Millenarianism and Messianism in
Early Modern European Culture

Volume IV

CONTINENTAL MILLENARIANS: PROTESTANTS, CATHOLICS, HERETICS

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

176

Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture

Volume IV

CONTINENTAL MILLENARIANS: PROTESTANTS, CATHOLICS, HERETICS

Edited by
JOHN CHRISTIAN LAURSEN and RICHARD H. POPKIN

Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture

Volume IV

CONTINENTAL MILLENARIANS: PROTESTANTS, CATHOLICS, HERETICS

Edited by

JOHN CHRISTIAN LAURSEN
University of California, Riverside, California

and

RICHARD H. POPKIN
University of California, Los Angeles, California

SPRINGER SCIENCE+BUSINESS MEDIA, B.V.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available.

ISBN 978-0-7923-6847-2 ISBN 978-94-010-0744-3 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-94-010-0744-3

Printed on acid-free paper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MILLENARIANISM AND MESSIANISM IN EARLY MODERN EUROPEAN CULTURE

Volume I

Jewish Messianism in the Early Modern World

Edited by
MATT GOLDISH and RICHARD H. POPKIN

Volume II

Catholic Millenarianism: From Savonarola to the Abbé Grégoire

Edited by
KARL A. KOTTMAN

Volume III

The Millenarian Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics, and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

Edited by
JAMES E. FORCE and RICHARD H. POPKIN

Volume IV

Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics

Edited by
JOHN CHRISTIAN LAURSEN and RICHARD H. POPKIN

R.H. POPKIN

INTRODUCTION TO THE MILLENARIANISM AND MESSIANISM SERIES

Within Judaism and Christianity there has always been a great expectation that something monumental would happen that would transform human existence and bring an end to human history as we know it. In the Bible, from the time of the Babylonian Captivity, there has been the expectation that a messianic figure would appear who would bring about the culmination of Jewish hopes. In the subsequent centuries, as Palestine came under Greek, Syrian and then Roman control, the messianic expectation grew stronger and stronger. The Dead Sea Scrolls suggest that a great ferment and fervor existed in the period just before the beginning of Christianity.

And, of course, Christianity as a religion began as a claim that the messianic expectation of Judaism had been fulfilled in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The early Christian texts, especially the four gospels, portray the life and death of Jesus as historically linked to biblical messianic expectations, especially as put forth in the book of *Isaiah*. However, the Crucifixion did not seem to be attended with the expected political triumph of the Jewish Messiah over all of the enemies of the Jewish people. In fact, it looked like a complete defeat. But as St. Paul explained at length, it would come to be fulfilled at the time of the Second Coming of Jesus into world history. Jesus first came to expatiate the sins of mankind, and he would return to reign on earth and to inaugurate the events leading to the Day of Judgment. The most forceful and exciting statement of when, where, and how the messianic triumph would occur was that which appears in the last book of the New Testament, *The Revelations of St. John*, which played a great role in future discussions within Christendom. This work, along with sections of the *Book of Daniel*, provided a blueprint centuries later for those seeking to determine exactly when the Second Coming would occur. It named and described many symbolic figures who would appear as the dramatic climax of human history neared. It also stressed the importance of the events that would lead up to the Second Coming. These included the appearance of the Antichrist, who would try to lead the believers

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, vii–xiv.

astray, the conversion of the Jews to belief in Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, and the rebuilding of the Holy Temple in Jerusalem.

In the first century of the Common Era, Jews were crushed physically and emotionally by the Roman destruction of Jerusalem. Some had hoped the Messiah would arrive in time to save the Temple and the holy city. After the Roman general, Titus, captured and destroyed the city and made captives of the Jews, survivors sought clues of God's plan for when the long sought Messiah would arrive. When a rebellion against Roman rule took place in the second century, some thought its leader, Bar Kochba, was the expected Holy One. In the centuries thereafter, Jewish leaders studied various malevolent developments in Jewish history as containing possible evidences of the birth pangs of the Messiah. They looked for clues about the mighty empires that would have to be destroyed, as foretold in the *Book of Daniel*, in order for the Messianic Age to begin. They tried to calculate from the symbols in the *Book of Daniel*, how long it would be after the end of the Roman Empire.

The messianic expectations on the part of both Jews and Christians reached new heights in the late Middle Ages in Europe. On the Christian side, the preachings and writings of the Italian monk, Joachim de Fiore, provided a new and urgent reading of *Revelation* as foretelling the third and final age of human history that would soon begin.

Jewish kabbalistic thinkers in southern France and Spain sought clues about when the Messianic Age would begin in the kabbalistic interpretations of biblical texts. Numerological readings of Hebrew terms, it was hoped, would provide significant clues. The Jewish scholars investigating this lived, of course, in Christian communities in Europe. Although often isolated by medieval anti-semitic laws and regulations, some interchange of ideas, interpretations, expectations and documents occurred. In the late Middle Ages, Christians became concerned about studying the Bible in the original languages and also about finding out what secret information the Jews might have in their possession. Jews and Jewish converts were contacted and employed in Christian research centers to find out when the long awaited return of Jesus, when he would begin his thousand-year reign on earth, would take place. So, by the late fifteenth century, Christian millenarians and Jewish scholars seeking to find out when the Messiah might arrive, knew of some of each other's findings and ideas. Leading Jewish scholars interacted with important persons in the Church and State in many places in Europe. In Spain, for example, until 1492, figures like Don Isaac Abarbanel, a leading theorist on messianism, was a prominent financial court adviser, first in Portugal and then in Spain.

The many turbulent developments in Europe in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries convinced both Jewish and Christian thinkers that the end of days was at hand. In the West, the forced conversion of most of Spain's Jews, the collapse of the Moorish kingdom in Spain, the expulsion of the Jews from Spain and later Portugal, and the unification of Castille and Aragon were taken as indications that something monumental was starting. 1492 was seen as the miracle year, the *annis mirabilis*. The Voyages of Discovery emanating from Portugal and Spain, the new worlds they revealed and the riches they brought

back to Europe had to be part of the great Divine plan. Christopher Columbus, in his *Book of Prophecies*, told Isabella that he would find enough gold in the Americas to rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem!

At the other end of Europe, the Ottoman invasions conquered Constantinople, the seat of Eastern Christianity, in 1453, and spread as far as the Balkans, Budapest, the outskirts of Vienna, and the waters around Italy. This also had to be some indication of divine significance. And in Europe, the corruption of the papacy and of the clergy, railed against by Savonarola and Erasmus, was taken as a sign of the deteriorating world that would precede the coming of the Messiah. The resurgence of Greek and Roman learning provided ammunition for those seeking clues about the ways of God in History. All over Europe, the eruption of reform movements within the Church, which led to the establishment of non-Catholic Christian states in England, Germany, Bohemia, and Switzerland, and the emergence of organized Reformed churches as powerful alternatives to Roman Catholicism, all made various visionaries think in terms of the dramatic scenarios in both the book of *Daniel* and *Revelation*. Some hardy thinkers saw the Turkish Empire as the last empire before the divine one. Others saw the pope or the papacy as the Antichrist who was about to be overthrown as a prelude to the Second Coming of Christ. Some commentators on Scripture had come to the conclusion, based on calculations drawn from *Daniel*, that the Millennium would commence 1260 years after the fall of the once mighty Roman Empire. This made it all important to figure out exactly when the Roman Empire ended. Much had to be studied and examined about the last days of the Roman Empire. Sir Isaac Newton became a super-expert on the late, late Roman Empire after it had moved out of Rome and even after it had moved out of Italy in the sixth and seventh centuries. The Scottish mathematician, John Napier, devised the system of logarithms to help in these difficult calculations.

The *Book of Daniel*, Chapter 12, verse 4, told that at the time of the end, people would move to and fro and knowledge would increase. People living in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries saw the voyages of exploration, the creation of colonies all over the world, the development of international commerce and the startling increase of knowledge in so many areas, as sure signs that the Time of the End was fast approaching.

The early modern period saw a wide variety of different and often incompatible millenarian and messianic scenarios being set forth, some of which guided the leading players in different parts of European history. A rich and often wild ferment of ideas, incorporating earlier texts, new Judeo-Christian interpretations, and elements of what was to emerge as the new science, melded together. Examining developments from 1500 onward in terms of these ideas throws quite a different light on the course of events and the motivations behind all sorts of developments, from the theocracy of Savonarola in Florence and the dramatic doings of the early reformers in Germany, to the plans advocated by early Christian Hebraists, Catholic and Protestant missionaries, and optimistic Jewish thinkers who were looking for some ray of hope after the expulsion of the Jews from Iberia. The religious controversies

that dominated English history in the sixteenth century, the religious civil wars in France, the rise of Calvinism in the Netherlands and the Dutch Rebellion, along with the religious fragmentation of the German states, and the rise of Protestant sects in Poland and Hungary, all set forth millenarian interpretations. And climactic events such as the defeat of the Spanish Armada looked to many at the time as a most important sign of God's plans for mankind.

Many Jewish scholars had figured out that 1648 would be a most important year for the Jewish world, the moment of the arrival of the Messiah. Protestants in England and The Netherlands had calculated that 1655–56 would be decisive, beginning with the conversion of the Jews. With religious issues holding such an important part in the conflicts all over Europe, millenarian and messianic thinking and acting played an exciting role in the history of the times.

So, from Portugal to Sweden to Poland to Italy to Palestine and Constantinople, there were exciting and excited messianic outpourings. For example, in Portugal in the late sixteenth century, there was constant expectation that a lost king, King Sebastian, lost in battle, would return and usher in the Messianic Age. Then, in the next century, there was a claim that Jesus would come first to Portugal to rescue the new Christian Marranos and take them with him to Palestine where they would rebuild the Temple. At the same time, Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel proclaimed in 1655 that the coming of the Messiah was imminent because a Portuguese explorer had reported finding some lost tribe members in the Andes mountains. And Menasseh learned from perusing Queen Christina's copy of La Peyrère's *Du Rappels des Juifs* that the King of France would soon lead the Jews to the Holy Land where they would rebuild the Temple and where the Messiah would rule with the King of France as his Regent. Menasseh rushed back to Amsterdam to tell people that the coming of the Messiah was imminent. To prepare for this he rushed to England to get the Puritan government to re-admit the Jews as a prelude to the Messianic Age. Foreign diplomats at the time said it was impossible to talk to Oliver Cromwell about mundane business because he was only concerned about when the Messiah would come. We have an account of some Swedish emissaries who had come to London to discuss some disputes about the Russian fur trade with Cromwell. They reported that the only thing Cromwell would discuss was if there were any new reports about when the Messiah was coming.

When Menasseh ben Israel arrived in England to begin his negotiations with the British government, he was met at the dock by a Welsh millenarian with the improbable name, Arise Evans, who told him that the son of the recently beheaded King Charles I would be the Regent of the Messiah and would rule the world with him. Menasseh is reported to have said that this seemed most unlikely but that he could believe that either the King of Sweden or the King of France could play such a role. Poland, at around the same time, was being invaded by the Swedish army. Just as the Swedes seemed to be over-running the country, the Polish King held up the statue of the Black Madonna in front of the Swedish troops who immediately withered away. This was taken as a divine sign and was followed by an actual marriage of King John Casimir to the

statue of the Black Madonna. This was followed by the destruction of the various Protestant millenarian groups in Poland as a token of Polish love for the Madonna who had saved them.

The Center for 17th- & 18th-Century Studies at the University of California at Los Angeles asked me to organize a series of conferences on Messianism and Millenarianism in 1997–1998 in view of the growing interest and concern with the Millennium, and to present these conferences at the William Andrews Clark Library.

For over twenty years I had been setting forth my own researches into the subject, and organizing conferences of other scholars at the Clark. In 1975 I gave a paper at the Clark, in the series, *Culture and Politics*, organized by Perez Zagorin. My paper was on "Jewish Messianism and Christian Millenarianism" and dealt with the amazing interactions between Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel of Amsterdam and the British and Dutch Christian Millenarians, and with the French Marrano theologian and courtier, Isaac La Peyrère, who was predicting that at any moment the King of France would lead the Jews back to the Holy Land and rule the world with the Messiah! After more research on such matters I was invited in 1981–82 to be the Clark Professor to organize a lecture series on the subject. I was able to bring together people working in different disciplines and in different countries. And I was able to work with an exciting group of young scholars in the bowels of the Clark, and to imbibe the fruits of rooting through the rich collection of seventeenth-century religious tracts in the Clark collection.

So, it seemed fitting that a more comprehensive group of conferences should be organized at the Clark near the end of century, bringing together people in many disciplines from Europe, Israel, Canada, Brazil and the United States.

Although the messianic and millenarian movements often were intertwined and took place in the same geographical space and chronological time, it was thought best to divide the conferences by the religious groups involved. Originally I had hoped to have conferences on Jewish messianism, Moslem millenarianism, Catholic millenarians, British millenarianism, and Continental millenarianism. For reasons beyond my control, we ended up with just four conferences, leaving the Moslem side of the story for later discussions.

In the second half of this century, the study of millenarianism has been led in part by studies such as Norman Cohn's *The Pursuit of the Millenium*, Gershom Scholem's studies on Jewish mysticism, by the studies into the forces at work in the Puritan Revolution in England and North America by Christopher Hill, Hugh Trevor-Roper and others, by the studies on millenarian religious views in The Netherlands and in Bohemia, by studies on the influence of Jacob Boehme's mysticism, by studies on the impact of the early Quakers in England and all over Europe, and by studies on the millenarian movements and proto-Jewish ones in Transylvania and Poland. The wealth of material examined in the last fifty years of religious movements incorporating millenarian and messianic ideas, and the influences of these groups, needs a lot of cross fertilization of disciplines, scholars and ideas.

National histories have had difficulty with historical actors who moved

easily from one country into another and interacted in different circumstances. The career of John Dury in the seventeenth century may be an extreme example. Of Scottish extraction, he was schooled in The Netherlands, got his theological training at the French Walloon seminary in Leiden, and became a pastor in Elbing, Germany where he met Jan Amos Comenius and Samuel Hartlib. Early on he was a correspondent of Joseph Mede, the Cambridge don who was the theoretician of how to read *Revelation*. Dury knew Descartes. He was very active in organizing new programs at the beginning of the Puritan Revolution. Later he was appointed by the Westminster Assembly in London to be their official negotiator to unify the Protestant churches all over Europe in preparation for Jesus's imminent return. In this capacity he traveled all over Europe and met many theologians and princes. He was an intelligence agent for Oliver Cromwell. He was also one of the most active persons in trying to bring the Jews back to England. His contacts spanned most of Continental Europe, New England, and of course England. After the Restoration he was banned from living in Britain as a regicide, and spent most of the rest of his life in Germany, Sweden and Switzerland. He was the father-in-law of Henry Oldenburg, a secretary of the new Royal Society of England. He was continuously rethinking millenarian possibilities as events unfolded in European history. He even became quite concerned about whether Sabbatai Zevi's claim to be the long awaited Jewish Messiah affected Christian expectations.

Dury may be an extreme case, but his many roles, and his many links to different religious worlds, mirror the events of the time. Comenius, the leader of the Moravian Brethren, who was in exile because of events in the Thirty Years War, lived in Poland, Germany, The Netherlands and England. He revolutionized the educational system in various parts of Europe, proposed all sorts of educational reforms from kindergarten to graduate school, held a summit conference with Descartes in The Netherlands and was offered the first presidency of Harvard College in the New World. It's hard to fit him into just one national history.

We hope that by opening up many of the kinds of discussions and activities that were going on in the Jewish, Catholic and Protestant worlds in many countries, it will help people see the international character of the phenomenon. From Savonarola to the visionaries in the Puritan Revolution, to the studious Isaac Newton seeking the secrets of nature and Scripture, to the Catholic millenarians like the Jesuit Immanuel Lacunza and the Abbé Henri Grégoire at the time of the French Revolution, millenarian and messianic visions played many great roles.

By dividing up the thinkers by religion, it is hoped that the interconnection and interaction of these many people does not get lost. We are dividing them up both creedally and also in separate volumes. At the conferences we discussed them at different times, with different groups of speakers, and changing audiences. Nonetheless we hope and trust that the reader will see that there are significant connections between the ideas in one volume and those in another, and some of the people being discussed were contemporaries who knew each other and exchanged ideas. Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel knew Father

Antonio Vieira of Portugal and Brazil, and they talked in Amsterdam of their common eschatological views. Isaac La Peyrère knew Catholic and Protestant thinkers in France, The Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Italy, Spain and England. The English, New England and Dutch millenarians were well aware of the messianic movement of Sabbatai Zevi taking place in Turkey, and tried to fit it into their own scenarios. The Abbé Grégoire knew Jewish leaders in France, Germany and Italy, as well as many Protestant thinkers in Europe and America. Simultaneously with the millenarian interpretation of the American and French Revolutions by participants, a Jewish messianic movement centered around Jacob Frank was taking place in central Europe. The many movements and many interpretations of what was going on spawned a host of intriguing figures, like Swedenborg and Rabbi Falk, the Baal-Shem of London, whose influences are still to be worked out. And the ways in which events were being construed in millenarian and messianic terms spawned a backlash of critics like Pierre Bayle, who needs to be understood in terms of the millenarian context in which he lived, especially his opposition to the French Reformed Millenarian, Pierre Jurieu.

We have tried to give each part of our conferences its due in terms of the carefully prepared and edited presentations of papers, with an overall introduction in each volume by its editor. I want to thank Matt Goldish, then of the University of Arizona and now of Ohio State University, a veteran of many earlier Clark conferences, both for helping me select the participants in the Jewish Messianism conference and for his hard work in preparing the articles for publication. Next I should like to thank Karl Kottman, who did his doctorate with me a long time ago on Fray Luis de León, and with whom I have discussed Catholic Millenarianism over the years. I selected the participants in the Clark conference, and Karl willingly took on the task of editing the results. Thirdly, I should like to thank James E. Force of the University of Kentucky for both organizing and editing the third conference on British Protestant Millenarianism. He and I have worked together now for over twenty-five years on our common interests in millenarianism, most recently concerning Isaac Newton's views. Jim was working on his dissertation on Newton's disciple, William Whiston, at the Clark during 1981–1982, when I first tried my hand at organizing a year of lectures on the subject of millenarianism in British thought in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Fourthly, I should like to thank John C. Laursen of the University of California at Riverside, who has become part of my intellectual circle in the last decade. I selected the speakers, and Chris did the heavy lifting, collecting the papers, editing them, and preparing an introduction to the volume. There was also a fifth conference on Messianism and Revolution organized by my son, Jeremy, that included papers about the American Revolution, the French Revolution, as well as the Revolutions in Mexico and Russia, the emergence of the B'hai movement, and the effect of the translation of the Book of Revelation into Chinese, among other topics. It was decided that since many of the participants wanted to publish their papers separately that no volume would be prepared. However, the conference was an extremely lively finale to the year's program.

Of course, I should like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who participated in the conferences, coming from as far away as Israel, Brazil, France, Germany, Canada and Sweden. Not only their presentations, but also their participation in formal and informal discussions greatly enriched the proceedings.

Lastly I should like to thank Peter Reill, Director of the Center for 17th and 18th Century Studies for inviting me to prepare these conferences, and for the hospitality that he and his staff extended through the academic year 1997–98. Two assistants provided to me by the Center, Anna Suranyi and Tim Corrall, now married and new parents, played an indispensable role in making my participation possible. I could no longer drive and needed special medical equipment and they cheerfully pushed and pulled me from the meetings at the Clark, to the receptions and dinners. Without their aid and comfort I would not have been able to participate as fully as I did. And I should make a note of thanks to Peter and the Clark for putting in ramps to aid in getting me from the parking lot to the wonderful central room of the Clark Library where we met.

Three assistants did the serious work of transforming the four separate conference volumes into the completed form. Laura Emerson Tremonte began the work in the summer of 1999. Then Gabriella Goldstein did heroic work in getting all of the corrections and changes into the text. And Stephanie Chasin accomplished the last stage of the process, getting the four separate conference volumes into uniform shape for publication. Without all of this help the venture could not have finally gotten from conference to book publication. I am most grateful to all three of these women for their efforts.

I hope that the finished product, the four volumes, are worthy of our efforts and will be a serious contribution to further studies of millenarianism and messianism.

Richard H. Popkin
May 19, 2000
Pacific Palisades, California

INTRODUCTION

Any number of misconceptions about millenarians and messianism in the early modern period will be laid to rest by a reading of this volume. It is too often thought that millenarianism was largely an English phenomenon. One of the reasons for bringing these studies together is to show, as Martin Mulsow puts it, that we can understand this European-wide movement as a "millenarian international" in analogy with the later "socialist international". Another misconception is that millenarianism and messianism were a world apart from mainstream developments in intellectual history; but, as Mulsow also insists, a proper understanding of millenarianism places it in the context of the growth and stabilization of science, material progress, and political reform. A third mistake is to conclude too quickly that millenarianism and messianism have formed a single, monolithic bloc in history; but we learn in this volume that there were all sorts of millenarians.

Readers of this volume will be struck by at least two things. One is the sheer numbers of millenarian thinkers to be found throughout Europe in the early modern period, especially north of the Mediterranean. We will not list them all here, but the index to this book contains dozens and dozens of them.[1] The second striking point is the amount of work that remains to be done. For every millenarian that we explore and explain here, several are mentioned about which little is known. In addition, the relations among them and their relationships with the millenarians discussed in the other volumes in this series are often only sketchily understood.

Our volume starts with Susanna Åkerman's discussion of the Rosicrucian manifestos of the early 1600's, which were closely bound up with astrology and politics. Prophecy could have real political effects in these years, possibly inspiring the "Winter King", Frederick V of Württemberg, and his young English wife to take the Crown of Bohemia, unleashing the Thirty Years War. Developing work from her recent book on Rosicrucianism in Scandinavia,[2] she discusses the point that Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–1654), alleged author of one of the Rosicrucian tracts, described it later as a joke. Since we know that many a later literary hoax began as a *jeu d'esprit*, it is worth considering that some percentage of all millenarian prophecy may have been tongue-in-cheek. The historical puzzle is how to tell the joke from the sincere. And what does it mean when a joke takes on a life of its own that is taken at face value?

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, xv–xx.

Howard Hotson's chapter discusses the relations between millenarianism and Arianism (also known as Socinianism or anti-trinitarianism). Here we have the paradox that one of the founders of the anti-trinitarian movement, Faustus Socinus, was a confirmed anti-millenarian, but that many of his comrades-in-spirit were confirmed millenarians themselves. Thanks to relative press freedom in the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, such grand publishing ventures as the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* in 11 folio volumes (1656–1692) and C. Sand's *Bibliotheca anti-trinitariorum* (1684, repr. 1967) provide us with a great deal of information about these heretical movements.

The connection of millenarianism to Arianism is of no small importance since a wide variety of influential thinkers from Milton to Locke to Newton were Arians of one shade or another, and if Arianism had a tendency toward millenarianism, then we should look for the latter in those famous thinkers. Among other things, Hotson writes of Matthias Vehe-Glirius, whose Christian millenarianism shaded off into Jewish Messianism. Hotson brings the story down to Kant's great interlocutor, Emanuel Swedenborg, who was not properly a millenarian nor an Arian, since he no longer relied on Biblical texts but rather his own visions. But his example is instructive as one of the logical extremes or paths of possible historical development of Arianism and millenarianism.[3]

Next, Ernestine van der Wall explores mystical millenarianism in the Dutch republic in the seventeenth century. She questions whether there was anything specifically Dutch about the Dutch millenarians, who were instead caught up in an international movement. In a case study of Petrus Serrarius, she shows how mysticism and millenarianism could be combined.[4] In contrast to Moise Amyraut's anti-chiliastic anti-Semitism, Serrarius was a philo-Semitic millenarian. Van der Wall suggests the need for further work exploring how millenarianism was eventually domesticated, becoming acceptable within the Dutch Reformed Church.

Andrew Fix argues that two Dutch writers can in fact be credited with a peculiarly Dutch form of millenarianism. Unlike the more optimistic and joyful sort of millenarian, Dutch Collegiant Daniel De Breen wrote of a decaying and depressing world, and when the millennium failed to appear, Fix writes, his contemporaries were left with nothing but a secular world. That, in turn, led to the more optimistic plans of Spinoza – who lived with the Dutch Collegiants for a period – Bredenburg, and others to reform the world through reason. For Joachim Oudaan, another Collegiant, human reason and conscience became the last resort on which to build hopes for the future. Together, Fix claims, the role that these writers assigned to reason can be taken as a distinctly Dutch contribution to the movement. To the extent that it inspired Spinoza's work, it is of no small importance in the history of ideas, both political and philosophical.

As already mentioned, there has been a tendency in the study of early modern English millenarianism to treat the matter in an insular way. Upon occasion, an article has been entitled something like "Three Foreigners" in order to register English distance from and distaste for anything so disrepu-

table – in some circles – as millenarianism, but many other authors have written as if the bulk of the story could be told without reference to the continent.

Hugh Trevor-Roper's "Three Foreigners" is the work of a leading expert on English millenarianism in the seventeenth century.[5] He points out that Samuel Hartlib from Germany, the Czech Jan Amos Comenius, leader of the Moravian Bretheren, and John Dury, a Scot trained in the Netherlands and active in many Protestant lands, joined together in 1641 in London at the beginning of the English or Puritan revolution, in order to decide what was to be done. Trevor-Roper found their plans in the massive collection of Hartlib's papers that turned up at the University of Sheffield right after World War II.

The three foreigners were central figures in directing the beginnings of the English Revolution, pointing out the many areas of human life that would have to be reformed before the Millennium. Comenius planned appropriate educational reforms from kindergarten to the university level. Hartlib and Dury, who had met for the first time in the Hanseatic City of Elbing, dealt with creating a spiritual brotherhood of like-minded individuals, bringing them together in many projects including the spreading of Christianity in the newly-found lands, preparing ways to convert the Jews and bring them back to England, reuniting the fractured Christian churches in Europe, and making new inventions.

Comenius left England after a year and carried on his millenarian planning on the continent. Hartlib stayed in England and was the center of a circle of progressive millenarians. The Hartlib papers are an amazing picture of this circle and its influence from 1640 to 1660. Dury was busy in England and on the continent. He became the Keeper of the Royal Library and saved it from destruction. He was also an intelligence agent for Cromwell, and was sent on missions to France, The Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, and Sweden. He was involved with other Cromwell agents such as the mathematician John Pell and the Rev. Jean-Baptiste Stouppe of the Walloon Church of Soho, and together they did a lot of espionage and negotiating for the government.

Dury was a prime mover in bringing Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel to England in 1655 to try to obtain the readmission of the Jews. He was appointed by the Westminster Assembly and many other English divines to attempt to unify the Protestant churches of Europe, a task he pursued almost to the end of his life in 1680, negotiating with various groups to establish a common statement of beliefs. He was a lifelong friend of the Dutch millenarian Petrus Serrarius, discussed by van der Wall, having studied at the Walloon Seminary in Leiden with him. He was married to an important Englishwoman, Dorothy Moore, who was active in the Puritan Revolution. Their daughter married Henry Oldenburg, correspondent of Spinoza and later secretary of the Royal Society of England.

These millenarians did not have an easy life. Comenius was chased out of several countries. Dury was labelled a regicide by the restored king, Charles II, a charge he denied to no avail. He was exiled and forbidden to return to England. He spent his remaining years trying to bring continental Protestant groups together in preparation for the Millennium. Pierre Bayle regarded him

as a wild fanatic because his last work, which Bayle was never able to locate, is entitled *The Apocalypse Explained by Itself.*[6]

All of these millenarians maintained correspondence networks throughout northern Europe. The reproduction of Hartlib's papers on CD-Rom by the University of Sheffield has led to many rich studies which have enlarged our understanding of English millenarianism. The publication of Henry Oldenburg's and Robert Boyle's correspondence has made it clear that millenarianism was at the center of the concerns of the Royal Society in its founding years. In contrast, Dury's papers are still neglected. They are spread all over Europe, and possibly also in America since Dury was an active advisor and fund-raiser for the Massachusetts Bay Colony, even trying to get Comenius appointed the first President of Harvard. The largest collections of Dury's papers are in Zurich in the Dureana at the Stats-Archiv and in various collections at the Zentral Bibliothek. In many cases the companion letters to those in Hartlib's papers are in Dury's papers. When Dury's papers are published we will have more evidence about how closely tied the millenarian movements in England were to those on the continent.

Martin Mulsow's chapter in this volume is a valuable corrective to excessive anglo-centrism, as its painstaking detective work shows that one of the chief publications of English millenarianism, the *Clavis Apocalyptica* of 1651, was originally written in German. The author was a small-court tax official in Silesia, and his millenarianism was bound up with negotiations for alliances with Sweden and France. Of comfort to the Anglo-centrists, he was convinced that England would be the chief actor in the events of chapter 18 of *Revelation.*

Mulsow also makes the valuable point that there has always been a wide range of millenarians, from the "subtle" to the "crass," as he puts it. In other writings, Richard Popkin has pointed out that there have always been peacable, tolerant millenarians, to be contrasted to the better-known aggressive, hot-headed types.[7] Millenarianism could be a small part of an author's life and work, or a major obsession.

If the Dutch did not have a large, well-marked, nationalist millenarianism, and some Germans gave the leading role to another country, Popkin's chapter in this volume shows us that the French, at least, knew how to combine nationalism with millenarianism. Isaac de La Peyrère managed to place France at the center of millenarian predictions. The King of France would recall the Jews, who would convert to a newly developed Jewish Christian church just for Jews and wait for a Jewish Messiah who would take them all to the Holy Land where the King and the Messiah would rule the world from Jerusalem.[8] The blending of nationalism and millenarianism has worked on other occasions, too. Millennial movements in the United States which foreground the country's role as a City on a Hill are always likely to find a hospitable reception.

One of the crucial intellectual interchanges about millenarianism arose in the late seventeenth century. As Harry Bracken's chapter shows, exiled Huguenot spokesman Pierre Jurieu convinced himself that the Bible predicted a grand alliance of the English, the Dutch, and others against the French and the papacy which would result in a triumphal return of the Huguenots to France.

This made Jurieu an anti-absolutist and justified rebellion, positioning him at the origins of modern political thought in some respects. In other respects, he represented a throwback to older forms of politics, since, in the last analysis, politics would be driven by prophets like himself.

In John Christian Laursen's chapter, we see Pierre Bayle's response to Jurieu and many other millenarians. Bayle was a thoroughgoing anti-millenarian, even to the point of unfairness and distortion of their position. His presence in this volume is justified by the contribution to understanding millenarians that a look at one of their fiercest and most influential enemies can provide. Not only did Bayle single-handedly poison many minds of the eighteenth century against millenarianism by means of the many diatribes in his *Historical and Critical Dictionary*, but further developments of his themes led to the twentieth-century anti-millenarianism of authors like Norman Cohn.

Against the bleak view of some of the anti-millenarians, Ulrike Gleixner's chapter shows that millenarianism survived in Germany at least into the middle of the nineteenth century, and that it could perform a sort of liberating role in the lives of pietist women. Millenarian beliefs justified the higher education of some women so that they could help with the Greek and Latin of scholarly work for the cause. In her case study, millenarianism provided Beate Hahn-Paulus with the internal resources to resist the family domination of her husband.

A full study of millenarianism would require a return to its roots in ancient Persia, Israel, and early Christianity.[9] From there we can work forward to the early modern period covered by this volume, and then into the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries. Together with other recent work on continental millenarianism in the early modern period, our chapters prepare the way for a better understanding of contemporary millenarianism.[10] We are still a long way from a complete account of early modern millenarianism.

Among other things, our chapters establish that millenarianism was by no means an exclusively, or even largely, English phenomenon; that it was not always socially and politically retrograde; and that it was far more pervasive than many intellectual histories of the rise of the West have recognized. Millenarianism belongs in the history of almost every European social movement of the early modern and modern periods, including socialism, Marxism, National Socialism, and a host of religious and secular millenarian groups. It was an important part of the French, Russian, Mexican, and Chinese revolutions, along with other progeny on other continents.

It is of no small significance that a number of recent major social movements in the United States are rooted in European millenarian and messianic ideas. There is a danger of missing this dimension of American politics out of simple ignorance. For example, a recent book entitled *Rural Radicals: From Bacon's Rebellion to the Oklahoma City Bombing* attributes numerous movements and incidents of social unrest and violence throughout U.S. history to racism, sexism, and other unpalatable motives of what it calls a "culture of vigilantism," with only one page which mentions the millenarianism of some of the chief actors in this culture.[11] The result is that we have no sense of why people

should be so evil, and are left in ignorance of the fact that these people have a coherent world-view that is not simply meant to oppress others. Even if that is the result of their beliefs, it will not help anyone to combat them if the rest of us are unaware that they often think they are living in a messianic, millennial age.

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin

NOTES

1. To give a sense of how much we have added to the canon of millenarian studies, one recent major survey knows something about Alsted, Comenius, Kuhlmann, Milton, Serrarius, Jurieu, and Newton, but does not mention Andreae, Breen, Dury, Gühler, Hahn-Paulus, Hartlib, La Peyrère, Oudaan, or Vehe-Glirius: Bernard McGinn, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, vol. 2: *Apocalypticism in Western History and Culture* (New York: Continuum, 1998).
2. Susanna Åkerman, *Rose Cross Over the Baltic: The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
3. See Hotson's two forthcoming books on Alsted from Oxford University Press and Kluwer.
4. See also her book, *The Mystical World of Petrus Serrarius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
5. Hugh Trevor-Roper, "Three Foreigners: The Philosophers of the Puritan Revolution" in his *Religion, the Reformation, and Social Change* (Third edition, London: Secker & Warburg, 1984; orig. 1967), 237–293.
6. Richard Popkin found a copy of it at Wolfenbüttel some years ago. It is not so crazy, but is a last effort on Dury's part to find certainty in Biblical prophecies as an answer to Descartes's claim to find it in mathematics.
7. See Richard H. Popkin, "Skepticism about Religion and Millenarian Dogmatism: Two Sources of Toleration in the Seventeenth Century" in J.C. Laursen and C.J. Nederman, eds., *Beyond the Persecuting Society: Religious Toleration Before the Enlightenment* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 232–250.
8. See also Richard Popkin, *Isaac La Pèyrere (1596–1676): His Life, Work, and Influence* (Leiden: Brill, 1987).
9. See John J. Collins, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, vol. 1: *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1998) and several of the articles in G.N. Stanton and G. Stroumsa, eds., *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
10. E.g., Peter Schäfer and Mark Cohen, eds., *Toward the Millennium: Messianic Expectations from the Bible to Waco* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
11. Catherine McNichol Stock, *Rural Radicals: From Bacon's Rebellion to the Oklahoma City Bombing* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996; Penguin, 1997), 144. Her discussion of Identity Christianity and the New Christian Right (the very label is telling here: it is *not* "new") misses the millenarian aspect of the movements she traces. She mentions fundamentalism and evangelism, but she has no discussion of chiliasm, millenarians, millenarianism, Apocalypticism, or other key ideological elements of these movements. See, covering some of the same ground but supplying the missing dimension, David S. Katz and Richard H. Popkin, *Messianic Revolution: Radical Religious Politics to the End of the Second Millenium* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1999; London: Penguin, 1999). Eugen Weber's *Apocalypses: Prophesies, Cults, and Millennial Beliefs through the Ages* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999) stresses the ubiquity of the phenomenon.

S. ÅKERMAN

1. THE ROSICRUCIANS AND THE GREAT CONJUNCTIONS

The Rosicrucian manifestoes were published at Kassel in 1614, and there is controversy about their authorship. This chapter will explore some of the personalities known to be involved in one way or another, and bring out some of the intended meanings of the millenarian symbolism used in them. It shows that astronomical/astrological calculations based on several major conjunctions of the stars and planets were an important part of millenarian symbolism.

The first of the manifestoes was *Fama Fraternitatis Roseae Crucis*, which describes the recent discovery of the grave of Christian Rosencreutz, a fourteenth-century knight who traveled to the Middle East and there gained wisdom in magic, kabbalah, and astrology. On return to Germany he founded a brotherhood to guard the knowledge he brought home. The *Fama* now announces that the brotherhood has come into the open to let it be known that a new age of reformation of all the arts is to begin. It calls for others to come forth in print to let themselves be known to the brotherhood.

The second manifesto, *Confessio Fraternitatis Roseae Crucis*, is addressed to all the learned of Europe and is even more apocalyptic in tone. It begins with the statement that it is now possible to securely name the Pope as Antichrist, and goes on:

> It is Jehova who, seeing how the world is falling to decay, / and near its end, doth hasten it again to its beginning, / inverting the course of Nature, and so what heretofore / hath been sought with great pains and daily labour He doth / lay open now to those thinking of no such thing, offering / it to the willing and thrusting it upon the reluctant, that it / may become the good that which will smooth the troubles of human / life and break the violence of the unexpected blows of Fortune ... .

The *Confessio* states that the trumpet shall sound since it has become manifest to many learned men in Germany that the Pope shall be trodden under foot and "a final groan shall end his Ass's braying." This will lead to much commotion but "our treasures shall remain untouched, till the Lion shall

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 1–8.

arise and exact them as his right, receive and employ them for the establishment of his kingdom." The Lion here introduced is almost certainly a reference to the Paracelsian Lion prophecy. Its renewed use in Germany can be traced back to at least 1598. A first part was culled from Paracelsus's *Liber Mineralibus* (ca. 1540), republished in his collected works at Basel in 1588. Also, Paracelsus had published a shorter prophecy in 1530 that was republished at Strassburg in 1616. Paracelsus stated that after a great and fearful solar eclipse there will be revolts, riots, and wars, whereupon:

> The Lion having Blue and White for associates will march in a high manner ... . An Old Lion will be bound and a young Lion will become free. He will please all those animals that the old had vexed ... . Then shall the Pearl, so long lost, be found by one of humble estate, and will be set as a jewel in gold. It will be given to the Prince of all beasts, that is, to the right Lion. He will hang it about his neck, and wear it with honour. He will resist the Bear and the Wolf, and rend them asunder; so that the Beasts of the forest shall be safe. Then will the Old Art flourish and no heed will be given to the New. Then will the New World begin and the White and the Black shall disappear ... .[1]

This prophecy circulated in manuscript, and in the form finally published as *De Tinctura Physicorum* (1619) the prophecy brings together some new elements. The prophecy now involves three precious treasures buried in Europe and the coming of *der Löwe aus Mitternacht* (The Lion of the North). While the first part was written by Paracelsus, the second part on the Lion was added by someone else.

The northern Lion as an emblematic savior is found in several places in the Bible; for instance, as the Swedish Rosicrucian Johannes Bureus showed, in *Amos* 3:8 and in *Revelation* 5:5. It worked as a forceful emblem for psychological resistance and popular messianism. It was later used in the Thirty Years War, first in 1624 through a series of pamphlets speaking in a nondescript way of the rise of a German Lion and then in 1626 in a document written by a Rosicrucian from Rostock, Anastasius Philareta Cosmopolita or Joachim Morsius, which called for the intervention of the Danes in the German war. In 1631, the Lion of the North was used massively in pamphlets to prepare the Swedish invasion of Germany. Its occurrence in the *Confessio* has stirred Frances Yates's speculation that in 1614 it designated the Palatine Prince Fredrick V of Württemberg, later King of Bohemia, who lost his realm shortly thereafter at the Battle of the White Mountain in 1618.

The *Confessio* continues:

> God hath already sent messengers which should testify His will, some new stars which have appeared in Serpentarius and Cygnus the which powerful signs of a great council shew forth how for all things which human ingenuity discovers, God calls upon his hidden knowledge, as likewise the Book of

> Nature, though it stands open truly before all eyes, can be read or understood by only a few.

The stars can be taken together with the assertion in the *Fama* there has been a showing of "the uppermost point in *Trygono igneo*, whose flame should now be more and more bright, and shall undoubtedly give to the world the last light." This is a reference to the recent cycle of conjunctions of Jupiter and Saturn in the fiery trigon that play a hidden role in the Rosicrucian texts. Thus, it may seem unenlightening to be informed that Christian Rosencreutz was born in 1378 and lived 106 years. In the *Fama*, we are told of the rediscovery of his grave, as he had predicted, 120 years after his death in 1484, i.e., as the *Confessio* states – in the year of the new star of 1604. Yet, readers are no doubt supposed to know that the birth of the knight coincides with the end of the Great Papal Schism in 1378, while his death concurs with the birth of Martin Luther in 1484; a year in which a conjunction between the planets Saturn, Jupiter, and Mars appeared in the zodiac sign of Scorpio.

Indeed, the *Fama* was likely to be understood only by readers conversant with certain themes in Arabic astrology. The doctrine of the great conjunctions was described in detail by the ninth century astronomer of eastern Khurashan, Abu Ma'shar al-Balki, who argued that a great prophet who would supercede Mohammed would appear when these planets meet in Scorpio, as they did in 1484.[2]

The impact of the conjunctions had been debated in Germany for some time. In his treatise *Mysterium Cosmographicum* (Tübingen, 1596), Johannes Kepler studied records from Johannes Regiomontanus on the great conjunctions between Jupiter and Saturn and found how each conjunction "occur[s] successively eight zodiacal signs later, how they gradually pass from one trine to another," and in particular now generating conjunctions in the fiery trigon of Aries (1583), Sagittarius (1603), and Leo (1623), all dates significant in Rosicrucian calculations.

The astronomical debate intensified after the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 1603/04. In 1605, Kepler and the Paracelsian astronomer Helisaeus Roeslin appeared together as commentators on the new star in Serpentario that appeared just above this conjunction. A year later, Kepler shifted grounds and wrote a thesis dedicated to Rudolph II, *De nova Stella visitatu in pede Serpentario* (Prague, 1606), in which he agreed with Roeslin that there would be further wars of religion even after the truce of Duke Matthias and the Turks in Hungary, but he also smugly mocked Roeslin's prediction of a great catastrophe after 1604. Kepler instead briefly warns of the advent of a new union and sect to which both Turks and Christians will be admitted, a remark that could well be a reference to Guillaume Postel's mystical tract *Panthenousia* (Venice, 1547), which argued for a future concordance between messianic religious groups whether Hebrew, Christian, or Ishmaelite. Kepler then quickly invokes the silence of Harpocrates and asserts that no punishment is severe enough for those who allow it to be breached.[3]

As the *Confessio* states, it was the comet in the (cross-shaped) sign of Cygnus

or the Swan and the little nova in Serpentario (1603/4) that triggered the Rosicrucian movement. The deeper reason for this enthusiasm was that the nova of 1603/4 appeared in the sky a little above the great conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in Sagittarius, being part of a sequence of conjunctions in the fiery trigon so rare that in Arabo-Latin astronomy it was taken to mark the coming of a new age, a circumstance explained by Robert Fludd in his Apology for the Rosicrucians in 1616. Celestial signs were taken to be crucial for marking the new era, and the appearance of the two stars in the *Confessio* (Kassel, 1614), and then again on the famous image of the Rosicrucian tract *Speculum sophicum rhodo-stauroticon* (Frankfurt, 1618) by Theophil Schweighardt (Daniel Mögling), shows that the Roeslin/Kepler discussion of astronomical phenomena was central to the Rosicrucians.[4]

There is the possibility that the Lion referred to in the Confessio is the sign for the awaited Great Conjunction in the fiery trigon, that of Leo in 1623, underlined by such writings as Paul Nagel's *Cursus Quinquenali Mundi oder Wundergeheime Offenbarung* (Halle, Saxonia, 1620) which stated that the whole course of history would repeat itself within the course of four years before the bitter end: "1624 nec plus ultra." Of course, Nagel was immediately attacked by a Jesuit author claiming that his doctrine of compressed repetition was a mere stage-play, falsely transposed to the scene of reality.

The *Fama* and the *Confessio* were published at Kassel in 1614, but were written in 1609/10 in Tübingen in the circle of Johannes Valentin Andreae, a student of theology. Investigations of the Tübingen scene show that Andreae was influenced by Tobias Hess, a millenarian and Christoph Besold, a learned Doctor of Jurisprudence.

Recently formulated doubts on Andreae's authorship of the *Fama* stem from his own disavowal of the movement. In a later phase, he dismissed the Rosicrucian fiction as a joke, a "ludibrium." Also, in his extant writings, there is no unambiguous reference to his authorship of the tracts. He instead shows a polemical attitude, and in 1617 he ridicules predictive astronomy and Rosicrucian ideas in his plays, *Menippus* and *Turbo*. Moreover, in *Mythologiae Christianae* of 1619, Andreae lists a number of apocalyptic authors whom he regards as deluded, including the spectacular apocalypticists Paul Lautensack, Guillaume Postel, Jacob Brocardo, Aegidius Gutman, Simon Studion, and even his former friend Tobias Hess. This is notwithstanding that they all appear to have been part of the tradition that sets the millenarian tone of the Rosicrucian pamphlets.

The influences on the writer of the *Fama* are laid out in the research of Will-Erich Peuckert. Peuckert saw the Rosicrucians somewhat vaguely as an offshoot of a larger school of Pansophism, but he also provided new material on the background of the millenarian calculations of the Second Coming of Christ in Simon Studion's manuscript *Naometria sive nuda et prima libri intus et foris scripti per clavem Davidis et calamum virgae similem apertio*, begun according to Studion's own account in Tübingen in 1592 and given in complete form to Duke Fredrik IV of Württemberg in 1604. Studion (1543–1606) worked as a Lutheran pastor at Marbach outside Stuttgart. Few details are known about

his life, but he studied history with Martin Crusius (1526–1607) at Tübingen and he continued to have contacts there, particularly with Tobias Hess. Crusius was in any case pleased to see the young brothers Andreae in his class; in 1603 he records that Johan Valentin visited his class on Cicero. In 1597, another student of Crusius, Tobias Hess, read Studion's *Naometria* in manuscript and started to develop his own apocalyptic predictions. Hess searched for further details in the millenarian commentaries on Genesis and the Song of Songs by the Italian unionist Jacob Brocardo. It was through Hess that Andreae learned of Studion's ideas.[5]

Naometria means "the measurement of the holy place." In it, Studion works out a chronology for the rebuilding of the Temple and calculates the time of the Second Coming. In an important analysis, Robin Bruce Barnes has shown that Studion partly relies on the mystical number reckoning of Eustachius Poyssel, whose *Der Schlüssel David, Esaie: 22. Apocalip: 3.* (n. p. 1594) focuses on the recent Calvinist takeover in Saxony and the threatened fate of Lutheranism in the Palatine realm of Frederick IV. Describing the Teutonic Order during the mid-medieval reign of the millenarian Emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen (declared anathema in 1240), Studion aggressively predicts the crucifying of the Pope in 1620 (punning on 1260 as a failed Joachimite prediction for the millennium). As with Poyssel, Studion locates the Second Advent to 1623.

The reckoning is laboriously subtle and each of Studion's two manuscripts counts to over a thousand pages of biblical commentary and prophecy on the turn of events after the rise of Luther and Zwingli in 1521 and 1528. The reformist activity of Luther's protector, Duke Frederick of Saxony (d. 1525), is coordinated with the apocalyptic rider of the White Horse. Conclusions are drawn on the rise of Henry of Navarre and Emperor Rudolph II. In a central and much debated phrase, Studion states that negotiations for an evangelical union among Protestant princes and electors took place at Lüneburg in July 1586 with diplomatic representatives from France, Britain, and Denmark.

Subtle calculations are given by hand that the year 1590 will emerge as a decisive historical turning point, a year of mutation. In particular, Studion offers a significant numerical computation based on the Hebrew words for Rose and Lily (in Hebrew "hebsaleh" and "shushanna"), yielding 530 + 661, adding up to 1191, the year of the founding of the Teutonic Order. Similarly, Studion's *militia evangelica* dwells *sub rosa et lilio.* One image in the text can be interpreted as a protean Rose Cross: a round black cross is set within seven concentric circles overlaid by petal-shaped markings for numerical figures, thus forming a rose. Studion calls it the entrance of the four archangels to the Temple.[6] Studion's proto-Rosicrucian ideas thus are firmly linked to the Teutonic Order and to Frederick of Saxony as the protector of the Lutheran reform.

Studion now mixes the quest for the New Jerusalem with suggestions for a historically determined political alliance. An appendix to the 1604 edition, titled *Hieroglyphica Simone Studionis*, delivers political instructions in a six part motet set to horns, strings, and the human voice and written by Johannes Brauhart, a cantor at Marbach. The song expresses hopes that Henry IV of

France and James I of England. along with Frederick IV of Württemberg, shall initiate a new confederation, praised by the cryptic text:

> The lily nurses the Nymph; the Lion benymphs;
> The Fortress, the Lion.

Further, all is signified in the image of the cross:

> The speedy Roman emperors (Quirini) shall ravish the Sun and Moon. Let God be sustained by them (Lily, Nymph, Lion). The earthen-born Lily of the circle will bring forth, the wave of the sea will cast forth the Lion, Arctophylax will breed the Nymph and her confederates.[7]

The significance of the astral sign Arctophylax, or Bootes, the Herdsman, remains unclear. Bootes is situated next to Ursa Major and could be taken to point to the north, among other things. Some are reminded of its use in Spencer's *Faerie Queene* and recall that Arcturus, the bear-keeper, King Arthur, is its brightest star.

The significant subtitle of the second version of Studion's manuscript, *prognosticus Stellae illius ... 1572, conspectae ductu, in crucifera militia evangelica gratiam*, draws attention to the new star of 1572, a super nova. In its most central image (the last plate of the manuscript), Studion sets out an emblematic construction: seven candelabra and seven swords and two great pyramids forming a wheel of the heavens on which comets are tracked.

As Adam McLean observes, the candelabra have 40 nodes in 16 levels, where each level measures an interval of 120 years; the corresponding swords have only 16 nodes on 16 levels, creating a complex chronology of years. The construction also correlates the seven planets and the seven churches, the twelve tribes of Israel and the twelve disciples, and the two corner stones and the twelve precious stones upon which the New Jerusalem is to be founded according to Revelations 21:24. As McLean argues, "each Church together with its 'star' (the sword) rules a period of 240 years, with the sevenfold cycle coming to an end in 1620."[8]

The cycles are reminiscent of, but not identical with, the seven angelic periods set out in Johannes Trithemius's *De septem secundeis intelligentijs sive spiritibus orbes post Deum moventibus* (Cologne, 1547), a work drawing upon the Arabic work on the great planetary conjunctions, Abu Ma'shar's *De magnis coniunctionibus et annorum revolutionibus*.[9]

In effect, Studion's seven candelabras are to replace the Chaldean Zodiac, and the sequence of times (from Constantine to the present) operates within the medieval prophetic framework set up by Joachim di Fiore. The loss of the Holy Land to the Muslims at the fall of Acre in 1291 caused Christian observers to revive the Joachimite theory of 'double sevens,' a set of parallels between 'seven periods' of the Old Testament and the 'seven ages' of the Church under the New Testament. Studion rebuilt these medieval theories with the aim of predicting the fall of Rome as Antichrist. Studion's massive manuscript can thus be seen

as a summation of the many sixteenth-century Protestant attempts to adapt the threefold Joachimite scheme to the Sabéan seven ages and to coordinate them with recent astronomical phenomena, predicting that the new age will begin at the turn of the century, after 1600.[10]

Studion's idea of a Franco-Anglo-German alliance was inspired by a diplomatic meeting taking place in July 1586 when, as he states, an assembly of evangelicals took the name *cruce signati* when they met at Lüneburg, a small town situated between Lübeck and Braunschweig, to discuss whether "to adopt a new cross" as a sign for the Third Age of the Spirit.[11] This would be a spiritual order in defence against the schemes of the Roman Counter-Reformation.

If one places Studion's wheel on top of the cometary sphere drawn up by the Paracelsian astronomer Helisaeus Roeslin, one will find that there is a perfect match. Roeslin, a friend and rival of Johannes Kepler, offers one of the earliest heliocentric cometographies in *Theoria nova Coelestium Meteoron* (Wittenberg, 1578). His celestial model is constructed not through a coordination to the planetary orbs, but out of the stellar coordinates and the two solstices, and shows the precise paths of the comets of 1533, 1556, 1577, and the great nova of 1572.[12] Studion thus makes imaginative use of the fact that Frederick III of Württemberg was born after the comet of 1556. Based on Roeslin's careful record, Studion's naometrian stargazing scheme was brilliantly confirmed by the comet in the cross-shaped sign of the Swan in 1602. There immediately was a major growth in expectations among Württemberg Reformed theologians. Some, such as Tobias Hess, Christoph Besold, and Johan Valentin Andreae, prepared for their proclamation of a general reformation of the arts. As a culmination of all of this speculation, the legend of Christian Rosencreutz was born.

Stockholm University

NOTES

1. I have used a translation by J. Kohn from Paracelsus's works published by Johan Huser (Strassburg, 1616), Vol. II, 594–608. Kohn quotes the line on 625 of this edition: "The wild Lion, that is Bohemia, will again enter the Church ... ."
2. Cf. "Abu Ma'shar", *The Encyclopedia of Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1960), vol. I. 139. On the reception of these ideas by Pierre D'Ailly and Roger Bacon, see Eugenio Garin, *Le Zodiac de la Vie* (Paris: Les belles lettres, 1991; Original edition, Rome-Bari: Laterza, 1976).
3. On Kepler's role in Tübingen, see *J.V. Andreae (1586–1654) – Leben, Werk und Wirkung einer Universalen Geistes* (Bad Liebenzell: Bernard Langenbach, 1986). On Roeslin see my *Rose Cross Over The Baltic – The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 1998). Cf. Carlos Gilly, "Theophrastia Sancta – Der Paracelsismus als Religion im Streit mit den offiziellen Kirchen", 425–473 in Joachim Telle, ed., *Analecta Paracelsica – Studien zum Nachleben Theophrast von Hohenheims im deutschen Kulturgebiet der frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994).
4. Reproduced in Frances Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), titlepage. Cf. Robert Fludd, *Apologia Compendiaria, Fraternitatem de Rosea*

Cruce suspicionis et infamiae maculis aspersam, veritatis quasi Fluctibus abluens et abstergens (Leiden, 1616).

5. Will-Erich Peukert, *Das Rosenkreutz* (Jena, 1924; 2d. ed. Berlin, 1973). J.W. Montgomery, *Cross and Crucible – Johannes Valentin Andreae – Phoenix of the Theologians* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1973), 31–32, 205. See also Carlos Gilly, *Cimelia Rhodostaurotica – Die Rosencreutzer im Spiegel der zwischen 1610–1660 entstandenen Handschriften und Drucken* (Amsterdam: Pelikaan, 1995).
6. The manuscript of the *Naometria*, at Würtembergische Landesbibliothek, Stuttgart, Cod. Theol. 2, 34 and 4, 23. Robin Bruce Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis – Apocalypticism in the wake of the Lutheran Reformation* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 198. A.E. Waite, *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross* (London, 1922), 641, quoting Studion f. 271 for the cross with five plus eight petals, Rose Cross and f. 1673 for the rose and lily. The Tau cross of the Teutonic order f. 69 and on f. 565 appears a star called Crux Salvatoris. In the first version, the star of 1572 appears on f. 115.
7. It is sung by three voices, Rose, Star, and Lily.
8. Adam McLean, *A Compendium on the Rosicrucian Vault* (Edinburgh, 1986), 97–101.
9. Tritheim is said to have taken this planetary theory from the *Conciliator* of Pietro De Abano (1250–1316), in turn a commentary on Averroes.
10. On Joachim di Fiore, see Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis*, 224–225. Note that the Hermeticist Heinrich Nollius wanted to form a new group in 1625 under the rubric, "the keepers of the celestial wheel (rotae celestae)."
11. *Naometria*, f. 34, stella nova f. 49. On the "cruce signati", Will-Erich Peuckert, *Das Rosenkreutz* (2d ed. Berlin, 1973), 4, 30. A.E. Waite (1922) 641. Åkerman, *Rose Cross over the Baltic*, 101, 102, 105.
12. Roeslin (1578), ch. ix, *Naometria* f. 505. Other aspects of the computations may derive from Elchanon Paul, a converted Jew at Prague, *Mysterium novum ... verdeckt in den Hebräischen Buchstaben* (Vienna, 1582), cf. Ruth Tatlow, *Bach and the Riddle of the Number Alphabet* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 130.

H. HOTSON

2. ARIANISM AND MILLENARIANISM: THE LINK BETWEEN TWO HERESIES FROM SERVETUS TO SOCINUS

Arianism and millenarianism, on the face of it, seem strange bedfellows. In a tradition stretching back to the post-Reformation era, canonised in the Enlightenment, consolidated by the liberal historiography of the nineteenth century, massively restated in the post-war period, and still very evident in recent literature, these two forms of unorthodoxy are associated with seemingly antithetical sets of values and behaviours.

Anti-trinitarianism on the one hand has won a firm place in the classic narrative of the emancipation of the western mind from the bondage of medieval dogma. In attacking the central mystery of orthodox Christianity, it is routinely claimed, antitrinitarians developed the most progressive aspects of the Renaissance and Reformation in the direction of the Enlightenment and nurtured a trinity of liberal values: freedom, reason, and tolerance. The classic two-volume history of Unitarianism by Earl Morse Wilbur, published in 1946 and 1952, begins and ends by describing its subject as "a movement fundamentally characterised by its increasing devotion to these three leading principles: ... freedom, reason and tolerance."[1] The standard history of Socinianism in England by Herbert John McLachlan, published in 1951, adopts precisely the same formula – "devotion to the principles of freedom, reason, and tolerance in religion marks the movement through every change in its forms of thought" – adding that it also "helped pave the way for the 'Age of Reason.'"[2] Similar statements in more recent literature are easy to find in leading accounts of the Italian, Polish, Czech, Transylvanian, and Dutch wings of the antitrinitarian movement.[3]

The post-war reputation of millenarianism, on the other hand, already indelibly soiled by Müntzer, Münster, and the Fifth Monarchists, could scarcely offer a greater contrast. In the immediate aftermath of Hitler's Third Reich, Walter Nigg published in Zürich one of the first modern histories of millenarianism, cast as a history of the vain and destructive pursuit of the "eternal empire," "das ewige Reich."[4] A few years later, Norman Cohn

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 9–35.

produced the first version of his famous study of what he variously called "revolutionary messianists," "mystical anarchists," and "millenarians." Conceived, like his later work on witchcraft and anti-semitism, as a study of the social and ideological preconditions for persecution and genocide, its second edition concluded with an appendix directly exploring the bearing of these medieval and Reformation movements on the totalitarian eschatologies of Hitler and Stalin.[5] If antitrinitarianism emerged from the Second World War still associated with individual freedom, reason, and tolerance, millenarianism remained no less firmly associated with messianic tyranny, mass delusion, and violent fanaticism.

As a result of this conceptual divide, Arianism and millenarianism have rarely been discussed together. Modern Unitarians and millenarians, in the first place, have not been keen to associate with one another. Unitarianism's claim to be a precursor to the Enlightenment seems incompatible with an association with millenarianism, and none of the leading surveys of the movement dwell on it. McLachlan's survey of English Socinianism, for instance, refers to millenarianism only in passing as one of the "divergent elements" "which made for dissension and disunity"; while the first survey of the heyday of the doctrine in Transylvania seemed at pains to deny any association with millenarianism.[6] On the other hand, the Adventist historians who pioneered the study of the history of Protestant millenarianism had enough difficulty establishing the respectability of their own heritage without emphasising its association with other heresies such as antitrinitarianism. The indexes in LeRoy Edwin Froom's four-thousand-page history of prophetic exegesis – another work contemporaneous with Wilbur and McLachlan, Nigg and Cohn – turn up a mere handful of references to antitrinitarianism, Arianism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism,[7] while the equally voluminous but far less well-known anthology of texts on the Kingdom of God compiled by Ernst Staehelin includes only two documents by Socinians, neither of them millenarian.[8] Even in case studies of individuals and small groups, the coincidence of antitrinitarianism and millenarianism is rarely noted, more rarely analysed, and never analysed in a sustained, synoptic fashion.

The best known such cases, nevertheless, are extremely impressive: five of the most intellectually distinguished representatives of either movement in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Isaac Newton (1642–1727) and his chosen successor as Lucasian Professor of Mathematics at Cambridge, the "honest Newtonian" William Whiston (1667–1752), were of one mind on many questions; but "the most startling point of similarity in their views," according to James E. Force, "is the confluence between the heartfelt Arianism of the two men and their millennial hopes."[9] The two leading dissenting intellectuals of late eighteenth-century England, Richard Price (1723–91) and Joseph Priestley (1733–1804), dissented from one another on many fundamental theological issues – including Original Sin, the Virgin Birth, the preexistence of Jesus, the sufficiency of Scripture, and the details of their eschatologies. Despite the common association of the two, Jack Fruchtman Jr's study of them concluded that "the only principles that they held in common were their rejection of the

idea of the trinity and [their acceptance of] the coming millennium."[10] A less familiar but no less distinguished example is one of the greatest intellectuals of eighteenth century Sweden: the nobleman, inventor, natural philosopher, metaphysician, theologian, and mystic, Emanuel Swedenborg (1688–1772), who combines an unusual brand of antitrinitarianism with a unique quasi-millenarian interpretation of the Apocalypse.[11]

The continuation of millenarianism amongst such distinguished intellectuals in the era when it was least respectable amongst their enlightened contemporaries generally is striking *prima facie* evidence of a strong link of the doctrine with antitrinitarianism. If one begins to search for earlier cases, moreover – with the indispensable contemporary bibliography of antitrinitarian literature compiled by the Socinian Christoph Sand and edited by Benedict Wissowatius in 1684 at one elbow and modern critical literature at the other – one very quickly reaches the conclusion that these latter day Arian millenarians were in fact part of a long, varied, and widespread tradition.[12]

Even before antitrinitarianism emerges from the welter of radical theologies of the early reformation era to assume an identity as an independent movement, it is combined with millenarianism in the thought of a number of prominent figures. According to Wilbur, "the first known Protestant" to express unorthodox views on the Trinity in print was Martin Cellarius-Borrhaus (1499–1564).[13] The work in which he did so, his *De operibus Dei* of 1527, is also amongst the first explicitly millenarian writings to emerge within the inner circle of Lutheran reformers; and the condemnations of millenarianism in the Augsburg Confession of 1530 and the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566 are both partly in response to this work.[14] Cellarius's combination of Arianism and millenarianism led the more outspoken antitrinitarians who followed to regard him as a precursor[15] and influenced the leaders of the first generation of antitrinitarians in Transylvania, Giorgio Biandrata and Ferenc Dávid. Dávid published key excerpts from the work together with one of his own writings[16] and it appears to have been one of the most important sources for the millenarian strains in one of Dávid's most important works.[17] Nor is Cellarius a unique case. Two of his Italian colleagues in Basle, Coelio Secundo Curione and Sebastian Castellione are numbered amongst early antitrinitarians and millenarians.[18] Among early Dutch radical reformers noted in standard works for their antitrinitarian views are such well-known millenarians as Melchior Hoffmann, David Joris, and Hendrik Niclaes.[19] Unexplored thematic continuities link sixteenth century spiritualists with philosemitic millenarians of the mid-seventeenth century such as Isaac La Peyrère, Paul Felgenhauer, and Abraham von Frankenberg, all of whom expressed unorthodox views on the Trinity.[20] And numerous millenarians in eighteenth-century Germany[21] and Britain[22] display similar predilections for antitrinitarianism.

Millenarianism was clearly combined with antitrinitarian and Christological heresies of great variety in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Such instances in themselves, however – and more could doubtless be found – might seem to suggest only that all manner of heresies were bubbling up and mingling together in the seething cauldron of the radical reformation. More

impressive evidence of a genuine link is found by pursuing the opposite strategy: not locating antitrinitarian ideas among early millenarians but noting the regularity with which millenarian ideas are found in pioneers of early modern antitrinitarianism.

The chief of these is undoubtedly Michael Servetus (d. 1553). This highly unorthodox Spaniard has long been celebrated as a champion of intellectual freedom and toleration, a religious martyr, and even a medical innovator as well as the father of Unitarianism. But as Jerome Friedman has pointed out, "among all the images associated with the name of Michael Servetus" in a large and polyglot literature, "rarely if ever does one come across that of millenarian or chiliast."[23] The oversight is all the more extraordinary since an at least quasi-millenarian position is implicit in the very title of Servetus's masterpiece, the *Christianismi restitutio*, which promises the imminent destruction of Antichrist, emancipation from Babylonian captivity, and the restoration of apostolic purity and the kingdom of heaven to the church.[24] This apocalyptic vision is elaborated in great detail within the work itself, and it exercised considerable influence on the later antitrinitarian movement.

Servetus is doubly appropriate as a point of departure because his treatise illustrates perhaps the most direct and important link between antitrinitarianism and millenarianism. As Friedman has rightly emphasised, the centre of Servetus's apocalyptic thought "lay not in a vision of the future, but in a systematic presentation of the past, what might be called the pre-history of the millennium." Indeed he is scarcely exaggerating in suggesting that Servetus's apocalyptic scheme is "dominated by the figure of Antichrist, and only secondarily concerned with the returned Christ and the kingdom of God."[25] Several lengthy sections and innumerable shorter passages in the *Christianismi restitutio* describe the kingdom of Antichrist, the celestial, terrestrial, and infernal power of Satan and Antichrist, the mystery of iniquity, and sixty characteristics of the reign of Antichrist.[26] Taken together, they represent one of the most damning apocalyptic and typological indictments of the Roman papacy every written, which has never been given the attention it deserves.

In the course of the *Christianismi restitutio*, to begin with, the papacy is assaulted with the full armoury of apocalyptic images.[27] The abomination of desolation in *Daniel* (666), the great apostasy of the "little apocalypse" (664), the Mystery of Iniquity, Man of Sin, and Son of Perdition of II Thessalonians 2 (393, 667), the Antichrist of John's epistles: all of these and a host of images from the Apocalypse are applied to the bishop of Rome and his church. The latter include the four horsemen of the Apocalypse;[28] the sun and moon obscured, the stars falling from heaven;[29] the great red dragon persecuting the new-born church and fighting with the Archangel Michael;[30] the beast with two horns (the two swords of temporal and spiritual power);[31] the Whore of Babylon, riding upon the beast with seven heads, with its crown, its scarlet robes, its gold, its "sorcery and whoredom," its merchants trading in souls, adoring the beast and his image, drunken with the blood of saints;[32] and the diabolic trinity of dragon, beast, and false prophet,[33] to mention only the most important. In short, one could digest from the *Christianismi restitutio* a fairly

complete, brief commentary on the Apocalypse in which every sinister image is referred to the Roman church and papacy.

This extensive catalogue of apocalyptic prophecies, however, does not begin to exhaust Servetus's wrath or the inexhaustible stock of biblical images through which he expresses it. Here the apocalyptic weapons so beloved of the magisterial reformer are deployed as part of a far larger campaign in which virtually all of the malign figures, images, and episodes of the entire Bible are typologically referred to the mysterious transformation of Christ's church into the abomination of desolation by the Roman Antichrist.

The precipitous fall of the church under the Antichrist not only fulfils the prophecies of the last book of the Bible; it also recapitulates the story of the fall of the human race as a whole narrated in the first chapters of Scripture. No sooner had God created the world than man was seduced by Satan and the whole perfect work was fatally corrupted. No sooner had God sent his son to restore that original perfection than Satan sent his son, the Antichrist, to corrupt everything once again. The desolation and contamination wrought by this second Fall, moreover, is "longe maiora" than the first, and the punishment of the Roman Antichrist will therefore be far greater than that inflicted on the serpent who seduced Adam and Eve: while the serpent was condemned merely to crawl upon the earth on his belly, the "Babylonian beast" will be cast into eternal fire (393–4).

But if the corruption of the church by the Antichrist represents a recapitulation of man's primordial fall, it also presents a typological repetition of all the other evils recorded in the Scriptures. All the debauched cities, the depraved peoples, the monstrous races, the evil rulers, pseudo-prophets, and false priests recorded in Scripture are in effect mere precursors of the Roman Antichrist. The pope and his minions live like Sodomites. They adorn themselves in purple and scarlet like Babylonians. They practice the abominations of Egypt, the baleful business of Tyre and Sidon, the deceitful commerce of the Chananites, trafficking in human souls. Like the Edomites they sell their own brothers into slavery; like the Philistines they tear the people of God to pieces and secretly remove the Ark of the Covenant from their midst; like the Moabites they offer forbidden sacrifices for the dead. Everything, in short, which the Old Testament relates concerning the Mystery of Iniquity is a mere foreshadowing of things fulfilled spiritually in anti-Christian Rome. "Therefore it will be more bearable for Tyre, Sidon, Sodom, and Gomorra in the Day of Judgement than for that great city."[34]

The same typological logic applies to all the crimes committed by the blackest figures on Biblical record. The sins of Cain, Nimrod, Jezabel, Jeroboam, Pharaoh, Absolom, Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus Epiphanes, Herod, Simon Magus, even Judas Iscariot – "all these are heaped together and crowned spiritually in the Beast." In Babylon will be played out all the acts of evil to be found in sacred history from the beginning of the world.[35] All the idols and false gods of Israel's neighbours – Baal, Beelzebub, Astarot, Dagon, Elilim, Moloch – are likewise mere types of the Roman Antichrist. "In short, you will find nothing written in the sacred mysteries of the pagan gods which he

will not fulfil ... . Just as Christ made a single people from the Jews and the Gentiles, so Antichrist has heaped together in one pile all the abominations of the Jews and the Gentiles."[36]

Worst of all, the destiny of the Antichrist is to inflict on Christ and his church all the evils suffered by Christ in person during the thirty-three years of his life. From the massacre of the innocents to the crucifixion, "all these were later administered in a new and more subtle manner" by the Roman Antichrist (458). While traditional lore enumerated a mere fifteen signs of the imminent advent of Antichrist, Servetus lists sixty and claimed to be able to collect a further six hundred from these seemingly innumerable scriptural types of Antichrist (664–70). It is difficult to imagine a more systematic and comprehensive indictment of the Roman church than this.

The source of Servetus's monomaniacal vision of the Antichrist reflected in all the sinister images of Scripture is not difficult to trace. No less than thirty times Servetus defines the duration of Antichrist's reign as 1260 years – a period derived in standard fashion from the 1260 days of the woman's flight into the wilderness (*Apoc.* 12: 6), the forty-two weeks of the prophesying of the two witnesses (*Apoc.* 11: 2–3), and the "time, times and half a time" of *Daniel* 12: 7 and *Apocalypse* 12: 14.[37] In eight different places he dates the beginning of this 1260-year reign from the time of the emperor Constantine and Pope Sylvester.[38] In accord with a tradition already well established in other branches of the radical reformation,[39] Servetus interpreted the conversion of Constantine not as the salvation of the church from temporal persecution but as the initiation of a precipitous spiritual decline. The transformation of Christianity from the faith of a persecuted minority into a state church brought with it a deluge of corruptions: the institution of infant baptism; the veneration of martyrs, relics, and images; the transformation of the papacy into a "Roman monarchy"; the inundation of the church with "Judaic" legalism; and the culmination of all of this error, idolatry, and coercive caesaro-papal legislation with the imposition of Trinitarian theology at the Council of Nicea.[40] At the heart of Servetus's assault on the Roman Antichrist, therefore, are the radical doctrines which set him apart from the magisterial reformers. His treatment of the sixty signs of the Antichrist's coming concludes by reproducing the words with which Servetus had taunted Calvin in the second of his anonymous letters, written in 1547: "Whoever truly believes that the Pope is the Antichrist will likewise believe that the papistical trinity, infant baptism, and the other sacraments of the Papacy are the doctrines of demons."[41]

Such a radical reconsideration of the past history of the Christian church could not but have equally profound consequences for his vision of the future, and here we pass from consideration of Servetus's neglected apocalypticism in general to his millenarianism in particular. The implications of this conception of the past for Servetus's vision of the future can most clearly be seen by setting it in the context of the other main interpretations of the millennium standard in the sixteenth century. Catholics, with very few exceptions, regarded themselves as living *in* the millennium. St Augustine taught that the "thousand years" prophesied in Revelation 20 should be interpreted as the "perfect interval"

between the advent of Christ and the advent of Antichrist, during which Satan was prevented spiritually from leading the faithful astray; and this interpretation was accepted virtually without exception by Catholic exegetes from his day to Servetus's. Magisterial reformers in the sixteenth century almost as universally adopted a modified form of Augustine's interpretation. Since, in their view, the Antichrist had now clearly been revealed in the form of the papacy, the millennium must clearly be over. They therefore typically interpreted the millennium as a thousand year period in the *past* history of the church ended by the rise of the papal Antichrist; and they generally dated this millennium as the thousand years after either the resurrection of Christ (c. A.D. 33–1033) or the end of the great persecutions at the conversion of the Roman empire under Constantine (c. A.D. 300–1300).[42] In the face of Servetus's radical critique, however, none of these alternative interpretations could be maintained for an instant. Mankind had fallen the first time almost immediately after its creation by God and a second time almost immediately after its redemption through Christ. The mystery of iniquity was already at work at the time and in the person of the apostles, and it gradually transformed the apostolic office into the dignity and kingdom of the papacy.[43] Still less could Servetus maintain that the millennium began with the conversion of Constantine: Constantine's rule marked the beginning, not of a 1000-year reign of Christ but of a 1260-year reign of Antichrist. If the promises of a messianic kingdom and a millennial reign of Christ were not fulfilled in the past or the present, their fulfilment was still to be awaited in the future.

Servetus did not attempt to date the beginning of Antichrist's reign more precisely than this, and he therefore did not specify precisely when he expected it to end. Exactly when this "tempus Syluestri et Constantini" was he does not precisely say; but since Constantine ruled from A.D. 312 to 337 and Sylvester I was bishop of Rome from A.D. 313 to 335, this emphatically repeated chronology clearly implied that the reign of Antichrist was destined to end sometime between 1562 and 1597, presumably around 1585, 1260 years after the Council of Nicea. Although this imprecision led to a degree of ambiguity in his conception of the present and immediate future, Servetus clearly situated his generation at the decisive turning point in sacred history, when the long night of anti-Christian darkness was rapidly giving way to a new dawn. The Man of Sin has been revealed; the 1260 years of Antichrist's reign are or soon will be complete; the great war in heaven between the dragon and the angels is beginning or about to commence.[44] In this great war, the Archangel Michael (and his namesake, Michael Servetus) will play a key role;[45] but temporal princes will also take an active part if they choose. One of the most sustained apocalyptic passages in the book concludes with a cry to overthrow Babylon reminiscent of Thomas Münzter's famous "Sermon before the Princes:" "Oh all you Christian princes, hesitate no longer: Make desolate the Whore and the Beast who desolate the religion of Christ so that the prophecy of John's Apocalypse 17 may be fulfilled in you. The prophets call you blessed if you accomplish this."[46]

With his gaze fixed primarily on the past, Servetus did not specify the nature

of the age to come in much detail; but such glimpses of the future state as he allows are uniformly optimistic and collectively can confidently be described as millenarian. "Just as the abomination began gradually, so it now also begins to be gradually removed, and in a short time it will be removed completely."[47] Babylon is now falling and will soon lie beneath the feet of the saints.[48] Once Antichrist has fallen, the Gospel will be preached to the entire world and the Jews will convert to faith in Christ.[49] There will follow a "perfect restitution" of the spiritual blessedness previously enjoyed only fleetingly in the Adamic and apostolic ages.[50] The desolation of the Antichrist will be repaired by a new consolation from the Holy Spirit, which will remain with us always and teach us all things. The advent and tyrannical reign of Antichrist will be countered by a "repetition" of Christ's advent and the spiritual resumption of Christ's reign.[51] Christ's flock will at last enjoy the "true peace of the Sabbath," the "supper of the lamb, and the kingdom of God."[52] Finally, two passages identify this coming age explicitly with the millennium of *Apocalypse* 20. The day in which Babylon falls, Servetus claims, will be a great "day of the Lord," "the day of our resurrection:" "At that time we shall rise again from the Papist death for a thousand years, which John calls the first resurrection."[53] The final paragraph of the first book of the *Christianismi restitutio* spells the idea out in greater detail. The darkening of the sun of Christ represented in the sixth seal is interpreted as the spiritual "death" which Antichrist has wrought in the church for 1260 years. From this death, Servetus concludes, "we must now rise for a thousand years; and this [rising] will be the first resurrection of Revelation 20. [For] they are said to rise from death who are liberated from Babylon ... . We therefore pray, 'Oh Lord Jesus Christ, May thy kingdom come; may thy truth reign on earth.' "[54]

An almost Manichaean, apocalyptic reading of history and an explicitly millenarian vision of the future were therefore integrally related to Servetus's antitrinitarian, anti-paedobaptist, anti-papal theology. These apocalyptic aspects, transmitted within the body of his masterpiece, were to exercise considerable impact throughout the nascent antitrinitarian movement of the sixteenth century. Two of the earliest and most important antitrinitarian publications in Poland and Translyvania excerpted and republished precisely this apocalyptic material from the *Christianismi restitutio*; and in both cases the resulting works contributed to millenarian movements with significant implications for the history of antitrinitarianism as a whole.

The agent of the first of these republications was the pioneering Polish antitrinitarian, Grzegorz Paweł (Gregorius Paulus, d. c. 1591). Already in 1563 Paweł had published a work of his own *De Antichristi Deo*.[55] In 1568 he complemented this with a Polish paraphrase of the "Signa sexaginta Regni Antichristi, et revelatio eius, iam nunc praesens" and some other relevant material from Servetus's *Restitutio* under the title *The Revelation of the Antichrist and his Kingdom*.[56] In the immediately ensuing years Paweł played a leading part in inspiring and sustaining the most famous and radical utopian experiment of the Polish antitrinitarian tradition: the communistic, egalitarian, anti-paedobaptist, and pacifistic community described in one contemporary

chronicle as "a sort of New Jerusalem or Zion," established in the newly founded town of Raków, which later emerged as the centre of the Socinian tradition.[57] Whether this "New Jerusalem" had an explicit millenarian dimension is not entirely clear but seems more than probable. It was certainly apocalyptic: one of its leading members prophesied that "the Lord will in a short time inflict punishment on the wicked and ungrateful world by the final deluge, not of water but of fire"; and others looked forward to the imminent resurrection of the dead and advent of the Kingdom of God.[58] The Zürich theologian, Josias Simler, was of no doubt: he complained that "Paweł and his people ... daily coin new prophecies and predict that within two years from now some sort of golden age will begin in which, once the Jews and Turks have converted to Christ, we shall live happily here on earth for a thousand years."[59] Paweł certainly had views on this subject: his last work, written some two decades later and now lost, was a manuscript *Tractatus de regno Christi millenario.*[60]

In 1569 – the very year of the founding of Raków – the two leaders of the antitrinitarian movement in Transylvania, Giorgio Biandrata (d. 1588) and Ferenc Dávid (d. 1579), published in Gyulafehérvár (Alba Julia) a tripartite work entitled *De regno Christi liber primus. De regno Antichristi liber secundus. Accessit Tractatus de Paedopaptismo et Circumcisione.*[61] As Stanislas Kot first showed in 1953, this work also consists almost entirely of reorganised excerpts from Servetus's *Christianismi restitutio.*[62] The second book *De regno Antichristi* was composed, in effect, by including virtually all the sections of Servetus's work pertaining most directly to the Antichrist and leaving out virtually everything else.[63] This second book, in other words, conveyed Servetus's shocking apocalyptic vision in a more coherent and concentrated but otherwise unabridged form. An independent preface to this volume added by the Transylvanians explicitly taught that in the sixth and final age of history before the eternal Sabbath of heaven, Christ will reign with his saints on earth for a thousand years.[64]

Biandrata and Dávid's work, like Paweł's, was part of a series which demonstrates still more clearly the importance of this apocalyptic and millenarian material amongst early antitrinitarians. Drawing, it would appear, on the success of Melanchthon and Cranach's *Passional Christi und Antichristi*, one of the first works which they published was a series of antitheses between the true Christ described in Scripture and the Antichrist described in the Athanasian Creed.[65] While the true Christ was conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, and descended from the house of David, the Athanasian Antichrist came not from the Holy Spirit, from a woman, from David, nor indeed from any man, "since the Antichrist imagines him to have been generated before all men out of the essence of God." The true Christ grew in age and wisdom, slept, ate, fled danger, struggled with Satan, prayed, wept, suffered, died, was resurrected, ascended into heaven, and so on. The Antichrist of papist theology, on the other hand – an eternal, immortal, omnipresent being co-equal with the Father – can by definition do none of these things. In another important work published at the same time Biandrata and

Dávid added another element crucial to the success of the *Passional Christi und Antichristi*: eight crude engravings depicting the three persons of the one God, the two natures of Christ, and other aspects of Athanasian theology in a series of monstrous visual images.[66]

This third work, *On the false and true knowledge of the one God*, also fleshed out their history of the rise and reign of Antichrist in greater detail. The first chapter rehearsed Christ and the Apostles' warnings of the coming abolition of Christ by Antichrist. The second chapter recounted the way in which Antichrist had gradually corrupted the purity of the early church. The third chapter presented – for the first time in the history of the antitrinitarian movement – a systematic historical account of the rise of the Trinitarian dogma itself. In the following chapter, the authors moved cautiously from this exposure of the anti-Christian past to a quasi-millenarian future. Luther and Melanchthon had taken the first step in the restoration of the church to apostolic purity. Zwingli and Calvin had taken the second. But at this point the process had stalled, and the church had wandered for forty years in the wilderness. Only now was the revelation of the full nature of Antichrist at hand, the ruin of Babylon in Revelation 18–19, and the establishment of the New Jerusalem described in chapter 21.[67]

Such a formulation stopped just short of predicting a future millennium fulfilling the prophecy of *Apocalypse* 20; but in a fourth, closely related, Hungarian work entitled *Rövid magyarázat* or *Brief Explanation of how the Antichrist has obscured the true knowledge of God*, Ferenc Dávid moved beyond Biandrata to explicit millenarianism.[68] The emphasis in the Latin text on the restitution of apostolic Christianity is replaced in the Hungarian version with the prophecy of a future state of affairs which has never previously existed: "The prophets predict a peace that has never been. Then all arms will have to be destroyed and burnt, sabres will be beaten into plowshares, angry wild beasts will not do harm and there will be such a peace that will never again leave room for war." The addition of an explicit reference to *Apocalypse* 20 leaves no doubt that Dávid's expectation is a fully millenarian one. The crucial part of St John's message for him was the description of "how wonderfully the holy church will be renewed, how Satan, who has never been bound in this world, will be bound a thousand years."[69] Moreover, although Servetus's *Restitutio* is clearly among the most important sources of this work, Dávid radicalises his chronology in two important respects. While Servetus had left the date of the beginning of the millennium vague and implicit, Dávid substitutes an explicit and precise date. And while Servetus's implied date was still several decades after the period in which it was written, Dávid expected the beginning of the millennium only three years after his work was published. Dating the period of forty years wandering in the wilderness from the publication of the Augsburg Confession in 1530, he foresaw the imminent dawn of the millennium as early as 1570[70] – the same year allegedly predicted by Grzegorz Paweł.[71] Nor did Dávid restrict his propagation of these ideas to pamphlets written in Hungarian: in 1570 – at the height of the "New Jerusalem" at Raków – he addressed a manuscript letter (now lost) to the

Polish church "on the question of the millennial reign of Jesus Christ on this earth."[72] Of the two leaders of the Transylvania antitrinitarian church, Dávid was clearly the more radical, as subsequent events would still more clearly show.

In order to follow these events and the further development of antitrinitarian millenarianism resulting from them, it is necessary first to return to Poland, where the radical social experiment undertaken in Raków had aroused fierce debate. The Racovian radicals were seeking, in effect, to interpret the Sermon on the Mount not as a series of ethical precepts but as a canon of religious laws. Turning the other cheek, for them, was not merely a moral maxim but a religious obligation. Any exercise of violence – whether in defence of one's country, one's property, one's status, or the civil peace – was strictly forbidden; and the true Christian was obliged to remove himself entirely from the jurisdiction of "the sword" and those who wielded it – its laws, its offices, its defensive levies. Needless to say, the brunt of these strictures fell most heavily on the most privileged order of society – the nobility – who were required, on pain of excommunication, to surrender their traditional social and economic privileges, their military status, their governmental offices, and the use of the sword over their serfs, who were to be emancipated and recognised as their brothers in Christ. In short, the social and political radicalism of Raków threatened drastically to undermine the support for antitrinitarianism amongst the *szlachta* and to transform the Polish Brethren in its very infancy into a tiny, exclusive, persecuted sect.[73]

More socially conservative and pragmatic antitrinitarians in Poland were therefore quick to oppose the radicalism of Raków. Principal among these opponents was the Greek-born ex-Dominican, Jacobus Palaeologus (d. 1585), who entered into a lengthy published debate with the leader of the Racovian radicals, Grzegorz Paweł.[74] Paradoxically, Palaeologus sought to undermine all the socially radical tendencies of Raków with a simple but even more radical theological proposition. Jesus of Nazareth, he claimed, was not a divine or super-angelic being sent by God to redeem mankind from original sin: he was a man of the house and lineage of David chosen by God to fulfil a political mission by establishing the messianic kingdom promised in Old Testament prophecy. But the Jews of his day had failed to recognise their divinely appointed leader, and Jesus had therefore failed to fulfil his mission. From this basic position derived the designation of this form of antitrinitarianism as "non-adorantist:" since Jesus is not divine, he is the proper object of neither prayer nor worship. Other implications of this non-adorantist theology were extremely useful in combating sectarian tendencies particularly vigorous where (as in Poland and Transylvania) antitrinitarianism was combined with anti-paedobaptism. Since Jesus's mission was essentially political, it was clearly absurd to restrict Christians from political activity, as many anabaptist antitrinitarians in Poland were attempting to do. Since Jesus's political mission had failed, he had also failed to found a new law: the Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount were to be interpreted not as religious laws but as moral ideals. Since Jesus had not come to redeem man from sin, to found a new church, or to

impose a new covenant, these ethical precepts were sufficient to gain salvation. And since these moral precepts were common to all the religions of Europe – Jewish and Moslem, Greek and Latin, Catholic and Protestant, magisterial and radical – the basic tendency of Palaeologus's theology was a radical ecumenism rather than an exclusive sectarianism.

Back in Transylvania, theological radicalism likewise threatened to engender political and social radicalism. In 1569–70, for instance, simultaneous with the foundation of Raków and the publication of the first key series of Unitarian works in Transylvania, a Wallachian peasant visionary, György Karacsony, had attempted to establish a "Kingdom of God," analogous to those of Münster and Raków, in the Hungarian city of Debrecen.[75] In Transylvania the stakes were, in fact, even higher than in Poland, since the antitrinitarians there had temporarily enjoyed the favour of the Transylvanian prince, the voivode. In such circumstances, the political leader of the Transylvanian antitrinitarians, Giorgio Biandrata, evidently saw the merits of Palaeologus's radical theology as a check against the social radicalism which might totally undermine support for his church among the prince and nobility of Transylvania. Although he did not accept this radical non-adorantist theology himself, Biandrata was therefore content to see it circulate in Translyvania as a powerful antidote to sectarianism. Throughout the latter 1570s, in fact, Palaeologus seems to have exercised a position of considerable theological leadership within the Transylvanian antitrinitarian church, analogous almost to that of Fausto Sozzini among the Polish Brethren a decade later.[76]

Radical theological innovations of his kind, however, were extremely dangerous in the confessional age, since they inevitably contained the seeds of still more radical innovations. During this same decade non-adorantist antitrinitarianism of the kind formulated by Palaeologus was in fact extended in two millenarian directions quite contrary to the original intentions both of its author and of its political patrons in Transylvania. The first such development from this non-adorantist Christology was an antitrinitarian millenarianism still more virulent than that formulated by Servetus. Jesus, Palaeologus taught, had failed to fulfil his mission by establishing the kingdom promised to the Hebrews. But God, other theologians insisted, had undeniably promised a messianic kingdom to his chosen people; and all divine promises must eventually be fulfilled. If the messianic kingdom promised in the Old Testament had not been realised in the past, then it must be realised in the future. If the chosen Messiah had failed to accomplish his mission during his first coming, he would return to complete it in a Second Advent. In order to prepare for the realisation of his ineluctable will, they argued, God had taken his Son to heaven, where he waits patiently at His right hand for a second opportunity to fulfil his divinely appointed mission. During the present era, Christ is entirely passive and prayers to him are therefore ineffectual. But the day will surely come when all the promises made to his chosen people will be fulfilled, when Christ comes a second time to establish on earth for a thousand years the kingdom which he failed to gain at his First Advent. Some non-adorantist antitrinitarians seem somehow to have avoided these millenarian conclusions

from their theology;[77] but the theological leader of the Transylvanian antitrinitarians, Ferenc Dávid, had already manifested his weakness for Servetus's millenarianism and would soon follow these non-adorantist principles through to their millenarian conclusions.

In making this move, Dávid was following in the footsteps of a still more radical antitrinitarian whom he had invited to Transylvania: the former deacon in Heidelberg, Matthias Vehe (c. 1545–90), who by changing his surname to Glirius after fleeing to Poland managed to throw contemporary authorities and future historians off his scent for over four hundred years.[78] In Germany or Poland Vehe-Glirius had evidently encountered the non-adorantist theology of Palaeologus; and upon moving from Poland to Transylvania in the autumn 1578 he carried the logic underlying it one radical stage further still. Jesus's political mission, he agreed, had failed; and Jesus himself had therefore instituted no new law. But if Jesus had instituted no new law, Vehe-Glirius continued, he did not abrogate the old law either. Since Jesus had inaugurated no new dispensation, the conditions of the old dispensation remained in place. Even those who recognised Jesus's status as God's chosen Messiah (that is to say, Christians) were therefore obliged to fulfil all the prescriptions of the law of Moses, with the possible exception of circumcision. Only when Christ returns to inaugurate a new dispensation during the millennium will the Mosaic Law cease to be obligatory. Until then, Christians are obliged to live virtually as Jews.

The introduction of this radically Judaising doctrine, passionately defended by a theologian of considerable Old Testament erudition, provoked the final rift between the politically cautious Biandrata and the theologically restless Dávid, splitting the Transylvania antitrinitarian church down the middle. Dávid had drawn the millenarian conclusions from their shared antitrinitarian position as early as 1567, had moved from denial of Christ's deity to non-adorantism by 1572, the year of Palaeologus's arrival in Transylvania, and was evidently converted to this profoundly Judaising form of antitrinitarian millenarianism shortly after the arrival of Vehe-Glirius in Kolosvár (Cluj) in the autumn of 1578. Giorgio Biandrata on the other hand was clearly horrified. Having tolerated non-adorantist Christology as an antidote to sectarianism, he now witnessed his closest comrade drawing out of that theology a legal rigourism even more suicidal politically than that of the Racovians. If the nobility of Poland had balked at surrendering their inherited military status, withdrawing from the rights and duties of political activity, and submitting themselves to ecclesiastical discipline, the prince and nobility of Transylvania were still less likely to submit themselves to the ritual purity and sabbatical observances of the Mosaic law! With a nominally Catholic voivode now ruling the principality, Dávid's theology was also exposing the tolerated Unitarian church to legally enforceable charges of innovation.

Alarmed by the possible consequences of this radicalisation for the future of Unitarianism in Transylvania, Biandrata, with the backing of the prince, attempted to coax Dávid back to a more moderate position. But Biandrata, trained as a physician, was unable to prevail over the theologically more erudite Dávid. When his own efforts as exhortation and argumentation failed,

Biandrata turned to Poland for help, where the Italian theologian, Fausto Sozzini (1539–1604) – the famous Socinus – had arrived to combat sectarian tendencies within the Polish Brethren with more moderate theological weapons than Palaeologus. At Biandrata's request, Socinus travelled from Cracow with the aim of reconverting Dávid to a more moderate position, and upon his arrival in Gyulafehérvár there ensured what must surely be one of the most intense and protracted debates of the confessional age. In order to pursue an unremitting campaign, Socinus was lodged in Dávid's house for a period of four and one half months, and the results of their deliberations, subsequently edited by Palaeologus, make up a substantial volume.[79] Even these extreme measures, however, ultimately proved insufficient to break Dávid's adamant commitment to his new theological principles. With all the opportunities for persuasion exhausted, therefore, Biandrata resorted to political means. In March 1579 Dávid was arrested, accused of maintaining sixteen heretical theses substantially similar to the radical views of Vehe-Glirius,[80] tried for heresy, condemned, and cast into prison. Although the death penalty had not been used in Transylvania for religious offences for half a century, incarceration was effectively equivalent to capital punishment for the already gravely ill Dávid, who died after a few months in prison.[81]

Dávid's condemnation signalled the triumph of more moderate theological principles amongst the best-organised group of antitrinitarians in Transylvania, but it did not spell the end of similar ideas nearby. Despite their radicalism, these views won a scattered following in east-central Europe, notably in the Turkish-occupied territories of Hungary (outside the authority of the prince of Transylvania), where the former Unitarian bishop of Temesvár, Pál Karádi, dedicated a manuscript of some six hundred pages to demonstrating the necessity of Christ's earthly kingdom.[82] More important still was the work of the nobleman Andreas Eössi, who translated Vehe-Glirius's strange theological principles into Hungarian prose and verse, applied them to practical life, and helped to build a Sabbatarian sect in Transylvania of which chiliasm was one of the fundamental dogmas.[83] When Eössi's adopted son Simon Péchi further diluted the future role assigned to Jesus in this theology, the result was a religious community poised neatly between Judaism and Christianity which survived in the upland regions of Transylvania until "the last representatives of the sect were dragged off to concentration camps by the Nazis in the summer of 1944."[84]

This backlash against extreme Judaisation, the non-adorantist Christology underlying it, and the millenarianism which derived from it had a further echo in the more moderate theological environment of Polish Socinianism as well. In Poland too the struggle between Dávid, Biandrata, and Socinus marked a turning point in the career of antitrinitarian millenarianism. As G.H. Williams has argued, Socinus's protracted debates with Dávid had a formative influence on the Italian's theology.[85] These debates clearly ranged beyond Christology to related issues of eschatology: Socinus both debated Dávid's millenarian views and wrote antitheses to the radically chiliastic theses ascribed to him during his trial.[86] Socinus therefore returned to Poland fully informed of and adamantly

opposed to both non-adorantist Christology and the radical millenarian eschatology derived from it; and in the years which followed he began a concerted campaign against them both. Two years later, in 1581, in a treatise defending the pacifist tradition of Paweł and the Racovians against the attacks of Palaeologus, Socinus inserted a refutation of the millenarianism which the former supported and the latter opposed.[87] A second set of undated notes included in his *opera* criticised the work of an unidentified Polish colleague "concerning the reign of Christ on earth" without exposing much of his own interpretation of *Apocalypse* 20 to view.[88] In a lengthy letter from Cracow to the synod of Chmielnik in September 1589, Socinus firmly if respectfully opposed the non-adorantist millenarianism which, as he fully acknowledged, appealed strongly to many of the Polish Brethren, including some outstanding for their piety and authority.[89] Eventually Socinus would be followed on this point by a number of his closest disciples. The principal author of the Racovian catechism, Valentin Schmaltz (1572–1622), included a refutation of millenarianism in his important work on the divinity of Christ.[90] A colleague in the composition of the catechism, Socinus's long-time amanuensis and successor as leader of the Polish Brethren, Johann Völkel (d. 1618), rehearsed Socinus's arguments against millenarianism within a huge work which Wilbur regarded as "the completest and best systematic treatment of Socinianism."[91]

Despite this apparent consensus amongst the most authoritative theologians of the tradition, the debate regarding millenarianism and interest in apocalypticism did not die out in Poland. Grzegorz Paweł apparently remained unconvinced: his last work, written around 1590, was a manuscript treatise "on the millenarian reign of Christ."[92] About the same time, the Polish nobleman and first historian of unitarianism, Stanislaw Budzinski (c. 1530–after 1595), wrote a *De regno Christi millenario tractatus* apparently on non-adorantist principles.[93] Another distinguished nobleman, Andreas Lubieniecki (c. 1550–1623), wrote a treatise on the same subject which he repudiated after Socinus's position was made known; yet at his death he also left in manuscript a commentary on the Apocalypse and a chronicle of the kingdom of God, both in Polish.[94] Beyond this interest in the millennium specifically was a more pervasive interest in the *Apocalypse*. Andreas Voidovius wrote a brief dissertation on the visions of the Antichrist contained in chapters 13 and 17 of the *Apocalypse*.[95] Erasmus Johannis – a German by birth who began his career with a treatise identifying the Trinity as the God of Antichrist and then fled Antwerp to Poland before moving on to Transylvania – wrote a book on the four monarchies of Daniel and a lengthy *Commentarius in Apocalypsin*.[96]

Part of the reason for this abiding interest may have been the failure of the pillars of Socinian orthodoxy (if one may use that term) to establish a convincing alternative interpretation of the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse. In the course of a review of virtually the whole of Socinian theology during a colloquium held in Raków in 1601, for instance, Socinus and twelve of his followers stumbled on this chapter in a discussion "of the state of the dead up to the Last Day." The position which they resolved to refute was the common one "that from Adam up to the end of the world all human beings will be resurrected

from the dead," in favour of the view that only the pious will be resurrected to eternal life. But for this purpose the key text on the millennium, with its clear distinction between first and second resurrections, posed obvious difficulties. "The passage, Rev. 20," they concluded, "is very difficult and obscure, because prophetic"; and having thus labelled it, they attempted to restrict its application to the very limited group of martyrs who had resisted the temptation to worship the Beast and who were then slain with an axe.[97] Those martyrs stoned, crucified, grilled, flayed, thrown to the lions, or slain with a sword, evidently, would not qualify for this exclusive first resurrection.

Socinus's personal reticence regarding the proper interpretation of *Apocalypse* 20 is more striking still. All of his brief writings on the subject are dedicated primarily to refuting erroneous interpretations and stop well short of suggesting a better one. His only emphatic positive assertion within these writings is the insistence that this chapter must be read allegorically rather than literally. What precisely the correct allegorical reading of the chapter might be, however, he flatly refuses to declare:

> If anyone asks me what this allegorical interpretation of this passage might be, I will not be ashamed to admit that I do not yet know it, nor among the many interpretations of this kind advanced by the most learned men, both ancient and more recent, have I encountered any which I more than partially accept. And who would wonder if I do not fully understand a vision, and indeed a prophetic one, that is a vision of future things? Is it not characteristic of virtually all prophecies that they are not clearly understood until after their fulfilment? Nor is it necessary in this disputation to possess the true interpretation of this vision: it is perfectly sufficient to show clearly that it is not to be interpreted literally, which I trust I have shown.[98]

Even within this disclaimer, however, Socinus unexpectedly reveals a second assumption regarding the correct interpretation of this perplexing chapter which might help account for the continued attraction of millenarianism in Socinian circles after the 1580s: even Socinus seems to assume that the twentieth chapter of the *Apocalypse* is a prophetic vision of the *future*, a vision which has *yet to be fulfilled*.[99] This suggestion that the millennium (whatever it may be) is still to be awaited in the future is spelled out more clearly in another brief treatise dedicated (again) primarily to refuting another eschatological scheme. In the course of a now lost treatise on the two beasts of *Apocalypse* 13, Eberhard Spangenberg had argued that the millennium should be identified with the seven-hundred-year interval between the emperors Charlemagne and Charles V. Socinus, in responding, concentrated once again on refuting Spangenberg's position rather than establishing his own; but one of his arguments in doing so is nevertheless highly revealing. The order of the narrative, he argued, clearly shows that the binding of Satan, the first resurrection, and the millennium of chapter 20 all *follow* the ruin of Babylon in chapters 17–19.[100] Since the Roman Babylon had clearly not yet fallen, Socinus seems again to be presuming that the millennium cannot be located in the past or present and must still be awaited in the future.

It would perhaps be rash to ascribe any positive teaching on the millennium to Socinus when he himself was so unwilling to express one; but these passages raise the possibility that Socinus intended to discredit only the radically Judaising, non-adorantist, and materialistic varieties of millenarianism, leaving a more spiritualised millenarianism open to discussion. That his chief opponents were the literalistic, materialistic, non-adorantist millenarians is clear from his longest treatise on the subject, the letter of 1589 to the synod of Chmielnik. The specific eschatology attacked in this text is that of a future kingdom of Christ on earth, visible to the eyes, perceptible to the senses, with Christ himself bodily present for many years on earth together with the physically resurrected saints.[101] The specific opponents confronted in it are the theological radicals who confirmed their opinion that Christ is not to be worshipped or invoked in prayer with the additional doctrine that Christ does not presently reign in heaven but will reign in the future on earth.[102] And the possibility that Socinus's critique was limited to these radicals is enhanced by the fact that two of his closest associates developed a spiritualised millenarianism in the immediately ensuing years.

The first of these was Johann Krell (Crellius, 1590–1633), a man whose authority within the early Socinian tradition was perhaps second only to that of Socinus himself. Krell, the rector of the Socinian academy in Raków, collaborated with Johann Völkel in composing the chief *summa* of Socinian theology, and his *opera omnia* follow immediately after those of Socinus in that great library of Socinian theology, the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*.[103] These writings contain at least three extended comments on Apocalypse 20, two of which clearly place the millennium in the past. One of these addresses the vexed problem of the two resurrections of *Revelation* 20:4–5. Krell's solution to this problem hinges on the paradoxical identification of the thousand-year reign of the saints with the tyrannical reign of Antichrist (an identification pioneered by the Scottish mathematician, John Napier, whom Krell cites in a related context elsewhere).[104] The first resurrection is interpreted as the continual revival of the spirit of those martyrs slain by the Antichrist within the tiny community of the faithful on earth during the thousand years of Antichrist's reign. The second resurrection is the revival of pure religion within a larger community after the end of the millennium and the fall of Antichrist.[105] In this first passage, then, the millennium is clearly past and the two resurrections are clearly spiritual. The same applies to a second passage, found within Krell's commentary on Romans 11; but in this case Krell adds a highly optimistic sequel: "Once this [second resurrection] is accomplished, that new and heavenly Jerusalem (treated in the immediately following chapter) will be established, [that is] undoubtedly the Church collected from the Jews." Although the millennium of chapter 20 still refers to the past, the New Jerusalem of chapter 21 evidently depicts a golden terrestrial future during which the Jews will finally convert to Christ (though Krell concedes parenthetically that it also refers to the celestial state after the end of this world).[106] Finally, in an unfinished commentary on the entire *Apocalypse*, Krell abandons Napier's paradoxical solution in favour of a briefly adumbrated, spiritualised,

but clearly future millennium. The twentieth chapter of the *Apocalypse*, he states at the outset in a manner reminiscent of Socinus, "contains prophecies concerning the times *after* the fall of Antichrist." The first part of the chapter shows "the manner in which the Devil – the author of persecution under Antichrist – *will have been* confined." The nature of this future millennium, to be sure, is a reworking of his previous position. The first resurrection prophesies the emergence of *many* Christians similar to the pure few who suffered under Antichrist. The "judgement" given to them is the "facultas judicandi" regarding pure religion. Echoes of Napier are still found both in the definition of the millennium as a period free from war and in the identification of Gog and Magog with invading Parthians, Turks, "and other barbarians."[107] But again, the transfer of the millennium from the past to the future clearly marks out this reading as millenarian. The chronological relationship of these three texts to one another is unknown,[108] but Krell clearly continued to contemplate a spiritualised millenarianism after the backlash against literalistic millenarianism in the 1580s.

A still clearer case is found in the introduction to the principal points of the Christian religion published in 1601 by one of the participants at the Raków colloquium, Christoph Ostrorodt (c.1575–1611), as a fuller overview of Socinian theology than that found in the Racovian catechism. In his chapter on the kingdom of Jesus, Ostrorodt condemns the "noxious" opinion of those non-adorantists who hold "that Christ is not yet the Saviour of his Church ... and thus is not worthy of any divine honor." Still more particularly, he rebukes those non-adorantist millenarians "who do not admit that Christ rules at present, and truly possesses a kingdom" but merely contend that he "has been predestined and ordained to rule for a limited time of a thousand years, not in heaven in a spiritual way, but here on this earth, that is in Jerusalem." Ostrorodt directly attacks the materialism of this view of the millennium as well as the Christology on which it is founded, but his attack is limited in two important respects. First, he too refuses to give a clear and comprehensive alternative exposition of Revelation 20: "Indeed," he writes, echoing the subterfuge of the colloquium in Raków three years before, "we claim that no one can fully understand or explain such a prophetic prediction, unless he has a prophetic spirit and thus could reasonably boast on account of this." More significantly still, he expresses a guarded approval of the doctrine of a spiritualised millennium:

> We do admit freely that those who believe in Christ, will, in some sense, rule here on earth, but that should be rightly understood, for as God's word testifies, we earnestly hope that the truth of the gospel will be known and accepted over the whole face of the earth and will prevail for a long time. And, perhaps, the thousand years, of which John has prophesied (Rev 20:4), can be understood to refer to these things. For in that sense it is true and reasonable to say that the Christian will rule with Christ on this earth for a thousand years – even though Christ, in the meantime, would truly be in heaven. For where Christ's people are, there he is with them, and where they rule, there it is necessary that he himself also rule. Where, then, the Christian

> truth rules, who will deny that they rule who confess it? Who cannot confess, even further, that if the Christian truth rules everywhere, Christ himself rules there?"[109]

In the very year of Socinus's death and a year before the publication of the first edition of the Racovian catechism, loyal followers both of his theology generally and his attack on non-adorantist millenarianism particularly were showing signs of a drift back to a more spiritualised notion of a future millennium. In comparison with the social radicalism of the Racovian "New Jerusalem" or the theological radicalism of the Judaising Vehe-Glirius, this form of spiritualised millenarianism may seem rather tame. But Krell, Ostrorodt, and perhaps even Socinus were in fact only returning to the doctrine of Servetus, who interpreted the first resurrection of Apocalypse 20 allegorically as a revival of pure religion after the spiritual death wrought by the Antichrist.[110] At least one pioneering Calvinist millenarian, Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588–1638), was aware of this eschatological current within Socinian antitrinitarianism and attempted to exploit it for his own purposes. Sensing an optimism regarding the future expansion and illumination of the church even within the magisterial exposition of Socinian theology written by Völkel and Krell, Alsted attempted in his own gigantic refutation of their work to use it as a basis for converting the Socinian community back to the millenarianism of earlier antitrinitarian traditions.[111]

There is no space here to trace the rich if tangled later history of antitrinitarian millenarianism. A glance at the earliest history of English Arianism, however, suggests that millenarianism reasserted itself seemingly spontaneously in antitrinitarian circles outside the direct sphere of influence of the Polish Brethren. Of a small group of "Arian" heretics in late Elizabethan and early Jacobean England, the only one to leave any published writings is Francis Kett (d. 1589). These writing show that he combined the belief "that the Holie Ghost is not god" and "that Christ is only man" with the expectation "that Christ shall come before the last daie and raigne as materiall Kynge uppon Mounte Syon at Jerusalem."[112] What McLachlan calls "the first Socinian tract in English," written by Paul Best (1590?–1657) and published in London in 1647, bears an apocalyptic title which directly reflects the perspective developed in Servetus's masterpiece: *Mysteries Discovered. Or a Mercuriall Picture: pointing out the way from Babylon to the Holy City.* This brief text cites the two pioneering Calvinist millenarians, Alsted and Joseph Mede, and their precursor, John Napier, in arguing that, since the 1260 years of the Antichrist's reign were "begun by the first Nicen Councill about 328 [sic], and made Catholike by the Imperial decree at *Thessalonica*, 342, ... the time of this generall Apostasie is expired, the mystery disovered," Babylon is falling, the "first resurrection from Antichristian errour" is taking place, "and the calling of the Jews [is] comming so fast on, *Rom.* 11.15, &c. to make one sheepfold."[113] Best's successor, John Biddle (1616–62) – whom McLachlan dubbed the "father of English Unitarianism" – is still more explicitly millenarian. His main work concludes with a passage asserting, on the basis of *Apocalypse* 20.4–

6, the distinction between the final, universal resurrection and judgement and "another resurrection and judgement that shal precede this last and general one."[114] His last work was a careful study of the Apocalypse of John, later printed in London under the title, *Essay to the Explaining of the Revelation*, no copy of which seems to have survived.[115] Since none of these millenarian passages are discussed in the dominant surveys of the origins of English anti-trinitarianism, one can only expect that further research will reveal a subterranean tradition linking these earliest English Arian millenarians with their celebrated successors at the end of the seventeenth century.

Even without moving beyond the first two generations of continental European antitrinitarians, however, some general conclusions can be drawn. As within mainstream Protestantism, millenarianism was not accepted unanimously by antitrinitarians. Just as the mainstream reformers recoiled from millenarianism, the most established and conservative antitrinitarian church – the Socinians – attempted to stem or at least rechannel the tide of millenarianism in their midst. But their success in doing was considerably less even than that temporarily enjoyed by the mainstream Protestant churches, and for this there are several reasons. While Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin had manifested not the slightest inclination towards millenarianism, the founding father of modern antitrinitarian, Michael Servetus, had embraced it. Within the first generation of mainstream reformers millenarianism had been sporadic, transient, and easily suppressed; but chiliasm immediately accompanied the rise of antitrinitarianism virtually everywhere: in the Dutchmen Hoffmann and Joris, the Germans Cellarius-Borrhaus and Vehe-Glirius, the Italians Curione and Castellione, the Spaniard Servetus, the Pole Paweł, the Lithuanian Budny, the Hungarian Dávid, perhaps the Austrian Sylvanus, the Englishmen Kett, Best, and Biddle. Most importantly, millenarianism proved far more attractive because it derived so naturally from the fundamental theological tenets of antitrinitarianism. The antitrinitarians' profound break with theological tradition necessitated a profound reconstruction of theological history. The thousand years after Christ or Constantine, during which the Antichristian theology of Athanasius had been adopted by the Roman church, could not be interpreted as the millennium, as many mainstream reformers believed, but must be regarded as the height of Antichrist's reign. And if the prophecy of the millennium had not been fulfilled in the past it must yet be awaited in the future. However paradoxical from a nineteenth-, twentieth-, or indeed twenty-first-century standpoint, the link between antitrinitarianism and millenarianism in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries was not so much psychological as logical. Antitrinitarians adopted millenarianism not primarily as a source of consolation in turbulent times but as a rational inference from their central theological commitments – an inference fully in keeping both with the proto-rationalistic nature of the movement as a whole and with the celebrated examples of antitrinitarian millenarianism extending throughout the century of the Enlightenment.

University of Aberdeen

NOTES

1. Wilbur, *A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and its Antecedents* (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), 5, 263, 586–7; and idem, *A History of Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America* (*ibid.*, 1952), 486–7. Hereafter, Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, vols. i and ii, resp.
2. McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951), 336–7.
3. Stanislas Kot, *Socinianism in Poland: The Social and Political Ideas of the Polish Antitrinitarians in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, trans. E.M. Wilbur (1932; Boston, 1957), 'Introduction,' xxiv–xxv; Delio Cantimori, *Eretici italiani del cinquecento* (1939; Turin, 1992), 418; Paul Wrzecionko (ed.), *Reformation und Frühaufklärung in Polen: Studien über den Sozinianismus und seinen Einfluß auf das westeuropäische Denken im 17. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1977), *passim*. Wacław Urban, *Der Antitrinitarismus in den Böhmischen Ländern und in der Slowakei im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* [Bibliotheca Dissidentium, Scripta et Studia no. 2] (Baden-Baden, 1986), 'Schlußwort,' 162.
4. Nigg, *Das ewige Reich. Geschichte einer Hoffnung* (Erlenbach-Zürich, 1944; Zürich and Stuttgart, 1954, 2nd ed. Munich and Hamburg, 1967).
5. Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (London, 1957); reissued with a new appendix and subtitle: *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Messianism in Medieval and Reformation Europe and its Bearing on Modern Totalitarian Movements* (2nd ed., New York, 1961); revised and expanded edition with altered subtitle: *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1970).
6. McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England*, 11; Antal Pirnát, *Die Ideologie der siebenbürger Antitrinitarier in den 1570er Jahren* (Budapest, 1961), 11, 103–7, 187.
7. Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers* (4 vols., Washington, D.C., 1946–54). Servetus and Priestley's rejection of the Trinity is mentioned in passing; Newton's is passed over in silence.
8. Staehelin, *Die Verkündigung des Reiches Gottes in der Kirche Jesu Christi. Zeugnisse aus allen Jahrhunderten und allen Religionen* (5 vols., Basel, 1951–65), vol. 5, 448–56.
9. Force, *William Whiston: Honest Newtonian* (Cambridge, 1985), 118.
10. Fruchtman, *The Apocalyptic Politics of Richard Price and Joseph Priestley: A Study in Late Eighteenth-Century English Republican Millenarianism* [Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 73, pt. 4] (Philadelphia, 1983), 36.
11. Careful historical studies of these two aspects of Swedenborg's thought are lacking.
12. Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum* ('Freistadt' [i.e. Amsterdam], 1684), reprint ed. Lech Szczucki [Biblioteka pisarzy reformacyjnych nr. 6] (Warsaw, 1967).
13. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 24, quoting Cellarius-Borrhaus, *De operibus Dei* (Strasbourg, 1527), 28a.
14. Arno Seifert, 'Reformation und Chiliasmus: Die Rolle des Martin Cellarius-Borrhaus,' *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 77 (1986), 226–64.
15. Cantimori, *Eretici italiani*, 120–1, 317.
16. *De mediatoris Jesu Christi hominis divinitate aequalitateque libellus. Item de restauratione ecclesiae Cellarii cum epistola praeliminari Fabricii Capitonis* (Alba Julia/Gyulaferhérvár, 1568). For bibliographical detail, see *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok*, ed. G. Borsa *et al.* (Budapest, 1971–), vol. 1, 249 (hereafter *RMN*).
17. The *De falsa et vera unius Dei ... cognitione libri duo* (Alba Julia/Gyulaferhérvár, [1568]), 43, to be discussed further below (see p. 18). Further evidence of influence is presented in Mihály Balázs, *Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism (1566–1571): from Servet to Palaeologus* [Bibliotheca Dissidentium, Scripta et Studia, no. 7] (Baden-Baden, 1996), 34, 36, 37, 154, 157–61, 164.
18. Balázs, *Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism*, 161–7.
19. W. J. Kühler, *Het socinianisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1912; facs. repr. Leeuwarden, 1980), 35–40; Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 40–1, 43–6, 46–7, resp.
20. For La Peyrère's links with Socinianism, cf. Leo Strauß, *Die Religionspolitik Spinozas* (Berlin, 1930), 34 ff; Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Philo-Semitismus im Barock. Religions- und geistesgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Tübingen, 1952), 6. For Felgenhauer, the Athanasian formula was therefore 'der allergröbste vnnd gröste diebstahl/ des allgemeinen großen Sectirischen

Widerchrists,' since it stole Christ from the temple of God in heaven and substituted in his place 'einen Thierischen/ Irrdischen/ animalischen Christum/ aus Adamischen vnd ihren Eigenen Fleisch vnd Blut.' The papacy is likewise the 'große Hure Babylon, die Göttliches und Menschliches, Geistliches und Animalisches mischt und aus zwei Naturen eine Person macht.' Cf. Schoeps, *Philosemitismus*, 26–31; citing also idem, *Vom himmlischen Fleisch Christi* (Tübingen, 1951), 71–80. The Danish millenarian philosemite Oliger Paulli 'war naturgemäß Gegner des Trinitätsdogmas': Karl Heinrich Rengstorf and Siegfried von Kortzfleisch (eds.), *Kirche und Synagoge. Handbuch zur Geschichte von Christen und Juden* (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1968), vol. 2, 66.

21. Cf. for instance Martin Brecht and Klaus Deppermann (eds.), *Der Pietismus des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* [= *Geschichte des Pietismus*, vol. 2] (Göttingen, 1995), 134, 158, 161.
22. Examples include Thomas Pyle (1674–1756), *The Scripture Preservative against Popery: being a Paraphrase with Notes on the Revelation of St. John* (London, 1735) (*DNB*, xvi. 517–18); and the Irish bishop Robert Clayton (1695–1758), *A Dissertation on Prophecy ... . Together with an Explanation of the Revelation of St. John* (rev. ed. London, 1749) (*DNB*, iv. 475–6).
23. Jerome Friedman, *Michael Servetus: a Case Study in Total Heresy* (Geneva, 1978), 36. Cf. in general the discussion on 36–43, which largely replicates Friedman's 'Archangel Michael vs. The Antichrist: The Servetian Drama of the Apocalypse,' *Renaissance and Reformation*, 11 (1975), 45–51.
24. [Michael Servetus] *Christianismi Restitutio. Totius Ecclesiae Apostolicae est ad sua limina vocatio, in integrum restituta cognitione Dei, fidei Christi, justificationis nostrae, regenerationis baptismi et coenae domini manucationis. Restituto denique nobis regno caelesti, Babylonis impiae captivitate soluta, et Antichristo cum suis penitus destructo* ([Vienne] 1553; facs. ed. Frankfurt am Main, 1966).
25. Friedman, *Servetus*, 36, 39.
26. Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 388–410, 446–69, 664–70.
27. In the following paragraphs, numbers in parentheses refer to the pages of Servetus's *Christianismi restitutio*.
28. *Apoc.* 6:1–7; Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 408–10.
29. *Apoc.* 6:12–14, 9:1–2; Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 395.
30. *Apoc.* 12:1–13:1; Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 393, 395, 667.
31. *Apoc.* 13:11–18; Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 407–8, 669.
32. *Apoc.* 17–18; Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 402–7, 668–70.
33. *Apoc.* 19:19–20:2; Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 463.
34. *Ibid.*, 446–51, quoting 451.
35. *Ibid.*, 451–7, quoting 457.
36. *Ibid.*, 466–9, quoting 469.
37. *Ibid.*, 394–8, 400–1, 406, 666–8.
38. *Ibid.*, 395, 396, 398, 399, 409, 666.
39. Franklin Hamlin Littel, *The Origins of Sectarian Protestantism: a Study of the Anabaptist View of the Church* (New York, 1964); Walter Klaassen, 'The Anabaptist Critique of Constantinian Christianity,' *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, 55 (1981), 218–30.
40. See esp. Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 398–9.
41. *Ibid.*, 670: 'Quisquis vere credit, Papam esse Antichristum, vere quoque credet, Papisticam trinitatem, Paedobaptismum, et alia Papatus sacramenta, esse doctrinas daemoniorum.' Cf. Jean Calvin, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. G. Baum, E. Cunitz, and E. Reuss (Braunschweig, 1863–1900), vol. 8, 719; Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 134.
42. For a preliminary sketch of this argument, see Howard Hotson, 'The Historiographical Origins of Calvinist Millenarianism,' in Bruce Gordon (ed.), *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe* (2 vols., London, 1996), ii. 159–181.
43. Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 395, 396: 'Cuius mysterium iniquitatis iam apostolorum tempore agebatur, vt ait ibi Paulus. Verum nunquam fuit mysterium iniquitatis, cum se apostolatus munus in Papatus dignitatem et regnum sensim transformauit, idque magis post Syluestrum et Constantinum.' 'Ab apostolorum enim tempore, et in ipsa apostolorum persona, originem sibi fecit Papatus.' Cf. also 666.

44. Cf. *ibid.*, 388–9, 395, 400, 401, 668.
45. See esp. *ibid.*, 667–8: 'In tempore illo regni Antichristi, ait Daniel, post annos mille ducentos sexaginta regni eius, consurget Michaël stans pro filiis populi Dei, et erit tempus maximae angustiae. Vidit Ioannes futuram post annos mille ducentos sexaginta, hanc caelestem pugnam. Caelestia et terrestria contra draconem, et Antichristum iam mouentur. Sanctos altissimos hic pugnaturos ait Daniel.' Cf. also *ibid.*, 395.
46. *Ibid.*, 469: 'O vos omnes Christiani principes, nolite amplius cunctari: desolatam facite meretricem, et Bestiam, quae Christi religionem desolauit, vt compleatur in vobis Ioannis prophetia apoc. 17. Beatos vos dicunt prophetae, si hoc facitis, psal. 136. Esa. 13. Iere. 50. et apoc. 18.'
47. *Ibid.*, 396: 'Postea aliquot annos adiecit, vsque ad perfectam restitutionem: quia sensim coepit abominatio, sicut sensim tolli nunc incipit, et breui erit tota sublata.'
48. *Ibid.*, 393: 'Quem nunc pugnantibus contra ipsum angelis Christi, videbimus sicut fulgur de caelo cadentem: et quem Deus conteret sub pedes nostros, vt Christus et apostolus nobis praedixerunt. Contra draconem hunc Papatus fautorem nunc pugnabunt angeli, apoc. 12. et Dani. 12.'
49. *Ibid.*, 397: 'Futurum ait Christus, vt in consummatione praedicetur euangelium regni in vniuerso orbe, Matth. 24. Hoc vltra factam praedicationem expectandum est, in consummatione mundi destructo Antichristo.' Ibid., 461: 'Futurum ait Paulus, vt cum aduenerit plenitudo gentium, Israël totus ad Christum conuertur, Rom. 11.'
50. Cf. above note 47 and Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 401: 'spiritualiter post annos 1260. esse omnia nunc restituenda. Necessario debet nunc fieri eorum omnium restitutio, cum nunc sit reuelatus homo ille peccati.'
51. *Ibid.*, 460–1: 'Triplex est spiritus sancti missio: ... Tertio nunc repetito post Christum nouae hebdomadae mysterio, denuo mittitur columba, et spiritus paracletus, qui nobiscum perpetuo manebit, et nos docebit omnia ... Tertia erit nunc spiritualis et interna missio admodum necessaria. Necessarium est Christum denuo regnum assumere, vt ipse ait. Necessaria est per Paracletum noua consolatio, post nouam desolationem. Post Antichristi glorificationem necessaria est noua Christi glorificatio. Repetendum esse Christi aduentum, et regni spiritualem fore reassumtionem, docet ispemet in parabola regni, Lucae. 19 ... Christus tamen denuo regnum assumit, impios illos perdens... Venturum denuo, ait Christus, regnum Dei, et tempus nostrae redemptionis, Lucae 21.'
52. *Ibid.*, 408: 'Post sex [sigillis] igitur Babylonicae vastitatis modos, quos in sex sigillis mox referemus in septimo mysterio, quod iam appropinquauit, donante nobis Christo Iesu veram sabbati requiem, destruitur Babylon, et libro aperto manifestatur Christus viui fontes baptismi, caena agni, et regnum Dei.'
53. *Ibid.*, 422: 'Laudamus maxime in ecclesiis ... commemorationem ... diei dominici, in quo concidet Babylon, qui erit dies nostrae resurrectionis, ... Nunc a Papistica morte ad annos mille resurgemus, quae Iohanni dicitur resurrectio prima.'
54. *Ibid.*, 410: '... in sexto sigillo sequitur solis Christi iam exposita obtenebratio: et haec est mors, qua nos Antichristus spiritualiter interfecit: a qua nos nunc oportet ad mille annos resurgere, et erit haec resurrectio prima apoc. 20. Resurgere a morte dicuntur, qui a Babylone liberantur, Ezech. 37. Dani. 12. Esa. 26. 59. et Ephes. 5. Eo magis, quia nunc per regenerationem in Christo ad coelestia resurgemus. Precamur igitur, o domine Christe Iesu, adueniat regnum tuum. Regnet in terra veritas tua.' Cf. the account of the resurrection of the two witnesses, *ibid.*, 461–2.
55. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 317n, notes a unique copy in Dresden.
56. Paweł, *Okazanie Antychrysta i jego Królestwa* (Cracow, 1568). Stanislas Kot, 'L'Influence de Michel Servet sur le mouvement antitrinitarien en Pologne et en Transylvanie,' in Bruno Becker (ed.), *Autour de Michel Servet et de Sébastien Castellion* (Haarlem, 1953), 72–115, here 99. Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio*, 664–70.
57. Cf. Stanislas Lubienicki, *History of the Polish Reformation and Nine Related Documents*, trans. and ed. G.H. Williams (Minneapolis, 1995), 279–80, 695–701; Kot, *Socinianism in Poland*, 28–30, 50–3; Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 356–62; Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1092–8.
58. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1098, 1141, 1093.

59. Josias Simler, *De aeterno Dei filio domino et servatore nostro Iesu Christo et de spiritu sancto, adversus veteres et novos antitrinitarios, id est Arianos, tritheistas, Samosatenianos et pneumatomachos, libri quatuor* (Zürich, 1568), fol. 15r: 'Secutus est has partes Gregorius Paulus cum suis, qui nunc quoque quotidie nova oracula cudit, et nescio quod aureum seculum, quod conversis ad Christum Judaeis et Turcis, mille annos in terris foeliciter degamus, ad biennium ab hinc incohandum esse vaticinatur.' Lech Szczucki has speculated that this comment is based on Paweł's now lost *Okazanie Antychrysta*: see *Acta Poloniae Historica*, 65 (1992), 134.
60. Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 45. See also Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, 378–9; Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1028.
61. *RMN*, i. 270. Copies in the British Library, London; the Bodleian Library, Oxford; and the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel.
62. Kot, 'L'Influence de Michel Servet,' 99–102.
63. *De regno Antichristi*, fols. R2-EE1, reproduces Servetus, *Restitutio christianismi*, 390–2, 393–410, 446–69, 478–83, 664–70. Cf. note 26 above.
64. See Mihály Balázs, 'Die osteuropäische Rezeption der Restitutio Christianismi von Servet,' in Róbert Dán and Antal Pirnát (eds.), *Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the 16th Century* (Budapest and Leiden, 1982), 13–23, here 16, citing *De regno Christi*: 'sexto regnabit ante seculi consummationem (uti eruditi plerique opinantur) mille annis cum suis in terra felicissime.'
65. *Antithesis Pseudo-Christi cum vero illo ex Maria nato* (Alba Julia/Gyulaferhérvár, 1568); *RMN*, i. 24; reprinted in Delio Cantimori and Elisabeth Feist (eds.), *Per la storia degli eretici italiani del secolo XVI in Europa* (Rome, 1937), 97–103; and Mihály Balázs, *Az erdélyi antitrinitarizmus az 1560-as évek végén* [*Antitrinitarianism in Transylvania in the late 1560s*] (Budapest, 1988), 224–95.
66. [Biandrata and Dávid], *De falsa et vera unius Dei patri, filii, et spiritus sancti cognitione, libri duo* ([Alba Julia/Gyulaferhérvár], 1568; facs. ed. Utrecht, 1988), cap. iv: De horrendis simulacris, Deum trinum et unum adumbrantibus. *RMN*, i. 254.
67. *De falsa et vera ... cognitione*, [121–32]: Quomodo Christus suam instauret ecclesiam. This third chapter is also reprinted in Cantimori and Feist (eds.), *Per la storia degli eretici italiani*, 104–10. For Biandrata's view of history, see Cantimori, *Eretici italiani*, 321–30; and idem, 'Tradizione ecclesiastica e storia cristiana nel pensiero degli eretici italiani del cinquecento,' in Cantimori, *Umanesimo e religione nel rinascimento* (Turin, 1975), 213–31, here 228–31.
68. Dávid, *Rövid magyarázat miképpen az Antikrisztus az igaz Istenröl való tudományt meghomályositotta* (Alba Julia/Gyulaferhérvár, 1567; facs. repr. Kolozsár, 1910). On the work and its background see *RMN*, i. 232; Balázs, *Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism*, 27–55.
69. Dávid, *Rövid magyarázat*, 46–7; as translated and discussed in Balázs, *Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism*, 154.
70. Balázs, *Early Transylvanian Antitrinitarianism*, 154–5.
71. Balázs has argued extensively for a joint Polish-Hungarian authorship of sections of this work: see esp. *ibid.*, 41.
72. Dávid, *Epistola ad Ecclesias Polonicas, super quaestione de regno millenario Iesu Christi hic in terris* (Alba Julia/Gyulaferhérvár, 1570 MS); noted in Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 56; further described in *RMN*, i., App. 30.
73. On this background, see Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1136–8.
74. The political dimension of this debate is narrated in Kot, *Socinianism in Poland*, 52–68; Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 375–8. Paweł's main contribution is reprinted in Lech Szczucki and Janusz Tazbir (eds.), *Literatura arianska w Polsce XVI wieku* (Warsaw, 1959), 33–58. For the place of this debate within Palaeologus's thought as a whole, the most comprehensive treatment is Lech Szczucki, *W kręgu myśicieli heretyckich* (Warsaw, 1972), 83–121; which is essentially reproduced in Szczucki, 'Le dottrine ereticali di Giacomo da Chio Paleologo,' *Rinascimento*, serie II, vol. 11 (1971), 27–75. In addition, see Antan Pirnát, 'Jacobus Palaeologus,' in *Studia nad arianizmem*, ed. Ludwika Chmaja (Warsaw, 1959), 73–129; and Massimo Firpo, *Antitrinitari nell'Europea orientale del '500: Nuovi testi di Szymon Budny, Niccoló Paruta e Iacopo Paleologo* (Florence, 1977).

75. Émile G. Léonard, *A History of Protestantism*, vol. ii: *The Establishment*, ed. H.H. Rowley, trans. R.M. Bethell (London, 1967), 50; citing I. Révész, 'Debrecen lelki válsága [The Spiritual Crisis in Debrecen], 1561–71,' *Századok* (1936), 38–75, 163–203. See also Francisc Pall, 'Soziale und religiöse Auseinandersetzungen in Klausenburg in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jh. und ihre polnisch-ungarischen Beziehungen,' in György Székely and Erik Fügedi (eds.), *La Renaissance et la Reformation en Pologne et en Hongrie* (Budapest, 1963), 313–28.
76. Antal Pirnát, 'Il martire e l'uomo politico (Ferenc Dávid e Biandrata),' in Dán and Pirnát (eds.), *Antitrinitarianism*, 157–90, here esp. 165–9, 182–4, 186.
77. The most notable exception is Palaeologus himself: cf. Pirnát, *Ideologie der siebenbürger Antitrinitarier*, 103–7; Firpo, *Antitrinitari*, 88; Dán, *Vehe-Glirius*, 110. For another example, see Géza Szabó, 'A Hungarian Antitrinitarian Poet and Theologian: Miklós Bogáti Fazakas,' in Dán and Pirnát (eds.), *Antitrinitarianism*, 215–30, esp. 228.
78. His story was finally pieced together in the splendid book by Robert Dán, *Matthias Vehe-Glirius: Life and Work of a Radical Antitrinitarian with his Collected Writings* (Budapest and Leiden, 1982). Vehe-Glirius was formerly the deacon of the early Unitarian martyr, Johannes Sylvanus (c.1533–72), who in turn was converted to antitrinitarianism in Heidelberg by reading Biandrata and Dávid's *De regno Christi, Antichristi et Paedobaptismo* in 1570. The title of Sylvanus's lost work – burned on the same pyre as the heretic himself – also seems to reflect the conception of history stemming from Servetus: *Wahre christliche Bekäntniß des uhralten Glaubens von dem einigen wahren Gott und von Messia Jesu des wahren Christus, wider den Dreypersönlichen Abgott, und Zweigenaturten Götzen des Widerchrists.* On Sylvanus, see most recently Christopher J. Burchill, *The Heidelberg Antitrinitarians* [= *Bibliotheca Dissidentium*, vol. 11] (Baden-Baden and Brouxwiller, 1989), 21–106, here esp. 21, 23, 25, 26–7, 36, 87–8, 98–9. Burchill speculates on page 88 that Sylvanus's *Bekäntniß* may also have sown the seeds of Vehe-Glirius's still more radical millenarianism and antitrinitarianism.
79. *Defensio Francisci Davidis in negotio de non invocando Jesu Christi in precibus*, ed. Jacobus Palaeologus ('Basle' [actually Cracow], 1581; 2nd. ed. 1582), facs. repr. ed. Róbert Dán with introduction by Mihály Balázs [Bibliotheca Unitariorum, I] (Utrecht, 1983). Socinus later supplemented this further with his *De Iesu Christi invocatione disputatio* (Cracow, 1595), repr. in Socinus, *Opera omnia in duos tomos distincta* [in *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*] (2 vols., Irenopoli [i.e. Amsterdam], Post annum Domini 1656), ii. 709–76.
80. Preserved in Pál Ember Debreczini, *Historia ecclesiae reformatae in Hungaria et Transylvania*, ed. Friedrich Adolf Lampe (Utrecht, 1728), 304–11; repr. Dán, *Vehe-Glirius*, 138–40, and Pirnát, 'Il martire e l'uomo politico,' 160–3. Dán, *Vehe-Glirius*, 140–6, first demonstrated the similarity of these theses with Vehe-Glirius's Judaising theology but speculated that these extreme positions had been falsely attributed to Dávid by Biandrata in order to fabricate a strong case for convicting him of theological innovation. Pirnát subsequently argued convincingly that they must have represented Dávid's actual position: 'Il martire e il uomo politico,' esp. 163–4. For further, up-to-date historiographical and bibliographical guidance see Williams's notes to Lubienicki, *History of the Polish Reformation*, 670–95 *passim*.
81. On this famous incident in general, cf. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, ii. 57–80; Dán, *Vehe-Glirius*, 127–46; Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1119–33.
82. Dán, *Vehe-Glirius*, 110, 185.
83. S. Kohn, *Die Sabbatarier in Siebenbürgen. Ihre Geschichte, Literatur und Dogmatic* (Budapest and Leipzig, 1894); and more recently, L.M. Pákozdy, *Der siebenbürgische Sabbatismus* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1973). Dán questions the importance of millenarianism to this sect, due to unclarity regarding whether the terrestrial reign promised to Christ will be before or after the Last Judgement: *Vehe-Glirius*, 165, 170.
84. Dán, *Vehe-Glirius*, 172. See also Daniel Liechty, *Sabbatarianism in the Sixteenth Century* (Berrien Springs, Michigan, 1993), part ii; which strangely overlooks Robert Dán, *Az erdélyi szombatosok és Péchi Simon [The Transylvanian Sabbatarians and Simon Péchi]* (Budapest, 1987), with English summary 317–20.
85. Williams, 'The Christological Issues between Francis Dávid and Faustus Socinus during the Disputation on the Invocation of Christ, 1578–1579,' in Dán and Pirnát (eds.), *Antitrinitarianism*, 287–321.

86. *Ibid.*, esp. 301–4, citing Socinus, *Opera*, ii. 728–31, 735, 737, 749–51, 753–4.
87. Socinus, *Ad Jac. Palaeologi librum, cui titulus est Defensio verae sententiae de magisratu politico, pro Racoviensibus responsio* (Cracow, 1581; Raków, 1627), part iv, ch. 45; reprinted in Socinus, *Opera*, ii. 1–114, here 110a–113a. On the political dimension of the debate, see Kot, *Socinianism in Poland*, 82–96; Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 398–400. On the anti-millenarianism, see George H. Williams (ed.), *The Polish Brethren: Documentation of the History and Thought of Unitarianism in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and in the Diaspora 1601–1685* [Harvard Theological Studies, no. 30] (2 vols., Missoula, Mont., 1980), i. 162.
88. Socinus, 'Notae in scriptum N.N. Polonicum de Christi regno in terra,' *Opera*, ii. 446a–448b.
89. Socinus, 'Contra Chiliastas, de regno Christi terreno per annos mille, ad Synodum Chmielnicensem, F. S. Epistola,' dated 17 Sept. 1589. First published in Socinus, *Miscellanea: Hoc est, Scripta Theologica, seu Tractatus breves de diversis materiis* (Raków, 1611), 50–73; reprinted twice in Socinus, *Opera*, i. 441–4; ii. 457–61 (the former a slightly longer version).
90. Schmaltz (Smalcius), *De divinitate Jesu Christi* (Raków, 1608), cap. xv: De Regno Christi millenario, 93–5. Cf. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 409–11, 434, etc.
91. Völkel, *De vera religone libri quinque: quibus praefixus est Iohannis Crellii Franci Liber De Deo et ejus attributis, ita ut unum cum illis opus constituat* (Raków, 1630), lib. V, cap. xxviii: De Millenario Christi regno, 607–12. Cf. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 409–10, 418.
92. Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 45. See also Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, 378–9; Williams, *Radical Reformation*, 1028.
93. Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 55; George H. Williams, 'Stanisław Budziński (c. 1530–c.1595): the First Historian of Unitarianism,' in John Godbey (ed.), *Unitarianism in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Settings* [= *Proceedings of the Unitarian Universalist Historical Society*, 20 no. 2 (1985–6)], 77–88, esp. 84, 86; Wacław Urban, 'Stanisław Budzyński,' *Bibliotheca dissidentium*, 8 (1987), 35–54, esp. 36, 50–1.
94. Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 89: A. Lubieniecki, '*De regno Christi millenario.* MS. Quod scriptum postea, Socini de hac controversia sententiam amplexus, ipse repudiavit. – *Commentarii in Apocalypsin S. Johannis.* MS. Pol. – *Chronicon seu Descriptio Regni Dei, initium sumens à nativitate Regis Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, MS. Pol.'
95. Voidovius, *Brevis dissertatio de visionibus, quae capitibus XIII. et XVII. Apocalypseos describuntur 17. Sub nomine Roberti Janssonii Campensis* ('Claudiopoli' [probably printed in Poland], 1625); as noted in Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 92, and discussed in *RMN*, ii. App. 124.
96. Johannis's first major work (1585) is preserved in Girolamo Zanchi's refutation: *Ad cuiusdam Ariani libellum: cui titulus est, Antithesis doctrinae Christi et Antichristi, de uno vero Deo: responsio* (Neustadt an der Hardt, 1586), further reprinted in Zanchi's *Opera* (Heidelberg, 1619), vol. 8, 849–938. Sand, *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum*, 88, describes the *Commentarius* as 'operosus ac diffusus.' On Johannis, see Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 536, where further literature is listed.
97. Lech Szczucki and Janusz Tazbir (eds.), *Epitome colloquii Racoviae* (Warsaw, 1966), 101–2; English trans. in Williams (ed.), *Polish Brethren*, here i. 113. Socinus defends a similar position in his letter 'Contra Chiliastas' of 1589: *Opera*, i. 442a–b.
98. Socinus, 'Contra Chiliastas,' *Opera*, i. 443b: 'Quod si quis me interroget, quaenam sit ista ejus loci allegorica interpretatio, nihil pudebit confiteri, me hactenus eam ignorare, nec ex multis ejusmodi interpretationibus, quas à doctissimis viris, cum antiquioribus tum recentioribus, afferri cognovi, ullam mihi, nisi forte aliqua ex parte, probari. Quid autem mirum, visionem, eamque propheticam, id est; de rebus futuris, non plene intelligi? An non hoc proprium est ferme omnium vaticinationum, ut scilicet non plane intelligantur, nisi post earum eventum? Nec sane necesse est in hac disputatione ejus visionis veram interpretationem tenere: sed satis omnino est, aperte constare, eam non ita esse interpretandam, ut ipsa verba sonant, id quo me ostendisse confido.'
99. Here, as throughout this article, I take as the minimal definition of millenarianism the view that Apocalypse 20 is a prophecy which will be fulfilled on earth in the future (not in the past,

as many mainstream Protestant supposed, or in the entire present era, as Augustine and most Catholics maintained).

100. Spangenberg's work is known only through Socinus's response: 'Notae in Eberhardi Spangenbergii scriptum de duabus bestiis Apocalysis' (pre-1600): Socinus, *Opera*, ii. 448b–453a, which considers Rev. 20 on 450b–2b. See esp. 451a no. LI: 'Immo ea, quae cap. 20 leguntur, si quis diligenter attendat, ut ordine ipsius narrationis, sic reipsa post Babylonis excidium exitura, facile cognoscet; adeo ut ipsi illi mille anni, primaque illa resurrectio, et Satanae vincula et conjectio in abyssum, etc. ista, inquam, omnia Babylonis ruinam sint secutura.'
101. Socinus, 'Contra Chiliastas,' *Opera*, i. 440a (beginning of the letter): 'Etsi saepius dicere consuevi, in quaestione de regno Christi in terris futuro, ratione corporeis oculis conspicua, et hisce sensibus perceptibili, una cum ejusdem Christi in terris corporali praesentia, idque per compura secula, me multo libentius audire, quam loqui: et doceri, quam docere velle; tamen sciunt plerique ex toto coetu, me ex altera parte semper professum fuisse, nullo pacto mihi probari sententiam de hujusmodi futuro Christi regno.' Most of the letter is devoted to opposing the doctrine of a physical first resurrection.
102. *Ibid.*, i. 440a–b.
103. Cf. Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 418, 425–6, etc.; his *vita* in Williams (ed.), *Polish Brethren*, doc. iv; and above, note 91.
104. On this aspect of Napier's interpretation, see Hotson, 'Historiographical Origins of Calvinist Millenarianism,' 166–8.
105. Krell, *Explicationes locorum difficiliorum N. Testamenti*, in Krell, *Opera omnia exegetica, didactica et polemica* [in *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*] (4 vols., Eleutheropoli, Post annum 1656), ii. 304a (on Rev. 20.4–5).
106. Krell, *Commentarius in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*, in *Opera*, i. 168b–169a, here 169a: 'Quo facto, nova illa et coelestis Hierusalem, Ecclesia nimirum ex Judaeis collecta (quanquam eadem coelestem quoque fidelium rempublicam seu mavis statum ac conditionem significat, quae post mundi hujus finem existet) constituetur, de quo sequenti statim capite agitur.'
107. Krell, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis Apostoli*, in *Opera*, iii. 372b: 'Continentur in capp. seqq. vaticinia de temporibus interitum Antichristi secuturis ... In prima parte 1. ostenditur, quomodo Diabolus, persecutionum sub Antichristo autor, fuerit coërcitus; 2. effectum ejus rei.' Emphases mine. Napier is cited on 371a (re. Apoc. 17:7).
108. All three seem to have been published for the first time after Krell's death in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*. The first two are based on auditor's versions of Krell's sermons (the latter recorded by Jonas Schlichting), which Krell himself never revised: cf. Krell, *Opera*, vol. i: 'Praefatiuncula,' fol. *2v and p. 65; vol. iii: title page.
109. Ostrorodt, *Unterrichtung von den vornehmsten Hauptpunckten der christlichen Religion* (Raków, 1604, 1612, 1625, 1629), ch. 40; English excerpts in Williams (ed.), *Polish Brethren*, i. 162–8, here quoting 162, 164–5. On the work in general, see Wilbur, *History of Unitarianism*, i. 416–17. On the author, see Henryk Guiterek, 'Christoph Ostrorodt,' *Bibliotheca dissidentium*, 14 (1992), 103–34.
110. See above, notes 53 and 54.
111. See Alsted, *Prodromus religionis triumphantis* (Alba Julia/Gyulafehérvár, '1635' [actually 1641]), 8–10, 1033–40. For further detail, see Howard Hotson, *Johann Heinrich Alsted 1538–1638: Between Renaissance, Reformation and Universal Reform* (Oxford, 2000), 131–5.
112. Dewey D. Wallace, Jr. 'From Eschatology to Arian Heresy: The Case of Francis Kett (d. 1589),' *Harvard Theological Review*, 67 (1974), 459–73.
113. Best, *Mysteries Discovered*, 5, 10–12, here quoting page 11. On Best, see McLachlan, *Socinianism*, 149–62.
114. Biddle, *A Twofold Catechism: The One simply called A Scripture-Catechism; The Other A brief Scripture Catechism for Children* (London, 1654), 140–1. On Biddle, see McLachlan, *Socinianism*, 163–217.
115. McLachlan, *Socinianism*, 212 cites A. Wood, *Athenae Oxoniensies* (London, 1721), vol. ii, 305. Wood's source is in turn [John Farrington] *Johannis Bidelli Academiae Oxoniensis quondam Artium Magistri Celeberrimi Vita* (1687/8): Bodleian MS Ashm. 1563 (1).

E. VAN DER WALL

3. MYSTICAL MILLENARIANISM IN THE EARLY MODERN DUTCH REPUBLIC

Is there a special phenomenon which can usefully be labelled 'Dutch millenarianism'? Or should we rather speak about 'millenarianism in the Dutch Republic'? Is there a 'corpus' of Dutch millenarian literature? Or did Dutch millenarians rely on international chiliastic publications? In order to answer such questions concerning the national and international contexts of millenarianisms it might be best to look at the problem from a comparative perspective. We know that millenarianism was a widespread phenomenenon in early modern Europe and North America. A comparative approach might help us to solve questions about specific national elements in an international movement.

I will argue here that specifically Dutch elements are almost non-existent in millenarianism in The Netherlands. We do not detect special features which can be labelled as typically Dutch. Even the particular political nature of the early modern Dutch Republic as a federative state does not change this situation.

If asked to describe Dutch millenarians, I would say that they were characterized by being politically and socially conservative, more learned than popular, more individual than collective, and above all, their ideas were primarily an imported product. Although in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century we do come across a number of chiliasts who were born in the Low Countries such as Willem and Ewout Teellinck, Daniel van Laren, Daniel de Breen, and Coenraad van Beuningen, the majority of chiliasts in the Dutch Republic were foreigners. Millenarians such as the English preachers John Archer and Thomas Goodwin, the German scholars and mystics Philip Ziegler, Paul Felgenhauer, Friedrich Breckling, and Christian Hoburg came to teach millenarian doctrines in the Dutch Republic. The same holds true for Jeremiah Burroughes, William Bridge, Jan Amos Comenius, Johannes Rothe, Quirinus Kuhlmann, Isaac de la Peyrère, Jean de Labadie, Antoinette Bourignon, Pierre Jurieu and Robert Fleming: they all came from abroad. Numerous famous chiliastic publications came out in the Netherlands: the works of Thomas Brightman, Patrick Forbes, Hugh Broughton, Jane Leade,

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 37–47.

Pierre Allix, and Daniel Whitby. So it was mainly due to the influx of foreign millenarians that belief in a future millennium came to flourish in the United Provinces.[1]

Judging from John Durie's remark that 'many people in the Low Countries were looking forward to the fulfilment ot the Book of Revelation,' millenarianism was well received by the local population. Friedrich Breckling's observation that chiliasm was preached from every Dutch pulpit[2] might have been an exaggeration, but that millenarianism really was a significant factor in the Dutch Republic is shown by the often vehement manner in which it was combatted by learned Reformed theologians such as Antonius Walaeus, Antonius Hulsius, and Samuel Maresius. These scholars thought along the lines of the official Dutch version of the Bible, the States Version (1637), and its marginal annotations were regarded as almost as holy as the Bible itself. In these marginal annotations millenarian beliefs were discussed and rejected.

Although millenarian convictions did not form part of orthodox Protestant teaching and were to be encountered mainly in circles of religious non-conformists, chiliastic beliefs could also be detected within the walls of the official churches, particularly as the century progressed. What I find really interesting is the change in attitude towards millenarian beliefs which occurred in the later seventeenth century: while at first millenarianism was mainly regarded from a negative viewpoint as heterodox, as a belief held by people on the religious fringe, from 1660 onwards there was a shift towards a more positive judgement, even to the point of millenarianism being accepted within the orthodox Reformed church. What factors contributed to this highly interesting development of what can be labelled the 'orthodoxization' of millenarianism? Unquestionably, the growing popularity of prophetic theology under the influence of Johannes Cocceius did much to make millenarianism acceptable within the Dutch Reformed Church. Simultaneously, another millenarian tendency made itself felt in the Calvinist church: some important exponents of the orthodox Reformed pietist movement called the "Further Reformation" ("Nadere Reformatie") expected a future millennium on earth. Both Reformed movements (prophetic theology and pietist eschatology) made this special form of eschatology more respectable in Dutch Calvinist circles than it had ever been before.[3] This process of 'orthodoxization' was not limited to the United Provinces. For example, there was a similar development in Germany where chiliasm as 'a hope for a better state of the church on earth' (Spener) became a pietist tenet which was maintained by Lutheran pietist theologians for a long time.

I would like to pay attention here to one aspect of 'Dutch' millenarianism which supports my thesis that it was not a typically national movement but above all part of a larger European movement. This aspect concerns what I have called 'mystical millenarianism'. 'Mystical millenarianism' was a wide-spread phenomenon in early modern Europe: many scholars strove to combine mystical theology with millenarian beliefs, which led to a special form of chiliasm. We need only think of such German Lutheran theologians as Christian Hoburg, Friedrich Breckling, and Georg Lorenz Seidenbecher. A

good example is Pierre Serrurier or Petrus Serrarius (1600–1669), who was not a native Dutchman (this Walloon theologian was born in London) but whom we may regard as a 'Dutch' millenarian since he lived in the Dutch Republic for the largest part of his life.[4]

Even if his first publications displayed his connection with mysticism it soon became clear that Serrarius was more than just a mystic: he was also a convinced millenarian. Although his words already suggest a clear realisation of the approaching end of the present age of the world, there is little or no indication of millenarianism in those first publications. He only emerges as a convinced chiliast in his *Assertion du règne de mille ans* of 1657 – a work which shows that his millenarian persuasions were not in contrast to his mysticism but were actually intimately connected with it.

It seems plausible that Serrarius's millenarian convictions emerged in the early 1650s. At all events it was in these years that he plunged into the study of chiliasm. This is proved by the extensive knowledge of millenarianism which we find in his *Assertion du règne de mille ans.* In contrast to his previous publications, this work is an entirely autonomous piece of writing and provides the first incontestable evidence that Serrarius had become a millenarian. It is characterized by clear and succinct discussions which reveal a deep knowledge of chiliasm. "A better introduction to chiliastic thought and a better preparation for the refutation of orthodox attacks cannot be found anywhere in that time period", wrote Johannes Wallmann.[5]

In his *Assertion* Serrarius was reacting to an antichiliastic work by French professor Moïse Amyraut. Amyraut,[6] attached to the Protestant academy of Saumur, is known above all for his teaching on predestination, his so-called hypothetic universalism. Where that dogma was concerned the positions of Amyraut and Serrarius were probably less far apart than on the subject of millenarianism. In his *Du règne de mille ans*, which appeared in Saumur in 1654 and was reprinted in Leiden a year later, Amyraut attacked chiliasm in general and the English chiliasts in particular. He was totally opposed to the revolutionary activities of people who directly connected Biblical texts with political ends. Afraid of the possible spread of this propheticism, he composed a work which led to a bitter controversy with one of the few French chiliasts of his day, his friend Pierre de Launay.[7]

Amyraut compared the arguments of the millenarians with those of the Copernicans, and those of the antichiliasts with those of the peripatetics. In order to prove their view that the earth was the immovable centre of the universe the peripatetics, he said, advanced arguments which everyone could understand. The disciples of Copernicus, on the other hand, could only provide arguments comprehensible to very few. Well, something similar could be said about the arguments of the chiliasts and the antichiliasts. The latter, like the peripatetics, based thamselves on arguments comprehensible to any believer, taken, as they were, from "des maximes les plus communes de l'Evangile, des livres dogmatiques de l'Escriture, et de l'analogie que les parties de la religion Chrestienne ont entr'elles." The arguments of the chiliasts, on the other hand, as far as they were worth mentioning, could hardly be comprehended since

they were based on divine revelations. For these reasons Amyraut preferred to leave interpretation of the prophecies alone.[8]

As a peripatetic, Serrarius may have been surprised to see his millenarianism associated with Copernicanism. He replied that Amyraut would have done better to act according to his own words and should not have ventured to interpret the prophecies. Indeed, even Serrarius himself would not have dared to do so had divine grace not accorded him "quelque petite ouverture au Siècle à venir, et intelligence en les Escriptures Sainctes touchant ce Règne," from which he had concluded that, since God was willing to guide his pen, he could advance some unimpeachable truths about this mystery. He could also appeal to prominent chiliasts from the early church, such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and Lactantius, and was thus pursuing a laudable early Christian tradition.[9]

He had not published his *Assertion* without some hesitation. He did not intend, as he said in his foreword, to shock certain friends who were pious people in search of the inner kingdom of God, with his proof of God's external kingdom on earth, "as if one wished to amuse them with external matters in order to prevent them from searching internal and purely spiritual matters".[10] He could set their minds at rest, however. If they were prepared to follow his line of reasoning they would realize that he did not want to discourage them, but to encourage them. For in order to become an inhabitant of the external kingdom it was necessary first to take part in the internal, spiritual kingdom. The inner kingdom must be set up in man. Only then could one hope to become a citizen of Christ's external kingdom on earth.

In other words, millenarian expectations stimulated a search for the inner kingdom. Serrarius was obviously well aware of the possible conflict that might result from the confession of an inner religion, the 'theologia mystica', on the one hand, and millenarianism on the other. He resolved it by closely connecting the two in such a manner that the path from the inner kingdom led to the outer one.

Those who observe the commandments of the Gospel will be saved even if they do not believe in Christ's future kingdom on earth, Serrarius observes. Chiliasm, however, is the best means of prompting man to practise all the Christian virtues and is above all an exceptional consolation in suffering for Christ. Serrarius sees himself and his fellow millenarians adumbrated in the tribe of Issachar (Gen 49:14–15). Like Issachar, the strong ass who, "couching down between two burdens", bows his shoulders to bear the burdens when he sees how good rest is and how pleasant the land, Serrarius and his companions bow their shoulders under the cross when God shows them the rest which will follow the suffering, and lets them see in the distance the land of the glorious saints. The view of that land, the external kingdom of Christ on earth, facilitates the choice of taking up the cross in the present life. Chiliasm is thus not necessary for salvation but is both morally inspiring and comforting.[11]

In the *Assertion* we find all the basic ideas of Serrarius's theology. Even if certain themes were to be elaborated in his later writings they are in essence already present in this tract: first of all we have the expectation of Christ's glorious kingdom on earth, described as the resurrection of the church; then

there is the idea of the general conversion of the Jews, including the ten tribes, and their return to their former fatherland, a theme revealing a special sympathy for the Jews; finally, there is the vision of history, characterized by the idea of decline.

An important theme of the *Assertion* concerns the Christian prejudice against chiliasm as if it were a Jewish, material expectation of the future. When examining the motives for Amyraut's antichiliasm Serrarius is struck by the coarse prejudice which this theologian, like so many other Christians, has against the Jews. He apologizes in advance for the word 'prejudice' which he uses in this context, but he is unable to open this abcess without using that particular lancet.[12] This prejudice consists in the conviction that chiliastic expectations are the product of Jewish ignorance. The Jews had never had an eye for the spiritual aspect of biblical prophecy, runs the anti-chiliastic argument. Their material feelings, their life in a fleshly covenant, their physical slavery, all contribute to the fact that they could not conceive anything other than a temporal, visible messianic kingdom.

To these arguments Serrarius responds violently. Certainly, he begins, the Jews were grossly mistaken about Christ's first coming, but the Christians should thereby be warned against making a more serious mistake by misunderstanding Christ's second coming.[13] One of Serrarius's most basic convictions is that Jews and Christians are both partly blinded. If the Jews had only attended to the material aspect and had expected an earthly, material kingdom, the Christians can be reproached with having conceived everything in a spiritual sense and thus having reached the mistaken conclusion that only a spiritual, invisible kingdom lies in store. From a formal point of view Jews and Christians can therefore be accused of exactly the same thing.

The Jews have only listened to the promises in the Old Testament, while the Christians have only looked at the path leading to the fulfilment of these promises as it is described in the New Testament. Owing to this partial neglect neither Jews nor Christians have understood the matter properly. The full truth about Christ's earthly kingdom contains both elements, however. It contains the path, which is suffering; and it contains the objective, the marvellous promises which will be fulfilled in Christ's glorious kingdom. It is the chiliast who holds the key to this full truth since he knows about the path as well as the promises. Chiliasm is thus a synthesis of the partial truth which the Jews and the Christians have each appropriated. The idea that Christianity and Judaism are in a sense complementary can be regarded as one of the basic features of Serrarius's millenarianism.[14]

What is the cause of the partial blindness among both Jews and Christians? It is the ideas which they have imbibed from their youth; they have received opinions which prevent them from hearing the teaching of the Spirit.[15] Ever since their infancy Christians have received a belief in Christ, the crucified and resurrected Lord, who rose to heaven and sat on the right hand of God the Father. The Jews who, according to a mysterious divine decree, temporarily rejected the crucified and resurrected Christ so that the Gospel might go to the heathens, "ont cependant autres maximes et principes touchant le Messie non

moins véritables que les nostres."[16] For they believe that He will one day gather his dispersed people and lead them to their former country where they will enjoy greater benefits than their forefathers ever did; that He will then circumcise their heart so that they can love God with their whole heart and soul (Deut 30:5–6); and finally that He will be their king for ever and will subdue the peoples and nations under their feet (Ps 47: 2–4). This is what the Jews imbibed with their mothers' milk. Since they did not know the mystery of the suffering of the Messiah which had to precede that glorious kingship, they were blind to Christ's first coming.

Similarly, the Christians are so filled with the belief in Christ as the crucified and resurrected Lord that they reject all views of the Jews who talk of a Messiah as a king, and thus accuse them of ignorance. We Christians are just as ignorant, however, argues Serrarius, but since we know a truth which was concealed for some time from the Jews, we behave as though we hold the key to every truth and assume that the Jews cannot possess one concealed to us Christians.[17] Yet the Christians should never believe that they have an exclusive right to the truth because they know the mystery of Christ's suffering on earth. For the Jews know about His glorious advent on earth, something which is unknown to the Christians. Christian arrogance is thus misplaced.

Why, Serrarius asks Amyraut, should we not believe together with the Jews in Christ's enhancement on earth, even if the Jews do not yet believe with us Christians in his humiliation on earth?[18] Is it not high time, now that Christ's second coming is at hand, for the Christians to show some indulgence to the Jews and adapt themselves to their views? After all, both Jews and Christians expect the appearance of the glorious Messiah, with just one difference: "Il y a seulement cette différence, que les Juifs ne sçavent pas que c'est ce mesme Christ que leurs pères ont livré à Pilate pour estre crucifié, qu'ils attendent en gloire. Mais nous sçavons que c'est luy-mesme et nul autre."[19] We who know that He whom we expect is their Messiah and that the blindness which has afflicted the Jews is to our advantage, Serrarius objects to Amyraut, have every reason to support the poor Jews and to cooperate with them as much as possible. For the sake of the heritage which has been promised to them and which has been given us through the mercy of Jesus, who is both their and our Messiah, we should love them and treat them with respect. This will be the beginning of our joining together.[20]

Another tenet which is emphasized by Serrarius in his *Assertion* concerns the idea of the future millennium. Christ's future kingdom on earth will be no earthly, material kingdom, but a heavenly one. When Christ says that his kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36) he simply means that it has a different nature and a different origin from those of the earthly kingdoms known by history hitherto. Christ's kingdom comes into existence through much suffering and proceeds from heaven. Christ does not wish to deny, however, that it will be established on earth. His disciples too have understood it in this manner and they can rightly be numbered among the chiliasts.[21]

The millennium will entail a state of prosperity for the church. The church, as the bride of Christ, has the same history of suffering, resurrection, and

ascension as the bridegroom.[22] Its glorious resurrection will occur in Christ's kingdom. In his deep longing for the restoration of the fallen apostolic church Serrarius's essential involvement with the idea of the church comes to the fore.

Like many of his fellow-Christians, Amyraut has a mistaken conception of the future Jerusalem, according to Serrarius. The new Jerusalem will not be a reconstruction of the old city built with the hands of man. God is the architect of the new city. Its outskirts will be on earth, but the centre will be raised above the earth. It will be a temple "dont la cour externe peut estre en la terre, mais le *lieu Sainct*, ou nuls autres que les oincts de l'Eternel ne peuvent entrer, est eslevé au dessus de la terre".[23]

In order to show that such an idea is not only to be found among Christians but also among Jews, Serrarius quotes the words of Rabbi Nathan Shapira – whom he does not mention by name, however – who speaks, with reference to *Malachi* 3:1, of a temple which God built and continues to build day by day. At one point this temple will descend from on high at some distance from the earth. There the Messiah, in the midst of thousands of angels and saints, will have his throne, while all those who have believed in God, both Jews and Christians, will be raised up by the Spirit of God and will live there for ever. According to Shapira there were other Jews in Jerusalem who were of the same opinion and who, full of repentance, awaited the coming of Him whom they had once failed to recognize.[24]

Who are these saints who will soon reign with Christ in the millennium? They are those, says Serrarius, who are deeply despised by the present world and are regarded as the rejects of humanity.[25] The element of evident joy about the radical reversal in the balance of power in the future millennium can also be detected here. Serrarius is comforted by the fact that present suffering is not in vain, and he expects his reward. At that point the present wielders of power will be outwitted.

The saints participate in the first resurrection. Against Amyraut–and later also against the orthodox Reformed theologian Samuel Maresius – Serrarius defends the idea of two bodily resurrections, one before and one at the end of the millennium, the first of the saints and the second of all mankind. Since the saints, rather than the rest of huminaty, died physically for Christ and conformed to his death, they should also be resurrected in the body before the rest of mankind in accordance with Christ's glorious resurrection. Serrarius mentions 1 *Corinthians* 15 in this connection, where, according to him, the first physical resurrection of the saints is predicted[26].

In addition to scriptural arguments, Serrarius provides other reasons for expecting a heavenly kingdom on earth. The mere order of things requires the existence of such a kingdom. Are summer and winter not connected by autumn? And winter and summer by the spring? Does daylight not turn into the dark of night by way of the twilight? Well, in the same way this earthly, ephemeral world can only be connected to the eternal, heavenly kingdom of the Father by Christ's 'interregnum' which combines both elements, earth and heaven, flesh and spirit, transience and eternity. His kingdom is "un règne entremoyen entre les royaumes précédens, qui n'estoyent que temporels et

visibles, et celuy qui suivra après que Christ aura remis son règne purement spirituel et invisible." A kingdom will come "qui tiendra du corporel et du spirituel, du visible et de l'invisible tout ensemble."[27]

The millennium thus forms the link between the worldly kingdoms and that of the Father. Serrarius may have derived the view of an intermediary kingdom from contemporary mystics, hermeticists and Rosicrucians such as Julius Sperber, Robert Fludd, and Franckenberg, who probably drew the idea from the Joachite tradition.[28] The idea that two extremes can never touch one another directly but always need a link also occurs in other forms in Serrarius's work. Besides, this 'interregnum' is the beginning of the eternal heavenly kingdom. Admittedly, once the sacred millennial sabbath has run its course, the devil will be released briefly and will tempt Gog and Magog to attack the new Jerusalem, but they will not triumph: they will be consumed by fire from heaven. Never again will God's name be desecrated. The peace established with the beginning of Christ's external kingdom is thus an eternal peace which will continue uninterruptedly until the kingdom of the Father. When Christ hands over his kingdom to his Father it will not be 'une dissipation' (an abolition in the figurative sense) but 'une exaltation' (an elevation in the literal sense).

Another argument in favour of millenarianism is connected with Serrarius's view of the creation. He can simply not accept that God created the world intending it to remain for ever a scene of injustice, war, and damnation, as the 'mockers' say who do not wish to think of a 'restauratio et renovatio omnium' (2 Peter 3:4–5).[29]

Serrarius hardly dares to broach the date on which the kingdom will begin. He provides certain customary numbers. Assuming, for example, that a day corresponds to a year, he says that the 1260 days spent by the woman (the church) in the desert (Rev 12:6) correspond to the same period as the three and a half days during which the two witnesses lay dead in the street (Rev 11:7–11), viz. 1260 years. Furthermore, the church may have to wander for forty times forty years in the desert of the world, but by never stating when this 'desert journey' began Serrarius leaves the reader in some uncertainty about when it should end.[30]

The prophecies, so popular in chiliastic circles, in *Isaiah* 65, *Daniel* 2 and *Revelation* 20, are dealt with extensively. After giving a survey of the content of the last book of the Bible, in which he pays special attention to chapters 12 and 19, Serrarius asks Amyraut whether the book does not contain a beautiful and perfect eternal order.[31] In connection with *Daniel* 2 he discusses 'revolutionary' chiliasm. Like Amyraut he is highly critical of the radical English chiliasts, regarding their outrages as a strategy of Satan in order to make the wonderful truth of Christ's glorious kingdom hateful.[32] Although he accepts their basic principle, he would be horrified to be associated with them. Thanks to Christ any reliance by man on himself or on any earthly power has become unnecessary. Besides, it is only for God and Christ to establish the heavenly kingdom on earth.[33]

Serrarius says that in his interpretation of the various prophecies Amyraut is the victim of his own prejudice.[34] The French theologian makes everything unnecessarily complicated, while the truth itself is so simple and uniform. The more enlightened and sanctified we are, the simpler the truth appears to us; the more prejudiced we are, on the other hand, the more colours it assumes.[35] May God free us of every human prejudice and let us keep our eyes fixed forever on Him alone "qui est ce seul clair et constant Miroir qui représente nuëment la Vérité telle qu'elle est."[36] It will then be possible for us to distingiush between the truth and the garment in which it is concealed. At that point, Serrarius tells Amyraut, our dispute about Christ's glorious kingdom on earth will end in a holy symphony in which we shall praise the Lord together with the twenty-four elders and the four beasts and the incalculable number of peoples round the throne of the Lamb.[37]

Conclusion

After the appearance of the *Assertion*, Serrarius defended chiliasm energetically until his death. His philojudaism, so fully expressed in this work, emerges as a striking component of his millenarianism. In all this Serrarius was, and remained, a mystic. In his chiliastic and philojudaic views, too, the mystical and spiritual dimension is unmistakably present.

Did Serrarius refer in his writings to a Dutch corpus of millenarian literature? If we take a look at his library we are confirmed in our suggestions that such a thing as a typical 'Dutch millenarianism' is not likely to have existed. Browsing through the auction catalogue – which fortunately has been preserved – we become immediately aware of the nature of this millenarian's literature: the chiliastic publications in his possession mainly stem from British, French, and German authors. Only a few are written by native Dutch authors, for example, Cornelius Bergius's *De Mille Annis*. By far the largest part of millenarian publications in his catalogue are those by Breckling, Seidenbecher, and Hoburg; Brightman and Homes, Patrick Forbes and William Gouge, Ephraim Huit and William Cowper, Jean de Labadie and Isaac La Peyrere. The catalogue also shows the mixed interests of its owner: besides millenarian books there is a lot of mystical literature, some Rosicrucian manifestoes, and the like.

As I said above, in the 1660s and 1670s an interesting development occurred when millenarianism became more or less acceptable within the Dutch Reformed Church, due to Cocceian prophetic theology and the pietist Further Reformation. It is striking to see that the mystical millenarianism of Serrarius – or Breckling, Hoburg, and others – shows many affinities to both elements of prophetic theology and pietist millenarian beliefs. There is an important link between the ecclesiological views of a mystical millenarians such as Serrarius, Hoburg, and others and Reformed theologians such as the prophetic theologians and the pietists. However this may be, it might be interesting to take a closer look at these affinities between mystical millenarianism and orthodox Reformed chiliasm in order to clarify the process of 'orthodoxization' of

millenarianism in the United Provinces. In a wider perspective it will be helpful to look at early modern Dutch millenarianism in a comparative context. Such an approach might help to elucidate the nature of European millenarianisms.

University of Leiden

NOTES

1. A survey of Dutch millenarianism is still lacking. One can however consult the studies by Hylkema, *Reformateurs*; Lindeboom, *Stiefkinderen*; Kolawski, *Chrétiens sans église*; Van den Berg, *Joden en christenen*. See also studies devoted to individual millenarians, such as K.H.D. Haley, "Sir Johannes Rothe: English Knight and Dutch Fifth Monarchist", in D. Pennington and K. Thomas eds., *Puritans and Revolutionaries. Essays in Seventeenth-Century History Presented to Christopher Hill* (Oxford 1982), 310–332, which offers a lucid analysis of the difference in background between British and Dutch millenarianism. Cf. also Ernestine van der Wall, "'Antichrist stormed'. The Glorious Revolution and the Dutch Prophetic Tradition", in Dale Hoak and Mordechai Feingold, eds., *The World of William and Mary. Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89* (Stanford 1996), 152–164.
2. John Durie, "An Epistolical Discours ... concerning this Exposition of the Revelation by waie of Preface thereunto", in *Clavis apocalyptica* (1651), p. 6; Friedrich Breckling, *Synagoga satanae* (1666), p. 19.
3. See also Ernestine van der Wall, "Between Grotius and Cocceius: the 'theologia prophetica' of Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722)", in Henk J.M. Nellen & Edwin Rabbie, eds., *Hugo Grotius Theologian. Essays in honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes* (Leiden, 1994), 196–215.
4. For Petrus Serrarius, see my dissertation, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius (1600–1669) en zijn wereld* (Leiden 1987); the English version is due to appear soon. The following paragraph is largely based on chapter 6 of this version.
5. "Eine bessere Einführung in die chiliastische Gedankenwelt und eine bessere Zurüstung zur Widerlegung orthodoxer Einwände gibt es zu dieser Zeit wohl nirgendwo". J. Wallmann, *Philip Jakob Spener und die Anfänge des Pietismus* (Tübingen, 1970,1986^2), 331.
6. For Moïse Amyraut (1596–1664), see E.E. Haag, *La France protestante* I, 185f.; R. Voeltzel, *Vrai et fausse église selon les théologiens protestants français du XVIIe siècle* (Paris 1955); R. Stauffer, *Moïse Amyraut* (1962); F. Laplanche, *Orthodoxie et prédication. L'oeuvre d'Amyraut et la querelle de la grâce universelle* (Paris, 1965); id., *L'Ecriture, le sacré et l'histoire. Erudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVIIème siècle* (Amsterdam-Maarssen, 1986); B.G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy* (Madison, 1969), 116f.
7. Moïse Amyraut, *Du règne de mille ans ou de la prosperité de l'Eglise* (Saumur 1654; 1st ed.); (Leiden, 1655; 2nd ed.); (Genèva, 1670; 3rd ed.). For Amyraut's antimillenarianism, see Laplanche, *L'Ecriture, le sacré et l'histoire*, ch. X, 413–471.
8. Amyraut, *Du règne de mille ans*, 72f.
9. *Assertion*, Préface, 35.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*, 283.
12. *Ibid.*, Préface.
13. *Ibid.*, 6: Je vous advoue volontiers, touchant les Iuifs, que ce pouvre peuple s'est grandement mespris a l'endroit de Christ. Mais je dis aussi que nous autres, regardans leur exemple, avons bien juste suject de craindre que leur insultans trop, nous ne soyons un jour trouvés avoir heurté, autant et plus grossièrement qu'eux, contre la mesme pierre. Et comme eux se sont scandalisés de Christ en son abaissement en terre, nous ne le soyons pareillement de son exaltation en mesme lieu.
14. *Ibid.*, 7.

15. *Ibid.*, 9: Mais pour exprimer encore le fonds du mal plus clairement, je dis que nous tous, tant Chrétiens que Juifs, sommes de nature enclins à nous laisser posséder par les maximes et principles que nous avons succé avec le laict de nostre mère et desquels nous avons esté imbus et informés dès notre jeunesse, avant que par l'Esprit de Dieu nous en ayons appris la vraye et naifue vérité.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*, 11.
18. *Ibid.*, 11.
19. *Ibid.*, 16. Cf. Menasseh ben Israel, *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, 124: "the differences [between the Jewish and Christian eschatological expectations] consist only in the circumstance of the time".
20. *Ibid.*, 17.
21. *Ibid.*, 40–48; cf. *Apol. resp.*, 29–30.
22. *Ibid.*, 49.
23. *Ibid.*, 37.
24. *Ibid.*, 38. Cf. Homes, *A Brief Chronology*, 120: in 1658 he received a letter in which Shapira is quoted as having said that some Jerusalem Jews were inclined to acknowledge Christ as the Messiah.
25. Voire nous, qui autrefois avons esté les plus méprisés et déboutés d'entre les hommes, qui avons esté estimés comme la lie et la rachure du monde ... nous voicy à present relevés de la poudre, assis sur des thrônes pour juger ceux qui nous ont jugé autrefois et rendre au double la rétribution à nos adversaires.
26. *Assertion*, 265–282.
27. *Ibid.*, 11–12.
28. See Franckenberg, *Von dem Ohrte der Seelen* (Amsterdam, 1677), 21; Sperber, *Ein feiner Tractatus von Vielerley wunderbarlichen Dingen* (Amsterdam, 1662), 42.
29. *Assertion*, 107–108.
30. *Ibid.*, 355–356.
31. *Ibid.*, 356.
32. *Ibid.*, Préface.
33. *Ibid.*, 183.
34. *Ibid.*, 210.
35. *Ibid.*, 177: le vitre de nostre sensualité et conception humaine, au travers nous regardons et lisons les prophètes, nous fait juger souvent, qu'il y a là tant de divers sujects, de choses de tant différente nature et séparées de si grans intervalles, encore qu'il n'y ait qu'une simple et naïfue vérité qui s'entresuit d'un fil continuel et que les simples pourroyent discerner, moyennant qu'ils eussent mis bas ce vitre et qu'ils regardassant les prophètes d'un oeil simple.
36. *Ibid.*, 180.
37. *Ibid.*

A. FIX

4. DUTCH MILLENARIANISM AND THE ROLE OF REASON: DANIEL DE BREEN AND JOACHIM OUDAAN

I

In a famous article in 1992, Richard Popkin argued that philosophical rationalism was not the only intellectual reaction to the crisis of scepticism that swept Europe in the wake of the Protestant Reformation. Another reaction, which Popkin referred to as the "Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought," attempted to combat scepticism and find truth without using reason as its sole guiding principle. This Third Force involved what Popkin called "strange combinations" of empirical and rationalist thought with theosophic speculations and millenarian interpretations of Scripture.[1]

While Popkin's attention was turned to English and continental writers like Joseph Mede, Henry More, John Dury, and the cosmopolitan Jan Amos Comenius, an interesting example of Third Force thinking arose within The Netherlands in the persons of Daniel De Breen (1594–1664) and Joachim Oudaan (1628–1692) and in a radical religious sect to which they belonged, the Rijnsburg Collegiants. De Breen, Oudaan, and other Collegiants shared many of the views of Popkin's Third Force thinkers, but there were some important differences as well. Popkin's thinkers had religious concerns, especially for the coming of the millennium, and they saw the increase of knowledge and the development of science as a crucial preparation for the millennium.[2] For some Collegiant thinkers, however, millenarianism interacted with reason in a different way: rather than being a force to usher in the millennium reason was instead a recourse accompanying a decline of millennial fervor in the 1670s and 1680s.

Millenarianism was a significant factor in the intellectual and religious world of the seventeenth-century Dutch Republic. Professor van der Wall points out that it was most commonly found among the many nonconformist groups that flourished in the tolerant atmosphere of the Republic, especially in the urbanized provinces of North and South Holland and West Friesland. She also notes that the sources of millenarian ideas in the Republic were largely English

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 49–55.

and German, even when a native Dutchman such as Daniel De Breen or a "naturalized" Dutchman such as Petrus Serrarius actually penned them.[3]

Daniel De Breen was born in Haarlem and attended the States College of Leiden University, where the fledgling Dutch Republic trained its Reformed ministers. He inclined to the more liberal Remonstrant side in the great conflict of ideals and life paths that tore the Dutch Reformed church apart in the last two decades of the sixteenth century and the first two decades of the seventeenth. De Breen served as secretary for the Remonstrant party in its great confrontation with the stricter Contra-Remonstrant faction at the Synod of Dordrecht in 1618–1619. Finding himself and his party on the losing side of the struggle at Dordrecht, De Breen left Holland rather than renounce his convictions. He traveled to, among other places, Strasbourg, where he mixed with a number of millenarian sectaries, including followers of the German spiritualist Kaspar von Schwenkfeld.[4] It was at this time that De Breen's interest in the millennium was born.

In 1621 De Breen returned to Haarlem and began to associate with the Rijnsburg Collegiants, a loose group of religious dissidents many of whom, like the great millennarian Petrus Serarrius (1600–1669), harbored chiliastic sympathies. Also in 1621 De Breen was arrested by the authorities when officials raided an illegal Remonstrant meeting. After being questioned by the city pensionary and mayors, De Breen was released with the admonition not to attend such meetings in the future. Some years later, in 1646, De Breen was among the founders of an Amsterdam branch of the Collegiants.[5]

Many Collegiants were drawn to millenarianism by something like – but also in important ways unlike – the sceptical crisis in European thought that spawned Popkin's Third Force. Collegiant millenarians reacted to what they saw as the corrupt state of religion and all of the established churches of their time. They felt that they lived in a world unholy. Following spiritualist ideas, these Collegiants held that as soon as the church had come into contact with the sinful, secular, and material state under the Emperor Constantine the result had been a steady and tragic fall of the church into decay and debauchery, unchecked by the Reformation, to end only with the expected coming of the millennium. These Collegiants saw the millennium as an escape from a world unholy, a world that would be destroyed when Christ came again.

Like Mede, More, Dury, and others of Popkin's Third Force, De Breen's thought was a mixture of different elements. While many of his works focussed on the millennium, his Scripture interpretation was rationalistic, attempting to adapt holy writ to the demands of natural reason. According to De Breen, Christianity contained nothing that is not in accord with reason. The believer should select as the true religion the one that gives the best rules for divine service and the one that most conforms to reason. Indeed, De Breen would accept no interpretation of Scripture that was contrary to reason or external experience. While Leszek Kolakowski has called De Breen's rationalism "empty phraseology," Popkin has shown how millennial and scientific outlooks often went together as parts of a vital transitional worldview.[6]

II

De Breen's most important millenarian writing was *Van 't Geestelijck Triumpherende Ryck onses Heeren Jesu Christi (Concerning the Triumphant Spiritual Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ)* published in Amsterdam in 1653. Already by the early 1650s there was growing millennial excitement and expectation in Collegiant circles because of the approaching decade, which would include such numerologically promising years as 1660, 1662, and 1666. De Breen began his book by telling his readers that the coming of the kingdom of Christ on earth was a belief held by many of the Church Fathers as well as by Paul in Romans II. But these prophecies had not yet been fulfilled, and mankind still awaited the glorious return of Christ. DeBreen then used the first major portion of his book to convince his readers that the temporal kingdom of Christ would indeed take place.[7] While Mede, Dury, and others spent much time calculating a method for finding out when the prophesies of Daniel and Revelation would be fulfilled, De Breen's arguments for when and how the millennium would appear emerged out of a far darker background, a world filled with unholy kingdoms that had to be destroyed as part of the Second Coming.[8]

Signs of the coming millennium included false Christs (and De Breen was quick to point out that the world was full of false prophets), wars (of which the terrible Thirty Years War gave recent example), famine, pestilence, suppression of the holy by the Roman Pope and Empire, and a general cooling of love and respect toward God. Men will be very careless and disobedient even though the day of Christ's coming has been revealed to them, De Breen continued.[9] Christ will destroy the earthly monarchy that suppresses the holy people. He will bring terrible judgement over the heathen destroyers of Jerusalem, a judgement that will be marked by a fearful darkening of the sun, moon, and heavens. Thus with the fourth and last empire destroyed the holy will rule on earth for a thousand years, after which the devil and evil men will be thrown into the fires. God's judgement over the dead will then take place, followed by God's final destruction of his enemies and the Last Judgement.[10]

With this frightening prognostication De Breen left little doubt that he considered the world prior to the advent of the millennium, the days in which he himself lived, to be a world unholy and deserving of righteous annihilation. The millennium served as a deliverance for God's people from this evil world. De Breen remarked that people could read about all of this in *Revelation* 20:1–11, where the secrets of God and the future state of the church and its enemies at the end of the world are all revealed, in order to give believers comfort in the days of persecution.[11]

De Breen continued his discussion with *Matthew* 5:5, where Christ said that the meek would rule the earth. Many would have it believed, he wrote, that Christ meant only eternal life, not salvation for the holy in this world. But De Breen objected that this would mean that there would be no limits placed upon the tyranny of the Godless in this world, and that the holy would not be delivered from this tyranny until the Last Judgement. De Breen argued that by

the Kingdom of Heaven the Bible meant the Kingdom of the Messiah on earth. Even *Matthew* 13:24, which was often said to refer to the Last Judgement, the resurrection of the dead, and the destruction of heaven and earth, really referred to the destruction of the fourth and last worldly monarchy.[12] Again De Breen emphasized holy destruction of the pre-millennial world, with the kingdom of Christ waiting as a reward.

De Breen's vision was a bipolar one of good versus evil. After the total destruction of the worldly empire the holy people would be placed above other people as rulers. But who were the holy people? They were all true and sincere Christians and the Jews who convert. Their enemies are Antichrist and his godless followers who persecute Christians, confessing Christ in words while denying him in deeds.[13]

Christ's Second Coming will not be in person but in spirit, through the service of the angels, De Breen announced. This coming had to be distinguished from Christ's last coming when he will come in person, appear in clouds, resurrect the dead and take the holy to heaven.[14] Some people believed that Christ's kingdom would be only spiritual, destroying not empires but false religion, having no outer, visible power but only the power of spirit. De Breen admitted that Christ's kingdom would be spiritual and different in nature from worldly kingdoms, but Christ's kingdom would be on the earth and it would destroy worldly kingdoms, he insisted.[15] According to *Matthew* 25, the punishment of the Godless in this first judgement will be eternal: they will be thrown into a fire, "there eternally to remain," while the reward of eternal happiness for the holy will also be eternal, because they will live until the Last Judgement, De Breen added.[16]

Having said that Christ would not erect his kingdom in person but by using messenger angels, De Breen added that Christ would rule his kingdom through his believers. These believers will have heavenly strength, and they will rule over other people of the earth as "Stadtholders of Christ." Yet again De Breen repeated that this new kingdom could only be erected after the total destruction of the Roman Empire, which crucified Christ, and the Roman church, the great Anti-Christ, whose followers will be "expunged from the earth."[17] This great judgement will be carried out not by God's people but by God himself, through hail, fire, thunder and lightening from heaven.[18]

In Christ's kingdom the majesty and glory of the Christian church will be great, De Breen continued. All that peoples' senses enjoy, all that their hearts find desirable, will be in the new kingdom. It will be a change and renewal of the whole world, and all that is needed for man's full blessedness on earth will be provided. It will be a New Jerusalem of great peace and well being. There will be an exceptional knowledge of God's secrets (a point that De Breen does not expand upon as did Dury and Comenius). Exceptional holiness will prevail, and the church will live in peace, free from fear, danger, persecution, and oppression. Temporal pleasures will abound, as will good bodily health and long life. The holy will have the fullness of spiritual gifts, and belief, hope, and love will flourish, De Breen concluded.[19]

Despite descriptions of Christ's kingdom such as De Breen's, the view of the

millennium in Collegiant circles did not produce the confident, hopeful, indeed joyous, feeling often found among English Millennarians. Collegiant millenarianism was based just as much, if not more, on the complete destruction of a world they saw as decayed and sinful. Other Collegiant writers, such as Joachim Oudaan, wrote apocalyptic works depicting a world unholy, a world gone wrong and in rapid decline, hurtling towards its destruction at the hands of a vengeful God. Works such as these had only vaguely millennial overtones, as will be seen below.

From these chiliastic and apocalyptic works the Collegiants developed a picture of a pre-millennial world in such a state of decay that only a miracle such as the millennium could save it. When the millennium failed to appear on the several dates set for it (1660, 1662, 1666) the Collegiants were left with a view of a world unholy, divorced from God's caring and nurturing power, a world essentially secular. Rather than give up in despair, many Collegiants built on this dreary foundation new hopes for reforming the world based on the power of human reason. The ideas of Spinoza, who had many Collegiant friends, most famously reflect these rational reform plans, but there were many other lesser minds pointed in the same direction, such as Jarig Jelles, Pieter Balling, and Johannes Bredenburg.

III

The Collegiant transition from millennial expectations to reliance on human reason can be seen clearly in the work of Joachim Oudaan. Poet and classical scholar, Oudaan was born in 1629 in Rijnsburg, the cradle of Collegiantism, but moved to Rotterdam in 1656. In Rotterdam his interest in millennarianism grew as the years passed, and in 1689 he published a chiliastic work entitled *Bedenkelijke Toepassing op eenige stukken in de Openbaring ... (Thoughtful Application of some parts of Revelation)*, a commentary on the *Book of Revelation* focussing on the prophecy of the seals.

With an apocalyptic outlook, the *Bedenkelijke Toepassing* painted a gloomy picture of a world corrupt and unholy, destined for divine destruction, a destruction that unfolds with the opening of each seal. Peoples, lands, and kingdoms are laid waste for their sins. This dark forecast was only lightened by the opening of the seventh seal, revealing angels sounding trumpets heralding the end of all things.[20] Little hope seemed to be left for humanity and the world it had built. By 1689 all the prime dates for the millennium had passed uneventfully, no doubt further shading Oudaan's dark outlook.

Yet in the very same year that he wrote this story of the world's gloomy end Oudaan wrote a work of religious reform in which he came to rational terms with the fallen world. His *Overwegging eeniger grond-stellingen door J.V.G. in zelfs redenering over de algemeene kerk ter neder gestelt: en der zelver onrechtmatigheid aangewezen(Consideration of some principles made by J.V.G. in his argument about the universal church, and the illegitimacy of the same shown)* outlined the sorry decline of the church since Constantine's time and the corrupt state of the Catholic church of his own day as well as that of its

Protestant "descendants." With the spiritual corruption of all visible churches there were no preachers or religious leaders present in the world on whom pious Christians could rely for guidance, Oudaan declared. In this dark age God no longer granted mankind the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and as a result no one in the world of the seventeenth century had the divine power and infallibility to preach God's truth. Such a divine prophet Oudaan referred to as a "sprekenden Rechter" or a "speaking Judge." There were no such men in the seventeenth century, and therefore the clergy of the various churches possessed no divine abilities or special authority over other people. Thus, if Christians relied on clerical guidance in religious matters it would be like the blind leading the blind.[21]

In the absence of divinely inspired religious leaders, Oudaan declared that man was left with only one option in his search for religious truth: human reason. Each person could only turn to his individual reason. "Since we have no speaking Judge here on earth, and especially none who can show his character with miracles, we have only our own understanding, however great or small ... or our reason, however weak or powerful, and the dictates of our conscience that can be our guide in these matters," Oudann wrote.[22]

Thus for Oudaan, and for other Collegiants as well, human reason was a last resort to fall back on in secular times rather than a glorious device to be used to increase knowledge in preparation for the millennium. By 1689 it was apparent to many Collegiants that no millennium would come – at least any time soon – and thus the growth of rationalism among the Collegiants was not so much a beacon of the future as it was a way of making do in the secular present.

Professor van der Wall notes in her chapter that the sources of millenarian ideas in the Dutch Republic were largely English and German. There was no distinctive "Dutch millenarianism," she concludes. Yet here we see a distinct difference in the role assigned to reason in Dutch Collegiant millenarianism and English-German millenarianism. Perhaps the ideas of this small group of thinkers cannot be made to represent a substantial entity called "Dutch millenarianism." Nevertheless, the view of reason that the Collegiants developed out of millenarianism gave their version of this ancient thought system a distinctively different orientation from that of the millenarianism that Popkin encountered in England and Germany.

Lafayette College

NOTES

1. Richard Popkin, "The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought: Scepticism, Science, and Millennarianism," in Richard Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Leiden, 1992).
2. *Ibid.*, 90–92.
3. See Professor van der Wall's article in this volume.

4. J.P. de Bie, J. Loosjes, *et al., Biographisch Wordenboek van Protestansche godgeleerden in Nederland*, I, 604–605; S.B.J. Zilverberg, *Geloof en Geweten in de zeventiende* eeuw (Bussum, 1971), 29.
5. de Bie, *Biographisch Wordenboek*I, 604–605; A.J. van der Aa, ed., *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden* (Haarlem, 1852–1878), 391–392; on the Collegiants see Andrew Fix, *Prophecy and Reason: the Dutch Collegiants in the Early Enlightenment* (Princeton, 1991).
6. Popkin, *The Third Force,* 90–126; Leszek Kolakowski, *Chretiens sans eglise: la conscience religieuse et le lien confessionnel au XVIIe siecle* (Paris, 1969), 200–201.
7. Daniel De Breen, *Van 't Geestelijck Triumpherend Ruck onses Heeren Jesu Christi* (Amsterdam, 1653), 1.
8. Popkin, *The Third Force*, 92.
9. De Breen, *Van 't Geestelijck*, 97–120, 189–192.
10. *Ibid.*, 141–154.
11. *Ibid.*, 212–213.
12. *Ibid.*, 80–94.
13. *Ibid.*, 2–3.
14. *Ibid.*, 3–4.
15. *Ibid.*, 3, 35–40.
16. *Ibid.*, 178–180.
17. *Ibid.*, 371–390.
18. *Ibid.*, 392–434.
19. *Ibid.*, 437–445.
20. Joachim Oudaan, *Bedenkelijke Toepassing op eenige stukken in de Openbaring: ten proeve voorgestelt* ... (Rotterdam, 1689), 4–124.
21. Joachim Oudaan, *Overwegginge eeniger grond-stellingen door J.V.G. in des zelfs redenering over de algemeene kerk ter neder gestelt: en der zelver onrechtmatigheid aangewezen* (Amsterdam, 1689), 10–21.
22. *Ibid.*, 21.

M. MULSOW

5. WHO WAS THE AUTHOR OF THE *CLAVIS APOCALYPTICA* OF 1651? MILLENARIANISM AND PROPHECY BETWEEN SILESIAN MYSTICISM AND THE HARTLIB CIRCLE

The year 1654 was rather unpleasant, filled with rumours about the beginning of the millennium.[1] Cromwell ruled England, Queen Christina abdicated in Sweden, and Germany was still paralyzed by the horrors of the Thirty Years War. Although peace had finally been made in 1648, there was great discontent, especially in the eastern regions of Bohemia and Silesia, because the treaty of Münster had not restored Protestantism in these regions but had in fact solidified the Catholic rule of the Hapsburgs.[2] A steady flow of refugees continued to leave the region, and there was constant anticipation of new military action against the Catholic side.

In Vienna, nervousness was mounting. A secret correspondence between Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld and John Dury regarding millenarian plans for a unification of all Protestants had been found. The emperor offered a reward of 4000 thaler on the head of the author of a work entitled *Clavis apocalyptica.*[3] The book had come out anonymously in English in 1651, and included a foreword by John Dury in the form of a letter to Samuel Hartlib. Joseph Mede's book of the same title most certainly had served as a guide for it, but in the newer version the predictions were more concrete and the beginning of the millennium was pinpointed for the year 1655.

Knowledge concerning the identity of the author was limited to the presumption that he was German, since the manuscript was written in that language, and that he must have given it to Comenius, who sent it on to Hartlib. There have been numerous suggestions that the author may have been Abraham von Franckenberg,[4] but for all his millenarian views Franckenberg had quite a different conception of the coming of Christ. Besides, Franckenberg died in 1652 whereas the emperor offered the reward in 1654, after having learned the name of a suspect who was still very much alive. Peter Figulus wrote that same year in the beginning of July to Hartlib, telling him

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 57–75.

how he admired the steadfastness of the writer.[5] So who, then, was the actual author?[6]

We may indeed obtain a clue to the solution of this mystery from Abraham von Franckenberg, who had known the author of the *Clavis apocalyptica* and associated with him. The library at Gotha contains a letter written from a physician from Aschersleben, Matthias Engelhart, to Johann Friedrich Münster. This letter, too, was written in 1654, only two weeks prior to the letter from Figulus, and it, too, was apparently a response to rumours of the imperial blood money. Engelhart writes about the recently published *Apocalypsis reserata* and the *Clavis apocalyptica*, and relates something which he had learned about their author from Abraham von Franckenberg before his death in 1652. "In addition, Mister A.V. Franck[enberg] wrote me that the author of the named texts had something complex under preparation at the time, which would be [...] an important work. Mister Güler is a persona politica and a secretary with the duke of Brieg, but does not like his name to be made public."[7]

Who is this Güler? He is Michael Gühler (Güler, Gueler), a revenue- and tax-collector for Georg III, viceroy of the duke, at the court of Brieg in Silesia.[8] We know that his first wedding took place in 1636 in Brieg and that he was born in Gräditz in 1598. He went to school at the Gymnasium of Schweidnitz until 1617; then he traveled through the Holy Roman Empire and stayed for two years in Preßburg (Bratislava). In 1621, he went to Wittenberg where he studied theology and mathematics. After he finished the university in 1626, he returned to Silesia and became *praeceptor* of the children of Georg Friedrich von Senitz. Then, in 1629, Gühler came to Breslau and functioned as a teacher again, now for the children of Adam von Franckenberg und Proschlitz auf Reinersdorf. Maybe it was through that connection with a member of the Franckenberg family that Gühler came in contact with Abraham von Franckenberg.[9] From Breslau he soon went to Brieg to start his career as a revenue-collector.

The court of Brieg, of which we are informed only in broad outline, was Calvinist, and Duke Johann Christian had taken in Bohemian exiles in 1620 after the defeat of the Winter King at the battle of White Mountain. Thus, many of the compensatory ideas which had originated around the Palatine Elector Frederick V after the Bohemian tragedy – one may recall for instance the prophecies of Christoph Kotter – came immediately to Brieg.

A leading purveyor of such ideas was Hans Theodor von Tschesch, who assembled a circle of like-minded people who engaged in the study of mysticism, the Kabbalah, chronology, and the apocalypse.[10] One member of this circle was Abraham von Franckenberg, who in the train of war turmoil (from 1639 onwards Silesia became the main seat of war after the Swedish invasion) left the region and went to Danzig.[11] The works of Jakob Böhme were read and edited in the circle, yet interest was also shown in contemporary natural sciences and scientific chronology. The manuscript of a *Chronologia omnium temporum*, which contained a number of predictions for the future, could also be found in Brieg.[12] It seems to have been written around 1630, at a

time when Gühler was still a young man, possibly by Paul Kaym, who – like Gühler – was a toll collector in the neighboring town of Liegnitz.[13] Incidentally, Tschesch, too, like Franckenberg, fled the war: in 1641 he was supposedly planning to go to the Holy Land but was hindered by pirates from doing so; instead, he went to Holland and from there to Elbing near Danzig, where he died in 1649.

The millenarian circles around Tschesch exchanged views on texts and insights concerning the prophecies of the *Book of Revelation.* Revenue officials like Kaym and Gühler dealt with mathematics and had through this employment a natural affinity for chronology, which was often pursued by mathematicians and astronomers. Gühler cites exegetical and chronological works by Scaliger, Pareus, Graser, Reusner, Calvisius, Krentzheim, Helvicius, Napier, Piscator, Crell and Clüver – an impressive bulk of academic literature.[14] After writing the *Clavis* he seems to have worked on another, 'complex' and 'important' book – at least this is what Franckenberg reported[15] – but we do not know anything further about it.

Already in 1642 one finds Franckenberg corresponding with his old friend Johann Permeier, now living in Frankfurt am Main, about a *Clavis apocalyptica*, possibly the work of Mede that Permeier had offered to send to his friend in Danzig. Franckenberg replies: "I gladly await the clavis and take it (with God) under consideration. ApOcA! is naturally in itself the true Clavis Script[urae] S[anctae] and of the secrets sealed therein, hence also of current times; as to how the clavis of the Apocalypse should be [...] discovered, however, I believe it not to be quite accessible to one (person) alone."[16] Franckenberg seems sceptical about the possibility that one man – like Mede – should be able to interpret the Revelation in a satisfactory manner. Rather, he appears to believe that one can gain results by consulting the entire tradition of commentaries as well as through an exchange between scholars.

Let us suppose that Gühler belonged to the close circle around Franckenberg and had hitherto not been acquainted with Mede's book. In this case, Permeier's sending the book from Frankfurt (known for its book trade) could have been a possible way for him to become familiar with the work. At least one must suppose that Gühler's book was inspired by the discussions that took place in Brieg, Liegnitz, Breslau, Elbing, and Danzig. Franckenberg himself – although he was interested in prophetic chronology[17] – seems to have reserved his opinion when it came to specific datings of the anticipated last days. He was more inclined to a 'subtle' millenarianism in terms of an anticipation of a spiritual renewal.[18]

The German manuscript of the *Clavis* must have reached Hartlib and Dury in England around 1650. It was then translated and made into an English published edition, to which Dury wrote the foreword. In it, Dury makes very clear that he had soon become aware of how much the German work was influenced by Joseph Mede's book of 1627: "In effect I finde that it is an abbridgment of our friend Mr Mede (now with God) his interpretation of the Revelation, with som additions confirming the truth thereof, and applying the same to the present state of affairs in Europe and in Asia, more closely, and

circumstantially than hee did, to show the distinct events which are shortly to bee fulfilled."[19] This was the main difference from Mede: at points where Mede was still vague, the new work tended to specify particular circumstances, applying the calculations to the current political state – and it did this with considerable urgency, as the beginning of the millennium was predicted for the year 1655.

In England the work was quite a sensation, and even Cromwell was apparently influenced by it.[20] On the continent, however, the work was hardly known. This was about to change, though, as an anonymous book was published in 'Christianstadt' in 1653 under the title *Apocalypsis reserata, Das ist: Geöffnete Offenbahrung Johannis.*[21] Here, too, the assertion was made that 1655 was the key year. But most importantly, the reader would find an appendix with a further German text entitled *Clavis apocalyptica.* Textual comparison shows without doubt that it is the very same text which Hartlib and Dury had translated into English; hence, it must be the first edition of the German original by Gühler. 'Christianstadt' may mean the town of Duke Johann Christian, that is, Brieg. In the English version, the more elaborate *Apocalypsis reserata* was made into the second part of the work published by Hartlib and Dury, and was therefore not mentioned in the title. This inverted order has hitherto prevented the bibliographic identification of the German and English works.

The German edition made both the prediction of the onset of the millennium in 1655 and the related decline of the papacy and the Hapsburgs instantaneously known in the empire. In 1654 a reprint was made in Elbing and Danzig, which were already well-established centers of followers of Böhme and Comenius.[22] Vienna's reaction and the offering of a reward on the author's head was only too understandable. It was just as understandable that orthodox theologians like Johann Heinrich Ursinus were asked to write refutations.[23]

How might one suppose that Hartlib obtained a copy of the *Clavis*? Although we can only speculate, there are a few indications based on connections among Brieg and Transylvania, Poland, and England. In his foreword to the English edition of the *Clavis* dated 28 November 1650, Dury had included the letter Comenius had sent to Hartlib together with the German manuscript. Comenius explains: "my son in law hath been away these two weeks, beeing sent to Warsaw, and to Brieg, hee bring's no news but terrors, by reason of the Peace, which is to bee feared will afford nothing but new tortures to the confidences of those that are deserted by it, and excluded from it. Nor are the forerunners hereof wanting."[24] So it may have been Comenius's son-in-law Peter Figulus who, on his short journey to Silesia, had made a stop in Brieg and obtained the *Clavis.* Dury translates Comenius's *Wratislaviam* falsely as *Warsaw*, since what is meant is neither Warsaw nor Bratislava, but Wroclaw (Breslau). In order to report on the rather unpleasant news, Figulus had thus been to the two Silesian towns, Brieg and Breslau.

Now it is no longer surprising that Figulus had written to Hartlib in 1654 praising the steadfastness of the author of *Clavis* – after all, he was one of the few who actually knew the author's identity, and furthermore the one through

whom the manuscript first became publicly known. Gühler had apparently asked Figulus to bring the manuscript out of devastated Silesia, yet urged him to keep his name secret because of his position as a 'politicus.' Comenius at any rate goes directly from describing Figulus's journey to his remarks about the *Clavis* and the *Apocalypsis reserata*: "Behold, here I import unto you these Germane Treatises, concerning the Periods of the Reveleation-times, drawing to an End (Godgrant they may not bee lost, nor fall into other hands) but upon this condition that you shall let us know your Judgment thereof; for to this effect, hee that is the author of them caused them to bee communicated unto us, that whoever should read, should also judg and censure. I have heard a little while ago of this book, that is the true revelation of the Revelations; and that which will bee most comfortable (if hee hath hit right) is, that wee are so near the term prefixed. I praie you communicate this to your men, if yet you have anie Joseph Medes amongst you; but it must first bee translated into English." The fact that Comenius knew about the existence of the text beforehand suggests that he might have sent Figulus to Brieg with the explicit purpose of contacting the author.

There had long existed contacts with Brieg in the circles around Comenius. There was Cyprian Kinner, for example, an old friend of Hartlib's, who since the mid-1630s had collaborated with Bisterfeld and from the mid-1640s also with Comenius: he had started out as Gühler's colleague, a physician in ordinary at the Brieg court. During the years 1646 to 1650, which is the time during which the *Clavis* was most probably written, he was in close association with both Franckenberg and Hartlib.[25] The fact that Gühler was affiliated with the ideas of the Comenius-circle through Franckenberg and Kinner becomes quite evident even by the choice of words of the *Apocalypsis 'reserata'*, this being a widespread metaphor due to Comenius's *Janua linguarum reserata.*

There are still further inquiries which need to be made concerning the relationships of the 'Third Force' described by Richard Popkin[26] with the so-called 'Silesian mysticism' in the works of Gühler and even more so in such persons as Tschesch and Franckenberg. The similarities of the two groups are striking and call into question the hasty pigeonholing of the Silesians under the categories of 'mysticism,' 'escapism,' and 'stoicism.' It would certainly be incorrect to view such texts as the German *Clavis apocalyptica* as nothing but an immediate reaction to or reflection of the war situation and confessional conflicts. First of all, one must note that there existed something of a 'millenarian International.' Comenius alludes to this when he speaks of "anie Joseph Medes amongst you" – which included mutual contacts among such men as Tschesch and Franckenberg, the Dutchman Petrus Serrarius, the Lutheran Georg Lorenz Seidenbecher, John Dury, and Menasseh ben Israel.[27] Secondly, recent research – especially that of Howard Hotson[28] – has made us aware of the fact that the 'scientific' form of millenarianism represented by Alsted, Mede, and their followers was in no way contrary to philologically and humanistically oriented historical research.[29]

The first generation of main-stream Protestants, Hotson argues, broadly agreed in their identification of the papacy as Antichrist. Since, according to

the received Augustinian view of history, the Antichrist was to arise at the end of the millennium, Protestants also generally agreed that the millennium prophesied in *Revelation* 20 was a thousand-year period in the past history of the church. But the Protestant thesis of the corruption of the church through the rise of the papal Antichrist soon generated unprecedentedly thorough investigations into the history of the medieval church. The further Reformation and Counter-Reformation scholars penetrated into the medieval past, the less the period seemed to resemble a Protestant millennium.[30] From this point onwards, one of the academic millenarians' strongest arguments was that, since God had clearly foretold a thousand-year period of prosperity for the church on earth and since no previous period fulfilled that prophecy, the prophecy of the millennium remained to be fulfilled in the future.[31] It is well known how Mede, in his subtle art of constructing 'synchronisms,'[32] had let the prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse elucidate each other.[33] The Brieg manuscript of the *Chronologia omnium temporum* as well as treatises like Johannes Clüver's commentary on the Revelation, which Gühler refers to, remind us of the 'scientific' dimension of the crisis of chronology – connected with names like Joseph Scaliger[34] – out of which seventeenth-century millenarianism could emerge.

As Richard Popkin has shown, this millenarianism was one possible answer to the sceptical crisis of early modern times, and John Dury was not the only one who was impressed by the certitudes that could be obtained from an infallible exegesis of the prophecies. When Hartlib sent Mede's *Clavis* to Dury in Leiden in 1634,[35] he and other members of his circle there felt that they were finally back on solid ground. Thus John Jonston,[36] like Dury a Scot brought up in Poland and moreover a student of Mede, exclaimed that he had finally found "securitas in turbido alias Historiarum oceano"[37] and wrote a treatise called *Naturae constantia*, which attacks common complaints about the decline of the world.[38] Jonston's little work makes abundantly clear that 'Third Force' millenarianism belongs in the context of the stabilization of science, progress, and political reform. This was a conscious and deliberate accomplishment, directed against philosophical and historical skepticism, fatalistic historical pessimism, and an anti-modernist inferiority complex.

The concurrence of chronology, Bible exegesis, and Lullism seemed to yield conclusive certainty, much as the Cartesian philosophy suggested to others, although with the advantage of including theology, politics, and history in the realm of certain knowledge. Naturally, with all the certainty striven for, there existed also debates within the 'Third Force' about which criteria were to be employed for exegetically founded and calculated prophecies, and how directly inferences could be made. Dury had deliberated on this in the foreword of the English *Clavis*, and on the continent one found a similar awareness of the ambivalences attached to too-direct interpretations of the prophecies.

In Gühler's Brieg, the *Clavis* caused considerable upheaval immediately after its publication in German in 1653, which can be seen as an indication for the presence of the text in this particular region. Take, for example, the Lutheran army chaplain Gerstenmayer, a man who had served the Swedes but then after

the war had remained in Brieg. A maid named Rosina had followed an apocalyptic vision and given him a rusty old sword which had been given to her – or so she claimed – by an angel. With it he should decapitate the Roman pope and himself become head of the Protestant church. Friedrich Lucae, who in 1689 recounted this incident, tells us that these events took place "after someone had published a very dangerous booklet under the title: *Apocalypsis reserata, oder die eröffnete Offenbahrung Johannis*, which dealt with the decline of the Pope and other potentates."[39] It is not surprising to find such a prompt reaction in Brieg, since we know that this was the very town where the treatise was written.

At any rate, the army chaplain buckled on his rusty sword and rallied around him a whole group of stray war refugees from Upper Silesia, who were only too happy to comply with the aggressively anti-Catholic and anti-Hapsburg prophecies. After all, in Gühler's work one can read on the "List of forthcoming Coincidences: The last Actus reformationis, sive evacuationis of the Evangelical churches in Silesia [...], the Continuation of wars in those kingdoms/ wherein one can scent the innocent blood of the martyrs" meaning the exiled Silesian Protestants – "[...], a sudden collapse of the strong pillar of the papacy, the rise of an Evangelical leader, a reformation in Germany, Destruction of the city of Rome", etc. etc.[40] All this the *Apocalypsis reserata* claimed to be able to deduce from the Revelation of St. John. And it was in full accordance to this that the army chaplain-'pope' already bestowed upon various of his followers the titles 'bishop of Ferrara,' 'confessionarius,' 'master of ceremonies,' 'commandant of the abode of the angels' and 'treasurer.' The chaplain's group seems to have combined a spontaneous millenarian rebel organization with a secret society – a typical combination for the anarchic condition of the area recently ravaged by the Thirty Years War. This organization, like the prophecy it was based on, remained nothing but an episode, and can be placed somewhere between Christoph Kotter's millenarian compensation for the banishment of the Protestants from Bohemia and the visionary demands of Mikulas Drabik.[41] It may even have been influenced by Drabik, for he had indeed demanded the founding of secret societies.[42]

This episode is in one sense quite informative: since many of the 'Third Force' intellectuals were firmly bound to the millenarian prophecies, the question arises how they reacted when scholarly chronological and exegetic calculations were converted into practical politics, and even to actions of 'primitive rebels,'[43] as was the case with our army chaplain. When Dury spoke of a sword in his foreword to the *Clavis* – exclaiming "when I saie this Sword shall bee thus made use of, and applied; then, and not till then, I shall exspect that the Beast and the fals Prophet shall be taken alive, and destroied" – he was referring to a "Sword of the Spirit" and hardly to the rusty sword that Rosina the maid – recalling the apocalyptic horsemen – had handed the army chaplain.[44] Yet where should one draw the line? The Lutheran Johann Conrad Dannhauer had warned his audience – referring to Piscator, Bisterfeld, and Serrarius as the most important millenarians of the time – in his peace sermon in 1650: "I will not hope that anyone [...] should want to persuade himself or

others [...] that one should now first of all expect the aureorum seculorum of those golden one thousand years, in which Christ will create a magnificent, blissful and joyous worldly kingdom before the end of this world [...]."[45]

In the following attempt to draw the line, I refer to the man mentioned by Dannhauer, namely Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld – one of the less spectacular and yet central activists and theorists within the 'Third Force.'[46] Most of all, Bisterfeld differed from Comenius in the sense that although he was a resolute millenarianist he reacted very sceptically towards the kind of prophecies put forward by Mikulav Drabik. Why? Bisterfeld had millenarian ideas at least since his father-in-law Johann Heinrich Alsted wrote his *Diatribe de mille annis* in 1627.[47] He was well versed in the matter of chronological and exegetic science. And it was probably he who in 1634 – having meanwhile, like Alsted, sought refuge from Herborn in exile in Weißenburg – had formulated the millenarian results of the synod of Transylvania initiated by Dury.[48] Also, he had high regard for the visions of both Christoph Kotter and Christina Poniatowska, and even made predictions himself. In 1643 he was, moreover, engaged in writing a treatise – since then lost – about the course of the coming century.[49] Yet Bisterfeld was never a 'fanatic' or 'enthusiast' in the sense that he believed in a direct intervention of God. This is the difference we now want to turn to, as it will refer us to his philosophy.

The millenarian projections about the Transylvanian dynasty – and thus in the immediate sphere of influence of Bisterfeld's politics – became acute in 1648, the very moment the old Prince Georg Rácócki died and the leadership of the country was put in the hands of both his son Sigismund and his elder brother. The Transylvanian dynasty had already supported the Bohemian Protestants at the beginning of the Thirty Years War, so it was by no means wholly absurd – at least not in the minds of the millenarians – to expect them to be the saviors of evangelical Christianity. Sigismund was very receptive to the projections being made about him. Another matter that played a part in these expectations was the possibility of a so-called 'Calvinoturcism,' the formation of a political coalition with the Ottoman empire in order to fight the Catholic Hapsburgs.[50] Thus the above-mentioned Mikulav Drabik foretold that Sigismund would overpower the Hapsburgs and free Bohemia with the help of the Turks.

Now, Bisterfeld was both the educator and most influential advisor of the young Prince. The letters he wrote to the prince during this time reveal as clearly as do Gühler's activities and Drabik's visions how discontented the Protestants of eastern Europe were with the Peace of Westphalia. On November 22, 1649 Bisterfeld wrote: "Whatever else happens, Christianity will not be rid of war as long as Rome is not torn down. May God grant this, the sooner the better." A little later, on December 31, he became even more explicit: "My hopes for the destruction of Rome are daily confirmed, partly by experience and partly by the Holy Scriptures." And on March 7, 1650 he predicted: "The complete reform will be preceded by both a theological and political chaos."[51] For a time he fixed the date of the end of the Hapsburg monarchy to be the year 1653. Still, Bisterfeld was never one to pressure the

Prince into military action in a vehement manner like Drabik – on the contrary, he tried to curb Drabik's actions.

Expectations reached a peak in 1651 when Sigismund married a daughter of the Winter King. Although she was impoverished, the act was symbolically extremely effective and can be seen as a continuation of the story which Frances Yates has recounted about Frederic, Elector Palatinate, his wife Elisabeth of England, and the Rosicrucians.[52] Sigismund was heir of the elect protagonists of the general Reformation! And it was Comenius himself who developed the idea of a continuation by composing a little text on the occasion of the marriage, entitled *Sermo secretus Nathanis ad Davidem.* In it he renewed the project of a treatise that was written in 1619, following the Rosicrucian books by Andreae, named *Secta Heroica Beatrix Reformatrix.*[53] The motto of this treatise was a verse from *Revelations* 21, and it thus suited well the anticipation of the last days around 1651. Comenius had even moved to Sárospatak, where the Rákóczis resided, and summoned there a 'heroic sect,' a secret society of the kind he had already designated the *Collegium lucis.*[54] What the men of the 'Third Force' – including Drabik's prophecies about Sigismund being the premillenarian destroyer of Catholicism – had in mind here was actually not all that different (though naturally on a bigger, courtly scale) from the secret society the army chaplain Gerstenmayer had shortly after organized on a small scale in the ruins of postwar Brieg.

Only Bisterfeld remained somewhat sceptical about all this. He wasn't very fond of Drabik, even if only for reasons of rivalry: they both competed for the post of first millenarian advisor of the prince.[55] When Sigismund then unexpectedly died in 1652, it was Drabik who embarrassingly enough heard about it too late, having just boastfully predicted that Sigismund was to become king of Hungary. Even before, he had occasionally warned the Rákóczis that if they would not take immediate action against the Hapsburgs this eschatological task would be taken over by the northern people (i.e., the Swedes) and the Rákóczis would be annihilated.[56] All this may have given Bisterfeld reason to express his doubts about the visionary.

It is worth examining more closely the philosophical and theological reasons that may have played a part in Bisterfeld's disillusion as well. After 1651 Bisterfeld had several disputes with Comenius – who was still adhering to Drabik – about these matters. The difference of opinion lay mainly in Bisterfeld's criterion, according to which God lets his plans be fulfilled only by human beings and thus makes their success dependent on the prudence and energy of these persons. The claim of an alleged prophet that his wishes were godly was not enough of a legitimation, especially if these wishes were not reconcilable with prudence.[57] Bisterfeld's scepticism fits in with the circumstances: ever since the times of abundant millenarian visions there had been an increase of literature about pseudoprophets and impostors down to the books by Rocoles and Van Dale.[58]

The criteria for true prophecy bring me to the question concerning the fundamentals of the 'Third Force': what was the relationship between millenarianism and pansophy?[59] After all, pansophy is not only the universal

knowledge enabling a *Collegium lucis* to prepare the unity of all men through a wisdom of the world. In Bisterfeld's understanding, pansophy included a prudential factor. Bisterfeld's criterion, according to which prophetic plans must correspond with prudent political action, refers to what he called his 'symbiotics.' In the posthumously published *Sciagraphia symbiotica* he defined symbiotics as prudence with regard to society.[60] Obviously it was an attempt to bring together the discourse of the *prudentia civilis*, which in an Aristotelian sense should lead to a happy community, and pansophic speculations.[61] Bisterfeld brings this about through the idea of the Trinity, which is invoked as the primary example of a panharmonious personal union. Theorists such as Bisterfeld and Comenius had outlined their Trinitarian thinking through conflicts with the Socinians in Poland, Moravia, and Transylvania. The refutation of the Socinian Johann Crell was in fact the beginning of Bisterfeld's European literary activities.[62] Even Hebraists like Johann Stephan Rittangel, who was acquainted with Bisterfeld[63] and had spent time in England with Comenius, defended the Trinitarian doctrine against Socinians and Jews. For them, the study of the Kabbalah became a foremost means of converting the Jews – this being a prerequisite for the millennium – since in it they believed they could find first impressions of the Trinity.[64]

All these diverse motivations, however important to Bisterfeld's intellectual horizon, cannot be followed up here and must be left for another occasion.[65] Yet the Trinity was exemplary for Bisterfeld's social ontology in the sense that in it the community of intelligent people was thought to follow the model of an *immeatio*[66] and the hypostatic union of human and godly nature in Christ[67] – that is, a highly complex structure of interrelated independent agents being mutually constrained and connected. A similar structure can, according to Bisterfeld, already be observed in nature. In this context, prudence would mean handling the nature of things in a right manner. This means utilizing natural interrelations as effects of intensification – quite in Francis Bacon's sense – and avoiding their repugnancy.[68] This perspective's vanishing point was thus a sort of restitution of previously conflicting relations, i.e., something that Bisterfeld's colleague Georg Ritschel had called a reconciliation through a return to consensus.[69]

Therefore – and this answers our question – it was the duty of a millenarian politician who was to restore stable and nonrepugnant conditions through a chronological exegesis of John, to do so only by means of a careful consideration of the natural circumstances. One possible background for this idea of restitution may have been the kabbalistic (*Tikkun*) and Origenian notion of the restitution of all things. At least the assumption of such an idea explains the corrective Bisterfeld sets against Drabik's politically immediate activism, which was in no way mediated by a prudent assessment of realist politics.[70]

These reflections should help reconstruct at least a facet of the complex mental world in which such men as Gühler, Kaym, Tschesch, Franckenberg, Bisterfeld, and Rittangel acted: whether they argued against Socinians and Jews whilst forming alliances with Sweden or France; whether they pursued

both kabbalistic speculations about the Hebraic protolanguage or the plans of an international academy of scholars to form a secret society; whether they set up a chronology ranging from Adam to the coming century as well as attempted to convert both pagans and Jews and to bring about the fall of the Hapsburgs; and finally, whether they defended the Trinity or the constancy of nature and articulated a theory concerning the connection of all things with one another. The publication of a text like the *Clavis apocalyptica* must be seen in this context, both with respect to its origin and its effect. When the author of the text, Michael Gühler, first pressed the manuscript in the hands of Peter Figulus, who may have expressly made the journey to fetch it, he naturally could not have had any idea of what kind of resonance his text might produce. Strictly speaking, he didn't need to. After all, in only a few years – this was Gühler's conviction – the millennium would, in any event, begin.[71]

University of Munich

NOTES

1. I am grateful to Joachim Telle for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper. I would also like to thank Janita Hämäläinen, who translated the text from German into English, and Howard Hotson, who emended the translation in many respects.
2. For the situation in Silesia, see *Deutsche Geschichte im Osten Europas. Vol. 3: Schlesien*, ed. Norbert Conrads (Berlin, 1994). For the millenarian currents of this time, see Heinrich Corrodi, *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus* (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1781–83); Roland Haase, *Das Problem des Chiliasmus und der Dreißigjährige Krieg* (Leipzig, 1933). There is no more recent treatment of this whole complex. Among the older literature see also Dietrich Korn, *Das Thema des Jüngsten Tages in der deutschen Literatur des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1957).
3. See Milena Blekastad, *Comenius. Versuch eines Umrisses von Leben, Werk und Schicksal des Jan Amos Komenský* (Oslo and Prague, 1969), 527.
4. The origin of these suggestions (and assertions) seems to be Jan Kvacsala's *Johann Amos Comenius* (Berlin, Leipzig, Wien, 1892), 323f. After Kvacsala one can find the attribution to Franckenberg in many writings: Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Religion, Reformation and Social Change*; German translation: *Religion, Reformation und sozialer Umbruch* (Frankfurt, 1970), 319, 322, 331; Elisabeth Labrousse, *L'entree de Saturne au Lion* (La Haye, 1974), 7f.; Henri Méchoulan und Gérard Nahon, 'Introduction' to Menasseh ben Israel, *The Hope of Israel,* English translation by Moses Wall, 1652 (Oxford, 1987); Ernestine E.G. van der Wall, *De mystieke chiliast Petrus Serrarius (1600–1669) en zijn wereld* (Leiden, 1987), 159; R.H. Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth Century Thought* (Leiden, 1992), 96; Susanna Åkerman, *Queen Christina of Sweden and her Circle: the transformation of a philosophical libertine* (Leiden, 1991), 163; John Schulitz, *Jakob Böhme und die Kabbalah. Eine vergleichende Werkanalyse* (Frankfurt, 1993), 20; and others.
5. Peter Figulus to Samuel Hartlib, 3. 7. 1654, Letter CXLII in *Korrespondence Jana Amosa Komenského. Listy Komenského a vrstníku jeho*, ed. Jan Kvacsala, 2 vols. (Prague, 1898 and 1902), vol. 1, 187. The letter is also accessible in the CD-ROM-edition of the Hartlib Papers (Sheffield University Library), HP 43/46b.
6. Bisterfeld, too, has occasionally been mentioned as a possible author. See Blekastad (footnote 3), 527.
7. Matthias Engelhart to Johann Friedrich Münster, 18. 6. 1654, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek Gotha, Chart. A 413, Bl. 217r–222v, here Bl. 221r: "Sonst hat mir vor

diesen herr A. V. Franck. geschrieben, das bemeldten scripti Autor itzo ettwas weitleuftiges unter handen hette, welches [...] j stattliches und wichtiges werck sein würde. Herr Güler ist j Persona Politica, u. Secretarius beym Hertzogen zum Brieg, wil aber nicht gern, das man seinem nahmen solle melden."; partly cited in: Abraham von Franckenberg, *Briefwechsel,* ed. Joachim Telle (Stuttgart, 1995), 322.

8. There is scarcely any biographical information about Gühler available. No entry on him is included in the 'Deutsches biograhisches Archiv' (DBA). Only a few older writings mention Gühler or the *Apocalypsis reserata*: Friedrich Lucae, *Schlesische curieuse Denkwürdigkeiten,* 1689, 436–439 (without Gühler's name); Gottlieb Wernsdorf (praes.) / Gotthelf Liefmann (resp. et auctor), *Dissertatio de fanaticis Silesiorum speciatim Quirino Kuhlmanno* (Wittenberg, 1693), § XII; this book contains an attribution of the *Apocalypsis reserata* to Gühler which is apparently independent from Franckenberg's report to Engelhart (although in this source Gühler's first name is given as 'Martin'): "Firmabat hominum errores libellus brevi ante Ao. 1653 Christianopoli in publicum emissus, quem Auctor Martinus Gühlerus, t. t. Georgii Princ. Breg. reditum praefectus vocavit Apocalypsis reseratum, in quo multa de die judicii extremi, Papae interitu, novo Christi regno, aliisque capitibus fanaticis propriis praefractae scribuntur." See further Gustav Koffmane, *Die religiösen Bewegungen in der evangelischen Kirche Schlesiens während des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Breslau, 1880), 43. For more recent mention, see Pierre Béhar *Silesia tragica. Epanouissement et fin de l'école dramatique silésienne dans l'oeuvre tragique de Daniel Casper von Lohenstein (1635–1683)*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1988), 40, 385. In addition, Klaus Conersmann names some officials of the court of Brieg in his review of Ernst-Peter Wieckenberg's edition of the *Sinngedichte* of Friedrich Logau, in *Arbitrium*, vol. 5, 1987, 158–161; from this review I take the description of Gühler's work. (I thank Wolfgang Harms for the reference to this work). Conersmann indicates the source of his information as Wenzel Scherffer von Scherffenstein, *Geist= und Weltlicher Gedichte Erster Teil* (Brieg, 1652, repr. Tübingen, 1997, ed. Ewa Pietrzak). Gühler is mentioned in the Afterword. The Hartlib Papers do not mention the name Gühler. See also the *Katalog der Stolberger Leichenpredigtsammlungen* and Hans Heckel, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur in Schlesien. Vol. I: Von den Anfängen bis zum Ausgange des Barock* (Breslau, 1929), 297f. That Gühler was 'doctor' (of theology?) can possibly be inferred from the phrase "written by a Germane D" in the title of the English *Clavis*: see footnote 19.

9. For the wedding, see the indication of the printed Epithalamium of October 14th, 1636 (and for the second wedding of September 12th, 1645) in Wenzel Scherffer von Scherffenstein (footnote 8), Afterword, 13*. (See also *Wolfenbütteler Barocknachrichten*, vol. 23, 1996, 2). According to Scherffenstein, Gühler was "Brother" and "friend of the Muses": see 324. I am grateful to Urszula Bonter, who found a short printed description of Gühler's life in the library at Wroclaw: *Bey Christlicher Sepultur und Ehren-Gedächtnüß / Des weiland Ehrenvesten / Wolbenambten und Wolgelährten / Herren Michael Gülers / Fürstl. Briegischen RentMeisters und dieses Fürstenthumbs OberSteuer-Einnehmers / Welcher den 22. Junii instehenden 1655sten Jahres / war der Dinstag vor S. Johann. Baptist. zwischen 11. und 12. zu Mittage allhier zum Brieg im Herren sanfft und seelig verschieden [...] zum Druck übergeben von Johanne Letschio der Pfarrkirchen daselbst Pastorem [...]*, Brieg [1655], 8 pages. From this description I take most of the information about Gühler's life. See esp. fol. 3* (text without pagination): "Weil aber bald darauff die *Religions-reformation* im Schweidnitzschen Fürstenthum fürgangen / hat Er seine Loßlassung leichtlich wieder erlanget / und sich hierauf nach Breßlau begeben, allwo der treue GOtt schon weiter für Ihn gesorget / in dem der Wohl Edle Gestrenge und Hochbenamte Herr Adam von Franckenberg und Proschlitz auf Reinersdorf / Fürstlicher Liegn. Briegischer Rath und Haubtmann zu Kreutzburg und Pitschen, Ihn von dar abholen lassen / und zu seiner Söhne *Praeceptore* angenohmmen / auch noch selbiges Jahr an Martini anhero nacher Brieg verschickt; Da er denn durch diese gelegenheit folgendes 1630gste Jahr an Georgi / an weiland Hr. Matthes Kloses Fürstl. Brieg. Rentmeisters / seeligen andenckens / tisch behausung und Kundschaft gerathen / und bey Ihme verblieben bis Ao. 1634." Through Klose Gühler got into the circles of the financial bureaucrats of the court of duke Johann Christian of Brieg. When Johann Güttner, the 'Rentschreiber' died in 1637, Gühler followed him in his post. In 1640, Gühler became Adjunctus of his patron Klose, the Rentmeister, and

in 1643 he succeded Klose in this function. In 1654, Gühler became sick and died on 22. 6. 1655.

10. For Tschesch (1595–1649), see Koffmane (footnote 8), 25–38; Winfried Zeller, 'Augustin Fuhrmann und Johann Theodor von Tschesch', in his *Theologie und Frömmigkeit. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, vol. 1 (Marburg, 1971), 117–153; Siegfried Wollgast, *Philosophie in Deutschland 1550–1650*, 2d ed. (Berlin, 1993), 762–775; Ewa Pietrzak, 'Tschesch', in Walter Killy, ed., *Literaturlexikon* (Gütersloh and Munich, 1991), Vol. 11, 432f.
11. For Franckenberg (1593–1652), see Hubert Schrade, *Beiträge zu den deutschen Mystikern des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts. II: Abraham von Franckenberg* (Heidelberg, 1923); Wollgast (footnote 10), 775–799; Joachim Telle in his introduction to Franckenberg, *Briefwechsel* (footnote 7).
12. See Béhar (footnote 7), 438f. Before the Second World War, the manuscript was in the Städtische Bibliothek zu Breslau, Kollektion Rehdinger. It contains predictions until the year 2080.
13. For Kaym (who died in 1633) see DBA 632, 431–433. Kaym published under the pseudonym P.K. See his Explication of the Song of Solomon, of the Revelation of St. John, *Von alten und neuen Menschen, Vom Kreutz und Trost der Gläubigen.*
14. Joseph Justus Scaliger, *Thesaurus temporum* (Paris, 1606); idem: *Opus novum de emendatione temporum* (Paris, 1583); David Pareus, *In divinam apocalypsin S. Apostoli Joannis commentarius* (Heidelberg, 1618); Konrad Graser, *Historia antichristi* (Leiden, 1608); Elias Reusner, *Commentariolus de vera annorum mundi ad natum Christum supputatione* (Jena, 1600); Sethus Calvisius, *Chronologia* (Leipzig, 1605); idem, *Opus chronologicum* (Frankfurt, 1620); Leonhard Krentzheim, *Chronologia* (Görlitz, 1577); Christoph Helwig, *Theatrum historicum* (Gießen, 1609); John Napier, *A plaine discovery of the whole Revelation of Saint John* (Edinburgh, 1593); Johann Piscator, *In Apocalypsin commentarius* (Herborn, 1613); Paul Crell, *Evangelium unseres Herrn Jesu Christi* (1571); Johannes Clüver, *Historiarum totius mundi epitome* (Rostock, 1637); idem, *Diluculum apocalypticum seu commentarius posthumus in apocalypsin*, ed. Michael Clüver (Stralsund, 1647). The possible influences that Gühler may have received during his stay at Wittenberg university, 1621–1626, are a subject for future research.
15. See the letter cited in footnote 7.
16. Abraham von Franckenberg to Johann Permeier, in A. von Franckenberg, *Briefwechsel* (footnote 7), 159: "Den clavem wil ich erwarten und mein weniges Bedencken (mit Gott) gar gerne eröffnen. ApOcA! ist freilich selber der rechte Clavis Script[urae] S[anctae] und dehrer darinnen versigelten Geheimnüßen, also auch itziger Zeiten; wie aber der clavis über Apocalypsin [...] zu finden, achte ich, Einem allein nicht ganz eröffnet zu sein." Franckenberg continues: "Es hat zwar vor 200 Jahren (wie mich H[err] D[aniel] R[udolph] berichtet) zue leyden ein Anonymus über Apocal[ypsin] geschrieben und dzselbige Buch gantz Einig auf den Menschen allein appliciret, welches dann ein feines Licht geben möchte, wenn man selbiges B[uch] zu leyden (aldar es im M[anu]S[crip]to noch vorhanden sein sol) erlangen und publiciren köndte. Fast dergleichen hat auch D[avid] Joris, doch particular und partheiisch, etwas ediret. So ist für anderen opus mirabile Pauli Bruni al[ias] Lautensacks so wol in M[anu]S[crip]tis als im druck unterschiedlich bekandt. Und hat H[err] J[ohann] T[homas] A[grivillensis] BUREUS, Prof[essor] zu Upsal, einen besonderen Clavem Theosophicam Prophetico-Apostolicam in seiner Fama Scanziana uff 2 bogen in 8° 1616, item in Tab[ula] Smaragdina Chronol[ogica] Cherubinica in fol[io] patenti angedeutet per Nuncios, Signa, Sydera, Stellas, Radios, worumb ich Ihme neulich über Coppenhagen durch H[errn] R[itt]m[eiste]r G[eorg] Maeß daselbst geschrieben etc[etera]. Aber CHR[istu]S JH[esu]S ist selber der Schlüßel u[nd] Ausleger, nach deme es zu einer oder der anderen (VII) Zeit nötig etc[etera]."
17. See e.g., Franckenberg to Permeier 1. 8. 1638, *Briefwechsel* (footnote 7), 113, in regard to the Görlitz mathematician Bartholomaeus Scultetus, *Diarium humanitatis Christi*, Frankfurt/Oder, 1600; see also 46–48.
18. For 'subtle' millenarianism, see Walter Sparn, '*Chiliasmus crassus* und *Chiliasmus subtilis* im Jahrhundert Comenius'. Eine mentalitätsgeschichtliche Skizze,' in Norbert Kotowski and Jan

B. Lasek, eds., *Johann Amos Comenius und die Genese des modernen Europa* (Fürth, 1992), 122–129.

19. *Clavis apocalyptica, or / A Prophetical KEY, by which The Great Mysteries in the Revelelation of St. John, and in the Prophet Daniel are opened / It beeing made apparent that the Prophetical Numbres com to an end with the year of our Lord, 1655. Written by a Germane D, and now translated out of High Dutch* (London, 1651), 'An Epistolical Discours, from Mr John Durie to Mr Sam. Hartlib, concerning this Exposition of the Revelation. By waie of Preface thereunto', 11.
20. For millenarianism in England, see Bryan W. Ball, *A Great Expectation. Eschatological Thought in English Protestantism to 1660* (London, 1975); Richard Bauckham, *Tudor apocalypse: sixteenth century apocalypicism, millenarianism and the English Reformation* (Oxford, 1978); Bernard Capp, 'Chiliasm in the English Revolution', *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 14, 1988 (*Chiliasmus in Deutschland und England im 17. Jahrhundert*), 125–130; Peter Toon, ed., *The Millenium and the Future of Israel* (Cambridge, 1970).
21. *Apocalypsis RESERATA / das ist / Geöffnete Offenbarung / Johannis darinnen Nach ge-/ machter einteilung der Zeiten deß Newen Testaments / in / Das Reich des Drachens; / Die Statthalterey des Antichrists; / Der Ruhige Zustand der Kirchen / im Reich Christi / Durch erklärung des XI. und XVI. Cap. gezeiget wird / Waß bey diesen unsern Zeiten / 1. Bißher erfüllet worden; / Jetzund in vollem effect stehet; / 3. Und nunmer in bald künfftigen jaren zugewarten ist. / Apocal. c. XXII. v. 12. / Siehe ich komme bald / und mein Lohn mit mir / zugeben einem jeglichen / wie sein Wercke sein werden. / Christianstadt / Auff Kosten Christian Cassubens / 1653.*
22. *APOCALYPSIS / reserata. / Das ist / Geöfnete / Offenbarung / Johannis / Darinnen [...] 1654 / Elbingen / auff Kosten Jacob Weißens.* Jakob Weiß was a printer in Danzig. See J. Benzing, *Deutsche Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts* (1977).
23. Compare Johann Heinrich Ursinus, *Richtiges Zeigerhändlein Oder Christliche / in H. Schrifft und den fürnembsten newesten Außlegern wolgegründte Einleitung in das göttliche Buch der heimlichen Offenbahrung S. Johannis / Darinnen sonderlich das erdichtete tausendjährige Friedensreich auff Erden / gründlich widerleget / und vor solchem Schwarm alle vernünfftige Christen trewlich gewarnet werden / Allerhand Irrwischen der newen Chiliastischen Propheten / und sonderlich deß Liechtschewenden Eröffneter Offenbahrung / jüngst Anno 1653. außgestrewet / entgegen gesetzet / Neben einer Vorrede / was von allen zu diesen letzten Zeiten entstandenen Gern-Propheten beständig zu halten seye?* (Frankfurt, 1654). Ursinus was a minister in Speyer. The 341-page book opens with a dedication to the city officials of Frankfurt/Main by the printer Christian Hermsdorff: "[...] Wann dann unter vielen unzahlbaren Gattungen der Enthusiastischen Schwärmer / davon in folgenden Discurs / damit E.E.E. Hochweißh. und Herrlichk. nicht zu lang auffgehalten werde / sonderlich eine Zeit hero die Chiliastische Propheten sich dapffer an Laden geleget / und unter dem Traum eines bald vor der Thür stehenden tausendjährigen Friedensreichs / nicht allein einen in Ewigkeit unverantwortlichen Eckel und Verdruß der dieser letzten undanckbaren Welt so reichlich bewiesener Gnaden Gottes; sondern auch dazu einen verdamlichen / zur offenbaren sedition und Auffruhr außstehenden Haß / gegen dem H. Predigampt / und werthen Stand der lieben Obrigkeit / in die newsichtige / und zu allen Mutationen und Veränderungen / verpichte Hertzen der murrisch unnd ungedultigen Menschen / einzutrucken sich unterstanden; auch im nechst zuruck gelegten Jahr ein Lucifuga Anonymus, und liechtschewender Irrwisch / der seine Kunst und Wissenschafft zu Gottes Ehr wol besser hätte anwenden sollen / und können / solchen Chiliastischen Irrthumb / welchem bißher alle rechtschaffene Evangelische Theologi standhafftig und einhelliglich widersprochen / unter dem Namen eines Evangelischen Scribenten in seiner Apocalypsi Reserata oder geöffneten Offenbarung Johannis / und andern derselben beygefügten Scarteken zu behaupten unterfangen / den Anfang solches Chiliastischen-Utopischen / Schlauraffenländischen Reichs ins nechst bevorstehende 1655. Jahr gesetzet / seinen Traum auff lauter bodenlose Einbildungen gegründet / und durch Lästerungen der Majestaten auff Erden / auff Eingeben ohne Zweiffel deß höllischen Friedensstörigen Morphei, unser reine in Gottes Wort unbeweglich stehende / und durch jüngsten thewrerworbenen Friedenschluß / auß sonderbarer Göttlicher Vorsorg / auffs new im

Röm. Reich stabiliret, unnd befestigte Kirch / der ungeänderten Augspurgischen Confession / die mit solchen Schwärmern nie kein Theil gehabt / auch nimmermehr haben wird oder kan / in bösen Verdacht zu ziehen / bey den Widersachern verhaßt / und verschimpfft zu machen / auch die höchste Häupter auff Erden widereinander zuverbittern / und die Wunden / welche durch so langwürige Unruhe gehawen / durch den allgemeinen Frieden aber wider verbunden / und etwa noch mit allerdings zur gäntzlichen Heilung kommen seynd / widerumb auffzureissen / sich erkünet." It was, eventually, through the Jesuits that the Vienna court managed to identify Gühler as the author. See the letter from Figulus to Hartlib (footnote 5): "The Iesuits have learnt who is the Author of Clavis Apocalyptica, which You have translated and printed in English, and the Emperor hath set 4000 Rixdollars upon his head."

24. Comenius to Hartlib, in *Clavis Apocalyptica* (footnote 19), 'Epistolical Discours', 2f.: "Gener meus per duas Hebdomades abfuit Wratislaviam missus et Brigam, nihil adfert praeter terrores, per Pacem, quae derelictis, et a Pace exclusis nihil praeter novas conscientiae carnificationes allatura metuitur; et prodromi non absunt. Tractatus Germanicos (de Periodicis Apocalypticis ad finem decurrentibus) en communico tibi: faxit Deus ut haec ne pereant; neque in alienus veniant manus. Sed ea lege ut Judicium de his expromas. hujus enim elliciendi voluit auctor, ut quisquis legeret, judicet simul, et censuram addat. Audivi de isto libello jam nuper veram esse Apocalypsoon Apocalypsin: et quod maxime solabitur (si rem acu tetigerit) quod a termino prope absimus. Communica quaeso vestis; si quos Josephos Medes habetis; sed erit in vestratem linguam transferendum."
25. For Kinner see Blekastad (footnote 3), 402f and passim; 415 for the contacts that Kinner had. See also the remarks on Kinner's studies of the Caraites and the Areopagites in Transylvania, 415, 403, 447; for Kinner see further George H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius* (London, 1947), 383–440.
26. Richard H. Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth Century Thought* (footnote 4).
27. See Johannes Wallmann, 'Reich Gottes und Chiliasmus in der lutherischen Orthodoxie', in his *Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (Tübingen, 1995), 105–123, esp. 118ff.; Ernestine G.E. van der Wall, 'Chiliasmus sanctus. De toekomstverwachting van Georg Lorenz Seidenbecher', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, vol. 63, 1983, 69–83. For millenarianism in Lutheran culture in the 16th century see Robin B. Barnes, *Prophecy and Gnosis. Apocalypticism in the Wake of the Lutheran Reformation* (Stanford, 1988). For Menasseh see Yosef Kaplan, Henri Mechoulan, and Richard H. Popkin, eds., *Menasseh ben Israel and his World* (Leiden, 1989).
28. Howard Hotson, 'The Historiographical Origins of Calvinist Millenarism', in Bruce Gordon, ed., *Protestant History and Identity in Sixteenth-Century Europe*, vol. 2: *The Later Reformation* (Aldershot, 1996), 159–181.
29. For the somewhat similar case of the Daniel prophecy, see Arno Seifert, *Der Rückzug der biblischen Prophetie von der neueren Geschichte. Studien zur Geschichte der Reichstheologie des frühneuzeitlichen deutschen Protestantismus* (Köln and Wien, 1990).
30. The prophecies of the Book of Daniel are significantly different in this respect. The sneaking 'preterition' of the prophecy was a more linear process – although the Coccejans objected to the 'preterist' argument. See Seifert (footnote 29), 120ff.; see also Ernestine E.G. van der Wall: 'Orthodoxy and Scepticism in the Early Dutch Enlightenment', in Richard H. Popkin und Arjo Vanderjagt, eds., *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden, 1993), 121–141, for the seventeenth-century perception of Coccejanism and Cartesianism as parallel phenomena in regard to their claims of rationality and certainty.
31. Hotson (footnote 28), 180f.: "External criteria could not, it seems, be extended to an entire thousand-year period. Internal criteria could not be restricted to a mere thousand-year period. The spiritualised, Augustinian conception of the nature of the millenium could only be fully harmonised with the spiritualised, Augustinian conception of the duration of the millenium. Recognition of this dilemma provides an altered perspective on the problem of the origins of Calvinist millenarism. The logic which first drove senior seventeenth-century Reformed theologians to place the millenium in the future is not to be found merely in soaring expectations for the future, much less in radical programmes of political transformation. It must also be sought in the theological and historiographical difficulties encountered by their

sixteenth-century predecessors in attempting to find somewhere else to put it, the difficulty, that is, of accessing their place in sacred history, of establishing a historical identity." Arno Seifert, 'Von der heiligen zur philosophischen Geschichte. Die Rationalisierung der universalhistorischen Erkenntnis im Zeitalter der Aufklärung,' *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, vol. 68, 1986, 81–117, esp. 102f., has not compared the preterition of the millenium with the preterition of the Daniel prophecy, but the general preterition of the whole apocalyptic prophecy through Grotius and Hammond – which was in turn already a reaction to millenarians like Brightman. For this reason Seifert does not recognise the opposition in the tendencies of preterition of Daniel prophecy and criticism of preterition in regard to the Revelation of St. John around 1600.

32. 'Synchronismus' is a term from universal history and chronology. See, e.g., Theodor Berger, *Historiam universalem per synchronismum tradendam [...]* (Leipzig, 1728).
33. For Mede's *Clavis* see Katherine R. Firth, *The Apocalyptic Tradition in Reformation Britain 1530–1645* (Oxford, 1979), chap. VI; Leroy Froom, *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers* (Washington, 1948), vol. II, 542ff.; Ernest Lee Tuveson, *Millenium and Utopia* (Gloucester, 1972), 76–85.
34. See Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger*, Vol. 2, (Oxford, 1993).
35. This is Richard Popkin's conjecture in *The Third Force in Seventeeth-Century Thought* (footnote 4), 96.
36. See Peter Geierhaas, *Bildungs- und Wissenschaftskonzepte unter dem Einfluß des Chiliasmus im 17. Jahrhundert*, unpublished Magisterarbeit (München, 1989).
37. John Jonston, *Naturae constantia: Seu diatribe, I qua, per posteriorum temporum cum prioribus collationem, Mundum, nec ratione sui totius, nec ratione partium, universaliter & perpetuo in pejus ruere, ostenditur* (Amsterdam, 1634), 74. Jonston's teacher was Konrad Graser, the author of the millenarian *Historia antichristi* (Leiden, 1608); see Geierhaas (footnote 36), 117. Graser and Johannes Clüver are prominent in Jonston's treatise. The decisive certainty emerges, according to Jonston, through the 'synchronism' of the exegesis of Daniel (which is relevant for profane history) with the exegesis of the Revelation of St. John (which is relevant for ecclesiastical history). This was the specific achievement of Mede, Jonston claimed. Thus the "amicus honorandus Joseph Mede," whose student Jonston was in 1631 when he studied in Cambridge, is also rendered prominent by Jonston. See his *Naturae constantia*, 129–132.
38. The book is based on George Hakewill, *An Apologie or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God in the Government of the World or An Examination and Censure of the Common errour touching Natures Perpetuall and Universall Decay* (Oxford, 1627).
39. Friedrich Lucae (footnote 8), 437: "Kurtz vorher hatte einer ein sehr gefährliches Büchlein heraus gegeben / unter dem Titul, Apocalypsis reserata, oder eröffnete Offenbahrung Johannis. [...] Weil es viel redet von deß Pabsts und anderer Potentaten Untergang / setzten es jene gleichfalls zum Grund ihres Vorhabens." The names are mentioned in Werensfels/ Liepmann: *Dissertatio de fanaticis silesiorum* (footnote 8), § XII.
40. *Apocalypsis reserata* (footnote 21), sheet E2v: "Der letzte Actus reformationis, sive evacuationis der Evangelischen Kirchen in Schlesien [...], Die Continuation der Kriege in denen Königreichen / darinnen das unschuldige Blut der Märtyrer gerochen wird [...] Plötzlicher fall der starcken Seule des Papstumbs, Zerstörung der Stat Rom."
41. For Drabík see Blekastad (footnote 3), passim.
42. See Drabík's visions are printed in the volume *Lux in tenebris Hoc est Prophetiae Donum quo Deus Ecclesiam Evangelicam (: in Regno Bohemiae & incorporatis Provinciis:) sub tempus horrendae ejus pro Evangelio persequtionis, extremaeque dissipationis, ornare, ac paterne solari, dignatus est*, Amsterdam, 1657, edited by Comenius; the visions circulated in a certain milieu already before they were collected and printed, especially in the years around 1652. See Blekastad (footnote 3), 506f.
43. Compare Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels* (New York, 1959).
44. John Dury, 'An Epistolical Discours' (footnote 19), 79. Compare also what Abraham von Franckenberg said in regard to Ludwig Friedrich Giffteil. Franckenberg, *Briefwechsel* (footnote 7), 46, 165ff., 242–252.

45. Johann Conrad Dannhauer, *Christliche Friedens-Dank-Predigt / Auß der Ersten Epistel S. Pauli an die Thessal. (5,3–6). (...) Auf den Dreyssigsten Hewmonat / im Jahr (...) (1650) zu Straßburg im Münster (...) abgelegt* (Straßburg, 1650), 6: "ich will nicht hoffen, daß jemand [...] sich selber oder andere bereden wolte [...], jetzo habe man allererst der aureorum seculorum der guldenen tausend Jahren, da Christus hier in dieser Welt vor dero Untergang ein prächtiges, glückseliges und freudenreiches Welt-Reich [...] anfangen werde, zu erwarten [...]." As quoted in Johannes Wallmann, 'Die Eigenart der Straßburger lutherischen Orthodoxie im 17. Jahrhundert', in his *Theologie und Frömmigkeit im Zeitalter des Barock* (footnote 27), 87–104, here 102.
46. For Bisterfeld (1605–1655), see Jan Kvacsala, 'Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld', *Ungarische Revue*, vol. 13, 1893, 40–59 and 171–197; Martin Mulsow, 'Sociabilitas. Zu einem Kontext der Campanella-Rezeption im 17. Jahrhundert', *Bruniana & Campanelliana*, vol. 1–2, 1995, 205–232; Thomas Leinkauf's article in *Grundriß der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts. Deutschland.* Kap. III, § 6: Der Lullismus, Abschn. 8 (Basel, 1999).
47. See Johann Heinrich Heidegger, *Dissertationes selectae* (Zürich, 1675–1697), 4 vols., 652: "Alstedius (...) Regnum millenarium (...) in terra obeundum (...) in Diatribe de mille annis edita et 1627 uti patebat, incrustatum ivit, secundas ei faciente genero doctissimo Bisterfeldio." But this does not mean that Bisterfeld really assisted in the genesis of Alsted's work.
48. See Kvacsala, 'Bisterfeld' (footnote 46), 50f.
49. See *ibid.*, 176.
50. See M.E.H.N. Mout, 'Calvinoturcismus und Chiliasmus im 17. Jahrhundert', *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 14 (footnote 20), 72–84.
51. For the citations see Kvacsala: 'Bisterfeld' (footnote 46), 182. "Was auch geschehen möge, das Christenthum wird des Krieges nicht los, bis Rom nicht niedergerissen ist. Gebe Gott dies je früher [...]." "Mich bestärkt in meinen Hoffnungen über Roms Verderben täglich theils die Erfahrung, theils die h. Schrift." "Der vollständigen Erneuerung wird ebenso ein theologisches, als auch ein politisches Chaos vorangehen."
52. Frances A. Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London and Boston, 1972).
53. Johann Amos Comenius, *Sermo secretus Nathanis ad Davidem* (Sarós Patak, 1651). An extract is printed in Jan Kvacsala, *Die pädagogische Reform des Comenius in Deutschland bis zum Ausgange des XVII Jahrhunderts*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1903), 282–287.
54. See Johann Amos Comenius, *Via lucis. Vestigata et vestiganda, h. e. Rationalis disquisitio, quibus modis intellectualis Animorum LUX, SAPIENTIA, per omnes Omnium Hominum mentes, et gentes, jam tandem sub Mundi vesperam feliciter spargi possit* (Amsterdam, 1668) (written 1641).
55. As Bisterfeld told Comenius about Sigismund: "Wenn ich ihm sage: gehe! dann bricht er auf." See Blekastad (footnote 3), 508f.
56. Compare Blekastad (footnote 3), 499.
57. Compare Kvacsala: 'Bisterfeld' (footnote 46), 188.
58. Jean Baptiste de Rocoles, *Les imposteurs insignes ou Histoires de plusieurs homme de néant* (...) (Amsterdam, 1683); Antonius van Dale, *Dissertationes de Origine ac progressu Idololatrie et Superstitionum* (Boom, 1696).
59. This question is also posed by Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, 'Apokalyptische Universalwissenschaft. Johann Heinrich Alsteds *Diatribe de mille annis apocalypticis*', *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 14, 1988 (see footnote 20), 50–71, 69f.: "Nur in der Chronologie scheint der Millenarismus eine grundlegende Rolle gespielt zu haben, nicht in der Theologie. Alsteds Theologie wirkt keineswegs eskapistisch, sie ist noch weniger als die Theologie des Comenius eine Theologie der Weltverachtung unter der Bedingung, daß diese Welt bald zugrunde gehe. [...] Die Theologie wird eingeordnet in ein Gesamtkonzept des Wissens, das die Grenzen der menschlichen Intellektualität ausschöpfen will, in eine enzyklopädische Scientia omnium scibilium. Möglicherweise liegt aber gerade hier eine [...] Möglichkeit, Millenarismus und Universalwissenschaft zusammenzudenken: Die 'reformatio doctrinae & vitae' war Voraussetzung des Tausenjährigen Reichs. Alsteds Wissenschaftsprogramm paßt insgesamt 'ad magnam reformationem, quae adfert epocha nostri millenarii'. Sie paßt in die Vorstellung

von der Generalreformation, die er selbst in der Diatribe anfordert und die sich durch die Frömmigkeits- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte vor dem Dreißgjährigen Krieg gleichermaßen hindurchzieht. [...] Zum glückseligen Zeitalter gehörte für den Enzyklopädiker das Wissen um die Geheimnisse der Natur, die Kenntnis aller Geschichte, die Verfügung über alle menschliche Weisheit, das Universalwissen."

60. Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld, *Sciagraphia symbiotica*, 3, in idem: *Bisterfeldus redivivus*, vol. 1 (Den Haag, 1661): "Symbiotica est prudentia de societate. Quia est prudentia erit habitus activus, adeoque disciplina practica, ac praesupponet Theoreticas, in primis Metaphysicam cujus axiomata practice enunciat: Nam termini Metaphisici sund primae symbioticorum radices." Without naming his source, Bisterfeld takes the notion of 'symbiotica' from the Herborn political theorist Johannes Althusius.
61. For the early modern notion of 'prudentia' see Wolfgang Weber: *Prudentia gubernatoria. Studien zur Herrschaftslehre in der deutschen politischen Wissenschaft des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen, 1992); Horst Dreitzel, *Protestantischer Aristotelismus und absoluter Staat. Die Politica des Henning Arnisaeus (ca. 1575–1636)* (Wiesbaden, 1970). Already as a young professor in Herborn in 1629, Bisterfeld had been concerned in some dissertations with practical politics, especially the theory of the 'consiliarii'.
62. See Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld, *De uno Deo, patre, filio, ac spiritu sancto, mysterium pietatis contra Ioannes Crellii, Franci, de uno Deo patre, libros duos, breviter defensum* (Leiden, 1939).
63. See Hartlib Papers, University Library Sheffield, 37/21B, Moriaen to Hartlib, 19. 4. 1639.
64. See Johann Stephan Rittangel, *Liber Jezirah qui Abrahamo Patriarchae adscribitur*, Amsterdam, 1642; idem, *Veritas religionis Christianae in articulis de trinitate [...] probata* (Franeker, 1699).
65. See Martin Mulsow, 'Antisozinianismus, Kabbala und Pansophie im 17. Jahrhundert. Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld und Johann Stephan Rittangel' (forthcoming).
66. A term of the doctrine of the Trinity ('emperichoresis'), especially in Gregor of Nazianz, Maximus Confessor, Pseudo-Cyrill, and Johannes Damascenus. See Bisterfeld, *Sciagraphia symbiotica* (footnote 60), 25: "Medium symbioticum est unio vel communio, haec duo intime sunt sibi proportionalia: nam unio est radix, communio fructus, omnis enim unio est propter commune, & omnis communio fluit ex unione, atque si est unio, est quoque communio, & vicissim si non est unio non est communio. Qualis & quanta unio, talis & tanta est communio, & vicissim, si vero hae regulae non observentur in societate, tum oritur fallacia seu vitium & incongruentia Symbiotica." From this Bisterfeld derives a theory of mutual contracts, conventions and obligations. For the term 'immeatio' see idem: *Philosophiae primae Seminarium*, ed. Adrian Heereboord (Leiden, 1657), 186f.; idem: 'Logica', in: *Bisterfeldus redivivus* (footnote 60), 17f.: "Immeatio realis est rerum in natura unio, indeque proficiscens ineffabilis communio, haec est basis et norma mentalis. Immeatio mentalis ineffabilis est inexplicabilis cogitationum penetratio, qua unus conceptus alterum parit, nutrit ac auget." Compare M. Mugnai: 'Der Begriff der Harmonie als metaphysische Grundlage der Logik und Kombinatorik bei Johann Heinrich Bisterfeld und Leibniz', *Studia leibnitiana* (1973), 43–73. For the term 'emperichoresis' see Peter Stemmer: 'Perichorese. Zur Geschichte eines Begriffs', *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, vol. 27, 1983. I believe that Bisterfeld took his knowledge of 'immeatio/emperichoresis' from Rudolph Goclenius, *Lexicon philosophicum graecum* (Marburg, 1615), 177f.
67. *Sciagrahia symbiotica* (footnote 60), § IV, 6: "Persona ratione sui est sociabilis, quatenus natura ipsius est sociabilis: Hinc datur etiam societas naturarum intelligentium, qualis est unio hypostatica divinae ac humanae naturae in Christo: E qualis est personarum natura, talis quoque est ipsarum sociabilitas."
68. See Martin Mulsow, 'Definitionskämpfe am Beginn der Moderne. Relationsontologie, Selbsterhaltung und *appetitus societatis* im 17. Jahrhundert', *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (1998).
69. Georg Ritschel, *Contemplationes metaphysicae ex natura rerum et rectae rationis lumine deductae quibus universales Rerum Habitudines et Respectus, atque Dependentiae monstrantur, et notionum communium et illorum conjunctione surgentium exhibetur specimen* (Oxford, 1648), 309: "Modus reconciliandi est, tollere disciplita, reducere in consensum." Furthermore, one could see the conversion of the Jews as a removal of an obstacle to the – eschatologially

conceived – restitution. See in general Richard H. Popkin (footnote 4), 109f.; David S. Katz, *Philosemitism and the Readmission of the Jews in England 1603–1655* (Oxford, 1982).

70. For ideas of Tikkun and restitution in the circles of the Cambridge Platonists (to whom Ritschel was near) see the essays in Marialuisa Baldi, ed., *Mind senior to the world. Stoicismo e origenismo nella filosofia platonica del Seicento inglese* (Milano, 1996).
71. See also Figulus's report to Hartlib (footnote 5) on Gühler's steadfastness: "But he remains constant in his opinion, that a notable beginning, shal be seene and heard of the execution of those things which are expressed in the 18 Chapter of Revelation and England to bee the chiefe Actor in it." See also Gühler's words of 2. 8. 1650: "Es wäre eine gewaltige Sache, wenn das aureum saeculum bei diesen unsern zeiten mit dem lieben frieden eintreten wollte." Cited from Konrad Wutke, *Schlesiens Bergbau und Hüttenwesen. Urkunden und Akten (1525–1740)* (Breslau, 1901), 199 (I am grateful to Joachim Telle for this reference).

R.H. POPKIN

6. MILLENARIANISM AND NATIONALISM – A CASE STUDY: ISAAC LA PEYRÈRE[1]

As Western Europe became Christianized during the early Middle Ages the various converted countries began to trace their origins back to the biblical account of the origins and development of mankind. Since all of mankind was supposed to come from the survivors of Noah's Ark, each nation saw its origins as coming from one of Noah's grandchildren, whose descendants were dispersed after the Tower of Babel episode. France claimed from way, way back that its peoples were descended from Japhet, the oldest son of the oldest son of Noah. This supposedly made France the senior biblically derived country in Europe, and gave it primacy over other countries.

The French also claimed that Christianity was first brought to southern France before it reached any other European nation. It was claimed that Mary Magdalene, Joseph of Arimethea, and Dionysius the Areopagite all fled Palestine after the Crucifixion and the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, landed in the Marseilles area, and established Christianity in France. The French fleur de lys was supposedly the rose of Sharon of the Bible. And to carry this on and on, Clovis, the first King of the Francs, converted to Christianity and Christianized his people; Charlemagne, King of the Franks, was crowned by the pope as the Holy Roman Emperor, the Christian ruler of the successor to the Roman Empire; and St. Louis, King Louis IX, bought the Crown of Thorns from an Arab and built the Sainte Chapelle in Paris to house it. All of this was supposed to make France the chief European Christian nation, and its king the most Christian monarch in Europe.[2]

In the late Middle Ages prophecies circulated that reported that the French king would play a special role in future times. In the mid-sixteenth century the foremost French Hebraist and prophet, Guillaume Postel, professor of Hebrew at the Collège de France, started producing a series of works contending that the restitution of the entire world would come from France, and that the French king would lead mankind into a new spiritual age. Postel tried to get three successive kings of France to drop everything and take on their divine role in saving the world and bringing about a millenarian age. For his pains,

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 77–84.

Postel found himself locked up and declared too insane to punish by being put to death.[3]

Postel's version of the new age passed on in the seventeenth century to other countries, where new modern monarchs were portrayed in the providential role of preparing for the messianic kingdom. This became a justification for policies and an explanation of why Portugal, or Spain, or England or Sweden was prospering so well in the new imperial world. In France an extreme nationalist version of this type of view was offered by a courtier, Isaac La Peyrère. He claimed that the king of France would bring the Jews to France, make them Jewish Christians, and then at the appropriate moment when the Messiah returned, he would lead his Jewish Christian converts to the Holy Land and rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem. Then the king of France would rule the world with the Messiah, and his Jewish Christians would constitute the court of this millennial kingdom.[4]

La Peyrère was apparently from a wealthy New Christian family in Bordeaux. He was raised, as were many of the Portuguese converts in the south of France, as a Calvinist. Early on he showed heretical tendencies, and was charged before a synod with raising questions about the truth or consistency of the biblical text regarding the origin and development of mankind. Because of his family's influence he was not punished. He went on to become secretary to the Prince of Condé in Paris in 1640. There he wrote two works, *Du Rappel des Juifs*, and *Prae-Adamitae*. The first was published in 1643, and the latter banned and circulated in manuscript until published in 1655. The *Rappel des Juifs* gives all sorts of biblical texts to support the view that the political Messiah long awaited by the Jews is about to appear and join forces with the king of France.[5]

Before going into any detail, it should be kept in mind that La Peyrère was not a crackpot, like Postel. He was secretary and confidant of the most powerful nobleman in France, who thought that he, rather than the upstart Bourbon Louis XIV, should be the king of France. And both Condé and his secretary knew that a rabbi in Constantinople had predicted that a king of France born in 1588 would rule the world with the Messiah.[6] None of Louis's ancestors was born that year, but the father of the Prince, the Grand Condé, was born in 1588. Thus what was being proposed in La Peyrère's first work was not a pipe dream but a program of political action.

In his two books, La Peyrère offered what he called a system of theology, contending that mankind had been in existence for an indefinite past. They had been fighting a war of all against all. Life was nasty, brutish, and short. (La Peyrère knew Thomas Hobbes, who was closely involved with the intellectuals who met in the Hotel Condé. It is not clear which of them invented the picture of man in the state of nature).[7] Then, according to La Peyrère, God decided to commence providential history by creating Adam, the first Jew, *not* the first man. The history of the Adamites, Adam and his progeny, is what is recorded in biblical history. The history of the rest of mankind is the meaningless history of the pre-Adamites that has been going on from an indefinitely long past.[8]

Within biblical history the Messiah arrived in the year 1, namely, Jesus as a

spiritual being. The Jews did not recognize him as the divine political figure they were awaiting. The Jews were then rejected from Divine History. From the year 1 to 1640, the actors on the Providential stage were the gentile Christian pre-Adamites, who were grafted onto the stock of the Jews. And now, wonder of wonders, the Jews were about to be recalled to be the central actors in the finale of the Divine Drama, and this time the Jewish political Messiah would appear. (La Peyrère called the first Messiah "Jesus in the spirit," and the second one "Jesus in the flesh." The Jews expected an earthly messianic king and hence did not recognize the spiritual Jesus).[9]

In order to buttress his vision, La Peyrère presented his radical thesis that the biblical text that has come down to us is corrupt, "a heap of copie of copie,"[10] inaccurate and inconsistent, and has to be reconstructed in order to understand the central message. Analyzing a passage from St. Paul's *Romans,* La Peyrère insisted it showed that people existed before Adam. St. Paul said law came into the world with Adam. So, there must have been a lawless world before him![11]

La Peyrère then went on to reconstruct the Bible to show that it only presented the history of the Jews. It did not account for the Chinese, the peoples of the Americas, the Eskimos, the South Sea Islanders, etc. Then, he contended, all sorts of clues pointed to France as being the chosen place for the playing out of the last stage of the Divine Drama that began in the land of Eden. (This was then thought to have been located in what is now Iraq, perhaps in one of Saddam Hussein's palaces.)[12]

The king of France, because of his role in post-biblical Christian history, and because of his being the senior Christian king in Europe, was the obvious person to take political charge of this last stage of Divine History. He could (a) "recall the Jews" by recalling them to France, which La Peyrère called "the land of liberty," because it had no slaves; then (b) banning all legal restrictions on Jewish activities in France (the Jews had been banned from living in France in 1390–91). He could next (c) eliminate antisemitism in social practice, and (d) undertake the creation of a Jewish Christian Church, solely for recalled Jews, who would accept Christianity as long as it had no doctrines which were offensive to them. La Peyrère's two-Messiah theory would eliminate the biggest offense, the Christian claim that the Jewish Messiah had already arrived. Beyond this, the Jews and the French king would wait for the Jewish Messiah who would take them all to Palestine, where the Temple would be rebuilt, and the Messiah and the French king would rule the world from Jerusalem. The converted Jews would lose their distinguishing characteristics, such as the Jewish smell, and become just like everyone else, awaiting the Messianic Age. And in this wonderful world to come, everyone would be saved, Adamites and pre-Adamites. Thus the Recall of the Jews would lead to the Plentitude of the Gentiles as well.[13] La Peyrère's Marrano theology led to a complete universalism in which everybody on the planet would be saved in the great events that were about to take place.

La Peyrère wrote this around 1640–41, right after he moved to Paris to be the Prince of Condé's secretary. The first part, *Du Rappel des Juifs* was published anonymously in 1643. One of the leading theologian-philosophers of the time,

Father Marin Mersenne, praised the work and sent it to various people, claiming it explained many difficulties in the Bible.[14] The second work, the theological system based on the supposition that there were men before Adam and the theoretical basis for the millenarian thesis, was duly dedicated to Cardinal Richelieu, who promptly banned it.[15] Nonetheless, it floated around in manuscript copies for the next twelve years. Mersenne even sent a manuscript of it to the Vatican. The recent finding of La Peyrère's correspondence indicates that the work was widely known all over Europe. The author showed it to people wherever he went. Hugo Grotius wrote a refutation twelve years before the book was published, arguing that the American Indians were not pre-Adamites but survivors of Leif Erikson's expedition.[16]

From 1644 to 1655 La Peyrère was active as a French diplomat, principally acting for the interests of the Prince of Condé. La Peyrère travelled to Scandinavia, the Netherlands, England and Spain on various missions. One of them seems to have been a theological-political mission to make the Prince of Condé the king of France, and he would be an ally of Oliver Cromwell and of Queen Christina of Sweden.[17]

The Prince was locked in a struggle with Louis XIV. The Protestants in France were anxious to replace Louis with Condé, whose family had been Protestant until recently. Susanna Åkerman and I traced a wondrous plot in 1654–55 to make Condé the king of France and to arrange a "marriage alliance" of Condé and the Queen. After her abdication she moved to Brussels, where she was installed in the home of one of her bankers, and next door, the secretary of the Prince of Condé was installed to make arrangements.[18] A further piece of the puzzle was supplied by one of Cromwell's intelligence advisers, the Rev. Jean Baptiste Stouppe, head of the French Reformed Church in Soho in London. Stouppe, who came from the land of the Waldensians in northern Italy, was stirring up the cause for an English invasion of France because of the miserable way the proto-Protestant Waldensians were being persecuted by Catholic French authorities. Stouppe published several very incendiary accounts.[19] He crossed into France to contact Protestant leaders, and then, being chased by the French police, he went to Belgium and presented the Prince of Condé with the news that if he would declare himself king of France, Cromwell would invade France so he could take the country. For better or worse, the Prince replied that he would be glad to become king of France if Cromwell would first invade and get rid of the Catholic ruler.[20] Since neither would agree to make the first move, the plot came to naught. Condé made his peace with Louis XIV and accepted the role of a military chieftain. He later led the invasion of Holland in 1672, where he came in contact with Spinoza and offered to bring him to Paris as an "official" philosopher.[21]

While the negotiations between Condé and Cromwell and Condé and Christina were going on in Brussels, Christina became enchanted with La Peyrère's ideas. She paid for La Peyrère to go to Amsterdam and get the *Prae-Adamitae* published, where it came out in 1655 in five separate printings. It was quickly denounced as an extreme heretical work. Christina also showed the

earlier *Rappel des Juifs* to Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel of Amsterdam, who had come to see her. He was overcome with the news that the Jewish Messiah's arrival was imminent. He rushed back to Amsterdam and told the Protestant Millenarians, not the Jewish congregation, of this startling news.[22] He and Czech millenarian Paul Felgenhauer quickly published *Good News for the Jews*.[23] Menasseh then packed his bags to go off to discuss messianic arrangements with Oliver Cromwell, including the readmission of the Jews to the kingdom. The first word we have of Menasseh's arrival in Britain is of his telling a wild millenarian who believed that the son of Charles I would rule the world with the Messiah, that that was preposterous, but that it was much more likely, as a renowned French theologian had said, that the king of France would rule the world with the Messiah.[24] And Menasseh kept offering this view during his stay in England.

La Peyrère's French messianic politics came to an abrupt end when he was arrested in Belgium and charged with being a heretic, a Calvinist, and a Jew. Condé found he was not powerful enough to get him released, and finally the only solution was that La Peyrère would have to convert to Catholicism and personally apologize to the pope, which he did. He ended his days in the monastery of the Oratorians, gathering more evidence for his pre-Adamite theory but not being able to publish anything further.[25] La Peyrère paid no attention to the Jewish messianic movement of Sabbatai Zevi even though his friend and fellow Oratorian, Richard Simon, offered to introduce him to Sabbatai Zevi's agent in Paris.[26]

This might just be the tale of an eccentric Marrano, except that his biblical criticism and his pre-Adamite theory were picked up by a young Jewish radical, Baruch de Spinoza, and by the French Bible scholar, Richard Simon, and developed into the modern critical study of the Bible.[27] So La Peyrère is one of the makers of the modern intellectual world. La Peyrère's pre-Adamism was quickly picked up by those defending black slavery, who were delighted to argue that the Africans and their descendents were pre-Adamities, and thus not entitled to any rights.[28] This theory was still being advanced in the U.S., even after the Civil War.

A third afterglow of his career is the brief resurrection of it by Napoleon Bonaparte in 1806. As Napoleon rapidly rose in importance, there are indications that he saw himself and his accomplishments in millenarian terms. Napoleon captured and imprisoned the pope, the leading candidate for Anti-christ to many. When Napoleon left France to undertake his Egyptian campaign, an announcement appeared on the front page of the official newspaper, *Le Moniteur*, urging the Jews of Asia and Africa to join Napoleon in liberating Jerusalem and rebuilding the Temple.[29] A letter of Napoleon's from the period of the Egyptian campaign has him describing his fervent desire to reach the Holy City, which he never did, because the British cut him off.[30]

Several years later in 1806, after Napoleon's most successful campaigns against Russia, Austria, and Germany, the emperor arrived at Strasbourg to be met by a delegation that wanted him to solve "the Jewish question" by exiling all of the Jews from France. Napoleon set up a task force to study the problem,

examining books about the history of the Jews in the Imperial Library. Suddenly Napoleon announced that he was calling together an Assembly of Jewish Notables from parts of the Napoleonic Empire to discuss what status Jews should have. If they could assure the emperor that Jews could be good Frenchmen, then the Assembly could appoint members to a new Sanhedrin to decide legal matters of the French Jews. The Sanhedrin had last met on the day that Titus conquered Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and according to Jewish tradition it could not meet again until the Messiah arrived and appointed the members.[31]

Napoleon, fully cognizant of this, issued a coin in honor of the meeting of the Paris Sanhedrin, showing on one side Napoleon in all his glory as emperor, and on the other, Napoleon handing the new tablets of the law to a kneeling Moses.[32] And on the first day the Assembly met to answer Napoleon's queries about the compatibility of Jewish law and French law, an item appeared in *Le Moniteur* announcing the discovery of "a book as curious as it is rare," *Du Rappel des Juifs* by Isaac La Peyrère, which proclaimed that the king of France would rule the world with the Messiah.[33] Apparently one of Napoleon's aides found the work in the Imperial Library and the emperor saw it as predicting his own future state of affairs.

National millenarianism has had its ups and downs. The English Puritans and the New England ones saw themselves as a divine nation intended to play an important role in Providential History. Too many Americans have seen the United States as the Redeemer Nation, with its Manifest Destiny. A mid-nineteenth century development is a view called British Israelism, which claims that the British and their American cousins are the descendents of the actual biblical Israelites. The nineteenth-century growth of the British Empire and the advance of American capitalism and its influence were then seen as the latest stage of the Divine Drama, preceding Jesus's return. British Israelism has had a curious history getting transformed into the doctrine of the Church of Jesus Christ Christian, which denies any Jewish involvement in the biblical world. In its most virulent present form it describes the Jews as the children of Satan and the real Israelites as the inhabitants of Hayden Lake, Idaho, trying to establish an Aryan Nation from which the returned Jesus will reign.[34]

Much of the history of nationalist millenarianism is curious, quaint, and even bizarre, as attempts are made to fuse ordinary historical developments with some rereading of the divine scheme in the Bible. It is obviously a way of inflating the egos of the various nations claiming to be nations holy and elect, and of providing justification for their policies. Occasionally, as in the case of La Peyrère and his schemes with the Prince of Condé, Cromwell, and Queen Christina, it can become *Realpolitik* instead of fantasy. In present day Middle Eastern history it can be a way of justifying the worst aspects of one group's domination over another.

Washington University and UCLA

NOTES

1. I should like to thank Anna Suranyi for all of her assistance in preparing this paper for publication.
2. See Léon Poliakov, *Le Mythe aryen* (Paris: Calman-Lévy, 1971), chap. 2.; and Richard H. Popkin, *Isaac La Peyrère (1596–1676): His Life, Works and Influence* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1987), chap.v.
3. On Postel, see William J. Bowsma, *Concordia mundi: The Career and Thought of Guillaume de Postel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957); Marion L. Kuntz, *Guillaume Postel: The Prophet of the Restitution of All Things* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981); Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 64, and Popkin "Postel and La Peyrere," *Actes du Colloque international d'Avranches, 5–9, Septembre 1981: Guillaume Postel 1581–1981* (Paris: Editions de la Maisnie, 1985), 171–181.
4. This is the picture presented in the first two books of Isaac La Peyrère's *Du Rappel des Juifs* ([Paris], n.p.,1643).
5. For biographical information about La Peyrère, see Popkin, *La Peyrère*, chap. 2, and Jean-Paul Oddos, *Recherches sur la vie et l'oeuvre d'Isaac de Lapeyrère*, unpublished thesis 1971–74, (Université des sciences sociales, Grenoble).
6. Cf. Francois Bruys, *Mémoires historiques et littéraires*, (Paris: 1751) II, 284.
7. On possible links between La Peyrère and Hobbes, see Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 45–46.
8. This theory is expounded in Books I and II of Isaac La Peyrère, *Prae-Adamitae* (Amsterdam: 1655), and *Men Before Adam*, (London: 1656).
9. La Peyrère, *Du Rappel des Juifs*, livres I and II.
10. This phrase appears in *Men Before Adam*, Book III, chap. 1, 208.
11. See La Peyrère, "Proeme" to the "Discourse on the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth verses of the fifth chapter of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans," in *Men Before Adam*.
12. La Peyrère, "Discourse on the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth verses of the fifth chapter of the Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans," in *Men Before Adam*, especially chaps. viii and xxvi.
13. All of this is developed in detail in *Du Rappel des Juifs*.
14. Cf. Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 5 and 6 and especially note 12 for Mersenne's correspondence in 1642 and 1643, when he was sending various people copies of the book or news about it.
15. On this see René Pintard, *Le Libertinage érudit* (Paris: Boivin, 1943), 356.
16. Hugo Grotius's book is entitled *Disseratio altera de origine gentium americanum adversus obtrectatorem* (1643).
17. La Peyrère's diplomatic activities are described in Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 10–15.
18. The relations between Christina and La Peyrère in Belgium are described in Susanna Åkerman, *Queen Christina* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990).
19. The British Library has a collection of them in which Stouppe describes how the Catholics are doing terrible things to the Protestant Waldensians.
20. Francois Laplanche, *L'écriture, le sacré et l'histoire: érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au xvii siècle* (Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press, 1986), 432–433 and 931–932; and the letter of Louis de Bourbon, Rocroy, in *Mémoires de Henri-Charles de la Tremoille. Prince de Tarante*, (Liege: 1767), 168–171.
21. On Stouppe and his career, see R.H. Popkin, "The First Published Reaction to Spinoza's *Tractatus*: Col. J.B. Stouppe, the Condé Circle, and the Rev. Jean Lebrun," in Paolo Christofolini, ed., *The Spinozistic Heresy. The Debate on the Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, 1670–1677* (Amsterdam & Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1995), 6–12.
22. David S. Katz, "Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Queen Christina of Sweden, 165–1655," *Jewish Social Studies*, XLV (1983–4), 57–72; Richard H. Popkin, "Menasseh ben Israel and Isaac La Peyrère, II," *Studia Rosenthalia*, XVIII (1984), 12–20, and Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 13.
23. Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 13; Popkin, "Menasseh ben Israel," 59–60.
24. Arise Evans, *Light for the Jews, or the Means to convert them, in answer to a Book of theirs, called the Hope of Israel, Written and Printed by Menasseth Ben-Israel, Chief Agent of the Jews here* (London: 1664). See Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 100–1.

25. Oddos, *Recherches*, 123–4, 128. See Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 18–19.
26. See Richard Simon, *Lettres choisies de M. Simon* (Rotterdam, 1702), II, 14.
27. See Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 175.
28. This issue is discussed in more detail in Popkin, *La Peyrère*, chapter 10.
29. My son, Jeremy Popkin, has pointed out that there is no evidence that Napoleon was personally responsible for this proclamation.
30. Ms. Yahuda 2, National Library of Israel, Jerusalem, Napoleona.
31. See Popkin, *La Peyrère*, 108–9
32. See Popkin, "La Peyrère, the Abbé Grégoire, and the Jewish Question in Eighteenth Century Culture," *Studies in Eighteenth Century Culture*, IV, (1975), 215, for a discussion of the ways in which Napoleon made use of the meeting of the Sanhedrin to bolster his messianic image. I possess a copy of the coin, which was issued in 1806 and bears the inscription "Grand Sanhedrin XXX Mai MDCCCVI." It is reproduced in Ismar Elbogen, *History of the Jews after the Fall of the State of Jerusalem* (Cincinnati, 1926), facing page 167, although the caption erroneously describes the reverse side of the coin as "Napoleon receiving the Tablets of the Law."
33. *Journal de Paris*, 29 Août 1806, and *Gazette de France*, 28 Août 1806. See also Popkin, "La Peyrère, Grégoire," 214–15.
34. For more on British Israelism and the Church of Jesus Christ Christian, see David S. Katz and Richard Popkin, *Messianic Revolution: Radical Religious Politics to the End of the Second Millenium* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1998), in particular 189 and 197–8.

H.M. BRACKEN

7. PIERRE JURIEU: THE POLITICS OF PROPHECY[1]

In a century in which invective seems to have reached new heights, or depths, it is hard to find a more vicious exchange than that between Pierre Bayle and Pierre Jurieu. Jurieu's name, his publications, and his views are discussed and fiercely criticized in almost all of Bayle's writings, especially in the *Dictionnaire* (1696 f). Indeed, he reserves his final attack for the penultimate article, *Zuerius*, where he alleges that Jurieu had preached on the subject "thou should hate thy neighbor"[2] before twelve hundred parishioners, and that nevertheless it proved impossible to find agreement on the matter just three days later.

Bayle may have had the last word on the sermon, but within the Walloon community Jurieu was largely unscathed. The crux of their disagreement was how the members of the Walloon Church should behave. Bayle dreamed of returning to France and hence that they should avoid politics and display loyalty to Louis XIV. Jurieu had fewer illusions. He thought it ridiculous to think that Louis XIV would change his brutal policies toward Protestants. Instead, he turns to an analysis of apocalyptic writings in order to show that the biblical texts reveal that both the destruction of the papacy, i.e., the Antichrist and the end of Louis XIV are nigh.

Jurieu, born in 1637, was Bayle's senior by ten years. He received the degree *maître ès arts* in 1656 from Saumur and later moved to Sedan. He spent some time in England where two uncles lived, one of whom was a canon at Canterbury Cathedral. It has been said that Jurieu was ordained a priest in the Church of England, but Knetsch, who has searched various church records, has found no evidence.[3] On the other hand bishops were given to ordaining priests while residing in London, or otherwise outside their home dioceses, and records may not always have found their way back to the home cathedrals. What is clear, however, is that Jurieu was not an enemy of the English Church. "We have always professed the same *Religion* with the *Church of England*, on the account of the perfect agreement of our *Doctrine*, notwithstanding the difference of *discipline* and *government*. When as [sic] the *Lutherans* have constantly refused to receive the *Reformed* into their *Communion*."[4] Jurieu went on to become a spy for William III and for the English Protestants.

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 85–94.

Bayle and Jurieu became friends following Bayle's appointment as professor of philosophy at Sedan. Indeed, Jurieu seems to have taken his young colleague under his wing and on more than one occasion Bayle praised Jurieu's brilliance and sought to minimize the difficulties which Jurieu's stormy polemical disposition got him into. With the suppression in 1681 of the Huguenot university at Sedan both Bayle and Jurieu moved to Rotterdam where they were both appointed professors in the newly founded École Illustre. Jurieu, a minister, quickly became the senior dominee at the largest Walloon church in town. The church is now gone but at least until recently a plaque embedded on the Hoogstraat wall of Vroom and Dreesman's department store marked its pre-1923 location. In any case, the entire area, the very heart of Rotterdam, was totally destroyed in the German World War II bombing. A small Walloon church now stands on tiny Pierre Baylestraat, just off the Schiedamsedijk. There is some irony in the fact that a bronze plaque on one side is dedicated to Pierre Bayle, the *Philosopher* of Rotterdam, and on the other side is one dedicated to Pierre Jurieu, the *Theologian* of Rotterdam.

Jurieu's mother was a Du Moulin and the daughter of one of the great Huguenots, Pierre Du Moulin (professor of theology at Sedan when Jurieu was a student there). Jurieu married his own first cousin, another Du Moulin. They had no children. Bayle seems to have gotten on very well with Mme Du Moulin and was a frequent guest in the Jurieu house. But the friendship became strained. It may have been over personal matters or, more likely, over political and religious differences. There is a story that the reason for the breakdown is that Bayle had an affair with Mme Jurieu. So far as I know, there is no evidence for this. But perhaps its implausibility is reduced by the fact that Bayle – in later years – suggests that Jurieu is impotent.[5]

There are good political reasons for their disagreement. At the most general level, they disagreed over the prospects for the Huguenots. Bayle hoped that by behaving in a circumspect fashion, with ample displays of their loyalty, they might be able to persuade Louis XIV to treat his Protestant citizens in accordance with the provisions of the Edict of Nantes and to allow the refugees to return to the land of their birth and to practice their Reformed faith in peace. Jurieu, on the other hand, had few illusions about the possibility that the French Court would reverse its policies. So he set about conspiring to bring down the French King by, for example, supporting governments which opposed France.

As early as his *Esprit de M. Arnauld* (1684), Jurieu argued that the Huguenots, lest they succumb to hypocrisy, have an absolute duty to God to meet and to worship. "Here for the first time Jurieu is approving and implicitly advocating the use of arms by subjects for a religious cause."[6] Thus God's Truth takes precedence over everything from the moral law to government edict. Of course this is precisely the sort of thing that terrified Bayle. Bayle worried about the hostages still in France, especially his own family. More generally, he was forever fearful both of anything which might generate civil disturbances as well as what he perceived as a drift towards anarchism. It is not entirely clear that Bayle was the author of the *Avis aux réfugiez sur leur prochain retour en*

France (1690), a work written under the pseudonym of a Catholic, but it did represent his sentiments. By spewing forth sedition and by conspiring with Protestant princes, the Huguenots were jeopardizing their futures and the lives of their relatives still in France. Moreover, the author of the *Avis* points out that Protestants seem not only to ignore their own crimes against Catholics, but the English Revolution was their fault. "The main target of the *Avis* was the political side of the Protestant reversal, the theory that sovereignty resides in the people, and only derivatively in the sovereign himself."[7] From then until the ends of their lives Bayle and Jurieu fought, alas incessantly. It was brought to Jurieu's attention, to no effect, that if an assembly exercises its putative right to make laws, there is nothing to prevent it from enacting laws which might oppress the true religion.[8]

Bayle made fun of the shifts which occurred in Jurieu's theories as he moved from an early (pre-Revocation) opinion of letting sovereignty reside in the King to treating him as a mere agent by which *the people* exercised their sovereignty. Although it is a brilliant work, the *Avis* was bound to fail if it was intended as a device for dissuading the Huguenots from their aggressive speech and conspiratorial actions. In 1685, Louis XIV, noting that there were no more Protestants in his realm, abrogated the Edict of Nantes.

It is difficult to understand how Bayle could have thought the King's decision might be undone and the policy of forced conversions eliminated. Although many tens (if not hundreds) of thousands of Huguenots did flee France, they fled at great risk. Refugees are almost always in difficult political positions and the Huguenots were no exception. As Walter Rex has pointed out in a typically brilliant article,[9] one had to strike a delicate balance. One had to be moderate in criticizing Louis XIV lest one put at risk one's brethren still in France while at the same time one had to give some sort of visible support to William, their host. It was easy to slide from being a neutral towards William to being his opponent, but being his opponent would hardly help one's brethren. Unfortunately, Bayle's unease with (Stadthouder) William put him at odds with many of his co-religionists and city leaders. This proved to be a very serious matter and seems, even more than his religious disagreements with Jurieu, to have been the real reason for his losing his Rotterdam teaching job.[10]

Right after the Revocation, Jurieu published his monumental studies of the Apocalypse. Part I of his *Accomplishment of the Scripture Prophecies, or the Approaching Deliverance of the Church. Proving that the Papacy is the Antichristian Kingdom; and that that Kingdom is not far from its Ruin. That the present Persecution may end in Three years and half, after which the Destruction of Antichrist shall begin* ... runs over 250 pages, and Part II, almost 300 pages. *The Continuation of the Accomplishment of the Scripture-Prophecies, or a Large Deduction of Historical Evidences; Proving, that the Papacy Is the Real Antichristian Kingdom* ... is also about 300 pages.[11] Jurieu presents an infinitely detailed, extensive, and learned analysis of the prophetic texts, *Daniel* and the *Book of Revelation*, together with comments on and criticisms of various commentators.[12]

The occasion for these publications was clearly the Revocation and the

systematic destruction of what Jurieu takes to be the true religion, the Huguenots, in France. There are discussions of the Beast, the Vials, the Monarchies, the plagues, the trumpets, and the meaning of days and years. Interpretations of the latter are crucially important because Jurieu wants to suggest the date on which the Papacy will come tumbling down. He concludes that the Antichristian Empire must fall between 1710 and 1715.[13] He calculates that the "glorious reign" of Christ on earth shall begin in 1785,[14] although Jurieu is not dogmatic about such dates. He is greatly reassured by the fact that the English [Protestant] Glorious Revolution occurred three and a half years after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.[15] He generally says that he has simply worked out the calculations with great care and that others can check out his estimates. Moreover, *we can not be sure that God counts as we do.*

> I strongly hope, that God intends to begin [the reckoning of the three and a half years] at the time of the *Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* ... . I am well content (as I have said) that my Readers should account these assertions to be conjectures, provided that I may have the liberty to believe what I see, or what I believe I see in the *writings* of the *Prophets.* Besides, it seems that there is no great necessity of punishing me for this pretended rashness; seeing if so be that I am mistaken, *Time* is preparing for me a *mortification* sore enough. Let us leave *Providence* to work: it will discover who is guilty of *rashness* and fond credulity.[16]

After the publication of Bayle's *Dictionnaire* (1696), Bayle was ordered to appear before the Consistory of the Rotterdam Walloon Church. The Consistory decreed that Bayle correct certain matters before the appearance of a second edition. Among the five topics which they ordered be rectified was the article *David.* I accept Rex's view that Bayle's most general aim in this article is to challenge one of the older traditional Calvinist political theories but that his primary aim is to expose and then attack Jurieu's attempts to offer a modern version of, as Bayle sees it, the very dangerous theory of giving priority to Old Testament politics rather than the gentler politics developed in the light of the New. Bayle had watched Jurieu's reputation and influence among the Calvinists both in France and the Refuge increase. Bayle knew that Jurieu's *Lettres pastorales* (1686–89) together with his writings on the Apocalypse had tremendous impact. Bayle was both dismayed and frightened by the air of rebellion he detected within the refugee community and to which he believed, probably correctly, Jurieu had made a significant contribution. Although, as Rex points out, Jurieu's name does not occur in *David*, itself quite remarkable, Rex maintains that Jurieu's ideas are the primary target.

French hostility against the Huguenots began long before the Revocation[17] and I suspect that Jurieu had a much clearer eye about where things were going than Bayle. He monitored one of the worst features of French policy towards the Reformed: the quartering of dragoons[18] in Protestant homes in order to force conversions to Catholicism. Having troops in one's home not only destroyed family life, it was generally accompanied by extreme brutality. So it

is not surprising that Jurieu was among the first to cease subscribing to such traditional Calvinist views as pacifism, royalism, passive resistance in the face of a hostile state, and the rights of an erring conscience. Hence, after the Revocation, Jurieu's account differed: (1) He rejected pacifism on the ground that "the Gospel had not abrogated the law of nature."[19] (2) He held more strongly that sovereignty derived from the people. (3) He rejected what had become accepted doctrine, that with the New Testament, the religious and the secular were no longer unified.

Matters are even more complicated. Jurieu's anti-rationalism takes precedence over all other theological/religious considerations. Rationalism is rejected for good conservative Calvinist reasons: there is nothing one human can do for another to facilitate the acquisition of God's grace. There is no argument such that grace is a product of our reasoning. Grace is totally a question of God's activity, not ours. As Richard Popkin has pointed out, Jurieu rejected the contention of

> some of the liberal Protestant theologians of his day that the Cartesian criterion of clear and distinct ideas should be applied to theology, and that religious propositions should be accepted only insofar as they are *évident* or insofar as there is *évidence* for them. For Jurieu this contention was an outrageous form of the Pelagian heresy in that if belief were a function of *évidence*, man could save himself, or be saved by confronting the objective evidence.[20]

Jurieu grants that some people, thanks to their different backgrounds, etc., claim to have truth on their side, and these people may well appeal to contrary feelings. And we *feel* the truth. "L'heritique & l'orthodoxe parlent de mesme, mais ils ne sentent pas de mesme."[21] Heretics are just wrong. *Their* feelings are not grounded in grace. Lest one think that Jurieu's doctrine of *goût* should either generate religious pluralism or encourage toleration, he reminds us that "le *goût* & le *sentiment*, est le privilege des élûs, & ne se donne qu'aux élûs."[22] Conclusion: the argument for toleration based on the erring conscience fails.

As noted, Bayle had, much to Jurieu's disgust, advocated religious toleration.[23] Roughly speaking, he argued that on the basis of clear and distinct ideas of morality, intolerance as expressed by, e.g., the state "forcing" consciences, was morally wrong. Bayle takes core Calvinist positions, the inviolability of conscience plus the central role of rational examination, to ground his defense of toleration. It does lead to some strange consequences: the heretic and even the criminal must be granted the right to conscience, although always with a return to reason because of the obligation to examine. Nevertheless, to Jurieu, Bayle's extended and magnificent defense of religious toleration in his *Philosophical Commentary upon the words of Jesus Christ, Compel them to come in* [Luke 14:23] (1686) was totally anathema. Jurieu believed that to support toleration in religious matters was to foster Socinianism and other heterodox ideas and that it was the duty of a Christian government to suppress error in the interest of truth. For Jurieu, *no* moral principle takes precedence over religious truth.

Bayle seeks to evade crucial difficulties generated by the rooting of his absolutist theory of toleration in freedom of conscience. But his critics maintained that he would then be obliged to tolerate not only heterodox religious opinions but even criminal actions and religious persecution if done on the dictates of (even an erring) conscience. I believe Bayle was aiming to avoid this difficulty, a difficulty which threatened his theory of toleration. Bayle had to find a solution and I propose that he seems to have sought a way out by trying to draw a radical distinction between freedom of speech and freedom of action, and in turn grounding that distinction in mind/body dualism.[24] Some evidence for this interpretation of Bayle may be found in the fact that Jurieu *explicitly* denies any sort of "category distinction" between talking and doing: if the magistrate can bind your arm he can bind your tongue.[25] He also vigorously rejects the Cartesian mind/body dualism which is so much a part of Bayle's *Commentaire philosophique* and on which the speech/action distinction appears to be based. Thus Jurieu's arguments with Bayle are often rooted not only in political differences but also in fundamental philosophical disagreements.

Bayle saw that Jurieu was reversing Calvinist political thinking. He was using his writings on prophecy as a vehicle for binding the political with the religious and thereby making a radical return to Old Testament thinking. Understandably, Jurieu's writings on prophecy and thus the impending downfall and destruction of the Antichrist (Rome) and of the French monarch were well received among the Huguenots. It gave them hope. But it did so at a price which Bayle felt those remaining in France would be forced to pay. Rex takes Bayle, in the article *David*, to be analyzing the Biblical text in great detail as a means of demonstrating that Jurieu is discounting New Testament Christian teaching in order to elevate and reconsecrate Old Testament prophecy and again to make legitimate the role of the Old Testament prophet. Thus the aim of Article *David* is to condemn the union of politics and faith, and not simply because Bayle saw the intolerance this move would generate. He also feared Jurieu's goal of molding the Protestants into a community prepared to arm itself and fight to the death. Jurieu, however, had early acquired a mass audience through his *Lettres pastorales*[26] and not because of displays of logic and sound reasoning. With his more explicit prophetic writings he provided his co-religionists with an exciting purely biblical vision of the possibility of a divinely inspired victory of the members of the Reformed Church over their enemies.

Rex writes: "Jurieu scarcely attempted to explain; he simply became a prophet himself, and gave forth divine oracles of the future ... ."[27] An analysis of David's behavior as reported in the Bible gave Bayle the perfect occasion for sorting out the difficulties of exalting "the man after God's own heart," the Biblical line which is a constant refrain in *Dictionnaire* article *David*. What Bayle also does is underscore the terrible things which the Bible tells us this man "after God's own heart" does. These things, from adultery to theft and murder, all run counter to Christian teachings and, moreover, are in violation of the moral law. Thus Bayle puts in dramatic form his basic disagreement with Jurieu: for Jurieu, God's word and Truth take absolute priority over moral

principles. It is a straightforward case of what Kierkegaard was later to call the "transcendental suspension of the ethical." Antinomianism is a very uncompromising doctrine,[28] as Bayle appreciated. He had already encountered it earlier when spelling out and challenging the arguments *for* intolerance.

Schlossberg summarizes what he takes to be the inconsistencies within both Bayle's and Jurieu's positions. Bayle had "two absolute principles which, in practice, tended to cancel each other out. He had to take something away from royal power – the right to legislate over conscience – and still keep his fellow Protestants from completely overthrowing legitimate authority." Jurieu had a complementary inconsistency: "he wanted to preserve the right to rebel against arbitrary, tyrannical government and, at the same time, allow the sovereign to discriminate against religious minorities and maintain a dominant 'true' religion."[29]

As noted, although Bayle wants to separate politics from faith, he believes the rebellious ideas Jurieu purveys can only generate an anarchy in which everyone loses. Jurieu is apparently willing to accept a modicum of standard Reformed policies until the early 1680s, at which time he worries that toleration encourages Socinianism and other views which run counter to the Truth Faith. He argues at length against Bayle on this score. On the other hand, anti-absolutism, Knetsch writes, is "one of the great constants of [Jurieu's] life."[30] Although a royalist in his early writings, he accords primary sovereignty to the people, a position Bayle, ever distrustful of "the people," can never accept. Towards the ends of their lives Bayle and Jurieu devote most of their literary energies to trying to destroy one another. And yet, despite all the sound and fury, the differences between Bayle and Jurieu were primarily in the political domain, e.g., in their political theories, their analyses of the historical situations in France, England and among the Huguenots, and their remedies, rather than being primarily rooted in theology. They were both orthodox Calvinists to the end.[31] Bayle's reputation later becomes secure as a hero in the eighteenth century while Jurieu is confined to the lunatic fringe of the Calvinist dogmatists despite his being extremely knowledgeable about seventeenth-century philosophy, both rationalist and scholastic.

From at least 1681 until the Revocation (1685), Jurieu saw the situation of the Huguenots in France profoundly and quickly deteriorating. As a leader of the refugee community, Jurieu diagnosed the problem and proposed a means of solving it. The problem was to save the entire Reformed community. To that end, the community must be unified. But the community could hardly be unified so long as rationalism in religious matters has a "splintering" effect.[32] The use of arguments from natural law in support of toleration, pacifism, etc., served only to divide the Huguenots and to sap their political strength by generating sects and then sects of sects. Without a unified community there could be no response to the acts of the Antichrist. That is why Jurieu went to great lengths to show that appeals to reason must be understood as absolutely contrary to the True Faith of the Reformed.

How can one articulate a political position if one is precluded from appeals to reason and the natural, i.e., moral, law? The most fruitful and productive

model, one which would still resonate within the Reformed community, Jurieu found in an Old Testament framework in which politics and faith are united. Second, within that framework he accorded priority to the role of the Old Testament prophet, a role for which, despite the obligatory denials, he virtually anointed himself. Third, the New Testament's apocalyptic texts, properly interpreted, provided a political program for the Huguenots. And this messianic/millenialist program promised a future for the elect of the community. In summary, there are thus four elements in Jurieu's "political" doctrine: (1) anti-rationalism, (2) using Old Testament models to restore a union of faith and politics, (3) functioning as a prophet himself, and finally (4) using the prophetic texts to provide a program for the worldly salvation of the Reformed community.

As a person, Jurieu fits into a pattern with which we are familiar: a theoretician whose life is profoundly disrupted by external events over which he or she has no control and who then devotes his or her time and energy to trying to gain a measure of control over those events. I am thinking of people who, like Karl Popper, abandon the left-wing views of their youth in the face of (say) Hitler and Stalin and then feel obliged to spend the rest of their days trying to come to grips with their old mistakes and the new realities. Seventeenth-century Rotterdam, and The Netherlands generally, were full of refugees who wondered what had happened to them and what the future held. Jurieu told them where they had come from, and what they could do to rectify the wrongs they had suffered. In retrospect, we can see that Bayle's dream of a return to France was hopeless. Jurieu was far more realistic. He also appreciated that the popular acceptance of messianism or millenialism frequently occurs when a community undergoes extreme trauma. Jurieu and the entire Huguenot community underwent such a trauma. In the short term his prophetic dream, although driven by his strong religious commitment, may have come to naught, but that dream was articulated in a context of constant propaganda for the Protestant cause throughout Europe and in that sense it was a success far beyond his detractors' expectations.[33]

Jurieu had connections throughout Europe and he used them. He was, paradoxically, an able politician. I say paradoxically because he also had a true talent for antagonizing people, although it must be said that the Walloon community seldom sought to restrain him. His political ideas were increasingly meshed with his religious concerns as they evolved from the abstract to the concrete. The writings he produced and the arguments he advanced were intended to make a difference in the practical politics of the day. And because he was continuously subjecting his theoretical ideas to the political exigencies of the moment, they did. Richard Popkin has argued for the existence of a Third Force in seventeenth-century thought in addition to the traditional intellectual forces, science and scepticism. This Third Force was *millenarianism*.[34] Perhaps we should think of Jurieu as providing the Third Force with its own political theory.

Arizona State University

NOTES

1. My thanks to the members of the Clark Library conference on *Continental Millenarianism* for their helpful comments and criticisms. I am especially grateful to Richard Popkin, who (many years ago) first introduced a young graduate student to Sextus Empiricus, Bayle, and Jurieu. I wish also to thank Walter Rex, Freek Knetsch, John Christian Laursen, and Elly van Gelderen for their generous support and useful comments.
2. It seems that Jurieu meant one should hate the neighbor who was an enemy of God, intending, of course, Louis XIV. But thanks to Bayle, the shorter formulation is what gained currency.
3. F.R.J. Knetsch, *Pierre Jurieu: Theoloog en Politikus der Refuge* (Kampen, J.H. Kok, 1967) 20 f. This remains the definitive study of Jurieu.
4. Jurieu, *Accomplishment of the Prophecies* ... Part II. [English translation] (London, 1687), chap. X, 220.
5. See Elisabeth Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle*, Vol I (Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963), 206, n. 74. She refers to *Dictionnaire*, art. Ochin. [Rem X, iv]. Hers is the definitive study of Bayle. See also her Vol II, 1964.
6. R.J. Howells, *Pierre Jurieu: Antinomian Radical* (Durham: University Press, 1983), 40.
7. Herbert Schlossberg, *Pierre Bayle and the Politics of the Huguenot Diaspora* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota PhD, 1965), 127. This is an extremely valuable study.
8. Cf. Guy Howard Dodge, *The Political Theory of the Huguenots of the Dispersion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947), 68 f.
9. Walter Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle and religious controversy* (Den Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965); see chap. 6: Bayle's Article on David, 197–255.
10. Cf. Rex, *op. cit.*, 234, note 126. See also page 251, note 175.
11. *L'Accomplissement* ... Rotterdam: Abraham Acher, 1686. An English translation appeared in London in the following year. *La suite* ... 1687. An English translation of this second work appeared again in London the following year. Pierre Du Moulin, Jurieu's grandfather, published a book under a similar title in 1612. Cf. Knetsch, *op.cit.* 207, note 272.
12. Just to mention a few of those cited: Coccius, Forbes, Henry More, Joseph Mede (whose views are frequently discussed), Launay, Du Moulin, Bellarmine, Testard, James Durrham, Arnauld, Nicole, Durandus, Gabriel Biel, Burnet, Bossuet, Ussher, Maimbourg, Witsius (of Utrecht).
13. *Accomplishment*, Part II. Ch. 5, 54.
14. *Ibid.*, 59.
15. The three and a half days [*Revelation* 11, v. 11] usually were counted as years.
16. *Accomplishment*, Part II. Chap. 15, 278–9.
17. See Elisabeth Labrousse's prize winning book: *"Une foi, une loi, un roi?" Essay sur la révocation de l'édit de nantes* (Paris: Payot, 1985). She does not think that the anti-Huguenot sentiment which increased throughout the seventeenth century should count as a form of racism (cf. 117). It is hard, in the present world, to decide what should count as racism. The *pure laine* of Quebec, i.e., those descended from the original 60 000 French settlers, or the Protestants of Belfast often seem to try to give their differences from The Others a metaphysical, if not a biological, status (and The Others usually try to return the favor). Something of the sort seems to have afflicted the Huguenots.
18. The tercentenary of the Revocation was marked by several conferences. For an interesting set of papers see *The Huguenots and Ireland: Anatomy of an Emigration*. eds. Edric Caldicott, Hugh Gough, Jean-Paul Pittion (Dun Laoghaire: Glendale Press, 1987). See, e.g., the contributions by Roland Mousnier, Pittion, Patrick Kelly, and Mark Goldie.
19. Presumably recollections of the dragonnades influenced the introduction into the US *Constitution* of the Third Amendment (Bill of Rights). "No soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law."
20. Rex, *op.cit.*, 228.
21. Richard H. Popkin, "Hume and Jurieu: Possible Calvinist Origins of Hume's Theory of Belief," in *The High Road to Pyrrhonism*, eds. Richard A. Watson, James E. Force (San Diego:

Austin Hill Press, 1980), 165. Popkin cites Jurieu, *Traitté de la Nature et de la Grace. Ou Du concours général de la Providence & du concours particulier de la Grace efficace* ... (Utrecht: François Halma, 1687 [1688]), pps. 244–46 and 254–59.

22. Pierre Jurieu, *Histoire de la doctrine universelle de l'eglise* ... (Rotterdam: Abraham Acher, 1695), 145–6; see also 267.
23. Jurieu, *Le vray systeme de l'eglise* ... (Dordrecht: Caspar & Goris, 1686), 426. See my *Mind and Language: Essays on Descartes and Chomsky,* Chap. 5, and also for a remarkably orthodox reading of Bayle see my: "Bayle's attack on natural theology: the case of Christian Pyrrhonism," in *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, eds. Richard H. Popkin and Arjo Vanderjagt (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1993), 254–66.
24. On the larger question of Bayle's politics see Sally L. Jenkinson, "Rationality, pluralism and reciprocal tolerance: a re-appraisal of Pierre Bayle's political thought," in *Defending Politics: Bernard Crick and Pluralism*, ed. Iain Hampsher-Monk (London: British Academic Press, 1993), 22–45, and also her "Two concepts of tolerance: or why Bayle is not Locke," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 4, 1996, 302–321.
25. In my *Freedom of Speech: Words are not Deeds* (Westport: Praeger, 1994). I argue that Bayle draws a "category distinction" between *talk* and *action.* He introduces the notion of *freedom of speech* and thus that one ought to be free to *talk* about torture (or religious persecution) but not to engage freely in the *act* of torture. In this way the rights of an erring conscience might be preserved.
26. Jurieu, *Histoire du Calvinisme* ... Vol. 2 (Rotterdam: Reinier Leers, 1683), 279. For a discussion of Jurieu's compilation and editing methods for the *Histoire*, see the various papers by Knetsch as well as his *Pierre Jurieu* ... esp. 164.
27. Widely distributed (by post) in France and elsewhere on a fortnightly basis, 1686–89.
28. Rex, *op.cit.* 215.
29. See again Howells, *op.cit.*
30. *Op. cit.* 251.
31. Knetsch, *op.cit.* 384.
32. Bayle's subscription to Orthodoxy was ignored and his claims to being religious were taken as ridiculous on their face by most Enlightenment types. The evidence for ascribing to him an anti-religious position is often said to be that the *Dictionnaire* is 'full of obscenities' and that Bayle was obliged to answer for them. However, it is by no means obvious that Bayle's 'obscenities' prove anything about his religious sentiments. Even Calvinist theologians (and not just authors of guidebooks for Confessors) whose orthodoxy was not questioned often employed ribald, earthy examples. At that time and in earlier centuries the eyes of censors were usually focussed on heresy and blasphemy rather than obscenities. Twentieth-century commentators like Elisabeth Labrousse have been more generous to Bayle then Enlightenment commentators. Perhaps this is in part because we are more aware (since Kierkegaard? – certainly since Barth) of how ill equipped we are to plumb the depths of another person's faith. David Wootton is an exception. He has sought, I think without much success, to resurrect the eighteenth-century interpretation in his "Pierre Bayle, Libertine?" in *Studies in Seventeenth-Century European Philosophy*, ed. M.A. Stewart (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 197–226.
33. Bayle was very aware of this fragmentation process. He seems to have seen it ultimately leading to each sect being a "minority of one". See *Dictionnaire* Art 'Mammillaires.'
34. Just as Elisabeth Labrousse's superb work on Bayle has stimulated a generation of scholars to revise and reconsider traditional readings – I have in mind the work of Walter Rex, Richard Popkin, and Gianni Paganini – so Jurieu has also undergone major scholarly re-evaluation, thanks in particular to the fine work of Dodge, Schlossberg, and Knetsch.
35. See Richard H. Popkin, *The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

J.C. LAURSEN

8. BAYLE'S ANTI-MILLENARIANISM: THE DANGERS OF THOSE WHO CLAIM TO KNOW THE FUTURE

Millenarians and chiliasts claim to know something about the future. Pierre Bayle hated them more than almost anything else. Together with other believers in presages, revelations, and contemporary miracles, prophets, enthusiasts, millenarians, and chiliasts are lumped together as seditious fanatics, deserving of the stake. Bayle's *Historical and Critical Dictionary* contains a widespread, multi-pronged, and multivalent attack on millenarians. Text or notes to numerous articles pillory millenarians: Savonarola, Kotterus, Alstedius, Comenius, Kuhlman, Drabicius, Marests, Maresius, Braunbom, Stifelius, Paulicians, to name only some. If we add the articles that assail other forms of religious superstition, inspiration, or enthusiasm, we find that a substantial portion of the *Dictionary* is dedicated to savage and often unfair attacks on certain kinds of religion. Considering that Bayle is known for a robust theory of tolerance and for claims of even-handedness in historiography, this cries out for an explanation.[1]

However, the explanation will not be simple. Nothing about Bayle is straightforward.[2] He wrote at a time in which censorship and persecution would follow certain types of criticism of religion and rulers, and he and many other authors thus cultivated indirect ways of getting their message across. He was a master rhetorician as well, using attacks on one author to get at another, on one theory to undermine another. In Friedrich Schiller's terms, he was not a naïve, but rather a sentimental writer. At the outset I observe that if nothing else, Bayle is misunderstood when he is widely considered to be merely a journalist, polemicist, and compiler rather than a philosopher in his own right. The subtlety of his rhetoric and argumentation suggest that he was indeed a philosopher of the first order.

Just one example of the layers of meaning in Bayle's writings and of his disingenuousness will suffice. His first major published work, *Letter on the Comet* of 1682/3, purports to answer the many people who took and are taking the comet of 1680 seriously as a portent. Long ago, however, A. Prat reviewed the literature of the period and found that for decades the great majority of the

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 95–106.

literature of the day refuted the idea of comets as presages.[3] There was no need for Bayle to refute the idea; that had already been done. Bayle must be doing something else, under cover of refutation of an already refuted idea. What exactly that is remains the subject of much debate. For our purposes it shows that Bayle's attacks on claims to know the future were not limited to his later writings, but can be found as early as his first major work.

This chapter will not attempt to review Bayle's anti-millenarianism in all of his writings, but rather concentrate on his *Historical and Critical Dictionary*, which certainly had the widest and longest-lasting distribution of all of his writings. The Bayle of the *Dictionary* was arguably one of the most influential writers in developing mainstream Enlightenment and modern attitudes toward millenarians and other inspired religious groups. If Hume and Kant drove the final nails into the coffin of the prophetic world-view for the Enlighteners,[4] Bayle undeniably hammered in some of the sharpest nails. His detailed, one-by-one refutation and ridicule of individual millenarians likely had as much or more impact on general public opinion than Hume's brief logical demolition or Kant's major theoretical statement. Instead of seeing the good side of millenarianism, writers such as Norman Cohn have followed Bayle in blaming them for everything bad, even for the anti-semitism that led to the Holocaust.[5] The newspapers reveal that cults like the Waco Koreshians and some of the right-wing militias have millenarian connections, and the whole movement is tarred with that brush. Richard Popkin is one of very few writers who has recently brought pacific and loving millenarians to our attention.[6]

To anticipate my conclusions, Bayle's anti-millenarianism is fully consistent with understanding him as a Calvinist, and reinforces the claim that he was very much a political thinker, with politics as the driving force behind many of his intellectual polemics.

The anti-millenarian texts

Before turning to possible deeper meanings of Bayle's anti-millenarianism, let us briefly review the texts. The article on Savonarola seems to be the historical starting point of Bayle's reflections. Moravian Bishop Jan Comenius is one of the most often mentioned figures. Bayle's arch-enemy after about 1682, Pierre Jurieu, is usually referenced, directly or obliquely, in connection with other prophets and millenarians.[7]

The surprising thing is that Bayle expresses no reservations with respect to the fate of millenarians such as Savonarola, tortured and burned at the stake in Florence; Simon Morin, burned at the stake in Paris; Quirinus Kuhlman, burned at the stake in Moscow.[8] Ruth Whelan has observed the same thing with respect to the radical reformers, some inspired by prophecy and millenarianism, and some of whom met cruel ends: "he is insensitive to the severity of the punishments they received."[9] Elisabeth Labrousse has written of Bayle's "antipathie foncière pour l'illuminisme."[10]

Savonarola is treated unfairly by Bayle. Bayle relies almost entirely on polemics against Savonarola as his sources, and specifically rejects

Guicciardini's balanced account. "If this Dominican was not an impostor, he must necessarily have been a prodigious fanatic," he writes (V.71).[11] It "profanes the name of God" to "put off his particular opinions for immediate revelations" (V.70). But his real crime was that he "concerned himself too much with political affairs": this "is always blameable in persons who have dedicated themselves to the ministry of the word of God" (V.61). Bayle even sanctions the use of torture to make Savonarola admit to his crimes, although elsewhere he opposed it (V.69).

Similarly, Comenius is treated unfairly, not only in the eponymous article, but also in several articles such as "Kotterus" and "Drabicius," to which the reader is referred in notes. Only his chief opponents are cited, not his supporters.[12] Comenius is "infatuated with prophecies, and revolutions, the fall of Antichrist, the millennium and with like whims of a dangerous fanaticism: I say dangerous, not only in relation to orthodoxy, but also in relation to princes and states" (II.537). On top of the irony of Bayle posing as a defender of orthodoxy, contemporary scholarship tells us that Comenius was in fact quite orthodox for his times.[13]

To Bayle, Comenius was a sophist. When his prophecies failed, he would suddenly remember a clause that would explain why the event had not occurred. "These are the men for my money: there is always some clause that is not attended to ... the same clauses are essential or accidental to the prophecies of these people, just as the event pleases to determine. This is their grand key" (II.692–3).[14] Comenius was also venal: he ended his life in comfortable Amsterdam while his people suffered elsewhere, because he had found "a gold mine" in his patrons there (II.537).[15]

Comenius's main crime, like Savonarola's, was political ambition: "a divine, who travels as much as he did, and who has such frequent business at the courts of princes, is a man, who is not much to be trusted" (III.682). Bayle blames him for the massacre of Moravians at Lesno in Poland because he had told them not to leave because divine intervention would save them from an approaching army, and he had rendered the Protestants odious to the Polish Catholics "by reason of a Panegyric that he unseasonably made upon Charles Gustavus, King of Sweden, at the time of the invasion of Poland" (I.539).

Bayle's contemporaries would have recognized the analogy of Comenius's panegyric to Pierre Jurieu's panegyrics of William of Orange, which naturally angered the French and confirmed their opposition to the Huguenots. Most of Bayle's attacks on other millenarians had obvious analogies to Jurieu.

In "Braunbom," Bayle devotes substantial attention to Pierre Jurieu's prophetic calculations, which were based in part on Joseph Mede. Predictions of the end of Antichrist for 1620, 1653/4, and 1690 have been substantially refuted, he asserts. Those of Mede and others which give the date as 1710–15, 1716, 1720, 1736, or more prudently, "during the eighteenth century," will soon enough be refuted. Bayle notes that "What is surprizing is that the ill success of an infinite number of commentators on the Apocalypse does not hinder others from falling into the same temerity ... . They embark every day on the sea, as if it were not noted for thousands of shipwrecks" (II.122). Here again, Bayle does

not stick to the canons of impartiality on which he has elsewhere insisted. He admits, for example, that he knows Braunbom's book only from a refutation by Adam Contzen, which he accepts uncritically (II.122).[16]

Another millenarian pilloried in "Braunbom" is Pierre Allix. "Mr. Allix, after the ill success of Mr. Jurieu, has entered the field to declare to the Public, that Antichrist shall perish either in the year 1716, or in the year 1720, or at least in the year 1736" (II.125). Yet another prophet, Nicolas Gurtlerus, predicts that "the Apocalyptical Babylon shall fall entirely in the course of the XVIIIth century" (ibid.). Enough of such predictions, and the public will not know which one to believe. In a paraphrase of Cicero's claim that the best way to deal with the gods is not to judge of them at all, Bayle observes that "the surest way is not to judge at all of things to come" (I.794).

From "Braunbom" we are directed to "Stifelius." In that article, Bayle cites predictions for the end of the world in 1533, 1670, 1689, and 1696 (V.236–8). Of the last, he writes, "The event has shown that they were mistaken" (ibid.). Peasants, rich men, and even the tyrant of Syracuse, who stopped working and splurged all their money because the end was coming, ended up beggars. There are ulterior motives: "an artful fellow had encouraged this man [Campanus] in his whimsical notions, in order that he might purchase at a cheaper rate the lands of the credulous country people" (V.238).

Bayle does not hesitate to attack icons of the Huguenots for such predictions. In "Braunbom," Bayle asserts that Du Plessis Mornay's Epistle Dedicatory to his *Mystère d'iniquité* was designed to "set all Europe in a flame, and cause a deluge of blood to be shed," leading to "the general desolation of all the states of Europe" and "the most execrable horrors of a war for religion" (II.126–7). He charges that "it is endeavouring to introduce slaughter and massacre everywhere, to talk of accomplishing prophecies. The books in these oracles of St. John are oil to the fire." It provokes an enemy "to be perpetually foretelling that he shall, in a little time, be exterminated by the sword." By way of damage control, Bayle is thankful that "they who have the sovereign authority among the Protestants do not measure their conduct by the predictions or exhortations of their writers" (II.127).

Jean Rothe "disturbed the church and state with his libels; but nothing came to pass of what he had foretold" (III.689). He was "shut up in a prison of Amsterdam" and after "being set at liberty, he was laughed at by every body, his prophecies being found contrary to the event" (III.690). Sometimes it is enough to leave the criticism to one of their own. Another prophet, Antoinette Bourignon, accused Rothe of being a false prophet, "over whom the devil has a great power" (III.690). But Bayle also draws another conclusion: "she would not suffer any Companion or Colleague" (II.111). In turn, her critics accused her "either of Imposture, or of Diabolical Illusion" (II.114).

In addition to whole articles or notes devoted largely to the errors of millenarians, parries and jabs can be found here and there throughout the *Dictionary*. Guillaume Postel is called "a learned man and a fool" (III.883). Melchior Hofman predicted a day of judgment in 1534 based on "I know not what medley of Zuinglianism and Fanaticism," from which Bayle concludes

that "Men should be very cautious in judging the whole by a part" (III.480–1). The article on Alstedius – Comenius's teacher – ends with the remark that "I must not omit, that he was a Millenarian ... . He pretended, that this Reign [Christ's] would commence in the Year 1694. We are fully assured he was mistaken" (I.234). Sebastian Franck, who imagined that even plants and inanimate things have souls, was "a true fanatic" (III.99). John Des Marests "became at last a visionary and fanatical" (IV.113). John Dury "at last became a sort of visionary" (III.34–5). Hugh Broughton was "a furious and abusive writer" (II.150). Paul Felgenhawer "assumes to himself more than once a prophetic spirit"; Petrus Serrarius was "deposed from the ministry for the fanatical errors of Swenckveldius [Schwenkfeldt], to which he was wholly addicted" (IV.123). Martin Borrhaus "showed a great deal of Fanaticism," but reconverted back to Calvinism "when the hopes they [Anabaptists] had given of the renovation of all things proved false" (II.83–4).

Millenarianism affects personal life. Bayle retails a story told of Jean Labadie, significantly without revealing any source. That millenarian told a woman to pray, and when he then put his hand upon her breast and she protested, he rebuked her for not concentrating on her prayer. It "is very probable," Bayle asserts, "that some of those spiritual devotees, who make people believe, that a strong meditation will ravish the soul, and hinder it from perceiving the actions of the body, have a mind to toy with their devout sisters with impunity." He cannot resist adding, "and many are glad to be deceived" (IV.87).

The worst results, according to Bayle, are the political consequences. Jacob Brocardus was "an Apocalyptical author" who "foretold that such and such things would happen to the Prince of Orange, Philip II, Queen Elizabeth, the Emperor, etc." Even as he denies that Brocardus was dangerous, Bayle takes the opportunity to attack prophets who are: "they will occasion the attempting of a thousand things which nobody would think of; they are perfect Incendiaries ... some of them design only to cause wars ... they have more Wit than Honesty, and are the plague of Mankind" (II.142–3). He endorses Maresius's view that millenarians incite revolutions (IV.122). He is often careful to distinguish "political conjecture" from "poetical rapture" (I.794).

Occasionally Bayle tries to dismiss millenarians as harmless, or beyond the pale. One, Christopher Helvicus, refuted another, Angelocrater. "This much diminishes the glory of those who confuted him, it being an easy thing to find a thousand chimaeras in the writings of those pretended inspired men," Bayle remarks (III.388). But this is disingenuous. If it were true, why, then, would Bayle spend so much time trying to refute millenarians?

This review of Bayle's often-extreme attitude toward millenarians raises a puzzle about the status of Bayle's claims to high historiographical and journalistic standards. If those claims are sincere, then his unfair assaults on millenarians suggest that there must be some deep psychological or emotional reasons for violating his own standards. If they are just a rhetorical tool for claiming the moral high ground and for masking his biases, then Bayle must be a cynical propagandist. Questions of sincerity and cynicism in complex texts

are, of course, notoriously hard to decide. Rather than trying to settle this issue here, however, we shall go on to explore the meaning of these attacks on millenarians for the interpretation of Bayle's religious and political views.

Bayle's religion

The meaning of Bayle's critiques of enthusiastic religion will depend upon their context in his overall view of religion, and that has been much contested. His anti-millenarianism will mean one thing if it is part of a sometimes-covert but general assault on organized religion *tout court*, and something else if it is part of a defense of his own brand of Calvinism.

Many readers in and since his own time have taken Bayle to be undermining all organized religion on behalf of deism or atheism. Nevertheless, in the twentieth century some of the best Bayle scholars have concluded that Bayle was himself religious; a certain sort of Calvinist.[17] We do not have to settle this question here, but rather to look at what Bayle's anti-millenarianism would mean for each of these positions. In fact, these possible meanings provide some evidence for one of the hypotheses about Bayle's religion.

If Bayle is a sincere Calvinist, one thing that needs explaining is his notorious scepticism. This has been explained by Popkin and others in terms of fideism, a tradition that stretches from Montaigne through Pascal, Bayle, Hamann, and Jacobi at least to Kierkegaard. After scepticism has reduced reason to a pulp, Bayle often claims that we should accept Christianity on faith. Scepticism is thus taken as an ally of faith which clears away the obstacles that reason might put in its way.

The trouble, of course, is that there is not much of a pro-active or positive reason why we should take what Kierkegaard called a "leap of faith" after reason has been destroyed. Critics might even accuse Bayle of relying on some sort of implicit enthusiasm or inspiration to justify this leap. And that suggests the implicit role of Bayle's anti-millenarianism.

I have suggested elsewhere that Bayle's reaction to the millenarians was that of fratricide.[18] If Popkin is right that after Montaigne the sceptical tradition branched into two schools – that of the sceptical fideists like Montaigne and Bayle and that of the prophets and millenarians like Savonarola and Comenius who concluded that if reason was destroyed one could rely on prophecy – , then Bayle's reaction was all the more indignant because he recognized that his enemies were members of his own sceptical fraternity but he believed that they misused their scepticism.

Not long before Bayle, as Daniel Fouke has explained, Henry More had written *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* (1662) and several other writings in virulent attack on religious enthusiasts *precisely because* they held a position very close in some ways to his own, which was a Platonic mysticism.[19] Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* of 1621 had inaugurated a genre of anti-enthusiastic literature which medicalized religious inspiration, and More did not want to be tarred with the same brush. How self-conscious this was, or whether it was in fact sub-conscious, does not need to be decided here.

The suggestive parallel is that perhaps Bayle was particularly sensitive to the enthusiasts precisely because he had no better justification for his faith than they did.

A contemporary suggestion to this effect can be found in a letter to Bayle from an ex-Oratorian, Michel Le Vassor. Bayle had written that he was going to defend his attacks on religious dogma in his usual way: that one could still have faith. Le Vassor answered that "no one will believe that you speak sincerely on this occasion. Because, after all, could a man who has spirit and discernment like a principle from which it follows that one could not be truly Christian without a species of enthusiasm or fanaticism? Aren't you reduced to having recourse to that ridiculous opinion of the man that you combat the most?"[20] If Le Vassor is right, Bayle's rancor against millenarians could be, like More's, an emotional reaction to the danger of being identified with those who were closest to him in some respects, but which he rejected.

Psychological or emotional explanations such as the foregoing are notoriously hard to justify or to falsify, but they may on occasion be true. Otherwise, how do we explain Bayle's peculiar behavior with respect to millenarians?

All of the foregoing applies to the case if Bayle is a genuine Calvinist in his own right. An irony here is that as a sectarian he may be more dangerous to the general cause of religion than he might have been if he were an atheist. If he were an atheist, he might have been more generous to poor, deluded religionists of all sorts. But in defense of his own interpretation of Christianity, he makes other branches look bad. If he can see that his attacks on other Protestants play into the hands of the Catholics, he does not care because he thinks they are just as bad as the Catholics. In this he is like all the warring parties in religious feuds.

It rings true that we can explain the rise of irreligion as a product of each of those warring parties accusing the other of atheism and of exposing so much error inside religion that some people began to search outside of it.[21] Even if Bayle was genuinely religious, he surely contributed to this process, whether deliberately or not. This would, of course, be one of the reasons why he was read as irreligious. Readers who could not see or could not believe that Bayle's animus against other forms of religiosity was in fact based on his own form of religion would naturally take it as part of a general campaign against religion.

If, however, Bayle was actually irreligious, and all his protestations of religion were just designed to avoid offending readers in order to insidiously subvert them and to prevent censorship and persecution, then it is no puzzle that he attacked the millenarians. His assaults on them would just go hand in hand with his assaults on other forms of religion. He does indeed attack the rationalists, from the sixteenth-century Socinians to his contemporaries Jacques Bernard, Jean Le Clerc, and Isaac Jaquelot, with ferocity, although he does not suggest the stake.[22] He is not always gentle in his probing of the orthodox (see, for example, "David" or "St. Francis"), but he does seem, on the whole, to be fairer, often citing both the pros and the cons. If Bayle is indeed more vicious in his attacks on millenarians than he is on a wide range of figures

from the more orthodox Calvinists and Catholics to the rationalists, we still need to know why. It is not clear why an atheist or deist would single out and be so strident and so unfair with the millenarians.

I have not found an answer to this in David Wootton's, Gianluca Mori's, or Jean-Michel Gros's recent arguments for taking Bayle as an atheist or libertine.[23] If there is no good answer, this very point may be an argument in favor of the hypothesis that Bayle was indeed religious. At least we have the foregoing explanation for his behavior if he was religious, and no good explanation for his behavior if he is indeed a deist or atheist.

I can, however, think of some possible theories. For example, one could see the attacks on millenarians as strategic. If millenarians were the most vulnerable and least likely to be defended of the religious people, an atheist could attack them with relative impunity and hope that the general implications would rub off on other religious positions as well. However, I do not, at present, have any good reasons to believe that they were so vulnerable; in fact, presumably they had the sympathy of many readers and especially of Jurieu's supporters. Socinians and rationalists were probably at least as vulnerable.

The most promising possible explanation deserves further development. That is that Bayle disfavored millenarianism largely because it was connected to certain kinds of political behavior.

Bayle's Politics

A second contested issue in the literature is Bayle's politics. Most commentators take Bayle to have been an absolutist who hoped that complete submission to the powers that be would lead to the recall of the Huguenots to France by a grateful king.[24] Then much of his ire at millenarians who get involved in politics can be understood as a rejection of their mixing of politics and religion. He would belong in the camp of the *politiques*, those who favored separation of religion and politics in order to maintain political stability. On this reading, the worst thing a millenarian could do would be to rock the boat, to provoke civil war, to upset the civil peace which made the life of letters possible.[25]

There is substantial evidence for reading Bayle as an absolute monarchist in politics. Normally, he evidences enormous respect for kings and other authorities. Hubert Bost has pointed out that the one reproach he ever makes against a king comes when he suggests that Francis I should have left men's consciences to God.[26] Michel de l'Hospital is one of Bayle's heroes. Thus, since Bayle's chief enemy was Jurieu, who relied on prophecy to inspire the Huguenots at home and abroad to consider armed rebellion,[27] one reading of all of Bayle's attacks on millenarians is that they were all directed *sub rosa* at Jurieu, and provoked by the perceived threat to political stability that they represented. Surely some of his contemporaries would have understood this.

It is a pity that Dominique Colas's recent book, translated into English as *Civil Society and Fanaticism*,[28] did not know much about Bayle. In Colas's view, fanaticism is always to be understood in opposition to civil society. It is an

attack on representation or mediation in everything from art to government, rejecting representative assemblies and the rule of law in the name of direct advice from God. The Anabaptists, the French Camisards, Engels's defense of Thomas Müntzer, and the Bolsheviks count as fanatics. Melanchthon, Spinoza, Leibniz, and Kant count as defenders of civil society determined to suppress fanaticism. Bayle's critiques of the millenarians, then, would count as defenses of civil society as represented by political elites against the theocracy or the "direct democracy" of the inspired. On the basis of the trenchancy of his arguments and their widespread influence, Bayle deserves a place in Colas's canon of anti-fanatics.

One drawback to this explanation is that Bayle must have known that Jurieu and the millenarians were not as dangerous as he sometimes makes him out to be. At the very least, if Bayle's concern about a radical Calvinist uprising was justified in 1685–1690, he must have seen that it was hardly justified by 1697–1702 and the writing of the *Dictionary.*

One question about this interpretation is whether or not Bayle's anti-millenarianism was really a matter of politics. It is not really known which came first, the personal or the political animosity to Jurieu. If his anti-millenarianism was largely part of a personal feud against Jurieu, then we can explain it as an idiosyncrasy of his personality, and he would look like a sort of obsessive maniac, perhaps even paranoid. On the other hand, if it really was the politics that turned him against Jurieu, then we would have to count Bayle as a deeply and fundamentally *political* thinker, more so than most commentators have done.

In the political interpretation of Bayle, he fought with Jurieu for ideological reasons which overrode their previous friendship, and he loaded his texts with partisan political polemic. There is some justification for the *politique* view in interpretations of Bayle as an erasmian in both religion and politics.[29] But unlike Erasmus's projection of moderation and irenicism, Bayle emerges as a rather disturbed figure, a vindictive political (or anti-political) enthusiast of his own sort, certainly not the passionless erudite of some of the secondary literature.

A recent interpretation tends to support something like the foregoing, even as it rejects the prevailing view of Bayle as an absolutist. Sally Jenkinson notes that he supports republican revolutions such as the Dutch Revolt and the Glorious Revolution in the right circumstances.[30] Religion certainly played a significant role in both of those revolts. But perhaps the key is that neither one relied heavily on enthusiastic religion. Bayle's republicanism is probably a traditional republicanism of the *pars maiores*, which means that only high civil magistrates can lead a republic, but "the people," priests, and free-lancing prophets cannot. It was the "States of Holland" who lead the revolt (Koornhert: 3.675), and the Dutch nobleman and publicist of the revolt St. Aldegonde was "one of the illustrious men of the XVIth century" (5.25). Thus, even if Bayle is prepared to endorse republicanism and not just absolutism, his horror of the involvement of priests in politics remains the same. As Harry Bracken points out in his paper in this volume, the constant is separation of church and state.

But this still does not solve our problem. Staid, established, non-enthusiastic religions that do not upset the political status quo, if we may so understand mainstream Catholicism and Calvinism, were closely involved, to say the least, with states and politics. Everything that Bayle said about millenarians could have been said about some of their members (i.e., that they were venal, subversive, political, etc.). But they do not come in for the same strident and unfair treatment as the millenarians. Why not? Politics explains the direction, but not the fanaticism, the emotion, the obsession of Bayle's anti-fanaticism.

I am afraid the answer is going to be one of those tendentious psychological explanations. Bayle was just more comfortable with established, staid, non-enthusiastic religions which did not claim to know any details about the future and did not systematically promote revolution. He was insensitive to the cruel punishments of the radicals and millenarians in the same way that he was insensitive to any religious feeling beyond the tepid religion that he describes in "Bunel, Pierre,"[31] and this was one of the irreducibles of his emotional make-up. With respect to the millenarians, it looks like he had a deep-seated fear of those who claim to know the future.

University of California, Riverside

NOTES

1. This chapter challenges all such generalizations as that Bayle "treated everyone with dignity" and extended "toleration almost without limit" (Thomas M. Lennon, *Reading Bayle* [Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999, 44, 74]). Otherwise, Lennon's book is very fine.
2. I have discussed puzzles in his famous theory of the erring conscience in "The Necessity of Conscience and the Conscientious Persecutor: the Paradox of Liberty and Necessity in Bayle's Theory of Toleration" in Luisa Simonutti, ed., *Dal necessario al possibile: Critica al determinismo e luogo delle libertà nel pensiero anglo-holandese del XVII secolo* (Milan: Francoangelli, 2000).
3. A. Prat, "Introduction" to Pierre Bayle, *Pensées diverses sur la comète* (1911; second ed. Paris: Société des Textes Français Modernes, 1994), vii–xiii.
4. See Richard Popkin, "Predicting, Prophecying, Divining and Foretelling from Nostradamus to Hume" in *The Third Force in Seventeenth-Century Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 285–307.
5. Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961).
6. See Richard Popkin, "Scepticism About Religion and Millenarian Dogmatism: Two Sources of Toleration in the Seventeenth Century" in J.C. Laursen and C.J. Nederman, eds., *Beyond the Persecuting Society: Religious Toleration Before the Enlightenment* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998), 232–250.
7. For another treatment of some of the texts, see my "Baylean Liberalism: Tolerance Requires Nontolerance" in Laursen and Nederman, eds., *Beyond the Persecuting Society*, 209ff.
8. On Kuhlman, see Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, "Salvation Through Philology: The Poetical Messianism of Quirinus Kuhlmann (1651–1689)" in Peter Schäfer and Mark Cohen, eds., *Toward the Millennium: Messianic Expectations from the Bible to Waco* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 259–298.
9. Ruth Whelan, "Les Reformateurs radicaux dans le *Dictionnaire* de Bayle: analyse d'une attitude ambivalente" in Gérard Gros, ed., *La Bible et ses raisons: Diffusion et distortions du discours religieux* (St. Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne, 1996), 260.

10. Elisabeth Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle*, vol. 2, *Hétérodoxie et rigorisme* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1965), 582.
11. Bayle's *Dictionnaire* is cited by volume and page number from the English edition of 1734, *The Dictionary Historical and Critical of Mr. Peter Bayle. The Second Edition* (London: 1734–1738).
12. See F.R.J. Knetsch, *Bayles Ordeel over Comenius* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1970) and "Le jugement de Bayle sur Comenius," *Bulletin de la Commission de l'histoire des Eglises Wallones* (1969–71), 83–96. Ruth Whelan reports on Bayle's unfair historiography with respect to the superstitious Catholic Agreda in *Anatomy of Superstition,* Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century No. 259, Oxford, 1989, 9–30.
13. Emidio Campi, "Johann Amos Comenius (1592–1670) und die protestantische Theologie seiner Zeit," *Zwingliana*, vol. 22, 1995, 67–83.
14. Similarly, "the fanatic Nagelius," "had foretold surprising revolutions, and was a man of so great obstinacy, that however contrary an event proved to his predictions, he would still maintain that they were true. He always brought himself off by asking a further delay" [saying they would come true later] (V.237).
15. Given Bayle's attitude toward Comenius, it is rather surprising that Erich Beyreuther's "Zinzendorf und Bayle," *Herrnhüter Hefte*, vol. 8, 1955, 1–36, which describes Zinzendorf's admiration for Bayle, does not mention the problem that Bayle's attacks on Comenius must have posed for that early eighteenth-century leader of Comenius's religious group, the Moravians.
16. This point, along with some of the foregoing material about one-sidedness, should be explained by any attempt to cast Bayle as an Academic skeptic who gives equal weight to both sides of every argument. See Jose Maia Neto, "Bayle's Academic Scepticism" in James E. Force and David S. Katz, eds., *Everything Connects: In Conference with Richard H. Popkin* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 264–276. Bayle was an *avocat* against the millenarians, not a *rapporteur.*
17. E.g., Cornelia Serrurier, *Pierre Bayle en Hollande* (Lausanne: La Concorde, 1912); Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle*; Richard Popkin, "Introduction" to *Pierre Bayle: Historical and Critical Dictionary: Selections* (1966; second edition, Indianapolis: Hackett, 1991); Gianni Paganini, "Fidéisme ou 'modica theologia'? Pierre Bayle et les avatars de la tradition érasmienne" in *Le Dictionnaire Historique et Critique de Pierre Bayle* (Maarssen: APA-Holland University Press, 1998), 389–409.
18. Laursen, "Baylean Liberalism: Tolerance Requires Nontolerance," 213.
19. See Daniel Fouke, *The Enthusiastical Concerns of Dr. Henry More: Religious Meaning and the Psychology of Delusion* (Leiden: Brill, 1997). See also Michael Heyd, *"Be Sober and Reasonable": The Critique of Enthusiasm in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) and the special issue of the *Huntington Library Quarterly*, vol. 60, 1998, titled *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650–1850.*
20. Letter of 7/5/1697 in Emil Gigas, *Choix de la correspondance inédite de Pierre Bayle* (Copenhagen and Paris, 1890), 504–5; E. Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle*, vol. 2, 311 interprets Le Vassor's argument as rationalist narrow-mindedness.
21. John Redwood, *Reason, Ridicule, and Religion: The Age of Enlightenment in England 1660–1750* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976); Alan Charles Kors, *Atheism in France, 1660–1730* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).
22. See Massimo Firpo, "Pierre Bayle, gli eretici italiani del cinquecento e la tradizione sociniana," *Rivista storica italiana*, vol. 85, 1973, 612–666; Stefano Brogi, *Teologia senza verità. Bayle contro i 'rationaux'* (Milano: Francoangeli, 1998). Barbara Tinsley even argues that Bayle's writings on the Socinians are designed to promote toleration of them, in "Sozzini's Ghost: Pierre Bayle and Socinian Toleration," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 57, 1996, 609–624, but she does not cover most of the materials cited by Firpo and Brogi.
23. David Wootton, "Pierre Bayle, Libertine?" in M.A. Stewart, ed., *Studies in Seventeenth-Century European Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 197–226; Gianluca Mori, "Pierre Bayle, the Rights of Conscience, the 'Remedy' of Toleration," *Ratio Juris* vol. 10, 1997, 45–60 and "L'<athée spéculatif> selon Bayle: permanence et développements d'une idée" in M. Magdelaine, M.-C. Pitassi, R. Whelan, and A. McKenna, eds., *De l'Humanisme*

aux Lumières (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1996), 595–609; Jean-Michel Gros, "Sens et limites de la théorie de la tólerance chez Bayle" in P.-F. Moreau, ed., *Pierre Bayle: La foi dans le doute* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1995), 65–86.

24. See Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle*, esp. vol 2, chs. 16–19 and Whelan, "Les Reformateurs radicaux dans le *Dictionnaire* de Bayle," esp. page 261.
25. See Gisela Schlüter, *Die französische Toleranzdebatte im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1992), 191ff. on the importance to Bayle of organizing political life around endless debate and discussion.
26. Hubert Bost, "L'Histoire des églises réformées de France dans le *Dictionnaire* de Bayle" in Jens Häseler and Antony McKenna, eds., *La Vie intellectuelle aux Refuges protestants* (Paris: Champion, 1999), 232.
27. See Harry Bracken's chapter in this volume.
28. Dominique Colas, *Civil Society and Fanaticism: Conjoined Histories* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997) [orig. *Le Glaive et le fléau: Généalogie du fanatisme et de la société civile* (Paris: Grasset & Fasquelle, 1992)].
29. See Paganini, "Fidéisme ou 'modica theologia'?"
30. Sally Jenkinson, "Introduction. Bayle's Dictionary: A Defense of Justice and Freedom" to Pierre Bayle, *Historical and Critical Dictionary: Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and "Rationality, Pluralism, and Reciprocal Tolerance" in Iain Hampsher-Monk, ed., *Defending Politics: Bernard Crick and Pluralism* (London: British Academic Press, 1993, 22–45.
31. Popkin suggests that "Brunel, Pierre" can be interpreted to contain Bayle's statement of faith. See "Introduction," xxv.

U.M. GLEIXNER

9. PIETISM, MILLENARIANISM, AND THE FAMILY FUTURE: THE JOURNAL OF BEATE HAHN-PAULUS (1778–1842)

The millenarian perspective in Württemberg Pietism was grounded in the social base of this movement. Current research on German Pietism has almost entirely neglected questions of communication, group culture, world view, and the role of religion in the organization of life.[1] The contextualization of Württemberg millenarianism can contribute to filling in this gap. In recent years, the connection between intellectual and social history has laid the groundwork for a new cultural history.[2] The research I present here has grown out of this cultural historical perspective.

Working in the field of tensions among the individual and his or her gender, group membership, and religious ideas, I ask the following questions: To what intellectual audience was the work of a particular author directed? How were those in the direct personal circle of learned men influenced by their millenarian ideas? Did they put their chiliasm into practice in their teaching, pastoral work, and sermons? Were their families – their sons, daughters and wives – also included in the society of the learned? Is there a connection between the formation of elite groups and a millenarian perspective?

These questions will be put to the test in a case study. Beate Hahn-Paulus (1778–1842), the daughter of the minister, watchmaker, and inventor Philipp Matthäus Hahn (1739–1790), was very familiar with the millenarian ideas of her father and those of his teacher, Friedrich Christoph Oetinger. In 1817 – many years after her father's death – at age 39 and after 17 years of marriage, Beate Paulus began to keep a diary. Her apparent primary concern was with the academic education of her sons, which was permanently imperilled by a disagreement with her husband on this matter. Beate's beseeching prayers to God are imbued with her millenarian hope that her sons would be permitted to play a special role in preparing for the coming of the kingdom of God. First, I provide an introduction to the development of Pietism in Germany and a sketch of the most important millenarians in Württemberg. Then a connection will be made to Beate Hahn's close personal circle and to her own reception of the millenarian perspective.

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 107–121.

My primary interest here lies with inner-churchly Pietism, and thus I shall trace only those millenarian authors who remained within the state church of Württemberg. This inner-churchly Pietist reform movement was led by a middle-class, educated elite, the so-called *Ehrbarkeit* (honorables). Since the nobility in post-Reformation Württemberg no longer had any political importance in the territorial Diet, the middle class took its place. This university-educated and pious middle-class group was composed of the families of professors, ministers, jurists, doctors, pharmacists, teachers at academic schools, and a few merchants. Class membership and piety formed the basis of their endogamous marital behavior.[3] It was not until the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century that Pietism became popularized in Württemberg and began to attract lay groups with little education – above all among winegrowers and craftsmen – who gave the movement a strong separatist thrust.

The Pietist Reform Movement in Germany

The Protestant reform movement of Pietism took on a different character in different regions of Germany. In a mixture of territorial politics, leading personalities, impulses from Pietist movements outside of Germany, and various social bases, this reform movement was particularly influential in a few Protestant territories. The influences of English Puritanism, the Dutch Pietist movement, and the roots of the movement in Germany (Schwenkfeld, Paracelsus, Valentin Weigel, Johann Valentin Andreae, Johann Arndt, and Jakob Spener) may be considered preconditions for the different territorial expressions of the movement. Territorial developments in the seventeenth century include the Silesian spiritualists in the circle around Jakob Böhme; Dutch-influenced reformed Pietism on the lower Rhine, in Nassau, Hessen-Kassel, the Palatinate, and northern Germany; and the most frequently mentioned model of Prussian Pietism, which is inextricably linked to August Hermann Francke and his educational institutions in Halle. Separatist tendencies also sprang up everywhere. Radical Pietist groups were criminalized and wandered from exile to exile. These were followed in the eighteenth century by the community founded by the Herrnhuter in Saxony (associated with Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf) and by Württemberg Pietism.

Württemberg Pietism was characterized by its social base in a corporately organized educated middle class, by its inner-churchly development, and its heavy emphasis on the doctrine of God's saving grace (*Heilsgeschichte*).[4]

Johann Jakob Spener and the Impact of Millenarian Aspirations upon the Protestant State Church

The incorporation of Pietist reform tendencies into the Lutheran state church is usually dated to Philipp Jakob Spener's (1635–1705) publication of *Pia Desideria* in 1675, although Spener's reform program was neither autonomous nor original. Rather, it was deeply anchored in seventeenth-century Protestant

piety movements and in mysticism and spiritualism, and its suggestions for improvement belonged to a set of reform ideas discussed throughout the seventeenth century. Spener closely followed precursors and renewers such as Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–1654) and devotional author Johann Arndt (1555–1621). Thus it comes as no surprise that he published his reform program as a preface to a new edition of Arndt's sermons.

In his *Pia Desideria* Spener sketched not only rebirth, personal piety, and the observance and spiritual priesthood of the laity (which explicitly included women as well as men) and called for private congregational gatherings, but also formulated an eschatological hope for better times for the church. Before the end of the world, the faithful could expect the fall of papal Rome and thus should convert Jews and heathen with holy zeal so that the divine promise according to the *Revelations* of John could be fulfilled. The improved condition of the church promised by God could be fulfilled when individuals and congregations strive for perfection.[6] The questions of how to classify Spener and of whether his restrained, optimistic vision was a millenarian one have been the subject of bitter controversy in the theological research on Pietism,[7] and appear to have been decided in favor of the millenarian quality of his aspirations.[8] The most important arguments in favor of his link to a chiliastic rather than an orthodox tradition seem to me to be his combining of the conversion of Jews with eschatological aspirations and his close ties to the millenarians Jean de Labadie (1610–1674), Anna Maria von Schurmann (1607–1678), and Johann Jakob Schütz (1640–1690), within whose separatist context he developed his own ideas.[9]

Nonetheless, Spener rejected a more radical millenarian framework along the lines of a physical, bodily resurrection of all the just, as in the works of Johann Wilhelm Petersen (1649–1726) and Johanna Eleonora Petersen (*née* von Merlau) (1644–1724).[10] That Spener's references in the *Pia Desideria* are to Luther, orthodox theologians, and the devotional writers accepted by them should probably be understood strategically and indicates his strict adherence to an inner-churchy discursive framework.

Spener's state-churchly reform perspective seems to be decisive with respect to the categorization of his activities. It permitted him to clearly distance himself from former close allies who went on to develop separatist ideas such as the Petersens or Johann Jakob Schütz. Politically, his path to reform, which was oriented toward the state church, remained loyal to the authorities, antirevolutionary, and proceeded from the duty of subjects to obey. As a minister at Straßburg Minster, at the Barfüßerkirche in Frankfurt-am-Main, and later as court preacher in Dresden and Berlin, Spener held high ecclesiastical offices throughout his career. In Frankfurt and Berlin he had considerable influence over the enforcement of a new, stricter church discipline. He may be considered an activist in the disciplinary campaign against popular culture in the second half of the seventeenth century.

Learned Millenarians in Württemberg: Johann Albrecht Bengel, Friedrich Christoph Oetinger, and Philipp Matthäus Hahn

Württemberg Pietism has been regarded in recent theological and historical research as an autonomous type of Pietist thought with strong millenarian influences.[11] The early Pietism of 1680–1715 was a politically active force for reform at both the inner-churchly and separatist levels.[12] In the seventeenth century, some Württembergian ministers lost their offices because of their millenarian writings and holding of conventicles.[13] While it is true that the University of Tübingen rejected the new piety, the Stuttgart Consistory was open to Spenerist Pietism.[14]

The harshest measures against separatist millenarians were taken not by the church leadership but by the Duke, since the immorality of Baroque court life was a target of the separatist critique of society. His Pietist edict of 1694 rejected revolutionary chiliasm but made room for Spener's formulation of a "hope for better times" and did not categorize it as heresy.[15] Until 1715 many edicts followed which were decidedly directed against separatist groups. A period of greater tolerance began in 1715 with the toleration of private gatherings, which ultimately led to the legalization of conventicles in 1743.[16] With this, millenarian aspirations in Württemberg became a component of the church constitution, laying the groundwork for an inner-churchly development. Middle-class Pietism in a sense infiltrated the state church, while separatist tendencies were repressed. Not until the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century did new, lay-based separatist groups arise, and these no longer drew their recruits among the old Pietist elite.[17]

The notion of the unity of all knowledge was a fundamental consensus in the thinking of the learned Swabian Pietists in the eighteenth century. The wholeness of the Bible was the basis for recognition of the unity of nature and history. This linking of theological, scientific, and historical knowledge found its equivalent in the impulse for scientific research among millenarian ministers. A connection between the humanistic and natural sciences continues to this day to be very formative for the self-image of educated Württembergers, who think of themselves as a nation of inventors and constructors.

Inner-churchly Württemberg Pietism was marked by a millenarian eschatology in which the idea of the kingdom of God was central. Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687–1752), Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702–1782), and Philipp Matthäus Hahn are the most important representatives of this tendency. They represent successive generations and are connected through a teacher-student relationship.

Bengel, the most important theologian of Württemberg Pietism in the eighteenth century, concentrated his textual-critical, exegetic, and millenarian work exclusively on the Bible.[18] Bengel spent the greater part of his career as a preceptor – a combination of minister and teacher – in the convent school at Denkendorf, in which the fledgling Württemberg minister first underwent a two-year training. This seclusion and routine enabled him to write his theological works.[19] Toward the end of his life he attained higher ecclesiastical

office. He became a prelate and finally a member of the state parliament and of the Consistory, the highest ecclesiastical authority in Württemberg.

Bengel's eschatology was built upon the foundation of Württemberg separatist chiliasm of the seventeenth century, in which calculations of the beginning of the millennium and of the Last Judgment were not unusual.[20] His millenarian character was no doubt fostered by his upbringing as a half-orphan in the house of Stuttgart separatist leader David Wendelin Spindler, who was relieved of his teaching duties in 1710 because of his millenarian and separatist activities. In *Erklärte Offenbarung* Bengel presents his key to the Apocalypse. Based on the number 666 from *Revelations* 13, 18, he calculates all the numbers and times in *Revelations* and finally dates the beginning of the first millennium to the year 1836. In this, every prophesy in *Revelations* corresponds to an event that has already occurred in history or has yet to occur.

Like Spinoza and Leibniz before him, Bengel attempted to prove the existence of a chronological world order based on the doctrine of God's saving grace by means of a set of mathematical rules.[21] The publication of his devotional hours given in Herbrechtingen, "Sixty devotional talks on John's Revelations," shows that Bengel also presented his *Heilsgeschichte* in popular form. His millenarian perspective had a great influence in Württemberg. He succeeded in integrating separatist millenarianism into the state church.

With respect to society, Hartmut Lehmann sees the millenarianism of Bengel and his friends as combined with social conservatism and political quietism. For them, millenarianism was "a sweet secret."[22] The emphasis on his dating of the beginning of the millennium apparently developed only after his death. Philipp Matthäus Hahn prepared an excerpt from Bengel's "Explained Revelations" directed at the uneducated reader and composed in a catechism-like question-and-answer form. The library of the University of Tübingen houses a copy that once belonged to his daughter, Maria Barbara Bengel (1727–1782). On the first page, there is a rather long commentary in her handwriting criticizing the reduction of Bengel's millenarian message to the date of its onset:

> Maria Barbara Burkin receives this as a gift from her oldest son ... 1772. The author of this work has also done me a pleasant service with this short and thorough extract; only the determination of the time is really much too precisely presented. Anyone who knows what my dear departed father meant – how, although he was certain of his business, he would never have determined the actual time – cannot approve of this all-too-frank open-heartedness.[23]

Friedrich Christoph Oetinger, who belonged to the generation of Bengel's students and even accepted a post as a minister in his vicinity in order to be able to remain in intensive communication with him, was a polymath. After many study trips and longer sojourns with Zinzendorf at Herrnhut, he accepted a position as minister in Hirsau in 1738. In 1766 the Duke appointed him prelate of Murrhardt and a member of the territorial Diet. At once a

theologian, philosopher, and scientist, he was also active in the fields of chemistry, alchemy, and medicine.[24] For example, he produced drops to cure melancholy. He was familiar with the writings of Leibniz and Newton and corresponded with Swedenborg. In his search for certain knowledge through the connection between *Heilsgeschichte* and natural philosophy he was influenced by Valentin Weigel, Jacob Böhme, and the Kabbalah.[25]

Oetinger's millenarian text *Die Güldene Zeit* is dedicated to preparations for the kingdom of God.[26] He assumed the accuracy of Bengel's calculations and was also certain that the kingdom was nigh. In preparation for the millennium, the present is merely a transitional stage, which demands a readiness for worldly and political action in which governments and their laws as well as scholars and teachers bear a special responsibility. Changes in nature and natural catastrophes are to be read as "signs of the times" and herald the kingdom. The thousand-year kingdom of God on Earth will, however, remain hidden and the worldly order will continue to exist.

Oetinger outlined a set of changes which will be realized for the kingdom of God on Earth: A general peace will reign on Earth; with the help of divine law, justice will function quickly and easily; worldly rulers and priests will find themselves in complete harmony; the language of the peoples will be Hebrew and due to slight shifts of the poles, spring, summer, and autumn will lengthen while winter will become shorter. All branches of knowledge will be united in one fundamental wisdom. Like Bengel, he assumed that there would be two millennia, one earthly and the other divine. Although Oetinger, like Bengel, was critical of the political situation and of Baroque courtly life, he also believed that Christians were bound to respect the inviolability of the existing power relations.[27]

Philipp Matthäus Hahn, at once a minister, watchmaker, and inventor,[28] was a millenarian activist in several respects. As a curate he supported the ill Oetinger for six months, during which time he prepared excerpts from the latter's writings on chemistry and alchemy. Bengel's eschatological calculations were the foundation for his first astronomical clock, which he built in 1768/69 for Duke Karl Eugen of Württemberg, together with the schoolmaster Philipp Gottfried Schaudt (1739–1809). He composed a catechism-like summary of Bengel's interpretation of the Apocalypse, *Die Hauptsache der Offenbarung Johannis*, which he published anonymously in 1772.

Hahn followed Bengel's and Oetinger's tradition of interpreting *Revelations*. However, he placed the realization of the kingdom of God at the center of his literary and pastoral work.[29] Hahn popularized the expectation of the millennium in Württemberg. His devotional hours in Kornwestheim were so well attended that the audience was divided into groups according to gender and marital status. Because of denunciations, the Consistory increased its control over Hahn, forbidding him to hold any more lessons or to publish.[30]

On the basis of *Eph.* 1, Hahn saw the elect as particularly *predestined* to carry out God's *plan*. In his own consciousness of being chosen, he put his energy into the teaching of children, devotional hours, and sermons about the realization of the kingdom of God. He regarded the realization of the latter as

the most important task of all.[31] The kingdom of God, he preached, had already begun, but many had not yet seen or recognized it.[32] The second passage central for his millenarian activism is *Mat.* 20, 1–16, the *workers in the Lord's vineyard.* The first workers were the disciples of Jesus. The vineyard is the still-developing divine kingdom. The complete kingdom will only come into being when all humanity has submitted to Jesus. Everyone has his task in the vineyard and each inspires the others.[33]

Hahn's private journal clearly reveals his religiously motivated activism as a Pietist minister and millenarian. That his first marriage with a woman who saw the light only two years before her death was doomed to fail is plausible from his perspective. In the shock following her death, he wrote in self-justification in his journal that she had disapproved of his conventicle and his many visitors and had wrongly interpreted them as directed against herself. Because his work for the kingdom of God left him no time for her, it looked as though he did not love her. This led to much argument and discord between them and ultimately to an emotional coolness toward her on his part. He, however, had only been acting on behalf of the kingdom of God.

> But if she had shared my cast of mind and believed my path and will to be divine and deeply grounded, she would have been a help to me ... .

It is clear from his diaries that Hahn derived an exaggerated sense of his position as head of the household and as husband from his consciousness of being chosen. He took on the role of a patriarch, which was typical of Württemberg Pietists. Being among the elect in the divine order, he concluded that he was also entitled to hold a special position in the worldly order. He justified his demand for absolute obedience by claiming that his will was "divine" and that, by extension, any violation of it represented a violation of God's laws.

Beate Hahn's millenarian aspirations

Like her father, Beate Hahn lived under the religiously grounded conviction of being chosen and in possession of knowledge. The evidence of her engagement is her so-called *Wochenbuch* (weekly book). She was born in 1778 as the oldest daughter of Philipp Matthäus Hahn and his second wife, Beate Regina. In 1800, after the death of her father, she entered into an arranged marriage with the pastor Karl Friedrich Paulus, who came from a wealthy family of Stuttgart civil servants. Paulus, however, was not a Pietist and the spouses' differing conceptions of piety led them into considerable conflict. Beate began her journal in 1817 and ended it after the death of her husband in 1828. In these eleven years she filled eight books, which together contain about a thousand manuscript pages, now housed in the manuscript department of the Württemberg State Library.[35] Her writings document the couple's primary marital conflict over the financing of their sons' formal education. According to her husband's plan, one was to become a scrivener and the other a game-

keeper, a notion which repelled her as both occupations were for her associated with a sinful life. She was convinced that only with a university education would her sons be able to serve the kingdom of God in a proper fashion:

> ... that is also because of the extension of his kingdom, as workers in his vineyards are in such short supply. Thus let him put his spirit in their [the sons'] hearts, so that their life in the world may not be in vain.[36]

With the support of her family, Beate succeeded in negotiating a financial plan with Paulus, according to which her brother, his wife, and their mother would pay for the maintenance of two sons on the basis of the paternal inheritance, leaving her husband responsible only for paying for the maintenance for his oldest son.[37] However, this plan fell through, apparently because it had not been precisely worked out how books, school fees, and travel and clothing expenses were to be paid for. In addition, her husband continued to refuse to pay his share. Beate's attempt to finance these expenditures through agriculture, which was normally leased out, was thwarted by her husband, who claimed that all of the income belonged to him. All transactions involving money and food had to be carried out in secret behind his back. Despite all her calculations and economizing, however, money was always short and Beate was repeatedly obliged to borrow from the wealthy innkeepers of the village against the proceeds of the next harvest. In the constant marital struggle over finances, the academic education of her sons was in permanent danger.

The idea that her sons were being educated beneath their status – that, as members of a learned elite family, they "are being made into peasants" – threw her into a deep crisis. Her lending of a religious tone to the issue of worldly status must be understood against the background of the Pietist notion of the elite, in which the learned constitute an especially elect group in working towards the kingdom of God.

Beate's conviction that her sons could only appropriately serve God with a formal education accords completely with Oetinger's model of the special responsibility of the educated for the preparation of God's kingdom. In his text, *Die Güldene Zeit*, he prophesizes a better future and determines the preparations necessary for it on the basis of the words of the Prophet Isaiah. In the desert, the voice of a divine herald announces to the people of Israel the end of their slavery in Babylon and a new future (*Isaiah* 40.3–5). According to Oetinger, the Prophet Isaiah demands above all of kings, princes, and republics that they watch out for the signs of the times; for, according to Isaiah, the coming of the kingdom will be accompanied by geographic changes – all the valleys shall be exalted and all the mountains shall be made low – which must be read as signs of the times. Universities and academies should prepare themselves and the teachers trained there should inform the people of the "last things" that are in store for humanity.[38] A special mediating role falls to the learned in preparing for the kingdom of God. They bear the responsibility for saving the common people from darkness.

In especially desperate phrases, in which Beate was almost forced to accept that her plans for her sons' education and thus her hopes will be defeated, she appealed to God to realize his plan in her and her children:

> therefore I put to the Lord that he couldn't abandon me and had to listen to my prayer because of his proverb. Should God not save his chosen people who call to him loudly day and night, he could not do otherwise, he must help ... .[39]

Beate's astounding indifference as to what academic professions her sons should enter is explained by the Württembergian view of the kingdom of God. According to Oetinger, all the sciences, jurisprudence, medicine, theology, and history will be fused into one fundamental wisdom.[40] Beate's plan for her sons' academic, professional, but as yet unspecified course of study stands in close reciprocal relation to the group-specific Württembergian expression of her millenarian aspirations. Her efforts for the kingdom of God go even beyond those made on behalf of her children. Occasionally she makes a summary request on behalf of all students that God make them into workers for his vineyards. In the devotional hours that she held with a few other women, she spoke, borrowing from her father's texts, about the approaching kingdom of God.[41] Together with her oldest daughter, she read from the revelations of her father[42] and discussed differing perspectives on the shape of the kingdom of God with theologians in her family and within her circle of friends:

> ... then Uncle accompanied me as far as Enzingen, where we talked about the millennium and debated and ultimately were so much in agreement that the millennium will, like our kingdom, be perceptible more in the spiritual than in the physical sense, which also pleased me ... .[43]

With the assurance that the kingdom of God was eventually coming, Beate placed herself entirely within the millenarian tradition of her father. While it was true that Oetinger also envisioned that the earthly authorities would be preserved after the onset of the kingdom, he nevertheless still held to the Bengelian view of a precisely dated beginning of the kingdom.

In Beate's millenarian aspirations, two perspectives come together. The fundamental assumption of the Württemberg Pietists that everyone had to fit into a higher framework of salvation was connected with a family-related perspective on salvation. The superindividual plan for salvation must also be expressed in the history of the family:

> ... my whole life long I have trusted in him because even in my earliest youth I earnestly called to him [72:] for wisdom and always, even in my single years, asked God. I do not demand any worldly happiness but this I ask of him: that he make me useful for his kingdom and as I in my household could do so little or nothing for the kingdom of God, it was my only request that he give me the blessing to live for others. He also had the blessing to live for others, so he should give me this joy as well.[44]

The goal of establishing the thousand-year kingdom of God on Earth connects Beate to the future of her family. The plea for God to accept her sons and make them "useful workers in his vineyard" occupies a great deal of space in the journal. As theologians and university graduates they would be involved in a special way in the realization of the millennium. On this point her gendered position is made very clear: She, as a woman, cannot serve the kingdom of God, just as her daughters cannot, who therefore receive hardly any mention in the diary. Work in the service of the kingdom of God is the professional work of men with university degrees. Her only contribution can be to do everything in her power to assure that her sons achieve such a position.

Beate Hahn's journal offers us insight into the way in which women participated in theological discourse. It shows that she put the learned millenarian vision into practice in her family and congregation. The desperation that continually resounds throughout her journal is perhaps an exception; her participation in theology and her responsibility for the education of her children can, however, be generalized to the group. Among the honorables of Württemberg, the commitment of mothers to the higher education of their sons was by no means unusual. Oetinger mentions in his autobiography that when it came to his studies, his mother was ambitious.[45] Philipp Matthäus Hahn writes that with the death of his mother when he was 13 his preparation for theological studies was imperilled, as his father had little inclination to make sacrifices for the education of his children.[46]

The importance of mothers and grandmothers in producing learned sons and grandsons was not limited to Württemberg but indeed applies to the educated middle class as a whole in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Spener's daughter Susanna Katharina (1665–1726) was described as an exceptionally learned woman who educated her son Karl Otto with care.[47] Susanna Wesley (1669–1742), the mother of the Methodist leader John Wesley, systematically oversaw and controlled her children's educational progress. Zinzendorf's grandmother, Henriette Catharina Gersdorf, had an important role in his religious education.[48]

The participation of daughters and wives in the theological discussions and plans of their educated fathers and husbands was likewise no exception.[49] Women in this group possessed a basic knowledge of Latin which they were taught in the parental home, together with their brothers, by their fathers, teachers, or curates. Their lessons ended when their brothers left home to begin their higher education.[50] In the autobiographies of learned Pietists, references are frequently made to the involvement of their wives and daughters in their work. Oetinger writes of the highly educated daughter of Johann Jakob Schütz, who drew his attention to Rosenroth's *Kabbala denudata*.[51] After their marriage, Bengel taught his wife, Johanna Regina Seeger, Greek. He wrote: "In my wife I had an excellent helpmeet."[52] Philipp Matthäus Hahn also taught Greek to his second wife, Beata Regina Flattich, who was herself a minister's daughter.

Such instruction of wives did not take place without a reason. It was the women who copied out the theological manuscripts of their husbands so that

they could be sent to intimate colleagues for evaluation. Against this background, it becomes clear why Bengel describes his wife as a "helpmeet." Hahn's second wife Beate Regina wrote down from memory his devotional hours, which he then corrected for the printer.[53] These few references to the environment of the millenarians show firstly that women were involved in the work and thought processes of their fathers and husbands and secondly that millenarian plans were important for their work on the group, family, and couple level.

Summary

Bengel's millenarian ideas as well as those of Oetinger were circulated and handed down among the learned Pietist elite of Württemberg through a combination of reading and devotional hours. Their ideas also underwent shifts in the process. The precisely dated beginning was displaced in favor of a gradual, hidden beginning, and in the second half of the 18th century an intensified form of activist work for the kingdom of God arose, beginning with Philipp Matthäus Hahn.

The extension of the history of an intellectual idea to include the perspectives of gender and of the social base of a movement has proven worthwhile. It has been shown that intellectual models shaped the culture of the group as a whole and that women also played an active role here. They were familiar with the learned texts and worked on behalf of the kingdom of God in the congregation and in the education of children.

Hartmut Lehmann has argued that Württemberg millenarianism, understood as insight into special knowledge, led to the isolation of the group and to an insular group culture.[54] The example of Beate Hahn furthermore shows that the *heilsgeschichtliche* perspective was also realized in the genealogical future of the family as a learned and at the same time pious social elite. Religious aspirations thus ensured a continuity of class in Württemberg. The strong emphasis within millenarianism on linking the divine and worldly perspectives helped to achieve the permanent formation and renewal of the middle class into the nineteenth century.

The Pietist drive for education is well known. What seems new to me is the connection shown here between millenarianism and the role of the teacher. With an academic education one was a member of the elect because one bore particular responsibility for saving the ignorant from darkness. Here the focus was placed on the university educated man, who only through his professional work could be counted among God's chosen people.

The example of Philipp Matthäus Hahn shows that his conviction of being elect strengthened his gendered position as head of the household. His spiritualization of the earthly order and the claim devolving from it led to a subjective exaltation which – as his journal shows – led to permanent tensions in both his marriages. The gendered position of his daughter was also influenced by her view of herself as being elect, if albeit in an very different way. She went against the worldly order and thereby took on the position of a

disobedient wife. While it is true that special knowledge legitimated her resistance to her husband, she continually sought reassurance in her journal. A certain degree of tension existed between the divine millenarian order and the earthly order of class, family, marriage, and household. This opposition affected the lives of Pietist men and women in Württemberg in very different ways. In inner-churchly Pietism, this latent polarity between the divine and the earthly order could not be reconciled as it could in radical Pietism, where it often led to the creation of new gender and social utopias.

A final question arises of how to assess the activist social elements of Württemberg millenarianism. The activist form of millenarian expectations on the part of Hahn and his daughter confirms Lehmann's thesis that in the late eighteenth century the old Pietist elites also developed a millenarian activism.[55] Helping to form the imminent kingdom of God and thereby belonging to the chosen people revealed itself in a concept of time which was characterized by urgency, restlessness, and permanent tension.

Berlin

NOTES

1. Hartmut Lehmann, "Vorüberlegungen zu einer Sozialgeschichte des Pietismus im 17./18. Jahrhundert," *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 21, 1995, 69–83.
2. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973); Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1975); Joan Wallach Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 1988); Lynn Hunt, ed., *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley, 1989); Roger Chartier, *Die unvollendete Vergangenheit. Geschichte und die Macht der Weltauslegung* (Frankfurt a. Main, 1992); Wolfgang Hardtwig and Hans-Ulrich Wehler, eds., *Kulturgeschichte Heute* (Göttingen, 1996).
3. Joachim Trautwein, *Religiosität und Sozialstruktur* (Stuttgart, 1972).
4. Martin Schmidt, *Pietismus* (Stuttgart, 1972); F. Ernest Stoeffler, *German Pietism During the Eighteenth Century* (Leiden, 1973); Mary Fulbrook, *Piety and Politics. Religion and the Rise of Absolutism in England, Württemberg and Prussia* (Cambridge, 1983); Johannes Wallmann, *Der Pietismus* (Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte, vol. 4) (Göttingen, 1990); Martin Brecht, Klaus Deppermann, Ulrich Gäbler, and Hartmut Lehmann, eds., *Geschichte des Pietismus* 2 vols. (Göttingen 1993, 1995).
5. Martin Brecht, "Philipp Jakob Spener und das Wahre Christentum," *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 4, 1977/78, 119–154 and "Philipp Jakob Spener, sein Programm und dessen Auswirkungen," *Geschichte des Pietismus*, vol. 1, 281–389; Johannes Wallmann, *Philipp Jakob Spener und die Anfänge des Pietismus* (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie Bd. 42), (2nd. ed., Tübingen, 1986) and *Theologie und Frömmigkeit des Barock* (Tübingen, 1995).
6. Philipp Jakob Spener, *Pia desideria oder Herzliches Verlangen nach gottgefälliger Besserung der wahren Evangelischen Kirche* (1675), ed. Erich Beyreuther and Dietrich Blaufuß in Philipp Jakob Spener, *Schriften*, vol. 1, (Hildesheim and New York, 1979).
7. See the arguments in Wallmann, *Philipp Jakob Spener* and *Theologie und Frömmigkeit*; Kurt Aland, "Philipp Jakob Spener und die Anfänge des Pietismus," *Jahrbuch Geschichte des Pietismus*, vol. 4, 1977/78, 155–189 and "Spener-Schütz-Labadie?," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, vol. 78, 19811, 206–234. For the complete literature in this dispute see Wallmann, *Theologie und Frömmigkeit*, 390 note 2. The argument of Aland seems to me influenced by the denominational point of view of a theologian. According to him, Spener has to stand strictly

in the tradition of Orthodoxy and the Confessio Augustana and any influence of non-orthodox intellectuals on him is denied.

8. For Spener's Chiliasmus see Walter Nigg, *Das Ewige Reich. Geschichte einer Sehnsucht und einer Erwartung* (Zürich, 1944); Johannes Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Pietismus. Reich Gottes und Chiliasmus in der lutherischen Orthodixie," in *Verifikationen* (Festschrift Gerhard Ebeling), eds. Eberhard Jüngel, Johannes Wallmann, and Wilfried Werbeck (Tübingen, 1982), 187–205 and *Spener und die Anfänge*; Friedhelm Groth, *Die "Wiederbringung aller Dinge" im württembergischen Pietismus. Theologiegeschichtliche Studien zum eschatologischen Heilsuniversalismus württembergischer Pietisten des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus Bd. 21) (Göttingen, 1984), see 37f.
9. Martin Brecht, "Chiliasmus in Württemberg im 17. Jahrhundert," *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 14, 1988, 25–49; Wallmann, "Zwischen Reformation und Pietismus" and *Spener und die Anfänge*, 323. Wallmann also emphasizes British influences on the development of Spener's eschatology; on Spener's references to the work of Joseph Mede (1586–1638), see 326f.
10. Groth, *Wiederbringung*, 40.
11. Hartmut Lehmann, *Pietismus und weltliche Ordnung in Württemberg vom 17. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1969) and "Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft im Denken des Württembergischen Pietismus," *Geschichte und Zukunft. Fünf Vorträge*, ed. Heinz Löwe (Berlin, 1978), 51–73; Groth, *Wiederbringung*; Brecht, "Chiliasmus in Württemberg"; Wallmann, *Pietismus*.
12. Fulbrook, *Piety and Politics*.
13. Ludwig Brunnquell (died in 1680) lost his ministry in 1675 and Johann Jakob Zimmermann (1644–1694) lost his in 1685, both because of their millenarian work, and Eberhard Zeller (died in 1692) lost his ministry in 1685 for conventicles; see Brecht, "Chiliasmus im 17. Jahrhundert"; Wallmann, *Pietismus*, 123–126.
14. Wallmann, *Pietismus*, 127.
15. Martin Brecht, "Philipp Jakob Spener und die Württembergische Kirche," in *Geist und Geschichte der Reformation* (Festschrift Hans Rückert), 443–459 (Berlin, 1966); Groth, *Wiederbringung*, 52.
16. Christoph Kolb, "Die Anfänge des Pietismus und Separatismus in Württemberg," *Württembergische Vierteljahresschrift für Landesgeschichte*, vol. 9, 1900, 3–99, 368–412; vol. 10, 1901, 201–251, 364–388; vol. 11, 1902, 43–78; Friedrich Fritz, "Die evangelische Kirche Württembergs im Zeitalter des Pietismus," *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 55, 1955, 68–116; vol. 56, 1956, 99–167; Groth, *Wiederbringung*, 55f.
17. Lehmann, *Pietismus und weltliche Ordnung*, 117ff and "Pietistic Millenarianism in Late Eighteenth-Century Germany," in *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century*, ed. Eckhart Hellmuth (Oxford, 1983), 267–279; Hans-Volkmar Findeisen, *Pietismus in Fellbach 1750–1820* (Tübingen, 1985).
18. For the newer literature on Bengel see Friedrich Fritz, "Altwürttembergische Pietisten," *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte* (Sonderheft Bd. 10) (Stuttgart, 1950); Gerhard Sauter, "Die Zahl als Schlüssel zur Welt," *Evangelische Theologie*, vol. 26, 1966, 1–36; Gottfried Mälzer, *Johann Albrecht Bengel. Leben und Werk* (Stuttgart, 1970); Lehmann, "Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft"; Brecht, "Chiliasmus in Württemberg"; Groth, *Wiederbringung*.
19. To his main work belongs a critical edition of the Greek text of the New Testament (1734), an exegesis of the New Testament, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (1742). His millennarian works are *Erklärte Offenbarung Johannis* (1740); *Ordo temporum* (1741); *Cyclus* (1745); *Welt-Alter* (1746).
20. The jurist, doctor, and Rosicrucian Tobias Heß (1558–1614), for example, had calculated the beginning of the Judgement (*Revelations* 18) to 1620; see Kolb, "Anfänge des Pietismus und Separatismus"; Fritz, "Altwürttembergische Pietisten," 52f; Brecht, "Chiliasmus in Württemberg," 25ff.
21. Sauter, "Die Zahl"; Lehmann, *Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft*, 58; Groth, *Wiederbringung*, 67ff.
22. Lehmann, "Pietistic Millenarianism."

23. (Anon) *Die Hauptsache der Offenbarung Johannis oder vielmehr Jesu Christi*, Schaffhausen 1772. Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen Ge 919.
24. For Oetinger see Karl Christian Eberhard Ehmann, ed., *Friedrich Christoph Oetingers Leben und Briefe als urkundlicher Commentar zu dessen Schriften* (Stuttgart, 1859); Friedrich Christoph Oetinger, *Selbstbiographie. Genealogie der reelen Gedanken eines Gotttesgelehrten* (Zeugnisse der Schwabenväter vol. 1), ed. Julius Roessle (Metzingen, 1961); Groth *Wiederbringung*; Martin Weyer-Menkhoff, *Christus, das Heil der Natur. Entstehung und Systematik der Theologie Friedrich Christiph Oetingers* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Pietismus Bd. 27) (Göttingen, 1990).
25. He took lessons with Jewish scholars and studied the Kabbala Denudata: see Oetinger, *Selbstbiographie*, 50.
26. *Die Güldene Zeit* (1759), ed. K.Ch.E. Ehmann in Friedrich Christoph Oetinger, *Sämtliche Schriften*, vol. 6 (Stuttgart, 1864).
27. Lehmann, *Pietismus und weltliche Ordnung*, 109f.
28. For Hahn see Alfred Munz, *Philipp Matthäus Hahn, Pfarrer, Erfinder und Erbauer von Himmelsmaschinen, Waagen, Uhren und Rechenmaschinen* (Sigmaringen, 1977); Philipp Matthäus Hahn, *Die Kornwestheimer Tagebücher 1772–1777*, ed. Martin Brecht and Rudolf F. Paulus (Berlin/New York, 1979) and *Die Echterdinger Tagebücher 1780–1790*, ed. Martin Brecht and Rudolf F. Paulus (Berlin/New York, 1983); *Philipp Matthäus Hahn 1730–1790, Ausstellungskatalog*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1989). With his first wife's money, he set up a watchmaker's workshop in which apprentices, his brothers, and later his sons worked. Hahn improved the cylinder gear in pocket-watches, built astronomical clocks, and developed an adding machine and clinometric scale.
29. Hahn's works include the exegesis of parts of the letter to the Ephesians: *Fingerzeig zum Verstand des Königreichs Gottes und Christi* (1773), a translation of the New Testament, *Die Heiligen Schriften der guten Botschaft vom verheißenen Königreich* (1777); *Eines ungenannten Schriftforschers vermischte Schriften, 4 vols,* (1779–1780); and his published *Erbauungsreden Versuch einer neuen Erklärung der Offenbarung Johannis* (1785).
30. Martin Brecht, "Philipp Matthäus Hahn und der Pietismus im mittleren Neckarraum," *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 77, 1977, 101–131.
31. Hahn, *Kornwestheimer Tagebücher* (KwTb), 45.
32. KwTb, 223.
33. In his diary he developed this concept for his *Erbauungsstunde*, see KwTb, 136f.
34. In the original version one page was taken out here, see KwTb, 352.
35. Württembergische Landesbibliothek (WLB) Cod. hist. 8° 109, 4; 8° 109, 5; 8° 109, 6; 8° 109, 7; 4° 370, 8; 8° 109, 9; 4° 109, 10; 4° 370, 11.
36. WLB Cod. hist. 8° 109,5 (book 2) Bl. 63.
37. Retrospective account after the death of her husband in WLB Cod. hist. 4° 370,11 (Book 8), 18ff. Later, friends in Stuttgart agreed to take in another son without charge. The youngest of her five sons was later able to live at limited expense with his brother in Tübingen.
38. Oetinger, *Güldene Zeit*, 7ff.
39. WLB Cod. hist. 8° 109,7 (book 4) :12.
40. Oetinger, *Güldene Zeit*, 47.
41. WLB Cod. hist. 4° 370,8 (book 5) :131.
42. WLB Cod. hist. 8° 109,5 (book 2) :131.
43. WLB Cod. hist. 8° 109,6 (book 3) :168.
44. WLB Cod. hist.8° 109,9 (book 6) :71f.
45. Oetinger, *Selbstbiographie*, 21ff.
46. Philipp Matthäus Hahn, *Die gute Botschaft vom Königreich Gottes* (Zeugnisse der Schwabenväter Bd. 8), ed. J. Roessle (Metzingen, 1963).
47. Paul Grünberg, ed., *Philipp Jakob Spener, Schriften*, vol. 3, (Hildesheim/New York), 71.
48. John A. Newton, *Susanna Wesley and the Puritan Tradition in Methodism*, (London, 1968); Katherine M. Faull, *Moravian Women's Memoirs. Their Related Lives 1750–1820* (Syracuse/New York, 1997), XIX.

49. For the inclusion of the ministers' wives in the duties of their husbands as part of the Protestant tradition see the overview in Luise Schorn-Schütte, "> Gefährtin und Mitregentin < Zur Sozialgeschichte der evangelischen Pfarrfrau in der Frühen Neuzeit," in *Wandel der Geschlechterbeziehungen zu Beginn der Neuzeit*, ed. Heide Wunder and Christina Vanja (Frankfurt a. M., 1991), 109–153.
50. Patricia H. Labalme ed., *Beyond Their Sex. Learned Women of the European Past* (New York/London 1984); Christel Köhle-Hezinger, "Frauen im Pietismus" *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 94, 1994, 107–121; Claudia Opitz and Elke Kleinau, eds., *Geschichte der Mädchen- und Frauenbildung*, vol. 1, (Frankfurt a. M./New York, 1996).
51. Oetinger, *Selbstbiographie*, 50.
52. Cited in Mälzer, *Bengel*, 59 and 62.
53. Philipp Matthäus Hahn, *Versuch einer neuen Erklärung der Offenbarung Johannis* (1785). The handwritten copy by his wife is in the manuscript section of the Württembergische Landesbibliothek in Stuttgart. A later edition, based on the copy made by Beata Regina, was published by his grandson: *Leitfaden zum Verständnis der Offenbarung*, Ludwigsburg 1851.
54. Lehmann, "Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft," and "Absonderung und Gemeinschaft im frühen Pietismus," *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, vol. 4, 1977/78, 54–82.
55. Lehmann, "Pietistic Millenarianism."

INDEX

J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics, 123–126.

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

1. E. Labrousse: *Pierre Bayle.* Tome I: *Du pays de foix à la cité d'Erasme.* 1963; 2nd printing 1984 ISBN 90-247-3136-4
   For Tome II *see below under Volume 6.*
2. P. Merlan: *Monopsychism, Mysticism, Metaconsciousness.* Problems of the Soul in the Neoaristotelian and Neoplatonic Tradition. 1963; 2nd printing 1969 ISBN 90-247-0178-3
3. H.G. van Leeuwen: *The Problem of Certainty in English Thought, 1630–1690.* With a Preface by R.H. Popkin. 1963; 2nd printing 1970 ISBN 90-247-0179-1
4. P.W. Janssen: *Les origines de la réforme des Carmes en France au 17^e Siècle.* 1963; 2nd printing 1969 ISBN 90-247-0180-5
5. G. Sebba: *Bibliographia Cartesiana.* A Critical Guide to the Descartes Literature (1800–1960). 1964 ISBN 90-247-0181-3
6. E. Labrousse: *Pierre Bayle.* Tome II: *Heterodoxie et rigorisme.* 1964 ISBN 90-247-0182-1
7. K.W. Swart: *The Sense of Decadence in 19th-Century France.* 1964 ISBN 90-247-0183-X
8. W. Rex: *Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy.* 1965 ISBN 90-247-0184-8
9. E. Heier: *L.H. Nicolay (1737–1820) and His Contemporaries.* Diderot, Rousseau, Voltaire, Gluck, Metastasio, Galiani, D'Escherny, Gessner, Bodmer, Lavater, Wieland, Frederick II, Falconet, W. Robertson, Paul I, Cagliostro, Gellert, Winckelmann, Poinsinet, Lloyd, Sanchez, Masson, and Others. 1965 ISBN 90-247-0185-6
10. H.M. Bracken: *The Early Reception of Berkeley's Immaterialism, 1710–1733.* [1958] Rev. ed. 1965 ISBN 90-247-0186-4
11. R.A. Watson: *The Downfall of Cartesianism, 1673–1712.* A Study of Epistemological Issues in Late 17th-Century Cartesianism. 1966 ISBN 90-247-0187-2
12. R. Descartes: *Regulæ ad Directionem Ingenii.* Texte critique établi par Giovanni Crapulli avec la version hollandaise du 17^e siècle. 1966 ISBN 90-247-0188-0
13. J. Chapelain: *Soixante-dix-sept Lettres inédites à Nicolas Heinsius (1649–1658).* Publiées d'après le manuscrit de Leyde avec une introduction et des notes par B. Bray. 1966 ISBN 90-247-0189-9
14. C. B. Brush: *Montaigne and Bayle.* Variations on the Theme of Skepticism. 1966 ISBN 90-247-0190-2
15. B. Neveu: *Un historien à l'Ecole de Port-Royal.* Sébastien le Nain de Tillemont (1637–1698). 1966 ISBN 90-247-0191-0
16. A. Faivre: *Kirchberger et l'Illuminisme du 18^e siècle.* 1966 ISBN 90-247-0192-9
17. J.A. Clarke: *Huguenot Warrior.* The Life and Times of Henri de Rohan (1579–1638). 1966 ISBN 90-247-0193-7
18. S. Kinser: *The Works of Jacques-Auguste de Thou.* 1966 ISBN 90-247-0194-5
19. E.F. Hirsch: *Damião de Gois.* The Life and Thought of a Portuguese Humanist (1502–1574). 1967 ISBN 90-247-0195-3
20. P.J.S. Whitemore: *The Order of Minims in 17th-Century France.* 1967 ISBN 90-247-0196-1
21. H. Hillenaar: *Fénelon et les Jésuites.* 1967 ISBN 90-247-0197-X
22. W.N. Hargreaves-Mawdsley: *The English Della Cruscans and Their Time, 1783–1828.* 1967 ISBN 90-247-0198-8
23. C.B. Schmitt: *Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1469–1533) and his Critique of Aristotle.* 1967 ISBN 90-247-0199-6
24. H.B. White: *Peace among the Willows.* The Political Philosophy of Francis Bacon. 1968 ISBN 90-247-0200-3

25. L. Apt: *Louis-Philippe de Ségur.* An Intellectual in a Revolutionary Age. 1969 ISBN 90-247-0201-1
26. E.H. Kadler: *Literary Figures in French Drama (1784–1834).* 1969 ISBN 90-247-0202-X
27. G. Postel: *Le Thrésor des prophéties de l'univers.* Manuscrit publié avec une introduction et des notes par F. Secret. 1969 ISBN 90-247-0203-8
28. E.G. Boscherini: *Lexicon Spinozanum.* 2 vols., 1970 Set ISBN 90-247-0205-4
29. C.A. Bolton: *Church Reform in 18th-Century Italy.* The Synod of Pistoia (1786). 1969 ISBN 90-247-0208-9
30. D. Janicaud: *Une généalogie du spiritualisme français.* Aux sources du bergsonisme: [Félix] Ravaisson [1813–1900] et la métaphysique. 1969 ISBN 90-247-0209-7
31. J.-E. d'Angers: *L'Humanisme chrétien au 17^e siècle.* St. François de Sales et Yves de Paris. 1970 ISBN 90-247-0210-0
32. H.B. White: *Copp'd Hills towards Heaven.* Shakespeare and the Classical Polity. 1970 ISBN 90-247-0250-X
33. P.J. Olscamp: *The Moral Philosophy of George Berkeley.* 1970 ISBN 90-247-0303-4
34. C.G. Noreña: *Juan Luis Vives (1492–1540).* 1970 ISBN 90-247-5008-3
35. J. O'Higgens: *Anthony Collins (1676–1729), the Man and His World.* 1970 ISBN 90-247-5007-5
36. F.T. Brechka: *Gerard van Swieten and His World (1700–1772).* 1970 ISBN 90-247-5009-1
37. M.H. Waddicor: *Montesquieu and the Pilosophy of Natural Law.* 1970 ISBN 90-247-5039-3
38. O.R. Bloch: *La Philosophie de Gassendi (1592–1655).* Nominalisme, matérialisme et métaphysique. 1971 ISBN 90-247-5035-0
39. J. Hoyles: *The Waning of the Renaissance (1640–1740).* Studies in the Thought and Poetry of Henry More, John Norris and Isaac Watts. 1971 ISBN 90-247-5077-6
For Henry More, *see also below under Volume 122 and 127.*
40. H. Bots: *Correspondance de Jacques Dupuy et de Nicolas Heinsius (1646–1656).* 1971 ISBN 90-247-5092-X
41. W.C. Lehmann: *Henry Home, Lord Kames, and the Scottish Enlightenment.* A Study in National Character and in the History of Ideas. 1971 ISBN 90-247-5018-0
42. C. Kramer: *Emmery de Lyere et Marnix de Sainte Aldegonde.* Un admirateur de Sébastien Franck et de Montaigne aux prises avec le champion des calvinistes néerlandais.[Avec le texte d'Emmery de Lyere:] *Antidote ou contrepoison contre les conseils sanguinaires et envinemez de Philippe de Marnix Sr. de Ste. Aldegonde.* 1971 ISBN 90-247-5136-5
43. P. Dibon: *Inventaire de la correspondance (1595–1650) d'André Rivet (1572–1651).* 1971 ISBN 90-247-5112-8
44. K.A. Kottman: *Law and Apocalypse.* The Moral Thought of Luis de Leon (1527?–1591). 1972 ISBN 90-247-1183-5
45. F.G. Nauen: *Revolution, Idealism and Human Freedom.* Schelling, Hölderlin and Hegel, and the Crisis of Early German Idealism. 1971 ISBN 90-247-5117-9
46. H. Jensen: *Motivation and the Moral Sense in Francis Hutcheson's* [1694–1746] *Ethical Theory.* 1971 ISBN 90-247-1187-8
47. A. Rosenberg: *[Simon] Tyssot de Patot and His Work (1655–1738).* 1972 ISBN 90-247-1199-1
48. C. Walton: *De la recherche du bien.* A study of [Nicolas de] Malebranche's [1638–1715] Science of Ethics. 1972 ISBN 90-247-1205-X

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

49. P.J.S. Whitmore (ed.): *A 17th-Century Exposure of Superstition.* Select Text of Claude Pithoys (1587–1676). 1972 ISBN 90-247-1298-X
50. A. Sauvy: *Livres saisis à Paris entre 1678 et 1701.* D'après une étude préliminaire de Motoko Ninomiya. 1972 ISBN 90-247-1347-1
51. W.R. Redmond: *Bibliography of the Philosophy in the Iberian Colonies of America.* 1972 ISBN 90-247-1190-8
52. C.B. Schmitt: *Cicero Scepticus.* A Study of the Influence of the *Academica* in the Renaissance. 1972 ISBN 90-247-1299-8
53. J. Hoyles: *The Edges of Augustanism.* The Aesthetics of Spirituality in Thomas Ken, John Byrom and William Law. 1972 ISBN 90-247-1317-X
54. J. Bruggeman and A.J. van de Ven (éds.): *Inventaire* des pièces d'Archives françaises se rapportant à l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs et son cercle et à la Résistance contre la Bulle *Unigenitus* et à l'Appel. 1972 ISBN 90-247-5122-5
55. J.W. Montgomery: *Cross and Crucible.* Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–1654), Phoenix of the Theologians. Volume I: Andreae's Life, World-View, and Relations with Rosicrucianism and Alchemy; Volume II: The *Chymische Hochzeit* with Notes and Commentary. 1973 Set ISBN 90-247-5054-7
56. O. Lutaud: *Des révolutions d'Angleterre à la Révolution française.* Le tyrannicide & *Killing No Murder* (Cromwell, *Athalie*, Bonaparte). 1973 ISBN 90-247-1509-1
57. F. Duchesneau: *L'Empirisme de Locke.* 1973 ISBN 90-247-1349-8
58. R. Simon (éd.): *Henry de Boulainviller* – Œuvres Philosophiques, Tome I. 1973 ISBN 90-247-1332-3

    For Œuvres Philosophiques, Tome II *see below under Volume 70.*
59. E.E. Harris: *Salvation from Despair.* A Reappraisal of Spinoza's Philosophy. 1973 ISBN 90-247-5158-6
60. J.-F. Battail: *L'Avocat philosophe Géraud de Cordemoy (1626–1684).* 1973 ISBN 90-247-1542-3
61. T. Liu: *Discord in Zion.* The Puritan Divines and the Puritan Revolution (1640–1660). 1973 ISBN 90-247-5156-X
62. A. Strugnell: *Diderot's Politics.* A Study of the Evolution of Diderot's Political Thought after the *Encyclopédie.* 1973 ISBN 90-247-1540-7
63. G. Defaux: *Pantagruel et les Sophistes.* Contribution à l'histoire de l'humanisme chrétien au 16^{e} siècle. 1973 ISBN 90-247-1566-0
64. G. Planty-Bonjour: *Hegel et la pensée philosophique en Russie (1830–1917).* 1974 ISBN 90-247-1576-8
65. R.J. Brook: [*George*] *Berkeley's Philosophy of Science.* 1973 ISBN 90-247-1555-5
66. T.E. Jessop: *A Bibliography of George Berkeley.* With: *Inventory of Berkeley's Manuscript Remains* by A.A. Luce. 2nd revised and enlarged ed. 1973 ISBN 90-247-1577-6
67. E.I. Perry: *From Theology to History.* French Religious Controversy and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. 1973 ISBN 90-247-1578-4
68. P. Dibbon, H. Bots et E. Bots-Estourgie: *Inventaire de la correspondance (1631–1671) de Johannes Fredericus Gronovius* [1611–1671]. 1974 ISBN 90-247-1600-4
69. A.B. Collins: *The Secular is Sacred.* Platonism and Thomism in Marsilio Ficino's *Platonic Theology.* 1974 ISBN 90-247-1588-1

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

70. R. Simon (éd.): *Henry de Boulainviller.* Œuvres Philosophiques, Tome II. 1975 ISBN 90-247-1633-0

For Œuvres Philosophiques, Tome I *see under Volume 58.*

71. J.A.G. Tans et H. Schmitz du Moulin: *Pasquier Quesnel devant la Congrégation de l'Index.* Correspondance avec Francesco Barberini et mémoires sur la mise à l'Index de son édition des Œuvres de Saint Léon, publiés avec introduction et annotations. 1974 ISBN 90-247-1661-6

72. J.W. Carven: *Napoleon and the Lazarists (1804–1809).* 1974 ISBN 90-247-1667-5

73. G. Symcox: *The Crisis of French Sea Power (1688–1697).* From the *Guerre d'Escadre* to the *Guerre de Course.* 1974 ISBN 90-247-1645-4

74. R. MacGillivray: *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War.* 1974 ISBN 90-247-1678-0

75. A. Soman (ed.): *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.* Reappraisals and Documents. 1974 ISBN 90-247-1652-7

76. R.E. Wanner: *Claude Fleury (1640–1723) as an Educational Historiographer and Thinker.* With an Introduction by W.W. Brickman. 1975 ISBN 90-247-1684-5

77. R.T. Carroll: *The Common-Sense Philosophy of Religion of Bishop Edward Stillingfleet (1635–1699).* 1975 ISBN 90-247-1647-0

78. J. Macary: *Masque et lumières au 18^{e} [siècle].* André-François Deslandes, Citoyen et philosophe (1689–1757). 1975 ISBN 90-247-1698-5

79. S.M. Mason: *Montesquieu's Idea of Justice.* 1975 ISBN 90-247-1670-5

80. D.J.H. van Elden: *Esprits fins et esprits géométriques dans les portraits de Saint-Simon.* Contributions à l'étude du vocabulaire et du style. 1975 ISBN 90-247-1726-4

81. I. Primer (ed.): *Mandeville Studies.* New Explorations in the Art and Thought of Dr Bernard Mandeville (1670–1733). 1975 ISBN 90-247-1686-1

82. C.G. Noreña: *Studies in Spanish Renaissance Thought.* 1975 ISBN 90-247-1727-2

83. G. Wilson: *A Medievalist in the 18th Century.* Le Grand d'Aussy and the Fabliaux ou Contes. 1975 ISBN 90-247-1782-5

84. J.-R. Armogathe: *Theologia Cartesiana.* L'explication physique de l'Eucharistie chez Descartes et Dom Robert Desgabets. 1977 ISBN 90-247-1869-4

85. Bérault Stuart, Seigneur d'Aubigny: *Traité sur l'art de la guerre.* Introduction et édition par Élie de Comminges. 1976 ISBN 90-247-1871-6

86. S.L. Kaplan: *Bread, Politics and Political Economy in the Reign of Louis XV.* 2 vols., 1976 Set ISBN 90-247-1873-2

87. M. Lienhard (ed.): *The Origins and Characteristics of Anabaptism / Les débuts et les caractéristiques de l'Anabaptisme.* With an Extensive Bibliography / Avec une bibliographie détaillée. 1977 ISBN 90-247-1896-1

88. R. Descartes: *Règles utiles et claires pour la direction de l'esprit en la recherche de la vérité.* Traduction selon le lexique cartésien, et annotation conceptuelle par J.-L. Marion. Avec des notes mathématiques de P. Costabel. 1977 ISBN 90-247-1907-0

89. K. Hardesty: *The 'Supplément' to the 'Encyclopédie'.* [Diderot et d'Alembert]. 1977 ISBN 90-247-1965-8

90. H.B. White: *Antiquity Forgot.* Essays on Shakespeare, [Francis] Bacon, and Rembrandt. 1978 ISBN 90-247-1971-2

91. P.B.M. Blaas: *Continuity and Anachronism.* Parliamentary and Constitutional Development in Whig Historiography and in the Anti-Whig Reaction between 1890 and 1930. 1978 ISBN 90-247-2063-X

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

92. S.L. Kaplan (ed.): *La Bagarre.* Ferdinando Galiani's (1728–1787) 'Lost' Parody. With an Introduction by the Editor. 1979 ISBN 90-247-2125-3
93. E. McNiven Hine: *A Critical Study of [Étienne Bonnot de] Condillac's* [1714–1780] *'Traité des Systèmes'.* 1979 ISBN 90-247-2120-2
94. M.R.G. Spiller: *Concerning Natural Experimental Philosphy.* Meric Casaubon [1599–1671] and the Royal Society. 1980 ISBN 90-247-2414-7
95. F. Duchesneau: *La physiologie des Lumières.* Empirisme, modèles et théories. 1982 ISBN 90-247-2500-3
96. M. Heyd: *Between Orthodoxy and the Enlightenment.* Jean-Robert Chouet [1642–1731] and the Introduction of Cartesian Science in the Academy of Geneva. 1982 ISBN 90-247-2508-9
97. James O'Higgins: *Yves de Vallone* [1666/7–1705]: *The Making of an Esprit Fort.* 1982 ISBN 90-247-2520-8
98. M.L. Kuntz: *Guillaume Postel* [1510–1581]. Prophet of the Restitution of All Things. His Life and Thought. 1981 ISBN 90-247-2523-2
99. A. Rosenberg: *Nicolas Gueudeville and His Work (1652–172?).* 1982 ISBN 90-247-2533-X
100. S.L. Jaki: *Uneasy Genius: The Life and Work of Pierre Duhem* [1861-1916]. 1984 ISBN 90-247-2897-5; Pb (1987) 90-247-3532-7
101. Anne Conway [1631–1679]: *The Principles of the Most Ancient Modern Philosophy.* Edited and with an Introduction by P. Loptson. 1982 ISBN 90-247-2671-9
102. E.C. Patterson: *[Mrs.] Mary [Fairfax Greig] Sommerville* [1780–1872] *and the Cultivation of Science (1815–1840).* 1983 ISBN 90-247-2823-1
103. C.J. Berry: *Hume, Hegel and Human Nature.* 1982 ISBN 90-247-2682-4
104. C.J. Betts: *Early Deism in France.* From the so-called 'déistes' of Lyon (1564) to Voltaire's 'Lettres philosophiques' (1734). 1984 ISBN 90-247-2923-8
105. R. Gascoigne: *Religion, Rationality and Community.* Sacred and Secular in the Thought of Hegel and His Critics. 1985 ISBN 90-247-2992-0
106. S. Tweyman: *Scepticism and Belief in Hume's 'Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion'.* 1986 ISBN 90-247-3090-2
107. G. Cerny: *Theology, Politics and Letters at the Crossroads of European Civilization.* Jacques Basnage [1653–1723] and the Baylean Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic. 1987 ISBN 90-247-3150-X
108. Spinoza's *Algebraic Calculation of the Rainbow & Calculation of Changes.* Edited and Translated from Dutch, with an Introduction, Explanatory Notes and an Appendix by M.J. Petry. 1985 ISBN 90-247-3149-6
109. R.G. McRae: *Philosophy and the Absolute.* The Modes of Hegel's Speculation. 1985 ISBN 90-247-3151-8
110. J.D. North and J.J. Roche (eds.): *The Light of Nature.* Essays in the History and Philosophy of Science presented to A.C. Crombie. 1985 ISBN 90-247-3165-8
111. C. Walton and P.J. Johnson (eds.): *[Thomas] Hobbes's 'Science of Natural Justice'.* 1987 ISBN 90-247-3226-3
112. B.W. Head: *Ideology and Social Science.* Destutt de Tracy and French Liberalism. 1985 ISBN 90-247-3228-X
113. A.Th. Peperzak: *Philosophy and Politics.* A Commentary on the Preface to Hegel's *Philosophy of Right.* 1987 ISBN Hb 90-247-3337-5; Pb ISBN 90-247-3338-3

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

114. S. Pines and Y. Yovel (eds.): *Maimonides* [1135-1204] *and Philosophy.* Papers Presented at the 6th Jerusalem Philosophical Encounter (May 1985). 1986 ISBN 90-247-3439-8
115. T.J. Saxby: *The Quest for the New Jerusalem, Jean de Labadie* [1610–1674] *and the Labadists (1610–1744).* 1987 ISBN 90-247-3485-1
116. C.E. Harline: *Pamphlets, Printing, and Political Culture in the Early Dutch Republic.* 1987 ISBN 90-247-3511-4
117. R.A. Watson and J.E. Force (eds.): *The Sceptical Mode in Modern Philosophy.* Essays in Honor of Richard H. Popkin. 1988 ISBN 90-247-3584-X
118. R.T. Bienvenu and M. Feingold (eds.): *In the Presence of the Past.* Essays in Honor of Frank Manuel. 1991 ISBN 0-7923-1008-X
119. J. van den Berg and E.G.E. van der Wall (eds.): *Jewish-Christian Relations in the 17th Century.* Studies and Documents. 1988 ISBN 90-247-3617-X
120. N. Waszek: *The Scottish Enlightenment and Hegel's Account of 'Civil Society'.* 1988 ISBN 90-247-3596-3
121. J. Walker (ed.): *Thought and Faith in the Philosophy of Hegel.* 1991 ISBN 0-7923-1234-1
122. Henry More [1614–1687]: *The Immortality of the Soul.* Edited with Introduction and Notes by A. Jacob. 1987 ISBN 90-247-3512-2
123. P.B. Scheurer and G. Debrock (eds.): *Newton's Scientific and Philosophical Legacy.* 1988 ISBN 90-247-3723-0
124. D.R. Kelley and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *The Shapes of Knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment.* 1991 ISBN 0-7923-1259-7
125. R.M. Golden (ed.): *The Huguenot Connection.* The Edict of Nantes, Its Revocation, and Early French Migration to South Carolina. 1988 ISBN 90-247-3645-5
126. S. Lindroth: *Les chemins du savoir en Suède.* De la fondation de l'Université d'Upsal à Jacob Berzelius. Études et Portraits. Traduit du suédois, présenté et annoté par J.-F. Battail. Avec une introduction sur Sten Lindroth par G. Eriksson. 1988 ISBN 90-247-3579-3
127. S. Hutton (ed.): *Henry More (1614–1687). Tercentenary Studies.* With a Biography and Bibliography by R. Crocker. 1989 ISBN 0-7923-0095-5
128. Y. Yovel (ed.): *Kant's Practical Philosophy Reconsidered.* Papers Presented at the 7th Jerusalem Philosophical Encounter (December 1986). 1989 ISBN 0-7923-0405-5
129. J.E. Force and R.H. Popkin: *Essays on the Context, Nature, and Influence of Isaac Newton's Theology.* 1990 ISBN 0-7923-0583-3
130. N. Capaldi and D.W. Livingston (eds.): *Liberty in Hume's 'History of England'.* 1990 ISBN 0-7923-0650-3
131. W. Brand: *Hume's Theory of Moral Judgment.* A Study in the Unity of *A Treatise of Human Nature.* 1992 ISBN 0-7923-1415-8
132. C.E. Harline (ed.): *The Rhyme and Reason of Politics in Early Modern Europe.* Collected Essays of Herbert H. Rowen. 1992 ISBN 0-7923-1527-8
133. N. Malebranche: *Treatise on Ethics* (1684). Translated and edited by C. Walton. 1993 ISBN 0-7923-1763-7
134. B.C. Southgate: *'Covetous of Truth'.* The Life and Work of Thomas White (1593–1676). 1993 ISBN 0-7923-1926-5
135. G. Santinello, C.W.T. Blackwell and Ph. Weller (eds.): *Models of the History of Philosophy.* Vol. 1: From its Origins in the Renaissance to the 'Historia Philosophica'. 1993 ISBN 0-7923-2200-2
136. M.J. Petry (ed.): *Hegel and Newtonianism.* 1993 ISBN 0-7923-2202-9

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

---

137. Otto von Guericke: *The New (so-called Magdeburg) Experiments* [Experimenta Nova, Amsterdam 1672]. Translated and edited by M.G. Foley Ames. 1994 ISBN 0-7923-2399-8
138. R.H. Popkin and G.M. Weiner (eds.): *Jewish Christians and Cristian Jews.* From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment. 1994 ISBN 0-7923-2452-8
139. J.E. Force and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *The Books of Nature and Scripture.* Recent Essays on Natural Philosophy, Theology, and Biblical Criticism in the Netherlands of Spinoza's Time and the British Isles of Newton's Time. 1994 ISBN 0-7923-2467-6
140. P. Rattansi and A. Clericuzio (eds.): *Alchemy and Chemistry in the 16th and 17th Centuries.* 1994 ISBN 0-7923-2573-7
141. S. Jayne: *Plato in Renaissance England.* 1995 ISBN 0-7923-3060-9
142. A.P. Coudert: *Leibniz and the Kabbalah.* 1995 ISBN 0-7923-3114-1
143. M.H. Hoffheimer: *Eduard Gans and the Hegelian Philosophy of Law.* 1995 ISBN 0-7923-3114-1
144. J.R.M. Neto: *The Christianization of Pyrrhonism.* Scepticism and Faith in Pascal, Kierkegaard, and Shestov. 1995 ISBN 0-7923-3381-0
145. R.H. Popkin (ed.): *Scepticism in the History of Philosophy.* A Pan-American Dialogue. 1996 ISBN 0-7923-3769-7
146. M. de Baar, M. Löwensteyn, M. Monteiro and A.A. Sneller (eds.): *Choosing the Better Part.* Anna Maria van Schurman (1607–1678). 1995 ISBN 0-7923-3799-9
147. M. Degenaar: *Molyneux's Problem.* Three Centuries of Discussion on the Perception of Forms. 1996 ISBN 0-7923-3934-7
148. S. Berti, F. Charles-Daubert and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *Heterodoxy, Spinozism, and Free Thought in Early-Eighteenth-Century Europe.* Studies on the *Traité des trois imposteurs.* 1996 ISBN 0-7923-4192-9
149. G.K. Browning (ed.): *Hegel's* Phenomenology of Spirit: *A Reappraisal.* 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4480-4
150. G.A.J. Rogers, J.M. Vienne and Y.C. Zarka (eds.): *The Cambridge Platonists in Philosophical Context.* Politics, Metaphysics and Religion. 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4530-4
151. R.L. Williams: *The Letters of Dominique Chaix, Botanist-Curé.* 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4615-7
152. R.H. Popkin, E. de Olaso and G. Tonelli (eds.): *Scepticism in the Enlightenment.* 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4643-2
153. L. de la Forge. Translated and edited by D.M. Clarke: *Treatise on the Human Mind (1664).* 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4778-1
154. S.P. Foster: *Melancholy Duty.* The Hume-Gibbon Attack on Christianity. 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4785-4
155. J. van der Zande and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *The Skeptical Tradition Around 1800.* Skepticism in Philosophy, Science, and Society. 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4846-X
156. P. Ferretti: *A Russian Advocate of Peace: Vasilii Malinovskii (1765–1814).* 1997 ISBN 0-7923-4846-6
157. M. Goldish: *Judaism in the Theology of Sir Isaac Newton.* 1998 ISBN 0-7923-4996-2
158. A.P. Coudert, R.H. Popkin and G.M. Weiner (eds.): *Leibniz, Mysticism and Religion.* 1998 ISBN 0-7923-5223-8
159. B. Fridén: *Rousseau's Economic Philosophy.* Beyond the Market of Innocents. 1998 ISBN 0-7923-5270-X
160. C.F. Fowler O.P.: *Descartes on the Human Soul.* Philosophy and the Demands of Christian Doctrine. 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5473-7

ARCHIVES INTERNATIONALES D'HISTOIRE DES IDÉES

*

INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS

161. J.E. Force and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *Newton and Religion.* Context, Nature and Influence. 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5744-2
162. J.V. Andreae: *Christianapolis.* Introduced and translated by E.H. Thompson. 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5745-0
163. A.P. Coudert, S. Hutton, R.H. Popkin and G.M. Weiner (eds.): *Judaeo-Christian Intellectual Culture in the Seventeeth Century.* A Celebration of the Library of Narcissus Marsh (1638–1713). 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5789-2
164. T. Verbeek (ed.): *Johannes Clauberg* and Cartesian Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century. 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5831-7
165. A. Fix: *Fallen Angels.* Balthasar Bekker, Spirit Belief, and Confessionalism in the Seventeenth Century Dutch Republic. 1999 ISBN 0-7923-5876-7
166. S. Brown (ed.): *The Young Leibniz and his Philosophy (1646–76).* 2000 ISBN 0-7923-5997-6
167. R. Ward: *The Life of Henry More.* Parts 1 and 2. 2000 ISBN 0-7923-6097-4
168. Z. Janowski: *Cartesian Theodicy.* Deścartes' Quest for Certitude. 2000 ISBN 0-7923-6127-X
169. J.D. Popkin and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *The Abbé Grégoire and his World.* 2000 ISBN 0-7923-6247-0
170. C.G. Caffentzis: *Exciting the Industry of Mankind. George Berkeley's Philosophy of Money.* 2000 ISBN 0-7923-6297-7
171. A. Clericuzio: *Elements, Principles and Corpuscles.* A Study of Atomisms and Chemistry in the Seventeenth Century. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6782-0
172. H. Hotson: *Paradise Postponed.* Johann Heinrich Alsted and the Birth of Calvinist Millenarianism. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6787-1
173. M. Goldish and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture.* Volume I. Jewish Messianism in the Early Modern World. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6850-9
174. K.A. Kottman (ed.): *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture.* Volume II. Catholic Millenarianism: from Savonarda to the Abbé Gregoire. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6849-5
175. J.E. Force and R.H. Popkin (eds): *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture.* Volume III. The Millenarium Turn: Millenarian Contexts of Science, Politics and Everyday Anglo-American Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6848-7
176. J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.): *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture.* Volume IV. Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics. 2001 ISBN 0-7923-6847-9

KLUWER ACADEMIC PUBLISHERS – DORDRECHT / BOSTON / LONDON