



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

Chapter 4: Distilling spirits and theology

After March, 1582, Coolhaes was no longer allowed to preach in the public Reformed Church in Leiden, due to his being excommunicated and defrocked by the Synods. However, his opponents had been only partly successful in silencing him. He could not preach, but he continued to write and publish, even though they had objected to that just as strongly. The end of Coolhaes' preaching career was the beginning of his activity as a pamphlet-writer.¹ He was motivated by events around him to write about the church not only from a theoretical standpoint, but also from a pastoral one, even when he was no longer a pastor. Through his writings, a window opens up to us about the further course of his life, and one can see which contemporary issues moved him to respond.

In this second half of his life Coolhaes found, learned, and perfected a new trade, built a business, and continued to write theology, all of which showed his survival instinct and sense of vocation. He still enjoyed the approval of many of the citizens of Leiden, including, in general, the magistracy.² He himself, and a certain number of those around him, may still have considered him a public figure, with a right to a voice in public and ecclesiastical affairs. His excommunication may have made him even more notorious, controversial, and thus fascinating to some of the populace. He would continue to write throughout his long life - both in Leiden and later in Amsterdam, where he eventually relocated.

His next publication dealt, unsurprisingly, with his disagreement with the practice of excommunication as a form of Christian discipline. *Van de christelijke discipline ende excommunicatie*³ is a collection of Coolhaes' Dutch translations of sermons and writings by Zwinglian Rudolph Gwalther, with Coolhaes' original introductions. It was first published without Coolhaes' name, but with the acrostic pseudonym *C.C.V.M.I.D.H.G.*, meaning "*Caspar Coolhaes van Menschen in Den Heere Ghebannen*." He used this acrostic pseudonym in signing several of his works written immediately after his excommunication,

1. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 41.

2. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 65.

3. Coolhaes, *Van de christelijke discipline ende excommunicatie*. A reproduction of the title page of the 1611 edition can be found in Bostoën, *Hart voor Leiden*, 51. This work was first published in 1582, and then re-published in 1585 and in 1611.

perhaps to avoid trouble for the Leiden magistracy who were protecting him. Coolhaes says he has chosen this way to refer to himself, not out of shame, but because of “legal reasons.”⁴ Since much of *Van de christelijcke discipline ende excommunicatie* deals with the questions of church and state, it will be discussed again in Chapter 7, for a closer look at these topics. It should be noted, though, that Coolhaes had opposed excommunication as a form of Christian discipline in his earlier writings also – before he was excommunicated himself.

Coolhaes steadily continued his writing. In 1584,⁵ three pamphlets were published: *Een christelijke vermaninghe* (Coolhaes dates it January 5, 1584, making it arguably the first of the three, unless of course the others were written at an earlier date and only published in that year), *Seeckere pointen*,⁶ and *Toutzsteen*.⁷ They have in common the topics of true apostolicity, hypocrisy, and the claims of various groups to be the true church. *Een christelijcke vermaninghe* is the shortest of the three. It is also the most impassioned and strongly-stated, the most Reformed and the most anti-Catholic. However, all three books are critical of all churches, regardless of confession.⁸

In 1585, the Leiden magistracy allowed his translations of Gwalther from the year before to be reprinted. Also, Coolhaes published *Conciliatio* (dated February 21, 1585), which is a strongly-worded theological argument against the decision of Middelburg, and an answer to the preachers’ *Cort eenvoudich verhael* from 1582. Coolhaes says that he wrote this book three years earlier, but hoped not to have to publish it. Nevertheless, since his situation had not improved, he was publishing it now at his own expense, and continued to hope that a

4. Coolhaes, *Een christelijcke vermaning*, folio Eij.

5. It is interesting to note that “New-style” or Gregorian dating (abbreviated “n.s.”) was adopted by Holland in 1583. However, in Utrecht dating was “old-style” or according to the Julian calendar, until 1700. Gregorian is ten days ahead of Julian; see Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, xvii. We bring this up for the sake of completeness, but in fact this distinction does not clarify any difficulties or questions in Coolhaes’ works, although he sometimes specifies the date in *stylo novo*.

6. Caspar Coolhaes, *Seeckere pointen met die heylighe godtlicke schriftuur, ende vervolch vandien ghenomen: aenwysende het ghene, dat allen gheloovighen, bysonder doch den predicanen ende leeraren van allerhande partijen, soorten, ofte exertitie van religien, wel aen te mercken, ende tachttervolgen van nooden is: ende grootelijcks, soo wel tot gherustheyt van eens yeghelicken menschen conscientie, als tot tijdtlijcken vrede, soude mogen dienen* (N.p., 1584).

7. Caspar Coolhaes, *Toutzsteen tot een seecker proeve welcx in der waerheydt die apostolische, catholijcke, evangelische, gereformeerde reyne kercke sy. Allen leergierigen menschen, ten besten voor ooghen ghestelt, ende in handen ghegheven, door C.V.M.I.D.H.G* (N.p., 1584).

8. *Toutzsteen* contains much discussion about diversity, and will be discussed extensively in Chapter 9.

national synod would overturn his case.⁹ He insisted in it that he did not contradict himself by signing the theses,¹⁰ and wished the preachers would show him where they think he did.¹¹ It seems clear by this that Coolhaes was hoping for a return to the ministry. On the other hand, he wrote near the end of his life that during this period he had no thoughts about trying to regain the office of preacher, and was glad to serve the church by his writing. He would have given a great service to Satan, he says, if he had changed “parties,” or had tried to found his own church.¹²

Reinventing himself

Coolhaes’ life changed dramatically after the decisions of Middelburg and Haarlem. Banned from the pulpit and the Lord’s Table, he learned a trade. He depended temporarily upon a continued salary from the city to support his large family and chronically ill wife. As he put it, God “allowed, in his grace” the Leiden magistracy to continue his salary.¹³ This amounted to three hundred *guldens* (guilders) per year, and thirty *guldens* for house-hire, which he received while he learned a new way to support his family - the making of medicinal wines, “waters,” and oils with fire, instruments, spices, roots, herbs, flowers, and wines from the Rhineland, Spain and France. Thanks to the teaching of his neighbor in the Papengracht, the “impartial” Johannes Heurnius, whom we have mentioned earlier, Coolhaes learned to distill these wines, which, as he said, “serve the human body internally and externally.”¹⁴ He spared no effort and worked day and night to learn his new trade.¹⁵ His fellow Spiritualist Sebastian

9. Caspar Coolhaes, *Conciliatio: dat is verghelijckinghe, van sekere punten der leere, ende disciplijn. Van C.C. gheschreven ende onderschreven, in diewelcke claerlijk is blijckende, met wat recht, die voornoemde C.C. in namen van allen kercken in Hollant gheexcommuniceert: ende met een wtghegheven boeck, van kettery ende der christelicker disciplijn verachtinghe, ghediffameert is worden* (Gouda: J. Tournay, 1585), folio Ciiijr.

10. Coolhaes, *Conciliatio*, folio Kiiijr.

11. Coolhaes, *Conciliatio*, folio Kiiijv.

12. Coolhaes, *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 163.

13. Rogge says that this was via Lodewijk van Treslong, on the condition that he would be quiet and obedient, and continually prepared to take up public ministry if requested to do so by the magistracy. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 2.

14. Coolhaes, *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 141.

15. Coolhaes’ distilling is mentioned in R. J. Forbes, *A Short History of the Art of Distillation: From the Beginnings up to the Death of Cellier Blumenthal* (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 161.

Franck had turned to soap-making as a trade when he was expelled from Strassburg.¹⁶ However, Franck did not enjoy the success with his business that Coolhaes did with distilling. Coolhaes also wrote two books dealing with the technicalities of the distilling process: *Van seeckere seer costelijke wateren*¹⁷ and *Water-boecxken*.¹⁸ They have no significant theological content, but are interesting because of the details of the distilling process described. In 1584, after two years of receiving a salary, in 1584 he was able to go to the City Hall and tell the magistracy that it was no longer needed. He reported proudly that since that time, he had received no payments from the Leiden magistracy, and also nothing from the States of Holland out of the funds of convents, despite his earlier monastic profession. However, it appears that payments were not discontinued until his reinstatement to the ministry in 1586.¹⁹ Perhaps Coolhaes was not a reliable narrator on this matter.

Along with his distilling, he continued to write and publish, disobeying the decrees of the Synods and the order of the States. This disobedience not only to religious but also civil authority he excused by quoting Acts 5:29: “We must obey God rather than men.” The support of the Leiden magistracy was crucial to him in the years after the excommunication, both in regard to the continuing salary and for the protection which they gave. As Coolhaes says, they refused to “play executioner” for the Synods, but instead “held their hand over him” and gave him the freedom to continue writing.²⁰ He and his family were able to remain

16. Hayden-Roy, *The Inner Word and the Outer World*, 103-104.

17. Caspar Coolhaes, *Van seeckere seer costelijke wateren diemen met recht soude mogen noemen aquae vitae: ende sommige wtgelesene olien den edelen en welruykenden balsem olie, niet sonder redenen te vergelijken: der welcker cracht ende menichfoudige deuchden in dit boecxken cortelijc (wt den schriften sommiger hoogheleerden ende experten doctoren ende professoren der loffelijcker medecijnen, welcker naemen op dandere zijde deses blats verhaelt zijn) beschreven worden. Met eener voorreden des distilateurs vanden stercken ende bernenden smaeck deser wateren. De welckemet Gods hulpe cunstelijck digereert. circuleert oft subtilizeert ende distileert worden . tot Leyden op Rapenburch, al waer men die te coop vintom eenen redelijcken prijs, ten huysse van Casper Coelhaes* (Amsterdam: Barendt Adriaensz, 1588).

18. Caspar Coolhaes, *Water-boecxken: het welcke aenwijst, hoe men seeckere edele ende seer goede spiritus, aquae vitae compositae, wateren, cracht-wateren ende gedistilleerde olien, tot een yeder cranckheit ende ghebreken des menschen lichaems, die uyt kouden humoren ende catharen haren oorspronck hebben, so wel uytwendich als inwendich, met grooten nut sal moghen ghebruycken. Met een corte ende clare aenwijsing uyt des Heeren woort, hoe enn yeder selfs door Gods genade, achtervolgende het bevel des Heeren, veel ende verscheyden sware crankheit ende gebreken can voor-comen: sijn leven niet verkorten: een geruste conscientie behouden: ende ten laetsten vrolijck in den Heere soude moghen ontslapen. Door Casparum Coolhaes. By des welcken soon, Adolf Casparsz. Coolhaes, die voorgheenoemde wateren na rechter const gedistilleert ende verkocht worden tot Amstelredam, in de Warmoesstraet, in den vergulden Mortier, by Sanct Olofs Poort* (Gouda, 1608).

19. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 2-3.

in their house and even expand it to include a shop which opened onto the Rapenburg. In that shop, they sold the medicinal and alcoholic “waters” which they distilled, as well as books. He does not mention anywhere that he and his family felt a sudden lowering of their social class as a result of becoming tradespeople. Perhaps his earlier contact with the magistrates allowed him to remain in touch with them. In short, if 1581-1582 was the “downfall” of Caspar Coolhaes,²¹ one could say that, actually, he landed on his feet.

Continuing to incite

In 1583, Adrianus Saravia, the Calvinist Leiden University professor who at the request of the States had earlier debated Coornhert together with Arent Cornelisz in The Hague as a follow-up to the Leiden debate, got into a dispute with Coolhaes over his freer ideas about theology and discipline. The Leiden magistracy put a stop to it hurriedly.²² However, much public opinion was in favor of restitution for Coolhaes to the public ministry. The magistracy discussed sending a statement of faith from Coolhaes to the Universities of Zurich and Basel to ask for their advice and, hopefully, support. Coolhaes corresponded with the Leiden magistracy in 1583 about other preachers who did not feel his views were wrong, including Herman Herberts of Gouda. He wanted to invite twenty or so impartial preachers to a meeting to examine his views, a meeting which would be open to the public and be judged by the magistrates. He called this attempt to bring about some reinstatement to the preaching ministry a simple and inexpensive plan;²³ however, it never came off. Again, in 1584, there was public discussion about Coolhaes’ restitution and rehabilitation, but the magistracy responded that they could do nothing so quickly.²⁴

For the moment, the magistracy was able to protect him. However, his activities tried this protection of the magistrates sorely. At least twice, Coolhaes’ hospitality again caused

20. Coolhaes, *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 161.

21. This is Gäbler’s term; see the title of: Gäbler, “Zur Verbreitung des Zwinglianismus in den Niederlanden und der Fall C.C.”

22. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 64.

23. The letters are reproduced in Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 42-43, one in a photograph of the original and one transcribed. He says that these documents are part of a file in the city archive, but despite the help of archive staff I have been unable to find them.

24. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 65.

scandal and upset. The first incident happened when the Coolhaes family still inhabited Rapenburg 22, that is, before 1583. Godefroy Hubertsz from Liège, who had been wanted by the States of Holland for counterfeiting gold coins, had been staying there. Apparently after three calls for his arrest, he was able to escape from the law. It was not discovered if Coolhaes had any real involvement with any criminal activity in the case.²⁵

The second incident became known when, on March 8, 1584, Coolhaes' wife Grietje sold twenty copies of a work by the well-known anti-Trinitarian, Erasmus Johannes, out of their shop. Erasmus Johannes (Erasmus Janssens, c. 1540-96),²⁶ had been rector in Antwerp in 1576, but was made to resign by William of Orange due to his anti-Trinitarian teaching. In 1584, he published *Clara demonstratio Antichristum immediate post mortem apostolorum coepissi regnare in ecclesia Christi*, which caused so much controversy that he was forced to emigrate. It may have been that he stayed with Coolhaes on his way out of the country. He went to Poland and disputed with Faustus Socinus on November 29-30 of the same year, officially embraced Unitarian views, and lived to the end of his life in Budapest. Two hundred-twenty more copies of Johannes' books (perhaps including the aforementioned *Clara demonstratio Antichristum*, or the Dutch translation, *Clare bewijsinghe dat d'Antichrist terstondt...*, which came out in the same year), destined for sale, were found in Coolhaes' house. The Leiden magistracy let it pass. However, on May 24 of the same year, one hundred more suspicious books were seized from Coolhaes' house and brought to the City Hall. Burger points out that it is surely a sign of the favor in which Coolhaes was held by the magistracy, that they confiscated Johannes' books but left those written by Coolhaes alone.²⁷ He was known to be very hospitable to traveling preachers. He seems to have found Johannes to be a "brother," and as such worthy of his help.

Did Coolhaes agree with Johannes' developing anti-Trinitarianism? There is no proof of it from any of Coolhaes' writings. In fact, he held the Trinitarian Apostles' Creed (the

25. Scheurleer, Fock, and Van Dissel, *Het Rapenburg*, vol. 4, 352-53.

26. Philip Knijff, Sibbe Jan Visser, and Piet Visser, eds., *Bibliographia Sociniana: A Bibliographic Reference Tool for the Study of Dutch Socinianism and Antitrinitarianism* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2004), 26, 48-49; Martin Schmeisser, *Sozinianische Bekenntnisschriften: Der Rakower Katechismus des Valentin Schmalz (1608) und der sogenannte Soner-Katechismus* (Munich: Oldenbourg Akademie Verlag, 2012), 40; "Janssens, Erasmus (Lat. Erasmus Johannes)," in *McClintock and Strong Biblical Cyclopedia*, [http://www.biblicalcyclopedia.com/J/janssens-erasmus-\(lat-erasmus-johannes\).html](http://www.biblicalcyclopedia.com/J/janssens-erasmus-(lat-erasmus-johannes).html) (accessed 27 January 2015).

27. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 44-46.

“Twelve Articles”) as part of his foundational doctrine,²⁸ which we will discuss at greater length later. He did not write about Erasmus Johannes, nor did he mention him or the incident in any of his writings.

Coolhaes’ desire to help and identify with the persecuted and with minority views, for the sake of diversity, seems to be operating here. However, the two rebels did have certain beliefs in common. Clearly Johannes believed that the spirit of Antichrist entered the church after the death of the Apostles, and worked in the synods, corrupting it. Coolhaes also believed that the church had declined after the time of the Apostles, and was against the authority of synods.²⁹ It seems likely that Coolhaes’ tolerance of radical viewpoints and their propagators, and his belief in their right to exist and have a voice, extended even to those with whom he had theological disagreements – especially if they were also at odds with the authorities.

Tolerant Leiden

As a shelter for rebels, Leiden was in many ways an ideal place. Diversity of opinion could be found in Leiden; the magistrates tolerated it; this worked in Coolhaes’ favor. In 1584 Leiden was already a center for education and theology; it was becoming an important center for book-publishing. Lodewijk Elsevier had been there since 1580. Christoffel Plantijn published for the university till 1585. Leiden was also a congenial place for confessional non-conformists, including English publisher Thomas Basson, who had also lived for a time in Cologne. He came to Leiden in about 1584. Some of these, including Plantijn, Basson, and possibly Coolhaes’ neighbor Heurnius, seem to have had some connections with the “Family of Love,” the secretive religious group based on the teachings of Hendrik Niclaes. Somewhat later, Paulus de Kempenaer was another unusual figure - an irenic Reformed elder during the

28. He also affirmed the clearly Trinitarian confession of earlier Frisian Anabaptists: Caspar Coolhaes, ed. *Summa, ende bekentnisse christelijcker leer der predicanten, die in Oost-Vrieslandt omtrent tachtentich iaren voorleden, opentlijk ghepredickt ende gheleert hebbe: met een supplication der selven, aen den welgheboren en edelen heere, Heer Enno, te dier tijt zijnde grave en heer van Oost-Vrieslandt, van woorde tot woorde gevolgt het exemplaer, tot Embden ghedruckt Anno 1565. Met noch een schoone bekentnisse, schriftuerlijk inventeert, ende rethorijlick ghecomponiert*, by Johan Baptista Houvvart, consilier ende meester ordinaris van die reeckeninghen des hertichdoms van Brabandt, beschreven in zijn boek van de vier wtersten des meschen, ende anno 83 t’Antwerpen ghedruckt by Christoffel Plantijn (N.p., 1603), A–F4b. See also his statement about the importance of the Holy Spirit, applying to the Spirit the pronoun “he,” in Coolhaes, *Toutzsteen*, folio Bijr.

29. We will discuss this in more depth in Chapter 8.

tenure of Hackius in Leiden in the 1590's and 1600's, who was also syncretistic, interested in astrology, Kabalah, and alchemy, and may have been linked to Rosicrucianism.³⁰

But toleration in Leiden and elsewhere could not be taken for granted. 1584 was the year of the violent death of William of Orange. To Coolhaes, he was not only the “father of the fatherland” and the highest secular ruler, but a defender of freedom of conscience and religious plurality. The Prince had earlier supported Coolhaes in his disagreement with Pieter Cornelisz. Coolhaes would certainly have been disheartened by the death of the Prince, as so many of his subjects undoubtedly were. Coolhaes and other broad-minded churchmen lost in him a defender. The Prince had desired religious freedom and had instituted his *godsdienvrede*. Once again, one sees the split between the *libertatis causa* group and the *religionis causa* group, in terms of the goals of the Revolt. But Petrus Dathenus, for one, had been opposed to this degree of religious freedom. In this period, hate between the Reformed and the Roman Catholics had increased. Others, such as De Villiers, found instead that the polemicism and anti-Catholic rhetoric of Dathenus was inexcusable. Why, he wrote, should the church discipline men like Duifhuis and Coolhaes, but not Dathenus?³¹

Meanwhile, inside the Leiden Reformed Church, things were not peaceful, even without Coolhaes in the pulpit. Leiden preacher Petrus Hackius was in favor of a role for the secular government in church affairs. He irritated the consistory in various ways in the years 1584-1586, including his support of Coolhaes' writing,³² but they were patient with him so as not to anger the magistrates. Adrianus Saravia was his co-preacher in the beginning; later, when Mattheus Platevoet had also come as preacher, Saravia was no longer one of the official preachers but did preach regularly along with his work as professor/rector at the university.³³ Coolhaes supported Hackius in his efforts. Helmichius wrote to Arent Cornelisz in 1583 that Coolhaes “incited” Hackius.³⁴ In 1584, Coolhaes wrote a seven-page letter to the preachers

30. J. A. van Dorsten, *Thomas Basson 1555-1613, English Printer at Leiden* (Leiden: Sir Thomas Browne Institute, 1961), 10-25; Alastair Hamilton, “Paulus de Kempenaer, ‘non moindre Philosophique tresbon Escrivan,’” in *Quaerendo* X (1980), 293-335; C. C. de Bruin, “Radicaal spiritualisme te Leiden,” in *Rondom het Woord* 17 (1975), 66-81, spec. 73. See also: Alastair Hamilton, *The Family of Love* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co.), 1981, for a general introduction to the group.

31. Boer, *Hofpredikers*, 102-104.

32. Nijenhuis, *Saravia*, 81.

33. Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia*, 55-57.

34. Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia*, 81-82.

and elders in Leiden, causing the magistrates to wonder to Saravia if he could not be reconciled with the church. Later, when, as will be seen, Coolhaes was temporarily reinstated to the ministry while Hackius was suspended, Coolhaes wrote to the consistory to defend him. Coolhaes' wife was deputed to deliver the letter since Coolhaes himself refused to be present. Reconciliation was achieved in Saravia's home.³⁵

New hope

In August of 1585, Antwerp had fallen to the Spanish after a prolonged siege. Thousands of Calvinists fled to the North. Drama continued into 1586 concerning Coolhaes, with accusations that the Leiden magistrates had received sealed letters directing them to keep him in lifelong service.³⁶ But new hope of positive resolution in the Coolhaes matter arrived in the form of Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, who had been sent by Elizabeth of England in response to requests for help from the Dutch. He was a boon to the Calvinists but a threat to others who feared English control. Coolhaes was a very small point on Leicester's radar. The Earl of Leicester had come to the Netherlands along with advisors and soldiers – "court" and "camp." This period was not only of military importance, but also allowed the meeting of humanistic scholars from both nations. The Earl and his people toured the country in a "progress," and stayed in Leiden from January through March, 1586. Thereafter, they kept court in The Hague.³⁷

A national Synod in The Hague began on June 20, 1586. Leicester as Governor General, allied with the stricter Reformed interests,³⁸ was keen to resolve outstanding ecclesiastical problems that were causing disunity.³⁹ Coolhaes was not an admirer of

35. Nijenhuis, *Adrianus Saravia*, 82-85. See also Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 57, 117.

36. Coolhaes, *Conciliatio*, Cijjr.

37. Van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons, and Professors*, 106-18. For a map of where the Earl and various notables stayed in Leiden, see plate 5 (plate located between pages 108 and 109). For more about the Leicestrian period in the Netherlands, see also Harold John Cook, *Matters of Exchange: Commerce, Medicine, and Science in the Dutch Golden Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 109, and Van Dorsten, *Poets, Patrons, and Professors*, 64-69, 78, 126-30, 168.

38. For more of the political background of Leicester's goals, see F. G. Oosterhoff, *Leicester and the Netherlands 1586-1587* (Utrecht: HES, 1988), 182-84.

39. Van Dooren, *De nationale synode te Middelburg*, 180-81; Kooi, *Liberty and Religion*, 111.

Leicester. The Earl “lit a fire” in all the places where he visited, he wrote, and one can see that he is “born of the flesh, not after God’s Word.”⁴⁰ Coolhaes, in fact, suspected his opponents of hoping to use Leicester to have him exiled. The orthodox preachers, on their side, were not happy that Coolhaes continued to speak out in print, and was being tacitly supported by the magistracy and the States. The magistrates, also, were not pleased that they had already that year been forced to question the city preachers about the suspicious presence in Leiden of other preachers whom they believed had kept the disputes alive.⁴¹ Coolhaes’ views were not completely re-examined at the Synod. It was, however, insisted that Coolhaes affirm the Belgic Confession.⁴² Article 16, about the doctrine of election, proved to be particularly troublesome, but Coolhaes was convinced to sign Article 16 on July 25, 1586.⁴³ Ironically, this synodal attention, motivated by the interest of strict Calvinist Leicester, led to a rescinding of the excommunication. Coolhaes was declared to be a member of the church and able to participate in the Lord’s Supper, and able to preach and teach after a six-month “suspension.”⁴⁴ Coolhaes was warned to refrain from advocating the doctrine of God’s grace to all people.⁴⁵ An additional requirement was that his books would have to be suppressed.⁴⁶ He was also asked during this time to attend lectures of theology at the university and to confer with the professors. So Coolhaes registered for lectures (*colleges*). The *Album academicum* lists Coolhaes enrolled as student in 1578 along with Pieter Cornelisz, and again in 1586, “both times probably to give an appearance of a reconciling spirit.”⁴⁷

Sadly for him, Coolhaes’ rehabilitation was short-lived. Some short time after the Synod in The Hague in 1586, Coolhaes preached in Warmond. Perhaps the six months of

40. Coolhaes, *Van de christelijcke discipline ende excommunicatie*, 1611 edition, folio Av.

41. The city preachers were Balc, Van de Wouwer and Hackius; the others were Platevoet and Van der Corput. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 66.

42. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 68. See also Rutgers, *Acta*, 536-89.

43. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 47.

44. Coolhaes, *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 163-66.

45. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 46-48.

46. Burger says (Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 47) that the Leiden city (now regional) archive has a copy of the proceedings of this conference. I have not found it.

47. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 131-32. Rieu, *Album studiosorum*, 2, 20.

probation were not up, or perhaps the problem was that he had not attended those theology classes at the university. In any event, he had been invited to preach twice in Warmond by its preacher Pieter van Oy and the Lady of Warmond, ostensibly because of Van Oy's age and sickness. He preached first on the text Romans 12:1, and the following Sunday on Romans 12:2-3. Afterwards he was visited by two Leiden elders to discipline him and forbid him access to communion until he would confess his guilt. The two elders claimed to come at the request of the consistory. Coolhaes relates details about these two elders which paint them in a very bad light: the one, Pieter Crutziger, apparently went bankrupt two weeks after this event, ruining others with him, and the other, Jacques Vallemaer (or Valmaer), was imprisoned three weeks later and executed for his alleged involvement in the "Leiden *coup*." This failed plot to seize Leiden and Amsterdam came to light on October 11, 1586, and Leicester and the English were discredited by it. They and Saravia soon left the Netherlands for England. Vallemaer's head, Coolhaes claims, was stuck up on the ramparts of the city as an example.⁴⁸ Regardless of the apparent bad character of these two, however, the consistory stood by their decision against Coolhaes. He was amazed to learn that the consistory did not think that anything he had preached in Warmond had been wrong; the error was that he had gone without the consent of the consistory and the Rhineland classis.⁴⁹ There is no record that Coolhaes ever preached again after this. In the Leiden church council *Acta*, there is evidence that he corresponded with the consistory in 1585 and 1587. It is noted there that on December 3, 1585, "another" letter was received from him (a note is made of November 26); on March 10, 1587 that Coolhaes had instructed his wife not to throw a certain letter "inside" (presumably, into the consistory chamber), but to give it to the sexton. Evidently she had indeed thrown it, and this was mentioned by way of an apology. Were these letters about the rehabilitation efforts, or protesting the renewed ban on preaching? Unfortunately, there is no other evidence.⁵⁰ Coolhaes ceased attending the *colleges* at the university after his rehabilitation attempt failed.⁵¹

48. Coolhaes, *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 168-76. The whole story can be found in: W. Bisschop, *De woelingen der Leicestersche partij binnen Leiden, 1586 en 1587* (Leiden: Boekdrukkerij J. C. Drabbe, 1867), 49-74.

49. Coolhaes, *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 171.

50. De Wildt, *Ambt, doop en avondmaal*, 26, 37.

51. Bonger, *Leven en werk*, 102. For more small references from the point of view of the synods and classes about Coolhaes in the period 1583-89, see M. Kok, J. Roelevink and A. J. J. van 't Riet, eds., *Classicale*

However, at least distilling was going well for Coolhaes. In 1588, he published the aforementioned *Van seeckere seer costelijke wateren*, a distiller's *vademecum*.⁵² This book catalogues many of the alcoholic and medicinal wines and "waters" which he had learned to distill. Although the book is not theological, it occasioned another flurry of controversy. He used the opportunity to write, to apologize for his change of profession, and to assert that he had been defrocked unlawfully. This caused conversations about him in synodal meetings, and reprimands followed.⁵³

Coolhaes was proud of his new profession and skill, and related how his new knowledge helped him to overcome persistent colds which he had had for fourteen years, and enabled his wife (who suffered from various weaknesses and sicknesses) to recover her "earlier verve" despite her increasing age.⁵⁴ Until the late 1580's, he remained outspoken and productive in Leiden, raising his family and distilling both medicinal potions and theology.

A peculiar shop

However, in the later part of the century, Coolhaes, his family, and his business relocated to Amsterdam.⁵⁵ Reasons behind the move are unknown. Perhaps things in Leiden were, after all, getting too tense for him. Perhaps Coolhaes was bitter that the Leiden magistracy had ultimately let him down.⁵⁶ Perhaps it was related to his distilling - twice in 1590, he petitioned the States to request freedom from tax for his "waters," but they were unable to

acta V, classis Leiden 1585-1620, classis Woerden, 1617-1620 (The Hague: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 1996), 4; P. H. A. M. Abels and A. P. F. Wouters, eds., *Classicale Acta 1573-1620 VII, Provinciale synode Zuid-Holland, Classis Delft en Delfland 1572-1620* (The Hague: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis, 2001), 12, 26-27, 28-29, 38, 229.

52. This expression is from M. Wagenaar, "Een predikant-destillateur-artsenijmenger," *Pharmaceutisch Weekblad* 22 (1932): 592.

53. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 60-61.

54. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 54. Coolhaes mentions his own health again in his second distilling book, *Water-boecxken*, telling how he treats his "cold and damp." Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 57.

55. Burger says it was between August, 1590, and August, 1591. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 62. This is also the year in which Coornhert died. (There is no evidence that the two had any contact in Coornhert's final years.) However, the BWNZL, 167-68, says that the family moved to Amsterdam in 1587.

56. Cited in Kamphuis, *Kerkelijke besluitvaardigheid*, 43.

grant this, at least at first, as a safeguard against frauds or damage arising from his products.⁵⁷ In any event, they moved, and his Amsterdam distillery and shop were established “in the Gilded Mortar by St. Olof’s Gate”⁵⁸ in the Warmoesstraat – in the heart of the city, close to the Old Church.

It must have been a peculiar shop in the Warmoes Street at St. Olof’s Gate, where one could find benefit for both the body and soul – where healing waters and oils in little bottles stood ready, while edifying and at the same time satirical prints decorated the walls and windows.⁵⁹

These prints were a new occupation of his. At about the same time as the move, Coolhaes started the production of woodcut prints with text, for the purpose of communicating simple religious lessons. He called them *Inventiones* or *Schilderijen*.⁶⁰ This sort of print is usually labeled *emblemata*, a genre of art and literature in which a picture is paired with a text, on religious or secular themes. When compiled, they form emblem books. *Emblemata* and emblem books were popular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Italy, France and Germany, and developed into a true craze in the Netherlands.⁶¹ Many in the sixteenth century were printed by Christoffel Plantijn.⁶² Politically, “visual propaganda” had not been much used during the Dutch Revolt, but in Germany woodcut and broadsheets with pictures had been common since the 1520’s.⁶³ In the Netherlands, poems and *emblemata*

57. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 50.

58. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 62. It is interesting to note that at this location on the corner of Warmoesstraat and Nieuwebrugsteeg, in present-day Amsterdam, there is a building dating from 1618-19, so the old gate building which Coolhaes would have known is no longer there. However, the location is still connected to strong drink. It houses an establishment, “Café In Den Olofpoort,” which specializes, according to its website, in over two hundred different domestic and imported spirits.

59. “Het moet in de Warmoesstraat bij St. Olofspoort wel een eigenaardige winkel geweest zijn, waar men baat kon vinden voor lichaam en ziel tegelijk, waar geneeskrachtige wateren en oliën in fleschjes klaar stonden, terwijl de stichtelijke en tegelijk min of meer satirieke prenten wanden en ramen sierden.” Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 66.

60. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 12.

61. For fascinating examples of many different emblem books, see “Emblem Project Utrecht,” <http://emblems.let.uu.nl> (accessed January 27, 2016). Also useful (although Coolhaes’ *emblemata* are not listed) is John Landwehr, *Emblem Books in the Low Countries, 1554-1949. A Bibliography* (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1970).

62. Landwehr, *Emblem Books in the Low Countries*, ix.

were predominantly written on themes of courtly, romantic love (some blatantly erotic), or on religious piety. Some poets wrote both, such as the later Jan Luyken.⁶⁴ A comparison can be made with Coornhert who was also an engraver, and had produced engraved prints.

Coornhert's style was quite elaborate and extravagant, whereas the allegorical woodcuts accompanying Coolhaes' texts were much simpler in style.⁶⁵

Coolhaes' *emblemata* were on strictly religious themes. He wrote the texts, and the woodcuts were done, probably, by Wilhelm Janszoon van Campen.⁶⁶ They were sold at fairs and markets,⁶⁷ and proved to be controversial, as they criticized preachers as well as emphasized heart religion as opposed to outward ceremonies and appearances. Coolhaes' first was *De mensch die eenvoudich is ende van ganser harten Godt suckt*, also known as *De weg met zijwegen* (1591).⁶⁸ Like the trope of the much later *Pilgrim's Progress* of John Bunyan (1679), this is a picture of a man going to a heavenly city, asking the way of people he passes, and in danger of being distracted by what is on his right and left. Another woodcut, *Van de twee aanbidders* (also called *De waerachtige ende valsche aenbidder Godts*) from 1591, was also very popular, contrasting the true and false worshippers of God.⁶⁹ Unfortunately, most of the rest of these woodcuts, which are mentioned in Coolhaes' works and by others, are non-extant. They are described in documents of the pamphlet-battle, such as Coolhaes'

63. Duke, *Dissident Identities*, 169-70; Duke, *Reformation and Revolt*, 104-106. For more specific information on and reproductions of the prints which *did* appear during the Dutch Revolt, see Daniel R. Horst, "De Opstand in zwart-wit: Propagandaprenten uit de Nederlandse Opstand 1566-1584; Deel I en II: Propaganda en Prenten; Deel III: Catalogus en Afbeeldingen" (PhD diss., Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 2000).

64. For the poems of Luyken, see J. W. Schulte Nordholt, ed., *Ontmoeting met Jan Luyken* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1978).

65. Bongers, et al., *Dirck Volkertsz Coornhert: Dwars maar recht*, 115. For more about Coornhert, his prints, his time in Cologne, and his ideas, see also Ilja M. Veldman, "Keulen als toevluchtsoord voor Nederlandse kunstenaars (1567-1612)," *Oud Holland* 107 (1993): 38-40, and Ilja M. Veldman, *De wereld tussen goed en kwaad* (The Hague: SDU uitgeverij, 1990).

66. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 10-11.

67. According to Trigland, as quoted by Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 70.

68. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 10; also printed in Van Dooren, *De nationale synode te Middelburg*, 271. The original is: Caspar Coolhaes, *De mensch die eenvoudich is ende van ganser harten Godt suckt*, [Amsterdam]: Willem Janz van Campen, 1591.

69. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 71; Burger gives more information and reproduces the picture and some of the text; Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 15-19. The original is: Caspar Coolhaes, *De waerachtige ende valsche aenbidder Godts* [Amsterdam]: Willem Janz van Campen, 1591.

Wederantwoort, Grontlicke waerheyt and Cort waerachtich verhael. Cornelisz and Van der Corput also mention them in *Corte Antwoordt*.

Jacob Arminius was also in Amsterdam during this time, as a preacher, from 1588 to 1603. One wonders what sort of contact Coolhaes may have had with Arminius, if any. There is no record of this, but perhaps Coolhaes was a communicant again in these years, since even though he was not allowed to preach, it was not mentioned that he was excommunicated again after the Warmond incident. On the other hand, perhaps he attended the sermons but was not a communing member. In any case, it seems unlikely that he and Arminius would have had no relationship at all. Arminius and his fellow preacher, Petrus Plancius, had fallen into disagreement. This is not surprising; Plancius was a firm Calvinist and predestinarian who would oppose Arminius and would later be an important Contra-Remonstrant figure.

Coolhaes' move to Amsterdam, and the *emblemata* prints, were mentioned at the Synod in The Hague in August, 1591. The church of Leiden was directed to write to the church in Amsterdam and recommend an inspection and exhortation.⁷⁰ Presumably the exhortation concerned his books and prints, or perhaps he was also outspoken in general. Later in the same year, Coolhaes was visited by the preacher Plancius together with one of his elders, for a conversation on Coolhaes' views. The fact that Plancius visited him seems to show that he was still in the Reformed world and that he was seen as a responsibility of Plancius. Perhaps it was a disciplinary visit, associated with the question of Coolhaes' fitness to come to the Lord's Table, although that is only conjecture. Plancius would later be sent to investigate other objectionable activities; he came to Leiden in 1595 about Chamber of Rhetoric feasts.⁷¹ In his visit to Coolhaes, Plancius was concerned about Coolhaes' theology and also about the distilling book.⁷² A report was made from Amsterdam back to the next Synod, in Leiden, November 1592, saying that Coolhaes preferred not to speak to them, due to his age, but preferred to have their conversation in writing. This was a strange objection,

70. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 61.

71. Rogge, *Caspar Janszoon Coolhaes*, vol. 2, 120; Pater, *Jan van Hout*, 118. Regarding Plancius' role with Coolhaes, see also R. B. Evenhuis, *Ook dat was Amsterdam*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam: W. Ten Have, 1965), 172-75.

72. Michael A. Hakkenberg, "Plancius, Petrus," *OER*, vol. 3, 280.

considering he was only about fifty-seven. Perhaps it was just an excuse. They asked him if he considered the Reformed, visible Church to be the true church, and he answered, no.⁷³

Defending himself: pamphlets and *hutspot*

Coolhaes defended himself, during the late nineties, in what came to be known as the “pamphlet battle.” The old Leiden controversies were re-publicized and both old and new accusations were leveled against Coolhaes, which he attempted to counter in print. For instance, the consistory of Deventer received a copy of Coolhaes’ *Apologia* on August 13, 1599, with the request to read it (presumably again, since it had been available since 1580) and give their judgment. No response from them is recorded.⁷⁴

What was the cause of this renewed interest in Coolhaes and the Leiden affair? It is because Coolhaes was not quiet in his new location, but remained very outspoken, especially in print. The whole renewed controversy may have begun with the publication of Coolhaes’ *Aenwijsinge* (mentioned in *Aenhechtsel* as having been published in 1596, presumed non-extant), but certainly the re-issuing of Coornhert’s *Justificatie* and *Remonstrance* in 1597 would have further stoked the fire of controversy. *Remonstrance* was so popular that it was actually published in that year in three editions.⁷⁵ It is unknown why *Remonstrance* itself was so popular. In any case, people who may not have been old enough twenty years earlier in the 1580’s to be aware of Coolhaes’ case could now judge the whole debate for themselves. It can be assumed that there was enough opposition to the stricter Calvinists that the Coolhaes affair and Coornhert’s impassioned writing caught the attention of a new generation. But the stricter Calvinists did not keep silent. *Justificatie* caused a response to come in the form of a lengthy *Antwoorde op de valsche beschuldiginghen* (1598),⁷⁶ and the printing of an older

73. The record is unclear and something has been left out; Burger explains it further. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 62-63.

74. Revius, *Licht op Deventer*, 96.

75. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 76.

76. The title page of this work is reproduced in Bostoen, *Hart voor Leiden*, 53.

anonymous work, *Verantwoordinghe van den dienaar, ouderlinghen ende diaconen der kercke tot Leyden*, which had been written to refute the *Justificatie* earlier but never printed.⁷⁷

Coolhaes published his *Wederantwoort* in 1598 as his response to what he considered slander.⁷⁸ The book begins with a poem of thirty-six lines. Perhaps it is Coolhaes' own verse, although this is unclear. The book continues with the discussion of the slanderous writing which has been published about him by "one of the preachers." He finds it outrageous that his "brothers" should attack him. This slander is actually nothing more than "old spit" (*oude wtspoechsel*) mixed up like a mashed stew (a *hutspot*, as he calls it), and served up to the simple.⁷⁹ Recounting the Leiden controversy, he exhorts the preachers and elders with biblical passages, and cites the example of Zwingli, in response to Luther and his followers, to show that even disagreement over the Real Presence can coexist with "friendliness and politeness."⁸⁰

Response to *Wederantwoort* came from the South Holland Synod in The Hague in 1599, which declared that anyone publishing the slanderous books of Coolhaes, or Coornhert's *Justificatie* and *Remonstrance*, would be censured by their classis. They also appointed Coolhaes' old opponents, Arent Cornelisz and Hendrik van der Corput, to write a response,⁸¹ which was their *Corte antwoordt*, published in 1600.⁸² These orthodox preachers charged that he had spread his writings and pictures through the country to the unrest of many

77. *Verantwoordinghe van den dienaar, ouderlinghen ende diaconen, der kercke tot Leyden, eertijds naer het wt-gheven van de Justificatie ghestelt, ende nu door occasie van de vernieuwinghe, ende herdruckinghe der zelve Justificatie, int licht ghebracht*. There is no title page for this piece, which seems to have been printed and distributed together with the reprinted *Justificatie*. The author is unknown. See also: Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 76-77.

78. Caspar Coolhaes, *Wederantwoort Caspari Coolhaes op een faemroovende boexken sonder naem des authours onder eenen gedichten ende versierden naem van een verantwoordinghe des dienaers. oulingen [sic] ende diaconen der kercken tot Leyden, voor seventhien jaren tegen die Justificatie van Leyden geschreven, ende nu eerst tot Rotterdam gedrukt by Jan van Waesbergen int jaer 1598* (Rotterdam: Jan van Waesbergen, 1598).

79. Coolhaes, *Wederantwoort*, 28; Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 78.

80. Coolhaes, *Wederantwoort*, 18, Bv-Br.

81. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 79-80.

82. Arent Cornelisz (Crusius) and Hendrik van der Corput, *Corte antwoordt op de valsche beschuldighingen end' blameringen van Casper Coolhaes teghen de ghemeene kercken, begrepen in syn boecxken ghenaemt Wederantwoort : waer inne ooc vervatet is een corte aenwijsinge end' wederlegginge van dwalinghen, stekende inde boecxkens end' afbeeldinghen hier voren van Coolhaes uytghegheven, door Adr. Cornelisz van der Linden*. N. p., 1600.

of the pious.⁸³ They also took issue with his claim not to have chosen a party or sect. On the contrary, he was part of the biggest party of all – the *stilstaenders, speculeerders ende toekijckers* – “the silent, the speculators and the on-lookers”⁸⁴ who all wanted to establish a new “Catholic” Church: always seeking, but never finding, wanting only to sit at Christ’s feet like Mary. They are found in countless numbers, and must be counted.⁸⁵ Their reference is likely to the *toehoorders* or *liefhebbers*. In addition to criticism of Coolhaes, the two preachers wrote about Sebastian Franck’s *Apologia*, which Coolhaes was translating.⁸⁶ “Franck was not pure, and Coolhaes dirties himself with Franck, with whom it is well-known that he agrees.”⁸⁷

Coolhaes responded by publishing *Grondlicke waerheydt*,⁸⁸ which Burger calls Coolhaes’ “confession of faith.”⁸⁹ Coolhaes himself, who begins the book by listing many of his works to date, calls it his “fifth apology” (after but in the same category, as he explains, as *Apologia*, *Breeder bericht*, *Conciliatio*, and *Wederantwoort*).⁹⁰ The verse included on the title

83. Cornelisz and Van der Corput, *Corte antwoordt*, 75; Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 83.

84. Cited by Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, 72. For more about the difficulty of determining who belonged to this amorphous group, see Kaplan, *Calvinists and Libertines*, 68-69.

85. “... die altoos soecken, maer nemmermeer vinden.... Dese Stilhouders, ende die haer uytgheven dates alleen aende voeten des Heeren Christi met Maria begheeren te zitten, zijnder huydendaeghs in ontallijcker grootermenigte, God better: Maer zy moeten al mede voor een partye gerekent worden.” Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 83-84; Cornelisz and Van der Corput, *Corte antwoordt*, 73.

86. We will address this work extensively in Chapter 9.

87. “Franc niet zuyver en is gheweest, ende dat Coolhaes hem selven vuyl maect met Francken, met wien hy rondelijc bekent in een ghevoelen (te weten, gheheel onpartydich) te staen.” Cornelisz and Van der Corput, *Corte antwoordt*, 45-56; Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 82-83.

88. Caspar Coolhaes, *Grontlicke waerheyt op het min dan waerachtich schrijven van eenen, schuytlende onder t’decksel van die gereformeerde kercke, sonder ontdeckinghe zijns naems teghens die Wederantwoort Caspari Coolhasen* ([Amsterdam]: Peeter Gevaerts, 1600). Initial attempts in 2011 to find this book in Rotterdam and elsewhere were unsuccessful. I feared it was no longer extant. However, I noticed in August, 2015, that an entry for it had appeared in the Universal Short Title Catalog, where it had not been before. Dr. A. H. van der Laan, curator at the Erasmus Center for Early Modern Studies, Bibliotheek Rotterdam, was then able to find the physical copy. He wrote, “Inderdaad hebben wij dit boek in beheer als bruikleen van de Remonstrantse Gemeenschap Rotterdam. Omdat het niet ons eigen bezit is, hebben we dit boek nog niet beschreven in onze online catalogus. Het boek is het zevende onderdeel van een convoluut (signatuur Erasmuszaal 29 E 2) dat ooit deel uitmaakte van de bibliotheek van Johannes Vvtenbogaert, die overigens geen sporen in het boek heeft nagelaten.” E-mail to author, 14 August 2015.

89. “Het geschrift ‘Grondelijke waerheyt’ van 1600, bevat wat men zijn geloofsbelijdenis zou kunnen noemen.” J. Reitsma en Lindeboom, *Johannes Geschiedenis van de Hervorming en de Hervormde Kerk der Nederlanden* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1948), 173.

page is 2 Timothy 3:8, which mentions the two men Jannes and Jambres, who stood against Moses and were publicly exposed. Since Moses for Coolhaes is a symbol for the secular government, who should guide the church in place of the clergy, this is a clear message of his derision for the preachers who have been writing against him in the “pamphlet war,” and a prediction of their eventual downfall. In this book, Coolhaes takes a tone which is frustrated and even angry. He responds in detail to accusations from his detractors, often quoting passages out of their writings before giving his defense. They accused him of false teaching and godlessness in 1579, which he is still anxious to disprove. They were the ones who sent his writings throughout the country, not he.⁹¹ But the main problem, he goes on, is that he will not agree that their church is the one true church.⁹²

Some of Coolhaes’ other works from this period appear to be non-extant; for instance, *Van eenen mensche in twijffel staende*, 1596 (mentioned in *Aenhechtsel*, 1602), and *Naespeuringhe*, 1597 (mentioned in *Cort, waerachtich verhael*, 1610). Arent Cornelisz and Van der Corput did not respond again, but a schoolmaster in Naarden made up a slanderous song which Coolhaes answered with *Vermaninge aen Jaques Mercijs*, 1601.⁹³

Petrus Plancius, meanwhile, had brought a complaint regarding Coolhaes and his continued writing to Leiden in 1600. He felt that Coolhaes, even after long years in Amsterdam, was persisting in his wrong opinions and acting very party-spiritedly against the church. In his opinion, the South Holland churches were the ones which should proceed against him. Amsterdam had been obligated to have him, not as a preacher but as a private person. He had been exhorted to no avail, he remained obstinate, so he should be excommunicated - because if he was tolerated too long, the true Christian Reformed religion would be mocked.⁹⁴ His complaint is yet more proof that Coolhaes remained in the orbit of the Reformed world as a member or *liefhebber* during these years.

90. Coolhaes, *Grondlicke waerheyt*, Bijv.

91. Coolhaes, *Grondlicke waerheyt*, Bjr.

92. Coolhaes, *Grondlicke waerheyt*, 102.

93. Also assumed non-extant, but discussed by Burger. Burger was published in 1915 but no trace of some of the works he mentions can be found today. Perhaps, like *Grondlicke waerheyt*, they will eventually be relocated as part of a *convoluut* as described above. *Vermaninge aen Jaques Mercijs* is mentioned in Coolhaes, *Een noodtwendighe broederlijcke vermaninghe*, Eb.

94. *Acta III*, 153; Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 85-86.

At the Amsterdam Synod in 1601, the delegates discussed Coolhaes' book *Grondlijke waerheyt*. A strong statement was made in Gouda in August 1601, saying that even though a certain D. Halsbergius had talked to Coolhaes without much fruit, the procedure begun against him in South Holland was improper and should be overturned. Evidently by this point Coolhaes had not stopped attending church. It was reported that he said that he differed in opinion and thus was not coming to listen to sermons because, first, the preachers from the pulpit slandered others. In particular, they slandered those whom they have not heard and whose books they have never read, such as "Mennonists" and Arians. Second, the preachers taught erroneously about predestination. Third, he did not need the sermon - he understood all things better than the preachers themselves. When asked about his books and prints and what he wrote about Franck in the foreword to his translation of the *Apology*, which is a section of Franck's *Das verbüthschiert mit sibem Sigeln verschlossen Büch*, he said that the preachers did not understand either Franck or his own books and prints. The Synod weighed this and decided that Wernerus Helmichius, Casparus Grevinckhovius, and another preacher from the Amsterdam church, who remained unnamed, would further exhort Coolhaes to recant his views and books. If he did not, excommunication would proceed without further writings to answer his books. The Synod wished this to be done in the Amsterdam church, since he had been living, writing and publishing his books in Amsterdam all this time, and then to be publicized in churches in South Holland.⁹⁵ Obviously, Coolhaes and his activities were an embarrassment to them.

However, their attempts did not lead to anything. Over the next few years, synods kept calling for his excommunication, but in 1604, at the Synod in Emden, it was reported that the church in Amsterdam opposed his excommunication, and that therefore it would be very difficult. It was put off again.⁹⁶ Much of the difficulty was in regard to the question of whether the responsibility belonged to North Holland or South Holland. It was finally decided in Rotterdam (1605) to put off any resolution until the next national synod. Excommunicating Coolhaes again probably seemed less urgent at that moment, since the pamphlet battle had slowed down.⁹⁷

95. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 87-88, from *Acta III*, 168.

96. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 89, from *Acta I*, 363, and *III*, 214.

97. Moes and Burger, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers*, 90-91.