

A portrait of a man in 17th-century attire, likely a Dutch statesman or scholar, is the background of the page. He is wearing a dark, heavy coat with a large white collar and cuffs. His hair is long and dark, and he has a serious expression. The background is dark and indistinct.

# The echoes of the brothers De la Court in early eighteenth-century republican publications

*Verhandeling van de  
vryheid in den  
burgerstaet*

*Hollands Aeloude Vryheid,  
Buyten Het Stadhouderschap*

*Haec libertatis ergo Of brandmerk van de stadhouderlike  
regering*

*De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye der Graven en Stadhouders*

*De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland*

*Hollandsche Spectator*

Thesis RMA Ancient, Medieval  
and Renaissance Studies, Renaissance track

Ir. Jan Fongers, Solisnr.: 3935019

Supervisor: Dr. D.L.M. Onnekink

Second Reader: Dr. A.V. Weststeijn

Date: 27-02-2019

Frontpage: modified image of a painting by Abraham van den Tempel of Pieter de la Court (1662).  
[https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pieter\\_de\\_la\\_Court](https://nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pieter_de_la_Court) (accessed 10-01-2019)

# Table of Contents

	page
Introduction	1
The brothers De la Court in context	3
Historiography	4
1. Methodology	10
1.1 Introduction	10
1.2 Political Discourse Analysis	11
1.3 Intertextuality	13
1.4 Corpus	15
2. The second Stadtholderless Period, an overview	18
3. Results	26
3.1 Introduction	26
3.2 Constitutional premises	27
3.2.1 <i>Popular government the oldest and most lawful government</i>	28
3.2.2 <i>Monarchy and Court</i>	30
3.2.4 <i>Geweld ende bedrog</i>	31
3.2.5 <i>A mixed government</i>	32
3.2.6 <i>Freedom versus slavery</i>	33
3.2.7 <i>A true republic is incompatible with a monarchical state</i>	35
3.2.8 <i>A Stadtholderate is equal to a monarchy</i>	37
3.2.9 <i>The Counts of Holland are servants of the Provincial States</i>	39
3.2.10 <i>Discord as an instrument of power</i>	41
3.2.11 <i>Capitain-Generaal as stepping stone</i>	43
3.2.12 Discussion	44
3.3 Political and societal premises	47
3.3.1 <i>The absolute sovereignty of the States of Holland</i>	48
3.3.2 <i>Particularism</i>	50
3.3.3 <i>Neutrality and alliances</i>	52
3.3.4 <i>Broad representation</i>	54
3.3.5 <i>Church, religion and secular authority</i>	58
3.3.6 Discussion	61
3.4 Premises related to the economy	63

3.4.1 <i>The pillars of the economy</i>	63
3.4.2 <i>Increase of trade as reason of state</i>	65
3.4.3 <i>Restrictions to the economy</i>	68
3.4.4 Discussion	71
Conclusion	72
Bibliography	77

# The echoes of the brothers De la Court in early eighteenth-century republican publications

**Abstract:** In historiography the afterlife of the brothers De la Court is in general marginalized. The hypothesis in this thesis is that the absence of their names in the publications that appeared in the second Stadtholderless Period are no indication of a neglect of their ideas. A novel application of existing methods is employed for the comparison of those publications with the work of the De la Courts: Political Discourse Analysis comparing the content on premise and argumentation, and Intertextual Analysis determining the various types of linguistic imitation. The corpus consists of treatises, pamphlets and an edition of a spectatorial journal. The analyses show a high degree of similarity in content and imitation of language between the De la Courts' work and the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period. The array of premises discussed, its frequency and the moment of publication is determined by the historical context. The results confirm that the Republican thoughts of the De la Courts survived the monarchical period of William III in perfect order and were used by the Republican minded authors of the second Stadtholderless Period.

## Introduction

On March 19, 1702, Stadtholder-King William III passed away at Hampton Court in England after a fall from his horse.<sup>1</sup> His death was commemorated with an enormous number of panegyric poems on both sides of the North Sea.<sup>2</sup> There were, however, also pamphlet writers who saw his death as the end of an oppressive reign. An anonymous Dutch citizen, for example, celebrated the death of William with a long poem from which the following excerpt reads:

[...] *Vrijheit, vrijheit hebt gij weer:  
Uw beheerscher legt ter neer:  
Doodt is William en in de aarde;  
Weg is 't juk, 't welk u beswaarde,  
Vrij is 't land, 't is heel geredt  
'T is op vaste voet geset  
Als 't oit stond in vroegen tyden [...]*<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic. It's rise, greatness and fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 959.

<sup>2</sup> Donald Haks, *Vaderland en vrede 1672-1713. Publiciteit over de Nederlandse Republiek in oorlog* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2013) 131-133.

<sup>3</sup> Pamphlets in notes are referred to by catalogue number according to W.P.C. Knuttel. *Catalogus van de pamfletten verzameling berustende in de Koninklijke bibliotheek* (Utrecht 1978). This reference: *Op de doot van William den derden (1702)* (Knuttel 14696). (Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek 75 K 126) 9.

Although the date on the manuscript is 19 March 1702, the actual date of the death of William III, it was in print in 1707. It is conceivable that the manuscript circulated before 1707.<sup>4</sup> The first and last sentence are clearly references to the period of True Liberty, the first Stadtholderless Period, by many seen as the zenith of Dutch political, military and economic power in Europe and overseas.<sup>5</sup> Surprisingly, the text reflects the same feeling as was expressed forty-five years earlier by two brothers, merchants and descendants of protestant refugees from the Southern Netherlands, living in Leiden, and profuse writers on republican theory. In his monograph *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age*, (2012) on those brothers, Johan and Pieter de la Court, Arthur Weststeijn cited from the preface of their treatise *Politike Discoursen* (published in 1662) recalling that feeling in the following sentence: *'Rulers as Subjects, as well as thoughts, Tongues, Writing Pens and Printing presses were free again.'* It was their comment on the death of Stadtholder William II in 1650.<sup>6</sup>

When William III died in 1702 the United Provinces were divided in the choice of a continuation of the pseudo-monarchical Stadtholdership by appointing Johan Willem Friso (Stadtholder of Friesland and Groningen and designated heir) or a return to the republican status of the period before William III.<sup>7</sup> Six days after his death the States of Holland declared in the States-General through their Pensionary Heinsius that they would leave the Stadtholderate vacant.<sup>8</sup> And just like in the 1660's a number of publications – treatises, pamphlets, images - appeared in the public sphere during the, what is conveniently called, second Stadtholderless Period, advocating either the return to a Stadtholder of the house of Orange or a justification of a truly republican government, that is a government without an 'Eminent head', read a Stadtholder.<sup>9</sup>

In this thesis I will compare the publications that justified the republican government in the Second Stadtholderless Period with the work of the brothers De la Court that was

---

<sup>4</sup> David Onnekink, 'The War of the Spanish Succession (1702–1713)', in: *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War, 1672–1713* (London: Palgrave Pivot, 2016) footnote 172.

<sup>5</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 739-795.

<sup>6</sup> Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 50: *Politike Discoursen*, "Voor-Reeden," sig. \*2v.: "... maar dat warelik alle de Regeerders, ende Onderdanen, als meede alle de gedagten, Tongen, Schrijf-pennen, ende Druk-persen, seederd de dood des laatsten Stad-houders en Kapitains Generaal in Holland, hebben bekoomen meer vryheids."

<sup>7</sup> Under William III the Stadtholdership of Holland had become perpetual and hereditary in the male lineage. Furthermore he had obtained such a position of sovereign power that it did resemble, if not in name, the existing monarchies in Europe. See: Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 813-815.

<sup>8</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 959-968.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, 962.

published, read and discussed so widely and intensively during the First Stadtholderless Period.<sup>10</sup> The purpose is to see if the ideas of the brothers De la Court on republicanism had survived the pseudo-monarchy of Stadtholder William III and were still able to inspire later authors in their defence of the status quo between 1702 and 1747 in Holland.

### The brothers De la Court in context

The problem with the work of the brothers is to define who wrote what: Johan died in 1660 and left all his manuscripts to his brother Pieter who in many cases reworked the manuscripts and had them printed. Only in the case of the *Sinryke fabulen* and *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland* the author is known: Pieter De la Court. In my thesis I will use the plural whenever I refer to work of the brothers. They published their ideas during the first Stadtholderless period in the midst of a heated polemic on the right form of republican government. In this discussion the issue was not between republic and monarchy, but between a republican view in which the (provincial) States were sovereign and where was no place for a hereditary Stadtholder with political and military power, and a mixed republican government where the Stadtholder functioned in collaboration with the States as a *primus in Republica* and as safeguard of the republican liberty.<sup>11</sup> In their publications the De la Court brothers presented themselves as ‘wise merchants’ and outspoken truth-tellers schooled in political insight and mercantile expertise<sup>12</sup>. What made their ideas special was that they did not take classic philosophies on government as starting point, as was usual in the seventeenth century.<sup>13</sup> Their starting point was the question how to combine the private interest with the public interest in the practice of day-to-day government.<sup>14</sup> They maintained that a true republic could only be a commercial commonwealth, and that trade could only prosper under a truly republican government.<sup>15</sup> In their opinion a ‘truly’ republican government was incompatible with any form of monarchy. They considered a Stadtholder a pseudo-monarch and therefore to be rejected radically. The ideas of De la Court were highly contested throughout the Republic by – naturally - the adherents of a Stadtholder, but also by the

---

<sup>10</sup> Wyger Velema, ‘That a Republic is Better than a Monarchy’: Anti-monarchism in Early Modern Dutch Political Thought’, in: Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism, A shared European Heritage* Vol.1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 13..

<sup>11</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 44-46.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*, 4.

<sup>13</sup> Karl Enenkel and Koen Ottenheim, *Oudheid als ambitie. De zoektocht naar een passend verleden 1400-1700* (Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2017) 23-29.

<sup>14</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism* 63-64.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, 4.

Regents.<sup>16</sup> Although their ideas supported (to a certain degree) the concept of *De Ware Vrijheid* (the true liberty) - that is the sovereignty of the States, the term that Grand-Pensionary Johan de Witt coined for his form of States government – their radicalism on subjects as government participation, religious tolerance and monopolism went too far for the States-party adherents.<sup>17</sup>

## Historiography

Historical research into republican ideology of the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century has not been studied very systematically. Research focussed often on the position of the Stadtholder, a function unique to Europe at that time, the concurrent anti-monarchism and the bipartisan governmental system.<sup>18</sup> This focus was not surprising as the Dutch Republic of the United Provinces was the exception in an Europe dominated by more or less absolutist monarchies.<sup>19</sup> The subject had already in the early modern Dutch Republic of the seventeenth century attracted attention. Not only in the academic community (Hooft, Boxhoorn, Grotius, Spinoza and many others), but also at large via a large number of anonymous pamphleteers.<sup>20</sup> To give one example, already in the beginning of the seventeenth century Cornelis Pietersz. Hooft argued that a republic governed by an aristocracy was far superior to a monarchy.<sup>21</sup>

Political thought in the second Stadtholderless period is even less systematically researched. According to Wyger Velema, the main reason for this lack of attention is that it did not have the appeal of the Revolt (1578-1648) or the splendour of the Golden Age nor did it have the excitement of the drive for political renewal of the Patriot-era and the Batavian Republic.<sup>22</sup> Again, this lack of systematical historical research is surprising as, according to Wyger Velema, the political discourse in the Second Stadtholderless Period was ‘lively and

---

<sup>16</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 3, 35-36.

<sup>17</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 758-759.

<sup>18</sup> See for example: Israel, *The Dutch Republic*; Israel, Jonathan I., *Monarchy, orangism and republicanism in the later Dutch Golden Age* (Amsterdam 2004); Eco Haitsma Mulier, ‘The language of seventeenth century republicanism in the United Provinces: Dutch or European?’, in: Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The languages of political theory in early modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Velema, ‘That a Republic is Better than a Monarchy’; Helmers, Helmer J., *The royalist republic. Literature, politics, and religion in the Anglo-Dutch public sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

<sup>19</sup> Wyger Velema, *Republicans. Essays on Eighteenth-Century Dutch Political Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) 31.

<sup>20</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 33-43.

<sup>21</sup> Haitsma Mulier, ‘The language of seventeenth century republicanism’, 182.

<sup>22</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 53.



sophisticated.<sup>23</sup> Jonathan Israel sees the first half of the eighteenth century in Holland even as the crucible of radical thoughts that would eventually lead to the French Revolution.<sup>24</sup>

As mentioned, most of the research that was performed in the twentieth century focussed on the anti-monarchism aspect which set the Dutch Republic so apart from the rest of Europe.<sup>25</sup> Before and even after World War II Dutch historians adhered to this uniqueness and failed to appreciate the broader aspects of, and European influences, in republican thought.<sup>26</sup> This started to change in 1960 when Ernest Kossman published his analysis of political thought in the context of the socio-political reality of that time (*Politiek theorie in het zeventiende eeuwse Nederland*).<sup>27</sup> In 1980 Eco Haitsma Mulier drew attention to the ideal of the Venetian republicanism that had created much interest under Dutch republican writers in the seventeenth century (*The myth of Venice and Dutch Republican thought in the seventeenth century*).<sup>28</sup> The internationality of republican thought was shown by Hans Blom. Using a reference about popular government by the De la Courts to the English theorist on republicanism Harrington he assumed an influence of English seventeenth century republican ideas on the work of the brothers De la Court and via them on Spinoza.<sup>29</sup> Weststeijn, however, disagreed with his point of view using the same reference and argued that for De la Court ‘Harrington’s agricultural republic for increase could not be easily adapted to Holland’s commercial republic for preservation’.<sup>30</sup> Harrington had nothing to offer to the Dutch Republic. In my opinion the interpretations of Blom and Weststeijn do not contradict each other, but show the importance of language-in-context: the language of Harrington was the language of the political thinker whereas the language of De La Court was that of the activist. More recently the Dutch historian Helmer Helmers stressed the uncertainty of defining ideological borders and the problem of national limitations of ideas. He showed that the boundaries between ‘Loevesteins’ or ‘Statesparty’ or ‘Republicans’ and ‘Orangists’ or

---

<sup>23</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 53-54.

<sup>24</sup> Jonathan Israel, *The Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the making of Modernity, 1650-1750* (Oxford: OUP, 2002).

<sup>25</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 32.

<sup>26</sup> Haitsma Mulier, ‘The language of seventeenth century republicanism’, 179.

<sup>27</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 32; F.R. Ankersmit, ‘Ernst Kossman, 31 januari 1922-8 november 2003’, in: *Digitaal Wetenschapshistorisch Centrum, Levensberichten*, 66-75. <http://www.dwc.knaw.nl/DL/levensberichten/PE00001369.pdf> (accessed 8-11-2018).

<sup>28</sup> Haitsma Mulier, ‘The language of seventeenth century republicanism’ 183-186

<sup>29</sup> Hans W. Blom, ‘Popularizing Government: Democratic Tendencies in Anglo-Dutch Republicanism’, in: Gaby Mahlberg and Dirk Wiemann (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013) 121-126.

<sup>30</sup> Arthur Weststeijn, ‘Why the Dutch didn't read Harrington: Anglo-Dutch Republican Exchanges 1650-1670’, in: Gaby Mahlberg and Dirk Wiemann (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013) 116.

‘Prinsgezinden’ were more fluid than previously assumed and were strongly influenced by political and religious developments in England and Scotland.<sup>31</sup>

With respect to historical research on the eighteenth century, Velema stressed in his essays on Dutch political thought the ideological character of the polemic between what was then called *Republikeinen* and *Prinsgezinden* (Republicans and Orangists) in the years 1736 to 1739. In this polemic a cultural dimension complimented the republican ideology, seen by many only on institutional terms.<sup>32</sup> Velema treated Republicanism as a political language which should protect the *burgher* against the language of *politesse*. The latter was brought by her adherents (*Prinsgezinden*) as the ultimate sign of civilisation and developed at the royal courts, above all the French court.<sup>33</sup> According to Hietbrink and Velema the protection of the *burgher* was exactly the intention of a new phenomenon in the public sphere of the Republic, the Spectatorial journals.<sup>34</sup> The language of republicanism (as promoted in the Spectatorial journals) thus became important in articulating and responding to the political processes of the second half of the eighteenth century.<sup>35</sup>

In the second half of the eighteenth century the collected work of the brothers De la Court was mentioned in publications describing the forms of government in Europe. Their work was in general not seen in a positive light: whenever the work, or the authors, were mentioned in the publications it was to reject them vehemently.<sup>36</sup> An example of such an author was Elie Luzac who argued strongly against their republicanism, although he supported their thoughts on economy.<sup>37</sup> In the nineteenth century, as reported by Blom and Wildenberg during a symposium in 1985 on the brothers De la Court, the economist Otto van Rees (1825-1868) analysed the position the brothers De la Court had taken with respect to state-economy. Although the brothers argued in their work for the abolishment of monopolies, they still had

---

<sup>31</sup> Helmer Helmers, *The Royalist Republic, Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

<sup>32</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 53.

<sup>33</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 85; Iain Hampsher-Monk, ‘From Virtue to Politeness’, in: Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, vol.2 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005) 87-88.

<sup>34</sup> A. Hietbrink, ‘De deugden van een vrije republiek. Opvattingen over beschaafdheid in de achttiende-eeuwse republiek’, in: Pim den Boer (ed.), *Beschaving. Een geschiedenis van de begrippen hoofsheid, heusheid, beschaving en cultuur* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001) 205-210; Velema, *Republicans*, 84-88.

<sup>35</sup> Hampsher-Monk, ‘From Virtue to Politeness’, 85.

<sup>36</sup> Ivo Wildenberg, ‘Appreciaties van de gebroeders De la Court ten tijde van de Republiek’, in: *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis* 98 (1985) 549-550.

<sup>37</sup> Wildenberg, ‘Appreciaties van de gebroeders De la Court’, 551.

to be considered, according to Van Rees, mercantilists.<sup>38</sup> During the same symposium Van der Bijl connected the commercial policy advocated by the brothers De la Court to their ideas on foreign policy: as peace was beneficial for commerce, one should avoid as much as possible international (military) obligations; a strong navy, however, was seen as necessary to protect international trade.<sup>39</sup> In 1973 the English historian Leonard Leeb heralded the brothers De la Court as the most prominent theorists and writers on republicanism in the United Provinces of the seventeenth century. He drew the attention to their use of the word ‘interest’ as the key concept for the required policy of each city and for the province of Holland as a whole. Furthermore Leeb pointed to the importance the brothers had attached to relating the experiences of the province of Holland with their Counts in the past.<sup>40</sup>

More recent authors focussed on the radicalism of their anti-monarchism and their definition of a ‘popular’ state. Eco Haitsma Mulier focussed on the position the De la Courts took in respect to the issue of inclusion and exclusion in civil government. He argued that they had made the line between independent (wealthy) citizens and the poor distinct, but had the line between the independent citizens and the regents on purpose not so sharply drawn. The objective had been, according to Haitsma Mulier to make the capacities of independent citizens clear to the governing regents and at the same time avoid any conflict with the regents by associating themselves with the common man.<sup>41</sup> Jonathan Israel highlighted in his seminal work *The Dutch Republic. Its rise, greatness and fall, 1477-1806* (1995) the brothers’ ideas on the intrinsic superiority of a republic over a monarchy.<sup>42</sup> A more comprehensive overview of the ideas of the brothers De la Court was given by Wyger Velema in 2007. In his essay he discussed the influence of Hobbes on their worldview. According to him, the interpretation of Hobbes by the De la Courts had led them to a total rejection any form of monarchy or mixed government and as a consequence of this point of view, a rejection of the Stadtholderate.<sup>43</sup> According to De la Courts, in Velema’s words, ‘everything that was said about monarchies

---

<sup>38</sup> H.W. Blom and I.W. Wildenberg, ‘Otto van Rees, ‘De Economische denkbeelden van Pieter de la Court’, in Blom, H.W. and I.W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist; voordrachten gehouden op het De la Court symposium, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam* (Amsterdam & Maarsen: Holland University Press, 1986) 161-193.

<sup>39</sup> M. van der Bijl, ‘Pieter de la Court en de politieke werkelijkheid’, in: Blom, H.W. and I.W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist; voordrachten gehouden op het De la Court symposium, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam* (Amsterdam & Maarsen: Holland University Press, 1986) 72.

<sup>40</sup> Leonard Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution: History and Politics in the Dutch Republic 1747–1800* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973) 34-35

<sup>41</sup> Haitsma Mulier, ‘The language of seventeenth century republicanism’, 188-191.

<sup>42</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic 1648-1713*, 759-760.

<sup>43</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 35-43.

could also be said about ‘so-called republics with an hereditary head who was their supreme military commander’.<sup>44</sup> Furthermore he emphasised their statement that ‘in a good government the welfare or misery of the rulers necessarily follows the welfare or misery of the subjects.’<sup>45</sup> In the De la Courts’ view the private interest of a monarch would always interfere with the common good.<sup>46</sup> In *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War, 1672-1713* (2016) David Onnekink drew attention to the particularism of the De la Court brothers as their work was directed to the province of Holland only. This particularism was already observed by for example, Leeb (1973) and Velema (2007). And the interest of Holland was peace, a condition for trade and industry to prosper. This explained, according to Onnekink, their anti-monarchism.<sup>47</sup> According to the De la Courts, monarchical ambition and lust for glory leads to slavery of the people. The De la Courts put the blame for this ambition and lust for domination on the court life, taking the French court as a typical example of such court life, and contrasted it with the modesty of the Dutch merchant.<sup>48</sup> Interestingly, Onnekink (like Leeb), referred to the historical component in their ideas. Key moments in the history of Holland for the De la Courts were the Dutch Revolt against Spain and the constitutional crises of 1618/1619 and 1650. They also expressed a negative attitude towards the rule of the Counts of Hollands.<sup>49</sup> Although earlier authors, both national and international, have referred to the life and work of Johan and Pieter de la Court, it is above all thanks to Arthur Weststeijn’s monograph *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2012) that we really got an insight in their radical political thoughts on republicanism. In my opinion his main contribution was that he showed that rhetoric was an integral part of their strategy to influence the public debate on republicanism. According to Weststeijn, the way to understand the impact of the ideas of the De la Courts was to accept that rhetoric was the key: their work was an active participation, not an academic reflection, in the public debate on government and a challenge to the status quo of the Republic.<sup>50</sup>

In 1973 Leeb concluded that the brothers De la Court ‘became perhaps the most quoted source of all later critics of government by a Stadtholder and served as the chief repository of

---

<sup>44</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 43.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*, 38.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibidem*, 40.

<sup>47</sup> Onnekink *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War*, 27-29; Leeb, *The Ideological Origins*, 34-35; Velema, *Republicans*, 37.

<sup>48</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 109; 242-256.

<sup>49</sup> Onnekink, *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War*, 29.

<sup>50</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 69-140.

republican wisdom down to the end of the republic.<sup>51</sup> Unfortunately Leeb never mentioned where he found those quotations.<sup>52</sup> In 1985 Ivo Wildenberg remarked that the afterlife of the brothers De la Court deserved more attention. In his study he found eighteenth century reprints (edited) of their work and instances where their texts were appropriated by eighteenth century authors, both pro- and anti Stadtholderate. His end conclusion was that it concerned series of isolated references only.<sup>53</sup> A drawback of his approach was that he looked primarily for direct quotations with reference to the name 'De la Court' and less to appropriation of their political message. And where he did so, it was only in a very general sense.<sup>54</sup> Velema was in his research of the political writer Lieven de Beaufort more precise. He detected in the work of De Beaufort references to the work of De la Courts, both in opposition to and in support of their ideas.<sup>55</sup> Weststeijn found some allusions to the ideas of De la Court in English, French and German publications, especially on state-economy but his final conclusion was that by and large they were either forgotten or vehemently criticised for their anti-monarchism.<sup>56</sup>

It is surprising that so many historians have commented on life and work of the brothers De la Court and only have to some extent researched their afterlife. According to Wildenberg and Weststeijn their work had been reprinted in the eighteenth century, be it under their own name or under another name (for example a French edition under the name of De Witt).<sup>57</sup> My hypothesis is that the absence of a name doesn't mean that the ideas of the name-holder are not used or even forgotten. One should, however, not expect to find those ideas in the same form and expressed with the same words back after thirty years. Thirty years that could be characterised as monarchical. In my thesis I intend to show, using a methodology that I will explain in the next chapter, that the ideas of Johan and Pieter De la Court had very well survived the pseudo-monarchy of Stadtholder William III and were still able to inspire later authors in their defence of the Republicanism between 1702 and 1747.

---

<sup>51</sup> Leeb, *The Ideological Origins*, 44

<sup>52</sup> Wildenberg, 'Appreciaties van de gebroeders De la Court', 541.

<sup>53</sup> Ibidem, 543-551.

<sup>54</sup> Ibidem, 548-549.

<sup>55</sup> Velema, Wyger R.E., "That a republic is better than a monarchy": anti-monarchism in early modern Dutch thought', in: Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, vol.1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005) 21-24.

<sup>56</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 350-357.

<sup>57</sup> Wildenberg, 'Appreciaties van de gebroeders De la Court', 549; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 350-357.

# 1. Methodology

## 1.1 Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to see if the ideas of the brothers De la Court on republicanism had survived the pseudo-monarchy of Stadtholder-King William III and were still able to inspire later authors in their defence of the status quo in the second Stadtholderless Period between 1702 and 1747 in Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht and Overijsel. My corpus consist of two treatises, of which one is illustrated, nine pamphlets and the edition of one journal that appeared in the public sphere during the Second Stadtholderless Period. I have incorporated on purpose also an illustrated treatise, various pamphlets and the journal edition to cover the discussion in public space in the broadest sense. The texts are chosen on the basis of their advocating or justifying a republican government without a (hereditary) Stadtholder. Although it would also give an indication about the survival of the ideas of the De la Court brothers, it is beyond the scope of this study to include the publications in favour of the Stadtholderate and analyse those publications on anti-De la Court content.

As both the content – the premises and their argumentation – and the language – the rhetoric - are important to understand the work of the De la Courts I have used two analytical methods to compare the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period with the work of the De la Courts. The first one is based upon discourse analysis, the second one upon intertextuality. For the discourse analysis I have used the concept of Political Discourse Analysis (PDA), a specific approach within the concept of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as developed by Isabel Fairclough and Norman Fairclough.<sup>58</sup> For the intertextuality between the publications I have applied the literary-critical method developed by Thomas Greene.<sup>59</sup> The method of PDA enables me to compare the content of the texts for their meaning, whereas intertextuality highlights the similarity between the expressions and words used in the texts. Using both methods together strengthens the results of the comparison and produces a higher degree of credibility that the works of the De la Courts have been used by the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period.

---

<sup>58</sup> Isabel Fairclough, and Norman Fairclough, *Political Discourse Analysis. A method for advanced students* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012); Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis : The Critical Study of Language* (London: Routledge, 1995).

<sup>59</sup> Thomas M. Greene, *The light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

## 1.2 Political Discourse Analysis

In the concept of CDA, ‘discourse’ is the use of language seen as a form of social practice, and ‘discourse analysis’ is analysis how texts work within social practice.’<sup>60</sup> Texts are therefore indicators of sociocultural processes, relations and change.<sup>61</sup> In texts two social processes occur at the same time: the representation of the world according to the author’s worldview (ideology), and an author-reader interaction when there is a shared discourse.<sup>62</sup> CDA has its roots in critical social science which aim is not only to describe societies and their systems but also to understand the obstacles in changing them to ‘good societies’ caring for the well-being of their members. Those obstacles, the social reality, are according to critical social scientists, ‘conceptuality mediated’, that is in the form of a discursive process. In PDA the research focus is on a manipulative discourse that reflects the inequality in political power to create changes in society (normative critique) or on the explanation of a discourse that creates or maintains a specific social order (explanatory critique).<sup>63</sup> Although PDA is developed as a tool for analysing political publications I will use it to compare the eighteenth century publications favouring republicanism with the seventeenth century republican publications written by the De la Courts. In my opinion this is justified as PDA focusses on premises and the argumentation to defend those premises: how are social and political orders represented (the premise) and which discourses are used to defend or attack those orders (the argument). Both the premise and the argument are clearly stated in the publications and can therefore be compared and conclusions can be drawn with respect to similarity. Arguments often include suggestions for operationalization or are accompanied by action points, both of which are recognizable in a text, too. Special attention will have to be given to re-contextualisation of a discourse: the lifting from its originating context and insertion in a new setting.<sup>64</sup> An example of such a re-contextualisation can be found in the research of John Pocock on eighteenth century English political ideologies. By comparing early eighteenth century speeches in Parliament and letters to and from parliamentarians with the work of the seventeenth century republican theorists Harrington, Pocock was able to

---

<sup>60</sup> Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, 7.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibidem*, 2.

<sup>62</sup> Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, 6.

<sup>63</sup> Fairclough and Fairclough, *Political Discourse Analysis*, 79.

<sup>64</sup> Adam Hodges, ‘Intertextuality in Discourse’, in: Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (second edition) (E-Book: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2015) 43. URL: <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.library.uu.nl/doi/book/10.1002/9781118584194> (accessed 08-10-2018); Fairclough and Fairclough, *Political Discourse Analysis*, 83.

demonstrate that the Country faction (the landed gentry) was using contemporary language in an ideological framework developed by Harrington to denounce the politics of the Court faction.<sup>65</sup>

The work of the De la Court brothers consists of a critique on the status quo of the Republic, a vision as how it should be and the changes needed to realise that vision.<sup>66</sup> Overarching in their work was the concept of ‘Interest’, and more specifically: ‘what was in the Interest of Holland?’. They were strongly influenced by Hobbes ideas on the State of Nature of humankind, which they expressed as ‘*alle mensen altyd haar eigen, zelden andermans welvaren [...] maar ter contrarie haar eigen voordeel to nadeel van een ander betragten zullen.*’<sup>67</sup> The concept of the State of Nature served them as a means to explain the inevitability of Government and politics.<sup>68</sup> Based on this worldview they took a number of premises for granted in answering the question of Interest. Their work was not only meant as a contribution to an academic discussion about the true characteristics of the constitution of a Republic, but also as a wake-up call to regents and *burghers* in the towns of Holland and the Provincial States to reconsider the whole polity of the Province of Holland. As such it had to be persuasive and the brothers used therefore an extensive range of rhetorical skills.<sup>69</sup> Their starting point was the question how to combine the private interest with the public interest in the practice of day-to-day government.<sup>70</sup> This practice covered the relation to the typical Dutch phenomenon of a Stadtholder, the federal structure of the United Provinces and the Province itself, the structure of its economy and the relations between secular government, the Public Church and dissenting denominations. For reasons of transparency I have divided the premises of the De la Court brothers in three categories - constitutional, political-societal and economical - and will compare them separately with the expressions in those categories in the publications in the second Stadtholderless Period. The categories have been chosen on the basis of the work of the De la Courts. Their focus was on the interest of a country/province and the constitution, the political-societal structure and the economy where the drivers of that interest.

---

<sup>65</sup> John Pocock, *Political Language and Time. Essays on political thought and history* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1972) 104-147.

<sup>66</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 4-5.

<sup>67</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism* 142-145; ‘V.H.’ [Johan and Pieter de la Court], *Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal* (Amsterdam; Jacob Volckertsz, Zinbreker, 1661) 433.

<sup>68</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism* 144

<sup>69</sup> *Ibidem*, 92-114.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibidem*, 63-64.



### 1.3 Intertextuality

Greene's study on intertextuality between classical authors and Renaissance poets has generated a method which, to my opinion, is very useful to distinguish the voice of De la Court in the description of the premises and the argumentation used by the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period. Greene differentiates between four types of intertextuality. The first type is the 'reproductive imitation': the true citation of a word or a sentence from the subtext to the new text. The second type is the 'exploitative imitation': allusions, phrases and images from a large number of authors and/or subtexts are used in the creation of the new text. The third type is the 'heuristic imitation'. It differs from the previous one in the sense that it also uses many subtexts/authors, but there is one subtext/author which dominates. Furthermore the subtexts accentuate that they are written in a different context than the new text. Difference is of course a subjective concept, but in the case of this study the first and second Stadtholderless Period can be considered economical, ecclesiastical and political different. Linguistically the differences between the periods are less significant, although some changes in expressions might have occurred. The fourth type of intertextuality is the dialectical imitation: the new text makes a kind of implicit criticism of its subtexts.

This method requires a close reading of the primary sources. Besides studying primary sources also the use of secondary sources is helpful as they often include quotes from the primary sources thereby highlighting the important parts in the primary text. Reproductive imitation (a literal quote of the De la Courts) will probably be exceptional, but quotes from classical authors are likely to be present as they were considered to be more authoritative in both the seventeenth and eighteenth century than from contemporary authors.<sup>71</sup> The quite common practise of quoting either classical or more recent authors (sixteenth and early seventeenth century) can be an indication of acquaintance with the De la Courts work, who also frequently quoted classical and recent authors, or using the same source. My focus will be primarily on heuristic imitation and dialectical imitation. Where there are clearly cases of reproductive or exploitative imitation I will of course discuss them.

In the heuristic imitation I will look for the presence of the language used by the De la Courts (specific words and word-combinations) in the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period. 'Interest' is probably the most used word in the work of De la Courts, but due to its general use it does not indicate acquaintance with their work. A frequent use of the word 'passion(s)' in combination with the name 'Hobbes' is already more indicative of

---

<sup>71</sup> Enenkel and Ottenheim, *Oudheid als ambitie*, 23-29.

having read the work of De la Court. In the dialectical imitation I will mainly search for comparable parody and satire as they are typical forms of dialectical imitation.<sup>72</sup> The brothers De la Court used this kind of imitation fairly often in their fables. For clarification of this type of imitation I will show hereunder how they exploited the text of the anecdote of the honest man and the hypocrite who visit the court of the king of apes. The De la Courts replaced the honest man for a Dutchman and the hypocrite for a Frenchman. They imitated the story, but used it to show that all forms of monarchical government, kings or courtiers as the Frenchman, are apes who succumb to abject behaviour. At the same time they made fun of those in Holland who were in favour of establishing a apelike court, that is a court around the Prince of Orange. Through the strategy of dialectical imitation they convey the message that *‘die als een Vry ende Regtschapen Mensch wil spreken sig seer sorgvuldig wagten moet [...] in synen eigen Vrye Vaaderlande een Koninkrijke der Aapen te stiften.’*<sup>73</sup> Although outside the scope of this thesis, pro-Stattholderate publications with anti-De la Court arguments could (mis)use typical De la Court discourse in a satirical way.

Above example underlines Weststeijn’s statement that rhetoric was the key to communicate persuasively in the public sphere in the seventeenth century.<sup>74</sup> A proper training in the art of rhetoric was part of the educational system and prepared the De la Court brothers for their future careers. Notably, the most characteristic technique used by the De la Courts was *parrhèsia*, the outspoken telling-the-truth, which they considered to be the (laudable) rhetoric of the public sphere.<sup>75</sup> They saw this outspokenness, speaking the truth without fear for life or property, as condition *sine qua non* of a true republic. Weststeijn argued that *parrhèsia* could only be expected to be used by those citizens that possessed significant standing and were trusted. The rhetoric of *parrhèsia* of the brothers De la Court was in that way an indication of how they valued citizenship. With their emphasis on *parrhèsia* the De la Courts actually claimed that those capable of that (mercantile) frankness personified true republican citizens, and therefore they should constitute the representative assembly that governed the republic.<sup>76</sup>

Next to *parrhèsia*, which pervades their whole work, they used frequently satire, *sententiae* and *exempla* to instruct the readers. Many of those came from the classical writers Tacitus and

---

<sup>72</sup> Greene, *The light in Troy*, 16-19, 37-53.

<sup>73</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 111-114.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibidem*, 71-80.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem*, 104-105.

<sup>76</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 167.

Lucan, writers well-known for their anti-monarchical attitudes.<sup>77</sup> In the intertextual comparison of the arguments I will also pay attention to the rhetorical techniques the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period have used and to which extent they were inspired by the De la Courts.

#### 1.4 Corpus<sup>78</sup>

The work of Johan and Pieter De la Court consisted of a large number of pamphlets and treatises in which they outlined their ideas on politics, economy and relations between church and government. Apart from a number of pamphlets defending their sister in a conflict with her husband, their first work was *Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal*.<sup>79</sup> After the death of Johan De la Court in 1660 his brother Pieter published the book in 1661. In 1669 Pieter De la Court published *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland*, an edited version of an earlier analysis of the political and economic situation of Holland. In 1662 appeared *Politike Discoursen, handelende in Ses onderscheide Boeken van Steeden, Landen, Oorlogen, Kerken, Regeeringen en Zeeden*, also a joint project of Johan and Pieter. In the same year Pieter wrote and published *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland*. In 1685 the *Sinryke Fabulen, verklaart en toegepast tot alderley zeede-lessen, dienstig om waargenoomen te werden in het menschelijke en burgerlijke leeven* by Pieter De la Court was published as his last book. All publications saw many regular editions and pirated editions.<sup>80</sup> For the comparison with the republican publications in the second Stadtholderless Period I will use the *Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal*, published in 1661, *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland*, published in 1671, and *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland*, published in 1672. In the *Sinryke Fabulen*, published in 1685, no new premises or arguments were added to the already discussed ones, and the book is not used for comparisons. The availability of the above mentioned editions in the Special Collections of the Utrecht University Library has been the reason for the choice.

The publications from the second Stadtholderless Period which will be compared with the above mentioned work of the De la Court brothers, were selected on the basis of their defence of a republican government without a Stadtholder. They consists of two books, nine

---

<sup>77</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 104-114.

<sup>78</sup> See: Bibliography

<sup>79</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 87-91.

<sup>80</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 50-57.

pamphlets and the collective issues of one journal. The books are: *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid, Buyten Het Stadhouderschap* (second edition) by Emanuel van der Hoeven, published in 1706 and *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet* by Lieven de Beaufort, published in 1738. Actually there is a third treatise which appeared during the researched period (Cornelis van Binckershoek, *Vrijmoedige bedenkingen over de vrijheid* (Amsterdam, 1738)) but this treatise was written in support of the treatise by Lieven de Beaufort and contained no additional information that differed from what could be found in the treatise of De Beaufort. For that reason I did not include it in my corpus.

Emanuel van der Hoeven, was a Dutch merchant and amateur historian, born in Amsterdam around 1660 and passed away in the same town in 1727. He was a Roman Catholic who next to his professional life was an active member of the literary circle *Nil volentibus arduum* ('Nothing is impossible to the valiant').<sup>81</sup> Important members of *Nil volentibus arduum*, like Lodewijk Meyer and Johannes Bouwmeester, were known to be supporters of Spinoza and the circle had the reputation of being a debating club for spinozist ideas.<sup>82</sup> As such his membership might have influenced Van der Hoeven and can explain the political position he took in his book. The literary circle might have also brought him into contacts with the works of the brothers De la Court. An interesting aspect of the book are the illustrations and their explanation, made by the renowned engraver Romeyn de Hooghe. The role of engravings was to visualise the text and thereby enhance the attractiveness (and the sales). Romeyn de Hooghe was particularly renowned for his satirical political caricatures, which were all supporting William III.<sup>83</sup> Still, according to Jonathan Israel, he should be considered as a republican writers because of his extolling the institutions of the Republic in the *Spiegel van Staet* (1706).<sup>84</sup> In his monograph on Romeyn de Hooghe, Henk van Nierop came to a different conclusion: although De Hooghe's work can be seen as 'propaganda' for William III, he was first and foremost an entrepreneur who sold his talent to make a living, whether this was as propagandist for William III or as supporter of a republican government.<sup>85</sup> To my opinion, that explains better his involvement and republicanism in Van der Hoeven's *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid, Buyten Het Stadhouderschap*. The book came to the market

---

<sup>81</sup> E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier en G.A.C. van der Lem, *Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland 1500-1800* (Den Haag: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1990) 191-192.

<sup>82</sup> Israel, *The Radical Enlightenment*, 196-205.

<sup>83</sup> Henk van Nierop, 'Romeyn de Hooghe and the imagination of Dutch foreign policy', in: David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and foreign policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011) 197-198.

<sup>84</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic* 962.

<sup>85</sup> Van Nierop, 'Romeyn de Hooghe and the imagination of Dutch foreign policy', 212-214.

shortly after the death of Stadtholder William III. His death had led to changes in power, positions and decision-making processes within almost every political institution in the Republic. In many councils regents who had been favoured by William III had been replaced by regents (or their offspring) ousted in the purges of 1672-1676. With those changes the interest in republican ideas sprang to life again and a large number of books, such as Van der Hoeven's, and pamphlets promoting a republic without a Stadtholder appeared.<sup>86</sup>

Lieven de Beaufort had been a member of the *Zeeland Gecommitteerde Raden* when he wrote the *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*. Many historians argued that in his book he, as a regent, had taken the position that the regent-oligarchy was an example of how well classic republicanism could function. Therefore he was in general depicted as a hypocrite.<sup>87</sup> Velema argued however, that the objective of the book was not the defence of a regent-oligarchy, but to warn for the mounting dangers of the European monarchies to the civil republican liberty of the United Provinces.<sup>88</sup> The book appeared at the time of general malaise feelings in the Republic and resurgent Orangists sentiments focussed on the aspirations of William Charles Henry Friso, who already had been appointed Stadtholder of Friesland (1711), Groningen (1718) and Gelre (1722).<sup>89</sup> It was De Beaufort's intention to counter those sentiments.

The first pamphlet is dated 1702 and the last 1737 and the pamphlets vary between in-depth long treatises and satirical poems. They all belong to the Knuttel collection and have been selected on their pro-Republican sentiments in the catalogue description. The relative low number of nine republican-minded pamphlets compared with the total number (2911) is surprising. It is rather difficult to compare the number of pro-Stadtholderate pamphlets with Republican pamphlets because the total number of pro-Stadtholderate pamphlets for the period (121) is skewed by a relative high number (70) of pro-Willem III pamphlets lamenting his death and the issue of his testament in the first years of the period. Between 1702 and 1714 one pamphlet appeared congratulating the Frisian Stadtholder Johan Willem Friso with acquiring the Stadtholdership of Groningen and no other pamphlets defending a government that would include a Stadtholder in Holland or any other province. From 1714 to 1747 only 15 pamphlets in support of a Stadtholder appeared.<sup>90</sup> As there was a peak in the production

---

<sup>86</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic* 962-963.

<sup>87</sup> Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution*, 54.

<sup>88</sup> Velema, 'That a republic is better than a monarchy', 20; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 995.

<sup>89</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 995.

<sup>90</sup> W.P.C. Knuttel, *Catalogus van de Pamfletten Verzameling, berustende in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek*, Tweede Deel (tweede stuk) 1668-1688, Derde Deel 1689-1713, Vierde Deel 1714-1765.

during the years before the coming of age of the Frisian Stadtholder – which dropped immediately after the death of Johan Willem Friso at Moerdijk – the absence of a Stadtholder-to-be for a substantial part of the period might have been a reason for this paucity: there was little opposition from pro-Stadtholderate supporters.

The journal, *De Hollandsche Spectator*, was the creation of Justus van Effen and was one of the many Spectatorial journals, a literary-journalistic genre that appeared in Europe in the first half of the eighteenth century. Jonathan Israel sees the Dutch *De Hollandsche Spectator* in the light of the later Dutch Enlightenment in which the awareness of economic downturn was very prominent. By many the moral decay was seen as the root cause for the economic downturn and as such, according to Jonathan Israel and many Dutch historians, the journal should be considered as apolitical and an instrument of moral education.<sup>91</sup> Hietbrink and Velema disagreed with the conclusion that the character of the journal was apolitical. Hietbrink pointed only to the political aspect as such of the Spectatorial journals but according to Velema, especially the *Hollandsche Spectator* represented the cultural dimension of republicanism and was meant to educate the republican citizens.<sup>92</sup> Velema treated republicanism as a political language and he drew attention to the growing influence of the speech-practice of *politesse*, presented by her adherents, the *Prinsgezinden*, as the ultimate sign of civilisation. The origin of this *politesse* were the royal courts, above all the French court. The objective of Justus van Effen was to protect the *burgher* against the speech-practice of *politesse* by teaching him the republican counterpart.<sup>93</sup> In this thesis I intend to analyse to what extent also Justus van Effen was inspired by the language of the brothers De la Court.

## 2. The second Stadtholderless Period, an overview

The fatal fall from his horse of William III in 1702 heralded in the United Provinces the second Stadtholderless Period. With his death the peculiarity of the constitutional structure of the United Provinces became noticeable again: a balance of power between regents who

---

<sup>91</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1064. The expression ‘True Liberty’ was coined by Johan de Witt during the first Stadtholderless Period.

<sup>92</sup> A.Hietbrink, ‘De deugden van een vrije republiek. Opvattingen over beschaafdheid in de achttiende eeuwse republiek’, in: Pim den Boer (ed.), *Beschaving. Een geschiedenis van de begrippen hoofsheid, heusheid, beschaving en cultuur* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001) 205-210; Velema, *Essays on Eighteenth-Century Dutch Political Thought*, 84.

<sup>93</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 85; Hampsher-Monk, ‘From Virtue to Politeness’, 87-88: Speech-practise refers to the performativity of language in the construction of identities. The theory was developed by J.L. Austin in the middle of the last century (Michel Leezenberg en Gerard de Vries, *Wetenschapsfilosofie voor geesteswetenschappen, Herziene editie* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012) 99-102.

favoured a mixed government that included a Stadtholder who wielded formal and informal power and those who favoured a republican government where there was no place for a Stadtholder, often called States government or True Liberty.<sup>94</sup> From 1672 until 1702 the balance of power and influence had been shifted towards the mixed government of William III and his favourites, thereby reducing the influence of the True Liberty republican regents. His death turned the scales again. Already six days after the death of William III the States of Holland declared that they would leave the Stadtholder position vacant and return to the regime of the first Stadtholderless Period. Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland and Overijssel followed suit. In the provinces of Friesland and Groningen the Stadtholderate was in the hands of the House of Nassau-Dietz and as such they were not influenced by the death of William III.

After his demise the regents who had been ousted in 1672 and later, or their offspring, demanded their place in the local and provincial governmental institutions back. In Holland the take-over by the republican regents went rather smoothly: already by the end of 1702 all city governments and Provincial States were dominated by States-party regents. On the other hand in Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, and Overijssel, the four other provinces that had also decided to do without a Stadtholder, the transfer of power did not go so peacefully. The inroads William III had made in those provinces, changing the appointment procedures, the representative councils and the governmental institutions, had left many people frustrated and angry.<sup>95</sup> The frustration led to riots directed at the Orangist regents and to purges of city governments instigated by organised non-patriciate citizens (*gemeenslieden*, guildmembers, militia) who had lost their influence during the reign of William III.<sup>96</sup> According to Jonathan Israel one of the key features of those disturbances was the collaboration between various groups in different provinces. Although there were shared strong anti-Holland sentiments

---

<sup>94</sup> J.L. Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century. The Politics of Particularism* (London: Clarendon Press, 1994) 134-148, 171.

<sup>95</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 959-961, 963-967; Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution*, 41; Herbert Rowen, 'The second Stadtholderless period: doldrums', in: *The Princes of Orange. The Stadtholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 149.

<sup>96</sup> In historiography the ousted party in 1702 and the following years is in general tagged 'Orangists' and the incoming party 'States-party'. Roorda pointed already in 1962 and Leeb in 1973 to the fragility of those tags: both parties or *facties* were more 'interest groups' based on material interest and family loyalties. Price showed in 1994 that factions cannot be seen as an alternative for parties but were the only form of political organisation which were effectively available for the achievement of party objectives. See: Cited in: Onnekink, 'General Introduction', in: *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War*, 5; Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution*, 41; Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 65-66.

among the rioters it was striking that they transcended the traditional particularism on other issues, too. The collaboration was facilitated by exchange of pamphlets, in which the impact William III had had on the country as a whole was deplored and in which the republican idea of ‘sovereignty that [has] developed upon the people’ was promulgated.<sup>97</sup> The riots were eventually suppressed by militia or even by the Generality army and the ‘new’ regents took their seats as during the first Stadtholderless Period: it was, according to Rowen, ‘government by and of the States with no control, either from below nor from above.’<sup>98</sup>

Just as the States-party regents had not been without influence during the reign of William III, the Orangist regents were not silenced either and used every opportunity to advance their return to power.<sup>99</sup> That opportunity came with John William Friso, Stadtholder of Friesland, reaching the age of majority in 1707. In 1708 Groningen, too, accepted him as Stadtholder and Orangist sentiments in the country rose. Although the Stadtholderless provinces were able to block his advancement to captain-general in the army, his instalment as member of the Council of State and the recognition of the title ‘Prince of Orange’, he still became a political factor to be reckoned with in the Republic. John William Friso’s career and the possibilities of an Orangist return to power disappeared suddenly when he drowned at Moerdijk in 1711.<sup>100</sup> Six weeks after his death his son, William Charles Henry Friso, was born and the Orangists had to wait until he reached the age of majority and had climbed some steps upon the Stadtholderian career ladder. He was appointed Stadtholder of Friesland in 1718 and the following year he became Stadtholder of Groningen and in 1729 of Gelderland.<sup>101</sup> Especially the elevation to Stadtholder of Gelderland was fiercely contested by Holland, but to no avail. Gelderland defended the appointment with an appeal to its provincial sovereignty like Holland had done at earlier occasions.<sup>102</sup> The settlement with Frederic William, king of Prussia on the shared use of the title ‘Prince of Orange’ in 1732 and his marriage to Princess Ann, the oldest daughter of King George II of Hannover, King of England, Scotland and Ireland, in 1734 enhanced his status and the expectations of the Orangists, considerably. The problem for the Orangists, however, was that William Charles Henry Friso only wanted to accept what was rightfully his, as was defined by Prince Maurice

---

<sup>97</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 966.

<sup>98</sup> Rowen, ‘The second Stadtholderless period:doldrums’, 151.

<sup>99</sup> See the conflicts he had with the city of Amsterdam about, among others, the War of the Spanish Succession, which the Amsterdam *vroedschap* considered to be detrimental to the commercial activities of the city: David Onnekink, ‘The War of the Spanish Succession’, 113-115.

<sup>100</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 961-962, 967-968; Rowen, ‘The second Stadtholderless period: doldrums’, 148-151.

<sup>101</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 989.

<sup>102</sup> Rowen, ‘The second Stadtholderless period: doldrums’, 156.



in 1618. His point of view was that the government system of the United Provinces was a mixed republican system with himself in the traditional post of Stadtholder and captain-general. He did not contest the sovereignty of the States, but he wanted the restoration of the rights and prerogatives that his ancestors had held during the sixteenth and seventeenth century and he wanted them offered by the States-General freely. He rejected any action by popular unrest or Calvinist preachers to advance him to his rightful position. Due to this attitude the anti-Stadtholderate regents had no problem to keep him in a subordinate position.<sup>103</sup>

The death of William III did not change the foreign policy of the Republic. Under Grand Pensionary Heinsius it fully complied with the obligations under the Alliance with England and the Emperor with regards to the war with France.<sup>104</sup> At the end of this War (on the Spanish Succession) in 1713, the third war in 40 years against France, the Republic was totally exhausted and dispirited. The general feeling was that the Republic had not been very successful at the peace negotiations in Utrecht in 1713 although they had contributed significantly to the war efforts.<sup>105</sup> The public debt of the Republic was enormous as the war had been mostly financed on credit and not on taxes. Due to the financially necessary cuts in numbers of the States army and navy, and the huge public debt the Republic had become a second-tier nation in Europe.<sup>106</sup>

Against the background of financial crisis and mismatch of financial strength and obligations between the provinces, and within the provinces between the towns, the second Great Assembly was held in 1716-1717. The objective of the assembly was to discuss the possible solutions to the problems as suggested by Simon van Slingelandt, secretary of the Council of State, in his various tracts and memoranda.<sup>107</sup> He stated, according to Leeb, that the government of the Republic of the United Provinces should be based on the sovereignty of the People and the States representing the People, that decisions should be taken by majority rule, that laws and ordinances relating to the collection of taxes were executed equally and nobody had the right to exclude himself except by decision of the People and, finally, that

---

<sup>103</sup> Rowen, 'The second Stadholderless period: doldrums', 157-158.

<sup>104</sup> Ibidem, 148.

<sup>105</sup> J.Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa. Deel 1: Achtergronden en algemene aspecten* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhof, 1980) 1-2

<sup>106</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 985.

<sup>107</sup> Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution*, 42-53; Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 9-14.

those who were commended by the People or the States to the execution of those laws and ordinances had sufficient power to do so but could not misuse that power.<sup>108</sup>

Van Slingelandt's suggestions were meant to put the general interest of the Union above the particular interest of the Provinces and towns. He advocated a greater role of the Council of State as seat of executive power of the Union, and even supported a role for a Stadtholder as arbiter in the Provincial affairs. In his opinion the first Great Assembly of 1651 had supplied the States-General and the Council of State with imprecise directions which ran counter to the Acts of 1579, 1588 and 1590.<sup>109</sup> Throughout his proposals and suggestions he stressed the fact that his ideas were not innovative or new, but they were based on original historical Acts and the description given by De Groot, 'that great champion of Liberty and of the legitimate government'.<sup>110</sup> The Assembly was closed in 1717 without any solution: particularism remained as in the past, no agreement was reached with respect to changes in the system of taxation and neither was there any agreement on institutional reform. The only measure taken was a further reduction of the army.<sup>111</sup>

Interestingly, at the closing speech, the period before 1672 was heralded as the representative Republican period. The message was that instead of war and alliances, peace and abstinence of international obligations would lead to prosperity and this could only be achieved again through unity.<sup>112</sup> Next to this 'prosperity policy', which focussed on abstinence of international developments, absolutely no territorial expansion and a protective navy for the benefit of the merchant fleet, the idea of a 'surety policy' was also very strong among regents and even gained power in the later years of the second Stadtholderate Period. The policy was directed at defensive alliances and proportional military strength, both at land and at sea. Both policies had their roots in the States party policies of the first Stadtholderless Period.<sup>113</sup>

Economically the second Stadtholderless Period showed a steady decline. In the first half of the Period not every industrial branch, province or town was hit to the same extent, but from 1720 onwards it became visible everywhere. The Republic fell behind the other European countries, notably England and France, but also Prussia. The decline was caused by a complex of factors: the loss of world trade primacy in both the rich trade and the bulk

---

<sup>108</sup> Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution*, 45.

<sup>109</sup> Leeb, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution*, 51.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibidem*, 51.

<sup>111</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 986-988

<sup>112</sup> Haks, *Vaderland en vrede*, 292.

<sup>113</sup> Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 26-60.

carrying trade, which could not be defended anymore by political, financial, military or diplomatic power, the accompanying collapse of export-oriented industry, the disappearance of the staple-market, the contraction of the fisheries and a failing tax system. The root cause of the loss of world trade primacy should be sought in the expansion of mercantile and industrial activities in other countries combined with a growing mercantilist policy in those countries. The only sector that prospered was the capital market: the money earned in the seventeenth century served now, due to lack of opportunities in the Republic, for growth and employment elsewhere. The return on those investments enriched only the established regents who were already favoured by the tax system.<sup>114</sup>

In the 1730's this led to a general feeling of social and political frustration among the people. More and more the blame for the malaise was put on the regents who were since 1702 in control. In the arising polemic the Orangists regents, who had been excluded from government, exploited the economic situation to promote a return to the a mixed government in which the Frisian Stadtholder William Charles Henry Friso would also become Stadtholder in the other provinces. The States Republicans from their side having no economic situation to be proud of, introduced a new element to the discussion. To counter the Orangists they presented themselves as protectors of 'True Liberty'. To them *Ware Vryheid*, True Liberty, had always been the fact that the interest of the state was better served in the absence of a perpetual and hereditary Stadtholderate and that it guaranteed religious and intellectual tolerance. As a third principle they now added a cultural element to republicanism: the dignity of the individual in civil society.<sup>115</sup>

The death of William III also changed the balance in the tension within the Reformed Church between Cocceians and Voetians about the extent of interference of the secular government in church matters. Traditionally the Stadtholder had been supported by the predominantly orthodox Reformed Church and in return had given the Reformed Church a relative free hand in own matters. With the return of a States government the followers of Cocceius who supported the involvement of the secular government in church matters, got the upper hand and Voetians, who favoured a more independent position of the church, missed the support of William III and his supporters.<sup>116</sup> Ascendancy of the Cocceians opened the possibility for town councils to extend their authority to church matters and diminish the

---

<sup>114</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 998-1003; Rowen, 'The second Stadholderless period: doldrums', 152; Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 14.

<sup>115</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 994-995; Velema, *Republicans*, 82-85.

<sup>116</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1030.

influence the Voetians had on society and politics.<sup>117</sup> The general attitude of the city governments was to damp down the Voetian-Cocceian conflict as much as possible, even using officially issued regulations. Attempts to return to the conflict were met with immediate preventive action by the local government. As all the churches were financially dependent on the secular government their councils practised an accommodation policy with respect to the secular authorities.<sup>118</sup> During the second Stadtholderless Period the Voetian churches remained very quiet about the House of Orange and the Cocceians became more Orangist only after 1747.<sup>119</sup> Still, the polemic between the two groups influenced society and university for most of the second Stadtholderless Period. During this Period the conflict became less pronounced although Voetian or Cocceian credentials influenced (academic) appointments for years to come.<sup>120</sup> The diminishing sharpness of the polemic within the public Church coincided with a further tolerance of the church councils towards the other confessional groups within society, especially Jews, Lutherans and even Catholics. This led to dialogue between the groups and, slowly, a weakening of both theological dogma and ecclesiastical authority in society. At the end of the Period William IV (and William V after him) tried to revive the Voetian theology and practices, but the ideas of tolerance and dialog were already firmly established.<sup>121</sup>

The combination of economic decline and the presence of a Prince of Orange as Stadtholder in three provinces who, as expressed by the States of Gelderland was “the only born resident of this state who can be elected to the High Dignity”, eroded the regime of the States regents in the later years of the second Stadtholderless Period. Although the Republic desired to stay neutral in the War of the Austrian Succession, the system of European alliances pulled her into it anyhow. The war became the force that ended the Second Stadtholderless Period. When in 1747 French troops invade States Flanders the people agitated and the mood turned against the governing regents. William Charles Henry Friso received his rightful position and became Stadtholder William IV.<sup>122</sup>

The second Stadtholderless Period had parallels and differences with the first Stadtholderless Period. Both ended a period of Orangist power with the sudden death of the Stadtholder, but

---

<sup>117</sup> Ibidem, 697.

<sup>118</sup> Roelof Bisschop, *Sions Vorst en Volk* (Veenendaal: Kool Boeken Distributie, 1993) 140; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1031-1032.

<sup>119</sup> Bisschop, *Sions Vorst en Volk*, 126-127, 194-195.

<sup>120</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1030.

<sup>121</sup> Ibidem, 1033.

<sup>122</sup> Ibidem, 996-997.

the confrontational policy of William II against the States of Holland had brought the Republic to the brink of civil war. Especially his attempt to take Amsterdam by force prior to his death had discredited the House of Orange and undermined the Orangist arguments about the unifying role of a Stadtholder. His death caused an immediate and widespread swing to republican leadership in the towns of Holland and precipitated the decision to leave the Stadtholderate vacant.<sup>123</sup> It also brought the Province of Holland again into a leading position in the Republic as became clear at the Great Assembly of 1651.<sup>124</sup> The absence of a male successor at the death of William III in 1702, and the need for a stable and consistent policy in the face of the War on the Spanish succession were perfect excuses for the States-party regents to keep the position of Stadtholder vacant, but even more, to return to the long-time desired centre of power of the Republic again. It did not, however, discredit any Orangist opposition, like had been the case at the beginning of the first Stadtholderless Period. Unfortunately for the Orangists the first candidate, who had the capacities to grow to the position of Stadtholder in all the provinces drowned and the second candidate only wanted the position when it was offered to him on a platter.<sup>125</sup>

The internal policy in the first Period was marked by a strong particularism and domination of Holland over the other provinces.<sup>126</sup> In the second Period the particularism was still present but there was also a strong appeal to unity. Remarkably the ideal self-representation and justification of the republican government of the Republic changed from the Batavian past in the first Period to the times of the Revolt, Oldenbarnevelt and De Witt, the ‘Golden Age’.<sup>127</sup>

There were remarkable similarities in the foreign policy. During the first Stadtholderless Period the policy of De Witt was primarily directed towards neutrality and defensive alliances when necessary. His objective was peace in order to let commerce prosper.<sup>128</sup> He was able to do this because the Republic was dominating the world trade and most other European countries had to recover from internal devastating struggles.<sup>129</sup> During the second period there were two trends in the Republic’s foreign policy, but both were rooted in the maxims of the first Stadtholderless Period. Aalbers described the trends as ‘prosperity

---

<sup>123</sup> Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic*, 170-171; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 604-609.

<sup>124</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 702-707.

<sup>125</sup> Rowen, ‘The second Stadtholderless period: doldrums’, 148-151.

<sup>126</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 707-713.

<sup>127</sup> Haks, Donald, *Vaderland en vrede 1672-1713*. 292.

<sup>128</sup> Wout Troost, ‘To restore and preserve the liberty of Europe’: William III’s ideas on foreign policy’, in: David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and Foreign Policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Ashgate 2011) 285.

<sup>129</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 610-612.

policy' or 'surety policy'. The prosperity policy was characterised by a foreign policy of neutrality and non-interference. Only an alliance with England was seen as beneficial to the country. Even the barrier towns in the Southern Netherlands were considered to be a liability and should be abandoned. Support for this policy came notably from the Amsterdam merchant community. The focus of the surety policy was also on non-interference, but did see defensive alliances as a necessity. For that reason the adherents of this policy advocated the maintaining of the barrier towns in the Southern Netherlands. The support for the policy was notably in circles around Van Slingelandt and Fagel. The two trends should not be seen as oppositional. First of all, the supporters of one of the other were very opportunistic, and secondly, the objective of the two trends in policy was the same: the recovery of the prosperity which had made the Republic during the first Stadtholderless Period great.<sup>130</sup> The objective was the same: the recovery of the prosperity which had made the Republic during the first Stadtholderless Period great.

Unfortunately the Republic was unable to enforce her intentions due to the (financial) consequences of forty years of war, loss of her position as world trade leader and growing mercantilism in her export markets. The financial position expressed in total capital was probably similar in the two Periods, but where as in the first Period it was invested at home, in the second Period it went abroad. Instead of recovery there was steady decline of prosperity in society which eventually led to unrest at critical moments.<sup>131</sup>

The conflict within the public Church between Voetians and Cocceians, already present during the first Period abated during the second.<sup>132</sup> The public church (and her internal fights) changed from a prime position with a huge influence in society and politics to, reluctantly, accepting a more modest position under secular rule.<sup>133</sup>

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will compare the work of the De la Courts with the publications that appeared in the second Stadtholderless period supporting a true republican government. As discussed in the chapter on methodology I will use Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) to compare the content of the publications focussing on the premises and the argumentations to justify those

---

<sup>130</sup> Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 26-60.

<sup>131</sup> Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 14; Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 998-1003.

<sup>132</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1030.

<sup>133</sup> Bisschop, *Sions Vorst en Volk*, 248-249.

premises with the work of the De la Courts. In addition to PDA I will analyse the text of the argumentation for intertextuality with the De la Courts'. The method I use for detecting intertextuality recognizes four types of imitation: reproductive imitation (the use of literal quotes from a subtexts), exploitative imitation (the use of various equivalent subtexts), heuristic imitation (the use of one specific subtexts among other subtexts) and dialectical imitation (the use of a subtext as instrument of criticism to the content of that subtext). The focus of my analysis of the text of the premises and the argumentation will be on reproductive, heuristic and dialectical imitation. Although reproductive imitation - the use of literal quotes - would probably only show that a same source was used, it is still very interesting, as it can be a sign of the influence of the De la Courts in choosing that source. Exploitative imitation is less interesting as, contrary to heuristic imitation where the emphasis is on the specificity of one source, exploitative imitation takes various sources into account and is therefore less distinctive. Although all the words the De la Courts used were fairly common at that time, a specific combination of words would set them apart from contemporary writers. The rhetoric with its emphasis on satire, *paradiastole*<sup>134</sup> and fables to stress and illustrate the argument makes their work very suited for analysis based on dialectical imitation: did the writers in the second Stadtholderless Period use similar rhetoric and for the same purpose?

The chapter has been divided in three sub-chapters, based on the character of the premises used by the De la Courts: constitutional premises, political and societal premises and premises related to the economy. Each of those sub-chapters has been split in several sections in which the specific premises are discussed. In the first part of those sections I briefly describe the premise and argumentation used by the De la Courts, followed by an analysis of the content of the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period: did they use the same premise and if so, was there a similarity in argumentation with the De la Courts? In the second part of the section I give a summary of the characteristic expressions the De la Courts used, followed by a textual analysis of the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period for signs of imitation and if so which type of imitation.

### 3.2 Constitutional premises

In this chapter I will analyse the premises on the constitution of the Province of Holland and

---

<sup>134</sup> Paradiastole is a rhetorical technique whereby certain actions are described in such a way that they alter their conventional moral connotations. The technique is especially useful for refutation and reprehension. See: Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 79.

the Republic used by the De la Courts and in the publications that appeared in the second Stadtholderless period. The constitutional premises cover the systems of government in general, the government system in the Republic and the position of the Stadtholder therein, and the historical background of the governmental system in Holland as seen by the authors. As mentioned, I have subdivided those premises according to their focus. Each of those focus-areas is first analysed for similarities in content (PDA) and thereafter for intertextuality.

### *Popular government the oldest and most lawful government (PDA)*

The first premise of the brothers De la Court was that by nature a popular government was the oldest and most lawful government. In a State of Nature people would organise themselves to protect their interest. In that way the people became the basis and holder of sovereignty for every government: *'Want geen Vergaadering aan een andere Souveraine magt kan opdragen indien zy die zelfs niet heeft.'*<sup>135</sup> They added to this that, when the people choose to delegate the governmental process to a selected number of them, an aristocratic government could also be considered to have had a lawful origin, too. The most unlawful form of government was a monarchy. Their argument for this was based on the idea that the passions that dominated humankind would always favour the private interest at the detriment of the common good.<sup>136</sup> As monarchs, having unrestricted power and being human like everybody else, a monarch would always let his self-interest prevail at the cost of the common good. Furthermore, they argued, this passion for self-interest caused that no individual could accept that somebody else was a better ruler than himself: *'[...] de mensen naturelik soo grote presumptive van hare eige bequaamheit [...] hebben, dat sy nooit willens en wetents, de magt van hare eigen voordeel te betragten, aan eenig anderen, hoedanig die syn, sullem hebben opgedragen.'*<sup>137</sup> Therefore monarchy could never be lawful as natural law forbade that men would voluntarily accept domination by another man.

From a PDA point of view the republican authors of the Second Stadtholderless Period fully agreed with the premise and argumentation of the De la Courts that a popular government was the oldest and most lawful government: Van de Hoeven stated in 1706 that from pre-Roman times onwards important decisions had always been taken by an assembly of the inhabitants of the now-called province Holland and that the institution of a single head

---

<sup>135</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 30.

<sup>136</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 29-30; Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 154.

<sup>137</sup> Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 142-157.



was unknown.<sup>138</sup> Three of the six illustrations in his book were dedicated to this premise showing the assemblies in action.<sup>139</sup> De Beaufort declared in 1737 that in a State of Nature every man was equal and would not submit himself voluntarily to another man. He used this argument to proof the unlawfulness of a monarchy. Discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a monarchy he concluded that all the advantages were being negated by the fact that a monarch was also a human and therefore victim of his passions. As an arbitrary head his private interests would always prevail over the common good.<sup>140</sup> In 1735 an author of a pamphlet presented himself as ‘*een liefhebber van der Aloude Vryheyd*’<sup>141</sup>, whereas another author in that year started his pamphlet with the words: ‘*Holland is in den beginne vrij geweest als staat, met een populare regering*’ and later in the pamphlet gave a definition of sovereignty and the impossibility to transfer sovereignty to a single head or an oligarchy, very similar to the text of the De la Courts on this issue.<sup>142</sup> In a pamphlet that appeared in 1737 the ideas of the De la Courts on government were perfectly summarized. The author of this pamphlet designated *Democratie of Volks-Regeering* as the oldest and most lawful form of government although, he conceded, it had its drawbacks. As one of the drawbacks he mentioned the risk of an oligarchy, just like the De la Courts did in their discussion on popular government. He saw, just like the De la Courts, aristocracy as the best system of government: they had the knowledge and capacity to perform the task, the wealth not to be receptive to corruption and sensitive to loss of honour and reputation. This last element would stimulate them to balance private interest with common interest.<sup>143</sup> As argued by Weststeijn, mercantile honour and virtue were also determining factors with the De la Courts in balancing private interest and common interest.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Emmanuel van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid, Buyten Het Stadhouderschap*, Tweede druk (Amsterdam: Ten Hoorn, 1706) Part 1: 44-46.

<sup>139</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part I: 1-2, 24-25, 46-47.

<sup>140</sup> Beaufort, Levinus Ferdinand de, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet* (Leiden: Samuel Luchtman, Middelburg: Leendert Bakker, 1737) 15-24.

<sup>141</sup> Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander tegens den vermonden Hollandschen Patriot. Door een liefhebber de Aloude Vryheyd, in het licht gebracht* (1735) (Knuttel 16987).

<sup>142</sup> Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland, verdedigt tegen de schryver van den Hollandsche Patriot* (1735) (Knuttel 16986) 2, 31.

<sup>143</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland. Onder drie tyden: zo voor, onder, als na de Regeering der Graven van Holland. Door een liefhebber der Vryheid* (Amsterdam: Hermanus Uytwerf, 1737) (Knuttel 17056) 223-232.

<sup>144</sup> Arthur Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 142, 187.

### *Popular government the oldest and most lawful government (Intertextual)*

As the brothers De la Court were influenced by Hobbes the word ‘*passies*’ occurred frequently in their work. And as the constitution of the Republic was one of their main topics, the words ‘*Monarch*’, ‘*aristocratie*’, ‘*regeering*’ and ‘*interest*’ appeared also every so often. When they wrote about government they used repeatedly the expression: ‘*populare Regeering*’ and ‘*Vrye ende wettighe or Staats-gewijse Regeering*’. Similarly, writing about the drawbacks of an arbitrary head, ‘*een Uytstekend Hoofd*’ in their parlance, they combined it almost always with the trinity: ‘*Koningen, Princen ende Heeren*’.<sup>145</sup>

Comparing the texts the De la Courts used for the argumentation of the premise with the texts used by the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period I found a high degree of heuristic imitation. The most frequently used expression of the republican authors in the Second Stadtholderless Period, for example, was ‘*een populaire regering*’ or ‘*Volks-Regeering*’, but also words like ‘*interest*’ and ‘*Vrye ende wettighe*’ were used frequently.<sup>146</sup> Beaufort even mentioned the word ‘*passies*’ speaking about the drawbacks of a monarchy.<sup>147</sup>

### *Monarchy and court (PDA)*

When the De la Courts elaborated about the effects of a Court on the government of a country, they stated that courtiers would have a negative effect on a monarchical government by pushing a monarch into military exploits, luxurious living and distributing favours to the same courtiers for their own benefit.<sup>148</sup>

Similar arguments can be found for example in De Beaufort. According to him a court was a corrupting environment full of ambitious and lust and luxury seeking favourites.<sup>149</sup> Also the pamphlet writer of 1737 saw favourism at a court for the same reason as one of the drawbacks of a monarchy.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> For example: Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 29; ‘V.D.H.’ [Pieter de la Court], *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* (Leiden and Rotterdam: Hakkens, 1671) 1-2.

<sup>146</sup> For example: Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland*, 2; Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 223.

<sup>147</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 9.

<sup>148</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Weeg-schaal*, 44-49.

<sup>149</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 60-70.

<sup>150</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 28, 212, 225.

### *Monarchy and Court (Intertextual)*

The De la Courts constantly described the entourage at a court as ‘*Monarchale pluymstryckers ende Hoofse flatteurs*.’<sup>151</sup>

De Beaufort (1737) agreed with them, calling courtiers ‘*pluymstrijkers en vleiers*’.<sup>152</sup> A pamphlet in verse in 1704 was using similar words to express its opinion about courtiers, whereas in 1735 the writer of a pamphlet depicted the secretary of one of the Counts of Holland as a ‘*hoofs pluymstrycker*.’<sup>153</sup> Although the word ‘*pluymstrycker*’ was quite commonly used in seventeenth and eighteenth century texts, the combination with the words ‘*hoofs*’ and ‘*vleiers*’ and the connection to courtiers point to a heuristic imitation of the De la Courts.

### *Geweld ende bedrog (PDA)*

According to the De la Courts a monarch was always searching for conquests and expansion of his reign to satisfy his self-interest at the costs of other people’s interest. Therefore, their premise was that wherever a monarch reigned he had obtained his power by fraud and military power.<sup>154</sup>

In the anti-Stattholderate poem of 1704 the author accused monarchs of *list en bedrog* and sowing discord in their rise to power. Based on the experience of having lived under Stadtholder William III who had recently passed away (1702), he concluded that a monarch was always imperious and looking for war and glory.<sup>155</sup> De Beaufort’s message was similar to the De la Courts’: a monarchs ambition and self-interest could only be fulfilled through brute force and devious tricks.<sup>156</sup> In a pamphlet in 1735 the Counts of Holland were still depicted as despots, tyrants, warmongers and perjurers.<sup>157</sup> And the author of a lengthy pamphlet in 1737 stated that the only way for monarchs to rise to power was through coercion and weapons.<sup>158</sup> In all those publications the premise and argumentation was obviously similar to the De la Courts’.

---

<sup>151</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Weeg-schaal*, 64-69.

<sup>152</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 73.

<sup>153</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo. Of brandmerk van de stadhouderlike regering. Aan de vrye Nederlanden* (Vrystad: Waarmond Staet-Vorst. In’t Wapen vande Oude Vryheit, naest het Welvaren van’t Vaderland, 1704) (Knuttel 15136) 5; Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland*, 3.

<sup>154</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 436; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 153.

<sup>155</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 6-10.

<sup>156</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 368.

<sup>157</sup> Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland*, 7.

<sup>158</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 88-89.

### *Geweld ende bedrog (Intertextual)*

A monarchy in the words of the De la Courts came to power by ‘*Geweld ende Bedrog*’ and was characterised by: ‘*Onchristelike Bloed-stortingen*’ due to continuous wars.<sup>159</sup>

When discussing the way a monarchical government came onto being De Beaufort used the word-combination ‘*geweld, list ende kuipery*’.<sup>160</sup> All the other authors mentioned not only the violent character of the system, but also the deviousness: monarchs were not to be trusted. Monarchy was equal to violence, war, destruction and misery. The language in the pamphlets was expressive to the extreme: in 1735 the author of a pamphlet wrote: ‘[...] *onder Hertogen, Graven, Bisschoppen, ende Heeren [...] met hunne aanhang in gedurige wapene, met onchristelyke bloedstortingen hebben gestaan.*’<sup>161</sup> The most vivid description was given by the author of another pamphlet in 1735: ‘*Vorsten zijn ‘quistachtig’, wispelturig, dol, wreed, heerszuchtig. Altijd uit op oorlog.*’<sup>162</sup> In all this they heuristically imitated not only the words given by the De la Courts to monarchy but also their outspokenness: *Geweld ende bedrog*.

### *A mixed government (PDA)*

The De la Courts also rejected a mixed government: the strongest party would always destroy the weaker party which would create the unnatural and unwanted state of chaos and war.<sup>163</sup> Here they appropriated Hobbes’ theory on the indivisibility of sovereignty: ‘A Sovereign is always One, or indivisible.’<sup>164</sup>

Of all the authors of the second Stadtholderless period, only De Beaufort addressed in 1737 the possibility of a mixed government. He rejected the model at the same grounds as the De la Courts: the balance between the two systems of government would be unmaintainable as the one who had the military power at his disposal would always suppress the other.<sup>165</sup> An explanation for the absence of this topic in the other publications could be that most of the authors either justified the republican government or attacked the stadholder-as-monarch.

---

<sup>159</sup> ‘V.H.’ [Pieter de la Court], *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland* (s.l., 1662) Dedication.

<sup>160</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 19.

<sup>161</sup> Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 10.

<sup>162</sup> Anonym, *De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye der Graven en Stadhouders: nagespoord in de oude regtspleegingen en wetten in de Nederlanden gebruikelyk* (1735) (Knuttel 16988) 21.

<sup>163</sup> ‘V.D.H.’ [Pieter de la Court], *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* (Leiden and Rotterdam: Hakkens, 1671) 23; Weststeijn, 156.

<sup>164</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 145-155.

<sup>165</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 103-106.

Addressing the disadvantages of a mixed government required a more theoretical knowledge of both the author and the intended audience.<sup>166</sup>

#### *A mixed government (Intertextual)*

The De la Courts argued against a mixed government with the words ‘[that] *Het Swaard van Oorloge in de handen van een Capiteyn-Generaal altyds veel scherper is en verder reykt als het Swaards van Justitie in de handen van Politike Regeerders ende Regteren.*’<sup>167</sup>

Although De Beaufort did not use the same expression literally, he did refer to the power of the sword of the military man in relation to the weakness of the judicial and political power. As such there is a high degree of heuristic imitation by De Beaufort of the De la Courts.<sup>168</sup>

#### *Freedom versus slavery (PDA)*

An important premise in the worldview of the De la Court brothers was related to the opposition between freedom and slavery. Liberty was not only the freedom of restraint, of course within the limits of the agreed laws, but also the opposite of slavery. As a consequence true liberty was only possible in a republic where, by definition, nobody was subjected to another human being and everybody was entitled to participate in the political process. Therefore they made no difference between monarchy and tyranny as both led to slavery. In a monarchy one was always dependent on the vagaries of the ruler which made both restraint and subjection a constant threat.<sup>169</sup> In their eyes, to choose voluntary for a monarchical government was therefore equal to high treason.<sup>170</sup> Slavery was living under a yoke, freedom was having cast off that yoke. According to the De la Courts, social unrest would create the

---

<sup>166</sup> Interestingly the arguments used to justify the premise could also be used to reject the *trias politica*, the separation of powers. Weststeijn argued correctly that the brothers De la Court advocated an absolute sovereignty and rejected the separation of the executive, judicial and legislative powers (Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 145). As seen above, also De Beaufort supported this point of view. Interestingly, in his book, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution: History and Politics in the Dutch Republic 1747–1800*, published in 1973, Leeb made a statement that ‘by the end of the seventeenth century all the ideas that would be useful in the full flowering of Enlightenment were already in place’ (Leeb, *The Ideological Origins*, 39). If we consider the separation of powers to be one of the ideas of a full flowering Enlightenment, the statement made by Leeb becomes doubtful, taking the rejection of the separation by De Beaufort in 1737 into account.

<sup>167</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 375.

<sup>168</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 113-114.

<sup>169</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 132; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 236-241.

<sup>170</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 215-216.

possibility for return of the yoke. Therefore rightful laws and obedience to those laws was necessary as the common man was easily led astray by demagogues.

In the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period it was again De Beaufort who in 1737 based the premise on a theoretical argument. He declared, just like the De la Courts, that living under an arbitrary supreme power was equal to slavery and the opposite of liberty and it was one of the reasons to reject a monarchy. Servility was the characteristic of the court and of the subjects of a monarchy. They were dependents of an arbitrary head and therefore actually slaves. As slavery was against the natural law of humans, government by any arbitrary head had to be rejected.<sup>171</sup> In the pamphlet of 1737, called '*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland*', the same argument was used that humans were by nature born equal, free and independent of each other. The pamphlet continued with the statement that humans could lose those rights through coercion or voluntary, but voluntary only happened through necessity and was temporarily as it went against Nature.<sup>172</sup>

De Beaufort defined liberty as the opposite of slavery and as the right of the people to the supreme power and the protection of life, freedom and property under laws.<sup>173</sup> Under a monarchy none of the two conditions applied, an aristocracy restricted the first condition, but fulfilled the second, and under a democracy (sic) both conditions were fulfilled.<sup>174</sup> Like the De la Courts, De Beaufort drew attention to the risks of a democracy, notably the influence of demagogues.<sup>175</sup> Another risk of democracy was noted by the author of the pamphlet of 1737, namely the risk of oligarchy, which was also mentioned by the De la Courts as a risk.<sup>176</sup> Both De Beaufort and the author of the pamphlet of 1737 copied the De la Courts' argumentation almost to the letter. The absence of other authors might well be caused by the same reason as above: arguing this premise required a more theoretical knowledge of both the author and the intended audience.

#### *Freedom versus slavery (Intertextual)*

The image used by the De la Courts to describe the value of freedom is best expressed in their opinion on giving up freedom voluntary: '*een niet vergankelijk, maar onbeeterlik, ende door*

---

<sup>171</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 21-22, 200-207, 73-74, 78.

<sup>172</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 94.

<sup>173</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 26.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibidem*, 61-121.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibidem*, 119-120.

<sup>176</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 224.

*successive, een eeuwighdurend land verraad, zulks alle nakomelingen in der eeuwigheid onder dat Monarchaale juk te moeten zugten.*<sup>177</sup> Slavery was living under a yoke, freedom was having cast off that yoke. Unrest would create the possibility for return of the yoke. Therefore rightful laws and obedience to those laws was necessary as the common man was easily led astray by demagogues. In their work the words ‘*Vrye regeering*’ and ‘*wetten*’ were very frequently used and when they spoke about the common man they used the word ‘*graauw*’.<sup>178</sup>

For the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period the yoke (*juk*) was also a frequently used image. The author of an anti-Stadtholderate poem that was published two years after the death of William III, for example, spoke about ‘*slaafse ketens en juk*’ as the instruments of a tyrant, when he equalled the Stadtholder-King with a monarch and a tyrant.<sup>179</sup> Also the connection between liberty and laws was quite common. De Beaufort, for example, wrote in 1737 that ‘[wij] *Dienstbaar aan de wetten wezen opdat wij in vrijheid mogen leven*’.<sup>180</sup> And the author of the pamphlet ‘*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog van de aloutheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland*’ that was published the same year also emphasised the importance of laws to enforce good behaviour: ‘*de deugd van het volk hangt af van de strengheid van haar wereldlijke Rechters*’.<sup>181</sup> Also the threat the common man could form to the stability of the society and the role of demagogues therein worried De Beaufort. Their rhetoric could, according to him, easily lead *het gemeene volk*’ into tyranny.<sup>182</sup> Therefore in the premise that freedom is the opposite of slavery I found a high degree of heuristic imitation in the above mentioned publications.

#### *A true republic is incompatible with a monarchical state (PDA)*

Another important premise of the brothers de la Court was that a monarchical state was incompatible with a true republic.<sup>183</sup> They argued that under a popular government the interest of the assembled people would be balanced by the total of individual interests. And even an aristocracy, if not based on life-long and hereditary positions, would take the common interest

---

<sup>177</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 215-216.

<sup>178</sup> Ibidem, 32.

<sup>179</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 4-6.

<sup>180</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 26.

<sup>181</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog*, 24.

<sup>182</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 117-118

<sup>183</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 213-216.

at heart as it coincided with their private interest. Only in a monarchical state the private interest of the Head would always prevail over the common interest.<sup>184</sup>

Reading De Beaufort, one gets the impression that he seriously considered the possibility that a monarchy could be the best system of government. However, he concluded his argument with the statement that the conditions under which this could happen were such that it was unconceivable. The arbitrariness and the private interest of a monarch made a monarchical state therefore incompatible with a true republic.<sup>185</sup> In 1735 the author of a pamphlet defending the historical freedom of the province of Holland against a supporter of a Stadtholderate concluded that any Republic would be better than an Eminent Head or Monarch.<sup>186</sup> The author of another pamphlet that appeared in that same year agreed to that conclusion, although in a less courteous way: *‘Een gematigde regeering van vele Perzoonen is beter dan een stijfkoppige Alleenheerser.’*<sup>187</sup> According to the writer of a pamphlet in 1737 it was exactly the issue of interest that made a monarchy the worst system of government: being a human with human passions and shortcomings, living at a corrupting court with military means at his disposal there would be no monarch who would let the common interest prevail over his private interest.<sup>188</sup> In all those pamphlets the argument was that the expenses of a monarch would always be at the cost of the common interest. Whereas most of the authors attacked the monarchy in order to claim superiority of the republic, the author of the pamphlet of 1737 made the observation that only in a true republic reputation and status connected the private interest of the regents to the common interest of the people who were governed. From a PDA point of view all authors followed the De la Courts, but De Beaufort and the author of the pamphlet of 1737 even followed the brothers in their argumentation exactly. The subject of incompatibility of a true republic with a monarchical state was dominant in all the pamphlets of the 1730’s and in the book by De Beaufort. This is not surprising as in 1734 William Charles Henry Friso married princess Ann of England, Scotland and Ireland. His elevation to the Stadtholderate of Gelderland (1729) and his recovery of the (shared) title ‘prince of Orange’ (1732) had already strengthened his position, but the marriage with princess Ann reminded the Orangists to past successful alliances.<sup>189</sup> In the following years a number of Orangists pamphlets appeared calling for a restauration of the

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibidem, 29-30.

<sup>185</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 64-67.

<sup>186</sup> Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 5-7.

<sup>187</sup> Anonym, *De Bataafsche vrijheid en tyranny*, 108.

<sup>188</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 225.

<sup>189</sup> Rowen, ‘The second Stadholderless period: doldrums’, 156.



Stadtholderate in the whole Republic. As a reaction the supporters of the governing States-party regents had to contradict the advantages of a Stadtholderate and defend the existing form of government. They could not claim any economic success as had been the case during the first Stadtholderless Period. Therefore they focussed on the inherent detrimental effect a monarchical state, read Stadtholderate, had on the common interest.<sup>190</sup>

*A true republic is incompatible with a monarchical state (Intertextual)*

The key expression used by the De la Courts focussed on two connections. The first connection was between the common good and the public good. The second connection was between the regents and the subjects. In a true republic '[...] *het wel en quaalik vaaren der Regeerders geschaakeld is aan het wel en quaalik vaaren der Onderdaanen.*'<sup>191</sup> To achieve the '*wel vaaren*' of all citizens the objective of a true Republic had to be peace and prosperity.<sup>192</sup> All this was impossible in a monarchy because of '*eigen Interest*'.<sup>193</sup>

It is interesting to see how Romeyn de Hooghe depicted and described in the book by Van der Hoeven (1706) this self-interest in combination with *Geweld ende Bedrog: 'een verwatene dolle Helleveeg die opklauterd over de puin der Landsheeren slooten en gesloopte -Steeden. 't Is de Vorstelyke Eigenbaat.*'<sup>194</sup> Even the author of a pamphlet in 1722 that only secondarily mentioned the position of an arbitrary head, exclaimed: '[...] *niets zoo nadelig kan Zijn, als een form van regeering, die voor Eygenbaat en verdrukkingen deuren en vensters opent [...] die se meer zal gebruyken om zig zelve als de Natie groot te maken.*'<sup>195</sup> The key expression in all those publications is '*Vorstelyke Eigenbaat*' and as such the authors have imitated the De la Courts. The rhetoric (*paradiastole*) used by De Beaufort to reject the monarchical system is even a dialectical imitation of the De la Courts: first he describes the superiority of the monarchical system, only to conclude that the advantages are inconceivable.<sup>196</sup> The De la Courts used the same technique.

*A Stadtholderate is equal to a monarchy (PDA)*

In the same vein the De la Courts equalled a Stadtholderate with a monarchy. This premise

---

<sup>190</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 994-995.

<sup>191</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 23.

<sup>192</sup> Ibidem, 442-447.

<sup>193</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 291.

<sup>194</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part I: 76.

<sup>195</sup> Anonym, *Libertatem nemo bonus nisi cum anima amisit. Dat is, de vryheid heeft geen eerlyk man, als met zyn leven verloren (1722)*. (*Nimwegen: Johannes Kragt, 1722*). (*Knuttel 16573*), 4.

<sup>196</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 110-112.

led to the radical rejection of the Stadtholderate. In their argumentation they referred to the two above mentioned reasons – the origin of their power (*Geweld ende Bedrog*) and the balance of interest (*'eigen Interest'*) – by highlighting the behaviour of the Counts of Holland and the Stadtholder of the House of Orange.<sup>197</sup> In their radicalism they even didn't spare William the Silent. According to them the House of Orange had come to their elevated position in the Netherlands through manipulation of the towns and knighthood of Holland.<sup>198</sup>

The writer of the pamphlet *'Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland'* (published in 1737) followed their argumentation and showed on the basis of letters to the States of Holland that William of Orange requested the title and all the rights that, according to him, went with it of the Count of Holland.<sup>199</sup> The request was, as De Beaufort reminded his readers, also in 1737, repeated by Stadtholder Maurice (and denied by the States).<sup>200</sup> Both Van der Hoeven in 1706 and De Beaufort in 1737 stressed in their publications that the Stadtholder of the House of Orange constantly had been trying to gain the supreme power in the Republic.<sup>201</sup> The printer of a very straightforward anti-Stadtholderate poem in 1704, still being afraid of accusations of *lèse-majesté*, took no risks and printed the work under a pseudonym that could be seen as a statement in itself: *'Gedruckt in Vrystad, by Waarmond Staet-Vorst. In 't Wapen vande Oude Vryheyt, naest het welvaren van 't Vaderland.'*<sup>202</sup>

#### *A Stadtholderate is equal to a monarchy (Intertextual)*

The De la Courts connected in their texts the Stadtholder of the House of Orange constantly with: *'Koningen, Princen ende Heeren'* and of course on a regular base with the word *'Monarch'*.<sup>203</sup>

All the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period imitated this frame of the De la Courts. Exemplary was the introduction to the poem written in 1702 right after the death of William III: *'Op den doot van Willem den derden, stadhouderlijken koning van Goot Brittanje en koninklijk stadhouder van de Verenigde Nederlanden'*<sup>204</sup> The author left no doubt about the monarchical pretension of William III.

---

<sup>197</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing, voor-reeden*, 25, 130, 417, 474.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibidem*, 399.

<sup>199</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog*, 122.

<sup>200</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 562.

<sup>201</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part II: 47-48; De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 560-567.

<sup>202</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, Front page.

<sup>203</sup> For example: Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 46.

<sup>204</sup> Anonym, *Op de doot van William den derden*, Aanhef.

*The Counts of Holland are servants of the Provincial States (PDA)*

To undermine the essentiality of the Stadtholderate in the constitution of the United Provinces, a key constitutional element of the Republic for the Orangists, the brothers De la Court used historical sources to degrade the position of the Counts of Holland. The premise of the De la Courts was that Holland had never been a conquered part of either Germany or France, but that in medieval times the States of Holland, consisting of representations of the towns and the knighthood, had chosen the heads of those countries as Stadtholder. They received the title ‘Count of Holland’ and – important for the De la Courts’ argument – became servants of the Provincial States as military leaders and prosecutors in court cases.<sup>205</sup> In the publication *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland* Pieter De la Court stressed the position as servants of the States. For that reason he included large tracts of the Great Privilege, issued by Mary of Burgundy in 1477 to the towns of (among others) Holland and numerous chapters from the *Deductie* written by Johan de Witt in 1654.<sup>206</sup> But in his description of the life and actions of the Counts he stressed the manipulations of almost every Count to extent his power at the detriment of that of the States.<sup>207</sup>

Of all the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period, Van de Hoeven was the most comprehensive and detailed when it came to historical background. His work started with a very detailed description of the assemblies of the Batavians, the first inhabitants of ‘Holland’ and ended, again in full detail, with the exploits of all the Stadtholders of the House of Orange up to and including William III. His conclusions were clear: in times of war the Batavian forefathers had chosen a leader for the duration of a conflict, Holland had never been incorporated into Germany or France or governed by one of the two, the assemblies of cities and nobles of Holland had chosen the rulers of those countries to the function of ‘Stadtholder’ responsible for the military and the judicial affairs. Whether these rulers were called ‘Counts, Princes, Dukes, Kings, Emperors, etc.’ was irrelevant. They were all Stadtholder who had to answer to the assembly – the ‘States’ - of towns and nobles. From the early Middle Ages the cities and nobles were the real protectors of Liberty. This was the Liberty which Van der Hoeven called ‘*Aeloude Vryheid*’. On the other hand he also pointed to the many times the ‘Stadtholder’ had abused their position to extend their grip on the towns and knighthood.<sup>208</sup> To strengthen the argument Van der Hoeven had added in an appendix to the book the whole

---

<sup>205</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Historie der Gravelike Regering*, Voor-reeden.

<sup>206</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Historie der Gravelike Regering*, Inleyding, Cap.XXXIII.

<sup>207</sup> For example the description of the behaviour of archduke Maximilian of Austria: Pieter de la Court, *Historie der Gravelike Regering*, 150-156.

<sup>208</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, “Bericht aan den Leezer”.

Great Privilege, various agreements between the States and towns of Holland with successive Counts, Dukes and Archdukes about rights and privileges, and the *Deductie* written by Johan de Witt. The book was illustrated by Romeyn de Hooghe with allegoric engravings in a very expressive style. The engravings were accompanied by a description in a similar expressive text.<sup>209</sup> This extensive description of the ideas of Van der Hoeven with respect to the representation of the past served as a model for almost all the pamphlet writers. They all recorded the Batavian past of people's assemblies, the '*soevereign populare regering*' as one author in 1735 called it. Furthermore they all stressed the position of servant to the States of the Counts of Holland.<sup>210</sup>

Also De Beaufort referred to the Batavian past, but more summarily. He described the Batavians as courageous and noble people and therefore capable of self-government. This Batavian past was for De Beaufort the explanation of the strong desire for freedom and the prosperity of later times in Holland: '*het welvaeren van de state is op vryheid gebouwd*'.<sup>211</sup> De Beaufort described the period of the Counts of Holland and their legal position and power briefly in more or less similar words as Van der Hoeven. He was, however, more straightforward than Van der Hoeven when it came to describing the actual power relation: the Provincial States possessed most of the times only a shadow of authority: '*een schaduw van gezag*'.<sup>212</sup> From a PDA point of view all the authors follow the De la Courts in their argumentation. Haitsma Mulier has shown that the Batavian past as an ideal society, developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, was still very much alive in the eighteenth century although contrary knowledge was already at the end of the seventeenth century present. He argued that in the eighteenth century the 'myth' was only used when opportune.<sup>213</sup>

#### *The Counts of Holland are servants of the Provincial States (Intertextual)*

The texts of the arguments the De la Courts used to justify this premise were mostly coming from other sources, notably classical Greek and Roman Republican authors and more or less contemporary authors like Grotius, Viglius van Aytta, and Lieuwe Aitzema. Still, some

---

<sup>209</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, front page, Part I: 1-2, 24-25, 46-47, 76-77, Part II: 140-141, Part III: 306-307.

<sup>210</sup> Anonym, *Op de doot van William den derden*, 9; Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 5; Anonym, *De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye*, 37; *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 9.

<sup>211</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 9.

<sup>212</sup> *Ibidem*, 104.

<sup>213</sup> E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier, 'De Bataafse mythe opnieuw bekeken', in: *BMGN Low Countries Historical Review* 111 (1996) 357-361.

expressions were clearly based on typical De la Courts word-combinations like ‘soevereign populare regering’ and ‘Schaduwe van Vryheid’.<sup>214</sup>

As there was a huge amount of different quotations but from the same classical sources and more recent sources (sixteenth and seventeenth century) in the publications I concluded that the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period were familiar with the sources that had been used by De la Courts. Some typical De la Court word-combinations were also used, like ‘soevereign populare regering’ and ‘een schaduw van gezag’ (De Beaufort,<sup>215</sup>), but from an intertextuality point of view it is more a question of exploitative imitation than heuristic imitation: the De la Courts were imitated, but so were a number of other authors (which had been quoted by the De la Courts as well). There is no proof that they had imitated the De la Courts quotations.

#### *Discord as an instrument of power (PDA)*

To explain the current position of power of the Stadtholder the De la Courts showed that over time the Stadtholder in Holland, be it counts, dukes or princes, had accumulated through marriage, succession, fraud and raw power such an amount of influence that they could sow discord between the cities and nobles and dominate them.<sup>216</sup> In the *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland* (1662) Pieter de la Court described the Hook and Cod wars as a typical example of this behaviour. In the description he represented the Hook-faction as the defenders of the States and the Cod-faction as destroyers of the rightful government.<sup>217</sup> A second reference to discord was the theological polemic between Arminius and Gomarus and the discord between Johan van Oldenbarnevelt and Stadtholder Maurice as a consequence of the polemic. The discord ended with the beheading of Oldenbarnevelt.

All the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period warned strongly against the risks that brought discord within the Provinces or between the Provinces. For most of them both the Hook and Cod wars and the polemic between Arminius and Gomarus were the prime examples of such discord that benefitted the Stadtholder. Van der Hoeven described in his book in 1706 the Hook and Cod wars in detail and especially the illustration by Romeyn de Hooghe on this subject was telling and a clear warning against discord.<sup>218</sup> All the writers, when they discussed the Hook and Cod wars, sided with the Hook faction and with

---

<sup>214</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 239.

<sup>215</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 104-105.

<sup>216</sup> Pieter De la Court, *Historie der Gravelike Regering*, Inleyding.

<sup>217</sup> *Ibidem*, 154.

<sup>218</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, 76-77.

Oldenbarnevelt. The latter was described as upholder of the sovereignty of the States of Holland (whereby Maurice was the tyrant), a position he shared with Johan de Witt and the *Loevesteiners* in the poem of 1704 and in the *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland* of 1737.<sup>219</sup> Very interesting is a pamphlet of 1733, not so much for its content, as for its title. It is called ‘*Palamedes of de onderdrukte deugt, berispdigt op de hedendaagsche tyden.*’ The title refers evidently to the drama ‘*Palamedes oft Vermoorde onnooselheid*’, written by Vondel in 1625 in support of Johan van Oldenbarnevelt, which make the pamphlet immediately an anti-*Stadtholderate* pamphlet.<sup>220</sup> The content is an allegorical polemic between Virtue and Vice to persuade the listener to choose for one of the two. The text is not explicitly anti-*Stadtholderate* or pro-States faction, but one can deduct from the text that Virtue represented the ‘*Staatsgezinden*’ by the reference to the cap and spear of Liberty and to Marcus Porcius Cato, the paragon of classical republicanism. ‘Vice’ tried to lure the listener with promises of ambition, luxury and power, a typical frame of the *Stadtholderate* by the ‘*Staatsgezinden*’ of that time.<sup>221</sup>

#### *Discord as an instrument of power (Intertextual)*

As discussed in the political discourse analysis the De la Courts and the authors of the second *Stadtholderless Period* used the same premise, but they also defended this premise with the same examples: the Hook and Cod Wars and the discord between Johan van Oldenbarnevelt and Stadtholder Maurice. The terminology used by the brothers De la Court in representing the Hook-faction as the defenders of the States and the Cod faction as *usurpateurs* was clearly indicating their bias.<sup>222</sup> In their description of the discord between Maurice and Oldenbarnevelt they honoured the latter by presenting him as ‘*een oud Patriot*’.<sup>223</sup> Van der Hoeven (and De Hooghe in the book by Van der Hoeven) gave a heuristic imitation of the same bias towards the Hook-faction in the Hook and Cod wars. He described the Hook-faction as ‘*Vrye Staats-gezinden*’, and the Cod-faction as the ‘*usurpateurs*’.<sup>224</sup> De Beaufort wrote in similar terms and he described the Cods as the ‘*hofpartij*’, also a heuristic imitation if

<sup>219</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 9-10; Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland*, 9; Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 6, 9, 18; Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog* 81, 140.

<sup>220</sup> J.L. Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century. The Politics of Particularism* (London: Clarendon Press, 1994) 251-252.

<sup>221</sup> Anonym, *Palamedes, of de onderdrukte deugd: Berispdigt, op de heedendaagse tyden* (Amsterdam: Gerrit Bouman, 1733). (Knuttel 16910).

<sup>222</sup> Pieter De la Court, *Historie der Gravelike Regering*, 154.

<sup>223</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing, voor-reeden*.

<sup>224</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part I: 76, 135.

we take the description of a court by De Beaufort into account.<sup>225</sup> Van de Hoeven described in detail the final days of Oldenbarnevelt and cited his last words on the scaffold: ‘[...] *als een goed Patriot zal ik sterven.*’<sup>226</sup> Also here he imitated the De La Courts heuristically by calling Oldenbarnevelt a patriot.

#### *Captain-General as stepping stone (PDA)*

The brothers De la Court were especially suspicious about ambitious members of the House of Orange trying to be appointed at important (military) positions: once appointed it was difficult to stop them in their rise to power. The fact that such a person had an army at its disposal made them the more dangerous.<sup>227</sup> Although he was not mentioned once, it was clear to every reader that they were referring to Prince William III who would at the time they published their books be in a position to be elevated to the Captain-Generalship.<sup>228</sup>

In his book and in an added comment to a letter, which was part of the book, De Beaufort warned with exactly the same argumentation against the elevation of Willem Karel Hendrik Friso, Stadtholder of Friesland and Groningen, to the position of Captain-General of the States army.<sup>229</sup> In the poem of 1704 the author warned specifically for the ambition of the Houses of Orange and Nassau. In the pamphlet he wrote that the appointment of the young Prince, Willem Karel Hendrik Friso, would be disastrous for the freedom of the Republic. He concluded that such an appointment would be a reason to exchange the lion for the donkey as image of the Republic.<sup>230</sup> The author of a pamphlet, printed in Nijmegen in 1722, explicitly mentioned that a Stadtholder who had at his disposal the nation’s military power would use it for its own interest.<sup>231</sup> Also in 1735 the mistrust against the House of Orange and Nassau was high; the *Vrijgeboren Hollander* was sure that the first lesson the Princes would get was to set their aim no lower than the Captain-Generalship and from there to the Stadtholderate.<sup>232</sup> It is questionable whether this author imitated the De la Courts or Van der Hoeven. The latter had used in his book, published in 1706, the same argument with the same words.<sup>233</sup> All the authors were convinced of the risk to give an ambitious person the access to military power.

---

<sup>225</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 107, 299-300.

<sup>226</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 273.

<sup>227</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 215-216.

<sup>228</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 50, 100, 123, 132.

<sup>229</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 84, *Vyfde Brief*, 68.

<sup>230</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 5, 13; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 260.

<sup>231</sup> Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 4.

<sup>232</sup> Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 21.

<sup>233</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 410.

### *Capitain-Generaal as stepping stone (Intertextual)*

In their work the De la Courts constantly used the word ‘*Capitain-Generaal*’ when they discussed military affairs (even when they referred to Julius Caesar), or starting positions with a prospect of higher position.<sup>234</sup> It was one of their favoured frames used for the members of the House of Orange and a warning for the potential danger of the House of Orange to the ‘*Vrye ende wettighe or Staats-gewijse Regeering*’ (indicating the government of a true Republic).

The word-combination *Capitain-Generaal* used by the De la Courts was imitated in various forms by authors in the second Stadtholderless Period. De Beaufort copied it even in the enlarged expression of the De la Courts: ‘*Capitain - Generaal en Stadhouder*’ (elsewhere *Kapitein - Generaal en Stadhouder*’), and in the poem of 1704 the expression became *Doorlugtig hoofd en veldheer*.<sup>235</sup> Other authors described the risk of elevating a person to such a function, like the author of the pamphlet of 1722: ‘[...] *niets zoo nadelig kan Zijn, als een form van regeering, [...] en ‘s Lands Militie stelt ter discretie van een person, die se meer zal gebruyken om zig zelven als de Natie groot te maken.*’<sup>236</sup> Looking at the reproductive and heuristic imitations one must conclude that this frame coined by the brothers De la Court for the Princes of Orange was in the second Stadtholderless period still very popular, even when it concerned the House of Nassau.

### Discussion

The result of the Political Discourse Analysis and the intertextual analysis show that of all the authors it was De Beaufort that stayed closest to the De la Courts. Although he formulated his ideas differently from the De la Courts he was not only using the same premises, but he also argued them in the same way. Like the De la Courts he used both theoretical arguments and examples based on archival sources. Exemplary is how De Beaufort and the De la Courts defined liberty in both a negative sense and in a positive sense based on a theoretical argument. They saw the negative sense as the freedom of restraint: ‘*De Vryheit is een natuerlyke ofte aengebore Macht, om te mogen doen, alle het gene een iegelyk belieft, ten zy, dat hem iets door geweld ofte door het recht verboden zy.*’<sup>237</sup> or, in the words of the De la Courts: ‘*een volkoomen Vryheid om alles te doen, ‘t gene tegen de Policie, en menschelijcke*

---

<sup>234</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 225.

<sup>235</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 5.

<sup>236</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 84, *Vyfde Brief*, 68; Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 4.

<sup>237</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 24.



*societeit niet strijdich is [...]*<sup>238</sup> and the positive sense as freedom as opposite to slavery, which they both described as ‘*een vrij man is daarom vrij van de noodzakelijkheid, om aan een mensch te gehoorsamen.*’<sup>239</sup> The De la Courts concluded that States in which both types of liberty were practised were called Republics.<sup>240</sup> De Beaufort saw it as the particular feature of good government.<sup>241</sup> As argued by Weststeijn and Velema, they both therefore saw positive liberty as a precondition to negative liberty. This was a revolutionary idea at that time.<sup>242</sup> In the same way the similarity between De Beaufort and the De la Courts in rejecting the monarchy on theoretical grounds is striking. De Beaufort also emphasised the same issues with respect to the practicalities of the constitutional system: the violence of the monarch, the corrupting influence of the court, the danger of allowing a prince the first step on the ladder to power, the opportunities discord furnished to the Stadtholder, the risks of demagogues in a democracy, and the preference for an aristocracy with temporal positions. The heuristic imitation, and quite often even a reproductive imitation, in the De Beaufort’s work with the De la Court is remarkable: typical words and word-combinations used by the De la Court were literally or near-literally used by De Beaufort. In the description of the advantages and disadvantages of a monarchy he even used the rhetorical technique of *paradiastole*, a favourite technique of the De la Courts as well. Although De Beaufort claimed that he would write straightforward – *rondborstig* – the text doesn’t express the same *parrhèsia* as the De la Courts’ work. A reason for this difference is probably that the objective of De Beaufort was to send, as a retired Regent, a wake-up call to the higher middle and *renteniers* class to support and participate in the existing government process, whereas the De la Courts tried to dissimulate their message of change to all the republican citizens.<sup>243</sup> Throughout the book De Beaufort used analogues from Greek and Roman antiquity to illustrate his argumentation whereas the De la Courts used fables for the same purpose.

The influence of the De la Court seems less outspoken in the first chapters of the work of Van der Hoeven. His book was primarily a historical overview which was used to propagate the message that a Stadtholder, in any form, had always been disastrous and would therefore in the future also be disastrous for the country. He presented the early inhabitants of Holland as courageous and peace loving people who had always governed themselves and

---

<sup>238</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, Note 137, 237.

<sup>239</sup> Ibidem, Note 138, 238.

<sup>240</sup> Arthur Weststeijn, *De Radicale Republiek. Johan en Pieter de la Court – Dwarse denkers uit de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2013) 128-129.

<sup>241</sup> De Beaufort, *Vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 2.

<sup>242</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 128-129; Wyger Velema, *Republicans*, 56-58.

<sup>243</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 44-49; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 140.

when necessary chose their leaders for a restricted period of time. The De la Courts were less interested in that historical period, which might explain the absence of typical De la Courts language.<sup>244</sup> In Van der Hoeven's description of the period of the Counts of Holland the resemblance in text with the De la Courts, especially with the *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland*, became much stronger. Although there is no reproductive imitation by Van der Hoeven of the De la Court, it is quite clear that both used the same sources, notably the Great Privelege, the work of Viglius van Aytta for the description of the Burgundian and Habsburg dukes, the *Deductie* of 1587 by Francois Vrancken on the historical basis of the Union, the work of Lieuwe Aitzema on the Westphalian Peace and the years 1650-1651, and the *Deductie* of 1654 by Johan de Witt.<sup>245</sup> In that sense there is certainly exploitative and sometimes reproductive imitation when both cited the same source. Totally different from the text in Van der Hoeven's work, which is all very factual, biased but factual, are the illustrations by De Hooghe and the accompanying explanations of the illustrations. They are expressive, straightforward, sometimes even blunt and provocative and show the same *parrhèsia* in word and image as the texts of the De la Courts. There is certainly a high degree of heuristic imitation and from the images one can even detect forms of dialectical imitation in the use of satire. To my opinion the illustrations in the book of Van de Hoeven, although less in number, fulfil the same function as the illustrated fables in Pieter de la Court's book '*Sinryke Fabulen*': strengthening the argumentation. It is unfortunately beyond the scope of this thesis to elaborate further on the exceptional combination of a factual text and a number of illustrations which are loaded with symbolism and on top of that are accompanied with descriptions that excel in expressive rhetorical techniques.

The pamphlets are in general more straightforward anti-*Stadtholderate* with a focus on all the bad characteristics of monarch and therefore of *Stadtholders*. There is less reference to the theoretical arguments the De la Courts used to argue for example that true republic is incompatible with a monarchical state. This does not automatically mean that the authors did not use the De la Courts. For example, the authors of the earlier pamphlets of 1702 and 1704, written shortly after the death of William III (and more vindictive than theoretically substantiated of character) used absolutely the rhetoric of *parrhèsia*. They expressed all the evils of monarchy and especially of the *Stadtholderate* loud and clear. Furthermore, they used

---

<sup>244</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 64.

<sup>245</sup> Jonathan Israel., *The Dutch Republic*, 598; J.Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 43: the *Deductie* of 1587 stated that Holland had never been subjected to foreign rule. It was used by the regents who in the second *Stadholderless Period* favoured a policy of international abstinence and demilitarisation.

the same premise as the De la Court on this subject. In the text one finds some words that are also used by the De la Courts, like *'pluymstrycker'* but far less the typical word-combination *'Monarchale pluymstryckers ende Hoofse flatteurs.'* From a Political Discourse Analyse point of view the premise of the De la Courts is certainly the same although the argumentation is not as complete as with the De la Courts. The intertextual imitation is less evident: the rhetoric is typical the De la Courts, but there is less heuristic or other imitation. The total picture, however points strongly in the direction of the De la Courts. It might well be that these pamphlets were written for another public and another purpose than the later pamphlets which had a more historical approach. The earlier pamphlets could have been written to herald the end of a period whereas the later had to defend an existing government situation.

The later pamphlets (1722 and 1735) were still anti-*Stadtholderate* but more based on historical arguments. In general they also lacked the theoretical argumentation that is typically De la Court. As such they were similar to the work of Van der Hoeven and the question arises to which extent the De la Courts or Van der Hoeven was used when the pamphlets were written. More than in the early pamphlets word-combinations appeared that were heuristically imitations of the De la Courts. The language used was direct, but not vindictive as in the early pamphlets. A special case was the pamphlet of 1737 (*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog van de aloutheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland*). When discussing the constitutional system the author used the same premises and argumentation as the De la Courts, both theoretically as in the historical examples. Also interesting was his preference for an aristocratic system, a choice that the De la Courts in the end also made. The language he used was also clearly an heuristic imitation of the De la Court. Whereas in the pamphlets of 1722 and 1735 one could still question the influence of the De la Court in all aspects, the writer of the pamphlet of 1737 had clearly studied the De la Court from beginning to end. Interestingly the argumentation for the premises was in general also to De Beaufort's and one can speculate how near the authors were to each other, if not the same. Imitation of each other has to be excluded as the book and the pamphlet were published in the same year (1737) and both were too extensive to be imitated easily.

### 3.3 Political and societal premises

In this chapter the premises the De la Courts assumed concerning the policy of the province of Holland and the Republic and the premises concerning the relation between politics and society will stand central. They cover the ideas the brothers had about domestic- and foreign politics, representation of the people in the public administration and the relation between

religion, churches and secular authority. Two premises in this chapter require some explanation. The first one concerns the premise on the sovereignty of the Provincial States and especially of the States of Holland. The second one concerns the premises on religion and the position of the ecclesiastical authorities versus the secular authorities. I have included the premise on sovereignty in this chapter and not in the previous one, because the provincial sovereignty of Holland versus the other provinces was to the brothers De la Court the main building block of the domestic policy of the province of Holland. In the previous chapter (on constitutional premises) the premises on sovereignty reflected the ideas they had about the sovereignty of the province versus the Count or Stadtholder. The premises on religion and authority over church matters might at first instance look out of place, but religion and church belonged according to the brothers De la Courts absolutely to the public domain.<sup>246</sup> For that reason they are included in this chapter.

*The absolute sovereignty of the States of Holland (PDA)*

For this premise the brothers De la Court appropriated Hobbes' argument that 'A Sovereign is always One or indivisible'.<sup>247</sup> Their interpretation of Hobbes would ensure a republican absolutism that underlined the indivisibility of sovereignty giving supreme authority to the States of Holland in all political and religious matters. The objective was to stop short any claims someone could put forward for a role, either political or military, for the Stadtholder. They rejected any propositions whereby legislative power would be separated from executive power. Such a separation of power would give individuals – read the Stadtholder - the opportunity to assume all military command, whereby the power of arms would prevail over legitimate rule.<sup>248</sup>

On the issue of supreme authority for the States of Holland Van der Hoeven stated in his book in 1706 that the States of Holland and West-Friesland were sovereign and had the power to decide on everything that concerned the Province. That implied, in Van der Hoeven's words, that each of the provinces were free to take decisions independent from other provinces: every province was sovereign.<sup>249</sup> De Beaufort highlighted in his work in 1737 that each of the provinces belonging to the Union of Utrecht was sovereign in relation to the other provinces and had the supreme power in the Provincial States and was subject to no one. He continued by mentioning that some matters of general interest were delegated to the States-

---

<sup>246</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 300.

<sup>247</sup> Ibidem, 155.

<sup>248</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 156.

<sup>249</sup> Emanuel van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 250.

General, but that in the States-General each individual province was free again to vote in such a way that no decision could be taken that went against the interest of the province.<sup>250</sup>

The earlier pamphlets in the second Stadtholderless Period connected the concept of ‘sovereignty’ to the struggle for sovereignty between the province and the Counts of Holland and the Stadtholder, as discussed in the chapter on constitutional premises. The authors of the pamphlet *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland* and the pamphlet *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland*, printed in 1735 and 1737 respectively, emphasized, however, the condition of unanimously voting in the States-General on certain issues to safeguard the interest of the individual provinces. The author of the pamphlet ‘*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog*’, published in 1737, followed the same argumentation: the provinces were sovereign and in the States-General unanimously voting was required to protect the interest of the individual provinces.<sup>251</sup>

From PDA point of view it is interesting to see that differences are starting to appear. The premise of absolute sovereignty of the States of Holland, and in general sovereignty of the individual Provincial States, was in 1706 for Van der Hoeven still valid and the argumentation was equal to the De la Courts’ argument that military command would prevail over legitimate rule. In 1736 De Beaufort agreed with the De la Court on this premise on the same grounds, but immediately added to this premise the role of the States-General. The pamphlets of the 1730’s were even less outspoken with respect to the absolute sovereignty of the States of Holland. In their publications there was as much attention to the Provincial States as to the States-General. According to Donald Haks, the turning point has to be sought in the second General Assembly (1716-1717). Although the Assembly did not produce any tangible results, in the closing speech by the representative of Overijssel, Van Rechteren, stressed under wide acclaim of the other representatives, the necessity of collaboration between the provinces for the prosperity of the whole Union.<sup>252</sup>

#### *The absolute sovereignty of the States of Holland (Intertextual)*

The ideas of the brothers De la Court on the issue of sovereignty of the provinces were expressed with words and word-combinations like ‘*Vrye ende wettighe Regeering*’ or ‘*Staatsgewijze Regeering*’, ‘*Democratie ofte populare regeering*’, ‘*souveraine magt*’, ‘*Oppermagt*’

---

<sup>250</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 124.

<sup>251</sup> Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland 11*, 31; Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog 110-114*.

<sup>252</sup> Haks, *Vaderland en vrede*, 290.

and 'vergaadering'.<sup>253</sup> Also their reluctance with respect to majority voting was visible in the combined use of words like 'weinigen' and 'veelen.'<sup>254</sup> As the De la Courts focus was almost exclusive on the province of Holland, the words 'provincie' or 'Staeten-Generael' were not used too often.

With respect to expressions related to sovereignty there was heuristic imitation of the De la Courts by the earlier authors of the second Stadtholderless Period. In the words of Van der Hoeven in 1706: 'Zoo dat haar Ed: Groot Mog: voornamentlyk, het regt van Opperste macht over alles in Hollandt en Weft-Vrieslandt toekomt' and 'volkome Souverainiteit onafgescheiden en onafscheidelyk, by de onderlinge Provintien, yder in de zyne'.<sup>255</sup> In the 1730's something had changed. Unlike the De la Courts, expressions related to the Provincial States and the States-General were used by those authors as frequently as expressions related to sovereignty. Although De Beaufort still stressed the provincial sovereignty - 'ieder op haer selve, Souveraine Landen zyn, [...] en alle de deelen van de Oppermacht in haer selven hebben, [...]'<sup>256</sup> - the emphasis of the writers in 1735 and 1737 was as much on sovereignty of the Provincial states as on the relation between Provincial States and States-General. The expressions 'Democratie ofte Volks Regeering' and 'Staats-gewijse Regeering' were regularly used in the pamphlets of that period.<sup>257</sup> In the publications the same concern with respect to majority voting as was visible in the work of the De la Courts, was noticeable by the frequent use of words as 'meerdere' and 'mindere' when discussing the authority of the States-General.<sup>258</sup> There was no textual reference whatsoever to a theoretical underpinning of the concept of sovereignty. From an intertextuality point of view the imitation moves from heuristic to exploitative imitation, that is from a dominant source to the use of more equivalent sources.

### *Particularism (PDA)*

The premise on absolute sovereignty of the States of Holland was the guiding principle of the De la Courts for their ideas on the socio-political position of the province of Holland. The interest of the province could only be served when the province was sovereign in her decisions and the interest of the province overruled everything else. The brothers De la Court

---

<sup>253</sup> For example: Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 29-31.

<sup>254</sup> For example: Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 246.

<sup>255</sup> Emanuel van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 250.

<sup>256</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 124.

<sup>257</sup> For example: De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 117.,121; Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog*, 224.

<sup>258</sup> For example: Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland*, 11.

therefore were outspoken in their particularism in Union politics. De la Courts stated that Holland as a province could establish itself as a self-supporting state within Europe without depending on any other state if it observed its own interest consciously.<sup>259</sup> They rejected a closer union of the United Provinces beyond a defensive alliance and saw the other provinces as inferior to Holland.<sup>260</sup> They even went so far to suggest that a large trench should be dug around Holland to turn the province in an self-contained island.<sup>261</sup> Their argumentation was not only based on theoretical grounds, like their interpretation of Hobbes, but also on classical and contemporary history. Their classical example was the Delian League, an association of Greek city-states with Athens in a leadership's role.<sup>262</sup> Contemporary history had learned them that the other Provinces could not be trusted to take the interest of the province of Holland at heart.<sup>263</sup>

None of the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period supported the ideas of the De la Courts of a self-supporting and superior province of Holland. For most of them it was not even an issue worthwhile discussing. The author of the pamphlet published in 1714 about the economy of the Republic did mention the idea of a trench around the province, but he saw it only as a military defence and not as a separation between Holland and the other provinces. His objective was to strengthen the economy of the United Provinces and he stressed the concept of 'United'.<sup>264</sup> In another pamphlet in 1735 the author explicitly pointed to the interdependency of the provinces and the interrelatedness of their inhabitants. The idea of a Holland-oriented particularism was completely rejected.<sup>265</sup> Also De Beaufort, not surprisingly as he was a Regent from the province of Zeeland, did not mention a possible self-supporting province of Holland, let alone a superiority over the other provinces. Interestingly he did, like the De la Courts, compare the Republic with the early Delian League.<sup>266</sup> From a PDA point of view there is no similarity between the De la Courts and the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period.

---

<sup>259</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 297-318.

<sup>260</sup> Ibidem, *Aanwysing*, 43.

<sup>261</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 311; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 223.

<sup>262</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 44; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 217.

<sup>263</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 264, 310.

<sup>264</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen door de laatste Vrede, Nevens eenige Aanmerkingen op het stuk van de Commercie en Barriere*. Gedrukt voor den Autheur, 1714 (Knuttel, 16231) 76-81; Haks, *Vaderland en vrede 1672-1713*, 276; Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 30.

<sup>265</sup> Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 21-22.

<sup>266</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 122-123.

### *Particularism (Intertextual)*

In the political particularism of the brothers De la Court expressions like *'heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen'* and especially the word *'Interest'* in combination with *'Hollland'* were everywhere.<sup>267</sup>

In the texts of the second Stadtholderless Period the word *'Interest'* was used, but it was not dominant and certainly not in combination with a province. The words *'Staeten-Generael'* and *'Unie van Utrecht'*, were more the key-words for the authors of the texts that did address the domestic politics of the provinces.<sup>268</sup> Although some expressions frequently used by the De la Courts were still imitated, they did not play a decisive role in the text. The political particularism that was characteristic for the De la Courts did not inspire the authors in the second Stadtholderless Period anymore. They either did not address the issue at all, or disagreed with it, using language from other sources.

### *Neutrality and alliances (PDA)*

The premises of the brothers De la Court with regards to foreign policy were also driven by the interest of Holland: a policy of neutrality and non-interference was the only foreign policy beneficial for Holland.<sup>269</sup> The argument was that war was detrimental for Holland and should only be considered when the province should be threatened in her prosperity. Conquest of land should never be a reason to start or continue a war.<sup>270</sup> The only military expenditure that they approved of, was for a navy to protect convoys of merchant ships and the fishery fleet.<sup>271</sup> They rejected any expenditure for a land-army as it would, according to the De la Courts, only be used for conquests that brought benefit to the States-General and the Prince. Therefore it would not be in the interest of Holland.<sup>272</sup> Their example was classical Athens: according to the De la Courts the city lost its power because they pursued to many wars for territorial gains.<sup>273</sup> Within such a foreign policy there was minimal interest for alliances and certainly not for alliances with monarchies. The basic attitude of the brothers De la Court was one of

---

<sup>267</sup> See for example the titles of their books: *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* and *'V.D.H.'* [Pieter de la Court], *Interest van Holland, ofte gronden van Hollands-welvaren* (Amsterdam: 'Cyprianus vander Gracht', 1662) [nine editions dated 1662] (Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, Bibliography, 361).

<sup>268</sup> For example: Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 21-22; Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 36.

<sup>269</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 238-247.

<sup>270</sup> Ibidem, 247-265.

<sup>271</sup> Ibidem, 161-238.

<sup>272</sup> Ibidem, 207.

<sup>273</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 524-525.



mistrust towards other countries. As a consequence they only approved of commercial agreements and alliances between countries when they needed each other to withstand a threat from a third country.<sup>274</sup> An alliance with England according to the De la Court fell in that category as there was a reciprocal commercial benefit and a pressing need against a common large scale threat.<sup>275</sup>

In 1737 De Beaufort endorsed the policy of neutrality completely: the Republic was looking with a friendly face to all European countries, and her military expenditure should only be used for the protection of her means to generate prosperity, never for expansion of her territory.<sup>276</sup> For the authors of pamphlets in the second Stadtholderless Period the foreign policy of the Republic and the subject of alliances with other countries was clearly not interesting enough to write about. Only the author of the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen door de laatste Vrede*' in 1714 mentioned the detrimental effects of war for the prosperity of the Republic.<sup>277</sup> The author also warned for any form of alliances with monarchs as they would eventually become harmful for the Republic. In his pamphlet he recommended to conclude only alliances of peace and commerce.<sup>278</sup> He did, however, on religious grounds advocate a continuation of the alliance with England, but was aware that in trade England was, and would always be, the main threat for the Republic. Therefore he pleaded that a secret maxim of Holland should be to disrupt the trade of England as much as possible.<sup>279</sup> The ongoing War on the Spanish Succession, which at that time was supported by both Republicans and Orangists, is probably the reason that the subject of neutrality and alliances is totally missing in the work of Van der Hoeven. As Onnekink has shown, after the onset of the War the Republican sentiments of defensive alliances and neutrality had lost all ground.<sup>280</sup> The absence of this topic in most of the pamphlets might be caused by the focus in the politics of the Republic on abstinence of international developments after the end of the war on the Spanish Succession (Peace of Utrecht, 1713). The foreign policy of the Republic in the second Stadtholderless Period after 1713 was dominated by either a policy of territorial retraction to the borders of 1648 and only a protective navy for the benefit of merchantmen, or closing defensive alliances and proportional military strength, both at land and at sea.

---

<sup>274</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 260.

<sup>275</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 290-302.

<sup>276</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 139-144.

<sup>277</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 7-9.

<sup>278</sup> *Ibidem*, 86.

<sup>279</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 22.

<sup>280</sup> Onnekink *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War*, 113.

Interestingly both policies were based on the premises and argumentation of the De la Court developed in the 1660's.<sup>281</sup>

#### *Neutrality and alliances (Intertextual)*

The emphasis in the De la Courts' language was on the conditions for peace, as peace was in the '*interest van Holland*' and '*De Maxime tot Vreede is in Holland van ouds bekend geweest*'.<sup>282</sup> Opposite to peace was war, especially offensive war, and the De la Courts used their typical anti-monarchic and anti-Stadtholderate expressions, which connected the Stadtholder with war, to express their abhorrence of war: '*Conquesten en Victorien*' and '*bezoldigde vreemde Krygs-magt*'.<sup>283</sup> Although the De la Courts preferred not to get involved in any European conflict whatsoever, they realised that for the benefit of trade and the continuation of prosperity defensive military actions might be necessary. Holland should therefore accept '*Vreedens Tractaaten en Defensiven Alliantien*', being '*eene weederzydige beloften van elkanderen geen quaad te doen*'.<sup>284</sup>

The language used by De Beaufort was very similar to the De la Courts': '*De Staet der Vereenigde Nederlanden is [...] een Vrye en vreedsaeme Staet [...]*' and '*[...] niet opgeset is, om de Nabueren te ontrusten, om Staet zuchtige oorlogen te voeren, en om alle andere Vorsten t'onder te brengen*'.<sup>285</sup> The imitation in the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen door de laatste Vrede*' is also evident. Although it does not include the anti-Stadtholderate expressions which are typically 'De la Courts', the writer does warn for '*Oorlogzugtige monarchen*' in general.<sup>286</sup> In that sense there is heuristic imitation of the De la Courts. The writer uses similar expressions as the De la Courts when describing the detrimental effects of war and the need for peace in Holland. As with the De la Courts the emphasis was placed on commercial expressions. With respect to alliances, expressions used in the pamphlet, like '*Vreedens-Tractaten*' and '*Defensiven alliantien*', are clearly imitations of the language of the De la Courts.<sup>287</sup>

#### *Broad representation (PDA)*

The basis of the governmental system in and the politics of the province of Holland were the

---

<sup>281</sup> Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 26-60.

<sup>282</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 232.

<sup>283</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 444.

<sup>284</sup> *Ibidem*, 266.

<sup>285</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 140.

<sup>286</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 81.

<sup>287</sup> *Ibidem*, 85-86.

towns with voting rights in the Provincial States. Therefore citizenship and not landownership played the mayor role in the political thoughts of the De la Courts. In seventeenth century Holland being a citizen (a *burgher*) was acquired through birth, marriage or through purchase. In principle every *burgher* had the same rights which included, among others, the right to participate in municipal government. In many cities, however, persons who had bought their right would be excluded from the higher government functions, which were kept within a group of elite families with generations of citizenship. The brothers De la Court, descendants from immigrants, criticised these obstructions to the application of their rights. According to their opinion, admittance to the full citizenship rights would be a natural right and in the interest of the city.<sup>288</sup> Still, they did not consider every inhabitant or person with citizen rights eligible to this ‘full’ citizenship. According to them the ideal republican assembly was [...] *een Vergaaderinge, bestaande uit alle de Ingeseetenen des Lands, die gepresumeerd konnen werden magts en kennisse genoeg te hebben, om hun eigen welvaaren te versorgen [...]*<sup>289</sup> That excluded everybody who was economically and mentally dependent, but it included *burghers* who had bought their town rights not too long ago and contributed to the general prosperity of a town. With the exclusion of economic dependents from full citizenship the De la Courts connected wealth – and in their view wealth was achieved through mercantile activities – with politics. Participation in the political decision-making required, according to the De la Courts, the ability to speak freely, frankly and knowingly. A central asset that distinguished active citizens from their passive fellow residents was therefore the capacity and the position to speak truthfully in public by mastering the rhetorical technique of *parrhèsia* (which the brothers considered to be the natural speech of the mercantile world).<sup>290</sup> The implicit message was that to be able to speak frankly in public was a sign of true citizenship. For that reason the De la Courts accepted at the end of their book ‘*Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal*’ that an aristocracy (of merchants) was the best possible government for Holland: ‘*dat men gewisselik in soodanige Aritokratike Regeeringe soude vinden alle die gewigtige voordeelen der populaare Regeeringe*’.<sup>291</sup> Condition was that the regents wouldn’t fall prey to the drawbacks of aristocracy: the risk of emergence of a single Head, organised political groups and factions within the regent community, and oligarchy. Therefore non-heredity of the city council seats was a necessity.<sup>292</sup> The ideal citizen was the

---

<sup>288</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 157-161.

<sup>289</sup> *Ibidem*, 166.

<sup>290</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 167, 188.

<sup>291</sup> Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, 563-567.

<sup>292</sup> *Ibidem*, 280-292.

well-educated, honestly speaking, frugal, down-to-earth merchant. The fear for organised political groups (guilds, but also political active religious segments of a Church) came from their ability to stir up segments of the population and create discord and disturbances in the towns. In spite of the radical ideas of the De la Courts with respect to representation, the maintenance of the status-quo in society was of utmost importance for them. In that aspect they were not different from the governing elite.<sup>293</sup>

De Beaufort endorsed the conclusion of the De la Courts that every citizen should have access to governmental positions and similarly to the De la Courts' opinion that this did not mean everybody. He stressed the same conditions for eligibility to government positions as the De la Court: knowledgeable, a position to be able to speak honestly, a frugal life style and a certain austerity in public display.<sup>294</sup> De Beaufort described such a citizen as a man who loved honour and virtue and saw his own 'class', the *renteniers*, as the example of the most outstanding citizen. The biggest threat to the Republican government saw De Beaufort in the growing trend of the pursuit of luxury and ambition within the regent class. According to him a luxurious lifestyle led to decadence and was a threat to civic equality – *evengelykheit* - the hallmark of republican liberty. Ambition caused the neglect of the common good to the benefit of the private interest. Furthermore ambition could lead to disturbances and changes in the status quo.<sup>295</sup> Interestingly, and revealing for the bad economic situation during De Beaufort's life, he was a supporter of sufficient payment for civil officers to avoid any threat of corruption.<sup>296</sup> He preferred an aristocratic government, but was, like the De la Courts, aware of the risks: a single Head, factions within the regent community, and oligarchy.

De Beaufort was not the only one who was worried about the quality of the representative character of the *Staatsgezinde* government in the Republic. Already in 1722 a pamphlet was advocating a broader participation of the population in the selection of the *vroedschappen* in the towns of Holland. The author of the pamphlet *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland*, published in 1737, expressed his concern about the economic situation and the moral decay he observed in the Republic. He stressed the need for honesty in expression, modesty in behaviour and acceptance of the status quo as law abiding citizens. Those elements were also present in the arguments used by the De la Courts.<sup>297</sup> The same elements were propagated by

---

<sup>293</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 289-292.

<sup>294</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 208-210.

<sup>295</sup> *Ibidem*, 349.

<sup>296</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 317.

<sup>297</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 28.

Justus van Effen in his efforts to educate the people to become truly republican citizens. He used for this purpose the *Hollandsche Spectator*, a journal that appeared in the years between 1731 and 1735. Van Effen wanted to counter any *Prinsgezinde* opposition that claimed to represent the pinnacle of civilised behaviour, *politesse*.<sup>298</sup> Van Effen's image of a *burgher* stood for a free political community where virtuous, educated citizens of relatively equal position acted socially, open and civilized to each other.<sup>299</sup> Those citizens would experience that actions contributing to the public good would be called virtuous and would reflect on their status as private citizens. Interestingly, Van Effen took as his examples of virtuous behaviour neither the Batavians, nor the classic Romans or Greeks past, but the Dutch seventeenth century *burghers*. They were characterised by him as: honest, simple, industrious, frugal, and relatively egalitarian.<sup>300</sup>

#### *Broad representation (Intertextual)*

The most used expression of the De la Courts with respect to representation was, as expected, *interest* and any combination with governmental institutions. Equally important in their texts on this subject were expressions like '*aristokratie*', '*populare regeering*' and '*Monarchale ende Princelike Regeering*'.<sup>301</sup> To underline the importance of a broad representation to voice the will of the people they used the Latin expression '*Salus Populi suprema Lex*'.<sup>302</sup> On the conditions for participation in the governmental institution they repeatedly used the expressions '*borg(h)ers*', '*Borgerschap*' and the word-combination '*Magt en kennisse*', whereas the speech of the representatives should be '*rondborstig*'. Their abhorrence of unrest, which they primarily saw as result of discord, they expressed as *Scheuringe ofte oproer*.<sup>303</sup>

The importance of the favoured rhetorical technique and condition for civil participation of the De la Courts, *rondborstheid*, was also imitated in the frequent use of that expression by the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period. They used the same word or the expressions '*uyt de borst spreken*', '*onbeschroomd spreken*' or '*oprecht spreken*'.<sup>304</sup> Similarly the expression '*Salus Pupuli suprema Lex*' was in 1737 faithfully imitated by, for

---

<sup>298</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 82-88.

<sup>299</sup> *Ibidem*, 84.

<sup>300</sup> *Ibidem*, 88.

<sup>301</sup> For example: Johan and Pieter de la Court, *Polityke Weeg-schaal*, Register de capittelen.

<sup>302</sup> 'V.H.' [Johan and Pieter de la Court], *Consideratien van Staat*, 551.

<sup>303</sup> For example: 'V.H.' [Johan and Pieter de la Court], *Consideratien van Staat*, Book III.

<sup>304</sup> For example: De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet* 417; Anonym, *Palamedes*, B2; Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 20; Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 4; Justus van Effen, *Hollandsche Spectator*, (Hermanus Uytwerf, Amsterdam) Jaargang 1732, I, (2), 15 Februarie, 362-372.

example, De Beaufort.<sup>305</sup> Of course all authors agreed with the De la Courts that the ‘*Monarchale Regeering*’ was to be rejected in favour of a more ‘*populare regeering*’ and De Beaufort was clearly in favour of an ‘*aristocratie*’, although one with a democratic (*sic*) signature.<sup>306</sup> Interestingly, none of the authors used the expression ‘*Princelike*’, although the author of the *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog van de aloutheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland* in 1737 put the blame for the moral decay in the Republic squarely at the feet of a monarchic style of government.<sup>307</sup> De Beaufort dedicated a long chapter to all the reasons for the moral decay which he equalled with the disappearance of liberty. He mentioned ‘*dertelheit, pracht en overdaed*’, ‘*tweedracht*’, ‘*stoutheid, kuypery en omkoopning*’ and ‘*gierigheid en geldzucht*’.<sup>308</sup> At the time De Beaufort wrote his book (1737), he was defending the *Staetswyse Regeering* in a polemic against the supporters of a Stadtholderate. From an intertextuality point of view he used a comparable vocabulary as was used by the De la Courts, when they described the perils of the Stadtholderate in their time. In that sense one can define his language as heuristic imitation.

#### *Church, religion and secular authority (PDA)*

The premises of the De la Courts in this field expressed again their interest of Holland as leading principle: what disturbed the conditions for prosperity should be suppressed, what enhanced the prosperity should be stimulated. Therefore De la Courts took the position that the church should be under the control of the provincial state authorities. Their argument was that the church was part of the public life and therefore it was the State’s prerogative to control the church: the sovereignty of the State was indivisible. Furthermore, history had shown that reverends as an interest-group were able to create discord and should therefore be under the control of the *vroedschap*.<sup>309</sup> Similarly the brothers De la Court stated that it was in the interest of Holland to tolerate religious ideas that did not concur with the public church. The condition was that the owners of those ideas stayed loyal to the state. Their argument was both principal and practical. To start with the latter, tolerance of religious ideas would attract foreigners who, through their economic activity, would contribute to the interest of Holland. The former was based on their ideas about natural law: every individual was entitled to believe what he thought was true and just. When a government denied an individual, who

---

<sup>305</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 79.

<sup>306</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 123-125.

<sup>307</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog*, 28.

<sup>308</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, Chapter X.

<sup>309</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 284-343.

expressed his obedience to that government, that right, it undermined its own credibility as representative government.<sup>310</sup> The tolerance supported by the De la Courts was, however, no reason for them to doubt the superiority of the Reformed Church.<sup>311</sup> Still, on many occasions they attributed the same ‘*Christelijke deugden*’ to different denominations.<sup>312</sup>

Van der Hoeven still followed in 1706 the De la Courts in their position that the church authorities should be subjected to the secular authorities. Like the De la Courts he saw religion as a danger to the *Aeloude Vryheid*, as history had shown, to create discord. Liberty in Holland was vested in the towns and the nobles, not in the clergy.<sup>313</sup>

De Beaufort stated in his preface clearly his position with respect to freedom of religion: ‘*Vryheid, beide in den Burgerstaet en in den Godsdienst, zyn de twee zuylen waar op het gebouw van onsen Vryen Staet is gevestigd*’.<sup>314</sup> The only condition was that everybody should pay respect to the laws of the Republic.<sup>315</sup> From this statement one could deduct that De Beaufort saw religion as belonging to the public domain but there is no direct reference in his book about control of the secular authorities over the Church. De Beaufort was, like the De la Courts, convinced that the Reformed Church was superior to all other denominations. He saw the Reformed Church as a necessary bulwark against Roman Catholicism.<sup>316</sup> Maybe that has been the reason that he did not take a position in the struggle for authority over church matters. The author of the pamphlet ‘*De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland*’ (1735) was more clear than De Beaufort about religion being part of the public domain, but also refrained from putting the secular authorities – the *vroedschap* of the towns - above the church authorities.<sup>317</sup>

The author of the pamphlet ‘*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*’ (1737) also supported the idea of freedom of religion, but he was very ambiguous about the relation between secular authority and church authority. Initially he remarked that secular authorities had no say in any church matters like appointments of reverends or church council members. Later in his comprehensive pamphlet he stated that it was the responsibility of the *vroedschap* to watch over the peace and tranquillity within the church community.<sup>318</sup> That such a warning was not without ground the pamphlet of 1735 showed. The author criticised his opponent

---

<sup>310</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 309-310.

<sup>311</sup> Ibidem, 315-316.

<sup>312</sup> Ibidem, 325.

<sup>313</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 243.

<sup>314</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, Voorberigt 4

<sup>315</sup> Ibidem, 134-135.

<sup>316</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 478.

<sup>317</sup> Anonym, *De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland*, 11.

<sup>318</sup> Anonym, *Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog*, 139, 178, 197.

about supporting a trend in the Reformed Church to pray for the Stadtholder of Friesland and Groningen, a candidate for the Stadtholderate of the other provinces. This prayer divided the church community and caused quite some unrest.<sup>319</sup>

Interestingly none of the authors found it necessary to justify the freedom of religion. It was presented as an established characteristic of a republican government. Van Effen went a step further and did not refer to a specific religion, not even to the Reformed Church. He connected being a republican citizen with being ‘an honest man and an upright Christian’.<sup>320</sup> Only one author followed the De la Courts in their observation that tolerance of religious ideas would attract foreigners who, through their economic activity, would contribute to the interest of Holland. Not surprisingly, it was the pamphlet on ‘*s Lands welwezen*’.<sup>321</sup>

#### *Church, religion and secular authority (Intertextual)*

The argumentation of Pieter la Court for this premise was again characterised by the word ‘*interest van Holland*’. In this case it was sometimes more the danger to the interest that was apparent than the interest itself. He saw a high risk for unrest as the reverends were able to incite the ‘*aanhangh der domme en lightgelovige menschen*’.<sup>322</sup> The texts became almost vitriolic – ‘*Predikante die denken Godes Ambassadeurs te syn*’ - where he discussed the reverends of the Reformed Church as a potential source of unrest.<sup>323</sup> Also when he connected the reverends to the Stadtholder of the House of Orange the well-known descriptions of the Stadtholder appeared immediately in the text. The advantage of the religious toleration was seen in theoretical expression, like ‘*natuurlyke wetten*’, and in expressions related to the economy, like ‘*nering doen*’ and ‘*negoties*’.<sup>324</sup>

The language used in the second Stadtholderless Period was focussed on the existing freedom of religion, in some cases on the authority the secular power might have over the church matters and the potential for unrest and interference in secular matters. With respect to the latter, Van der Hoeven described the church in the same vein as the De la Courts: ‘*Want Religie is een gemeene dekmantel, om de Raadhuysen der Stede te bekruppen, ook kan zy geen bequamer hebben om gerust te heerschen*’.<sup>325</sup> Actually what he said is an heuristic imitation

---

<sup>319</sup> Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 28. Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 310-358.

<sup>320</sup> Van Effen, *Hollandsche Spectator*, Jaargang 1732, I (2), 17 Maart 1732, 362-372; Velema, *Republicans*, 87.

<sup>321</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 66.

<sup>322</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 383.

<sup>323</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 382.

<sup>324</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 380-390.

<sup>325</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part 2, Chapter 1: 243.



of the De la Courts: religion does not belong in the seats of secular power and the churches don't have the knowledge to govern. This last point is interesting as 'knowledge' was for the De la Courts a recurrent theme with respect to government. Also the expressions in which the word '*Stadhouder*' appeared were used frequently by Van de Hoeven. Next to 'knowledge', the De la Courts saw 'being a good Christian' also as a *sine qua non* for citizenship and representative positions. They did not specify which denomination 'Christian' was, although they supported the position of supremacy of the Dutch Reformed church in the Republic.<sup>326</sup>

Like the De la Courts, Van Effen used the expression '*Christenen*' when he referred to the members of various denomination together and he connected the word to the concept 'citizenship'.<sup>327</sup> As such there is certainly an heuristic imitation of the De la Courts, too. The economic benefit of the religious freedom was in 1714 expressed as: '*de vryheid van Religie en Conscientie, die zeer wel in Holland gepractizeert wort, en nog wel wat mag vergrooten, waer door den koophandel, en handwerken zal blyven, en onderhouden worden*'<sup>328</sup> is a clear heuristic imitation of the expressions used by the De la Courts when they discussed the economic benefit of freedom of religion. And like the author of the pamphlet, also the De la Courts were of the opinion that the freedom of religion should be extended to more groups. That the language used in the second Stadtholderless Period was focussed on the existing freedom of religion could be caused by the objective of the *Staatsgezinde* authors of publications and pamphlets. They had to defend the established government against the claims of the *Prinsgezinde* authors that the inclusion of a Stadtholder would be beneficial for the country. As the *Staatsgezinde* authors could not present the economic situation as a positive result of the governing regents they had to find other reasons. The freedom of religion could be argued as being an advantage of a States government. As opposed, the Stadtholderate governments in the past had always been characterised by suppression of the non-dominant denominations and unrest in the country.

## Discussion

The Political Discourse Analysis of the political and societal premises gave some interesting results. De Beaufort, for example, used frequent and extensive quotations from Roman writers. His heroes of republicanism and model citizens were the Republican Roman senators

---

<sup>326</sup> Weststeijn, *De Radicale Republiek*, 219-220.

<sup>327</sup> Van Effen, *Hollandsche Spectator*, Jaargang 1732, 2 (1), 28 Juli 1732, 362-372.

<sup>328</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 66.

like Cicero and Cato.<sup>329</sup> The De la Courts who used quotations from classical Roman writers frequently as well, had claimed the top citizen position for their own ‘class’, the merchants. From a Political Discourse perspective one can distinguish here a double re-contextualisation: first the De la Courts re-contextualised the Roman senator class to the merchant class, and subsequently De Beaufort re-contextualised the same Roman senator class to the *renteniers* who at a that time had replaced the merchants class as ruling citizens. This phenomenon was also observed by Jonathan Israel. In his study on urban decay in the eighteenth century in the Republic he found that in 1742 *renteniers* had outstripped the merchants and manufacturers in the *vroedschappen* of Holland completely.<sup>330</sup> The language De Beaufort and the brothers De la Court used, however, remained basically the same.

Another example was the message of the *Hollandsche Spectator*, the creation of Justus van Effen. Hietbrink and Velema argued correctly that his message was a political one, but they did not point to a source of his inspiration.<sup>331</sup> Although Velema referred in a general sense to ‘republican thought’, I will argue that Van Effen re-contextualised the ideas on citizenship of De la Court.<sup>332</sup> Van Effen took his example of virtuous behaviour not from the Romans senator class, like De Beaufort had done, but from the Dutch seventeenth century *burgher*-class as it was described by the brothers De la Court. He even argued that the public interest was connected to the private interest, one of the main premises of the De la Courts. For Van Effen the *rentenier* class had lost its prime position in a Republic because they had embraced the concept of *politesse*, the style of the monarchic court. The De la Courts, De Beaufort and Van Effen re-contextualised the Roman senator class, each to their prime example of citizenship: merchant, *rentenier* and republican *burgher*, respectively.

Like De Beaufort and Van Effen, also Van der Hoeven showed a strong heuristic imitation of the language of the De la Courts. There is, however, a distinction between the former two authors and Van der Hoeven with respect to the way they looked at the Republic as a whole. Van de Hoeven followed the De la Courts still faithfully in their ideas about absolute sovereignty of Holland and particularism, whereas De Beaufort and Van Effen rejected any particularism. This same rejection of particularism was also present in the pamphlets of the 1730’s. It might well be that the economic and political position of the Republic in the second Stadtholderless Period was reason for this change. Holland was, like the other provinces, in no position to play a dominant role anymore. Interestingly, it looks that

---

<sup>329</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 56-64.

<sup>330</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1006-1007.

<sup>331</sup> Hietbrink, ‘De deugden van een vrije republiek’, 205-210; Velema, *Republicans*, 84-88.

<sup>332</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 85-86.

with the rejection of particularism, there came room in their language for imitation of other sources than the De la Courts.

All authors pride themselves on being *rondborstig* in their speech (as true republican citizens should be...), but when it comes to the relation between secular and ecclesiastical authorities they either don't address it or become sometimes even contradictory. A possible explanation for this behaviour might be that the pamphlets appeared in a period that the polemic between Voetians and Cocceians was losing its impetus and especially the Voetians sought accommodation with the secular authorities. The ambiguity in the pamphlets might reflect this accommodation.

### 3.4 Premises related to the economy

As discussed in the previous chapters the main conclusion of the De la Court's had been that 'true republics [...] are commercial republics, and truly commercial states must be republican states.'<sup>333</sup> In such a republic, the brothers De la Court claimed, there was no opposition between serving self-interest and the common good when pursuing private mercantile honour.<sup>334</sup> Furthermore they had concluded that a government should consist of wealthy merchants as they had the financial means and were used to the language of the market, which was by nature straightforward.<sup>335</sup> In the position as regents they were able to combine the common good and their own interest. Trade and merchants were the key drivers for the interest of Holland. For that reason I will treat the premises regarding the economy as a separate topic in my thesis. The De la Courts used a number of premises with regards to the economy in general and the economy of the province of Holland in particular to argue their ideas for changes in the politics of Holland and the Republic. In this chapter I will discuss those premises and analyse to which extent they have inspired the authors of republican publications in the second Stadtholderless Period.

#### *The pillars of the economy (PDA)*

According to De la Courts there were, due to the geographical conditions of Holland, only four areas which contributed to the economy of Holland: fisheries, manufacture, trade and shipping.<sup>336</sup> Countryside, landownership and agriculture played no role in the republican

---

<sup>333</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 4.

<sup>334</sup> *Ibidem*, 4.

<sup>335</sup> *Ibidem*, 167.

<sup>336</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing, Voor-reeden*; Blom & Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd*. 163.

thoughts of the De la Courts, because for all their ideas the frame of reference was the town: the embodiment of the political or civic body.<sup>337</sup> Therefore they did not include agriculture as a contributing factor to the interest of Holland.

Although Van der Hoeven wrote his book in 1706 primarily to justify a republican government system without a Stadtholder on historical grounds, he also used the opportunity to prove that such a system was the most beneficial to the economy of the Republic and specifically to Holland. The absence of a Stadtholder, like had been the case in the days of Johan de Witt, would, according to him, contribute to the development of the same pillars of the economy as mentioned by the De la Courts.<sup>338</sup> As Jonathan Israel has shown, the economy of the Republic was, contrary to the later part of the second Stadtholderless Period, still flourishing, especially in Holland, when Van der Hoeven wrote his book. Republican writers as Van der Hoeven could use this fact and connect it to the economic prosperity under the De Witt to counter *Prinsgezinde* sentiments in favour of the Frisian Stadtholder Johan Willem Friso.<sup>339</sup> Even in 1722 the author of the pamphlet '*Libertatem nemo bonus nisi cum anima amisit*' could still write about the same four pillars of the economy.<sup>340</sup>

Twenty-five years later De Beaufort, however, could not refer anymore to the beneficial effect of the absence of a Stadtholder. The days of De Witt were too long ago and the republican regents had no economic successes to be proud of. Still, he claimed that the pillars, as mentioned by the De la Courts, would benefit from the presence of a '*Vrye Regeering*'. Interestingly he did not include fisheries as a pillar anymore.<sup>341</sup> According to Jonathan Israel the herring fishery had almost collapsed when De Beaufort wrote his book and this might have caused the omission of fishery in his book.<sup>342</sup> In some of the pamphlets the diminishing trade was mentioned, but only in general terms and in relation to the decline of the economy in the second Stadtholderless Period.<sup>343</sup>

Contrary to those pamphlets that only lamented the economic situation and made no proposal for recovery, the pamphlet *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen door de laatste Vrede*, published in 1714, was almost totally dedicated to the economic situation and did suggest actions for improvement of the economic situation. The pamphlet was written shortly

---

<sup>337</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 158.

<sup>338</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 410.

<sup>339</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 961-962, 967-968.

<sup>340</sup> Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 8.

<sup>341</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 164.

<sup>342</sup> Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 1001.

<sup>343</sup> For example: Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 4, 6; Anonym, *Palamedes*, A2; Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 13; Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 17-19.

after the Peace of Utrecht (1713) and the author stated that the economy of the Republic had suffered enormously under the war efforts (War of the Spanish Succession). He presented his pamphlet as a list of suggestions to the government for the recovery of the Republic. Among others, it restricted the economy of the Republic to the same four pillars as the De la Courts had done: fisheries, manufactory, trade and shipping.<sup>344</sup> Remarkably, none of the authors in the second Stadtholderless Period mentioned agriculture as an economic pillar. In that sense their frame of reference, like the De la Courts' was the town as well.

#### *The pillars of the economy (Intertextual)*

It is not surprising that the key expression in the chapters of the '*Aanwysing*' on the contribution to the prosperity of Holland was: '*Hollands welvaeren t'eenemael bestaet in het bloeyen der Manufacturen, Visseryen, Navigatie, ofte Scheepvaert, end Negotien*'.<sup>345</sup>

Whereas Van der Hoeven in 1706 gave an almost reproductive imitation of the expression used by the De la Courts: '*Koophandel, Visschery, Redery, en Manufactuur-en*'<sup>346</sup>, the description in the pamphlet of 1722 was clearly heuristic: '*Zeevaart, Koophandel, Neeringen, Zyde-, Wolle- en Linne-weveryen, Fabrycquen, Ambagten, Haringvangst en andere Visserye*'.<sup>347</sup> De Beaufort in 1737 expressed his idea of the pillars of the economy shorter, but still it can be easily recognized as an heuristic imitation: '*koophandel, neering, konsten en handwerken*'.<sup>348</sup> With respect to the four pillars of the economy, the pamphlet of 1714 was also an heuristic imitation: '*Lands welweezen, uit de Navigatie, vissery, commercie en manufacturen geboren*'.<sup>349</sup> In the other pamphlets no imitation of economy related expressions used by the De la Courts was found.

#### *Increase of trade as reason of state (PDA)*

One of the main premises of the De la Courts with respect to the economy was that increase of trade was in the interest of Holland and should be the main reason of state. Although the De la Courts were aware of the growth potential of the market due to competition, their attitude was still very much mercantilist: the total of (international) trade was a zero-sum and countries should take steps to promote their export and restrict their import to create a positive

---

<sup>344</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welweezen*, 7.

<sup>345</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 56.

<sup>346</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 410.

<sup>347</sup> Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 8.

<sup>348</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 164.

<sup>349</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welweezen*, 7.

balance sheet.<sup>350</sup> To create this positive balance sheet they proposed in the *Aanwysing* a number of actions and changes in the existing practices to increase the volume of trade.<sup>351</sup> They were, for example, convinced that trade should not be restricted to Europe, but that it should be really worldwide. To facilitate the activities outside Europe they proposed the establishment of colonies that could serve as trading posts, emigration destination for non-productive inhabitants, and serving stations for the merchant fleet.<sup>352</sup> The De la Courts also promoted the immigration to Holland of craftsmen who could produce goods to enhance the export and to lower the import. To make such an immigration successful every inhabitant of a town should be entitled to earn a living in that town, whether he or she had paid for the citizen-right or not. Of course this was against the guild regulations, but the De la Court brothers saw the guilds anyhow as an obstruction to prosperity.<sup>353</sup> According to them, the more inhabitants lived in a town, the more prosperous the town would become.<sup>354</sup> For the same reason the religious toleration in the Republic should be promoted as the De la Courts saw tolerance as an asset to attract immigrants.<sup>355</sup>

The premise here is that increase of trade is in the interest of Holland. The brothers De la Court gave no argument for this premise. Blom and Wildenberg argued that the De la Courts were primarily thinking from a mercantilist position, notably with an emphasis on growth of gold value in a country in relation to other countries. No increase in Holland would mean increase somewhere else. It was only in the second part of the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century that mercantilism was criticised.<sup>356</sup> Although the focus in PDA is on argumentation, it offers also the possibility to analyse and compare actions on the basis of the premise.<sup>357</sup> In the situation here, where the argumentation is absent and the emphasis is on actions (for example change of regulations), I have compared the actions proposed by the De la Courts with the actions for change (proposed or completed) as mentioned in the publications of the second Stadtholderless Period.

The author of the pamphlet of 1714 on the economy of the Republic argued that increase of trade was in the interest of the Republic. He followed the De la Courts in their emphasis on immigration, in their ideas on the importance of international trade, their ideas

---

<sup>350</sup> Blom & Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd*. 162-163.

<sup>351</sup> Weststeijn, Arthur, *De Radicale Republiek*. 120.

<sup>352</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 137-154.

<sup>353</sup> *Ibidem*, 73-74.

<sup>354</sup> *Ibidem*, 6, 64-68.

<sup>355</sup> *Ibidem*, 57-64.

<sup>356</sup> Blom & Wildenberg, 'Otto van Rees, 'De Economische denkbeelden van Pieter de la Court', 161-164.

<sup>357</sup> Fairclough, Isabel, and Norman Fairclough, *Political Discourse Analysis*, 79.

on overseas colonies and their mercantilism. He also saw the freedom of religion and the tolerance towards non-Reformed churches as an important incentive for newcomers.<sup>358</sup> In 1737 De Beaufort still agreed with the De la Courts that more people would lead to more prosperity. He praised the benefits of a Republican government without a Stadtholder with arguments as security of life and goods, tolerance of religion and opportunity for advancement. He did not, however, discuss existing restrictions to new arrivals.<sup>359</sup> According to De Beaufort the reason for the disastrous economic situation was the decadence of the regents.<sup>360</sup> The other pamphlet writers lamented the economic situation, but did not propose any remedies. Most of them simply put the blame on the costs of the Stadtholderate army.<sup>361</sup>

*Increase of trade as reason of state (Intertextual)*

The De la Courts frequently used the expressions ‘*vremde*’ or ‘*nieuwe Aenkomelingen*’, as they called the immigrants, and the expression ‘*oude Ingeseetenen*’ for the established citizens.<sup>362</sup> Logically, also the words ‘*interest*’ and ‘*Vryheid*’ could be found everywhere in their texts on this subject. Furthermore they used regularly the well-known negative expressions concerning the Stadtholder.

The author of the pamphlet of 1714 followed the De la Courts to the letter in their suggestions on the economy, with the exception that he left the Stadtholder out. This is reflected in his language which shows a strong heuristic imitation.<sup>363</sup> The language used by De Beaufort was characterised by the expression ‘*Vrye Regeering*’. Whereas the De la Courts focussed on the negative influence on society of the Stadtholderate, De Beaufort attributed a positive situation in society always to the ‘*Vrye Regeering*’.<sup>364</sup> It might well be that the experiences with Stadtholder had been more in the past and less fierce with De Beaufort to have left an impression than they had been for the De la Courts to explain this difference in their work. They fully agreed on the positive effect immigration could have and the type of government that was beneficial for immigration: ‘*Vrye Regeering*’ and ‘*welvaeren in den Lande*’ (De Beaufort)<sup>365</sup>, ‘*Vrye ende wettighe Regeering*’ and ‘*Interest van Holland*’ (De la

---

<sup>358</sup> Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 8, 25, 37-40, 66.

<sup>359</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 164-168.

<sup>360</sup> Ibidem, 337.

<sup>361</sup> Anonym, *Haec libertatis ergo*, 13; Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 4; Anonym, *Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander*, 17-19.

<sup>362</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 66

<sup>363</sup> For example the position on the tolerance with respect to religion: see Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 58-64, 79-81 and Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*, 66.

<sup>364</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, Chapter V.

<sup>365</sup> Ibidem, 165.

Courts). Although the subject of decadence, one of the main themes in the work of De Beaufort, does not appear in the work of the De la Courts, the vocabulary De Beaufort uses to contrast his description of decadence is clearly ‘De la Courts’. De Beaufort argues, for example, that decadence was not only affecting the regents, but also the merchants: the ‘*swierige levenswyse*’ had made the ‘*koophandel*’, traditionally ‘*naersig en spaersaam*’, now ‘*vadsig en traag*’.<sup>366</sup> With his description of the traditional merchant class he heuristically imitated the De la Courts. They also described their fellow merchants as active and frugal.<sup>367</sup>

#### *Restrictions to the economy (PDA)*

Another economical premise of the De la Courts was that trade could only fully prosper when there was competition. As they expressed it crudely: ‘[...] *dat de nood een oud wyf doet draven*’.<sup>368</sup> For that reason they saw regulation as detrimental to the common interest. As a consequence they rejected vehemently the restrictive policy of the Guilds and the privileges of the VOC (*Vereenigde Oostindische Compagnie*) and WIC (*West-Indische Compagnie*) with their monopoly.<sup>369</sup> The premise that there should be no restriction on competition might have given the impression that the De la Courts were in favour of free trade. They were, however, more protectionists than free-traders. In their opinion a government should protect and support the essential industries.<sup>370</sup> Therefore they recommended the exemption of tax and excise for the fisheries, manufactory, trade and shipping.<sup>371</sup> In that sense they really understood the trend of mercantilist politics in Europe.<sup>372</sup> They strongly criticised the current situation in Holland of high taxes on services and excises on products related to the four pillars of the economy and foresaw a decline in prosperity if no changes would be made in the tax system. According to the De la Courts, taxation should be on all the other activities in the provinces as they benefitted from the four pillars.<sup>373</sup> The revenues coming from the taxation should be spend on strengthening the towns and on the defence of the merchant- and fishery fleet by the Admiralties. The De la Courts’ opinion about a Stadtholder was also evident on this premise: they warned the authorities for any interference by the Stadtholder in the tax and

---

<sup>366</sup> De Beaufort, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet*, 337.

<sup>367</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 167, 188.

<sup>368</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 70.

<sup>369</sup> *Ibidem*, 69-74.

<sup>370</sup> Blom & Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd*, 163.

<sup>371</sup> Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 229.

<sup>372</sup> Onnekink, David, and Rommelse, ‘Introduction’, in: David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and foreign policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011) 5-6.

<sup>373</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 87-90.



excise levy as it would only go to the bottomless pit of the Stadtholderate army. According to the De la Courts the only way for a Stadtholder to get money was to ask the Provincial States through the traditional system of the *bede*.<sup>374</sup>

The plight of the States of Holland to fund a possible Stadtholderate army was mentioned by Van der Hoeven in 1706<sup>375</sup>, but also by the writer of the pamphlet '*De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye der Graven en Stadhouders*' in 1735. The latter accused the last Stadtholders of extortion of the townspeople through the taxes and excises to finance the Stadtholderate army consisting of mercenaries.<sup>376</sup> The author of the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*' addressed in 1714 the issue of competition and taxation in more detail. He fully agreed with the De la Courts that competition was beneficial and that therefore the power of the guilds and the '*Oostindische en Westindische Compagnien*' had to be curbed.<sup>377</sup> Like the De la Courts he proposed tax reductions and higher excises on the import of foreign goods. Contrary to the De la Courts he did not propose to tax only the persons and industries outside the four pillars of the economy, but to alleviate the burden for the industry and trade in general and develop a more fair tax system.<sup>378</sup> His remedy for the economic situation had all the characters of a mercantilist policy and the measures were similar to those proposed by the De la Courts forty years earlier.

From a PDA point of view the pamphlet is very interesting. As Donald Haks has shown, the pamphlet bears a strong resemblance to the De la Courts' '*Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland*'.<sup>379</sup> The striking difference, however, was that the author of the pamphlet rejected the typical particularism of the De la Courts, both with respect to Holland as a province and with respect to the exclusive taxing of products and service outside the four pillars of the economy. His objective was a recovery of the whole United Provinces whereas the De la Courts objective was to safeguard the prominent position of Holland. The circumstances under which the De la Courts and the author of the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*' had written their action plans had drastically changed. From the way of arguing one can deduct that the author of the pamphlet was clearly inspired by the De la Courts, but there was definitely also a re-contextualisation.

---

<sup>374</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 102, 196.

<sup>375</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 298.

<sup>376</sup> Anonym, *De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye*, 27-28.

<sup>377</sup> Van der Hoeven, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid*, Part III: 323; Anonym, *Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*.

<sup>378</sup> Haks, *Vaderland en vrede*, 275-277

<sup>379</sup> Haks, *Vaderland en vrede*, 275.

The '*Korte Schets*' was published two years before the General Assembly and it addressed the financial problems of the Republic in a comprehensive way. Unfortunately the author of this interesting and well-written pamphlet is unknown. The moment of publication and the focus on solutions to repair the economy could point to Van Slingeland, the secretary to the Council of State, as the author. However, I find this doubtful as the financial issues of the pamphlet were related to the country's economy, whereas Van Slingeland in his notes for the General Assembly addressed the fiscal and the budgetary issues of the Republic, notably the quota system of provinces. Furthermore the pamphlet advocates a retraction from the barrier towns. Van Slingelandt was against such a move.<sup>380</sup>

#### *Restrictions to the economy (Intertextual)*

The expressions most frequently used by the De la Courts were related to free trade and its obstacles: '*vrye neering*', '*Gildens*', '*Gilde-brieven*' and '*keuren*' and '*geoctroyeerde ofte geslootene Compagnien*.' Their disgust of taxation came to the fore through the frequent use of the word '*Belasting*', but the word '*impost*' surpassed in frequency every other word.<sup>381</sup> When they proposed that the four pillars of the economy should be exempt of taxes, they argued that a government should not be so foolish to tax the wrong persons: '*Syn eyge levensmiddelen te beswage is ene groote dwaesheid*'.<sup>382</sup> The change in taxation was justified because '*alle andere Ingesetenen van gesejde Manufactuur-maekers, Vissers, Negotianten en Navigateurs dependeeren en gevoed werden*'.<sup>383</sup> And, being almost the leitmotif of their work, the '*imposten*' were always connected to the high cost of the Stadtholder for military actions of the '*bezoldigde vremde Krygs-magt*' for '*Land - conquesten*'.<sup>384</sup>

The most comprehensive pamphlet on the restrictions to the economy, although it was written as recommendation of recovery of the economy, was the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*' published in 1714. Written in 1714, linguistically the pamphlet resembled more the text written by De Beaufort in 1737 than the texts written by the De la Courts in the 1660's. The meaning of the words and the word-combinations, however, was clearly the De la Courts'. Therefore, as in the sections above, the imitation should be classified as a heuristic imitation of the De la Courts vocabulary. With respect to the constant demand of the

---

<sup>380</sup> Leeb, *The Ideological Origins*, 40-53; Aalbers, *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa*, 3, 62-66; Haks, *Vaderland en vrede*, 288-289.

<sup>381</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing*, 69-75.

<sup>382</sup> *Ibidem*, 75.

<sup>383</sup> Pieter de la Court, *Aanwysing* 38.

<sup>384</sup> *Ibidem*, 139.

Stadtholder for money to keep an army in the field, the language of the other publications contained some imitations of typical 'De la Court' language like '*imposten*' levied on '*Ingezeetenen*', '*Conquesten en Victorien*' and '*bezoldigde vremde Krygs-magt*'.<sup>385</sup> The lack of attention to solutions for the economic situation in those pamphlets might look the imitation of the De la Courts language less convincing than in the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*', but one has to realise that they were probably written for a different audience. The frequency of the words and the combinations of words is however such that also here I have concluded that the authors have heuristically imitated the De la Courts.

## Discussion

With regards to the premises on the economy two observations can be made. The first observation is that most authors lamented the economic situation, put the blame with typical the De Court's language on the Stadtholder (William III), but had no remedies to propose. From a PDA point of view there is no reason to suppose an influence of the De la Courts. The authors who lamented the economy assumed no premises on economy and therefore there were no arguments in their pamphlets to compare with the De la Courts. Still, the authors touched on the economic situation of the Republic, but they used arguments which appeared also in the chapter on constitutional premises (*Monarchy and Court* and *A true republic is incompatible with a monarchical state*). Furthermore they did so with expressions that were heuristic imitations of the De la Courts'. The authors were therefore to my opinion inspired by the work of the De la Courts.

The second observation concerned the two publications that did not put the blame on the Stadtholder, but imitated the De la Court's in their language, too. The first one is Lieven de Beaufort's *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet* (1737) and the second one is the pamphlet '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*' (1714).

Although the premises of the De la Courts and De Beaufort were the same, the argumentation was different. The De la Courts argued from an activist point of view: They claimed that the situation had to change otherwise Holland would not prosper and would lose her position as the dominant province and as a world power. De Beaufort followed a more theoretical approach: he described the ideal situation and took the first Stadtholderless Period as example. He described the premises with regards to the economy of the Republic as if most of the recommendations of the De la Court had been effectuated in the Republic of the

---

<sup>385</sup> For example: Anonym, *Libertatem nemo*, 8; Anonym, *De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye*, 27;

second Stadtholderless Period. Therefore his focus was not so much on the restrictions to the growth of the economy, but more on the threats to the republican ideal that had made the growth possible.

The '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen*' case is similar and different. The premises were the same, the argumentation was the same, but the objective of the argumentation was totally different. The De la Courts argued that certain changes in the economics in Holland had to take place to ascertain the provincial superiority in the Union. The author of the pamphlet followed the same argumentation with regards to the premises, but his objective was, still accepting that Holland was the economic powerhouse of the Union, an economic recovery of the total Union. A recovery of Holland would be impossible without the collective efforts of all provinces (this rejection of particularism was also evident in the other pamphlets thereafter). As the pamphlet showed that the changes suggested by the De la Courts in the 1660's were not effectuated in 1714, one can question therefore whether in 1737 De Beaufort was describing the real situation or his ideal situation.

## Conclusion

The purpose of my thesis was to see if the ideas of the brothers De la Court on republicanism had survived the pseudo-monarchy of Stadtholder William III and were still able to inspire later authors in their defence of the status quo between 1702 and 1747 in the Republic. From a historiographical point of view only four historians have seriously delved into the afterlife of the brothers De la Court. In 1973 Leeb concluded that the brothers De la Court had become the most prominent theorists and writers on republicanism in the United Provinces of the seventeenth century and inspiration for every republican writer until the end of the eighteenth century. Unfortunately Leeb never mentioned which writers were inspired. In 1985 Ivo Wildenberg drew attention to the absence of any studies on the afterlife of the brothers De la Court. In his study he found eighteenth century reprints (edited) of their work and instances where their texts were appropriated by eighteenth century authors, both pro- and anti Stadtholderate. His conclusion was that it concerned only series of isolated references and that there were no authors who had used the ideas of the De la Courts when writing their publications. Unfortunately he looked primarily for direct quotations with reference to the name 'De la Court' and less to appropriation of their political message. In 2007 Velema detected in the publication of De Beaufort, published in 1737, the intellectual legacy of the De la Courts, although there was no direct reference to the name 'De la Court'. And finally, in 2012, Weststeijn found some allusions to the ideas of De la Court in English, French and

German publications. His conclusion was that the brothers were either forgotten or vehemently criticised for their anti-monarchism.

With a corpus of two books, nine pamphlets and one edition of a journal the question of representability and relevance is certainly justifiable. I have selected the *Hollandsche Spectator* by Justus van Effen as it is one of the most representative journals of its kind in the Republic during the second Stadtholderate Period. I have not found any books in which the inclusion of a Stadtholder was defended on theoretical grounds and three that defended the exclusion of a Stadtholder from government on the basis of Republican ideas. I have excluded one book as it was purely written as a defence of one of the other books and supplied no additional insights. With respect to the pamphlets I have restricted myself to the Knuttel Collection, being one of the most extensive collection of pamphlets of the Republic. On a total amount of almost three thousand pamphlets for the period between 1702 and 1747 nine pamphlets defended or justified a Republican government and fifteen called for a return of a Stadtholderate (mixed) government. Therefore I would argue that the nine pamphlets, the two books and the edition of the *Hollandsche Spectator* are representative for all the Republican publications that were published in the period 1702-1749.

The results of my research present a different picture of the afterlife of the De la Courts. Based on the results of Political Discourse Analysis, I argue that all the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period shared almost all the premises that the De la Courts followed. The argumentation to justify those premises was not always as extensive as the De la Court's, but was to a large extent the same. In some publications the argumentation was even exactly the same. Such exact similarity could be found, for example, on the constitutional premises and some of the socio-political premises in the work of De Beaufort in 1737 and the author of the pamphlet '*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend vertoog van de aloudeheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland*' in the same year. Another pamphlet that resembled the De la Courts exactly was the '*Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen door de laatste Vrede*', published in 1714, one year after the end of the War on the Spanish Succession. This pamphlet dealt notably with the economic situation and the measures that had to be taken to turn the economic tide and bring the country back to prosperity. All the measures suggested by the author came straight out of the economic action plan suggested by the De la Courts for the safe guarding of the dominant position of Holland in the 1660's. Interestingly, two premises assumed by the De la Court, were not followed by all authors of the second Stadtholderless Period. Those premises were both related to the ideas the De la Courts had on the politics of Holland, notably, the premise on absolute sovereignty of the province and the

premise on particularism. Interestingly, the authors of the early part of the second Stadtholderless Period (1702, 1704 and 1706) still followed the De la Courts in their premises on the dominant position of Holland and the particularism, whereas the later authors rejected or ignored those premises. They put the emphasis on cooperation between the provinces and the role of the States-General instead of the Provincial States. The conclusion of Donald Haks that the second General Assembly of 1716-1717 has played a role in the strengthening of the Union is certainly confirmed by the rejection or ignoring of the premises on absolute provincial sovereignty and particularism in the publications.

The Political Discourse Analysis of the premise on broad representation revealed a very interesting example of multiple re-contextualisation: for the De la Courts and De Beaufort the exemplary citizen was the Roman senator, but the person who resembled them most was for the De la Courts the merchant and for De Beaufort the *regent/rentenier*. For Justus van Effen, however, the exemplary republican citizen was the *regent/burgher* of the first Stadtholderless Period and the person who resembled him was the *burgher* who had rejected the *politesse* of the monarchical court.

Confirmation that the authors were familiar with the work of the De la Courts could be found in the Intertextuality Analysis: the extent to which they imitated the language of the De la Courts. I found in the books, the pamphlets and the journal edition published in the second Stadtholderless Period, in general a high degree of heuristic imitation, that is the same type of words and especially word-combinations as used by the De la Courts. A good example of the similarity in the texts are the frames that were used to characterize the Stadtholder and a Republican government. They might have been spelled differently or slightly adjusted but the representation of the position ‘Stadholder’ remained extremely negative whereas for the institute ‘Republican government’ the frame contained only words and word-combinations with positive connotations.

Especially in the books and the more treatise-like pamphlets of the 1730’s quotations were used very frequently. Most of the sources and some of those quotations were identical to the ones used or mentioned by the De la Court. It was therefore difficult to determine whether there was reproductive or exploitative imitation being practised.

The variation in rhetorical techniques, characteristic for the work of the De la Courts, was notably present in the pamphlets of the early part of the second Stadholderless Period (1702 and 1704). Those pamphlets had as common denominator that they took a belated revenge on William III who passed away in 1702. In those pamphlets *parrhèsia* and hyperbole were very much present. The pamphlets of the 1730’s and also the book of De

Beaufort (1737) did not show the same exuberance in rhetorical techniques as the De la Courts. The difference in audience might well be the reason for the rhetorical techniques used. The early pamphlets had to stir up a general feeling of relieve that a new period, comparable to a still remembered period of freedom and prosperity, was ahead. The later pamphlets and De Beaufort's book were meant to persuade in a reasonable way a learned public of a constitutional concept.

The examples of the mentioned premises show that the context was the determining factor for the moment of the publication and its frequency, for the completeness of the array of premises discussed and for the occurrence of re-contextualisation in the argumentation. The context had, however, no influence on the premises assumed by the authors of the second Stadtholderless Period (with the exception of the premise on absolute sovereignty of Holland and the premise on particularism). For the other premises all authors faithfully used the same argumentation as the De la Courts.

Noteworthy was the relative high number of publications in the 1730's. Like above, the context is again the most probable explanation. In 1734 the position of William Charles Henry Friso had become such that Orangists could foster hope upon a restoration of the Stadtholderate. A large number of Orangists pamphlets appeared and as a reaction the supporters of the governing States-party regents had to contradict the advantages of a Stadtholderate and defend the existing form of government.

The method of combining Political Discourse Analysis with Intertextuality Analysis worked very well to detect and confirm the influence the De la Courts had had on the republican authors of the second Stadtholderless Period. The authors were clearly inspired by the message of the brothers and used their vocabulary to convey that message to contemporaries. The combination of the two methods was very useful as it removed any possible doubt when one of the two was not conclusive.

The lack of interest as expressed in a total of only two books and twenty-four pamphlets over period of forty-five years gives the impression that ideological thought was non-existent in the second Stadtholderless Period. Still, when the Republican governmental system was perceived to be under a threat, notably by a Stadtholder-pretender from Friesland, the defenders of the Republican ideology met the challenge immediately. A clear example of this reaction is the gulf of publications in the 1730's. As this thesis has shown, they were clearly inspired by the intellectual legacy of the brothers De la Court and even used their vocabulary. Wildenberg and Weststeijn hav already shown that the publications of the De la Courts were widely available in the second Stadtholderless Period, this thesis shows that they

were used.<sup>386</sup> The corpus, although small, shows that the legacy of the brothers De la Court had survived the monarchical period of William III and was very much alive in the second Stadtholderless Period. As such the corpus is also relevant.

The results of this thesis do call for further research. A follow-up on this thesis could be the question how the legacy of the De la Courts survived the period of anti-Republicanism between 1702 and 1749. And in a more broader sense one could ask how political theory developed and was propagated between 1672 and 1702? Another avenue of research could be to analyse anti-Republican pamphlets (e.g. the *Schuytepraetjes* by Van Itsma and Van Burmania<sup>387</sup>) which could reveal influence earlier theorists on mixed government or maybe even the reveal the influence of the De la Courts in the rejection of their ideas. The methodology of this thesis could be useful in such research. Moving from the textual to the visual, the book by Van der Hoeven of 1706 deserves further attention. The combination of a visual and two textual representations of the same subject in a wide variety of rhetorical techniques poses for example the question of how the representations interact with each other.

In a sense, this thesis has brought the authors that Leeb has left out into the open, corrected Wildenberg in his conclusion that the references to the De la Courts were only incidents, extended the work of Velema beyond De Beaufort, and contradicted the conclusion of Weststeijn that the brothers De la Court were either forgotten or criticized. They were right in one aspect: nowhere Johan and Pieter De la Courts were mentioned by name. Their echoes, however, were everywhere.

---

<sup>386</sup> This thesis, 9: Wildenberg, 'Appreciaties van de gebroeders De la Court', 549; Weststeijn, *Commercial Republicanism*, 350-357. .

<sup>387</sup> Velema, *Republicans*, 69-75.



## Bibliography

### Primary literature

- Beaufort, Levinus Ferdinand de, *Verhandeling van de vryheid in den burgerstaet* (Leiden: Samuel Luchtmans, Middelburg: Leendert Bakker, 1737).
- Effen, Justus van, *Hollandsche Spectator*, Jaargang 1731 tot 1735 (Hermanus Uytwerf, Amsterdam).
- Hoeven, Emanuel van der, *Hollands Aeloude Vryheid, Buyten Het Stadhouderschap*, Tweede druk (Amsterdam: Ten Hoorn, 1706).
- ‘V.H.’ [Johan and Pieter de la Court], *Consideratien van Staat, ofte Polityke Weeg-schaal* (Amsterdam; Iacob Volckertsz. Zinbreker, 1661).
- ‘V.D.H.’ [Pieter de la Court], *Aanwysing der heilsame politike Gronden en Maximen van de Republike van Holland en West-Vriesland* (Leiden and Rotterdam: Hakkens, 1671).
- ‘V.H.’ [Pieter de la Court], *Historie der Gravelike Regering in Holland* (s.l., 1662).
- [Pieter de la Court], *Sinryke Fabulen, verklaart en toegepast tot alderley zeede-leszen, dienstig om waargenoomen te werden in het menschelijke en burgerlijke leeven* (Amsterdam: Hieronymus Sweerts, 1685).

### Pamphlets

- "Op de doot van William den derden [...]". Hekeldicht op Willem III, prins van Oranje (1650-1702), koning van Groot-Britannië. (1702). (Knuttel 14696).*
- Haec libertatis ergo. Of brandmerk van de stadhouderlike regering. Aan de vrye Nederlanden* (Vrystad: Waarmond Staet-Vorst. In't Wapen vande Oude Vryheit, naest het Welvaren van't Vaderland, 1704). (Knuttel 15136).
- Korte Schets Van 's Lands welwezen door de laatste Vrede, Nevens eenige Aanmerkingen op het stuk van de Commercie en Barriere. Gedrukt voor den Autheur, 1714 (Knuttel, 16231).*
- Libertatem nemo bonus nisi cum anima amisit. Dat is, de vryheid heeft geen eerlyk man, als met zyn leven verloren* (1722). (Nimwegen: Johannes Kragt, 1722). (Knuttel 16573).
- Palamedes, of de onderdrukte deugdt: Berisptdigt, op de heedendaagse tyden* (Amsterdam: Gerrit Bouman, 1733). (Knuttel 16910).
- De vryheydt der Staten van Holland ende Westvriesland, verdedigt tegen de schryver van den Hollandsche Patriot* (1735). (Knuttel 16986).
- Den oprechten vrygeboren Hollander tegens den vermonden Hollandschen Patriot. Door een liefhebber de Aloude Vryheyt, in het licht gebracht* (1735). (Knuttel 16987).

*De Bataafsche vrijheid en tirannye der Graven en Stadhouders: nagespoord in de oude regtspleelingen en wetten in de Nederlanden gebruikelyk* (1735). (Knuttel 16988).  
*Aanmerkingen op het redenerend verhoog van de aloudheid en souverainiteit der Heeren Staten van Holland. Onder drie tyden: zo voor, onder, als na de Regeering der Graven van Holland. Door een liefhebber der Vryheid* (Amsterdam: Hermanus Uytwerf, 1737). (Knuttel 17056).

### **Secundairy literature**

- Aalbers, J., *De Republiek en de vrede van Europa. Deel 1: Achtergronden en algemene aspecten* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhof, 1980).
- Ankersmit, F.R., 'Ernst Kossman, 31 januari 1922-8 november 2003', in: *Digitaal Wetenschapshistorisch Centrum, Levensberichten*, 66-75.  
<http://www.dwc.knaw.nl/DL/levensberichten/PE00001369.pdf> (accessed 8-11-2018).
- Bijl, M. van der, Pieter de la Court en de politieke werkelijkheid, in Blom, H.W. and I.W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist; voordrachten gehouden op het De la Court symposium, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam* (Amsterdam & Maarsen: Holland University Press, 1986) 65-92.
- Blom, H.W. & I.W. Wildenberg, 'Otto van Rees, 'De Economische denkbeelden van Pieter de la Court', in Blom, H.W. and I.W. Wildenberg (eds.), *Pieter de la Court in zijn tijd. Aspecten van een veelzijdig publicist; voordrachten gehouden op het De la Court symposium, Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam* (Amsterdam & Maarsen: Holland University Press, 1986) 161-185.
- Blom, H.W., 'Popularizing Government: Democratic Tendencies in Anglo-Dutch Republicanism', in: Gaby Mahlberg and Dirk Wiemann (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013) 121-135.
- Enenkel, Karl, and Koen Ottenheim, *Oudheid als ambitie. De zoektocht naar een passend verleden 1400-1700* (Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Vantilt, 2017).
- Fairclough, Norman, *Critical Discourse Analysis : The Critical Study of Language* (London: Routledge, 1995).
- Fairclough, Isabel, and Norman Fairclough, *Political Discourse Analysis. A method for advanced students* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012).
- Greene, Thomas M., *The light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven: Yale University Press 1982).

- Haitsma Mulier, E.O.G., 'De Bataafse mythe opnieuw bekeken', in: *BMGN Low Countries Historical Review* 111 (1996) 357-361.
- Haitsma Mulier, Eco, 'The language of seventeenth century republicanism in the United Provinces: Dutch or European?', in: Anthony Pagden (ed.), *The languages of political theory in early modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 179-195.
- Haitsma Mulier, E.O.G. en G.A.C. van der Lem, *Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland 1500-1800* (Den Haag: Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 1990).
- Hampsher-Monk, Iain, 'From Virtue to Politeness', in: Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, vol.2 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005) 85-105.
- Haks, Donald, *Vaderland en vrede 1672-1713. Publiciteit over de Nederlandse Republiek in oorlog* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2013).
- Helmets, Helmer J., *The royalist republic. Literature, politics, and religion in the Anglo-Dutch public sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- Hietbrink, A., 'De deugden van een vrije republiek. Opvattingen over beschaafdheid in de achttiende-eeuwse republiek', in: Pim den Boer (ed.), *Beschaving. Een geschiedenis van de begrippen hoofsheid, heusheid, beschaving en cultuur* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2001) 197-211.
- Hodges, Adam, 'Intertextuality in Discourse', in: Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (second edition) (E-Book: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2015). <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.library.uu.nl/doi/book/10.1002/9781118584194> (accessed 08-10-2018).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *The Dutch Republic. It's rise, greatness and fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *The Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the making of Modernity, 1650-1750* (Oxford: OUP, 2002).
- Knuttel, W.P.C., *Catalogus van de Pamfletten Verzameling, berustende in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek* (Den Haag: Algemeene Landsdrukkerij, 1902).
- Leeb, I. Leonard, *The Ideological Origins of the Batavian Revolution: History and Politics in the Dutch Republic 1747-1800* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).
- Nierop, Henk van, 'Romeyn de Hooghe and the imagination of Dutch foreign policy', in: David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and foreign policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011) 197-198.

- Onnekink, David, 'The revolution in Dutch foreign policy (1688), in: Femke Deen, et al. (eds), *Pamphlets and politics in the Dutch Republic* (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 143-171.
- Onnekink, David, *Reinterpreting the Dutch Forty Years War, 1672-1713* (London: Palgrave, 2016).
- Onnekink, David, 'The ideological context of the Dutch war (1672)', in David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and Foreign Policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Ashgate 2011) 131-144.
- Onnekink, David, and Rommelse, 'Introduction', in: David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and foreign policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011) 1-9.
- Pocock, J.G.A., *Political Language and Time. Essays on political thought and history* (London: Methuen & Co Ltd, 1972).
- Price, J.L., *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century. The Politics of Particularism* (London: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Rowen, Herbert H., 'The second Stadtholderless period', in: *The Princes of Orange. The Stadtholders in the Dutch Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Troost, W., '“To restore and preserve the liberty of Europe”: William III’s ideas on foreign policy’, in: David Onnekink, (Editor) and Gijs Rommelse, *Ideology and Foreign Policy in Early Modern Europe (1650-1750)* (Ashgate 2011) 283-303.
- Velema, Wyger R.E., “That a republic is better than a monarchy”: anti-monarchism in early modern Dutch thought’, in: Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Republicanism. A Shared European Heritage*, vol.1 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005) 9-25.
- Velema, Wyger R.E., *Republicans. Essays on Eighteenth-Century Dutch Political Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Weststeijn, Arthur, *Commercial Republicanism in the Dutch Golden Age* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- Weststeijn, Arthur, *De Radicale Republiek. Johan en Pieter de la Court – Dwarse denkers uit de Gouden Eeuw* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Bert Bakker, 2013).
- Weststeijn, Arthur, 'Why the Dutch didn't read Harington: Anglo-Dutch Republican Exchanges 1650-1670, in: Gaby Mahlberg and Dirk Wiemann (eds.), *European Contexts for English Republicanism* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013) 105-120.
- Wildenberg, Ivo W., 'Appreciaties van de gebroeders De la Court ten tijde van de Republiek', in: *Tijdschrift voor Gechiedenis* 98 (1985) 540-555.