# 'Het hart des Offraers' – The Dutch Gift as an Act of Self-Representation

Inge Broekman and Helmer Helmers

***Abstract.*** *In the course of the seventeenth century the States General and other institutions of the Dutch Republic made three notable gifts to the English royal family. In 1610 two Dutch marine pictures were given to Henry Prince of Wales. In 1636 Charles I and his queen were presented with horses and a carriage, linen and other luxury items and four Dutch religious paintings. And in 1660 Charles II received furniture, a substantial collection of Italian and Dutch pictures and antique sculpture, and a yacht. The first part of this double article discusses the significance of the items chosen mainly from the Dutch point of view. They represented the manufacturing and trading interests of the young Republic and reflected the changing balance of power within the state. At the same time the gifts were intended to appeal to the taste and influence the policy of the Stuart court. The second part of the article considers the Gift of 1660 in the context of contemporary party conflict in the Dutch Republic. Despite official propaganda that the Gift was a gesture of admiration and gratitude from 'the heart of the givers', it was in fact a hastily improvised attempt to appease Charles II and promote Anglo-Dutch friendship and to contain popular Orangism at home. Public opinion, however, did not approve of the Gift. Orangist pamphleteers condemned such gift-making as corrupt, and even republicans like Pieter de la Court thought it mistaken since a king would always pursue his own interests.*

## Introduction

One of the most famous and valuable gifts of all time, the gift that the States General of the Dutch Republic presented to the restored Stuart king Charles II in 1660, has become known in history as The Dutch Gift.[1] The States of Holland presented the king with a bedstead and accompanying furniture, twenty-four (mainly sixteenth-century) Italian pictures, four contemporary Dutch paintings and twelve antique sculptures. The Dutch poet Joost van den Vondel wrote a poem on this gift titled the *Kunstkroon* that was given with it. The gifts were presented to

the new king by representatives of the States General. Finally a yacht, the Mary, was contributed by the city of Amsterdam.[2] Though the scholarly literature on the gift focuses mainly on the paintings,[3] the gift is interesting from more than one perspective. Not only does the gift contain more than paintings alone, it can also be discussed as part of a culture of gift giving.

## I. THREE GIFTS COMPARE (BY INGE BROEKMAN[4])

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Dutch government had given three major gifts to the English royal family: both in 1610 and again in 1636 they were honoured with lavish presents. In 1610 the States General gave the first present that is nowadays referred to as the Dutch Gift: Prince Henry, the eldest son of King James I, received two seascape paintings purchased from Hendrick Cornelisz. Vroom.[5] And in 1636 they presented Charles I and his wife Henrietta Maria with horses with equipment, a carriage, a watch, mother of pearl, ambergris, porcelain, paintings, embroidery, damask and a list describing these items.[6] In this article I will examine the question of representation.[7] I will explore the contents of the gifts themselves in order to show how the States General represented itself at the English royal court.[8]

### The Anglo-Dutch relationship (1610–1660) in a nutshell

When the States General honoured Prince Henry with paintings in 1610, the position of the Dutch Republic in Europe was increasing in strength. In 1609, the Twelve Years' Truce (1609–1621) had been signed in Antwerp, a treaty that brought about an armistice in the war against Spain. Even though the truce did not mean official independence for the Republic from Spain, it was seen as such by other European countries. Since the mediation of both England and France in making the truce with Spain was considered vital, the States General sent ambassadorial missions, with gifts, to both countries in the spring of 1610. The countries became further aligned in 1641 with the marriage of Frederick Henry's eldest son, William II, and Charles I's eldest daughter, Mary Stuart. By that time though, Charles was already in trouble. Despite Frederick Henry's efforts, the Dutch marriage did not safe prevent his utter defeat: he was executed in 1649. During the Interregnum, relations with the Dutch Republic were tense. Despite Cromwell's efforts to forge an alliance, economic competition and mutual distrust led to the first Anglo-Dutch war (1652–1654) which was won by the English. The Restoration of Charles II to the British throne in 1660 was a turning point: from one moment to the next, Charles's position had been transformed from a refugee to the representative of a European power.

## The Dutch Gift of 1610

The *Resolutiën* of the States General provide explicit reasons for the gift to Henry, the eldest son of king James I: his 'successie [is] seecker' and his 'vriendschap [is] dese landen noodich'[9] In 1610 the Dutch saw him as a promising political ally in the future, but they could also have considered him an important contact in their current diplomatic policy. As the son of James I, he could have been seen as part of the monarch's broader identity. Henry was described by contemporaries as a 'hopeful, serious-minded young man', who 'seemed the ideal Prince in the Renaissance tradition'.[10] On 13 April a decision was recorded to buy *The Battle of Gibraltar* by Vroom, and also to pay him for 'a sea-storm' that they wanted to present to Henry.[11] However, only one painting 'don bij de ault [the old] from [Vroom] […] giffen bij der stats tu pinz hanri' can be found in the inventories of the English Royal collection.[12] Since no *Sea Storm* by Vroom is described in these inventories, disagreement has arisen about whether or not this painting was actually his.[13] To me, the hand responsible for the *Sea Storm* is less significant than the fact that the *Resolutiën* directed representatives 'te coopen die 2 stucken schilderyen van Vroom, van Haerlem', which indicates that they came from his studio and were valued similarly.[14]

It is not surprising that the 1610 search for 'eenige schoone stucken schilderyen, vande beste meesters, die in dese landen syn', as the Dutch ambassador in London, Caron, described what he thought would please the young Prince Henry,[15] ended up in the studio of the Haarlem painter Hendrick Cornelisz. Vroom (ca. 1563–1640). As early as the first decade of the seventeenth century, the painter had achieved an international reputation. In 1604, Van Mander says that Vroom had acquired international renown because he designed tapestries for Charles Howard, Lord Admiral.[16]

By looking at the subject matter of these paintings, it becomes clear there are two different types. Where the *Battle of Gibraltar* is a painting telling a story of an event from recent history, the title of the second piece, a *Sea Storm*, does not refer to a concrete historical situation. What underlying message can be read in the choice of the States General to present Prince Henry with these two paintings? The message of the Battle seems to be the more explicit: it tells the story of the first Dutch naval victory against the Spaniards, which took place in 1607. Especially in the context of the embassy, the commemorative element of this event should not be underestimated. The presentation of this particular piece can be seen as a direct attempt to bring issues of war and victory to the attention of the prince. But more meaning can be read into the subject matter of this painting. Israel has argued that the battle itself stood as a symbol for the great economic future of the young Republic.[17] Seen in this light, references to both the Spanish

occupation and the importance of naval power for the Dutch are represented in this painting.[18]

From the title of the second painting, it can be assumed it depicts a rough sea, probably with a ship or ships struggling to survive. Goedde explains that such pictorial elements carried multiple meanings and that one has to be careful not to get entangled in this web of meanings, as they can be contradictory.[19] Here I will briefly discuss a hypothetical meaning of two marine paintings given to Henry. At the time, the ancient symbolism of the 'Ship of the Church' existed simultaneously with a secular version, the 'Ship of State'. Whereas Christ was the skipper in the first case, the national ruler sailed the ship of state in the secular version, so depicting a ship in difficult conditions could symbolize political hazards.[20] In this connexion, it is interesting that Vroom is known to have made marine paintings in pairs: pendant pieces usually composed of one historical scene and one painting without references to real events that produce symbolic meaning together.[21] It is not known whether the *Sea Storm* bought by the States General in Vroom's studio was to be considered some sort of companion or antithesis to the historical battle scene, but it is interesting to combine the symbolism of the ships of church and state with the concept of pendant pieces. By presenting Henry with a painting containing an implicit reference to political, religious and economic hardship under Spanish occupation (*Sea Storm*) and a painting bringing up issues of victory and prosperous trade (*The Battle of Gibraltar*), the States General could have intended to show the Republic as a worthy ally.

## The Dutch Gift of 1636

In their article on the second Dutch Gift, Bruyn and Millar argue that the Dutch embassy sent to the English court in March 1636 should be understood in the context of the 'growing anxiety in The Hague as a result of Charles I's pro-Spanish policy and of his pretended 'ancient and undoubted right' to the 'Dominion of the Seas'. The Dutch ambassador Cornelis van Beveren was not only nominated to go to Charles I in March 1636 to discuss political issues, he also was to present the king with the elaborate package of presents.[22] The States General could have considered Charles, who was engaged in a web of international rulers with their own individual policies, susceptible to persuasion. But how and with what kind of offerings did they try to gain the favour of the king?

The official report that Van Beveren wrote to the States General at the beginning of April 1636 describes how the gifts were presented to the monarch 'met behoorlijcke complimenten, van dat hetselve waren vruchten van soodanigen acker, die niet en conde voortbrengen als teickenen van affectie ende willigen dienst'.[23]

Since part of the gift itself is a list of the items given, it is known how the States General decided to show this 'affection' and 'obedience'. The list is reproduced in Appendix I, where the different items are numbered. I will refer to these numbers in the following paragraphs. It describes seven white horses with full equipment, a carriage, a watch, mother of pearl, ambergris, porcelain, four early Netherlandish paintings, a piece of embroidery and various items of damask. Furthermore, Van Beveren informs the States General the ambassaors had told the king the 'peerden, schilderien, linden, tstuck mit de naelde gemaect etc., waren vruchten ende wercken van ons Landt, ende de reste, doorde industrie van onse Scheep-vaert en negotie becomen' and that the gift was presented to and received by both the king and the queen.[24]

In 1636, then, the States General presented itself by giving items that were made in their own country (as they did in 1610), but also by giving presents that were representative of the extent of their trade. The 'linen' given can be considered a national product, even though item number 12 is said to be from Kortrijk. This city was located in the Spanish Netherlands and had monopolized the production of luxury linen and damask during the sixteenth century. Religious and social economic problems at the turn of the century had caused an outflow of weavers to the Northern Netherlands, and the majority of these weavers settled in Haarlem.[25] It is likely that the items of luxury linen for Charles also originated from Haarlem. And even though the watch (item 2) is not explicitly mentioned as a product of national manufacture, it could have been made in Haarlem as well. Where the earliest 'horloges' were made in Italy, France and Germany during the fifteenth century, Haarlem was the first city in the Northern Netherlands where references to watchmakers can be found.[26]

Other items in the inventory of gifts were considered national products and originated from Haarlem. Two of the paintings, *The Lamentation and The Legend of the Relics of St. John* (7), were by the painter Geertgen tot St. Jans (ca. 1460–ca. 1488).[27] They had formed part of an altarpiece formerly belonging to the Haarlem monastery of the Knights of St. John.[28] The *St. Jerome* (8) is described as by Lucas van Leyden but nowadays identified with a work by Aertgen van Leyden. Similarly, the *Adam and Eve* (6), a 'Tableau de Mabuse', is believed to be the well-known piece by Jan Gossaert (ca. 1478–ca. 1532).[29] It has been argued that these works also originated from the Haarlem monastery.[30] The same has been said about the 'Tableau en brodderie' [10], which has been identified with a description of a landscape in the English royal inventories.[31]

Examination of the history of the Knights of St. John shows how these works were considered a 'national product'. The Haarlem monastery of St. John was founded in 1310 and formed part of the Knightly Order of St. John of Jerusalem. While the

original aim of the Order was to accommodate, protect and cure pilgrims, the Haarlem monastery was neither a chivalric order nor a hospital. It focused primarily on the practice of the Catholic faith and on the protection of its worldly goods, including a considerable amount of real estate. Apart from the property, the Haarlem Order also possessed an important art collection.[32] The monastery came into the hands of the Reformed city government in 1581, but it took Haarlem until 1625 before the possessions of the monastery could be confiscated.

Why did the States General decide to give away these parts of its national heritage? It had taken the city of Haarlem forty-four years to obtain the monastery's goods. The Knights had not only appealed to the clause in the Pacification of Ghent (1576), which says that goods of *foreign* Catholic orders did not have to be handed over to the regional government (the monastery functioned under the Knights in Jerusalem), but they also knew they had the support of a part of the nobility in attempting to hold onto their possessions.[33] The death of the last Knight in 1625 finally meant the city's victory. But the confiscation caused a new problem in terms of what to do with the goods. Not only were the Knights formerly linked to high nobility, which suggests that the property had to be dealt with cautiously, but the city government had also heard that the king of France supported the Order. This made them fear that the confiscation would cause French naval reprisals. In order to prevent this, the city government was advised to sell the goods in the same year.[34] Even though it is not known where the paintings had been between 1625 and 1636, it is likely they were in governmental circles. I would suggest that giving away the paintings, which so clearly carried the symbols of the Catholic Order, was considered a respectable way to get them out of the country. This process seems to have transformed the pieces from devotional objects to works of art by situating them within the growing English royal collection.

While the States General gave items of domestic manufacture, they also presented Charles I with items they had acquired abroad through the wide scope of their trade. Products like mother of pearl (3), ambergris (4) and porcelain (5) can be seen in the context of the rising position of the Dutch international luxury trade. By the 1630s, both the VOC and the WIC were well on their way to dominating the international economy.[35] Even though the English East India Company was established in 1600, two years before the Dutch VOC, the importance of the English overseas trade became more significant during the second half of the seventeenth century.[36] In presenting these items to the English court, the States showed their superior 'diligence' in navigation and trade. Someone who was collecting precious items from overseas during this period was Amalia van Solms; she received many presents in her position as consort of the stadholder.[37] In view of Amalia's preferences it can even be speculated that these presents – presented to both the king

and the queen – were aimed at Charles I's wife, Henrietta Maria. From there it is arguable that item 1 was particularly chosen to please Charles since gifts of horses, equipment and carriages were objects of lively exchange among male courtiers.[38]

## The Dutch Gift of 1660

It can generally be said that the gifts made in 1610 and 1636 met the criterion of being either national products or items reflecting the Dutch prominence in luxury trade – as stated in 1636. In 1660, however, the donors seem to represent themselves differently. So far as the gifts of art are concerned, the Republic seems to be making a deep bow to the restored Stuart king, humbly presenting him with what his father had lost: Italian masters. As Helmer Helmers will show in the second part of this paper, this is indeed the interpretation of Orangists authors. Lammertse says that whereas the States General deliberately opted for work by Dutch painters in 1610 and 1636, they apparently considered Charles II's taste for Italian art sufficient reason to deviate from this tradition.[39] From the perspective of the previous gifts, States General seemed to be overruling their tradition of giving items of national pride. In the following I will emphasize that they not only gave art, and show how the paintings given can be see in a different light.

The *Resolutiën* of the States of Holland record a decision to budget the very large sum of 600,000 guilders on the 29 May 1660.[40] Lammertse explains that this money was reserved for a trip already made to Breda, for a banquet in the Mauritshuis and for 'sortable schenkagien ende presenten'.[41] In the following months the gift was brought together. The Resolutiën of the States of Holland and West-Friesland record a decision of 21 July to honour Charles II with a 'costly embroidered bedstead' that would be bought from his sister Mary Stuart for 100.000 guilders.[42] From another contemporary document it is known that with this bed other pieces of bedroom furniture were also given.[43] The bedstead was not of Dutch manufacture. Mary's late husband, William II, had bought it in France when she was expecting William III, the son and heir who was born after his father died in 1650.[44] Beds and furniture were common wedding and engagement gifts.[45] However, the significance of this particular, extremely expensive, item could be read in the context of the renewed bond between Charles and the country over which his father James had claimed dominion and it could have also functioned to remind Charles about his sister's Anglo-Dutch marriage and its fruitful progeny.

A yacht was given to Charles II on behalf of the city of Amsterdam in August. The letter written by the burgomasters of Amsterdam explains that now that the king

was restored he could 'gouster les agreables fruits de l'union et de la paix'.[46] And in September the members of the Sates of Holland and West-Friesland, who were asked to think about other gifts, reported that the king would be pleased with antique pieces and pictures by Italian masters.[47] In May 1660 the Restoration of Charles II was officially announced and on the very same day a committee was established to reconstitute the collection of Charles I's goods, jewels and pictures.[48] Prince Henry had started establishing a royal collection of paintings, sculpture and other objects during the first decade of the century and Charles I's interest in art and collecting was also comparable to that of other European monarchs at the time. He was a great patron of painters and sculptors and his agents were sent all over Europe to buy works of art. Charles collected antique and Renaissance art but mainly seemed to have focused on contemporary works from the Continent. After the king's execution in 1649, his whole collection was sold.[49] Charles II presumably had explicitly asked for this kind of art in 1660.

In 1610 and in 1636 most of the objects given met the criterion of being either 'fruits and products of our Country' or products 'acquired through the diligence of our navigation and trade'. The same is true for the art presented to Charles II in 1660. During the second half of the seventeenth century, a large amount of Italian paintings could be found in only a few Dutch collections.[50] On 17 September 1660, Cornelis van Oudtshoorn bought twenty-four, mainly sixteenth-century, Venetian paintings and twelve classical statues from the famous Reynst collection on behalf of the States of Holland. Over the years the brothers, working closely together with their uncle Jacques Nicquet, built up an enormous art collection by their strategic trade contacts both in Venice and in Amsterdam.[51] By giving the pieces from the Reynst collection the States General not only demonstrated that they had the breadth and sophistication of taste to encompass antiquity and Italian art, but also showed how easily they could acquire these relatively rare items. As such the Italian paintings and antique sculptures can be seen as commodities exemplifying the reach of Dutch trade. Gerard Reynst outlived his brother and died in 1658. In 1660 his widow Anna Schuyt received 80,000 guilders for the items that included works by Bassano, Schiavone, Tintoretto, Titian, Veronese and others.[52]

But the States also added four Dutch pictures to the collection of presents. Presumably, Saenredam's *View of the Groote Kerk of Haarlem* was bought from the Amsterdam burgomaster Andries de Graeff, and three other paintings were bought from Dou. One of them must have been Dou's *The Young Mother*, a second piece may have been a version of Elsheimer's *Mocking of Ceres*, and the third painting remains unidentified.[53] Why did they chose Dou and Saenredam of all the painters available at that time? Gerard Dou (1613–1675) had been trained in Rembrandt's workshop in Leiden, and elite patronage enabled him to specialize

in the very time-consuming and specifically Netherlandish style of 'fine painting'.[54] Pieter Saenredam (1596–1665) was trained in Haarlem by Frans Pietersz. de Grebber and from about 1628 he had specialized in church interiors. He had received royal commissions from the late 1640s onwards and had also worked for the Winter Queen of Bohemia, Charles II's aunt.[55] The States General apparently considered Dou's and Saenredam's work worthy of being placed alongside antique sculptures and paintings by Titian and Veronese. As such, the Dutch paintings in the gift can be seen as a gesture of national pride no less powerful than the other, much more expensive, tokens of esteem that were presented to Charles II.

## Discussion

The total package of presents given in 1660 reveals a distinct presence of Amsterdam. Not only was the yacht given on behalf of the city, but the States of Holland also 'used' the Reynst collection available there. The self-representation is different from the earlier gifts: the majority of the items given in 1610 and 1636 directly or indirectly seem to lead to Haarlem. How can this change be interpreted? Whereas Haarlem was the most important centre for the production of art and crafts at the beginning of the century, Amsterdam had become more important artistically by the middle of the century. Since the presents were given by the States General, the governing body of the Republic, it might also be useful to consider the role and position of both cities in the province of Holland.[56]

The political character of Haarlem and Amsterdam was different. While Amsterdam had formed the heart of the war faction of stadholder Maurits on the eve of the Twelve Years Truce, Haarlem had been part of Oldenbarneveld's peace faction in the States. During the truce the political power of the stadholder increased: from 1621 onwards he was considered the central figure in the government and the truce was not prolonged. The cities continued to have opposing visions on the war with Spain. When in the 1630s the Spanish rulers started negotiating an armistice, Amsterdam and the majority of the cities in Holland supported a new peace treaty. Frederick Henry, though, whose power had risen since he was appointed stadholder in 1625, decided to continue the war after signing an anti-Spanish alliance with France in 1635. Leiden and Haarlem supported him in this move. In the crisis that led up to William II's assault of 1650, Amsterdam turned her back to the Orangist party. During the First Stadholderless Period, the political role of Amsterdam increased to the detriment of Haarlem.

From this perspective it is interesting to see how the States General compiled their major gifts to the English court. During the seventeenth century when the Republic was in the process of establishing itself, the relative power of the cities,

the States General and the stadholders varied greatly. The origin of the presents selected seems to be informed by political dynamics. In 1610 and 1636 the majority of gifts originated from Haarlem, whereas in 1660 Amsterdam was at the centre of attention. Did the States General prefer to express their gratitude for the truce to the English court in 1610 by giving items that were linked to the city that had supported the peace? Did Frederick Henry intentionally ignore Amsterdam in compiling the 1636 gift because of their governmental opposition? And does the 1660 gift represent the unrestricted growth and power of Amsterdam? Or was the importance of economic interests the reason the States General made Amsterdam the centre of attention in 1660, since it was Amsterdam which stood to gain most if Charles II were to repeal the Navigation Act? Even though one can only speculate about this, the parallel between power and representation is striking.

## Appendix I

**Lijste des presens pour le Roij dela Grande Bretagne**[57]

(1) Sept Chevaulx blancs, de carosse, la couverture de velour Rouge Cramoisin, et les brides et l'appareil a dentelles d'Or.
(2) Un Horloge.
(3) Un coffre de perlemour.
(4) Une masse d'Ambregris.
(5) Trois petites Couppes de Spiritus porcelain, lesquelles se cassent quand on y mect du venin dedans.
(6) Un Tableau de Mabuse, d'Adam et Eve, apres la cheute.
(7) Deulx Tableaux de Girard de St. Jean, l'un de Jesus Christ, descendant de la Crois, l'autre des Reliques de St. Jehan Baptiste.
(8) Un Tableau de St. Hierosme, de Lucas de Leijden.
(9) Deulx grandes pieces de damas pour Nappes.
(10) Un Tableau en brodderie, fait avecq l'Esguille.
(11) Six douzaines de Serviettes de damas.
(12) Quatre pieces de damas, longues deux cens-quinze aulnes.
(13) Six pieces fines de Cambraij.
(14) Deux pieces de Toille fines.
(15) Deux aultres pieces de Toille fort fines.

## II. A KINGLY FOLLY? THE GIFT CONTEXTUALIZED (BY HELMER HELMERS)

The Dutch Gift of 1660 was no ordinary congratulatory tribute from one sovereign body to another. In total more than six hundred thousand guilders, the equivalent of about 30 million euros today,[58] were spent on the House of Stuart.

For the bourgeois Republic, that was extravagant indeed. In this article I ask the question why the Dutch were so conspicuously generous in that summer of 1660. Most people, then and now, would after all agree that it was not exactly in their nature to be so. Even in November 1659, on the eve of the Restoration, John Evelyn made the Dutch ambassador Nieupoort 'acknowledge that his nation mind only their own profit, do nothing out of gratitude, but collaterally as it relates to their gain, or security'.[59] Nieupoort's confession is but one indication that there must have been very good reasons for the generous atmosphere one year later.

While the magnificence of the Gift has ensured a steady stream of scholarly attention, explanations for the regents' conspicuous generosity are scarce. To some, perhaps, the question may seem to be self-evident and therefore of little interest. Lammertse and Van der Veen, for example, dismiss it in one sentence when they note that 'it was customary in the seventeenth century to honour foreign princes of countries that were of importance to Dutch trade with valuable objects'.[60] It is usually assumed that the aims of the Dutch givers were identical to the objectives of the States General's embassy that was sent to England on 26 November 1660.[61] In this interpretation, the Dutch Gift was meant to smooth the States General's ambassadors' mission: to obtain an Anglo-Dutch alliance on terms that would favour Dutch trade. This view is all too attractive (after all, it was the ambassadors who presented the gift at Charles's court) and it should be clear from the outset that I do not wish to challenge the argument. Israel admirably shows that trade interest was undoubtedly in the regents' minds when they decided to endow Charles II with a substantial gift.[62] Yet, from the perspective of self-representation, I think that the case was more complex.

I want to suggest that the Gift's grandeur may be even better understood if seen from the perspective of party strife within the Dutch Republic that was greatly influenced by the Restoration. In the following, I shall therefore first sketch the political context in the summer of 1660 to establish the connection and to show how much the givers of the Gift had to fear from the Restoration. As we shall see, this approach might throw some more light on the argument made by Inge Broekman in this issue: Amsterdam, I believe, was much more prominent in the Dutch Gift than it had been in earlier gifts, because the city had been sympathizing with the States Party for the past decade. By way of conclusion, I shall show how the Gift and political presents in general figured large in the propaganda battle that ensued between the Orangists and the States Party.

## The Restoration and Dutch politics

The Restoration of Charles II was widely celebrated in the Dutch Republic. Travel-

ling from Breda, where he had accepted the English crown, to Scheveningen, where he was to depart for England, Charles was abundantly feasted, as appears, for example, in William Lower's *Relation in form of Journal* (1660), the well-known description of Charles's journey through the Netherlands.[63] Lower shows himself rather disappointed by the fact that the King's triumphant entry in the Hague on 25 May was not 'made with an extraordinary pomp and glory, worthy so great a Monarch,' but he comforts his readers by asserting that 'it was impossible to make greater preparations, in the time the King had appointed for it' and that, despite the unexceptional shows, 'the crowd was so great, because the curiosity to see this miraculous Prince, had drawn a great part of the inhabitants of the neighbour towns to this entrance'.[64] A week later, during the night before Charles departure to England, The Hague was still so crammed with people that, in Lower's words,

> there was, in a manner, no night between Tuesday and Wednesday; particularly for those, who finding no hole to put their heads, because the houses not being able to lodge the crowd of people, which ran there from all the neighbour Towns, the most part were constrained to walk the streets.[65]

In Holland, the Relation concludes, 'the person of his Majesty was no less dear then in his Kingdom'.[66]

This assertion is not to be dismissed as a panegyrist's fantasy, for Lower is not the only reporter of Charles' popularity in Holland. It is also evidenced by the fact that the Restoration was a major subject in many genres in 1660–61. Sermons, portraying the Restoration as an act of divine providence, stimulated people's enthusiasm. Several biographies and histories of Charles appeared.[67] But in poetry the Stuart Restoration was even more prominent. In 1660 alone, more than 80 celebratory poems were written, by all the major and many minor poets of the period.[68] They were published as broadsides, but also in more expensive collections like *Engelsche triomph* and *Herstelde zeegtriomf van Karel de Tweede*.[69] Lambert van den Bosch even wrote an epic (one of the very few Dutch epics of the period) featuring Charles as its hero, the *Britannias* (1661).[70] 'It seems,' the literary scholar Te Winkel wrote somewhat unbelievingly, noting Charles II's prominence in the Dutch literature of 1660–61, 'as if Orangist and States' Party authors in that time knew of nothing better to do but to compete in honouring this rising sun, the characterless, immoral English King'.[71]

Whether one shares Te Winkel's disapproval of Charles or not, considering the Restoration's impact on party strife in the Republic, the jubilant atmosphere in 1660 is indeed remarkable for its univocality. For the Republic was as far removed from unison as it had been in years. In fact, as Pieter Geyl and Jonathan Israel

explain, the Restoration rekindled the struggle between the Orangist and States parties that had subsided since the death of William II in 1650.[72] Charles, being the uncle of of the ten year old William III of Orange, was widely expected to use his power to improve William's position in the Republic. Some Orangists, carried away by their enthusiasm, even fancied that William would become the monarch of the United Provinces once the house of Stuart had been restored. This appears for example from a poem by one Daniel Jonktijs, one of those who had predicted that Charles's Restoration would make his nephew 'our sovereign'.[73] Many like him were hoping the same thing. One restored Prince, they reasoned, might help restore another.

Orangists' expectations were even raised during Charles' journey through the Republic, when he urged both the States General and the States of Holland to look after the interests of his sister and nephew.[74] As it turned out, to De Witt's relief, Charles eventually refused to become William's sole guardian, and the designation (as Stadholder of Holland) and the education of William III were to be contested for years to come.[75] In the Spring and Summer of 1660, however, nobody could foresee Charles's reluctance in the business of his nephew, and his support for the Orangist cause seemed serious enough to worry the Wittian regents in Holland. It was, after all, the States of Holland, led by Amsterdam, that had been the prime combattants of both Orangist ambition and Stuart hope in the last ten years. Not forgotten was Amsterdam's opposition to William II's plans to come to Stuart's aid in 1650. Not forgotten was Charles' being expelled from the Republic by Johan de Witt in 1653. But an even more painful wound was the Act of Seclusion of 1654, the annexe to the peace treaty of Westminster that had excluded the House of Orange from the Stadholderate of Holland and from the Captaincy-General on the instigation of Oliver Cromwell. Significantly, the Act of Seclusion had been concluded separately from the regular peace negotiations (that involved the Protector and the States General) between the Protectorate and the States of Holland. Now Charles had been restored, the threat to the States party of Holland (and Amsterdam) seemed all too real: having slighted Charles in the 1650s first by refusing to support the royalist cause and by remaining neutral, then by expelling him from the Republic's soil and finally by adopting the Act of Seclusion, they had every reason to fear the wrath of the new English monarch in 1660. On top of that, they were confronted with ecstatic Orangist crowds. Of course, they looked both for a means to appease him, and to keep popular unrest under control.

Te Winkel, then, signalled a problem that seems all too real: if Charles was the Orangists' champion, why did even Wittian authors, like Jan Vos and Joachim Oudaen, join in the festivities? Why did they contribute to his popularity, to his heroic aura, if this would weaken the Wittian position? In part the answer to these

questions should be that those authors had been supporters of Stuart ever since the execution of Charles I in 1649. From that moment onwards, Dutch public opinion had been almost universally royalist.[76] As long as Charles II was a powerless wanderer, supporting him, often for the sake of his martyred father, was politically harmless. In the summer of 1660, however, as Charles suddenly gained power, such support was no longer detached from domestic party strife. One could therefore argue that the authors in question did not perceive any harm being done to the Wittian cause by eulogizing Charles; they were just doing what they had been doing for years. I am inclined to this view, yet I think we should go even further: the eulogists that tripped over each other in the wake of the Restoration, were appropriating Charles for their party as much as they were singing his praise.

The desire to appropriate Charles and his family is apparent in the behaviour of the States and the city of Amsterdam throughout the summer of 1660. It explains, for instance, why De Witt had been eager to invite Charles to travel via Holland, in April, and why his brother, Cornelis, even brought a toast to William at the feast that was organised by the States (see below).[77] It also explains why the burgomasters in Amsterdam were so anxious to have Charles visit their city: it would give them the occasion to show the Orangist mob that he was the regents' hero too. Parading in harmony with Charles would be the ideal propaganda to quell any Orangist aspirations. Charles's choice of The Hague as his final destination was, from this perspective, politically sensitive.

The Dutch Gift, too, should be interpreted from the perspective of the Orangist-Wittian struggle of 1660–1. In the remainder of this article, I shall first argue that the funding and the acquisition of the Gift indicate an improvised attempt at damage control on behalf of the States of Holland and the city of Amsterdam. Then I shall point out how the polemic about the Gift in popular print reflects the Orangist-Wittian struggle to appropriate Stuart.

## Assembling the Gift

The decision to endow the House of Stuart with a major gift was taken on Saturday 29 May, when the States of Holland voted to reserve the enormous amount of 600,000 guilders to cover the expenses made during the king's journey through Holland and to provide 'sortable schenkagien ende presenten' ['appropriate gifts and presents'] for the King and his family.[78] The journey itself was costly enough. Charles was particularly impressed with the 'most magnifick and stately feast' the States of Holland prepared 'at Prince Maurice his House' on Sunday, 30 May.[79] Sitting under a canopy, the King enjoyed a rich dinner during which he

was entertained with music and fireworks, which were shot from a boat on the 'Viver' 'to the divertisement of the people, the whole night'. The costs were, of course, considerable. Lower writes:[80]

> It is forbidden me to speak of the expence, but I think I may alledge here the person of the King, and affirm, that he said the next day […] that he never better supped, then the day he arrived at the Hage, and that in all the feasts which were made, as well in France as Spain, in Germany and in the Low-Countries […]he saw nothing come neer that, wherewith the Estates of Holland had entertained him the day before.

By an admittedly crude calculation we may infer that the States spent somewhere between 100,000 and 200,000 guilders only to accommodate and entertain the King and his retinue during their journey through Holland.[81] When Amelis van Boeck-horst, lord Wimmenum, told the King on Monday 31 May that the States were desirous to give him some 'rarities' from their province before his departure, Charles's polite answer that he needed 'no other assurances of the affection of the Lords the Estates of Holland' than the ones they had already given him, may therefore have been as sincere as it was polite.

Presents, however, he and his family would have. Once the budget was fixed, it had to be spent. During the same evening Wimmenum raised the subject in Charles' presence, he presented the King's brothers, Henry, duke of Gloucester, and James, duke of York, with cheques worth 75,000 guilders each.[82] Previously, on 24 May, the day on which he had left Breda, Charles had already been offered a yacht by Cornelis van Vlooswijck on behalf of the city of Amsterdam. 'The King,' Lower writes about that occasion,[83] 'accepted it not absolutely, but declined not so strongly' to deter Vlooswijck from obtaining it for him. Three weeks after the King's departure (2 June), on 21 June, the States of Holland resolved to buy the bed that William II had given to Mary Stuart when she had been expecting in 1650. They were willing to 'present and honour' Mary with 100,000 guilders in return. Again Wimmenum was charged with the transaction, which he rounded off successfully. On 20 July, he reported that the Princess Royal had accepted the States' request, and that she had expressed her thanks.[84] The use of the expression 'present and honour'[85] and the gratitude of the Princess Royal may help to explain why the bed was so outrageously expensive. In all probability, the States' acquiring this particular gift for the King of England, was a veiled way of subsidizing his sister.[86]

Still it was not enough. With the States General's embassy to England drawing near, the Committed Council of the States of Holland sent a letter to Cornelis van Oudshoorn on 2 September, in which they wrote that the King had expressed a

preference for 'antique pieces and [pieces] of Italian masters'. Oudshoorn was asked to sound the widow of Gerard Reynst, who was known to possess one of the few collections that included such works, if she would be willing to sell a part of her collection 'at a just price'.[87] A fortnight later, Oudshoorn answered that he had obtained 'the most rare pieces' at the price of 80.000 guilders. The Gift was now complete. On 26 November (NS) the bed and the paintings were presented in the Banqueting Hall, where they were very much praised.[88]

The main purpose of my reconstructing the Gift is to emphasize that it did not consist only of the paintings and statues. In monetary value, these were not even the principal parts. The principal part, whether it was a veiled subsidy or not, was the bed. And this bed was, of course, highly symbolic. It was iconic of the wedding between William II and Mary in 1641, it referred to the birth of their son (Mary was meant to give birth in it), and, by extension, it emphasized the bonds between Orange and Stuart. The bed may even have hinted at a future wedding between a Princess of Orange and Charles II.[89] Whereas the paintings were chosen for aesthetic reasons, the bed was a clear message that these bonds were considered important and that they would be respected.

The above is also meant to stress that the Gift was not financed by the States General, as would have been customary, but by the States of Holland and the city of Amsterdam.[90] While the Gift is often associated with the embassy that carried it to London, from a perspective of self-representation, the distinction is essential. The Gift was an initiative of exactly those political bodies that had obstructed Stuart and Orange in the previous decade. What is more, the manner in which this was done suggests that the Gift was very much an improvised affair. With apparent haste and thinly veiled anxiety, the States carried out an entire programme to honour the House of Stuart: Charles, his brothers, and the Princess Royal. The bed, with all its connotations with Orange, suggests that their desire to give was inspired at least as much by considerations of party strife, as by trade. Rather than trying to impress Charles with lavish gifts, the States and Amsterdam were showing their fear and their weakness.

## Interpreting the Gift

One can, of course, only speculate on the intentions the States of Holland and the city of Amsterdam had when they gave Charles their valuable presents. It is a fact, however, that in contemporary reactions to the Gift, it is almost invariably drawn into a discourse of fear, corruption, and party strife. As we shall see, especially Orangist commentators were very sensitive to the supposed political motivations behind the Gift. By no means, however, was this interpretation confined to

Orangists. Even the States party partisan Pieter de la Court assumed that fear was the prime reason behind the Gift.

The most famous comment on the Gift, Vondel's *Kunstkroon voor de Koningk van groot Britanje* (1660), seems to be an exception. Undoubtedly commissioned by Simon van Hoorn, burgomaster of Amsterdam and one of the ambassadors, the poem portrays the Gift as an expression of Holland's 'Love' and 'Loyalty' towards Charles.[91] In Vondel's rendering, 'Holland's art gift' was very much a gesture of the people of Holland, who were united in their admiration for Charles. The poem even strikes a religious note. When Vondel writes that the Gift will enable the King to see 'het hart des offraers', he strongly suggests that the Gift is a sacrifice to the deified English monarch. Such a reading of 'offraers' (givers or sacrificers) concurs with the religious devotion that Vondel and many of his fellow-countrymen had shown for Charles II. Vondel's assurance that the gift came right from the sincere heart of the givers did not only reflect his own enthusiasm, it also suited the official line of propaganda that had to contain the Orangist revival of 1660. By conflating the Stuart-minded people with the government, it made things look as if the Gift was indeed an act of gratefulness, while in reality, as I have tried to show, the Gift was much more of an apologetic nature, a desperate measure rather than anything else.

Orangist commentators, by contrast, never separate the Gift from party strife. They emphasize that the Gift symbolized the regents' change of heart, and they fiercely resisted any interpretation of the Gift that made it an expression of gratitude on behalf of the people. In 1660 and 1661, Orangist pamphlets continually point out the hypocrisy of the Wittian leadership of Holland, which, they argued, had always ignored vigilant public opinion in favour of Stuart, while they had now suddenly become his greatest admirers. As a tailor argues in the immensely popular pamphlet *The Turned Coat of Holland* (1660), the regents 'bring presents, caress the Dukes of York and Colchester [Gloucester], and embrace the Princess Royal, so that through her intercession […] the past may be forgotten'. 'How many millions were not spent,' he continues, 'to redress at the expense of the community that which one had rejected and scandalized?'[92] The Gift, on this account, is meant to allow the past to be forgotten.

Orangist arguing against the Gift denounced political gifts in general by designating them as typical products of the corrupt regent culture (as opposed to a 'pure' monarchist culture).[93] In a 1660 dialogue between Charles II and his brother James, the Duke of York, Charles asks his brother what he should do with the Dutch embassy. In his answer, James stipulates that if he had been King, he would not accept gifts or presents. 'How many bad and unjust things are done with gifts,' he exclaims, and he continues to explain that

> many illustrous Greeks deemed it irreputable and improper that a royal diadem should be disgraced by gifts and presents, because via taxes and impositions a sovereign King disposes over as much money as he desires, to buy that which is agreeable and serviceable to him. To receive gifts from those with whom one has to negotiate, cannot but create injurious effects.[94]

According to James, in his capacity as the mouthpiece of Orangist discomfort, a monarchy is not as liable to corruption as a Republic. But even though a King 'disposes over as much money as he desires' and is therefore incorruptable, he should abstain from accepting gifts, because he has to mind the fact that he is an example to his advisers. Apparently, it was widely known that James had received a considerable gift himself, as the James in the pamphlet acknowledges as much. He assures his brother, however, that this was very much against his heart.

The point the Orangist authors keep hammering home, however confused their arguments sound, is the propensity of their regents to bribe and be bribed. This lingered in their readers' minds, since corruption scandals about gifts and presents had frequently occurred in the 1650s.[95] The same ideas about corruption underlie a pamphlet about a conference in hell between Cromwell, Mazarin, Karl Gustav of Sweden and John de Witt, in which the three dead leaders and De Witt discuss the present state of Europe. During their conference, the character 'Cromwel' also emphasizes the corrupt nature of Dutch regents, when he compares the Dutch Gift to the great gifts Turkish ministers send to their emperor in order to avoid punishment when they have made a fatal mistake. To further characterize the regents' opportunism, Cromwell adds that despite his own tyranny and his robberies, the regents often gave him money. 'What won't they do in the just case of King Charles and the interest of his nephew!', he exclaims. He comforts his Orangist readers, however, by completing the analogy. 'The Great Turke,' he argues, 'knows that those gifts are bought with the blood and sweat of their subjects, and are not of great interest to the givers.' Despite the presents, the emperor usually wields the unbelievers' sword of justice to punish the flatterers. Likewise, Cromwell concludes, the Dutch Gifts will not help to further De Witt's ends.[96]

Time after time, the Orangist pamphleteers contradict Vondel and show that the Dutch Gift did *not* show the loyal heart of the givers. They either emphasize corruption, or they contend that De Witt and his clique feigned friendship to Orange and the English monarch in order to delay the 'restoration' of William III, as they call it (delay, because as soon as the times will change, the feigned friendship will vanish again, they argue). Interestingly, pamphlets do not focus on the paintings that feature so prominently in modern scholarly texts about the Dutch Gift. Perhaps taking their cue from the *Hollandtsche Mercurius*, which only mentions

that '[t]he King was honoured with a bedstead and appurtenances of 90,000 guilders and 8,000 guilders worth of *Harlem* linnen', it is the bedstead that draws the attention.[97] As we have seen, the bed symbolized the wedding between Orange and Stuart, and by extension the bond between the Republic and England. For the Orangist author of one pamphlet, however, it meant something completely different. When it is asked why there were four ambassadors with such a great train of followers,[98] the answer goes, 'Well, they have to come with many to carry their gift, put up their wonderful bedstead, and make the bed, so that the principal issue, the indignations against your royal majesty and the interest of the prince, may be laid to rest'.

Remarkably, even a States Party theorist such as Pieter de la Court admits that the Gift originated in fear, and he, too, discusses it in the context of corruption. De la Court's conclusion is of course exactly opposite: a republic was in his view less corruptible because competing regents would at least correct one another, while in a monarchy such a mechanism was absent, and courtiers would vie with each other for gifts and favours from the monarch. Despite this difference of opinion about gift culture, one passage in De la Court's work that seems to be directly inspired by the Dutch Gift of 1660, shows some remarkable similarities with the Orangist pamphlets. 'It is strange,' De la Court wrote in 1662,[99]

> that any Supreme Powers should imagine that they can oblige a formidable Sovereign Prince to gratitude for Benefits received without any preceding promises, impoverishing themselves by Liberalitys, in order to enrich and strengthen those they fear: For we ought always to presume, that Kings will ever esteem themselves obliged to any thing but their own Grandeur and Pleasure, which they endeavour to obtain, without any regard to Love, Hatred or Gratitude.

Like the Orangist pamphleteers, De la Court presumes that a king's gratitude cannot be bought, the king cannot be obliged, for he is always bound to pursue his own grandeur and pleasure. De la Court's take on the subject, however, is radically different from the Orangist assertion that a king is incorruptible. In De la Court's mind, the fact that the gratitude of a king cannot be ascertained, only goes to prove that a king is not to be trusted. Significantly, De la Court uses the same religious vocabulary as Vondel when he describes the folly of giving valuable presents to a feared sovereign:

> […] it is cursed religion which teacheth men to sacrifice to the Devil, that he may do them no mischief; we may likewise say, that nothing less than the utmost despair can reasonably induce a Government to discover its own weakness to a dreaded Neighbour, and to make him stronger by giving him

> Mony to buy off a feared Evil, which ought to be resisted by the best Arms, and most vigorous Efforts; according to the Spanish Proverb, To give to Kings is a Kingly, that is, a monstrous great Folly: for the holy Wood, the blunt Cross of Prayers and Remonstrances, is of small force among men of Power; and the Mony sacrificed to the Idol of Gratitude, is yet of less value.

In this States party text – if we apply the passage, as I think we should, to the Dutch Gift of 1660 – Charles has become a devil rather than Vondel's godly creature, and the States were only showing their weakness when they tried to gain his good will through a gift. Vondel's language of sacrifice and gratitude is here utterly subverted, and the Gift is turned into foolish idolatry. De la Court's judgment about tributes to neighbouring Princes, indicates that he thought the Gift to have been a mistake.

This view quickly gained currency.[100] However much the Dutch perception of the Gift was subjected to the Orangist-Wittian struggle of 1660/1661, after Charles' confirmation of the Navigation Act and on the eve of the Second Anglo-Dutch War, the ranks closed. While Orangist authors before had focused on the corrupt hearts of the givers, now, as in De la Court, the heart of the receiver came to be scrutinized. Unthankfulness became a central theme in anti-English pamphleteering. As one poet put it,[101]

> Behold the terrible reward our state begot
> All honours, money, happiness, and hospitality
> Stuart, so rapidly restored, so soon forgot!

Orangist or Wittian, after 1662 all agreed that the Dutch Gift had been a waste.

## Bibliography

Anon., *Bloemkrans van verscheiden gedichten, door eenige liefhebbers der Poëzij bij een verzamelt*. Amsterdam 1659.

Baer, R., 'The Life and Art of Gerrit Dou', in R. Baer (ed.), *Gerrit Dou: master painter in the age of Rembrandt*. New Haven, London 2000.

Blom, H., 'Les réactions hollandaises à l'exécution de Charles I. "Monarchie" et "république" dans les Provinces-Unies après 1649'. Manuscript.

Bosch, L. van den, *Britannias of herstelde majesteyt, heldendicht*. Dordrecht 1661.

Broekman, I., Unwrapping the Gift: Dutch Self-representation in Three Major Gifts from the States General to the English court. M. A. thesis, Univ. Coll. London, 2005.

Bruyn, J. and O. Millar, 'Notes on the Royal Collection – III: The 'Dutch Gift' to Charles I', *Burlington Magazine*, 104 (1962), pp. 291–294.

Bueren, T., van *Macht en onderhorigheid binnen de Ridderlijke Orde van Sint Jan. De commandeursportretten uit het Sint Jansklooster te Haarlem*. Haarlem 1991.

Burgers, C. A., *17e eeuws tafellinnen met Bijbelse, Historische en Heraldische motieven*. Den Bosch 1959.

Châtelet, A., *Early Dutch Painting: painting in the northern Netherlands in the fifteenth century*. Oxford 1980.

Court, P. de la, *The true interest and political maxims of the Republick of Holland and West-Friesland*. In three parts. London, 1702.

Davis, N. Z., *The gift in sixteenth-century France*. Oxford 2000.

Deursen, A. Th. van, *Het kopergeld van de Gouden Eeuw. Vol. I: Het dagelijks brood*. Assen 1978.

Dodt van Flensburg, J. J., *Archief voor Kerkelijke en Wereldsche geschiedenissen inzonderheid van Utrecht*. Ve Deel. Utrecht 1846.

Evelyn, J. *Diary and Correspondence*. Vol. 1. Edited by William Bray. London 1883. Available on Tufts Digital Library: <http://nils.lib.tufts.edu/>.

Franits, W. (ed.), *Realism reconsidered: looking at seventeenth century Dutch art*. Cambridge 1997.

Friedländer, M. J. *Geertgen tot Sint Jans and Jerome Bosch*. Leiden, Brussels 1969.

Geest, T. J. Amalia van *Solms en de Nederlandsche politiek van 1625 tot 1648. Bijdrage tot de kennis van het tijdvak van Frederik Hendrik*. Baarn 1909.

Gelder, J. G. 'Notes on the Royal Collection – IV: The 'Dutch Gift' of 1610 to Henry, Prince of 'Whales', and Some Other Presents', *Burlington Magazine*, 105 (1963), pp. 541–545.

Geyl, P., *Orange and Stuart, 1641–1672*. London 1969.

Giltaij, J. and J. Kelch, *Lof der Zeevaart. De Hollandse zeeschilders van de 17e eeuw*. Rotterdam, Berlin 1996.

Goedde, L. O., *Tempest and Shipwreck in Dutch and Flemish Art*. Pennsylvania, London 1989.

Haan, R. L., *The treatment of England and English affairs in the Dutch Pamphlet Literature, 1640–1660*. Ph. D. Diss. Univ. of Michigan 1960.

Haitsma-Mulier, E. O. G. 'The History of Great Britain as seen by the Dutch of the Seventeenth Century: A Chapter from the History of Historiography', in S. Groenveld and M. Wintle (eds.), *The exchange of ideas. Religion, scholarship and art in Anglo-Dutch relations in the seventeenth century*. Zutphen 1991, pp. 133–149.

Helmers, H. J. 'Dees verwarde tijden. Koning David en Koning Karel hersteld'. Neerlandistiek.nl (2007). <http://www.neerlandistiek.nl/>.

't Hooft, C. G., 'Een geschenk van Amsterdam aan Karel II van England in 1660', *Genootschap Amstelodamum*, 19 (1921), pp. 1–13.

Hornstein, S. R., *The Restoration Navy and English Foreign Trade 1674–1688*. Aldershot 1991.

Israel, J., *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall. 1477–1806*. Oxford 1995.

Keblusek, *Boeken in de Hofstad. Haagse boekcultuur in de Gouden Eeuw*. Hilversum 1997.

Kooijmans, L. and C. Misset 'Opstand, regentenbewind en politieke cultuur. Van Rebellen

tot "Koningen in Eigen Huis"', in T. de Nijs and E. Beukers (eds.), *Deel II: Geschiedenis van Holland 1572–1795*. Hilversum 2002.

Knuttel, W. P. C. *Catalogus van de pamfletten-verzameling berustende in de Koninkljke Bibliotheek*. Utrecht 1978.

Lammertse, F., 'Gerrit Uylenburgh, kunsthandelaar en schilder te Amsterdam en Londen', in F. Lammertse and J. van der Veen, Uylenburgh & Zoon. Zwolle, Amsterdam, pp. 61–115.

Leupe, P. A. 'Brief van de Gezanten in Engeland aan de raadpensionaris', *Nederlandsche Spectator* (1878), pp. 82–83.

Leupe, P. A. 'Schilderijen en statueten voor Karel de Tweede, Koning van Engeland', *Nederlandsche Spectator* (1876), pp. 184–186.

Levey, M., *The later Italian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. Cambridge, 1991, 19641.

Logan, A. S., *The 'Cabinet' of the brothers Gerard and Jan Reynst*. Amsterdam, Oxford, New York 1979.

Lower, W., *Relation in form of Journal, of the Voiage and Residence Which the most Excellent and most Mighty Prince Charls the II. King of Great Britain, &c. Hath made in Holland, from the 25 of May, to the 2 of June, 1660*. London 1660.

Lugt, F. 'Italiaansche kunstwerke in Nederlandsche verzamelingen van vroeger tijden', *Oud-Holland*, 53 (1936), p. 97–135.

Mahon, D., 'Notes on the 'Dutch Gift' to Charles II: I' and 'Notes […]: II', *Burlington Magazine* 91 (1949), pp. 303–305, 349–350.

Mahon, D., 'Notes on the 'Dutch Gift' to Charles II: III', *Burlington Magazine* 92 (1950), pp. 12–18 and 'The 'Dutch Gift' to Charles II', *Burlington Magazine* 92 (1950), p. 238.

Millar, O., *The Age of Charles I: painting in England, 1620–1640*. London 1972.

Millar, O., *The Pictures in the Collection of H. M. the Queen. Pt. 1. The Tudor, Stuart and Early Georgian Pictures*. London 1963.

Millar, O., *The Queen's Pictures*. London 1984, 19771.

Millar, O., (ed.) *Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I by Abraham van der Doort*. Walpole Society XXXVII (1958–1960), Glasgow 1960.

Mitchell, D. M., *Fine table linen in England 1450–1750*. London 1999.

Peck, L. L., *Court patronage and corruption in early Stuart England*. Boston, London 1990.

Ploeg, P. van der and C. Vermeeren (red.), *Vorstelijk Verzameld. De kunstcollectie van Frederik Hendrik en Amalia*. Zwolle 1997.

Ree-Scholtens, G. F. van der (ed.), *Deugd boven Geweld. Een geschiedenis van Haarlem, 1245–1995*. Hilversum 1995.

Reid, W. 'The Present of Spain', *Connoisseur*, 146 (1960), pp. 21–26.

Russell, M., *Visions of the Sea: Hendrick C. Vroom and the origins of Dutch Marine Painting*. Leiden 1983.

Schendel, A. van, *Het Nederlandse geschenk aan koning Karel II van Engeland 1660*. Amsterdam 1965.

Schwartz, G. and M. J. Bok, *Pieter Saenredam: the painter and his time*. London 1990.

Sluijter, E. J. 'Schilders van 'cleyne, subtile ende curieuse dingen'. Leidse 'fijnschilders' in contemporaine bronnen', in E. J. Sluijter, M. Enklaar, P. Nieuwenhuizen, *Leidse Fijnschilders: van Gerrit Dou tot Frans van Mieris de Jonge 1630–1760*. Zwolle, pp. 14–55.

Smit, W. A. P., 'De epen van Lambert van Bos', in Kalliope in *de Nederlanden: het Renaissancistisch-klassicistische epos van 1550–1850*. Part 1. Assen 1975, pp. 445–528.

Spierdijk, C., *Horloges and horlogemakers*. Amsterdam 1973.

Strong, R., Henry, *Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*. New York 1986.

Troost, W., *Stadhouder-koning Willem III: een politieke bibliografie*. Hilversum 2001, pp. 40–55.

Vondel, J. van den, *De werken van Vondel. Negende deel 1660–1663*. Ed. J. F. M. Sterck, H. W. E. Moller, C. G. N. de Vooys, C. R. de Klerk, B. H. Molkenboer, J. Prinsen J. Lzn., L. Simons, C. C. van de Graft, L. C. Michels, J. D. Meerwaldt en A. A. Verdenius. Amsterdam 1936. See also <http://www.dbnl.nl/>.

Walsh, J., 'The Dutch Marine Painters Jan and Julius Porcellis – 1 Jan's Early Career', *Burlington Magazine*, 116 (1974), pp. 653–662.

Westerbaen, J., *Het derde deel der gedichten van Jacob Westerbaen*. Den Haag 1672.

Whinney, M., *Sculpture in Britain 1530–1830*. Revised by Johan Physick. London 1988, 19641.

White, C., *The Dutch pictures in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen*. Cambridge 1982.

Winkel, J. te, *De ontwikkelingsgang der Nederlandsche letterkunde. Deel IV: Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde van de Republiek der Vereenigde Nederlanden.* Haarlem 1924. <http://www.dbnl.nl/>.

Wood, J. 'Taste and Connoisseurship at the Court of Charles I: Inigo Jones and the Work of Giulio Romano', in E. Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts*. Gloucestershire 2000, pp. 118–140.

Wroughton, J. *The Stuart Age, 1603–1714*. London, New York 1997.

## Notes

1. After the publication of some primary documents by Leupe (1876) and (1878), Mahon (1949) and (1950) was the first to focus on the contents of the 'Dutch Gift' of 1660. Though we have not found the first use of the term 'Dutch Gift' for the 1660 transaction, it clearly predates Mahon's articles.
2. For the most detailed overviews of the presents given in 1660, see Logan (1979), pp. 75–81 and Lammertse (2006), pp. 64–70.
3. Mahon (1949) and (1950), Bruyn and Millar (1962), Millar (ed. 1984), pp. 47–48, White (1982), pp. xxxiv–xxxv and Wood (2000), p. 118.
4. This part of the article formed part of a thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the MA degree at the University of London in 2005. This thesis was written to finish the MA in Dutch Golden Age at Univerisity College London, and was

supervised by Dr. Joanna Woodall (Courtauld Institute of Art) and Prof. Dr. Benjamin Kaplan (University College London). Here I would like to thank them both for their help. Furthermore I would like to thank Jacquelyn Coutré for editing my part of this article.

5. See Van Gelder (1963) on what he called the 'Dutch Gift' of 1610.
6. See Bruyn and Millar (1962) on what they called the 'Dutch Gift' of 1636.
7. Whereas the Dutch Gifts of 1610 and 1636 were given by the States General, the Gift of 1660 was an assembly of presents from different parties: the States of Holland, West-Friesland and Amsterdam. Since they were presented to the King by representatives of the States General and functioned in a network of gift-giving, I will examine the representation in the same context.
8. Van Gelder (1963) was the first to discuss the different gifts in relation to each other. He though focusses on the paintings only. See also Lammertse (2006) who recently discussed the gifts in this context. I deny an historical link: there does not seem to be any contemporary evidence supporting the claim that the three Dutch gifts were explicit and intended repetitions of each other.
9. Dodt van Flensburg (1846), p. 19: his 'succession is certain', his 'friendship [is] needed by this country'.
10. Millar (ed. 1984), p. 25.
11. *Idem*.
12. Millar (1960), p. xiii-xvi, p. 196, Van Gelder (1963), p. 542.
13. Van Gelder suggests that the *Sea Storm* was a piece by another Haarlem marine painter, Jan Porcellis (1584/87–1632): Van Gelder (1963), p. 543. White supports the claim that the *Sea Storm* must have been by Porcellis but argues that it is not the one described in the inventory of the royal collection: White (1982), p. xv. Arguing that Porcellis was 'totally unknown' at that time, Russell says it must have been a work by Vroom that was given by the States General to the English court in 1610: Russell (1983), pp. 162–164. Walsh (1974) and Strong (1986) do not question Van Gelder's attribution.
14. Dodt van Flensburg (1846), p. 19: 'to buy those two paintings by Vroom, of Haarlem'.
15. *Idem*: 'some good paintings by the best masters that are in this land'.
16. Russell (1983), pp. 116–137.
17. For the historical interpretation see Israel (ed. 1996), pp. 440–441 and for the art historical significance of the depiction of this battle, see Daalder (p. 42) and Giltaij and Kelch (105–112) in their 1996 study.
18. In this gift, the Battle seems to have functioned exactly as Goedde explains paintings with a public function do, to underline national pride and identity, and to position themselves in the present: Goedde in Giltaij and Kelch (1996), p. 65.
19. Goedde in Giltaij and Kelch (1996), pp. 69–73. See also Goedde (1989). The question of whether or not moral messages can be read into Dutch seventeenth-century painting has been the subject of a still continuing discussion. For an overview of interpretations in general, see Franits (1997).

20. Russell (1983), pp. 68–71.
21. Russell illustrates this by Vroom's pendant pieces *The Battle of Cadiz*, 1596 and *The Great Sea Storm* now both in an English collection: Russell (1983), pp. 153–154.
22. Bruyn and Millar (1962), p. 292.
23. Bruyn and Millar (1962), pp. 292–293: 'with appropriate comments saying these [presents] were fruits of such a field as could bring forth nothing but signs of affection and willing obedience'.
24. Bruyn and Millar (1962), p. 292: 'horses, pictures, linen, the piece of needle-work etc. were fruits and products of our country and the rest acquired through the diligence of our navigation and trade'.
25. Mitchell (1999), pp. 27–29. The States General had commissioned from Passchier Lammertijn (the most famous weaver who fled from Kortrijk to Haarlem at the end of the sixteenth century) various royal presents in the past, including tapestries given to English courtiers within the broader context of the Dutch gift of 1610: Burgers (1959), pp. 4–6.
26. The first documents date from the second half of the 16th century. Another important centre of clockmaking in the Republic from 1600 onwards was Leeuwarden: Spierdijk (1973), pp. 1–8, 98–99.
27. Bruyn and Millar (1962), p. 292. These paintings are currently in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, inv. nr. 991.
28. Only the right wing of the altarpiece, with *The Lamentation* on the inside and *The Legend* on the outside, survived the iconoclast attacks of the end of the sixteenth century: Friedländer (1969), pp. 11–30; Châtelet (1980), 93–120.
29. Bruyn and Millar (1962) explain when these paintings must have left the English royal collection. Van Schendel (1965) says the Jerome is identified with the piece by Aertgen van Leyden now in the Rijksmuseum Amsterdam (SK-A-3903) and the Adam and Eve is thought to be the painting by Gossaert in the Hampton Court collection (on loan to the National Galery London).
30. Bruyn and Millar (1962), 293.
31. White (1982), p. xxxv. Catalogue by Van der Doort: 'Item a longe narrow Lanskipp peece done in Holland – wth a needle in Silke beeing a Lanskipp of some= Roman Ruins whereby a Sea whereon some 4. or 5– shipps in the Lanskipp a bridg where a herd drives 2. goates over it, conteyning some 18en little-figures beeing one of the 5: peecs wch the States Embassador gave to your Matie at St James 1635: whereof the other 4. were in paintings. Done in Holland – by a woeman, given by the States to yor Matie'. Millar (1960), p. 157.
32. Van Bueren (1991), pp. 13–20, 70–74; and Van der Ree-Scholtens (1995), pp. 123–124 (article by Van den Bergh-Hoogterp)
33. Van Bueren (1991), pp. 74–75; and Van der Ree-Scholtens (1995), pp. 83–87 (article by Verkerk).
34. Van Bueren (1991), pp. 75–76.
35. Israel (1995), chapter 14.

36. Hornstein (1991), pp. 33–42. See also Wroughton (1997), pp. 90–99.
37. Between 1625 and 1647 she acquired huge amounts of gold objects, furniture, Chinese lacquerware, porcelain, and objects of ambergris, agate, crystal, precious stones, pearls and diamonds: Geest (1909), pp. 11–12. On her porcelain collection, see the article by Fock, and on her position in general, see the article by Groenveld in Van der Ploeg and Vermeeren (1997).
38. See Van Gelder (1963), p. 543 for gifts of horses in the broader context of the 1610 gift. A similar present was given in 1600 by the earl of Salisbury to Robert Cecil (Peck (1990), p. 19), in 1607 from the King of Denmark to Prince Henry, and in 1614 these items were exchanged between James I and Philip III of Spain (Reid (1960), pp. 21–24).
39. Lammertse (2006), p. 68.
40. Lammertse (2006), pp. 64–65.
41. Lammertse (2006), pp. 64–65: 'for appropriate gifts and presents'.
42. Leupe (1876), p. 184.
43. Lammertse (2006), p. 79, quoting Wicquefort (1660).
44. Van Schendel (1965), p. 4.
45. Davis (2000), p. 46.
46. Quoted in 't Hooft (1921), pp. 7–8.
47. Leupe (1876), p. 184.
48. Millar (ed. 1984), p. 64.
49. See Millar (1984), p. 25 and Strong (1986), pp. 184–189 on Henry's interest in the arts, and Millar (1972), pp. 6–8, Millar (1977), pp. 55–63, Millar (1984), pp. 29–63 and Levey (ed. 1991), pp. xiv-xxvi on Charles's collecting. For Charles's interests in sculpture, see Whinney (1988), pp. 86–92.
50. Lugt (1936), pp. 97–98.
51. Logan (1979), pp. 13–36.
52. Logan (1979), Lammertse (2006), pp. 64–70.
53. Logan (1979), pp. 75–79. Saenredam's work is inscribed, signed and dated 1648 and is now in the collection of the National Gallery of Scotland in Edinburgh (NG 2413). Dou's *Young Mother* is signed and dated 1658 and is today in the Mauritshuis in The Hague (inv. nr. 32). Baer suggests that the third painting might have been a *Young Mother* by Dou that is now in Berlin: Baer (2000), p. 32.
54. See Sluijter (1988) and Baer (2000).
55. Schwartz and Bok (1990), pp. 27, 51–56, 192–195, and 208. On p. 128 the authors further suggest that the painting by Saenredam served as a memento of the visit of Charles II's sister, Mary Stuart, to this church just months before the Restoration.
56. For the following summary I used the overview articles by Groenveld in Van der Ree-Scholtens (1995) and Kooijmans and Misset (2002).
57. Van Gelder (1962), pp. 292–293.
58. Of course, this is an approximate value, based on an average month's wages of about 25 guilders. Cf. Van Deursen, p. 13.

59. Evelyn, p. 352.
60. Lammertse and Van der Veen, p. 65.
61. See e. g. Lammertse and Van der Veen, p. 65; Troost, p. 53; and Israel, p. 750. Geyl's silence on the subject of the Dutch Gift is telling.
62. See Israel, pp. 748–58.
63. Wicquefort's (or: Wickevoort's) *Relation en forme de journal, du voyage et séjour que le serenis-sime et tres-puissant prince Charles II. roy de la Grand' Bretagne, &c. A fait en Hollande, depuis le 25. May jusques au 2 Juin 1660*, was published in The Hague by Adriaen Vlacq not long after the Restoration. It was immediately translated into Dutch. Vlacq also published an English edition. Keblusek suggests that the original text may have been written by William Lower, yet the fact that the title page of the *Relation in form of Journal, of the Voiage and Residence Which the most Excellent and most Mighty Prince Charls the II. King of Great Britain, &c. Hath made in Holland, from the 25 of May, to the 2 of June, 1660* (Wing R781.821:08) specifies that the text was 'rendered into English out of the original French by Sir William Lower', seems to indicate that he was only the translator. Wicquefort's claim is further bolstered by the author's focus on, and his evident knowledge of, the Dutch political scene. Finally, one of the poems Jacob Westerbaen wrote for the Dutch edition of the Relation, expressly mentions 'Vicfort' as the author: Op het verhael van de reyse en 't Vertoeven van sijn hoogst-gemelte Majesteyt in Holland, in 't Fransch beschreven door Monsr. Vicfort, ende in Duytsch overgeset en uytgegeven door A. V. For reasons of convenience, however, I will here refer to Lower's translation only. See Keblusek, *Boeken in de Hofstad*, p. 301.
64. Lower, pp. 33–34.
65. Lower, p. 102.
66. Lower, p. 63.
67. Lambert van den Bosch translated two English biographies into Dutch: David Lloyd's *Eikon basilike or, the true pourtraicture of his Sacred Majesty Charls the II in three books. Beginning from his birth 1630. unto this present year, 1660. Wherein is interwoven a compleat history of the high-born Dukes of York and Glocester* (London: Brome and Marsh, 1660) and John Dauncey's *The history of His Sacred Majesty Charles the II. King of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. begun from the murder of his royall father of happy memory, and continued to the present year, 1660.* They were published respectively as *Koninckliycke beeltenis ofte waerachtige historie van Karel de II* (Dordrecht: A. Andriesz. 1661) and *De historie van sijn majesteyt Karel de II* (Dordrecht: A. Andriesz, 1660). Also in Dordrecht, and also at Abraham Andriesz', *Iacob van Oort published his Ontlokene Roose, bloeyende distelbloem en hersnaerde harp: door den Alder-doorluchtighsten vorst en prins Karel Stuart den II. Koningk van Groot Britanje, Vrankrijk, en Ierlandt, &c. Beschermer des geloofs. Ofte: Kort verhael, van alle de gedenkwaerdighste beroerten, in de Koninkrijken van Engelandt, Scotlandt en Ierlandt voorgevallen, sints het Jaer 1640. tot desen dagh* (Dordrecht: Abraham Andriesz., 1661). A comparable history, by one P. S.

(sometimes said to be Peter Scriverius, who died in the same year, though Haitsma Mulier suggests P. de Lange) was the *Historie der Ballinghschap, en de herstellinge van (…) Carel Stuart de II (…) door P. S.* (Amsterdam: Ernestus Back, 1660). Samuel Tuke's short panegyric *A character of Charles the Second* was translated as *Caracter van Carel de tweede* (Kn. 8231). Some of these histories are mentioned and discussed in Haitsma-Mulier.

68. A bibliography of poems on the Restoration will be provided in my forthcoming article 'The Stuart Cult'.
69. R. Keuchenius' *Anglia Triumphans* was added to the international editions of the Relation. *Engelsche Triomph* was only added to the Dutch edition of Wicqueforts Relation (Den Haag: Adriaen Vlacq, 1660). *Herstelde zeegtriomf van Karel de Tweede* was added to Van den Bosch's *De historie van sijn majesteyt Karel de II* (Dordrecht: A. Andriesz, 1660).
70. Bosch, L. van den, *Britannias of herstelde majesteyt, heldendicht* (Dordrecht: Abraham Andriessz, 1661). For an analysis of this poem, see: W. A. P. Smit, 'De epen van Lambert van Bos'.
71. Te Winkel, p. 350, y translation.
72. See Geyl, pp. 135–148; Israel, pp. 748–758; Troost, pp. 51–55.
73. Orig.: 'Onzen vorst' (my translation). See: Jonktijs, D. 'O smart …', in Bloemkrans van *verscheiden gedichten*, p. 424.
74. Intriguingly, as Lower relates, when members States of Holland complained to De Witt that they had not heard the king, De Witt refused to repeat his words concerning the prince and the princess royal. 'The King,' Lower writes, 'being advertised of the displeasure of the Estates of Holland, had the goodness to call for pen, ink and paper' in order to make sure that the message got across. The letter, in Lower's translation, ran as follows: "Sirs, whereas I leave here in your hands, the Princess, my sister, and the Prince of Orange, my Nephew, two persons which are extreamly dear unto me, I pray you, Sirs, to take their interest to heart, and to make them te resent the effects of your favour, in the occasions which the Princess, my Sister, shall request you, either for her self, or for the Prince, her son; assuring you that all the effect of your good will towards them, shall be acknowledged of me, as if I had received them in my own person; and was signed, CHARLES R." See Lower, p. 95. This letter was subsequently archived in the registers of the States General and the States of Holland, and got reprinted in several Orangist pamphlets. Geyl gives the French original on pp. 138–39.
75. See n. 15 above.
76. See Blom, and my forthcoming article 'The Stuart Cult'.
77. Troost, p. 52.
78. National Archive, *The Hague, States of Holland*, 3.01.04.01, nr. 2403, fol. 183, cited by Lammertse and Van der Veen, pp. 64–65.
79. Described by Lower, pp. 78–82. Like Lower (pp. 111–12) Jacob Westerbaen wrote a poem on the print of this 'great feast', which was added to the Dutch edition of the *Relation*, and which can also be found in *Het derde deel der gedichten van Jacob*

Westerbaen, Ii6v–Ii7r.

80. Lower, p. 81.
81. Of the 600,000 guilders, about 400,000 were spent on gifts to the king and his court. See below.
82. Lower, pp. 101–2. Lammertse and Van der Veen, p. 65 n. 31, note that the Dutch edition has the dukes receive 60,000 guilders each, while the National Archive, The Hague, 3.01.04.01, nr. 2403, sig. 199v, gives 75,000.
83. Lower, p. 26.
84. Leupe (1876), p. 184.
85. The Dutch reads 'aanbieden [present, offer] en vereeren [honour]'.
86. I have not been able to investigate how much William II actually spent on the bed when he bought it in 1650. The phrasing of the agreement between the princess royal and the States, however, has convinced me that his will prove a sound investment.
87. Leupe (1876), p. 184.
88. Lammertse and Van Veen, p. 70. Also: Israel, p. 750.
89. In November 1658, when Charles' prospects to regain his crown – despite Cromwell's death – still seemed bleak, the princess dowager Amalia had withdrawn her permission for a wedding between her daughter Henriëtte Catharina and Charles II. See Geyl, p. 134.
90. Israel suggests the gift to have been a present of the States General, rather than the States of Holland: Israel, p. 750; also Troost, p. 53.
91. Vondel, pp. 260–62. Logan prints a facsimile of the broadside of the poem in Logan, p. 76.
92. Knuttel 8374. Other editions are Kn. 8372, 8373, 8375, 8376 and 8377. Cf. Haan, p. 232.
93. One pamphlet written before the the Restoration predicts that the Holland regents will have to bribe Charles once he is restored. See: Knuttel 8240. Cf. Haan, p. 240.
94. Knuttel 8224. *T'samenspraeck tusschen Carel de II. koninck van Engelant &c. ende den hertogh van Jorck, syn broeder. Ter saecke vande aenstaende Hollantsche ambassade* (Wilmstadt, printed by Ph. Langhstraten, 1660), p. 9. My translation from the original Dutch: 'Veel illustre Griecxsche mannen achten 't irreputabel ende onbehoorlijck, dat een koninclijck diadema ontciert soude worden door giften en gaven, om dat een souvereyn kon: door gabelles [tax, toll], impositien en belastingen soo veel gelts heeft als hy begeert, om te koopen dat hem aengenaem en dienstigh is, ende dienvolghens geschencken t'ontvangen van die, daer mede men moet tracteren, konnen niet als nadelige effecten baren: 't is waer, men heeft my in Hollandt oock wat in de vuyst gedouwt, maet het was gantsch tegens mijn hert'.
95. A famous scandal had occurred in 1652, when the The Hague publisher Michiel Stael was convicted for publishing The names of the Lords guilty of corruption. Not long afterwards, the States of Zeeland issued a declaration against gifts for public administrators, *Placcaet, teghens het ontfanghen van verboden giften en gaven* (Middelburgh: H. vander Hellen pr., 1652) Knuttel 7293. In 1669, the States of Holland followed Zeeland's example after yet another scandal. See: Namen *van de heeren*

*schuldigh zijnde aende corruptie*n (Arnhem: J. van Biesen, 1652 [=Den Haag: Michiel Stael, 1652]). Also: Keblusek, *Boeken in de Hofstad*, p. 235; and *Ordre, vande ed: groot mog: heeren Staten van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt, tegens giften, gaven ende geschencken* (Den Haag: J. Scheltus, 1669).

96. *Schryvens uyt de helle, vande derde, ende naerdere conferentie ende t'samensprake gehouden tusschen Gustavus, Olivier, Mazarijn en Jan de With. Gedruckt ten Diependal in Lucifers Blaesbalck, Anno 1660* (SN, SD; Knuttel 8243), p. 15. The Dutch original reads: 'Maer meeren deels weet den Grooten Turck dat die geschencken hare eygen niet en zijn, maer afgedrongen sweet en bloet van de Landtsaten, en dienvolgens geen gevoeligh intrest voorde schenckers, locktse met de presenten in, en vervolgens de schande, en afbreuck aen sijne authoriteyt gedaen, die werdt door de balance en heydensch sweert van Justitie geboet en herstelt. Dus sullen de Hollandtse geschencken, (ist my mogelijck uyt te wercken) niet helpen, ofte daer moet preallabele herstellinge en satisfactie gedaen werden.'
97. *De conclusie van den Hollandtsche Mercvrivs, bestaende in de wonderl_cke avonturen van Carolvs II. koningh van Engeland* (Haarlem: P. Casteleyn, 1660), sig. B3v. I have used third enlarged impression, in the University Library, Leiden. See also Kn. 8221/8222.
98. Instead of four lackeys, as was customary, the ambassadors to Charles II were accompanied by eight lackeys each. See Lammertse and Van der Veen, p. 65 n. 32.
99. De la Court, pp. 259–60. As with Wicquefort, I have used the earliest English translation of De la Court's (V. D. H.'s) 1662 text, The true interest and political maxims of the Republick of Holland and West-Friesland (London, 1702).
100. See Israel, p. 753.
101. My translation of a prefatory poem by one A. Pars. S. S. Th. Cand. to: Swinnas, *Willem. Vermeerderde, en verbeterde Engelse, Nederlandse en Munsters krackeelen* (Amsterdam: Jacob Vinckel, 1666; Knuttel 9243). 'Ziet hier voor onzen staat een schrick'lijke belooning | Al d'eer, hulp, blijdschap, geld, vereering en onthaal, | Stuart zoo ras in 't Rijk vergeet het altemaal