

## THAT IS WHERE GOD COMES IN. JACOB DUYM'S *GHEDENCK-BOECK* (1606) AS ARGUMENTATIVE DISCOURSE

Jeroen Jansen  
Universiteit van Amsterdam  
Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen  
Spuistraat 134  
Kamernummer: 453  
1012 VB Amsterdam  
J.Jansen@uva.nl

RESUMEN: De acuerdo con el subtítulo, el *Libro de la memoria* (1606) de Jacob Duym descubre al lector cómo memorizar para siempre toda la maldad causada a los holandeses por los españoles y sus aliados, junto con el amor y fidelidad de los príncipes de la holandesa casa de Nassau. En esta compilación de seis obras de teatro, Duym evoca imágenes del pasado con la intención de argumentar que una guerra justa era mejor que una paz injusta (según el título del último texto). Este conjunto muestra al traidor enemigo español así como las acciones carentes de fiereza de los holandeses, oponiendo personajes españoles y holandeses de la Casa de Nassau. Este artículo describe cómo maneja Duym el contenido de las cinco primeras obras como premisas de la última composición, mediante la técnica de moverse de lo particular a lo general y viceversa. La contribución de Dios ofrece un enlace intermedio para ver los diferentes eventos individuales desde una perspectiva más amplia del común interés y el bienestar público de las Provincias Unidas.

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Ghedenck-boeck*, retórica, argumentación, Tregua de los Doce Años, Guillermo de Orange, Jacob Duym.

SUMMARY: According to the subtitle, the *Ghedenck-boeck* (1606) by Jacob Duym learned the reader to forever memorize all evil and malevolence brought about by the Spaniards and their adherents, as well as the great love and fidelity, displayed to the Netherlands by the princes of the Dutch House of Nassau. In this compilation of six stage plays Duym has evoked images from the past, in order to argue that a fair war was better than a fake peace (the title of the last play). They showed the treacherous Spanish enemy as well as the brave-fearless actions of the Dutch, opposing individual Spanish characters to Dutch ones, from the House of Nassau. This paper describes how Duym managed to bring the content of the first five plays as premises into the final play, for instance by applying the technique of moving over from the particular to the general and the other way around. The contribution of God offered an intermediate link, as to see the different individual events in the wider perspective of the common interest and the

public welfare of the United Provinces.

KEYWORDS: *Ghedenck-boeck*, Rhetoric, Argumentation, Twelve Years Truce, William of Orange, Jacob Duym.

## INTRODUCTION

In spite of all military and economic prosperity since the 1590's, the United Provinces had experienced serious problems in covering the increasing expenses of the war against Spain. To meet the growing Spanish pressure, the Dutch standing army had been expanded since 1598, with mounting debts of many millions of guilders<sup>1</sup>. Holland's advocate Oldenbarnevelt was convinced that peace or a truce was the only way out of a financial impasse. In a letter of 18 January 1606 to François van Aerssen, the Republic's envoy at Paris, Oldenbarnevelt explained that «more than half of the inhabitants in the towns and countryside» were inclined towards peace. In this respect Oldenbarnevelt referred to the increased impact of the Spanish embargoes on the Dutch economy, and diversion of traffic away from the Republic, since the revival of commerce between England and Spain following the treaty of 1604. Due to this treaty English ships were free to sail to Spain and Portugal, but not carrying for Dutch merchants<sup>2</sup>. Besides, the rural provinces got tired of the plunder by Spanish soldiers at the countryside and in small cities. On the other hand, as Jonathan Israel has described in his *The Dutch Republic and the Hispanic World*, along with new pressure to end the war, in both the Republic and Spain, the wish to continue it, remained<sup>3</sup>. Van Aerssen, who initially was prepared to support a peace agreement, was strongly opposed to Oldenbarnevelt's accepting what Spain had offered: not a full concession of sovereignty, but merely a temporary recognition<sup>4</sup>. In the face of the contradictory pressures impelling either side towards both war and peace, intricate peace negotiations began in 1606 which, after lengthy and hard negotiation, led first to the Dutch-Spanish cease-fire agreement of April 1607 and two years later, after a complex sequence of negotiation, resulted in the signing of the Twelve Years Truce at Antwerp on the 9th of April 1609<sup>5</sup>.

But that day had not yet come when Jacob Duym, a Leiden rhetorician and Brabant exile with a military past in the Southern Netherlands, published his *Ghedenck-boeck* (*The Book of*

---

1. Between 1597 and 1606, the Dutch army had doubled in size rising by 1607 to 60.000 men, costing at 9 million guilders yearly, impossible to sustain. Besides, spending on fortifications had quintupled. See Israel, 1998: 400 y 1982: 18-19; Meijer Drees, 1993: 245-246 y 1990: 3.

2. Israel, 1998: 399-400. The letter is published in Van Deventer, 1862: 69.

3. Israel, 1982: 1, 28 ff.

4. Israel, 1982: 32.

5. Israel, 1982: 3. A good overview of the negotiations offers Van Eysenga, 1959. In this period, 1607-1609, over 250 pamphlets about this issue are known to have been published, speculating on the outcome of the negotiations. See Van Zuilen, 90; Muller and Tiele, 1858: 80-96.

*Memory*) in 1606, probably at the beginning of March<sup>6</sup>. The compilation of six stage plays that constitute the *Ghedenck-boeck* deals with the Dutch Revolt and the ensuing war of liberation. According to the American rhetorical theorist Michael McGee «the first principles of all public argument appear to lie in the society's collective judgment of its past»<sup>7</sup>. Indeed, the six stage plays by Duym appeal to the collective memory of the young Republic by reviving traumatic and successful episodes, framed to underpin and enforce the political consciousness and attitude of its citizens towards the state of war against Spain and the position of the foe. The German intellectual historian Reinhart Koselleck argues that it is only within the horizon of expectation of a people left to its own that the formula «friend and foe» can be understood. The «horizons of expectation» sketched by an author will only be accepted by his audience if these horizons are based on shared «space of previous experience and expectation» («der Raum ehemaliger Erfahrung und Erwartung»). Future and past are related in this sense<sup>8</sup>. In this view a convincing strategy for acting in the future is based on showing and memorizing the past. This exactly goes for Duym's method of using past episodes of the Dutch Revolt, to base his arguments for a future goal on solid grounds. The *Ghedenck-boeck* contains three history plays, a mythological play and two allegorical plays, recalling the atrocities committed by the Spaniards and the hardship endured by the Princes of Orange in recent years, like the battle of Antwerp and its fall, and the assassination of William the Silent, as well as more successful Dutch achievements, like the siege and relief of Leiden (1574) and the capture of Breda (1590)<sup>9</sup>.

Henk Duits, in his study about the *Ghedenck-boeck* as political manifesto, has rightly argued that there is a coherence in the compilation of stage plays as a whole, apparent from the conception of the work, the form and content of the plays and their paratexts<sup>10</sup>. Throughout the book Duym presents himself as a fellow combatant in the struggle for freedom<sup>11</sup>. According to Duits, the *Ghedenck-boeck* culminates in the final play, that contains an exhortation to employ every possible means to pursue the struggle and an urgent call to the Dutch people for financial support.<sup>12</sup> The title of this allegorical play makes Duym's standpoint perfectly clear: *Een Bewys*

---

6. An accompanying dedication letter is dated 6 March 1606 (see Meijer Drees, 1990, p. 1). See on Jacob Duym: Poll, 1898; Van Even, 1901: 515-537; Meijer Drees, 1990, p. 3; Koppenol, 2001; Groenland, 2011: 135-138. A basic study on the *Ghedenck-boeck* is: Duits, 2001.

7. McGee, 1977: 28.

8. Koselleck, 2004: 191, 223 (transl. of Koselleck, 1979: 258, 301).

9. See Groenland, 2011: 136-137.

10. Duits, 2001. See Porteman and Smits-Veldt, 2008, p. 175.

11. Pamphlets with warnings against the peace supporters appeared as early as 1605. Cf. Muller and Thiele, 1858, numbers 544 ff. I treat the subject from Dutch perspective, mainly using Dutch and English literature and studies. Needless to remark that several aspects of the political issues in this period have also be dealt with from a Spanish perspective (see the studies by Yolanda Rodríguez-Pérez). These studies are not involved here, as the publication by Jacob Duym is my focus.

12. After the death of Philips II the Spanish crown and the archdukes were prepared to negotiate peace. Grand

*dat beter is eenen goeden Crijgh, dan eenen gheveysden Peys* («A proof that a fair battle is better than a fake Peace»)<sup>13</sup>. This play differs from the other five plays as it is not about illustrious historical events and barely has any action. Besides, the play deviates from the others as regards content, for example because the House of Orange hardly comes up, as Duits has indicated. However, Duits has deduced from this that the final play is *not* closely related to the preceding ones and stands more alone<sup>14</sup>. According to him, the piece falls outside the scope of the intention of the *Ghedenck-boeck* so to speak, as it is far more directly political-ideologically focused on the political situation here and now<sup>15</sup>.

In this paper I will regard this compilation from a slightly different point of view, as I consider the whole series as an argumentative discourse, starting the other way round. I read the compilation as a complex. The topic of the final play determines at the one hand the way in which Duym has chosen the subject and at the other the filling-in and wording of the other five plays, as well as most of the paratextual presentation of these previous plays, the dedications, the prefaces to the reader and the pro- and epilogues by the «Dichtstelder» (poet) in every piece. From a rhetorical perspective it is described how Duym applies the technique of moving over from the particular to the general and the other way around. The contribution of God offered an intermediate link, as to see the different individual events in the wider dimension of the common interest and the public welfare of the United Provinces.

## FRAUD AND ENDURANCE

I consider the *Ghedenck-boeck* in its entirety as a deliberative discourse or *dubium* (a question that is open to doubt), which finds its fullest verbal expression in an implicit *quaestio*. What is better: to wage war or to conclude a peace? Maybe not a very difficult question to answer in general, certainly not if we consider most of the stage plays as an illustration of the

---

Pensionary Oldenbarnevelt, who was convinced up to 1605 that one must not negotiate with a false enemy, changed opinion in that year. Costs of war had rocketed sky-high and a majority of the population wanted peace. Maurice set himself the task of leading the group that wanted to continue the struggle, in order to still liberate the Southern Netherlands (Bloemendal, 2007: 111).

13. The subject was not completely new. In 1596 Duym, at that moment the leader of the Flemish chamber d'Orainge Lelie in Leiden, took part with his chamber of rhetoric in a huge lottery feast, in which the participating chambers had to write refrains on the words: `Voor een beveysde paeys, een rechte crijch te prijsen is' (More than a fake peace a just war is to be praised) (Meijer Drees, 1990: 3; Duits, 2001: 13; see Koppenol, 2001: 15-16; Groenland, 2011: 138). At that time there was an actual cause, as the Republic, together with France and England, would enter into a triple pact with Spain a few months later. The peace proposals from the South were rejected more than once.

14. Duits, 2001: 13.

15. Duits, 2001: 13-16, 32. In the view of Duits, this play has been written last, when Duym realized in 1605 that the political situation concerning the peace negotiations asked for a more political statement (33). Since 1568 William of Orange had incited to unity and solidarity between the inhabitants of the Bourgundian Netherlands, on the basis of one Dutch national identity.

atrocities of war, endurance and adversity. But as we will see, Duym has framed these texts in such a way that the reader is easily inclined to decide differently. Moreover, by the paratextual material the reader is explicitly forced to reconsider the obvious way of thinking that concluding peace will be the best thing to do. In the final play Duym definitively resolves the dubium «war or peace» with itself by using the adjectives «fair» and «fake», which leaves little room for discussion. Besides, he calls his play a «Proof» (*Een Bewys*), a well-reasoned case. Thus the *Ghedenck-boeck* at large may be seen as argumentative discourse: different reasons are put up in the different plays why continuing the war against Spain is to be preferred above peace or a truce<sup>16</sup>. In a pragmatic argument scheme (speech act: advise) the standpoint in the *Ghedenck-boeck* would be that continuing the war should be performed, because continuing the war leads to desirable consequences (i.e. freedom of speech, etc.), and if continuing the war leads to a desirable consequence, then it should be performed.

My research is on how Duym uses the paratext and text of these plays to strengthen his argumentation. It is shown that each of the five history and allegorical plays represent a piece of evidence and proof, constructing the sum of Duym's arguments on solid bases, to complete the argumentation put forward in the final play. Therefore, I will argue that the view propagated in *Een Bewys* is the standpoint of the argumentation in the *Ghedenck-boeck*, that due to the latter's subtitle, was completely devoted to «memorize all evil and the great malevolence of the Spaniards» («het welck ons leert al het quaet en den grooten moetwil van de Spaingnaerden»),<sup>17</sup> as well as to memorize «the great love and fidelity of the Princes belonging to the House of Nassau showed to us» («de groote liefde ende trou vande Princen uyt den huys van Nassau, aen ons betoont...»). These contrasting elements make up the premises for the conclusion that the United Provinces must go on with the war against Spain. The first five stage plays contain arguments in the form of important historical events from recent history, selected, explained and framed, as to highlight the positive role of the house of Orange in contrast with the negative one of the Spanish enemy. The individual cases in these plays demonstrate that the individual deed by the Spaniards are illustrative for their attitude, which may be characterized by the term «fraud»<sup>18</sup>. At the same time the individual plays attest to the «brave and fearless actions by the Princes of Orange», to unity and solidarity as well. Therewith, in the first four plays Duym is constructing a justification of the terms «fake» in «fake peace» and «fair» in «fair battle», used in the title of the final play:

---

<sup>16</sup> A comparable approach can be found in the excellent MA-thesis by Hugo van Willigen, 2002, who states that every play delivered a new argument: the barbarity of the Spanish troops, William of Orange as a good father and husband, religious motivation etc. I build on Van Willigen's findings, but my approach starts from framing techniques, in order to contrast the Spanish evil and the brave deed of the Dutch.

<sup>17</sup> See Meijer Drees, 1990: 14, n. 31, who has indicated a few signals in the paratextual material, among which the subtitle of the *Ghedenck-boeck*: Spaniards personify evil, the Nassau princes good.

<sup>18</sup> Meijer Drees, 1997: 166-167, mentions «fraud» as one of the stereotypes in the conceptualization of the Spaniards, that were spread by Beggars' songs.

[standpoint:] (a peace with Spain will be a fake peace (*eenen gheveynsden Peys*)).

[premise:] Because Spaniards are not to be trusted.

[Explanation:] Spaniards are fraudulent.

[Illustration:] As is evident from... [play 1-4 furnish evidence of the Spanish hate and fraud]]<sup>19</sup>

and

[standpoint:] (a battle with Spain will be a fair battle (*eenen goeden Crijgh*)).

[premise:] The cause is legitimate and the Netherlands have been successful in recent years.

[Explanation:] The House of Nassau (our legitimate leaders) is brave in warfare against Spain.

[Illustration:] As is evident from... [play 1-5 furnish evidence of good leadership and some successes]]

On first thoughts the argumentation looks quite simple. The author wanted to confront his readers (again and again) with all the hardship they suffered at the hands of a relentless and treacherous Spanish enemy, opposed to the Dutch heroism of the Nassau's<sup>20</sup>. In almost every play Spanish fraud against Dutch endurance is illustrated over and over again<sup>21</sup>. But the way in which Duym presents the material, to strengthen his argumentation, is quite interesting. To illustrate this, I take you along to the Leiden city wall. In the fourth scene of the third act in Duym's *Benoude belegheringe der stad Leyden* (*The anxious siege of the city of Leiden*), the third play of the compilation, a discussion is going on between two soldiers. One is from inside the city, thus a Leiden soldier, the other from outside, a Spanish soldier. The scene starts with the Leiden soldier singing a song in which he begs the Lord to help them and asks Him to show that He is their Shepherd. The soldier from outside tries to persuade the other to give up, otherwise the inhabitants will get hurt (fol. 2r)<sup>22</sup>. The answer is clear: better to die than to trust the enemy. A promise by Spaniards is not to be trusted. Here the Dutch soldier does not refrain

---

19. The fifth stage play is on the siege and liberation of Breda by way of a tactic reminiscent of the Trojan horse. A ship carrying peat was got in the city, hiding Dutch soldiers in the peat. Here, the Spanish side (and the Spanish fraud as well) does not get a real chance. The focus is on Dutch solidarity and bravery.

20. Groenland, 2011: 137.

21. This is also evident from the concluding remark of the Poet in the final play (Duym, *Een Bewys*, 'Epilog by the Poet' (Besluyt-reden by den Poeet oft Dicht-stelder), mentioning «bedroch» (fraud) over and over: «voor het Spaensch bedroch soo vreesden yder man. / Om eenen vasten peys behoort elck een te wenschen, / Maer eylaes het bedroch dat verschrickt alle menschen, / En maeckt dat niemand hem op den peys en betrouet. [...] elck een sorgt voor bedroch, / Men vreest al om voor doud quaed Bloed-dorstich soch, / Dat onsen vyand heeft soo hittich in ghedroncken. [...] Sy hebben anders niet dan groot bedroch gheploghen, / En twaer te laet bedacht, als elck een waer bedroghen». See Duits, 2001: 27.

22. He writes: «Denckt dat voor u haest naeck een al te groot verseer, / Soo ghy u niet en wilt in onse handen gheven».

from referring to the cruel massacre of Naarden in 1572, when this city fell to Alba, who reported to the Spanish king Philip that «not a mother's son escaped». In the city of Naarden, the Leiden soldier states, the Spaniards have proved how promises are dealt with, and: «We know your false, evil practices too well» (fol. 2r)<sup>23</sup>. It is revealing that the Naarden episode is not explained: clearly all readers were supposed to know about this event, some 35 years earlier.

When the Spanish soldier indicates the famine in the city of Leiden, the Dutch soldier answers that this is no problem: we would rather eat our left arm fighting with the other than surrender.

We are prepared to die, and this for the sake of the country's wealth,  
 We know the cruel Spanish nature too well,  
 We prefer to choose death  
 Above loosing the Word of God, and the freedom of the Country.  
 After all, temporality is small, but the eternal is to be gained,  
 We all possess the Maccabean spirit,  
 We rather die than to be poor slaves,  
 Which would happen to us, if we gave up... (fol. 2r)<sup>24</sup>

When we look more closely at these verses, what strikes most is the way in which Duym moves from the particular to the general, or in rhetorical terms, from a *quaestio finita* (a particular case) to a *quaestio infinita* (the general discussion). The soldier says he is prepared to die, not for his own sake or that of the city but for the sake of the country's wealth, not for his own freedom but for the freedom of the country and for preserving freedom of worship. Not the Spanish soldiers outside the city wall are a threat, but the cruel Spanish nature in general, temporality is small and the eternal is what one wins. In this scene the liberation of Leiden has been generalized by putting it in biblical perspective referring to the fight of the Maccabees against king Antiochus (B1r, prologue by the poet)<sup>25</sup>, implicitly denoting the struggle of the Jews for religious, cultural, and political independence. These generalizations are the prelude to

---

23. In original: «Te sterven liever dan u te betrouwen yet, / Had ghy ons wat belooft, ghy soudet houwen niet, / Tot Narden hebt ghy sulcx al te wel laten blijcken, / Ons zijn te wel bekend u valsche snoo practijcken...».

24. The original reads as follows: «Om sterven ziin wy reed, en dat voor s'Lands welvaert, / Ons is te wel bekend den wreedden spaenschen aert, / Wy hebben liever doch hier den dood te verkiesen, / Dan t'Godlick woord, en des Lands vrijheyd te verliesen, / Het tijdlick is doch cleyn, maer d'eeuwich is ghewin, / Wy hebben al gheliick den Machebeeschen sin, / Wy bliiven liever dood, dan te ziin arme slaven, / T'soud' ons ghebeuren doch, soo wy ons op gaven...».

25. Originally: «Zy [the people of Leiden] streden vroom voor Gods naem hoogh ghebenedijt; / Als de Machabeen oock daer deden sonder duchten, / Als Antiochus boos ontsteken zijnde vol nijd...». See Duits, 2001: 24; Spies, 1994.

the final verses in this passage that represent the general idea of the *Ghedenck-boeck* at large and that of the final play *Een Bewys* in particular: rather to die than to give up one's freedom, and the latter will happen, as Duym argues in the final play, if a fake peace is concluded. Duym uses all the historical material to frame his opinion, starting from individual experiences to ideas on the general interest of the country (more examples below)<sup>26</sup>.

## WILLIAM OF ORANGE AND MAURICE

How can the character of Maurice, to whom the *Ghedenck-boeck* is dedicated, be related to warfare and to the freedom of the country? In the first play of this compilation it is argued that the princes of Orange deserve to be honored and that good leadership, i.e. of the house of Nassau, is indispensable to command the army and to control the fight. In fact the piece recalls the famous myth of Perseus and Andromeda in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (IV, vv. 663-705) and allegorically mixes it with actual history from the years 1567-1573: Perseus represents Maurice's father William of Orange as fighter for the freedom of the country («»slands vrijheid»), who liberates Andromeda (i.e. the Netherlands) from the claws of the sea monster (Alba)<sup>27</sup>. The historical events around 1570 are actualized in the epilogue, spoken by the Poet. There, the finite question becomes more infinite, where the poet points out that Maurice has gained several victories over the last years (*Perseus*, fol. G3v-4r)<sup>28</sup>: privileges and freedom were lost and the Netherlands would have learned the Spanish language forever, living as slaves under their cruel rule (fol. G4r)<sup>29</sup>, if not the great virtues and deed of the House of Orange, especially those by Maurice, had prevented the country from such misery and sorrow (fol. 4Gr)<sup>30</sup>. Now, in 1606, everybody lived in freedom of consciousness (fol. G4r)<sup>31</sup>. Finally, the poet starts another praise to Maurice, the hero, who has risked his life for the prosperity of the country, who has defended it against all intruders, following the wish of the States General, and who has gained already so many victories (fol. G4r)<sup>32</sup>. Not surprisingly, this piece is also

---

26. Reese, 2010: 23: «In their life and death implications, war frames are highly significant in the way they direct vital debates on national policy». This «national policy» is here regarded as a *quaestio infinita*. However, a real infinite question would have been issues as «freedom» and «benefit» in a more abstract sense.

27. Duits, 2001: 12-13. Spies, 1999: 76-77; Duits, 1999: 106.

28. The text is as follows: «Den Oraingnischen Prins verlost t'Land uyt benouwen: / O Belgica wilt dit doch in u hert doorknouwen, / Denckt om de goote deught die door hem is gheschiet».

29. Original text: «De Privilegen en de Vrijheyd was te niet: / Spaens soud' ghy voor altiit daer hebben moeten leeren, / Men soud' als slaven groot al onder t'wreed ghebiet, / [...] u hebben sien verkeerren».

30. Duym writes: «Denckt om de groote deught die door hem [Prins van Oranje] is gheschiet: / Eert het Nassousche huys, dwelck is vol liefd' en trouwen / Dat t'Land verlost heeft uyt sulck' elend' en verdriet».

31. Original: «In vrijheyd des ghemoed leeft elck tot deser stond». See Van Gelderen, 1999: 42 ff.

32. The text is as follows: «Graeff Mauritz den Held, die hem geensins en wilt sparen, / Voor des Lands welvaert goet, maer vroegh en spaed' sorg draeght, / Om dit Land voor al haer vyanden te bewaren, / Der Heeren Staten wil, volght hy wat haer behaeght, / Die so dickwils daer heeft sijn edel bloed ghewaeght, / Iae heeft so menich schoon

dedicated to Maurice, as he had followed in the footsteps of his father and persevered in the fight against Spain<sup>33</sup>.

The figure of Maurice is also highlighted in the final part of the *Moordadich Stuck* (The Murder of the Illustrious Prince of Orange committed by Balthasar Gerards). This is the second play of the compilation, in which the murder (1584) of William of Orange by the Catholic Balthasar Gerards is represented, after King Philip II of Spain had placed a large reward on the head of the leader of the Dutch Revolt. The *Moordadich stuck* may not have functioned as to portray William as a hero and martyr to build the latter's image as *pater patriae*<sup>34</sup>, as this image existed already in 1606. Duym must have set himself a higher target, namely to demonstrate the fraud and hypocrisy of the Spanish enemy, and at the same time the value of the recent resistance (Maurice's feats) against the same enemy. The murder is illustrated as an act of Spanish hate, bloodthirstiness and fraud. In the final part of this play a character named «Freedom of the Country» is lamenting final words before (almost) dying as well (fol. H1v), while Maurice cries out for revenge, praying to God to make him fearless. In the epilogue the poet refers once again to the Spanish hate, bloodthirstiness and fraud and to the new leaders of the House of Nassau, Maurice and Frederik Hendrik. For Duym this was an indication which side God had chosen, if for him this was open to doubt anyway (fol. H3v-H4r)<sup>35</sup>. It is also an argument for the central proposition (the war-or-peace-question), as this honour to and belief in Maurice himself (giving vent to his revenge feelings), on the part of the author, reflect the warnings of the stadholder against the political and strategic dangers of the proposed truce terms. In reality, Maurice had a vested interest in continuing the war since, under the prevailing system, both his authority and his emoluments must have been much greater during war than in peace time<sup>36</sup>.

### GOD AS INTERMEDIATE

The conclusion so far that in the *Ghedenck-boeck* Duym has put the Netherlands and

---

overwinning' ghecreghen: / Die den vyand selfs meest ghesoght heeft onvertzaeght, / Des en magh sijnen loff nimmermeer zijn versweghen [...] / En sijne vroomheyd, moet de werelt deur bekend zijn».

33. Duym, *Een Ghedenck-boeck*, dedication to Maurice, fol. \*3<sup>v</sup>: 'Ende alsoo uwe Excellentie uwes Heer Vaders voetstappen in desen deele ziit naervolghende, enden in de selvighe verlossinghe vol hardende, en heb ick niemand waerdigher weten te vinden om desen Nassauschen Perseum toe te eyghenen ende te dediceren als uwe Excellentie...'

34. See Groenland, 2011: 127.

35. The text reads: «the faithful God will let them [the Spaniards] complain yet» («Maer den ghetrouwen God salt haer noch doen beclaghen»).

36. Israel, 1982: 30. Maurice has got political friends to block the truce from certain sections of the urban patriciate, in Zeeland, Amsterdam and Delft, but obviously a minority (30-31). The Zeelanders insisted that the Spanish recognition was inadequate, the security of the Republic threatened, the commerce of the entire country put at risk, and the cause of the 'true Christian religion' being neglected (41).

Spain diametrically opposed to each other, is not a very striking one. Indeed, for Duym there was a clear contrast between good and bad that he brought in to strengthen his final argumentation of continuing the war. The way in which the author fills in the different arguments, however, is interesting in the light of God's help. After all, Duym's standpoint that a battle with Spain will be a fair battle (*eenen goeden Crijgh*) has got the premises that the cause is legitimate and the Netherlands have been successful in recent years. An important role to support this justification is reserved for the contribution that is assigned to God. In every play it is beyond doubt that the Lord was and is on the Dutch side, and the plea to Him for assistance in future actions must guarantee that this situation will last. Perhaps some of the readers will have noticed that God was not always on the side of the Dutch, as may be deduced from the different setbacks, for example in the second play about the murder of William of Orange. But Duym has taken that into consideration, as the contribution of God in such a situation is of a different kind. The play starts with a monologue by William of Orange. He states that the good Lord, who takes decisions on good and bad, has embellished the house of Orange and their descent with so many sincere princes, pious by heart and mind (*Heet moordadich stuck*, fol. 2Br)<sup>37</sup>. William continues with some prospective remarks: the Spanish king couldn't kill William in a straight fight, thanks to God, so he had to achieve it through cunning and guile (fol. B3v)<sup>38</sup>. And in the concluding verses of this play the Poet remarks that the faithful God is the hope and comfort for the Netherlands in revenging the murder with help of this young child, Frederik Hendrik, at that moment (1584) laying in a cradle (on stage), but to which the play is dedicated in 1606 (fol. H3v-4r, epilogue by the poet)<sup>39</sup>. The final verses are:

O Spain, a very big lamentation is approaching you.  
 The Lord does not like this kind of deed, you will get your just deserts.  
 In God is our hope, comfort and all our wishes (H4r)<sup>40</sup>.

---

37. In original: «De goede God die d'Aerd' en Hemel oock regeert / [...] Hy ist die ons huys, en ons afcomst heeft verciert, / Met soveel Princen goet, vroom van hert en ghemoed».

38. This is the passage: «Met wapens can hy [the Spanish king] niet, daer ick God om moet loven: / Nu soeckt hy my met list, jae met een valsche moort, / Te brenghen om den hals».

39. These are the verses: «Den ouden Spaenschen haet hebt ghy nu claer gesien, / Den grooten Bloet-dorst hebt ghy nu hier connen speuren [...] Sy meynden dat te niet soud' gaen t'Nassousch geslacht [...] / Maer ghelooft sy den Heer en boven al ghepresen, / Die s'Heeren Staten druck soo troulijck heeft ghenesen [...] En heeft den jongen Held, Graeff Mauritz uytghelesen / Nu verweckt tot s'Lands dienst en s'Heeren Staten last [...] Maer den ghetrouwen God salt haer noch doen beclaghén, / Dat jonck Princelick Kind dat daer in de wiegh lagh, / Salt helpen wreken noch in sijn bequame daghen» («You have seen the Spanish hate and their huge bloodthirstiness. They thought the house of Nassau would perish, but thank God who has so faithfully healed the misery of the States General, urging Maurice to serve the country. The revenge will be by the little child Frederik Hendrik as well, when he is able to do so»).

40 Now in original: «O Spaengnen u naeckst vrij noch al te groot gheclagh, / Sulck werck verdriet den Heer ghy

This kind of «conclusion» fits into how a more general lesson or a moral is used to conclude the act of a drama. Also in this respect the technique of a frequent moving over from a *quaestio finita* to a *quaestio infinita* is much applied by Duym. Continually the particular character of the different historical events is related to the general (the interest of the country), for example by mentioning individual deed of the Princes of Nassau, and adding that they as «advocates of our sorrowful Netherlands, have looked after the protection and liberation of the country in its entirety» (fol. A2r, dedication to Frederik Hendrik)<sup>41</sup>. It is a common trick in literature to rise the actions represented above the incidental to emphasize the common interest, or the other way round to relate and compare the actual events to acts of heroism, that are at hand in the cultural baggage of the readers.

How makes Duym the technique to bring individual cases under one heading acceptable time and again? That is where God comes in. The method Duym uses to connect both is nearly always the mentioning of the good Lord, who is functioning here as an intermediate. The corresponding aspect is of course that God is the hope, help and protector in individual cases, but also were the common interest of the country is concerned. Now the appearance and «participation» of God in itself is not remarkable in all these texts, as the war was partly being waged in defence of the true Protestant faith and the revolt against Spain clearly dealt not only with a political controversy but also a religious one. A lot of plays written in this period were demonstrations of great themes like the justice and wisdom of God's government and the position of man between right and wrong<sup>42</sup>. Besides, in many plays of this period the divine providence (*Providentia Dei*) is made responsible for the course of things, be it in reality or in the dramatic action<sup>43</sup>.

But in my opinion Duym uses the divine power also as an argumentative element, from the premise that God is on the Dutch side. Duym argues that this is the case on the basis of several past episodes. Due to God the Dutch were successful. The influence of God is evident from the following scheme:

[standpoint:] God is on our side

[premise:] We have been successful lately due to God

[Explanation:] God makes us brave to fight and has given us the spirit to know the Spanish fraud

---

sult den loon ontfangen / In God is onse hoop en troost en al t'verlanghen».

41 This is the passage: «Princen ende Heeren, de welke als Voorstanders van dese onse bedroefde Nederlanden, de beschuttinghe en de verlossinghe der selver beherticht hebben». As Judith Pollmann, 2007: 219, has argued, anti-hispanicism was more than an accidental by product of the Revolt. One of the main challenges for the rebel propagandists had been to define a common cause with which all Netherlanders could identify.

42. See for example: Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen, 1991: 37, 53.

43. See Konst, 2003.

[Illustration:] This is evident from recent events.

How Duym used such schemes and brought them into his «proof that a fair battle is better than a fake Peace», is evident from the final play that deals also with what has happened in 1600 (*Midsgaders t»gene ghebeurt is inden jaere 1600*), namely «how these lands were urged towards peace by various delegates from many potentates in 1600,<sup>44</sup> and pressured thereafter from Brabant, first by a merchant, then by a lawyer, to lend their ears to peace, invariably in the hope that if these lands would not enter into the fake peace, that by this rumour of peace at least some strife or discord would rise among the united provinces». However, «the good Lord gave the mighty Lords of the States General such a constant spirit that they, aware of the Spanish intentions, instead of making peace rather decided amongst one another not to seek out their enemy at sea and on land, but to fight a fair battle as soon as they provided money and manpower» (*Een Bewys*, fol. A3r-v, dedication to Oldenbarnevelt)<sup>45</sup>. Here, the Spanish double-crossing and God's intervention appear again. In this way, the fact that God was on the side of the Dutch functioned not only as a conclusion on the basis of the content of the plays in the *Ghedenck-boeck*, but it became also a premise in the argumentation of the final play, especially where it concerned future actions, in the following way: «As God is on our side, it will be better to keep up the fight than to lose heart by making a fake peace».

Time and again, the text of Duym's plays and the remarks in the paratexts bear witness of the idea that the Netherlands were backed up by God in the past, how He was on *their* side in the present and that there is hope and good reason to expect that the future would not be very different. Recent military successes should have supported this vision. The problems in meeting the growing cost of the war against Spain are dealt with in the final play, where Duym asks for financial sacrifices of the Dutch people.

The perception that God was on the Dutch side, was also supported by an additional argument, namely the fact that the achievements of the Nassau heroes were, according to Duym, so exceptional and unrivalled, that a comparison had to be drawn with the well-known heroism in Antiquity. Only the contribution of divine intervention could have accounted for

---

44. In 1600 Albert of Austria diplomatically tried to get the Netherlands under control of Spain. The peace offered was only on the surface, because the Spaniards got so much influence in the long term, that they could oppress the country again. That was why it has been a good decision to continue the war, according to Duym (*Een Bewys*, fol. A4<sup>r</sup>-B1<sup>r</sup>: «Tot den goetwillighen Leser»).

45 In original: «hoe dees Landen inden jaer seshien hondert door verscheyden Ghesanten van veel Potentaten tot Vrede zijn vermaent gheweest, ende daer naer uyt Brabant, dan door eenen Coopman, dan door een Advocaet zijn ghetert geweest, om haer ooren tot den vrede te keeren, altijd hopende dat soo sy den geveynsden vrede niet en wilden aengaen dat door dit gherucht van vrede ten minsten onder de vereenichde Landen eenighen twist ofte tweedracht soude op staen, maer de goedighe God gaf de Moghende Heeren Staten sulck een standvastich gemoed, dat sy het Spaensch voornemen wel wetende, in plaets van vrede te maken liever onderlinghen verdraghen hebben haren Vyand te water ende te lande selver te soecken, ende haer van ghelt en volck beter versien hebbende goeden Crijch te voeren». See Duits, 2001: 21.

these unusual actions. That is why Duym, in his play on the liberation of Breda, starts the dedication to the municipality with a comparison between the praiseworthy deed by the Ancient Romans with those by the «Heeren Staten» and by de «Prince vanden Huyse van Nassau» (i.e. the States General and Justinus van Nassau, the son of William of Orange) (*Breda*, fol. A2r, dedication). If something has to be indicated as praiseworthy, Duym argues in this dedication, there is no greater honour than to name it a «Roman deed» («een Romeyns stuk»). As in the history of the Dutch revolt the house of Orange has done so many exceptional deed, nowadays one would prefer to name them «a Dutch deed», or «a Nassau deed» («Dit is een Nederlandsche daet, oft tis een Nassausche daed»). This applies the capture of Breda, but also the liberation of all those other cities and the battles won (fol. A2r-v). According to Duym, God deserved all the credit, as He had inspired and leaded all people involved, be they of a high or low social position (fol. A2v). In fact, Duym idealized this history, making it to an example of warfare that fitted in God's plan (*Providentia Dei*) with the suppressed Netherlands<sup>46</sup>.

Another case. The play on the siege and relief of Leiden, in 1574 is introduced by a dedication to the burgomasters and town council of this city (*Leyden*, fol. A2v). Here, Duym moves from an infinite proposition to the concrete case of Leiden and back again to the infinite by mentioning the Divine help and the well-being of the country in general. For Duym begins this dedication from classical historiography (Livius, Plutarchus), that made mention of besieged and starving cities. In recent times there were cases (France, Haarlem, Middelburg) of hungry people as well, Duym continues, but none of them is comparable to the 1574 situation in Leiden. Next he tells the reader that the citizens of Leiden have showed great courage in their resistance and in their endurance, due to the concord and firmness among them. Subsequently, he turns back again to the infinite (the public interest) with God as an intermediate link. After all, due to these virtues the Leiden citizens were certain of heavenly protection<sup>47</sup>. God gave them His infinite grace, as He saw the evil intention of their enemies from outside the city, and the «drive, love and faith within the City for the benefit of their motherland in general» (fol. A2v)<sup>48</sup>. In other words, the power God gave to the Dutch people, is evident from incidental achievements but extends much further, in order to support the public interest and the general good of the country.

The same technique is used later on in the same dedication, where Duym as a Brabant exile thanks the burgomasters and the municipality for their virtues and helpfulness done to foreigners and refugees. The Almighty God has seen these virtues and will therefore reward

---

46. Meijer Drees, 1990: 5; Konst, 2003.

47. Noak, 2002: 69. The Leiden citizens, who had to bear a divine test, have done so bravely. That is why they were assured of divine protection.

48. The text reads as follows: «om den cloecken ende vromen wederstand teghens haer ghedaen, ende en is niet alleen te verwonderen de groote stant vasticheyd ende eendracht der Borgheren, maer boven al de groote ghenade des Alder-hooghsten, die insiende het boos voornemen uwer E. vyanden van buyten, ende den yver, liefde, ende trou, die binnen der Stad was voor den welstand des alghemeyne Vaderlands».

this as the improvement of the situation in the city testifies already: «May the Lord go on in this way, making it increasingly better, in honour of God and for the sake of the general state of our Motherland» (fol. A3r)<sup>49</sup>.

The triangle Leiden-God-Netherlands has argumentative value, also in the sense that Leiden strived for the freedom of the country and for the Godly word as well; the city was devout. The country from its side has shown faith, concern, love and power to this city, as God has shown His grace (*Leyden*, fol. B1r, prologue by the poet)<sup>50</sup>. God is the protector of Leiden and of the Netherlands who will faithfully keep watch.<sup>51</sup>

From these examples it is clear that God plays an important role at crucial moments, represented in the *Ghedenck-boeck*<sup>52</sup>. The resistance of the Dutch people was supposed to be successful as God was on their side. As there is always the hope and wish that God will sustain them in the future, in his wording Duym shifts between the present and the future, as between the particular and the general good. See for example the epilogue of the dedication in the final play, the «Proof», directed to Oldenbarnevelt:

praying to God that it will be His wish to grant Your Honour [Oldenbarnevelt] a long, blessed life, and that He will provide you with wisdom and bravery, for the benefit of the Country and the

---

49. Now in original: «men siet den Almachtighen God de deught ende behulpsaemheyt die uwe E. aen alle vreemdelinghen ende ghevluchte liedens zijt bewijsende, soo heerlijk, ende wel te rechten vergelden, daer af dat de verbeteringhe van uwe E. stad genoechsaem ghetuygenis geeft. De Heere latet noch hoe langher, hoe meer, soo voorts varen tot Godes eere ende den ghemeynen stand des Vaderlands ten besten». See the epilogue by the poet in this play, fol. i4r (It was nothing but the work of God): «Op den ghetrouwen dienst van mijn Heer Boysot let, / Die hy daer heeft ghetoot, voor t'Land end' d'Edel Staten... / [...] Twas enckel Godes werck, hy stierden sulcx doch meest»; cf. the prologue by the Poet to *Het moordadich stuck*, fol. B1<sup>v</sup> (God counts the intention of the Spaniards [to murder William of Orange] much less than mire, and such a brutal act is horrible; how it could happen, this play will learn, and how the Lord can arrange that things take a favourable turn for the country): «Maer haer [of the Spaniards] voornemen acht God al veel min dan slijck. / En sulcke wreede daed is gants afgrijpselijck, / Hoe dat is toeghegaen, sal u dit spel wel leeren, / En hoe't de Heer al kan voor 't Land ten besten keeren». See for God's help at the liberation of Breda: «Tis Godes werck, ten is gheen menschen te betrouwen» («It is the work of God, not to be left to man»). See Meijer Drees, 1990: 5; Duits, 2001: 24.

50. Original text: «Maer noch heeft God de Heer haer willen wel bewaren». And later: «Waer heeftmen desghelijcx ter wereld oyt ghehoort: / O Leyden [...] s'Lands vrijheyd socht ghy seer, en boven al Gods woort, / [...] t'Land heeft aen u oock trou, sorgh, liefd, en macht ghetoot, / God toonden boven al sijn jonst weerd hoogh verheven» (fol. B1v). See Noak, 2002: 76.

51. Cf. Duym, *Antwerpen*, fol. B2<sup>r</sup> (Antwerp is speaking): `Al mach den vyand snoo, seer naer ons bederf haken, / Al mach hy teghen ons seer veel valstricken maken, / Al mach hy dorsten oock, naer ons onnoosel bloet, / wy hebben eenen God die voor ons trou sal waken...' (Although the enemy may be fraudulent, bloodthirsty [etc.], we have a God that will faithfully watch over us).

52. See Korsten, 2011: 12, on God as the ultimate source of knowledge, and as the ultimate point of reference, who will act as the one that holds it all together (especially concerning stage plays by Joost van den Vondel). Duits, 2001: 23-25.

public interest (*Een Bewys*, fol. A3v)<sup>53</sup>.

For the readers Duym's prayer will have got another dimension in the light of Oldenbarnevelt's position in the actual debate on the continuation of war. After all, one may read in these words the wish that «the wisdom and bravery» mentioned were turned into a decision of Oldenbarnevelt to persist in the battle, as well as that the «benefit of the Country and the public interest» would be a direct result thereof. In other words, Duym wants God to give these insights to Oldenbarnevelt. It was him at that moment who had to be persuaded by the «Proof» (*Een Bewys*). Of course this play was dedicated to Oldenbarnevelt.

The (good) characters in the plays declare to conform to the God-given political and social order, in which everybody has a task and knows his role<sup>54</sup>. The contribution of God is an important means for Duym to relate the finite to the infinite, to argue that not only this individual Spaniard in that situation was a fraud, but all Spaniards were, are and always will be. Moreover, the heroism of the House of Nassau not only affected the specific cases described in the plays but concerned a higher and surpassing ideal of public welfare and common good. The political fight between William of Orange and the Duke of Alba in the myth of Perseus and Andromeda (in the first stage play) was for example not only represented to focus on specific clashes, but also to generalize the purpose of the revolt to the liberation of all Dutch provinces, which had to be brought together in one, independent confederation<sup>55</sup>. Besides, Duym used the contribution of God to link the past experience of God's help to future situations. He made the help of God palpable in the victories and successes from the past. God liberated Breda and Leiden, punished Antwerp and permitted William to be murdered<sup>56</sup>.

Nothing happened without His interference<sup>57</sup>. Where there was a victory, God had showed his grace, where there was a loss, He had decided otherwise. What has happened in Antwerp, for example, is a mirror up to and warning for all other cities that there would be peace as long as God protected the city (*Antwerpen*, fol. Gev-4r, epilogue by the poet)<sup>58</sup>. The brave capture of Breda has succeeded thanks to God, as He had put courage and wisdom in the hearts of Maurice, the States General, the captain of the peat boat and his servant, as well in

---

53. Now in original: «God biddende dat hem ghelieve uwe E. een langh salich leven te verleenen, ende den selven met wijsheyt ende cloeckmoedicheyd wil versien tot des Lands dienste ende ghemeen saeck ten besten».

54. See Meijer Drees, 1990, p. 9 (concerning Duym's play on Breda).

55. Duits, 2001: 13.

56. See Noak, 2002: 76 (concerning Duym's play on Leiden).

57. Duits, 2001: 23.

58. Text: «Dit is den Spieghel nu van al ander Steden, / Wat helpt Antwerpens macht, dat sy schoon is en rijck, / Niet langher als God wil, kond sy gheziin in vreden.. [...] Wat helpt u sterckte nu, wat helpt nu al u ghelt: / Och spieghelt u nu ghy stercke Steden machtich, / In plaets van t'Godliick woord, wort sy nu ghequelt / Met menschen droomen quaet, en woorden onwarachtich».

that of the brave captain Héaugièrè<sup>59</sup>. To add a new dimension to this heroic event Duym makes another comparison with Roman and Greek Antiquity: Maurice has beaten Hannibal in heroism (*Breda*, fol. B1r, prologue by the poet)<sup>60</sup>, as Breda has surpassed Troy (fol. A3v, to the reader)<sup>61</sup>. The whole epilogue by the Poet is devoted to the difference, as Troy was destroyed and burned down, while Breda is liberated by its friends, by the Nassau hero, «on behalf of the whole country» («uyt den naem van t'heel Land», *Breda*, fol. G4r, epilogue by the poet)<sup>62</sup> and, eventually, by God, who must be praised here (fol. G4r, epilogue by the poet)<sup>63</sup>. Indeed, Duym calls the liberated citizens of Breda «the Lord's chosen number» («'t vercoren Gods ghetal»), thus God's elect<sup>64</sup>. According to Duym the liberation of Breda primarily was the work of God and now its inhabitants are a part of God's chosen people<sup>65</sup>.

For the contemporary readers the conclusion must have been that God would protect the Netherlands. Duym has linked the incidental cases to the general welfare, as he linked the past (proved help when the Dutch were successful) to the future (hope directed towards God).

#### **A PROOF THAT A FAIR BATTLE IS BETTER THAN A FAKE PEACE**

The final play in the *Ghedenck-boeck* is an allegorical filling in of the question of war or peace, or as Duym calls it himself: «A proof that a fair battle is better than a fake Peace, as well as what happened in the year 1600». Duym's standpoint is clear from the title, as he uses here the terms «fair battle» and «fake peace». As I have explained, the previous five stage plays will have allowed him to do so.

But what argumentation does he use here? In his dedication to Oldenbarnevelt Duym builds up the argumentation, starting from the infinite question «what is better: war or peace». And he agrees that peace is to be preferred:

---

59. Meijer Drees, 1990: 5.

60. This is the passage: «Van de Romeynen wort wel menich stuc beschreven, / Van stoute Helden cloeck hoogmoedich aengericht / En HANIBAL bedreef oock wonder in sijn leven, / Maer noyt gheen stouter daed oyt verhaelt op gedicht, / Noyt quamer sulck een werck den mensch int gesicht, / Als onder t'beleyd cloeck des Princen hooch-geboren, / Graeff MAURITZ, nu cortis is ghecomen hier int licht, / Breda dat onlangs was gheroofft gegaen verloren»

61. See the prologue by the poet, fol. B1v: «Dit is Troiaensche paert [...] En Troyen was verbrant, en gerooft na Mars zeden, / Maer Breda word verlost, en quijt van haren last». («This is the Trojan horse, and Troy was burned and plundered in accordance with the custom of Mars, but Breda will be liberated, and delivered from her problems»).

62. The contrast between Troy and Breda could have shown that Duym wants his readers to know that the liberation of Breda is worth more than that of Troy (Meijer Drees, 1990: 6; Duits, 1999: 111).

63. Original: «Verblijd u dan Breda, verheught u al ghy vromen, / Eert, prijst, looft uwen God, weet hem danck boven al, / want u vyanden ziit ghy quijt, leeft sonder schromen, / Denckt vrij dat ghy ziit van't vercoren Gods ghetal, / En dat hy sijnen Naem door u groot maken sal».

64. Meijer Drees, 1990: 6; Duits, 1999: 111.

65. See Duits, 2001: 24-25.

[standpoint:] Peace is sweet and delightful,  
 [premise:] (all people love what is sweet and delightful,)  
 [conclusion:] All people love peace.

Conclusion 2: Thus, may God give our sad Netherlands a continuous and fair peace once (*Een Bewys*, fol. A2r)<sup>66</sup>.

The second conclusion does not fit very well to the previous standpoint and premise. The adjectives «continuous» and «fair» in combination with «once («eens») suggest that Duym's introduction is no more than a preamble to the actual discussion and that no continuous and fair peace is within reach at that very moment. That is why Duym has changed the *status definitio-nis* of the term «peace» in his «conclusion», and defines it in accordance with the circumstances at that moment<sup>67</sup>. Duym explains that the Dutch people were not able to see the almighty God giving them the means and possibility to «live in a fair and continuous peace» («om in goeden ende vasten vrede te moghen leven»), as the greater part of the population was so blinded by the power of the pope, the old age of the Roman Catholic church, and the great power of the Spanish king. The definition of a fair peace will thus be a good alliance between the Northern and Southern Netherlands<sup>68</sup>, in order to throw off the yoke of the enemy (*Een Bewys*, fol. A2r)<sup>69</sup>, and to keep their freedom of religion.

---

66. The text is as follows: «We know for sure and everybody does, how sweet and pleasant peace is. The name of it even, or the rumour, pleases all people, let alone peace itself. And may God give that our sad Netherlands open up their eyes once and looked for a long-lasting and fair peace among them» («Wy weten wel ende eenen yghelijck is kennelijck, hoe soet, ende lieflick dat den peys ende vrede is, den naem des selfs, oft het gherucht daer van, is allen menschen aengenaem, ick laet staen den vrede selver: en gawe God dat onse bedroefde Nederlanden eens haer ooghen open deden, ende sochten onder haer eenen gheduerighen ende oprechten vrede»).

67. See on the notion «status»: Braet, 1987.

68. See Meijer Drees, 1990: 10.

69. These are the original words: «maer den meestendeel der selver zijn so in des Paus moghentheyd, ende oudtheyd der Roomscher Kercken, als oock in de groote macht des Coninx van Hispaingnen so verblind, dat sy niet en duncken oft en sien dat den Almachtighen God ons middel ende bequaemheyd jont om in goeden ende vasten vrede te moghen leven, waerom en souden wy niet kunnen, soo de Zwitsersche Steden doen, in een goed verbond ende accoort met elckanderen gheleven, ende ghelijck sy het jock van al hare vyanden af gheworpen hebben, ons oock ghesaemder hand het jock ende slavernij der Spaingnaerden quijt maken» (Translation: «but as the greater part of the population was so blinded by the power of the pope, the old age of the Roman Catholic church, and the great power of the Spanish king, that they don't think or see that the Almighty God has granted us the means and ability to live in a good and firm peace. Why couldn't we, as the Swiss cities do, live in a good alliance and agreement with each other, and like them having thrown off the yoke of their enemies, get collectively rid of the yoke and slavery of the Spaniards»). The definition of a fair peace will thus be a good alliance between the Northern and Southern Netherlands. See for a comparison between the Netherlands and Switzerland (1500-1800), for example concerning political discourse justifying the republican form of government: Holenstein, Maissen and Prak, 2008.

The Catholic South remained under Spanish domination, though since 1598 it had come under the nominal rule of the Habsburg Archdukes, Albert and Isabella, protégés of Madrid<sup>70</sup>. Many South Netherlanders should have been malcontent at the disreputable content of an armistice agreement which had obtained nothing for the Catholics residing under the States General, as so unsound an accord would undermine the security of the Southern Netherlands<sup>71</sup>. In 1605, Oldenbarnevelt and Spinola decided to negotiate, due to the financial depletion on both sides. The leaders of the Republic had to refrain from the reunification with the Southern Netherlands. Duym, being an exile from the South, may have considered this a reason to not only publish his Proof (*Een Bewys*), but also the other five plays as a kind of preliminary evidence, in order to influence public opinion and drive the political leaders to a different understanding<sup>72</sup>.

The specter that Duym raises in his dedication to Oldenbarnevelt is the Spaniards being our masters and the Netherlands living in slavery (fol. A2r-v). After all, history had learned that the Spanish wanted supremacy in Europe. That is why, in the opinion of Duym, all sincere Christians were afraid when peace was mentioned<sup>73</sup>. God has prevented the Netherlands from this misery. If God and all pious Christians have not guarded them better than they do themselves, then the Spaniards would have mastered them a long time ago<sup>74</sup>.

In his preface «to the benevolent reader» the Spanish fraud is specified as «fake peace» by referring to the appointment of Albrecht of Austria as governor of the Southern Netherlands as a representative of the Spanish king. Albrecht was appointed falsely and covertly.<sup>75</sup> The fake and fraudulent character of the Spaniards was also expressed in the fact that they would try to get magistrates and other prominent people in their power offering gifts and promises. When the Dutch are disarmed and no financial resources remained, the Spaniards would play with them as a cat with a mouse and eat them in the end.<sup>76</sup> Therefore, a lot of money was needed for a fair battle,<sup>77</sup> and for keeping what the Netherlands had till that moment, and what they wanted

---

70. Israel, 1982: 2-3.

71. Israel, 1982: 29-30.

72. Peace negotiations were a constant threat to the liberation of the Southern Netherlands and to Duym's return to the South. Cf. Meijer Drees, 1990: 10; Duits, 2001: 33 (somewhat vaguely states that some themes from the five pieces offer —as it were— an extra legitimation of *Een bewys*).

73. The examples mentioned are the Paris peace (1498), the peace of Don Juan (1577), the peace of Cologne (1579), and the peace of Oostende (1604). Duym, *Een Bewys*, fol. A2v: «God betert tis soo verre onder alle Vrome ende oprechte Christen gecomen dat sy schroomen ende vervaert zijn als men van vrede hoort spreken, ende dat als sy aen den Parijsschen Vrede, aen den Peys van Dom Ian, aen den Vrede-handel tot Ceulen, ende Oostende ghedencken».

74. Duym, *Een Bewys*, fol. A2<sup>v</sup>-3<sup>r</sup>: `Ende voorwaer dat God ons ende alle vroomen Christenen niet beter en bewaerde dan wy selfs en doen de Spaeynaert waer langh meester over ons...'

75. Duym, *Een Bewys*, fol. A4<sup>r</sup>.

76. Duym, *Een Bewys*, fol. A4<sup>r</sup>-<sup>v</sup>. According to Duits, 1999, p. 106, Duym must have been convinced that the Spaniards would not adhere to the truce, and seize the opportunity to arm and to start war again.

77. Duym, *Een Bewys*, fol. A4<sup>v</sup>.

to keep for their children («naecomelingen»): religious freedom. In the paratext of *Een Bewys* Duym constantly warns his readers that God's Word is in danger and that religious liberation will disappear when the fake peace will be an accomplished fact. Money is needed, and by way of conclusion it is argued that the Netherlands are better off sacrificing half their resources than living in eternal slavery to the Spaniards and their supporters:

We realize the many contributions are made and that great burdens are imposed by the war, but yes, we have to make these sacrifices if we wish to maintain God's word, the freedom of the country and our own peace and quiet. It is better to give abundantly and to maintain something to ourselves than to lose all that we have and to be conscience-stricken and led once again to gallows, wheels and stakes. Through sacrifice we free not only ourselves but also our descendants, and preserve the life of so many thousands of souls who suffer persecution and are only kept alive as long as they are not completely in control. By way of conclusion it is argued that we are better off sacrificing half our resources than living in eternal slavery to the Spaniards and their supporters<sup>78</sup>.

Where was God? Duym informs the readers that it was God who had given the States General such a stable mind that were well informed about the Spanish intention to spread discord and dispute, so that they have continued war on land and sea, providing money and people to wage a fair war (fol. A3r-v)<sup>79</sup>. This was the course to be continued, and with these means: money, people and the help of God.

## CONCLUSION

The order in these six plays is not a chronological one, but an argumentative. Reminding the readers to the brave, fearless actions of the House of Orange as key points is a goal in itself,

---

78. Duym, *Een Bewys*, fol. A4<sup>v</sup>: 'Wij bekennen wel datter veel gegeven word, ende dat de lasten des oorlooghs groot zijn, maer wat ist daer moet ghegheven zijn, willen wy Godes woord de vrijheyd des Lands, ende ons eyghen rust behouden beter ist grootelicx te gheven ende noch wat te behouwen, dan dat wy al verliesen dat wy hebben, ende in groot bedwanck der conscientie sitten, ende weer naer galgen, raderen, ende brand-staken gheleyd worden: door het geven en bevrijen wy niet alleen ons selven, maer oock onse naecomelinghen, ende behouden het leven van soo veel duysent sielen die noch op verschyden plaetsen onder het cruys sitten, ende die sy noch laten leven soo lang als sy niet heel meester en zijn, ende voor besluyt reden word hier verstoont dat wij beter de helft van al onse middelen gaven dan dat wy in de eewighe slavernije vande Spaingnaerden en haren aenhanck souden gheraken' (translation based on Groenland, 2011: 140).

79. Original: «altijd hopende dat soo sy den geveysden vrede niet en wilden aengaen dat door dit gherucht van vrede ten misnten onder de vereenichde Landen eenighen twist ofte tweedracht soude op staen, maer de goedighe God gaf de Moghende Heeren Staten sulck een standvastich gemoed, dat sy het Spaensch voornemen wel wetende, in plaets van vrede te maken liever onderlinghen verdraghen hebben haren Vyand te water ende te lande selver te soecken, ende haer van ghelt en volck beter versien hebbende goeden Crijch te voeren».

but the paratext gives the author an opportunity to convince his readers to interpret the arguments in the light most favorable to his side. One may consider how authoritative his voice may have been. According to his own words in the Dedication to the *Ghedenck-boeck* Jacob Duym had experienced the Spanish hate himself in the conduct of war, in prison, and in losing his goods (fol. \*2v, dedication to Maurice)<sup>80</sup>. He had faithfully done military services to William of Orange and to the motherland and would have done the same if not he was taken prisoner during 22 months. The fall of Antwerp liberated him, but he became disabled due to the long-lasting sitting down, so that he barely was able to walk (fol. \*2v-3r)<sup>81</sup>. From then on, as he describes, he could only use his mind (and pen) to combat the Spaniards and to spread the fame of the House of Nassau, to memorize Maurice and his father, William of Orange, who «didn't avoid any distress, danger, nor diligent care for the prosperity of the United Provinces» (fol. \* 3r)<sup>82</sup>. Indeed, Duym presents himself in the *Ghedenck-boeck* as a passionate writer, highly motivated from personal experience, and thus adding a pathetic and ethical appeal to his logical argumentation (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1355b35-1356a1). He has taken up his pen to display his service and devotion to the Dutch cause, never losing sight of what in his opinion was the country's interest. Implicitly and explicitly, in the paratext as well as in the text of the different plays, Duym incited his readers to remember the different war events, which would teach them that in this case a fair battle was to be preferred above a fake peace<sup>83</sup>. One of the main aspects is the Spanish fraud, as opposed to the fearless actions of the House of Orange. The act of memorizing was in fact stirred up by the argumentative structure, for which *Een bewys* is the starting point. All kinds of vices, like fraud, were framed qualities of the Spaniards as to warn against any negotiation with this enemy. Virtues like bravery and solidarity were obviously found at the Dutch side. The different stage plays function on the one hand as reference material to acts of heroism from Antiquity in order to praise the war actions, on the other as a way to broaden the view into a general idea of the country's benefit and welfare. At the same time they are an implicit premise in Duym's argumentation on the battle being «good» and the peace being «fake».

---

80. The text reads: «Al tghene daer ick nu teghenwoordelick af schrijve, en schrijf ick niet van hooren segghen: maer als meestendeel met miin ooghen ghesien, en met miin ooren ghehoort hebbende, ende als een die den Spaenschen haed soo in Crijchs-handel, soo in ghevanghenis, als in verlies van miine goederen ghenoech beproeft hebbe» («All what I write of at this moment, I do not write from hearsay, but as seen with my own eyes for the most part, and heard with my ears, and as one that has experienced enough the Spanish hate both in war, and in prison, as well as in loss of my goods»). See Duits, 2001: 25-26.

81. See Koppenol, 2001: 4; Duits, 2001: 8.

82. The text is as follows: «Maer al ist dat het lichaem gheen sonderlinghen dienst en heeft konnen doen, en heeft niet te min den gheest konnen ledich zijn van yet voor te nemen, t'geen dat soude moghen strecken tot eer, lof, en prijs van het doorluchtich Huys van Nassauwen, ende meesten deel tot gedachtenis van uwer Excellentie Heer Vaders hoog-loflicker memorien, ende oock van uwe Excellencie selver, die voor de welvaert van dese vereenichde Landen geen nood, gheen ghevaer, noch vliitighen sorgh geschout en hebben».

83. Pollmann, 2008: 11.

Besides, Duym brings the actual situation of the country's financial despair to the notice of the readers to warn them not to take a prompt decision for a fake peace. In the stead he asks for financial sacrifices of the population, if they wish to maintain God's word, the freedom of the country and their own peace and quiet, preventing the Spanish enemy from a new opportunity to settle scores<sup>84</sup>. When we consider the final piece as the mean standpoint, as a proof that a fair battle is better than a fake Peace, the first five stage plays may be considered as a summing up of the supporting arguments and main points of this case. In that respect the *Ghedenck-boeck* functions as a closing argument, a vital part of the case however, as it contains a «last» chance to convince the readers to see the issue from the author's perspective. The political intention may be obvious, and Duym will have engaged with his memory book in the current political debate about war-or peace.

Duym was convinced of God's personal concern with the war, God being a pillar to Orange, offering help or punishing, whereas the Spanish side was represented by evil powers.<sup>85</sup> By switching between individual actions and the public interest and using God as an intermediate, Duym explored a well-considered technique of mobilizing different episodes to sustain the arguments by which he could plead his case. The «horizons of expectation» (Koselleck) sketched by the author were accepted by his audience as they were based on shared experience. For Duym and his readers future and past must have been related in this sense. They provided a convincing strategy for future goods.<sup>86</sup> In this light the history from 1568 to 1605 was an argumentative event in itself. History became argumentation and thus, mentioning the different events in the different stage plays of the *Ghedenck-boeck*, Duym did nothing else but to write a passionate peroration, a closing argument. In his plea for a continuation of the war the (re)considering of historical episodes functioned as a last opportunity to remind his readers.

---

84. See Duits, 2001: 31.

85. Duits, 2001: 22-23.

86. Koselleck, 2004: 223.

## WORKS CITED

- BLOEMENDAL, Jan, «De dramatische moord op de Vader des Vaderlands. De verhouding tussen vier typen toneel in de vroegmoderne Nederlanden», *De zeventiende eeuw*, 23, 2007: 99-117.
- BRAET, Antoine, «The Classical Doctrine of *status* and the Rhetorical Theory of Argumentation», *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 20.2, 1987: 79-93.
- DEVENTER, Marinus L. van, (ed.), *Gedenkstukken van Johan van Oldenbarnevelt en zijn tijd*, The Hague, 1862, vol. 2.
- DUITS, Henk, «“De Vryheid, wiens waardy geen mensch te recht bevat”. “Vrijheid” op het Nederlands toneel tussen 1570 en 1700», in *Vrijheid. Een geschiedenis van de vijftiende tot de twintigste eeuw*, ed. E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier and W. R. E. Velema, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1999: 99-131.
- , «Om de eenheid en vrijheid van de gehele Nederlanden: Jacob Duym's Ghedenck-boeck (1606) als politiek manifest», *Voortgang*, 20, 2001: 7-45.
- DUYM, Jakob, *Een Ghedenck-boeck, het welck ons leert aen al het quaet en den grooten moetwil van de Spaingnaerden en haren aenhanck ons aen-ghedaen te ghedencken. ende de groote liefde ende trou vande Princen uyt den huysen van Nassau, aen ons betoont, eeuwelick te onthouden*, Leyden, 1606. [*Ghedenck-boeck*]
- , *Een Nassausche Perseus, verlosser van Andromeda, ofte de Nederlantsche Maeght*, s.l., s.a. (Leyden, 1606). [*Perseus*]
- , *Het moordadich stuck van Balthasar Gerards, begaen aen den Doorluchtighen Prince van Oraingnen, 1584*, Leyden, 1606. [*Het moordadich stuck*]
- , *Benoude Beleggeringe der stad Leyden, uyt bevel des Machtighen Conincx van Hispaingnen, in den Iaere 1574 haer aen-ghedaen. Ende het wonderbaerlijck ontset daer op den derden dagh Octobris 1574 ghevolght*, Leyden, 1606. [*Leyden*]
- , *Beleggeringe der Stadt Antwerpen, By den Prince van Parma uyt crachte van sijne Conincklijcke Majesteyt van Hispaingnen, in den jaere 1584. Mitsgaders, Het droevich overgaen der selver Stadt*, Leyden, 1606. [*Antwerpen*]
- , *De Cloeck-moedighe ende Stoute daet, van het innemen des Casteels van Breda en verlossinghe der Stad. Onder het beleyd van den Hoogh-Gheboren Prins Graeff Mauritz van Nassau, etc.*, Leyden, 1606. [*Breda*]
- , *Een Bewys dat beter is eenen goeden Crijgh, dan eenen gheveynsden Peys. Midsgaders t»gene ghebeurt is inden jaere 1600*, Leyden, 1606. [*Een Bewys*]
- EVEN, Edward van, «De krijgsman en dichter Jacob Duym», *Verlagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Vlaamsche Academie*, 1901: 515-537.
- EYSENGA, Willem J. M. van, *De wording van het Twaalfjarig Bestand van 9 april 1609*, Amsterdam, Noord-Hollandsche uitgevers mij, 1959.
- GELDEREN, Martin van, «De Nederlandse Opstand (1555-1610): van “vrijheden” naar “oude vrijheid” en de “vrijheid der conscientien”», in *Vrijheid. Een geschiedenis van de vijftiende tot de twintigste eeuw*, ed. E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier and W.R.E. Velema, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1999: 27-52.
- GROENLAND, Juliette, «Playing to the public, playing with opinion: Latin and vernacular dutch history drama by Heinsius and Duym», in *Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Low Countries, 1450-1650*, ed. J. Bloemendal, A. van Dixhoorn and E. Strietman, Leiden / Boston, Brill, 2011: 121-150.
- HOLENSTEIN, Andre, Thomas MAISSEN, and Maarten PRAK (ed.), *The Republican Alternative*.

- The Netherlands and Switzerland compared*, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2008.
- ISRAEL, Jonathan H., *The Dutch Republic and the Hispanic World 1606-1661*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1982.
- , *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall 1477-1806*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1998.
- KONST, Johannes W. H., *Fortuna, Fatum en Providentia Dei in de Nederlandse tragedie 1600-1720*, Hilversum, 2003.
- KOPPENOL, Johan, «Jacob Duym en de Leidse rederijkers», *Neerlandistiek.nl*, 01.11, 2001: 1-23.
- KORSTEN, Frans-Willem, «God as Keystone of the System of Commonplaces. The Case of Joost van den Vondel's Plays», in *Commonplace Culture in Western Europe in the Early Modern Period II. Consolidation of God-given power*, ed. Kathryn Banks and Philip G. Bossier, Leuven, Peeters, 2011: 1-23.
- KOSSELLECK, Reinhart, *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*, Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp, 1979.
- , *Futures past. On the semantics of historical time*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2004.
- MCGEE, Michael C., «The Fall of Wellington: A Case Study of the Relationship between Theory, Practice and Rhetoric in History», *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 63, 1977: 28-42.
- MEIJER DREES, Marijke, «Liever een rechtvaardige oorlog dan een geveinsde vrede. Politieke propaganda in een vroeg zeventien de-eeuws toneelstuk over het turfschip van Breda», *Jaarboek De Oranjeboek*, 43, 1990: 1-15.
- , «16 januari 1643: Uit naam van Frederik Hendrik stuurt Huygens een zilveren kan en schotel aan Hooft als dank voor de Neederlandsche historien. Betekenis van de vaderlandse geschiedenis voor de literatuur», in *Nederlandse literatuur, een geschiedenis*, ed. M.A. Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen and Ton Anbeek, Groningen, Nijhoff, 1993: 243-248.
- MULLER, Frederik and Pieter Anton TIELE, *Bibliotheek van Nederlandsche pamfletten*, vol 1. Amsterdam, 1858.
- NOAK, Bettina, *Politische Auffassungen im niederländischen Drama des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Münster, Waxmann, 2002.
- POLL, Klaas, *Over de tooneelspelen van den Leidschen rederijker Jacob Duym*, Groningen, University of Groningen, 1898.
- POLLMANN, Judith, «“Brabanters do fairly resemble Spaniards after all”. Memory, Propaganda and Identity in the Twelve Years' Truce», in *Public Opinion and Changing Identities in the Early Modern Netherlands. Essays in Honour of Alastair Duke*, ed. Judith Pollmann and Andrew Spicer, Leiden, Brill, 2007: 211-227.
- , *Het oorlogsverleden van de Gouden Eeuw*, inaugural lecture, Leiden, Universiteit Leiden, 2008.
- PORTEMAN, Karel, and Mieke B. SMITS-VELDT, *Een nieuw vaderland voor de muzen. Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse literatuur. 1560-1700*, Amsterdam, Bert Bakker, 2008.
- REESE, Stephen D., «Finding Frames in a Web of Culture. The Case of the War on Terror», in *Doing News Framing Analysis. Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*, ed. Paul D'Angelo and Jim A. Kuypers, New York / London, Routledge, 2010: 17-42.
- SCHENKEVELD-VAN DER DUSSEN, Maria A., *Dutch Literature in the Age of Rembrandt. Themes*

- and Ideas*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, Benjamins, 1991.
- SPIES, Marijke, «Verbeeldingen van vrijheid: David en Mozes, Burgerhart en Bato, Brutus en Cato», *De zeventiende eeuw*, 10, 1994: 141-155.
- , «“Vrijheid, vrijheid”: poëzie als propaganda, 1565-1665», in *Vrijheid. Een geschiedenis van de vijftiende tot de twintigste eeuw*, ed. E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier and W.R.E. Velema, Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 1999: 71-98.
- WILLIGEN, H. van, *Het toneel van Jacob Duym. Een onderzoek naar de plaats van Duym in de Nederlandse toneelliteratuur*, Amsterdam, Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2002. [MA Thesis.]
- ZUILEN, Vincent van, «The “Netherlandish Beehive” (1608). Public opinion and identity as a commonplace in Dutch anti-peace propaganda», in *Commonplace Culture in Western Europe in the Early Modern Period II. Consolidation of God-given power*, ed. Kathryn Banks and Philiep G. Bossier, Leuven, Peeters, 2011: 89-107.