



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Spiritual alchemy from the age of Jacob Boehme to Mary Anne Atwood, 1600–1900

Zuber, M.A.

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Other version

License

Other

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Zuber, M. A. (2017). *Spiritual alchemy from the age of Jacob Boehme to Mary Anne Atwood, 1600–1900*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

CONVENTIONS

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

While documenting the sources throughout this thesis, the guiding concern was ease of use. At the same time, the conventions I employed require explanation because my methodology and research call into question the sharp distinction between print and manuscript that is widely taken for granted. This dichotomy underlies entire institutional structures – most modern libraries have different departments for printed books and manuscripts. As a corollary, most bibliographies similarly house them in different sections, too. While I ultimately submitted to this approach as well, I have strong misgivings about its implications. Put bluntly, the impression created by standard approaches is that printed texts are floating around in a disembodied manner, whereas manuscripts are treated as museum pieces rather than texts to be read. The truth lies somewhere in the middle for both media; neither of them is entirely disembodied or unique. Actually, early-modern readers distinguished far less absolutely than we are wont to do between print and manuscript: they viewed their reading matter simply as books, be they ‘written’ or ‘printed’. Even printed publications are material objects with a distinctive history, and thus they may have distinguishing, even unique features, such as annotations. Conversely, due to the persistence of scribal publication and associated practices, many manuscripts are actually not unique in the sense that there are other copies of the same text, with only the most minor of differences or another provenance to distinguish them.

In referencing printed sources, the surname of the author(s) and short title are given in the footnotes, which allows straightforward identification in most cases. When specifically referring to unique features of a given copy, I name the institution and provide the shelf-mark in the footnotes as well as in the bibliography. As most of the few websites cited throughout this study are of limited interest, they only appear in the footnotes. Standard sources, reference works and dictionaries available online are quoted in the same manner as printed sources, in the case of the most commonly known ones using abbreviations, e.g. the *Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED*). Another important online resource is the *Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachraum erschienenen Drucke des 17. Jahrhunderts* (*VD17*) – it was constantly at my fingertips. Among Bible versions, I have drawn on the English standard version (*ESV*), Luther’s German translation of 1545, the Hebrew *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensis* and the Vulgate.

Manuscript and archival sources require slightly more explanation. The most commonly used reference procedures indicate the location of a manuscript source without providing any idea of its contents. I consider this a glaring lack of information, and my bibliography provides a name associated with a given manuscript and information on (part of) the content. To refer to manuscript sources in footnotes, I first state the surname of the author, compiler or scribe. In many instances, the name given may thus not correspond to that under discussion in the main text. In choosing such names, I have drawn on existing catalogues whenever possible, but frequently they simply do not exist; alternatively, the information they supply may be deficient. Ultimately, the purpose of the name mentioned in connection with a manuscript or archival source is simply to allow for the source to be listed alphabetically in the relevant bibliography section. Second, I provide, in brackets, the location, holding institution (in abbreviated form) and the complete shelf-mark. Again, in most cases, this will allow straightforward identification, so that readers could, in theory, immediately get in touch with the holding institution and call up the source under discussion.

To provide an example, a footnote might refer to the following source: ‘Pseudo-Sendivogius (London, BL: Sloane MS 1800)’. Some readers will know and others may be able to guess that this refers to the British Library; everyone else will be able to rely on the complete entry listed under ‘Pseudo-Sendivogius, Michael’ in the bibliography to find out, which also contains a title or brief description of the manuscript. The location is important because the same abbreviation may apply to different institutions. This is particularly obvious with the commonly used UB (Universitätsbibliothek/Universitätsbibliothek). In the case of ‘Roach (Oxford, BL: MSS Rawl. D 832/33)’, the location indicates that BL refers to the Bodleian Library, rather than the British Library. Though perhaps unconventional, this procedure allows me to spare my readers many a wild goose chase from a specific footnote to the bibliography and thence to a list of abbreviations: all three of these are usually at different strategic locations at the beginning, middle and end of academic books. This means that, by the time one has identified the holding institution, one may already have forgotten which source originally triggered the effort – and why, if only the shelf-mark is given in the bibliography.

BOEHME'S WORKS

The works of Jacob Boehme, as referenced throughout this study, require further explanation in several ways. Generations of scholars have dutifully turned to Will-Erich Peuckert's reprint of the 1730 edition of Boehme's complete works (*Sämtliche Schriften*, 10 vols., 1955–61). In recent years, however, several scholars (in particular Günther Bonheim, Andrew Weeks and Leigh T. I. Penman) have begun expressing dissatisfaction with this state of affairs, as they observed that the 1730 edition does not merit unquestionable acceptance. Additionally, the open-access availability of a great number of early-modern sources, including many editions of Boehme's writings, render continued reliance on Peuckert's reprint all but unnecessary. I have therefore chosen to quote from earlier versions, including some in manuscript, according to the following hierarchy or criteria:

1) For the texts it contains, Werner Buddecke's edition of Boehme autographs (*Die Urschriften*, 2 vols., 1963–66) is the unquestionable standard. Buddecke's *Aurora* (the bulk of vol. 1) has since been re-used in a facing-page translation by Andrew Weeks (2013). I have used this re-edition, as it makes the text more readily accessible to an international audience.

2) If a given text has not been preserved in autograph form, I have relied on the earliest manuscript or print version to which I had access. With the notable exceptions of Boehme's *Ein kurtzer einfeltiger Sumarischer bericht von der Newen wiedergeburch* (Erfurt, BEM: Msc 21), f. 328r–61r, and the first edition of *Der Weg zu Christo* (Görlitz, 1624; Den Haag, KB: Ritman Kerncollectie, PH 2337), most of these are available online. In the case of *Signatura rerum*, there is a modern edition of the 1634 version, edited by Ferdinand van Ingen (*Werke*, 1997).

3) If there is reason to assume that a specific figure discussed may have used an identifiable edition of Boehme's texts, I have sought to reflect that in the version I quote. This mostly concerns Dionysius Andreas Freher in Part IV, who relied on the first complete edition of Boehme's works printed in 1682.

In addition to quoting a specific version, I have referred to the corresponding passage in the 1730 edition (reprinted by Peuckert), as a concession to its status as *textus receptus* and earlier practice. As a corollary, even if the specific editions and manuscripts quoted divide their texts further, I only refer to individual pages or folios. This is to avoid confusion deriving from slightly different counts of chapters and especially paragraphs in comparison to the 1730 edition. References to the 1730 edition consist of an abbreviation of the normalized Latin titles, chapter and paragraph number(s) in brackets. 'A 22: 84' therefore refers to: *Aurora*, ch. 22, § 84. If the work is

structured differently, I expand on this basic scheme by relying on the standard abbreviations detailed below, e.g. ‘AS1, § 78’, which refers to a treatise not divided into chapters, *Anti-Stiefelius I*, and ‘CS, bk. 4, 5: 1’, which refers to the booklet ‘De Regeneratione’ (*Von der Newen wiedergeburch*) as part of *Christosophia*, perhaps better known as *Der Weg zu Christo*. If the version quoted is that of the 1730 edition, I indicate this with an equal sign, e.g. ‘= C’, meaning that the *Clavis* edition cited is that of 1730. Occasionally, I remark on significant differences between the versions referenced.

Abbreviations for Boehme’s Writings

A	<i>Aurora</i>
AS1/2	<i>Anti-Stiefelius I/II</i>
AT1/2	<i>Erste/Andere Apologia wider Balthasar Tilken</i>
C	<i>Clavis</i>
CS	<i>Christosophia</i>
DC	<i>De Divina Contemplatione</i>
ET	<i>Epistolae Theosophicae</i>
IV	<i>De Incarnatione Verbi</i>
MM	<i>Mysterium Magnum</i>
PV	<i>Psychologia Vera</i>
SR	<i>Signatura Rerum</i>
TaP	<i>Tabula Principiorum</i>
TC	<i>De Testamentis Christi</i>
TP	<i>De Tribus Principiis</i>
TV	<i>De Triplici Vita</i>
VS	<i>De Vita et Scriptis</i>

TRANSCRIPTION OF SOURCES

Considerations of ease of use also apply to the transcriptions of sources in print and manuscript. This thesis was written with an international audience in mind, yet most quotations stem from sources in archaic forms of German. In general, and at the risk of waxing philosophical, I view *transcription*, which is too often regarded as a simple act of copying, as a complex process of *translation*. Additionally, my approach to this

process is based on *meaning*, not on *looks*. If it were about communicating the *looks*, the most obvious solution, in this day and age, would be to provide digital facsimiles and let readers figure it out for themselves. That would obviously be beside the point: as a scholar, I am making the *meaning* of obscure manuscript texts (which, in many cases, even native speakers of German are entirely unable to read due to scripts that are no longer used) accessible to readers less familiar with these sources, their conventions and language.

To give an obvious example of what this means in practice, we might consider the archaic English letter *þ* (*thorn*) that ended up looking a lot like *y* in many early-modern texts. Consequently, it is often encountered in transcriptions based on *looks* as *ye* or *yt*, while what the writer originally *meant* were the words *the* or *that*. However much this letter may look like a *y*, it clearly is not, for all intents and purposes, a *y* if we employ it in today's writing or type. Despite many similarities, the transition from, say, early-modern manuscript text to twenty-first century type is radical, and it is in this sense that it requires a *translation*, not a mere *transcription*. Even if we turn to early-modern type, though the difference to present-day type may not be as striking, there is nonetheless an inalienable alterity between these two comprehensive systems of writing. There were indeed differences between the languages of early-modern type and manuscript, but these are much more subtle than the use of the archaic virgule / instead of the simple comma would suggest. Consequently, I have translated virgules as commas, as the virgule was simply the equivalent of the comma in German blackletter type.

Rather than helping non-specialist readers understand foreign texts, transcriptions adhering to the *looks* seem to serve the purpose of staging scholarly accuracy or signalling that their user belongs to an elite group that is in the know and able to correctly read *yt* as *that*. At worst, however, such a procedure may simply reveal ignorance, for instance when standard abbreviations (or elements thereof) are slavishly reproduced instead of correctly expanded. For instance, a standard abbreviation for the Latin suffix *-que* (meaning 'and') *looks* a lot like *-q;*. A scholar may correctly extrapolate [*ue*] but stop short of dropping the semicolon, resulting in a proliferation of semicola that will inevitably disrupt the flow of reading and cause confusion among readers not familiar with this Latin abbreviation. In my view, the correct *translation* of *-q;* into present-day type would simply be *-que*. I have silently expanded unambiguous and commonly used abbreviations, even if they are still commonly used (such as & for 'and').

The most common exception to this rule concerns German *dz* (and, less commonly, *wz*), which could be expanded in many different ways, such as *dasz*, *daß* and *das*

or with other intervening vowels altogether. In this case, I have refrained from imposing what I thought would be the most appropriate expansion, as early-modern German did not distinguish between these spelling variants as systematically as modern German does. In addition, I have distinguished between abbreviations based on dots (not expanded) and flourishes (expanded), respectively. This means that *H.* remains *H.* but *H[flourish]* becomes *Herr* (German for ‘Mr’ and ‘Mister’, respectively).

Furthermore, the semblance of accuracy in scholarly transcriptions critiqued here is usually highly selective: I do not think that I have encountered modern transcriptions consequently distinguishing between different forms of the letter *s/f* or *r/ɾ*. According to my understanding, for early-modern readers the difference between the components of these pairs was basically of the same kind as that between *u/v*. From this angle, it is implicitly presentist and thus anachronistic to transcribe both *s/f* and *r/ɾ* simply as *s* and *r*, respectively, but to differentiate between *u* and *v*. This happens for the simple reason that we nowadays distinguish sharply between these two letters but no longer pay attention to the elongated *s* or the rounded *r*. In short, the letter *u* at the beginning of German words in early-modern print and manuscript truly does look like a *v*, yet the modern distinction between the letters *u* and *v* was simply not yet in place (Latin also treated these letters as mostly interchangeable, particularly in riddles). The case is vastly different for the two sounds these letters signify, which obviously already existed. Rather than slavishly adhering to the letter and its looks, I have given precedence to the meaning of the letter and the sound it represents. In other words, I have normalized the use of *u/v* and *i/j* in general. However, dialectal variation means that, particularly in the latter case, I have not done so uncritically: *ieder* and *jeder*, for instance, continue to be used as variants in present-day Dutch and German, respectively, and this variation already existed in the early-modern era. From this perspective, it would have been wrong to inconsiderately normalize *i/j* in every single case.

My approach to neo-Latin has been somewhat different: the tendency in scholarship is to normalize it according to classical models. In contrast, I understand neo-Latin as the distinct *lingua franca* of the early-modern age and have therefore retained elements usually eliminated in transcriptions. This concerns accents or the letters *æ* and *œ*, which are used quite consistently for *ae* and *oe* in Latin text throughout the early-modern period and may hint at a difference in pronunciation compared to classical Latin, where *ae* and *oe* had been articulated as vowel glides (diphthongs). In contrast to *æ/œ*, I have considered *&* as a ligature of the letters *e* and *t* and transcribed it as *et* in Latin contexts.

It would take us too far afield to discuss all the other issues in the process of working with manuscript sources written over the course of five different centuries, containing material in at least as many languages. Yet based on the examples and the considerations outlined along with them, I am confident that it would be possible for others sufficiently skilled and knowledgeable in working with early-modern sources to arrive at transcriptions very similar to my own, with only the most minor of discrepancies.¹ I have equally applied these conventions to modern editions/transcriptions of sources, without specifically mentioning this in each case.

Another note concerns the use of square brackets, ellipses and *sic*, that tiny Latin word suggesting something is wrong with the source. Most of the quotations I use originated during the age of the sprawling Baroque sentence. This means that my quotes, although some of them may be long indeed, almost never span an entire period. If we look at it from another angle, the modern concept of the sentence is simply very different from that encountered in my sources, which contrast is further heightened by the transition from German to English. Thus, ellipses preceding and succeeding quotations are the norm. Rather than starting and ending next to every one of them with the three dots ... that mark ellipses and, moreover, adding a capital [I]nitial in square brackets, I have omitted the dots and silently capitalized the first word of each quotation, if it was not a capital letter in the original. Doing otherwise would have turned my footnotes, which are intended to give easy access to the source material translated in the main text, into veritable eyesores. Regarding *sic*, the idea that a given word should be spelt the same way each and every time it occurs is a modern one that postdates most of the texts discussed throughout this thesis. Consequently, I have used *sic* as rarely as possible, only when I felt that some element within the text of a source was disrupting the understanding, definitely wrong and/or not amenable to a charitable interpretation, according to which it may be seen as correct in some way.

TRANSLITERATION OF HEBREW

Most of the time, I have provided both the Hebrew text and a transliteration. I have employed a number of non-standard characters when transliterating Hebrew, which

¹ For some of the literature that has shaped my views, see Hunter, *Editing Early Modern Texts*; Love, *The Culture and Commerce of Texts*, ch. 8: 'Editing Scribally Published Texts'; Mundt, et al., *Probleme der Edition von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit*; Joost, 'Prolegomena zu einer editionskritischen Untersuchung der deutschen Zweischriftigkeit'.

are listed here. Regarding vowels, only the *schwa* (unmarked or *ə*) needs to be specified, for which the IPA symbol *ə* is used. The table below shows the relevant Hebrew letter, its name as practical examples of transliteration, the corresponding letter used in transliteration and its phonetic value according to the symbols used by the International Phonetic Association (IPA).

א	<i>aleph</i>	ʾ	/ʔ/
ה	<i>het</i>	ħ	/ħ/
ע	<i>ayin</i>	ʿ	/ʕ/
צ	<i>zadi</i>	z	/ts/

TRANSLATIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Unless I reference existing translations in the footnotes, the translations of sources appearing throughout the main text are my own. Based on my familiarity with different geographical and historical varieties of German, I have sought to avoid *literal* translations and instead striven for an *idiomatic* ideal, both with respect to the source and target languages. To provide some examples, *der andere* most commonly meant ‘the second’ in early-modern German, rather than ‘the other’, and *Christi Zukunfft* does not refer to ‘the future of Christ’ but to his ‘Second Coming’. In many cases, I had to try and simplify intricate sentence structures, partly by introducing additional punctuation or splitting up a long sentence into smaller ones.

To help in identifying cases in which I drew on modern translations, I use the forward slash / when referring to modern editions that contain the original text of a source alongside a translation, most commonly on facing pages. Usually, the page number before the slash refers to the original and that after it to the translation. Note that the same slash occurs in some folio references, e.g. *f. 8r/v*, when I cite the front and back of single sheet. A vertical line | indicates a line break, for instance in poems. Since pages (*p./pp.*) are far from the norm throughout the materials referenced in this study, I have used whatever unit(s) seemed most pragmatic for easily locating the relevant passage in a given source. The abbreviations and symbols employed include, among others, *v./vv.* (verses), *n./nn.* (notes), *col./cols.* (columns), *§/§§* (paragraphs), *pos.* (microfilm position), *ch./chs.* (chapters), *bk./bks.* (books), *vol./vols.* (volumes). For alphabetically structured works, I use *s.v.* (‘sub voce’/‘sub vocibus’) and then name the relevant entry or entries.

SYMBOLS

Various symbols frequently occur in early-modern texts, particularly those devoted to alchemy. In the vast majority of cases, the meaning is straightforwardly identifiable, and I have translated these symbols into English on this basis. I have only occasionally retained symbols when their shapes are used as substitutes for regular letters, as in ‘Harm⊙nia’. The following symbols are encountered throughout this thesis:

♄	Saturn, lead, Saturday
♃	Jupiter, tin, Thursday
♂	Mars, iron, Tuesday
⊙	<i>Sol</i> /sun, gold, Sunday
♀	Venus, copper, Friday
♿	Mercury, mercury/quicksilver, Wednesday
☾/☾	<i>Luna</i> /moon, silver, Monday
♁	Antimony
□	<i>Sal</i> /salt, square
⊕	Earth
△	Fire
▽	Water
✝	<i>Kreuz</i> /cross
♥	<i>Herz</i> /heart