



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Pleading for diversity : the church Caspar Coolhaes wanted

Gottschalk, Linda Stuckrath

Citation

Gottschalk, L. S. (2016, April 6). *Pleading for diversity : the church Caspar Coolhaes wanted*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/38762>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/38762>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/38762> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Gottschalk, Linda Stuckrath

Title: Pleading for diversity : the church Caspar Coolhaes wanted

Issue Date: 2016-04-06

Introduction

In this dissertation, I set myself the task of bringing the ecclesiology of Caspar Coolhaes into focus, first through an updated biographical sketch, and then through special attention to his written works. Coolhaes opposed many features of the organization of the developing Reformed Church in the Northern Netherlands and Dutch Republic in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. He disagreed strongly with the “Reformed polity” which many of the the Calvinist clergy were pursuing with vigor.¹ He was also critical of all other major confessions. The question, therefore, is this: what sort of church would Coolhaes himself have wanted to design for the new Republic?

Caspar Coolhaes (c. 1534-1615) was a Reformed preacher and a writer of theological tracts. In his writings he showed himself to be a critic of the churches of his day and an advocate of religious diversity. Originally from the German Palatinate, he came to preach and live in the Northern Netherlands during the Dutch Revolt, when the region was struggling for a new political direction and a new identity. He advocated a broader church than many of his Reformed colleagues. Although he died before the National Synod of Dordt (1618-1619), he would have opposed its decisions vehemently.² He was linked during that process with the ideas of Arminius, and it is no wonder that H. C. Rogge, his first biographer, took hold of and further established the idea of Coolhaes as the forerunner of Arminius and the Remonstrants.³ But Coolhaes never saw the emergence of the kind of church he was advocating.

He was not unique in his broader views, nor in his critiques. Others in his day felt similarly. In addition, a large percentage of the population in the Northern Netherlands and the emerging Dutch Republic of the late sixteenth century had not made a clear choice for

1. Alastair Duke and Rosemary Jones, “Towards a Reformed Polity in Holland, 1572-1576,” in Alastair Duke, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1990), 199-226.

2. It may seem bold of me to speculate as to Coolhaes’ reaction to the National Synod, but, as we will see, he died only in 1615, just three years before the start of the Synod and during the controversy which led up to it. He had also earlier addressed both Arminius and Gomarus about their disagreements, as will be discussed.

3. Hendrik Cornelis Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes, voorlooper van Arminius en de Remonstranten* (Amsterdam: H. W. Mooij, 1856). The first volume of the two-volume work appeared in 1856, and the second volume in 1858. They were reprinted in 1865, but that edition is missing a few pages (vol. 2, 241-47, which comprise several pages of “Additions and corrections”). There is also a new scanned and reprinted facsimile version available from Nabu Press, 2010. All of these editions are identical; they are the 1865 edition; there is no new material, although both the Nabu Press edition and the online versions are missing the aforementioned pages. So, the 1856/8 edition is actually the more complete one.

any confessional identity. True, many of them were *liefhebbers* of the Reformed religion, others were members of that church or of some other, but others had no ties to any church. Those who differed in their views were often categorized as “other”: as Papists, libertines, Neutralists, Schwenckfelders, Franckists, “enthusiasts,” *Schwärmer*, *geest-drijvers* – pejoratively-meant terms which were also often inaccurate.⁴

Coolhaes was, himself, eclectic in the views he held. This study will argue that he was inspired by Reformed ideas, both Zwinglian and Calvinist, and also by Lutheranism and Spiritualism. In fact, this dissertation will argue that Spiritualism is foundational to his ecclesiology. Spiritualists were a heterogeneous group who tended to be dissatisfied with the progress of the Reformation, critical of established or state churches, tolerant of diversity, and who focused on the Spirit and the subjective aspects of religion. Many were members of the so-called “Radical Reformation.” But Coolhaes was a Reformed Spiritualist, who identified as Reformed, served as a Reformed preacher, and continued to hold broadly Reformed beliefs throughout his life.

Nevertheless, Coolhaes was a critic of the Reformed Church. His writings are full of criticism of what he saw as hypocrisy in many Reformed preachers. He deplored treating “human” (non-biblical) writings such as catechisms, synodal acts, and writings of theologians as authoritative, which he held that many Reformed preachers did. He disagreed with those who emphasized visible, external things but in his view disregarded the invisible, the internal, but essential things. Especially, he opposed the lack of love in the greater Body of Christ - in other words, in the whole visible church - which was leading to judgment and condemnation of some by others. Coolhaes pleaded for religious diversity within the visible church as well as society. Surprisingly, because of this, he often held even his own theological views loosely for the sake of what he considered love and tolerance.⁵ This has frequently made it difficult for scholars to categorize him.

4. Wiebe Bergsma, “Calvinisten en libertijnen,” *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 22 (1996): 209.

5. “Tolerance” and “toleration” are very similar words, and share the verb form “to tolerate.” Benjamin J. Kaplan writes that, traditionally, tolerance was seen as an abstract ideal, whereas toleration means the actual, “peaceful coexistence” between those whose religions differed. Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Divided by Faith: Religious Conflict and the Practice of Toleration in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2007), 7-8. A similar way of differentiating the two concepts is to say that tolerance is a non-judgmental attitude and acceptance of differences, whereas toleration is the legal acceptance of others while at the same time retaining the right to a personal disapproval of them or their views or practices. In other words, tolerance is an attitude; toleration is a law. See *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://www.iep.utm.edu/tolerati/> (accessed 3 August 2015), for the history of this view. Coolhaes himself usually wrote of *verdraagzaamheid*, which can be translated as both toleration and tolerance. I will use

A longer biographical sketch will follow, in the first part of the dissertation, but the basics of his biography are that Coolhaes was raised Roman Catholic in the German Palatinate, and then became a monk. He had then “come over to the Reformation,” as he put it, and preached in various cities. In 1566 he moved to the Northern Netherlands to serve as a Reformed preacher. Later, as one of the city preachers in Leiden, he ran afoul of stricter Calvinist colleagues and took the side of the city magistrates against them. His insistence on a broader sort of Protestantism, and specific disagreements with the consistory and preachers, eventually led to his defrocking at the Synod of Middelburg (1581), and, soon after, to excommunication from the Reformed Church. He was the first person to be excommunicated by these Dutch Calvinists.⁶ To support his family, he learned the distilling trade, but continued to write in defense of religious diversity and tolerance throughout his long life.

Although this dissertation has no pretensions to offer a full-fledged biography,⁷ the first part will summarize, supplement and update Coolhaes’ life story with details which were not known to the only major biographer Coolhaes has had up till today, the nineteenth-century Remonstrant, Hendrik Cornelis Rogge. Many of these details have been brought to light after Rogge’s two-volume study in 1856-1858 by other scholars, and this biographical sketch will make an effort to bring them together. I was also glad to build on the work of other scholars, including Christine Kooi, Olivier Fatio, Jan van Dooren and others, to add pertinent details from those sources, and to weave them into my story. In short, this is not yet the definitive biography of Coolhaes; the first part of this dissertation is intended to bring together the biographical facts which are known at this point, as a solid basis for the discussion of ecclesiology in the second part. The first part will introduce most of his writings, putting them in context. The second part of the dissertation will focus in detail on his ecclesiology. Coolhaes was critical of all churches and confessions, so what sort of church would he have wanted? His doctrine of the church, its definition and its practices, will be explored, using a deeper discussion of his books and other writings as the main sources of his views. Despite Coolhaes’ various writings, interests and activities throughout his life, his main preoccupation was the church.

the word “tolerance” in my discussion of Coolhaes’ view about personal religious freedom, and “toleration” when I am talking about his opinion of legal religious freedom.

6 . J. Wayne Baker, “Zwinglianism,” *OER*, vol. 4, 325.

7. I also look forward very much to the work which C. P. (Kees) de Wildt, PhD researcher at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, is doing with the Leiden church council records from this period.

A forerunner of Arminius and the Remonstrants?

Coolhaes was a preacher and theologian, but he built no far-reaching theological system as, for instance, Arminius would. He was not the founder of a separate church, nor would he have wanted to be. Nevertheless, as just mentioned, he has been identified with Remonstrantism. Contra-Remonstrants were quick to connect Coolhaes with the Remonstrants. After his death, he was listed in the foreword of the *Acta* of the Synod of Dordt.⁸ Remonstrant Johannes Wtenbogaert, in his *Kerkelicke historie* of 1647, however, claimed that the Remonstrants were not Coolhaes' followers. Referring to Coolhaes' *Naedencken*, he maintained that Coolhaes had not actually denied predestination.⁹ It was Contra-Remonstrant Jacobus Trigland, responding to Wtenbogaert, who first called Coolhaes "the forerunner of Arminius and the Remonstrants," the label which Rogge would later use. Trigland, in his *Kerkelycke Geschiedenissen* of 1650, retold the whole Coolhaes history to prove that the Reformed Church was consistent and fair in their judgment of him and others.¹⁰

It is possible that early Remonstrants may have minimized any connection with the disgraced, excommunicated Coolhaes because their reputation would not have benefited from it. Over time, though, Remonstrants have been more than willing to claim a connection with the earlier conflicts in which Coolhaes and others had been involved.¹¹ In the early twentieth

8. This list is reproduced in the "Acta of handelingen der nationale synode Dordrecht 1618-1619," *Kerkrecht*, www.kerkrecht.nl/node/1857 (accessed 26 jan. 2016). For more background on those mentioned and on the Synod as a whole, see also the following recent works relating to it: Donald Sinnema, Christian Moser, and Herman J. Selderhuis, eds., *Acta of the Synod of Dordt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015); Aza Goudriaan and Fred van Lieburg, eds., *Revisiting the Synod of Dordt (1618-1619)* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

9. Johannes Wtenbogaert, *Kerkelicke historie vervattende verscheyden, gedenckwaardige saken in de Christenheyt voorgevallen van het jaer 400 af tot het jaer 1619: voornamentlijck in dese geunieerde provincien*, vol. 2 (Rotterdam: Wagens, 1647), 214b. See also J. Kamphuis, *Kerkelijke besluitvaardigheid* (Groningen: Uitgeverij De Vuurbaak, 1970), 12.

10. Jacobus Trigland, *Kerkelycke geschiedenissen. begrypende de swaere en bekommerlijcke geschillen, in de Vereenigde Nederlanden voorgevallen, met derselver beslissinge, ende aenmerkingen op de kerchelycke historie van Johannes VVtenbogaert* (Leiden: A. Wijngaerden, 1650), 188-90. See also Jacobus Trigland, *Klaer ende grondich teghen-vertooch, van eenighe kercken-dienaren van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt, gestelt tegen seker vertoogh der Remonstranten* (Amsterdam: F. M. J. Brandt, 1617), 36-37. See also mention of Coolhaes in H. W. ter Haar, *Jacobus Trigland* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1891), 159, 166-67.

11. Benjamin J. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines: Confession and Community in Utrecht 1578-1620* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press/Clarendon Press, 1995), 230; James Nichols, trans. *The Works of James Arminius, D.D.*, vol. 1 (Auburn/Buffalo, NY: Derby and Miller, 1853), 240, 229-30.

century, Coolhaes was given several pages as part of a discussion of currents preceding the Remonstrant movement in a volume celebrating the three-hundred-year anniversary of the Remonstrant Brotherhood.¹² However, it has really been since the nineteenth century, through Rogge's biography, that Coolhaes has become so linked with Arminius. Rogge's interest and archival diligence produced the biography that has long stood as a good reference about Coolhaes' life and many of his basic views. He is right that Coolhaes was certainly one forerunner of Arminius and also of the Remonstrants. Rogge's biography is still extremely valuable, and an important study to build on for any scholar who wants to study Caspar Coolhaes. In a way, however, it can be argued that Rogge did Coolhaes a disservice by so closely identifying him anew with Remonstrantism, a theological and political movement with which Coolhaes had much in common, but which he did not know in his life and which brought a division which I believe he would not have supported.

In what ways, then, is Coolhaes linked to Arminius? Coolhaes and Arminius are both representatives of the rather heterogeneous *libertatis causa* faction as opposed to the *religionis causa* group. *Libertatis causa*, "for the sake of liberty," was used widely during the Dutch Revolt as a rallying cry by many, in contrast to others who preferred the slogan "for the sake of [the] religion." The stricter Reformed, or Calvinist, portion of the population, wanted rather to frame the Revolt as a fight for the Reformed faith.¹³

Also, it will be shown that Coolhaes, like the Remonstrants, seemed to oppose what we know as the doctrines of total depravity and limited atonement. In addition, he opposed continued focus on predestination and other "hard" doctrines, when they were insisted upon to the detriment of love and tolerance. Also, his pleading for diversity and toleration was very much in the spirit of the Remonstrants. Coolhaes emphasized that God gives grace to all to choose to do the good. In a desire not to make God the author of evil, he put any failures on the human side of the equation. This was Arminius' view also,¹⁴ and the view of the earliest

12. F. Pijper, "Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland vóór de opkomst van het Remonstrantisme," in *De Remonstranten. Gedenkboek bij het 300-jarig bestaan der Remonstrantsche Broederschap*, ed. G.J. Heering and H.Y. Groenewegen (Leiden: Sijthoff, 1919), 54-57.

13. Christine Kooi, *Liberty and Religion: Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572-1620* (Leiden, Boston, Cologne: Brill, 2000), 29.

14. Keith D. Stanglin and Thomas H. McCall, *Jacob Arminius, Theologian of Grace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 140.

Remonstrants.¹⁵ Coolhaes' statements on these ideas will be examined in more detail throughout the dissertation. Holding Scripture above confessions, and desiring unity and toleration, are two important aspects of the "Arminian legacy,"¹⁶ which in fact Coolhaes taught first. Furthermore, his desire for toleration and diversity, free from the rule of the preachers and the church, foreshadows the Remonstrants. In these basics, he can truly be said to be their forerunner. On the question of the relationship between church and state, the Remonstrants also reflected and indeed expanded Coolhaes' ideas. Wtenbogaert, in his 1610 publication *Tractaet van t'ampt ende autoriteyt eener hoogher christelicker overheydt in kerckelicke saecken*, asserted that "collaterality" between ecclesiastical and secular governments as two separate authorities was unworkable. Instead, the secular government, ordained by God, should have authority over all public, external worship.¹⁷ Hugo Grotius would go on to say that when a church is called "public," it means that no one except God may decide on it.¹⁸ All of these points are arguments for Coolhaes being a forerunner of the Remonstrants.

However, a close identification of Coolhaes as the forerunner of Arminius, especially as his primary inspiration, is not made as easily. In the nineteenth century, Rogge picked up this old claim. A Remonstrant himself, he was interested in establishing Coolhaes' link with Remonstrantism, and to identify and popularize in him a hero for his church. His biography of Coolhaes is very thorough in discussing events up to the Synod of Middelburg in 1581, which began the process which led to Coolhaes' defrocking and excommunication. In addition, Rogge summarized some of Coolhaes' works, but did not spend much time on the majority of the theological writings, which were written after this Synod. Even when he used, as sources, those works of Coolhaes accessible to him, he focused largely on the biographical sections, the schisms, and the synods, while summarizing and skimming over many doctrinal sections. For any theological analysis of Coolhaes, therefore, Rogge's biography is not enough. It is important to look more closely at Coolhaes' theological writings.

15. Stanglin and McCall, *Jacob Arminius*, 190.

16. Stanglin and McCall, *Jacob Arminius*, 204-205.

17. Quoted in Hugo Grotius, *Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas (1613)*, ed. Edwin Rabbie (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 15-16.

18. Grotius, *Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas*, 189. See also Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 12, in regard to this connection.

In looking at these writings, one can see that Jacob Arminius was not a follower of Coolhaes in any clear way. They did hold common ground in an emphasis on free will, and in finding problematic any systems which seemed to make God the author of evil. Nevertheless, there is no one-to-one correlation between Coolhaes and Arminius, historically or doctrinally. It is true that Arminius had been a student in Leiden when Coolhaes was a preacher there in the city churches, and was present in the city during the so-called “schisms” of the Leiden church which resulted from Coolhaes’ disagreements with his fellow Leiden preachers. Coolhaes and his preaching would thus certainly have been familiar to Arminius. And, as it will be shown, Coolhaes briefly lectured at Leiden University in the spring of 1575. However, Arminius would not have been one of his students, since he studied in Leiden from 1576 to 1581.¹⁹ No list remains of the students Coolhaes taught. It is, nevertheless, certainly possible that Arminius may have absorbed some general impressions from Coolhaes during his time in Leiden which inspired him.

However, Arminius was not impacted solely by Coolhaes. As a theologian, Arminius had studied not only at Leiden University but also in Geneva with Theodore Beza. He was conversant with the philosophical thought of Petrus Ramus. He was a greater and more far-ranging theologian than Coolhaes had the capacity or interest to be. He was also systematic and thorough, as Coolhaes was not; his writings encompassed all dogmatic *loci*. He went on to become a Reformed preacher in Amsterdam as well as returning as a professor in Leiden. He famously disputed with Franciscus Gomarus and his other colleagues at Leiden University, at the heart of one of, arguably, the most significant theological debates in the history of Christianity.²⁰

19. Guilielmus du Rieu, *Album studiosorum academiae Lugduno Batavae 1575-1875* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1875) 4, 1449.

20. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to analyze Arminius or Gomarus, or their thought, fully; however, a few sources may be helpful. For sources on the life of Franciscus Gomarus, see J. P. van Itterzon, *Franciscus Gomarus* (Den Haag: Nijhoff, 1929); and J. van Belzen, and S. D. Post, *Vroom, vurig en vreedzaam: het leven van Franciscus Gomarus (1563-1641)* (Houten: Den Hertog, 1996). For Arminius’ biography, see Carl Bangs, *Arminius. A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1998) (originally published by Abingdon Press, 1971). See also Stanglin and McCall, *Jacob Arminius, Theologian of Grace*. See also: Keith Stanglin, ed., *The Missing Public Disputations of Jacobus Arminius: Introduction, Text, and Notes* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010); William den Boer, *God’s Two-fold Love. The Theology of Jacob Arminius (1559-1609)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010). See also some newer studies about Arminius: William den Boer, “Defense or Deviation? A Re-examination of Arminius’ Motives to Deviate from the ‘Mainstream’ Reformed Theology,” in *Revisiting the Synod of Dort (1681-1619)*, 23-48; Simon Vuyk, *Het einde der Remonstranten: Arminius als mythe: vrijheid en verdraagzaamheid bij de Remonstranten als probleem* (Utrecht: Kok, 2012); John Valero Fesko, “Arminius on Justification,” *Church History and Religious Culture* 94 (2014): 1-21; Simon

Furthermore, during the course of that debate, it is important to know that Coolhaes rebuked both Arminius and Gomarus equally for what he saw as a mistaken focus and lack of good teaching and example. These rebukes will be described in more detail later.

Also different from Arminius was Coolhaes' controversial support of Mennonites, Catholics, and Spiritualists, and even of certain Socinians. Coolhaes was broader and more accepting in that sense than Arminius. In fact, Willem Nijenhuis found this decisive. He judged that Coolhaes' sympathies for Socinians and Spiritualists make it impossible for him to be the forerunner of the Remonstrants.²¹ Finally, Coolhaes would have abhorred the continued division between Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants which played out after his death in 1615. He pleaded for diversity within the visible church, not for the creation of more theological or confessional groups. It is hard to imagine him at all happy with the emergence of the Remonstrants, even though he would have thoroughly opposed many of the Contra-Remonstrant positions. For all of these reasons, even though similarity can be seen between the broader Reformed ideas of Coolhaes and Arminius, and it may be true that Coolhaes was one inspiration to Arminius, it is inadvisable to link them together unquestioningly.

In addition, Coolhaes himself is a part of a bigger stream of critics and discontents: it is important to say that he was more than "just" a forerunner of Arminius and the Remonstrants. Coolhaes was similar to other libertine preachers in the Netherlands in various ways. Rogge pointed out his resemblance to Herman Herberts of Gouda, who had affirmed human perfectability and denied predestination, to Tako Sybrants of Utrecht and later Medemblik, who also rejected predestination, and to Cornelis Wiggertsz of Hoorn, who had rejected the doctrine of original sin.²² Herberts, Wiggertsz and Coolhaes were named as forerunners of Arminius at the National Synod of Dordt, 1618-1619, in the foreword of the *Acta* of the Synod.²³ But they were not the only contemporaries of Coolhaes who were

Vuyk, *De Arminiaanse vredeskerk: redevoeringen van Jacobus Arminius (1606) en Simon Episcopus (1618) over de onderlinge verdraagzaamheid van Christenen* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2015).

21. Willem Nijenhuis, "Coolhaes (Koolhaes, Coelaas), Caspar Janszoon," in *BLGNP*, vol. 4, 102.

22. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 152-230. Although Coolhaes was compared to some who rejected original sin and affirmed human perfectability, we will argue that his position on these questions is difficult to pin down.

23. "Foreword of the *Acta* of the National Synod of Dordt," *Kerkrecht*, www.kerkrecht.nl/node/1857 (accessed 26 jan. 2016).

similar to him. Cornelis van Braeckel and Pieter (Petrus) Hackius, both later preachers in Leiden, would be his successors in criticism of Reformed power there.²⁴ Also, earlier, Herman Duifhuis in Utrecht had agreed with Coolhaes on the importance of the Spirit and open communion, and opposition to consistories and confessionalism.²⁵ In Rotterdam, the conflict around Petrus Anastasius Hyperphragmus Gandensis, the magistrates' choice, echoed the struggle in Leiden between consistory and secular government. In addition, Michiel Andrieszoon, who preached in several places including The Hague and in Friesland, opposed Reformed organization in favor of secular oversight of the church.²⁶ So, in short, Coolhaes was one of a large number of preachers and laymen of his time who were critical of and discontented with various aspects of the churches and belief.

In addition, Coolhaes was a Spiritualist, which Arminius was not. This dissertation argues that he should be seen as a member of a “fourth stream” of sixteenth-century Dutch church history. Sebastian Franck, a German Spiritualist who inspired Coolhaes, described this category:

Three main beliefs have originated in our times, which have large following: Lutherans, Zwinglians and Baptists; the fourth is coming, that will clear out of the way all outward preaching, ceremonies, sacraments, the ban, and callings as unnecessary, and simply collect an invisible, spiritual Church in unity of the Spirit and belief among all people²⁷

The great Dutch expert on Reformation history, Cornelis Augustijn, also spoke of these categories when he proposed that alongside Catholics, Calvinists and Anabaptists, one should speak of a fourth stream – libertines, enthusiasts, “neutrals.” This fourth stream is for him not necessarily a statement of ideology, but should be seen as those who had a more critical

24. Olivier Fatio, *Nihil pulchrius ordine: contribution à l'étude de l'établissement de la discipline ecclésiastique aux Pays-Bas, ou Lambert Daneau aux Pays-Bas (1581-1583)* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 83.

25. Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, 80, 86-92.

26. *NNBW*, vol. 9, 25-26; J. Smit, “Michael Andrieszoon, de eerste predikant van Den Haag, medestander van Coolhaes in zijn strijd tegen kerkorde en confessie,” *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 24 (1931): 25-68.

27. Quoted by Patrick Hayden-Roy, *The Inner Word and the Outer World. A Biography of Sebastian Franck* (New York: Peter Lang, 1994), 40.

stance against the Reformed Church.²⁸ Coolhaes fits into this stream. In this dissertation, I define this “fourth stream” as that of the Spiritualists, and talk more in depth about it in Chapter 6.

One could even argue that Coolhaes, along with other Spiritualists, critics of clericalism and a strict rule of the Reformed Church, and advocates of tolerance and religious diversity, can be seen as forerunners of other broad, modern movements and ideas. In this group of many critics, skeptics, libertarians and free-thinkers, Coolhaes is like one small drop of water in a thunderstorm. But it is not too much to say that he, together with many, many others, is one forerunner not just of Arminius and the Remonstrants with their opposition of Calvinist predestination and their calls for toleration, but also of the Collegiants and Quakers and their free preaching and reliance on the Spirit, the Pietists and their emphasis on affective religion, and even in a small way of the Enlightenment and its religious skepticism.²⁹

Overview of Coolhaes study: some trends and aspects

This dissertation is being completed in 2015 – four hundred years after Coolhaes’ death in 1615. Interest in Coolhaes by others has ebbed and flowed with these centuries. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Coolhaes was mentioned in contemporary documents. The first few sources are from Coolhaes’ lifetime, in the period before his excommunication, during the turbulent times of disagreement between the Leiden preachers, elders and magistrates. Most of them will be discussed in more depth as they come up chronologically and thematically, but a brief introduction is in order at this point. The “Arbitral Accord” is the document of reconciliation between previously quarreling preachers Coolhaes and Pieter Cornelisz, which was reprinted and discussed, in the story of Leiden’s Reformation and its

28. Cornelis Augustijn, “Die Reformierte Kirche in den Niederlanden und der Libertinismus in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts,” in *Querdenken. Dissenz und Toleranz im Wandel der Geschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Hans R. Guggisberg*, ed. M. Erbe et al. (Mannheim: Palatium, 1996), 107-21. See also: Bergsma, “Calvinisten en libertijnen,” 220; Janse, “De protestantse reformatie,” 42.

29. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *An Introduction to Ecclesiology: Ecumenical, Historical and Global Perspectives* (Downer’s Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002) 67; John G. Stackhouse, Jr., ed., *Evangelical Ecclesiology: Reality or Illusion?* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic), 2003, 23; R. Emmet McLaughlin, *The Freedom of Spirit, Social Privilege, and Religious Dissent: Caspar Schwenckfeld and the Schwenckfelders* (Baden-Baden: V. Koerner, 1996), 70-71; R. Emmet McLaughlin, “Sebastian Franck and Caspar Schwenckfeld: two Spiritualist *Viae*,” in Jan-Dirk Müller, ed., *Sebastian Franck (1499-1542)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1993), 84.

fiery schisms, by Christine Kooi.³⁰ *Justificatie* and *Remonstrance*, presented initially as anonymous works issued by the Leiden magistracy and signed by Jan van Hout, were actually written by Dirck Volkertsz Coornhert on behalf of the city government.³¹ Coornhert also wrote two letters to Coolhaes,³² although any of Coolhaes' to Coornhert that may have existed have not survived. The *Cort, eenvoudich en waerachtich verhael*³³ is a document written by preachers who opposed Coolhaes, justifying their decision. The records of Leiden University, where Coolhaes briefly lectured, also mention him. There are also engravings from his lifetime: a well-known depiction of the festive procession, including Coolhaes, on the occasion of the university's dedication, and a portrait of Coolhaes as "professor of theology."

Those early and mid-seventeenth-century works in which Coolhaes is connected with Arminius and the Remonstrants have already been mentioned. For many chroniclers, interest in him mostly ceased after the story of his excommunication. This may be because the majority of his written works, written after that excommunication, were not reprinted, and survive in single or very few copies in archives only. Also, the early identification of him with the Remonstrant movement by the Synod of Dordt and by Trigland likely pigeonholed him for many as "heretical" - as a known, and possibly despised, character.

30. "Het Arbitrael Accord," 29 October, 1580, no. 3358, RKZA, SA II, ELO. The text of the *Arbitral Accord* is also reproduced in Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 217-20.

31. Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert, *Justificatie des magistraets tot Leyden in Hollandt, teghens de calumnien, ter saecken vande differenten, tusschen henluyden ende eenighe vande ghemeente aldaer, by den selven, den magistraet wat min dan Christelicken nageseyt* (Leiden: Andries Verschout, 1579); Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert, *Remonstrance, of vertooch by die van Leyden den heeren ritterschappen ende steden representeerende de Staten slants van Hollant, in februario 1582. hare mede-lidmaten gedaen, nopende tverhandelde der predicanten, inden latest-voorledenen zomer tot Middelburch in het nationael synodus (zo zijt noemen) vergadert geweest zijnde, met den gevolge van dien* (Amsterdam: N. Biestkens, 1582).

32. Dirck Volckertsz Coornhert, Two letters from Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert to Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes, "Brieven-boek," in *Wercken*, vol. 3, BPL 2249, folio 146BCD, UBL.

33. [Arent Cornelisz (Crusius)?], *Cort eenvoudich ende waerachtich verhael, waaromme Caspar Coolhaes predikant gheweest zijnde binnen Leyden: eytelick (na langhe handelinghe diemen met hem vander ghemeyner kercken weghe gehadt heeft) den 25 martij anno 1582 by den synode provinciael van Hollandt van der kercke Christi is ghexcommuniceert. Ghestelt van weghe der predicanten ende ouderlinghen in den voorsc. Synode vergadert, tot noodwendighe verantwoordinghe der waerheyt, ende onderwijs der ghene, die vander saken qualick oft onrecht bericht moghen zijn. Waerinne verhaelt wort het beghin des twist binnen Leyden, ende wat neersticheyt ghedaen is, om dien neder te legghen, ende den voorsc. Casparen tot afstandt zijns onrechts ende dwalingen te brenghen* (Dordrecht: Jan Canin, 1582).

In the seventeenth century, Coolhaes is mentioned briefly in A. J. van Beeck Calkoen's *Observationes aliquot juris publici sacri in Hollandia*, 1619,³⁴ and Meursius' *Illustrium Hollandiae et West-frisiae ordinum alma academiae Leidensis*, 1624.³⁵ He comes up repeatedly in Remonstrant Gerard Brandt's history of the Reformation, 1677.³⁶

Then, for quite some time, Coolhaes was not written about. In 1800, J. A. de Chalmot wrote the entry for Coolhaes in the *Biographisch woordenboek der Nederlanden*, but makes factual errors in his account, such as the dates of Coolhaes' preaching in Deventer.³⁷ In 1857, Kist addresses the negative reaction of Coolhaes to Justus Lipsius' return to Catholicism.³⁸ In 1895, J. Hania refers to him in his biography of sixteenth-century preacher Wernerus Helmichius, one of the mediators in the "Coolhaes affair."³⁹ So, in a small way, Coolhaes was beginning to be mentioned by scholars.

The most significant of these nineteenth-century scholars, as has been mentioned, was H. C. Rogge. His two-volume work⁴⁰ is a Remonstrant, confessional, biographical and thematic study of Coolhaes as "the forerunner of Arminius and the Remonstrants." Rogge believes that Coolhaes is important and worthy of study, because to Rogge the Arminius/Gomarus conflict is the "flashpoint" of Dutch church history, involving the issues of church/state relationships and free will upon which all other disputes are based.⁴¹ Rogge ends the work with attention to other broader thinkers whom he believes are also forerunners, as mentioned earlier: Herman Herberts of Gouda, Tako Sybrants of Utrecht and later Medemblik, and Cornelis Wiggertsz

34. A. J. van Beeck Calkoen, *Observationes aliquot juris publici sacri in Hollandia, desumptae ex historia introductae legis ecclesiasticae, anno 1619* (Trajecti ad Rhenum: N. van der Monde, 1830).

35. Joannes Meursius, *Illustrium Hollandiae et West-frisiae ordinum alma academiae Leidensis* (Leiden: Colster, 1624).

36. Gerard Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* (Amsterdam: Jan Rieuwertsz, Henrik en Dirk Boom, 1671), vol. 1, 366, 557, 649, 652-54, 674-75, 684-85, 716-17, and in the Register, spelled "Koolhaes."

37. See *BWDN*, vol. 7, 266. Chalmot says Coolhaes preached in Deventer in 1576, when it was actually in 1566. This error is mentioned by E. W. Moes and C. P. Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers en uitgevers in de zestiende eeuw*, vol. 4 (Amsterdam: C.L. van Langenhuisen, 1915), 135-38.

38. Nicolaas Christiaan Kist, "J. Lipsius door Caspar Coolhaes beoordeeld," *Kerkhistorisch archief* 1 (1857): 425-27.

39. Jan Hania, *Wernerus Helmichius* (Utrecht: H. Honig, 1895), 28, 130-44, 207-13.

40. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*. Rogge also wrote a shorter but very enthusiastic biographical sketch in W. Moll, ed., *Kalender voor de protestanten in Nederland*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: H.W. Mooij, 1856), 210-15.

41. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. I, 3.

of Hoorn.⁴² Rogge also appends lists of Coolhaes' (and Herberts') written works, in so far as he knows them. He also uncovered more of Coolhaes' writings and so continued to focus on Coolhaes by editing *De Roomsche feestdagen en hunne viering in de 16de eeuw*.⁴³

The twentieth century saw much more interest in Coolhaes. C. P. Burger, in 1915, continued the series about Amsterdam book publishers of the sixteenth century begun by Ernst Wilhelm Moes, and devoted quite a lot of attention to Coolhaes. He brought much new scholarship to the discussion, reproduced rare content and illustrations, and included a substantial section of biography, a list of works by Coolhaes, and brief discussions of most of them. He featured the books and woodcuts Coolhaes produced during his later Amsterdam years, some of which were unknown to Rogge.⁴⁴ So, Burger's work is essential to the study of Coolhaes.

More study of Coolhaes appeared in the 1970's and 1980's, beginning with J. Kamphuis' small book in 1970 about the Synod of Middelburg and Coolhaes' excommunication. Kamphuis, from a strongly confessional, Calvinist perspective, discussed the Synod of Middelburg as a useful weapon in the hands of the Reformed of the sixteenth century against confessional indifference.⁴⁵ In his view, it was Coolhaes' unwillingness to submit to the church order and church rule that led to the disputes in Leiden in 1579-1580, by which the city was *beroerd en gescheurd* ("disturbed and torn apart").⁴⁶ Importantly, Kamphuis also included previously unpublished documents from Middelburg, including letters between Coolhaes and the Leiden magistracy, and Coolhaes and this Synod, in the person of Arent Cornelisz.⁴⁷ Also, he discussed the strong link between Coolhaes and Sebastian Franck, an important topic which had not been adequately explored up to that time. To him, Coolhaes was primarily a follower of Franck. Despite its small size, and its bias, addressing these important topics makes Kamphuis' book vital to our topic.

42. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 152-230.

43. H. C. Rogge, ed., *De Roomsche feestdagen en hunne viering in de 16de eeuw*. N.p., 1886.

44. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*.

45. Kamphuis, *Kerkelijke besluitvaardigheid*, 9.

46. Kamphuis, *Kerkelijke besluitvaardigheid*, 10.

47. Kamphuis, *Kerkelijke besluitvaardigheid*, 66-82. Kamphuis relates that these were found in the Leiden Archive, in a group which Burger mentions he had scanned quickly. See Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 42.

Other twentieth-century authors have also gone deeper in discussing Coolhaes, even though they have not devoted an entire book to him. Carl Bangs, in 1971, wrote about him in his definitive biography of Arminius.⁴⁸ In the same year, Olivier Fatio addressed Coolhaes in some detail from the point of view of his Calvinist opponent Daneau, in his study of the latter⁴⁹ – an important critical perspective. Willem Nijenhuis mentioned him in his biography of Adrianus Saravia in 1980.⁵⁰ R. H. Bremmer, in 1981, analyzed Coolhaes at Middelburg in a volume commemorating the four-hundredth anniversary of the Synod of Middelburg.⁵¹ J. P. van Dooren, in the same volume, wrote about Coolhaes' early years in Germany, enlarging the fund of biographical facts with German sources from Coolhaes' earlier life. Van Dooren had also written an article in German the year before, giving a concise biography of Coolhaes and presenting him as a Biblical theologian, rather than a libertine.⁵² A certain amount of attention was paid to Coolhaes in the dissertation of Wiebe Bergsma on Aggaeus of Albada in 1983.⁵³ Coolhaes as a "Zwinglian" is discussed in an article by Ulrich Gaebler in 1985.⁵⁴ Coolhaes was mentioned numerous times in the 1986 history of the Rapenburg by Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel, and a short biography was given in volume 4.⁵⁵

Attention to Coolhaes continued to increase. Willem Nijenhuis focused important, renewed attention on Coolhaes by a biographical entry in the *Biografisch Lexicon voor de*

48. Bangs, *Arminius*. (See note 17).

49. Fatio, *Nihil pulchrius ordine*. (See note 21).

50. Willem Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia (c. 1532-1613): Dutch Calvinist, First Reformed Defender of the English Episcopal Church Order on the Basis of the ius divinum* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 81.

51. R. H. Bremmer, "De nationale synode van Middelburg (1581): politieke achtergronden van kerkelijke besluitvorming," in *De nationale synode te Middelburg in 1581. Calvinisme in opbouw in de Noordelijke en Zuidelijke Nederlanden*, ed. J. P. van Dooren (Middelburg: Koninklijk Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen, 1981), 1-63.

52. J. P. van Dooren, "Kaspar Kohlhaas (Caspar Coolhaes) (1532-1615), Prediger in Essen und der Niederlanden," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Stadt und Stift Essen* 95 (1980), 85-99; J. P. van Dooren, "Caspar Coolhaes: het een en ander uit zijn leven vóór en na de synode van Middelburg," in Van Dooren, *De nationale synode te Middelburg*, 174-83.

53. Wiebe Bergsma, *Aggaeus van Albada (c. 1525-1587), schwenkfeldiaan, staatsman en strijder voor verdraagzaamheid* (Meppel: Krips Repro, 1983), 140-41.

54. Ulrich Gäbler, "Zur Verbreitung des Zwinglianismus in den Niederlanden und der Fall C.C." in H. R. Schmitt, *Zwingli und Europa* (Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 217-36.

55. Th. H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, C. Willemijn Fock, and A. J. van Dissel, *Het Rapenburg: geschiedenis van een Leidse gracht*, vol. 4 (Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, 1986), 395-98.

Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme, which includes facts Rogge did not bring out.⁵⁶ Benjamin Kaplan has written Coolhaes' entry in the 1996 edition of *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*, and has mentioned him in other books and articles. Kaplan identified Coolhaes as Reformed yet libertine, "a champion of tolerance," and felt that his writings "reveal spiritualist influence."⁵⁷ Gerrit Voogt included a good description of Coolhaes in connection with Coornhert, Lipsius, and questions of conscience.⁵⁸ Christine Kooi has done significant work with Coolhaes as part of her book on the Reformation in Leiden, published in 2000. She highlights the two factions: those who act on behalf of "the religion," and those who are motivated by liberty – in other words, *religionis causa* and *libertatis causa*. She focuses predominantly on the "schism" between colleague-preachers Coolhaes and Pieter Cornelisz, and includes the text of the "Arbitral Accord."⁵⁹ Karel Bostoën, in 2009, wrote in some detail about Coolhaes' translation of Gwalther, *Van de Christelijcke discipline ende excommunicatie*.⁶⁰ Marianne Roobol has also given some concentrated attention to Coolhaes in her study of Coornhert from 2010.⁶¹ In 2012, Huib Noordzij detailed quite a lot of Coolhaes' story, along with those of other "dissidents" and their opponents.⁶² Mirjam van Veen contributed an article on Coolhaes' time in Deventer, in which she notes that a "modern biography of Coolhaes is a desiderium."⁶³ All in all, interest in Coolhaes has continued to grow throughout the twentieth century and beyond.⁶⁴

56. Nijenhuis, "Coolhaes (Koolhaes, Coelaas), Caspar Janszoon," (See note 18).

57. Benjamin J. Kaplan, "Remnants of the Papal Yoke: Apathy and Opposition in the Dutch Reformation," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 25 (1994): 653-67; Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*; Benjamin Kaplan, "Coolhaes, Caspar," *OER*, vol. 1, 423-24.

58. Gerrit Voogt, "Primacy of Individual Conscience or Primacy of the State? The Clash between D. V. Coornhert and Justus Lipsius," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 28 (1997): 1231-50.

59. Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*.

60. Karel Bostoën, *Hart voor Leiden: Jan van Hout (1542-1609), stadssecretaris, dichter en vernieuwer* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2009).

61. Marianne Roobol, *Disputation by Decree: the Public Disputations between Reformed Ministers and Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert as Instruments of Religious Policy during the Dutch Revolt (1577-1583)* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010).

62. Huib Noordzij, *Handboek van de reformatie: de Nederlandse kerkhervorming in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw* (Kampen: Kok, 2012).

63. Mirjam van Veen, "'... your praiseworthy town Deventer ...' Caspar Coolhaes on Unity and Religious Tolerance," in *Religious Minorities and Cultural Diversity in the Dutch Republic: Studies Presented*

Coolhaes, therefore, has an established niche in the history of the Dutch churches as the “libertine,” “Erastian” preacher who sided with the Leiden magistracy against his fellow Reformed clergy: a forerunner of the Remonstrants. Why then, in light of this, should there be a fuller re-examination of Caspar Coolhaes at this time? Several reasons may be put forward.

First, and most importantly, in the various studies about Coolhaes, there has been insufficient attention to his theological works, especially the works which have been more recently rediscovered, and in turn no adequate integrated definition of Coolhaes’ identity or ecclesiology. Studying all of his writings allows us to place him more precisely on the colorful spectrum of Dutch Reformation diversity, and to analyze his eclectic views. In examining Coolhaes’ writings, his most pressing concerns can be clearly seen to have to do with the church, both visible and invisible. Therefore, any good analysis of him and his thought should focus on his ecclesiology. What did he believe and teach about the church?

Also, Coolhaes’ story lends itself well to the writing of religious history in which confessional emphases are giving way to other approaches.⁶⁵ The Reformed have long been seen as confessional “champions,” while the libertines or other independents were “fierce opponents.” In today’s climate, it is tempting to read the situation in the opposite way – the Reformed as having been the fierce ones, and the libertines as the champions of tolerance and freedom of religion and thought.⁶⁶ Coolhaes’ writings reflect that latter point of view. Certain Reformed preachers were his primary opponents, as will be seen. The divisive early seventeenth-century Remonstrant/Contra-Remonstrant struggles served to sideline Coolhaes;

to Piet Visser on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday, ed. August van Hollander, Mirjam van Veen, Anna Woolstra, and Alex Noord (Leiden: Brill, 2014). 111-23.

64. See also the short Coolhaes bibliography on Leiden University’s site: <https://vre.dutchrevolt.leiden.nl/vre/dutch/personen/C/Pages/coolhaes.aspx> (accessed 26 jan 2016).

65. Wim Janse, “De protestantse reformatie in de Nederlanden. Wendingen in de twintigste-eeuwse historiografie,” in *Balans van een eeuw: wendingen in de historiografie van het Christendom 1901-2001*, ed. Jack de Mooij and Ineke Smit (Heerenveen: Uitgeverij Groen, 2002), 33-49. For an overview of the process of confessionalization and how this process affected and was affected by the forces of modern state-building, see Heinz Schilling, *Konfessionalisierung und Staatsinteressen, Internationale Beziehungen 1559-1660* (Paderborn, Munich, Vienna, Zürich: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2007), 34-41.

66. Bergsma, “Calvinisten en libertijnen,” 211.

a non-confessional historiography is a good opportunity to re-present this “confessionally-indifferent” preacher – a prime representative of the *latitudinaire hervormingsgezinden*.⁶⁷

Further, the study of Coolhaes is interesting as it informs the histories of Leiden and Amsterdam, assisting in the fleshing out of the study of the “Reformation in the cities.”⁶⁸ These include Coolhaes’ relationships with magistrates, consistories, classes, and the States of Holland. Both Leiden and Amsterdam were growing and changing during Coolhaes’ lifetime. The Reformation and, indeed, the Reformed Church, did not just become accepted and dominant in society by some easy and natural process, but had to convince each city in turn, which in some cases went against local urban customs and governments.⁶⁹ Coolhaes is also what might be called in today’s scholarship a “transnational” figure. He passed back and forth between the cities and towns of the Palatinate and the Northern Netherlands, linking those regions in the company of other exiles and religious immigrants. All in all, through reflecting on these emphases, Coolhaes comes more clearly into view and in turn enhances the picture of his geographical, historical, political and especially religious contexts.

In addition, a compelling reason for new attention on Coolhaes is to highlight his pleading for religious diversity. This is a vital feature of his thought which must not be forgotten in the midst of details about specific controversies in which he was involved. The sixteenth century was a time of dangerous division, much as ours is today. Coolhaes’ ideas of confessional diversity and Christian freedom are interesting for this reason. He defined the church as a place which should be characterized by inclusion, not exclusion. His idea of society was that different church confessions could and should exist side by side in peace. This will be considered in more detail in later chapters; it is the theme of this dissertation, and it is key to the understanding of Coolhaes.

Finally, a word or two about the sources and the structure of this study. Coolhaes’ extant works,⁷⁰ which we have considered to be the most important sources for this project, are

67. Bergsma, “Calvinisten en libertijnen,” 216; Johannes Lindeboom, *De confessioneele ontwikkeling der reformatie in de Nederlanden* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1946), 107-109.

68. Kooi mentions this as a reason for her study of Leiden: Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 2.

69. Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 3-6.

70. The Bibliography lists all of Coolhaes’ extant works, all of which I have analyzed for this study. Several works by Coolhaes, which he himself or others reference, are non-extant. They are: *Aenwijsinge*

mostly little-known and un-examined. Some are in manuscript, but most are printed but not reprinted since the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. They have survived exclusively in archives, many in a single copy, although since this research was begun in 2005, several have been scanned and put online by others. In making the choice to use Coolhaes' own works as the main sources for this study, it must be admitted that the polemical nature of many of his works may make him somewhat unreliable as a narrator for historical events or for the evaluation of other figures. However, his own works are the best choice for a study of what he believed his own theological views to be – far better than the works of his detractors or even admirers. His own positions are, of course, the focus of this dissertation. Combining a critical analysis of his own works with those of his contemporaries – both those who admired him as well as those who despised him – yields the best overall result. The evaluation of his works has not been a quantitative study which would equate numbers of pages with the importance of a certain topic, but one which qualitatively sought to know his life events, to understand to what provocations he was responding in any given work, and then to discern his views under and behind the lengthy rhetoric and criticism. This was especially important since he rarely makes any systematic exposition of his ideas. Familiarity with biblical themes and passages has been key in this evaluation, in order to understand his use of spiritualizing metaphors and symbolic language. This reading of Coolhaes' works has enabled a systematizing of the key features of his ecclesiological framework – distilling, to use a metaphor appropriate to Coolhaes, his most distinctive ideas about the church.

Since these ideas are mirrored in some significant ways by his life events, this dissertation will, as promised, begin with an updated biographical sketch of Coolhaes, interspersed with short descriptions of his writings when helpful. This biographical sketch is the introduction to our main question, and fills in vital background. Rogge and Burger's foundational story will be fleshed out with Coolhaes' own narration from his writings, and with archival facts when available. First, there will be a description of his life before his

(mentioned in *Aenhechtsel* as having been published in 1596); *Afbeeldinghe vande waerachtige kercke Godts, mitsgaders de sichtbaerlijcke Kercken* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *Afbeeldinghe vande waerachtige kercke Godts, hoe sy is in deser werelt* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *De eenvoudige ende van gantscher herten Godt soekende mensch* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *De Leeraer die tgene dat hy anderen leert, selfs niet en doet* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *De Leeraer, in godlicken saecken blint zijnde* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *De Leeraer, neerstich zijnde* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *Van de godlick wijsheyt* (woodcut with Coolhaes text); *Vermaning aen Jaques Mercijs*, 1601; *Christelijcke Schrijf-calendar*, 1606?

arrival as a preacher in Leiden in 1574, and the disagreements and power-struggles, such as the so-called “Coolhaes affair,” which led to his excommunication, will be traced. It will be shown that although his ideas developed in small ways throughout his life, the main beliefs remained constant from early in his ministry. The Middelburg Synod and his excommunication will receive special attention. The story will then follow his unexpected career change: his life as distiller and rogue writer of theology in Leiden and Amsterdam. In the second part, the dissertation will leave the biographical and focus on Coolhaes’ thinking, and on the main question, which is what sort of church Coolhaes would have founded if he could. Several main themes, the ecclesiological ideas which drove him most, form the body of this work. His writings will inform the sections in which they fit best. Our examination of his ecclesiology runs as follows. First, there will be an examination of his Spiritualism, meaning his bipartite emphasis on the visible and invisible, the seen and unseen, which will be argued to be at the very basis of all his views. Then, it will be shown how this inspired his Erastianism on the relationship between church and state. After that, his views on clergy, both his criticisms of them and also what should characterize them in order for them to serve the churches well, will be laid out. Finally, his deep desire for tolerance, religious diversity, and individual freedom, both in the visible church and in society, will be displayed, by looking at the congregation of people as a whole.