A.J. Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, Haarlem, 1854, vol. II, p. 918; F. Nagtglas, *Levensberichten van Zeeuwen*, Middelburg, 1890, vol. I, p. 58; Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 138; Cornelis Bonnes Hylkema, *Reformateurs, geschiedkundige studiën over de godsdienstige bewegingen uit de nadagen onzer gouden eeuw*, Haarlem, 1900, vol. I, p. 12; Hugo Visscher & L.A. van Langeraad, *Het Protestantsche Vaderland. Biographisch Woordenboek van Protestantsche Godgeleerden in Nederland*, Utrecht, 1907, vol. I, p. 500; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 32.

²⁷ Here I rely on Schneider, who quoted the baptismal book of the Reformed community of Middelburg. I was not able to have access to this book. See: Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), pp. 5 e 32.

²⁸ For more information about Boreel's family, see: Hoogstraten, *Groot Algemeen Woorden-Boek* (see above, n. 14), vol. II, p. 322; Luiscius, *Het algemeen historisch, geographisch en genealogisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 15), vol. II, pp. 46-47.

²⁹ About Peter or Pieter Boreel, see: Luiscius, *Het algemeen historisch, geographisch en genealogisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. II, pp. 47; Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden* (see above, n. 2), vol. II, p. 913; P.C. Molhuysen & P. J. Blok, *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, Leiden, 1927, vol. VII, p. 177.

³⁰ See: Luiscius, *Het algemeen historisch, geographisch en genealogisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 15), vol. II, pp. 47; Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden* (see above, n. 26), vol. II, p. 913-914; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n.

relationship with Boreel's family. Not only he was a fellow traveler of Jacob Boreel, but he was also a close friend of Johan (Johann or Joan) Boreel, older brother of Adam. Grotius even wrote a poem in order to celebrate the wedding of Johan Boreel, which is entitled *Epithalamium Joannis Borelii, et Agnetis Haymanna*³¹. This older brother of Adam Boreel was a distinguished person not only for the political position that he held in the Dutch Republic, but also for his travels in the oriental countries, such as Syria and Palestine, where he found books and manuscripts that he took back with him in his homeland. These books were so rare and wondrous, that a learned man such as Petrus Cunaeus (Peter van der Kun)³² said that he never had seen them before and he praised Johan Boreel's actions³³. As a matter of fact, Johan Boreel was a learned man, who was skilled in the oriental tongues, especially in Hebrew and Arabic. Furthermore, as his father before him, he went to England and he attended the court of king James I³⁴.

We do not have much information about Adam Boreel's childhood. In the *Apologia pro ecclesia christiana*, Johannes Hoornbeeck says that Boreel was raised in the faith of the Reformed Church,³⁵ that is to say

19), p. 33; Molhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlanden Biografisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 5), vol. VII, pp. 176-177.

³¹ Hugo Grotius, *Poemata omnia. Editio quarta*, Leiden, 1645, pp. 109-111.

³² He was a professor of law at the University of Leiden, but he was also famous for his Jewish studies. See: Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. 3, pp. 914-918; Molhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlanden Biografisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 5), vol. I, pp. 658-660; J.R. Ziskind, *Petrus Cunaeus on theocracy, Jubilee and the latifundia*, in «Jewish Quarterly Review», 68(4), 1978, pp. 235-254.

³³ «Eum luculentum autorem [Maimonide] transmisit ad nos vir amplissimus, Ioannes Borelius, qui potentissimis Zelandiae Ordinibus à secretis est. Utique quantumcunque est illud, quod nobis monumenta maximi Rabbini perlustrantibus mirifice placuit, id omne acceptum ferri ejus viri humanitati debet, à quo eximium illum rerum Iudaicarum scriptorem accepimus. Nos neminem scimus, in quo nunc plus praesidii Hebraismus, quàm in Borelio, habeat. Adeo ille ingentem thesaurum ex Oriente eorum voluminum comportavit, quae nunquam aut rarò vidit noster orbis». Cunaeus, *De Republica Hebraeorum Libri Tres. Editio Novissima*, 1632, no page.

³⁴ See: Van der Aa, *Biographisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. II, pp. 914-915; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 33-34; Molhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlanden Biografisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 5), vol. VI, p. 166.

³⁵ The *Reformed Dutch Church* or *Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk* was the "official" Church of the Dutch Republic and was established after the Synod of Emden in 1571, held by some Dutch believers in the Calvinistic faith who had emigrated in Germany. This Synod ratified the adoption of the Belgic Confession and of the Heidelberg Catechism. Furthermore, the "Drie formulieren van enigheid", the theological foundation of the Reformed Church, was the main outcome of this Synod and of the following Synod of Dordrecht. For the Belgic Confession, see: A. Cochrane, *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century*, Louisville, 2003; N.H. Goothes, *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources*, Grand Rapids, 2007. For the Heidelberg Catechism, see: L.D. Bierma, *Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History and Theology*, Grand Rapids, 2005; M. Ernst-Habib, *But Why Are You*

believing in the Calvinistic doctrine.³⁶ This is most likely, since the Boreel family officially embraced the faith of the Reformed Church. On the other hand, if the connections between the Boreel family and Hugo Grotius are taken into consideration, it cannot be excluded some kind of sympathy for the Arminian or Remonstrant faith³⁷. Regardless, during his youth Adam Boreel was able to hear the sermons of Antonius Walaeus, who was a preacher in Middelburg between 1605 and 1619.³⁸ Furthermore, given the connections between the Boreel family and the English kingdom, it cannot be excluded that Adam could have known some people from the English community that lived in Middelburg. If so, he could have met some members of the Brownist group that lived in that community.³⁹ This is all we can say about Adam Boreel's life between 1602 and 1619.

In 1619, Boreel matriculated at the University of Leiden. From the *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Bataviae* it is possible to learn that the first registration of Adam Boreel occurred on January 21, 1619: «21/01/1619, Adamus Boreel Middelburgensis. 20. L.»,⁴⁰ where “L.” means

Called a Christian? An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism, Gottingen, 2013. For the “Drie formulieren van enigheid”, see: J. Vree, *Drie Formulieren van Enigheid*, in G. Hanrinck, H. Paul & B. Wallet (ed.), *Het Gereformeerde Geheugen. Protestantse herinneringsculturen in Nederland, 1850-2000*, Amsterdam, 2009, pp. 118-119.

³⁶ «[...] quod vehementer miror alicui excidere potuisse in Ecclesia nostra enutrito». Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Apologia pro ecclesia christiana hodierna, non apostatica; opposita libello, cui tit. Ad Legem et ad Testimonium, etc.*, Amsterdam, 1647, p. 21. The *Apologia pro ecclesia christiana* was reprinted by Hoornbeeck in the second edition of the *Summa Controversiarum Religionis*. For the passage here quoted, see: Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Summa controversiarum religionis; cum infidelibus, Haereticis, schismaticis: id est, gentilibus, iudaeis, Mihammedanis; papistis, anabaptistis, enthusiastis et libertinis, socinianis; remonstrantibus, lutheranis, brouwnistis, graecis. Editio secunda, auctior, et emendatior*, Utrecht, 1658, p. 488.

³⁷ For more information about Arminianism and the Remonstrant movement, see later in this chapter.

³⁸ J.D. de Lind van Wijngaarden, *Antonius Walaeus*, Leiden, 1891, pp. 24-57; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 35.

³⁹ See: J. de Hoop Schiffer, *History of the Free Churchmen Called the Brownists, Pilgrim Fathers and Baptists in the Dutch Republic, 1581-1701*, Ithaca, 1922, pp. 10-16.

⁴⁰ W.N. Du Rieu (ed.), *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae MDLXXV-MDCCCLXXV: accedunt nomina curatorum et professorum per eadem secula*, Den Haag-Leiden, 1875, p. 138. Adam Boreel enrolled at the Leiden University a second time in 1628, enrollment that is examined in the next chapter. As for this first registration, it is necessary to underline a difficulty: according to the *Album Studiosorum* Boreel was 20 years old when he enrolled at the University of Leiden. However, in January 1619 he was only 16 years old. It can be supposed that the “Adamus Boreel” here quoted was not the same person who we are speaking about. This is why Schneider in his biography do not refer to this first registration, but only to the second in 1628. Furthermore, the German scholar openly says that the “Adamus Boreel” mentioned in the registration of 1619 was another Boreel. However, I believe that there was an error in the calculation of Boreel's age or in the

«Litterarum studiosus».⁴¹ It is not clearly known what «litterarum studiosus» means. However, it is most likely that Boreel was a student in the *Facultas philosophiae et artium liberarium*, where he would have studied the classical and oriental languages.

Since Boreel enrolled at Leiden University in January 1619, he started his studies during the Synod of Dordrecht. The first session of this Synod was held on November 13, 1618, and the last one on May 9, 1619. The main outcome of the Synod of Dordrecht was the defeat of the Remonstrant movement, a happening that had great consequences in the history of the Dutch Republic and so of the Leiden University as well. Moreover, as we will see later, the defeat of the Remonstrants was the historical reason that gave birth to the Collegiant movement.

The Synod of Dordrecht was summoned by the States General of the Dutch Republic in the summer of 1617 to resolve the religious disputes between the Reformed Church and the Arminian or Remonstrant movement.

transcription from the original book of enrollments. In other words, I think that the “Adamus Boreel” who started to attend the University of Leiden on January 21, 1619, was none other than the Adam Boreel of our biography. It is possible to produce some considerations to strengthen this assertion. First, it must be taken into consideration that the attribute *Middelburgensis* is the same used for all the members of Boreel’s family. In the registrations of Johann, Willem (o Wilhelm) and Abraham, who were Adam Boreel’s brothers, and of Josephus, Theodorus, Jacobus and Johannes, his nephews, we find the epithet «Middelburgensis». Surely, it is possible to argue that this designation was used for all the people that came from Middelburg. On the other hand, the existence of another Adam Boreel from the same city, only four years older than our author, and not related with the Boreel family seems really odd. Second, it must be taken into account that there are other enrollments with errors about the age of the students. For instance, it is possible to examine the enrollments of Willem and Abraham Boreel. The former was born in 1591, but his registration, which is dated October 12, 1609, says that he was 28 years old. Likewise, from Abraham Boreel’s enrollments on October 25, 1623, it seems that he was 20 years old, even though he was born in 1605. Finally, it is possible to argue that a first registration of Adam Boreel at the University of Leiden in 1619 could better explain his expertise in the classical and oriental tongues, which was praised both by his opponents and by his friends. Boreel could have learned Hebrew and Greek afterwards, but it cannot be denied that a first enrollment in 1619 as a *litterarum studiosus* would better explain his great skill in these languages. For the enrollments of the other members of Boreel’s family, see: Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), pp. 46, 96, 145, 171, 205, 230, 308. For Willem Boreel’s date of birth, see: Van der Aa, *Biografisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. II, p. 915; Nagtglas, *Levensberichten van Zeeuwen* (see above, n. 26), p. 57; Molhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 29), vol. 7, pp. 177. Abraham Boreel’s date of birth, see: NNA, MS 1.10.10; Van der Aa, *Biografisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. II, p. 920; Melhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 29), vol. 7, p. 176. For Schneider’s considerations, see: Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), pp. 35-37.

⁴¹ Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. LXIV.

The latter took its name from Jacobus Arminius (Jakob Hermanszoon), professor of theology at the University of Leiden from 1603 to 1609, when he died. In the last years of the 16th century, after he studied theology in Leiden and spent some months in Genève, where he studied under Theodor Beza,⁴² Arminius went back to Holland and became a minister of the Reformed Church. However, shortly after, disagreements started to arise in the Church, especially between Arminius and Petrus Plancius, because the former did not believe in the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination.

The controversies between Arminius and his followers on the one hand, and the Reformed Church on the other, kept growing in the following years, particularly when Arminius became professor of theology at the University of Leiden. Here he held numerous discussions with Franciscus Gomarus, professor of theology and a strict advocate of the Calvinistic doctrines.⁴³ The controversy reached its climax in 1608, when Arminius officially rejected the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination in front of the States General, which supported both Arminius' ideas and his followers. Even though Arminius died in the following year, the controversies between the two opposing parties did not end.⁴⁴

⁴² For more information about Theodore Beza, see: Henry Martyn Baird, *Theodore Beza: the counsellor of the French reformation, 1519-1605*, New York, 1970; John S. Bray, *Theodore Beza's doctrine of predestination*, Nieuwkoop, 1975; Tadataka Maruyuma, *The ecclesiology of Theodore Beza: the reform of the true Church*, Ginevra, 1978; Scott M. Manetsch, *Theodore Beza and the quest for peace in France, 1572-1598*, Leiden, 2000; Jeffrey Mallinson, *Faith, reason, and revelation in Theodore Beza: 1519-1605*, Oxford, 2003.

⁴³ For more information about Franciscus Gomarus, see: C. van Bovenkamp, *De getuige der waarheid: een schets over het leven en de arbeid van prof. Franciscus Gomarus*, Vianen, 1970; J. van Belzen, Stephen Garrard Post, *Vroom, vurig en vreedzaam: het leven van Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641)*, Houten, 1996; Si Hun Kim, *Providentiae divinae pars & Evangelii materia: die Prädestinationslehre des Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) in ihrem theologischen und historischen Kontext*, diss. Proefschrift Theologische Universiteit van de Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland, Apeldoorn, 2013.

⁴⁴ For more information, see: Carl Bangs, *Arminius: a study in the dutch reformation*, Grand Rapids, 1985; Robert E. Picirilli, *Grace, faith, free will: contrasting views of salvation*, Nashville, 2002; Keith D. Stanglin, *Arminius on the assurance of salvation: the context, roots, and shape of the Leiden debate, 1603-1609*, Leiden, 2007; Roger E. Olson, *Arminian theology: myths and realities*, Downers Grove, 2006; Theodoor Marius van Leeuwen, *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60 – 1609)*, Boston, 2009; F. Leroy Forlines, *Classical Arminianism: the theology of salvation*, Nashville, 2011; Keith D. Stanglin, Thomas H. McCall, *Jacobus Arminius: theologian of grace*, Oxford, 2012.

In 1610 the Arminian party develop a formal remonstrance to be submitted to the States General, asking for religious toleration and for protection from the persecutions of the Reformed Church. This is the reason why in the following year people started to refer to the Arminian party as Remonstrants or the Remonstrant movement. Although among the spokespersons of the movement were people like Johan van Oldenbarnevelt⁴⁵ and Ugo Grozio⁴⁶, and even though the Remonstrants had the support of the States General of Holland, nevertheless the States General of the Dutch Republic decided to summon a national synod to put an end to the religious controversies.

As has already been said, the Synod of Dordrecht started on November 13, 1618, and from the very beginning the Calvinistic or anti-remonstrant party dominated the assemblies. Simon Episcopius, a theologian who studied in Leiden under the lead of Arminius, was at the head of the Remonstrant delegation. After they came to understand that they would be condemned, the Remonstrant delegates decided to obstruct the sessions of the synod. However, they were dismissed and condemned *in absentia*. Then, the members of the Synod started to reject most of the Remonstrant doctrines. The Reformed Church was victorious from all points of view. In addition, in order to strengthen the decisions made in the Synod of Dordrecht, the civil and religious authorities decided to dismiss all professors of the University of Leiden who were inclined to Arminian beliefs and to forbid any kind of religious meeting held by Remonstrant believers.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ For more information, see: Jan den Tex, *Oldenbarnevelt*, 5 vol., Haarlem, 1960-1972; Jan den Tex, *Oldenbarnevelt, translated from the dutch by R.B. Powell*, Cambridge, 1973.

⁴⁶ For more information, see: Edward Dumbauld, *The life and legal writings of Hugo Grotius*, Norman, 1969; Lucia Nocentini (ed.), *Conciliazione dei dissensi sulla predestinazione: Ugo Grozio*, Tirrenia, 1997; Luc Foisneau (ed.), *Politique, droit et theologie chez Bodin, Grotius et Hobbes*, Paris, 1997; Cristina Londo (ed.), *Ugo Grozio: l'umanista, il teologo, il giurista*, Galatina, 1999; Lucia Nocentini, *All'origine del discorso politico moderno: Ugo Grozio teologo e politico*, Pisa, 2002; Jan-Paul Heering, *Hugo Grotius as apologist of the christian religion: a study of his word «De veritate religionis christianae», 1640*, Leiden, 2004; Henk J.M. Nellen, *Hugo de Groot: een leven in strijd om de vrede*, The Hague, 2007; Maria Rosa Antognazza, *The truth of the christian religion: with Jean le Clerc's notes and addition, Hugo Grotius; translated by John Clarke (1743)*, Indianapolis, 2012; Vittorio Nazzareno Pasqua, *Ugo Grozio e il dialogo interreligioso*, Chieti, 2014.

⁴⁷ For more information, see: Henry Petersen, *The canons of Dort; a study guide*, Grand Rapids, 1968; Jonathan Israel, *The dutch republic: its rise, greatness, and fall, 1477-1806*, Oxford, 1995, pp. 361-398 and 421-477; E.H. Cossee, T.M. van Leeuwen, M.A.

This was the rather tense atmosphere that surrounded Leiden University when Boreel started his studies. If we examine the *l'Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Bataviae*, we can suppose an ideal course of study that he could have followed. In the *Facultas philosophiae et artium liberarium* there were at that time three main experts of classical and oriental languages. From 1619 onwards there were Johannes Meursius (van Meurs)⁴⁸ and Daniel Heinsius (Heins)⁴⁹, who taught classical Greek; and Thomas Erpenius (van Erpe), professor of Hebrew and Arabic.⁵⁰ Furthermore, even if Boreel was a *litterarum studiosus*, it is most likely that he was also interested in other subjects. For instance, starting in 1620 Franck Pieterszoon Burgersdijk (Franco Petri Burgersdijk or Franciscus Burgerdiscius) was professor of logic and natural philosophy.⁵¹ Furthermore, Antonius Walaeus,⁵² Antonius Thysius,⁵³ and Andreas Rivetus (André Rivet)⁵⁴ were

Bosman-Huizinga, *De remonstranten*, Kampen, 2000; David N. Steele, Curtis C. Thomas, S. Lance Quinn, *The five points of calvinism: defined, defended, documented*, Philipsburg, 2004; Emanuele Fiume, *Il sinodo di Dordrecht (1618-1619): predestinazione e calvinismo*, Torino, 2015.

⁴⁸ For more information, see: C.L. Heesakkers, «Te weinig koren of alleen te veel kaf? Leiden's eerste Noordnederlandse filoloog Joannes Meursius (1579–1639)», in R.J. Langelaan & M. Simons (ed.), *Miro Fervore. Een bundel lezingen & artikelen over de beoefening van de klassieke wetenschappen in de zeventiende & achttiende eeuw*, Leiden 1994, pp. 13–26; K. Skovgaard-Petersen, *Historiography at the Court of Christian IV (1588–1648): studies in the Latin histories of Denmark by Johannes Pontanus and Johannes Meursius*, Copenhagen, 2002.

⁴⁹ For more information, see: H. Jan de Jonge, *Daniel Heinsius and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament*, Leiden, 1971; H. Jan de Jonge, «The “Manuscriptus Evangeliorum Antiquissimus” of Daniel Heinsius», in *New Testament Studies*, 21(02), 1975, pp. 286-294; B. Becker-Cantarino, *Daniel Heinsius*, Boston, 1978.

⁵⁰ For more information, see: C. de Jonker, *Thomas Erpenius*, Amsterdam, 1793; M.T. Houtsma, *Uit de Oostersche correspondentie van Th. Erpenius, Jac. Golius en Lev. Warner: eene bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van de beoefening der Oostersche letteren in Nederland*, Amsterdam, 1887; A.J. Drewes, *Erpenius over werkwoorden*, Leiden, 1969; A. Vrolijk, «The Prince of Arabists and His Many Errors: Thomas Erpenius's Image of Joseph Scaliger and the Edition of the Proverbia Arabica (1614)», in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73(1), 2010, 297-325; O. Zwartjes, «De studie van het Arabisch in de zeventiende eeuw. Thomas Erpenius' grammatica vergeleken met de studies van Franciscanen in Zuid-Europa en in het Midden-Oosten», in T. van Hal, L. Isebaert & P. Swiggers (ed.), *De tuin der talen: taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen*, Leuven, 2013.

⁵¹ For more information, see: De Waard, *Burgersdijk (Franco)*, in Melhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 29), vol. 7, Amsterdam, 1974, pp. 229-231.

⁵² For more information, see: J. Borsius, *Antonius Walaeus in zijn leven en in zijn verdiensten geschetst*, Leiden, 1848; De Lind, *Antonius Walaeus* (see above, n. 38).

⁵³ For more information, see: P.J. Blok, *Thysius (Anthony)* in Melhuysen, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 29), vol. 5, Leiden, 1921, pp. 923-924; A.J. Lamping, «Antonius Thysius», in *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme*, vol. 5, Kampen, 2001, pp. 505-508.

⁵⁴ For more information, see: A. Gijsbert van Opstal, *André Rivet: een invloedrijk Hugenoet aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik*, Harderwijk, 1937; P. Dibon (ed.), *Inventaire de*

the professors of the *Facultas theologica*. As we will see in the next chapter, Boreel and Rivet had some theological discussions at the beginning of the 1630s. It cannot be excluded that a first meeting between them occurred at the beginning of 1620s.⁵⁵

Regardless, we have no useful evidence either to establish how many years Boreel spent at Leiden University, nor to determine if he really concluded his studies. We have neither a thesis, which could have pointed out what kind of studies he undertook, nor some kind of documents that could show the end of his studies.

It is possible to suppose that Boreel met Petrus Serrarius during the time he spent in Leiden. Serrarius studied at the «Waalse College of ‘Collegium Gallo-Belgicum’» of Leiden between 1620 and 1622.⁵⁶ Since Boreel was in the same city from 1619 onwards, it can be argued that the two of them met in these years. In addition, the affinity between their ideas could have helped their meeting, since Serrarius’ theological ideas could have raised Boreel’s curiosity.

For instance, Serrarius ended his studies at the *Waalse College* with a dissertation entitled *Explicatio quaestionis an ecclesia possit deficere*. Giving voice to the classical reformed spirit, in this work Serrarius says that there is a difference between the visible church of God, that is the Roman-Catholic Church, and the invisible church of God, where all the true Christian believers are gathered. The first can be subject to a decline, says Serrarius, and if one looks at the history of the Roman-Catholic Church, it is clear that it lost the original purity of the Apostolic times. On the contrary, the invisible church of Christ is and will always be uncorrupted.⁵⁷ Furthermore, in a following dissertation entitled *De necessitate et autoritate Sacrae*

la correspondance d'André Rivet (1595-1650), Den Haag, 1971; H. Bots & P. Leroy (ed.), *Correspondance intégrale d'André Rivet en Claude Sarrau*, Amsterdam, 1978-1982; G.P. van Itterzon, «Rivet (André)», in *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme*, vol. 2, Kampen, 1983, pp. 375-378.

⁵⁵ For the list of the professor at Leiden University, see: Du Rieu, *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), pp. XXXVIII-XLV.

⁵⁶ See: Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 26-34.

⁵⁷ See: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 31-32.

Scripturae, Serrarius clearly claims that the Sacred Scripture is the necessary means to walk the path towards God.⁵⁸ The ideas expressed in both these dissertations could have been fascinating for the young Boreel and could have helped his meeting with Serrarius.

On the other hand, it is also possible to suppose that their first meeting happened later, between 1624 and 1626, when Serrarius was *hulpprediker* at the Walloon Churches of Vlissingen, Middelburg and Ter Groede.⁵⁹ Around 1625 Boreel went to England and so he could not have met Serrarius then. On the other hand, if Boreel in 1624 was in his hometown, he could have easily made Serrarius' acquaintance. However, we do not have any kind of information to strengthen this hypothesis. This is the reason why Van der Wall only supposed that a first meeting between them could have happened while Serrarius was *hulpprediker* at Middelburg.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 32-34.

⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 34-35.

⁶⁰ «Of Serrarius in deze tijd in contact is gekomen met Adam Boreel, met wie hij naderhand in Amsterdam goed bevriend zou raken, valt niet met zekerheid te zeggen». Ibid., p. 35.

The first trip to England and Ziegler's case

In the years 1625-1626 Boreel stayed in England, where he studied in Oxford⁶¹ and where he was deceived by Philip Ziegler, to all appearances a member of the Rosicrucian order.⁶²

The main sources to make such assertions is a letter that John Dury,⁶³ one of Boreel's closest friends, sent to Samuel Hartlib.⁶⁴ In August 31, 1646, the Scottish theologian wrote: «[...] from his youth [Boreel] since the tyme that hee liued here in England & did studie at Oxford hee hath beene noted for zeale to Religious wayes, & for exemplarie forwardnes to aduance the knowledge of the Truth in matters of Practise. his affection that waye when the German Sigler (who was in ende discouered to bee an imposter) was here; did cost him deer, for hee was free of his purse toward him till hee was found out».⁶⁵

Before drawing conclusions about Boreel's stay in England, it is necessary to examine the figure of Philip Ziegler, who claimed to be a member of the Rosicrucians. The Rosicrucian order refers to a legendary and

⁶¹ However, we have to highlight that we cannot find the name of Adam Boreel in the book of registrations of Oxford University. See: J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses: the Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, Oxford, 1891.

⁶² We do not have much information about this subject, who seems to have been a chiliast, prophet and member of the Rosicrucian order. Few referents to Ziegler can be found in works either about the Rosicrucians, or about magic and alchemy in the XVII century. I know only one article that focuses specifically on Ziegler, written by Ron Heisler. I did not find the paper copy of this article, which was published in 199 in «The Hermetic Journal». However, it is possible to read it for free on «The Alchemy Website». See: Ron Heisler, «Philip Ziegler: the Rosicrucian King of Jerusalem», in http://www.levity.com/alchemy/h_zeigl.html; Govert Snoek, *De Rozenkruisers in Nederland, voornamelijk in de eerste helft van de 17 e eeuw. Een Inventarisatie*, Haarlem, 2006, pp. 333-334 and 396-399.

⁶³ For some information about John Dury, see next chapter.

⁶⁴ For some information about Samuel Hartlib see next chapter. The letter here mentioned is preserved in the Hartlib Papers, a collection of the library of the University of Sheffield. It is possible to consult these papers through the website of the Hartlib Papers Project: <https://hridigital.shef.ac.uk/hartlib/>. As the letter here quoted, see: Hartlib Papers MS (from now on HP) 3/3/32A-33B. Ernestine van der Wall had published an extract of this letter. See: Van der Wall, «*Without Partialitie Towards All Men*» (see above, n. 21), pp. 145-149.

⁶⁵ HP 3/3/32B. Although he did not quote the sources of his assertion, it can be assumed that Richard Popper had in mind Dury's letter when he stated that «Boreel, from a patrician Dutch family, studied at Oxford». See: Richard Popkin, «Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges in Holland and England 1640-1700», in Van der Berg, *Jewish-Christian Relations* (see above, n. 7), p. 7. Furthermore, from Dury's letter it is possible to conclude that Boreel gave financial support to Ziegler in England, not in Holland. See: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), p. 97; Snoek, *De Rozenkruisers in Nederland* (see above, n. 62), p. 334.

secret hermetic Christian sect which people started talking about at the beginning of the 17th century. As a matter of fact, between 1614 and 1615 two anonymous works were published in Kassel, the so called *Fama Fraternitatis Rosae Crucis* and *Confession Fraternitatis*. Another work came out in Strasburg in 1616, entitled *Chymische hochzeit Christiani Rosencreuetz*, where the famous physician «Father C.R.C.», the main character of the *Fama Fraternitatis*, was identified to Christian Rosenkreutz. We still do not know if he really existed. Anyhow, after the publishing of the *Chymische hochzeit*, the German theologian Valentinus Andreae claimed to be the author of this work.⁶⁶

The *Fama Fraternitatis* and the *Confession Fraternitatis* are considered the two manifestos of the Rosicrucian order. The anonymous author of the *Fama Fraternitatis* describes the history of this sect, from the time of its founder «Father C.R.C.», a man with great intelligence, esoteric knowledge, and great healing abilities, to the last adepts. On the other hand, in the *Confessio Fraternitatis* we can find the real manifesto of the Rosicrucians. In this work the author expresses the idea of a necessary and forthcoming reform of Europe, which would have involved all aspects of human life, from natural sciences to theology. The author of the *Confessio* emphasize the Christian nature of the Rosicrucian sect. Furthermore, in both books there was an invitation for anyone who believed in the order to join the Rosicrucians. The learned men of 17th century Europe interpreted both books as an allegory and denied the factual existence of the Rosicrucian order. Nonetheless, the publishing of these books provoked great excitement and commotion in all of Europe. The promises of a spiritual and cultural transformation, and of an attainment of great esoteric and mystique knowledge, charmed both learned and common people, who started to claim they were members of the Rosicrucian order. However, in the following year

⁶⁶ See: Harald Scholtz, *Evangelischer Utopismus bei Johann Valentin Andreae: ein geistiges Vorspiel zum Pietismus*, Stuttgart, 1957; Roland Edighoffer, *Rose-croix et société idéale selon Johann Valentin Andreae*, Neully-sur-Seine, 2 vols., 1982-1987; Friedrich Bran, *Johann Valentin Andreae, 1586-1654: ein universaler Geist des 17. Jahrhunderts in internationaler Sicht*, Bad Liebenzell, 1987; Maurizio Cambi, «La città degli eletti di Dio. Utopia e teologia luterana nella Christianopolis di Johann Valentin Andreae», in *Rinascimento: rivista dell'istituto nazionale di studi sul rinascimento*, 48, (2008), pp. 493-509.

the initial excitement started to wane. The secrecy of the order made many people believe that the Rosicrucian sect did not exist at all. In the second half of the 17th century and at the beginning of the 18th century there are only a few references to the Rosicrucians and to their order.⁶⁷

After the publishing of the two manifestos, Philip Ziegler was one of those people who claimed to be part of the Rosicrucian order. We know little about his life and activities. From a manuscript preserved in the “Ashmole Collection” of the Bodleian Library, Oxford University, it is possible to conclude that Ziegler was in the Dutch Republic around 1624. It seems that he visited both Groningen and Amsterdam.⁶⁸ However, his Dutch stay ended in the same year, since between the end of 1624 and the beginning of 1625, Ziegler went to England. This assertion can be based upon the following sources.

First, it is possible to quote a letter written by Johannes Joachim von Rusdorf, a German politician and emissary in England.⁶⁹ In November 28, 1626, he wrote to Frederick V, Elector Palatine: «Nous avons par deça, depuis un an et demi environ, ce prophète frénétique, Ziglerus, lequel se dit *secretarium Dei*: il a été jusques ici tranquille, et ne se faisoit pas entendre; mais maintenant il est tout à fait enragé, de sorte que toute la ville de Londres est pleine de ses rêveries, lesquelles il a fait même passer jusques aux oreilles de S.M., par le moyen du Sr. David Ramsey, en telle forte: il envoya au Roi un petit papier, plié en forme de letter, dans lequel fut peint un Ω et ces deux

⁶⁷ See: Frances Yates, *The rosicrucian enlightenment*, London, 2^o ed., 2002 (1^oed. 1972); Alberto Cesare Ambesi, *I rosacroce*, Milano, 1975; F.A. Janssen (ed.), *Das Erbe des christian Rosenkreuz : Vorträge gehalten anlässlich des Amsterdamer Symposiums, 18.-20. November 1986 Johann Valentin Andreae 1586-1986 und die Manifeste der Rosenkreuzerbruderschaft 1614-1616*, Amsterdam, 1988; Jean-Pierre Bayard, *La spiritualité de la Rose-Croix: histoire, tradition et valeur initiatique*, Saint Jean de Braye, 1990; Christopher McIntosh, *The rose cross and the age of reason: eighteenth-century rosicrucianism in central Europe and its relationship to the Enlightenment*, Leiden, 1992; Eugenio Bonvicini, *Rosarocce: la storia di un pensiero*, Foggia, 1996; John Matthes, *The rosicrucian enlightenment revisited*, Hudson, 1999; Govert Snoek, *De Rozenkruisers in Nederland* (see above, n. 62); Tobias Churton, *The invisible history of the rosicrucians: the world's most mysterious secret society*, Rochester, 2009.

⁶⁸ Bodleian Library, Ashmole MS 1149. See also: Heisler, *Philip Ziegler* (see above, n. 62).

⁶⁹ See: «Rusdorf: Johann Joachim», in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 30, Leipzig, 1890, pp. 1-3.

mots souscrits, d'encre dorée, *Pseaume septante un: la suspriction telle: glorioso Regi, Carolo, filio Dei et nostro, future Imperatori Britannico*»⁷⁰.

Second, we can quote an extract of a letter that Thomas Birch, one of the most famous English historian of the 17th century, published in his work about the court and times of Charles I.⁷¹ In this letter, sent on November 27, 1626, it is possible to read: «there is a stranger hath been two years in London, and some say is the same, who, as hath been heretofore reported, told the Prince Palatine, at the beginning of his election to the crown of Bohemia, of all the misfortunes and calamities which have befallen him since that time, and nevertheless advised him to accept it. Whosoever he be, he yesterday sent a letter to our king».⁷²

From this extract alone it is impossible to determine who this «stranger» was. However, from a letter that John Pory⁷³ sent to Joseph Mede (Mead), the famous English millenarist scholar,⁷⁴ on November 26, 1626, it can be concluded that the «stranger» of Birch's letter was none other than Ziegler. In his letter Pory says: «The young ambassador of our President of the Rosy Cross did not appear this afternoon at Whitehall; [...] he sent a letter unto the king, the copy whereof is this [...]»⁷⁵. From the temporal proximity of the two letters it is possible to conclude that the «stranger» in Birch's letter is the same «President of the Rosy Cross» in Pory's letter. Furthermore, the same reference to a missive for Charles I in all three letters here quoted is sufficient proof that both Birch's and Pory's letters describe Ziegler's activities.

⁷⁰ E.G. Cuhn (ed.), *Mémoires et négociations secrètes de Mr. De Rusdorf, conseiller d'état de S.M. Frédéric V, roi de Bhoème, électeur Palatin, pour servir à l'histoire de la guerre de trente ans*, vol. I, Leipzig, 1789, pp. 785-786.

⁷¹ Birch also published a six volumes edition of the works of Robert Boyle. See: D.P. Miller, «Birch, Thomas (1705-1766)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

⁷² Thomas Birch, *The court and times of Charles the First; illustrated by authentic and confidential letters, from various public and private collections*, vol. 1, London, 1848, p. 175. It is not known who sent this letter and who received it.

⁷³ For more information, see: W.S. Powell, *John Pory, 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts*, Chapel Hill, 1977; C. Fell-Smith, «Pory, John (1572-1633)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

⁷⁴ For more information about Joseph Mede, see: Bryan W. Ball, «Mede, Joseph (1586-1638)», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004; Jeffrey J. Kue, *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarism*, Dordrecht, 2006.

⁷⁵ Birch, *The court and times of Charles the First* (see above, n. 72), pp. 173-174.

In addition, from these three letters it is possible to establish when Ziegler went to England. It is most likely that he left the Dutch Republic to reach the British territories between the end of 1624 and the beginning of 1625. The nameless epistle published by Birch asserts that on November 26 Ziegler had been in England for two year, while Von Rusdorf on November 28 states that Ziegler had been in England for one and a half year. Therefore, it is most likely that he went to England between 1624 and 1625.

As for Ziegler's activities in the British territories, it can be argued that he was not alone. He had some «serviteurs» and with them was put in jail in December 1626. The sources of this information are Von Rusdorf's letters once again. In the letter already quoted, he explains that he does not know ««d'où ce fou [Ziegler] prende les dépenses qu'il fait», since Ziegler had «toujours cinqu ou six, qui le servent, auxquels il faut qu'il donne à manger».⁷⁶ Moreover, in a following missive sent on December 3, 1626, Von Rusdorf tells Frederick V: «ce que j'avois prédit à notre Ziegler, lui est arrivé: car on l'a mis en prison avec ses secrétaires et serviteurs; on a épluché tous leurs papiers, dans lesquels on ne trouve que des folies. Après qu'ils auront fait un peu de pénitence, et qu'ils seront revenus à eux-même, on les remettra en liberté».⁷⁷

Furthermore, it is evident that during his English stay Ziegler not only stayed in London, but he also went to Oxford. In a missive sent to Elias Ashmole,⁷⁸ an unknown Mr. Townesend says: «is acknowledged for one of ye brotherhood of ye R.C. by... Philip Zieglerus... by divers relations which I have heard, I am induced to believe that he [Ziegler] understood neither the true theory nor manual operation of the great work [alchemy]. In my time in Oxford, he was accused to have stoll'n the booke he called Monas Hieroglifica

⁷⁶ Cuhn, *Mémoires et négociations secrètes de Mr. De Rusdorf* (see above, n. 70), p. 786.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 790. See also: Heisler, *Philip Ziegler* (see above, n. 62).

⁷⁸ I was not able to identify this «Mr. Townesend». On the other hand, Elias Ashmole was an English collector, historian and alchemist. See: M. Hunter, *Elias Ashmole, 1617-1692: The Founder of the Ashmolean Museum and His World*, Oxford, 1983; M. Hunter, «Ashmole, Elias (1617-1692)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004; V. Feola, *Elias Ashmole and the Uses of Antiquity*, Parigi, 2013.

[by Dee] out of All Soules College in Oxford (out of ye library there)». ⁷⁹ In addition, in the National Archives of London there is a letter written by one of Ziegler's followers who were arrested with him in 1626, where the writer clearly says that Ziegler spent a year in Oxford. ⁸⁰ If we consider that Ziegler went to England between 1624 and 1625, we must conclude that he was in Oxford between 1625 and 1626.

It is now possible to draw some conclusions from the following: Dury affirms that Boreel gave financial support to Ziegler when he was in England; the Rosicrucian prophet stayed in the British territories between 1625 and 1626, reaching the climax of his activities in December 1626, when he was put in jail; Boreel returned to the Dutch Republic in 1628. All this information lead us to conclude that our author spent at least two years in England, between 1625 and 1626. To strengthen this conclusion, we can quote once again the letter of Peter Wundertios. In his epistle, he explains that he had already understood that Ziegler was a dangerous man before he was arrested. Wundertios admits that he made an error following the Rosicrucian prophet and explains that the reasons of this error were poor experience, excessive curiosity, and ignorance. In the end, he decided to leave Ziegler and, before he was arrested, he had been able to meet «Borelium», who «accurate etiam ipsius [of Ziegler] vitam, acta dictaque observare solebat». Wundertios had explained to Boreel the «majoris momenti negotia» of Ziegler's activities and the two of them had decided to leave the Rosicrucian prophet immediately. ⁸¹ This missive is also useful to reject the hypothesis that

⁷⁹ Heisler, *Philip Ziegler* (see above, n. 62). The letter is preserved in "Ashmole Collection". I was not able to have access to this epistle. See: Bodleian Library, Ashmole MS 1446 IX.

⁸⁰ Peter Wundertios wrote this letter to explain his association with Ziegler and to ask to be released. I did not find any information about this subject. Anyhow, after he has explained the reasons why he has started to doubt about Ziegler ideas and activities, Wundertios says: «vidi enim per septem hos dies, quo se quotidianis suis actibus omnibus manifestavit, plura, quam per integrum fere annum Oxony aut hic Londini per omne tempus a me ipso, aut ab ullis alys observari potuit». The National Archives, State Papers Office MS (from now on SP) 46/127/fo221r. It seems that Peter Wundertios is the same «Dr. Wunderlichium» that on September 28, 1632, received a letter where the writer called Ziegler a «fraudulent hyporite». It is most likely that this missive was sent by Samuel Hartlib. See: British Library, Sloane Collection MS 648, 147r-151v; Heisler, *Philip Ziegler* (see above, n. 62). I was not able to have access to this epistle.

⁸¹ SP 46/127/fo221v.

Boreel could have been in England between 1627 and 1628, and that could have given financial support to Ziegler after his imprisonment.⁸²

In conclusion, even if we do not have much information about Boreel's stay in England, we can say for sure that he became one of the supporters of the Rosicrucian Philip Ziegler. The latter spent a year in Oxford, where Boreel in all appearances was carrying on with his studies. From John Dury's words we cannot establish if Boreel's stay in Oxford was part of a larger trip made in England. Regardless, he was deceived by Ziegler and he gave financial support to the Rosicrucian prophet. In this way we can also answer to the question raised by Von Rusdorf in his letter of November 28: it was Boreel, and maybe someone else, who provided Ziegler and his adepts with economic means.

It is not certain if the English authorities put Boreel in jail with Ziegler and his supporters. In the *Mantissa* enclosed in the second edition of the *De usu et honore sacri ministerii in ecclesiis reformatis*, Samuel Desmarets says that Boreel went to England, where he was imprisoned for his enthusiastic behaviour.⁸³ If this is true, it can be argued that the incident described by Desmarets must be related to the Ziegler case. In other words, it can be argued that Boreel was one of Ziegler's supporters who were put in

⁸² We can also add that after his detention Ziegler seems to have disappeared from the public eye. In his article Heisler says: «what happened to Ziegler thereafter remains a blank: either death was not long in coming or he settled for total obscurity». Heisler, *Philip Ziegler* (see above, n. 62). On the other hand, Heisler asserts that at the beginning of the 30s there was a Rosicrucian college in London, which could testify that Ziegler was active once again. He bases this assertion upon the article "Rosicrucianism" in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana. However, I did not find such article in this encyclopedia. I only found a vague reference to a "society of Rosicrucians" in London in the article about "Mason – Free Masonry": «Elias Ashmole was made a Mason at Warrington in the year 1646. At the same time, a Society of Rosicrucians had been formed in London [...]». E. Smedley, Hugh J. Rose & Henry J. Rose (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana; or, Universal Dictionary of Knowledge*, vol. 22, Londra, 1845, p. 19. Furthermore, even if there really was a new sect of Rosicrucians in London in the 30s, we should still recognize that the climax of Ziegler's activities was in the years 1625-1626, since it has already been shown that in 1632 someone wrote that Ziegler was a «fraudulent hyporite». For an index of the articles of the Encyclopedia Metropolitana, see: Smedley, *Encyclopaedia Metropolitana* (see above, n. 58), vol. 26.

⁸³ «eum [Boreel] post Studium Theologicum utcunque delibatum, et aliquos profectus in lingua Graeca et Hebraica, primùm Enthusiastam egisse, et Fanaticis deliramentis plenum, se pro Vate et Propheta in Anglia venditasse: Quo nomine cùm turbas daret, autoritate Regis in vincula fuit coniectus». Samuel Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore sacri ministerii in ecclesiis reformati; opposita anonymi cujusdam periculoso libello, qui inscribitur Ad Legem et Testimonium, sive Erotemcatica propositio et deductio etc. Editio altera, abAuthore recognita, accuratior et nova ad calcem Mantissa auctior priori, factae anno 1646*, Groningen, 1658, p. 39.

jail with their prophet in December 1626. It has been shown that Peter Wundertios and Boreel decided to leave the Rosicrucian prophet, but it is evident that Wundertios made this decision too late, since he was imprisoned with Ziegler. Perhaps, the same happened to Boreel. If we consider what has been said about the Rosicrucian prophet, Desmarets' assertions, suggesting that Boreel «se pro Vate et Propheta in Anglia venditasse» and «in vincula fuit coniectus» because of the public «turbas» he raised, these could acquire a certain degree of validity.

However, we should underline some facts about the *Mantissa* written by Desmarets. First, he clearly wrote it to discredit Boreel from a personal point of view. Second, Boreel himself in the *Ad Samuelem Maresium* denied Desmarets' accusations.⁸⁴ Third, it is evident that the French theologian made some errors in his account of Boreel's life. He says that Boreel, after his imprisonment and after his release, was forced to go back to the Dutch Republic, where at first he committed himself to the cause of converting the Jews, then he retired to an «extra Patria urbem tuguriolo», until he went to Amsterdam. Up to a certain point, these assertions do fit the facts of Boreel's life, because they refer to events that really happened between 1639 and 1645. However, since Desmarets describes them right after Boreel's imprisonment, either he did not know any detail of Boreel's life between 1626 and 1638, or he believed that his stay in England and his imprisonment happened shortly before 1639. So, his biographical information is not fully reliable. This is the reason why we should be careful asserting that Boreel was imprisoned with Ziegler in December 1626.

Before moving on to the following chapter, we have to take into account another hypothesis about Boreel's life, which can be only based upon an anonymous pamphlet from 1663, entitled '*t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt, van Dr. Galenus Abrahamsz*'⁸⁵. Since in this work there are various references

⁸⁴ After he illustrated the seven accusations made by Desmarets, Boreel clearly says that neither Desmarets, nor anyone else could have proved these accusations: «Haec tibi, aequè ac alii ulli, probatu prorsus omnino sunt impossibilia. Tu, si dictis meis fidem non habeas, tenta modò; atque, ipsomet eventu, oleum et operam te perdidisse, edoceberis». ASM, in OP, p. 85.

⁸⁵ '*t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt, van Dr. Galenus Abrahamsz*, Leiden, 1663. This work, as well as the *Lammerenkrijgh* that in all appearances came from the same pen, is

to the most famous *Lammerenkrijgh*, which is usually ascribed to Passchier de Fijne,⁸⁶ the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* is credited to the same author too. De Fijne was one of the first Remonstrant ministers who clashed with the newborn Collegiant movement first in Warmond, then in Rijnsburg.⁸⁷ In the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* the author writes some pages about Adam Boreel, the one who led Galenus Abrhams astray. Among the biographical information, is written: «[Boreel] gefrusteert van een huweliks versoeck van seeckere aensienelicke Juffrouw / (ghelhck de wanhoop gemeynelick / of een soldaet of een Munniek maeckt) tot de oeffeninge van de Theologie oversloegh».⁸⁸

So, the author of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* believed that Boreel started to study theology after a certain girl rejected his marriage proposal. If this is true, I think we should place this happening between 1627 and 1628, after Boreel came back from England and before he started a new course of studies at the University of Leiden. However, we must underline that there is no other reference to Boreel's marriage proposal. Furthermore, the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* is clearly hostile towards Boreel. For instance, here it wants to suggest that Boreel started to study theology only because some girl did not want to marry him. Hence, even if it is impossible to exclude that someone rejected Boreel's marriage proposal, we should be careful of accepting this information as true.

related to the dispute arisen in the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam between the lamists and the zonists. For more information see chapter III.

⁸⁶ [Passchier de Fijne], *Lammerenkrijgh: Anders / Mennonisten Kercken-Twist, verhandelt door Vlaams Mennonist. Een Remonstrant. Watelrandts Broeder, en een Collegiant*, Waerschouw, 1663.

⁸⁷ For more information about Passchier de Fijne, see: Van der Aa, *Biograpisch woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. 6, pp. 275-278; Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), passim; B.A. Venemans, «Fijne, Passchier de», in *Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme*, Kampen, 1988, vol. 3, pp. 125-126.

⁸⁸ *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2.

Chapter II: 1628 – 1638

In the previous chapter, it has been shown that after his first enrollment at University of Leiden as a «litterarum studiosus», Boreel went to England, where he stayed at least for the years 1625-26. During his stay Boreel studied in Oxford and was involved in the Ziegler case. We do not know either if Boreel remained in England after December 1626, nor if he visited cities other than Oxford. Regardless, it is certain that during 1628 he went back to the Dutch Republic: in October 20, 1628, he enrolled again at the University of Leiden.

As for the years between 1628 and 1638, there is little biographical information available to reconstruct Boreel's life. This chapter is divided in two sections. In the first, Boreel's second enrollment at the University of Leiden is taken into account, showing that in 1632 he had some theological discussions with one of his professors, André Rivet. The second section examines the years between 1632 and 1638. There is almost no information about Boreel's life during these years. Therefore, at first some biographical data concerning Boreel's activities in these years must be examined. Then, it is possible to present the few certain facts that we know about Boreel's life between 1632 and 1638, when he seems to have not left any trace of his activities.

Boreel's second enrollment at the University of Leiden

On October 20, 1628, Boreel enrolled at Leiden University for the second time. As a matter of fact, in the *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae*, it is possible to read: «20/10/1628, Adamus Boreel Middelburgensis 25, Optim. Scient.».⁸⁹ It is clear that in this second registration there are no errors concerning Boreel's age, since in October of 1628 he was 25 years old.

However, it is hard to establish what it means that Boreel enrolled as a *optimarum scientiarum studiosus*.⁹⁰ It is most likely that during this second course of studies he attended the *Facultas Theologica*, since many sources testify his deep theological knowledge. For instance, in the *Familieboek* Jan Boreel wrote: «Adam Boreel is geboren 1602 heeft seer treffelijck gestudeert, ende tot groote kennisse gecomen synde, heeft een groote renommee (soo in philosophie daer seer subtil in was, als in theologie daer profonde kennisse in had) van geleertheyt gehad».⁹¹ Furthermore, similar assertions are also found in the writings of Boreel's opponents, such as Desmarets and De Fijne. It has already been shown that the former says that Boreel went to England «post Studium Theologicum utcunq̄ue delibatum, et aliquos profectus in lingua Graeca et Hebraica» and that Boreel studied theology after the rejection of a marriage proposal, according to the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt*.⁹²

We can stress that none of the three sources here quoted openly states that Boreel enrolled at the *Facultas Theologica* of Leiden University. On the other hand, it is evident that the phrase *optimarum scientiarum studiosus* refer neither to the theological studies, nor to any kind of specialized study. Moreover, as far as my knowledge goes, between 1575 and 1875 only Boreel enrolled as a *optimarum scientiarum studiosus*. So, here we must agree with Schneider when he says that probably this expression shows that Boreel

⁸⁹ Du Rieu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. 214.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. LXIV.

⁹¹ NNA, MS 1.10.10.

⁹² See: Desmarets, *Dissertatio Theologica* (see above, n. 83), p. 39; *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2.

desired to specialize in more than one subject.⁹³ In other words, it is most likely that in 1628 Boreel started to attend both the *Facultas Theologica* and the *Facultas philosophiae et artium liberarium*. If so, it can be concluded that Boreel continued his previous studies in classical Greek and Hebrew, and that he increased his theological learning, which probably he had already begun to acquire some years before.

In addition to the professors mentioned in the previous chapters, in from 1628 onwards, the following taught in the University of Leiden: Johannes Polyander, professor of theology from 1625;⁹⁴ Franck Pieterszoon Burgersdijk, who from 1628 also started to teach physics;⁹⁵ Joan Bodecheer Benningh (Johannes Bodecherus Benningius), as professor of ethics;⁹⁶ Gerardus Vossius, as professor of eloquence and Greek literature, but he was also a famous theologian;⁹⁷ Costantijn van Oppyck (Opwijck) l'Empereur, from 1628 professor of Hebrew and Jewish literature, but he was also

⁹³ «Mir Scheint es. daß Boreel diesen Ausdruck gewählt hat, um das Studium in mehreren Fakultäten damit zu zu bezeichnen». Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 35.

⁹⁴ De Riu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. X. For more information about Polyander, see: A.J. Lamping, *Johannes Polyander, een dienaar van Kerk en Universiteit*, Leiden, 1980; A.J. Lamping, “Polyander van Kerkhoven, Johannes”, in *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*, vol. 2, Kampen, 1983, pp. 366-368. In 1625 the four professors of the *Facultas Theologica*, Walaeus, Thysius, Rivet, and Polyander, published the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae*, which arose from the theological discussions they held in the faculty of theology about the most important questions of Christian doctrine. The aim of this work was to propose to his readers the true reformed theology, against the corrupted theology of people such as Catholics, Spiritualists, Arminians, Socinians, etc. An English translation of the *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae* is now in press. They already published the first volume, while the second and third ones are scheduled for 2016 and 2018. For the first volume, see: R.T. te Velde (ed.), *Synopsis Purioris Theologiae – Synopsis of a purer theology*, vol. I, Leiden, 2014.

⁹⁵ De Riu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. XLIII.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. XLIII. For more information about Joan Bodecheer Benningh, see: Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. 2, pp. 321-322.

⁹⁷ De Riu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. XLIV. For more information about Vossius, see: Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. 19, pp. 408-415; S.B.J. Zilverberg, «Vossius, Gerardus Joannes», in *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*, vol. 1, Kampen, 1978, pp. 414-416.

interested in theological questions;⁹⁸ Jacobus Golius (Jacob van Gool), pupils of Erpenius and from 1628 professor of oriental languages and literature.⁹⁹

Like Boreel's first enrollment, there are no documents to establish either how much time Boreel spent at the University of Leiden, nor if he completed his studies. However, it is possible to argue that at the beginning of 1632 he was in Leiden, since he had the opportunity to discuss some ecclesiological questions with André Rivet. This is not sufficient proof to assert that Boreel was still studying at Leiden University, since he could have gone to Leiden just to discuss with Rivet. However, if we take into consideration his deep theological knowledge, and his expertise in classical and oriental languages, I think that it is most likely that he stayed in Leiden at least until 1632, in order to increase his learning.

From Boreel's words it is possible to conclude that in 1632 he met André Rivet and he asked his opinion about some ecclesiological matters. In ASM Boree affirms: «post Anno 1632 cum *Andrea Riveto* scripto ac ore habitam de hisce collationem, in qua mihi causaeque, quippe à scopo aberrans, nullatenus satisfecit, et, ad rescriptum meum, responsum mihi hactenus debet».¹⁰⁰ Since Rivet left Leiden at the beginning of 1632 to become tutor to the future William II, and he held his valediction at the University of Leiden on March 11, 1632, it must be concluded that Boreel

⁹⁸ De Riu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. XLV. For more information about Constantijn L'Empereur, see: Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), pp. 134-136; D. Nauta, «*Empereur van Oppyck (Opwijck), Costantijn*», in *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*, vol. 2, Kampen, 1983, pp. 187-188; 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.

⁹⁹ De Riu, *Album Studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae* (see above, n. 40), p. XLV. For more information about Golius, see: Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek* (see above, n. 26), vol. 7, pp. 270-273; F.J. Dijksterhuis, *The Mutual Making of Sciences and Humanities: Willebrord Snellius, Jacob Golius, and the Early Modern Entanglement of Mathematics and Philology*, in E. Bod, J. Maat & T. Weststeijn (ed.), *The Making of the Humanities, volume II: From Early Modern to Modern disciplines*, Amsterdam, 2012, pp. 73-93; T. Weststeijn, *The Middle Kingdom in the Low Countries: Sinology in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands*, in Rens Bod, Jaap Maat, and Thijs Weststeijn (ed.), *The Making of Humanities volume II: From Early Modern to Modern Disciplines*, Chicago, 2012, pp. 209-243.

¹⁰⁰ ASM, in OP, p. 86.

met Rivet before the spring of the same year.¹⁰¹ More information about this episode can be drawn from Hoornbeeck and Desmarets.

In the *Mantissa*, the French theologian says that, when he started his *diatribam* with Boreel, he did not know who the author of ALAT was. However, soon after André Rivet told him that this author was none other than Adam Boreel.¹⁰² As a matter of fact, Rivet was able to recognize the author of ALAT as soon as it was published, because this work expressed ideas that Boreel had already discussed with Rivet in 1632. This is what it can be deduced from Hoornbeeck's words. Like Desmarets before him, after he read Boreel's work, Hoornbeeck wrote to André Rivet about the author of ALAT. The latter enclosed with his answer a *fasciculo litterarum*, which Boreel sent him years before, so that Hoornbeeck could have better refuted Boreel's work.¹⁰³ In the *Summa Controversiarum* Hoornbeeck copied an extract of one of Boreel's letters. In this epistle Boreel asks Rivet if he thinks that the Christian ministers of the modern churches administer public religion

¹⁰¹ See: Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19) p. 38; Van Opstal, *André Rivet* (see above, n. 54), pp. 14-20.

¹⁰² «Cum hanc Diatribam scriberem ante duodecennium, penitus nesciebam quis fuisset Author Libelli inscripti *Ad Legem et testimonium*, cujos nervos tunc succidebam: Sed paullò post ipse Celeberrimus *Rivetus ó μακαρίτης*, cui meum Opusculum inscripseram, suis ad me literis, eum ita et à nomine, et ab aliis circumstantiis, depinxit». Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore* (see above, n. 83), p. 39. Here Desmarets refers to the polemics that he had with Boreel in 1646, after our author published ALAT. From Desmarets' letters it is possible to establish when Rivet informed him about Boreel. Most of the letters that Desmarets sent to Rivet were preserved and they were published by Nauta. Furthermore, the latter briefly describes the subjects of those missives that he did not publish. In the *Mantissa*, Desmarets says that he discovered the identity of the author of ALAT after their diatribe. Moreover, his first edition of the *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore sacri ministerii ecclesii reformatis* was published in October 1646, as it is possible to conclude from the dedicatory letter to André Rivet that Desmarets enclosed in his work. Therefore, if we look at Desmarets' correspondence with Rivet after October 1646, we can find reference to Boreel in just one epistle, sent on February 6, 1647: «Audio illum ipsum erotematicum scriptorem, cuj meam de honore Ministerij diatribam opposuj responsum parare: Quale illud erit suo loco videbimus. Crediderim, ex quo quis ille sit mihi significastj, eundem esse, qui Grallas virulentas in D. Apollonium nuper emisit; in quibus suis hypothesibus / inistit, et Independentium furores propinat lectori suo». D. Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, Amsterdam, 1935, p. 527. Hence, it is possible to argue that Rivet and Desmarets discussed about Boreel either between October 1646 and February 1647, or soon after this February 6.

¹⁰³ «Praeterea Cl. Rivetus p.m. cui scriptum meum miseram, censens, me rem acutegisse, eum in finem donavit fasciculo litterarum, ad se ante plures annos tua manu scriptarum, hac ipsa de re». Hoornbeeck, *Summa controversiarum* (see above, n. 36), p. 465. It is evident that the phrase «scriptum meum miseram» cannot refer to the *Apologia pro ecclesia christiana*. First, here Hoornbeeck describes events that occurred before he wrote his *Apologia*. Second, Rivet sent Boreel's letters to Hoornbeeck so that the latter could have better refuted Boreel's ideas by writing the *Apologia pro ecclesia christiana*. Hence, with «scriptum meum miseram» I understood that Hoornbeeck sent a letter to Rivet in order have some information to better refute Boreel's work.

as was once done by the ministers ordained by Christ and his disciples, that is in the name of God or with divine authority.¹⁰⁴ Since this is one of the central questions which Boreel based ALAT upon, is therefore not surprising that Rivet was able to recognize the author of this work.

From Hoornbeeck's words it is impossible to establish when Boreel sent that *fasciculo litterarum* to Rivet, but it is most likely that it was part of the discussion that he and Boreel had in 1632. In conclusion, from all that has been shown, we can confirm this account of Boreel's discussions with Rivet. During his theological studies Boreel started to develop the ecclesiological ideas that later he expressed in ALAT.¹⁰⁵ At the beginning of 1632 or maybe some months before he decided to discuss these ideas with André Rivet, who had been one of his professor at the *Facultas Theologica*. When Rivet left Leiden, Boreel started writing to him to continue their discussions. We do not know how many letters they sent each other. Anyhow, at some point Rivet decided to end this correspondence, probably because he thought it was impossible to dissuade Boreel from his ideas. So, he left him without an answer to his last *rescriptum*.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ «Epistola tua ad Rivetum, sic quaestionem proposuisti: “An Reformatarum Ecclesiarum ministri, qui hodierno tempore publicum N.T. cultum mediantibus concionibus, Dei et Christi loco, nomine, et autoritate hominibus exhibent: eundem illum publicum N.T. cultum administrent, qui olim in primitiva N.T. ecclesia, mediantibus concionibus ab ipso Christo, aut ab Apostolis, et lxx. Discipulis, ordinariisque per eos vocatis ministris, Dei et Christi loco, nomine et autoritate exhibitus fuit?”». Ibid., p. 466.

¹⁰⁵ In this way, we can explain also a passage of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt*. The author of this pamphlet asserts that once Boreel disputed with Bartel Louwer, a member of the conservative party of the Amsterdam *doopsgezinde*, and that he said that he had thought about the idea of a new kind of Church for 20 years: «soo smede hy [Boreel] in sijn warmgeestighe herssenen / door langhe tijdt van jaren (want hy seyde eens tegen *Bartel Louwer*, dat hy daer meer als twintigh jaren mede besich was gheweest) een ydee van een nieuwe kerk». *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2.

¹⁰⁶ About this episode, Schneider writes that, after some unsatisfying conversations, Boreel sent a first letter to Rivet. After he received the answer, he sent to Rivet his *rescriptum*, where he better explained his ideas, but he never received an answer. Furthermore, Schneider goes as far as to say that this *rescriptum* represent a first draft of ALAT. However, since Schneider uses the same sources above-quoted, I believe that it is impossible to infer his conclusion. On the contrary, the expression *fasciculo litterarum* employed by Hoornbeeck indicates that Boreel sent to Rivet more than one letter and a *rescriptum*. Moreover, I believe that using the term *rescriptum* Boreel only meant the last epistle that he sent to Rivet, not a supposed first draft of Boreel ideas that later become his first published work. See: Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), pp. 38-41.

1632: a new trip to England? A discussion about Schneider's biography and the first contacts with the Hartlib Circle

After the meeting and the discussions with Rivet of 1632, and until 1639 there is no significant information about Boreel's life and activities. There are a few scattered data available, which are only useful to establish the first contacts between Boreel and the Hartlib Circle. However, before showing these data, the biographical information that we can find in more recent biographies must be discussed. Particularly, we have to refute both Schneider's biography and some assertions concerning Boreel's activities that we can find in the edition of the correspondence of Marin Mersenne.¹⁰⁷

As for Schneider's biography, the German scholar says that in 1632 Boreel went to England for the second time, if we accept Schneider's reconstruction, and that roughly in the same period Boreel tried to become a minister of the Reformed Church, but he did not succeed. It is possible to show that Schneider's biographical reconstruction has no solid foundation.

Regarding Boreel's attempt to become a minister of the Reformed Church, Schneider draws this information from the *Mantissa* of Desmarets.¹⁰⁸ Even if he had some doubts about the truth of Desmarets' word, the German scholar says that, if Boreel had really tried to become a Reformed minister, it would have happened soon after 1632.¹⁰⁹ However, I believe that there are at least two considerations that are able to confute Desmarets' words.

First, it has already been shown that in 1632 Boreel had developed a first fundamental core of his thought concerning the church and its alleged authority. Therefore, it must be wondered if it could have been possible that someone who had raised doubts about the legitimacy of the office of the

¹⁰⁷ C. de Waard (ed.), *La Correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne, religieux minime; commencée par M.me Paul Tannery, publiée et annotée par Cornelis de Waard*, vol. VIII, Parigi, 1963.

¹⁰⁸ «quod [Boreel] nequiverat obtinere in gremio Ecclesiae, repulsam passus circa petitionem Ministerii». Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore* (see above, n. 83), p. 40.

¹⁰⁹ «Maresius berichtet in seiner Mantissa, daß Boreel sich um ein Predigtamt beworben habe. Aber Boreel selbst erklärt diese Angaben wie die anderen der Mantissa für unrichtig, allerdings mit etwas gewundenen Worten. [...] Sollte aber diese Notiz des Maresius wahr sein, was mir nicht wahrscheinlich ist, so wäre die mißlungene Bewerbung um ein Predigtamt bald nach 1632 zu setzen». Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 40.

Church ministers and that in later years wrote a work against ecclesiastical authority, had tried to become part of that same church that he criticized. It could be argued that in 1632, even though he started to have doubts about the authority of the modern churches, Boreel did not fully develop his ideas, and so that he could have tried to become a minister of the Reformed Church nonetheless. However, there are no sources other than Desmarets' words to prove this hypothesis. This is the second reason why this alleged attempt to become a minister can be doubted.

As has already been said, it is clear that Desmarets' aim is to discredit Boreel from a personal point of view. This aim is even clearer if we look at the general context of his discourse. Shortly before he said that Boreel tried to become a minister, Desmarets had said that Boreel at first spent some time in a *tuguriolo* near his hometown, where he indulged in his melancholy, in his meditations and in his fantasies, and then he went to Amsterdam, since he had become aware of a new sect of prophets and had hoped to gain among them that fame which he did not obtain in the official church.¹¹⁰ In other words, Desmarets claims that Boreel went to Amsterdam and that he founded his College only because he was not able to gain some kind of fame within the Reformed Church. So, I believe we should doubt Desmarets' words.¹¹¹ Moreover, as we said before, Boreel himself rejected the accusations made by the French theologian, even if he did not explain why Desmarets' assertions are false.

As for Boreel's second stay in England, Schneider says that Boreel went to England shortly after his discussions with Rivet, where he had contacts with the Cambridge Platonists. In England, continues Schneider, Boreel was imprisoned, because his ideas were similar to those of the sects

¹¹⁰ «Visus est quoque aliquando eo usque melancholiae suae indulgere, et cum Bellerophonte Veterum, ipse suum cor edens hominum vitare vestigia, et tumultuario opere excitato extra Patria urbem tuguriolo, eo se contineret dies noctesque, suis meditationibus et imaginationibus indulturus. Sed tandem ubi intellexisset apud Batavos novam quam oriri sectam novorum Prophetarum, Swecnkfeldiano et Weigeliano Spiritu plenorum, et quadantenus praeludentium Quakeris Angliae, Amstelodamum concessit, inter hos nomen aliquod consequuturus, quod nequiverat obinere in gremio Ecclesiae, repulsam passus circa petitionem Ministerii». Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore sacri ministerii* (see above, n. 83), p. 40

¹¹¹ I believe that the only possible reason why Boreel could have attempted to become a minister of the Reformed Church is because he thought that it could have been easier to change the Christian Church from within. However, this is mere speculation.

that he calls «Independentisten», that is the English Christian dissenting groups of that time. After some months in jail Boreel was released, thanks to the help of his friends. Schneider suggests that maybe these were the Cambridge Platonists and among them Henry More, who was in the King's graces. Since he was released with the condition that he would leave the British territories, Schneider asserts it is likely that Boreel returned to the Dutch Republic.¹¹²

Schneider bases his assertions upon three sources: the papers from Boreel's family archives, Desmarets' *Mantissa*, and «Henricus Morus».¹¹³ However, on closer inspection, it is easy to understand that Schneider's assertions are an almost literal translation of Desmarets' passage that we had already quoted before.¹¹⁴ Since he recognizes that Desmarets' aim is to discredit Boreel from a personal point of views, Schneider asserts that the only true facts of Desmarets' words are Boreel's imprisonment and his release

¹¹² «Bald nach 1632 hat Boreel sich nach England begeben, wo er vielleicht schon mit den Cambridger Neuplatonikern in Berührung kam. Da seine Anschauungen denen der Independentisten verwandt waren [...] wird er in irgend eine Beziehung zu ihnen getreten sein und infolgedessen unter dem absolutistischen Regiment Karls I in den Kerker geworfen worden sein. Nach einigen Monaten jedoch wurde er auf Fürsprache seiner Freunde hin wieder freigelassen. – Vielleicht waren es einige der Cambridger Neuplatoniker, von denen z. B. Morus beim Könige sehr angesehen war, durch deren Vermittlung er freikan. – Da ihm die Freiheit unter der Bedingung geschenkt worden war, daß er Englands verlasse und in sein Vaterland zurückkehre, so wird er dies auch getan haben». Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), pp. 41-42.

¹¹³ Ibid. From the list of Schneider's sources we can infer that by «Henricus Morus» he meant chapters XI-XIII of the *Magni Mysteriorum Pietatis Explanatio*, that is the Latin edition of the *An Explanation of the grand mystery of Godliness*, written by Henry More himself and published in 1675. As a matter of fact, in the Latin translation of his work More enclosed three new chapters that he wrote using one of Boreel's work, the *Jesus Nazarenus Legislator*. For the English edition of More's work, see: Henry More, *An Explanation of the grand mystery of Godliness; or a true and faithfully representation of the everlasting gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the onely begotten Son of God and Sovereign over Men and Angels*, London, 1660. For the three chapters added in the Latin edition, see: Henricus Morus, *Magni Mysteriorum Pietatis Explanatio, sive vera ac fidelis repraesentatio aeterni Evangelii domini ac servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, Dei Filii, Unigeniti, Hominumque Principis ac Angelorum*, in *Henry More Opera Omnia, vol. I: Opera Theologica. Édité avec une introduction par Serge Hutin*, Hildesheim, 1966.

¹¹⁴ «Sufficiat eum [Boreel] post Studium Theologicum utcumque delibatum, et aliquos profectus in lingua Graeca et Hebraica, primùm Enthusiastam egisse, et Fanaticis deliramentis plenum, se pro Vate et Propheta in Anglia venditasse: Quo nomine cùm turbas daret, autoritate Regis in vincula fuit coniectus, et post aliquorum mensium detentionem, aegrè ad intercessionem amicorum, suae libertati restitutus, ea conditione ut illa Insula relicta ad Patrios Lares remearet». Desmarets, *De usu et honore sacri ministerii* (see above, n. 83), pp. 39-40.

thanks to the help of some friends.¹¹⁵ This is the reason why Schneider introduces three new elements.

First, the German scholar says that it is possible that in England Boreel's had contacts with the Cambridge Platonists. To strengthen his hypothesis, Schneider quotes the «Familienchronik gegen Schluß» and the three chapters of More's *Magni Mysteriorum Pietatis Explanatio*.¹¹⁶ Yet, none of these two sources testify that Boreel had some kind of relationship with the Cambridge Platonists.

In the *Familieboek* it is only possible to read that Boreel went often to England, where he was praised by learned men. There is neither temporal references to Boreel's trip, nor any kind of information useful to understand who were these learned men.¹¹⁷

On the other hand, More's assertions can be misleading. In the three chapters that he added, More uses a new method to prove the truth of the books of the New Testament, a method that he took from some «lectis confusaneis» of Adam Boreel, «viri pii ac eruditi».¹¹⁸ From these words, it could be possible to suppose that More and Boreel knew each other, and that the latter gave to the former a copy of his manuscript concerning the proof of the New Testament's books. However, from the preface of the Latin edition of More's works it is easy to conclude that the Cambridge Platonist had never met Boreel. Here he clearly says that he took that proof from a work written by Boreel and entitled *Universi humani generis Legislatore*, a work that he had the opportunity to read thanks to Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), pp. 6 and 42.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 41. Although Schneider had never mentioned this *Famlienchronik* before, we can argue that he here wanted to quote the *Familieboek* from the Boreel family's archives. As a matter of fact, Schneider refers to note 114 of his work, where he quoted the *Familienaufzeichnungen*, that is the *Familieboek*.

¹¹⁷ «is ooc veeltijts in Engelandt geweest alwaer van veel geleerde luyden wel gesien ende geacht was». NNA, MS 1.10.10

¹¹⁸ «Est autem et altera eodem spectans minimè contemnenda argumentandi ratio, quae ex lectis confusaneis quibusdam *Adami Borelii*, viri pii ac eruditi, chartulis primùm mihi innotuit, quaeque ex locis ipsorum scriptorum Evangelicorum [...] est eruenda». More, *Magni Mysteriorum Pietatis Explanatio* (see above, n. 113), p. 280.

¹¹⁹ He was the son of the famous Jan Baptist van Helmont and he was an alchemist, a philosopher, and a millenarist theologian, who was particularly interested in the Jewish Kabbalah. During the 70s he became acquainted with the Quaker movement. However, some years later he disputed against the Quakers. Van Helmont was a friend of Benjamin Furly and he was a member of the circle around the Quaker merchant named "The Lantern". See:

When the two of them were at Ragley Hall, the estate in the Warwickshire of Anne Conway, wife of the count Edward Conwey and pupil of Henry More,¹²⁰ Van Helmont gave Boreel's manuscript to Henry More.¹²¹ Since Van Helmont came to Ragley Hall for the first time in 1670, it is evident that More had the opportunity to see Boreel's work only between 1670 and 1675, that is to say five years later Boreel's death.¹²²

In conclusion, from the *Familieboek* and More's assertions it is impossible to assert that Boreel in the years 1632-33 went to England and that he could have had some kind of relationship with the Cambridge Platonists.

The second new information that Schneider added in his biography is that he rejected the idea that Boreel could have been imprisoned because of his enthusiastic behavior. As a matter of fact, Schneider says, it is impossible to conclude that Boreel was some kind of enthusiast both from his biography and from his works. Therefore, the German scholar supposes that Boreel was put in jail because he could have been in contact with the English religious dissenting sects of that time, since they shared similar ideas. However, it must be emphasized that this is a mere speculation. Schneider did not have any kind of sources to explain Boreel's imprisonment and, therefore, he vaguely supposes an alleged contact or meeting with some kind of nonconformists, who he did not name.

A. Coudert, «A Quaker-Kabbalist Controversy: George Fox's Reaction to Francis Mercury van Helmont», in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 39, 1976, pp. 171-189; A. Coudert, *The Impact of the Kabbalah in the Seventeenth Century: the Life and Thought of Francis Mercury van Helmont (1614-1698)*, Leiden, 1999; S.A. Spector (ed.), *Francis Mercury van Helmont's "Sketch of Christian Kabbalism"*, Leiden, 2012

¹²⁰ Anne Conway was the pupil of Henry More and shared his ideas. However, in 1670 she met Franciscus van Helmont, who was called to cure her frequent health problems. She was fascinated by Van Helmont's thought and personality. Thanks to him, she became acquainted with Quakerism and started to hold Quaker meetings at Ragley Hall. In 1677, two years before her death, she converted to Quakerism, even though her former mentor Henry More was strongly against it. See: M. Hope Nicolson (ed.), *The Conway Letters. The correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry More, and their friends (1642-1684); revised edition with an introduction and new material edited by S. Hutton*, Oxford, 1992; S. Hutton, *Anne Conway. A woman philosopher*, Cambridge, 2004; S. Hutton, «Lady Anne Conway», in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), 2015.

¹²¹ «è Borelii Legislatore (cujus videndi vir illustrissimus praestantissimusque Dominus Franciscus Mercurius Helmontius cum Ragleiae essem, potestatem mihi fecerat) in librum septimum hujus Tractatus transferenda inserendaque curavi». More, *Henry More Opera Omnia I: Opera Theologica* (see above, n. 113), p. 4.

¹²² Coudert, *The impact of the Kabbalah* (see above, n. 119), p. 157.

Finally, the third new information concerns the attempt to identify those friends who helped Boreel to be released. Since he had no evidence to explain Desmarets' words, Schneider could only suppose that those friends were the Cambridge Platonists. He goes as far as to say that among the Cambridge Platonists Henry More was in the king's graces. However, since in 1632-33 More was still a student, it is unlikely that he had some kind of influence on the king's will. In addition, it has been shown that it is impossible to prove that Boreel knew the Cambridge Platonists.¹²³

In conclusion, I believe that Schneider's reconstruction of Boreel's life between 1632 and 1633 must be rejected. In the previous chapter, it has already been shown that, if we accept Desmarets' words as true, Boreel's imprisonment must be related to the Ziegler's case. So, it would have happened in 1626. As for Boreel's release, it is possible to explain it by referring to the connections that Jacob and Johan Boreel had in England.

Now the correspondence of Marin Mersenne must be examined. Here there is a missive that Joahn-Albert Ban sent to Constatin Huygens, describing the visit that he received from Boreel.¹²⁴ So, the editor of the correspondence took this opportunity to give some biographical information about our author. In this brief biography, we read that in 1632 Petrus Cunaeus praised the ability of Adam Boreel in the preface to the *De Republica Hebraeorum*. However, this is not true. In the previous chapter it has already been shown that Cunaeus does not mention Adam Boreel, but rather his brother Johan, who was a collector of rare books of the Jewish and Islamic tradition. It is most likely that Boreel's fame as a learned Hebraist started only in the 40s, when he worked to a vocalized edition of the Jewish Mishnah.¹²⁵

¹²³ To strengthen his assertions about the possible influence of Henry More in Boreel's release, Schneider refers to the article «Henry More» in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. As a matter of fact, the article's author says that More was well considered by the English monarchy, since he was «intensely loyal to the king, both during the civil wars and after the restoration». However, he says nothing about the possibility that More could have had some kind of impact in the decisions of Charles I between 1632 and 1633. In addition, there is no proof that More met Charles I. More enrolled at Christ College in 1631 and got his B.A. in 1635: as a student, he hardly could have influenced the king's decisions. See: J.H.O., «More, Henry (1614-1687)», in S. Lee (ed.), *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 38, London, 1894, pp. 421-423; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 42.

¹²⁴ See the next chapter.

¹²⁵ See the next chapter.

These are the main data concerning Boreel's life between 1632 and 1639 that are usually accepted by scholars of the 20th century. Since they have been confuted, it is now possible to describe the few biographical evidence available of Boreel's life in these years.

First, in October 1633 Boreel met John Dury, one of his long-life friends.¹²⁶ During the spring of 1631 the Scottish theologian left England to travel into Europe, in order to find support among the political and religious European leaders for his ideas about the reunification of the Protestant Churches. To organize this mission Dury had the assistance of Thomas Roe, an English statesman who was the mediator of the peace between Sweden and Poland at the end of the Thirty Years' War. In his travelling in the German and Polish territories Dury found support for his ideas among the political and religious Swedish authorities. In particular, it is said that he found the approval of the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus. However, the latter died in battle in 1632 and Dury's plans gradually faded away. Dury was summoned in England in 1633. So, on his way home he decided to visit the Dutch Republic.

Dury's travels in the years 1631-33 are described in a manuscript preserved among the Hartlib Papers, entitled *Copy Memo on Dury and Ecclesiastical Peace 1631-1633*. In all appearances Dury himself wrote this travel diary.¹²⁷ As for his visit in the Dutch Republic, the Scottish theologian

¹²⁶ John Dury was born in 1596 in Edinburgh. Since his father was banned from Scotland, he spent his youth in the Dutch Republic. He became a preacher in 1624 and during his life he travelled through Europe to find the right means to unify the Protestant Churches. Throughout the Commonwealth he was a supporter of Cromwell and his party. This is the reason why after the Restoration he was forced to leave England. He lived the rest of his life in exile and he died in Kassel in 1680. For more information, see: Joseph Minton Batten, *John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion*, Chicago, 1944; George Henry Turnbull, *John Dury's Correspondence With the Clergy of New England about Ecclesiastical Peace*, Boston, 1959; Thomas H.H. Rae, *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety*, New York, 1998; John T. Young, «Dury, John (1596-1680)», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004; K. Gibson, «John Dury's Apocalyptic Thought: a Reassessment», in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61(2), 2010, pp. 299-313; Pierre-Olivier Léchet, *Un Christianisme "sans partialité": irénisme et méthode chez John Dury (1600-1680)*, Paris, 2011; P.O. Lechet, «Between Ramism, Socinianism, and Enthusiasm: the Intellectual Context of John Dury's Analysis Demonstrativa Sacrae Scripturae», in *Acta Comeniana*, 25, 2011, pp. 93-123.

¹²⁷ HP 20/11/15A-28B. The account of Dury's travels is written in the first person. This is the reason why it can be argued that Dury is its author, even though the manuscript preserved in the Hartlib Papers is just a copy of the original. However, in one passage *John Dury* is mentioned in the third person. A deeper study of this manuscript could help both to better understand the religious mood of the Protestant Europe in the first half of the

says that on October 11, 1633, he went to Utrecht and then he visited Leiden, Amsterdam, and Rotterdam. He met with Polyander and Rivet. Shortly after he went to Zeeland, because he had to set sail in Vlissingen (Flushing). During his travel in Zeeland he met Boreel, a meeting that Dury describes with this words: «[...] therefore I went on towards Zeland, & after I had there conferred with Mr Boreel a man wholly set of his owne inclinations vpon this studdy & labouring in it affectionately I tooke shipping at Flushing».¹²⁸

It seems not possible to establish if Boreel and Dury had already known each other. It cannot be excluded that they met in the years 1619-21, when Dury lived in Leiden, where he attended the Walloon College. Or in 1624, when it is said that Dury attended Oxford University.¹²⁹ Anyhow, it is evident that their friendship started at least in October 1633. Furthermore, from Dury's words it is possible to made some other conclusions. First, in autumn 1633 Boreel was in Zeeland, probably in Middelburg, his hometown. In his account Dury says that he arrived in London in November 8, 1633. Therefore, his meeting with Boreel must have occurred between the end of October and the beginning of November. Second, Boreel not only had the same interests of Dury concerning the religious peace and the means to unify the Christian religion, but he had also developed some ideas concerning these subjects and he had started to work zealously in order to achieve these aims.¹³⁰

Thanks to John Dury and his friendship Boreel was introduced into the Hartlib Circle. Samuel Hartlib was born in Elblag (Elbing), in Poland, around 1600 and lived there until 1628, when he moved to England. In Elblag, he met John Dury, who lived in the Polish city for two years, in 1627-28, at first working as secretary of the English ambassador in Sweden, James Spens, then as minister of the English community that lived in Elblag. Since their first meeting in Elblag Dury and Hartlib became close friends and partners, until Hartlib's death in 1662.¹³¹ Furthermore, in Elblag they forged a long

seventeenth century, and to clarify this incongruence in the copy we now possessed. See: HP/20/11/26A.

¹²⁸ HP 20/11/28A.

¹²⁹ See: Young, *Durie, John (1596-1680)*, (see above, n. 126).

¹³⁰ This is how I interpreted Dury's words when he says that Boreel was ««a man wholly set of his owne inclinations vpon this studdy & labouring in it». HP 20/11/28A.

¹³¹ For more information about Hartlib, see: G.H. Turnbull, *Samuel Hartlib: With Special Regard to his Relation to Jan Comenius*, London, 1919; Charles Webster, ed., *Samuel*

friendship both with Thomas Roe and John Amos Comenius (Jan Amos Komensky, Johann Amos Comenius, Ioannes Amos Comenius).¹³²

It cannot be a mere coincidence that in the Hartlib Papers we find the first references to Boreel after his meeting with Dury in 1633. In *Ephemerides 1634, part 3*, that is to say in Hartlib's working diary of 1634,¹³³ where Hartlib wrote: «Boreel hase a special Booke de Natura et Gratia of which hee seemes somewhat to bee coy. Libri Irenici Boreel». ¹³⁴ It is possible to make two suppositions: either Boreel himself told Hartlib that he had that book, or Dury told the German-British intelligencer that our author had that book. As it may be, it is clear that in the first half of 1634 Hartlib knew Boreel wheter in person or not.¹³⁵

We can find a brief and obscure reference to Boreel in *Ephemerides 1635* too.¹³⁶ While he is discussing some authors of the «spiritual divinity», Hartlib says that they are mistaken as much as the socinians, because the latter make reason the absolute judge of the Sacred Scripture, while the former

Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning, Cambridge, 1970; Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor, ed., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, Cambridge, 2002; Mark Greengrass, «Samuel Hartlib», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004; Filip Buyse, «Boyle, Spinoza, and the Hartlib Circle: The Correspondence which never took place», in *Societate si politica*, 7(2), 2013, pp. 34-53; Leigh T.I. Penman, «Samuel Hartlib on the Death of Descartes: a rediscovered Letter to Henry More», in *Notes and Records: The Royal Society Journal of History of Science*, 69(4), 2015, pp. 361-372.

¹³² Comenius was a philosopher, pedagogue and theologian famous in all Europe. Thanks to his vast knowledge and his innovative studies, especially in the educational field, the most famous courts of Europe demanded his presence. See: J.M. van der Linde, *Jan Amos Comenius, 1592-1670: theolog, pedagoog, politicus*, Zeist, 1970; M. Denis, *Comenius: une pédagogie à l'échelle de l'Europe*, Berne, 1992; D. Murphy, *Comenius: a critical reassessment of his life and work*, Dublino, 1995; C. Ferranti (ed.), *Johannes Amos Comenius, 1592-1670: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata, 2-5 dicembre 1992*, Macerata, 1998; Daniel S. Larangé, *Le parole de Dieu en Bohême et Moravie: la tradition de la prédication dans l'Unité des frères de Jan Hus à Jan Amos Comenius*, Paris, 2008; C.D. Atwood, *The theologu of the Czech Brethren from Hus to Comenius*, University Park, 2009; John Edward Sadler, *J.A. Comenius and the concept of universal education*, Londra, 2014; H.E.S. Woldrig, *Jan Amos Comenius: zijn leven, missie en erfenis*, Budel, 2014; Vladimír Urbaněk, *Gewalt sei ferne den Dingen!: contemporary perspectives on the works of John Amos Comenius*, Wiesbaden, 2016.

¹³³ HP 29/2/22A-32B. This working diary of Harltib is composed of numerous papers placed in chronological order. See: S. Clucas, «Samuel Hartlib's Ephemerides, 1635-59, and the pursuit of scientific and philosophical manuscripts: the religious ethos of an intelligencer», in *The Seventeenth Century*, 6(1), 1991, pp. 33-55.

¹³⁴ HP 29/2/26A.

¹³⁵ Although it is not easy to establish when the different parts of the *Ephemerides* were written, the editors of the Hartlib Papers suggest that Hartlib must have written the third part of *Ephemerides 1634* by July of this year.

¹³⁶ HP 29/3/24A-36B.

entirely deny the importance of the holy books. After he says this, Hartlib seems to stop his speech and asserts: «such a divine is Borellius». Then, he starts to talk again about the «mystical or spiritual divinity».¹³⁷ It can be supposed that by 1635 Hartlib already received two works of Boreel that focus on the practice of the Christian life, works that Boreel wrote in 1628 and that now are preserved in the Hartlib Papers.¹³⁸ Since in this part of *Ephemerides 1635* Hartlib discusses the «English practical divinity», it would explain the reference to Boreel.

It is most likely that around 1636 Boreel met another of his closer friends, Justinus van Assche, who was also a friend of Dury and Serrarius. Van Assche was born in Emden in 1595 and, when his parents died shortly after his birth, he was raised by his uncle Philips Willem Arondeux. After his first studies, Van Assche went to Scotland with his cousin Justinus Arondeux, where he started to attend St. Andrews University. Once back in the Dutch Republic in 1620, he became a minister of the Reformed Church in 1622 and he obtained the office of «predikant» in the Churches of Frankfurt and Cologne, where he met Dury and Serrarius. In 1631 Van Assche settled down in Amsterdam, where he practiced as a physician. Due to the plague that raged in the Dutch Republic between 1635-36, Van Assche lost both his wife and his daughter. Hence, he decided to leave Amsterdam and in the autumn of 1636 he settled in Middelburg.¹³⁹

Although we do not have any certain information about the first meeting between Boreel and Van Assche, we can suppose that it occurred in Middelburg. We can take into considerations three facts that can strengthen our hypothesis. First, it is certain that Boreel and Van Assche knew each other in 1641, so they had met before. As a matter of fact, from a letter of Van Assche to Serrarius, dated February 23, 1641, it can be concluded that Serrarius gave to John Dury two copies of the *Von dem Wesen un Leben der Geschöpfe Gottes* of Johannes Sophronius Kozack, so that the Scottish

¹³⁷ HP 29/3/31A.

¹³⁸ HP 26/25/1A-24B. These works are the *Consiliarius Christianus* and the *Specilegium divinorum praeceptorum*. See also Boreel's bibliography.

¹³⁹ Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), passim.

theologian could have given them to Van Assche and Boreel.¹⁴⁰ Second, although we cannot exclude that Boreel during the 30s made some trips in the Dutch Republic or in Europe, it is most likely that he lived in Middleburg until he settled down in Amsterdam in 1645. Third, since we do not know very about the activities of Van Assche and Boreel before 1636, it seems more safe to assert that they met in 1636 or shortly after, when they could have been in the same city. Anyhow, it is certain that they became close friends, a friendship that lasted until the death of Van Assche in 1650.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 106-106.

Chapter III: 1639 – 1654

In the previous chapters, there is lack of information about Boreel's life until 1639. In particular, we have no information whatsoever for the years 1632-39, as Boreel seems to have left no trace of his life and activities. We concluded the previous chapter saying that it is most likely that Boreel lived in Middleburg until he settled down in Amsterdam, in 1645.

However, this does not mean that he stayed always in his hometown. For instance, shortly before October 4, 1639, he went to Haarlem to visit the Dutch Catholic minister and composer Johan Albert-Ban. The latter describes his meeting with Boreel in a letter that he sent on October 4, 1639, to Constatijn Huygens, a Dutch poet, composer and statesman, and father of the most famous scientist Christiaan Huygens.¹⁴¹ From Albert-Ban's letter it is evident that Marin Mersenne had advised Boreel to visit the Dutch composer, since he was an «exploratore» of Albert-Ban's musical works and he wanted to learn «de scientia et arte musica».¹⁴²

On the other hand, there is much more biographical information available about the second part of Boreel's life. Letters by Boreel, by his closest friends, and by his acquaintances provide us with useful material to give an account of Boreel's life and activities between 1639 and 1665. Nevertheless, the information from these sources is not sufficient to write a complete chronological biography of Boreel. This is the reason why the last two chapters are divided into sections, each one dealing with a separate subject according to Boreel's main activities at that time.

In particular, I divided this chapter, which examines the years 1639-54, into four sections. The first examines Boreel's interests in Jewish people

¹⁴¹ See: C. W. Kruyter, *Constantijn Huygens oongetroost. Een interpretative studie*, Meppel, 1971; L. Strengholt, *Constanter: het leven van Constantijn Huygens*, Amsterdam, 1987.

¹⁴² *Fatebatur istud etiam Adamus Boorelius Middelburgensis, vir trilingui ac omniscia eruditione praestans, quem Mersennus ad me, ante paucos dies, miserat operis mei musici exploratorem. Cui, licet ignoto hactenus, horulae spatio tantum de scientia et arte musica demonstravi, ut composita mente asseveraret se de musica tantum hactenus nec audivisse nec legisse nec seria cogitatione assecutum esse, quantum unius horulae spatio ex me acceperat». De Waard, *La correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne* (see above, n. 107), vol. VIII, p. 525. We cannot say when and how Boreel met Marin Mersenne. However, it seems that the contacts between them lasted at least until 1646. See later in this chapter.*

and in their traditions, showing the results of Boreel's studies of Hebrew and the role he played in Samuel Hartlib's circle. Second, the ecclesiological and theological works that Boreel wrote between 1639 and 1654 are taken into considerations, as well as the disputes in which he got involved. The third section reconstructs the history of the college of Amsterdam, which was founded by Boreel at the beginning of 1646 and where he remained a major figure for many years. Finally, the last point covered is Boreel's interest in chemistry, alchemy and optics, as well as the financial problems he had in this period.

The vocalized edition of the Mishnah and the interests in Jewish people

In the previous chapters, it has been shown that Johan Boreel, older brother of Adam, was very interested in the Jewish tradition and that he was praised as a learned man in Hebrew. It is clear that our author decided to follow his older brother's steps. It has been argued that he started to study Hebrew since his first time in the University of Leiden, when he enrolled as a «litterarum studiosus», and that he continued this study during his second enrollment at the same university. Thanks to his studies and expertise in Hebrew between 1639 and 1646 Boreel worked to a vocalized edition of the Mishnah, that is the book in which are collected the Jews' oral and rabbinical traditions. Although this edition was an editorial failure, Boreel gained great reputation from it, and both his friends and his opponents started to look at him as a specialist in Hebrew and in Jewish culture. However, this vocalized edition of the Mishnah was the only work concerning the Jews and their traditions that Boreel published. He never put to press other works related to his Jewish studies, works that are now lost.

The most important information about the editorial project of the vocalized Mishnah can be found in the correspondences of Hartlib and Dury. Among these letters the missive that the Scottish theologian sent to Hartlib on August 31, 1646, is the most significant. Here Dury says that Boreel was committed for seven or eight years to a persistent study of subjects concerning the Jewish people and traditions and that Boreel often thought about the means through which the Christians could have better dealt with them. To this end Boreel employed a Jew, who helped him in his studies about the Mishnah and its most important commentators. Since this Jew did not know either Dutch, nor Latin, Boreel learned «the spanish & portugall language to bee able to understand his true & full sense in matters concerning their lawes». The main result of their collaboration was an edition of the Mishnah «transcribed, & punctuated, interpreted, & enlarged with commentaries which are amongst them authentically». ¹⁴³

¹⁴³ «Hee [Boreel] did spend, to satisfie himself in dealing with the Iewes, & to inable others heerafter to deale with them; seuen or eight yeares<in> constant studie, with a

However, in the edition that was published in 1646 it is impossible find Boreel's name anywhere.¹⁴⁴ Dury also explains why. He says that Boreel himself did not want to put his name in the edition, but he wanted that the *Misnayot* was published only by the name of Jewish people, because it would have obtained no credit among the Jewish people, if it was put to press by Christians. Therefore, Boreel chose Menasseh ben Israel as editor of the vocalized edition, since he thought that the rabbi was the best choice to spread the *Misnayot* among the Jews.¹⁴⁵

From Dury's epistle and from other letters, it is possible to determine a more precise publication date of the vocalized Mishnah. First, on August 25, 1646, Marin Mersenne¹⁴⁶ wrote to Johan Buxtorf¹⁴⁷ and he explained that Boreel had sent to him some papers related to the *Misnayot*, because the

Iewe whom hee did hire to go along with him in the course of his studie; I saye hee did spend this tyme with incredible diligence & constancie in the studie of the Misnayoth & of the Chief Commentators therof; & because his Iewe could not speake Latin but portugalls & French only; hee did Learne the spanish & portugall language to bee able to understand his true & full sense in matters concerning their lawes: & with this Iewes helpe hee gotte the Misnayoth transcribed, & punctuated, interpreted, & enlarged with commentaries which are amongst them authentically». HP 3/3/33A. Although at first Dury did not say who this Jew was, later in the same letter he identifies him with the rabbi Jacob Judah Leon. Boreel himself give us more detailed information about how many years he worked with Judah Leon and he provided for him. In a letter sent to Marin Mersenne on September 3, 1646, Boreel says: «[...] chez moy avec l'aide d'un Juif que j'ay eu alimenté environ cinq ans pur cette affaire, mais il fault aller avec degrez en communicant ces choses». De Waard (ed.), *La correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne* (see above, n. 107), vol. XIV, p. 431. Therefore, Boreel worked with Judah Leon since 1641. It must be underlined that in the edition of Mersenne's correspondence the Jew with who helped Boreel is erroneously identified with Menasseh ben Israel.

¹⁴⁴ A copy is preserved at the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome. See: *Mišnayot*, Amsterdam, 1646.

¹⁴⁵ «before I went from him hee [Boreel] told me *that* his waye would bee to publish the Misnaioth with points first under the name of some Iew; because if it should bee put forth under the name, or by the Industrie of any Christian, it would not bee of Credit amongst them: & hee told me *that* none but Manasseh Ben Israel was fit to haue the Credit of it to make it currant amongst the Iewes». HP 3/3/33B. For some information about Menasseh ben Israel, see the next chapter.

¹⁴⁶ Mersenne was a French theologian and a Catholic friar, but also a philosopher, mathematician and theoretician of the musical science. During his life, he established around himself an enormous network of correspondences with learned men and scientist of all Europe. See: Alistair Cameron Crombie, *Marin Mersenne (1588-1648) and the seventeenth-century problem of scientific acceptability*, Firenze, 1975; De Waard, *Correspondance du pere Marin Mersenne* (see above, n. 107), 17 vols., 1972-1988; Albano Biondi, *L'esegesi biblica di frate Marin Mersenne*, Bologna, 1992; Jean-Marie Constant (ed.), *1588-1988, quatrième centenaire de la naissance de Marin Mersenne: actes du colloque scientifique international et célébration nationale*, Le Mans, 1994; Jean Robert Arnogathe, *Mersenne (Marin): religieux minime 1588-1648*, Ginevra, 1997; Antonella del Prete, *Réfuter et traduire: Marin Mersenne et la cosmologie de Giordano Bruno*, Turnhout, 2000.

¹⁴⁷ Son of the famous professor of Hebrew in Basle, Johannes Buxtorf, member of a prestigious family of Orientalists, he was a famous Hebraist as well. See: Rudolf Smend, *Vier Epitaphe – Die Basler Hebraistenfamilie Buxtorf*, Berlino, 2010.

French friar was committed to spread the work in France.¹⁴⁸ Second, after he made clear Boreel's intention of publishing the *Misnayot* with Menasseh ben Israel as principal author and editor, in the end of his missive Dury says: «& therefore I see that hee hath brought his designe to passe in this particular».¹⁴⁹ Therefore it is clear that Dury had already seen the vocalized edition of the Mishnah at the end of August and that Menasseh ben Israel accepted Boreel's proposal of publishing that work under his name.

It is possible to find a final proof in the only survived letter of Boreel's correspondence with Marin Mersenne, which our author sent to the French friar on September 3, 1646.¹⁵⁰ Here Boreel thanks Mersenne for the commitment he took up regarding ««les *Mischnaïoth* icy par Menasseh ben Israel, imprimees avec des pointcs», and he asks the French friar how many copies he should have sent in France and if Mersenne could suggest for him a contact in Paris. Boreel says nothing about the selling price, because they had already discussed it in their previous epistles.¹⁵¹ If some new letters between Boreel and Mersenne were to be located, maybe it would help to better understand the history of the vocalized edition of the Mishnah and the relationship between the two of them.

Regardless, on September 8, 1646, Dury wrote again to Hartlib to explain that ««Mr. Boreel his letter is a cleer ground to me of that which I wrote that the Misnaioth is printed by him under the care of Manasseh Ben Israel».¹⁵² Furthermore, in the following letter of September 22, Dury wrote: «Mr Ellis & his Cousin & my self will take each <of us> one of the Coppies of the Misnaioth; I shall send yow by the next the sheets sent to me, backe

¹⁴⁸ «Dominus Boreel ad me prima folia Misnaioth punctuali misit quem librum hîc diuendi curabimus, ubi perfectus fuerit». De Waard, *La correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne* (see above, n. 107), vol. XIV, p. 416.

¹⁴⁹ HP 3/3/33B.

¹⁵⁰ We do not have any kind of information to establish how many letters Boreel and Mersenne sent to each other. We can only say that the missive from September 3 is not the only one of their correspondence. This is what we can infer from both the epistle to Buxtorf from August 25 and the letter of Boreel from September 3.

¹⁵¹ «Nous vous remercions de bon coeur qu'il vous a pleu de prendre la peine de nous respondre touchant les *Mischnaïoth* icy par Monasseh ben Israel, imprimees avec des pointcs. Mais puisque nous n'avons cognoissance à Paris pour y envoyer des exemplaires, nous vous prions humblement de nous counseiller combien d'exemplaires pour ceste fois y seront mis. Touchant le prix, vous en estes adverti par nos precedentes». De Waard, *La correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne* (see above, n. 107), vol. XIV, p. 431.

¹⁵² HP 3/3/34B.

again & I suppose our rector of the Colledge will take also one».¹⁵³ From these two missives it can be concluded that between August and September 1646 Boreel wrote to Hartlib and sent some sheets of the *Misnayot* to him, asking to weigh up the English market.¹⁵⁴ It is possible to strengthen this conclusion by quoting Boreel's words in two epistles, which he sent to Dury and Hartlib on November 14, 1646. In the first letter, Boreel says to his Scottish friend that he received Hartlib's answer about the *specimen* of the vocalized Mishnah that he had sent to him before.¹⁵⁵ In the second letter, Boreel thanks the German-British intelligencer for the spreading of that *specimen* among those who could have been able to judge about it.¹⁵⁶

Furthermore, from the missives so far quoted it is possible to draw other information about the Mishnah project. First, on November 14, 1646, Boreel explained to Dury that four Mennonites merchants were involved in the publication of the *Misnayot*, who were «studiorum et linguarum ignari» and who covered the expenses for the press of four thousand copies. Boreel entrusted all the copies to those merchants, so that they could have got both the money they used for the publishing and a little profit, which those pious Mennonites had already decided to give to Boreel.¹⁵⁷ Second, the purpose that

¹⁵³ HP 3/3/36A.

¹⁵⁴ This is how I interpret the two references to «Mr. Boreel his letter» and to the «sheets» sent to Dury. As a matter of fact, the phrase «Mr. Boreel his letter» cannot be related to a missive that our author had sent to Dury, because from an epistle that Boreel sent him on November 14, 1646, it must be concluded that their correspondence had stopped since June 12, 1646: «Tuas 12 Junii ad me datas recepi Amstelodami a communi nostro amico D. Justino». We can infer the same conclusion from the final lines of the same letter: «Ad alia nunc pergo, rogans ut per occasionem me de rebus tuis certum facias, quomodo valeatis, tu tuaque, liberi, amici, ubi degas, quid rerum geratur apud vos, quae spes, quae vita [*in marg. vota*], quae consilia, quis status, quid agant ecclesiastici, et num ordinem ecclesiarum brevi ut et confessionem et catechismum unanimem sint edituri pluraque similia, ut intermissum scribendi commercium redintegremus». Therefore, we can argue that in the summer of 1646 Boreel was in contact with Hartlib and that at the end of August he sent a letter to him, in which he enclosed some «sheets» of the printed *Misnayot*. Hartlib in turn sent Boreel's letter and sheets to Dury, who answered with the two epistles of September 8 and 22. For both missives of November 14, 1646, see: Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), pp. 251-255.

¹⁵⁵ «[...] et D. Hartlibio rescribam, qui mihi respondit super specimine Ebraicarum cum punctis Mischnaiot ad ipsum transmissis». Ibid., p. 252.

¹⁵⁶ «Gratias insuper habeo quod specimen illud *TWV* Mischnajot cum punctis tradere animus tibi sit iis qui de eo judicare poterunt». Ibid., p. 254.

¹⁵⁷ «Quatuor honesti viri hic sunt, qui singulari charitate me prosequuntur et impensas typographiae fecerunt, quibus ideo omnia exemplaria, quae ad 4000 excurrunt, tradidi, ut ex eorum venditione impensae una cum modica usura recuperarent, contenti ut ego quod tunc ex venditione supererit consequar. Viros illos Deus mihi non sine tuis aliorumque pro me precibus suscitavit. Mercatores sunt, studiorum et linguarum ignari, sed viri probissimi et integerrimi, ἀδιάκριτοι aut Mennoni addicti». Ibid., pp. 251-252. About this

Boreel pursued with the publishing of the vocalized Mishnah can be concluded from Dury's epistle of August 31. Here the Scottish theologian affirms that Boreel thought this edition useful for two kind of people: on the one hand, for «the Common sort of Iewes», that is to say the Jewish non-learned people, so that they would have been able to understand the basis of their religion; on the other hand, for the learned Christians, so that they would have been able to better deal with Jews and to convert them.¹⁵⁸

However, Boreel's hopes were not fulfilled: the vocalized Mishnah was nothing else than an editorial failure. Shortly after his publishing, Boreel and his English friends started to understand that the learned English Christians were not interested in such edition, because they were waiting for a Latin translation of the Jewish book. On September 8, 1646, Dury wrote to Hartlib that, when he asked opinions about the *Misnayot* and its utility at the learned men that lived in Winton, he mostly received negative answers. The learned Christians of Winton believed that the vocalized Mishnah would have been of no interest for the English Hebraists, if a Latin translation of the same book was not published.¹⁵⁹

This kind of negative opinions continued in the following weeks. So, in his letters of November 14 Boreel was forced to recognize that the *Misnayot* had not been succesful in England. Since he was aware of this editorial failure, Boreel was very cautious about the possibility of a Latin translation of the Mishnah. He thought it necessary to make a market survey, in order to understand who could have been interested in it, how many copies could have been needed, as well as the selling price, before he began to work

topic, Boreel's letter to Hartlib do not add any relevant information. On November 14 Boreel only explains to Hartlib his choice to have written some previous letters in *gallice*, since those epistles were related to the vocalized edition of the Mishnah. The four merchants who committed themselves for the publishing expenses wanted to know what Boreel wrote about it to his English friends, but they would have not understood if he had wrote in Latin: «Quod postremas meas ad te gallice exararim in causa erat commercium quod mihi cum honestis illis mercatoribus, qui impensis suis editionem τῶν Mischnajot cum punctis procurarunt, nimirum ut ipsi rescire possent, latine ignari, quid ego de exemplarium istorum distractione ad amicos meos scribam et ab illis responsa referam». Ibid., p. 254.

¹⁵⁸ «[...] to the ende *that* both the Common sort of Iewes might know *what* the Constitutions of their Religion is, & also that the Learned sort of Christians upon the same discouerie might bee able to know how to deale with them for their Conviction». HP 3/3/33A-B.

¹⁵⁹ «but I find by one or two here *that* except it bee translated into Latin *that* it will not bee much affected amongst our Hebricians». HP 3/3/34B.

on this translation.¹⁶⁰ In the letter sent to Hartlib on the same day, Boreel makes the same kind of considerations. After he thanked him for his commitment in spreading the *specimen* of the *Misnayot*, Boreel explained his fear concerning the possibility that no one would have bought his work. Nevertheless, he says he still has hope to sell some copies. This is the reason why he decided to ask to the four Mennonites merchant to make a discount the selling price: maybe in this way it would have been easier to sell the *Misnayot* in England.¹⁶¹

Since we only have one epistle of the correspondence between Mersenne and Boreel, and since there are no other references to the vocalized Mishnah in Mersenne's letters, we do not know either how the French Christians welcomed the *Misnayot*, nor if it was an editorial failure in France too. Likewise, there is no evidence to learn if the vocalized Mishnah had some kind of success in the Dutch Republic. However, if we consider that Boreel wanted to try selling his work to the Jewish community of Poland¹⁶² and that in his last will Boreel left hundreds of copies of the *Misnayot* with his friends,¹⁶³ we can argue that it is most likely that neither the Christians, nor the Jews were interested in this edition, even though famous Jews like Menasseh ben Israel and Jacob Judah Leon were involved too.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁰ «At video libros illos a Christianis non desiderari. Ideo si contingat ut latine edantur, primum explorabo utrum et quot sint, qui et quoi exemplaria certo pretio emere velint, ut de número exemplarium imprimendorum pro ratione emptorum constare posset. Nam si priora haec exemplaria non distrahantur, vix patroni mei ad alias editiones animum applicabunt». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 252.

¹⁶¹ «at vereor ne illa apud vos distrahantur [...]. Si tamen vestri quinquaginta vel centum exemplaria cupiant, pretio trium florenorum singula, curabo ut ipsis mittantur, nam id pretii viris illis honestis, de quibus supra egi, jam placet, nisi forsan ab ipsis impetravero, ut ab illis medium florenum remittant itaque inter utrumque pretium illud si libet cum emptoribus agere poteris; prius tamen mihi rescribas velim, antequam plane ipsis quicquam addicas». *Ibid.*, p. 254.

¹⁶² «nos per librarium Gedanensem Forsterum tentamus eorum apud Judaeos Polonos venditionem». *Ibid.*

¹⁶³ «Uit het testament dat Boreel op 31 mei 1665 liet opmaken, blijkt nu dat hij zelf nog zeshonderd exemplaren in huis had liggen. In presentie van Galenus en Moorman verklaarde hij dat deze zeshonderd Hebreeuwse boeken in octavo, genaamd 'Misnajat met punten', eigendom waren van respectievelijk Angenieta Leeuw (tweehonderd stuks), Jacob Linnigh junior (tweehonderd stuks), David Spruyt (honderd stuks) en Robert Stiles (honderd stuks), mits Stiles alsnog naar verhouding dezelfde prijs zou betalen als de anderen al hadden gedaan». Lambour, *De Alchemistische Wereld van Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 23) pp. 110-111.

¹⁶⁴ I believe that Desmarests alluded to the events concerning the vocalized edition of the Mishnah, when he says that, after he went back to the Dutch Republic, Boreel tried to convert the Jews and started various activities to seek his goal, but without any success:

However, the *Misnayot* was not the only outcome of the collaboration between Boreel and Jacob Judah Leon. First, they also started a Spanish-Portuguese translation of the same book. In the epistle that Boreel sent to Mersenne on September 3, 1646, he says that «toutes le *Mischnaiot* sont jà depuis l’an 1639, avec une bonne partie des Commentaires, traduites en Espagnol chez moy avec l’aide d’un Juif que j’ay eu alimenté environ cinq ans pur cette affaire». ¹⁶⁵ However, they never published this translation. ¹⁶⁶

Second, thanks to the financial support that Boreel gave him, Judah Leon built a model of Salomon’s Temple, which made him famous in all Europe. It is thanks to this model that he was named Jacob Judah Leon Templo. Once again, Dury’s epistle of August 31 provided us with the most useful information. After he identifies «the Iewe» who helped Boreel in the vocalization of the Mishnah with Jacob Judah Leon, the Scottish theologian says that thanks to the financial aid given by Boreel the Amsterdam rabbi had built a model of Jerusalem’s temple according to the descriptions that we find in the Holy Scripture. Dury emphasizes the value of this model, because it would have been able at first to catch the curiosity of the Christians and then to raise more interest about the Jewish religion. ¹⁶⁷ In 1642 Judah Leon wrote

«Postea verò ex Calcaria in Carbonariam delapsus, in aliam incidit imaginatione, se videlicet à Deo delectum extra ordinem, cujus Ministerio Judaei ad Christi fidem essent revocandi: Atque circa illud consilium, multa quidem movit, sed nihil promovit; et quaecunq; ad illam rem praemeditata habuerat, tenues in auras abiere. Visus est quoque aliquando eo usque emlancholiae suae indulgere, et cum Bellerophonte Veterum, ipse suum cor edens hominum vitare vestigia, et tumultuario opere excitato extra Patria urbem tuguriolo, eo se contineret dies noctesque, suis meditationibus et imaginationibus indulturus». Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore* (see above, n. 83), p. 40.

¹⁶⁵ De Waard (ed.), *La correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne* (see above, n. 107), vol. XIV, p. 431. In the following lines Boreel explains what commentaries he took into considerations: «Pour le *Mischne Torah*, ce ne sont (comme sçavez) que des aphorismes du *Thalmud*, rangez en lieux communs; mes Commentaires sur le *Mishnaiot* engluteront le contenu de ce livre et du *Talmud Hierosolimitain* et des Commentaires sur le *Babylonien*, et d’*Harombam* et d’*Obadjah* de Bartenòra, etc. sur les *Mischnaiot*, de sorte que puor le *Mischneh Thorah* on n’en doibt pas avoir du souci». Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Boreel worked again to this translation during the 50s and the 60s. See the next chapter.

¹⁶⁷ «The Iewe which hee made use of is one Called Iudah Leon who att his cost did build the Moddell of the temple of Ierusalem with all the appurtenances therunto, in a most exact waye according to the description made therof in the Scripture & after the sense of all the Rabbies that are of note & Credit: this peece I haue seene, & amongst all the Rarities & Antiquities which are to bee taken notice of there is none to bee compared therunto; when once our Antiquaries shall see the description therof, they will find other objects of Curiositie then hitherto haue beene minded; & that one peece of discouerie of Iewish matters will bee an inlett to the manifestation of all other things which concerne the tenour of their Religion: & so a meanes to raise mens thoughts to mind them, & to Compare their former & latter wayes of worshipping God & to offer unto them that truth of worship which is most spirituall,

a brief Spanish pamphlet where he described the model of Salomon's temple that he built, entitled *Retrato del Templo de Selomon*.¹⁶⁸ The pamphlet was translated in Dutch in the same year and in French in 1643. Judah Leon himself translated it in Hebrew in 1650. His model of Salomon's Temple gained a lot of fame and afterward was moved to England, where was showed at the court of Charles II. We do not know what happened to it in the following years.¹⁶⁹

In spite of the editorial failure, thanks to the *Misnayot* Boreel gained great fame as a learned Hebraist. This reputation spread among both his opponents and friends, particularly in England. This is the reason why since

which the prophets haue foretold should bee exercised in the Kingdome of the Messias». HP 3/3/33B.

¹⁶⁸ Jacob Judah Leon, *Retrato del templo de Selomo. En el qual brevemente se describe la hechura dela fabrica del Templo, y de todos los vasos y instrumentos con que en el se administrativa, cuyo Modelo tiene el mismo Autor, como cada uno puede ver. Compueste, por Iaacob Ieuda Leon Hebreo, en el anno de 5402 ala creacion del mundo*, Middelburg, 1642.

¹⁶⁹ To confirm the role that Boreel played in the building of this model, it is possible to produce two more sources. First, the *Familieboek* of the Boreel's family archives, Jan Borele wrote: «Hij [Boreel] gebruyckte in syne studien in de hebrewse tale [...] syne helper, die daer door groote licht creeght ende daer uyt weten te fabriceren een model van den tempel van salomon, soo net ende curieus gemaect, dat elck door Europa het werck met groote verwondering aenschoude». NNA MS 1.10.10. Second, in the Dutch edition of *De Republica Hebraorum Libri III* of Petrus Cunaeus, Wilhelmus Goeree asserts the same things. In two different places of the introduction, Goeree emphasizes the role that Boreel played in the building of Judah Leon's model. First, he says that in the project of the model of Salomons's temple were involved not only the Jews, but also some learned Christians, a truth that people such as Adam Boreel would have confirmed, if he had been alive: «'t Beste dat die Natie oyt heeft voortgebracht, sal mogelyk dien Grooten Tempel van Salomon zyn, door Jacob Juda Léon gemaakt. Doch wy souden wel reden van kundschap konnenby brengen, schoonse voor onse tyd geraaakt is, en meest steund op de Joodsche gedagten, dat het geheele beiluur des Werks uyt zyn eygen iherssens niet alleen geboren is, en datter ongetwyffeld meer Christenen als Joden aan gearbeyd hebben: Gelyk den Aucheur deses Boeks, en den Taalkundigen Heer Adam Boreel, en andere geleerde Luyden, indiense leefden, ruymweydig souden konnen getuygen». Second, Goeree clearly asserts that Jacob Judah Leon built the Temple's model in Middelburg, when he lived there and where he received assistance from the deceased Adam Boreel: «En ter tyd dat dien beroem den Tempel van Salomon door Rabbi -Jacob Juda Leon binnen de Stad Middel burg gemaakt wierd , daar dien Jode toen woonde, en seer veel hulp en onderstand van wylen Heer Adam Boreel en andere tot dat werk genoot, had hy ook Dagelyks met andere Liefhebbers het Odg daar over, en oeffende alsoo sich selven en synen Naasten in dingen die fraay te weten zyn. Welken Tempel naderhand van daar naar Amsterdam verhuysde, daar hy eenige Jaren te fien is geweest; en nu ai een wyle tyd met den Tabernakel, door den selven Jode gemaakt, na Engeland is overgescheept». See: Wilhelmus Goeree, *De republyk der hebreen, of Gemeenebest der Joden, onder de Wet der Werimonien en Dienstbaar Jerusalem, vervolgd op de drie boeken van de Heer Petrus Cunaeus. Uit de naargelaten Schriften van Wylen H. W. Goeree [in zyn leven Doctor in de God-geleerdheyd geneesoeffenaar binnen Middelburg in Zeeland] by een versameld door een Liefhebber der Joodse Oudheden*, Amsterdam, 1685, [no pages].

1646 he had become to play a role in Hartlib and Dury's projects concerning the creation of an «Agency for Advancement of Universal Learning».¹⁷⁰

During the 40s of the 17th century Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius started to develop a project that they named at first «Office of Address» and then «Agency for Universal Learning». The main idea of this project was the creation of an agency whose goal was to make easier and to encourage the communication between the learned men of Europe. In this way, Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius thought that it would have been possible to increase human knowledge in any field of the sciences. At first, they thought that it would have been best to create such agency in Amsterdam, since it was one of the most active cultural center of Europe. However, later they decided that London would be the best choice. In their original intentions, the three learned men thought that Dury should have been in charge of the theological matters, Comenius of the human sciences, and Hartlib of the international correspondences related to the scientific world. Furthermore, in later years some new plans started to be connected to this original project, such as the foundation of a college for the Jewish studies in England. Dury and Hartlib believed that Boreel could have played a major role in this project.¹⁷¹

It has already been shown that at the end of August 1646 Boreel sent to Hartlib a *specimen* of his vocalized edition of the Mishnah and that later Hartlib wrote to Dury asking some information about Boreel. The letter that Dury sent on August 31 represents the answer to Hartlib's previous questions. From this letter, it can be argued that the two Englishmen had already started to think about a college for Jewish studies at that time. Furthermore, in the

¹⁷⁰ I took this name from a pamphlet written by Dury and published by Hartlib. See: John Dury, *A Seasonable Discourse Written by Mr. Iohn Dury upon The earnest requests of many, briefly shewing these Particulars: 1. What the Grounds and Method of our Reformation ought to be in Religion and Learning. 2. How even in these of distraction, the worke may be advanced. By the Knowledge of Orientall tongues and Jewish Mysteries. By an Agency for advancement of Universall Learning*, London, 1649.

¹⁷¹ For the projects of Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius, see: G.H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: gleanings from Hartlib's paper*, Londra, 1947; Charles Webster, *Samuel Hartlib and the advancement of learning*, Cambridge, 1970; Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 87-93 e 95-99; Antonella Cagnolati, *Il circolo di Hartlib: riforme educative e diffusione del sapere. Inghilterra, 1630-1660*, Bologna, 2001; Charles Webster, *The great instauration: science, medicine adn Reform, 1626-1660*, Oxford, 2002.

same letter Dury began to think that Boreel would be more than suitable for an employment in this college.

Dury begins his letter by promising to Hartlib that he would satisfy his inquiries «concerning the office of Adresse». However, before he gives his account about Boreel, Dury wrote to Hartlib about Christian Ravius (Ravis).¹⁷² It is most likely that German-British intelligencer thought to employ Ravius in the college for the Jewish studies instead of Boreel. Although at first Dury seems to use praising words for the German orientalist, in the end his description of Ravius is totally negative.¹⁷³ From here Dury moves to give an account of Boreel, his life, and his activities, account that on the contrary concluded with a full praise: «I could wish from my heart that if God doth put it in the heart of this state or of the City of London to aduance Godlines & Learning in an uniuersall waye which is the least requitall can bee giuen to his glorye for all his mercies to them; that this man [Boreel] & such as are qualified in this kind might bee sent for & employed in these workes wherunto God hath eminently fitted them».¹⁷⁴

So, it is clear that in August 1646 Dury started considering his Dutch friend as one of the people that could have been best employed in their plans for the advancement of the Christian knowledge about the Jews and their religion. Since in the same period the vocalized edition of the Mishnah was published and this is one of the main argument of Dury's letter, it can be argued that both this work and the role played by Boreel in the building of the model of the Jerusalem's temple gave him such a reputation as a Hebraist that Hartlib and Dury started to consider him suitable for their projects.

¹⁷² Born in 1613, Ravius was a German theologian and orientalist, who taught in Oxford, Constantinople, and Uppsala, among other cities. See: J. Olszowy-Schlanger, «The Generall Grammer of Orientall Tongues' and universal language schemes in 17th-century Britain: The contribution of Christian Ravius», in *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series III*, 95, 1999, pp. 131-142; G.J. Toomer, «Ravis, Christian (1613-1677)», in *Oxford Dictionnary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

¹⁷³ «& if this Ravius hath beene alreddie false to the worke & to Comenius in it by deserting him, who shall assure us *that* hee will bee henceforth Constant therunto. what Age hee is of Learne if yow can; for if hee bee young & giuen to Companie & loytering, I feare wee shall not haue much good of him, & what hee will doe, will come from him by flashes, & as the fitt doth take him, & so wee shall neuer bee able to make any reckoning of him further then a priuate interest with a shew of his owne parts & Contriuances will leade him to cooperate. but enough at this tyme of him». HP 3/3/32A-B.

¹⁷⁴ HP 3/3/33B.

It seems that in the following weeks Boreels himself became aware of the growing interest for his intellectual skills. Furthermore, he heard rumours about Dury and Hartlib's project and about his feasible role in them. In his letter to Dury of November 14, 1646, he explains to his Scottish friend that he heard that in England they were arranging something for him, but that he feared that there he would not have been as free to write and to publish his ideas as he was in the Dutch Republic. Nevertheless, he tells Dury that he would not have made any decision until he had learned more information about their projects.¹⁷⁵

Furthermore, some of Boreel's assertion in his epistle to Hartlib can be better understood, if we relate them to those projects about the advancement of the knowledge about the Jewish religion among the learned Christians. In his letter Boreel explains that he believed that there were two main things useful to the *judaicae genti*: on the one hand, the Latin translation of their Talmud and of the traditions written in the Midrash, because thanks to those translations the Christians could have been able to better approach the Jews; on the other, the confutation of all the basis upon which the Jews based their religion, a confutation that had to be published in Hebrew and in all the vernacular languages of the Jewish people.¹⁷⁶

It is possible to mention other writings preserved in the Hartlib Papers which are useful to prove that Hartlib and Dury took Boreel into consideration for the success of their plans.¹⁷⁷ However, the project of Dury and Hartlib was never carried out, even though Boreel hoped that an employment in England could have been useful to improve his financial

¹⁷⁵ «Apud vos audio aliquid pro me parari, at omnia ibi minus commoda liberae meorum scriptioni et editioni. Attamen videbo quid tempus ferai, ubi intellexero ad quid ibi usui esse possimo». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 252.

¹⁷⁶ «Judaicae genti iuvandae plurima conducunt, in specie, thalmodis et traditionum quae τού Midraschim continentur latinae versiones, ut nostri cum iis debite congregi possint, jam opinionum Judaicarum ignari; ad haec refutationes omnium fundamentorum, quibus ab aevo hodieque Judaei nituntur, eaeque Hebraicae et linguis quae Judaeis vernaculae sunt, publicatae». Ibid., p. 254.

¹⁷⁷ For instance, there is a document entitled «Notes on foundations at Winchester», where Boreel is mentioned under the point «Propagation of religion to jews». Moreover, in another document entitled «Copy extracts on hebrew learning and the office of address» some lines are dedicated to Boreel and Jacob Judah Leon. See: HP 47/9/33A-B and HP 53/37/1A-2B.

situation.¹⁷⁸ If we refer to this failed achievement of their project and the subsequent continuation of Boreel's serious economic condition, we can easily explain the regret that we can perceive in a epistle that Dury sent to Boreel on August 9, 1649. Here the Scottish theologian expresses his desire to help his Dutch friend and his studies, and his hope that they would find the necessary means to allow Boreel to work without worries, after the interest of the learned Christian for the conversion of the Jews would have increased.¹⁷⁹

Dury expresses the same kind of concern also in a epistle that he sent to Benjamin Worsley on May 2, 1649.¹⁸⁰ Since in that period Worsley lived in Holland, the Scottish theologian asks him to give his regards to «Mr. Morian and Mr. Borell». Furthermore, he encloses in his letter a message for Boreel: «although as matters now stand with us here; I know not whether God will ever inable me to accomplish the thoughts which I haue had to assist him in his designes from hence: yet I should be glad from time to time to know how it fareth with him, and what God doth for him to advance the publication of his matters».¹⁸¹ It is clear that here Dury referred to the projects concerning the «agency for universal learning», because shortly after he asserts that he still hoped that something in favor of their project would happen and that they would be able to establish «a peculiar rent apart for publicke uses of advancing learning». If so, those who were chosen for the employment would have not been forgotten. Among those people there was Boreel too.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ See later in this chapter.

¹⁷⁹ «Nec meae Curiositati hac in parte solum indulgeo, sed maius quid ob oculos habeo, quod per dei gratiam ad promotionem tuarum Cogitationum gradum struere poterit; si propensiores nostrorum hominum affectus, erga Iudæorum Conversionem fovere, et legitimis viis promovere licuerit. quis scit an non media subsidiaque tuo studio necessaria, quæ sine intermissione quæsivimus hactenus, tandem obtineri non poterunt, si ad justam maturitatem perducantur inclinationes illorum, quibus hæc De Iudæorum Conversione cogitata cordi sunt?». HP 1/31/1B.

¹⁸⁰ Born in 1618, Worsley was an English physician and scientist. He was deeply interested in alchemy and in the new chemistry. He was part of Hartlib's circle and he was linked to Robert Boyle too. See: C. Webster, «Benjamin Worsley: engineering for universal reform from the Invisible College to the Navigation Act», in in M. Greengrass, M. Leslie e T. Raylor (ed.), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, Cambridge, 1994, pp. 213-236; A. Clericuzio, «New Light on Benjamin Worsley's Natural Philosophy», in Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation* (see above, n. 156), pp. 236-246; T. Leng, *Benjamin Worsley (1618-1677): trade, interest and the spirit in revolutionary England*, Woodbridge, 2008.

¹⁸¹ HP 4/1/26A.

¹⁸² HP 4/1/26A-B.

Even though their projects about the advancement of the Jewish studies did not succeed, the interest of Dury and Hartlib for the Jews did not decrease at all. On the contrary, during 1649 it kept growing, especially after they heard rumors suggesting that someone had found the ancient tribes of Israel in America.¹⁸³

For reasons that are unknown to us, the correspondence between Dury and Boreel stopped at the beginning of 1649.¹⁸⁴ Hence, since he and Hartlib needed information about the books of Menasseh ben Israel and of the Amsterdam Jewish community, Dury wrote to Worsley, asking him to be the middle-man between him and Boreel. For instance, on March 14, 1649, Dury thanked Worsley for his commitment in delivering Hartlib's *memorandum* concerning the selling price of Ben Israel's books to Moriaen or Boreel.¹⁸⁵ It is clear that Worsley fulfilled his task, because in a following letter of May 2, 1649, Dury thanked him for what he did, sending his gratitude also to «him [Boreel] or Mr. Morian or both», because they delivered the list of Ben Israel's books.¹⁸⁶

In the following weeks Moriaen and Boreel continued to be the middle-men between Dury and the Jews of the Amsterdam community. On May 2, Dury wrote some questions that Moriaen and Boreel had to ask to the people of the Jewish congregation. These questions concerned the Jews and their relationship with the Islamic religion. As a matter of fact, in 1649 an English edition of the Alcoran was published and Dury hoped to receive some help to confute the Islamic religion through the answers of the Jewish

¹⁸³ For more information, see: T. Parfitt, *The Lost Tribes of Israel: The History of a Myth*, Phoenix, 2003.

¹⁸⁴ This is what can be deduced from a letter that Dury sent to Worsley on January 26, 1649, where he wrote: «I pray remember my seruice and affection to Mr Moriaen; to Mr Pergens; and to Mr Boreel of whom I wonder that I haue not heard any thing in so long time». HP 1/7/1B.

¹⁸⁵ «I thanke you for the Care which you promisse to take of the memorandum which I sent by Mr Hartlib to know the Pryce of the Hebrew Books which Manasseh Ben Israll hath to sell either Mr Moriaen or Mr Boreel. (to both of them I pray remember my love & service) wilbe able to effect it I suppose without difficulty». HP 1/2/1A.

¹⁸⁶ «I pray thanke him or Mr Morian or both for the catalogue of Manasse Ben Israels bookes which I haue received, with the prices; and here you are to haue <your> share in this acknowledgment, because you had the trouble of setting either of them upon the worke, and of returning that which was done, hither to Mr Hartlib from whom I haue received it; and it hath given satisfaction to him for whom it was procured». HP 4/1/26B.

community.¹⁸⁷ In particular, the Scottish theologian wanted to know the following: if there had ever been some Jews who wrote something against the Alcoran and against Mohammed; if there were some accounts of the discussions between the Jews and Mohammed, since from the history of his life it is possible to conclude that he had occasion to discuss with them; if there were stories of Mohammed's life among the Jewish traditions; if had ever been some Patriarch other than Moses whose life was written as Moses' life, that is to say «in a fabulous Romancy-like way».¹⁸⁸

We do not have Worsley's answer. So, we do not know if Menasseh ben Israel or some other rabbi of the Amsterdam community ever received these questions and if he gave an answer. However it may be, during May and June 1649 rumors about «the Jews which are said to bee in America» started to spread.¹⁸⁹ Therefore, on July 12, Dury wrote again to Worsley, asking him to learn the opinion of the Jew of the Amsterdam community about those rumors through Boreel or Moriaen. If the Jews believed these rumors, Dury wanted to know the account that induced them to believe that «the Ten tribes are seated there».¹⁹⁰ On July 27 Worsley answered Dury's question: «about the Jews Mr Boreel is only able to procure those writings that were delivered,

¹⁸⁷ Alexander Ross (ed.), *The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French, by the Siur Du Ryer, Lord of Malezair, and Resident for the King of France, at Alexandria. And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish vanities*, London, 1649. As we can easily understand from the title, this English translation was made on the basis of a previous French edition, published in Paris in 1647 by André du Ryer, entitled *L'Alcoran de Mahomet. Translaté d'arabe en françois par le Sieur du Ryer, Sieur de la Garde Malezair*.

¹⁸⁸ «The Alcoran is come forth in English; and if Mr Morian, or Mr Boreel can giue us any information from Manasse or any other of their Rabbies there, concerning the other demands of the memoriall which I formerly sent, they would pleasure us; and inable some of us to serue the publicke in discovering the falshood of the Mahometan Religion, whereof the Law is now published, and made common. Those other demands were, 1. whether the Iewes haue never written any thing against the Alcoran? or against Mahomet to refute his Religion? and if they haue controverted with him in former times, (as by the History of Mahomets life it is cleere they did) whether any monuments be exstant of those controversies, and if any, where they may be had? 2. whether among the Iewes there is no History exstant of the life of Mahomet? and if any where it may be had? 3. whether any other Patriarchs lives (besides that of Moses which is knowen) be set out by any of the Rabbies, in such a stile and way as Moses life is described? that is, in a fabulous Romancy-like way». HP 4/1/26B-27A.

¹⁸⁹ These rumors started to spread some years before. As a matter of fact, Dury heard them in 1645.

¹⁹⁰ «There is a great deale of enquiry here concerning the Iew's which are said to bee in America. I pray learne what the Opinion is of the Iew's at Amsterdam and what the report is which they haue had from thence to make them beleeeve, that the *Ten* tribes are seated there. I purpose to write about it to Mr Boreel, howeuer it will bee worth your enquirie by Mr [Moriens?] meanes and j know you will pleasure Mr Lamy and Mr [Hartlib?] if you giue them any information of that matter». HP 26/33/5A.

which if you haue, is all that the Iews themselves know of them. If they bee there, the prosperity of Virginia will not harme them».¹⁹¹

It is clear that the Scottish theologian was not satisfied with this answer and he seizes the opportunity to write to Boreel. In a letter dated August 8, 1649, Dury explains to his Dutch friend the uppermost value of converting the people who lived in America. First, says Dury, some pious colonists of New England started to succeed in bringing those native people to the light of the true God, as if «Deus manifesto multorum aures aperiat, et mentes barbarorum inclinet ad attentionem testimonio Christi ipsis a quibusdam annunciato, et [obedientiam?] mandatis eius præstandam». Moreover, some people, both in America and in England, suppose «ex argumentis non omnino contemnendis» that those native people «ex Israelis [pro]sapia oriundos esse».¹⁹²

It is evident that Dury was fascinated by this second hypothesis. Using words of a Millenarist nature, Dury says that he wanted to examine the truth of that idea for two reasons. First, that hypothesis «mirifice excitat multorum animos, piorumque erigit affectus; ut zelum prodant solito alacriorem erga illorum Conversionem promovendam». Second, the thought «de futura Israelitarum restauratione ipsis per Prophetas promissa, deque salutari ipsorum revocatione ad Dominum nostrum Messiam suam appropinquante» gives the uppermost consolation to the spirit of Dury himself.¹⁹³

Before he left Holland, says the Scottish theologian, he had already heard a rumor suggesting that a *Lusitano* came from America, who argued that some Jewish tribes were discovered there. However, Dury did not know exactly what this *lusitano* told to the rabbis of the Amsterdam community and he wanted to know the accurate account of that story, «prout ea Iudaeis Amsterodamensibus oblata fuerat». So, before he left Rotterdam, he had asked Jacob Judah Leon, «qui tuis impensis Templum Salomonis suum exstruxit», for some information, who promised him the «apographum, illius

¹⁹¹ HP 26/33/8B.

¹⁹² HP 1/31/1A.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

Narrationis antequam Roterodamo discessi, sed expectationi meae non satisficit». This is the reason why now Dury asks Boreel not only to find and to send to him that account as soon as he can, but also to add some information concerning that *lusitano*, in order to know who he was, how he behaved, if he was accepted by the Amsterdam Jews, and why afterwards he was dismissed.¹⁹⁴

Unfortunately, we do not possess Boreel's answer. However, it seems that he was able to satisfy Dury's curiosity. As a matter of fact, in 1650 a book concerning the possibility that the ancient Jewish tribes were in America was published in London.¹⁹⁵ In this book, after the preface to the reader, a brief work written by Dury was enclosed, entitled *An Epistolicall Discourse of Mr. Iohn Dury to Mr Thorowgood. Concerning his conjecture that the Americans are descended from the Israelites. With the History of a Portugall Iew, Antonie Monterinos, attested by Manansseh Ben Israel, to the same effect*. Therefore, it is possible to argue that Boreel was able to send to Dury the written account that he asked for. Thanks to that, Dury was able to confirm the rumors about the presence of some Jews in America, rumors that in the end led to the writing of Thorowgood's work.

¹⁹⁴ «cumque inter alia mihi adhuc obversetur aliquid, quod ante meum ex Hollandia discessum evenisse [intellexeram?]Amsterodami, de Lusitano quopiam, qui ex America eo venerat, deque tribubus Israelis in illa mundi plaga repertis, nescio quid Senioribus Synagogæ Iudaicæ indicaverat, magnopere [expeto?] veram rei illiusexplicationem nancisci, prout ea Iudæis Amsterodamensibusoblata fuerat Tuus ille Iuda Leon, qui tuis impensis Templum Salomonis suum exstruxit, promiserat mihi apograhum, illius Narrationis antequam Roterodamo discessi, sed expectationi meæ non satisficit. Velim itaque mihi hac in parte fauias, vt exscriptam illam Narrationem, quamprimum commodum erit transmittas, etsi addantur breviter illa, quæ nota sunt de circumstantiis Personæ illius Lusitani, qualis fuerit quomodo sese gesserit? quomodo a fratribus suis exceptus et qua ratione dimissus fuerit? desiderio meo cumulate satisfacies». HP 1/31/1A-B.

¹⁹⁵ Thomas Thorowgood, *Jewes in America, or, Probabilities that the Americans are of that race. With the removall of some contrary reasonings, and earnest desires for effectuall endeavours to make them Christian*, London, 1650.

The first works of Adam Boreel

In the previous pages, it has been shown that between 1639 and 1646 Boreel worked on two different versions of the Jewish Mishnah: its vocalized edition, which was published in 1646, and its Spanish-Portoguese translation with the addition of the most important commentaries, which was not published. However, these were not the only works that Boreel wrote in those years.

In 1645 he published his most famous ALAT.¹⁹⁶ We do not have any kind of evidence to make assertions about the writing and the publishing of ALAT. We know neither when he started to write it, nor how much time he worked on it. Furthermore, Boreel published this work without name of the author, of the editor, and of the city where it was published, even though it is most likely Amsterdam. All that we know is that he had begun to develop his fundamental ideas about the state of the Church in 1632, when he had raised some questions to André Rivet, and that thirteen years he published his major work. Anyhow, it is clear that ALAT is one of the most important works written by Boreel. Not only it is the only one that he ever published, if we except the vocalized Mishnah and few pamphlets written against his opponents,¹⁹⁷ but in ALAT it is also possible to find the main core of Boreel's ecclesiological and theological thought, which he never questioned in his later works. On the contrary, it is the keystone to reading his posthumous opera and to understand Boreel's thought.

There are no references to ALAT in the correspondences of Boreel, of his friends, and of people that were connected to our author. John Dury and Henry Oldenburg never mentioned this work.¹⁹⁸ Samuel Hartlib named ALAT a few times only to make it clear to John Worthington who Adam

¹⁹⁶ [Adam Boreel], *Ad legem et ad testimonium. Sive Erotematica propositio et deductio quorundam conscientiae casuum; praecipuè de publico Novi Testamenti cultu; aliisque, Christianismo vel necessariis, vel utilibus: exhibita CHristianorum Ecclesis et coetibus illis, qui solam Veteris et Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei et morum Canone profitentur*, [Amsterdam], 1645.

¹⁹⁷ We can divide those pamphlets in two kinds: on the one hand, there are those that are related to ALAT; on the other, there is a single pamphlet that Boreel wrote against the Quakers. We will talk about the first kind here in this chapter, while we will discuss of the polemics with the Quakers in the next chapter.

¹⁹⁸ For more information about Oldenburg and about his relationship with Boreel, see the next chapter.

Boreel was.¹⁹⁹ There is a single reference to this work in the epistle that Boreel sent to Hartlib on November 14, 1646. Here Boreel says that he was amazed that no one has still answered ««ad tractatum illum». It is evident that Boreel made reference to ALAT. As a matter of fact, he had published this work just a year before. Moreover, Boreel's wonder was related to the fact that no one, neither from the Reformed Church, nor from other sects of Christianity, had yet refuted his ideas expressed in ALAT, where Boreel criticizes and condemns all kind of ecclesiastical authority. In his letter Boreel suggests a probable reason why no one answered his work. He explains that many people believed that the ministers of the churches had not refuted Boreel's work because they would have made the dispute public by doing so. Consequently, the common people could have started to question their ecclesiastical authority. Regardless, whatever explanation there could be, says Boreel, there is no doubt that no one would be able to refute his ideas and to defend the ecclesiastical authority against the accusations that he made in ALAT.²⁰⁰

However, Boreel's puzzlement was not going to last. In the following months, Samuel Desmarets and Johannes Hoornbeeck started a dispute against him, writing two different works against ALAT. Some years later Desmarets described the entire controversy in the second edition of his work against Boreel.²⁰¹

The quarrel started at the end of 1646, when Desmarets published the first edition of *De usu et honore sacri ministerii in ecclesiis reformatis*. In this work he enclosed a dedicatory epistle to André Rivet, dated October 1646.²⁰² Since on November 14 Boreel was still complaining about the

¹⁹⁹ For more information about Worthington, see the next chapter.

²⁰⁰ «Ad tractatum illum nil rescribi, mirum est, ne hic quidem, ubi ita scripturiunt et in mediis bellis alta pace fruuntur, quicquam responderet; putant multi ipsos Camarinam illam movere nolle, quia de majestate eorum ibi agitur, quae si apud vulgus in dubium vocari coeperit, acta res sit et autoritas eorum omnis labefiat. Quicquid sit, non dubito ipsis aquam haerere et de putativa sua autoritate defendenda desperare; sive negligant aut vilipendant interrogata, erit tempus, Deo volente, quum omnia exegetice cum munimentis requisitis [?.]entur». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 254-255. It is not clear who were the «multi» mentioned by Boreel.

²⁰¹ Samuel Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore sacri ministerii* (see above, n. 83).

²⁰² Samuel Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore sacri ministerii in ecclesiis reformatis; opposita nupero Anonymi cujusdam eruditi periculoso libello, qui*

absence of refutations, it must be concluded that either he was not yet aware of Desmarets' confutation, or the French theologian published his work shortly after that date. Anyhow, after he read Desmarets' refutation, Boreel decided to answer him and he wrote a brief *Monitum* against the *De usu et honore*, which he published in 1647.²⁰³ However, in his pamphlet Boreel does not refute the objections and the assertions made by Desmarets, but he only says that the French theologian did not understand the essence of his ideas and of the controversy. Moreover, says Boreel, Desmarets expressed ideas and notions that were far from his words in ALAT and from the intentions that he pursued with the writing of that work. Therefore, in the conclusion of his *Monitum* Boreel invites the French theologian to refute the thesis of ALAT and to answer to the questions raised in this work in the same order in which Boreel expressed them.²⁰⁴

After Boreel published his *Monitum*, Hoornbeeck entered the dispute and in 1647 he published the *Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana Odierna*.²⁰⁵ Contrary to Desmarets, who at first did not know who the author of ALAT was, Hoornbeeck recognized the author as soon as he read the work. In the dedicatory epistle to *Henrico Blancheteste*,²⁰⁶ the Dutch Reformed theologian clearly says that, after the publication of ALAT, «significatus mihi Auctor

inscribitura Ad Legem et Testimonium, sive Erotematica propositio et deductio etc., Groningen, 1646.

²⁰³ This brief pamphlet published by Boreel is lost. However, Desmarets copied it in his second edition of the *De usu et honore*, whence we also draw the title of *Monitum*. «Ubi haec mea Diatriba in ejus manus venit», says Desmarets, « ex furore in rabiem actus, cum se imparem sentiret vel qui meis argumentis contra novum suum εῶρημα responderet, vel qui sua adversus meas exceptiones propugnaret, nihil antiquius habuit quam personam agere illius qui in scena italica *Il Capitano* dicitur, inclamando *Vittoria, Vittoria* dum fugatur et fugit. Etenim Replicae loco, opposuit mihi sub *Moniti* titulo scriptum viginti circiter linearum, in patenti expressarum, qua forma solent Edicta et Programmata Superiorum promulgari, quibus non sine atrocibus conviciis et dicteriis, etsi comiter admodum et moderatissime cum eo egissem, negat à me sibi responsum, aut nodos, quos nexuerat, vel resolutos vel resectos fuisse, aliosque Thrasonicè provocat ad refutationem sui libelli, eorum silentium in argumentum convictionis aliàs traducturus». Desmarets, *Dissertatio theologica* (see above, n. 83), p. 40. For the text of the *Monitum*, see: *Ibid.*, pp. 40-41.

²⁰⁴ «à verbis quippe scopo et mente auctoris aliena sibi fingant, quae propugnent, impugnent, misellisque discipulis suis nimum credulis persuasum eant: sed ipsomet libelli contextum, controversiaeque verum statum (non autem fictitium illum suum) luculentissimè Artic. XVIII signatum, pedepressim aggrediantur; ejusque vel Thetica refutent, atque ad Erotematica respondeant; vel manus dent. Ita nec in seriis luisse, ne conscientis suis vim fecisse putabuntur» *Ibid.*, p. 41.

²⁰⁵ Hoornbeeck, *Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana hodierna* (see above, n. 36).

²⁰⁶ I was not able to identify this man.

quis esset, neque is mihi jam pridem ignotus».²⁰⁷ As a matter of fact, Hoornbeeck personally knew Boreel and he was able to understand that he was the author of ALAT, because he had had occasion to discuss it with him. In the *Summa Controversiarum*, Hoornbeeck says that Boreel was a «vir non indoctus, praesertim in Hebraicis olim, et vitae hactenus haud malae, mihi probè notus, Dominus, amicusque A.B.».²⁰⁸ It is most likely that they were not close friends, but on April 16, 1644, Hoornbeeck went to Zeeland, where he met Boreel. They discussed for a few days the ideas and the notions that later our author expressed in ALAT. This is the reason why Hoornbeeck recognized Boreel as the author of that work shortly after it was published.²⁰⁹

Shortly after he read the *Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana Odierna*, Boreel decided to answer Hoornbeeck too and in 1647 he published a new pamphlet, entitled *Pacis Ecclesiasticae Propempticon*.²¹⁰ As he already did in the *Monitum*, in this new pamphlet too Boreel did not answer the thesis and objections that Hoornbeeck wrote in his refutation. In the *Pacis Ecclesiasticae Propempticon*, Boreel only asserts that Hoornbeeck did not understand either the purpose of ALAT, or the subjects that Boreel questioned with his work.²¹¹ Therefore, he invites Hoornbeeck to analyze ALAT once

²⁰⁷ Hoornbeeck, *Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana Odierna* (see above, n. 36), [no page].

²⁰⁸ Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversiarum* (see above, n. 36), p. 463.

²⁰⁹ «etiam tum memineram, ex nostra de hisce a. 1644 d. XVI Aprilis, sequentibusque, in Selandia, sermocinatione crebra, ex qua sententiam quia satis nova et paradoxa videbatur, aliquot thesibus, in mei meaeque memoriae gratiam comprehenderam, cum quibus statim ac libellum anno sequente editum legi, videbam ut conveniret, et auctorem mihi suum significaret protinus». Ibid., p. 465. In the previous chapter, it has already been shown that later Hoornbeeck wrote to André Rivet, who sent to him a *fasciculo litterarum* written by Boreel.

²¹⁰ [Adam Boreel], *Pacis ecclesiasticae propempticon*, 1647. This pamphlet was published without name of the author, of the editor and of the city where he published it. A copy of this pamphlet is preserved in the Universiteitbibliotheek of Utrecht. Furthermore, it was reprinted both in the second edition of the *De Usu et Honore Sacri Ministerii* of Desmarets and in the edition of the posthumous works of Boreel. See: Desmarets, *Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore* (see above, n. 83), pp. 42-45; Adam Boreel, *Scripta Adami Boreelii posthuma. Quibus praefixus ejusdem tractatus: Ad Legem et Testimonium; olim editus, cum annexis in fine nonnullis aliis ad haec spectantibus*, Cosmopoli (Amsterdam), 1683, pp. 145-152.

²¹¹ «eadem (vel superiore) cum istis, ut strictim blandeque dicatur, perpetuae et futilitatis, et confusionis, et inconsiderantiae, et à veritate, textus concatenatione, auctoris mente ac scopo, quaestioneque aberrationis, animique impotenter maledicendo exacerbati, turbiter oberrant chorda». PEP, in OP, p. 146.

more, but following the order of thesis and questions that Boreel used to write his work.²¹²

In 1648 Boreel decided to write a third pamphlet, even though neither Desmarets nor Hoornbeeck had replied to Boreel's refutations. This third pamphlet is lost too, but Desmarets copied it in his second edition of *De Usu et Honore*. The *Invitatio*, as Desmarets called it, is quite similar to the previous pamphlets. Boreel invites again his opponents to analyze the thesis and the articles in ALAT in the same order in which he wrote them. This time he extends the invitation also to those that «à Luthero Mennone aliis nomen ducunt».²¹³ Furthermore, he says that he would be willing to criticize his work, if someone was able to show that there are dubious notions or errors in it. However, if no one could find mistakes, lies, or the likes, Boreel would invite everyone to accept his ideas and to become an advocate of the thesis that he expressed in ALAT.²¹⁴ He does not make explicit reference to the previous discussions with Hoornbeeck and Desmarets. Nevertheless, we can find in the *Invitatio* a brief accusation against the two theologians, when Boreel says that those who want to refute his work are not worthy to be called true christians, if «ut priores illi, convitiis maledictis falsitate praejudicato exulceratoque animo responderint». Even if Boreel does not directly mention Desmarets and Hoornbeeck, there is no doubt that the two theologians are hidden under the word «illi».²¹⁵ With the publishing of this *Invitatio*, the dispute between Boreel and the two theologians temporarily ended.²¹⁶

From Dury's and Boreel's letters it is possible to argue that in these years our author wrote not only ALAT and the pamphlets above-mentioned, but also other works. However, Boreel never published them.

In the epistle of August 31, 1646, Dury informs Hartlib that he saw «divers of his peeces [of Boreel] which are elaborat; & drawn from grownds

²¹² Boreel repeats this kind of invitation more than one time in PEP. See: *Ibid.*, pp. 147, 148 and 151.

²¹³ Desmarets, *Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore* (see above, n. 83), p. 45.

²¹⁴ «Sed à libelli titulo praefationeque exorsi, articulos ejus quo sunt ordine sigillatim expendant; quaeque in iis vel dubia vel falsa minusve connexa putarint, ingenuè producant; aut caeteroquin, eos admittant». *Ibid.*

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*

²¹⁶ In 1662 Boreel wrote another pamphlet against Desmarets, after the latter published his second edition of the *Dissertatio Theologica*. See Boreel's bibliography.

which are to all men that <are> but rationally undeniable: hee makes no haste to put forth any thing, nor hath hee any ambition to bee knowne to haue any thing of this kind elaborat; but rather conceales himself & his labors & is not unwilling that others may enioye the benefit of them without any notice that they are his». ²¹⁷

It is evident that these «peeces» cannot be identified with the pamphlets that Boreel wrote against Desmarets and Hoornbeeck, because that quarrels started half a year later Dury's letter. Furthermore, the Scottish theologian describes the subject of one of these works. In order to make easier the coming of Christ's kingdom on earth, Boreel «hath prepared a treatise fitted for their use [for the Jews] to demonstrat the Divinitie of the Histories of the New testament by all the Arguments by which they beleve the old testament to bee delivered by God unto their nation; which Arguments hee sheweth to bee more plentifull, & more pregnant in the new then in the old testament». From Dury's point of view, this treatise was useful not only to persuade and to convert the Jews, but also «to refute all atheists who value the Holy scriptures no more then some other writes of cunning men, or of philosophers, that wrote by <their> naturally eminent parts wisely, yet in straine differently from others, of which sort there are many in the Christian world, which have as great need to bee soundly dealt withall as any others; for such undermine & ouerthrow all Religion whatsoever». ²¹⁸

Unfortunately, there is no evidence neither to determine the argumentations that Boreel used in this treatise, nor to know the subjects and the questions of his other «peeces». It is not even possible to find out how many works Boreel had written in 1646. Furthermore, it is impossible to determine if some of these works were published in the posthumous editions of Boreel's opera.

In Boreel's letters there are a few more pieces of information about these works. On November 14, 1646, Boreel explains to Dury that he had started to work again on his *privata studia* and that he wanted to publish them, so that «animam meam tandem aliquando liberem coram Domino et

²¹⁷ HP 3/3/33A.

²¹⁸ HP 3/3/33B.

hominibus». Then, continues Boreel, he had the desire to turn to the Pagan world and to translate the New Testament in their vernacular languages, so that «eos Deo et verbo gratiae committamus».²¹⁹ In the letter that he sent to Hartlib on the same day, Boreel describes also the subjects of some of his works: «multa variaque sunt, de quibus Deo volente una cum iis quae Christianismum aliasque in mundo religiones et status concernunt publice tractare animus est liberrimo atque ἀδιακρίτῳ stylo».²²⁰

Similar assertions can be found in Dury's epistle to Boreel of February 8, 1650. From this letter it can be argued that Boreel was planning a journey and that he asked for some suggestions to his Scottish friends. Although we do not know the exact destination of Boreel's trip, it seems that he wanted to go to one or more places where there was a strong presence of Pagans, in order to convert them to the Christian faith.²²¹ As it may be, Boreel also expressed his intention to publish or at least to leave for the publication his writing useful for the English Christians, so that they would have been able to better deal with the Jews and their conversion.²²² We can suppose that among those writings there was also the work about the proofs for the truth of the New Testament above-mentioned. Anyhow, after he approved Boreel's design, Dury asked his Dutch friend to send to him all the titles of the works that he wanted to publish, the number of volumes of each work, the aim that he pursued writing them and their utility «ad reformandum Christianismum aut Judaisum etc.».²²³

In conclusion, during the 30s and the 40s Boreel was a prolific author and wrote many works, whose subjects was of theological and ecclesiological

²¹⁹ Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 252.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

²²¹ «Consilium quod in postremis tuis mihi aperuisti vehementer approbo, de modo quo comités tuos in itinere evangelico explorare decrevisti. Nam certum est nullos nisi sinceros veritatis caelestis cultores illam sequuturos peregrinandi rationem quam tu praescribis, atque illud vitae institutum vere apostolicum praecidet etiam gentibus ad quas pervenies suspicandi occasiones, quas habere possent, si aliter viveretis. Nam in proclivi illis foret cogitare, si alienis impensis et submissis aliunde per collectas stipendiis viveretis, vos emissarios esse alicuius status atque alio fine peregrinari quam puro veritatis evangelicae propagandae studio». *Ibid.*, p. 257.

²²² «Illud etiam laudo quod antequam hinc discedes tua quae in Christianorum in hisce locis usum praeparata habes scripta (ut reddantur magis idonei ad promovendam Judaeorum conversionem) editurus sis, aut saltern praelo subiicies, ut postea eduntur». *Ibid.*

²²³ *Ibid.*

nature. However, if we exclude the versions of the Mishnah, ALAT, and the pamphlets related to his dispute with Desmarets and Hoornbeeck, we do not know how many works Boreel really wrote. From the few references to them in the correspondences taken into considerations we can argue that the book where Boreel wanted to prove the truth of the New Testament, by using the same argumentations that the Jews used to prove the Old Testament, is lost. However, we do not have the necessary evidence to determine if the other works are lost too, or if some of them survived in the edition of Boreel's posthumous works.

The College of Amsterdam

In the previous pages, it has been shown that in 1645 Boreel published ALAT. In this work he questioned the existing churches and ecclesiastical authority, and at the end he concluded that all Christians must leave those churches where only the official minister have the right to speak and where religious toleration was not practiced. However, in this work Boreel tries also to suggest a new way of experiencing the public Christian religion. He thinks about a universal Church that is formed of free assemblies, where each Christian must have the freedom to speak and where the different religious opinions must be tolerated, provided that they do not question the fundamentals of the Christian religion.²²⁴

Shortly after he published his major work, Boreel tried to put in practice his ideas. He settled down in Amsterdam and in 1646 started to hold some meetings with people who shared similar ideas. In such gatherings at first they read some passages of the Holy Scripture and then each one had the opportunity to express his opinion about what they read. Because of the ideas expressed in his work and because of the meetings he held in Amsterdam, Boreel is rightly mentioned as a member of the Collegiant movement.

It is not strange that Boreel chose Amsterdam both to publish his work and to hold this kind of meetings. From the 16th century Amsterdam, as well as other cities of the Dutch Republic, had become the destination of those people who were persecuted for their religious ideas. This growing migration had two main results: on the one hand, it helped to increase the economy of Amsterdam and in general of the Dutch Republic; on the other, it helped to grow a spirit of religious toleration unknown in other European nations. Furthermore, not only those who were persecuted for their religions, but also those who did not conform to the official doctrines of the Christian religion and those who did not agree with the official Church of their State found in Amsterdam a safe shelter. We can find proof of these assertions in the large amount of non-conformist works that were published in Holland's capital. Since the last decades of the 16th century Amsterdam had witnessed such an

²²⁴ For more information about Boreel's theological and ecclesiological thought, see Part II of this work.

increasing growth of editorial activities, that in the 17th century this city was publishing many books as were produced in the rest of Europe. The pseudonyms *Irenopolis* and *Cosmopolis*, which many authors chose for Amsterdam, can give us an idea of the religious spirit that dominated the city in that time.²²⁵

In literature related to the Collegiant movement, Boreel is always considered as one of the founders of the Amsterdam College. The other founders are often identified as Daniel de Breen, Cornelis Jan Moorman, Michiel Comans and Galenus Abrahamsz. These are the names that almost always we found in the Collegiant's literature since Van Slee's major work, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten*.²²⁶ In turn, one of the main sources of Van Slee is the *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* written by Elias van Nijmegen.²²⁷ So, before we start to reconstruct the history of the Amsterdam College between 1646 and 1654, it is useful to briefly discuss both the date of birth of that College and the role that those four people really played in its foundation.

As for the second topic, in *De Rijnsburger Collegianten*, first edited in 1895, it is written: «Het was in het jaar 1646 of iets later dat ook te Amsterdam een college van Rijnsburgers werd opgericht. Eenige vrome en vroede mannen, die zich kwalijk konden vinden in de destijds heerschende godsdienstige denkbeelden en zich door geen der bestaande kerkgenootschappen ten volle bevredigd gevoelden, sloegen daartoe de handen inee. Deze mannen waren Daniel de Breen, Adam Boreel, Michiel Comans en Galenus Abrahamsz. de Haan».²²⁸ After he had offered some biographical information about our author and De Breen, Van Slee affirms that Boreel «sloeg daarom dan ook omstreeks 1646 met Daniel de Breen de handen ineen tot de oprichting van een particulier college te Amsterdam in den trant der van der Kodde's». «Aan dit werk», continues Van Slee, «werd ook deelgenomen door zekeren Michiel Comans, een man van Doopsgezinde

²²⁵ See: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 62-63; Israel, *The Dutch Republic* (see above, n. 23), pp. 450-477 and 610-676.

²²⁶ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25).

²²⁷ Van Nijmegen, *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* (see above, n. 18).

²²⁸ Van Slee, *De rijnsbruger collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 135.

afkomst, omtrent wien ons verder weinig bekend is geworden, maar vooral mocht het den steun en de sympathie verwerven van Galenus Abrahamsz. de Haan». After he had provided some biographical information about Galenus, Van Slee asserts that «aan deze mannen nu had het Amsterdamsche college zijn ontstaan te danken. Spoedig sloten zich Cornelis Moorman en de vroegeer reeds genoemde Frans Kuyper bij hen aan».²²⁹ In short, Van Slee believed that the Amsterdam College was founded around 1646 thanks to Boreel and De Breen, who were helped by Comans and Abrahamsz. Later, Moorman and Kuyper joined that group.

However, I think that we have to question these assertions. Let us begin with the role played by Galenus Abrahamsz. From his biography it is possible to conclude that he arrived in Amsterdam in 1646, where he practiced as a physician and where he joined the *doopsgezinde* congregation «Het Lam», whose name originated from the brewery «Het Lam» near their meeting place. In August 16, 1646, Galenus married «Saertghen Abraham Dircksdochter», the daughter of one of the members of the *doopsgezinde*

²²⁹ Ibid., pp. 140-141. Here we do not want depreciate or condemn Van Slee's work at all. The *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* is the major work about Collegiantism that each scholar who wants to study this Dutch religious movement must read: in Van Slee's work one can find the sources both for the history of Collegiantism and for Collegiant thought, if there is one, as well as peculiar data about the history of the various College that were founded in the Dutch Republic during the seventeenth century. However, as for these first assertions about the Amsterdam College, we have to highlight that Van Slee does not provide us with new significant data compared to Van Nijmegen. As a matter of fact, in the *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* we can read that «omtrent het jaer 1650, of zoo anderen willen vier of vijf jaren vroeger, heeft men te Amsterdam eene vergadering van Kollegianten beginnen opteregten. Onder de eerste aenleggers en voornamste steunpilaren van dezelve worden, behalven den gemelden de Breen, Adam Boreel en Galenus Abrahamsz geteld». After he gave some biographical information about these three people, Van Nijmegen adds that «Galenus Abrahamsz is een groot vriendt van Boreel, en volkomen in deszelfs gevoelen geweest. Hij heeft, nevens Boreel, den grondslag helpen leggen, tot het Kollegie te Amsterdam; en schoon zijne zucht voor het zelve, door den tijdt, merkelyk verflaauwde, moet men hem nothans als een der eerste en voornaemste voorstanderen daarvan aenmerken». Then, after he drew a brief sketch of Galenus' life, Van Nijmegen concludes saying that «deze waren de eerste aenleggers van het Kollegie te Amsterdam, daer zich Kornelis Moorman, en naderhand Frans Kuiper en anderen bijgevoegd hebben». See: Van Nijmegen, *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* (see above, n. 18), pp. 91 and 95-96.

community.²³⁰ Moreover, during 1648, Galenus became a «leraar» of the *Het Lam* congregation.²³¹

Now, if we accept Van Slee's assertions suggesting that the Amsterdam College was founded around 1646, I believe it is very unlikely that Galenus could have been one of its first founders. As we will see in the next chapter, during the 50s, when it became known that he was a member of the Amsterdam College and that he attended its meetings, the conservative party of the *Het Lam* congregation started to fiercely oppose Galenus. In the end this opposition and the subsequent struggles within the *doopsgezinde* community led to a schism that lasted until the beginning of the 19th century.²³² Therefore, I think that it is very unlikely that Galenus could have become a member and a «leraar» of the *Het Lam* congregation, if he would have been associated with Boreel and the Amsterdam Collegiants since 1646. On the contrary, I believe that the fact that Galenus became a «leerar» in 1648, even though there were some reservations to his election, is sufficient proof to argue that he was not a member of the Amsterdam College between 1646 and 1648.²³³

²³⁰ I drew this information from Meihuizen's biography of Galenus Abrahamsz. Here we can read that «omstreeks de jaarwisseling vestigde Galenus zich te Amsterdam; op 8 Februari 1646 werd zijn attestatie, te Leiden door Pieter Jansz Moyer ondertekend, door de 'kerkenkamer' (zoals men destijds de kerkeraad noemde) van de Verenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente aanvaard. Me kan zich afvragen of Galenus er goed aan gedaan heeft zich tot deze, uit Friezen, Hoogduisters en twee soorten Vlamingen samengestelde, Gemeente te wenden. Al spoedig immers zou blijken, dat hij zich beter bij de Waterlanders zou hebben thuisgevoeld. Maar de relatie met de Oudste, die hij in Leiden had leren kenne, en met Jacob van der Vecht, die hem zijn studie mogelijk had gemaakt, zal hem hebben doen kiezen voor 'het Lam', de Gemeente, waarvan het kerkgebouw naar de gevelsteen van de belendende brouwerij dat 'bij het Lam' werd genoemd». Shortly after, Meihuizen adds that Galenus strengthened his ties with the *doopsgezinde* congregation «door zijn huwelijk met de dochter van Abraham Dircksz Bierens en Jacomijntje Jacobs Boox». In August 16, 1646, hebben Doctor Galenus de Haen en Saerthgen Abraham Dircksdochter zich ten stadhuize en ter kerkenkamer vervoegd ter zake van hun huwelijk». H.W. Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz (1622-1706). Strijder voor een onbeperkte verdraagzaamheid en verdediger van het Doperse Spiritualisme*, Haarlem, 1954, p. 31.

²³¹ Ibid., p. 32.

²³² For more information, see the next chapter.

²³³ For the reservations to Galenus' election, see: Ibid. Perhaps, it is possible to add another consideration to strengthen our assertion. After he became a «leraar» of the *Het Lam* congregation, the *doopsgezinde* community of the Waterlanders sent a peace offering to the *Verenigde Doopsgezinde Gemeente* of Amsterdam, in order to ask the unification of the two congregations. This peace offering, which was sent on September 28, 1647, remained unanswered for a long time, until in March 11, 1649, the *Het Lam* congregation refuted the proposal of unification. Among those who signed the refusal there was also Galenus. Meihuizen asks himself how it was possible that Galenus, who during his life became known as an advocate for religious toleration and led his community to the unification with the

As for Michiel Comans, there is no proof that he was one of the founder of the Amsterdam College or that he was one of its first members. We do not find his name in the accounts of the council of the Reformed Church related to the Collegiants of Amsterdam. He is not even mentioned in the *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering*.²³⁴ Van Slee himself, even though he refers to Coman as one of the first Collegiants, says that we have very little information about him.²³⁵ For these reasons, I believed that Comans was one of the members of the Amsterdam College, but that he started to attend its meetings only in later times, probably during the 50s.

On the contrary, although both Van Nijmegen and Van Slee assert that he became a member of the Amsterdam College after it was founded, Cornelis Moorman was clearly one of his first Amsterdam Collegiants. Perhaps, we can go as far as to say that he was one of the founders of the Amsterdam College. As a matter of fact, we found his name in the first report of the Reformed ministers concerning Boreel and his group. In particular, Moorman's house was one of the first meeting places of the Amsterdam College.²³⁶ Therefore, there is no doubt that Moorman was one of the first people who joined Boreel and his meetings.

As for De Breen, this is not the place to make an inquiry about this fascinating character. We do not know much neither about his life or thought. It seems that he was a Remonstrant minister and that he began to share Collegiants' ideas during the 1630s, when the Remonstrant movement started to organize itself and to become a Church. Perhaps it was De Breen who published the second edition of Dirk Rafaels Camphuysen's theological

Waterlanders' congregation at the end of the 60s, gave his support to that refusal, whose advocates were the conservatives members of the *Het Lam* congregation. Meihuizen answers that it is most likely that Galenus' support to the refusal was due to his little knowledge of the Waterlanders' community and to the prejudices for that congregation, to which Galenus did not escape in that period. Anyhow, we can argue that in 1648-49 Galenus was not yet the advocate of the ideas of religious toleration that he certainly expressed after he met Boreel and after he started to attend the meeting of the Amsterdam College. Therefore, we can argue that he became a member of the Amsterdam collegiant only after 1649. See: Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 35-39; Andrew Fix, *Prophecy and reason. The Dutch Collegiants in the Early Enlightenment*, Princeton, 1991, p. 95.

²³⁴ Van Nijmegen, *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* (see above, n. 18), pp. 91-96.

²³⁵ Van Slee, *De rijnsburger collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 140.

²³⁶ See later in this chapter.

works. Anyhow it seems that around 1640 he settled down in Amsterdam, where he worked as a proofreader for the editor Joan Blaeu.²³⁷ We do not know when De Breen and Boreel met for the first time. Maybe they became acquainted between the end of 1645 and the beginning of 1646, when Boreel settled down in Amsterdam too. Since I did not find new information about De Breen's role in the Amsterdam College, we must rely on the previous' accounts of De Breen and we must say that he was one of the founders of the Collegiant group of Amsterdam.²³⁸

Finally, there is no doubt that Boreel was the founder or one of the founders of the Amsterdam College. Not only we can always find his name in the literature related to the Collegiants, but there are also sources from the 17th century that testify Boreel's role in the meetings of the Collegiant group of Amsterdam. In the *Summa Controversiarum*, both in the first edition of 1653 and in the second of 1658, after he had introduced Boreel, Hoornbeeck says that he had founded a *coetum* that was isolated from all Christian Churches. However, he says nothing about where and when Boreel laid the foundations of such *coetum*.²³⁹ Likewise, Passchier de Fijne in the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* says tha Boreel was able to establish his «oogh-

²³⁷ See: Van Nijmegen, *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* (see above, n. 18), pp. 84-91; Van Slee, *De rijnsburger collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 135-138; J. Trapman, «Erasmus seen by a Dutch Collegiant: Daniel de Breen (1594-1664) and his Posthumous Compendium Theologiae Erasmi (1677)», in *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 73(2), 1993, pp. 156-177; J. Trapman, «Breen, Daniel de», in *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme* (see above, n. 1), vol. 4, 1998, pp. 55-56. De Breen must not be confused with Daniel van Breen, who was born in Middelburg and worked in Amsterdam as an engraver.

²³⁸ A full study about De Breen's life and thought could help in clarifying both its role in the history of the Amsterdam College and his importance in the Dutch religious culture of 17th century. However, this kind of study is still lacking.

²³⁹ «[...] Dominus, amicusque A.B. qui separatim moliebatur ab omnibus in Christianismo Ecclesiis coetum». Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversiarum* (see above, n. 36), p. 463. I believed that in his biography Schneider misinterpreted Hoornbeeck's assertions. The German scholar says that from those words we can deduce that Boreel founded his *coetum* in 1645. Here he quoted another place of the *Summa Controversiarum*, where Hoornbeeck says: : «fuit haud ita pridem anno 1645 vir non indoctus, praesertim in Hebraicis olim, et vitae hactenus haud malae, mihi probè notus, Dominus, amicusque A.B. qui separatim moliebatur ab omnibus in Christianismo Ecclesiis coetum, ideo quod putabat, Ecclesiam omnem Christianam ab aevo Apostolico, quamdiu defuerunt Doctores infallibiles, apostaticam esse, quia in ea docetur et exponitur verbum à ministris non infallibilibus, et tamen in nomine Dei: pro qua sua sententia libellum scripsit, *Ad legem et ad testimonium*, etc. quem examinavi, eique opposui anno 1647». However, from Hoornbeeck's words it can be easily concluded that in 1645 Boreel did not establish the Amsterdam College, but rather he published ALAT, which Hoornbeeck was here introducing. See: Hoornbeeck, *Summa Controversiarum* (see above, n. 36), p. 463; Schneider, *Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 19), p. 52.

luyckende Kerck» in Amsterdam. Although the Remonstrant minister did not explicitly mention the Collegiant meetings held by Boreel, it can be concluded that De Fijne was talking about the Amsterdam College from his references to the «mennoniten» and to «Doctor Galenus».²⁴⁰ Moreover, as we will see later, in some of the accounts of the Reformed Church the members of the Amsterdam College were designated as «boreelisten» and the College itself as the «borelsche vergaderinge».

In conclusion, we can certainly say that Boreel was the founder or one of the founders of the Amsterdam College, and that one of the first members of this group of collegiants was Cornelis Moorman. Furthermore, it is most likely that Daniel de Breen had a major role in the establishing of such College: as a matter of fact, in the literature related to the Collegiants De Breen is always mentioned as the co-founder of the Amsterdam College together with Boreel. On the contrary, as for people like Michiel Comans and Galenus Abrahamsz, even if they were member of the Collegiant group, they started to attend the meetings of such College only some years after his establishing.

As for the date of foundation, we can argue that the meetings of the Amsterdam College started in the first half of 1646. As a matter of fact, Boreel settled down in Amsterdam in December 1645.²⁴¹ Furthermore, among the reports of the meetings of Reformed Church's council of Amsterdam, the first reference to the Collegiants can be found in the account of July 12, 1646,

²⁴⁰ «[...] soo spande hy al sijn krachten aen / om sijn oogh-luyckende Kerck, zijnde een voorbereydinghe tot het duysent-jarighe Rijck, hier in dese Landen op te rechten / waer in hy soo yverigh speculeerde / da thy tot soo een stant quam (soo hy seyde) da thy wel vier of vijf weecken niet en wist of hy opghetrocken was in den Hemel / dan / of sijn lichaem hier zijnde / sijn geest alleenigh opghetrocken was: over al seer neerstigh soeckende het gheselschap van de Predikers / om in haer persoonen haer gheheele kercke tot sich te stepen / en tot sijn oogh-luyckende Kerck te voeghen / welcke hy oock begon op te rechten / onder de Remonstranten tot Rotterdam en Vlaerdinghe, onder de Lutheranen tot Kampen en Zwol, onder de Papisten door middle van Helmont in Brabandt, doch onder de Mennoniten over al / door dien die eenvoudige luytjes met een schoonen schijn alderlichtst te verleyden zijnde / de bequaemste aerden waren / daer sijn oogh-luyckende kerck oock haer diepste wortel heft gheschooten / voornamelick / door dien hy terstondt Doctor Galenus gheheel en al in sijn kaproen kreegh». *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A3r.

²⁴¹ We can conclude this date from Boreel's epistle to Dury of November 14, 1646: «Tuas 12 Junii ad me datas recepi Amstelodami a communi nostro amico D. Justino, qui tunc ibi erat cum uxore et liberis ut amicos suos inviseret meque inter illos, qui iam a praeteriti anni mense Decembri hie moror, studiis Ebraicis intentus, quorum specimen jam vidit orbis per nuperam τὼν Mischnaiot Ebraicarum cum punctis editionem». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 251.

where the Reformed ministers says that they heard that some «socinienen» held their meetings twice a week and that one of their meeting place was the house of a certain Moorman.²⁴² Therefore, it can be argued that the meetings of the Amsterdam Collegiants started in the first half of 1646.²⁴³

From the accounts of the Reformed Church's council it is possible to trace the history of the Amsterdam College. These accounts are useful sources that reveal the meeting places of Boreel's group and their activities in these meetings. Furthermore, they are useful to understand when the Amsterdam College achieved enough popularity as to attract the attention of the Reformed ministers and to perceive the spirit of toleration that dominated Amsterdam in that period. As a matter of fact, when the Reformed Church asked the civil authorities to forbid the meetings of the Collegiants, the burgomasters often avoided until they could taking action against Boreel and

²⁴² The reports of the council of the Reformed Church of Amsterdam are preserved in the *Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief* and they are divided in chronological order. See: Gemeente Amsterdam Stadsarchief, Archief van de Hervormde Gemeente; Kerkenraad, Algemeen, MS 376.1 (from now on GAS MS 376.1). For the report of July 12, 1646, see: GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 83r.

²⁴³ In his work about the circle of Spinoza's friends and acquaintances, even though he refers to the reports of July 12, Meinsma seems to assert that the Amsterdam College existed before that date. This is how I interpreted these assertions: «vers le 1645 les réunions des collégiants à Amsterdam prirent aussi une teinte socinienne. Elle se tenaient deux fois par semaine chez l'anabaptiste Cornelis Moorman qui habitait en 1646 dans le "Coorenboot", une maison du Nieuwe Zijds Achterburgwal et, à partir de 1647, le Lindengracht». So, Meinsma not only thought that the Collegiants held their meetings in Amsterdam already in 1645, but also that a College existed in Amsterdam even before that year. Otherwise, I do not know how to interpret his assertions suggesting that around 1645 the Collegiants of Amsterdam «prirent aussi une teinte socinienne». In the same direction goes also the *Dissertatio Theologica* written by Desmarets, when the French theologian says that Boreel went to Amsterdam after he became aware of a new sect of prophets: «Sed tandem ubi intellexisset apud Batavos novam quam oriri sectam novorum Prophetarum, Sweckfeldiano et Weigeliano Spiritu plenorum, et quadantenus praeludentium Quakeris Angliae, Amstelodamum concessit, inter hos nomen aliquod consequuturus, quod nequiverat obinere in gremio Ecclesiae, repulsam passus circa petitionem Ministerii». Although I cannot exclude the existence of a group of Collegiants in Amsterdam in 1645 or even before, in the reports of the Reformed Church I did not find any reference to the meetings of the Amsterdam College before July 12, 1646. On the other hand, on this report we read about «die socinienen» who «wederom hare bijeencompsten houden». So, it seems that the Reformed minister had been already aware of the meetings of the «socinienen». However, we can make two considerations: on the one hand, as I have already said, I did not find other references to the meetings of a Socinian group in the previous reports of the Reformed Church; on the other, we can explain those words saying that the Reformed ministers heard about those meetings some months before July 12. In conclusion, in absence of new data, I believed that we must place the first meetings of the Amsterdam Collegiants in the first months of 1646. See: Desmarets, *Dissertatio Theologica* (see above, n. 83), p. 94; K.O. Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle. Étude critique historique sul les étérodexes hollandais. Traduit du néerlandais par S. Roosenburg. Appendices latins et allemands traduits par J.P. Osier*, Paris, 2006, p. 94.

his group. In the account concerning the years 1644-1653, after the first reference on July 12, 1646, there are no other mentions of the Socinians until 1647,²⁴⁴ when the Reformed ministers of Amsterdam often mentioned the «sociniaenen» or the «sociniaensche vergaderinge» in their council's meetings.²⁴⁵

After the report of July 12, 1646, there is a new reference to the Collegiant group in the account of the council held on March 14, 1647. Shortly before this day the Reformed ministers had heard that the Socinians had met almost publicly in two different places and that they had discussed

²⁴⁴ In his history of the Collegiant movement, Van Slee says that, after the Reformed Church put pressure on the civil authorities, «stelden de burgemeesters reeds in 1646 een onderzoek naar het karakter van het nieuwe college in, maar ontvingen ten antwoord dat het “een vergadering was van Mennisten”». However, I believe that these assertions must be questioned. First, it has already been said that in 1646 among the reports of the Reformed council of Amsterdam there is just one reference to the Collegiants. Therefore, even though it is true that in 1647 the Reformed ministers put pressure on the burgomasters to forbid the meetings of the Amsterdam College, we cannot make the same assertion for the year 1646. Second, the sources that Van Slee quoted actually seem not to support his assertion. I was not able to check all the works he mentioned. However, neither in the *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering*, nor in the *Tegenwoordige Staat der Vereenigde Nederlanden* written by Jan Wagenaar, the inquiry made by the burgomasters in 1646 is discussed. Furthermore, I think that here one of the major sources of Van Slee was the *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht*, written by Steven Blaupoten ten Cate. In this work the author wrote that the burgomasters of Amsterdam «in 1646 onderzoek lieten doen, of dit collegie ook misschien eene zamenkomst van Socinianen ware. Zij kregen echter geen ander berigt, dan dat het “eene vergadering van Mennisten” was». In turn Blaupoten ten Cate quoted the *Amsterdam, in zyne opkomst, aanwas, geschiedenissen* by Wagenaar. However, in this work Wagenaar only refers to the decree of September 30, 1648, by the General States of Holland and of West Friesland, where it is possible to read that the civil authorities of Amsterdam «hebben gheseid geen kennis te hebben, dat in hare stadt een Seminarium der Socinianen soude wesen, maer wel den tijd van twee jaren gelede, haer luiden voor te zijn gekomen, dat aldaer doen sekere vergadering van Mennonisten sich openbaerde». In short, in 1648 the civil authorities of Amsterdam informed the General States that in their city there was no kind of Socinian meetings, but only a «vergadering van Mennonisten», that had started to meet two years before. In addition, the magistrates of Amsterdam had taken measures against such assembly around 1648, not in 1646. In conclusion, I believe it is most likely that in 1646 there was no inquiry about the Amsterdam College and that Van Slee assertions must be related to the testimony of 1648. See: Jan Wagenaar, *Tegenwoordige Staat der Vereenigde Nederlanden*, Amsterdam, vol. 1, 1739, p. 88; Jan Wagenaar, *Amsterdam, in zyne opkomst* (see above, n. 26), pp. 76-78; Van Nijmegen, *De historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering* (see above, n. 18), pp. 185-187; Steven Blaupoten ten Cate, *Geschiedenis der Doopsgezinden in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht en Gelderland*, Amsterdam, vol. 1, 1847, pp. 268-269; Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 142; Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 47-48; Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), p. 203.

²⁴⁵ The Reformed ministers never used the words “Collegiants” in their accounts. Only once I found the term «coleghe» to refer to their meetings. Nevertheless, it is clear that by using the word «sociniaenen» and the like they refer to the Collegiant group of Boreel. To support this assertion, it must be considered that in some reports the Reformed Ministers discussed the assembly or the meetings of Boreel. This is the reason why in the next pages I will use the words “Socinian” and “Collegiant” as identical. For the accounts related to the years 1644-1653, see: GAS MS 376.1.8.

«horrifying» doctrines. So, all ministers were asked to pay more attention to this topic and to provide the council with more information about the Socinians.²⁴⁶ The next week, on March 21, the «Dominus Lupenius en Dominus Wittewrongel» informed the Reformed council that a «vergaderinge van Socinianen» was held on Sunday in the house of Cornelis Moorman, where the participants read and explained the Acts of the Apostles. Furthermore, the Collegiants held another meeting on Tuesday «in de tuynstract», where they explained the writings of «Daniel den Propheet». Hence, the Reformed council instructed Lupenius and Wittewrongel to find new evidences within a week.

However, they failed to complete their task within the week, so they gave their account on April 4, 1647.²⁴⁷ Leupenius communicated to the members of the Reformed Church that those Socinians used to meet «als vrienden» and that, after their meeting started, they discussed among themselves, proposing all kind of questions. However, they used to blame or condemn no one for his opinions. Moreover, continues Leupenius, there were many people taking part to the meetings of the Collegiants, who tried to defend dangerous and harmful doctrines, even though they were respectable people. After they listened to Leupenius' account, the council's Reformed ministers judged necessary to hinder such meetings. Therefore, they decided to ask the civil authorities to forbid the assemblies of the Amsterdam College by using their power and their authority.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁶ «Is de vergaderinge bekend gemaect dat de Socinianen op twee plaetsen genoegh opentlyck vergaderen, en grouwelijcke stucken disputeeren, is elck een gerecommandeert nader daer na te vernemen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 110.

²⁴⁷ In the meeting of the Reformed council of March 28 it is only asserted that Leupenius would have tried to collect additional data about the Collegiants. See: GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 113.

²⁴⁸ «D. Leupenius heeft hem wat naerder op de sake vande socinianen en haer gevoelen geïnformeert, dat se bij malkanderen komen als vrienden om een praetien, en als hare vergaderinge begint aen te wassen, dat se dan beginnen, d'een oft d'andere vrage voor te stellen, en te disputeeren, yder een hoorende, maer niemant veroordeelende, synde haere vergaderinge wel houdert in getale sterck, dat goey fatsoenelijche lieden daer commen, en dat se seer schadelycke stucken zoeken te defendeeren. De vergaderinge acht hoochnodich dat quaet tegen te gaen, en den heeren burgemestereen ernstelijch daer toe te versoecken dat hare eersaemheden met hare macht en autoriteyt soodanige schadelycke conventiculen gelieven te stuiten, en voor de welstant van de kercke en ruste van hare stadt te yveren, twelck sullen doen D. Leupenius en Jonas Abeels». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 114. As for the accounts of July 12, 1646, of March 2 and 21, 1647, and of April 4, 1647, see also: Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243), pp. 94-95.

However, the Reformed Church did not immediately get the assistance it hoped from the burgomasters. On April 11, «Dominus Leupenius e Jonas Abeels» informed council that they had met the burgomasters of Amsterdam and they had discussed with them about the Collegiants, asking them to forbid their meetings. Still, the civil authorities only answered that they would pay attention to the question. The Reformed ministers decided that Leupenius and Abeels had to keep a «watchful eye» on the socinians.²⁴⁹ On the other hand, the council's members continued to search for the help of the civil power and on April 25 Leupenius informed his fellow ministers that he had spoken with the president of the burgomasters in order to stop the Socinian assemblies, who answered to him that the civil authorities would have made the necessary efforts to forbid those gatherings.²⁵⁰

It can be argued that the president of the burgomasters gave an answer to the Reformed minister that did not match with the real intentions of the civil power. The meetings of the Amsterdam College kept going in May, a sign that the burgomasters either did not act against the Collegiants or did not use all the necessary means to stop them.²⁵¹ So, on June 6, 1647, Otto Simonsen and Claes Jansz Visscher informed the council's members that the Collegiant meetings kept going in the house of Cornelis Moorman «op de lindegracht». Since they had finished reading the Acts and discussing them, Boreel and his fellow-thinkers started to examine the Letters to the Romans

²⁴⁹ «D. Leupenius en Jonas Abeels hebben gerapporteert dat se boven syn geweest en den *heren* burgemeesteren gerecommandeert de schriftelijcke suplicatie van de gevangenen tot Algiers, ende oock bekend gemaeckt de schadelijcke conventiculen van de socinianen en versocht dat hare *Edelen* met hare acht en autoriteyt haer van Godt tot dien eynde verleent, de selve geliefden te stuyten, ende dat hare *Edelen* tot antwoord hadden gegeven, op het eerste, dat die sake behoort tot de generaliteyt, ende dat sy haer aen de magistraten hadden behooren niet haer schrij[?] te adresseeren, Op het tweede, dat hare *Edelen*, daer op souden letten gelijk sy voor desen oock gedaen hadden, de vergaderinge heeft hier op goetgevonden, het eerste door den gedeputeerden onses synodi daer toe versocht synde aen de generaliteyt te brengen, en wat het tweede belanght, den broederen tot die Sake gecommiteert te beveelen een wakende ooge daer over te houden». GAS MS 376.1.8, ff. 115-116.

²⁵⁰ «D. Leupenius rapporteert, met de praesident burgemeester over de vergaderinge van de socinianen gesproken en seer goet antwoord becomen te hebben, dat alle devoyren, sullen werden aengewent, om de selve te stuyten». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 117. Leupenius received his task in the previous session of the Reformed council, on April 18: «D. Leupenius sal den heer president van burgemeesteren aenspreken over de vergaderinge van de socinianen die noch continueert». Gas MS 376.1.8, f. 116.

²⁵¹ This is what it is possible to conclude from the reports of May 9, 16, and 23, when at first «D. Somerus and then «D. Otto Simonsen» were instructed to deal with the Socinian problem. See: GAS MS 376.1.8, ff. 119 and 121.

and to argue about them according to their custom. The Reformed ministers expressed once again the necessity of stopping these meetings and they decided once again to find additional information about the disputes and discussions held by the Collegiants. With this new data they would have gone to the civil authorities.²⁵²

The research for information useful to stop the assemblies of the Collegiants lasted some weeks: there are no references to the questions of the Socinians and of their gatherings in the other reports of June and July 1647. On the other hand, in the account of the council's session on August 1 it is possible to read that the Reformed ministers discussed again the Socinians and that some specimen of their actions were showed. So, they decided to submit the question to the burgomasters, but only after they received the account of «D. Rodolpho», who at that time stayed in Leiden.²⁵³ The Reformed ministers got this account around September 19, 1647, since in the council's session held in this day it was said that the meetings of the «socinianen binnen Reynsburgen» were losing their relevance and that the number of Collegiants was decreasing. Nevertheless, the Reformed Church of Amsterdam decided to investigate if in their city still there were assemblies of Socinians.²⁵⁴

Now, three facts must be underlined. First, between June and September 1647 there were fewer accounts about the Collegiants in the

²⁵² «Otto Symonsen en Claes Jansz Visscher hebben vernomen na de vergaderinge der Socinianen, en bevonden dat se noch continueert ten huise van Moorman op del lidegracht, ende dat se na afhandeling van de handelingen der Apostelen, nu begonnen hadden den Sentbrieft aen de Romeynen voor te lesen, en daerover na haer gewoonte te disputeren. De vergaderinge achtende hoochnodich, en [?] sulcke schadelycke vergaderingen te stuyten, windtgoet sich noch wat nader van hare disputen en conclusien te informeeren en daerna 't selve wederom ernstelyck den heeren te remonstreeren twelck de broederen int gemeen wordt bevolen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 121.

²⁵³ «Is wederom gesproken van de socinianen en eenige staeltiens van haer dryven wort gebracht, en goetgevonden den *Edelen Heren* Borgemeesteren op nieuw ernstelijck daer over te begroeten, doch eerst verwachten 't gene D. Rodolpho. daer van sal aengeschreven worden van Leyden, en elk een sal soo veel mogelijk is, hem naerder daer van informeeren». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 133.

²⁵⁴ «D. Rudolphus brengt in vernomen te hebben, na de vergaderinge der socinianen binnen Reynsburgen, en verstaen dat de selve allenskens meer en meer versmelt, en met dese socinianen niet ss alles overeen en commen, is goetgevonden dat de broeders vant quartier, sich wat nader sullen informeeren, of hare vergaderinge hier noch duert, en wat se al maken». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 139. Since Rijnsburg was the stronghold of the Collegiant movement, this report is an additional proof that the reformed ministers identified the collegiants with the socinians.

council's session. Second, from the last report above-quoted it seems that the Reformed ministers were no longer sure about the presence of the Collegiants' assemblies. Third, after the session of September 19 the Reformed ministers did not discuss the Collegiants until November 21, when they learned about a «nieuwe sociniaensche libertynische secte». From these three points, it is possible to conclude that Boreel and his group began to be more cautious in their meetings, in order to avoid the close watch of the Reformed Church. In this way it is possible to understand why the Reformed ministers spent two months in the searching of some «staeltiens van haer dryven», why it was necessary to confirm if «hare vergaderinge hier noch duert, en wat se al maken», and why there are no references to the Socinians until November 21, even though the Reformed council had intended to ask the burgomasters to stop them.

On November 21, the Reformed ministers learned that there was a «nieuwe sociniaensche libertynische secte» in Amsterdam, which was rapidly growing. So, they decided to find the best way to counterattack it.²⁵⁵ On November 28, 1647, there is a long report about the question of the Socinians. On that date the Reformed ministers read in front of the council an account that was written after some of them had attended to a Collegiant meeting. From this account the council's members clearly perceive the Collegiant errors, which were related to the Fall of Adam, the original sin, and Christ's justification.²⁵⁶ After they wondered about the best way to stop the Amsterdam College, the members of the Reformed council decided to inform the civil authorities again, to give the best information about those meetings to the burgomasters, and to loudly ask for their assistance.²⁵⁷ On December 5

²⁵⁵ «Verstaende dat die nieuwe sociniaensche libertynsche secte seer toeneemt, is goetgevonden dese saecke in rype deliberatie te nemen tegen over acht dagen, hoemen haer best soude mogen tegen gaen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 149.

²⁵⁶ The ministers used the word *gerechtigheyt*, that is *gerechtigheid*, which means "justice". However, if it is related to theological questions, this word acquires new meanings. If it is referred to God, it means «de hoedanigheid van gerechtigt te zijn, t.w. met betrekking tot Zijne beloften; getrouwheid daaraan, en vervolgens, daar die beloften veelal zegeningen betreffen, barmhartigheid», that is the trust in the justice of God and in his promises of grace. Therefore, it is most likely that Christ's *gerechtigheyt* must be referred to the doctrine of the justification.

²⁵⁷ «Is by der handt genomen de sake van de nieuwe sociniaensche vergaderinge en voorgelesen een geschrift, waer in verhaelt worden, wat dwalingen noch jonckst daer gedreven en geventileert waren, den val Adams, erst sonde, en toegerekende gerechticheyt Christi aengaende, by occasie van het voorlesen van het 5^o cappittel des Sentbrefts Pauli tot

the Reformed ministers thought they had gathered sufficient evidences to show the burgomasters that they were in front of an assembly dangerous and harmful both for the Church and the State.²⁵⁸

However, as it had happened before, the civil power did not give to the Reformed ministers the answer they hoped. The burgomasters of Amsterdam informed the Reformed delegation that they would look into the question and they would take action against the «sociniaensche ofte swenckfeldische vergaderinge» as far as it would have been necessary for the peace of the Republic. This was not the answer that the Reformed minister hoped for and they decided to act in two ways: on the one hand, they resolved to pay more attention to the meetings of the Collegiants, so that they could have provided the burgomasters with better motivations to act; on the other, in the meantime they decided to use the means and the weapons available to attack the errors that the members of the College defended.²⁵⁹

den Romeynen, ende dat se van geen nieuwe ketterije willen weeten, die daer sonden worden staende gehouden; en gevraecht wat best dient gedaen om haer te stuyten, ende na verscheyden advisen voor het raetsaemste voor dese tyt geoordeelt den heeren Burgemesteeren, hoe wel het voor desen geschiedt is, evenwel noch eens, doch na voorgaende goede informatie en preparatie, over dese saecke te begroeten, eerst int particulier in hare huysen, en daer na int gemeen opt stathuys, met ernstich versoeck, dat hare *Edelen* en [?] believe dese saecke te behertigen, ende als voesterheeren der kercke, desen suerdeesem wt dese Stadt te keeren, waervan niet dan groote onheylen voor de kercke, en oock politie te vreesen syn, doch sal toecommende donderdach noch nader van het eene en ander gesproken worden». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 149.

²⁵⁸ «De saecke van de nieuwe sociniaensche of swenckfeldiaensche vergaderinge hervadt synde, is geoordeelt, dat wy stofft genoeg hebben, om de heeren Burgemesteeren te informeeren, wat een schadelycke en verderfelycke 't samenrottinge dat is beyde voor de kercke ende politie, ende ernstelijck te versoecken, at hare *Edelen* believe hare macht en autoriteyt, tegen de selve te gebruycken, dat se maer gedissipeert, en verbroken worden, gelyck voor desen is geschiet, en daerom goetgevonden, de selve Broeders die voor desen de selve commissie hebben gehadt, op nieuw daer toe te gebruycken, om hoe eer hoe liever hare Commissie te vervolgen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 150.

²⁵⁹ «De Broeders gecommiteert om de heeren Burgemesteeren te begroeten, en te sprecken, aengaende dat pasquil en oock de meer gemelde sociniaensche ofte swenckfeldische vergaderinge, hebben gerapporteert dat se boven geest synde, De heeren Burgemesteeren hebben versocht, hare Macht en autoriteyt, tegen de soodanige te gebruycken, ende tot antwoord gekregen, dat hare *Edelen* wat het eerste belanght, daer op souden letten; en wat het tweede belanght, dat hare *Edelen* daer in souden versien, soo veel als de ruste van de politie en republicke souden vereisschen, is daer op goetgevonden noch nader op gemelte vergaderinge en haer dryven te letten, en sich met meer goede redenen te versien, om daarmede hare *Edelen* in beter gelegenthey, noch nader te dienen, en ondertusschen gebruycken die middelen en wapenen, die wy van den heere hebben, om soodanige dwalingen tegen te gaen, doch sal toecommende donderdach nader daer op gelet worden. Heeft oock D. Badius den man angesproken daer dat Pasquil heeft te coop gehangen, maer dat hy heeft ontkent, daer van geweeten te hebben, en syn vrouw, bekent daerin en grooten misslach begaen te hebben, dat se sonder te weeten wat het was, de knecht bevolen

It can be assumed that in the following days the Collegiant meetings kept going without serious problems, thanks to the partial toleration that the civil authorities practiced towards Boreel and his group. It is evident that the burgomasters of Amsterdam were not in favor of religious censure without true dangers for the peace of their city and of their State. Still, the Reformed Church did not share their opinion and on December 19 the ministers gathered in the council expressed their great concern, because the Socinian meetings were growing in the city. Nevertheless, they decided to do nothing until the *Avondamaal* and to observe the situation in the meanwhile, so that they would have understood what the civil magistrates would have decided to do.²⁶⁰

In the council's accounts there is no information whatsoever about the Collegiants for almost a year. It is likely that Boreel and his fellow-thinkers met more carefully, as they did in the last months of 1647, and that they avoided the surveillance of the Reformed ministers until September 1648. In that period the synod of the Reformed Church of South Holland acquainted the ministers of Amsterdam with the existence of a Socinian and Anabaptist assembly and asked the council to pay more attention to this question. Hence, on September 10, 1648, the council decided to make an inquiry and to find information about the Collegiants, in order to inform the civil authorities as soon as they could.²⁶¹

In the same period, the General States of Holland and West Friesland got the same information. From the «extract uit het Register der Resolutien van hunne Ed. Gr. Mog. De Staten van Hollandt en Westvrieslandt, van 't jaer 1648», published in the *Historie der Rijnsburger vergadering*, it can be

hadde, dat voor de deur te hangen, instantelijck begeerende dat haer de selve werdelen besten gehouden». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 151.

²⁶⁰ «Aengaende die nieuwe sociniaensche oft swenckfeldiaensche vergaderinge, daer men nu van soude spreecken, en van de welke men verstaet, datse haer al wyder verspreyen in andere plaetsen buyten dese stadt, waer van de grootste verweringe in de kercke ende politie te vreesen is, alsoo het laet was, is goetgewonden dese saecke wt te stellen tot na het Avontmael om rypelijck daer van te spreecken, en ondertusschen te sien wat onse [?] magistraten daer in sullen doen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 152.

²⁶¹ «Also van den Sinode van Suit Holland onderricht is dat enige sociniaensche ende wederdopchs vergaderinge onder ons 't samen rotten - ende versocht dat de kerckenraed alhier daer op gelieve te letten, is goetgevonden dat men sich naerder daer op sal informeren om metten eersten t' selve aen de heren magistraten te recommanderen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 185. I did not find a translation of the word *wederdopchs*. However, since the word *wederdoper* means "anabaptist" and *wederdoperij* means "anabaptism", I translated the word *wederdopchs* with the adjective "Anabaptist".

deduced that the General States heard about the existence of a «Sociniaensch Seminarium» in Amsterdam. However, when they asked the civil authorities about it, the magistrates of Amsterdam answered that in their city there was no assembly of Socinians, but only a «vergadering van Mennonisten», which had started to meet two years before. Regarding this assembly, the civil authorities of Amsterdam had already taken such measures that the «predikanten van hare stadt diesaengaende contentement hadden genomen».²⁶²

However, the Reformed ministers of Amsterdam were not satisfied with the measures that the civil authorities took against the collegiants. The two «domini Somerus en Lupenius» were instructed to find evidence of the Collegiants' meetings.²⁶³ After three weeks, on October 1, 1648, they were able to confirm that the Collegiants still held their assemblies. So, the Reformed council decided to ask again the burgomasters to put an end to those dangerous *conventiculen*.²⁶⁴ Somerus and Lupenius were appointed with this task and on October 22 they informed the council that they had spoken with the burgomasters of Amsterdam. The latter had expressed their desire to stop those meetings and they asked the assistance of the Reformed ministers, who had to learn who were members of the Amsterdam College, where they met, and when they had their meetings.²⁶⁵

It is evident that the appointed ministers quickly collected the information they were asked for, since on October 29 the civil authorities were informed about the people who took part to the meetings of the

²⁶² Van Nijmegen, *Historie der Rijnsburger vergadering* (see above, n. 18), pp. 185-187. See also: Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 142; Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243) p. 113.

²⁶³ See: GAS MS 376.1.8, ff.

²⁶⁴ «Also de sociniaense factie noch gelyck te vooren vergadert ende daer over verscheyde clachten voor comen. Is goetgevonden met ernst aen de Achtb. Heren Burgermeesteren te remonstreeren op dat sodanige schadelicke conventiculen door hare authoritheytey geinhibeert werden t' welck sal geschieden door D. Lupenium; scribam [?] onderlinge». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 187.

²⁶⁵ «De broederen voor desen gecommiteert om de heren burgermeesteren. te remonstreren de schadelickheyt van de sociniaensche en andere ketterse vergaderingen sullen gerapporteeren sulcks by haer seriuselick geschiet te syn. om dat de heeren sullen verclaeren dat si door haer authoritheytey sulcks sullen soecken tegen te gaen en te verhinderen – bevelende en versoeckende ondertusschen. Dat men haere *Edelen* sullen bekent maecken enige van de voornaampste personen die daer te samencomen. Met een de plaetsen waer ende tyt wanneer Zi vergaderen. t' welck metten ernst haren Achtbaerheden sal genotificeert werden door de selve gecommiteerde». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 189.

Amsterdam College, about their meeting places, and about the days when they met. Unfortunately, in the account of the council's session they did not reproduce such information. It would have been most useful to learn the identities of the members of the Amsterdam College. Anyhow, the Reformed council decided to wait for the burgomasters' decision.²⁶⁶

For almost two years there are no mentions of the Collegiants in the accounts of the Reformed council's session. From the report dated September 22, 1650, it is possible to understand why. After the Reformed ministers provided the civil authorities with all the information they needed about the Amsterdam College, the Reformed Church succeeded in obtaining a formal forbiddance against the Collegiant meetings. As a matter of fact, in the account of September 22 it is possible to read that there were new rumors about a «vergaderinge van de nieuwe dwaelgeesten» that met in Amsterdam, even though the civil authorities forbade such assemblies. Therefore, it is evident that shortly after October 29, the burgomasters of Amsterdam issued a decree to prohibit the Collegiants' meetings. It is hard to say if they really stopped their assemblies or if they just met avoiding the Reformed Church's surveillance. This second hypothesis seems more probable, but we do not have any proofs.

Anyhow, it is most likely that between the end of 1649 and the beginning of 1650 Boreel met Galenus Abrahamsz for the first time. Meihuizen suggests that, after the refusal of the peace offer made by the Waterlanders, Abrahamsz started to doubt about the foundation of ecclesiastical authority. These doubts strengthened in March 1649, when Galenus took part in the delegation that went to Texel to discuss the case of Claes Arentsz, a *doopsgezinde* preacher who was put in jail because he spoke too carelessly in front of some Reformed ministers about Infant Baptism. Furthermore, because of this trip Galenus arrived late to the «Synode der Mennisten», which was held in Haarlem on June 1649. Among other things, the members of this synod decided to forbid each member of the

²⁶⁶ «De heeren burgermesteren syn door de gecommiteerde broeders bekent gemaect de personen: plaetse: en tyt van de sosiniaense en andere schadelicke t' samenrottingen Sullen ondertusschen wachten wat by de Heeren daer in gedaen sal worden». GAS MS 376.8.1, f. 191.

doopsgezinde congregations to listen the sermons of people who did not believe in the confession of faith of the *doopsgezinde* congregations reunited in Haarlem.²⁶⁷ This not only meant that Galenus and his brethren could not have taken part in the services of the Reformed, Lutheran, or Remonstrant Churches, but also that they could not have attended the services of the Waterlanders or the meetings of the Collegiants.²⁶⁸

It is most likely that after these happenings Galenus decided to meet Boreel and his group, or at least that he was more inclined to make Boreel's acquaintance. Meihuizen rightly suggests that the middle-person between them was Cornelis Jans Moorman. As it has been shown, Moorman was both a member of the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam and one of the first Collegiants together with Boreel.²⁶⁹ Furthermore, it is possible to add more circumstances that could have made easier the meeting between Galenus and the Collegiants of Amsterdam. First, Boreel and his group acknowledged to each Christian Church a little value. This is the reason why they regarded the Amsterdam College as a place where all Christians could have met and discussed, while remaining formally member of their Christian Church. This was not a practice that all Dutch Colleges shared. Second, the idea of the Church's decline, embraced by Boreel and other Collegiant authors, was to some extent similar to some assertions of the first Anabaptists. This is one of the reasons that could have made easier for the less conservative Mennonites to accept the ideas advocated by Boreel and the Collegiants.²⁷⁰

²⁶⁷ In 17th century Dutch Republic there were three main sects among the Mennonites: there were the Flemishes, the Frisians, and the Waterlands. They were not distinguished on geographical bases. They held different doctrines instead. However, now and then some people decided to leave each one of these three main groups, by forming new sects, such as the Old and Mild Flemishes, the Young Frisians, etc. Galenus was a member of the Flemish congregations, which at that time had reunited some minor sects. For more information, see: the articles «Flemish Mennonites», «Frisian Mennonites», and «Waterlanders» in the *Global Anabaptist Mennonite Encyclopedia Online*. See also: Gary K. Waite, «The Drama of the Two Word Debate among Liberal Dutch Mennonites, c. 1620-1660: Preparing the Way for Baruch Spinoza?». Forthcoming in *The Protestant Reformation and its Radical Critiques*, Anorthe Kremers, ed., Göttingen, March 2017. I would like to kindly thank professor Waite for the opportunity he has given me to consult the manuscript of his article before publication.

²⁶⁸ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 37-43.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 43.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

However, even if it is possible to argue that Galenus began to attend the Collegiant meetings in 1649-50, it must be emphasized that he became a major figure in the Amsterdam College only around 1655, when Boreel stayed in England for some years. There are two main arguments to strengthen this assertion. First, the *lammerenkrijgh*, which at the end led to a schism in the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam, rose around 1655, when some conservative *doopsgezinded* started to publish some pamphlets in which they accused Galenus of being part of the Amsterdam College.²⁷¹ Second, from the accounts of the sessions of the Reformed council it is possible to conclude that in 1650 and in the following years Boreel was the major figure among the Collegiants of Amsterdam, since in some reports their meetings are named as *boreelsche vergaderinge*.

Around September 22, 1650, the Reformed council heard new rumors about the gatherings of some «dwaelgeesten». So, all Reformed ministers were requested to pay more attention to this subject.²⁷² Soon they discovered that those rumors were true. On September 29, 1650, some Reformed ministers informed the council that these «nieuwe dwaelgeesten» had met on the previous Sunday in the house of Moorman, on the «lindegracht», where those meetings had started to increase in numbers. Furthermore, they had met also in the house of an Englishman «op de haerlemmer dyck by het pleyn» and in the *tichelstrate*.²⁷³ On the sessions of October 6 the Reformed ministers were able to add new information. They mentioned once again Moorman's house as one of the principal meeting place and they added that the Collegiants had met also in the *Haarlemmerdijk*.

²⁷¹ For more information, see the next chapter.

²⁷² «Alsoo men verstaet dat de vergaderinge van de nieuwe dwaelgeesten hier en daer noch in dese stadt continueeren (niet tegenstaende dat de heeren burgemeesteren de selve hadden verboden) soo is goetgevonden dat de Broederen int gemeen op dese saecke haer sullen soecken naerder te informeeren, ende syn de broederen des quartiers, daer se voor dese plachten te vergaderen, specialycken versocht nauwe daer op te willen inquireeren». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 295.

²⁷³ «Is by de broedeeren des quartiers vernomen dat dese nieuwe dwaelgeesten noch continueeren hare vergaderingen, alle acht dagen sondaechs omtrent vyft ofte ses [?], ten huysse van Moorman op de lindegracht, ende den anderen sondach op de haerlemmerdyck by het pleyn, ten huysse van een engelsman, daer de halve syde een cruydenierswinckel is, worden oock geseght in de tichelstrate te vergaderen, ende alsoo ten huysse van gemelte Moorman de vergaderinge seer groot wort. Is goetgevonden naer dese geheele sake tegens den toecommenden donderdach noch naerder te vernemen, om daer naer met suffesante kennisse de heeren Burghmeesteren hier over te begroeten». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 295.

Moreover, they had been able to learn what these people were doing in their meetings: at first, they read some passages of the Holy Scripture and then they started to discuss about what they read, as they were used doing. Since the Reformed ministers believed necessary to stop again those meetings, the council's members decided to inform the burgomasters of Amsterdam.²⁷⁴

Since they had forbidden the meetings of the Collegiants, the civil authorities of Amsterdam took action shortly after the Reformed ministers informed them. This is the reason why on October 27, 1650, some Reformed ministers informed their brethren that the president of the Burgomasters, Anthony Oetgens van Waveren, had assured them about the civil power's intention to put an end to the «*nieuwe byeencomste van eenige dwaelgeesten*» once again. He had summoned the leaders of the Amsterdam College, but they arrived too late, when the burgomasters had left. However, these unknown leaders went to Van Waveren's house, where the president of the burgomasters told them the reasons why they had been summoned. At first, they had tried to justify their actions, but then they agreed to submit themselves to the will of the civil authorities. Once they had heard this account, the members of the Reformed council said to be satisfied with the actions of the burgomasters. Nevertheless, they ordered the «*broederen des quartieers*» to learn if the Collegiants would have continued their meetings

²⁷⁴ «*Is naerder vernomen naer de vergaderinge van de nieuwe dwaelgeesten, ende vernomen datse wederomme vergaderen, ende seer toenemen, commende den eenen sondach by een ten huysen van Cornelis Jansz Moerman, op de Lindegracht, ende den anderen sondach op de haerlemmer dyck, haer selven besich houdende in het lesen van een deel der h. schrifture, ende daer overdoende haere verclaringe, daer op elck vryheyt heeft om syn gevoelen te openen, seer op de selfde maniere als se voor desen gewoon syn geweest te doen. Dese saecke ter degen ingesien synde, is geoordeelt, dat men door alle goede devoiren dese schadelycke byeenkomsten sal soecken in haere beginselen te weeren; ende tot dien eynde, de heeren burgemeesteren te versoecken dat se naer haeren voorigen yver Inde selfde saecke, dese vergaderingen gelieven te steuyten, alsoo de heer burghmeester (by ons verscheenen synde) aengenomen heeft, op dese saecke [?] te letten, soo is de saecke daer by gebleven*». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 297

nonetheless.²⁷⁵ However, the assemblies of the Amsterdam College apparently stopped.²⁷⁶

For three years, there are no references to the socinians or collegiants in the accounts of the Reformed council's session. As before, it is hard to say if Boreel and his group really ceased to meet or if they just avoided the surveillance of the Reformed ministers. Once again, even if there no evidence to prove it, I believe that the second hypothesis is more likely.²⁷⁷ The Reformed council started to take care again of the «socinyaensche ofte borelsche seckte» on June 19, 1653, when the ministers heard rumors about the growing of a sect of Boreelists. Hence, the Reformed ordered his members to find more information.²⁷⁸

It took few weeks to collect the necessary evidence.²⁷⁹ On July 17, 1653, some ministers informed the council that the «socinsche vergadering»

²⁷⁵ «De heer burghmeester Oetges heeft de vergaderinge bekent gemaect dat volgens d' intentie van de vergaderinge daer op was gelet van de nieuwe byeencomste van enige dwaelgeesten te verbieden, dat de hoofden van dien oock daer over voor haere *Edele* waren ontboden, maer te laet commende naer dat de heeren waren gescheyden, hadden haer ten huuse van d' here burghmeester laten vinden. Ende de meyninghe van de *Edele* heeren en waeromme sy ontboden waren, verstaen hebbende, hadden wel gesocht haer te excuseeren maer eyndelyck soo eeniger mate aengenomen haer naer het goetvinden van der *Edele* heeren te reguleeren daer by het voor die tyt was gelaten. De broederen hebben de goede devoiren van de achtbare heeren laten wel gevallen, ende ondertusschen syn de broederen des quartieers gelast, daer naer te vernemen, of de persoonen voornoemt in het houden van hare vergaderingen noch sullen bestaen te continueeren». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 301.

²⁷⁶ «Wert in gebracht van de broederen des quartiers, dat de nieuwe dwaelgeesten hare vergaderigen voor eerst naerlaten, wert de gantsche saecke de naerder op sicht van de selve broederen bevolen». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 303. Meisma made reference to some reports of 1650 too. See: Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243), p. 110.

²⁷⁷ In the reports from 1652, there are only two references to the «borelianen». In October 3, 1653, the Reformed ministers informed the council about an assembly of boreelists: «aangaende de vergaderinge der borelianen wort in gebracht dat sy vergaderen op de suidsyde van de angeliens graft tot een syde reeder het 4 huuse voor by de eerste dwars Straet sal noch nader na haar vernoomen worden». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 440. This report surely strengthens our hypothesis suggesting that the Collegiants continued to meet after October 1650. Moreover, in October 10, 1652, the Reformed council discussed about a book of the Boreelists, which *dominus Langelio* had to examine: «het boeck van de borelianen sal *Dominus* Langelio van broeder holt behandicht worden en van Langelio gevisiteert worden». GAS MS 376.1.8, f. 442. Meinsma quoted the account of October 3 too and he said that the meetings of the Collegiants were held in Daniel de Breen's house. However, it is not clear where he took this information. See: Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243) p. 114.

²⁷⁸ «Den K.R. met Droefheyte hoorende dat de Socinyaensche oft Borelsche seckte haer meer ende meer In dese stadt wtbraut²⁷⁸ is goet ghevonden dat de broeders elck In zyn quartier vernemen en teghen over 8 daeghen daer rapoort van Inbrenghen». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 25.

²⁷⁹ In the account of June 26 it is written that the «broederen» were still instructed to find information about the «socinsche ofte borelsche vergaderinghe». In the account of July 3 there is the same assertion, while on July 10 they council's members said that next

was held on Sunday in the *Elandstraat*, in the house of «Ian Tuenessen Linnewever» and «tot Oliver n passementwerker».²⁸⁰ So, the council ordered his members to keep an eye on those *conventikelen*.²⁸¹ By the next week the Reformed ministers collected new evidences, useful to conclude that the Amsterdam College had really grown. The Collegiants met four times a week: on Sunday, they gathered at the house of a certain «Cuiper»;²⁸² on Monday they met in the *St. Janstraat*, «ten huise van een barbier»; on Tuesday the assembly were held «op de haeck van de nuwe straet Int wapen van clef op de nuwendyck»; on Thursday the Collegiants met again in Kuyper's house, nearby the *Harlemmerpoort*.²⁸³ So, on July 31, 1653, the Reformed council instructed two of its members to speak with the burgomasters of Amsterdam about the «borelsche vergaderinghe», in order to make the Collegiants obey the civil decree and so to forbid their meetings once again.²⁸⁴

The two ministers quickly accomplished their task and on August 7 they informed the Reformed council that they talked with the burgomasters

week they would have an account concerning «Boreel met zynen anhang». See: GAS MS 376.1.9, ff. 23 and 25r-v.

²⁸⁰ I was not able to identify these two men.

²⁸¹ «Van de Socinsche Vergadering wort bekend ghemaect dat de selve zyn Inde Elantstraet ten Huise van Ian tuenessen Linnewever en tot Oliver n passementwerker recht over tlegghende hart Vergaderen des sondaegs nae de predicasy bliven de B. belast op dese Conventikelen te letten». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 26v. See also: Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243), p. 114.

²⁸² Probably Frans Kuyper, who is here associated with the Amsterdam College for the first time. He is regarded as one of the Socinians most active in the second half of 17th century. Kuyper left the Remonstrant movement because of his objections to the Infant Baptism. In Amsterdam he was a renowned member of the Collegiants and he worked in the editorial field. Among other works, he published the posthumous opera of Daniel de Breen and the *Bibliotheca fratrum plonorum*. Furthermore, he wrote various works himself. For instance, he was the author of the *Arcana atheismi revelata, examine tractatiis theologico-politici*, a work written against Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. For more information, see: Van der Aa, «Kuyper (Frans)», in Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden* (see above, n. 26), vol. 10, 1862, p. 440; Wiep van Bunge, «Kuyper (Kuyper, Cuperus), Frans (Franciscus)», in *Biographisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het nederlandse*, vol. 4, 1998, pp. 283-285; A. de Groot, «Arcana atheismi (1676): Frans Kuyper contra de ongodisten van zijn eeuw», in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis*, 13(3), 2010, pp. 97-109.

²⁸³ «Is vernomen nae de Borelsche vergaderinghe datse daer In noch continiweren sondags op de Braeck van een die ghenamp is de cuiper des maendachs In St. Ianstraet ten huise van een berbier des dickxdachs op de haeck van de nuwe straet Int wapen van clef op de nuwendyck des donderdags op de braeck by de harlemmer poort tot de ghemelde Cuiper beginnende ten 4 [vren?] naemiddach». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 26v.

²⁸⁴ «Alsoo de Borelsche vergaderinghe nae het verbot vande A.B. Hr. Burg noch haer vergaderinghe continiweren en haer door dese stadt verspreiden sal Het de Hr Burghem op een nu bekend ghemaect worden op dat strickt verbot aen haer mach ghegheven worden om t selve te beletten ende sal D Bady en den ouderling I. maes ghedaen worden». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 27.

about the Collegiants and their assemblies. The civil authorities assured that they would stop the «borelsche verghaderinghe» and that they would instruct the sheriff of the city to deal with the Collegiants.²⁸⁵ However, as it has happened before, the civil authorities did not act with the necessary strength to really stop the Collegiants, who still kept going with their meetings. On November 13, 1653, the Reformed ministers discovered that the Boreelists had not stopped their assemblies at all.²⁸⁶ However, they could do anything but to inform the burgomasters of Amsterdam once again.²⁸⁷

However, some weeks before the States General of Holland and of West Friesland had issued a decree against Socinianism, an event that had strong consequences for the life of the Amsterdam College. Six delegates of the Synod of South and North Holland went to the States General and asked for an act against the meetings of Socinians and against the publishing of books that advocated the ideas of Socinus and of his followers. The six delegates argued that Socinianism was certainly the worst heresy that ever arose in the Christian Religion, because it denied the fundamentals of Christianity, such as the doctrine of the Trinity, and identified the Christian moral doctrine with a kind of Pagan morality. Furthermore, the Reformed Church itself was at stake, because Socinianism could have led to a new schism. For these reason the delegates of the Reformed Synod asked the States General that «ce fléau soit combattu en temps voulu, que des ordres soient donnés contre les personnes, que les conventicules et les livres soient interdits, que le presses et les imprimeries se soient plus polluées par ces ordures, que les boutiques soient purifiées d'un commerce aussi nocif». Therefore, on September 19, 1653, the Dutch authorities issued a decree

²⁸⁵ «D. Badyo en frater maes Raporteren dat zy haer last In voorghande Achte haer ghegheven Aende E. A. Hr. Burg wt ghevoert hebben namentlyck dat de Borelsche Verghaderinghe Haer teghen het verbot vande E. mayestraet door dese stadt noch verspreiden dat Hare Achtbarheden weederom seryueselycke belooft hebben te verbieden en daer toe den Hr. Schout bevel gheven en met een raporteren de B. dat Hare AA. Ghehoort en ghezien hebbende door optekeninghe der menichvuldighe platssen daer de papisten In dese Stadt vergaderen als oock meede de papse scholen die ghehouden worden hebben meede belast met den eersten daer In te zullen versien». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 28.

²⁸⁶ « Alsoo verstaen wort dat de borelyannen continiweren soo langs soo meer met hare conventikelen soo salmen alle nersticheyt». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 35r.

²⁸⁷ «Is bevonden dat de Borelyanen hare Conventikelen meer en meer verspreiden en wort den H. Commisaryus de sake de H Burmesteren erenstelyck te recommanderen dat het mach ghestuit worden die Het selve aenghnommen heeft». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 36v.

against Socinianism: if someone had spread Socinian ideas, he would have been banned from the Dutch Republic, while for the second offence there would have been a punishment according to his crime; if an editor had published Socinian books, his license would have been revoked and he would have had a fine of three thousand florins; if someone had sold or traded Socinian books, he would have had a fine of one thousand florins.²⁸⁸

It is clear that this decree had a strong impact in the life of the Amsterdam Collegiants, who were seen as Socinians by the Reformed ministers. If they were accused of Socinianism and if they were proved to hold Socinian ideas, they would have incurred in stronger punishments than before. Still, the activities of the Amsterdam College did not stop. After the report of November 20, 1653, there are no references to the Collegiants in the Reformed council's accounts until 1656. Nevertheless, it can be assumed that Boreel and his fellow-thinkers continued with their meetings. Moreover, it must be underlined that in the same period a change started in the Amsterdam College: it is most likely that Galenus Abrahamsz began to acquire a major role in the assemblies of the Collegiants during 1653-54. An event that certainly facilitated the new position of Galenus in the life of the collegiants was Boreel's leaving: at the end of 1654 he went to England, where he lived until 1659, leaving the Amsterdam college and his fellow-collegiants for 4 years.

²⁸⁸ Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243), pp. 113-114. Meinsma transcribed the decree of the General States in his work. See: K. O. Meinsma, *Spinoza en zijn kring*, 's-Gravenhage, 1986, «Bijlagen IV», pp. 3-5. In the edition here referred to there is a French translation of this decree. See: Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle* (see above, n. 243), pp. 369-370.

Boreel's scientific interests and his financial problems

So far it has been shown that Boreel's main interests between 1639 and 1654 were related to the Jewish and Christian religions: he committed to vocalize and to translate the Mishnah; he wrote works of an ecclesiological and theological nature, as well as works to make easier the understanding of the Jewish traditions; he founded the Amsterdam College, where his theoretical ideas found a practical use. However, Boreel's interests were not only related to religious subjects, but he also paid some attention to the scientific world. On the one hand, it seems that for a while he was fascinated with alchemical and chemical experiments; on the other, he studied optics and he learned how to grind lenses.

In order to discuss these activities, first it is necessary to examine the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt, van Dr. Galenus Abrahamsz*, since it is the main source of information concerning Boreel's interests in scientific topics. Here it is possible to read that Boreel needed to find a way to curry favor with kings and political leaders, in order to found his Church of Connivance. This is the reason why he tried to achieve «de overghebleven vrucht van de Boom des Levens, die eertijds in het Paradijs van Eden stondt, welcke by dese natuer ondersoekers den Goudt-steen, ghenamt werdt».²⁸⁹ In short, in order to achieve support for his religious Reform, Boreel tried to make the elixir of the eternal life, which sometimes is identified with the Philosopher's Stone, that is the higher purpose of the alchemists.²⁹⁰ However, continues the author of the pamphlet, not only did Boreel fail in his attempt, but he also used all his money in the searching for the «Goudt-steen». So, he was forced to go

²⁸⁹ «Doch alsoo hy de Kerck der oogh-luyckinge oock onder de oogh-luyckinge van koningen en Princen most oprechten / soo wist hy wel dat hy yets most hebben / 't gheen hem voor een credentie-brief soude verstrecken / om by haer aengangh en kredijt te bekomen: om nu den wegh in te slaen van mirakelen te willen doen / daer toe wash y niet fantastijck ghenoech / weshalven hy / soo men uyt waerschijnelicke reden oordeelt / door natuer-weet socht uyt te vinden / de overghebleven vrucht van de Boom des Levens / die eertijds in het Paradijs van Eden stondt / welcke by dese natuer ondersoekers den Goudt-steen, ghenamt werdt / en soo men seght / kracht heeft om den mensche langher frisser en jeughdigher te doen leven / waer door hy ghewisselick die aerdsche Goden, eer tot sich soude ghetrocken hebben». *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2v.

²⁹⁰ Using these assertions of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt*, Ruud Lambour says that «was Boreel oock alchemist en zocht hij het levenselixer om als dank van groten der aarde bescheming te verkrijgen voor zijn antikerkelijke religie van individuele bijbelinterpretatie». Lambour, *De alchemistische wereld van Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 23), p. 106.

back to his home without any result and his disciples had to take care of him.²⁹¹

When Boreel understood that he could not achieve the elixir of the eternal life, he decided to «seer groote en klare brillen te maecken, met de welcke men in de Maen als in andere werelden soude kunnen sien». The author of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* asserts that Boreel committed to this new activity because he hoped to gain the respect of kings and princes once again, so that they would help him to foster his religious ideas.²⁹²

So, from the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* three main conclusions about Boreel's life can be drawn: he had some kind of alchemical knowledge and he tried to create the Philosophical stone; he studied optics and he learned how to grind lenses; because of his alchemical experiments he had financial problems and his disciples had to provide for him. Let us examine each one of these assertions.

As for Boreel's alchemical activities, it must be underlined that the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* is the only source to make such assertions. There are other circumstances that can testify Boreel's interest in alchemical or chemical topics, but in the end none of these is sufficient proof to argue that Boreel practiced alchemical or chemical experiments.

First, in his last will Boreel mentioned a little furnace made of stone and a big kiln made of steel, two instruments that could have been useful to do alchemical or chemical experiments. Therefore, it is possible to argue that Boreel could have practiced alchemy or chemistry. However, as Ruud Lambour rightly underlines, Boreel was not the owner of those instruments. From the codicil dated May 31, 1665, it is clear that Galenus Abrahamsz was the owner of both the «oventje» and the «kachel», and that Boreel had them

²⁹¹ «Doch hy en heeft de plaets van het Paradijs niet konnen vinden / om de vruchten aldaer op te rapen / die van den Boom des Levens waren overghebleven / en men ghelooft dat hy al sijn teer-geldt / da thy hadde op den wech tot roock geconsumeert hebbende / met de ledighe beurse t' huys ghekomen is / soo dat sijn discipelen (nader binnens monds wordt ghemompelt) nu al langh hebben dienen sorghe voor hem te dragen». *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2v-A3r.

²⁹² «Desen aenslagh van den koningen het leven te moghen verlangen misluekende / soo sloegh dien grooten geest / die niet rusten konde / een ander wech in / onder nemende seer groote en klare brillen te maecken / met de welcke men in de Maen / als in andere werelden / soude kunnen sien». *Ibid.*, p. A3r.

in his rooms only because he spent his last months in the same house where Galenus had previously lived.²⁹³

Second, in his letter of November 14, 1646, Boreel says to Dury that he knew that his «planta illa acque» and the «optici mei tubi» were in the hands of Hartlib. Since there was no hope to use that «aqua illa», Boreel asked Dury to give back those objects that he left with him when the Scottish theologian was in Rotterdam, that is «illud scriptum [...] una cum planta, opticos pariter tubos».²⁹⁴ In the same day Boreel asked Hartlib for the same things.²⁹⁵ Once he got Boreel's letter, Dury wrote to Hartlib, saying that Boreel wanted back «the papers which I left with yow bound up; concerning the water which Cureth stinking waters; & that his optically glasses which are in the bagge hee will give yow directions how to dispose of».²⁹⁶

From the three letters here quoted it is possible to conclude that the «planta aquae» and the «scriptum» which Boreel referred to are related to a kind of liquid that was able to cure the «stinking waters». In order to better understand what Boreel and Dury were talking about, it is necessary to examine some extracts of letters concerning the «water purification», which are preserved in the Hartlib Papers.²⁹⁷

The first extract is related to a letter written in Rotterdam on May 4, 1645 and is entitled «Of the Experiment of Making Stinking Water Sweete». Here, the writer explains that during the long travels by sea the water that was carried in the ship tended to get a very bad smell and taste. However, one of

²⁹³ «In dit codicil komt onder meer de intrigerende zin voor dat een stenen oventje dat in huis stond, evenals de grote ijzeren kachel in de kamer waar hij lag, niet van hemzelf was maar van Galenus, die het daar bij zijn verhuizing had laten staan». Lambour, *De alchemistische wereld* (see above, n. 23), p. 111. In the previous pages Lambour shows that Boreel on May 1665 lived in the same house where Galenus used to live: «Volgens de notaris aan wie hij [Boreel] op 30 en 31 mei 1665 kort voor zijn dood zijn laatste wil dicteert, woont hij dan op de Prinsengracht tegenover de Reebrug. Vanaf dit adres, waar zoals straks zal blijken eerder Galenus zelf had gewoond [...]». Ibid., p. 109.

²⁹⁴ «Planta illa aquae et optici mei tubi in manibus Dn. Hartlibii sunt, ut a te et ab illo intellexi. Si spes nulla sit aqua illa sibi utendi, pace tua scriptum illud ab eo repetam una cum planta, opticos pariter tubos, quos putavi potius apud te relinqui debere Roterodami usque ad reversionis meae tempus quam absque necessitate inde non sine molestia recuperare». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 252.

²⁹⁵ «Si commodum ac tutum fuerit tubos meos opticos aliaque per D.Duraeum apud se deposita mihi remittere, gratum mihi erit». Ibid., p. 254.

²⁹⁶ HP 3/3/60B.

²⁹⁷ «Extracts on Water Purification in Scribal Hand B, Worsley &?», 14 May 1645 – 28 May 1648, in HP 71/15/1A-2B.

his friends had «a rare secret to clense the watter in a moment and by a meanes that is very healthfull, soe that in sea voyages all those that drinke watter may put some thereof in their Cupp and soe preserve their health». So, the writer asks the person he was speaking to how much the East India Company and the West India Company would have paid for such secret. This supposed gain, the writer continues, would be useful for the public good, since «hee that hath the secrett is wholly bent to advance religious aimes and would spend what he getteth upon that object of Gods glory, which is most eminent viz: to further the converssion of the Iewes and the Gentiles instruction». In Middelburg the author of the letter had been able to deal with this person who owned «the invention to cure stinking waters» and he had got his consent to deal with anyone who could have been interested in the use of such an invention. In order to guarantee the efficacy of such a secret, the writer says also that he had seen many experiments about it and that he believes that this liquid would have been much useful for the well-being of those who had to make long travels by sea.²⁹⁸

If we compare these assertions with the previous letters of Boreel and Dury, it is evident that the invention to cure stinking waters must be identified with those papers that Boreel asked back from Dury and Hartlib. Furthermore, it is clear that the writer of the letter of May 4, 1645, is John Dury and that Boreel was the one who owned that «secret». Since Dury lived in Rotterdam between May 1644 and August 1645, he must have discussed with Boreel about the «water which cureth stinking waters» within this period.²⁹⁹

After Boreel asked for his papers concerning this invention back, Hartlib sent them to him and for some time no one talked about it anymore.³⁰⁰

²⁹⁸ HP 71/15/1A.

²⁹⁹ From a letter of September 8, 1644, it is possible to conclude that Dury and Boreel were in contacts while the former lived in Rotterdam. As a matter of fact, in this epistle Dury says to Hartlib that «the last weeke Mr. Boreel & Dr. Iustinus ab Aschen came from Zeeland of purpose to see me & conferre with me». HP 3/2/57A. For Dury's staying in Rotterdam, see: Young, *Durie, John* (see above, n. 126).

³⁰⁰ From the extract of Mat 4/14, 1648, it can be assumed that the inventor of this prodigious cure took his invention back and tried to make use of it without success. In this letter Worsley wrote: «for the Alexipharmacum, against stinking watter, I weighing it's singular property in ressisting of putrefaction iudged that it very probably might prove a very great secret in medicina, in fevers, by its seperating energy, in breaths that are ill smelling and in putrifid ulcers and therefore was for the translations sake very desirous of it, which I

However, around May 4/14 Worsley was instructed to make a final test of that invention and so to prove its real efficacy. In that day Worsley went to «Mr. M» and «Mr. B.», probably Moriaen and Boreel, but our author was not willing to go with them to the inventor of the supposed cure, since the latter was «a man it seems that doth Heretoclitum Caput gerere». Nevertheless, Worsley was confident that such invention would have been very useful.³⁰¹

However, Worsley's confidence was about to vanish soon. In the extract of May 8/28, 1648, he gives a very negative opinion about that invention. He says that thanks to «Mr. Borrells» he had been able to have access to that supposed cure and to make some experiments about it. The outcome of these trials was negative, since he discovered that the it was not a cure but a poisonous liquid instead. Therefore, he had paid homage to God's Providence, because they did not do any business with that invention before. Furthermore, Worsley adds that he and Moriaen were much angered with the inventor of that poisonous liquid, but not with Boreel, «who was not aware of the Inconvenience of it and therefore take noe further notice of it seing I am soe farre from being injured».³⁰²

From the history of this «water that cure stincking waters» it is possible to conclude that Boreel had some interest about subjects that to some extent were related to alchemy and chemistry. The invention that provoked the interest of Boreel and of the Hartlib's circle is called a secret many times, and it seems to have all the features of those experiments between alchemy and chemistry characterizing the 17th century. Moreover, Worsley seems to suggest that Boreel owned some instruments useful to make experiments or that at least he had a room suitable for this kind of experiment. As a matter of fact, Worsley clearly says that he was able to prove the deceit of the «cure of stincking water» in Boreel's «chamber».³⁰³ However, it is also evident that

thought the more reasonable in regard of the inventor, who being not soe much as a pretender to learning knew not how to philosophize upon it (which is apparent seeing he never put to it any other use) and having tried all the wayes to make benefit off it, and in noe kingdome succeeding, might the easier and the more justly bee willing to part with it». HP 71/15/1B.

³⁰¹ Ibid.

³⁰² HP 71/15/2A-B.

³⁰³ «The Cure of stincking water, I now know and without *the* injunction or sacrament of secrecy, having found it out myselfe, by Mr. Borrells favour in giving me leave first to taste it, and after upon a suspicion to make a proof or 2 of it myselfe in his chamber» Ibid.

Boreel was not the inventor of that cure. His interest in this invention can be related to the economic gain that he and those who were part of the Hartlib's Circle thought they could make out of it. Moreover, he was not even able to understand that it was only a deceit, which Worsley immediately understood as soon as he was able to make some experiments with it. So, we have to conclude that either Boreel was a very bad alchemist and chemist, or that he was not an alchemist and chemist at all.

In conclusion, as for Boreel's alchemical activities that are described in the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt*, we have to be very careful. On the one hand, this pamphlet is the only source upon which it is possible to assert that Boreel was interested in alchemical and chemical subjects. The other sources that can be adduced do not seem to strengthen these assertions enough. On the other hand, we have to underline that not only the biographical data of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* are not always reliable, but also that the author of this pamphlet did not say that Boreel certainly practiced alchemical experiments, but that he heard some rumors about it and that he believed it was possible.³⁰⁴

As for the assertions suggesting that Boreel studied optics and that he learned how to grind lenses, there is strong evidence to prove them. In the letters of November 14, 1646, and of December 1, 1646, Boreel and Dury make reference to some «tubi optici» or «optical glasses». It is not clear what they refer to, but it can be supposed that Boreel created some telescopes and that he gave them to Dury, so that his Scottish friend could have examined and judged them. The missive that Worsley sent to Dury on July 27, 1649, proves this supposition. After he communicated the information about the Jews which Dury asked Moriaen and Boreel for, Worsley says that Boreel was not in Amsterdam, «being at Rotterdam learning to grind and make Persipicilla».³⁰⁵ Galileo Galilei coined the term *perspicillum* in the *Sidereus*

³⁰⁴ This I show I interpreted this passage: «soo men uyt waerschijnelicke reden oordeelt» inserita nel passo in cui vengono narrate le attività chimico-alchemiche a cui si sarebbe dedicato Boreel. *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2v.

³⁰⁵ HP 26/33/8B.

Nuncius and it indicates the telescope.³⁰⁶ Therefore, it is evident that Boreel studied optics, and that he learned how to grind lenses and how to make telescopes.

We do not know when Boreel began this kind of activities, but he continued to grind lenses until 1665. As a matter of facts, in his last will he mentions the lenses that he had already ground and those that needed to be finished: all his lenses had to be cleaned, organized, wrapped up, and described by an optician, so that it could have been possible to sell them.³⁰⁷

In conclusion, the assertions in the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* about Boreel activities concerning the optics and the grinding of lenses are true. Nonetheless, motivations to conduct such activities remain in doubt. The author of the pamphlet says that Boreel wanted to obtain assistance from kings and princes by making lenses through which it could have been possible to look «in alderen werelden», so that he could have founded his Church of Connivance.³⁰⁸ However, it is most likely that Boreel started to grind lenses and to make *perspicilla* to solve the financial problems that he had until 1654.

As a matter of fact, as for Boreel's economic situation, the assertions of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* are true. Or better still, they are true to the extent that they attest to Boreel's financial problems, even though it can be doubted about the reasons of these difficulties, which the author of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* related to Boreel's activities in the alchemical experiments. Anyhow, it is most sure that Boreel underwent economic difficulties during the 40s and in the first years of the 50s. In the missive dated August 31, 1646, after he had explained to Hartlib that Boreel would have translated the Mishnah into Latin, Dury says that our author did not have «such meanes of his owne as will beare the charges which are requisite in

³⁰⁶ «Quae omnia ope Perspicilli a me excogitati, divina prius illuminante gratia, paucis abhinc diebus, reperta atque observata fuerunt». Galileo Galilei, "*Sidereus Nuncius*", *traduzione e commento di Pietro A. Giustini*, Roma, 1978, p. 12.

³⁰⁷ «De lenzen, zowel gespleten als ongespleten, moesten door een brillenmaker zorgvuldig worden schoongemaakt, geordend, ingepakt en beschreven, om tezamen met het slijpbekken te worden verkocht». Lambour, *De alchemistischewereld* (see above, n. 23), p. 111.

³⁰⁸ *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A3r.

prosecuting this designe, yet there is hope that God will raise instruments to assist him».³⁰⁹

The letter that Boreel sent to Dury on November 14, 1646, confirm Dury's assertion and explain his financial problems in detail. Boreel had a debt of sixteen thousand florins. He would have paid a part of this debt by selling his library for six thousand florins.³¹⁰ However, he did not know how to pay the remaining ten thousand florins.³¹¹ Moreover, from the same epistle it can be concluded that Boreel's debt had been bigger: those Mennonite merchants who paid the expenses for the publishing of the vocalized Mishnah and other people had paid some of his debt before.³¹²

Because of his financial problems Boreel believed that he could not have left Holland. This assertion must be related to Dury and Hartlib's ideas about the employment of Boreel in their «agency for the universal learning». However, in his letter Boreel also suggested a plan to pay his debts. He thought that Dury and Hartlib could have tried to collect ten thousand florins in England. If they had succeeded and if he had paid his debts, afterwards Boreel would have repaid them in two ways: on the one hand, he would have renounced half of his salary for the activities that he would have done for Hartlib's agency; on the other, he would have pawned all the copies of his future Latin edition of the Mishnah.³¹³

³⁰⁹ HP 3/3/33B.

³¹⁰ Unfortunately, we have no documents concerning the selling of Boreel's library and so we do not have any kind of information about the books he owned, such as their subjects or their numbers. It is only possible to say that it was a very big library, since Boreel paid a debt of six thousand florins with it. Furthermore, on February 16, 1648, Johann Moriaen told to Hartlib that Boreel had «ein schöne Bibliotheca die auch in seinem furnehmen». HP 37/129A.

³¹¹ «Si debitis extricari possem, non hic haererem, sed Deo quae Dei sunt darem, et scopum meum prosequerem. At adhuc haereo defixus, adeo ut praeter debitum librorum, quod ad sex mille florenos excurrit (loquor de debito illo pro quo libri mei oppignorati sunt), praeter, inquam, debitum illud adhuc decem mille floreni requirantur, ut plane liber esse possim; ita usura sortem augmentavit et indies crescere facit». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 252.

³¹² «Hi ipsimet a debitis effraenatum [?] me liberarunt aliisque incommodis, at debitorum meorum sors adhuc illibata est, quamvis per eos similesque alios occasio mihi oblata sit usuram quorundam solvendi». Ibid.

³¹³ «Si mihi in oris vestris occasio sese offerat, ut decem mille florenis illis mihi praestitis hinc evolare possem, tunc libros meos venderem ad sex mille florenos illos dissolvendos et ad vos excurrerem ea conditione, ut si exempli gratia mihi mille floreni quotannis pro salario suppeditentur, ut, inquam, singulis annis mihi detrahant medium eorum partem, qua victitare satis potero; reliquum autem ipsis solverem per oppignorationem

However, Boreel's plan failed and in the following years he continued to deal with his financial problems. For instance, on October 29, 1647, Moriaen told Hartlib that Boreel was afraid of poverty, which burdened him.³¹⁴ Moreover, on February 10, 1648, Moriaen explained to Hartlib that Boreel in that period was in Leiden to print the catalogue of his books and so he was at that moment far from his creditors.³¹⁵

Afterwards, Boreel's situation did not change. In 1650 he had sold his library and he had paid his debt of six thousand florins, but he still had the other ten thousand florins to pay. This is the reason why on February 8, 1650, in order to suggest some way to repay his creditors, Dury advised Boreel to publish his writings concerning the Mishnah and the Jewish traditions. With the profits from these books he could have paid his creditors.³¹⁶ In addition, on June 5, 1651, Dury explained that he had not been able to help Boreel, probably because of the historical circumstances that were occurring in that period in England.³¹⁷

There are no other references to Boreel's economic situation. However, it can be assumed that in the end he found a way to pay all his debts, since at the end of 1654 he was able to leave Holland and he move to England, where he lived for four years.

omnium exemplarium versionis latinae τὸν Mischnaiot, sive solarum sive cum commentariis rabbinorum». Ibid., pp. 252-253.

³¹⁴ «Die persohn ist Mons. Boreel und mir woll bekant und nicht weit vom Reich Gottes wie es scheint aber die furcht *der* armuth ist ein groszer Stein den ein iedweder nicht vom grab seines herzens walzen kan». HP 37/123B.

³¹⁵ «Monsr Boreel ist vor wenig tagen nach Leyden gezogen Catalogum Librorum suorum druckhen zuelaszen demnach seine creditores nicht lōnger zusehen sondern gegen den Maj dieselbe verkauffen wollen». HP 37/129A. In the same letter Moriaen says that Boreel would have gone from Leiden to Rotterdam, without explaining the reason.

³¹⁶ «Miratus sum débita tua adhuc ad X millia florenos excrescere post venditionem bibliothecae tuae. Annon oportebit transigere cum creditoribus ante tuum discessum? Vel an relinques ea quae imprimentur ex scriptis tuis de Misnajot in solutionem istius debiti?». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 257.

³¹⁷ «Domino Borelio cui adhuc responsum debeo ad ultimam quam mihi misit, salutem in Domino dicas: angor quod nostra hoc in loco molimina circa id quod ejus Scopo conducibile est tam sint tarda; sed Deum respicere oportet qui omnia omnium rerum et temporum momenta in sua habet manu». HP 17/7/5B. We do not know who was the recipient of Dury's letter. The curator of the Hartlib Papers identifies this person with Samuel Hartlib, but there are two proofs against this identification. First, in his letter Dury mentions Hartlib in the third person. Second, in their letters Dury and Hartlib always spoke in English, not in Latin. For the same reasons I believe that Dury did not sent this letter to Worsley. Since this recipient was an acquaintance of Boreel and since Dury wrote it in Latin, we can assume that he sent it to Johannes Moraien, who communicated in Latin with his English acquaintances.

Chapter IV: 1655 – 1665

In the previous chapter it has been shown that between 1639 and 1654 Boreel pursued various activities. First, his studies and his interest in the Jews and in their traditions had a first outcome in the vocalized edition of the Mishnah, which was the result of the collaboration between Boreel and the rabbi Jacob Judah Leon. Thanks to this edition our author became a major figure among those who belonged to the Hartlib Circle and he became part of Hartlib's plan for the creation of an «agency for universal learning». Second, in the same years Boreel further developed his theological and ecclesiological ideas, and he published ALAT, his most famous work, which caused a dispute between him, Samuel Desmarets and Johannes Hoornbeeck. Third, Boreel put into practice his ideas and he founded the Amsterdam College. Finally, it has been showed that Boreel had some interests also in the new sciences. In particular, he could have been interested in some subjects related to the alchemical and chemical world, and he learned both how to grind lenses and how to create telescopes.

This last chapter covers the years between 1655 and 1665, when Boreel died. This chapter too is divided into sections each one dealing with a separate subject according to the main events of Boreel's life at that time. In particular, there are five sections. The first examines Boreel's second stay in England, where he lived between the end of 1654 and the beginning of 1659. The second section deals with the history of the writing of the *Jesus Nazarenus Legislator*, a work that Boreel began when he was in London and that at the end he could not finish. The third point concerns Boreel's interests in the Jewish world once again. Between 1659 and 1665 he committed to the translation of the Mishnah, as well as to the creation of a *societas* that had to make easier the conversion of the Jews. The fourth section deals with the history of the Amsterdam College. The meetings of the Collegiants kept going during Boreel's absence and, when he returned from England, he started again to attend the College that he founded more than ten years before. Finally, the last section examines the last months of Boreel's life.

Boreel's stay in London

In the previous chapters, it has been shown that Boreel had deep relationships in England. He went to England for the first time during the years 1625-26 and afterwards he became acquainted with many English scholars. Not only was one of his closest friends John Dury, a Scottish theologian, but he was also member of the Hartlib Circle. Hartlib himself knew Boreel and thanks to Dury's suggestions the German-English intelligencer decided to employ Boreel in his plans for the advancement and the propagations of Jewish studies, even though in the end those plans failed. These deep connections with the English world were strengthened in the last decade of Boreel's life. As a matter of fact, between the end of 1654 and the beginning of 1655 he went to England, where he lived for four years. During this time, not only did he strengthen his acquaintance with Hartlib, but he also became friends with people like Henry Oldenburg, Robert Boyle, and Walter Strickland.

In April 1656 Henry Oldenburg, a German scholar who had settled down in England during Cromwell's Commonwealth, a friend and the closest partner of Robert Boyle,³¹⁸ as well as future secretary of the Royal Society, sent a letter to Boreel, in which he complained about Boreel's absence. When they were both in London they used to meet regularly, but then Oldenburg went to Oxford and he could not enjoy Boreel's company anymore.³¹⁹

³¹⁸ Robert Boyle was a chemist, physicist, philosopher, and theologian, as well as one of the most famous scientists of the 17th century. For further information, see: Agostino Lupoli, *La corpuscolar philosophy di Robert Boyle*, Linate, 1980; Michael Hunter (ed.), *Robert Boyle by himself and his friends: with a fragment of William Wotton's lost "Life of Boyle"*, London, 1994; Michael Hunter (ed.), *Robert Boyle reconsidered*, Cambridge, 1994; Michael Hunter & Edward B. Davis (ed.), *The Works of Robert Boyle*, 14 vols., London, 1999-2000; Michael Hunter, *Robert Boyle, 1627-91: Scrupolosity and Science*, Woodbridge, 2000; Michael Hunter, Antonio Clericuzio, & Lawrence M. Principe (ed.), *The correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 6 vols., London, 2001; Michael Hunter, *The Boyle Papers: understanding the manuscripts of Robert Boyle*, Aldershot, 2007; Michael Hunter, *Boyle: Between God and Science*, New Haven, 2009; Joseph Agassi, *The very idea of modern science*, Dordrecht, 2013; Salvatore Ricciardo, *Robert Boyle: un naturalista scettico*, Brescia, 2016.

³¹⁹ «Si fas est studia tua piissima interpellare, Doctissime et Conjunctissime Domine Borelli, significare tibi lubet, me non incolumem modo appulisse Oxonium, sed etiam ad ibi commorandum sollicitari. Nil me magis urit, quam a latere tuo divelli. Hoc interim levamentum est, animos divortium non pati. De meo equidem in te studio securum te esse velim, de tuo in me affectu reciproco dubitare nefas judico». A.R. Hall & M.B. Hall (ed.), *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, vol. I, Madison-Milwaukee, 1965, p. 89. For further information about Henry Oldenburg, see: A.R. Hall & M.B. Hall (ed.), *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, XIII vols., Madison-Milwaukee, 1965-1986; Marie

Although it is impossible to understand the circumstances of their first meeting, Oldenburg himself explains where and how he met Boreel. On July 25, 1657, Oldenburg wrote to Menasseh ben Israel. At the beginning of his letter Oldenburg reminds the rabbi about the circumstances of their first meeting, explaining that they met in England, when Ben Israel was in London to plead for the return of the Jews to England and when Oldenburg went to his house with Edward Lawrence, president of Cromwell's council. After these first meetings, continues Oldenburg, he and Ben Israel continued to meet, especially «apud Dominum Borrelium».³²⁰ So, Boreel was in London when Menasseh ben Israel was there too. While he was in England, Boreel met Oldenburg, who was able to continue to enjoy Ben Israel's company thanks to Boreel.³²¹

From Oldenburg's assertions it is impossible to determine when Boreel settled down in London, how much time he spent there, and the reasons why he decided to move to England. As for the first question, it is evident that Boreel was in London at the end of 1655. On December 18, 1655, Dury wrote to Hartlib from Kassel, where he was living at that time, and he sent his regards to Boreel. Moreover, he asked Hartlib to tell Boreel that he would be «gladde to heare from him before hee goes out of England, as I am

Boas Hall, *Henry Oldenburg: shaping the Royal Society*, Oxford, 2002; Marie Boas Hall, «Oldenburg, Henry [Heinrich] (c.1619-1677)», in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies*, Oxford, 2004; Iordan Avramov, «The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg and circulation of objects at the early Royal Society of London, 1660-1677», in Andrea Galdy & Sylvia Heudecker (ed.), *Collecting Nature*, Cambridge, 2014.

³²⁰ «Cum persuasum habeam, Vir Clarissime, necdum deposuisse te memoriam mei, qui subinde tecum, cum in Anglia essem, conversabar, litteras hasce (gravi imprimis, ut mox intelliges, occasione data) tanto liberius ad te scribere potui. In mentem duntaxat tibi revoces, oro, quod filius natu maximus illustrissimi Laurentii, qui Domini Protectoris Consilio praesidet, in hospitio tuo semel atque iterum te visitabat uno solo comitatus qui ego eram; ubi non tamen perhumaniter nos excipiebas, sed et libello tuo, qui rationes exponit gentis vestrae in Angliam recipiendae liberaliter utrumque nostrum donabas. Dehinc aliquoties tum apud Dominum Borrelium, tum apud nobilissimam illam et piissimam Dominam Ranalaugh tuae consuetudine sum usus». Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), pp. 123-124.

³²¹ From Oldenburg's letters it is possible to draw two other evidences about Boreel's stay in England. First, on August 25, 1660, Oldenburg wrote to Boreel, saying that he often prayed God so that his Dutch friend «tandem aliquando ad nos redire» ed «in hisce te oris domicilium tuum figere». In addition, on September 1660 Oldenburg wrote again to Boreel, wishing that he «denuo excurrere ad nos posses et in hac regionem sedem tuam figere». See: *Ibid.*, pp 381-382 e 390-393.

told hee has some purpose so to doe».³²² Hence, Boreel was not only in London on December 18, 1655, but he was also planning to leave England.

From Dury and Hartlib's correspondences it is possible to place Boreel's arrival in London to the end of 1654.

First, on April 1654 Boreel was still living in Amsterdam and he was planning a journey to Constantinople. As a matter of fact, on December 9, 1654, Dury wrote to Hartlib from Zurigo, defending Boreel from some charges of Socinianism. In his letter he says to Hartlib that last time they spoke in Amsterdam Boreel explained to his Scottish friend «his sense of the doctrine of the Trinitie which had no affinitie to what the Socinians hold of that mysterie; for hee did explaine his conception so as to confesse plainly the mysterie which they do denye». As for Boreel's journey to Constantinople, Dury says to Hartlib that he is not able to explain how this trip would be possible considering «his [Boreel] other occasions». It is not clear what Dury refers to. Perhaps he was talking about Boreel's financial problems.³²³ Anyhow, since Dury went to the Dutch Republic on April 1654, it must be concluded that at that time Boreel was still living in Amsterdam.³²⁴

Second, in the letters that Dury wrote to Hartlib between the end of 1654 and 1655 he often asked his German-British friend to give his regards

³²² HP 4/3/139A.

³²³ «I neuer knew Mr Boreel to bee a Socinian, nor did I belieue him to bee one although I knew him to bee as much for Moderation as any; but hee that doth admit of Iacob Bohemæ his Principles which I belieued him to doe, can not bee guiltie of Socinianisme; but I am gladde that he hath purged himself from that suspicion; & in his conuersation last with me at Amsterdam, hee tooke occasion to let me know his sense of the Doctrine of the Trinitie which had no affinitie to what the Socinians hold of that Mysterie; for hee did explaine his Conception so as to confesse plainly the Mysterie which they do denye. Concerning his going to Constantinople with Maior Salloway; I know not how it will sute with his other occasions; & how hee will bee able to dispose of his workes which hee doth leaue behind him; otherwise it may bee a wished for occasion to let him see those parts & make an estimat of the way how propagat the Gospell in those quarters of the world». HP 4/3/65A-B.

³²⁴ Hartlib himself describes Dury's travel in Europe between 1654 and 1657. In his work Hartlib says: «then the peace being happily concluded between England and the United Provinces, on the fifth day of Aprill, 1654, Master Dury having gotten his Highness the Lord Protectors approbation and countenance, for the continuance of his design op pacification amongst protestants, and having obtained the assistance of the two universities, and of the chief ministers in and about London, to concurre with him in his endeavours, he went from London on the foresaid day of April; and through the Low-Countries, and a par of High Germany, hee came to Zurich in Switzerland on the eighteenth day of May». [Samuel Hartlib], *A summarie account of Mr. John Dury's former and latter negotiation: for the procuring of true Gospell peace, with christian moderation and charitable unity amongst the protestant churches, and academies*, London, 1657, p. 24.

to Boreel.³²⁵ In the epistles that Dury sent to Hartlib between April 1654, when he left England to go to Switzerland, and November of the same year there are neither references to Boreel, nor regards for him. So, it can be argued that Boreel moved to London between October and November 1654, and that this is the reason why Dury started to send his regards to him on November 23, 1654, when Boreel had the chance to meet Hartlib regularly.

On the other hand, it can also be argued that Dury's regards for Boreel in this letter to Hartlib are not sufficient proof to determine that our author went to England in November 1654. However, we must examine the possible reasons why Boreel decided to move to London.

First, it may have been due to the difficulties that he and his group of collegiants had to face because of the Reformed Church. These difficulties surely increased after the decree against the socinians that the General States issued in September 1653: since the Reformed ministers regarded the collegiants as socinians, it is clear that this decree made life difficult for all the Dutch Colleges. Moreover, from Dury's letter of December 9, 1654, it is evident that Boreel himself was charged with Socinianism. We do not know who accused him and if he was accused in front of the civil authorities, but there is no doubt that this was a serious charge. Since Boreel « hath purged himself from that suspicion», this could be a good reason why Boreel decided to leave the Dutch Republic.

Second, Boreel's financial problems may well have been one of the motives that could have urged him to leave his home country. It has been already shown that in 1646 Boreel thought to move to England in order to solve his economical situation. Moreover, Boreel expressed the desire to leave the Dutch Country more than once, but he could not leave until he had solved his financial problems.³²⁶ Since it seems that in the end Boreel was

³²⁵ For instance, at the end of the missive that he sent on November 23, 1654, Dury writes: «Remember my service to Mr. Borrell» (HP 4/3/62B). In a similar manner, on February 12, 1655, he says: «Remember me to Mr. Clodius & Boreel & all friends» (HP 4/3/76A). In addition, on April 14, 1655, Dury writes to Hartlib: «salute your Son Clodius from me: & Mr. Borrell & all friends» (HP 4/3/91A).

³²⁶ In addition to the journey to Constantinople, in the previous years Boreel expressed his desire to go abroad two times. On July 27, 1649, Worsley told Dury that Boreel was «halfe minded if j goe over to goe to Virginia». Furthermore, from Dury's letter to Boreel, dated February 8, 1650, it is possible to conclude that Boreel wanted to embark on a

able to pay off all his debts,³²⁷ it is possible to argue that finally he went to England, where many of his friends lived and where his intellectual skills as hebraist and theologian were particularly appreciated.

Anyhow, it has already been shown that Menasseh ben Israel went to London too, while Boreel was in England. Ben Israel's mission was to gain political support for the return of Jewish people to England. He certainly was moved by reasons of Messianic nature and he went to London in September 1655, in order to persuade Oliver Cromwell and his party to let the Jews return to the English territories.³²⁸ The Lord Protector called for a commission to discuss Ben Israel's ideas and proposals, a commission that is known as the «Whitehall conference». Even though the majority of the people who took part in this commission held millenaristic ideas, so they believed that the return of the Jews to England was a sign of their forthcoming conversion and of the coming of Christ's reign on earth, difficulties about the practical return of Jewish people arose during the sessions of the Whitehall conference. Therefore, Cromwell decided to give up the question for the moment and to discuss it again in the future. However, the Whitehall conference did not meet in the following months and no one raised the question of the Jews' return ever again.³²⁹

Among the problems that arose during the Whitehall conference, the question about the return of the Karaites was raised, who were a Jewish sect separated from the Rabbinic Judaism. They did not give any value to the oral tradition codified in the Talmud and subsequent works, because they believed that the divine commandments that God had given to Moses were all recorded in the written Torah. Some scholars of the 20th century believed that Boreel was the one, or at least one of those, who raised this question during the sessions of the Whitehall conference. So, the failure of this commission

journey to spread the Christian religion. For the two letters, see: HP 26/33/8B; Van der Wall, *The dutch hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), pp. 257.

³²⁷ There are no references to Boreel's debts after 1651.

³²⁸ For the historical background of these events, see: Richard Popkin, *Some aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges* (see above, n. 65), pp. 3-32.

³²⁹ Henry Jessey describes the events related to the Whitehall conference in one of his work. See: Henry Jessey, *A Narrative of the late Proceeds at White-Hall, concerning the Jews, who had desired by R. Manasses and agent for them, that they might returne to England, and worship the God of their Fathers here in their Synagogues, etc.*, London, 1656.

was also Boreel's fault. For instance, in one of his works, Richard Popkin argues that «just before last meeting of the commission in December 1655, Boreel, who was in London at the time, raised the question as to whether the Caraites also should be readmitted».³³⁰ Other scholars made the same assertion according to Popkin's words.³³¹

Popkin founded his assertion on a letter of Hartlib, dated December 12, 1655. In his Epistle he writes to John Worthington:³³² «This day is the great Meeting about the Jews, but I had rather hear the issue from your relations, than give it to you. I suppose pur friends that are members of it will write freely and impartially of that business. I am for Mr. Borels Judaical studies and undertaking and that the Caraites might be invited hither and encouraged, being such as begin to look towards their engraffing again».³³³ On closer inspection, from Hartlib's words it is impossible to conclude both that Boreel raised the question concerning the return of the Karaite sect and that his opinion was that the Karaites had to return to England together with all the other Jewish people. As a matter of fact, it can be argued that the opinion suggesting that «the Caraites might be invited hither and encouraged, being such as begin to look towards their engraffing again» was Hartlib's opinion, not Boreel.

In order to support this conclusion, another letter of Hartlib can be taken into consideration. After the Whitehall conference failed and the possibility for the forthcoming return of the Jews to England faded away, Hartlib and Worthington continued to talk about the return of the Jewish people, discussing also the possible return of the Karaites. On February 26, 1656, Worthington asked Hartlib what Boreel thought about the Karaite sect. This letter is lost, but in his answer Hartlib says that he did not know «of any

³³⁰ Popkin, *Some aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges* (see above, n. 65), pp. 15-16.

³³¹ For instance, see: Van der Wall, *The dutch hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), pp. 249; Rob Iliffe, *Jesus Nazarene Legislator* (see above, n. 22), pp. 375-396.

³³² Born in 1618 in Manchester, Worthington was a Cambridge Platonist. He was an active correspondent of Samuel Hartlib and other English intellectuals. He died in 1671. For more information, see: James Crossley (ed.), *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, Vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge, etc.*, 3 vols. Manchester, 1847-1886; J.T. Young, «John Worthington», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

³³³ Crossley (ed.), *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. I, pp. 78-79.

course which Mr. Borel takes about the Caraites». This is the reason why he wanted «Mr. Dury to give me his advice about them and to resolve the Case of Conscience which he hath done as you will find in the adjoined packets».³³⁴ So, if on December 12, 1655, Hartlib had known Boreel's opinion about the Karaites and if it had been Boreel who had raised the question about them in the Whitehall conference, then on February 26, 1656, Hartlib would not have said that he did not know «of any course» which Boreel was considering about the Karaites.

However, this does not mean that Boreel was not interested in Ben Israel's mission. On the contrary, since Boreel and the rabbi had known each other at least since 1645-46, when they published the vocalized edition of the Mishnah; since Boreel, Ben Israel, Oldenburg, and others met often at Boreel's house; since Boreel had deep interests for Jewish people and their traditions; it is most likely that our author discussed with his English friends about the return of the Jews to England. In order to strengthen this hypothesis, it is possible to take into account the fact that some people wished to know Boreel's opinion about this question. It has already been shown that Worthington asked Hartlib what Boreel thought about the Karaites. Dury as well had asked Hartlib Boreel's opinion before Worthington did. Shortly after the Whitehall conference failed, on December 18, 1655, Dury wrote to Hartlib. In his letter he says that he was in favour of the return of the Jews to England, provided that «the meanes to deale with them for their Conuersion were also thought upon». Furthermore, in the following lines Dury mentions Boreel and asks Hartlib what their Dutch friend thought about this issue.³³⁵ In

³³⁴ Ibid., pp. 83-84.

³³⁵ «Concerning the admission of the Iewes I belieue that in your warre with Spaine they may bee of use to the state; the restraints that are laid upon them are necessary; but I wish that the meanes to deale with them for their Conuersion were also thought upon; to lette them see that the Messias is reuealed to us, & hath brought us gentiles to the father according to the Prophesie of Iacob that to him belongeth the gathering <of> the people Genes. 49. 10. & in dealing with them I would aduise that all wherin wee & they doe agree for the worshipping of God in spirit & truth should bee made out from Moses & the Prophets & shewed that this is the only worship which the father requires, & that the Messias is come to teach us Gentiles aswell as their forefathers this truth, & that this hauing beene foretold that hee should doe this to us; & this now beeing done, which could bee done by none but by him, it is euident that hee is come in his spirit to us, & that it is his purpose by us to shew mercy unto them also & to bring us all in one fold together to his father. what doth Mr Borell say of the way of dealing with him? I pray salute him from me, & tell him I would bee gladd to heare from him before hee goes out of England, as I am told hee has some purpose so to doe». HP 4/3/138B – 4/3/139A.

conclusion, Boreel was certainly interested in Menasseh ben Israel's mission in London, but it cannot be argued that he raised the question about the Karaites, which in the end led to the failure of the Whitehall conference.

We do not know much about Boreel's activities in England during his stay. As we will see later, Boreel started to write his *Jesus Nazarenus Legislator* while he was in London. However, this is all we can say. From the biographical data that is available it is impossible to determine what Boreel did when he was in England or if he always stayed in London.

As for Boreel's return to the Dutch Republic, it is possible to argue that he moved again to his home country in the first months of 1659.

First, it has already been shown that Boreel wanted to leave England at the end of 1655, even though we do not know why. However, he did not leave England either in December 1655, nor in the following months. On the contrary, it can be argued that he stayed in London at least until the beginning of 1657. In order to support this assertion, we can produce a missive that Oldenburg sent to Boreel on January 24, 1657. In his letter the German scholar assures Boreel about the security and the secrecy of their letters, mentioning Hartlib as their middle-man.³³⁶ Furthermore, in the final lines of his letter Oldenburg sends his regards to Boreel, to John Dury's wife and to Boreel's «cognatae».³³⁷ So, it is evident that Oldenburg, who at that time lived in Oxford, believed that Hartlib was able to give Boreel's letters to Oldenburg

³³⁶ «Si quid in me fuerit, quo tibi esse usui laborem tuum levare possim, qualecunque sit audacter tibi deposcas. Litterarum nostrarum satis tutum fore commentum credo, si Hartlibio nostro sub tegumento commendentur. Scripsi ad esum hoc nomine ut mihi significet, num hoc nobis officium sine incommodo praestare possit». Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), p. 115.

³³⁷ «Salutem plurimam tibi adscribit filius Dominae Ranalaugh; Eam quoque ut ex me Dominae Durae et cognatae tuae deferas enixe rogo. Vale». Ibid. It is not clear who Oldenburg refers to with the terms «cognatae tuae». He had used the same words in his previous letter of April 1656, where Oldenburg writes: «et cognatam tuam laetissimam plurimum ex me saluta» (Ibid., p. 90). Perhaps, in these two letters Oldenburg refers to the same person who is mentioned in two epistles that Boreel sent to Dury. On August 10, 1660, he wrote to his Scottish friend: «Oeconomam meam officiosam tibi salutem dicit». Likewise, in November 1660 Boreel was organizing Dury's arrival in Amsterdam, since his Scottish friend was forced to leave England after the Restoration. So, on November 22, 1660, after he told Dury that Serrarius lived again «op de printze gracht, by de brouwerve van't roode hert», he wrote to his Scottish friend: «tuas per oeconomam tradendas curavi, quae mecum juxta tibi omnique familiae tuae omnia ab omni boni auctore Deo felicia precatur». However, I was not able to identify the *oekonomam* who both Oldenburg and Boreel refer to. For Boreel's letters, see: Van der Wall, *The dutch hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 259-260.

and viceversa. Although this is not sufficient proof to determine that Boreel was still in London in January 1657, the mention of Dury's wife in Oldenburg's letter could strengthen this hypothesis. As a matter of fact, Dury left his wife in England when he went to Switzerland in 1654. Therefore, Boreel could only have given Oldenburg's regards to her if he had been in England too.³³⁸ On the other hand, it can also be argued that none of these two circumstances are adequate proof that Boreel was still in London in January 1657. However, even though each circumstance is not sufficient when considered individually, I believe that the combination of the two can give enough support to this hypothesis.

Second, it is possible to argue that Boreel left London in the first months of 1659 and that he moved back to the Dutch Republic. On May 5, 1659, Hartlib wrote Worthington: «[...] the author of ad Legem et Testimonium, who hath left above 200 copies of the Mishnaioth in my hands, of which I have not been able to sell one copy for him, so that I fear they must all be returned upon his hands».³³⁹ So, Boreel had left London before May 1659 and he had left some copies of the vocalized Mishnah with Hartlib, hoping that the latter would be able to sell them to his acquaintances.³⁴⁰ It must be assumed that Hartlib had tried to sell these copies for a few months before he decided to send them back to Boreel. Therefore, we can conclude that Boreel left London at least at the beginning of 1659.

³³⁸ «In 1652 he [Dury] spent three months accompanying a diplomatic mission to Sweden, and from 1654 to 1657 was continuously abroad, furnished with parliamentary funding and personal recommendations from Cromwell, visiting Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands. His wife, who was pregnant when he left, remained in England». Young, *Durie, John* (see above, n. 126).

³³⁹ Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), p. 131.

³⁴⁰ On August 10, 1660, Boreel wrote to Dury, explaining that he had received the copies he left to Hartlib in June or July of the same years: «Antequam ultimas tuas 13 July ad me datas accepi, redditi mihi fuerint libri תּוֹב Mischnajot. Gratias eo nomine habeo et tibi et amico nostro Hartlibio, quem per Dni. Moriani ad me literas intellexi filiae elocatione generum in familiam suam adscivisse, qui scipionis vice ipsi esse potest in vergente ejus aetate ac turbato hoc rerum statu, quapropter ei congratuler ac precor ut ex voto omnia succédant». Van der Wall, *The dutch hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 258. Furthermore, it is possible to argue that between May 1659 and July 1660 Hartlib sold some copies of the vocalized Mishnah. On January 1, 1661, he wrote to Worthington that he was forced «to send back unto him [Boreel] almost the whole impression of the Hebrew copy, there being few or none willing to buy any of them». Crossley, *The correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), p. 258.

As a matter of fact, in this same period Boreel was in Amsterdam. In April 1659 Lancelot van Brederode published the *Van de Apostasie*.³⁴¹ It seems that Van Brederode was in touch with Boreel and Galenus, but he had discussed his work with them before publishing it. This is the reason why Boreel and Galenus complained to Van Brederode and they told him that, if he had consulted them before, they would have advised him not to publish it.³⁴² Therefore, it is evident that in the spring of 1659 Boreel was living in Amsterdam again.

As for Boreel's reasons for leaving England, no information is available. However, it can be supposed that he decided to go back to the Dutch Republic because of Cromwell's death on September 3, 1658, and because of the problems that arose in the English Commonwealth after the succession of Richard Cromwell. In order to strengthen this hypothesis, we can examine one of Oldenburg's letter. Answering a previous question that Boreel had asked him, on December 13, 1660, Oldenburg told him that «*quae de reliquis familiae et amicorum Cromwelli scire cupis, non ita tuto literis mandantur*».³⁴³ Perhaps, Boreel was associated to a certain extent with Cromwell's family and with those who supported the Lord Protector. This was the opinion of the author of the *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt*, who wrote that in London Boreel lived in Walter Strickland's house.³⁴⁴ If so, it is likely that Boreel decided to leave England after Cromwell's death. This is the same reason why Dury was forced to leave his home country at the beginning of

³⁴¹ For more information, see later in this chapter.

³⁴² «Van tevoren had hij [Brederode] met niemand over de inhoud van zijn boek gesproken, maar enkele maanden na publicatie ervan had hij met onder meer Adam Boreel en Galenus Abrahamsz daarover "gecommuniceert". Die waen winig gelukkig geweest met de verschijning van zijn tractaat en zij hadden het ten zeerste betreurd dat hij er niet eerder met hen over gesproken had, want dan hadden zij hem stellig afgeraden het in deze vorm te publiceren». Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), p. 232.

³⁴³ Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), vol. I, p. 405. It is most likely that Boreel asked Oldenburg the same question that he had previously asked Dury. On August 10, 1660, the Scottish theologian wrote to Boreel: «*De Miltono et captivis, quid actum fuerit, aut agetur, proximis tuis mihi rescribes*». Van der Wall, *The dutch hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 259. It is not sure if «Miltono» who Dury refers to was John Milton.

³⁴⁴ «Want hy was van so grooten geest / dat sijn gedachten veel te hoogh ginghen / om een perticulier Prediker te zijn; altijd in 't hooft hebbende / niet alleen perticuliere ghemeenten / maer koninckrijcken en Volckeren te bekeeren. Is derhalven voor desen een tijdt langh gheweest by Whalter Stricklandt, recherthandt van Olivier Kromwel, welcken sijn Macker de Breen, Schrijver van de duysent-jarighe regeeringe / sustineerde dat de Paus soude uyt sijn zetel stoten / en Fondateur vande vijfde Monarchie zijn». *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2v.

1661, since he had given his support to Cromwell and to the Commonwealth.³⁴⁵

³⁴⁵ On February 26, 1661, Dury was already in the Dutch Republic, since Hartlib wrote to Worthington: «I cannot learn yet any satisfactory answer concerning Ainsworth, but Mr. D.[ury] being in the Low Countries will be able to give an account». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. I, p. 276. See also: Young, *Durie, John* (see above, n. 126).

The writing of the Jesus Nazareus Legislator

It has already been shown that during his stay in England Boreel met Henry Oldenburg. Soon they became friends and they kept in touch until Boreel's death. Their relationship was surely based upon the theological ideas that the two of them shared and upon the respect that Oldenburg had for Boreel, for his thought, and for his work. Furthermore, they started an Anglo-Dutch project in defense of the Christian religion. In particular, Oldenburg suggested that Boreel should have written a definitive defense of christianity, a work where he would have proved that only the Christian religion is true and that Christ is the legislator of mankind. Boreel accepted Oldenburg's suggestions and in the last decade of his life he worked on this project, but in the end he did not finish it. This work would have been entitled *Jesus nazareus humani generi universi legislator*.

In the letter that Oldenburg sent to Boreel in April 1656 the German scholar had one major aim: he wanted to acquaint Boreel with two *scrupuli* against the three revealed religions, *scrupuli* that he had heard about when he arrived in Oxford. In his letter he wrote:

Est, quod tibi, Vir optime, alterius impertiar. Injecti fuere nuper duo scrupuli, quibus eximendis operam tuam expeto. Prior est, Totam creationis historiam in ordine ad Sabbatum concinnatam videri, idque ex prudentia mere politica. Ad quid enim (ajebat objector) tam operosus tot dierum labor in Deo παντοκρατορι, cui ad nutum omnia, unoque momento obedire datum. Videtur legislator ille et princeps prudentissimus, Moses, historiam ex proposito contexisse, ut excitata in animis populi sui adnictione, certum aliquem diem sanciretur, in quo Numen illud invisibile publice et solemniter adorarent, et quique ab eodem numine ipse profectum diceret, eo majori cum obsequi<o> et reverentia observarent. Alter est, Mosen quidem movisse populum et stimulasse ad obediendum sibi et Fortiter pugnandum, spe et promissis adipiscendae praedae ditissimae et possessionum amplissimarum, multumque ea ratione promovisse Christum virum, Mose prudentiorem, illexisse suos spe vitae et felicitatis aeternae, gnarum, fieri haud posse, ut humile et abjectum quid sapiat animus aeternitatum serio cogitans. At Mahumetum, omnium callidissimum, tum hujus tum aeternae vitae bonis totum hominem penitus

occupasse sibi que devinxisse, ac proinde imperii sui fines multo laetius, quam ullus vel ante vel post eum legislator, protulisse. Vides, quam sibi licentiam sumat caro ratiocinandi: cui ut pro pietate et doctrina tua fibulam injicias, mihi que hic nonnihil laboranti manum porrigas, impense rogo.³⁴⁶

Oldenburg did not say who put forward these two *scrupuli*. Perhaps, we can identify those people with those who «solidioribus, quam aliis, studiis animos tradunt, et Theologiae Scholasticae et Nominalis philosophiae pertaesi». At the beginning of the letter Oldenburg describes them, saying that they were people who «rem ipsam et veritatem sectantur, judicantes insuper, non adeo senuisse mundum, nec aetatem nostram adeo effaetam, ut nihil magis memorabile progignere possit».³⁴⁷

Anyhow, it can be easily concluded from the above-mentioned quote that Oldenburg asked for Boreel's help twice to refute those *scrupoli*, as he was terrified of them.³⁴⁸ Against these ideas Boreel started to write his JNL. From Boreel and Oldenburg's point of view this work could have been the ultimate and highest defense of Christ and of his religion.

From Oldenburg's and Hartlib's correspondances it is possible to provide some information about the writing of the JNL. Furthermore, although Boreel was the one who actually wrote this work, it is possible to argue that both Oldenburg and Hartlib had a role in the shaping of the JNL.

First, in his letter to Boreel, dated January 24, 1657, Hartlib describes the major purpose of the JNL: in this work Boreel wanted to prove that religion has a divine origin and that God appointed no one but Jesus to be the only Legislator of mankind, because He gave him His authority.³⁴⁹ In

³⁴⁶ Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), pp. 89-90.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 89.

³⁴⁸ Oldenburg asked for Boreel's help both at the beginning and at the end of the passage quoted. At first he says: «Injecti fuere nuper duo scrupuli, quibus eximendis operam tuam expeto». In addition, at the end he underlines: «Vides, quam sibi licentiam sumat caro ratiocinandi: cui ut pro pietate et doctrina tua fibulam injicias, mihi que hic nonnihil laboranti manum porrigas, impense rogo». *Ibid.*, pp. 89-90.

³⁴⁹ «Si quid igitur tuus apud te Oldenburgius valet, ad duplex illud argumentum, quod in litteris memoras, quantocius te accingas, nec ullis nisi re confecta, rationibus inde te divelli patiaris. Etenim, originem religionis vere divinam esse, nec ullum a Deo, nisi <J>esum nostrum, constitutum esse totius humani generis legislatorem, duo tanti ponderis capita sunt, ut iis semel probe assertis firmatisque ne ullus quidem Hercules profanus contramoliri quicquam audeat». From the following lines it is possible to understand how Oldenburg appreciate Boreel and his work: «selegit te Dominus, quod languenti per omnes mundi plagas

other words, Boreel believed that Christ's divine authority had to be proven, in order to refute those who said that Christ was just a deceiver. Furthermore, in the same letter Oldenburg also testifies that at the beginning of 1657 Boreel wrote some parts of his work.³⁵⁰

In November 1657 Oldenburg wrote to his Dutch friend again. He invited Boreel to publish what he had written «tum de necessitate Religionis in genere, tum de veritate ac praecellentia Christianae deque summo totius mundi Legislatore». Oldenburg's greatest desire was to confute the atheists and those who offended Christian religion, since «multa in hanc rem scriptitavere; pauci solida et assensum extorquentia».³⁵¹ It is clear that this letter does not add anything to the previous epistle dated January 24: first, Oldenburg suggests that Boreel had already written some parts of his work, maybe that he was close to the conclusion, but that he did not want to publish it yet;³⁵² second, in the JNL Boreel wanted to prove the truth and the divinity of the Christian religion, and also of its founder Jesus Christ.

The following letter of the correspondence between Oldenburg and Boreel is dated August 25, 1660. There is no information to determine if they stopped writing each other after November 1657 or if the letters they sent in these years are lost. However, I believe that this second hypothesis is most likely. As it may be, from the epistle of August it is possible to argue that they

labantique religioni succurras, eamque fulori adeo nostri is statumines[?]. Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), p. 115.

³⁵⁰ «Literas tuas, mihi per jucundas, non ita dudum accepi; impense gavisus te Elencheis fere expeditis, transitum ad dogmatica parare. Vellem equidem». Ibid.

³⁵¹ «Effusissimum quippe meum in te affectum cultumque tibi confirmo, idemque mecum facit pernobilis Ranalaus. Quoties tui recordor [observationis?] votis expeto, ut producas tandem extra siparium, quae tum de necessitate Religionis in genere, tum de veritate ac praecellentia Christianae deque summo totius mundi Legislatore te meditatam novi. Valde velim, genuinum frangi tum Atheis tum doctrinae Jesu Christi sugillatoribus. Multo multa in hanc rem scriptitavere; pauci solida et assensum extorquentia». Ibid., p. 142. It is most likely that Moriaen referred to the JNL and to its purpose against the atheists, when he wrote to Hartlib: «seÿe möcht ich etwan gern vernehmen H Boreel pflegt sonsten ex lumine Naturæ contra Atheos zue disputirn und dieselbe zue convincirn beides das ein Gott und das die Schriffte sein Wortt seÿe wie kombts aber das man nun gar nichts mehr von ihm vernimbt oder hört». HP 42/2/26B.

³⁵² Oldenburg invites Boreel to publish his work a second time in the same letter: «Age, igitur, amice integerrime, edas tandem veritatis modo dictae vindicias; nec torosa ejus argumenta diutius nobis invideas. Meam hoc pacto observantiam amicitiamque tibi adstringes, faciesque, ut omni studiorum officiorumque promptitudine eam confirmem». Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), p. 115.

stopped their correspondence at least for a few months.³⁵³ Nevertheless, information about Boreel and his work can be found also in other letters.

On August 27, 1659, Oldenburg, who was in Paris, wrote to Hartlib, after he had been able to obtain a copy of Jean Bodin's manuscript *Colloquium heptaplomeres de rerum sublimium arcanis abditis*.³⁵⁴ After he read this work, Oldenburg was horrified by Bodin's ideas and he believed that in the *Colloquium* the Christian religion was not defended enough.³⁵⁵ So,

³⁵³ This is how I interpreted the first lines of Oldenburg's letter: «Exultabam gaudio, vir plurime colende, quando lectissima Durea mihi nuper significabat, te incolumem nunc Amstelaedami commorare». Ibid., p. 381

³⁵⁴ Jean Bodin was a French jurist and a philosopher. He was also deeply interested in religious subjects and he was an influential writer on demonology. Although he officially remained a Catholic throughout his life, he was critical of papal authority over the States, while he was in favor of a strong control of national monarchies over religious questions. He was the author of the most famous manuscript *Colloquium heptaplomeres de rerum sublimium arcanis abditis*, which was widespread in 16th and 17th century Europe. For more information, see: Luciano Parinetto, *L'Inquisitore Libertino: Discorso sulla Tolleranza Religiosa e sull'ateismo. A proposito dell'Heptaplomeres di Jean Bodin*, Milan, 2002; Andrea Suggi, *Sovranità e Armonia: la Tolleranza Religiosa nel Colloquium Heptaplomeres di Jean Bodin*, Rome, 2005; Julian H. Franklin (ed.), *Jean Bodin*, Aldershot, 2006; Donatella Marocco Stuardi, *La République di Jean Bodin: sovranità, governo, giustizia*, Milan, 2006; Laurence Wuidar, *Musique et démonologie au 17. siècle de Jean Bodin à Pier Francesco Valentini*, Florence, 2007; Anna di Bello, *Stato e sovranità nel De republica Libri Sex di Jean Bodin*, Naples, 2014. For a Latin edition of the *Colloquium Heptaplomeres*, see: Jean Bodin, *Colloquium heptaplomeres de rerum sublimium arcanis abditis e codicibus manuscriptis Bibliothecae Academicae Gissensis cum varia lectione aliorum apographorum nunc primum typis describendum / Joannes Bodinus ; curavit Ludovicus Noack*, Hildesheim, 1970. For an English editions of the *Colloquium Heptaplomeres*, see: Jean Bodin, *Colloquium of the Seven about Secrets of the Sublime. Translation with Introduction, Annotations, and Critical Reading, by Marion Leathers Kuntz*, University Park, 2008.

³⁵⁵ «And having made mention of Bodinus his book, I shall, before I passe to other matter, tell you my thoughts upon it. First of all, I believe, it will never be printed, nor in my opinion ought it to be, unlesse it come forth accompanied with the Censure and animadversions of an understanding, judicious and sincere Christian. For the Intelocutors being a Jew, a Mahumetan, a philosopher (who maintains only a natural religion), a papist, a Calvinist and a Lutheran, the three first seem to me to defend their religion in good earnest, but the three latter maintain the Christian so coldly and impertinently that it appears to me, they had no true sense of it, but tooke a way to betray it by their frigid and weak defence to the enemies thereof. Next it is evident to me, and I think will be to all that examine well this writing, tha the drift of it was, to insinuate into the Spirits of men, that any religion is acceptable to God, wherein men serve him or them, whom they take for their God or Gods, with a good heart, whether it be the God of Abraham, or a Jupiter, or Christ, or Mahomet. Besides, there is so much said in this book to the dishonor of Christ and the disadvantage of his most excellent Law, that a Simon Magus and an Apollonius Thyaneus is preferred before him; which cannot but make a honest Christian heart ake, especially when one reads, how languidly those base Christian interlocutors answer those abominable reproaches and injuries, done to their master». Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), pp. 306-307. Although Oldenburg had arrived in Paris some months before, he was able to have a first look to Bodin's *Colloquium* only in August 1659. On August 13 he had written to Hartlib, saying that he was not able yet to give him «so full an account [...] concerning Bodinus his Ms. de rerum sublimium Arcanis». In the following lines Oldenburg says: «I have heard since, that it is not a book fit to be printed, and that few persons here at Paris have copies thereof. I doe not know, whether I shall get leave to see any of them, the

Oldenburg expressed his desire to see only Boreel as the advocate of christianity in Bodin's *Colloquium*, instead of the three Christians: Coronaeus, Fridericus, and Curtius, who were respectively a Catholic, a Lutheran and a Calvinist. Since it would have been impossible to fulfil this wish, Oldenburg suggested to give a copy of Bodin's manuscript to Boreel, so that the Dutch theologian could have refuted the accusations that the Pagan, the Jew, the Islamic, and the natural philosopher made in the *Colloquium* against the Christian religion.³⁵⁶ There is no evidence to prove that Boreel got Bodin's manuscript. However, it is most likely that Oldenburg was able to give a copy of it to his Dutch friend.³⁵⁷

In addition, from Hartlib's correspondence it can be argued that between 1659 and 1660 Boreel was writing two works. On January 30, 1660, Hartlib explained to Worthington that at that time Boreel was writing «a large Tr. about the Divinity of the N. Testament, as likewise a larger Work against all sorts of atheist».³⁵⁸ If they really existed, these works are now lost. However, it is evident that Boreel deal with the same topics in the JNL. As a matter of fact, in this work Boreel tried to prove both the truth of the New Testament's books, and the divine origins of Christ and of his religion. So, it can be supposed that Hartlib did not refer to two different works, but only to the JNL. There is no evidence to prove which of these two hypotheses is true.

matter, as I heare, being ticklish, and seeming to preferre Judaisme before all other religions». Ibid., p. 302.

³⁵⁶ «I wish out all my heart, such a man, as Monsr Borreel, had been alone in stead of those three sorts of Christians, for to defend Christian religion against the others; or, seing that wish is in vaine, that he might have a Copy of the booke, and substitute his answers to the pretences of pagans, Jews and Turks in stead of those, wich the 3. lukewarme and indifferent Christians haven treacherously given». Ibid., p. 307.

³⁵⁷ In the following lines of his letter, Oldenburg writes to Hartlib: «I shall doe my best, to procure for me the full perusall of it for some time, in the space whereof if I can get a Copist, I intend, God willing, to have it wholly transcribed, though it will cost much time and trouble, because it is very falsely written and requireth a constant inspection, if the Clerk, that is to write it out, have not some understanding to gather the sense by the context. The piece, that is here, is bigger, than that you mention for it contatineth almost six quires of paper; which will not be written out nor in a day nor in a week». Ibid.

³⁵⁸ «By Boreel is meant, he that is the author, Ad Legem et Testimonium. He hath written a large Tr. About the Divinity of the N. Testament, as likewise a larger Work against alla sorts of Atheist. He is very much pressed to publish it, but I cannot telle yet how soon it will be done». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), p. 168.

Anyhow, on June 4, 1660, Hartlib wrote to Worthington: «Mr. Dury informs me that he [Boreel] is going on in his *Jesus Nazarenus Legislator*». ³⁵⁹

In the letter that he sent to Boreel on August 25, 1660, after he invited his Dutch friend to conclude his work once again, Oldenburg describes some of the subjects of the JNL. In this work Boreel wanted to prove the three fundamentals of the Christian religion, that is, the existence of God and of his Providence, and the divine origins of the revelation of the New Testament. ³⁶⁰

The next letter of their correspondence is dated December 13, 1660. This epistle strengthens the hypothesis suggesting that Boreel was writing more than one work. After he invited Boreel again to reach the conclusion of his thoughts, Oldenburg wrote: «Nobilis Boylius salutem tibi plurimam per me scribit atque sedulam laboris hujus accelerationem inter caeteros exoptat». ³⁶¹ Oldenburg's assertions are echoed by Hartlib, who on June 11, 1661, explained to Worthington that Boreel lived in Amsterdam, that he was a close friend of Dury for many years, and that he was «still busy with those Treatises concerning J. C. Legislator and the Discourse of the Reasonableness of the Laws of Christ». Boreel had not published yet these works, but Hartlib promised Worthington that he would inform him as soon as they were published. ³⁶² If Boreel wrote a work about the reasonableness of Christian

³⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 199.

³⁶⁰ «[...] ut tandem aliquando ad nos redire, in hisce te oris domicilium tuum figere, et quae in ipsius honorem et divinae veritatis praesidium meditari et consignare caepisti felici et minus interrupto tramite consecrari et commode ad umbilicum perducere queas. Sunt illa tria religionis primo prima principia, Deitatis existentia, ejusdem providentia, ac revelationis in S. literis factae divino origo, tanti ponderis, ut eorum irrefragabilis probatio, quae hactenus desideratur, inconcussam in hominibus mentibus fidem, et sinceram in eorum cordibus et actionibus pietatem essent paritura. Ejusmodi enim probatio cum <?> ac languida inimis in hunc usque diem extiterit, supparem[?] sibi, i.e. vacillantem hucusque fidem et frigidam omnino pietatem in mundo reliquit. Age igitur, vir candide, opus ea in hoc genere caeptum constater et alacrite urge, et si quid a me pusillo adminiculi (quantulumcunque, illud sit) in hujus operis bonum profisci possit, id audacter postula. [...] Sub Dei praesidio rei religionis lapsantis columnen, et Atheismi et impietatis averruncum respicimus. Ille te mentisque ac corporis tui facultates omnes ita firmet atque stabiliat, ut gloriae ejus per universon orbem diffundenda sine impedimentis, et curarum aliarum immunis longum servire valeas». Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), p. 381.

³⁶¹ Ibid., p. 404.

³⁶² «Borellius lives a Amsterd. for ought I know. He hath been most familiarly acquainted these many years with mr. Dury. He is still busy with those Treatises concerning J. C. Legislator and the Discourse of the Reasonableness of the Laws of Christ. Whent they are done or publickly extant I hope I shall not forget to give you notice of it». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), p. 335.

religion, it is lost. However, as before, it is possible to find assertions about this topic in the JNL too. So, it is evident that his ideas about the reasonableness of the Christian doctrine influenced the writing of the JNL.

The letter above-quoted is the last of Oldenburg's correspondence with Boreel. As before, there is no evidence to determine if they stopped to write each other or if their epistles are lost.

However, it can be supposed that Oldenburg and Boreel met when the German-British scholar went to the Dutch Republic.³⁶³ For instance, on June 30, 1661, Dury, who was living in Amsterdam at that time, wrote to Hartlib: «Mr. Oldenburg has been here; but I was not in towne & so haue not spoken with him: & if he makes no stay at his returne it may bee tenne to one if I speake at all unto him except hee lette me know where to find him when I am abroad».³⁶⁴ Furthermore, on August 10 Hartlib told Worthington that Oldenburg had come back in England, but then Oldenburg went to the Dutch Republic again, since in September 5 he was in Leiden.³⁶⁵

Furthermore, it must be taken into considerations that Oldenburg made every effort to obtain a copy of the JNL, after he had known about Boreel's forthcoming death. On June 16/18, 1665, Oldenburg wrote to Robert Boyle and he told him that Boreel was seriously ill. Oldenburg had written to his Dutch friend, asking him to give his manuscript «that concerne the proof of the truth of Christian religion» to someone who could have made a copy of it. Boreel had answered that he had already done so, and that soon Oldenburg and Boyle would have had a copy of the JNL, if they had been

³⁶³ Ernestine van der Wall made the same hypotesis: «in de zomer van 1661 maakte Oldenburg een reis door de Republiek en deed daarbij ook Amsterdam aan, waar hij zijn goede vriend Boreel bezocht». Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), p. 262.

³⁶⁴ HP 4/4/24A.

³⁶⁵ On August 10, 1661, Hartlib wrote to Worthington: «Mr. Oldenburg, of whom I wrote formerly, is come over again. He professeth he hath been diligent ab^t Blesdekus in more shops than those at Leyden, but can get nowhere a copy thereof». In addition, in his epistle dated September 5, Hartlib says: Mr. Oldenburg being at Leyden, I presume he might hear something of Josephus and of Hesychius, whether either of them be in the press; both the books being so very considerable, would easily invite one upone the place to such an enquiry». See: Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. I, pp. 352; Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. II, p. 3.

willing to pay for it.³⁶⁶ On June 20, Boyle answered Oldenburg's letter, and he assented to pay for the expenses necessary to copy Boreel's manuscript.³⁶⁷

From the letters between Boyle and Oldenburg it can be concluded that Boreel chose Petrus Serrarius to deal with JNL's copy. As a matter of fact, on September 16, 1665, Boyle says that he was glad about what «Monsr Serrarius promises [...] concerning Honest Mr Borells manuscripts».³⁶⁸ Both Serrarius's and Oldenburg's letter concerning the JNL are lost, so we do not have any details about the copying process. However, on September 28, Oldenburg wrote to Boyle: «M. Serrarius tells me, that the transcribing of Mr Borrels manuscript goes on a pace, and desires, that some money may be assigned, at first some 30. or 40. gilders: which is about 3. lb sterl.».³⁶⁹

Boyle paid the first expenses for the copy of the JNL on October 14.³⁷⁰ Hence, in the following days Serrarius explained to the two Englishmen that the copying process was near to the conclusion. The JNL's copy was completed between the end of 1665 and the beginning of 1666, and on January 16, 1666, Oldenburg wrote to Boyle that «M. Serrarius [...] he is

³⁶⁶ «I did also intend to have had some discourse with you concerning Mr Borreel, of whom I understood some weeks since, that he was very sick, and not likely to recover. I can only say this of him at the present, that I wrote to Amsterdam, and intreated him to consign his writings that concerne the proof of the truth of Christian religion to such hands, that we might have a Copy thereof at least: whereupon I had this answer, that he had taken care for that particular, and that you and I should have a Copy thereof, if care were taken and the expenses borne to transcribe it. To which I returned, that I was persuaded, you would accept of that condition; nor doe I believe now, that you will give me authority to revoke, what I have said». Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), vol. II, pp. 404-405.

³⁶⁷ «I am glad you have written what you tell mee, concerning Monsr Borreel's papers; For I am very willing to be at the charge of haveing them faire transcrib'd, & therefore I must desire you would be pleas'd to sollicite the expediting of the Copy, & when you let mee know what the charge will bee I shall (God permitting) take speedy order for the punctuall defraying of it. But I cannott but heartily wish the good man may live to finish the excellent worke he has carry'd on soe farr». Ibid., p. 408.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 509. For the role played by Serrarius in the copying of Boreel's manuscript, see also: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 265-267.

³⁶⁹ Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), vol. II, p. 534. Oldenburg stated the necessity of paying Serrarius again on October 10, when he send to Boyle «M. Serrarius his owne Note of what is desired at present for the copying of M. Borreels papers». In the meanwhile, Oldenburg had wrote to the Dutch chiliast, saying to him «that I have acquainted you with it, and that I doubt not but you will give all reasonable satisfaction for the paines taken in this matter». Ibid., p. 556.

³⁷⁰ «[...] I doe not well know what the value of the Dutch florens are, but as I remember you mentioned that three pound should be sent to Mr Serrarius for which I therefore transmit you a Bill, & if more be needed, you may be pleas'd to signify it». Ibid., p. 570.

watching for a safe conveniency to transmit Mr Borrels copied MS». However, the expenses of the copy was higher than the two Englishmen would have expected. In the same letter Oldenburg complains with Boyle, saying that Serrarius told him that «the Account of the Copist amount to 67. gilders and 10. stuivers, there being an 135. leaves, each 10 stuivers». Oldenburg had already paid the three pound that Boyle had given to him and other two pounds out of his pocket, but this was not sufficient to pay the bill. However, Oldenburg had complained with Serrarius, telling him «that it is a pretty bigge sum for a writing, and not yet seen by us» and that they would have sent the rest of the money after they got the manuscript's copy.³⁷¹

From all the letters taken into consideration it can be concluded that Oldenburg played a major role in the writing of the JNL. First, after he had heard some *scrupuli* against Christian religion, he thought about the writing of a definite work in defense of Christianity, and he suggested Boreel should have written it. Second, it has been shown that Oldenburg expressed the desire to give a copy of Bodin's *Colloquium Heptaplomeres* to Boreel, so that the Dutch theologian would be able to refute the accusations against Christian religion written in this work. Although there is no evidence that Boreel ever got Bodin's *Colloquium*, it is most like that Oldenburg gave a copy to him, or at least that he told Boreel his concerns related to Bodin's manuscript. We cannot exclude that Oldenburg met Boreel at the beginning of 1660, when he was returning to England, and that they discuss about Bodin's work in their meeting.³⁷²

Moreover, it seems that from time to time Boreel communicated his progress in the writing of the JNL and the difficulties he had to face to Oldenburg and Boyle. This is how interpreted Oldenburg's words in the last

³⁷¹ Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), vol. III, p. 18.

³⁷² In Oldenburg's biography it is possible to read: «In May 1660 Oldenburg and Jones were summoned home and arrived in time for Charles II's triumphant entry into London». As a matter of fact, on June 4, 1660, Hartlib wrote to Worthington that «the gent.[leman] who is here returned from Paris (Mr. Oldenburg, I mean)». Moreover, it is clear that in Paris Oldenburg was able to get a copy of Bodin's manuscript, since on January 30, 1660, Hartlib said to Worthington: «If I could have been master either of my own copy of Bodin's MS, or of that which my Parisian friend hath caused to be transcribed, Mr. More should have had it long before this time». See: Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. I, pp. 168 e 192; Hall, *Oldenburg, Henry* (see above, n. 319).

letter to Boreel: «Huic dum incumbis, totius operis ichnographiae ac difficultatum quas in eo pertexendas[?] adhuc exantlandas sunt, expositionem, uti promittis lubentes videremus. Imo si tibi allubesceret solidam partis illius quam expedivisti descriptionem nobis procurare, suas illi adornandae impensas Dominus Boylius liberaliter offert».³⁷³ Since the deep interest that both Oldenburg and Boyle had for Boreel's work, it is most likely that sometimes they raised questions, doubts, and difficulties, or that they suggested argumentations, in order to strengthen Boreel's defense of Christian religion.

Moreover, Boreel sent some of his papers to his other friends as well. This is what it can be argued from Hartlib's correspondence. In the letter that he wrote to Worthington on January 10, 1660, after he had said that Boreel was writing a treatise about the divinity of the New Testament and another one against Atheism, Hartlib says: «by some of the papers you will see what he is a doing for the present».³⁷⁴ It is most likely that the papers which Hartlib refers to were parts of Boreel's works that he sent to Hartlib in order to show his progress and to know Hartlib's opinion about them. Therefore, Hartlib and his acquaintances could have had some kind of role in the shaping of Boreel's JNL.

To strengthen this hypothesis it can be taken into consideration one of Worthington epistles. In December 1660, after Henry More published *An explanation of the grand mystery of godliness*,³⁷⁵ Worthington suggested to Hartlib that «Dr. More's book might be fit to be perused by the author of Jesus Nazareus Legislator».³⁷⁶ Since More's and Boreel's works had similar aims, it can be easily concluded that Worthington believed that More's work could have been useful to Boreel's argumentations in the JNL. There is no evidence to establish if Boreel ever got More's book. However, on January 1, 1661, Hartlib answered Worthington: «Mr. Boreel understands English very well. I wish I had my former pension, he should have had Dr. More's excellent book

³⁷³ Hall, *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* (see above, n. 319), vol. I, pp. 404-405.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 168.

³⁷⁵ More, *An explanation of the grand mystery of godliness* (see above, n. 113).

³⁷⁶ Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. I, p. 242.

before this time».³⁷⁷ In addition, on January 15 he wrote to Worthington again: «I have given notice of Dr. More's excellent book beyond seas, but my giving notice heretofore of such treasures was to send at least one copy of the book itself, which now is impossible for me to continue».³⁷⁸ Hartlib did not say who was the addressee of More's book. So, we cannot say he sent it to Boreel, even though this is the most likely hypothesis.

In conclusion, from the analysis of the letters written by Oldenburg, Hartlib, Worthington, and Boreel himself it can be argued that the three Englishmen had some kind of role in the shaping of Boreel's JNL. If so, we cannot exclude that Boreel discussed his work with other scholars as well, who could have helped him writing his defense of Christian religion by proposing argumentations and raising objections to what Boreel had already written.

³⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 259.

³⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 271.

The translation of the Mishnah and the “Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate”

After the possibility of the return of the Jews in England had faded away, between the end of the 50s and the beginning of the 60s those who were part of the Hartlib Circle started again to look for the means to convert Jewish people. In particular, they believed that a double translation of the Mishnah was necessary: a Spanish-Portuguese edition, so that the Jews would have been able to better understand their religion; a Latin translation, so that the learned Christians could better understand the Judaism that was practiced in that period.

Boreel committed to this double translation. After he went back to Amsterdam at the beginning of 1659, in addition to writing the JNL and other works, Boreel committed himself to finish the Spanish-Portuguese translation of the Mishnah that he and Jacob Judah Leon had begun in the 40s. As before, Hartlib's correspondences is the most useful source to draw information about this new project.

It has been already shown that in May 1659 Hartlib decided to send back to Boreel all the copies of the vocalized Mishnah he left him. In the same epistle, after he had explained the difficulties he had to face to sell those copies, Hartlib says to Worthington: «he [Boreel] resolved some years ago to translate the whole book, but not knowing how far he has proceeded therein, I shall labour to get a fuller answer with all possible speed».³⁷⁹ In the following days Hartlib received new information about Boreel's translation and on June 7 he wrote to Worthington that John Sadler told him that Boreel was translating the Mishnah into Portuguese. Therefore, the German-British intelligencer suggested that someone else in England could have worked to a Latin edition.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 131.

³⁸⁰ «Mr. Sadler has given me a true information concerning Dr. Boreel's Portuguese translation of the Mishn. so that your friend may be encouraged to go on with the intended Latin translations». Ibid., p. 134. It is not clear if Boreel was translating the Mishnah in Spanish or in Portuguese. In their letters Hartlib and Worthington sometimes refers to a Spanish edition and other times to a Portuguese edition. However, most of the Jews of the community of Amsterdam had Portuguese origins, so it is most likely that Boreel was working to a Portuguese edition. As for John Sadler, he was an English scholar and lawyer.

However, Worthington was not interested in a Portuguese edition of the *Misnayot*, but only in his Latin edition, since «it would be for the use of Christians, that hereby might be better instructed to deal with the Jews». This is the reason why on December 1660 he suggested that Boreel should have published in Latin what he had already translated in Portuguese.³⁸¹ Moreover, Worthington wrote some questions and some suggestions that he sent to Boreel through Hartlib.³⁸² It is not clear if Boreel had already finished his Portuguese translation and if he had begun to work to the Latin edition. Worthington's and Hartlib's words seem to confirm this hypothesis. As a matter of fact, on January 1, 1661, Hartlib wrote to the Cambridge Platonist he should «endeavour G. W. to put Mr. Boreel in mind of his Latin Essays of the Mishneh». Furthermore, in the following lines he added that he did not know «how far he [Boreel] has proceeded in the Latin Translation». However, Hartlib would have asked information about it and he would have informed Worthington as soon as he received an answer.³⁸³ However, as we will see soon, in 1661 Boreel had not yet finished his Portuguese translation of the Mishnah.

When Worthington received Boreel's answer, he was not satisfied with it. Our author expressed doubts related to the publishing at first of a Portuguese edition and then of a Latin translation. Boreel thought necessary to add the commentaries made by the most famous rabbis, so to publish both a Portuguese and a Latin edition of the Mishnah would have been an

During the Commonwealth, he fulfilled numerous political positions and he was very close to Oliver Cromwell. Furthermore, he held philo-semitic ideas and this is why he became part of the Hartlib Circle. There is no evidence to determine when he met Boreel, but it is clear that they had known each other since the 40s. As a matter of fact, on January 7, 1649, he sent his regards to Boreel through Worsley. See: HP 46/9/14A-B. For more information about Sadler, see: Richard L. Greaves, «Sadler, John (1615-1674)», in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

³⁸¹ «If he would publish in Latin so much as he hath of the translation of the Mishnaioth, it would be for the use of Christians, that hereby might be better instructed to deal with the Jews. I know no two designs so considerable for such like advantages to Christianity, as the publishing this ancient body of the Jewish religion, the Mishneh, and also the Alcoran, in a language generally known, as the Latin is». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), vol. I., pp. 242-243.

³⁸² This is what can be concluded from a letter that Hartlib wrote to Worthington on December 20, 1660. In this epistle, he says: «I shall mind Mr. Boreel of what you have written. I sent you in the last packet a copy of his last letter». Ibid., 255. Here Hartlib refers to one of his previous letters, dated December 17, to which he had enclosed the last epistle that Boreel had sent to John Dury. Since in this last letter Hartlib did not refer to Worthington questions, it can be argued that Worthington sent them to him between December 17 and 20.

³⁸³ Ibid., p. 259.

enormous work. Boreel's answer is lost, but this is what it can be concluded from Worthington's letter dated June 3, 1661. As a matter of fact, in his epistle the Cambridge Platonist says that he did not think that the publishing of the Mishnah would be a too difficult task, because he and other English scholars believe that it would be more useful just to publish the translation of the Mishnah. At most they could have added some commentaries made by Maimonides and concerning the most obscure passages of the Jewish book. At the conclusion of his letter, Worthington suggests that they could find someone in England to work to the Latin translation of the Mishnah, if no one in the Dutch Republic wanted to do it.³⁸⁴

Boreel answered Worthington's objections through John Dury.³⁸⁵ On July 15, 1661, Dury explained to Hartlib that Boreel believed it impossible to make the Mishnah understandable to the learned Christians without adding the major and most important commentaries of the rabbis. Furthermore, the *Misnayot* would have been clear neither to the Jews that were committed to the Portuguese translation, if these commentaries had not been added, since «the words are very few and short of uncouth and unaccustomed matters,

³⁸⁴ «Doth not Borellius live at Amsterdam? And is he known to Mr. Dury? If so, could nothing be done about the Spanish Version of the Mishnaioth? It seems by his letter to you, that he looks upon it as too chargeable and too troublesome a work to undertake the printing of the Mishnaioth; because it must be done into Latin, (whereas the Jew, he used, did it all in Spanish) and there are added the Rabbinical Commentaries. But I have advised with some learned men about it, who think it far more desirable to leave out those Commentaries, which are bulky and swelling. If the Mishnaioth alone were printed in Latin, it would be more useful: and I believe it would help off his Hebrew edition of the Mishnaioth, which did not sell. But instead of those bulky Commentaries or large Excursions, there might be some short notes upon such passages as most need them, taken out of Maimonides, who hath in a more facile and clear way explained the Talmud. There are scholars enough in Holland that could turn the Spanish into Latin; and being revised by some that understand both the Hebrew and the Translations, the work might come forth with good advantage. If it may not be undertaken there, I would hope that some in Inghland would not be averse from a work that may be of so much use: for if Christians would more knowingly and pertinently deal with Jews and Mahometans, they should be acquainted with the Mishnaioth and the Alcoran». Ibid., pp. 319-320.

³⁸⁵ On June 20, 1661, Dury wrote to Hartlib: «I shall speake to Mr. Boreell concerning the Misnayot; I haue<not> seene him before this day, since I receiued your former». HP 4/4/24. This is the letter which Hartlib refers to in his epistle to Worthington, dated June 26, where he wrote: «Mr. Dury answers this week, as followeth, being returned to Amsterd.: - "Dr. Worthington's extract of letter I have not yet time to take into considerations and make enquiry, for I am engaged to deal with the Professors of Leyden and others. I shall speak to Mr. Boreel concerning the Mishnaioth. I have not seen him before this day since I received your former". Thus far he from Amst. The 20/30 June, 1661». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), p. 134. However, Dury was not able to speak to Boreel in the following days. Hence, on July 8 he wrote again to Hartlib: «[...] but concerning Mr Boreell his Misnaioth I shall God willing by the next give you a particular account what may bee expected». HP 4/4/25A.

that the very commentaries written to explain them to the Jews, require a very serious meditation and consideration». At that time Boreel had already translated together with the Jews he employed «all six treatises of the Misnayoth», but he had translated only the commentaries concerning four of these treatises. Hence, he was committed «to gette the Commentaries also added». However, Boreel believed that it would not have been possible to publish anything, until the entire Mishnah and all the commentaries would have been translated. Otherwise, some problems could have been raised among the Jews of Amsterdam, «by reason of the iealousie & envious spirit which is in that Nation to hinder all strangers from the knowledge of their Law & way».³⁸⁶

In short, in 1661 Boreel was working on a Portuguese edition of the Mishnah together with some Jews. He wanted to publish it in the name of these same Jews, «whom hee must employ to make the edition Authentique amongst them», as it had already happened with the vocalized edition of 1646. Furthermore, after they published the Portuguese translation, it would have been possible to publish the Latin edition as well, which would have been based upon the Portuguese Mishnah.³⁸⁷

However, it is not clear if Boreel had started to translate the Jewish book in Latin. Popkin suggests that Boreel only completed the Portuguese translation and that the Jews he employed were Jacob Judah Leon, Jacob Abendana, and his brother Isaac. Nevertheless, they did not put it to press. As a matter of fact, Surenhusius was the first to publish a Latin translation of the Mishnah in 1698.³⁸⁸ In the preface of this edition Surenhusius thanks the

³⁸⁶ HP 4/4/26A.

³⁸⁷ This is how I interpreted this passage from Dury's letter: «Mr Boreel is now busie to gette the Commentaries also added, & when that is done then hee will consider the way of putting it forth, but hee must not publish any part of it till hee hath gotten all done by the Iewes, whom hee must employ to make the edition Authentique amongst them: for except it bee done by one of them it will not bee Credited, & if any part should bee published before all bee done, it might fall out *that* none would bee employed to further the translation; or dare apply himself therunto by reason of the iealousie & envious spirit which is in that Nation to hinder all strangers from the knowledge of their Law & way. for this Cause all must bee first done as it were in priuat for his owne use before any thing bee put forth: but when he hath gotten all done by some of their owne Rabbies, hee will bee able to publish it by the whole or by parts as he shall see Cause». HP 4/4/26A.

³⁸⁸ Guilielmus Surenhusius, *Mischna sive totius hebraeorum juris, rituum, antiquitatum, ac legum oralium systema, cum clarissimorum rabbinorum Maimonidis et*

rabbis Jacob Judah Leon, Jacob Abendana, and Isaac Abendana, and he said that the Abendana brothers had completed a Spanish translation of the Mishnah with the major commentaries. Therefore, it is most likely that this translation is the same which Boreel worked on.³⁸⁹

Unfortunately, from Hartlib's and Worthington's letters we cannot draw any more information about Boreel's translations of the Mishnah. After Boreel's answer, on August 22, 1661, Worthington wrote to Hartlib that he was «very glad that Mr. Boreel hath exprest so much resolution to see the whole perfected» and that he made those observations only because Boreel had seemed to have «represented the work as too great to be finished». Nonetheless, in the conclusion Worthington repeated again that he and some other English scholars believed that it was not necessary to add the rabbinical commentaries.³⁹⁰ Hartlib only answered that he would have informed «Mr. D. what you have written concerning Boreel, that he may impart it to him».³⁹¹ This is the last reference available concerning the translations of the Mishnah. It is most likely that after Hartlib's death on March 10, 1662, the expectations related to the Latin edition of the Jewish book gradually faded away.

While he was working on the translations of the Mishnah, Boreel started to work on a parallel project, whose aim would have been the conversion both of the Jews and of those who were not Christians. As a matter of fact, in two letters written in 1660 Boreel refers to a *Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate*, whose major goal was the spreading of the Christian religion to all the nations of the world.

After he had known that Dury would have been forced to leave England, on August 10, 1660, Boreel invited his Scottish friend to reach the

Bartenorae commentariis integris. Quibus accedunt variorum auctorum notae ac versiones in eos quos ediderunt codices, Amsterdam, 1698.

³⁸⁹ Popkin, *Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges* (see above, n. 65), pp. 9-11 e 23-24.

³⁹⁰ «I am very glad thath Mr. Boreel hath exprest so much resolution to see the whole perfected. I was the more inclined to write so as I did, because your last from him represented the work as too great to be finished. So that it be done, though with those larger comments, it will be very acceptable; but others are still of the mind, that it needed not to have been made so bulky. It is fit that those who are engaged in such undertakings, should please themselves; and I wish all success and encouragement to such persons of puclick spirit and goodwill towards men». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), pp. 354-355.

³⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 365.

Dutch Republic and to join him in their «communibus studiis», which were connected to «Christi Domini regno, publicae aedificationi et paci». In his letter Boreel explains to Dury that he believes that there were so many people who were committed to their personal interests, while very few directed their actions and their thoughts to those things «quae sunt Christi Jesu». However, continues Boreel, he had no doubts about Dury: he had known him for so many years and he was fully persuaded that his Scottish friend «ex animo regni Christi Domini propagationem intendere». In order to reach this goal, concludes Boreel, «opus est, ut erigatur Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate, quae isti occupatur quae breviter literis quibusdam ad te meis praeterito anno perscripsi».³⁹²

In his letter dated November 22, 1660, Boreel mentions this *societas* again. After he had referred to the partial outcome of the Protestant reformation and to Acts 3: 19-20, Boreel said to Dury that Christ would have not fulfilled the «veram ecclesiae suae reformationem» until all people, included the Jews, would have followed his doctrine. In particular, wrote Boreel, «gentilibus enim absque Israelitica natione nulla in ecclesiis gloria promissa est». This is the reason why «nihil stabile, nihil gloriosum ecclesiae gentilium obtinget», until they would have recognized Christ as their Messiah. While they were expecting this, Boreel hoped that a new «fuoco», a new «zelo» towards God would have seized men and that they would have established the *societas* to spread the conformity with God and Christ according to the Holy Scripture, so that «Jesus Nazarenus pro humani generis

³⁹² « Ne post traditam possessori tuo bibliothecam suspensus haereas, incertus quid acturus sis, si placet apud me diverte et communibus studiis consulamus Christi Domini regno, publicae aedificationi et paci. Plerique enim quae sua sunt quaerunt, non quae sunt Christi Jesu. De te autem, mi frater, multis a pluribus retro annis cognitis argumentis plane persuasus sum te ex animo regni Christi Domini propagationem intendere. Quern in finem opus est, ut erigatur *Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate*, quae istis occupatur quae breviter literis quibusdam ad te meis praeterito anno perscripsi. Quibus solus occupor, quia qui una deberent aut talia neglegunt, aut rei familiari intenti sunt, aut minus idonei. Utinam vero plurimi tibi similes suppeterent, facile societas ista erigi possit. Haec velim ut perpendas et mentem ea de re tuam mihi aperias, nam res Christi Domini alacrius promoveri debent quam factum est hactenus atque communibus operis, studiis et peregrinationibus, quaqua versum diffundi. Messis profecto est ampla at operarii pauci. Oremus vero ut messis Dominus operarios in messim suam ἐκβαλή [?.] expellat tanquam nimium négligentes ac cunctantes». Van der Wall, *The dutch hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 258.

universi legislator agnoscatur, recipiatur, et legi ejus omnes ac singuli sese subjiciant, in omnibus ac singulis humanae vitae statibus».³⁹³

In short, the major aim of the *Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate* was the same that Boreel pursued with the writing of the JNL: to persuade all people that Christ is the only legislator of mankind. However, while in the JNL Boreel pursued this aim from a theoretical point of view, by proving that all people have to follow Christ's Law, the *Societas* had a more practical purpose, that is to convert those who have not yet embraced the Christian Religion.

Unfortunately, Boreel mentions this *Societas* only in the two letters to Dury above-quoted. However, in the posthumous edition of Boreel's writings there is a brief work, entitled *Alloquium ad humanam creaturam universam necessarium*. This is the manifesto that Boreel wrote for the *Societas de propaganda Dei et Christi Jesu conformitate*, in order to find fellow-thinkers that would have helped him to found it. Here Boreel says that from the evangelical books it can be easily deduced that God only established «Jesum Nazarenum» as «universi humani generis prophetam ac legislatorem, mediatorem ac summum pontificem, regem ac judicem». All people have to embrace him as such. Only if they do so, they can hope to achieve «the repentance and the remission of the sins, the obedience and the justice of the

³⁹³ «Veram ecclesiae suae reformationem Christus dominus ad “καίρουζ ἅ ναυρῶξεωζ”, quum omnis Israel Dei salvabitur, reservavit. Gentilibus enim absque Israelitica natione nulla in ecclesiis gloria promissa est. Clamat id universum canticorum canticum Israeliticae restitutae ecclesiae inscriptum. Demum enim cap. 8.8. sub parvae sororis nomine de gentilium ecclesia mentio aliqua injicitur, adeo ut praecedentia cantici istius omnia interlocutoribus Christo atque Israelitica ecclesia pertractentur. Clamat id senis Simeonis prophetia. Ait enim de gentilius “φῶζ εἰς ἀποκαλύψιν” at “δόξαν λαῶν σδῶ Ισσαιηλ”; quare quamdiu Israelitica ecclesia Messiam suum non receperit, nihil stabile, nihil gloriosum ecclesiae gentilium obtinget. Utinam igitur, o utinam populus iste tandem aliquando Messiam suum, Jesum Nazarenum, pro legislatore suo recipiat! huc vota, vires, vita conferenda, insumenda. Interea dum de jurisdictione, ritibus, ambitu, mundus disceptat, hinc novus Deo dicata pectora invadat ignis, zelus qui terrenos omnes obices consumat, perrumpat, erecta societate de propaganda Dei et Jesu Messiae secundum S. Scripturam conformitate, ut Jesus Nazarenus pro humani generis universi legislator agnoscatur, recipiatur, et legi ejus omnes ac singulis sese subjiciant, in omnibus ac singulis humanae vitae statibus. Id enim est unicum opus, nimirum “αυτῶδ ἄκούετε”, quo in voto desino». Ibid., pp. 259-260. This is the letter which Hartlib refers to in his epistle to Worthington, dated December 17, 1660, where he says: «by the adjoined letter of Mr. Borel's to Mr. D. you will see how he methodizes the great affairs of God's kingdom. The world may not expect great happiness before the conversion of the Jews be first accomplished». Crossley, *The diary and correspondence of John Worthington* (see above, n. 332), pp. 249-250.

faith, the gift of the Holy Spirit, the holy resurrection, and the glorious eternal life» through the «Spirit, the doctrine, and the life» of Jesus Christ.³⁹⁴

Therefore, continues Boreel, all people have to look for that kind of life that leads to embrace Christ as Highest Legislator. As a matter of fact, it is clear that each man ruined all human conditions through «abusibus, vanitatibus, incertitudinibus, confusionibus, conventionibus, caedibus, stragibus, superstitionibus, falsitatibus, omnimodisque scandalis», because they did not conform those human conditions to the Spirit, the life, and the doctrine of Jesus Christ. This is the reason why Boreel invites each man not only to arouse that «rationalem zelum» useful to pursue God's aim, but also to act with his fellow-thinkers, so that Christ could be embraced as the only Legislator of mankind. In order to achieve this goal, it is necessary to establish the «societatem de propaganda Dei et Jesu Nazaren conformitate».³⁹⁵

In the *Alloquium* Boreel also explains the means through which the *Societas* could have achieved his aim. First, it would have been necessary to prove that «esse Deum, esse veram aliquam Religionem, quae Deum

³⁹⁴ «Quandoquidem ex libris, qui novi foederis seu Testamenti nomine veniunt, sufficienter constare potest, supremum univerosum Dominum, qui *Deus Opt. Max.* vocatur, proposuisse, ut humanum genus universum in omnibus ac singulis vitae statibus, juxta *Jesum Nazarenum*, quem universi humani generis *Prophetam* ac *Legislatores*, *Mediatorem* ac summum *Ponteficem*, *regem* ac *Judicem* constituit, sese componeret: aequum omnino fuerit, ut universae ac singulae orbis terrarum nationes, supremo rerum omnium moderatori *Deomorem* gerentes *Jesum Nazarenum* pro tali recipiant; eique, tanquam *Legislatori* ac *Judici suo*, juxta ea, quae libris istis habentur, sese subjiciant; sub spe ut Spiritus, docritaneque ac vitae ejus auxilio, resipiscentiam ac remissionem peccatorum, obedientiam ac justitiam fidei, donum Spiritus sancti, beatam resurrectionem, ac vitam aeternam gloriosissimam consequantur». AN, in OP, p. 91.

³⁹⁵ «Huc itaque mortalium cogitationes sese convertant, ac vias singuli suas considerent; ut ex libris hisce, de jam nominati, ipsimet certiores reddantur: aut si hac in re negligentiores fuerint, ea, quae hunc in finem, suo tempore, ac ordine suo, Deo dante, proditura sunt, non respuant. Nimis enim diu humanum genus in omnibus et singulis vitae aetatibus, privato nempe *Oeconomico*, *Mechanico*, *Scholastico*, *Medico*, *Literatorio*, *Militari-politico*, *Ecclesiastico*, atque ex horum aliquibus mixto, a *Dei Opt. Max.* proposito isto devium oberravit: adeo, ut omnes istos status abusibus, vanitatibus, incertitudinibus, confusionibus, conventionibus, caedibus, stragibus, superstitionibus, falsitatibus, omninodisque scandalis mire foedaverit, eò quod ad Jesu Nazareni Legislatoris ac Judicis sui vitam, doctrinam, ac Spiritum, illos non composuerit. Quod cum ita se habere sani omnes nosse queant; agedum, quicumque mecum est a partibus Dei, ac humani generis Legislatoris ac judicis Jesu Nazareni, suscitet in se rationalem zelum promovendi propositum istud Dei, juxta vitam sive exemplar, doctrinam ac Spiritum Jesu Nazareni, prout illa libris novi foederis comprehenduntur. Agedum, inquam, consilia communicet voce, scripto, det illa, accipiat: ut conjunctis operis rei huic unice necessariae, auque est, Jesu Nazareni tanquam Legislatoris ac Judicis in humanum genus universum omnesque ac singulos vitae status introduction, insudetur atque invigiletur; hunc in finem erigendo *societatem de propaganda Dei et Jesu Nazareni conformitate*». Ibid., pp. 91-92.

Authorem habeat», as well as that «religionem hanc esse istam, quae per Jesum Nazarenum promulgata libris qui Novi Testamenti nomine veniunt, et juxta hosce lege Mosis et Prophetarum Ebraeorum scriptis, continetur». Second, it would have been necessary to prove the «Religionis hujus Scopum usum», the «debitam ejus in omnibus ac singulis humanae vitae statibus constitutionem», the «ab ea defectionem; provisionalem ejus restitutionem; restitutionem ejus genuinam; atque horum inter homines introductionem, propagationem, defensionem, ac conservationem».³⁹⁶

These means are very similar to those through which Boreel wanted to prove JNL's aim. As a matter of fact, it is possible to find a reference to the *Societas* in the JNL too. In some notes of the section entitled *De probatione veritatis librorum Novi Testamenti considerationes*, Boreel affirms the necessity to show that the New Testament's books must be regarded «pro principio manifestissimo, verissimo, et maximè rationali».³⁹⁷ To pursue this aim argumentations that are very grounded and that are not subject to exceptions must be used.³⁹⁸ Boreel wanted to write a *compendium nervosissimum* of all these argumentations, so that «Sacra Novi Testamenti scriptura, apud homines recipi possit ac recipiatur pro primo principio manifestissimo, verissimo, ac maxime rationali».³⁹⁹ In other words, Boreel intended to use this *compendium* to convert all people who had not yet embraced the Christian religion. This is the reason why he asserts the necessity to print this *compendium* and to translate it in various languages, so that he could have brought it with in his «peregrinationem», when he would have spread the doctrines of the New Testament in the Pagan nations, «erecta, istum in finem, de propaganda Dei ac Christi Jesu conformitate, societate».⁴⁰⁰

³⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 92.

³⁹⁷ London, The Royal Society, MS RB 1/15/1 (4th foliation), f. 4r.

³⁹⁸ «Id ut fiat, ex omnibus ad id probandum argumentis illa duntaxat desumes, et adhibebis, quae firmissima, et nulli exceptioni obnoxio fuerint». Ibid.

³⁹⁹ «Quare omnis scopi tui compendium nervosissimum scribi debet, juxta modum numeris 10, 11, & 12, praescriptum; ea de omnibus quae scribere instituisti seliges, quae fortissima fuerint, ac nulli objectioni vel exceptioni obnoxia; istum in fine directum, ut Sacra Novi Testamenti scriptura, apud homines recipi possit ac recipiatur pro primo principio manifestissimo, verissimo, ac maxime rationali». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 4v-5r.

⁴⁰⁰ «Hoc compendio absoluto, et ad impressionem parato, plurimasque in linguas verso, ad peregrinationem te conferas; et in ea introducas Legem Novi Testamenti, introducas inquam illam ejusque cultum, per ejus auditum ac tacitas preces, erecta, istum in finem, de propaganda Dei ac Christi Jesu conformitate, societate». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) f. 5r.

There is no evidence to determine if Boreel ever established this *Societas*, or if at least he tried to. Anyhow, it is clear that in the last decade of his life Boreel was committed to the spreading of Christian religion among the people who did not follow Christ's doctrine. He tried to pursue this aim in two ways. From a theoretical point of view, Boreel wrote the JNL and worked to the translations of the Mishnah, in order to make easier the relationship between Jews and Christians. From a practical point of view, he wanted to found a *Societas* where people with similar thinking would have been committed to spread the Christian religions in the Pagan nations.

The Amsterdam College

In the previous chapter the history of the Amsterdam College ended with the exposition of the account of the Reformed council dated November 20, 1653, when it was decided to ask again the civil authorities to stop the meetings of the Collegiants. For more than two years there are no references to the Socinians or to the assemblies of Boreel's College in the reports of the Reformed Church of Amsterdam. However, it is possible to assume that the Collegiants did not stop meeting, but rather they continued their meetings more carefully, trying to avoid the surveillance of the Reformed ministers. On the other hand, it has already been shown that during the 50s Boreel spent four years in England. Therefore, someone else must have taken the leading role of the College between the end of 1654 and the beginning of 1659.

Of course, it cannot be excluded that De Breen continued to be a major figure among the Collegiants of Amsterdam. Likewise, the growing position that people like Cornelis Moorman and Frans Kuyper had within the College must not be underestimated.⁴⁰¹ However, after Boreel left, Galenus was the one who became the major figure in the Amsterdam college. He played the leading role at least until 1663, when the *Lammerenkrijgh* ended and the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam was divided in two different congregations, the "lamists" and the "zonists".⁴⁰² It is likely that Galenus started to have an increasingly significant position among the Collegiants before 1655. However, it is clear that in this year he reached a most important role in the Amsterdam College. To support this assertion, two main happenings must be taken into consideration.

⁴⁰¹ For instance, Moorman's resignation from his position in the *doopsgezinde* congregation was an event of the utmost importance. In 1653 Moorman had to make a fundamental choice: either he continued to be a minister of the *Het Lam* community, but he had to cease attending the meetings of the Collegiants, or he continued to be part of the Amsterdam College, but he had to give up his office within the *doopsgezinde* congregation. Moorman chose to continue to be a Collegiant next to Boreel and his group, and so he resigned his office in the *Het Lam* community. See: Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 53.

⁴⁰² The term *Lammerenkrijgh* is usually used to describe the dispute that occurred within the *Het Lam* community between 1655 and 1663, and it is drawn from the pamphlet entitled *Lammerenkrijgh*. In this work the author reconstructs the history of the struggles that occurred during these years within the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam, when the more liberal party, led by Galenus and David Spruyt, and the conservative party, led by people like Tieleman Tielen and Samuel Apostool, fought each other by publishing numerous pamphlets. See: [De Fijne], *Lammerenkrijgh* (see above, n. 86).

First, in 1655 some pamphlets against Galenus started to be published, works that are the first signs of the beginning of the *Lammerenkrijgh*. For instance, in 1655 an anonymous work was published, entitled *Commonitio*.⁴⁰³ In spite of the difficulties to establish who wrote this work, it is clear that Tieleman Tielen's ideas influenced the *Commonitio*, if he was not its author. Anyhow, in this work the author accuses Galenus of Socinianism and asks the *doopsgezinde* congregation to examine the ideas of Galenus and of his fellow-thinkers concerning this topic.⁴⁰⁴ Shortly after another work was published, entitled *Renovatio van de Commonitio*, where an «antwoort geschreven aen seker vrient» written by Tieleman Tielen was enclosed, dated May 1, 1655.⁴⁰⁵ Despite the accusations made in these two pamphlets, Galenus decided to not answer them and he gave to each member of his congregation the opportunity to judge through Galenus' words in his sermons and through his actions.⁴⁰⁶

Furthermore, in the same year other pamphlets were published. For instance, in 1655 appeared the *Ontdekte veinsing der heedendaaghsche Geest-dryvers en Sociniaenen*, a work divided in two parts.⁴⁰⁷ Although the

⁴⁰³ *Commonitio ofte Waerschouwinghe, aen de Vlaemsche Doops-gesinde Gemeynte binnen Amsterdam tegen eenige Leeraren onder haer, op welke sy wel hebben te letten: aengaende haer Leere, by-al-dien sy van quaet tot erger niet willen vervallen. Door een Doorstander ja een Lidmaet der selve Gemeynte, ten eynde dat se in lief de ruste ende vrede mochte behouden worden*, 1655.

⁴⁰⁴ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 49.

⁴⁰⁵ *Renovatio van de Commonitio ofte Waerschouwinghe, aen de Vlaemsche Doops-gesinde Gemeynte binnen Amsterdam tegen eenige Leeraren onder haer, op welke sy wel hebben te letten: aengaende haer Leere, by-al-dien sy van quaet tot erger niet willen vervallen. Door een Doorstander ja een Lidmaet der selve Gemeynte, ten eynde dat se in lief de ruste ende vrede mochte behouden worden. Hier is oock by gevoeght een verantwoordinge voor Tielman Tielen Vlaemsch Leeraer deser Gemeente tegen sijne beschuldigers. Mitsgaders oock een Brief door hem selven geschreven aen seker Vrient wegens sijn onschuldige*, 1655.

⁴⁰⁶ «Vanzelfsprekend bleef Galenus het antwoord schuldig. Op niet getekende aanklachten behoefde hij niet in te gaan. Bovendien weigerde hij zich ter verantwoording te laten roepen door willekeurigen. Ook al zou Tieleman de opdrachtgever van de zich verborgen houdende werkelijke schrijver geweest zijn, dan was zelfs hij niet degene aan wie Galenus rekenschap verschuldigd was. Dat was niet eens de verzamelde dienaarschap; dat kon alleen de gehele Gemeente wezen. En dan wist hij, dat zijn gemeenteleden de caricatuur, die in het pamflet van zijn geloof getekend werd, wel zouden weten te onderscheiden van de werkelijke inhoud van zijn prediking. Zijn gehoor was talrijk en aandachtig, want zijn aangeboren welsprekendheid wer nog vergroot door zijn vermogen de dingen helder voor te stellen. Zijn vroomheid bezat een weldadige warmte, en menigeen kon hem dan ook niet andres dan als een heilig en oprecht man beschouwen». Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 50.

⁴⁰⁷ The first part was published without the name of the editor and of the city, and at the end it was signed by Radbodus Reinardi. The second part was published without the name of the editor and of the city as well, but at the end was signed by Radbodus Reinard,

author seems to be a certain «Radbodus Reinardi», already in 1655 Tieleman Tielen was believed to be the principal writer. In addition, in the same year the brief *Sociniaense hooft-pyn* was published without the name of his author, of the editor, and of the city where it was put to press.⁴⁰⁸ In both pamphlets the authors accuse Galenus of holding Socinian ideas and of trying to transform the *doopsgezinde* congregation into a Socinian sect.⁴⁰⁹ The *Winckel-praetjen* was published in 1655 too.⁴¹⁰ In this work the author, a certain Somer Genasarium, clearly says that Galenus was a close friends and associate of Collegiants like Moorman and Boreel.⁴¹¹

Second, the event that most sharpened the hostilities between Galenus and the conservative *doopsgezinden* occurred in 1655. It has already been shown that in 1653 the General States of Holland and of West Friesland issued a decree against Socinianism, which surely made much more dangerous to held Collegiant assemblies. This is the reason why after 1653 the Collegiants of Amsterdam needed a safe meeting place. So, in August 12, 1655, some of them asked to the *doopsgezinde* ministers if they could use the sacristy of the *doopsgezinde* Church to held their meetings. Galenus was the middle-man between the Collegiants and the *doopsgezinde* ministers, and this role raised against him the anger of the conservative party. Even though the *doopsgezinden* did not immediately gave a negative answer, many among the conservative party were horrified by the possibility that the Collegiants could have met in their church. After all, people like Michiel Comans, who were excluded from the «avondmaalsdeelneming» by his previous *doopsgezinde*

Vatiomundus Balduini, Botho Brechti, and Conradus Clodomiri. See: *Ontdekte veinsing der heedendaaghsche Geest-dryvers en Sociniaenen; Het tweede Deel, van de Ondekte Veinzingh der hedendaeghze Gheest-dryvers, en Sociniane. Oordeelt een gherecht Oordeel*, 1655.

⁴⁰⁸ *Sociniaense Hooft-pyn*, 1655.

⁴⁰⁹ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 54-55.

⁴¹⁰ Somer Genasarium, *Wnckel-praetjen, Gehouden tusschen twee Persoonen in een Barbiere winckel, den eenen gedoopt en den anderen noch ongedoopt. Over ende van wegen de oneenigheden die onder de Gemeente (die men Vlamingen noempt) geresen zijn. Daer in klaerlick ontdeckt wordt het gevoelen van Galenus ende sijn compliceren, dienende tot onderrichtinghe voor die gene die noch niet kunnen gelooven dat sy het Sociniaensche gevoelen zijn toe gedaen*, 1655.

⁴¹¹ For instance, the author openly affirms that all people had known for a long time that Galenus was a close friend and associate of Boreel. When the character *ongedoopt* asks how it was possible that Boreel had the opportunity to held a public debate within the *doopsgezinde* congregations, even though had been accused of Socinianism, the *gedoopt* answers: «wie den eersten aenleyder daer van geweest is dat en weet ick juyst niet op 't nauste: maer dat Galenus veel met Borreel verkeerde dat is een yghelick wel bekend». Genasarium, *Winckel-praetjen* (see above, n. 410), f. Br.

congregation in Rotterdam, Moorman, who had given up his position to continue to be a Collegiant, Frans Kuyper and Ian Knol, who clearly held Socinian ideas, were members of the Amsterdam College. Therefore, the role that Galenus played in this request could only exacerbate the hostilities against him.

Despite the difficulties caused both by the Reformed Church and by the conservative *doopsgezinden*, the Collegiants kept going with their meetings. However, eventually they were discovered by the Reformed minister, who at the beginning of 1656 became aware that the Amsterdam College was still meeting. As a matter of fact, on January 27, 1656, «D. Belcampius» informed the Reformed council that some Socinians held an assembly in the Lauriergracht, «aen de noort syde by de brugge». Hence, «D. Wittelvongel met syn ouderlingh» were instructed to find more information about this question.⁴¹²

On February 3 the two members of the Reformed Church informed the council that the «sociniaense vergaderinge der borellisten» had various meeting-places in Amsterdam and that their members were spreading the «periculeuse ende siel verderstelycke» errors of their leaders.⁴¹³ The council decided to inform the burgomasters about the Collegiants and «dominus Wittewrongel, dominus Langelius ende frater De Beyer» were instructed to discuss with the civil authorities.⁴¹⁴ In the following days they discussed with the burgomasters and on February 10 the council expressed the desire to know what actions the civil power would undertake against the Socinians. So, the council's members decided to talk about the Socinians with the president of

⁴¹² «*Dominus* Belcampius brenck in dat op de Lawerriergrecht aen de noort syde by de brugge een sociniaensche vergaderinge gehouden wort *dominus* Wittewrongel met syn ouderlingh sal daer naer vernemen». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 143.

⁴¹³ Unfortunately, in the report there is not the name of these leaders. Perhaps one of them was Ian Knol, who later became one of the main target of the Reformed ministers.

⁴¹⁴ «*Dominus* Wittewrongel met syn ouderlingh rapporteert dat in verscheyden plaetsen vande stad de voorschrevene sociniaense vergaderinge der borellisten gehouden worden, verhalende hare periculeuse, ende siel verderstelycke dwalingen van twee van hare hoofden. de *Edele* kerckenraet siende met droefheyt dese donckere wolcke ende swaricheden, oordelt, dat met ten eerste persoonen moeten gedeputeert worden, om dese sake mondelinge te brengen by de *Edele* heeren burgemeesteren, by forme van droevige clachte over de hoofden van dese sociniansche godt lasteringen. Hier toe syn gedeputeert *Dominus* Wittewrongel, *Dominus* Langelius ende frater de Beyer». MS GAS 376.1.9, f. 146

the burgomasters.⁴¹⁵ The «Edele Here Commissaris Dronckelaer» answered them that the authorities of the city would make sure that the Collegiants would no meet any more. Nevertheless, the Reformed ministers decided to pay attention to these «wolgen in schaeps cleederen vermaent», in order to find out if they would have really gave up their assemblies.⁴¹⁶

As it had happened before, the collegiants stopped their meetings or they went undercover again. Anyhow, for a few months the Reformed ministers heard nothing about the collegiants. However, in the summer of the same year they were discovered again. On July 6, 1656, the council of the Reformed Church were informed that the socinians continued their meetings, even though the burgomasters had forbade them to. Therefore, it was decided to obtain more information about their meeting and then to inform the authorities of Amsterdam again.⁴¹⁷

It is clear that this time the precautions the Collegiants took were stronger than before. For some months they were able to avoid the surveillance of the Reformed ministers, who collected significant information about the College only in November. As a matter of fact, on November 9, 1656, the council became aware that the Socinians continued to hold their meetings in the «legghende Hert» and in the «ghecronde Niet» on the Elandstraat, in other places of the same street, and in the «spinnekop» on the Elandsgracht. In particular, in this last place Ian Knol had spoken in one of the Collegiant meetings and he had pronounced a Socinian blasphemy in front

⁴¹⁵ «De gedeputeerde over de sociniaensche vergaderinge te clagen aen de achtbare Magistraet rapporteren huer devoir gedaen te hebben, syn daer over van de Edele Kerckenraet hartelyck bedanckt. Is geresolvert met de president Burgemerster te spreken, ende te vernemen watter in dese sake by hare Edele gedaen is». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 149.

⁴¹⁶ «De gedeputeerde aen de E. heer president Burgemeester om te vernemen watter by hare Edele gedaen was in de sake de sociniaensche vergaderinge, rapporteren dat de Edele Here Commissaris Dronckelaer daer van soude spreeken inde kerckenraet, de welke verhaelt datter soo danigh vande Achtbare heeren Burgemeesteren in versien is datter sulcke particuliere Sociaensche vergaderingh niet meer sullen gehouden worden, ende syn de E. broederen gedeputeerden wegens hare yverige gedane devoire bedanckt, ende tot nauwe op sich over die wolven in schaeps cleederen vemaent, om te sien oft sy dese vergaderinge in elckx quartier sullen nalaten, ende wat aengaet het prinsipale van den brief van Jan knol aen de Edele heeren Burgemeesteren over te leveren, ende de Copie van dien by ons te behouden». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 152.

⁴¹⁷ «Wort voor ghestelt niet teghenstaende dat het den socinijanen van de Achtbare heeren Burgemeesteren verbooden is hare verghadering te houden dat se evenwel onbeschroomt daer in voortghaen is gheresolvert dat men sich op alle partikelaris wat naeder informacij [(omitted): verzamelt] en als dan de novo te doleren daer het behoort». GAS MS 376.9.1, f. 169v.

of some members of the Reformed Church. He asserted that he did not know in what kind of God they believed, apparently in a Pagan God who had three heads. Horrified by Knol's words, the council decided to obtain a written proof of what Knol said in that meeting. In the meanwhile, the Reformed ministers had to keep a close watch on the Collegiants.⁴¹⁸

«Dominus Coop van Groen en Otto Simonsz» were appointed to find proofs against Ian Knol. On November 16, 1656, they not only delivered to the council a «deposyta» concerning Knol's blasphemy, but they were also able to give new information about two other meetings of the Collegiants, which they had held in the previous weeks. In particular, on October 22 the Socinians had held a «coleghe» in the *Spinnecop* on the Elandsgracht, where fifty people had gathered. Furthermore, they had had another meeting on November 10 in the house of Galenus' mother, where ten people had met and where Moorman, Ian Knol, and Galenus himself had spoken. Since they believed to have evidence enough to inform the authorities, the reformed ministers decided to speak to the burgomasters. They would have seized the opportunity to denounce the Quakers too, who in the meanwhile had begun their mission in Amsterdam.⁴¹⁹

⁴¹⁸ «Wort inghebracht dat de socinyanen noch al haer conventikelen hebben besonderlyck int legghende Hert oft ghecronde Niet inde Elants straet oock noch elders daer omtrent in de spinnekop op de Elants graft in de welke de gronden van het socinyaenschap worden voor ghestaen daer Ian Knol duergaens hem mede laet vinden die teghen eenighe van onse ledematen op de publike straet dese godts lasteringhe heeft wt gebraecht Ick en weet niet In wat voor een godt ghy gheloofft in een haidenschen af godt die wt drie personen te samen ghesmeet is de vergadering vindt goet dat men van die luiden die Ian Knol soo hebben hooren lasteren atestacy sal afaisschen en dat men naeder het oog sal houden op de socinyansche vergaedinghen sal houden en tot het afnemen van de depositie syn ghedeputeert D: Cap a groen en frater Otto Simonsz». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 180r.

⁴¹⁹ «Belanghende de byeenkomste van de sosyansche en int besonder het voorghemelte segghen van Jan Knol verhalen D. Coop van Groen en Otto Simonsz dat se seker beriecht hebben bekomen dat se op den 22 ocktober coleghe hebben ghehouden op de Elants graft, inde spinnekop starck synde wel 50 personen ghelyck oock den vijfden november inde Elantstraet ten huise van de moeder van Galenus in ghetal sinde omtrent 10 personen waer in de meste sprekers syn gheweest Galenus – Morman en Ian knol ghelick oock voorn[o]emde broederen inbrengghen een deposyta betreffende de godtloose lasteringhe van Jan Knol die inde naest voorgaende achte wt ghedruicht was onder taikent Willem Dirckxsz Cornelus Lueven en elsen Heindrickx verstaen de *Edele* broederen een stemmelyck nu soo veel bewys bekomen te hebben dat met ghenochsaem fondement de *Achtbare Here* Burghemeesteren het een en Het ander Als meede het doen van de quaeckxsters sal worden gheremonstret met erenstich versoecken dat hare *Achtbare* soodanighe godts lasteringhe en verderffelycke quaden door haer auteritait ghelieven te verbieden en te weeren waer toe ghecommiteert syn D. preses D Langhelyus en frater Rainier Andriesz» GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 181r. For some information about the Quakers and their relationship with the Collegiants of Amsterdam, see later in this chapter.

In the two following weeks, the Reformed ministers informed the burgomasters of Amsterdam of the Collegiant meetings, of the Quakers who were in the city, and of the activities of Jan Knol.⁴²⁰ On the account of the council's session held on November 30, 1656, there are two references to the questions of the Collegiants and of the Quakers. First, the «Achtbare Here Commisaryus» informed council's members that those who had been instructed to discuss with the civil authorities had fulfilled their assignment. Hence, the burgomasters had authorized the officer to deal with the «conventikelen» of the Socinians, with the Quakers, and with Ian Knol.⁴²¹ Then, the same ministers who were appointed to discuss with the authorities of Amsterdam gave another report about their assignment. They informed the council that the burgomasters would have summoned some *doopsgezinde* ministers who were against the Amsterdam College and then they would have dealt with the Collegiants. As for Ian Knol, the burgomasters had informed

⁴²⁰ In the report dated November 23, 1656, it is possible to read: «De broederen ghecommiterde raportereren dat se tot noch toe de *Here* Burgmesteren over de socinyaense conventikelen en van de lastering van Ian Knol niet ghesproken en hadden niets gaders meede van de enghelsche quecksters door dien dat haer hoope was ghegheven dat se in vertien daghen nader bliken ter handt souden kon[n]en hebben het ghenne ghister Avont na de predicacy in eenighe kercken de presente leeden was bekent ghemaect het wtstel aende *Here* te remonsteren der ghesaide stouticheyt de vergaderinghe vindt goet dat sonder lang wtstel op de dokementen die wy nu al hebben over desen allen hare *Achtbare* heden door de vorighe ghedupiterde sullen werden aenghesproken en ernstelycken tot weringhe van alle die quaden sullen worden versocht». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 181v. Therefore, on November 23 the appointed minister had not yet spoken with the burgomasters, because they were hoping to find new evidence against the collegiants and against the quakers.

⁴²¹ «Den Acht.Bare *Here* Commisaryus maeckt bekent dat de *Edele Here* Burghemeesteren verstaen hebbende door onse ghedupiterde het onhebbelyck doen van Ian Knol en de bienkomst van de quecksters en van de socinyaen den *Here* officier hebben belast na behooren volgens syne onhebbelick daden met hem te handelen ende geode acht te nemen teghen die ghesaide conventikelen van de enghelsche quecxsters en van de cosyamen daer benoffens dat de *Here* Burgemeesteren beriecht syn dat eenighe vrous personen in onse stadt hier en daer tot miscontement van veelen inde particuliere huisen catigiseeren sonder te weeten oft sulckx gheschiet met autorisacy van dese *Edele* vergadering Hebben synne *Achtbare* belast het selve al hier voor te draghen ten einde daer op meede te deggen acht op ghenomen mocht worden waer over om vraghe ghedaen is en hebben de *Burgemeesteren* betuigt niet te weeten dat eenighe catigisacy elders onordentlyck teghen wil en danck souden gheschieden maer allen dat eenighe wel gheoeffende personen dese en ghenne onder wesen de welke voor hadden haer tot syner tyck tot de ghemente te begheven het welke gheordelt werde een gans dienstelyk werck te syn te meer dewyle soo veel cloppen In onse stadt door mieddel van cattigisacy hare afgodische dwalinghe int miedden van ons soecken voort te setten doch sal der naeder opworden ghelet ofter oock eenighe onordentlyckhyt by imant omtrent het catigiseren op dat de selve in ordre mochte ghehouden worden om Hare *Achtbare* En andre verghenoeghen te gheven». GAS MS 376.1.9, 182r. Most of this account concerns some people who catechized in their home without having neither the necessary knowledge, nor the permission to do it.

the sheriff, who would have taken care of him. In addition, the council had to send to the sheriff the written proof of Ian Knol's blasphemy.⁴²²

In 1657 the hostilities between Galenus and his supporters on the one hand, and the members of the conservative *doopsgezinden* on the other, started to worsen. Not only had Galenus tried to use the sacristy of the *doopsgezinde* church to hold Collegiant meetings, but during 1656 he also made available his mother's house as one of the meeting place of the Amsterdam College.⁴²³

In January 1657 Jeye Jeyes publicly asked from the pulpit to stop the publishing of pamphlets, so that the struggles within the *Het Lam* congregation would not become public knowledge. Furthermore, on January 11 Galenus delivered to the members of his community the «Negentien Artikelen», a work that he wrote together with David Spruyt, in order to make known their true ideas to all the *doopsgezinden* of the *Het Lam* congregation. In this work they dealt with many theological doctrines, such as the modern condition of the Church, the origins of ecclesiastical authority, the perfectibility of men, etc.⁴²⁴

Galenus and Spruyt did not want to publish their «Negentien Artikelen». Nevertheless, this work was put to press without their knowledge. In 1658 Jan Jansz Swichtenheuvel published it with an answer to these articles made by deacons of Amsterdam.⁴²⁵ Galenus and Spruyt were forced to

⁴²² «De Edele Broederen ghedupiteerde raportereren dat se hare comissy betreffende de socinyaennen Ian Knol en de enghelsche quecksters hebben wt ghevoert ghelyck mede de maniere op welck haer de *Achtbare Here Burgemeesteren* op het eerste hadden gheantwoort dat se noch nader daer na souden vernemen en een oft twee van de menniste vermanders⁴²² die oock teghen die vergadering syn souden ontbieden en als dan daer op behorlycke ordre stellen en belaghende het werck van Ian Knol Hare *Achtbare* hadden ghesait dat se het selvighe souden gheven in handen van de schout en de *Heren* Schepenen en dat wy onse bewysen van synne begaenne godts lasteringhe aen den *Here* officier souden overleveren en dat Hare *Achtbare* het wel soude maken dat hy in toekomende het niet meer soude doen insghelyckx de sake van de quecksters stellen in handen van den Heer schout ende *Heeren* schepenen met besorginghe dat sulcke tsamen rottinghe in onse stadt niet meer en soude voorvallen». GAS MS 376.1.9, f. 182v.

⁴²³ Meihuizen suggests that Galenus make available his mother's house as one of the meeting place of the College while they were waiting for the answer of the *doopsgezinden*. Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230).

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-58.

⁴²⁵ Jan Jansz Swichtenheuvel, *Oprechte Editie, ofte Uytgift van het Geschrift van Doct. Galenus ende David Spruyt, in Volkomenheydt, so als Sy-lieden die met haer Bewijsredenen, ende bygebrachte Schriftuer-plaetsen, t' samen met een By-voeghsel daer by, aen hare genoemde Mede-dienaren der Vereenighde Vlaemsche, Hoogduytsche, ende Vriesche*

publicly defend themselves. So, in 1659 they wrote and published a new work, entitled *Nader Verklaringe van de XIX Artikelen*, in which they offered the original nineteen articles with further explanations and in which they answered the accusations and the refutations published in the *Oprechte Editie*.⁴²⁶ In the same year Serrarius joined the dispute, publishing *De Vertredinge des Heyligen Stads*, in which he defended Galenus and Spruyt's ideas against the accusations of the conservative *doopsgezinden*.⁴²⁷

Boreel returned in Amsterdam in this time of struggles between the Collegiants and the *doopsgezinde*. It has already been shown that Boreel went back to Amsterdam between the end of 1658 and the beginning of 1659, since he was in touch with Lancelot van Brederore both before and after the publishing of the *Van de Apostasie*.⁴²⁸ It is possible to find the first reference to this work in the account of the council's session held on April 17, 1659. Therefore, Boreel had returned in Amsterdam some months before. Furthermore, in the same account the reformed ministers refer to the «book of doctor Galenus». So, it can be concluded that Boreel was in Amsterdam while Galenus and Spruyt were writing the *Nader Verklaringe*, or at least when they published it.⁴²⁹ Anyhow, there are no reference to the Collegiant meeting in the reports of the Reformed council until 1661.

Gemeenten tot Amsterdam overgegeven hebben, ende soo voor desen noyt in Druck geweest is. Midtsgaders: De Antwoordt van der selver Dienaeren voor ghenoeft, tot Wederleggingh, met ghemeenen raedt ende overlegh, door Laurens Hendrickx in geschrift gestelt, ende alsoo oock aen Dr. Galenus ende David Spruyt over-gegeven, Haarlem, 1658.

⁴²⁶ G. Abrahamsz & D. Spruyt, *Nader verklaringe van de XIX Artikelen, voor desen door G. Abrahamsz ende D. Spruyt aen hare Mede-dienaren over-ghegeven: dienende tot Wederlegginge van 't Gheschrift, genaemt: Antwoorde by forme van aenmerckingen, vragen, ende redenen, etc.*, Amsterdam, 1659.

⁴²⁷ Petrus Serrarius, *De Vertredinge des Heyligen Stads ofte een Kleer Bewijs van 't verval der eerste Apostolische Gemeente, gestel tot Antwoort op Drie Vragen diesaengaende aen Dr. Galenus gedaen*, Amsterdam, 1659. For more information about Serrarius' role in the dispute, see: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 205-214.

⁴²⁸ [Lancelot van Brederode] *Van de Apostasie, dat is Van den Afval der Christenen. Door een Ondersoecker der Waerheyt*, Amsterdam, 1659.

⁴²⁹ «Also men verneemt dat een seer lasterlyck sociniaens boexken gedruet ende in een publycke winckel alhier vercocht is, welckes tytell is den Apostasie, of afval der Christenen gedruet by Jacob Nieuwelingh sal Dominus Coop a Groen met syn ouderlingh vernemen door wien het gemaect is, om nae goede informatie ende kennisse daer yets tegen te doen, als oock mede tegen andere schadelycke Boecken die hier inde Stadt uyt gegeven worden, onder andere van Docter Galenus». GAS MS 376.1.10, f. 53. Although the reformed ministers did not mention the title of Galenus' work, it is evident that they referred to the *Nader Verklaringe*. The Reformed council continued to discuss about the books of Galenus and Van Brederore in its following sessions. See: GAS MS 376.1.10, ff. 53, 54, 55, and 56.

However, the Collegiants of Amsterdam did not stop their activities during the years 1659-60. If we examine the dispute that arose between the collegiants and the Quakers in Amsterdam during this period, we can prove that Boreel, Galenus, and their fellow-thinkers continued to meet at least in 1660.

The sect of the Quakers or «Religious Society of Friends» was born in England around 1647, thanks to the preaching of George Fox, who believed that it was possible to have a direct experience of God and who started to gather some disciples around himself. Fox and his followers believed that God gifted them with His Holy Spirit, which they refer to as the «inner light», and that He had appointed them to spread their teaching both in England and in Europe.⁴³⁰

Between 1655 and 1657 some members of the Society of Friends reached the Dutch Republic. The leading figures of the Quaker mission were William Ames, William Caton, John Stubbs, Humble Tatcher, and John Higgins, who started to spread their teachings in the Dutch territories. The meeting between Quakers and Collegiants in Amsterdam was only natural. Their members shared ideas like God's immediate action in each man through his Spirit, the belief in the decay of the Church, the hope in the forthcoming kingdom of Christ. Furthermore, they shared similar interests concerning the Jews as well.⁴³¹ However, after the first friendly relationship, Collegiants and

⁴³⁰ For more information about George Fox and the beginnings of the Quaker movement, see: Richard Bailey, *New light on George Fox and early quakerism: the making and unmaking of a God*, San Francisco, 1992; Larry H. Ingle, *First among friends: George Fox and creation of quakerism*, Oxford, 1994; Jean Hatton, *George Fox: the founder of the quakers*, Grand Rapids, 2007. Per ulteriori informazioni sul quaccherismo si vedano: William I. Hull, *Willem Sewel fo Amsterdam: 1653-1720. The first quaker historian of quakerism*, Philadelphia, 1933; Hull, *The rise of quakerism in Amsterdam* (see above, n.5); William I. Hull, *Benjamin Furly and quakerism in Rotterdam*, Philadelphia, 1941; Elfrida Vipont, *Quakerism; a faith to live by*, London, 1965; Richard T. Vann, *The social development of english quakerism: 1655-1755*, Cambridge; 1969; J.Z. Kannegieter, *Geschiedenis van de vroegere quakergemeenschap te Amsteerdam. 1656 tot begin negentiende eeuw*, Amsterdam, 1971; Melvin B. Endy, *William Penn and early quakerism*, Princeton, 1973; Jonathan Fryer (ed.), *George Fox and the children of the light*, London, 1991; Sünne Juterzenka, *Über Gott und die Welt. Endzeitvisionen, Reformdebatten und die europäische Quäkermission in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Göttingen, 2008; Stephen Ward Angeli, *Early Quakers and their theological thought: 1647-1723*, New York, 2015.

⁴³¹ The Quakers believed that they had to convert both Christians and Jews. This is one of the main reason why they went to the to Amsterdam, where there was one of the biggest Jewish community of all Europe. Some scholars had argued that in Amsterdam the Quakers were able to meet the young Baruch Spinoza, who was banned from the Jewish congregations shortly before and who offered them to translate some of their pamphlets,

Quakers started to dispute and to publish numerous pamphlets against each other.

The first hostilities arose between Petrus Serrarius and William Ames, the leader of the Quaker mission in Amsterdam. In 1657 Ames published a pamphlet in which he asked twenty three questions of the Collegiants and the *doopsgezinden* who were followers of Galenus. Serrarius replied to this pamphlet, writing the *Antwoort op 23 vragen*. Both these pamphlets are lost. Afterwards Ames responded to Serrarius' work, publishing the *Wederlegginge van een boek genaemt Antwoort op 23 vragen*.⁴³² It is evident that the main reason of the struggles between them concerned ecclesiological ideas. The Quakers believed that God appointed them to restore the fallen Church, while Serrarius denied their claim.⁴³³

Since at that time Boreel lived in England, he did not meet Ames and the other Quakers who reached Amsterdam, and he did not take part in the quarrel between Ames and Serrarius. However, Boreel had been aware of the existence of the Society of Friends, and of Quakers' ideas and activities since 1647.⁴³⁴ Even though he took no part in these first hostilities, after he returned in Amsterdam Boreel got involved in two disputes with the Quakers.

written in order to convert the Jews. See: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 32), pp. 215-217; Popkin, *Spinoza's earliest publication?* (see above, n. 6)

⁴³² William Ames, *Wederlegginge van een boek genaemt Antwoort op 23 vragen door F.D. waervan, de logens uygenomen zijnde, ende den logenaer ontdeckt sijnde, sijn Antwoort sonder kracht blijft. Als mede een wederlegginge van een andere Antwoort, die door P.S. daer op gedaen was, waer in zijne dwaesheyt ontdeckt is. Soo dat mijne vragen klaer staen van alle besmettingen van hare logens, ende noch in haer volle macht blyven, om beantwoort te worden*, 1657.

⁴³³ Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 219-221; Juterczenka, *Über Gott und die Welt* (see above, n. 430), pp. 242-243.

⁴³⁴ On December 7, 1647, Dury sent a long letter to Boreel. In his letter the Scottish theologian made his Dutch friend aware of the existence of the Quakers, describing their customs and their activities, and how dangerous they were for Christian religion: «Et certé sub prætextu Scientiæ Spiritualis, et perfectionis Evangelicæ, incredibilis nos invadit licentia et Confusio, tam in doctrinâ Fidei quàm Praxi virtutis, quæ infinitis scandalis nullo remedio abolendis, Ecclesiam hanc repleverunt. Vera sunt illa quæ Honorius Reggius refert de hac Ecclesiâ, sed præter omnes illos sectarum Coryphæos, qui ab illo recensentur, novi sunt exorti aliqui, qui sese Apostolicâ Authoritate præditos jactant, ac suarum manuum impositione Spiritum Sanctum donari ajunt; horum discipuli qui fidem ipsis adhibent, convenire solent et expectant immediatum Spiritus tactum, qui sæpé illis contingit et quidem plerumque cum magnâ membrorum commotione et [tremebundæ?] totius corporis conquassatione, quæ ad horæ circiter quadrantem et amplius aliquando durat: tum cessante illo motu (ut illi putant Spiritus Sancti) prophetare incipiunt de rebus Dei magnificis; nempe aliqui ex Scripturæ verbis recitant quædam de futuro Ecclesiæ statu glorioso, alij suas deprædicant Auditoribus perfectiones, et jam omnem deposuisse carnem, se Deo in sanctitate

On August 24, 1660, the Collegiants held a meeting in Serrarius' house on the Prinsengracht, in which some Quakers took part too. Among the Collegiants there were Boreel, Serrarius, and Galenus. In this meeting John Higgins read a pamphlet entitled *Eenige waerdige en gewichtige aenmerckingen voor Galenus Abrahamsz ende Adam Boreel, ende haere aenhangers*.⁴³⁵ Although Higgins directly attacked him, Boreel did not reply to the accusations made by the Quakers. Serrarius wrote a first reply to Higgins' work, who in turn was attacked by Ames, who criticized the XIX articles of Galenus too. These first pamphlets were the first signs of a long struggles that lasted until 1662, whose major characters were Serrarius, Galenus, and Pieter Balling among the Collegiants, and Higgins and Ames among the Quakers.⁴³⁶

However, this was the second time that Boreel and his group had disputed with the Quakers. During 1660 there was at least another Collegiant meeting held in Serrarius' house in which the Quakers took part.⁴³⁷ Boreel,

similes evasisse; se jam ultra statum vitæ in quo per fidem deo vivendum est provectos esse, et ad gloriam pervenisse: se non amplius opus habere Christo mediatore; et hisce monstrosis blasphemijs similia. Inter eorum doctores unus, qui ausus fuit definire præcisum ultimi judicij diem (qui jam ante quatuor menses effluxit, atque adeo falsus Propheta compertus est) vnus inquam illorum qui multas habet asseclas non obstante illo, in quo deprehensus est, errore, non veretur hanc tueri sententiam; se de sese ipso cogitare debere quod revera ipse sit verus ille Deus; atque instillat discipulis suis hanc doctrinam; omne illud pro peccato esse habendum quod in se ipsis non vident esse ipsissimum deum; atque illud esse perpetuó rejciendum, quicquid illud sit, unde aliqui inferunt, in ijs qui spiritu ducuntur immediato nullum aliud esse aut cadere posse peccatum nisi hoc, non cogitare se esse Deum». In the conclusion of his letter Dury asked Boreel how they could have dealt with the Quakers, who «nec enim Scripturas, nec Rationem, nec sensum communem; nec Spiritum in alijs sed in se ipsis solùm audire volunt». HP 4/1/17A-20B.

⁴³⁵ John Higgins, *Eenige waerdige en gewichtige aenmerckingen voor Galenus Abrahamsz ende Adam Boreel, ende haere aenhangers*, [Amsterdam], 1660. Serrarius describes this meeting in the *Van de waere wegh*, while gives an account of it in the *De misslagen en valscheden wederleydt*. See: Petrus Serrarius, *Van den waere wegh tot God. Tot bewijs dat niet alle licht dat inde duysternisse schijnt den wegh zy tot god. Gestelt tegens 't voorgeven van William Ames (een derghene die men Quakers noemt) in seecker wederlegginge (als hy 't heet) op een antwoordt door J. Higgins als oock op iets in d' eerste en tweede pag. van mijn boeck De vertredinge der h. stadt genaemt, t' Alckmaer, 1661; William Ames, De misslagen en valscheden wederleydt, die gevonden zijn in de extracten uyt de schriften van Jacob Adriaensz. van oudts genaemt Mr. Jans: tegen een volck Quakers genaemt, welcke onschuldigh zijn van 't gene hy haer oplegt. Mede (een extract uyt) James Naylors bekentenis (door hem in druck uytgegeven,) van sijne afwijckinge, tegens welcke de Quakers getuyght hebben*, Amsterdam 1661.

⁴³⁶ For more information about this dispute, see: Hull, *The rise of Quakerism* (see above, n. 5), pp. 234; Van der Wall, *De mstieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 32), pp. 221-225; Juterzenka, *Über Gott und die Welt* (see above, n. 430), pp. 243-244.

⁴³⁷ This meeting is described in a pamphlet entitled *Adam Boreel, ontdeckt door sijn vruchten. Tot waerschouwinge van de oprecht meenende, die door hem etc.*, which some Quakers wrote together. Since this pamphlet was published in 1662, some scholars argued

Abrahamsz, and Serrarius attended this meeting among other Collegiants, while on the Quaker side there surely were Ames and Benjamin Furly. During the meeting Boreel read a brief work against the Quakers. He argued that James Naylor was their leader and that they wanted to venerate Christ, probably referring to Naylor himself.⁴³⁸

James Naylor's case deeply shook the Quaker movement. Like George Fox, Naylor was a soldier in the army of the Parliamentarians during the English Civil War and he met Fox in 1652. After their meeting, Naylor said that he had felt God's calling and he joined the Quakers. Shortly after he became one of the most influential Quaker preachers and many members of the Society of Friends regarded him as one of their best spokesmen. However, many Quaker leaders, among them George Fox, started to become aware that Naylor and his followers were too much inclined to enthusiastic behaviors and actions. They understood that they were right on Palm Sunday, 1656. Naylor went to Bristol riding a horse, while some of his followers sang hosanna. Although Naylor always denied that he had tried to imitate Christ as he had entered Jerusalem, the civil authorities were horrified by his actions and they put him and his followers in jail. The Quaker leaders immediately tried to distance themselves from Naylor's actions. As a matter of fact, after they met in prison, Fox refused to forgive him. Nevertheless, Naylor's case cast shadows upon the entire Quaker movement and many of their enemies

that the meeting in Serrarius' house occurred in the same year. However, Ames gave an account of the same meeting in the «Na-Schrift» that he enclosed in the *De mislagen en valscheden wederleydt*, which was published in 1661. So this meeting was held before 1662. Furthermore, in the «Na-Schrift» it is possible to read: «het meer dan een jaer is verleden, dat William Ames versocht was om met eenige van die lieden, Collegianten genaemt, te spreken; alwaer gekomen zijnde in de tegen woordigheyt van veel volks, welke aldaer vergadert waren; eenen Adam Boreel las een geschrift, 't welck hy selfs had geschreven, [...]». If Ames describes a happening that occurred «meer dan een jaer» before 1661, it is evident that the meeting in Serrarius' house was held during 1660. See: Ames, *De mislagen en valscheden* (see above, n. 435), pp. 12-14; Adam Boreel, *ontdekt door sijn vruchten. Tot waerschouwinge van de oprecht meenende, die door hem etc.*, Amsterdam, 1662; Hull, *The rise of quakerism in Amsterdam* (see above, n. 5), pp. 260-261; Van der Wall, *De mstieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 32), pp. 225; Juterczenka, *Über Gott und die Welt* (see above, n. 430), pp. 245.

⁴³⁸ Van der Wall, *De mstieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 32), pp. 225-226; Juterczenka, *Über Gott und die Welt* (see above, n. 430), pp. 245.

founded their accusations of enthusiasm against the Quakers on Naylor's actions.⁴³⁹

In the *Adam Boreel, ontdeekt door sijn vruchten* the authors say that our author made use of Naylor's actions in the same way, in order to attack the Quakers who stayed in Amsterdam at that time and their mission. Furthermore, this pamphlet was the Quaker reply to a previous Boreel's work, entitled *Waerschouwinge*. In this pamphlet Boreel denied what Ames had written in the «Na-Schrift», which was enclosed at the end of the *De mislagen en valscheden wederleydt*.⁴⁴⁰ In other words, the aim of the *Adam Boreel, ontdeekt door sijn vruchten* was to confute Boreel's assertions in the *Waerschouwinge*, by printing the testimonies of the Quakers who took part to the meeting in Serrarius' house.

In the *Adam Boreel, ontdeekt door sijn vruchten* we read that during the meeting in Serrarius' house Boreel argued that the Quakers idolized James Naylor, or at least they had idolized him in the past. Boreel's assertion raised the anger of the Quakers. Ames asked him for a copy of what he read, but Boreel refused to give it to him, because he had heard that Ames wanted to publish a confutation. So, he promised Ames that he would have given a copy of his pamphlet only after he could confirm his assertions through his English sources. However, Boreel never gave this copy to Ames, even though he had sent some letters «aen een vrouw» in England, asking her some information about the relationship between Naylor and the Quakers. When Ames and his fellow-thinkers in Amsterdam asked for an explanation of Boreel's refusal, Moorman answered them that «onsen vriendt Boreel, heeft we een Copy belooft, maer hy en heeft niet gheseght wanneer». The Quakers said that this was a typical «colegiantsche streeck». They waited for Boreel's pamphlet for

⁴³⁹ For more information, see: *The Sorrows of the Quaker Jesus: James Nayler and the Puritan Crackdown on the Free Spirit*, Cambridge, 1996; Vera Massey, *The Clouded Quaker Star: James Nayler, 1618-1660*, York, 1999; E. Bell, «Eighteenth-Century Quakerism and the Rehabilitation of James Nayler, Seventeenth-Century Radical», in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59(3), 2008, pp. 426-446; Bernadette Smith, *Martha Simmon[d]s, 1624-1665: her Life and Quaker Writings and 'the Fall' of James Nayler*, York, 2009; David Neelon, *James Nayler: revolutionary*, Becket, 2009.

⁴⁴⁰ See above, n. 416. There is only one copy of Boreel's *Waerschouwinghe*, which was published behind one edition of the *Adam Boreel, ontdeekt door sijn vruchten*. This copy is preserved in the British Library. Unfortunately, I was not able to examine it. See: Adam Boreel, *Waerschouwinghe [A reply by Boreel to an attack upon himself]*, in the British Library, General Reference Collection, 855.i.1.

more than a year, but in the end he refused to give them his work. This is the reason why Ames wrote his «Na-Schrift» and published it. Then Boreel wrote the *Waerschouwinge* to reply to the «Na-Schrift» and the Quakers published the *Adam Boreel, ontdekt door sijn vruchten* to confute Boreel's assertions, which represents the end of the dispute. It is most likely that two main events contributed to conclude this controversy: on the one hand, Boreel did not reply to the last Quaker pamphlet; on the other, Ames's death, which occurred in 1662, put an end to the struggles between him and Boreel.

In the meantime, the Reformed council started to pay attention to the Amsterdam Collegiants once again. On January 7, 1661, some Reformed ministers informed the council that the next week they would submit some information concerning both the Socinian edition of the New Testament and the Collegiant meetings. So, they invited all members of the Reformed Church to find some «besondere staaltiens» of these meetings.⁴⁴¹ Furthermore, on January 1661 a group of Boreelists went to an assembly of *doopsgezinden*, which was held in their Church on the Singel, where four *doopsgezinden* who were not part of the Amsterdam community had been invited, so that they could explain what had been discussed in the Mennonite Synod of Leiden concerning Galenus' and Spruyt's actions.⁴⁴² When they reached the *doopsgezinde* Church, the Boreelists tried to hinder the meeting, by making such «onfatsoenlijck gheraes», apparently in order to support Galenus and Spruyt.⁴⁴³

The Reformed minister quickly collected the information they needed, but nonetheless they did not want to give such proofs against the Collegiants to the civil authorities, because shortly after the current burgomasters of Amsterdam would be resigning and new people would have fulfilled that role.⁴⁴⁴ It is most likely that the Reformed ministers wanted to

⁴⁴¹ Toekomende weeck sal men soot god belieft bij de hand neemen de consideratien over het sosiniaens testament ende de sosiniaensge vergaaderinger sullende een ider lid deser vergaaderinge verneemen na de besondere staaltiens». GAS MS 376.1.10, f. 176.

⁴⁴² Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 71-74.

⁴⁴³ Ibid., pp. 74-75. I wonder that there is no reference to this happening in the accounts Reformed council's session, since in the following reports there are references to turmoil made by the Collegiants.

⁴⁴⁴ This is what it is possible to conclude from the reports dated January 13 and 20. See: MS GAS 376.1.10, ff. 176 and 177.

wait for the new authorities because of the negative answer that the current burgomasters had given them concerning the Socinian edition of the New Testament.⁴⁴⁵ The new burgomasters were chosen at the end of January. So, on February 3, 1661, the Reformed council decided to send a delegation to send their regards to the new authorities of the city. At the same time the delegation seized the opportunity to discuss with the burgomasters about the Socinian New Testament and about the «exorbitantie» of the Socinian meetings. The Reformed council had learned that these meetings were attended both by Boreelists and Quakers, and that they were growing, since one hundred or one hundred and fifty people regularly attended them. Furthermore, the Reformed ministers had learned that their meeting places were on the Herengracht, at the corner of Treeftsteeg, on the Elandsgarcht, on the Lauriergracht and on the Prinsengracht, near the brewery «t' roode Hert».⁴⁴⁶ So, the Reformed delegation had to inform the new civil authorities about the dangers of these meetings, which were feared by the *doopsgezinden* too, so that the burgomasters would have taken action against them.⁴⁴⁷

⁴⁴⁵ «Is aengaande het hoogduytsche testament gerapporteert dat haare Achtbaarheeden dese saacke met de *Edele* heeren schepenen hadde gecommuniseert, maar alsoo haar achtbarheden exsipieeren, dat het voor haar quaalyck was te oordeelen van de eyenschappen so der grieksche als der hoogduytsche taale, en is daar noch niet in gedaan ende word gevreesd datter oock weynig te verwachten is, alsoo haare *Achtbaarheeden* met eenen hadden [?] kennen gegeven dat het niet duydelyck applicabel is, op t' geene in de hoogduytsche taale uyt koomt tgene aengaande de oversettinge des bybels tegen de sosinianen by haare groot mogende is geresolveert, maar soo het wierde int neerduytsch uytgegeven dat dan daar meer perykel in soude weesen, het selvige had oock naa in substantie de officier geantwoord, de vergaaderinge haar bedroevende, dat de vervalschinge van de heylige schrifture tot ontteeringe van onsen gesegenden saligmaker soo weynig word ter herten genoomen heeft geresolveert op dese gewichtige saake aen te houde, ende op dat het met dies te meer der vrucht mag geschiden, sal men met de saacke van de sosiniaensche conventiculen dit de nieuwe regeeringe remostreren». GAS MS 376.1.10, f. 179.

⁴⁴⁶ This last meeting place was Serrarius' house, who had made it available for the assemblies of the Amsterdam College. See: Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 204-205.

⁴⁴⁷ «Also de ver[g]anderinge in de magistrature na ouder gewoonte nu is geschied, sal de congratulatie uyt name deser vergaderinge aen de nieuwe regeringe gheschiden, by welke occasie met eenen sal worden geïnsteert op de weeringe van het hoogduytsge sosiniaensche testament, en belettinge van het nederduytsgh t' welck gevreesd word dat eer lang in druck sal koomen, sal oock worden geremonstreert de exorbitantie van de sosiniaensche conventiculen, waar onder sich quakers en boerelisten vermengen, hoedanige onder anderen tot hondert hondert vyftich, en somtyts noch meer in getale worden gehouden, op de oude zyts⁴⁴⁷ Heeregracht op de hoeck van de Treeftsteegien, op de Elandsgracht naast de leely, op de Lauriersgracht suydsyde int gekroonde laaken, en noord syde in de spinnekop, als mede op de Prinsegracht by de brouwery van 't roode Hert, met aenwyssing van de schadelycke gevolgen die onder de menoniten alreede worden bespeurt, ende noch meerder gevreesd, ten eynde Haare Achtbaarheeden met authorithey in also sulcke periculeuse

However, in the following two months the new burgomasters decided to do nothing against the Collegiants.⁴⁴⁸ The situation changed at the beginning of April, when «dominus Nieuwenhuysen», who was appointed by the Reformed council, discussed with Gerard Schaep, «Heer van Kortenhoef», about the Socinian New Testament, about Brederode's work *Van de Apostasie*, and about the Collegiants' meetings. Schaep affirmed that the burgomasters had already discussed these subjects and that they had decided to inform the judicial authorities. To this end they had appointed two members of their assemblies.⁴⁴⁹ Since in the following accounts of the Reformed council there are no reference to the assemblies of the Collegiants, even though the Reformed ministers continued to discuss Brederode's work and the Socinian New Testament,⁴⁵⁰ it is possible to conclude that the civil power took action against the Amsterdam College. So, the Collegiants started to hide their meetings again and to avoid the surveillance of the Reformed Church.

As a matter of fact, there are no more references to the Socinians or Collegiants in the accounts of the Reformed council, between 1661 and 1665. However, Boreel and his fellow-thinkers continued to meet at least in 1662.

nieuwicheeden spoedichlyck gelieven te voorsien, waar toe gecomiteert zyn *dominus* preses met zyn ouderling». GAS MS 376.1.10, f. 181.

⁴⁴⁸ This is what can be concluded from the accounts dated February 10, and March 3, 10, 17 and 24. However, shortly before March 31 a turmoil occurred during the meeting of the collegiants on the Lauriersgracht. So the Reformed council seized the opportunity to ask again the burgomasters to stop the Amsterdam College: «Alsoo voorleeden sonnedach openbaere beroerten ontstaen is by de vergaderplaesen van de Sociniaennen op de laueriers graft, waer van in voorgige actis staet, soo is goet gevonden de gelegentheyt waer te neemen ende de saecke der sociniane, met den aenkleven van dien ernstelyck by haer groot achbaer heer rememoreeren, twelck doen sal *Dominus* Nieuwenhuysen met syn ouderling als synde met deese commissie belast heeft *Dominus* Ruleutsis by deese gelegentheyt bekent gemaect dat het sociniaense testament, voor deese int hooghduyts wt gegeven, geseght wert oock int neederduyts haest te sullen wt coomen en dat men suspeckteert, Pieter de la Burgh als of hy daer van drucker was, is geresolveert dat nader hier nae sal vernoomen ende toecomende donderdach rappoort sal werden in gebraecht insgelyck sal geschieden ontrent het schadelycke boeck van den Afval der Christenen». GAS MS 376.1.10, f. 189. For the previous accounts, see: GAS MS 376.1.10, ff. 183, 186, 187 and 189.

⁴⁴⁹ «Noopende de saecke der sociniaennen heeft *Dominus* Nieuwenhuysen gerapporteert hoe dat syn *Edele* geassisteert met syn ouderling den heer van Cortenhoef, hadde gesproocken die syn *Edele* hadde verhaelt, hoe de heeren burgemeesteren dit stuck met de heeren scheepenen hadden gecommuniceert, ende alsoo dese oordeelden beeter door de politie hier in souden connen werden voorsien, hadden de heeren burgemeesteren, twee wt het midden van haer gecommiteert, om op deese saecke naeder te letten is goet gevonden, de saecke af te wachten, ende by gelegentheyt, daer na naeder te verneemen, blyven oock daer meede belast». GAS MS 376.1.10, f. 191.

⁴⁵⁰ See the accounts dated April 21 and 28, May 3 and 12, in GAS MS 376.1.10, ff. 192, 193, 194, 195.

This is what can be deduced from the travel diary of the Danish scientist Ole Borch, who between 1660 and 1665 stayed in the Dutch Republic.⁴⁵¹

In January 1662 Borch reached Amsterdam, where he attended the funeral of «D.M. Nicolao Svenonio Chronio».⁴⁵² At this funeral he met people like ««Dn. Comenio, Boreelio, Serario, Christiano Charstansonio sive Mekelburg, Dn. Hermanno Mönichedamensium pastore lutherano, etc.»».⁴⁵³ In the same day Borch was able to hear Boreel's speech in the meeting of the Amsterdam College that was held on the Herengracht. Here Boreel spoke about the twenty stages of penitence.⁴⁵⁴ While he was in Amsterdam, Borch took part in other two Collegiants' meetings.

On March 19, 1662, after he attended a Quaker assembly, Borch went to the meeting place of the Amsterdam College, where Boreel gave a speech concerning the passage from the Epistle to the Corinthians, in which «Paulus suas virtutes recenset et se ter caesum flagellis memorat». Galenus spoke too, giving his interpretation of the same passage. At the end of the meeting Boreel asked those who were present to give financial assistance to the Jews who lived in Thessalonica.⁴⁵⁵

Borch also attended the Collegiants' meeting on April 10. Boreel gave another speech, even though this time Borch did not describe it. The

⁴⁵¹ H.D. Schepelern (ed.), *Olai Borrichii itinerarium 1660-1665: the Journal of the Danish Polyhistor Ole Borch*, 4 vols., Copenhagen, 1983.

⁴⁵² He was a Danish scientist like Ole Borch, who was forced to leave his home country because of his religious ideas: «Maria Jani Jersina filia erat M. Jani Dionysi Jersini, olim celeberrimi Dioeceseos Ripensis in Cimbria Episcopis, quae nupsit M. Nicolao Svenonio Chronio, initio scholae regiae Coldingensis rectori, inde SS. Theologiae in gymnasio christianiensi apud norvegos lectori seu professori, sed demum, propter dissentientes a fide et doctrina nostrarum ecclesiarum opinionem, in exilium ejecto. Illa, mariti exularitis assidua comes, multis vitae incommodis constanti patientia toleratis, demum Amstelodami in Belgio obiit». Albertus Thura, *Gynaeceum daniae litteratum, feminis danorum, eruditione vel scriptis claris conspicuum; praemissa praefatione de feminarum variarum apud danos in litteras et litteratos munificentia, et adjecto ad calcem, una cum appendice, duplici indice personarum*, Altona, 1732, p. 75. See also: Lambour, *De alchemistische wereld van Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 23), p. 108-109.

⁴⁵³ Schepelern, *Olai Borrichii itinerarium* (see above, n. 451), vol. II, p. 48.

⁴⁵⁴ «Boreelum concionantem de 20 statib. poenitentia audivi in Heeren gracht in angulo plateae». *Ibid.*, p. 49.

⁴⁵⁵ «Hinc hora V. audita concio Boreeli super caput ad Corinth: quo Paulus suas virtutes recenset et se ter caesum flagellis memorat, audita etiam Galeni Anabaptistae interpretatio super eodem capite, et alterius cujusdam civis meditatio. Adjunctum fuit à Boreelio postulatam ut praesentes succurrerent inopiae Judaeorum Thessalonicae viventium, qui soliti à Constantinopolitanis sublevari, jam illis quoque laborantibus paene succumberent, ideoque jam in Europam ad benevolos legatum suo nomine operi petiturum amandarant, etc.». *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78.

other spokesmen were Serrarius, who interpreted Luke 24, and a certain «Normand», who examined the reasons why Christ had revealed himself to his disciple but not to others. At the end of the meeting they sang and preached together.⁴⁵⁶

We can suppose that between 1661 and 1665 in the reports of the Reformed council there are no references to the Collegiants for two main reasons. First, it can be supposed that Boreel and his group were more careful in holding their meetings. So, they were able to avoid the surveillance of the Reformed ministers. Second, it is also most likely that during these years the group of Boreelists, that is Boreel and his closest fellow-thinkers, was losing their relevance within the College and that it was superseded by Galenus and his fellow *doopsgezinden*, who attended the meeting of the Amsterdam College. As a matter of fact, in the reports of the Reformed council between 1663 and 1668 there are various references to Galenus and to the Socinian Mennonites.⁴⁵⁷

After Galenus and Spruyt published the *Nader Verklaringe*, and after Serrarius joined the controversy within the *Het Lam* community, the *Lammerenkrijgh* kept going. Here it is not possible to reconstruct the entire history of the struggles that tore apart the *doopsgezinde* congregation of Amsterdam. Since Boreel did not directly take part to this dispute, it would not be useful to broaden Boreel's biography by taking into account the history of the *Lammerenkrijgh*. Here it is sufficient to say that after a series of attacks between the two opposing parties, by speaking from the pulpit of the *doopsgezinde* church and by the publishing of various pamphlets, and after few attempts of peace, the definitive fracture between the two parties occurred in June 1664. At that time the conservative *doopsgezinden*, led by Samuel Apolstoon, left the larger party led by Galenus and they started to meet in a

⁴⁵⁶ Post sacra ordinaria, ad vesperam in de Heeren gracht sub insigni cÿgni in conventu Collegiati audivi primò recitantem Serrarium cap: 24 Lucae et interpretantem, hinc concionantem quendam Normand de causis cur Christus ita seorsum se manifestasset discipulis et non evidentiori statim argumento omnibus, huc redibant ejus rationes, Christum voluisse 1. aliqualem cognitionem discipulis communicare, hinc 2. Judicium illorum explorare, 3. Liberum arbitrium illis non adimere, 4. In vero firmare; inde concionantem Boreelium, tandem cantantem quendam solum suaviter; ultimò precibus caludentem omnia Serrarium, sed is ardentissimis, et cum gemitu et fletu mixtis». Ibid., p. 98.

⁴⁵⁷ See the entry «Galenus» in the index of the reports dated 1663-1668, in GAS MS 376.1.11.

former brewery on the Singel, which had the sign of a sun, «zon» in Dutch, on the entrance. So, they were called the *zonists*, while Galenus' party became the *lamists*, that is those who continued to meet in the *Het Lam* community.⁴⁵⁸

Some authors from that period believed that Galenus' aim was to establish Boreel's Church of Connivance within the *doopsgezinde* community. They regarded Galenus' participation in the meetings of the Collegiants and his struggles with the conservative members of his congregations as signs of his real aim. However, it is evident that they were wrong. Lambert Bidloo, one of the major figure among the zonists, wrote some works concerning the history of the *Lammerenkrijgh*. In his works he says that Boreel too was persuaded that Galenus would have accepted the Collegiants in his congregation after the separation from the zonists, in order to gradually transform the *Het Lam* community in a «Collegiantse kerk». Therefore, continues Bidloo, Boreel was so disappointed when he understood that Galenus would not pursue that aim, that he called his *doopsgezinde* disciple a «sectemaker».⁴⁵⁹ However, it seems that the disagreements between them disappeared shortly after and that Boreel supported Galenus' attempt to unite the *doopsgezinden* again. To this end he also discussed with both parties about the «broederlijcken godsdienst», but without any success.⁴⁶⁰

Although Galenus did not try to transform the *doopsgezinde* community either in a Collegiant sect, nor in Boreel's Church of Connivance, however he continued to attend the Collegiants' meetings. As a matter of fact, he helped to pay the «collegekamer» that they rented on the Rokin, where the Amsterdam College met between May 1, 1665, and April 30, 1667.⁴⁶¹ Furthermore, between 1668 and 1675 the Collegiants were able to meet in the «kerkekamer» of the *doopsgezinde* church.⁴⁶² Of course this not means that

⁴⁵⁸ For more information about the *Lammerenkrijgh*, see: Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 143-161; Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 54-98.

⁴⁵⁹ Lambert Bidloo, *Mennoos Kerck in en uyt Babel, ofte den Aenvang, Voortgang, en redderinge van de Verwarringen der Vlaemsche Doops-gesinden, vergeleken met de tseventigh-jarige Gevangnisse, en herstellinge der Israeliten*, Amsterdam, 1665, p. 53; Lambert Bidloo, *Onbepaalde Verdraagzaamheyde de Verwoesting der Doopsgezinden*, Amsterdam, 1701, p. 5v; Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 99-100.

⁴⁶⁰ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 100.

⁴⁶¹ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 161.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 162-164.

the Collegiants and the *doopsgezinden* became one community, but only that they had friendly relationships.⁴⁶³ However, after 1675 the collegiants left the *doopsgezinde* church and they held their College in the «Oranje-appel», which previously was the house of the burgomaster Opmeer. Since that time the Collegiants and the *doopsgezinden* seemed to have taken different paths.⁴⁶⁴

⁴⁶³ Here we must emphasize that in January 1666 Galenus, in order to prepare the forthcoming union of the two congregations, accepted one of the conditions of the Waterlanders' community, that is to exclude from the «Avondmaal» those who were «ongedoopt». Among these there were the collegiants who were not Mennonites. Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 109. For more information about Galenus and the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam after Boreel's death, see: *Ibid.*, pp. 108-193.

⁴⁶⁴ For more information about the Amsterdam College after Boreel's death, see: Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 163-177.

The illness, the last will, and the death of Adam Boreel

It has already been shown that on June 16, 1665, Oldenburg sent a letter to Robert Boyle, explaining that Boreel was very ill and that he would die soon. There is no evidence to describe Boreel's illness, but it is most likely that he had been ill for a few weeks and that he had understood that he would soon die. As a matter of fact, his name was not among those who in May 1665 decided to rent a room on the Rokin, in order to hold the College's meetings. In addition, on May 30 and 31 Boreel decided to make his will. On May 30, the witnesses of his will were David Spruyt and Abraham Warnaerts, deacon of the *Het Lam* church, while on May 31 the witnesses were Galenus and Cornelis Moorman.⁴⁶⁵

First, Boreel left his library with Moorman, which was appraised at 500 florins. Although it was not as big as his previous library, Boreel's new book collection was still outstanding. Unfortunately, there is not a catalogue of Boreel's books. Second, when he died Boreel still owned 600 copies of the vocalized Mishnah. He left 200 copies with Anganieta Leeuw, a member of the Waterlanders' community, whose father was one of the Mennonite merchants that paid for the publishing of the *Misnayot*; 200 copies with Jacob Linnigh Junior, another member of the Waterlander's congregation; 100 copies with David Spruyt; 100 copies with Robert Stiles, an English «lakenkoopman» who had his shop on the Singel.

Furthermore, Boreel decided that a box of his papers, accounts, and letters had to be destroyed, while other five boxes had to be delivered to John Dury. Since the Scottish theologian was in Switzerland, Serrarius took these boxes. In the will dated May 30 Boreel took measures to ensure that only the one he left his papers to, papers that concerned «sijne studien», could have used them. It is not clear if here Boreel referred to the five boxes that he left to Dury or if he was talking about other manuscripts. Perhaps he left some

⁴⁶⁵ The draft of Boreel's last will is preserved in the archives of Amsterdam. See: GAA, NA, 2967, 206-209; GAA, NA, 2967, 210-214. Ruud Lamour have already described the core of Boreel's will. See: Lambour, *De alchemistische wereld van Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 23), pp. 109-111.

papers to Galenus too.⁴⁶⁶ Finally, Boreel gave orders to organize and to sell his lenses, together with his instrument to grind them.⁴⁶⁷

Boreel died a few days after he answered Oldenburg's letter about the JNL and its copy. On June 20, 1665, he was buried at his request in the graveyard of Pretuskerk in Sloterdijk, just outside Amsterdam, in the grave owned by his friend and disciple Galenus Abrahamsz.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁶ «Vermoedelijk is bedoeld Galenus die in zijn testament van 2 september 1704 (notaris J. Backer, NA 4636, 889-897) de manuscripten legateerde aan onder andere doctor Isaac Galenus, doctor Willem van Maurik en Herman ten Cate, om eventueel door hen uitgegeven te worden». Ibid., p. 110.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 110-111.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 109.

Chapter V: The Bibliography of Adam Boreel

So far there has been some kind of confusion with regard to Boreel's works. It is possible to find a more accurate bibliography of his writings in Schneider's biography, but even the German scholar did not avoid some errors. Therefore, we now propose a new and updated bibliography of all the works written by Boreel. Such list of books is divided in three parts. First, we show his published work, which are put forward in chronological order. Second, we make a list of the writings published in the edition of the posthumous works. Finally, we describe his manuscript writings. Since in the subsequent part of this work it is possible to find an analysis of Boreel's thought, which relies on most of the writings listed here, in this sections the contents of Boreel's works are not examined. However, few information is added, if necessary.

Boreel's published works

- 1645: *Ad Legem et ad Testimonium, sive erotematica propositio et deductio quorundam conscientiae casuum; praecipuè de publico Novi Testamenti cultu; aliisque, Christianismo vel necessariis, vel utilibus: exhibita Christianorum ecclesiis et coetibus illis, qui solam Veteris et Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei et morum canone profitentur.*
- 1646: *Mišnayot.*⁴⁶⁹
- 1647: *Monitum.*⁴⁷⁰
- 1647: *Pacis Ecclesiasticae Propempticon.*⁴⁷¹
- 1648: *Inviatio.*⁴⁷²
- 1662: *Ad Samuelem Maresium, authorem mantissae libelli, cui titulus, Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore Sacri Ministerii in Ecclesiis Reformatis; opposita libello Ad Legem et ad Testimonium. Protrepticon.*⁴⁷³

⁴⁶⁹ This are the vocalized edition of the Mishnah which Boreel worked on together with Jacob Judah Leon. It was not published using Boreel's name, but by Jewish people such as Judah Leon and Menasseh Ben Israel. I did not write the entire title of this edition because I was not able to see a copy of this work. For more information, see chapter III of Boreel's biography.

⁴⁷⁰ This is the pamphlet that Boreel wrote against the «*Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore Sacri Ministerii in Ecclesiis Reformatis*» published by Desmarets. This pamphlet is lost, but Desmarets transcribed in the second edition of his works. For more information see chapter III of Boreel's biography.

⁴⁷¹ This is the pamphlet that Boreel wrote against the Hoornbeeck «*Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana Odierna*». I was able to locate only one copy of this pamphlet, which is preserved in the Universiteitsbibliotheek of Utrecht. Furthermore, it was published both in the second edition of Desmarets' «*Dissertatio Theologica*» and in Boreel's posthumous works. For more information, see chapter III of Boreel's biography.

⁴⁷² This is the third pamphlet that Boreel wrote against Desmarets and Hoornbeeck, but it is lost. However, Desmarets transcribed it in the second edition of the «*Dissertatio Theologica*». For more information, see chapter III of Boreel's biography.

⁴⁷³ As it can be concluded from the title, this is another work that Boreel wrote against Desmarets. It was published in Amsterdam by the editor Dendrinus, after Boreel had become aware that Desmarets published a second edition of the «*Dissertatio Theologica*», where he had also added a «*Mantissa*» describing some events of Boreel's life, and summarizing the controversy that occurred between 1646 and 1648. Although Desmarets had published this edition in 1656, Boreel put to press his confutation six years later. It is most likely that he had not been aware of Desmarets' work, since in 1656 he was living in England. As before, in this writing Boreel does not deal with Desmarets' accusations and confutations. In the first part of ASM Boreel transcribes Desmatets' *mantissa* and argues that no one could

- 1662: *Waerschouwinghe*.⁴⁷⁴
- 1678: *Concatenatio Aurea Christiana, sive; cognitio Dei, ac Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Proposita secundum rationem, S. Scripturam, atque internam divinam approbationem. Exacte, ac simplicet composita, per Adamum Boreel, piae memoriae, nativum in Zeelandia*.⁴⁷⁵
- 1683: *Scripta Adami Borelii Posthuma. Quibus praefixus ejusdem tractatus: Ad Legem et Testimonium; olim editus, cum annexis in fine nonnullis aliis ad haec spectantibus*.⁴⁷⁶

prove the truth of the events narrated by his opponent. In the second part, Boreel only claims that Desmarets has not fully understood Boreel's purpose, and he invites his opponent to read *ALAT* and to confute it again, by following the same order in which Boreel has expressed his thesis and his questions. It is curious that Boreel wrote and published a new pamphlet against Desmarets, but he wrote nothing against Hoornbeeck, who in the second edition of the «*Summa Controversiarum*» added many pages to his chapter VI, concerning «*enthusiastis et libertinis*», in order to deal with Boreel. In these pages Hoornbeeck explains his relationship with Boreel, describes the controversy occurred between 1646 and 1648, and published again his «*Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana Odierna*». It is rather difficult that Boreel did not know about Hoornbeeck's new work. Perhaps, he decided to reply only to Desmarets because the French theologian had slandered him from a personal point of view. So, driven by his anger, Boreel wrote and published *ASM*. I was able to locate only one copy of *ASM*, which is preserved in the Universitätsbibliothek of Heidelberg. Furthermore, it was also published in Boreel's posthumous works.

⁴⁷⁴ This is the pamphlet that Boreel wrote against Ames' «*Na -Schrift*». I was able to locate only one copy, preserved in the British Library. For more information, see chapter IV of Boreel's biography.

⁴⁷⁵ This is a posthumous work, which was published in 1678. This work is almost identical to *PR*, which was later published in the edition of Boreel's posthumous writings: the content of the two books is the same, but they are quite different in the Latin form. Furthermore, the «*Concatenatio Aurea Christiana*» is longer than *PR*, even though the parts that are lacking in *PR* are not essential to the argumentation that Boreel conceived in the work. So, it is most likely that both editions are Latin translations of an original Dutch work that is lost. Otherwise, it can be argued that one of the two Latin editions is Boreel's original works and that the other was altered by the editors. There is no evidence to establish what hypothesis is true. However, since these two editions are identical in the contents and in the argumentation, they raise no problem for a throughout analysis of Boreel's thought. «*Concatenatio Aurea Christiana*» was published in Amsterdam by Jacobum Arnoldi Columnam. Since there is neither a preface nor a foreword written by the editor or the publisher, there is no evidence to establish who was the owner of Boreel's original manuscript. However, it is most likely that it was preserved in the five boxes of papers that Boreel left with John Dury.

⁴⁷⁶ This is the edition of Boreel's posthumous works, which was published in 1683 in Amsterdam without the name of the publisher. In this edition, it is possible to find both writings of Boreel and a few works that he did not write. In particular, there are a few works written by Quaker authors. The reason of such editorial choice can be found in the foreword. Here the editor of the posthumous works explains that Boreel himself entrusted his works to one of his friends, so that he could published them. However, Boreel did not instruct to publish a larger but unfinished work, which consequently was not put to press. There is no clear evidence to prove it, but it is most likely that this «*prolixius quoddam opus, ast certè relictum, hoc est, valde imperfectum*» is nothing other than the *JNL*. Anyhow, among the

- 1693: 't Evangely volgens Mattheus en de Brief van Paulus Aan de Romainen in't grieksch, met een nieuwe nederduitsche vertaaling, van woord tot woord onder het grieksch gevoegt, door wylen Adam Boreel. By welke gevoegt zyn I. De verscheide grieksche leezingen, met hun nederduitsche vertaalingen II. De syriscche overzetting van zommige plaatzen, waar in't syriscch anders als in den grieksche tekst schynt geleezen te worden.⁴⁷⁷

papers that Boreel left with his friend there was a brief writing against the Quakers. Since by the time he decided to publish Boreel's posthumous works, the editor had become a Quaker himself, this unnamed friend of Boreel had decided to put to press also some works written by Quaker authors, in order to confute Boreel's writing against Quakerism. In particular, there is a work by George Keith that was precisely written in order to refute Boreel's work against Quakerism. There is no strong evidence to establish who the editor of Boreel's posthumous works has been, who must be identified with one of his friends. In the last chapter of Boreel's biography, it has been shown that Boreel left five boxes of papers with John Dury, which were entrusted to Petrus Serrarius at the moment. However, neither Dury, nor Serrarius ever embraced Quakerism. Furthermore, it cannot be excluded that Galenus Abrahamsz had some of Boreel's papers, but he did never become a Quaker either. So, it is rather difficult to determine who this editor has been. Despite this lack of evidence, it can be suggested that Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont was the editor of Boreel's posthumous works. This hypothesis relies on three main considerations. First, in Boreel's biography, it has been argued that during the 1670s Van Helmont was in possession of one copy of JNL manuscript, and that Henry More was able to read such works thanks to Van Helmont. Second, in Van Helmont's «Paradoxal Discourses» published in 1685 it is possible to find an English translation of the poem written by Boreel that is published in the edition of the posthumous works. Van Helmont enclosed Boreel's poem after the preface, and he writes: «A Low-Dutch hymn of Adam Boreel, presented by him to the author of this book, who had it translated into English». Furthermore, Henry More published the same poem in the «Annotations upon the two foregoing treatise» of 1682 thanks to Van Helmont, who had given it to him. So, it is evident that Van Helmont was in possession of Boreel's poem before the publication of the «Scripta Adami Borelii Posthuma» in 1683. Third, even though Van Helmont never officially converted to Quakerism, between 1675 and 1685 he surely was a sympathizer of the Quaker religion. So, although none of these considerations is sufficient proof to establish that Van Helmont was the editor of Boreel's posthumous works, this is the most likely hypothesis. However, it is not clear when they met or when Boreel had made Van Helmont promise to publish his works. In Van Helmont's biography, Allison Coudert states that he was a close friend of Boreel. However, I was not able to verify such assertion: as it can be concluded from Boreel's biography, in which I mention Van Helmont nowhere, I found no evidence of their friendship.

⁴⁷⁷ This is the last work of Boreel that was put to press. It was published in 1693 by Jan Rieuwertz. In the preface, the editor, Willem Homma, explains that some of his friends had asked Boreel to teach them how to read the Greek New Testament, since he was skilled in the Holy Scriptures, in Hebrew, and in Greek. Therefore, Boreel took some copies of the Greek New Testament published by Elzevier in 1658, he orally translated it to them, and he let them write the equivalent Dutch term under the Greek words. Willem Homma got a copy of such translation and he decided to publish it. However, he did not put to press the original translation, but he added some things, such as variations that he took from Stephan Curcelaus. I was not able to establish who Willem Homma was.

The writings published in the «Scripta Adami Boreelii Posthuma»

This is the list of Boreel's writings that can be found in the editions of his posthumous works, in the same order in which they were published:

- Ad Legem et ad Testimonium. Sive erotematica propositio et deductio quorundam conscientiae casuum; praecipuè de publico Novi Testamenti cultu; aliisque, Christianismo vel necessariis, vel utilibus: exhibita Christianorum ecclesiis et coetibus illis, qui solam Veteris et Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei et morum canone profitentur.⁴⁷⁸
- Ad Samuelem Maresium, authorem Mantissae libelli, cui titulus, *Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore Sacri Ministerii in Ecclesiis Reformatis; opposita libello Ad Legem et Testimonium. Protrepticon.*⁴⁷⁹
- *Alloquium ad humanam creaturam universam necessarium.*⁴⁸⁰
- *Scriptum Generale de tutissima ad Deum via; fide; verbo fidei, medio ad illam; cultu: praecipuè quoad hodiernos cognitos ecclesiastas, ac populum iis addictum.*⁴⁸¹
- *Quoad hodiernos cognitos coetus, solam S. Scripturam pro fidei et morum canone profitentes.*⁴⁸²

⁴⁷⁸ ALAT, in OP, pp. 1-81. There is no difference between this edition and that published in 1645..

⁴⁷⁹ ASM, in OP, pp. 82-90.

⁴⁸⁰ AN, in OP, pp. 91-92.

⁴⁸¹ SG, in OP, pp. 93-104. This work is divided in XXIX articles and covers the same subjects that Boreel had taken into consideration by writing ALAT. There is no evidence to establish when Boreel wrote it.

⁴⁸² QHC, in OP, pp. 105-118. This is a preface to a second edition of ALAT that Boreel never published. Schneider claims that Boreel wrote it in 1665, but his argumentation is not very solid. In fact, the German scholar argues that the edition of 1645 was available no more around 1665. This is what he concludes from a Dutch translation of ALAT published in 1666. So, Boreel in 1665 decided to publish his work again, but he did not succeed because of his death. Although it cannot be excluded that Boreel wrote QHC in 1665, I believe that Schneider's argumentation is not sufficient to establish that QHC was written in 1665. On the other hand, I believe that Boreel wrote such work after he returned to the Dutch Republic in 1659. As a matter of fact, in the end of QHC, writes: «quis hanc agenda atque examinandi rationem sanus tali in scripto rationi consentaneam esse, atque necessariam inficias ibit? Plane nullus. Quod quum qui hactenus adversus libellum ad Legem et ad Testimonium scripserunt, sequuti non sint, [...], nihils prorsus omnino ad rem dixerunt; quae quidem

- Ad hodiernos cognitos pontificios, ac similes, traditionibus non-scriptis addictos.⁴⁸³
- Probatio religionis per naturales rationes, et Christianos cum ea eatenus consensus.⁴⁸⁴

ipsorum omnia facillimè ad perpetuum adversariorum dedecus, refutare nunc possem, utpote quae à pluribus annis à me refutata habeam. At, ob gravissimas rationes, suo tempore manifestandas, id fieri nec dum expedit; malui enim ac malo famae jacturam pati, quasi quod reponam in prompt non sit, prout à parvi, ne pravi dicam, iudicii hominibus hinc inde mussitari audio, quam adversariorum scripta ante justum tempus refutando, rectam meam intentionem temerare». QHC, in OP, pp. 117-118. The references to the confutations that he had written against the opponents of ALAT many years before and to the rumors suggesting that he was not able to confute such writings, which can be related to the new editions of Hornbeeck's and Desmarets' works, can support the hypothesis that Boreel wrote QHC after he returned to the Dutch Republic in 1659.

⁴⁸³ «Ad hodiernos cognitos pontificios, ac similes, traditionibus non scriptis addictos», in OP, pp. 118-127. This work is dated December 4, 1650. Furthermore, under the title, it is written: «qui tamen tractatus pro A. Borelij opera non habetur». So, it seems that Boreel did not write this work. In the first lines, the author openly asserts that he has embraced the Catholic religion, but that he is not at ease with some of its beliefs. In particular, he believes that the foundations of Papal authority are not very clear, that Catholic sacraments are not fully useful, and that the bases of the authority of the Roman Church can be questioned. However, in this work the author only argues that it is impossible to prove the authority of the Roman Church and thus it must be rejected. Schneider believes that we have to regard Boreel as the author of this work. However, his argumentation is not very solid. First, Schneider argues that no one would have written a work against Catholicism under Boreel's name, who was attacked by its own Church. Second, he stresses that the content and the structure of such work, and the kind of argumentations used in it, are quite similar to Boreel's other works, such as ALAT and SG. Third, he argues that the author was not a real Catholic, but that he claimed to be a member of the Roman Church only to better persuade other Catholics of his theses. To support his hypothesis, Schneider mentions an alleged contradiction in the first lines of the work, where at first the author claims to be born as a Catholic and then he asserts that he has joined the Catholic Church some time before writing his work. However, there is no such contradiction in the first lines, where the author writes: «postquam perturbato per aliquod tempus animo meo, nec omnia illa, quae Romana Ecclesia ad sopiendos tristioris animi motus adhibere solet, remedia, nec rationes Vestrae Generositatis, cui hunc morbum detexeram, mederi ullo modo potuissent, accuratius paulo quam antehac considerate hodiernae Romanae Ecclesiae, (cujus coetui me adjunxeram) statu, deprehendere coepi, verissimam iniquitatis meae causam, cum caeteris quibusdam extitisse id ipsum quo adhibito Ecclesia illa pacem affectui meo promittebat atque tranquillitatem». It is evident that from these assertions it is impossible to argue that the author of such work was born in the Catholic religion. On closer inspection, only Schneider second argumentation is solid, since the content, the structure, and the argumentations of «Ad hodiernos cognitos pontificios» are similar to other Boreel's work, such as ALAT and SG. However, this does not seem sufficient proof to establish that Boreel wrote this work. In fact, we cannot exclude that it was written by some of Boreel's followers, the so-called Boreelists, and that he gave his work to Boreel. If so, the editor might have found it among Boreel's papers and he might have decided to publish in his posthumous works because of its similarity to Boreel's writings. At the end of his analysis Schneider suggests that the author could have also been Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont. However, it is necessary to make further studies in order to support such assertion.

⁴⁸⁴ PR, in OP, pp. 127-135. This is another Latin translation of the «Concatenatio aurea christiana». It is most likely that both these editions were Latin translation of an original Dutch work that is lost.

- A brief work with no title.⁴⁸⁵
- *Demonstratio certitudinis Scripturae Sacrae*.⁴⁸⁶
- *De primo statu hominis, in cursu Christianae religionis, ad Deum Dominum nostrum. Unicum sufficiens bonum, videlicet de statu integritatis vel rectitudinis et innocentiae*, Gen. I, 26.27. cum vs. 31, Eccl. 7, 29. Marc. 10, 6. Jac. 3,9.⁴⁸⁷
- *Pacis ecclesiasticae propempticon*.⁴⁸⁸
- *Consiliarius Christianus, sive de comparanda vitae christianae strenuitate*.⁴⁸⁹
- A work with no title.⁴⁹⁰
- *De scopo religionis christianae, et mediis ad eam conducentibus*.⁴⁹¹
- Three letters that Boreel wrote in 1653 to an unknown woman.⁴⁹²

⁴⁸⁵ OP, pp. 135-136. It is divided in 12 points, but its content is not clear.

⁴⁸⁶ DCSS, in OP, pp. 136-137. This is a brief proof of the truth of the Holy Scriptures divided in 9 points.

⁴⁸⁷ «*De primo statu hominis*», in OP, pp. 137-144. In this work Boreel describes the human nature and faculties, even though it can be argued that Boreel describes the nature and the faculties of mankind before Adam's fall. This is what can be concluded from the title and from some assertions of this work. «*De primo statu hominis*» is divided in two parts, which describe the same content, but through different structure and words. In the analysis of Boreel's thought I do not take this work into account for the following reasons. First, because it seems that Boreel describes the nature and faculties of mankind before Adam's fall. So, this work is not useful for reconstruct Boreel's anthropology. Second, it is a very fragmentary work, which raises questions about Boreel's beliefs concerning the human nature, rather than give a full account of his ideas.

⁴⁸⁸ PEP, in OP, pp. 145-252 (there is an error in the foliation). This is the pamphlet that Boreel wrote against Hoornbeeck's «*Apologia pro ecclesia christiana odierna*».

⁴⁸⁹ «*Consiliarius Christianus*», in OP, pp. 163-171. This is part of a larger manuscript work, which is preserved among the Hartlib Papers. In this work Boreel gives a series of advices in order to remember the most important doctrines of Christian religion.

⁴⁹⁰ OP, pp. 171-181. In this work Boreel describes what each man must do and suffer in order to be a true «*discipulum Christi*».

⁴⁹¹ PRC, in OP, pp. 181-186.

⁴⁹² TL, in OP, pp. 186-199. I was not able to identify such woman. Furthermore, it must be stressed that in such letters Boreel gives no kind of biographical information, but only explains his beliefs concerning the union between man and God instead. So, it is possible to argue that they were not real letters, or that the editor modified them, by removing all the biographical references.

- Two religious poem written by Boreel.⁴⁹³
- Quoad hodiernos cognito pneumatistas; ut Quakeros; eorumque similes.⁴⁹⁴
- Responsio Christianorum Quakerorum contemptim dictorum.⁴⁹⁵
- Inquisitio simplex an fundamentum religionis illorum Christianorum, quo vulgò Anglice Quakers, id est Trementes nominant, pugnet contra rationem homini à natura datam.⁴⁹⁶

⁴⁹³ OP, pp. 199-202. The first of these two poems was quite famous in the 17th century. As has been already asserted, Henry More published an English translation of such religious hymn in the «Annotations upon the two foregoing treatises, Lux orientalis, or, An enquiry into the opinion of the Eastern sages concerning the prae-existence of souls, and the Discourse of truth written for the more fully clearing and further confirming the main doctrines in each treatise, by one not unexercized in these kinds of speculation», which he published in 1682 (I was not able to have access to this work). The same English translation was enclosed in the «The Paradoxal Discourses of F.M. van Helmont, concerning the Macrocosm and Microcosm», which Franciscus van Helmont published in 1685. Furthermore, Rosalie Colies found a manuscript copy of this hymn among the Locke Papers, which is entitled “On the Love of Pain” and which is dedicated to Anne Conway. Finally, the original Dutch poem was published two times after the edition of Boreel’s posthumous works. It can be found both in Van Helmont’s «Eenige Gedachten van Franciscus Mercurius van Helmont rakende de Natuur-kunde», published in 1690, and in the collection of Dutch poems entitled «Lusthof der Zielen», which Claes Stapel published in 1692. In this last edition, Boreel’s poem is entitled «Begeerte, om met God te vereenigen». On the contrary, the second poem written by Boreel and published among his posthumous works was not published again.

⁴⁹⁴ «Quoad hodiernos cognitos pneumatistas», in OP, pp. 203-209. In this work Boreel attacks the Quakers and those who judge the Holy Scriptures as «litera mortua», since they believe in the preaching of an «internae lucis, quam universalme Christum nominant». Because of their belief, such people also claime to be true emissaries of God and to be endowed with divine authority. So, in this works Boreel argues that neither the Quakers, nor anyone else can prove to have such divine authority. Because of this work, the editor of Boreel’s posthumous works, who claimed to be a member of the «Society of Friends», added some Quaker writings, so that the reader could have better judge about the Quakers and their true teachings.

⁴⁹⁵ «Responsio Christianorum Quakerorum», in OP, pp. 210-229. This is the first Quaker work that the editor added to Boreel’s posthumous works. In the preface, the editor asserts that this work was written by George Keith, in order to refute Boreel’s «Quoad hodiernos cognitos pneumatistas».

⁴⁹⁶ «Inquisitio simplex», in OP, pp. 230-246. This is the second Quaker work added to confute Boreel’s opinions against the Quakers. There is no evidence to establish who wrote this work.

- Lucerna super candelabro. Inserviens ad elucidationem rerum praecipuarum, quae in libello, cui titulus est, *Mysteria regni Dei*, etc., continentur.⁴⁹⁷

⁴⁹⁷ «Lucerna super candelabro», in OP, pp. 247-260. This is the last Quaker work that the editor added to Boreel's posthumous works and the last writing of this edition. However, we should be careful in accepting it as a Quaker writing. In the 17th there were many editions of this work. The first one anonymously appeared in 1662, entitled «Het Licht op den Kandelaar». In the following year, the Quaker Benjamin Furly published an English translation, entitled «The Light upon the Candlestick», which he ascribed to the Quaker William Ames. However, in 1684 Jan Rieuwertz published the Dutch edition again and he explained that this work had been originally written by Pieter Balling, a *doopsgezinde* of the Amsterdam community, who was friend of Galenus Abrahamsz and Baruch Spinoza. In the 20th century scholars discussed the authorship of such work: some people argued that Ames was the true author, while other people believed that it was written by Balling or Boreel. However, in the last few years it has been established that Balling was the first author of the «Het Licht op den Kandelaar», and that afterwards it was regarded as a Quaker work because of the vagueness of its content and of its terms. Here I do not discuss the authorship of this work. Nevertheless, it can be surely asserted that Boreel was not its author, since the «Lucerna super candelabro» was added to Boreel's posthumous works in order to confute his ideas against the Quakers. For more information about the authorship of the «Het Licht op den Kandelaar», see: W.N.A. Klever, «De Spinozistische prediking van Pieter Balling. Uitgave van "Het licht op den kandelaar", met biografische inleiding en commentaar», in *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen*, 14, 1988, pp. 55-85; Wiep van Bunge, «Balling, Pieter», in *Biografisch lexicon voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlands protestantisme*, vol. IV, Kampne, 1998, pp. 24-25; Wiep van Bunge, «Spinoza and the Collegiants», in *Philosophia Osaka*, 7, 2012, pp. 13-29; Ruben Buys, «"Without Thy Self, O Man, Thou Hast No Means to Look for, by Which Thou Maist Know God". Pieter Balling, the radical Enlightenment, and the Legacy of Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert», in *Church History and Religious Culture*, 93, 2012, pp. 363-383.

Boreel's manuscript writings

There are three manuscripts of Boreel's works.

- *Consiliarius Christianus*.⁴⁹⁸
- *Specilegium divinorum praeceptorum*.⁴⁹⁹
- *Jesus Nazarenus Legislator*.⁵⁰⁰

⁴⁹⁸ This manuscript is preserved among the Hartlib Papers. See: HP 26/25/1A-10B. This is a copy of Boreel's original manuscript made by John Dury. Furthermore, this is the same work that can be found in Boreel's posthumous works, even though the editor of the «*Scripta Posthuma*» only published the first part of the original manuscript. In fact, Dury's copy is much longer than the «*Consiliarius Christianus*» that can be found in the edition of the posthumous works. Moreover, from Dury's copy it can be concluded that this is one of the first works written by Boreel, since is dated the 21th and 22th August, 1628.

⁴⁹⁹ This manuscript is preserved among the Hartlib Papers too, in the same section of the above-mentioned «*Consiliarius Christianus*». See: HP 26/25/11A-24B. This is also a copy made by Dury and the original manuscript was written by Boreel on August 21 and 22, 1628, when he also wrote the «*Consiliarius Christianus*». In this writing Boreel make a list of 500 divine precepts.

⁵⁰⁰ This manuscript is preserved among the Robert Boyle Papers. See: London, The Royal Society, MS RB 1/12/1, MS RB 1/13/1, and MS RB 1/15/1. For more information see chapter IV of Boreel's biography.

Part II: The thought of Adam Boreel

Chapter I: Boreel's criticism of ecclesiastic authority and his Church of Connivance

In his biography, it has been stated that in 1646 Adam Boreel founded a non-confessional College in Amsterdam, where Christians of different sects and confessions met to read and discuss the Scriptures, to pray, and to exert mutual edification. Socinians, Quakers, Calvinists, Remonstrants, Doopsgezinden, Millenarists: members of these Christian groups attended the Collegiant meetings of Amsterdam, some more than others. As a matter of fact, the main characteristics of these kind of assemblies were absence of ecclesiastic authority and toleration of different opinions.

Boreel also tried to develop theoretical ideas to argue in favor of these two features, which he and his fellow-thinkers practiced in the Amsterdam College. Anyone who read his work can easily realize that criticism of ecclesiastic authority and religious toleration are two of the keystones of his thought. They represent the fundamental ideas in the first work he published, ALAT, and it is also possible to find them in some of his posthumous writings. Moreover, they can be found, even if just implicitly, in the manuscript of JNL, to the extent that some of the reflections that Boreel made in it, concur and complete what he started with ALAT. On the other hand, it must be pointed out that Boreel surely was not the first author who criticized the clergy's authority or who advocated religious toleration. Since the beginning of the Reformation, without considering scholars from previous centuries, learned men labeled by historiography as «radicals» developed many ideas related to these two topics.

The main theme of this chapter is the criticism of the ecclesiastic authority and the possibility to lead a religious life without churches' ministers. The first paragraph is an historical account concerning scholars of the 16th and 17th centuries who discussed these themes in their works. In particular, since Boreel is considered one of the Collegiants, this Christian movement and its most significant authors are taken into consideration.

Secondly, the ideas conceived by some people who certainly were Boreel's friends or acquaintances are examined. Lastly, the thinkers who are regarded as the main sources for Collegiant beliefs are taken into account. In the second paragraph, the accusations that Boreel made against ecclesiastic authority are examined. From all these accusations Boreel argued the necessity of a new way to lead religious life and to administer Christian public religion. Therefore, in the third and last paragraph, Boreel's idea concerning the "Church of connivance" are taken into consideration.

The “radical reform” against the ministers of modern churches

In the first chapter of Boreel’s biography the historical events that led to the synod of Dordrecht in 1619, when the final confrontation between the Remonstrants and the Reformed Church occurred, have already been discussed. One of the main consequences of the defeat of Remonstrant ministers was the birth of the Collegiant movement. In fact, among the Remonstrants who were dismissed from their office after the victory of the Reformed Church, there was Christiaan Sopingius, the pastor of Warmond. When the citizen of this small village, who had embraced the Remonstrant faith, suddenly found themselves without a religious guide, they went and spoke to one of the elders of their church, Gijsbert van der Kodde. He was a self-taught man who had read the works of Jacobus Acontius, Sebastian Castellio e Dirck Coornhert.⁵⁰¹ Gijsbert van der Kodde and his brothers proposed the community to hold private religious meetings in order to read and to interpret the Scriptures. In this way, they believed they could continue their religious life while waiting for a new Reformed minister. The meetings organized by the Van der Koddes were based upon the readings of some passages of the Holy Scriptures, upon the practice of prayers, and upon the freedom that each member had to intervene and to give his opinion about what they read, with the purpose to edify himself and the others. This was the decision that led to the birth of the Collegiant movement.⁵⁰²

In the months following the synod of Dordrecht, the Remonstrant leaders start to reorganize their movement. Thus, in 1620 some Remonstrant ministers were instructed to go to the village of Warmond and to take back their role of leaders of the religious congregation. However, here they ran into people who were led by the Van der Kodde brothers, who were against the

⁵⁰¹ According to Joachim Oudaen’s account. See: Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 22.

⁵⁰² The terms “Collegiant” refers to the colleges of the 16th century, where some people who were not part of the clergy could interpret some passages of the Sacred Scriptures. At first, these colleges had been founded in Switzerland, where people able to explain or interpret passages of Scriptures were called “prophets”. Afterwards, the synod of the Dutch Churches held in Wezel in 1568 had decided to found such colleges in the Dutch Republic too. Despite the noticeable differences with the meetings of the Van der Kodde and their group, which were separated from the all the Christian churches and where anyone could have freely spoken about the Holy Scripture’s passages that had been read, Collegiants’ opponents started to call their meetings “Colleges”, while they denoted the practice of free interpretation of the Scriptures as «libertas prophetandi». Ibid., pp. 30-34.

idea suggesting that only official ministers could have freedom of speech during religious services. Instead, the Van der Kodde brothers and their followers stated that no one could claim any religious authority above the other members of the congregation and that gatherings based on free interpretation of the Scriptures were enough to lead a true Christian life. Despite attempts to merge the parties by some Remonstrant ministers such as Passchier de Fijne, who proposed to organize free assemblies after the official services, Van der Kodde and his group moved after few months to the village of Rijnsburg, which became the stronghold of the Collegiant movement. After other Colleges were founded in Dutch cities, members of each College started to meet twice a year in Rijnsburg, in order to celebrate the ceremony of the «Lord's Supper».⁵⁰³

In the 17th century, the first historians and opponents of the Collegiant movement focused their attention on Collegiant criticism of ecclesiastical authority, making it the main characteristic of the Rijnsburg movement. However, in the 19th century, Van Slee rightly rejected this opinion. In his work dedicated to the Collegiants, he asserts that the starting point and the fundamental principle of the movement was freedom of speech, which was expressed in the Colleges by the practice of the «libertas prophetandi».⁵⁰⁴ Van Slee rejects both the mere historical reason and the tenet of «sola Scriptura» as starting points of the Rijnsburg movement. It is evident that at the beginning the historical opportunity resulting from the synod of Dordrecht and the preeminence of the Holy Scripture had a main role in the birth of the meetings organized by the Van der Kodde brothers. However, they are not adequate enough to explain why the first Collegiants refused to follow the Remonstrant ministers who came back to the village of Warmond, and why in later years their ideas spread in other cities of the Dutch Republic.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰³ For more information about the birth of the Collegiant movement, see: Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 13-56; Andrew Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 23-56; Kolakowski, *Chrétiens Sans Église* (see above, n. 7), pp. 166-177; Gerrit Voogt, «“Anyone who can read may be a preacher”: Sixteenth-Century Roots of the Collegiants», in *Church Histories and religious culture*, 85(1), 2005, pp. 409-425.

⁵⁰⁴ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 57-62.

⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 267-268.

On the other hand, Kolakowski partially questioned Van Slee's assertions, and he stated that freedom of speech and criticism of ecclesiastical authority are two sides of the same coin. It would be impossible to affirm freedom of speech without questioning the authority of organized clergy, as well as to criticize the latter without establishing freedom of speech for each member of the community.⁵⁰⁶ Surely, Kolakowski's account is more accurate. However, it should be underlined that Van Slee also seems to acknowledge the close connection between criticism of ecclesiastic authority, freedom of speech and religious toleration. After he ruled out the historical reason and the «sola Scriptura» as foundations of the Collegiant movement, the Dutch historian states that its «grondbeginsel», which was acknowledged by all Collegiants, was the negative opinion concerning the status of the Christian Church, which was judged devoid of the ancient purity of the Apostolic communities. This is the reason why they were anti-clerical and anti-confessionals, for «dit beginsel verbood hen zelven een nieuwe kerk op te richten of een secte te vormen en eischte zoowel de vrijheid van spreken voor allen als de onderlinge verdraagzaamheid».⁵⁰⁷

So, the criticism of the ecclesiastic authority was surely one of the main distinguishing principles of the authors belonging to the Collegiant movement.⁵⁰⁸ For instance, it is possible to find ideas against ecclesiastical authority in the thought of Dirck Camphuysen.⁵⁰⁹ In his works, he asserts that the existence of the clergy, as a separate and superior group compared to the

⁵⁰⁶ «Van Slee, l'historiographe du mouvement de Rijnsburg, s'oppose à l'opinion du XVIIe siècle selon laquelle l'anticléricalisme était ce qui cimentait essentiellement le mouvement, et la suppression des pasteurs, son but principal; en effet, dit-il, le point de départ et le fondement du mouvement était l'idée de la liberté de parole qui supposait l'anticléricalisme en tant que moyen. Cette discussion semble purement verbale car, dans la pensée des collégiants, l'idée d'une vie religieuse sans la moindre autorité institutionnelle et l'idée d'un christianisme fondé sur le principe de la liberté de parole avaient exactement le même sens; elles exprimaient une tendance identique, formulée tantôt sous son aspect négatif, tantôt sous son aspect positif». Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église* (see above, n. 7), p. 170.

⁵⁰⁷ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), p. 269.

⁵⁰⁸ As stated by Kolakowski, by its very nature the Rijnsburg movement was devoid of specific features. It is evident that all authors who belonged to the Collegiant movement criticized the clergy's authority and were advocates of freedom of speech and religious toleration. However, because of these principles, people who held the most different opinions joined the Rijnsburg movement, from those of mystic and millenarian ideas to those who, conversely, mainly expressed rationalistic beliefs. So, it is hard to find specific features of the Collegiant movement other than the three ideas above-mentioned. See: Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église* (see above, n. 7), p. 176.

⁵⁰⁹ For biographical information, see: *Ibid.*, pp. 87-90.

rest of the community, precisely leads to the moral decline of the Church's ministers. In particular, if only the minister has the right to speak during religious services, his followers will listen to him only out of habit and thus his sermons will not contribute to the moral improvement of the community.⁵¹⁰ Basing his assertions on 1Corinthians 14, a passage from the Bible always quoted by Collegiant literature, Camphuysen states the equality of all believers in religious congregation.⁵¹¹

As a matter of fact, in modern times no one can claim divine authority and thus neither the ministers, nor synods or ecclesiastical councils must be considered infallible.⁵¹² Camphuysen argues that the moral loss originating from ecclesiastic authority is tied to the very nature of clergy's power. This is why he does not seek for a moral reformation of priesthood, but instead he advocated the abolition of the very office of Church's ministers.⁵¹³ From Camphuysen point of view, he who wants to lead a real Christian life must part from any kind of external worship and just follow Christ's precepts. In this way, «s'il agit bien, la communauté du 'bien agir' l'unit à Dieu et à tous les véritables chrétiens, alors il est un véritable chrétien de l'Église universelle».⁵¹⁴

Here, two principal differences between Boreel's and Camphuysen's thoughts must be underlined. First, while Boreel founds his criticism of ecclesiastical authority on the Scriptures, Camphuysen bases his accusations against ministers and churches upon his radical moral individualism, and upon his ideas concerning God's Grace and the perfectibility of mankind.⁵¹⁵

⁵¹⁰ Ibid., p. 118

⁵¹¹ Ibid., p. 119.

⁵¹² Ibid., p. 120.

⁵¹³ Ibid., pp. 118-119.

⁵¹⁴ Ivi, p. 120.

⁵¹⁵ Camphuysen bases his criticism of ecclesiastical authority on his own ideas about the necessity of leading a moral life, and the contrast between "heart" and "reason". Camphuysen believes that faith consists in an aptitude towards a practical exercise of virtues, which are regarded as goods provided with an innate moral value. This aptitude can be pursued through the "heart" and the testimony of the "conscience" of each one, a gift from God that allows to judge the moral value of an action. Since "heart" and "conscience" are considered as the tribunal of faith, and since all people possess these faculties, it is evident that no one needs the clergy to help him leading his Christian life. What distinguishes Church's ministers from the common people is only their capability to conduct theological and metaphysical discussions, but these discussions are by no means required by faith. In short, the emphasis on the faculties of "heart" and "conscience" leads to: a critique of speculative religion, which distinguishes the learned, namely the clergy, from the believers,

Hence the second difference. While Boreel believed in the possibility of a universal Church, the so-called “Church of Connivance”, Camphuysen rejects this possibility and he refuses the idea of a religious reformation useful to unify all confessions of Christianity through common doctrines, in order to achieve the Universal Christian Church.⁵¹⁶

Camphuysen certainly was not the only scholar belonging to a College or linked to the Collegiant movement to attack ecclesiastical authority in his works. On the contrary, Joachim Oudaen, Jan Bredenburg, Joost van Geel e Jarend Joosten Stol must be mentioned too.

Joachim Oudaen belonged to the Rotterdam College and in 1672 he published the «Aanmerkingen over het verhaal van het eerste begin en opkomen der Rijnsburgers», a work that he wrote against one of Passchier de Fijne’s books, where the Remonstrant minister gave a first account of the Collegiants’ origins.⁵¹⁷ In his work Oudaen rejects De Fijne’s assertions suggesting that the Van der Kodde’s group represented a new sect born from a schism in the Remonstrant movement. On the contrary, Oudaen states that after the synod of Dordrecht Remonstrant ministers, and in particular leaders who sought refuge abroad, could not claim any kind of authority: nor political, since they lost any civil support after the defeat at the synod, nor ecclesiastical, since the Reformed Church officially detained ecclesiastical authority in the Dutch Republic. Therefore, Oudaen concludes that the birth of a new order within the Remonstrant movement could not be established by leaders external to local congregations, but only by the initiative of these congregations, as the Van der Koddess did in Warmond.⁵¹⁸

In a later work, the «Overweginge eeniger grond-stellingen, door J.V.G. in des zelfs redenering, over de algemeene kerk ter neder gestelt, en der zelve onrechtmatigheid», Oudaen questioned the very idea of

namely the people; a critique of religion based on ceremonies and exterior rituals; a critique of religion as the sum of orthodox views. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-98. As for Camphuysen’s ideas concerning the means to obtain salvation, see chapter VI of this work.

⁵¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 120-121. See also: *Ibid.*, pp. 122-129.

⁵¹⁷ [Joachim Oudaen], *Aanmerkingen over het verhaal van het eerste begin en opkomen der Rijnsburgers*, Rotterdam, 1672.

⁵¹⁸ Voogt, *Anyone who can read* (see above, n. 503), pp. 412-413.

ecclesiastical authority.⁵¹⁹ In this work he asserts that the Christian Church had lost his original purity and was slowly decaying in the corruption of earthly world. The main reason of this decadence had been the alliance between Christianity and civil power during the era of Constantine the Great. As a matter of fact, this meddling with secular power had caused schisms, hatred, and intolerance within the Christian religion. Furthermore, because of the gradual moral decay, in modern times no one could prove to have divine inspiration and so an authority deriving from God. While Christ and his disciples proved their mission by miracles, now God has deprived people of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. So, no one can claim a special authority above other Christians. In the absence of a spiritual guide sent by God Himself, all people must rely on their reason to find religious truths.⁵²⁰

It is possible to find similar ideas in the writings of Jan Bredenburg, maybe the most famous member of the Rotterdam College. In the «Heylzamen raad tot christelijke vrede»,⁵²¹ Bredenburg asserts that since the time of the emperor Constantine the Great, councils, synods, and intolerance exercised by Church's ministers had caused schisms and divisions among Christians, which is a clear sign that the Church had lost its original state of purity and of spiritual unity. However, Bredenburg states that the struggles within Christianity are futile, because since apostolic time there has been no prophet who is able to understand which doctrine is closest to the divine nature. Without a real emissary of God on earth, any Christian is free to hold his own opinion in religious matters. In other words, no minister can claim any kind of spiritual authority over other Christians.⁵²²

⁵¹⁹ Joachim Oudaen, *Overweginge eeniger grond-stellingen, door J.V.G. in des zelfs redenering, over de algemeene kerk ter neder gestelt, en der zelve onrechtmatigheid*, Amsterdam, 1989.

⁵²⁰ Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 120-121.

⁵²¹ Jan Bredenburg, *Heylzamen raad tot christelyke vrede, ofte, Aanwijzinge van het rechte middel tot christelijke vereeniging : volgens de eyge natuur der onderlinge verdraagzaamheid, aan alle Christenen, die elkanderen de broederschap waardig oordeelen : benevens een na-reden, dienende tot beantwoording van de voorreden van het verhaal der opkomste van de nieuwe secte der propheten of Rijnsburgers*, Rotterdam, [1671].

⁵²² Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 124-125. For a thorough biography and a full discussion of Bredenburg's thought, see: Wiep van Bunge, *Johannes Bredenburg (1643-1691): een Rotterdamse collegiant in de ban van Spinoza*, Rotterdam, 1990.

The Rotterdam poet Joost van Geel expressed ideas similar to those held by the Collegiants. In his poems he states that in modern times no one can claim divine inspiration, since no one can perform miracles as proof of his mission in the name of God. In the absence of true ambassadors of God, every Christian must rely on his own reason.⁵²³

The same ideas are expressed in the «Den filosofherenden boer» by Barend Joosten Stol.⁵²⁴ Here, the «boer», the main character of this work, clearly affirms that any Church of his time lacks the Holy Spirit's gifts. Hence, they have no right to endow the right to read and to interpret the Scriptures to their ministers, and to deny it to other believers. People created both ministers and ecclesiastic authority, without a direct order from God.⁵²⁵

In conclusion, the writings of these four Collegiants, who were most active in the second half of the 17th century, show the main role that criticism of ecclesiastical authority played in the movement of Rijnsburg. However, if we take their ideas into consideration and we compared them to Boreel's thought, we must underline a major difference. After they argue for the absence of the Holy Spirit's gift, Oudaen, Bredenburg, Van Geel, and Stol relies on human reason as the judge of religious matters. On the contrary, even though reason has a significant role in Boreel's thought too, in the end he still regards God's revelation as the keystone of the Christian life, a revelation that every man can find in the Sacred Scriptures.

As for authors who certainly were Boreel's friends, it is possible to examine the ideas conceived by Petrus Serrarius and Galenus Abrahamsz.

⁵²³ Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 126-127.

⁵²⁴ [Barend Joosten Stol], *Den filosofherenden boer, handelende van de dwalingen der hedensdaagse Christenen, filosofhen, Cartesianen en Quaakers, &c. In verscheyden onvermeynde zaaken begrepen in een samenspraak tusschen en boer, filosooph en Quaker. Door S.I.B.*, 1676. In the same year Frans Kuyper published a second part of this work. Fix states that in all likelihood Kuyper had a role on the writing of Stol's «Den filosofherenden boer», because many of his ideas are included in this work. See: Frans Kuyper, *Tweede deel of vervolg van de filosofheerenden boer. In welk de geheyme gevoelens der Quaakers, uyt haar eygen Schriften, en met haar eygen woorden, ontdekt worden, in mees al de 28 vraagen, in de Filosofheerende Boer aan de Quaakers voorgesteld. Tot beantwoording van der Quaakers aanmerkingen, voor den Filosofheerende Boer*, Rotterdam, 1676; Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), p. 174.

⁵²⁵ Ibid..

Critical remarks about the status of modern churches can certainly be found in the «Negentien artikelen», which Galenus wrote together with David Spruyt, another member of the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam.⁵²⁶ In this work it is stated that it is possible to conclude two main features of the Apostolic Church from the Holy Scriptures: the presence of the Holy Spirit's gift in both Church's ministers and common people, and the sermons of the first ministers, characterized by such a nature that those who listened them were fully persuaded by the truth of what was been told. However, these characteristics are now lost. Since in the Scriptures there is no divine order to restore the ancient apostolic community, it is clear that the modern churches, including the *doopsgezinde* Church, are not based on any command of God.⁵²⁷ Galenus says that the churches of modern times can be considered at best as the result of pious efforts, founded on men's imperfect knowledge and skills. Therefore, he invites all Christians to recognize their churches as devoid of divine authority and to conduct a religious life based on humility and toleration.⁵²⁸

Galenus expressed the same ideas in the «Nader verklaringe». While recognizing the good intentions that induced the reformers of 16th and 17th centuries to take action, Galenus affirms that their confessions, their doctrines, and especially their bans had only human nature. He considered crucial for a Christian life the awareness that the true Church of Christ was the one of apostolic times and that, on the contrary, modern churches possess no divine inspiration whatsoever. Furthermore, Galenus believes that an improvement of the religious life is possible, even if no Christian can prove

⁵²⁶ In Boreel's biography it has been shown that Galenus and Spruyt did not write the «Negentien artikelen» with the intent to publish them, but to make their ideas known to members of their *doopsgezinde* community. However, Jan Jansz published their work without their knowledge in 1658, together with the answers the deacons gave to the articles written by Galenus-Spruyt. In order to confute this last work, in 1659 Galenus and Spruyt wrote the «Nader verklaringe van de XIX artikelen». See: Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 61-62.

⁵²⁷ Ibid., pp. 57-58.

⁵²⁸ Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 97-99. Meihuizen suggests that it was an historical event, the imprisonment of the *doopsgezinde* shepherd Claes Arentsz, that had roused the first doubts of Galenus regarding ecclesiastical authority. Arentsz was accused by four Reformed ministers of discussing in public too freely about the practice of infant baptism. After the incarceration, it was necessary a discussion between few ministers of the Reformed Church and a delegation of the *doopsgezinden*, which Abrahamsz attended. See: Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 39-41.

to have divine authority. To this end, he takes into account and advocates the example of Rijnsburg Colleges: each believer could lead a Christian life through informal meetings where no one would claim to possess divine authority, where the Scriptures would be read and freely interpreted, and where everyone would pray and sing for mutual edification.⁵²⁹

In his works, Petrus Serrarius made similar statements. In fact, he showed interest in the matter of Church's decay since his first studies at the «Waalse College» of Leiden. At the conclusion of his studies, on July 6, 1622, he wrote a dissertation entitled «Explicatio quaestionis an ecclesia possit deficere». Giving voice to one of the classical ideas of the Reformation, he distinguishes the visible church, that is the Roman-Catholic Church, and the invisible church, that is the universal community formed by all true Christians. In particular, Serrarius states that the visible church can fall and had historically fallen from the purity of apostolic times, as testified by the very history of the Church.⁵³⁰

Serrarius resumed the subject concerning the falling of Christian Church in the «De Vertredinge des heyligen stadts», which he wrote to join the controversy between Galenus and the conservative faction of the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam, giving his support to Galenus and his ideas.⁵³¹ This controversy also concerned the condition of the visible church, because Galenus believed that no existing church could claim to be the continuation or the restoration of the apostolic Church. Serrarius, while criticizing the *doopsgezinde*, who believed their community to be «de ware bruid van Christus», asserts that the church is only a human institution and so it can be, at most, the outcome of the will of «goet-meenende menschen». No existent church, continues Serrarius, is founded «op eenigh expres ghebodt oft exempel in de schriften des Nieuwen Testament», nor «op eenigh extraordinary autoriteyt, last oft commissie hier toe van Christo den Heere

⁵²⁹ Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp., pp. 100-101.

⁵³⁰ Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 31-32. Here Van der Wall points out that in this work Serrarius expressed ideas much similar to those of the rector of the «Waalse college» of that time, Daniël Colonius. *Ibid.*, pp. 26-31

⁵³¹ Petrus Serrarius, *De vertredinge des heyligen stadts ofte een klaer bewijs van 't verval der eerste apostolische gemeente, gestalt tot antwoord op drie vragen diesaengaende aen Dr Galenus gedaen ... door Ian Iansz Swichtenheuvel*, Amsterdam, 1659.

verleent». However, it must be stressed that Serrarius' critical argumentations against ecclesiastic authority, together with his theory of the fall of Church, acquire «een duidelijk chiliastische spits», which is surely missing in the works of Boreel and Galenus.⁵³²

Anyhow, in order to strengthen his ideas, in the «De Vertredinge des heyligen stadts» Serrarius enclosed a Dutch translation of the «Von den manigfaltigen in glauben zerspaltungen», written by Christian Entfelder, and published in Strasbourg in 1530. In this work, the Moravian Anabaptist argues that all divisions of the Church were caused by its lack of divine authority. Entfelder practically followed his ideas about the absence of divine authority in modern times and he gave up his office within the Anabaptist community, spending the rest of his life «niet meer soeckende een gemeente op te richten, maer sijn eygen ziele uyt het algemeene verderf te redden», as Serrarius says.⁵³³ Obbe Philips, another of the first Anabaptists, gave voice to similar ideas in his «Bekentnisse Obbe Philipsz».⁵³⁴ In his work Philips describes the first members of the Anabaptist movement as men willing to serve God without ministers, teachers, or assemblies. He complains about the strict internal structure advocated by some of the Anabaptist leaders and he asserts that he has no sufficient proof to determine if Anabaptist ministers were really sent by God. Philips, as Entfelder before him, gave up his position within the Anabaptist community too.⁵³⁵

As for authors from the 16th century, besides the above-mentioned Entfelder and Philips, it is possible to take into account the thought of Sebastian Franck, Caspar Schwenkfeld, and Dirck Coornhert.

In the works of Franck, it is possible to find a fierce attack against ecclesiastical authority. Distinguishing between visible Church and invisible Church of Christ, he asserts that, since the 2th century, the visible Church had

⁵³² Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), p. 207. See also: *Ibid.*, pp. 205-206.

⁵³³ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

⁵³⁴ Obbe Philips, *Bekentnisse Obbe Philipsz: waer mede hy verclaert sijn predick-ampt sonder wettelicke beroepinghe gebruyckt te hebben beclaecht hem dies en waerschuwet eenen yeders wt sijnen eyghen boeck met eyghener handt gheschreuen ghecopieert, ende nu tot ghemeene besten door eenen liefhebber der waerheydt in druck veruerdighet, met eenen voorreden aen den onpartydighen lesers*, Amsterdam, 1584.

⁵³⁵ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 46.

started to fall from its original spiritual purity. Moreover, no existing Christian sect can prove to be endowed with divine authority and so there is none worthy of the title of true Church of Christ, which must be identified with a free and universal Christianity, which transcend any specific sect. As a matter of fact, the true Church of God «is not a special group and sect, bound to element, time, person and place, to which one may point with one's finger, but a spiritual, invisible body of all the members of Christ, born of God, and of one mind, spirit and faith».⁵³⁶

From these assertions, it is possible to conclude two main differences between Boreel's and Franck's ideas. First, Franck founded his criticism of ecclesiastic authority on his spiritualism, that is, on his belief concerning the divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the soul of any believer. This «inner light» could guarantee salvation to each individual. Franck invited each man to become «fools and children once again», so that «God shall write in us the content of his holy word, imprinting himself upon our unformed, insignificant, outpoured, soft heart, as a seal is impressed upon responsive wax». On the other hand, Boreel based his criticism on the Holy Scripture.⁵³⁷ Second, Franck argued that in modern times a visible Church of Christ is by no means necessary. For instance, in a letter that he wrote to Campanus, Franck announced the coming of a new sect, the Spiritualists, which would have removed «all audible prayer, preaching, ceremonies, sacraments, and ordinances such as excommunication, and also ministry». On the contrary, Boreel tried to establish his “Church of Connivance”.⁵³⁸

Despite similar ideas on spiritual matters, in his works Caspar Schwenkfeld gave a less pessimistic account of the true visible Church of God. While sharing the idea that no existing church could be considered as true Christian Church, Schwenkfeld believed that God would have eventually restored on earth the true visible church of apostolic times. A «stilltand», a temporary suspension of all existing church, would have been necessary until that moment. However, this does not mean that Christians should decline any

⁵³⁶ Voogt, *Anyone who can read* (see above, n. 503), p. 414.

⁵³⁷ Ibid.

⁵³⁸ Ibid., p. 413. See also: Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 79 e

external form of worship. On the contrary, Schwenkfeld argued for the possibility of private meetings, in order to practice prayers and mutual edification. In the south of Germany he put into practice his ideas, organizing private assemblies where their members met to pray, to read, and to interpret the Scriptures. The resemblance with the gatherings of Rijnsburg is obvious, in particular with the meetings of the Amsterdam College of Boreel and his group.⁵³⁹

The ideas of Dirck Coornhert were certainly one of the most significant sources for many Collegiant authors. As a matter of fact, it is possible to find accusations against the modern churches in many of his works. One of the most recurrent themes within his writings, is the idea that the modern ministers are not able to prove their mission and thus their alleged divine authority. The leaders of the new sects born from the reformation, such as Lutherans, Calvinists and Anabaptist ministers, etc., should give proof of the divine origin of their offices through the Holy Scriptures or by performing miracles. However, no one is able to give such proof.⁵⁴⁰ Therefore, Coornhert asserts that the main cause of divisions and fights within the Christian religion is to be found in the creation of new sects and churches by people who have not clearly proven their alleged divine call.⁵⁴¹

For instance, this is one of the objections that Coornhert moved to David Joris in his «Kleyn Munster» of 1590. In some of his writings, Joris stated that anyone who wants to be accepted as a religious leader must have experienced himself the Truth. Of course, he made such assertion in order to attack other modern ministers. In previous years Coornhert had agreed with Joris' assertions and he had shared some of his ideas. However, after advocating Joris' idea concerning the ministers of the churches, in the «Kleyn Muntser» Coornhert accuses him to rule himself out by his own criteria.⁵⁴² Therefore, Coornhert affirms that each man has to doubt the works and the

⁵³⁹ Ibid., pp. 86-88; Voogt, *Anyone who can read* (see above, n. 503), pp. 414-415.

⁵⁴⁰ Gerrit Voogt, *Constraint on Trial. Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert and Religious Freedom*, Kirksville, 2000, pp. 133-134. See also: Ibid., p. 116.

⁵⁴¹ Ibid., p. 136.

⁵⁴² Mirjam G.K. van Veen, «Spiritualism in the Netherlands: From David Joris to Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert», in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 33(1), 2002, p. 144. For a complete analysis of the controversy between Coornhert and the «davidists» see: Ibid., pp. 143-148.

preaching of other people until they can clearly prove that God appointed them. Till then, each Christian must rely only on the Scriptures.⁵⁴³

Furthermore, Coornhert attacked other scholars besides Joris. For instance, in some passages of his works he criticized Menno Simons and Hendrik Niclaes, because they had argued that in the Holy Scripture there are obscure words and tenets, which required their interpretations and their writings to be clarified. On the contrary, Coornhert invited every believer «to hold on to the truth, which is Jesus Christ, and not to H.N. (Hendrik Niclaes), Hernic Jansz (i.e. “Hiël”, Hendrick Jansen Barrefelt, leader of a sect that broke away from Niclaes), nor any other human being, which definitely includes me, being human as well».⁵⁴⁴

Coornhert also condemned the existing churches for abusing external ceremonies. He distinguished between external and internal religion, stating that the first one is characterized by the sanctity of the way of life and by the use of ceremonies. However, the ceremonies became cause of divisions and fights among Christians, bringing sadness to Coornhert because «not in appearances, but in the essence do we find true religion».⁵⁴⁵ He was aware that Catholic Church’s decay is a well-known fact. In spite of this, Coornhert believed that no church born after the Reformation had received a special mission from God to restore and to purify Christian ceremonies. So, no one can determine if the reformed churches are better than the Catholic and its ceremonies. In such a situation, it is better to refrain from the latter, rather than practice something that could be wrong.⁵⁴⁶ As for Coornhert’s opinion about Catholicism, even though he acknowledged its corruption, he still considered the Roman-Catholic Church the greatest existing in the 16th century: «the Catholic Church may have become weighed down with encrustations and accretions, but it still goes back to the true apostolic church, “for the dirt does not remove the substance, but sticks to it”».⁵⁴⁷ This explains why Coornhert always remained bound to Catholicism, at least officially.

⁵⁴³ Voogt, *Constraint on Trial* (see above, n. 540), p. 109.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 135.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

⁵⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

In the work «Sparks of reason. Vernacular rationalism in the Low Countries», Ruben Buys examines the vernacular Dutch tradition and shows that traces of rationalism and of ideas that later Coornhert shared can be also found in Dutch authors between the late Middle Ages and the early modern era. Buys suggests that Coornhert probably knew and used this vernacular tradition. Furthermore, he does not exclude that scholars from the 17th century, such as Boreel and Galenus, knew these first Dutch authors too.⁵⁴⁸ Among these people, here it is possible to give a brief account of Dirck Potter, who lived between the 14th and the 15th centuries. In his works Potter emphasizes the role of reason in the moral life, pleading his readers to use their «inner light», instead of relying on the clergy and on its ecclesiastical authority. Consequently, his writings are full of critical assertions against Church's ministers. For instance, Potters condemns their vicious habits and the practice of evading their accusers by using their knowledge and their sophisticated words.⁵⁴⁹ It is evident that in Potter's writings we cannot find the same kind of argumentations against ecclesiastical authority that can be found in scholars from the 16th and 17th centuries. However, it is also evident that traces of critical argumentations against the Church and its ministers can be found in a previous Dutch vernacular tradition, a tradition that had been simply disregarded before Buys.

⁵⁴⁸ Ruben Buys, *Sparks of Reason. Vernacular Rationalism in the Low Countries (1550-1670)*, Hilversum, 2015, pp. 232-233.

⁵⁴⁹ Ivi, pp. 80-85.

Boreel's critical argumentations against ecclesiastical authority

It is now possible to examine Boreel's ideas concerning the modern clergy and its alleged authority. His biography already shows that he has started to develop a fundamental core of his thought at the beginning of the 1630s. As a matter of fact, in 1632 Boreel sent a letter to André Rivet, asking him if he believed that the ministers of the modern churches administered the same kind of public religion as once was done by Christ, by his disciples, and by the first ministers of the Apostolic Church.⁵⁵⁰ In later years Boreel gave a negative answer to this question and hence started to form the series of argumentations against ecclesiastical authority that he expressed in ALAT.

In this work, after articles I-XVII in which he lays out the premises of his entire argument, Boreel immediately establishes the foundations of his argumentations against ecclesiastical authority.⁵⁵¹ Basing his assertions on the Sacred Scriptures, Boreel argues that in the beginning God established that his emissaries should have preached the Gospel only through Christ's Word, that is God's Word.⁵⁵² So, in the New Testament it is impossible to

⁵⁵⁰ «Epistola tua ad Rivetum, sic quaestionem proposuisti: "An Reformatarum Ecclesiarum ministri, qui hodierno tempore publicum N.T. cultum mediantibus concionibus, Dei et Christi loco, nomine, et autoritate hominibus exhibent: eundem illum publicum N.T. cultum administrent, qui olim in primitiva N.T. ecclesia, mediantibus concionibus ab ipso Christo, aut ab Apostolis, et lxx. Discipulis, ordinariisque per eos vocatis ministris, Dei et Christi loco, nomine et autoritate exhibitus fuit?"». Johannes Hoornbeeck, *Summa controversiarum* (see above, n. 36), p. 466.

⁵⁵¹ From his posthumous work QHC, it is possible to conclude that articles I-XVII of ALAT were useful to make a comparison between the first Church's ministers of Apostolic times and those of the modern churches. As a matter of fact, Boreel believes that the first Christian ministers were provided by God with the Holy Spirit's gifts, whereas the modern ministers lack them, because God ceased to bestow them to mankind. In QHC Boreel says that when he wrote ALAT he wanted to deduce from the Holy Scriptures the true features of the ministers and of the common people of apostolic time, because he was aware of the different sects that divided the Christian religion and of the struggles between them. In order to determine if the modern ministers have the same characteristics of apostolic people, he asserts that he had to make a comparison «ad exemplar primae Christi Domini institutionis particularium ministrorum, eorum scilicet dotes, ac requisita». In this way, it would be clear «utrum genuinorum particularium juxta primam Christi Domini institutionem ministrorum dotes ac requisita hodiernis istis reverà adsint, nec ne». See: QHC, in OP, pp. 105-106.

⁵⁵² This is the main topic of article VI-IX of ALAT. Here Boreel claims that, if the Holy Scriptures are rightly examined, no one can deny that in the beginning John the Baptist, Christ, and his apostles preached the Gospel through «verbo illo promisso, ita ut dictum est, ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vero». Likewise, no one can deny that they preached as God's emissaries, that is, in the name of God and through His authority. This is the reason why those who heard their preaching believed that it was God Himself who spoke through their mouths. On the other hand, in articles XI-XVII, Boreel argues that even the first apostolic ministers preached as God's emissaries, since they were ordained by Christ and by his first disciples. So, those who heard the preaching of the first Church's ministers believed that they spoke in the name of God and with divine authority. However, Boreel distinguishes between

find God's order or even His permission to continue the apostolic *praedicatio* through a «verbo non-ὄλωϑ insitè indubiè merequè vero», as once was Christ's oral doctrine. Nor even to begin a new *praedicatio* with the same kind of *verbum*.⁵⁵³ Those who nonetheless offer this kind of preaching, do not serve according to God's will, but rather as they want to. For this reason, they commit the sin of *ethelothréskia*.⁵⁵⁴ Of course, God cannot have established a vocation or a mission that could commit this kind of sin. Therefore, it must be concluded that those who preached as His emissaries, that is in the name of God, a *verbum* which is not God's Word, have no backing from the Holy Scriptures for any kind of vocation or mission neither to preach it, nor to found a new religious cult on it. In other words, those people cannot establish and administer any kind of church.⁵⁵⁵

Boreel's argumentations against ecclesiastical authority are based on these preliminary assertions. So, since in modern times only the Holy Scripture is provided with the same truth and the same nature as «verbum illud per quod Deus nomine ut dictum est suo, Euangelii praedicationem inchoavit et instituit»,⁵⁵⁶ and since from the Bible it can be deduced that only the Bible itself can be publicly used to make people attain that kind of faith that leads to salvation,⁵⁵⁷ it must be concluded that the modern ministers who preach not God's Word, but rather their sermons, as if people can attain salvation from them, do not behave according to God's order.⁵⁵⁸ As a matter

these first ministers, and Christ and his disciples. As a matter of fact, the apostolic minister could have walk away from the original purity of Christ's Word, because of their human nature, while Christ and his disciples were so godly that they could have never walked away from God's Word. See: ALAT, pp. 3-24.

⁵⁵³ «Sin autem responsum fuerit, Deum nullibi in S. Scriptura ullis ecclesiae suae ministriis aliisve mandasse, aut beneplacite permisisse, ut genuina illa debitaque Euangelii praedicatio, quae Dei ut dictum est nomine, duntaxat verbo illo ὄλωϑ insitè indubiè merequè vero primitus inchoata ut dictum est et instituta à Deo fuit, deinceps Dei nomine ab illis sive consciè sive insciè continuaretur verbo quod est non ὄλωϑ insitè indubiè merequè verum [...]: Item, Deum nomine ut dictum est suo, nullam Euangelii praedicationem à ministris speciatim ac debite ad eam missis datis et vocatis primitus inchoari et continuari voluisse, instituisse, mandasse, aut benplacite permisisse, quae Dei ut dicutm est nomine sive consciè sive insciè ab ijs aliisve perageretur verbo itidem non-ὄλωϑ insitè indubiè merequè vero, ut dictum est [...]». ALAT, pp. 26-27. See also: ALAT pp. 25-26.

⁵⁵⁴ ALAT, pp. 28-29. For instance, it is possible to find the term *ethelothréskia* in Col. 2, 23.

⁵⁵⁵ ALAT, pp. 29-31.

⁵⁵⁶ ALAT, p. 33.

⁵⁵⁷ ALAT, pp. 34-37.

⁵⁵⁸ ALAT, p. 39.

of fact, their *verbum* «non est verbum Dei»,⁵⁵⁹ which is «insite seu natura sua, totum, et in singulis, etiam minimis partibus suis, pura ac mera veritas; certissimum, absque ulla mistura ullius inscii erroris qualiscunque».⁵⁶⁰ In short, the sermons and preaching of modern ministers are not endowed with the absolute truth, which is the most significant feature of God's word. Boreel says that these same ministers know that they do not preach God's true word. If they believe they do, they cannot prove their assertion.⁵⁶¹ Moreover, not only do they untruthfully regard their preachings as the means through which each man can attain salvation, but they call them the «genuini verbi Dei predicati» and they prefer their sermons to the public preaching of the Holy Scriptures.⁵⁶²

From the Bible it is not even possible to assert that modern ministers are instructed by God to clarify the most difficult and obscure passages of the Bible itself.⁵⁶³ On the contrary, the New Testament is sufficient to establish the true Christian cult and worship, that is, to achieve the catechesis and the true confession according to which each Christian can lead a religious life. So, since God's Word is only available through the Holy Scriptures, it must take the place of the forged human confessions and catechesis.⁵⁶⁴ All human confessions must be removed instead.⁵⁶⁵

⁵⁵⁹ SG, art. VIII, in OP, p. 95.

⁵⁶⁰ SG, art. IV, in OP, p. 94.

⁵⁶¹ SG, art. VI, in OP, pp. 94-95. Boreel make similar assertions in the PEP. Here he says that from argumentations he used in ALAT, it can be easily concluded that the churches «sive Luthenarorum, sive Reformatorum, sive Mennonitarum, sive quorumque tandem qui solam Veteris ac Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei ac morum canone nunc profitentur, Universas ac singulas, ejusmodi naturae verbo non uti in Concionibus, Catechismis, Confessionibus, Formulis, Consistoriis, Classibus, Synodisve suis, quo Evangelii Praedicatio, Ecclesiaeque reliqua, per particularium quoque Ecclesiarum ministros, administratio, a Deo Christoque primitus et instituta fuit, et peragi potuit». PEP, in OP, pp. 148-149.

⁵⁶² ALAT, pp. 38-39.

⁵⁶³ ALAT, pp. 42-45.

⁵⁶⁴ «Cum Dei institutione mandato vel beneplacita permissione convenire ut loco catechesium et confessionum illarum non-ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merequè verarum et non-authenticarum, substituatur in Ecclesia, nomine ut dictum est Dei, ipsissimum scriptum Dei verbum, tanquam authentica ac ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merequè vera Christianorum praedictum in finem catechesis et confessio». ALAT, p. 51.

⁵⁶⁵ «Tum quaerendum est; Utrùm igitur non-ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèquè verae illae et non-authenticae formulae catechesium et confessionum, quibus ab aevo hodieque tanquam authenticis, homines ab ineunte aetate ac deinceps innutriuntur Dei ut dictum est nomine et erudiuntur, eorumque tam privatus quàm publicus cultus limitatur Dei ut dictum est nomine ac dirigitur, aboleri (quà tales) et e manibus eorum seponi debeant; nec ne?» ALAT, p. 52.

From all that has been said, it follows that those ministers who from the beginning of their office preach their sermons instead of the Holy Scripture, who maintain that their *verbum* is God's true Word, who make use of human confessions and catechesis, cannot find in the Bible a command or even permission from God that give them divine authority to found churches and to gather people in them. Furthermore, they can neither rule the existing churches through their liturgies and through the proceedings of their consistories and synods, nor establish the offices and the task of bishops, pastors, presbyters, doctors, and so on.⁵⁶⁶ In short, it would be necessary to remove their alleged divine right and authority.⁵⁶⁷ As a matter of fact, says Boreel, it is impossible to deny that a church which from its beginning has lacked Christ's oral Word, which has replaced it with the forged *verbum* of its ministers, which has preferred the public preaching of this forged *verbum* instead of the Holy Scripture, which has advocated human catechesis, human confession, human liturgies, and so on, has turned away from Christ's original doctrine. This is the reason why such churches can be described as apostate.⁵⁶⁸

If the current ministers must be deprived of divine authority, it is clear that they cannot preach a human and forged *verbum*, they cannot develop or use confessions, and they cannot administer the sacraments. Furthermore, they cannot have the power to excommunicate other Christians,

⁵⁶⁶ ALAT, pp. 52-53.

⁵⁶⁷ «Tum quaerendum est; Annon igitur expediat, et jus illud ac auctoritatem illam ministrorum illorum praesumptam, erectionem item et collectionem illam Ecclesiarum, ut et regimen illud earum (quae Dei ut dictum est nomine ab iis peraguntur) e medio tolli?». ALAT, p. 54. See also: art. CXVII e CXVIII in ALAT, p. 54.

⁵⁶⁸ «[...] utrùm inquam talis Ecclesia cum ratione negare possit, se recessisse aut defecisse a primaeva illa Christi quoad verbum promissum institutione, Ecclesiarumque per id, juxta illam, nomine Dei seu pro Deo legatione fungendo, erectione collectione et regimine; atque eatenus (de promisso autem spiritu id suo etiam loco probabatur) apostaticam esse; nec ne?». ALAT, p. 55. See also: art. CXXI e CXXII in ALAT, pp. 55. Desmarets and Hoornbeeck attacked Boreel because of this accusation, saying that Boreel had claimed that all churches from apostolic time onwards were apostates. Boreel replied in QHC. Here he says that he had never had the purpose to question all the churches born after apostolic time. On the contrary, he had questioned only the Reformed churches and he had only accused them to be apostates. See: QHC, in OP, p. 108. On the other hand, in PEP Boreel explains the reasons of his charge. Here he says once more that modern ministers do not make use of God's true Word, and, nonetheless, they found new churches and they continued to administer their religious congregations, even though they have no right or no authority to do so. For these reasons, «eatenus quoque, (Spiritu, eorumque moribus juxta consideratis) à prima illa unicaque Christi (Ephes. IV 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16) institutione, suo etiam singuli modo (in templo Dei sedentes) recesserint, defecerint atque apostatarint». PEP, in OP, pp. 149-150.

to appoint new ministers, or to use the secular power to punish heretics. In short, they cannot do anything that they are used to doing both in Catholic and in Protestant churches. The ministers and their churches must be deprived of all their offices and alleged duties.⁵⁶⁹

In addition, from Boreel's point of view all the ministers of the current churches are advocates of a vicious circle, which is most dangerous for the Christian religion. In SG Boreel argues that every man must achieve the ability to judge sermons, interpretations, and explanations of the Holy Scripture made by other men, only through the Bible itself. However, Boreel is aware that in modern times common people look for the faith necessary to attain salvation and the ability to judge the ministers' words only through the sermons and the speeches of the same ministers. This is a vicious circle that is advocated by the preachers themselves. They assert that common people must achieve the faith necessary to attain salvation through their sermons and their preaching. Furthermore, common people can be sure of these sermons and of this preaching through the Holy Scriptures, as «statera ac lydio lapide». However, they can achieve from the Bible the ability to judge the ministers' words only through their sermons and their preaching.⁵⁷⁰ From Boreel's point of view this is an exceedingly dangerous vicious circle. As a matter of fact, he argues that common people would be corrupted by such prejudices that would hinder them to achieve the true ability to judge the ministers' words, if they did not become able through the Holy Scripture to judge the preaching,

⁵⁶⁹ ALAT, pp. 62-64. Boreel makes similar statements in QHC too. Here he says that by writing ALAT he had the purpose of pushing all current ministers «ut dotes genuinorum ministrorum istas ac requisita, sibi, ut istis olim reverà aderant, reverà adesse, debitè probarent». If they had not done so or if they could not have done so, he would have concluded that «nullos istarum Ecclesiarum ministros esse genuinos, sed spurios ipsos esse, genuinorum istorum et nomen et rem emenientes; ac proinde, ab omnibus Ecclesiasticis administrationibus, sive pro Deo et Christo legatione fungendo, sive caetero-quin tanquam à genuinis particularibus Novi Testamenti ministris peractis, prorsus ipsis eam ob causam abstinendum esse». QHC, in OP, p. 107.

⁵⁷⁰ «Si enim ab hodiernis cognitis Ecclesiasticis quaeratur: unde populus veram fidem consequi debeat ac possit? Ex concionibus nostris, dicent, tanquam ex auditu verbi Dei praedicati. Unde populus sciet, num auditus iste sit auditus verbi Dei? Ex Sacra Scriptura, inquier, tanquam statera ac lydio lapide; Unde populus ex Sacra Scriptura consequi debet, ac potest stateram judicandi istam ac lydium lapidem? Ex auditu concionumstrarum, dicent, juxta illud, (Act. 8, 30, 31) intelligisne quae legis? Quinam verò possim, nisi aliquis me in viam ducat. Unde sciet populus, quod per conciones istas in rectam salutis viam ducatur? Ex Sacra Scriptura, inquier, Unde sciet populus ex Sacra Scriptura, quod per conciones istas in rectam salutis viam ducatur? Per conciones istas, respondebunt». SG, in OP, p. 99.

the explanations, the confessions, and so on, of the current ministers before listening to their words.⁵⁷¹

In conclusion, from all that has been said, it is clear that Boreel believed that each Christian must judge any church that is not founded according to the Holy Scripture as defective and presumptuous. They are defective because they lack God's true Word. Moreover, they are presumptuous because they replace God's Word with the preaching of their ministers, and because they give the right only to the same ministers to speak in religious services, even though this is against the custom of the apostolic Church.⁵⁷²

⁵⁷¹ SG, in OP, p. 98.

⁵⁷² ALAT, pp. 65-66. Here Boreel quotes the Collegiant passages in 1 Corinthians: 14, to support his assertions.

The Church of Connivance

After this fierce criticism against ecclesiastical authority, one could rightly ask if it is still possible to found a Church. Not only Boreel's answer is positive, but it can also be argued that this question is the main core of ALAT and in general of Boreel's thought. As a matter of fact, after he has argued that it is impossible to establish churches both through divine authority, that is in the name of God, and through ecclesiastical authority, that is «nomine membrorum talis Ecclesiae respectivorum, seu tanquam membra talis Ecclesiae respectiva», Boreel asks himself if it is really possible to found a Church in this «defectivo ut dictum est Ecclesiae statu», when God has ceased to provide men with the Holy Spirit's gifts and when men only have God's written Word.⁵⁷³

In the Bible, Boreel argues, there are passages whence it can be deduced, to a certain extent, that God tolerates that churches are founded and administered by their members with «summa animi κατηφεία». These churches must be based on God's toleration and on «ad populi sui jam dictos defectus aliosque eatenus conniventia». In other words, those who establish this kind of church have not divine authority, but only ecclesiastical authority: they must behave only as members of the same Church. This is the reason why in this kind of religious congregation the error must be tolerated.⁵⁷⁴ In short, it is impossible to find in the Holy Scriptures God's command or His permission to gather Christian people and to found a Church, neither through

⁵⁷³ ALAT, pp. 56-57.

⁵⁷⁴ «Sin autem hac de re proferatur: Tum quaerendum est; Utrum in SS. literis loca habeantur (in quibus non quidem instituat mandetur aut beneplacitè permittatur, sed) unde aliquatenus colligi possit, a Deo tolerari, quod jam dicto Ecclesiae statu defectivo, Ecclesiae in Dei displiciti tolerantia, et ad populi sui jam dictos defectus aliosque eatenus conniventia, a talibus ejus membris cum summa animi κατηφεία, erigantur colligantur et regantur: non quidem Dei nomine id est loco et autoritate Dei seu pro Deo legatione fungendo, id enim ὁλως insitè indubiè merequè verè cum ὁλως insitè indubiè merequè veris tantummodò fieri debet, quibus requisitis, ab aevo hodieque destituimur: sed Dei quidem praevia ad id (ut dictum est) tolerantia et conniventia, et quamproximè fieri potest ὁλως insitè indubiè merequè verè cum ὁλως insitè indubiè merequè veris: attamen autoritate duntaxat talis Christianismi Ecclesiastica, nomine membrorum, talis Ecclesiae respectivorum seu tanquam membra talis Ecclesiae respectiva, et jure vocationis talium Christianorum communis; ita ut error ibi tolerari possit ac debeat?». ALAT, p. 58. In QHC Boreel makes similar assertions. Here he says that, while he was looking for the best means to lead religious congregation, he understood that «in SS. libris loca, undè aliquatenus colligi possit, à Deo tolerari, quòd isto rerum statu Ecclesiae in Dei tolerantia et conniventia à talibus, cum summa animi κατηφεία erigantur, colligantur et regantur». QHC, in OP, p. 108.

divine nor through ecclesiastical authority. However, thanks to God's connivance for the sins of His people, Christians can work together to establish a kind of religious congregation that is tolerated by God. This is the reason why Boreel's church is called the "Church of Connivance".⁵⁷⁵

However, Boreel does not quote the passages of the Holy Scriptures useful to understand the right way to found a Christian church in modern times. He only says that these passages can be found throughout the Bible. Furthermore, he adds that he who looks for the right way to found a Christian congregation not only must find all these passages and judge using all of them, but he also has to take into consideration various editions of the Holy Scriptures, such as the Greek Bible, the Syrian Bible, the Ethiopian Bible, etc. Moreover, he must take into account all the commentaries concerning the Holy Scriptures, both the most ancient and the most recent, written by Jews, Greeks, Latins, etc. After he has collected all that is necessary, he must examine those passages without prejudices. He must weigh up the pros and cons of these passages. From Boreel's point of view, this is the only way to rightly judge about such a subject. However, Boreel believes that this would not be a very difficult task, even though at first sight it seems impossible to make such a research. As a matter of fact, he emphasizes that God had given the Holy Scripture to start, to spread, and to preserve the divine cult, «non autem ad apostaticae Ecclesiae in Dei displiciti conniventia ac tolerantia cultum praescribendum». ⁵⁷⁶ So, there should be only few passages useful to understand how to found religious congregations in modern times. However,

⁵⁷⁵ This name was coined by Boreel's opponents. For instance, it can be found in Hoornbeeck's «Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana». Here he asserts that Boreel had named the kind of Christian congregation he conceived as «coetum *Conniventiae*, digna hypothese nomenclatura, quia nimirum ob diuturnam omnium totius Christianismi Ecclesiarum apostasiam offensus Deo, sub ejus ira, vel indulgentia, in *Dei displiciti tolerantia*, hoc defectivo *Ecclesiae statu*, ut loqui amas, colligitur». As a matter of fact, Boreel in article CLXII of ALAT calls the kind of Church he theorized *Cultum Conniventiae*. In addition, Hoornbeeck invites Boreel to prove that «illam *Conniventiae ecclesiam* erigi, et sistendam sub *Dei conniventia*, et non sub ejus ira et indignatione, juxta cum aliis Ecclesiis; vel Deum tuis *connivere* potius, quam irasci». The same name for Boreel's Church can be found in «'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt», when the author affirms that Boreel gave to his religious congregation «den naem van *Kercke der oogh-luyckinghe*». See: ALAT, p. 68; Hoornbeeck, *Summa controversiarum* (see above n. 36), pp. 499 and 500; 't *Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt* (see above, n. 85), p. A2(v);

⁵⁷⁶ ALAT, p. 62.

Boreel admits that up until now no one has examined the Holy Scriptures in search of such passages.⁵⁷⁷

Since no one has examined the Bible in this way, Boreel takes into account the way in which each Christian should behave towards the existing churches. Although they are defective and presumptuous, Boreel says that Christians should judge these churches with benevolence if: the churches have sinned out of ignorance, because the Holy Scriptures have not been examined as proposed by Boreel; they are not aware of the right way to found and lead religious congregation, even if Boreel's kind of investigation has been done. In such cases, each Christian should regard the existing churches as if they were based only on ecclesiastical authority, that is as Christian congregations where no one speaks in the name of God, where each member only speaks for himself instead, and where the error must be tolerated. In such cases, even if the existing churches are defective and presumptuous, each Christian can behave in a loving way in them, thanks to the « cultus aedificative-propheticus (1Cor. 14)», by adopting what has been said in 1Thessalonians 5: 20-21, and by making use of the sacraments.⁵⁷⁸

⁵⁷⁷ ALAT, pp. 58-62. The method of investigation that Boreel here advocated, is quite similar to the kind of argumentation that in JNL he calls the «statera iudicii». For more information, see the next chapters.

⁵⁷⁸ «Sin autem nihil ea de re proferatur: Tum quaerendum est; Quandoquidem cultus talium caetuum non-ὄλως insitè indubiè merèque verus, pro genuino cultu, nomine Dei seu Dei loco et autoritate, juxta Dei aliquam institutionem mandatum vel beneplacitam aliquam permissionem divinam peracto, haberi, ob rationes saepiùs jam dictas, non potest; etiamsi coetus illi juxta solam S. scripturam ab eorum autoribus, quàm optimè potuerunt, erecti essent; Tum inquam quaerendum est; Utrùm omnes et singulos tales coetus quamdiu ex ignorantia peccant, iudicio Charitatis aliquatenus habere liceat pro coetibus, autoritate duntaxat Ecclesiastica, jure communis vocationis, et nomine membrorum Ecclesiae respectivorum, defectivo Ecclesiae statu, in Dei ut dictum est tolerantia et conniventia erectis collectis et rectis? id est, pro talibus coetibus, in quibus nemo Dei nomine seu pro Deo legatione fungendo vel Ecclesiam regit, vel loquitur aut loqui debet, sed suo id est membri Ecclesiae respectivi nomine loqui potest; in quibus utique coetibus eorumque cultu, error tolerari potest et debet: quibus hodiernis coetibus, sese Dei nomine (attamen ex ignorantia) venditantibus; etiamsi ut dictum est imperfectis [...]; et praesumptuosis [...]; nihilominus tamen aliquatenus, ratione videlicet cultus aedificative-propheticus (1Cor. 14), ibi per eorum ministros et populum, quamvis defectivè et abusivè administrati, homo Christianus charitativè (praesumptionis eorum fastu ac scandalo ipsis condonato) communicare possit; illud apostoli (quoad ejus fieri potest) illis applicando, prophetias ne spernite, omnia probate, quod bonum fuerit retinete: Sacramenta autem itidem ibi usurpando, prout sunt publicae omnibus Christianis communes professiones salutis in Christi morte et resurrectione quaesitae; nulla ad personas quae ea administrant, earumque vocationem, relatione habita». ALAT, pp. 66-67.

Here Boreel's assertions are not perfectly clear. It is likely that he wanted to lessen his critical reflections against the Protestant churches, suggesting that Christian people could continue to be part of them, so that they could get from them all that is good for a Christian life. However, at the same time Boreel set limits to this kind of participation. On the one hand, Christian people could only continue to be part of their church until no one examined the Holy Scripture, so that the right way to establish Christian congregations in modern times could be found. On the other hand, Christian people should be part of their churches only if these are going to improve themselves. As a matter of fact, Boreel seems to suggest that their ministers should give up their alleged divine authority, so that each member could have freedom of speech and so that in these churches the error could be tolerated.⁵⁷⁹

However, if these churches refused examine the Holy Scriptures in detail, or if they refused to improve themselves and to establish the Church of Connivance, after this research had been carried out, then each Christian should leave these churches and should practices the private worship of God through the Holy Scriptures alone.⁵⁸⁰

As a matter of fact, Boreel clearly states that each Christian should only join the Church that uses the Bible as the only catechesis and the only confession of God, as the only means to administer public religion through ecclesiastical authority, and to establish mutual toleration.⁵⁸¹ In this way both

⁵⁷⁹ This is how I interpret the passage above-quoted: «id est, pro talibus coetibus, in quibus nemo Dei nomine seu pro Deo legatione fungendo vel Ecclesiam regit, vel loquitur aut loqui debet, sed suo id est membri Ecclesiae respectivi nomine loqui potest; in quibus utique coetibus eorumque cultu, error tolerari potest et debet». Ibid.

⁵⁸⁰ ALAT, pp. 69-70. Since he has not divine authority, Boreel cannot say how to practice this kind of private religion. This is the reason why in ALAT he does not give any information about it. However, perhaps here Boreel had in mind a kind of religious private meetings similar to those he and his fellow-thinkers practiced in the Amsterdam College. As a matter of fact, the Collegiants of Amsterdam held private meetings where people from different Christian congregations gathered in order to read the Holy Scriptures and to freely discuss what they read. So, it can be supposed that the Collegiant meetings represent that way of practicing «in bona conscientia cultum ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque verum, mediantibus SS. Literis prout sunt et jacent adhibitis, privatim», which Boreel advocates in ALAT. On the other hand, it can be supposed that by referring to a private religion Boreel only means a worship individually practiced through the readings of the Holy Scripture. If so, one may wonder if the meetings of the Amsterdam College must be identified with the above-mentioned Christian congregations that had improved themselves.

⁵⁸¹ «Sin autem nil hac de re proferatur: Tum quaerendum est; utrùm, quum ipsissimae SS. Literae prout sunt et jacent, publicè offeruntur pro unica Dei ut dictum est nomine catechesi et confessione; pro unico item medio universi publici cultus, defectivo hoc Ecclesiae statu, per illas, nomine Dei, id est qua medium pro Deo legatione fungendo,

the ministers and the people would leave a forged religion and they would reach the true Christian form of worship, which is peaceful by nature, and which is founded on God's tolerance and connivance for the sins of his people.⁵⁸²

Ecclesiastica duntaxat ut dictum est autoritate, jure vocationis communis, et nomine membrorum Ecclesiae respectivorum, in Dei ut dictum est tolerantia et conniventia, administrandi; item pro unico ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vero medio Ecclesiastici in communibus fundamentalibus regiminis, et mutuae itidem mediante sermone aedificationis publicae, quae ipsi S. scripturae subordinata, ac quoad exercitium, proximè ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vera sint; pro debito item medio mutuae tolerantiae: Quum inquam ipsissimae SS. literae ab aliquibus Christianis Deum timentibus, qui defectivo hoc Ecclesiae statu, universas SS. literas, quoad illam Ecclesiae in Dei tolerantia et conniventia erectionem collectionem et regimen, pro et contra ut dictum est ruminati sunt, et collecta illa omnibus sincerè communicarunt, praedicto modo publicè offerentur; et omnis Ecclesiarum erectio, collectio, cultus, aedificatio, regimen, ac tolerantia, juxta SS. literarum in collectis illis manifestissimam determinatione, Ecclesiastica ut dictum est duntaxat autoritate, jure vocationis communis, et nomine membrorum Ecclesiae respectivorum, admissis semper gratoque animo manifestissimè melioribus, unicè componitur; Utrùm tunc inquam, homini Christiano praefata prout optimè poterit probanti, et sincerè liberèque approbanti, tempestivum ac utile futurum sit, caetui illi sese adjungere, ad Deum uno cum pluribus animo publicè colendum, laudandum, ac profitendum; proximumque invicem mediante sermone, publicè cum fundamentalibus illis communibus aedificandum: quò alii similiter agant; ut ita, pro ratione praesentium singulis talis Ecclesiae aetatibus donorum, voluntas Dei in terra ab omnibus talibus Christianis unanimiter fiat, quemadmodum unanimiter fit in coelo?». ALAT, pp. 70-71.

⁵⁸² «Sin autem responsum fuerit, quòd homo Christianus id tunc facere possit, eique utile futurum sit: tum benè habet; et satis est: ad alium enim publicum cultum jam perducti sunt; nempe ab hodierno natura sua turbolento, imperfecto, et praesumptuoso, non-ὁλως insitè indubiè merequè vero cultu, qui sese nihilominus Dei nomine id est Dei loto et autoritate seu pro Deo legatione fungendo, mediante verbo orali, regimine, catechismo et confessione non-ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque veris, pro genuino Dei cultu venditat; ad cultum natura sua pacificum, Ecclesiastica quidem duntaxat ut dictum est autoritate, jure vocationis communis, et nomine membrorum Ecclesiae respectivorum, in Dei ut dictum est tolerantia et conniventia erectum; attamen per ipsissimum ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vera, et quoad exercitium proximè ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vera, peractum, tam ministri inquam quàm populum perducti sunt». ALAT, pp. 71-72.

Chapter II: The Church of connivance: Scriptures, Toleration and Freedom of Speech.

In the previous chapter it has been asserted that Boreel did not want to explicitly describe any characteristic of the “Church of Connivance”, which should be established in a period when people had received by God neither divine gift, nor Christ’s oral Word. This unwillingness perfectly agrees with his claims. Boreel clearly argues that no one has yet examined the Holy Scripture in order to find the passages concerning the “Church of Connivance”. So, nothing can be told about it, until this research is not carried on.

However, some of the most significant features of the Church of connivance can be clearly concluded from Boreel’s words. In particular, the Holy Scripture as the keystone of religious life, the necessity of religious toleration, and of freedom of speech are the fundamentals of the Church of Connivance. These three ideas are also the themes of this chapter.

The first section examines the thoughts of some authors from 16th and 17th centuries who dealt with the role of the Scriptures in the Christian life, and with the importance of toleration and freedom of speech in religious matters. As before, at the beginning the Collegiant movement and some of its main figures are considered. Second, the thoughts of Galenus Abrahamsz regarding these aspects is examine, with a brief account of the differences between his hermeneutical approach on the scriptures and Boreel's one. Furthermore, this section shows that ideas about freedom of speech and religious toleration in 17th century were also shared by some non-Collegiant people as Gijsbert Voet (o Gisbertus Voetius) in Holland and Jeremy Taylor in England. Lastly, the assertions of three classical champions of toleration and freedom of speech of the 16th century, Sebastian Castellio, Iacopo Aconcio and Dirck Coornhert, are taken into account.

The second section discusses the central role that the Scriptures played in the “Church of Connivance” and the reasons that lead Boreel to argue for this main role. At last, the third section shows that freedom of speech and religious toleration are so significant in Boreel’s thought, that

when he discusses the Church of Connivance he believes necessary to establish toleration and freedom of expression as fundamental qualities of Christianity. However, as for public religion, Boreel puts some limits to the real freedom of speech that each Christian can enjoy.

Two centuries of struggles for freedom of speech and religious toleration

In the previous chapter, it has been shown that critical argumentations against ecclesiastic authority, freedom of speech, and religious toleration were sides of the same coin in the Collegiant movement. Thus, it comes as no surprise that Boreel underlines the importance of the Bible, of freedom speech and of toleration as main features of the Church of Connivance. In fact, these three aspects were the bases which the Colleges were founded on. In their meetings the Collegiants read and examined some passages of the Bible. Then each participant could freely express his opinion on the matter.⁵⁸³ In «Chrétiens sans Église» Kolakowski perfectly summarizes the distinctive features of the Rijnsburg movement: the principle of non-exclusion, since individuals of any confession faith were allowed at their meetings, even non-Christian; the absolute equality of each participant and thus the universal right to speak, or *libertas prophetandi*; the absence of any ecclesiastical authority; the absence of ceremonies or sacraments of a particular confession of faith whatsoever.⁵⁸⁴

The Collegiants used three different argumentations to defend freedom of speech. First of all, they used a scriptural argumentation, taken from 1Corinthians 14, through which they advocated the *libertas prophetandi*.⁵⁸⁵ In one of the first meetings held by the Van der Kodde brothers, Passchier De Fijne argued against the Collegiants that from this passage it is not possible to conclude the necessity of freedom of speech to achieve mutual edification. Faced with these objections, one of the Van der Kodde brothers, Jonge Jan, intimated the remonstrant minister to be silent, as one could easily deduce from 1Corinthians 14: 30 that, when a believer feels driven to speech by the Holy Spirit, the preacher must remain quiet and allow him to express himself. De Fijne objected that this was only freedom to argue, not to prophesy, but Adriaan van der Kodde replied that, in spite of this,

⁵⁸³ For instance, that was the custom of the assemblies held by Boreel and his fellow-thinkers, as it has been shown earlier in the history of the Amsterdam College.

⁵⁸⁴ Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église* (see above, n. 7), pp. 175-176.

⁵⁸⁵ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 275-276.

anyone should express his opinion freely.⁵⁸⁶ Second, they used an argument based on ancient costumes, since from the Scriptures and other accounts it is possible to conclude that in the old Jewish synagogues and in apostolic times free discussion among the believers was customary.⁵⁸⁷ Lastly, it was argued that not only freedom of speech agreed with the laws of equity, nature, and reason, but it was also the best means to mutual edification. From a Collegiant point of view, the Church had clearly lost its ancient purity when freedom of speech was bestowed exclusively on the ministers, who gradually gave in to lust, arrogance, pride, and any kind of vices.⁵⁸⁸

Camphuysen was surely one of the first Collegiant scholar to conceive ideas on behalf of free speech and toleration of different opinions. While advocating the idea of universal priesthood, Camphuysen attacks the «alleenspreken», that is, the practice of bestowing freedom of speech only to the minister appointed by existing churches. In his works, he refers to the example of the old apostolic communities and he asserts that all members of a congregation must be free to express their own opinion during religious services. Furthermore, Camphuysen argues that the clergy grants itself an authority that it has no right to have, if only the churches' ministers and preachers can speak during the religious services. On the contrary, Camphuysen states that all believers are equal in religious congregations, accordingly to 1Corinthians 14: 26, and thus they all have the right to speak.⁵⁸⁹

Since he advocates freedom of opinion and speech, Camphuysen also became an advocate of religious toleration. In the previous chapter it has been shown that he denies the idea of a visible church and so he rejects the possibility of a new reformation. Nevertheless, he does not advocate the destruction of existing churches. On the contrary, he urged the necessity of establishing religious toleration in each existing church. In this way each opinion, ceremony, and institution, no matter how absurd they sounded, could be tolerated, provided a real Christian moral conduct: «Quelles que soient les

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid., pp. 49-50.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid., pp. 276-277.

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 277-278.

⁵⁸⁹ Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église* (see above, n. 7), pp. 118-119.

fautes, grandes ou petites, nous sommes tenus de maintenir la fraternité et la communauté avec ceux qui errent, dans la mesure de nos forces, si seulement le fondement – Jésus-Christ, ainsi que le mystère de la piété (ainsi que l'Apôtre appelle la religion chrétienne dans la 1^{re} Épître à Timothée, III, 16) – est conservé».⁵⁹⁰ Although Boreel conceived the “Church of Connivance”, which surely could not have received Camphuysen’s approval, the assertions of the latter concerning toleration of absurd opinions are quite similar to Boreel’s belief suggesting that any error must be tolerated in the “Church of Connivance”. Anyhow, even if he had not shared any particular theological conception and he had not belonged to any Christian sect, Camphuysen plainly advocates absolute toleration for each religious opinion, by suggesting an individual religion based on the moral capacity of each believer.⁵⁹¹

Among the Collegiant scholars of the second half of 17th century, here Bredenburg, Van Geel and Laurens Klinkhamer must be mentioned.

Bredenburg expresses his ideas on behalf of religious toleration in both «Een praetje over tafel»,⁵⁹² and the «Heylzamen raad tot christelijke vrede».⁵⁹³ In the first work, Bredenburg praises the kind of religious toleration advocated by the Rijnsburg movement, since he believes it is superior to the kind of toleration practiced by Remonstrants or *Doopsgezinden*. Since he defends the belief on Christ as savior of mankind as the only essential Christian doctrine, and since he considers all other doctrines indifferent to a Christian life, Bredenburg argues that a reform of religious life would be possible only through universal toleration in all matters and doctrines not required to salvation.⁵⁹⁴ It is possible to find similar ideas in the «Heylzamen raad tot christelijke vrede». Here, while he criticizes ecclesiastical authority and establishes the equality of all believers, Bredenburg affirms that, in absence of real emissaries sent by God, the opinion of each believer is

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 121. See also: Ibid., p. 120.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid., p. 123.

⁵⁹²[Jan Bredenburg], *Een pratje over tafel, tusschen een remonstrant, waterlandsdoopsgeinde, ende den waerd. Behelsende consideration over den vrede-handel, nu tusschen de remonstranten en de waterlandsche-doopsgeinde tot Rotterdam, voorgevallen. Waer van sy nu beyderzijds de stucken hebben uytgegeven. Betoonende oockm ter dier occasie, de rechte natuur der onderlinge verdraeghsaemheydt, en hoe die beyder zijden gepractiseert wordt*, Amsterdam, 1671.

⁵⁹³ Bredenburg, *Heylzamen raad tot christelyke vrede* (see above, n. 521).

⁵⁹⁴Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 123-124.

genuine. In other word, in a world that lack God's direct inspiration, religious toleration is the only way that Christians should walk. In this work Bredenburg also develop a plan to reunify Christianity, a plan that is based on mutual toleration and on the institution of a universal Church shaped after the Collegiant movement. Proving his spirit of reciprocity, equality, and toleration, Bredenburg argues that in this Church each confession could keep celebrating its own peculiar services, but then all Christians should have meet in Rijnsburg from time to time in order to celebrate Communion as a token of Christian universal fraternity.⁵⁹⁵

Van Geel considered toleration as the best means to reunifying Christian churches too. After he has denied the presence of true divine ambassadors on earth and he has affirmed that in this situation each believer should rely on his own reason, Van Geel asserts that no Christian must yield to the opinion of others, nor he must force his own on his brethren. Van Geel criticizes the existing churches because they are based on human and not Divine ideas. However, he believes that all churches still keep the fundamental core of the original Church of God, that is, the faith in Christ as savior of mankind. So, he believes that it is possible to reunite all Christianity in a single, universal, and spiritual Church of Christ, if one accepts this doctrine as the fundamental core of Christian religion and if all theological disputes among Christians are removed. The first step to do so, is to adopt love and mutual toleration as key principles.⁵⁹⁶

Laurens Klinkhamer, a physicist and one of the pillars of the Leiden College, was one of the most significant spokesman in favor of the *libertas prophetandi* and religious toleration, in particular by rejecting all theological doctrines that do not originate from the Holy Scriptures. During the dispute in the Rotterdam College caused by some of Bredenburg's ideas, Klinkhamer tried to play the role of mediator between the opposing parties. To this end, he composed the «Losse en quaade gronden, van de scheur-kerk»⁵⁹⁷, where

⁵⁹⁵Ibid., pp. 124-125.

⁵⁹⁶Ibid., pp. 127-128.

⁵⁹⁷Laurens Klinkhamer, *Losse en quaade gronden, van de scheur-kerk, eeniger soo genaamde collegianten, tot Rhijnsburg, gelegd A° 1686. Naaktelijk ontdekt, en verbroken. Behelsende een antwoord op zekeren brief, eeniger rotterdamse collegianten, aan de collegianten tot Leyden*, Amsterdam, 1686.

he gave voice to his ideas concerning religious toleration. Furthermore, in 1655 he had already advocated freedom of speech, in a work entitled «Vryheydt van spreekken».⁵⁹⁸

In this work Klinkhamer states that the *libertas prophetandi* is based on a gift of God, reason, which is not one of the extraordinary gifts described in the New Testament, but an ordinary one that God has given to all men.⁵⁹⁹ Klinkhamer examines the biblical passages 1 Corinthians 14 and states that in apostolic times people who were provided by God with the ability to interpret his will were the one exercising the *libertas prophetandi*. Nonetheless, Paul the Apostle had not bound this practice only to the presence of special gifts from the Holy Spirit, but rather he had encouraged his followers to examine the words of a prophet, in order to understand if he had been truly inspired by the Holy Spirit. Klinkhamer believes that, in the modern time deprived of the blessings of the Holy spirit, people had still available two gifts from God: Holy Scriptures and human reason, useful to understand the first. Since God gave reason all people, anyone should be free to express his own opinions. Moreover, through the *libertas prophetandi* each man could not only make easier mutual edification, and avoid fights and schism within Christian religion, but also increase toleration among Christians, so that Christianity could finally be reunited into an universal Church of Christ.⁶⁰⁰

Galenus' ideas concerning the significance of the Holy Scriptures, freedom of speech, and religious toleration, are surely close to Boreel's thought. For instance, in the «Aenspraeck aen den leser», which is enclosed in the «Nader verklaringe» of 1659, Galenus expresses ideas similar to classical Collegiant thinking. First, he argues that the doctrines necessary to attain salvation are clearly expressed in the Bible, and that the lives of Christ and of his apostles are sufficient to understand Christ's doctrine: the explanations of the ministers are merely human and useless.⁶⁰¹ Furthermore,

⁵⁹⁸Laurens Klinkhamer, *Vryheydt van spreekken inde gemeynte der geloovigen. Beweesen met geboden, exempelen, redenen, weeregging van tegenwerpen*, Leiden, 1655.

⁵⁹⁹ Fix point out that according to Klinkhamer reason has not the secular features expressed by followings authors, but it is still bound to a religious concept of reason as gift of God. Please see Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), p. 178.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 178-180.

⁶⁰¹ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 64.

after he has denied that the modern ministers are endowed with divine authority, Galenus argued that they have no exclusive right to speak in religious congregations, nor to exclude from the ceremony of the «avondmaal» other Christians belonging to different confessions.⁶⁰²

Galenus distinguishes God's divine gifts of the apostolic time in two categories: there are the «heiligmaking» gifts, that is, those which are aimed to salvation, and the «heerlijkmaking», that is, extraordinary gifts or *charismata* useful to understand and to convey divine truths. Galenus believes that in modern times God ceased to bestow the «heerlijkmaking» gifts to both Church's ministers and common people, so that no one is capable to infallibly proclaim God's Word. This is the reason why each Christian has equal right to express his opinion on divine matters.⁶⁰³ From his assertions concerning freedom of speech, it is clear that Galenus highly values religious toleration too. For instance, in some works he identifies toleration with charity itself and defines it as the ability to forgive the weaknesses of his brethren concerning the knowledge and the practice of religious life, by avoiding to rashly criticize them.⁶⁰⁴

This kind of ideas could lead to consider Galenus as a member of the Collegiant movement or at least a sympathizer of their ideas, and to consider him close to Boreel and his doctrine. However, by taking into account other aspects of his thought and some historical events that occurred during his life, it can be concluded that Galenus could hardly be considered as a spokesperson of a precise movement or school of thought: his ideas seem to relate at the same time to Boreel, to Collegiants ideas, to internal debates within the *doopsgezinde* community, to other religious movement, and to the same historical event that had characterized his congregation in the second half of 17th century.

⁶⁰² Ibid., p. 65.

⁶⁰³ Fix, *Prophecy and Reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 170-173. Fix suggests that Galenus' ideas allowed the transition between the *libertas prophetandi* still bound to divine inspiration of the first Collegiants, to a secularized freedom of speech based on human reason, which was advocated by Collegiants of the second half of 17th century. See: Ibid., pp. 162-174.

⁶⁰⁴ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 142.

First, Galenus refers to the separation between the visible and invisible community of Christ, a difference that for example is not possible to find in Boreel's work. Galenus asserts that the true followers of Christ are hidden within every Christian sect, and can be recognized for their aversion to controversy and sectarianism. In front of the decay of earthly Christian churches, these members of the real congregation of Christ could approach to a certain extent the ideal Christian congregation of the apostolic times, if their ministers regained the gift of the Holy Spirit. However, this could be possible, «wanneer zij hun ambt weer gaan beschouwen als gegrond op de voor alle gemeenteleden gelijkelijk geldende plicht tot naastenliefde, waaruit de prediking en toediening der ceremoniën immers is voortgevloeid». ⁶⁰⁵ From here Meihuizen deduces that Abrahamsz was not a spokesman of absolute freedom of speech, as it was advocated and practiced in the Collegiants' meetings. Although he shared the duty and right of each Christian to urge the edification of his brothers, Galenus however seems to confine the practice of the *libertas prophetandi* in small private meetings. ⁶⁰⁶

Meihuizen suggests that, even though he expresses with his words ideas coming from different religious groups, Galenus never completely felt part of these sect, in spite of the claims of his opponents, and that he was always faithful in his heart to the *doopsgezinde* community. In fact, he retained the core belief of Anabaptists fathers and the faith in their «bijzondere Gemeente». Thus, it is likely that Galenus regarded the Collegiants' freedom of speech and the toleration for different opinions as the best means to reunite the different *doopsgezinde* communities, divided since the 16th century. Boreel believed that through freedom of speech and religious tolerations it could be possible to unity all Christians. ⁶⁰⁷ However, this was not Galenus' aim. Two historical events must be taken into account in order to support this assertion.

First, in Boreel's biography it has been shown that, after the separation within the *doopsgezinde* community of Amsterdam between «lammisten» and «zonnisten», Galenus refused to turn his community into a

⁶⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 67. See also: *ibid.*, p. 66.

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid. As we will see later in this chapter, this is also Boreel's opinion.

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 81-82.

Collegiant Church. From Boreel's point of view, this could have been the first step to restore an universal Christianity. By refusing to make such step, Galenus disappointed the hopes of the Collegiants of Amsterdam and he angered Boreel, who defined him a «sectemaker».⁶⁰⁸ Second, around 1666 the *doopsgezinde* community of the «waterlanders» had decided that no «ongedoopt» would have been accepted at the «Avondmaal» ceremony, and that only instructed members of the community could have preached in the religious services. Although in his previous works Galenus had rejected this two ideas, and even though afterwards the exclusion from the «Avondmaal» of non-*doopsgezinde* members was later crossed out, Galenus initially accepted these position of the *Waterlanders* and thus he started the negotiations that lead to the union of the two communities in 1668.⁶⁰⁹ Moreover, Meihuizen states that in the same period the Collegiant group of Amsterdam waived at the hope of shaping one of the existing churches in the Church of connivance, and that in his community Galenus strived to reduce any opportunity of «vrijspreken» to small meetings of few people organized for this purpose.⁶¹⁰

Furthermore, it is possible to notice a clear difference between Galenus' and Boreel's thoughts in their approach to the Bible. Gary Waite argues that Galenus' approach to the Scriptures combined both the spiritualistic belief of an «inner Word», which is able to enlighten the reader, a depreciation of Bible's authority, and a Socinian-like rationalism that considered the Scriptures as a mere historical document.⁶¹¹ Waite suggests that Galenus has been most likely influenced by disputes occurred within the *doopsgezinde* congregations, not by philosophical thoughts as Cartesianism. In particular, Waite reconstructs the *doopsgezinde* dispute concerning the so-called «Two-Word approach», showing the similarity between Galenus' ideas and the Two-Word approach of Hans de Ries and of his followers.

At the beginning of the 17th century the most conservative members of the Mennonite community defended a hermeneutical approach to the

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid., pp. 99-100.

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 109-110.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid., p. 110.

⁶¹¹ Gary K. Waite, *The Drama of the Two Word Debate among Liberal Dutch Mennonites* (see above, n. 267).

Scriptures, in which they emphasized Bible's authority and its clarity. In particular, one of the main points shared by these people was the idea suggesting that the Bible is sufficient to attain salvation. However, not everyone agreed on this approach. Some members of the Waterlander community, such as Hans de Ries and Pieter Pietersz, were in favor of a more spiritualistic approach instead. They emphasized the importance of the «inner Word» or «inner light», that is, the action of the Holy Spirit on the believer, which they believed necessary for a proper interpretation of the Scriptures. The conflict between the two factions began when Hans De Ries accused one of his brothers, Nittert Obbesz, of holding rationalistic thoughts of Socinian nature. In turn, the latter replied charging De Ries of spiritualistic fanaticism, and he asserted that his emphasis on the «inner Word» diminished the Holy Scriptures. Shortly after, Jan Theunisz joined the controversy. He defended Obbesz's ideas and asserted that the De Ries' approach to the Bible would have lead again to a fanaticism similar to the Münsterites' belief. Furthermore, Theunisz accused De Ries of diminishing the Scriptures and of Socinianism, at the same time.

The dispute became public when non-Mennonite people joined it. For instance, remonstrant minister Simon Episcopius and the dramatist Joost van den Vondel, who defended the Holy Scripture as the keystone against any fanatical drifts, which could have followed from De Ries' approach. On the other hand, the poet Robbert Robbertsz le Canu wrote a satirical play against both factions. Eventually, the discussion sorted out in favor of De Ries and of his supporters. Obbesz apologized and accepted the exegetical method of the «two-Word», while Theunisz was «shunned» until he apologized as well in 1634.⁶¹²

In his account, Waite clearly shows that both parties, those who were advocates of Bible's authority and clarity, and those who were advocating the «two-Word» approach, combined in their works both spiritual and rational elements. So, «this dispute reveals that spiritualistic and rationalistic hermeneutics were not intrinsically at odds; the argument was merely over

⁶¹² For more information about this dispute, see: Waite, *The Drama of the Two Word Debate* (see above, n. 267).

degree», Waite says.⁶¹³ This is the reason why we should not be surprised that in Galenus' hermeneutical approach to the Holy Scriptures it is possible to find both spiritualistic and rationalistic conceptions.

Here the differences between Galenus' and Boreel's thoughts must be pointed out. As a matter of fact, Galenus shared the tradition defended by De Ries. In his works, he affirms that it is possible to achieve the true understanding of the Scriptures only through the action of the Holy Spirit, whereby it is also possible to practice a moral Christian life. On the contrary, Boreel advocated ideas similar to Obbesz, Theunisz and Episcopius. In his works, he argues both for the absolute authority of the Scriptures, and for its clarity and sufficiency concerning the doctrines that are necessary to attain salvation. However, compared to those people, Boreel evidently takes a step forward, since he uses his assertions about the Scriptures to attack ecclesiastic authority and to theorize the main role of the Scriptures in his Church of Connivance.

As for the authors from the 16th and 17th centuries who developed ideas concerning the Holy Scriptures, freedom of speech and religious toleration, we must underline that these ideas were not exclusively advocated by Collegiant people or by scholars related to this movement. For instance, in the second half of the 16th century, during the gradual rising of the Reformed Church, the preacher of Utrecht Huibert Duifhuis became a spokesman in favor of free interpretation of the Scriptures and of mutual toleration. He was described by his biographer as a man that hated no one for their opinion, a man who not only «voor zich zelve vrijheid begeerde van de leer der kerk af te wijken», but also «aan anderen ruimte van onderzoek overliet». Furthermore, he refused to impose any catechism or written confession to others and thus he did not inquire the opinions of those who were gathered for the «avondmaal», stating «dat zij zich zelve ernstig moesten beproeven voordat zij deel namen aan deze plechtigheid».⁶¹⁴

Between the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, an English group of Brownists had formed in the Dutch Republic. In their

⁶¹³ Ibid.

⁶¹⁴ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 372-373.

Confession of Faith, which they wrote in 1598 to defend their separation from the English Church, they defend the necessity of establishing a new community, where each member should have had the right to «profeteeren», that is, to proclaim God's Word, and to choose suitable people for carrying out the offices within the community. So, after the sermons, in their religious assemblies anyone could freely express his own opinion about what he had heard. Furthermore, they denied the *successio apostolica* of modern churches, advocating the idea about the decay of the visible Church of God. Brownists of Leiden and collegiant of Rijnsburg were close not only because of the similar ideas they expressed, but also because of vicinity of the two Dutch cities, even if there are no evidence of direct contacts among them.⁶¹⁵

Even the Calvinist theologian Gisbertus Voetius (or Gijsbert Voet) made some assertion in favor of freedom of speech in religious matters, to a certain extent. Voetius promoted the institution of secular assemblies in order to interpret and apply the Scriptures to practical situations, using as an example the Dutch colleges of 16th century, where the *libertas prophetandi* was allowed to their members. He proclaimed the right of each believer to interpret the Scriptures, a practice he defined as «to prophesy», which was able to increase the spiritual knowledge of the believers, to avoid deviations from the orthodoxy, and to foster faith, hope and charity. However, Voetius did not advocate absolute freedom of speech. He believed that these secular assemblies should have been attended by ministers of the Reformed Church, and discussion should not have regarded matters capable of damaging the unity of the Church.⁶¹⁶

In the same period, questions about religious tolerance started to be raised in England too. For instance, it is possible to consider some of the scholars of the so-called «Tew circle». In the 1630s Lucius Cary, known as Lord Falkland, gathered in Great Tew, near Oxford, a circle of learned people who shared ecumenical ideas. There were among them William

⁶¹⁵Ibid., pp. 374-376.

⁶¹⁶Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 166-167.

Chillingworth, who composed in Great Tew «The religion of protestants»,⁶¹⁷ and John Hales, who had participated to the synod of Dordrecht and for this reason had abandoned Calvinist faith. The members of the «Tew circle» developed ideas concerning the necessity of free speech and toleration in religious matters, particularly through the works of Erasmus. In his works, Lord Falkland questioned the doctrine suggesting that the belief in the infallibility of the Church is necessary to attain salvation, and he condemned the punishment of alleged heretics, since this habit was not practiced in apostolic times. Chillingworth rejected the idea of death penalty itself, and emphasize the fact that Church's dogmas are not eternal. To assert that a dogma is true just because it was considered so by influential people in the past is erroneous. Furthermore, Chillingworth clearly asserted that no dogma could question the freedom of speech of people. In «A tract concerning schisme and schismatiques»,⁶¹⁸ Hales directly linked together ambition, superstition, and dogma, while he indicated freedom of speech as necessary in religious matters, because it would have led to religious toleration and to harmony among Christians.⁶¹⁹

Moreover, Jeremy Taylor wrote one of the most important English apologies of free speech and religious toleration in the first half of the 17th century. In 1647 he published the «Discourse of the liberty of prophesying».⁶²⁰ Taylor wrote this work to overcome struggles and diatribes that had characterized Christianity for many years, and even more to end persecutions and afflictions of all people who advocated opinions not shared by the official Church or by the State. In addition, he tied the political and

⁶¹⁷William Chillingworth, *The religion of protestants a safe way to salvation. Or An answer to a booke entitled Mercy and truth, or charitie maintain'd by Catholiques: which pretends to prove the contrary*, London, 1638.

⁶¹⁸[John Hales], *A Tract Concerning Schisme and Schismatiques, wherein is briefly discovered the original causes of all schism. Written by a learned and iudicious divine*, London, 1642.

⁶¹⁹For more information about the «Tew Circle», see: Peter G. Bietenholz, *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus. Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe*, Toronto, 2009, pp. 171-173.

⁶²⁰Jeremy Taylor, *Theologia eklektikē: a discourse of the liberty of prophesying. Shewing the unreasonableness of prescribing to other mens faith, and the iniquity of persecuting differing opinions*, London, 1647. For the passages here quoted I used an edition of 1834. See: Jeremy Taylor, *A discourse of the liberty of prophesying: showing the unreasonableness of prescribing the other men's faith; and the iniquity of persecuting differing opinions. With an introductory essay by the Rev. Richard Cattermole*, Washington, 1834.

social situation in England with the contemporary religious disputes. «The infinite variety of opinions in matters of religion», Taylor writes in the introduction of his work, «as they have troubled Christendom with interests, factions, and partialities, so have they caused great divisions of heart, and variety of thoughts and designs amongst pious and prudent men». However, Taylor continues, as a «mistaken physician, who gives excellent physic but misapplies it, and so misses his cure», men who tried to settle this situation failed, «for they put their help to a wrong part, or they have endeavored to cure the symptoms, and have let the disease alone till it seemed incurable».⁶²¹

From Taylor's point of view, the main problem of Christianity is that people disputed and struggled on articles of faith and on doctrines that were not necessary to attain salvation, while they neglected the real precepts of Christianity and religious life. People, he writes, «are now-a-days, and indeed always have been, since the expiration of the first blessed ages of Christianity, so in love with their own fancies and opinions, as to think faith and all Christendom is concerned in their support and maintenance». These human opinions and dogmas are judged as «theological matter» and they are the basis of persecutions and even of death penalty in the name of God. However, Taylor says, «if we should examine the matter rightly, the question is either in *materia non revelata*, or *minus evidenti*, or *non necessaria*».⁶²² In order to find a solution to this situation, in his work Taylor analyzes those doctrines unnecessary to salvation which usually raise struggles among Christian. He shows that these doctrines are uncertainty, by comparing them with the essential articles of faith which all Christian agree on. Furthermore, he shows that people are not able to draw absolute conclusions about these unnecessary doctrines. To this end, he examines the difficulties inherent the Scriptures concerning speculative doctrines, the uncertainty of traditions, the fallibility of ecclesiastical councils and Church Fathers, etc.⁶²³

From this analysis, Taylor deduces the solution to religious disputes. Since the truth about minor dogmas is uncertain and since it has little importance for a Christian life, everyone must look for peace and charity,

⁶²¹ Ibid., p. 39.

⁶²² Ibid., p. 40.

⁶²³ Ibid., p. 24.

which are the highest purposes of each Christian, instead of searching for truth in doctrines unnecessary to salvation. To achieve peace and charity, it is necessary to tolerate different opinions and to claim toleration for their own. This toleration must be founded on what all Christian share: the confession of the apostolic creed.⁶²⁴ In short, Taylor suggests a practice of toleration where the different Christian sects must be able to agree on the same fundamentals of their religion, even though they are aware of the insurmountable speculative differences dividing them. In this way they can practice mutual friendship.⁶²⁵ As a matter of fact, Taylor writes, «it is not differing opinions that is the cause of the present ruptures, but want of charity; it is not the variety of understanding, but the disunion of wills and affections; it is not the several principles, but the several ends that cause our miseries: our opinions commence and are upheld according as our turns are served and our interests are preserved, and there is no cure for us but piety and charity».⁶²⁶

As for 16th century thought, we must take into account the three champions of free speech and religious tolerance: Sebastian Castellio, Iacopo Aconcio e Dirck Coornhert.

A first core of Castellio's thought concerning religious toleration can be found in the preface of his Latin translation of the Scriptures, published in 1551.⁶²⁷ Dated February, this preface contains many ideas that Castellio later resumed in his work against the persecution of heresies. He put forward two main theses in his preface: Christians must follow God's command suggesting that they cannot judge each other; the civil power cannot be involved in religious matter. At the beginning of the preface, Castellio explains the importance of Bible's translations during the Reformation. However, he complains that all these translations are not enough to change

⁶²⁴ Ibid., pp. 17-18.

⁶²⁵ Ibid., pp. 28-29.

⁶²⁶ Ibid., p. 43.

⁶²⁷ This Latin version of the Scriptures knew different editions edited by Castellio himself, and was reprinted many times until the XVIII century. In the monograph dedicated to the French thinker, Hans Guggisberg reproduced the frontispiece of his last edition. See: Hans R. Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio, 1515-1653. Humanist and Defender of Religious Toleration in a Confessional Age. Translated and edited by Bruce Gordon*, Aldershot, 1988, pp. 49 and 68.

the world. In fact, even though these translations were well-made by their authors, great ignorance still lingers over religious matters, a fact which is testified by the continuous struggles among Christians about the proper interpretation of the Scriptures. In this situation, believers do not rely on true kindness and charity, as the Scriptures teach, but they fight each other, clearly ignoring the divine command of not judging one's own brethren, which is found in Matthew 7: 1. Furthermore, the meddling between civil power and religious authorities worsens this situation. On the contrary, civil authorities must exclusively judge and discipline those who break State's laws, leaving to God the power to judge in mere spiritual matters. So, from Castellio's point of view, it is evident that in modern times civil authorities claim a right they do not have.⁶²⁸

In his preface Castellio does not analyze the question about the heretics and how they should be treated by civil power, even if he divides Christians in persecutors and persecuted.⁶²⁹ Heresies and heretics are the main topics of «*De haereticis, an sint persequendi*», written in 1554.⁶³⁰ This work is a collection of ancient and modern writings by Christian authors, where Castellio even quoted works by Luther and Calvin. Furthermore, it is clear that some writings belong to Castellio himself, who hides behind pseudonyms. Here we cannot discuss what pseudonyms Castellio used.⁶³¹ However, it cannot be denied that one of the most important writings in «*De haereticis, an sint persequendi*» is the preface written by Martin Bellius, where it is possible to find many ideas expressed by Castellio in his preface of the Latin edition of the Scriptures.⁶³²

In the preface Bellius complains about the modern state of Christianity, which is divided by struggles and disputes not only among scholars, but also among common people, who had lost completely kindness

⁶²⁸ Ibid., pp. 53-56.

⁶²⁹ Ibid., p. 56.

⁶³⁰ [Sebastian Castellio], *De haereticis, an sint persequendi, et omnino quomodo sit cum eis agendum, Luteri et Brentii aliorumque multorum tum veterum tum recentiorum sententiae. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore pernecessarius et cum omnibus, tum potissimum principibus et magistratibus utilissimus, ad discendum, quodnam sit eorum in re tam controversa tamque periculosa, officium*, [Basilea, 1554].

⁶³¹ For more information, see: Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, n. 627), pp. 93-94.

⁶³² [Castellio], *De haereticis an sint persequendi* (see above, n. 630), pp. 3-28.

and love for each other. These disputes concern all possible dogmas, even the doctrines that are not necessary to attain salvation. To worsen this situation, Christians shed blood of their own brethren, since they kill without remorse those who are found guilty of heresy. Bellius clearly states that he has no intention to defend heretics.⁶³³ However, he is compelled to condemn their killing for two reasons: first, the possibility to accuse someone of heresy by mistake, as happened to Christ; second, to kill a heretic is a severe act, more than required by the «christiana disciplina».⁶³⁴

Bellius believes that controversies among Christians are firstly caused by their inability to recognize religious truths, because of the ambiguity of certain passages of the Scriptures. After he recognize that all Christians agree on the existence of God and on the divinity of Christ, he affirms that there is no such agreement about doctrines as «de baptismo, de coena Domini, de invocatione sanctorum, de iustificatione, de libero arbitrio», or about others «obscuris quaestionibus» that cause disputes «ex ignorantia veritatis».⁶³⁵ To end this situation, Bellius pleads people to focus on the common doctrines of Christianity and to follow the teaching of Paul in Romans 14: 3-4, that is, to not judge others, because only God can pass judgments on people concerning spiritual matters. In short, he urges to follow the example of Christ and of his apostles, who lived through gentleness, love, and charity. All Christians must imitate Christ's life and practice mutual toleration. In this way, «possemus inter nos tranquillè vivere, dum in aliis rebus discordes, saltem in amore mutuo (quod pacis vinculum est) consentiremus, donec veniremus ad veritatem fidei».⁶³⁶

⁶³³ «Haec iudicandi licentia, quae hodie grassatur, et replet omnia sanguine, impulit me, Princeps illustrissime, ut sanguinem pro virili sistere conarer: praesertim eum, in quo fundendo peccari potest videlicet eorum qui vocantur haeretici. Quod nomen hodie adeò infame, adeò detestabile, adeò atrum factum est, ut is quis inimicum suum velit interfici, nullam expeditiorem viam habeat, quàm ut eum haereseos accuset. Simulac enim nomen hoc audiverunt homines, hominem adeò hoc solo nomine detestantur, ut obtusis ad eius defensionem auribus, non solum ipsum, sed etiam omnes qui pro eo hischere audeat, furiosè et effrenatè persequantur. Qua rabie fit, ut multi è medio tollantur, ante quàm eorum causa sit verè cognita. Neque verò haec ideo dico, quòd haereticis faveam. Odi ego haereticos». Ibid., p. 12.

⁶³⁴ Ibid., p. 13. See also: Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, n. 627), pp. 85-86.

⁶³⁵ [Castellio], *De haereticis an sint persequendi* (see above, n. 630), pp. 24-25.

⁶³⁶ Ibid., 25-26. See also: Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, n. 627), pp. 87-88.

Iacopo Aconcio too, by sharing many of the ideas expressed by Castellio, was one of the most important advocates of religious toleration. His major ideas can be found in the «*Satanae Stratagemata*».⁶³⁷ However, compared to Castellio, it is evident that Aconcio gave more importance to the topic of free speech in religious matters. In fact, he argues that only by freely expressing one's own opinions it would be possible to eliminate the *satanae stratagemata*, that is, the numerous and useless theological conflicts within Christian religion.⁶³⁸ Aconcio agrees with the principle of *sola Scriptura*, pointing out the uselessness of human explanations. As a matter of fact, Church's ministers do not have the exclusive access to the truth, and they poorly conduct religious matters because of the authority bestowed to them by civil power. This is the reason why forged doctrines could stick into Christianity. Consequently, Aconcio argues that every believer must diligently read the Scriptures and be aware of possible corruptions from people. If an error is found, it should be exposed, as stated in 1Corinthians 14. Freedom of speech is a divine tenet taught by God and thus Church's ministers have no authority above other members of a religious congregation. They are equal to the common people instead. Moreover, Aconcio stresses that freedom of speech also existed in the ancient Jewish synagogues and in the first Christian churches, at least until the era of Constantine the Great. On the other hand, he warns that freedom of speech must not lead a congregation into chaos: he who wants to express his own opinion must act carefully, and should not keep defending his ideas or create problems, if they are rejected by the Church.⁶³⁹

Centrality of the Scriptures, defense of free speech and emphasis on religious tolerations are three main themes in Dirck Cornheert's thought, which can be traced in many of his works. For instance, in the «*Vre-Reden of onderwijs tot eendracht, vrede ende liefde*», he stresses the importance that charity, tolerance, and patience, should have in Christ's Church, basing his

⁶³⁷ Iacopo Aconcio, *Satanae Stratagemata Libri Octo. Accessit eruditissima epistola de ratione edendorum librorum, ad Iohannem Vuolsium Tigurinum eodem eutore*, Basilea, 1565.

⁶³⁸ Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, 627), pp. 234-235.

⁶³⁹ Voogt, *Anyone who can read may be a preacher* (see above, n. 503), pp. 416-418.

assertions on many biblical passages. In this work Coornhert asserts that the true Christian spirit of brotherhood is much more important than theological discussions, warning the reader about the bad example that these disputes and the persecution of heretics give to non-Christians, turning them away from Christian religion instead of attracting them.⁶⁴⁰ Furthermore, the central role that free speech and religious toleration played in Coornhert's thought can be easily deduced by his statements about the relationship between Church and civil power.⁶⁴¹

The «Synod on the freedom of conscience», published in 1582, is probably the most important work Coornhert dedicated to freedom of speech and religious toleration.⁶⁴² It is divided in two books of nine sessions each, which describe a synod that takes place in the imaginary city of «vrijburgh» among men of different cultural backgrounds. Coornhert in the dialogues takes the name of Gamaliel, the Pharisee of the Scriptures who was against taking action against Christians. Voogt shows that by choosing this alias Coornhert suggests two of the main arguments in favor of free speech: the truth of God triumphs without human help, and men cannot judge heresies.⁶⁴³ Coornhert elaborated all the sessions of the synod in the same way: first, the Catholic characters defend intolerant ideas concerning the matter of each session; second, the Reformed criticize the Catholics, who in turn criticize the Reformed, accusing them of hypocrisy, because they are subject to their same accusations; eventually, the session concludes with the summary of the dispute and a tolerant alternative always proposed by Gamaliel.⁶⁴⁴

As for the topic of religious toleration, the first 9 session of the first book are the most important. In the first session Coornhert denies the dogma of the infallibility of the Church, while in the following six he refutes all the argumentation that are not related to the Scriptures, which Catholics and Reformed usually used. Furthermore, when the Reformed attack the Catholics, Coornhert always use the persecution practiced by Protestant

⁶⁴⁰Voogt, *Constraint in trial* (see above, n. 540), p. 81.

⁶⁴¹ For more information about this topic, see chapter V.

⁶⁴² Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert, *Synod on the freedom of conscience*, translated, edited, annotated by Gerrit Voogt, Amsterdam, 2008.

⁶⁴³Voogt, *Constraint in trial* (see above, n. 540), p. 96.

⁶⁴⁴Voogt, *Synod on the freedom of conscience* (see above, n. 642), p. 12.

churches. The last two sessions concern the right to judge others and here the Christian “golden rule” plays a central role. From these two sessions it is possible to conclude that no one is able to determine the truth between two opposing doctrines. So, at the end, Galamiel declares the impossibility of a fair trial. To him judges are necessary figures, so he concludes asking: «What other conclusion may be drawn [...] than that, just as Israel used to be without a king, the Christians now lack a judge, and that all do as they see fit?». ⁶⁴⁵

As for the topic of freedom of speech, Voogt has found eighteen argumentations on behalf of free conscience in a letter that Coornhert sent to his friend Hendrik Laurensz Spiegel. Among these, here can be mentioned the following: by nature, anyone is free to speak and to teach what he wants; anyone has the undeniable right to assert what he believes is the truth; theologians trained in the interpretation of the Scriptures are the most biased people in religious matters; any man has the moral obligation to reject fake doctrines through truth; freedom of speech and of teaching cannot damage anyone, but is useful for all Christians. ⁶⁴⁶ For Coornhert, constraint of consciences and of free speech are contrary to reason, to nature, and to the Scriptures, ⁶⁴⁷ causing controversy between men and divisions within Christianity. ⁶⁴⁸

In the writings of Coornhert, freedom of conscience is strictly connected to his reflections about the Holy Scripture. By advocating the principle of *sola Scriptura*, he asserts that the Bible is the keystone to determine the truth of a doctrine and the best means to overcome Christian divisions and to reunite the Christian religion. ⁶⁴⁹ Furthermore, in the New Testament it is possible to find all that is necessary to attain salvation ⁶⁵⁰. To this end, in the «Middel tot minderinghe der secten» Coornhert suggests a temporary solution, which is based on the importance of the Scriptures recognized by all Christians, as they are source of knowledge, while human explanations are «cisterns, not exempt from impure slime and dirt seeping

⁶⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 16. See also: *ibid.*, pp. 13-15.

⁶⁴⁶ Voogt, *Constraint in trial* (see above, n. 540), pp. 157.158.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 103.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 165-169.

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 105.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., pp. 105-106.

from the corrupt understanding of man». According to this solution, all ministers can only preach passages from the Scriptures, without human interpretations.⁶⁵¹

It is possible to find similar assertions in other works of Coornhert too. In the «Ooghwater» he says that the Bible is sufficient for salvation of people, and that all human explanations and writings must be doubted, until it is not proven that their authors have divine authority. To his adversaries, worried that free interpretation of Scriptures would have led to the birth of many different sect, Coornhert answered that divisions within Christianity rises from the exclusive right of ministers to interpret God's Word. Again, he regarded the Scriptures as the means to overcome these divisions, thanks to its message of mutual toleration, since in the Bible there is no reference to persecution of different opinions.⁶⁵²

At last, after he condemns as intolerant any sect proclaiming itself true Church of God, in some of his works Coornhert advocates the creation of a totally free and impartial Church, even if it would be devoid of divine authority. He suggests that this Church should be based on the Holy Scriptures and on the apostolic creed, that it should not have any official ministers, and that its members should not discuss and speculate about theoretical truth unnecessary to salvation. In short, as Voogt noticed, it seems that here Coornhert conceived what some decades later became the Collegiant movement of Rijnsburg.⁶⁵³

⁶⁵¹ Ibid., pp. 106-107.

⁶⁵² Ibid., pp. 108-109.

⁶⁵³ Ibid., pp. 82-84; Voogt, *Anyone who can preach* (see above, n. 503), pp. 421-

Boreel and the Holy Scriptures as the cornerstone of public religion

After discussing the ideas concerning Holy Scriptures, freedom of speech, and religious toleration, it is now possible to consider Boreel's thought. From the account of Boreel's critical argumentation against ecclesiastical authority, we have already understood that the Bible played a major role both in making those accusations and developing Boreel's idea concerning the Church of Connivance. For instance, he can assert that modern ministers have no right to use their forged sermons to make people believe that they could attain salvation through them, only because he had previously affirmed that each Christian can find all that is necessary to attain salvation in the Holy Scriptures.⁶⁵⁴ Likewise, Boreel can assert that all human catechesis and confessions must be eliminated, only because he had previously affirmed that these catechesis and confessions must be substituted with the Bible.⁶⁵⁵ As a matter of fact, the Holy Scripture are sufficient to administer both public and private religion.⁶⁵⁶

From these first assertions, it is already possible to deduce the central role that the New Testament's books would have to play in Boreel's Church

⁶⁵⁴ «Tum quaerendum est; Utrùm igitur auditus ille scripti illius verbi Dei, publicè tanquam verum ac genuinum medium fidei salvificae publicum (publico videlicet cultu, Dei ut dictum est nomine, per auditum illum exhibitum) adhiberi debeat, nec ne?». ALAT, p. 37. After giving a positive answer, Boreel asks: «Utrùm alius praeterea publicus auditus, tanquam verum ac genuinum publicum medium, ad fidem salvificam homini nomine Dei id est loco et autoritate Dei seu pro Deo legatione fungendo per id conciliandam, adhiberi etiamnum juxta Dei in S. scriptura institutionem mandatum vel beneplacitam permissione divinam possit, nec ne?». ALAT, p. 37. Of course, he gives a negative answer to this last question.

⁶⁵⁵ «Responsum fuerit, cum Dei institutione mandato vel beneplacita permissione convenire ut loco catechesium et confessionum illarum non-ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merequè verarum et non-authenticarum, substituantur in Ecclesia, nomine ut dictum est Dei, ipsissimum scriptum Dei verbum, tanquam authentica ac ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merequè vera Christianorum praedictum in finem catechesis et confessio». ALAT, p. 51.

⁶⁵⁶ «Ac proinde [...] quaerendum est; Utrùm igitur loco verbi illius concionatorii non-ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèque veri [...] utrùm inquam conveniat cum Dei mandato vel beneplacita permissione, substitui loco ejus omnibus illis utile illud (ut vidimus) verbum Dei scriptum ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèque verum, in publico nimirum cultu qui Dei ut dictum est nomine fieri debet». ALAT, p. 46. In the following pages Boreel continues his series of questions by asking: «Utrùm solum illud ipsum verbum Dei scriptum [...] omnium statuum Christianis esse possit Dei nomine id est Dei loco et autoritate seu pro eo legatione fungendo, et debeat, pro sufficiente catechismo et confessione; quibus videlicet tanquam fidei analogia mediantibus, et privatus et publicum eorum cultus limitari ac dirigi Dei ut dictum est nomine debet ac potest?». Likewise: «Utrum ipsae SS. literis sint sufficientes ad omnem cultum ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèque verum, mediantibus iis solis prout sunt et jacent, tanquam ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèque vero medio quod Dei nomine, id est pro Deo legatione fungens, adhibeatur, peragendum, nec ne?». See: ALAT, pp. 47 and 49.

of Connivance: only the Holy Scripture would be preached in public religion. In other words, since the Bible is sufficient to administer any kind of religious worship and services, the *cultum conniventiae* would rely on it surely, without referring to human additions, commentaries, glosses, explanations, interpretations, etc.

Boreel suggests the way in which the Holy Scriptures should be used in the Church of Connivance. He asserts that public religious services must be led only through the reading of the Bible. Every day passages from the Scriptures must be read to all Christians. These readings would have been particularly useful for those people who do not know how to read or who neglect the reading of the Scriptures because of their daily duties.⁶⁵⁷ Furthermore, Boreel says, only those passages concerning doctrines and questions that are shared by all Christians could be publicly read. As for all other doctrines and questions, people could only discuss them in private meetings.⁶⁵⁸

Since Holy Scriptures are considered central to the Church of Connivance, we must understand why Boreel believed that only the Bible can be preached in public religion. In order to have a clear understanding of these reasons, two conclusions that have been established in the previous chapter must be summarized.

First, Boreel argues that God did neither order nor permit the continuation of pristine Gospel preaching, which in apostolic times had been

⁶⁵⁷ «Ut autem homines ad genuinum Dei verbum reduci ac perduci queant, publica auditoria institui debebunt, in quibus sola S. scriptura, prout est ac jacet, reverente ac distinctè singulis diebus per justum aliquod tempus praelegatur, in usum quidem omnium, praesertim vero eorum, qui vel legere nesciunt, vel distinctè legere nequeunt; negotiisque impliciti, lectionem privatam negligunt ac procrastinant». SG, in OP, p. 103.

⁶⁵⁸ «Ab iis verò qui per auditum et lectionem solius S. scripturae fundamentalem suam fidem jam consequuti fuerint, collationes ad donorum communicationes atque exercitium publicè haberi possent (analogicè ad 1Cor. 14) modò id decenter ac ordine fiat, quod ut hodierno tempore obtineatur in solis fundamentalibus communibus ibi substituendum erit, iis nempè materiis, ac articulis, eorumque deductionibus istis, in quibus omnes, qui solam S. scripturam, prout est ac jacet, pro unico fidei et morum canone recipient, prorsus omininò convenient. De reliquis autem, in quibus non una est omnium mensa c sententia, privatim conferre liceat; nullo tamen publico, qui Religiosi cultus nomine veniat, cum iis exercitio habito, propter schismatis metum, quod hodierno tempore inde facile atque in proclivi est». SG, in OP, pp. 103-104. It is possible to find similar statements in QHC. When he describes the Church of Connivance, Boreel says that public religious services must be only based on «S. Scripturae praelectione pro unico verbi Dei auditu, et communibus fundamentalibus pro mutua exhortatione, regimine, etc., adhibitis». QHC, in OP, p. 108.

carried out through Christ's oral Word, through a kind of *verbum* that did not have the same nature of Christ's Word, that is, God's Word.⁶⁵⁹ Neither would it have been possible to begin new Gospel preaching through the same kind of *verbum*. Secondly and therefore, God's people could be gathered in religious congregations only through a «verbo, quod insitè atque indubiè ejusdem veritatis et naturae est ac verbum illud per quod Deus nomine ut dictum est suo Euangelij praedicationem inchoavit et instituit».⁶⁶⁰

So, Boreel asks himself if in the actual world something still exists that has the same nature of Christ's oral Word. Of course, from Boreel's point of view the Holy Scriptures still has this kind of nature, since in the New Testament it is possible to find the same doctrine that Christ taught during his life.⁶⁶¹ Furthermore, only the Holy Scriptures can be regarded as God's Word, because human preaching and sermons cannot prove to have the same nature of Christ's Word.⁶⁶²

Finally, the Holy Scriptures are a sufficient means «prout est et jacet», that is, without human interpretation, explanation, or commentary, to attain salvation. Boreel wrote many pages about this third characteristic of the Scriptures. As a matter of fact, after he had argued that the New Testament is the true and only Word of God, if he had proven that it is also sufficient to

⁶⁵⁹ Christ's Word is nothing other than the same doctrine he taught during his life, which his Apostles and the Church's first ministers taught after his death, and which now is written in the New Testament. Although Boreel has never openly made this assertion, only by arguing the Christ's Word is Christ's doctrine it is possible to fully understand ALAT. Furthermore, such conclusion can be also drawn from articles X and XI of this work. Finally, Boreel clearly identifies Christ's word with Christ's doctrine in QHC. Here he asserts that among the gifts that God bestowed upon apostolic ministers there was «Verbum seu doctrina, quae reverà in se talis omninò erat, ut neutiquam falleret, seu, cui nullus omninò error vel consciis ipsis, vel insciis, admixtus esset. Hoc est, doctrina ὁλως insitè ndubiè merequè vera». QHC, in OP, p. 107. As for articles X and XI, see: ALAT, pp. 6-16.

⁶⁶⁰ ALAT, p. 32.

⁶⁶¹ «Responsum fuerit, sacrum Veteris et Novi Testamenti contextum, insitè atque indubiè ejusdem esse veritatis et naturae ac verbum illud per quod Deus nomine suo Euangelii praedicationem inchoavit et instituit». ALAT, p. 33. See also: ALAT, p. 32. By identifying the Bible with God's Words, Boreel shows a true Reformation spirit: «i riformatori basavano l'autorità della Scrittura sul suo rapporto con la Parola di Dio. Per alcuni si trattava di un'identità: la Scrittura è la Parola di Dio. Per altri si trattava di un rapporto più complesso: la Scrittura contiene la Parola di Dio. Tutti erano però d'accordo nel dire che la Scrittura va ricevuta come se Dio parlasse in essa». Alistair McGrath, *Il pensiero della riforma*, Claudiana, Turin, 1999, p. 172.

⁶⁶² «Responsum fuerit, nullum verbum etiamnum esse inter homines, praeter verbum veteris et Novi Testamenti scriptum, quod insitè atque indubiè ejusdem sit veritatis et naturae ac verbum illud per quod Deus Euangelii praedicationem, nomine ut dictum est suo, inchoavit et instituit». ALAT, p. 34. See also: ALAT, pp. 33 and 37-38.

attain salvation, he would have given the final blow to the preaching and sermons of the churches' ministers, who would have proven to be useless and without divine authority.

So, in the first place Boreel argues that the *verbum scriptum Dei* is the means through which mankind can attain salvation, as was Christ's oral Word in the apostolic period, and that no one needs human interpretations to attain salvation from it.⁶⁶³ As a matter of fact, Boreel says, the *auditus* of the Holy Scriptures is identical to the preaching of the divine word through which Christians can achieve that kind of faith which allows them to attain salvation. So, it is evident that the Bible is sufficient for this purpose. If it had been inadequate, the preaching of the Holy Scriptures would have needed the assistance of something that has not the same nature as Christ's oral word, since only the Bible has that nature. However, Boreel argues, it is impossible that God had ordered or permitted that His written Word should have been completed by something that is not the absolute truth. So, Boreel concludes that preaching the Holy Scripture is sufficient to attain salvation, «absque ullis ad auditum illum additamentis quibuscunque».⁶⁶⁴

Consequently, every Christian can find all that is necessary to attain salvation in the New Testament. As a matter of fact, Boreel says, it has already been proven that the Scriptures are sufficient for that purpose and no one can persist arguing that they are inadequate to pursue it. In fact, no one can argue that the Holy Scriptures had to be completed either by another divine Word, since in modern times there is not any, or by preaching and sermons that do not have the same nature of God's Word. Furthermore, no one can prove that Christians are not able to attain salvation from the Scriptures because of some kind of obscurity in its passages. Whether this obscurity concerns the whole Bible, or only the doctrines necessary to salvation, or only the doctrines

⁶⁶³ «Tum quaerendum est; Utrùm igitur verbum illud Dei scriptum, prout est et jacet, absque ullis ejus explicationibus sit medium salvificae fidei, nomine Dei id est Dei loco et autoritate seu pro Deo legatione fungendo ingenerandae, sicuti erat verbum illud prout est et jacet absque ullis ejus explicationibus, per quod Deus nomine suo id est Dei loco et autoritate seu pro Deo legatione fungendo ut dictum est, Euangeli praedicationem inchoavit et instituit». ALAT, p. 34.

⁶⁶⁴ «Ac proinde, affirmativa quaestionis articulo L teneri debet, nempe, nudum illum verbi Dei scripti auditum sufficere ad fidem salvificam, homini nomine Dei id est loco et autoritate Dei seu pro Deo legatione fungendo conciliandam, absque ullis ad auditum illum additamentis quibuscunque». ALAT. p. 37. See also: ALAT, pp. 35-36.

unnecessary to salvation, no one can prove that modern ministers or other people had been instructed by God to remove this alleged obscurity. Therefore, God could not have given His written word to mankind without the ability to understand it. In other words, the Scriptures are absolute clear, at least in those passages concerning mankind's salvations. Finally, it is impossible to argue that Christians cannot understand the Bible because of its size or because God had openly forbidden people to only rely on it. So, Boreel concludes, it is evident that every Christian can get all that is necessary to attain salvation through public or private readings of the Holy Scriptures.⁶⁶⁵

These are the reasons why the Bible is one of the cornerstones of Boreel's thought. As a matter of fact, after he had established that the Bible is God's true Word, that it is the only divine Word which Christian can refer to, and that it is sufficient to attain salvation, Boreel was able both to develop his critical argumentations against the modern Churches' ministers, since their preaching and sermons do not have these features, and to establish the central role that the Holy Scripture should have played in his Church of Connivance: the public religion should have been administered «per ipsissimum ὄλωσ insitè indubiè merèque verum verbum Dei scriptum».⁶⁶⁶

⁶⁶⁵ «Quare, ad id quod articulo LXX quaesitum fuit, omnino affirmative respondendum erit; nimirum, puerolos juvenes et patres in Christo, ex solo SS. literarum publico vel privato auditu, qui nomine Dei seu loco et autoritate Dei adhibitus fuerit, lac panem et vinum suum haurire et consequi posse: quum certum sit, S. Scripturae prout est et jacet sufficientia et perspicuitate quoad puerolorum juvenum et patrum in Christo salutem (ut vidimus) asserta, nullum singulis illis statibus impedimentum sed adjumentum potius ab ampla S. scripturae latitudine qua eadem subinde repetuntur et inculcantur (et ad quam pro Deo legatione fungendo contrahendam nemo hodie datus est) causari posse: nullum insuper in S. scriptura vetitum exstet quo praedicti illi suam indè ut dictum est salutem procurare, rebus Christianismi sic stantibus, prohibeantur». ALAT, pp. 45-46. As for Boreel's argumentations, see: ALAT, pp. 39-45. In SG Boreel makes similar assertions. Here he asserts that according to the Scripture the righteous man lives «ex fide sua» and that such faith must rely on God's true Word. Since modern ministers cannot prove that their preaching and sermons have the same nature of God's Word, no one can rely on them. On the contrary, since in modern times only the Holy Scripture has this nature, Boreel concludes: «quod sola sacra veteris et novi Testamenti Scriptura, prout est ac jacet, hodierno tempore sit Dei istud verbum, quo fides ista niti debet ac potest». Moreover, in the conclusion of this work Boreel states again: «esse justus fide sua vivens, quae per charitatem efficax est, is et fidem et charitatem istam superstruat unico isti Dei verbo, quod sacra Scriptura, prout est ac jacet, habetur», mentre in alcuno modo deve fondare tale fede e tale carità sul «hodiernorum cognitorum Ecclesiastarum verbo; utpote, quod nec est insitè, seu natura sua totum, et in singulis, etiam minimis, partibus suis pura ac mera veritas; nec est certissimum; nec est absque ulla mistura ullius inscii erroris qualiscusque; ac consequenter, non est Verbum Dei, quo fides niti debet ac potest». See: SG, in OP, pp. 94-96 e 103.

⁶⁶⁶ ALAT, p. 72. Furthermore, in the previous chapter it has been asserted that from Boreel's point of view Christians must join a religious congregations only when «ipsissimae

Toleration and freedom of speech within the Christian religion

One of the main aspects of Boreel's Church of Connivance is the central role played by the reading of the Holy Scripture. However, this is not the only characteristic of the Church of Connivance that can be deduced from Boreel's words. If the passages concerning this topic are taken into account, two other characteristics become evident, which are strictly connected to each other: in the Church of Connivance, Christians must have freedom of speech and they must practice religious toleration among each other. As a matter of fact, even though Boreel did not want to fully describe the Church of Connivance, since he had not examined the Scriptures in the way he assumed people had to, when he discusses it he always makes references to the necessity of freedom of speech and of religious toleration among Christians.

For instance, article CXXXIV of ALAT can be examined, where Boreel makes his first statements concerning the Church of Connivance.⁶⁶⁷ After he affirms that in the Holy Scriptures there are some passages from which it is possible to argue that churches can be founded on God's toleration and connivance, Boreel offers two main characteristics of these kinds of churches. First, he asserts that none of his members can claim to have divine authority.⁶⁶⁸ Although Boreel does not go any further, it can be concluded that each member of these churches must enjoy freedom of speech. If no one is provided with divine authority, that is, if no one can speak in the name of God, no one can claim to be above his brethren or to have a major role among them. In other words, the churches' ministers cannot claim to be extraordinary

SS. literae prout sunt et jacent, publicè offeruntur pro unica Dei ut dictum est nomine catechesi et confessione; pro unico item medio universi publici cultus, defectivo hoc Ecclesiae statu, per illas, nomine Dei, id est qua medium pro Deo legatione fungendo, Ecclesiastica duntaxat ut dictum est autoritate, jure vocationis communis, et nomine membrorum Ecclesiae respectivorum, in Dei ut dictum est tolerantia et conniventia, administrandi; item pro unico ὁλως insitè indubiè mereque vero medio Ecclesiastici in communibus fundamentalibus regiminis, et mutuae itidem mediante sermone aedificationis publicae quae ipsi S. scripturae subordinata, ac quoad exercitium, proximè ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vera sint; pro debito item medio mutae tolerantiae». ALAT, pp. 70-71. As for the central role of the Scriptures in the Church of Connivance, see also: ALAT, pp. 37, 46-48, 49-51.

⁶⁶⁷ See: ALAT, p. 58.

⁶⁶⁸ «Non quidem Dei nomine id est loco et autoritate Dei seu pro Deo legatione fungendo, id enim ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque veris tantummodò fieri devet, quibus requisitis, ab aevo hodieque destituimur: sed Dei quidem praevia ad id (ut dictum est) tolerantia et conniventia». Ibid.

compared to other Christians. All people live in the same period when God's gifts of apostolic time are lacking and when Christ's oral Word no longer exists. So, all Christians are equal and each one has the same right to speak as all others. This is the reason why it is possible to argue that the lack of divine authority among mankind is the necessary condition to establish freedom of speech: once the former is proven, the latter follows automatically.

In turn, the lack of divine authority and freedom of speech are necessary conditions for religious toleration. As a matter of fact, after he had established that there is no divine authority in the Church of Connivance, but only ecclesiastical authority, Boreel says that for this reason the error must be tolerated.⁶⁶⁹ Here, Boreel's reference to religious toleration seems quite obvious. In a religious congregation where no one has divine authority and where all members have the same freedom to speak, all opinions must be tolerated, even if they are erroneous. It is not clear neither what Boreel meant with the word «error», nor what kind of criterion is necessary to judge opinions or doctrines as erroneous. It can be supposed that an opinion can be judged erroneous compared to the words of the Holy Scriptures, or to the opinion of the major party within a congregation, or to certain truths. Perhaps, it is possible to go as far as saying that here Boreel wanted to refer to the issues of heresies and heretics. Unfortunately, there is not enough evidence to give a full explanation of Boreel's words. However, it is evident that Boreel here establish that the members of the Church of Connivance must practice religious toleration with each other.

To strengthen the idea suggesting that freedom of speech and religious toleration are two of the cornerstones of the Church of Connivance and in general of Boreel's thought, it is possible to take into account that Boreel identifies the causes of Christian struggles and divisions with the lack of a detailed research of the Holy Scripture, concerning those passages from which it is possible to understand the right way to found churches in modern

⁶⁶⁹ «attamen autoritate duntaxat talis Christianismi Ecclesiastica, nomine membrorum talis Ecclesiae respectivorum seu tanquam membra talis Ecclesia respectiva, et jure vocationis talium Christianorum communis; ita ut errori ibi tolerari possit ac debeat». Ibid.

times. As a matter of fact, after he asserts that no one has still done this kind of research, Boreel says that nevertheless modern Churches' ministers had continued to administer religious congregations and to found new churches, claiming a divine authority that they did not possess. This is the reason why «tot ac tantae in Ecclesia Christiana rixae contentiones et schismata pullularint, ac etiamnum pullulent».⁶⁷⁰ In short, Boreel argues that the divine authority which ministers claim for themselves, which in turn leads to the lack of freedom of speech and of religious toleration within Christianity, is the main cause of struggles and divisions among Christians. If those ministers had examined the Holy Scripture in the same way Boreel suggested, they would have understood that they did not have divine authority. So, all Christians would have enjoyed freedom of speech and religious toleration, and struggles and divisions among them would have never occurred.⁶⁷¹

Furthermore, while describing the consequences of the Church of Connivance, Boreel asserts that thanks to it, each man could live in peace in the Christian congregation he embraced, without schisms or divisions in the same Church of Connivance. Furthermore, each Christian congregation could exist in harmony with the other «similibus coetibus».⁶⁷² It can be easily concluded that here Boreel wants to establish religious toleration both between members of a same confession of faith, and among the different Christian sects that would have formed the Church of Connivance.

⁶⁷⁰ ALAT, p. 61.

⁶⁷¹ Boreel made similar assertions in PEP too. Here he says that modern ministers must examine the way to found the *cultum conniventiae* from the Scriptures and they must establish it among Christians, provided that they gave up both their habit to found churches as God's emissaries and their «fastu, mutuoque contemptu», which is «schismatum vomica». They have to do so, «ad schismata quae singuli hactenus foverunt, abolenda». PEP, in OP, p. 150. Boreel's assertions are not very clear. However, it is evident that the habit of founding churches as emissaries of God, the pride, and the contempt which Boreel allude to, refer to the alleged divine authority that those minister claim for themselves. So, after all, divine authority is «schismatum vomica».

⁶⁷² «ut hac ratione, singula caetuum illorum membra [...] absque ullis seditioibus aut schismatibus, cultui illi conniventiae, singula inquam suo manentia in caetu, in pace sese addicere, in eoque unaninimiter cum aliis similibus caetibus coalito, retineri possint». ALAT, p. 68. Boreel expresses the same idea in QHC too, by using the same words. Here he assert that in the Church of Connivance «singula caetuum illorum membra [...] absque ullis seditioibus aut schismatibus, cultui illi conniventiae, singula inquam suo manentia in caetu, in pace sese addicere, in eoque unaninimiter cum aliis similibus caetibus coalito, retineri possint». QHC, in OP, p. 108.

Lastly, the final articles of ALAT must be mentioned. In article CLXXIV Boreel states that each Christian has to join a church only when the Holy Scriptures are regarded as the means both for mutual edification, which must be practiced «mediante sermone», and for mutual toleration.⁶⁷³ In this way, Boreel continues in article CLXXVI, a religion that is peaceful by nature can be established, which is based on the Bible, as God's true Word, on the dialogue among Christians, and on mutual toleration.⁶⁷⁴ Here it is evident that through the word «sermone» Boreel means the opportunity to speak freely both within a same Christian congregation and within all Christian sects that would have formed the Church of Connivance. Likewise, through the «mutua tolerantia» Boreel both meant toleration among members of the same congregation and among all sects of Christianity.

In order to understand how much he had valued both freedom of speech and religious toleration, it should be underlined that Boreel cannot help but make reference to them. It has already been said that he had not done that kind of research on Holy Scriptures which he refers to. This is the reason why he did not fully describe the Church of Connivance and he did not explain how it could be founded. For the same reason, he refuses to establish how each Christian has to behave towards the churches that he judges as defective and presumptuous, and how each Christian has to practice private religion, even though Boreel openly states that each one must part with those churches that refuse to establish the Church of Connivance. However, in spite of this lack of information, Boreel always refers to freedom of speech and to religious toleration, when discussing the Church of Connivance. Therefore, it is evident that these two are major keystones to understanding both Boreel's ideas concerning this kind of church and his general thought.

Before moving on the next chapter, it is necessary to discuss two issues that so far have not been examined enough: Boreel's purpose with the creation of the Church of Connivance; the real extension of freedom of speech advocated by Boreel. By analyzing these two issues, we can start to fully understand Boreel's ideas concerning Christian religion, both in his public

⁶⁷³ ALAT, p. 71.

⁶⁷⁴ ALAT, p. 72.

and private side, ideas that will be confirmed and completed by analyzing in the following chapters Boreel's reflections concerning the relationship between State and Church.

As for the first issue, it is evident that Boreel has conceived the Church of Connivance because of the struggles and divisions within Christianity: so, its purpose is religious peace and the reunification of Christian religion. As a matter of fact, it has already been shown that Boreel identifies the causes of the struggles and divisions between Christians with the lack of an in-depth research of the Bible to understand how to found churches in modern times. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Church of Connivance, which would have been the outcome of this research, is the means to remove those struggles and divisions. Likewise, Boreel believes that the Holy Scriptures must have a major role in the Church of Connivance, since it is the means to establish mutual toleration, so that «*voluntas Dei in terra ab omnibus talibus Christianis unanimiter fiat, quemadmodum unanimiter fit in coelo*».⁶⁷⁵ Finally, in QHC Boreel openly says that he had written ALAT because Christian religion was torn apart and that his purpose was to look for a way to overcome the struggles among Christians, so eventually he thought about the Church of Connivance.⁶⁷⁶ In conclusion, what Boreel aims to achieve through the Church of Connivance are religious peace and the unity of all Christians.

As for the second issue, in the first place it is important to underline that Boreel does not advocate absolute freedom of speech. As a matter of fact, he believes that each man could freely express his own opinions only within the Church of Connivance and only about religious matters. Boreel does not stretch his assertions concerning freedom of speech to political matters. Furthermore, only Christians could freely express their opinions in religious

⁶⁷⁵ ALAT, p. 71.

⁶⁷⁶ «Ratio, ob quam libellum Ad legem et Ad testimonium scripsi, haec est, quòd, quum animadverterem, Christianismus, qui pacis esse societas debebat, dissidiis de Religione undique miserè distractum, doluerim. Et quaenam resarciendi ratio hodiernis Ecclesiis adhiberi posset, diu mecum ac seriò considerarim». QHC, in OP., p. 105. Boreel makes this assertion again in the conclusion of this work. After he had discussed about the Church of Connivance, explaining that in this way each Christian could live in peace, Boreel says: «haec est ratio ac sententia, pro cuius declaratione libellum ad Legem et ad Testimonium scripsi». QHC, in OP., p. 108.

matters and not everybody, since only Christians could be members of the Church of Connivance.

Second, it is important to note that Boreel himself sets limits to the real freedom of speech he advocated, stating that it could be practiced only privately. In fact, in the Church of Connivance each member could freely express his opinion about any religious issue only in private meetings, not during the public reading of the Holy Scriptures. This is what Boreel openly asserts in SG. Furthermore, only those passages of the Bible concerning matters and doctrines shared by all Christians can be publicly read. It is only possible to discuss about all other aspects of the Christian religion privately, «propter schismatis metum, quod hodierno tempore inde facile atque in proclivi est».⁶⁷⁷ So, in order to avoid new schisms to a Christianity that could be reunited through the Church of Connivance and thus to preserve religious peace, Boreel decides to set limits to the freedom of speech he advocated, asserting it is possible to publicly read and discuss only those passages of the Scriptures which all Christians agree on.

It is possible to find the same idea in ALAT and QHC too, even though in these works he did not make such assertions as clearly as in SG. However, the frequent references to the *communia fundamentalia* of Christian religion leaves no room for doubt. For instance, in article CLXXIV of ALAT Boreel clearly states that the Holy Scriptures must be regarded as the way to administer the Church of Connivance, but only through those doctrines which all Christians agree upon. The same doctrines must also be the basis of the above-mentioned public *sermone* aimed to the mutual edification.⁶⁷⁸ Furthermore, in QHC Boreel openly states that the Church of Connivance must be characterized by the «S. Scripturae praelectione pro unico verbi Dei

⁶⁷⁷ SG, in OP, pp. 103-104.

⁶⁷⁸ Tum quaerendum est; utrùm, quum ipsissimae SS. literae prout sunt et jacent, publicè offeruntur [...] pro unico ὁλως insitè indubiè merèque vero medio ecclesiastici in communibus fundamentalibus regiminis [...] utrum tunc inquam, homini Christiano praefata prout optimè poterit probanti, et sincerè liberèque approbanti, tempestivum ac utile futurum sit, caetui illi sese adjungere, ad Deum uno cum pluribus animo publicè colendum, laudandum, ac profitendum; proximumque invicem mediante sermone, publicè cum fundamentalibus illis communibus aedificandum». ALAT, pp. 70-71.

auditu», using the «communibus fundamentalibus pro mutua exhortatione, regimine, etc.».⁶⁷⁹

In conclusion, it is evident that freedom of speech cannot be practiced in public and must only be based upon the *communia fundamentalia* of Christian religion. Since all Christians agree on these doctrine, they cannot be subject to discussion.

From here it is possible to give a first account of Boreel's thought about Christian religion. He believed that in modern times no one has divine authority. He asserted the necessity to remove this alleged authority from modern churches' ministers and to find a new way of leading religious life. So, he conceived the Church of Connivance, which would have been able to establish religious peace and to unite all Christians sects once again. From a public point of view, the Church of Connivance would consist in a religious assembly where all Christians could be gathered, despite the differences of opinions and of confessions of faith that each one had embraced. In this assembly, all Christians would have met in order to read those passages of the Holy Scripture where the doctrines shared by all people could be found. Furthermore, they would have practiced religious toleration of the different confessions of faith that each one had embraced concerning the remaining articles of faith, which are not shared by all Christians. From a private point of view, in the Church of Connivance every man would have been free to embrace the confession of faith that he believed most suitable and to meet with other Christians that shared his same opinions. In these private meetings, which would have been devoid of official ministers, it would have been possible to discuss about all doctrines and articles of faith of the Christian religion, as long as the opinions of all members would have been tolerated. In short, the Church of Connivance, both in its public and private side, would have been nothing else than the theoretical expressions of the Collegiant movement.

In the following chapters Boreel's ideas about the rationality of Christian religion, and about the relationship between State and Church will

⁶⁷⁹ QHC, in OP, p. 108.

be taken into consideration. From this analysis, it will be possible to complete the account of Boreel's thought, describing the kind of religion which he thought about. As for the arguments analyzed so far, we must summarize this conclusion. By conceiving the Church of Connivance Boreel's highest purpose was to pursue religious peace and the reunification of Christian religion. In order to achieve this purpose was willing to put limits to the real freedom of speech that each man could have enjoyed, asserting that it would be possible to freely express one's own opinion only in private meetings.

Chapter III: The truth of the Holy Scriptures

In the previous chapters, it has been concluded that the Holy Scripture played a major role in the shaping of Boreel's thought. In fact, the Bible is the cornerstone through which Boreel developed his critical arguments against ecclesiastical authority and his reflections concerning the "Church of Connivance". From Boreel's point of view, public religious services must be led only through the reading of the Holy Scripture. Since it is God's Word at mankind's disposal, public religion cannot but rely on the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, Boreel argues, everyday some passages of these books, which all Christians agree on, must be publicly read, so that each Christian could obtain all that is necessary to attain salvation through them.

In the works so far taken into account, Boreel never discussed the Holy Scripture. For instance, he asserts that it is God's unique Word still at mankind's disposal, but he did not prove such assertion. Even less he questioned the truth of the New Testament. However, this must not come as a surprise. Boreel wrote those work for a precise audience: Protestant Christians.⁶⁸⁰ This is the reason why he did not need to make a preliminary discussion regarding the Bible itself.

However, such discussion had to be carried out in JNL, a writing which Boreel worked on between 1656 and 1665, and which, ultimately, he was not able to finish. There is only one manuscript copy of such a work, now

⁶⁸⁰ This is what it is possible to conclude from the same title of ALAT, since it declaims that the «erotematica proposition et deductio» is «exhibita Christianorum Ecclesijs et coetibus illis, qui solam Veteris et Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei et morum Canone profitentur». ALAT, p. 1. Furthermore, in QHC clearly says that in ALAT he had only discussed «de hodiernis enim, et quae patrum nostrorum memoria à Romana recedentes Ecclesia coeperunt, [...] Ecclesiis, solam Sacram Scripturam pro canone profitentibus». QHC, in OP, p. 108. Likewise, in PEP Boreel asserts that it must be established that «Ecclesias sive Luthenarorum, sive Reformatorum, sive Mennonitarum, sive quorumcunque tandem qui sola Veteris ac Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei ac morum canone nunc profitentur, Universas ac singuals, ejusmodi naturae verbo non uti in Concionibus, Catechismis, Confessionibus, Formulis, Consistoriis, Classibus, Synodisve suis, quo Evangelii Praedicatio, Ecclesiaeque reliqua, per particularium quoque Ecclesiarum ministros, administratio, a Deo Christoque primitus et instituta fuit, et peragi potuit». PE, in OP, pp. 148-149. Assertions that recur in *Ad Samuelem Maresium* (from now on ASM), where Boreel states that he had only questioned «vestri caetus, de quibus solis antea cum *Riveto* egeram, sive aliis similes caetus, qui unà cum vestris caetibus, patrum nostrorum memoria, Pontificiis relictis, erecti, solam Veteris et Novi Testamenti scripturam pro unico fidei et morum Canone etiamnum hodie profitentur, quales sunt, qui vocantur *Lutherani, Reformati, Mennonitae*, ac similes». ASM, in OP, p. 87.

preserved among the Robert Boyle Papers.⁶⁸¹ Boreel wrote this work for a much wider audience than his previous writings. As a matter of fact, the JNL was meant for all Christians, both Protestants and Catholics, and for all people who had not yet embraced the Christian Religion, such as Jews, Muslims, Atheists, Sceptics, etc. This the reason why, in order to achieve the purpose of his work, that is, to show that Christ is the only legislator that mankind must follow, Boreel was forced to discuss the Holy Scripture and to prove its truth.

This chapter deals with this topic. In the first section, two works are examined, which undoubtedly Boreel used as sources to prove the truth of the New Testament: «De Auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae», written by Fausto Sozzini, and «De Veritate Religionis Christianae», written by Hugo Grotius.⁶⁸² These two works were not chosen by chance. Boreel himself mentions both Sozzini and Grotius in the JNL, as two authors that could have provided him with solid argumentations for his work. In the second section, there is a brief introduction to the JNL, with an account suggesting how Boreel would have shaped and developed this work. In the third section, Boreel's reflections concerning the truth of New Testament are taken into account, showing the kind of argumentations that Boreel believed would have been useful to prove this truth.

⁶⁸¹ London, The Royal Society, MS RB 1/12/1, MS RB 1/13/1, and MS RB 1/15/1. In each volume, there is more than one foliation.

⁶⁸² Fausto Sozzini, *De Sacrae Scripturae auctoritate. Libellus Fausti Socini Senensis. Cum addita est Summa Religionis Christianae, ejusdem Socini. Utrumque ex italico in latinum conversum*, Racoviae, 1611; Hugo Grotius, *Sensus librorum sex, quos pro veritate religionis christianae batavice scripsit Hugo Grotius*, Parisiis, 1627. In the following pages I will refer to these two editions: Fausto Sozzini, *De auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae*, in Fausto Sozzini, *Fausti Socini Senensis Opera Omnia in duos tomos distincta. Quorum prior continet ejus opera exegetica et didactica. Posterior opera ejusdem polemica comprehendit. Accesserunt quaedam hactenus inedita. Quorum catalogum versa pagina exhibet*, Amsterdam, 1656, pp. 265-280; Ugo Grozio, *Della vera religione cristiana. A cura di Fiorella Pitnacuda de Michelis*, Roma, 1973.

The proofs of Sozzini and Grotius for the truth of the Christian Religion

Boreel usually hides the sources of his reflections. In the works so far examined, he never directly quotes a precise author or a specific work from which he has taken ideas or argumentation that influenced his assertions. As for his ideas concerning the rationality of Christian Religion, or the relationship between State and Church, in the JNL too Boreel does refer neither to scholars, nor to writings, which he used to develop or to strengthen his opinions. However, for unknown reasons, as for the proof of the truth of the New Testament, Boreel openly mentions some scholars that wrote works concerning the same subject and that Boreel believed most helpful to write his own defense of the Christian religion. Among these authors there are Fausto Sozzini and Hugo Grotius. For instance, in note 51 of a section entitled «Ad tractatum legislator, revisum ab 21 Junii, 1660, notae», Boreel writes that he would use both «Grotium in annotationibus suis in Novum Testamentum, et libello ejus de veritate christianae religionis», and «Socinum», referring to «de auctoritate S. Scripturae, ubi de libris Novi Testamenti agit».⁶⁸³ In the same note and in others as well, Boreel made reference to other authors. However, by reading the works of Sozzini and of Grotius, it can be easily concluded that Boreel has been deeply influenced by them. This is the reason why only these two works are taken into account in this section.

In «De Auctoritate», Sozzini has one major purpose: to prove the truth of the New Testament both to Christians and to those who had not yet embraced the Christian religion. Sozzini believes that such proof is necessary, because many people, and among them Christians too, were doubting «de auctoritate Scripturae, quae dicitur sacra, id est librorum, qui Biblia vocantur, seu Vetus et Novum Testamentum», since they were asking themselves «cur credentium sit, vera esse et recte dicta, quae in illis continentur».⁶⁸⁴

Sozzini divided his works in six chapters. However, the first two must be regarded as the main corpus of «De Auctoritate». In fact, in the first

⁶⁸³ MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) f. 10(r-v).

⁶⁸⁴ Sozzini, *De Auctoritate Sacrae Scripturae* (see above, n. 682), p. 265.

chapter Sozzini proves that it is impossible to doubt the truth of the New Testament, if the Christian religion has already been accepted. Moreover, in the second chapter he establishes that no one can doubt this truth, neither those who believe in the existence of a God but do not accept the Christian God, nor those who denied the existence of a deity itself. In the remaining chapters Sozzini deals with minor issues. In the third chapter he proves that no one can adduce reasons to doubt the sacred books of the Christian religion, while in the fourth chapter he shows that «*istis libris majorem debere fidem adjungi, quam aliis communiter adjungatur, doctrinam historiamve aliquam continentibus*».⁶⁸⁵ The fifth chapter deals with the errors that those who discuss such things usually make. Finally, in the sixth chapter Sozzini strengthens all that he has written by quoting the Italian poet Dante Alighieri, and by arguing that he had already proved all that Sozzini has tried to show. In these section, the analysis is focused on Sozzini's first two chapters.

After asserting that it is sufficient to prove the truth and authority of the Christians' sacred books in order to prove the Old Testament too, «*cum aperte à Novo Testamento confirmetur*», Sozzini makes a list of the four major causes why someone can rightly doubt the authority of a certain book. First, it is possible to question a work, if one has no trust in its author or authors, or at least if one is not sure about them. Second, the same kind of suspect can be raised if no one know who wrote a certain book. Third, the authority of a certain work can be doubted, if it is evident or if there is the suspect that it has been corrupted and changed during the centuries. Finally, if there is trustworthy evidence that urge to doubt a certain work.⁶⁸⁶

As for the first cause, Sozzini asserts that a certain book can be doubted for two main reasons. First, if it is evident or if it can be rightly suspected that its author has not known the things he wrote about, or that he

⁶⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 276.

⁶⁸⁶ «*Quatuor sunt, ut videtur, caussae, cur jure dubitari possit de auctoritate libri cujuspiam. Prima est, si scriptor parum sit fide dignus, aut non ejusmodi, de cujus fide et scientia dubitari nequeat. Altera est, si revera scriptor ignoretur. Tertia, si constet aut justa suspicio sit, librum depravatum fuisse, aut aliquo modo immutatum. Quarta vero et postrema, si non rejicienda testimonia adsint, quod libro isti nequaquam sit adhibenda fides*». Ibid.

wittingly wrote falsehoods. Second, if in the same book there are evidences that make the reader suspicious about its author.⁶⁸⁷

However, Sozzini argues, it is evident that Christians cannot doubt the authority of New Testament because of these two reasons. In order to strengthen his assertions, Sozzini sets two preliminary conditions. On the one hand, if someone doubts that the authors of these books had really known the things they wrote about, or if he suspects that they willingly wrote falsehoods, he must look for the reasons of his doubts in the same New Testament.⁶⁸⁸ On the other hand, it must be assumed that the authors of these books are those same people who are usually regarded as such. As a matter of fact, the possibility that someone else had written the New Testament's books belongs to the second kind of causes that can urge someone to doubt the authority of a certain book.⁶⁸⁹

If these two conditions are accepted, Sozzini argues that no one can doubt that the authors of the New Testament's books gave an account of events and doctrines that they had directly known. In fact, these authors were either Christ's first apostles, or disciples and followers of Christ's apostles. Therefore, even though it is possible that they were not direct witnesses of those events and doctrines, however they lived in the same time and in the same places in which Christ and his apostles lived, and thus they undoubtedly had access to direct witnesses.⁶⁹⁰ Furthermore, it cannot be argued that they wrote falsehoods, because they were Christ's first and more faithful disciples, sometimes dear to Christ himself, and because they wrote these books for one reason only, that is, «quod Jesum Christum, ejusque religionem ex animo colebant». Hence, it is impossible that they could have lied.⁶⁹¹

⁶⁸⁷ «Itaque, quod ad primam causam attinet; quod libri alicujus scriptor parum sit fide dignus, aut non ejusmodi, de cujus fide, et scientia dubitari nequeat; id sane ex eo fit, quod vel alioqui constat, justamve aliquam ob causam suspicio est, eum non recte novisse ea, quae scripsit, aut non ita scripsisse, ut noverat; vel ejus rei in ipso libro aliqua indicia apparent». Ibid.

⁶⁸⁸ «Jam vero non video primum, quo pacto de scriptoribus ejus libri, qui Novum Testamentum vocatur, constare possit, aut justa suspicio esse (nisi propter id, quod ex uniuscujusque ipsorum scriptis colligi queat) eos aut non recte novisse ea, de quibus scripserunt, aut non ita, ut noverant, scribere voluisse». Ibid.

⁶⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 266.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid.

So, there is no reason to doubt that the authors of the New Testament had not known what they wrote, or to believe that they had given a forged account of what they witnessed. In addition, no one can find in these books internal evidences to doubt their authors. This kind of suspect, Sozzini argues, could be raised if in the New Testament there were events or doctrines «*quae vel inter se diversa aut repugnantia, vel per se ipsa falsa esse deprehendantur*». ⁶⁹² However, it is impossible to argue such a thing. As a matter of fact, Sozzini asserts, the internal disagreements that can be found within these books or among different editions of the New Testament do not affect the Christian doctrine at all. On the contrary, all these books give a harmonious and unanimous account of Christ's doctrine. The few disagreements within the Christian holy books only concern minor happenings and issues. Furthermore, the «*commune consensum*» of all Christians since apostolic times, which concerns both doctrines and events described in these books, argues against the presence of falsehoods in them. ⁶⁹³ In conclusion, the first cause of doubting the truth and authority of a certain work does not concern the New Testament.

The second kind of cause that can lead someone to doubt a book relies on the ignorance of its author or authors. As a matter of fact, from this ignorance a series of doubts could be raised, so that in the end the reliability of the writing would be completely undermined. In addition, this is especially true in the case of the Christian holy books. ⁶⁹⁴ However, Sozzini argues that this second kind of doubt does not concern the New Testaments books either. In fact, he asserts, no one among Christians can doubt that the authors of these

⁶⁹² Ibid.

⁶⁹³ Ibid., pp. 266-267.

⁶⁹⁴ «*Dicet enim quispiam, quamvis alioqui fateatur, Christianam religionem esse veram, quisnam mihi certum facit, scripta Novi Testamenti ab iis revera conscripta fuisse, qui, ut tales, in inscriptionibus aut prooemiis illorum nominantur, et ea conscripsisse vulgo creduntur? Et cum nihil certi de hoc hebeamus, nonne aperte hinc sequitur, incertum esse, quinam ea scripserint; quando nulli alii nominari possunt, quos tam verisimile sit ea scripsisse, ut istos? Quod cum ita se habeat, undenam fieri poterit, ut debeam scriptis illis fidem adhibere, sive in rebus ad doctrinam spectantibus, sive in rebus ad historiam pertinentibus? Fides, quae historico alicui libro adhibetur, eo potissimum inniti solet, quod constet, scriptorem, rem, uti gesta fuerit, probe tenuisse, et talem fuisse, quem haud verisimile sit voluisse mentiri. Atqui huic rei quomodonam locus esse poterit, ubi ignoratur scriptor? Pari ratione, quod ad res attinet ad doctrinam spectantes, si scriptori cuiquam fides adhibenda est, nosse oportet, eum hominem fuisse doctum in eo genere doctrinae, adeo ut ei merito credendum sit. Ut vero hoc sciatur (si modo sciri potest) an non necesse est, non dubium esse quisnam fuerit scriptor iste?».* Ibid., pp. 267-268.

books are those usually accepted, that is, Christ's apostles and their disciples. From Sozzini point of view, the universal agreement among Christians about this subject is sufficient proof that the authors of these books are those same people usually regarded as such, an agreement that has persisted since apostolic times.⁶⁹⁵ This proof is strengthened even more, Sozzini continues, if the struggles and divisions among Christians are taken into consideration. As a matter of fact, despite all the struggles concerning all kind of doctrinal points of the Christian religion, «nullus tamen (quantum historiae nos docent, et fama tulit) fuit unquam homo prudens et gravis inter eos, qui aperte ac libere Christi nomen profitentur, qui dubitaret, quin supra enumerata scripta [of the New Testament] eorum essent, quorum esse dicuntur».⁶⁹⁶

The third cause of doubt described by Sozzini is related to the idea that a certain book has been corrupted and changed during the centuries. However, he denies that this kind of doubt can be raised against the New Testament. While discussing the first cause of doubt, Sozzini has asserted that there are not essential inconsistencies within these books or among the different editions of the Christian holy writings. The few discrepancies that can be found are not of such nature as to undermine the authority of the New Testament. Furthermore, Sozzini clearly asserts that «nullum enim est scriptum, in quo temporis longinquitate, ob varias incidentes causas, multa aliqua ratione non immutentur».⁶⁹⁷ Sozzini clearly argues that God's providence and goodness has made sure that during the centuries these books would not have undergone essential debasements and changes, because people can find His revelation and His will concerning mankind's salvation in the New Testament.⁶⁹⁸

Sozzini does not discuss much the fourth cause of doubt, that is, the existence of sound evidence useful to argue that the New Testament is not

⁶⁹⁵ «Et sane mirum est, neminem fortasse esse, qui audeat negare, aut etiam dubitare, quin liber aliquis, quantumvis antiquitus scriptus, eum habeat auctorem, cui communi hominum consensu tribuitur, nisi firma aliqua ratione aut testimonio ad id impellatur; et tamen hodie nonnullos inveniri, qui aut negent, aut dubitent, horum scriptorum auctores esse eos, quibus communi hominum consensu tribuuntur, immo quorum se esse ipsamet majore ex parte ostendunt; cum interim nullum testimonium aut rationem habeant, qua ad hoc impelli queant». Ivi, p. 268.

⁶⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 270.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid.

reliable. He just asserts that this kind of evidence does not exist and that no one among Christians has never doubted about the truth and the authority of these books. In short, Sozzini make use once more of the universal agreement among Christians as sufficient proof for the truth of their holy writings.⁶⁹⁹

Since he has argued that the four causes of doubting a certain book do not concern the New Testament, and thus he believes that he has shown the truth and authority of these books to all Christians, in the second chapter Sozzini proves the same thing to those who had not yet embraced the Christian religion. He divides these people in two kind: first, there are those who believe in the existence of God and of a true religion, but who deny the Christian God and religion; second, there are those who deny the same existence of a deity and those who believe in the existence of God, but deny his providence, thus rejecting the existence of a true religion. However, Sozzini believes that the best way to reach his purpose is the same for both kind of people: it is necessary to prove the truth of the Christian religion. As matter of fact, if they accepted it, they would necessarily accept the arguments Sozzini used to prove the truth of the New Testament to Christians.⁷⁰⁰

Sozzini begins by dealing with those who embraced other religions. In order to persuade them of the truth of the Christian religion, Sozzini asserts that Christianity «non solum alias omnes [religions] longe antecellere, sed etiam omnia habere, quae in religione aliqua vera desiderari possit, adeo ut aut haec sola sit vera, aut nulla vel sit, vel esse possit non falsa».⁷⁰¹ To prove this assertions, he takes into account and confutes three major objections.

First, against the Christian religion it can be objected that there are too many different opinions and beliefs among Christians. However, Sozzini replies that all Christians share the «summa» of Christ's doctrine, that is, his precepts and his promises, and that they are far more excellent than the doctrines of other religions. Furthermore, Christ gave a real example, by

⁶⁹⁹ «Verum, ut dixi, quod hoc deprehendatur, nihil scio; nec fieri ferme potest, ut tale quid ad nostram notitiam pervenerit: cum nemo unquam vulgo verus Christianus existimatus fuerit, qui de auctoritate eorum scriptorum in universum dubitaverit, nedum affirmaverit, in rebus ad Christianam religionem pertinentibus, scriptis illis credendum non esse, neque esi standum». Ibid.

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 271.

⁷⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 271-272.

living according to his precepts and promises, an example that no one can find in other revealed religions.⁷⁰²

The second objection concerns the reliability of the historical events about Christ's life, which some people believe to be fairy tales or falsehoods. However, Sozzini replies that it is not necessary to establish if this historical events are really true in order to embrace the Christian religion, because all people who do not lack judgement can easily understand that it is far superior to all other religions, and that it is the only true belief. Furthermore, if someone accepted the «summa religionis» that he can find in the New Testament, he would be able to easily understand other doctrines and matters related to the Christian religion too.⁷⁰³

Finally, Sozzini replies to the objection suggesting that no one can achieve anything through the New Testament, if he doubts about their truth and authority. Sozzini argues that no one can doubt that in these books it is possible to find Christ's doctrine, even if someone doubts the historical events there recounted. However, once one is became aware of Christ's doctrine, he can easily understand that it is far more excellent than the doctrines of other religions.⁷⁰⁴

In order to strengthen his argumentations in favor of the Christianity, Sozzini also adduces some historical circumstances that occurred to the Christians through the centuries. First, no one can doubt that many people, sometimes even learned men, left the religion and the traditions in which they were raised in order to embrace the Christian religion, even though they often risked their life by doing so. It is clear that they made this choice because they deeply believed in the truth of the Christian religion. Furthermore, Christianity spread to remote places in a very short time, a fact that cannot but arise astonishment, if both the poor means of the first advocates of Christian religion, who were people «*minimae aut potius nullius auctoritatis existimationisve inter alios, omnibusque humanis viribus desituti*», and the

⁷⁰² Ibid., p. 272.

⁷⁰³ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 272-273.

hate and dangers towards those who decided to embrace Christ's religion in the first centuries, are taken into account.⁷⁰⁵

From all that he has argued so far, Sozzini concludes: «si ulla religio in orbe terrarum est, quae nunquam defutura sit, quaque ad omnes cujuscunque generis homines pertineat, hanc Christianam esse; et ob eam causam, si ulla vera religio est, hanc esse verissimam».⁷⁰⁶

So, all that remains is to deal with those who accept the existence of God, but rejects its providence and thus its religion, and those who deny the very existence of a deity. Sozzini's argumentation for both kind of people is the same: it is necessary and sufficient to prove the existence of God and of its providence. If they accepted these truths, both kind of man would be forced to recognize the existence of a true religion and thus they would be persuaded of the truth of the Christian religion through the above-mentioned argumentations.⁷⁰⁷

Sozzini begins his proof by asserting that it is beyond doubt that a man has really existed whose name was Jesus Christ, who has taught a religion, who has died on the cross, who has been accused to be a subversive and a blasphemer, and who has performed miracles in order to prove and to strengthen his doctrines. No one, Sozzini argues, can refuse these historical events, because not only those who believe in Christ, but also his enemies, such as the Jews, witnessed to them. Since Christ's miracles are far superior to natural and ordinary power, it must be concluded that God performed them, who has proven that Christ's doctrine is divine, by giving him divine authority through these miracles. If so, it is evident that the Christian religion have divine origins. Christ's wondrous resurrection strengthens these assertions. Therefore, Sozzini concludes, it can be easily argued that «non solum unum aliquem Deum esse, eumque homines singulatim curare, sed etiam ipsius Jesu religionem esse veram».⁷⁰⁸

⁷⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 273.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁸ Ivi, pp. 274-275.

After this account of Sozzini's ideas concerning the proof of the New Testament and of the Christian religion, it is clear how much Boreel was influenced by him. Sozzini's «De Auctoritate» and the JNL have the same purpose: to show to all men that Christianity is the only true divine religion. As Sozzini before him, Boreel too decided to prove that the New Testament is true by showing that their authors are the same people usually accepted by all Christians and that these books have not been corrupted during the centuries. Furthermore, Boreel tried to show that the Christian religion is far superior all the other revealed religion, as Sozzini had tried too. Finally, both authors believed that the best way to deal with Atheist, Deists, and Sceptics, was to prove the existence of God and of its providence. Once they were persuaded of these two truths, it would be easier to prove them the divinity of the Christian religion. However, two main differences between Sozzini and Boreel must be underlined. First, our author gave the most importance to the arguments based on Christ's miracles and prophecies, while Sozzini had made use of this kind of arguments only on the end of the second chapter. Second, Boreel believed that proving the rationality of the Christian religion was a necessary step to persuade both those who embraced other religions and those who did not believe in a religion at all, while Sozzini never discussed this subject in the «De Auctoritate». As for these two main differences, it is most likely that Boreel was influenced by Grotius' «De Veritate Religionis Christianae».

As Jan Paul Heering has already argued, it is most likely that Grotius had read Sozzini's work and that he made use of «De Auctoritate». As a matter of fact, in Grotius' «De Veritate Religionis Christianae» it is possible to find similarities with Sozzini's proof for the Christian religion.⁷⁰⁹

Grotius made the first reference to the desire of writing an apology of Christian religion in a letter that he sent to his friend Gerard Vossius in July 1619, when Grotius was in jail because of the events following the Synod of Dordrecht. In his letter he expressed his desire to write a work in vernacular, whose main purpose would have been an apology for the

⁷⁰⁹ See: Jan Paul Heering, «The sources of Grotius' *De veritate religionis christianae*», in *Grotiana*, 35, 2014, pp. 53-65.

Christian religion. It is evident that Grotius in the following months committed to such a work, since there are references to it in a letter that he sent to his brother Willem on April 12, 1620.⁷¹⁰

The work that Grotius wrote while being in jail was a Dutch poem, which was published in 1622. He had intentionally made use of vernacular language for several reasons, but in the first place because this was the only way to make such a poem understandable to common people, who did not know Latin. However, shortly after its publication, many learned men expressed their desire to see a Latin edition, that eventually Grotius himself wrote and that was published in 1627. It was entitled «Sensus librorum sex, quos pro veritate religionis christianae batavice scripsit Hugo Grotius», but later became famous as the «De veritate religionis christianae».⁷¹¹

This work is divided into six books. In the first book, Grotius approach the subject of religions from a philosophical point of view. At first he proves God's existence and then he makes a list of His most significant characteristics, eventually proving His providence too. In the second and the third books, Grotius establishes the truth of the Christian religion and of the New Testament. In the last three books, he makes a strict comparison between Christianity and the other three major religious beliefs, the Pagan religion, the Jewish religion, and the Islamic religion. Through this comparison, Grotius shows the reasons why the Christian religion is far superior all those beliefs. In this section, the analysis focuses on the second and the third books of «De Veritate».

Grotius begins the second book by asserting that his purpose is not to prove the truth of all Christian dogmas, but rather to establish the truth of the Christian religion as a whole.⁷¹² In order to achieve his goal, at first Grotius takes into account the historical existence of Christ. Grotius argues that no one can deny that Jesus Christ has really existed, because both Christians from different and distant places, and enemies of the Christian religion, such as Jews and ancient Pagan writers, witnessed to Christ's life.⁷¹³

⁷¹⁰ See: Grozio, *Della vera religione cristiana* (see above, n. 682), pp. xix-xxx

⁷¹¹ Ibid., pp. xxx-xxxii.

⁷¹² Ibid., p. 43.

⁷¹³ Ibid., pp. 43-44.

Then, Grotius refers to those people who had embraced the Christian religion in early times, even though they were aware of the dangers that would have followed their decision. Among them many suffered martyrdom because of their desire to follow Christ and his doctrine. Furthermore, not only common people, but also learned men left the religions and the traditions in which they had been raised to become Christians. From Grotius' point of view, there could be only one reason to explain these happenings: those people decided to make such a dangerous choice only because they firmly believed in the truth of Christ's miracles.⁷¹⁴

It is evident, Grotius argues, that these miracles were performed by God. Moreover, it is clear that He did not work such wonders without a reason, since the wisest Legislator allows that his eternal Laws could be broken only because of reasons of utmost significance. Therefore, it is evident that God performed such miracles through Christ because he wanted to bear witness to his doctrine.⁷¹⁵ On the other hand, Grotius has previously argued that no one can prove that such miracles were forgeries, because they were performed in front of many people, and among them surely were learned men who were opponents of Christ and of his doctrine. If Christ had been a deceiver, they would have discovered it and they would have publicly denounced him.⁷¹⁶ Grotius particularly focuses on Christ's resurrection, because many people bore witness to it.⁷¹⁷ From all that he has shown, and from the fact that Christ himself preached in the name of God, Grotius concludes that Christ's doctrine is true, because God would have not bestowed such a honor to Christ through His providence and wisdom, if he had been a deceiver.⁷¹⁸

In short, Grotius proves that Christ's doctrine is endowed with divine authority, by relying on the historical truth of Christ's life, of his miracles, and of his resurrection. Since he has established that the Christian religion has

⁷¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 45-46. As De Michelis has underlined, it is evident that Grotius bases his proof of the Christian religion mainly on Christ's miracles. See: Ibid., p. 45.

⁷¹⁵ Ibid., p. 48.

⁷¹⁶ Ibid., p. 47.

⁷¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 49-53.

⁷¹⁸ Ibid., p. 53.

divine origins, Grotius can move on and take into account Christ's doctrine, in order to prove that it is far superior to all other religions.

Grotius founded such a proof on three major bases. First, the Christian religion promises the immortality of the soul and of the body to all people who are willing to follow Christ's precepts. This kind of promise is far superior to the promises of other religions.⁷¹⁹ Second, Christianity is the greatest religion because of the holiness of its precepts, because it only teaches to honor God through a pure mind and to follow that kind of works that are most virtuous.⁷²⁰ Finally, the Christian religion is superior to all other religion because of its precepts concerning the relationship among men too.⁷²¹ Here Grotius underlines the holiness of the "golden rule", through which God and Christ forbid to reply to an offence with an offence, either through words or deeds, so that the first wickedness is not carried on by a series of evil deeds.⁷²²

In short, the Christian religion is superior to all others because of Christ's doctrine and precepts. In addition, Grotius shows a series of circumstances that strengthen this assertion. First, Christ has been an historical example of his moral and practical doctrine, while the other religion's founders have not lived as they taught to do. For this reason, each Christian can actually say that its master did what he has ordered and that he achieved what he has promised.⁷²³ Second, during the centuries the Christian religion has spread through all places. Grotius argues that this has occurred only thanks to God's providence, who has taken care of His true doctrines and precepts.⁷²⁴ This spreading is even more unbelievable, if both the poor means of the first advocates of the Christian religion and the dangers that the first Christians underwent are taken into account.⁷²⁵ Therefore, Grotius

⁷¹⁹ Ibid., pp. 55-58.

⁷²⁰ «L'essenziale della religione si rivela ovunque consistere in un sentimento di devota fiducia, per il quale dispostici a un fedele ossequio riposiamo interamente in Dio e manteniamo una salda fede nelle sue promesse, da cui scaturisce anche la speranza e il vero amore sia di Dio sia del prossimo, onde avviene che obbediamo ai suoi precetti non servilmente per timore della pena ma per essergli graditi e per averlo come padre e benefattore per la sua bontà». Ibid., pp. 60-61.

⁷²¹ Ibid., pp. 61-69.

⁷²² Ibid., p. 63.

⁷²³ Ibid., pp. 70-72.

⁷²⁴ Ibid., pp. 72-73.

⁷²⁵ Ibid., pp. 73-77.

concludes that the long survival and the great spreading of the Christian religions must be explained through God's miracles, because no human faculty or ability could have reached such outcomes. Using a kind of pun, Grotius even adds that, if someone denied the existence of the miracles, he would nonetheless be forced to recognize that such spreading without the help of God's miracles is a miracle itself.⁷²⁶

In the third book of the «De Veritate Religionis Christianae» it is possible to find Grotius' proof for the truth and authority of the New Testament. He begins his argumentation by stating that these books have been written by the same people who usually are believed to have done so. This is evident, Grotius argues, both from the universal agreement among all Christians concerning this belief, and from the lacking of its confutation among the enemies of Christianity. So, Grotius argues, if no one doubt that Omero and Virgilio had really written their works because of the continuous testimonies of Greek and Latin authors, no one must ever doubt that the New Testaments book were written by Christ's apostles and by their disciples, because almost all people of all times agree on such belief.⁷²⁷

If so, Grotius continues, no one can doubt that the historical events described in these books had really occurred, since they were written by direct witnesses or by people who had had access to direct testimonies of such events.⁷²⁸ Furthermore, Grotius adds that the good will of these writers is sufficient proof of the truth of those happenings. As a matter of fact, these authors did not write these books in order to lie, but only to honor God, who does not persuade no one to lie, especially in matters concerning the salvation of mankind. In addition, the doctrines of these authors, which are

⁷²⁶ Ibid., p. 78. The similarities between the second book of Grotius' «De Veritate Religionis Christianae» and the second chapter of Sozzini's «De Auctoritate» are striking. This is the reason why we have to share Heering's words: «on comparing the second chapter of *De auctoritate* with de second book of *De veritate*, one does not only find corresponding arguments, but complete patterns of similar argumentation. Moreover, the similarity in details is so striking that we cannot but assume that Grotius had Socinus' work at hand when composing his *Bewijs*». Heering, *The sources of Grotius* (see above, n. 709), p. 62.

⁷²⁷ Grozio, *Della vera religione cristiana* (see above, n. 682), pp. 80-81. See also: Ibid., pp. 81-82.

⁷²⁸ Ibid., pp. 83-84.

characterized only by piety, and their same lives, which no one ever accused of evil or deceit, bear witness to their good will.⁷²⁹

In fact, God Himself bestowed His authority upon these writers, by performing miracles through them, as once He had done through Christ. Grotius argues that these miracles really occurred, because of the circumstances in which they were performed. For instance, learned men witnessed to them, who would be able to easily confute them, if such miracle were fake. However, Grotius asserts that neither the Jews, nor the Pagan authors ever denied or confuted the miracles that Christ, and his apostles and disciples performed.⁷³⁰ Moreover, God himself guarantees the truth of the New Testament. If one believes that God look after human things through his providence, it is impossible to argue that He allows that so many people, who only wanted to honor Him, would be deceived by false books.⁷³¹

These are the main arguments that Grotius uses to prove the truth and the authority of the New Testament. In the remaining pages of the third book, he confutes some objections that could be raised against the Christian holy writings.

First, Grotius rejects the idea suggesting that the New Testament includes impossible things, because, even though there are some things that men cannot do, nothing is impossible for God's omnipotence, provided that these things are not contradictory.⁷³²

Second, he confutes the objection suggesting that there are contradictions and incongruences within the different books of the New Testament. However, Grotius replies that such contradictions concern only minor issues and thus they must be overlooked. Furthermore, the presence of these incongruences argues in favor of the truth of the same books, because, if their writers had written forgeries, they would not have allowed any kind of contradiction in their books.⁷³³

⁷²⁹ Ibid., p. 85.

⁷³⁰ Ibid., pp. 85-87.

⁷³¹ Ibid., p. 87.

⁷³² Ibid., pp. 91-92.

⁷³³ Ibid., pp. 93-94.

Finally, Grotius asserts that no one can put forward objections from the writings of authors who were not Christians, since their writings argue in favor of the truth of the New Testaments, or from ideas suggesting that these books had been corrupted during the centuries.⁷³⁴

These are the argumentations that Grotius uses to prove the truth and authority of the New Testament's books. The similarities between Grotius's work and Sozzini's «De Auctoritate» are striking: in the former it is possible to find many arguments that Sozzini had already developed in the first book of his work. On the other hand, Heering rightly suggests that Grotius relied on arguments based on the miracles of Christ and of his disciples much more than Sozzini had done.⁷³⁵ In fact, Grotius makes reference to these miracles not only in the two books here examined, but also in the remaining three books, where God's miracles are often used to assert the excellence of the Christian religion.⁷³⁶

From the analyses of the JNL in this and in the following chapters, it can be concluded that Boreel has been influenced by Grotius's ideas. Boreel focuses his attention mainly on the miracles that God performed through Christ and his disciples, and on the excellence of Christ's practical and moral doctrine, as Grotius did before him. Furthermore, even though in the following pages we will not take into account the particular arguments that

⁷³⁴ Ibid., pp. 94-102.

⁷³⁵ Using Heering's words: «The third book of *De veritate* shows remarkable parallels with the first chapter of Socinus's *De auctoritate*. Socinus considers in this chapter the authority and credibility of the Bible, especially the New Testament. Grotius again argues in quite the same way, but deviated from Socinus on one point. In order to obtain a further affirmation of the reliability of the authors of the New Testament, Grotius refers to the miracles and prophecies they had performed – for convenience's sake identifying these authors with the apostles. Probably Grotius did not feel completely at ease with the argumentation of Socinus, that lacked any appeal to notions generally used in reformation theology like the inspiration and the internal testimony of the Holy Ghost. Grotius's appeal to the miracles and prophecies of the authors of the new Testament serves as an additional argument to prove the reliability of these accounts». Heering, *The sources of Grotius* (see above, n. 709), pp. 63-64.

⁷³⁶ «In Grotius's apologetic work the testimony of miracles plays a decisive role everywhere in his argument. In the first book he calls the argument from miracles, as I already mentioned, the most certain testimony of God's providence; in the second he regards the miracles of Christ as the ground of the honors paid to him after his death; in the third he states that the reliability of the authors of the New Testament is confirmed by the miracles they performed; in the fourth he disqualifies the so-called miracles of the pagans; in the fifth the author places the miracles of Jesus in the foreground as the proof of the superiority of Christianity over Judaism; and finally in the sixth book he states that the miracles of Muhammed pale in comparison with those of Jesus». Ivi, p. 60.

Boreel would have used to prove the truth of the New Testament, anyone who read the JNL can easily understand that he wanted to resume and enlarge on many of Grotius' arguments. However, a most important difference between Grotius' and Boreel's works must be underlined. The Dutch jurist had used arguments based on Christ's miracles in the second book, even though he proved the truth of the New Testament only in the third book. On the contrary, Boreel understood that he had to prove such a truth in the first place, and only then he could have used arguments based on the miracles described in the same books. This is the reason why he made every effort to prove the truth of the New Testament and why the a few chapters of JNL concern this proof. However, despite this difference, it cannot be denied that the «De Veritate Religionis Christianae» is one of the main source of Boreel's JNL.⁷³⁷

⁷³⁷ In the following pages I will analyze the kinds of arguments that Boreel would have used to pursue the purpose of the JNL, not the few specific arguments that we can find in the manuscript preserved among the Robert Boyle Papers. However, a strict comparison between the JNL and Grotius' works could be very helpful to establish how much Boreel was influenced by Grotius' ideas and reflections.

The Jesus Nazarene Legislator: an unfinished work

In Boreel's biography it has been said that Boreel worked on JNL for around 9 years. However, in the end he was not able to finish it, and the copy that Oldenburg and Boyle got from Serrarius was a work far from being complete. It can be supposed that during the writing Boreel was forced to face some difficulties that he was not able to solve. For instance, Oldenburg's reference to some «difficultates» in the letter he sent to Boreel in December 1666, seems to strengthen this hypothesis.

The JNL's manuscripts preserved among the Robert Boyle Papers consist of 567 *foli*, which are divided in three volumes. However, only in the first volume it is possible to find some chapters that would have been part of the treatise. In particular, here it is possible to find 17 chapters, for a total of 200 *foli*. The remaining parts of JNL are notes that Boreel took in order to enlarge on some arguments or topics of his treatise, or to make revisions to what he had already wrote. Furthermore, even though the 17 chapters of the first volume seem to be completed, they are not final drafts. From the notes in the other two volumes it can be easily understood that Boreel wanted to deeply change them. These are the reason why the notes to JNL are the most interesting part of Boreel's manuscript. From them it is possible to draw conclusions about the treatise's aim and the way in which Boreel had meant to pursue it.

There is no evidence to establish when Boreel wrote the various sections of the JNL. Just once he dated his notes, asserting that he wrote them starting from June 21, 1660.⁷³⁸ At first glance it seems that the three volumes are not in chronological order. However, there is no evidence enough either to prove such assertion with due certainty, nor to date the other JNL's sections. This is the reason why the JNL's analysis made in this section and in the followings, do not take into account when Boreel could have wrote the various notes. Furthermore, this analysis only summarizes a fundamental core of the ideas and reflections that Boreel would have made known in his finished work, without making reference to the notes where Boreel expressed

⁷³⁸ «Ad Tractatum Legislator. Revisum, ab 21 Junii, 1660. Notae». MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) ff. 2(r) – 12(r).

his desire to make minor changes or non-essential revisions to particular themes he took into account.

Despite these difficulties concerning the JNL manuscript, it is possible to give an account of the entire treatise and of the way in which Boreel wanted to arrange the series of argumentations that would have led to the JNL purpose. In fact, among its folios there are numerous index of the JNL chapters with the title of each one. Furthermore, Boreel wrote some summaries of his entire treatise, explaining how he wanted to develop his work and the argumentations he would have used in it. It is possible to find the most complete summary in the second volume, which is entitled «Ordo Tractatus Legislator». ⁷³⁹

It has been said more than once that the JNL aim is to prove that Christ is the universal Legislator of mankind, and thus that each man must accept and follow his Law. In order to achieve this purpose, Boreel believed that the first necessary step was to prove that the first books of the New Testament, that is, the four Gospels and the Acts, had been written by the four disciples of Christ, that they had written them in apostolic times, and that nothing had changed in the following centuries. In this way, Boreel would have proved the truth of these five books. From such proof he would have concluded that the prophecies and the miracles in these books had really occurred. However, Boreel would not have taken into account all the prophecies and miracles narrated in the four Gospels and in the Acts, but only the prophecies which had been fulfilled and the miracles which are described with enough circumstances to argue that they were really performed. Boreel would have argued that only a most powerful and wise cause could have made such prophecies and miracles. Since ordinary people, «mali genii», chance, and nature, have not the necessary power to cause such effects, Boreel would have proven that they must be ascribed to God.

From here, Boreel would have undertook the second necessary step to reach the JNL aim: to show that God had endowed Christ with divine authority. As a matter of fact, Boreel would have argued that through these

⁷³⁹ Ibid., (1th foliation) f. 1(r) – 3(v).

miracles «Deus Jesu Nazareno ejusque vitae et doctrinae fidem apud homines faceret», since it must be assumed that God's actions always have a purpose.⁷⁴⁰ Then, Boreel would have showed that God also had given «suum testimonium» to Christ through the remaining miracles and prophecies described in the New Testament, as well as through the introduction, the spreading, the preservation, and the defense of the Christian religion. After he had established these truths, Boreel would have proved the same things by referring to the other books of the New Testament.

From this first part of JNL Boreel would have drawn this conclusion: the New Testament is absolutely true and from these books it is possible to conclude that Christ was a true emissary of God. Then, he would have proceeded to the third necessary step to achieve the purpose of his treatise, that is, to prove that all people must follow Christ's Law. Boreel had thought to divide this proof in two parts. First, he would have taken into account Christ's Law per se. Then, he would have compared it with other laws which people usually refer to, such as «Lex conscientiae et naturae», «Lex ratiocinationis», «Lex Mosis et Prophetarum Hebraeorum», «Lex paganorum», «Muhamedi Lex», etc.⁷⁴¹ Through this third step Boreel would have reached the highest purpose of JNL, because he would have argued that «nullam unquam talem personam, ejus vitam, et doctrinam seu Legem, tam excellentem, vel fuisse, vel esse, vel futuram».⁷⁴²

In conclusion, Boreel believed that he had to develop his treatise in three major phases. First, he had to prove the truth of New Testament. Second,

⁷⁴⁰ Ibid., (1th foliation) f. 2(r).

⁷⁴¹ Ibid., (1th foliation) f. 2(v).

⁷⁴² Ibid. It has been asserted that in the JNL manuscript there are numerous notes in which Boreel makes changes to JNL index, or in which he adds new chapters to his manuscript. However, none of these notes makes essential changes to the fundamental core of the JNL here summarized. For the various indexes see: MS RB 1/12/1, (1th foliation) f. 2(r) – 6(v); MS RB 1/13/1, (1th foliation) f. 1(r) – 3(v); Ibid., (1th foliation) f. 4(r) – 5(v); Ibid., (2th foliation) f. 20(v) – 37(r); Ibid., (4th foliation) f. 1(r) – 3(v); notes 104, 109, 150, 282, 345, 365 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 16(v), 18(r), 26(r), 52(r), 64(r), 70(v). Notes 172 and 352 of the section entitled «Notae miscellaneae ad Tractatus Legislator. Primam partem generalem» are of particular interest. Here Boreel divides his treatise in two main parts. In the first, he would have made a comparison between Christ's Law and the laws of other legislators, while in the second part he would have compared the religion of apostolic times with the various sects of modern Christianity. In this way he could have confuted the modern confessions of faith and he would have shown that each man must live accordingly to Christ's Law. If Boreel had really developed this second part, it would have had strict connections with his other works. See: MS RB 1/15/1, ff. 31(v) e 67(r).

he had to establish that God endowed Christ, His greatest emissary, with divine authority, so that Christ's Law could have been regarded as God's Law. Finally, he had to show that mankind had to follow only Christ's Law. In order to prove this, Boreel had to examine this Law and to compare it with other laws that people usually follow.

Here it must be underlined that Boreel wrote JNL for two kind of people. As we will see in the in the following pages, Boreel wrote his treatise for common people, which are not able to understand rational argumentations, and for rational and learned men, which can use their natural reason to develop and to know rational arguments. It is clear that the first two steps, which are strictly tied, are meant to prove the JNL purpose to common people. If Boreel had been able to prove the truth of the New Testament, it would have followed that Christ was endowed with divine authority. As a matter of fact, once he had proved that the happenings described in these holy books really occurred, it would have been sufficient to quote all the passages from the Bible where it is evident that God has endowed Christ and his doctrine with His authority, in order to show that Christ is the only Legislator to mankind. On the other hand, to examine Christ's Law and to compare it with the Law of other legislators, was a step meant for rational people, who could not have been satisfied by the proof taken from the New Testament.

In the following pages Boreel's proof for the truth of New Testament is taken into account, while in the next chapters we will deal with the third step that Boreel had to make to achieve the JNL purpose.

The proof of the New Testament: a necessary step to show that Christ is the only Legislator of mankind

So, proving the truth of New Testament was the first necessary step that Boreel had to make to reach the JNL aim. However, in the following pages the particular arguments that Boreel wanted to use to prove such a truth are not examined. There are many folios in which Boreel deals with such proof, but an analysis of these arguments would not be useful either to the account of Boreel's thought, nor to study of JNL. On the contrary, here we focus on the kinds of argumentation that Boreel would have used to prove both the truth of the New Testament and the general goal of his treatise. From this analysis two major results follow. First, it can be understood why Boreel believed necessary to prove the truth of the Christian holy books, while he had never committed to such proof before. Second, some of the difficulties that Boreel was forced to face during the JNL writing are shown. This analysis mainly relies on a section entitled «De probatione veritatis librorum Novi Testamenti considerationes».⁷⁴³ This is not a random choice. In fact, in this section it is possible to find the most complete account of Boreel's opinions concerning the kinds of argumentation useful to achieve the JNL purpose.

Before going any further, it is necessary to establish a preliminary condition, otherwise the following analysis would be unclear. Although he had never dealt with this issue before, Boreel does not believe that people are equal. In some of the JNL notes, Boreel refers to an essential difference between two kinds of men. On the one hand, there are common people or «vulgus», who are not able to develop and to understand rational argumentations, because they have a poor degree of intellect. If they tried to use rational argumentations, they would fall in a perpetual «fluctuatio animi». On the other hand, there are learned men, who can develop and understand rational argumentations, because they have a higher degree of intellect.⁷⁴⁴

⁷⁴³ MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 1(r) – 21(r).

⁷⁴⁴ See: MS RB 11/13/1, (2th foliation) ff. 2(r), 9(v) e 10(r); notes 153, 228 e 309 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 27(v), 43(v), 55(v); MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) fol. 11(r). Here I have not referred to further differences that Boreel establishes among people. For instance, in note 320 of the section «Notae miscellaneae ad Tractatus Legislator. Primam partem generalem», Boreel states that there are people who have «parvi et mediocris intellectus et iudicii», people who have «subtilis intellectus et iudicii» but who did not make

Since Boreel intended to prove to all people that Christ is the only legislator they had to follow, and since he believed there were men who were not able to understand all kinds of argumentation, he was forced to find a «quoddam principium» which he could have based the entire JNL's proof upon, a *principium* that common people could have understood too.⁷⁴⁵ This is the reason why he had to examine the various kinds of argumentation that he could have used in the JNL.⁷⁴⁶

Boreel examines five *modos probandi* that he could have used to prove the JNL purpose to all man.⁷⁴⁷

The first is based upon «*insita argumenta non-artificialia autoritativa*»,⁷⁴⁸ that is, argumentations that are drawn from the passages of the New Testament in which God's action is evident. Boreel divides these arguments in «*autoritativa realia*»,⁷⁴⁹ that is, prophecies and miracles, and in

any kind of studies, and people who have «*subtilis intellectus et iudicii, qui studiis et literaturae operam dederunt*». It is possible to find the same kind of assertions in the following note 321. However, here it is sufficient to show that Boreel believes in the existence of people unable to understand rational argumentations and of people able to do it. For notes 320 and 321, see: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 57(r) e 58(r).

⁷⁴⁵ «*Quandoquidem verò, hic, de talis rei probatione agitur, quae omnes homines concernit; ac inter omnes homine, longè major numerus sit eorum, qui mediocris aut parvi ingenii et iudicii sunt, quorum praecipuè in gratiam haec probatio instituitur; idcirco, probationi huic tale quoddam principium quaerendum erit, quod facile sit intellectu; ac proinde, et a mediocris et a parvi ingenii et iudicii homine, probe percipi possit: atque, unà cum facilitate sua, validissimè probet*». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) f. 11(r).

⁷⁴⁶ *Examinandi igitur erunt omnes hi probandi modi; ut principium istud facile perceptu, ac validissimè probans, inveniri; atque, ad hunc Tractatum, tanquam basis, cui caetera superstruantur ac innitantur, seligi et adhiberi queat*. Ibid., (4th foliation) f. 11(v).

⁷⁴⁷ This specification is necessary, because Boreel briefly discusses also a way to prove that Christ is the only legislator of mankind to each man. In short, this proof consists in following the precepts of the New Testament. If someone practiced all the precepts of the Christian religion, Boreel argues, he would easily understand that Christ is the only legislator of mankind and that his religion is truly divine. Here, two aspects regarding this proof must be underlined. First, Boreel does not propose a kind of “personal” proof for the Christian religion, which is different for each believer, but rather one kind of proof that is valid for all believers and that they could achieve, if they followed Christ's precepts. Second, this kind of proof is valid only for the one who follows Christ's precepts. In other words, if someone understood that Christ is the only legislator of mankind by following his doctrine, he would not be able to prove such thing to other people, because his understanding would follow from his practical experience. See: notes 26, 46, and 51, in MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 8(r), 10(v), and 11(v).

⁷⁴⁸ Ibid., (4th foliation) f. 8(v).

⁷⁴⁹ «*Autoritativa Realia; sunt, propheticae praedictiones et miracula*». Ibid. Here Boreel does not refer to the different kinds of prophecy and miracle described in the New Testament. In other passages of the JNL Boreel argues that there are two kinds of prophecies and miracles. On the one hand, there are prophecies that were really fulfilled and miracles that surely occurred, because they are described with enough circumstances to make everyone believe in them. On the other hand, there are prophecies and miracles which have not such characteristics. Since here Boreel does not mention these two kinds of prophecies

«authoritativa testimonialia», that is, those passages from which it can be concluded that God had endowed Christ with divine authority.⁷⁵⁰

The second *modus probandi* consists in «argumenta insita non-artificialia non-authoritativa», which are divided in «testimonialia» and «allegativa».⁷⁵¹ Boreel identifies the first with passages of the Bible from which it can be concluded that Christ is the legislator of mankind and that his Law has divine origins, without referring to God's action. On the other hand, «allegativa» arguments are «ista; quae in libris Novi Testamenti allegantur ex Ethnicis scriptoribus; ut, poetis; Arato, Act. XVII. 25; Menandro, 1Cor. XV. 33; Epimenide, Tit. 1.12».⁷⁵²

The third sort of argumentation consists of «argumenta Novo Testamento insita artificialia», which are «ratiocinativa». In short, they consist of rational deductions from the introduction, spreading, conservation, and defense of Christ's doctrine, from the properties and effects of his life and doctrine, from the virtues of his disciples and ministers, etc.⁷⁵³

Then, there are the «argumenta exotica; quae sunt ista, quae, ad probandum, aliunde quam ex Libris Novi Testamenti adducuntur»,⁷⁵⁴ which in turn are divided in «non-artificialia» and «artificialia». The first are «testimonia sive allegationes» from either Christian or Pagan authors, in which it is possible to find references to Christ, to his life, and to his doctrine.⁷⁵⁵ On the other hand, the arguments «exotica artificialia» are «argumenta ratiocinativa quae, ad jesum nazarenum legislatorem aliis hominibus probandum, educuntur ex naturalibus rationibus».⁷⁵⁶

and miracles, it must be assumed that the arguments «authoritative realia» consist of both sorts. As for the differences among prophecies and miracles, see: MS RB 1/13/1, (3th foliation) ff. 10(r) – 14(v); notes 14, 32, 44, 48, 49, 73, 74, 341, 388, 395, in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 2(r), 6(r), 7(r), 8(r), 11(r-v), 63(r), 80(v), 85(r).

⁷⁵⁰ MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation), f. 8(v). Here Boreel also makes a list of passages of the New Testament that can be regarded as arguments «authoritativa testimonialia».

⁷⁵¹ Ibid.

⁷⁵² Ibid., f. 9(r).

⁷⁵³ Ibid.

⁷⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁵⁶ JNL III, (4th foliation) fol. 9(v). Boreel asserts that there are 8 kinds of rational and natural argumentations. First, it is possible to follow the examples of Thomas Aquinas, Raimundus Sabundus, Ramon Llull, Alexander Gil, and Philippe de Morany, who had tried to prove the Christian religion through *naturales rationes*. Second, Boreel argues that Christ and his religion can be proven «per modum istum τὸ omnino nil, et τὸ quid, cui postea

After Boreel has shown the five kinds of *argumenta* that can be used in his treatise, he starts to examine which one could guarantee that *principium* which both common people and learned men could understand.⁷⁵⁷

First, no one can deny that both the *argumenta exotica artificialia* and the *argumenta exotica non-artificialia* cannot be helpful to achieve this *principium*. Boreel objected that the common people cannot understand the first kind of argumentation, because they consist in rational reasoning and deductions through *naturalibus rationibus*.⁷⁵⁸ He made a similar objection against the *argumenta exotica non-artificialia*. In fact, Boreel argues,

adjiciatur, dari debere legem autoritativam». It is evident that Boreel refers to a proof that he had conceived, because in the following lines he adds: «prout, hoc modo, scripsisti Legem Naturalem Rationalem; et, necessitatem Legis Autoritativae, probasti». Unfortunately, this writing is lost, but it is most likely that such proof was similar to the demonstration of God's existence in PR. Third, it is possible to prove the Christian religion through «modo isto, quo archiepiscopus ille, cui cognomen, a capite fontium, id tentavit, in libro quem novam fidei illustrationem vocat». I was not able to unravel Boreel's reference. Fourth, it is possible to rationally prove God's nature and attributes, and then to argue that Christ religion agree with God's nature more than all other religions. Fifth, it is possible to establish the precepts through which each man can achieve a nature similar to God, and to show that Christ's precepts are the best means to achieve such nature. Sixth, it is possible to prove the Christian religion through God's creation. Seventh, by proving through *naturalibus rationibus* the nature of the «partium integrantium Legis a Deo ortum habentis; et, Legis Jesu Nazareni, prae aliis omnibus Legibus, quoad partes illas, praestantiam». Finally, the Christian religion can be proved by establishing the general bases of a true religion, and by applying them to Christ's doctrine, so that it could be shown that his religion is far superior to all others. See: *Ibid.*, fol. 10(r-v).

⁷⁵⁷ Here it must be underlined that Boreel has started his explanation by discussing the *modos probandi*, but then he takes into account only the different kinds of *argumenta*. However, it can be easily argued that he refers to the same things. For instance, in note 321 of the section «Notae miscellaneae ad Tractatus Legislatro, Primam Partem Generalem», at first Boreel divides the different sorts of *argumenta* and then starts discussing about the *modi probandi*. So, it can be concluded that with the words «modus probandi» Boreel refers to the actual use of the different kinds of argumentation. So, the «modus autoritativus» refers to the use of «insita argumenta non-artificialia autoritativa», while the «modus ratiocinativus» consists in using both «argumenta Novo Testamento insita artificialia» and «exotica artificialia». See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 58(r).

⁷⁵⁸ MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 12(r-v). If common people tried to make use of this kind of arguments, they would fall in the «perpetuae fluctuationi de Religione», because ««a subtiliori rationatione, priora ipsis adimi semper poterunt; utpote, qui idonei non sint, ad debite de ratiociniis istis judicandum; unde eveniet, ut a posteriore ratiocinatione semper in triumphum ducantur: atque ita per omnem vitam, hac procedendi ratione, fluctuari sint». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) fol. 14(v). In some notes Boreel stresses that the *vulgus* cannot understand any kind of philosophical argumentation. For instance, in note 228 of the section entitled «Notae miscellaneae ad Tractatus Legislatro, Primam Partem Generalem», he writes: «vulgus, rationes Scepticorum, Atheorum, Deistarum et Philosophorum, quibus hi nituntur in opinionibus suis sive proponendis et asserendis, sive adversus objectiones vindicandis ac defendendis, capere non potest; ac proinde, non debere se sinere ab iis quae capere potest divelli per ratiocinia quae non capit». Furthermore, in note 360 of the same section, Boreel asserts that the «revelatio seu Lex autoritativa» is absolutely necessary, because of the «homines parvi ingenii et judicii qui Cartesianorum ratiocinationes capere nequeunt». For them it is easier «credere, quam ratiocinari». See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 42(v) and 68(v).

common people do not know the languages used by Christian and Pagan authors. So, they cannot peruse their writings.⁷⁵⁹

Moreover, neither the *argumenta insita artificialia*, nor the *argumenta insita non-artificialia non-authoritativa* can be used to find the *principium* which JNL can rely on. Boreel makes two major objections against the first kind of arguments. On the one hand, the *argumenta insita artificialia* consist of rational conclusions drawn from written accounts of the New Testament. However, common people cannot be sure of these accounts, because they did not know if these events really occurred. On the other hand, other religions too can give similar accounts concerning their founder and their origins. So, from the passages of the New Testament a *principium* valid only for the Christian religion cannot be concluded.⁷⁶⁰ Boreel makes the same objections against the *argumenta insita non-artificialia non-authoritativa testimonialia*.⁷⁶¹ As for the *allegativa*, he again asserts that common people cannot understand them, because Pagan writers used *subtilibus ratiociniis*.⁷⁶²

Therefore, all that remains is to examine the *insita argumenta non-artificialia authoritativa*, which were divided in *realia* and *testimonialia*. As for the latter, Boreel makes the same kinds of objections he had already made against the other sorts of arguments. First, he says that the *insita argumenta non-artificialia authoritativa testimonialia* are not true per se, but they must be proven. Second, Boreel argues, *aliarum Legum scriptores* can adduce this kind of arguments too.⁷⁶³

Furthermore, he makes the same objections against the *argumenta authoritativa realia*, that is, against the passages in which it is possible to find the prophecies and the miracles that God performed through Christ and his

⁷⁵⁹ MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 12(r-v).

⁷⁶⁰ Ibid., ff. 14(v) – 15(v).

⁷⁶¹ Ibid., ff. 16(r-v).

⁷⁶² Ibid., f. 16(r).

⁷⁶³ «ex quibus cerni potest, scriptoris, quà hominis, assertum, de hisce testantibus, eorumque testimoniis, non esse ἀυτόπιζον; sed, aliunde constare debere, tales et talia esse; et, reverà, testimonium tale perhibuisse. Quare, nudum assertum scriptoris, de hisce rebus eorumque testimoniis, qua simpliciter assertum, non potest hominibus suppeditare principium istud validissimè probans; quia aliarum Legum scriptores, similia pro personis et rebus suis testimonia adducunt; neque tamen ideò, ab iis qui legibus istis addictis non sunt, testimonia ista pro veris recipiuntur atque admittuntur; idque hanc ob causam, quia aliquid praecedere oportet, quo homo certus sit, et res tales testantes reverà esse, et tale illas testimonium perhibuisse; quod utique aliunde constare debet». Ibid., f. 17(v).

disciples. However, here Boreel tries to rescue this kind of arguments. If it was possible to prove that these prophecies and miracles really occurred as the authors of the New Testament had written, Boreel asserts, it would be possible to argue that there is a cause of these prophecies and miracles. It is evident that this cause cannot but be God. Furthermore, if it was proved that God had endowed someone with His authority through these prophecies and miracles, so that each man could have rightly follow this man in all the *statibus* of human life, it would be possible to argue that everyone can be sure about the doctrine of this men. So, if it was proved that God had chosen as His *actuaries* the same people that had written the New Testament's books, that these people are those usually accepted by all Christians, and that nothing has changed in these books during the centuries, in the end it would be possible to find that *principium* which he was looking for, that is, «Authoritativa, veri Dei, ac voluntatis suae, revelatio; sive Autoritas Dei, consilium ac voluntatem suam de hominibus salvandis, revelantis».⁷⁶⁴

In short, by proving the truth of the New Testament to common people, Boreel would have deduced God's authority from the accounts of God's miracles and prophecies, as the *principium* to achieve the JNL purpose. As a matter of fact, Boreel argues, God's authority is a «*principium intellectu facile, et validissimè probans, quò se, tanquam scuto tutissimo, adversus omnes adverariorum insultus, tueri poterunt*».⁷⁶⁵ Nothing can prove that God

⁷⁶⁴ «Si verò constare possit, talia quae Novi Testamenti scriptores narrant, tam propheticas praedictiones quam Miracula, reverà sic ut narrant praedicta et impleta, ac reverà perpetrata fuisse; hinc, argui poterit, causam aliquam esse debere, quae talia et praedixerint et perpetravit. Quandoquidem verò, talia posse praedicere, summam potentiam, ac talia posse perpetrare, summam potentiam arguit; utique, sapientiam ac potentiam istam esse, hinc constare potest; et quia summa est, nonnisi unica erit; quia, duorum summorum, neutrum, summum est; deesset enim eorum singulis, id, quo alterum summum esset. Quòd si verò, summum istud per praedictiones istas et miracula, testimonium alicui perhibuisse, probari queat, quo testetur, velle se, ut istum, cui testimonium istum perhibuit, in omnibus quoad Religionem omnesque reliquos vitae status, homines sequantur; nil restat, quàm ut de ejus doctrina certi fieri queant: quem in finem, si probari possit, summum istud numen, sibi tanquam actuarios selegisse, qui ista et praedicerent et conscriberent; ac, in scriptis istis, postquam publicata fuerunt, nihil quoad rei substantiam attinet, mutatum demptum vel additum fuisse; a talibus itidem, quorum nomen praeferunt, haec scripta esse: hinc, principium istud, hominibus mediocris aut parvi ingenii et judicii, facilè perceptum, et validissimè probans, suppeditari poterit; quod est, supremum omnium mediatorem ac creatorem Deus Opt. Max., consilium suum ac voluntatem suam de salvandis hominibus, libris istis Novi Testamenti proposuisse, ac declarasse; ita, ut unicum verae Religionis principium, sit, Authoritativa, veri Dei, ac voluntatis suae, revelatio; sive, Autoritas Dei, consilium ac voluntatem suam de hominibus salvandis, revelantis». Ibid., ff. 18(r-v).

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid., f. 19(r).

had endowed Christ with divine authority better than His prophecies and miracles.⁷⁶⁶

This is the reason why Boreel had to prove the truth of the New Testament, in order to achieve the JNL purpose. As a matter of fact, after arguing that God's authority is the best means to prove that Christ is the only legislator of mankind, Boreel raises a few objections. First, how can it be possible to prove to common people that the prophecies of the New Testament were foretold in apostolic times, and that the miracles performed by Christ and his disciples really occurred? Second, how can it be possible to prove to common people that the historical events concerning the lives of Christ and of his disciples really occurred as the writers of the New Testament had narrated? There are some people who believe that the Christian holy books were written after those prophecies and miracles occurred, when all their witnesses were already dead. Moreover, there are some people who believe that these books were not written by Christ's disciples in apostolic times, and that they were corrupted during the centuries.⁷⁶⁷

Therefore, the first step that Boreel had to make to achieve the JNL purpose was to prove the truth of the New Testament. Boreel divided this proof in three parts. First, he had to establish that the four Gospels and the Acts were written in apostolic times. Second, he had to prove that their

⁷⁶⁶ Boreel makes similar assertions in other notes of JNL. For instance, since Christ's religion is based on God's authority, not on rational arguments, otherwise common people could not have understood it, Boreel argues that «*palmarium ejus probandae argumentum, ducetur ab autoritate, quam per prophetias et miracula, evincente eventu et indicis munita, nanscitur*». Furthermore, he also wrote: «*Nihil facit Autoritative argumentum, quam prophetiae, hodierno eventu comprobatae; et, miracula, indicis et circumstantiis suis munita*». See: notes 153 and 391 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 27(v) e 83(r).

⁷⁶⁷ «*Obiici verò posset, bene quidem esse, quòd homines ad Divinam Autoritatem, quoad Religionis principium, statim perducantur, at hoc, sua difficultate non carere; quomodo enim, hominibus Mediocris aut parvi ingenii, probari poterit, prophetias istas, tum temporis, quo libri Novi Testamenti indicant, fuisse praedictas; et, miracula ista, reverà perpetrata fuisse; nam, dicitur, libros istos Novi Testamenti, scriptos ac publicatos fuisse, postquam res contigisse viderunt, de quibus deinde prophetias fecerint; ac, libros istos scriptos et publicatos esse, quum nulli in vivis essent qui contrarium testimonium de ibi recitatis miraculis perhibere possent. item, libros istos non esse scriptos ab iis quorum nomen praeferunt; sed, nomina ista postmodum addita fuisse, ut libris istis dignitatem aliquam conciliarent; adhaec, libros istos postquam scripti et publicati fuerunt, in multis corruptos, mutatos, et mutilatos esse; [...] praeterea, unde mediocris aut parvi ingenii hominibus probabitur, Historiam Doctrinae et Vitae Jesu, ex vero fuisse conscriptam; ut et, reliqua Historica, quae libris istis narrantur*». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) f. 19(v).

authors were Christ's disciples. Finally, he had to show that these five books had not been corrupted during the centuries, at least «quoad rei substantiam». In this way, he would have proved the truth of the four Gospels and of the Acts, and thus that God's prophecies and miracles described in these books had really occurred. From here he would have established the same things for the other books of the New Testament. So, finally he could have argued that God endowed Christ with divine authority and he could have used this assertion to achieve the purpose of this treatise.⁷⁶⁸

However, here an objection can rightly be raised. How can it be proved to common people that the New Testament is true? Boreel was aware of such a problem and he was forced to assert that the *vulgus* would have needed «multo studio». Furthermore, he affirmed that it would have been necessary to choose arguments suitable for their understanding. However, he believed that it would have been possible to prove such a truth to common people, because the New Testament was precisely written for this kind of people.⁷⁶⁹

However, it is evident that Boreel was not able solve a difficulty that is strictly tied with his own ideas. As a matter of fact, he argues that common

⁷⁶⁸ «Respondetur. Quòd, primò manifestè constare debeat, libros istos quinque priores, publicatos fuisse aetate Jesu Nazareni; quia, inter alia, nemo aliud tempus publicatorum istorum librorum prodicere velet; quòd facile fieri posset, si hi libri postea publicati fuissent; nam, de fraude ista, mentio apud aliquos, sive Christianos, sive Judaeos, sive Arabes, sive paganos, facta fuisset, atque extaret in ipsorum libris, nempe, quòd tanto tempore post, talia, nomine Jesu Nazareni, ac tanquam ejus Legem, publicassent; quod tamen scriptum fuisse, nusquam legitur. Hoc utique probate, per se sequuntur duo sequentia capita, ac per se patent; nempe, quòd scripti sint isti libri, ab iis quorum nomen praeferunt; et, quòd postea, nil in iis quoad rei substantiam mutatum sit; nam, a quo, et a qua aetate in omnibus simul exemplaribus id fieri potuerit, a nemine probari vel ostendi potest. quibus tribus capitibus sartis tectis, prophetiae istae quarum eventum nunc cernimus, comprobantur, tanto ante tempore, fuisse praedictae; miracula itidem, tunc fuisse perpetrata; utpote, quum tot circumstantiis atque indiciis muniantur, ut impossibile sit talia falsa esse; quia, a viventibus, tam voce quàm scripto refutari potuissent. quibus ita se habentibus, tunc probandum erit, talia a nemine fieri potuisse quàm a sapientissimo ac potentissimo; qui, ad certum finem quum omnia faciat, utique prophetias istas et miracula frustra perpetrare esse, dici non potest; Testantur autem scriptores isti, qui Jesu Nazareni aetate vixerunt, perpetrata ista fuisse ad testimonium perhibendum Jesu Nazareno, vitae ejus ac doctrinae». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 20(r-v).

⁷⁶⁹ «Fatendum quidem interea est, ut de hisce hactenus dictis, hominibus mediocrius aut parvi ingenii ac judicii manifeste constet, opus esse multo studio, et materiarum ad id idonearum selectu, quae captui eorum respondeant; nihilominus tamen, haec illis sic constare posse, ut probè ea sint percepturi, dubitandum non est; ad ipsos enim praecipuè, Christiana Religio ac consequenter, etiam munimenta ejus pertinent. Quare, despondendus animus non est» MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) f. 20(v).

people could not understand rational argumentations, and that they could not use proofs based on the New Testament, if these books are not proved through God's authority. However, nothing can be based upon God's authority until the truth of the New Testament is not proven. Therefore, here Boreel was in front of a vicious circle that in the end he was not able to solve.

Chapter IV: The Rational fundamentals of Christian religion

The last chapter described that Boreel wanted to develop the JNL in three main phases: one to prove the truth of the New Testament, one to show that Christ and his doctrine have divine authority, and the last to demonstrate that the Law of Christ is the only one that all people must follow. So, after discussing Boreel's reasons and difficulties in demonstrating the truth of Scriptures, this chapter takes into considerations Christ's Law and its rationality.

The first paragraph shows that during the 16th and 17th centuries the idea concerning the rationality of Christian religion had been significantly developed by European thinkers, by taking into account some authors who discussed such subject in their works and who elaborate a minimum creed of Christianity that all people could have shared. In particular, not only scholars from the Collegiant movement or friends to Boreel were analyzed, but also people from the Remonstrant movement and authors of the 16th century, like Castellio and Coornhert, who had already developed such ideas. Furthermore, there is a brief analysis of Jean Bodin's manuscript, «Colloquium Heptaplormeres», since Boreel most likely read it. The second and the third paragraphs deals with the JNL. As it has been already said, the manuscript preserved is not a finished work. This is the reason why there are only few passages concerning the way in which Boreel would have proven that all people must follow Christ's Law. However, in these paragraphs it is argued that the core of such demonstration was to prove that Christ's Law consists of some rational fundamental doctrines, which all people could agree on. In fact, if Boreel had been able to make such proof, it would have been easier to show that Christ's Law is superior to all human law and that all people could follow it.

Truths necessities and non-necessaries to salvation: the centrality of “communia fundamentalia” of Christianity.

In the 16th and 17th centuries some thinkers began to examine rationality in Christian Religion. Most of these people did not believe that natural reason could have proven and understood all aspects of Christianity. However, they argued that at least some Christian doctrines are rational, that is, such that human intellect could grasp them and prove their truth without the assistance of God’s revelation. This growing interest in Christian doctrines that do not need God’s revelation to be understood is often linked to the elaboration of a minimum creed that all Christian could have shared. These doctrines were often called the «communia fundamentalia» of Christianity and some people believed that it would have been possible to reunite all Christians through them, regardless of their particular confessions of faith. Moreover, the idea of a minimum creed of Christian religion is certainly tied to the difference many authors made between necessary and unnecessary doctrines to salvation, since the first ones must be common to all Christians, otherwise they could not attain salvation. Some of these authors tried to prove that this minimum creed is rational, so that not only Christians, but all people could accept it. Boreel was one of them.

From a practical point of view, the «communia fundamentalia» were considered as a means to unify all Christians. This is the way in which the Rijnsburg movement made use of such doctrines. The Collegiants believed that the faith in God, in Christ as savior of mankind, and in the Scriptures as true Word of God, was the fundamentals which all Christian agreed on. All the other dogmas and doctrines had to be considered *adiaphora*, that is, indifferent to a true Christian life, because unnecessary to salvation. This is the reason why in their meetings the Collegiants did not rely on ceremonies or confessions of faith. For instance, it is true that they practiced immersion baptism in Rijnsburg, but such a ceremony was not regarded as necessary to joins the “Collegiant sect”. They considered it as a symbol, through which the

believer could express his desire of becoming part of the Universal Church of God.⁷⁷⁰

Even the Dutch *doopsgezinde* communities had relied on the existence of fundamental doctrines in order to overcome the differences among themselves. On May 6, 1668, a document to ratify their union had been read in the two communities «Het Lam» and «Bij den Toren», entitled «Ontwerp van voorslag tot bevredigin». The authors of such work argued that in the «hoofdzaken van het geloven» there was no difference between the two congregations: customs and beliefs that distinguished them were not important enough to prevent their union.⁷⁷¹

The «*communia fundamentalia*» of Christianity were conceived by many Collegiant authors on the second half of the 17th century, who also argued in favor of the rationality of these doctrines. Previously it has been shown that Bredenburg argues the importance of a universal tolerance in all matters unnecessary to salvation in «Een praetje over tafel». In particular, he regards the faith on Christ as savior as the only fundamental doctrine of Christianity: all other dogmas are indifferent to a true Christian life.⁷⁷²

In the first part of «Den filosofherenden boer», Stol shows the significant role of reason in religious matters. By rejecting the assertions of a Cartesian philosopher, the Collegiant farmer argues that human reason is able to understand what doctrine is most to the Scriptures, in which God's revelation is recorded. In other words, he states that each individual can use his natural reason to understand religious matters through the Scriptures, even without formal education, because religion is rational by nature.

However, it should be underlined that in this work reason is always subdue to the divine revelation of the Scriptures and thus it cannot reach the truth in religious matters without them. This can be easily concluded from the «boer»'s replies to the demonstrations of the existence of God given by the philosopher. Moreover, it can be concluded from the farmer's ideas regarding the moral doctrine of Christian religion: while the philosopher states that it is

⁷⁷⁰ Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), p. 117.

⁷⁷¹ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 110-111.

⁷⁷² Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233), pp. 123-124.

possible to live a moral life through natural reason, the farmer argues that moral precepts are not innate and they are contrary to human nature. So, these precepts cannot be based on mankind's natural inclinations, but only on the supernatural rewards promised by God's revelation. In short, God revealed all that is necessary to lead a moral life in the Scriptures: natural reason can only comprehend this revelation.⁷⁷³

Oudaen expressed similar ideas. In «Overwegginge eeniger grondstellingen», he criticizes the meddling of civil power in religious matters and the spiritual corruption of existing churches. Furthermore, he argues that there are no gifts of the Holy Spirit in modern time and this that ministers have no divine authority. Therefore, given this condition of the Church, Oudaen claim that everyone must necessarily rely on reason in religious matters. He does not deny that God's revelation is recorded in the Scriptures and does not undervalued such a revelation, but nonetheless he argues that it is possible to fully understand the Bible only by using natural reason and by rejecting external authorities. This is the only way to reach the truth in religious matters in a world devoid of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Oudaen believes that reason is a gift from God and that it provided every man with the ability to strictly judge everything. So, even though he does not question the authority of the Scriptures regarding the truth of religious matters, and even though he considers God's precepts in the Bible sufficient to salvation, Oudaen regards natural reason as the only means to properly interpret the Scriptures. In addition, he also acknowledges the existence of a minimum common creed, since he identifies true Christians with those people who believe in Christ as son of God and savior of mankind.⁷⁷⁴

Finally, among the Collegiant authors Jan Claesen Backer van Grouw must be mentioned. In the October 1691, answered to a question raised by Adriaan Swartepaard, asking if the Colleges were able to maintain unity among Christians. Backer van Grouw replied that such a unity cannot be achieved and maintained by adopting a particular confession of faith, which is contrary to the toleration of different opinions. Such a unity can be

⁷⁷³ Ivi, pp. 150-154.

⁷⁷⁴ Ivi, pp. 120-122.

only achieved and maintained by focusing attention on what is necessary to salvation, that is, the faith in God and in his son Jesus Christ. By accepting these two doctrines as the fundamentals of Christian religion, it would be finally possible to reach toleration and harmony among all confessions of faith.⁷⁷⁵

Among Boreel's friends, Galenus must be taken into account, since he discuss the necessary and unnecessary doctrines to salvation in some of his works. In the «Aenspraeck aen den Leser» of «Nader verklaringe XIX artikelen», Galenus states that the doctrines necessary to salvation are clearly expressed in the Scriptures and thus Christians do not need writings or preaching of other people to understand what is required to attain salvation. The moral example of Christ and of his disciples is the rule and the guide each believer must follow.⁷⁷⁶ He made similar assertions in the «Anleyding tot de kennis van de christelyke godsdienst», published in 1677.⁷⁷⁷ Here Galenus affirms that Christ taught his doctrines so that people could participate to divine nature, by practising obedience and love. Galenus distinguishes between the «opdrachten», which Christ ordered to his disciples, and the «hulpmiddelen» to obtain salvation. All external ceremonies, such as the Infant Baptims and «Avondamaal», must be regarded as «hulpmiddelen».⁷⁷⁸

In some of the works he published at the end of 17th century, Galenus again refers to the difference between necessary and unnecessary doctrines to attain salvation. In particular, he argues that it would be possible to unite all Christianity through the first ones, while all people capable of using their reason and willing to follow God's commands could comprehend the «hoofdzaken» of the Holy Scriptures. In fact, every Christian can find the suitable means to understand Christ's doctrine by contemplating his life, while he can acknowledge that the most significant part of Christian beliefs is the «apostolische geloofsbelijdenis»: anyone must follow these twelve

⁷⁷⁵ Van Slee, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten* (see above, n. 25), pp. 278-279.

⁷⁷⁶ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 64.

⁷⁷⁷ Galenus Abrahamsz, *Anleyding tot de kennis van de christelyke godsdienst, by wijze van vragen, en antwoorden, tot onderwijs der jeugt. 't samen-gesteld, door Galenus Abrahamsz. Met toestemming, en uyt de name, van sijn mede-dienaren*, Amsterdam, 1677.

⁷⁷⁸ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 125-126.

articles, but at the same time he is free to have his own opinion on the other dogmas.⁷⁷⁹

The same ideas concerning the rationality of Christian religion, its «*fundamentalia communia*», and the difference between necessary and unnecessary truth, can also be found in non-Collegiants author. For instance, the Dutch alchemist Henricus Appelius, who were one of the members of the Hartlib Circle, in a letter dated 1642 wrote that divisions among Christians are mostly founded on prejudices, since most people do not really know the opinions held by the members of other sects or confessions. because they base their judgment on books and teachings of other people. On the contrary, if every man could learn to know his neighbor, they could understand that their hearts and souls are not divided, because they agree on the fundamental principles and doctrines of their religion.⁷⁸⁰

In the same period, the Mennonite Pieter Jansz Moyer, serving as «*leraar*» in Leiden since 1642, asserted that even the Scriptures must be judged by men, because the «*beneficial geloof*» certainly originates from the word of God, but not «*zonder berading an bestemming*» of people. So, he denied the scriptural approach to the Bible as means to attain salvation: only faith in God can lead to salvation, not a mere scriptural hermeneutic. In particular Moyer distinguishes «*de noodzakelijke van de nuttige geloofskennis*» and affirms that a practical religious life is much more important than external ceremonies is possible because men can follow God's commandments. Meihuizen argues that these ideas are very similar to the ones that later Galenus conceived.⁷⁸¹

At the beginning of the 17th century, by further processing the ideas of Arminio, the Remonstrant movement criticized theological speculations, and advocated the importance of a moral life and toleration among Christians. After examining the birth of the Remonstrant movement and its controversy with the Reformed Church, Kolakowski concludes that the Reformation was considered by Remonstrant people as a criticism of theological disputes and

⁷⁷⁹ Ivi, pp. 174-177.

⁷⁸⁰ Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 109.

⁷⁸¹ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), pp. 28 e 33.

that they pursue a reform of costumes, politics, and morality. Furthermore, they believed that people could return to freedom and simplicity of apostolic times, without confessional constraints or intolerance, through the same Reformation. This is the only way to fully understand the weight of the accusations they moved to the Reformed Church. Arminian authors looked upon religion as a matter of costumes and morality and this is the reason why they lessened Christian religion to simpler doctrines, which every Christian could accepted without additional explanations.⁷⁸²

To confirm his statements, Kolakowski quoted the speech that Episcopius, one of the most important Remonstrant leaders, made to f his students before going to the synod of Dordrecht. Episcopius asserted that it was necessary to make use of the simple language of the apostles in religious matters, so that every Christian could understand the preaching of the Gospel, and to delete any philosophical speculation conceived by schools and academies. «Quant à moi», Episcopius says, «étant donné que toutes les vérités ne sont pas également nécessaires, je me suis uniquement efforcé de faire pénétrer celles qui le sont, tout en expliquant pourtant tous le passages qui peuvent contribuer a leur compréhension correcte».⁷⁸³ As Erasmo and the authors inspired by him, Episcopius believed that a non-philosophical religion is a practical one, which consists of simple rules to lead a true Christian life.⁷⁸⁴

A Remonstrant document written on March 1, 1617, divided in eighteen points, proves that at the beginning the Remonstrants embraced many fundamental ideas later resumed by Boreel and the Collegiants. The fundamentals of this document are the following: the civil power has supreme authority over public religion; the catechism of the Church must be mandatory only if conforms to the Scripture and if can be modified to pursue such a conformity; anyone can freely express his religious opinion in public, as long as he does not lead the faith of other people to confusion and as long as he practices mutual love and brotherliness; heretics never deserve death

⁷⁸² Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église* (see above, n. 7), p. 81.

⁷⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 82.

⁷⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

penalty.⁷⁸⁵ Because of this document, Voogt argues that the purpose of the Remonstrant movement was a «latitudinarian, doctrinally inclusive church», characterized by the saying «Unity in what is necessary / Freedom in what is unnecessary / In both Love». It is very surprising that shortly after these same ideas advocated by the Remonstrants became the cause of the Collegiant breaking off.⁷⁸⁶

Anyhow, after the leader who sought refuge abroad reorganized the Remonstrant movement during the 1620s, some of their first doctrines were questioned. For instance, among the doctrines established in 1624, there was the division between necessary and unnecessary dogmas to salvation. As a consequence, religious toleration should be only practiced in the latter, because all believers must agree on the doctrines necessary to salvation and no one can question them. These doctrines would constitute the confession of faith of the Remonstrant movement.⁷⁸⁷

As for the 16th, two of the main sources of the ideas held by the Collegiant movement and Boreel must be taken into consideration: Castellio and Coornhert.

After receiving a series of attacks by Calvino and his followers, and also a letter of accusation by Philip Melancthon, in 1558 Castellio wrote the «Harpago, sive defensio ad authorem libri, cui titulus est, Calumniae nebulonis».⁷⁸⁸ In the attachment of this work, Castellio pleaded for mutual toleration, by arguing that Christians could live in harmony through the commandments of the Bible, even if they held different opinions on some doctrinal matters. Against his adversaries, Castellio claims the same freedom of speech he grants to others, saying that it is wrong to judge people holding different ideas as heretics or blasphemous. He says: «In the essential points of religion, I am not in dispute with you; I wish to serve the same religion as you, and it is only in certain matters of interpretation that I (with many believers) do not hold with you». Castellio recognizes that anyone could made

⁷⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 83-84.

⁷⁸⁶ Voogt, *Anyone who can read* (see above, n. 503), pp. 410-411.

⁷⁸⁷ Kolakowski, *Chrétien sans église* (see above, n. 7), p. 85.

⁷⁸⁸ This work was published posthumous in 1578, but was spread in manuscript form while Castellio was still alive. To fully understand the reasons that lead to the writing of such a word, see: Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, n. 627), pp. 144-146.

mistakes and thus he asks his opponents for the «Christian duty to love our neighbor».⁷⁸⁹

These first statements regarding the existence of the «*communia fundamentalia*» of Christian religion, which mutual toleration must be based on, were resumed and developed in «*De arte dubitandi et confidendi, ignorandi et sciendi*».⁷⁹⁰ Here, Castellio states that the fundamental doctrines of Christian religion are imparted to all people. These doctrines are the same that are clearly recorded in the Scriptures: the existence of God, his equity and his love for mankind, the duty of every man to love and worship Him, to obey to His commandment and to reject sin. On the other hand, in the Scriptures there are some controversial and confused passages, concerning doctrines that are commonly believed as essential but, that in reality are quite not. Castellio even goes as far as to establish the presence of contradictions in the Scriptures, produced by the copyists of these text. In other words, he seems to suggest that the Bible is a human outcome, and not of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁹¹

The presence of these issues in the Scriptures is very important in Castellio's analysis, because it allows him to say that the true meaning of the Bible depends not on single assertions, but on its main "tone". Without taking into account God's revelation in the hermeneutical approach to the Scriptures, Castellio argues that this "tone" can be understood through senses and reason, which are the means that God gave to all people. However, Castellio acknowledge that these means have some limits, because there are matters in the Scriptures beyond human experience.⁷⁹²

However, it is clear that in this work Castellio high valued human reason, since he asserted that Christ and the patriarchs lead a moral life through their reason, as a gift of God. He argues that reason existed before religious ceremonies and that will continue to exist once they will be

⁷⁸⁹ *Ivi*, p. 147.

⁷⁹⁰ This work, composed probably in 1563, when Castellio died, remained in manuscript form for many years. A complete version was only published in the 20th century. *Ibid.*, pp. 218-219.

⁷⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 222-223.

⁷⁹² These are defined as "supra sensum" and concern, for example, the God's nature and the creation of the world. *Ibid.*, p. 223.

abolished. So, «it was in obedience to reason that Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham and many others led pious lives before the coming of the Mosaic scriptures, and many will lead such lives when those scriptures are seen to have been superseded». In fact, he continues, «reason guided Jesus Christ, the son of the living God [...] it was by her that Christ taught others and refuted the writings and ceremonies, to which the Jews attributed more authority than reason».⁷⁹³ There is nothing in Christ's doctrine against senses or reason, Castellio asserts.⁷⁹⁴ This is certainly one of the most interesting parts of his thought, since Boreel also argues that human reason is sufficient to a moral life.

Coornhert, who surely examined Castellio's works, conceived similar ideas. In a writing published in 1558, entitled «Verschooninghe van de Roomsche Afgoderye», where he opposed Calvino and his followers about Nicodemism, he says that external ceremonies and rituals cannot in any way corrupt a pure conscience. So, instead of being killed for not agreeing with those external manifestations, he suggests a more prudent approach, giving his own assent to Nicodemism, which he believed useful to avoid religious persecution.⁷⁹⁵

Showing that he had already developed his major theological ideas and his spiritualist approach to religion, Coornhert asserts that the Jews lived under the law in a visible kingdom with a visible church, but then Christ established a spiritual kingdom and priesthood, which is not tied to any particular place, but lies in the heart of all Christian believers. Moreover, Christ put an end to Moses' law, and he summarized it in the precepts of loving God and one's own neighbor. This is the reason why he was attacked by the Pharisees, as in modern times true Christians are persecuted by religious leader like Calvino and Menno Simonsz.⁷⁹⁶ In short, the core of Coornhert's can be described in this way. Christ's Law commands only the love towards God and the mutual love among people. He who demonstrates such love must be considered a true Christian and thus he must not be

⁷⁹³ Ibid., pp. 224-225.

⁷⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁵ Voogt, *Constraint on trial* (see above, n. 540), pp. 13-14.

⁷⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 14. See also: *ibid.*, pp. 15-16.

persecuted for his nonconformity with external ceremonies of the Churches. As we will see in the following pages, Boreel surely shared similar ideas.

Coornhert founded his assertion suggesting that Christ's doctrine is nothing other than the moral precept of loving God and all people on the belief that a moral Christian life is more important than theological matters, a belief that in turn he founded on his theory on human perfectibility.⁷⁹⁷ The eminence of a moral life can be concluded from many of his works. For instance, in one of Coornhert's dialogues a Münsterite asks why Coornhert is not interested to widen his knowledge concerning Christ's reign on earth. The author answers that he is more interested in a moral life, not in learning «how to learn much».⁷⁹⁸ One's own knowledge does not make anyone better, but rather it is necessary to live through Christ's Law.⁷⁹⁹

Therefore, from Coornhert's point of view, to be a real Christian means to love God and follows the “golden rule”. In particular, his focus on the “golden rule” is a keystone to understand many of his ideas and Coornhert identified it with the law of nature. «Let everyone follow», he writes, «the law of nature: if you do not like being forced in your conscience, then do not force others either in word or in deed».⁸⁰⁰ In one of his works, entitled «Dat Godts gheboden licht zijn ende leerlijck», Coornhert argues that the love of one own's neighbor is a natural command, because it express a natural inclination of all people. So, by ordering to follow the “golden rule”, God asked men only to act by their own nature.⁸⁰¹ In one of his dialogues, Coornhert even states that Pagans can also follow the “golden rule” and thus obtain salvation. In order to strengthen this thesis, Coornhert argues in favor of God's universal kindness, through which people of any time and place received the ability to become his image, of the testimony of God's glory in the Psalms, and of the universal law of nature. As for the latter, Coornhert affirms that all Pagans who can use their reason can follow this rule, which includes the love towards God and one own's neighbor. Therefore, he

⁷⁹⁷ On the doctrine of perfectibility, see chapter VI.

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 66.

⁷⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 67.

⁸⁰⁰ Ibid., pp. 120-121.

⁸⁰¹ Ibid., p. 121.

concludes, «one may also have Christ in his heart without knowing the historical Christ».⁸⁰²

In «Wortel der Nederlantsche oorloghen», by hiding under the name of Pacifijc, Coornhert stresses the importance of the “golden rule” as means to establish mutual toleration.⁸⁰³ In this work, he asks all Christians to focus on the shared doctrines, not on the theological disputes instead. The doctrines which all Christians agree on are God’s love and the “golden rule”, the believing in the Scriptures, in the Trinity, in the twelve articles of faith which form the apostolic creed and the death of Christ for all men.⁸⁰⁴

Ruben Buys showed that similar ideas were expressed in the same time also by Marcus Antonius Gillis. In «Hantboecxken, leerende na der Stoischer filosofhen wyse hoe elc in sinen roep gherustelyck leven sal», Gillis states that through their natural intellect ancient philosophers conceived incredible rules of life, such as the need to subdue to God and nature, to do good to others in the best way, to not hurt anyone, etc.⁸⁰⁵ Gillis seems to equate philosophy and theology to a certain extent, since both gave people real rules to lead their life. Classical authors conceived moral precepts through their reason and lived according to them, which are the same that people can draw from God’s revelation. Furthermore, through the «dlicht van deser redenen», philosophy can reach some of the theological theoretical truths, such as the existence of a God. In short, through natural reason is possible to learn the most important doctrines that theology teaches thanks to God’s revelation.⁸⁰⁶

However, there is a major difference between theology and philosophy. As a matter of fact, human reason must not be used to understand doctrines or to reach truths that are beyond its limits, so much that people try to defend it «against everything that H. Scripture says about God and of the creation of the world and of ham, his fall and resurrection, of the salvation of

⁸⁰² Ibid., p. 121. See also: Buys, *Sparks of reason* (see above, n. 548), pp. 48-49 e 205-207. Buys showed that also Spiegel, friend of Coornhert, agreed to those ideas, even if expressed them with more caution. Ibid., pp. 217-218.

⁸⁰³ Voogt, *Constraint on trial* (see above, n. 540), pp. 121-122.

⁸⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 151.

⁸⁰⁵ Buys, *Sparks of reason* (see above, n. 548), pp. 107-109.

⁸⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 109.

the faithful and the damnation of the unfaithful, and of the resurrection of the flesh»⁸⁰⁷. In addition, even if some classical authors were able to elaborate moral doctrines, others denied God or doubted His existence through the same natural reason: through their intellect alone, people are easily inclined to skepticism and atheism.⁸⁰⁸

On the other hand, Gillis expressed more positive ideas about reason in the preface of «Isocratis vermaninghe tot Demonicum», published in 1564. Here, focusing on the practical life, he emphasizes the role of natural reason in the moral life, instead of discussing its limits. In short, people can acquire the wisdom that lead to a moral life through the innate abilities of their reason, and thus they should only exercise their rational faculties and apply them on the acquisition of knowledge. Buys says that many of the statements of the «Hantboecxken» can be related to a script of Hieronymous Wolf and so, maybe, the ideas expressed in the preface of the «Isocratis» are mostly close to Gillis ones.⁸⁰⁹

Before analyzing the ideas of Boreel on the rationality of Christ's Law, it is useful to examine some passages of Jean Bodin's «Colloquium Heptaplomeres». In Boreel's biography it has been shown that Oldenburg, after reading Bodin's manuscript, was horrified by it and he wished to see only Boreel as advocate of Christian religion, instead of the three Christians in the *Colloquium*: Coronaeus, Curtius e Fridericus. There is no evidence to establish if Oldenburg ever gave a copy of the manuscript to Boreel or if he ever talked with him about such work. However, it is evident that Bodin examined matters which Boreel took into account in JNL. Here we will only examine some of the ideas that can be found in the «Colloquium Heptaplomeres», without establishing if those who express them are alter egos of Bodin: it is sufficient to show that Boreel could have resumed or opposed some of the statements Bodin's work.⁸¹⁰

⁸⁰⁷ Ivi, p. 110.

⁸⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁹ Ivi, pp. 110-111.

⁸¹⁰ For a discussion concerning the position of the «Colloquium Heptaplomeres» in Bodin's thought and for some information about which character expressed his ideas in the dialogue, see: Bodin, *Colloquium of the seven* (see above, n. 354), pp. xv-lxxii.

In the fourth book of the *Colloquium*, there is a discussion concerning the existence of a true religion. After he has considered the difficulty to establish which one is the real religion, Senamus asserts that is better «to admit publicly all religions of all peoples in the state», mentioning as example the kingdoms and republics of Classical Greece, and the Roman empire.⁸¹¹ In fact, he argues that all rites are appreciated by God, if lead by a pure heart.⁸¹² Octavius partially agrees with these ideas and he underlines the compassion God showed to those who try to avoid sin.⁸¹³ Even the Christian Coronaeus affirms that «all are convinced it is much better to have a false religion than no religion», because «there is no superstition so great that it cannot keep wicked men in their duty through the fear of divine power and somehow preserve the law of nature».⁸¹⁴ This is one of the statements that horrified Oldenburg and it is possible to argue that Boreel tried to demonstrate the superiority of Christian religion against Senamus' idea.

Furthermore, after denying that it is possible to establish the true religion through Christ and the Church,⁸¹⁵ Toralba argues that the true religion must be endowed with divine authority: since God cannot deceive, nor being deceived, his authority «has by far more weight than all the proofs, arguments, writings, and witnesses».⁸¹⁶ So, it is important to find the criteria to understand if a certain religion is founded by God and thus endowed with His authority. So, Salomon answers that Judaism is the true religion, because «the Hebrew nation witnessed more signs than any other peoples». «Can be there any more certain approbation», asks Salomon, «of the true religion than this?».⁸¹⁷ In turn, Curtius replies that the true religion must be approved «by the authority of the church, the truth of Sacred Scripture, by its antiquity, divine pronouncements, heavenly portents, and clear reasons».⁸¹⁸

Among these proofs mentioned by Curtius, the criterion based on antiquity is emphasize. A a matter of fact, the remaining part of the fourth

⁸¹¹ Ibid., pp. 152, 154 e 155-156.

⁸¹² Ibid., pp. 158, 159, 160 e 162.

⁸¹³ Ibid., p. 159.

⁸¹⁴ Ibid., p. 162.

⁸¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 170-172.

⁸¹⁶ Ibid., p. 172.

⁸¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 172 e 173.

⁸¹⁸ Ibid., p. 173.

book is dedicated to inquire which is the oldest religion. However, it is important to notice that here the characters of Bodin's manuscript start to discuss the best religion, not the true one.⁸¹⁹ Anyhow, Salomon and Toralba seem to agree on the fact that the religion of the patriarchs is the oldest one. «I only conclude», Toralba says, «that Adam and his son Abel had been instructed in the best religion, and after them Seth, Enoch, Methusaleh up to Noah who worshipped in great holiness, to the exclusion of all others, that eternal and only true God, the Builder and Parent of all things and the great Architect of the whole world». So, he continues, «I believe this religion is not only the oldest but also the best of all, and those who have departed from that most ancient and best religion have fallen into an irreconcilable labyrinth of errors».⁸²⁰

From Toralba's point of view, the patriarchs' religion is the same law of nature. This is the best and most ancient religion, which is imparted «in the human minds with right reason by eternal God», so much that that anyone who worships God and follows the laws of nature cannot doubt «that he will enjoy the same happiness which Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Job, and the rest enjoyed, because God Himself declared with laudable testimony that they were most pleasing and holy to him».⁸²¹ In other words, the natural law or religion is sufficient to attain salvation.⁸²² If this is true, all ceremonies and rituals of revealed religions are useless, even the ones of Moses' law, which Salomon had previously linked to the patriarchs' religion and thus to natural reason.⁸²³ However, this does not mean that such external rituals must be abolished. In fact, Toralba, Salomon and Octavius agree on considering

⁸¹⁹ This same change of discussion can be also found in the sixth book. Here Curaneus resume the subject concerning the true religion, but after Curtius and Salomon expressed their criteria to establish it, Toralba states that it is impossible to find the true religion because of the many religions and sects. *Ibid.*, pp. 333-337.

⁸²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 183.

⁸²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 185.

⁸²² *Ibid.*, pp. 185-186. Toralba supports again this thesis, he says «If true religion is contained in the pure worship of eternal God, I believe the law of nature is sufficient for man's salvation. We see that the oldest leaders and parents of the human race had no other religion [...] from nature they drank the streams of piety, religion, integrity, and all virtues and imitated them». *Ibid.*, pp. 225-226.

⁸²³ To defend Moses religion, Solomon distinguishes his law in moral, ritual, and political, stating that only the precepts in the Decalogue are necessary to salvation. *Ibid.*, pp. 186-189. Toralba agrees with him and affirms that all precepts, except the one about the Sabbath, are expressions of the natural law. In fact, apart from that one, all men can agree on the Decalogue of Moses. *Ibid.*, pp. 192-193.

rituals and ceremonies useful to strengthen the precepts of the natural religion. «Those who press the people with a multitude of rites turn religion into superstition», says Toralba. However, «those who completely remove all rites overturn all religions from the root».⁸²⁴ Up to a certain point, Boreel could have agreed to such ideas. As a matter of fact, the minimum creed he conceived surely includes the ancient religion of the patriarchs and he emphasizes the moral precepts of Christianity. On the other hand, he firmly believed that God only endowed Christian religion with His authority. This is the reason why Boreel includes the faith in Christ as God's ambassador among the doctrines of his rational minimum creed.

Anyhow, the same matters can be found also in the final pages of Bodin's manuscript, where the seven characters start discussing the fundamentals of religion. In particular, Toralba argues that all religions are different and that it is possible to find many sects within the same one. This is the reason why Toralba wonders if would be best to embrace the natural religion, as the simplest, more ancient, and truer religion. However, this idea is immediately dismissed, because «it is hardly possible and even impossible for the common people and the untutored masses to be restrained by a simple assent of true religion without rites and ceremonies».⁸²⁵ Therefore, Senamus suggests his solution: in front of a multitude of sects and religions it is best to accept all of them, instead of excluding one that could be the God's true religion.⁸²⁶

From a practical point of view, Senamus proposes the coexistence of all religions within the same city or state, a coexistence that could be based on the common faith in God, the Creator of all things. «I enter the temples», he says, «of Christians and Ismaelites and Jews wherever possible and also those of the Lutherans and Zwinglians lest I be offensive to anyone, as if I were an atheist, or seem to disturb the peaceful state of the republic. Still I attribute all thing to that best and greatest Prince of the gods. Therefore, what hinders us from appeasing with common prayers the common Author and Parent of all nature, so that He may lead us all into a knowledge of the true

⁸²⁴ Ibid., p. 228.

⁸²⁵ Ibid., p. 462.

⁸²⁶ Ibid., p. 465.

religion»⁸²⁷. This proposal seems to gradually find the agreement of all the characters, thanks this shared idea: no conscience must be forced in religious matters.⁸²⁸ So, at the end of the works, the seven dialoguers retired, «having embraced each other in mutual love», and then «they nourished their piety in remarkable harmony and their integrity of life in common pursuits and intimacy». However, affirms the narrator, «afterwards they held no other conversation about religions, although each one defended his own religion with supreme sanctity of his life».⁸²⁹

⁸²⁷ Ibid., p. 466.

⁸²⁸ Ibid., pp. 468-470.

⁸²⁹ Ibid., p. 472.

Veritas, certitudo e Lex Christi in the thought of Boreel

It is now possible to examine Boreel's JNL. However, in order to better understand his assertions concerning Christ's Law, it is necessary to make some preliminary considerations. In particular, it must be defined the meaning of Christ's Law, and the difference that he makes between *veritas* and *certitudo* must be explained.

As for the first issue, it is evident that the *Lex Christi* cannot be seen in a mere juridical way, as a set of norms or prescriptive laws. Boreel affirms many times that the Christ's Law is recorded in the New Testament.⁸³⁰ As a matter of fact, his laws coincide with the «codices» of the New Testament itself.⁸³¹ It is clear that these books do not contain juridical laws that God gave to mankind through Christ, as the Moses's law in the Old Testament. On the contrary, the books of the New Testament tell the historical events of Christ and of his first disciples, particularly in the four Gospels and in the Acts. In other words, these Books lack any God-given juridical law, but they practically show the right way to live in order to attain salvation.⁸³² Therefore, it must be concluded that Christ's Law is the same doctrine that he taught during his life.⁸³³

It is possible to conclude that Christ's Law is the same doctrine that he taught during life and that his disciples spread after his death from some passages of JNL. For instance, in the «Ordo Tractatus Legislator» previously quoted, Boreel argues that, after demonstrating Christ's Law, a comparison between the latter and the laws of other legislators would be useful to show that «nullam unquam talem personam, ejus vitam, et doctrinam seu Legem, tam excellentem, vel fuisse, vel esse, vel futuram».⁸³⁴ The words «doctrinam

⁸³⁰ For instance, see: notes 87, 143, 155, 256, 322, 372 of the «Notae Miscellaneae, ad Tractatus Legislator, Primam Partem Generalem» in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 13(r), 25(r), 28(v), 48(v), 59(r), 76(v).

⁸³¹ See: MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 2(r) e 3(r). The same notion is stated in note 179 of the «Notae Miscellaneae, ad Tractatus Legislator, Primam Partem Generalem» in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) fol. 37(v).

⁸³² In SG Boreel argues that in the New Testaments there are not only precepts or prohibitions, but «cum aliis mediis vivum quoque exemplum proponitur ad illustrationem totius doctrinae, (quae modum tradit sese conformandi ad divinam voluntatem, summoque hoc Bono indesinenter fruendi), quod est Christus Iesus». SG, in OP p. 133.

⁸³³ MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) fol. 78(v).

⁸³⁴ MS RB 1/13/1, (1th foliation) fol. 2(v).

seu legem» leave no room for doubts. Christ's Law is the same doctrine that he taught during his life.

Moreover, note 153 of the «Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem» can be taken into account. Here Boreel claims that it is possible to prove Christ's doctrine using this argument: God has the «jus» to determine what people should consider as true, what they should believe or hope, what is virtue, what is vice, what should be indifferent and what free.⁸³⁵ Here Boreel does not openly state that Christ's Law is his same doctrine, but this assertion seems coherent with the words of this note, which acquires more clarity after assuming such identity. In fact, only if Christ's Law coincide with his doctrine, it is possible to easily explain why Boreel wanted to demonstrate such doctrine through the divine right to determine how men should live.⁸³⁶

In addition, it is possible to make a consideration of practical nature to strengthen the hypothesis that Christ's Law is nothing other than his doctrine. If the «Lex Christi» does not coincide with his teachings, the reader of the JNL would have in front of him a manuscript arguing that Christ is the legislator of all mankind and that every man can find his Law in the books of the New Testament, while not defining this Law. However, if Christ's Law coincides with his doctrine, the JNL would become much more clear.

Boreel argues that the Law or doctrine of Christ consists in two parts, the theoretical or dogmatic doctrines and the practical ones. The first is about the things to know and to believe in, and also the «prophetica».⁸³⁷ The

⁸³⁵ «adeò quidem, ut omnis Jesu doctrina tam Theoretica quàm Practica, isto modo probetur, nimirum, Deum, prophetiarum istarum et miraculorum Authorem, jus habere determinandi, quidnam homini pro certo habendum, seu credendum, ac sperandum; item, quidnam ipsi pro virtute, quidnam pro vitio, quidnam pro adiaphoro et libero habendum sit». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 27(v).

⁸³⁶ A similar observation can be made regarding another passage of JNL, where Boreel states that, through the divine will showed by prophecies and miracles, common people can be sure «quòd Jesus Nazarenus missus sit a summo cum ista doctrina quam docuit; ac proinde, teneri omnes, cum pro tali recipere, eique obedire». Here the reference to people's obedience to Christ and to his doctrine seems to identify it with the *Lex Christi*. See: note 389, in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 81(r).

⁸³⁷ «Ad Caput XII^{um} quod agit de proprietatibus vitae et doctrinae Jesu Nazareni, doctrina ejus considerari debet ut Theoretica et practica. Theoretica, ut complectens scienda, credenda et prophetica». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 23(r).

practical doctrines concerns God, people, and the relationship among each other.⁸³⁸

As for the difference between «veritas» and «certitudo», in the notes dated June 21, 1660, Boreel argues that it is impossible to establish the truth of a doctrine or of a proposition by refuting all the «exceptiones» and «objectiones» against it. In other words, the truth of a proposition, and thus of the corresponding idea or doctrine, cannot be based on the possibility to confute all the objections against it.⁸³⁹ As a matter of fact, Boreel argues that a proposition that cannot refute all objections is not necessary false.⁸⁴⁰ On the other hand, the proposition that can refute all objections is not necessary true.⁸⁴¹ Furthermore, the proposition with better argumentations compared to the opposed one, is not necessary true either.⁸⁴²

So, Boreel argues that, until the truth of a doctrine is not completely known, people are inclined to agree to the doctrine that seems to better manifest the truth. However, this not necessarily make it true. This happens until «veritas sese de re ista totam planissimè manifestaverit». However,

⁸³⁸ This is stated many times by the author. For instance, see: notes 6, 17 e 20 in MS RB 1/12/1, (3th foliation) ff. 3(v), 6(v) e 7(v). See also: note 380 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 78(r).

⁸³⁹ «Ratio autem, cur, in talibus, aliquid sit verum, vel falsum; non est ex eo, quòd exceptionibus et objectionibus allatis, apodicticè responderi possit, vel non possit». MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) f. 8(v).

⁸⁴⁰ «Sententia seu propositio, quae non potest apodicticè respondere omnibus adversus illam motis exceptionibus et objectionibus, non ideò est falsa». As a matter of fact, if the antipodes exist, Boreel says, «falsum olim fuisset dati Antipodes; nam qui illos dari tunc statuebant, non poterant apodicticè respondere omnibus adversus sententiam istam allatis exceptionibus et objectionibus». MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) f. 8(v).

⁸⁴¹ «Sententia seu propositio, quae apodicticè respondere potest omnibus adversus illam allatis exceptionibus et objectionibus, non ideò est vera». In fact, Boreel argues, in the past the proposition that denied the existence of the antipodes would have been true, because «antequam experientia id docuit et evicit, apodicticè respondere poterant omnibus objectionibus et exceptionibus, quae tunc contra afferebantur: et, nihilominus, falsum erat, non dari Antipodes». MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) f. 8(v).

⁸⁴² «Tametsi propositiones ponantur ἀμέσως, non tamen sequitur, veritatem stare a parte illa quae potiora argumenta habet. nam, in propositionibus ἀμέσως positis, de hisce sequentibus, videlicet, Terra movetur, Terra non movetur; non sunt Antipodes, sunt Antipodes; Religio Mahumedis est vera, Religio Mahumedis non est vera; Regum Chinensium monumenta sunt a septem mille annis, Regum Chinensium monumenta non sunt a septem mille annis; in hisce, inquam, ἀμέσως positis, non semper veritas stat ab ista parte, quae plures rationes pro se habet; ita enim, Antipodes non fuissent isto tempore, quo, rationibus omnibus subductis, olim statuebatur, impossibile esse dari Antipodes. similiter, quoad Terrae motum; quoad Mahumedis Religionem, respectu illorum qui inter Mahumedanos nati et educati sunt; item, quoad Chinensium monumenta, quae ibi palam ostenduntur, et, per isporum annales tantae antiquitatis esse probantur, statuendum esset». MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) ff. 8(r-v).

Boreel underlines that «veritas, de rebus admodum paucis sese totam planissimè manifestat». Therefore, he believes that the best way to inquiry the truth of a statement, notion, doctrine, etc., is to formulate two ἀμέσως propositions and to argue in favor of both, while raising at the same time «exceptions» and «objections» against them. Through such method people which proposition had better argumentations and thus which one they should agree with.⁸⁴³ However, it is necessary to remember that «ista pars, quae id faciliùs praestat, est hactenus vel eatenus probabilior altera parte, quae id necdum sic praestare potest». So, afterwards new argumentations could be raised on behalf of the opposed proposition, which could therefore gain the title of truth, «accidentibus scilicet ad eam rationum momentis, quae antea necdum cognitae erant».⁸⁴⁴

So far, it is evident that the *veritas* is tied to people's knowledge. In other words, based on the level of knowledge of a certain era and of certain people, it is possible to use better argumentations in behalf of a certain proposition and thus to establish its probable truth. Probable, not certain: new knowledge could afterwards advance new argumentations in behalf of the proposition initially rejected, which could gain the title of truth. This can happen until people only possess partial knowledge on the matter they inquire.

However, Boreel believes in the possibility to establish an absolute truth, when someone possesses the full knowledge on the matter he was

⁸⁴³ This method of investigating the truth can be called *statera iudicii*. After expressing two opposite proposition regarding the same matter, and after arguing in favor of both of them, Boreel states that is necessary to establish the «Statera Iudicii, quoad utriusque propositionis sive partis argumenta», were to shortly resume all argumentations in favor of both, in order to show to the reader «quaenam duarum istarum partium potiora argumenta habeat». See: notes 2-14 in MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) ff. 2(v) – 3(r).

⁸⁴⁴ «[...] quia de re aliqua, omnis veritas necdum cognita est; unde fit, ut, quatenus singulis aetatibus, de hac vel illa re, veritas sese manifestarit, homines ad illam partem inclinent, in qua veritas semet eatenus, etsi non totam, manifestarit. Sin autem veritas sese a contraria parte magis manifestet, quàm a priore parte, tunc homines inclinant ad contrariam istam partem: et hoc contingit eo usque, donec veritas sese de re ista totam planissimè manifestaverit. at, id raro fit; quia veritas, de rebus admodum paucis, sese totam planissimè manifestat. ac proinde, ad indagandam veritatem, propositiones ἀμέσως formari debent, et ab utraque parte omnes possibles exceptiones et objectiones moveri; ut cernatur, quaenam istarum partium, faciliùs illis occurrere possit; quo in casu, ista pars, quae id faciliùs praestat, est hactenus vel eatenus probabilior altera parte, quae id necdum sic praestare potest. quamvis fieri queat, ut postea, altera ista quae id nunc non potest, sit probabilior, accidentibus scilicet ad eam rationum momentis, quae antea necdum cognitae erant». MS RB 1/13/1, (2th foliation) ff. 8(v) – 9(r).

inquiring. In fact, Boreel clearly states that people embrace probable truths because «*omnis veritas necdum cognita est*», adding that «*veritas, de rebus admodum paucis, sese totam planissimè manifestat*». So, it can be concluded that there are some doctrine or notions, even if only a few, where people achieved or can achieve a level of knowledge so high that a proposition labeled as true cannot later become false because of new argumentations⁸⁴⁵.

So, *veritas* must be linked to people's knowledge, and can relate to both a probable and an absolute truth. On the other hand, Boreel defines *τὸ certum* with something that implies no contradictions, doubts or objections, that is, something that «*semper, ubique, atque apud omnes indubitatum fuit, est, ac manebit*».⁸⁴⁶ So, it is clear that the *certitudo* depends on human knowledge too. In particular, it can be concluded that the *certitudo* consists in the above-mentioned absolute truth or knowledge. In conclusion, from Boreel's point of view, the *veritas* correspond to a probable truth, which depends on people's partial knowledge concerning the matter inquired, while the *certitudo* is an absolute truth, based on the full and perfect knowledge of a certain topic.⁸⁴⁷

⁸⁴⁵ Boreel seems to acknowledge the existence of absolute truths, such as mathematical truths. See: note 251, in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) fol. 47(v).

⁸⁴⁶ «*τὸ certum, est istud, quod nullam contradictionem, nullamve contrarietatem involvit; et adversus quod, nullum dubium, nullus scrupulus ac nulla exceptio vel minima, cum ratione produci vel moveri potest. Sed, quod semper, ubique, atque apud omnes indubitatum fuit, est, ac manebit, ulla absque vel minima mutatione, vel dubio aut scrupuli suspicione*». Ibid., f. 47(v).

⁸⁴⁷ Since from Boreel's point of view *certitudo*, absolute truth and perfect knowledge, are equivalent, in the following pages these terms will be used indistinctly.

The rationality of the Christian religion and the “communia fundamentalia”

Since it has been shown what is Christ’s Law, and the difference between *veritas* and *certitudo*, it is now possible to examine Boreel’s ideas concerning Christ’s doctrine. Previously it has been argued that the purpose of the JNL is to prove that each man has to follow Christ’s Law, which is recorded in the New Testament. Furthermore, Boreel had to examine Christ’s Law per se and to compare it with the other laws that mankind could follow. This was the third and final step that Boreel had to take in order to achieve his highest aim. Unfortunately, in the manuscript preserved among the Boyle Papers there are no folios concerning this step and thus it is almost impossible to establish how Boreel intended to develop this part of his treatise.

However, it is most likely that a discussion concerning the rationality of Christ’s doctrine would have played a fundamental role in this final step. As a matter of fact, by arguing and proving that Christ’s doctrine complies with human reason, Boreel would have reached two main conclusions. First, it would have been much easier to show that Christ’s Law is superior to the laws of other legislators.⁸⁴⁸ Second, it would have been easier to argue that all people must live according to it. In fact, if Christ’s doctrine is rational, not only all Christians, regardless of their confessions of faith, but also all people could have recognized its greatest worthiness. So, everyone could have embraced it, since no one would have gone against his reason by doing so.

In order to analyze Boreel’s ideas concerning the rationality of Christ’s Law, two groups of notes must be taken into account, which are part of the section entitled *Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem*: notes 229-281 and 306-319.⁸⁴⁹ In both groups of notes Boreel clearly asserts that all men must be certain of the Christian religion.⁸⁵⁰

⁸⁴⁸ Among these laws Boreel mentions the «lex conscientiae et naturae» and the «lex ratiocinationis». Therefore, it is evident that he had to prove that Christ’s Law is rational, otherwise no one would have argued that it is more excellent than the «lex ratiocinationis».

⁸⁴⁹ See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 43(v) – 52(r) and 55(v) – 56(v).

⁸⁵⁰ «quia plus homini situm est in Religione, quàm in re aliqua alia; utique, certius esse debet de religione, quàm de re aliqua alia minoris momenti, ac proinde, Religio certior homini esse debet, quàm omnia qualiacunque certa quae minoris momentis fuerint. Certior itaque homini Religio esse debet, quàm bis bina sunt quatuor; quia minus refert, hominem certum esse quòd bis bina sint quatuor, quàm ipsum aeternum salvari. igitur, medium ac ratio

In other words, they have to reach the *certitudo* about it. In these two groups of notes Boreel examined the means through which it is possible to reach absolute knowledge of the Christian religion. Since this is nothing but the manifestation of Christ's Law, it is evident that in these notes Boreel inquires into the ways through which everyone can reach the *certitudo* about the latter.⁸⁵¹

In notes 306-319, Boreel examines the way common people can become certain of the Christian religion. From Boreel's words it can be easily concluded that they can reach the *certitudo* of Christ's Law only through God's revelation. On the one hand, they cannot understand rational argumentations.⁸⁵² On the other, all the other possible ways of acquiring knowledge, such as the external senses, the common agreement among men, traditions, etc., can only lead to a lesser degree of knowledge than the *certitudo*.⁸⁵³ Therefore, in order to acquire perfect knowledge of Christ's Law, common people need God's revelation, which is recorded in the New Testament.⁸⁵⁴

salvationis istius, homini certior esse debet quàm bis bina sunt quatuor». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 47(v) – 48(r). Furthermore, he writes again: «in Religione, certitudo illa esset certissima, de qua certitudine nemini quoad religionem scrupulus ullus obrepere posset». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 55(v).

⁸⁵¹ «[...] quod Lex Divina vocatur; ac hominis juxta legem istam compositionem, esse id, quod Religio dicitur». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 6(r-v).

⁸⁵² «primus gradus certitudinis non-revelationis, quoad religionem, foret Ratiocinationis; si contradictoriè procedatur. at, quia plebs, ob exiguum intellectum et iudicium sic procedere nequit. idcirco, haec via ipsi, certissima non est». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 55(v).

⁸⁵³ See: notes 309-317, in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation), ff. 55(v) – 56(r).

⁸⁵⁴ «Revelationis certitudo est: si ea in omnibus hominis facultatibus potentiis ac sensibus saepius sese prodat; atque per evidentia miracula, evidentes prophetias, opera justitiae evidentia, constantem in jam nominatis permanentiam, ad unius Dei gloriam, nullo sibi honore vendicato, absque proprii commodi quaesitione, praeceptisque communi omnium bonis ac justis roboretur. item, talia quoque suis sequacibus, et vivus et post mortem communicet, et quaquaverùm absque vi externa introducat, propaget, conservet, ac defendat, omnimodasque afflictiones eò nomine lubens subeat ad ipsam mortem usque constanter; atque haec ratione, ipsosmet adversarios suos in partes suas traducat, qui et ipsi talia perpetrent atque propagent, ac sic brevi tempore, per universum terrarum orbem sua haec spargat, multisque seculis post continuet, a solo caeli terraeque Domino, sua ista omnia provenire testificans, summis ejus nomine promissis propositis, nulla autem re terrena suis sequacibus promissa, sed contrà adversitatibus crucibus ac mortibus praenunciatis; ac nihilominus tamen integras nationes sui sequaces habeat per multa secula continuantes. istas tales hominis revelationes esse certas, atque a summo Deo ei obvenisse, statuendum erit. Atqui tales revelationes obtigerunt Jesu Nazareno, qui talia quoque reverà praestitit atque exhibuit. Igitur Religio Jesu Nazareni, qua talia proponit, est a summo Deo profecta». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 56(v) - 57(r). Here Boreel seems to face the same vicious circle that we have shown in the previous chapter. If everyone has to acquire the *certitudo* about the Christian religion and if common people can obtain this kind of knowledge only through

From notes 229-281 it can be concluded that, ultimately, learned men too need God's revelation in order to acquire the *certitudo* of the Christian religion, even though they can use and understand rational argumentations. In fact, since Christ's Law also consists of positive doctrines, it is evident that learned men too must rely on God's authority, that is on God's revelation, to fully understand the Christian religion.⁸⁵⁵ However, here Boreel introduces a significant difference. Learned men too must be certain that God's revelation in the New Testament is true. Contrary to common people, they can and must prove this revelation through their intellect.⁸⁵⁶ Through *naturalis ratiocinatione*, it is possible to prove that God and His providence exist, that there is a Law that all people must follow, and that this Law must comply with God's nature and attributes. Furthermore, through

God's revelation in the New Testament, how can they be certain that this revelation is true? Of course, not through God's revelation. Neither through rational arguments, since they cannot understand them. Not even through the other means to acquire knowledge, since they are lower means than God's revelation and rational arguments. Ultimately, it seems that common people cannot acquire absolute knowledge about the truth of God's revelation in the New Testament. So, it can be argued that they cannot acquire the *certitudo* about Christ's Law.

⁸⁵⁵ In notes 229-281 Boreel does not openly assert that learned men need God's revelation in order to acquire the *certitudo* of Christ's Law. However, this conclusion can be deduced from notes 245 and 246. In the first one, Boreel writes: «in rerum certitudinibus considerandis, attendi debet ordo majoris et minoris certitudinis; et medium probandi istam rerum certitudinem». In notes 246, he adds: «quoad ordine dignitatis itaque; prima certitudo, est revelationis. 2^a, ratiocinationis. 3^a, sensuum exteriorum. 4^a, communis omnium hominum consensus. 5^a, prophetiarum. 6^a, miraculorum. 7^a, sermonis seu loquela. 8^a, scripti et historiarum. 9^a, traditionis. 10^a, conscientiae. Quarum quatuor posteriores, se juxta sex praecedentes componunt». So, *prima certitudo* in religious matters relies on God's revelation. See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation), f. 46(v). Furthermore, in other JNL's notes Boreel openly says that God's Word is necessary to acquire full knowledge of the Christian religion. For instance, in note 153 of the same section, he writes: «religios igitur, Jesu, nititur autoritate, non autem ratiociniis. Postquam autem veritas ejus, mediante autoritate ista probate fuerit; tunc ratiocinatio ejus, quoad doctrinam et alia investigari poterit; at, palmarium inde argumentum duci nequit, quia multa mere positive, et Legislatoris Dei voluntate et autoritate duntaxat nixa, ibi continentur; quarum ratio convictiva, per humana ratiocinia dari nequit. Atque ideo praestat, omnia Lege ista comprehensa, argumento a divina autoritate ducto, duntaxat probare; ut hominum animi, a fluctuatione quae humanis ratiociniis facile oboritur, plane hoc pacto liberari queant». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 28(r-v).

⁸⁵⁶ As a matter of fact, Boreel clearly asserts that no one can rely on God's revelation until His existence is proven. However, it is impossible to prove God's existence through prophecies and miracles, «quia per ista duntaxat probari potest, esse talem sapientiam et potentiam quae talia praedicere et perpetrare potuerunt», but this not means that «sapientiam et potentiam illam esse summam, potest enim esse sapientia et potentia esta ex medio ordine sapientiae et potentiae». His existence cannot be proved either «ex coeli et terrae fabrica», because from the God's creation it is only possible to argue «quod insignis potentia sapientia et bonitas fuerit quae talia condiderit; at, inde non sequitur, illam esse supremam». Moreover, it is impossible to establish God's existence and thus His revelation through the common agreement among men, traditions, and external senses. Neither through someone's *sermo* or *scriptum*. Therefore, Boreel concludes: «Revelatio duntaxat probari possit Ratiocinatione». See: notes 247-249 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 46(v) – 47(v).

their intellect learned men can prove that among men's laws only the one that most complies with God's nature must be regarded as divine,⁸⁵⁷ and that this is Christ's Law, now written in the New Testament. Hence, in these books it is possible to find God's revelation.⁸⁵⁸

In order to prove such truths, it is necessary to use the argumentative method which Boreel had referred to while he was discussing the difference between *veritas* and *certitudo*, that is, to establish two contrary propositions about the same subject and to argue in favor of both.⁸⁵⁹ In fact, Boreel asserts, this is the best way to acquire absolute knowledge or *certitudo* through natural reason.⁸⁶⁰ However, once they have proven these truths, learned men too must

⁸⁵⁷ Whence, it must be concluded that through *naturali ratiocinatione* it is also possible to understand God's attributes, otherwise it would be impossible to establish what law is most similar to His nature.

⁸⁵⁸ «Restat igitur, ut revelatio ista probetur naturali Ratiocinatione. idque hoc modo. 1°, contra Scepticos, probetur certi aliquid. 2°, contra Atheos, probetur esse Deum. 3°, contra Deistas, probetur Dei providentia. 4°, contra Libertinos, probetur devere dari Legem aliquam juxta quam homo sese componat. 5°, probetur, Legem istam debere exprimere Dei naturam et attributa. 6°, probetur, Legem istam quae inter omnes quae inveniuntur, naturam et attributa Dei magis caeteris expresserit, debere esse Legem istam. 7°, ostendatur. 1°, ex praeceptis; 2°, ex promissis; 3°, ex exemplari; 4°, ex beneficis; 5°, ex ope caelesti. 6°, ex charismatis, nullam omnium Legum cognitarum paria pro se, quoad sex jam nominata, producere posse, ac pro se proferre potest Lex Jesu Nazareni, Libris Novi Testamenti comprehensa. ac proinde, illam pro Lege ista esse recipiendam, qua Revelatio quaesita contineatur. MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 48 (r-v). Similar assertions can be found in note 21 of the section entitled «De probatione veritatis librorum Novi Testamenti considerations». In addition, here Boreel argues that the Christian religion can also be proved «per insita librorum Novi Testamenti argumenta. quum videlicet, ex ipso librorum istorum textu, talia investigantur, unde contra Scepticos probari possit, dari aliquid certi; esse Deum, contra Atheos; Deum curare a se condita, contra Deistas; Deum, homini finem, et media ad illum, proposuisse; istum nempe, et ista, quae Libris Novi Testamenti continentur. ac proinde, post Legis Jesu Christi et Librorum istorum publicationem omnes ei accedere teneri». Boreel argues that there is a main difference between the two methods. The first one, which aims to prove the Christian religion through the natural reason, starts by proving the existence of God and of his providence, and then it establishes that a Law which all men must follow really exist. On the contrary, the second method starts by proving the existence of the divine Law and by considering its properties, and then it established the existence of God and of His providence. From Boreel's point of view, common people could understand only the second way of proving the Christian religion, because they could not follow the rational argumentations of the first method. However, the second method relies on the truth of the New Testament, whose proof is hindered by the above-mentioned difficulties. See: notes 21-24 in MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) f. 6(r) – 8(r).

⁸⁵⁹ «Restat igitur, quòd Revelatio duntaxat probari possit Ratiocinatione ἀμέσως contradictoriè proposita et deducta». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 47(v).

⁸⁶⁰ «Medium verò certitudinis omni exceptione majoris per intellectum et ratiocinationem acquirendae, est, ut propositionem aliquam omni exceptione majorem formet et ponat ἀμέσως et terminis contradictoriis, ita ut impossibile sit propositionem istam sic sibi oppositam, eodem respect quoad omnia consideratam, simul veram esse et falsam: sed, ut omnino necesse sit, unam earum esse veram, alteram autem falsam. quo peracto, tunc iterum accipiat istam jam inventam; atque eam, ut dictum est, contradictoriè ponat. et sic progrediatur cum omnibus de quibus certitudinem omni exceptione majorem nosse desiderat, ita enim eam reperturus est; sive id sit in Revelationibus, supposito quòd reverà a

rely on God's revelation, if they want to achieve the absolute truth of Christ's Law. Otherwise, as for all the remaining aspects of the Christian doctrine, they could only attain probable truths.⁸⁶¹

In conclusion, from both groups of notes it is evident that all people need God's revelation in order to acquire full knowledge of Christ's Law. Although learned men can achieve the *certitudo* of some theoretical truths of the Christian religion, ultimately, they have to rely on the divine revelation too. However, it must be underlined that in these notes Boreel does not refer to the difference between Christ's theoretical and practical doctrine. Since Boreel had argued about the rationality of few theoretical truths, we must rightly wonder if people need God's revelation to know and follow Christ's moral precepts.

From some JNL passages it is possible to give a negative answer. On the contrary, Boreel believes that the Christian practical precepts are wholly rational. Therefore, those who can understand and follow rational argumentations can follow Christ's practical doctrine without the help of God's revelation.

First, note 125 of the section *Notae Miscellaneae, ad Tractatus Legislator, Primam Partem Generalem* must be examined. Here Boreel clearly asserts that within Christ's doctrine there are some things, the «moralia», which «insitis rationalitatis suae argumentis semetipsa probant». On the contrary, other doctrines «authoritate ac testimonio Dei nituntur», because they are «positiva».⁸⁶² Although Boreel does not clearly explain what he means with the term «moralia», it is evident that these must be identified with Christ's practical doctrine.⁸⁶³ Furthermore, by saying that these doctrines «insitis rationalitatis suae argumentis semet ipsa probant», Boreel means that they can be proven by themselves, since they are rational. In other words,

Deo sint, et sensum earum in iis quae sic contradictoriè adhibet, probè perceperit; sive id sit in naturalibus, sive moralibus, sive mathematicis, aliisque materiis quibuscunque». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 49(v).

⁸⁶¹ See: notes 406 and 412 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 86(r) and 89(v).

⁸⁶² «In doctrina Jesu Nazareni quaedam sunt quae insitis rationalitatis suae argumentis semetipsa probant, qualia sunt morali. Quaedam autem positiva quum sint, autoritate ac testimonio Dei nituntur» MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 22(v).

⁸⁶³ The same conclusion can be drawn from other notes. For instance, see: notes 132 and 412 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 24(r) and 89(v).

rational men do not need God's revelation to know and follow such doctrines, since human reason is sufficient enough for this purpose. This is the reason why Christ's moral doctrine can be proven only through rational argumentations, while most of theoretical doctrines cannot be established without the assistance of God's revelation and authority.

The following note 128 strengthens these conclusions. Here Boreel clearly argues that Christ's practical doctrine can be proven «per insitas rationes», while everyone needs «Dei istud testimonium» to establish theoretical doctrines.⁸⁶⁴ If some people can prove the moral precepts of Christianity without the assistance of God's revelation, that is without referring to God's authority, it is clear that these precepts are rational. So, those who can understand rational argumentations can know and follow these precepts through human reason alone. On the contrary, God's revelation and authority are absolutely necessary to prove most of Christ's theoretical doctrines. Apart from the above-mentioned rational truths, the theoretical doctrines of the Christian religion are «positiva» and thus each man requires God's revelation in order to acquire the *certitudo* about them.⁸⁶⁵

Furthermore, the passages in which Boreel denies that the excellence of Christ's practical doctrine is useful to plead for the Christian religion can also be taken into account. In fact, Boreel argues, there have been other men besides Christ who have led a moral life without following some kind of divine revelation.⁸⁶⁶ Hence, this conclusion can be drawn. If a moral and practical doctrine does not require God's revelation in order to be known and followed, likewise some men can know and follow Christ's moral precepts only through their *naturali ratiocinatione*. In other words, Christ's practical

⁸⁶⁴ «Practica autem, probabuntur per insitas rationes. at Theoretica, per Dei istud testimonium, Capp. VII^o, VIII^o, IX^o, X^o, et XI^o, de Jesu Nazareno ejusque vita ed doctrina perhibitum». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 23(v).

⁸⁶⁵ It is possible to draw the same conclusion from note 105 of the same section. See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 17(v).

⁸⁶⁶ For instance, in note 413 of the same section Boreel clearly asserts that he must examine if Christ's doctrine «argumentum per se facere possit». However, he answers that this is not possible, because «similia moralia ab aliis proferri et scripi posse, Sceptici Athei et Deistae dicturi sunt». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 90(r). See also: note 125 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 22(v); notes 58 and 71 in MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 14(v) and 19(r).

doctrine is rational and rational men do not need assistance from God's revelation to know it.

Finally, it is possible to examine note 138 of the section entitled «Ad tractatum quo probatur per insita Novi Testamenti argumenta, quod Jesus Nazarenus sit humani generis universi Legislator, notae ad Caput duodecesimum». Here Boreel leaves no doubt. He argues that Christ's moral doctrine can be proven by any kind of argumentation, while the dogmatic or theoretical doctrine cannot be established by human intellect alone, but it needs assistance from God's prophecies and miracles, that is from His revelation and authority.⁸⁶⁷

Therefore, from the analysis of these JNL passages it is possible to draw this conclusion. Christ's Law consists of two parts, that is, practical or moral doctrine, and theoretical or dogmatic doctrine. The former is wholly rational: rational and learned men can prove the truth of Christ's practical precepts through their natural reason, without referring to God's revelation. In other words, natural reason is sufficient to achieve the *certitudo* of the moral doctrine of the Christian religion. On the contrary, through natural reason alone it is possible to acquire the same kind of knowledge of only a few theoretical truths of Christ's dogmatic doctrine. To achieve the *certitudo* of the remaining truths, everyone must rely on God's revelation and authority. Otherwise, through natural reason alone it would be possible to achieve only probable truths about Christ's other theoretical doctrines.

However, by asserting that there are rational truths within Christ's doctrine and that some people do not need assistance from God's revelation to know them, Boreel does not aim to argue or to establish that God's Word is not necessary. As a matter of fact, common people do require divine revelation to know both the practical and theoretical doctrines of the Christian religion, since they are not able to understand rational argumentations.

So, they need the assistance of God's revelation not only to know his existence, the existence of His Law, and all other theoretical truths, but also

⁸⁶⁷ «Moralis doctrina Jesu Nazareni, utcunque rationibus probari posset; At Dogmatica doctrina Jesu Nazareni, solis prophetiis et miraculis, nullatenus autem sola ratiocinatione probari potest». MS RB 1/12/1, (3th foliation) fol. 25(r).

to understand how they have to lead their moral life. This is what can be concluded from all the notes in which Boreel distinguishes between *vulgus* and learned men.⁸⁶⁸ Furthermore, note 3 of the section «Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem» strengthens this conclusion. Here Boreel clearly affirms that God had added His miracles to Christ's doctrine, «propter parvi ingenii homines, qui ex doctrina missione ejus colligere nequeunt», even though «doctrina Jesu sufficeret suiipsius probationi». Three aspects must be emphasized about these assertions. First, with the term «doctrina» Boreel only means Christ's practical doctrine, since it is not «positive» and can be sufficient for the «suiipsius probationi». Consequently, it follows that the moral precepts of Christian religion are rational, since they do not require God's revelation to be proven. Third, God had performed His miracles only because of the common people, since they were not able to understand Christ's mission through their natural reason. In other words, if they had been rational and learned men, they would have understood that Christ was a true divine emissary without the assistance of God's authority and they would have been able to follow Christ's moral precepts and thus to lead a true Christian life through their natural reason alone.

It is now possible to make further considerations about Boreel's ideas concerning the rationality of Christ's Law. The theoretical doctrines of the Christian religion that people can prove through their natural reason can be summarized in these three truths: the existence of God, of His providence, and the Holiness of Christ's Law. The moral precepts of the Christian religion must be added to these three theoretical truths, since they are rational too. This body of theoretical truths and practical precepts can be regarded as the fundamental core of the Christian religion. In fact, it could not exist without any of those three truths. Furthermore, no one could claim to be a true Christian, if he did not live according to Christ's moral precepts.

⁸⁶⁸ For instances in notes 153, 318, and 389 of the section entitled «Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem», Boreel clearly asserts that common people need God's revelation to know every aspect of the Christian religion. See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 27(v), 56 (v), and 81(r).

Although Boreel never referred to such a subject, his ideas concerning the rationality of Christ's doctrines must be connected to the discussion concerning the existence of *adiaphora* in the Christian religion, namely those doctrines about which people can have different opinions. The Stoics used the term *adiaphora* to refer to matters and actions that were morally neuter. Later, some Christian authors made use of the same term to refer to discussions about Christian dogmas and doctrines that were indifferent to a true Christian life. As has been shown previously, during the 17th century some people went as far as to identify Christian religion with some fundamental doctrines which all Christians could have agreed on. The remaining dogmas and ceremonies had to be regarded as *adiaphora* or indifferent for a true Christian life.⁸⁶⁹

In his works Boreel never openly argues for the existence of *adiaphora* or indifferent doctrines, about which each Christian could have his own ideas. However, sometimes it is possible to find references to the existence of fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, which all Christians could share. If such doctrines really exist, it is evident that the remaining doctrines are not fundamentals of Christianity. So, it can be easily argued that they must be regarded as *adiaphora* and that Boreel was well aware of the discussions about the indifferent doctrines of Christian religion.

First, in the final articles of ALAT Boreel refers to the existence of the fundamentals of Christian religion, when he asserts that the Holy Scriptures must be regarded as the «unico ὄλωζ indubiè merèque vero medio Ecclesiastici in communibus fundamentalibus regiminis»,⁸⁷⁰ and when he says that joining the “Church of Connivence” is a useful way for people to edify themselves and others, «mediante sermone, publicè cum fundamenalibus illis communibus». ⁸⁷¹ It is evident that both these references

⁸⁶⁹ For more information, see: See: Bernard Verkamp, *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554* (Athens, 1977); Timothy Wengert, “Adiaphora”, in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. H. Hillerbrand, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1996) 1: 4–7; Gary Remer, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration* (University Park, 1996); Gillian Evans, «Sancta Indifferentia and Adiaphora: “Holy Indifference” and “Things indifferent”», *Common Knowledge* 15(1) (2009), 23–38; Manfred Svensson, «Adiaphora en la Reforma protestante: ¿minimalismo doctrinal y neutralidad moral?», *Theologia y vida* 53(4) (2012), 547–574.

⁸⁷⁰ ALAT, p. 71.

⁸⁷¹ Ibid.

to the *communibus fundamentalibus* point out the existence of some fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, which could be embraced and shared by all people who believe in Christ and in his Law.⁸⁷²

Second, in previous chapters it has been shown that, while discussing the sufficiency and clarity of the Holy Scriptures, in ALAT Boreel refers to doctrines that are necessary to attain salvation and others that are unnecessary to this purpose.⁸⁷³ Although he does not mention the *communia fundamentalia* of Christianity, it is evident that the necessary doctrine to attain salvation are the fundamentals of the Christian religion. As a matter of fact, since all Christians must attain salvation, each one must accept and share all that is necessary for this purpose. Otherwise, if there were some doctrines that are necessary to salvation, but which are not universally agreed upon by all Christians, some people would not be able to reach the highest goal of their life. So, it must be concluded that the *communia fundamentalia* of the Christian religion are the same doctrines that are necessary to attain salvation.⁸⁷⁴

Furthermore, in PEP Boreel openly affirms that it is necessary to found public religion only on those doctrines on which all Christians agree. This is the way to avoid the schisms that had torn apart Christianity.⁸⁷⁵ He makes the same assertion in SG too. After he had argued that «publica auditoria» must be established, in order to read the Holy Scriptures, Boreel

⁸⁷² It is possible to find the same reference in QHC, when Boreel states that he had written ALAT so that all Christians «in pace sese addicere, in eoque unanimiter cum aliis similibus coetibus coalito, retineri queant; S. Scripturae praelectione pro unico verbi Dei auditu, et communibus fundamentalibus pro mutua exhortatione, regimine, etc., adhibitis». QHC, in OP, p. 108.

⁸⁷³ For instance, see: ALAT, p. 42.

⁸⁷⁴ It is possible to find similar assertions in SG. In this work Boreel asserts that all people must found their faith on things about which they are absolutely certain. Therefore, «sequitur, quod ipsiusmet S. scripturae loca illa, materiae, et contextus, de quibus homo, quoad genuinam eorum mentem, non est omninò atque ex vero certus, nec debeant, nec possint esse res ista, ex qua homo veram fidem consequi, eique superstruere debeat». On the contrary, each one must found his faith on those passages and doctrines of the Holy Scripture «de quibus ipse, quoad genuinam eorum mentem, omnino atque ex vero certus est, hanc fidem suam consequi, iisque superstruere teneatur». SG, in OP, pp. 96-97. See also: SG, in OP, pp. 100-101. It is clear that those doctrines which Christians can be certain about are the fundamentals of their religion.

⁸⁷⁵ «cultum in Dei displiciti tolerantia et conniventia, convenienter è S. Scriptura educere, eumque inter sese Universi ipsi quamprimum erigere possint, ad schismata quae singuli hactenus foverunt, abolendae: nimirum, ut in iis duntaxat ubi omens ipsi omnino convenient, publicum Uniformem cultum constituent». PEP, in OP, p. 150.

asserts that in public religion must be founded only on the fundamentals of Christianity, that is on «iis nempè materiis, ac articulis, eorumque deductionibus istis, in quibus omnes, qui solam S. scripturam, prout est ac jacet, pro unico fidei et morum canone recipient, prorsus omninò convenient».⁸⁷⁶

Finally, Boreel makes a few implied references to the existence of the fundamentals of Christian religion in the JNL too, when in some passages he argues that he had to emphasize those parts of Christ's life and doctrine that are most clear and that are shared by everyone.⁸⁷⁷

Now, it is possible to take into consideration Boreel's ideas about the rationality of Christian religion again. In particular, it can be argued that the rational doctrines of Christ's Law must be regarded as the *communia fundamentalia* of Christianity. If Boreel argues that there are some doctrines, either theoretical or practical, that can be known and proven through natural reason alone, it is evident that all people who can understand rational argumentations can embrace such doctrines. In other words, regardless of their particular confessions of faith, all Christians who are able to rightly use their rational faculties can give their own consent to these doctrines. So, the belief in the existence of God and of His providence, the belief that Christ's Law is God's Law, and leading a moral life by following Christ's practical precepts must be regarded as the *communia fundamentalia* of Christian religion. All remaining doctrine and dogmas must be judged as *adiaphora* and thus everyone can have their own opinion about them.

Furthermore, not only all Christian could agree on these doctrines, but all people could accept and embrace them. In fact, once God's existence and his providence has been rationally proven, all people who can understand rational argumentations could accept these truths and give their own consent to them, even Atheist, Deists, and Sceptics. Otherwise, they would be judged as irrational men. Furthermore, once it has been proven that Christ's Law is

⁸⁷⁶ SG, in OP, pp. 103-104.

⁸⁷⁷ «in capitis autem hujus tractatione, istas duntaxat proprietates et effecta cum vitae tum doctrinae Jesu Nazareni exsertè adhibebis, quae ab omnibus admittuntur». MS RB 1/12/1, (3th foliation) f. 4(r). See also: notes 17, 176 e 318 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation), ff. 3(v), 33(v) e 56(v).

God's Law, all people who previously had embraced other religions could accept Christ as their Legislator and they could easily share his rational doctrines. In addition, no one could judge that living according to Christ's moral precepts is difficult or irrational, because these precepts comply with their reason.

In conclusion, although in the JNL's manuscript there are no folios concerning the third step to achieve the main purpose of Boreel's treatise, it can be argued that proving the rationality of fundamental core of the Christian religion would have played a central role in Boreel's argumentation. First, it would have been easier to show why Christ's Law is superior to the laws of other legislators. Furthermore, by establishing the fundamentals of Christian religion and by arguing their rationality, it would have been easier to make all people accept Christ's doctrine and to make them live according to it.

Chapter V: Christ Legislator: The Relationship between Church and State

In the previous chapters two central JNL aspects have been taken into consideration. At first, the necessity of proving the truth of the New Testament, in order to show to common people that Christ is the only legislator of mankind. Then, Boreel's ideas concerning the rationality of the Christian religion, which would have played a central role in proving the JNL purpose to rational and learned men. In particular, it has been shown that Boreel believed that the fundamentals of Christian religion, that is a few theoretical truths and Christ's practical precepts, are rational.

Boreel's purpose by writing the JNL was to provide Christianity with the strongest defense. This is the reason why he wanted to prove to all people that Christ must be accepted as the only legislator of mankind and thus that everyone must follow his Law. However, from the JNL analysis it has been concluded that Christ's Law is nothing else than the doctrine, both theoretical and practical, that he taught during his life and that now is preserved in the New Testament's books. So, we have to find an answer to this question. What meant Boreel by asserting that Christ must be accepted as the only legislator of mankind? It is possible to give two opposing answers. On the hand, it can be argued that Christ must be regarded as the only spiritual legislator of mankind and thus all people must follow his Law in order to attain salvation. On the other hand, it can be argued that Christ must be accepted as both a spiritual and a political legislator. If so, not only all people must embrace his religion and follow his doctrine in order to attain salvation, but the States must enact their laws according to Christ's law. Therefore, the question about Christ as legislator also involve the relationship between Church and State. This chapter deal with this topic.

In the first section, Castellio's and Coornhert's ideas concerning the relationship between Church and State are taken into consideration. In the previous chapters, it has been shown that these two scholars have been two of the major sources of the Collegiant thought and most likely of Boreel's ideas. This is certainly true also for Boreel's reflections concerning the role of the Church in the State. By reading at first Castellio's and Coornhert's

ideas concerning the relationship between the secular and religious powers, and then Boreel's assertions about the same topic, it can be easily concluded that he was deeply influenced by the ideas that Castellio and Coornhert advocated.

The second section examines Boreel's assertions concerning Christ as the legislator of mankind that can be found in JNL. In particular, it shows that it is not possible to give a definitive interpretation of Boreel's words, because in some passages he seems to assert that Christ is both a political and spiritual legislator, while at least once he openly asserts that Christ must be only accepted as a spiritual lawgiver.

The third section tries to solve this apparent contradiction. By referring to a letter that Boreel sent to John Dury, and to his ideas concerning the Church of Connivance, it argues that Boreel had in mind a universal Christian State, which was founded on Christ's rational doctrines and that had only two purposes, that is, to guarantee a public religion based upon the readings of the Holy Scriptures, and to advocate religious toleration for the different confessions of faith.

The relationship between Church and State in the thoughts of Sebastian Castellio and Dirck Coornhert

Anyone who takes into account Castellio's works can easily conclude that his theological-political ideas had played a central role in his thought. From what has already been asserted in previous chapters concerning his opinions on freedom of speech and religious toleration, it is possible to conclude Castellio's beliefs concerning the relationship between Church and State: the civil power cannot and must not punish the citizens because of their religious beliefs, because civil authorities can and must take action only when someone breaks the civil laws and disturbs the peace of the State.

Castellio started to develop these ideas against Calvin and his followers. In February 1554 Calvin published the «*Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra trinitate*».⁸⁷⁸ In the introduction, he explains the purpose of this work: to justify his actions, in particular those connected to the sentence against Michael Servetus, who was burnt at the stake, and to confute the theses of this heretic, who had continued to find followers even after his death. Therefore, in the *Defensio* Calvin examines the question concerning the killing of heretics and the role of civil authorities in their sentence.⁸⁷⁹

In his work Calvin distinguishes his opponents in two kinds. First, there are the «*turbulentes homines*», who judge that the Church held a tyrannical power and who believe that all people have the right to freely express their opinions. Of course, by describing the «*turbulentes homines*» Calvin had in mind not only Servetus, but also Castellio. In fact, he refers to an opponent who had claimed that the heretics must not be punished, because everyone must enjoy the freedom to read the Holy Scriptures and to express his opinions concerning what he read. It is evident that Calvin refers to Castellio, since in the following lines he speaks about a «*translator of the Bible*», who would prefer that faith is removed «*from the heart of a man than allow for the punishment of those who bring doubt in place of faith*».⁸⁸⁰

⁸⁷⁸ Jean Calvin, *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra trinitate: contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti hispani. Ubi ostenditur haereticos iure gladii coercendos esse, et nominatim de homine hoc tam impio iuste et merito sumptum Genevae fuisse supplicium*, Geneva, 1554.

⁸⁷⁹ Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, n. 627), pp. 77-78.

⁸⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

Second, there are the people «boni et simplices», who denies the right to punish the heretics to civil authorities only because of their ignorance and of the oppressions they endured under the Papal yoke.⁸⁸¹

Against these people, Calvin argues that civil authorities have the right to punish heretics and that this does not mean to found again the Papal tyranny. As a matter of fact, the Catholics persecute true Christians too, while Calvin only advocates the right to punish the apostates, who tries to alienate the believers from true faith, and to destroy the peace and the harmony among Christians. Although Calvin acknowledges that from an ideal point of view no one can use constraints on religious matters, however he believes that the existence of the Church must be defended by the civil power. Here Calvin clearly express his beliefs concerning the relationship between Church and State. He asserts that the Christian civil authorities must «watch over the teaching of piety, not in order to compel the minority to belief, but to ensure that Christ is not driven from their land».⁸⁸² The State must not allow that blasphemers, heretics, and apostates could freely destroy Christ's teachings and lead weaker believers to damnation. This is the reason why the State must have the right to prosecute and to punish these people. On the other hand, Calvin argues that the civil authorities must inflict the death penalty only in the most serious cases.⁸⁸³

Shortly after Calvin published the «Defensio», Castellio wrote «De haereticis, an sint persequendi». In previous chapters, it has been argued that in this work Castellio likely hides his identity under some pseudonyms. For instance, the introduction signed by «Martinius Bellius», where it is possible to find ideas about freedom of speech and religious toleration surely shared by Castellio, is probably written by Castellio himself. Furthermore, it is likely that he also uses the pseudonym of Georgius Kleinberg. As a matter of fact, in the writing signed by Kleinberg, which is a clear reply to Calvin's

⁸⁸¹ Ibid., pp. 78-79.

⁸⁸² Ibid., p. 79.

⁸⁸³ Ibid., pp. 79-80. Theodor Beza expressed similar opinions in «De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis libellus, adversus Martini Bellii farraginem et novorum Academicorum sectam, Theodore Beza Vezelio auctore», which he wrote against Castellio's «De haereticis, an sint persequendi». See: Ibid., pp. 110-114.

«Defensio», it is possible to find ideas that later has Castellio expressed in the «Contra libellum Calvinii».⁸⁸⁴

Kleinberg argues that civil authorities have every right to persecute thieves, traitors, liars, and in general those who break the civil laws. Furthermore, they have the duty to protect the believers from injustices. However, they have no right to meddle in religious matters, since the «doctrina theologiae» does not come under the jurisdiction of the State. Hence, no one must be persecuted or punished because of his religious beliefs. Otherwise, no one could guarantee that true Christians will be punished by the civil power too. Furthermore, even if civil authorities were able to discover true heretics, they should not forget the first duty of each Christian, that is, to forgive his brethren. Christ, Kleinberg argues, forgave those who crucified him. So, even more Christians should forgive their brethren, even if he is clearly wrong. Finally, Kleinberg stresses that religious persecutions can only lead to civil disorder and rebellions, while there is only peace where there are no persecutions.⁸⁸⁵

The same ideas can be found in the second preface that is published in the French edition of «De haereticis, an sint persequendi».⁸⁸⁶ This second preface is signed by Martin Bellius again. Its author has the plain purpose of clarifying the relationship between Church and State. Bellius argues that the civil authorities have no power to meddle in religious matters, because only God can judge heretics and no one can seize His authority. If there is a member of the religious community who causes problems to their brethren, for instance by spreading blasphemies such as the denial of God's existence or of Christ's resurrection, he must be rightly reproached by his congregation and eventually punished. However, he must not be persecuted by the civil power, which can intervene only if there are violations of State's laws. Furthermore, even if he who spread blasphemies also breaks civil laws, the State must not inflict the death penalty on him. Therefore, Bellius writes: «il

⁸⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 89.

⁸⁸⁵ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

⁸⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 92.

vaudrait mieux vivre cent, voir mille heretique, que de faire mourir un homme de bien, sous d'hombre d'heresie». ⁸⁸⁷

In the «*Contra libellum Calvini*», which Castellio wrote to confute Calvin's «*Defensio*», it is possible to find similar ideas. ⁸⁸⁸ In this work Castellio openly deals with the topic concerning the right to punish heretics with death penalty. Even if he often refers to Servetus and to the events of his life, Castellio clearly asserts that he does not want to advocate his doctrine. Rather, he has just one purpose: to show Calvin's errors concerning the question of heretics' persecutions. Servetus' case is just a pretext to attack Calvin and his doctrines. ⁸⁸⁹ Anyhow, as for the relationship between Church and State, Castellio gives voice to the same idea embraced by Bellius in the first preface of «*De Haereticis*»: civil authorities only have to establish the fundamentals of the true religion and to guard the teachings of the Church. However, this does not mean that they can persecute someone because of his religious beliefs. In religious matters, only God and Christ have the authority to judge a believer, and thus the State has not right to punish alleged or true heretics. Civil authorities can only deal with the State's laws, and thus they can intervene and punish only those who break these laws. ⁸⁹⁰

From all that it has been asserted, it can be concluded that Castellio developed his ideas concerning the relationship between Church and State mainly to deny civil power's right to persecute and to kill heretics. As it has been affirmed before, Boreel does not deal with the topics concerning heresies, heretics, and their punishments, at least not openly. Nevertheless, he and Castellio shared this fundamental belief: civil authorities must not deal with religious matters, but rather they must only guarantee the proper conduct of public religion, so that their citizens could live in peace and harmony.

Coornhert shared this belief too. However, he developed more ideas and reflections concerning the relationship between the civil power and the religious authorities. In order to approach Coornhert's thought about this

⁸⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 93.

⁸⁸⁸ [Sebastian Castellio], *Contra Libellum Calvini in quo Ostendere Conatur Haereticos jure Gladij Coercendos Esse*, 1562.

⁸⁸⁹ Guggisberg, *Sebastian Castellio* (see above, n. 627), pp. 106-107.

⁸⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 109.

topic, the letter that he sent to his friend Spiegel can be taken into account. In fact, besides expressing his fundamental opinions regarding freedom of conscience, in this letter Coornhert also describes the role that the civil authorities must play in religious matters.

Voogt has well summarized the ideas that Coorhert expressed in his letter in the following fundamental points: the State has no authority over hearts and beliefs of his citizens; God had revealed His will and His truths through prophets, not through rulers; civil authorities has no power over religious matters; lies and errors must be rejected through the truth, not by force; an unnecessary use of civil power is identical to tyranny and thus raises citizens' hate; since only wise and pious people could judge religious matter, and since a few people can be regarded as wise and pious, it is almost impossible that rulers can be able to judge about blasphemies and heresies; the equality among citizens lead to the harmony of the State and thus civil authorities must guarantee freedom of worship; persecution is the first cause of heresies; it is far better to allow the presence of heresies than to risk killing a true Christian; many rulers are able to protect the peace among their citizens, even though they allow the existence of different beliefs and confessions in their State.⁸⁹¹

These ideas can be found in many of Coornhert's works and the fundamental core of Coornhert's thought regarding the relationship between Church and State can be summarized in this way. God gave to civil authorities the duty of preserving civil laws, of protecting the poor, of preventing and punishing crimes, etc. All citizens, regardless of the religion or confession of faith embraced by the State, must obey to the civil power. On the other hand, rulers have no right to impose a certain religion or confession of faith on his citizens. The civil authorities must be the impartial judges who guarantee the coexistence of different religious congregation and who make sure that none of them overcome the others. Since God did not give his authority to rulers in order to impose certain beliefs on citizens, it must be concluded that State and Church refers to two different aspects of human life, the corporeal and the

⁸⁹¹ Voogt, *Constraint on trial* (see above, n. 540), pp. 157-159.

spiritual, which must be mingled in no way. This fundamental core of Coornhert's thought is wholly shared by Boreel.

On the other hand, it must be underlined that these ideas of Coornhert are the outcome of a long process. Therefore, in some of his works it is possible to find some different assertions. For instance, in the «Justificatie des magistraets tot Leyden in Holland», Coornhert seems to state that in some cases civil authorities have the right to meddle in religious matters. Although he clearly argues that the State has no authority to impose a certain religion on his citizens or to establish the teachings of the Church, in this work Coornhert states that civil authorities must have the power to choose its ministers. There has always been the possibility, Coornhert affirms, that some wolfs dressed up as shepherds could be part of a religious congregation. If civil authorities want to rightly use their power and to avoid protecting these wolfs, they must have the power to examine those who desire to become ministers and to choose them. In the light of what has been asserted before, these assertions of Coornhert cannot but come as a surprise. However, Voogt underlines that the «Justificatie» must be read in the light of the dispute which Coornhert took part in, concerning the growing position of the Reformed Church as the State Church of the Dutch Republic.⁸⁹² This is the reason why in this work he argues for a meddling of the State in religious matters that he did not advocated in later years.⁸⁹³

In the «Van de aangheven dwangh» too, which Voogt regards as a through point between Coornhert's first theological-political reflections and the ideas he expressed in later years, it is possible to find assertions that to a certain extent clash with the above-mentioned ideas. In this work, at first

⁸⁹² Ibid., pp. 159-161. Voogt shows that Coornhert conceived these reflections as a reply to the historical events of his time. In fact, after the independence from the Spaniard yoke, the Reformed Church had not become the official Church of the Dutch Republic, even though it surely held a privileged role in the life of the State. At the beginning, some Dutch magistrates had refused to give excessive power to the Reformed Church. In particular, the States General of the Dutch Republic had tried to establish some sort of universal Church, where all the citizens who had lived in the Dutch territories for at least two years could have taken part in the Lord's Supper, regardless of their particular confessions of faith. However, this proposal was refused by the Reformed Church, which in the following years started to acquire increasingly power and to become the official Church of the Dutch Republic. However, its new role did not come without controversies. When Coornhert wrote the «Justificatie», he had involved himself in these disputes. See: Ibid., pp. 154-156.

⁸⁹³ Ibid., pp. 85-86.

Coornhert argues that the civil authorities cannot compel no one to hold certain beliefs in religious matters. However, afterwards he describes a kind of State where the rulers must choose the official religion. In such a State, civil authorities have the duty to protect Church's ministers without interferences in religious matters, which must be defended by the ministers themselves. So, even though Coornhert gives voice to the idea suggesting that the civil power must not meddle in religious matters, however it is evident that in this work Coornhert describes a State which does not play the above-mentioned role of the impartial judge in religious matters.⁸⁹⁴

Of course, here it is not possible to give a full account of Coornhert's theological-political thought. This is the reason why the central core of his ideas concerning the relationship between Church and State has been summarized in the previous pages.

Coornhert believed that the civil authorities must play the role of impartial judges in religious matters, and that they must guarantee harmony and peace among the different religious congregations. Therefore, it is evident that Coornhert believed that each man must be free to embrace a particular confession of faith according to his beliefs and his reason. In other words, everyone must be free to examine different religious doctrines and to follow the belief he regards as true. This does not mean that Coornhert was a relativist, and that he believed in the existence of many religious truths and of many ways to attain salvation. By basing his assertions on his ideas concerning moral individualism and perfectibility of mankind, he stresses the central role of human choice in religious matters, in which no one must follow the opinions of religious leaders, but his own reason instead. Salvation depends on this choice.⁸⁹⁵

On the other hand, the civil power must be an impartial judge as long as no one breaks the State's laws. Although Coornhert argues for religious toleration regarding all religious beliefs, he put limits to this kind of

⁸⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 90-91.

⁸⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 164. Coornhert went as far as to assert that in the State Atheist must be tolerated too. Since no one can impose a religious belief on other people, no one can compel someone to believe in the existence of God. Hence, the civil authorities have the duty «to tolerate everybody: that they may believe what they want or are able to believe». Ibid., p. 167.

tolerations, that is, the observance of civil laws. In other words, civil authorities have the duty to guarantee the coexistence of all religious congregations and the freedom of worship as long as their citizens follow the civil laws.⁸⁹⁶

Since the fundamental core of Coornhert's thought has been described, we must wonder if he had given some practical solution concerning the relationship between civil and religious powers. In some of his works, Coornhert advocated two kinds of solutions.

First, he made references to the Polish kingdom led by king Stephan I Bãthory, where the citizens could enjoy religious freedom as long as they did not break civil laws. Coornhert asserted that, when Protestant people understood that they were the majority of the king's council, they asked him to banish all Catholics from Poland. However, the king refused to do so, arguing that he was the monarch of people, not of their consciences.⁸⁹⁷

Second, Coornhert proposed a sort of religious synod, where all people who were members of a church or Christian congregation could have been safely gathered. This synod would have had this main purpose: to remove all doctrines and ceremonies that had been causes of disputes and divisions among Christians, in order to establish the fundamentals of Christianity, that is, a few doctrines that would have been shared by all people. In this way, Christians would have founded a true and universal Church, and thus they would have finally established unity and harmony within the Christian religion.⁸⁹⁸ As we will see in the following pages, it is most likely that this second kind of solution could have most raised Boreel's interest.

⁸⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 166-167.

⁸⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 174. Voogt underlines that, by making reference to king Stephan I Bãthory Coornhert, did not consider the real religious freedom practiced in the Polish kingdom, where nobility was more free than common people.

⁸⁹⁸ Ibid., pp. 174-175.

Christ as legislator of mankind

Before we examine Boreel's assertions concerning Christ as legislator of mankind and we give an interpretation of such assertions, it is necessary to understand why Christ must be regarded as the only legislator of mankind. In fact, it has been argued that in Christ's Law there are few rational doctrines that are the fundamentals of Christian religion. However, it is evident that most of these doctrines are shared by other religions too. All revealed religions believe in the existence of God, of his providence, and of a divine Law that all people must follow. Furthermore, Boreel himself emphasized that Christ's practical doctrine is not unique to Christianity, since other legislators had been able to establish moral precepts through their natural reason.⁸⁹⁹ So, why can people not follow Mohammed's laws or believe in the Jewish religion?

The answer has to be found in the most significant truth among the fundamentals of Christian religion: Christ's Law is God's Law. It has been argued that a discussion concerning the rationality of Christ's doctrine would have played a central role in Boreel's proof in the JNL. As a matter of fact, Boreel believed that he could have proven through *naturali ratiocinatione* that the law that most expresses God's nature and attributes must be regarded as the divine law, and that only Christ's doctrine fulfill these conditions. It must be proven, Boreel argues, that Christ's Law has divine nature «1°, ex praeceptis; 2°, ex promissis; 3°, ex exemplari; 4° ex beneficiis; 5°, ex ope caelesti; 6, ex charismatis», and by arguing that «nullam omnium Legum cognitarum paria pro se, quoad sex jam nominata, producere posse; ac pro se proferre potest Lex Jesu Nazareni».⁹⁰⁰

In short, Boreel believed that it would have been possible to prove that Christ is the only legislator of mankind and that all people must follow

⁸⁹⁹ «Dogmatica verò doctrina, quia positiva est, convincere nequit; Moralis, natura sua convincere nequit, nisi sciatur a Deo ortam; nam, et alii, moralia excogitare possent, neque tamen hinc sequitur illa a Deo esse; quis enim scire potest, quibus moralibus et dogmaticis Deus coli velit ab hominibus, nisi id ipse Deus revelaverit?». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 15(r-v).

⁹⁰⁰ MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 48(v). It is possible to find the same assertions in notes 19-21 of the section «De probatione veritatis librorum Novi Testamenti considerations». See: MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) ff. 6(r) – 7(v).

his Law by showing that his doctrine is superior to all other religious doctrines. This is the reason why he had to make a comparison between Christ's Law and the laws of other legislator, because he had to show that Christian precepts and doctrines are more eminent than the laws and customs of Jews, Muslims, Pagans, natural philosophers, etc.⁹⁰¹ Although there no reference in JNL manuscript concerning such comparisons, some notes about the excellence of Christ's doctrine can still be found.

In note 142 of the section «Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem», Boreel clearly asserts that in JNL he has to fully discuss God's nature and attributes, so that it would be possible to show that Christ's life and doctrine have a divine nature, once he has compared them with God's attributes.⁹⁰² Likewise, in the following note 173 he states that he needs to show the excellences of Christ's life and doctrines, which are more numerous and more eminent than the qualities of all other legislators.⁹⁰³

Furthermore, in note 333 of the same section, Boreel asserts that in the «parte comparativa» he has to examine all the laws that are claimed to be divine, in order to show that Christ is superior to all other legislators, by comparing their laws to his doctrine. In this way, all people could be persuaded to follow Christ's Law.⁹⁰⁴ Note 377 reaffirms these assertions. Here Boreel writes that it was necessary to add new chapters, where he would have

⁹⁰¹ «Ne verò homines prolabentur ad alias positivas leges vel Leges quascunque alias, id praecavebis parte comparativa, ostendens nullam esse Legem quam homines pro Divina recipere habeant, quàm Legem Jesu Nazareni». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 63(v).

⁹⁰² «Capite Operis VI^o, amplius et dilucidius de Dei natura disseri debet, ut inde attributa ejus colligi possint, quibus proprietate vitae et doctrinae Jesu Nazareni, capite XII^o proponendae conferantur. alioqui Dei natura et attributis ignoratis, frustra capite XII^o inferetur Vitam et doctrinam Jesu Nazareni propter proprietate earum Deo placere, eumque Authorem habere». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 25(r).

⁹⁰³ «Ostendandum erit, quòd in solo Jesu Nazareno, ejus vita et doctrina, plures excellentiae concurrant; quàm in omnibus simul junctis Legislatoribus, eorum vita, et doctrina reperiri possunt». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 31(v).

⁹⁰⁴ «In Tractatus Jesus Nazareni Legislator parte comparativa ad alias omnes Leges, agendum erit de omnibus et singulis Legibus quae se pro divinis unquam habuerunt, ac etiamnum habent; nempe, de Mahumedana, Quakerorum, Davidis Georgii, Veterum et hodiernorum Paganorum, ac aliorum omnium, quorum seriem variis scriptis tuis consignasti. ut, comparatione, cum Jesu Nazareno ejusque Lege, ac utriusque praestantia, instituta cum aliis legibus earumque promulgatoribus, evidenter cuilibet constare possit, Jesum Nazarenum ejusque Legem aliis omnibus longè praestare; ac, pro Legislatore ac lege esse debere quem et quam homines in omnibus vitae humanae statibus usque sequantur». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 61(v).

argued that no one can be compared to Christ and that no doctrine can match his precepts and teachings.⁹⁰⁵

Of course, this kind of argumentation was meant for rational and learned men. On the other hand, we should not forget that from Boreel's point of view Christ must be accepted as the only legislator of mankind not only because his doctrine is superior to all other religious laws, but also because God Himself had given him divine authority, by performing prophecies and miracles through him. Although this kind of argumentation was mainly meant for common people, in two notes Boreel regards God's prophecies and miracles as a useful way to persuade learned men too.

In note 4 of the section «Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem», he argues that God had performed miracles so that all people could accept Christ's precepts and so that no one could question them, as happened in ancient times, when Pagans used to discuss vices and virtues.⁹⁰⁶ In note 153 of the same section there are similar assertions. After he argued that Christian religion must be founded on God's authority, otherwise common people could not understand it, Boreel asserts that both theoretical and practical doctrines must be proven through the «jus Dei», so that no one can questioned them.⁹⁰⁷

⁹⁰⁵ «Parti secundae generalis hujus primae partis, Nava haec capita addi debent, videlicet, Quòd dotes omnium Legislatorum aequare nequeant ea, quae de Jesu Nazareno allata fuerunt. II^o, quòd dotes omnium hominum, aequare non valeant ea, quae de Jesu Nazareno allata fuerunt. III^o, quòd omnium Legislatorum leges, aequare nequeant ea quae de Jesu Nazareni Lege allata fuerunt. IV^o, quod omnium hominum Leges et doctrinae, aequare nequeant ea, quae de Lege Jesu Nazareni allata fuerunt». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 77(v). There are many more passages in which Boreel asserts the excellence of Christ's doctrine. For instance, see: notes 176, 177, 340, 342, 375, 377, 387, 389, 392, 389 e 426 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 33(v), 34(r), 62(v), 63(r), 77(r), 77(v), 80(r), 81(r), 84(r), 85(v) e 92(v).

⁹⁰⁶ «Miracula adduntur praeceptis, ne homines praecepta ista disputent, ut quidem Ethnici de virtute et vitio facerunt. sed ut norint, ita esse accipienda, prout ab omnibus verba istorum praeceptorum intelliguntur». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 2(r).

⁹⁰⁷ «[...] adeò quidem, ut omnis Jesu doctrina tam Theoretica quàm Practica, isto modo probetur, nimirum, Deum, prophetiarum istarum et miraculorum Authorem, jus habere determinandi, quidnam homini pro certo habendum, seu credendum, ac sperandum; item, quidnam ipsi pro virtute, quidnam pro vitio, quidnam pro adiaphoro et libero habendum sit; ac ista determinatione, probè cognita, disceptationibus humanis de rebus istis, utrum pro talibus habendae sint, nec ne, silentium et finem imponi». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 27(v). See also: notes 155, 176 e 358 in MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 28(v), 33(v) e 68(r).

In conclusion, although human reason is able to establish moral precepts and although over the centuries some people had developed moral doctrines, mankind must only follow Christ's Law, because it is the closest to God's nature and attributes, and because God gave his authority to Christ and to his doctrine.

It is now possible to examine Boreel's assertions concerning Christ as a legislator. As has already been asserted, in JNL it is possible to find some notes arguing that Christ is both a political and spiritual legislator, while in one note Boreel openly states that Christ's kingdom is spiritual.

In note 3 of the section «De probatione veritatis librorum Novi Testamenti considerationes», Boreel clearly argues that all parts of human life, so even laws and religions, must be established according to Christ's doctrine.⁹⁰⁸ He immediately repeats this assertion in the following note 4, where he argues that New Testament must be regarded as the «normam» of laws, religions, and of all *statuum* of human life.⁹⁰⁹ Boreel does not explain what he means with the term «leges». However, it is most likely that he wanted to refer to civil law.⁹¹⁰ So, Christ must be accepted as a political and spiritual legislator, because the people have to establish civil law according to his doctrine.

It is possible to draw the same conclusion from note 358 of the section «Notae Miscellaneae, ad Tractatus Legislator, Primam Partem Generalem». Here Boreel asserts that through *naturali ratiocinatione* no one can know the true law that must rule the relationship among people, and between man and other living creatures. People can establish moral precepts and laws. However, some people believe things that other people deny, and so they have enacted various kinds of laws. This is why God's revelation and

⁹⁰⁸ ⁹⁰⁸ «Probandum est, Jesum Nazarenum esse humani generis universi Legislatorem unicum, a Deo constitutum. Leges ejus, esse codices Novi Testamenti. Juxta istas leges, omnes vitae humanae status, Leges, Religiones, res, componi, ac, ad debitum suum finem referri, debere». MS RB 1/15/1, (4th foliation) f. 2(r).

⁹⁰⁹ «Igitur, probari debet. 1. Codices istos, qui Novum Foedus seu Testamentum dicuntur, vera continere. 2. Codices istos, esse Legem Jesu Nazareni. 3. Codices istos, esse aliorum omnium Legum ac Religionum, vitaeque huamane Statuum, normam; juxta quam, ad debitum finem reduci debent». Ibid.

⁹¹⁰ There are similar assertions in note 352 of the section «Notae miscellaneae, ad tractatus legislator, primam partem generalem». See: MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) f. 67(r).

authority is necessary, so that no one can question these matters anymore.⁹¹¹ In other words, God has ordered through His revelation what laws people must follow and no one can oppose or question them, because they are based on God's authority. If so, it is evident that civil law also must be established according to Christ's Law.

Furthermore, the same definitions of Christ's doctrine seem to strengthen the hypothesis suggesting that Christ must be regarded as a political and spiritual legislator. In fact, Boreel asserts many times that Christ's practical doctrine concerns «vel Deum, vel homines», and as for people «vel ipsum hominem, vel proximum». In other words, Christ's practical doctrine concern the duties that everyone has towards God and towards other people.⁹¹² Therefore, it can be argued that the «officia» towards God refer to religious precepts, while the «officia» towards other men are related to civil law that guides people's relationships. If so, both religious and civil law must be established according to Christ's doctrine.

However, in note 398 of the section «Notae Miscellanae, ad Tractatus Legislator, Primam Partem Generalem», Boreel argues against this hypothesis. Here he asserts that all people can be certain that Christ is God's emissary and that his doctrine is truly divine thanks to his miracles, his prophecies, the holiness of his life, the excellency of his law, etc. This is the reason why everyone must accept him as such and obey him «in regimine hoc spirituali».⁹¹³ This last assertion clearly confutes the hypothesis suggesting that Christ must be considered as a political legislator too.

If we take into account how Boreel has made use of the term «regimen» in his other works, it can be easily concluded that he refers to the

⁹¹¹ «Item, adversus eosdem quòd naturali ratiocinatione homini ignorenti, an et quale jus habeant aut habere debeant in semet ipsos, in semet-invicem, e in alias res quae in mundo sunt. Nam unus, jus istud sic intelligent, alius aliter: ac proinde, ne homines perpetuò hic fluctuant, Dei revelatione ac autoritate opus est, ut juris istius limites statuantur». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) ff. 68(r-v).

⁹¹² «Practica concernit, vel Deum, vel homines. Quae homines, vel ipsum hominem, vel proximum. Hoc est, quòd practica doctrina tradat et praescribat debita Deo et hominibus officia». MS RB 1/12/1, (3th foliation), f. 4(r).

⁹¹³ «utique, haec sufficiunt subditis, ut in regimine hoc spirituali certi esse possint, pro ratione subjectae materiae, quòd Jesus Nazarenus missus sit a summo cum ista doctrina quam docuit; ac proinde, teneri omnes, cum pro tali recipere, eique obedire». MS RB 1/15/1, (1th foliation) fol. 80(v).

semantic areas of «government» and of «administration». For instance, in ALAT Boreel makes use of the term «regimen» to refer either to the wrong management of modern churches, or to the right administration of public religion through the “Church of Connivance”.⁹¹⁴ Therefore, it is evident that the words «in regimine hoc spirituali» leave no doubt. In note 398 Boreel argues that Christ’s Law is nothing other than spiritual doctrines that everyone must follow in order to attain salvation. So, Christ is not a political legislator and his kingdom is just spiritual.

⁹¹⁴ See articles CXVI, CXX, CXXXVIII, CXL, CXLIII, CXLVI, CXLVIII, CL, CLIV, CLVIII, CLXII, CLXXIV e CLXXVI in ALAT, pp. 54, 59, 60, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68, 70 e 71. Boreel had made use of the terms «regimen» and «regere» in the same ways in ASM, in QHC, and in PEP. See: ASM, in OP, p. 87; QHC, in OP, pp. 107, 108, 114, 115 e 116; PE, in OP, p. 149.

Christ as Legislator: Boreel's universal State based on the Church of Connivance

From the analysis of the JNL it is rather difficult to determine how we should interpret Boreel's assertion suggesting that Christ is the only legislator of mankind. At first sight, there are numerous passages arguing that he must be accepted as a political and spiritual legislator, and thus that civil law must be enacted according to Christ's doctrine. It is possible to interpret this last assertion in two different ways. On the one hand, it can be argued that Boreel was a Millenarian and that he conceived God's reign as a future kingdom upon Earth, where Christ would rule over mankind through his laws. On the other hand, it can be assumed that Boreel had in mind a Christian Theocracy, where State law is enacted according to Christ's laws recorded in the New Testament.

However, both interpretations must be rejected. First, it is impossible to argue that Boreel held Millenarian ideas, since he had never expressed such ideas neither in his works, nor in his letters, although in some of them he made use of some expression that are quite similar to Millenarian assertions.⁹¹⁵ On the other hand, it is impossible to argue that he wanted to establish a Christian Theocracy, since this would have been against both his assertion in note 398 about Christ's «regimine spirituali» and the ideas he expressed in previous works, where he had pleaded for freedom of speech and religious toleration.

Furthermore, from a letter that he sent to John Dury on August 10, 1660, it can be concluded that Boreel was not in favor of any kind of theocracy.⁹¹⁶ On the contrary, in this letter Boreel's assertions argue in favor

⁹¹⁵ Therefore, I agree with Ernestine van der Wall, when she writes: «It may well have been that Boreel's conversionism was inspired by millenarian expectations. Some of his expressions in his letters possess a millenarian flavor, as, for example, the sentence just quoted, or when he talks about the building up of Christ's reign and the demolition of Satan's dominion, but as far as I know he never put forward the idea of Christ's thousand-year reign with his saints upon earth, nor does he speak about such eschatological notions as the fall of Babylon or the resurrection of the just. Furthermore, it is surprising that the fierce antimillenarian Maresius did not attack the eschatological aspect of Boreel's thought, which the Groningen professors undoubtedly would have done if Boreel had given him any reason to do so. If Boreel cherished millenarian expectations, then his millenarianism was much less outspoken than that of millenarian friends such as Durie and Serrarius». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel* (see above, n. 21), p. 247.

⁹¹⁶ This letter is preserved in the Sloane Collection of the British Library. See: Sloane MSS 649, ff. 41-42. Furthermore, it was published by Ernestine van der Wall. See: Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist* (see above, n. 21), pp. 258-259.

of the hypothesis that Christ's Law only concerns religious matters and that he is just a spiritual legislator. In fact, after arguing that the highest purpose of each one is to attain salvation and that religion is founded in order to pursue this purpose, Boreel clearly affirms that a State must never meddle with Christ's spiritual reign. Therefore, those who try to join these two aspects of human life do it in vain.⁹¹⁷

It is evident that Boreel's assertions leave no doubt. Christ's «regnum spiritual» must not be confused or mingled with human political systems. Otherwise, one of the many Christian sects or confessions of faith would acquire civil power and thus it would hold a leading position over all the others. As a consequence, it would deny freedom of expression to all other Christian congregations and, in the end, it would eliminate them. This is the reason why previously Boreel had explained to Dury that civil power must only have two duties in religious matters: it must base public religion on the readings of the Holy Scriptures, and it must guarantee freedom of speech and the right to congregate in private meetings to each confession of faith.⁹¹⁸

These assertions are consistent with Boreel's ideas concerning the Church of Connivance. On the other hand, one may ask: is it possible to find some kind of conformity between the JNL notes in which Boreel affirms that civil law must be established according to Christ's doctrine, and his assertions suggesting that no one must ever confound civil power with Christ's spiritual reign, or is there a contradiction that no one can solve?

I believe it is possible to find accordance between these two opposite opinions by referring to the fundamentals of Christian religion that Boreel conceived in JNL. In particular, by arguing that Boreel had in mind an

⁹¹⁷ «At politici populi salutem pro summa lege habent, cui religio accomodari ab iis solet; quare Christi vero spirituali regno numquam cum regno quod de hoc mundo est bene convenit, convenit ac conveniet, non magis ac ferro cum luto, ac proinde frustra sunt qui ista sociare tentant, mea quidem sententia». Van der Wall, *The Dutch Hebraist* (see above, n. 21), p. 258.

⁹¹⁸ «Caeterum de rebus vestris nil adhuc certi decretum a Rege ac Parlamento accipio. Si solius S. Scripturae publicam praelectionem pro unitivo cultu adhiberent, et cuilibet perculiares suas synagogas liberas permetterent, nec ullis conscientiiis, quae solam pro fidei ad morum canone S. rescipiunt Scripturam, vis intentaretur, facile res transigi posset. Quoad pontificios, praeter S. Scripturam etiam traditionibus nonscriptis addictos, possent isti tollerari, ita ut simul a politicis rebus sese immiscerent, insignem mulctam pecuniarum Regi penderent. Id enim homine magis formidarent quam carceres et mortem pro religione (ut ipsi quidem arbitrantur vera) tolerata». Ibid.

universal Christian State based on these fundamentals and on the Church of Connivence, it is possible to solve this contradiction. As a matter of fact, if we assume that Boreel conceived a Christian State only founded on the rational truths of Christian religion, we can argue that from a theoretical point of view such a State would accept as fundamental truths only the existence of God and of His providence, and Christ's Law as God's Law. All other theoretical doctrines would be regarded as *adiaphora*. On the other hand, from a practical point of view, this State should enact its law according to Christ's moral precepts.

It is clear that this hypothesis agrees with the JNL notes where Boreel argues that all aspects of human life must be based on Christ's Law. Furthermore, it agrees with the idea suggesting that no one should meddle civil power with Christ's spiritual reign. As a matter of fact, by accepting only the three fundamental theoretical truths of Christian religion, this kind of State would give no power to a particular confession of faith, but, as for all Christian doctrines that are *adiaphora*, it would instead guarantee freedom of speech to each Christian sect. If so, Christ could be accepted as a political legislator, but the State based on his rational doctrines would accept such generic theoretical truths that it could guarantee both the union of the Christian religion and the freedom to hold private meetings for each particular confession of faith. In other words, civil power would not be meddled in Christ's spiritual reign, because civil authorities would have no kind of jurisdiction over religious matters, and because they should only guarantee religious peace by enforcing civil laws. In conclusion, by enacting its laws according to the *communia fundamentalia* of Christianity, Boreel's State would achieve two main results: first, it would not have neither the necessity, nor the right to intervene in discussions concerning the *adiaphora*; second, all Christians could accept and follow its laws, since they comply both with Christ's doctrine and human reason. Furthermore, by giving people the freedom to choose their particular confession of faith and by establishing its practical laws according to Christ's moral precepts, this State would be unable to hinder the salvation of any individual. So, Christ could be regarded as both a political and spiritual legislator.

The hypothesis suggesting a State that must be founded on Boreel's fundamentals of Christian religion agrees not only with JNL's assertions, but also with the ideas concerning the Church of Connivance that Boreel had expressed in previous works. As a matter of fact, it has been shown that the public worship of Boreel's Church is only based on the reading of the Bible,⁹¹⁹ since it is possible to administer any kind of worship through God's written Word.⁹²⁰ Furthermore, public religion must be only led through the *communia fundamentalia* of Christianity and only those passages of the Scriptures which all people agree on must be publicly read. As for all other doctrines of Christian religion, that is the *adiaphora*, people can only discuss them in private meetings. It is evident that these assertions regarding the Church of Connivance fully agree with the ideas Boreel expressed in his letter to Dury and with a State based on the rational doctrines of Christ's Law.

The political system conceived by Boreel accepts as fundamental truths of the Christian religion only the existence of God, of His Providence, and of His Law, that is, Christ's doctrine. Therefore, it is evident that public religion must be only based on the reading of those passages of the Holy Scriptures in which these truths and Christ's moral precepts are clearly stated. This is the only way to guarantee a public religion that does not support a particular confession of faith, which is based on certain beliefs concerning *adiaphora* doctrines.

Furthermore, it is clear that Boreel's beliefs about the existence of rational fundamentals in Christian religion and about the possibility of establishing a State based on them, support and strengthen the importance he

⁹¹⁹ Ut autem homines ad genuinum Dei verbum reduci ac perduci queant, publica auditoria institui debent, in quibus sola S. scriptura, prout est ac jacet, reverente ac distinctè singulis diebus per justum aliquod tempus praelegatur, in usum quidem omnium, praesertim vero eorum, qui vel legere nesciunt, vel distinctè legere nequeunt; negotiisque impliciti, lectionem privatam negligunt ac procrastinant». SG, in OP, p. 103.

⁹²⁰ «Ac proinde [...] quaerendum est; Utrùm igitur loco verbi illius concionatorii non-ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèque veri [...] utrùm inquam conveniat cum Dei mandato vel beneplacita permissione, substitui loco ejus omnibus illis utile illud (ut vidimus) verbum Dei scriptum ὄλωϛ insitè indubiè merèque verum, in publico nimirum cultu qui Dei ut dictum est nomine fieri debet». Ritenendo la risposta positiva, l'autore continua la sua sequenza di domande retoriche chiedendosi se il «solum illud ipsum verbum Dei scriptum [...] omnium statuum Christianis esse possit Dei nomine id est Dei loco et autoritate seu pro eo legatione fungendo, et debeat, pro sufficiente catechismo et confessione; quibus videlicet tanquam fidei analogia mediantibus, et privatus et publicum eorum cultus limitari ac dirigi Dei ut dictum est nomine debet ac potest?». ALAT, p. 46-47. See also: ALAT, p. 49.

attached to religious toleration and freedom of thought. Since Boreel's State only accepts the rational fundamentals of Christian religion and does not support any particular confession of faith, regarding their dogmas, doctrines, and matters that must be regarded as *adiaphora*, it is clear that each member of such State can follow the opinion that he believes most fitting or true. Furthermore, he can freely hold private meetings where he and his fellow-thinkers are allowed to freely express their opinions and beliefs. In short, the civil authorities of Boreel's State must tolerate all confession of faith and all Christian sects, and they must guarantee the freedom to congregate and to express their beliefs.

In conclusion, by taking into account what has been said in this and in previous chapters, Boreel's thought concerning Christian religion and its relationship with civil power can be summarized in this way. Civil authorities must not deal with religious matters or discussion that concern doctrines and articles of faith which are *adiaphora*, that is which are not shared by all Christians. By enforcing civil law, which must be enacted according to the rational fundamentals of Christian religion, civil power must only guarantee religious peace and harmony. Furthermore, civil authorities have to establish the Church of Connivance. So, in their State public religion must be led only through the reading of those passages of the Holy Scriptures in which the fundamentals of Christianity are clearly stated. Furthermore, from a private point of view, each particular confession of faith concerning dogmas and doctrines which are *adiaphora* must be tolerated, so that everyone can privately follow their own beliefs and can hold free meeting with those people who share the same opinions. In such private meetings, everyone must enjoy freedom of speech and the opinions of everyone must be tolerated, even if they are erroneous.

Therefore, it can be concluded that Boreel had in mind a sort of Universal Christian State, where mankind could be united. Since such State is founded on few rational truths and on Christ's moral precepts, which are rational too, all people could give his own assent to these truths, they could resolve to live according to them, and thus they could decide to be citizens of such a State. In this way, Christ can be regarded as the legislator of mankind.

Surely, he would be a spiritual legislator, since all people could attain salvation through public religion based on the reading of the Holy Scripture, where Christ's law is preserved, and through religious toleration and freedom of thought, that everyone could enjoy in private religious meetings. Moreover, Christ would be a political ruler too, to the extent that this State would accept the rational core of his doctrine.

Chapter VI: The union between man and God

In the previous chapters, it has been shown that Boreel had conceived the existence of a few rational theoretical truths of the Christian religion, such as the existence of God, of His providence, and of His Law, which must express His nature and attributes, and which must be identified with Christ's doctrine. As a matter of fact, Boreel wanted to prove that the Christianity is far superior to all other religions and that God Himself gave divine authority to Christ's teachings, by performing miracles and prophecies through him. For these two reasons, Boreel argued that Christ's Law is truly divine.

Boreel believed that these few theoretical truths together with Christ's moral precepts, which are rational too, were the fundamentals of Christianity, since all Christians could agree on them, regardless of their particular confessions of faith concerning dogmas, doctrines, and religious matters that must be regarded as *adiaphora*, that is, indifferent for a true Christian life. Moreover, since these fundamentals are rational, even those who did not embrace the Christian religion and those who did not believe in God's existence could give their own assent to them. These are the reasons why Boreel thought that a State could be founded on the fundamentals of the Christian religion, so that all people could practice public religion through the readings of the Holy Scriptures, and enjoy religious toleration and freedom of thought.

Boreel tried to prove that all people can and must follow Christ's Law because he believed that God is the Highest Good of all creatures. In other words, the highest purpose of each man is to acquiesce in God. The Christian religions, Boreel argues, is the best means to achieve this purpose.⁹²¹ If someone proves that Christ is the legislator of mankind, and

⁹²¹ «Nemo, hominibus ostendere, exhibere, ac probare potest, ullam meliorem aut tutiorem, aut aequae bonam ac tutam, ad Deum Opt. Max. viam; quam est ista, quae libris Novi Testamenti et, juxta istos, Veteris Testamenti libris; qui junctim Sacrae Scripturae nomine veniunt, continetur. Adhaec; nemo viam istam in dubium revocare, rejicere, negare, eive contradicere majoribus vel paribus, ac sunt istae, quibus illa constat rationibus, potest. Ac proinde ij, qui eam pro tali jam receperunt, constanter illi adhaerere; ij verò, qui eam pro tali necdum receperunt, incunctanter ad eam accedere tenentur». SG, in OP, p. 93. Similar assertions can be found in a brief writing entitled «Demonstratio certitudinis Scripturae Sacrae». In this work Boreel proves that God is the highest purpose of mankind and that He

that all people must accept and follow his doctrine, each man will acquire the means to reach God, since everyone will find these means in the Holy Scriptures. This is the reason why, Boreel says, it is necessary to read or to listen the readings of the New Testament.⁹²²

In this chapters, which concludes the account of Boreel's thought, his ideas concerning the union between man and God, and the means to pursue such purpose, are taken into consideration.

As in previous chapters, the first section deals with some authors from the 16th and 17th centuries who expressed ideas similar to Boreel's ones. In particular, this section examines the thought of four major authors: Petrus Serrarius and Galenus Abrahamsz, since they were two of Boreel's closest friends; Dirck Camphuysen, because his belief concerning the possibility of a perfect life, and his belief in Christ as the example that all people must follow, could have influenced Boreel's thought, up to a certain point; finally, Dirck Coornhert, who was one of the major source of Collegiant ideas and who conceived a path that each man must follow in order to reach God, the Highest Good of mankind.

The second section examines Boreel's thought. His ideas concerning the union between man and God are expressed in some posthumous works, such as PR, SRC, and the three letters published in the «Opera Posthuma». There are other writings among the posthumous works that deal with these matters, such as Boreel's poem and few pamphlets. However, Boreel's major

gave to all people a proper means to pursue their aim. Each man must acquire a nature similar to God through that means. So, Boreel concludes, no one can prove a «meliorem ac certiore, vel aequè bonam atque certam viam ad Deum; quam est haec via, quae in libris novi foederis, et secundum hos in libris antiqui foederis, qui conjunctim libri S. Scripturae vocantur, proponitur». Furthermore, no one can doubt, deny, or confute through «pluribus vel aequè firmis rationibus, ac sunt istae rationes, haec quibus via subsistit, et quibus haec via fundata est». This is the reason why all people who had already accepted the Holy Scripture as such means must continue in their path towards God, while those who have not yet embraced it «necesse habent, ut in eam è vestigio se conferant». DCSS, in OP, pp. 136-137.

⁹²² «Media vero ad ea, quae diximus, conducentia, sunt, resipiscentia, obedientia fidei, et promissum dominum Spiritus Sancti: hoc est, praedicatio Joannis baptistae, praedicatio Domini Jesu Christi, et praedicatio Spiritus Sancti; quas tres secundum ordinem unam post alteram invenimus in libri Novi faederis. Quibus libris, ut in hunc finem rectè utamur, necessarium est, ut eos legamus, aut legi audiamus, ut lectos meditemur, et tandem Deum ardentè invocemus». SRC, in OP; p. 183.

ideas are expressed in the above-mentioned works and thus we will focus the analysis on them.

The “radical reformation” and the path towards God

The subject concerning the way to reach the union between man and God has been discussed by Christian authors of all time. Of course, here we cannot give a full account, if such an account is even possible, regarding all that has been written about such union and the means to reach it. Most of the Christian authors who dealt with such topic often held spiritualistic and mystical ideas, even though in the 16th and 17th centuries many scholars started to consider human reason as a necessary means to walk the path towards God. In this section, we examine four major authors of the so called “radical reformation”, whose ideas likely had some influence on Boreel’s thought. Moreover, as for Serrarius and Galenus, since they were two of Boreel’s closest friends, we cannot exclude that such influence was mutual and that Boreel had some role in the shaping of their ideas. Furthermore, the historical context in which the ideas of these four authors were conceived is briefly examined.

As for Petrus Serrarius, who certainly was one of the Collegiants of Amsterdam and a close friend of Boreel, even though it is not sure when they met, Ernestine van der Wall shows that he started to conceive his mystical-spiritualist thought, as Van der Wall has called it, during the 1630s. In these years, he started to express his ideas concerning the «imitation Christi», and the «conformitas» with his life and sufferings, which everyone must aim to.⁹²³ In the same period, Serrarius was in touch with some people that could have influenced his thought, a circle of friends which was characterized by «een dergelijke atmosfeer van mystieke vroomheid, theosofie en boehmisme», as Van der Wall says.⁹²⁴

Among these friends there was Cornelis Laakhuizen, a button dealer of *doopsgeziden* origins from Amsterdam, who in the 1630s was banished from the «Oude Vlamingen» congregation and who in 1637 joined the «Waterlandse doopsgezinden». Among Laakhuizen’s friends must be mentioned Iustinus van Assche, who was one of Boreel’s closest friends during

⁹²³ Van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius* (see above, n. 7), pp. 80-81.

⁹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

the 1630s and 1640s. Besides being a button dealer, Laakhuizen was a writer of religious hymns and poems. In his writings, he puts much emphasis on being «eenig en bloot in God geheel gezonken», a condition that must be achieved through the denial of corporeal world.⁹²⁵

Caspar Luiken too, father of the famous Caspar and Jan Luiken, was one of Serrarius' friends during the 1630s. He lived in Amsterdam, where he was a «schoolmeester» and where in 1634 became a member of the Remonstrant community. In his works, he expresses both a strong piety and an interest in Jakob Böhme's mysticism, by advocating religious toleration, a practical Christianity and the hope in the forthcoming Christ's reign on Earth.⁹²⁶

Theodoricus Gravius certainly was one of the major figures in Serrarius' life during the 1630s, even though he was not living in Amsterdam, but in England. Two letters dated 1631 and 1633 are preserved, which prove the friendship between them. Little is known about Gravius' life. The few biographical information we have, can be found in some manuscript which are preserved in the collection of Elias Ashmole, where the two letters of Serrarius are also preserved.⁹²⁷ In the letter that he sent to Gravius on September 23, 1633, Serrarius shows his ideas concerning the «imitation Christi». He underlines that each man must part with all things that are contrary to Christ. Furthermore, he stresses the necessity to emulate Christ's life, because he is the «porta sapientiae», through which each man can achieve the full knowledge of all thing that are on Earth and in Heaven, and the true «via ad beatitudinem».⁹²⁸ Because of his assertions concerning the necessity to leave human «scientia», in order to achieve the true «sapientia» through Christ, and to emulate Christ's life and sufferings, Van der Wall asserts that Serrarius clearly shares the «christosofische traditie van spiritualisten en mystici als Schwenckfeld, Paracelsus, Weigel en Boehme».⁹²⁹

⁹²⁵ Ibid., pp. 67-68.

⁹²⁶ Ibid., pp. 69-70.

⁹²⁷ For more information, see: *ibid.*, pp. 70-72.

⁹²⁸ Van der Wall has transcribed some parts of Serrarius' letter. See: *ibid.*, p. 73.

⁹²⁹ For more information about Gravius and his relationship with Serrarius, see: *ibid.*, pp. 70-78.

In 1647 Serrarius translated a work of the German mystic Johannes Tauler, a disciple of Meister Eckart, which he entitled «Aendachtige oeffeningen over het leven ende lijden Iesu Christi»⁹³⁰. He also wrote a preface to such edition, dated January 5, 1647, in which the «imitatio Christi» is the main subject. In the preface Serrarius argues that the imitation of Christ's life and sufferings can show the spiritual path that each man must follow. All Christians, Serrarius asserts, must contemplate Christ's life and cross, and they must lead their life in conformity with his deeds and sufferings. In this way, everyone could leave behind «den ouden mensch met alle desselfs begeerlijkheden», and embrace ««den nieuwen, die na God geschapen is, in ware gerechticheyt ende heyligheyt» instead. Furthermore, in this preface Serrarius stresses his little interest in doctrinal discussions and questions, while he bestows the highest value to Christ's imitation. For instance, he makes reference to 1 Corinthians 2: 2, where Paul claims that he has come only provided with the knowledge of Christ and of his crucifixion. Furthermore, Serrarius asserts that Paul desired to found his religious life only on Christ's life and crucifixion, «als de middelpunct daer alle de linien onses omneloops weder te samen loopen», even though he had the necessary knowledge to dispute as the Christian were used to doing in the 17th century. Therefore, Serrarius concludes, all Christians must not value the knowledge they did not acquire through the Holy Scriptures so high as they usually do.⁹³¹

One of Serrarius most significant works to understand his ideas concerning the way each man must follow to reach God, is the «Goddelycke aandachten ofte vlammeende begeerten eens boetvaerdige geheyligd en lief-rycke ziele», published in 1654. This «embleemboek» is not an original work wrote by Serrarius, but rather a mystical-spiritualist adaptation of the «Pia Desideria» of Hermann Hugo, published in 1623.⁹³² By publishing this work, Serrarius joined the discussion concerning the causes that had led to the divisions among Christians, and the means to solve them. In the preface he complains about the decay of the Church, where discord has taken the place of harmony, where arrogance is in place of humbleness, where there is hate

⁹³⁰ Ibid., p. 124. See also: *ibid.*, pp. 122-123.

⁹³¹ Ibid., pp. 124-125.

⁹³² Ibid., p. 137.

instead of love. However, Serrarius states, it is possible to solve such situation through mysticism, by walking a path that leads to the personal purification and then to the union with God. This is the purpose that Serrarius has pursued by writing the «Goddelycke aandachten»: to show the way to reach God.⁹³³

The path that Serrarius conceived is divided in three main steps. First, it is necessary that everyone obtains the death of the «oude Adam». Through a gradual inner search each Christian must leave behind all that is external and he must turn to his soul: ««wy moeten», Serrarius affirms, «het oordeel over anderen die buyten ons zijn t'eenemaal varen laten en moeten ons in ons zelven inkeeren, ons eygen inwendigheyt vlijtig waarnemen, onze gedachten, driften, begeerten en al ons doen zelf leeren oordeelen, of ook Christus met sijn liefrijke, vreedzame, ootmoedige en zachtmoedige, reyne, kuysche Geest daer in heersche». Otherwise, each one would remain tied to the «oude Adam met sijn veleschelijke affecten van toorn, nijd, haat, achterklap, gierigheyt en onkuysheyt».⁹³⁴

After each Christian has eliminated the «oude Adam», then de «nieuwe Adam», the true light that shines into darkness, can rise in everyone. Once the second step of Serrarius' path has been reached, Christ rises in the earth of every man, so much so that «dit yver en goddelijk licht van graad tot graad in den mensch toeneemt en wonderlijke dingen werkt». In this condition, each man becomes a new son of God, who lives under His Grace, and for this reason God Himself starts to reveal truths to human souls that had been unknown until that moment.⁹³⁵ Once this second step has been taken, each Christian can move forward on Serrarius' path. he who has reached the third step, parts with that is not divine, so much so that «gelijk God tot de mensch was needergedaalt in Christo, de mensch nu ook tot God opklimme in Christo». In short, through Christ everyone can become one spirit with God, so that a «godformig, lief-rijk, eenwezig leven met God» can be finally achieved.⁹³⁶

⁹³³ Ibid., pp. 137-139.

⁹³⁴ Ibid., pp. 140-141.

⁹³⁵ Ibid., p. 141.

⁹³⁶ Ibid., pp. 141-142. For a full analysis of Serrarius' work, see: *ibid.*, pp. 137-148.

To a certain extent, the ideas Serrarius expressed are similar to Boreel's ones. First, they certainly shared the idea suggesting that Christ's imitation must be regarded as the cornerstone of a true Christian life. In Boreel's thought the imitation of Christ's example is one of the fundamental steps that form the path towards God. Second, the ways they conceived to reach God are quite similar: at first, they argue that each man must part with all that is contrary to the divine nature; then, thanks to this separation from the corporeal world, each man is driven to find a nature similar to God, who starts to enlighten human faculties; finally, people reach their full union with God. However, a fundamental difference between their thoughts must be underlined: in Boreel's works it is impossible to find the mystical-spiritualistic tone that characterizes Serrarius' writings.

Galenus too deals with ideas concerning man's ability to reach God, his highest Good. In particular, in some works he expresses opinions that are quite similar to Boreel's beliefs. However, it is rather difficult to establish whether one has influenced the other, or if they just shared common ideas of the 16th and 17th centuries. Nevertheless, by reading Galenus' «Aanleyding tot de kennis van de Christelijke godsdienst», published in 1677, or a letter that he sent in the same year to Claes Stapel, leader of the Hoorn College, it can be easily concluded that Galenus and Boreel hold similar beliefs concerning the highest purpose of all people and the means to pursue it.

Meihuizen asserts that Galenus' letter can be regarded as a kind of introduction to the *Aanleyding*. Furthermore, since he had no intention to publish it, Meihuizen argues that in this letter Galenus most likely describes what he considered the true core of the religious life.⁹³⁷ Here Galenus clearly asserts that Christians' salvation is bound to the imitation of Christ, so that each man «oock selfs alsoo wandele, gelijk Hij [Christ] gewandelt heeft». In order to imitate his life, all Christian must externally practice virtues, while they exercise internal love towards God. These two aspects are strictly connected: he who live following virtues necessarily loves God and he who loves God necessarily practices the virtues. The purpose Christ's imitation is to reach God and to acquire a divine nature. Furthermore, in the postscript

⁹³⁷ Meihuizen, *Galenus Abrahamsz* (see above, n. 230), p. 121.

Galenus invites Stapel and his fellow-thinkers to never neglect the meetings of their College, since there is nothing more useful than reading the Holy Scripture, when no true minister of God can be found on Earth.⁹³⁸ The similarity between the ideas here expressed by Galenus and Boreel's assertions is striking.⁹³⁹

Similar ideas can be found in the «Aanleyding». In this work Galenus focuses on the personal relationship that each Christian must have with God. He frequently makes reference to the «bevindelijke genade», that is, the living experience of God's attempts to have a relationship with each man. Galenus argues that all people can acquire knowledge of the divine nature through the Holy Scriptures, which in turn can raise a burning love towards God. He clearly asserts that Christ is the greatest prophet, shepherd, and king that mankind has ever known. Christ has been instructed by God through the Holy Spirit to proclaim His doctrine, so that each man can reach a nature similar to God through the practices of obedience and love. Christ's doctrine, Galenus says, is well summarized in the Sermon on the Mount, in Matthew 5, 6 and 7. Christ's purpose is to lead mankind to salvation, which is God's «gevoelige ervarenheid inwendig», which all people can acquire through Christ. In other words, man's salvation is nothing else than the divine internal experience, which God bestows on those who are willing to relinquish himself, and who imitates Christ's life and sufferings.⁹⁴⁰

So, it is evident that Galenus and Serrarius share the idea suggesting that the imitation of Christ is necessary to reach God. Furthermore, they believe that it is necessary to renounce the corporeal work and to imitate Christ's life, even in his sufferings. In other words, they believe that people can reach God by practicing Christian moral precepts. The belief that people are able to lead a moral life and thus to reach their highest Good plays a major role in the thought of Dirck Camphuysen. Although he shares this idea with Galenus and Serrarius, a fundamental difference among them must be

⁹³⁸ Ibid., p. 122.

⁹³⁹ Perhaps a strict comparison between Galenus' and Boreel's work could be helpful to establish whether they had influenced each other or not. However, such comparison is still lacking.

⁹⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 123-131.

underlined: Camphuysen does not believe that people must renounce temporal goods. He argues that Christ has not required his believers to part with all that belong to the corporeal world, nor to give up the love for the creatures. He has only condemned that kind of love for corporeal things which can take mankind away from God. To part with the old man, Campuysen says, does not mean to destroy the external man.⁹⁴¹

In previous chapters, it has been shown that Camphuysen focuses on the inner nature of faith, which relies on the “hearth”, that is, the cognitive and practical faculty of each man, which in turn is tied to the “conscience”, able to confirm the purity of human deeds. Therefore, faith does not rely on human reason, which is just a speculative faculty. In other words, Camphuysen stresses the practical nature of faith. The purpose of his works is to argue in favor of a practical moral life: leading a moral life is what denotes the nature of a true Christian, not the ability to hold and solve theological discussions. However, this does not mean that Camphuysen criticizes human reason. On the contrary, he clearly states that Christianity has a rational nature, because its precepts are rational. He only criticizes the way in which people usually make use of human reason, which is regarded as the means to hold theological disputes.⁹⁴²

The importance that Camphuysen bestows on the practical and moral character of faith is tied to the idea suggesting that each man can attain salvation. Faith, Camphuysen asserts, is nothing other than obedience and observance of Gods’ Law. Man’s salvation consists in the union with God and it is a gift which God Himself endows people with, when they fulfill the duties that He has given them.⁹⁴³ So, Cambhuysen believes that all people must have an active role in the path that leads to salvation. His thought can be summarized in this way. Everyone can attain salvation, if he shows true faith, that is, if he proves that he has followed God’s precepts and if he has led a moral life according to them. In other words, everyone can attain salvation if he lives according to Christ’s moral precepts. Following the

⁹⁴¹ Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans église* (see above, n. 7), p. 114.

⁹⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 94-95.

⁹⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

“golden rule” is one of the necessary conditions to reach salvation.⁹⁴⁴ Furthermore, everyone can find God’s Law in New Testament, in particular in the Sermon on the Mount. In the same books, people can also find the proof that salvation is truly attainable and the example that they must follow: Jesus Christ. God sent him as a teacher and mediator. To believe in Christ, Camphuysen affirms, means to regard him as Lord, Teacher, and Legislator.⁹⁴⁵

Although there are many differences between Camphuysen’s and Boreel’s thoughts, it is evident that they share the ideas suggesting that leading a moral life is the first mark of true faith and that Christ is the example which people must follow in order to attain salvation.

Camphuysen’s ideas were not unique in the Dutch Republic of that period. By examining his beliefs concerning man’s salvation, Kolakowski shows that these beliefs were deeply tied to the ideas expressed by Dirck Coornhert, especially because Camphuysen believes that everyone can follow the precepts that lead to perfection and salvation. Moreover, Camphuysen also agrees on some ideas held by Remonstrant authors. For instance, Kolakowski briefly examines Edouard Poppius’ thought. This Remonstrant preacher believes that religion must be considered as a kind of agreement between God and mankind, through which God promises eternal life to his creatures, if they follow his commands. True faith, Poppius argues, relies on accepting Christ as God’s emissary, on repentance of the heart, and on practical obedience to his precepts. In other words, God has given his Law to mankind. If people live according to God’s orders, they can attain salvation.⁹⁴⁶

Ideas suggesting that leading a moral and practical life is the major distinguishing mark of true Christians, that people must play an active role in the path towards salvation, and that people are able to perfectly follow God’s commands, were not novelties of the 17th century. For instance, at the beginning of the 16th century the Anabaptist Hans Denck argued that

⁹⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 100-109.

⁹⁴⁵ Ibid., pp. 112-117.

⁹⁴⁶ Ibid., p. 99.

believers' justification necessarily involves moral improvement and obedience to Bible's commands. Melchior Hoffman shared these ideas too. He affirmed that a "reborn believer" would have sinned no more and that God had created mankind so that everyone could be saved. Hence, all people are able to do good works and the doctrine of the predestination is just an excuse to justify people's sins.⁹⁴⁷

Calvin joined the controversy about man's perfectibility, by mocking those who believed that a state of perfection would be possible. Shortly after, Castellio attacked Calvin's doctrine of predestination. He argued that everyone can achieve moral perfection, because God created mankind in his image. Castellio regarded Christ as the Redeemer of mankind's sins, he blamed Calvin because of his opinions concerning sins, and he argued that everyone is able to refrain from sinning.⁹⁴⁸

The belief in mankind's ability to lead a perfect moral life spread in the second half of 16th century in the Dutch Republic and the Reformed Church started to regard such doctrine as a serious threat to their doctrines concerning man's justification. This is the reason why it is possible to find a reference to the doctrine of perfectibility in the Heidelberg Catechism. In fact, in the fifth section, it is openly stated that no one can lead a perfect moral life, because each man has a natural inclination to hate God and his brethren.⁹⁴⁹

Mirjam van Veen situates Coornhert's doctrine concerning the perfectibility of mankind in this historical context. In previous chapters, it has been shown that Coornhert highly values a true moral life: it is evident that doctrine of people's perfectibility leads him to bestow this importance on the moral life. The fundamental core of such a doctrine is the belief that all people are able to follow God's precepts and orders over their earthly lives. God is the highest purpose of each believer and by practicing virtues everyone can reach it. In some works, Coornhert clearly argues that all people are created to become God's living images, to be united with Him, and to be saved through such union. Coornhert believes that the "golden rule" plays a central

⁹⁴⁷ Mirjam G.K. Van Veen, «"No one born of God commits sin": Coornhert's Perfectionism», in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 84, 2004, p. 339.

⁹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 339-340.

⁹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 340.

role in the path towards moral perfection. He argues not only that each believer must honor God and love his neighbor, but also that the Golden Rule in Matthew 7: 12 is the highest *ratio* that God has given to mankind. In other words, to love your neighbor is a rational precept and all people can follow it, even those who have not yet embraced the Christian religion. By following their reason, all people can live according to the Golden Rule and thus they can lead a moral life.⁹⁵⁰

All people must achieve the union with God through the practice of virtues, if they want to attain salvation. To this end, Coornhert conceives a path that can lead all people to moral perfection, which he calls “Jacob’s ladder”. He divides this path in six steps: in the lower step there are impious people, who do not regret having done evil things; then there are the sinners, who are divided in servants, that is, those who try to avoid evil because they fear punishments, and mercenaries, that is, those who try to avoid evil because they hope to gain rewards; finally, there are God’s sons, that is, those who are able to refrain from sins and who are divided in children, who are still hindered by old habits, adults, who are able to part with such old habits, and wise men, who are really united with God.⁹⁵¹

Coornhert’s path towards God requires that each man avoids evil and sins through human knowledge and biblical laws. If those who have exerted their power over sins suffer the cross and life’s tribulations, they will be united with Christ and God. It is possible to recognize these “reborn believers”, that is, the above-mentioned sons of God, by their love towards Him and by their divine virtues.⁹⁵²

Human ability to use reason and to gain knowledge is one of the fundamental conditions in order to follow the path towards moral perfection. Coornhert describes two kinds of knowledge. On the one hand, there is the knowledge tied to curiosity, which is useless and misleading, because leads people to look for answers to theological questions of no significance, concerning doctrines such as the trinity, predestination, the way in which

⁹⁵⁰ Voogt, *Constraint on trial* (see above, n. 540), pp. 67-69.

⁹⁵¹ Van Veen, *No one born of God commits sin* (see above, n. 947), p. 344.

⁹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 343-345.

Christ was resurrected, etc. This kind of knowledge only leads people to pride.⁹⁵³ On the other hand, there are self-awareness and the knowledge that leads to a moral life. Through self-awareness rational people are able to understand that they will be condemned to damnation, if they sin. If someone is able to understand the consequences of his actions, Coornhert argues, he is also able to follow divine precepts. As a matter of fact, fear of punishments and hope of rewards are the first steps of “Jacob’s ladder”. Here reading the Holy Scripture plays a fundamental role, because it is possible to understand the sins committed by ancient people and thus one’s own sins thanks to the readings of the holy books. As for the knowledge that leads to a moral life, this knowledge is tied to the understanding of God’s goodness and virtues. Only through personal experience, Coornhert asserts, people can obtain this kind of knowledge: by living according to reason, it is possible to achieve the divine virtues and thus a nature similar to God.⁹⁵⁴

From what has been asserted, it can be concluded that Coornhert highly values human reason. He believes that each man can achieve the necessary knowledge to attain salvation because God has created mankind with a “spark” of divine reason. Everyone must avoid sins and follow this spark of divine reason, because he who make use of his rationality will necessarily choose good.⁹⁵⁵

Coornhert believes that to avoid sin is not a difficult task: people must become aware of their sins, make use of their reason, and follow Christ’s example. This is how people can open their heart to God’s grace and cooperate to their salvation. This is the condition of “reborn men” or “God’s sons”. However, it has been said that those who take the first step of such conditions, the children of God, are still hindered by old habits. Hence, people deeds are still necessary to gradually leave behind these habits and to become “wise men”. Here Coornhert made use of mystical terms and described this final step as «resignation» and «to sabbath», that is the rest from sins, and the submission to God’s will and action in each man. A reborn man desires that

⁹⁵³ Ibid., p. 345.

⁹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 346.

⁹⁵⁵ Ibid., pp. 346-347. See also: Voogt, *Constraint on trial* (see above, n. 540), pp. 71-73; Buys, *Sparks of reason* (see above, n. 548), pp. 49-51

God's will be done and he believes that this happens in himself: such belief protects him from any kind of sufferings, because nothing can happen against God's will. In this conditions the believer parts with his own will and with the earthly goods, being aware that his highest reward is God Himself.⁹⁵⁶

By reading Boreel's works it is easy to perceive differences between his ideas and Coornhert's thought. However, it must be stressed that the main core of their beliefs is the same: first, everyone can avoid sin and practice the virtues by using his reason; second, reading the Holy Scriptures and following Christ's example are necessary steps in the path towards God; finally, each man can and must cooperate with God's work in order to be united with Him and thus to attain salvation.

⁹⁵⁶ Van Veen, *No one born of God commits sin* (see above, n. 947), pp. 349-351.

Boreel's threefold way towards God

Boreel starts SRG by saying: «religio christiana est tuta via, qua mediante Christo et Deo in hac vita similes evadimus: ipsa enim est cognitio veritatis, quae secundum pietatem consistit: qua nobis causam Deus filium suum Jesum humano generi donavit, ut per imitationem sanctae ejus vitae, tanquam per clavem sanctae ejus doctrinae, hic ad hujusmodi similitudinem cum patre et filio possint pervenire; ut viventem, hoc est, firmam ratione fundatam spem habentes, ac per temporalem morem penetrantes, cum unico illo sufficientissimo bono aeternum uniantur, et ejus gloriae ac felicitates per beatam resurrectionem participes fiant. Haec est res supra modum excellens: verum, quis ad eam idoneus est? Proinde dum hanc materiam breviter quidem at paulo specialius secundum meum conceptum tractare institui, sciendum est, Deum creatorem omnium, qui hominem adornavit et instruxit facultatibus, viribus et sensibus, in spiritu, anima et corpore, videlicet memoria, amore, odio, spe, metu, tristitia, gaudio, imaginatione, locomotiva potentia, visu auditu, olfactu, gustu, tactu, sicut etiam diversis aliis ex iisdem existentibus, qualia sunt, vigilare, dormire, edere, jejunaere, conversatio, solitudo, loqui, tacere, et hiis similia; Deum, inquam, delectari habitando in et cum filiis hominum, et in eorum spiritu, anima et corpore, atque in omnibus illis annexis facultatibus, potentiis et sensibus regnum suum erigendo».⁹⁵⁷

In short, Boreel asserts that Christian religion is the best means to become similar to Christ and God, because God himself had sent his son among mankind, so that people could have followed his example and imitate his life. In this way, people can be united with their highest and eternal good, God Himself, who, Boreel says, enjoys being united with his creatures and permeating their faculties. In some works, Boreel calls this union the «cohabitatio Patris», which is the final step of the path that leads mankind towards God, and the state in which He enlightens and makes perfect all human faculties. However, because of errors and sins, usually these faculties are characterized by such a «deformatas» that God cannot establish his

⁹⁵⁷ SRG, in OP, pp. 181-182.

kingdom in the spirit, soul and body of his creatures, until each man has amended and purified himself.⁹⁵⁸

In other words, people have to take other steps before reaching his union with God. In particular, Boreel conceives a threefold way that can lead mankind to pursue his highest good. First, through natural reason people must prove and accept that God is their highest purpose, and thus they must establish a rational path towards Him. Then, they must be recognized that this rational path is identical to the way suggested by the Christian religion, and that living according to Christ's precepts and imitating his life are the best means to follow it. If someone takes these two steps, God Himself will permeate him and will enlighten his faculties, so that in the end he will become perfect.

In order to prove that God is the highest purpose of mankind, Boreel makes a fundamental assumption: people aim for that purpose they believe most eminent. Once they have established what this purpose is, they make use of every means to pursue it.⁹⁵⁹ The best means to determine this purpose is human reason. Through the rational faculty people can understand the «evidentissimae rationes» through which it is possible to determine their highest purpose.

First, through natural reason it is possible to prove that this purpose must be an «aliquid», because the «nihil» cannot present any kind of reason

⁹⁵⁸ «Homo tamen, antequam hoc accurate cognoscit, seipsum cum seipso et cum aliis creaturis reperit inordinatè dispositum: unde tanta deformitas in omnibus istis facultatibus potentiis et sensibus extitit, ut regni Dei modò dictri particeps esse nequeat, nisi denuò nascatur». Ibid.

⁹⁵⁹ «Certum omninò est quemlibet mortalium ad eum anhelare scopum, quem sibi putet prae caeteris quam exactissime convenire; undè eodem rectè constituto atque praefixo, plerosque omnia videmus adhibere media, ut ad istam delati metam finem suum ultimum ritè consequantur». PR, in OP, p. 127.

to be pursued.⁹⁶⁰ This «aliquid» must be necessary,⁹⁶¹ unique,⁹⁶² without origin and end,⁹⁶³ and absolutely perfect,⁹⁶⁴ that is, provided with all perfections.⁹⁶⁵ Only God is endowed with all these qualities. Therefore, Boreel concludes, «Deus [...] plurimas offerat sese commendandi rationes, ab intellectu humano pro scopo firmissimo assumendus erit».⁹⁶⁶

After proving that God is the highest and most eminent purpose of mankind, it must be established that people can reach Him and thus achieve their purpose. Since God is endowed with all perfections, Boreel argues, it is evident that «quicquid vel est, vel habet aliquid, necessario sua omnia huic uni feret accepta». Hence, since people are endowed with reason and with a «vehementi desiderio (voluntatis)», it is clear that God gave them these two faculties. Furthermore, since He is the wisest being, it is also evident that he gave these two gifts to mankind for a particular purpose.⁹⁶⁷ Since the rational

⁹⁶⁰ «Cum autem Homo intellectu suo omninò comprehendere queat id, quod pro scopo praefigendum esse vult ut assumatur, quam evidentissimae ipsi suadent rationes; ideoque (ut ad inveniendum finem hominis propius accedamus) necesse est, ut si prima consideretur propositio, vel Nihil praefigatur, vel Aliquid. Nihilum ab intellectu pro scopo hominis firmiter assumi nequit, cum illud nullum menti objectum reale exhibeat, nec exhibere possit, undè consequenter nec ratio erit, quae illud praefigi suadeat; quare praefigendum erit Aliquid, quod objectum reale fieri, et consequenter rationes offerre poterit, propter quas praefigi possit ac debeat». PR, in OP, pp. 127-128.

⁹⁶¹ If it was not necessary, it could become the «nihil», but Boreel had already said that the «nihil» cannot be determined as the highest purpose of each man. This is the reason why this «aliquid» must be «Necessarium, id est, tale, quod ut Nihil sit vel fiat impossibile est; sive quod necesse est semper id ipsum esse et manere quod est; sive, quod ab intellectu humano nullo modo vel infirmari vel negari vel in dubium trahi potest». Ibid., p. 128.

⁹⁶² If there was more than one purpose, for instance ten different purposes, «certè, intellectus beneficio, denarius iste minui, et ad quinarium reduci poterit». However, this means that were not all necessary. Furthermore, Boreel continues, «quinarium diminutus ad ternarium, iste ad binarium atque hic ad unitatem reduci poterunt; unitatem autem intellectus diminuere nequit, nisi sibi praefigere velit supradictum Nihilum, quod fieri non potest ob rationes jam expositas». Therefore, Boreel concludes that this necessary «aliquid» «non nisi unum esse potest». Ibid.

⁹⁶³ Otherwise, this «aliquid» would not be «necessarium antequam inciperet esse, nec postquam desierit tale foret». Ibid.

⁹⁶⁴ If it was imperfect, there would be an «aliud quippiam, cujus respectu imperfectum dicitur». However, it has already been argued that it must be unique. Hence, «necessum est, ut Aliquid istud necessarium, unicum, principio et fine carens, sit Perfectum». Ibid., p. 129.

⁹⁶⁵ «Idque quod hac ratione perfectum est, necessariò omnes habebit perfectiones, cum unicum sit atque solum, nec detur aliud quid praeterea à quo quid possit accipere». Ibid.

⁹⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁶⁷ «Cumque ille unus omninò summèque perfectus sit, impossibile erit, ut à quoquam dependeat, sed è contrario, quicquid vel est, vel habet aliquid, necessariò sua omnia huic uni feret accepta; atque ita consequenter et Homo sese habebit, qui prae ceteris praeditus est intellectu et vehementi desiderio (voluntatis) quae duo, quia à Deo data sunt Homini, qui, cum reverà sit sapientissimus, omnia in certum aliquem finem largitur; necesse est eundem omninò posse consequi illum finem». Ibid.

faculty can prove that God is the highest purpose of each one and human will must achieve this purpose in order to «plenissimè acquiescere», it must be concluded that both intellect and will must be able to reach God. Otherwise, «ad maxima incommoda omnimodamque miseriam à Deo data essent homini». However, this does not conform «cum Bonitate atque candore summi illius Numinis».⁹⁶⁸

Once people have understood that they can acquiesce in God, they must part with all that is different from the divine nature and look for all that can make them similar to God's nature instead.⁹⁶⁹ In other words, once they have understood and contemplated God's perfections,⁹⁷⁰ people must part with all that is contrary to these perfections and they must «introducere naturam istam divinam, collatis cum eminentissima illa perfectione suis

⁹⁶⁸ «Posito ergò, Intellectum posse comprehendere, quod detur tam Perfectum aliquod Ens, atque Bonum, quale superius descriptum est; posito etiam vehemens illud (humanae voluntatis) desiderium non posse ad suum pervenire scopum, id est, plenissimè acquiescere, nisi tali fruatur Bono, cui nihil vel addi vel demi ne votis quidem queat, hinc sequitur, illud, non nisi in Deo acquiescere posse, quippe quem solum adeò perfectum esse Bonum intellectus perspexit. Porrò cum Desiderium istud plenè nequeat acquiescere in Bono quodam insufficienti, mutabili, nec ubique sibi praesenti, atque tandem quomodocunque ab homine separabili; hinc intellectus mox concludit Deum quippè omninò perfectum, sufficientissimum esse, immutabilemque ac omnipraesentem, atque a homine penitus inseparabilem: aliàs, enim Intellectus atque voluntas (non frustrà saltem, sed) ad maxima incommoda omnimodamque miseriam à Deo data essent homini, id quod cum Bonitate atque candore summi illius Numinis non concordat; quis enim existimet, optimum illum Patrem intellectus atque desiderii donis creaturas suas (adeo) stimulare potuisse, ut in se solo, nec in alio, quoquam cum perfectissima animi tranquillitate acquiescerent, et tamen postmodum, ubi manibus pedibusque obnixè omnia fecisset homo, ut isto Bono frueretur, eundem non solum vana lactare spe, sed plane deserere voluisse, idque in <?>, posthabitis omnique humanae mentis laboribus atque conatibus; tantum ut immensos homini dolores et taedium crearet insuperabile; idque tum praecipuè, cum iste uberrimos operum suorum fructus colligere deberet». PR, in OP, pp. 129-130.

⁹⁶⁹ «Cum inde igitur appareat, quod si Intellectus sit locus vehemens (voluntatis humanae) Desiderium ultimato acquiescere debeat possitque in Deo, tanquam in *Bono Unico* atque sufficientissimo, hinc facile intelligere poterit Homo, quod quia quae contrariis aguntur motibus suos sibi invicem actus ad plenae pacis fruitionem, communicare nequeunt, dissimiles illi virtutibus divinis hominum mores penitus sint abolendi, eorumque loco assumenda vita Deo quàm similissima, si in illo ultimatam desiderii sui quietem statuere voluerit Mens humana». PR, in OP, pp. 130-131.

⁹⁷⁰ From Boreel's point of view, God's perfections are the followings: «Veritas, Sapientia, Bonitas, Philautia ordinata, Libertas, Fuga partium, Justitia, Sanctitas, Puritas, Sufficientia, Perfectio, Fides dictorum et promissorum, Amor ordinis, Misericordia, Benignitas, Amabilitas, Facilitas condonandi, Providentia, Prudentia, Amor, Gaudium, Longaminitas, Aequitas, Mansuetudo, Pax, Quies, Amor proborum, Comitas, Odium mali, Beneficentia universalis, Candor animi, Laboris studium, Diligentia, Paenarum proemiorumque Distributio». PR, in OP, p. 131.

actibus atque moribus, ut adeo reductus ad omnimodam cum Deo aequalitatem aptus evadat ad unionem illam divinam atque aeternam».⁹⁷¹

Boreel shows seven impediments that people must avoid. Then, they must acquire seven perfections in order to acquiesce in God. First, they must avoid the «insensibilitas» towards God and an excessive desire for temporal things. Second, they must abstain from a love for creatures that hinders the love for God. Third, they must not look for those things that are «difformia vel contraria» to God's nature, because they hinder the «imitatio Dei». Fourth, people must not conform to these things that are contrary to God's nature, but they must seek for a «cum Deo interna conformitas». Likewise, they must abstain from an «externa realis conformitas cum aliis circa alia quae ipsi Deo contraria sunt». Sixth, they must not neglect a «familiaris conversatio» with God. Finally, they must avoid the separation from God, which is caused by an «unio cum contrariis aliis».⁹⁷²

After avoiding these seven «impedimenta», people can acquire the perfections that lead to God. The first is the admiration for God, because of His highest «perfectionem et pulchritudinem». The second is the love for God, while the third is the «conatus» to imitate God, by practicing divine virtues. The fourth perfection is a true «conformitas cum Deo interna», which concerns the internal human faculties, while the fifth is a true «conformitas cum Deo externa», attainable through external deeds. The sixth perfection is a «familiaris conversatio» with God, which people can reach through «colloquiis invicem habitis, variisque interni amoris exercitiis mutuis, fiducia itidem et spe in Deum collocata, nec non gratiarum actione et laudibus». Finally, the last is the «firmissima et indissolubilis cum Deo unio in hac vita», which necessarily follows the previous six perfections.⁹⁷³

This is the path, Boreel asserts, to reach God as the highest purpose of mankind, a path that can be established through rational argumentations.⁹⁷⁴

⁹⁷¹ Ibid.

⁹⁷² Ibid., pp. 131-132.

⁹⁷³ Ibid., p. 132.

⁹⁷⁴ «Atque haec breviter via illa per naturales rationes ab intellectu et desiderio hominis desumptas deveniendi ad scopum illum quem homo intelligere potest sibi omnium esse convenientissimum, ut Deo nempe, Bono illo unicè perfecto, plenissima mentis tranquillitate perpetuò fruatur». Ibid., p. 133.

Since he does not make any kind of reference to God's revelation, it is clear that Boreel thinks that all people who are able to use their reason can understand and follow this rational path. Both Christians and non-Christians can accept it. Moreover, once they have accepted it, Boreel says, all people can embrace the Christian religion. In fact, Boreel argues that, if someone look for a practical way to achieve his highest purpose, the «*primarium*» means is to acknowledge that the rational path he has conceived perfectly agrees with the religion of the New Testament.⁹⁷⁵ As has already been said, Boreel believes that the Christian religion is the «*tuta via, qua mediante Christo et Deo in hac vita similes evadimus*», since God Himself has sent His son to make people follow his example and imitate his life.⁹⁷⁶

In other words, in the New Testament each man can find the living example to conform to God's will and to reach Him, that is, Jesus Christ. By following his precepts and by imitating his life, it is possible to part with all that is contrary to divine perfections and to achieve a nature similar to God.⁹⁷⁷ This is the way to obtain the «*cohabitatio Patris*». As a matter of fact, the two necessary conditions to reach the union with God are the removal of all aspects of human life that are against God's and Christ's nature, and the purification of one's own faculties.⁹⁷⁸ The means to fulfill these two

⁹⁷⁵ «quare ille, ut supra jam dictum, his probè perspectis, omnia conquirere debet media, quibus ad istum finem perfectissimè deducatur, quorum *primarium* est hoc, quod ista via haec optimè convenit cum Religione, quam continent Libri Novi Testamenti». PR, in OP, p. 133. Boreel not only asserts that the Christian religion agrees with the rational path towards God, but he also claims that Christianity is rational. As a matter of fact, he writes that each believer must offer himself to God, «secundum rationalem illum Dei cultum, quem Dominus Jesu vita et Doctrina sua in libris Novi foederis expressit». SRC, in OP, pp. 184-185.

⁹⁷⁶ SRC, in OP, p. 181.

⁹⁷⁷ «[...] ibi non solum praecepta traduntur ac interdicta, sed cum aliis mediis vivum quoque exemplum proponitur ad illustrationem totius doctrinae, (quae modum tradit sese conformandi ad divinam voluntatem, summoque hoc Bono indesinenter fruendi), quod est *Christus Iesus*, consultum omninò est, ut quilibet quam exactissimè observet quaecunque inibi vel vetantur, vel praecipuntur, nec posthabitis minis atque promissionibus; utque singula illa omni labore atque studio conetur implere, ipsoque praestare opere, spectatis ubique imprimis his, quae ipse *Christus* Dominus noster vel omisit vel praestit, iisque ad imitationem quam rigorissimam propositis. In quem finem praecipuè legi prosunt Matthaei, cap. 5.6. et 7. Luc, cap. 6. et 12. Epistolae quoque ad Romanos cap. 6. et 12. nec non cap. 3. Epist. Ad Collossens. p.t. inique 4. Versus. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Item 2. Pet. 1. versus priorer undecim; ex quibus ratio difformitatis atquem conformitatis cum *Deo* et *Christo* maximam partem innotescere poterit. Ad dignoscendum autem speciatim difformitatem et peccata, legi possunt Rom. 1.v. 29.30.31.32. 1. Cor. 6. V. 9.10. Gal. 5. v. 10.20.21. 1. Tim. 2. v. 9. 1. Pet. 3. v. 3». PR, in OP, pp. 133-134.

⁹⁷⁸ «Ad quod, siquidem Deus absolutum regnum in homine erigere vult, primò requiritur totalis resolutio, abnegatio, separatio, mors, mortificatio et omnimoda extinctio omnium illorum, quae Christo et Deo dissimilia sunt, eaque in omnibus facultatibus potentiis

conditions, Boreel continues, are described in the New Testament. This is the reason why it is necessary «ut eos legamus, aut legi audiamus, et lectos meditemur».⁹⁷⁹

Only after all human faculties are purified the «occupatio, inhabitatio, perseverans immansio et constans operatio» of God and Christ can occur, and each man can finally acquiesce in God as in his highest good. In such state, people are inactive and they do not hinder God's actions.⁹⁸⁰ If someone has understood and accepted the rational path towards God, if he recognizes that it agrees with the teachings of the Christian religion, and if he decides to follow Christ's precepts and to imitate his life, then God Himself will lead him in the right way through which it is possible to reach true peace and the «jucundissimum Dei consortium».⁹⁸¹ This is the final stage of the union between man and God, that Boreel describes as a «medium ad scopum illum pertigendi internum, nempe experimentale atque obsignans medium».⁹⁸² He who enjoys God through his reason, the Holy Scriptures, and the internal divine experience, will never be divided from his highest good and he will reach that «aeternam nempe atque beatam illam vitam, in qua Deus omnia erit in omnibus».⁹⁸³

et sensibus hominis. Secundò requiritur totalis mundatio, emundatio, vel purgatio et purificatio omnium praedictarum facultatum, potentiarum et sensuum hominis». SRC, in OP, p. 182.

⁹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 183. Furthermore, it is necessary to continue reading the Holy Scripture or listening its readings until «legem Dei impressam esse in nostram memoriam». Ibid., pp. 182-183.

⁹⁸⁰ «Tertio requiritur totalis occupaio, inhabitatio, perseverans immansio et constans operatio Christi et Dei in omnibus et per omnes illas purificatas facultates, potentias et sensus in Sabbato vel quiete eorundem; adeò ut conversio ad Christum, ad Deum et ad alia res, duntaxat per Christum et Deum fiat; et homo se tantummodò passivè habeat et gerat, sine ullo impedimento Divinae operationis». Ibid., pp. 182-183.

⁹⁸¹ PR, in OP, p. 134.

⁹⁸² Ibid.

⁹⁸³ «Ut adeò respectu trium horum mediorum, verè dici queat, Eum, qui triplicis hujus funiculi, Rationis nempe, S. Scripturae atque Divinae internaе experientiae, in Religionis cum Deo colligetur, ab eo numquam separatum iri, sed partim hic quidem in felicissima illius communionē victurum esse, partim verò delatum tandem iri ad unicum illum trium horum mediorum scopum, aeternam nempe atque beatam illam vitam, in qua *Deus omnia erit in omnibus*». Ibid. In SRC Boreel makes similar assertions. After he has argued that the third kind of union with God naturally follows from the purification of one own's faculties, Boreel asserts that everyone must persevere in such state, until «in omnibus istis facultatibus, potentiis et sensibus spiritus, animae et corporis, *Deus fit omnia in omnibus*». SRC, in OP, p. 183.

In PRC and in SRC Boreel does not give many information concerning this third and final stage of the union between man and God, that is, the internal divine experience. From these two works it can be only concluded that this third way follows from the rational and scriptural paths, through which people can purify their faculties, and that this internal divine experience mainly relies on God's activity, which people must undergo without resistance. In order to provide more information about this last step, the three letters published among Boreel's posthumous works must be examined.

In the first and third letters, dated January 17 and February 7, 1653, Boreel describes a way to reach God that is identical to the path he describes in PRC and SRC. He starts his reflections by saying that the union with God can be reached in two ways. On the one hand, there is the «cohabitatio Patris», which is «respectu Dei Domini abstractae ab omnibus rebus naturae». On the other hand, there the «cohabitatio Christi», related to God as He shows Himself through his creatures. The «cohabitatio Patris» can be achieved only through the «cohabitatio Christi», because it is possible to understand God's perfections only by contemplating His attributes.⁹⁸⁴ In order to achieve the «cohabitatio Patris», people must part with all that is not God, so much so that «homo nullum sibi objectum propositum habeat, quam illud purum abstractum necessarium *Aliquid*, quod Deus nominatur».⁹⁸⁵ Furthermore, in order to achieve the «cohabitatio Christi», people must acquire the internal conformity with divine properties and attributes.⁹⁸⁶

⁹⁸⁴ «Primo quidem respectu *Dei Domini* abstractae ab omnibus rebus naturae, qua in se ipso consideratur, absque ulla ad creaturas relatione; Secundo autem, respectu ejus extensae naturae, qua consideratur tanquam se patefaciens per creationem creaturarum, atque iisdem, per communicationem divinorum ejus attributorum; ex quibus tum plenitudo perfectionum abstractae sive absconditae ejus naturae animadverti potest. Communio cum abstracta *Dei* natura, est cohabitatio *Patris*; communio autem cum extensa *Dei* natura; est filii, sive *Domini Christi* cohabitatio». TL, in OP, pp. 186-187.

⁹⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁸⁶ «Jam autem, respectu extensae *Dei* naturae, ab homine, ut ejus particeps fiat, requiritur, totalis interna conformitas cum divinis proprietatibus et virtutibus, per quas *Dominus*, utpote qui est extensa illa natura, se creaturis manifestat notumque facit, quales inter alias sunt, veritas, sapientia, verbis et promissis, misericordia, benignitas, suavitas, remissio et condonatio, providentia prudentia, charitas, gaudium; longaminitas, aequitas, mansuetudo, pax, quies, charitas erga bonos, comitas, odium adversus malum, beneficentia erga omnes, sinceritas, in opere sedulitas, gravitas». Ibid., pp. 187-188.

Although in these letters Boreel does not make use of the same terms we can find in PR and SRC, the path towards God he conceives is the same. As a matter of fact, it has been said that avoiding all that is not God is necessary to achieve the «cohabitatio Patris». Boreel describes this state as a «mera sui resignatio», which is based on a «placida seu tranquilla animi hominis cum Dei voluntate convenientia [...] respectu concedendi vel arcendi omnia illa, quae Deus Dominus ipse non sunt», that is, the creatures.⁹⁸⁷ Furthermore, it must be stressed that the «cohabitatio Christi» and the «cohabitatio Patris» are mutually tied and they both lead to the union with God.⁹⁸⁸ In particular, people must examine the imperfections of the creatures and compare them with God's perfections.⁹⁸⁹ By doing so, it is possible to obtain the «divinam conformitatem tam internè quam externè», a necessary condition to achieve the «familiarem conversationem»,⁹⁹⁰ which in turn lead to the eternal union with God.⁹⁹¹ Since the internal and external conformity with God is what Boreel has previously described as the «cohabitatio Christi»,

⁹⁸⁷ «reliquum adhuc foret tractare de mera sui resignatione, seu animi in *Deo* acquiescentia, respectu omnium creaturarum; ac de plena satietate seu contentatione in *Deo Domino* solo. Ut autem hoc ordine peragatur, considerandum est, meram illam sui resignationem, in placida seu tranquilla animi hominis cum *Dei* voluntate convenientia sitam esse, respectu concedenti vel arcendi omnia illa, quae *Deus Dominus* ipse non sunt, videlicet creaturas». Ibid., p. 195.

⁹⁸⁸ In final lines of the third letters, Boreel writes: «hi duo status invicem connexi, egregium ornamentum praecedentibus conferant, eosdem concludant, et ad unicum eorum scopum, nempe ad plenam in et cum *Deo Domino* satietatem, ejusque Sancta voluntate, perducant». Ibid., p. 198.

⁹⁸⁹ To this end, Boreel describes four kinds of imperfection of creatures and four kinds of God's perfections. First, everyone must regard all created things as imperfect because they are not fully satisfying for human soul, since «divisam perfectionem ostendant, cui adhuc aliquid vel addendum vel adimendum optari potest». Second, «mutationi obnoxiae sunt, quia non ista prima firmitudo seu stabilitas sunt». Third, they are not omnipresent and thus an «inquietudo et animi male contenti aegritudo seu taedium» necessarily follow. This is the reason why created things «non semper homini iis frui desideranti adsunt». On the contrary, since God is absolutely perfect, He is fully satisfying for human soul, so much so that «nihil quicquam vel addendum vel adimendum optari possit; quia *Deus* primum et unicum, ac proinde, omne bonum est; ex cujus plenitudine, illud quod aliquid est, accepit illud quod est; quippe qui origo et fons sit, ex quo, per quem, et ad quem omnia alia sunt». Second, God is immutable, because «ille prima veritas et firmitudo est, à nullo alio dependens; adeo ut qui *Domino* fruitur, ei minimè metuendum sit, ex parte *Dei* ulla instabilitatem aut mutabilitatem orituram esse». Furthermore, He is omnipresent, and thus «permagnum *Deo* fruente animae solatium est, quod nimirum illa quem intimè diligit, ubique paratum ac praesentem inveniatur, habeat, ac possidere possit». Finally, God will never part with the one who has reached Him and so «hic nullus omninò istius aliquando luctuosae derelictionis metus sit; quod aliàs, tres illas priores excellentias tenebrosa anxietatis, doloris ac tristitia, media nocte obnubilare valeret». Ibid., pp. 196-197.

⁹⁹⁰ This is achievable «per mutua colloquia, per mutua internae dilectionis exercitia, per spem et fiduciam in *Deum*, per gratiarum actionem et laudem» Ibid., p. 198.

⁹⁹¹ Ibid.

it can be concluded that the «familiarem conversationem» with God must be regarded as the «cohabitatio Patris».

In short, it can be argued that in the three letters Boreel has conceived a sort of virtuous circle in order to reach the highest purpose of mankind. Each man must start his path towards God by considering divine perfections and by comparing them with the imperfections of created things. By doing so, he is pushed to pursue the same perfections and so he starts to achieve the «cohabitatio Christi». Furthermore, by pursuing them he is also pushed to part with created things, since they are imperfect, and the more he parts with them, the more he seeks God's perfections, and the more he seeks them, the more he parts with created things, until he finally achieves the «sui resignatio», that is, the condition in which he does not care of all creatures because he enjoys God. In other words, in this condition God becomes his only object of contemplation. This is the «cohabitatio Patris», through which everyone can achieve the eternal and everlasting union with God, both during the earthly time and in the afterlife.

The highest degree of the «Cohabitatio Patris» is marked by «passivorum statum»:⁹⁹² when one reaches the state in which «non ipse, sed Pater et Christus Dominus excellenti colliquefacientis amoris robore in illo vivat atque habitet», then in front of the greatest «suavitas» of God's love «omnes activae spiritus, animae et corporis facultates in homine suspenduntur, et in divinum Sabbatum sive requiem inducuntur».⁹⁹³ However, it has been said that this state is the outcome of a long process, through which people gradually acquire the «cohabitatio Christi» by contemplating Gods' perfections, and thus they reach more and more degrees of the «cohabitatio Dei», until God becomes the only object of human mind. This is the reason why Boreel argues that there are different degrees of God's love, through which He permeates human faculties. During this process, each man is able to endeavor to preserve the state that he has reached and to

⁹⁹² «Ex meis postemis 17 hujus mensis literis, potuisti intelligere rationem conformitatis hominis cum duplici *Dei Domini* natura; quarum prima, quae in *Patris* cohabitatione sita est, una est passivorum statuum». Ibid., p. 190.

⁹⁹³ Ibid.

cooperate with God's action to achieve the highest degree of the union with God.⁹⁹⁴

In order to understand how people can «operare» and «cooperare», it must be clarified that during the first degrees of the «cohabitatio Patris» God can only permeate one or more human faculties, not all of them.⁹⁹⁵ If He only pervades one faculty, people must stay in «passivo modo» until the strength of God's love does not start to lessen. When they perceive that it has begun to decrease, they could arouse themselves «pro ratione istius facultatis, in qua illa fit operatio», so that God's love can be strengthened again.⁹⁹⁶ On the other hand, if God pervades more than one faculty, people must strengthen

⁹⁹⁴ «qui hoc statim versetur, respectu variorum hujus amoris graduum certus esse possit, an, et quid operabitur, cooperabitur, et aget, valeatque nec ne; quandoquidem experientia majoris minorisve hujuscemodi colliquefacientis amoris, quid agendum sit tunc docet; ita ut in hoc statu etiam minima mensura sive gradus, magis passivo quam activo modo sese habeat; quapropter totus hic status, Passivus vocatur; quamvis propriè loquendo, mensura illa sive gradus hujus dicti status solummodò passive sese habeat, quando, ut diximus, excellens illud liquefacientis amoris robur omnes hominis vires succintas suspensasque tenes, eum in illimitatam Divinam requiem et tranquillitatem inducit. Unde tum apparet, in immenso illo amore, summoque ejus gradu, hominem nihil expectare, illum neque operari nec cooperari, nec velle nec posse. Verum in inferioribus ejusdem amoris gradibus, tantum potest, vult ac licet ei co-operari, et operari, quantum experientia ipsum docet ad dilectum apud se conservandum maxime conducibile esse». Ibid., p. 191.

⁹⁹⁵ «Si quando igitur immensum illud colliquefacientis amoris robur apud hominem et in homine est, omnis actio hominis, ut ante diximus, quiescit, quando autem amor iste in minoribus suis mensuris vel gradibus est, iste vel in harum facultatum una tantum, vel in pluribus quam una operatur». Ibid., p. 192. This idea must be tied to some assertions of the first letter. After he has explained that the «cohabitatio Christi» can be achieved through the «conformitas» with God's attributes and virtues, Boreel writes: «in qua conformitate cum homo versatur, obviatio illi fit, non cum illimitata, qualis prima erat, obviatio, sed cum fruitione, quae respectu divinae illius proprietatis, sive virtutis, in qua practicè versatur, sese prodat; adeo quidem ut, si in aliqua virtute intellectum concernente, occupatus sit, verbi gratia, veritate sapientia, obviatio illa se exserat et operetur in intellectu, eundem illuminans. Si autem in aliqua virtute voluntatem vel animi affectus, respiciente, veluti bonitate, justitia, charitate, misericordia, pace, et similibus supra memoratis, occupetur, tum exserit se operaturque illa obviatio in voluntate animique affectibus, illos suaviter irradiando ac calefaciendo, et veluti unguendo, sive aptiores quam antea fuerunt reddendo. Et tunc quidem, homo filii, sive *Domini Christi* cohabitatio fruitur». Ibid., p. 188. Although Boreel's words are not very clear, it can be argued that during the first degrees of the «cohabitatio Christi», God's action only concerns the human faculties through which the divine virtues are practiced. So, also the first degrees of the «cohabitatio Patris», which necessarily follows the practice of the divine virtues, concern only those faculties through which someone is achieving the «cohabitatio Christi». If so, it can be concluded that the words «illimitata, qualis prima erat, obviatio» refer to the highest degree of the «cohabitatio Patris», which he has discussed in the previous lines.

⁹⁹⁶ «Priori modo si homo in se operationem sentiat, divinam actionem passivo modo in ista facultate seu vi spiritus aut animae agere permittet, quamdiu illa in suo vigore sive vivacitate et efficacia perseverat; sin autem languescere incipiat, atque illam diutius retinere utile sit, tunc homo sese suaviter pro ratione istius facultatis, in qua illa fit operatio, ad laudem, gratiarum actionem, amplexus similesque obviaciones excitabit, eo usque donec iterum priorem illum majoremve vigorem acquirat». Ibid., pp. 192-193.

God's love, if it starts to lower like before, and they also must operate through that faculty that most can lead them to achieve a nature similar to God.⁹⁹⁷ All people can acquire increasing degrees of the «cohabitatio Christi et Patris» through these «operatio» and «cooperatio», until God becomes the only object of human mind and thus the union with Him is finally achieved.

It has been asserted that the path towards God that Boreel describes in the three letters is identical to the ideas expressed in PR and in SRC. This can be easily proved, if the virtuous circle of the three letters is compared to the rational path that Boreel has conceived in PR.

The first two steps of the rational path towards God are the admiration and the love for God, which can be risen through the contemplation of Gods' perfections. Likewise, in the three letters Boreel argues that it is necessary to contemplate God's perfections and to compare them to the imperfections of the created things, in order to reach the union with God. The three following steps in PR are the imitation of God by practicing his virtues, and the internal and external conformity with his nature, which people can acquire by removing all things that «Christo et Deo dissimilia sunt», and by the «mundatio, emundatio, vel purgatio, et purificatio» of the human faculties.⁹⁹⁸ It is evident, that these three steps are identical to the «cohabitatio Christi». Furthermore, the sixth step in the rational path towards God is a «familiaris cum Deo conversatio», which everyone can attain through «colloquiis invicem habitis, variisque interni amoris exercitiis mutuis, fiducia itidem et spe in *Deum* collocata, nec non

⁹⁹⁷ «Si verò secundo modo, in pluribus scilicet quam una facultate in sese operationem sentiat, tum se, praeter id quod de priori modo dictum est, operantem et cooperantem constituet, respectu illius facultatis sive potentiae spiritus vel animae, per cuius operationem maximè ad divinae naturae conformitatem promoveri possit». Ibid., p. 193. In this way, the difference between the «operatio» and «cooperatio» can be explained. Boreel writes: «quae operatio et cooperatio in hoc a sé invicem differunt ac consistunt; quod nempe operatio ex praesenti hominis, quam habet efficacia aliquid ad dilectu ad re-actionem commovendum proferat, sive dilectionem, desiderium, votum, amplexum, et similia; Co-operatio verò se componat in conformitate praeventis operationis dilecti, id est, sese accomodans ut dilectum in ista dilectionis, amplexus, intrinsecae illuminationis operatione, atque in ulteriori communionem, quantum potest, similiter obviam veniat, qua ille anima jam ante praeventis in modum obviavit». Ibid., p. 191. Boreel's words are not clear. However, it can be suggested that the «operatio» consists in people's actions to revive and to strengthen God' love that has started to decrease, while the «cooperatio» consists in using that faculty that most makes people similar to God's nature, when He permeates more than one human faculty.

⁹⁹⁸ SRC, in OP, p. 182.

gratiarum actione et laudibus».⁹⁹⁹ In SRC this conditions is described as a «occupatio, inhabitatio, perseverans immansio et constans operatio Christi et Dei», which must be strengthen by the «absolutum et continuum incrementum in isto regno Chrsti et Dei».¹⁰⁰⁰ This is nothing other than the «cohabitatio Patris», which in the third letter Boreel describes as a «familiarem cum *Domino* conversationem», which can be attain through «mutua colloquia, per mutua internae dilectionis exercitia, per spem et fiduciam in *Deum*, per gratiarum actionem et laudem».¹⁰⁰¹ Finally, as in PR the union of God necessarily follow from the first six steps, so in the three letters people can achieve the highest degree of the «cohabitatio Patris», that is, the eternal union with God, through the virtuous circle.

Furthermore, it has been shown that in PR and in SRC Boreel argues that the best means to reach God can be found in the Holy Scriptures, from which people can draw Christ's precepts and the way of imitating his life. It is possible to find the same assertions in the three letters too. First, Boreel argues that the «cohabitatio Patris» usually follow from the «cohabitatio Christi» or from the observance of the divine precepts, which are recorded in the Holy Scripture.¹⁰⁰² Furthermore, Boreel clearly asserts that people must acquire both God's and Christ's «cohabitatio» and they must avoid all that can hinder their purpose. This is not a difficult task, Boreels says, if «nos ejus praecepta servant, eo testemur, nos illum diligere, atque illius dilectione permanere».¹⁰⁰³ Finally, Boreel begins the first letter by openly saying that each Christian has the means to achieve his highest purpose, because the

⁹⁹⁹ PR, in OP, p. 132.

¹⁰⁰⁰ SRC, in OP, pp. 182-183.

¹⁰⁰¹ TL, in OP, p. 198.

¹⁰⁰² «Passivus autem stato de quo agimus, ordinario modo in homine oritur post activi status exercitium, aut post accuratam divinatorum praeceptorum observationem». Ibid., p. 193. Boreel claims that this occurs in «ordinario modo», because sometimes God «aliquas animas suo immenso amore quidem praevenire solet, tametsi illae in activo statu non perfectè fuerint exercitae». These «preventae animae» are those «quibus *Dominus* ad peculiare quid in sui ministerio vult uti; quibus se ipsum etiam ut plurimum in hoc passivo statu patefacere solet; per quam patefactionem, illae, pro ratione diversarum mensurarum et graduum istius, in se operationem fieri permittunt; eo operantes, atque operantes cum illo et circa illum; vel non; ut supra declaravimus». Ibid., pp. 193-194.

¹⁰⁰³ Ibid., p. 188.

observance of the «verbum Christi», that is of Christ's precepts and life, are sufficient to pursue it.¹⁰⁰⁴

In conclusion, from the analysis of PR, of SRC, and of the three letters it can be concluded that Boreel has conceived a unique path that would lead all people to achieve their highest purpose, that is the union with God. There is only a main difference from PR and the other works examined. While Boreel wrote SRC and the three letters for a Christian audience and thus he had no need to discuss a rational way towards God, he wrote PRC for all people. This is the reason why at first he conceived a rational path that would lead all people to be united with God, and then he argued that the best means to follow such path can be found in the Holy Scriptures and in the Christian religion.

So, from Boreel's point of view, people can know that their highest purpose is to find and to be one with God through rational argumentation. Furthermore, through their natural reason they can also understand that they have to part with all that is contrary to God's nature, and that they have to practice his virtues and qualities, if they want to reach their highest purpose. He who follows this rational path does nothing more than gradually acquiring both the «cohabitatio Christi», which follows from practicing God's virtues, and the «cohabitatio Patris», which follows from parting with all created things. In fact, Boreel openly argues that he who rationally understands that God is the highest purpose of all creatures and who decides to follow the rational path towards him, can easily acknowledge that such way fully agrees with the precepts of the Christian religion, which Boreel has described as «rationalem illum Dei cultum, quem Dominus Jesus vita et Doctrina sua in libris Novi f<o>ederis expressit».¹⁰⁰⁵ Therefore, from the New Testament all people can draw the «vivum quoque exemplum [...] ad illustrationem totius doctrinae, (quae modum tradit sese conformandi ad divinam voluntatem, summoque hoc Bono indesinenter fruendi), quod est Christus Jesus».¹⁰⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰⁴ «Eximia res est, tale nobis Christinis medium in manibus constitutum esse, quo unicum nostrum et plenè satians bonum ubique locorum nobiscum habere possumus; conservationem videlicet verbi, hoc est praeceptorum ac vitae *Domini Jesu*». Ibid., p. 187.

¹⁰⁰⁵ SRC, in OP, p. 185.

¹⁰⁰⁶ PRC, in OP, p. 133.

If someone decides to live according to Christ's precepts and life, he will eliminate the «difformitas» from God and acquire the «conformitas» with the divine nature instead. Then, God Himself will lead him «in recto illo tramite» through which «in hac ipsa vita ad veram pervenit pacem, gaudiumque et jucundissimum *Dei* consortium, in quo revera summum Bonum consistere censendum est».¹⁰⁰⁷ This is nothing else than the highest degree of the «cohabitatio Patris», where «homo nullum sibi objectum propositum habeat, quam illud purum abstractum necessarium *Aliquid*, quod *Deus* nominatur».¹⁰⁰⁸ In such state each man has already acquired the perfection of all his faculties. However, this highest state is the outcome of a long process, through which people can purify their faculties. As a matter of fact, in the lesser degrees of the «cohabitatio Patris» God only pervades and enlightens some human faculties. For instance, if people become similar to God by looking for truths and knowledge, which are virtues related to the rational faculty, God will pervade and enlighten their reason, while he will pervade the will, if they became similar to God by practicing some virtues related to the volitional faculty.¹⁰⁰⁹

Furthermore, God will bestow the greatest gifts on the people who are able to achieve the highest degree of the «cohabitatio Patris». Boreel writes: «quae homo in passivo statu à *Domino* accipit, sunt, immensum divini amoris robur, spiritus *Domini* in magna mensura; spiritus sapientiae, et intellectus, spiritus consilii, et fortitudinis; spiritus cognitionis, et timoris *Domini*; spiritus veritatis, spiritus exemplaris sanctitatis, puritas, mundities et nitiditas Cordis, spiritus excellentis fiduciae ac fortitudinis, in opere *Domini*, spiritus eloquentiae et apertionis oris, os et sapientia, quibus adversarii resistere non valent, spiritus gratiae, quo nempe *Deo* hominibusque acceptus est, spiritus gratiae seu favoris divinae et precationis, spiritus gravitatis et modestiae, spiritus prudentiae, spiritus gloriae, qui sese demonstrat per

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 134.

¹⁰⁰⁸ TL, in OP, p. 187.

¹⁰⁰⁹ «si in aliqua virtute intellectum concernente, occupatus sit, verbi gratia, veritate sapientia, obviatio illa se exserat et operetur in intellectu, eundem illuminans. Si autem in aliqua virtute voluntatem vel animi affectus, respiciente, veluti bonitate, justitia, charitate, misericordia, pace, et similibus supra memoratis, occupetur, tum exserit se operaturque illa obviatio in voluntate animique affectibus, illos suaviter irradiando ac calefaciendo, et veluti unguendo, sive aptiores quam antea fuerunt reddendo. Et tunc quidem, homo, filii, sive *Domini Christi* cohabitatione fruitur». Ibid., p. 188.

Divinas visiones, mentisque ecstases sive raptus; per prophetias sive veras praedictiones, per sanatione, per miracula operaque admiranda, per donum diversarum linguarum». ¹⁰¹⁰ Therefore, if someone pursue the union with God through his reason, through Christ's precepts, and through the internal divine experience, he will become a most perfect man, because he will reach the «unicum illum trium horum mediorum scopum, aeternam atque beatam illam vitam, in qua *Deus* omnia erit in omnibus». ¹⁰¹¹

¹⁰¹⁰ Ibid., p. 194.

¹⁰¹¹ PR, in OP, p. 134.

Conclusion

At the beginning of the 17th century a new Christian movement was founded in the Dutch Republic. After the defeat of the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dordrecht, the religious community of the little village of Warmond was left without ministers. So, they started to gather in the house of Gijsbert van der Kodde, one of their elders, who became the leader of their religious life along with his brothers. They held private meetings in their house in order to read the Holy Scriptures, to pray, and to practice religious edification. The two main features of these meetings were freedom of speech and religious toleration: every member of the Warmond community could freely express his opinions concerning the passages of the Bible they had read. Shortly after, informal religious meetings held by the Van der Kodde brothers became the focal point of a new Christian sect, which is known as the Collegiant movement. When Remonstrant ministers came back to Warmond, some people decided to continue attending the meetings' in Van der Kodde's house instead. Shortly after, these little Christian congregations left Warmond and went to Rijnsburg, which became the stronghold of the Collegiant movement. As a matter of fact, during the 17th, century Christian people who did not recognize themselves in the official Christian churches or who wanted to freely discuss the Bible, started to hold meetings similar to the Van der Kodde's assemblies in different cities of the Dutch Republic. Their members were called Collegiants and sometimes they all met in Rijnsburg, in order to held religious services.

The Collegiant movement played a major role in the cultural life of the Dutch Republic in the 17th century. Many of their members were learned people who expressed their ideas concerning freedom of speech, religious toleration, the rationality of the Christian religion, the central role of reason in a true religious life, etc. People like Dirck Camphuysen, Petrus Serrarius, Jan Knol, Barend Joosten Stol, Frans Kuyper, Laurens Klinkhamer, Joachim Oudaen, Jan Bredenburg, were members of the different Colleges held in various Dutch cities. Through their works, they all contributed spreading

Collegiant ideas, some more than others, and to lay down the foundations of the Enlightenment.¹⁰¹²

Adam Boreel certainly was one of the most important members of the Collegiant movement. In particular, he played a major role in the life of the Amsterdam College for many years. However, it must be stressed that he often held opinions less radical than the ideas expressed by some of the above-mentioned authors. He surely was one of the leading figures among the first Collegiants, who were inclined to philosophical and rationalistic ideas, but who were still tied to older theological and Christian beliefs. In the works of people like Boreel, it is possible to perceive an underlined hesitancy to full accept rationalistic ideas due to his Christian beliefs. For instance, this is perfectly clear from Boreel's ideas about the rationality of Christian religion: even though he argued that natural reason is able to attain some fundamental religious truth and that it is sufficient to lead a moral life, he still tried to argue that God's revelation and the Holy Scriptures are necessary.

Although Boreel had connections with many Dutch and English scholars from the 17th century, up until now little was known about his life. During the 1980s and 1990s, some scholars, like Richard Popkin and Ernestine van der Wall, started to show interest in Boreel and they began to clarify some aspects of his life, such as his relationship with the Hartlib Circle and his interest in Jewish people. However, up until now, an updated biography was still lacking. Furthermore, no one had ever tried to give a full account of his thought. In fact, Schneider's analysis of Boreel's works seems to be lost and in the last few years Rob Iliffe only examined some aspects of Boreel's ideas. These are the reasons why we decided to write both an updated biography of Boreel and a full account of his thought.

As for Boreel's life, these are the main conclusions that have reached. He was born in Middleburg on November 2, 1602, from an ancient patrician family who had deep relationships both with Dutch and English scholars and politicians. We have very little information about his youth. He enrolled at the University of Leiden on January 21, 1619, where he most likely

¹⁰¹² To fully understand the role that such people played in spreading ideas that eventually lead to the Enlightenment, see: Fix, *Prophecy and reason* (see above, n. 233).

studied classical and oriental languages, such as Greek and Hebrew. In the years 1625-26 he spent some time in England, where he was involved in the Ziegler's case. Philip Ziegler was an alleged Rosicrucian prophet, who lived in England between 1625 and 1626, where he gathered some followers around himself. Among these people there was also Boreel, who gave financial support to Ziegler. However, eventually the Rosicrucian prophet was exposed as a deceiver, and he was put in jail with his supporters. We have no strong evidence to establish if Boreel was imprisoned too, but it seems most likely. Then, he went back to the Dutch Republic and he enrolled again at the University of Leiden, where he continued to study classical and oriental languages, and where he increased his theological knowledge. During these years he started to develop the fundamental core of his ecclesiological ideas and in 1632 he discussed them with one of his ex-professors, André Rivet.

However, the most important events of Boreel's life occurred from the 1640s onwards. In these years, he started to play a major role in the Hartlib Circle, thanks to his friendship with John Dury. Samuel Hartlib had an interest in Boreel as a learned man for many reasons. First, Boreel worked on a vocalization of the Mishnah, which he published in 1646 with the support of some Mennonite merchants and of some Jewish people, like Menasseh ben Israel. To vocalize such a book, Boreel had worked together with another Jewish rabbi, Jacob Judah Leon Templo, who thanks to the financial support of Boreel was able to build a model of Salomon's Temple, which gained much fame in the 17th century. Furthermore, Boreel and Judah Leon also began to translate the Mishnah in Portuguese. Hartlib and the circle of his acquaintances were very interested in such works, even though the vocalized Mishnah soon became an editorial failure. So, when they again believed that a translation of the Mishnah was necessary between the end of the 50s and the beginning of the 60s, they contacted Boreel once again. As a matter of fact, in these years Boreel was again working on a Portuguese edition of the Jewish book, which would have also been the basis for a following Latin translation. However, none of these translations were ever published neither by Boreel, nor by the Jewish people who worked with him.

Although during the 40s the vocalized Mishnah was an editorial failure, Boreel gained fame through it and he was recognized as a learned Hebraist. For this reason, Hartlib and Dury believed that he would have played a major role in their projects concerning Jewish studies. In particular, they thought that he could have been employed in their «Agency for advancement of universal learning». However, such a project never took off. Moreover, in the same years Boreel was also the middleman between the Hartlib Circle and the Jewish community of Amsterdam. When Dury and Hartlib needed information from some Jews of Amsterdam, it was Boreel that provided them with such information.

In addition, the interests that people from the Hartlib Circle had for Boreel were not related only to his knowledge of Jewish traditions. During the the 40s Boreel had also some kind of scientific interests. In particular, he was the owner of an invention that would have purified putrid water in long voyages by ship. This invention aroused the interest of Hartlib and of people such as Benjamin Worsley, who eventually found out that such a miraculous invention was nothing other than a fraud. Furthermore, in the same years Boreel also learned how to grind lenses and how to make telescopes. It is most likely that he devoted himself to such activities because of his financial problems, that lasted at least until 1654.

In 1645 Boreel published his most famous writing, «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium». Because of this work, between 1646 and 1647 Samuel Desmarets and Johannes Hoornbeeck attacked him by writing two works, the «Dissertatio Theologica de Usu et Honore Sacri Ministerii» by Desmarets and the «Apologia pro Ecclesia Christiana Odierna» by Hoornbeeck. In turn, Boreel replied with three pamphlets. Furthermore, from some letters of John Dury it can be argued that in the same years Boreel had written other works. However, there is no evidence to establish if such writings are lost or if they were published in the edition of Boreel's posthumous works. In 1656 Boreel started to write a new major work, which would have been entitled «Jesus Nazarenus Legislator». In fact, at the end of 1654 Boreel went to England, where he lived for around four years and where he met people like Henry Oldenburg, Robert Boyle, his sister Lady Ranelagh, and Walter Strickland. It

was Oldenburg that suggested to Boreel to work on the «Jesus Nazareus Legislator», which they regarded as the highest defense of Christian religion. In 1656 Oldenburg went to Oxford, where he heard two *scrupuli* against Christianity which he immediately communicated to his Dutch friend, asking him to write a defense of Christ and of his religion. Furthermore, it is likely that Hartlib had some kind of role in the shaping of Boreel's work. However, he never completed the «Jesus Nazareus Legislator». Moreover, from Harltib's and Oldenburg's correspondences, it can be argued that during the 1650s and the 1660s Boreel had written other works. However, there is no evidence again to establish if they were published among the posthumous works or if they are lost.

In 1646 Boreel started to hold a College in Amsterdam, together with Daniel de Breen and Cornelis Moorman. In later years the famous *doopsgezinde* preacher Galenus Abrahamsz started to attend the Collegiant meetings of Amsterdam too. Thanks to the reports of the Reformed Church's council of Amsterdam, we reconstructed the history of the Amsterdam College between 1646 and 1665, when Boreel died. Thanks to this account it is possible to understand where and when the Collegiants met, and to perceive the atmosphere of toleration that surrounded Amsterdam in those years, since the civil authorities often decided not to stop the assemblies of the Amsterdam College, even though the Reformed Church asked them many times to do so. Furthermore, from the accounts of the Reformed council it is also possible to understand the major role that Boreel played among the Collegiants of Amsterdam, so much so that sometimes their assemblies are mentioned as meetings of Boreelists. After he left the Dutch Republic in 1654, Galenus Abrahamsz became a major figure among the Collegiants. Because of his involvement in the Amsterdam College, Galenus was attacked by conservative members of his *doopsgezinde* congregation. The first struggles gradually became a public dispute that also involved people like Petrus Serrarius, as well as members from the *doopsgezinde* community, and this eventually led to a schism within the Mennonite congregation.

When Boreel returned to Amsterdam in 1659, the controversy between Galenus' party and the conservative Mennonites was reaching its

highest point. In addition, in the following year Boreel, Galenus, and other members of the *doopsgezinde* community were involved in some controversies with Quakers who had arrived in Amsterdam in 1657. Despite such difficulties and frequent attacks from the Reformed ministers, the meetings of the Collegiants continued. However, during the 1660s Boreel did not recover his previous leading role and gradually the Boreelists were substituted by the liberal *doopsgezindend*. After Boreel died, Collegiants and Mennonites took different paths.

Boreel died on June 20, 1665, and he was buried in the grave owned by Galenus in the graveyard of Petruskerk, in Sloterdijk. The importance of this author can be understood through the circle of people that he met during his life. Among his closest friends, it is possible to find Petrus Serrarius, John Dury, Justinus Van Assche, Johan Moriaen, Samuel Hartlib, Henry Oldenburg, Galenus Abrahamsz, Cornelis Moorman, David Spruyt. Furthermore, during his life he surely met people like Marin Mersenne, Jacob Judah Leon, Menasseh Ben Israel, Benjamin Worsley, Robert Boyle, Walter Strickland, William Ames, Benjamin Furly, and many others. In short, it cannot be denied that Boreel was at the heart of the Dutch and English world of the 17th century.

As for Boreel's thought, in this dissertation a thorough analysis of his works has been done. The choice of such an analytical approach was not arbitrarily made. Since an account of Boreel's thought was lacking, at first it was necessary to fully understand his true ideas and thus a detailed examination of his works was necessary. Such analysis has been divided into six chapters, which gradually reconstruct Boreel's beliefs from his first work to the «Jesus Nazareus Legislator», showing that he was not contradictory and that this last manuscript completes the first ideas that he had expressed in «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium». Such an account of Boreel's thought is completed by a general description of the beliefs of authors from the 16th and 17th century, who expressed ideas similar to Boreel's beliefs in their works. In particular, the thoughts of some friends of Boreel, of some Collegiant authors, and of some scholars whose ideas had been the main sources for the Collegiant thought, were taken into consideration. In this way it is possible to

place Boreel's works in their historical context. Furthermore, the accounts concerning these authors is also useful to identify some of Boreel's main sources. Of course, the analysis concerning Boreel's thought and his probable sources made in this dissertation must be regarded as the starting point for further studies. As a matter of fact, starting from an analysis of Boreel's works and from a general account of authors that embraced similar ideas, it is possible to make further inquiries concerning Boreel's sources, and his probable influence on contemporary and subsequent thinkers.

Instead of giving a brief account of the different chapters regarding Boreel's thought, here we propose an interpretative summary of his beliefs, by considering them according to the following subjects: the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; the relationship between reason and God's revelation; the theological-political ideas.

As for the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, Boreel believes that the doctrines necessary to attain salvation are clearly asserted in the Bible and thus every Christian can understand such doctrines by simply reading the passages from the Holy Scriptures concerning them, without interpretations or explanations made by other people. This is one of the main reasons why Boreel believes that public religion must only rely on the readings of those passages from the Bible which all Christians agree on. If we consider that he also argues that the Holy Scriptures are the only way to know God's Word, we can easily understand why he believes that the New Testament is sufficient to administer any kind of religious worship. Because of his beliefs concerning the Holy Scriptures, Boreel has been able to develop his critical argumentations against modern ministers and ecclesiastical authority, which eventually lead him to state that modern ministers have no divine authority, that they should not have any kind of power or offices within religious congregations, and finally that in modern times Christians do not need churches' ministers.

As for the doctrines that are not necessary to attain salvation, Boreel's opinion is not very clear. In «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium» Boreel argues that no one can prove to be instructed by God to clarify those passages of the Bible that are obscure. Although he does not openly state if such

passages really existed, it can be argued that he believes that in the Holy Scriptures it is at least possible to find passages less clear than those concerning doctrines that are necessary for salvation. It is most likely that in these passages people could find those dogmas and doctrines that are not necessary for salvation and that must be regarded as *adiaphora* for this reason. Boreel argues that no one should discuss such passages and doctrines in public, in order to avoid schisms that have always characterized Christian religion. People can discuss them in private meetings instead, where everyone would be free to express his opinion and where every belief would be tolerated, as the Collegiants were used to doing.

So, we can rightly ask: what kind of relationship is there between reason and the Holy Scriptures? Boreel never took such topic into consideration. However, it is evident that he does not share a kind of Socinian idea suggesting that passages and doctrines in the Bible must be judged by human reason. On the contrary, in the JNL Boreel openly argues that natural reason cannot achieve the absolute knowledge of all Christian doctrines: as for the theoretical part of Christ's Law, natural reason can obtain *certitudo* of a few fundamental truths, while natural reason alone would achieve only probable truths of Christ's remaining theoretical doctrines. On the other hand, it seems that Boreel neither shares the opposite idea, suggesting that natural reason should bow to the Holy Scriptures. In fact, asserting that the truths achieved through natural reason must bow to the truths that arise from the Bible, entails that it is possible to achieve such truths by reading passages from the New Testament. However, if these truths were attainable by just reading the Holy Scriptures, it would not be possible to freely discuss dogmas and doctrines that are not necessary for salvation, as Boreel argues. If someone achieved the highest truth about a certain Christian doctrine by just reading the Holy Scriptures, no one could question such a truth. So, we must conclude that Boreel does not believe it possible to attain all religious truths through the readings of the Holy Scriptures and thus that the truths achieved by natural reason must not be subjected to the Bible.

In short, it seems possible to summarize Boreel's belief in this way. As for the fundamentals of Christianity, there is a perfect consensus between

the truths attainable through natural reason and those achievable through the Holy Scriptures. These fundamentals are shared by all Christians and so they must be identified with the doctrines that are necessary to attain salvation. The passages from the New Testament concerning such doctrines are absolutely clear, Boreel argues, and thus they do not need any kind of interpretation. As for the other Christians doctrines, it is impossible to achieve perfect knowledge about them both through natural reason and the Holy Scriptures. This is the reason why Christians can freely discuss them in private meetings and why all opinions about them must be tolerated. In the JNL Boreel argues that all people need God's revelation to obtain *certitudo* of the doctrines that are not necessary for salvation. However, he believes that only the Holy Scriptures are God's true Word, and that no one can claim to be gifted with God's revelation. Otherwise, he would be endowed with divine authority, against Boreel's belief. So, we should wonder if he believed that it was possible to attain absolute truth about the doctrines unnecessary for salvation. From what has been said so far, it seems that we must give a negative answer. On the other hand, we could argue that every man would be able to attain *certitudo* about such doctrines through the «cohabitatio Patris». As a matter of fact, it has been shown that, if someone decides to walk the rational path towards God and follows Christ's example to reach his highest purpose, God Himself will pervade his faculties and enlighten them. Perhaps, through such enlightenment people could reach the *certitudo* of all Christian doctrines.

As for the relationship between reason and God's revelation, much has been already said by discussing Boreel's idea concerning the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. First, we must stress that human natural reason is not necessary to understand God's revelation. As a matter of fact, God had clearly revealed the doctrines that all people must embrace and follow in order to attain salvation in the Holy Scriptures and no one needs reason to understand them. Furthermore, natural reason cannot attain perfect knowledge of all remaining doctrines of the Christian religion. It can only establish probable truths instead. So, what is the role of human reason in Boreel's thought? He believes that natural reason is able to achieve the same truths necessary for salvation that God had revealed through Christ's oral

Law, which are now recorded in the Holy Scriptures. In other words, Boreel believes that a minimum and fundamental creed of the Christian religion can be proved and established through natural reason. Such fundamental creed would consist of a few theoretical truths, that is, the existence of God and of His providence, and the equality between God's Law and Christ's Law, and of all practical precepts of Christ's doctrine. By accepting and following such a creed, all Christian would attain salvation. So, Boreel believes that people could prove that the transcendental Christian God exists, that He has given a Law to mankind through His highest emissary and legislator Jesus Christ, and thus that the Christian religion is true through natural reason. However, these are the limits of natural reason. If people tries to use it to find truths of the remaining religious doctrines, they will attain only probable truths.

Boreel believes that such a proof would have two main outcomes. First, it would unite Christianity once again. If a fundamental rational core of the Christian religion is established, through which all people can attain salvation, all learned Christians would agree on such doctrines and embrace them, regardless of their particular confessions of faith. They would understand that these are the only fundamental doctrines that every man must follow to lead a true Christian life and thus they would practice religious toleration regarding all other dogmas, doctrines, and beliefs. In short, all Christian sects and churches would continue to exist, but at the same time they would be united in universal Christianity. Second, the proof of a minimum rational creed would unite all people within the Christian religion. Atheists would be persuaded of the existence of God, Deists of the existence of a true religion, Pagans, Jewish people, Muslims, all people would embrace the Christian God and would recognize that Christ was His true emissary, that his doctrines are God's Laws, and thus that he must be accepted as the Legislator of mankind.

As for the theological-political aspect of Boreel's thought, it must be stressed once again that his highest purpose is the reunification of the Christian religion. In order to achieve such goal, he believes that two conditions are necessary: first, it is necessary to establish the Church of Connivance; second, it is necessary that for a State to embrace such a Church.

As for the Church of Connivance, Boreel believes that it would not need official ministers, since no one in modern times can claim to be endowed with divine authority. In short, Boreel shapes such a Church on the example of the Collegiant movement. It would be characterized by a public and a private side. On the one hand, the Church of Connivance consists of a public religious assembly where all Christians can be united, regardless of their different opinions and of the confessions of faith they embrace. In such public assemblies, Christians would only read those passages of the Holy Scriptures where God revealed the fundamental truths necessary to attain salvation, which all Christians agree on. Furthermore, they would practice religious toleration among each other, so that no one would be condemned for the opinions he held about dogmas or doctrines that are not necessary for salvation. On the other hand, the Church of Connivance also consists of private meetings, where Christians who hold similar opinions can meet. As a matter of fact, Boreel argues that in the Church of Connivance every Christian must be free to embrace the particular confession of faith that he believes most adequate or true, and that he must be free to meet with other people who share similar ideas, in order to read the Holy Scriptures, to discuss those passages regarding dogmas and doctrines unnecessary to salvation, to pray and to practice mutual religious edification. In such private meetings, all people would be free to express their opinions and all beliefs would be tolerated.

As for the relationship between civil power and the Church, Boreel believes that States should not embrace particular confessions of faith and they should not meddle in religious matters. Otherwise, one among the various Christian sects would gain political authority, and thus the freedom and eventually the very existence of other confessions of faith would be denied. Therefore, civil authorities should only found public religion on the readings of the Holy Scriptures and they should allow every Christian to hold private meetings in order to freely express their particular beliefs. In this way, civil power would guarantee religious peace and freedom of worship to its members. In other words, Boreel believes that the civil authorities of a certain State should found the Church of Connivance. In this way, they would guarantee religious freedom and toleration to all its citizens. So, it is evident

that Boreel embraces the idea suggesting the separation between political power and Church, since civil authorities have no right to meddle in religious matters. However, at the same time he believes that political power has to maintain some kind of role in the religious life of its citizens, by deciding how to administer public religion, by defending religious peace, and by making sure that every citizen can enjoy religious toleration, and freedom of worship and of speech in private meetings. Furthermore, we must stress that Boreel only thinks about a Christian State. So, religious peace, toleration, and freedom of worship and of speech would concern only Christian people.

In the end, Boreel's main purpose is to establish religious peace and union among all Christians. Furthermore, he wants to convert all people to the Christian religion, by showing that Christ must be regarded as the only legislator that every man should embrace and follow. In this way, all people could acquire the means to pursue the highest purpose of mankind, that is, to be united with God. In fact, Boreel believes that the utmost aim of every man is to find God and that the Christian religion is the best means to achieve such a goal. So, if all people accept Christ as their only legislator and decide to follow his doctrines, all people will begin their path towards God, by following Christ's example. If so, God Himself will decide to pervade and enlighten their faculties, so that in the end every man will attain that «aeternam nempè atque beatam illam vitam, in qua Deus omnia erit in omnibus».

We should now make a few considerations about the significance of Boreel's ideas for the thought of the 17th century. Boreel surely lived in a transitional period from the old Christian religious belief to the new philosophical, scientific, and rationalistic ideas that eventually led to the Enlightenment. Scholars like Coornhert from the 16th century and Camphuysen from the 17th had already started to highly value human reason, by arguing that it plays a major role in the life of each Christian, while in the same time they do not question the Christian religion. Furthermore, the 17th century was also the period of the scientific discoveries. For instance, few years before Boreel published «Ad Legem et ad Testimonium», Galileo Galilei had conceived his ideas about the two truths, religious truth, which

every man must pursue through the Bible and which leads to salvation, and scientific truth, which concerns natural phenomena and which must be pursued through human reason. Furthermore, in the same period in which Boreel lived, Robert Boyle had started to establish the principles of his corpuscular philosophy, which mainly relies on the ability of human reason alone. However, neither Galilei nor Boyle ever questioned the truth of Christian religion. On the other hand, the 17th century was also the period of philosophers like Thomas Hobbes and Baruch Spinoza, who held more radical beliefs and who questioned the very idea of a religious truth.

In such an atmosphere that permeated European culture of the 17th century, Boreel is a fitting example of a scholar who took up an intermediate position: he embraced some philosophical and rationalistic ideas, but at the same time he was tied to his religious beliefs. So, instead of questioning Christian doctrines and the very idea of God's revelation, as for instance Spinoza did, Boreel tried to use these ideas to defend Christianity and to unite all Christians in a unique religion. With regard to such a position, we can certainly argue that Boreel's thought was not a novelty of the 17th century. As has been shown in the account of Boreel's thought, many of his ideas had been held by previous people and were held by contemporary scholars too.

However, we should not underestimate the significance of Boreel's ideas in the context of 17th century thought. As a matter of fact, he had deep relationships with both Dutch and English scholars. Furthermore, many people attended the meetings of the Amsterdam College and thus Boreel's opinions were well known. For instance, many of Spinoza's friends attended such meetings from time to time. So, Boreel's importance could be measured according to the people who might have listened to him, who might have read his works, and thus who might have known his opinions in religious matters. In fact, it is most likely that the ideas that Boreel and people like him had expressed, were the starting point of more radical thoughts.

We should make an example by considering Boreel's belief concerning the rational fundamentals of Christian religion. If a learned man who did not share Boreel's faith in the Christian religion read his ideas suggesting that human reason is able to prove a few theoretical religious truths

and that it is sufficient to lead a moral life, he could draw different conclusions from them. He could argue that there is no true religion, but that all religious beliefs are pleasing to God. Or, he could argue that God exists, but that he has not revealed himself to mankind. In this way, he could deny all the revealed religions and the same providence of God, thus reaching opinions similar to the ideas expressed by Deists. Furthermore, since natural reason is sufficient to lead a moral life, someone could easily argue that there is no need to prove the existence of God and that every man should only follow his own rational faculty. From such conclusion, even other ideas held by Boreel could reach new outcomes. For instance, by denying that there is a true religion, it would be possible to extend religious toleration to all people, not only to Christians as Boreel did. Likewise, all people could enjoy freedom of speech and worship not only in private meetings, but also in public assemblies. Furthermore, it would be possible to argue that civil power must not meddle in religious matters at all and that it should guarantee the existence of every religion instead, as long as no one endangers the very State and the peace of its citizens. Of course, Boreel would never have made such steps because of his deep faith in Christ and in his doctrine. Nonetheless, we cannot exclude that contemporary and subsequent scholars questioned religions and reached more rational conclusions by using the same ideas through which Boreel tried to defend Christ and his doctrine.

Bibliography

Abrahamsz G. & Spruyt D., *Nader verklaringe van de XIX Artikelen, voor desen door G. Abrahamsz ende D. Spruyt aen hare Mede-dienaren overghegeven: dienende tot Wederlegginge van 't Gheschrift, genaemt: Antwoorde by forme van aenmerckingen, vragen, ende redenen, etc.*, Amsterdam, 1659.

Aconcio Iacopo, *Satanae Stratagemata Libri Octo. Accessit eruditissima epistola de ratione edendorum librorum, ad Iohannem Vuolsium Tigurinum eodem euthore*, Basilea, 1565

Agassi Joseph, *The very idea of modern science*, Dordrecht, 2013.

Ambesi Alberto Cesare, *I rosacroce*, Milano, 1975.

Ames William, *Wederlegginge van een boek genaemt Antwoort op 23 vragen door F.D. waervan, de logens uytgenomen zijnde, ende den logenaer ontdeckt sijnde, sijn Antwoort sonder kracht blijft. Als mede een wederlegginge van een andere Antwoort, die door P.S. daer op gedaen was, waer in zijne dwaesheynt ontdeckt is. Soo dat mijne vragen klaer staen van alle besmettingen van hare logens, ende noch in haer volle macht blyven, om beantwoort te worden*, 1657.

Ames William, *De misslagen en valscheden wederleydt, die gevonden zijn in de extracten uyt de schriften van Jacob Adriaensz. van oudts genaemt Mr. Jans: tegen een volck Quakers genaemt, welcke onschuldigh zijn van 't gene hy haer oplegt. Mede (een extract uyt) James Naylor's bekentenis (door hem in druck uytgegeven,) van sijne afwijckinge, tegens welke de Quakers getuyght hebben*, Amsterdam 1661.

Arnogathe Jean Robert, *Mersenne (Marin): religieux minime 1588-1648*, Ginevra, 1997.

Angeli Stephen Ward, *Early Quakers and their theological thought: 1647-1723*, New York, 2015.

Antognazza Maria Rosa, *The truth of the christian religion: with Jean le Clerc's notes and addition, Hugo Grotius; translated by John Clarke (1743)*, Indianapolis, 2012.

Atwood C.D., *The theologu of the Czech Brethren from Hus to Comenius*, University Park, 2009.

Avramov Iordan, «The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg and circulation of objects at the early Royal Society of London, 1660-1677», in Andrea Gàldy & Sylvia Heudecker (ed.), *Collecting Nature*, Cambridge, 2014.

Bailey Richard, *New light on George Fox and early quakerism: the making and unmaking of a God*, San Francisco, 1992.

Baird Henry Martyn, *Theodore Beza: the counsellor of the French reformation, 1519-1605*, New York, 1970.

Ball Bryan W., «Mede, Joseph (1586-1638)», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2004.

Bangs Carl, *Arminius: a study in the dutch reformation*, Grand Rapids, 1985.

Batten Joseph Minton, *Johnd Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion*, Chicago, 1944.

Bayard Jean-Pierre, *La spiritualité de la Rose-Croix: histoire, tradition et valeur initiatique*, Saint Jean de Braye, 1990.

Becker-Cantarino B., *Daniel Heinsius*, Boston, 1978.

Bell E., «Eighteenth-Century Quakerism and the Rehabilitation of James Nayler, Seventeenth-Century Radical», in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59(3), 2008.

Bidloo Lambert, *Mennoos Kerck in en uyt Babel, ofte den Aenvang, Voortgang, en redderinge van de Verwarringen der Vlaemsche Doops-gesinden, vergeleken met de tseventigh-jarige Gevangenisse, en herstellinge der Israeliten*, Amsterdam, 1665.

Bidloo Lambert, *Onbepaalde Verdraagzaamheyd de Verwoesting der Doopsgezinden*, Amsterdam, 1701.

Bierma L.D., *Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism: Sources, History and Theology*, Grand Rapids, 2005.

Bietenholz Peter G., *Encounters with a Radical Erasmus. Erasmus' Work as a Source of Radical Thought in Early Modern Europe*, Toronto, 2009.

Biondi Albano, *L'esegesi biblica di frate Marin Mersenne*, Bologna, 1992.

Birch Thomas, *The court and times of Charles the First; illustrated by authentic and confidential letters, from various public and private collections*, vol. 1, London, 1848.

Bodin Jean, *Colloquium heptaplomeres de rerum sublimium arcanis abditis e codicibus manuscriptis Bibliothecae Academicae Gissensis cum varia lectione aliorum apographorum nunc primum typis describendum / Joannes Bodinus ; curavit Ludovicus Noack*, Hildesheim, 1970.

Bodin Jean, *Colloquium of the Seven about Secrets of the Sublime. Translation with Introduction, Annotations, and Critical Reading*, by Marion Leathers Kuntz, University Park, 2008.

Bonvicini Eugenio, *Rosaroce: la storia di un pensiero*, Foggia, 1996.

Borsius J., *Antonius Walaeus in zijn leven en in zijn verdiensten geschetst*, Leiden.

Bots H. & Leroy P. (ed.), *Correspondance intégrale d'André Rivet en Claude Sarrau*, Amsterdam, 1978-1982.

Bran Friedrich, *Johann Valentin Andreä, 1586-1654: ein universaler Geist des 17. Jahrhunderts in internationaler Sicht*, Bad Liebenzell, 1987.

Bray John S., *Theodore Beza's doctrine of predestination*, Nieuwkoop, 1975.

Bredenburg Jan, *Een pratje over tafel, tusschen een remonstrant, waterlandts-doopsgesinde, ende den waerdt. Behelsende consideration over den vrede-handel, nu tusschen de remonstranten en de waterlandsche-*

doopsgesinde tot Rotterdam, voorgevallen. Waer van sy nu beyderzijds de stucken hebben uytgegeven. Betoonende oockm ter dier occasie, de rechte natuur der onderlinge verdraeghsaemheydt, en hoe die beyder zijden gepractiseert wordt, Amsterdam, 1671.

Bredenburg Jan, *Heylzamen raad tot christelyke vrede, ofte, Aanwijzinge van het rechte middel tot christelijke vereeniging : volgens de eyge natuur der onderlinge verdraagzaamheid, aan alle Christenen, die elkanderen de broederschap waardig oordeelen : benevens een na-reden, dienende tot beantwoording van de voorreden van het verhaal der opkomste van de nieuwe secte der propheten of Rijnsburgers, Rotterdam, 1671.*

Buyse Ruben, *Sparks of Reason. Vernacular Rationalism in the Low Countries (1550-1670)*, Hilversum, 2015.

Buyse Filip, «Boyle, Spinoza, and the Hartlib Circle: The Correspondence which never took place», in *Societate si politica*, 7(2), 2013.

Cagnolati Antonella, *Il circolo di Hartlib: riforme educative e difusione del sapere. Inghilterra, 1630-1660*, Bologna, 2001.

Calvin Jean, *Defensio orthodoxae fidei de sacra trinitate: contra prodigiosos errores Michaelis Serveti hispani. Ubi ostenditur haereticos iure gladii coercendos esse, et nominatim de homine hoc tam impio iuste et merito sumptum Genevae fuisse supplicium*, Geneva, 1554.

Cambi Maurizio, «La città degli eletti di Dio. Utopia e teologia luterana nella Christianopolis di Johann Valentin Andreä», in *Rinascimento: rivista dell'istituto nazionale di studi sul rinascimento*, 48, 2008.

Castellio Sebastian, *De haereticis, an sint persecuendi, et omnino quomodo sit cum eis agendum, Luteri et Brentii aliorumque multorum tum veterum tume recentiorum sententiae. Liber hoc tam turbulento tempore pernecessarius et cum omnibus, tum potissimum principibus et magistratibus utilissimus, ad discendum, quodnam sit eorum in re tam controversa tamque periculosa, officium*, Basilea, 1554.

Castellio Sebastian, *Contra Libellum Calvinii in quo Ostendere Conatur Haereticos jure Gladij Coercendos Esse*, 1562

Chillingworth William, *The religion of protestants a safe way to salvation. Or An answer to a booke entitled Mercy and truth, or charitie maintain'd by Catholiques: which pretends to prove the contrary*, London, 1638.

Churton Tobias, *The invisible history of the rosicrucians: the world's most mysterious secret society*, Rochester, 2009.

Cochrane A., *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century*, Lousville, 2003.

Constant Jean-Marie (ed.), *1588-1988, quatrième centenaire de la naissance de Marin Mersenne: actes du colloque scientifique international et célébration nationale*, Le Mans, 1994.

Cossee E.H., Van Leeuwen T.M., Bosman-Huizinga M.A., *De remonstranten*, Kampen, 2000.

Coudert A., «A Quaker-Kabbalist Controversy: George Fox's Reaction to Francis Mercury van Helmont», in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 39, 1976.

Coudert A., *The Impact of the Kabbalah in the Seventeenth Century: the Life and Thought of Francis Mercury van Helmont (1614-1698)*, Leiden, 1999.

Crombie Alistair Cameron, *Marin Mersenne (1588-1648) and the seventeenth-century problem of scientific acceptability*, Firenze, 1975.

Crossley James (ed.), *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, Vice-chancellor of the Unviersity of Cambridge, etc.*, 3 vols. Manchester, 1847–1886.

Cuhn E.G. (ed.), *Mémoires et négociations secretès de Mr. De Rusdorf, conseiller d'état de S.M. Frédéric V, roi de Bhoème, électeur Palatin, pour servir à l'histoire de la guerre de trente ans*, vol. I, Leipzig, 1789.

Cunaeus, *De Republica Hebraeorum Libri Tres. Editio Novissima*, 1632.

De Fijne Passchier, *'t Gescheurde Schaaps-kleedt, van Dr. Galenus Abrahamsz*, Leiden, 1663.

De Groot A., «Arcana atheismi (1676): Frans Kuyper contra de ongodisten van zijn eeuw», in *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis*, 13(3), 2010.

De Jonker C., *Thomas Erpenius*, Amsterdam, 1793.

De Waard C. (ed.), *La Correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne, religieux minime; commencée par M.me Paul Tannery, publiée et annotée par Cornelis de Waard*, vol. VIII, Parigi, 1963.

Del Prete Antonella, *Réfuter et traduire: Marin Mersenne et la cosmologie de Giordano Bruno*, Turnhout, 2000.

Den Tex Jan, *Oldenbarnevelt*, 5 vol., Haarlem, 1960-1972.

Den Tex Jan, *Oldenbarnevelt, translated from the dutch by R.B. Powell*, Cambridge, 1973.

Denis M., *Comenius: une pédagogie à l'échelle de l'Europe*, Berne, 1992.

Desmarets Samuel, *Dissertatio theologica de usu et honore sacri ministerii in ecclesiis reformatis; opposita nupero Anonymi cujusdam eruditi periculoso libello, qui inscribitura Ad Legem et Testimonium, sive Erotematica propositio et deductio etc.*, Groningen, 1646.

Di Bello Anna, *Stato e sovranità nel De republica Libri Sex di Jean Bodin*, Naples, 2014.

Dibon P. (ed.), *Inventaire de la correspondance d'André Rivet (1595-1650)*, Den Haag, 1971.

Dijksterhuis F.J., *The Mutual Making of Sciences and Humanities: Willebrord Snellius, Jacob Golius, and the Early Modern Entanglement of Mathematics and Philology*, in E. Bod, J. Maat & T. Weststeijn (ed.), *The Making of the Humanities, volume II: From Early Modern to Modern disciplines*, Amsterdam, 2012.

Drewes A.J., *Erpenius over werkwoorden*, Leiden, 1969.

Du Rieu W.N. (ed.), *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae MDLXXV-MDCCCLXXV: accedunt nomina curatorum et professorum per eadem secula*, Den Haag-Leiden, 1875.

Dumbauld Edward, *The life and legal writings of Hugo Grotius*, Norman, 1969.

Dury John, *A Seasonable Discourse Written by Mr. Iohn Dury upon The earnest requests of many, briefly shewing these Particulars: 1. What the Grounds and Method of our Reformation ought to be in Religion and Learning. 2. How even in these of distraction, the worke may be advanced. By the Knowledge of Orientall tongues and Jewish Mysteries. By an Agency for advancement of Universall Learning*, London, 1649.

Edighoffer Roland, *Rose-croix et société idéale selon Johann Valentin Andreae*, Neully-sur-Seine, 2 vols., 1982-1987.

Endy Melvin B., *William Penn and early quakerism*, Princeton, 1973.

Ernst-Habib M., *But Why Are You Called a Christian? An Introduction to the Heidelberg Catechism*, Gottingeng, 2013.

Evans Gillian, «Sancta Indifferentia and Adiaphora: “Holy Indifference” and “Things indifferent”», *Common Knowledge* 15(1), 2009, pp. 23-38.

Fell-Smith C., «Pory, John (1572-1633)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

Feola V., *Elias Ashmole and the Uses of Antiquiy*, Parigi, 2013.

Ferranti C. (ed.), *Johannes Amos Comenius, 1592-1670: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Macerata, 2-5 dicembre 1992*, Macerata, 1998.

Fiume Emanuele, *Il sinodo di Dordrecht (1618-1619): predestinazione e calvinismo*, Torino, 2015.

Fix Andrew, *Prophecy and reason. The Dutch Collegiants in the Early Enlightenment*, Princeton, 1991.

Foisneau Luc (ed.), *Politique, droit et theologie chez Bodin, Grotius et Hobbes*, Paris, 1997.

Forlines F. Leroy, *Classical Arminianism: the theology of salvation*, Nashville, 2011.

Foster J., *Alumni Oxonienses: the Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, Oxford, 1891.

Franklin Julian H. (ed.), *Jean Bodin*, Aldershot, 2006.

Fryer Jonathan (ed.), *George Fox and the children of the light*, London, 1991.

Galilei Galileo, “*Sidereus Nuncius*”, *traduzione e commento di Pietro A. Giustini*, Roma, 1978.

Genasarium Somer, *Wnckel-praetjen, Gehouden tusschen twee Persoonen in een Barbiers winckel, den eenen gedoopt en den anderen noch ongedoopt. Over ende van wegen de oneenigheden die onder de Gemeente (die men Vlamingen noempt) geresen zijn. Daer in klaerlick ontdeckt wordt het gevoelen van Galenus ende sijn compliceren, dienende tot onderrichtinghe voor die gene die noch niet kunnen gelooven dat sy het Sociniaensche gevoelen zijn toe gedaen*, 1655.

Gibson K., «John Dury’s Apocalyptic Thought: a Reassessment», in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 61(2), 2010.

Goeree Wilhelmus, *De republyk der hebreen, of Gemeenebest der Joden, onder de Wet der Werimonien en Dienstbaar Jerusalem, vervolgd op de drie boeken van de Heer Petrus Cunaeus. Uit de naargelaten Schriften van Wylen H. W. Goeree [in zyn leven Doctor in de God-geleerdheyd geneesoeffenaar binnen Middelburg in Zeeland] by een versameld door een Liefhebber der Joodse Oudheden*, Amsterdam, 1685.

Goothes N.H., *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources*, Grand Rapids, 2007.

Greaves Richard L., «Sadler, John (1615-1674)», in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004

Greengrass Mark, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor, ed., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, Cambridge, 2002.

Greengrass Mark, «Samuel Hartlib», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

Grotius Hugo, *Sensus librorum sex, quos pro veritate religionis christianae batavice scripsit Hugo Grotius*, Parisiis, 1627.

Grotius Hugo, *Poemata omnia. Editio quarta*, Leiden, 1645.

Grozio Ugo, *Della vera religione cristiana. A cura di Fiorella Pitnacuda de Michelis*, Roma, 1973.

Guggisberg, Hans R., *Sebastian Castellio, 1515-1653. Humanist and Defender of Religious Toleration in a Confessional Age. Translated and edited by Bruce Gordon*, Aldershot, 1988.

Hales, John, *A Tract Concerning Schisme and Schismatiques, wherein is briefly discovered the original causes of all schism. Written by a learned and iudicious divine*, London, 1642.

Hall, A.R. & Hall M.B. (ed.), *The correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, XIII vols., Madison-Milwaukee, 1965-1986.

Hall, Marie Boas, *Henry Oldenburg: shaping the Royal Society*, Oxford, 2002.

Hall, Marie Boas, «Oldenburg, Henry [Heinrich] (c.1619-1677)», in *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies*, Oxford, 2004.

Hartlib Samuel, *A summarie account of Mr. John Dury's former and latter negotiation: for the procuring of true Gospell peace, with christian moderation and charitable unity amongst the protestant churches, and academies*, London, 1657.

Hatton Jean, *George Fox: the founder of the quakers*, Grand Rapids, 2007.

Heering Jan-Paul, *Hugo Grotius as apologist of the christian religion: a study of his word «De veritate religionis christianae», 1640*, Leiden, 2004.

Heering Jan Paul, «The sources of Grotius' *De veritate religionis christianae*», in *Grotiana*, 35, 2014.

Heesakkers C.L., «Te weinig koren of alleen te veel kaf? Leiden's eerste Noordnederlandse filoloog Joannes Meursius (1579–1639)», in R.J. Langelaan & M. Simons (ed.), *Miro Fervore. Een bundel lezingen & artikelen over de beoefening van de klassieke wetenschappen in de zeventiende & achttiende eeuw*, Leiden 1994.

Heisler Ron, «Philip Ziegler: the Rosicrucian King of Jerusalem», in *The Hermetic Journal*, 1990.

Higgins John, *Eenige waerdige en gewichtige aenmerckingen voor Galenus Abrahamsz ende Adam Boreel, ende haere aenhangers*, Amsterdam, 1660.

Hoogstraten, *Groot Algemeen Woorden-Boek, zo Historisch, Geographisch, Genealogisch, als Oordeelkundig*, Amsterdam, 1725.

Hoornbeeck Johannes, *Apologia pro ecclesia christiana hodierna, non apostatica; opposita libello, cui tit. Ad Legem et ad Testimonium, etc.*, Amsterdam, 1647.

Hoornbeeck Johannes, *Summa controversiarum religionis; cum infidelibus, Haereticis, schismaticis: id est, gentilibus, iudaeis, Mihammedanis; papistis, anabaptistis, enthusiastis et libertinis, socinianis; remonstrantibus, lutheranis, brouwnistis, graecis. Editio secunda, auctior, et emendatior*, Utrecht, 1658.

Houtsma M.T., *Uit de Oostersche correspondentie van Th. Erpenius, Jac. Golijs en Lev. Warner: eene bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van de beoefening der Oostersche letteren in Nederland*, Amsterdam, 1887.

Hull William I., *Willem Sewel fo Amsterdam: 1653-1720. The first quaker historian of quakerism*, Philadelphia, 1933.

Hull William I., *The rise of quakerism in Amsterdam: 1655-1665*, Philadelphia, 1938.

Hull William I., *Benjamin Furly and quakerism in Rotterdam*, Philadelphia, 1941.

Hunter M., *Elias Ashmole, 1617-1692: The Founder of the Ashmolean Museum and His World*, Oxford, 1983.

Hunter Michael (ed.), *Robert Boyle reconsidered*, Cambridge, 1994.

Hunter Michael (ed.), *Robert Boyle by himself and his friends: with a fragment of William Wotton's lost "Life of Boyle"*, London, 1994.

Hunter Michael & Davis Edward B. (ed.), *The Works of Robert Boyle*, 14 vols., London, 1999-2000.

Hunter Michael, *Robert Boyle, 1627-91: Scrupolosity and Science*, Woodbridge, 2000.

Hunter Michael, Clericuzio Antonio, & Principe Lawrence M. (ed.), *The correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 6 vols., London, 2001.

Hunter M., «Ashmole, Elias (1617-1692)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004

Hunter Michael, *The Boyle Papers: understanding the manuscripts of Robert Boyle*, Aldershot, 2007.

Hunter Michael, *Boyle: Between God and Science*, New Haven, 2009.

Hutton S., *Anne Conway. A woman philosopher*, Cambridge, 2004.

Hutton S., «Lady Anne Conway», in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), 2015.

Hylkema Cornelis Bonnes, *Reformateurs, geschiedkundige studiën over de godsdienstige bewegingen uit de nadagen onzer gouden eeuw*, Haarlem, 1900.

Ilfie Rob, «Jesus Nazarenus Legislator: Adam Boreel's defence of Christianity», in Silvia Berti & Richard Popkin (ed.), *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and free-thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe: Studies on the Traité des trois imposteurs*, Dordrecht, 1996.

Ingle Larry H., *First among friends: George Fox and creation of quakerism*, Oxford, 1994.

Israel Jonathan, *The dutch republic: its rise, greatness, and fall, 1477-1806*, Oxford, 1995.

Jan de Jonge H., *Daniel Heinsius and the Textus Receptus of the New Testament*, Leiden, 1971.

Jan de Jonge H., «The "Manuscriptus Evangeliorum Antiquissimus" of Daniel Heinsius», in *New Testament Studies*, 21(02), 1975

Janssen F.A. (ed.), *Das Erbe des christian Rosenkreuz : Vorträge gehalten anlässlich des Amsterdamer Symposiums, 18.-20. November 1986 Johann Valentin Andreae 1586-1986 und die Manifeste der Rosenkreuzerbruderschaft 1614-1616*, Amsterdam, 1988.

Jessey Henry, *A Narrative of the late Proceeds at White-Hall, concerning the Jews, who had desired by R. Manasses and agent for them, that they might returne to England, and worship the God of their Fathers here in their Synagogues, etc.*, London, 1656.

Juterczenka Sünne, *Über Gott und die Welt. Endzeitvisionen, Reformdebatten und die europäische Quäkermision in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Göttingen, 2008.

Kannegieter J.Z., *Geschiedenis van de vroegere quakergemeenschap te Amsteerdam. 1656 tot begin negentiende eeuw*, Amsterdam, 1971.

Kim Si Hun, *Providentiae divinae pars & Evangelii materia: die Prädestinationslehre des Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641) in ihrem theologischen und historischen Kontext*, diss. Proefschrift Theologische

Universiteit van de Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerken in Nederland, Apeldoorn, 2013.

Klinkhamer Laurens, *Vryheydt van spreecken inde gemeynte der geloovigen. Beweesen met geboden, exempelen, redenen, weeregging van tegenwerpingen*, Leiden, 1655.

Klinkhamer Laurens, *Losse en quaaade gronden, van de scheur-kerk, eeniger soo genaamde collegianten, tot Rhijnsburg, gelegd A° 1686. Naaktelijk ontdekt, en verbroken. Behelsende een antwoord op zekeren brief, eeniger rotterdamse collegianten, aan de collegianten tot Leyden*, Amsterdam, 1686.

Kolakowski Leszek, *Chrétiens Sans Église. La Conscience Religieuse et le Lien Confessionnel au XVII^e Siècle. Traduit du polonais par Anna Posner*, Paris, 1987.

Kruyter C. W., *Constantijn Huygens oongentroost. Een interpretatieve studie*, Meppel, 1971.

Kue Jeffrey J., *Heaven upon Earth: Joseph Mede (1586-1638) and the Legacy of Millenarism*, Dordrecht, 2006.

Kuyper Frans, *Tweede deel of vervolg van de filosofheerenden boer. In welk de geheyme gevoelens der Quaakers, uyt haar eygen Schriften, en met haar eygen woorden, ontdekt worden, in mees al de 28 vraagen, in de Filosofheerende Boer aan de Quaakers voorgesteld. Tot beantwoording van der Quaakers aanmerkingen, voor den Filosofheerende Boer*, Rotterdam, 1676.

Lamping A.J., *Johannes Polyander, een dienaar van Kerk en Universiteit*, Leiden, 1980.

Larangé Daniel S., *Le parole de Dieu en Bohême et Moravie: la tradition de la prédication dans l'Unité des frères de Jan Hus à Jan Amos Comenius*, Paris, 2008.

Lechot P.O., «Between Ramism, Socinianism, and Enthiasism: the Intellectual Context of John Dury's Analysis Demonstrativa Sacrae Scripturae», in *Acta Comeniana*, 25, 2011.

Léchoy Pierre-Olivier, *Un Christianisme "sans partialité": irénisme et methode chez John Dury (1600-1680)*, Paris, 2011.

Leng T., *Benjamin Worsley (1618-1677): trade, interest and the spirit in revolutionary England*, Woodbridge, 2008.

Leon Jacob Judah, *Retrato del templo de Selomo. En el qual brevemente se describe la hechura dela fabrica del Templo, y de todos los vasos y instrumentos con que en el se administrativa, cuyo Modelo tiene el mismo Autor, como cada uno puede ver. Compueste, por Iaacob Ieuda Leon Hebreo, en el anno de 5402 ala creacion del mundo*, Middelburg, 1642.

Londo Cristina (ed.), *Ugo Grozio: l'umanista, il teologo, il giurista*, Galatina, 1999.

Lupoli Agostino, *La corpuscolar philosophy di Robert Boyle*, Linate, 1980.

Mallinson Jeffrey, *Faith, reason, and revelation in Theodore Beza: 1519-1605*, Oxford, 2003.

Manetsch Scott M., *Theodore Beza and the quest for peace in France, 1572-1598*, Leiden, 2000.

Maruyuma Tadataka, *The ecclesiology of Theodore Beza: the reform of the true Chruch*, Ginevra, 1978.

Massey Vera, *The Clouded Quaker Star: James Nayler, 1618-1660*, York, 1999.

Matthes John, *The rosicrucian enlightenment revisited*, Hudson, 1999.

Mcgrath Alister, *Il pensiero della riforma*, Claudiana, Turin, 1999.

McIntosh Christopher, *The rose cross and the age of reason: eighteenth-century rosicrucianism in central Europe and its relationship to the Enlightenment*, Leiden, 1992.

Meihuizen H.W., *Galenus Abrahamsz (1622-1706). Strijder voor een onbeperkte verdraagzaamheid en verdediger van het Doperse Spiritualisme*, Haarlem, 1954.

K.O. Meinsma, *Spinoza et son cercle. Étude critique historique sur les éterodoxes hollandais. Traduit du néerlandais par S. Roosenburg. Appendices latins et allemands traduits par J.P. Osier*, Paris, 2006.

Miller D.P., «Birch, Thomas (1705-1766)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

More Henry, *An Explanation of the grand mystery of Godliness; or a true and faithfully representation of the everlasting gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the onely begotten Son of God and Sovereign over Men and Angels*, London, 1660.

More, *Henry More Opera Omnia I: Opera Theologica. Édité avec une Introduction par Serge Hutin*, Hildesheim, 1966.

Morus Henricus, *Magni Mysteriorum Pietatis Explanatio, sive vera ac fidelis repraesentatio aeterni Evangelii domini ac servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, Dei Filii, Unigeniti, Hominumque Principis ac Angelorum*, in *Henry More Opera Omnia, vol. I: Opera Theologica. Édité avec une introduction par Serge Hutin*, Hildesheim, 1966.

Murphy D., *Comenius: a critical reassessment of his life and work*, Dublino, 1995.

Nagtglas F., *Levensberichten van Zeeuwen*, Middelburg, 1890.

Nauta D., *Samuel Maresius*, Amsterdam, 1935.

Neelon David, *James Nayler: revolutionary*, Becket, 2009.

Nellen Henk J.M., *Hugo de Groot: een leven in strijd om de vrede*, The Hague, 2007.

Nicolson M. Hope (ed.), *The Conway Letters. The correspondence of Anne, Viscountess Conway, Henry More, and their friends (1642-1684); revised edition with an introduction and new material edited by S. Hutton*, Oxford, 1992.

Nocentini Lucia (ed.), *Conciliazione dei dissensi sulla predestinazione: Ugo Grozio*, Tirrenia, 1997.

Nocentini Lucia, *All'origine del discorso politico moderno: Ugo Grozio teologo e politico*, Pisa, 2002.

Olson Roger E., *Arminian theology: myths and realities*, Downers Grove, 2006-

Olszowy-Schlanger J., «The Generall Grammer of Orientall Tongues' and universal language schemes in 17th-century Britain: The contribution of Christian Ravius», in *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science Series III*, 95, 1999.

Oudaen Joachim, *Aanmerkingen over het verhaal van het eerste begin en opkomen der Rijnsburgers*, Rotterdam.

Oudaen Joachim, *Overweginge eeniger grond-stellingen, door J.V.G. in des zelfs redenering, over de algemeene kerk ter neder gestelt, en der zelver onrechtmatigheid*, Amsterdam.

Parfitt T., *The Lost Tribes of Israel: The History of a Myth*, Phoenix, 2003.

Parinetto Luciano, *L'Inquisitore Libertino: Discorso sulla Tolleranza Religiosa e sull'ateismo. A proposito dell'Heptaplomeres di Jean Bodin*, Milan, 2002.

Pasqua Vittorio Nazzareno, *Ugo Grozio e il dialogo interreligioso*, Chieti, 2014.

Penman Leigh T.I., «Samuel Hartlib on the Death of Descartes: a rediscovered Letter to Henry More», in *Notes and Records: The Royal Society Journal of History of Science*, 69(4), 2015.

Petersen Henry, *The canons of Dort; a study guide*, Grand Rapids, 1968.

Philips Obbe, *Bekentnisse Obbe Philipsz: waer mede hy verclaert sijn predick-ampt sonder wettelicke beroepinghe gebruyckt te hebben beclaecht hem dies en waerschuwet eenen yeders wt sijnen eyghen boeck met*

eyghener handt gheschreuen ghecopieert, ende nu tot ghemeene besten door eenen liefhebber der waerheydt in druck veruerdighet, met eenen voorreden aen den onpartydighen lesers, Amsterdam, 1584.

Picirilli Robert E., *Grace, faith, free will: contrasting views of salvation*, Nashville, 2002.

Popkin Richard and Signer Michael A. (ed.), *Spinoza's earliest publication?: the hebrew translation of Margaret Fell's: A Loving salutation to the seed of Abraham among the Jews, where they are scattered up and down upon the face of the earth*, Assen, 1987.

Powell W.S., *John Pory, 1572-1636: The Life and Letters of a Man of Many Parts*, Chapel Hill, 1977.

Rae Thomas H.H., *John Dury and the Royal Road to Piety*, New York, 1998.

Remer Gary, *Humanism and the Rhetoric of Toleration*, University Park, 1996.

Ricciardo Salvatore, *Robert Boyle: un naturalista scettico*, Brescia, 2016.

Ross Alexander (ed.), *The Alcoran of Mahomet, Translated out of Arabique into French, by the Siur Du Ryer, Lord of Malezair, and Resident for the King of France, at Alexandria. And newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turskish vanities*, London, 1649.

Sadler John Edward, *J.A. Comenius and the concept of universal education*, Londra, 2014.

Schepelern H.D. (ed.), *Olai Borrichii itinerarium 1660-1665: the Journal of the Danish Polyhistor Ole Borch*, 4 vols., Copenhagen, 1983.

Schiffer J. de Hoop, *History of the Free Chruchmen Called the Brwonists, Pilgrim Fathers and Baptists in the Dutch Republic, 1581-1701*, Ithaca, 1922.

Schneider Walther, *Adam Boreel. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften*, Giessen, 1911.

Scholtz Harald, *Evangelischer Utopismus bei Johann Valentin Andreae: ein geistiges Vorspiel zum Pietismus*, Stuttgart, 1957.

Serrarius Petrus, *De vertredinge des heyligen stadts ofte een klaer bewijs van 't verval der eerste apostolische gemeente, gestalt tot antwoord op drie vragen diesaengaende aen Dr Galenus gedaen ... door Ian Iansz Swichtenheuvel*, Amsterdam, 1659.

Serrarius Petrus, *Van den waere wegh tot God. Tot bewijs dat niet alle licht dat inde duysternisse schijnt den wegh zy tot god. Gestelt tegens 't voorgeven van William Ames (een derghene die men Quakers noemt) in seecker wederlegginge (als hy 't heet) op een antwoordt door J. Higgins als oock op iets in d' eerste en tweede pag. van mijn boeck De vertredinge der h. stad genaemt, t' Alckmaer*, 1661.

Skovgaard-Petersen K., *Historiography at the Court of Christian IV (1588–1648): studies in the Latin histories of Denmark by Johannes Pontanus and Johannes Meursius*, Copenhagen, 2002.

Smend Rudolf, *Vier Epitaphe – Die Basler Hebraistenfamilie Buxtorf*, Berlino, 2010.

Smith Bernadette, *Martha Simmon[d]s, 1624-1665: her Life and Quaker Writings and 'the Fall' of James Nayler*, York, 2009.

Snoek Govert, *De Rozenkruisers in Nederland, voornamelijk in de eerste helft van de 17 e eeuw. Een Inventarisatie*, Haarlem, 2006.

Sozzini Fausto, *De Sacrae Scriptura auctoritate. Libellus Fausti Socini Senensis. Cum addita est Summa Religionis Christianae, ejusdem Socini. Utrumque ex italico in latinum covnersum*, Racoviae, 1611.

Sozzini Fausto, *Fausti Socini Senensis Opera Omnia in duos tomos distincta. Quorum prior continet ejus opera exegetica et didactica. Posterior opera ejusdem polemica comprehendit. Accesserunt quaedam hactenus inedita. Quorum catalogum versa pagina exhibet*, Amsterdam, 1656.

Spector S.A. (ed.), *Francis Mercury van Helmont's "Sketch of Christian Kabbalism"*, Leiden, 2012.

Stanglin Keith D., *Arminius on the assurance of salvation: the context, roots, and shape of the Leiden debate, 1603-1609*, Leiden, 2007.

Stanglin Keit D., McCall Thomas H., *Jacob Arminius: theologian of grace*, Oxford, 2012.

Steele David N., Thomas Curtis C., Quinn S. Lance, *The five points of calvinism: defined, defended, documented*, Philipsburg, 2004.

Stol Barend Joosten, *Den filosofherenden boer, handelende van de dwalingen der hedensdaagse Christenen, filosofhen, Cartesianen en Quaakers, &c. In verscheyden onvermeynde zaaken begrepen in een samenspraak tusschen en boer, filosooph en Quaker. Door S.I.B.*, 1676.

Strengholt L., *Constanter: het leven van Constantijn Huygens*, Amsterdam, 1987.

Stuardi Donatella Marocco, *La République di Jean Bodin: sovranità, governo, giustizia*, Milan, 2006.

Suggi Andrea, *Sovranità e Armonia: la Tolleranza Religiosa nel Colloquium Heptaplomeres di Jean Bodin*, Rome, 2005.

Surenhusius Guilielmus, *Mischna sive totius hebraeorum juris, rituum, antiquitatum, ac legum oralium systema, cum clarissimorum rabbinorum Maimonidis et Bartenorae commentariis integris. Quibus accedunt variorum auctorum notae ac versiones in eos quos ediderunt codices*, Amsterdam, 1698.

Svensson Manfred, «Adiaphora en la Reforma protestante: ¿minimalismo doctrinal y neutralidad moral?», *Theologia y vida* 53(4), 2012, pp. 547-574.

Swichtenheuvel Jan Jansz, *Oprechte Editie, ofte Uytgift van het Geschrift van Doct. Galenus ende David Spruyt, in Volkomenheydt, so als Sylieden die met haer Bewijs-redenen, ende bygebrachte Schriftuer-plaetsen, t'samen met een By-voeghsel daer by, aen hare genoemde Mede-dienaren der Vereenighde Vlaemsche, Hoogduytsche, ende Vriesche Gemeenten tot Amsterdam overgegeven hebben, ende soo voor desen noyt in Druck geweest is. Midtsgaders: De Antwoordt van der selver Dienaeren voor ghenoeemt, tot*

Wederleggingh, met ghemeen raedt ende overlegh, door Laurens Hendrickx in geschrift gestelt, ende alsoo oock aen Dr. Galenus ende David Spruyt over-gegeven, Haarlem, 1658.

Taylor Jeremy, *Theologia eklektikē: a discourse of the liberty of prophesying. Shewing the unreasonableness of prescribing to other mens faith, and the iniquity of persecuting differing opinions*, London, 1647.

Taylor Jeremy, *A discourse of the liberty of prophesying: showing the unreasonableness of prescribing the other men's faith; and the iniquity of persecuting differing opinions. With an introductory essay by the Rev. Richard Cattermole*, Washington, 1834.

Thorowgood Thomas, *Jewes in America, or, Probabilities that the Americans are of that race. With the removall of some contrary reasonings, and earnest desires for effectuall endeavours to make them Christian*, London, 1650.

Thura Albertus, *Gynaeceum daniae litteratum, feminis danorum, eruditione vel scriptis claris conspicuum; praemissa praefatione de feminarum variarum apud danos in litteras et litteratos munificentia, et adjuncto ad calcem, una cum appendice, duplici indice personarum*, Altona, 1732.

Toomer G.J., «Ravis, Christian (1613-1677)», in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

Trapman J., «Erasmus seen by a Dutch Collegiant: Daniel de Breen (1594-1664) and his Posthumous Compendium Theologiae Erasimicae (1677)», in *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 73(2), 1993.

Turnbull G.H., *Samuel Hartlib: With Special Regard to his Relation to Jan Comenius*, London, 1919.

Turnbull G.H., *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: gleanings from Hartlib's paper*, Londra, 1947.

Turnbull G.H., *John Dury's Correspondence With the Clergy of New England about Ecclesiastical Peace*, Boston, 1959.

Urbanék Vladimír, *Gewalt sei ferne den Dingen!: contemporary perspectives on the works of John Amos Comenius*, Wiesbaden, 2016.

Van Belzen J. & Post Stephen Garrard, *Vroom, vurig en vreedzaam: het leven van Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641)*, Houten, 1996.

Van Bovenkamp C., *De getuige der waarheid: een schets over het leven en de arbeid van prof. Franciscus Gomarus*, Vianen, 1970.

Van Brederode Lancelot, *Van de Apostasie, dat is Van den Afaval der Christenen. Door een Ondersoecker der Waerheyt*, Amsterdam, 1659.

Van der Linde J.M., *Jan Amos Comenius, 1592-1670: theolog, pedagoog, politicus*, Zeist, 1970.

Van der Wall Ernestine G.E., *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) en zijn wereld*, Leiden, 1987.

Van der Wall Ernestine G.E., «“Without Partialitie Towards All Men”: John Durie on the Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel», in J. van der Berg & E.G.E. van der Wall, ed., *Jewish-Christian relations in the Seventeenth Century*, Dordrecht, 1988.

Van der Wall Ernestine G.E., «The Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel and the Mishanh Project. Six Unpublished Letters», *LIAS*, 16(2), 1989.

Van Leeuwen Theodoor Marius, *Arminius, Arminianism, and Europe: Jacobus Arminius (1559/60 – 1609)*, Boston, 2009.

Van Nijmegen Elias, *Historie der Rijnsburgsche Vergadering*, Rotterdam, 1775.

Van Opstal A. Gijsbert, *André Rivet: een invloedrijk Hugenoet aan het hof van Frederik Hendrik*, Harderwijk, 1937.

Van Rooden P.T., *Theology, Biblical Scholarship and Rabbinical Studies in the Seventeenth Century. Constantijn L'Empereur (1591-1648), Professor of Hebrew and Theology at Leiden*, Leiden, 1989.

Van Slee Jacobus Cornelis, *De Rijnsburger Collegianten. Geschiedkundig onderzoek door J.C. van Slee. Met inleiding van Dr. S.B.J. Zilverberg*, Utrecht, 1980.

Van Veen Mirjam G.K., «Spiritualism in the Netherlands: From David Joris to Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert», in *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 33(1), 2002.

Van Veen Mirjam G.K., «“No one born of God commits sin”»: Coornhert’s Perfectionism», in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, 84, 2004, p. 339.

Vann Richard T., *The social development of english quakerism: 1655-1755*, Cambridge;1969.

Verkamp Bernard, *The Indifferent Mean: Adiaphorism in the English Reformation to 1554*, Athens, 1977.

Vipont Elfrida, *Quakerism; a faith to live by*, London, 1965.

Visscher Hugo & van Langeraad L.A., *Het Protestantsche Vaderland. Biografisch Woordenboek van Protestantsche Godgeleerden in Nederland*, Utrecht, 1907.

Voogt Gerrit, *Constrain on Trial. Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert and Religious Freedom*, Kirksville, 2000.

Voogt Gerrit, «“Anyone who can read may be a preacher”»: Sixteenth-Century Roots of the Collegiants», in *Church Histories and religious culture*, 85(1), 2005.

Volckertsz Coornhert Dirck, *Synod on the freedom of conscience*, translated, edited, annotated by Gerrit Voogt, Amsterdam, 2008.

Vree J., *Drie Formulieren van Enigheid*, in G. Hanrinck, H. Paul & B. Wallet (ed.), *Het Gereformeerde Geheugen. Protestantse herinneringsculturen in Nederland, 1850-2000*, Amsterdam, 2009.

Vrolijk A., «The Prince of Arabists and His Many Errors: Thomas Erpenius's Image of Joseph Scaliger and the Edition of the Proverbia Arabica (1614)», in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73(1), 2010.

Wagenaar Jan, *Amsterdam in zyne opkomst, aanwas, geschiedenissen, voorregten, koophandel, gebouwen, kerkenstaat, scholen, schutterye, gilden en regeeringe*, vol. VIII, 1763.

Wagenaar Jan, *Tegenwoordige Staat der Vereenigde Nederlanden*, Amsterdam, vol. 1, 1739.

Waite Gary K., «“The Drama of the Two Word Debate among Liberal Dutch Mennonites, c. 1620-1660: Preparing the Way for Baruch Spinoza?”». Forthcoming in *The Protestant Reformation and its Radical Critiques*, Anorthe Kremers, ed., Göttingen, March 2017.

Webster Charles (ed.), *Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning*, Cambridge, 1970.

Webster Charles, «Benjamin Worsley: engineering for universal reform from the Invisible College to the Navigation Act», in in M. Greengrass, M. Leslie e T. Raylor (ed.), *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, Cambridge, 1994

Webster Charles, *The great instauration: science, medicine and Reform, 1626-1660*, Oxford, 2002.

Wengert Timothy, “Adiaphora”, in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, ed. H. Hillerbrand, 4 vols., Oxford, 1996.

Weststeijn T., *The Middle Kingdom in the Low Countries: Sinology in the Seventeenth-Century Netherlands*, in Rens Bod, Jaap Maat, and Thijs Westeijn (ed.), *The Making of Humanities volume II: From Early Modern to Modern Disciplines*, Chicago, 2012.

Woldrig H.E.S., *Jan Amos Comenius: zijn leven, missie en erfenis*, Budel, 2014.

Wuidar Laurence, *Musique et démonologie au 17. siècle de Jean Bodin à Pier Francesco Valentini*, Florence, 2007.

Yates Frances, *The rosicrucian enlightenment*, London, 2° ed., 2002 (1°ed. 1972).

Young John T., «Durie, John (1596-1680)», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

Young J.T., «John Worthington», in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004.

Ziskind J.R., *Petrus Cunaeus on theocracy, Jubilee and the latifundia*, in «*Jewish Quarterly Review*», 68(4), 1978.

Zwartjes O., «De studie van het Arabisch in de zeventiende eeuw. Thomas Erpenius' grammatica vergeleken met de studies van Franciscanen in Zuid-Europa en in het Midden-Oosten», in T. van Hal, L. Isebaert & P. Swiggers (ed.), *De tuin der talen: taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen*, Leuven, 2013.