

SOCINIANISM, ISLAM AND THE RADICAL USES OF ARABIC SCHOLARSHIP

EL SOCINIANISMO, EL ISLAM Y LOS USOS RADICALES DE LA ERUDICIÓN ÁRABE

MARTIN MULSOW
Erfurt University

Socinianism —or, broader: anti-trinitarianism— was often paralleled to Islam: both the Christian heresy and the Muslim religion reject the doctrine of the Trinity and regard Jesus only as a prophet, not as a god. There are indeed numerous historical connections between both currents. From Michael Servetus onward, the *Qur'ān* and islamic writings had an impact on the emerging Socinian critique. Antitrinitarians tried to establish a historical genealogy from early (Ebionite) Christianity through Islam (which preserved the true monotheistic idea) to the present. They often took their knowledge from much more orthodox Christian Arabist scholarship, which provided e.g. translations of passages from al-Qarāfi's critique of St. Paul. Moreover, some bold writers like Aubert de Versé even proposed a historical-critical approach to the text of the *Qur'ān*, having in mind the model of Richard Simon's historical criticism of the Old Testament.

Key words: Freethinkers; Freethinking; Antitrinitarianism; Socinianism; Radical Enlightenment; Heresy; Heresies; *Qur'ān*; Early Christianity; Dualism; Bible; Jews; Jewish; Judaism; Orientalism; Orientalists; Deism; Deist.

El socinianismo, o más ampliamente el antitrinitarismo, fue comparado muchas veces con el islam: tanto la herejía cristiana como la religión musulmana rechazan la doctrina de la Trinidad y consideran que Jesús fue tan solo un profeta y no un dios. De hecho, hay numerosos vínculos históricos entre las dos corrientes. Desde Miguel Servet, el Corán y las escrituras islámicas tuvieron un gran impacto en la crítica emergente sociniana. Los antitrinitarios intentaron establecer una genealogía histórica que iba desde el primer cristianismo de los ebionitas hasta el presente, pasando por el islam (que preservó la verdadera idea monoteísta). A menudo los antitrinitarios adquirieron sus conocimientos de las obras mucho más ortodoxas de los arabistas cristianos, que incluían, por ejemplo, traducciones de pasajes sacados de la crítica a San Pablo de al-Qarāfi. Además, algunos escritores atrevidos, como Aubert de Versé, propusieron incluso un enfoque histórico-crítico para el texto del Corán basándose en el modelo de la crítica histórica del Antiguo Testamento de Richard Simon.

Palabras clave: librepensadores; librepensamiento; antitrinitarismo; Socinianismo; Ilustración radical; herejía(s); Corán; primer cristianismo; dualismo; Biblia; Judíos; judaísmo; orientalismo; orientalistas; deísmo; deístas.

I

It is only due to the experience of the Radical Enlightenment of the eighteenth century that we now know about the «freethinkers of Islam.»¹ When Johann Jacob Reiske tried to introduce his students in Leipzig in 1748 into classical Islamic culture, he pointed out parallels to the Christianity of his time. Islam had also experienced schisms and the emergence of many sects, heresies, dispute, and absurd doctrines. Among its heretics were also religious critics:

Just as certain freethinkers among us, who have dared to attack the unprotected flank of religion, there were a certain Ma'arri and a certain Ibn ar-Rawandi among the Arabs, whom it pleased to mock all kinds of sects and to tear them apart, by saying that there was no sound basis save in pure reason.

Reiske had apparently encountered these authors in his research and he compared them to what was called a mocker of religion —a «Religionsspötter»— in his time.² Although in the standard works on Islam, such as Hottinger's *Historia Orientalis* (1651), there were already certain surveys about Islamic groups including the «zindikaei»³ that were based on al-Makīn, and Jakob Friedrich Re-

¹ This paper was presented at the conference “Islamic Freethinking and Western Radicalism: Possible Ways of Transmission”, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, April 21-24, 2008, organized by Patricia Crone, Jonathan Israel and myself. A shorter and different version of it will appear in Simonutti, L. (ed.), *Obbedienza religiosa e resistenza politica*, Firenze 2010, under the title “Socinianism, Islam, and the Origins of Radical Enlightenment”. Some parts appeared in German in Mulsow, M., “Islam und Sozinianismus. Eine Parallelwahrnehmung der Frühen Neuzeit”, in D. Klein et al. (eds.), *Wahrnehmung des Islam zwischen Reformation und Aufklärung*, München, 2008, 27-40.

² Reiske, J.J., “Oratio Studium Arabicae Linguae Commendans dicta Quum is munus Professoris Arabicae Linguae Publ. Extr. in Academia Lipsiensi. MDCCXLVIII”, in *idem*, *Conjecturae in Jobum et Proverbia Salomonis cum eiusdem orationes de studio Arabicae Linguae*, Leipzig 1779, 219-292, 233: «Ut apud nos libere philosophari quidam religionis nudum latus petere ausus sunt; sic etiam apud Arabes non unus fuit Abuola, non unus Ibn er Rawandi, qui in ridendis et lacerandis sectis omnibus sibi placuit, statuens, nihil usquam, praeterquam in sola sana ratione, sani esse.» See Loop, J., “Kontroverse Bemühungen um den Orient. Johann Jakob Reiske und die deutsche Orientalistik seiner Zeit”, in H.-G. Ebert and T. Hanstein (eds.), *Johann Jacob Reiske-Leben und Wirkung. Ein Leipziger Byzantinist und Begründer der Orientalistik im 18. Jahrhundert*, Leipzig, 2005, 45-85, esp. 78. On the contemporaneous terminology in Germany see Liepe, E., *Der Freigeist in der deutschen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Kiel, 1930; Mulsow, M., *Freigeister im Gottsched-Kreis. Wolffianismus, studentische Aktivitäten und Religionskritik in Leipzig 1740-1745*, Göttingen, 2007.

³ Hottinger, J.H., *Historia orientalis, quae ex variis orientalium monumentis collecta, agit [...]*, Zürich, 1651. On Hottinger see Loop, J., “Johann Heinrich Hottinger

immann disussed the possibilities of an «atheismus Mohammedorum» in 1729,⁴ the names of an al-Ma'arrī or of an al-Rāwandī⁵ do not appear, nor do they in Pierre Bayle.⁶ Reiske's discovery, of course, was too late to still have an impact on the Enlightenment. In fact, it would take until the twentieth century that fragments of religious-critical works of these authors could be retrieved through extracting them from their refutations.⁷ Scholarship was still far from being able to connect the *dahrī*-s that were mentioned in 1697 by D'Herbelot —he calls them «deherites»⁸— and Pietro della Valle's

(1620-1667) and the *Historia Orientalis*”, *Church History and Religious Culture*, 88, 2 (2008), 169-203.

⁴ Reimmann, J.F., *Historia universalis atheismi*, Hildesheim, 1725, 528-541.

⁵ Stroumsa, S., *Freethinkers in Medieval Islam. Ibn al-Rāwandī, Abū Bakr al-Rāzī, and Their Impact on Islamic Thought*, Leiden, 1999; Urvoy, D., *Les penseurs libres dans l'Islam classique*, Paris, 1996. On al-Ma'arrī see Badrān, M.A.l-F., “... denn die Vernunft ist ein Prophet”. Zweifel bei Abū l-'Alā al-Ma'arrī”, in F. Niewöhner and O. Pluta (eds.), *Atheismus im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance*, Wiesbaden, 1999, 61-84; on al-Rāwandī see also Van Ess, J., *Theologie und Gesellschaft im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert Hidschra. Eine Geschichte des religiösen Denkens im frühen Islam*, IV, Berlin, 1997, 295-349.

⁶ On Bayle see Israel, J., “Rethinking Islam: Philosophy and the ‘Other’”, in *idem*, *Enlightenment Contested. Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752*, Oxford, 2006, 615-639.

⁷ See esp. Kraus, P., “Beiträge zur islamischen Ketzergeschichte. Das *Kitāb az-Zummurūḍ* des Ibn ar-Rāwandī”, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 14 (1933), 93-129 and 335-379, reprinted in *idem*, *Alchemie, Ketzerei, Apokryphen im frühen Islam. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Wiesbaden, 1994, 109-190. Kraus has analyzed the text entailed in an manuscript by Khayyāt edited by Nyberg in 1925; but see already Von Kremer, A., “Ein Freidenker des Islam”, *Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 29 (1875), 304-312, on al-Ma'arrī.

⁸ D'Herbelot, B., *Bibliothèque orientale*, Paris, 1697, 303a: Art. “Dunia” (le monde): «Il y a aussi parmi les Musulmans des Docteurs qui ont été soupçonnés d'être du sentiment de ces philosophes que les Arabes appellent Deherioun, Deherites, c'est-à-dire, qui croyent que le monde soit éternel. Les Docteurs sont Averroes, Avicenne, Alfarabius, & autres qui ont fait une profession particuliere du suivre la Philosophie d'Aristote. Ha – Poëte Persien, Philosophe, et Theologien mystique dit sur le sujet de l'éternité du monde: Parlons de nous réjoüir, et n'entrons point dans ce mystere: car nul homme n'a pû jusqu'à present déchiffrer par sa philosophie cette enigme.» 311b: Art. “Elahioun” (le divins): «Les Musulmans intendent par ce mot la seconde secte des Philosophes qui a admis un premier moteur de toutes choses, et une substance spirituelle détaché de toutes sorte de matiere; en quoy ella a en plus de lumieres que la premiere, composée de ceux, qu'ils appellent Deherioun et Thabāioun, c'est-à-dire, Mondains, et Naturels, ou si vous voulez Mondanistes, et Naturalistes, à cause qu'ils n'admettoient point de principes hors du monde materiel, et de la nature.» See Reimmann, *Historia universalis*, with his critical remarks: 534f.: «Non confundendum est haec Secta Dararioum cum alia dicta Deheritarum vel Beheritarum, quae mundum docuit esse aeternum. Attingit eam Herbelotius in Bibliotheca orientali p. 303. Sed extremis tantum digitis nec satis lucide exponit qua in

naturalists from Lar,⁹ whom Bayle had identified as proto-Spinozists, with Islamic freethinkers.¹⁰

If we want to talk in terms of a general «transfer of heresy» from Islam to the European Radical Enlightenment, then we have to expect other very complex forms of transmission.¹¹ On the one hand there was perhaps a subliminal continuity of heretical ideas in astrological, alchemical, or medical treatises, but on the other hand we need to take a simple fact into consideration: orthodoxy of one particular religion is automatically a heresy in the eyes of another. This means that those who argue especially for the truth of the doctrines of their own religion may in fact have a subversive effect on another religion.

A key example in the relationship between Islam and Christianity is antitrinitarianism.¹² In its opposition to Christianity, Islam perceives itself as true monotheism. Within Christianity, however, there has been a certain movement that rejected the trinity as a construction of three persons that could not be logically understood and that was not supported by biblical evidence. This antitrinitarian movement, which appeared during the mid-sixteenth century, has later been called Socinianism in reference to the antitrinitarian Fausto Sozzini. Throughout the entire seventeenth century, it became the specter of all Christian denominations until it slowly transformed into unitarianism and liberal theology during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.¹³

re a Secta Thabaïoun, a qua eam p. 311. diversam fuisse indicat, fuerit distincta. Hoc ait, e duabus hisce Sectis natam esse tertiam Mundanistarum & Naturalistarum, quae praeter mundum materialem & naturalem aliud non agnoverit principium, atque in hac haeresi fuisse Alfarabium & Avicennam.»

⁹ Israel, "Rethinking Islam", 635; Bayle, P., *Écrits sur Spinoza*, F. Charles-Daubert and P.-F. Morau (eds.), Paris, 1983, 114.

¹⁰ On the *dahrī*-s and other «freethinkers» see now Crone, P., "Post-Colonialism in Tenth-Century Islam", *Der Islam*, 83 (2006), 2-38.

¹¹ Heresy transfer should be regarded as a specific case of cultural transfer. On cultural transfer, there has been an elaborate discussion during the last twenty years. See e.g. Espagne, M. and Werner, M. (eds.), *Transferts. Les Relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIIIe et XIXe siècle)*, Paris, 1988.

¹² Mulsow, "Islam und Sozinianismus".

¹³ See in general Wilbur, E.M., *A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and its Antecedents*, Boston, 1945; idem, *A History of Unitarianism in Transsylvania, England, and America*, Cambridge, Mass., 1952; Fock, O., *Der Socinianismus nach seiner Stellung in der Gesamtentwicklung des christlichen Geistes, nach seinem historischen Verlauf und nach seinem Lehrbegriff dargestellt*, Kiel, 1847.

Within Christianity, Socinianism was the heretical counterpart to Islam as a whole, as anti-Trinitarian monotheism outside of Christianity (together with Judaism). On the other hand, this means that orthodox Islamic theological treatises and Islamic polemics against Christianity in particular are in this point related with a heresy within Christianity. If then, rather than just an affinity, a transfer existed between both Islam and Socinianism, this was in structural terms a transfer from the orthodoxy of a competing system to the heterodoxy of one's own system.¹⁴

More interestingly, Socinianism was in fact a precursor to the Enlightenment—and to the Radical Enlightenment as well. Its rationalist opposition to everything that seemed illogical in doctrine, its interpretation of the teachings of Jesus—he was simply viewed as a human being—as some kind of moral philosophy, and its arguments for religious tolerance foreshadow the views of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. Indeed, especially during the second half of the eighteenth century it is possible to see a continuity between Socinians such as Andreas Wissowatius, Samuel Przyckowski and Samuel Crell on the one hand, and early Enlightenment figures such as John Locke, Jean Le Clerc, Philipp van Limborch—even Isaac Newton and William Whiston—on the other.¹⁵ Around 1700 there were numerous members of the intellectual avantgarde who promoted various mixes of Socinian, Cartesian, Spinozistic, and Lockean views.¹⁶

What does this constellation mean for a transfer of heresy? It means that during the transitional period from Socinianism to En-

¹⁴ On the terminology of cultural transfer see Espagne and Werner, *Transferts*; Schmale, W. (ed.), *Kulturtransfer. Kulturelle Praxis im 16. Jahrhundert*, Innsbruck, 2003. On heresy transfer see Hunter, I., Laursen, J.C. and Nederman, C.J. (eds.), *Heresy in Transition. Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, Aldershot, 2005.

¹⁵ Wrzecionko, P. (ed.), *Reformation und Frühaufklärung in Polen. Studien über den Sozinianismus und seinen Einfluß auf das westeuropäische Denken im 17. Jahrhundert*, Göttingen, 1977; Mulsow, M. and Rohls, J. (eds.), *Socinianism and Arminianism. Anti-trinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, Leiden, 2005.

¹⁶ On these hybrid forms and transitions see Van Bunge, W., *From Stevin to Spinoza*, Leiden, 2001; Mulsow, M., "The 'New Socinians'. Intertextuality and Cultural Exchange in Late Socinianism", in Mulsow and Rohls, *Socinianism and Arminianism*, 49-78; Mulsow, M., *Moderne aus dem Untergrund. Radikale Frühaufklärung in Deutschland 1680-1720*, Hamburg, 2002, chapter III; Israel, *Enlightenment Contested*, 115-134.

lightenment during the late-seventeenth and early eighteenth-century, a matrix existed, within which Islamic anti-Christian polemics could be read and absorbed. As we may know through research in the field of cultural transfer, a certain constellation of ideas from one cultural context is often reconstituted in a completely different way in another. This is exactly what happened in this case, and we will see in the last part of this paper what strange avenues, for example, Islamic polemic against Paul took in the West.

I have already pointed out that Islam was not the only religion that claimed to represent a genuine and uncorrupted monotheism. Judaism could make a similar claim that went back in time even further. This means that we would have to acknowledge that the «monotheistic transfer of heresy» could always also occur in relationship to Judaism. In the course of its reception by the Radical Enlightenment, Jewish anti-Christian works and Islamic anti-Christian works were often connected and mutually reinforced themselves.¹⁷

But the constellation is even more complex. It is not only a matter of a parallelization and of a transfer of heresy between Islam and Socinianism —with an incorporation of Judaism— but during the seventeenth-century, it is also a matter of constructing or reconstructing the historical succession of religious movements. It is a matter of a historicization of this parallel. As we shall see, the seventeenth century saw the emergence of theories that try to establish the chain of Jewish — Christians — Islam — Socinians — Enlightenment.¹⁸

This historicization needs to be seen in the context of a number of historicizations, which were created in the course of the seventeenth century. Some of these historicizations are explicit counter-narratives, which means that they are attempts to rediscover against official historiography latent transmissions of marginal groups. In

¹⁷ The two types of transfer have rarely been studied in their entanglement so far. On the effects of Jewish anti-Christian polemics on the European Enlightenment see e.g. Kaplan, Y., *From Christianity to Judaism. The Story of Isaac Orobio de Castro*, Oxford, 1989; Popkin, R.H., “Jewish Anti-Christian Arguments as a Source of Irreligion from the Seventeenth to the Early Nineteenth Century”, in M. Hunter and D. Wootton (eds.), *Atheism from the Reformation to the Enlightenment*, Oxford, 1992, 159-181; Berti, S., “At the Roots of Unbelief”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 56 (1995), 555-575; Mulsow, *Moderne aus dem Untergrund*, Chapter II.

¹⁸ Champion, J., *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken. The Church of England and Its Enemies 1660-1730*, Cambridge, 1992, 99-132.

this respect they are also relevant for the emergence of the Radical Enlightenment, because the latter found —from Gabriel Naudé to Gottfried Arnold and Pierre Bayle— in these counter-narratives one of its main resources.¹⁹

If we are then interested in a reception of Islamic texts —and manuscripts— in the milieu of the Radical Enlightenment, we need to look not only at the continuity of materialistic, sceptical, and religious-critical ideas, but to incorporate to a large extent also this discontinuity of an interreligious transfer of heresy. How else could it be explained that Islamic and Jewish polemicists such as al-Qarāfi, Alguazir, Orobio de Castro, and Elijah Montalto were avidly read by thinkers such as Henry Stubbe, Noël Aubert de Versé, John Toland or Anthony Collins and were used for their unitarian, deist, or atheist projects?

In what follows, I shall try to draw a line which leads from the political pressures of the early antitrinitarianism to the apologetically inclined oriental studies of the seventeenth century and then to the pro-Islamic tendencies among figures of the Radical Enlightenment around 1700. I would like to argue that what was still an enforcedly strategic, tactical, and voluntary «islamizing» and «judaizing» in the 1570s, became, partly also through the unintended help of orientalist scholarship, genuine, historical-critical models, founded on textual evidence, which were incorporated by protagonists of the Radical Enlightenment into their own world views. Crucial are in this context the details of the historicization of these models. It was important whether early Islam was connected to Nestorian, to Arian, or to Ebionite origins. Each individual connection would attract different recipients within the Radical Enlightenment.

II

Already from early on, polemicists recognized the striking parallels between Socinianism and Islam. Was this really the case? Did anti-Trinitarians use Islam as their model? It might be possible to

¹⁹ Bianchi, L., *Tradizione libertina e critica storica. Da Naudé a Bayle*, Milano, 1988; Mulsow, M., “The Trinity as Heresy. Socinian Counter-Histories of Simon Magus, Orpheus, and Cerinthus”, in J.C. Laursen (ed.), *Histories of Heresy in early Modern Europe. For, Against, and Beyond Persecution and Toleration*, New York, 2002, 161-170.

answer this question, albeit only by a step-by-step and careful analysis. Let's start by looking at Miguel Servet, the founder of the anti-Trinitarian movement. Servet came from Spain, where Islamic rule prevailed for centuries and where still hundreds of thousands of Moriscos lived.²⁰ In his work *De trinitatis erroribus* (1531), Servet mentions the *Qur'ān* several times. After Theodor Bibliander's Latin translation of the *Qur'ān* that was based on the medieval translation of Robert of Ketton (1143) had been printed in 1543,²¹ Servet had actually read it and he even quoted specific *sūrah*-s such as *sūrah* 3, 4, and 5 in his main work, *Restitutio Christianismi* (1553).²² Calvin has used this against Servet during his trial in Geneva. However, it needs to be pointed out that the Islamic influence in Servet's work is rather marginal. It is surpassed by Jewish influences.²³ Above all, however, the criticism of the Trinity in Servet was a result of a bypass of late scholastic nominalistic criticism and Erasmian exegesis.²⁴ Authors such as William of Ockham, Robert Holcot, Gregory of Rimini, Pierre d'Ailly, and John Major, on whom Servet relies in his *De trinitatis erroribus* had discovered innate contradictions in the doctrine of the Trinity only to suggest that a belief in the Trinity was what mattered and not if one could know for sure. Such contradictions became critical once humanist scholarship on the New Testament suggested that earlier testimonies of Christianity did not yet contain any evidences for the doctrine of the Trinity.²⁵

²⁰ On the Moriscos see Harvey, L.P., *Muslims in Spain, 1500 to 1614*, Chicago, 2005. The Polish Socinian and historian of the Reformation Lubiniecki even asserted a travel by Servetus to Africa: «Ut ingenium excoleret, in Africam quoque transfretaverat. Is apud instar cuncta sibi profutura unique colligens, et ex ipsis Alcorani —tribulis mellis materiam exigebat», *Historia reformationis Polonicae*, Amsterdam, 1685, 96, cited in La Croze, M.V. de, "Historical and Critical Reflections upon Socinianism and Mahometanism", in *Four Treatises Concerning the Doctrine, Discipline and Worship of the Mahometans*, London, 1712, 212.

²¹ *Machumetis Saracenorum principis eiusque successorum vitae, ac doctrina, ipseque Alcoran*, Basel, 1543. See Bobzin, H., *Der Koran im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Beirut, 1995.

²² Hughes, P., "Servetus and the Quran", *Journal of Unitarian Universalist History*, 30 (2005), 55-70.

²³ See the editor's introduction in Servet, M., *Obras completas, vol. V: Restitución del Cristianismo, 1*, ed. intro. y notas de Á. Alcalá, Zaragoza, 2006, LXXXVIII-XCVII.

²⁴ Bainton, R.H., *Hunted Heretic. The Life and Death of Michael Servetus, 1511-1553*, Boston, 1960, 21-40.

²⁵ Erasmus' eliminating of the *Comma Johanneum* (1. Epistle of John, 7) had been a signal, even if Servetus did not accept this elimination but rather reinterpreted the pas-

Only the generation after Servet made a larger step towards Islam—a step which was mainly politically motivated. After Servet had been burned at the stake, antitrinitarianism developed only in those areas where there was no strong national state with a centralized authority emerging, or where the control of confessional orthodoxy was weakened by external influences. This was the case in Poland and Hungary. Transylvania was since 1541 under the influence of the Ottoman Empire.²⁶ Ferenc David and Giorgio Biandrata, the antitrinitarians there who were influential at the court of Johann Sigismund, elaborated those references to the *Qur'ān* that Servet had already made and they carefully established a certain relationship to the Islamic faith.²⁷ It becomes clear that alongside of Judaizing—Matthias Vehe (Glirius) was already seeking connections to Judaism²⁸—Islamizing became a reality approximately at the same time. Since Jews had a better standing than Christians in the Ottoman Empire, a conversion to Judaism was also a possibility for the latter.

The necessity to be on good terms with the powerful neighbor motivated the Hungarian antitrinitarians to strategically stress the proximity to Islam. And it was the search for an ally, which led sporadically radical protestants who no longer believed in the Trinity to contact Islamic authorities. Widely known is the case of the theologian Adam Neuser from Heidelberg, who wrote a letter to the Sultan in Constantinople in 1570, which reads:

I am firmly persuaded that my Retreat from among the idolatrous Christians will engage many Persons of Consideration to embrace your Belief and your Religion, especially since many of the most learned and most considerable amongst them are herein of the same Sentiments with me, as I shall inform your Majesty by word of mouth.²⁹

sage in an antitrinitarian way. See Schmidt-Biggemann, W., *Apokalypse und Philologie. Wissensgeschichten und Weltentwürfe der Frühen Neuzeit*, Göttingen, 2007, 79ff.

²⁶ Ritchie, S., “The Pasha of Buda and the Edict of Torda. The Islamic Ottoman Influence on the Development of Religious Toleration in Reformation Transsylvania”, *Journal of Unitarian Universalist History*, 30 (2005), 36-54; Sugar, P.F., *Southeastern Europe Under Ottoman Rule, 1354-1804*, Seattle, 1983; for the later period, Murdock, G., *Calvinism on the Frontier: 1600-1660*, Oxford, 2000.

²⁷ Pirnat, A., *Die Ideologie der Siebenbürger Antitrinitarier in den 1570er Jahren*, Budapest, 1961.

²⁸ Dán, R., *Matthias Vehe-Glirius: life and work of a radical Antitrinitarian*, Leiden-Budapest, 1982.

²⁹ See Burchill, C.J. (ed.), *Bibliotheca Dissidentium, Tome XI: The Heidelberg Antitrinitarians*, Baden Baden, 1989. I cite Neuser's letter according to La Croze, “His-

Neuser and his friends considered the visit of the Transylvanian envoy Kaspar Beke in Speyer as the perfect opportunity to establish contacts to the Hungarian antitrinitarians. The letter, however, was found in Neuser's house and his plan scandalized. Eventually, Neuser converted to Islam and moved to Constantinople, only because he was unable to find refuge elsewhere. Behind the overly sensitive reaction of Palatine officials was of course the fear of subversive political alliances with the Ottoman Empire.³⁰ Coalitions with the religious enemy were considered high treason.³¹ In this context, «Papal-Turkism» (*Papatoturcismus*) or, more severely, «Calvinist-Turkism» (*Calvinoturcismus*) was attacked.³² Implicit in such neologisms was the fear that Calvinist monarchs could strike a politically motivated alliance with the Turks. Still in 1716, people were outraged about the extravagant plans of a certain Marquis de Langallerie, who allegedly, with an accomplice, had promised the Turkish Aga in The Hague to rally Protestants and, after overthrowing the Pope with the help of the Turkish fleet, proclaim a universal theocracy, with its seat in Rome.³³ If this adventurous story is to be believed, then it was certainly still a late reverberation of baroque chiasm. Throughout the Thirty Years' War and shortly thereafter, self-styled prophets had proclaimed the imminent fall of Rome by the Turks. Soldiers of fortune adopted such ideas and tried to put them into practice just like brigadiers would. During the 1650s, for example, a former military commander traveled across Silesia, a

torical and Critical Reflections", 215. See also Pirnat, *Die Ideologie*, 117-134; Motika, R., "Adam Neuser —ein Heidelberger Theologe im Osmanischen Reich", in S. Prator et al. (eds.), *Frauen, Bilder und Gelehrte*, Istanbul, 2002, 523-538, and Mulsow, M., "Fluchträume und Konversionsräume zwischen Heidelberg und Konstantinopel: Der Fall Adam Neuser", in *idem* (ed.), *Vergesellschaftung unter Abwesenden. Räume des clandestinen Untergrundes in der Frühen Neuzeit* (to appear), with new manuscript evidence.

³⁰ Horn, C., "Der Kampf zwischen Calvinismus und Zwinglianismus", in *Heidelberg und der Process gegen den Antitrinitarier Johann Sylvan*, Heidelberg, 1913 (also in *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher*, 17 (1913), 219-310).

³¹ Schulze, W., *Reich und Türkengefahr im späten 16. Jahrhundert*, München, 1984.

³² Mout, N., "Calvinoturcismus und Chiliasmus im 17. Jahrhundert", *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, 14 (1988), 72-84.

³³ *La Guerre d'Espagne, de Bavière, et de Flandre, ou Memoires du Marquis. Contenant ce qui s'est passé de plus secret et de plus particulier depuis le commencement de cete Guerre, jusq'à la fin de Campagne de 1706*, Cologne, 1707. See Simons, O., *Marteaus Europa, oder: Der Roman, bevor er Literatur wurde*, Amsterdam, 2001, 621ff.

rusty apocalyptic sword in his hand, promising his followers already titles such as «Bishop of Ferrara».³⁴

Neuser and his few followers, however, can be compared to neither Calvinist rulers nor apocalyptic warriors. Yet, the perceived threat that emanated from him was similar, which means that the fear of a *Socinoturcismus*, a Socinian-Turkism, seemed just as plausible as that of a Calvinist-Turkism had been. Fausto Sozzini, in return, had avoided any affiliation with Islam, probably because he was well aware how such an image could harm his still infant movement.

III

One can certainly imagine how Christian orthodoxy was trying to stress the association between Socinianism and the religious enemy Islam. In Transylvania, Peter Melius already warned in 1568 that anti-Trinitarians preached a «Turkish Christ».³⁵ Already in these years an anti-Socinian polemic was born which denounced antitrinitarianism by stressing its similarities with Islam. The anti-Socinian texts of the next one hundred and fifty years to come have readily incorporated this topos.³⁶ It is only natural that the developing field of Arabic studies of the early seventeenth century, often practiced by theologians and entrusted with a polemical mandate, had its fair share in anti-Socinianism and contributed to the parallizing effort. The Leiden-trained theologian Johann Heinrich Hottinger from Zurich published in 1660 in the second edition of his *Historia orientalis* a chapter with the title “De pseudo-Christianis illis, quos

³⁴ Mulsow, M., “Who was the author of the ‘Clavis apocalyptica’ of 1651? Millenarianism and Prophecy between Silesian Mysticism and the Hartlib Circle”, in J.C. Laursen and R.H. Popkin (eds.), *Millenarianism and Messianism in Early Modern European Culture: Continental Millenarians: Protestants, Catholics, Heretics*, Dordrecht, 2001, 57-75.

³⁵ Biandrata and David wrote a refutation against his accusations, *Demonstratio falsitatis doctrinae Petri Melii, et reliquorum Sophistarum per Antitheses una cum refutatione Antitheseon veri et Turcici Christi*, Weißenburg, 1568. See Hughes, P., “In the Footsteps of Servetus: Biandrata, David, and the Quran”, *Journal of Unitarian Universalist History*, 31 (2006-7), 57-63, 58.

³⁶ See e.g. Janse, W., “Reformed Antisocinianism in Northern Germany: Ludwig Crocius’ Antisocinianismus contractus of 1639”, *Perichoresis*, 3 (2005), 1-14; Gensichen, H.-W., *Die Wittenberger antisozinianische Polemik*, Göttingen, 1942; Comenius, J.A., *Antisozinianische Schriften*, hg. von Erwin Schadel, Frankfurt, 2007, “Introduction”.

Arabes vocant *al-muwahhīdīn*”.³⁷ It dogmatically explicitly spelled out the parallels between Socinianism and Islam, mainly based on authentic Muslim documents. Already before Hottinger, the latter’s teacher Jacob Golius, Johannes Hoornbeek and others had in some passages in their works emphasized this similarity, but nobody had done it so systematically and based on Islamic scholarship.³⁸

Hottinger had made first attempts on the subject in his German *Christlichen unpartheyischen Wägweyser*.³⁹ This time, however, he tackled it on the basis of Arabic manuscript sources. He states his concern very clearly, namely «that those teachings that have been called from the abyss of the old anti-Trinitarians may pave a way for Islam within the boundaries of Europe». ⁴⁰ What he intended was «to prove from a synthesis of the principles of the Mohammedans that barely one milk resembles more another, one egg more another than most of the teachings of both of these religions». ⁴¹ This required first of all to reduce first Islam and then Socinianism to its fundamental articles of faith. Thereafter it would be possible to compare their essential characteristics. Hottinger does so in five bullet points:

1) «Both teach that religion is also a community, for the sake of whose welfare it is permissible for humans to follow any random sect». ⁴²

³⁷ Hottinger, *Historia orientalis*; I use the augmented second edition, Zürich, 1660. On Hottinger see besides Loop, “Johann Heinrich Hottinger”; Fück, J., *Die arabischen Studien in Europa bis auf den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig, 1955; Hamilton, A., “Seventeenth Century-Studies on Islam”, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 3 (2001), 169-182. Hottinger’s language skills in Arabic have been evaluated critically by a contemporary native speaker: Ecchellensis, A., *Euty chius patriarcha alexandrinus vindicatus*, Roma, 1661, 378-446.

³⁸ Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, 362ff.; see Hoornbeek, J., *Summa controversiarum religionis cum infidelibus, hæreticis, schismaticis*, Utrecht, 1653; *idem*, *Socinianismi confutati*, I-III, Utrecht, 1650-1664; Maccovius, J., *Theologia polemica posthuma*, Franeker, 1646.

³⁹ 3 vols., Zürich 1647-49, e.g. II, 23.

⁴⁰ Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, 361f.: «ne ab orco illa veterum Anti-Trinitariorum revocata dogmata viam Muhammedismo, in ipsis etiam Europae pmoeriis, struerent.»

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 363: «[...] si ex ipsis Muhammedanorum principiis instituta synthesi demonstraremus, vix lac lacti, aut ovum ovo esse similium, quam sunt pleraque utriusque Religionis dogmata [...]»

⁴² Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, 364: «Religionem etiam Communem esse, per quam salutem liceat cujuscunque sectae hominibus consequi, utriusque docent.»

2) «About Holy Scripture both say that the Old Testament has been corrupted by the Jews» and «that Christianity could not proven by evidence from the Old Testament. [...] Both take from the New Testament only as much as serves their cause». ⁴³ We shall still return to the corruption thesis.

3) «In regards to the nature and the attributes, one has to note that the Socinians partly agree with the Mohammedans, partly they fall back to contrary errors —the teachings of the Catholic Church— partly the Mohammedans are better than the Socinians». ⁴⁴ This observation indicates an interesting distinction of Hottinger: the Socinians are in fact even worse than Islam. This means a quiet and careful appreciation of Islam (at the expense of the Socinians), in the sense, as Hottinger points out later, that «the Mohammedans provide us nonetheless with ammunition against their own brothers-in-arms, the Socinians». ⁴⁵ Islam —the distant opponent— may then be used to fight threats within one's own religion. If the Socinians, for example, deny the miracles of Christ, then they can be confronted with Islamic texts that point out that these miracles occurred by divine will and authority, but they are generally accepted. As it was the case with Theodor Hackspan, Islamic scholars during the seventeenth century justified their occupation partly by saying that Arabic and Persian texts could be used for Christian Apologetic purposes. ⁴⁶

4) It is «certain that the Socinians borrowed those arguments which they used against the Holy Trinity, from the work-shop of the Mohammedans». ⁴⁷

5) «The core arguments about divine revelation are incomplete and mutilated in both.» This is also where Socinians are worse than Islam.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 364-366: «De scriptura utrique tradunt: Vetus testamentum a Judaeis corruptum. [...] Religionem Christianam ex Vet. Test. non esse probandam. [...] Novo testameno utrique tantum defrerunt, quantum causae eorum expedit.»

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 368: «Circa Essentiam et attributa notandum, Socianos vel cum Mohammedanis consentire, vel oppositis erroribus, a media Catholicae Ecclesiae sententia, iisdem passibus recedere, vel hos illis esse saniores.»

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 383: «[...] ut tamen saepe Muhammedani, contra Socinianos tribules, arma nobis suppeditent.»

⁴⁶ Klein, D., «Muslimischer Antitrinitarismus im lutherischen Rostock. Zacharias Grapius der Jüngere und die Epistola theologica des Ahmed ibn Abdallāh», in *idem et al.* (eds.), *Wahrnehmung des Islam*, 41-60.

⁴⁷ *Historia Orientalis*, 384: «[...] rationes quibus S.S. Trinitatem arietant utrinque, Socinianos ex Muhammedanis officina mutuasse certum est.» Next reference, 386: «Capita cognitionis Dei utrique manca et mutila sunt [...]».

The Islamic texts which Hottinger uses for his analysis are, aside from the *Qur'ān*, on the one hand the standard works in the field: Pococke's editions of Abū l-Faraj (Bar Hebraeus)⁴⁸ and Erpenius's edition of al-Makīn (Elmacin).⁴⁹ Especially the footnotes in these works, which referenced further readings, were widely used by early modern scholars.⁵⁰ But Hottinger also drew on a number of manuscripts. Those were manuscripts that had either been acquired by Golius from Syria and Constantinople some time between 1625 and 1629, or they were purchased by Hottinger himself.⁵¹ He owned, for example, al-Bayḏāwī's *Qur'ān* commentary —which is archived at the *Zentralbibliothek* in Zurich under Ms. Or. 8 and which he used extensively.⁵² But Hottinger used one particular manuscript more extensively than any other: Aḥmad b. Idrīs al-Ṣanhājī al-Qarāfī's *al-Ajwiba al-fākhira 'an al-as'ilah al-fājira*.⁵³ We shall still talk about al-Qarāfī more extensively, but it should be noted here that the manuscript which Hottinger probably used was no. Or. 173 from Golius's collection.⁵⁴

⁴⁸ Bar Hebraeus, *Historia compendiosa dynastiarum Authore Gregorio Abul-Pharajio Malatensi medico [...], accuratissime describens arabice edita et latine versa ab Edvardo Pocockio*, Oxford, 1663; *Specimen Historiae Arabum*, Oxford, 1650.

⁴⁹ *Historia Sarracenicā qua res gestae Muslimorum inde a Muhammede Arabe usque ad initium Atabacasi [...] explicantur*, Leiden, 1625.

⁵⁰ Accordingly even Hottinger often cited «second hand», e.g. from Abu Hanifa (367), Abi Abulchasan (368), Scharistanus (369).

⁵¹ The presence of oriental manuscripts in Hottinger's papers in the Zentralbibliothek Zürich is still to explore. On the Hottinger papers see in general: Büsser, F., "Johann Heinrich Hottinger und der 'Thesaurus Hottingerianus'", *Zwinglyana*, 22 (1995), 85-108. On Golius' acquisitions in the orient see Toomer, G.J., *Eastern Wisdom and Learning. The Study of Arabic in Seventeenth-Century England*, Oxford, 1996, 48ff.

⁵² Hottinger, *Historia Orientalis*, 371; I am grateful to Tobias Nünlist (Zentralbibliothek Zürich) for the information. See Nünlist's catalogue, *Arabische, türkische und persische Handschriften (Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich 4)*, Wiesbaden, 2008. Hottinger mainly used his own copy, however.

⁵³ On al-Qarāfī (1228-1285), a Maliki jurist of Berber origin who lived in Ayyubid and Mamluk Egypt, see Jackson, S.A., *Islamic Law and the State: The Constitutional Jurisprudence of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qarāfī*, Leiden, 1996. On his scientific interests see: Sayili, A.M., "Al-Qarāfī and His Explanation of the Rainbow", *Isis*, 32 (1940), 16-26. On al-Qarāfī's theological polemic against Christianity, see Bouamama, A., *La littérature polémique musulmane contre le christianisme depuis ses origines jusqu'au XIIIe siècle*, Algiers, 1988, 112-118 and 170-179.

⁵⁴ Witkam, J.J., *Inventory of the Oriental Manuscripts in the Library of the University of Leiden. Vol. I: Manuscripts Or. 1-Or. 1000. Acquisitions in the period between 1609 and 1665. Mainly the Collections of Jacobus Golius (1629), Josephus Justus Scaliger (1609) and part of the collection of Levinus Warner*, Leiden, 2007, 74: Or. 173.

Based on Hottinger's work, it was possible to put arguments about the parallels between Socinianism and Islam on more solid foundations. Polemicists such as Jurieu, Abbadie, Prideaux and many other authors have made ample use of it in the decades thereafter. The author of the *Réflexions historiques et critiques sur le mahométisme et socinianisme* (1707), Mathurin Veysière La Croze, a former Benedictine refugee and librarian of the Royal Library in Berlin, argued along similar lines, but with a slightly different structure.⁵⁵ Unlike many before him, he had a clear motive. He was worried about the steadyfastness of young scholars, who might be led astray by Socinianism:

The Mind of Man is made for knowing and worshipping of God, but it must be fix'd by Motives upon which it can rest; and these Motives the Socinian Religion will never be able to furnish. Thus when they have pass'd some time in that Sect, they are soon appris'd of their wavering State between Doubt and Knowledge; and like People that are ready to drown, they grasp at the first thing that comes in their way. Some of them embrace Spinosism, some Popery; others go over to Judaism or to Mahometanism, and very few of them return to the Orthodox Religion.⁵⁶

La Croze had critically examined the cases of Adam Neuser and Matthias Vehe (Glirius),⁵⁷ where he discovered such kind of psychological dynamic, even though he did not even know the more extreme cases from anti-Trinitarian circles of the 1570s such as Martin Seidel, who became a deist, or Christian Franken, who even died a convinced atheist.⁵⁸ La Croze's reference to Spinozism, however, indicates that

The manuscript contains 143 folios and is dated on 707 AH. It originates from the Golius collection. In the Zentralbibliothek Zürich, in which Hottinger's manuscripts are today, there is no copy of al-Qarāfi among the papers. I am grateful to Tobias Nünlist for the information.

⁵⁵ The text appeared in La Croze's anonymously published *Dissertations historiques sur divers sujets*, Rotterdam, 1707. On La Croze see Mulso, M., *Die drei Ringe. Toleranz und clandestine Gelehrsamkeit bei Mathurin Veysière La Croze*, Tübingen, 2001.

⁵⁶ I cite from the English translation "Historical and Critical Reflections", 198.

⁵⁷ La Croze, "Historical and Critical Reflections", 213-228.

⁵⁸ On Seidel see Schröder, W., "Religionsphilosophie im 16. Jahrhundert? Martin Seidel und seine Schrift *Origo et fundamenta religionis Christianae*", in M. Mulso (ed.), *Spätrenaissancephilosophie in Deutschland 1570-1650. Entwürfe zwischen Humanismus und Konfessionalisierung, okkulten Traditionen und Schulmetaphysik*, Tübingen, 2009, 161-172; on Francken see Simon, J., *Die Religionsphilosophie Christian Franckens (1552-1610?): Atheismus und radikale Reformation im frühneuzeitlichen Ostmitteleur-*

he had not only past cases in his mind. On the contrary, he was much more concerned about intellectuals from his own time. One of his *protégé*'s in Paris, for example, experienced a skeptical crisis and, after turning to anti-Trinitarianism, converted to Judaism, thus grabbing the life-saving straw which La Croze had evoked.⁵⁹ Unlike Hottinger, however, who almost dogmatically tried to show parallels, La Croze was mainly interested in illuminating the psychological-intellectual dimension and in documenting it with concrete historical cases. This was another peculiarity of La Croze's work, which was almost a historically documented survey of Socinianism.

In the eyes of some of his orthodox contemporaries, this was already going too far. La Croze's opponent in Berlin Johann Heinrich Oelven circulated a review of the *Réflexions* in 1708, where he referred to it as *Der turbanisierte Socinianer* [The Turban-Wearing Socinian].⁶⁰ In it, he attacked La Croze for using a treatise about Nestorians to stress the religious tolerance in Islam and its ethical value system. This praise of Islam—expressed as a criticism of the contemporary intolerance of Christianity—put a different light on the parallels between Socinianism and Islam which La Croze stressed in his book. Implicitly, Oelven observed, the comparison became something positive.

It was possibly the initiative of Michel de La Roche, a friend of the Trinitarian skeptic Samuel Clarke, that led to the translation of La Croze's *Réflexions* (1712) into English, together with three other works on Islam (one of them by Reland).⁶¹ Le Roche was in charge of publishing the *Bibliothèque angloise* and the *Memoirs of Literature*.⁶² He praised Islam as a wonderful religion in the former in

opa, Wiesbaden, 2008. La Croze ("Historical and Critical Reflections", 239) mentions Seidel as a semi-judaizer.

⁵⁹ Mulsow, M., "Cartesianism, Skepticism and Conversion to Judaism. The Case of Aaron d'Antan", in M. Mulsow and R.H. Popkin (eds.), *Secret Conversions to Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, Leiden, 2004, 123-182.

⁶⁰ [Oelven, C.H.], *Wöchentliche Curieuse Natur- Kunst- Staats- und Sitten-Praesentent*, Berlin, April 1708, 100ff. See Mulsow, *Die drei Ringe*, 72-78; *idem*, "Views of the Berlin Refuge: Scholarly Projects, Literary Interests, Marginal Fields", in S. Pott, M. Mulsow and L. Danneberg (eds.), *The Berlin Refuge 1680-1780. Learning and Science in European Context*, Leiden, 2003, 25-46.

⁶¹ *Four Treatises*; see Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken*, 115f.

⁶² Thomas, M.D., "Michel de la Roche, a Huguenot Critic of Calvin", *Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century*, 238 (1985), 97-195.

1717 and recommended Reland's *De religione mohammedanica* (1705) to all of his readers. In the latter, he discussed Servet's burning at the stake and provided a review of La Croze's work that was extremely positive.

IV

But we are already getting ahead of us, since this is already part of the islamophilia of the early Enlightenment.⁶³ It is important to recognize that Hottinger's dogmatic parallelization of Socinianism and Islam, although it was supported by Arabic manuscripts, was not a historical theory. What counted was the comparison, not a historical construct. Since the Reformation, however, historical constructs had become an important component of the destruction of the traditional perception of Christianity. They were especially used in the Radical Reformation.⁶⁴ In this vein in 1568, in their anonymously published *De falsa et vera unius Dei Patris Fili et Spiritus Sanctus cognitione*, Biandrata and David mention Islam for the first time in the context of a briefly sketched history of antitrinitarianism.⁶⁵ According to them, the Doctrine of the Trinity was to be blamed for the «East to have been lost,» because, while Islam had succeeded in appealing to the people of the Near East, Christianity had become incredible:

Because of the Christian Doctrine of God in the three persons and the co-eternal, co-equal and co-essential son, the entire East was lost, as their writings clearly testify. Consider, for instance, the *Qur'ān*, not indeed to confirm some truth of faith, but to understand, on account of this single cause, the loss of the entire east.

Such words about the loss of the East, of course, bore considerable political weight in the Europe of the 1560s, and both Biandrata and David were well aware of it. In this context, Biandrata even

⁶³ Israel, "Rethinking Islam"; Gunny, A., *Images of Islam in Eighteenth-Century Writings*, London, 1996.

⁶⁴ See in general Williams, G.H., *The Radical Reformation*, London, 1952; more specific: Mulsow, "Trinity as a Heresy".

⁶⁵ *De falsa et vera unius Dei Patris Filii et Spiritus Sancti cognitione*, Weißenburg, 1568, 37; cited after Hughes, "In the Footsteps", 59.

quoted Averroes, when he talks about this loss: «Equally due to this doctrine of the deity, the Jews rejected Christianity. But even the philosophers ridiculed the Christians, because they worship numerous deities: see Averroes.»

According to Biandrata, it was Joachim of Fiore during the twelfth century who rebelled against the power of academic theologians after the victory of Islam. Following in the latter's footsteps were later scholars such as Erasmus, Juan de Valdés, Bernardino Ochino, Lelio Sozzini and others. These figures had only continued to destroy the edifice of the Old Church that both Luther and Zwingli had already severely damaged. This historical-theological interpretation, which seems so typical for the Reformation period, albeit it already contains strong anti-Trinitarian traits, still views Islam as the opponent, to whom, due to serious mistakes, territory was lost. This, however, was about to change — although it should take a while, because Socinianism after Fausto Sozzini was predominantly concerned with biblical interpretation and avoided devising any kind of historical construct; it confided itself to «sola scriptura» and refrained from historical thinking. It required the input of a denominationally unaffiliated antitrinitarian like Daniel Zwicker to change the situation some time during the mid-seventeenth century. In his work *Irenicum irenicorum* (1657), Zwicker provided a very peculiar counter-narrative about the doctrine of the trinity, which included Simon Magus as the evil inventor of the trinity, followed by Cerinth and Pseudo-Orpheus.⁶⁶ However, Zwicker would not have accepted a corruption of pre-Nicene Church Fathers to an extent that they had proclaimed the equality of Father and Son. Such teaching could be found neither in Clemens Romanus, nor in Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatian, Irenaeus, or Tertullian.⁶⁷ This claim had more or less been made by David and Biandrata,⁶⁸ but Zwicker's advantage was that he could draw on a historical-critical investigation of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity that was scholarship at its best, namely the *Opus de theologicis dogmatibus*, which the Jesuit Denis Pétau published be-

⁶⁶ Mulsow, "Trinity as a Heresy"; Bietenholz, P.G., *Daniel Zwicker 1612-1678. Peace, Tolerance and God the One and Only*, Firenze, 1992, 63ff.

⁶⁷ Zwicker, D., *Irenicum irenicorum*, Amsterdam, 1658, 14-58.

⁶⁸ Pirnat, A., *De falsa et vera*, Utrecht, 1988, 186-193. Similar passages in Jacobus Palaeologus. See Bietenholz, *Daniel Zwicker*, 65ff.

tween 1644 and 1650 in five volumes, to the dismay of his colleagues.⁶⁹

In 1661, after he had been severely criticized by Comenius, Zwicker changed his narrative and in his *Irenicomastix* he tried to sketch an uninterrupted non-trinitarian tradition from Early Christianity to the present. He had to defend himself against Comenius's objection that the Monarchist system became extinct in the fourth century and that there was a big gap between them and the work of Servet. This led Zwicker to look for allies for the period after the fourth century and he carefully made references to the *Qur'ān*. He quotes *sūra* 12 —Servet had already used it— which says «And the most of them do not believe in God without committing idolatry».⁷⁰

Zwicker then suggested a counter-narrative of antitrinitarianism, which led through Islam. As it was already the case with Biandrata and David, his model was the ideal of a connected chain of witnesses of truth since the time of Christ, as it had been suggested by Sebastian Franck during the «left» Reformation. Not only orthodoxy was capable of displaying a continuity, but so could the «true» spiritual Church of supposed heretics.⁷¹

What was only suggested in Zwicker was more fully developed only a few years thereafter, namely in the circle of Amsterdam emigres from eastern Germany and Poland.

Christoph Sand (the Younger) had come to his Dutch exile from Brandenburg and he continued the Patristic scholarship of his father, Christoph Sand the Elder, while he worked as a deputy lector at the Elzevier printing house. The work of both Sands appeared in 1668 under the title *Nucleus historiae ecclesiasticae*.⁷² It is a counter-Church history from a specifically Arian point of view. Sand was not a Socinian proper, but he defended the subordinatian Trinity, similar

⁶⁹ Pétau, D., *Opus de theologicis dogmatibus*, Paris, 1644-50; see Hofmann, M., *Theologie, Dogma und Dogmenentwicklung im theologischen Werk Denis Petaus*, Bern, 1976. On the broader context see Glawe, W., *Die Hellenisierung des Christentums in der Geschichte der Theologie von Luther bis auf die Gegenwart*, Berlin, 1912; Mulsow, *Moderne aus dem Untergrund*, 261-307.

⁷⁰ *Qur'ān*, 12:106; Bietenholz, *Daniel Zwicker*, 96. On the Servetus passage see Hughes, "In the Footsteps", 60.

⁷¹ Franck, S., *Chronika, Zeitbuch und Geschichtsbibel*, Straßburg, 1531.

⁷² Sand, C. [son], *Nucleus historiae ecclesiasticae*, [Amsterdam], 1668. The *Nucleus* has to a large extent been written by Christoph Sand [father] and was completed by the son. On the Sands —especially the son— a monograph is lacking.

to Zwicker. In his *Nucleus* Islam plays an important role. It is treated in seven densely written pages, which make already good use of Hottinger's *Historia orientalis*. Sand tries to refute numerous anti-Islamic claims and he attempts to show that Muḥammad did in fact believe in Christ as the son of God. But just like the Arians, Muḥammad viewed him as a most excellent and perfect human being.⁷³

This allows us for the first time to see how the developing anti-trinitarian counter-narratives paradoxically connect with certain anti-Islamic polemical writings from the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. A specific dogmatic position (Arianism in the work of Sand) makes a certain source attractive, where the *Qur'ān* was brought into connection with Christian influences. In the case of Sand this was a medieval tradition that viewed Muḥammad as a disciple of an Arian. That was the tradition, which had originated with John of Damascus, who had suggested, based on one particular Muḥammad legend of the Christian monk Bahīrā, that this monk had been an Arian.⁷⁴

V

Already at this stage, it would be possible to speculate about possible influences of historicizing anti-Trinitarians and Arians about the evolving Radical Enlightenment, especially in England. During the 1660s and thereafter, Arianism was appealing especially to English circles. In his clandestine work *An Account of the Rise and Progress* (1671) Henry Stubbe, for example, writes «that the Religion of Mahomet is chiefly founded on the Doctrines of the Nazarene Christians and the Arrians».⁷⁵ But it is still too early for this at that point.

⁷³ Sand, *Nucleus*, 347-353. 347: «[Anno 630] Eodem tempore exorta est religio Mohammedanorum auctore Muhammede Homerita ex Arabia Felice, quem nonnulli dicunt in Sarracenorum religionem cecidisse. Ille asserebat se esse servum Dei missum ad praedicandam Dei unitatem contra eos, qui credebant tres deos. Magistri Muhammedis fuisse Berra seu Baira quidam dictus, religione Jacobita, Joannes de Antiochia Arianus, et Sergius Monachus Italicus, quorum hic ob Arianam sectam Byzantio in Arabiam transfugerat; quanquam aliqui id propter haeresin Nestorianam accidisse referunt.»

⁷⁴ Tolan, J.V., *Saracenes. Islam in the Medieval European Imagination*, New York, 2002. On the Bahīrā legend see Roggema, R., *The Legend of Sergius Bahīrā*, Leiden, 2008.

⁷⁵ Stubbe, H., *An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometism, with the Life of Mahomet*, H.M.Kh. Shairani (ed.), London, 1911, 146.

What we need to understand before we can go on is how anti-trinitarian genealogies connected in peculiar ways with different narratives of corruption. It is not easy to get a general idea about the numerous narratives that tell about an intentional corruption of sacred texts. First, there is the accusation of Muslims that Jews and Christians had corrupted the Bible —the doctrine of *tahrīf*.⁷⁶ Then, there is the Christian claim that Jews had corrupted the *Qur'ān*.⁷⁷ Third, Christians were accused of having corrupted the *Qur'ān*. Hava Lazarus-Yafeh has examined such claims for the Middle Ages and published her findings in a book under the title *Intertwined Worlds*.⁷⁸ These intertwined worlds, however, have continued to exist during the early modern period.

Only after the complexity of the competing corruption-narratives is understood properly is it possible to understand how both orientalists and radicals integrated their own projects and claimed it for themselves. The connection with the constructed genealogies of Socinianism seems obvious, but also with legitimizing genealogies of Calvinist or Lutheran Christianity. Arabic scholars, for example, tried hard to legitimize their study of Islamic culture. Theodor Hackspan, Professor of Oriental Languages at the University of Altdorf, for instance, adopted from his teacher Georg Calixt the conviction that it was important to discover an earlier consensus within the Church in order to regain the true system of faith again.⁷⁹ In Hackspan's eyes this implies, with the help of Pharisaic Judaism and Islam, the reestablishment of the uncorrupted Abrahamic religion which, according to the *Qur'ān*, had been corrupted by the Jews. This was possible, because Hackspan viewed the *Qur'ān* as a blend of Jewish, Christian, and original components. Hackspan pointed out in 1644 that the *Qur'ān* was a «mixture of many differ-

⁷⁶ *Qur'ān*, 2:75; 7:175. See Lazarus-Yafeh, H., *Intertwined Worlds. Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism*, Princeton, 1992, 19-35 and 77-79; Caspar, R. and Gaudel, J.M., "Textes de la tradition musulmane concernant le *tahrīf* (falsification) des Écritures", *Islamochristiana*, 6 (1980), 61-104.

⁷⁷ Adler, W., "The Jews as Falsifiers: Charges of Tendentious Emendations in Anti-Jewish Christian Polemics", *Translations of Scripture, Jewish Quarterly Review Supplement*, (1990), 1-27.

⁷⁸ Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*.

⁷⁹ Klein, D., "Inventing Islam for Support of Christian Truth. Theodor Hackspan's Arabic Studies in Altdorf 1642-1646", to appear in *History of Universities*. I am grateful to Dietrich Klein for providing me with this important paper before its publication.

ent things, partly revealed, partly corrupted, and partly added to what had been revealed». ⁸⁰ Nonetheless, Hackspan concludes, it contained also genuine Abrahamic elements and should therefore be used for restitution purposes.

In his chapter “De statu Christianorum et Judaeorum tempore orti Muhammedani” of his *Historia orientalis* Hottinger also discusses the Jewish and Christian elements of the *Qur’ān*. ⁸¹ The sources for such claims are very old and can already be found in Byzantine anti-Islamic polemics, such as those by Ricoldus de Monte Crucis or Johannes Kantakuzenos. ⁸² According to legend, Muhammad had a Jewish servant, Abdia ben Salomon and, as we have heard already, a Christian servant as well, a monk by the name of Sergius, who is otherwise generally known as Baḥīrā.

In addition to that, there were also historians of heresies, who had acquired a considerable knowledge about the Orient. One of the most significant among them was Abraham Hinckelmann, who published an edition of the *Qur’ān* in Hamburg. ⁸³ Hinckelmann attempted to uncover the roots of Jakob Böhme’s heresy in Zoroastrian dualism. He retraced the teachings of the alleged Zoroastrian Chaldaic oracles via the Kabbalah and Islamic mysticism to Europe. His own collection of Sufi manuscripts, Kabbalistic and neo-Platonic texts formed the basis of his work. Hinckelmann views the corruption of Christianity as recurring, caused by a pagan («Sabian») doctrine of dualism and of a concealed deity, which consisted along with it. His agenda was the restitution of genuine Christianity. ⁸⁴

Slightly different was the thesis of Willem Hendrik Vorst, a Dutchman with Socinian leanings, who privately expressed his con-

⁸⁰ Hackspan, T., “De scriptorum Judaicorum in Theologia usu”, in Lipmann von Mühlhausen, *Yom Tov, Liber Nizachon*, Nuremberg, 1644, 486: «[...] Alkoranum esse farraginem, multarum rerum, quae partim revelatae, partim depravatae, partim revelatis superadditae sunt [...]»

⁸¹ Hottinger, *Historia orientalis*, 320-361.

⁸² Khoury, A.T., *Polémique byzantine contre l’Islam*, Leiden, 1972.

⁸³ Hinckelmann, A., *Al-Coranus, sive lex islamitica Muhamedis*, Hamburg, 1694. See Braun, H., “Der Hamburger Koran von 1694”, in C. Voigt and E. Zimmermann (eds.), *Libris et litteris (FS H. Tiemann)*, Hamburg, 1959, 149-166.

⁸⁴ Hinckelmann, A., *Detectio fudamenti Böhmiāni*, Hamburg, 1693. See Mulsow, M., “Den ‘Heydnischen Saurteig’ mit dem ‘Israelitischen Süßteig’ vermengt: Kabbala, Hellenisierungsthese und Pietismusstreit bei Abraham Hinckelmann und Johann Peter Späth”, *Scientia Poetica*, 11 (2007), 1-50.

viction that the passages in the *Qur'ān* that provided a positive portrayal of Jesus Christ must have been inserted later by Arabic Christians.⁸⁵ This enabled people such as Vorst to rid Christianity from its link with Islam. It was especially embraced by Socinians, who had been critical of a Christian *interpretatio pia* of the *Qur'ān* that had been put forward by Nicholas of Cusa, because it tainted the idea of a «pure» monotheistic Islam by asserting an alledged veneration of Christ as the son of God.

In fact, the ideal of a defense of a pure monotheistic Islam was the goal of all those anti-Trinitarians who had developed an interest in Islam, even if this meant to bring hypotheses about potential forgeries into play. Already from the beginning, several anti-Trinitarians suspected that certain passages might be later interpolations. Very important for them was the search for old textual variants in manuscripts, especially those of the Prologue of John, which contained the most explicit textual manifestation of the much despised Trinitarian logos theology. Already long before John Mill's critical edition of the New Testament from 1707, which contained more than ten thousand different textual variants,⁸⁶ scholars had gathered textual variants.⁸⁷ When Adam Neuser, for example, spent his days in Constantinople as a simple cavalryman, he searched the libraries for old New Testament manuscripts and sent copies of them to his followers in Transylvania.⁸⁸ He knew that the latter were in process of preparing a new edition of the New Testament which was supposed to prove the Unitarian truths of ancient Christianity. The new development since the mid-seventeenth, however, was the fact

⁸⁵ Christoph Arnold to Sebastian Snell, in *Triginta epistolae philologicae et historicae de Flavii Iosephi testimonio quod Jesu Christo tribuit*, Nürnberg, 1661, Epist. 15: «Cl. Vorstius Iosephi locum cum Muhammedicis de Christo Jesu Filiae Mariae aliquot Testimoniis in compendium historicum a Levino Warnerio duce Golio fideliter collectis editisque comparans, constanter asserit ea omnia in eodem habenda esse pretio, quo nempe Iosephi locus, id est, esse suppositia. Causam desideranti, hoc ulterius respondi dedit; tot Christianos in Arabia, Persia, & in Indiis facili negotio talia inserere, & sic nos perinde ac infideles eadem arte ludere istos omnino posse.» Vorst, Conrad Vorst's son, later published anonymously the treatise *Bilibra veritatis*, s.l. 1700.

⁸⁶ Mill, J. (ed.), *Novum testamentum Graecum, cum lectionibus variantibus*, MSS, Oxford, 1707.

⁸⁷ See, in general, Ehrmann, B.D., *Misquoting Jesus. The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, New York, 2005.

⁸⁸ Pirnat, *Die Ideologie*, 126.

that now the *Qur'ān* became also subject of such historical-critical study.

In 1682 we encounter an antitrinitarian corruption hypothesis concerning the *Qur'ān* that may have been inspired by Hendrik Willem Vorst. It took, however, a path of its own and was not just orally considered like in the case of Vorst. This hypothesis occurred in the context of an attempt to establish contacts with Islam, which seems, almost one hundred years later, just like Neuser's «Socino-Turkish» move. The pattern is again the same: A letter was supposed to be handed over to an envoy who happened to be on a diplomatic mission to the West and who was supposed to serve as a vehicle to transmit the message to Islamic countries. This time the envoy is the Moroccan ambassador in London. The letter, which contains a text from the early seventeenth-century by a certain Ahmed ben Abdala, together with an extensive commentary, promises an alliance between Western anti-Trinitarians and Mohammedans.⁸⁹ This time, however, the tone of the letter is markedly more self-confident and direct.

Two Socinians tried to convey the letter and some manuscripts to the Moroccan ambassador who was visiting London. Noël Aubert de Versé, the Huguenot author of the letter,⁹⁰ not only offers an alliance between Western Antitrinitarians and Eastern Islam, but surprisingly also demands from the Muslims to accept certain corrections in the *Qur'ān*, since certain passages were corrupted. One of them was the famous passage in *sūra* 4,156, which claims that Christ did not die on the cross: «But they did not kill him, nor did they crucify him, it only seemed to them as such.»

In his Latin commentary to the manuscript which accompanied his letter—a text by Ahmed ben Abdala from around 1610—Aubert suggests that this passage must be a later interpolation that had been added after the times of Muḥammad.⁹¹ Based on the scholarship of

⁸⁹ On this episod, see Matar, N., *Britain and Barbary 1589-1689*, Gainesville, 2005; *idem*, “The Toleration of Muslims in Renaissance England: Practice and Theory”, in J.C. Laursen (ed.), *Religious Tolerance: The “Variety of Rites” from Cyrus to Defoe*, New York, 1994, 127-146. I hope to publish a monograph on this topic under the title *Islamisches Christentum. Geschichte einer Utopie*.

⁹⁰ On him see Morman, P.J., *Noël Aubert de Versé. A Study in the Concept of Toleration*, Lewinston, 1987; Mulsow: “The ‘New Socinians’”.

⁹¹ Lambeth Palace Library, London, Ms. 673: «enim maxima ea parte schedae erant, quae et adhuc hodie male sibi cohaerent, quaeque variis occasionibus et temporibus ab ipso Mahomete brevi et conciso admodum sermone conscriptae fuerant, quaeque demum

Gerard Wieggers, we know that the Ben Abdala letter is to a large extent a modified adoption of the anti-Christian polemics by the Morisco Muhammad Alguazir.⁹² Aubert writes in his commentary that the Prophet Muḥammad did not have any reason to deny the death of Jesus: «I dare to say that the Quranic text has been corrupted».⁹³ According to Aubert, it was easy to do so, because these were very short and disconnected passages, which Muḥammad had written down. It was possible to change, corrupt, and correct them after his death —by the Jews, who did not want Christianity to spread in the East under the flag of Muḥammad, and so inserted an absurd story which would divide Christians and Muslims. Similarly, the «Dedicatory Epistle» by Aubert to the Moroccan ambassador reads: «those contradictions were foistered into the scatter'd papers found after Mahomet's death, of which in truth the Alcoran was made up.» And the letter promises: «We do in these our papers endeavour to clear by whom, and in what time such alterations were made in the settings of the Alcoran».⁹⁴

Unlike Vorst, Aubert charges the Jews, not the Christians, with forgery:

When some Jews, whom Mohammad used when he was still alive, saw that the latter's teachings were accepted by all people, by both his own countrymen and the Jews, and that this actually produced Christians under the guise of Islam, they were deeply hurt and they fraudulently inserted these completely absurd stories into his papers. This is how they turned Mohammad into the main culprit of the entire fallacy and they taught and showed that it was a mistake to believe him and his teachings and that people would adopt a belief system from a person who was completely inexperienced, yet the most audacious and shameless of all.⁹⁵

illius consanguinei post ipsius mortem pro libitu depravare, immutare, corrigere potuerunt; quam in rem facili conspirare et consentire poterant; quippe qui in una eademque urbe manebant, et apud quos solos multa nondum aliis cognita, nondum edita Mahometis scripta; reposita erant imo ferunt.»

⁹² Wieggers, G.A., «The Andalusi Heritage in the Maghrib: The Polemical Work of Muhammad Alguazir (fl. 1610)», in O. Zwartjes *et al.* (eds.), *Poetry, Politics and Polemics (Orientations 4)*, Amsterdam, 1996, 107-132. On the Morisco polemics in general see Cardaillac, L., *Morisques et Chrétiens. Un affrontement polémique (1492-1640)*, Paris, 1977.

⁹³ Lambeth Palace Library, London, Ms. 673: «meliori jure corruptum Alcoranum dicere ausim.»

⁹⁴ Dedicatory Epistle, Ms. 673, fol. 2f.

⁹⁵ Ms. 673 (footnote 91): «Judaeos aliquot quorum opera in suis rebus gerendis utebatur vivus Mahometes, cum viderent, dolerentque ipsius doctrinam ab universis re-

The Jews thus wanted to spill discredit upon Muḥammad in order to prevent a pure —non-Trinitarian— Christianity from spreading.

Such a utilization of the *Qur'ān* may seem surprising. The idea of an interpolation of the *Qur'ān* is hardly discussed among Islamic scholarship and appears only among a very select circle of Western scholars today. Generally, the concept of «athetesis,» an unauthorized insertion, is not made in regards to the *Qur'ān*.⁹⁶ But how did Aubert come up with it then in the first place? Was he even able to read Arabic? It seems as if he did not. Neither the bundle of papers captured by the English court nor any other of his writings betrays traces of a proficiency in Arabic. He mainly draws on Patristic sources. In fact, Aubert did not even seem to have a profound knowledge of the Oriental scholarship of his time. But how did Aubert arrive then at his historical-critical hypothesis about the *Qur'ān*?

The answer has two parts. The first part: there is a medieval tradition, according to which three crafty Jews, Wahb b. Munabbih, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Salām and Ka'b al-Aḥbār, had become followers of Muḥammad so that they would render him into a dissenter of Christianity, to which he had assigned. In their hearts, however, they remained Jews. But after the death of Muḥammad they persuaded 'Alī, the son of Abū Ṭālib, to whom Muḥammad had bequeathed his writings that he would proclaim himself as a prophet. They then made numerous changes and alterations to the *Qur'ān* that were in agreement with their on interests. This tradition comes from the *Risālat*

cipi populis, a suis etiam popularibus et Judaeis, et isto pacto sub Mahumedano nomine vere Christianos evadere, veriti ne tandem tota gens Christiana efficeretur, absurdissimam hanc fabulam in ejus schedas intrusisse, ut tanti erroris reum Mahometem ipsum facientes, docerent, ostenderentque temere illi credi, ejusque disciplinam recipi, utpote hominis vel imperitissimi vel omnium audacissimi et impudentissimi.» The text goes on: «Profecto corruptum hac in causa Alchoranum videri debere omnibus et sapientibus Mahumedanis merito asseruerim, cum ipse Mahometes sese Christi disciplinam annunciare re doceat, nullo ullibi exceptione ab ipso facta, cum clamat multoties se Evangelio credere, nullibi corruptum esse accusans. Id tamen procul dubio fecisset si ei constitisset Jesum minime mortuum fuisse, et si ei corruptus fuisse a Christianis scriptura. Innumeris in locis idololatriam, superstitionem, polytheismum Christianis exprobrat, alium vero hac de re silet.» Usually, the redaction of the *Qur'ān* after Muḥammad's death is ascribed to Zayd b. Thābit, who operated according to the orders of 'Umar or Abū Bakr.

⁹⁶ Cook, M., *The Koran. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford, 2000; Paret, R., *Mohammed und der Koran*, Stuttgart, 1957; Bell, R., *Introduction to the Qur'ān*, Edinburgh, 1958, 43f.; but see now Neuwirth, A., *Der Koran als Text der Spätantike*, Berlin, 2010.

al-Kindī, a Christian anti-Islamic work from the tenth century, which consists of a fictional exchange between a Muslim and a Christian.⁹⁷ This work has greatly influenced the image of Islam during the European Middle Ages. Its thesis appears again in Nicolaus of Cusa's *Cribratio Alkorani* (1461), on which numerous Arabists from the seventeenth century drew.⁹⁸ Sand had used the *Cribratio* with the intention to find positive statements about Christ in the *Qur'ān*.

The second part of the answer is more complicated, though more interesting: Aubert seems to have interpreted the tradition that had been transmitted by Nicolaus of Cusa in the light of his most recent experiences. We know that Aubert, shortly before his visit to England in 1681, when he was living in Holland, trying to make ends meet, worked for the Elzevier publishing house.⁹⁹ At the shop, he was entrusted with the Latin translation of Richard Simon's revolutionary *Histoire critique de vieux testament* from 1678. After Bossuet's protest, the first edition, published in Paris, had been confiscated and destroyed.¹⁰⁰ However, a manuscript copy of it survived and, partly due to Elzevier's eagerness to make a profit, it was translated into Latin and published in 1681.¹⁰¹

In his work, Simon discusses also the corruption of the original biblical text in the process of the vocalization by the Masorettes.¹⁰² Apart from that, Moses, according to Simon, was not the author of the Pentateuch. In fact, it had been compiled much later. The message of Simon's work is clear: even a «holy» text can be problematic. Aubert, who translated Simon's work, was a diligent disciple of his master. He also knew the tendencies among several Socinians such as those by Lelio Sozzini in his commentary to the Gospel of

⁹⁷ Muir, W. (ed.), "The Apology of al-Kindī, written at the Court of al-Ma'mūn (ca. A.H. 215, A.D. 830)", in *Defense of Christianity against Islam*, London, 1882; see Tolan, *Saracenes*, 60-64.

⁹⁸ On Cusa's book see Bobzin, *Der Koran*; Hopkins, J., *A Miscellany on Nicholas of Cusa*, Minneapolis, 1994.

⁹⁹ Morman, *Noël Aubert de Versé*.

¹⁰⁰ Müller, S., *Richard Simon (1638-1712). Exeget, Theologe, Philosoph und Historiker. Eine Biographie*, Würzburg, 2005.

¹⁰¹ Simon, R., *Historia critica veteris testamenti juxta exemplar impressum Parisiis*, s.l., 1681.

¹⁰² Danneberg, L., "Ezechiel Spanheim's Dispute with Richard Simon. On the Biblical Philology at the End of the 17th Century", in Pott, Mulsow and Danneberg, *The Berlin Refuge*, 49-88.

John to consider several passages as later and corrupted interpolations. Several years later and influenced by Jean Le Clerc's *Liberii de Sancto Amore Epistolae theologicae*, Aubert expressed the hypothesis that the term «Jesus» that appeared in the manuscript of the Prologue of John had been replaced by «God».¹⁰³ Aubert, like Willem Hendrik Vorst before him, applies this philological scepticism in regards to the Bible to the *Qur'ān*, combining it with the thesis from the *Risālat al-Kindī*, and draws his own conclusions. Thereupon, Aubert sketches, without any knowledge of Arabic, a «histoire critique» of the *Qur'ān*.

But what, aside from Simon's work, instilled in him the desire to try to emend the *Qur'ān*? In what direction was this emendation supposed to go? As becomes clear from the document, Aubert's goal was to uncover a pure version of Islam that was still connected to Christianity and the crucified Jesus, but that could also be understood as a rational faith. Such interest sprang purely from scholarly reflection and was entirely theoretical in nature.

Presumably, between 1679 and the end of 1680, when Sand died, and still before he left for England, Aubert may have discussed with Sand at length the relationship between Arianism and Islam in the facilities of the Elzevier publishing house. Maybe they even discussed the question of how it would be possible to apply Simon's new critical approach to the problem.¹⁰⁴ One passage in Sand's book focuses on the *Qur'ān sūra* four, which denies that Jesus was actually crucified. Sand points out that this opinion was unjustifiably «attributed» to Muslims.¹⁰⁵ In return, he quotes several other Islamic documents which imply that Jesus did in fact die on the cross.

¹⁰³ [Le Clerc, J.,] *Liberii de Sancto Amore Epistolae theologicae in quibus varii scholasticorum errores castigantur*, Irenopoli [Saumur], 1679; [Aubert de Versé, N.,] *Le Tombeau du Socinianisme*, Frankfurt, 1687. See Mulsow, "The 'New Socinians'", 67-74.

¹⁰⁴ See the statement on Sand in Aubert's commentary on the letter of Ben Abdala, Ms. 673, *ad paginam* 12.

¹⁰⁵ Sand, *Nucleus*, 350ff.

VI

Only if we understand these complex connections between partisan genealogies, theories of corruption, and plans of restitution, only then is it possible to understand the matrix in which the early modern reception of Islamic anti-Christian and anti-Pauline texts took place and which contributed to the Radical Enlightenment. In order to do that, it will be necessary to retrace what I shall call «the natural history of the discourse».¹⁰⁶ A natural history of this kind does not only retrace the broad intellectual lines, but it pursues in detail every individual manuscript in regards to how it was received in scholarly libraries and by collectors, every form of adaption of the text by intellectuals.

We soon discover that in the case of the reception of ideas from Islam this discourse was influenced by all kinds of accidental factors. It depended on what kind of manuscript—one out of a thousand possible ones—a Golius or a Pococke purchased at the Bazaar in Aleppo or from their contacts in Constantinople. The fact that al-Qarāfī, from a theological point of view a second—or third—rate author, would play such a prominent role in the circles of European freethinkers (instead of, say, Ibn Ḥazm or Ibn Taymiyya),¹⁰⁷ or that Aubert—without his own knowledge—would write a commentary on Muḥammad Alguazir, that Hinckelmann arrives at his speculations in part due to his reading of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd al-Ṣanhājī and ‘Atā’ b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusaynī,¹⁰⁸ all of that is highly accidental. On the other hand: once an idea was picked up in the West which could be of interest for certain purposes, things become much more «necessary» and cogent.

More precisely, in all of these cases there is a divergence between the «necessity of the influence» and the «contingency of the transmission.» By «necessity of influence» I mean that the ideas that were transmitted were certainly important and, once they be-

¹⁰⁶ I take this expression from the collective volume: Silverstein, M. and Urban, G., *The Natural Histories of Discourse*, Chicago, 1996, but I use it differently from the use of the editors.

¹⁰⁷ On Ibn Ḥazm see Behloul, S.-M., *Ibn Hazms Evangelienkritik. Eine methodische Untersuchung*, Leiden, 2002; Ljamai, A., *Ibn Ḥazm et la polémique islamo-chrétienne dans l’histoire de l’Islam*, Leiden, 2002.

¹⁰⁸ Mulsow, “Den ‘Heydnischen Saurteig’”.

came known, could not be ignored. The contingency of transmission refers to the authors and channels, though which these ideas were transmitted to the West and which were profoundly coincidental.

Especially by looking at the *longue durée* of the natural history of this discourse, then all the numerous paradoxes it contains become obvious. It all starts with *Risālat al-Kindī*, which, as we have seen, exercised such tremendous influence during the early modern period, and which, as Paul Kraus discovered, even influenced Ibn al-Rāwandī's *Kitāb al-Zumurrudh*.¹⁰⁹ This means the arguments used by early Christian polemicists originated partly from freethinkers within Islam itself.

This is the reverse scenario from what we know about the reception of anti-Christian Islamic polemics in Socinianism: In the *Risālat al-Kindī* Christian orthodoxy as the direct enemy of the antagonistic religion joins forces with a heresy within Islam. Moreover, Hava Lazarus-Yafeh has shown how the field of biblical criticism witnessed a complex interplay between Christians, Jews, and Muslims.¹¹⁰ Finally, both Jewish and Islamic anti-Christian polemicists drew on the work of Socinians and on Western scholastic logic, before their work became a source for the arguments of Christian anti-Trinitarians and freethinkers.¹¹¹

Reconstructing the natural history of this discourse will also help us to identify practices—the compilation, the secondary reception, the modification—that played an integral role in the process of transmission by radicals. In his contribution in this volume Justin Champion has beautifully shown how much radicals and freethinkers during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries depended on what they were able to read in translation in the publications of orientalists. By looking at the transmission of anti-Pauline polemics, we shall see in greater detail how exactly the perspective in regards to genealogies and concepts of corruption came to be modified in the process of transmission.

Islam knows a number of various traditions of stories about the Apostle Paul and his role in the corruption of original Christianity.

¹⁰⁹ Kraus, "Beiträge zur islamischen Ketzergeschichte".

¹¹⁰ Lazarus-Yafeh, *Intertwined Worlds*.

¹¹¹ Wiegers, "The Andalusī Heritage". On Jewish texts, see Kaplan, *From Christianity to Judaism*.

Accordingly, Paul turned Jesus into the Son of God who was more than just a prophet. This led Christianity astray from its genuine faith. Research by Samuel Stern and P.S. van Koningsveld has shown that the story as we know it in its original form is part of the *Kitāb al-ridda wa-l-futūḥ* by Sayf b. ‘Umar al-Tamīmī, who died in 796-7.¹¹² It is the story of Paul and his four disciples, Jacob, Nestorius, Melcun, and a fourth who is called «the believer.» The three first names are references to the three Christian groups in Syria; the fourth is a reference to true faith, Islam. Several different versions of the story are structured similarly to the Parable of the Three Rings: a father or king confidentially tells each of his sons or disciples that he was telling only him the truth.¹¹³ However, he tells each one of them something different. After the father’s or king’s death, the sons discover the divergences in each version of the story, which is the starting point for religious strife. What is peculiar on some of the anti-Pauline version, however, is not just the fourth disciple, but that this disciple has a group of followers who live as eremites. Thirty of them will eventually come to face with the prophet, which establishes the connection to Islam.

At this point, I will skip the transmission history of the story as far as it is known to us in the Islamic tradition. It is clear, however, that in this tradition the story was in its different versions fairly well-known. Some time in the thirteenth century, al-Qarāfī learned about it and used to it in his apologetic work. The latter, of course, was only one of many potential sources that were involved in the transmission process of the story.¹¹⁴ But so that the story arrived and made an impact in the West, it needed to pass through the eye of needle, so to speak: the manuscript, which now carries the call number Or. 173 and which contains al-Qarāfī’s *al-Ajwiba al-fakhira* that contains three versions of the story,¹¹⁵

¹¹² Sayf b. ‘Umar, *Kitāb al-ridda wa-l-futūḥ wa-Kitāb al-jamal wa-masīr ‘Ā’isha wa-‘Alī*, Q. al-Samarra’i (ed.), Leiden, 1995, 132ff; Koningsveld, P.S. van, “The Islamic Image of Paul and the Origin of the Gospel of Barnabas”, *JSAI*, 20 (1996), 200-229; Stern, S., “Abd al-Jabbar’s Account of How Christ’s Religion was Falsified by the Adoption of Roman Customs”, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 19 (1968), 128-185.

¹¹³ On the parable of the three rings see Niewöhner, F., *Veritas sive Varietas. Lesings Toleranzparabel und das Buch von den drei Betrügern*, Heidelberg, 1988.

¹¹⁴ On other possible sources see Bouamama, *La littérature polémique*.

¹¹⁵ Al-Qarāfī, *al-Ajwiba al-fakhira ‘an al-as’ila al-fājira*, B.Z. ‘Awād (ed.), Cairo, 1986, 316ff.

needed to be part of the manuscript corpus which Golius purchased in the Levant.

When Johann Heinrich Hottinger from Zurich studied Arabic culture under Golius around 1640, he also came across this particular text and used it intensively for his studies. The story came to be known to intellectuals in the West then predominantly through the passages Hottinger quotes from it in his *Historia orientalis*. Still, we need to carefully examine how Western scholars interpreted and adopted the anti-Pauline story.

Henry Stubbe, physician, a follower of Hobbes, and political theoretician and orientalist—in the eyes of James R. and Margaret Jacob, he is the key link between the radicals of the English Revolution and the evolving Radical Enlightenment¹¹⁶—was eager to integrate the material transmitted by Hottinger in his clandestine work from 1671, the *Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism*:

I remember a Mahometan story of Ahmed ben Idris, that Paul instructed three Princes in religion, and taught each of them a different Christianity: assuring each of them singly that he was in the truth, and that afterwards when Paul was dead, each of them pretended his religion to be the true religion derived from Paul, whence arose great feuds amongst them.¹¹⁷

A different passage reads:

Ahmed ben Edris, passing over the Nestorians as a foolish sort of Christian Hereticks, brings in a fable concerning Paul, as if he had deluded the World into an opinion of the Deity of Isa, and given a beginning to the Heresy of Euty-chius and the Jacobites. And that an Arrian or else a Judaising Christian whom he calls an Elmunin (al-Mu'min), or true believer, did anathematize Paul thereupon, saying, We were the companions of Isa; we saw him; we are descended from him; he was the servant and Apostle of God; he never told us otherwise. And the same Author further tells us that Mahomet met with thirty of the descendants of this Elmunin or orthodox person, who were retired into an Hermitage, and that they owned his Doctrine and profess'd Moslemism.¹¹⁸

From this Stubbe concludes that Islam was founded on the teachings of Nazarene Christians and Arians. This conclusion, however,

¹¹⁶ Jacob, J.R., *Henry Stubbe and Radical Protestantism and the early Enlightenment*, Cambridge, 1983; Jacob, M.C., *The Radical Enlightenment. Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*, London, 1981. See also Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken*.

¹¹⁷ Stubbe, *An Account*, 56.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 146.

is somewhat imprecise, because viewing the descendants of Elmun-in as Arians follows still the tradition that stems from John of Damascus. This was also what Sand had believed. Yet, Arian and «Nazarene Christians» are two different things, but we encounter this more precise analysis only later, in the work of La Croze.

When La Croze, about thirty years after Stubbe, read the history in Hottinger, he solved the puzzle in a different way. He initially had another problem in his mind which he brought into it. Muḥammad had obviously a strange idea about Christianity, especially about the Trinity. He believed that the Trinity consisted of the Father, Jesus, and Mary. But where did this idea come from? Ludovico Marracci, the *Qur'ān* translator, had suggested that Muḥammad adopted here the views of the sect of the Collyridians, which Epiphanius mentions in his work.¹¹⁹ This sect worshipped especially the Virgin Mary, and Muḥammad could according to Marracci have believed that they saw Mary as a Deity and as the third person of the Trinity. In Germany, Johann Michael Lange, a student of Wagenseil in Altdorf, had criticized in his treatise *De fabulis mahomedicis* (1697) Marracci's theory and examined the entire subject anew.¹²⁰ According to Lange's findings it is, as La Croze points out, much more probable that Mahomet, who had commerce with the Nestorian Christians, who were very numerous both in Persia and in Arabia, had also been witness to their complaints concerning the title of the Mother of God, which Cyril of Alexandria, and the Council of Ephesus had decreed to the Blessed Virgin. Besides, La Croze adds, there might have remained until then some of the Nazarenes and Ebionites in Arabia, where the strength of the party was in the time of Epiphanius. Mahomet might have learned from them what was to be found, according to Origin's account, where they have our Lord Jesus Christ proclaim as follows: «The Holy Spirit, my Mother, took me up by one of the hairs of my head and transported me to

¹¹⁹ La Croze, "Historical and Critical Reflections", 174: "But the Ignorance of Mahomet, concerning the Trinity of the Christians, is monstrous. According to him, it consists in God, in Jesus Christ, and in the Blessed Virgin; a Thought as strange as ridiculous". Marracci, L., *Prodromus ad refutationem Alcorani*, Roma, 1691. On Marracci see Borrmans, M., "Ludovico Marracci et sa traduction latine du Coran", *Islamochristiana*, 28 (2002), 73-86; Nallino, A., "Le fonti arabe manoscritte dell'opera di Ludovico Marracci sul Corano", M. Nallino (ed.), *Raccolta di scritti editi e non editi*, Roma, 1940, II, 90-134.

¹²⁰ Lange, J.M., *De fabulis mahomedicis*, Nürnberg, 1697.

the great mountain Tabor.» All these things might have produced a confusion of ideas, which is not improbable in such a man as Muḥammad.¹²¹ Based on a fragment from the Nazarene gospel,¹²² La Croze then brings, with a certain level of caution, the Ebionites as a possible group in Arabia during the seventh century into play.

These were the subjects which La Croze had in mind when he was reading Hottinger's translation of the al-Qarāfī passage during his study of Lange's work. Once the Ebionites had caught his attention, La Croze saw the history of the thirty adherents of the faithful in a different light.

One may see here sensible traces of Ebionism. Those Hereticks hated St. Paul, whom they treated as an Apostate and Transgressor of the Law. We have no reason to doubt, but in Mahomet's time there were some who liv'd in Retirement, to save themselves from Persecution. And therefore however embroil'd and perplex'd this Narration be, we may conclude that the thirty Persons, whom Ahmed speaks of, were the remains of the Ebionites, who without any difficulty, embrac'd the Doctrines of the false Prophet, who reviv'd Opinions perfectly like their own.¹²³

When Shlomo Pines wrote his disputed theory about the Jewish-Christian sources in 'Abd al-Jabbār b. Aḥmad's *Tathbūt*, he did not know that La Croze had already anticipated the idea of the presence of Jewish Christians at the time of Muḥammad, based on the al-Qarāfī material which he used.¹²⁴

Recently, François de Bois argued in regards to the *naṣārā* which are mentioned in the *Qur'ān* that they were not just Christians but Nazareans, Jewish Christians. De Bois reminds us that Epiphanius mentions the Elchasaitians, who share several important doctrines with Islam, starting with prayer towards Jerusalem to their interpretation of other rituals. He also points out that the concept of the concluding prophet—the «seal of the prophet»—does not only ap-

¹²¹ La Croze, "Historical and Critical Reflections", 174ff.

¹²² On the question of the gospel used by the Ebionites see Schoeps, H.-J., *Das Judentum*, Bern, 1964.

¹²³ La Croze, "Historical and Critical Reflections", 206.

¹²⁴ Pines, S., *The Jewish Christians of the Early Centuries of Christianity According to a New Source*, Jerusalem, 1966; reprinted in *The Collected Works of Shlomo Pines*, Jerusalem, 1996, IV, 211-284. In this volume are reprinted also the subsequent studies by Pines on this topic. See also Reynolds, G.S., *A Muslim Theologian in the Sectarian Milieu: 'Abd al-Jabbār and the Critique of Christian Origins*, Leiden, 2004.

pear in Mani but already among the baptismal sect, in which he was raised and which, according to de Blois, was most likely a group of Elchaisaitians.¹²⁵ Already in 1978, Patricia Crone observed in a different context that the Elchaisitians were a similar combination of Jewish Christianity and Gnosticism as the Athinganoi in Byzantium and the Arabs at the time of Muhammad.¹²⁶

If this means that the Christians mentioned in the *Qur'ān* were Elchaisitians or only a group of Judaizing Christians, who developed similar characteristics after the seventh century as genuine Jewish Christians did during the first, second, or third century can remain open at this stage. What is important for us, however, is that the Jewish-Christians living in Northern Mesopotamia —especially around Nisibis— correlate with what we know from the anti-Pauline legends.

Shortly after his *Réflexions* and after his encounter with this particular work, La Croze met and befriended a real Socinian. This was Samuel Crell, the grandson of the famous Socinian theologian Johann Crell. Both men had an exchange about the attitude of the Socinians towards Islam, in which Crell stressed that Sozzini had distanced himself from it.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Du Blois, F., “Elchasai —Manes— Muḥammad. Manichäismus und Islam im religionshistorischen Vergleich”, *Der Islam*, 81 (2004), 31-48.

¹²⁶ Crone, P., “Islam, Judeo-Christianity, and Byzantine Iconoclasm”, *JSAI*, 2 (1980), 59-94, esp. 79 n. 112.

¹²⁷ See the letter from Crell to La Croze (without date) in L. Uhl (ed.), *Thesaurus epistolicus Lacrozianus*, Leipzig, 1742-46, vol. I, 110-112: «De titulo fratris non succensebis, puto, quandoquidem etiam reu. ABBADIE, acerrimus licet Vnitariorum antagonistes, et quo nemo fortius SOCINVM aggressus est, SOCINI tamen assecelas fratres errantes uocare non dubitat initio operis *de diuinit.[ate] Christi*. Iam uero scis, me SOCINVM, qua SOCINVS fuit, id est, ab aliis diuersa excogitauit, plane deserere. In dogmate de uno Deo Patre constanter persisto. Quoad alia diuersarum partium orthodoxis communia, cum orthodoxis sentio, aut ad eos propius accedo. MAHOMETIS doctrinam non ego tantum, uerum etiam qui SOCINVM stricte sequebantur, semper sunt detestati et abominati. Nec uideo, quomodo ii, qui Christum non prophetam solummodo aliis excellentiorem, sed dominum coeli et terrae, Deo Patri, quantum fieri potest, coniunctum, imperiique eius reapse participem, credunt, magis quam alii Christiani Mahometismo obnoxii fieri possint. Fateor, illa Vnitariorum monstra, quae Christum inuocandum esse inficiantur, aut tantum pro propheta fere in regno demum millenario regnato habent, facilius eo insaniae delabi posse. Vt de NEVSERO dogmatis istius impii parente refertur. Parente, inquam; FRANCISCVS enim DAVIDIS eo adhuc tempore, quo cum GEORGIO BLANDRATA GEORGIVM MAIOREM professorem Wittenbergensem refutabat, Dominum Iesum inuocandum esse statuebat, ut ex isto opere non uno indicio constat. NEVSERVS uero non obscure sibi dogmatis huius inuen-

Later Orientalists no longer repeated La Croze's thesis in their work, although they continued to study intensively the Christian and Jewish influences in the *Qur'ān*.¹²⁸ During the middle of the eighteenth century, for example, David Mill, the successor of Adrian Reland as Professor of Oriental languages in Utrecht published a work entitled *De Mohammedismo ante Mohammedem*.¹²⁹ This work constitutes another forgotten work of oriental scholarship of the early and mid eighteenth century. On the one hand, the work surprises: it is a genuine predecessor of Abraham Geiger's famous first publication *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?* [What did Muhammad take from Judaism?]. When Geiger published his dissertation in 1833, he barely consulted any scholarly literature on Islam and therefore did not know about Mill's text, nor the works of La Croze and others.¹³⁰ Although the work is justifiably

tionem adscribit, adeoque etiam FRANCISCVM illum seduxisse uidetur. Imo potius orthodoxi in castra Turcarum non raro, et Iudaeorum quandoque, transeunt recta, nec id facturi ad SOCINUM prius diuertere opus habent. Cum e contra nullo, quod sciam, exemplo constet, SOCINI aliquem in Christo inuocando assecclam ad Turcas umquam defecisse, ne tunc quidem, cum e uicina Turcis Polonia anno 1658 et 1660 pellerentur. Et quomodo ad Turcas deficere facile possent, qui Dominum Iesum, qua publice qua priuatim, testibus libris precum et orationum, quos in lucem diuerso tempore ediderunt, inuocant, ut impuri Mahometis doctrinam abominabilem quantocyus aboleat? Sed num filium meum Halam dirigere debeam, dubito: Nisi enim ad mensam communem studiosorum admittatur, ibi subsistere non poterit ob rem angustam domi, si numerum spectes amplissimae. Iam uero tot filiifamilias alii aliis succedentes pani isti inhiant, eumque occupant, ut uix spes supersit, posse eo aliquando uesci catellos. Armenica tua feliciter procedere, gaudeo. Dabis ergo, promisisti enim, non contemnendum *uariarum lectionum noui praecipue testamenti*, etiam e Slaunica uersione, *spicilegium*. Historiam, quam meditaris, utinam quoque perficias. In ea procul dubio, ubi de Arabibus ages, docebis nos, qua ratione fieri potuerit, ut Arabes, gens libera semper et erectae indolis, religionis Christianae a prima eius origine non omnino expers, quae non tertio demum seculo episcopus habuit Christianos, post MAHOMETIS demum tempora *de uersione sacrae scripturae* conficienda cogitauerit cum effectu.»

¹²⁸ Already before La Croze's treatise, Fahlen, E., *Historiola Al-korani et fraudum Mohammedis*, Uppsala, 1699. See Roling, B., "Humphrey Prideaux, Eric Fahlenius, Adrian Reland, Jacob Ehrharth und die Ehre des Propheten: Koranpolemik im Barock", in D. Klein et al. (eds.), *Wahrnehmung des Islam*, 61-76.

¹²⁹ Mill, D., "De Mahomedismo ante Mohamedam", in B. Ugolino (ed.), *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum [...] in quibus veterum Hebraeorum mores [...] illustrantur*, Venice, 1760, 23, 1091-1155.

¹³⁰ See the introduction in the new edition: Geiger, A., *Was hat Mohammed aus dem Judenthume aufgenommen?*, F. Niewöhner (ed.), Berlin, 2004. On Geiger see Heschel, S., *Abraham Geiger and the Jewish Jesus*, Chicago, 1998; Koltum-Fromm, K., *Abraham Geiger's Liberal Judaism: Personal Meaning and Religious Authority*, Bloomington, 2006.

famous for its new approach to compare the *Qur'ān* and Judaism, it needs to be said that many subjects and passages quoted by Geiger were already discussed by Mill.¹³¹

On the other hand, however, Mill's treatise is also disappointing. If one searches for the subjects and theories discussed around 1700, one searches in vain. There is no trace of La Croze, Stubbe, or Aubert. Mill's treatment is entirely academic in nature. First he discusses the pagan roots and Christian roots of Islam, and then, more elaborately, the Jewish ones. Whenever Mill mentions the Melkites, he neither quotes al-Qarāfī like Hottinger, and when he discusses the Christian sources upon which Mohammad had drawn, he does not mention the story of Paul and his four disciples either.

However, although Orientalists until Pines had forgotten the theory of the connection between Ebionites and the *Qur'ān*, it featured prominently in the revisionist historical concept of one thinker: John Toland. I do not need to elaborate here —Justin Champion is much more qualified to do so— how the discovery of the *Gospel of Barnabas* in the library of the Prussian Consul in The Hague prompted Toland to become interested in and endorse the genealogy Jewish-Christians-Islam-contemporary Unitarianism.¹³² The Morisco forgery from around 1600 that was supposedly a genuine gospel of the Apostle Barnabas, which already announces the coming of Muḥammad as mediator and which is in agreement with the four rules of Islam, appeared to be the missing Jewish-Christian link between Christianity and Islam.¹³³ From the study of English Deist circles it becomes clear how the interplay of these forgeries with both Islamic and Jewish anti-Christian polemical works —Anthony Collins bought numerous treatises of this kind when the *Bibliotheca Saraziana* was sold¹³⁴— creates a completely new image of the

¹³¹ See esp. Mill, "De Mahommedismo ante Mohamedam", 1109.

¹³² See Champion's edition, Toland, J., *Nazarenus or, Jewish, Gentile and Mahometan Christianity*, Oxford, 1999.

¹³³ Wiegiers, G., "Muḥammad as the Messiah: A Comparison of the Polemical Works of Juan Alonso with the Gospel of Barnabas", *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, 52, 3-4 (1995), 245-291; Harvey, *Muslims in Spain*, 287-290; Bernabé Pons, L.F., *El evangelio de San Bernabé. Un evangelio islámico español*, Alicante, 1995; Wiegiers, G.A., "The persistence of Mudejar Islam? Alonso de Luna, the 'Lead Books' and the Gospel of Barnabas", in *Medieval Encounters*, 12, 3 (2006), 498-518.

¹³⁴ Popkin, "Jewish Anti-Christian"; Berti, "At the Roots of Unbelief", 571ff.

history of religion which oscillates between Unitarianism, Deism, and Atheism.

This development, from early anti-Trinitarianism to seventeenth-century Orientalism and the reception of Islamic sources by early Deism, illustrates the origins of the Radical Enlightenment. Of course, it is just one of many. It seems stunning that this development came to end precisely at that moment when the thirty-two-year old Reiske discovered the heterodoxies of al-Ma'arrī and Ibn al-Rāwandī.

Recibido: 05/04/2010

Aceptado: 21/06/2010