



LUND UNIVERSITY

Alchemy of the Ancient Goths: Johannes Bureus' Search for the Lost Wisdom of Scandinavia

Håkansson, Håkan

Published in:
Early Science and Medicine

2012

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Håkansson, H. (2012). Alchemy of the Ancient Goths: Johannes Bureus' Search for the Lost Wisdom of Scandinavia. *Early Science and Medicine*, 17(5), 500-522.

Total number of authors:

1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

Alchemy of the Ancient Goths: Johannes Bureus’ Search for the Lost Wisdom of Scandinavia

Håkan Håkansson*

Lund University Library

Abstract

The Swedish polymath Johannes Bureus (1568–1652), Royal Librarian and close friend of King Gustavus Adolphus, is primarily known as an exponent of early modern “Gothicism,” i.e., the idea that the ancient Goths of Scandinavia were the first rulers of Europe and Sweden the true origin of Western culture. But Bureus was also an avid reader of alchemical literature, as well as a practising alchemist. Influenced by the Neoplatonic revival of the Renaissance, he viewed alchemy as part of a *prisca theologia* stemming from the ancient Goths, arguing that the Scandinavian runes constituted a “Gothic Cabala,” in which the secrets of all sciences—including alchemy—had been hidden for posterity. Drawing on Bureus’ notes, glosses and excerpts from textual sources, this article considers the role attributed to alchemy in his quest for this lost wisdom of the Goths.

Keywords

alchemy, Gothicism, Cabala, runes, Renaissance neoplatonism, theosophy, perennial philosophy, magic

Introduction: Johannes Bureus and Gothicism

Even among Scandinavian historians the polymath Johannes Bureus (1568–1652)—or Johan Bure, as he was called in Swedish—is a relatively unknown figure. Though often mentioned in the context of Lutheran apocalypticism and the early modern fascination for the occult

* History of Ideas and Sciences, Lund University Library, Box 3, 221 00 Lund, Sweden (Hakan.Hakansson@ub.lu.se). I would like to thank Matthew Norris and Eva Nylander, as well as the editors and referees of this volume, for helpful suggestions.

sciences, he is generally passed over as an eccentric outsider, out of step with his own age; a lone visionary, lost in esoteric speculations that verged on heresy in the eyes of religious authorities and made him a laughing stock in scientific circles. It is not a completely untrue picture. As a self-proclaimed prophet and sage, he clearly had to endure his fair share of ridicule and critique, and he was often haunted by a feeling of being misunderstood—“*Combure* [Burn!] say the enemies, whereas Jesus says: come Bure,” he bitterly scribbled in one of his notebooks.¹

Yet Bureus was hardly an outsider. For most of his career he held a prominent position in the Swedish court, moving freely in the inner circles of power at a time when the imperialist politics of Sweden were beginning to redraw the European map. In 1604 he was appointed tutor to the young Gustavus Adolphus, whose close friend he remained until the king's death on the battlefield of Lützen. In the 1610s he was promoted to Royal Librarian, and in 1630 was appointed *Antiquarius regni* in recognition of his contributions as an historian.²

Today Bureus is best known as an exponent of the patriotic view of history known as “Gothicism.” As early as 1434, Bishop Nicolaus Ragvaldi (c. 1380–1448) had claimed that Sweden constituted the very cradle of European culture, since virtually all the peoples of Europe—the Huns, the Wends, the Lombards, and the Saxons—were descendants of the ancient Goths of Scandinavia. A century later, Archbishop Johannes Magnus (1488–1544) traced the birth of the Swedish nation to the biblical Magog, grandson of Noah, who had disembarked in the Stockholm archipelago exactly eighty-eight years after the Flood. According to Magnus, this very first kingdom of Europe had swiftly

¹) Linköpings stiftsbibliotek, MS N24 [hereafter referred to as N24], 12r: “Comebure säia owennerna När Jesus seger Kom Bure.”

²) The best and most comprehensive treatment of Bureus' life and work is still Sten Lindroth, *Paracelsismen i Sverige till 1600-talets mitt* (Uppsala, 1943), 82–252. More recently, Susanna Åkerman has discussed the esoteric aspects of Bureus' work, most comprehensively in her *Rose Cross over the Baltic: The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden, 1998). However, though Åkerman relies heavily on Lindroth's earlier work, it should be noted that she is sometimes less than careful when handling the primary sources. A similar critique can be raised against Thomas Karlsson, *Adulruna und die gothische Kabbala* (Rudolstadt, 2007) and idem, *Götisk kabbala och runisk alkemi: Johannes Bureus och den götiska esoterismen* (Stockholm, 2009).

flourished into a magnificent civilization, unparalleled in the history of mankind, until—in the year 836 *post diluvium*—King Magog's descendants set out on a triumphant military expedition, conquering large parts of Europe and bringing the virtues of Gothic high culture to the primitive peoples of the Continent.³

Needless to say, the idea of the ancient Goths as the original rulers of Europe, from Italy and Spain in the south to England in the north, lent a certain lustre to Sweden's political pretensions, and the Gothic theory was to remain the officially endorsed version of Sweden's history until well into the eighteenth century.

Equally evident is that Bureus' prominent position in the court owed much to his defence of these ideas. Influenced by the Renaissance notion of a *prisca theologia*, or “ancient theology,” he claimed that the entire classical heritage of philosophy and mythology originally stemmed from the Goths, for it was the Goths who had taught the Greeks and the Romans all the arts and sciences. Indeed, in philosophy the ancient Goths had surpassed all the pagan peoples, since they had been in possession of a knowledge stemming directly from Noah's descendants; a reflection of the wisdom revealed by God to Adam at the beginning of time.⁴

The idea of the Goths as keepers of an ancient, ultimately divine wisdom was intimately tied to Bureus' theory that the old Scandinavian alphabet, the runes, constituted a sacred form of writing. As early as 1603, he claimed that the runic characters had “double” meanings,

³ Whereas there is a fairly large body of research on early modern “Gothicism” available in Swedish, the literature is decidedly sparse in other languages. For useful overviews, see Kristoffer Neville, “Gothicism and Early Modern Historical Ethnography,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 70 (2009), 213–34; Kurt Johannesson, *The Renaissance of the Goths in Sixteenth-Century Sweden: Johannes and Olaus Magnus as Politicians and Historians* (Berkeley, CA, 1991); Andreas Zellhuber, *Der gotische Weg in den Deutschen Krieg: Gustav Adolf und der schwedische Gotizismus* (Augsburg, 2002); and, in particular, Inken Schmidt-Voges, *De antiqua claritate et clara antiquitate Gothorum: Gotizismus als Identitätsmodell im frühneuzeitlichen Schweden* (Frankfurt am Main, 2004).

⁴ This idea recurs throughout his remaining papers, but is most comprehensively treated in his *Adulruna Rediviva seu Sapientia Sveorum Veterum*, of which six different manuscript versions are extant. See, for instance, Stockholm, Kungl. Biblioteket, MS Rål. 9, 8°, 9r–27r.

carrying veiled and “secret” significances hidden beneath their conventional meanings as letters of the alphabet. The runes, he stated, constituted a symbolic language, similar to—but also more ancient than—the Hebrew Cabala and Egyptian hieroglyphs, into which the ancient Goths had poured their vast knowledge, keeping it intact for future generations.⁵

Though Bureus spent almost fifty years trying to restore this ancient wisdom to its original perfection, little of his work was ever published. To some extent, however, the ideas underpinning his theories can be reconstructed by means of his personal notebooks and diaries. In these, he not only jotted down his own thoughts and ideas, but also compiled extensive excerpts from the literary sources he drew upon to bolster his theories. Somewhat surprisingly, a vast majority of these textual sources were a product of the Renaissance Neoplatonic revival. By the time Bureus compiled these notes, the ideas of Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, and Agrippa had not yet had any discernable influence on the scholarly debate in Sweden and few, if any, of his fellow countrymen could claim more than a basic knowledge of Neoplatonic philosophy. Bureus’ close reading of these authors made him virtually unique in early seventeenth-century Sweden.⁶

Bureus’ excerpts also reveal an unusual familiarity with alchemical literature, not least with literature belonging to the Paracelsian corpus. Though alchemy and iatrochemistry were certainly discussed and to some extent practised in early modern Sweden, there are few traces of Paracelsian influences in Swedish sources before the 1630s. This meagre interest in Paracelsian philosophy certainly differentiated Sweden from other European countries, including neighbouring Denmark, where the publication of Petrus Severinus’ *Idea medicinae philosophicae* in 1571 had done much to promote Paracelsian ideas in academic circles.⁷ In Sweden, however, scholarly life had suffered a serious blow when Uppsala University—the sole university in the country—was closed

⁵ Stockholm, Kungl. Biblioteket, MS F.a.14, 25–26.

⁶ The most comprehensive collection of excerpts can be found in Linköpings stiftsbibliotek, MS N24, in which the vast majority of notes are dated to 1609–1612, a period coinciding with Bureus’ promotion to Royal Librarian.

⁷ Jole Shackelford, *A Philosophical Path for Paracelsian Medicine: The Ideas, Intellectual Context, and Influence of Petrus Severinus (1540/2–1602)* (Copenhagen, 2004).

down in 1515, owing to political and religious conflicts. Though the university finally reopened in 1595, when Bureus was enlisted among its first 64 students, it would take several decades before Sweden was on a par with the rest of Europe.⁸

Bureus was thus one of the first Swedish scholars to show a serious interest in Neoplatonic and Paracelsian ideas, and in the following I shall focus on his notions of alchemy. It should be borne in mind, however, that none of Bureus' texts were devoted strictly to alchemy, and that the significance he attributed to the discipline has to be deduced from his unpublished notebooks and excerpts. Hence, all interpretations are necessarily tentative.

Bureus the Alchemist: “Practical” or “Spiritual” Alchemy?

Bureus' interest in alchemy is evident throughout his remaining papers. As early as 1604 he made references to “alchimica”⁹ in his diaries, and in his notebooks he carefully noted key ideas and concepts from the alchemical texts he studied, stretching from medieval classics like the *Aurora consurgens* and *Turba philosophorum* to the fashionable works of Paracelsus, Gerhard Dorn, and Andreas Libavius. Quite often he also tried to recreate the experiments described in this literature, though not always with success—“Great lie,” he once exclaimed in the margin of Pseudo-Lull's *Testamentum novissimum*, in reference to a complicated process involving pulverized sulphur and mercury.¹⁰ Other experiments succeeded, and it seems he even demonstrated some of them at the court. Next to a passage in Paracelsus' *De renovatione et restauratione*, which describes how to make the incorporeal image of an herb appear inside a glass vessel by extracting the *primum ens* or quintessence of the herb from the earth, Bureus excitedly noted, “Mirum vidit Rex Gustav Adolf”—“King Gustavus Adolphus saw the miracle.”¹¹ In 1612, he

⁸) On the early history of Uppsala University, see Claes Annerstedt, *Uppsala universitets historia*, vol. 1: 1477–1654 (Uppsala, 1877).

⁹) Stockholm, Kungl. Biblioteket, MS F.a.2, 8r.

¹⁰) (Ps.) Lull, “Testamentum novissimum,” in *Libelli aliquot chemici* (Basle, 1572) (Uppsala University Library, shelfmark 1930/1718), 1–174, at 78: “stohr lögn.”

¹¹) Paracelsus, *Archidoxorum de secretis naturae mysteriis libri decem* (Basle, 1570) (Uppsala University Library, shelfmark Oo 454), 41.

claimed to have produced a noble “tincture of metals” using Libavius’ *Alchemia* (1597) as his guide, and as late as 1633, he carefully noted his expenses for various glassware and chemical vessels.¹²

And yet, for all his down-to-earth experimentalism, Bureus viewed alchemy as something much more than a simple craft. In fact, very few of Bureus’ notes deal with the common chrysopoetic form of alchemy, aimed at transmuting base metals into gold. Instead, the vast majority suggest that he viewed alchemy as a science capable of revealing the mysteries of God’s Creation, and even of transforming the alchemist himself into an almost godlike being. He accordingly took extensive notes from the Flemish physician Gerhard Dorn (ca. 1530–1584), who described the Philosophers’ Stone as a gift of God, possessing the power to exalt the soul of man to a holy state.¹³ Many notes also suggest that he viewed the alchemical transmutation of matter and the human soul’s ascent toward God as two parallel and intimately linked processes. So, for instance, he repeatedly juxtaposed the different stages in the alchemical process, stretching from *calcinatio* to *tinctura*, with a “runic progression” of his own invention, symbolizing the soul’s ascent into a divine state of comprehension (fig. 2).¹⁴ As Bureus put it, the runic alphabet constituted a “Gothic Cabala,” having the power to raise the mind to a comprehension of the divinity. Quoting verbatim from Johannes Reuchlin’s *De arte cabalistica* (1517), he described this “Cabala Gothorum” as a “symbolic theology,” in which the runic letters were signs of

¹² N24, 75r: “Tinctura producta est, quae a centro ad superficiem producitur et extrahitur, inveni 12 merid. 22 Feb 1612. Nobilissimae hic sunt tincturae metallorum.” The list of purchased equipment is now at Linköpings stiftsbibliotek, MS N25, unpaginated last leaf.

¹³ N24, 81v: “Effectus lapidis. Quisquis hoc unicum unitumque medicamentum propter quod Chemia solum a Deo concessa fuit hominibus, assequitur, syncerum intellectum, non perturbatam mentem, sed memoriam integram, per illud sibi (Deo dante) resuscitare poterit, ac ad hunc utique disponi modum in honestam Deo placentem vitam et conversationem,” based on Dorn’s *Congeries Paracelsicae chemiae* (Basle, 1581), A3v. On Dorn’s alchemical views, see also Jean-François Marquet, “Philosophie et alchimie chez Gerard Dorn,” in Jean-Claude Margolin and Sylvain Matton, eds., *Alchimie et philosophie à la Renaissance* (Paris, 1993), 215–21.

¹⁴ N24, 72v–74r, 77v, quoting various passages from Dorn’s *Congeries Paracelsicae chemiae* (Basle, 1581), and 85v, 190r, quoting from Dorn’s *Clavis totius philosophiae chymisticae* (Frankfurt, 1583).

divine secrets, leading the one who could fathom their full meaning to a union with the ultimate godhead, the *principium absolutis entis*.¹⁵ The overall impression when leafing through Bureus' notes is that he viewed the knowledge of alchemy as essential to the attainment of this cabalistic ascent of the soul, an impression reinforced by his remark to a passage describing how the exalted soul of Moses had risen through forty-nine of the fifty "gates of understanding." According to Reuchlin, Moses had not been let through the very last, fiftieth gate, thereby preventing him from beholding God "face to face," because this last gate was either identical to the "making of life" or to the "essence of God"—to which Bureus bluntly added, "Alchimia, too."¹⁶

Bureus' notes raise a number of questions about the relationship between the "practical" and "spiritual" dimensions of early modern alchemy, a relationship that has been under considerable debate in recent years. In an important essay, Lawrence Principe and William Newman have persuasively contested the prevailing idea of alchemy as an essentially "spiritual" or "mystical" discipline. The allegorical and religious language of many alchemical texts has led numerous historians to conclude that "the operations recorded in alchemical texts corresponded only tangentially or not at all to physical processes." Instead, alchemical texts are often interpreted as veiled expressions of the moral and religious transformation of the human soul, fostering the idea that alchemy was "an art of internal meditation or illumination rather than an external manipulation of apparatus and chemicals."¹⁷

¹⁵ N24, 47r–48r, quoting and glossing Reuchlin, *De arte cabalistica* (Hagenau, 1517), 52r, 21v.

¹⁶ N24, 46v, quoting and glossing Reuchlin, *De arte cabalistica*, 53r: "indumentum Dei transcendere ac faciem eius videre nequires, recte dicetur ex 50 portis intelligentiae una carere. Som är vivificatio men han mener Essentiam Dei & mundum incomparabilem. Alchimia också."

¹⁷ Lawrence M. Principe and William R. Newman, "Some Problems with the Historiography of Alchemy," in William R. Newman and Anthony Grafton, eds., *Secrets of Nature: Astrology and Alchemy in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 2001), 385–431, at 388. It should, of course, be noted that Principe and Newman were by no means the first historians to critique this view. Their far-reaching refutation, however, has had a more profound effect on the historiography of alchemy than any of their precursors'.

Principe and Newman are undoubtedly correct when claiming that this idea—one of the “myopic stereotypes that have come to dominate the historical study of the occult sciences,” as they put it in a different context¹⁸—has resulted in a lopsided picture of early modern alchemy. Equally misleading, however, would be to treat the practical and spiritual dimensions as two mutually exclusive ways of “doing alchemy.” Given Bureus’ engagement in practical alchemy, he clearly did not regard alchemy as an exclusively “spiritual” discipline. For him, alchemy was as much a practical art as a contemplative means of deifying the soul: a philosophical and devotional *craft*, capable of raising man to a comprehension of the divine mysteries of creation. In the following sections I shall outline the intellectual framework of Bureus’ work, showing how he used a variety of sources to bolster this idea of “practical” and “spiritual” alchemy—and, by extension, of natural philosophy and theology—as intimately related and interdependent realms of knowledge.

The Ancient Wisdom of the Goths

As already noted, Bureus was as early as 1603 convinced that the runic alphabet constituted a form of Cabala, in which some of the letters carried “secret” and “hieroglyphic” significances. These characters he called “adelrunor” or “noble runes,” from the Swedish words “adel,” meaning noble, and “runa,” which he believed to stem from the Swedish word “röna,” meaning to receive or experience something. Somewhat surprisingly, he also suggested that the term *alchimia* was closely related to the word *adelruna*: “Alchimia may also be called *adelruna*, since it discloses the nobility of all mundane or natural things.” To this he added the clarifying definition, “Adel-runar is that which receives [röner] and reveals [röjer] everything that is noble [ädel].”¹⁹ He also suggested that the term *alchimia* was originally derived from the supposedly ancient Swedish word “adel-kyn-maija,” roughly translatable as “the noble power of nature.” According to his notes, the word “kyn”

¹⁸) Grafton and Newman, “Introduction,” in *Secrets of Nature*, 30.

¹⁹) N24, 36v: “Alchimia kan ock kallas adelruna quia experitur nobilitatem rerum mundanarum seu naturalium. Adhel-runar som röner och röjer alt det ädhelt är.”

was an ancient form of the Swedish “kön,” meaning gender or nature (in his Latin notes variously rendered as *natura*, *species* or *sexus*), whereas the word “maija,” from which the Latin *magia* was derived, supposedly meant “power” or *virtus* in the old Gothic language.²⁰ Bureus’ etymological exercises may have been overly imaginative, but they also highlight the fact that Bureus regarded alchemy and the Gothic Cabala as intimately related, both being arts of truly ancient origin. Indeed, when compiling a list of different names attributed to the Philosophers’ Stone throughout the ages—from the “Crater et Unitas” of Hermes Trismegistos to the “Margarita gloriosissima” of Arnaldus de Villanova—he also chose to include “Adelruna” among them.²¹

Bureus’ ideas were to a large extent bolstered by his Gothic interpretation of history. As he was well aware, a number of early modern scholars had explicitly situated alchemy in the historical context of a *prisca theologia*, a move that enabled him to forge a link between alchemy and the Scandinavian runes. So, for instance, Bureus collected extensive excerpts from the *Congeries Paracelsicae chemiae* (1581) of the Belgian physician and alchemist Gerhard Dorn, one of the foremost popularisers of Paracelsus’ works. He devoted particular attention to Dorn’s account of how Adam, infused by the light of God, had invented all the arts and sciences. To make sure that this divine wisdom remained intact for future generations, his sons had engraved two tablets of stone, describing “all natural arts in hieroglyphical characters.” After the Flood, one of these tablets was found on Mount Ararat by Noah, who passed the knowledge on to his descendants. From them it later spread to Chaldea, Persia and Egypt, where it flourished under the divine supervision of Hermes Trismegistos. In the course of time, however, the “universal knowledge” of Adam gradually deteriorated and fragmented into different disciplines, so that “one man became an astronomer, another magician, a third cabalist, and a fourth an alchemist.”²²

²⁰) N24, 36v, 133v, 164r.

²¹) N24, 143v.

²²) Dorn, *Congeries*, 154–155, quoted *in extenso* in N24, 79r. Dorn’s account of the *prisca* tradition in the *Congeries* was to a large extent based on the pseudo-Paracelsian *Aurora philosophorum*, which he had translated and published some years earlier. For valuable discussions, see Philipp Redl, “*Aurora Philosophorum*,” *Daphnis*, 37 (2008), 689–712, and Didier Kahn, “Le début de Gérard Dorn d’après le manuscrit autographe

Dorn's exposition of the *prisca* tradition was hardly original, and similar accounts can be found in a number of early modern works. Even the idea of the two stone tablets—the legendary “pillars of Seth”—was a commonplace notion, tracing its origin to the *Jewish Antiquities* of Josephus. For Bureus, however, Dorn's account was significant in that it identified Noah as the discoverer of the tablets, thereby forging a solid connection between the wisdom of Adam and the ancient Goths. If the Goths were the direct descendants of Noah's grandson Magog, as a number of Scandinavian scholars claimed, it seemed quite possible that Magog had brought the wisdom of Adam—original, undivided, and untainted—to Sweden shortly after the Flood. Next to Dorn's account of how Adam's “universal knowledge” had been engraved in “hieroglyphic characters,” he noted: “And the runes, too, are universal, so that all the *artes* are contained therein.”²³

Though the idea of an ancient wisdom or *prisca theologia* was common in the Renaissance, the extent of its influence on the practices and aims of early modern scholarship is not always recognized. First, it played an important role in fostering a syncretistic approach to textual interpretation. Since all knowledge was believed to stem from one and the same source, conflicting accounts could be interpreted as reconcilable in meaning, if not in terminology. (Pico nicely exemplified this viewpoint when claiming that there was nothing that Aristotle and Plato did not agree on “in meaning and substance [*in sensu et re*], although in their words they seem to disagree.”)²⁴ Second, the idea of an ancient wisdom tended to pre-empt the concept of scientific progress (in the modern sense) of meaning by laying emphasis on the continuity and unity of knowledge. Truth was not attained by proving one's predecessors wrong, but by restoring the lost unity of their views. This unity of knowledge, moreover, not only implied that contesting philosophical traditions could be harmonized and reconciled, but also that the divi-

de sa *Clavis totius Philosophiae Chymisticae* (1565),” in Joachim Telle, ed., *Analecta Paracelsica: Studien zum Nachleben Theophrast von Hohenheims im deutschen Kulturgebiet der frühen Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 1994), 59–126, esp. 107–16.

²³) N24, 79r: “Så är Runorne och Universales, Så att alle artes äre der inne.”

²⁴) Pico della Mirandola, *Conclusiones*, “Conclusiones paradoxe numero XVII secundum propriam opinionem,” no. 1, in S.A. Farmer, ed. and trans., *Syncretism in the West: Pico's 900 Theses* (Tempe, AZ, 1998), 364–65.

sion of knowledge into separate and independent disciplines was an artificial construction, a symptom of the general decline of knowledge since the time of the ancient sages.

The narrative of ancient wisdom thus had a considerable impact on how the relations between different disciplines were construed and defined. When reading Dorn's account, Bureus clearly envisioned the runic alphabet as a symbolic representation of Adam's divine knowledge, containing not only the secrets of alchemy but also of astronomy, magic, and the Cabala—sciences that were not merely related, but constituted different facets of the one and only “Ur-science,” the Adamic wisdom. Next to his quotation of Dorn's account, Bureus even tried to represent this idea graphically by sketching a fictive coat of arms, representing the “universal knowledge” of Adam, in which the different scientific disciplines were symmetrically arranged in interrelated circles.²⁵

Interestingly, Bureus also juxtaposed Dorn's account with Pico della Mirandola's similar account of the *prisca* tradition in his famous *Oratio*, where Pico singled out “Xalmosis, whom Abaris the Hyperborean imitated,” as one of the first practitioners of natural magic. Unlike Dorn, Pico made no reference to alchemy in his account of ancient wisdom. He did, however, describe Xalmosis' magic as a “medicine of the soul, by which temperance is obtained for the soul, just as health is obtained for the body,” prompting Bureus to speculate whether the magic of Xalmosis had in fact been a form of alchemy that had granted him access to the Philosophers' Stone.²⁶

The mythical Xalmosis—or Zamolxis as Bureus preferred to spell his name—was attributed an important role in Bureus' Gothic historiography. Though originally described as a disciple of Pythagoras by Herodotus and Plato, he was later described as the erudite king and demigod of the ancient Goths in the well-known *Getica* of Jordanes. The *Getica* was also one of the sources that inspired Bureus to identify the legendary Hyperboreans—the mythic lands in the far north—with

²⁵) N24, 79r.

²⁶) Pico della Mirandola, *Opera* (Strasbourg, 1504), 89r: “Respondebit in Charmide magiam Xalmosidis esse animi medicinam, per quam scilicet animo temperantia, ut per illam corpori sanitas comparatur.” Bureus quoted Pico's account *in extenso* in N24, 71r–v, under the heading “De Zamolxidis magia,” next to which he remarked “Och han hadhe Lap. filos. [...] därföre at hans incantationes ginge in på läkedomar.”

the Scandinavian peninsula, prompting him to single out Zamolxis and his disciple “Abaris the Hyperborean” as the two foremost of the ancient Gothic sages.²⁷ Indeed, according to Bureus it had been the Swede Abaris who had taught Pythagoras all the secrets of philosophy, thereby passing the wisdom of the Scandinavians on to the Greeks. Wisest among the Goths, however, had undoubtedly been the venerable Zamolxis, whom Bureus described as the keeper of the secrets of the *adelrunas*, a master of the magical arts, and a true “theosopher,” whose mind had ascended toward heaven and eventually united with God.²⁸

Though Bureus’ sketchy notes do not allow us to reconstruct his version of the *prisca* tradition in detail, this historiographic framework clearly served an important function in bolstering his idea of the runic characters as receptacles of an original, undivided, ultimately divine and complete knowledge of the world. Accordingly, Bureus devoted much attention to the idea that alchemy was closely related to both cabala and magic (a common idea in Paracelsian philosophy), trying to demonstrate how the main principles of these disciplines could all be represented by the same runic symbols. So, for instance, he quoted Dorn’s definition of magic as an art “whereby the elementary bodies, their fruits, properties, virtues, and hidden operations are comprehended,” suggesting that knowledge of this art was vital to master the “magical separation” of the elements when preparing the Philosophers’ Stone.²⁹ Similarly, he defined Cabala as an art showing man the way to God—again quoting Dorn—while simultaneously suggesting that the soul’s ascent was to some extent achieved by magical means, since it depended on “the marriage of the celestial powers and properties with the elementary bodies.”³⁰

²⁷) N24, 99v–100r, 138r, 185r.

²⁸) N24, 71r, 101r, 132r–v, 159v.

²⁹) N24, 77v and 79r, quoting and glossing Dorn, *Congeries*, 65 and 161: “Magia est ars et facultas per quam, ad elementorum, corporum et fructuum suorum, proprietatum, virium, et abstrusarum operationum cognitionem pervenitur.”

³⁰) N24, 79v–80r, quoting and glossing Dorn, *Congeries*, 162: “... coniugium virium et proprietatum coelestium cum elementaribus corporis ...” In the margin, Bureus represented this “marriage” of the heavenly and terrestrial realms with the same runic progression he used to represent the different stages in the alchemical transmutation of matter, and the mind’s ascent toward God.

Bureus' insistence on the close affinity of alchemy to magic and the Cabala cannot be solely explained by his reading of Dorn, however. In the following sections I will try to show how this idea was dependent on the larger philosophical context of Bureus' alchemical views, a context primarily derived from the Neoplatonic philosophy of Pico della Mirandola and his followers.

The Philosophical Context: Pico on Man, Nature and Scripture

Among the most frequently quoted sources in Bureus' notebooks are Pico della Mirandola's *Oratio de hominis dignitate*, *Conclusiones*, and *Heptaplus*, all instrumental in stimulating the Neoplatonic revival in the sixteenth century.³¹ The *Oratio* in particular seems to have captivated Bureus, who carefully transcribed Pico's famous account of man as a "great wonder," having the ability to leave his humanity behind in a flight towards union with the divine. As is well known, Pico described man's transformation into a god-like being as the ultimate goal of philosophy: by cultivating his intellect, man had the ability to raise his divine and immortal soul toward God until he became "a divinity clothed with human flesh."³²

Pico's formulation of these views owed much to his reading of late ancient pagan sources like Plotinus and Iamblichus, as well as to his growing interest in the Hebrew Cabala. Equally important, however, was the commonplace Christian notion of man as an *imago Dei*, carrying a reflection of God's wisdom within himself, buried in the recesses of his soul. As Pico emphasized, "he who knows himself, knows all things in himself," for just as God "assembles and unites" everything in the cosmos, so man encompasses "all the natures of the world" within his soul, a notion that Bureus repeatedly echoed in his notebooks.³³

³¹) Bureus, N24, 49v, 51v, 58r-59v, 66v, 70v-72r, 74r, 150v, 157r.

³²) For the sake of convenience, I here follow the translation of C.G. Wallis, in Pico della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man, On Being and the One, & Heptaplus* (Indianapolis and New York, 1965), 3-6. Cf. N24, 58v and 66v, where Bureus quotes these passages *in extenso*.

³³) Pico della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man*, 15, 135. Bureus transcribed both passages in N24, 58v and 70v.

Yet Pico did not imply that true knowledge could be attained simply by an act of introspective contemplation. Rather, it had to be acquired gradually by ascending through a hierarchy of disciplines, in which knowledge of the soul merely constituted the first step. Since man reflected within himself everything existing in the world, Pico wrote, self-knowledge “arouses us and urges us towards the knowledge of all nature”—that is, to engage in natural philosophy. And by practicing natural philosophy we might in turn be raised to the queen of sciences—theology—ultimately leading us to a state of divine *felicitas*, in which we are literally deified and our souls united with God.³⁴

Needless to say, Pico’s insistence that knowledge of nature ultimately led to a knowledge of God was far from original. The idea of natural philosophy as the “handmaiden of theology” had been commonplace since the early Middle Ages, based on the notion of nature as God’s creation, manifesting His wisdom in material form. But Pico’s dependence on Neoplatonic philosophy also urged him to develop this idea further in a way that significantly strengthened the ties between philosophy and theology. In Pico’s view, natural philosophy did not merely play a supporting role as a morally and religiously edifying body of knowledge, filling us with wonder at the powers of God. Instead, he suggested that knowledge of natural philosophy served as an indispensable preparation for engaging in theology, necessary to unlock the true meaning of scripture.

This idea was ultimately dependent on Pico’s view of Biblical exegesis, most clearly expressed in his famous commentary on the creation narrative of Genesis 1, the *Heptaplus*. In this work, Pico diverged from the mainstream theory of biblical interpretation based on the notion that scripture contained four different levels of meaning (literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical). Instead, he advocated a theory of allegory based on the hierarchical structure of the cosmos itself. Like most early modern scholars, Pico viewed the universe as consisting of separate but interrelated realms or spheres—terrestrial, celestial, and angelic—all

³⁴) Pico della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man*, 14–15. Cf. N24, 59v, where Bureus quotes Pico’s *Conclusiones*, “Conclusiones secundum Plotinum,” no. 7, on the notion of *felicitas* as the state when man’s intellect is united with “the total and first intellect”: “Foelicitas hominis ultima est cum particularis intellectus noster totali primoque intellectui plene coniungitur,” in Farmer, ed., *Syncretism in the West*, 298; 299.

“bound together both by a certain harmonious kinship of nature and by a regular series of ranks.” As Pico emphasized, this cosmological scheme implied a close correspondence between the different levels in the hierarchy of being. “Whatever is in the lower world is also in the higher ones, but of a better stamp,” he wrote; “likewise, whatever is in the higher ones is also seen in the lowest, but in a degenerate and adulterated condition.” As a consequence, the cosmos was, in the fullest sense of the word, *symbolically* structured—and from this principle, he claimed, flowed “the science of all allegorical interpretation.” When Moses described divine entities “figuratively now as stars, now as wheels and animals, now as elements” in the Bible, he had merely made use of the natural correspondences between the different spheres of creation, implying that the scriptures contained an “exact image of the world.”³⁵

Bureus’ extensive notes from the *Heptaplus* suggest that Pico’s theory played an important role in shaping his view of the relation between theology and natural philosophy. So, for instance, he devoted much attention to Pico’s idea that the Biblical account of Moses’ tabernacle could be read allegorically as a description of the tripartite structure of the universe—an idea that some decades later formed the basis of his attempt to formulate a “Mosaic physics,” grounded solely on scriptural authority. Arguing that the “architecture of the world” had been reflected in the “tabernacle of Moses (and the Temple of Solomon),” Bureus gave a detailed account of the measures given by Moses, claiming that these “sacred” numbers constituted a blueprint of the cosmos.³⁶

³⁵ Pico della Mirandola, “Heptaplus,” trans. D. Carmichael, in *On the Dignity of Man*, 77–79. For a comprehensive discussion of Pico’s theory of allegory, see Crofton Black’s seminal study *Pico’s Heptaplus and Biblical Hermeneutics* (Leiden, 2006).

³⁶ Bureus’ draft for a “Mosaic” natural philosophy is now at Linköpings stiftsbibliotek, MS Spr. 1; see esp. part I, 29–37. The quoted passage can be found on p. 29: “Nu wil man korteligen til ett beslut, taga den samma Skipelsen eller Dispositionem Mundi, Werldenes Bygning, utaf Mosis Tiäll (och Salomons kyrkia,) hwilka Gud siälf kallar för sin helgedom han bor uthi, efter som de der om hafwa haft hwar sijn eftersijn som de af Gudhi haft.” Cf. N24, 53v, 58r–59r, 72r, 150v. The idea that natural philosophy should be grounded on scriptural authority rather than pagan opinion was quite common in the early modern era, not least in Lutheran circles. For an informative discussion, see Ann Blair, “Mosaic Physics and the Search for a Pious Natural Philosophy in the Late Renaissance,” *Isis*, 91 (2000), 32–58.

Equally important for Bureus, however, seems to have been the general argument of the *Heptaplus*: that scripture reflected the order of the universe, implying that natural philosophy and theology, the study of nature and the study of scripture, were closely interdependent. For it was ultimately this idea that provided the basis for Bureus' belief that the adelfrunes, his Gothic Cabala, contained a truly all-encompassing knowledge, comprising the principles of natural philosophy as well as of theology. In his notes, Bureus carefully summarised Pico's argument that God had handed down two different teachings to Moses: one was the written law (that is, the Pentateuch) using a literal language to describe historical events; the other was the science of the Cabala, a "true exposition" of the biblical text, explaining the spiritual mysteries hidden underneath the surface of the words. As Pico emphasized, it was this "spiritual" interpretation of the Bible that revealed the powers of the superlunary realm, implying that the Cabala could also be defined as a form of "natural magic."³⁷ In his commentaries to these passages, Bureus explicitly stated that Pico's distinction between the literal and spiritual senses of the biblical text corresponded to the distinction between the conventional runes, used as letters of the alphabet, and the secret adelfrunes, containing the secrets of the natural and supranatural worlds: "This distinction between literal and spiritual ... is also the distinction between Runa and Adelfruna."³⁸ In effect, Bureus equated the Gothic adelfrunes with the biblical text: like the Pentateuch, the adelfrunes constituted a "true" representation of God's wisdom—indeed, a more ancient and hence less corrupted representation than the writings of Moses. The ancient adelfrunes were, in other words, not merely conventional symbols, but means by which the hidden mysteries of the cosmos could be grasped and comprehended. As he put it, the adelfrunes constituted "the most perfect method for all sciences," revealing the secrets of the natural as well as the divine realm.³⁹

³⁷ N24, 59r, quoting Pico's *Apologia*, in Pico della Mirandola, *Opera omnia* (Basle, 1557), 180–81: "Aliam quae est virtutibus rerum superiorum, quae sunt supralunum, et est pars Magiae naturalis suprema."

³⁸ N24, 59r: "Sådana åtskillnat som är emellan Literalem et Spiritalem, Legis literalem sensus och spiritalem cabalam (vide Pico Mirand. in Apologia) ... sådana är mellan Runa och Adelfruna."

³⁹ N24, 73r: "Ty at den är Perfectissima ad omnes scientias methodus som Alpha-

Admittedly, it is not always easy to discern Bureus' own "voice" in his jumble of excerpts, glosses and commentaries—if indeed he can be claimed to have had a voice of his own. As a true syncretist, he was clearly not interested in contributing to the philosophical discussion per se. Instead, he devoted all his energy to finding correspondences between different textual sources and the adelfrunes—his only original idea being that these graphical symbols reflected and contained the ancient wisdom that Pico and his followers had begun to uncover. Time and again, he juxtaposed his quotes from Pico with sketches of runes, suggesting, for instance, that the threefold nature of the universe and of man was symbolized by the rune named "Kön" (gender), made up of three straight lines in the shape of a Y.⁴⁰ Likewise, when Pico in the *Heptaplus* described heaven and the soul as circles, Bureus complemented the quotes with sketches of the runes named "Thors" (representing man) and "Byrghal" (representing God), showing how both could be derived from intersecting circles.⁴¹ And when these two runes were superimposed upon each other, they formed a symbol of man's "heavenly ascent toward the highest seat of salvation," or what Pico had called the state of divine *felicitas*.⁴²

Pico, of course, did not say a word about alchemy in the texts that Bureus studied. What he provided was the general philosophical framework for Bureus' ideas, in particular the notion that true knowledge was attained through a gradual ascent through a hierarchy of sciences, reflecting the structure of the cosmos, and culminating in the literal deification of the soul. Pico was decidedly vague, however, when describing how the different arts and sciences related to one another. In the *Oratio*, for instance, he merely singled out natural magic as the "absolute consummation of the philosophy of nature," preparing the

bethum och bör wara—Adelfrunae generalitas." Cf. 79r: "Så är Runorne och Universales, Så att alle artes äre der inne."

⁴⁰ N24, 53v and 70v, quoting various passages from Pico's *Heptaplus*, *Oratio* and *Conclusiones*.

⁴¹ N24, 58r, glossing Pico della Mirandola, *Heptaplus*, 118–119. Cf. N24, 55r–57v, where Bureus demonstrates the geometrical principles of the adelfrunes.

⁴² Bureus, Rål. 9, 8°, 67–68: "[man's] himlafärd ... til däd högsta frälse säter"; cf. N24, 59v for his explicit reference to Pico's concept of *felicitas* in connection with the adelfrunes.

philosopher for engagement with the Cabala, which he—like Bureus—described as an all-encompassing science, containing “an ineffable theology ... an exact metaphysics and a most sure philosophy of natural things.”⁴³ But Pico’s scheme had also been developed in another, more recent work that caught Bureus’ attention: the *Amphitheatrum sapientiae aeternae* of Heinrich Khunrath (1560–1605).

Khunrath and the Hierarchy of Sciences

Khunrath’s work seems to have had a tremendous impact on Bureus. No single work is quoted as frequently in his notebooks as the *Amphitheatrum*, and though it was to provoke harsh responses from many theologians, Catholics and Lutherans alike, its enigmatic style and illustrations captivated Bureus. Filling his notebooks with excerpts, cross-references, and rough sketches of Khunrath’s mystifying emblems, Bureus clearly interpreted the *Amphitheatrum* as an elaboration of the Neoplatonic philosophy of Pico. Throughout the *Amphitheatrum*, Khunrath emphasized the close ties between natural philosophy and theology, stressing that the book of nature and the book of scripture must be studied conjointly and with equal fervour, “for the Book of Nature explains the Book of Sacrosanct Scripture, and vice versa.”⁴⁴ He also repeatedly stressed man’s status as an *imago Dei*, carrying a reflection of God within his divine soul. Indeed, man had the ability to “see

⁴³ Pico della Mirandola, *On the Dignity of Man*, 26, 31.

⁴⁴ Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum sapientiae aeternae* (Magdeburg, 1609), II: 58: “Liber enim Naturae explicat librum Ss^{ae} Scripturae: Et contra.” My reading of the *Amphitheatrum* is much indebted to Peter Forshaw’s groundbreaking work on Khunrath: Forshaw, “Alchemy in the Amphitheatre: Some Considerations of the Alchemical Content of the Engravings in Heinrich Khunrath’s Amphitheatre of Eternal Wisdom (1609),” in Jacob Wamberg, ed., *Art and Alchemy* (Copenhagen, 2006), 195–220; “Curious Knowledge and Wonder-working Wisdom in the Occult Works of Heinrich Khunrath,” in R.J.W. Evans and Alexander Marr, eds., *Curiosity and Wonder from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (London, 2007), 107–29; “Subliming Spirits: Physical-Chemistry and Theo-Alchemy in the Works of Heinrich Khunrath (1560–1605),” in Stanton J. Linden, ed., *Mystical Metal of Gold: Essays on Alchemy and Renaissance Culture* (New York, 2007), 255–75; “Vitriolic Reactions: Orthodox Responses to the Alchemical Exegesis of Genesis,” in Kevin Kileen and Peter Forshaw, eds., *The Word and the World: Biblical Exegesis and Early Modern Science* (Basingstoke, 2007), 111–36.

himself in God and God in himself, as in a mirror,” and the ultimate goal of all true philosophy was to close the remaining gap between man and God. By contemplating nature, scripture, and the human soul—the three gates to eternal wisdom, into which God’s Word had been engraved—the philosopher was able to elevate his mind and unite with his archetype, thereby transforming himself into “a human God or a Divine man.”⁴⁵

Like Pico, Khunrath viewed this deified state as attainable by gradually ascending through a hierarchy of sciences, from natural philosophy to theology. In contrast to Pico, however, Khunrath presented a detailed account of how to ascend “a mystical ladder of seven orthodox grades,” corresponding to seven separate arts.⁴⁶ As glossed by Bureus in his notebooks, the progression began with the study of physics, then progressed to medicine, alchemy, and natural magic. These four sciences all dealt with the natural realm, but from the study of natural magic the philosopher could progress to “hyperphysical magic” (defined as “pious and useful conversation ... with the good angels, God’s fiery ministers”), which took him into the realm of the supranatural. The study of *hyperphysico-magia*, in turn, prepared him for engaging in the Cabala, which ultimately took him to the pinnacle of the philosophical disciplines—*theosophia*. Significantly, Bureus once again tried to show how the ascent through these seven arts could be represented by the very same runic progression used to represent the seven stages in the alchemical transmutation of matter, suggesting that these processes somehow reflected one another (see figs. 1 and 2).⁴⁷

Perhaps the most significant aspect of this scheme is that alchemy is situated quite low in the hierarchy of sciences, emphasizing its status

⁴⁵ Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, II: 24, 109, 203; quoted in N24, 122v, 128v, 130r, 176r: “Mens inebriata Deo videt tanquam in speculo Deum in se et in Deo. [...] Sicuti homo, unitus DEO, ratione DEI fit quasi deus humanus, aut homo Divinus, h.e. DEIFICATUR, & propterea potest, quae vult; vult, autem, quae DEUS IPSE.”

⁴⁶ Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, I: 19, quoted in N24, 142v: “Prologus hic praesens SCALAE cuidam STUDII SAPIENTIAE verae, recteque PHILOSOPHANDI tationis, GRADUUM orthodoxorum SEPTEM mysticae assimilatur.”

⁴⁷ N24, especially 133v, 150r; quoting Khunrath’s *definitiones* in *Amphitheatrum*, II: 147 [mispaginated as 145]: “HYPERPHYSICOMAGEIA ... est cum Angelis bonis, flammeis DEI ministris ... pia & utilis conversatio.”

Similarly, he attributed to the Philosophers' Stone a range of powers that went far beyond the simple transmutation of base metals into gold, claiming that it had the power to cure sick animals, revive plants, heal all human maladies, stimulate man's innate genius, and enhance his memory.⁴⁹

As Peter Forshaw has emphasized, however, this should not be taken to imply that Khunrath viewed alchemy as a form of mysticism. Though he clearly saw the alchemical work "as an essential part of his religious activity," Khunrath did not suggest that man's spiritual transformation in itself constituted an alchemical process, or even that the transmutation of matter and the deification of man constituted two simultaneous and analogous processes.⁵⁰ In Khunrath's view the alchemical preparation of the Philosophers' Stone was very much a practical craft, dealing with material substances and physical processes, not a form of contemplative and introspective mysticism. What should be remembered, however, is that alchemy was a craft explicitly dealing with the vivifying principle of the universe. Even in the Middle Ages, the Philosophers' Stone was commonly attributed the power to rejuvenate man and heal the sick, an idea that gained further weight when Marsilio Ficino offhandedly identified the alchemical quintessence with the vital *spiritus* of the cosmos in his *De vita coelitus comparanda* (1489). Many early modern scholars, not least in Neoplatonic and Paracelsian circles, tended to view alchemy as the art of artificially isolating the vital principle of nature, the life-giving *spiritus mundi*, which permeated the entire cosmos and infused God's generative powers into all material entities.⁵¹ To a large extent, it was this "cosmic" character of the alchemical quintessence that gave the Philosophers' Stone such wide-ranging powers and made it so symbolically dense and multifaceted. Accord-

⁴⁹ Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, II: 204-206, and "Pyramid engraving" [unpaginated]: "ALCHYMIAE, Arti Artiu[m] cu[m] Antiquis[im]ae, Certae, sagiss[im]ae Sanctae (adeo etiam, ut, c[um] aliis & Thoma de Aquino attestat[um] te, homine[m] aut reperiatur Sa[n]ctu[m], aut reddat Sanctu[m]) Mirabilis & Mirificae."

⁵⁰ Forshaw, "Subliming Spirits," 262-65, at 264.

⁵¹ Marsilio Ficino, *Three Books on Life*, ed. and trans. Carol V. Kaske and John R. Clark (New York, 1989), III.3: 255-57. For a discussion of the influence of this idea, see Sylvain Matton, "Marsile Ficin et l'alchimie: sa position, son influence," in Margolin and Matton, eds., *Alchimie et philosophie*, 123-92.

ingly, Khunrath repeatedly alluded to the correspondence existing between the chemical *Lapis* and Christ, claiming that the Stone was the “type” (*typus*) of Christ and that the philosopher must “learn to read, see, touch [and] know the Messiah through [his] real type in the universal book of nature.”⁵² Such allusions were quite common in early modern alchemy, and although they are often interpreted as veiled references to the religious character of alchemy, it is more likely that they were borne out of the commonplace notion of the cosmos itself as symbolically structured. Simply put, the Philosophers’ Stone was not a spiritual entity, but the material manifestation of God’s life-giving power on earth; a physical and tangible object, having the power to “heal” and “perfect” matter, just as Christ had the power to heal the human soul spiritually.⁵³

Khunrath’s work lucidly illustrates how misleading the idea of alchemy as a spiritual enterprise can be if divorced from its proper historical and intellectual context. Within the philosophical framework that underlay his views, *all* the sciences were ultimately aimed towards man’s inner deification (or as Khunrath put it, man’s “reformation to his original archetype”).⁵⁴ In other words, alchemy was no more—and

⁵²) Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, II: 58: “... ut discerent legere, videre, tangere, cognoscere MASCHIAM typo reali in Libro Naturae Catholico...” Cf. N24, 127r and 151v, where Bureus summarizes this notion. The concept of *typus* was generally used in biblical exegesis when referring to the inherent correspondences between the Old and the New Testament; so, for instance, Adam could be described as the *typus* of Christ. But it could also refer to the analogical relation between the heavenly and earthly worlds, in the sense that the heavens were the exemplar or model of the material world. For a discussion of the concept, see *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (Stuttgart, 1972), 8: 246–59.

⁵³) It should be noted that these analogies can also be found in the medieval works of, for instance, Arnaldus de Villanova and John of Rupescissa. Hence, I do not claim that the Neoplatonic revival of the Renaissance was solely responsible for fostering the symbolic dimension of alchemy; however, due to the Neoplatonic revival, the religious symbolism was to gain a much more prominent role in early modern alchemy than it had had in the Middle Ages. For a valuable discussion of these ideas in late medieval alchemy, see Leah DeVun, *Prophecy, Alchemy, and the End of Time: John of Rupescissa in the Late Middle Ages* (New York, 2009).

⁵⁴) Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, II: 105; quoted in N24, 171v, 176r: “reformatio ad exemplar archetypi.”

no less—“religiously oriented” than any other scientific discipline in Khunrath’s scheme.

Though Bureus’ patchwork of quotes, glosses and cross-references leaves many questions unanswered, his notes strongly suggest that his views conformed to Khunrath’s, and that he too viewed the practical craft of alchemy as an essential means to reach the highest stage of knowledge. As he noted next to an excerpt on the preparation of the Philosophers’ Stone, this highest stage of knowledge was attained partly by divine grace, partly by engaging in the practical arts—and no art did Bureus practice as assiduously as alchemy.⁵⁵ In Khunrath’s work, this stage was defined as *theosophia*, an all-encompassing wisdom, comprising the knowledge of both nature and of scripture. As he put it, it was a “universal” form of theology—or “science of God”—studied “Biblically, Macrocosmically and Microcosmically,” revealing the “voice of God” in all and through all.⁵⁶ And in this quest, Bureus seems to have followed Khunrath’s advice to the letter. On the very last leaf of his notebook, he carefully wrote down the main “rules for theosophy”: how the true “theosopher” always rises before dawn; only eats half a meal a day; how he regularly prays before sunrise, at breakfast, at one o’clock, and before he goes to sleep—and, of course, how he contemplates the *Amphitheatrum* every day and learns Khunrath’s text by heart.⁵⁷ None of this mattered, however, if he did not devote himself to the study and practice of natural philosophy, including alchemy: not in its own right, but as one aspect of that vast world of knowledge he had to fathom in order to regain his original likeness to God.

⁵⁵) N24, 146r: “min mening: per gratia, per artem,” glossing Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, II: 192–94.

⁵⁶) Khunrath, *Amphitheatrum*, II: 147, quoted in N24, 150r: THEOSOPHIA est theologia, in ternario, (hoc est, Biblicè, Micro et Macrocosmicè) Catholica IEHOVAE Mirabilis mirifica ... VOX DEI in Omnibus, per Omnia, de Omnibus, ad Omnes.”

⁵⁷) N24, fol. 217v.