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IN AN article seeking to establish the bibliographical identity of Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen’s long-lost *Spiegel die niet vlyt*, I thought it possible to assert with assurance that the work had, in fact, been printed and that it contained but one sermon. In attempting to determine the printer and/or publisher (I knew it had been printed in Amsterdam), I believed it fair to conjecture that “it could well have been printed by Johannes Douci who later printed Frelinghuysen’s *Een bundelken leer-redden.*” The other likely candidate for printer would have been the pietistic Jacobus Borstius, son of the like-minded Gerardus Borstius. The Borstius family had not only printed such established authors as Nicolaus Lydius and Johannes d’Outrein but even such off-beat lay pietists as Jacob Ziegenmeyer and Nicolaus Simonsz van Leeuwaarden.

Although no copy of the *Spiegel* has yet appeared, some new information about the work has come to light. In a recently acquired copy of Jodocus van Lodenstein’s *Geestelyke opwekker* (Amsterdam, Johannes Douci, 1740), appears an enlightening four-page list of books from the shop of the brothers Adrianus and Johannes Douci. In addition to listing “Frilinghuysen Bundeltje H. Leerredenen,” the list includes his *Spiegel die niet vlyt*. It is clear then, that the Spiegel had been printed, or at least published, by the firm of Douci and was for sale in their shop alongside the old town-hall in Amsterdam.

The list also includes the information that the tract had been printed in an octavo format, similar to that of Frelinghuysen’s *Bundelken*. As binders often gathered together many such short tracts into one larger volume, a copy of the *Spiegel* may yet turn up in such an overlooked octavo tome.

In addition to the light shed upon printer and format, Douci’s list adds one further bit of evidence. Though such lists of “available

works” cannot be relied upon for the exact form of any title, as is clear from the variant form given Frelinghuysen’s other work, it does come closest on this title (*Spiegel die niet vlyt*) to the form given in the acts of the Classis of Amsterdam.

The list as a whole affords still other useful information, including as it does works by some of Frelinghuysen’s friends and other books known to have been in his library. In addition to the *Spiegel*, other books are included in this list which were once available but which are no longer to be found. The list interestingly reflects the pietistic theological tastes of the times and, in the absence of regular bibliographies, evidences the usefulness today of even such small pieces of scattered information. The wonder is, as one looks over the range of sources used to piece together the story of the *Spiegel*, that often the most useful information is found in the most unlikely places.