Universiteit Leiden
The Netherlands

Three Letters by Menasseh ben Israel to John Durie. English Philo-Judaism and the Spes Israelis

Wall, E.G.E. van der

Citation
Wall, E. G. E. van der. (1985). Three Letters by Menasseh ben Israel to John Durie. English Philo-Judaism and the Spes Israelis. *Nederlands Archief Voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, *65*, 46-63. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8257

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Leiden University Non-exclusive license
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8257

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

THREE LETTERS BY MENASSEH BEN ISRAEL TO JOHN DURIE

*English Philo-judaism and the "Spes Israelis"**

by

ERNESTINE G. E. VAN DER WALL

Leiden

In 1649 the Scottish theologian and well-known irenicist John Durie wrote a letter to his Amsterdam Jewish friend Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel in order to inquire after the rumours he had heard about the discovery of the lost ten tribes of Israel in America. When asking for Menasseh's views on this issue Durie could hardly know that his inquiry would lead to the publication of a book that would immediately become a great success in Jewish and non-Jewish circles alike: the *Miqveh Yisrael* or *Spes Israelis*, which appeared in 1650 in Latin, Spanish, Hebrew and English.[1] In the following years this tract played an important role in the campaign for the readmission of the Jews to England which resulted in the Whitehall Conference of December 1655. Since it was discovered that Jews lived in America, Menasseh pointed out, it became apparent that the Jews were scattered to nearly all of the ends of the world except England; now the readmission of the Jews to this country, from which they had been officially expelled in 1290, would mean that they were finally dispersed all over the world. This universal dispersion was regarded as the necessary condition for the coming of the messianic age, according to Daniel's prophecy: "And when the scattering of the holy people shall have an end, all those things shall be fulfilled." (Daniel 12, 7).

Throughout Jewish and Christian history the fate of the lost ten tribes has been a subject of considerable interest. These tribes, carried away by king Shalmaneser to Assyria (722/721 B.C.), were believed to be staying

---

* I thank Dr Norma E. Emerton (Cambridge) for the correction of the English text.

[1] On Menasseh and the *Spes Israelis*, see Lucien Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell*, London 1901, XXII-XXVII; Cecil Roth, *A Life of Menasseh ben Israel. Rabbi, Printer and Diplomat*, Philadelphia 1934, 176-224; Henri Méchoulan et Gérard Nahon, *Menasseh ben Israel. Espérance d'Israel*, Paris 1979, 35-99; David S. Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Re-admission of the Jews to England 1603-1655*, Oxford 1982, 127-157. The English version, entitled *The Hope of Israel* (edition 1652), is reprinted in Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission*, 1-56. A French translation is published by Méchoulan and Nahon in their abovementioned work.

Nederlands Archief voor
Kerkgeschiedenis 65 (1985)

in some secret place in the world, in a country that had not been inhabited before. At the end of days, however, they would reappear and return to their ancient homeland, together with the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin.[2] Innumerable theories about their possible place of residence came into being. For example, they were supposed to be living in China, Tartary, Ethiopia, India or America. Especially after the discovery of the New World the issue of the ten tribes received renewed attention and it was commonly thought that they—or at any rate part of them—were living in this corner of the world. It was suggested that the American Indians were descendants of the Jews.[3]

About the middle of the seventeenth century it was the story of a Portuguese New Christian, Aaron ha-Levy alias Antonio de Montezinos, that caused a sudden revival of the debate about the ten tribes. In July 1644 Montezinos came to Amsterdam to inform the Jews about his finding of a remnant of the lost tribes in South America. Testifying under oath before the leaders of the Portuguese-Jewish synagogue, among whom was Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel, he related that while travelling through Quito Province (now Ecuador) he had met some descendants of the tribe of Reuben.[4] Menasseh thought this story to be very probable:

> But I having curiously examined what ever hath hitherto been writ upon this subject doe finde no opinion more probable, nor agreeable to reason, then that of our *Montezinus*, who saith, that the first inhabitants of *America*, were the ten Tribes of the *Israelites*, whom the *Tartarians* conquered, and drove away; who after that (as God would have it) hid themselves behind the Mountaines *Cordillerae*.[5]

However, according to Menasseh the ten tribes were scattered into various areas all over the world, while only part of them was living in

---

[2] This belief was based upon the following texts: 2 Kings 17: 6, 23, 2 Kings 18: 11, and 2 Esdras 13: 40-47.

[3] On the issue of the lost ten tribes of Israel, see among others Albert C. Hyamson, "The Lost Tribes, and the Influence of the Search for them on the Return of the Jews to England", *Jew. Qly. Rev.* XV (1903), 640-676; Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 127-157; Richard H. Popkin, "The Rise and Fall of the Jewish Indian Theory" (paper presented at the International Workshop on Menasseh ben Israel and his world, Tel Aviv/Jerusalem 1985).

[4] See Roth, *A Life*, 176-181; Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 141-143. Montezinos was also in contact with the wealthy Amsterdam merchant Abraham Pereira, one of the founders of the *yeshiba* of which Menasseh was the Principal. In the middle 1660s Pereira was a fervent follower of the pseudo-Messiah Sabbatai Sevi (see Méchoulan et Nahon, *Espérance*, 76, 77).

[5] *The Hope of Israel*, "To the Courteous Reader" (Wolf 6). See also Section 13 (Wolf 27, 28); "Yet I give more credit to our *Montezinus*, being a *Portingal*, and a *Jew* of our Order; borne ... of honest and known Parents, a man about forty yeares old, honest, and not ambitious."

America. Moreover, he made it quite clear that he did not believe the American Indians to be of Israelite origin.[6]

At about the same period that the Amsterdam Jews heard this exciting story of Montezinos, news had arrived from another part of the world, reporting that one Rabbi Baruch Gad on his way from Palestine to Persia had met a messenger of one of the lost tribes, telling him that these Israelites were willing to join the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin. They dwelt however beyond a river which they could not cross: the mysterious Sambatyon river. This river, as legend had it, ran on weekdays carrying heavy stones, while resting on the seventh day. But then, on Sabbath, the Jews could not travel, so these children of Moses were shut up there until the end of days. The legends about this river were firmly believed by Menasseh who devoted a lengthy paragraph to prove that this 'sabbaticall' river really existed, basing his arguments on various authorities, among whom was his own father.[7]

It is no surprise that these and other reports concerning the ten tribes created a stir in both Jewish and non-Jewish circles. In the middle decades of the seventeenth century messianic expectation among the Jews greatly intensified, the hope of restoration growing stronger over the years and culminating finally in the messianic movement of the pseudo-messiah Sabbatai Sevi (1665/1666). In this hope of a restored Israel the ten tribes played an important role and naturally rumours about their return contributed largely to the messianic excitement of those years.[8] Equally, in the Christian world of that day millenarian expectations, which were widely diffused in England, Germany, and the Dutch Republic, created renewed interest in the ten tribes of Israel. The conversion of the Jews was

---

[6] This is apparent from Section 6 of *The Hope of Israel* where Menasseh explicitly states that "he that will compare the Lawes and Customes of the *Indians* and *Hebrewes* together, shall finde them agree in many things; whence you may easily gather, That the *Indians* borrowed those of the *Hebrewes* (who lived among them) before, or after they went to the unknowne Mountaines". Having summed up several similarities between Indian and Jewish customs, he asks "May not you judge from these things, that the *Jewes* lived in those places, and that the *Gentiles* learned such things of them? Adde also to what hath been said, that the knowledge which the *Indians* had, of the Creation of the world, and of the universall Flood, they borrowed from the *Israelites.*" Certainly Menasseh does not deny the remarkable similarity of Jewish and Indian customs, but he explains this phenomenon not by supposing the Indians to be descendants of the Israelites but by maintaining they borrowed those customs from the Jews. See also Méchoulan et Nahon, *Espérance*, 73, who emphasize the notion that Menasseh did not support the Jewish Indian theory.

[7] See *The Hope of Israel*, Section 20 (Wolf 35-38). On this legendary river, see *Enc. Jud.* 14, 762-764.

[8] See Gershom Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi. The Mystical Messiah 1626-1676*, London 1973, 332 ff.

not merely regarded by the millenarians as the prelude to the second coming of Christ but rather as the necessary precondition to the establishment of His millennial reign. According to the words of the apostle Paul 'all Israel' would be saved (Romans 11, 26), which was interpreted to refer not only to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin but to the ten tribes as well. The restitution of Israel would not take place without those tribes being present, appearing again at the end of days. So the millenarians, believing that the last times had arrived, looked anxiously forward to any news about these tribes, and when such news arrived, this in its turn confirmed them in their notion of living in the last days.

Thus Durie, when inquiring with Menasseh about the ten tribes, may be regarded as merely representing the great interest in this issue of his Christian millenarian friends, such as the well-known theologian Nathaniel Homes, the Baptist preacher Henry Jessey, and the former walloon minister Petrus Serrarius—all of whom were also in contact with Menasseh.[9] Apparently Durie was not content with the statement of Montezinos—on his request a copy of the affidavit was sent to him by Menasseh—but he wanted to know more about the Jewish view on this subject.[10] The three letters by Menasseh to Durie, published here, testify to the common interest of the Jewish Rabbi and his Christian millenarian friend in the lost ten tribes.

---

[9] The English millenarians Nathaniel Homes and Henry Jessey both carried on a regular correspondence with Menasseh. One of their letters to him, dated 24 December 1649, was published by Paul Felgenhauer in his *Bonum Nuncium Israeli*, 1655, 103-106. On the friendship between Menasseh and Jessey, see David S. Katz, "Menasseh ben Israel's Christian connection: Henry Jessey and the Jews" (paper presented at the International workshop on Menasseh ben Israel and his world, Tel Aviv/Jerusalem 1985). The Amsterdam millenarian Petrus Serrarius was a good friend of Menasseh. On Menasseh's friendship with Serrarius, see Ernestine G. E. van der Wall, "Petrus Serrarius and Menasseh ben Israel. Christian millenarianism and Jewish messianism in 17th century Amsterdam" (paper presented at the International Workshop on Menasseh ben Israel and his world, Tel Aviv/Jerusalem 1985). A dissertation on the life and work of Serrarius is being prepared by the author of the present article.

[10] The copy of the affidavit was published by Durie as an appendix to Thomas Thorowgood, *Iewes in America, or Probabilities that the Americans are of that Race*, London 1650. In 1648 Thorowgood sent the proofs of his tract to his friend Durie, who then remembered the story of Montezinos which he had heard several years before in The Hague. Thereupon he wrote to Menasseh to ask for a copy of the affidavit, who immediately sent a French version of it. The appendix ends with the following testimony: "I, *Menasseh Ben Israel* underwritten, beare witnesse, that this present paper hath been coppied with the whole truth of the originall, and that the Author, *Monterinos* (sic) is a vertuous man, and separate from all manner of worldly interests; and that hee swore in my presence that all that which he declared was a truth." The Rabbi's confirmation of Montezinos's story was first mentioned in a tract by E. Winslow which appeared in June 1649. See J. A. de Jong, *As the Waters cover the Sea. Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640-1810*, Kampen 1970, 58-67.

The three letters by Menasseh date from 25 November 1649, 23 December 1649, and 14 July 1650 respectively. These letters are not autographs but copies, made by the man among whose papers they have been preserved: Samuel Hartlib (d. 1662). Hartlib, one of the most famous German exiles in seventeenth century England, was the instigator of many projects to further the 'great instauration'. Besides, he was an indefatigable correspondent, carrying on an extensive correspondence with friends and informants all over Europe. Fortunately a large part of this correspondence has been preserved.[11] Many letters were copied by him, among them the present ones.[12] These letters are largely concerned with the contents and the publication of the *Spes Israelis*. They provide interesting information on Menasseh's British friends and on the dedication of the tract. Furthermore, the letter of July 1650 contains a catalogue of his books.

Now the contents of the first two letters, those of November and December 1649, are not entirely unknown to us: portions of them have been published in English by Durie in his 'Epistolicall Discourse', dated 27 January 1650. This discourse appeared as an appendix to Thomas Thorowgood's missionary tract *Jewes in America*.[13] These abstracts were then republished by Lucien Wolf in his *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Oliver Cromwell* (1901), furthermore in Albert Hyamson's article on the lost tribes (1903), in Cecil Roth's biography of Menasseh (1934), and recently they appeared in a French translation in the introduction to the edition of the *Spes Israelis* by Henri Méchoulan and Gérard Nahon (1979).[14]

Wolf thought that the original letters had been written in French, while Roth suggested Latin or Spanish as the language in which they were composed.[15] Now the copies in the Hartlib collection are in Latin. Yet, in view of the fact that all known autograph letters of Menasseh are in Spanish,

---

[11] On Hartlib and the Hartlib Papers, see G. H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius. Gleanings from Hartlib's Papers*, London 1947. See also Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration. Science, Medicine and Reform 1626-1660*, London 1975.

[12] HP 44/5/5; HP 44/5/1; HP 44/5/3,4 (University Library Sheffield). Turnbull (262) remarks: "There are also copies of three letters to Dury from Menasseh Ben Israel, written from Amsterdam between November 1649 and July 1650, in which he tells of his writings, such as the two volumes in which he has handled all the controversies between the Jews and the Christians, and refers also to a work of his to be published under the title of *Spes Israelis*."

[13] *An Epistolicall Discourse of Mr. John Dury to Mr. Thorowgood concerning his Conjecture that the Americans are descended from the Israelites. With the history of a Portugall Iew Antonio Monterinos (sic) attested by Menasseh ben Israel to the same effect.* On Thorowgood and his missionary efforts, see De Jong, *As the Waters cover the Sea*, 63-73.

[14] See note 1.

[15] Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission*, LXXVIII; Roth, *A Life*, 330 n. 3.

one might wonder whether these letters, too, have not originally been written in Spanish. Moreover, some doubts have arisen—already in his own day—whether Menasseh had sufficient active knowledge of Latin to write letters or books in this language. On the other hand it is also maintained that Menasseh knew Latin "perfectly".[16] The fact that he had some of his works translated into Latin by someone else does not imply that he could not write Latin himself. As may be seen from these letters too, Menasseh was very much afraid of making mistakes one way or another, fearing that thus feelings of annoyance and hatred against him and his co-religionists might easily be raised. This may be one of the reasons why he sometimes may have preferred to rely upon translators. As far as these letters are concerned, they seem to have been written offhand, the Latin being not of an exceptionally high quality, which may support the assumption that Menasseh wrote them himself. So for the moment, unless evidence to the contrary turns up, there is no reason to doubt that these letters have been written in Latin by the Rabbi himself.

The two 1649 letters have not been printed in full up till now, while the 1650 letter has as yet not been published at all. Interesting parts have been left out by Durie, which throw light on the background of Menasseh's dedication of his new treatise to the English Parliament and, furthermore, suggest that this treatise indeed was composed in Latin and not in Spanish. It also becomes apparent that already at this moment Menasseh was befriended by John Sadler, whom he would meet afterwards during his stay in England, while he also maintained friendly relations with two men whose names do not figure yet in any biographical sketch on the Rabbi: Benjamin Worsley and Johannes Moriaen.

John Sadler (1615-1674) was a well-known London lawyer and constitutional theorist, and a good friend of Oliver Cromwell, at one time serving as his personal secretary. During the 1650s he held several offices, being secretary to the Council of State and a member of the Committee for the Advancement of Learning and the Comittee for Lunatics. Possibly

---

[16] In his *Sorberiana*, Paris 1684, 125, Samuel Sorbière claimed: "Latini lingua non ita peritus erat ut aut scribere aut ex tempore loqui posset expedite...". However, Franco Mendes, *Memorias*, 22, says that Menasseh knew Greek and Latin "perfectly". See Aaron L. Katchen, *Christian Hebraists and Dutch Rabbis. Seventeenth Century Apologetics and the Study of Maimonides' Mishneh Torah*, Cambridge (Mass.) and London 1984, 316 n. 105. On this issue, see also H. Méchoulan, "Le problème du Latin chez Menasseh ben Israel et quelques implications religieuses et politiques à propos d'une lettre inédite à Beverovicius", *Studia Rosenthaliana* 14 (1980), 1-6; A. K. Offenberg, "Some remarks regarding a new publication of six autograph letters by Menasseh ben Israel" (paper presented at the International Workshop on Menasseh ben Israel, Tel. Aviv/Jerusalem 1985). See also below note 32.

he was an active participant in the Invisible College, a short-lived and rather obscure utilitarian and utopian society, initiated in 1646 by the famous chemist Robert Boyle and his friend Benjamin Worsley. In 1650 Sadler took up a university position, being appointed as Master of Magdalene College Cambridge.[17]

It is a well-known fact that Sadler and Menasseh were close friends in the 1650s when the latter stayed in England in order to promote the readmission of the Jews. However, that they were on friendly terms already as early as 1649—or maybe even earlier—has, as far as I know, escaped notice up to now. How and when they got into contact is not known; it is likely that Durie played an intermediary role. Sadler, a great Hebraist and a millenarian, was very much interested in the Jews, as may be seen from his *Rights of the Kingdom*, a discursive and rather chaotic treatise on the origins and history of the English constitution, published anonymously in 1649. It also shows that Sadler knew Menasseh's writings:

> How they (sc. the Jews) are now, I need not say, although I might also beare them witness, that they are yet zealous in their way, nor do they wholly want ingenious able men, of whom I cannot but with honour mention him that hath so much obliged the world by his learned writings, Rab. Menasseh ben Israel: a very learned civill man and a lover of our nation.[18]

It may well be that when writing these flattering words about the Amsterdam Rabbi he already had got to know him. As to the issue of the ten tribes, Sadler was convinced that once they would return: "the *Iewes*, and Their Returne. It is so Cleare; and so full in the Scriptures."[19] Referring to the relation of Montezinos—that "grave, sober man"—, he connected it with the Jewish prediction concerning the year of redemption: according to the *Zohar*, the main kabbalistic work, their final redemption would take place in or about the year 1648:

> Nor do they think the Time farre off. And that, from better grounds perhaps, then is the old prediction in their *Zohar* which fortels their Redemption should be upon, or about, the yeare last past. To which they add, somewhat they see, or have heard, from their Brethren of *Iuda*, in *Brasile*: or of *Israel* in other parts of *America*. which they cannot much believe, (till it be better confirmed:) although it be, with many Arguments, asserted by a Grave, Sober Man, of their own Nation, that is lately come from the Western World.[20]

---

[17] On Sadler, see *DNB* L, 104-105; Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission*, *passim*; Hyamson, "The Lost Tribes", 667-668; 672-673; Roth, *A Life*, 191, 220, 252, 275, 335-336, 339, 348; Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 66, 72, 73, 80, 300; Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 103, 140, 194-195, 231, 242, 244.

[18] *Rights of the Kingdom*, 48.

[19] *Rights of the Kingdom*, 40.

[20] *Rights of the Kingdom*, 38-39.

It is no wonder that Sadler, like Durie and other millenarians, also was very interested in Menasseh's view on this story, though he felt some doubts upon the truth of it. However, in the same year that his *Rights of the Kingdom* was published he got involved in the publication of the *Spes Israelis*, as we shall see below.

So besides Nathaniel Homes and Henry Jessey—who were corresponding with Menasseh at the same time[21]—Sadler belonged to the group of English admirers of the Amsterdam Rabbi. When in 1655 Menasseh came over to London to plead the Jewish readmission in person, Sadler showed himself to be one of his greatest friends. After Menasseh's death, he was the one who on behalf of the Rabbi's widow wrote petitions to Oliver Cromwell and then to his son Richard to ask for financial support for her.[22]

Apart from Sadler, the 1649 letters mention another name, that of an Irishman who is well-known for several reasons but not so much for his friendly relationship with Menasseh: Benjamin Worsley. Menasseh called him his dear friend and sent him his warmest regards. In his own day Worsley (c. 1620-1673) was a well-known practical chemist and physician, interested in distilling and a stimulator of various mining projects. He was an intimate friend of Boyle—an Irishman like himself—both of them, as stated above, being involved in the formation of the Invisible College. Maybe it was here that he also got acquainted with Sadler. In 1650 he became secretary to the newly formed Council of Trade. In the following years English colonial policy was one of his main subjects of interest; he was engaged in the plan for a new plantation to be established in Virginia. Like Durie and Sadler he was a member of the Hartlib circle, regularly corresponding with Hartlib himself. Being especially fond of Durie and his wife, at one time he even thought of living with them as their son.[23]

In 1649 Worsley went to visit the Low Countries in order to gather technical and commercial information. Probably through the means of

---

[21] See note 9.

[22] Sadler addressed one or two petitions on behalf of Menasseh's wife to Oliver Cromwell. His petition to Richard Cromwell is printed in Wolf, LXXXVII-LXXXVIII. He asked Cromwell to pay two hundred pounds to "the said poore Widow and relations of a man so eminent and famous in his owne and meny other nations and for the honour of Christian religion with many other reasons...".

[23] On Worsley, see Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 31, 55, 56, 87, 260-261, 262; Webster, *The Great Instauration*, *passim*. In 1649 the Duries were in difficult financial circumstances, Mrs Durie contemplating the making and selling of perfumes as a means of earning a living. Worsley promised to teach her how to distil choice waters and spirits from spices and herbs. (see Turnbull 260-261).

one whose name also figures in these letters, Johannes Moriaen, he came into contact with Menasseh. The German Moriaen is another friend of Menasseh who, like Worsley, deserves a place in the Rabbi's biography. He is an interesting but still largely unfamiliar figure. For some time Moriaen had been a minister at Cologne, where he became acquainted with his colleagues Durie and Serrarius, who in the 1620s both served the Walloon congregation there—Serrarius being Durie's successor. In 1637 Moriaen left Germany for the Republic and settled at Amsterdam. Among other things, he was very interested in Helmontian medicine and chemistry, acting as an agent for the well-known German alchemist/chemist Johann Rudolf Glauber. Being a regular correspondent of Hartlib, it was presumably the latter who recommended Worsley to go to Moriaen, who in his turn introduced the Irish visitor to his friends. Sharing a common interest in practical chemistry, Worsley kept in touch with his "good friend Moriaen" after his return to England, which took place in November 1649, as is apparent from Menasseh's letter, corresponding about all kinds of (al)chemical experiments.[24] Now Moriaen had good connections with Amsterdam Jews and like Durie and Serrarius he belonged to the circle around Menasseh. He acted as an intermediary between the latter and his friends Durie and Hartlib. Therefore, it may well have been through the means of Moriaen that Worsley became acquainted with Menasseh. Worsley himself adhered to the belief in the future general conversion of the Jews and the reunion of the Christian churches.[25]

While he was at Amsterdam, Worsley received a letter from Durie, dated 12 July 1649, dealing, among other things, with the issue of the ten tribes:

> There is a great deale of enquiry here concerning the Jews which are said to bee in America. I prey (to know) what the Opinion is of the Jews at Amsterdam and what the report is which they have had from thence to make them

---

[24] Letters from Moriaen to Worsley, mainly dating from 1651, have been preserved among the Hartlib Papers. Worsley "had been converted to Helmontianism by Johann Morian". (Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 301). On Morien or Morien, see M. Blekastad (Hrsg.), *Unbekannte Briefe des Comenius und seiner Freunde 1641-1661*, Kastellaun 1976, 9, 10, 125-150 (publication of nine letters by Moriaen); Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 301, 302, 304, 387, 395. The author of the present article is preparing a paper on "An unknown member of the Hartlib circle: the German theologian and alchemist Johannes Moriaen".

[25] Webster, *The Great Instauration*, 381. In an anonymous, undated tract, presumably by Worsley, entitled "Proffits humbly presented to this Kingdome", it is said that the conversion of the Jews is "a worke as most Divines conceave shortly to be expected and without doubt at hand...". (see Webster 545).

> beleeve that the X tribes are seated there. I purpose to write about it to Mr. Boreel, however, it will be worth your enquirie by Mr. Mor(iaen's) means, and I know you will pleasure Mr. Lamy and Mr. H(enry) J(essey) (when) you give them any information of that matter.[26]

Thus Durie sought to ascertain the rumours about the lost tribes through several sources of information: not only Menasseh, but also Worsley, Moriaen, and their common friend, the learned Dutch Hebraist Adam Boreel, were asked to supply him with more information. Worsley replied to him that Boreel was only able to procure those writings that Durie already knew—which was all that the Jews themselves knew about those tribes being in America. "If they bee there, the prosperity of Virginia will not harm them", he added.[27] Maybe Worsley's own plans to go to Virginia were also connected with the idea of the lost tribes inhabiting this colony, the education of the American Indians being one of the objects of the "Virginia business".[28] As stated above, the theory that these Indians were descendants of the lost tribes was very popular at the time and helped to support Christian missionary efforts.[29]

The year 1649 then shows Durie, Worsley, Sadler, Jessey, Moriaen, Boreel and Menasseh all dealing with the question whether the lost tribes were living in America and whether the Jewish Indian theory might be regarded as valid. The clearest answer was given by Menasseh in his *Spes Israelis*, who believed that the lost tribes were the first inhabitants of America but denied that the American Indians were to be considered as their descendants.

The three letters by Menasseh to Durie are mainly concerned with the contents of his treatise and its dedication. Both portions, known through Durie's publication, deal with the subject of the book. In the first letter of 25 November 1649 Menasseh apologizes to Durie for not having answered his letter earlier, his reply having been delayed because the short exposition he had intended rapidly had developed into quite a tract. He then gives a synopsis of its contents, returning to this more extensively

---

[26] HP 26/33/4,5. "Mr. Lamy" could not be identified by me. See also Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 260-261. In the same letter Durie asked Worsley various questions about points in distilling that were not clear to him and Mrs. Durie, adding "if it please God to furnish us with some small bottome to begin we hope our venturing may bee to profit", see Turnbull 261. However, it does not seem that Mrs. Durie's distilling projects resulted in some profits.

[27] HP 26/33/7 (undated).

[28] Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury and Comenius*, 31, 262. For Worsley's sake, Durie tried to get the English government interested in the plantation in Virginia.

[29] See De Jong, *As the Waters cover the Sea*, 63-78.

in his letter of 23 December. The tract deals with the first inhabitants of America which, as we have already seen, Menasseh believes to be the lost tribes of Israel. On the basis of the Scriptures he wants to show in a clear and modest way—according to his custom, he says—that these tribes have been scattered into other countries as well; that up to this day they keep the true religion; that one day they will return to their ancient homeland; that they will meet in the two provinces of Assyria and Egypt; that their kingdom will not be divided any more, but that they will be joined together under one Prince: Messiah the son of David.[30] Other issues are dealt with too, such as the miserable fate of Jewish and Christian martyrs of the Spanish Inquisition, and the many marks of honour conferred upon Jews by Christian princes.[31] Furthermore he seeks to prove that the day of the promised Messiah draws near.

These matters are also known to us through Durie's abstracts. Several interesting points in these letters, however, need further consideration. Thus it may be inferred from his words that the tract was composed in Latin—as was stated by Roth but denied by Wolf and others—and that the first edition appeared in this language. This would confirm Menasseh's own statement in his dedication of the *Spes Israelis* to the Parnassim (the Spanish and Dutch editions were not dedicated to the English Parliament but to the Parnassim of the Amsterdam Portuguese synagogue), where he tells them that, when asked by a prominent English scholar (Durie) to write down his opinion, he composed his reply in Latin.[32]

---

[30] There is a striking similarity between the synopsis in the December letter and Section 37 of the *The Hope of Israel*, in which Menasseh sums up the consequences to be deduced from his argument about the ten tribes.

[31] See *The Hope of Israel*, Section 30 on "that horrible monster, the Spanish Inquisition" and its victims; and Sections 32 and 33 on the privileges and honours the Jews enjoy from Christian princes. On the connection between the examples mentioned by Menasseh and the contemporary state of affairs, see Jonathan I. Israel, "Menasseh ben Israel and the Dutch Sephardi Colonization Movement, 1645-1660" (paper presented at the International Workshop on Menasseh ben Israel and his World, Tel Aviv/Jerusalem 1985).

[32] See Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission*, 150, 151, and Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 146. Méchoulan and Nahon, *Espérance*, 71, mention that the Latin and Spanish edition appeared almost simultaneously without indicating which was the original version. Roth, *A Life*, 186, 331 n. 5, claims that this tract was composed in Latin, referring to the explicit statement of Menasseh himself in the dedication of the Spanish edition that this work was originally written in Latin. The Dutch translation is clearly based on the Spanish version; in the Dedication he wrote: "so heb ick in de Latijnsche tael dit uytgegeven, hoewel niet sonder sorghe, ter oorsaeck dat de voorstellen daer van ick schrijf, seer raer zijn en door niemant bondigh beschreven". In the present letters no mention is made of the work having been composed in Spanish. On Menasseh and his knowledge of Latin, see note 16.

More important is the question raised in these letters as to the dedication of the new tract. In his November letter Menasseh tells Durie that the tract is going to be printed in Latin and that he wants to consult his English friends about the question to whom this treatise might be dedicated. Durie is asked to discuss this point with the "very noble and friendly" Sadler.[33] It seems that Menasseh held the opinion of this lawyer and Hebraist in high esteem and was anxious to hear his suggestions. Nearly a month later he thanked Durie for their advice to dedicate his book to the English Parliament which, he said, he embraced wholeheartedly. These English authorities were all lovers of liberty and their singular benevolence towards foreigners was made publicly known.[34] However, being afraid to make some stupid mistakes either in the title or in the matter itself, he would very much like Durie to forward the dedication the latter had already written. You know, he explains his request, how easily we annoy people or arouse feelings of hatred when, from sheer ignorance, we do something wrong. He preferred, then, to rely upon Durie's wording rather than upon his own. Thus his English friends not only inspired the idea to dedicate the *Spes Iraelis* to the English Parliament but they also drafted this dedication: apparently Durie was its author and not Menasseh himself. In the December letter, besides Parliament, Sadler's friend the future Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell, is also mentioned as one to whom this extraordinary treatise might be directed if only Menasseh would know how it would be received. The final dedication, however, was addressed to the Parliament and the Council of State, Cromwell's name not being referred to at all.

---

[33] The description of Sadler as "very noble" could throw light on the identification of the anonymous English correspondent who suggested to Menasseh that he should write an official reply in order to refute the anti-Jewish libels that were published at the time. Menasseh then wrote his famous *Vindiciae Judaeorum* (1656). Now Wolf (LXII, LXIII) identifies this "noble" correspondent with Sadler. Roth, however, thinks that this description cannot well be applied to Sadler, who, as Roth says, "though indubitably 'learned', could hardly be described as 'noble' ". He suggests the name of Robert Boyle instead (348 n.11). However, the description of someone as "nobilis" certainly does not always mean that this person is of noble birth. As we see here, Wolf's identification may be the right one.

[34] In the Dedication of *The Hope of Israel* to the English Parliament and the Council of State, Menasseh writes: "As for me (most renowned Fathers) in my dedicating this Discourse to you, I can truly affirm, that I am induced to it upon no other ground then this, that I may gain your favour and good will to our Nation, now scattered almost all over the earth; neither think that I do this, as if I were ignorant how much you have hitherto favored our Nation; for it is made known to me ... that you do vouchsafe to help us, not onely by your prayers; yea, this hath compelled me to speak to you publickly, and to give you thanks for that your charitable affection towards us, and not such thanks which come only from the tongue, but as are conceived by a grateful mind."

That Menasseh was worried about the impression he would make on the outside world also becomes clear from his statement that he feared to seem to be a brawler instead of the assiduous searcher of the truth he sought to be.

The 1649 letters confirm the suggestion that the *Spes Israelis* was written in the autum of 1649 and that at the end of November it was nearly finished. In December—Menasseh then revealed its Latin title—he announced that it was being printed by his own printing house, asking Durie whether he would like to receive, through Moriaen, bound copies or unbound ones. Apparently the book appeared at the beginning of 1650, the dedication being dated 15 January 1650. In the following months Menasseh and Durie kept in touch, the first despatching copies of his work to England, the latter being busy distributing them there among all leading Puritans. At the end of April 1650 Menasseh was asked to send more copies. Instead of Menasseh himself Moriaen sent a reply, not to Durie but to Hartlib, telling him that the Rabbi could not answer Durie's letter immediately because he had to deliver a sermon the next day, but that he promised to forward yet another hundred copies or so to Durie.[35] As appears from the letter of 14 July 1650, Menasseh assumed that by then these extra copies had been safely delivered to Durie—Moriaen had taken care of transmitting them—adding that there were still two hundred copies left which, if it would be to their interest, Menasseh said, might be sent too. This offer would be accepted only too gratefully a few months later: something had gone wrong with the shipment of the first hundred extra copies, which never reached their place of destination. Moriaen, being the one who was responsible for this transmission, was quite puzzled by the situation: he was sure he had sent them to England but unfortunately he had forgotten by what ship. At any rate, Menasseh would forward yet another hundred copies.[36]

The *Spes Israelis* was indeed an instantaneous success in England and soon it was suggested that it should be translated into English. In his July letter Menasseh expressed his joy about this news. He would, however, like to make a few corrections and additions, having drawn up a list of them in his letter. The English edition, published in the autumn of 1650 (without the additions and corrections), was rapidly sold out.[37] Further-

---

[35] HP 37/153.

[36] HP 37/159, published by Blekastad, *Unbekannte Briefe*, 148.

[37] Wolf, *Menasseh ben Israel's Mission*, XXVII. The first English editions appeared anonymously and for some time Durie was thought to be the translator. It was however translated by Moses Wall.

more, Menasseh included a catalogue of his books in his letter, some of them having been published already, others ready for the press.[38] To "the English library", that is, the library of St. James's Palace of which Durie was the newly appointed librarian, he offered a copy of his—as yet unpublished—book on all controversies between Jews and Christians, two volumes with which he himself showed not to be dissatisfied.[39] By this generous offer he hoped to win the favour of the English authorities.

The postscript to the July letter is interesting, showing that Menasseh was afraid Durie's letters would fall into the wrong—Jewish—hands. It is interesting to note that Menasseh used in this connection the adjective "perfidus", which reminds one of the use of this word in connection with Jews in the Christian prayer "pro perfidis judaeis" on Good Friday. So here we see that a Jew could use this word to denote a co-religionist. Menasseh told that he had not received Durie's first letter, the second, however, he did receive but it had been opened and read by some Jew. Therefore he asked Durie to send his letters in the future to Moriaen, who then would deliver them to Menasseh. Clearly this seemed to be the safest way. Thus we see that the Amsterdam Jews kept a close eye upon Menasseh's contacts with his Christian friends, even intercepting letters if they thought that to be necessary.

When in 1655 Menasseh left Amsterdam for London to negotiate the Jewish readmission, previous years of correspondence with his English friends had prepared him for this mission. As he stated himself in his *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, written in England in 1656:

> "... I shall now onely say, and that briefly, that the communication and correspondence I have held, for some yeares since, with some eminent persons of *England*, was the first originall of my undertaking this design. For I alwayes found by them, a great probability of obtaining what I now request; whilst they affirmed, that at this time the minds of men stood very well affected

[38] In both his *Piedra gloriosa o de la estatua de Nebuchadnesar* (1655) and his *Vindiciae Judaeorum* (1656), Menasseh gives a catalogue of his works, in which, of course, works written after 1650 are also mentioned. In these catalogues, however, his work on the Jewish-Christian controversies is not listed, so this was probably not printed. Another difference concerns the work containing his letters to learned men: in his letter of 14 July 1650 he mentions 160 letters. This number matches that mentioned by him in 1640/1641, when he talked of more than 150 letters. In 1647, however, he spoke of more than 300 letters. So in 1650 there was a considerable diminution of the number of letters stated by him. Finally, in 1655, he spoke of 200 letters. See also Offenberg, "Some remarks" (note 16). As to the continuation of Josephus's History, see the ending of his word "To the Courteous Reader" in *The Hope of Israel*, where Menasseh entreats all learned men, wherever they live, to give him timely notice of anything worthy of posterity they might have.

[39] In 1650 Durie was appointed library-keeper of St. James's Palace, which may explain Menasseh's idea to offer one of his works to this library.

towards us; and that our entrance into this Island, would be very acceptable, and well-pleasing unto them. And from this beginning sprang up in me a semblable affection, and desire of obtaining this purpose. For, for seven yeares on this behalf, I have endeavoured, and sollicited it, by letters, and other means, without any intervall."[40]

Indeed, since 1649 Menasseh was in regular contact with his eminent English friends, Durie and Sadler, who with their advice to dedicate the *Spes Israelis* to the English Parliament, directed attention to England and the role it could play for the Jews, thus more or less initiating the readmission campaign in which the Amsterdam Rabbi became so deeply involved. When the Whitehall Conference on this issue, held in December 1655 at London, did not lead to any official results, Menasseh was very disappointed, not being aware of the gain unofficially achieved. He stayed in England, "so long, that he was allmost ashamed to returne to those that sent him", as Sadler afterwards wrote.[41] In September 1657, however, Menasseh left, not returning to Amsterdam but going to family in Middelburg, where he died in November of that year.

His *Spes Israelis*, the tract that had been so important to the English campaign, was to become very popular again in the 1660s. At that time England did not seem important anymore, all eyes then being turned to the Near East and North Africa whence reports reached Europe that the lost tribes were gathering in Assyria and Egypt. Menasseh's tract had clearly contributed to the atmosphere in which such news might easily be accepted. In 1666 the Dutch edition of the *Spes Israelis* was reprinted twice. His old friend Durie was as interested in the fate of the tribes as he had been about seventeen years before, now eagerly awaiting Serrarius' letters on this issue.[42] One might wonder whether Durie realized that his simple inquiry with Menasseh in 1649 had been one of the initial factors, by occasioning the publication of an influential book, of the messianic outburst of the 1660s.

I. Menasseh ben Israel to John Durie 25 November 1649 (HP 44/5/5)

Reverende et doctissime vir,

Quod ad tuas simulac delatae fuere non responderim, nolim existimes minus eo gratus fuisse. Nimirum cum me aliquem esse censeas, dum judicium nostrum supra illa Antonii Mortosini [*sic*] relatione expostulas, ac deesse humanissimae invitationi tuae nec possem nec vellem, responsionem distuli, quia explicationem quaestionis propositae una mittere erat animus. Sed enim dum plenius desiderio

[40] *Vindiciae Judaeorum*, reprinted in Wolf 105-147, see 143.

[41] In his petition to Richard Cromwell, see Wolf LXXXVII-LXXXVIII.

[42] Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi*, 344-346.

tuo satisfacere satagebam, accidit, ut meditatione alia aliam pre/perimente (?), id quod pagina una altera absoluturum me speraram, in iustum tractatum excreverit. Ago itaque in eo de primis Americae incolis, quos ex decem tribubus fuisse existimo. Quid, quod eos per alias etiam, quas ostendo regiones, sparsos, rectaeque etiamnum religioni addictos, ut qui suo tempore in terram sanctam redituros se confidant, ex Sacris candide, et qui mihi mos est, modeste, probem. Cum autem id jam curem unicum ut Latinis typis excudatur, te, vir pietate insignis, rogatum velim, ut cum nobilissimo atque amicissimo nobis domino Sadlero consilium ineas de viro, cui potissimum inscribendum opusculum hoc judicetis, meque certiorem reddere prima occasione non graveris. Officiosa salute imperti nobilissimum Sadlerum ac generosum virum communemque amicum nostrum dominum Worsleyum, quem jam peracto feliciter itinere ad vos venisse spero. Vale.

Claritati tuae addictissimus
Menasseh ben Israel

Amstelodami XXV Nov. An. 5410.
(i.m. illegible short remark)

II. Menasseh ben Israel to John Durie 23 December 1649 (HP 44/5/1ro,vo)

Reverende et clarissime vir,

Fervet jam praelum meum opere nostro, de quo ego ad te nuper, cui titulum do Spes Israelis. Praemitto ei Antonii Montezini relationem Latine versam. Doceo autem quomodo primi fuerint Americae inventores Israelitae nostri; aliorum nil moratus opiniones, quas breviter tantum refutare visum fuit. Neque ibi tantum vivere existimo X tribus, sed et aliis passim in terris. Illae vero nunquam ad secundum redierunt templum servantque adhuc dum hodie religionem Judaicam. Siquidem omnes etiam prophetiae, quae de reductione in patriam loquuntur, impleri debent, ita convenient suo tempore omnes tribus ex omnibus mundi plagis, in duas provincias Assyriam nempe et Aegyptum, ac non amplius divisum erit eorum regnum, sed unum habebunt principem Messiah ben David. Perstringo etiam inquisitionem Hispanicam, ac recenseo aliquot tum nostrae nationis tum Christianos martyres varia tormentorum genera nostris temporibus passos. Dein, postquam ostendi quantis Judaei nostri a variis etiam, qui Christo nomen dedere, principibus afficiantur honoribus, probo multis brevi instare diem promissi nobis Messiae, qua itidem occasione multas explico prophetias. Id vero mihi curae est, ne, dum candide ac modeste mea ago, cuiquam molestus sim, et vitili[ti]gator potius quam veritatis studiosus indagator dicar. Multa videbis hic quae et scire proderit et juvabit, ex authoribus Hebraeis, Graecis, Latinis, et Hispanis collecta, quamquam alias nemini haec ex professo, ut loquuntur, tractata sciam. Multa vero me movent ut candidum consilium tuum ambabus, quod dici solet, ulnis amplectar. Itaque libellum hunc, ut mones, consilio illi vestro dedicare constitui, eo quod ab omnibus libertatem amari videam, ac singularem eorum erga exteros et peregrinos praedicari audiam benevolentiam. Sed enim quia facile a me, vel in titulis vel in ipsis etiam rebus, multis modis peccari possit, ignosces mihi, vir reverende, si dedicationem ipsam a te confectam exspectare me, quacun-

que mittere libuerit occasione, dixero. Scis quam facile nobis vel invidiam vel odium talibus conciliemus, quando rerum vivimus ignari. Peculiarem vero tractatum dein domino Oliverio Cromwel inscribere animus est, si quidem serena fronte acceptaturum nostra cognovero. Scribe quaeso mittendane sint exemplaria compacta an incompacta per dominum Morianum. Cum voto finio, ut nempe tibi in omnibus faveat Deus, ut et illis, a quibus amari me scio, ut domino Sadlero et domino Worslaeo. Amstelodami 23. dec. an. 5410/1649.

Clarissimi nominis tui
observantissimus
Menasseh ben Israel

III. Menasseh ben Israel to John Durie 14 July 1650 (HP44/5/3,4)

Nunquam a te accipio literas, quae non summum tuum ac nobilissimi Sadleri erga me amorem testentur, Duraee vir clarissime. Nunquam vero ego quicquam ad vos praeter inanem gratiarum actionem, et quin insuper vobis molestus sim. Sed enim novi ego humanitatem vestram nec fugit vos nihil ab homuncione hoc proficisci posse, quod vobis sit dignum. Quod si tamen opera ejus utilis esse queat, facito ut re-ipsa ostendam potius quam verbis esse me vestrum. Caeterum jam duo sunt menses, quod penes se habuerit illa tractatus nostri quae desideras exemplaria dominus Morianus, ac non dubius sum, quin vobis jam sint tradita, siquidem aliquot diebus favit ventus secundior Angliam vestram petentibus. Restant mihi adhuc ducenta exemplaria, quae si mitti e re nostra fore existimaris, curabo id quamprimum fieri. Admodum autem mihi gratulor, quod opusculum hoc nostrum dignum judices, ut in linguam vestram traductum ab omnibus vestris legatur. Sed vide quaeso pauca haec quae addi velim. Jungo et catalogum operum meorum quae hactenus edidi ac quae partim affecta, partim confecta habeo. Sunt vero inter haec duo tomi in quibus ago de omnibus controversiis, quae inter Judaeos et Christianos ventilantur, quos quidem ego in precio summo habeo: nec tamen in tanto, ut non lubentissimo animo Bibliothecae vestrae Anglicanae eos offerre velim, si hoc modo videar vobis posse conciliare mihi procerum vestrorum animos, ut ipsis inopiae nostrae succurrentibus commodius evulgem, quae affecta habere me juxta cum domino Sadlero non ignoras. Deum precor, ut te diu servet incolumem, ut et nobilissimum dominum Sadlerum; ac rogo vos, ne nostri vivatis immemores. Dabam Amstelod. XIIII Jul. Sty. nov. An 5410.

Tuus tuo merito
M.b. Israel

Literas meas quas ad me mittis, quaeso tuis ad dominum Morianum include: siquidem tamen minus erit periculi, ut vel in perfidas incidant manus vel oculos. Primae nempe tuae mihi redditae non sunt, secundae quidem redditae, sed jam ab nescio quo alio Judaeo lectae.

[CORRECTIONS & ADDITIONS]

— Pag. 80 lin. 24 corrige "non restaurabitur; nam ut monet Ezechiel c. 37. erunt X. tribus sub unico imperio Messiae etc."

— et Pag. 81 l. 2. dele vocem "X. tribus".
— Pag. ead. l. 4. pro "Princeps" lege "Principes".
— Pag. 89 lin. 1 adde "Pauci etiam sunt anni quod Parisiis Antonius Vanininus et Genevae (anno huius saeculi XXXII) Nicolaus Antonius Jesuita Philosophus insignis eadem de causa extincti sint; atque hic quidem quod 12 Theses contra fidem Christianum, quas penes me habeo, defendere vellet."
— Pag. 91 lin. 4. "Sic Moses postquam cap. 28 Deut. protulisset maledictiones adversus eos qui transgrederentur legem Domini, repetit novas maledictiones cap. XXIX. quo significaret diuturnitatem captivitatis ac multitudinem instantium calamitatum. Et tamen cap. XXX. benedictiones ac de restauratione populi etc. missionem subjungit."
— Pag. 97 lin. 12. "Dominus" etc. adde "Sic vertendum est. Non autem ut Hieronymus et alii devorabant et evenisse."
— Pag. eadem lin. 20. secundi. adde "et alias respublicas castigavit Deus statim cum peste ac morbis cum in modum contagiosis, ut brevissimo tempore plusquam tertiam partem absumerent, quanquam voce divina causam aliam traderent."

CATALOGUS
Librorum editorum Hebraice
Pen Raba in Rabot

Latine
Prima pars Conciliatoris
Libri 3 De resurrectione mortuorum etc.
Problemata de creatione
De termino vitae
De fragilitate humana
Spes Israelis
Oratio gratulatoria ad Celsissimum Principem Auriacum

Hispanice praeter hosce qui etiam eadem lingua editi sunt
2 et 3 partes Conciliatorium
Pentateuchus cum Notis
Libri V de ritibus et ceremoniis Judaeorum
Libri quatuor liturgiarum reformatarum cum nova versione

Edenda jam confecta in lingua Latina
Duo magni tomi in quibus agitur de omnibus controversiis, quae inter Judaeos et Christianis moventur, cum diversis tractatibus
CLX Epistolae scriptae ad viros doctos et magnates
CCCCL Conciones in lingua Lusitanica

Affecta
Historia Judaica vel continuatio Historiae Flavii Josephi ad haec usque temporum
Bibliotheca Rabbinorum
De divinitate legis Mosaicae

EEN PLEIDOOI VOOR DE VERBETERING VAN DE POSITIE DER KATHOLIEKEN IN DE STAATSE LANDEN VAN OVERMAAS TIJDENS DE VREDESONDERHANDELINGEN IN RIJSWIJK (1697) EN EEN PROTESTANTSE REACTIE DAAROP.

door W. A. J. Munier

In de geschiedenis van wat tegenwoordig in het nederlandse staatsbestel de provincie Limburg heet, vormen, althans voor de stad Maastricht en de z.g. landen van Overmaas, de jaren 1632 en 1661 markante momenten[1]. In het jaar 1632 vond de in die tijd opzienbarende verovering van de strategisch uiterst belangrijke vestingstad Maastricht door Frederik Hendrik plaats, en sindsdien is de stad op een aantal kortere of langere onderbrekingen na onder nederlands gezag gebleven. In het jaar 1661 werd een accoord bereikt over het lot van de z.g. landen van Overmaas tussen de Republiek der Verenigde Nederlanden en het koninkrijk Spanje dat een eind maakte aan een conflict dat beide landen vanaf 1648, dus na de vrede van Munster, tegenover elkaar had geplaatst. Beide gebeurtenissen bepaalden ook de status van de twee religies, de rooms-katholieke en de gereformeerde, op een aan de eigen status van Maastricht en het staats geworden deel van de landen van Overmaas aangepaste wijze. In het kader van de z.g. tweeherigheid die vanaf de middeleeuwen kenmerkend was geweest voor Maastricht had de stad voortaan niet alleen twee heren, maar ook twee confessies. De ene heer, de prins-bisschop van Luik, was de rooms-katholieke religie, de tweede heer, de Staten Generaal der Verenigde Nederlanden die in de rechten waren getreden van de hertog van Brabant, was de gereformeerde religie toegedaan. Het capitulatieverdrag dat op 22 augustus 1632 was afgesloten[2], bepaalde in principe de status van beide

---

[1] Voor een algemene oriëntering in de hier beschreven periode kan men terecht in de Algemene Geschiedenis der Nederlanden, 8, Haarlem 1979, 282vv., in het bijzonder 310-315; voor de geschiedenis van Limburg in deze periode zie Ch. Thewissen, Limburg van 1648-1795, in: Limburgs Verleden, II, Maastricht 1967, 302-355, en W. Jappe Alberts, Geschiedenis van de beide Limburgen, II, Assen 1974, 1-115. Voor de hier bedoelde markante momenten in de geschiedenis van Maastricht en de landen van Overmaas zie P. J. H. Ubachs, Twee heren, twee confessies, de verhouding van Staat en Kerk te Maastricht, 1632-1673, (Maaslandse Monografieën, 21), Assen 1975; en J. A. K. Haas, De verdeling van de Landen van Overmaas 1644-1662, territoriale desintegratie van een betwist grensgebied, (Maaslandse Monografieën, 27), Assen 1978.

[2] De tekst is te vinden bij Ubachs, a.w., 442-444.