2016

Allies to Enemies: Popular Xenophobia during the Seventeenth Century Anglo-Dutch Wars

Adrian T. van der Velde
Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/etd_all

 Part of the History Commons

ALLIES TO ENEMIES:
POPULAR XENOPHOBIA DURING THE
SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ANGLO-DUTCH WARS

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

By

ADRIAN THOMAS VAN DER VELDE
B.A., Cedarville University, 2005

2016
Wright State University

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

<u>April 27, 2016</u>

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION
BY <u>Adrian Thomas van der Velde</u> ENTITLED <u>Allies to Enemies: Popular Xenophobia
During the Seventeenth Century Anglo-Dutch Wars</u> BE ACCEPTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF <u>Master of Arts</u>.

_____

Paul Lockhart, Ph.D.

Thesis Director

_____

Carol Herringer, Ph.D.

Department Chair

Committee on
Final Examination

_____

Roy Vice, Ph. D.

_____

Christopher Beck, Ph. D.

_____

Robert E.W.Fyffe, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research and
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

van der Velde, Adrian Thomas. M.A. Department of History, Wright State University, 2016. Allies to Enemies: Popular Xenophobia in the Seventeenth Century Anglo-Dutch Wars.

This thesis examines the excoriating pamphlet literature of both Dutch and English origin during the three Anglo-Dutch Wars of the seventeenth century. The Dutch Republic of this time was in the midst of its Golden Age, while England was on its ascent to eventual predominance in world affairs. By looking at concepts such as *staartmannen* [tail-men], *Duivelskind* [Devil's child], or "Hollandophobia," themes of mockery, religion, and xenophobia in popular printed works – including the engraved illustrations which accompanied the texts – are observed. Ultimately the thesis argues that the pamphlet literature bolstered the regional identity of *Hollander* in the Dutch Republic and helped reinforce an English identity that arose in opposition to its rival.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

## I.	INTRODUCTION

PREFACE

Only a few years after fighting alongside each other, both in the Dutch Republic's war of independence from Spain and in the Thirty Years War, the English and Dutch switched to a position of enmity. The three Anglo-Dutch Wars of the seventeenth century, fought between the years 1652-1674, saw these two nations battle for trade and military supremacy on the seas and around the globe. Meanwhile, at home, citizens of both nations resorted to derogatory name-calling and wrote scurrilous stories regarding each other. Dutch pamphleteers insulted the English by using clever pejoratives such as *Engel*. At first glance, the word appeared close to *Engels*, the Dutch word for "English." But the one letter held significance, for the word now meant "angel." Given that the usage often accompanied references to the devil or hell, the insinuation of the English as fallen angels in league with the devil was clear to the audience. Engravings found in these pamphlets, often created by some of the brightest and most influential Dutch artists, illustrated the vast array of creative firepower aimed in England's direction. In response, English pamphlets consistently characterized the Dutch people as fat, greedy, and cruel – all versions of their Hollandophobia. The legacies of this Anglo-Dutch propaganda war in many ways superseded and cultivated the physical conflict that stretched over two decades, for it stoked the animus of the population of the two nations.

This thesis will attempt to provide an answer to three key questions relating to the pamphlet literature of the three Anglo-Dutch Wars of the seventeenth century. (1) Based upon evidence from the pamphlet literature, what types of anti-English invective did the Dutch employ prior to and during the wars of the seventeenth century? (2) What function(s) did this anti-English pamphleteering serve in Dutch society? (3) How did the English respond to the Dutch, and what role did it serve in their society?

The thesis of this paper proposes that Dutch pamphleteering in the seventeenth century both reflected and fostered a developing identity. This nascent identity emerged after the once-fractured territories became the United Provinces, and it proclaimed the preeminence of Dutch power and culture. While popular literature ridiculed undesirable and feared traits in the English, it also created a unique self-image that distinguished the Dutch from their foes. In order to demonstrate this thesis, three specific components relating to Dutch pamphleteering will be examined. The first component to be examined consists of the numerous portrayals of the English as *Staartmannen* [tail-men], explaining the symbolism of docking the tails of men and animals represented. The second component investigates the previously mentioned term *engel*, and will examine its use as both a pejorative and as a critique of English religious life. The third component explores the role of pamphleteering as a propagandistic component that helped create a unified self-image for the Dutch. As the subject could easily turn into a massive undertaking beyond the scope of this project, the focus will center primarily on the Dutch side of the Anglo-Dutch pamphleteering, although one

chapter will address the concept of English "Hollandophobia" (a term created by Simon Schama) as well.

The subject of Anglo-Dutch pamphleteering holds significance for several reasons. An examination of the mass-published literature of the era, along with its effect on the population, provides perspective on the influence and implications of written propaganda for the early modern audience. The in-depth investigation of a national history, such as that of the Dutch Republic, allows for a comprehensive appreciation of both the ideas and occurrences that shape modern events. Generating new interpretations of historical subjects opens areas of research that might hitherto have been unexplored. The Anglo-Dutch Wars themselves have become an area of increased interest as historians give greater weight to this portion of history. The combination of all these factors makes the subject of sufficient magnitude for study.

HISTORICAL SETTING

Less than a decade after the official end of the bloody revolt against Spain, the Dutch Republic stood at the apex of European culture, power, and trade. The Peace of Westphalia, agreed upon in 1648, formally concluded the Thirty Years War and officially recognized the independence of the United Provinces. Dutch sailors traveled the world in search of spices and other exotica. Settlers inhabited far-flung locations in North America, the West Indies, and the East Indies. Merchants exchanged goods with West Africa, India, and even Japan. The founding of the *Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie* (VOC) in 1602, the first publicly traded company in European history, established a trading dominance that lasted nearly

two hundred years. Dutch painting sparked an artistic revolution, exemplified by masters such as Frans Hals, Rembrandt van Rijn, and Johannes Vermeer. Publishers produced thousands of books, pamphlets, and other printed material. Scientists opened up new frontiers – literally – as engineers such as Jan Leeghwater claimed great tracts of land from the sea, Christiaan Huygens explored space with the telescope, and Antony van Leeuwenhoek used the microscope to observe hitherto unknown "animalcules." Philosophers reveled in the freedom of idealistic expression, and intellectual radicals of foreign origin such as Baruch Spinoza, René Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke helped initiate a revolution that resulted in the Enlightenment. The Dutch operated a navy without technological or strategical equal, a necessity to protect their vast merchant fleet. Maurice of Nassau's innovations in army organization modernized military structure, and based upon his efforts the Dutch created the first modern professional army in Europe. Truly, the United Provinces of the seventeenth century merited their reputation of being in the midst of a "Golden Age."[1]

The greatest rival to Dutch power lay just a few miles across the Channel: England. Its status as an island naturally inclined it toward seafaring, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries its sailors also traveled around the world. Because the leaders of the two countries embraced a Protestant faith and feared Spanish hegemony, this made the two competing nations allies for a time. During the Dutch Revolt, the English (under Elizabeth I) lent money to the rebels, fought

---

[1] K. H. D. Haley, *The Dutch in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Thames and Hudson, Ltd., 1972), 25, 126-128, 149-152, 166, 169-170.
"Leeghwater." Museum in 't Houten Huis. http://www.houtenhuis.nl/pagina/37/leeghwater/.

alongside their ships against the Spanish galleons, and supplied troops to the

ground effort in the Low Countries. Nearly one third of Maurice of Nassau's newly

organized army contained English or Scots soldiers.[2] Their tandem efforts helped

ensure the defeat of the fearsome Spanish Armada in 1588. Mutually beneficial

interactions were not limited to war efforts. Religious and philosophical thinkers,

such as the Pilgrims who eventually migrated to New England, travelled to Holland

to partake in its greater freedom and ensure the publication of their writings. Dutch

painters, such as Antony van Dyck, plied their trade in England rather than in their

home country, and their artworks received praise from English connoisseurs and

nobility.[3] A contemporary, albeit optimistic, thinker might have envisioned a

partnership between the two countries as a dominating force in the world that could

last for centuries to come.

One of the reasons a Dutchman or Englishman of the mid-seventeenth

century might have used to support an alliance would have been the fact that the

official church of both countries was Protestant. And, after all, the Dutch had just

spent eighty years wresting their independence from Spain, in great part out of a

desire for religious freedom and escape from persecution. Calvinism and

Anabaptism – two of the fastest growing Protestant sects in Europe – flourished in

the Low Countries. After both political and religious differences with the papacy,

England's monarchs separated themselves from Catholicism and created a state

---

[2] Roger B. Manning, "Prince Maurice's School of War: British Swordsmen and the Dutch." In *War and Society*, (25), 1.

[3] Lisa Jardine, *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory*. (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2008), 130-131.

church. Protestantism spread quickly, and Catholics were often viewed as religious and political enemies. However, the two nations' shared antipathy for the papacy did not create sufficient grounds for entente. Common religion did not necessitate an alliance, as demonstrated by the example of Catholic France's alliance with Sweden and support of the Protestant Germans against the Habsburgs in the Thirty Years War. Instead, economic, political, or even personal commitments superseded the claims of religious groups. Of these, conflict over economic interests most often trumped theological affinity. As historians Roger Hainsworth and Christine Churches pointed out, "...the ideological ties linking the republics 'were flimsy compared with the material interests which divided them.' Material interests certainly did divide them as we shall see but the 'ideological ties' were only apparent to the English; to the Dutch they were invisible."[4] Thus, while an alliance based upon shared religion held some theoretical promise, practical considerations overrode such a position.

Most importantly, a hope of an alliance based upon a similar Protestant faith relied upon the myth of both the Dutch Republic and England as monolithic religious states, similar to European nations of the Middle Ages. But the sectarian nature of Protestantism itself, where each believer could be a "priest," resulted in fractured societies. When combined with the incomplete transition from Catholicism (a significant percentage of the population held on to their Catholic faith), a purely sacred alliance was impossible. Dutch "religious pluralism," as

---

[4] Roger Hainsworth and Christine Churches, *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars: 1652-1674* (Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998), 7.

described by historian Maarten Prak, meant that no one denomination dominated the national constituency. Thanks to an influx of dissidents of all faiths from the Spanish Netherlands, many cities in the United Provinces found themselves religiously divided. In the case of seventeenth century Haarlem, at least three sects comprised over ten percent of the city's population, and many residents failed to identify themselves as members of any denomination at all.[5] The inclusion of Calvinists, Catholics, and Mennonites in the leadership of guilds demonstrated that differences in creed did not preclude cooperation at the local level. Calvinist ministers, who represented a majority of the ruling class, viewed their nation as God's chosen people and a "second Israel," but many Dutch did not adopt their postmillennial perspective.[6] Similarly, England by 1652 found itself religiously divided. Oliver Cromwell, himself a Puritan and therefore a Calvinist, seemed to desire a modicum of religious toleration (although his ruthless repression of Irish Catholics belied this perspective). But repressive measures, such as the deceptively-named Tolerance Act of 1650 or the Act of General Pardon and Oblivion of 1652, merely served to polarize the English. Divisions in Parliament between sects like the Anglicans, Puritans, Presbyterians, and Quakers illustrated the division of the nation itself. Thus, any hope of an alliance based upon religion seemed doomed by internal partisanship.[7]

---

[5] Maarten Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age*, trans. Diane Webb. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 209

[6] Pieter Geyl, *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century*. (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1961), 161-162.

[7] Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Longman Group UK Limited, 1991), 81, 83.

Cooperation between the Dutch and English barely lasted beyond the Peace of Westphalia, and by 1652 the first of a series of four wars, collectively known as the Anglo-Dutch Wars, plunged the former allies into violent conflict with each other. The First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654) pitted the Dutch Republic, under the leadership of the *Staten-Generaal* [States-General], against the Commonwealth of England, under the leadership of Cromwell. Leading up to the war, the world observed two nations in ferment.[8] While the Dutch were in the midst of great prosperity due to their free trade policies, the government was also in the midst of transition after the unexpected death of the *Stadhouder* [Stadtholder], William II of Orange, in 1650. His son was born not long after his death, but the assembly decided to not appoint a new *Stadhouder* (partly in deference to the English), and the Republic entered the time period known as the *Eerste Stadhouderloze Tijdperk* [First Stadtholderless Era]. The Grand Pensionary, Johan de Witt, rose to lead the assembly (and thereby the nation), and maintained this role for nearly twenty years.[9] Similarly, England had just entered a time of change. After a fractious Civil War, its government in upheaval just a few years after Charles I's deposition and execution in 1649, and its merchants struggling to compete on the world market, England faced multiple crises. Cromwell's dictatorial hand directed the nation, and he eventually assumed the role of Lord Protector. By 1652, both the Dutch Republic

---

[8] The *Staten-Generaal* was a legislative body that functionally governed the Dutch Republic, a stronger role than intended by the Habsburg rulers who instituted the chamber. The *Stadhouder* presided over sessions, and each province had one vote. While this one vote policy ensured representation for the smaller provinces, it also meant that the province of Holland – which had the largest population and paid 60% of the tax burden and an even greater proportion of war loans – consistently felt that its interests were underrepresented. For more information see James Tracy's *The Founding of the Dutch Republic: War, Finance, and Politics in Holland, 1572-1588*.
[9] Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century*, 196.

and England were searching for a new identity to distinguish them from their predecessors.

Surprisingly, one of the actions that led to war began as an effort to unite the two countries. In 1651, emissaries from the Commonwealth (which the Dutch had not recognized until January of that year), approached the Dutch and proposed a radical idea. They wanted to join forces in an effort to control world trade, and even seemed to suggest the creation of a consolidated empire. Their combined merchant and naval fleets would divide the globe between them, with the English dominating the Americas while the Dutch controlled Africa and Asia. Not only did the idea appear far-fetched to the Dutch, they feared it would inevitably lead to a renewal of conflict with Spain and even France, as neither of those nations would stand by idly while they lost their overseas empires. Perhaps most importantly, the offer appeared to imply that the Dutch would be subservient to the English, and would not rule the world as coequals. After months of deliberation, they counter-offered with a free-trade proposal, hoping to mollify the English delegation with a less-risky proposition. But this in turn upset the English, for they had imposed tariffs on Dutch imports to their colonies due to their own inability to compete on equal terms. Other points of discontent – such as the Dutch harboring of Royalist sympathizers in Holland or the participation of Englishmen as prize judges in Flanders – further precipitated the conflict. With both parties feeling insulted by the other, the delegations split and the stage for war was set.[10]

---

[10] Simon Groenveld, "The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640-1652." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (September, 1987), 555-556.

As 1652 progressed, English aggression toward Dutch merchant shipping grew. The English had claimed sovereignty on the seas for many years, and Dutch captains generally avoided their English counterparts if possible, or lowered their flags in deference if a meeting could not be avoided. From 1647 to 1650, British privateers (this includes Royalists, Irish, and others) captured 137 ships of Dutch origin. But in 1651 and the first 6 months of 1652, before any declaration of war, this number rose to 246 ships. These statistics bore great importance before the commencement of a war that took place primarily on the sea.[11] In July 1652, the countries officially declared war. The Dutch obtained the advantage in the early stages, but suffered setbacks, partly due to poor weather. The English managed to drive the Dutch back into their ports by 1653, and began a blockade that starved cities like Amsterdam and Haarlem because they were cut off from grain imports. With the exception of the English victory at the Battle of Scheveningen and the resultant death of Dutch Admiral Maarten Tromp, the naval battles themselves often ended in stalemate, where even the victors retreated to metaphorically lick their wounds. But the war's progress clearly favored the English. By 1654, both sides tired of the conflict and agreed to a peace, one that would barely last a decade. England would restore the monarchy under Charles II, and new reasons for conflict presented themselves.[12]

Deeply-seated political distrust between the two nations may have played a role in starting the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667). Historian Steven Pincus

---

[11] Ibid., 547, 561.
[12] Hainsworth and Churches, *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars*, 85-87; 89-93.

argued that the Royalist fear of Dutch political ideas was the primary cause for conflict. The newly restored government of Charles II equated the philosophical ideas of Cromwell and the Dutch Republicans, and blamed the latter for the English rebellion. In an attempt to garner ideological and economic support from within the nation, Royalist members passed a trade resolution in April of 1664 whose sole purpose was to damage Dutch trade power. Thanks to growing Dutch trade influence across the globe, the English feared the rise of a new "universal monarchy," a replacement for the rapidly declining Spanish empire.[13] Another view, put forth by historian Maurice Ashley, posited that the machinations of the French King Louis XIV created the rift that led to the Second Anglo-Dutch War. Desirous of the Spanish Netherlands, Louis manipulated Charles II into war with the Dutch by playing on the traditional trade rivalry between England and the Dutch Republic.[14] Dutch merchant ships sailed throughout Western Europe, and by successfully plying their trade in French waters they diverted profits from French merchants.[15] Although historians debate the exact political reasons for war, the influence of economic interests clearly influenced all parties.

As in the prior war, the English seizure of Dutch shipping precipitated the conflict. The first great battle – known as the Battle of Lowestoft – ended in a resounding English victory, but the Dutch quickly rebuilt their fleet. Unlike before, other European nations – Denmark and France – joined in. Internal problems caused

---

[13] Steven C.A. Pincus, "Popery, Trade and Universal Monarchy: The Ideological Context of the Outbreak of the Second Anglo-Dutch War." *English Historical Review* 107, no. 422 (1993), 2, 3-6, 22.

[14] Maurice Ashley, *England in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1978), 139-141.

[15] Geyl. *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century*, 161.

each state difficulty as it pursued the war. Despite early successes, England's faced

problems in financing the war, especially in comparison to the Dutch Republic's

growing wealth. When combined with the Great Plague of 1665-1666 and the Great

Fire of 1666, the island nation was under great strain. In the United Provinces, the

Orangist party desired to restore the House of Orange to the position of *Stadhouder*.

They threatened the unity of the republic by their political machinations against the

Staten-Generaal, and infighting between politicians and military generals threatened

to split the country apart. An audacious Dutch incursion into the Thames in 1667

precipitated the end of the war and humiliated English leadership, but yet again

neither side could claim a clear-cut victory.[16]

Unlike the earlier conflicts, the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672-1674) did not

begin due to purely economic or naval antagonism. After examining new

historiography on the subject, Dutch historian Gijs Rommelse concluded that the

war grew out of many more factors. These included diplomatic and ideological

concerns, as well as economic and military considerations.[17] Already at war with the

French (which lasted until 1678), the war with England started poorly for the Dutch.

The bitter political infighting in the Dutch Republic over the restoration of the house

of Orange eventually led to de Witt's resignation and his brother's imprisonment in

1672. Not long after, a mob brutally murdered the Grand Pensionary and

eviscerated his body. For the first time since its independence from Spain, foreign

---

[16] Hainsworth and Churches, *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars*, 160-163.
[17] Gijs Rommel, "The Role of Mercantilism in Anglo-Dutch Political Relations, 1650-74." *The Economic History Review*, 63, 3 (2010), 608.

soldiers occupied Dutch cities. Slowly, the Dutch began to push the invaders out.[18] England, its populace never fully engaged in this newest war, began dealing with its own internal conflicts over politics and religion. Some of the allies began to individually sue for peace, and by the end of 1673 England's part in the war was effectively over.[19] Little was gained by any of the belligerents, but a political marriage in 1677 changed the course of Anglo-Dutch relations.

Willem III van Oranje's ascent to the English throne, as King William III, came about thanks to his marriage to Mary and via the Glorious Revolution in 1688. It forestalled further hostilities for nearly a century. As Dutch power waned and English capability grew, the peaceful marriage between the two nations became increasingly fractious. Yet again, a quarrel between the two nations arose over trade. This time Dutch merchants had supplied England's enemies with goods, many of them of a military nature. But by the time of the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War (1780-1784), the Dutch Golden Age was a distant memory, and the British Empire tried to subjugate an inferior foe, as well as the rest of the world, rather than defeat an enemy of equal strength.[20] The short-lived era of Dutch military might, and its resultant belligerency with England, was over.

---

[18] Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century*, 49-54.
[19] Hainsworth and Christine Churches, *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars*, 189-190.
[20] H.M. Scott, "Sir Joseph Yorke, Dutch Politics and the Origins of the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War." In *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (Sep., 1988), 572-573, 588.

II.   *STAARTEN*: THE SYMBOLISM OF ENGLISH TAILS

According to evidence from the popular literature, Dutch prejudice against the English clearly began prior to the Anglo-Dutch Wars. One of the themes consistently seen throughout seventeenth century pamphleteering portrayed the English as having tails. Two primary accusations accompanied this representation. First, as the devil had been depicted with a tail since the Middle Ages, English people were to be viewed as servants of Satan. In the religious, albeit pluralistic, environment of the Dutch Republic, this indictment carried significant weight. After all, people remembered the relatively recent persecution and killing of both Catholics and Protestants for heresy. Any association with the devil, however minor, resulted in both physical death and damnation.[21] Second, as only animals possessed tails, this characterized the English as bestial. Not only did this carry religious connotations – humans had been ordained by God to be caretakers of all of the animals – it made the enemies of the Dutch less cultured, intelligent, and human. Such representations served to "other" the English and helped foster the psyche of dehumanizing the opposition, a useful tool for a nation about to engage in war.

A number of Dutch historians in the past century developed upon the seventeenth century idea of the *staartman*, including Diedrik Enklaar and Marijke

---

[21] This idea will be explored further in the next chapter, which explores the relationship between the pamphleteering and religious critique.

Meijer Drees.[22] More recently, the work of Elizabeth Staffell transformed

scholarship on the topic. She traced the origin of the Dutch reference to the English

staartman to 1150. These references continued to the seventeenth century, and its

use grew during the period around the Anglo-Dutch Wars. Pamphlets portrayed the

English as animals – including lions, sharks, scorpions, and dogs (the texts

specifically identified them as mastiffs) – and continually described or pictured the

cutting or shortening of English tails. When accompanied by the imagery of docking

a tail, *staart* also functioned as a double entendre, for it implied that cutting off the

tail was a type of castration. The Dutch still commonly use the imagery of cutting off

the tail as weakening an individual or teaching a lesson, and gelding an animal

created the ultimate lack of strength. By making the English impotent, tail-chopping

functioned as a means of removing the power from the Dutch Republic's enemies.[23]

DE NEDERLANDSCHE NIJPTANG AS AN EPITOME OF DUTCH PAMPHLETEERING

Staffell predicated much of her argument upon a pamphlet published in

1652, just before the start of the First Anglo-Dutch War, entitled *De Nederlandsche*

Nijptang [The Dutch Pincers]. But while she focused on the *staartman* typology, the

layered invective that surrounded the term lost much of its provocative, indeed

earthy and off-color, elements in the translation. While the pamphlet itself has no

extant copies, it had the entirety of its text reproduced in the nineteenth century

---

[22] Helmer Helmers, *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 203, 291.
Enklaar's article, "De Gestaarte Engelsman" in *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Academie van Wetenschappen* 18 (1955).
Meijer Drees's book, *Andere Landen, Andere Mensen: de Beeldvorming van Holland Versus Spanje en Engeland Omstreeks 1650* (1997).
[23] Elizabeth Staffell, "The Horrible Tail-Man and the Anglo-Dutch Wars." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 2000, 169; 179-182.

Geschiedenis van Nederlands Volk en Staat [*History of the Dutch People and State*] by

Johannes van Vloten.[24] Below is the English translation of the first four stanzas of

the pamphlet:

> Britons, may I ask you what, With the preservation of my life
> Without fights, without blows, Without cursing or wrangling?
> I seek nothing but pleasure and satisfaction, really love the Britons
> Away with stepping on toes, Who steals their honor is a thief! —
>
> Why are your people called *Tails*? When proclaimed, not by chance,
> Men call, on the road and on waterways, everywhere, Tail-man! Tail-man!
> Tail-man! That they make strange sounds; A tail covers a beast's ass,
> Tails do not crown Anglos [Angels]; Tail-man! – well, what Devil is that?
>
> Tail-man, as I understand, Has really not a bad virtue,
> Because the tail suits dogs, And curls over the asshole
> Was a horse not highly praised? Is a peacock not more worthy?
> If the tail is upraised? What are foxes without tails?
>
> What are Anglos [Angels]? What are Britons? What is Fairfax, what Crom-
> well?
> If they sit without tails, then might Hell be empty?
> Hell! There lives nothing but scoundrels, Murderers of their own father
> Who destroy his property and blood. What's a Tail-man, dear leaders?[25]

---

[24] Ibid., 169-170. Some authors anglicize the word as *Nyptang,* but traditional Dutch spelling will be used here.

[25] Johannes van Vloten, *Algemeene Geschiedenis des Vaderlands van de Vroegste Tijden tot op Heden*, (Haarlem: I. de Haan, 1879), 280. The translation is mine, and the original is quoted below.

Britten, mag ik u wat vragen, Met behouding van mijn lijf
Zonder vechten, zonder slagen, Zonder vloeken en gekijf?
Ik zoek niet dan lust en vreden, Heb de Britten bijster lief:
Weg met op de tee[n] te treden, Die haar eer steelt is een dief! –

Waarom hiet uw volkjen *Staarten*? – Met voordracht, niet bij geval,
Roept men, op de weg en vaarten, Staartman, Staartman! overal;
Staartman! dat zijn vreemde tonen; Staart bedekt der beesten gat,
Staarten zijn geen Anglens kronen; Staartman! – wel, wat Droes, is dat?

Staartman, als ik 't ga doorgronden, Heeft voorwaar geen slecht bescheid,
Want de staart versiert de honden, Die gekruld op 't naaragat leit;
Werd een paard niet hoog geprezen? Is een pauw niet meerder waard,
Als zijn staart staat opgerezen? Wat zijn vossen zonder staart?

Wat zijn Anglen, wat zijn Britten, Wat is Fairfax, wat Crom-wel,
Als zij zonder staarten zitten, Anders als een leege Hel?
Hel! daar wonen niet dan fielen, Moorders van heur eigen vaar,

The pamphlet continued for many more stanzas, but the introductory words bear

examination in relation to the milieu surrounding the concept of *staartman*.

Although unnamed, the writer of this pamphlet was doubtless a *rederijker*, one of

the numerous rhetoricians famed for their caustic wit, and found primarily in the

province of Holland's cultural centers, such as Haarlem and Amsterdam.[26]

The writer of *De Nijptang* began by talking of his love for the English, as well

as his desire for friendship and peace. He decried those who would "take away their

honor" by calling the English harmful names. Helmer Helmers argued that this tone

reflected Dutch attitudes as a whole, and that the worst of Dutch hostility focused

upon the leadership of the Parliamentarians for their act of regicide.[27] After all, a

significant source of Dutch antagonism before the First Anglo-Dutch War focused on

Oliver Cromwell himself. He had killed King Charles I, an act that horrified even the

republican United Provinces.[28] *De Nijptang* specifically condemned Cromwell and

Fairfax to hell for their role as "murderers of their own father." Cromwell's offer to

join forces in an effort to conquer the world had also upset the *Staten-Generaal*, for

it implied the subservience of the Dutch to the English. The Dutch attempt to smooth

over the fractious political exchange with a trade treaty – despite Cromwell's affront

– reflected both a self-interest and a desire for a good relationship with their

neighbor. Based solely on the information above, Helmer's argument that Dutch

---

Die zijn goed en bloed vernielen. Wat 's een Staartman, lieve kaar?

[26] Walter Liedtke, "Frans Hals: Style and Substance," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (Summer 2011), 18.

[27] Helmers, *The Royalist Republic,* 204-209.

[28] Given the egregious terms of the Treaty of Westminster's Act of Seclusion (which prohibited the House of Orange from the position of *Stadhouder*), perhaps the Dutch hatred for Cromwell was not misplaced.

hatred focused on Cromwell, not the English people, merits consideration. And as will be seen, much of the pamphlet literature placed Cromwell in the center of their target, both figuratively and visually.

But *De Nijptang's* tone changed quickly to contempt for English as a whole, not just Cromwell. Similar to other nation's stories of the creation of their enemies (including the English descriptions of Dutch origins), the pamphlet described the Britons as having been spawned from Satan's pants, and called them a *Duivelskind* [Devil's-child].[29] The multi-layered meanings of the word *Anglen*, used in various ways throughout the stanzas, allowed the *rederijker* to play with the language. Rather than using the more common *Engels* [English], *Anglen* referred specifically to the Anglo-Saxons. But when the plural form was dropped – a move that the reader would have done naturally given the surrounding text – the meaning changed to "angel." Rather than a form of praise, this shift emphasized the status of the English as fallen angels, i.e., demons. Of course, demons contained nothing of good or virtue, and thus the battle against them was a righteous one. Further reiterating the English damnation to hell, the author described them as *fielen* [scoundrels]. Yet again, the language disguised a double entendre, for the word was traditionally directed towards homosexuals, with a use more similar to the English word "faggot." With few exceptions, early modern Europeans viewed this as one of the ultimate sins against the Almighty. Most members of a religious, and homophobic, society would remember Paul's words from Corinthians stating that gays could not inherit the

---

[29] *Algemeene Geschiedenis*, 281. "Dat den Britton was gerezen Uit des Duivels zwarte broek. / Van den Duivel? Hoe kan 't wezen? Zijt gij mal of stekeblind? / Doch is zolks voorwaar te lezen, Zoo blijft Staartman – Duivelskind."

kingdom of God. Thus, any reader who fully appreciated *De Nijptang* would have viewed the English not only as their enemy, but as accursed spawn of the devil.

Part of what made the concept of *staartman* particularly galling to the English stemmed from its scatological and bawdy humor at their expense. *De Nijptang* employed an "excremental" playfulness throughout the pamphlet, not reserving such jokes for the purview of immature teenagers. Residents in the urban areas, especially Amsterdam, enjoyed various types of ribald humor, and artists and writers incorporated it into their works.[30] Both Staffell and Helmers made significant contributions to the study of *staartman* imagery in seventeenth century literature, but their studies did not thoroughly examine the ways the *rederijker* played with the Dutch language to insert double entendres and other bawdy jokes. First, the author described why an animal, such as a dog, needed a tail. *Bescheid[en]* – virtue or modesty – made an animal's tail "curl over the asshole." Perhaps the phrase *wanneer het schijt* [whenever it shits] was too explicit for the author (although other authors used such expressions freely), but the phrase would have been mentally inserted by the reader. Cromwell's name itself, emphasized in the text as "Crom-well" (lest contemporaries miss the double meaning), reinforced this imagery. *Crom* (or, more correctly, *krom*) meant "curl" or "crooked," and Cromwell's

---

[30] Craig McDaniel, "Rethinking Rembrandt: Experiments in Pictorial Concoctions." *Midwest Quarterly* 56, no. 2, January 2015, 117-120. For examples of Netherlandish artists using such imagery, consider the shadow of Frans Banninck Cocq's hand pointing to his lieutenant's crotch in Rembrandt van Rijn's *The Night Watch* (1642), or a similar use by Judith Leyster in her *Self Portrait* (1630). Pieter Bruegel the Elder portrayed the dictum "men all shit the same way" in his *Flemish Proverbs* (1559).

role as the evil "tail that wagged the dog" was clear to the audience.[31] *De Nijptang*, literally "the pincers," called for the Dutch to snip off the English tail and the *crom* that covered its wickedness.

STAARTMANNEN AND OTHER VISUAL INSULTS IN THE PAMPHLETS

Although artwork adorned many of the Dutch pamphlets, the artists who created the engravings used by printers usually did so separated from the writers who created the images. In addition, many illustrations existed separate from any accompanying text, and vice versa. This was in part due to the two-step process required for printing a pamphlet with both an image and text. But many writers based their content upon the engraving, thus creating a cohesive narrative that kept the attention of the reader focused. The reading experience involved continuously switching back and forth between the text and the image in order to fully understand the pamphlet's message.

Some context must be given in order to understand the relationship between the illustrations and the pamphlet literature. At its height in the seventeenth century, Dutch art as a whole reigned supreme throughout Europe. Only individual painters, such as Caravaggio and Peter Paul Rubens, approached the level of influence, innovation, and fame achieved by the Dutch. With the notable exception of Frans Hals, most Dutch artists produced both paintings and engravings or etchings. Unfortunately, many of the illustrations found in Dutch pamphlets did not contain recognizable artist's marks. This commonly occurred in both paintings and

---

[31] J.A. Jockin ~la Bastide and G. van Kooten, *Kramers' Engels Woordenboek: Deel 2, Nederlands-Engels* (Amsterdam: Elsevier Nederland B.V., 1978), 290. While the exact idiom of a tail wagging the dog has later origins, the idea of Cromwell as an evil man leading a country astray seems obvious.

engravings, as the custom of signing artwork took hold only in the second half of the seventeenth century.[32] Skilled artists possessed the remarkable ability to capture movement, emotion, and esoteric ideas in a way that the common person, as well as critics, understood its layered meanings. They incorporated this into almost all of their works, making a comprehensive study an impossible task for such a short thesis. Thus, rather than focus on the ubiquity of *staartmannen* throughout the pamphlet literature, the approach taken here will focus on a few specific illustrations and the literature that accompanied them.

One image, *Cromwell als de Afgrijselijke Staartman* [*Cromwell as the Hideous Tail-man*], published by an anonymous printer in 1652, typified the Dutch view of English Republicans.[33] It portrayed Cromwell in the center of a crowd of men, wearing an ostentatious Cavalier-style hat that belied his supposedly-conservative Puritanism. A huge, scaly tail – apparently made of *rijksdaalders* – stretched behind him, tapering off dozens of feet away. At his feet lay a number of the coins, perhaps shed by the tail or excreted by Cromwell himself.[34] Lest the audience be confused, the artist made the identity of each character obvious by placing labels above their heads. The figures to Cromwell's left represented the English. Lord Thomas Fairfax, bowing obsequiously, held forth three crowns to place in Cromwell's hands. This clearly indicated the Dutch view of the Civil War, which believed Fairfax abetted

---

[32] Christopher Atkins, *The Signature Style of Frans Hals: Painting, Subjectivity, and the Market in Early Modernity* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012), 12, 150.

[33] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7284. Although the maker of the image is not identified, the inset looks identical to one found in a work by Crispijn van de Passe II, *Uytbeeldinge van de Hoogmoedige Republijk van Engelandt*, and even has the same inscription.

[34] This idea of gold as a type of excrement can be seen in other pamphlet illustrations and is also implied by the language in *De Nijptang* which described the tail's function as "covering the ass when it shits."

Cromwell's usurpation of the throne. Orangist sympathizers – Dutchmen who wanted to restore the *Stadhouder* – strongly disliked Cromwell's seizure of power, despite the Dutch Republic's shared lack of a monarchy.[35] Completing the English contingent, Admiral Robert Blake and three members of Parliament stood off in the shadows. The structure of the illustration presented a binary view similar to that of the biblical parable of the sheep and the goats. Those on the left hand were evil and received damnation as a punishment, while those on the right were righteous and earned life as a reward.

On Cromwell's left in *Hideous Tail-man*, a number of figures hacked at his tail with various types of blades. These represented Cromwell's enemies from both the United Provinces and the British Isles. Far in the back, a *Conings-man*, or Royalist, helped hold the end of the tail as a Scotsman prepared to slice it off with a sword. Prince Rupert of the Rhine, who had helped the Dutch fight the Spanish for independence before his failed support of King Charles, seemed to disinterestedly watch the Dutch in action. An Irishman – representing a people who were in the midst of being crushed in their homeland by Cromwell's forces – stood off to the side and impotently brandished a curved dagger. Rather than representing the Dutch as one figure, the artist broke them up into groups. Three of the provinces were represented: Holland, Zeeland, and Friesland, i.e., the states most affected by England's seizure of ships before the war.[36] A smaller image, set in the back left

---

[35] Simon Groenveld, "The English Civil Wars as a Cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War, 1640-1652." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (September, 1987), 555-556.
[36] The significance of this fact will be explored more fully in Chapter 4 of this thesis, which will examine it in relation to the creation of a regional identity.

corner, pictured ships in a harbor amidst billows of cannon smoke. Multiple barrels

lay on the wharf, and a number of Englishmen appeared to be at a makeshift market.

It held the caption: *Hier verkopense de gestoole goederen* [here they buy the stolen

goods], a reference to the English participation in maritime courts in the Spanish

Netherlands where privateers sold their prizes. The symbolism seen in this image,

of Cromwell as an evil *staartman* against a group of enemies, was one that continued

throughout the first two Anglo-Dutch Wars.

One pamphlet illustration by Crispijn van de Passe II (whose father had also

been a pamphleteer), printed in 1652, also allegorized Oliver Cromwell. Entitled

Uytbeeldinge van de Hoogmoedige Republijk van Engelandt [*Depiction of the Proud*

Republic of England], this violent engraving focused on the perceived financial greed

of the English leader.[37] The regal figure of Cromwell stared straight at the observer,

seemingly unconcerned with the multiple figures he was in the midst of destroying.

Three of the figures folded their hands to pray for mercy, and the pamphlet's legend

told that they represented France, Scotland, and Ireland. Each one appeared ready

to encounter the same fate as the Hollander on the left. This particularly gruesome

individual lay dead on the table, and Cromwell distractedly pulled its intestines from

a split-open abdomen. Standing on the table above the Hollander stood a griffin,

which combined the physical attributes of a lion and an eagle, and thus represented

the power of the English. The caption labeled the mythical creature as a *Roof-vogel*, a

bird of prey, or literally, "robber bird." The text told how the griffin *"schiet uit 'et*

gat" [shit out its asshole] in a shower of coins, and piles of money lay in the corner

---

[37] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7276.

of the picture. The griffin also placed a crown on Cromwell's head, a not-so-subtle reminder that Charles' power and possessions had been stolen by the Republicans. The text's author used the term *staartman* interchangeably with "Englishman," even though the pictorial representation showed no tail. Here, as in other cases, the tail indicated a connection with the devil, and the text described the English enslavement of "brothers of one church," i.e., the Scots, as "a devil's work."

Four insets, each depicting a disparate yet connected event, surrounded the central figure in the *Proud Republic*, and the legend described what the scenes imported. The first inset copied the one found in the *Hideous Tail-Man*, which complained about the English buying stolen goods. A second inset depicted five figures attacking an Englishman. Three received identification – a Frenchman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman – and they were accompanied by an unnamed figure whose attire looked like that of a Royalist. The accompanying text described them as helping the Hollander, in the form of the Dutch lion, to "strike the life out" of the Englishman.[38] Similarly, the third inset also struck a hopeful note, and the image depicted a fleet in the midst of battle. In prescient fashion, it foretold the burning of the English fleet at the hands of the Dutch, a prediction apparently based upon the visions of Nostradamus.[39] Interestingly enough, the last scene had neither a label nor a description, for it assumed that the audience understood what the image conveyed without explanation. It portrayed a crowd gathered around a scaffold, and

---

[38] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7276. "Den Hollandtschen Leeuw balt / met hulp van den Schotsman / Frans-man en Yrsman / Den Engelsman op 't lijf." Unlike the legend for the image, the text of the pamphlet underneath identified the man being attacked solely with the term *Staertman*.

[39] Ibid., "Beteikent / dat door Branders de Engelsche Vloot zal bernielt mouden." The theme of Nostradamus will be examined in greater detail in the next chapter.

they looked on in celebration at a body separated from its head. In the eyes of the

artist, this portrayed not just the execution, but the murder, of King Charles, just one

more of Cromwell and England's crimes that merited judgment and avenging by the

Dutch.

The pamphlet which most explicitly combined both *staartman* imagery and

scatological humor held the grandiose title *Voorspookkend Zinne-beeld, op den Staat*

der Engelsche en Nederlanders [*Prophetical Emblem, on the Condition of the English*

and Dutch], published by an unknown printer in 1652.[40] Cromwell, only identified as

"the robber," lay atop a wheel, puking forth a litany of stolen riches: coins, crowns,

miters, and tableware. The text described his stealing of the Stuart's throne and

riches, and a curly-haired lion – representing the Dutch nation – attempted to attack

him from the side. Lightning bolts from the Almighty struck him from heaven,

inscribed with the words *een quaade zaak verdient Gods wraak* [an evil case

deserves God's wrath]. Behind Cromwell, Admiral Blake leaned against the wheel

and held onto his leader's tail with two hands, as if trying to keep together a lost

cause.[41] A Dutch sailor stood behind Blake and used a spear to pull down the

Admiral's pants and expose his tailed butt, from which poured a diarrhea of ships

that the English had stolen from the Dutch. Two insets contained pithy sayings

intended to motivate the Dutch to action. The first portrayed two groups of men,

and its words *seght wat ghy wilt en doet wat ghy kunt* [say what you will, and do

---

[40] Ibid., 7280.
[41] Neither Cromwell nor Blake were identified by name in the text of the pamphlet. However, Cromwell's identity is confirmed in other ways, while scholars (including Staffell) argue that the context supports identifying Blake as the second man in the image.

what you can], implied that the two nations should do their best to keep their word as they negotiated a deal. The second inset showed a Dutch fleet sailing past a smaller English contingent. As an expression of proto-capitalism, it stated *Hebben is hebben, krygen is kunst* [having is having, getting is art]. The message it contained was clear to the intended audience: the English might possess great power, but the Dutch cultivated an inborn skill of trading. Thirteen years later, a printer recycled the entire image. The new pamphlet's text replaced Cromwell and cast Charles II as the principal antihero.[42] This demonstrated the flexibility of the *staartman* image to vilify any Englishman and that the Dutch did not reserve its use for Cromwell alone.

Another of de Passe's illustrations was found in the pamphlet *Leeuw en Honden Gevecht* [*Lions and Dogs Fight*]. The Dutch lion – put to sleep by the bass-playing musician (bribed by Cromwell) – ignored the bristling of the foolishly brave English dogs. Behind the dogs, a sailor prepared remove their pride by docking their tails with a large pair of pincers, for their "*steerten zijn te langh*" [tails are too long]. Cromwell – identified both as the *Conterman* and as the *Staartman* – prodded at the lion in an effort to awaken it. However, as the scenes in the background demonstrated, the Dutch lion would tear the English mastiff apart once awakened. The label *Conterman*, while not directly translatable, contained two meanings. The context made Cromwell the "opponent," evidenced by his actions to rile the Dutch. More crudely, it also called him an "asshole," and the text portrayed him as a

---

[42] Staffell, "The Horrible Tail-Man," 174.

belligerent leader who consistently sought to start a fight against the peace-loving United Provinces.[43]

Use of *staartman* seemed to subside after the first war, although it did not entirely go away. An untitled image, engraved by Jan van Souffenborgh and published in 1656 between the first two Anglo-Dutch Wars, portrayed Cromwell as the whore of Babylon. He rode upon a dragon with a tail and seven heads, a reference to Revelation chapter 12. This combined both the *staart* imagery and the potent religious symbolism related to the Apocalypse. The text accused the English leader of bringing violence and desolation as the tyrant of Europe. He had bullied other countries with his dragon and caused the tormented states of Holland to cower before him. By only referring to him as *Crom*, the pamphlet asserted the belief that Cromwell was crooked, and the curlicue tail of the dragon served as a pictorial reinforcement of this conviction.[44] In his left hand he held an empty glass, a common pictorial metaphor for the brevity of life.[45] Given that he died only three years later, this imagery conveyed the Dutch belief that even the reign of the whore of Babylon, i.e., Cromwell, would soon come to an end.

Although the use of *staart* imagery appears to have slowed by the time of the Third Anglo-Dutch War, the pamphlet entitled *Algemeene Verklaring van dit Sinnebeeldt* [*General Statement on this Symbol*] demonstrated that the metaphor still held meaning for both Dutch and English audiences.[46] Originally published in 1668

---

[43] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7277. The picture portrays the musician as playing a cello, and other sources refer to the instrument as such, but the text refers to it as a bass.

[44] Ibid., #7734.

[45] Liedtke, "Style and Substance," 42.

[46] Frederik Muller, *De Nederlandsche geschiedenis in platen: beredeneerde beschrijving van Nederlandsche historieplaten, zinneprenten en historische kaarten*, cat.nr. 2303, p. 347.

by a Dutch printer only a year after the end of the second war, the illustration seemed to posit a chaotic and apocalyptic vision of the future that combined *staarten* with a mythological message. A score of animals – including an elephant, peacock, snake, pegasi, and a dozen dogs – added to the scene's pandemonium. At the center stood a woman, identified as the "Virgin Netherlands." She was about to be crowned with a laurel wreath by two cherubs who descended from heaven. In the foreground, a Dutch sailor raised an axe to chop off the tail of a dog, clearly ready to add to the pile of those he had previously docked. Two other dogs, still uncut, snarled at the sailor, while the rest of the mutilated dogs ran away. This symbolism glorified the might of the Dutch navy, which had recently sailed up the Thames and demonstrated the impotence of English power.

While the text of the *General Statement* claimed that anyone could understand the illustration without explanation, it nevertheless expounded on the picture. It stated that the recent war, from which the Dutch emerged victorious, served as God's punishment on the English for their pride. Just like Jupiter, who killed Phaeton with a lightning bolt for his arrogant driving of the sun-chariot, the Almighty used the Dutch to strike down the haughty English. The Virgin Netherlands stood atop her conquered foe and leaned upon the elephant behind her. She held up an olive branch of peace, content in her God-given victory. While dressed in finery that indicated her wealth and power, the female personification of England raised a weak hand for mercy. Consistently referring to England as a "bad neighbor," the anonymous author portrayed a nation who had overstepped its position in Europe at the expense of its allies; an adder who bit the breast of its protector. The United

Provinces had been forced into a fight they did not want, and they docked the English *staarten* as a reminder to the world that the proud would be humbled.

In 1673, two Englishmen, Henry Hills and John Starkey, reprinted the image from the *General Statement* in a long pamphlet by Henry Stubbs, "A Further Justification of the Present War against the United Netherlands," in order to stimulate outrage against the Dutch.[47] English people understood the symbolism of the illustration, especially the docking of the mastiff tails by a Dutch sailor. The text recounted a litany of Dutch crimes in ports around the world, and decried the slander that caused foreign merchants to believe that the "...English were so odious, so despicable a people, that they deserved not to be regarded in point of commerce."[48] Stubbs analyzed the illustration and incorrectly identified the Dutch sailor as a *Boor*, or farmer.[49] Perhaps this stemmed from a simple misunderstanding of the language or from the clothing of the character. More likely, Stubbs intentionally used the term to denigrate his opponent, for it had a double meaning: not only was the Dutchman a farmer, he was also a "rude, ill-bred fellow; a clown."[50]

STAARTMANNEN CONCLUSIONS

Based upon Staffell's research, Dutch use of *staartman* imagery directed toward the English began hundreds of years before the Anglo-Dutch Wars. Conflict in the seventeenth century merely intensified the written and visual rhetoric in the

---

[47] Rijksmuseum.nl, "Spotprent op de Engelsen, 1673," http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.358558.
[48] Henry Stubbe, "A Further Justification of the Present War Against the United Netherlands."
[49] Ibid.
[50] "boor, n.". Oxford English Dictionary Online, Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/view/Entry/21500 The etymology of the term traces back to the fifteenth century, but it began to be used specifically to refer to the Dutch around 1580.

pamphleteering, and did not represent a new idea. *Staart* functioned as a double-entendre, for not only did it turn opponents into an animal, images of it being docked also implied sterilization, i.e., removal of power and strength. Here *De Nijptang*, with its utilization of both crude humor and religious symbolism, provided a basis for analyzing other Dutch propaganda. While many of the barbs targeted the English people as a whole, a significant portion specifically concentrated on Cromwell. His role as the architect of regicide made him hated by the Dutch, who were no doubt influenced by the Royalists who fled to Holland.

How much did the image of the *staartman* influence Dutch life and thought? Popular hatred for Cromwell, a figure often identified only by his tail, seemed to have remained strong until his death. After his death, the use of the metaphor declined in pamphlets. Yet the relationship between the two countries, especially politically, did not thaw until decades later. Antipathy remained strong despite the change of regime in England that the Dutch supported. A new king, Charles II, merely replaced Cromwell as a new target for pamphleteering invective, and he became the new *staartman*. And the English themselves actually resurrected the tail-man image in an attempt to revive the propaganda war. Given the centuries of separation from its use in Dutch pamphlets, a complete understanding of the *staartman* is impossible. But grasping the complexities of this imagery is crucial to comprehending the element of the pamphleteering examined next: religious critique.

III.   *ENGEL AND DUIVELSKIND*: DUTCH PAMPHLETS

AND THEIR CRITIQUE OF RELIGION

Within the century prior to the First Anglo-Dutch War, both England and the
Dutch Republic experienced the changes that accompanied the religious chaos of the
Reformation. But the two nations approached the transition in very different ways.
Even though the United Provinces never united under a single branch of
Protestantism, or even Christianity, the common effort to throw off the Spanish yoke
worked to downplay religious tensions in the country and promoted an unusual
level of toleration. Indeed, the greatest conflict occurred within a single
denomination, as strident Calvinists in the Dutch Reformed Church (whose
members dominated positions of political power), castigated their Arminian
counterparts for believing in free will.[1] People of diverse faiths married each other,
managed the same guilds, and even let artists paint them in the same pictures.
Religious refugees fled to Holland from countries around Europe, including England.
Although its members created neither a prudish or austere society, some type of
Christian belief permeated daily life for the Dutch. In contrast to the Dutch Republic,
England experienced a different type of Reformation. After many years of vocal, yet

---

[1] Seventeenth century pamphlet literature includes multiple cases of Calvinists excoriating their
Arminian opponents (for example, see *Den Teghenwoordighen Arminiaen* [*The Presence of the
Arminians*], written by an anonymous author in 1623 with an etching by Cornelis Blaeu-Laken and
David Ronsaeus), but its examination is beyond the scope of this thesis.

persecuted, resistance, the nation split from the Catholic Church. Under the forceful hand of Henry VIII, England established its own church, a move based upon reasons that still engender debate among historians and theologians. A polyphonous Protestant movement continued to grow with succeeding monarchs. By the time of Oliver Cromwell's rise to power, representatives of various sects occupied key positions within Parliament. As one might expect, the diverse theological beliefs – vocally espoused by passionate members of the government – led legislators to wrangle bitterly over the religious and political future of the English state.

Cromwell became the primary target of the attacks by Dutch pamphleteers in the 1650s. According to historian Barry Coward, the English leader desired a "godly reformation" of England more than any political agenda or personal aggrandizement, and toward that end he also worked to ensure religious freedom for dissidents who based their beliefs upon the Bible. But his motives were often viewed dubiously by his contemporaries, as illustrated by Richard Overton's scathing assessment: "You shall scarce speak to Crumwell [sic] about any thing but he will lay his hand on his breast, elevate his eyes and call God to record, he will weep, howl and repent, even while he doth smite you under the first rib."[2] While Overton's words were intended to rile the readers of his pamphlets and arose from his Leveler faith (which desired to eradicate social and religious hierarchies), Dutch pamphleteers seized upon such language by the time of the First Anglo-Dutch War. Their religious castigation of Cromwell naturally expanded to the English people as a whole – for, after all, they were enemies – and it included themes of deceit,

---

[2] Barry Coward, *Oliver Cromwell* (London: Longman Group UK Limited, 1991), 94, 132, 160.

treachery, and the ultimate crossing of religious lines: association with the devil. As with any popular movement, the motivation for such actions was multi-layered, but an examination of the religious critique in the Dutch pamphlet literature adds to the understanding of one of the underlying conflicts that erupted into open war in 1652.

DE NEDERLANDSCHE NIJPTANG: ASSOCIATING THE ENGLISH WITH THE DEVIL

As with the previous chapter's discussion of *staartman* [tail-man], the words of the Dutch pamphlet *De Nederlandsche Nijptang* [*The Dutch Pincers*] provide insight into not only the scatological humor of the Dutch *rederijkers* [rhetoricians], but also to the religious critique they leveled at their English opponents:

Sir, what one finds are stupid gawkers! Anglo pudding, it is too rough!
Who saw ever the Devil stir, without a tail hanging behind?
Devils certainly have tails, the Devil is the Briton's father;
What you know not, dear Maarten, So you don't understand it clearly.

See this property they inherit from their best father:
How then would the tail deny itself, that descends from the Devil's hair?
Let us therefore this conclude, That the Tail comes out of Hell,
And that the Britons' tail must sprout From their father's grumbling hide.

Now, men must leave such business, And the tail on Briton's asshole,
No evil speech from these mates! On whosoever's mother the Devil sat,
He surely is a boss at lying, Thieving and murder from the beginning;
Tail-man cannot then deceive, Tail-man has the Devil in him.

What good would be hidden in Tail-man], Who for good deeds steals mercilessly?
Have stolen from their neighbors' homes, And cleaved the neck of its residents.
Entered under a pretense A common Republic,
Tricks men of nobility, burghers, farmers, And it becomes a Devil-realm.

Devil's-realm, that the Dutch peace with a proud foot,
Will reject, will trample, by Elizabeth brooded,
And under Jacob grew larger, Under Charles its hour shined,
In whose blood dogs piss, Ravens greedily eat her stolen paunch! [3]

---

[3] Johannes van Vloten, Algemeene Geschiedenis des Vaderlands van de Vroegste Tijden tot op Heden, (Haarlem: I. de Haan, 1879), 281-282. The translation is mine, and the original is quoted below. Heer, wat vindt men botte loeren! Anglens podding, 't is te grof!

The author wove a number of interconnected accusations against the English throughout this section of the poem. Instead of a merely obscene, albeit humorous, poking fun at gross anatomy, this use of *staartman* primarily focused on its rather serious association with the devil. Religious Dutchmen knew the references to the devil as a thief who came "to steal, and to kill, and to destroy."[4] If the English were the devil's spawn, bred from unholy sexual intercourse with a human woman, then their devilish behavior came naturally from birth. The *rederijker* of *De Nijptang* drew these parallels out, declaring that the *staartman* had "the devil in him." Multiple stories in the Bible contained examples of demon possession, including a number where Jesus or the apostles cast demons out of a berserk individual.[5] But the author offered no such positive solution for the *staartman*, for his blood came directly from the devil himself.

Wie zag ooit den Duivel roeren, Daar geen staart hing achter of?
Duivels hebben wisse staarten, Duivel is der Britten vaar;
Vat gij 't not niet, lieve Maarten, Zoo is u 't begrijp niet klaar.

Ziet dees eigendom zij erven Van haar over-bestevaar;
Hoe zou dan de staart versterven, Die neerdaalt van Duivelshaar?
Laat ons daarom dit besluiten, Dat de Staart komt uit de Hel,
En dat Brittons staart moet spruiten Uit haar vaars begrommeld vel.

Nu, men moet de zaak zoo laten, En de staart aan Brittons gat,
Geen kwaad van dees maats te praten! – Op wien moer de Duivel zat,
Die is wis een baas in 't liegen, Stal en moordde van 't begin;
Staartman kan dan niet bedriegen, Staartman heeft den Duivel in.

Wat goeds zoude in Staartman scholen, Die voor 't weldoen vinnig rooft?
Heeft naburen haaf gestolen, En d' inwoners nek gekloofd.
Onder schijn van in te voeren Een gemeene Republijk,
Scheert men adel, burgers, boeren, En het wordt een Duivelsrijk.

Duivelsrijk, dat Nederlands vreden, Met een opgeblazen voet,
Gaat verwerpen, gaat vertreden, Bij Elys'bet aangebroed,
En door Jacob meer gewassen, Onder Karel stond in glans,
In wiens bloed does honden plassen; Ravens, vreet haar diefsche pans!
[4] John 10:10, King James Version.
[5] For examples see Matthew 8, Mark 5, Luke 11, Acts 16.

The other important wordplay used by *De Nijptang's* author stemmed from the use of the term *Anglens*. Given its context, the reference to "Anglo" specifically indicated the English, not angels. As Elizabeth Staffell pointed out, "When insulting an enemy, the inversion whereby an angel becomes a fallen angel is an obvious step…"[6] Elsewhere in the stanzas the *rederijker* primarily used the much clearer *Britton*, but the double-meaning of *Anglens* accompanied all such references. By literally demonizing the English, any struggle against them equated to a holy war. In the battle between good and evil, God stood firmly on the side of good, and the Bible clearly foretold the final triumph of Christ over the devil. Thus, fighting against the English promised not only the rewards of a righteous cause, but the spoils from a winning one.

While condemning the English as *duivelskinderen* [devil's children], the author of *De Nijptang* did not spare his audience from rebuke. He castigated the Dutch who, rather than recognizing the devil and his tricks, stood and gawked in amazement at the sight of a tail. They swallowed the "rough pudding" given to them by the English, i.e., the stealing of Dutch ships and goods. In addition, the initial focus on Cromwell evolved into a criticism of the English monarchy, for Elizabeth and Charles both bred and raised the *duivelskind*. The *rederijker* sought to inform the audience of the true nature of such a devil in order that the injustice it effectuated could be stopped. Addressing the reader as "dear Maarten" (not a specific person, but a representative), he recounted multiple instances of English villainy. Their

---

[6] Elizabeth Staffell, "The Horrible Tail-Man and the Anglo-Dutch Wars." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 2000, 170.

35

leaders had stolen from the peaceful nations that neighbored them, tricked their

own people into changing regimes, and cut of the head of their king. All this resulted

in a dastardly republic – very unlike the righteous Dutch republic – a true "Devil's

realm." Herein the English trampled the rights of both their own citizens and those

of the countries around them. But, as the writer continued, the surety of England's

doom lay ahead, and he forecasted an apocalyptic death replete with dogs and

scavengers that would desecrate its corpse.

ENGEL, DUIVELSKIND, AND SIMILAR RELIGIOUS INSULTS

Pamphlets other than *De Nijptang* continued the themes that identified the

English as spawn of the devil who not only lied to the Dutch and stole their goods,

but also trampled their pride. The writings and illustrations included both obvious

and subtle references to devil. While the specific characters and setting of each war

changed, the underlying assumption that the English drew their inspiration from

hell permeated the Dutch texts. As more belligerents entered the fray,

characterizations of the Dutch Republic as an oppressed nation proliferated. The

scatological insults of *staartman* were joined by the far weightier accusations of

heresy. Now, with the intellectual ground fertile due to the abundance of flung

manure, the fruit grown from the productive minds of the *rederijkers* and artists was

tantalizingly ripe.

Published in 1652, the illustration by Salomon Savery and Pieter Quast

entitled *Siet t'verwarde Gaerens ent vant Bloedich Engels Parlement* [*Behold the

Confused Yarns the Bloody English Parliament Grafts*] displayed the Dutch perception

of Cromwell as a malicious instrument of the Devil. Although it pictured only three

characters, each one communicated a litany of Dutch grievances. In the background stood the devil, an unnatural combination of wolf and human. He drew raw material from a distaff filled with snakes, and he whispered this "flax of lies" into Cromwell's ear, which came out of the opposite ear as a finished yarn. Clearly this process had been occurring for quite some time, for the swift in Cromwell's right hand, along with the spindle in his left, were both fairly full of yarn. Dressed only in his undergarments (replete with a prominent codpiece), he spun the yarn from his swift in the direction of the *Bedrog*, i.e., the "deluded" Parliament. But Parliament – a woman, her head adorned with a hat made from the serpentine yarn and begging with clasped hands to hear Cromwell's lies – held the distaff from which the devil pulled the original falsehoods. This implied a pattern of circularity that not only begged the question of which villain originated the deceit, but also made each character equally culpable. Yet the text confirmed the true source of the deceit, the "father of all lies." While Cromwell was labeled as the *uitwerker*, or schemer, the devil *quaet ingeven*, or "croaked suggestions." When combined with the nightshirt, the idea that the devil whispered lies to Cromwell in his dreams became clear. A trio of ships, barely visible in the background, reminded the viewer of the content of English yarns, i.e., the justification of their greed when they confiscated Dutch ships at sea.[7]

Also published in 1652, the pamphlet *Uytbeeldinge van de Hoogmoedige Republijk van Engelandt* [*Depiction of the Proud Republic of England*] took a radically

---

[7] This same image was reproduced in another pamphlet with an alternative title, *De Duivel Verwart Het Garen* [*The Devil's Confusing Yarns*].

different approach to critiquing the English by referencing a seer: Nostradamus.[8] Such a source did not fit neatly into the Protestant, or specifically Calvinist, view of the world. Indeed, its mentions of "fortune" or "luck" directly contradicted Reformed determinism, but its vague prognostications made for an easy way to predict victory for the Dutch (inaccurately, as it turned out), and reemphasized the English relationship to the devil. The pamphlet continued on and decried the English treatment of the Scots, who they sold as slaves to Catholics and Muslims, for they were "brothers of one church." A Calvinist might have referenced the famous case of John Knox – he had served in a French galley for several years – but this would have been an example of long memory, as Knox died in 1572.[9] Instead, this referred to the more contemporary, albeit less well-known, case of over four hundred prisoners shipped as slaves to New England after the New Model Army defeated the Scottish Royalists at the Battle of Dunbar in 1650 and the Battle of Worcester in 1651.[10] Given the early Dutch domination of the African slave trade, this was not an objection to slavery, per se, but a protest against the subjugation of white Protestants. By calling this action the "devil's work," the author emphasized English damnation. The *rederijker* even accused Cromwell of praying to the devil and borrowing or "stealing" prideful ideas from hell. In combination with the scatological humor of the accompanying image (discussed in the *Staartmannen* chapter), this pamphlet provided one of the most nuanced and wide-ranging critiques seen in the seventeenth century literature.

---

[8] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7276.

[9] Carter Lindberg, *The European Reformations* (Malden: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2010), 318.

[10] "Scottish Slavery in 17th Century New England," *History of Scotland Magazine 5,* no. 1 (2005), 44-52.

Anonymously authored and published in Rotterdam in 1652, the pamphlet

entitled *Over den Wreeden Handel der Engelschen, Tegen de Hollanders Gepleegd*

[*About the Cruel Business the Englishmen have Committed Against the Dutch*]

purported to be the continuation of a letter between friends. The pamphlet focused

primarily on sea battles between the Dutch and English, and specifically how these

perpetuated the harsh treatment of the crews of merchantmen. Interestingly, it

began with a reference to the devil and his possession of an Englishman, a man who

was then able to vanquish his enemy with a supernatural power. Given the rest of

the pamphlet's content, the remark seemed out of place. When considered alongside

the proliferation of comments regarding the devil in other pamphlets, however, this

usage illustrated the Dutch belief that the English functioned as Satan's instruments.

Clergymen regularly reminded their congregations of the cruelties and punishments

of hell, and these extended to suffering and temptation in the temporal realm. It also

excused any defeat, for who could gain victory over a superhuman enemy?[11]

Battles of commerce between the Dutch and English might have seemed a

straightforward confrontation over trade with no religious connotations. Yet in the

1652 pamphlet entitled *Scheeps-Gevecht* [*Ship Battle*] by Hugo Allard, the author

made the battle appear to have been instigated by the devil. Apparently, according

to Allard, the captain of a Dutch ship, known as Jonge Kees (pictured above the text),

took his fishing vessel onto the North Sea. The crew of a similarly-sized English

fishing vessel accosted him, called his men "dogs," and threatened to hang the entire

crew. Such confrontations occurred regularly, and probably the only reason this

---

[11] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7153.

story even made it to print lay in the fact that Jonge Kees's crew were victorious. Most interesting for this thesis, however, was the motivation or impetus for the English action of accosting the Dutch vessel as stated by Allard. The Englishman was accused of being manipulated by the devil, who possessed the "whole Brit." Indeed, his hands still held burns, ostensibly from the fires of hell. This mimicked the allegations of devilish control seen in other pamphlets. While the religious critique did not comprise the majority of the text, the undercurrent of "devilishness" still permeated the primarily secular renditions of the war narrative.[12]

One untitled pamphlet image by Jan van Souffenburg, printed in 1656, broadened its focus beyond the conflict between England and the United Provinces. The engraving pictured the Last Judgment, as God divided the sheep (the redeemed) from the goats (the damned). Prominently in the center, Christ – replete with the stigmata from his crucifixion – spoke from heaven to two groups of people. On his left stood Cardinal Mazarin, the chief minister of King Louis XIV of France, along with Cromwell and Lord Fairfax. Behind them stood the devil, who held onto the chains attached to their wrists. The Cardinal's haughty words made their way up into heaven, and he foolishly boasted about his own greatness. Cromwell's position behind Mazarin suggested a type of subservience, as if English power had begun to wane or that the French had gained supremacy. Their stance contrasted with the devout attitude displayed by Queen Christina of Sweden and the three figures behind her dressed in Dutch clothing. She knelt, humbly dedicating everything she possessed to Christ and his five wounds, including her heart, scepter, crown, state,

---

[12] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7188.

and blood. Christ's words to her spoke of great reward, and an angel above her prepared to replace her temporary crown with one that was everlasting. In contrast, Christ spoke harshly to the devil's minions, and warned them that they must provide an account for all their actions. In the background, the words *t'goet tegen t' quaet* [good against evil] reminded the viewer that the European-wide struggle extended beyond mere squabbles over trade routes. Under the words lay five graves, and only two of them held figures rising from the dead. Again, this indicated the selective nature of membership in the Elect, for more people descended to hell than ascended to heaven. It also reminded the Dutch to be vigilant in pursuing their good cause over the evil designs of their enemies.[13]

Another of van Souffenburg's pamphlets published in 1656 continued the religious attack against the English. Here Cromwell, rather than Mazarin, took center stage. He rode upon a seven-headed dragon, which trampled on a communion cup, wafer, crucifix, and miter – all potent symbols of the church. From its mouths spewed a poisonous stream against a collection of European enemies, including Philip IV of Spain and Ferdinand III of Austria. Although these were no friends to the Dutch, they were seen as potential allies in the fight against Cromwell, the whore of Babylon. The beast also targeted hapless Dutch peasants, who "shrieked" at the terror unleashed by Cromwell as he prepared to exercise tyranny over the entire world. The word used for terror, *quelt* (modern *kweld*), reemphasized the devilish nature of Cromwell, for a *kweller* [one who torments] could also be called a *kwelduivel* [tormenting devil]. At the far right stood the real devil, a dark and

---

[13] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7734.

sinister figure who held chains connected to Mazarin, the French royal family, Cromwell, and the hydra-like monster. He held a pair of bellows that blew into Mazarin's ear, a not-so-subtle indication of mind-control. More telling than the visual image of the bellows were the words that emanated from the Cardinal's mouth: *t'moet noch al Crommer syn* [It has neither been Cromwell]. As if to reinforce this phrase, Mazarin held the forked tail of the dragon, steering it by the tail. This visually told the viewer that the war they waged was a holy one, not just against evil men like Cromwell or Mazarin, but against the father of all evil, *de duivel*. The inset at the top left corner referenced the twelfth chapter of the Apostle John's book, Revelation. That story included not just the seven-headed beast and the whore of Babylon, but also retold the story of how the devil and his demons lost the war with the archangel Michael and were cast out of heaven. Thus the concept of the English as *Engelen*, or fallen angels, came full circle.[14]

Unlike many of the other pamphlets, the work entitled *Quaakers Vergadering* [*Quakers Meeting*], printed by Carolus Allard c. 1656, did not attack the English by using wit or direct connotations to the devil.[15] Rather, it used the medium in quite a different manner by using Christian scriptures, argumentation, and observations of a Quaker meeting. Its intended audience also differed from the other pamphlets examined, for it contained both the original Dutch and an English paraphrase. Quakers presented an awkward dilemma for many Protestants, for they added an element of direct inspiration by the Holy Spirit to the Bible. This resulted in many

---

[14] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7734.
[15] "Spotprent op de Engelse Quakers," *Rijksmuseum*, http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.464365.

cases of ecstatic and bizarre manifestations, such as the case of the English minister

James Nayler, who infamously reenacted Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem by

riding a donkey into Bristol, replete with members of his congregation shouting

"hosanna."[16] The illustration depicted a scene of men and women in a prayer

meeting. A woman stood on an improvised platform – an overturned half-cask at the

center – evidently preaching to her fellow Quakers, but the people around her

seemed relatively uninterested. Two dogs fought in the corner, an addition of

mayhem that furthered the sense of impropriety. The text quoted the seemingly

misogynistic words of the Apostle Paul, which forbade a woman to preach, and

impugned her for speaking. Playing with words and ideas, the author contrasted her

as she "raves darkly" to "mind the light," but her audience instead stayed "fast

asleep." By referring to the darkness of her speech, the author correlated the

Quakers with evil. And, as England allowed the Quakers to continue in their

theological heresy, they would share in their fate of damnation for not following the

mandates of the Bible properly.

Another apocalyptic vision of the conflict between England and the United

Netherlands could be seen in *Een Nacht-Gesicht, Waar in Vertoont Word den*

Geparsten Koe [*A Night Poem, Where the Cracked Cow is Exhibited*], published in

1672.[17] Pamphlet literature contained multiple allusions to the Dutch "milk cow,"

and obviated the belief of the Dutch Republic as the prosperous nation from which

---

16 Douglas Gwyn, "James Nayler and the Lamb's War," *Quaker Studies* 12/2 (2008), 171.
17 *De Nederlandsche geschiedenis in platen : beredeneerde beschrijving van Nederlandsche historieplaten, zinneprenten en historische kaarten*, Frederik Muller, #2309

other powers wanted to siphon wealth.[18] The cow lay between the jaws of a large vice in the shape of an altar, an unwilling sacrifice to European greed. As the screws were painfully turned, the cow spewed forth gold coins from its mouth, udder, and butt; the French rooster used its beak to rip open the side to allow more money to stream out. This particular image explicitly tied the De Witt brothers – Johann, the Grand Pensionary of the *Staten Generaal*, and Cornelis – to the English and French efforts to fleece the Dutch.[19] They knelt at front and back of the cow, collected the fount of money into bags, and passed out the overflow to the enemy. Behind them, the French army fired at an unresponsive Dutch force, which seemed more preoccupied with fighting each other than the enemy. In the foreground, a bedraggled, scrawny lion symbolized the disarray of the Dutch Republic at the beginning of the Third Anglo-Dutch War.

Most importantly as a religious critique, the *rederijker* of *The Cracked Cow* identified the two flying beasts who turned the screws of the vice as *Eng'len*. These monsters combined the torso and arms of a man, the head of and horns of a steer, and their pairs of legs each resembled the tail of a demon. By calling them *Eng'len*, the writer pinpointed their status as both English and as fallen angels. While not specifically a religious criticism, per se, this accusation of "deviltry" made it easier for the audience to "other" the English in a method similar to that which accompanied the epithet of *staartman*. The text, in combination with the image, also

---

[18] Perhaps the most humorous example of the nation's depiction as a cow can be seen in the pamphlet, *Der Castilianen uyt-vaert: Mitgaders de Vlaemsche* [*The Catalans' Funeral: Together with the Flemish*], 1646, where two Spaniards lie on their back and drink directly from the engorged teats of the Dutch milk cow.

[19] For further illustration of how the virulent Dutch hatred for the De Witt brothers ended in 1672, the *rampjaar*, see the painting *The Corpses of the De Witt Brothers* by Jan de Baen.

clearly put forward the belief that Charles II had entered the conflict merely out of greed, and obviated that the main beneficiary of English involvement was the other primary belligerent in the war, i.e., France. The pamphlet ended with the cryptic phrase, *Als for dezen, Zal 't noch wezen* [as for this, it shall not exist]. Given that the year of 1672 held the title *rampjaar* [disaster year], the phrase did not offer much hope to the reader. Perhaps the only solace for a contemporary would have arisen from a firm belief in the imminent return of Christ, who would smite the enemies of God's newly "chosen people" (the Dutch Calvinists), and create a new earth. In such a world, the United Netherlands' tribulations – suffered at the hands of enemies spawned by Satan – would be worth a great, and everlasting, reward.

ENGEL, DUIVELSKIND, AND OTHER RELIGIOUS INSULTS CONCLUSIONS

Clearly the Dutch possessed multiple reasons for verbally and visually attacking their English foes, but religious themes played a considerable role in their barrage. For the most part, the *rederijkers* merely employed religion as another weapon in their arsenal, a blunt instrument they wielded more like a cudgel than a rapier. No matter how often writers leveled accusations of devilish parenthood, only the most naïve reader interpreted this in a literal way – after all, no such thing as a *Duivelskind* existed. Devout Christians doubtlessly believed in a demonic influence upon Cromwell and the rest of England, but they still understood the basics of human reproduction. Nor did Dutch people truly consider the English as fallen angels, despite the persistent use of *Engel* instead of *Engels*. Instead, the pamphleteers utilized their works to unite the people in a common cause and against a shared enemy. Associating the opponent with the devil turned their

antagonists into soulless fiends. And while depictions of the devil, demonic beings, and their influence upon the world had pervaded both literature and art in the Low Countries for at least the previous two centuries, the *rederijkers* took its usage as a pejorative to a higher level.[20]

Lest the pamphleteers be construed as one-dimensional, they also possessed the ability to employ biblical imagery at a deeper level to critique the English. References to the beast of Revelation – replete with seven heads – placed the wars in the biblical context of the Apocalypse. Like Nostradamus' predictions, the Apostle John's prophecy twisted in a malleable fashion to fit a more modern context. And, as the pamphlet *Quakers Meeting* demonstrated, *rederijkers* played to the most devout members of their readership, not just the average individual looking for a laugh or a means of focusing their frustration with the state of the country. Such pamphlets revealed the sophisticated demands of the Dutch public for nuanced literature that incorporated both the crassness of the *staartman* and the religious critique of *Engel* and *Duivelskind*. And has been seen, the pamphleteers were quite capable of fulfilling the expectations of their audience.

---

[20] For popular references in the Low Countries to the devil influencing human action, see *In Praise of Folly* by Desiderious Erasmus, or paintings such as *The Fall of Rebel Angels* (replete with farting demons) by Pieter Brueghel the Elder.

IV.   HOLLAND: THE CREATION OF A PROVINCIAL IDENTITY

The governance in the Dutch Republic at the time of the First Anglo-Dutch War arose from a seemingly confusing milieu of politics, at least to a modern observer. While under the rule of the Holy Roman Emperor, the region had been lumped in with the Spanish Netherlands, which included the people of Flanders and Wallonia. During the mid-sixteenth century, the northern provinces paled in comparison to these southern neighbors in both size and wealth. For example, Amsterdam – later the hub of Dutch trade – only had 30,000 residents in the 1560s, a mere third of the population of Antwerp at the same time. The Spanish Netherlands also held some of Europe's largest and most prosperous guilds, where skilled craftsmen organized and plied their trade.[1] But the population and wealth shifted northward, for the Low Countries were embroiled for eighty years in a fight with their sovereign, Spain. As the southern provinces often felt the brunt of the "Spanish fury," people fled to safer areas with their skills and belongings. These northern provinces called themselves *Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Provinciën* [Republic of the Seven United Provinces], and were composed of the states of Brabant, Friesland, Gelderland, Holland, Overijssel, Utrecht, and Zeeland. Of these, Holland exercised the greatest influence, in part because it was the first to rebel, but

---

[1] James Tracy, *The Founding of the Dutch Republic: War, Finance, and Politics in Holland, 1572-1588* (New York: Oxford University Press), 17.

primarily because it possessed the largest and most urban population. While

Zeeland held some importance in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries due to its

shipping industry, even it was overshadowed by Holland. William the Silent, from

the House of Orange, acted as the republic's first *Stadhouder*, but by the time of the

First Anglo Dutch War, his descendants no longer held this position due to a treaty

negotiated with England. Johann de Witt acted as the *raadpensionaris* [Grand

Pensionary], leading a divided *Staten-Generaal* through both the First and Second

Anglo-Dutch Wars. 1672, known as the *rampjaar* [disaster year] saw the murder of

de Witt and the reinstatement of the House of Orange. Although the *Staten-Generaal*

supposedly gave equal representation to each province, delegates from Holland

tended to direct and dominate parliamentary proceedings.[2]

    While Napoleon Bonaparte and his brother Louis briefly turned Holland into

a kingdom that stretched beyond its traditional borders, the province of Holland

split into northern and southern states while under French rule in the nineteenth

century.[3] Despite this fact, Dutch people often identified themselves by the general

term *Hollander* without an appellation of north or south, and this practice often still

supplants the more correct *Nederlander*. Like their seventeenth century forebears,

modern Dutch people continue to use the regional label *Holland* to identify the

entire country. For example, fans sing *Hup Holland Hup* [*Go, Holland, Go*] in support

of the national soccer team. Foreigners often (incorrectly) identify the country as

---

[2] Robert Siebelhoff, "The Demography of the Low Countries: 1500-1990: Facts and Figures," in *The Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies*, Issue XIV, I, Spring 1993, 125.
Pieter Geyl, *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century.* (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1961), 49-54.
[3] *The Napoleonic Empire and the New European Political Culture*, ed. Michael Broers, Peter Hicks, and Agustin Guiemera (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 101-105.

Holland rather than the Netherlands, and the Dutch are usually too polite to disabuse them of this mistake. Many Dutch people fault this common misidentification upon the seventeenth century tendency of sailors who traveled abroad to state *Ik ben van Holland* [I am from Holland], rather than the more accurate explanation *Ik ben van Nederland*.[4]

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF IDENTITY

For the purpose of clarity, the term crucial to understanding this chapter, "identity," will use the following definition: "Who or what a person or thing is; a distinct impression of a single person or thing presented to or perceived by others; a set of characteristics or a description that distinguishes a person or thing from others."[5] Answering the question of how the Dutch formed such a singular regional or national perception of themselves is one of the primary goals of this thesis. Such a quest is complicated by the status of the Dutch Republic – and most of its contemporaries – as a "conglomerate state." As Harald Gustafsson described it, such a nation was a "political, judicial and administrative mosaic, rather than a modern unitary state."[6] In order to understand the process of identity formation as it occurred in the United Provinces during the seventeenth century, four explanations will be considered – shared language, ethnicity, religion, and economics. While by no means exhaustive, these frameworks should provide a means of grasping the intricacies of the identity of *Hollander*.

---

[4] This last point is based upon my own interactions with Dutch people who have tried to explain why they (or others) say that they are from Holland.

[5] "identity, n.". *OED Online*. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/view/Entry/91004 ?

[6] Harald Gustafsson, "The Conglomerate State: A Perspective on State Formation in Early Modern Europe," in *Scandinavian Journal of History* 53, no. 3 (September 1998), 189.

Within the intellectual framework of sociology, some scholars have posited that language functioned as the primary means of political identification for any country.[7] For some nations with a unified language, but also containing varied ethnicities, religions, and geography, this perspective appears to have merit. But few, if any, nations in Europe could claim that they exhibited such homogeneity of speech. While variations of the language certainly existed within the Dutch Republic – Frisian dialects in the north, soft German-like pronunciations in the east, and Flemish in the south – these did not prevent understanding or cooperation. Yet, while a shared language certainly enhanced the ability of the provinces to unite in rebellion, this did not unite all Dutch speakers. The artificiality of the border with the Spanish Netherlands demonstrated that language alone did not create identity. Thus, while speaking Dutch allowed for a shared identity, language alone did not provide the basis for it.

Perhaps a stronger source of identity came from a shared ethnicity. According to Charles Tilly, "An ethnic group is a set of people who publicly claim a common origin and kinship that distinguishes them from other members of the same population." He argued that such groups often strove for power after a government acted to disenfranchise them or threatened their sovereignty and identity.[8] Given the proliferation of the identity *Hollander* after the Spanish oppression, this argument appears to carry greater weight. Further support can be seen in the rise of Dutch self-identification as *Batavieren* (examples of this will be

---

[7] Charles Tilly, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2002), 47.
[8] Ibid., 167-168.

explored later on), strongly influenced by a desire for a shared ethnic history. Unfortunately, this theory still fails to fully explain the shared identity of *Hollander*. Large numbers of immigrants moved north from the Spanish Netherlands during the revolt of the sixteenth century, and these were not ethnically identical to the native population. Frisians from the north also claimed a different ethnic heritage, but they were not excluded from the identity. Nor did the experience of other ethnic populations in Europe in the seventeenth century reflect this theory. States often ignored the origins of a people as they divvied up lands, a practice merely continued – rather than spawned – by the more obvious colonialism of the nineteenth century European powers. Therefore, *Hollander* arose from something other than a shared ethnicity.

An older form of social theory, out of vogue since the 1970s, posited the idea of a unified religion as a source of identity. Of all the European nations to apply this theory upon, the Dutch Republic appears to cause the greatest interpretative difficulty.[9] In the wake of the Protestant Reformation, Calvinism, Lutheranism, and numerous Anabaptist sects proliferated throughout the provinces. A significant portion of the population also remained Catholic. Maarten Prak described this phenomenon as "religious pluralism," and detailed the cities which had populations where no religion had a true majority.[10] Hence, unlike many of the other European states, the Netherlands had no unified religion. Another source of religious unity

---

[9] Philip Gorski, "The Return of the Repressed: Religion and the Political Unconscious of Historical Sociology," in *Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, and Sociology*, ed. Ulia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens, and Ann Orloff (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 163, 171, 180-181.

[10] Maarten Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 209.

could have created a shared identity – the Dutch value of toleration. And, as an answer to the question of Dutch identity, the idea of religious tolerance could be directly connected to Holland, as this province saw the greatest religious privileges for nonconformists. After all, heretical theologians and philosophers experienced an intellectual freedom unlike that available in any other European nation. Yet, even though the reputation of the United Provinces as a place of toleration generated Dutch pride for centuries, the country's official policies did not actually reflect this concept of freedom. For example, while Catholics were not actively persecuted by the government, they also did not have the civil rights granted to Calvinists. This lack of liberty led religious sects to form smaller, communal identities, rather than recognize themselves as part of some larger, tolerant whole. Indeed, scholars have argued that the concept of the Dutch "Erasmian toleration" of ideas and faiths was a nineteenth century construct, and people from the seventeenth century felt no such sense of open-mindedness. With these arguments in mind, it should be concluded that the self-description of *Hollander* did not rise from an identity of shared religious tolerance.[11]

The famed social theorist Max Weber postulated that a "spirit of capitalism," connected to a "Protestant ethic," created a common identity. In tandem with this theory, Philip Gorski argued that Calvinist infrastructure, based upon strict morality and thrift, led to the rise of the Dutch Republic. While the issue of a shared religion

---

[11] Joke Spaans, "Religious Policies in the Seventeenth-Century Dutch Republic" in *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age*, ed. R. Po-Chia Hsia, Henk van Nierop (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 72-74. For arguments in favor of Erasmian tolerance, see Johan Huizinga's *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation,* translated by F. Hopman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).

has already been addressed, the subject of capitalism – an economic system – as a uniting force must be considered. As an economic power, few nations equaled the riches of the Dutch Republic. In its numerous conflicts with surrounding nations, its great wealth allowed it to operate a disproportionately large military, often filled with mercenaries from other nations. Trade and profit were considered of such importance that many merchants continued to deal with Spain, even in the midst of the war for independence. Holland played a dominant role in Dutch shipping and commerce, its source of prosperity. By itself, the province provided approximately sixty percent of the budget for the *Staten Generaal*, giving it tremendous political power.[12] When England attacked Dutch shipping before the start of the First Anglo-Dutch War, Holland bore the brunt of the losses. This meant that the pamphlets naturally decried English aggression against Holland, even though the republic as a whole was involved in the war. Fiscal complaints – disruption of trade, greed, privation, and theft – pervaded the literature. Thus the rise of *Hollander* as an identity, as seen in the pamphlet literature, had strong ties to capitalism.

By no means should the discussion above be considered exhaustive, nor should it be viewed as exclusive. Numerous other sources of the unified identity of *Hollander* might have worked in combination with capitalism. For example, the Dutch fought in a fierce war of independence, against one of the strongest nations in Europe, for more than three generations. This prolonged experience of the people forced them to cooperate against a common foe because they believed that their

---

[12] Philip Gorski, *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003), 26-28, 39-40, 46-47, 56-61.

existence depended upon it. State formation, although not an interchangeable term with identity, often arose from war during the early modern period. According to Tilly, governments trying to create a unified state while under the duress of war were forced to integrate outlying populations. In the case of the Dutch Republic, provinces such as Friesland or Groningen were pulled into the unified identity of *Hollander* in order to feel that the attacks on Holland affected them as well. Another source may have arisen from a shared pride in the artistic, philosophical, and scientific achievements of the nation's brightest minds, although the populist nature of such an identity could be called into question.[13]

EVIDENCE OF IDENTITY IN THE PAMPHLET LITERATURE

A discussion of Dutch identity as seen in the pamphlet literature requires a more thorough introduction of the *rederijkers*, or rhetoricians, who composed the texts and used wit to communicate ideas about social issues, morality, and politics to their audience. While much of their comedy tended to be crude, it also contained inside jokes that only members of the society understood. These men not only penned clever ditties and pamphlets, they also wrote original plays which they performed as they traveled around Dutch cities. Although they tended to live around the major cities of Holland, they were generally not members of the intellectual elite. Instead, the *rederijkers* drew their membership from the trade guilds, including carpenters, tailors, and painters. They formed *rederijkerskamers* [societies of rhetoricians] where they crafted their original works. These societies also functioned as social spaces where the men gathered, and they infamously drank

---

[13] Gustafsson, "The Conglomerate State," 189.

copious amounts of alcohol together. The location of both the *rederijkers* and the printing presses in Holland's cities of Amsterdam, Leiden, and The Hague no doubt influenced the predominance of references to Holland in the pamphlet literature as opposed to references to the Netherlands or the United Provinces. Of smaller, but not insignificant, importance, the rhyming flexibility of using the two-syllable word *Holland* as opposed to *Republiek, Nederlanden, Staten-Generaal*, or the appalling tongue twister *Verenigde Provinciën*, should also be considered. The existence of numerous *rederijkerskamers*, their popularity in their communities, and the sheer output of their members generated a notable impact upon Dutch society.[14]

Dutch pamphleteers consistently portrayed their enemies as *kuypers* [coopers or barrel makers], something they did not reserve for the English alone.[15] In the pamphlet from 1652 entitled *'t Engels-Kuipertje* [*The English Cooper*], written just before the start of the First Anglo-Dutch War, the illustration portrayed an English cooper. His adze stood poised above a chisel as he prepared to remove the bands of the Dutch barrel, identified by the crest of the *Nederlandse leeuw* [Dutch lion] on the lid. A missing stave demonstrated that the cooper had already been at work for a while. Outside the window a group of soldiers used swords and spears to attack a helpless man who lay prone on the ground. The text conveyed a dialogue between the cooper and the *joncker* [squire] (pictured in the shadows of the image),

---

[14] P.C. Sutton, "Jan Steen: Comedy and Admonition," *Bulletin: Philadelphia Museum of Art 78*, no. 337-38 (Spring 1982-1983), 25-27.
Walter Liedtke, "Frans Hals: Style and Substance," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (Summer 2011), 9.

[15] For other examples of pamphleteers using the position of cooper as a critique see *Den Grooten Zweedschenkuipper* [*The Great Swedish Cooper*] from 1656, which attacked the Swedes, or *De Vernieling der Aristocratische Kuiperij* [*The Demolishing of the Aristocratic Coopers*] from 1785 which attacked Munster.

and its style mimicked that of a *rederijker* skit. The cooper acted as the voice of the

author, and he goaded his audience. He upbraided his interlocutor for yawning and

standing silent, a clear reference to Holland's inaction in response to England's

pillaging of Dutch ships. Around the perimeter of the dialogue, more text interpreted

the image further. It identified Sir Thomas Fairfax as the cooper, and specifically

accused him of placing an ungodly yoke upon Holland's neck. No references to the

republic, other provinces, or even *Nederland* existed in the pamphlet. But it

presented the case that Holland alone bore the brunt of the English onslaught.[16]

Another pamphlet, also produced in 1652, utilized a very similar image of a

cooper. Written as a long poem by Jan de Mol, *Engels Kuiper* [*English Cooper*]

included similar themes, but conveyed a slightly different message. Rather than

symbolizing a specific individual, the cooper represented England's government. He

was in the process of building a barrel to function as a prison, and it was already in

use for Scots, Irish, and even English captives. Unlike the previous pamphlet, it

included no specific mention of a Dutch province or even the nation, and only a crest

and the symbol of the Dutch lion represented the country. This lion frantically

scratched at the ropes binding the cask together, attempting to undo the cooper's

work. The poem ended by chastising the *Domme Kuiper* [Foolish Cooper] for trying

to disturb the peace, for the fate of the country lay in divine, not human, hands. The

decision by de Mol not to reference *Holland* or *Nederland* most likely stemmed from

the fact that the pamphlet was published in Middleburg, Zeeland. By only

---

[16] "Spotprent op de Hollandse kuiperijen tegen de Engelsen," *Rijksmuseum*,
http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.388097

referencing the *Leeuw,* which the text always capitalized, he avoided the dominant regional identity, thereby allowing his readers to more readily associate themselves with the national cause of the upcoming war.[17]

The pamphlet *Cromwell als de Afgrijselijke Staartman* [*Cromwell as the Hideous Tail-man*], published by an anonymous printer in 1652, portrayed the different provinces as allied in a common cause against the English during the First Anglo-Dutch War. In the illustration, Cromwell posed in the center with a hand on his hip, a large and scaly tail stretched far behind him. Figures representing English Royalists, the Irish, and the Scots all cooperated in an attempt to hack off the tail. Most importantly for the idea of regional identity, three figures represented specific Dutch provinces – Friesland, Zeeland, and Holland. The Frisian stood to the side, barely involved in the attack on Cromwell, and the image showed only his arms and head. Indeed, this character was the only one portrayed without a weapon of some sort. These indications implied not only an ancillary role for Friesland in the war, but also seemed to demonstrate that the northern province had both invested little in the conflict, and had little to lose. The figure of Zeeland, on the other hand, stood at the forefront of the conflict, wielding a halberd that he used to saw at the tail. Dressed as a sailor, he stooped in his effort to create greater leverage. This stance, in combination with a gaze fixed upon the face of the *Hollander*, also served to make it appear that he was subservient to the representation of the larger province. Clothed in the apparel of a burgher, the *Hollander* wrapped his arms around Cromwell's tail, holding it up not just for the *Zeelander*, but also for the rest of England's enemies. He

---

[17] Atlas van Stolk, #2178.

looked down at the *Zeelander* with an almost paternal expression on his face, as if he were trying to help a young child learn a task. The etching served not just to illustrate the various roles the provinces played in the war, it also asserted the primacy of Holland. While it excoriated the enemy – Cromwell – it reinforced regionalism, for it indicated that only three of the seven provinces held any stake in the outcome of the war, and that Holland's role made it the most important. As other writings referred to the conflict as a fight between England and Holland – using Holland as a synonym for the Netherlands – this further strengthened the sectarian depictions seen in this image.[18]

The pamphlet *'t Wonderlik Verkeer-Spel* [*The Wonderful Game of Commerce*], printed by an anonymous author in 1652, specifically addressed what it termed the "proper opportunity" of the First Anglo-Dutch War. The image showed a group of men gathered around a table playing backgammon. At the center sat the imposing figure of Cromwell, and the words on his hat, *'t gaet wel* [it goes well], indicated the progress of the war for England. In the background a half dozen jesters danced around, the words *gecken te hoop* [foolish to hope] emblazoned above their heads. Interestingly, it referred to the war by using the proper title, *d' Engelsche en Nederlandsche Oorlogh*, and also referred to *Vrederijk Nederlandt* [Kingdom of Peace of the Netherlands]. But a map – located in an inset at the top left corner – labeled the entirety of the nation as *Hollandt*. Interestingly enough, another map on the

---

[18] W.P.C. Knuttel, #7284. Although the maker of the image is not identified, the inset looks identical to one found in a work by Crispijn van de Passe II, *Uytbeeldinge van de Hoogmoedige Republijk van Engelandt*, and even has the same inscription.

same pamphlet described all of the British Isles under the name *Engelandt*.[19]

Perhaps the map's simplistic labeling of both states arose from expedience, which

might call into question the importance of the pamphlet's use of *Hollandt*. But this

confusing mishmash of proper names reflected the difficulty of identity in the

seventeenth century, for one place could receive multiple titles with quite disparate

origins and connotations.

At least two renditions of the pamphlet entitled *Den Vyerigen Triumph-*

Wagen van den Vroomen Marten Herpertsz. Tromp [*The Celebration of the Triumph*

Wagon of Maarten Herpertszoon Tromp], were published. This publication fit well

into the Dutch style and tradition of memorializing heroic figures, as dozens of

pamphlets – dating back into the sixteenth century – portrayed champions as riding

into glory upon gilded carriages of victory. The idolized subject of this particular

tribute, Admiral Tromp, perished during the Battle of Scheveningen against the

English in 1653. Both sides claimed victory after the battle, but the damage done to

the Dutch fleet hastened the end of the war on terms favorable to the English. One

version of the pamphlet, composed by the poet Herman Frederik Waterloos,

followed conventional form. It extolled Tromp's victory as it told the story of his

death, comparing his maritime prowess to that of the Greek god Neptune, for he

heeft uit de zee geslaagen [has conquered the sea]. Replete with cherubim who

trumpeted *eer en lof* [honor and praise], the illustration portrayed Tromp as both a

Christian – ready to receive heaven's crown of life – and as a demigod. As the text

---

[19] Atlas van Stolk, #2180.

expressed, the picture portrayed not just a personal victory, but a public one, for it was *Hollandts zegewaagen* [Holland's triumph-wagon].[20]

However, not all citizens in the Dutch Republic were *Hollanders*, and such individuals subtly resisted the sublimation of the country's image to just one region. Another pamphlet, published in 1654 – both the year after Tromp's death and the year that England and the United Provinces ended the first war – utilized the same theme but with a different text and illustration. Written by Casparus de Carpentier, this edition also eulogized Tromp as a national hero.[21] Unlike many of the other authors of the pamphlets, de Carpentier functioned as a *predikant*, a Dutch Reformed minister, and was not a *rederijker* or a poet. He served in the towns of Amsterdam and Sliedrecht, in Holland, and most importantly for the topic at hand, in Amersfoort, Utrecht.[22] His writing sounded like that of a preacher, replete with Bible verses and references to heaven instead of illustrations from Greek and Roman mythology. Despite Tromp's obvious warlike tendencies (he was, after all, a navy admiral), de Carpentier continually praised his desire for peace and directly credited him with bringing about a cessation of hostilities. Although the subtitle identified Tromp as an Admiral of both Holland and West Friesland, not the United Provinces, no other reference to these provinces existed in the text. Most interestingly, the pamphlet's text identified Tromp as a *Batavieren*, not the more accurate *Hollander* or *Nederlander,* despite his being from the town of Den Brill,

---

[20] F.W.H. Hollstein, p. 121, #158.
The publication date for this pamphlet is uncertain, but the probable dates range from 1653-1654.
[21] Jan van der Wals, *Prenten in de Gouden Eeuw: Van Kunst Tot Kastpapier* (Rotterdam: Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, 2006), p. 119, #172.
[22] "Portret van Casparus de Carpentier (1615-1667)," *Museum Catharijnconvent*, https://www.catharijneconvent.nl/adlib/35307/?q=Herman+van+Aldewereld&f=maker

Holland. But Batavia was neither a town nor a province in the republic, and although it held some historical significance, it had not existed for hundreds of years. Why had de Carpentier chosen this label when eulogizing the nation's hero?

The answer to the question regarding Batavia came, in part, from the work of Dutch scholars tasked with rediscovering the nation's heritage and identity. Both Cornelius Gerardi Aurelius [Cornelis Geritsz. van Gouda] and Hugo Grotius [Hugo de Groot] wrote of the *Batavi*, an ancient Germanic tribe which lived on an island (now called *Betuwe*), in the mouth of the Rhine River. But the scholar with the greatest hand in perpetuating what later came to be called "the Batavian myth" was the sixteenth century Northern Dutch humanist, Hadrianus Junius [Adriaen de Jonghe]. Commissioned by Holland to write its history in 1566, Junius completed the book by 1570, but it was not published until 1588, thirteen years after his death. While other scholars had attempted to create narrative histories of the Low Countries, he crafted a critical historiography, basing his work on the writings of previous scholars. In his seminal work, *Batavia*, Junius recalled not only the history of a lost tribe but pontificated on Dutch achievements. Perhaps his most famous, albeit controversial, claim asserted that a Haarlem native, Laurens Jansz. Coster, invented the printing press. This exemplified Junius' desire to create a glorified vision of the past, and his Dutch contemporaries seized upon his history, using the idea of *Batavia* to create a unified ethnic identity. For people living in rural areas, it reestablished their importance, as the highly urbanized areas, such as Amsterdam and Haarlem, did not exist until sometime in the High Middle Ages. If their ancestors arose from farmland to greatness, then so could they. As many of the newer residents in big cities came

from either rustic roots or as refugees from the Spanish Netherlands, *Batavieren* as an identity served to unify them to a greater degree than *Hollander*. For further evidence of its effect upon the Dutch in the seventeenth century, not only did they name their *Oost Indies* capital Batavia, but their descendants utilized the name in North America. They even renamed the country at the end of the eighteenth century, albeit under French rule, as the *Bataafse Republiek* in order to reflect their supposed heritage.[23] Thus, when de Carpentier identified Tromp as a *Batavieren,* the label not only made sense to his audience, it fell solidly within a tradition which recalled the heyday of a people which no longer existed. It also served as an identity not directly tied to Holland, and as a history that encompassed people throughout the Dutch Republic, not just one province. While this concept influenced the country for an extended period of time, it did not match the overwhelming amount of literature which referred to Holland, not the Netherlands or Batavia.

An untitled work from 1673 focused on the battle between England and Holland at Kijkduin (also known as the Battle of Texel), fought on the coast of Holland by The Hague. Led by Admirals Michiel de Ruyter and Cornelis Tromp (the son of Maarten Tromp), the Dutch managed to defeat the combined English and

---

[23] Chris Heesakkers, "From Erasmus to Leiden: Hadrianus Junius and His Significance for the Development of Humanism in Holland in the Sixteenth Century," in *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575): Northern Humanism at the Dawn of the Golden Age*, Dirk van Miert, Ed. (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2011), 33.
Coen Maas, "Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia* and the Formation of a Historiographical Canon in Holland," in *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius,* 53-54.
Nico de Glas, "Context, Conception and Context of Hadrianus Junius' *Batavia*," in *The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius*, 69-70.
The English later referred to the United Provinces collectively as Batavia, as exemplified by the book entitled *Batavia Illustrata: Or, a View of the Policy, and Commerce of the United Provinces, Particularly of Holland. With an Enquiry into the Alliances of the States General with the Emperor, France, Spain, and Great Britain,* written in 1728 by Onslow Burrish,

French fleet and protect the incoming spice ships, a huge boon for an economy struggling to survive under the pressures of a multi-front war.[24] The accompanying illustration reveled in the victory as it recalled the *staartmannen* imagery. Dutch sailors prepared to cut off the tails of their English counterparts. The prehensile tails of these English seamen were not just for show, as they used them to grasp for support or balance on a tightrope. Another Dutchman led a pack of leashed mastiffs, while a lion tore at the stomach of a dog with its teeth while it stood next to another already-disemboweled canine. The picture was one of abject humiliation for the English, and overwhelming triumph for the Dutch.[25]

Within the text of the poem on Kijkduin, the *rederijker* referred to the United Provinces by an assortment of names. He stated that the victorious sailors came from Holland, but the *Batavier wint den Britschen* [defeated the British], and the *Leeuw* destroyed the English dogs. More interestingly, the author used another term to refer to the nation, one not seen in the other texts – *Vaderlandt* [Fatherland].[26] Of all the titles used in the pamphlets, this one was the most evocative. After all, not everyone came from Holland, had Batavian blood, felt that their province had an equal role in the governance of the country, or even wanted a republic. *Vaderlandt* as a nationalist identity appealed to a wide audience, for its definition of the nation was the most amorphous. Its use in popular culture continued to grow, and in 1815 the brand new Kingdom of the Netherlands (which at that time included modern Belgium), adopted *Wien Neêrlands Bloed* [*Those in Whom Dutch Blood*] as its

---

[24] Atlas van Stolk, #2344.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.

national anthem – the original song used the term *vaderland* ten times. As Dutch nationalism waned in the 1930s, some citizens refused to sing the anthem, and the country reverted to singing the *Wilhelmus*. But the "new" anthem – it was actually older than the first, as it was written in 1568 in honor of William the Silent – retained one use of the all-encompassing name, *vaderland*.[27]

IDENTITY CONCLUSIONS

Although seventeenth century pamphlets were not the source of the identity *Hollander*, they served to reinforce the idea for their audience. They almost universally appealed to a regional concept of citizenship. On one hand this served to divide the nation along provincial lines, but the term eventually grew large enough to encompass the entire country. The *rederijkers* and *predikanten* who penned the pamphlets, along with the artists who drew the illustrations and the publishers who printed leaflets, generally came from Holland. Those from other provinces tried to craft other identities by refusing to refer to the largest province or by referencing ideas such as *Batavieren*, but *Hollander* overcame all other conceptions. Complicated interrelationships between language, ethnicity, and religion – while not the sole sources of the identity – further reinforced the shared patriotism. Most importantly, communal economic motivations, a part of an underlying capitalism, played the greatest role in furthering the position of Holland in the Dutch Republic. Writers also utilized emotionally charged terms, such as *vaderland*, to stimulate greater

---

[27] "Voor Vorst En Vaderland: Het Eerste Volkslied," *Geschiedenis van Zuid-Holland*, http://geschiedenisvanzuidholland.nl/nieuws/voor-vorst-en-vaderland-het-eerste-volkslied "Wien Neêrlands Bloed," *Liefde Voor Holland*, http://www.liefdevoorholland.com/wien-neerlands-bloed/

fervor for the nation. Once a mere regional identity, the use of *Hollander* became

ubiquitous. The people of the entire nation began to use the term for themselves as

they experienced victory over the Spanish, wars with the English, and the dizzying

heights of a Golden Age.

V.   HOLLANDOPHOBIA: ENGLISH HOSTILITY TOWARD THE DUTCH

The Dutch warred against the English in the seventeenth century not just via their ships and cannon, but by utilizing the popular press. Their pamphlets included biting and sarcastic criticisms that focused on topics such as greed, heresy, or regicide. Thus far, their attacks upon the English have been the primary focus of this thesis. But as two nations engaged in the conflict of the Anglo-Dutch Wars, this necessitates at least an abbreviated overview of the English pamphleteering throughout the three struggles. As will be seen, the virulence of the Dutch authors met its match in the writings of their counterparts across the channel. Indeed, the English felt the pricks of the written barbs shot by their enemy, as Henry Stubb described in 1673: "The *Tongues*, the *outrages*, and the *insolencies* of the *Dutch*, have done *England* more *prejudice*, than *Their Ships* and *Canons*."[1] In response, England's pamphleteers created their own brand of vitriolic literature which propagandistically attacked the United Provinces. The "Hollandophobia" – a term crafted by the English historian Simon Schama – contained in the pamphlets characterized England's hatred and fear of the Dutch.[2] One obvious, but considerable, motivation for this writing stemmed from the worldwide fight for

---

[1] Elizabeth Staffell, "The Horrible Tail-Man and the Anglo-Dutch Wars," in *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 2000, 182-183 (emphasis Stubb's).

[2] Carmen Nocentelli gives Schama credit for originating this term in her article "The Dutch Black Legend," in *Modern Language Quarterly,* 75:3 (September 2014), 356.

dominance of trade, especially in the East and West Indies. Both nations desired to control the seas, and this contributed to the conflicts of the seventeenth century's Anglo-Dutch Wars. In addition, the English royalty's understandable fear of republicanism trickled down to their supporters, and these viewed the Dutch Republic as the source of the nefarious politics that led to the regicide of Charles I. Differences in religious beliefs and cultural norms also heightened the hostility, and countless evidence of these clashes permeated the texts.

Not all blame for the poor relations between the two nations rested on the war, or even the economic rivalry. As historian Carmen Nocentelli demonstrated, English hatred for the Dutch superseded the wars, and anti-Dutch invective originated well before 1652 and continued far beyond the end of the third war in 1674. This mirrored the emotions expressed in the pamphlets published in the Low Countries. Descriptions of the Dutch as fat, cowardly, greedy, and barbarous abounded in popular literature. Stories of supposed Dutch atrocities against Englishmen, especially in the East Indies, gave rise to a "Black Legend" that stigmatized the Dutch. The argument can be made that Hollandophobia defined English culture in the entire seventeenth century.[3]

EVIDENCE OF HOLLANDOPHOBIA IN ENGLISH PAMPHLET LITERATURE

When English pamphlets were compared to the Dutch pamphlet literature, the most striking difference came from the contrast in the quality of the illustrations that accompanied the text. English images from the seventeenth century were primarily made using woodcuts, as opposed to the engravings or etchings found in

---

[3] Ibid., 355-356.

the pamphlets of their Dutch counterparts. Such a technological disadvantage resulted in less-detailed images with blurred edges and uneven ink application. English artists often lacked the finesse seen in Holland's works, and their illustrations frequently felt unnatural or stiff. Accordingly, their pamphlets contained fewer visual satires. Similarly, the print quality of English pamphlets – made primarily in London – paled in comparison to the copy produced by more experienced printers from Holland's cities. But by the time of the Third Anglo-Dutch War, and definitely by the eighteenth century, the English appeared to have made up much the technological and artistic gap as they ascended to the summit of both European politics and culture.

One Royalist pamphlet, printed in London in 1650, two years before the start of the First Anglo-Dutch War, blamed the United Provinces for setting a poor example, one which a rebellious England had followed in its Civil War. Entitled *A Briefe Description of the Two Revolted Nations Holland and England*, it decried the leaders of the "usurped states" as being worse than the enemies of Christendom, including Turks, Jews, heathens, and infidels. Considering that the Dutch supported the cause of Charles I and hated Oliver Cromwell, this attack must have caused some surprise. The text expounded on Dutch greed, for their love of money – a sin which Christians knew had been condemned by Solomon as the "root of all evil" – was as innate as a goose's swimming on water or a crow eating the remains of corpses. Playing on the word "Boer," which the English used as another name for the Dutch, the author wrote of a "Boare" [pig] who lay in his own filth. It further accused the citizens of Holland of replacing devotion to God with worship of country, a fickle

loyalty primarily driven by avarice. The author spent a considerable portion of the text criticizing the "anarchy" of the Dutch Republic's government, for it recognized no right of inheritance and allowed every man to express an opinion. Sprinkled throughout were frequent allusions to Holland's alliance with the devil. This resulted in such barbarisms as a Dutch attack on a Spanish fort, where one of the men ripped out the heart of a Spanish captain, tore it apart with his teeth, and threw the remains to his men. It further portrayed promiscuous relationships, more concerned with progeny than sacrament, as typical of Dutch marriage. Thus one tract encapsulated nearly all of the same accusations seen in Holland's pamphleteering. It covered greed, religion, government, values, and devilish origins. But English invective became more detailed as the wars progressed, and therefore grew even stronger.[4]

One particular tale of Dutch monstrousness pervaded the English literature, and the 1653 pamphlet *A Memento for Holland* contained the most detailed account as it tried to use the story to stoke national furor. The author accused the Dutch of trumping up conspiracy charges against innocent Englishmen out of a desire to dominate the entirety of the East Indies. It was based on a true story from thirty years earlier, when a group composed of ten English spice merchants endeavored to overthrow Dutch rule at Fort Victoria, located on the Indonesian island of Amboyna. Captured during the attempt, the leaders of the failed conspiracy were tortured and then executed. The diplomatic fallout after this event led not only to strained

---

[4] *A Briefe Description of the Two Revolted Nations Holland and England*, London, 1650. *Early English Books Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:117706>

relations between England and the Dutch Republic, but also weakened the reign of James I, as many of the nobility viewed him as having handled the situation poorly.[5] The pamphlet provided a very different backstory, and described an idyllic record of peaceful trade. It told of a Japanese trader who innocently inquired about the fort's defenses. Overly suspicious, the Dutch tortured him (by a form of waterboarding), and he implicated the English merchants on the island. These merchants protested against the Japanese man's abuse, but they too were put in prison and then tortured. The visual and written depictions were brutal. Over a period of eight days, the soldiers stretched their English captives on the rack, blew their eyes out of their sockets with water, burned their skin until the viscera was visible, and allowed maggots to set up in their festering wounds. Understandably, the English confessed to a plot they knew nothing about. After a pious expression of their faith in God and the resurrection, the majority of the English were executed.[6] Known as the "Massacre at Amboyna," writers recalled this episode for over a century as a means of generating English indignation at the perfidy of the Dutch. Rather than an esoteric dispute over trade, the victims embodied what was at stake in the war. Not only could the Dutch not be trusted, they would viciously murder innocent, Christian Englishmen. This legitimized the First Anglo-Dutch War not only for economic reasons, but righteous ones. Truly, in the eyes of the English, this was a just war.

---

[5] Karen Chancey, "The Amboyna Massacre in English Politics, 1624-1632," in *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Winter, 1998), 583-585.
[6] *A Memento for Holland: Or a True and Exact History of the Most Villainous and Barbarous Cruelties Used on the English Merchants Residing at Amboyna in the East-Indies, by the Netherland Government and Council There*. London, 1653.
<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:170004>

English pamphlets martialed the war effort at home by the use of one of the earliest forms of positive propaganda. The author of *A Great and Terrible Fight at Sea* described a massive conflict between the top admirals from both sides in the First Anglo-Dutch War. It began by obsequiously deferring to Cromwell's rank, and proceeded to equate the English cause with that of the nation of Israel. England's victory occurred because "the war was of God," and he fully supported their cause and had delivered them from their enemies.[7] Another pamphlet from 1653, *A Great Victory Obtained*, recounted the first Battle of Texel, but neglected to mention the death of the Dutch admiral, Maarten Tromp. Instead it focused on the successful blockade of Holland's fleet and upon a successful expedition which captured a number of merchant ships attempting to sail around Scotland. Printed as if it were an official report intended for Cromwell, it revealed the successful strategy employed by the English naval commanders. Such literature not only served as a type of news report, but it also told of victories, and this helped maintain positive morale on the home-front.[8]

Perhaps the most unusual illustration the English used for the Dutch connected to the idea of a butter box. The first written use of "butter box" as a pejorative for the Dutch dated from 1600 – a practice that lasted into twenty-first century – but the reason for its origin remains unclear. One explanation referred to the shape of Dutch boats, which English sailors often referred to as butter boxes.

---

[7] *A Great and Terrible Fight at Sea Near the Coast of Holland*, London, 1653. *Early English Books Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:166514>

[8] *A Great Victory Obtained By the English Against the Hollanders*, London, 1653. *Early English Books Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:205321>

Another interpretation posited that the English believed Dutch people ate copious amounts of butter, an idea supported by the deprecating term "butter-mouth."[9] Whatever its source, the label had become commonly used by the time of the First Anglo-Dutch War, and references to it showed up frequently throughout the rest of the seventeenth century. The stories connected to it illustrated that the English were comfortable with excremental humor, and that it was not just the purview of the Dutch, examples of which were seen earlier in this thesis.

During the second year of the first war, in 1653, an English pamphlet entitled *The Dutch-mens Pedigree* played upon the term "butter-box" as it abused the enemy. The author, identified only by the initials D.F., told a fantastic and vulgar creation myth. According to the story, in the beginning there existed an abominable horse who spent more time in water than on land. It possessed a human face, a horse face, and whale fins, and ate a diet not only of vegetation, but of filth. After an accident, the panicked horse had "such a fit of shiting [sic], that he died thereof," and demons carried the body into hell. Under the direction of a conjurer, Germans collected the dead horse's feces into a large box, the insides of which were covered with butter. The devil incubated this nest, and after nine days the first Dutch men, women, and children spontaneously generated. Lest the reader were too dense to understand the text's meaning, the accompanying illustration pictured the defecating horse next to Admiral Maarten Tromp and Grand Pensioner Johan de Witt, who both peered over the edge from the inside of "The Great Butter Box." The author left off with this

moral: "do not wonder at their barbarous and inhumane cruelties, since from Hell they came, and thither without doubt they must return again." With such words, the possibility for a diplomatic conclusion of the war, at least from the English perspective, appeared slim. Not only did the pamphlet demonize its target, but as with the Dutch *staartman* [tail-man], it established a religious connection with the devil. But this line of argument went a step farther, for it also labeled the Dutch as filthy and ugly, making them appear not just beyond the reach of salvation, but of human decency.[10]

Near the end of the first war, a celebratory pamphlet, *The Dutch Damnified*, recounted the story of an English expedition which attacked the Frisian town of Bandaris. Although the English attacked with a smaller fleet, through bravery and good strategy they managed to destroy 160 Dutch ships and 1,000 houses, as well as sail off with a considerable plunder. The unidentified author viewed this victory as a means of humbling the "Hogan Mogans," a bastardized form of the Dutch phrase meaning "high and mighty." The subtitle – "The Butter-Boxes Bob'd" – reinforced this idea of humiliation as it used the pejorative nickname for the Dutch. It also implied an emasculation, for "bobbed" referenced a docked horse's tail. A poetic structure of ten stanzas buttressed the central triumphant message, and one phrase repeated at the end of each verse: "Then Hogan Mogans b'ware your Pates/For now we shall make you distressed States." This encapsulated one of the English goals for

---

[10] D.F., *The Dutch-mens Pedigree, or, A Relation, Shewing How They Were First Bred, and Descended from a Horse-turd, Which Was Enclosed in a Butter-Box*, London, 1653. *Early English Books Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:163234>

the war, namely, to take the battle to the Dutch cities and shores. Such strategy not only contributed to England's superiority in the war, but also to the Dutch perspective that their enemies were the aggressors. By the Second Anglo-Dutch War the tables were turned, and Holland sailed its fleet up the Thames, a replication of the account seen in this pamphlet.[11]

Possibly the most consistent accusation the English leveled at the Dutch concentrated upon their supposed avarice and greed. One pamphlet, entitled *The Lovv Dutch Character'd, Their Butter-Box Opened, and Their Juggles* [Tricks] *Apprehended and Reproved*, purported to reveal the wide range of their misdeeds. Published in between the first two wars, in 1658, the author (identified only with the initials T.P.) accused Holland's merchants of tricking all of Europe into trading with them. Even more damning, the Dutch sailed under the flags of multiple nations and traded munitions with the very enemies of Christendom, leading to the deaths of Christians at the hands of Turks, Indians, and Africans. But eventually their rapacious gluttony would lead to death, and the author encouraged the reader to help hasten this end: "Give him his great belly full & make him fat, he'l [sic] feed the worms & manure the earth the better." Further on, the poem threatened to reignite the fight between the two nations, and reminded the Dutch of their earlier defeat. The denizens of Holland were so concerned with increasing their wealth, they would surely lose; the Mennonites further guaranteed such a fate because they were afraid

---

[11] *The Dutch Damnified: Or, The Butter-Boxes Bob'd*, London, 1654. *Early English Books Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:174377>
"hogen-mogen, n. and adj." *OED Online*. http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/view/Entry/87588?redirectedFrom=hogan+mogan

to fight. As an epithet, this pamphlet's use of "butter box" referred not to the Dutch people but to their "bag of tricks," which would be rendered ineffective as the English now knew what to expect and were prepared for any chicanery.[12]

A comprehensive account of the English view of the Dutch Republic could be seen in Owen Felltham's *A Brief Character of the Low-Countries Under the States*. The writer based his perspective on a three-week stay in Holland, and he purportedly tried to give an impartial account on the "vices and virtues of the inhabitants." But the pamphlet contained numerous tropes – some directly copied from earlier pamphlets – as well as original ones that later pamphleteers copied and modified. Topographically, the narrative accurately described a flat land of mud and bogs, so low that they "have a shorter cut to Hell than the rest of their neighbors," and Felltham ascribed the tolerance of many religions to the location below sea level. He remarked at the richness and finery seen throughout the country, and admired the orderliness of their houses, although they kept these cleaner than their bodies, which in turn were less dirty than their souls. Most telling, he attacked them for their idolatry, for "Their Countrey is the God they worship. Warre is their Heaven, Peace is their Hell, and the Spaniard is the Devil they hate." Shipping and trade were, so to speak, the sacraments of this jingoistic devotion. Felltham's account ended with a criticism of Dutch drinking habits, one that echoed the traditional English contempt for many other European nations. For although an Englishman might

---

[12] T.P., *The Lovv Dutch Character'd, Their Butter-Box Opened, and Their Juggles Apprehended and Reproved*, London, 1658. *Early English Books Online.* <*http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:171815*>

become drunk quickly, Hollanders were continually-intoxicated alcoholics. Thus the Dutch were dirty infidels who lived in an unholy land, a people obsessed with greed and warmongering as they worshiped the false idol of the United Provinces.[13]

In 1665, in the midst of the Second Anglo-Dutch War, a pamphlet entitled *Quaeries* crafted a somewhat confusing and self-contradictory image of the Dutch Republic. The unnamed author compared England to Samson, for it defeated the Dutch lion with a jawbone. In hindsight, this reference must have appeared ironic, given the ultimate defeat of England at the end of the war (one might wonder what nation filled the role of Delilah). The doggerel continued with a mockery of Dutch canals and polders, for the United Provinces were "dis-united by water." As the author also claimed that Hollanders possessed the ability to swim and breathe underwater, such obstacles seemed of little practical impediment to harmony. Further onslaughts castigated Dutch fatness, as they were literally made of the foods they consumed – pickled herring, butter, onions, and cheese. But the greatest criticism arose from a religious motivation. Based upon a trope first seen in *A Brief Character of the Low Countries*, it claimed that the Dutch followed a false doctrine: "Whether this may not be a real truth, that their Country is the God they adore, War their Heaven, Peace their Hell; and that they love not any but for Interest…" This assertion directly countered Dutch allegations of English aggression, for it labeled Holland's residents as the initiators of conflict, consumed with love of money and

---

[13] Owen Felltham, *A Brief Character of the Low-Countries Under the States: Being Three Weeks Observation of the Vices and Virtues of the Inhabitants*, London, 1660. *Early English Books Online*. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:121274>

country rather than love of God. Combined with references to a new Babel and a criticism of what he called "hodge-podge" Dutch Christianity – direct charges against the tolerance of supposedly heretical faiths – the author redirected the Dutch indictments of deviltry right back at their source. This demonstrated the similarity of the concerns of both countries during the wars. Yet while the proliferation of such polemical literature in both England and the United Provinces may have tickled the fancy of their respective audiences, by no definition were they intellectually weighty.[14]

English people at the beginning of the Third Anglo-Dutch War no doubt wondered why their leaders entered into another costly struggle. Unlike the prior conflicts, the reasons – as well as the outcome – appeared much less clear. In order to stimulate support for the resumption of hostilities, the anonymous writer of the pamphlet *The Grand Abuses Stript and Whipt* articulated the injustices the English suffered at the hands of the Dutch. Like the earlier *A Memento for Holland*, it told of the terrible tortures that prefaced the Amboyna Massacre. But why would the author rehash this event from a half-century before? Yet again, the threats to commerce and trade motivated such a reference. Like previous authors, he referred to the "high and mighty" Dutch, an accusation of misplaced pride. As an interesting juxtaposition, he also described them as moles who treacherously tried to undermine their enemies, or as an Icarus with wax wings, both actions that would

---

[14] *Quaries: Or a Dish of Pickled-Herring Shred, Cut and Prepared According to the Dutch Fashion for the Squeamish Consciences of English Phanaticks, Who Pray for the New-building of Their Old Babell*, London, 1665. *Early English Books Online.* <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:35569>

actually cause them to fall from their position of influence. The writer exhorted the

Royal Navy to press the Dutch, thus acting as God's force of humility upon a nation

that had become too proud.[15]

The lynching of Johan de Witt and his brother, Cornelis, stood as one of the

worst episodes of 1672, the terrible *rampjaar* [disaster year] for the Dutch. Citizens

of the United Provinces, tired of war and spurred into action by the Orangists (those

loyal to the hereditary House of Orange), attacked the brothers while they were in

prison, tortured and killed them, and then displayed their mutilated bodies in the

street. These actions belied the typical depictions of the seventeenth century Dutch

as being an enlightened, tolerant people.[16] This event did not go unnoticed by the

English, and the pamphlet *Strange Newes from Holland* exultantly told of the ferocity

of the murders and the chaos that surrounded the deaths of the Dutch leaders.

Written by an unnamed person, it began with a condemnation of Holland's rebellion

against their just leaders. Given the relatively recent experience of England's own

bloody rebellion, this no doubt resonated with a significant portion of the

readership. It recounted a litany of wrongs committed by the Dutch against the

English, stretching across the globe from the islands of the West Indies, Suriname,

and to, of course, Amboyna. The Dutch Republic's very existence was deemed

unnatural, for if God had intended for the country to exist, he would not have placed

the land underwater. The majority of the pamphlet continued in such a vein, and left

---

[15] *The Grand Abuses Stript and Whipt; Being an Account of Some of the Injuries, Pride, and the Insulting Insolencies of the Hogen Mogen States of Holland*, London, 1672. <http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:186955>
[16] Maarten Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 49-54.

only the penultimate paragraph of the pamphlet to tell the story of the murder of the de Witt brothers. It confusingly identified Cornelis only as "Ruward van Putten," which was actually his title, for he was the governor of Putten, an island in Holland near Rotterdam. Although in prison before being banished, Cornelis hired an assassin to kill the Prince of Orange, but the man turned against him and instead incited a crowd against the governor. This mob attacked the prison and removed the brothers, trampled them underfoot, and shot them. They began cutting off appendages and – in the fashion of the strawman of Dutch greed – began selling fingers, ears, and toes to the onlookers. As the author stated, these barbaric actions merely reinforced the justness of England's war, for evil permeated both the leadership and the citizenry of Holland.[17]

THE FUNCTION OF HOLLANDOPHOBIA IN ENGLISH PAMPHLET LITERATURE

While the pamphlets no doubt struck their initial audience as humorous (although not to the same degree as a modern reader), a reading or interpretation that only appreciated hilarity missed some of the less obvious, but equally important, messages contained. Appreciating it as literature, as suggested by historian Joad Raymond, implied that an interpretation which focused solely on the prosaic function of propaganda ignored the multilayered meaning. The pamphlets functioned as a powerful communication tool, and they exerted influence on society

---

[17] *Strange Newes from Holland Being a True Character of the Country and People*, London, 1672. *Early English Books Online*.
<http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:193609>

because people read and understood them.[18] Schama – the creator of the term

Hollandophobia – described the content (and therefore the impact) of the

pamphlets as malevolent, a means of creating an enemy with no value:

> Propaganda is nourished by such denaturing simplifications: the reduction of the feared and detested Other to a few simply recognizable vices. What was striking about the Hollandophobic variety was how far it went beyond the old Catholic style of anathematizing heretics, and even beyond the stock conventions of late baroque name-calling, to something more sinister. At its most bilious, it implied that the Dutch title to freedom and sovereignty was spurious…[19]

Based upon this criteria, the English certainly othered the Dutch by their utilization

of stereotypes, such as gluttony and greed, or their use of pejorative terms, such as

"butter box." And the pamphlets clearly questioned Holland's right to nationhood, as

the derogatory references to the Dutch jingoism indicated. The pamphlets made it

simpler to ignore the humanity of England's enemy, for they created an easily

destroyable caricature.

More important than its focus upon the propagandistic elements of English

pamphlets, Schama's statement above followed the logic of a Sartrean

phenomenology. According to the French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre, an

individual discovered the Other via three passions – shame, fear, and pride. These

experiences with the Other, in turn, molded the self-image of the subject,

constructing both identity and self-awareness.[20] As has been seen, the pamphlets

---

[18] Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 25-26.

[19] Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987), 261.

[20] Marjorie Grene, "Sartre and the Other," in *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, Vol. 45 (1971- 1972), 27. Sartre based his concept of the Other on the work of Edmund Husserl. For greater detail, see Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*, 1943.

clearly expressed the shame of defeat, the fear of loss or change, and the pride of victory. Nocentelli extrapolated from this phenomenology, and – moving from the individual to the collective – she argued that the pamphlets worked to create a uniquely English identity. By vilifying its enemies (pamphlets also attacked the "Spanish Black Legend," the French, and other European nations), England not only forged a national identity, but a supranational one. It also crafted a racially purer ethnicity than its enemies, whose blood was tainted by the black deeds of a demonic parentage. Such a course also separated the English from other branches of Christianity, including the Protestants, providing them with another unique identifier. While Nocentell's concept does not fully answer all of the questions regarding England's creation of a national identity (nor did she claim that she intended it as such), the idea that English self-awareness arose as a sort of "anti-identity" holds promise for further historical and philosophical study.[21]

HOLLANDOPHOBIA CONCLUSIONS

England's Hollandophobia of the seventeenth century left a complicated legacy. The Glorious Revolution of 1688 appeared to indicate that antipathy for the Dutch had disappeared, or at least was of less importance than their hatred for King James II. After all, not only did the two countries share a monarch, the English actually implored William to come to England. Yet the excremental humor at Holland's expense continued at least into the eighteenth century. For example, Isaac Cruikshank's 1794 cartoon *Opening the Sluces or Hollin's Last Shift,* depicted a long line of Dutch women – drinking gin, stooped over, and with their bottoms exposed –

---

[21] Nocentelli, "The Dutch Black Legend," 358, 372-376.

urinating or defecating into the sea to repel an invasion of French soldiers.[22] Similarly, the English scorn for Holland's supposed greed persisted, lasting even into the present. Only the utilization of religious critiques appeared to wane, and that no doubt paralleled religion's slowly decreasing relevance to the daily life of most Europeans.

Interestingly, the Dutch self-deprecatingly adopted the habit of telling originally English jokes about themselves, such as the story of how two greedy Dutchmen invented copper wire by fighting over a *stuiver*. This raises the question of what extent the English pamphleteering affected the psyche of the Dutch. People in both nations clearly despised each other, evidenced by the written invective and the fighting of multiple wars. But while individuals such as Henry Stubb complained of the terrible repercussions of Holland's literature, similar comments seem absent from Dutch writers. Perhaps this indicates that the pamphlets, while similar on a surface level, actually served quite different purposes for their respective societies.

---

[22] Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 191.

VI.   CONCLUSION

A significant portion of the Dutch pamphleteering in their Golden Age focused upon one of their many enemies – England – for the nations waged three wars against each other during the seventeenth century. The first of the so-called Anglo-Dutch Wars, fought from 1652-1654, emanated from a fight over trade, which stemmed from the English confiscation of Dutch shipping. Perhaps the most ferocious of the three, it resulted in a short-lived peace based upon terms favorable to the victorious English. The second, which lasted from 1665-1667, saw the newly restored monarchy of England humbled by the Dutch, whose navy audaciously sailed up the Thames River and held London at their mercy. During the third war, from 1672-1674, England united with enemies of the Dutch Republic for a short while, only to withdraw without a definitive conclusion. Erstwhile allies – Elizabeth had provided a modicum of funding and military support during the United Provinces' fight for independence from Spain – the citizens of these predominately Protestant countries truly despised each other, as pamphlet literature from both sides demonstrated. Indeed, the hatred predated official hostilities, and the wars only served to intensify this preexisting antipathy.

Significant upheaval characterized the political culture of both the Dutch Republic and England during the three decades that enveloped the wars. Newly cementing their role in the world, the Dutch experienced the chaos of war with

83

multiple nations, a ballooning population, and a changing leadership. The First

Stadtholderless Era began in 1650, and resulted in the rise to power of Johan de

Witt as the Grand Pensionary. His gruesome murder in 1672, the *rampjaar* [disaster

year], led to the return of the House of Orange to power. Despite these pressures,

both the culture and finances of Holland continued to flourish. Similarly, England

also experienced a revolution. The system of government changed to a republic,

which executed the former king, installed Oliver Cromwell as Lord Protector, and

then restored the monarchy under another Stuart, Charles II. Like the Dutch,

expanding power and trade characterized the English experience of the seventeenth

century. Pamphleteers seized upon these transformations and made them a primary

target of their verbal and visual assaults on the populace of their enemies.

As has been seen, the primary writers of the Dutch pamphlets were

rederijkers [rhetoricians]. These men participated in *rederijkerskamers* [societies of

rhetoricians], social groups that travelled around Holland. The members composed

plays and poems while they drank copious amounts of alcohol, a supposed character

flaw that the English targeted. Rather than being members of an intellectual elite,

these individuals came from many of the trade guilds. Not only did their writing

reflect the "low humor" that appealed to members of their class, but it also

contained meanings that only other *rederijkers* understood. Pamphlet texts held

multi-layered interpretations intended for a wide audience. On the one hand, they

acted as a source of news, telling of events that denizens of Dutch cities had not yet

heard. On the other hand, they gave scathing commentary on both the enemy and

objectionable elements within their own society. Other authors, such as the

predikanten [ministers], penned texts that primarily conveyed one meaning – usually spiritual – to their audience. Their work contributed to the entertainment of an astoundingly literate Dutch society.

The most visually striking feature of Dutch pamphlet literature portrayed the enemy – the English – with tails, and this concept of *staartman* [tail-man] pervaded both images and texts throughout the seventeenth century. Most of the time the tails adorned the backsides of human figures, although artists and writers also alluded to the symbolic English Mastiff. References to "docking the tail" of the *staartman*, as the work of Elizabeth Staffell established, indicated a type of emasculation or castration. Such an action implied a lessening of England's virility, for their pride and strength came from their tail. While the composition, usage, and size of the tail varied, it adorned the figures of both leaders and unnamed archetypes. And as *De Nederlandsche Nijptang* [*The Dutch Pincers*] demonstrated, this transformed to become a type of excremental humor, based upon the function of the tail. For the tail covered the asshole, the supposed source of "shame" for any animal, especially the English dog. Texts further referred to the English defecation of their *gestolen goederen* [stolen goods], illicitly taken from defenseless Dutch ships. The *rederijkers* embraced low-brow farce in order to humiliate their foe.

In addition to the excremental humor, *staartman* also conveyed a religious critique of the English. As *De Nijptang* pointed out, Cromwell, Fairfax, and their followers – the Roundheads – all committed the sin of regicide, and this originated from their devilish parentage, a paternity evidenced by their tail. Some illustrations even showed the devil steering the English by the use of the tail. This idea of

85

duivelskind [devil's child] worked to dehumanize the enemy, as association with hell meant both temporal and spiritual death, i.e., damnation. It also implied that God favored the Dutch, and Calvinist preachers often spoke of the United Provinces as a new Israel, the favored of the Lord. Stories of English atrocities – unnatural acts of horror committed because of their diabolical ancestry – gave these arguments extra credence. Sometimes the characters possessed supernatural strength – given to them by their progenitor – and writers sometimes appealed to this unhuman power as a reason for Dutch defeat. Pamphlets portrayed the English as liars, further cementing their status as the children of the "father of all lies." Another form of religious critique came from the term *Engel. Engel* played with the Dutch words for "English" and "Angel," as dropping the letter "s" at the end changed the word to imply that Holland's enemies were fallen angels or demons. Additionally (and somewhat strangely), authors appealed to heretical prognosticators such as Nostradamus to foretell of an English defeat and a Dutch victory. Overall, the pamphleteering fell into an apocalyptic vision of the conflict, and this appealed to the intended audience.

The most important function of Dutch pamphleteering worked to create an identity for the fledgling nation in the midst of political infighting, numerous wars, and the cultural leap forward of its Golden Age. Before the war for independence, the people viewed themselves as a collection of provinces under the rule of a foreigner, a relatively accurate reflection of their situation. Leaders recognized that autonomy necessitated an historical and collective self-description that applied to the whole country. Constructing this proved a complicated and difficult task. The

province of Holland commissioned Hadrianus Junius [Adriaen de Jonghe] to write a history in 1566, and the scholar attempted to find a unified ethnic identity. Junius crafted "the Batavian myth," which proposed that the Dutch descended from an ancient Germanic people, the *Batavi*. Numerous references to the *Batavieren* could be found in the pamphlet literature, and authors of these works often utilized it as a substitute for *Nederlander* or *Hollander*. Indeed, this concept persisted into the nineteenth century, when the French set up a puppet Batavian Republic in the Low Countries, a clear reference to this supposed past. But the Dutch did not truly coalesce around this ideal. Instead of *Nederlander* or even *Batavieren*, the predominate identifier used was a regional one – *Hollander*. Its use proliferated due to the supremacy of the province of Holland in culture, politics, trade, and wealth. A prime example of this could be seen in the sailors who traveled the world; when asked where they were from, they would say "Holland."

Four theories regarding why the Dutch chose the unified identity of *Hollander* were examined. The first, religion, failed as an explanation due to the diversity of Christian faith in the Dutch Republic – Calvinism, Catholicism, and Anabaptism all were unable to have a significant majority of the population – a phenomenon that Maarten Prak called "religious pluralism." Similarly, religious tolerance fell short as a unifier. Although the Dutch historically prided themselves for their tolerance of other faiths, such magnanimity did not actually exist in the seventeenth century, as non-Calvinist faiths were officially banned. Second, the concept of language as a focal point for the Dutch to rally around was seen as inadequate. The proliferation and recognition of dialects, and even another language

– Frisian – meant that country identified with something other than speech. As a third option, shared ethnicity as identity was explored. But the denizens of the United Provinces traced their heritage to more than one Germanic tribe. *Batavieren* came the closest to melding the entire population of the country into one ethnicity, yet it did not fully take hold in the Dutch psyche. Much of the population could not trace themselves back to the Batavi, however, making ethnicity an incomplete explanation. Finally, economics was considered as a driving force behind the shared identity of *Hollander*. In this sense, financial power and influence overcame any reservations that people from outside the largest province might have possessed. The name of Holland spread across the world based upon its commercial might and trade. Thus the use of *Hollander* as an identity proliferated due to economics rather than religion, language, or ethnicity. While the evocative term *Vaderland* was popularly used, it referred to an amorphous place, not a defined state from which an identity could be derived. Based upon how it was incorporated into the national anthem, it primarily evoked a patriotism tied directly to the *Stadhouder*. Only *Hollander* allowed a Dutch person to be a part of the larger identity.

As has been seen, the English created their own pamphleteering in response to the Dutch. The historian Simon Schama labeled what he described as a combination of fear and prejudice as Hollandophobia. The English strongly felt the pangs of the Dutch attacks, as evidenced by the seventeenth century declamation by Henry Stubb that the literature caused greater harm than any physical confrontations at sea. Although the illustrations produced in London lacked the finesse of their Amsterdam (or even other Dutch cities) counterparts, the venom the

pamphlets contained certainly matched or even surpassed them. Excremental humor also permeated English pamphlets, despite the supposed Puritanism of the population. This could be seen in *The Dutch-mens Pedigree*, which described Holland's origins from the turds of a mystic horse. The fact that the devil incubated the nest added an element of theological critique. Englishmen who were devout Anglicans, Puritans, or even Catholics despised the religious pluralism found in Holland, and considered it a form of idolatry. Multiple writers commented on what they deemed transgressions against God's law. They also criticized Dutch greed – somewhat disingenuously – as they railed against a people who wanted to dominate world trade. Arising from this came the pejorative "butter box," a clever way of combining the sin of gluttony with the supposed diet of Holland's population. But the most substantive accusation came from the story of the massacre at Amboyna, an event that occurred thirty years before the start of the First Anglo-Dutch War. By rehashing the terrible cruelty and tortures, the English created a new "Black Legend," a focus for a national antipathy.

Similar to Holland, England used the pamphlet literature – and especially the "Black Legend" to generate a national identity for its people. But while both nations attacked each other in print, Anglo authors forged their national self-awareness specifically from this milieu of antithesis. Following the argumentation of both Schama and Carmen Nocentelli – both of whom derived their logic from Jean-Paul Sartre – this phenomenological realization of the Other arose from a type of negation; this resulted in a distinct and describable Englishness. Through the experiences of the shame of defeat, fear of change, and pride in victory as chronicled

by the pamphlets, English authors managed to set their people up as a paragon of an ideal society, even as they demeaned Holland as a completely barbaric enemy. Schama decried the ugly discrimination of their Hollandophobia, but it helped to create a unified identity as the pamphleteers negated the Dutch.

The pamphleteering of the Dutch Republic and England in the seventeenth century resulted in a stream of xenophobic invective that flowed back-and-forth across the Channel. For one country it happened in the midst of a Golden Age, and for the other it preceded an auspicious future. Despite their recent alliance against a common enemy, seemingly similar religious beliefs, and a short-lived period as fellow republics, the two nations fought multiple wars. Indeed, the points where they appeared most alike often became the foci of the greatest attacks. The literature illuminated belief and culture in both nations as it barraged the enemy and extolled the virtues of its heroes. Excremental humor, religious critique, and fear of the dissimilar permeated the texts and images. Most importantly, the pamphlets helped reveal and shape the identity of these nascent powers. The majority of the Dutch *rederijkers* who penned the pamphlets remain anonymous, despite the popularity of their works in their age, and their persistent use of *Hollander* in their writings took firm hold in the Dutch Republic. Thus, the identity with which the Dutch cemented their legacy in the seventeenth century – a history of artistic, financial, intellectual, and military power – held the name *Hollander.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Most of the original Dutch pamphlets needed to research and write about regarding the insulting stories, aphorisms, and myths between the English and the Dutch during the seventeenth century come from the Knuttel Collection, comprised of over 30,000 titles. Physical copies are contained in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB), the Dutch National Library, located in Den Haag, The Netherlands.[1] The online catalog is also searchable via TEMPO, a service provided by Koninklijke Brill NV.[2] Other sources included the catalogue Atlas van Stolk and the collection of Frederik Muller.

While they function as an auxiliary to the thesis proposal, the English pamphlets needed to explore the topic are found in the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC). These pamphlets are located at the British Library, primarily in London at the St. Pancras location and in Wetherby at the Boston Spa location. This collection holds over 460,000 items.[3] Similar to the Knuttel Collection, most of the ESTC has been digitized and is available via OhioLINK or WorldCat. The catalog can be easily searched through the British Library website.

Secondary sources used to research this thesis are primarily in English, although Dutch sources are also consulted. In order to focus research, attention centered upon the time period between the beginnings of the Dutch Revolt in 1568

---

[1] "Address and Directions," *Koninklijke Bibliotheek*, accessed February 3, 2016. https://www.kb.nl/en/visitors/address-and-directions
[2] "The Early Modern Pamphlets Online," *Koninklijke Brill*, accessed February 3, 2016. http://tempo.idcpublishers.info/content/coll_pamphlets.php
[3] "English Short Title Catalogue – Welcome," *The British Library*, accessed February 3, 2016. http://estc.bl.uk/F/?func=file&file_name=login-bl-estc

to the Glorious Revolution in 1688. A complete listing of all primary and secondary

sources are found below.

<center>PRIMARY SOURCES</center>

A Briefe Description of the Two Revolted Nations Holland and England. London, 1650. *Early English Books Online.* http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver= Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:117706

A Great and Terrible Fight at Sea Near the Coast of Holland. London, 1653. *Early English Books Online.* http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver= Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:166514

A Great Victory Obtained By the English Against the Hollanders. London, 1653. *Early English Books Online.* http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver= Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:205321

A Memento for Holland: Or a True and Exact History of the Most Villainous and Barbarous Cruelties Used on the English Merchants Residing at Amboyna in the East-Indies, by the Netherland Government and Council There. London, 1653.. *Early English Books Online.* http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver= Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:170004

Algemeene Verklaring van dit Sinnebeeldt, 1668. Frederik Muller, #2303.

Allard, Carolus. *Quaakers Vergadering,* c. 1656. *Rijksmuseum.nl, http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.464365.*

Cromwell als de Afgrijselijke Staartman, 1652. W.P.C. Knuttel #7284.

De Carpentier, Casparus. *Den Vyerigen Triumph-Wagen van den Vroomen Marten Herpertsz. Tromp*, 1653, in Jan van der Wals, *Prenten in de Gouden Eeuw: Van Kunst Tot Kastpapier*. Rotterdam: Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, 2006. #172.

D.F., *The Dutch-mens Pedigree, or, A Relation, Shewing How They Were First Bred, and Descended from a Horse-turd, Which Was Enclosed in a Butter-Box*. London, 1653. *Early English Books Online.* http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver= Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:163234

De Mol, Jan. *Engels Kuiper*, 1652. Atlas van Stolk, #2178.

Een Nacht-Gesicht, Waar in Vertoont Word den Geparsten Koe, 1672. Frederick
    Muller, #2309.

Felltham, Owen. *A Brief Character of the Low-Countries Under the States: Being Three
    Weeks Observation of the Vices and Virtues of the Inhabitants*. London, 1660.
    Early English Books Online.
    http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=
    Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:121274

't Wonderlik Verkeer-Spel, 1652. Atlas van Stolk, #2180.

Over den Wreeden Handel der Engelschen, Tegen de Hollanders Gepleegd, 1652.
    W.P.C. Knuttel #7153.

*Quaries: Or a Dish of Pickled-Herring Shred, Cut and Prepared According to the Dutch
    Fashion for the Squeamish Consciences of English Phanaticks, Who Pray for the
    New-building of Their Old Babell*. London, 1665. *Early English Books Online*.
    http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=
    Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:35569

Scheeps-Gevecht, 1652. W.P.C. Knuttel #7188.

"Spotprent op de Engelsen," 1673. *Rijksmuseum.nl*,
    http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.358558.

Strange Newes from Holland Being a True Character of the Country and People.
    London, 1672. *Early English Books Online*.
    http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=
    Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:193609

Stubbe, Henry. "A Further Justification of the Present War Against the United
    Netherlands."

The Dutch Damnified: Or, The Butter-Boxes Bob'd. London, 1654. *Early English Books
    Online*.
    http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=
    Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:174377

*The Grand Abuses Stript and Whipt; Being an Account of Some of the Injuries, Pride,
    and the Insulting Insolencies of the Hogen Mogen States of Holland*. London,
    1672.
    http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=
    Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:186955

T.P., *The Lovv Dutch Character'd, Their Butter-Box Opened, and Their Juggles Apprehended and Reproved*. London, 1658. *Early English Books Online.* http://gateway.proquest.com.ezproxy.libraries.wright.edu/openurl?ctx_ver=Z39.88-2003&res_id=xri:eebo&rft_id=xri:eebo:image:171815

Untitled, 1673. Atlas van Stolk #2344.

Van de Passe, Crispijn. *Der Castilianen uyt-vaert: Mitgaders de Vlaemsche*, 1646. Frederik Muller, #1914.

Van de Passe, Crispijn. *Leeuw en Honden Gevecht*, 1652. W.P.C. Knuttel #7277.

Van de Passe, Crispijn. *Uytbeeldinge van de Hoogmoedige Republijk van Engelandt*, 1652. W.P.C. Knuttel #7276.

Van Souffenburg, Jan. *Untitled*, 1656. W.P.C. #7734.

van Vloten, Johannes. *Algemeene Geschiedenis des Vaderlands van de Vroegste Tijden tot op Heden*. Haarlem: I. de Haan, 1879.

Waterloos, Herman. *Den Vyerigen Triumph-Wagen van den Vroomen Marten Herpertsz. Tromp*, c.1653-1654. F.W.H. Hollstein #158.

Zoet, Jan. *Den Grooten Zweedschenkuipper*, 1656. *Rijksmuseum.nl*, http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.464387.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Ashley, Maurice. *England in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 1978.

Atkins, Christopher. *The Signature Style of Frans Hals: Painting, Subjectivity, and the Market in Early Modernity*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012.

Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age, edited by R. Po-Chia Hsia and Henk van Nierop. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Chancey, Karen. "The Amboyna Massacre in English Politics, 1624-1632." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Winter, 1998).

Coward, Barry. *Oliver Cromwell*. London: Longman Group UK Limited, 1991.

Geyl, Pieter. *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: Barnes and
     Noble, Inc., 1961.

Goldgar, Anne. *Tulipmania: Money, Honor, and Knowledge in the Dutch Golden Age*.
     Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Gorski, Philip. *The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early
     Modern Europe*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Grene, Marjorie. "Sartre and the Other." *Proceedings and Addresses of the American
     Philosophical Association*, Vol. 5 (1971-1972).

Groenveld, Simon. "The English Civil Wars as a cause of the First Anglo-Dutch War,
     1640-1652." *Historical Journal* 30, (September 1987).

Gustafsson, Harald. "The Conglomerate State: A Perspective on State Formation in
     Early Modern Europe." *Scandinavian Journal Of History* 23, no. 3 (September
     1998).

Gwyn, Douglas. "James Nayler and the Lamb's War," *Quaker Studies* 12/2 (2008).

Hainsworth, Roger, and Christine Churches. *The Anglo-Dutch Naval Wars 1652-1674*.
     Gloucestershire: Sutton Publishing Limited, 1998.

Haley, K.H.D. *The Dutch in the Seventeenth Century*. London: Thames and Hudson,
     LTD, 1972.

Helmers, Helmer. *The Royalist Republic: Literature, Politics, and Religion in the Anglo-
     Dutch Public Sphere, 1639-1660*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
     2015.

Jardine, Lisa. *Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory*. New York:
     HarperCollins Publishers, 2008.

Jones, J.R. *The Anglo Dutch Wars of the Seventeenth Century.* London: Longman
     Group Limited, 1996.

Kramers' Engels Woordenboek, edited by J.A. Jocken-la Bastide and G. van Kooten.
     Amsterdam: Elsevier Nederland B.B., 1978.

Lambert, Andrew. *War at Sea in the Age of Sail 1650-1850*. London: Cassell & Co.,
     2000.

Liedtke, Walter. "Frans Hals: Style and Substance." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art
     Bulletin*, Vol. 1, 2011.

Lindberg, Carter. *The European Reformations*. Malden: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., 2010.

Manning, Roger B. "Prince Maurice's School of War: British Swordsmen and the Dutch." *War & Society* 25, no. 1 (May 2006).

McDaniel, Craig. "Rethinking Rembrandt: Experiments in Pictorial Concoctions." Midwest Quarterly 56, no. 2 (January 2015).

Michel, Emile, and Victoria Charles. *The Brueghels*. New York: Parkstone Press International, 2007.

Nocentelli, Carmen. "The Dutch Black Legend." *Modern Language Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (September 2014).

North, Michael. *Art and Commerce in the Dutch Golden Age*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Parker, Geoffrey. *The Dutch Revolt*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Pincus, Steven. "Popery, Trade and Universal Monarchy: The Ideological Context of the Outbreak of the Second Anglo-Dutch War." *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 107, No. 422 (Jan., 1992).

Prak, Maarten. *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century: The Golden Age*, translated by Diane Webb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, and Sociology, edited by Julia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens, and Ann Shola Orloff. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.

Rommelse, Gijs. "The role of mercantilism in Anglo-Dutch political relations, 1650-74." *The Economic History Review*, Vol. 63, No. 3, 2010.

Schama, Simon. *The Embarrassment of Riches: An Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1987.

"Scottish Slavery in 17th Century New England." *History of Scotland Magazine* 5, no. 1 (2005).

Scott, H.M. "Sir Joseph Yorke, Dutch Politics and the Origins of the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War." *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (Sep., 1988).

Siebelhoff, Robert. "The Demography of the Low Countries 1500-1990: Facts and Figures." *Canadian Journal of Netherlandic Studies* Vol. 14, no. 1 (Spring 1993).

Staffell, Elizabeth. "The Horrible Tail-Man and the Anglo-Dutch Wars." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, Vol. 63 (2000).

Sutton, Peter C., and Marigene H. Butler. "The Life and Art of Jan Steen." *Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin*, Vol. 1, 1982.

The Kaleidoscopic Scholarship of Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575): Northern Humanism at the Dawn of the Golden Age, Edited by Dirk van Miert. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill, 2011.

The Napoloeonic Empire and The New European Political Culture, edited by Michael Broers, Peter Hicks, and Agustin Guimera. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Tilly, Charles. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2002.