

**Godly Intelligence: Intellectual Contacts between  
England, Germany and the Netherlands 1638-1662  
A Study of the Correspondence of Johann Moriaen**

**by John Tone Young**

submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of History

November 1995

UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

*Godly Intelligence: Intellectual Contacts between England,  
Germany and the Netherlands 1638-1662*

*A Study of the Correspondence of Johann Moriaen*

*John Tone Young*

*Summary*

The German natural philosopher Johann Moriaen (c.1582-c.1668) is among the best represented yet least known figures in the papers of Samuel Hartlib. This study presents a fully annotated edition of his German letters from the archive. This forms the primary source for an account of the intellectual contacts fostered by the Hartlib circle.

Born in Nürnberg to a family of Dutch exiles, Moriaen served for eight years as minister to the clandestine Reformed church in Catholic-controlled Cologne and then became a leading organiser of charitable collections for Reformed exiles from the Palatinate. In 1638 he settled in the Netherlands, and became closely involved with Hartlib's circle. He was the principal manager of the Dutch collection for Comenius, promoted Jewish-Christian relations, supplied mystic and utopian literature, served as agent for a number of German technologists and inventors, and was actively engaged on the search for the Philosopher's Stone.

His correspondence sheds much new light on a number of figures, especially the pansophist Jan Amos Comenius and the alchemist Johann Rudolph Glauber, and on the structure and practical operation of Hartlib's enormous network of intelligence. It is most valuable, however, as a window onto an intellectual world. The study reconsiders the ideas of Pansophy and alchemy as essentially similar methodologies for realising a resolutely non-sectarian but by no means non-religious vision. It aims to provide a fuller account of the 'third force' in seventeenth-century thought, neither empirical nor rationalist, but clinging to the notions of universal coherence discernible through a combination of practical study and divine enlightenment.

## Contents

<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Part One: Johann Moriaen: A Biographical Sketch</u>	
<u>Chapter One: Servant of the Church</u>	
1:1 Origins and Upbringing	13
1:2 Under the Cross	21
1:3 Mystics and Utopists	48
1:4 Wanderjahre	72
<u>Chapter Two: Servant of God</u>	
2:1 In a Free Country	86
2:2 Moriaen and the Jews	99
2:3 Technology Transfer	119
2:4 The Godly Entrepreneur	146
<u>Chapter Three: An Intelligencer's Ethos</u>	
3:1 Public and Private	166
3:2 'Without Partialitie': The Irenic Ideal	192

Part Two: Universal Wisdom

Chapter Four: Paying for Pansophy

4:1	<i>Origins of the Pansophic Project</i>	230
4:2	<i>The Notion of Pansophy: Beyond Bacon and Alsted</i>	245
4:3	<i>'To Leave No Problem Unsolved': The New Mathematics as a Model for Pansophy</i>	263
4:4	<i>The Collection in the Netherlands</i>	288
4:5	<i>Comenius's Visits to England and the Netherlands</i>	307

Chapter Five: 'Ora et Labora': Science and Spirituality

5:1	<i>'Philosophia Experimentalis'</i>	334
5:2	<i>Chemistry versus Alchemy?</i>	362
5:3	<i>The Key to Creation</i>	378



Chapter Six: A Case Study in Seventeenth-Century  
Scientific Exchange: Moriaen, Glauber and the Hartlib  
Circle

6:1 'Paracelsus of the Seventeenth Century' or 'German Robert Boyle'?	392
6:2 Heyday in the Netherlands	402
6:3 Flight into Germany	415
6:4 Last Years in Amsterdam	429
6:5 Glauber's Reception in the Hartlib Circle	437
Appendix One: Glauber's 'Furni Novi Philosophici Utilitates'	463
Appendix Two: Charles de Montendon on Glauber	470

Chapter Seven: The Dawn of Wisdom

7:1 Benjamin Worsley's Alchemical Mission to the Netherlands	472
7:2 Moriaen and the 'Great Work'	500
7:3 The Gate of Things	515
Appendix: Glauber's 'Undertaking'	534

<u>Conclusion</u>	537
-------------------	-----

<u>Bibliography</u>	548
---------------------	-----

<u>List of Abbreviations</u>	571
------------------------------	-----

## Introduction

Though it is now over sixty years since the physical existence of the papers of Samuel Hartlib was discovered by George Turnbull,<sup>1</sup> those papers are still being discovered. This single large trunkful of manuscripts has provided not only a great deal of raw evidence about the intellectual history of the early and middle seventeenth century, but the stimulus to reconsider many of the preconceptions and categorisations brought to bear on that history. Among the various opportunities the discovery has afforded is that of viewing familiar territory from unfamiliar perspectives, gaining access to the viewpoints of little-known and virtually unknown figures. The principal aim of this study is to contribute to the understanding of the period by presenting in some detail the view from one such hitherto neglected perspective and supplying it with a background.

Hartlib was born in Elblag (Elbing) at the beginning of the seventeenth century, into a well-connected merchant family of the Reformed religion, to a German father and an English mother. Having studied at Cambridge in 1625-6, he left his home town for good in

---

1 In 1933: for the history of the papers, see 'Introduction' to *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation: Studies in Intellectual Communication*, ed. Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie and Timothy Raylor (Cambridge, 1994), (SHUR) 1-26.

1628 and settled in England. He brought with him a positively missionary determination to contribute to a new Reformation, one that would encompass learning, science and religion, changing all three out of recognition and restoring to humankind the pristine knowledge of and dominion over the earth that had been its birghright in Eden. He elaborated a wide assortment of practical schemes for furthering this idealistic vision, foremost among them being the notion of an Office of Address. This was to be a State-funded institution operating as a sort of clearing house of knowledge. It would receive information on all subjects from all quarters, categorise and store it, and pass it on to those best equipped to make use of it for 'the common good'. He was convinced that such fostering of intellectual exchange, or 'intelligencing', was necessary to bring humanity to its preordained inheritance.

Though Hartlib's proposals for the Office of Address, or Council of Learning as it was alternatively known, aroused considerable interest in Parliament, especially under Oliver Cromwell, that interest was never transmuted into the funding that might have realised the vision. The indomitable Hartlib devoted the greater part of his life to fulfilling single-handedly the function he had envisaged for this institution. He made it his business to establish contact with scholars and



scientists in every field, to gather intelligence from them, to log that intelligence and to pass copies on to others. In the course of three and a half decades, he developed an enormous network of communication and amassed a remarkable and eclectic store of letters and manuscripts from the most diverse sources and covering an almost limitless range of subjects.

It was in the nature of Hartlib's purpose that his collection should not, in principle, be limited by religious or political allegiance. In practice, however, his own background in the Reformed faith inevitably affected the contacts he made and the subjects that preoccupied him. The characteristic obsessions of the 'Second Reformation' loom large: millenarianism, encyclopedism, educational theory, 'useful' knowledge.<sup>2</sup> His papers also constitute perhaps the largest single source of primary material by or about the representatives of what Richard H. Popkin has dubbed the 'third force', a distinctive though long neglected school of thought that 'seems to be neither rationalist, nor

---

<sup>2</sup> All these subjects will be dealt with in rather more detail in the course of the following study. On the notion of a 'Second Reformation', see *Die Reformierte Konfessionalisierung in Deutschland - Das Problem der 'Zweiten Reformation'*, ed. Heinz Schilling (Gütersloh, 1986), esp. Heinz Schilling, 'Die "Zweite Reformation" als Kategorie der Geschichtswissenschaft', 387-437.

empiricist, but combines elements of both with theosophy and interpretation of Bible prophecy'.<sup>3</sup>

The 'third force' arose and took on definition as a reaction to the sceptical crisis of the seventeenth century, to the revival of Pyrrhonism, the deductivism of Descartes and the materialism of Hobbes. According to Popkin, the group found its principal source of inspiration in the German mystic and visionary Jacob Böhme, who viewed both the created world and the human mind less as objects or tools of enquiry in themselves than as channels through which a transcendent, spiritual perception might be attained, bringing humanity into direct contact with God and revealing the divine quality inherent in all things. Reason and sense perception, as Böhme saw things, were inadequate to reveal more than the shell or shadow of the divine ideas embodied in Creation. Böhme in turn derived much of his thought and ideology from the highly idiosyncratic alchemist and mystic Theophrastus Paracelsus, who had believed likewise that Nature was something not so much to be looked at as seen through, the means of God's revelation if humanity could only learn to read it aright.

---

<sup>3</sup> Richard H. Popkin, 'The "Third Force" in Seventeenth Century Philosophy: Scepticism, Science and Biblical Prophecy', in the same author's *The Third Force in Seventeenth Century Thought* (Leiden, 1992), 90-119, 90.



This was essentially a Protestant, and primarily a Reformed school of thought which flourished mainly in England, the Dutch Netherlands, Protestant Germany and Scandinavia. Its principal exponents, Popkin argues, were all members of the Hartlib circle: the millenarian exegists Joseph Mede and William Twisse, the educational reformer Jan Amos Comenius, the irenicist John Dury and the 'Cambridge Platonist' Henry More. For all the frequent emphasis laid on practical utility in the papers Hartlib amassed, the underlying and unifying ethos of his collection is the spiritualistic ideal of the 'third force': the affirmation of God's providential design in the world, the assertion of man's potential to gain access, through grace, to a more than human understanding of the nature of things, and a palpably horrified rejection of the idea that either mind or matter is on its own sufficient to explain the universe. That rejection was by no means blinkered or uninformed, but on the contrary arose in many cases out of a personal flirtation with materialism or (especially) scepticism, which had led to a deeply felt sense of the inadequacy of such systems of thought to meet the spiritual needs of the individual.

Two of the foremost 'third force' thinkers, John Dury and Jan Amos Comenius, were Hartlib's principal allies in his great plan for universal reformation. In

1652, these three committed themselves by a 'Christianæ Societatis Pactum' ('pact of Christian union') to cooperate in the prosecution of the scheme.<sup>4</sup> Comenius's task was the reform of education, Dury's the reform and reconciliation of the church, and Hartlib's the reform of science - tasks which interrelated and overlapped one with another. It is not surprising, therefore, that Dury and Comenius should be the individuals best represented, after Hartlib himself, in his surviving papers. After theirs, one of the largest collections of papers by a single hand to be found in the Hartlib archive is comprised by the letters of the German natural philosopher Johann Moriaen (c. 1591-c.1668).<sup>5</sup>

Unlike Dury and Comenius, Moriaen was almost totally unknown between his death and the rediscovery of Hartlib's papers. He published nothing, and he never held any public or academic office. Consequently, he features in no biographical dictionary. Before Turnbull's discovery, he was noticed, if at all, only as a name that occurs occasionally in contemporary correspondence, principally that of Hartlib and another intimate of his circle, the German translator and diplomat Theodore Haak.

4 George Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (Liverpool, 1947) (HDC), 363 and 458-460.

5 The only other figure to compare with him in terms of quantity of material preserved is the Parliamentarian Cheney Culpeper, concerning whom see Chapter Seven.



Even now, for all the work that has been done on the archive, he remains an extremely obscure figure. The first work to make frequent mention of him is Turnbull's account of the Hartlib Papers, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, though all Turnbull set out to do was to extract statements from his letters which shed light on the activities of better-known figures, principally Comenius. Charles Webster makes occasional references in the same vein in his magisterial *The Great Instauration*.<sup>6</sup> Milada Blekastad has published nine of his letters from the Hartlib archive (also selected for their relevance to Comenius), in generally excellent transcriptions,<sup>7</sup> and some extracts from his work are reproduced by E.G.E. Van Der Wall in her study of the Hebraist J.S. Rittangel.<sup>8</sup> Inge Keil has used part of his correspondence as a primary source for her study of the Augsburg optician Johann Wiesel, whose agent Moriaen was for a time.<sup>9</sup> The fullest account of him anywhere to date is the synopsis of his life in E.G.E. Van Der Wall's biography of the

---

6 Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-1660* (London, 1975).

7 Milada Blekastad (ed.), *Unbekannte Briefe des Comenius und seiner Freunde 1641-1661* (Ratingen and Kastellaun, 1976), 125-150.

8 E.G.E. Van Der Wall, 'Johann Stephan Rittangel's Stay in the Dutch Republic', *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, eds. J. Van Den Berg and E.G.E. Van Der Wall (Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1988), 119-134.

9 Inge Keil, 'Technology Transfer and Scientific Specialization: Johann Wiesel, optician of Augsburg, and the Hartlib circle', *SHUR*, 268-278.

chiliast Petrus Serrarius (Pierre Serrurier).<sup>10</sup> Except by these scholars, his correspondence remains an almost wholly untapped source.<sup>11</sup>

Moriaen was born into a Reformed Dutch family living in exile in Nürnberg, and he spent much of the first half of his long life in the service of those Reformed communities that suffered most from the Counter-Reformation and the Thirty Years War. From 1619 to 1627, he was a preacher 'under the Cross' with the clandestine Reformed church in Catholic-controlled Cologne. Subsequently he became a principal organiser of relief work for exiles from the Palatinate. Later in life, however, he distanced himself consciously from any denominational allegiance, and portrayed himself less as the servant of any church than as that of God and his fellow man in general. He settled in the Dutch Netherlands in 1638, where he made a living as a merchant and entrepreneur in a variety of fields, while involving himself in further charity work and the dispensing of medicine. It was at this time that he became closely involved with Hartlib's intelligence network, and his

10 E.G.E. Van Der Wall, *De Mystieke Chiliast Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) en zijn Wereld* (Leiden, 1987) (*Serrarius*), 99-101, 302-33 and *passim*. This is a work that has been of enormous value to me in the preparation of this study.

11 One short copy extract (no. 133 in my edition) appears in James Knowlson's 'Jean Le Maire, the Almérie, and the "musique almérique"', *Acta Musicologica* 40 (1968) 86-89, 89, but the article is not concerned with Moriaen himself.



vision of public service acquired a new breadth. Instead of merely alleviating the sufferings of particular persecuted or impoverished communities, he began to believe that he could contribute, in his role as intelligencer, to an advancement of learning and discovery of nature that would not only benefit but totally transform the entire world.

Moriaen was no great original thinker or scientist. He made no claims for himself as an innovator, either in practical or theoretical terms. Like Harlib, he saw his own function as that of a channel of information and ideas. Besides a considerable stock of raw information, what his letters supply is an insight into the workings and ideals of Harlib's intelligence network, and a means of access to a particular world-view, a particular intellectual context. For the purposes of appreciating such a context, a substantial body of writing by a figure like Moriaen is valuable precisely because he was *not* exceptional, not 'ahead of his time'. He was informed, educated and alert but he broke no new ground: he kept eagerly abreast of new ideas in a wide variety of fields but initiated no such new ideas himself. Though he was certainly not unoriginal, he can be taken as far more representative of his period and milieu than any more innovative or influential thinker.



The principal object of this study is to make his letters accessible to scholars by supplying them with detailed annotations, and introducing them with a study of Moriaen's life and thought in the context of his association with the Hartlib circle and the broader intellectual currents of the time. All the German letters by Moriaen to be found in the Hartlib archive are presented as the second volume of this thesis. The introductory study divides naturally into two roughly equal parts, the first charting Moriaen's personal history, and the second using him as a point of reference for a more general discussion of the ideas of the 'third force'. The focus of this second part is on two concepts that were of crucial importance to the movement as a whole and were Moriaen's own principal obsessions. They are two alternative but (it will be argued) closely related attempts to transcend any merely materialist or rationalist view of the world and to gain access to the spiritual dimension: the concepts of Pansophy and alchemy.

#### Note on the Text

All references in the following study to Moriaen's German letters are to the numeration of the accompanying volume, which is arranged chronologically. The Hartlib Papers call number of each letter is given in that volume's list of contents. To avoid an excessive

proliferation of footnotes, references for direct quotations from these letters are retained in the body of the text. All other references, including those to Moriaen's letters where they are not directly quoted, are given as footnotes.

English translations are supplied for quotations not in English or German. Where the language changes in mid-quotation, the translation is placed immediately after the relevant portion, italicised in square brackets.

The editorial policies used in the transcription of Moriaen's letters (set out at the front of the accompanying volume) are applied to other citations from manuscript sources, and occasionally to primary printed sources where editorial interference has been necessary (eg. in explicating alchemical symbols or expanding now unfamiliar abbreviations). Citations from manuscripts have occasionally been supplied with additional punctuation, placed in square brackets, to aid comprehension or to clarify possible ambiguities. Abridgment of any quotation is indicated thus: [...].

Proper nouns are generally given in vernacular, rather than Anglicised or Latinised forms, except where this would entail using another alphabet than the Roman, and except in the cases of countries, geographical areas and cities so well-known in their English form as virtually to constitute part of the language: thus 'Cologne' and 'Danzig' rather than 'Köln' and 'Gdansk',

but 'Nürnberg' and 'Elblag' rather than 'Nuremberg' and 'Elbing'. In the case of personal names, standardisation is rendered virtually impossible by the fact that contemporaries applied none, even to their own names. I have generally tried to use the form favoured by the individual in question where this can be ascertained, and when in doubt have favoured vernacular forms.

The second volume of this study, the edition of Moriaen's letters, since it does not constitute part of the thesis proper but rather the principal primary source for it, is given in single spacing.



PART ONE: JOHANN MORIAEN: A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Chapter One

Servant of the Church

'Morian [...] is admirably skilful but can bring nothing to perfection but is very inconstant and falls from one thing to another' - Kenelm Digby, cited in *Ephemerides*, 1654, HP 29/4/11A.

*1:1 Origins and Upbringing*

The Free Imperial City of Nürnberg was a commercial centre strategically located at a nexus of major European trade routes. Long before the Reformation, it already had a substantial Dutch population purely on the strength of its economic connections with the Netherlands. This in itself recommended it as a possible destination to the Dutch refugees driven out of their homeland after the Netherlands, at this time hereditary lands of the Habsburgs, fell to Felipe II of Spain in 1556 and the new ruler set about extirpating Protestantism from his dominions. The Nürnberg authorities viewed this influx with mixed feelings. On the one hand, the vast majority of such exiles were Calvinists, and the *Stadtsrat* or City Council, though humanistically inclined and averse to rigid dogmatism, did not wish to see the faith of the solidly Lutheran populace tainted with the new heresy, or the city a prey to partisan strife. Nor did it wish to provide the city's great Catholic neighbour Bavaria with an excuse for territorial aggression by overtly fostering

a religion that had no legal existence within the Holy Roman Empire under the terms of the 1555 Treaty of Augsburg. On the other hand, the city's market-based economy, which had suffered from the political upheavals of mid-century, stood to benefit from an infusion of skilled artisans and craftsmen. It was precisely from this walk of life that the overwhelming majority of the Dutch refugees hailed - exile being for them, as it was not for unskilled labourers and peasants, a financially viable option. Like a number of other commercial centres in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries - most notably Hamburg and (after shaking off Spanish dominion at the turn of the century) the Dutch Netherlands - Nürnberg discovered that a measure of religious toleration was good for business.

In 1569, as the notoriously bloody measures of Felipe's new lieutenant the Duke of Alva (appointed Governor 1567) led to a redoubling of the exodus from the Netherlands, the Nürnberg City Council moved from toleration to positive encouragement of the immigrants, or at least of certain selected ones, having spotted an opportunity to capitalise on the textile trade that was being driven out of the Netherlands along with Protestantism. It paid the travelling expenses of and found or even built accommodation for a hand-picked group of skilled workers in this field - dyers, weavers,



stitchers and embroiderers - who with their families numbered about forty. Far greater numbers of exiles who arrived of their own accord were also admitted. Many such immigrants acquired Nürnberg citizenship, a stipulation for this being that they should undertake not to set up any separate church or 'sect' within the Lutheran city, or make any attempt to convert or quarrel with any of the native populace. In other words, the city authorities wanted their technical expertise and commercial experience badly enough to be prepared to put up with their obnoxious opinions, provided they in turn were prepared to keep those opinions to themselves. Thus there was from the mid-sixteenth century a substantial and almost exclusively immigrant Calvinist population in Nürnberg, principally Dutch but including French Huguenots and English Puritans, unable (in principle at least) to make any public profession of their faith or conduct any communal worship, but accepting this as the price of shelter in a city where it was at least tacitly accepted that they practised it in private. Though there were periodical investigations of secret religious services being conducted within the Calvinist community, leading to the issuing of threats and admonishments, the authorities were decidedly luke-warm about taking real reprisals against such activity. It was not, however,

until 1650, in the wake of the Peace of Westphalia, that a Reformed Church was officially recognised in Nürnberg.<sup>1</sup>

Among these immigrants was a braid-maker by the name of Hans Morianus, who acquired Nürnberg citizenship on 12 April 1581.<sup>2</sup> Two years later, this Morianus featured in a group of nine immigrant citizens and denizens who were summoned before the city court for having had their children baptised in Reformed churches of the Upper Palatinate instead of Lutheran ones in Nürnberg.<sup>3</sup> That they had done so testifies to the tenacity of their faith, since such a journey entailed three days' travelling (with, obviously, a young infant in tow), and moreover Theodor Beza, Calvin's successor in Geneva, had explicitly declared three years earlier that the 'Dutch brethren in Nürnberg' might, under the circumstances, attend communion and celebrate baptisms according to the ordinances of their adoptive city without being considered in breach of their faith. The City Council admonished its stiff-necked asylum-seekers to stop

---

1 See Hans Neidiger, 'Die Entstehung der evangelisch-reformierten Gemeinde in Nürnberg als rechtsgeschichtliches Problem', *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg* XLIII (1952), 225-340. My account of Nürnberg at the time of Moriaen's birth is heavily indebted to Neidiger's fascinating study, which far transcends the bounds of its somewhat dry-sounding self-appointed brief.

2 Kurt Pilz, 'Nürnberg und die Niederlande', *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg* 43 (1952), 1-153, 56.

3 Neidiger, 'Die Entstehung der evangelisch-reformierten Gemeinde in Nürnberg', 258.



visiting churches outside the city boundaries, but appears as usual not to have imposed any actual penalties - or to have had much effect on their subsequent conduct.<sup>4</sup>

The surname Morian[us] is a highly unusual one, and it is beyond the bounds of plausible coincidence that this Hans Morianus should not have been related to Frans Morian and his wife Maria, née von Manten (which is probably a Germanicisation of Van Manten), whose son Johann was born in the latter half of 1591 or shortly thereafter.<sup>5</sup> He was not baptised in Nürnberg, which suggests that the family, like so many of the Reformed Dutch immigrants, persisted in the practice of sneaking out of Nürnberg to the Upper Palatinate to celebrate communion, weddings and baptisms according to the rites of their own faith. While there is no concrete evidence that the family was Dutch, the Netherlands are far and away the likeliest place of origin for Calvinist immigrants to Nürnberg at this period. The assumption is effectively clinched by the fact that Moriaen consistently spelled his name in the Dutch manner, in preference to the much more Germanic 'Morian' favoured by almost everyone else at the time or since,<sup>6</sup> and that he

4 Ibid., 258-9.

5 *Protokolle der hochdeutsch-reformierten Gemeinde zu Köln 1599-1754 II* (Cologne, 1990), 476, no. 947.13.

6 There are only two signatures to non-Latin holograph letters spelled 'Morian' (nos. 6 and 9). Latin letters have to be considered separately, since it was normal to

was fluent in Dutch well before he settled in Amsterdam in 1638.<sup>7</sup>

The few other facts about Moriaen's family discernible from his letters can be quickly summarised. He had at least two sisters. One married the merchant Abraham de Bra, whom Moriaen described as his brother-in-law.<sup>8</sup> De Bra was another member of the Nürnberg Dutch community. He left the city in 1633, probably for Amsterdam, and subsequently became a leading figure in the Dutch West India Company.<sup>9</sup> Another sister married into the Abeele family - a transparently Dutch name.<sup>10</sup> Her husband may well have been related either to the Jan Abeels of Flanders who was an elder of the important

---

use the Latin form of a name when writing in that language (Hartlib for instance becoming Hartlibius, and Dury Duræus), but even when writing in Latin Moriaen occasionally used the Dutch form. A significant exception to the general preference for the spelling 'Morian' is provided by Dury, who was brought up in the Netherlands: he used both forms, but marginally preferred the Dutch.

7 Four holograph letters in Dutch (to Justinus Van Assche) date from before his move (UBA N65a-d).

8 No. 39. Moriaen actually wrote only 'mein schw.' but this can hardly be an abbreviation for anything but 'schwager'. That this is being used in the strict sense of 'brother-in-law' (rather than the looser one equally current at the time of any male relative by marriage) is borne out by a letter to Hartlib of 22 April 1661 from one Isaac de Bra - doubtless Abraham's son - enclosing a (now lost) recommendation 'meynes herrn Ohman Ioh: Moriaen' (HP 27/41/1A); cf. no. 75, n.2.

9 Neidiger, 'Die Entstehung der evangelisch-reformierten Gemeinde in Köln', 270.

10 The evidence for this is, again, the existence of a nephew, Jean Abeel, who, writing from Amsterdam on 10 April 1659, sent Hartlib £3 'van mynnen waerden Oom Iohan Morian' ('from my worthy uncle Johann Moriaen') (HP 27/44/2A).

Dutch Church in Austin Friars, London, from 1604 to 1611 or earlier, or the English-born John vanden Abeele who was elder from 1630-36, both of them merchants.<sup>11</sup>

Moriaen also had at least one brother, whose daughter in 1649 or 50 married into the family of the renowned Frankfurt printer and engraver Matthias Merian.<sup>12</sup> Other members of his family lived in Cracow, whence Catholic persecution drove them into exile in Danzig.<sup>13</sup>

The first surviving documentary evidence of Moriaen is his matriculation at Heidelberg University in 1611.<sup>14</sup> Later, Moriaen fondly recalled his student days at Heidelberg and his friendship there with Georg Vechner (later a collaborator and editor of Comenius), for whose accommodation he apparently paid.<sup>15</sup> His family evidently had the funds and the will to ensure he was well provided for. Since Moriaen subsequently became a Reformed minister, it is altogether likely that he studied theology, but the records yield no more than the date of

11 See Ole Peter Grell, *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London: The Dutch Church in Austin Friars 1603-1642* (Leiden, New York, Copenhagen and Cologne, 1989), 257, and J.H. Hessels (ed.), *Ecclesiæ Londino-Batavæ Archivum III, passim*. Neither of these was the husband, for their marriages are recorded (*ib.*, 270), but a family connection is altogether likely. There was also another Jan Abeel at Austin Friars at least between 1648 and 1656 (Hessels III, nos. 3013 and 3043).

12 No. 116

13 No. 34.

14 G. Toepke, *Die Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg von 1386 bis 1662* (Heidelberg, 1886), II, 254, entry 84.

15 No. 17. Georg Vechner matriculated at Heidelberg two months after Moriaen, on 8 July 1611 (*Matrikel der Universität Heidelberg*, II, 254, entry 118).



matriculation, with no indication of how long he remained in Heidelberg or what degree, if any, he obtained.

Heidelberg was a stronghold of Calvinism at this period. The Reformed faith had been imposed on the Palatinate in 1562 (and again, after a Lutheran interlude, in 1583), thus gaining for the cause the oldest university in Germany, and one of the most reputable. Though it initially remained academically conservative by comparison with the newly-founded Reformed academies such as Herborn (established 1584), the ethos was changing at the very moment of Moriaen's arrival. In particular, the logical and pedagogical ideas of Bartholomäus Keckermann (1571-1609) were (somewhat belatedly) meeting with an enthusiastic reception. Keckermann had set out to define what he called 'methodical Peripateticism', a synthesis of the traditional Aristotelian logical methodology with the newer and ostensibly anti-Aristotelian ideas of Pierre de la Ramée (Ramus) which had become a standby of Reformed education. Ramism, as Howard Hotson puts it, 'was an instrument adopted in order to achieve a Second Reformation', and Keckermann's achievement was a fusion of 'Ramist clarity with Peripatetic substance'.<sup>16</sup>

16 Howard Hotson, *Johann Heinrich Alsted: Encyclopedism, Millenarianism and the Second Reformation in Germany* (PhD thesis, Oxford, 1991), 41 and 82. For a fuller account of Keckermann and his impact, see the second chapter of this thesis, pp.52-90. On Ramus and his impact, see Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method and the Decay of*

Keckermann was a founder of the encyclopedic tradition that led through Alsted to Comenius and his notion of Pansophy, of which Moriaen was later to become a prominent champion and supporter. Though there is not a single mention in his surviving correspondence of either Ramus or Keckermann - or, for that matter, Aristotle - his university education took place at the same time Comenius was studying under Alsted in Herborn, just the time when the notions of universal method and encyclopedic knowledge were achieving their greatest vogue, especially in Reformed establishments.<sup>17</sup> It is even possible Moriaen first met Comenius during the latter's brief spell at Heidelberg in 1613, but it is by no means certain Moriaen was still there by then.

\* \* \* \* \*

### *1:2 Under the Cross*

There is no record of Moriaen at all for the next eight years, but at some point during this period he became a minister in Frankfurt am Main. The situation there must have been familiar enough. Like Nürnberg, Frankfurt was an Imperial city under Lutheran control, cautiously and uneasily tolerating a substantial Calvinist minority of largely Dutch origin which was

---

*Dialogue: From the Art of Discourse to the Art of Reason* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 82-5. See Chapter Four, sections 1 and 2 for a fuller discussion.

accorded no officially recognised church. Services and sacraments could be delivered only secretly, in private houses, just as they were in Nürnberg. As a boy, Moriaen would have attended such clandestine religious gatherings in his home city; as a young man, he conducted them in Frankfurt.

A new experience for him at this time, which may well have had an impact on his later thought and attitudes, will have been the Jewish ghetto. There was a sizeable Jewish community in Frankfurt, tolerated like the Reformed Christians because it was economically useful, but very much on sufferance and with far more severe circumscriptions. The Jews were subject to a strict curfew, being confined to their ghetto after dark and on Sundays, and at no time permitted to leave it without sporting the stigma of a prominent yellow circle sewn onto their clothing, or to assemble outside it in groups of more than two.<sup>18</sup> No comment whatsoever by Moriaen survives concerning his time in this city, but it is a reasonable conjecture that his experiences or observations in Frankfurt had a bearing on the keen interest he later displayed in Judaism, and the considerable sympathy he showed, by the standards of the day, for its practitioners.

---

18 See Gerald Lyman Soliday, *A Community in Conflict: Frankfurt Society in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries* (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1974).



In 1619, at the outbreak of the Thirty Years War, he was summoned by his Church to the still less congenial surroundings of Cologne, one of the most staunchly and intransigently Roman Catholic enclaves of the entire Empire. The records of the German Reformed Church there (henceforth *Protokolle*) note that on 27 February 1619,

Weil die Brüder sich entschlossen den dritten Diener zu berufen, und uns einer mit Namen Johannes Morian vorgeschlagen wird, welcher sich auf die zukünftige Woch wird finden lassen zu (Frankfurt); als sollen die Brüder Wilhelm Engels und Johan Fassing Anordnung tun, daß gemelter Morian in seiner Predigt von den vornehmsten Gliedern der Kirche angehört werde, damit man abnehmen möge, ob er dieser Gemeinde würde fruchtbarlich dienen können.<sup>19</sup>

Apparently his preaching met with the approval of the church authorities, since two months later he was sent a written summons.<sup>20</sup> The phrasing of the above-cited entry - 'welcher sich [...] wird finden lassen' - is highly suggestive of the conditions under which Moriaen worked: he was evidently not a man accustomed to 'letting himself be found'. But for a Reformed minister to move from Frankfurt to Cologne was to exchange, quite deliberately, the frying pan for the fire. The Nürnberg and Frankfurt authorities were prepared to turn a blind eye to

<sup>19</sup> *Protokolle* I, 235, no. 750. The *Protokolle* are a fascinating document, but unfortunately are published in a massively modernised and standardised form with what appear to be somewhat *ad hoc* editorial policies: it is never made clear what the bracketing of (Frankfurt) indicates, though I would guess it is editorial expansion, perhaps of 'Ffort', a common abbreviation of the name.

<sup>20</sup> *Protokolle* I, 235, no. 752, 25 April 1619.



Calvinism so long as its adherents maintained a reasonable level of discretion. Cologne wanted no truck with any form of Protestantism at all.

At the time of the first wave of Protestant emigration from the Netherlands, Cologne had offered numerous attractions to the exiles: many Dutch traders had business connections there, it was reasonably close to the Netherlands, and it was known for tolerance and hospitality. The Jesuit-led Counter-Reformation soon changed this. The Lutheran and the three rather larger Reformed Churches (German, Dutch and Walloon) found themselves under constant surveillance and at risk of unwelcome attention from the authorities or more orthodox citizens. As Rudolf Löhr, the first modern editor of the *Protokolle*, sums the record up:

Vom ersten Schlag, 1566/1568, über berichtete oder nur angedeutete Überfälle auf Predigten [...] ist es bis 1627 eine fortwährende Kette von Verhören, Geldstrafen, Haft und Stadtverweisungen, von Hausdurchsuchungen und Hausverschließungen, worunter die Evangelischen zu leiden haben [...] Bis zum Ende der Reichsstadtära galt hier grundsätzlich und unverändert das Verbot der öffentlichen Ausübung für jeden nichtkatholischen Kultus.<sup>21</sup>

---

21 Rudolf Löhr, 'Zur Geschichte der vier heimlichen Kölner Gemeinden', *Protokolle* IV, 11-33, 16-17 (prepared for publication by Dieter Kastner: Löhr died before completing his work). See also A. Rosenkranz, *Das Evangelische Rheinland: ein rheinisches Gemeinde- und Pfarrerbuch* I (Düsseldorf, 1956), esp. p.376. Rosenkranz gives the name of the 'third minister' in Cologne from 1619-27 as Johann Moreau, which must be a variant form or a mistranscription of Morian.

The full congregation never met at any one time, and from October 1619 on no more than two of the three German ministers ever attended consistorial meetings together.<sup>22</sup> When a service or communion was arranged, the ministers decided which of their flock to call to it, by turns and according to the standard of their behaviour, and secret messages were conveyed to those summoned, informing them of the time and place. Whenever Catholic processions, such as the Corpus Christi day parade, were due to take place, the ministers went discreetly from house to house among their congregation exhorting them to keep well clear of the 'abgöttliche Götzendracht'. When the Reformed Churches, by contrast, decided on a day of prayer and fasting - a standard Protestant strategy for appeasing the wrath of God which was employed about once every three or four months - the same procedure was repeated, firstly to let people know it was happening and secondly to encourage them to observe it.

The Elders of the church occupied their position only for a year at a time, after which new elders were elected. This tended to be a cyclical process, former elders being regularly proposed for re-election after four or five years. The ministers never appeared publicly in clerical dress. The locations of the services

---

<sup>22</sup> *Protokolle I*, 243, no. 775. On 29 July 1626, the maximum number was further reduced to one (pp.327-8, no. 1040).

and even the days on which they were held were frequently changed. The watchword was discretion, and the foremost concern of all members of the church was to avoid drawing attention to themselves.

Despite such conditions, the role of Reformed minister in Cologne may well, in early 1619, have presented brighter prospects to a devout believer in the imminent and ultimate triumph of the Protestant cause than can easily be appreciated with the handicap of hindsight. Bohemia was making its stand against domination by the Catholic Habsburgs and it was fondly supposed by many Protestants that its elected champion, Friedrich V of the Palatinate, would be supported by the might of England under his father-in-law James I. The abundant prophecies of the impending downfall of Antichrist seemed to be borne out by this massive challenge to Catholic domination within the Holy Roman Empire. Moriaen had certainly read the *Fama* and *Confessio* of the Rosicrucians,<sup>23</sup> the one predicting an imminent rebirth of the Evangelical church, the other announcing with positively sadistic glee the downfall of Rome. He also saw the manuscript of the first two parts of *Lux in tenebris*, the visions of Christina Poniatowska and Christoph Kotter, translated into Latin by Comenius,

23 *Fama Fraternitatis des löblichen Ordens des Rosenkreutzes* (Cassel, 1614) and *Confessio Fraternitatis oder Bekanntnuß der löblichen Bruderschaft deß hochgeehrten Rosen Creutzes* (1615): see no. 190.



foretelling the restoration of Elector Friedrich and the triumph of Protestantism. That is not of course to say that he uncritically believed them, and his own much later recollection was that he approached *Lux in Tenebris* at least with considerable scepticism.<sup>24</sup> But he can hardly have been unaffected by the emotional and intellectual climate that produced such works, distinctly and deliberately reminiscent of the vengeful optimism and dogged faith of the early Christian Church - another oppressed dissident minority - as expressed in *Revelation*.

Whether Moriaen shared it or not, the illusion did not last long. The summer of 1620 saw Friedrich's lands in the Palatinate overrun by forces allied to the Emperor, and in November his army in Bohemia was routed by Bavarian-led troops at the Battle of the White Mountain outside Prague. Friedrich and his family fled to the Netherlands, and in 1623 his Electorate was transferred to the Catholic Maximilian of Bavaria. It had rapidly become apparent that the English crown had no intention of engaging for one side or the other, and the position of Protestants in such Catholic strongholds as Cologne, where the Counter-Reformation had in any case already been in full swing for some decades, became more difficult and dangerous than ever. Far from spearheading

---

24 No. 172.

a Third Reformation, Moriaen and his colleagues can at best have found themselves struggling to sustain the faith of a beleaguered congregation forced to worship in secret and displaying considerable courage in doing so at all. The one thing to be said for Cologne, from a Protestant point of view, was that unlike so much of Germany it avoided becoming a battleground, but in that respect it was a haven securely in hostile hands. It was not until 1802 that public Evangelical worship became possible in the city.<sup>25</sup> That Moriaen stuck to this singularly thankless and dangerous post for a full eight years bespeaks considerable courage and tenacity of purpose on his part.

The contemporary *Protokolle* give some impression of what Moriaen's life must have been like for these eight years. Laconic but vivid, they are records of great value not only for their many historical and biographical details but also for sheer human interest: and they incidentally refute the stereotypical image of Calvinists as humourless. Moriaen's name appears dozens of times over the period of his ministry. In the early years especially, the keepers of the *Protokolle* clearly set out to convey as great a sense of normality as possible, assiduously noting the routine tasks assigned to the church's servants, tasks which would have been the stock-

25 Löhr, 'Zur Geschichte der Vier Heimlichen Kölner Gemeinden', *Protokolle* IV, 11-33, 19.

in-trade of a Reformed minister in any location, Geneva as much as Cologne. Moriaen oversaw accounts and dealt with church correspondence; he received and passed on pleas for charitable assistance, both from distressed individuals and other Reformed communities; he catechised aspiring members of the congregation and assessed their suitability in terms of their behaviour and their familiarity with the principles of religion. He frequently attended the consistorial meetings of the three Reformed Churches which took place every few months, and at which common policies were agreed on, the division of labour between the three sister churches allotted and disagreements discussed. Above all, he carried out that most central of a Reformed minister's duties, the supervision of the morals of his flock.

Soon after joining the church, Moriaen was confronted with the rather surprising case of one Jeremias Mist, who wished to marry his late stepfather's widow. Moriaen was appointed to write to the Heidelberg theologian Scultetus for advice. The reply was, as the *Protokolle* drily note, that the proposal was found unacceptable 'in Ansehung gedachte Witwe seine Mutter sei oder zum wenigsten dafür gehalten werde'.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> *Protokolle* I, 238-40, nos. 762 and 767 (3 and 31 July 1619).



Most of the misdemeanours he was called on to admonish were more commonplace:

Wir kommen in Erfahrung, daß Johann Mosten bald nach dem Gebrauch des heiligen Abendmahls sich mit dem Trunk überladen und darüber zu Hause gegen seine Hausfrau ungebührlich verhalten, dadurch die Gemeinde Christi geärgert. Soll deswegen bestraft werden von Bruder Jordan und Morian.<sup>27</sup>

One of the worst recidivists in this respect was a certain Matthias Kuiper. On 1 August 1624, Moriaen was appointed to help arrange a reconciliation between Kuiper and his wife, as they had been leading 'ein ärgerliches Leben'.<sup>28</sup> The following December, Kuiper complained that he was still not being called to the church services, only to be told the church was unconvinced by his explanation 'daß er seiner gewesenen Magd nachgangen, hab er allein getan, sie zu versuchen, ob sie fromm wäre oder nicht'.<sup>29</sup> Some months later, being assured that he and his wife were now reconciled, Moriaen was again sent to tell Kuiper that he could return to the fold if he promised to remain sober.<sup>30</sup> But by 30 October the wheel had once more turned full circle:

Matthias Kuiper ob [...] er [...] mit hohem Eid und teuren Worten einsteils Besserung angelobet, andern Teils seine Mängel verneinet, so haben danach die Sachen anderes befunden, daß er dem Saufen, Spielen und Leichtfertigkeit unaufhörlich nachhanget.<sup>31</sup>

---

27 Protokolle I, 259, no. 838 (16 June 1621).

28 Protokolle I, 299, no. 966.

29 Protokolle I, 302, no. 977.

30 Protokolle I, 309-10, no. 1000 (7 Aug. 1625).

31 Protokolle I, 312, no. 1006.

Moriaen was again given the seemingly hopeless task of persuading the errant Kuiper back onto the paths of righteousness.

In the early years of his ministry, indeed, the concern expressed in the records about 'un-Christian' behaviour on the part of the congregation, such as drinking, swearing, gambling, quarrelling, fornicating and dancing, rather outweighs that about Catholic persecution. Dancing particularly concerned the German church, which appears to have been the most sternly puritanical of the three. A constant complaint in the records after consistorial meetings was that the Dutch and Walloon churches considered excommunication an excessive punishment for persistent dancing, and could not be persuaded to join the German in a united and uncompromising stance against such behaviour.

Another recurrent problem was the habit of the congregation of attending Catholic ceremonies and festivals, or, worse, sending their children to Catholic schools or tutors. Since there was no official or legal alternative, this is hardly surprising. Association with Catholics, however, was a matter of concern not only for its corrupting influence on the individual concerned, but for the danger it posed to the Reformed community as a whole, especially to those actually in Church service.



When, for instance, the daughter of the woman appointed to summon catechists took up with a Papist, the Church was reluctantly obliged to dispense with her mother's services.<sup>32</sup> A careless or malicious word might let slip the identity of a minister or the location of a service, as when

Christian Stoffgen wird berüchtigt, daß er in Gegenwart einer Pöpstischer Frauen sich ungebührlich verlauten lassen, daß er von D. Lauterbach unfreundlich tractiert wurde, und dabei gesagt, 'so tun unsere Eltesten'. Soll darüber von Bruder Johann und Schütgens angesprochen und nach Befindung gestrafet werden.<sup>33</sup>

The result might be banishment from Cologne of one of the Church's servants, as happened to Johann Kray in 1623,<sup>34</sup> or the arrest of the owner of a house in which services were held. This befell Peter Gülich on 5 March 1627. Faced with the threat of a heavy fine or imprisonment unless he would reveal the names of at least some of the congregation, Gülich was on the point of capitulating, and the Church found itself obliged to spend 300 Imperials from its funds to buy his release.<sup>35</sup> Children of course were particularly susceptible to Papist wiles, and were not admitted to services on the grounds that they were too young for their discretion to be relied on.<sup>36</sup>

---

32 *Protokolle I*, 327, no. 1037 (8 July 1626).

33 *Protokolle I*, 305, no. 988 (6 March 1625).

34 *Protokolle I*, 282, no. 919 (5 July 1623).

35 *Protokolle I*, 335, no. 1056.

36 *Protokolle I*, 242, no. 774 (10 Oct. 1619).



In the course of his ministry, Moriaen formed a number of lasting friendships: many of the names that feature regularly in the *Protokolle* recur too in his later correspondence with Hartlib. Among the more respected members of what was in general a well-to-do congregation were the Pergens family. Long before Moriaen's arrival, one Jacob Pergens was Elder for a year (1604),<sup>37</sup> and Leonard Pergens was upbraided for the tiresome sin of dancing.<sup>38</sup> These are almost certainly older relations of the Jacob Pergens, Herr von Vosbergen, who later settled in Amsterdam and became a director of the West India Company, and is frequently mentioned in Moriaen's correspondence with the vague designation 'Vetter' (ie. any male relation beyond the immediate family). His trading contacts would make him a useful channel for conveying parcels of books, minerals, medicines, etc. between England and the Netherlands. Another prominent family was the von Zeuels: Peter and Jacob appear as servants of the church during Moriaen's ministry, and before his arrival, Adam von Zeuel was an elder.<sup>39</sup> Moriaen would later marry this Adam von Zeuel's daughter Odilia. There is frequent mention of the Lauterbach family, who also appear later as relatives of

---

37 *Protokolle* I, 118, no. 286.1.

38 *Protokolle* I, 122, no. 303 (14 June 1606).

39 *Protokolle* I, 118, no. 286.1 (he took over from Jacob Pergens at the end of 1605).

Moriaen.<sup>40</sup> In the tight-knit Reformed community, intermarriage between the larger families was virtually inevitable, so it is hardly surprising that all these names occur in his later correspondence as relations, probably through his marriage to Odilia von Zeuel.

It was also in Cologne that Moriaen became associated with the large Kuffler family. Abraham Kuffler was Elder in 1622 and 1627,<sup>41</sup> and numerous other members of the family are mentioned as attending catechism, delivering their *Glaubensbekenntnis* and so forth. At the same time, another Abraham Kuffler of Cologne and his brother Johann Sibertus were in England. These two would later achieve considerable celebrity as inventors, and from the late 1640s onward the fate of Johann Sibertus in particular became inextricably linked with that of Moriaen.

Moriaen's own interest in technological development, particularly in the field of optics, was also established by this time. He is almost certainly the person referred to in a letter of December 1626 from Prince August of Anhalt to the natural philosopher and bibliophile Carl Widemann, mentioning that 'zue Cölln einer seii sehr perfect Inn solchen [optischen] Sachen, der hab ainen

---

40 See no. 5, n.10.

41 *Protokolle* II, 275, no. 898, and 332, nos. 1048-9.

gesellen Morian genandt'.<sup>42</sup> Among his accomplishments was the making of microscopes, albeit relatively basic ones.<sup>43</sup> There is no clue as to the identity of his employer, but he later told the story of a glassmaker of Cologne who was forced to flee the city because his lenses proved so fragile that they tended to burst spontaneously.<sup>44</sup> As Inge Keil suggests, the profession of glassmaker may have served as a cover for Moriaen's involvement with the clandestine Reformed Church.<sup>45</sup> There is no doubt, however, that his interest in the subject was genuine and profound, and it remained with him for the rest of his life. His later activity as agent for the German telescope and microscope maker Johann Wiesel will be considered shortly. Moriaen expected more from his lenses, however, than mere magnification: he came to believe that by means of them sunlight itself could be concentrated into a material

---

42 August von Anhalt to Widemann, 13 Dec. 1626, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek Hannover, MS iv 341, 861, cit. Inge Keil, 'Technology transfer and scientific specialization: Johann Wiesel, optician of Augsburg, and the Hartlib circle', *SHUR*, 268-278, 272, n.18.

43 As appears from his letter to Hevelius, 9 April 1650, Observatoire de Paris Corr. Hev. AC I,2, fol. 215v, ref. Inge Keil, 'Technology transfer and scientific specialization: Johann Wiesel, optician of Augsburg, and the Hartlib Circle', *SHUR*, 268-78, 275. Cf. no. 30 on optics: 'Ich hab in diesen sachen auch etwas gethan vnd verstehe die handarbeit so weit sie dieser zeit vblich vnd bekand ist'.

44 No. 156.

45 Ibid., 272.



form and the 'universal spirit' or 'world soul' extracted from it.<sup>46</sup>

His future wife aside, the closest and most enduring relationships Moriaen established were with preachers of the other Reformed Churches. Justinus Van Assche<sup>47</sup> served the Dutch Church in Frankfurt and Cologne simultaneously from October 1622 (some three years after Moriaen's arrival) till June 1627 (almost exactly the same time Moriaen left). Hartlib's great friend Dury was with the Walloon Church in Cologne from 1624 to 26,<sup>48</sup> and was replaced by Pierre Serrurier, or Petrus Serrarius as he is better known, who stayed until 1628.<sup>49</sup> All three were noted for being free-thinkers, and particularly for being irenically inclined.

---

46 Nos. 177, 183, 189. See Chapter Five, section 3, for a detailed discussion of Moriaen's ideas on this notion, and his reports of experiments to demonstrate it.

47 See *NNBW* I, 187-8; *Journal tenu par Isaac Beeckman* (ed. Cornelijns de Waard) I (The Hague, 1939), 219, n.2 and II (1942), 175-6, n.3; E.G.E. Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 39-42 and *passim*.

48 See J. Minton Batten's hagiographical *John Dury, Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago, 1944); Karl Brauer, *Die Unionstätigkeit John Duries unter dem Protektorat Cromwells* (Marburg, 1907); G. Westin, *Negotiations about Church Unity 1628-1634* (Upsala, 1932); George Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius: Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers* (HDC) (Liverpool and London, 1947); Anthony Milton, "'The Unchanged Peacemaker'? John Dury and the politics of irenicism in England 1628-43", *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation*, ed. M. Greengrass, M. Leslie and T. Raylor, (Cambridge, 1994) (*SHUR*), 95-117.

49 See Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, and 'The Amsterdam Millenarian Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) and the Anglo-Dutch Circle of Philo-Judaists', *Jewish Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century: Studies and Documents*, ed. J. Van Den Berg and E.G.E. Van Der Wall (Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1988), 73-94.

Early in 1624, Van Assche wrote to his friends and future brothers-in-law Jacob and Isaac Beeckman expressing concern about the heterodox opinions of a friend in Cologne. Van Assche's letter is lost, and is known only through Jacob Beeckman's reply, in which the staunchly Reformed Beeckman urged him to keep his distance from such dubious ideas.<sup>50</sup> Neither the friend's name nor the unorthodoxy in question is specified. Since the exchange pre-dates the arrival of either Dury or Serrarius in Cologne, Van Der Wall conjectures that it may refer to Moriaen.<sup>51</sup> This is certainly feasible, though as she stresses herself there is no conclusive proof. As things turned out, however, Moriaen was the only one of the four friends not to become embroiled in public doctrinal disputes.

Van Assche was summoned in 1626 to a new post in Veere, but refused to sign the rigid *Glaubensbekenntnis*, an affirmation of sound doctrinal Calvinism drawn up at the Synod of Dordrecht. It is a sign of how much laxer his church was than Moriaen's that he had presumably not been required to do so before. This led not only to the appointment's not being ratified but to Van Assche's excommunication - an excommunication which, it appears

---

50 Jacob Beeckman to Van Assche, 31 March 1624, *Journal tenu par Isaac Beeckman IV*, 79-80.

51; Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 40-41. The letter from Van Assche Beeckman was replying to is lost.



from Moriaen's correspondence, was still in force thirteen years later.<sup>52</sup> Serrarius, who would later become one of the most spectacularly non-conformist figures of his day, was also removed from his post for unorthodoxy. The precise grounds are unclear, but Van Der Wall, who is the chief authority on this intriguing character, suggests that Serrarius may have rejected the idea of Christ's having assumed human nature.<sup>53</sup>

As for Dury, he spent his life engendering public controversies precisely by dint of his tireless efforts to bring all controversy to an end. Since the studies of Turnbull and Webster established (quite rightly) the centrality of Dury's role in Hartlib's conception of the Great Instauration, it has been all too easy to overlook the fact that this was very much Hartlib's personal opinion, and that to many of his contemporaries Dury's close involvement with his projects seriously compromised their credibility. When the mystic and alchemist Johannes Tanckmar was accused by the Church authorities in Lübeck of promoting unorthodoxy, his friendship with Dury was cited in evidence against him.<sup>54</sup> In November 1639, Van Assche objected, through Moriaen, to a proposed publication of his correspondence with Dury about

52 No. 30.

53 Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 45-50. For the extreme views adopted by Serrarius in later life, see below.

54 See Starck, *Lübeckische Kirchen-Geschichte*, 785-811, partially reproduced in Steiner, *Morsius*, 48-57, and no. 15, n.2.



scriptural analysis, 'denn Er selbst Iustinus vmb dieser vrsach willen des ministerij entsezet worden vnd annoch von der Communion abgehalten wird' (no. 30). Though one reason cited is that Van Assche's known unorthodoxy might be seen to taint Dury's endeavours, the letter makes it plain that Van Assche was at least equally worried about the converse: that making his association with Dury public would bring him into greater disrepute. Bringing the work out anonymously would solve nothing, he protested, for Dury's style was so distinctive it would immediately be recognised. If his ideas were to be made public, it should be in a separate edition: 'Will man aber auch Iustini sachen gemain machen so thue mans absonderlich damit andere gute furnehmen dardurch nicht gehindert vnd diffamirt werden' (no. 30).

It is highly probable, though there is no firm evidence, that Moriaen's friendship with another of Hartlib's closest associates, Theodore Haak, also dates from this period.<sup>55</sup> Haak was a translator from the Palatinate, who later settled in England and became a diplomat in the service of Cromwell and a Fellow of the Royal Society. He played a leading role in the organisation of charitable collections for the Palatine

---

55 See Pamela R. Barnett, *Theodore Haak, FRS (1605-1690): The First German Translator of Paradise Lost* (The Hague, 1962). The book is a fund of information on the Hartlib circle and gives a vivid impression of their milieu.

refugees, in the promotion of the work of Comenius, and in furthering experimental philosophy through the scientific club known as the '1645 group', including John Wilkins and John Wallis, and of which Haak was certainly a member and may have been the instigator.<sup>56</sup> After studying at Cambridge, Haak spent a year or two in Cologne from the summer of 1626, where he 'joined a group of fellow Protestants and took a regular part in the secret religious meetings which they were holding in a private house.'<sup>57</sup> That is to say, he practised his religion: there was no other sort of Protestant meeting in Cologne. Though there is no mention of Haak in the *Protokolle*, it would be surprising if he and Moriaen did not come into contact in such an environment. Indeed, Haak was in all likelihood part of the audience for Moriaen's sermons.

As time went on, the veneer of ordinariness affected by the Church records became perceptibly thinner. At the beginning of Moriaen's period of service, the days of fasting and atonement were regularly instituted with the formulaic remark that penitence was particularly necessary 'in diesen geschwinden gefährlichen Zeiten'. By the end of 1625, this had turned to 'wegen großer gegenwärtiger Not und schrecklichen Zorn Gottes'.<sup>58</sup> The

---

56 See Webster, *Great Instauration*, 54, for details.

57 Barnett, *Haak*, 13.

58 *Protokolle I*, 312, no. 1006.



steady trickle of ministers and others in the church's employ requesting demission because they were becoming too well known swells with the passing of time, as does the number recognised by the authorities and imprisoned or banished from the city. The elder Jacob Phinor, when he died in 1624, was not replaced, 'weil es uns allbereit an Personen mangelt, und je länger, je mehr ermangeln wird'.<sup>59</sup> A recurrent cause of concern was the question of how to reconcile a clean conscience with interrogation under oath if the worst came to the worst. This was discussed on 4 May 1623, but as the records put it no one could come up with a better idea than that already in practice, that anyone put in such a position should consider him or herself automatically released from the Church and hence able to say honestly that he or she had nothing to do with it.<sup>60</sup> This perhaps proved inadequate to cope with the formula 'are you now or have you ever been', for the same question was raised again, in the 'jetzt überaus schwehrlicher und gefährlicher Zeit', on 26 August 1626, and brothers 'Henricus und Morian' were appointed to search the church records diligently for a previous ruling on the matter that might supply a better solution.<sup>61</sup> (The result of their deliberations is not recorded.) The resolute tone of the earlier entries, and their frequent sardonic humour, gradually give way to a

59 *Protokolle I*, 297, no. 960.

60 *Protokolle I*, 280, no. 913.

61 *Protokolle I*, 328-9, no. 1042.



gathering sense of impotent frustration, exemplified by the decision on 1 April 1627:

In Betrachtung der großen Gefahr und Not, die an diesem Ort je länger je mehr zunimmt, wollen sich die sämtlichen Brüder mit Anrufung göttlicher Hilf auf die allerheilsamsten und sichersten Mittel eifrig bedenken, wie wir möchten unsern Gottesdienst besten Fleißes verrichten, und gleichwohl Gefahr wohl vermieden bleibe.<sup>62</sup>

By this juncture, Moriaen, who had already stuck to his post a good deal longer than the majority of ministers found possible, had applied to join the swelling exodus. 'Bruder Joh' was released from his duties 'aus erheblicher und hochdringender Not' on 29 February 1627 - but with the proviso 'daß gleichwohl er uns seine Gutwilligkeit, solange es Gelegenheit gibt, wolle wiederfahren lassen'.<sup>63</sup> Quite what was meant by this is not altogether clear, but it was evidently more than a rhetorical turn of phrase and involved some sort of practical commitment, since on 1 April he pressed again 'um seinen ordentlichen Abschied', the other brothers agreeing to refer the matter to their superiors. It was not until 26 May that he was finally, and reluctantly, released:

Über die Gelegenheit Bruder J haben die sämtlichen Brüder aus Betrachtung hochdringender Not einmütiglich dahin geschlossen, daß, ob wir wohl sehr ungern

---

62 *Protokolle I*, 336, no. 1057.

63 *Protokolle I*, 334, no. 1055.

seines Dienstes entbehren wollten, dennoch ihm auf sein Begehren zu willfahren.<sup>64</sup>

Soon after renouncing his ministry at Cologne, Moriaen became involved in administering charitable collections for the Reformed ministers and teachers, and their families, driven out of the Upper Palatinate by the Bavarian invasion. He later informed Hartlib, when recommending Lodewijk de Geer as a patron for Comenius, that

seine [de Geer's] gutthat den Exsulibus vnd die sonst in frembden landen verlaßen sietzen, vermainet ist. Ich weiß auß gutem grund das dieser Man allein, vber 20000 Rtr vor vnd nach den Pfälzen vbermachtet hatt, immaßen Ich vber 5 Iahr beÿ der rechnung selbsten geseßen vnd das collecten werckh der ober Pfälzer stifften vnd administrirn helffen (no. 64).

Turnbull mistakenly places this phase of Moriaen's life some eight years later: 'from 1636 onwards until certainly 1641 he had been engaged in the Upper Palatinate on the work of collecting funds for Protestant exiles - work which he helped to start and administer'.<sup>65</sup>

---

64 *Protokolle I*, 337, no. 1060.

65 'Peter Stahl, the First Public Teacher of Chemistry at Oxford', *Annals of Science* 9 (1953), 265-70, 265, n.5. The above-quoted passage is clearly the (unstated) source for this - 'helped to start and administer' is a direct translation of 'stifften vnd administrirn helffen' - but Turnbull has confused German and English usage of the perfect tense, assuming that Moriaen meant he was still involved at the time of writing (1641): the sense, however, is not 'I have been working for over five years ...' but 'I worked for over five years ...'. Cf. the still more literal version in *HDC*, 355: 'he has [in 1641] been at the reckoning for more than 5 years and has helped to start and administer the work of collecting in the Upper Palatinate'.

Blekastad follows Turnbull's error of dating and adds a distortion of her own by stating that De Geer

*hatte [Hartlib] durch Morian sagen lassen, dass er in den letzten fünf Jahren 20.000 R. Th. an Flüchtlinge verschenkt habe und dass 1000 Libr. jährlich für ihn nichts bedeuteten (emphasis added).*<sup>66</sup>

This is unfair both to Moriaen and to De Geer: there is no reason to suppose the former was writing at the latter's behest. Moreover, such work was carried out not in the Upper Palatinate itself, but in Moriaen's nearby birthplace Nürnberg, the foremost resort of the refugees and the administrative centre for the distribution of funds raised by the international relief effort.<sup>67</sup>

This charitable collection for exiled Protestant preachers and teachers, who in many cases were literally facing starvation, was first organised in 1626 as a private enterprise by Johannes Cüner, a former Reformed preacher of Amberg who had himself taken refuge in Nürnberg. Amberg was a town of the Upper Palatinate which had been among those to which Reformed Nürnbergers such as Hans Morianus resorted for baptisms and communion. From the start, however, it was an international operation, applying for and receiving subsidies from sister churches in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, and England. Various members of the

<sup>66</sup> *Comenius*, 328. The remark that £1,000 a year meant nothing to de Geer occurs in no. 67.

<sup>67</sup> Grell, *Dutch Calvinists*, 186-7; Barnett, *Haak*, 21.



Nürnberg Dutch community soon became involved in the project. Among the merchants who acted as clearing agents in this business, by accepting in their own names the foreign currency donations received and passing on the equivalent amount in Nürnberg guilders to the overseers of the collection, was Moriaen's brother-in-law Abraham de Bra, alongside Jermias Calandrin and Johann Kendrich, two other names that occur, albeit only in passing, in Moriaen's later correspondence.<sup>68</sup>

On 30 March 1627, the deposed Elector Palatine, Friedrich V, issued a 'royal' decree from his exile in The Hague, 'officially' sanctioning the programme. De Bra, Calandrin and Kendrich all appear shortly after this, no longer as middle-men, but as organisers and overseers of the collection, and were joined in this capacity, according to Neidiger, by the Dutch Nürnberger 'Johann Moriau'. This is an evident (and easily-made) mistranscription of 'Morian'.<sup>69</sup>

As far as the City Council was concerned, of course, the enterprise had no official character at all, and the official approbation of Friedrich, if they knew about it at all, could only serve to make the whole business

---

68 Nos. 56 and 76: it is not certain the individuals concerned are the same, but they are almost certainly members of the same family. See Hans Neidiger, 'Die Entstehung der evangelisch-reformierten Gemeinde in Nürnberg', 269.

69 Ibid., 270.

highly suspect. In 1628, the Council organised an investigation of it. This declared the collection not only illegal but apt to awaken suspicion that Nürnberg was secretly promoting Calvinism, a charge likely to lead to dire reprisals from the Emperor, or to provide Maximilian of Bavaria with an excuse for occupying the city. Charity toward exiles was all well and good (and was, indeed, being organised by the Council itself on a smaller scale), but only under the Council's own aegis. The Council duly admonished the organisers and threatened them with banishment. As had earlier been the case with baptisms and weddings outside Nürnberg or secret Calvinist services within it, however, this seems to have been more a matter of form than a genuine attempt to put a stop to the collection. The 'Dutch' administrators, presumably including Moriaen, discreetly handed their responsibilities over, in name at least, to four ministers and officials from the Palatinate, but by 1631 had as quietly taken them up again. The Council's main concern, it would seem, was to be able to demonstrate if necessary that it was not secretly in league with Friedrich V or actively condoning heresy. It was more important to have these statutes noted in the records than actually to implement them. All it really wanted from the Calvinists was discretion. The one person involved who actually was officially banished from the city, Dr Johann Jakob Heber, himself a Palatine exile and



principal overseer of the distribution of funds, did not in fact leave.<sup>70</sup> The collection continued to function until after the end of the war, finally being wound up in 1650. In 1637, indeed, it was given *de facto* recognition when the Council referred an application from a Palatine serving maid for treatment in a Nürnberg charity hospital to 'den pfälzischen Exulanten, als dieser Patientin Landsleuten' and 'der Collecta und dero Verwaltern'.<sup>71</sup> After what Moriaen had been accustomed to in Cologne, this hardly counted as persecution.

Of all the contributions that reached Nürnberg from the various foreign churches they had appealed to, the most substantial was that from the two Royal Collections in England administered by the Dutch Reformed church at Austin Friars. Hartlib and (especially) Haak were involved in organising these.<sup>72</sup> Despite the obstruction of William Laud, Bishop of London, who was not best pleased to see his sovereign sanctioning what he saw as support for the cause of international Calvinism, the two collections raised close to £10,000 for the relief effort (there was a third Royal Collection in 1635 but Laud, by

---

70 Ibid., 271-3. My account of the Nürnberg collection is again heavily indebted to of Neidiger's excellent article, esp. pp.269-275.

71 Ibid., 273.

72 Cf. Ole Peter Grell, *Dutch Calvinists in Early Stuart London*, ch. 5 ('The Collections for the Palatinate'), 176-223, Barnett, *Haak*, 21-3, and Hessels III, nos. 2141 and 2244. Haak acted as representative in England for the Lower Palatine refugees.



then Archbishop of Canterbury, kept a much tighter rein on this).<sup>73</sup> It is impossible to say, however, whether Moriaen was already in personal contact with Hartlib by this juncture.

\* \* \* \* \*

### *1:3 Mystics and Utopists*

The cultural and confessional atmosphere of Nürnberg had changed somewhat since Moriaen's childhood. It was still a Free Imperial City and still officially Lutheran, but was becoming known, as were Hamburg, Frankfurt, Lübeck, Rostock and Bremen, as a centre for religious independents. This was perhaps the result of the willingness these free Lutheran cities had earlier shown to admit refugees of various Evangelical hues.

Luther's most revolutionary achievement had been, perhaps, the bringing of the Bible to the people, that they might no longer be duped by the casuistical interpretations set on it by Rome. A perennial source of embarrassment to learned Lutherans in positions of authority, both ecclesiastical and secular, was that instead of uniting joyously in the pure and simple faith that had thus been revealed to them, considerable numbers of the people proceeded to put their own novel interpretations on the sacred texts, and to argue that

---

73 Grell, *Dutch Calvinists*, 206-7 and 223.

the Lutheran theologians who sought to suppress their views were indulging in quite as much casuistry and restraint of conscience as the Romanists they had taken over from.<sup>74</sup> In fact, the Lutheran cities were on the whole a great deal milder in their treatment of non-conformists than either Catholic or Calvinist territories, which is the main reason they attracted so many of them.

These Evangelical independents, representing a very broad spectrum of views, and united more by their shared rejection of both Lutheran and Calvinist confessionalisation than by any doctrinal unanimity, are generally lumped together by modern historians under the *faute de mieux* labels 'spiritualist', 'separatist' or (in German) 'Schwärmer'. This last, much like the English 'enthusiast', was a catch-all derogatory term applied promiscuously at the time to the uncategorisably unorthodox. Other contemporary expressions applied in similarly arbitrary fashion were 'Schwenckfeldianer', 'Böhmenist' and 'Weigelianer', after the mystic writers Caspar Schwenckfeld, Jacob Böhme and Valentin Weigel.

---

74 Starck's *Lübeckische Kirchen-Geschichte*, for instance, provides throughout the period of the Thirty Years War a catalogue of non-conformists laying such charges, and meeting with a palpably embarrassed response to them. A classic example is the *Abgetrungen Kurtze [...] Verantwortung NICOLAI TETINGS* (s.l., 1635). For a more sympathetic account of the *Schwärmer*, see Gottfried Arnold, *Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzler-Historia* (Schaffhausen, 1741) II, *passim*.



Though all these writers had their genuine adherents among the independents, these terms were on the whole used loosely and arbitrarily, often without any clear idea of the doctrines they ostensibly designated.

There are, for obvious reasons, considerable difficulties in establishing the nature and membership of such independent circles, if indeed they can be deemed to have had a sufficiently formalised existence for words such as 'circle' and 'membership' to be applicable to them at all. It is clear, however, that in the Nürnberg of the late 1620s and early 1630s, there were considerable numbers among the populace prepared openly to refuse attendance at Lutheran services. These non-conformists came almost exclusively from the milieu of the traders and artisans.<sup>75</sup> They were, in short, the children and grandchildren of the Reformed immigrants among whom Moriaen's parents had featured towards the end of the previous century, grown a little more confident than their forebears had been of their right to assert an independent religious identity, but also less committed than those forebears to the orthodoxies of Calvinism.

---

75 See Richard van Dülmen, 'Schwärmer und Separatisten in Nürnberg (1618-1648)', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 55 (1973), 107-137, 115. Van Dülmen is overly inclined to take passing mentions in letters as evidence of close and formalised contacts, and consequently gives an impression of more organised and active resistance to orthodoxy than his evidence warrants. The essay is nonetheless a valuable account of unofficial religion in Nürnberg at the period and the (not very effective) measures taken to suppress it.



The use of the term 'Schwärmer' for dangerously independent religious thinkers seems to have originated with Luther himself, reflecting his own alarm at some of the forces he had helped unleash. The danger they posed to the establishment was in most cases more perceived than real. A few, such as J.L. Münster and Ludwig Gifftheil, preached armed insurrection in the name of the Messiah, but they found few followers. The majority were more concerned with an internalised, pietistic spiritualism, and were quite content to leave the established church to its own devices so long as it extended the same courtesy to them. By definition individualistic, most rejected the very notion of sects and schools. In the case of Nürnberg, there can be no knowing what passed in the private gatherings which undoubtedly took place, but of which no detailed record has survived. However, there is no evidence to suggest that these were more than occasions to discuss and celebrate a doctrinally independent faith, or that the participants either did or desired to challenge the officially established religion of the city.

This was the milieu to which Moriaen returned in (probably) 1627. While such associations provide no conclusive proof of Moriaen's own opinions and still less of his activities, a consistent picture emerges of a man much involved with the doings and writings of these so-

called 'enthusiasts' or 'Schwärmer', whose beliefs varied widely on points of detail, but who were generally agreed on the importance of a personal understanding of and relationship with God and the expression and propagation of that faith through practical works of charity and the dissemination of inspirational literature.

It is from Nürnberg that his first surviving letter is addressed: it is to Dury, and dated 22 January 1633.<sup>76</sup> It is a short note in Latin, mainly concerned with an exchange of literature: Moriaen had been enquiring on Dury's behalf after a number of works by the 'spiritualists' Sebastian Franck, Christian Endfelder and Daniel Friedrich, and specified Caspar Warnle as a contact through whom he had tried to obtain them. This Warnle (Werlin, Wörnlein) came from one of the more prominently unconfessionalised Nürnberg families. In January 1648, a church commission considered what to do 'mit den weigelianischen Personen als Niclaus Pfaffen, Hanns von der Houven und Caspar wörnleins wittib', and recommended banishment, though it is not clear to what extent this advice was acted on.<sup>77</sup>

Later the same year, Moriaen wrote again to Dury that his sister's daughter had married Peter Neefen,

---

76 HP 9/15/1A-B.

77 Van Dülmen, 'Schwärmer und Separatisten in Nürnberg', 132-4, esp. n.96 which quotes extensively from the commission's findings.

adding that Neefen was no stranger to Dury.<sup>78</sup> Neefen, together with Warnle and a few others, belonged to the inner circle of friends of Nikolaus Pfaff, who has been described as the spiritual leader of the Nürnberg non-conformists.<sup>79</sup> Neefen was also particularly close to the mystic Johann Ludwig Münster, who even hoped that in the event of his wife's death, Neefen would undertake the care and upbringing of his children.<sup>80</sup>

Moriaen's interest in rare and unorthodox mystic literature surfaces again in a letter to Van Assche of 1634, in which he expressed hopes of obtaining a copy of Paul Felgenhauer's *Monarchen-Spiegel* (1633-5).<sup>81</sup> In this work, Felgenhauer accused the rulers of the world of neglecting the higher authorities of Christ and God, and of staining their hands with the blood of innocents. He contrasted the 'Reich des Teufels, des Tieres und der Tyrannen in dieser Welt' with the reign of Christ in the world to come (the Millennium) and finally with the reign of God in a new incarnation of this world at the end of

---

78 Moriaen to Dury, 19 Sept. 1633, HP 9/15/3A: 'Nuptias neptis meæ ex sorore, cum Petro Neefio tibi non ignoto celebravi'.

79 Van Dülmen, 'Schwärmer und Separatisten in Nürnberg', 115.

80 Van Dülmen, 'Schwärmer und Separatisten in Nürnberg', 116, n.50, and 119. On the pietistically inclined J.F. Münster, see Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 112. He is not to be confused with his much more radical and aggressively chiliastic, almost Fifth Monarchist brother Johann Ludwig (see Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, *passim*).

81 A fuller account of Felgenhauer and Moriaen's attitude to his writings is given in Chapter Two.



time.<sup>82</sup> Since the attack on temporal authorities included explicit denunciation of the Emperor Ferdinand, the work later brought down the accusation of lèse-majesté against Felgenhauer.<sup>83</sup> Whether Moriaen was trying to acquire it from or for Van Assche is not clear, but it is evident both men were avid readers and collectors of such books.<sup>84</sup>

However loosely the name of Jacob Böhme may have been invoked by the denouncers of non-conformity, there is no doubt that this mystic visionary genuinely was a source of inspiration for many of the period's freer thinkers, as for some of the radical religious movements that sprang up during the political upheavals in England in the 1640s.<sup>85</sup> Böhme (1575-1624), a cobbler by trade and largely self-educated, preached an intensely personal

82 See Ernst Georg Wolters, 'Paul Felgenhauers Leben und Wirken', *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für Niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 54 (1956), 63-84, and 55 (1957), 54-94, esp. part 2, 72-3.

83 Ibid., part 2, p.69, and see nos. 166 and 174.

84 UBA N65a (10 March 1634), a letter principally devoted to alchemy, but which concludes 'als ul den monarchen Speigel oock per dominum Serrarium (quem ex me ut salutes rogo) niet tewege brengen can so moet ick dien in de toecomende missie bestellen' ('if you cannot obtain the *Monarchenspiegel* through Mr Serrarius (to whom please send my regards), I can order it at the next [Frankfurt] Fair'). Van der Wall (100) takes this to mean that Moriaen was trying to obtain the work through Van Assche, but the implication could equally be that Moriaen would try to get it for Van Assche if Serrarius could not.

85 See Margaret Lewis Bailey, *Milton and Jakob Boehme: A Study of German Mysticism in Seventeenth-Century England* (New York, 1964), and Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London, 1972). See also Chapter Five, section 3, for further discussion of Böhme's views.

understanding of God and an almost boundless tolerance to the rest of humanity. His writing is distinguished by an incantatory, Biblically inspired and resolutely anti-intellectual lyricism, and by a passionate and transparently sincere desire to communicate a vision individualistic to the point of incommunicability. (The only writer in English remotely like him is William Blake.) The themes that recur above all in his work are dissolution of the individual in spiritual communion with the divine, and an empathy not only with all other human beings but the whole of Creation, all of which he maintained was animated by the same divine spirit. It is in connection with Böhme's works, and with the underground literary contacts of Caspar Warnle, that in 1634 Moriaen makes his first appearance in Hartlib's day-book, the *Ephemerides*:

Omnes libri Iacob. Bohmen apud Ioach. Morsium dr. quid illos habet et est Hamburgi. [All Jacob Böhme's books at Dr Joachim Morsius's, who has them and is of Hamburg.] [...]  
 Caspar Warnle ein hutstuffwerder zu Nuremberg bei der barfusser brucken recommended by M. Morian for one that could give a Catalogue of all rare books [...]  
 Libri Iacob Bohmen haberi possunt a Ioach. Meursio Hamburgensi Patritio per Dn. Morian [Jacob Böhme's books may be had from Joachim Morsius, patrician of Hamburg, through Mr Moriaen].<sup>86</sup>

Of all the many admirers and disseminators of Böhme active in Germany at the period, this Joachim Morsius was

---

86 *Ephemerides 1634* (Eph 34), HP 29/2/12A-B.



among the most enthusiastic (in every sense of the word). How close Moriaen's relationship with him was at this date it is impossible to say. There is no mention of him in any surviving writings by Moriaen. However, there is one surviving mention of Moriaen by Morsius, and since it occurs in a document of some significance and celebrity, a fairly full account of Morsius is necessary to place it in context.<sup>87</sup>

Morsius (1593-1643) was, as Hartlib noted, a patrician of Hamburg, though Hartlib was wrong about his being a doctor. He was a scholar of some renown, who devoted a great deal of time and energy to attempting to locate and join the Rosicrucians, whose two manifestos, the *Fama Fraternitatis Deß Löblichen Ordens des Rosenkreutzes* and *Confessio Fraternitatis* had appeared in 1614 and 1615 respectively.<sup>88</sup> In 1616, when he was

87 The principle source on Morsius is Heinrich Schneider, *Joachim Morsius und sein Kreis: zur Geistesgeschichte des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Lübeck, 1929), which repeats or supersedes everything about him in Rudolf Kayser, 'Joachim Morsius', *MCG VI* (1897), 307-19, and Peuckert, *Die Rosenkreuzer. Zur Geschichte einer Reformation* (Jena, 1628).

88 Textually, much the best modern edition is provided by Richard van Dülmen in *Quellen und Forschungen zur Württembergischen Kirchengeschichte* Bd. 6 (Stuttgart, 1973), which unlike all its predecessors makes no attempt to modernise or 'correct' the original text. The introduction and notes, however, are perfunctory and often inaccurate. The colossal impact of the Rosicrucian manifestos, and the complex question of their origins and authorship, have been discussed and debated respectively at daunting length ever since the works were first published, and there is still no scholarly consensus in sight. Many later myths have their origin in Gottfried Arnold's wonderfully vivid but not overly reliable



briefly University librarian at Rostock, an open letter was published urging the entire theological faculty to join the Fraternity. Morsius's authorship is not proven, but he is certainly a candidate.<sup>89</sup> Another open letter, addressed to the Rosicrucians themselves and applying for admission, from one 'Anastasius Philaretus Cosmopolita'

---

*Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzler-Historien* (Schaffhausen, 1740-42) vol. II, book 7, ch. 18, and vol. III, book 4, ch. 25. Will-Erich Peuckert's *Die Rosenkreuzer. Zur Geschichte einer Reformation* (Jena, 1628) is a book rich in useful references and imaginative speculation but very short on reliability: Peuckert has a particularly annoying habit of not distinguishing quotation from narrative, so that what appears to be (modernised) citation of a source sometimes turns out to be his own invention or commentary, and vice versa. Frances Yates, in *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London, 1975), also tends to let her imagination run away with her, and her thesis that the Rosicrucians were formed as part of the support mechanism for Friedrich V of the Palatinate has subsequently been disproved, but the book contains much of interest, and depicts with singular vividness the extraordinary contemporary reaction to the *Fama* and *Confessio*. Probably the soberest account is J.W. Montgomery's chapter on 'Andreas and the Occult Tradition' in *Cross and Crucible: Johann Valentin Andreas (1586-1654), Phoenix of the Theologians* (The Hague, 1973) I, 158-255. See also Paul Arnold, *Histoire des Rose-Croix et les origines de la franc'maçonnerie* (Paris, 1955); *Die Erbe des Christian Rosenkreuz: Vorträge gehalten anlässlich des Amsterdamer Symposiums 18-20 November 1986* (no editor named) (Amsterdam, 1986), especially Adam McLean, 'The Impact of the Rosicrucian Manifestos in Britain' (170-179); and Susanna Åkerman, *Queen Christina of Sweden and her Circle: The Transformation of a seventeenth-century philosophical libertine* (Leiden, 1991), especially Chapter Seven, 'Neo-Stoic Pan-Protestants and the Monarchy'. I have not been able to consult Roland Edighoffer, *Rose Croix et société idéale selon Jean Valentin Andreas* (Paris, 1995), or Susanna Åkerman's forthcoming *Rose Cross over the Baltic*, except for a draft version of Chapter One, for access to which I am much indebted to Dr Åkerman.

89 G.F. Guhrauer, *Joachim Jungius und sein Zeitalter* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1850), 67; Schneider, *Morsius*, 30-31.

of 'Philadelphia' and including quite a detailed description of the author, is almost certainly by Morsius.<sup>90</sup>

Though he never did receive a reply from the Rosicrucians, Morsius's belief in them and taste for literature that blended mysticism and utopism never abated. In later years, he found himself in repeated trouble with the authorities of Lübeck and Hamburg for his persistent dissemination of 'enthusiastic' literature such as Böhme's *Weg zu Christo*, Felgenhauer's *Geheimnis vom Tempel des Herrn* and (in particular) Christoph Andreas Raselius's *Trew-Hertzige Buß Posaune* (s.l., 1632).

This last, which purports to be the elucidation of a prophecy dating from 1332 and recently discovered in an ancient Bible, is mainly given over to denouncing the war, for which Raselius blamed the German rulers of all sides, from the Emperor Ferdinand to the Elector Friedrich. He claimed that those in power had squandered their territories' wealth in peace time with 'spielen/ sauffen/ singen/ Turniren/ Mascaraden vnd Comedien, Musicanten, vilem hoffgesind vnd Frawenzimmer/ pferden/ hunden vnd andern pracht',<sup>91</sup> and then, having embroiled themselves in a totally unnecessary war through their own

90 Schneider, *Morsius*, 31-2, including a summary of the letter.

91 Raselius, *Trew-Hertzige Buß Posaune*, 32.

incompetence, made their already impoverished subjects pay and suffer for it. The Protestant rulers of Germany had, Raselius complained,

nur auß eigener Rachgier vnd vorgefaßtem haß  
 gegen die Papisten [...] wie man meinet/ für  
 Gottes wort vnd die Teutsche freyheit zu  
 streiten vnd fechten sich leichtfertig in  
 gefahr gestzet/ leib vnd leben/ gut vnd blut/  
 Land vnd leut an die spitzen des degens  
 gewaget: vnd vnter dessen manch arm vnschuldig  
 land vnd leut/ darunter auch viel  
 glaubensgenossen/ muthwillig mit rauben/  
 morden/ brennen/ frawen vnd Iungfrawen schenden  
 vnd andern vnthaten verhöret vnd verzehret/ vnd  
 viel 1000 menschen elendlich auf die  
 fleischbanck geliefert.<sup>92</sup>

The 'kindischer Kaiser' is lambasted for being a plaything of the Jesuits, and the half-witted Protestant leaders are lambasted for electing him. It is little wonder the tract was deemed subversive. Besides distributing copies of such literature, Morsius further offended through his association with various suspect figures including Moriaen's friends Dury and Johann Tanckmar.<sup>93</sup>

As well as attracting unfavourable attention from the ecclesiastical authorities, Morsius also found himself in regular trouble with the secular, at the instigation of his own family. This was due to his refusal to adhere to the terms of the pension inherited from his brother Hans at the latter's death in 1629,

---

92 Ibid., 23.

93 See above, and no. 15, n.2.



which were that he should live an 'orderly' life, adopt a 'godfearing' profession,<sup>94</sup> and take back the wife he had left at some time before 1617, claiming she had insulted him. The lady in question, of whom no more is known than that her maiden name was Telsen, would perhaps have placed a slightly different emphasis on the quaint assertion of Morsius's biographer Schneider that

Die Vermutung liegt nahe, daß die Frau sich nicht in sein unruhiges, phantastisches Wesen zu finden wußte, das immer nach Neuem sehnsüchtig ausschauend nie zu einer festen männlichen Klarheit gelangte.<sup>95</sup>

Morsius of course completely ignored all these requirements and persisted in demanding his money. After protracted legal wrangling, he was finally committed to the Hamburg lunatic asylum in 1636, where he remained for four years. Whether he really was, in the modern sense of the term, clinically insane, it is now obviously impossible to determine. But it should be said that the Hamburg authorities were in general distinguished, by the standards of the day, by their tolerance and leniency towards the unorthodox, preferring to admonish or at worst banish troublemakers rather than incarcerate them. The 'Protestschrift' Morsius published in his own defence in 1634 is a work of quite exceptional incoherence which

---

94 The rest of the family were jewellers; Morsius was an itinerant scholar who seems never to have held down any position for long.

95 Schneider, *Morsius*, 64.

to say the least provides little support for a claim of *mens sana*.<sup>96</sup>

He was released from the asylum in 1640 after intervention on his behalf by King Christian of Denmark. Three years later, he wrote, apparently out of the blue, to his erstwhile teacher at Rostock University, Joachim Jungius.<sup>97</sup> Jungius, by this time Rector of the Hamburg Gymnasium and a generally respected though sometimes controversial figure in the scientific and educational establishment, had in 1622 founded a short-lived and decidedly secretive scientific research association in Rostock going by the exotic name of 'Societas Ereunetica vel Zetetica'.<sup>98</sup> This group, like just about any private organisation in Germany at this period, had attracted suspicions of Rosicrucianism, and it was even suggested that Jungius was himself the author of the Rosicrucian manifestos.<sup>99</sup> This was enough to make Morsius assume

---

96 Morsius, *COPIA Einer kurtzen eylfertigen/ doch Rechtmässiger Ablehnung vnd Protestation [...] in justissimâ causâ Morsiana ('Philadelphia', 1634).*

97 Morsius to Jungius, 26 Aug. 1643, Stadts- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, 98.19-22; transcript in Schneider, *Morsius*, 57-62, following R. Avé-Lallemant, *Des Dr. Joachim Jungius Briefwechsel*, (Lübeck, 1863). An earlier transcript by Guhrauer (*Jungius*, 232-5) contains a great many errors; Avé-Lallemant's is much superior. Quotations here are from the original manuscript.

98 Guhrauer, *Jungius*, 69-71.

99 See Guhrauer, *Jungius*, 56-67, and Peuckert, *Die Rosenkreuzer*, 88-9 and 228-30 on the suggestion of Jungius's involvement with Rosicrucianism. Not even Peuckert, who can generally be relied on to find evidence of Rosicrucian mysticism almost anywhere, takes the idea very seriously.



Jungius took the liveliest interest in such matters, and the letter is given over almost entirely to discussion of the Rosicrucians and other secret societies, and to the literature relating to them that Morsius had in his possession. He was particularly keen to know whether Jungius's friend Tassius had obtained

tertiam partem Dextræ amoris porrectæ & Imaginis Societatis Evangelicæ, Themidem videlicet auream de legibus illius societatis, vnd leges Antilianas [...] oder andre particularia de istâ societate ac socijs<sup>100</sup>

(the third part of the *Right Hand of [Christian] Love Offered* and of the *Model of an Evangelical [in fact Christian] Society*, that is, the *Golden Themis* of the laws of that society, and the Antilian laws, or other details of this society or its members).

This is typical of Morsius's jumbled thinking.

*Societatis Christianæ Imago* and *Christiani Amoris Dextera Porrecta* were published in 1620 by Johann Valentin Andreæ, a Lutheran preacher and acknowledged influence on Comenius, author of the Utopian novel *Christianopolis* (1619) and a fervent promoter of model Christian societies.<sup>101</sup> These two companion pieces constitute a

100 SUBH 98.19v.

101 The best and fullest account of Andreæ, which contains an extensive bibliography, is J.W. Montgomery's *Cross and Crucible: Johann Valentin Andreæ (1586-1654), Phoenix of the Theologians* (The Hague, 1973); see also Andreæ's *Selbstbiographie*, translated from the Latin manuscript *Vita ab ipso conscripta* by David Christoph Seybold (Winterthur, 1799). On his relations with Comenius, see Comenius, *Opera Didactica Omnia* (Amsterdam, 1657; facsimile reproduction Prague, 1957) I, 283-4, and Ludwig Keller's fanciful extrapolations from this, 'Johann Valentin Andreæ und Comenius', *MCG I* (1893), 229-241.



description of (or a proposal for) a loose association of pious spirits dedicating themselves to Christian learning, mutual moral and practical support and charitable works.<sup>102</sup> These works were subsequently to take on a life of their own when Hartlib, unbeknownst to Andreae, had them translated into English by John Hall, and used them to promote his own very different visions of Christian assemblies or 'correspondencies'.<sup>103</sup> The *Themis Aurea* which Morsius took for their 'third part' is a totally unrelated work by the mystic Michael Maier, a nobleman of the Palatinate who was certainly involved in some sort of Rosicrucian society in 1611, though whether this was the same group that produced the famous manifestos is another matter.<sup>104</sup> The 'leges Antilianas',<sup>105</sup> are the statutes of yet another society,

102 Turnbull discovered copies of the two tracts in question, which were long supposed lost, among the Hartlib papers (HP 25/2/1A-B and 6A-20B, and 55/19/1A-15A), and published them with a valuable introduction in *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie (ZfdPh)* 73 (1954), 407-432. He followed this with a reprint of Hall's English translation in *ZfdPh* 74 (1955), 151-185. A printed version of the original was later discovered in the HAB, Wolfenbüttel, by Roland Edighoffer: see his 'Deux écrits de Johann Valentin Andreae retrouvés ou le nouveau Neveu de Rameau', *Etudes Germaniques* (Oct.-Dec. 1975), 466-470.

103 Turnbull, 'John Hall's letters to Samuel Hartlib', *Review of English Studies New Series* IV (1953), 221-233. They were published as *A Modell of a Christian Society and The Right Hand of Christian Love Offered*, with a dedication to Hartlib, in 1647.

104 See McLean, 'The Impact of the Rosicrucian Manifestos in Britain'.

105 Not, as Guhrauer reads, 'Andilianos', a mistake taken over, with a surprised '(sic!)', by Turnbull ('Johann Valentin Andreae's *Societas Christiana*', *ZfdPh* 73, 410).

'Antilia', which was operative in Nürnberg in the 1620s. Hartlib was associated with this, and Andreae was aware of it, though he distinguished clearly and carefully between it and his own projected 'Societas Christiana'. The 'leges Antilianas' have never been identified.<sup>106</sup>

For Morsius, however, all these disparate productions related to the same thing and were in turn traceable back to, or at the very least reminiscent of, the original Rosicrucian summons. He told Jungius,

habeo alia, & de Rhodostauroticis singularia,  
si intellexero ex responsorijs vestris, literas  
meas vobis non ingratas futuras, quæ  
superioribus addenda erunt<sup>107</sup>

(I have other [such works], and some by the Rosicrucians, which, if I understand by your response that future letters from me will not be unwelcome, shall be added to the foregoing).

Morsius then proceeded, for no apparent reason, to inform Jungius that fourteen years before writing, in 1629, he had visited Andreae and obtained twelve copies of the *Imago* and *Dextera*, which he had distributed to assorted leading lights in Germany and Scandinavia. Tenth on the list, amid this illustrious company, is 'Ioannes Morian Patricius Noribergensis, pijssimus chemicus' ('Johann Moriaen, patrician of Nürnberg, most pious chemist').<sup>108</sup>

106 Cf. Turnbull, 'Johann Valentin Andreaes Societas Christiana', 409-10.

107 SUBH 98.21v.

108 SUBH 98.20v. The twelve alleged recipients are enumerated in detail. They are: Herzog August the Younger of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel; Prince Moritz of Hessen, the great patron of alchemists; Duke Frederick of



Here, Morsius's letter provides the source for an error that has passed into a variety of footnotes, the idea that Moriaen was a Nürnberg patrician rather than a first generation immigrant from a family of Dutch artisans or merchants. Though hardly a point of crucial historical importance, it is nicely illustrative of the reliability, or rather the lack of it, of Morsius's evidence. The letter has, naturally enough, attracted a good deal of attention from historians of Rosicrucianism, for its relevance to the distribution of Rosicrucian literature and the continuing debate about Andreae's alleged authorship of the original Rosicrucian manifestos.<sup>109</sup> These subjects are not at issue here, but

---

Schleswig-Holstein; Prince Ludwig of Anhalt, founder of the literary 'Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft'; Holger Rosenkrantz, the King of Denmark's former privy counsellor; Johann Adler Salvius, a Swedish diplomat; Henricus a Qualen, a Danish noble; Laurens Grammendorf, a leading German lawyer and theologian; Wendelin Sybelist, a spagyrist who had been personal doctor to the Russian Czar; Moriaen; Johann Jakob Pömer, a Nürnberg patrician associated with Antilia, and Georg Brasch, a Lutheran pastor who - ironically enough - represented Lüneburg at the conventicle arranged in 1633 by the churches of Hamburg, Lübeck and Lüneburg to discuss ways of dealing with such enthusiasts as Felgenhauer, Raselius, Tanckmar and Morsius (see Caspar Heinrich Starck, *Lübeckische Kirchen-Geschichte*, 797-8 and 977-80).

<sup>109</sup> His authorship is strongly contested by J. Kvačala, *J.V. Andreäs Antheil an Geheimen Gesellschaften* (Jurjew, 1899), which like so much of Kvačala's work stands up as well now as it did a hundred years ago; R. Kienast, *Johann Valentin Andreae und die vier echten Rosenkreutzer-Schriften* (Leipzig, 1926); J.W. Montgomery, *Cross and Crucible: Johann Valentin Andreae, Phoenix of the Theologians* (The Hague, 1963). For important supplementary evidence, see Wolf-Dieter Otte, 'Ein Einwand gegen Johann Valentin Andreäs Verfasserschaft der Confessio Fraternitatis R.C.' *Wolfenbüttler Beiträge* 3



it does seem worth pointing out that Morsius's letter cannot be seen as concrete evidence of anything at all beyond the confusion of the man who wrote it.

A striking feature of Morsius's list of addressees is that, with the exception of the name at its head, Herzog August of Wolfenbüttel, not a single figure on it features in any of the several detailed accounts by Andreae himself of the history of his project for a Christian Society.<sup>110</sup> Andreae conducted a lengthy correspondence with Herzog August, which in the early 1640s deals extensively with his plans for this society, plans he was hoping might at this date be revived under August's patronage. The Duke responded with polite interest rather than active encouragement, observing rather evasively,

Wan die wällen des vom Marti erregten meeres sich etwas zum kalm werden legen; so muß umb so viel eyferiger nach der vorgeschlagenen Christlichen Union befoderung getrachtet werden. Unter dessen und allewege, verleihe

---

(1978), 97-113. For summaries of the evidence presented on either side and full bibliographies of the issue, see Montgomery, *op. cit.*, who comes out against Andreae's authorship, Frances Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London, 1972), who suspends judgment, and Susanna Åckerman, *Rose Cross Over the Baltic* (forthcoming), who favours the attribution.

110 In his autobiography, his letters to Herzog August in the Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel, his funeral oration on his friend Wilhelm von der Wense who first proposed the scheme (in *Amicorum singularium clarissimorum Funera*, Lüneburg, 1642), and a letter to Comenius of 16 Sept. 1629 (Comenius, *Opera Didactica Omnia*, Amsterdam, 1657, I, 284).

Gott seine gnade und beystandt in allem unsern  
vorhaben.<sup>111</sup>

At the end of the following year, Andreae was accepted on August's recommendation into Christian of Anhalt's 'Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft', of which the Duke was also a member. Andreae had earlier remarked that the very notion of the 'Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft' put him in mind of his own earlier vision of a 'Societas Christiana'.<sup>112</sup> There is little to suggest, however, that this principally literary and philological organisation really did provide much consolation, in the ageing Andreae's eyes, for his long-cherished but never realised Model of a Christian Society.

In the course of his correspondence with Andreae, August mentioned that he had seen Andreae's two proposals, the *Imago* and *Dextera*, when they first came out in 1620,<sup>113</sup> and also wrote himself a private note that they had been procured for him by his agent Georg Philip Hainhofer: 'wie sie dz erstemahl herauß gekommen [habe ich sie] vom G. Ph. Hainhofero, ni fallor, auch erhalten'.<sup>114</sup> He also made the same remark to Hainhofer himself a few days later:

111 Herzog August to Andreae, 1 Nov. 1642, HAB 236.1 Extrav. fol. 26r.

112 Andreae to August, 19 March 1645, HAB 65.1 Extrav. fol. 214r.

113 August to Andreae, 26 July 1642, HAB 236.1 Extrav. fol. 30r.

114 Note in August's hand at the foot of a letter from Andreae dated 27 June 1642, HAB 65.1 Extrav. fol. 23v, transcript in *MGP I*, 184.



Wir haben die MSs des H.D. Iohann Valentin  
 Andreæ wol empfangen, Auch die 2. Tractetlein,  
 so anno 20. getruckt, vnnd wir damahl, wie vns  
 nit anders wißendt, dergleichen von euch  
 erhalten.<sup>115</sup>

Though both these quotations stress that the Duke did not entirely trust his memory ('ni fallor', 'wie uns nit anders wißendt'), it hardly seems likely he could have confused Hainhofer and 1620 with Morsius and 1629. This raises the question of why, when the works were the subject of so much of his correspondence and he was specifically trying to recall how he had come by them before, he never once mentioned having received copies from Morsius. In Andreæ's side of the correspondence, which is preserved in its entirety and which returns repeatedly to the history of these manifestos and of the society they set out to publicise, there is not a single reference to Morsius.<sup>116</sup> In late 1629, Morsius was

---

115 August to Hainhofer, 19/29 July 1642, HAB 236.1 Extrav. fol. 12r.

116 A letter from Andreæ to August of 27 June 1642, HAB 65.1 Extrav. fol. 21r-23v, includes a list (admittedly obviously incomplete) of the 'Pauci, ad quos Christianj amoris dextera porrecta pervenit' ('the few whom the *Right Hand of Christian Love* reached': Andreæ's emphasis is very apparent in the original). Though often interpreted as a membership list of the *Societas Christiana*, this is surely only a punning account of which individuals Andreæ was aware had received copies of the work. It is reproduced in *MGP I*, 184, but Kvačala mysteriously transcribes 'Daniel Hizler' as 'Daniel Hikler' and 'Baltas. B. Roggendorffij' as 'Baltas. B. Seckendorffius', errors uncharacteristically taken over by Montgomery (*Cross and Crucible I*, 176). A few members of the society who do not appear on this list are mentioned in the funeral oration on Wense and the autobiography. See Montgomery, loc. cit., for details.



indeed commissioned by August to obtain various manuscripts for him from the bibliophile Karl Widemann in Amsterdam. He proved, as the Duke put it, 'ein wunderlicher [Mercurius]',<sup>117</sup> and finally returned from his mission in May 1630, four months overdue, with the news that 'er hat seine Sachen noch zu Amsterdam: hat vergessen, was es für MSS seyn, die ihm D. Widman zugestellt, umb mir zu überbringen'.<sup>118</sup> This is precisely the date at which, according to Morsius, he had sent August and the others the Andreae tracts, but again there is no mention at all by the Duke of any other materials being acquired for him by Morsius. Morsius also claimed in the letter to Jungius that Moritz of Hessen was so impressed by the works that he translated them into German and proposed to publish them in that language, but that Morsius dissuaded him from doing so without first obtaining Andreae's permission. No other reference to this translation, let alone a copy of it, has ever been found. If there were a single piece of independent evidence to corroborate any of the claims Morsius made in this letter, it might be taken a little more seriously, but until any such evidence surfaces, it must be reckoned possible that the whole business took place only in Morsius's fevered imagination.

---

117 August to Hainhofer, 9 Jan. 1630, HAB 149.6 Extrav. fol. 214r.

118 August to Hainhofer, 22 May 1630, HAP 149.6 Extrav. fol. 214v-15r.

The letter is, however, very suggestive of the impression Moriaen made on Morsius in the 1620s, even if the story of distributing the manuscripts is pure fantasy. Moriaen was already a 'pijssimus chemicus', and he evidently struck Morsius as a man interested in mystic literature and the promotion of non-denominational allegiances. Again, Morsius's impressions are in themselves a long way from constituting objective evidence, but in this instance there is corroboration for them. The same impression is given by Moriaen's own account of his earlier association in Nürnberg with the Reformed preacher Georg Sommer, and their discussions about the reform of learning, science and especially theology. Sommer thought Moriaen's plans for theology would never be realised in practice, much as he approved of them in theory.<sup>119</sup> Unfortunately, Moriaen was typically reticent as to what these plans might have been, but Sommer's reaction suggests they struck him as too radical ever to find favour with any established church.

Moreover, it is apparent from Moriaen's letters that he was indeed involved with an 'unpartheyliche gesellschaft' in Nürnberg.<sup>120</sup> It may have been this that Sommer had in mind when he fondly recalled the 'lieben discursen so der herr [Moriaen] mit mir zue Nurmberg

119 No. 17.

120 No. 1.

gepflogen'.<sup>121</sup> Moriaen's sole surviving reference to this society is very vague and fleeting, but does locate the group in Nürnberg and reveal that 'ein Sohn Jacob Andrea[s]' was a member.<sup>122</sup> Jakob Andrea was Johann Valentin's grandfather, one of the most famous Lutheran preachers of the sixteenth century, so the son in question was probably one of Johann Valentin's numerous uncles.<sup>123</sup>

This association must have been either in Moriaen's teens, before he went to Heidelberg, or, much more probably, after his return to Nürnberg in about 1627. In the latter case, this may well have been the Nürnberg group 'Antilia' with which Hartlib, at this time preparing to leave Elblag for a new life in England, was also associated, if only by correspondence.<sup>124</sup> Whether or not Antilia was the society he joined, Moriaen was certainly aware of it, as appears from his oddly isolated reference over a decade later to an 'Antilianorum socium' ('member of the Antilians') whose exposé of false alchemists Hartlib had sent him.<sup>125</sup> Moriaen's name, however, is mentioned nowhere else in connection with Antilia or any other such society.

121 Sommer to Moriaen, as quoted by the latter in no. 17.

122 No. 1.

123 One of Jacob Andrea's sons was called Jacob after him, but Moriaen was almost certainly referring to the much more famous preacher.

124 Turnbull, 'John Hall's letters to Hartlib'.

125 No. 10.



The history of Antilia, of Rosicrucianism, and of what German scholars call the *Sozietätsbewegung* in general, is a fascinating and enormously complicated subject which it would explode the limits of this study to deal with in full. It is evident Moriaen was at least peripherally associated with the *Sozietätsbewegung*, but the evidence is so sparse, so vague, and in the case of Morsius's letter so utterly unreliable, that no exact account of the nature of his involvement can be given. What is abundantly clear, however, is his urgent desire for a new Reformation, a Reformation that would encompass church, school and state, and that at this stage in his life he saw mystic literature and the organisation of Christian societies as the means to further it. Later he would look to Comenius's scheme of Pansophy and later still to experimental science, in particular to alchemy, to accomplish this goal, but his guiding vision was always the same: the coming dawn of a new era of enlightenment, unity and Christian brotherhood.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **1:4 *Wanderjahre***

Moriaen left Nürnberg in March or April 1633, and by late April was in Frankfurt. Here he put his name to two

irenic documents that were circulating at the time.<sup>126</sup> Both originate from Hanau and are addressed to the divines of Great Britain by various churchmen with whom Dury had been engaged in negotiations for some two years, principally Johann Daniel Wildius, the Hanau Inspector, and Haak's uncle Paul Tossanus (Toussaint). One is a distinctly unspecific proposal for reconciliation, barely touching on the points of contention and suggesting somewhat vaguely that communication between the British and German churches would be a good thing.<sup>127</sup> The other proposes the compilation of a complete body of practical divinity acceptable to all parties.<sup>128</sup> In both cases, Moriaen's name is a later addition to an original document, indicating only that he approved of the proposals: there is no suggestion that he had anything to do with composing the letters.

He then set off on a tour of the Netherlands. His own account of this, in a further Latin letter to Dury of 19 November 1633, is exceptionally cryptic, reading in

---

126 Copies at HP 59/10/53A-60B, 24 Feb. 1633, and 59/10/113A-116B, n.d. Both were signed by Moriaen on 23 April. See *HDC*, 146, n.1, and 153.

127 Turnbull states that it 'deals with the main differences between the Lutherans and the Reformed, and hints at a conference between representatives of both sides' (*HDC*, 153), but this is to credit the proposal with more content than it has. Like so many irenic tracts of the day, it is more a statement of worthy intent than a serious plan of action.

128 Published with an English translation in Dury's *The Earnest Breathings of Forreign Protestants* (London, 1658).

its entirety: 'Belgium peragravi' ('I have been through the Netherlands').<sup>129</sup> The exact purpose of the visit remains unclear, though given the central role of De Geer in the Palatine collection, it is more than likely that maintaining contact with him or his agents was at least one of the goals. On a more personal level, Moriaen also took the opportunity to establish contact with other scholars resident there or visiting. He had evidently been a keen and able student of natural philosophy, and especially of optics, in the course of his career to this date, since he showed enough familiarity with recent developments in this field to make an impression on two leading experts in it, Isaac Beeckman and René Descartes.

Beeckman met him in Dordrecht on 24 August 1633, and made a note of his account of a *perpetuum mobile* which Johann Sibertus Kuffler had tried to sell to Duke Wolfgang-Wilhelm of Neuburg.<sup>130</sup> Kuffler and his younger brother Abraham were members of the extensive Kuffler family Moriaen had known so well as a preacher with the Cologne church. They had been based in England from around 1620, and married two daughters of the (then) celebrated emigré Dutch inventor Cornelius Drebbel; the *perpetuum mobile* in question was in fact (like a number of 'their' inventions) the work of their father-in-law,

---

129 HP 9/15/3A.

130 De Waard, *Journal tenu par Isaac Beeckman III* (The Hague, 1945), 302.



or perhaps a modification of it. According to Beeckman's account of Moriaen's report, the Duke was so impressed with Kuffler's model that he had been willing to offer ten thousand Imperials for a full-scale realisation but was dissuaded by his advisors. In the event, however, Kuffler did set up such a machine for him that year,<sup>131</sup> and Moriaen himself in 1640 mentioned the Drebbel/Kuffler *perpetuum mobile* in Pfalz-Neuburg.<sup>132</sup>

In recording Moriaen's account, Beeckman rather implied - as a great many people who mentioned him implied - that he thought him somewhat gullible. Moriaen did not understand how the mechanism worked but thought it had something to do with mercury: Beeckman, however, suspected that Moriaen had fallen for a ruse, the mention of mercury being a red herring used by Kuffler to mislead potential imitators.<sup>133</sup>

---

131 See *NNW*, II, 736 (which misprints the date as 1663).

132 No. 34.

133 He may well have been right, but a contemporary account of Drebbel's device also implies some sort of chemical process at work: Drebbel 'extracted a fierie spirit, out of the minerall matter, joininge the same with his proper aire, which enclued in the Axeltree, being hollow, carrieth the wheeles, making a continual rotation or revolution' (Thomas Tymme, *Dialogue Philosophicall* (London, 1612): summary and extracts in Harris, *The Two Netherlanders*, 152-5). Harris believes the device to have been powered by variations in temperature and air pressure, though how this could have yielded the regularity claimed for the device it is difficult to see.

Beeckman took a more respectful interest in Moriaen's views on lens-grinding,<sup>134</sup> as did René Descartes, who thought it worth telling his friend Constantin Huygens that

Il y a quelque temps qu'un honnête homme de Nüremberg, nommé M. Morian, passant par ici [Utrecht], me dit qu'il avait souvent taillé sur le tour des verres sphériques qui s'étaient trouvés fort bons; mais il m'avoua aussi qu'il s'y servait de deux mouvements, appliquant tantôt une partie de son modele contre le milieu du verre, tantôt une autre; ce qui est bon pour les verres sphériques, à cause que toutes les parties d'un globe sont également courbées, mais, comme vous savez mieux que moi, ce n'est pas la même de l'hyperbole, dont les côtés sont fort différents du milieu.<sup>135</sup>

('Some time ago, an honest man of Nürnberg by the name of Mr Moriaen, who was passing this way, told me he had often ground spherical lenses which had proved very good; but he also admitted that in doing so he made use of two movements, now applying one part of his model to the glass and now another, which is all very well for spherical lenses, since all parts of a sphere have an equal curvature, but as you know better than I it is not the same for hyperbolic lenses, in which the edges are markedly different from the centre.')

This is surely the same encounter Moriaen himself recalled in tellingly different terms when warning the mathematician John Pell, through Hartlib, not to become involved in Descartes' schemes:

Ich will ihn [Pell] woll versichern das viel zeit vnd muhe nur vergeblich zuebringen [...] wird[.] was Er suchet ist noch vngewiß vnd darzue nur ein particular stuckh. [...] Auß diesem fundament der parabolæ ist es meines

134 *Journal tenu par Isaac Beeckman III*, 300 (24 Aug. 1633) and 381 (1 July 1634).

135 8 Dec. 1635, *Correspondence of Descartes and Constantin Huygens*, ed. Leon Roth (Oxford, 1926), 9.



erachtens nicht zue practiziern. auff dem pappier kan mans woll demonstrirn aber der artifex kans nicht præstirn, wie sie mit der that woll finden werden. [...] Ich hab in diesen sachen auch etwas gethan vnd verstehe die handarbeit so weit sie dieser zeit vblich vnd bekand ist H des Cartes hatt mich berait vor 5 Jahren sehr eÿferig ersucht das Ich ihme die handt bieten vnd sein furhaben ins werckh richten wolte, Ich sehe aber darzue keine mÿglichkeit, wie sie auch bißher im werckh selber erfahren haben (no. 30).<sup>136</sup>

That each man comes out of his own report sounding rather cleverer than the other is not in itself very surprising: more telling is the difference in the rationales behind this. Whereas Descartes' version has Moriaen 'admitting' that he lacked the skill to grind hyperbolic lenses, Moriaen's has Descartes obstinately persisting with a hypothesis that had not stood up to practical experiment. This was to become something of a refrain in Moriaen's reflections on natural philosophy, placing him firmly in the Hartlibian camp of experimental research. Deeply mistrustful both of 'book learning' as opposed to experiment and of theory divorced from practice, these thinkers interpreted Nature by the twin lights recommended by Bacon, the Book of God's Works and the Book of God's Word. For them, Descartes' resolutely deductive thought, though admirable for breaking with scholasticism, replaced it with as great a vanity, that

---

136 Dated 14 November 1639, this report of a meeting 'vor 5 Jahren' ties in plausibly enough with Descartes' 'quelque temps' before December 1635.



of shutting oneself up in the labyrinth of fallible human reason.<sup>137</sup>

From the Netherlands, Moriaen returned to Cologne. Here on 6 October 1633, under the auspices of the secret church he had so long served, he was married to Odilia van Zeuel, the sister of his former colleague Peter.<sup>138</sup> Of Odilia, virtually nothing else is known at all. Her presence is barely felt in the correspondence except as someone receiving or sending greetings, or whose ill health interfered with Moriaen's work and curtailed the time he had available for writing (which does at least imply he made some effort to tend her). There is no indication whatsoever of what sort of a relationship they had. Moriaen generally referred to her as 'meine liebe hausfrau' but how much weight the adjective carries is not at all clear. (The term 'hausfrau', it should perhaps be stressed, was simply the seventeenth-century German term for 'wife' and was not intended to imply any

---

137 The response to Descartes in the Hartlib circle was by no means uniformly negative, and his mathematical gifts in particular were generally recognised and admired. But the approach I have outlined was the prevalent one, the more so as time went on. Comenius in particular, after some initial interest, became increasingly hostile to Descartes, whose approach he thought likely to lead to atheism. He wrote a refutation of Descartes and Copernicus which was destroyed in the siege of Leszno (*Comenius*, 549) and a satirical pamphlet *Cartesius cum sua naturali philosophia a mechanicis eversus* (*Descartes and his natural philosophy overthrown by craftsmen*) (1659: *Comenius*, 593, and see also pp.640-641).

138 *Protokolle* II, 476, no. 947.13.

more particular domestication than was implicit in that status.)

Mystifyingly, a letter from Moriaen to Dury apparently dated 19 November, though the date has been altered and is ambiguous, refers to the marriage as imminent. Perhaps Moriaen was having one of his frequent bouts of absent-mindedness and meant to write September.<sup>139</sup> In the same letter, he informed Dury that he had 'frustrated, or, rather, freed' himself of his Nürnberg citizenship.<sup>140</sup> Though the letter bears no address, it must have been sent from Cologne.

Given that he had so urgently needed to flee the city six years previously, it is a little surprising that he should then have settled in Cologne for a further two and a half years. However, his involvement with the Reformed Church was henceforth purely as a lay member: there is no further mention of his service in the *Protokolle*. It is from this period that his first surviving mentions date of an interest that was to be his consuming passion in later years: Paracelsian chemistry. By the end of 1635 at least, he was producing chemical medicines for sale through Abraham de Bra. Advice and

---

139 HP 9/15/3A-B. The date is given, bewilderingly, as 'Ao 1633 Ad 16 19 9b; both '1633' and '16' have been altered, and '19' could debatably be read as '29'. Dury has noted on the back 'Scripsit 19. 9bris.'

140 HP 9/15/3A: 'Noribergâ solvi civitatis Iure me frustravi aut liberavi potius'.



materials were supplied him by Van Assche, who had returned to his original profession as a physician after being dismissed from the church, and was now practising in Amsterdam. It was not, however, a straightforward teacher-pupil relationship, more an exchange between equals: though eager to receive his friend's recommendations, Moriaen was confident enough of his own abilities to query or challenge them in some instances.<sup>141</sup> Whether Moriaen was actually earning his living as a medical practitioner is not clear, but it is obvious that the prospect of financial recompense provided some incentive. He was working on the 'Elixir proprietatis Paracelsi', and also on medical preparations of juniper berries and bezoar stone, both staples of the Paracelsian tradition. There is reference too to the authority of Johann Hartmann (1568-1631), who at Marburg in 1609 became the first professor of chemistry (specifically iatrochemistry) in Europe. Medicine was not, it would seem, his sole means of support at this period, but he was hoping to make some money from it. Physic provides the classic example of a field in which the profit motive and charitable service of one's neighbour could be reconciled:

so hebbe ene tyt lang met t'Bezoardicum maeken besig geweest, en hebbe voor enige daegen aen Monsieur de Bra ontrent ¼lb daerof gesonden, om niet alleen de vrienden maer oock andere daermede te [illeg.] [...] dat oock een wat

---

141 Moriaen to Van Assche, 6 September 1636, UBA N65c.



profyt van mynen arbeyt quaem dat soude mij  
incourageren om de Naturæ wonders t'[illeg.]<sup>142</sup>

(I have been busy making Bezoar for some time, and a few days ago sent about ¼lb. to Mr de Bra, that not only our friends but others too might be [served?] by it [...] were any profit to come from my work, it would encourage me the more to [delve into?] the secrets of Nature).

This too was an interest that remained with him throughout his life, and several of Hartlib's correspondent referred to him specifically as a medical practitioner, though there is no evidence that he possessed any medical qualification, and the title 'Dr' was never applied to him.<sup>143</sup> The available evidence provides no means of gauging his success as a physician, either from his own point of view or that of his patients. However, a rather crestfallen report that the glasses in which he was rectifying some medicine had burst apart and that he could not understand what he had done wrong suggests that initially at least it was less than overwhelming.<sup>144</sup>

Odilia Moriaen's two brothers, Adam and Peter, were living with or near the couple in Cologne. Though there is no mention whatsoever of the Van Zeuels in any account of the scientific literature of the period, it is obvious that Peter at least was a committed Paracelsian, and in

142 Ibid.

143 For instance Appelius to Hartlib, 12 June 1644, mentioning 'H Morian, vnd andere Medici' (HP 55/1/8A), Rand to Hartlib, 10 Jan. 1653, HP 62/17/4A, and Hübner[?] to ?, 30 July 1655, HP 63/14/31B.

144 Moriaen to Van Assche, 17 January 1637, UBA N65d.

Moriaen's eyes a proficient one. In 1651, Moriaen cited him as a vital source of information on alchemical matters with whom he had hoped to collaborate on the 'great work', a plan frustrated by Adam's death.<sup>145</sup> A visit from him in 1642 was sufficient excuse for a two month lapse in the correspondence, 'haben wir so woll in vnseren gemeinen als meinen priuatsachen so viel zue thun gefunden das Ich auff nichts anderß gedenkhen können' (no. 43). The letter does not specify what these affairs were that were of such consuming interest, but it is altogether likely that alchemy featured among them. It is quite conceivable, indeed, that Peter van Zeuel's alchemical and iatrochemical expertise constituted part of his sister's attraction.

Adam van Zeuel, despite his new brother-in-law's medical prowess, died not long before 24 November 1635,<sup>146</sup> and it may be that the Moriaens benefited financially from this event. This would account for Moriaen's deciding about a year later to move to Amsterdam and to set himself up as a merchant. It would also explain his later rather odd remark that 'ich mit meiner haußfr. dz mehrertheil an landgutern bekommen habe' (no. 20), which I can only construe as meaning that

145 Moriaen to Worsley, 9 June 1651, HP 9/16/7A. A fuller account of Moriaen's alchemical project and Van Zeuel's putative involvement is given in Chapter Seven, section 2.

146 Moriaen's letter of that date to Van Assche, UBA N65b.



the lands came along with the wife through an inheritance or a dowry. Again in 1640 he mentioned his hopes of improving 'vnseren landguttern' by applying some of the methods of Hartlib's protégé, the agriculturalist Gabriel Plattes (no. 43). This striking and very unusual inclusion of Odilia in a first person plural, effectively acknowledging her as co-proprietor, strongly suggests the lands belonged originally to her family. In this case, they would presumably have been in the region of Cologne, and have suffered badly from the Thirty Years War: Moriaen mentioned that 'bey diesen zeiten vnd der gemeinen wise nach' they yielded very little (no. 20).

Moriaen had decided to move by January 1637, when he wrote to Van Assche that they planned to arrive in early or mid-May.<sup>147</sup> He added, however, that Odilia was pregnant,<sup>148</sup> and that Peter van Zeuel, who had earlier been suffering from an abdominal disorder<sup>149</sup> and was evidently still in poor health, could not be abandoned

---

147 Moriaen to Van Assche, 17 Jan. 1637, UBA N65d: 'maeken wy rekenninge tegen t'beginnel of ½ Mey te geliggen God geue tot syns naems eer genadige uytcoomste'.

148 Ibid: 'het heeft God belieft myn beminde huysvrouw met de hote van lyfsvrucht te segenen'.

149 Moriaen to Van Assche, 24 Nov. 1635, UBA N65b, with the news that 'het onsen God ook belieft heeft onsen Broeder Adam van Zeuel uyt dese werelt te nehmen ende onsen noch resterenden Broeder Pet. v Z. met de beginneln van malo Eupochondriaco te gesoeken daeraen hy nu over 3 weken te bedde ligt'.



until a wife had been found to take care of him.<sup>150</sup>

These considerations detained the Moriaens in Cologne for over a year. Their daughter Maria Elisabeth (named after Johann's and Odilia's mothers in that order) was baptised into the German Reformed Church there on 13 June 1637.<sup>151</sup>

The best part of another year elapsed before a wife was found to tend Peter van Zeuel, who married Gertraud Breyers on 12 March 1638.<sup>152</sup>

It was probably soon after this that the move was finally made. At the date of his first surviving letter to Hartlib, dated Amsterdam, 13 December 1638, Moriaen owed his friend replies to three letters. The excuse he gave for his failure to reply was lack of time due to his wife's and his own recent illnesses and the upheaval of their departure from Cologne. One at least of Hartlib's letters must, then, have been received before that departure, and the earliest of them is mentioned as being dated 13 July 1638. Some three months later, Moriaen wrote that he could not comment on a treatise on magnets until it was sent on to him from Cologne, where he had

---

150 Moriaen to Van Assche, 17 Jan. 1637, UBA N65d: 'so lang Monsr: van Zeu: niet getrouwt is so haeken hem niet te verlaeten'.

151 *Protokolle* II, 511, no. 989.9. There were no less than five witnesses: Abraham de Bra's wife (so Moriaen's sister if this is not a different Abraham de Bra), standing in for Elisabeth de Famars, Maria Mitz, Magdalena Bergens (ie. Pergens), Maria Hildebier (standing in for the Lauterbachs), and Odilia's brother Peter.

152 *Protokolle* II, 480, no. 952.2.

left it behind: again this powerfully suggests that the move was a relatively recent event, and that Hartlib had been sending him materials to Cologne.<sup>153</sup> Settled at last, Moriaen now embarked on a new career as a businessman and on what was initially at least a rather more stable phase of his life than the fifteen or so years spent in the service of the Reformed Church and its exiled ministers.

---

153 See no. 10, n.3. Moriaen did not say in so many words that he had had the piece from Hartlib, but this is the obvious implication.

Chapter Two

Servant of God

'He is taxed for nothing so much as with the general fault of all honest men too much charity or overmuch credulity' - Hartlib to John Winthrop, 16 March 1660, HP 7/7/3A.

*2:1 In A Free Country*

Moriaen had mixed feelings about his new home, the United Provinces. He was certainly not unduly proud of his Dutch parentage. Though there were many individuals of that nationality among his closest friends, notably Justinus Van Assche, Lodewijk de Geer and the Collegiant Adam Boreel, his remarks on the nation as a whole suggest he thought them a vain people, jealous of their academic and cultural reputation and stinting of their money, adept at capitalising financially and intellectually on other people's talents and ideas, but loth to give credit where it was due. He advised against bringing Comenius to the Netherlands on the grounds that he would meet with envy if not outright slander from the country's own scholars:

Diese lande sindt ehrgierig vnd lieben den ruhm von gelehrten leuthen vnd nuzlichen Inventis zue haben, wie nun Ihrer viel sindt die allein die kunst lieben vnd suchen also sindt deren nicht wenig welche es ihnen eine verkleinerung halten das ein frembder etwas mehr als sie wißen vnd was newes erfinden solle (no. 2).

G.J. Vossius in particular, he went on (Professor of History at the Athanæum Illustre), had dismissed Comenius



as unlearned: a half-learned Dutchman could do more, and Vossius himself twice as much if he cared to.<sup>1</sup> He considered that John Pell (an Englishman) was shabbily treated as Mathematics Professor at the Athanæum and warned, with a rare shaft of sardonic humour, that Christian Rave (a German) would meet with the same fate if he accepted an invitation to Amsterdam: 'wan man die leuthe hatt so achtet man Ihrer nicht[;] wan sie vmbsonst arbeiten oder geltt zuegeben wolten das weren männer fur diese Statt' (no. 94).

On the other hand, he warmly approved the liberty of conscience and lack of censorship which so distinguished the Dutch Netherlands, and especially the capital: 'man ist hier in einem freyen land' (no. 11). This was the country in which both the deposed Calvinist Elector Palatine and the deposed Catholic Queen of England took refuge, where exiles of any denomination were accepted, where Collegiants and Anabaptists were tolerated and where the largest Jewish community in Europe was free to practise its faith in public. Deploring the censorship imposed on Joachim Jungius by the Hamburg school authorities and on Comenius by his own church,<sup>2</sup> Moriaen repeatedly contrasted the situation in the Dutch

---

1 No. 4, paraphrased in *HDC*, 343. Rulice had written in similar terms of Vossius's judgment a year earlier (quoted by Turnbull from HP 36/1/3B-4A).

2 See below, and nos. 1, 11, 17, 28 and 38 and annotations.

Netherlands: 'hie hatt man freyheit zue glauben vnd zue schreiben was man nur will oder kan' (no. 28).

He settled in Amsterdam as a man of some means, and a number of incidental comments suggest that his principal investment was in the fishing industry. In April 1641 he told Hartlib he was totally taken up with the whaling fleet but would knuckle down to the business of finding a means of supporting Comenius in England as soon as it had set sail.<sup>3</sup> Just over a year later he told Van Assche he had no opportunity to visit him as he had to be at home for the return of the herring fleet.<sup>4</sup> He remarked so phlegmatically on the seizure of three ships in which he had an interest<sup>5</sup> - one at least of which was a fishing vessel<sup>6</sup> - by Dunkirk privateers in 1640 and 42 that it seems fairly safe to assume he had considerable other assets besides.<sup>7</sup> Two weeks after the second incident he asked for Hartlib's help in the recovery of yet another ship, also taken by privateers and sold by them in England, in which he stood to inherit a one-

---

3 No. 59.

4 UBA N65e, 24 June 1642.

5 Though he describes them as 'his', it is unlikely he owned them outright: normal practice was for a syndicate to raise funds for any given fishing or trading expedition and divide the profit (or loss) accordingly.

6 No. 43: 'So gleich iezund bekom Ich aduis das die Deynkerker mir ein Schiff dz auff den fischfang auß war abgenommen'.

7 Nos. 43 and 78.



sixteenth share (whether from the Moriaens or the Van Zeuels is not clear).<sup>8</sup>

A further indication that things were going well for him financially during the early years in Amsterdam is his remark in March 1639, à propos his work for Hartlib on the collection for Comenius and other scholars,<sup>9</sup> that 'Ich nun fortan all mein werkh von diesen dingen machen kan' (no. 11). What exactly it was that had enabled him to devote himself entirely to the project he did not specify, but the obvious implication is that the chore of earning a living was no longer obstructing him. On 15 August 1643 he bought 2600 guilders (about £260) worth of shares in the Dutch West India Company. He finally cashed them in, having fallen on hard times, in 1658.<sup>10</sup> These are not vast sums, but probably represent only a portion of his total investments.

During their first few years in Amsterdam, the Moriaens moved house with considerable regularity, first in 1639, again in 1640, and yet again in 1641.<sup>11</sup> In no surviving letter, however, did he give an address, not

---

8 No. 79.

9 See Chapter Four, section 4.

10 Gemeendearchief Arnhem, RA 513 fol. 101, 19 July 1658; it is this document that records the date of purchase.

11 Nos. 14 (12 May 1639), 40 (26 April 1640), 54 (11 February 1641) and 56 (28 February 1641). At least I take it that in the second of these it is his own move he refers to when he remarks that 'man hiezuland nun eben mit dem verhaußen geschäftig vnd vnmüsig ist'.



even when telling Hartlib in April 1640 (just before his second move) that he was now well enough known in Amsterdam for letters to be addressed directly to him rather than through his brother-in-law Abraham de Bra.<sup>12</sup> It seems likely that these moves reflect increasing prosperity, especially given that on the third occasion he was not merely moving but building a house (or having one built). The only evidence of an address is from November 1651, when Christian Rave (of whom more anon) wrote to him 'in de uitter Uoss up de Princen Gracht to Amsterdam' - an elegant street in the heart of the city, in the merchant quarter, not far from the De Geer's Amsterdam residence in the Kaizersgracht.<sup>13</sup>

Maria Elisabeth Moriaen, the daughter born in 1637, died of an unspecified illness at the age of just over two. She was, according to Moriaen's stoical report of the event, the couple's only child.<sup>14</sup> References in the published correspondence of Mersenne to 'le fils de Mr. Morian', whom the editors identify as Moriaen's son,<sup>15</sup> are surely mistranscriptions. This person had come over

---

12 No. 39.

13 Rave to Moriaen, 12 November 1651, Bodleian MS. Lat. misc. c.17 f.42. I am indebted to Gerald Toomer of Harvard University for pointing this letter out to me.

14 No. 21.

15 Mersenne to Haak, 16 Nov 1640: 'j'essayeray de [vous écrire] par la voye que vous me donnez, ou bien par le fils de Mr. Morian, qui m'a apporté vostre lettre', and 28 Nov. 1640: 'Si vous m'envoyez quelque chose, vous le pourrez adresser à ce jeune Mr. Mor. qui passe icy l'hiver', *Correspondance de Mersenne*, XI, 420 and 431.

from England, bearing Mersenne a letter from Haak, to spend the winter of 1640-41 in Paris. I have not seen the manuscripts on which the edition is based, but copies of the same letters in Hartlib's papers read, quite distinctly, 'Merian' and 'Mer.'<sup>16</sup> The young man in question is Matthias Merian the Younger, of the Frankfurt family of printers and engravers, who had visited England in 1640 and made the acquaintance of Haak, who signed his *Stammbuch* in September of that year, before proceeding to Paris.<sup>17</sup> Not one extant letter makes any reference to subsequent offspring, and the concern Moriaen expressed after narrowly surviving a serious illness in 1657 as to what would become of his wife should he die strongly suggests he left no heirs.<sup>18</sup> One of the very few extant letters addressed to him, from 1651, concludes with

---

16 HP 18/2/29A and 28B respectively (not in chronological order). On his first appearance in the printed Mersenne correspondence, this figure is given as 'M. Mer.' and 'le fils de Mr Merian, allemand' (X, 269; HP 18/2/28B and 31A). In the subsequent volume, the editors are moved to 'correct' themselves by a genuine reference to Moriaen in a letter from Pell to Hartlib, which, however, makes no mention of a son: 'Il fallait lire MOR. au lieu de MER. au t.X, p.269' (XI, 308). In any case, Moriaen had only been married for seven years at this date; the only explanation for an obviously adult son in Paris would be that this was the offspring of an earlier and completely unrecorded marriage (or other liaison), but again, Moriaen's mention of the death of 'mein [not 'unser'] ainiges Kindt' rules this out.

17 Barnett, *Haak*, 27, n.1, and Hans Vollmer (ed.), *Thieme-Becker Künstler-Lexikon* XXIV (Leipzig, 1930), 413. No. 32 furthermore suggests Haak was considering using the Merians as publishers in 1639.

18 No. 160, July 1657: 'sie würde sich hier under frembden und ganz allein ohne rath und trost von menschen befinden, niemand würde viel nach ihr umbsehen'.



greetings to his wife and friends but makes no mention of any other family.<sup>19</sup>

Besides his business activities, Moriaen had three main occupations during his early years in Amsterdam. First and foremost, he became Hartlib's principal agent in the Netherlands for the drive to raise financial support for and interest in the Moravian thinker Comenius and his educational reform programme. This will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four. His other principal concerns were the printing industry and the conversion of the Jews.

Writers from all over Europe looked to Amsterdam to publish works that would be banned in their native

---

19 Christian Rave to Moriaen, 12 Nov. 1651, Bodleian MS. Lat. misc. c.17 f.42: 'Tua Castiss. Uxorem et Amicos omnes meo quæso nomine diligentissime salutabis'. The only contrary evidence is the description of him, in the above-mentioned document concerning the selling back of his West India shares, as 'Iean Moriaen den ouden'. It is possible, however, that the younger 'Iean Moriaen' was not a son but the 'Cous: Ioh: Moriaen' whom 'Iean den ouden' had much earlier recommended to the care of Justinus Van Assche in Amsterdam (UBA N65d, 17 January 1637, cf. n.1). There were certainly other Moriaens in Arnhem, where he was by then living: the court ordered the paying in of debts to one 'Christina Morians', wife of the engineer and surveyor Isaac van Geelkerch, in May 1661, especially those relating to 'Moriaens erfschap' (the Moriaen inheritance) (Gemeendearchief Arnhem, RA 513, fol. 226, 6 May 1661). There was also a 'Haus Moriaen' in the centre of the town, though Johann was not living there. Unfortunately, the records are so fragmentary (and, in the case of the legal documents, in such an appallingly bad scribal hand) that no more can be deduced about this Christina and her inheritance, nor what connection Moriaen had with the house that bore his family's name.



countries. Moriaen promptly associated himself with the leading printers in Amsterdam, Willem Jansz Blaeu, Johann Jansson and Lodewijk Elsevier. As has been mentioned, he was also friendly with the Frankfurt printer Matthias Merian the Elder, and he was quick to make the acquaintance of another German, Hans Fabel, when the latter set up a press in Amsterdam in 1646. Moriaen was particularly impressed with Fabel, who specialised in works of a mystical and alchemical nature, such as Franckenberg, Tschesch, Böhme, Raselius and above all Felgenhauer<sup>20</sup> - all very reminiscent of the type of literature Moriaen had been discussing with Dury and Van Assche, and obtaining from Morsius, during his stay in Nürnberg. In 1648, Fabel also printed a work by Hartlib's brother, *Georgii Hartlibii Exulis Diarium Christianum*,<sup>21</sup> though this (rather surprisingly) is unmentioned anywhere in Moriaen's surviving correspondence. Through these various contacts, and no doubt also through old acquaintances in Frankfurt who could keep him advised of what was on show at the city's annual book fair, he became one of Hartlib's principal informants on what was being published in Germany and the Netherlands, and a major supplier of continental literature. The names of Böhme and Felgenhauer recur

20 See J. Bruckner, *A Bibliographical Catalogue of Seventeenth-Century German Books Published in Holland* (The Hague and Paris, 1971), *passim*.

21 Bruckner, no. 167. Bruckner somewhat mystifyingly gives Samuel Hartlib as the author.

once again in the commissions sent him by Hartlib and Haak, as does that of the similarly unorthodox spagyrist and prophet Sophronius Kozack.<sup>22</sup>

He also commissioned a number of publications on Hartlib's and Dury's behalf and oversaw their printing. Costs were lower in Amsterdam than in England, and there was less likelihood of interference from the censors, though the problem still remained of having the works brought into England after they had been printed. Most of the works commissioned were intended to publicise Comenius's pansophic work or Dury's irenic projects. Hardly any of the pieces mentioned have been preserved, which suggests they were brief pamphlets issued in cheap editions for widespread and possibly free distribution by the intelligencers in England.

It was Moriaen who commissioned the 1639 Elzevier edition of Comenius's *Prodromus Pansophiæ*, and he consulted with Hartlib about any alterations to be made in the new 1640 edition of the *Janua Linguarum*.<sup>23</sup> There is repeated mention of a planned Amsterdam edition of the English mathematician William Oughtred's *Clavis Mathematica*, though this seems never to have appeared,

---

22 See especially no. 46, in which Moriaen promised to obtain unspecified works by Böhme (probably his *Mysterium Magnum*) for Haak, and by Felgenhauer and Kozack for Hartlib (see no. 46, nn.1 and 3).

23 No. 29.



probably because of Oughtred's failure to send over his revisions and additions.<sup>24</sup>

In many instances, it is impossible to tell whether proposed printings in fact took place. This is the case with Hübner's *Idea Politica*, which Moriaen was keen to print but the author apparently deemed unworthy of publication,<sup>25</sup> and with Dury's *Analysis Demonstrativa*.<sup>26</sup> Other works that certainly did go to press under Moriaen's auspices are an unidentifiable *Parænesin* ('Exhortation') by Dury, which Moriaen also spoke of having translated (probably into German or Dutch, possibly Latin),<sup>27</sup> *An Exhortation for the Worke of Education Intended by Mr Comenius, The Duties of Such as Wish for the Advancement of True Religion*,<sup>28</sup> *an Answer to the Lutherans*,<sup>29</sup> and an unspecified 'dissertatio didactica', all by Dury.<sup>30</sup> Of all these works, the only

---

24 Nos. 50, 51 and 114: in the last, dating from 1650, Moriaen was still complaining that Oughtred was failing to send material for the edition that had first been proposed at least ten years earlier. The work finally came out in 1652 in Oxford.

25 No. 9.

26 No. 18. The *Analysis Demonstrativa*, which survives in manuscript, is discussed in some detail in Chapter Four, section 3.

27 Nos. 13 and 18.

28 Both mentioned in nos. 18 and 21.

29 Nos. 73 and 84. See Turnbull's checklist of Dury's works, item 21 (*HDC*, 302). This is probably identical with the 'Schreiben an die Professoren' mentioned in no. 78, and (as Turnbull suggests) with the "Answer to those of Wittenberg" which Dury spoke of as being printed by Moriaen (Dury to Hartlib, 2 Oct. 42, HP 2/9/34B; cf. *HDC*, 302).

30 No. 87.



one now known to survive in printed form is the *Duties*, a later edition of which is noted in Wing's *Short Title Catalogue*.<sup>31</sup> A number of other works were also entrusted to Moriaen, but their titles are not recorded. Indeed, Moriaen considered Hartlib's passion for publishing somewhat excessive: 'Ich kan zwar nicht absehen was so viel verscheidene zue einem zweckh gerichtete schreiben nuzen können' (no. 21). However, he did as he was asked, and 1640 in particular saw a steady flow of tracts from the Amsterdam presses sent across by Moriaen into London.

One large batch of works, evidently by Dury and including the above-mentioned *Duties* and *Exhortation*, was impounded by the English authorities acting under instructions from the Church. Dury at this time, as Anthony Milton puts it, had 'both sides [Anglican and Puritan] scrutinizing him for lack of zeal', and was extremely uneasy about receiving politically sensitive material, such as an anti-Laudian petition of March 1640, by post from Hartlib.<sup>32</sup> Suspicion had been aroused in the case of the pamphlets by another piece of carelessness on Moriaen's part: the works had been bound

---

31 Wing, no. 2907B: the edition listed is dated Edinburgh, 1659. Moriaen's came out in Aug. 1639 (no. 21).

32 Milton, 'The Unchanged Peacemaker?', 109-110, and see Dury to Hartlib, 31 March 1640, HP 2/2/10A. Milton also refers to the business of the impounded pamphlets, but with the minor error of assuming it was Dury himself who sent them into England.

under the wrong titles.<sup>33</sup> Moriaen's letters suggest that this was indeed a genuine error rather than a deliberate piece of camouflage. It is of course possible that the letters were themselves adapted to take account of the possibility they too might be intercepted, but the remarks about the unchristian and untimely zeal of the impounders hardly sound calculated to reassure official eavesdroppers.<sup>34</sup> In any case, it is understandable that the authorities should have wondered what was being brought into the country under an apparent disguise. Moriaen's indignant declaration that a title is neither here nor there, and that this was a typical piece of petty-minded interference on the part of the tiresome bishops, is less than reasonable:

so hatt das kind einen vnrechten nahmen bekommen vnd sind das dan so schröckliche sachen? ist doch niemand dabey verkurzet, Ich kan mir fast nicht einbilden das die Bischoffe dißfals beÿ einigen verständigen Politico beÿfall ihres vnzeitigen eÿfers (die materiam betreffend) finden werden (no. 38).

In due course, the works were indeed found to be innocuous and were released, but not until Hartlib had been put to a deal of trouble to negotiate this outcome.<sup>35</sup> Dury, who was in Hamburg at the time, sent a rather ingratiating letter about the affair to Philip

33 No. 38.

34 No. 38.

35 No. 40, and Dury to Hartlib, 31 March 1640, HP 2/2/10A: 'I am gladde a warrant is gone to free the Printed Coppies which were unaduisedly sent out of holland'.



Warwick, the Bishop of London's secretary, thanking him for ordering their release. The whole point of this, as he told Hartlib, was 'to Cleere my self of all suspicions which might fall upon me'.<sup>36</sup> In the letter to Warwick, Dury castigated Moriaen (without naming him) for his inefficiency, and rather implausibly denied that Dury himself knew anything at all about the printing and shipping of his works:

although the harmeslesse matter contained in them so farre as my conceptions were unaltered, needeth no Apologie; yet the fashion of their habit, the place whence they came, the company which came with them, et the forme of their conveiance being somewhat suspicious in these doubtfull times, et I being ignorant et innocent of all this, who neverthelesse hadd might a been<sup>37</sup> a sufferer thereby in the judgment of superiours: therefore your courtesie deserveth thancks et due acknowledgment from having freed me from the appearance of guilt which the irregular proceeding of imprudent, though well meaning persons, was like to bring upon me.<sup>38</sup>

This did not prevent Dury from employing Moriaen two years later to print his now lost *Answer to the Lutherans*, and in the case of this work there can be no doubt whatsoever that publication occurred at his own request, since he repeatedly mentioned the fact himself and complained about the delays in bringing the work out - delays for which Moriaen apparently blamed the dilatoriness of the printer (which printer this was is

36 Ibid.

37 Sic, probably a scribal error.

38 Dury to Warwick (scribal copy), 1 May 1640, HP 6/4/46A.



nowhere specified).<sup>39</sup> When it finally appeared in October 1642, it turned out that Moriaen had botched the job again. Dury was thoroughly disappointed and annoyed:

Mr Moriaen hath caused the Epistolicall Dissertation to bee printed, but so incorrectly that it is a shame to see it: & without any preface; so that I shall be taken for the putter of it forth, by euery one that seeth it; I would rather it hadde not at all beene putte to the presse, then so abused.<sup>40</sup>

Having blamed the delays on the printer, Moriaen now rather lamely blamed the errors on the transcriber: he had checked the edition not against the original but the transcription.<sup>41</sup> After 1642, Hartlib and Dury looked elsewhere to have their productions brought to light by agents whose skill and efficiency were better answerable to their zeal.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 2:2 *Moriaen and the Jews*

Moriaen also cultivated contacts with Amsterdam's substantial Jewish community. The exceptional tolerance with which Jews were treated in the Dutch Netherlands, being allowed to maintain synagogues openly and to associate freely with any Christians who cared to let

39 Dury to Hartlib, 18 Sept. 1642, HP 2/9/24A, n.d. but obviously slightly earlier, HP 2/9/17A, and 16 Oct. 1642, HP 2/9/34B.

40 Dury to Hartlib, 23 Oct. 1642, HP 2/9/39B; it is quite obvious from the context of earlier letters that this 'Epistolical Discourse' is the Answer to the *Lutherans*.

41 No. 85.

them do so, made the capital a focal point for Christian-Jewish contacts. Moriaen took full advantage of this fact, as did his friends Van Assche and Serrarius, who had both moved to Amsterdam ahead of him. As Dury later remarked with regard to the activities of the Hebraist Christian Rave in promoting such dialogue,

I conceiue that Amsterdam where there is a Synagogue of Iewes, & a Constant waye of Correspondencie towards the orientall parts of the world; & where there are some alreddie in a public waye intending the promotion of those studies; will bee a place more fit for his abode then any in england, except somethinge extraordinarie were done by those of London for the aduancement of vniuersall Learning.<sup>42</sup>

How far Moriaen's scholarly interest in Judaism extended is not at all clear. He mentioned having lent the Hebraist J.H. Bisterfeld his concordance of Hebrew, and spoke of plans for Bisterfeld to teach him his 'methodum inquirendi veram radicem Hebraicarum significationem' ('method of investigating the true meaning of Hebrew roots'),<sup>43</sup> which argues at least an interest in studying the language, but gives no firm evidence as to how far he had progressed. There is also an intriguing reference to 'Mein Hebræus', possibly a convert, with whom he had been discussing religion, and who had drawn his attention to a passage in a Jewish text about the sufferings of the Messiah for the sins of the

---

42 Dury to Hartlib, 31 Aug. 1646, HP 3/3/32A. For the 'somethinge extraordinarie' Dury had in mind, see below.

43 Nos. 4 and 5.



whole human race ('de passionibus Messiaë pro peccatis totius generis humanj').<sup>44</sup> This delight in finding supposed prefigurations of Christianity in the parent religion is very much like Serrarius's response to the highly unorthodox opinion of Rabbi Nathan Shapira that the Messiah had been revealed in Jesus among others:

When I heard these things, my bowels were inwardly stirred within me and it seemed to me that I did not hear a Jew, but a Christian, and a Christian of no mean understanding, who did relish the things of the Spirit and was admitted to the inward mysteries of our religion.<sup>45</sup>

Serrarius was one of the foremost promoters, on the Christian side, of communication between the two camps. He came to believe that the Jewish expectation of a coming Messiah and the Christian expectation of Christ's return were simply two sides of the same coin, and that though the Jews had failed to recognise their Saviour on his first visit, they would not make the same mistake again. This synthesis of Christian Millenarianism and Jewish Messianism was an area where a number of less orthodox figures from either faith found common doctrinal ground. Serrarius eventually became so involved with Messianism that he went half-way to accepting the self-proclaimed Jewish Messiah Sabatai Sevi, who launched his

---

44 No. 114.

45 Serrarius to Dury, in *An Information concerning the Present State of the Jewish Nation in Europe and Judea*, by Dury and/or Henry Jessey (London, 1658), 13; cit. Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 182.

mission in 1665, though Serrarius saw him only as a precursor of the true Second Coming, a sort of latterday John the Baptist. Even Sevi's subsequent public conversion to Islam was seen by Serrarius as a part of the providential scheme and failed to shake his faith.<sup>46</sup>

While there is nothing in Moriaen's letters to suggest that his sympathy for Judaism went nearly so far as this, he was certainly interested in the Jews and concerned like Serrarius 'to gain them through kindness',<sup>47</sup> to present them with the human face of Christianity. He was particularly keen to see a Hebrew version of Comenius's *Janua Linguarum* brought out,<sup>48</sup> for as will be discussed he saw Comenius's educational and philosophic method as a far more effective means toward the reconciliation of different faiths than doctrinal dispute. He and Van Assche were even involved in a charitable collection for the Amsterdam Jews in 1643 - a most remarkable activity for a respectable Amsterdam merchant to be engaged in at this period. Popkin describes the fund raising efforts in 1657 by Dury, Serrarius and other Millenarians for the visiting Rabbi

46 See Van Der Wall, 'The Amsterdam Millenarian Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) and the Anglo-Dutch Circle of Philo-Judaists', *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. Van Den Berg and E.G.E. Van Der Wall (Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1988), 73-94, 90-94, and Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi, The Mystical Messiah 1626-76* (London, 1973).

47 *An Information*, 2, cit. Van Der Wall, 'The Amsterdam Millenarian Petrus Serrarius', 80.

48 Nos. 10 and 13.



Nathan Shapira of Jerusalem on behalf of Palestinian Jews as 'the first known case of a Christian venture of this kind for Jews',<sup>49</sup> but this collection for the Amsterdam Jews preceded it by fourteen years. Whether Moriaen and Van Assche had a hand in organising it or merely contributed is uncertain: the only record of the business is a mention in a letter from Moriaen to his friend, stating that some of the Jews had become suspicious about the way the money was being distributed.<sup>50</sup> Moriaen asked Van Assche to send a detailed account of how much he had given and exactly to whom, so that any doubts could be cleared up, at least so far as his part in the matter went.

For many Christians, a major impetus to such endeavours was the belief that the conversion of the Jews was prophesied in the Bible. The key text here was *Romans* 11, especially verses 23, 26 and 27:

And they [the Jews] also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again. [...]  
And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob [ie. Israel]:

---

49 'Hartlib, Dury and the Jews', 132; and see *ibid.*, 130-32 for a fuller account of Shapira's visit and relations with Dury's circle. Shapira had come to Amsterdam intending to raise money from the Jewish community, but had been turned down by them, providing the Christians with an opportunity to outdo them in charity.

50 Moriaen to Van Assche, 9 May 1643, UBA N65g, and see Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 159-60.

For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.

Paul's somewhat ambivalent thinking on this point, moving as it does from the conditional possibility of Jewish redemption to confident prediction of it, in fact allows of a number of interpretations. To a doctrinally uncommitted reader, this looks very much like an unresolved struggle on the author's part to reconcile his sense of his own Jewish origins with his commitment to the new faith. The chapter begins: 'Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite'. Paul sought to resolve this conflict by deciding that the rest of his nation was destined to follow him in his conversion. For his Christian readers in the seventeenth century, however, the passage of course represented not Paul's private difficulties but a divine prophecy. To the Millenarians looking to the fulfilment of all Biblical prophecy in the near future, conversion of the Jews thus became a major desideratum. So did the completion of the Jewish diaspora, for it was believed that the scattering of the Jews to all corners of the earth was also destined to precede the Millennium. This was another point on which Millenarians and Messianists found common ground, and is why both the circle around Menasseh ben Israel and that around Hartlib were so excited by the reports that began to come out in 1650



that the native Americans were of Hebrew descent.<sup>51</sup> (No comment by Moriaen on this notion survives.) Menasseh made this a keynote of his bid to have the Jews readmitted to England. The diaspora was already much further advanced than anyone had realised: England and Spain were practically the only places left without a Jewish population (or at least without an officially recognised one). The Christian Millenarians added to this a providential role for England not only in the completion of the diaspora but also in the conversion of the Jews.

One of the reasons the Jews rejected Christianity, it was argued, was that even where they were not actively persecuted or oppressed by its adherents, they saw it practised in such corrupt and absurd forms that there was little incentive for them to study it more closely or seriously. Once the Jews saw the true faith being practised in truly godly fashion, as it was in England, they would be far more likely to take it seriously.<sup>52</sup> In the Reformed Dutch Netherlands, for instance, while there had not been quite such a spate of conversions as might have been hoped for, there were a number of Jews - such as Menasseh, Jehudah Leon and Moriaen's anonymous 'Hebræus' - who were at least willing to consider the arguments and look at the evidence.

---

51 See Popkin, 'Hartlib, Dury and the Jews', 125-7.

52 Ibid., 126.

The promotion of Jewish-Christian dialogue, particularly at an intellectual and academic level, was a favourite project of Hartlib and especially of Dury. They petitioned Parliament in 1649 for £1000 to set up, as part of a new University of London,<sup>53</sup> a College of Jewish Studies (to be attended exclusively by Christian scholars), with a view to increasing Christian knowledge and awareness of Jewish language, culture, customs and beliefs, the better to be able to enter into a dialogue with the Jews and to explain to them that Christianity, far from being a rejection of their faith, was its culmination.<sup>54</sup> They were in regular contact with Menasseh (who was proposed as one of the professors) about plans for this college and for the readmission of the Jews to England, and Moriaen was frequently used as an intermediary in these exchanges.<sup>55</sup>

---

53 See Webster, *Great Instauration*, 222-24.

54 See Popkin, 'Hartlib, Dury and the Jews', *SHUR*, 118-136, esp. 123-4, and 'Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges in Holland and England 1640-70', *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, 3-32.

55 Cf. Van Der Wall, 'Three letters by Menasseh ben Israel to John Dury', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 65 (1985), 46-62, and see nos. 113, 114, 118, all referring to contacts between Dury and Menasseh via Moriaen in 1650. On 29 April 1654, Dury wrote to Hartlib from Amsterdam that Menasseh 'intends to come over to sollicit a freedome for his nation to liue in England [...] if he come hee will make his addresse to you by Mr Moriaens direction' (HP 4/3/2A). For a succinct account of Menasseh's (unsuccessful) mission, see *Worthington Diary* I, 78, n.1.



Moriaen also became involved with all the Christian figures who loomed largest in the plans for the College of Jewish Studies. Johann Stephan Rittangel (1606-52) had lived a long time among Jewish communities in Eastern Europe and, it was said, at some time shared their faith. Dury even stated that 'in Asia and some part of Europe [he] hath been above twenty years conversant with them, and a doctor in their Synagogues'.<sup>56</sup> Moriaen too, some time before meeting him, heard from Bisterfeld of a learned 'Rabbi Rittungal' (no. 13), which looks very much like a slightly skewed form of his name. Adelung, in his notice on Rittangel, claims the story that he was born or converted to Judaism is unfounded, that he himself always denied it and that 'seine Gegner selbst haben ihm nie solches vorgeworfen'.<sup>57</sup> But Dury, Bisterfeld and Moriaen were by no means his enemies, and were under this impression well before 1652, when (according to Adelung) the 'accusation' was first made (by the Königsberg Consistory). The possibility remains, of course, that Bisterfeld, Dury and Moriaen were mistaken; on the other hand, if the story was true, it would not be surprising

---

56 Dury, 'Epistolicall Discourse' to Thomas Thorowgood, *Jewes in America* (London, 1650), cit. E.G.E. Van Der Wall, 'Johann Stephan Rittangel's Stay in the Dutch Republic (1641-1642)', in J. Van Den Berg and E.G.E. Van Der Wall, eds., *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Dordrecht, Boston and London, 1988), 119-134, 120.

57 *Jöcher-Adelung* VII, 30-32.

that in 1652 Rittangel found it expedient to deny the fact.

He was Professor of Oriental Languages at Königsberg in the 1640s, and in 1641 set off on a visit to Amsterdam to supervise the publication of his manuscripts. However, the ship he was travelling on was attacked by privateers, and his manuscripts and many personal effects lost. Furthermore, in the wake of the attack, the ship put in at England, presumably having been left in no condition to continue its journey, and Rittangel found himself unexpectedly in London. Here he was eagerly taken up by Hartlib and Dury. This was precisely the moment when they thought their grand design for religious reconciliation and educational and scientific reform was on the point of bearing fruit in England. Comenius had at last been persuaded to join them in London, and the newly-convened Parliament was looking favourably on their plans.<sup>58</sup> The sudden and unlooked-for appearance of a brilliant Hebraist seemed nothing short of providential. They set about promoting him as a reconciler of Jews and Christians and an indispensable source of information on the former.<sup>59</sup>

---

58 See Chapter Four, section 5.

59 Dury and/or Hartlib?, *Englands Thankfulness, or An Humble Remembrance presented to the Committee for Religion in the High Court of Parliament* (London, 1642): for full title, see *HDC*, 90; and see no. 67, n.3.



Rittangel, however, appears to have been less impressed by his new friends and benefactors than they, at least initially, were by him. He left England in November 1641 and proceeded with his original plan to go to Amsterdam, where Moriaen took him under his wing. In the letters relating to Rittangel, the high ideals of Jewish-Christian reconciliation and the propagation of knowledge are repeatedly interrupted by references to the incongruously mundane detail of Rittangel's bed, which had for some reason been left behind in London and which Hartlib was supposed to forward. Rittangel became thoroughly despondent about his missing bed, and according to Moriaen came to the conclusion 'das Er von dem herrn durch nicht vbersendung seiner sachen nun wiederumb wie dorten werde auffgehalten werden' (no. 81). A likely explanation of this remark is that the ever-optimistic Hartlib had been holding out to Rittangel glowing prospects of Parliamentary sponsorship for his work, and that the failure of any such sponsorship to materialise led the Hebraist to think Hartlib was merely dallying with him. Certainly Moriaen was still hoping there might be some support forthcoming for Rittangel from the English Parliament, in return perhaps for the dedication of his work, some months after his departure from England.<sup>60</sup>

---

60 Nos. 75 and 78.



Rittangel was a particular authority on the Caraites, or Caraeans, Jews, among whom he had apparently lived. The Caraites were a sect who rejected the Talmud (ie. the post-Biblical Jewish oral tradition), a stance in which some Protestant commentators saw a parallel with their own rejection of the Scripturally unsanctioned 'innovations' of Rome. By the same token, Caraites were often seen as prime targets for conversion to 'true' Christianity: as Hartlib wrote to Worthington, they were 'such as begin to look towards their engraffing again'.<sup>61</sup> Hartlib's papers include a sympathetic account of them by Rittangel, in which he stressed their favourable disposition to Christian teaching and their respect for New Testament figures, and claimed (somewhat implausibly, since the sect did not come into being until the eighth century AD), that according to their own literature, their schism with the Pharisees first arose because the Caraites tried to protect Christ from them.<sup>62</sup>

Rittangel's principal occupation in Amsterdam was the preparation of an edition of the Cabbalistic *Sefer Yezirah*, or 'Book of Creation',<sup>63</sup> which explained a

---

61 Hartlib to Worthington, 12 Dec. 1655, *Worthington Diary* I, 79. See J. Van Den Berg, 'Proto-Protestants? The Image of the Karaites as a Mirror of the Catholic-Protestant Controversy in the Seventeenth Century', *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century*, ed. J. Van Den Berg and E.G.E. Van Der Wall, 33-50.

62 HP 1/33/62A-63B, copy enclosed with a letter from Cyprian Kinner to Hartlib.

63 See no. 70, n.1.

method of mystic contemplation based on the ten *sefirot*, or primordial numbers, and the twenty-two Hebrew letters. A Hebrew manuscript of this was obtained, probably through Moriaen, from the merchant and Hebrew scholar Gerebrand Anslo, who had studied under Menasseh ben Israel. First, Rittangel had to transcribe the entire work so that he could return the precious original to its owner, and then he set about translating it into Latin and annotating it. Moriaen followed his work on the project closely and reported to Hartlib on his progress. Interestingly enough, he saw the work not only as a means of increasing Christian awareness of Jewish traditions and beliefs, but as containing important religious truths in its own right:

bin woll versichert das der gleichen secreta Rabinorum sonderlich doctrinam de Triunitate belangend zuevorn niemalen ans liecht kommen sind, vnd trage gleichfals keinen zweyfel man wird seiner arbeit so woll gegen die Anti Trinitarios als Iudæos nuzlich gebrauchen können (no. 78).

It was evidently his view that, since the Christian faith was implicit in the Jewish, or at least in the pre-Christian form of the Jewish, a true exposition of Jewish texts could only serve to demonstrate the truths of the daughter faith. The *Yezirah* was in fact written at some time between the second and sixth centuries, but was believed to be contemporaneous with the patriarch Abraham, if not actually to have been set down by him.

It was Moriaen who arranged for publication of Rittangel's translation, through his old friend Johann Jansson, in 1642.<sup>64</sup> Rittangel also considered undertaking a translation of another Cabbalistic work, the *Ticcunei Zoar*, though he seems never to have got round to this.<sup>65</sup>

During the eight months or so Rittangel spent in Amsterdam, Moriaen found him lodgings, raised money for him (he specifically mentioned supplying fifty Imperials, though whether from another collection or out of his own pocket is not clear<sup>66</sup>), and did his best to keep his spirits up. This last undertaking seems to have been a lost cause. To be fair, Rittangel had had more than his share of bad luck, and moreover was missing his wife and young child, left behind in Königsberg.<sup>67</sup> But Moriaen soon came to find him insufferably melancholic and thoroughly tiresome, as he repeatedly complained both to Hartlib and Van Assche.<sup>68</sup> It has to be said that

---

64 Nos. 75 and 77.

65 See no. 70, n.2. The fact that Moriaen evidently misread 'Ticcunei' (or perhaps 'Tecunei') as 'Tecuum' suggests his interest in Rittangel's work was more enthusiastic than informed.

66 No. 78.

67 No. 75.

68 Nos. 75, 78, 80, 81, and Moriaen to Van Assche, 24 June 1642, UBA N65e, in which he complained that he was prevented by one thing after another from undertaking a visit to his friend, 'vindende alle daegen nieuwe belaetselen als t'ene over is soo is ander voor de deure Rittangelius heeft my dit geheele Iaer geoccupeert met het ouersien van syn Liber Iezirah' ('finding new hindrances daily, as one is past there is another at the



Rittangel's report on the Caraites, mentioned above, does not say much for his sense of proportion or his humility. He claimed that the Caraites had advised the King of Poland that if he wished to know more about them, he could do no better than to read Rittangel's work, and that Rittangel himself, after acting as interpreter, so impressed the King and his confessors that

ich [habe] etliche mal mit ihnen essen müssen, vnd dz auch, in præsentz hoher herrschaft, hören müssen: Diß ist der einige Man in den orientalischen Sprachen, den ganz Europa nicht hat!<sup>69</sup>

After Rittangel's return to Königsberg in mid-1642, his association with the circle fizzled out in mutual disappointment. Looking back on the business some five years later, Moriaen observed of Rittangel, 'Er ist auch dermaßen selzam das nichts oder wenig mit Ihm anzuefangen ist (no. 94). Nonetheless, he continued to do his best for the man and to promote his studies, distributing copies of the *Yezirah* through Van Assche and Dury (and no doubt other contacts besides),<sup>70</sup> but without undue success: in 1657, he had to send fifty unsold copies back to the author (and, furthermore, payment for a another fifty he had never seen, 'wolte ich ruhe fur ihm haben').<sup>71</sup> As he put it in a typical little burst of

---

door. Rittangel has kept me busy the whole year overseeing his *Liber Jezirah*').

69 HP 1/33/63B.

70 Moriaen to Van Assche, November 1644, UBA N65h, and no. 153.

71 No. 153.

homely philosophy, 'allein vmb des süßen honigs willen muß man zue zeiten das stechen der bienen mit geduld verschmerzen' (no. 78).

Moriaen had higher hopes of the young Hebraist Georg Gentius (1618-87), another protegé of the same Anslo who lent Rittangel his copy of the *Yezirah*. Anslo, however, imposed on his patronage the condition that he be made sole dedicatee of any of Gentius's work, thus cutting him off from any other possible source of income.<sup>72</sup> Both Gentius and Moriaen considered this an entirely unreasonable attitude, saying more about Anslo's regard for himself than about his concern for the common good. Through Hartlib, Moriaen tried to arrange a secret patronage deal with James Ussher, Bishop of Armagh and Primate of all Ireland. Ussher, however, turned out not to be interested. Gentius, who was planning a visit to the Middle East in the service of the Turkish Ambassador to the Netherlands, was also seen as a possible means of contact with the Caraites, despite Rittangel's characteristic warning that noone else would be able to win their trust in the way that he had.<sup>73</sup> There was even talk of Rittangel's joining him to provide an introduction, but again nothing came of this. On his return from Constantinople after a visit of no less than eight years, Gentius pursued a career as diplomat and

72 No. 58.

73 No. 78.

interpreter in the service of Johann Georg of Saxony, with no further involvement in such schemes.

By at least 1647, Moriaen had become acquainted with another Hebraist, the Dutch patrician Adam Boreel, who he suggested might be better suited than Rittangel to provide the bridge of learning and correspondency that would span the gulf of mutual ignorance separating the two religions.<sup>74</sup> The only problem was that he was expensive.

In fact, Boreel was already known to the circle. A letter from Dury to Hartlib of 31 August 1646 contains extensive details about him, which have been summarised by Popkin in his study of Christian-Jewish contacts in Amsterdam.<sup>75</sup> Boreel, according to Dury, had supported the Amsterdam Rabbi Jacob Jehuda Leon while the latter produced an exact scale model of the Temple of Solomon according to the specifications in *Ezra*, a model which subsequently brought Leon considerable fame (and profit) and provided a popular attraction as he took to going on tour with it and charging fees for viewings. Its fame was such that Leon became known by the pseudonym 'Templo'. Boreel learned Portuguese in order to be able to communicate with Leon, who did not speak Latin, and

---

74 No. 94.

75 HP 3/3/32A-33B; Popkin, 'Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchanges', and see also A.K. Offenbergh, 'Jacob Jehuda Leon (1602-1675) and his Model of the Temple' (*Jewish-Christian Relations*, 95-115).



elicited his help in producing a punctuated and annotated edition of the *Mishna*, or Jewish Oral Law, which was published not under Boreel's (or Leon's) name, but that of Joseph ben Israel, with a preface by Menasseh, 'because if it should bee put forth under the name, or by the Industrie of any Christian, it would not bee of Credit amongst them [the Jews]'.<sup>76</sup> It was Boreel's intention to produce similar versions of other sacred Jewish texts, and also Latin translations for the benefit of Christian scholars, and Spanish ones for the benefit of European Jews who did not know Latin or Hebrew. Boreel had also, apparently, produced a treatise

to demonstrat the Divinitie of the Histories of the New testament by all the Arguments by which they [the Jews] beleue the old testament to be deliuered by God unto their nation.<sup>77</sup>

This was precisely the sort of labour Dury and Hartlib hoped their College of Jewish Studies might promote: Dury was most anxious to see state funding provided 'that this man & such as are qualified in this kind might bee sent for & employed in these workes wherunto God hath eminently fitted them'. For

no doubt the tyme doth draw near of their Calling; & these preparatifs are cleer presages of the purpose of God in this worke for when hee doth beginne to fitte meanes for the discoverie of their errors & for the Manifestation of the Truth of Christianitie

---

76 Dury to Hartlib, 31 Aug. 1646, HP 3/3/33B.

77 Ibid.

[...] it is a cleer token that hee intends to take the vaile from of their faces.<sup>78</sup>

This letter of Dury's provides an excellent example of the essentially colonialist attitude adopted towards the Jews by those Christians who are frequently termed 'philo-Semites'. This expression is semantic nonsense on at least two counts. Firstly, their attention was directed not at Semites in general but at Jews in particular. The absurd use of the word 'Semite' to mean 'Jew' can only stem from an uneasy sense that the word 'Jew' is a term of abuse, and, paradoxically, can only enhance the potential for the word 'Jew' to be used as such.<sup>79</sup> This objection is avoided by the term 'philo-Judaism', which has less to be said against it. But although it is true that genuine friendships between Jews and Christians did occur, and there were a number of Christian scholars with a real interest in and extensive knowledge of Jewish culture, the motive force on the Christian side behind such interests and such friendships was almost invariably the desire to convert. Unless love (the Greek *phileein*, whence the prefix *philo-*) is understood as the desire to annihilate the individuality of the beloved, it does not provide a very good account

78 Ibid.

79 On perverse usage of the word 'Jew' (or in this case 'Jude'), see Victor Klemperer, *LTI [= Lingua Tertii Imperii]: Notizbuch eines Philologen* (Berlin, 1949), a chilling and thought-provoking first-hand account by a German Jewish philologist of the linguistic policies of the Third Reich, which raises many questions that resonate beyond its immediate historical context.

of the type of relationship envisaged by the 'philo-Judaists'.

The purpose of Boreel's work on the *Mishna*, as Dury described it, was

that the Common sort of Iewes might know what the Constitutions of their Religion is, & also that the Learned sort of Christians upon the same discoverie might bee able to know how to deale with them for their Conuiction.<sup>80</sup>

So far as the Christians were concerned, Jewish-Christian relations were a strictly one-way traffic, the Jews constituting the object of attention and the Christians being the people who did all the studying, all the proselytising and all the persuading. The Jews were viewed as raw material that the Christians might mould into their own image.

The proprietorial tone so noticeable in Moriaen's mention of 'mein Hebræus' is still more marked in Dury's letter on Boreel. Leon is referred to as 'his Iewe' and 'The Iewe which hee made use of'.<sup>81</sup> My point in stressing this is not to condemn Dury, Moriaen and their ilk for an attitude that to them would have seemed self-evidently right and to call for no justification; it is rather to urge that that attitude be recognised for what it was, intellectual colonialism, and not mistaken for an early form of liberalism or humanism.

80 Dury to Hartlib, 31 Aug. 1646, HP 3/3/33A-B.

81 Ibid.



### 2:3 Technology Transfer

In the late 1640s, Moriaen's financial situation was deteriorating. In letters to both Van Assche and Hartlib he bemoaned the declining value of his West India Company shares.<sup>82</sup> By the end of 1647, he was complaining bitterly about the expense of receiving so many letters, and especially about the exorbitant charges levied on those from England: he was spending as much on correspondence, he claimed, as on household necessities.<sup>83</sup> (Hartlib responded by arranging for people to whom he sent letters via Moriaen to pay the full cost of the postage from England, thus relieving Moriaen of having to pay for the letters to him sent together with them. While waiting for settlement of such payments, Moriaen could charge his expenses to Hartlib's account.<sup>84</sup>) In February 1648 he was pursuing his various debtors, and particularly asking Hartlib's help in persuading Christian Rave, who was then in England, to settle up with him.

The precise cause of this collapse is not altogether clear. Moriaen himself repeatedly put it down to his excessive Christian charity: 'Euserlichen ansehen vnd

---

82 UBA N65h, November 1644, stating perhaps hyperbolically that the value of the shares had halved, and no. 98, 27 Feb. 1648, in which he reported a loss of 800 guilders.

83 No. 94.

84 No. 111.

Weltweißheit nach, hab Ich freylich (wie die freunde <wohl> vrtheilen) dem Sprichwort nachgethan alijs in *serviando consumidor*' ('I have used myself up in serving others') (no. 111.) This is not mere specious self-justification. Moriaen genuinely was given to loaning large sums without security, and he did lose by it. Comenius benefited for several years from an interest-free loan of 100 Imperials.<sup>85</sup> Moriaen's friend Budæus died owing him 1000 guilders (about £100).<sup>86</sup> His support for Rittangel, despite his personal antipathy to the man, has already been mentioned. 1644 saw him prepared to loan an unnamed friend 'another 2000 thalers' although 'dit quaem mij seer beswaerlyck voor [...] well om hem niet te laeten soo hadde al geresolueert hem te helpen' ('this was very difficult for me, but not wishing to abandon him I had resolved to help him'), though on this occasion a brother-in-law (probably de Bra) relieved him of this burden.<sup>87</sup> In early 1647 he was supporting a son of his friend Matthias Merian, who was apprenticed to an Amsterdam engraver, and wrote to Hartlib with obvious embarrassment that this was proving something of a financial strain on him.<sup>88</sup> Christian Rave owed him something in the region of 300 guilders.<sup>89</sup> Visited by the somewhat shady English inventor William Wheeler in

85 See Chapter Four, section 4.

86 No. 84.

87 Moriaen to Van Assche, Nov. 1644, UBA N65h.

88 No. 91.

89 No. 94, reporting 65 repaid and over 200 outstanding.

1650, Moriaen went so far as to borrow £13 himself in order that he might lend it to Wheeler: a fortnight's loan was agreed on, but six months later he had still not seen his money.<sup>90</sup>

This all adds up to evidence that Moriaen was not merely indulging in pious rhetoric in his frequently repeated assertion that it is more blessed to give than to receive.<sup>91</sup> However, it was also at this period that he became deeply involved in an assortment of expensive alchemical projects, together with the German natural philosophers J.R. Glauber, J.S. Kuffler and Antony Grill, the English Benjamin Worsley and the American George Starkey. While these undertakings, which will be considered in detail in Chapter Seven, were probably not the initial cause of his financial decline, they certainly set the seal on it. Things took an abrupt turn for the worse in 1650, when he declared himself virtually ruined:

Ich [muß] bey so unträglichen schaden vnd verlust gleichwoll mit allem ernst vnd fleiß dahin bedacht vnd auch damit geschäftig sein [...] wie Ich vor meinem ende [...] meine sachen in richtigkeit bringen [...] vnd also meine ehre, die nächst meinem guten gewißen mein höchster schaz auff Erden ist, erhalten vnd retten möge (no. 111).

---

90 Nos. 110 and 118. On Wheeler, see no. 96, n.6.

91 See especially the long diatribe at the beginning of no. 167.



It may well have been this reversal of fortune that moved Moriaen to set himself up at just this time as an informal agent for technologists and inventors, finding many of his customers through Hartlib. He presumably received a commission for his pains, and this may have helped him keep his head above water.

Moriaen's various contacts with the scientific communities of Germany and the Netherlands, cultivated at least since his days in Cologne, made him a valuable source of news and personal introductions, promoting the very considerable input from mainland Europe to English science and technology. Especially under the Commonwealth and Protectorate, England seemed a promising location for the professional freelance inventor. The new regime was eager to promote technological advance, and showed every sign of being favourably disposed to Hartlib's schemes for State-sponsored promotion of such inventors and projectors.

In the event, the assorted and ultimately fatal teething troubles of the new Republic meant that these worthy intentions were seldom translated into practical measures and hard cash, but Hartlib was not to be daunted. After repeated disappointments during the reign of Oliver Cromwell, he saw new hope in his son and successor Richard. Eleven days after the former's death, he wrote to Boyle that 'I suppose, that his Highness,

that now is, will perhaps more favour designs of such a nature, than his deceased father, otherwise of very glorious memory'.<sup>92</sup> Boyle apparently shared the view: Hartlib a little later declared himself 'wondrous glad, that you have written of the present protector's intentions for countenancing and advancing of universal useful learning in due time'.<sup>93</sup> Hartlib's unquenchable optimism, as relayed by friends such as Moriaen, did much to enhance the apparent prospects and to encourage the influx of foreign scientists and inventors.

The first German inventor to use Moriaen as an agent was the optician Johann Wiesel (c.1583-1662).<sup>94</sup> A Protestant from the Palatinate, Wiesel had moved to Augsburg by 1621, where he gained citizenship by marrying the daughter of a local craftsman, and founded what was probably the first optical workshop in Germany. As early as 1625, he was noted for the production of burning-mirrors, lenses and other instruments. He was 'probably the first optician in Europe to make use of a third lens - the field lens - in his microscopes to give a greater field of vision'.<sup>95</sup> After the Swedish occupation of

---

92 Hartlib to Boyle, 14 Sept. 1658, Boyle, *Works* VI, 114.

93 Hartlib to Boyle, 16 Dec. 1658, Boyle, *Works* VI, 115.

94 The fullest account of him is Inge Keil, 'Technology transfer and scientific specialization: Johann Wiesel, optician of Augsburg and the Hartlib circle', *SHUR*, 268-78, to which the following account is heavily indebted.

95 Keil, *op. cit.*, 269, information derived from the Wiesel extract of 17 Feb. 1650 in no. 108.

Augsburg in 1632, he produced optical instruments for King Gustavus Adolfus; in 1650 his clients included Maximilian of Bavaria and the University of Paris.<sup>96</sup> It may have been through Hartlib's and Moriaen's mutual friend the mathematician John Pell, who in the late 1640s was eagerly investigating developments in optics on the Continent, that Moriaen first learned of Wiesel.<sup>97</sup>

Through friends such as Jan Hevelius and Constantijn Huygens, but above all through Hartlib, Moriaen helped spread Wiesel's fame around northern Europe and across the water to England. It was through him that Wiesel's telescopes and microscopes first reached these shores. His customers included the astronomer Hevelius and the cartographer Joan Blaeuw on the mainland, and Robert Boyle, Benjamin Worsley and one Mr Sotherby in England.<sup>98</sup> He also sent news of Wiesel's newly-invented binoculars and ophthalmoscope,<sup>99</sup> the latter being an instrument which represented a major advance in the investigation and treatment of defects of the eye.

Moriaen must have been very useful to both Wiesel and his clients as a middle man and a trustworthy agent

---

96 Wiesel to Moriaen, 17 Feb. 1650, copy in no. 108.

97 Ibid., 272. On Pell, see Chapter Four, section 3.

98 See nos. 107 and 109. Hevelius, Blaeuw and Sotherby each wanted a telescope, Boyle a microscope and Worsley one of each. No. 115 also has Moriaen ordering four more microscopes from Wiesel, but for whom is not clear.

99 Wiesel to Moriaen, 17 and 30 Dec. 1649, copies of both in no. 108.



by way of whom the valuable and fragile instruments could be conveyed, and payment for them settled. However, as with his printing commissions from Dury, and despite his previous experience as an optical instrument maker, he evinced a certain tendency to bungle. A telescope for Worsley reached him with one of its lenses loose, so Moriaen glued it into place with lime. This piece of well-meant interference spoiled the telescope, as the lens had to be removable in order to be kept clean. It was supposed to be kept in place by an adjustable screw. Moreover, Wiesel surmised, Moriaen had not fixed the lens into the right place. Whether Worsley managed to mend the instrument himself according to Wiesel's directions or had to send it all the way back to Augsburg to be fixed (as Wiesel offered) is not clear.<sup>100</sup>

The publicity material Wiesel sent through Moriaen strikingly reflects the popular attitude to microscopes and telescopes, which were recognised by relatively few for their enormous potential to expand the scope of scientific enquiry, but much more widely sought after as 'curiosities' or sources of entertainment. Boyle was regarded as exceptional in that he 'cares not for optical niceties but as they are subordinate to Natural Philosophy'.<sup>101</sup> Describing his microscope, for instance, Wiesel remarked not on its potential utility for medicine

100 See nos. 111, 113, 115.

101 *Eph* 51, HP 28/2/3B.

and science but its sensation value: 'machtet einen floch so groß als ein schildkrotten [...] wer solchen durch dießes Instrumentlein schawete müste sich von herzen darvor entsezen'.<sup>102</sup> The sort of games that could be played are suggested by Wiesel's directions for viewing a small picture at a distance through his daytime telescope in such a way as to make it appear life-size, 'diß mit sonderlichem lust zu schawen'.<sup>103</sup> However, when the client in question (possibly Worsley) tried to set up this party piece, it failed. Wiesel concluded that this was because he had specified the relevant measurements in Augsburg ells, and that English ells were different. Apparently frivolous pastimes such as these played their role alongside weightier pieces of international scientific cooperation in bringing about the standardisation of weights and measures. Wiesel, ever the pragmatist, sent over a piece of string to indicate the precise distance required.

Wiesel's telescopes and microscopes enjoyed a very high reputation in England when they began to arrive at mid-century. In time they were surpassed by native products, but as Inge Keil shows, Wiesel was imitated before he was superseded, and (as Hartlib reported to Hevelius) it was precisely the desire to outdo the German

---

102 Wiesel to Moriaen, 17 Feb. 1650, copy in no. 108.

103 Wiesel to Moriaen, 17 Dec. 1649, copy in no. 108.

that stimulated the great English opticians such as Richard Reeve to their finest efforts.<sup>104</sup>

Friedrich Clodius, a Paracelsian iatrochemist who had at some point lived as a guest in Moriaen's house,<sup>105</sup> moved to England in 1652 with a letter of recommendation from Moriaen,<sup>106</sup> though he had been known to Hartlib (probably through Moriaen) at least since the previous year.<sup>107</sup> He at first gave the impression of living up to his personal and professional credentials so well that he gained not only the confidence of Hartlib and friends such as Boyle, but also the hand of Hartlib's daughter Mary, probably in late summer 1653. Boyle wrote fulsomely to him in congratulation: though Clodius had earlier declared he would never marry, being wedded to his chemical calling,

I cannot conclude you less a servant to philosophy, by choosing a mistress in his [Hartlib's] family; and I cannot but look upon it as an act of his grand design to oblige this nation, that he hath found this way to detain you among us.<sup>108</sup>

He installed himself in his father-in-law's house and converted the back kitchen into a laboratory which he used as the headquarters of his 'Chemical Council'. This was an association headed by Clodius and Kenelm Digby,

104 Keil, 'Johann Wiesel and the Hartlib circle', 276-8.

105 See no. 168: 'da H Clodius bey mir wohnte'.

106 As promised in no. 128.

107 Reports from him suddenly start appearing in the *Ephemerides* from about April 1651 onward.

108 Boyle to Clodius, 27 Sept. 1653



with which Boyle was also involved, devoted to the production of chemical medicines and the quest for the great iatrochemical arcana, elixir, alcahest, lapis and ludus.<sup>109</sup> Though the addition of Clodius to the family subsequently proved to be a very mixed blessing,<sup>110</sup> he was certainly an important figure in the scientific community of England in the 1650s and 60s.

It was Moriaen too who recommended the multi-talented inventor J.S. Kuffler and the chemists Remeus Franck, Peter Stahl and (probably) Albert Otto Faber, all of whom settled in England between 1654 and 1661.<sup>111</sup> Hartlib obviously passed on Moriaen's recommendation of Stahl to Boyle, whose protégé Stahl became. He shared Boyle's house in Oxford for a time, and later gave private chemistry lessons there.<sup>112</sup>

Remeus Franck or Franken was an apothecary who moved to England, with a reference from Moriaen, in 1654, and was given lodgings at Hartlib's house. Like Clodius, he had at some point lived with Moriaen, who seems to have

---

109 See Webster, *Great Instauration*, 303, and Hartlib to Boyle, 8 May 1654, Boyle, *Works* VI, 86. On alchemical terminology, see Chapter Five, section 1.

110 See below, and Chapter Three, section 1.

111 Kuffler's case is dealt with in detail below. See no. 139 for Moriaen's recommendation of Franck, 184 for his recommendation of Stahl, and 197 for his association with Faber. Faber (1641-78) is briefly mentioned by Thorndike (VII, 233) and Partington (II, 182).

112 See Turnbull, 'Peter Stahl, the first public teacher of chemistry at Oxford', *Annals of Science* IX (1953), 265-70; Webster, 165, and Partington, II, 488.

kept open house for alchemists (Glauber was also his guest for a period).<sup>113</sup> His *Nottwendige Anmerckung vnd Betrachtung Allen Gelehrten vnd wohlerfahrnen Männern/ welche die CHIRURGIAM Handhaben/ erhalten vnd derselben sich gebrauchen* (Amsterdam, 1653),<sup>114</sup> appeared in William Rand's English translation as 'A short and easie Method of Surgery, for the curing of all fresh Wounds or other Hurts' in Hartlib's *Chymical, Medicinal and Chyrurgical Addresses* of 1655. It describes five 'chirurgical balsams', which, the English version concludes, 'are to be bought of Remeus Franck, who is to be found at Mr Hartlib's house, neer Charing-cross, over against Angel Court' (180).<sup>115</sup> The content of the balsams is, of course, not specified, but the treatments Franck offered probably were a genuine advance on contemporary surgical practice, especially as applied to the poor, if only in that he stressed the importance of hygiene and advised against amputation except as a last resort. In a chilling evocation of the current state of surgery, Franck suggested that 'Governours and Magistrates' should recommend his balsams to their hospitals, not only out of charity but also because

it would prove likewise very beneficial and profitable unto themselves, when the maimed

---

113 Hartlib to Boyle, 8 May 1654, Boyle, *Works* VI, 87. Hartlib described him as 'an expert ancient old laborant, which hath lived with Mr Morian'. On Glauber and his relations with Moriaen, see Chapter Six, section 2..

114 Incomplete copy at HP 18/3/1/1A-8B.

115 See Webster, *Great Instauration*, 304.



persons shall depart the sooner from the Hospitals, and the cries of the distressed shall not so long vex their ears, by reason that many violent and offensive practices of Chyrurgery, in such cases usual, shall by this Method be avoided.<sup>116</sup>

At some point between the end of April and 16 October 1654 Moriaen moved to Arnhem,<sup>117</sup> where he took up residence on the estate of Hulkestein as a guest of the Kuffler brothers, who had a dye works there.<sup>118</sup> A possible reason for Moriaen's being invited is that in 1654 J.S. Kuffler planned to return to England as (he thought) a guest of Parliament, to demonstrate various inventions including his torpedo, or 'dreadfull Engine for the speedy & effectuall destroying of shipping in a Moment', and to discuss terms should his secrets be deemed worth purchasing. This information is preserved

---

116 *Chymical, Medicinal and Chyrurgical Addresses made to Samuel Hartlib Esquire* (London, 1655), 161.

117 On 6 May, Dury mentioned having been with him in Amsterdam 'last week' (HP 4/3/3A); 16 Oct. is the date of his first surviving letter from Arnhem (no. 141).

118 The Kuffler brothers moved to the Netherlands from England, where they had also run a dye-works (at Stratford le Bow), just before the outbreak of the Civil War (*NNWB* is incorrect in dating their return c. 1650: Moriaen reported their recent arrival in Amsterdam to Van Assche on 24 June 1642, UBA N65e). By September they were in the Hague (UBA N65f), but had moved to Arnhem at least by 16 Oct. 1646, when Heinrich Appelius wrote to Hartlib about a dyer known as Flensburg whom the Kufflers were supporting at their home there (HP 45/1/27B). On 26 Aug. 1647 Appelius specifically mentioned that they 'dwell & exercise their dying of cloath' at Arnhem (HP 45/1/33A). No patent for the dye-works has survived (cf. G. Doorman, *Patents for Inventions in the Netherlands during the 16th, 17th and 18th Centuries* (abridged trans. Joh. Meijer), The Hague, 1942), but since Moriaen later commented that this was the only dye-works in the province (no. 167) they perhaps felt no need of one.



in a petition to Richard Cromwell giving a history of Kuffler's attempts to sell his inventions to England and the various assurances he had received, which he hoped Cromwell would honour.<sup>119</sup>

The *Calendar of State Papers* makes no mention of any such invitation issued at this period, but it hardly seems likely Kuffler made the whole story up later merely to impress Cromwell, who after all was singularly well placed to verify the claims. Was Kuffler perhaps misled, just as Comenius and perhaps Rittangel earlier had been,<sup>120</sup> by over-enthusiastic private assurances from Hartlib or his friends in Parliament that the State was well-disposed to Kuffler's project and keen for him to visit? This must remain a conjecture, as there is no firm evidence that Hartlib was in contact with Kuffler as early as May 1653.<sup>121</sup> According to the petition, Hartlib had 'from time to time Corresponded with yr Petitioner for applying his said Invention [the torpedo] to the use

---

119 Three copies in the Hartlib Papers (HP 53/5A-B, 53/41/4A-5B and 66/18/1A-2B); the document is undated but probably late 1658 (mid-1653 is 'about 5. years since' but Richard Cromwell is Protector).

120 On Comenius's belief that he was invited to England by Parliament, see Chapter Four, section 5.

121 A letter from George Horne to Hartlib of Sept. 1653, describing a highly skilled dyer specialising in scarlet, well known to Moriaen and planning to visit England to impart his knowledge for a suitable price, surely refers to Kuffler and implies that Hartlib knew little about him (Horne to Hartlib, 15 Sept. 1653, HP 16/2/2A). But Horne may simply have been unaware how well-informed Hartlib was: it was certainly not news to him that Kuffler knew Moriaen and was an expert in scarlet dye.

of the State of England', but there is no indication of when such correspondence began. Hartlib had, however, taken an enthusiastic interest in Kuffler's inventions since at least 1635,<sup>122</sup> and was certainly his main promoter in England from late 1654 onwards.

If the time spans cited in Kuffler's account are at all accurate, he must have set out for England in early or mid-1654. He had received the invitation, he claimed, shortly after May 1653, and had initially intended to set sail at once, but was prevented by a 'sickness which continued vpon his family for neare 12 months together'. Mid-1654 is just the end of the period during which Moriaen is known to have remained in Amsterdam. It seems likely that Moriaen, as an experienced chemist and long-standing friend of the family, was invited to become a partner in the business and to supervise the dye-works during J.S. Kuffler's absence, either on his own or together with Kuffler's brother Abraham.<sup>123</sup> This would have enabled Moriaen to realise some much-needed cash by selling his house in Amsterdam while still keeping a roof over his head.

Kuffler did not, however, reach England in 1654, for

---

122 Nine mentions of Kuffler in *Eph* 35, relating to his ovens, optics, medicines, a method of drying malt, and Drebbel's 'weather-glass' (ie. his perpetual almanac) (HP 29/3/44A, 48B, 52A, 55B, 56A, 56B, 57B, 62A-B, 63B).

123 It is not clear whether the family who set off together with Johann Sibertus included his brother.



being come neare to the Lands end [he] by a suddaine Tempest was driven back into the Low-Countries, where hee continued vpward of a yeare, hee being informed by some frinds of the change of the Government in England about that time, which made it not soe convenient a season [...] to make his application in.<sup>124</sup>

There is an anomaly here, in that the 'change of government', ie. the announcement of the Protectorate, occurred in December 1653, and it is hardly conceivable Kuffler did not hear of it until the middle of the following year. A rather likelier if not very edifying reason for this being 'not soe convenient a season' to sell arms in is that the first Anglo-Dutch War had come to an end in April 1654.

Kuffler returned to Arnhem, where a correspondent from Cleves (possibly Hübner) met both him and Moriaen in July 1655.<sup>125</sup> All the surviving extracts from Moriaen's letters of that year represent part of a campaign to arouse interest in England in Kuffler's inventions and to guarantee him a market should he decide to undertake the crossing again. Ideally, he hoped to interest the State

---

124 Petition to Cromwell, HP 66/18/1A. It is not immediately obvious why the change should so adversely have affected Kuffler's prospects. The Council of State which he supposed had invited him was drastically reduced, it is true, to the initially thirteen-strong Protector's Council (later Privy Council), and Major-General Harrison, his supposed champion, no longer featured on it (CSPD 1653-4, 297-8 (vol. 42, 16 Dec. 1653)), but it is by no means certain he would have known in such detail of the state of affairs in England. Rumour or sheer uncertainty may well have been enough to put him off.

125 HP 63/14/31B.



itself in the person of Oliver Cromwell, and Moriaen specifically asked Hartlib to approach the Protector with these proposals.<sup>126</sup> Several of the letters exist in two or more versions representing different stages of Hartlib's editing, showing how he adapted a personal letter into a formal petition, mainly by dint of excising personal details (including Kuffler's name) from Moriaen's reports.

The torpedo was not, initially, the main item on offer, or at any rate not the one Moriaen was keenest to promote. The principal subject of Moriaen's publicity was Kuffler's portable ovens, in one of which, it was claimed, 2000 pounds of bread could be baked in a single day.<sup>127</sup> These were designed primarily for armies to take with them on campaigns, and could also be used on board ship. Moriaen also promoted a device of Kuffler's for purifying water by distillation,<sup>128</sup> an operation of obvious use to a maritime nation such as England. Neither Moriaen nor Kuffler had any qualms about explaining that Kuffler had originally designed his ovens towards the end of his earlier stay in England and had intended to offer them to Charles I, but that his project had been cut short by the outbreak of the 'troubles' in

---

126 No. 145: 'Interim wolle der H. diese 2. Inventiones bey Seiner Hochheit dem H. PROTECTORI anbringen, vmb zu vernehmen, wie Ers apprehendire'.

127 No. 148.

128 No. 144.

1642.<sup>129</sup> As in almost every mention of them in Hartlib's papers, the 'troubles' are referred to with politic caution almost as if they had been a natural disaster which all concerned had simply weathered as best they could, having played no part at all in either their origin or outcome.

Hartlib obviously applied himself with his customary vigour to making Kuffler's inventions known both to Cromwell and to friends such as Worsley who had influence with the managers of the State economy.<sup>130</sup> There was, however, dispiritingly little response. Moriaen's letters reveal a mounting frustration, and considerable tetchiness with Worsley when he expressed doubts about the viability of the water-purifier.<sup>131</sup> He was even more annoyed when his erstwhile protégé, Hartlib's son-in-law Clodius, turned against his old benefactor by responding to the publicity about the ovens in a decidedly luke-warm, if not positively disparaging fashion, maintaining somewhat unsubtly that he could do a great deal better himself:

Nun mein Herr ich bin versichert, daß meine  
Invention in höherm grad alß H Kufflers stehet,

---

129 No. 142, which exists in what is probably an exact copy of the original and a version edited by Hartlib: Hartlib evidently saw no reason to cut out the reference to a proposed deal with Charles.

130 At this juncture, Worsley was Surveyor General of Ireland, though soon to be brought down by his rival William Petty. See Chapter Seven, section 1, and the literature cited there.

131 No. 146.

und ehe ich 1000 gl. darauff spendirt, weiß ich gewiß, meine sache demonstrel zu machen. [...] Ich weiß nicht wie es ist, daß ich das glück habe, die fewer Inventiones ziemlicher massen zuerkündigen [...] Ohne Ruhm zu melden, glaube ich nicht, das einer in Europa einen digerir ofen habe, der lenger, vnd mitt weniger Kohlen könne gehitzt werden, als meiner.<sup>132</sup>

But for all his own prowess, Clodius declared himself keen to receive further details of Kuffler's method. He did not consider that he should have to pay for this, as his intention, he claimed, was to improve on the design, for Kuffler's own benefit. If Clodius was such an expert on ovens, retorted Moriaen bluntly, then why did he not present his own products to the public instead of merely passing judgment on other peoples'? Moriaen may well have had a gullible side to his character, but in this instance he did not fail to draw the obvious inference; nor did he balk at telling Clodius precisely what he thought of such behaviour: 'solte ich [...] eines andern schweiß und arbeit mir zueignen wollen, das sey ferne von mir' (no. 143).

This was precisely the attitude that so bedevilled Hartlib's attempts to institute mechanisms for the dissemination of knowledge. For people to be willing to communicate their discoveries, they had to be guaranteed a just recompense for their labour and ingenuity, yet such guarantees became impossible as soon as the

132 Copy extract by Clodius, 17 Nov. 1654, HP 39/2/25B, probably to Moriaen: it is evident in any case that Moriaen read and responded to this letter.



knowledge was in the public domain. The security provided by a patent, assuming one could be obtained, was largely theoretical, and Kuffler remarked through Moriaen that he could see little point in taking the necessary trouble, especially not when a product was being pitched at the State as a whole rather than at private individuals.<sup>133</sup> Very few patents were issued under the Protectorate anyway, thanks to a backlash against the notion of monopolies.<sup>134</sup> Moreover, patent law was in many respects antithetical to the Hartlibian ideal of the free dissemination of learning and inventions in the interest of the common good.<sup>135</sup> The problem remained, however, of securing the rewards for ingenuity that both justice and expediency demanded. Moriaen's ideal (and rather naive) solution would seem to have been self-regulation by an honest and God-fearing populace, and to see that ideal being undermined by his own protégé must have been a bitter pill to swallow.

The first mention of Kuffler's torpedo occurs in July 1655, some months after Moriaen had begun promoting

---

133 No. 145.

134 Christine MacLeod, *Inventing the Industrial Revolution: The English patent system, 1660-1800* (Cambridge, 1988), Chapter 1, and see Webster, *Great Instauration*, 343-355 on the resentment earlier aroused by abuses of the patent system and monopolies.

135 On Hartlib's complex attitude to patents, see Greengrass, Leslie and Raylor, 'Introduction' to *SHUR*, 18-21, and Mark Jenner, '"Another epocha"? Hartlib, John Lanyon and the improvement of London in the 1650s', *SHUR*, 343-356.

the ovens. This was probably (like many of the Kufflers' projects) a development of an invention originally made by Drebbel, whose torpedo designed for Charles I had been used with some success at the siege of La Rochelle in 1626-8.<sup>136</sup> Moriaen had grave qualms about recommending a project explicitly designed to inflict death and destruction, but tried to reassure himself that its deterrent value would make it an instrument of peace rather than war, even managing to find Scriptural authority for the view:

Ich sehe daß werck auch dergestalt an, daß es mehr zu ersparung bluttvergiessens, alß zu vergießung dienen wirdt. Dann wie die Schrifft selbsten vns zu gemüth führet, so gehet niemand so vnbedachtsam zu Feld, oder er überschlägt zuvor seine, vnd des feindes macht, Wie Er dargegen bestehen könne. So nicht; so schicket Er von ferne zu Ihm, vnd bittet vmb Frieden (no. 147).

In the event, it was the torpedo that aroused most interest from the English authorities, and Moriaen's continuing unease about the invention reveals that he had not succeeded in convincing himself on this point.

Eventually, Kuffler set out again in the first half of 1656,<sup>137</sup> despite not having received the assurances he

136 L.E. Harris, *The Two Netherlanders*, chapter 17. See also the account of Kuffler's torpedo in Webster, *Great Instauration*, 390-91.

137 Between 3 March, when Moriaen was still trying to secure an invitation (no. 150), and 20 June, when Kuffler, Hartlib and Ezerell Tonge signed an agreement concerning the promotion of his work to Cromwell (HP 26/49/1A-B; see below). According to no. 148, his plan was to set off in March.

had hoped for that the journey would be made worth his while, and was joined in the summer by his family (this time definitely including Abraham, who died in London the following year).<sup>138</sup>

On arriving in England, Kuffler was at once, like almost all the technologists recommended by Moriaen who crossed to this country, given hospitality, encouragement and practical assistance by Hartlib and his friends. Hartlib arranged a loan of £100 from his friend the Puritan educationalist Ezerell Tonge, while Hartlib at the same time committed himself in a legal document to

produce in writing & deliver vnto the said Mr. Tonge, such Testimonials concerning Dr. Küffeler his abilities [...&] concerning the reality & certaintie of the Experiments [...] as shall vnto wise & indiferent men be of satisfaction.<sup>139</sup>

It was no doubt to fulfill this requirement that about three weeks later Moriaen sent over a fulsome testimonial for Kuffler, which Hartlib had translated into English.<sup>140</sup> The idea was evidently that Hartlib's petitioning on Kuffler's behalf could be expected to

---

138 The family was still in the Netherlands when the agreement with Tonge was drawn up in June. An entry in *Eph* 56 almost certainly dating from July (the previous entry but one refers to events of 8 July) mentions a medicine known as 'oleum Fraxini' and that 'Dr Ks wife is bringing some along with her'.

139 'Articles triperite Agreed & Concluded, betwixt Iohn Sivertus Küffeler, Dr. of Physick; Samuel Hartlib Esqr & Ezeral Tonge, Bac of Divinity. this 20th Day of Iune. 1656', HP 26/49/1A.

140 No. 151.



yield such results as would make Tonge's £100 a safe investment. Hartlib further promised that he would

diligently attend & sollicite his Highnesse [Cromwell], the Councill, the Secretary of Estate, & such other Persons, & use such other meanes, that may most probably bringe the said Experiments to their desired effect, for the benefitt of this Commonwealth.<sup>141</sup>

Tonge for his part was at the time a prime mover in schemes for a new college at Durham, which it was hoped would become a third university, and which was to promote the Hartlibian ethos of 'useful knowledge', with a strong emphasis on such subjects as husbandry, medicine and chemistry, at once spreading learning and true religion to the remoter provinces, and breaking the stranglehold of the traditional academics at Oxford and Cambridge on the nation's intellectual life.<sup>142</sup> When the college obtained its charter, with Oliver Cromwell's blessing, in 1657, the senior appointments consisted almost exclusively of Hartlib's associates and protegés. Tonge featured as a schoolmaster and fellow, and Kuffler as a professor, presumably of medicine and/or chemistry.<sup>143</sup> However, he never occupied his chair, apparently preferring to pursue the promotion of his various inventions. Events proved him wise, since after the Protector's death, Richard Cromwell (for all the hopes

---

141 'Agreements Tripertite', HP 26/49/1A.

142 Webster, *Great Instauration*, 232-42.

143 *Ibid.*, 239-40, and 529-32 for identification of the staff as a whole.

invested by Hartlib and Boyle in him as a patron of learning) bowed meekly to pressure from the established universities and declined to grant Durham equal status. After a promising start, the new college faded quickly into oblivion.<sup>144</sup>

Hartlib introduced Kuffler to Cromwell around the beginning of 1657, but beyond Kuffler's being 'freundlich empfangen' by the Protector,<sup>145</sup> nothing seems to have come of the meeting. At some point that year he also set up a maltings (for whatever else Kuffler may have been, he was certainly resourceful), but again without any apparent success.<sup>146</sup> Not until 13 May 1658, some two years after his arrival, was he finally given an opportunity to demonstrate his torpedo. Moriaen, Hartlib, Boyle and Brereton all waited in mildly horrified anticipation to see what the outcome would be; Brereton at least was present at the display, which took place at Woolwich. Moriaen, as Hartlib told Boyle, hoped that Kuffler 'may not blow up a good conscience to get riches by such means'.<sup>147</sup> The demonstration, in the

144 Ibid., 242.

145 No. 160.

146 Nos. 167, 169, 174, 178.

147 Hartlib to Boyle, 13 May 1658, Boyle, *Works* VI, 108: this letter also mentions Brereton's attendance. See also Moriaen's comments in nos. 181, 182, 183, 184. Winthrop, who learned about the business later, felt the same: 'I wish you could prevaile with Dr Keffler to bury that fireworke [...] in oblivion [...] there are menes ynough already knowne to the world of ruin & destruction to mankind' (Winthrop to Hartlib, 25 Aug. 1660, HP 32/1/7B).

event, was a failure, a fact Moriaen attributed to divine disapproval: 'so mag Gott kein gefallen an diesem furnehmen haben und den succes deswegen hindern' (no. 182). Boyle apparently shared these misgivings, for Moriaen later added, 'Ich bin mit H Boÿle eines sinnes und will lieber zu einigen furnehmen rathen und gluckwunschen als zue diesem' (no. 183). Kuffler would never have become engaged in such an enterprise, he repeatedly stressed, if not driven by financial extremity. Hartlib, indeed, seems to have been rather keener than most of his correspondents to see this warlike device promoted, so long at least as it was to remain in the hands of the godly nation he had made his home.<sup>148</sup>

A second demonstration, however, which took place at Deptford on 4 August 1656, was by all accounts a spectacular success. According to an anonymous German report in Hartlib's papers, the torpedo immediately blew a breach of over nine yards in the ship it was aimed at, sinking it instantly: the writer described it as a 'treffliches arcanum [...] zu verderben des menschlichen geschlechts', claiming it could also be used on land to annihilate entire regiments at a stroke, and that 'Es scheint den Engelländern beschert zu seyn durch eine

148 On Hartlib's attitude to such subjects, see Timothy Raylor, 'New Light on Milton and Hartlib', *Milton Quarterly* 27 (1993), 19-31, on Hartlib's (and Milton's) promotion of Edmond Felton's 'godly' engine of war.



Wunderliche Providentz'.<sup>149</sup> A few days later, Hartlib mentioned to Boyle that 'Dr Kuffler was with me on Monday, telling in what words you had congratulated the success of his terrible destroying invention'.<sup>150</sup> Moriaen's earlier remarks would seem to suggest that these words were not entirely approbatory.

According to Kuffler's later petition to Richard Cromwell, the Protector was so impressed with this devastating device, which as Hartlib put it would 'enable any one Nation that should bee first Master of it, to give the Laws to other Nations at Sea',<sup>151</sup> that he offered the truly magnificent sum of ten thousand pounds for it, £5000 for the proof and a further £5000 for a full revelation.<sup>152</sup> Cromwell having died the following month, however, the matter had been left in abeyance, and the purpose of Kuffler's petition was to claim the £5000 he was owed and renew the offer of full disclosure for a further £5000. This contrasts rather dramatically with the remark made twice by Moriaen that he had been offered £1000 for a demonstration and a further £1000 for a full revelation, Moriaen's opinion being that he should settle

---

149 Anon., 8 Aug. 1658, HP 48/6/1A.

150 Hartlib to Boyle, 10 Aug. 1658, Boyle, Works VI, 113.

151 Hartlib, testimonial on Kuffler, 26 May 1659, 53/41/3A.

152 Kuffler's petition to Richard Cromwell, HP 66/18/1A-B.

for the one thousand and consign the horrible secret to oblivion.<sup>153</sup>

Whatever the true figure Kuffler had been offered, Richard Cromwell proved no more scrupulous about honouring his late father's promises in the case of the torpedo than in that of Durham College. Kuffler never did receive his award, and as Moriaen and Boyle had hoped, the workings of the 'terrible destroying invention' were never revealed. Subsequent approaches to Charles II, though they did lead to an preliminary inspection by Pepys, also remained fruitless.<sup>154</sup> By April 1659, Hartlib was trying to secure Kuffler a post as physician to Boyle's elder brother Lord Broghill, for 'now he dares not go upon the streets to follow his business, for fear of being arrested. But such a protection would save him from all his creditors'.<sup>155</sup> Kuffler was now engaged on yet another new project, involving fertilisers, and Hartlib played adroitly on Boyle's moral unease about the earlier scheme: if Kuffler could find sponsorship for his agricultural plans, 'he would willingly desist from all eager pursuits about his dreadful and destroying machine'.<sup>156</sup>

---

153 Nos. 176 and 183.

154 Pepys, *Diary*, ed. Latham and Matthews, III (London, 1970), 45-6.

155 Hartlib to Boyle, 12 April 1659, Boyle, *Works* VI, 119.

156 *Ibid.*, 118.

Thanks probably to this or a similar petition from Hartlib, Kuffler managed to weather the storm. Though Hartlib was still complaining as late as March 1660 that he could not prevail upon the state to take the interest it should in any of Kuffler's proposals,<sup>157</sup> he seems to have found a sufficient private market for his dyes, fertilisers and ovens to get by. He was still making, or at least displaying, his ovens in 1666, at the age of over seventy: John Evelyn on 1 August that year 'went to Dr. Keffler [...] to see his yron ovens, made portable (formerly) for the Pr. of Orange's army'<sup>158</sup>

However various, and in many cases limited, the success of these inventors may have been from a personal point of view, their practical and theoretical expertise represented an important contribution to intellectual life and technological advance in England. Throughout the 1650s, Moriaen, in his discreet fashion, was a principal instigator and conveyor of such contributions. While the distasteful but unavoidable subject of money frequently came to the fore and hindered or compromised the ideal of a 'free and generous communication', communication there certainly was, and he and Hartlib between them were a major channel for it.

---

157 Hartlib to Winthrop, 16 March 1660, HP 7/7/2B.

158 John Evelyn, *Diary*, ed. W. Bray (London, 1879), II, 198. See also Webster, *Great Instauration*, 390.



## 2:4 The Godly Entrepreneur

The estate of Hulkestein, where Moriaen was now settled, did not belong to the Kufflers. The fragmentary accounts of the estate in the Rijksarchief, Arnhem show that from 1599 to 1666 it belonged to the Van De Sande family, whence it passed to a nephew, Johan Brantsen.<sup>159</sup> There is no mention in the records of either Kuffler or Moriaen, nor of the dye works. Kuffler rented Hulkestein, and in his absence, Moriaen was standing surety for him.<sup>160</sup> Against what security Moriaen could have done this if he was as destitute as he claimed is a moot point. Poverty short of outright starvation is a relative concept, and there is no suggestion he was starving: he even got by until 1658 without selling his West India shares. But he was certainly no longer in the situation to which he had been accustomed, and was in a state of constant anxiety as he waited to hear news of Kuffler's success in England.

The suggestion that Moriaen had gone to Arnhem to superintend, and indeed probably to take a share in, the Kufflers' dye-works is supported by Moriaen's at first

159 It was a large estate alongside the Rhine, just to the north-west of Arnhem. There is a rather purple description in A.J. Van Der Aa, *Aardrijkskundig Woordenboek der Nederlanden* (Gorinchem, 1844) V, 896-7. It was destroyed in the Second World War.

160 This is abundantly clear from no. 176, in which Moriaen specified the rent (104 Imperials a year) and that he had vouched for it, as also for other debts of Kuffler's (cf. also no. 181).

referring to it as 'unßere färberēy', presumably meaning his and the Kufflers'. By the beginning of 1658, this had run into the doldrums, and Moriaen had consequently had no income whatsoever since the previous September, when the merchant he had been dealing with had declined to renew his contract.<sup>161</sup> He put his failure on the market down to his inability to dye in more than one colour (probably the 'Bow scarlet' the Kufflers had imported into the Netherlands from their father-in-law Drebbel's dye-works at Stratford-le-Bow). However, he was unable to find anyone who could teach him to branch out, until a young Nürnberger happened by on his way from England offering to teach him all the arts of dyeing at a remarkably low rate (less than 12 Imperials). Moriaen was immediately moved to stake all his remaining money and any more he could by any means raise on relaunching the business. This latest piece of improvidence was enough to move Odilia Moriaen to emerge for once from the historical shadows by protesting about it strongly enough for her husband to consider the fact worth mentioning to Hartlib. Even after he had lectured her on the manifest operation of the hand of God in the matter, he had to admit that he won her 'consent' only with difficulty.<sup>162</sup>

From this point in the letters onwards, 'unßere färberēy' becomes 'meine färberēy', suggesting that

161 No. 167.

162 Ibid.

Kuffler had abandoned what appeared to be a sinking ship, perhaps handing over his stake in the business to Moriaen in lieu of his debts to him. Perhaps he had already resolved to settle again in England, this time for good. It is impossible, however, to be certain exactly what the financial arrangements were, as no documents have survived and Moriaen's letters are extremely vague about such details.

Virtually nothing else is revealed of the Nürnberg master dyer, who remains nameless and is hardly mentioned again: though Moriaen originally envisaged sharing the profits with him, it seems the young man simply sold his expertise and went on his way. Presumably Hartlib had met him in England and suggested he visit Moriaen, for Moriaen expressed his effusive thanks to God and Hartlib in roughly equal proportions. This is characteristic of their providential view of things: Moriaen could, with the utmost seriousness, see the encounter as a clear indication that God was guiding his affairs and also view Hartlib as God's chosen instrument. In the philosophical terms of the day, Hartlib was a 'secondary cause', and amply deserved recognition as such, but the prime mover in all matters was God. It is a clearer manifestation of the attitude earlier taken to the intelligence his circle received from Hartlib on the eve of the Civil Wars, 'darfur wir Gott vnd EL dankbar sindt' (no. 47).



Similarly, when Dury reached England in time for Comenius's arrival in 1641, it must have been obvious that the immediate impulse for his coming (as for Comenius's) was an urgent summons from Hartlib, but Moriaen still saw their coming together as 'eine sonderliche schickung Gottes vnd gutes zaichen' (no. 65).

There followed a string of letters of increasing urgency and proportionately decreasing subtlety bewailing Moriaen's lack of capital resources for the venture and fear that all would fail for want of a long term loan of a mere £200.<sup>163</sup> Hartlib did his best to help his friend. He told Boyle in February 1658 that he had

shot an arrow of charity at random toward Zurich [which] lighted upon our resident there Mr Pell, who hearing of his [Moriaen's] very low condition, and to have been assisted with 31 sterling by Dr Vnmussig, ordered, that the sum of 101 sterling, should be made over to that worthy man out of the pension, which the state doth pay him quarterly.<sup>164</sup>

Consequently, Hartlib added, he did not wish to press Moriaen for medicine from Glauber, lest Moriaen should suspect an ulterior motive behind Hartlib's petitioning on his behalf, or stint himself for Hartlib's sake:

if I should beg a few doses of the Glauberian medicine, Mr Morian might happily think, that I

---

163 Nos. 172, 173, 176, 183.

164 Hartlib to Boyle, 2 Feb. 1658, Boyle, *Works*, VI, 100-101. The published version gives 'Dr Van Mussig', an obvious mistranscription of 'Vnmussig', the pseudonym of the Paracelsian physician Johannes Brun. On Pell and Brun, see Chapter Four, section 3, and Chapter Three, section 2 respectively.

desired to be gratified this way, which truly is far from my spirit and intentions. But I am confident, if I should venture such a request upon him, he would certainly pay for the medicine whatever it should cost, out of those supplies, which have been procured, by the blessing of God, upon my hearty recommendations.<sup>165</sup>

Whether or not Boyle responded to the hint implicit in this story is not recorded, but many of Hartlib's friends and acquaintances did. The £3 from Unmüssig was acknowledged in August 1657.<sup>166</sup> Comenius, Rulice and Hartlib himself all contributed.<sup>167</sup> The MP and Neoplatonist thinker John Sadler was moved to send £10, asking in return only that Moriaen use his contacts in the printing industry to obtain Heinrich Bunting's rare *Itinerarium Sacrum* for him.<sup>168</sup> Hartlib hoped to make Moriaen a beneficiary of his projected Council for Learning, hopes for which were constantly being revived (and re-dashed) in the late 1650s. Exactly what sort of a role Hartlib had in mind for him is unclear, but it was probably that of local agent and intelligencer. He appears on none of Hartlib's surviving draft lists of prospective members of the Council.

The Council of Learning turned out to be another of Hartlib's pies in the sky, but the donations he sent or elicited seem to have been sufficient to enable Moriaen

---

165 Ibid., 101.

166 No. 162.

167 Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 303.

168 Nos. 183, 186, 187, 189.

to relaunch the business with some success. Moriaen, now well into his sixties, threw himself into this small cottage industry with a religious fervour of striking intensity. Indeed, to an age accustomed to see material and spiritual gain as utterly distinct if not outright antithetical, it can seem comically incongruous. There is a veritable deluge of references to 'Gottes genädige schickung', the 'wunderbahre fursehung Gottes an mich' (no. 167) and the like: the enterprise begins to sound more like a mystical pilgrimage than a business venture:

Ich werde woll wunderlich geleitet und weiß  
nicht wohin aber ich will mit blindem gehorsam  
meinem laidsman folgen, der mags versehen was  
der in mir sein und werden will des bin Ich  
zuefrieden (no. 172).

But this quasi-mystical approach is characteristically combined with a shrewd eye to a business opportunity. At one point, he announced that, despite being quite without funds or security, he had purchased all the necessary equipment and taken on an overseer and an unspecified number of hands on two year contracts. An almost identical diatribe to the one just quoted, stressing once again that he was acting not according to human reason but 'nach kindlichem vertrauen in einem blinden gehorsam der mich leitenden hand Gottes', is followed immediately by the remark that this was just the moment to catch the springtime orders from the local merchants before they sent their cloth to their usual dyers in the province of



Holland. To Moriaen, there was manifestly no discontinuity between the two thoughts. Like his old friends the De Geers, though obviously on a far smaller scale, Moriaen might be viewed as an archetype of the godly entrepreneur.

The highly ambivalent relationship in the Dutch 'Golden Age' of a ruggedly Calvinist ethos with an economy thriving principally - and spectacularly - on trade and speculation is analysed with great wit and originality in Simon Schama's *The Embarrassment of Riches*.<sup>169</sup> That ambivalence is encapsulated in his delightful declension, 'I invest, he speculates, they gamble'. Some dextrous ethical juggling was called for, Schama suggests, when unprecedented economic expansion driven largely by the manipulation and exploitation of markets coincided with a religious ethos that stressed primarily the virtues of penitence and self-denial, while the culture of the 'self-made man' sat ill with Calvinist notions of predestination. Christ's warnings about the camel and the eye of the needle,<sup>170</sup> about the rich man and Lazarus,<sup>171</sup> could not easily be ignored in such a society. Against these, however, could be set the

---

169 Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 1988).

170 *Matthew*, 19:24; *Mark*, 10:25; *Luke*, 18:25.

171 *Luke*, 16:19-31.

parable of the talents,<sup>172</sup> or the injunction to cast one's bread upon the waters.<sup>173</sup> The sin, then (or so the rationalisation went), was not to make money but to hoard it: the root of all evil is not money itself but the love of it.<sup>174</sup> Furthermore, disposable income provided a means of performing those good works that could not possibly guarantee membership of the elect but might very well be a sign of it. Conspicuous expenditure, wise investment and public philanthropy became, according to Schama, the standard strategies by which the wealthy Dutch, and especially those who were becoming wealthier, sought to square their ethos with their income.

The level of Moriaen's expenditure is not ascertainable. As has been suggested, however, the frequent changes of house during his early Amsterdam years probably represent part of an attempt to make outlay keep a seemly pace with income. By 1651, for all his claims of impecunity, he was living on the Princengracht, in one of the grand new buildings that still distinguish Amsterdam three and a half centuries later with their imposing blend of opulence and sobriety,

---

172 *Matthew*, 25:14-30, the classic Scriptural authority for capitalism: 'Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury [...] unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance: but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath' (v.27-29).

173 *Ecclesiastes*, 11:1.

174 *1 Timothy*, 6:10.

embodiments of the conflicting ideals of the godly entrepreneur. As he later ruefully remarked, 'Ich habs etwan an mir selbsten wolgehabt' (no. 173). He collected Oriental manuscripts and other rarities; he was able in the 1640s to leave home on tours lasting weeks or months; he could offer substantial loans to Comenius, Rave and others, and he could risk very considerable sums on speculative alchemical ventures.<sup>175</sup>

That Moriaen himself lent money is abundantly clear; whether he did so on interest cannot be determined. The hundred Imperials Comenius borrowed from him in 1641 appear to have been repaid six years later without any extra charge, but Comenius may well have benefitted from special treatment: Moriaen was, after all, collecting alms for him at the time. What is certain, however, is that he had no qualms about taking money against usury. In two of his thinly-veiled pleas to Hartlib to find him a patron or investor for the dye-works, he made specific reference to this point, stressing his willingness to offer an attractive return on any contributions.<sup>176</sup>

One of many tightropes the godly entrepreneur had to walk was that of accepting what Schama calls the 'providentially distributed opulence' of high return on a

---

175 Details of his alchemical projects are given in Chapter Seven, section 2.

176 Nos. 167 and 174.



risky investment<sup>177</sup> without falling into the sin of improvident gambling. For all the time he had spent in Cologne warning parishioners such as Kuiper against the evil of games of chance, Moriaen seems to have taken a fairly elastic view of the distinction. He evidently had no qualms about appearing in the Bourse, or Amsterdam Stock Exchange, an institution much condemned by Calvinist preachers and lampooned by puritanical satirists.<sup>178</sup> Fishing and, especially, whaling, which appear to have represented his major investments in his early Amsterdam years at least, were notoriously high-risk ventures, with potential profits running high but a fair risk of total loss, partly on account of the inherent dangerousness of the activity, partly because of the ceaseless depredations of privateers, to which at least three expeditions Moriaen had a stake in fell victim.<sup>179</sup> The same willingness to run risks is abundantly evident in his venture with the dye-works.

Of all the rationales for making money, directing it into good works naturally represented the least morally complicated. A man earning ten thousand Imperials a year

---

177 *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 309: Schama is referring here specifically to the grand lotteries held in the Netherlands, but it is very much part of his point that any return on an investment involving the risk of loss could be viewed in the same way.

178 See Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 347-9. Moriaen's attendance at the Bourse is mentioned in nos. 34 and 73.

179 See above.

could contribute more, quantitatively, to the public weal with ten percent of his income than a man earning one thousand could with fifty percent of his. The widow's mite was not, of course, to be despised, but it was still only a mite.

The attitude of Lodewijk de Geer to the getting and redistributing of worldly wealth provides a striking insight into the mentality of the godly entrepreneur. De Geer declined to take out insurance on any of his ships or family, giving the equivalent sums instead to charity, principally to the refugees from the Palatinate and the Spanish Netherlands. Moriaen remarked that the poor 'theilen [...] mit seinen gewin proportionaliter' (no. 50). Blekastad suggests that by this means de Geer had 'sich [...] die Gnade Gottes bei gefährlichen Unternehmungen erkaufte'.<sup>180</sup> This, however, is something of an over-simplification. It should not be supposed de Geer was trying to strike a deal with God. He knew very well that any covenants between Creator and creature were for the former alone to draw up. The gesture was more one of proffered sacrifice, for the Lord to take or not as he saw fit. When in due course de Geer was relieved of nine ships to the value of some fifty thousand guilders,<sup>181</sup> his reaction was probably very like that of

---

180 Blekastad, *Comenius*, 333.

181 Assuming Moriaen's second-hand report in no. 50 to be accurate.

Moriaen after his crash in the late 1640s: personal distress and concern for his dependents, tempered by acquiescence to God's will and a patient willingness to watch and wait until divine Providence should offer an opportunity to recoup the loss and resume the former works of charity. Job provided a precedent at once cautionary and reassuring.

Once Moriaen had launched his new dye-works, he promptly returned to a favoured charitable practice of his age, the dispensing of medicine. He was delighted to acquire as a nearish neighbour in Arnhem the Paracelsian iatrochemist André Niclaus Bonet, personal physician to the Elector of Brandenburg.<sup>182</sup> Thanks to the ten pounds Hartlib had procured him from Sadler, he wrote in June 1658, he had been able to buy coals and set up a cauldron, so that 'kunfftige woche soll und mus ich den leuthen helfen die nun lang auff uns gewartet haben und aus mangel eines kessels nicht haben geholffen werden können' (no. 187). While it is unclear what exactly Moriaen was cooking up in his philanthropic cauldron, the likeliest explanation by far is some sort of chemical medicine, for this stress on 'helping many' seems to rule out the possibility of its being merely a part of the dyeing equipment. In July 1658, Moriaen approached Bonet

182 According to an anonymous report from Berlin, Bonet was offered this post in Jan. 1655 after curing the Elector's wife of toothache (9 Jan. 1655, HP 39/2/31B). Moriaen applied the title to him in no. 152.



for advice and assistance, 'umb das einige patienten mit der fallenden Kranckheit [epilepsy] behafftet sich bey mir angeben [haben]' (no. 190). This is an unequivocal indication that he was operating some sort of medical practice alongside his dye-works.

There is another hiatus in the surviving holograph letters between July 1658 and January 1662, though it is obvious the two men remained in touch,<sup>183</sup> so no personal account of Moriaen's affairs is available, but numerous remarks from other sources suggest that his circumstances were at least comfortable again by early 1659. The clearest indication of this is that he went some way to returning the favours the now increasingly hard-pressed Hartlib had shown him, sending £3.8/- through his nephew Jan Abeel on 18 April 1659,<sup>184</sup> and another £3 in March

---

183 This is obvious from a number of remarks by Joachim Poleman. He asked Hartlib to convey Moriaen's reaction to his (Poleman's) medical ideas (HP 60/4/105A, n.d. but 1659 or 60), and thanked him for not revealing his (Poleman's) name when passing on his (profoundly negative) assessment of Friedrich Kretschmar to Moriaen (HP 60/4/150B, 17 Oct. 1659). Hartlib in turn reported Moriaen's favourable opinion of Poleman's *Novum Lumen Medicum* (1659) (HP 60/4/183A, 2 Jan. 1660). There is also an alchemical letter, probably from Kretschmar, of 1660, in which Hartlib is urged not to pass on the contents to anyone, especially not to Moriaen (HP 31/23/28A-31B; see Chapter Six, section 5 for a fuller account). On 21 April 1661 Moriaen's nephew Isaac de Bra (son of Abraham and Moriaen's sister) sent Hartlib a letter of recommendation from his uncle (now lost but mentioned at HP 27/41/1A).

184 HP 27/44/1A-2B.

1661.<sup>185</sup> Already by February 1659 he was in a position to send the overseer of his works to Amsterdam on business, and the following month was considering having a special 'optical lantern' made for himself.<sup>186</sup> In mid-1659 he revisited Amsterdam at least twice, lodging at Glauber's house,<sup>187</sup> which suggests that the dye-works was running well enough for him to entrust it to the supervision of his employees and/or his wife. The physician, alchemist and diplomat Friedrich Kretschmar, who met him during this stay in the capital, thought him 'stattlich':<sup>188</sup> an ambiguously complimentary term tending to suggest an air of prosperity. In March 1660, Hartlib strongly implied an upturn in his fortunes, and neatly epitomised the image of the godly entrepreneur, when he told John Winthrop that

Honest Mr Morian is still alive not far from Arnheim, having erected a new dying of colours in grain &c whereby he maintains himself and hopes to prosper in time to be able to serve the good of many.<sup>189</sup>

---

185 Dury to Hartlib, 11 March 1661, HP 4/4/5A-B, with instructions to Dorothy Dury to cash for Hartlib (at a favourable rate) a bill of exchange from Moriaen.

186 No. 193.

187 Kretschmar to Hartlib, 1 August 1659, HP 26/64/3B, and Poleman to Hartlib, 29 August 1659, HP 60/10/1A, both mention the first visit. Poleman also mentioned his arrival two days before 10 Oct. 1659 (to Hartlib, HP 60/10/2B), and departure before 17 October 1659 (HP 60/4/105A).

188 Kretschmar to Hartlib, 1 Aug. 1659, HP 26/64/3B.

189 Hartlib to Winthrop, 16 March 1660, HP 7/7/3A. Winthrop, who had met Moriaen during a visit to Europe, had asked after him the previous December (Winthrop to Hartlib, 16 Dec. 1659, HP 32/1/4).



A measure of financial security thus recovered, Moriaen must have been free to redouble his interests in optics, alchemy and chemical medicine, the main themes of the fragmentary remains of his letters of 1659. He was particularly concerned to find someone who might provide relief for Hartlib, who by this point was in continual agony from what he described as 'my three most tormenting diseases',<sup>190</sup> to wit haemorrhoids, what he took to be an ulcer either of the bladder or the testicles, and what he took to be a stone either in the liver or the kidneys. In his last years, he was taking increasingly desperate remedies for an increasingly desperate condition, and there can be little doubt that many of his treatments did him more harm than the ailments themselves. Peter Stahl, a chemist and iatrochemist who was shortly to come to England armed with a recommendation from Moriaen,<sup>191</sup> sent over some 'spirit of salt' (hydrochloric acid) for Hartlib's treatment which the patient was distressed to find had a tendency to dissolve the glass bottles it was kept in. What worried Hartlib seems to have been the fact that he had consequently lost a substantial amount of the medicine, not the thought of what it was doing to his innards.<sup>192</sup> Poleman was having made for him a

190 Hartlib to Boyle, 27 April 1658, Boyle, *Works* VI, 103.

191 No. 187.

192 Hartlib to Boyle, late April/early May 1659, *Works* VI, 122. On Stahl, see Turnbull, 'Peter Stahl, The First Public Teacher of Chemistry at Oxford', *Annals of Science* 9 (1953), 265-70.



whalebone catheter through which he might painlessly (Poleman claimed) inject into his bladder an acid distilled from four to five week old urine, in order to dissolve the stone.<sup>193</sup> In December 1661, Moriaen's young friend Albert Otto Faber<sup>194</sup> moved to England armed with a variety of treatments for Hartlib. He presented him with an amulet made from a urine-moistened cloth rubbed in 'sympathetic powder', a 'Primum Ens des Saurbrunnens' to be taken in beer or Spanish wine on an empty stomach, and 'ein lb. Ludi veri Paracelsi wie derselbe zu Antwerpen, nach Helmonts Anweisungen gefunden wird, vnd ich ihn von Moriano empfangen habe'.<sup>195</sup> It is interesting to find Moriaen still actively seeking, and indeed believing he had found, Paracelsian remedies at this late date, and being able to send to Antwerp to obtain them. Whatever the 'ludus' really was, it is unlikely, given the extraordinary properties ascribed to it, that it was cheap.

The last surviving letter of the correspondence - a stray holograph which may well be indeed the last written - makes melancholy reading, and suggests that Moriaen may have contributed, indirectly, inadvertently and probably mercifully, to Hartlib's death. Hartlib had received,

193 Poleman to Hartlib, 19 Sept. 1659, HP 60/4/186A-B.

194 See no. 139, n.8.

195 Faber to Hartlib, December 1661, HP 39/2/70A-B. The 'ludus Paracelsi' was one of the near-miraculous cure-alls of the Paracelsist chemical physicians, which will be discussed in Chapter Five.

obviously through Moriaen's recommendation, a medicine from one 'Herr Kreußner', who is mentioned nowhere else in the papers and of whom I can find no other trace. Nor is there any indication of the medicine's content: Moriaen did not know what it consisted of, only that it had proved efficacious in other cases. All that is clear is that it was causing Hartlib even greater pain than he was accustomed to. Moriaen was embarrassed, distressed, and unable to suggest anything but prayer. Two months later Hartlib was dead.

His death effectively brings to a close Moriaen's recordable history. This same last letter also contains the news that Moriaen was preparing to leave Arnhem and return to the province of Holland, but it has not been possible to ascertain whether the plan was carried out. The very manuscript of this last letter, which is badly damaged, seems to embody Moriaen's disappearance from historical record. The text becomes increasingly fragmented and illegible, finally breaking off altogether as the bottom of the paper is torn off through the middle of the last farewell. The signature is entirely missing.

The proposed move suggests perhaps that the dye-works had been successful enough for Moriaen, who was now about seventy, to retire at last on the profits, but without further evidence no definite conclusions can be drawn. What is certain is that in spite of all his

complaints about his ill health and failing strength, he survived for several more years. The history of his whereabouts and activities for this period is a complete blank. There remains only the report sent by a downcast and ailing Theodore Haak to John Winthrop on 22 June 1670, in reply to the latter's 'kinde & large letter to me last year'. This constitutes a catalogue of woe including a lawsuit and a serious illness, but principally the death of 'my dear wife' and

a sad traine of many other troubles to me; besides the losse of many very speciall ffrends in severall parts, & especially of that dear & worthy frend of ours Mr Moriaen, whom I had so great a Desire to have seen once more. He & his wife soon deceased one after another, & I am informed that all his goods & those many excellent curiosities & rarities he was master of were suddenly sold, distracted, scattered.<sup>196</sup>

Winthrop's letter being lost, the obvious inference is that the events related in Haak's may have occurred at any point between early 1669 and the date of the letter, 22 June 1670.<sup>197</sup> But this is to assume that Haak was informed of Moriaen's death straightaway and that he recalled perfectly the sequence of events over a particularly unhappy period during much of which he was seriously ill. A circumstantial clue suggests Moriaen's

196 R.C. Winthrop (ed.), *Correspondence of Hartlib, Haak, Oldenburg and others of the founders of the Royal Society with Governor Winthrop of Connecticut 1661-1672* (Boston, 1878), 45; the published edition gives the obvious mistranscription 'Morlaen'.

197 Barnett seems to me rash to assume that everything recounted in the letter happened in 1669 (Haak, 140-1).



death occurred in 1668. Amongst the 'curiosities and rarities he was master of' was an Arabic manuscript of the Greek mathematician Apollonius Pergæus belonging to Christian Rave, which Rave sent him in 1651 to forward to Claude Hardy in Paris.<sup>198</sup> Hardy never received it, and as late as 1669 Rave was

still complaining about certain unnamed persons who were detaining his manuscript "without the pretext of debt on my part" (which probably means, since he was a notorious liar, that the affair was somehow involved with his debts).<sup>199</sup>

But by then the manuscript was in the hands of Thomas Marshall, later Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, who had purchased it from the Amsterdam bookseller Ratelband almost certainly in the first half of 1668 and certainly not later than 24 June.<sup>200</sup> Rave was evidently not aware of this and perhaps thought Moriaen still had it. That Moriaen was deeply concerned about Rave's unpaid debts to him a few years before he was sent the paper has already been mentioned,<sup>201</sup> and whether they were ever settled in full remains uncertain. It is conceivable, then, that he detained Rave's manuscript as security against them, though obviously any number of other explanations are

198 Rave to Moriaen, 12 Nov. 1651, Bodleian MS. Lat. misc. c.17 f.42.

199 Gerald Toomer in a letter to me. I am extremely grateful to Mr Toomer for the information about the history of the Apollonius manuscript and Moriaen's involvement with it.

200 His interest in Apollonius was aroused in December 1667, and he had shown Castell the manuscript by 24 June 1648.

201 See above, and nos. 94, 95, 96, 98.

feasible. If this was indeed the case, the fact that the manuscript materialised in an Amsterdam bookshop in the first half of 1668 strongly suggests that this is when Moriaen died.

During the nearly eighty years of his life, Moriaen had been closely involved with some of the leading figures in the intellectual life of the day, foremost among them Hartlib, Dury, Comenius and J.R. Glauber. He had also been acquainted with a host of figures now largely forgotten but whose ideas and activities seemed at the time hardly less important, and a knowledge of whom is essential to a full understanding of the thought of the period on its own terms. He was personally and practically involved in promoting new technology and ideas, above all the concepts of Pansophy and alchemy that were so central to the 'Third Force'. His fortuitously preserved letters present a unique individual perspective on a whole mental world.

## Chapter Three

### An Intelligencer's Ethos

'Man wird doch auch hiernegst nicht so sehr darauff sehen was fur eine Persohn einer auff dem Schawplaz dießer welt agiret sondern wie Er dieselbe agirt und vertretten habe' - Moriaen to Hartlib, 1 January 1658 (no. 167).

#### 3:1 Public and Private

The foregoing biographical account of Moriaen portrays him in the context of his society, as a figure who, though he never held any political office as such, was primarily defined by his various functions in public life, as preacher, charity worker, physician, merchant, projector and entrepreneur. This is undoubtedly how he saw himself. The topos of the individual as an actor on the public stage, most famously epitomised in Jacques' monologue in *As You Like It* and frequently invoked by Comenius, is entirely characteristic of the self-perception of the members of Hartlib's circle. The notion of a 'private' or 'inner' life is a Romantic one which would have been largely incomprehensible to Moriaen. Nonetheless, the image of the actor on the public stage does surely imply a different and somewhat more vulnerable self beneath the greasepaint, albeit 'self' is not a word that would have been applied to it at the time. There follows a brief assessment of Moriaen's personality, and an account of the beliefs and precepts, shared to a large extent with many others of



the group, through which he made sense of himself and his activities.

Moriaen's correspondence with Hartlib cannot be described as personal or private. The very notion of a private letter to Hartlib, indeed, was virtually a contradiction in terms. His surviving papers abound in requests to the addressee to show the contents to no one else, or even to burn the letter after reading it, all faithfully copied out in the hand of one or other of his scribes. If anything was delivered in confidence it was necessary to stress the fact, Moriaen's stock phrase being 'sed hæc pereant inter nos' ('but let these [words] perish between us')<sup>1</sup> - not that Hartlib could be trusted even then to respect such commitments to secrecy.

This is not to condemn Hartlib as unscrupulous or deceitful. He saw it as his calling to disseminate information, and must frequently have experienced a conflict between such private injunctions to secrecy and a sense of duty to what he perceived as the common good. On the whole, he tended to favour public over private obligation. He deeply upset Dorothy Dury, for instance, by publishing her letter to Katherine Ranelagh explaining why she had decided to marry Dury.<sup>2</sup> George Starkey too was furious when the alchemical tract *George Riplye's*

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 160, 161, 179, 181, 190.

<sup>2</sup> *HDC*, 248; Dorothy Dury to Hartlib, n.d., HP 3/2/143A-144B.

*Epistle [...] Unfolded*, which he had confided to Hartlib, appeared in the *Chymical, Medicinal and Chirurgical Addresses*.<sup>3</sup> Anyone writing to Hartlib was well aware - or at least ought to have been - that he or she was addressing not an individual but potentially the whole scientific community of Europe and even beyond.

Private disburdenment was not, therefore, the purpose of these letters. As many of Hartlib's correspondents were fond of remarking (often at paradoxical length), time was a precious commodity loaned by God to be devoted to the furtherance of His cause, not frittered away on personal anecdote. The main aim of Hartlib's and Moriaen's correspondence was either the coordination of projects such as the promotion of Comenius, in which both men were involved, or the exchange of information; and in either case the material was intended to be made available to other involved or interested parties, not necessarily through publication. Among the projects discussed by the circle, some of the most eagerly pursued were those for shorthand writing, double or multiple writing machines, and processes for making copies of letters automatically, to save the time and expense of copying longhand or employing scribes to

---

<sup>3</sup> William Newman, 'Prophecy and Alchemy: The Origin of Eiranæus Philalethes', *Ambix* 37 (part 3, Nov. 1990), 97-115, 101-2.

do so.<sup>4</sup> Hartlib was one of the century's most active promoters of 'scribal publication', the dissemination of tracts and letters in manuscript copy.<sup>5</sup> 'Scribal publication' is a good deal more difficult for later historians to trace and assess than printing, but was at least as important as a means of communicating new ideas and knowledge. The letters Moriaen wrote to Hartlib, and those that reached Hartlib by way of him, were all intended to be fed into this semi-public communication network.

The attitude is exemplified by Moriaen's remark that he had opened, read and made copies of some letters sent him for forwarding, and hoped Hartlib would not object to his taking this liberty.<sup>6</sup> Evidently Hartlib did not, since Moriaen later remarked very much as a matter of course that he had read a letter from Comenius to Hartlib that had passed through his hands.<sup>7</sup> When Worsley complained that Moriaen had not written to him for four months, Moriaen replied that he had not considered it necessary, since he had written to Hartlib and assumed Worsley would have been told all his news.<sup>8</sup> The substantial numbers of his letters that survive as

---

4 Nos. 63, 64, 191, and see *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray (London, 1879) II, 80.

5 See Mark Greengrass, 'Scribal Publication', *Acta Comeniana*, forthcoming.

6 No. 28.

7 No. 34, 23 Jan. 1640.

8 Moriaen to Worsley, 27 Jan. 1651, HP 9/16/1A.



scribal copies or translations prove that copies of these were indeed being passed round by Hartlib to interested friends and acquaintances. He specifically promised Winthrop, for instance, copies of some of Moriaen's letters,<sup>9</sup> and it was probably material from Moriaen that Hartlib referred to when he sent Boyle 'the continuation of the respects from Amsterdam'.<sup>10</sup> Poleman acknowledged receipt of an extract from Moriaen and requested more.<sup>11</sup>

There was little room in all this for private opinion or personal anecdote except where it touched directly on more general and public issues. A certain amount slipped through, of course, for these people were not characterless automata, but it had to do so as it were by the back door. The public good could provide the justification for personal anecdote, as in a letter from Hartlib to Boyle about a new medicine, which begins:

I am so out of love with my tormenting pains, that I have never a good will to mention them, but when they may be an occasion of ushering in some good communication or other, for the ease and health of many.<sup>12</sup>

Moriaen took exactly the same attitude to the relation of private sorrows and joys. Even the death of his daughter

9 Hartlib to Winthrop, 16 March 1660, HP 7/7/3A.

10 Hartlib to Boyle, 24 July 1649, Boyle, *Works VI*, 78. The first mention of Moriaen in their surviving correspondence occurs on 9 May 1648 (*ibid.*, 77).

11 Poleman to Hartlib, 5 Dec. 1659, HP 60/4/159A; cf. Chapter Five, section 3.

12 Hartlib to Boyle, c. June/July 1658, Boyle, *Works VI*, 111. In fact, Hartlib mentioned his 'tormenting pains' in very nearly every surviving letter of his last years.

was mentioned only in the guise of an excuse for his failure to have made further progress with the collection for Comenius:

zeithero meinem Iungsten hatt es Gott gefallen  
mein ainiges Kindt mit kranckheit zue besuchen  
vnd endlich von dieser welt abzuefordern,  
welche kranckheit tod vnd begräbnus vnd was  
demselben anhängig mich eine zeit hero zue hauß  
gehalten, vnd an gewunschter fortsetzung  
gehindert hatt (no. 21).

This is not to suggest he was unaffected by the event, but rather to illustrate how inappropriate he evidently felt it to dwell on so personal a misfortune. In fact, it was surely the delay in the collection that provided the excuse for relating the loss, rather than the loss that excused the delay in the collection.<sup>13</sup>

It is, therefore, singularly difficult to form any clear picture of Moriaen as an individual. As to his physical appearance there is no evidence whatsoever. With regard to his beliefs, he was extremely reluctant to commit himself to an opinion on any but the most concrete of matters. His character and personal qualities can be deduced only from odd stray comments, most of them far

---

13 Cf. Simon Schama's crushing refutation of the idea that the tone of resignation or even indifference affected by many commentators of the day toward infant death, and indeed infants in general, reflects a genuine 'self-protective callousness' and 'self-denial of tenderness' in the face of extremely high infant mortality rates: *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 517-521. Such mortality rates are, after all, only high by comparison with a situation no one at the time had ever experienced.



from specific, by his various acquaintances, and from reading conjecturally between the lines of his own letters.

There is much of the Reformed ethos of simplicity, moderation and self-control about his habits of thought and what little is known of his behaviour. He had no taste for opulence, either in his prose style or in his own or anyone else's personal habits. He was particularly critical of Kuffler's family (though he obviously had a vested interest in Kufflerian thrift), in which 'niemand sich behelffen sondern vollauff haben will wie mans bey guten zeiden gewohnet hatt' (no. 162). He spoke harshly of those 'hohen Persohnen' who misused learning 'zu ihrer wollust vnd geitz' (no. 120). He specifically commended Comenius's frugality in being prepared to live and work on the relatively modest sum of £100 a year: 'Diß sein gut vertrawen vnd wiedertrachtigkeit hatt mir sehr woll gefallen' (no. 23).

Dury's notorious sister, by contrast, elicited a shocked reaction from Moriaen when he met her in 1640. It should be said he was by no means alone in his unfavourable opinion: she was by all accounts an extremely quarrelsome and dishonest woman, who lived beyond her means, largely on bad debts, and was much given to spreading malicious gossip about her brother's wife and friends. Dury himself hoped that God would



'forgiue hir malice which she hath against yow [Hartlib]'.<sup>14</sup> In August 1644 she pursued her brother to Rotterdam, where he was then pastor at the English Church, and wooing Dorothy Moore. Dury was much preoccupied at this period with finding a way of getting his sister off his hands. This he finally achieved in 1645 by marrying her off to Heinrich Appelius, a close friend of Dury who at some point had worked as his secretary.<sup>15</sup> The relief is palpable in his report to Hartlib on April 21 that

this day I am to marrie my sister to Mr Appelius & then to leaue them to their resolution of going into Germany. Shee hath beene & is a great distraction to me the Lord free me from the like in tyme to come.<sup>16</sup>

It thenceforth fell to Appelius to send Hartlib apologies for offences caused him and his friends by the sharp tongue of 'mea dura Duræa'.<sup>17</sup> The spirited Dorothy Moore, who was certainly not a spiteful or quarrelsome

---

14 Dury to Hartlib, 4 May 1645, HP 3/2/117B.

15 On Appelius, see Van Der Wall, *Serrarius*, 107-111. In a letter of 23 Aug. 1650 to Hartlib, Appelius mentioned an unspecified period 'when I had the credit to bee his [Dury's] pen-man' (HP 45/1/42A). This may have been the period immediately before the marriage: on 1 Dec. 1644 Dury mentioned 'Mr Appelius whom I maintaine till God prouide otherwise' (HP 3/2/77A). See *HDC*, 246-7.

16 Dury to Hartlib, 21 April 1645, HP 3/2/114A. In the event, the Appeliuses settled in Purmerent, near Amsterdam.

17 Appelius to Hartlib, 26 Nov. 1645, HP 45/1/22A: 'Wo sonsten mea dura Duræa ihn vnd andere freündte beleidiget, bitt ich, mich selbiges nicht entgelten zu lassen, sondern in der alten liebe bleiben vnd von mir auch alle schuldigkeit wiederumb erwarten'.

person, supplies perhaps the most convincing evidence of her future sister-in-law's personal shortcomings.

Weighing up Dury's proposal of marriage in late 1644, she came close to turning him down because of the sister, as she confided to Hartlib in a number of letters. 'Such a woman liues not as mr Duryes sistir one towne shall never hold vs both,'<sup>18</sup> she declared; 'it were a meere maddnes to put one selfe in danger of liuing in one contry with her'.<sup>19</sup> It appears she was spreading scandal because Dorothy visited her husband-to-be in Rotterdam before the marriage. Even after Dorothy had become Dury's wife, she told Hartlib 'I doe professe I will part out of the contry from him; if hee bringes her to torment mee for shee hath enough already begun to deuide our affections'.<sup>20</sup> Even to contemplate such a course of action was an extreme and scandalous move for the devout wife of a Protestant minister, and strongly suggests she was genuinely under extreme provocation.

What most upset Moriaen, however, seems to have been not so much Miss Dury's behaviour as merely her appearance. His account of her visit to him - undertaken with a view to borrowing money - is a rare instance in his overwhelmingly practical and/or cerebral correspondence of graphic physical description, and as

18 Dorothy Moore to Hartlib, 13 Oct. 1644, HP 21/5/18A.

19 Dorothy Moore to Hartlib, 30 Jan. 1645, HP 21/5/22A.

20 Dorothy Moore to Hartlib, n.d. (but certainly after the marriage), HP 3/2/144A.



such is very revealing, of him at least as much as her. He enumerated in horrified detail her fine items of clothing, down to the materials and colours, and with a sharply puritanical eye singled out the detail of her wearing her hair loose. He was distressed and angered ('betrübt vnd geärgert') by the immodest spectacle (no. 39).

Only twice in all his surviving letters is there mention of his enjoying a sensual pleasure. One of these is music, the other the admiration of the natural world. A musical instrument he saw and heard in Nürnberg 'konde mich so bewegen das nicht ein bluts-tropfe an seinem ortt bliebe' (no. 133). After a particularly hard Dutch winter, he delighted to see the thaw set in and the earth reawaken: 'die Bethaw diese lange zeit ganz under waßer gelegen kombt nun wieder so grun herfur das ein lust anzusehen ist Gott mach uns danckbar für seine genade' (no. 175). Beyond these two impeccably pious examples - Calvin had specifically commended music as a glorification of God,<sup>21</sup> and the admiration of Nature was manifestly a celebration of the work of Creation - there is not a single mention of the pleasures of the flesh. And its sufferings are given equally short shrift, though there is no doubt Moriaen experienced his full share of

---

21 T.H.L. Parker, *John Calvin* (London, 1975), 104, citing Calvin, *Opera selecta*, ed. P. Barth, W. Niesel, and D. Scheuner (Munich, 1926-52) II, 16-17.



them. News of his incipient bladder stone, for instance, was accompanied only by the stoically fatalistic observation that the pain was 'noch nicht unerträglich' (no. 187).

This is, again, not to suggest that Moriaen was an unfeeling man. Indeed, his delight in experimentation, his almost childlike excitement at solving problems and making new discoveries in nature, surfaces again and again. Of mathematics he could write, 'Ich bin dieser sachen auß der maßen begierig all meine tage gewest' (no. 10), and of new discoveries in optics, 'Ich weiß woll wie einem das herz brent wan man so etwas fur vnd der meinung nach ersehen hat' (no. 30). He acknowledged receipt of a work on agriculture with the comment, 'wie ich alle mein lebetag ein sonderlicher liebhaber des Ackerbawes gewesen bin sambt der viehe zucht also sind dergleichen tractat vnd wissenschaften mir vor allem lieb zu lesen' (no. 20). Friedrich Kretschmar was quite right, it would seem, to describe him as at once 'welthassend' and 'lustig'.<sup>22</sup>

Hartlib's papers, especially the *Ephemerides*, which - almost uniquely within the collection - were not intended for even semi-public distribution, supply a few more personal touches, among them some humanising blemishes. 'Mor. hath a stinking breath not beene able

---

22 Kretschmar to Hartlib, 1 Aug. 1659, HP 26/64/4A.

with all his Arts to cure himself of that'.<sup>23</sup> The aristocratic scholar and chemistry-lover Kenelm Digby considered him talented but faddish, unable to bring any project to a conclusion.<sup>24</sup> Worsley wrote ambiguously from Amsterdam that 'when I writt my last this day 7 night I was a little dull, neither had I much time; our Morian that day inviting Dr Kiffler, & this [sic] wife to dine with me at his house'<sup>25</sup> - though whether it was the shortage of time or the dullness, or both, that Moriaen and the Kufflers were responsible for is open to conjecture. The logician J.H. Bisterfeld, when he visited Amsterdam in 1639, certainly seems to have been at some pains to avoid Moriaen, constantly finding letters to write or other pressing engagements when Moriaen wanted to visit him.<sup>26</sup> The report of Bisterfeld's departure rings distinctly crestfallen: 'ist zeithero nie bej mir gewesen als wie Er mir valedicirt hatt vnd darzue mit wenig wortten' (no. 11)

For someone who, at least in his early years in Amsterdam, took such a keen interest in the 'Art of Memory',<sup>27</sup> Moriaen seems to have been remarkably absent-minded, even while relatively young. There are countless examples of this trait. His letters feature a Hamburg

23 Eph 48, HP 31/22/29B.

24 Eph 54, HP 29/4/11A; see epigraph to Chapter One.

25 Worsley to ? (scribal copy), 27 July 1648, HP 42/1/1A.

26 Nos. 4, 5 and 10.

27 Nos. 5, 6, 14 and 21.

didactician whose name Moriaen had forgotten, and, more strikingly, a letter of recommendation for someone whose name he claimed not to know (though the person in question is referred to again in the next letter as a good friend).<sup>28</sup> Other letters have him failing to forward one letter and forwarding another to the wrong recipient.<sup>29</sup> He upbraided himself on two separate occasions for not being able to remember whether he had passed on material from Hübner to Comenius: in the one case, he suspected he had not, since he had just come across a copy among his own papers; in the other, conversely, he concluded he probably had, since he could not find a copy at home.<sup>30</sup> Hartlib sent Appellius some prophecies of the English astrologer William Lily, which Appellius rashly lent to Moriaen, who lost them.<sup>31</sup> The most extreme example (admittedly from quite late in Moriaen's life) is the remark 'Ich weiß nicht ob dem Herrn einer Paulus Felgenhawer bekandt ist' (no. 174), for the mystic and chiliast had featured at least eight times before in their correspondence, often at some length, and it was Moriaen himself who some years previously had sent Hartlib Comenius's refutation of him.<sup>32</sup>

---

28 Nos. 15 and 26 respectively.

29 Nos. 44 and 114.

30 Nos. 49 and 59.

31 Appellius to Hartlib, 23 Aug. 1650, HP 45/1/43B.

32 No. 73; on Felgenhauer, see above, Chapter One.



On the other hand, he seems to have been exceptionally well-liked. In a correspondence rich in the abrasive personal attacks so frequently indulged in during the period, it is striking that no one at all has a bad word to say about him, while his friendliness, generosity and trustworthiness excited frequent comment. The Scots scholar William Hamilton found him 'a very learned man, & an humble & cowrteous spirit; & one, whom I much esteeme'.<sup>33</sup> It should be said that Hamilton, who had given up his post at All Souls, Oxford, and left England for the Netherlands to avoid having to comply with the Act of Allegiance<sup>34</sup> (or face the consequences of not doing so), had a vested interest in flattering Moriaen, through whom he thought he might be helped to a post at Franeker University. The purpose of his letter was to ask Hartlib for a letter of recommendation to him. But others wrote in similar terms without there being any possibility of an ulterior motive. Comenius's son-in-law

---

33 Hamilton to Hartlib, 16/26 Nov. 1650. Hamilton had become friendly with Dury and Hartlib in 1647 and not long afterwards added his signature to their pact with Comenius committing themselves to mutual support both moral and financial in their efforts for church unity and the reform of learning (HP 7/109/1A-2B, transc. *HDC*, 458-460). Ten years later he fell out with them and was released from it (HP 9/11/31A-34B). See *HDC*, 262-3, 287-9.

34 To 'the Commonwealth of England as the same is now established, without a King or House of Lords': initially required of all officials and university graduates, this was made compulsory on the entire male population on 2 Jan. 1650 (*HDC*, 267-8; Gardiner, *History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate I*, 176, 193, 246).

Petr Figulus knew him to be 'an honest & good man'.<sup>35</sup> Johannes Brun judged him 'ein freundlicher vnd aufrichtiger Man [...] deßen man wohl genießen kan so viel ich vermercke'.<sup>36</sup> John Sadler expressly thanked Hartlib for putting him in contact with various friends including 'mr Morian; with whom I am never weary'.<sup>37</sup> Friedrich Kretschmar described him as 'ein sehr stattlicher gottliebender, welthassender, erfahrner, auch lustiger und conversabler mann'.<sup>38</sup> Hartlib wrote of him to Winthrop as 'a man of a lovely spirit and a true nathaniel in the main',<sup>39</sup> and Winthrop in turn was delighted to hear good news about 'that honest worthy true Nathaniell as you are pleased rightly to terme him'.<sup>40</sup> Haak's heartfelt lament to the same addressee over the death of 'that dear & worthy frend of ours [...] whom I had so great a Desire to have seen once more' has already been cited.

Even the acerbic Joachim Poleman, whose letters abound in poison-pen-portraits of a wide variety of individuals and who found fault with almost everyone he encountered, accused Moriaen of nothing worse than gullibility, principally on the grounds of his

---

35 Figulus to Hartlib, 2 Nov. 1658, HP 9/17/43A, transc. in Blekastad, *Figulus*, 235.

36 Brun to Hartlib, 13 June 1649, HP 39/2/9A.

37 Sadler to Hartlib, n.d., HP 46/9/23A.

38 Kretschmar to Hartlib, 1 Aug. 1659, HP 26/64/4A.

39 Hartlib to John Winthrop, 16 March 1660, HP 7/7/3A.

40 Winthrop to Hartlib, 25 Oct. 1660, HP 32/1/9A.



association with Glauber and others of Poleman's pet hates.<sup>41</sup> Poleman affected to be appalled that Moriaen could take seriously the alchemist Heinrich Liebhart,<sup>42</sup> and was deeply condescending about his high regard for Glauber:

Daß Her Morian mehr rechte philosophie beÿ sich habe, als er selber wiße, solches kan gar wol sein [...]; so aber Her Morian solche philosophi in seiner eigenthümblichen Scients hatte, so würde er vom Glaubero nicht können bethöret werden; aber es mag wol seÿn, daß er magk sehr wichtige wißenschafften in Scriptis haben.<sup>43</sup>

When Hartlib sent him what was obviously a favourable report from Moriaen on Glauber's work, Poleman declared,

Wegen dess H Morians an den H gethane relation, verwundere ich mich nicht wenig, vnd erkenne darauss, wie ein mensch, so er erstlich mit einer præconcipirten opinion behaftet ist, durch dieselbe in die gröste absurda hingerissen werden kan.<sup>44</sup>

'Mich wundert aber noch dieses zum höchsten', he added later, again à propos Glauber, 'dass [Francis de la Boë] Sylvius, Morian, vnd andere die verstandige vnd erfahrene leute seÿn wollen, nicht mehr verstand gebrauchen, vnd

---

41 See Chapter Six, section 5.

42 Poleman to Hartlib, 19 Sept. 1659, HP 60/4/58A: on Liebhart, see no. 192, n.1.

43 Poleman to Hartlib, 19 Sept. 1659, HP 60/4/101A. The apparent inconsistencies in location references for Poleman are due to the fact that Hartlib had his letters copied out in the form of extracts and rearranged thematically rather than chronologically: thus two quotations from the same letter may appear at very different locations, or two from different letters at the same location. The originals are now lost.

44 Poleman to Hartlib, 29 Aug. 1659, HP 60/10/1A.



solche betriegerey nicht mercken können'.<sup>45</sup> He was particularly sarcastic about Glauber's fruit wines, an art of his which Moriaen especially admired and wished he could have had revealed to him:

Dz Glauber sonderliche wissenschaft habe in weinmachen auß honig rosinen etc. nach H. Morians zeugnuß solchs mag woll sein, vnd were ja nicht gutt, dz Er nit etwz wahrhaftiges wißen solte; Es kan aber auch wol sein, dz Er dem gutten H. Morian gutten naturlichen wein fur seinen kunstlichen außgegeben. Den die liste dieses Glaublosen Glaubers ist sehr groß.<sup>46</sup>

Coming from Poleman, such mild and morally neutral criticism virtually amounts to a testimonial. Poleman was not alone in seeing Moriaen as credulous: Worsley apparently passed similar judgment, and Moriaen himself - especially after he had lost all his money - did not deny it:

H Worslej urtheilt recht von mir dz ist mein mangel und fehler dz ich so leicht glaübe und des besten mich zue anderen versehen thue und das hatt mich umb das meinige gebracht sonst würde Ich izund niemands nötig haben. Ich habe der einfalt der dauben mich allezeit mehr beflissen als der Schlangen klugheit die mir nicht gegeben ist (no. 183).

This may ring more than a trifle sanctimonious to modern ears, but it should be remembered there is much evidence to suggest it is no more than the truth.

---

45 Poleman to Hartlib, 10 Oct. 1659, HP 60/10/2B.

46 Poleman to Hartlib, 21 Jan. 1660, 60/4/194A-B. On Moriaen's interest in Glauber's fruit wine, see no. 168.

Whatever justice there may have been in Poleman's low opinion of Moriaen's insights into both chemistry and human nature, there can be no doubt that his personal integrity was generally admired, as the previously cited remarks of Hamilton, Hartlib, Winthrop, Kretschmar, Figulus and Brun all bear out. The most striking testimony of this is a letter from Dury to Hartlib, written in 1654 while Dury was on his way to Switzerland together with Pell, the two having been appointed Parliamentary agents to the Protestant Cantons, in Pell's case on the recommendation of Haak.<sup>47</sup> Dury was for some reason very keen that Pell's involvement should be kept secret, and was alarmed to discover Haak had incautiously mentioned it to the Swiss Stockar.<sup>48</sup> He urged Hartlib to have the whole business hushed up: 'I wish that Mr Haak had not mentioned any thing to Mr Stockar of a double companion; I pray tell him of it & bee silent to all others even to Moriaen'.<sup>49</sup> The clear implication of this is that Moriaen was seen as the soul of discretion, to whom even the most sensitive information would normally be entrusted as a matter of course.

---

47 Barnett, *Haak*, 98-108.

48 Johann Jacob Stockar was Ambassador for Schaffhausen in Piedmont, and is frequently mentioned in Dury's letters from Switzerland, as is 'Mr Stockar who is with you' (ie. in England), presumably a relative of his and the recipient of Haak's confidence.

49 Dury to Hartlib, 24 April 1654, HP 4/3/1A. In fact, Moriaen already knew perfectly well that Pell was with Dury (no. 139): this is yet another instance of the folly of expecting Hartlib to keep a secret.



If he was little criticised by others in the circle, he in turn was singularly slow to chide. Though not afraid to speak his mind, he nearly always did so politely. As will be discussed in more detail, he was forthright in his criticisms of various members of the circle, including Hartlib himself, when he thought such criticism necessary. But his strictures were delivered in very measured, reasonable terms, as friendly admonitions rather than personal attacks. His comments on another man's work could equally well be seen as a characterisation of his own approach. Approving Hübner's harsh but on the whole objective (and certainly never *ad hominem*) criticisms of Comenius's *Didactica Magna*,<sup>50</sup> he asserted,

es ist durch auch [*sic*, for *durchaus*] rathsam vnd nötig das alles inter amicos privatim auff's fleisigste examinirt vnd censurirt werde, ehe mans vnder die leuthe vnd ans liecht kommen laße (no. 31).

Though the evidence leaves little doubt that both Christian Rave and William Wheeler sponged on him shamelessly, and he called on Hartlib to help in the recovery of at least some of his debts after his financial collapse in the late 1640s, he was never (so far as we know) personally rude about his debtors and never accused them of deliberately swindling him. The letters following Kuffler's departure for England feature

<sup>50</sup> See Kvačala, 'Über die Schicksale der *Didactica Magna*', *MCG* 8 (1899), 129-144.



a long litany of money worries as he was repeatedly called on to settle his friend's debts, while Kuffler's hopes of striking it rich were repeatedly deferred, and the inventor frequently failed even to let Moriaen know what he was undertaking or to attempt to explain or excuse the delay.<sup>51</sup> By July 1657 he was reduced to pawning his furniture to pay off Kuffler's debts.<sup>52</sup> Nonetheless, despite a moment of evident irritation when in lieu of money Kuffler sent some wholly impractical advice about the dye works,<sup>53</sup> Moriaen never lost faith in his friend's good nature, repeating over and again that he would certainly set things to rights if it were within his power to do so and even putting down his lack of communication to the likelihood that he was too busy with his schemes to write.<sup>54</sup> It is not clear from the surviving letters whether or not his trust was finally vindicated.

It was only those he saw as working actively against the common good who roused his real ire. Given his generally placid and charitable disposition, it is quite startling to find him sharing the blood-lust against Strafford and Laud that gripped England in 1640 and

---

51 Eg. nos. 152, 173, 181.

52 No. 160.

53 No. 175.

54 No. 181.

1641.<sup>55</sup> It would be as well to finish Strafford off quickly, he observed, in a rare excursion into realpolitik, or he would wriggle out of the net and it would have been better not to have tried him in the first place.<sup>56</sup> He saw Laud and Strafford as the men who had caused a schism between the King and his people - separated the head from the body, as Moriaen himself put it with unintentional prescient irony.<sup>57</sup> Laud, moreover, had actively obstructed the collections for the Palatinate, as Hartlib testified at the former's trial. Moriaen observed soon after Laud's arrest that he found it hard to believe there were still some in England who believed the Archbishop would be vindicated as a good patriot, the implication being that in Moriaen's eyes he was an obvious traitor.<sup>58</sup> Whether he saw that treachery as lying in Laud's supposed attempt to Romanise the Church of England or in more specific political manoeuvres is uncertain, but he certainly thought it merited the death penalty. Sending Hartlib a cipher by which he might convey politically sensitive information, Moriaen proposed, as a slightly macabre illustration of how it might be used, a sample encodement of the message 'episcopus morietur' ('the bishop is to die') (no. 70).

---

55 For a full account of this, see John Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (revised edition London, 1984), 6-17.

56 No. 61.

57 No. 74.

58 No. 50.

The other abuse of power that completely outstepped the wide bounds of Moriaen's tolerance was the misapplication of alchemical wisdom. The note of grim satisfaction in a well-merited death is struck again in his bitter remark on the French alchemist Pierre Jean Fabré, 'Wan Faber in Frankreich todes verfahren so ist ein betrieger weniger in der Welt' (no. 139). Fabré is not mentioned elsewhere in Moriaen's correspondence, and quite what he was supposed to have done to deserve such a caustic epitaph remains a mystery. There is little doubt, however, that the charge related to abuse of his art. There is a distinct sense in a great many writers of the group that alchemical enlightenment constituted a divinely-inspired insight into Creation quite as sacrosanct as any understanding of Scripture, so that any wilful misrepresentation or abuse of such knowledge was tantamount to blasphemy if not heresy.<sup>59</sup>

The New England alchemist George Starkey (or Stirk) (1628-1665), who introduced himself to Moriaen in May 1651,<sup>60</sup> and corresponded with him for an uncertain period thereafter, became the object of one of Moriaen's harshest denunciations after he lost his credit with the group. When he first reached England in the late 1640s, Starkey made a profound impression on many of the circle, including Boyle, with whom he worked as assistant-cum-

59 See Chapter Five, section 1.

60 Starkey to Moriaen, 30 May 1651, HP 17/7/1A-2B.



collaborator from at least 1651 till 1652.<sup>61</sup> However, a deep disillusionment with Starkey set in in 1654. The alchemist, despite his ability to turn antimony into silver and iron into gold (feats of which Dury was an eye witness<sup>62</sup>), twice found himself in gaol for debt, and Hartlib wrote indignantly to Boyle that

he is altogether degenerated, and hath, in a manner, undone himself and his family. [...] He hath always concealed his rotten condition from us [...] Mr. Webb doth now rail at him and curse him, as having been most wretchedly seduced and deceived by him.<sup>63</sup>

Hartlib was not a man to despise anyone for having run into debt: it was the deceit that angered him, and his unaccustomed vehemence suggests that he bore other grudges too, not specified in the letter. It is typical of him, however, that he did not entirely despair of the American, and concluded the report, with an aptly chemical metaphor, 'When God hath brought you over again [Boyle was in Ireland at the time], we shall leave him altogether to your test, to try whether yet any good metal be left in him or not'.<sup>64</sup>

Reacting probably to comment of this sort from Hartlib, and no doubt reflecting on his own experiences

61 A fuller account of Starkey's relations with the circle as a whole and Moriaen in particular, with bibliographical references, is given in Chapter Seven, section 2.

62 Eph 51, HP 28/2/18A.

63 Hartlib to Boyle, 28 Feb. 1654, Boyle, *Works* VI, 79-80. 'Mr Webb' has never been identified.

64 *Ibid.*, 80.

with Starkey,<sup>65</sup> Moriaen denounced the American in no uncertain terms, hinting this time not just at false claims but at positively nefarious use of his undisputed gifts:

Es ist schade und Iammer dz der Mensch sein verstandt nicht beßer anlegt zum guten lieber als zuem bößen aber das ist fast aller solchen geschwinden ingenien artt das sie sich lieber auff Ejtelkeit legen als dem guten obligen andere die es gern thun wollen sindt mit solchem verstand nicht begabt (no. 167).

It is tempting to speculate that among these unfortunate souls whose good intentions are not matched by their gifts, Moriaen perhaps had himself in mind. But if to be principled and ungifted was a misfortune, to be gifted and unprincipled was a sin, and the force of this condemnation should not be underestimated. Moriaen was not a man to use the word 'evil' ('böße') lightly, and this passage represents not just disapproval but deep moral outrage.

Perhaps Moriaen's greatest disappointment in this respect was Clodius, a disappointment compounded no doubt by Moriaen's being at least partially responsible for his introduction to the circle and indeed his inclusion in Hartlib's family. Even from the first, the generally favourable impression made by Clodius was not universally shared. John Evelyn later described him, apparently with some justification, as 'a profess'd adeptus, who by the

65 See Chapter Chapter Seven, section 2.

same *methodus mendichandi* [method of lying] and pretence of extraordinary arcana, insinuated himselfe into the acquaintance of his father-in-law'.<sup>66</sup> Soon after his arrival in England, Clodius's behaviour began to upset and offend his old patron. His high-handed and transparently duplicitous response to the publicity for Kuffler's ovens has already been described. This, however, was only the beginning of Moriaen's disillusionment.

Clodius repeatedly failed to reply to Moriaen's letters, and particularly to his requests for details of medicinal recipes and alchemical processes which Moriaen clearly saw as just return for similar secrets passed on by him to Clodius. This elicited many bitter complaints from the older man.<sup>67</sup> Worst of all, Clodius neglected to put his skill in chemical medicine (of which no one seems to have been in any doubt) at the disposition of his ailing father-in-law.<sup>68</sup> Indeed, at the beginning of 1658, he and his family moved out of the Hartlib household altogether. The reasons for this break-up of the family remain unknown, but there is an unmistakable sense of disillusion in the cryptic account of the move Hartlib sent to Boyle:

---

66 Evelyn to W. Wotton, 12 Sept. 1703, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray (London, 1879) IV, 33.

67 See esp. nos. 172, 186, 189, and 190.

68 See esp. no. 180.



to my very great perplexity, Clodius is again in such a labyrinth, that he will be forced to break his ovens, and to remove to another house, which also is a new kind of undoing of him.<sup>69</sup>

(Whether Mary Hartlib took any consolation in having her kitchen restored to her goes unrecorded.) Hartlib implied in the same letter that his son-in-law's departure meant he would have no more access to a medicine for the stone Clodius had been preparing for him according to a recipe sent by Friedrich Kretschmar, which Hartlib considered the best he had ever tried. Again in April or May 1659, Hartlib told Boyle that 'my son [ie. Clodius] might have prepared Ludus Helmontii for me before this time, but he wants bowels'.<sup>70</sup> Later, he sent a recipe for a 'water against the stone', hoping Boyle would persuade the chemist Peter Stahl to

make a good quantity for yourself and the poor, and to let me also be partaker of it. Really, Sir, next to the ludus Helmontii I have found it the best medicine. There is no trusting to Clodius for it.<sup>71</sup>

Moriaen was furious with Clodius for his neglect of Hartlib. Like Starkey, he was failing to accept the responsibility that a gift from God entailed, and using it for personal advantage instead of rendering it back to the donor through service of his fellow man.

---

69 Hartlib to Boyle, 7 Jan. 1658, Boyle, *Works* VI, 99.

70 Ibid., 122. On the 'ludus Helmontii', see Chapter Five, section 1..

71 Ibid., 134, 26 Nov. 1659.

### 3:2 'Without Partialitie': the Irenic Ideal

There can be no question of Moriaen's piety. The manner of its expression, since he was entirely ungraced by the literary flair of a Böhme or a Bunyan, can at times come across misleadingly as smug or sanctimonious. He was much given - more and more so as he grew older - to long and often repetitious disquisitions on divine providence and the importance of abject submission to the will of God.<sup>72</sup> While these may tax the patience of the modern reader, they were an essential part of a Reformed thinker's mind set, providing genuine comfort in the face of adversity and reassurance that there was a point to all his undertakings, whether successful or not. The same formulae recur over and again, like a litany, particularly with regard to his own and even more so to Hartlib's medical tribulations. It seems likely Hartlib found real solace in them. He thought it worth abstracting a similar burst of pious platitudes from a letter of Poleman and noting it, in his own hand, under the heading 'Pietas Polmaniana'.<sup>73</sup>

Moriaen's orthodoxy in doctrinal terms is, however, much more in doubt, whichever brand of 'orthodoxy' one

72 There are examples in virtually every complete letter, but see especially nos. 167, 173 (featuring the tortuous protestation, 'so geschehe sein wille, und was sein wille sein wird das soll sein und ist auch eben mein wille'), 176, 182, 183, 187, 190.

73 Poleman to Hartlib, 19 Sept. 1659, HP 60/4/69B.

cares to look for. It is not that he was given to unorthodox pronouncements, rather that he was conspicuously not given to orthodox ones. His pious outbursts remain so firmly within the realm of generalisation, and so thoroughly avoid even the implicit invocation of any particular doctrine, that most of them would be perfectly acceptable not only to any Christian but to any monotheist, certainly to any Jew or Moslem.

Given the conventions of the time, the lack of reference to Jesus Christ in his letters is particularly striking. Though God is invoked, often repeatedly, in practically every surviving complete letter, Christ is glaringly conspicuous by his absence. It might be argued that Christ is implicit in any reference to God, being understood as a partaker of the latter's triune nature. But the fact remains that the vast majority of Hartlib's correspondents repeatedly invoked him by name, while Moriaen very rarely did so. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence of Moriaen's opinions about the nature of the Trinity. In one of his godly expostulations, he contrasted 'welttweißheit' with 'Christliche liebe mitleyden vnd vertragen', declaring that the latter have 'Ihr sonderliche principia daruber niemand als Gott vnd sein Gaist vrtheilen kan' (no. 111). Since he went to the trouble of specifying both God and the Holy Spirit,



it is all the more remarkable that Christ himself should not be mentioned as an arbiter of 'Christian love'.

As has been mentioned, he did commend Rittangel's work as material to be used in persuading Anti-Trinitarians as well as Jews of their errors,<sup>74</sup> but Rittangel's work was the translation of Jewish religious texts, and the use of Jewish material other than the Old Testament (and, debatably, the Apocrypha) to demonstrate the truths of Christianity hardly counts as doctrinal soundness on anyone's terms. Though he spoke of having reassured the Reformed preacher and theologian Caspar Streso, when recruiting him to the Comenian cause, that the pansophist's collaborator Georg Vechner was not a Socinian,<sup>75</sup> he did so without giving the least indication that he personally cared whether Vechner was a Socinian or not. It is true that he saluted his fellow ministers (or fellow ex-ministers) Van Assche and Dury with the formulae 'friend in Christ' ('vriend in Christo') or 'brother in Christ' ('frater in Christo', 'Broeder in Christo') on various occasions (all from relatively early in his life), but only in one surviving letter is Christ invoked as an active force personally involved in Moriaen's life. He spoke of himself, Hartlib and their ilk as having 'in der Schule Christi profess gethan [...] vns selbsten zu verleugnen', and broke into the

74 See Chapter One, and no. 78.

75 No. 17.

spontaneous prayer, 'der HERR wolle mir genädig sein worin Ich zue kurz komme und in mir wurckhen und schafffen was Ihme gefällig ist durch I. Chr.' (no. 167). This would be an unremarkable enough piece of piety were it not for the complete absence of such specific mention anywhere else. And even here, it is striking that whereas God appears in capitals, Christ is rather drastically abbreviated.

If he was recognisably the product of a Calvinist upbringing, it seems likely that, at least by the beginning of his surviving correspondence (for it would be rash to assume his opinions were consistent throughout his life), he troubled himself little about the finer points of Calvinist doctrine. Even during his service in Cologne, there is an admittedly circumstantial hint that while evidently regarding formalised and doctrinally specific religious observance as necessary, and indeed worth taking quite considerable risks for, he discreetly distanced himself from some of its more rigid tenets. It may be significant that on two separate occasions during Moriaen's ministry, when the German church had resolved to lodge a formal complaint at the consistorial meeting about the laxness of the Walloons and Dutch with regard to condemning dancing, Moriaen was sent as a German delegate, and the contentious issue was, in the event,

quietly shelved.<sup>76</sup> The whole question of dancing may seem a trivial one now, but to the elders of Moriaen's church it manifestly was not. As the Lutheran J.V. Andreae approvingly remarked of Calvin's Geneva, contrasting its methods with the much more permissive approach of his own church, the prompt and uncompromising extirpation of such lesser sins meant that more serious ones never had a chance to take root in the first place.<sup>77</sup>

Two of Moriaen's closest friends in the ministry, Justinus Van Assche and Pierre Serrarius, were shut out from the church for their unorthodoxy, Serrarius temporarily, Van Assche, it seems, permanently.<sup>78</sup> There is not the least sign that Moriaen thought any the less of either of them for this. When Serrarius applied to be accepted back into the fold at the beginning of 1637, Moriaen wrote to Van Assche, 'Mr Serrarius wensch ick een betere uytcoomste als ick wel hopen can door dien de partyligheyt hedens tags te seer groot is' ('I wish Mr Serrarius a better success than I can well hope for, partiality being all too great nowadays').<sup>79</sup> As is evident from the terms of this gloomy (as things turned out, unduly gloomy) prognostication, Moriaen thought not

---

76 *Protokolle I*, 302, no. 978 (19 Dec. 1624) and 333, no. 1052 (20 Jan. 1627).

77 Andreae, *Selbstbiographie*, 37-8.

78 See Chapter One.

79 Moriaen to Van Assche, 17 Jan. 1637, UBA N65d.



that Serrarius was too intransigent to deserve readmission, but that the Church was too intransigent to readmit him.

Neither Calvin's name nor any derivation of it occurs even once in his extant writings.<sup>80</sup> This does not in itself reflect any rejection of Calvin's views. On the contrary, Calvin had never set himself up as the founder of a sect (any more than Luther). Insofar as Moriaen was of the Reformed faith - though he never expressly applied that description to himself either - it was not in its respect for but on the contrary its rejection of any merely human authority in matters of religion.

This is precisely the charge laid against the Lutherans among whom he had grown up in the one surviving letter in which Moriaen commented, however briefly, on the validity of any particular church's teaching. His attitude confirms that he disapproved not only of this sect in particular but of sectarianism per se. The great fault of Lutherans, in his eyes, was that implicit in their name: that they had set up an individual human being as arbiter of matters beyond human jurisdiction, ascribing to him an authority he had never claimed for

---

80 There is mention of 'einen alten Calvinisten' in no. 121, but this is within an extract from an unspecified Romanist wit who used the word 'Evangelical' as a synonym for 'incurable'.

himself, and 'so gar alles was nur von diesem Man kommen ist fur lauter Euangelium gehalten' (no. 118). He cited the faithful noting down of Luther's *Tischreden* in all their notorious vulgarity<sup>81</sup> as a prime example of this inappropriate (if not positively idolatrous) excess of respect for an individual human authority. But Moriaen characteristically went out of his way to absolve Luther himself of the errors committed in his name: 'daran aber nicht so sehr Luthero [... die Schuld] zuezuschreiben, sondern den Ienigen welche unbesonnenerweiß darfur gehalten es seye lauter heiligthum was von ihme außgehe'. Luther had only aspired to be the translator and broadcaster of the sacred word, or a commentator upon it, not its author. Though Moriaen was fairly disparaging about the *Tischreden* themselves, on Luther's more serious theological work, as on Calvin's, he maintained a discreet and impenetrable silence.

Van Der Wall summarises well the attitude of Serrarius and intimates such as Moriaen and Van Assche: 'Onpartijdig, katholiek, universeel: dat zijn de sleutelwoorden, waarmee het ideale christendom door hen wordt aangeduid'<sup>82</sup> ('Impartial,<sup>83</sup> catholic, universal:

81 As *Eph* 39 notes, 'Luther in his writings hase far more beastly expressions then Felgehauer and therefore wee should beare as well with him as many others and Luther': source unclear but probably Hübner.

82 Van der Wall, *Serrarius*, 119.

83 'Impartial', at least in its modern sense, is less than satisfactory as a translation of either the Dutch 'onpartijdig' or the German 'unparteilich' (older German



these are the key words by which they expressed their ideal of Christianity'). 'Unparteiisch' was one of Moriaen's highest commendations of a group or an individual, and 'parteiisch', by the same token, one of his sternest criticisms. His one initial objection to Bisterfeld was, 'Er ist dem partheylichen wesen noch etwas zue sehr ergeben'.<sup>84</sup> Hugely impressed by the writings of Hübner, he declared: 'das zeugt von einem tieffsinnichen vnd grundlich verständigen vnd was bey mir das maiste ist, von parteylichkeit befreÿten vnd der warheit allein begierigen gaist' (no. 9), and again in almost the same words, 'Ich spühre in diesem Mann schon sonderlichen gaben, vnd welches mir vor allem liebet ein freÿ vnd vnparteÿisch gemuth' (no. 12). He similarly recommended the (unnamed) bearer of no. 26 as 'ein auffrichtig vnd vnparteÿischer der warheit liebhaber mit dem woll vmbzuegehen ist'. It was perhaps part of the appeal of Comenius that he belonged to a church (the *Unitas Fratrum* - 'Unity of Brethren', also known,

---

'unparteiisch'), but there is no modern English word that will do. There is a sense not only of disinterested standing back from overt espousal of any camp, but also of disapproval of the existence of such camps in the first place. This is the sense of 'impartial' as it was used by Dury and other irenicists and the one in which it will be used here in characterising Moriaen's ideas.

84 No. 1. The ADB apparently agrees: 'in seiner religiösen Anschauung ward er aus einem entschiedenen Gegner des aus England [in Siebenbürgen] eingeführten Puritanismus ein eifriger Anhänger desselben' (ADB II, 683).



inaccurately, as the Bohemian Brethren<sup>85</sup>) that acknowledged neither Luther nor Calvin as its founder but respected both, while its acknowledged father figure Jan Hus was in turn respected by the adherents of both main branches of Western European Evangelicism. One of the things that most distressed Moriaen about Comenius was, conversely, his addiction to doctrinal debate and personal polemic. Even the refutation of as unorthodox a figure as Felgenhauer seemed to Moriaen counter-productive, liable to alienate in advance a portion of the potential audience for Pansophy, the universal wisdom to which all humankind might acquiesce: 'das nimbt ihm viel zeit weg vnd macht Ihn beÿ vielen parteijsch' (no. 44). Advising in similar terms against Comenius's becoming embroiled in controversy with opponents of Pansophy, Moriaen urged a course which Comenius certainly never followed, but which does provide quite a good description of Moriaen's own approach in his correspondence:

Mein einfältiger Rath were das beÿ so verschiedenen sinnen vnd secten [...] man [...] so lang vnd viel möglich sich indifferent vnd vnparteijsch halten, in generalibus bleiben vnd sich ad particularia nicht begeben soll (no. 12).

This conscious and conspicuous standing back from controversy about doctrinal niceties is a consistent

85 The church was not nationally exclusive and included Moravians, Poles and others. Comenius himself was not Bohemian but Moravian.

feature of Moriaen's approach to religion from his earliest surviving letters to his last. Like Dury, he was convinced that the 'incidentals' of faith were of little significance, provided a community could be formed on the basis of 'fundamentals'. Dury too had a marked liking for the word 'impartial' (or, as he more often wrote, 'unpartiall').<sup>86</sup> So thorough was Moriaen's eschewal of comment on potentially divisive 'incidentals' that it is virtually impossible to deduce what he did regard as fundamental, beyond the idea that there is one Supreme Being whose will is discernible in the Bible and the natural world, and that it befits mankind to acquiesce unreservedly in that will. It is tenable, though unprovable, that this is indeed all he held to be fundamental.

The fact that Moriaen was for several years a minister of the Reformed Church - and not just occupying a comfortable living, but undergoing constant personal danger for what can have been at best a paltry material reward - should not be seen in any sense as evidence of wholehearted assent to the finer points of that Church's teaching. Of the hundreds of 'enthusiasts' whose supposedly extravagant and misguided opinions caused so many headaches for both the Lutheran and the Calvinist

---

<sup>86</sup> The heading for this sub-section is borrowed from Dury's self-justificatory tract *A Peace-maker without Partialitie and Hypocrisie* (London, 1648).



authorities of Germany as well as the Anglican ones in this country, a great many were ordained ministers. Access to a pulpit was one of the most effective means available to a man with a message, especially if he was concerned to disseminate that message not only to the learned elite but also to those whose lack of education and/or resources denied them access to books and pamphlets. I do not mean to suggest that Moriaen was himself such an 'enthusiastic' preacher: on the contrary, all the evidence suggests he had no doctrinal tub whatsoever to thump. My point is merely that the fact of his ministerial calling gives no more than a very broad indication of what his beliefs were. And I would suggest that, in later life at least, he distanced himself from all doctrinal details, including those his ostensible church deemed fundamental, to a degree that amounts to unorthodoxy by default.

Very revealing of his attitudes is his reaction to the report that his and Hartlib's mutual friend Johannes Brun ('Unmüßig') had fallen prey to atheism, the spectre that so haunted the experimental scientists of the seventeenth century. Brun was a Paracelsian physician who, after an itinerant youth during which he was for a time employed (and, he claimed, cheated) by Prince Rakoczi of Transylvania,<sup>87</sup> and also spent some time in

---

87 *Eph* 48, HP 31/22/12B.



Turkey, joined the influx of European projectors and scientists to England at the close of the Civil Wars. He bore a recommendation from Rulice and soon made friends with Hartlib:<sup>88</sup> he appears with considerable frequency as a source of information and commentary on medical and chemical matters in the *Ephemerides* of 1648 onwards. He later moved to Ireland, which is where he allegedly fell into atheism.<sup>89</sup>

Moriaen's first response to the news was appropriate horror - 'es hatt mir halb davon geschwindelt' (no. 166) - but he immediately followed this by making the crucial semantic distinction so rarely formulated at the period: was this atheism in the strict sense - that is to say a rejection of the existence of any god of any kind - or a denial of a particular understanding of such a being?

As Michael Hunter argues, the looseness with which the term 'atheism' was so widely used at the time should not lead us to underrate the seriousness with which the charge was laid. If 'atheism' tended not to mean knowing no god but having a false impression of God, that did not make it any less worrying and dangerous an error.<sup>90</sup> For

---

88 *Eph* 48, HP 31/22/9A.

89 See Webster *Great Instauration*, 302, and several mentions in Hartlib's letters to Boyle (Boyle, *Works* VI, 81, 85, 87, 94, 96, where his pseudonym is consistently mistranscribed 'Van Mussig').

90 Michael Hunter, 'Science and heterodoxy: An early modern problem reconsidered', *Reappraisals of the Scientific Revolution*, 367-396.

the majority of believers, of whatever brand, to misunderstand God's nature was tantamount to denying His existence, if not worse. To most people at this period, the idea that there was no divinity at all was such manifest nonsense that it barely called for refutation. A distorted image, however, was likely to be far more seductive to those insufficiently strong in the faith (whichever faith). Hence, the vast majority of attacks on 'atheism' address not denials but misconceptions of God. Such misconceptions could refer to any number of the divine attributes: to the Trinity, to God's providential scheme and activity in the world, to his nature while on earth in person, to transubstantiation or consubstantiation at communion, and so on ad infinitum.

Moriaen explicitly distanced himself from this etymological inexactitude in a manner that has important implications for an assessment of his own views. He wanted to know of the charge against Brun 'ob es nun atheismus stricte dictus oder eine verwerffung der Heiligen Schrift seye' (no. 166). A clear distinction is drawn here between the rejection of god as a concept and the rejection of a particular conception of God. While it is not stated in so many words that the latter error is less serious than the former, the implication is barely veiled. The sentence almost demands to be read '... oder nur eine verwerffung ...'.



This is followed by what appears to be a recommended strategy for guiding Brun back onto the true path: 'H Boreel pflegt sonsten ex lumina Naturæ contra Atheos zue disputirn und dieselbe zue convincirn beides das ein Gott und das die Schrifft sein Wortt seye'. But if this is a recommendation of Boreel's philosophy - and it can hardly be seen as anything else - Moriaen was selecting an authority almost as unacceptable to any established Christian church as the Jewish traditional teaching he had recommended for the instruction and correction of anti-Trinitarians. Boreel, who has already been encountered in the context of his studies of Judaism, was the founder of the Collegiants, a group which was virtually by definition unorthodox. The Collegiant position was that any human mediation between God's word and mankind was a corruption of it. They accepted no church and recognised no form of preaching beyond the unadorned reading of the Bible. God, they maintained, had already said what he meant and did not need mortals to clarify it. To attempt to explain his message was to pervert it.<sup>91</sup>

Indeed, if Moriaen's account of Boreel's attitude is accurate, his views were even more radical than this. It was generally accepted as a given, within all the

---

91 On Boreel and the Collegiant movement, see Walter Schneider, *Adam Boreel: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Giessen, 1911).



Evangelical camps, that Scripture is true. There remained endless scope for dispute on how to interpret it, but that fundamental point was taken as read. This is the starting point, for instance, of Dury's *Analysis Demonstrativa*.<sup>92</sup> Dury's aim in this work was to establish a method of Scriptural analysis that would be acceptable to all sides, so that having applied it, all sides might concur on the unambiguous interpretation it would yield. Though there is much discussion in the tract of undeniable first principles on which the edifice of interpretation can be founded, the initial assumption that what Scripture is found to mean once it has been interpreted aright must necessarily be true is taken as so self-evident that it is not even mentioned. Here, however, we have Boreel (as reported by Moriaen) considering that this tenet itself needs to be proven - as does God's very existence. Particularly interesting is that he is said to have set out to do so 'by the light of nature'. This is the 'Third Force' counterpart of Descartes' more famous crisis of faith. Descartes' solution was to take his own intellect as the given, and to found his whole inductive logic on the first principle of *cogito ergo sum*. Free-thinkers from the Evangelical wing tended to be more sceptical about the reliability of

---

92 See Chapter Four, section 3, for a fuller discussion of this work.

their rational faculties and to depend instead either on enlightenment or, as here, on practical observation.

Regrettably, Moriaen made no attempt to explain how Boreel purported to demonstrate the existence of God and the divine provenance of the Scriptures 'ex lumine naturæ'. But such a strategy represents a bold assertion of the primacy of enlightened observation and demonstration over doctrine and faith. For there was developing at this period an unsettling sense that these two camps were in opposition. Thomas Browne regarded such conflict as an opportunity for salutary exercise in subjugating reason to faith:

thus I teach my haggard and unreclaimed reason to stoope unto the lure of faith [...] this I think is no vulgar part of faith to believe a thing not only above, but contrary to reason, and against the arguments of our proper senses.<sup>93</sup>

Boreel's approach, to be sure, denies such a conflict: on the contrary, faith and reason are portrayed as pointing to the same conclusion. But it is not Scripture that confirms the accuracy of observation, it is observation that confirms the validity of Scripture. This shift in priorities was viewed with alarm by more conservative thinkers, and with good reason. For what would happen when finite and fallible human faculties misguidedly

---

93 Browne, *Religio Medici* (1643), *Works of Sir Thomas Browne*, ed. Geoffrey Keynes (London, 1928, new edition 1964) I, 19.



pointed to a conclusion that, instead of confirming Scripture, flatly contradicted the divinely vouchsafed truths?

Moriaen, however, seems to have had no such difficulties. He was himself throughout his life a tireless investigator of nature and an equally tireless quoter of Scripture. The latter habit was of course second nature to a trained Protestant preacher, though the Scriptural references became if anything more numerous as the years went by and the days of his active service in the Church receded into the past. But nowhere in his surviving correspondence - not even when he was commenting on specifically theological tracts - is there any remark whatsoever about any given Scriptural interpretation. One almost gains the impression that Moriaen did not bother his head unduly about the precise meaning of God's word, that being assured in general terms of the covenant between his Creator and himself and of the duties it imposed on and reassurances it offered him, he was content to go through this life at least suspending judgment on the finer details.

In particular, he never commented, so far as the surviving letters reveal, on the millennarian speculations and prophecies that were so eagerly discussed in Hartlib's circle and that have been depicted (I think correctly) as an important motive force driving



its three great proposed reforms: Comenius's of education, Dury's of the church and Hartlib's of science. In the politico-religious upheavals of the sixteentwentiethies and thirties, eschatology of one form or another came increasingly to define the habits of thought of even the soberest minds. From the perspective of those who saw Antichrist reigning in Rome, the events of the Thirty Years War were quite obviously a fulfilment of the prophecies in *Revelation*. Nor was such an interpretation the brainchild of some Puritan fanatic: Luther's gloss on the book set the precedent for the precise allocation of contemporary figures or nations to the allegorical visions.<sup>94</sup> Though Luther himself explicitly warned against the presumption of attempting to ascribe precise dates to those events foretold in Scripture that had not yet come to pass, particularly the Last Judgment,<sup>95</sup> his interpretation clearly suggested that by the mid-sixteenth century humanity had reached chapter 16,<sup>96</sup>

---

94 Cf. the introduction and marginal notes to *Offenbarung* in Luther's Wittenberg Bible of 1545: the four angels bound by the Euphrates who kill a third of humankind (ch.9) are Mohammed and the Saracens, Gog and Magog (ch.20) the Turks, the Beast of the Whore of Babylon (ch.17) the Roman Empire in both its original and its 'holy' incarnations, and so forth.

95 *Vorrede vber den Propheten Daniel*.

96 The prophecies of ch.16 are interpreted as referring to contemporary events: the plague of frogs represents 'die Plauderer/ so itzt den Fürsten heuchlen/ vnd wider das Euangelium geken'.

which meant there was, quite literally, little time left.<sup>97</sup>

Unity of faith throughout the world (to which the conversion of the Jews was to be a major contribution), and the increase of knowledge prophesied for 'the time of the end' in *Daniel*,<sup>98</sup> were widely seen as prerequisites for the Second Coming, and while it was obviously impossible for human endeavour to accelerate the divinely ordained scheme, it was of the utmost importance to such thinkers to feel that they were fulfilling the role assigned to them in the providential timetable.

Moriaen, however, was not particularly given to quoting the prophetic books of the Bible and not given at all to commending particular interpretations of them. On the other hand, he occasionally struck a revelatory note decidedly reminiscent of the millenarians and chiliasts with whom he was so familiar. The apocalyptic flavour of his comments on the gathering political crisis in England at the beginning of the 1640s has already been noted. In an alchemical letter to Van Assche, he directly related the Paracelsian prophecy of an unveiling to all men of the hidden secrets of Nature to the visions of

---

97 Cf. *Vorrede vber den Propheten Daniel*: 'Jch aber fur mich lasse mir daran genügen/ das der Jüngste tag fur der Thür sein mus/ Denn die Zeichen/ so Christus verkündigt/ vnd die Apostel Petrus vnd Paulus/ sind nu fast alle geschehen.'

98 *Daniel* 12:4.



*Revelation*: 'wir verwachten ommers naer syn belofde neffens den nieuwen hemel oock een nieuwen aerde daer rechtveerdigheit in wonen sal' ('we expect, according to His will, not only a new Heaven but also a new earth in which redemption shall dwell').<sup>99</sup> In other alchemical letters too he spoke explicitly of anticipating a 'Dawn of Wisdom'.<sup>100</sup> The nearest he came to an overtly millennial statement was in his comments on the plans Hartlib was promoting in the 1650s for a universal language that would undo the curse of Babel:<sup>101</sup>

die zeit wird verhoffentlich gekommen oder Ia nicht fern sein das wir nicht allein aus einem Characteren uns undereinander werden berichten und verstehen können sondern auch das wir mit einem mund Gott werden bekennen loben und preißen lernen, am tage der offenbahrung des Sohns des Menschen Luc: 17. 22. (no. 165).

However, some doubt must be cast on the fervency of Moriaen's commitment to this notion by the fact that, unusually, he gave the wrong reference. *Luke 17:22* in fact reads, ironically enough, 'And he [Christ] said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire

---

99 Moriaen to Van Assche, 23 Sept. 1642, UBA N65f, fol. 1v. Cf. *Revelation* 21:1.

100 See no. 20, quoted at the end of this chapter, the epigraph to Chapter Seven, and Chapter Seven as a whole.

101 See James Knowlson, *Universal Language Schemes in England and France 1600-1800* (Toronto and Buffalo, 1975), Vivian Salmon, *The Works of Francis Lodwick: A Study of his Writings in the Intellectual Context of the Seventeenth Century* (Longman, 'throughout the world', 1972), and Comenius, *Panglottia* (trans. A.M.O. Dobbie, Shipton on Stour, 1989).



to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it'.

One of Moriaen's favourite platitudes was 'die zeit wird alles offenbahren' - neatly encapsulating both the confident expectation that all *will* be revealed and the modest acceptance that it has *not* been revealed yet. While this is generally used with regard to relatively mundane matters rather than to God's broader purposes, a man of his background and training could hardly use the word 'offenbahren' without at least half-conscious reference to the last book of the Bible. This suggests again a willingness to dispense with certainties about specific details, to suspend judgment on exactly how and when the prophecy would be fulfilled until the event itself should reveal it.

Comenius was explicit about the millenarian impulse behind his work, as was Dury (though he became more sceptical about the subject after Christ's expected reappearance in the 1650s failed to occur. Moriaen's friend Serrarius was an utterly committed chiliast. Hartlib is frequently assumed to have shared such views, though in fact concrete evidence of Hartlib's personal opinions is almost as scanty as that of Moriaen's. He certainly took a lively interest in the discussion, and encouraged or sponsored publication of the apocalyptic speculations of John Stoughton, Joseph Mede and Francis

Potter ('the 666 man', as Hartlib called him with probably unintentional humour), but this should not be taken as wholehearted assent to their opinions.<sup>102</sup> Indeed, a throwaway remark by Moriaen with regard to Stoughton suggests a much more detached view: 'Von des Strughtonij Titulo vrtheil Ich mit EL das es gar zue affectat seÿe' (no. 15). By 'affectat' is presumably meant *adfectatus*, a rhetorical term meaning either 'choice' or (as here) 'studied, far-fetched'. Though this appears to refer to a now lost 'Parænesis' or 'Exhortation' by Stoughton rather than to his great prophetic work *Felicitas Ultimi Sæculi*, it is significant of both men's attitudes to the millenarian, for Moriaen's comment makes it plain that Hartlib shared his opinion. It should not be automatically assumed that Hartlib unqualifiedly agreed with whatever he had a hand in printing or publishing: his aim was to promote discussion rather than to promote any one school of thought. It is nonetheless clear that these men moved in circles where millenarianism was a burning issue, and if Hartlib's acquaintance with Stoughton and Potter, or Moriaen's with Serrarius, is no proof that they accepted their views, it

102 See John Stoughton, *Felicitas Ultimi Sæculi: Epistola In Qua, Inter Alia, Calamitosus ævi præsentis status serio deploratur, certa felicioris posthac spes ostenditur, & ad promovendum publicum Ecclesiæ et Rei literariæ bonum omnes excitantur* (London, 1640), Francis Potter, *An Interpretation of the Number 666* (Oxford, 1642), and Joseph Mede, *The Key of the Revelation, searched and demonstrated out of the Naturall and proper Characters of the Vision* (London, 1643).

is clear they did not object to them and virtually inconceivable that they were wholly untouched by them.

Moriaen's apparent indifference to doctrinal issues may of course merely have been a stance adopted in the interests of avoiding dischord and of promoting his ideal of a Church unity based on tolerance and latitudinarianism. There can be no knowing what inner debates he kept to himself. But the fact that he advocated the use of non-Christian texts as supporting evidence of religious belief, and that he saw the validity of Scripture as being endorsed by empirical evidence rather than vice versa, strongly suggests an anti-literalist stance, an acceptance that the sacred texts were true according to the spirit rather than the letter, and a willingness to modify the understanding of them on the basis of non-Scriptural evidence.

Uncertain as his private views on pretty well any specific point of Christian doctrine must remain - an uncertainty so deep that it is even debatable whether he was, in the strictest sense, a Christian at all - what does emerge quite unequivocally from his correspondence is that he did not wish to impose those views on anyone else. He repeatedly stressed his advocacy of freedom of conscience, and as has already been noted it was precisely that freedom that most appealed to him about the United Provinces.



His comments on the views of Paul Felgenhauer, for instance, are strikingly non-committal. Though Felgenhauer disagreed violently with Boreel, and accused him of Socinianism,<sup>103</sup> their attitudes to organised religion were in many respects very similar. Felgenhauer too rejected every form of established church. He was particularly scathing about the Lutheran faith in which he had grown up as the son of a pastor, but his scorn was spread liberally across the whole spectrum of Christian confessionalisation: 'Alle Kirchen sind Babel, sind Sekten, sind in summa der Antichrist'.<sup>104</sup> Felgenhauer, like Böhme, maintained that Christ had come to save the entire human race, Jews, Moslems and heathens not excepted, let alone Christians of any specific denomination. His views on the nature of Christ were perhaps the most notorious element in what was one of the century's most notorious unorthodoxies. He vehemently denied the doctrine that Christ had literally become human, for Christ was God, and it was inconceivable that

103 No. 166. Felgenhauer attacked Boreel on these grounds in his *Refutatio Paralogismorum Socinianorum* (Amsterdam, 1656), and the now lost *Perspicillum theologicum sive Examen eorum qui theologi videri et audiri volunt, cum responsione ad librum illum qui inscribitur Ad legem et ad testimonium cujus Autor est Adamus Borelius latine* (date uncertain: Boreel's *Ad legem et testimonium*, a sort of Collegiant manifesto, appeared in 1645). See Wolters, 'Paul Felgenhauers Leben und Wirken' part I, 68.

104 E.G. Wolters' summation of the message of Felgenhauer's *Disexamen vel examen examinis* ('Wahrenburg' (in fact Amsterdam), 1624), op. cit., part I, 66. Cf. Moriaen's comments in no. 174.

the Creator should become a creature. Christ was indeed the word of God made flesh, but this was a spiritual flesh wholly distinct from the perishable flesh inhabited by mortals. By the same token, the Lutheran idea of consubstantiation at Communion was as absurd, in Felgenhauer's eyes, as the Catholic notion of transsubstantiation. Christ, as a partaker of the divine nature, could not possibly be constituted in perishable matter, be it wafers, bread or human flesh. He had taken on human form but never human substance.

The fact that, in what was effectively a semi-public account of such a heresy, Moriaen made not the slightest attempt to distance himself from it is in itself a statement of sorts, especially given that he knew very well the account was likely to be copied out and distributed. His reports state merely the opinion Felgenhauer held and the fact that he had been arrested for it.<sup>105</sup> There would be no justification for reading this as agreement with or support for Felgenhauer's views, but it can surely be seen as a tacit declaration that the man was entitled to his opinion. Moriaen had

105 The arrest occurred in 1657; why Felgenhauer suddenly attracted attention at this time for a doctrine he had been preaching publicly for decades remains uncertain. In the event, the sentence was commuted to banishment from Braunschweig-Lüneburg, and the destruction of his books was ordered. Felgenhauer was as surprised as anyone that he was released from prison after only a year, for he had (not unreasonably) expected to remain there until his death. See nos. 174 and 176, and Wolters, op. cit. part I, 68-70.



earlier been very keen to obtain a copy of Comenius's refutation of Felgenhauer, which he received in late 1640 and subsequently passed on to Hartlib,<sup>106</sup> but here again he gave not the least hint as to which side of the controversy he favoured, or indeed as to whether his own mind was made up on the subject. His only comment on Comenius's work was that he was sorry to see him engaging publicly in polemics.<sup>107</sup>

He had been more explicit in condemning the prescriptive attitude of the Hamburg school authorities to Joachim Jungius's *Logica Hamburgensis*.<sup>108</sup> Jungius was rector of Hamburg gymnasium, a linguist and natural scientist of considerable distinction, and an innovative educationalist who took a keen interest in the Pansophic project of Comenius backed by Hartlib and Moriaen. The *Logica Hamburgensis* was commissioned as a standard up-to-date school text on logical method, but while still in preparation it fell foul of the authorities for being altogether too up-to-date in its criticisms of and diversions from Aristotle. It was not, to be sure, suspected of being anywhere near as controversial as Felgenhauer's work; but on the other hand, it was a commissioned text-book for use in schools, and the school

---

106 See nos. 17 (he wants it), 44 (has obtained it), 46, 48 (promises it to Hartlib), 73 (wants it back from Hartlib).

107 No. 44.

108 See nos. 1, 17, 28, 38 and notes.



authorities did not want to see their wards steered too far from the traditional educational ethos that still regarded Aristotle (or medieval and Renaissance interpretations of him) as the highest authority in secular matters.

Exactly how much of the text Jungius reworked to comply with their specifications cannot now be ascertained, but one of Jungius's students put it about that the work was called *Logica Hamburgensis* because it represented Hamburg's idea of logic, not Jungius's.<sup>109</sup> Moriaen's letters lend weight to this by retailing exactly the same story, with another acquaintance of Jungius, Johannes Tanckmar, as the source.<sup>110</sup> Moriaen deemed this, literally, a crying shame: 'Das nun H Iungius wegen unbändigkeit der Ienigen under welchen er lebet, seinen gaist dempfen müßen vnd nicht frey heraus gehen dürffen das ist zue Iammern für Ihn vnd vnß' (no. 1). It appears there was talk of Jungius's obtaining a university post at Amsterdam, and Moriaen was extremely keen for him to take this up, that he might have liberty to apply his brain as he saw fit.<sup>111</sup> In the event, however, nothing came of the idea.

Worse still, in Moriaen's eyes, was the attitude of the Synod of the Unitas Fratrum to the controversy

109 Guhrauer, *Jungius*, 111, and see no. 17, n.16.

110 No. 17.

111 Nos. 28 and 29.

engendered when Hieronim Broniewski, a lay elder of the Unity, denounced Comenius's pansophic work as an inappropriate blend of divine and human wisdom. Comenius was called before the Synod to defend his stance, and though the outcome was far from being a vindication of Broniewski, it still entailed much more of a circumscription of Comenius's activities than Moriaen thought reasonable. Though he was given official sanction to proceed with his Pansophic studies, this was with the rider that he should publish nothing without first submitting it to the Synod and receiving their approval. Moriaen was immediately concerned that Comenius would be driven, like Jungius (he drew the comparison explicitly), to commit himself to a doctrinal camp, compromising the treasured ideal of impartiality:

die Libertet nach seinem herz vnd gemuth zue schreiben wie Ers in der Warheit befindet ist Ihme damit schon genommen, wird sich auff eine parteÿ legen müßen vnd beÿ allen andern desto weniger gelten (no. 17).

He seems to have been in no doubt that Hartlib would view the situation similarly: indeed, he went on to suggest that Hartlib was providing a means of side-stepping this censorship by receiving copies of Comenius's work without the Synod's knowledge, thus ensuring the survival of the original, undoctored versions: 'das beste ist das der herr die sachen von Ihme bekomt ehe Sie den Censoribus in die hände kommen[;]

wollen sie es dan nicht zuelaßen so kan gleichwoll  
 geschehen was recht ist' (no. 17). Whether Comenius was  
 aware of such machinations to protect his work from the  
 supervision of his own church is unfortunately not known,  
 though it is certain that Hartlib did not, in the event,  
 publish anything the Synod had censored. Indeed, the  
 only thing they did forbid Comenius to publish was the  
 book of prophecies *Lux in tenebris*, about which Hartlib  
 and Moriaen themselves had considerable misgivings,<sup>112</sup>  
 and in this instance Comenius went against both the  
 orders of his superiors and the advice of his friends,  
 and had the thing published at his own expense anyway.  
 But it is striking to find Hartlib being presented in  
 this fashion as guarantor of Comenius's freedom of  
 speech, protecting him and his work, in effect, from his  
 own confessional allegiance.

Most unequivocal of all such statements was  
 Moriaen's reaction to a report of the arrest in England  
 of a number of anabaptists. As usual, he gave no  
 indication as to whether his sympathy for the detainees  
 extended to their opinions or merely to their right to  
 hold them, but he observed most forthrightly that that  
 right was inalienable, and that Parliament was being  
 hypocritical by condemning religious compulsion on the  
 one hand (in such manifestations, presumably, as the

---

112 See Chapter Four, section 5.



Laudianisation of the Church of England and the Catholicisation of the Palatinate) while exercising it on the other against these hapless anabaptists. It was an action

welches denen sehr vbel anstehet welche den gewißens zwang an andern improbirn Man würde woll thun wan man vnder der hand dieser leuthe erledigung beförderte wehren sie anderst allein vmb ihrer bekandtnus willen verhafftet vnd sonsten keine vbeltheter sind (no. 53).

This is, surely, a broad hint that Hartlib should use his contacts in Parliament to effect the prisoners' release.

It was this steadfast refusal to make any concessions to 'das parteÿliche wesen', that led, if not exactly to a falling out, at least to a marked difference of opinion and cooling of relations with Dury, with regard to the strategies to be adopted in the quest for church unity. Where Moriaen parted company with Dury was in that the latter, seeing incidentals as unimportant, was prepared ostensibly to espouse (or reject) any of them at any given time in order to win round a given candidate to the cause of reconciliation. Rather than pick and mix, Moriaen consistently distanced himself from the lot.

Dury's idea was to draw up, as it were, a new and more inclusive Formula of Concord, an elucidation of the fundamental truths of Christianity to which all the Evangelical churches would be willing to subscribe.

Having achieved this, he would persuade them all to agree publicly that freedom of conscience on all other issues should be granted, and that no one should criticise anyone else for holding a different view on such incidentals. To this end, he engaged for half a century in what was effectively a form of shuttle diplomacy, devoting a quite extraordinary amount of time, money and energy to travelling around England, Germany, the Netherlands and Scandinavia, conducting negotiations with the ruling bodies of the assorted Protestant groups and attempting to present each side's views to the others in as favourable a light as possible. As one of his less well-disposed chroniclers puts it, 'His powers of boredom had wearied a continent'.<sup>113</sup> To Moriaen's suggestion that he would do better to settle down in one place and devote himself to private study, Dury retorted without a trace of irony that he quite agreed and had every intention of settling in Bremen at the first opportunity, but needed first to conclude a few outstanding negotiations in Lübeck, Helmstadt, Rostock, Hamburg, Denmark, England and Holland.<sup>114</sup>

His somewhat uncritical biographer J. Minton Batten remarks with supreme understatement that 'Dury's method

---

113 J.C. Whitebrook, 'Dr John Stoughton the Elder', *Transactions of the Congregational Historical Society* VII (1913-15), 89-107 and 177-187, 183.

114 Dury to Hartlib (but referring to no. 12 from Moriaen), 26 April 1639, HP 9/1/82A.



of presenting his cause varied from time to time'.<sup>115</sup> His devoted scribe and future brother-in-law Heinrich Appelius meant to compliment him by writing that he 'imitated Paul labouring to become all things to all men, that hy might in any respect gett et gaine men to the trueth'.<sup>116</sup> But a good many others profoundly mistrusted him (as many had mistrusted Paul) for precisely this reason. To the Puritan William Prynne he was a 'time-serving Proteus and ambidexter divine',<sup>117</sup> while Caspar Heinrich Starck's staunchly Lutheran *Lübeckische Kirchen-Geschichte* is no less scathing of this 'unglücklichen Friedemacher/ und gleichsam Nuntio Apostolico der Reformirten' and his 'concilia irenica, oder besser ironica'.<sup>118</sup> His conscious policy throughout his 'irenical' projects of presenting whatever face he thought a given interlocutor would find most appealing, in order to alienate none of them, more often than not had precisely the opposite effect and alienated them all.<sup>119</sup> Moriaen himself became quite exasperated with

---

115 J. Minton Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago, 1944), 94.

116 Appelius to Hartlib, 23 August 1650, HP 45/1/42A.

117 *The time-serving Proteus, and ambidexter divine, uncased to the world* (London 1650).

118 Caspar Heinrich Starck, *Lübeckische Kirchen-Geschichte* (Lübeck, 1724), 860-61. See Anthony Milton, '"The Unchanged Peacemaker"? John Dury and the politics of irenicism in England 1628-43', *SHUR*, 95-117.

119 On Dury's labyrinthine politico-religious manoeuvres, and the gamut of contemporary response to them, see Anthony Milton, '"The Unchanged Peacemaker"? John Dury and the politics of irenicism in England 1628-43', *SHUR*, 95-117.



Dury, not indeed because he thought him a hypocrite, but because he saw how counter-productive his strategies were.

Not only did Moriaen consider that Dury was wasting time and, more importantly, money that might be devoted to more useful causes on his 'schwehren kostbaren reisen' (no. 33), he also felt that Dury's personal involvement in the diplomatic endeavour was positively detrimental to the aim of reconciliation. Some account has already been given of the very low esteem in which Dury was held on both sides of the doctrinal divide. Moriaen repeatedly stressed how poor Dury's reputation was in the Netherlands, on account, presumably, of his extensive and very public contacts with Anglicans and Lutherans: 'ist sein furnehmen an diesem ortt von den maisten improbirt vnd seine persohn verdächtigt' (no. 13). After Moriaen had repeated this point three times in less than a month,<sup>120</sup> Hartlib perhaps objected to this assessment of his friend, for a little later Moriaen carefully dissociated himself from these condemnations of Dury and assured Hartlib, 'Ich laße auch nicht seine ehr zue retten vnd guten nahmen zue verthätigen so oft es nur gelegenheit gibt' (no. 18). Nonetheless, while protesting his own confidence in Dury's personal integrity, he continued to cast doubt on the feasibility

<sup>120</sup> Nos. 11, 12, 13; he makes the same point again in no. 83.

of his 'opus pacificationis' and to express his disappointment that Dury would not accept some settled post and devote himself to private scholarly activity for the furtherance of Pansophy.<sup>121</sup>

Minton Batten celebrates Dury as an 'Advocate of Christian Reunion'.<sup>122</sup> But as Anthony Milton points out in his shrewd and precise analysis of the 'politics of irenicism', virtually everyone in Christendom was an advocate of Christian reunion: 'most thinkers of this period accepted that religious unity was a good idea, in the same way that they believed sin was a bad idea'.<sup>123</sup> The devil, of course, was in the detail. Dury had no great difficulty in persuading Protestants to agree, in principle, to agree, but the question of what to agree about was somewhat thornier. Milton observes, with regard to English Puritans, that 'those divines who were most enthusiastic for union with the Lutherans on the level of theory were most likely to be those least capable of achieving it in practice'.<sup>124</sup> Moriaen made exactly the same point, though in more general terms:

wan man aber einst auff die particularia vnd  
Conditiones concordiaë kommen solte da wird man  
noch viel mehr zue thun vnd woll die Ienige am

---

121 Nos. 12, 32, 33.

122 J. Minton Batten, *John Dury: Advocate of Christian Reunion* (Chicago, 1944).

123 Anthony Milton, '"The Unchanged Peacemaker"? John Dury and the politics of irenicism in England 1628-43', *SHUR*, 95-117, 96.

124 *Ibid.*, 101.



vnwilligsten finden die sich zuevorn in  
generalibus am besten angelaßen haben (no. 12).

It is this letter, no. 12, that provides Moriaen's fullest and most considered criticism of Dury's approach. Negotiation, Moriaen pointed out, had so far served rather to exacerbate than to diminish mutual resentments over contentious details. At least during the earlier part of his correspondence with Hartlib, Moriaen staked his hopes for reconciliation on Comenius's notion of Pansophy, a new way of looking at the world that would teach humanity to put aside all dogma and see everything afresh, unblinkered by received ideas.<sup>125</sup> If Pansophy could not achieve this, declared Moriaen in so many words, God would have to do it himself: 'kan die vberzeugung dardurch gefunden werden so wird die Concordia sich auch woll finden wo nicht so muß alles von höherer hand erwartet werden' (no. 12).

Hartlib passed this detailed and apposite analysis on to Dury, who replied somewhat huffily and at equal length, but without in fact addressing Moriaen's main point.<sup>126</sup> The gist of his response is a tautology: once people have been persuaded to commit themselves not to argue about incidentals, they will find themselves bound by their own word not to argue about incidentals. He gave no straight answer to the question of how people

125 The notion of Pansophy as an irenic tool is discussed in more detail in Chapter Four.

126 Dury to Hartlib, 26 April 1639, HP 9/1/80B-83B.



were to be persuaded to agree on the definition of an incidental. As Milton points out, Dury was very prickly, and for good reason, about charges that he was behaving like a mere diplomat, a political negotiator interfering with the balance of temporal power. 'Dury declared his passionate determination to avoid "worldly wisdom" precisely because it was a constant temptation for him.'<sup>127</sup> This aspect of Dury's character comes to the fore in his high-handed dismissal of the objections to his schemes made by Moriaen and others:

they do imagine a thing which is more humane and politic then I aime at therefore their doubts are to them true difficulties, but to mee none; because I walke not in the sphere wherein their apprehension of the matter doth stand.<sup>128</sup>

Later, Moriaen lost faith in Pansophy, or at least in the prospect of Comenius's providing an adequate formulation of it, and looked rather to the experimental investigation of Nature for a frame of reference on which humanity might agree to build afresh a new and unifying religious vision of the world. Dury features with significantly less frequency in his later letters, and in mid-1657 he remarked that he had lost touch with him altogether.<sup>129</sup> Moriaen's attitude to the irenical scheme, however, remained unchanged. He commented on it a last time at the beginning of 1658 by damning it with

127 ' "The Unchanged Peacemaker"?', 116.

128 Dury to Hartlib, 26 April 1639, HP 9/1/82B.

129 No. 159.

faint praise: so long as Dury kept up his efforts, he wrote, the lovers of truth and peace would at least be able to say no stone had been left unturned.<sup>130</sup>

This disagreement with Dury over the strategies to be adopted in the promotion of ecumenicism goes to the heart of Moriaen's ideological outlook. Dury's mistake, as Moriaen saw it, was to attack the symptoms of discord instead of the cause. Dury wanted to negotiate about details, about outward forms and ceremonies, to achieve compromise between the different sects on the externals of religion, and thus by paring back such externals to demonstrate that all these branches grew from the same stem. Moriaen, though never so overtly radical as Boreel or Felgenhauer, shared their desire to go back further, to set aside all sectarianism and begin again from the root. Though it is uncertain whether he was a chiliast as such, he certainly anticipated, and believed he was contributing to, a new and more fundamental Reformation. The time for quibbling over niceties was over: what was needed now was to look at the whole Creation afresh, to learn a new and truer reading of Scripture, of Nature and of Mankind itself. As he wrote to an unidentified correspondent, consciously echoing the title of one of Felgenhauer's most notorious tracts, *Aurora Sapientiæ* (Magdeburg, 1628):

---

130 No. 168.

In Summa Aurora Sapientiaẽ wird verhoffentlichen bald anbrechen mußen weil sich alles an allen orthen so fein darzu schicket Gott gebe dz Sol Iustitiaẽ den folgenden tag machen vnd die gantze stockfinstere Weld dermal einst seliglich erleuchten möge (no. 20).

He spent his entire life watching for the dawn.