

February 2019

Persisting in the Negative: the Banishment, Exile, and Execution of Gerard Udinck, 1657-1665

David Beeler

University of South Florida, david.a.beeler@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Beeler, David, "Persisting in the Negative: the Banishment, Exile, and Execution of Gerard Udinck, 1657-1665" (2019). *USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/etd/7742>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. It has been accepted for inclusion in USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ University of South Florida. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usf.edu.

Persisting in the Negative: the Banishment, Exile, and Execution of Gerard Udinck, 1657-1665

by

David Beeler

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of History
College of Arts and Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Kees Boterbloem, Ph.D.
Darcie S. Fontaine, Ph.D.
Frances L. Ramos, Ph.D.
William Cummings, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
January 25, 2019

Groningen, Dutch Republic, Münster, egodocuments, microhistory

Copyright © 2019, David Beeler

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I am deeply grateful for my major professor, Dr. Kees Boterbloem, who has provided me with invaluable guidance, research leads, insights into navigating Dutch archives, constructive feedback on my writing, and tips on securing funding for research trips to the Netherlands. For over six years, during my time as both a masters student and a doctoral student, Dr. Boterbloem has challenged my methodologies, arguments, and historical perspectives. As a result, I have not only improved my writing, but have also gained a more nuanced understanding of the historiography, available primary sources, and potential opportunities for future historical studies. In addition, Dr. Boterbloem has been instrumental in helping me improve my proficiency of the Dutch language, as well as seventeenth-century Dutch paleography, both of which were critical to this dissertation. The entire Boterbloem family has also shown me tremendous support and hospitality, both in the US as well as in the Netherlands. Simply put, Dr. Boterbloem has been an advocate, a mentor and a close friend. Without his help, this project would never have been possible. Ik heb genoten van onze koffiepauzes en “editorial meetings.” Dank u wel!

I am also very thankful for the feedback and recommendations provided by my committee members. Dr. Darcie Fontaine provided countless grammatical edits, as raised pertinent questions that ultimately helped to strengthen my argument and clarify my conclusion. Dr. Frances Ramos, who has supported me in this project for years, provided a number of constructive critiques related to political theory, potential pitfalls associated with microhistories,

as well as valuable suggestions on the organization and the general flow of logic throughout the story. Dr. Cummings has helped me bridge the divide between history and the humanities more broadly. His lessons on the spread (and rejection) of colonialism across both natural and political borders have contributed greatly to the framework of this dissertation.

I am thankful for the archivists at the Groninger Archieven who were not only willing to answer my questions, many of which were in broken Dutch, but they did so with an unwavering kindness and patience. Thank you to those same archivists in Groningen who digitized and emailed over 200 pages of primary sources. Your assistance with these documents saved me time and money, two commodities that are often in short supply as a doctoral student. Thank you also to the archivists at the Koninklijke Bibliotheek, who assisted me with locating various pamphlets within their incredible Knuttel Collection.

I would also like to thank those who have offered encouragement or have contributed in other ways, either directly or indirectly, to the completion of this project. A special thank you to all of those who have provided feedback during past courses, workshops, and conference presentations, most notably Michael Swierczynski, Josh Britt, John Northrop, Blake Lorenz, and Sean Swenson. Thank you to the USF Humanities Department for providing employment opportunities during the summer to supplement my income. Thank you to my cousins in the Netherlands, Petra Even, Riek Even, and Stephanie Gringhuis, for your wonderful hospitality and for providing me with a tour of the town of Coevorden, the castle, water tower, and other fascinating points of interest there. Of course, I would be remiss if I did not thank my mother, Cindy Even, who, since the day I was born, has provided me with more than enough encouragement and material assistance to pursue and achieve anything that I've ever wanted. Thank you, Mom!

Finally, thank you to my wife, Sara, and our two boys, Evan and Jack, for enduring what often seemed like an endless ordeal. Your tireless patience, understanding, love and support have been a constant source of stability in a difficult and sometimes stressful experience. Thank you Jack for playing quietly near my desk so that I could push through long days and nights of reading and writing. Your playfulness and innocence was both motivating and inspiring. Thank you Evan for traveling to the Netherlands with me in the summer of 2018, and for finding and photographing the grave of Dr. Lucas Harckens in the Martinikerk in Groningen. It was inspiring to see you so interested in my research and so engaged in the history of the Netherlands more generally. And thank you Sara for your unwavering encouragement and optimism, without which, I likely never would have begun this adventure in the first place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: <i>Stad en Land</i> : The Underpinnings of Revolt	30
Political Rivalry in Groningen	33
The City Council	36
The Ommelanden	37
The Stadholderate in Groningen	39
The Guilds	42
The Guild Riot of 1657	46
Johan Schulenborgh	51
Chapter Two: The Price of Peace, 1661-1662	57
The Treaty of the Hague, 1661	59
The Case Against Schulenborgh	65
Schulenborgh and the Guild Riot of 1662	69
A New Propaganda War	73
Schulenborgh's Trial	75
Chapter Three: Dismembering the Guilds, 1662 - 1663	79
Gerard Udinck and the Tailors' Guild in Groningen	80
A Dark and Stormy Night	85
Military Friends, Patrons, and Clients	92
A Brush with Death	99
When the Clock Struck Seven, We Left Groningen	108
Chapter Four: Daily Life in Steinfurt, 1663 - 1664	112
Precarious Contacts	119
Time, Weather, Women and Finance	130
Business Transactions	135
The Dangers of Gossip and Dishonor	142
Chapter Five: "A rosebud in a poor man's bag": 1664	151
The Imminence of War	153
The Dijlerschans	155
A Conversation with the Stadholder	160
Spiritual Guidance in Exile	165
The Gift from God	167

The Comet	175
Chapter Six: No Return on Investment, 1665	180
Default Risks	184
The Marshaling of Forces	189
Misery Loves Company: War and Poverty	196
A Vague Belief and a Porous Border	201
Capture	208
Chapter Seven: “He would gladly bear the torment”: 1665	214
Münsterphobia	216
<i>Sauvegarde</i>	218
Interrogations	224
<i>Nostre Amis Commun</i>	227
<i>Gesundheit-Trinken</i>	230
Torment	236
Spectacle, Pain, and the Limits of State Punishment	240
Conclusion	246
Epilogue	255
Bibliography	260

ABSTRACT

In January 1663 the former alderman of the Groningen tailors' guild, Gerard Udinck, was sentenced to death for his role in orchestrating a series of riots in the city. On the day of his execution, however, Udinck received a pardon in the form of a lifelong banishment. Although initially relieved to be alive, Udinck's experiences in exile would prove taxing in a variety of ways. He spent the next three years in northwestern Germany, first in Steinfurt and then in Neuenhaus, where he recorded his daily life in a diary. Many of these entries describe a life that was shaped by disparaging gossip, threats of violence, physical assaults, a devastating plague epidemic, the loss of powerful patrons, and financial hardships. In the autumn of 1665 a massive army of mercenaries from Münster, some 20,000 strong, began advancing on the eastern provinces of the Dutch Republic. Fearing for his life and his property, Udinck made the fateful decision to flee back to the Dutch Republic. Soon after, he was arrested by the Groningen authorities, who accused him of conspiring with the Münster army, and subsequently sentenced him to death.

The story that follows explores Udinck's banishment, exile, and execution using a microhistorical approach. As a microhistory, this dissertation is primarily concerned with the juxtaposition between Udinck's agency or free will and the broader constraints of seventeenth-century European society. It argues that Udinck's arrest in 1665 was not simply the result of his possible collusion, stubbornness or naivety, but instead was informed by significant external

events, such as the consolidation and monopolization of power in Groningen's municipal government, as well as an acute sense of panic caused by the military invasion from Münster.

Recognizing that diaries, and other egodocuments, can serve as important counterweights to more formal sources, this dissertation examines Udinck's story through the lens of his diary entries. Furthermore, these are read against a number of other contemporary sources including trial records, interrogators' notes, pamphlets, and various accounts of the seventeenth-century Dutch historian, Lieuwe van Aitzema. As such, Udinck's diary provides a unique glimpse into the life of a man who was under enormous social pressure and heavily critical of the political leaders attempting to profit from his downfall. Udinck criticized these men in his diary entries, in letters, and in conversations in taverns and homes. For the Groningen authorities, Udinck's words were subversive and threatening to the social order. And with an enemy army literally outside the gates, the leaders of Groningen would not entertain the idea of a second pardon.

INTRODUCTION

On the morning of 18 November 1665 in the Dutch city of Groningen, two unlikely prisoners, Gerard Udinck, the former alderman of the Groningen tailors' guild, and his colleague, Dr. Lucas Harckens, the former lawyer of Groningen's eighteen guilds, emerged from their holding cells surrounded by a small contingent of soldiers.¹ After weeks of imprisonment, interrogation and torture, both men were found guilty of conspiring with the Bishop of Münster, Christoph Bernhard von Galen (1606-1678), whose army was pillaging the Dutch countryside, and as a result, both were sentenced to die by the sword. Cold, weak and disheveled, Udinck and Harckens were escorted one at a time to a scaffold located in the *Grote Markt*, the city's large central market square. There the condemned men awaited their fate surrounded by a crowd of onlookers, and two of Groningen's most imposing structures: the towering *Martinikerk*, often referred to as *d' Olle Grieze* (the Old Gray) by locals, to the east; and the *Stadhuis* (city hall) to the west. The *Martinikerk* and *Stadhuis* still dominate Groningen's cityscape today, but in 1665, the size, relative position and significance of these structures would have been even more impressive. Together, the citizenry and these landmarks emphasized the linkage and legitimacy of the city's spiritual, political, and economic centers of power: the Reformed Church, the city

¹ For the most part, the dates that appear in this dissertation follow the Julian calendar, which was favored by most of the Dutch Republic as well as the English. This is ten days behind and the "*stilo novo*" (new style) Gregorian calendar, which had been used in Holland, Zeeland, and Brabant since 1582/83. Gerard Udinck used the older Julian calendar, as did most of the Dutch Republic until 1700. Groningen did not adopt the new style until 1701. Therefore, the dates in Udinck's diary match the dates used in Groningen (because both followed the Julian calendar), but are often ten days behind those in Holland (where the Gregorian calendar was used). For more information on this, see Willem Frijhoff and Marijke Spies, *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective*. Vo. I: 1650, *Hard-Won Unity* (Assen: Palgrave, 2004), 127; and Hermann Niebaum and Fokko Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap (1663-1665)* (Groningen, the Netherlands: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1988), ix.

council, and the marketplace, respectively. Peering out from the scaffold, they were likely the last views seen by Udinck and Harckens.

This was not Udinck's or Harckens's first brush with death at the hands of the Groningen authorities. Almost three years earlier, in January 1663, both men, as well as their colleague, Gerrit Warendorp, a former *bouwmeester* (architect/representative) of Groningen's eighteen guilds, were all convicted of orchestrating riots in the city.² These guild riots, as they have come to be known, took place in 1657 and again in 1662 and were meant to undermine the authority of Groningen's city council, reduce some of the tax burdens on the guilds and increase the guilds' influence in the municipal government. For his part, Warendorp was executed, while Udinck and Harckens received a last minute pardon in the form of a lifelong banishment.³

For the next two and half years, Gerard Udinck lived in exile in northwestern Germany, first in the town of Steinfurt and later in Neuenhaus, where he recorded the many hardships and difficulties of daily life in a diary that has been preserved by, and is still held in, the *Groninger Archieven* (Groningen Municipal Archives). While a number of primary sources have been consulted for this project, the diary itself is the centerpiece of this dissertation. It is an intriguing source, not only because it describes the social and economic impact of gossip, dishonor, poverty, war, and disease, but also because it provides a remarkable glimpse into the private thoughts of a seventeenth-century craftsman who faced enormous social pressures. Udinck's diary, therefore, houses a story that is rich in both human agency as well as social constraints. The manner in which Udinck understood, navigated, and challenged his various external obstacles that lies at the heart of his diary, and thus flows throughout this dissertation.

² Groninger Archieven (GrA), Toegang 2041, Inv. 144, "Sententiën van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen tegen Gerrijt Harms Warendorp, Dr. Lucas Harckens en Gerhard Udinck," 16 January 1663.

³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 11, 16 January 1663.

Evidence of the tension between Udinck's private and public life appear almost immediately in his diary. In the opening pages, one finds two significant passages. One of these is a poem:

*Het koninckryck der hemelen te koopē:
Hett rÿke mett armoede
Die blydtschap mett droeffnisse,
Die ruste, mett moÿte, Die eerlyckheit mett schande,
Hett leeven mett die doodt.⁴*

To buy the kingdom of heaven:
The rich with the poor
The joy with the sadness,
The ease with the trouble
The honesty with the shame,
The living with the dead.

The poem is not dated, nor does Udinck provide a critical explanation of its deeper meaning or significance. At first glance, and especially if one is not familiar with the diary in its entirety, the poem resembles a riddle, awkwardly placed and perhaps of little or no insignificance. Researchers could easily skip over it without a second thought or quickly forget about it as they move on to the seemingly more poignant issues within his diary. I argue that this would be an unfortunate mistake, because it speaks to the essence of Udinck's mindset in the final years of his life: it signifies, more than anything else, his sentiments of loss, a theme that dominated his experiences in exile. This sense of loss is also juxtaposed to his embattled hope that those enormous losses would be remedied somehow through legal, political, and/or spiritual redemption.

The other passage is located just above the poem, and serves as a brief request to anyone who might come into possession of the diary: "*Begeere datt deesen na mÿn doodt, te weeten deese kladde, mag int vuÿr verbrant worden, want hÿr nÿdt sonderlings in iss, als alleen gedient*

⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274.

tot myn tyd verdrjff in myn ballinckschap.” ([I] desire to know that after my death, this notebook will be burned in the fire, because there is nothing unusual in it, as [it] only served to dispel my time while in exile.)⁵ This ostensible demand was not born out of pragmatism alone. Udinck surely recognized that his diary was filled with compromising stories that, if made public, could further jeopardize his honor and reputation, as well as that of his family.

The significance of these passages becomes clear as one traces the final years of Udinck’s life. By the autumn of 1665, shortly before his second arrest and execution, Udinck’s predicament had become untenable and his outlook increasingly pessimistic. In September 1665, the prince-bishop of Münster launched a massive military invasion into the eastern provinces of the Dutch Republic. Udinck, who at the time was living in Neuenhaus, suddenly found himself in the path of some 20,000 mercenaries. These men were violent, dangerous, and had a reputation for supplementing their meager income with plunder. As a property owner, Udinck had much to lose. It was in this moment that Udinck made a fateful decision to violate the terms of his banishment and travel back across the Dutch border.

He fled first to the quasi-province of Drenthe, where he reconnected with his old friend, Dr. Harckens, and then to the Groningen border, where, in October 1665, he was spotted and arrested.⁶ Harckens was apprehended a short time later as well.⁷ While in custody, both argued vehemently that they were not acting maliciously, but were simply fleeing from Von Galen’s mercenaries. The interrogators, however, never took this motive very seriously. In all likelihood, no excuse would have been sufficient; their fates were probably sealed the moment they crossed the border. As this dissertation makes clear, the city council members had for many years looked

⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274.

⁶ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxiv.

⁷ Ibid.

at the guilds with suspicion and had even sought revenge against those guild leaders who had orchestrated the earlier riots. The violation of Udinck's and Harckens's banishment provided such an opportunity. This is further evidenced by the severity of their punishment, which, even for seventeenth-century Dutch standards, was unusual and excessive. As W.J. Formsma has shown, throughout the entire Dutch Golden Age (c. 1600-1700), Udinck, Harckens and Warendorp were the only citizens in Groningen to be executed for political reasons, and this was indeed a testament to the bitterness that existed among Groningen's city council members.⁸

One of the aims of this dissertation is to examine why Udinck and Harckens were executed, while so many other criminals in the city had received mercy, some of whom on multiple occasions. A possible explanation is that their executions had a hidden agenda, serving a didactic purpose that had little to do with the ostentatious reckoning of alleged traitors; rather, these executions were meant to signify the final death blow to the guilds, the artisans' organizations that had been the city council's most significant economic and political rivals for decades. By the late seventeenth century, Dutch guilds were in the thrall of burgeoning capitalism, and contemporary entrepreneurs, financiers and political leaders increasingly considered the guilds, with their quality guarantees and wage-and-price agreements, a great hinderance to the unrestricted efforts of doing business. For the Groningen mayors and council members, the guilds' attempts to destabilize the city and undermine the city leaders' authority were unforgivable. When Udinck and Harckens were apprehended in October 1665, the Groningen authorities wasted no time in making an example of their old foes. After the two scapegoats were killed, no social or political upheaval would significantly upset or threaten the

⁸ W. J. Formsma, "De politieke toestand in het Noorden vóór de inval," in A. Westers ed., *Groningen Constant: Groningen-Münster, 1672* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1972), 33.

Groninger pecking order again, at least not until the age of the patriots around 1780. Thus, the deterrent seems to have worked.

These executions were also informed by an acute sense of panic - the invasion of Münster - suggesting that Udinck's and Harckens's death sentences served a sort of dual exemplary purpose. In addition to signifying the elimination of the guilds' power, their sentences also served as a warning to others within the province that colluding with the enemy would be met with swift and heavy punishment. In the fall of 1665, with Von Galen's troops on their doorstep, the patriotic fervor in the city of Groningen was palpable. The second arrests took place at a time when the Münster army was bogged down just south of Groningen, in Overijssel and Drenthe. There, Von Galen's mercenaries plundered, pillaged, and terrorized the countryside. For the Groningers, it appeared to be not a matter of if, but when, this horde would exhaust the peasants' and farmers' resources, and advance on the city of Groningen. The well-being and survival of the city hung in the balance, and the city leaders turned to extremes to steal their citizenry's resolve.

Von Galen, whom the Dutch had nicknamed "Bommen Berend" because of his fondness for artillery, seemed poised to either besiege the city of Groningen, or bombard it into oblivion. Stirred up with a sort of Münsterphobia, and faced with the sudden and unexpected reappearance of two notorious exiles, the Groningen authorities quickly accused Udinck and Harckens of assisting Von Galen's military invasion. City leaders and many of their citizens were only too willing to believe in their complicity. They were deemed treasonous actors, perhaps part of Von Galen's extended entourage, or, at the very least, having had strong sympathies for the prince-bishop. The interrogators even suggested that Udinck and Harckens were motivated by revenge against the city council and were bent on the complete destruction of Groningen.⁹ The surviving

⁹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665.

evidence, meanwhile, is ambiguous regarding Udinck's and Harckens's involvement. In the end they could do no more than refute these accusations, which they did to no avail.¹⁰

This dissertation does not necessarily attempt to prove the innocence or guilt of Udinck or Harckens, even if no real evidence has come to light to suggest that they did betray the city. Any attempt to claim definitively whether or not these men were guilty or innocent would be problematic, especially considering the fact that various forms of torture were used to secure confessions.¹¹ It is plain to see, however, that both men, through their prior roles in the guild riots and their interactions with controversial figures while in exile, had made a number of political enemies within Groningen's city council. This undoubtedly contributed to their undoing. Taken together, the long standing bitterness, the timing of the invading army, and their dubious contacts while in exile, coalesced in such a way that a second pardon was simply not possible.

Instead, the aim of this dissertation is to explore the economic, political and social circumstances that informed and restricted Udinck's life as a citizen of Groningen, as an exile in northwestern Germany, and as a prisoner condemned to die by the sword. The story that follows is built largely from Gerard Udinck's diary entries, and is intended to be told through the lens of a microhistorical approach. Such a reading allows for a fascinating insight into the seventeenth-century mindset, through which this dissertation is likewise a cultural history. Throughout Udinck's notes, we find him grappling with issues of free will that clash with the stifling constraints of seventeenth-century society. Pioneers of the microhistory genre, such as Natalie Zemon Davis, Carlo Ginzburg, Robert Darnton and others have shown that struggles between

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid., see also GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 33, 14 October 1665.

individual agency and hegemonic culture are the hallmarks of the microhistorical approach.¹² In addition, Giovanni Levi has argued that historians who engage in microhistory usually have “their roots in Marxism,” but they are generally interested in “more realistic descriptions of human behavior” that emphasize one’s “relative freedom beyond, though not outside, the constraints of prescriptive and oppressive normative systems.”¹³ As this dissertation shows, this “relative freedom” was the arc of Udinck’s life in exile.

Building on the microhistorical tradition, this dissertation addresses the following questions: to what extent could Udinck, and the other members of the guild leadership challenge Groningen’s prevailing power structures, which had long been dominated by a handful of politically-minded and well-to-do families? How and why did local political issues in Groningen interact with those of the ruling oligarchs in Holland? How did Holland and Groningen defend their provinces and the broader Republic against foreign military threats, and what impact did these political and military decisions have on those at ground level? What, if anything, did Udinck do to assist the invading army, one that operated under a notorious Catholic bishop? As a foreign-born craftsman, what limits, if any, were placed on Udinck’s social mobility and economic success - in good times and in bad? And what role did friendships and patronage-

¹² See for example, Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983); Richard L. Kagan, *Lucrecia’s Dreams: Politics and Prophecy in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990). Alexander Parma Cook and Noble David Cook, *Good Faith and Truthful Ignorance: A Case of Transatlantic Bigamy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991); Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992); Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books: 2009).

¹³ Giovanni Levi, “On Microhistory,” in Peter Burke ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 2001), 93-95. Microhistory, as a distinct style of history, rose from the political and cultural debates of the 1970s. In the 1970s and 1980s, the social sciences were increasingly seen as being “weighed down by a burden of inherited positivism.” Thus, microhistory was a response to the crisis of social history’s reliance on hard data and modeling. The underlying model for microhistories is the “constant negotiation, manipulation, choices and decisions in the face of a normative reality . . . Therefore the main conflict is not one between new and traditional history, but rather one of the meaning of history seen as an interpretive practice.”; see also Jill Lepore, “Historians Who Love Too Much: Reflections on Microhistory and Biography” *The Journal of American History* 88, 1 (June, 2001): 129-144: 133.

clientage relationships play in Udinck's life? These and other considerations will be examined in the pages that follow.

ON PRIMARY SOURCES

The story of Udinck's exile and execution is largely centered around two main archival collections: the first is Udinck's diary, a type of egodocument that is rare to find for someone of his station, and therefore presents a window into the mindset of a seventeenth-century Groninger. Udinck also wrote in a mix of Dutch and Low Saxon, or Plattdeutsch - a uniquely blended language that reflected the borderland region in which he lived - what is now the eastern Netherlands and northwestern Germany. In his diary, he recorded topics that were both mundane (remarking on time, weather, cooking, work, and church services) and extraordinary (discussing controversial contacts, arguments, gossip, the plague epidemic, and troop movements), all of which shaped his daily life between December 1662 and October 1665. While these elements contribute to our historical knowledge of early modern Europeans, what makes these types of sources so compelling is, in the words of Ronald Bedford and Lloyd Davis, the interactions between "the author and other participants, who are not always completely sure of how they are supposed to act or behave towards each other."¹⁴ In this regard, Udinck's diary is instrumental in describing contemporary social experiences, including his attempts at mapping out his own path in the face of a number of complex relationships, conflicts, and other social, legal, and political entanglements.

The second group of key primary sources for this study is a collection of interrogator notes and trial records, which have been read and analyzed against the background of the

¹⁴ Ronald Bedford and Lloyd Davis, *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation 1500-1660* (London: Routledge, 2007), 65.

chronicles of the Dutch historian Lieuwe van Aitzema (1600-1669). This second category helps to reconstruct the events, and possible motivations behind those events, which took place between Udinck's last diary entry in October 1665 and his execution in November 1665. Finally, there are a number of pamphlets and legal placards that were printed and posted throughout the Dutch Republic regarding the crimes, arrests, banishments and executions of the guild leaders. These are used to better illustrate the animosity that was felt, and the disparaging rhetoric that was employed, by various factions within Groningen.

HISTORIOGRAPHY

The intellectual parameters of this dissertation are situated at the intersection of three main historiographies: the broad political and economic history of the Dutch Republic in the Golden Age; the history of migration to the Dutch Republic; and the history of the province of Groningen, with a special focus on the competition for political primacy between Groningen's old patricians and the up-and-coming members of the citizenry. In addition to these three main historiographies, the aforementioned microhistories and the growing study of egodocuments (autobiographical sources such as diaries, journals, travel accounts and personal letters) have contributed greatly to the framework of this dissertation.¹⁵ In dialogue with these works, I not only intend to shed light on the political and economic underpinnings surrounding Gerard Udinck's story, but also to construct a more substantive discussion regarding how and why Groningen's citizenry interpreted, accepted, and challenged the prevailing power structures in and around the city.

¹⁵ Regarding the use of egodocuments as historical sources, see see Michael Mascuch, Rudolf Dekker, and Arianne Baggerman, "Egodocuments and History: A Short Account of the Longue Durée," *The Historian* 79,1 (spring 2016): 11-56; and Rudolf M. Dekker, *Family, Culture and Society in the Diary of Constantijn Huygens Jr, Secretary to Stadholder-King William of Orange* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

HISTORIOGRAPHY: THE DUTCH REPUBLIC

Historians of early modern Europe have long viewed the Dutch Republic with an exceptional curiosity.¹⁶ They have often questioned how such a small country could have become so wealthy, powerful and influential, even in the face of a seemingly unending war with Spain. The Dutch anomaly was further complicated in the 1960s and 1970s, when social historians, such as Hugh Trevor-Roper, and E. P. Thompson and others debated Eric Hobsbawm's notion that seventeenth-century Europe was in a "general crisis" because of widespread social changes, which they contended were driven by economic and political uncertainties.¹⁷ For Hobsbawm, the "general crisis" originated from economic shifts in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, including the decline of the Mediterranean as a center of commerce, disruptions in the Baltic grain trade, the rise of absolutism in places like France and Spain, and most important for Hobsbawm, the impact of capitalism around the globe.¹⁸ However, the Dutch Golden Age, so named for the Dutch Republic's unprecedented economic expansion, swelling middle class, and blossoming of art and culture, did not always fit neatly into Hobsbawm's broader critique of capitalism. Thus, the recent contributions to the historiography of the Dutch economy have reflected more nuanced approaches that seek to better understand how and why Dutch markets achieved so much success while most of Europe struggled to make ends meet.

¹⁶ Pieter Muller, *Onze Gouden Eeuw: de Republiek der Vereenigde Nederlanden in haar bloeitijd* (Leiden: Sijthoff, 1908); Johan Huizinga, *Dutch Civilization in the 17th Century and Other Essays* (London: Collins, 1968); Maarten Prak, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), in terms of political organization and collaboration, Muller and Huizinga have described the Dutch government as defective and a 'monstrosity', respectively; and Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995); see also Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*.

¹⁷ Trevor Aston, ed., *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1967).

¹⁸ Ibid.

One of the most significant contributions in this regard has been Jan de Vries' and Ad van der Woude's *The First Modern Economy*, which combines methodologies from the French *Annales* school with those from various American quantitative economic analyses.¹⁹ They position their research around the idea that geographical considerations (i.e., land reclamation, peat production, cattle farming, etc.) are best examined alongside political considerations (i.e., taxes, military expenditures, trade, etc.) with the intention of enhancing both.²⁰ For De Vries and Van der Woude, Dutch economic success was the product of exceptionally well developed markets, which increased social mobility, created more equitable property rights, and encouraged engineering and technological innovations, thus reflecting a more modern economy than was realized in other parts of Europe.²¹ This line of reasoning has hitherto been applied to studies of the Dutch military-industrial complex, in which scholars such as Marjolein 't Hart and Pepijn Brandon have shown that the relationship between war and commerce contributed not only to the accumulation of capital, but also to the unification of the various competing political factions within the Republic.²²

In addition to the aforementioned economic histories, there is also a rich historiography of seventeenth-century Dutch culture.²³ On this front, one of the most-cited works in the past

¹⁹ Jan de Vries and Ad van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 4.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 4-10.

²¹ See for example, Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011); and Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 313-315.

²² Marjolein 't Hart, *The Dutch Wars of Independence: Warfare and Commerce in the Netherlands, 1570-1680* (New York: Routledge, 2014); Pepijn Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State (1588-1795)* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).

²³ Rudolf Dekker, *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*, (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Erika Kuijpers, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, Jasper van der Steen, eds. *Memory before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2013); Benjamin Roberts, "Drinking like a Man: the Paradox of Excessive Drinking for Seventeenth-Century Dutch Youths," *Journal of Family History* 29, 3 (2004): 237-252; Benjamin Roberts, "The 'Marlboro Men' of the Early Seventeenth Century: Masculine Role Models for Dutch Youths in the Golden Age?" *Men and Masculinities* 9, 1 (2006): 76-94; Benjamin Roberts and Leendert

three decades is Simon Schama's *The Embarrassment of Riches*. In the vein of Johan Huizinga and Max Weber, Schama's research describes a Dutch national identity that is based on middle-class Calvinist morality.²⁴ However, rather than merely linking Calvinism with capitalist entrepreneurship to explain the Dutch economic miracle, Schama explores the awkward tension that existed between Calvinism and capitalism. For Schama, Dutch society was largely a bourgeois society centered around a relatively tolerant urban elite, all of whom grappled with how to reconcile the citizenry's newfound wealth with their prevailing beliefs in predestination.²⁵ At times, Schama's heavy emphasis on the middle class comes at the expense of a more inclusionary discussion of other classes and religions, such as the very poor, very wealthy, Catholics, Lutherans, etc., but nevertheless, Schama's work is invaluable to the broader historiography of the Dutch Republic and to this dissertation.²⁶

HISTORIOGRAPHY: IMMIGRATION IN THE DUTCH REPUBLIC

While much of the historiography of the Dutch Republic has focused on the lives of stadholders and leading regents, in recent decades there has also been a growing interest in those who had occupied the lower rungs of the Dutch social ladder, including soldiers, sailors, day laborers, maidservants, prostitutes, migrants, and other marginalized groups.²⁷ Studies regarding

Groenendijk, "Moral Panic and Holland's Libertine Youth of the late 1650s and 1660s," *Journal of Family History* 30, 4 (2005): 327-346.

²⁴ Simon Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches: an Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1988); see also J.L. Price, *Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (London: Reaktion Books, 2011).

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ See also, A.T. Van Deursen, trans. by Maarten Ultee, *Plain lives in a golden age: popular culture, religion, and society in seventeenth-century Holland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

²⁷ See for example, Van Deursen, *Plain lives*; and Lotte van de Pol, *The Burgher and the Whore: Prostitution in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

immigration, in particular, are yielding new insights into seventeenth-century Dutch society.²⁸ Between 1514 and 1680, the population of Holland more than tripled, and, between 1550-1650, the population of Amsterdam quadrupled as hundreds of thousands of immigrants hoped to carve out a better life for themselves by taking advantage of the expanding Dutch economy and the relative religious freedom in the Dutch Republic (not only in Amsterdam).²⁹ Merchants, artisans, and craftsmen fled Spanish religious persecution in the southern Netherlands, Scandinavians followed the timber trade from Norway where many of the men worked as sailors and the women as maids or servants, and the largest group, a mixed bag of laborers, farmers, servants, sailors, and soldiers from (especially northwestern) Germany - sometimes referred to as the *Hollandgänger* - all contributed to this “urbanization of Holland.”³⁰

Despite the influx of foreigners, Raingard Eßer has noted that many Dutch chroniclers from the seventeenth century failed to recognize the significance of immigrant labor, and this lack of mention in contemporary primary sources has carried over into recent secondary sources.³¹ As a result, Dutch historians have tended to adopt one of two lines of reasoning: some ignore the influx of immigrants entirely, suggesting that only the indigenous population contributed to the country’s successes; others claim that most immigrants easily acclimated

²⁸ See for example, David van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680-1700*, (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2015); Erika Kuijpers, “Poor, Illiterate and Superstitious? Social and Cultural Characteristics of the ‘Noordse Natie’ in the Amsterdam Lutheran Church in the Seventeenth Century,” in Louis Sickling, Harry de Bles, Erlend des Bouvrie, eds., *Dutch Light in the “Norwegian Night”: Maritime Relations and Migration Across the North Sea in Early Modern Times* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2004); Roelof van Gelder, *Zeepost: nooit bezorgde brieven uit de 17de en 18de eeuw* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Atlas, 2008); and Erika Kuijpers, *Migrantenstad: Immigratie en Sociale verhoudingen in 17e-eeuws Amsterdam* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2005).

²⁹ Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 74; see also Van de Pol, *The Burgher and the Whore*, 3, the population of Amsterdam grew from roughly 54,000 (early 1600s) to 200,000 (1650), and to 220,000 (1700).

³⁰ De Vries and Van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy*, 65, 72-74. This “urbanization of Holland” continued until the 1670s; thereafter, most cities experienced a decline in population, which “was all but complete by the mid-eighteenth century.”

³¹ Raingard Eßer, “From Province to Nation: Immigration and the Dutch Republic in the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries,” *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities* 5, 2 (2007): 263-277.

themselves to Dutch society and were understood more as fellow citizens than as a foreigners.³²

Neither explanation is satisfactory to Eßer, but these have nevertheless contributed to a sort of reified Dutch national identity, one that is particularly centered around the province of Holland.³³

This dissertation embraces a decentering approach. It represents a departure from the more traditional lines of inquiry found in the historiography of the Dutch Republic, which focus almost exclusively on the province of Holland, the city of Amsterdam, and the leading political characters in the maritime regions. This is not to say that Holland is ignored in this study. It is an unavoidable fact that as the entrepôt of the Republic's economy, Holland had long enjoyed both economic and political superiority over the other provinces. Holland was also instrumental in helping the Republic's economy through an intense focus on international trade, colonial ambitions, military successes, and investments in far-reaching trading companies. Thus, although this dissertation is focused on events in Groningen, Drenthe, and northwestern Germany, an occasional discussion of Holland's role and influence, even in these distant regions, is necessary.

While immigrants from all over Europe found their way to the Low Countries, the *Hollandgänger*, or German migrants to Holland, in particular had a reputation - especially among the wealthy Dutch city-dwellers - as taking on the most repugnant and the most dangerous professions in Dutch society.³⁴ For many decades, easily extending back to the early sixteenth century, German peasants had travelled to the eastern provinces for cyclical and seasonal work as laborers, farmers, and peat diggers.³⁵ In the seventeenth century, the vast majority of these *Hollandgänger* came from impoverished origins and worked in jobs that Dutch

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Van Deursen, *Plain lives*, 12-13.

³⁵ De Vries and Van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy*, 72-74; See also Steve Hochstadt. "Migration in Preindustrial Germany." *Central European History* 16, 3 (1983): 195-224: 206.

burghers abhorred. Many travelled to the Republic in the summer to extract peat, work in dairy or vegetable farms, or as laborers on dikes, dredging, and even burying the dead.³⁶ Jan Lucassen has suggested that the more dangerous the mission, the greater the reliance on foreign labor, and that, “half the male labor market in the western core parts of the Republic depended on foreigners.”³⁷ Likewise, Van Deursen has shown that the conditions were especially unfavorable for Germans, who were often “found at the lowest levels of society, in the worst-paid occupations . . . [and] were especially useful in remedying the shortage of sailors.”³⁸ Jaap Bruijn and Jan Lucassen have also shown that approximately forty percent of those in service of the Dutch East-India Company (VOC) between 1623 and 1791 were foreigners, and most of these men were Germans.³⁹ The influx of Germans into the Dutch Republic did not bolster their standing among the Dutch population. On the contrary, tropes, jokes, pejoratives, and farces from seventeenth-century Dutch popular culture reinforced the common stereotypes of German immigrants: penniless, pork-loving, beer guzzling, afraid of the sea, and as Lutherans or Catholics also superstitious, fond of idolatry, and easily tricked.⁴⁰ Udinck's life, however, challenges many of these stereotypes.

Strictly speaking, Udinck was a German immigrant. He was born in Westphalia, but he was wealthy, educated, and fluent in Dutch, German, French, and Latin. He had spent some time

³⁶ Lucassen, Jan, “Die Hollandgänger,” *Vortrag Stift Obernkirchen*, 14 December 2005.

³⁷ Jan Lucassen, “A Multinational and its Labor Force: The Dutch East India Company, 1595-1795,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 66 (2004): 12-39: 18, “The general principle governing recruitment into the maritime services of the Dutch Republic appears to have been that the larger the ships and the longer the voyages were, the lower the remuneration was and the higher the percentage of foreigners employed.” This notion is also supported by Jaap R. Bruijn and Jan Lucassen, eds., *Op de schepen der Oost-Indische Compagnie: vijf artikelen van J. de Hullu* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff and Bouma's Boekhuis, 1980), 140; Manon van der Heijden and Danielle van den Heuvel, “Sailors' Families and the Urban Institutional Framework in Early Modern Holland,” *The History of the Family* 12 (2007): 296-309: 301.

³⁸ Van Deursen, *Plain lives*, 33.

³⁹ Bruijn and Lucassen, *Op de schepen der Oost-Indische Compagnie*, 140.

⁴⁰ Dekker, *Humour in Dutch Culture*, 129-133.

in France as a young man, trained as a tailor, and migrated to the Dutch Republic, although not to Holland, but to Groningen, where he joined the tailors' guild in 1635.⁴¹ One year later, he married Janneke (Jantien) Jason, and while there is no mention of the couple having children of their own, they were guardians for Janneke's niece, Maria Jason, who lived with them in Groningen as well as in Steinfurt during their exile.⁴² He also had powerful friends and patrons within the Dutch military, many of whom were officers. It is worth noting, as Geert Mak makes clear, that "friendships had a different character in the seventeenth century than they have now."⁴³ Friendship was more than just mutual kindness, it was often akin to mutual patronage, a sort of quid-pro-quo.⁴⁴ Evidence from Udinck's diary, for example, suggests that he provided high quality clothing to military officers, which helped inform others of the officers' prestige. In turn, these officers provided Udinck with repeat business, word-of-mouth advertising, access to other high-ranking individuals, and perhaps even protection in times of crisis. Nevertheless, Udinck's military connections proved in the end not strong enough to save him. This is perhaps indicative of the growing marginalization of the soldiery in a country which had been born into war, but had all too easily forgotten the prime importance of military might in the hostile world of seventeenth-century Europe.

HISTORIOGRAPHY: POLITICAL HISTORY OF GRONINGEN

Like Holland, the eastern provinces also experienced an influx of German immigrants. And while some worked as day laborers or in other low paying seasonal jobs, many others could

⁴¹ GrA, Toegang 1605, Stadsbestuur 1594-1815, Inv. 332, Stadrekening 1635, fol. 134.

⁴² Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxx-lxxvi, Niebaum and Veldman suggest that Maria's parents may have passed away at a young age, but I have been unable to confirm this.

⁴³ Geert Mak, *The Many Lives of Jan Six: A Portrait of an Amsterdam Dynasty* (Amsterdam: Atlant Contact, 2017), 86.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

also be found among the middling sort, working as craftsmen, bakers, tailors, and merchants. By the mid-seventeenth century, the expanding Dutch economy had created opportunities for many of these immigrants to climb up the social ladder together with the indigenous population. As a result, a new class of urban-dwellers came into existence: the *homo novus* (new man), a Latin term used by contemporaries to describe one who had become wealthy enough, not only to attain citizenship, but also to enter into the dubious world of Dutch municipal and provincial politics.⁴⁵ In the province of Groningen, these *homines novi* increasingly threatened the political primacy of the older ruling-class families, and as a result, they have become a central theme in the historiography of Groningen during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁴⁶ Hidde Feenstra's research, for example, has shown that by the 1660s the political conflicts in Groningen no longer manifested themselves along one clear dividing line. Instead, these new men and their new money had splintered political rivalries into a number of shaky alliances. Most of these alliances were based on greed, nepotism, political aspirations, and other forms of self-interest. In this political maneuvering, patron-client networks, which could be encountered all across the Republic, played a crucial role in determining the extent to which one might succeed, or fail, to join and prosper in Groningen's economic and political circles.

The economic success of merchants and craftsmen also fueled a growing sense of civic consciousness in seventeenth-century Dutch society.⁴⁷ The up-and-coming segments of the population quickly gained a reputation for purchasing lands and titles, making large investments

⁴⁵ H. van Dijk and D. J. Roorda, "Social Mobility under the Regents of the Republic," in R. Baetens et al., *Acta Historiae Neerlandicae IX* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976), 77; see also H. Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web: Groningse regenten in relatie tot het omringende platteland tijdens de Republiek* (Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2007).

⁴⁶ Ibid.; see also, W.J. Formsma, ed., *Historie van Groningen. Stad en Land* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhof, 1981); and Geert H. Janssen, translated by J.C. Grayson, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic: Patronage and William Frederick of Nassau (1613-64)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008).

⁴⁷ Mak, *The Many Lives of Jan Six*, 25.

in international trade, and proudly displaying their family's coats of arms.⁴⁸ They also took steps to ensure that their offspring would be positioned for future success - often by sending them to prestigious universities, or marrying them into a well-respected family. They recognized the intrinsic value of political power and took steps to ensure that their sons would be placed in public offices, or entry-level political positions, such as a director of an orphanage, member of a trading company, or as an officer in the civic guard. The expectation was that these appointments would lead to something even more prestigious in the future. The natural progression of an ambitious burgher, therefore, was to attain some measure of wealth, followed by public office, and from there, with persistence and a little luck, one might gain acceptance into the city council, become a delegate in the States General, or possibly even mayor.⁴⁹

Groningen's politically-minded families, whether new or old, did not rule with an iron fist. They were simply too small in number to accomplish this. But they were deeply rooted in the city's economy and they often displayed favoritism for political patrons and clients who strengthened the city council's legitimacy, while ignoring or suppressing those who did not. As such, city leaders played an important role in setting the parameters around which various groups could gain influence and hegemony. This was sometimes accomplished formally through legislation and resolutions, which repeated the language of the dominant group, who were regularly referred to as "*Edele Mogende Heeren*" (Honorable Mighty Lords). This title was, for example, coveted by city leaders, but rarely used to address the leaders of the countryside.⁵⁰ In other instances, pamphlets and polemics were used to demonstrate the boundaries of acceptable behavior, or to spotlight potential deviants who threatened the authority of the city council. In

⁴⁸ Ibid., 158.

⁴⁹ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 214.

⁵⁰ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 236-237.

short, Groningen's political elites fostered an environment of deference, loyalty and subordination, while attempting to avoid physical conflict. But as the guild riots demonstrated, this strategy did not always have the desired effect.

In his study of the poor and poor relief in Groningen, Albert Buursma has identified five main episodes of social unrest in the city during the time of the Republic: these include the *pestoproer* (plague riot) (1623); *gildeoproer* (guild riots) (1657 and 1662); the *pachtersoproer* (tenants' riot) (1748); and the *patriottenoproer* (patriot's riot) (1787).⁵¹ As is evident by their names, these riots were primarily motivated by money and politics. This is also in line with Rudolf Dekker's research on popular protests in Holland, in which he contends that riots in the Republic during the seventeenth century were primarily driven by taxation and political issues.⁵² Protests regarding religious practices were largely inconsequential and limited to the first quarter of the century, and while food riots were commonplace throughout Europe, they were a rare phenomenon in Holland throughout the century.⁵³

Among the aforementioned riots in Groningen, only the plague riot of 1623 is described as a movement from below as the city forced local residents to pay for special pallbearers in order to transport the corpses of plague victims.⁵⁴ These added costs were disproportionately applied to the poorest residents in the city, which led to their rebellion.⁵⁵ The guild riots of 1657 and 1662, on the other hand, were orchestrated by the guild leaders, who then mobilized the poor

⁵¹ Albert Buursma, "*Dese bekommerlijke tijden*": *armenzorg, armen en armoede in de stad Groningen 1594-1795* (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2009), 337.

⁵² Rudolf M. Dekker, *Holland in beroering: oproeren in de 17de en 18de eeuw* (Ambo, 1982), 23-37; see also Rudolf M. Dekker, "Women in Revolt: Popular Protest and Its Social Basis in Holland in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Theory and Society* 16 (1987): 337-339.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Buursma, "*Dese bekommerlijke tijden*," 337-339.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

to achieve their own political and economic ends.⁵⁶ The riot of 1657 achieved some measure of success for the guilds in the form of increased political representation and influence over the city council. The riot of 1662, however, was brought to a halt by military force, and when the smoke cleared, no concessions to the guilds were made. On the contrary, as was mentioned, Gerrit Warendorp was executed, and a number of others, including Udinck, were banished from the city and province. The remaining guild members in the city were forced to sign an agreement, albeit under duress, that they would never again engage in any clandestine meetings or political interference.⁵⁷ On the whole, it seems that in 1662, the guilds more than forfeited all of the gains that they had achieved in 1657.

One of the questions that arises from the study of these events is, why was there not a third guild riot? Were the guild members content with the conditions set forth by the city leaders? Groningen's eighteen guilds were not a completely unified entity. As with the city council, there were factions within the guilds, and as might be expected, guild members were more likely to put their own individual interests ahead of those of the collective. Financial contentedness may have contributed to the guilds' pacification, but surviving financial records are few and far between. Thus, one cannot claim with absolute certainty that the lack of social disobedience between 1662 and 1748 is evidence of an entire social group that was content about its life and social situation.

Antonio Gramsci's theory on hegemony provides at least one other possible explanations for the pacification of the guilds: there was simply a lack of organized, talented, and motivated leadership, and without such leadership, discontented guild members were unable to unify in any

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Jan de Groot, G. Warnars, et al., *Tegenwoordige staat de Vereenigde Nederlanden; een en twintigste deel; Vervattende het vervolg der Beschryving van Stad en Lande* (Netherlands: Shouten, 1794), 160; Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 255.

meaningful way.⁵⁸ To this end, fear for harsh repercussions was without a doubt a driving force in this broader drama. Following the purge of the guilds' leadership in the winter of 1662/1663, guild members were certainly afraid, and rightfully so. If they initiated another revolt, they would likely find themselves isolated, imprisoned, banished, or dead. In Gramscian terms, if there were any remaining guild members in Groningen who were still harboring revolutionary fervor, they most likely waited in vain for a broader movement, foreign or domestic, to undermine the authority and hegemony of the municipal and provincial governments.⁵⁹ In this sense, the executions of Warendorp, Udinck, and Harckens had achieved some level of hegemonic power for the city council.

Throughout the historiographies of Groningen and the Dutch Republic, one theme in particular is often repeated: Dutch political and economic structures were unique, in part because they intertwined the global commercial interests of wealthy merchants and ruling oligarchs with those of small-scale artisans in local markets.⁶⁰ Maritime commerce is often the focus of histories concerned with the Dutch Republic, and while these broader studies are invaluable, they sometimes take for granted the human element - the lives of those who actually lived in these distant times and places. What is missing from the Dutch historiography, and in part, what this dissertation aims to contribute, is a more microanalytical perspective of the internal political and legal conflicts in a Dutch province outside of Holland, and their impacts on the individuals who were there. Social instability has been a hallmark of the countless debates by historians who

⁵⁸ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), 185; a similar sentiment is expressed in Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movements in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1965).

⁵⁹ Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, 241, "they waited for everybody to move together and nobody in the meantime moved."

⁶⁰ Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 33-34, 76, Brandon argues that seventeenth-century political theory and hegemony were based on three sources: negotiations among elite families, the institutionalized power of the state, and the merchant-class oligarchs with their middle-class constituencies.

regard the seventeenth century as a “general crisis,” but they do so only from a distance. This dissertation offers a bit of a corrective to this approach.

Using a microhistorical analysis built largely on egodocuments, this dissertation seeks to provide a human perspective that is typically not accessible in social histories. One of the overarching themes in Udinck’s diary, and therefore a theme that runs through these chapters, is that of loss. Initially, Udinck’s losses were political and economic in nature, but, as Pierre Bourdieu has professed, the loss of one form of capital is indicative of the loss of other forms, including social and cultural capital.⁶¹ For Udinck, these losses were detrimental to his wellbeing and his ability to regain a foothold on the socioeconomic ladder. Calvinism played a role in this hegemonic process. As Pepijn Brandon argues, Calvinism provided “a shared sense of purpose among elites,” while channelling “lower-class dissent.”⁶² Family was also critical as it mediated “the space between the public and private life.”⁶³ Indeed, throughout his exile, Udinck repeatedly attempted to overcome his political and legal challenges through the help of family, friends, scholars, church leaders, military officers and other powerful patrons.

It is also worth noting that Udinck did not always cave under pressure. He was certainly a man of his time, but his story is also counterhegemonic in the sense that he continuously pursued his own interests, rather than those of the state or of a particular ruling group, even in the face of grave danger. Udinck’s disregard for political authority in Groningen - and by extension to his own wellbeing - has led two scholars, Hermann Niebaum and Fokko Veldman, to describe Udinck as “a victim of a political game in which he could be abused because he did not fully

⁶¹ Pierre Bourdieu, “The Forms of Capital” (1986) in Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy, eds., *Cultural Theory: An Anthology* (Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2011), 46-58.

⁶² Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 76.

⁶³ Ibid.

recognize the consequences.”⁶⁴ Niebaum and Veldman may very well be correct in this regard, but it should be pointed out that their book, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballinschap* - to date the only secondary source dedicated to Udinck’s diary or experience in exile - is not a comprehensive historical study. Rather it is a transcription of Udinck’s diary along with a brief introduction focused more on Udinck’s unique Low Saxon language than on any broader historical analysis. While this dissertation makes occasional use of Niebaum’s and Veldman’s research on language, this dissertation is primarily concerned with the broader historical context surrounding Udinck’s banishment, life in exile, flight, and execution. As will become clear in the following pages, the circumstances that led to Udinck’s demise are far more complicated than simply asserting, as Fokko Veldman does, that Udinck “perished because of his own rigidity and naiveté.”⁶⁵

What follows is a story of conflict, framed in terms of human agency, or autonomy, versus the various hardships and constraints of seventeenth-century European society. At times, these constraints appear in the form of competing hegemonies such as the Groningen city council or the Bishop of Münster. At other times, Udinck’s story is shaped by local conflicts with neighbors, preachers, and family members. In both cases it seems that Udinck’s best efforts to scrape out a living in exile were repeatedly hindered by issues of gossip, dishonor, disease, war, money, and loss. As such, recognition of the brevity of life and a coinciding existentialist angst are themes that also appear with increasing frequency. In this sense, Udinck’s diary is a constant reminder of the passing of time, a sort of *memento mori*, that enhances both the human condition and the tremendous risks that he took in the final years of his life.

⁶⁴ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxxiv.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

This dissertation is divided into two parts: the first part contains two chapters and sketches the political disunity in Groningen from approximately 1657 through 1662, which led to the banishment of Gerard Udinck; the second part consists of five chapters and traces Gerard Udinck's life - largely following his diary - beginning with his first arrest in December 1662, including his experiences in exile from January 1663 until October 1665, and his execution in November 1665.

The first chapter explores the economic and political underpinnings that led to revolt in Groningen in the 1650s and 1660s. This chapter provides a glimpse into the structure and primary influences in Groningen's government from the late sixteenth century until uprisings after mid-century. Of utmost importance here is to highlight the deep-seated hostilities that existed in the province, between the city and countryside, between Calvinists and Catholics, and between old money and new money. With the expansion of the Dutch economy throughout the seventeenth century, a number of individuals realized an increase in wealth, prestige, and social mobility. These *homines novi* could be found throughout the Republic, but in Groningen, they were seen as especially threatening to the other political families, a situation that complicated an already complex political environment.

Chapter two begins by examining the political maneuvering by the Dutch, English, Portuguese, and French leading up to the Treaty of the Hague in 1661. In Groningen, where the provincial and city governments were strongly opposed to peace with Portugal, one deputy in particular, a *homo novus* named Johan Schulenborgh (1617-1692), was accused of having voted illegally for peace. As a result, his honor, political career, and even his life came under attack. In the months that followed, Schulenborgh, along with his close allies from the guilds, including

Gerrit Harmens Warendorp, Dr. Lucas Harckens, Gerard Udinck, Johan van Emmen, and Geert Claassen, organized riots that sought to undermine the city's authority and to have Schulenborgh's honor and political titles restored. For their part, the guild leaders hoped that they would receive lower taxes and greater representation in the city government in return. Despite their efforts, both Schulenborgh and the guilds were dealt a formidable setback in November and December 1662 when the city council, with the help of the stadholder and his army, put an end to their protests.

Chapter three reconstructs the events that took place in the winter of 1662, at the tail end of the guilds' riots. This chapter is largely based on Gerard Udinck's diary entries, many of which were written later from memory. This chapter is unique in that Udinck's own journal contributes a large amount of detail regarding specific conversations, important locations, movements throughout the city, and the growing sense of tension and anxiety that had overwhelmed the guild leaders in December 1662. Udinck's nervousness was palpable. Compared to the riot of 1657, the riot of 1662 was an utter disaster for the guilds, yielding death sentences, banishments, confiscation of property, and the complete forfeiture of formal political power.

Chapter four examines Udinck's initial experiences in exile, from approximately January 1663 to May 1664, when, Udinck and his family lived in Steinfurt, a small town northwest of Münster under the control of the prince-bishop Von Galen. Using Udinck's diary as a guide, this chapter explores the everyday, and not-so-everyday, challenges that Udinck and his family faced while in exile. Relationships, business practices, family life, commerce, budgets, diet, and gossip are all topics discussed in this chapter. While somewhat episodic, this chapter is meant to provide a sense of daily life in the seventeenth century from a close perspective and through the

lens of Udinck's own words. This chapter also continues to expose the nuances and importance of patronage networks in order to maintain one's trade, livelihood, friends, family, and honor. In a society with few safety nets, these relationships were vital for one's success and survival. Unfortunately for Udinck, they could also be a sort of double-edged sword, helping to indicate one's allies, religious following, and ideological preferences. Many of those with whom Udinck corresponded later proved to be liabilities for him.

Chapter five spans the year of 1664; a time of growing difficulties, not only for Udinck, but also for the Dutch Republic and indeed much of Europe. Rising tensions with England in the Atlantic all but confirmed that a second war between the Dutch Republic and England was inevitable; while, in the southeastern part of Europe, the expansion of the Turks into Hungary and Austria created anxiety among European Christians. For Udinck, 1664 was a year framed by war, plague, and the sighting of an ominous comet. Perhaps the only glimmer of hope from this year came in the form of a meeting that Udinck had with the stadholder Willem Frederik, who suggested to Udinck that he and his family might well return to the Dutch Republic one day.⁶⁶ Udinck's optimism, however, was dashed in October 1664, when the stadholder died unexpectedly. The plague epidemic, which occurred almost simultaneously, caused tens of thousands of deaths, including vast swaths of the population in Neuenhaus, and further contributed to Udinck's growing disillusionment and cynicism.

Chapter six explores the year 1665, a time period that continued to represent loss in new and unexpected ways for Udinck. The loss of economic capital, for example, is a theme that runs throughout this chapter. By 1665, Udinck was under increasing financial pressure - the result of his reliance on investments, corrupt bookkeepers, and a number of dubious tenants and

⁶⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 June 1664.

customers in Groningen. Ultimately, however, the biggest financial threat came in the form of war and the train of mercenaries that comprised Von Galen's invading army in September and October 1665. Rather than risk losing his possessions to Von Galen's troops, which had a reputation for committing unimaginable theft and violence, Udinck fled back to the Dutch Republic. He travelled first to Drenthe, and then, while en route to another province - most likely Holland or Gelderland - he crossed the border into Groningen, where he was quickly recognized and arrested.⁶⁷

Chapter seven describes Udinck's final months in Groningen against the backdrop of Von Galen's invasion. In terms of the primary sources on which it is based, chapter seven is somewhat unique in that it is constructed largely around the Groningen interrogators' notes. For more than a month, Udinck and Harckens were imprisoned, interrogated, and tortured. The interrogators themselves all came from the city council, and their notes provide an interesting glimpse into the motives, not only of Udinck and Harckens, but also of the city council members, who aggressively sought confessions. After the application of torture, those confessions were forthcoming. Building also from the chronicles of Lieuwe van Aitzema, the end of chapter seven reconstructs the final moments of Udinck's and Harckens's lives on the scaffold. In a final dramatic act, the audience watched in horror as the executioner botched both beheadings.⁶⁸ As this chapter argues, the execution scene served as a final violent and dramatic performance. The

⁶⁷ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665; GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 667, Nr. 37, 14 October 1665.

⁶⁸ Lieuwe van Aitzema, *Historie of Verael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh, in, ende ontrent de Vereenigde Nederlanden, Beginnende met het Jaer 1664, ende eyndigende met het Jaer 1666. Vyfde deel.* ('s Gravenhaghe: Johan Veely, 1670), 668.; see also Aantekening in het protocol van uitgaande brieven van Gedeputeerde Staten van Stad en Lande, "Een onhandige beul," *Groningsche Volksalmanak*, (Groningen, Erven B. van der Kamp, 1895), 74.

audience yelled in anger at the executioner's lack of proficiency, and even charged after him threatening to lynch him.⁶⁹

Taken together, the chapters of this dissertation examine the contours of seventeenth-century life on the margins; the contentions between old and new money - including the accessibility for individuals to climb up the social ladder; and the importance of honor and reputation as sources of political, social, and economic capital. For Udinck, neither political advancement before banishment, nor rehabilitation into Groningen society afterwards, were realistic options unless he was willing to take on extraordinary risks. While tragic, Udinck's life might also be considered counterhegemonic and even courageous. Despite numerous risks, he continued to test the boundaries between civil obedience and free will, ultimately refusing to buy in to the normative systems of Groningen or Münster. However, by skirting this liminal space, Udinck quickly found himself in over his head. As mentioned, Udinck's misfortunes have been described by some as a product of "his own rigidity and naiveté."⁷⁰ This critique, however, is a bit simplistic and should also be tempered by an equally critical assessment of the city government. The Groningen city council members were as self-serving as Udinck was naive. And their overt aggressiveness against Udinck - which was exacerbated in 1665 by their fear of the approaching Munsterite army - was equally driven by their own nepotism, corruption, and self-interests. In the end, Udinck's counterhegemonic attitude and behavior left him with a lack of networks, safety nets, or powerful protectors that others had enjoyed. As a result, he was shown his place as an unwelcome upstart, a parvenu, and a convenient scapegoat who was socially excluded and physically annihilated.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxxiv.

CHAPTER ONE:

STAD EN LAND: THE UNDERPINNINGS OF REVOLT

This chapter provides a glimpse into Groningen's political landscape. It shows the disunity that existed, not only at the state and provincial levels, but also at the municipal and communal levels, where deals were often negotiated on an ad-hoc basis with little or no concern about their broader implications. Backroom deals, infighting, gossip, and intrigue were part and parcel of Dutch politics and Groningen was no different. To make sense of the pivotal events that took place in the city of Groningen in the 1650s and 1660s, it is helpful to at least briefly summarize some of the key political conflicts that existed in the Dutch Republic in general, and in Groningen in particular, during the seventeenth century.

When the Union of Utrecht was signed in 1579, it had, at least in theory, formalized the unification of the seven northern Dutch provinces into a single confederacy of equal partners. In practice, however, Holland dominated the other provinces in terms of economic power, population growth, cultural influence, and political authority.⁷¹ For many Hollanders, the surrounding provinces were seen as little more than military buffer zones whose primary function was to protect the "*Hollandsche tuyn*" ("Dutch Garden," the metaphor used for Holland, the entrepôt of the Dutch economy).⁷² As G. de Bruin argues, the economic realities were such that "the smaller provinces, widely distributed and easy to play, were no match for Holland,

⁷¹ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 184-185.

⁷² Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 47, "without the protecting ring of the inland provinces 'Holland's garden' would be too exposed to foreign intrusion to bloom."

which looked after its own interests and sabotaged protests by pulling on the purse strings.”⁷³

Well aware of this power dynamic, but unable to curtail it, the provinces outside of Holland therefore shared in a sort of “*machteloze woede*” (“powerless rage”).⁷⁴

D.J. Roorda and others have also discussed this lopsided relationship, pointing out that both pro- and anti-Holland sentiments were a fact of life throughout the Republic, as were other forms of factionalism, such as support for, and against, the stadholderate.⁷⁵ Typically, there were two stadholders, from the closely related Houses of Orange-Nassau and Nassau-Dietz, who shared the seven stadholderates between them. Although the senior of these always hailed from the House of Orange and usually administered the province of Holland, there was still competition between the two houses, and even some wariness regarding the House of Nassau-Dietz’s potential to increase its power. This was especially true during those intervals in which there was no governing stadholder in Holland (i.e., 1650-72 and 1702-1747).

The seat of Holland’s government for both the stadholderate and the regents (i.e., the republicans or the States’ party) was in The Hague, but the decisions made there had ramifications that extended far beyond Holland’s borders. This was in part because The Hague doubled as the seat of government not only for Holland, but for all of the Republic. As the hub of Dutch political life, The Hague had become a city in which provincial leaders competed for influence, and jealously guarded their provincial independence, regional privileges, and relative autonomy.⁷⁶ The Estates-General and its leading officers in The Hague may have boasted that the country’s strength rested on its determination and unified sense of purpose, but behind the

⁷³ G. de Bruin, *Geheimhouding en Verraad: De geheimhouding van staatszaken ten tijde van de Republiek (1600-1750)*, (’s-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij, 1991), 122.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 123-124.

⁷⁵ D.J. Roorda, *Partij en factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1978); see also Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*.

⁷⁶ De Bruin, *Geheimhouding en Verraad*, 124.

rhetoric, discord persisted in a variety of forms: north vs. south, east vs. west, seaward vs. landward, city vs. country, regents vs. Orangists, Protestants vs. Catholics, Remonstrants vs. Counter-Remonstrants, etc. Still, these political, social and cultural fissures did not prevent the Dutch Republic from becoming a dominant economic and political power in Europe. Adding to this, for more than a century the Dutch Republic's economic prominence was underscored by a military that could match the best armies and navies the world over. The oddity that was the Dutch Republic continues to preoccupy the minds of historians, who ponder over how and why such a weak and chaotic confederacy, of which the constituent parts were often at odds with each other, nevertheless withstood both Philip II of Spain and Louis XIV of France.⁷⁷ Historians are often compelled to describe the provinces as having existed in a sort of felicitous symbiotic relationship - neither completely separate, nor completely united, but still surprisingly effective.⁷⁸

Regional conflicts, apart from those between Holland and the lesser provinces, also played an important role in the broader political history of the Dutch Republic. In the east, for example, the provinces of Overijssel and Groningen, as well as the semi-autonomous or semi-provincial region of Drenthe, had long distinguished themselves from Holland, and from each other.⁷⁹ This was in part due to their geographical locations and economic concerns, most notably their shared reliance on - and competition for control over - the flow of goods to and from Germany. Traditionally, the trans-IJssel (Overijssel) part of the Low Countries was set apart from the western maritime provinces of Holland and Zeeland, as well as the northern

⁷⁷ See for example Johan Huizinga *Verzamelde werken*, vol. II (Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1948), 432; Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*, 33. This was evident from the Republic's motto, "Concordia res parvae crescunt" (small things grow through concord, or in unity there is strength); Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, 1-3.

⁷⁸ Ibid., see also De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 509.

⁷⁹ Esser, *The Politics of Memory*, 262-266, Drenthe was not granted provincial status until 1796 and therefore was not represented in the Estates-General.

maritime provinces of Groningen and Friesland. Groningen, despite being a largely agrarian province, also had a port at Delfzijl on the North Sea.⁸⁰ Situated between Holland and the German states in Lower Saxony and Westphalia, the eastern regions of Groningen, Drenthe and Overijssel relied heavily on two main trade routes with the German hinterland: the *Emsweg* (via the River Ems) and the *Landweg* (through Coevorden, Bentheim, and Münster).⁸¹ But common trade routes did not always imply economic cooperation. In the province of Groningen, for example, where Udinck spent the majority of his life, Groningen City and the *Ommelanden* (surrounding countryside) had long wrangled with one another for control over trading rights, taxes, tolls, and other privileges along these and other routes within their own borders. These contestations in Groningen were of little concern to Holland, but they were a significant source of political tension throughout the eastern provinces in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

POLITICAL RIVALRY IN GRONINGEN

In the sixteenth century, and especially during the reign of Charles V (1500-1558), Groningen's municipal leaders boasted that their city was the link between the entire Low Countries and the ports of Germany, the "*arx Frisiae*" (citadel of Friesland), "*de sleutel van de Friese tuin*" (the key of the Frisian garden), and the bulwark of the north.⁸² At the time, the city's chief antagonists were found amongst the Ommelanden nobles, many of whom denounced the city of Groningen as nothing more than the "*stert van Drentlant*" (tail of Drenthe), thus rejecting

⁸⁰ Bruno Kuske, *Köln. Der Rhein und das Reich; Beiträge aus fünf Jahrzehnten wirtschaftsgeschichtlicher Forschung* (Köln: Böhlau-Verlag Köln, 1956), 214.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 214.

⁸² Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 235.

the positional superiority on which the city had prided itself.⁸³ This type of statement was part of a rhetorical tradition that associated Groningers with Drenthe on one hand, and Ommelanders with Friesland on the other. Even the first Nassau Prince of Orange, Willem I (1533-1584), equated the relationship between Groningen's city and countryside to that of a "man and wife quarreling, with neither side knowing who was the man or the wife."⁸⁴

Despite the disparaging rhetoric, during the Dutch Revolt against Spain, Groningen was hotly contested by both the Dutch rebels and the Spanish Habsburgs. It was only after Prince Maurits and Willem Lodewijk had taken the city of Groningen from the Spanish in 1594 that the entire province of Groningen was brought to heel, and, for all intents and purposes, forced to join the Dutch Republic.⁸⁵ The *Tractaat van Reductie*, the official agreement that made this union a reality, was signed on 23 July 1594. Within its twenty-two articles, the *Reductie* called for the removal of Spanish and Catholic inhabitants, and it stipulated that the city of Groningen and the Ommelanden would be joined together as a single province, also named Groningen.⁸⁶ Perhaps the most contentious aspect of the agreement, however, was that Groningen's provincial government would be housed within the city, thus providing an advantage to municipal leaders at the expense of their rural counterparts.⁸⁷ Not surprisingly, these conditions were an added source of bitterness for the Ommelanders. In a lukewarm attempt to curb the resentment, the authors of the agreement stipulated in Article 1 that "*alle offensien, injurien, misdaeden ende all weghe*

⁸³ Johan Rengers van ten Post, *Werken van den Ommelander Edelman Johan Rengers van ten Post, Volume 1* (Groningen: Mr. H. O. Feith, 1852), 71-72.

⁸⁴ D. G. Acker Stratingh, M. H. O. Feith, and M. W. B. S. Boeles, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis en oudheidkunde, inzonderheid in de provincie Groningen, Volumes 6-7* (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1869), 166-167; see also Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 235.

⁸⁵ Jan van den Broek, *Groningen, een stad apart: over het verleden van een eigenzinnige stad (1000-1600)* (Groningen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2007), 349.

⁸⁶ *Reductie van de stad Groningen*, 23 July 1594, a copy of the primary source can be found on the website: <http://www.dutchrevolt.leiden.edu/dutch/bronnen/Pages/1594%2007%2023%20ned.aspx> accessed on 25 August 2017.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

van feyte” (all offenses, injuries, misdeeds and all manner of incidents) should be “*vergeven ende vergeten*” (forgiven and forgotten).⁸⁸ Burying the hatchet, however, would be easier said than done.

The relationship between *Stad en Land*, as the province is often referred, was also impaired by the city’s repeated attempts to subordinate the Ommelanden quarters (Hunsingo, Fivelingo, and Westerkwartier).⁸⁹ Although reliable figures for Groningen’s population are elusive, it seems that around mid-seventeenth-century, the province probably had some 50,000 people, split almost evenly between the city and the surrounding countryside.⁹⁰ Both the city and Ommelanden received a vote in the States-General, but the city was given the right to sign provincial documents, and deadlocked votes were determined by the stadholder.⁹¹ Complicating matters further, the city magistrates, in the words of De Bruin, “poisoned the political climate” by purchasing land in order to increase their own economic and political leverage over the countryside.⁹² This was not unusual in the Republic. In Holland, for example, the Amsterdam regents were known for buying up the polders (reclaimed land north of Amsterdam). There, like Groningen, wealthy urban dwellers, nobles, and merchants attempted to swing the invisible hand of economics in their favor through land acquisitions.

Many of the Dutch provinces also retained a *ridderschap* (nobility who had historically represented the rural districts), although, throughout the life of the Republic, their numbers and influence were relatively small and in steady decline.⁹³ In some cases, rural communities could

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Groningen consists of five main districts, two under the city’s jurisdiction (Oldambt and Westerwolde) and three under the Ommelanders’ jurisdiction (Hunsingo, Fivelingo, and Westerkwartier).

⁹⁰ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 248; see also Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, 103.

⁹¹ Ibid., 248.

⁹² De Bruin, *Geheimhouding en Verraad*, 194.

⁹³ De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 530, “Rural Groningen could count 45 noble families in 1600, 33 in 1700, and only 10 in 1800”; and *ibid.*, 537, “In order to gain admission to the *Ridderschap*, one had

still rely upon their *ridderschap* as an ally against the growing authority of the cities. Groningen's countryside, however, lacked a significant *ridderschap*.⁹⁴ As a result, the Ommelanden was politically, economically, and socially splintered, and often failed to organize themselves into a force that could provide a real challenge to their municipal rivals. The city government for their part exploited this weakness, and manipulated both the markets and the flow of goods in their favor.

Although the relationship between the city and the countryside was contentious, the political landscape of seventeenth-century Groningen was not simply a matter of city versus country; rather, it was complicated by the presence of various other stakeholders: the four most prominent being the municipal government (i.e., the city council), the Ommelanden Diet, the stadholder, and Groningen's eighteen guilds. Each deserves closer inspection.

THE CITY COUNCIL

Groningen's municipal government consisted of two main branches: the magistracy and the *Gezwoeren Gemeente* (sworn representatives of the citizenry). The magistracy, sometimes referred to as the city council or "*senatus sanctus*" (Holy senate), consisted of four mayors, twelve city councilors, and a spokesperson; seventeen men in total.⁹⁵ The core of this group - the four mayors and twelve councilors - were known as *de zittende raad* (the sitting council) and served a two-year term.⁹⁶ Every year on 8 February, the terms for half of these men - six councilors and two mayors - would come to an end. These men were also known as the outgoing

to demonstrate noble lineage and be in the possession of historically noble property or seigneurial rights."; see also Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, 14, 132.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ De Bruin, *Geheimhouding en Verraad*, 194-195.

⁹⁶ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 30.

council (*de afgaande raad*) and were eligible for re-election the following year.⁹⁷ The remaining half stayed on for another year (*de continuerende raad*), while eight new councilors were elected (*de aangaande raad*), thus beginning the cycle anew.⁹⁸ Collectively the magistracy was the legislative, executive and judiciary power in the city and subordinate areas.⁹⁹ The other element of the municipal government was the *Gezwoeren Gemeente*, which included 24 members, three of whom were considered *taalmannen* (spokesmen), and was primarily meant to represent the demands of the citizenry, although this group was always subordinate to the more powerful city council.¹⁰⁰ Together, the city council and *Gezwoeren Gemeente* adopted the characteristics of a conservative, God-fearing and God-serving oligarchy.¹⁰¹

THE OMMELANDEN

Beyond the city were the Ommelanden, which was governed by the *Landdag* (Diet), a political body consisting of over 200 *jonkers* (someone of lower nobility like a German *Junker*), *hoofdelingen* (untitled nobles, or representatives), *eigenerfden* (landowners), and other small farmers.¹⁰² In theory, all of these Ommelanders were entitled to participate in governmental meetings, but in practice, very few actually showed interest in the affairs of the provincial estates outside of their respective districts.¹⁰³ Within the *Landdag*, only the *jonkers* consistently engaged

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, 170. Groningen was similar to Overijssel and Gelderland, however, in that its municipal government consisted of two main branches: the magistracy, which was in charge of both the judicial body and the administrative body; and the *gezwoeren gemeente* (sworn representatives), who were sworn to represent the citizenry; see also <http://www.grunn.nl> accessed on 21 September 2017.

¹⁰¹ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 252, 346, 348.

¹⁰² De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 537-538, "The fragmentation of landownership and the large number of districts combined to reduce the number of qualified eigenrfden in most districts to a very small number - often enough, to zero."

¹⁰³ De Bruin, *Geheimhouding en Verraad*, 194-195.

in broader political issues, and as a result, the Ommelanders had a limited influence on either municipal or provincial politics.¹⁰⁴ Still, there are certain episodes in Groningen's history, most notably in the first half of the century, when the Ommelanders fought back fiercely against the demands of the city.

In the 1630s, for example, the city implemented their *Stapelrecht* (staple rights or stacking rights), which required merchants to unload their cargo at specific markets in order to allow those communities the opportunity to purchase them before another.¹⁰⁵ This amounted to monopolizing the markets throughout the province by mandating where and when goods could be bought and sold. Throughout the seventeenth century, the delivery of peat, cattle, pork, honey, and other important commodities throughout Groningen and into neighboring lands, was severely hampered by these laws.¹⁰⁶ Furthermore, in 1635, the city ordered the Oldambt (an agrarian region in the Ommelanden along the German border, but under the jurisdiction of the city) to dig a new canal to improve the flow of trade, but the local farmers resisted, complaining that the proposed changes would benefit the city merchants at the expense of the Ommelanders.¹⁰⁷ Over the next decade, their struggle slowly developed into an outright revolt. In 1648, the Oldambt rebels declared their own independence from the city, set up their own means of governing, and prepared a small militia to defend their borders.¹⁰⁸ In the end, however, the States-General intervened, resolved the dispute, and the Oldambt was returned to its former

¹⁰⁴ De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 538, "Jonkers further strengthened their hold by buying the votes of farmers . . ."

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 250-251.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Marjolein 't Hart "Rules and Repertoires: The Revolt of a Farmers' Republic in the Early-Modern Netherlands" in Michael P. Hanagan, Leslie Page Moch, and Wayne te Brake, eds., *Challenging Authority: The Historical Study of Contentious Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 197.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

subordinate status.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, the tensions between the city and countryside persisted well into the late seventeenth century. As later chapters will show, these early economic and political contests fostered deep-seated sentiments of suspicion and distrust throughout Groningen, which contributed greatly to the demise of Udinck, Harckens, and other rivals to the city council in the 1660s and 1670s.

THE STADHOLDERATE IN GRONINGEN

Besides the municipal government and Ommelanden, there was also the stadholder, a position that had originally been created by the Habsburg sovereign to function as both an administrative and military deputy, or governor. His authority vis-à-vis the city regents, however, was not always clearly defined, often creating a sort of tug-of-war between the stadholder and the regents regarding the extent of their powers. By the mid-seventeenth century, most stadholders were responsible for, and primarily interested in, military operations. In provincial and municipal politics, the stadholder was often relegated to the role of a proxy depending on which group offered the greatest incentives for assistance.

In 1650, the position of the stadholder in Holland, the role of the House of Orange-Nassau, and the Dutch government in its entirety, were thrown into disarray after Willem II imprisoned six of his political rivals, launched a failed assault on Amsterdam, and then died unexpectedly later that year from smallpox.¹¹⁰ Willem II's death kicked off a twenty-two-year long period in which Holland lacked a stadholder, or at least one who was of age.¹¹¹ This stadholderless period, or the *Ware Vrijheid* (True Freedom) as it came to be known, presented an

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ John H. Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making in the States General of the Dutch Republic 1660-68," *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 2 (December, 1982): 125-153: 127.

¹¹¹ Willem III was born in 1650, and was only a child during most these events.

unimaginable opportunity for the regents to seize control of Holland's government. Almost immediately, a number of the regents who had been previously incarcerated by Willem II were released and restored to their old offices.¹¹² In January 1651, a Great Assembly of regents gathered at the Binnenhof in The Hague, where they reduced the authority of Holland's stadholderate even further and attempted to convince the other provinces to take similar anti-Orangist, or anti-monarchical, steps.¹¹³ Holland's regents succeeded in delaying the replacement of the stadholderate, but in Groningen, where the late Willem II had also served as stadholder, the institution of the stadholderate was more widely supported and the Groningen government moved quickly to fill this vacancy. Unlike Holland, the provinces of Groningen and Friesland, as well as the territory of Drenthe continuously kept a stadholder within their provincial governments and therefore any reference to a "stadholderless" period is misleading if applied to them.¹¹⁴

Following the death of Willem II, his cousin, Willem Frederik (1613-64), the head of a Nassau-Dietz cadet branch, began appealing to the power brokers in Groningen. Willem Frederik was already the stadholder of Friesland and Drenthe, and he was a grandson of the oldest of Willem I's younger brothers (Jan the Elder, 1536-1606), whose offspring earlier had been stadholders of the northern provinces. Thus he commanded considerable authority among the northerners. He had also shown a longstanding "inclination towards France," and, given the uncertainties of the infant who was the heir to Willem II as Prince of Orange (Willem III), a sense of anxiety over the sustainability of his dynasty.¹¹⁵

¹¹² Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 702-703.

¹¹³ Ibid., 706.

¹¹⁴ Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*, 94.

¹¹⁵ Susan Broomhall and Jacqueline van Gent, *Gender, Power and Identity in the Early Modern House of Orange-Nassau* (London: Routledge, 2016), 44.

Willem Frederik began his campaign by attaching himself to the Ommelanders' leading representatives, whom he promised to reward with commissions in the army should he be made stadholder of Groningen.¹¹⁶ In this pursuit, the primary target for Willem Frederik's patronage was Osebrand Jan Rengers van Slochteren (c. 1620-1678), the wealthiest and most powerful *jonker* in the Ommelanden.¹¹⁷ But Willem Frederik recognized the risk in having just one ally, so he also appealed to a number of powerful regents in the city, to whom he gifted some 20,000 guilders in exchange for their support.¹¹⁸ Willem Frederik's campaign was a success and on 9 December 1650 he was conferred as Groningen's new stadholder.¹¹⁹

Things were quite different in Holland, where, in the absence of a stadholder, it was Holland's Grand Pensionary, Johan de Witt (1625-1672), who became the *de-facto* head of the country. In this regard, many politicians in Groningen continued to believe that their interests were best assured vis-à-vis the province of Holland and through De Witt, rather than through their own provincial stadholder.¹²⁰ Even Willem Frederik, as stadholder of Groningen, Friesland, and Drenthe, spent much of his tenure showcasing his military skillset to Holland's regents in the hopes that De Witt would make him the next field-marshal of the Republic. This position had remained vacant since the death of Johan Wolfert van Brederode (1599-1655) and despite implying to Willem Frederik that he might soon be appointed, De Witt continued to resist filling it as long as possible out of fear of empowering the stadholders.¹²¹ It was not until 1668, some four years after Willem Frederik's death, that the States of Holland finally appointed Johan

¹¹⁶ Janssen, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic*, 110-111.

¹¹⁷ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 706, "Osebrand Jan Rengers, lord of Slochteren, richest noble of the Fivelingo quarter, and right-hand man of the Stadholder."; see also Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 241.

¹¹⁸ Janssen, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic*, 152.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 249.

¹²¹ See for example, Olaf van Nimwegen, *The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2010), 412, 431; and Janssen, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic*, 158.

Maurits of Nassau (1604-1679) as field-marshal of the Republic.¹²² Being passed-over for this position remained a point of contention for the rest of Willem Frederik's life, and he later wrote the word "deceit" in his diary whenever referring to these conversations with De Witt.¹²³

In Groningen the regents also set strict limits on the authority of the stadholder.¹²⁴ As a result, Groningen's stadholders, including Willem Frederik, lacked any meaningful sovereign rights, were denied the ability to grant full pardons, and their political leverage was almost always dependent upon negotiations with other provincial leaders, often through money, gifts, and favors.¹²⁵ As Frijhoff and Spies have correctly described it, the stadholderate in Groningen was "primarily symbolic, providing a sense of continuity and, with its allusions to the common past, provincial identity."¹²⁶

THE GUILDS

Finally, there were the guilds, a significant domestic political rival and constant source of frustration for Groningen's regents during the 1650s and 1660s. The guilds in Groningen can be traced back to the late medieval period when they were known simply as "*broederschappen*" (brotherhoods).¹²⁷ In 1436, the mayors and city councilors granted these brotherhoods official guild status.¹²⁸ These early guilds were divided into two groups: the *burgergilden* (citizens'

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Janssen, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic*, 158, In 1655, Willem Frederik "made an agreement with De Witt, the 'Harmony' as it was called. William Frederick resigned his lieutenancy in Overijssel, in the hope of being named field-marshal soon . . . [but] never gave him more than lukewarm support in his bid for the highest military rank in the following years. Later William Frederick wrote the word 'deceit' alongside the paragraphs in his diaries where the Harmony was mentioned, and drew up a lengthy list of the tricks De Witt had played on him."

¹²⁴ Ibid., 112, 152-155.

¹²⁵ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 243.

¹²⁶ Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*, 79.

¹²⁷ B.D. Poppen, "De Gilde-Rolle der Molenaers Gilde in de stad Groningen van 1652," *Vrienden van de Stad Groningen*, nr. 50, (2007): 8-11.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

guilds, which numbered eighteen by the mid-seventeenth century); and the *raadsgilden* (council's guilds, of which there were twelve, and were differentiated from the citizens' guilds based on their heavy reliance on government resources and their higher potential to impact foreign relations).¹²⁹ Any reference to 'the guilds' in this dissertation is a reference to the eighteen citizens' guilds.

Since the reign of the emperor Charles V, the political role of the guilds in Groningen was always an informal one.¹³⁰ The guilds in Groningen may not have had constitutional rights in municipal politics, but when organized and galvanized around a common goal, they had the potential to wield a significant degree of leverage over city leaders.¹³¹ During the first half of the seventeenth century, as the Dutch economy was rapidly expanding, the number of guilds in the Republic had increased significantly and most cities competed with one another to attract new craftsmen. This was certainly the case in Groningen where some of the newest guilds included the coppersmiths, founded in 1608, the pottery makers (1628), the mapmakers (1632), and the bakers (1640).¹³² Udinck himself was admitted into the tailors' guild in 1635 during the early stages of their rise in prominence.¹³³ Growth in both the Dutch economy and in Groningen's population certainly would have increased demand for clothing and it seems that Udinck had entered the market and Groningen's guild system at an opportune time.

Although the Dutch economy expanded throughout the seventeenth century, there had long been animosity and grievances between guilds and their supervisory regents in the cities of the Dutch Republic. Rudolf Dekker has shown that Dutch guilds typically did not possess

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Maarten Prak, Catharina Lis, Jan Lucassen, and Hugo Soly, eds., *Craft Guilds in the Early Modern Low Countries: Work, Power and Representation* (London: Routledge, 2016), 83.

¹³¹ Ibid., 90, There were uprisings in the 1520s, at the turn of the seventeenth century, in the 1640s, 1657, and 1662.

¹³² Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 243.

¹³³ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxv.

enough power or influence to challenge city leaders or incite full-fledged revolutions.¹³⁴ In many ways, the guilds' relationship with the municipal government was similar to that of the rural countryside in that both were usually subordinated to the rule of city leaders. Evidence of this could be seen when Dutch guilds desired policy changes regarding trade, taxes, or tariffs, none of which could be single-handedly initiated by the guilds; rather, the guild leaders were compelled to submit requests to the municipal government, and the final decisions regarding those requests were determined, not by guild members, but by city leaders.¹³⁵ This was the standard throughout the Republic, but in Groningen during the second half of the seventeenth century, a number of guilds had increased their wealth and influence to a point that they apparently felt confident enough to challenge the city authorities.

After mid-century, Groningen's municipal leaders had become increasingly threatened by the guilds' growing economic clout and political demands. In an effort to curb the guilds' growth, and likely skim a bit of profit for themselves, the city leaders instituted tighter regulations and higher taxes.¹³⁶ The guilds responded with anger and protests, some of which became quite violent, and ultimately yielded, at least for the next few years, increased representation and influence within the municipal and provincial governments. By the 1660s, the city again increased taxes and instituted new restrictions on the sale of goods, and again these moves did more to provoke opposition than to remedy tensions between these two groups. Guild leaders spoke out vehemently against these measures and rioted again in 1662. This second riot is discussed in more detail in chapter two. The frequency and intensity of the guilds' protests

¹³⁴ Dekker, "Women in Revolt," 347-348.

¹³⁵ De Vries and Van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy*, 162-163.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 582.

underscores the fact that they not only objected to the municipal government's economic and political policies, but also no longer trusted the city leaders to resolve their grievances equitably.

Demarcating the imagined borders between these competing factions was further complicated by shifting alliances, backstabbing, and infighting, as well as by the nepotism involved in filling government positions. To this extent, dynastic rivalries played a significant role, as both the city and the countryside were controlled by old Groninger families such as the Rengers, Drews, Lewe, Sickinge, De Mepsche, Clant, Jarges, and Coenders.¹³⁷ On occasion, typically when their interests aligned, two or more groups worked together, and sometimes even called upon the stadholder to gain additional leverage against their economic and political rivals.

Of course, not everyone within the city council were hardliners against their rivals. For example, Bernhard Alting (c. 1600-1656), a member of the city's ruling syndicate who promoted the city's privileges, openly professed his desire for a peaceful and more amicable resolution to the Ommelanders' grievances regarding the *stapelrecht*. He argued that without the *stapelrecht*, the city would be "*geruineert*" (ruined) because most of the goods would never reach the city's residents, but he also claimed that the countryside benefitted as well because it did not require Ommelander farmers to physically transport their goods all the way to the city.¹³⁸ In a more brazen tone, however, he also argued that the city "could not exist without the Ommelanden," and that "whoever disputes this is either ignorant in the affairs of Groningen, a fool, or both."¹³⁹ He blamed much of the deterioration in the relationship between the city and the Ommelanden on the sitting council members themselves; an accusation that contributed to Alting's dismissal

¹³⁷ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 247.

¹³⁸ J. A. Feith, *Historisch Genootschap te Groningen, Historische avonden*, vol. 2 (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1907), 326.

¹³⁹ Bernhard Alting, *De Pilaren Ende Peerlen van Groningen: Tractaet, betoonende waer op de Welvaart van in die Stadt is staende, ende waer door zy meest is geciert* (Groningen: Samuel Pieman, 1648), 10, "*noch leven Gelyck Groningen sonder den Ommelanden niet en kan. Wie anders oordeelt / de is een ignorant in de saeken van Groningen; of en sot; of alle beyde.*"

from the city government and eventual revocation of his citizenship.¹⁴⁰ Thus, as this dissertation will show, when their money and/or honor were threatened, Groningen's city council members typically responded with great, and sometimes even excessive, force.

THE GUILD RIOT OF 1657

According to Maarten Prak, most early modern urban rebellions in the Dutch Republic were motivated by the same fundamental issue: the citizens desired political space where they “could have an effective voice and agency.”¹⁴¹ This was certainly the case in Groningen around mid-century, when the political situation in the city began to unravel. Disputes between the city council, the guilds, and the Ommelanders increased in both frequency and intensity between 1648 and 1655. Many of these stemmed from disagreements over the aforementioned *stapelrecht* as well as other taxation policies imposed by the city, and soon after evolved into full-fledged riots.¹⁴² The situation in Groningen was complicated, in part because the guild leaders there were mixed in their opinions about the city and the Ommelanden. For example, the guilds' lawyer, Dr. Lucas Harckens, spoke contemptuously about both the city and the Ommelanders, whereas Gerrit Harmens Warendorp, the guilds' *bouwmeester* (architect, which means that he served as an intermediary for the guild members and the city, whose primary role was to mediate

¹⁴⁰ Feith, *Historisch Genootschap te Groningen*, 326.

¹⁴¹ Maarten Prak, *Citizens without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World c. 1000-1789* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 75.

¹⁴² Dekker, “Women in Revolt,” 337-339. The emphasis on taxes and politics in these demonstrations also fits a trend identified in Rudolf Dekker's research on popular protests in Holland. Dekker has argued that early modern Dutch protests were primarily driven by taxation between 1600 and 1750 as well as “food prices between 1690 and 1760,” and “religion only in the first quarter of the seventeenth century.” Meanwhile, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, “political issues gradually gained importance,” finally climaxing with the Patriot Revolt (1782-1787).

grievances between the two sides), argued that the Ommelanders should be treated kindly because “they are the veins that give life to the city.”¹⁴³

Despite his praise, the Ommelanders were generally distrustful of Warendorp, especially after he had openly supported the claim that the *stapelrecht* was the “pillar of the urban economy.”¹⁴⁴ This did not sit well with the rural merchants and farmers who struggled to find ways around the restrictive law. The city council members were also distrustful of Warendorp, in part because of his common origins, but also because of his growing influence over the guilds and hostile attitude towards the sitting council.¹⁴⁵ Warendorp was born into a relatively unknown family and became a member of the *bontwerkers* (fur workers), one of the least prestigious guilds in Groningen, but by 1648 he had risen from this relative obscurity to the rank of *bouwmeester* of the eighteen guilds.¹⁴⁶ Although similar to Bernhard Alting in his pragmatic stance regarding the economic and political relationships between the city and the countryside, Warendorp lacked Alting’s family lineage, formal education and sophistication. Likewise, the guild riots of 1657 and 1662 primarily involved those guilds on the lower end of the social ladder, such as the fur workers, tailors, bakers, and *kramers* (or *cramers*, meaning small merchants or pedlars). The more prestigious guilds, like the shipbuilders or large-scale merchants, do not appear in the archival record as having participated in these protests.

Resentment for the city council extended beyond the guilds and also included the Ommelanders. In the 1650s, Rengers, with the support of his ally, Rudolf Willem van Innhausen en Knyphausen - the Lord of Lutzburg - proposed a new policy that would alternate the position

¹⁴³ Warendorp’s declaration is quoted in Feith, *Historisch Genootschap te Groningen*, 325, “want wy weten wel, dat deselve de aderen zyn waer uyt de stadt het leven schept.”

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 329.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 324.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid; see also H.O. Feith, “Drie Gedichten, betreffende het oproer der gilden te Groningen, in het jaar 1662,” in *Groningsche Volksalmanak* (1850), 74, Warendorp also served as an accountant in the city’s knitting-house from 1645-1662.

of lieutenant of the *Hoofdmannenkamer* (the head of the provincial judiciary council) every two years between a representative from the city and one from the Ommelanden.¹⁴⁷ Previously the lieutenant of the *Hoofdmannenkamer* had been appointed for life, which resulted in a sort of zero-sum game for the city and the Ommelanden. This new policy, however, appeared to be more equitable solution for both the city and the Ommelanden. It was also politically expedient for Rengers, because it removed one of his most significant political rivals, the residing lieutenant, Schotto Tamminga. Although a fellow Ommelander, Tamminga had consistently sided with the city in regards to the enforcement of the *stapelrecht*.¹⁴⁸ After Rengers's proposal was approved, Tamminga was forced out and was scheduled to be replaced by none other than Rengers's friend, the Lord of Lutzburg.¹⁴⁹

In December 1656, Tamminga and his supporters appealed to the Ommelanden Diet, but were rejected.¹⁵⁰ Here again, Tamminga's support for the *stapelrecht* appears to have been a significant stumbling block for his restitution.¹⁵¹ Rengers probably relished in the moment. In addition to winning over the Ommelanders, he also gained support from the guild leaders by promising to help them attain seats in various prestigious committees as well as reductions in export tolls for the goods that they sold to the Ommelanden.¹⁵² In particular, Rengers rewarded the guilds' lawyer, Dr. Lucas Harckens, with a seat in the *Chambre mi-partie*, a council formed after the Peace of Münster (1648) comprised of an equal number of Catholic and Protestant members that was intended to handle border disputes between the Republic and its neighboring

¹⁴⁷ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 711; see also Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 250-251.

¹⁴⁸ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 249-251.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Feith, *Historisch Genootschap te Groningen*, 327-335.

countries and princedoms, including Münster.¹⁵³ In an attempt to combat Rengers's growing notoriety, the mayor Johan Tjassens and a number of other city council members adopted a new strategy; they attempted to delay the appointment of the new lieutenant.¹⁵⁴

By February 1657, the new lieutenant had still not been appointed and the patience of the Ommelanders and the guild members began to run thin. Finally, in an attempt to maintain the peace, the mayors and city council members agreed to settle the matter at a meeting on 18 March 1657, and promised that they would also seat the new lieutenant from the Ommelanden.¹⁵⁵ Many prominent voices from the Ommelanden and the guilds remained pessimistic about the city council's sincerity in this matter. They suspected additional delays were forthcoming and that the entire position of lieutenant was in jeopardy. During a meeting on 17 March 1657, Gerrit Warendorp warned the guild members and citizenry that the city council had no intention of keeping its word.¹⁵⁶ He urged as many as possible to appear in person at the *Grote Markt* the next day, where they could voice their dissatisfaction directly to the magistrates.¹⁵⁷

The following morning, on 18 March 1657, the interested parties arrived at the *Grote Markt*, where the city council members decided to hold a vote to determine if they should indeed appoint the new lieutenant, or continue to delay the process. Sixteen votes were cast, with nine of the sixteen voting to continue delaying the deputization.¹⁵⁸ The guild members and their

¹⁵³ Van Aitzema, *Historie of Verhael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh . . . Vyfde deel*, 668.

¹⁵⁴ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 249, They came to this decision based on the realization that the city's authority over the Ommelanden rested on their ability to enforce the *stapelrecht*, and control of the *stapelrecht* rested with the lieutenant. Tamminga may have been an Ommelander, but he was sympathetic to the city in this regard, and the city council must have known that Lutzborg would not be so accommodating.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ De Groot, *Tegenwoordige staat de Vereenigde Nederlanden*, 147.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., Among these nine were the mayors (Johan Tjassens, Aldringa, and Coenders), the council lord Van Mepsche, Buningh, Werumëus, Haikens, Gruis, and Meints. The seven votes in favor of deputizing came from the mayor Pieter Eissinghe, the council lord Folkers, Iddekinge, Celos, Tjaarda, Julsingha, and Cluivingh; see also Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 251.

supporters were outraged, and when the magistrate refused to budge, the protests turned violent. Guild members pelted the councilors with stones as they made their way to city hall.¹⁵⁹ The mayor, Johan Tjassens, one of those nine votes to delay, barely escaped with his life. He fled to the *Martinikerk* while his house in the *Oosterstraat* was looted and destroyed.¹⁶⁰ Another of the nine votes came from the councilor, Gerhard Buningh, whose house was also vandalized, his furniture pulverized, and his stores of beer and wine completely cleared out by the assailants.¹⁶¹ The riots continued throughout the day and into the next morning.

Meanwhile, the stadholder, Willem Frederik, dispatched soldiers from Delfzijl, the main port of the province, to reinforce the garrison in the city, but when they arrived at the city gates, the mob pelted the soldiers with stones, compelling them to turn back.¹⁶² The ease with which the army was repelled has been described by some as an indication of Willem Frederik's own personal reluctance to intervene.¹⁶³ The implication is that Willem Frederik feared choosing sides because it could have potentially derailed his own political aspirations.¹⁶⁴ After receiving little help from the military, the magistrates were in utter panic, and by noon of the next day, 19 March 1657, they capitulated to the protesters' demands.¹⁶⁵ They promptly held a meeting where they overruled their previous vote, and appointed the Lord of Lutzburg as the new lieutenant of the *Hoofdmannenkamer*.¹⁶⁶ Although the violence and uproar had temporarily ceased, these riots

¹⁵⁹ *Geschiedenis van Groningen Deel II Nieuwe Tijd* (Zwolle, Netherlands: Waanders Uitgevers, 2008), 236.

¹⁶⁰ Lieuwe van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh, in ende omtrent de Vereenigde Nederlanden: Beginnende met het jaer 1657, ende eyndigende met het jaer 1663. Vierde deel*. ('sGravenhaghe: Johan Veely, et al., 1669), 131; see also Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 251.

¹⁶¹ GrA, *Register van het Archief van Groningen* (Groningen: A.L. Scholtens, 1856), 127; see also Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh . . . Vierde deel*, 131-132; and Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 251.

¹⁶² Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh . . . Vierde deel*, 132.

¹⁶³ Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*, 79; see also Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 735, Willem Frederik's troops withdrew, "lest they should have to open fire and cause a massacre."

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁵ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 251.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

had left an indelible mark on the city council members. Embarrassed and all but defeated, the city council would not soon forget the insubordination, social disobedience, and physical destruction that was carried out at the behest of the guild leaders. For the city council members, this would remain a source of extreme bitterness for years to come, and played a powerful role in determining the fate of Udinck, Harckens, and many others in the 1660s and 1670s. In the meantime, however, the guild leaders relished in their victory.

JOHAN SCHULENBORGH

Now more than ever before or after in the Golden Age, the Groningen guilds made their presence felt. Their collaboration with Rengers and the other Ommelanders attracted additional allies, most notably Johan Schulenborgh (1617-1692), one of Groningen's *ordinaris* (ordinary) deputies, meaning that he had received a commission from the city council and had been appointed to the States General for life.¹⁶⁷ As a member of the States General, Schulenborgh regularly travelled with the other delegates, usually between four and eight in total, to The Hague. There, together with the other provincial delegations, they talked about matters affecting all of the United Provinces, especially those involving foreign and defense policies. Although Schulenborgh rose to prominence rather quickly, he was not held in high regard by many of the city council members, and these sentiments grew over time. This animosity stemmed from Schulenborgh's relatively humble roots, his allies in the guilds, his political actions while in office, and his ability to outwit the council's attempts to undo his career, and later even his life.

¹⁶⁷ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 129, In this period, the States of Groningen typically had maintained between four and six ordinary deputies, split evenly between the city and the Ommelanden. On occasion, additional *extraordinaris* (extraordinary) deputies, those who were not commissioned and only appointed for a predefined term, were also utilized.

Schulenburg had long maintained a sense of kinship with the guild members, and when the riots of 1657 ceased, he brazenly declared that “*zijn*” (his) guilds had brought peace to Groningen.¹⁶⁸ His fondness of the guilds and sympathies for their struggles took shape during his youth when he worked in his father’s tavern, *De Palm*, one of three taverns that served as popular gathering spots in the city for Groningen’s guild leaders, the other two being *Het Reventer* and the *Smidskroeg*.¹⁶⁹ Most of the other patrons were from the middling sort, or members of *schutters* (militiamen), and they spent their time in the taverns enjoying a drink and poking fun at the municipal government.¹⁷⁰ One of the few surviving records from these taverns indicates that on 26 March 1662 about 20 men from the guilds spent 33 guilders and 13 stuivers on beer at *De Palm*.¹⁷¹ This fraternizing was hardly politically neutral and did not go unnoticed by the city council. In an anonymously authored pamphlet titled *Schulenburgs waapenkreet* (“Schulenburg’s Call to Arms”) (1662), *De Palm* was described as a place where guild members conducted seditious acts against the city:

“Come, master Gerrit [Warendorp], come.
Come, rumble with your drum:
[In] the smiths’ pub and de Palm
[where] your voice penetrates and echoes.”¹⁷²

Like Warendorp, Schulenburg opposed the city’s authoritarian brand of urban politics and argued that the citizens were best served via a peaceful relationship with the Ommelanders, on whom the city’s trade and industry were heavily reliant.¹⁷³ This position did not help him win

¹⁶⁸ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 251-252.

¹⁶⁹ H.A. Poelman, “Johan Schulenburg,” in *Groningsche Volksalmanak: voor het jaar 1920* (Groningen: Erven B. van der Kamp, 1919), 40-68: 42; Feith, “Drie Gedichten,” 75-76; see also Dekker, “Women in Revolt,” 348, regarding the workshop and alehouse as the center of social life for male laborers.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 42; Udinck’s diary also describes town dwellers drinking and merrymaking with soldiers on a regular basis.

¹⁷¹ Feith, “Drie Gedichten,” 76.

¹⁷² A copy of the primary source is available in Poelman, “Johan Schulenburg,” 42.

¹⁷³ Buursma, *Dese bekommerlijke tijden*, 340.

over the city council, and he often complained that when the Groningen secretary, Dr. Andreas Ludolphi, addressed him in official documents, he did so with a title that was beneath the dignity of his position.¹⁷⁴ Ludolphi's passive aggressiveness followed the city council's tendency to shun Schulenborgh because of his lower-class origins. It was well known that Schulenborgh had not been born into privilege, nor had his family name acquired the level of honor or prestige found among the more respected delegates, such as Johan Isbrants, Hendrik Gockinga, and Johan de Drews.¹⁷⁵ On the contrary, Schulenborgh's rise to prominence was only made possible through the profits earned by his mother and step-father in *De Palm*, which they used to send him to the University of Groningen where he studied philology.¹⁷⁶ Afterwards, he served in the political ranks of the *Gezwoeren Gemeente* and city council before joining the States General.¹⁷⁷ Schulenborgh was indeed a *homo novus* (new man), surrounded by city councilors - some of whom were also 'new men' while others were descendants of more established political families - all of whom jealously guarded their political authority and family reputations.¹⁷⁸

Groningen politics in the second half of the century often reflected a power struggle between old and new money. For these new men, the minimum formal requirements for becoming a member of the city council was that one had to be at least 25 years old, a member of the Reformed Church, considered a good patriot, and have assets with a value of at least 3,000 *thalers* (daalders, the equivalent of 4,500 *Caroliguilders*).¹⁷⁹ In the early years of the Dutch Revolt in Groningen and elsewhere, these measures were sufficient to limit outsiders from gaining entry, but as the Dutch economy rapidly expanded throughout the seventeenth century,

¹⁷⁴ Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 47.

¹⁷⁵ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 136.

¹⁷⁶ Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 42.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 42-43.

¹⁷⁸ Van Dijk and Roorda, "Social Mobility under the Regents of the Republic," 77.

¹⁷⁹ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 33.

more and more *homines novi* were able to meet these minimum requirements, even if the average workman earned no more than 200 guilders per year.¹⁸⁰ Once they had successfully entered into the city government, these new men, much like the older families, took steps to ensure that they and their descendants would retain their newfound political positions for generations to come.

The idea of political self-determination was deeply rooted in Groningen, but by mid-century, and especially in the 1660s, the city government experienced a period of faction-forming. The result was a clustering of family names that came to dominate Groningen politics for the remainder of the century. The most powerful of these dynasties was born from the union of the Van Julsingha and Drews families, which by the last quarter of the seventeenth century, operated as a faction of its own and was able to nearly monopolize Groningen's mayoral seats.¹⁸¹ The leader of this family (and faction) was the mayor Johan van Julsingha (1624-1703), an ambitious *homo novus* and cunning jurist who was equally deceitful, heavy-handed and uncompromising in his approach to dispensing of potential rivals. Much more regarding Van Julsingha is discussed in later chapters, but it is important to note that throughout the 1660s and early 1670s, Van Julsingha's rise to power, hard-line mentality, and lack of remorse played a critical role in the removal of Schulenborgh from power, dismantling the guilds' ability to organize, and utter destruction of the lives of Udinck, Harckens, Warendorp, Rengers and other rivals in Groningen.

The animosity between political factions, and between old and new money, followed a more general pattern that had developed across the Republic. Especially after mid-century there was increasing opposition from the upper classes toward the middling sort, or as one Gouda

¹⁸⁰ For example, see Van Deursen. *Plain Lives*.

¹⁸¹ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 105.

regent described them, “those who did not dare to name their grandfather.”¹⁸² Ironically, Johan van Julsingha also fits into this category. Although he was born in Groningen, his family originated in the province of Drenthe (considered a rural backwater), and he often omitted this fact when discussing his ancestral lineage.¹⁸³ Similar attitudes also appeared in Dutch popular culture via the trope of “*De politycke kuyper*,” a stock character meant to showcase the deceitfulness of up-and-coming politicians, especially those who attempted to line their pockets or advance their own positions through backroom deals.¹⁸⁴ On the opening pages of his pamphlet, *De politycke kuyper onses tydts* (1647), Claude Fonteyne described these types of politicians as “dressing like courtesans, in a very fashionable manner . . . with Machiavelli’s book in one hand, and a scepter in the other,” the latter of which represented “his state-seeking vanity.”¹⁸⁵ Fonteyne went on to say that for the *Kuyper*, wine, bags of money, and rumors are never far away.¹⁸⁶ *De politycke kuyper*’s desire to live beyond his station made him untrustworthy, susceptible to blackmail, and the subject of gossip and intrigue, sentiments that the Groningen city council members had increasingly expressed toward Schulenborgh.¹⁸⁷

In addition to singling him out for his pretentious dual life in Groningen (i.e., his common origins and political aspirations), the city council also accused Schulenborgh of living a dual life in Holland (i.e., ostensibly representing Groningen while pursuing his own self-

¹⁸² Van Dijk and Roorda, “Social Mobility under the Regents of the Republic,” 76.

¹⁸³ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 113. He also had an older brother with the same name, Johannes Julsingha (d. 1664), but the two siblings differentiated themselves from one another by spelling their names differently (Johan van Julsingha and Johannes Julsingha), and by using nicknames of “junior” and “senior” respectively. Throughout the century, these and other Groningen families used similar strategies - marriage and differentiation models - to gain and retain their positions in government.

¹⁸⁴ See for example, Claude Fonteyne, *De politycke kuyper onses tydts* (Leeuwarden: Claude Fonteyne, 1647), Claude Fonteyne is listed as the publisher, but he may have also been the author of this pamphlet.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 1, “Verklaringe over den dubbel-sinnigenn Kuyper . . . Ghekleedt / ghelijck een Courtisaen Men / à la mode . . . Een Boeck en Scepter in de Handt, ‘t Boeck Machiavels . . . De Scepter is sijn Staet-suchts Vaen.”

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., “. . . oock aen sijn zijdtje sijn / Een Wijn-Kan, en een Fluyt met Wijn: Twee Sacken Geldts siet ghy oock hier . . . Soo staen de Roemers selden stil.”

¹⁸⁷ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 246.

interests). As deputies of Groningen to the States General, Schulenborgh and the rest of the Groningen delegation spent a considerable amount of time in the Binnenhof in The Hague.¹⁸⁸ There, they were immersed in a luxurious lifestyle complete with fringe benefits and access to the flattery and bribes of leading statesmen, diplomats, and other important politicians from Holland, the Generality, and foreign lands. This exposure to some of Europe's most influential diplomats was a point of contention in Groningen throughout Schulenborgh's tenure in the States General, but it became especially vexed following one of his most controversial political decisions, his vote at The Treaty of The Hague in 1661.

¹⁸⁸ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 129, "Normally each meeting included an average of twenty-five to thirty deputies, about two-thirds of the regular members . . . Friesland and Groningen were frequently represented by only half or less of their ordinary deputies, while Overijssel occasionally had no representatives at all." The inconsistent attendance was largely due to the deputies' domestic obligations.

CHAPTER TWO:

THE PRICE OF PEACE, 1661-1662

In the late 1650s, while the *Stad en Land* continued to wrangle with one another, other European, and even global, entanglements found their way into Groningen politics. The slow decline of Spanish power beginning in the 1640s, along with the defeat of the Dutch in the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654), provided new opportunities for the English, and to a lesser extent, the French, even if they were distracted by domestic turmoil related to the Fronde. England and France sought to add to their colonial possessions, increase their strength as maritime powers, and expand their global reach throughout the East and West Indies. Freed from many of their impediments in Europe, the Dutch were also eager to regain the sugar colonies and other possessions in Brazil that they had lost to the Portuguese in 1654. In this effort, the Dutch resumed their war with Portugal in October 1657. This military endeavor was short-lived, however, and by July 1658, the Portuguese ambassador, Dom Fernando Telles de Faro, was in the Republic attempting to negotiate a ceasefire. England had acquired a seat at the negotiating table during these peace talks because of its growing mercantile significance and strengthening ties with the Portuguese. England's presence proved to be a significant hindrance for those desirous of a swift peace as its diplomats were preoccupied with domestic matters - namely the

death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658, the collapse of the Commonwealth in 1659, and the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 - all of which delayed the negotiations.¹⁸⁹

In the meantime, France and the Dutch Republic entered into a separate negotiation regarding a possible defensive alliance. On 15 November 1660, a Dutch extraordinary embassy led by Coenraad van Beuningen (1622-1693) arrived in Paris, and for two years, Dutch and French counterparts ironed out the finer details of this agreement, finally signing the treaty on 27 April 1662.¹⁹⁰ For many on both sides, the alliance with France was an uneasy one. Louis XIV and his chief diplomats often referred to the United Provinces as *états populaires* (popular states), a bit of a pejorative term meant to emphasize the Dutch tendency to allow merchants and craftsmen into the political arena, whereas France prided itself on being controlled by a single sovereign.¹⁹¹ The French disdain for these lowborn types was further informed by practical considerations. For Louis XIV, the Dutch form of governing was inefficient, caused unnecessary delays, and resulted in disagreements, confusion, and a lack of secrecy.¹⁹² He was not altogether wrong. The delegates from Groningen, for example, repeatedly delayed signing the Dutch-French alliance over fears that forming a partnership with a Catholic kingdom, rather than with Protestant England, would lead to further religious conflicts within the Republic.¹⁹³ Zeeland also held out, although not because of religious concerns, rather for commercial reasons.¹⁹⁴ Despite these delays, the Dutch-French defensive alliance was a relative success in the short term,

¹⁸⁹ Roger Downing & Gijs Rommelse, *A Fearful Gentleman: Sir George Downing in The Hague, 1658-1672* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011), 56.

¹⁹⁰ John H. Grever, "The Dutch Assemblies and the Renewal of the French Alliance," *Parliaments, Estates & Representation* 17, 1 (1997): 81-87: 86; see also H. Rowen, *Johan de Witt: Statesman of the "True Freedom,"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 98-99, the Dutch already had a permanent ambassador, Willem Boreel, who was a pro-Orangist from Zeeland, at the French court.

¹⁹¹ John H. Grever, "Louis XIV and the Dutch Assemblies: The Conflict about the Hague," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7, 2 (May, 1982): 235-249: 235.

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Grever, "The Dutch Assemblies and the Renewal of the French Alliance," 85-86.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

proving quite valuable to the Dutch land army in 1665 when the prince-bishop of Münster launched a surprise attack into the eastern Netherlands.

THE TREATY OF THE HAGUE, 1661

Like the treaty with France, negotiations with Portugal also dragged on for two years. Finally, in 1661, the Estates General began showing an increasing willingness to accept a peace treaty, but it came at a price; the Dutch West-India Company (WIC) would have to abandon the idea of regaining their territories in Brazil, and in exchange, Portugal would compensate the Dutch Republic for its financial losses. For most of Holland, the ‘loss’ of Brazil could not come soon enough. The WIC had been hemorrhaging money for years, partly because its colonial possessions in the Atlantic were far more contested than those in the east, and partly because the WIC’s political backers prioritized state-sanctioned military endeavors (i.e., privateering) over more commercial enterprises.¹⁹⁵ By the late 1650s, it had become clear that the WIC was in serious financial trouble, and that the company could only hope to limit its losses. On the Amsterdam exchange, WIC share prices had been declining steadily for almost two decades, from approximately *f*134 (1640), to *f*46 (1645), to *f*14 (1650), *f*10 (1655), and became practically worthless throughout the remainder of the 1650s.¹⁹⁶ Directors of the WIC Chambers argued that the decline in the WIC’s share price was a direct result of Portuguese duplicity in both the assault on Brazil and in the peace negotiations, and therefore demanded restitution.¹⁹⁷ In

¹⁹⁵ Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 107, even if at exactly this time Formosa/Taiwan was lost to a Chinese rogue admiral.

¹⁹⁶ Jonathan I. Israel, *Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 163-168, “Under the first and last ‘governor-general’ of Dutch Brazil, Count Johan Maurits of Nassau-Siegen, in the years 1637-44, the fortunes of the WIC in Brazil reached their zenith,” but by the mid-1640s, “directors and investors alike were filled with apprehension about the future.”

¹⁹⁷ Cornelis van de Haar, *De Diplomatieke Betrekkingen Tussen de Republiek en Portugal, 1640-1661* (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1961), 173.

particular, the provinces of Utrecht, Groningen, Gelderland and Zeeland refused to negotiate a peace, which was adamantly opposed by Holland where many regents wanted to liquidate both the Brazil venture as well as the WIC in their entirety.

From The Hague, De Witt dispatched letters and representatives to these provinces in an attempt to shore up support, but only Utrecht agreed to consent. Gelderland, Zeeland, and especially Groningen continued to holdout. The intensity of Groningen's resistance is intriguing, especially since the WIC had no significant economic impact on the city, which remained largely dependent upon its surrounding agricultural regions. Orthodox Calvinism may have played a role, as many theologians and merchants alike argued that the company had received God's blessing to fight the perfidious Catholic Portuguese in order to counter the expansion of the papal religion across the Atlantic.¹⁹⁸ It is also possible that Groningen had rejected peace with Portugal in the hopes that through continued war, the WIC might experience another monetary windfall like that of Piet Hein's capture of the Spanish treasure fleet in 1628. This event alone yielded some 12 million guilders worth of Spanish gold and silver, and a 75% dividend to WIC investors.¹⁹⁹ Unlike the VOC, which relied heavily on peaceful trade, the WIC acted more like an extension of the navy, and as such, tended to profit more from privateering than from free trade. While all of the aforementioned reasons may have influenced the Groningen desire to continue the war with Portugal, it was large personal investments into the WIC that proved to be the main driver behind Groningen's unrelenting support for that trading company.

¹⁹⁸ Pieter Jan van Winter, *De Westindische Compagnie ter kamer Stad en Lande* ('s-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978), 13-14.

¹⁹⁹ Van Winter, *De Westindische Compagnie*, 19.

In their negotiations, Groningen argued for a continuation of war with Portugal on the grounds that the province had already invested over a half a million guilders in the WIC.²⁰⁰ Much of this money was personally invested by those who were part of the politically dominant and financially well-to-do city council, many of whom also served as directors of the Groningen chamber of the WIC.²⁰¹ There was also a political argument. Together with Friesland, the Groningen chamber controlled one ninth of the company, which gave them some leverage over WIC ventures in the Atlantic, Africa, the New World, and other speculative opportunities in the broader global market.²⁰² Recognizing that the WIC earned its profits, not necessarily through commerce, but through military action, many investors in Groningen justified the war effort on the basis that, although Portuguese privateers were a nuisance, they were not unbearable.²⁰³ Others maintained that the gains made by the VOC in Asia, particularly against Portuguese possessions in south India and Sri Lanka, far outweighed any losses in the Atlantic, and therefore continuation of the war was not much of a burden.²⁰⁴ Whatever the stakes, in March 1661, the directors of the WIC Chamber in Groningen finally declared that they would not allow themselves to be deceived by the Portuguese any longer, and that the proposed indemnities and territorial concessions in Asia would not be enough to cover the debts incurred from the WIC's Brazilian venture.²⁰⁵ The Groningers, who had invested so much in the WIC, had comparably very little invested in the VOC, which is supported by the fact that there were no Groningers

²⁰⁰ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 143.

²⁰¹ Van Winter, *De Westindische Compagnie*, 260-262.

²⁰² Mark Meuwese, *Brothers in Arms, Partners in Trade: Dutch-Indigenous Alliances in the Atlantic World, 1595-1674* (Leiden: BRILL, 2011), 26-27. With regards to managing the WIC, Holland had by far the most influential position: Amsterdam controlled 4 of the 9 WIC Chambers, Zeeland had 2/9, the *Maze* (made up of the three Holland towns of Rotterdam, Delft, and Dordrecht) 1/9, the *Noorderkwartier* (Holland's maritime centers north of Amsterdam) 1/9, and Groningen also had 1/9.

²⁰³ Downing & Rommelse, *A Fearful Gentleman*, 56.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, although Taiwan was lost in 1661, news of this probably had not yet reached the Republic.

²⁰⁵ GrA, 1 Staten van Stad en Lande, Inv. 257-262, 7 March 1661; see also Van Winter, *De Westindische Compagnie*, 127.

among the *Heeren XVII* (i.e., the directors of the VOC). Therefore, concessions in India were not compensating them for their losses in Brazil. On this, the States of Groningen agreed, and determined that Groningen would not vote in favor of a peace.²⁰⁶

By the spring of 1661, the debates between the provinces regarding peace and war with Portugal reached a tipping point. In April 1661, Holland declared that it would no longer contribute financially to the war effort against Portugal.²⁰⁷ In May 1661, efforts towards a peace were further hampered by the arrival of a new English envoy, George Downing (1623-1684), who repeatedly attempted to undermine Dutch interests by exploiting the political dissension within the seven provinces. That same month, Johan Schulenborgh made a surprising move. Faced with the overwhelming evidence that the continuation of the war with Portugal was well nigh impossible, he announced that the States of Groningen had reversed its stance.²⁰⁸

Groningen was finally willing to accede to peace, but only on the fulfillment of two conditions: one, that Portugal would furnish substantial payments in cash - not tolls or goods; and two, that those funds would be distributed amongst the nine chambers of the WIC, in accordance with the Eleventh Article of the WIC Charter.²⁰⁹ Copies of the instructions were sent directly to the delegation, but Schulenborgh's copy contained a critical error, the result of either a clerical mistake or an act of sabotage by his enemies back in Groningen.²¹⁰ Schulenborgh's copy differed from the others in that it specified the term, "*condicie*" (condition), rather than "*condiciën*" (conditions), so that, as far as Schulenborgh understood it, the States of Groningen

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

²⁰⁷ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 143.

²⁰⁸ Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 52.

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Ibid, 50-51.

demanded that only one condition be met in order to approve the peace treaty with Portugal.²¹¹ In the meetings that followed, Schulenborgh carried out his assignment as instructed; he signed the peace on the contingency that the indemnity would be distributed to the WIC's chambers, but not necessarily as cash.²¹²

In The Hague, decisions regarding declarations of war or peace were supposed to follow the rule of unanimity as outlined by the Ninth Article of the Union of Utrecht.²¹³ This was certainly the argument used by Holland in 1660 when it single-handedly prevented the other provinces from sending aid to the city of Münster, which at that time was under siege by the prince-bishop Bernhard von Galen.²¹⁴ But in the case of Portugal, and with five of the seven provinces now on the side of Holland, De Witt changed his tune and pushed to have the rule of unanimity set aside in favor of a majority vote.²¹⁵ This controversial shift in policy happened at precisely the moment when Schulenborgh was serving as the "president of the week," a position that was primarily symbolic, and as the name suggests, alternated weekly among the members of the States General.²¹⁶ Still, this position required Schulenborgh to take ownership of the process by attaching his name and reputation to the final decision. On 23 June 1661, Schulenborgh, as "president" of the States General, and the representative of Groningen, formally voted in favor of peace, as did the representatives from Holland, Utrecht, Friesland, and Overijssel. The

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² John Grever, "The Schulenborgh Affair and Provincial Politics in Groningen," in Robert S. Kirsner, ed., *The Low Countries and Beyond* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993), 37-38.

²¹³ See for example, J.C. Boogman, "The Union of Utrecht: its Genesis and Consequences," *Low Countries Historical Review*, 94, 3 (1979): 377-407, 391, Article, or Clause, 9 stipulated that the provinces "would generally act upon the basis of a majority decision except in the case of the declaration of war, the making of a truce, the conclusion of peace and the imposition of financial burdens on behalf of the Generality, in which instances unanimity was required," although "at the conclusion of the peace with Spain the unanimity was not taken too seriously."

²¹⁴ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 143.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 127.

representatives from Zeeland and Gelderland had not wavered from their earlier stances. On the contrary, they angrily lambasted both the voting process and its results. Specifically, they argued that the vote was a violation of the Ninth Article of the Union of Utrecht, and Zeeland even vowed that its privateers would continue to target Portuguese ships.²¹⁷

Meanwhile, Portugal had sent a new ambassador to The Hague. Count of Miranda Dom Henrique de Sousa de Tavares was tasked with replacing Telles de Faro after the latter was found to have been in secret and treasonous negotiations with Spain. De Faro quickly took flight to Madrid where he found safe refuge among Philip IV's court.²¹⁸ De Witt wasted no time with the new ambassador. He knew that Portugal, having also been at war with Spain, was eager to finalize the peace, and so De Witt promptly issued an ultimatum to Miranda: sign the treaty or leave the country: Miranda signed on 6 August 1661, as did the representatives from Holland, Groningen, Utrecht, Friesland, and Overijssel.²¹⁹ The representatives of Zeeland and Gelderland, however, were noticeably absent and continued to protest the negotiations, vote, and final peace. Zeeland even appealed to the States of Groningen, insisting that they question Schulenborgh regarding the motive behind his vote.²²⁰

The controversy and confusion was nuanced further by England's involvement. On 23 June 1661 - the same day as Schulenborgh's controversial vote - Charles II married the Portuguese princess Catherine of Braganza (1638-1705), who brought with her a substantial dowry consisting of, among other things, the Portuguese colonies in Tangiers and Bombay.²²¹ In return, Catherine was allowed to practice her Catholic faith freely "during one of the most

²¹⁷ Ibid., 143; see also Boogman, "The Union of Utrecht," 391.

²¹⁸ Van de Haar, *De Diplomatieke Betrekkingen*, 159; see also Downing & Rommelse, *A Fearful Gentleman*, 58.

²¹⁹ Ibid.

²²⁰ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 143.

²²¹ Leech, "Musicians in the Catholic Chapel," 571.

turbulent periods of anti-Catholic hysteria in English history.”²²² As a result, Charles II’s role in the negotiations between the the Dutch and Portuguese increased dramatically.²²³ England’s primary aim in these talks was to stir up dissension within the Dutch Republic. As Jonathan Israel points out, Downing was tasked with turning the disunity among the Dutch provinces into an advantage for the English: “In this way, England could simultaneously prevent the Dutch from recovering their trade with Portugal, and gaining commercial privileges there equivalent to those of the English, and widen the divisions between the provinces, weakening the Republic internally.”²²⁴ George Downing set out to accomplish this by making accusations that Schulenborgh had been bribed, that Miranda and De Witt had conspired with one another, and that the treaty between Portugal and the Dutch Republic violated agreements previously made between Portugal and England.²²⁵ Thus, the validity of the peace was severely threatened well before it had been ratified by the provincial estates and perhaps even before the ink on its pages had dried.

THE CASE AGAINST SCHULENBORGH

Although the treaty with Portugal had been signed, each province was expected to debate the terms prior to final ratification.²²⁶ These debates had begun even before Schulenborgh returned to Groningen. On 6 September 1661, a number of council members, including some of Schulenborgh’s most ardent political enemies, such as Johan van Julsingha, Andreas Ludolphi,

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Petrus Johannes Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1907), 299.

²²⁴ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 753.

²²⁵ Downing & Rommelse, *A Fearful Gentleman*, 58; see also Van de Haar, *De Diplomatieke Betrekkingen*, 173.

²²⁶ Ibid., 58-59, the peace had been signed but not yet ratified. Over the coming months, as the Dutch provinces argued over the terms, Dunkirk privateering, under the commission of both the English and Portuguese continued until final ratification took place at the end of 1662. Meanwhile in Asia, the VOC lustily fought the Portuguese in both Sri Lanka and along the Indian coast, carving out ever greater gains.

Tobias van Iddekinge, and Ludolf Coenders, met at the home of mayor Gerhard Swartte and discussed the ongoing political situation over wine.²²⁷ The following day, the city council held a more formal meeting regarding Schulenborgh's role in the signing of the treaty with Portugal. During a brief stay in East Friesland, Schulenborgh began hearing rumors of Groningen's growing discontent regarding the treaty, and that a number of provincial leaders had changed their stance on the original terms.²²⁸

On 12 September 1661, the States of Groningen demanded that Schulenborgh explain his actions, and by mid-September, the States of Groningen, likely influenced by Downing and the disgruntled leaders in Zeeland, publicly announced that they refused to ratify the treaty.²²⁹ Groningen's change of heart represented a significant setback for Holland, whose representatives had worked quite hard to make the peace a reality, and in October 1661, the States of Holland denounced Groningen for its shifting positions.²³⁰ In the meantime, Holland's representatives continued to try to find common ground with the States of Zeeland. Finally in November 1661, and presumably after many promises from De Witt, even Zeeland agreed to ratify the peace.²³¹

In Groningen, however, the hostilities were just beginning. Schulenborgh's livelihood was increasingly threatened by new rumors that he had conspired with Holland's elites, to the detriment of Groningen's well being, and that he had broken a number of laws in the process.²³² To give these claims teeth, city and provincial leaders requested that its members disclose any incriminating evidence that could be used against Schulenborgh.²³³ Johan Isbrants, a deputy from

²²⁷ Grever, "The Schulenborgh Affair," 39-40.

²²⁸ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 253-254.

²²⁹ Ibid.

²³⁰ Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 54.

²³¹ Grever, "The Structure of Decision-Making," 144.

²³² Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 54.

²³³ Grever, "The Schulenborgh Affair," 40.

the Ommelanden, offered up nothing, but some of his other colleagues did.²³⁴ Herman de Syghers from the Ommelanden provided a statement, as did Willem van Raesfelt, the deputy of Gelderland, who claimed that Schulenborgh had referred to his superiors as “a group of drunken and reckless rogues.”²³⁵ Joost Lewe, another deputy from the Ommelanden, reported that Schulenborgh referred to the States of Groningen as “tyrants and wretches.”²³⁶ With these new accusations, the anti-Schulenborgh movement was in full swing, and on 22 November 1661, Menso Alting, the syndic of the city, presented Schulenborgh with formal charges.²³⁷ When he appeared before the city council on 23 November 1661, Schulenborgh vehemently protested both the charges and the manner in which he was treated during the hearing, most notably the public humiliation of being forced to sit on a small bench instead of the “customary chair.”²³⁸ Schulenborgh must have seen the writing on the wall. Regardless of his guilt or innocence, this was clearly not going to end well for him. In December 1661, he wrote to Johan de Witt predicting a “*een grote verandering*” (a big change) and on 10 January 1662, after intense wrangling, the city council revoked Schulenborgh’s commission to serve in the States General.²³⁹

In their official decision, city leaders cited a rumor before the States of Groningen that the other delegates of the States-General had overheard Schulenborgh referring to the city council members as “*schelmen*” (scoundrels).²⁴⁰ The entire delegation, which, in addition to Schulenborgh, consisted of Herman de Syghers (Ommel.), Berend Coenders van Helpen (1601-1678) (Ommel.), Hendrik Gockinga (Gr.), and Warmolt Ackema (Gr.), were questioned regarding the accusation. De Syghers reported rather vaguely that he had heard the rumor in The

²³⁴ Ibid.

²³⁵ Ibid.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Poelman, “Johan Schulenborch,” 41.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 253-254.

²⁴⁰ Poelman, “Johan Schulenborch,” 54.

Hague from a certain female “*Persijn*” (person); Coenders and Gockinga reported that they had heard similar rumors, but Ackema claimed that he had not heard of a single insulting word from Schulenborgh.²⁴¹

One of the unintended consequences of these meetings is that they began to expose some of the political factions and divisions within the city council. On 30 November 1661, a number of council members voiced their opposition to the manner in which Schulenborgh was being treated. The mayor Johan Tjassens declared that he did not want to participate in such “godless procedures.”²⁴² Another mayor, Johan van Eeck, as well as the councilors Arend van Nijeveen, Samuel Emmius and Tjaert Gerlacius (1628-1694), all argued that the process was unlawful.²⁴³ On the other side, however, some of Schulenborgh’s old enemies, namely Berend Coenders, Johan van Julsingha, Rembt de Mepsche, Allard Aldringa and Henricus Weremeus, disregarded their colleagues’ concerns and demanded that the investigation and legal procedure continue.²⁴⁴

Schulenborgh not only hoped to emerge victorious in his legal battles, he also sought to regain his position as deputy in the States General. Initially, Eeck agreed to help in this pursuit, suggesting that he would attempt to keep the seat vacant until Schulenborgh could return.²⁴⁵ This, however, turned out to be a ploy. Under the pretense that he was helping Schulenborgh, Eeck had secretly attempted to make his own son the next deputy.²⁴⁶ Eeck was not an anomaly in this regard. Iddekinga also tried to make his own son deputy, and Van Julsingha was also

²⁴¹ GrA, “Dossier: Stucken raekende de proceduyren tegens Schulenborch” (1662); see also Poelman, “Johan Schulenborch,” 54, perhaps someone from the Van Persijn family, although this reference is probably to an unnamed person.

²⁴² Grever, “The Schulenborgh Affair,” 41-42.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 43.

“scheming on behalf of his brother.”²⁴⁷ In the end, six hard-core opponents of Schulenborgh - including Johan van Julsingha, Johan de Drews, Tobias van Iddekinga, Berend Coenders, Geert Gruijs, and Rembt de Mepsche - ultimately prevented Schulenborgh’s return.²⁴⁸ These six also convinced Eeck to turn against Schulenborgh. In exchange, they promised Eeck that they would make his son a member of the Admiralty College of Friesland.²⁴⁹ Indeed, these schemes were reminiscent to the machinations of the stereotypical *politycke kuyper* discussed in chapter one. Similar quid pro quo deals were made with other council members and it did not take long before Schulenborgh’s enemies made up the majority of the council.²⁵⁰

SCHULENBORGH AND THE GUILD RIOTS, 1662

Despite the rising opposition, Schulenborgh and his lawyers did not take this lying down. In February 1662, he had a pamphlet published in The Hague titled *Deductie, ofte kort verhael van 't gene voorgevallen is bij de provincie van stadt Groeninge en Ommelanden . . .* (*Deduction, or the short story of what happened with the province of the city of Groningen and Ommelanden. . .*) that rebuked the accusations against him, point by point.²⁵¹ The pamphlet caused a great stir, but he did not stop there. He also sought support from other groups, namely from his old friends in the guilds. In March 1662, the city council reported that Schulenborgh had been seen in his stepfather’s tavern, *De Palm*, “drinking and colluding with the common burghers.”²⁵² It seems

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

²⁵⁰ Ibid.

²⁵¹ Martin van der Goes, Cornelis Boey, and W. van Strijen, *Deductie ofte kort verhael van 't gene voorgevallen is bij de provincie van stadt Groningen en Ommelanden en derselver gecommiteerde ter vergaderinghe van haer Ho. Mog. ontrent het tracteren ende sluyten van de vrede met de croon Portugal mitsgaders van eenige proceduiren, naderhant daerop gevolgt, alsmede het advys op dat subject bij neutrale rechtsghelerden ghegheven* (The Hague, 13 February 1662).

²⁵² Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 253-254.

that at least one of the issues discussed in his meetings with the guild leaders involved aligning Schulenborgh's goals with those of the guilds. This is likely where they agreed to organize a protest that would be carried out by guild members aimed at the city council's taxation policies. If all went as planned, the guilds would receive a reduction in taxes and improved representation in the city government, while Schulenborgh would have his old position, titles, and honor restored.

In June 1662, seven of the guilds' leaders, including Gerard Udinck, submitted a list of demands to the city council.²⁵³ First on their list was a request for a new resolution that would prevent the succession of municipal offices from father to son.²⁵⁴ For years, the guilds had complained about the regents' tendency to allow only friends and family of the magistrate to serve within the city council and *Gezworen Gemeente*.²⁵⁵ Second, the guild leaders requested a reduction in taxes, specifically on food items and on the *schoorsteengeld* (chimney money), a type of early modern property tax that was assessed per chimney and benefited the larger houses owned by wealthier burghers at the expense of the smaller homes and poorer townspeople.²⁵⁶ The contemporary historian, Lieuwe van Aitzema, wrote that the guild leaders expressed a desire to resolve these issues as quickly as possible, in order to avoid any disruptions within the city.²⁵⁷ It is difficult to determine if this demand for a hasty resolution was meant as a threat or a genuine desire to avoid violence, but regardless, it fell by the wayside. One by one, the city rejected the guilds' requests, to which the guilds responded by taking to the streets in protest.²⁵⁸

²⁵³ Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 936, These seven included: Warendorp, Van Emmen, Vos, Alberts, Claasen, Udinck, and Van Hoorn.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 254-255.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 936.

²⁵⁸ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 254-255.

Initially, this show of public disobedience seemed to have worked. As was the case in 1657, the municipal government went soft. In order to pacify the guilds, the city council agreed to appoint six guild members, including Udinck, to the *Gezworen Gemeente*.²⁵⁹ Udinck himself was reluctant to serve in such a position, but he accepted the appointment anyway.²⁶⁰ This was a significant, although short-lived, victory for the guilds. They now had some degree of representation, but there was a great deal of resentment among the city councilors, who knew well that the *Gezworen Gemeente* typically served as a stepping stone to higher governmental positions.²⁶¹ Schulenborgh, for example, was made a member of the *Gezworen Gemeente* in 1642, and quickly advanced to Council Lord in 1643, and finally representative in the States General in 1652.²⁶² This was a liability for the elite political families in Groningen, who had no interest in sharing their power with guild members, and it did not take long before both sides were again embroiled in disparaging rhetoric and sharp protests towards one another.

Sporadic rioting continued throughout the fall of 1662, when demonstrations and social unrest began to spill over into the harbor areas where plundering and looting became significant problems.²⁶³ Fearing that the rioters could not be contained by local authorities, the city and the Ommelanders took additional steps to resolve the uproar. On 19 September 1662, the city leaders issued an amnesty for the guild members, while simultaneously blaming them for the recent unrest:

Mayors and the council in Groningen, know this. For some time, riots and misunderstandings [caused] by the eighteen guilds have arisen, whereby the government of this city and the usual course of

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

²⁶⁰ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 140, “Verklaring van enige gecommiteerden uit de 18 gilden, dat de olderman Gerrit Udinck tegen zijn wil is gekozen lid van de gezworen meente,” 16 December 1662.

²⁶¹ Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 936, Udinck and Claasen were among those guild members to be appointed to the *Gezworen Meente*.

²⁶² Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 249.

²⁶³ Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 937.

service has been disrupted; and that now, the ongoing concerns have been joined and resolved. We have taken into consideration the statements from the aldermen, and the representatives of the guilds, together with those of the architects themselves: So it is, that we have passed this off into oblivion, so that no one from the aforementioned guilds shall be assaulted or molested. To reassure everyone, we have found it good to issue this notification, and let it be known. *Actum* Groningen on this, the nineteenth of September, sixteen hundred sixty-two.

To the ordinance of the honorable Lords,
D[r]. A. Ludolphi, Secretary²⁶⁴

The Ommelanders also desired a peaceful resolution and took it upon themselves to contact the stadholder, Willem Frederik, requesting that he send troops to reinforce the garrison in Groningen, to which the stadholder obliged.²⁶⁵

Willem Frederik's army arrived at 3 o'clock in the morning on 20 November 1662, and at 6 o'clock that morning, the company began to beat their drums and blare their trumpets.²⁶⁶ Van Aitzema chronicled that on paper some ten companies of foot soldiers and two companies of horse were available, although only about six hundred troops were actually dispatched.²⁶⁷

Unaware of the move by the Ommelanders, the city leaders were initially shocked to see the stadholder in the city, but after law and order was restored, the city council used the opportunity to quickly regained its authoritative stance. Almost immediately, it began summoning the *bouwmeesters*, aldermen and courtiers of the guilds, warning them against any clandestine meetings, and threatening them with severe punishment if they did not stay out of government affairs henceforth.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁴ A copy of the amnesty can be found in Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 938-939.; and in Everard Jan Diest Lorgion, *Geschiedkundige Beschrijving der Stad Groningen*, vol. 1 (Rolfsema, 1857), 62.

²⁶⁵ Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 937.

²⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 939.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 937.

²⁶⁸ De Groot, *Tegenwoordige staat de Vereenigde Nederlanden*, 160; see also Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 255.

A NEW PROPAGANDA WAR

If the city had, through their proposed amnesty, extended a sort of olive branch to the guilds, these efforts were quickly cancelled out by the vicious publishing war that followed. Those sympathetic to the city council used this occasion to ramp up the disparaging rhetoric against Schulenborgh and his associates in the guilds. Here again, evidence of this rhetorical battle is found in the aforementioned pamphlet, *Schulenborghs waapenkreet*, which took direct shots at both Johan Schulenborgh and Gerrit Warendorp:

“Come, master Gerrit, come . . .
Beat fiercely on your drum
And rattle my gold;
Make the Ommelanden strong,
So that in The Hague
Your clothes will be the best”²⁶⁹

The anonymous author’s insults continue throughout the pamphlet, many of which are clearly aimed at tarnishing Schulenborgh’s status and honor. He refers to Schulenborgh’s wife as a “*kalkbrandersdochter*” (limestone burner’s daughter), a pejorative that highlighted her common origins, and he describes Schulenborgh’s relationship with Holland in metaphorical terms: as the head and tail of a horse - (Holland and Schulenborgh respectively).²⁷⁰ The implication, of course, was that Schulenborgh was easily manipulated by Holland. Another pamphlet from that same year vilified Udinck as the source of social unrest in Groningen:

“Let Udinck go with thy,
Geert Claassen stands before me;
But Udinck is a fool,

²⁶⁹ The original pamphlet is quoted in Poelman, “Johan Schulenborch,” 44, “Kom, meester Gerrit, kom . . . Slaa vinnig op dijn trom en rammel met mijn goudt; Maak d’ Ommelanden stout, Opdat maar in den Haag Sig ‘t werk ten besten draag.”

²⁷⁰ Ibid., 44-45; see also H.O. Feith, “Drie Gedichten, betreffende het oproer der gilden te Groningen, in het jaar 1662,” in *Groningsche Volksalmanak* (1850), 75.

He has served us in a rotten manner.”²⁷¹

The other individual mentioned in this passage, Geert Claassen, was the alderman of the merchants’ guild, and he had developed a reputation for lobbing insults and threats of his own against the city.²⁷² The author of this specific pamphlet clearly saw Udinck as the more significant threat, although the degree to which blame was rhetorically assigned varies amongst these publications.

In yet another pamphlet published in 1662, *t’Samen-spraecke, van een Advocaet, Boumeester der achtiën Gilden ende een Borger der Stadt Groningen*, (*Conversation together with a Lawyer, Bouwmeester of the Eighteen Guilds and a Citizen of the City of Groningen*) the anonymous author describes a fictional encounter between three unnamed characters: the first two, the lawyer and the *bouwmeester*, are clearly meant to represent Dr. Lucas Harckens and Gerrit Warendorp, respectively, while the third seems to represent a more idealized Groningen citizen. The conversation is set in Groningen during the closing moments of the 1662 riots, and begins with the lawyer’s expressing concern for the wellbeing of the fictional *bouwmeester*, who has clearly become crestfallen. The lawyer asks the *bouwmeester*, “How is it that I find you so defeated? After all, the business has not yet been settled,” to which the *bouwmeester* replies:

Is it any wonder that I am worried about the unrest? There is a lot of prosperity amongst the commoners nowadays and the responsibility on my shoulders is staggering. It worries me during the day and takes away all of my sleep at night. Because of that, I will have to succumb to these serious concerns . . . Those who are among the common people obey me . . . when I tell them to go, they’ll go, and when I tell them to come, they’ll come. Surely, I will feed them as my faithful sheep and guide them here as a

²⁷¹ The original pamphlet is quoted in *ibid.*, 57-58, “Laat Uding met dij gaan, Geert Claassen voor mij staan; Doch Udings hoofd is sot, Hij dient niet bij ons rot.”

²⁷² Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB), Knuttel 8748A, 24 January 1663, *Sententien by borgemesteren en raadt in Groningen, gepronuncieert tegens Johan van Emmen boumester der Achtijn Gilden, mitsgaders Geert Claessen olderman der Cramer Gilde, Volume 1* (Groningen: Frans Bronchorst, 1663), 5.

Moses . . . We must keep our silence now, until we have returned our Lord [Schulenburg] to the state. We may have the guilds in hand, but we must also have our Protector in the middle of the government.²⁷³

As the conversation continues, the *bouwmeester* repeatedly displays his support for Schulenburg and his desire to undermine the government; the lawyer appears naive and uninformed; and the burgher talks openly about the accusations levied against the guilds. In the end, it is difficult to determine how effective these fictional narratives and rhetorical devices were in fostering derision. It is clear, however, that Schulenburg's actual friends from the guilds were unable to draw enough support to rehabilitate his honor, nor were they able to assuage the legal realities that were enveloping him.

SCHULENBORGH'S TRIAL

In October 1662, Schulenburg was brought up on official charges. Some of these involved his suspected role in instigating the riots of 1657, which resulted in the looting of the houses of the lords, as well as publishing materials that were unfavorable to Groningen, and of course, failing to carry out his voting instructions regarding the peace with Portugal.²⁷⁴ Another significant accusation levied against Schulenburg was that he had stolen 4,577 guilders from the Groningen chamber of the WIC. The crux of this argument was that in 1657, Groningen's provincial executives discovered that the province of Groningen had overpaid by some 14,577

²⁷³ KB, Tiele 8641, Anonymous, *t'Samen-spraecke, van een Advocaet, Boumeester der achtiën Gilden ende een Borger der Stadt Groningen. Raeckende Den Oproer ende factien, soo onlanghs door 't beleyt van eenige seditieufe Menschen zijn gepasseert* (1662).

²⁷⁴ Lorgion, *Geschiedkundige Beschrijving der Stad Groningen*, 63, "The points of accusations brought against Schuilenburg were as follows: First, he was the cause of the unrest in 1657 involving the looting of the houses of the lords; Second, a sum of four to five thousand guilders of the country's money had been held maliciously; Thirdly, he opposed his voting instructions involving the peace with Portugal; Fourth, as an extension of the third point, his voting against the wishes of the province had caused an infraction upon the union; Fifth, he had printed and spread a Hollander resolution that was unfavorable to Groningen; Sixth, he printed a justification of his actions; and Seventh, he was the cause and the reason for the recent riots in Groningen."

guilders for their share of responsibility in maintaining the WIC's militias in Brazil.

Schulenburg was tasked with returning this sum to the Groningen chamber of the West-India Company, but an audit in 1662 could only account for 10,000 guilders having been paid back.²⁷⁵ Therefore, it was argued, albeit some five years after the fact, that Schulenburg must have skimmed the difference off the top for himself.²⁷⁶ Schulenburg was also rumored to have promised the Catholic members of the guilds that he would help them construct a Catholic Church in the city should he be restored to power.²⁷⁷ The deck was clearly stacked against Schulenburg, and in October 1662, he sent a letter to the city council requesting that, at a minimum, he be granted a competent judge, impartial jurors, and a court composed of residents from both the city and the Ommelanden.²⁷⁸ In an effort to prevent further social unrest, the city council assured the populace that Schulenburg's trial would be held in a special court in the presence of both townspeople and Ommelanders.²⁷⁹

Schulenburg's trial began in November 1662. Initially, he was free to come and go as he pleased, however, this freedom of movement came to an end on 11 November 1662, when he was placed under house arrest and guarded by two soldiers.²⁸⁰ Only his four lawyers, Gleints, Dijk, Siemans, and Dr. Lucas Harckens were allowed access to him.²⁸¹ Security was presumably very weak, however, and on 27 November 1662, with the help of his lawyers, Schulenburg escaped from his home by dressing in women's clothing.²⁸² For their suspected

²⁷⁵ Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB), Tiele 8641, Anonymous, *t'Samen-spraecke, van een Advocaet, Boumeester der achtien Gilden ende een Borger der Stadt Groningen. Raeckende Den Oproer ende factien, soo onlanghs door 't beleyt van eenige seditieufe Menschen zijn gepasseert* (1662); see also Poelman, "Johan Schulenburg," 59-60.

²⁷⁶ Poelman, "Johan Schulenburg," 59-60.

²⁷⁷ *Geschiedenis van Groningen Deel II Nieuwe Tijd* (Zwolle, Netherlands: Waanders Uitgevers, 2008), 236.

²⁷⁸ Poelman, "Johan Schulenburg," 60.

²⁷⁹ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 255.

²⁸⁰ Poelman, "Johan Schulenburg," 63.

²⁸¹ Ibid.

²⁸² Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 255.

roles in the escape, Gleints and Siemens were each fined 250 guilders, to benefit the *Blauwe kindershuis*, one of three orphanages in the city.²⁸³

Schulenburg's escape thoroughly embarrassed the Groningen authorities, and for years to come, the mayors, council members, and other authority figures in the city remained preoccupied with the whereabouts and activities of their old antagonist. On 3 December 1662, the Groningen Councillor Cluivingh was ordered to inventory Schulenburg's property so that it could be confiscated by the Groningen Provincial House.²⁸⁴ Cluivingh returned the next day with his report: he had found only a few carriages, horses, beds, paintings, empty crates and papers.²⁸⁵ The vast majority of Schulenburg's wealth was gone, most likely transferred out of the province weeks or even months earlier. Almost three years later, in October 1665, the city leaders were still searching in vain for Schulenburg's "hidden treasure."²⁸⁶

Schulenburg, meanwhile, fled to Bremen and then to Münster where he served in the prince-bishop's retinue until 1678.²⁸⁷ Despite his absence, the trial in Groningen persisted as though the accused was still there. On 30 December 1662, Schulenburg was convicted in absentia of treason.²⁸⁸ The verdict and sentence was announced in the open doors of the

²⁸³ De Groot, *Tegenwoordige staat de Vereenigde Nederlanden*, 61; see also Buursma, *Dese bekommerlijke tijden*, 146-152. Initially Groningen divided their orphanages into two main groups: the *Rode Weeshuis* for orphans of the citizenry, and the Reformed Church's *Groene Weeshuis* for poor orphans. The *Blauwe Weeshuis* was established in 1660 to help facilitate the growing number of poor orphans in the city; see also Anne E. C. McCants, *Civic Charity in a Golden Age: Orphan Care in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997), Anne McCants described a similar division of orphanages in seventeenth-century Amsterdam, where there existed a *Burgerweeshuis* for orphans of the middle-class citizenry, and an *Aalmoezeniersweeshuis* for poor orphans.

²⁸⁴ Poelman, "Johan Schulenburg," 64-65.

²⁸⁵ Ibid.

²⁸⁶ Ibid., 64-65.

²⁸⁷ De Groot, *Tegenwoordige staat de Vereenigde Nederlanden*, 162.

²⁸⁸ Poelman, "Johan Schulenburg," 64.

provincial house: “He shall be executed by the sword, until dead,” the spokesman declared, “and all of his property and his wife’s property shall be confiscated!”²⁸⁹

²⁸⁹ Ibid., “hij sal te becomen wesen, door den scherprichter met den swaerde geëxecuteert te worden, datter de doot na volgt, met confiscatie van alle sijne goederen, blijvende de vrouwengoederen daarvan geeximeert.”

CHAPTER THREE:

DISMEMBERING THE GUILDS, DECEMBER 1662 - JANUARY 1663

In the closing weeks of 1662, as Johan Schulenborgh was on the run and winding his way through northwestern Germany, Groningen's city council members refocused their investigation on those members of the guilds' leadership who were suspected of colluding with Schulenborgh and instigating the recent riots. Ultimately five were singled out as the orchestrators of the social unrest. These were Gerrit Hermans Warendorp, Dr. Lucas Harckens, Gerard Udinck, Johan van Emmen, and Geert Claassen. A comprehensive history of these culprits has never been published. This is, in my view, not due to a lack of interest, as the guild riots are often mentioned in secondary sources concerned with the history of Groningen, but likely the result of a lack of surviving primary sources. As Robert Darnton warned, limited source material is an inherent risk in microanalytical approaches to history.²⁹⁰

While all of the aforementioned names may be found in the archival record, their individual narratives and their own personal versions of the events have been distorted by a host of other published material, much of which was produced at the behest of the municipal authorities – the same authorities who prosecuted them. As a result, descriptions of these five men are limited to the polemics of anonymously authored pamphlets, interrogator notes written by rivals in the city council, as well as legal placards created by the city council's secretaries and

²⁹⁰ Robert Darnton, "First Steps Toward a History of Reading," in Peter Burke, ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 140-167: 142-146; see also Jeroen Blaak, *Literacy in Everyday Life: Reading and Writing in Early Modern Dutch Diaries* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 36.

dispersed throughout the country as both a notice and a warning to other potential criminals. Nonetheless, the story of one of the accused, Gerard Udinck, can be studied in far more detail. This is due to the survival of his diary, which remains housed in the *Groninger Archieven*, and contains daily entries from December 1662 until October 1665.

GERARD UDINCK AND THE TAILORS' GUILD IN GRONINGEN

Though his diary is intact, there are no portraits of Udinck or his family, nor are there any detailed descriptions of his outward appearance, demeanor, or personality. Thus there are a number of other details about him after which we can only guess. Still, through the archival record it is possible to recreate some aspects of the way he dressed, his personality, as well as the social, political, economic, and cultural environments that shaped the final years of his life. As the alderman of tailors' guild in Groningen, Udinck would have been well versed in the fashions of the day, and there are a number of examples of this in his diary. He had a few jackets, including a green one that he was quite fond of, he was known to wear hats and handkerchiefs, he carried a pocket watch (something that was quite novel), and at times used a walking stick.²⁹¹ Gerard Udinck was also a prolific reader, and a fan of music. He seems to have been well-educated, as evidenced by his correspondence with high-ranking theologians, professors, businessmen, political leaders, and military officers, and he did so in Dutch, German, French and Latin. He was a devout Calvinist who rarely missed church services, but he was also deeply interested in the ongoing religious debates of the day and seemed to relish in conversations regarding spiritual matters.

²⁹¹ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxxv.

Udinck's early life is a bit of a mystery. From the diary, one can glean that during his youth and/or early adulthood, he spent some time in France, although the exact length of time and purpose there is unclear. He may have travelled there as a journeyman perfecting his trade or perhaps as a mercenary or student. It is clear, however, that, while in France, Udinck met a number of prominent individuals including Werner Pagenstecker (who would later become a judge and professor in Steinfurt), Colonel Andolph Clant from Groningen, and perhaps Osebrand Johan Rengers van Slochteren, the powerful Ommelander mentioned in chapter one. Rengers had been inducted into the Order of Saint Michael in France, which was "the second highest chivalric order administered by the French king (after the Order of the Holy Spirit)."²⁹² Udinck may have been involved with others who were in the Order, but it is doubtful that he himself was ever admitted since candidates were typically required to show proof of their "noble stock."²⁹³ Udinck held no such title.²⁹⁴

Udinck's time and experience as a journeyman is absent from the archival record. Furthermore, the terms of apprenticeship on the continent varied based on trade and location. In France, for example, apprenticeships were typically five years, while in the Dutch Republic they were more often two years.²⁹⁵ During this time, journeymen often lived in hostels, or some other local housing, where young men fraternized, formed bonds of fellowship, and engaged in traditions and customs that continued with them when they finally completed their

²⁹² Esther Bell, *The Brothers Le Nain: Painters of Seventeenth-Century France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016), 35; see also E.H. Waterbolk, "Staatkundige geschiedenis" in Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 237, 245, 250-251; Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxviii; D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre Boulton, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2000), 446, The Order of Saint Michael was originally established in 1469 by the French King Louis XI, in order to keep his knights, and his brother's knights, from declaring loyalty to their rival, Charles the Rash of Burgundy

²⁹³ Bell, *The Brothers Le Nain*, 35.

²⁹⁴ Ibid.

²⁹⁵ Prak, *Citizens without Nations*, 97.

apprenticeship and officially joined a guild.²⁹⁶ In the guilds, much like in civic militias, these bonds of loyalty and friendship were often declared in elaborate drinking toasts involving highly decorated drinking vessels, elaborate speeches, and declarations of loyalty.²⁹⁷

Guild membership in the early modern period represented more than just a job; it also coincided with citizenship. And because citizenship in the Dutch Republic was primarily a local affair, guild membership (and by extension citizenship) was often required for one to have access to municipal safety nets, trading rights, and other privileges in the city. Udinck was originally born in Horstmar, Westphalia and was therefore an immigrant in the Dutch Republic. He likely became a citizen of Groningen in 1635, when he was admitted into the Groningen tailors' guild after paying the required admission fee of nine Carolus guilders (approximately thirteen and a half guilders) to the city trustee.²⁹⁸

As a tailor, Udinck would have been considered a skilled worker, but there were likely dozens of other tailors in the city with a very similar skillset. Jan de Vries and Ad van der Woude have estimated, for example, that the ratio of tailors to the overall population in Dutch cities was at least 1:500, and sometimes much higher.²⁹⁹ In Overijssel, there was “one village tailor for every 200 to 250 inhabitants.”³⁰⁰ Thus, if the population of the city of Groningen was around 25,000, one would expect to encounter at least 50 tailors working within the city, and each

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 102; see also Merry E. Wiesner, *Gender, Church and State in Early Modern Germany* (London: Longman, 1998), 163-177; and Merry E. Wiesner-Hanks, *Early Modern Europe, 1450-1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 44, Wiesner writes that guilds “developed a strong sense of masculine work identity and cohesion through ceremonies, celebrations, processions, and sometimes distinctive clothing.”

²⁹⁷ Prak, *Citizens without Nations*, 155.

²⁹⁸ GrA, Toegang 1605, Stadsbestuur 1594-1815, Inv. 332, Stadrekening 1635, fol. 134; According to the New Netherland Institute's Guide to Seventeenth-Century Coins, Weights and Measures, a Carolus guilder was worth approximately 1.5 guilders. A copy of the guide can be found on the New Netherland Institute's website: <https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/research/online-publications/guide-to-seventeenth-century-dutch-coins-weights-and-measures/> accessed on 6 October 2017.

²⁹⁹ De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 511-517.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

probably earned between 400 and 700 guilders per year.³⁰¹ This placed tailors higher on the socio-economic ladder than unskilled laborers, many of whom in the eastern provinces earned less than 200 guilders per year, and higher than the average burgher who earned between 200 and 300 guilders per year, but still a far cry from the *kassiers* (private bankers) and lawyers, who earned upwards of 1,200 and 1,800 guilders per year, respectively.³⁰² Udinck's exact income is difficult to pin down. He was certainly wealthier than most tailors in Groningen, as displayed by the property, investors, debtors, and rent collections that he attempted to manage while in exile. But it is also evident throughout the diary that Udinck relied heavily on these additional sources of income to supplement his trade, which was further hampered during his banishment.

On 28 August 1636, one year after joining the tailors' guild, Udinck and Janneke (Jantien) Jason were married.³⁰³ There is no mention of the couple having children, but they acted as the guardians of their niece, Maria Jason, whose biological parents, Paulus Jason (Janneke's brother) and Jantien Tymans, remain largely absent from the archival record.³⁰⁴ In addition to working as the alderman of the tailors' guild, Udinck also served as deacon of Groningen's Reformed Church between 1647 and 1651, where, among other things, he was responsible for assisting with poor relief.³⁰⁵ From Udinck's diary, it is clear that Janneke and

³⁰¹ For population estimates, see Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 248; and Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, 103; For income estimates, see De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 562-563, 573, De Vries and Van der Woude estimate that tailors in Holland earned between 600 and 1,000 guilders annually, but that those figures in the eastern provinces were lower, varying from about 60 and 70 percent of those in Holland.

³⁰² De Vries and Van der Woude *The First Modern Economy*, 562-563, 573, De Vries and Van der Woude estimate that in Holland in 1742, the average annual income for tailors was around 820 guilders, *kassiers* earned around 1,979, and lawyers earned around 2,741, but again, these figures varied between 60 and 70 percent in the eastern provinces. By 1742, some inflation was noticeable, making the guilder worth less. Still, the coin apparently held its value more or less throughout the century, and wages varied little during that same timespan.

³⁰³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 28 August 1664.

³⁰⁴ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxxv-lxxvi, Niebaum and Veldman suggest that Maria's parents may have passed away at a young age, but I have been unable to confirm this.

³⁰⁵ Buursma, *Dese bekommerlijke tijden*, 337, Buursma writes that these years coincided with other events taking place in Europe, namely the Peace of Münster (1648), and that Groningen witnessed an influx of impoverished immigrants, beggars and vagabonds, which the city increasingly attempted to restrict.

Maria had a number of family members who lived in various towns throughout Drenthe, just south of Groningen. For example, Janneke had a cousin in Zweeloo, and Maria's uncle, Lucas Tymans, owned property and worked as a landlord in Assen.³⁰⁶ These family members would play an important role in the couple's travels during exile and in Udinck's attempts to reenter the Dutch Republic in 1665.

Udinck's journal begins in earnest in December 1662, shortly before his arrest and the climactic moments of his first trial. Based on the detailed interrogators' notes from 1665, Udinck was in his mid-fifties in December 1662, Janneke was approximately 51 years old, and Maria was about 21 years old.³⁰⁷ In the opening page of his diary, Udinck claims that he only kept this diary to occupy his time while in exile.³⁰⁸ Thus, it seems that he had not kept a diary prior to his arrest and interrogations in December 1662 and January 1663, respectively. It was likely the trauma of these experiences that triggered him to keep a written record of the significant events in his life. It is also noteworthy that his diary writings began at about the same time as Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) and John Evelyn (1620-1706) began to record their impressions in the form of a diary. Indeed the chaos of the seventeenth century seems to have heralded a sort of *Zeitgeist* that is reminiscent of Paul Hazard's notion of a crisis of European consciousness, or the dismantling of classical stability.³⁰⁹ The timing also corresponds to early forms of the what would become a popular wave of religious pietism (particularly in German circles) and its reliance on soul-searching via supply sources. The individualistic quality of Protestantism that

³⁰⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274.

³⁰⁷ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 665, "Procesverbaal van de verhoren van Janneke Jason, vrouw van Gerhard Uding," 13 Oktober 1665; and Toegang 2041, Inv. 666, "Procesverbaal van de verhoren van Maria Jason," 13 October 1665. The interrogators' notes, written three years later, provide the ages of both women in 1665: "Janneke Jason Huisvrouw van Gerhard Uding. 54. jaer oudt," and "Maria Jason 24 jaer oudt."

³⁰⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274.

³⁰⁹ Paul Hazard, *The Crisis of the European Mind, 1680-1715* (New York: New York Review of Books, 2013), 3-4, 28.

one could already recognize in Luther, but may have been writ large by Calvin, comes to mind as well in speculating about the reasons for Udinck's peculiar decision to begin keeping a diary when he was already well into his fifties.

Many of Udinck's early diary entries, and some of his later ones, were clearly written from memory. And while memoirs, or writing from memory, became a popular style of writing in the eighteenth century, there are a number of modern characteristics of memoir writing that can be observed in Udinck's diary. For example, his diary entries are chronological, his "self" is the hero/protagonist, and he often displays feelings of instability, uncertainty, and fear. Inherent in some of these elements, especially fear, is Martin Heidegger's notion of "*dasein*" (being there), whereby one recognizes that one's time on earth is finite, and that all acts eventually must be reconciled with the approach of one's death (i.e., "being towards death").³¹⁰ In this process, Udinck's memoir writing provides the reader (i.e., himself) with an opportunity to not only recap the events of his life, but also to cast judgments on his past decisions and actions.

A DARK AND STORMY NIGHT

Like a cliché from a modern mystery novel, Udinck's story emerges during the ominous setting of a dark and stormy night. On 2 and 3 December 1662, the city of Groningen was consumed by cold temperatures, cloudy skies, freezing rain, and unusually strong winds. In the very early morning hours of 2 December, a large contingent of officers and soldiers under the command of the stadholder Willem Frederik took up posts throughout the city. Some of these soldiers were local militiamen and nightwatchmen, while others were dispatched to Groningen from garrisons outside of the city, such as the Ommelanden and even neighboring provinces.

³¹⁰ See for example, Martin Heidegger and Joan Stambaugh, *Being and Time: A Translation of Sein Und Zeit* (Albany: State University of New York, 1996).

Groningen had long maintained authority to command troops garrisoned along the eastern border in towns such as Coevorden, Emden, Bourtange and Wedde, and it seems many of these newly arrived soldiers originated in those parts.³¹¹

On the morning of 2 December 1662, Gerard Udinck and his wife watched the events unfold from street level. He noted in his diary that he first recognized a party of soldiers from Friesland, who had gathered around the *Vismarkt* (fish market) - a large market on the western side of the *Grote Markt*.³¹² When the church services ended, he was surprised to see “*syñ Vorstlyck Gnade*” (his princely grace; i.e., the stadholder Willem Frederik) there among those same soldiers.³¹³ Udinck and his wife paused for a moment in front of the market square, where they were greeted by a close associate, Colonel Andolph Clant, and a less friendly character, the city secretary Rhijmers. Watching the spectacle unfold, Clant asked, “What is the purpose of all this?”³¹⁴ The question was probably rhetorical in nature. Clant surely knew of the recent riots and why the soldiers were there. Rhijmers responded, “I don’t know for sure, but I believe that seven or eight [of the protestors] will be taken [prisoner], who will be forced to answer for this, [and] it shall reveal who shall be held responsible.”³¹⁵ Rhijmers’ commentary was likely a jab at Udinck. He knew, for example, that Udinck was closely aligned with many of those who might be taken into custody, and that the soldiers’ presence would ultimately lead to the guilds’ undoing. Concerned, and probably quite fearful, Udinck did not engage in the conversation any

³¹¹ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 239.

³¹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 5 November 1663, here Udinck recalls the events of 2 December 1662.

³¹³ Ibid.

³¹⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 5 November 1663 and 1 December 1664, recalling the events of 2 December 1662.

³¹⁵ Ibid.

further. He and his wife left the square and went home, where soon afterwards they were visited by their neighbor, the “*mennist*” (Mennonite) Peter Hindricks (Hendricks).³¹⁶

Hendricks’s visit, however, was also disconcerting. He had come to Udinck’s house in order to obtain confirmation of a rumor that Udinck and his family were harboring fugitives from the law (i.e., some of the other ringleaders from the recent riots): “I understand, neighbor, that some among you have gone into hiding and that you will be brought down with them.”³¹⁷ Udinck neither confirmed nor denied the rumor explicitly. He was, however, coming to terms with the precariousness of his situation. Udinck replied: “In God’s name, I must expect that I shall not, and can not, escape from here.”³¹⁸ Clearly nervous, Udinck attempted to draw strength from his faith, declaring that he was “thankful to God, not to the lies.”³¹⁹ Hendricks, however, had more bad news. He informed Udinck that a writer in Groningen named Lubbers was circulating a rumor that “*suster Jantien*” (sister Jantien, Udinck’s sister-in-law), was hiding the six guild members who had served in the *Gezwoeren Gemeente* as well as the two guild *bouwmeesters* in her bed.³²⁰ It seems as though Lubbers was playing with a double entendre here, not only suggesting that Udinck’s family was harboring fugitives, but also implying that his sister-in-law was perhaps prostituting herself. Udinck was in disbelief. “In God’s name,” he lamented, “I shall place my trust in God and my innocence rests with the amnesty.”³²¹ Here, Udinck was referring to the amnesty granted by the city in September 1662, which ostensibly forgave the guild leaders for their involvement in the previous riots, and in Groningen’s political affairs more generally.³²²

³¹⁶ Ibid.

³¹⁷ Ibid.

³¹⁸ Ibid.

³¹⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 December 1664, recalling the events of 2 December 1662.

³²⁰ Ibid.

³²¹ Ibid.

³²² A copy of the amnesty can be found in Van Aitzema, *Saken van staet en oorlogh*, 938-939.; and in Lorgion, *Geschiedkundige Beschrijving der Stad Groningen*, 62; see chapter two as well.

Although Udinck was indeed involved in the orchestration of the unrest in Groningen, the brazenness of Hendricks' demeanor, especially coming from a member of a religious minority such as the Mennonites, is striking. While many Dutch cities had a reputation for religious tolerance, Groningen did not.³²³ In 1601, Groningen's municipal leaders proclaimed a "Severe Edict" that prohibited the practice of the Anabaptist religion in Groningen.³²⁴ The edict created division among the townspeople throughout most of the century.³²⁵ In 1637, Uke Walles (1593-1653), the leader of the *Oude Vlamingen* (Old Flemish), a conservative, yet mystically minded branch of Mennonites, was banished from Groningen for suggesting that all sins could be forgiven and that even Judas would be saved.³²⁶ The guarantee of universal salvation not only went against the teachings of the Reformed Church, but also threatened the social stability of the city. Municipal leaders argued that if Walles was correct, then there was no motivation for men to live honest lives, for they knew that in the end they would be saved anyway.³²⁷ Despite his banishment, Walles returned to Groningen many times, and was eventually arrested and banished again in 1644.³²⁸

Mennonites in Groningen were typically only permitted to practice their faith in private or clandestine churches far from main streets.³²⁹ They were also forbidden from political offices, and because they refused to engage in combat, they were sometimes compelled to pay local

³²³ Benjamin J. Kaplan, "Dutch Religious Tolerance: Celebration and Revision," in R. Po-Chia Hsia and H. F. K. van Nierop, eds., *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 17, "Certain cities, like Haarlem and Gouda, consciously cultivated reputations for tolerance; others, like Dordrecht and Groningen, did not."

³²⁴ Samme Zijlstra, "Anabaptism and tolerance: possibilities and limitations," in Hsia and Van Nierop, eds., *Calvinism and Religious Toleration*, 116; see also Samme Zijlstra, "Het "scherpe plakkaat" van Groningen uit 1601," *Doopsgezinde Bijdragen* 15 (1989), 65-78.

³²⁵ Ibid.

³²⁶ Samme Zijlstra, "Anabaptism and tolerance: possibilities and limitations," 120-121.

³²⁷ Ibid.

³²⁸ Ibid.

³²⁹ Ibid.

authorities large sums of money in lieu of military service.³³⁰ In the late 1660s and early 1670s, similar restrictions were applied in Friesland, where, over the course of the seventeenth century, Mennonites paid over a million guilders to the provincial government - money that was used to finance the wars against England, Münster, and France - and through these payments, Mennonites “obtained *de facto* freedom of religion.”³³¹ In regards to Peter Hendricks, or the “*mennist*,” as Udinck referred to him, one can only speculate as to the supportive or adversarial relationship that he experienced with the townspeople and city authorities, but he was likely some sort of an outcast. Udinck does not appear to have held him in high regard, and he does not mention Hendricks again in his diary entries or correspondence.³³²

That afternoon, the final assemblage of soldiers was dispersed throughout the city streets. They were tasked with stopping the recent riots and restoring law and order, but that evening there was little for these fighting men to do. The inclement weather had curtailed both the intensity of the protests as well as the soldiers’ ability to respond to any potential upheaval. At night, the city became an especially dark and quiet place. Nearly all of the city’s inhabitants, in both businesses and homes, would have pulled their wooden shutters closed, shrouding the rooms and occupants behind them. Many of these buildings were further secured with iron bars, and on most winter evenings, only an occasional lantern, torch, or candle light would be visible at street level. On this evening, it seems that instead of concentrating on police duties, a number of soldiers, or at least the officers, took advantage of the downtime by engaging in an evening of merrymaking, indulging in beer, wine, tobacco, and other forms of debauchery.

³³⁰ Ibid.

³³¹ Ibid., 114-116.

³³² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 5 November 1663 and 1 December 1664, recalling the events of 2 December 1662.

The officers' festivities that evening were largely confined to the area immediately surrounding Groningen's two main guardhouses. One of these was the office of the *Hoofdwacht* (head guard), which was located on the eastern side of the *Grote Markt*, opposite the *Raadhuis* and directly adjacent to the *Martinikerk*.³³³ There, in front of the head guardhouse, and in the clear view of the *Grote Markt*, stood a set of cannons, which were symbolic in function, as well as a wooden horse, which was used to discipline deviant soldiers through various forms of physical punishment and public shaming.³³⁴ The second guardhouse was located north of the *Grote Markt*, at the end of the *Oude Boteringestraat*. There, a two-story building constructed in 1634 served as the headquarters for Groningen City's *kortegaard*, or *Corps de Garde*, (civic guard, city guard, or *schutters* as they were known in Holland).³³⁵ The ground floor of this building provided stables and shelter for the officers' horses and was generally open to the public, while the upstairs was reserved as a meeting place for officers.³³⁶

One of the merrymakers near the *Oude Boteringestraat* that evening was Wigbolt Isselmuiden, a Frisian colonel in the *leger* (the Dutch States' Army) as well as a friend, customer, and patron of Gerard Udinck.³³⁷ Isselmuiden was not a part of Groningen's civic guard, but he probably interacted with them, as he did with the local population. Earlier that day, Udinck had hand delivered to the colonel a new set of "light colored clothes" as well as a new "*casacke*" (cassock), an imposing coat with large cuffs that could be "doubled," or rolled back

³³³ Benjamin van der Linde, *Das Leibregiment der friesischen Statthalter: Kriegsgerichte, Offizierslaufbahnen und militärische Lebenswelten in den Garnisonsstädten Leeuwarden, Groningen und Emden, 1666-1752* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2016), 80.

³³⁴ Ibid.

³³⁵ Today the Hotel Corps de Garde sits on this site, but many elements of the original structure are still in place.

³³⁶ Van der Linde, *Das Leibregiment der friesischen Statthalter*, 80.

³³⁷ A.P. van Nienes and M. Bruggeman, *Archieven van de Friese stadhouders inventarissen van de archieven van de Friese stadhouders van Willem Lodewijk tot en met Willem V, 1584-1795* (Friesland: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002), 194.

along the sleeve, to display a contrasting color and style of fabric underneath.³³⁸ Cassocks were impressive and especially popular among wealthy and high-ranking men in both military and civilian circles in Dutch society. The colonel was probably pleased with Udinck's final product as the two spent the remainder of the day together drinking and socializing. They departed briefly that afternoon for dinner. Presumably Udinck went home, where he ate alone; he wrote in his journal that Janneke and Maria had gone to see their niece, Geertruit, with whom they ate dinner.³³⁹

After dinner, Isselmuiden and Udinck met again, this time at the home of the postmaster, Johan Flugger, who also lived along the *Oude Boteringestraat*.³⁴⁰ Udinck wrote in his diary that there were many officers at Flugger's house, and by the time Udinck arrived, Isselmuiden was already there drinking heavily, and having "a very good time," even as the "stormy winds raged all night long."³⁴¹ At some time in the early morning hours of 3 December, Isselmuiden left Flugger's house "completely drunk" and walked to the *Boteringepoort*, a bridge along the northern side of the *diepenring* (the main canal surrounding the city).³⁴² There, as a result of his inebriation, or possibly the freezing rain, dark skies, wet roads, and strong winds, the colonel lost his footing, stumbled along the edge of the *Boteringepoort*, and fell to his death. Tragedies like this occurred rather frequently in seventeenth-century Dutch cities, where streets, alleys, canals and bridges often became pitch black and quite dangerous at night. Safety improved somewhat in

³³⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 2 December 1662, 6 November 1663, 2-3 December 1664.

³³⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 5 November 1663, recalling the events of 2 December 1662.

³⁴⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 2 December 1662, 6 November 1663, 2-3 December 1664.

³⁴¹ Ibid.

³⁴² Ibid.

1669 when Amsterdam began widespread use of oil lanterns, and soon afterwards, other Dutch cities adopted similar forms of Dutch street-lighting.³⁴³

Udinck was not with the colonel at the time of his accident; he had most likely already gone home, but he learned of the tragedy from his servant the following day, and he repeats the story in his diary no fewer than three times, two of which were from memory years later.³⁴⁴ Like many of the more intriguing stories in Udinck's diary, his entries regarding Isselmuiden withhold numerous details that historians today would consider important. And given the low reflexive nature of early modern egodocuments, historians who use these types of sources are often compelled to derive meaning from the form, content, and explicit subject matter that they provide. For instance, it is obvious, based on the number of times that Udinck recalls this tragedy, that Isselmuiden's death had a profound impact on him, that Udinck probably considered Isselmuiden to be not only a friend, but also a patron who must have had the ear of Willem Frederik and, thus, might have shielded him from prosecution.

MILITARY FRIENDS, PATRONS, AND CLIENTS

As Udinck's and Isselmuiden's friendship makes clear, there were a number of entanglements that existed between the military and the civilians within the city. In seventeenth-century Dutch urban centers, the figurative line between the military world and the civilian world was not as clearly demarcated as contemporary popular culture might have us believe.³⁴⁵ The

³⁴³ Regarding the inventor Jan van der Heyden's oil lanterns throughout Amsterdam, see Mak, *The Many Lives of Jan Six*, 140.

³⁴⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 2 December 1662, 6 November 1663, 2-3 December 1664.

³⁴⁵ In seventeenth-century Dutch popular culture, soldiers and sailors were often described as the dregs of society and a nuisance to the citizenry. See for example, Van Deursen. *Plain Lives*; Sir William Temple. *Observations Upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands*. First published in 1668 (London: J. Tonson, Awnsham, and J. Churchill, 1705), 179-180; Johann Grimmelshausen. *Simplicissimus*, Translated by Mike Mitchell. Sawtry, (UK: Dedalus Limited, 2011), ch. 16; Johann Grimmelshausen. *The Life of Courage, the Notorious Thief, Whore and Vagabond*,

two groups were deeply intertwined and cohabited in ways that would be unfathomable today. It is certainly true that during wartime the citizenry was compelled to quarter and feed soldiers, and that this often led to various forms of conflict between these two groups. For example, in Germany during the Thirty Years' War many of those mercenaries who were quartered in private homes developed a reputation for disrespecting their hosts, overstaying their welcome, behaving immorally, and sometimes committing theft, assault, rape and even murder.³⁴⁶

Social tensions towards military men existed in the Dutch Republic as well. For example, the contemporary Dutch merchant and writer, Roemer Visscher (1547-1620), referred to soldiers as bullies and plunderers, and more recently the Dutch historian A.T. van Deursen has pointed out that soldiers were not welcome in the city hospitals in Delft or Amsterdam.³⁴⁷ Still, this animosity does not appear to have been as polarized in Dutch society as it was in the German context. This was in part because most of the fighting in the wars of the seventeenth century took place outside of the Republic, and therefore the Dutch population did not experience marauding bands of armies in the same way that German civilians did. There were also a number of steps taken by the Dutch army, especially following the military revolution of Maurits and Willem Lodewijk in the 1590s, to curb the hostility between the military and the citizenry. As Jonathan

Germany, 1670. Translated by Mike Mitchell. Sawtry, (UK: Dedalus Limited, 2010); Gert von der Osten and Horst Vey. *Painting and Sculpture in Germany and the Netherlands, 1500 to 1600* (London: Penguin Books, 1969), 100. Urs Graf spent most of his adult life as a *Reislauffer* (Swiss mercenary) and saw himself as “a free soldier rather than a plebeian craftsman.” Graf’s 1524 woodcut, *Two Mercenaries, Whore, and Death* also illustrates the early modern attitude towards mercenaries by depicting a *Reislauffer* (Swiss mercenary) and a *Landsknecht* (German mercenary), accompanied by a whore and death; and countless others; Jochai Rosen. *Soldiers at Leisure: The Guardroom Scene in Dutch Genre Painting of the Golden Age* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010), 26-32.

³⁴⁶ See for example, Peter H. Wilson, *The Thirty Years War: Europe’s Tragedy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009); Jan Peters (Hrsg.). *Peter Hagendorf - Tagebuch eines Söldners aus dem Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2012); and Hans Medick and Benjamin Marschke, *Experiencing the Thirty Years War: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2013).

³⁴⁷ Van Deursen, *Plain Lives*, 28-30.

Israel writes, “At the heart of the Dutch reforms was the need to protect civil society through tighter discipline and regular payment of the troops.”³⁴⁸

Still, the relationship between the military and the civilian populations in Dutch cities and towns was a nuanced one, especially when it involved police duties. Policing the community often fell on the shoulders of the bailiffs, *schulten*, civic guards, night watchmen and other militiamen who were no strangers to the community, and whose moral sense of duty was often overshadowed by the potential to earn additional income through bribery.³⁴⁹ This segment of the militia was typically occupied by family members of the regents, or by the regents themselves who did not necessarily engage in combat outside of the defense of their own cities. This type of local military service carried with it some heightened prestige, but as A.T. van Deursen has argued, these men sometimes “fell short of the ideal” because urban populations often “regarded the officers of justice as defenders of private interests.”³⁵⁰

Municipal authorities may have desired law and order, but in some cases the mere aesthetic of social stability was sufficient. The names, faces, and reputations of the city’s inhabitants were all well known to one another, and although the city perpetuated the facade of the watchmen’s authority, in many instances, authority figures and dissenters acted more like business associates than rivals. This was certainly the case with soldiers and the citizenry, who, like Udinck and Isselmuiden, lived, worked, and interacted regularly with one another. Even as the soldiers were specifically tasked with putting down the guilds’ unrest, much of which was blamed on Udinck and his colleagues, these ostensibly opposing groups continued to fraternize with one another.

³⁴⁸ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 267-271.

³⁴⁹ See for example, Van de Pol, *The Burgher and the Whore*.

³⁵⁰ Van Deursen, *Plain Lives*, 192.

This fraternization was more complicated than it might seem at first glance. Friendships in this period certainly existed between like-minded individuals, but, more commonly, they entailed some form of mutual assistance in the form of patronage-clientage relationships. In a society that lacked modern social safety nets, friendships and patronage could function as a sort of insurance policy in times of financial or legal hardship. Patronage also provided both parties with a means of reciprocating wealth and prestige. A skilled craftsman like Udinck probably found a lucrative and consistent customer base among the officers and soldiers in and around Groningen. In the seventeenth century, neither the full-time soldiers in the States' Army, nor the citizen-soldiers in the civic guard, wore uniforms.³⁵¹ Instead, they wore their own clothes, restricted by few, if any, regulations.³⁵² Udinck provided many of the military men in Groningen with high-quality clothing, dyed, measured and cut to the latest fashions, serving as powerful symbols of status and prestige. Sashes and feathers were used to identify officers, and colored clothes - especially reds, greens, dark blues, yellows, and true blacks - distinguished the wealthier urban burgher from the poor peasants in the countryside, most of whom continued to wear dull grays, browns, beiges, off-whites, or earth-tone colored clothing, and as a result, were referred to as "*het grauw*" (the drab).³⁵³

In addition to the colonels Clant and Isselmuiden, Udinck also mingled freely with a number of other high-ranking officers. On 12 December 1662, for example, he spent the afternoon socializing with the *Ritmeester* (cavalry officer) Hendrick van Echten of the Dutch States' Army, at the home of the *jonker* Sickinga.³⁵⁴ The Sickinga name was well known and

³⁵¹ Rosen. *Soldiers at Leisure*, 38.

³⁵² Ibid.

³⁵³ Ibid; see also Mak, *The Many Lives of Jan Six*, 22-23.

³⁵⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 December 1664, here Udinck writes about the events of 12 December 1662, *jonker* Sickinga's home was located to the north of Saint Martin's *kerkhoff* (church yard).

carried a great deal of prestige in Groningen, as many Sickinga family members served in political positions throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³⁵⁵ During their visit, Van Echten asked Udinck, somewhat rhetorically, “Why is it that you Groningers are so angry, that we [the army] are forced to come here in the winter, when my riders and other soldiers should be at home with their wives, who are instead forced to go begging?”³⁵⁶ Traditionally, the fighting season was concentrated around the summer months and military commanders tried to avoid engaging in routine military exercises during the winter, when, not only was the weather unfavorable, but also food, horses, wagoners, and other provisions were in short supply. Army activity was also hampered by a sharp reallocation of funds away from the land army and toward the navy, a trend that began following the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 and continued throughout the second half of the seventeenth century.³⁵⁷ A more detailed discussion of this reallocation of funds to the navy is discussed in later chapters.

Van Echten himself was from Coevorden, a sparsely populated town in Drenthe that was primarily known for its garrison, which was used to supply troops for the Dutch land army. Coevorden was often described as a town living on the margins of existence, whose impoverished citizenry was made up of poor farmers, mercenaries, widows of soldiers and other “*zelfstandige vrouwen*” (independent women).³⁵⁸ The contemporary playwright, G.A. Bredero

³⁵⁵ Formsma, *Historie van Groningen*, 90, 247.

³⁵⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 December 1664, here Udinck writes about the events of 12 December 1662.

³⁵⁷ Regarding reductions in military spending for the land army, see ‘t Hart, *The Dutch Wars of Independence*, 96; regarding the economic impact of these military cuts, see, Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 614. Israel writes that in Breda, “one of the towns hardest hit, the value of the tax-farm for the beer excise slumped from 21,000 guilders in 1641 to only 9,800 in 1655 . . . In all the garrison towns, almost every activity - tailoring, saddle-, boot-, and belt-making, innkeeping, prostitution, and not least construction and repairs on the fortifications - was drastically curtailed. An uncle of Vermeer, a military supplier and engineer, who worked at various strongholds in the 1630s and 1640s, was bankrupt within two years of the peace of Münster.”

³⁵⁸ Kariin Sundsbak, *Zelfstandige vrouwen in Meppel en Coevorden, 1600-1800*, from *Drentse Historische Reeks 15* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2010), 77; see also Van Gelder, *Zeepost*, 32, “Dutch wives were already in the early seventeenth century largely independent, which is explained by their marriages to men who operated on their own.”

(1585-1618), may have boasted that it was a “blessing of wealth” to be able to “distribute bread to the poor, to help widows and orphans, to build hospitals, to support old people and foreigners,” but the reality in a place like Coevorden was less utopian.³⁵⁹ The government in Coevorden simply could not afford to feed and clothe everyone, and to justify their limitations of their charitable works, it was often argued that not everyone had a right to poor relief.³⁶⁰ Discharged soldiers and deserters, most of whom were poor, foreign, and homeless, were simply lumped into a segment of the population referred to as the “undeserving poor,” a designation that was further shaped through published pamphlets, playwrights, and especially the church.³⁶¹ “In the eyes of the reformed church, begging was a public sin . . . [and] churches could not offer communion to willful sinners.”³⁶²

In December 1662, however, Udinck was not concerned with the plight of Van Echten’s soldiers; his focus was set firmly on his legal defense. He told Van Echten that “the citizens in Groningen still did not know how to live together,” but “thanks to God, there has been some peace since 18 September when the guilds declared their loyalty to the Lords, who in return, on 19 September, declared an amnesty that would last forever, thus reassuring everyone from the guilds that they were free of guilt and shall not be assaulted.”³⁶³ Udinck then tempered his optimism, stating that, “Some of your [soldiers] who have come here say this, others say that, but the cruelest thing that I’ve heard from them is that the people [the guild members] here will not know amnesty forever.”³⁶⁴ Again, Udinck’s focus was zeroed in on his future defense. Van

³⁵⁹ Van Deursen, *Plain Lives.*, 44, “. . . in the seventeenth century the concept of a society without the poor was simply unthinkable. Such a society could only exist as a Utopia, not to be realized by human beings on this earth.”

³⁶⁰ Ibid., 55.

³⁶¹ Ibid., The church in particular distinguished between those who were “deserving” and those who were ‘undeserving,’ or as they deemed them, able-bodied “willful sinners.”

³⁶² Ibid.

³⁶³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 December 1664, here Udinck writes about the events of 12 December 1662.

³⁶⁴ Ibid.

Echten, however, seemed alarmed by Udinck's tone and the direction in which the discussion was heading. He warned the alderman, "Spout, spout, you should not say that," and promptly left.³⁶⁵

The implications of Udinck's and Van Echten's hostile, or anxious, exchange suggest that the amnesty, upon which Udinck had so heavily relied, was indeed interpreted differently by different people, and even completely disregarded by some. It seems that there was no hard value placed on it, and in the event that the city council reneged on their promise, there was a real risk to those in Udinck's circle who intended to use the amnesty as their way out of trouble. It was probably conversations like this one that prompted Udinck to begin keeping a diary in the first place. He was certainly concerned for his well-being and it seems that he, at least in part, sought to record his activities in order to protect himself from any future legal actions against him.

After his exchange with Van Echten, Udinck stopped briefly at Hendrick Wijntapper's house (this may have been a tavern or wine cellar), which was located just around the corner from the *Boteringestraat*. There, two other men, a merchant named Jan Blencke and one Johannes Cloet offered Udinck yet another warning. They claimed that Lord Johannes "Gruus" Isebrands (a deputy to the States-General and a one-time ambassador to Sweden) had dispatched a series of unnerving letters to various officials.³⁶⁶ In these correspondences, Isebrands recommended that the six guild members who had been appointed to the *Gezworen Gemeente* be arrested for their involvement in the recent riots, as well as the insidious and coercive manner in which they had gained entry into the municipal government.³⁶⁷ An alarming bit of news to be sure, but Udinck wrote that he continued to "place his innocence in God's hands, and with the

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

³⁶⁶ Ibid.

³⁶⁷ Ibid.

amnesty.”³⁶⁸ Again, he apparently tried to show his innocence by recording his actions in his diary. Afterwards, he went home and ate dinner with his wife, but said nothing to her regarding these revelations. He probably hoped that she would be spared from any forthcoming legal ordeals, and therefore made sure to record that she was wholly ignorant of what was going on.

After dinner, he left again and walked to Jan Deters’ house, where he drank with Herman Udinck (an unspecified relative), as well as the guild alderman Jan Crans, and two “*hovelings*” named Jacob Cornelis and Hendrick “*Muscovyter*” van Muscovien.³⁶⁹ Udinck referred to these last two men as “*hovelings*,” but this term can be misleading. From the archival record, it is clear that Cornelis was employed by the city of Groningen, meaning that he probably was a servant of the legal court (*Hof* or *Gerechtshof*) in Groningen.³⁷⁰ The term “*hoveling*,” however, could also have been used to describe a courtier of the stadholder, Willem Frederik. The precise category of “*hoveling*” into which Van Muscovien fell remains unclear. Furthermore, Udinck did not leave a detailed description of their conversation that evening, but it undoubtedly centered around the growing military presence, and his precarious legal situation.

A BRUSH WITH DEATH

Four days later, with rumors now circulating widely of imminent legal action against the guilds’ leadership, various representatives from the guilds provided a formal declaration in the defense of Gerard Udinck. They explained that Udinck never intended to fill a political position, but “was chosen against his will to serve as a member of the *Gezworen Gemeente*.”³⁷¹ It was a

³⁶⁸ Ibid.

³⁶⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 December 1664, here Udinck writes about the events of 12 December 1662.

³⁷⁰ Ibid.

³⁷¹ Ibid., “Verklaring van enige gecommiteerden uit de 18 gilden, dat de olderman Gerrit Udinck tegen zijn wil is gekozen lid van de gezworen meente.”

clear attempt to distance Udinck from the stereotypical *politycke kuyper* discussed in chapters one and two. Nevertheless, their declaration did little to persuade the council. The following day, on 17 December 1662, Udinck met with Gerrit Warendorp, Jan van Emmen, and a clockmaker named Mr. Daniel, all of whom drank Spanish wine throughout the evening.³⁷² This was the last time that Udinck and Warendorp spoke to one another.³⁷³ As the evening came to an end, and the four men went their separate ways, Udinck was confronted by four soldiers from the company of Captain Hubert Struuck.³⁷⁴ The extent to which Udinck considered these soldiers as neighbors, or perhaps even friends, is difficult to determine, but he certainly knew all of them quite well, as he listed their full names and some familial information in his diary.³⁷⁵ The soldiers arrested Udinck on the spot and took him to the *Apoort*, a prison tower/gate located at the southwestern corner of the city's *diepenring*.³⁷⁶ Gerrit Warendorp and Dr. Lucas Harckens were also arrested that evening, and Johan van Emmen and Geert Claassen were arrested soon after.

For the next four weeks, Udinck sat in a holding cell in the *Apoort*, where he remained under the constant observation of guards from Captain Struuck's company.³⁷⁷ Like many of the other soldiers in the city, Udinck knew these guards and later meticulously recorded their names and familial information in his diary.³⁷⁸ Why Udinck recorded this information is not entirely clear. He may have done so for legal purposes, or perhaps it was part of a more sinister revenge fantasy, but it emphasizes an important characteristic of seventeenth-century life, that there was neither anonymity, nor decontextualization of one's self from one's community. To live, work, and thrive in the community required one to be a bit of an open book. Complete detachment of

³⁷² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14 December 1664, here Udinck writes about the events of 17 December 1662.

³⁷³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14 December 1664, here Udinck writes about the events of 17 December 1662.

³⁷⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 17 December 1662.

³⁷⁵ Ibid., Hendrick Beyser, Jan Michels, Camer Jan, and Bartholt Pauls, the son of Paull Jeuck.

³⁷⁶ Ibid.

³⁷⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 December 1662.

³⁷⁸ Ibid.

oneself from one's community was an impossibility. As later chapters will show, this phenomenon, or sense of attachment, persisted in Udinck's mind even while he was living in exile. In this regard, Udinck's diary, in addition to being a possible legal tool, was also a response to this lack of privacy that shaped seventeenth-century European society.

After his arrest, Udinck's personal belongings were guarded closely, and his diary entries from late December were surely made from memory weeks later. In the meantime, Udinck was interrogated at least twice, once on 23 December 1662 and again on 9 January 1663, and on both occasions Udinck later recorded the names of those who interrogated him.³⁷⁹ Most significant among them was the presiding mayor Gerhard ten Berge and the councilman Johan van Julsingha, but six other members of the city council were named as well.³⁸⁰ He would later recall that on the evening of his first interrogation, the weather had turned misty. Although it would be unfair to characterize Udinck as overly superstitious, he often interpreted misty, foggy, or rainy weather as foreshadowing the arrival of misfortune. In some cases, however, it seems as though he believed that this could be reversed through some sort of miraculous intervention (this is discussed in more detail in chapter four). In the coming days and weeks, it seems that Udinck would experience a bit of both.³⁸¹ During the subsequent trials in January 1663, Udinck, as well as his colleagues, Gerrit Hermans Warendorp and Dr. Lucas Harckens, were each found guilty of instigating the riots of the previous year, and each was sentenced to die by the sword. In the meantime, Udinck continued to be held in a prison cell at the *Apoort*.

³⁷⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 December 1662 and 9 January 1663.

³⁸⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 December 1662, these included Gerhard ten Berge, Gerhard Hornken, Johannes van Julsinga, Johannes Dreuws, Menso Altinck, Heer Berckhuus, and Schato Gockinge; GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 9 January 1663, this time, Dreuws and Gockinge were absent, and the secretary Andreas Ludolphi was present.

³⁸¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 21 December 1664.

On 15 January 1663, a city council member named Rempt de Mepsche and the secretary Schato Gockinge paid the condemned alderman a visit. These two men were no friends of Udinck's, and they had not come to offer words of support or comfort. On the contrary, their intentions were rather cruel. It seems that they, with the endorsement of the city council, intended to torment Udinck one last time. In his diary, Udinck recorded that De Mepsche and Gockinge delivered a message from the city council: "Prepare to die tomorrow morning."³⁸² It was not entirely unusual for the secular authorities to send instructions to the condemned prior to an execution, but it was typically done in order to encourage the criminal to seek repentance, forgiveness, and God's mercy for the sake of salvation. It was, after all, the secular authorities' responsibility to punish the body, not the soul.³⁸³ Udinck was not so naive to believe that the council, or these two messengers in particular, wished him well, but this message said nothing of Udinck's soul, God's mercy, repentance, or forgiveness. Even Udinck was surprised by the unusually brusque manner in which the message was delivered. He made one last vocal plea to the messengers: "Could there be no mercy?"³⁸⁴ De Mepsche and Gockinge did not respond verbally. They simply shrugged their shoulders and left the room without saying a word.³⁸⁵

It is not difficult to image a crestfallen Udinck slumped back in his cell. There, an unnamed man, perhaps another prisoner, suggested to Udinck that he should try to go home with his wife one last time.³⁸⁶ If this was meant as a joke, Udinck may have returned the jest, replying

³⁸² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened during the final moments of the trials and sentencing on 15 January 1663.

³⁸³ Mitchell Merback, *The Thief, the Cross and the Wheel: Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001), 148.

³⁸⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened during the final moments of the trials and sentencing on 15 January 1663.

³⁸⁵ Ibid.

³⁸⁶ Ibid.

that, “I am sure that if I go home with my wife, we shall have no sleep tonight.”³⁸⁷ A short time later, two *predikants* (preachers from the Dutch Reformed Church), Otto Zaunsleiffer (c. 1594-1678) and another, named Columbyer, arrived at Udinck’s cell.³⁸⁸ They informed Udinck that they were sent by the council to provide spiritual guidance, and that they would remain with him throughout the evening. Udinck attempted to reassure them, and probably even more so himself, that his faith was unshakable. He declared forcefully that, “Almighty God has given me so much strength through his Holy Ghost, that I am well rested in my mood and inwardly happy.”³⁸⁹ Zaunsleiffer and Columbyer stayed anyway. Udinck received more visitors that night, including the counselor Hendrick Jansen and his daughter, Greetien Jansen, as well as Udinck’s wife, Janneke, and his niece, Maria, all of whom spoke together until 2 o’clock in the morning.³⁹⁰

From the timing, location, and circumstances surrounding these meetings, it is obvious that Udinck did not record these events in his diary in real time. These were certainly done from memory, perhaps days or weeks later, which is evident from the somewhat haphazard form and content of these early entries. He also made a point to rewrite many of these stories from the winter of 1662/1663 on the one- and two-year anniversaries of these events. The retellings of these moments are not always exact duplicates, however. Many of them vary in the amount of detail, suggesting that they too may have been written down more so from memory than simply copying.

Sifting through these written memories, it is clear that Udinck did not sleep that night. About an hour after his wife had left, now 3 o’clock in the morning of 16 January 1663, a small

³⁸⁷ Ibid.

³⁸⁸ P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok, eds., *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek Deel 3* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1914), 1508-1510.

³⁸⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened during the final moments of the trials and sentencing on 15 January 1663.

³⁹⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened during the final moments of the trials and sentencing on 15 January 1663.

contingent of soldiers brought Udinck from his cell in the *Apoort* to the *Raadhuis*. There, another *predikant*, Gregorius Meeus (Mees) (1631-1694), joined Udinck and attempted to provide some degree of spiritual comfort.³⁹¹ At the *Raadhuis*, Udinck was brought before the *schulden* and a group of knights and foot soldiers, who, over the next eight hours, pushed Udinck's mental and physical endurance to the brink. It is unclear if this was in anticipation of his execution or simply wanton cruelty on behalf of the city council. Sleep deprived, exhausted and freezing, Udinck was forced to remain standing throughout the morning. He later recalled in his diary the physical and psychological hardships of that day:

“I could not escape. I was so paralyzed by the cold and other miseries, and I wanted so bad to rest my feet. At about a quarter past eleven o'clock that morning, I heard Lord Zaunsleiffer say that Gerrit Hermans [Warendorp] had paid for his guilt. Around half past eleven o'clock, I heard my sentence being read aloud, but I could not understand a word because I was already half dead, half buried in the grave.”³⁹²

The sentence that was read was not as Udinck had expected. At the eleventh hour, quite literally, both he and Harckens received unexpected pardons, which were initiated by Princess Albertine Agnes of Nassau (1634-1696), the wife of the stadholder, Willem Frederik.³⁹³ Although archival records regarding these pardons are scarce, Udinck's connections with military officers, through friendship and patronage, may have saved his life. Albertine Agnes's role in these legal proceedings, and in Dutch politics more generally, is also intriguing. Unfortunately, however, her significance in local politics has long been overlooked by historians. In the historiography, she has been largely relegated to a mere ward, or surrogate, for her son,

³⁹¹ P.C. Molhuysen and P.J. Blok, eds., *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek Deel 10* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1937), 600-601.

³⁹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 13 January 1665, here Udinck reflects back on the final moments of his trial and sentencing two years earlier, on 16 January 1663.

³⁹³ J. Visser, “Het huwelijk van Willem Frederik en wat er aan voorafging,” *De Vrije Fries*, 47 (1966), 5-39: 39.

Hendrik Casimir II (1664-1696), from the year of his birth, 1664 (the same year that his father and her husband, Willem Frederik, shot and killed himself by accident), until his majority in 1675.³⁹⁴ This lack of mention follows a trajectory set by seventeenth-century male nobility and other contemporary writers who described women, even those of noble birth, as being docile or fixed objects of political negotiation.³⁹⁵ Rudolf Dekker has pointed out that from the onset of the Dutch Republic, the wives of the stadholders in particular “remained background figures.”³⁹⁶ Noble women who ventured beyond these preconceived boundaries, such as those who displayed their martial prowess or diplomatic skills, also risked being lambasted. Tryntje Helfferich has shown, for example, that despite being capable of waging war and negotiating alliances during the Thirty Years’ War, the widowed ruler of Hesse-Kassel, Amalia Elisabeth (1602-1651), was still described by the male nobility as a “hermaphroditic genius,” or criticized for her perceived “female imbecility.”³⁹⁷ John Calvin himself argued that women in government was a “monstrous thing,” but he also conceded that in some extraordinary circumstances, women could be “supernaturally called” to rule “by the Spirit of God.”³⁹⁸

Albertine Agnes’ prestige, especially among the Groningen city council members, is a bit of a mystery. Certainly, it did not derive from Calvin’s misogynistic interpretation of scripture, nor was it maintained by her own personal military prowess. Rather, it seems that she was held in high regard, at least in part, because of her unique noble lineage, which was deeply intertwined with the Dutch military struggle against Spain in the Eighty Years’ War (1566-1648). In addition to being the wife of Willem Frederik, she was also the daughter of the

³⁹⁴ Ibid.

³⁹⁵ Ibid.

³⁹⁶ Rudolf Dekker, “Getting to the Source: Women in the Medieval and Early Modern Netherlands,” *Journal of Women’s History* vol. 10, no. 2 (Summer, 1998), 165-188: 166.

³⁹⁷ Tryntje Helfferich. *The Iron Princess: Amalia Elisabeth and the Thirty Years War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), 10.

³⁹⁸ Ibid., 11.

stadholder Frederik Hendrik, Prince of Orange (1584-1647), the granddaughter of Willem I, “the Silent,” Prince of Orange (1533-1584), and the sister of Willem II, Prince of Orange (1626-1650). In short, these were some of the most prominent military commanders and patriotic icons in the Dutch collective memory, and this certainly must have given her a degree of clout that was unusual even among noble women.

Albertine Agnes’s pedigree also played an important role in the maintenance of her family’s reputation and dynasty. Her marriage to Willem Frederik, for example, generally seen as a marriage into an “inferior” or “dependent” family, was tempered by her close management of her immediate family and indeed of her own house.³⁹⁹ Her relationship with her mother, the German princess Amalia von Solms (1602-1675), who has been described in the historiography as “aggressive and over-reaching,” also implied that Albertine Agnes too had a significant say in various political affairs outside of the military.⁴⁰⁰ So it was at Albertine Agnes’s request that Udinck’s and Harckens’s sentences were reduced.⁴⁰¹ In lieu of death, each were sentenced to a lifelong banishment, not only from Groningen, but from the entire Republic.⁴⁰² While these were the sentences issued by Groningen, not all provinces complied with such extradition decrees, something that is discussed in more detail in later chapters. Udinck recorded in his journal the moment that he heard the news: “At half past eleven, my sentence was read. I wanted to rest my back, but the Lord President [Gerhard ten Berge] said that I should remain standing . . . I was

³⁹⁹ Broomhall and Van Gent, *Gender, Power and Identity*, 160.

⁴⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 149.

⁴⁰¹ Visser, “Het huwelijk van Willem Frederik,” 39.

⁴⁰² GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 144, “Sententiën van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen tegen Gerrijt Harms Warendorp, Dr. Lucas Harckens en Gerhard Udinck,” 16 January 1663.

happy to hear the pardon read. In that area I fell to my knees on the floor of the council thanking God.”⁴⁰³

Around 6 o’clock that evening, Udinck was taken back to his holding cell in the *Apoort*. The *hoveling* Jan Tasche and the city counselor Hendrick Jansen came with him and had dinner together. During mealtime, a man from the Oldambt in Groningen, although it is not exactly clear who, described Gerrit Warendorp’s execution to Udinck: “He [Warendorp] had lied on his chest and tilted his head up when the sword struck.”⁴⁰⁴ This was a technique sometimes used by executioners that required the condemned to lie on a wooden block, anvil, or other device, presumably for a cleaner, faster and more efficient beheading. In his diary, Udinck recorded that someone - again, perhaps the executioner’s assistant - told him that he was surprised by the weight of Warendorp’s decapitated head, which this unnamed character said “felt so heavy, like a bucket full of water.”⁴⁰⁵ Udink was disgusted. He noted in his diary that he had not eaten since around noon the day before (about 30 hours prior), and despite being hungry all day, “sitting there at the table, [he] had no desire to eat.”⁴⁰⁶

Warendorp’s corpse was carried away and buried that evening in the *Akerkhof*, a large church and its surrounding courtyard/cemetery, which was located in the southwestern corner of the city.⁴⁰⁷ The speed with which Warendorp’s corpse was buried is somewhat striking. On the spectrum of executions, beheadings were reserved for only the most honorable of the condemned, whereas lower criminals might be sentenced to hanging. And, although criminal (let

⁴⁰³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 11, 16 January 1663 “ . . . omtrent 1/4 na Elf uhr worde mÿ . . . datt Gerritt Hermans, gefall hadde t geen bÿ schuldig wass. Ten halff twalven, worden mÿn sentenie voor geheesen, wilde ich mÿ ruggenaerd Retirenen, worde mÿ van d Hr. President geseidt datt ick soude staen blynr, ende hoor hett pardon. Leesen, Gelyck Gesebiede Ick vij mÿn knÿen den fluer van den Radt God danckende.”

⁴⁰⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 13 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened during the final moments of the trials and sentencing on 16 January 1663.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁷ Feith, *Historisch Genootschap te Groningen*, 344.

alone political) executions were relatively rare in the United Provinces compared to other European countries, the Dutch did not shy away from displaying the rotting corpses of criminals along the borders of their cities as a deterrent to other potential criminals.⁴⁰⁸ Warendorp, however, was neither hanged, nor is there any indication that his corpse was put on display, perhaps suggesting that the city council desired to put this entire episode to rest as quickly as possible. It seems that they did not want him to become a martyr for the guilds' cause.

In the days that followed, Udinck was forced to remain in his prison cell. The cell door was not locked, however, and he was no longer under the supervision of guards, nor was he restrained by irons or chains.⁴⁰⁹ There, he was visited by a number of prominent city officials, military commanders, associates, and close friends, including the Lord Stensma, Colonel Clant, Captain Cock, Ritmeester Unia, the secretary Moller, the widow Kerckhoffs, and Folckert Hellbardÿer, many of whom showered Udinck with gifts of wine, beer, and tobacco.⁴¹⁰ Biographical information on many of these characters remains elusive, but suffice it to say, Udinck was generally well liked among many of the well-to-do in the community, as evident from these visitors as well as from the correspondence and friendships that he maintained while in exile.

⁴⁰⁸ Pieter Spierenburg, *The Spectacle of Suffering: Executions and the Evolution of Repression from a Preindustrial Metropolis to the European Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 57-58.

⁴⁰⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 13 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened during the final moments of the trials and sentencing on 16 January 1663.

⁴¹⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 16 January 1664 and 15 January 1665, here Udinck recounts what happened following his pardon and the days leading up to his banishment, 17 January 1663.

WHEN THE CLOCK STRUCK SEVEN, WE LEFT GRONINGEN

On 19 January 1663 Udinck was finally given a copy of the official ordinance instructing him to leave Groningen within ten days.⁴¹¹ Over the next week, he remained in a sort of unsupervised custody within his cell, where he busied himself with the logistics of relocating himself and his family. On 20 January 1663, Udinck entrusted much of his property, including cash, valuables, and letters to Dr. Simon Wijchgel (1618-1676), who agreed to help Udinck administer his business affairs in Groningen.⁴¹² Wijchgel himself had served as a member of the syndicate of the Ommelanden party until he was ousted in 1661, likely due to his relationship with Rengers.⁴¹³ As the son of the mayor of Altona (a village near Hamburg), Wijchgel had some clout, but as an ally of Rengers, he was also at odds with the city authorities.⁴¹⁴ With Wijchgel's help, Udinck dispatched numerous letters to arrange the transportation of property, the settlement of debts, and the payment of "*die Costen en mijsen van jusitie*" (the costs and manner of justice; i.e., the court costs), which totaled some 398 guilders and 12 stuivers.⁴¹⁵

On 28 January 1663, at 6:30 in the morning, a driver brought Udinck's wagon to the gates of the city. When the clock struck 7:00 a.m., Gerard Udinck, his wife, Janneke, and his niece, Maria, left Groningen.⁴¹⁶ Alive, but stripped of their honor and livelihood, one can only imagine the mix of emotions that must have swirled in their minds as they departed the only

⁴¹¹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 145, "Bevel van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen aan Dr. Gehard Udinck, om binnen tien dagen zich uit de stad te begeven," 19 January 1663; GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14, 19 January 1663, "... om binnen den tyd van tyn daegen t vertrecken."

⁴¹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20, 26, 29 January 1663.

⁴¹³ K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954-1955) 2 Delen, 923.

⁴¹⁴ Ibid.

⁴¹⁵ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 145, "Bevel van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen aan Dr. Gerhard Udinck tot betaling van de rechtskosten," 23 January 1663; GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 January 1663, "Den 23. January, synde vreydag doer d. diener Hindrick Jansen, ontfangen, die Costen En mÿsen van Jusitie, monterende ter somma droÿhûndert en acht en t neegentich caroli gl. en 12 st. 398-12-0."

⁴¹⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14, 28 January 1663, "... woensdag morgens ten halfsoeven uhren, die waagen uydt die Helm under die Gevangen poorte laten koom undt die kloekslag sôöven, uydt Groninge Gevaaren, tradt van die Genangen porten trap in die waagen, undt mÿn voeten nydt updaarde Gesett. Komende voer in die Heer straet hebbe."

home that they had known for the last twenty-five years. After passing through the city gates, they travelled south, stopping first in Schoonloo and then Coevorden, both in Drenthe, where they visited Janneke's cousins, followed by Veldhausen and Schüttorf in Niedersachsen, Wettringen in Münsterland, and finally Steinfurt, a small town northwest of Münster, where they arrived on 1 February 1663.⁴¹⁷

Meanwhile in Groningen, the remaining two convicted guild leaders, Johan van Emmen, a *bouwmeester* of the eighteen guilds and an alderman of the bakers' guild, as well as Geert Claassen, the alderman of the merchants' guild, were sentenced on 24 January 1663. Van Emmen had confessed to conspiring with Gerrit Warendorp in order to instigate the guild members into interfering with the government affairs.⁴¹⁸ In the official sentence, the secretary Dr. Ludolphi pointed out that this interference was a violation of the resolution set forth by the “*Hog. Mog.*” (High and Mighty, i.e., States General) on 13 January 1601, and as a result, Van Emmen was banished from the province of Groningen.⁴¹⁹ Finally, Geert Claassen was sentenced. Ludolphi described him as being “one of the foremost authors of seditious attacks against the city government,” and that he was “complicit in the commotion and consequences” that followed.⁴²⁰ Like Van Emmen, Claassen was also accused of conspiring with Warendorp and was banished from Groningen for fourteen years.⁴²¹

With these sentences, almost all of the leading actors from the recent uprisings were either dead, banished, or had gone into hiding. Rengers, the head of the Ommelanders, remained in the province of Groningen, but at a safe distance from the city government, which continued

⁴¹⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 February 1663.

⁴¹⁸ KB, Knuttel 8748A, 24 January 1663, *Sententien by borgemesteren en raadt in Groningen, gepronuncieert tegens Johan van Emmen boumester der Achtijn Gilden, mitsgaders Geert Claessen olderman der Cramer Gilde, Volume I* (Groningen: Frans Bronchorst, 1663), 2.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid.

⁴²⁰ Ibid., 5.

⁴²¹ Ibid.; see also ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

to chip away at the guilds' remaining political influence. On 8 March 1663, the mayors and the city council abolished the role of the guild *bouwmeester* and, following the ringing of the bells in the *Grote Markt*, a new set of guild regulations was read aloud outside of the *Hoofdwacht*.⁴²² That same year, the mayors and city council also prohibited the reading and circulation of a pamphlet titled *Prodomus Schulenburgicae defensionis . . .* (1663), which was published in defense of Schulenborgh and offered harsh criticism of the city government.⁴²³ In their official prohibition of this text, city leaders described the pamphlet's content as "*calumnies, injurious en seditious*," (calumnious, injurious and seditious), and ordered that it be burned publicly by the city's executioner.⁴²⁴ Through these heavy-handed and symbolic acts, the city government dismantled the guilds' authority in Groningen and eliminated one of its most significant political rivals.

⁴²² GrA, Register J.A. Feith, Inventory of the Judicial Archives, "Introduction."; see also Hendrik Octavius Feith (Jr.), *Regeringsboek der provincie Groningen* (Groningen: Oomken, 1850), 21-22.

⁴²³ GrA, "Catalogue of pamphlets," nr. 185-203, De Bruijn bij nr. 671 (29 August 1663); see also P.J. Blok and P.C. Molhuysen *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek, Deel 5* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1921), 707; N. Tonckens "Het proces-Schulenborgh (1662) in het licht van de stadhouderlijke politiek in Stad en Lande," in *Groningse Volksalmanak* (Groningen, 1963), 65-98.

⁴²⁴ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 1200, "Plakkaat van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen waarbij het boekje getiteld "Prodromus Schulenburgicae defensionis" wordt verklaard te zijn een "calumnies, injurious en seditious" geschrift, hetwelk door de scherprechter in het openbaar zal worden verbrand," 29 August 1663.

CHAPTER FOUR:

DAILY LIFE IN STEINFURT:

GOSSIP, HONOR, AND THE LOSS OF SOCIAL CAPITAL, FEBRUARY 1663 – MAY 1664

After leaving Groningen, Udinck and his family travelled southeast for four days through the regions of Drenthe and Niedersachsen, both of which were sparsely populated, rustic in character, and largely dependent on agriculture. Jan Bieleman's study of seventeenth-century Drenthe described the area as an "empty steppe of heath and blanket bogs over which small villages and hamlets . . . were scattered like islands in an ocean."⁴²⁵ The peasants here, most of whom grew rye and herded cattle, even if the latter practice was in significant decline in the second half of the century, were constantly threatened by crop failures caused by inclement weather and infertile, overly sandy soil as well as distant markets.⁴²⁶ The level of rural poverty in Drenthe, and in the neighboring Dutch province of Overijssel, was noticeably more extreme than in Groningen, where many farmers benefited from a more nutrient-rich clay-soil.⁴²⁷ This meant that the farmers in Groningen's Ommelanden experienced more profitable harvests, creating more of a socio-economic continuum with their urban counterparts, than was the case in either Drenthe or Overijssel.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁵ Jan Bieleman. *Boeren op het Drentse zand 1600-1910: Een nieuwe visie op de 'oude' landbouw* (Utrecht: HES Uitgevers BV, 1987), 679.

⁴²⁶ Ibid., 680; see also De Vries and Van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy*, 220 - "The annual number of cattle driven from Drenthe to markets outside the province stood at 4,000 to 5,000 in the first half of the seventeenth century but fell by more than a third in the second half of the century."

⁴²⁷ Marjolein 't Hart, "Town and Country in the Dutch Republic, 1550-1800," in S.R. Epstein, ed., *Town and Country in Europe, 1300-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 86-87.

⁴²⁸ Ibid.

The history of Drenthe, especially in relation to that of the Republic, is largely one of poverty, neglect and exclusion. Provincial status was not granted to Drenthe until 1796, and political leaders in The Hague sometimes justified this iniquity by suggesting that Drenthe's impoverished population could not meet its financial obligations to the Union.⁴²⁹ As a result, contemporary works about Drenthe, the best known of which is Johan Picardt (1600-1670)'s *Annales Drenthiae* (1659), typically describe the population in terms of bitterness, suffering and victimhood.⁴³⁰ This sentiment extended to Drenthe's periphery as well, where little or no distinction was made between the agrarian villages in Drenthe, Overijssel, Lower Saxony, or even Westphalia. In Dutch popular culture, most of which was created in Holland, the *moffenkluchten* (Dutch farces about Germans) typically included the stereotypical German bumpkin. And although this stock caricature was often described as a "penniless immigrant from Westphalia," he could just as easily have come from Lower Saxony, Drenthe, or Overijssel.⁴³¹ For the middle-class Hollander the entire region of the eastern Netherlands and northwestern Germany was a backwater, neither wholly Dutch nor wholly German, and as a result, the inhabitants were often the subject of ridicule.⁴³²

After leaving Drenthe, Udink and his family crossed the border into the German (i.e., imperial) county of Bentheim in Niedersachsen. Contemporary travelers such as the Haarlem painter Jacob van Ruisdael (1629-1682) and the Grand Duke of Tuscany Cosimo de' Medici (1642-1723) depicted this borderland region as having poor roads, uncomfortable inns, and

⁴²⁹ Esser, *The Politics of Memory*, 262-266.

⁴³⁰ Johan Picardt, *Korte Beschrijvinghe van Eenige Vergeten en verborgene antiquiteiten . . . waerbij gevoeght zijn annales Drenthiae* (Amsterdam: G. van Goedesbergh, 1660).

⁴³¹ Leo Lucassen, "Poepen, Knoeten, Mieren en Mofen: Beeldvorming over Duitse immigranten en trekarbeiders in zeventiende- en achttiende- eeuwse kluchten," in Jan Erik Dubbelman and Jaap Tanja, eds., *Vreemd Gespuis* (Amsterdam: Ambo/Novib, 1987), 29-37: 33-35.

⁴³² Ibid., 35; see also Bieleman. *Boeren op het Drentse zand*, 679.

strange timber farmhouses that were surrounded by dunghills.⁴³³ Udinck and his family must have seen similar villages as they continued southeast through the towns of Laar, Veldhausen, Nordhorn, and Wettringen.⁴³⁴

Certainly one of the highlights of their trip would have involved seeing the Bentheim castle, which was the home of Count Ernst Wilhelm von Bentheim (1623-1693) and his wife Gertrud van Zelst (1633-1679). Standing about 90 meters above the town of Bad Bentheim, the castle is one of the most recognizable landmarks in this region.⁴³⁵ The castle itself sits atop of a sandstone formation known as *Teufelsfelsen* (Devil's Rock) or *Teufelsohrkissen* (Devil's Pillow), names that derived from a legend that the devil had once laid his head down there to rest, leaving behind an imprint of his ear in the sandstone.⁴³⁶ Nestled between the bishopric of Münster and the United Provinces, residents of the county of Bentheim had long maintained a sort of mixed, liminal identity, as trade, clothing, language, religion, and traditions of all sorts travelled back and forth across a permeable border.⁴³⁷ This area was not known for its exports, but Bentheim sandstone was a commodity that was especially valued in the Dutch Republic and was used in the construction of Amsterdam's town hall (today the Royal Palace) in 1655.⁴³⁸ Udinck himself was a native of this area and another example of this hybridity can be seen in Udinck's everyday writing language, which was an eclectic mix of both Dutch and Low German.⁴³⁹

As they passed the Bentheim castle, Udinck and Janneke likely discussed the controversies that had emerged from Count Ernst Wilhelm's marriage to Gertruid van Zelst, a

⁴³³ Quentin Buvelot, *Jacob van Ruisdael paints Bentheim* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2009), 24, the Haarlem painter, Jacob van Ruisdael (1629-1682), travelled through this area in the 1650s and 1660s, as did the grand duke of Tuscany, Cosimo de' Medici (1642-1723), in 1668. Both described similar descriptions of the farms and people.

⁴³⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 30-31 January 1663.

⁴³⁵ Buvelot, *Jacob van Ruisdael paints Bentheim*, 24.

⁴³⁶ Ibid.

⁴³⁷ Helmuth Weiß, *Graftschaft Bentheim: Ein Portrait* (Bremen: Edition Temmen, 2005), 5-6.

⁴³⁸ Buvelot, *Jacob van Ruisdael paints Bentheim*, 51.

⁴³⁹ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxxi.

Dutch woman who was not of noble birth, and was therefore considered to be below the count's station.⁴⁴⁰ This morganatic marriage, however, was only part of the drama affecting Bentheim's ruler. Since 1661, Ernst Wilhelm and his brother, the Count of Steinfurt Philipp Konrad (1627-1688), had been at odds with one another regarding the succession of the Bentheim territories. Many viewed the marriage with suspicion, suggesting that it was only carried out in order to thwart Philipp Konrad from his rightful inheritance as Ernst Wilhelm had not married previously, did not have children, and therefore did not have an heir to the throne.⁴⁴¹ In October 1663, Van Zelst requested the assistance from the prince-bishop Von Galen who agreed to intervene on Ernst Wilhelm's and her behalf, but on the condition that they and their children would convert to Catholicism.⁴⁴² The couple agreed, but five years later (long after Udinck had met his fate), neither Ernst Wilhelm nor Gertrud van Zelst had fulfilled their part of the agreement. After the death of Philipp Konrad in 1668, Von Galen took the matter into his own hands. He had the Count and Countess apprehended with the intention of forcing them to convert. Ernst Wilhelm capitulated to Von Galen's demands, but Van Zelst refused. She fled with her children to The Hague, where they lived under the protection of the States General for the remainder of her life.⁴⁴³ Although this affair continued to play out after Udinck's death, he certainly showed interest in this politically tense situation during his exile as he mentions it in his diary on several occasions.⁴⁴⁴

On 31 January 1663, Udinck and his family left Bentheim and on 1 February 1663, they arrived in Steinfurt, a German town located some 143 kilometers southeast of Groningen, which

⁴⁴⁰ Wessel Friedrich Visch, *Geschiedenis van het graafschap Bentheim* (Zwolle: J.L. Zeehuisen, 1820), 193.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴⁴² Ibid., 194.

⁴⁴³ In 1678, Ernst Wilhelm requested, and was granted, a divorce from Van Zelst. He remarried the following year.

⁴⁴⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 26 October 1663 and 23 March 1665.

fell under the jurisdiction of the bishopric of Münster. Steinfurt was not nearly as impoverished as the towns through which they had travelled, but it was also less impressive than Groningen in terms of size, stature and economic opportunities. On one hand, Steinfurt could boast of a Protestant *Hohe Schule*, and the city had a reputation as a refuge for Calvinists, Mennonites, and Jews.⁴⁴⁵ On the other hand, however, and as the Steinfurt city archives make clear, what the city lacked was “bourgeois prosperity.”⁴⁴⁶ For decades, the city had suffered from war and plague. In 1635, during the Thirty Years’ War, the city was looted by imperial troops, and the following year, a plague epidemic killed off almost the entire remaining population, leaving as few as fifty survivors in the entire town.⁴⁴⁷ Slowly, Steinfurt rebuilt and recovered. Then, in 1660 the prince-bishop of Münster, Christoph Bernhard von Galen, occupied the city, despite opposition from the *Reichskammergericht* (Imperial Chamber Court, one of the Holy Roman Empire’s highest courts).⁴⁴⁸ As was to be expected, Von Galen dismissed these complaints.⁴⁴⁹ He often showed an almost complete disregard for neighboring leaders and civic liberties more generally, a pattern of practice that earned him a reputation among other German princes as someone who could not be trusted.⁴⁵⁰

By the time of Udinck’s arrival in 1663, Steinfurt had a few guilds that were tied to the textile industry, including linen weavers and cloth makers.⁴⁵¹ This may have been what attracted Udinck to this region. At a minimum, he had two other advantages there as well: he was familiar

⁴⁴⁵ https://steinfurt.active-city.net/city_info/webaccessibility/index.cfm?item_id=855190&waid=178, last accessed 21 June 2018.

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁹ R. Po-chia Hsia and Bojia Xia, *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535-1618* (New Haven, CT: Yale University of Press, 1984), 69.

⁴⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁵¹ https://steinfurt.active-city.net/city_info/webaccessibility/index.cfm?item_id=855190&waid=178, last accessed 21 June 2018..

with the landscape and he had a number of contacts nearby. Udinck was born and raised in Horstmar, a town located about eight kilometers south of Steinfurt, which had been devastated during the Thirty Years' War, too.⁴⁵² This very well may have been the impetus for Udinck to leave Westphalia, and the economic growth in Groningen may have been what had drawn him to Groningen. Unfortunately, there are no surviving records regarding Udinck's life before he joined the tailors' guild in Groningen in 1635. In his diary, however, he explained that his parents were buried in Horstmar and that a number of surviving family and friends still lived in close proximity.⁴⁵³ Udinck's mother, Geertruit Borchorst, had at least three sons, and many of them retained their matronymic last name.⁴⁵⁴ It is not entirely clear why Udinck did not. His father's name is unknown and it is possible that many of these brothers were actually half-brothers, although this is strictly speculation. One of his brothers, Hindrick, and his wife Lyse, lived nearby in Legden, and during his exile, the siblings often ate, drank, and socialized together.⁴⁵⁵

For a skilled tailor like Udinck, life in Steinfurt was a considerable downgrade from the standard of living that he had known in Groningen.⁴⁵⁶ Even Münster, which was a relatively large city in Westphalia, paled in comparison to Groningen. Münster experienced stagnant growth throughout most of the seventeenth century (with a total population of approximately 10,000 in 1590 and 11,000 in 1685), and at the end of this period Münster was still oversaturated

⁴⁵² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 5 March 1663.

⁴⁵³ Ibid.

⁴⁵⁴ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxiv-lxv.

⁴⁵⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20 March 1663.

⁴⁵⁶ Bieleman, *Boeren op het Drentse zand*, 68, For example, the population of Drenthe grew from 21.9 thousand (1630) to 25.2 thousand (1672) to 28.7 thousand (1692), and continued to grow at roughly the same rate throughout the eighteenth century. The population of the entire province of Drenthe, therefore, was roughly the same as the city of Groningen.

with tailors, when more than sixty tailors were operating within the city.⁴⁵⁷ Making matters worse, the prince-bishop of Münster was suspicious of guild members because of their tendency to rebel. As was the case with the guild members in Groningen who opposed the city council in 1657 and 1662, the guilds in Münster were a primary source of resistance against the prince-bishop's attempts to takeover Steinfurt in 1660 and Münster in 1661.⁴⁵⁸ When Münster finally capitulated to Von Galen's army in 1661, he immediately confiscated the guilds' official books, roles, and records, and restricted the guild members from serving in any formal political positions.⁴⁵⁹ Von Galen also mandated that only Catholics could serve in the Münster city council.⁴⁶⁰ This had been the law since 1601, but it had been ignored by the magistracy for decades.⁴⁶¹ Thus, slow population growth, a mature tailoring industry, and a hostile sovereign probably added to an already unfavorable social, economic and political environment for Udinck and his family.

To ensure his livelihood while in exile, Udinck relied heavily on his familial and business networks throughout the Dutch Republic and northwestern Germany. In this regard, letter writing was obligatory not only for business, but also for survival. Evidence of this can be seen throughout his diary, especially in the 33 outgoing letters that he copied within his diary's pages.⁴⁶² Of these letters, 21 were addressed to his niece, Maria; 4 to his nephew in Amsterdam, Gerard Luycken; 4 to his nephew in Steinfurt, Geert Folckers; 2 to his legal representative in

⁴⁵⁷ Hsia, *Society and Religion in Münster*, 13; see also Helmut Lahrkamp, ed. *Münsters Bevölkerung um 1685, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Münster* (Münster: Band, 1972), 20.

⁴⁵⁸ Lahrkamp, *Münsters Bevölkerung um 1685*, 187-188.

⁴⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁰ R. Po-chia Hsia, "Civic Wills as Sources for the Study of Piety in Muenster, 1530-1618," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 14, 3 (1983): 321-348, 348.

⁴⁶¹ Ibid.

⁴⁶² Herman Niebaum, "hammen statt schincken. Zur adressatenorientierten variantenauswahl in der ausgehenden Korrespondenz eines Groninger Gildevorstehers aus der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts" in Jan Goossen, ed., *Franco-Saxonica: Münstersche Studien zur niederländischen und niederdeutschen Philologie* (Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1990), 74-75.

Groningen, Simon Wijchgel; 1 to a lawyer in Horstmar, Arnold Mollman; and 1 to Lieutenant Egbert Hidding in Drenthe.⁴⁶³ These letters discuss a number of concerns ranging from business affairs, the health and well-being of family and friends, the collection of investment income, as well as various political issues both near and far. Udinck's incoming letters are also telling about his worldview, lifestyle, and political enemies. For example, on 19 March 1663, he received a letter from Groningen informing him that "*vader Jason*" (Janneke's father; Udinck's father-in-law) had passed away and that he had been buried in the *Broerkerk* (Brothers' Church) in Groningen.⁴⁶⁴ This would be the first loss, of many, that Udinck and his wife would experience in exile. In the meantime, other letters followed.

PRECARIOUS CONTACTS

On 4 February 1663, just days after Udinck had been cast out of Groningen, Samuel Maresius (1599-1673), a French exile who had become a professor of theology at the University of Groningen, wrote a letter to Udinck. In the letter's opening lines, Maresius expressed his sympathies for Udinck's misfortunes, and recounted that: "The fears that I expressed to you when I endeavored to dissuade you from this vast design have passed into true prophecies."⁴⁶⁵ The statement would later prove quite damning. There were rumors circulating in Groningen of Maresius's suspected involvement in the guild riots of the previous year, and this letter seemed to validate them, or at the very least, show that Maresius had known of the guilds' plans to undermine the city government. In the letter, Maresius lamented further that he was not able to say goodbye - he was therefore doing so in writing - and he went on to express his willingness to

⁴⁶³ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 March 1663.

⁴⁶⁵ GrA, Toegang 2073, Inv. 72, nr. 52, fol. 3, 4/14 February 1663, Brief van Maresius aan Udinck.

help Udinck and his family while they were in exile.⁴⁶⁶ Maresius concluded the letter: “Just as you have opened your purse for me, I present to you my heart, and promise to take care of your father-in-law and all that may concern you . . . I will remain all my life, your very humble and very affectionate servant.”⁴⁶⁷ The letter is remarkable for a number of reasons, not least of which because it displays both a longstanding friendship, patronage relationship, but also because it implicates both men in the guilds’ previous uprisings.

The rhetoric that Maresius employs in these letters is also striking, and fits nicely into Sharon Kettering’s description of early modern patron-client relationships. Kettering argues that “the role of patron was modeled on that of the patriarchal father . . . and the role of the client on the loyal, obedient family member and servant. The rhetoric of clientage was that of paternalism . . . and was filled with such expressions as ‘I am your servant’ and ‘to render or give service.’”⁴⁶⁸ The result was the creation of a kinship, or family-like, bond between the patron and client, premised on mutual assistance through “obligation and commitment.”⁴⁶⁹ The language used by Maresius reflects these same attitudes and it did not take long for Udinck to reciprocate these gestures of fidelity.

On 7 February 1663, Udinck sent 53 hams to Groningen, three of which were destined for Maresius.⁴⁷⁰ This was no small order, and provides some sense of the wealth that Udinck must have still retained in 1663. In return, Maresius kept his promise of friendship by sending Udinck letters with detailed updates regarding the political conditions in Groningen, including

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁶⁸ Sharon Kettering, “Patronage and Kinship in Early Modern France,” *French Historical Studies*, vol 16, 2 (1989), 408-435: 430.

⁴⁶⁹ Ibid., 431.

⁴⁷⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 February 1663, the others were distributed as follows: 7 February 1663 - Udinck sent 53 hams to Groningen to be distributed as follows: 3 to Maresius; 3 to Colonel Andolph Clant; 3 to Professor Martini; 3 to Lord Zaunsleiffer; 3 to Lord Columbier; 3 to Meeus; 3 to the secretary Andolph Ludolfi; 3 to secretary Schato Gocking; and the rest to family members.

the deaths and appointments of prominent political figures in both the city and in the Ommelanden.⁴⁷¹ On 29 June 1663, Maresius sent a letter to Udinck again offering to help the banished alderman return to Groningen someday.⁴⁷² Gestures of friendship were reinforced in all of these letters, such as one on 19/29 June 1663, where Maresius wrote in the address line: “*Par bonne amie, que Dieu garde*” (Bye good friend, may God keep you safe).⁴⁷³ In that same letter, Maresius informed Udinck that the mayor Johan Eeck had died, and promised to continue monitoring the situation in Groningen in order to help facilitate Udinck’s return.⁴⁷⁴ In a subsequent letter in October 1663, Maresius explained that the lords of Groningen were planning a large meeting soon that could result in many changes within the city council.⁴⁷⁵ Maresius went on to recommend that, after the new year, Udinck should submit a petition to be allowed to settle in East Friesland or in Drenthe.⁴⁷⁶

On 8 February 1664, Maresius sent another letter to Udinck informing him that the late mayor Eeck had been replaced by Regnerus Tjaerda, a political elite who was related by marriage to the powerful Julsingha-Drews faction in Groningen.⁴⁷⁷ Maresius went on to say that others within the city and in the Ommelanden circles had also passed away too, but their positions had not yet been filled.⁴⁷⁸ He did not provide the cause(s) of death, although it is possible that these were the result of plague or any number of other diseases that were misunderstood in those days and therefore wreaked havoc on the population. Nevertheless, these timely updates were crucial for Udinck, especially if he planned on returning. The two-year

⁴⁷¹ GrA, Toegang 2073, Inv. 72, nr. 52, fol. 4, 19/29 June 1663, Brief van Maresius aan Udinck.

⁴⁷² Ibid.

⁴⁷³ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁵ GrA, Toegang 2073, Inv. 72, nr. 52, fol. 4 and 5, 27 October 1663, Brief van Maresius aan Udinck.

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁷ GrA, Toegang 2073, Inv. 72, nr. 52, fol. 5, 8 February 1664, Brief van Maresius aan Udinck.

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid.

rotating schedule for the mayors in Groningen meant that the political situation there was almost always in flux. Nepotism in Groningen's city council was a concern for Udinck because it meant that old political enemies were never far away, but it was curbed somewhat by rules that excluded immediate family members from serving at the same time. For example, Johan de Drews III was scheduled to become mayor in 1665, but when he married Regnerus Tjaerda's daughter in 1664, Drews III was forced to delay his appointment until after his father-in-law's service had ended.⁴⁷⁹ For Udinck, this type of information was critical to determining the optimal time to submit a petition to return, as the success of his petition depended almost entirely on which faction controlled the city council.

In addition to politics, Maresius also expressed interest in Udinck's proximity to the Steinfurt intellectual Dr. Prof. Wilhelm Heinrich Goddeus. Dr. Prof. Goddeus was the son of the eminent legal scholar and Steinfurt judge, Johannes Goddaeus (Johann Götde, d. 1642), and had acquired a reputation for being a "*theologus solidus et orthodoxus*" (solid and orthodox theologian).⁴⁸⁰ Maresius's interest in Goddeus was, at least in part, related to his efforts to attract foreign students and professors to the University of Groningen, a recruiting practice that was common among all Dutch universities.⁴⁸¹ Maresius himself was a Calvinist minister who had fled religious persecution in France, and received assistance from the Dutch orthodox Calvinist minister and theologian Francis Gomarus (1563-1641).⁴⁸²

⁴⁷⁹ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 36.

⁴⁸⁰ Doede Nauta, *Samuel Maresius* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1935), 391.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid.

⁴⁸² Gomarus is perhaps best known for his role in the Synod of Dort in 1618/19, which at his urging rejected the more liberal teachings of Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609).

Like his mentor, Maresius also had a reputation for speaking out openly against Socinians, Remonstrants, Catholics, and Lutherans.⁴⁸³ This type of intellectual posturing may have helped Maresius land his role as professor of theology at the University of Groningen, where he was inaugurated on 20 January 1643.⁴⁸⁴ After his appointment and throughout the second half of the seventeenth century, an almost continuous decline in enrollment ensued.⁴⁸⁵ On average about 100 new students enrolled each year around mid-century; about 70 each year between 1660 and 1690; followed by an even further decline throughout the eighteenth century.⁴⁸⁶ This decline has been attributed to a number of causes: the military invasions of the Bishop of Münster in 1665 and 1672, quarrels between professors which existed in all universities but were especially contentious in Groningen, and other conflicts between the city and the Ommelanden.⁴⁸⁷ To remedy this trend and improve recruitment, it seems that Maresius may have called upon Udinck to act as go-between by meeting with potential students, theologians, and other intellectuals in northwestern Germany.

This is further evidenced by Udinck's invitations to theology students and those interested in religious discourse to his home, where they discussed the various theological debates of the day. On several occasions, he was visited by Hindricus Alting, a popular theology student from Groningen. Alting was well-known, primarily because of his family lineage. His father, Johannes Alting (1583-1644), a native of Emden, was a professor at the University of Groningen and had even tutored "the Winter King," Frederick V (1596-1632); and his

⁴⁸³ Klaas van Berkel, *Universiteit van het Noorden: vier eeuwen academisch leven in Groningen: Deel I De oude universiteit, 1614-1876* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2014), 167.

⁴⁸⁴ G.A. van Gemert, *Om niet aan onwetendheid en barbarij te bezwijken: Groningse geleerden 1614-1989* (Groningen: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1989), 59-60.

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid., 60, Van Gemert points out that in 1710, representatives from the Ommelanden made a point to block as many academic appointments as possible during the War of the Spanish Succession.

grandfather, Menso Alting (1541-1612) had been a Calvinist minister as well. Thus, both father and grandfather had been highly influential Calvinist leaders in the Dutch Republic and Germany during the first half of the seventeenth century. Udinck did not leave a detailed account of their conversations, but they would have been hard pressed to avoid discussing the popular debates between Johannes Cocceius (1603-1669) and Gisbertus Voetius (1589-1676); debates that were further reverberated in Groningen in the dispute that had developed between Johannes Alting (Hindricus' father) at the very end of his life and Samuel Maresius.⁴⁸⁸

The teachings of Maresius sometimes met with a mixed reception in Groningen. Despite the Dutch reputation for religious toleration, Groningen had a much more orthodox-leaning character than most Dutch cities and the political and economic turbulence there meant that the limits of toleration were never quite fixed. As Peter van Rooden has argued, Dutch policies on religious toleration were “not founded upon an ideology,” but “a mixture of sentiment, tradition, and expediency.”⁴⁸⁹ In other words, pragmatism dictated the extent to which Dutch cities allowed dissenting religious groups to live and practice their faiths. In Amsterdam, for example, shipping and commerce compelled the city to tolerate foreign laborers, soldiers, sailors, and deckhands, most of whom came with their own unique languages, religions, and cultures. This was not so much the case in Groningen, and therefore toleration was minimal in comparison.

Despite the orthodox nature of his mentor, Gomarus, Maresius's brand of Calvinism was considered a farce by some of the other orthodox theologians. Gisbert Voetius, for example, insisted that Maresius was sympathetic to Descartes' mechanistic world-view (i.e.,

⁴⁸⁸ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdriff in ballingschap*, lxix.

⁴⁸⁹ Peter van Rooden, “Jews and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Republic,” in Hsia and Van Nierop eds., *Calvinism and Religious Toleration*, 132.

Cartesianism), and therefore was practicing some form of concealed atheism.⁴⁹⁰ Despite the accusations against him, Maresius was probably not as fanatical about Cartesianism as Voetius had claimed - that would indeed have been odd for someone who had been a Gomarist in his younger years.⁴⁹¹ This, however, is only scratching the surface of the religious disputes of the second half of the century. From the 1650s until the *Rampjaar*, 1672, a number of theologians in the provinces of Gelderland, Groningen, and Friesland remained embroiled in these and other philosophical and theological arguments that are difficult to reduce to a straightforward echo of Gomarists versus Arminians, or Voetians versus Cocceianists.⁴⁹² A comprehensive analysis of these religious debates is not the aim of this dissertation, and as Maresius's ideas demonstrate, it is nearly impossible to group individuals neatly into one of these rubrics. What is of primary importance here is the spread of these debates outside of academic circles and into the public sphere where they became popular talking points among the lay community. Udinck was precisely what the political elites and orthodox intellectuals feared most: a layman who relished in discussions and ideas that could potentially challenge orthodoxy, authority, and social stability. His diary is confirmation of that individualistic streak.

Udinck clearly felt more at home in the church, or among theological intellectuals like Maresius and Goddeus, than in formal political arenas. An early sign of this occurred in May 1663, when Udinck received an unexpected letter from one "NN," who invited him to come to Münster.⁴⁹³ It would later be revealed that this "NN" was the infamous Johan Schulenborgh.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹⁰ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 583-584, 889-891, For some orthodox theologians, Cartesianism undermined the traditionally accepted Aristotelian natural theology and thus did not easily sit with orthodox understandings of the true faith.

⁴⁹¹ Alexander X. Douglas *Spinoza and Dutch Cartesianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 56.

⁴⁹² Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 586-587, 894-895, Israel writes that, "in the Dutch context, contrasting attitudes to the 'new philosophy', and Descartes, became part of the ideological baggage of politics by the early 1640s and remained so until the beginning of the eighteenth century."

⁴⁹³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 May 1663.

In his diary, Udinck wrote that the letter caused him so much anxiety that it prevented him from sleeping and motivated him to seek out council from Professor Goddeus.⁴⁹⁵ Udinck ultimately declined Schulenborgh's offer, but not entirely. The following day, he sent Janneke and Maria to Münster under the guise that they were there "to see the procession."⁴⁹⁶ Udinck did not disclose the reason for the procession in Münster, but it must have conveyed both religious and political meaning.⁴⁹⁷ As Charles Zika has argued, processions linked various communities "to the mother church . . . and to both bishop and town council."⁴⁹⁸ Von Galen may have also used this procession to boast about the construction of three new chapels (*Josefskapelle*, *Ludgeruskapelle*, and *Maximuskapelle*) at the Münster Cathedral.⁴⁹⁹ Taken together, these new chapels were called *Galenschen Kapellen* (Galen's Chapels), and although they were part of the church, their construction was initiated at Von Galen's request in order to honor himself and his victory over the city in 1661.⁵⁰⁰ Whatever Udinck thought of the procession, or of Schulenborgh, is not entirely clear, but these events, the letter, and his corresponding diary entries served as a important, albeit circumstantial, pieces of evidence against Udinck upon his return to Groningen in 1665.

In the meantime, Schulenborgh seems to have continued to find success. He arrived in Münster sometime in March 1663, and on 12 May 1663 he received his appointment as councilor to the Bishop.⁵⁰¹ In the aforementioned letter, Schulenborgh informed Udinck that he was indeed

⁴⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 13-15 May 1663.

⁴⁹⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14 May 1663.

⁴⁹⁸ Charles Zika, *Exercising Our Demons: Magic, Witchcraft and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 169.

⁴⁹⁹ Stadtarchiv Münster, Stadtgeschichtliche Dokumentation, nr. 409, 1661 and 1663.

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁰¹ Wilhelm Kohl, *Christoph Bernhard Von Galen: Politische Geschichte des Fürstbistums Münster, 1650-1678* (Münster: Verlag Regensberg, 1964), 171-172.

in the service of the prince-bishop, and that he was earning an impressive annual salary of 2,000 guilders.⁵⁰² Perhaps he was attempting to lure Udinck into a similar role within Von Galen's retinue. Around that same time, in the spring of 1663, Schulenborgh also sent a letter to the Groningen mayor, Johan Eeck (the same mayor mentioned in Maresius's letters), apologizing for his actions, but the city council members would not accept it.⁵⁰³ Maresius, too, informed Udinck that the Groningen city council was intensely bitter and that they had promptly rejected Schulenborgh's "*Apologie*."⁵⁰⁴

On 19 June 1663, Professor Goddeus explained to Udinck that the Groningen authorities had issued a new resolution against Schulenborgh and that the old deputy had been ostracized for perpetuity.⁵⁰⁵ For Schulenborgh, rehabilitation into Groningen would never be an option. Von Galen knew this, and he also knew that Schulenborgh's service in Münster was not motivated by religious zeal or patriotism, but rather more by personal vengeance against Groningen's city council.⁵⁰⁶ Von Galen's decision to take on Schulenborgh was entirely pragmatic. Schulenborgh carried with him years of experience in Dutch politics, and inside knowledge of the men who ran the country.⁵⁰⁷ Of course, Schulenborgh's new role in Münster only stoked the flames of hatred that the Groningen city council members had felt for him. This was made even worse on 6 August 1663, when Schulenborgh published his *Prodomus Schulenburgicae defensionis*, a text that not only defended his actions in Groningen, but also offered harsh criticism of the

⁵⁰² GrA, Toegang 2073, Nr. 72, 23 May 1663, Brief van Schulenborg aan Udinck.

⁵⁰³ Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 40-68: 66.

⁵⁰⁴ GrA, Toegang 2073, Inv. 72, nr. 52, fol. 4 and 5, 27 October 1663, Brief van Maresius aan Udinck.

⁵⁰⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 June 1663.

⁵⁰⁶ Kohl, *Christoph Bernhard Von Galen*, 171-172.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid.

Groningen city council, and did so in Latin.⁵⁰⁸ As was discussed previously, the Groningen authorities ordered that copies of the text be burned publicly by the city's executioner.⁵⁰⁹

Udinck surely knew that he was straddling a dangerous line by even responding to Schulenborgh's invitation, especially if he ever intended to legally return to Groningen. His diary entries from this period, most notably those involving controversial figures, are often short, vague, and devoid of specific details. For example, on 27 June 1663, Udinck recorded in his diary that his wife and Maria had returned from Groningen with Schulenborgh's assistant, Christofell, but he writes nothing else about this episode.⁵¹⁰ And on 15 July 1663, Udinck was visited by Dr. Gleints, Schulenborgh's old lawyer from Groningen, although again no additional details are provided in his diary.⁵¹¹ These encounters and discussions certainly would have raised eyebrows in Groningen, and they were not the only ones.

There were other contacts as well. On Friday 15 May 1663, Udinck met with the Steinfurt judge and professor Werner Pagenstecker (1609-68).⁵¹² The two had met many years earlier in France, and during their conversation they reminisced about their time in Paris as well as their mutual friend, Colonel Andolph Clant, whose military service had brought him to Orléans around the same time.⁵¹³ As was mentioned previously, it remains unclear why Udinck had travelled to France decades earlier, but it was likely part of a journeyman's trip, or perhaps a

⁵⁰⁸ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 1200, "Plakkaat van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen waarbij het boekje getiteld "Prodromus Schulenburgicae defensionis" wordt verklaard te zijn een "calumnies, injurios en seditios" geschrift, hetwelk door de scherprechter in het openbaar zal worden verbrand," 29 August 1663.

⁵⁰⁹ GrA, "Catalogue of pamphlets," nr. 185-203, De Bruijn bij nr. 671 (29 August 1663); see also Molhuysen and Blok, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, Deel 5, 707; Tonckens "Het proces-Schulenborgh," 65-98.

⁵¹⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 27 June 1663.

⁵¹¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 July 1663.

⁵¹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 May 1663.

⁵¹³ Ibid.; see also H. J. Warnecke, "Die Räte des Grafen Arnold IV. von Bentheim und ihre Familien," in *Beiträge zur westfälischen Familienforschung* (1978/1979), 217-241: 229.

grand tour, although the latter would be much less likely for a tailor.⁵¹⁴ Grand tours were more common in the Dutch Republic among the merchants' and politicians' ranks and often included a trip to Italy, where young men would inspect various artifacts from antiquity and the Renaissance, as well as attempt to strengthen their family's trading networks. The grand tour was also used to reinforce the ideals of the *spezzatura* - a nonchalance attitude that was often expected of the aristocracy and well-to-do burghers. In the case of Udinck, it remains unclear why he was in France, or even which town he might have called home during the time of his travels.

For the militant Calvinists in Groningen, visits to France and Italy were not to be taken lightly. Those who visited realms that were dominated by papists were at risk of being labeled as having sympathies for the Catholic Church, or being converted themselves. Therefore, these travels were sometimes looked at with suspicion by city leaders, despite many of them having travelled to these places themselves. The Groningen mayor Gerhard Swartte, for example, obtained his doctorate degree from Orléans and travelled through Paris on his way back to Groningen, none of which seems to have impeded his career.⁵¹⁵ For others, like the Ommelander leader, Osebrand Johan Rengers van Slochteren, past travels to France were later directly interpreted by the Groningen city council as evidence of collusion with a foreign enemy. In 1641, Rengers travelled to Paris, where he was knighted in the Order of St. Michael, but only after he paid a significant sum of money to King Louis XIII, and promised to defend the Catholic Church and the interests of the French crown.⁵¹⁶ Berend Coenders van Helpen (1601-1678), who

⁵¹⁴ Blaak, *Literacy in Everyday Life*, 117, for example, the regent Pieter Teding van Berkhout (1643-1713) "acquired a university degree in Orléans, during the *grand tour* of France with which he concluded his education."

⁵¹⁵ *De Nederlandsche Leeuw, jaargang 42* (The Hague: Koninklijk Nederlandsch Genootschap voor Geslacht- en Wapenkunde, 1924), 359-363.

⁵¹⁶ K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

served as deputy to the States General in Groningen as well as ambassador to Denmark, also received this title, as did a number of other well-known Dutch Protestants, including P.C. Hooft (1581-1647) and Michiel de Ruyter (1607-1676), despite the requirement to make an oath to a Catholic Saint.⁵¹⁷ Nevertheless, in 1672, Rengers and others in his circle were accused of conspiring with France and Münster, and imprisoned.⁵¹⁸ Unlike many of the elites in the city, Rengers' old associations with France would prove life-threatening in the 1670s - and certainly did not help Udinck's cause in the 1660s - topics that are addressed in more detail in later chapters.

TIME, WEATHER, WOMEN AND FINANCE

Udinck's diary entries display a deep interest with time and weather, rarely missing the opportunity to report on either. He regularly recorded the time that he woke up, went for walks, attended church, ate dinner, and went to bed. Time was, at least in part, a means of organizing one's life around the Church, from which the bells offered additional daily reminders to pray, worship, and fulfill other spiritual obligations. And while modern notions of production and efficiency had not yet crystallized in the early modern mindset, contemporary capitalists recognized full well the old adage of time is money. As Ronald Bedford and Lloyd Davis have shown, "for every motto [on clocks] urging worldly "busyness," others warn of the world to come and thus of the individual's exposure."⁵¹⁹ The passage of time therefore signified a range of both spiritual and temporal responsibilities.

⁵¹⁷ Ibid.

⁵¹⁸ Ibid.

⁵¹⁹ Bedford and Davis, *Early Modern English Lives*, 24.

Whether it was for financial well-being in this life, or spiritual salvation in the next, the finiteness of earthly time - and the accompanying expectations of how time is best spent - contributed greatly to rhetorical expressions of selfhood in the early modern Dutch Republic. It is akin to the individualistic philosophies and self examination found in a variety of seventeenth-century works, such as René Descartes' famous dictum, "*Cogito ergo sum*" (I think, therefore I am), Rembrandt's eighty-plus self-portraits, the trope of the mirror as a symbol of vanity and self-reflection, and the explosion of egodocuments from this period. All of these things grew from the same inclination to examine oneself, and by extension, others from the standpoint of the self. In this sense, time, whether in terms of temporality or spirituality, was just as Norbert Elias wrote: "a complex system of self-regulation," a medium through which people policed themselves.⁵²⁰

Udinck's interest in time, especially linear time, is also reminiscent of Constantijn Huygens Jr.'s diary, which Rudolf Dekker has described in his book, *Family, Culture and Society in the Diary of Constantijn Huygens Jr, Secretary to Stadholder-King William of Orange*.⁵²¹ Huygens' diary, which was written at various intervals between 1649 and 1696, is primarily focused on court life during the reign of Willem III of Orange, but, as an egodocument, resembles Udinck's diary in both form and content. Both are clearly concerned with issues of business, politics, finance, gossip, reputation, and honor. Dekker lucidly summarizes the correlation between the rise of egodocuments and linear time, writing that in the second half of the seventeenth century, "the invention of the pendulum clock and the development of the modern diary . . . sprang from the same source: the wish to know, measure and describe the

⁵²⁰ Norbert Elias, *Time: An Essay* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 22.

⁵²¹ Dekker. *Family, Culture and Society*, 2, "His [Huygens Jr.'s] diary reflects the development of a modern awareness of linear time, in contrast to the traditional concept of time as cyclical, marked by recurring patterns of day and night or the four seasons."

world.”⁵²² But whereas Huygens wrote at length regarding contemporary instruments of science, including the microscopes, telescopes and clocks, Udinck seems to have been more preoccupied with theology and philosophy, than with scientific discovery.

In the late seventeenth century, scientific breakthroughs were on the horizon, but as Rudolf Dekker points out, this was a time when “science and alchemy still overlapped.”⁵²³ Eventually, the reciprocation of new ideas and instrumentation would increase people’s understanding of the natural world, but, in the 1660s, most Europeans had not yet joined the march towards some distant Enlightenment. Instead, radical new philosophies, like those of Descartes and Spinoza, were still condemned by moralists and orthodox Calvinists.⁵²⁴ Even secular leaders often struck down these new philosophical ideas related to scientific discovery, not necessarily for religious reasons, but out of fear that they might threaten the social order.

It seems that Udinck was still sorting these things out. His diary entries convey the sense that he was quite literally trying to conceptualize what God was, how God manifested Himself on earth, and what Udinck’s role was in God’s broader plan. One example of this occurred on Sunday 17 July 1664, when Udinck wrote that in church that morning, the *predikant* told the story of Nero, “who asked Simon [Magus, the sorcerer] what God actually was.”⁵²⁵ This is a reference to the apocryphal gospel, the Acts of Peter and Paul, where Nero held Peter and Paul in prison, while Simon’s dead body was kept under watch for three days, thinking that it would rise again. Udinck wrote in his diary: “I think about the answer; how can I understand what God

⁵²² Ibid., 16.

⁵²³ Ibid., 24.

⁵²⁴ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 889-891.

⁵²⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 17 July 1664.

is?”⁵²⁶ Udinck’s question is not only a theological one; it is also a philosophical and even political one. In this regard, Antonio Gramsci’s theory provides a useful framework.

Building on his notion that “all men are intellectuals . . . but not all men have in society the function of intellectuals,” Antonio Gramsci concluded that all men are, to some extent, engaged in the formulation of their own philosophy.⁵²⁷ The primary objective of this philosophizing is to answer the questions: “What is man,” “what can man become,” and is it possible for man to “dominate his own destiny?”⁵²⁸ This should not be understood simply as the benign contemplation of ideas; rather, it also involves the transformation of those ideas into action - political action - a process also known as the philosophy of praxis. For Gramsci, if everyone is indeed a philosopher, then “the real philosophy of each man is contained in its entirety in his political action.”⁵²⁹ Thus, when Udinck asked, “what is God,” he was, either consciously or unconsciously, fashioning his own personal philosophy, contemplating where or if he might be ranked among God’s elect, and weighing the political actions that were available to him.

For seventeenth-century philosophers, observing the world was the principal tool of their trade. These observations were not about disproving the existence of God; rather, they were an attempt to expose and better understand God’s work. Contemporary examples ranging from Rembrandt’s *The Anatomy Lesson of Dr. Nicolaes Tulp* (1632), which depicts the dissection of a human arm, to Antonie van Leeuwenhoek’s microscopes, which led to the discovery of bacteria and microorganisms in the 1670s and 1680s, reflect this preoccupation. Observation was the hallmark of a learned individual and critical to the better understanding of an otherwise chaotic

⁵²⁶ Ibid.

⁵²⁷ Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, 9, 323-326.

⁵²⁸ Ibid., 351.

⁵²⁹ Ibid., 326.

world. Small traces of Udinck's individual philosophy are present in his diary, although these are often masked in his descriptions of social relationships, his study of Scripture, his accounting of business and finances, and in his observations of daily life.

One of the ways in which Udinck made sense of these theological and philosophical questions was through his observations and inferences of different weather patterns. For Udinck, weather often had an emotional, if not spiritual or mystical, significance, rather than a scientific explanation. He regularly gave thanks to God during times of *moij weer* (beautiful weather), while often describing extremely hot or cold days as well as rainy and foggy weather as melancholic, and often foreshadowing some impending misfortune. It is entirely possible that these were simple metaphors, but the regularity with which he uses them suggests something more. During his interrogation on 23 December 1662, for example, he said that the air had turned "*heell stinckent mistich*" (very smelly fog; possibly a reference to the swamps, peat bogs, and the burning of peat for fuel, all of which has an unpleasant odor); in October 1664 he wrote that it had "rained the entire day, the sun has not been seen at all, and this morning, [my] neighbor Herman Cloosters' child died" the two phenomena were clearly linked; during the peak of the plague epidemic in November 1664 he repeatedly complained of "*melancolyke . . . mistich weer*" (melancholic . . . foggy weather); and in April 1664, when a wave of disparaging gossip aimed at Udinck's family began to circulate in Steinfurt, Udinck correlated that misfortune to the recent poor weather, declaring that "the same fog and rain that had taken me from Groningen, had come and found me in Steinfurt."⁵³⁰

Udinck was clearly a God-fearing Protestant, but he was not an unperturbed or uncomplicated follower of dogma. Calvinism demands an individualistic approach to one's

⁵³⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 October 1664, 23 November 1664, 21 December 1664 recalling the events of 23 December 1662; and 1 April 1664.

beliefs regarding life, death, and the afterlife. Udinck was by no means a sceptic or deist such as Newton or Locke, nor was he a pantheist such as Spinoza, but one can, through Udinck's diary entries, begin to see the kernel of a more modern view of religion. For Udinck, belief was increasingly a private matter, and although it was largely stripped from superstition, it was nevertheless balanced by certain correlations between human affairs and the weather. In other words, for Udinck, it was as if God was willing the weather to send signs, warnings, or omens to him. Thus, God remained a very active deity, not the sort of clockmaker who put the mechanisms into motion and then retired, as the deists maintained. Meanwhile, one can speculate about his open attitude toward Catholicism. Perhaps it was the effect of the mindless butchery in the name of the true religion he had witnessed in his younger years, which made him shy away from rejecting Catholicism outright. It is difficult to say with certainty, but of course, lying low was a wise move in a region dominated by a rather fanatical and violent Catholic prince-bishop. Altogether, he appears to have been unwilling to follow Schulenborgh's example and sell his soul to the devil in the shape of *Bommen Berend*.

BUSINESS TRANSACTIONS

In addition to time and weather, Udinck also regularly commented on business and financial transactions, both large and small. After his arrival in Steinfurt, Udinck worked as a tailor under the purview of his landlord, Johan Henrich Cottich, who was also a city council member there. He kept numerous records regarding deliveries of cloth, debt collections, rent payments, and groceries, among which beer, wine and bread were clear staples. He also recorded business trips, most of which involved the delivery of cloth, buttons, and other goods. Many of

Udinck's business transactions are included in the diary and provide an interesting glimpse into the vast network of rural laborers, through which his trade operated.

The business model that Udinck outlines, especially his reliance on rural laborers, is consistent with the "putting-out system" described by Jan de Vries.⁵³¹ The putting-out system was an economic model through which urban industrial merchants remedied their labor shortages by seeking out workers from the countryside. This was considered mutually beneficial for both the city and countryside, because many rural laborers had been compelled - by declining prices and few economic opportunities in agriculture - to seek out extra sources of income. At the same time, many urban industries were able to pull from "a growing low-cost labor force," increasing productivity without breaking the bank.⁵³² Udinck often hired rural laborers to assist him in his trade. He paid them to deliver wagons, materials, food, letters, and to more broadly maintain his networks throughout the Dutch Republic and northwestern Germany. Perhaps the most striking aspect of his trade, however, was his heavy reliance on female family members as workers.

During Udinck's exile, his wife Janneke made multiple trips to Groningen and Coevorden in order to conduct business affairs, while Maria also traveled to Groningen, and Geertruit to Bentheim.⁵³³ Meanwhile, Udinck's diary makes clear that his family was not unique in this regard. Many other women are also mentioned in terms of their roles as the procurers of business, trade, and communication. Udinck describes one Maria van Eversbach (the wife of a Groningen merchant, Christoffel van Eversbach), who traveled to and from Germany to close business transactions, Susanne Becker (the daughter of Udinck's neighbor in Neuenhaus, Peter Becker), who delivered messages to and from Amsterdam and Emden, and one might recall the

⁵³¹ Jan de Vries, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis, 1600-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 96.

⁵³² Ibid.

⁵³³ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap (1663-1665)*, lxxi.

mention in chapter three of the women in Coevorden, many of whom were wives or widows of soldiers, and therefore had developed a reputation for being independent and self-reliant.⁵³⁴

Evidently, Udinck recognized the financial savviness of both his wife and niece. On 29 March 1664, Udinck counted the money that he still had in his possession, which had dwindled down to about 115 guilders.⁵³⁵ He worried if it would be adequate, but then recalled, with admiration, the good financial advice that Janneke had given him: “If you have saved 100 guilders, it is enough.”⁵³⁶ Presumably, the idea was that an industrious individual who had fallen on hard times could recover with as little as 100 guilders.⁵³⁷ Udinck’s confidence in the women around him was further demonstrated in December 1664, when he gave his niece Maria power of attorney over his business ventures and property. He declared that he intended to continue collecting interest on his investments while he and his wife were still living, but upon their deaths, Maria would “inherit the capital,” as well as “their property, house, courtyard, and grave.”⁵³⁸ This was further conveyed in a number of letters that Udinck had copied and dispatched to Dr. Simon Wijchgell in Groningen.⁵³⁹

Despite the relative confidence that Udinck had in the women close to him, women more generally maintained a paradoxical position in seventeenth-century Dutch Republic. The Dordrecht *predikant*, Petrus Wassenburgh, for example, claimed that “Satan had no weapon more formidable than woman . . . therefore he had chosen Eve to lead Adam astray.”⁵⁴⁰ And Jacob Cats’ poem, “*Houwelijk*” (Marriage), characterized women via gross generalizations, often

⁵³⁴ Ibid., lxxi; regarding the women in Coevorden, see also Kariin Sundsback, *Zelfstandige vrouwen*.

⁵³⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 March 1664.

⁵³⁶ Ibid.

⁵³⁷ Van Deursen, *Plain Lives*, 125, Van Deursen argues that the average annual wage for a skilled craftsmen/artisan was about 200 guilders.

⁵³⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 18 December 1664.

⁵³⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁰ Van Deursen, *Plain Lives*, 97.

describing them as being either docile, rebellious, diligent, or lazy.⁵⁴¹ Despite his reliance on the women around him, Udinck was still a conservative patriarch, but his descriptions of women reflect neither Wassenburgh's biblical misogyny, nor Cats' rigid categorizations. The works of Simon Schama, Rudolf Dekker, A.T. van Deursen and others further reinforce the paradoxical position in which contemporary Dutch women found themselves; inferior to men in the eyes of moralists, but still needed to carry out financial transactions, inherit guild memberships and run businesses, and thereby serving as an integral part of Dutch economic life.⁵⁴² Nevertheless, even if women had more agency in these parts than elsewhere in Europe, the patriarchy here remained unchallenged.

One area where the women close to Udinck continued to maintain more traditional roles was in the procuring and preparation of food. There are numerous examples of this throughout his diary, but one in particular occurred on 15 June 1664. After a long and stressful day on the road, Udinck returned home and was pleased to find a delivery from his wife, who was still in Groningen. In this package, Janneke included a letter as well as sheep's meat and sauce, which he ate that evening along with some sprouts and bread.⁵⁴³ Udinck noted that he was very grateful to his wife "for these healthy things."⁵⁴⁴ Similarly, on 4 July 1664, Udinck wrote that his wife had prepared the last of the *nagelhout* that she had brought with her from Groningen.⁵⁴⁵ *Nagelhout* was an air-dried and salt-cured beef commonly enjoyed by farmers along the Dutch-German border. It was named after its drying process which typically involved hanging it near a fireplace, where it was eaten over the course of weeks or even months.

⁵⁴¹ Dekker, "Getting to the Source," 165-188: 176.

⁵⁴² Ibid.; see also Dekker, "Women in Revolt," 337-362; Van Deursen, *Plain Lives*, 9-10; Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*.

⁵⁴³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 June 1664.

⁵⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁴⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 4 July 1664.

In the seventeenth century, as Merry Wiesner-Hanks writes, “food was generally more important than medicine in keeping the body healthy and functioning.”⁵⁴⁶ Beer and bread were daily staples for Udinck, but it seems that he regarded those meals consisting of meats and vegetables as being the healthiest. These were also the most expensive. Nevertheless, he ate poultry, stockfish, and pork on a regular basis, and also mentions eating fruit, peas, buckwheat, raisins, prunes, cherries, milk, cheese, cream, butter, eggs, cabbage and sprouts.⁵⁴⁷ In terms of medicinal products, Udinck also consumed at least three tankards of anise water (herbal/medicinal water) between February and March 1665.⁵⁴⁸ Exactly what this medication was meant to treat or prevent is not clear. Perhaps it was used to help ward off the plague epidemic that devastated northwestern Germany and the Low Countries in the winter of 1664/1665. In any event, Udinck spent a significant sum of 16 *stuivers* per tankard on this remedy, so he clearly believed in its efficacy.⁵⁴⁹ These and other remedies are discussed in more detail in chapter five. What is of utmost importance here, is that the variety and abundance of food, drink, and medicine - and by extension healthiness or vitality - available to Udinck also hints at his unusual wealth and unique position in society, even in exile.

In addition to food, Udinck also enjoyed hosting, and attending, various feasts and social gatherings. Throughout his first few months in Steinfurt, for example, Udinck was visited many times by his brother, Dirrick, as well as Dirrick’s daughter, Geertruit, and her husband, “neef” Geert Folckers, and their time together often involved drinking, smoking and merrymaking.⁵⁵⁰ On 6 June 1663, Geert Folckers visited Udinck and the two of them drank beer and smoked “een

⁵⁴⁶ Wiesner-Hanks, *Early Modern Europe*, 56.

⁵⁴⁷ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap (1663-1665)*, lxxii.

⁵⁴⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 May 1664, 9 February 1665, 2 March 1665, and 27 March 1665.

⁵⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 May 1663.

pÿp tuback” (a pipe of tobacco) together.⁵⁵¹ Most of the tobacco that Udinck received was sent to him from family members in Amsterdam, but he also purchased it through vendors and merchants from Steinfurt, Münster, and Groningen.⁵⁵² On the afternoon of 17 December 1663, for example, Udinck walked to a nearby town where he met a messenger from Münster named Barent, who brought a letter from Amsterdam and two packages of tobacco.⁵⁵³ Two days later, on 19 December 1663, Udinck wrote that his wife had brought tobacco pipes from Geertruit’s house.⁵⁵⁴ There are plenty of occasions where Udinck smoked tobacco with other men, although he is somewhat ambiguous regarding the extent to which women also indulged in this novelty.

Alcohol consumption, on the other hand, was enjoyed by both sexes, and it was not uncommon for Udinck and his family to host large banquets of food and drink following church services. On Sunday 18 May 1663, for example, Geert and Geertruit brought wine and beer to Udinck’s home, where they “celebrated with Lord Tessinck and the mayor Schoppinge until ten o’clock that evening.”⁵⁵⁵ While most of this merrymaking was harmless, by the late spring/early summer of 1663, it was becoming clear that Geert was unable to control his drinking habit. This was problematic, not only on an individual level, but also on a familial and social level, and it did not take long for Geert’s drinking to threaten the family’s reputation.

On Saturday 13 June 1663, Geert got so drunk on brandy wine that he missed church the next morning, and was not seen the entire day: presumably this was the result of his hangover.⁵⁵⁶ It is worth mentioning that distilled alcohol was a relative novelty in those days and therefore it became much more difficult to maintain one’s measure once brandy wine and *jenever* were

⁵⁵¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 June 1663.

⁵⁵² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 17 December 1663.

⁵⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁵⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 December 1663.

⁵⁵⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 18 May 1663.

⁵⁵⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 13-14 June 1663.

widely available.⁵⁵⁷ Nevertheless, two days later, on 16 June 1663, Geert was again completely drunk on brandy wine.⁵⁵⁸ That same day, Udinck allowed Geert to rest in his home, and even fed him three meals, but by 4 o'clock that afternoon, his nephew was still in such a drunken stupor that he had to be dragged to a bedroom so that he could sleep off the effects of the alcohol.⁵⁵⁹ In a number of diary entries mentioning Geert Folckers, Udinck also included the French expression, "*estent jvres*" ([he] is drunk), a clear indication of Udinck's growing frustration and irritation with his nephew's drinking habits.⁵⁶⁰

Smoking and drinking were enjoyable pastimes for Udinck, but he also recognized the importance of consuming them only in moderation. Udinck often noted in his diary those occasions when he was merrymaking or melancholic, and thus consumed more beer or wine than usual.⁵⁶¹ On 16 May 1663, he wrote that he had "picked up two bottles of high-quality wine; enough to turn an honest man into a drunkard."⁵⁶² The importance of moderation can also be found in a number of contemporary sermons, treatises, and other prescriptive literature regarding middle-class etiquette, most of which "recommended no more than three glasses a day."⁵⁶³ Complete abstinence was not realistic; after all, beer and wine were usually safer to drink than water. Still many moralists and ministers considered drunkenness to be the "mother of all sins" because of its potential to lead toward other transgressive behaviors, including unbridled sex, violence, theft, rape, and even murder.⁵⁶⁴ Excessive drinking also threatened traditional gender roles. The prevailing belief was that intoxicated men were at risk of losing not only their

⁵⁵⁷ The lack of control is reminiscent of William Hogarth's depictions of eighteenth-century London in his print of *Gin Lane* (1751).

⁵⁵⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 16 June 1663.

⁵⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 17 August 1663.

⁵⁶¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 May 1664.

⁵⁶² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 16 May 1663.

⁵⁶³ Roberts. "Drinking Like a Man," 238.

⁵⁶⁴ Roberts and Groenendijk, "Moral Panic," 333.

rationality, but also their money, while intoxicated women were at risk of losing their chastity. Whatever the end result might be, excessive drinking was sure to stir up gossip and dishonor in the short term, with a high likelihood of pushing one to the margins of society and down the social ladder in the long term.

THE DANGERS OF GOSSIP AND DISHONOR

The worship of Bacchus was certainly not the only way to attract unwanted attention, gossip and dishonor. Unequal marriage partners and salacious romantic encounters could also quickly ruin the reputations of both the individuals involved as well as their extended families. In the historiography, the jury is still out regarding the extent to which parents or guardians could influence their children's decisions regarding relationships and marriage partners. It seems that for those who lived in the Dutch Republic and its borderlands during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, marriage was understood as "the most important decision" in a woman's life, and therefore it was not to be taken lightly.⁵⁶⁵ And although the suitability of a marriage partner was often based on economic and social prestige, love and affection were not entirely disregarded. In reviewing Udinck's diary, it becomes increasingly difficult to buy into the assertion that romantic love was an eighteenth-century invention.⁵⁶⁶ Still, Udinck's diary does make clear that in regards to deciding on a marriage partner, parental consent, family finances and family prestige were still vitally important considerations.⁵⁶⁷

⁵⁶⁵ Dekker, "Getting to the Source," 175, this notion was expressed in various forms of popular culture including the poetry of Jacob Cats, namely "*Houwelijk*" (Marriage), the novels of Wolff and Deken, and others.

⁵⁶⁶ Regarding some of the disagreements among scholars on the origins of romantic love, parental affection and the modern family, see for example Wiesner-Hanks, *Early Modern Europe*, 294-295; another interesting case study regarding these topics can be found in Peters (Hrsg.), *Peter Hagendorf - Tagebuch*.

⁵⁶⁷ Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 441-444.

Exact dates are difficult to pin down, but it seems that in December 1663, Maria had entered into a relationship with a man named Gescher, of whom Udinck did not approve, although it is not entirely clear why. It was around this time that Udinck began complaining in his diary about Maria's rebellious behavior. On 22 December, Udinck wrote that Maria and Janneke had argued fiercely - probably regarding Maria's tendency to stay out too late - and in the course of that argument, Maria referred to her aunt as "*een böös beest*" (an angry/evil beast).⁵⁶⁸ Over time it would be revealed that Maria's late nights were spent with Gescher. Initially, their less-than-secret rendezvouses were only mildly alarming; a situation that is in line with with Rudolf Dekker's assessment that "relations between young men and women in the Netherlands was rather unconstrained" and meetings between young couples rarely involved chaperones.⁵⁶⁹ Over the next few months, however, the relationship between Maria and Gescher became a source of embarrassment for Udinck, who often described it in a mixture of Dutch and French.⁵⁷⁰

On 24 December 1663, he wrote that "Maria had spent the next two nights at Geertruit Folcker's house, and she only came home in the mornings, still drunk on brandy wine, and missing church."⁵⁷¹ Her absences continued throughout the winter months of 1663/64. On Sunday 31 January 1664, Udinck noted in his diary that despite bitterly cold weather, Maria had gone to visit the home of the preceptor Hindrick Bertelinck.⁵⁷² This by itself was not unusual, as Maria was friendly with Bertelinck's daughter and others in the community who often spent time

⁵⁶⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 22 December 1663.

⁵⁶⁹ Dekker, "Getting to the Source," 172, The diary of Aafje Gijsen, written in the eighteenth-century, described a courting ritual commonly performed in the villages of the Dutch countryside that involved potential male suitors visiting young women to whom they had taken a liking, and signaling their interest in these women by "knocking on their doors at precisely nine o'clock at night on Sunday evening."

⁵⁷⁰ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxiii-lxiv.

⁵⁷¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 24 December 1663.

⁵⁷² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 31 January 1664.

together socializing after church. By midnight, however, she had not returned home. Troubled by this, Janneke dressed herself and set out to search for Maria.⁵⁷³ She went first to Bertelinck's, but Maria was not there; she then went to Geertruit's house, followed by the *apotheker* (pharmacist) Holterman's house, but still could not locate her niece.⁵⁷⁴ Janneke finally returned home empty handed in the early hours of the morning of 1 February 1664.⁵⁷⁵ In the margin of the diary, Udinck later wrote that Maria had not been at Bertelinck's as she had told them; rather she "had been sleeping with Gescher in Geertruit Folcker's house."⁵⁷⁶ With the growing threat of dishonor, Udinck and Janneke were finally forced to confront Maria.

That morning, Janneke scolded Maria: "How could you remain out for so long, about which word travels so high that it brings shame to us?"⁵⁷⁷ Udinck's tone in this passage conveys a sense of futility; he lamented that it was no use trying to reason with Maria, because she "always wants to be right, and therefore argues with a foul mouth."⁵⁷⁸ To a modern reader, the verbal confrontation between a parent and a child who is coming of age, seems familiar. Maria was clearly negotiating the transition between childhood and adulthood, but in the seventeenth century, the repercussions for this type of behavior, including the risk of pregnancy, could be severe and far reaching. Of utmost concern for Udinck and his wife was the gossip that Maria's actions invoked. For Udinck and Janneke, becoming the subjects of malicious gossip was comparable to a second banishment - more subtle in form, but equally damning. Gossip was a means by which one was psychologically cast out, or set apart, from a community through

⁵⁷³ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 February 1664.

⁵⁷⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 31 January 1664.

⁵⁷⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 February 1664.

⁵⁷⁸ Ibid.

dishonor and shame. This was certainly an experience that Udinck and his wife knew well and did not wish to repeat.

Despite Janneke's and Udinck's disapproval, Maria and Gescher continued to see each other in the weeks and months that followed. On 7 February 1664, Maria again told her aunt and uncle that she was going to Bertelinck's house, but again diverted to Geertruit Folcker's house, where she remained in Geertuict's room with "Gescher and others until ten o'clock."⁵⁷⁹ At this point, it seems that Udinck had had enough. In the weeks that followed, Udinck received a letter from Samuel Maresius, who informed him that the lords of Groningen had granted Udinck's wife permission to travel freely in the city and that this would allow her to submit a petition for Udinck to possibly return someday.⁵⁸⁰ The timing could not have been better. Udinck used this opportunity to resolve the issues with Maria and Gescher, putting a stop to their relationship on 26 or 27 March 1664, which caused a series of arguments on both days.⁵⁸¹ The decision was further cemented on 29 March 1664, when Udinck had his wife take their niece back to Groningen, where Maria would remain for the foreseeable future.⁵⁸²

The following evening, 30 March 1664, Geertruit visited Udinck and told him that she had "warned Maria on many occasions that she would be sent home [back to Groningen by her uncle]," but that Maria was either too stubborn or too infatuated with her lover to recognize the risks; or as Geertruit explained it, "her head was forged to her neck."⁵⁸³ Geertruit's appeal to her uncle was probably an attempt to deflect attention away from her own household. After all, it was in Geertruit's house where most of Maria's and Gescher's meetings took place. By that time,

⁵⁷⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 February 1664.

⁵⁸⁰ A transcription of the original letter is available in Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 564-565.

⁵⁸¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 26-27 March 1664.

⁵⁸² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 March 1664.

⁵⁸³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 30 March 1664, "see hadde die kop in die neck gesmeeten."

however, the court of public opinion in Steinfurt had already begun casting its judgment on Udinck's family, and they quickly became the subject of gossip and ridicule.

On 1 April 1664, Udinck began his journal entry as he did most days; by commenting on the weather and noting financial expenses: "Thank God, beautiful weather, although it was foggy this morning and began to rain around 8 o'clock . . . Also, I paid my room rent to Cottich: 5 guilders."⁵⁸⁴ In the margins, where most of Udinck's most compelling entries were made, he wrote about Janneke and Maria's travels back to Groningen: "last night, my wife slept in Rolde [a town in Drenthe]. [I] hoped that by midday that she would not be far from Groningen, and that God Almighty would save her from misfortune. But, the same fog and rain that had taken me from Groningen, had come and found me in Steinfurt."⁵⁸⁵ As mentioned, the fog and rain often signified misfortune or foreshadowed something ominous. In this instance, he clearly correlated the fog to the growing gossip.

The gossip came first from the Steinfurt preceptor Henrick Bertelinck, who, after drinking brandy wine, said that he was "surprised that Geertruit Folckers is still in her uncle's [Udinck's] good graces after the matter of Gescher has caused so much difficulty and is now known by everyone."⁵⁸⁶ Others in the community followed suit. That same day, 1 April 1664, Udinck complained that the incidents with Gescher had caused so much mockery by those "who had never been my friends" and they often "come to me with A Lion's Face and speak unwise words without thinking."⁵⁸⁷ In the days and weeks that followed, Udinck's honor was repeatedly

⁵⁸⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 April 1664.

⁵⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁸⁷ Ibid., A Lion's Face might be based on an old proverb or any number of biblical references including the beasts in Revelation 4:7, the cherubim in Ezekiel 1:10 and Ezekiel 1:14; the lion's roar in Revelation 10:3; the call for vigilance against a roaring lion (i.e., the devil) in 1 Peter 5:8; the desolation of the land by the lion's fierceness and anger in Jeremiah 25:38; and especially in Daniel 6:22-23 which recounts Daniel's salvation from the lion's den, "My God sent his angel, and he shut the mouths of the lions. They have not hurt me, because I was found innocent

challenged by people in the town, sometimes through the whispering of gossip, and other times through direct confrontations.

Udinck's diary omits a number of specifics regarding the harassment that he received, but it very well may have involved a sort of charivari (a type of mockery that is usually conveyed in the form of disparaging songs or some other form of public humiliation).⁵⁸⁸ From the sixteenth until the eighteenth centuries, charivari remained a popular form of public shaming, especially in rural settings such as the villages of the eastern Netherlands and northwestern Germany. Rudolf Dekker's analysis of the diary of Constantijn Huygens, Jr. for example, uncovered a number of incidents where charivari was used to publicly ridicule and shame others, including one such case that involved attaching horns to the front door of the accused adulterer.⁵⁸⁹ Charivari was not limited to adultery, however. Pasquills, or insulting broadsheets, were also commonly posted on the doors of those who were deemed illegitimate political leaders or dishonorable community members.⁵⁹⁰ And as Natalie Zemon Davis has noted, "A married couple who had not had a pregnancy after a certain period of time was a perfect target for a charivari."⁵⁹¹ These acts were not just innocent jests. On the contrary, they could easily spiral out of control and end in violence. Edward Muir has shown, for example, that after 1640 acts of charivari were prohibited by law in France in order to maintain some level of social stability.⁵⁹²

in his sight. Nor have I ever done any wrong before you, Your Majesty. The king was overjoyed and gave orders to lift Daniel out of the den. And Daniel was lifted from the den, no wound was found on him, because he had trusted in his God." (quoted from the New International Version)

⁵⁸⁸ Dekker, *Family, Culture and Society*, 124, "In many parts of Europe, village communities punished adulterers by 'charivari' or 'rough music', which entailed singing insulting songs, slinging mud, and dragging the victims around on the back of a donkey."; see also Rudolf Dekker, "Sexuality, Elites, and Court Life in the Late Seventeenth Century: The Diaries of Constantijn Huygens, Jr.," *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 23,3 (1999): 94-109: 96.

⁵⁸⁹ Dekker, "Sexuality, Elites, and Court Life in the Late Seventeenth Century," 96-97.

⁵⁹⁰ Kathy Stuart, *Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts: Honor and Ritual Pollution in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 202.

⁵⁹¹ Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*, 20.

⁵⁹² Edward Muir, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 135.

Udinck was intensely troubled by the gossip in the town, and with a decreasing number of confidants in the town on which he could rely, he turned instead to Scripture. On 27 March 1664, he recalled that at church that morning, they had sung Psalms 64: “Hear me, my God, as I voice my complaint; protect my life from the threat of the enemy. Hide me from the conspiracy of the wicked, from the plots of evildoers. They sharpen their tongues like swords and aim cruel words like deadly arrows.”⁵⁹³ During that same sermon, they read verses 12 and 13 as well: “Many bulls surround me; strong bulls of Bashan encircle me . . . Roaring lions that tear their prey open their mouths wide against me.”⁵⁹⁴ For Udinck, the parallels to his life were evident. In a dizzying sea of gossip, Scripture was clearly a source of comfort for him.

In the seventeenth century, and especially while in exile, using Scripture as a framework for one’s worldview had a number of pragmatic effects. For one, it reinforced notions of self-righteousness and affinity with God; something that, at least for an exile, would have been in short supply. This sense of isolation from society, but connection to God, could further be used to lift morale during times of strife. Biblical narratives were also used in the process of assimilation, allowing both the exile and the new community to find some measure of common ground based on their shared understanding of Scripture. In many Reformed communities in the late seventeenth-century, the presence of an organized hierarchical church, or even a *predikant*, was not always necessary; in some cases the presence of believers was sufficient. As was the case with pietism and puritanism, one could also find solace internally, individually, or within communities that had distanced themselves from institutional churches. The Letters of St. Paul in the New Testament, for example, describe the need for unity within Christian communities, and the Book of St. Matthew claims that, “For where two or three gather in my name, there am I with

⁵⁹³ Psalms 64:3.

⁵⁹⁴ Psalms 64:12 and 13.

them.”⁵⁹⁵ These notions would have appealed greatly to those who had travelled long distances, experienced overwhelming hardships, had fallen out of favor with the prevailing church, found themselves alone, or struggled to scrape out a living in exile. Udinck had faced a bit of each.

Much of Udinck’s diary centers around the various losses that he experienced while in exile, and his efforts to restore his honor. For Udinck, this was probably the most difficult, if not impossible, obstacle to overcome, and in the end, it seems that only an act of God could restore him to his former self. Kathy Stuart describes a similar phenomenon in her book, *Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts*, whereby the loss of honor, or “dishonor pollution,” is irreversible and “analogous to the loss of a woman’s virginity.”⁵⁹⁶ Stuart goes on to say that for guildsmen in particular, honor was closely linked to family reputation, legitimate birth, and moral conduct.⁵⁹⁷ To lack in any of these areas was to risk being deemed dishonorable. Udinck’s ambiguous status in each of these categories continued to weigh on him and, by the spring of 1664, he had reached a tipping point.

On 22 April 1664, Udinck remarked that Janneke had been gone for 25 days - it would be another month before she returned - and although it had rained almost everyday that she was gone, today was unusually sunny.⁵⁹⁸ The reprieve from poor weather and social harassment was short-lived, however. On 25 April 1664, Udinck heard that even more “*leelyck gepratett worde*” (ugly words [were] spoken).⁵⁹⁹ It was becoming increasingly obvious that there was no future left for the couple in Steinfurt. Udinck spent the next two weeks dispatching letters to family and friends, as well as preparing to begin again somewhere else. On 10 May 1664, while Janneke

⁵⁹⁵ Matthew 18:20.

⁵⁹⁶ Stuart, *Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts*, 109.

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁹⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 22 April 1664.

⁵⁹⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 25 April 1664.

was still in Groningen, Udinck left Steinfurt and on 12 May 1664, he arrived in Neuenhaus in the county of Bentheim.⁶⁰⁰ Udinck did not provide an exact reason for the move, but one would be hard pressed to deny the heavy social toll exacted on his family from this latest round of gossip, mockery, and dishonor.

The cascading losses that Udinck experienced in his first year in exile are reminiscent of Pierre Bourdieu's notion of convertible capital, whereby economic, cultural, and social capital are transferable to one another.⁶⁰¹ Initially, it seemed that Udinck's economic capital was unending. He was able to send an impressive quantity of pork to his old friends in Groningen, and even Maresius had commented on the extent to which Udinck opened his purse to help the struggling theology professor. In short, Udinck displayed few, if any, obvious concerns about money during his first year in exile. His wealth served as a means to retain friends and patrons in Groningen, as well as to acquire new patrons in Steinfurt. However, by the spring of 1664, Udinck's social standing in Steinfurt was in jeopardy, at least in part because of his nephew's alcoholism and Maria's relationship with Gescher. It is clear that Udinck's loss of social capital in Steinfurt also threatened their financial well-being, and perhaps even their physical safety. Udinck surely knew that it would not be long before the gossip began chipping away at his ability to attract new patrons and clients, resulting in less money, less opportunity, less peace, and less happiness. The only viable option was to leave Steinfurt.

⁶⁰⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 10 May 1664.

⁶⁰¹ Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 47.

CHAPTER FIVE:
“A ROSEBUD IN A POOR MAN’S BAG”:
WAR, PLAGUE, AND THE OMNIPRESENCE OF DEATH, 1664

Udinck arrived in Neuenhaus, an imperial town and largely Calvinist community within a stone’s throw of the Republic’s borders, on 12 May 1664.⁶⁰² He secured lodging, a single room in the home of one Gerrit Lanckhorst, to whom Udinck paid a monthly rent of 2 guilders and 10 stuivers.⁶⁰³ The accommodations in Neuenhaus were a significant downgrade from those in Steinfurt. Money as well as business prospects were likely in short supply, and there were probably few other options available for him in such a small town. Nevertheless, he settled into his new home, and on Sunday 15 May 1664, Udinck made his first trip to the newly constructed Evangelical Reformed Church in Neuenhaus.⁶⁰⁴ Inside, Udinck watched and listened to the pastor, Arnold Heinrich Wilhelm Speckmannus (c. 1636-86), who likely spoke from a wooden pulpit positioned at the center of the church.⁶⁰⁵ In reformed churches, sermons were typically read from the pulpit, which was physically positioned in the center of the church in order signify that Scripture was literally and figuratively the center of the reformed faith. In his diary, Udinck remarked that the congregation sang psalms and read from the catechism - biblical lessons

⁶⁰² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 May 1664.

⁶⁰³ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 May 1664, Like Steinfurt, Neuenhaus had suffered a great deal from pillaging mercenaries during the Thirty Years’ War as well as from a series of plague epidemics in the 1630s. Even at the time of Udinck’s arrival, almost two decades after the end of that war, the population and infrastructure of the town was still recovering.

⁶⁰⁵ Ibid.

presented in the form of questions and answers.⁶⁰⁶ The catechism in particular was obligatory for membership in the reformed church as well as access to communion. Udinck complained that the weather that day was unusually warm and that everyone in the church was sweating.⁶⁰⁷ At the close of the service, he also observed a sign hanging near the exit: “*pax Intrantibus, salus Exeuntibus*” (peace to those who enter, good health to those who depart).⁶⁰⁸

This message probably struck a chord with Udinck. Health, human contact, and relationships were vitally important to him, and he devotes considerable attention in his diary, as well as in letters, to inquiring about the health of family, friends, enemies, neighbors, and even strangers. He also regularly donated money and food to the poor, even in towns where he seemed unwelcome. However, his generosity, Calvinist convictions, and even his presence in the community, was not always appreciated. Like those in Steinfurt, many in Neuenhaus looked at Udinck with suspicion. He often remarked about those who said “ugly things” about him, and others who continuously questioned why he was in Neuenhaus, what he had done in Groningen, and what he was doing to earn a living.⁶⁰⁹ For his part, Udinck was equally curious about many of his neighbors, especially those higher on the social ladder such as counts, mayors, and councilors. He also commented regularly on the middling sort such as innkeepers, craftsmen, and preachers, as well as those among the lower ranks such as wagon drivers, maidservants, and laborers.

This type of information gathering provided him with a clearer picture of the social, economic, and political world that surrounded him, and by extension a means through which he could attract and maintain various forms of patronage and clientage. Knowing his community,

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁰⁹ See for example, GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 June 1664.

and maintaining his familial, legal, and business networks were vital for his financial wellbeing, the restoration of his honor, and even his own survival. This was especially true in 1664, when a number of calamitous developments over which he had no control - such as war and plague - increasingly impacted his safety, security and prosperity.

THE IMMINENCE OF WAR

Throughout 1664 Dutch and English ships repeatedly clashed with one another in the Atlantic, and although war had not yet officially been declared, both sides sought to protect and expand their possessions along the coasts of the Americas and West Africa. In the summer of 1664, the English Colonel Richard Nicholls positioned his naval squadron off the coast of Nieuw-Amsterdam (New York City) and on 8 September 1664, the governor Peter Stuyvesant (1610-1672) surrendered the Dutch colony without a fight.⁶¹⁰ That same month, a secret mission was dispatched from The Hague to Admiral Michiel Adriaenszoon de Ruyter, whose fleet was in the Mediterranean. De Ruyter was attempting to negotiate a treaty with the Ottoman regency in Algeria to curb their privateering operations, which had inflicted severe damage to Dutch merchant ships, but his new orders required that he abandon this objective and confront the growing threat from England.⁶¹¹ He was instructed to sail to Guinea and cruise along the west coast of Africa, where the English continued to capture Dutch ships and territory.⁶¹²

The extent to which this mission could be kept secret was hampered by a relatively efficient postal system that allowed sailors in De Ruyter's fleet to correspond with their family

⁶¹⁰ A.P. van Vliet, *'vriendelijke groetenisse': brieven van het thuisfront aan de vloot van De Ruyter (1664-1665)* (Den Haag: Uitgeverij Van Wijnen, 2007), 23.

⁶¹¹ Van Gelder, *Zeepost*, 76, "De Ruyter's fleet consisted of twelve warships and a supply ship. The total number of personnel, including soldiers, stood at 2,277 heads. All of these men sent letters to their wives, children, parents, and other family members sporadically."

⁶¹² Ibid.

and friends on Dutch home front.⁶¹³ As a result, it did not take long for nearly everyone in Holland to know that the fleet was en route to West Africa. On 14 October 1664, the English diplomat George Downing wrote about the growing rumors that were circulating throughout Amsterdam, many of which suggested that De Ruyter was going to attack the coast of Guinea.⁶¹⁴ Likewise, Samuel Pepys expressed concern about the growing hostilities between the English and Dutch, writing on 12 October 1664 that “all say De Ruyter is gone to Guinny before us.”⁶¹⁵

In the eastern provinces, there was mixed enthusiasm for this expedition. On one hand, many of the ships that had been captured by the English had sailed under the flag of the WIC, and so there was an obvious desire to retake those assets for the sustainability of the company and its shareholders. As described in chapters one and two, investors in Groningen had allocated significant sums of money in the WIC and therefore rooted for De Ruyter’s success, not only for the sake of national security, but also to ensure a profitable return on their investments. Many critics of De Ruyter’s expedition, however, argued that France would ultimately profit the most from a continued maritime conflict between the Dutch and English, and that such hostilities might even embolden the French to invade the southern Netherlands, despite the two countries’ existing military alliance.⁶¹⁶ Sentiments in Groningen were also complicated by the extraordinary bitterness toward Holland’s regents who consistently redirected large sums of money toward the VOC and the navy, at the expense of both the WIC and the Dutch land army. This was especially troubling in the eastern provinces, where garrisons were being systematically disbanded, even in the face of new military threats from the belligerent prince-bishop of Münster, Bernard von

⁶¹³ Ibid.

⁶¹⁴ Van Vliet, ‘*vriendelijke groetenisse*’, 28.

⁶¹⁵ <https://www.pepysdiary.com/diary/1664/10/> last accessed 22 June 2018.

⁶¹⁶ Van Vliet, ‘*vriendelijke groetenisse*’, 30.

Galen. Udinck himself would fall victim to this iteration of the war that erupted in earnest in 1665.

THE DIJLERSCHANS

On 23 December 1663, Udinck recorded in his diary that “30 [German] soldiers from Steinfurt passed by here [his home] on their way to the Dijlerschans,” a fortress overlooking the River Ems along the border of Groningen and East Friesland.⁶¹⁷ These soldiers were part of a larger group of some 800 to 900 troops sent by Von Galen, under the pretext that they were collecting a debt from the *Reichsfürst* (imperial prince) of East Friesland, Georg Christian (1634-1665), who was an ally of the Dutch.⁶¹⁸ Knowing full well that the debt could not be repaid, Von Galen ordered his troops to lay siege to the Dijlerschans, where the outnumbered and outgunned defenders surrendered almost immediately.⁶¹⁹ The loss of the fort created a stir in the Republic, especially in Groningen, and prompted the States-General to respond unanimously that an army should be formed to retake the fortress. This decision was assisted by the Friesland deputy, and close ally of Willem Frederik, Epeus van Glinstra (1605/6-1677), who argued that Von Galen would not receive military assistance from either the emperor or the neighboring German princes, because they were all preoccupied with fighting “the common enemy, the Turk.”⁶²⁰

⁶¹⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 73, 23 December 1663, “Woensdag den 23 december . . . trocken hÿr verbÿ Steinfurt, 30 soldaten na die Dÿlerschans in Ostfriesland.”

⁶¹⁸ Van Nimwegen, *The Dutch Army*, 411, “The emperor had authorized him to collect an old debt of 300,000 rix-dollars from the prince of East Friesland, Georg Christian (1634-1665), if necessary using military means.” It is to be noted that in 1662 Georg Christian had been engulfed in his own conflict with the estates of his realm about their privileges, not unlike the conflict that occurred in Groningen.

⁶¹⁹ Ibid., 411, “It was obvious to everyone that this operation was primarily aimed against the Republic, because the bishop’s troops laid siege to the Dijlerschans.”

⁶²⁰ Quoted in Ibid., 411, Many in the Dutch may have also desired to fight the Ottomans for religious reasons, but the Dutch were in no position to assist militarily as their army was already stretched thin.

These and other battles, both near and far, were noteworthy events for Udinck and he often recorded details about them in his diary. In the summer of 1664, Udinck recorded that news had just arrived that the Turks, under the Grand Vizier Fazil Ahmed Köprülü (1635-1676), had invaded Hungary, but that the defenders there had repelled them “so that 5,000 Turks were killed at that place, [and] 3,000 taken prisoner.”⁶²¹ Udinck was referring to the Battle of Saint Gotthard, which was fought in August 1664 along the River Raab as part of the broader Austro-Turkish War (1663-1664). The conflict began years earlier when a massive Turkish army began descending on Europe, taking Transylvania in 1661, then moving through Hungary towards Vienna. A number of German princes, including Von Galen, and a handful of other European leaders responded by sending troops to Austria. In the early stages of the conflict, Von Galen allowed the main contingent of his soldiers to join the imperial army, but also sent a smaller contingent - approximately 1,000 foot soldiers, 200 knights, 12 pieces of field artillery, and 2 Howitzers - toward the Danube without any clear instructions as to how they would fit into the broader military strategy.⁶²² Von Galen’s haphazard approach to foreign policy and military endeavors drew anger among the other German princes.⁶²³ Nevertheless, at the River Raab, the Christian Europeans, largely under the Italian military commander, Raimondo Montecuccoli (1609-1680), defeated the Turkish army handily.⁶²⁴

The war was remarkable for a number of reasons, not least of which was that it brought together some of Europe’s most prominent Christian leaders in what was known as the *Rheinische Allianz* (The Alliance of the Rhine or The League of the Rhine). This alliance included notable figures such as Louis XIV, Philip IV of Spain, the Pope, the Great Elector, and

⁶²¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 31 July 1664.

⁶²² Kohl, *Christoph Bernhard Von Galen*, 173-174.

⁶²³ Ibid.

⁶²⁴ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Raimondo-Montecuccoli> last accessed 6 September 2018.

a number of other German princes, including Münster's prince-bishop Von Galen. But, as David Parrott argues, Von Galen's rogue decision-making, shifting alliances, and overall poor reputation among the other leaders of Europe "destroyed all [of his] political credit and he found it impossible to secure lasting benefits from his military activities."⁶²⁵ The integrity of this alliance was also threatened by the duplicitous actions of Louis XIV. After the Battle of Saint Gotthard, Louis XIV had medals struck bearing the inscription "*Germania servata*," while simultaneously appealing to the sultan, to whom he insisted that the League of the Rhine, not France, was responsible for engaging his forces on the Raab.⁶²⁶

The political and military maneuverings along the edges of Europe and beyond would eventually find a way to influence local politics and even the everyday lives of villagers along the Dutch-German border. Udink wrote that "the entire garrison of Münster had soldiered on to Vienna against the Turks," and while exact numbers are difficult to obtain regarding these troop movements, it seems that Von Galen had left his principedom, and especially the Dijlerschans, vulnerable to a counterattack.⁶²⁷ The leaders of Friesland and Groningen wasted no time in taking advantage of Von Galen's thinning forces. They argued that the Dijlerschans should be taken back as soon as possible, and demanded that Willem Frederick - the stadholder of Friesland, Groningen and Drenthe - lead the operation, to which Holland consented.⁶²⁸

The Dutch expedition to retake the Dijlerschans was assembled just outside of Deventer, in Overijssel, and set out on 6 May 1664, passing through the county of Bentheim.⁶²⁹ During the march, Willem Frederik forbade his soldiers from plundering the local villagers under the threat

⁶²⁵ David Parrott, *The Business of War: Military Enterprise and Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 281.

⁶²⁶ Pierre Goubert, *Louis XIV and Twenty Million Frenchmen* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970), 101.

⁶²⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20 August 1664.

⁶²⁸ Van Nimwegen, *The Dutch Army*, 412; See also, 't Hart *The Dutch Wars of Independence*, 29.

⁶²⁹ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 412, "The assault on Fort Dijlerschans was the first important land-based operation that the Republic had undertaken since the Peace of Münster."

of corporal punishment.⁶³⁰ The stadholder's intentions may have been more pragmatic than compassionate. His troops had only brought enough bread rations for a few days because he intended to negotiate the baking of more bread with the locals. To do so, he would first have to convince the peasants in the countryside that they had nothing to fear. This proved difficult, however, and many of the inhabitants of Bentheim hid their food supplies and then fled the area, leaving their houses vacant.⁶³¹ To replenish the army's bread supplies, Willem Frederik dispatched two of his most trusted men: Thomas Kien (the commissioner of the victualing) was sent back towards Deventer, and Henri Charles de la Tremouille (the Prince of Tarente and Talmont; d. 14 September 1672), travelled across the Ems to see if the shortage could be remedied there.⁶³²

En route to Deventer, Kien stopped in Neuenhaus to consult with the bakers there. He reported to Willem Frederik's second-in command, Colonel Ernst van Ittersum van de Oosterhof (d. 1681), that only a few of them were willing to bake bread and they demanded exorbitantly high prices.⁶³³ However, Kien argued that despite the added costs, this would still be preferable to the delay that would be necessary to transport bread from Deventer.⁶³⁴ Udinck was in close proximity to these exchanges and, on 17 May 1664, he recorded that his friend, Lambert Becker, had even met with three soldiers and a lieutenant, almost certainly regarding these very issues.⁶³⁵ Kien's suggestion to have the Neuenhaus bakers supply the necessary bread was agreed upon and, on 18 May 1664, 8,000 pounds of bread was dispatched from Neuenhaus to the waiting

⁶³⁰ Ibid.

⁶³¹ Ibid., 412, 414.

⁶³² Ibid., 414, Henri Charles de la Tremouille was also the great-grandson of William I of Orange.

⁶³³ Ibid.

⁶³⁴ Ibid.

⁶³⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 17 May 1664.

troops.⁶³⁶ The fresh rations allowed the troops to continue their march towards the Dijlerschans, where they arrived two days later, on 20 May 1664.⁶³⁷ Meanwhile, Udinck had learned that his longtime friend, Colonel Andolph Clant, was among those soldiers in the march to the Dijlerschans, and on 20 May 1664, Udinck sent a letter to Clant, requesting an audience with “*sijn Excellencie*,” Willem Frederik.⁶³⁸

Willem Frederik’s focus, of course, was not on dealing with the banished tailor, but with the ongoing military operation, and it took no less than a month before Clant replied to Udinck. In the meantime, Janneke returned from Groningen, arriving in Neuenhaus on 31 May 1664 with approximately 784 guilders - mostly interest and debt payments from Groningen - before returning again to Groningen on 9 June 1664.⁶³⁹ Udinck remained in Neuenhaus, while Willem Frederik’s army spent two weeks bombarding the Dijlerschans with canon fire until the prince-bishop’s beleaguered defenders finally surrendered on 4 June 1664.⁶⁴⁰ Following the retaking of the Dijlerschans, most of Willem Frederik’s troops began marching southwest on their way back to Deventer. On 14 June 1664, around ten o’clock that morning, the Prince of Tarente and a large contingent of soldiers made a stop in Neuenhaus. Udinck described seeing the arrival of the Prince, who was accompanied by “a caravan of untold wagons.”⁶⁴¹

At the time of De la Tremouille’s arrival, Willem Frederik was only a short distance behind with his army in Veldhausen (a town about 3.5 km northeast of Neuenhaus, although today Veldhausen is officially considered part of Neuenhaus).⁶⁴² Soon afterwards, Udinck learned that Willem Frederik had stopped for the night at an abbey in the town of Wietmarschen,

⁶³⁶ quoted in Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 414.

⁶³⁷ Ibid.

⁶³⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20 May 1664.

⁶³⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 31 May 1664 and 9 June 1664.

⁶⁴⁰ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 414.

⁶⁴¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14 June 1664.

⁶⁴² Ibid.

about 13 km to the east.⁶⁴³ Udinck saw an opportunity and pursued it with a cautious optimism. Around one o'clock in the afternoon that same day, he traveled to Wietmarschen, where he repeatedly attempted to gain an audience with the stadholder.⁶⁴⁴ Initially his efforts seemed in vain, however, as Willem Frederik remained preoccupied with his officers and other guests throughout the afternoon and into the evening. Around eleven o'clock that night, as the fraternizing was winding down, Udinck received confirmation from one of Willem Frederik's assistants that the stadholder was in fact willing to speak to him, but it would have to wait until the next morning during the army's march back to the Republic.⁶⁴⁵

A CONVERSATION WITH THE STADHOLDER

It is difficult to overstate the significance of the opportunity that opened up before Udinck. After all, it was Willem Frederik's wife, Albertine Agnes, who had recommended pardons for Udinck and Harckens in January 1663. Moreover, Udinck desperately wanted to return to Groningen, and short of The Almighty, Willem Frederik was perhaps the only patron, at least in the immediate area, who could make that happen. From his entries, it is clear that Udinck recognized the significance of this moment. He meticulously recorded the details of his conversation with the stadholder and the account takes up no less than fourteen pages in his diary!

Early the next morning, on 15 June 1664, Udinck joined Willem Frederik's army, which was marching near Veldhausen. With the exception of the officers, Udinck described the entire army as being on foot and he remarked that the roads became especially difficult once they

⁶⁴³ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁵ Ibid.

passed Neuenhaus.⁶⁴⁶ Udinck declared that he simply wanted to “thank his Excellency and to God Almighty, for the mercy which saved me from death.”⁶⁴⁷ Moments later, he was finally brought before Willem Frederik, who greeted the exiled tailor in a respectful, but lighthearted tone: “Monsieur Udinck, Broersma has proposed that we meet, and I am greatly encouraged by Wijders, who says that you have, in Clant and Broersma, two trusted friends [all of these men were officers in Willem Frederik’s army]. Wijders also told me that he stayed with you in Steinfurt last summer. Whatever you did there, I am sure that it involved a good drink.”⁶⁴⁸ Udinck laughed and jokingly replied, “Yes, Your Excellency, [but we] also never forgot [to toast to] the health of Your Excellency’s niece, the princess.”⁶⁴⁹ Udinck remarked in his journal that he and the stadholder laughed and had fun with it.⁶⁵⁰ The conversation, it seemed, was off to a good start. The two got along quite well, and their conversation went on for some time and included not only the exchange of pleasantries and an occasional joke, but also more serious topics regarding legal and political matters back in Groningen.

Willem Frederik asked about Udinck’s wife, family, his stay in Steinfurt, and inquired about those with whom Udinck had spoken since leaving Groningen. Udinck replied that he had only visited “God’s House,” and that he had spoken to Professor Goddeus, although in his diary, he admittedly wrote that he held back a bit, not wanting to disclose too much about his relationship with the professor.⁶⁵¹ As was mentioned previously, Udinck had sought out advice from Goddeus regarding Schulenborgh’s attempts to make contact with Udinck. This was

⁶⁴⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 June 1664.

⁶⁴⁷ Ibid., Udinck first spoke with Lieutenant Colonel (and Governor of Coevorden - and later traitor) Wigbolt Broersma.

⁶⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁵¹ Ibid.

obviously a sensitive detail and Udinck was careful not to say too much when discussing it with the stadholder.

Udinck told Willem Frederik that he desired to return to Groningen, and if that was not possible, then perhaps to Drenthe. Willem Frederik replied somewhat ambiguously, “Liberty, in Groningen, where the *Heeren* (gentlemen) fear men who are allowed to have it.”⁶⁵² Udinck and the stadholder were like-minded in this regard. Udinck expressed his agreement, although in more materialistic terms: “The gentlemen of Groningen value the law above all else, except their possessions.”⁶⁵³ Willem Frederik then informed Udinck that he had heard that Dr. Lucas Harckens had also requested permission to live in Drenthe, but that that request had been denied. Udinck was probably surprised by these revelations. Up until this point, Harckens’s name appears only twice in Udinck’s diary; once in December 1663 regarding their ordeal in Groningen; and the other from February 1664 regarding a rumor that Harckens had in fact been granted freedom to live in Drenthe.⁶⁵⁴ Willem Frederik injected a bit of hope, however: “With you [Mr. Udinck], it is quite different. The lords of Groningen might give you something that they would deny him [Dr. Harckens].”⁶⁵⁵ Willem Frederik continued: “Your banishment has not been applied unanimously across the 6 provinces . . . It has not been approbated (formally approved) in Overijssel, Gelderland or Holland. Therefore you are free to come and go there. Also, in Drenthe there is a provision, whereby you might be able to speak to the leaders of Coevorden.”⁶⁵⁶ One can only imagine Udinck’s elation from hearing this.

⁶⁵² Ibid.

⁶⁵³ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, until this point, Harckens’s name only appears in Udinck’s diary on two other occasions: on 13 December 1663, Udinck reminisced that he had not spoken to Harckens since their ordeal in Groningen; and on 21 February 1664, he was told by one Dr. Kesterink (who had heard it from Lord Stule) that Harckens had received liberty in Drenthe.

⁶⁵⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 June 1664.

⁶⁵⁶ Ibid.

As the conversation continued, Udinck increasingly emphasized the burdens that he and his wife were forced to confront while living in Neuenhaus, as so much of their livelihood depended on maintaining contact with their business partners, family, and religious networks in the United Provinces.⁶⁵⁷ Udinck added that he would be extremely grateful to merely have permission to travel through the Drenthe countryside, even if it was solely for the purposes of worship, “and to keep our oath to God.”⁶⁵⁸ With this, Willem Frederik tempered his reassurance stating that attaining liberty to travel in Drenthe might well be accomplished, but he warned Udinck that he must be patient - a command that Udinck would repeat to himself numerous times over the next year. At least for the time being, Udinck and his wife would have to continue living as they had.⁶⁵⁹ The degree to which Willem Frederik might have been willing to assist Udinck with any of these propositions is difficult to say. It seems that Willem Frederik was careful not to overcommit, since he did not make any promises or go into any more details about the possibilities, or lack thereof, for restitution. Instead, if we follow Udinck’s account, Willem Frederik simply changed the subject.

“What do you do to drive away the time?” Willem Frederik asked.⁶⁶⁰ Udinck replied, “nothing special; just reading and walking.”⁶⁶¹ When asked what books he had read recently, Udinck replied, “God’s word . . . as well as *The Exact Description of France, The Life and Business of the Prince of Orange, Land and Sea* as well as the *Couranten* twice a week.”⁶⁶² Indeed, Udinck was a prolific reader. He received most of his books and almost all of his newspapers from his cousin, Gerard “neef” Luycken, who was a cloth merchant in Amsterdam,

⁶⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶⁶² Ibid.

as well as from one Dr. Caspar Kesterinck in Steinfurt.⁶⁶³ The “*Couranten*,” to which Udinck referred, was also known as the *Amsterdamsche Courant*. (There was also another widely circulated newspaper called the *Oprechte Haerlemse Courant*; together these were the most popular Dutch newspapers in the second half of the seventeenth century). Both were published several days a week, allowing them to report on very recent current events, and they did so in a newer style, sharing stories not only with local or regional significance, but also those that were nationally relevant.⁶⁶⁴ Given his interest in the news, he may have also read other popular periodicals such as *Tydinghen* or the *Gazette d’ Amsterdam*, although these are not explicitly mentioned in his diary.⁶⁶⁵

In the closing moments of their discussion, Udinck told Willem Frederik that he “rejoiced to know that his Excellency had agreed to speak [to him] at this time,” because he had been “very much deserted by everyone.”⁶⁶⁶ Willem Frederik again changed the subject. He took a drink of wine from a small silver cup and then offered some to Udinck and the other officers, while the rest of the regiment waited in formation.⁶⁶⁷ The stadholder’s gesture of politeness, or approbation, clearly made an impression on Udinck. He wrote that he “received a full cup of wine,” and in that moment, surrounded by so many impoverished foot soldiers, he felt incredibly fortunate: “like a rosebud in a poor man’s bag.”⁶⁶⁸

After their meeting, Udinck returned to Neuenhaus. On 18 June 1664, he wrote a letter to his wife, who was again in Groningen, to let her and Maria know that he had spoken to the

⁶⁶³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 30 September 1663.

⁶⁶⁴ Downing & Rommelse, *A Fearful Gentleman*, 79-80.

⁶⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 June 1664.

⁶⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁸ Ibid., “ . . . als een rosenobel in een arm mans tass.”

stadholder.⁶⁶⁹ Over the next year, Udinck often reflected on his meeting with Willem Frederik - the experience clearly had a profound impact on him - and he took comfort from the knowledge that he might have a powerful ally in his corner. Of course unbeknownst to any of them, Willem Frederik's time on this earth was coming to an end, and his unexpected death in October 1664 would inform Udinck's decision making in the fall of 1665. Nevertheless, in this particular moment, a single conversation had given Udinck a sense of hope that he might one day return to the Republic, if not to Groningen, then at least to nearby Drenthe. Until then, he would remain busy sustaining his family, his work, and his faith.

SPIRITUAL GUIDANCE IN EXILE

On 8 April 1664, just a few weeks before he left Steinfurt, Udinck attended church twice in order to celebrate Good Friday. During the afternoon service, the *predikant* Metternach informed his audience of a tragic fire that had devastated the nearby village of Nordhoorn.⁶⁷⁰ The fire began in a brewery and quickly spread to the neighboring houses.⁶⁷¹ Udinck wrote in his diary that "in four hours time, some sixty houses were turned to ashes, which caused a great deal of sadness and misery for the crowds of poor people there."⁶⁷² Metternach attempted to correlate the fire to Christ's suffering, proclaiming that "our Lord and savior, Jesus Christ, spent three hours on the cross, and 40 hours in the grave."⁶⁷³ Explaining contemporary events through biblical references like this was common practice for Udinck. The spiritual guidance that he and

⁶⁶⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 June 1664.

⁶⁷⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 8 April 1664.

⁶⁷¹ Ibid.

⁶⁷² Ibid.

⁶⁷³ Ibid.

his contemporaries received was significant, not only for the purposes of salvation, but also for making sense of the chaos that enveloped everyday life in seventeenth-century Europe.

For Udinck, Scripture was more than just a collection of biblical stories. It was also a blueprint for understanding the world, categorizing people, and making sense of complicated relationships. After nearly every church service that he attended, he recorded the chapters and verse numbers read, sung, and/or discussed. And during times of extreme stress, he often attempted to find connections between the content of those readings to the events taking place in his daily life. Some examples of this are given in chapter four when he correlated the psalms discussed in church to the gossip that was dishonoring himself and his family in Steinfurt, and to broader questions surrounding the meaning of life and how one might understand who, or what, God is. On 21 May 1665, he wrote that someone had asked him: “Why would God have wanted to create human beings in the first place?”⁶⁷⁴ To which, Udinck replied, “The answer to this curious question is: to have all of creation asking such curious questions. Note well, that the human body is like a treasure chest through which the soul shall be saved.”⁶⁷⁵ Udinck’s response implies that the human experience, ordeals, hardships, and even death are necessary for salvation.

On a few rare occasions, Udinck discussed the psalms and other biblical texts in extra detail, and when he does, they tend to stand out. This was certainly the case throughout August and September 1664, when he repeatedly referenced sermons mentioning Isaiah 38. On 31 August 1664 and again on 4 September 1664, he recounted how Isaiah visited the ailing King Hezekiah and copied down the moment of the story when Isaiah reminded Hezekiah of the Lord’s command: “Put your house in order, because you are going to die; you will not

⁶⁷⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 21 May 1665.

⁶⁷⁵ Ibid..

recover.”⁶⁷⁶ On 11 September 1664, Udinck recorded how King Hezekiah “faced the wall and prayed to the Lord.”⁶⁷⁷ And yet again on 14 September 1664, he recorded King Hezekiah’s prayers: “Remember, Lord, how I have walked before you faithfully and with wholehearted devotion and have done what is good in your eyes,” and then “Hezekiah wept bitterly.”⁶⁷⁸

Udinck’s tendency to record bits of Scripture began while he was in Steinfurt, but became increasingly prevalent in the summer of 1664 after he had relocated to Neuenhaus. In reviewing the diary entries from the late summer and early autumn of 1664, it becomes clear why. As the summer came to an end, Udinck found himself surrounded by death and disease. In addition to the untimely death of Willem Frederik in October 1664, the plague epidemic of 1664 claimed tens of thousands of lives in Germany and the Netherlands before it made its way to England the following year. Udinck’s faith would play a crucial role in maintaining his mental equilibrium in the months ahead.

THE GIFT FROM GOD

On 24 August 1664, Udinck lamented that “eight people had died in the last four days,” and the situation was made even worse by the absence of the pastors and mayors, most of whom were out of town.⁶⁷⁹ There is no mention of where they went or why they left, but perhaps they had fled the plague. Without the town’s spiritual and temporal leaders, Udinck was compelled to look inward for strength, hope, and resilience. On 25 August 1664, he tried reassuring himself that the recent deaths were somehow for the greater good: “God the Lord wants us to be safe and

⁶⁷⁶ NIV, Isaiah 38:1.

⁶⁷⁷ NIV, Isaiah 38:2.

⁶⁷⁸ NIV, Isaiah 38:3.

⁶⁷⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 24 August 1664.

wants to give us what is useful and salvation, amen.”⁶⁸⁰ This, however, was only the beginning of the epidemic. By September 1664, Udinck’s diary entries are consumed with daily references of disease, death, and burials, reflecting the devastation wreaked by the plague in northwestern Europe during the second half of 1664.⁶⁸¹ On 6 November 1664, Udinck received a letter from Luycken, who reported that about 450 people were dying from the plague each week in Amsterdam.⁶⁸² This death rate has been confirmed in the historiography as well, most notably by Roelof van Gelder, who describes the year 1664 as the first *Rampjaar* (disaster year).⁶⁸³ Udinck probably would have concurred. From September through December 1664, hardly a day went by when he did not record a death, burial or flight of someone from the town.

For many of those who lived in the early modern period, the plague was understood as a byproduct of the larger battle between good and evil (i.e., God and the Devil), or as a sign of God’s wrath, “*de gave Gods*” (the gift from God).⁶⁸⁴ Death rates, especially in comparison to birth rates, may have been used as a sort of litmus test for how well, or how poorly, the community was doing in this broader spiritual battle. On 1 January 1665, Udinck himself recorded that in Neuenhaus over the course of 1664, “38 children were born, 92 died, of which 78 had died from this contagious disease [the plague].”⁶⁸⁵ Udinck made a similar type of observation exactly one year earlier in Steinfurt, where he recorded that over the course of 1663, 71 people had died, but that 77 children had been born.⁶⁸⁶ Although looking at different towns, it

⁶⁸⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 25 August 1664.

⁶⁸¹ Van Gelder, *Zeepost*, 81, ‘In 1663 and 1664 34,000 people in Amsterdam died, out of a population of about 200,000’.

⁶⁸² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 November 1664.

⁶⁸³ Van Gelder, *Zeepost*, 40, 81, 105, the name *Rampjaar* (disaster year) is normally attributed to 1672, when the Dutch faced a combined military invasion by England, France, and the bishops of Münster and Cologne. Here, Van Gelder implies that the plague epidemic in 1664 was so disastrous, that it might well be called the first *Rampjaar*.

⁶⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 81.

⁶⁸⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 January 1665, roughly speaking, there was about 2.4 deaths for every 1 birth.

⁶⁸⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 January 1664, roughly speaking, there was almost 1 death for every 1 birth.

is still evident from Udinck's own amateur statistics that the death rates in relationship to birth rates had shifted dramatically.

To combat the plague, and other diseases, early modern people relied on a variety of remedies. Merry Wiesner-Hanks has identified three main types of medications commonly found in seventeenth-century apothecaries: sympathetic medicine (taken from nature and often mimicking the disease, such as the use of spotted plants to cure measles), astrological devices (believed to work according to the alignment of the planets and stars), and alchemy (solutions made from a variety of chemical or metal compounds).⁶⁸⁷ Of course, prayer was also widely employed, and in most instances, spiritual and material remedies were combined. In northwestern Germany the situation was especially dire, and villagers throughout this area, none of whom fully understanding what they were up against, took drastic measures in the hopes of suppressing the disease. Visual reminders of the trauma experienced in these towns can still be seen in the county of Bentheim, where etched in the sandstone exterior walls of the old Reformed churches in Nordhorn, Uelsen, and Veldhausen are ominous looking grooves known as "*Pestrillen*" (plague grooves).⁶⁸⁸ These grooves are rumored to have been created by desperate villagers who had chiseled away at the stone and ground it into a dust, which they then mixed with water and consumed in the hopes that it would protect them from the plague.⁶⁸⁹

While in the countryside bizarre remedies were swallowed that were the product of baffling superstition. In larger urban centers, explanations and remedies for the pestilence were sometimes more secularized, even if equally mistaken. In Amsterdam, for example, city leaders suggested that the plague might spread, not only by God, but also by consuming certain fruits

⁶⁸⁷ Wiesner-Hanks, *Early Modern Europe*, 301.

⁶⁸⁸ Jan Weertz, Els Weertz, and C.J. Duffin, "Possible Sources of Therapeutic Stone Powder from North West Europe," *Pharmaceutical Historian*, 44, 2 (2014): 27-32, 29-31.

⁶⁸⁹ Ibid.

and vegetables, or from rubbish on the streets, the remnants of which then polluted the air and spread the disease.⁶⁹⁰ Of course, by linking the outbreak of plague to garbage and miscreants in the streets, the upper classes were rhetorically blaming the epidemic on the poor, which helped foster a convention of avoidance. Many plague patients and their family members were prohibited from selling property for fear of contamination, while their children were barred from attending school, and their homes were publicly identified with signs.⁶⁹¹ Although most of the horror stories associated with the plague are centered around urban centers where the population lived in very close proximity to each other, the number of dead that Udinck chronicled in the countryside is equally staggering, and the psychological effects that the epidemic had on himself and his contemporaries are no less troubling.

In some reports, Udinck provides the names and occupations of the deceased, while in others they are simply lumped together in brief descriptions: “On Saturday 24 September . . . 7 have died and 4 were buried between noon and 1 o’clock, among them was Welsell Tenckinck.”⁶⁹² Udinck would later write that Tenckinck’s wife, maid, and at least three other family members had also succumbed to the plague.⁶⁹³ On 25 September, four more were buried, including Udinck’s friend, Joost Crull, whose daughter died two weeks later.⁶⁹⁴ On 26 September, the landlord Cludius, along with his wife and children packed up their belongings and left town.⁶⁹⁵ Two days later, on 28 September, Cludius returned to Neuenhaus, stopping briefly at Udinck’s house. Udinck, however, avoided speaking with him, to which Cludius remarked: “You don’t need to scurry away; I do not yet have the plague . . . you banished corrupt

⁶⁹⁰ Van Vliet, ‘*vriendelijcke groetenisse*’, 61.

⁶⁹¹ Ibid.

⁶⁹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 24 September 1664.

⁶⁹³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 September 1664, 28, 29 October 1664, 2, 16 November 1664.

⁶⁹⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 25 September 1664; GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 17 October 1664.

⁶⁹⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 26 September 1664.

dog.”⁶⁹⁶ It seems that Udinck still did not want to open his door or blinds. Instead, he stressed patience, “*Doch pacience*,” writing that “his [Cludius’s] thoughts are nonsensical.”⁶⁹⁷ That evening, Udinck watched from his window as Cludius left town once again.⁶⁹⁸ On 29 September, six more died.⁶⁹⁹ That same day, Udinck spoke with his neighbors, Lambert Bruna and his wife, all of whom were in agreement that they should leave Neuenhaus, although Udinck did not act on this.⁷⁰⁰ Days later, at the height of the epidemic, Udinck read in the *Couranten* that Willem Frederik had accidentally shot himself in his neck after the pistol that he was cleaning unexpectedly discharged.⁷⁰¹ The stadholder was still alive, but in grave condition. Death and misfortune, it seemed, were everywhere.

In the weeks that followed, the plague continued to decimate German and French towns up and down the Rhine. This was perhaps the most devastating bout of plague in that area since the 1630s, which killed between 1.5 million and 2 million in France alone.⁷⁰² In the 1660s, so many adults had perished in Germany that one group of travelers to Württemberg described it as “a land of children,” reflecting the unrelenting death toll, which was equally clear from reports in Holland and England.⁷⁰³ In Neuenhaus, Udinck himself reported that a servant who was suffering from the plague was found dead and stripped of his clothes outside of town; Barent, “the mailman,” his wife, and son all died; an unnamed knife-maker, his sister and two children

⁶⁹⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 28 September 1664.

⁶⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁶⁹⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 September 1664.

⁷⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁷⁰¹ Ibid, “NBene. Dito Vreÿdag is mett Prins Willem hett ungeluck geschiet.”; GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20 October 1664, “NB: In die courante stont van den 20: Verleeden Vreÿdag heeft die heer Prins Willem een ungeluck gehad.”

⁷⁰² Wilson, *The Thirty Years War: Europe’s Tragedy*, 794.

⁷⁰³ Ibid., 795; see also Pepys’ Diary, 30 April 1665, “Great fears of the sicknesse here in the City . . . God preserve us all!” <https://www.pepysdiary.com/diary/1665/04/> last accessed 13 October 2018.

also succumbed to the plague; as did an unnamed “hat-maker with her suckling child.”⁷⁰⁴ Day after day, for weeks on end, he recorded a relentless death toll and coinciding exodus of survivors that steadily transformed an already sparsely populated community into a ghost town.

The plague brought not only death and desertion, but also a sharp decline in trade. Fearing contamination, the French King Louis XIV declared a four-month quarantine period, during which time all trade with the Republic was halted.⁷⁰⁵ England, Scotland, the Southern Netherlands, Portugal and Spain soon followed.⁷⁰⁶ The decline in economic activity had devastating effects not only on cities, but also on the countryside. Florike Egmond, for example, has shown that during the 1660s vagrants were increasingly numerous in the Dutch countryside, where economic instability forced many people to rely on seasonal labor, migration, begging, and theft for survival.⁷⁰⁷ Still, Udinck tried to remain optimistic. In addition to Scripture, he looked to the works of the classic humanist, Desiderius Erasmus, for advice. On 20 October 1664, Udinck recalled one of Erasmus’s stories in which a man, who, after committing a “small crime,” had the word “honor” carved upon his hand by a tyrannical leader.⁷⁰⁸ In the story, the condemned man was then “thrown into an ugly pit,” where he was left to die.⁷⁰⁹ Udinck wrote that the man’s friends “brought him food to eat daily lest he die of hunger, where upon the man responded that one can live on hope.”⁷¹⁰ The tale, which Udinck attributes to Erasmus, was probably a retelling of Diogenes’ story, in which he claims to have lived in a large barrel or

⁷⁰⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19, 21-23, 25 October 1664, 16, 22 November 1664.

⁷⁰⁵ Van Vliet, ‘vriendelijcke groetenisse’, 61-62.

⁷⁰⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁷ Florike Egmond, *In Bad Company: Organized Crime in the Dutch Countryside During the 17th and 18th Centuries*, (Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 1991), 25.

⁷⁰⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20 October 1664.

⁷⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁷¹⁰ Ibid.

wine-jar.⁷¹¹ The implication for Udinck here is one of reflexivity: Udinck clearly saw himself in Erasmus', or Diogenes', character: alone, increasingly cynical, and either hopeless or perhaps stoic, ultimately surrendering himself to the whims of fate.

The omnipresence of death was a constant reminder to Udinck about the brevity of his own life, and so it is not altogether surprising that, at the peak of the epidemic, Udinck decided to draft a will. On 6 October 1664, Udinck sent at least two letters: one to his wife, who was at that time in Zwolle, and the other to Dr. Simon Wijchgel in Groningen.⁷¹² The content of both letters was more or less the same as they both expressed Udinck's desire to keep Dr. Wijchgel in charge of his property in Groningen, and in the event of his death, or his wife's death, to ensure that the surviving spouse would inherit the total sum of their principal.⁷¹³ The letters are rather detailed in terms of how Udinck envisioned this transfer of ownership would take place, presumably because of the anticipated political and legal obstacles that might be encountered in Groningen.

The following month, Udinck wrote to Wijchgel again explaining that his wife had gone to Groningen and talked to the courts there regarding the structure of interest payments, or dividends, on an investment that Udinck had made prior to his banishment.⁷¹⁴ These were set up to pay out every five years, and his wife pleaded with the courts to have this changed so that the interest might be paid more often.⁷¹⁵ The Groningen court denied her request, and it seems that Udinck may have blamed his wife, at least in part, for the way in which she presented their case

⁷¹¹ Hugh Gerald Arthur Roberts, *Dog's Tales: Representations of Ancient Cynicism in French Renaissance Texts* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006), 3, the man then requested Alexander the Great to move because he was blocking the man's sun.

⁷¹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 October 1664.

⁷¹³ Ibid.

⁷¹⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 November 1664.

⁷¹⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 October 1664.

to the courts.⁷¹⁶ In that same letter, Udinck also lamented that he still had not yet received money owed to him from Captain Hubert Struuck and Cornet (Calvary Ensign) Berent Eeck.⁷¹⁷ Udinck asked Wijchgel for assistance with all of these matters, stating rhetorically that, after mistakes with the interest payments, he “did not wish to put anymore nails in his foot.”⁷¹⁸

At the same time, Udinck began taking steps to make Maria Jason his new power of attorney, declaring that this change was necessary given the effects of the plague epidemic. Udinck wrote that this “infectious disease, which has over time sent so many people to the grave,” has caused him and his wife to acknowledge the “certainty of death, as well as the uncertainty of our own time.”⁷¹⁹ One death in particular left Udinck especially crestfallen, but it was not due to the pestilence. In early November 1664, Udinck read in the *Couranten* that Willem Frederik had died from the wounds he received after his tragic accident.⁷²⁰ Any hope of legally returning to Groningen, or of restoring his former life, probably died with the stadholder.

Willem Frederik’s death not only deprived Udinck of a powerful patron, it also weakened the position of the stadholderate in Groningen, thus strengthening the city council’s influence and political power there. Willem Frederik’s widow Albertine Agnes worked hard to represent and promote the interests of the new stadholder, her seven-year-old son Hendrik Casimir II (1657-1696). But at such a young age, neither he nor his mother could wield much influence over their political rivals in Groningen. For the time being, Albertine Agnes and Hendrik Casimir II were compelled to maintain a relatively low profile in the province of Friesland. A similar scene was playing out in Holland, where the presiding stadholder Willem III (1650-1702) was

⁷¹⁶ Ibid..

⁷¹⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 November 1664.

⁷¹⁸ Ibid.

⁷¹⁹ Ibid.

⁷²⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 21/31, 26 October 1664.

only fourteen-years-old, thus lending power to Holland's Grand Pensionary Johan de Witt and the regents there. It is for this reason that the historiography often describes the time span between 1650 and 1672 as a "stadholderless period," or as the regents called it, the *Ware Vrijheid* (True Freedom).⁷²¹ For many, especially the pro-Orangists, the events of 1664, including unofficial war with England and Münster, plague, and the death of Willem Frederik, were catastrophic. Some even went so far as to declare that these events were punishments from God. These assertions were further supported in December 1664, when an ominous shooting star appeared in the night skies.

THE COMET

The comet was first sighted in Leiden on 2 December 1664 by the Dutch astrologer Samuel Kechel (1611-1668), who described his observations in a letter that he sent to Christiaan Huygens.⁷²² Sightings of this comet were not limited to Holland - it could be seen all across Europe - and therefore interpretations of its purpose varied from place to place. The Amsterdam statesman and amateur scientist, Nicolaes Witsen (1641-1717), reported seeing the comet during his travels through Russia and described it as "*een groote comeetstar met een yselyke staart*" (a great comet star with a ghastly tale).⁷²³ Still, many of the Russians who witnessed the comet regarded it "as a positive sign."⁷²⁴ This viewpoint would have been in stark contrast to Witsen's, as well as to most of western Europe, where the prevailing belief was that comets signified God's wrath and foreshadowed impending doom, war, pestilence, or difficult times.

⁷²¹ See for example, Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 702-703; Frijhoff and Spies, *Hard-Won Unity*, 94; Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 49; Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System II*, 62, 76.

⁷²² Eric Jorink, *Het 'Boeck der Natuere' Nederlandse geleerden en de wonderen van Gods schepping 1575-1715* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2006), 157.

⁷²³ quoted in *Ibid.*, Jacob Boreel's embassy, on which Witsen served, had been forced to wait for a long time before it was allowed to cross the border, as the Russians feared contamination.

⁷²⁴ *Ibid.*, 156-157.

This comet carried with it some historical significance as well, for both Udinck on a personal level, and for Europe more generally. For one, it appeared on the anniversary of Colonel Isselmuiden's tragic death along the *Boteringepoort*, a fact that would not have been lost on Udinck. Chroniclers, diarists, sailors, astrologists, and others throughout Europe also described it as being the brightest comet in the skies since the comet that appeared in 1618 on the eve of the Thirty Years' War.⁷²⁵ Both were widely regarded as an ominous sign from heaven. In 1618, the German cobbler, Hans Haberle (1597-1677), described the earlier comet as "a great and terrible rod through which God threatened us mightily because of our sinful lives."⁷²⁶ Another German, Andreas Kothe described the comet of 1618, writing that "[It] appeared thirty nights in a row . . . If [I] had known that it was supposed to indicate a thirty-year-long war, I would have conducted my affairs differently."⁷²⁷

Like the earlier comet of 1618, the comet of 1664 captured the attention of people across Europe. On 15 December 1664, Samuel Pepys wrote in his diary that in "the Coffeehouse," there was "great talke of the Comet seen in several places; and among our men at sea, and by my Lord Sandwich," and on 17 December he recorded that "the King and Queene did sit up last night to see it."⁷²⁸ Contemporary descriptions of the newer comet are a bit more ambiguous than those of the earlier one. Some still believed that it was sent by God, but many authors also tried to derive meaning from its shape and size. On 19 December 1664, Admiral Michiel De Ruyter wrote in his

⁷²⁵ Luciano Boschiero "Giovanni Borelli and the Comets of 1664-65," *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, vol. 40, 2009, 11-30.

⁷²⁶ A copy of the primary source is available through the *Deutsche Geschichte in Dokumenten und Bildern* website: http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=3709 accessed on 26 October 2017; see also Stadarchiv Ulm, Forschungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ulm, Gerd Zillhardt, *Der Dreissigjährige Krieg in zeitgenössischer Darstellung: Hans Heberles "Zeytregister" (1618-1672)*.

⁷²⁷ Medick and Marschke, *Experiencing the Thirty Years War*, 5, 40.

⁷²⁸ A copy of the primary source is available on the website <https://www.pepysdiary.com/diary/1664/12/17/> accessed on 28 October 2017.

diary that, “We saw the big star with the tail even larger and clearer than ever before.”⁷²⁹ Similar reports appear in letters between sailors in De Ruyter’s fleet and their families back home in the Dutch Republic.⁷³⁰ Sightings were also described in printed sources like Aernout van Overbeke’s *Anecdotes* (a seventeenth-century collection of coarse jokes), and in a number of pamphlets that speculated on the purpose and meaning of the comet.⁷³¹ One such pamphlet published in Haarlem described the comet as “a little red light,” while another published in Amsterdam titled *Klare afbeeldinge van de staert-ster* (Clear Images of the Tailed-Star) made a direct comparison between the comet of 1618 and the comet of 1664, describing the latter as “greater in length, but not as thick” as the former.⁷³² Here again, the authors attempted to draw an inference about the comet’s meaning from its size and shape.

Udinck himself reported seeing the comet on 19 December 1664, and like so many others, he pondered its meaning based on the two competing interpretations that were being espoused in the churches and universities of the United Provinces. On this topic, Voetius and Maresius would be at loggerheads. In 1665, Voetius published his *Excercitatio de prognosticis cometarum*, which declared that the comet was indeed a sign of God’s wrath.⁷³³ Although many in the countryside followed this line of reasoning, not all were convinced. Udinck recorded in his diary that he had spoken about the comet with the mayor of Neuenhaus, Hendrik Grim, who reverberated a different explanation based on Samuel Maresius’s theory for these astronomical

⁷²⁹ Van Vliet, ‘vriendelijcke groetenisse’, 29, “Wij sagen de groote star met de staert grooter en claerder als noeyt.”

⁷³⁰ Ibid.

⁷³¹ Dekker, *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age*, 61; see also Jorink, *Het ‘Boeck der Natuere’*, 157-158.

⁷³² KB Knuttel 9201, Petit 3508, *Klare afbeeldinge van de staert-ster*, 1665; see also Roelof van Gelder, *Zeepost*, 105-106, “was grooter van extentie, als die van ’t Jaer 1618, maer niet soo dik noch klaer.”; and Jorink, *Het ‘Boeck der Natuere’*, 157-158, “een weynigh root doch helder.”

⁷³³ Klaas van Berkel and Arjo Vanderjagt, eds., *The Book of Nature in Early Modern and Modern History* (Leuven, NL: Peeters, 2006), 58.

wonders.⁷³⁴ Maresius developed his interpretation from a debate that had been ongoing since 1662 between himself and a small group of sectarians who had calculated, based on the alignment of the planets, that the end times would arrive in 1664.⁷³⁵ Maresius, however, dismissed this, arguing that it emphasized the *Book of Nature* over the *Book of Scripture*, and therefore went against God's Word.⁷³⁶ The degree to which Maresius may have been swayed by the likes of Descartes, Christiaan Huygens, or the coming scientific revolution is beyond the scope of this project, but suffice it to say that the comet's meaning was indeed a topic of profound interest across Europe.

While Udinck recounts discussing the comet and the competing interpretations about its meaning, he does not fully disclose in his diary entries whether or not he agreed with Maresius or Voetius, or some other theory. He was certainly interested in the phenomenon, but, in the end, he kept his opinions regarding the purpose or meaning of the comet to himself. Nevertheless, it seems inevitable that he would have linked the comet's arrival to the countless tragic events of 1664: the gossip in Steinfurt, the death of the stadholder, the plague epidemic, etc., not to mention its arrival on the second anniversary of the death of Colonel Isselmuiden. The old adage, "when it rains, it pours," seems apropos.

The events of 1664 were detrimental to the psychological health and financial wellbeing of almost everyone in Neuenhaus. In the year's final months, Udinck tried to help as much as he could by lending money to his poverty-stricken neighbors. On 31 December 1664, he drew up a short list of those who had not yet paid him back: the outstanding total was 62 guilders and 3

⁷³⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 December 1664.

⁷³⁵ Jorink, *Het 'Boeck der Natuere'*, 69; see also E.G.E. van der Wall, *De mystieke chilast Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) en zijn wereld* (Leiden: 1987), 316-337.

⁷³⁶ Ibid., For Maresius, like Calvin himself, the *Book of Scripture* taught God's Word, and therefore presupposed the *Book of Nature*, which taught God's power. In other words, the second could only be understood after one had a firm grasp of the first.

stuivers, a significant sum by any standard.⁷³⁷ But Udinck's finances were not what they used to be. Years ago in Groningen, Udinck's status as an alderman in the tailors' guild ensured him of at least some financial subsidies during difficult times, old age, or if he became sick. However, after being banished, Udinck was no longer eligible to receive this type of assistance from the guilds. He concluded his accounting that day, somewhat cynically: "If this money is paid back to us, we will not allow anyone to borrow even a penny from us in the future."⁷³⁸ Indeed, financial uncertainty would be the cornerstone of Udinck's life in the months to come.

Unable to gain the upper hand in the hardships of daily life or in the direction of his future, Udinck's diary entries in the latter half of 1664 increasingly convey a fatalistic attitude. This sentiment was sometimes expressed explicitly, as was the case on 31 December 1664, while at other times it was bound up in rhetoric of faith and patience, all of which likely reinforced his own notions of predestination. Udinck's unapologetic individualism is perhaps best summed up in Gramscian terms as his counter-hegemonic personality was clearly window dressing on a more fundamental problem: the decline of wealth, prestige, and the inability to control the direction of his life. The entire year of 1664 was overshadowed by gossip, death, disease, and misfortune. Few things had gone well for Udinck or his family, and on 31 December 1664, Udinck concluded his diary entry in a disgruntled and cynical tone: "It is bitterly cold . . . much colder than usual, and in the evening it began to snow, quite thick . . . Thank God, the year is now coming to an end."⁷³⁹

⁷³⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 31 December 1664.

⁷³⁸ Ibid.

⁷³⁹ Ibid.

CHAPTER SIX:
NO RETURN ON INVESTMENT:
WAR, PLUNDER, AND THE LOSS OF ECONOMIC CAPITAL, 1665

By January 1665, Udinck's entire experience in exile, now two years in the making, had brought hardships and loss in a variety of ways. The legal act of banishment was, first and foremost, a literal expulsion of the physical body from the community - a community that he had called home for over twenty-five years. But this physical act also had a number of cascading side effects, most of which involved the forfeiture or inaccessibility of economic, social, and political opportunities. As Pierre Bourdieu and others have asserted, implicit in the loss of one form of capital is the additional loss of other forms of capital.⁷⁴⁰ But the act of banishment also had an effect on both the expelling and receiving communities. For the former, it was a matter of abjection and catharsis; for the latter, it was a matter of weighing the costs and benefits of accepting or rejecting the exile into the community.

In the seventeenth century, the expulsion of a bad actor from a community was not only a legal sentence, it was also an act of social and spiritual cleansing. The casting out of beggars, prostitutes, deviants, hardcore criminals, and other evildoers, was a means, at least in the minds of the citizenry, to increase or improve the morality, safety, security, and prosperity of the community. It was also a demonstration of their commitment to God and to the maintenance of God's new chosen land. These were the expectations of the expelling community, but the

⁷⁴⁰ Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," 46-58; see also David Swartz, *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 74, 80.

situation for the receiving community was equally noteworthy. Those who had been sent into exile might bring unique skills to another community, which could benefit the community's economy. This was certainly the case with the large-scale migration of merchants and artisans from the southern Netherlands to the north during the Eighty Years' War, as well as the migration of French Huguenots in the 1680s following Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes.⁷⁴¹

Receiving communities were also compelled to weigh the potential benefits of the exiles' skills against their cultural baggage. Poor refugees, like many of the Germans and Scandinavians who came to the United Provinces during the Thirty Years' War, could help fill unwanted jobs, but they could also become a drain on local charitable institutions if they were not adequately employed. For politicians and church leaders, immigrants were often described as bringing not only poverty, but also foreign (i.e., threatening or alien) languages, cultures, and religions that did not always mesh well with the established population.⁷⁴² In the seventeenth-century Dutch mindset, this cultural baggage could be seen as subversive, or as a slippery slope towards crime, disease, defamation of the true faith, idleness, insecurity, social instability, and even the target of God's wrath. In addition, the legal exercise of banishment, or the performance of holding a trial and expelling one from the community, reinforced the notion that whether one acknowledges it or not, one's self and one's society are inexorably linked.⁷⁴³ Even if complete physical separation of the banished individual from the community might be imposed by legal force, the idea of complete psychological separation is not only difficult; it is impossible and even nonsensical.

⁷⁴¹ For example, see Van der Linden, *Experiencing Exile*.

⁷⁴² For example, see Erika Kuijpers, "Poor, Illiterate and Superstitious," 60.

⁷⁴³ For example, see Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003), 11, 25, Intersubjectivity "allows us to avoid both theories rooted in social determinism . . . and visions of an individualistic, atomized social order."; see also T.J. Jackson Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony," 570, "Spontaneous philosophy embodies all sorts of sentiments and prejudices that have private, subjective meanings apart from the public realm of power relations, yet it can never be divorced entirely from that realm."

To this end, Christopher D’Addario argues that many early modern exiles did not see “their removal from the homeland as an irreversible step but rather a temporary withdrawal.”⁷⁴⁴ Many expected that they would one day return to the community that had cast them out, and indeed many did. In his *Commentary on Hosea*, for example, John Calvin even argued that God had offered redemption to His people not only “from Babylonian exile,” but also “from hell itself.”⁷⁴⁵ This perceived ability to overcome adversity and return to the promised land encouraged contemporaries to seek out validation of their own unique place among God’s elect, sometimes through dramatic acts. This idea was also reinforced in Joost van den Vondel (1587-1679)’s *Lucifer* (1654), in which Lucifer (who would be driven from heaven) expresses his unhappiness with serving man, to which Gabriel responds, “Accept your fate! Your dignity’s God-given, like your state.”⁷⁴⁶ Lucifer, however, rejects Gabriel’s order. His defiance is best understood in the words of Noel Clark, who contends that Vondel’s *Lucifer* is “a play about human nature, the clash between obedience and free will.”⁷⁴⁷ Similar notions of individual agency in the face of banishment are evident in John Milton (1608-1674)’s *Paradise Lost* (1667), which, like *Lucifer*, demonstrated that even Satan, and his second archangel in command, Beelzebub, were unconvinced that they would remain in Hell forever:

For who can yet believe, though after loss,
That all these puissant legions, whose exile
Hath emptied Heav’n, shall fail to re-ascend
Self-raised, and repossess their native seat?⁷⁴⁸

⁷⁴⁴ Christopher D’Addario, *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 90.

⁷⁴⁵ John Calvin, *Commentary on Hosea* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1816), chapter 1, prayer lecture 3.

⁷⁴⁶ Justus “Joost” van den Vondel, *Lucifer*, translated by Noel Clark, (London: Oberon Books, 1990), 45.

⁷⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁷⁴⁸ John Milton, *Paradise Lost* (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1850), 35, verses 631-634.

The recurring themes of exiles desiring to return to their former community reinforced two important notions: first, the positional superiority of the community itself, which might be understood as a pristine and sacred space, complete with all the accoutrements of divine providence. This theme was often displayed through the combination of biblical narratives and patriotic rhetoric.⁷⁴⁹ And second, the mystery surrounding God's plan, as it was never explicitly clear who would receive His grace. In some cases it was actually the exile who was believed to have been saved. This was the plot of Vondel's play, *Gysbreght van Aemstel* (1637), which recounts the half-real, half-imagined story of the fall of Amsterdam around 1300 and the divinely ordained exile of Amsterdam's old ruling family.⁷⁵⁰ As was demonstrated in both Vondel's and Milton's works, even the most dangerous of God's spiritual enemies, Lucifer/Satan and Beelzebub, were unsure of what the future held. The truly devout militant Calvinists of the day, therefore, lived in a sort of Odyssean-like state of reality, constantly on the lookout for signs of God's providence as they traversed, or were divinely pulled toward the city of their destiny - Rome in the classical sense, or perhaps Amsterdam in the Dutch context.⁷⁵¹

Stories like these, involving loss and redemption would have been especially poignant for Udinck, who, by the spring of 1665, was desperate to return to Groningen. Dishonor, insecurity, and financial hardship had increasingly become the arc of his life in exile. In many ways his misfortune resembled the parables of Jesus, didactic tales which he himself read in church on 10 April 1665 and again on 11 June 1665.⁷⁵² Perhaps he, too, saw himself as one of God's lost

⁷⁴⁹ See for example, Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*.

⁷⁵⁰ Joost van den Vondel, *Gysbreght van Aemstel*, Mieke B. Smits-Veldt ed., (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994).

⁷⁵¹ Regarding themes of the Odyssey, in terms of seventeenth-century Dutch knowledge of ancient texts, literary form, travel accounts, and as a template for adventurers' worldview, see Kees Boterbloem, *The Fiction and Reality of Jan Struys: A Seventeenth-Century Dutch Globetrotter* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).

⁷⁵² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 10 April 1665 and 11 June 1665; the parables of the Lost Sheep, Lost Coin, and Prodigal Son appear in Luke 15:3-32 as well as an analogy of God in search of his lost sheep in Ezekiel 34:11-16.

sheep, as the prodigal son, or as an outcast who was determined, even at all costs, to recover his wealth, honor, and control of his own destiny. Like many of his contemporaries, he was constantly looking for signs of God's grace. As was mentioned in chapter four, he often drew inferences from the weather and health, but money could also be an important signifier of one's spiritual well-being. Many of Udinck's financial investments, however, were still firmly tethered to the city that had cast him out. Without this money, his life would become consumed with hardship, and as he would soon discover. As long as he remained in Neuenhaus, and in exile, managing his financial affairs would be nearly impossible.

DEFAULT RISKS

On 31 May 1664, Udinck recorded in his diary that he had approximately 784 guilders in cash in his possession, the majority of which Janneke had recently brought with her from Groningen.⁷⁵³ This may at first glance seem like a significant sum, but over the course of daily life and running his trade as a tailor, which required him to maintain an inventory of fabrics, buttons, and other materials, this money probably would not have lasted long. By the end of 1664 and throughout 1665 Udinck began experiencing a number of pressing economic concerns, most of which were still deeply intertwined with the city of Groningen. He had investments housed in the city, he was owed money by a number of individuals still residing in the city, and he owned a house along the *Oude Kijk in het Jatstraat*, a well-known street in a popular neighborhood just northwest of the city's center and a stone's throw away from the University of Groningen.⁷⁵⁴ In particular he repeatedly expressed his frustration regarding two soldiers, Captain Hubert Struuck, and to a lesser degree Cornett Berent Eeck, both of whom owed Udinck

⁷⁵³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 31 May 1664.

⁷⁵⁴ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxvi.

significant sums of money.⁷⁵⁵ It is not entirely clear how or why, but it seems that these men had accumulated substantial debts, perhaps as high as 4,000 guilders, but had paid virtually nothing.⁷⁵⁶

On many occasions during his exile, Udinck also voice his concern regarding the questionable characters who served as Groningen's financial clerks, all of whom worked under the purview of an unscrupulous *ontvanger-generaal* (receiver-general), Hendrik van Royen.⁷⁵⁷ These men operated out of the province of Groningen's *Collecthuis*, later renamed the *Goudkantoor* (Gold Office), a building that was constructed in 1635 and still stands behind the city's *Stadhuis*. Above the entrance, a centuries-old sign remains which reads: "*Date Caesaris quae sunt Caesaris*" (Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's).⁷⁵⁸ This passage, which stems from the biblical verse found in Matthew 22:21, emphasizes the ancient, yet critical, linkage between political, economic, and religious authorities. Just as the tribute money referenced in the corresponding biblical passage was stamped with Caesar's image, seventeenth-century guilders were stamped with the insignias of the Dutch ruling elites. In both cases, the purpose was to emphasize to the taxpayers (either the citizenry in Groningen, or the Jews in the biblical verse) the legitimacy of their tax collectors and other secular leaders. The second part of Matthew 22:21, which is intentionally absent from the sign in Groningen, but was certainly well known in Udinck's day, instructs Christians to also render "unto God the things that are God's." Through these verses, Christians were reminded that all authority stems from God, including the secular authorities who govern their daily lives. The sign, therefore, functioned as an important

⁷⁵⁵ See also chapter three: Captain Struuck and his soldiers were the ones who originally arrested Udinck in December 1662.

⁷⁵⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 21 April 1665, 10 July 1665.

⁷⁵⁷ GrA, Lijst van ontvangers-generaal, Hendrik van Royen was ontvanger-generaal from 1649 until May 1664, and Cornelis van Royen was ontvanger-generaal from May 1664 until 1671; see also Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 59-60.

⁷⁵⁸ <http://www.staatingroningen.nl/230/het-goudkantoor> last accessed 13 October 2018.

hegemonic device, combining an explicit message and an implicit biblical reference in order to promote secular and spiritual obedience. However, throughout the 1660s Udinck called into question the legitimacy of this financial institution, and perhaps even the utility of these messages, when a number of financial clerks were caught stealing from various accounts.

One of these clerks, Paulus van der Marck, had been appointed by Osebrand Rengers in 1658, and was closely aligned with the broader Ommelander party as well as the guilds in Groningen.⁷⁵⁹ There were also familial ties as Van der Marck had married into the Van Royen family.⁷⁶⁰ In the mid-1660s, a number of scandals involving these bookkeepers began to surface. The most significant occurred in 1665, when Hendrik van Royen was forced to resign as receiver-general after an audit revealed that over 200,000 guilders had gone missing, for which he could not account.⁷⁶¹ In the course of this investigation, another of Van Royen's clerks, Geert Lubbers (probably the same Lubbers from chapter three who was circulating disparaging rumors suggesting that Udinck's sister-in-law was harboring fugitives in her bedroom), was accused of stealing some 135,037 Caroliguilders from the *Groene Weeshuis*, one of Groningen's orphanages.⁷⁶² These were enormous sums of money. Soon afterwards, still in 1665, another clerk, Jeremias Mees, as well as the ringleader, Hendrik van Royen, were indicted and placed under arrest.⁷⁶³ Van Royen himself died in prison two years later in 1667.⁷⁶⁴ Lubbers also passed

⁷⁵⁹ GrA, Lijst van ontvangers-generaal; see also Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 59-60.

⁷⁶⁰ GrA, Algemeen doopboek 1640-1657, archiefnummer 124, Inv. 146, Paulus van der Marck married Cunne van Royen.

⁷⁶¹ GrA, Toegang 2170, *Kort en oprecht verhael van t' gene, wegen de suyveringe der provinciale ontvangers Reekieninge voor de Ed. Moog. Heeren Gecommitteerde Staten van Stadt en Lande, en anders tusschen den afgetreden ontfanger Hendrick van Royen en Jeremias Mees en Geert Lubbertsz. Weduwe is voorgevallen* (Groningen: Jan Draper, 1665); see also K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

⁷⁶² GrA, Toegang 2169, *Anwysinge Van dat De pennigen soo uit de Provinciale Cassa werden vermisset, sijn wegh gekoomen door de quaade administratie van de gewesene Commijs Jeremias Mees Ende Clercq Geert Lubberts Dienende tot justificatie van den Afgetreden Ontfanger Hendrick van Royen, Dat hy gene Provinciale pennigen tot sijn profijt hebbe ge-diverteert* (Groningen, 1665); see also K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

⁷⁶³ Van Winter, *De Westindische Compagnie*, 263.

away in the midst of this scandal, probably in 1665 - he does not appear in the archives after this - leaving behind a number of unanswered questions.⁷⁶⁵ Stories of Van Royen's corrupt administration were well known throughout Groningen, thanks in part to their reverberation via two pamphlets, *Aanwijzing van de penningen soo uit de provinciale casse vermisst* (Designation of the coins missing from the provincial register) and *Wagenpraatjes* (Wagon Talks).⁷⁶⁶

After Hendrik van Royen's arrest, his son Cornelis van Royen took over as receiver-general, but it appears that the apple did not fall far from the tree; soon after he was also implicated in a series of financial crimes. In 1667, the younger van Royen was found guilty of an "illegal sale of an enclosure north of the *ossemarkt*" in the amount of 4,000 guilders, and the buyer in that transaction was none other than Paulus van der Marck.⁷⁶⁷ It is not entirely clear whether these men had attempted to profit from embezzled funds and were caught in a failed money laundering attempt. Nor is it clear what type of punishment was implemented, although it cannot have been very harsh as both continued to work and live in the city. Cornelis van Royen served as the receiver-general until 1671 and Van der Marck appears in the archives in 1668 and again in 1670 when he was ordered to pay various debt holders.⁷⁶⁸

Udinck was aware of the dubious nature of these clerks, and understood that large sums of money, investments, and other accounting activity within the city would inevitably flow through their office. On 19 November 1664 he wrote a letter to his niece Maria warning her that

⁷⁶⁴ K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

⁷⁶⁵ GrA, 1501, archiefnummer 214, Inv. 2, 1665, in the archives, Geert Lubbers' wife, Jantijn Rotgers, appears as "de weduwe van Geert Lubbers," beginning in 1665, implying that Lubbers himself had passed away in the midst of this scandal.

⁷⁶⁶ GrA, Toegang 2170, *Kort en oprecht verhael*; see also K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

⁷⁶⁷ Hendrikus Oktavius Feith, *Register van het archief van Groningen, Vol. 4* (Groningen: A.L. Scholtens, 1856), 194.

⁷⁶⁸ GrA, Lijst van ontvangers-generaal, Cornelis van Royen was ontvanger-generaal from May 1664 until 1671; Hendrikus Oktavius Feith, *Register van het archief van Groningen, Vol. 4* (Groningen: A.L. Scholtens, 1856), 201.

“[Van] Royen, the clerk of the province, should not be trusted.”⁷⁶⁹ It seems that Udinck was concerned that the city council, and these clerks in particular, might confiscate money that they suspected was tied to him, believing - and rightfully so - that as an exile, Udinck would have no real recourse against them.

Struuck and Eeck may have had similar motivations. It seems that these two men had also taken advantage of Udinck’s vulnerable position as an exile, and had purposely avoided paying what they owed. This was certainly the sentiment expressed by Udinck. On 26 August 1664, he complained that neither Struuck nor Eeck had paid the money that they had promised.⁷⁷⁰ On 18 December 1664, Udinck sent a letter to his niece Maria again complaining that Struuck had still not paid what was owed to him.⁷⁷¹ A month later, in January 1665, Udinck lamented that, “this is now the third year that we have not received any interest and therefore we do not have enough [money] to buy bread.”⁷⁷² As winter turned to spring and then to summer, it seemed to Udinck that he was being strung along. On 21 April 1665, Struuck promised Udinck that he would pay what he owed in May.⁷⁷³ On 2 May 1665, while waiting for that payment, Udinck sent a sobering letter to Maria stating that: “I hope to receive the money from Struuck before the steward Van Royen invests it in the province,” because if he does, the lords of Groningen “will surely take it, and with it, my life.”⁷⁷⁴ On 15 May 1665, Maria replied to her uncle, letting him know that she had also spoken with Struuck, and that he had also promised her that he would pay in May; he did not.⁷⁷⁵

⁷⁶⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 November 1664.

⁷⁷⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 26 August 1664.

⁷⁷¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 18 December 1665.

⁷⁷² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 11 January 1665.

⁷⁷³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 21 April 1665.

⁷⁷⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 2 May 1665.

⁷⁷⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 May 1665.

For Udinck, the grim reality of the situation must have been setting in. On 10 July 1665, Udinck sent another letter to his niece Maria, lamenting that: “inevitably, the capital will be counted, and you can expect it to be invested in the office of Van Royen or in the offices of the city.”⁷⁷⁶ Increasingly, Udinck had become resigned to the fact that the city would not release his money, and although what was owed to him and what he had in possessions amounted to at least four thousand guilders, he lamented to his niece: “We will be fortunate to receive fifteen hundred.”⁷⁷⁷

Udinck’s suspicion of all of the aforementioned characters may have been well founded, but there is also evidence that at least some of these men were grappling with their own unique hardships. Struuck, for example, had married one Geertruida Fogelsangh in 1648, with whom he had eleven children.⁷⁷⁸ Struuck’s wife died in 1662, the same year that Udinck was first arrested, and his father, Jan Struuck, who served as the provincial secretary in Drenthe, died in 1665.⁷⁷⁹ From the archival record, it is clear that Struuck’s financial position had been in decline during this same period. He inherited his father’s estate in 1665, but it was deemed “*grasvellig*,” meaning that he was forced to sell it off in order to pay his debts.⁷⁸⁰ Udinck, however, would not benefit from that sale.

THE MARSHALING OF FORCES

Udinck’s remaining wealth and property were threatened on another front as well. In March 1665, England’s Charles II formally declared war on the Dutch Republic. The war against

⁷⁷⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 10 July 1665.

⁷⁷⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 10 July 1665.

⁷⁷⁸ *De Nederlandsche Leeuw* (1902), 91.

⁷⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁸⁰ Ibid.

England was fought entirely at sea, but in April 1665 witnesses in the eastern Low Countries and northwestern Germany were reporting a growing military presence in and around Münster. There, the prince-bishop Christoph Bernhard von Galen was ramping up an invasion force aimed at the eastern Netherlands. On 9 April 1665, Udinck himself wrote a letter to his cousin in Amsterdam, Gerard Luycken, reporting that Münster seemed poised to attack.⁷⁸¹ This prediction was hardly groundbreaking. Since 1663, tensions had been rising between the Dutch Republic and Von Galen, who had long claimed that the Catholic population in the eastern provinces fell under the authority of the bishop of Münster as their spiritual leader.⁷⁸² Of course, Von Galen was motivated by more than his Catholic faith. There had been the conflict about the Dijlerschans and even more important, Von Galen was eager to expand his principality in order to become one of the key princes of the empire.

With promises of financial assistance from England and the diplomatic guile of Sir William Temple, the prince-bishop of Münster had amassed an army of some 20,000 mercenaries.⁷⁸³ Although Temple's initial objective in the Low Countries was to "cement an *anti-Dutch alliance*," over the course of the 1660s he grew increasingly fond of Dutch virtues, liberty, and industry, viewpoints that he openly expressed years later in his work, *Observations upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands* (1672).⁷⁸⁴ Despite his later praise, most English polemics throughout the second half of the century described the Dutch accumulation of wealth and power, not as the fruits of hard work, but as the result of deceit, misdeeds, greed, and the

⁷⁸¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 9 April 1665.

⁷⁸² Gijs Rommelse, *The Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667): Reason D'état, Mercantilism and Maritime Strife* (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2006), 111; See also Pieter Geyl, *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century, Part Two, 1648-1715* (London: Ernest Benn, 1964), 56.

⁷⁸³ C Brinkman, "Charles II and the Bishop of Münster in the Anglo-Dutch War of 1665-6," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 21, No. 84, (October 1906), 686-698: 688-689.

⁷⁸⁴ Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 48.

Dutch rejection of the natural political order (i.e., the rejection of monarchy). This last point was especially relevant following Charles II's restoration to the English throne in 1660.⁷⁸⁵ Despite the "True Freedom," which was generally favored by the Dutch regents, most of the commoners and middling sort in the Netherlands still longed for the restoration of a powerful stadholder from the House of Orange who had "descended from the Father of the Fatherland."⁷⁸⁶ Willem III, Charles II's own nephew, however, was at this point still a teenager and so this popular desire would take time to remedy.

In the meantime, Charles II and Bernhard von Galen attempted to exploit this perceived Dutch weakness. The Münsterite army that was formed in 1665 was part of a secret two-pronged military strategy intended to overrun the Republic with attacks by sea from England and by land from Münster.⁷⁸⁷ The buildup of such a large adversarial force was nearly impossible to conceal. The leading authorities in Holland recognized their enemies' plans, but were simply too preoccupied with the naval conflicts against England to adequately respond to Von Galen's threats on land. As Jonathan Israel surmised, those in the eastern provinces of Groningen, Overijssel and Drenthe knew full well that "no one else was going to protect them from the quarrelsome and militantly Counter-Reformationary prince-bishopric or any other powerful eastern neighbor."⁷⁸⁸

The first significant military engagement of what would later be deemed the Second Anglo-Dutch War took place at sea between the English and Dutch at the Battle of Lowestoft on 13 June 1665. The battle was an overwhelming victory for the English, and allowed the English fleet to take control of the English Channel. It also emboldened the prince-bishop and his

⁷⁸⁵ Ibid., 49.

⁷⁸⁶ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 758.

⁷⁸⁷ Parrott, *The Business of War*, 281.

⁷⁸⁸ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 770.

military commanders to move forward with their land-based attack. In the weeks that followed, rumors of a growing army in Münster circulated broadly throughout the Republic, fueled in part by a number of letters dispatched from the Dutch/German borderlands to The Hague.⁷⁸⁹

A year earlier, Willem Frederik had also written to The Hague expressing concerns about the prince-bishop, and that a number of the other German princes looked at Von Galen with suspicion and distrust. He wrote that many German electors and princes appear to publicly support the prince-bishop, but in private they “desire that . . . his wings would be clipped.”⁷⁹⁰ In late July 1665 The Hague sent Colonel Arent Jurrien van Haersolte (d. 1672) to Germany to begin recruiting auxiliary troops to help defend the eastern border, but their effect was limited as De Witt remained hesitant to support a full-blown military confrontation against Münster.⁷⁹¹ In the meantime, the sparsely populated and poorly defended eastern provinces would have to fend off the enemy as best they could.

In August 1665, as Münster continued to prepare for war, Udinck was still in Neuenhaus, where he received news from Amsterdam, (and read himself in the *Couranten*) that ten Dutch East India ships had stopped temporarily in the port of Bergen, Norway on their return voyage from Batavia.⁷⁹² They had sailed north around Scotland in order to avoid the English Channel, where a large contingent of English ships had remained since the Battle of Lowestoft. While in the harbor of Bergen, the Dutch fleet came under attack by the English fleet. The Battle of Vågen, or the Battle of Bergen, as it came to be known, was skewed in favor for the Dutch by an unforeseen logistical obstacle. Days earlier, and unbeknownst to the Dutch fleet or the Norwegian garrison in Bergen, a secret military alliance was formed between England and

⁷⁸⁹ See for example Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 416.

⁷⁹⁰ Ibid., 417.

⁷⁹¹ Ibid., 419.

⁷⁹² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 22 August 1665.

Denmark/Norway. At this early stage of the alliance, however, only a verbal agreement was finalized, and the written stipulations inherent within it had not yet been forwarded to the Norwegian soldiers. As a result, the Norwegian commanders in Bergen believed themselves to be a neutral power, and ultimately made the executive decision to assist the Dutch, which contributed heavily to the Dutch victory there.⁷⁹³

Udinck read that the battle had left many casualties on both sides, and that his own nephew, the Vice-Admiral Jacob Borghorst (Borchorst), was among the wounded. In his diary, Udinck wrote that his nephew “was serving on his second trip with the East India [Company] as Vice-Admiral when to his misfortune, in that skirmish with the English, he was shot in the leg.”⁷⁹⁴ Years later, Wouter Schouten (1638-1704), a surgeon aboard the VOC ship *Rijzende Zon*, published a popular travel account titled the *Oost-Indische voyagie* (1676), which provides Schouten’s own first-hand account of the Battle of Bergen, including descriptions of those to whom he provided medical attention. One of his patients was Udinck’s nephew, Jacob Borghorst, who, according to Schouten, had been “gravely ill.”⁷⁹⁵ Borghorst survived the battle and continued to serve in the VOC, most notably as a commander of the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa from 1668 until 1670, when he returned to the Republic due to poor health.⁷⁹⁶

Following the Dutch victory at Bergen, the surviving Dutch ships were escorted back to the Republic by Michiel de Ruyter’s fleet, which was returning from the Americas. Poor weather delayed their travels, but on the afternoon of 6 August 1665, De Ruyter, along with nineteen ships - twelve warships, a supply ship called *De Kameel* (The Camel), five English prizes, and a

⁷⁹³ J.R. Jones, *The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Longman, 1996), 160-163.

⁷⁹⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 246, 22 August 1665.

⁷⁹⁵ Wouter Schouten, *Woutern Schoutens Oost-Indische voyagie; vervattende veel voorname voorvallen en ongemeene vreemde geschiedenissen* . . . (Amsterdam: Jacob van Meurs en Johannes van Someren, 1676), 227.

⁷⁹⁶ Molhuysen and Blok, *Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, Deel 3, 145.

merchant ship from Rotterdam called *Het Hart* (The Hart) - arrived at the Groningen port in Delfzijl.⁷⁹⁷ Before his arrival, many in the Republic were aware that De Ruyter was en route back to the Republic, but no one had heard from him in weeks and rumors had begun to circulate that that he might have been captured or killed at sea. Therefore, his arrival in Delfzijl was a surprise, albeit a welcomed one, which bolstered Dutch morale and called for a grand celebration. In his expansive work, *Het Leven en Bedryf van den Heere Michiel de Ruiter*, the seventeenth-century historian Gerard Brandt (1626-1685) described the jubilation:

The fleet was welcomed with the firing of the artillery, and the Commander of Delfzijl, named [Gerard] Schay, greeted De Ruyter and congratulated him on his happy return . . . From morning to night, men and women came by the hundreds, indeed the thousands, to see De Ruyter, his fleet, and the captured English ships. In an incredible demonstration of gratitude, they came from the city, from villages, and from the countryside; burghers and farmers alike came out and attempted to catch a glimpse.⁷⁹⁸

The celebration lasted for several days, sending a wave of patriotic fervor across Groningen. Gerard Schay also sent a short letter to the provincial estates of Groningen informing them of De Ruyter's arrival.⁷⁹⁹ For the Dutch, De Ruyter's return was nothing less than miraculous. This sentiment reverberated in Schay's letter and was made even more evident by the fact that the fleet had only a few days worth of provisions remaining, and no drinking water.⁸⁰⁰ The return was also a severe blow to the English. In August 1665, Samuel Pepys wrote in his diary that, "De Ruyter is come home, with all his fleete, which is very ill newes,

⁷⁹⁷ Gerard Brandt, *Het Leven en Bedryf van den Heere Michiel de Ruiter, Hertog, Ridder & L. Admiraal Generaal van Hollandt en Westvrieslandt* (Amsterdam, 1687), 388-389.

⁷⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁹ Nationaal Archief te Den Haag, Staten-Generaal, nr. 5587, 1665 augustus.

⁸⁰⁰ Ibid.; Brandt, *Het Leven en Bedryf van den Heere Michiel de Ruiter*, 388-389; see also Van Vliet, 'vriendelijke groetenisse', 44.

considering the charge we have been at in keeping a fleet to the northward so long, besides the great expectation of snapping him.”⁸⁰¹

Despite all of the Dutch cheers, and English grumbles, regarding the Dutch victory at sea and De Ruyter’s miraculous homecoming, the situation for the land army was less optimistic. Since mid-century, De Witt and Holland’s regents had supported a strategy that promoted aggression at sea while maintaining a defensive stance on land, calling up soldiers on somewhat short notice and only when they perceived an immediate need for them. Holland’s regents recognized the importance of maritime commerce, and in the absence of an adult stadholder who had always championed the army as its supreme commanders (whereas they only nominally commanded the navy), the regents continually diverted money and military resources away from the land army and toward the navy.

On the one hand, the expansion and strengthening of the Dutch fleet was an obvious need following the Dutch naval losses during the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654). After the naval revolution of the 1650s and 1660s, “the Amsterdam naval shipyard became the second biggest production facility [of ships] within the Dutch Republic, surpassed only by the VOC shipyard.”⁸⁰² On the other hand, this policy also created significant hardships for disbanded soldiers, most of whom were already short on money, education and opportunity. In the two years following the Peace of Westphalia (1648) the number of garrison soldiers was reduced by two-thirds, payments for housing soldiers were cut in half, and beer excise taxes declined.⁸⁰³ The

⁸⁰¹ <https://www.pepysdiary.com/diary/1665/08/> last accessed on 22 June 2018.

⁸⁰² Brandon, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State*, 139.

⁸⁰³ ‘t Hart, *The Dutch Wars of Independence*, 96; see also, Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 614. Israel writes that in Breda, “one of the towns hardest hit, the value of the tax-farm for the beer excise slumped from 21,000 guilders in 1641 to only 9,800 in 1655 . . . In all the garrison towns, almost every activity - tailoring, saddle-, boot-, and belt-making, innkeeping, prostitution, and not least construction and repairs on the fortifications - was drastically curtailed. An uncle of Vermeer, a military supplier and engineer, who worked at various strongholds in the 1630s and 1640s, was bankrupt within two years of the peace of Münster.”

civic guards, once renowned for their patriotism and military prowess, had by mid-century largely become social clubs, institutions through which wealthy burghers could appoint their children to officer posts.⁸⁰⁴ The rank-and-file soldier suffered in both perception and reality. Popular culture from this period often depicted soldiers as drunkards, gamblers, or idlers who slept of their hangovers in inns, taverns or alleyways, and thus neglected their duties because they were presumably unable or unwilling to protect the country.⁸⁰⁵

MISERY LOVES COMPANY: WAR AND POVERTY

While Udinck clearly displayed respect and admiration for military officers, he seems to have regarded the common foot soldier with a mix of contempt and disgust. He himself recognized and had remarked on the horrendous condition of the Dutch soldiers who passed through Neuenhaus in 1664 (see chapter five), but he also complained that he had been harassed by some of them. This first occurred with Dutch soldiers in Groningen in December 1662 (see chapter three), and he had further run-ins with German soldiers in Neuenhaus during the spring and summer of 1665.⁸⁰⁶ Unlike the soldiers on the Dutch side, especially the officers with whom Udinck had established some sort of longstanding clientage-patronage relationships, the soldiers from Münster seem to have been openly hostile to him.⁸⁰⁷

On 9 April 1665, Udinck wrote a letter to his cousin, Gerard Luyken, in Amsterdam, one of the few surviving records that clearly displays Udinck's distress regarding the impending war:

⁸⁰⁴ David Kunzle, *From Criminal to Courtier: The Soldier in Netherlandish Art, 1550-1672*, Leiden: Brill, 2002, 585.

⁸⁰⁵ See for example, Carel Fabritius, *The Sentry* (1654); Gerard ter Borch, *Woman Drinking with a Sleeping Soldier* (mid-seventeenth century), and *Guard Room with a Sleeping Soldier* (1652-1653), reflect the decline in soldiers' prestige, a trend that began following the First Anglo-Dutch War (1652-1654) when the Dutch renewed their efforts to strengthen their navy.

⁸⁰⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 9 April 1665.

⁸⁰⁷ Ibid.

The English war brings here great changes and also dire times. It is scary to think that Holland might lose the battle, God forbid . . . Until now, we have been living on hope that some change in our affairs in the province might occur. The hope now begins to disappear . . . We have been threatened by several soldiers, many of whom here say that the German princes will have a great deal of power, so we ourselves should not expect happiness. We would then be compelled to go to Overijssel and then to Campen, or elsewhere, because we have lost hope of any restitution in Groningen.⁸⁰⁸

The letter is significant in that it clearly expresses Udinck's dismay with the war, his desire for Holland to achieve victory, and his belief that they would not be happy living under a Catholic prince. Between April and September 1665, Udinck continued to express similar concerns, most of which oscillated around three main topics: his fears of the impending war, his desire to return to Groningen, and his frustrations regarding uncollected interest and principal payments. On 21 April 1665, in a mix of frustration and cynicism, Udinck wrote: "I understand that the citizens' expenses are increasing"- a reference to the rising chimney money (property taxes in Groningen) which were used to help fund the Dutch military response - "such are the fruits of the English war."⁸⁰⁹ On 29 June 1665, Udinck wrote to Luycken again lamenting his lack of progress in negotiating the return of his investments with the Groningen authorities:

I am heartbroken, but the Groningers who have envied my prosperity will not allow me to return and correct this. With all-knowing God as my witness in my innocence, they [the Groningen authorities] have forged so much anger and continue to leach from me . . . And without reason or cause, call me Godless. Such is the case with my sentence; when the soldiers are gone, our cock [perhaps a pejorative for Von Galen] will become king. Against this, I can only take all-knowing God as my witness and follow His plan for my life.⁸¹⁰

By attempting to navigate between two ideologically opposed and outwardly hostile powers (i.e., Groningen and Münster), neither of which he could wholly claim as his own, Udinck had ultimately made himself an enemy to both. This sense of not belonging permeated

⁸⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 21 April 1665.

⁸¹⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 June 1665.

into the local community as well. On 14 July 1665, he wrote that he had gone for a walk by himself around 5 o'clock that evening, whereupon his neighbor, a man named Clemens, snuck up on him, struck him "from behind with his [walking] stick," and then called him "a scoundrel."⁸¹¹ Udinck replied, "I am an honorable man," to which Clemens responded, "You're a scoundrel. Go back to Prince Willem and the other villains in Groningen."⁸¹² Udinck replied: "You speak like a drunken man. In the morning I will lodge my complaint with the Judge in Veldhuisen."⁸¹³ The next morning, "Clemens left for Zwolle."⁸¹⁴ He is not mentioned again in the diary and so it is difficult to say if Udinck ever followed through on his threat to report the assault. It is also unclear why Clemens went to Zwolle. His trip may have been pre-planned, but more likely he was following thousands of other people from these parts who were attempting to outrun the war. Udinck himself remarked on 25 July 1665 that, "the people here [in Neuenhaus] are very much afraid, because the Bishop of Münster has so many soldiers, and they say that on the first opportunity the people will flee, not knowing where they will go."⁸¹⁵

Udinck was also unsure of where the war would take him. On 12 August 1665, he wrote a letter to his wife, expressing his fear of what the war might bring: "[I] hope that the Bishop of Münster will allow us to live here in peace."⁸¹⁶ His hopes were soon dashed. On the evening of 23 August 1665, some 1,300 of the prince-bishop's troops arrived in Steinfurt, where Udinck's niece Geertruit was required to quarter and care for eight of them.⁸¹⁷ Days later, Von Galen dispatched an envoy to The Hague, outlining his demands, and threatening war if those demands were not met.

⁸¹¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 14 July 1665.

⁸¹² Ibid.

⁸¹³ Ibid.

⁸¹⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 July 1665.

⁸¹⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 25 July 1665.

⁸¹⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 August 1665.

⁸¹⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 30 August 1665, Udinck recalls the events of the previous week.

When Von Galen's envoy arrived in The Hague in mid-September 1665, they repeated the prince-bishop's earlier claims that the Catholics in the eastern provinces fell under his spiritual authority. He demanded restitution for the Dijlerschans and argued that the Dutch town of Borculo also belonged to Münster.⁸¹⁸ Included with the envoy was a letter written by Von Galen that emphasized that the Dutch seizure of the Dijlerschans was especially concerning because it took place while his forces were fighting "against the common enemy, the Turk."⁸¹⁹ Von Galen went on to write: "Nor must it be omitted how in the year 1616 you did against all rights, invade our territory of Borculo with other places belonging to us, of which you still most injuriously retain the possession."⁸²⁰ Von Galen concluded his letter with a warning that if restitution, or at a minimum a letter stating Dutch intentions, was not dispatched immediately, then: "[o]ur forces have order to be in readiness, and we must protest that we are innocent of all the mischiefs which may happen."⁸²¹ Von Galen did not wait for a response. His army was already advancing through northwestern Germany and on 21 September 1665, his soldiers marched into Twente.⁸²²

This was the point of no return for Udinck. He could no longer sit on the fence between these competing powers, and so he made the fateful decision to flee back to the Dutch Republic. Presumably, he believed that it was safer to take his chances with the authorities in Drenthe, than to remain in Münsterland, Bentheim, or travel deeper in the German hinterland where his possessions, and perhaps even his life, could be snatched up by the invading army. It was not only the 20,000 mercenaries that Udinck feared, although this alone would be enough to cause

⁸¹⁸ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 420; see also Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 770.

⁸¹⁹ Christoph Bernhard von Galen, *A Letter Sent by His Highness the Bishop & Prince of Munster to the Lords [of] the States General of the United Netherlands* (Command, 1665), 8.

⁸²⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁸²¹ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁸²² Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 420, Münster's army was under the command of Major-General Johann Georg Gorgas.

concern for any prudent person. There was an equally populous military train that accompanied the army.

The *Troß*, as it was known to seventeenth-century German soldiers, contained all of those things that one might expect a military caravan and encampment to have: weapons, armor, food, pack animals, clothing, equipment, cooks, doctors, sutlers, and various others who either helped maintain the effectiveness of the army, or simply sought to profit from it.⁸²³ In terms of the *Troß*'s relative numbers, Johann Jacob von Wallhausen's 1617 *Krijghskonst te Voet* explained that, "among three thousand German soldiers you will undoubtedly have four thousand prostitutes, valets and others serving the army."⁸²⁴ Likewise, in their commentary on the Army of Flanders in 1622, the pastors of Bergen-op-Zoom proclaimed that never before had they seen "such a long tail on such a small body."⁸²⁵ Billeting and lodging records of a Walloon *tercio* under Count Hennin in 1629 also indicated that it was composed of at least 28 percent women, many of whom actively participated in plundering.⁸²⁶ And in 1683, the Scottish soldier Sir James Turner complained that the large number of camp followers, particularly women and boys, "renders a march, slow, uneasie and troublesome," and for this reason, "the *Latins* gave baggage

⁸²³ Parrott. *The Business of War*. 167. "The communal and social life of the troops continued to focus upon the *Troß*, with its women, sutlers, servants and the facilities for drinking, eating, playing and socializing. This still provided local opportunities to sell pillaged goods, borrow money, pursue crafts and skills acquired outside military life, and to live domestically with wives, children or the camp women . . . the centrality of this structure of the *Troß* to maintaining regimental identity, keeping long-serving soldiers in the ranks by providing them with a focus for their social and emotional lives, was simply too great to risk substantial changes or draconian restrictions."

⁸²⁴ Barton C. Hacker. "Women and Military Institutions in Early Modern Europe: A Reconnaissance." *Signs* 6, 1981, 643-671: 647.

⁸²⁵ Geoffrey Parker. *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659* Second Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). 150. 'such a small army with so many carts, baggage horses, nags, sutlers, lackeys, women, children and a rabble which numbered far more than the Army itself.'

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, 252. Parker cited figures from the AGRB *Audience* 2806, which indicates 1,043 soldiers and 289 women within this group. Parker argues that since these figures were based on billeting and lodging, they represent a minimum.

the right name of *Impedimenta*, hinderances.”⁸²⁷ Turner, however, also admitted that the military train, “the baggage,” was necessary for the success of the army, and without it, “an Army cannot subsist.”⁸²⁸

The reverse was also true - without the army, much of the “baggage” could not survive - because like the mercenaries, those who made up the *Troß* often relied on plunder to sustain themselves. The farmers, villagers and others who found themselves in the trajectory of these forces could expect only misery and total loss. Theft, violence, rape, and even murder were commonplace. For most, the army and its *Troß* were the personifications of an unnatural world - a world turned upside down - their aggression and violence being fueled by poverty, evil, desperation and self-serving greed.⁸²⁹ It was the fear for this horde - the soldiers, train, and others who accompanied them - that motivated Udinck to go back across the Dutch border.

A VAGUE BELIEF AND A POROUS BORDER

Another phenomenon contributing to Udinck’s flight was his own vague understanding of the various jurisdictions in the Dutch Republic. Udinck was told and certainly wanted to believe that not all of the provinces in the Dutch Republic recognized Groningen’s banishment orders from two years earlier. Udinck had long heard rumors that the provinces of Holland, Gelderland and Overijssel were not in the habit of enforcing other provinces’ banishment orders, while Drenthe was merely as an appendage through which one might traverse in order to reach

⁸²⁷ Sir James Turner, Knight. *Pallas Armata: Military Essayes of the Ancient Grecian, Roman, and Modern Art of War* (London: M.W. for Richard Chiswell, 1683), 274.

⁸²⁸ Ibid.

⁸²⁹ Hans Jacob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen. *The Runagate Courage*, translated by Robert L. Hiller and John C. Osborne, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965), 18-20. Hiller and Osborne describe the Baroque themes as the dangers of disturbing the harmony of nature, the proposition *mulier non homo* (women are not human beings), and the vanity of the finite world.

these safer provinces.⁸³⁰ Udinck had first discussed this notion with Willem Frederik in June 1664, and he repeatedly attempted to confirm his right to pass through these regions through family and friends, most notably in his correspondence with Gerard Luycken in Amsterdam.⁸³¹ Unfortunately, only a handful of these letters have survived and the detail within them sheds little light on the matter.

Udinck's decision to act on these assumptions was probably motivated by the rather porous nature of the border between the German county of Bentheim and the Dutch province of Drenthe. For years, Udinck's contact with the eastern Dutch provinces was primarily carried out through trade, and through written correspondence with family, friends and business associates. Be that as it may, Udinck also took a number of pragmatic steps to help ensure the security of his personal property, especially as the hostilities between Münster and the Republic continued to escalate. By August 1665, Udinck and his wife were systematically moving their household goods from Neuenhaus to Coevorden.⁸³² Throughout his journal entries in August and September 1665, Udinck expresses a sense of urgency and desperation that coincides with the prince-bishop's military activities. A day after having his wagons moved to Coevorden, he noted in his diary that the prince-bishop's army had gathered near Neuenhaus, and was advancing yet again.⁸³³ Udinck, it seems, was attempting to stay one step ahead of the plundering mercenaries.

On Tuesday, 29 August, Udinck left Neuenhaus with his cousin, the barber Tammo Bunninga, and two wagons.⁸³⁴ They travelled northwest to Escherbrügge, which was still in the German county of Bentheim, but on the Dutch border and within very close proximity to

⁸³⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 June 1665.

⁸³¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 9 April 1665, 29 June 1665.

⁸³² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 August 1665,

⁸³³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 25 August 1665.

⁸³⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 29 August 1665.

Coevorden.⁸³⁵ Udinck noted that throughout the morning the sky was dark and windy, and by the afternoon, heavy rains had turned the road into a muddy quagmire that repeatedly trapped their wagons.⁸³⁶ Despite the delay and ominous weather, they reached Escherbrügge around midday and Udinck spent the next seventeen days there. During his stay in Escherbrügge, Udinck remarked again that everyone was in fear: “all of the people are fleeing with their best goods to the larger towns, such as Deventer, Kampen, Zwolle, and Coevorden.”⁸³⁷ On 5 September 1665, Udinck was visited by his old landlord, Henrick Cottich, who explained that his brother was forced to quarter six of the bishop’s soldiers, and that Cottich himself was fleeing to Laar.⁸³⁸ Like so many others in this region, Udinck was also fleeing. During his time in Escherbrügge, he busied himself with the various logistics involved with returning to the Republic, and his journal entries throughout September 1665 describe a daily life that was consumed with sending and receiving letters, planning the delivery of his valuables, and contacting Dutch authorities in order to gain permission to return.

On 6 September 1665, Udinck met with Rijke Tijmens, who passed along a message from his cousin Bunninga and the *schulte* (sheriff) of Coevorden, “Monsor Camerling,” (Mr. [Roelof] Camerling), regarding his request for permission to travel through Drenthe.⁸³⁹ As *schulte*, or *schout*, Roelof Camerling was responsible for various administrative and legal duties, including serving as the secretary of the city council and acting as a sort of sheriff or police chief in charge of maintaining public order.⁸⁴⁰ The position and title of *schulte* was awarded by the

⁸³⁵ Ibid.

⁸³⁶ Ibid.

⁸³⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 30 August 1665.

⁸³⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 5 September 1665.

⁸³⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 September 1665.

⁸⁴⁰ For example, see <http://geschiedenis.coevorden.nl/coevorden/picardtreks/christiaan-mensingh-een-coevorder-schulte-uit-picardts-tijd> regarding the various duties that a *schulte* was expected to perform. Last accessed on 12 July 2017.

drost (bailiff, or leading noble) and therefore carried with it significant prestige. Furthermore, Camerling held this position for over twenty-five years, from 1660 until 1685.⁸⁴¹ His tenure stretched some seventeen years after the death of the *drost* of Drenthe, Rutger van den Boetzelaer (1578-1668), who had appointed him, and throughout some of the Republic's most turbulent times, suggesting that Camerling had earned the respect of the nobles who employed him.⁸⁴²

Camerling advised Udinck to make his way to the outskirts of Coevorden, where he would be met by a group of soldiers on horseback, who would allow Udinck to continue into town.⁸⁴³ Udinck did as he was instructed, and met a small contingent of soldiers led by one Captain Tijaerdt Eeck (the brother of the aforementioned Berent Eeck and brother-in-law of Van den Boetzelaer), who asked Udinck from where was he traveling and what was the nature of his business in Coevorden.⁸⁴⁴ After Udinck explained his intentions, the riders allowed him to continue to Camerling's office.⁸⁴⁵ From the archival record, it seems that Van den Boetzelaer had close political ties with the House of Orange, and that his office corresponded regularly with Willem Frederik and Albertine Agnes.⁸⁴⁶ Perhaps this gave Udinck some sense of security, but this was only a preliminary meeting and any formal authorization for Udinck to travel through Drenthe would require additional negotiations. Nevertheless, this first meeting provided Udinck with some valuable information.

⁸⁴¹ See *Nieuwe Drentsche Volksalmanak* Vol. 20 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1902), 142, regarding Camerling's tenure in this position.

⁸⁴² *Ibid.*

⁸⁴³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 September 1665.

⁸⁴⁴ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 September 1665; regarding family relationships see GrA, Inv. 1109, Catalogue 229.

⁸⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴⁶ See for example, Van Nienes and Bruggeman, *Archieven van de Friese Stadhouders*.

Weeks earlier, Udinck had heard a rumor that Dr. Harckens had been living in Drenthe, and that the lords of Groningen may well have known about it.⁸⁴⁷ If true, this could be promising for Udinck's chances of returning. Camerling, however, tempered this optimism with a different viewpoint, and in hindsight some valuable advice. He informed Udinck that the Deputies of Groningen were outraged by a letter that Udinck had sent to them earlier that month, presumably requesting permission to return.⁸⁴⁸ Camerling warned Udinck that the Deputies of Groningen were intensely bitter, and that there was absolutely no possibility that they would allow either himself or Dr. Harckens to return.⁸⁴⁹ Camerling was not the only one to warn Udinck. Herman Aepkens, a *hopman* (captain) in the service of both Coevorden and Groningen, also told Udinck that the "Gentlemen of Groningen are aware that Harckens is living in Vries," and "they want to snatch him up by the head."⁸⁵⁰ Udinck also received threats and warnings from those outside of formal political circles. While in Coevorden, he encountered a number of citizens from Groningen, who "spoke evil" to him.⁸⁵¹ In his diary, however, Udinck claimed that these people "had never read his sentence" and therefore did not understand the legal parameters of his banishment.⁸⁵² He also repeatedly claimed that he had put his "trust in all-knowing God," because God knew that he was innocent.⁸⁵³

Events moved rapidly over the next week as Udinck and his wife spoke to various military and legal experts regarding the possibility of Udinck repatriating back to Groningen, but

⁸⁴⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 12 August 1665.

⁸⁴⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 September 1665.

⁸⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁵⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 4 September 1665.

⁸⁵¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 9 September 1665, "*bösheit seggen*"

⁸⁵² Ibid.

⁸⁵³ Ibid.

as Udinck later explained, no advantage was gained through any of these discussions.⁸⁵⁴ Udinck admitted that he was not sure what to do. He lamented that he did not trust the regents in Groningen, but he felt compelled to do something, because they still had his money.⁸⁵⁵ Furthermore, there was no knowing what the impending war might bring.⁸⁵⁶ He explained that the soldiers were plundering and running off with everyone's goods. Even the *drost* of Twente was forced to flee overnight with his 200 sheep and horses in order to keep them out of the hands of the approaching army.⁸⁵⁷ Unsure of the best course of action, he asked Maria to contact her uncle for advice, although it is not entirely clear what he recommended.⁸⁵⁸

On 11 September, Udinck made a note in the margin of his journal that “the bishop’s people [i.e., soldiers] have left Steinfurt.”⁸⁵⁹ Udinck later wrote to Maria explaining that the bishop’s soldiers “had displaced many daughters and maidens throughout the peat kingdom, including Agnes Bertelinck,” whose parents had allowed soldiers to lodge with them only after they threatened to burn their house down.”⁸⁶⁰ Two days later, on 13 September, news came that Enschede, a town in the southeastern part of Overijssel, was plundered by the “*Bischops volck*.”⁸⁶¹ On 15 September, Udinck remarked that, “The rainy weather has returned,” clearly an ominous sign, and that “a party from Coevorden [likely Struuck’s detachment] has set off to

⁸⁵⁴ GrA Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 September 1665; see also GrA Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 9 September 1665, in a letter to Maria, Udinck wrote that, “U moÿe heeft Cap. Struuk gesproken mett weinig vordell undt van onse doent tot Groningen, als oÿck eens laten weeten.”

⁸⁵⁵ Ibid., “Deesen vertrouwe ick nochtans nÿdt veele, maar sÿ nochtans mÿn geldt qwÿt.”

⁸⁵⁶ Ibid., “Sullent derhalven alhÿr noch een weinig ansÿen, watt uÿdkompst ons den oerlog sall brengen.”

⁸⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁵⁸ Ibid., “Vorders sall u oom u well schrÿven watt eÿgentlÿck die oersaack sÿ van Dr. Harckens anschrÿven, als oÿck sÿn advÿs in mÿn saake.”

⁸⁵⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 11 September 1665.

⁸⁶⁰ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 September 1665, brief aan Maria, recalling the events of 11 September 1665. It is worth noting that Udinck warned Maria that she must not let anyone know that she had read this letter, and that she should “burn it in the fire.”

⁸⁶¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 13 September 1665.

engage the Bishop's army. We are no longer free in Escherbrügge.”⁸⁶² The following day, 16 September, Udinck travelled to Zweeloo, where he stayed until 25 September.⁸⁶³ It was during his stay in Zweeloo that Udinck claimed to have finally received permission from Van den Boetzelaer to travel freely throughout Drenthe.⁸⁶⁴ Udinck would later explain that he had not received anything in writing from the *drost*, but was given verbal authorization from Camerling, after paying him four “*Rijndalers*.”⁸⁶⁵

On 19 September, while still in Zweeloo, Udinck wrote a letter to his wife in Groningen, stating his intentions to remain in Drenthe with the “hope that Almighty God, through his intercession . . . might provide a little more liberty.”⁸⁶⁶ Udinck also explained that Captain Struuck's company had travelled to the Ommerschans, a small fortress in Overijssel, to reinforce the garrison there.⁸⁶⁷ Over the next week, Udinck noted almost daily reports that the prince-bishop's army was plundering the countryside throughout Overijssel and Drenthe.⁸⁶⁸ On 23 September, Udinck received a letter from his cousin in Coevorden, Bunninga, who stated that “Groningen is in chaos.”⁸⁶⁹ Indeed villagers in Groningen's countryside were quickly being overrun and those in the city feared an impending siege. Later that day more news came of the “great horrors that the Bishop's people had plundered Ter Apel and Roswinkel,” villages in Groningen and Drenthe, respectively, “where they broke all of the glass and took all of the

⁸⁶² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 15 September 1665.

⁸⁶³ Ibid.

⁸⁶⁴ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665, describing events from September 1665.

⁸⁶⁵ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 6 September 1665; Toegang 2041, Interrogators' notes regarding the examination of Udinck, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665; Udinck's account of this transaction in his journal matches the information that he provided to the interrogators; The contemporary exchange rate for “*Rijndalers*,” or Rhine thalers, to guilders was approximately 1:2 or 1:2.5, suggesting that the economic equivalency of this transaction was approximately eight or nine guilders.

⁸⁶⁶ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 19 September 1665.

⁸⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁶⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 22 and 23 September 1665.

⁸⁶⁹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 September 1665.

animals.”⁸⁷⁰ On the heels of this news, and knowing that his wife and niece were still in the city, Udinck sent three coffers filled with his finest goods from Coevorden to Groningen, and he sent two of his wagons to Assen, about 30 km north of Zweeloo.⁸⁷¹ Udinck himself followed a day or so later and remained in Assen with Maria’s uncle for about a week, until 1 or 2 October.⁸⁷²

CAPTURE

It is clear from the archival records in Groningen, that sometime between 1 and 4 October 1665, Udinck reunited with his old friend, Dr. Lucas Harckens, in the town of Vries.⁸⁷³ Although the exact dates, how this meeting was organized, and their intentions are not entirely clear, both men later provided statements confirming that they had planned to flee, probably to the county of Culemborg, in the province of Gelderland.⁸⁷⁴ For fleeing fugitives hoping to remain in the Dutch Republic, Culemborg was an ideal choice. Throughout the seventeenth century, and well into the eighteenth, Culemborg was one of a handful of *vrije heerlijkheden* (free lordships), safe havens that were considered part of the Republic, but retained almost complete legal autonomy over their citizens, residents, and visitors.⁸⁷⁵ For Udinck and Harckens, however, the road to freedom was literally and figuratively fraught with difficulties, and the prince-bishop’s army forced them to divert their course again and again.

By late September 1665, the invading Münsterite army was assaulting and plundering various towns, farms, and fortifications throughout the eastern Dutch Republic. The sparse

⁸⁷⁰ Ibid..

⁸⁷¹ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 22 and 23 September 1665.

⁸⁷² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 23 September 1665.

⁸⁷³ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665.

⁸⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁷⁵ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 340-341.

population in these regions could provide little resistance against such a massive force.⁸⁷⁶ On 21 September, the commander of the Republic's Army, (and former governor-general of Brazil), Johan Maurits van Nassau-Siegen (1604-1679), estimated that he had, at best, only 12,800 troops, who were spread out along the entire eastern frontier.⁸⁷⁷ The French envoy, Godefroi d'Estrades (1607-1686), complained too that the Dutch had about 8,000 of their best infantry soldiers aboard the fleet, and even suggested to his colleague, the French statesman Hugues de Lionne (1611-1671), that the States would be far better off if they brought the fleet home so that those men could join in the fight against Münster.⁸⁷⁸ On 27 September, the prince-bishop's army arrived in Borculo, where the Dutch garrison surrendered the following day.⁸⁷⁹ In an attempt to justify the garrison's capitulation, the Lord of Borculo, Count Otto of Limburg-Stirum, wrote to Johan Maurits, stating that "... in 24 hours under siege about 100 were killed and injured," thus surrender was the only viable option.⁸⁸⁰

On Sunday, 1 October, Udinck recorded in his diary that the bishop's people had attacked the Ommerschans in Overijssel.⁸⁸¹ The Ommerschans was originally constructed around 1625 at the expense of Groningen and Friesland in order to defend the main road through Overijssel, which ran through an otherwise inaccessible peat bog, from Spanish troops.⁸⁸² Since the end of the Eighty Years' War, however, the condition of the fort had deteriorated considerably, and by

⁸⁷⁶ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 374.

⁸⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 420.

⁸⁷⁸ Godefroi Louis Estrades (comte d'), Hugues de Lionne, France. Sovereign (1643-1715: Louis XIV), *Letters and Negotiations of the Count D'Estrades, Ambassador from Lewis XIV to the States-General of the United-Provinces of the Low-Countries from the Year 1663 to the Year 1669* (London: D. Browne, 1711), 133-134, Letter from Count d'Estrades to Mr. de Lionne, 8 October 1665.

⁸⁷⁹ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 421.

⁸⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸⁸¹ Gr.A, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 1 October 1665.

⁸⁸² See for example the Provincie Overijssel website: <http://www.overijssel.nl/thema%27s/cultuur/cultureel-erfgoed/archeologie/verdedigen/ommerschans/> accessed on 8 November 2017.

1665 it was hardly a formidable defense against the prince-bishop's army.⁸⁸³ Still, the surrounding swamps created a significant quagmire for the bishop's troops and the small garrison in the Ommerschans, consisting of some 250 musketeers and only two cannons, took advantage of the opportunity. As the prince-bishop's troops slugged through the bog, the garrison open fired on them, destroying some fifty wagons.⁸⁸⁴ Udinck wrote in his diary that "news came of a storm that hit the Ommerschans, but with the help of the *huijs-luijden* [house-soldiers], it was repulsed."⁸⁸⁵ After their initial assault failed, the Münsterite army changed their angle of attack, overran the garrison, and then enacted their revenge on the local peasantry.⁸⁸⁶ The seventeenth-century Dutch historian, Lieuwe van Aitzema, noted both the assault and the barbaric nature with which the bishop's mercenaries plundered the fortress and surrounding countryside.⁸⁸⁷ In his diary, Udinck also wrote that "crowds of [Dutch] soldiers were fleeing from the Ommerschans," and that "in every instance we are driven away because of the war, where God's anger can be seen well."⁸⁸⁸ But not all of the destruction came at the hands of the Münsterite army. Dutch military leaders also inundated the land by breaking the dikes and by destroying a number of wind- and watermills throughout Gelderland, Overijssel and Groningen as a desperate last-ditch effort to disrupt the enemy's ability to use them for bread production.⁸⁸⁹ The peasant farmers in these regions suffered tremendously as a result.

⁸⁸³ See for example the Provincie Overijssel website: <http://www.overijssel.nl/thema%27s/cultuur/cultureel-erfgoed/archeologie/verdedigen/ommerschans/> accessed on 8 November 2017.

⁸⁸⁴ See for example the Provincie Overijssel website: <http://www.overijssel.nl/thema%27s/cultuur/cultureel-erfgoed/archeologie/verdedigen/ommerschans/> accessed on 8 November 2017.

⁸⁸⁵ Gr.A, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 28 September 1665.

⁸⁸⁶ See for example the Provincie Overijssel website: <http://www.overijssel.nl/thema%27s/cultuur/cultureel-erfgoed/archeologie/verdedigen/ommerschans/> accessed on 8 November 2017.

⁸⁸⁷ Lieuwe van Aitzema, *Historie of Verhael van Saken van Staet en Oorlogh, In, ende omtrent de Vereenighde Nederlanden, Beginnende met het Jaer 1665, ende eyndigende met het begin van 't Jaer 1666* ('s Graven-Hage; Johan Veely, 1668), 1360-1361.

⁸⁸⁸ Gr.A, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 30 September 1665.

⁸⁸⁹ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 364.

Based on Udinck's diary, one gets the impression that the prince-bishop's army was scattered aimlessly across the eastern provinces, but from a strategic point of view, the invasion force had initially been organized into two main groups of approximately equal size. One contingent, probably around 9,000 men, travelled west from Münster into Twente and Overijssel, where they plundered the countryside, setup road blocks, and threatened to cross the river IJssel to overrun the city of Arnhem in Gelderland.⁸⁹⁰ A second contingent, about 11,000 under the command of the Scottish general, D'Osserey, marched north almost completely unchallenged through the villages of Roswinkel and Ter Apel, and then on towards Groningen.⁸⁹¹ Udinck was in closer geographic proximity to this second group, which was again split up into subgroups, with some troops taking up posts in Assen, while others went to Yde, a small village in Drenthe.⁸⁹²

In addition to the pillaging, the prince-bishop's troops also cutoff routes into and out of the eastern provinces. Two of particular importance to Udinck and Harckens, were the roads through Steenwijk and Zwolle.⁸⁹³ These were the most direct routes to Culemborg, but the risk of being robbed, beaten, or even killed by the prince-bishop's troops compelled them to consider an alternate route further north; one which passed dangerously close to the provincial border with Groningen.⁸⁹⁴ Udinck was indeed living on a knife's edge. The looming question, of course, is how close, literally and figuratively, was Udinck to these soldiers? Archival evidence, outside of the diary, provides some valuable clues.

⁸⁹⁰ Ibid., 421.

⁸⁹¹ A. J. Smith, "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie" in *Groningsche volksalmanak voor het jaar 1903* (Groningen: E.B. van der Kamp, 1902), 116-178: 148, Van Aitzema mistakenly estimated this figure to be around 16,000.

⁸⁹² Ibid.

⁸⁹³ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxiv.

⁸⁹⁴ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665.

Udinck's diary ends abruptly on 2 October 1665, but from the interrogators' notes, it is possible to recreate the final route that Udinck had chosen. On 3 or 4 October, Udinck, along with one Pastor Oohne from Drenthe, and three wagons, left Vries and travelled first through the peat fields in De Punt and then to Donderen (De Punt and Donderen are both small villages located near the border of Drenthe and Groningen), where they stayed at least one night.⁸⁹⁵ While there, they found one Gerrit Kistemaker "living among the papists."⁸⁹⁶ This Gerrit Kistemaker was perhaps Gerrit Martens, a former *bouwmeester* to the eighteen guilds and a former alderman in the *kistemaker* (chest maker) guild.⁸⁹⁷ This Kistemaker had apparently settled in a Catholic enclave, which, despite the Republic's Protestant renown, could be found throughout the Dutch provinces.

At this point, however, Udinck made a fatal error. He decided to cross into the provincial territory of Groningen. On 5 October 1665, Udinck traveled north to Hoogkerk, a small town inside the province of Groningen, where he hoped to recover some of the money that was owed to him before continuing on to Friesland, Holland, or Gelderland.⁸⁹⁸ But Udinck was apprehended in Hoogkerk before he could carry out his plan. Van Aitzema later wrote that upon his arrest, Udinck reportedly declared that: "I was on this trip, not for the Bishop, but to keep myself out of danger."⁸⁹⁹ News of Udinck's arrest reached Dr. Harckens via Gerrit

⁸⁹⁵ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 663, Nr. 33, 13 October 1665.

⁸⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁹⁷ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 664, Nr. 37, 13 October 1665; GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665; GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 667, Nr. 37, 14 October 1665; see also J. A. Feith and J. E. Heeres, *Groningsche Volksalmanak voor het jaar 1897* (Groningen: E.B. van der Kamp, 1896), 219.

⁸⁹⁸ Ibid.; GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 667, Nr. 37, 14 October 1665.

⁸⁹⁹ Van Aitzema, *Historie of Verael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh . . . Vyfde deel*, 668.

Kistemaker.⁹⁰⁰ Harckens attempted to escape, but was quickly taken into custody in the village of Yde, where he was strapped to a wagon and then transported to Groningen.⁹⁰¹

Udinck's diary entries throughout the summer and early autumn of 1665 repeatedly displayed his concern for his personal safety, and for the security of his property. If Udinck had colluded with the prince-bishop, as the Groningen authorities later claimed, there is scant surviving evidence in the archival record to corroborate this. On the contrary, Udinck's diary shows time and again that he was genuinely in fear of the approaching army, and that his motivations for returning to Groningen were not malicious, but rather were the product of various push and pull factors. In terms of the push, he clearly sought to protect himself and his property from the bishop's mercenaries, and therefore fled from them. Udinck was driving multiple wagons filled with his property over terrain that was difficult, if not impossible, to traverse. In addition, many of the main roads were blocked by the invading soldiers. There was a significant pull factor as well that fueled his desire to return to Groningen: his money. Throughout his exile, and most notably in the early months of 1665, Udinck repeatedly expressed his aggravation with various individuals in Groningen who had prevented him and his wife from accessing their accounts or collecting investment income, such as interest, dividends, and rent payments. He and his family had been frustrated by Groningen's politically-minded courts, corrupt stewards and bookkeepers, as well as his deceptive tenants, all of whom were slowly crippling him financially. By the autumn of 1665, it was clear that neither legal restitution back into the province, nor legal assistance with these financial matters was forthcoming. In the end, his financial hardships provided the motivation to return while the war provided the trigger.

⁹⁰⁰ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 664, Nr. 37, 13 October 1665; GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665; GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 667, Nr. 37, 14 October 1665; see also Feith and Heeres, *Groningsche Volksalmanak*, 219.

⁹⁰¹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 664, Nr. 37, 13 October 1665; see also Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxiv.

CHAPTER SEVEN:

“HE WOULD GLADLY BEAR THE TORMENT”: OCTOBER – NOVEMBER, 1665

Udinck’s “*Examination*,” or interrogation, began almost immediately after he reached the provincial capital. As was common in seventeenth-century Dutch legal proceedings, the questioning was headed by a small contingent of city leaders. The interrogators’ notes indicate that four prominent members of Groningen’s municipal government took part in these interrogations: the mayor, Regnerus Tjaerda (ca. 1610/15-1668), and three city council members, Johannes van Julsingha, Tjaert Gerlacius, and Jacob Berchuis.⁹⁰² These men were no strangers to Udinck. Regnerus Tjaerda is mentioned twice in Udinck’s diary, albeit somewhat in passing, while the other three, Van Julsingha, Gerlacius and Berchuis, all participated in Udinck’s interrogations following his first arrest in 1662.⁹⁰³ In particular, Van Julsingha, who is discussed in early chapters, was at this point on a sort of fast track to becoming one of Groningen’s most powerful political leaders.

For Udinck, and indeed for the city of Groningen, these men were emblematic representatives of the new order that had crystallized in the Republic after 1600. They were wealthy, powerful, heavy-handed in their exercise of legal authority, and fearful that any leniency might subvert the newfound stability they had sought to maintain since the ouster of the Spaniards and Catholics in 1594. Their presence in the interrogation rooms was part of a broader

⁹⁰² GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

⁹⁰³ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 2 December 1662.

phenomenon that took place in the Dutch Republic throughout the seventeenth century whereby political and legal power was concentrated among a few family networks, some of which originated from the old aristocracy, although their majority entered the political arena after becoming successful entrepreneurs. The ascent of members of this latter group was not necessarily easy, but once once they had arrived *there*, they let little get in the way of protecting and expanding their wealth, privileges, and political influence.

Prestige was also obligatory in order to enter into Groningen's political scene. One of the common ways that a *homo novus* might add prestige to his family name, and thus help secure a political position, was through a process known as "*dubbele*" (duplicate) families.⁹⁰⁴ This involved legitimizing one's own name and reputation by either highlighting, or shrouding, familial connections, particularly marriages with other well-known families, which could potentially help, or hinder, their political ambitions. Tjaerda's family, for example, originated in Emden, but secured its place among the Groningen elites by intermarrying with the Drews, a powerful Groningen family.⁹⁰⁵

Of all of the men who interrogated Udinck, the most ambitious, most cunning, and perhaps the most ruthless, was Johan van Julsingha. Although Johan van Julsingha himself was born in Groningen, his family originated in Drenthe (considered a rural backwater), and, as was mentioned in chapter one, he often suppressed this fact when discussing his ancestral lineage.⁹⁰⁶ Although a Johan van Julsingha was himself a *homo novus*, he was also related to the Drews on his mother's side, which provided the prestige necessary to head one of the most powerful regent

⁹⁰⁴ Feenstra, *Spinnen in het web*, 112.

⁹⁰⁵ Ibid., 65.

⁹⁰⁶ Ibid., 113, He also had an older brother with the same name, Johannes Julsingha (d. 1664), but the two siblings differentiated themselves from one another by spelling their names differently (Johan van Julsingha and Johannes Julsingha), and by using nicknames of "junior" and "senior" respectively. Throughout the century, these and other Groningen families used similar strategies - marriage and differentiation models - to gain and retain their positions in government.

dynasties in Groningen's city government.⁹⁰⁷ By the last quarter of the seventeenth century, this family was able to monopolize Groningen's mayoral seats and began operating almost as a faction of its own.⁹⁰⁸ As a result, coalitions between the city and the countryside became more common, and there was a consolidation of power throughout the province that increasingly centered around the city in general, and around the Van Julsingha family in particular.⁹⁰⁹

Udinck's experience in Groningen was quite different. Prior to his banishment, Udinck had likely also considered himself to have been a *homo novus*, but he had never achieved the same level of prestige, reputation, or station in life as Van Julsingha, or any of the other men who were about to interrogate him. By October 1665, after having lived in exile for nearly three years, and especially with an invading army on Groningen's doorstep, his status had declined precipitously. He was no longer a mere political rival, but a fugitive and an enemy of the state. When the Republic was attacked by Münster, a sort of Münsterphobia enveloped Groningen, and as Von Galen's mercenaries advanced toward the city, Udinck found himself wholly ostracized from these men, and from Groningen's broader political circles.

MÜNSTERPHOBIA

Udinck's fate was also threatened by events outside of Groningen. In the early months of the war, a treasonous plot was uncovered in the Dutch province of Gelderland, in which two Dutch men, Jan Muller (aka Jan de Vlamsingh, or Vlamingh) and Henrick Jochimszoon (aka

⁹⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁰⁸ Ibid., 105.

⁹⁰⁹ Ibid.

Henrick in de Kelder), were accused of working as spies for Von Galen.⁹¹⁰ In the course of their interrogations, both men confessed to helping map out the river IJssel in order to determine an optimal crossing point for the prince-bishop's army.⁹¹¹ There was certainly a real fear that other traitors had infiltrated the Republic, and for many Dutch leaders, a statement needed to be made to dissuade others from sympathizing with the enemy.

On 21 August 1665, while imprisoned in Arnhem, Jan Muller, who surely contemplated the extent of pain and suffering that he had already faced during torture and would have to endure on the scaffold, committed suicide instead.⁹¹² Nevertheless, the court in Arnhem ordered that his corpse be gutted and strung up by one leg at the *Galgenberg* (gallows hill).⁹¹³ The desire to put Jan Muller's corpse on display was, in a Foucauldian sense, an "aesthetic of punishment" and a ceremony of sovereign power.⁹¹⁴ As an added deterrent, Muller's sentencing also blended symbolic elements of punishment with material ones, as his property was confiscated by the city authorities, and his wife was banished from Gelderland for life.⁹¹⁵ On 21 September 1665, the "aesthetic of punishment" recurred when Muller's co-conspirator, Henrick Jochimsz., was paraded through Arnhem's market and in front of the *Stadhuis* before being beheaded on the scaffold by the city's executioner, Andries Hanssen.⁹¹⁶ After his execution, Henrick Jochimsz.'s head was set atop the *Galgenberg* and his body was buried bellow the gallows there.⁹¹⁷

⁹¹⁰ Koninklijke Bibliotheek (KB), Knuttel 9163, *Copie van die Informatien, Confessien ende Sententien, van die twee Vertraders ende Conspirateurs tegens de Steden Arnhem ende Doesburgh, consequentelick tegens den Staat der Vereenighde Nederlanden ondernomen* (Arnhem: Jacob van Biesen, 1665).

⁹¹¹ Ibid.

⁹¹² Ibid.

⁹¹³ Ibid.

⁹¹⁴ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 2012), 101.

⁹¹⁵ KB, Knuttel 9163.

⁹¹⁶ Ibid.

⁹¹⁷ Ibid.

From time to time, Dutch authorities captured other spies as well. Outside of the city of Groningen, for example, a farmhand who had served as a guide for the bishop's troops received a "*pijnlijk examen*" (painful examination) before being hanged on the gallows in the eastern part of the province.⁹¹⁸ Meanwhile, in Holland, there were also attempts by pro-Orangist groups to restore the stadholder to power (see chapter five regarding the "stadholderless period"), some of which involved conspiring with the enemy. For example, Henri Buat, a French calvary officer who was in the service of the Dutch, attempted to overthrow Johan de Witt and the regents in Holland, but, on 18 August 1666, he mistakenly handed a letter outlining the finer details of the plot to De Witt himself.⁹¹⁹ Buat was found guilty of treason and beheaded on 11 October 1666, while his co-conspirator, Johan Kievit (1627-1692), a powerful Rotterdam politician, fled to England.⁹²⁰ These, and other, acts of betrayal contributed greatly to a growing sense of anxiety and uncertainty among the Dutch populace over the course of the war. As Jonathan Israel writes, "Panic gripped large parts of the Republic, not least Groningen which now came under threat."⁹²¹ But as shocking as these recent developments were for the eastern provinces, one of the most significant contributing factors to Groningen's Münsterphobia was the practice known as the *sauvegarde* (safe guard).

SAUVEGARDE

In the first week of October 1665, a large contingent of the bishop's troops under the command of the Scottish general, D'Osserey, marched into Drenthe and Groningen almost

⁹¹⁸ Smith, "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie," 167.

⁹¹⁹ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 775-776; see also Prak, *The Dutch Republic*, 50.

⁹²⁰ Ibid.

⁹²¹ Israel, *The Dutch Republic*, 770.

completely unchallenged.⁹²² Some of these men took up posts in Assen and Yde, both in Drenthe, while many others travelled to Sappemeer, a small village southeast of the city of Groningen.⁹²³ Farmers in the surrounding villages had first taken up arms, but upon seeing the swelling number of enemy troops, most put down their weapons and requested “*sauvegarde*,” or offered protection money and services in lieu of plunder.⁹²⁴ The *sauvegarde* was not a formal surrender, but rather a binding agreement between community leaders and the prince-bishop’s military commanders, whereby the residents provided money, quarters, or other forms of support to the enemy troops, and in exchange, those troops promised not to harm the residents or their property.⁹²⁵ During the Thirty Years’ War similar agreements known as “*salvanguardien*” (safe guards) were commonly used by both German and Swedish military commanders.⁹²⁶ German and Dutch contemporaries also referred to these payments as *Brandschatzung* or *brandschatten* respectively, both meaning “fire taxes,” reflecting the retribution that could be expected in the event that the civilian community refused to pay.⁹²⁷

The pressure placed on rural communities, both during the Thirty Years’ War and during the first invasion by Münster is difficult to overstate. During the latter engagement, a number of farmers and villagers in eastern Groningen initially took up arms and prepared to defend their communities. This may have been the case in Beerta, a village in the eastern part of the province that was overrun and plundered by Von Galen’s mercenaries. The survivors in Beerta estimated their damages to be a staggering 120,000 guilders, including the loss of 75 horses and 575

⁹²² Smith, “De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie,” 148, Van Aitzema mistakenly estimated this figure to be around 16,000.

⁹²³ Ibid., 148-149.

⁹²⁴ Ibid; see also GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 668.

⁹²⁵ Ibid; the *sauvegarde* was related to the practice of “*brandschatten*.”

⁹²⁶ Peter H. Wilson, *The Thirty Years War: A Sourcebook*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 251, 255, 257.

⁹²⁷ Wilson, *The Thirty Years War*, 402.

cows.⁹²⁸ As the enemy's numbers swelled, and Dutch military assistance was not forthcoming, these other farmers and villagers began to recognize the futility of such a defensive effort. Most were compelled to put down their weapons and seek out some sort of amicable solution with the enemy, lest their meagre lives and livelihoods be utterly destroyed.

As an added source of pressure for these rural communities, the Dutch government explicitly forbade anyone from entering into an agreement whereby the enemy soldiers might be paid concessions, quartered, or cared for. Still, despite the threats from their own government, a number of villages disregarded this law and quickly made their own requests for *sauvegarde*. In the first week of October, ninety residents from the village of Noordbroek signed a petition requesting *sauvegarde*.⁹²⁹ On 7 October, Zuidbroek also requested *sauvegarde*.⁹³⁰ The following day, on 8 October, one Hindrik Hindricx Hopster requested it on behalf of the residents of Westerlee and Heiligerlee, and on 9 October, representatives from Westerwolde and Slochteren also requested safeguarding.⁹³¹ The capitulation of these villages, all of which are on the eastern side of the city of Groningen, left the entire eastern half of the province nearly defenseless. In addition, the ease with which these rural communities laid down their arms demonstrated a sort of fickle loyalty on the part of the villagers. Of course, Dutch cities were better fortified than their rural counterparts, but there certainly seems to have been a fear that the villagers' lack of conviction to the Dutch cause might become infectious, and perhaps might even tempt those in the cities to surrender without a fight.

The authorities in Groningen were less than pleased about the surrender of the eastern settlements, and encouraged military leaders to pursue leads for potentially treasonous activity,

⁹²⁸ *Geschiedenis van Groningen Deel II Nieuwe Tijd* (Zwolle, Netherlands: Waanders Uitgevers, 2008), 275.

⁹²⁹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 668; see also Smith, "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie," 148-149, 168.

⁹³⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹³¹ *Ibid.*

including espionage and fleshing out those who had initiated requests for *sauvegarde*. On 4 November, Johan Maurits ordered that a military court be established in the Groningen town of Scheemda, through which five residents from Noordbroek and Zuidbroek were prosecuted for crimes related to the *sauve*.⁹³² The verdicts were rendered on 14 November and the leading representatives were fined 5,000 guilders and given 24 hours to pay it, which was an impossible task for villagers who had little cash on hand in general.⁹³³ When these fines were not paid, Johan Maurits sent a contingent of soldiers into the villages to plunder their goods.⁹³⁴

Meanwhile, in the city, Groningen's municipal leaders began their own initiatives to flesh out the city's Catholics, who they suspected were providing moral and/or financial support to Von Galen, or at the very least, having sympathies for the prince-bishop. On 21 August 1665, Groningen's city council dismissed a number of aldermen and members of the *Stelmakers* (wagonmakers') and *schoenmakers* (shoemakers') guilds, under the simple charge of "*niet zijnde gereformerd*" (not being reformed).⁹³⁵ On 9 October 1665, the council went a step further and passed a resolution that ordered all of the city's Catholic inhabitants to present themselves, along with any weapons "that might be used to the detriment of the city" to local authorities.⁹³⁶ Catholics were placed under house arrest, their homes were subject to be searched, and they were ordered to keep a lantern at their front door that was to remain lit all night.⁹³⁷ Any Catholics who violated these measures were subject to having their property confiscated.⁹³⁸

⁹³² Ibid., 168.

⁹³³ Ibid.

⁹³⁴ Ibid.

⁹³⁵ Smith, "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie," 156.

⁹³⁶ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 2086, "Resolutie van burgemeesteren en raad van Groningen dat in de burger vaandels het geweer van de pausgezinden zal worden afgenomen en dat in huizen, kelders en kamers zal worden onderzocht naar geweer en andere zaken die tot nadeel van de stad zouden kunnen worden gebezigd," 9 October 1665.

⁹³⁷ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 2086, 9 October 1665.

⁹³⁸ Ibid.

The city's nervousness regarding its internal threats were intensified by its external threats. The authorities in Groningen knew full well that the defenses in the countryside had long been neglected (see chapter six) and it was questionable as to whether or not the city of Groningen could withstand a siege. Therefore, the gates surrounding Groningen were kept closed day and night, the city's ramparts were reinforced and obstacles were placed on the land surrounding the fortifications.⁹³⁹ Finally, the city authorities dispatched letters to the surrounding provinces urgently requesting military assistance.⁹⁴⁰ On 16 October, the Groningen deputy, Arnoldus van Nijeveen, wrote a response from Zwolle in Overijssel to his colleagues in Groningen, reporting that the States' Army could not send reinforcements, because the enemy still had thousands of troops in and around Overijssel and Gelderland.⁹⁴¹ In short, the Republic's troops were already spread thin, dug in, and otherwise tied up in various defensive positions throughout the eastern provinces.

The commander of the States' Army, Johan Maurits van Nassau, contended that Von Galen's initial aim was not to occupy the city of Groningen, but rather to first conquer the port at Delfzijl in order to allow English reinforcements to land there.⁹⁴² Apparently unsure of the true strategy of Von Galen, Johan Maurits and others in the States' Army concomitantly suggested that Von Galen's plundering in Drenthe was a feint, intended to draw Dutch soldiers out of their garrisons so they could be cut down more easily.⁹⁴³ If that feint worked, the commander of the Münsterite army, Major-General Johann Georg Gorgas, could combine his forces, cross the river

⁹³⁹ Van Berkel, *Universiteit van het Noorden*, 214.

⁹⁴⁰ Smith, "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie," 145.

⁹⁴¹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 662, Nr. 32, 16 October 1665, "Brief van A. van Nijeveen uit Swol, aan de staten van stad en lande, over de bewegingen van den vijand." Van Nijeveen suggested that there were approximately 500 cavalymen in Doesburg (Gelderland), and some 2,200 troops in places like Lochem, Lichtenvorde, Doetinchem, and Keppel.

⁹⁴² Smith, "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie," 146.

⁹⁴³ Van Nimwegen *The Dutch Army*, 421.

IJssel, and overrun the city of Arnhem in Gelderland.⁹⁴⁴ For this reason, Johan Maurits positioned the largest contingent of his army in Dieren (near Arnhem), and ordered his men to hold their positions there.⁹⁴⁵

As this military chess match played itself out, many in Groningen remained convinced that it was only a matter of time before the prince-bishop besieged the city. Groningen's population displayed a mixture of anxiety, patriotism, and in some cases, enthusiasm to fight back against Von Galen's troops. The fervor could be seen not only in the city's political leaders, soldiers, and common citizenry (many of whom were expected to take up arms), but also in academic circles.

Academics were not required to participate in military service, but students from the University of Groningen volunteered en masse to help defend the city.⁹⁴⁶ These students, many of whom were natives of the German Empire, formed their own militia, appointed their own leadership, received weapons and even constructed a banner complete with the University's coat of arms and a motto in golden letters that read: "*Deo, Patriae, Academiae*."⁹⁴⁷ In an effort to ensure that the students would not tarnish their academic reputations, the professors required them to sign an agreement that they would not mix with regular soldiers.⁹⁴⁸ In the end, however, most Groningers did not experience combat first-hand. The invading army came no further than the Zuidbroek, the Frisians helped to cutoff the bishop's supply lines in Overijssel, English support was relegated to the sea, and French reinforcements from the south helped drive the bishop's troops out completely. Nevertheless, the determination of the Groningers to defend their

⁹⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁴⁵ Ibid.; see also GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 662, Nr. 32, 16 October 1665, The States' Army dispatched two commanding officers, Major-General Kirckpatrick and Colonel Askin, to Friesland and Groningen respectively, in order to help organize contingency plans should the prince-bishop shift the trajectory of his assault further north.

⁹⁴⁶ Van Berkel, *Universiteit van het Noorden*, 214.

⁹⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁴⁸ Ibid.

city helps to highlight their patriotism and fierce Münsterphobia, to which Von Galen was quickly becoming the enemy of the state *par excellence*.

Groningen's reaction to the invasion reflected a sense of urgency that was tribal in nature, reinforcing notions of the Other; and contributing to a dialectic of us vs. them. The threat rekindled memories of the Eighty Years' War. The citizenry certainly expected a fight, and some may have even desired it. And just as had occurred in Arnhem with Jan Muller and Henrick in de Kelder, citizens in Groningen, whether motivated by militant Calvinism or patriotism, sought to purge their community of their respective spiritual and temporal enemies. In their moment of crisis, they found two such enemies in Udinck and Harckens.

INTERROGATIONS

Perhaps no other description captures the purpose of seventeenth-century judicial procedures better than Schama's:

The trials were a cathartic rite of passage, a largely self-imposed ordeal in which the integrity and solidarity of the national community were reaffirmed against a phantom enemy. It was an extreme instance of differentiating insiders and outsiders, the alien from the native, the authentic from the counterfeit, the godly from the diabolical and the natural from the perverse . . . the control of the trials, as ugly and unjust as they were, within the regular institutions of justice - rather than a kind of messianic, clerically dominated tribunal - reinforced the legitimacy of the governing class.⁹⁴⁹

Such was the case for Udinck and Harckens, whose interrogators remained fixated on a few related lines of inquiry, while almost completely disregarding all others, and thus willfully ignoring any evidence of their possible innocence. As he sat in his jail cell, Udinck could hardly be optimistic about his chances for mercy, much less a fair trial. Fairness, in the modern sense,

⁹⁴⁹ Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 605-606.

was not the aim of seventeenth-century interrogations anyway. In general, these investigations were as much a formality as they were an actual quest for evidence. Florike Egmond, for example, has shown that early modern interrogators were far less concerned with exposing motives and/or alibis; what they wanted more than anything else was a confession and this was the “principal aim of interrogation.”⁹⁵⁰ On 5 October 1665, the interrogators drafted a summary of Udinck’s preliminary statement, in which he declared that he did not originally intend to come to Groningen, but was compelled to because of the ongoing war, fear of the prince-bishop’s soldiers’ pillaging, and his general lack of security in the German county of Bentheim.⁹⁵¹ This explanation was, by all accounts, the same that he had recorded in his journal, and mirrored his numerous entries and margin notes expressing anxiety related to being so close to an advancing army (see chapter six for examples). The interrogators, however, did not accept this motivation.

The center of gravity around which the interrogators’ questions oscillated included three main subjects: the first involved the whereabouts and interactions of Johan Schulenborgh, including Udinck’s and Harckens’s suspected collusion with him; the second sought clarification regarding letters that were sent by Samuel Maresius to Udinck which referenced their appreciation for “*nostre amis commun*” (our mutual friend), an unnamed individual whose identity Udinck repeatedly denied knowing; and the third was to validate a rumor that Udinck and Harckens had secretly toasted to the health of the prince-bishop.⁹⁵² The line of questioning also highlighted a distinction between the rhetoric in the city, which emphasized the insidious threat of Catholics in general, versus the concerns of the city council, which placed much more emphasis on specific political matters. Religious hatred certainly played a role in the fear-

⁹⁵⁰ Egmond, *In Bad Company*, 14.

⁹⁵¹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

⁹⁵² GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

mongering rhetoric, but it was political ideology and personal vendettas, not anti-Catholicism, that drove these interrogations. Of utmost importance was recapturing Johan Schulenborgh and anyone who might have assisted him.

The Groningen authorities knew full well that Schulenborgh was part of Von Galen's retinue, and therefore both a fugitive and a traitor. On 10 October 1665, the Groningen authorities posted a placard that read:

So it is, that we have found it good to let everyone know by public announcement that if the aforementioned Schulenborgh is apprehended, alive or dead, and brought over, then one shall receive the sum of 1,500 Car. guilders.⁹⁵³

The placard continued with a second clause that referenced those who had engaged in *sauvegarde*, and offered 500 Carolingian guilders to those who could identify others who were offering money, shelter, or other services to the enemy.⁹⁵⁴ The substantial sums of money that were offered as rewards speaks to the seriousness with which the Groningen authorities perceived these threats. Groningen's city leaders were also still tremendously bitter. He had after all consistently stayed one step ahead of them, and had undermined their authority at every turn. It is therefore not surprising that Schulenborgh's name came up during questioning.

Udinck was repeatedly pressed for details regarding his relationship with Schulenborgh and any potential collusion with Münster. Udinck explained to the interrogators that he had last seen Schulenborgh in Groningen in 1662, before Udinck went to Steinfurt, and that while in exile, Udinck had received only one letter from Schulenborgh.⁹⁵⁵ That single letter, however,

⁹⁵³ *Sommair verhael ofte recueil van vragen en antwoorden, voorgevallen in de examinibus met jr. Osebrandt Jan Rengers van Slochteren* (Amsterdam: Jan Claeszoon ten Hoorn, 1677), This is a collection of copies of government documents and notices primarily regarding Jr. Osebrandt Jan Rengers's correspondence with various soldiers from the army of the prince-bishop of Münster during the invasions of both 1665 and 1672, but it also includes a copy of the above mentioned placard.

⁹⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵⁵ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

was significant and more than enough to whet the interrogators' appetites for more information.⁹⁵⁶ They pressed Udinck further in the hopes of uncovering additional details regarding his alleged connections to Münster. Udinck, however, maintained his position, arguing that he had not received any correspondence from the prince-bishop, that he had only written letters to family, friends and business partners, and that he had indeed received letters dissuading him from coming to Groningen.⁹⁵⁷ He emphasized that none of these letters were written covertly and that he had nothing to hide.⁹⁵⁸ The interrogators, however, seem to have been unmoved.

NOSTRE AMIS COMMUN

Aside from Schulenborgh, there was another person of interest to the Groningen interrogators. On 5 October 1665, the Groningen secretary, D. N. Busch, recorded that during the apprehension of Udinck, his diary and a stack of letters written by Samuel Maresius were found in the possession of one of Udinck's associates.⁹⁵⁹ These were especially intriguing to the interrogators and problematic for both Udinck and Maresius.⁹⁶⁰ For one, their content confirmed Udinck's closer association with the earlier guild riots than had been hitherto known.⁹⁶¹ The interrogators were also concerned about the phrase, "*nostre amis commun*" (our mutual friend), which was used by Maresius in his letters to Udinck.⁹⁶² The interrogators demanded that Udinck identify this "mutual friend," but Udinck repeatedly claimed that he did not know who it was,

⁹⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁵⁹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 2091, Nr. 60, 5 October 1665.

⁹⁶⁰ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

⁹⁶¹ Van Berkel, *Universiteit van het Noorden*, 215.

⁹⁶² GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665. As far as I can tell, only Maresius used this term; Udinck did not.

and even suggested to the interrogators that they ask Maresius, after all, they were “his words.”⁹⁶³ Udinck declared that he could only guess who Maresius was talking about, before finally telling them that, “perhaps it could be the Hoofdman Horenken,” to which the interrogators replied, “He [Udinck] persists with his negativity.”⁹⁶⁴ Udinck was probably referring to the sitting councilman, Gerhard Horenken (1623-1666), and therefore his response may very well have been a form of sarcasm. This is supported by the interrogators’ lackluster response that Udinck “persists with his negativity,” which certainly suggests that the the interrogators never took his answer seriously. They clearly believed it to be some other insidious traitor or political rival within the city or province, but they needed confirmation, and so they pressed further.

The interrogators noted that it was on 5 October 1665 that Udinck was first “*met tormenten gedreicht*” (threatened with torture), and because of this threat, Udinck requested a delay in further questioning until the following morning. He stated that at that time, he would be willing to answer more questions.⁹⁶⁵ In early modern interrogations, it was common for legal authorities to threaten the accused with torture in order to elicit a confession or to extract some additional information, even though in the Dutch Republic, the actual implementation of torture was typically limited by a number of legal prerequisites and was therefore less frequent than in other parts of Europe.⁹⁶⁶ Again Udinck asked his interrogators for more time in order to search further *op zijn ziel* (upon his soul), and for the sake of *salicheit* (salvation).⁹⁶⁷ There is no pause mentioned in the notes, so it is unclear if Udinck’s request was granted, but after being pressured

⁹⁶³ Ibid.

⁹⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶⁶ Price, *Dutch Culture in the Golden Age*, 56, “Under the systems of law prevailing in most of Europe, the use of torture was strictly controlled and could only be used to extract a confession when strong evidence of guilt had been established by other means.”

⁹⁶⁷ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

to provide additional information, Udinck finally said that “based on the content of Maresius’s letters,” this mysterious mutual friend must have been the infamous Rengers.⁹⁶⁸

This was also confirmed in a second letter written by Maresius to Udinck on 3 October 1665. In it, Maresius discussed speaking to Rengers as soon as he knew that Udinck was in the vicinity. Maresius explained that he believed that there was still a possibility that Groningen would allow Udinck to return as he could justify his flight, but Maresius also emphasized that Udinck’s petition must be submitted prior to him entering the province.⁹⁶⁹ He also suggested that it would have been safer to travel through Friesland and Holland.⁹⁷⁰ For the Groningen authorities, Udinck’s mention of Rengers’s name - a longstanding foe of the city council - corroborated with this correspondence from Maresius, was sufficient for the interrogators to conclude that line of questioning.

Udinck was also guilty of violating the terms of his banishment. Even with the verbal authorization allowing him to travel through Drenthe, he had not received permission to re-enter Groningen. This was low-hanging fruit for the Groningen authorities, but, on its own, it probably would not have been enough to warrant capital punishment. In relative terms, criminal punishment in the Netherlands was not as harsh as other places in Europe. Geert Mak, for example, has shown that on average in the late seventeenth century, only about three people were executed each year in Amsterdam.⁹⁷¹ In lieu of the death penalty, it was much more common for executioners to publicly whip and beat trouble-makers, drive red-hot irons through the tongues of blasphemers, and hack off the hands of thieves.⁹⁷²

⁹⁶⁸ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665..

⁹⁶⁹ Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 566.

⁹⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁹⁷¹ Mak, *The Many Lives of Jan Six*, 140.

⁹⁷² Ibid.

Likewise, violating the terms of one's banishment was typically punishable through flogging and/or public shaming. Florike Egmond's research, for example, discusses the case of Jan Willems, who was banished by the Haarlem authorities from Holland in 1667.⁹⁷³ Within a year, however, he was arrested again in Delft, where he was whipped, branded, and banished for a second time.⁹⁷⁴ In 1668, the English physician, Edward Brown (1644-1708), witnessed a similar beating in Haarlem, where he described the accused as being lead "*to a Post upon a Scaffold, their hands tyed and by a Pully drawn up as high as can be extended, and then an Iron fastned about their waist to keep them steady; in which stretched-out posture they receive sometimes fifty or sixty stripes or more, according to the merit of their offence.*"⁹⁷⁵ So why did Udinck not undergo a similar punishment? For the interrogators, Udinck's violation of banishment was just the beginning. They clearly had their sights set on a bigger prize.

GESUNDHEIT-TRINKEN

The Groningen authorities aggressively sought a confession to a more sinister charge than the violation of banishment, namely espionage or treason. The leap from trespassing to treason, however, required a higher degree of proof on the part of the interrogators, and the intense questioning was a means to this end. Therefore, the interrogators shifted their questions towards a repudiated rumor that Udinck and Harckens had engaged in a treasonous, and therefore unforgivable, toast to the health of the bishop.

⁹⁷³ Egmond, *In Bad Company*, 16-17.

⁹⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁷⁵ Edward Brown, *A Brief Account of Some Travels in Divers Parts of Europe, viz. Hungaria, Servia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thessaly, Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Corniola, and Frivli, through a great part of Germany, and the Low-Countries, through Marca Trevisana, and Lombardy on both sides the Po. With some observations on the gold, silver, copper, quick-silver mines, and the baths and mineral waters in those parts. As also the description of many antiquities, habits, fortifications and remarkable places* (London: B. Tooke, 1687), 95; See also Schama, *The Embarrassment of Riches*, 583, regarding the punishment inflicted upon those who violated the terms of their banishment.

Exactly how the rumor first began circulating is not clear. The tradition, however, was rooted in the centuries-old drinking ritual known as *Gesundheit-Trinken* (drinking to one's health), which was commonly practiced among Dutch and German guild members in the early modern period.⁹⁷⁶ The guilds' ritual of *Gesundheit-Trinken* was typically carried out in the taverns where guild members fraternized - such as Schulenborgh's *De Palm* in Groningen - and signified more than just merrymaking among colleagues. The toast was actually a series of toasts meant to honor the spiritual and temporal hierarchies that the participating guild members recognized. The ritual began with *das Kreisen der Becher* (the circling of the cups), a prayer to the Almighty, followed by a remembrance - a toast to a deceased individual who was of significance to the group - and finally the official *Gesundheit-Trinken*, which was a formal toast to the current leader or another prominent benefactor.⁹⁷⁷ Following these toasts, the guild members consumed the contents of their drinking vessels.⁹⁷⁸ Udinck repeatedly denied taking part in this ritual, or at least in such a manner as to honor the prince-bishop of Münster.

The finer points of the rumor are a bit opaque, but based on the interrogators' notes, one can piece together some aspects of the accusation. Before his arrest, Udinck had spent at least two nights in Vries with Dr. Harckens, during which time a number of visitors came and went. On one occasion, Dr. Harckens's son (also named Lucas Harckens) visited, and according to the interrogators it was during this visit that Udinck and Harckens allegedly toasted to the health of the Bishop of Münster.⁹⁷⁹ Udinck confessed that they had a drink of beer, but at no time did they

⁹⁷⁶ Andreas Griessinger, *Das symbolische Kapital der Ehre: Streikbewegungen und kollektives Bewusstsein deutscher Handwerksgelesen im 18. Jahrhundert*, (Ullstein, 1981), 114; see also Rudolf Dekker, "Labour Conflicts and Working-Class Culture in Early Modern Holland," *International Review of Social History*, XXXV (1990): 377-420, 417.

⁹⁷⁷ Wolfgang Menzel, *Geschichte der Deutschen bis auf die neuesten Tage* (Cotta, 1834), 25; see also Erik Gustaf Geijer, *Geschichte Swedens*, vol. 1 (Friedrich Perthes, 1832), 293.

⁹⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁷⁹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665.

toast to the health of the Bishop.⁹⁸⁰ Udinck emphasized that it was a light-hearted meeting that lasted only a half hour and that during that time, the conversation focused mainly on the poor quality of the “*halve zuivers bier*” (either half-pure, or half-stuiver beer) that they drank.⁹⁸¹ Unfortunately, the interrogators did not include any additional commentary regarding this subject that day. They proceeded to put the matter to rest and Udinck’s interrogation on 5 October 1665 came to an end.

In the days that followed, the secretaries received a letter from Professor Samuel Maresius. The letter was written in Latin and was a response to those in Groningen who had accused Maresius of scheming with Udinck, Rengers, and Münster. Maresius’s letter begins by expressing his deference to the city council members, who he addressed as “*Nobilissimi et Potentes Domini*” (Noble and Powerful Lords).⁹⁸² Maresius then appealed to the city authorities through a sense of commonality, suggesting that “our human misery is sewn together,” like “smoke and fire,” or like “sacred rights and the Holy one himself.”⁹⁸³ Maresius went on to insist that Udinck was targeted by the prince-bishop’s troops because he was a property owner, and that Udinck himself was a mere “slave to this storm,” a victim of the ongoing war, and genuinely afraid of the bishop’s troops.⁹⁸⁴ As a result, he was forced from his residence by “*Caueres*” (Caurus, the ancient Roman deity who controls the northwest wind).⁹⁸⁵ In short, Maresius tried to show that Udinck’s decision to return was not malicious; rather, he was compelled to by a common enemy, the prince-bishop.

⁹⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁹⁸¹ Ibid.

⁹⁸² GrA, Toegang, 2041, Inv. 2091, Nr. 60, 6 October 1665, “brief van Samuel Maresius.”

⁹⁸³ Ibid.

⁹⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁸⁵ Ibid.

The second half of Maresius's letter expresses a more defiant tone, includes a scathing rebuke of the accusations levied against him, and attempts to preserve his own reputation: "If you are asserting that he [Udinck] schemed to come to the gates and profit . . . and if you are asserting that I was in close connection with the enemy . . . then look elsewhere for others on which to supply your insults."⁹⁸⁶ Finally, after having defended himself and his old friend, Maresius attempted to distance himself entirely from the alleged conspiracy. To do this, Maresius provided a short, but intensely disparaging assessment of the former representative, Johan Schulenborgh, who he described as a "traitor to his country, a deserter to his faith, an inventor of this war, and a criminal to all."⁹⁸⁷ Of utmost importance for Maresius, was to convince the city council that they had no reason to suspect him of collusion. Maresius's letter was written passionately and logically, but it failed to address the question of the aforementioned *amis commun* (likely Osebrand Rengers), a point that did not go unnoticed by the Groningen authorities. This was especially problematic for the interrogators who tried to reconcile the contents of this new letter to those found in Udinck's possession.

13 October 1665 was a busy day for the Groningen interrogators. Throughout the day, they questioned not only Dr. Harckens, Udinck, Udinck's wife Janneke and his niece Maria, as well as a young man named Henricus Woest who had visited Harckens and Udinck in Drenthe. The interrogators' main line of questioning circled back to address the infamous rumors of the *Gesundheit-Trinken* and possible collusion with Münster. Harckens explained to the interrogators that during Udinck's stay in Drenthe, the two did indeed drink together, but he denied ever toasting to the health of the bishop.⁹⁸⁸ When asked about his whereabouts during his

⁹⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸⁸ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 663, Nr. 33, 13 October 1665.

banishment, Harckens admitted that he had travelled through Olderveen, Deventer, Bentheim, and even Münster, and that he had spent the entire summer of 1665 in Drenthe.⁹⁸⁹ When asked about those with whom he had spoken during his banishment, Harckens confessed that he did speak to Schulenborgh once, but claimed that nothing came of it.⁹⁹⁰ Harckens also explained that he had a hostile exchange with Jan Bastiaan (Jan ten Berge), who called Harckens a “traitor,” and that Harckens quarreled with him over this insult.⁹⁹¹

The interrogators then shifted their questioning to Henricus Woest, a 22-year-old student who spent time with Harckens and Udinck shortly before they were apprehended. According to the interrogators’ notes, Henricus was the son of Jan Woest, most likely Jan Hendrick Woest who operated an unofficial printing house in Groningen.⁹⁹² Around mid-century, there were approximately nine licensed printing companies within Groningen, and many of these worked directly for the city and/or province, but there were also many unofficial publishers who did not have a formal (their own) print shop.⁹⁹³ During his interrogation, Henricus Woest explained that Pastor Oohne from Vries had taken him to Dr. Harckens’s house, where he met not only Harckens, but also Harckens’s son, Udinck, and the *Schulte* of Vries, all of whom drank together.⁹⁹⁴ There is no mention of *Gesundheit-Trinken* in Woest’s testimony, but he does claim that these men set off towards Groningen where Udinck planned to retrieve some money and then continue on, presumably to Holland, Friesland, or Gelderland.⁹⁹⁵ More damning, however, was Woest’s claim that Udinck had “received contributions from the approaching bishop’s

⁹⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹⁹² Harry van der Laan, *Het Groninger boekbedrijf: drukkers, uitgevers boekhandelaren in Groningen tot het eind van de negentiende eeuw* (Assen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2005), 44, 408.

⁹⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁹⁴ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 664, Nr. 34, 13 October 1665.

⁹⁹⁵ Ibid.

troops.”⁹⁹⁶ The interrogators’ notes do not provide any additional details regarding what these “contributions” might have entailed, and they are contrary to numerous entries made in Udinck’s diary regarding his fear of the approaching troops. Perhaps Woest’s claim was truthful, perhaps it was an attempt to save himself by discrediting the others, perhaps it was an attempt to collect on the aforementioned reward money. Either way, the Groningen authorities seemed satisfied with Woest’s testimony. Unfortunately, Woest does not appear again in the archival record.

The interrogators then turned their attention to Udinck’s family, beginning with his wife, Janneke Jason. The interrogators noted that she was 54 years old at the time, and that she had stayed with her husband during most of his exile, and had recently returned to Groningen because of the ongoing war.⁹⁹⁷ She admitted that she was aware of one letter that Udinck had received from Schulenborgh while they were living in Steinfurt and that Udinck had also spoken to Schulenborgh’s servant on at least one occasion in that same town.⁹⁹⁸ Aside from this, she claimed that she had no knowledge of any other Schulenborgh correspondence to or from Udinck, nor was she aware of any letters from Maresius.⁹⁹⁹ She also confessed that both she and her niece had travelled to Münster, but she insisted that it was only to attend the procession, not to meet with Schulenborgh (see chapter four regarding the procession).¹⁰⁰⁰ She told the interrogators that her husband had received permission from the *drost* of Drenthe and the *schulte* of Coevorden to travel through Drenthe, but that she did not know that Harckens had been living

⁹⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁹⁷ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 665, “Procesverbaal van de verhoren van Janneke Jason, vrouw van Gerhard Uding,” 13 Oktober 1665.

⁹⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Ibid.

in that province, nor did she know that Udinck had visited him.¹⁰⁰¹ This is not all that surprising. As discussed in chapters three and four, Udinck often kept information from his wife.

Udinck's niece, the 24-year-old Maria Jason, was also brought before the interrogators that day. Maria confessed that she knew that her uncle had sent letters to Groningen, but he never mentioned Maresius to her.¹⁰⁰² She only knew of correspondence sent to her personally, as well as some other letters sent to Dr. Simon Wijchgell regarding the collection of unpaid interest.¹⁰⁰³ She denied knowing the identity of the "friend" to whom Maresius had referred, but, like Janneke, she acknowledged that her uncle had spoken to Schulenborgh's servant in Steinfurt.¹⁰⁰⁴

TORMENT

Finally, the interrogators brought a beleaguered Udinck back for another round of questioning. During this interrogation, Udinck was asked similar questions to those that were asked on 5 October, and his answers were more or less the same: he continued to deny colluding with Schulenborgh and/or Münster; he persisted that he did not know for sure to whom Maresius was referring when he wrote "*amis commun*"; and he declared that he drank neither to the health of the Bishop, nor to the "*ondergang van Groningen*" (demise of Groningen) - the interrogators had expanded the questioning to include this clause.¹⁰⁰⁵ This time, however, Udinck was pressed even harder for additional details, including links between his recent activities in exile and those from years past. As a result, some of Udinck's answers became more complicated. For example, he explained that while living in Groningen prior to their banishment, Harckens regretted serving

¹⁰⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰² GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 666, "Procesverbaal van de verhoren van Maria Jason," 13 October 1665.

¹⁰⁰³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁵ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665.

as the lawyer for the guilds, but had never spoken badly about the city or the government.¹⁰⁰⁶

Here again, Udinck repeated his claim that he never intended to return to Groningen, but was forced to by the ongoing war.¹⁰⁰⁷

From the interrogators' notes it seems obvious that the interrogators believed that Udinck and Harckens were guilty of treason, espionage, or, at the very least, strong sympathies for the bishop. They were adamant that Udinck knew more than he was telling, a presumption of guilt that was propelled by Udinck's own dubious behavior while in exile, and by the controversial letters that were found to be in his possession around the time of his arrest. To this extent, the interrogators noted that, "*Hier op met tourmenten gedreicht met wieten eenige dessein en of eenige correspondentie te hebben*" (Here, [Udinck] was threatened with torment [i.e., torture], knowing that he had some of these correspondences).¹⁰⁰⁸ This was at least the second time that Udinck had been threatened with torture, but on this occasion he responded defiantly. He declared that he would "gladly bear the torment," that he would "call on God to make him stronger through the Holy Ghost," and that he "would remain strong with the truth."¹⁰⁰⁹

Research by Florike Egmond has shown that Dutch interrogators did not immediately apply torture if a confession was not forthcoming, in large part because of the costs involved.¹⁰¹⁰ The implementation of torture usually required the presence of at least one or two members of the court, the interrogator or bailiff, and a doctor.¹⁰¹¹ When torture was implemented, it typically began with thumb screws and, if necessary, ended with the *palei* (rack).¹⁰¹² The degree to which Udinck was tortured is difficult to ascertain, but the interrogators' notes do provide some clues.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁰ Egmond, *In Bad Company*, 15.

¹⁰¹¹ Ibid.

¹⁰¹² Ibid.

For example, on 13 October 1665, Udinck explicitly refused to cooperate with the interrogators any further, and it was at that point that “*de scheenijzers gezet*” (the shin irons [were] set).¹⁰¹³ Udinck again declared that he would remain strong with God and the truth, and with that, the shin irons were tightened.¹⁰¹⁴ The interrogators noted that Udinck then began to display the “horrific temptations of his soul and salvation . . . as the torment [torture] continued to bring out and clarify the truth.”¹⁰¹⁵ Unfortunately, Udinck’s interrogation notes end here and details of the actual confession do not appear in the archival record.

The following day, 14 October 1665, Dr. Harckens was brought before the interrogators. Initially, Harckens maintained his earlier story, and even after the “*de duimijzers*” (the thumbscrews) were set, the interrogators complained that Harckens “persists with his negative attitude . . . [He] denies having conspired with G[erard] Udinck to the detriment of the city or government and declares that his soul can not allow him to say anything more than the truth.”¹⁰¹⁶ It seems that at this point the thumbscrews were tightened, and Harckens subsequently admitted that he “had heard that Udinck had reunited and stayed with Schulenborgh once in Steinfort, and that his wife had gone to Münster with him [Schulenborgh].”¹⁰¹⁷ The interrogators then threatened heavier forms of torture, but Harckens replied that he had “no correspondence with the papists, neither having sent nor received anything from them,” and that “he had not fled to be here [in Groningen] with Schulenborgh.”¹⁰¹⁸ The interrogators asked him if he had provided Schulenborgh with any advice regarding his *Prodromo* from 1663, but Harckens denied any

¹⁰¹³ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 13 October 1665.

¹⁰¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁶ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 33, 14 October 1665.

¹⁰¹⁷ Ibid., presumably during the procession in 1663.

¹⁰¹⁸ Ibid.

involvement with that as well.¹⁰¹⁹ The interrogators' notes offer few details beyond this, and conclude with a rather menacing phrase, saying simply that "The particular affairs emerged when the torment [torture] finally came."¹⁰²⁰

Finally, Dr. Harckens's 25-year-old son, also named Lucas Harckens, was brought before the interrogators. His story was consistent with the others, and began with an explanation that the bishop's troops had been harassing Udinck, and that Udinck had not intended to come to Groningen, but instead wanted to "travel to Holland and then to Utrecht."¹⁰²¹ He explained further that he had no knowledge of whether or not Udinck or his father had been working in conjunction with Schulenborgh, or if his father had been to Münster, nor had he heard that either one of them had toasted to the health of the prince-bishop.¹⁰²² With that, the interrogations seem to have come to an end.

Altogether, the totality of the surviving evidence in the written record is rather meagre. The circumstantial evidence, while significant, still omits a number of important details. It is of course plausible, even likely, that other materials pertinent to the case have since disappeared. In the archival record, there are no signs of any last minute courtroom drama, only the confirmation that both Udinck and Harckens were found guilty of espionage and sentenced to die by the sword. Based on the surviving records, one gets the impression that this case was predicated not on the pursuit of justice, but rather on the settling of old scores, which had the double effect of warning others not to collude with Von Galen's camp, lest they too pay a swift and heavy price.

¹⁰¹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰²⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰²¹ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 667, Nr. 37, 14 October 1665.

¹⁰²² Ibid.

SPECTACLE, PAIN, AND THE LIMITS OF STATE PUNISHMENT

On the morning of the executions, 18 November 1665, the Lord Delegates of Groningen likely held a meeting where they addressed any last minute issues regarding the spectacle that was about to take place. One topic that would have been of unique importance to them was the city's decision to hire an executioner from Friesland. For the better part of the seventeenth century, the office of the *scherprechter* or *beul* (executioner) of Groningen was maintained by the Havestadt family. Geert Havestadt was named executioner of Groningen in 1607 and he served in that capacity until his death in 1633.¹⁰²³ Following his death, the title of *scherprechter* was then passed to his sons: first to Hans Havestadt and then to Joost Havestadt, followed by his grandson and namesake, Geert Havestadt.¹⁰²⁴

Of these three successors, Joost Havestadt had the shortest tenure as Groningen's executioner, serving only two years, from 1663 until 1665. In August 1665, Joost Havestadt apparently drank himself to death while working a few hours outside of the city.¹⁰²⁵ His unexpected passing left the position of executioner in Groningen vacant until 1666 when the younger Geert Havestadt took over. In the meantime, and as a result of this vacancy, the city had no executioner, prompting the provincial leaders to search outside of the province for a replacement. Their search led them to Valentijn Adams (d. 1673), an unpopular executioner from the province of Friesland, who, presumably after being offered the job in Groningen, travelled from Leeuwarden to carry out the deed. The leaders in Groningen were probably aware of Adams's poor reputation. The complaints levied against him date back to at least 1658, when he

¹⁰²³ A.A. Fokker, "De Scherprechter-ledenzetter. geschiedkundige bijdrage" in *Nederlandsch tijdschrift voor geneeskunde: tevens orgaan der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Geneeskunst*, vol. 21 (Amsterdam: A. Frijlink, 1870), 187.

¹⁰²⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰²⁵ Ibid.

was described as incompetent, and accused of causing so much unnecessary suffering that he should not be allowed to operate within the city.¹⁰²⁶ Nevertheless, the Groningen city council paid Adams 80 guilders for his part, and collectively paid his assistants, or “*witcogel*” (white cocks) as they are referred in the city account books, an additional 72 guilders.¹⁰²⁷ These rates seem to have been comparable to other Dutch executioners from this period. A rate card from a professional executioner in Warffum (a village in Groningen) in 1700, for example, showed that 50 guilders was charged for decapitations, but this was on top of his normal salary, which also included free living quarters in the *beulstoren* (executioner’s tower) and an occasional quart of wine.¹⁰²⁸

Between 10 and 11 o’clock in the morning, Dr. Harckens was brought before the executioner in the Grote Markt. Van Aitzema later wrote that Harckens appeared disheveled and defiant as he approached the scaffold; so much so that the “*Dienaers van de Justitie*” (servants of justice) “had to hold him down with ropes so that the executioner could deliver the final blow.”¹⁰²⁹ In terms of a successful beheading in the early modern period, the best case scenario for both the condemned and the executioner was that the head would be severed with one strike. Adams, however, demonstrated an unimaginable lack of proficiency at the scaffold that day, and neither Harckens’s nor Udinck’s execution went as expected. It took the executioner two swings of his sword to fully decapitate Harckens, and it would take more than double that number for Udinck.¹⁰³⁰

¹⁰²⁶ *De Vrije Fries* Nr. 31 (1932), 4.

¹⁰²⁷ J.C. Mekel, *Groningen* vol. 1 (Groningen: 1916), 375; see also K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

¹⁰²⁸ K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55), the *beulstoren* was located on the *Torenstraat* on the western side of the city and despite its name, actually had not had a tower since the sixteenth century.

¹⁰²⁹ Van Aitzema, *Historie of Verhael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh . . . Vyfde deel*, 668.

¹⁰³⁰ Aantekening in het protocol van uitgaande brieven van Gedeputeerde Staten van Stad en Lande, “Een onhandige beul,” *Groningsche Volksalmanak*, (Groningen, Erven B. van der Kamp, 1895), 74.

Around 11 o'clock, Udinck was brought to the scaffold. In his description of their last moments before death, Van Aitzema contrasted the desperation of Harckens to the courage of Udinck.¹⁰³¹ According to Van Aitzema, Udinck appeared poised, and when given an opportunity to make a valediction, he “showed great repentance.”¹⁰³² Udinck openly apologized to the court and the citizenry for his misdeeds, prayed to God, and finally asked for forgiveness.¹⁰³³ Van Aitzema’s account does not explicitly say if these misdeeds were related to Udinck being a sinner in general or if they were directly related to the betrayal of Groningen. Still, recent scholarship on these types of valedictions provides important insights into the potential mindset of both Udinck and the crowd members who were watching. In his book, *The Hour of Our Death*, Philippe Ariès describes this type of final declaration as an attempt by the condemned to “become his own judge” with the hope of dictating his own salvation.¹⁰³⁴ This is a theme that is prevalent, not only on scaffold, but throughout Udinck’s experience in exile. Likewise, Richard Wunderli and Gerald Broce suggest that valedictions were a way of displaying “an attitude of radical individualism,” because it allowed one to “control, by mental concentration, his own death and salvation.”¹⁰³⁵ Although Udinck himself was a devout Calvinist, his choices, behaviors and patterns of practice also demonstrated a unique individualism. While not enough to warrant another pardon, his valediction and courageous attitude on the scaffold, especially during the course of what became a botched execution, stirred up sympathy in the crowd.

¹⁰³¹ Van Aitzema, *Historie of Verhael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh . . . Vyfde deel*, 668; See also Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdsverdrif in ballingschap*, lviii.

¹⁰³² Van Aitzema, *Historie of Verhael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh . . . Vyfde deel*, 668.

¹⁰³³ Ibid.

¹⁰³⁴ Philippe Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death*, translated by Helen Weaver (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1981), 108-109.

¹⁰³⁵ Richard Wunderli and Gerald Broce, “The Final Moment before Death in Early Modern England,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 20.2 (Summer, 1989), 259-275: 259.

Udinck's beheading was an utter disaster. The executioner repeatedly missed the mark with his sword, and only after four or five blows upon the neck, (and most likely other areas such as the head, shoulder, back, etc.) was Udinck's head completely severed from his body.¹⁰³⁶ The carnage of such a botched execution, and at such close proximity to the public spectators, caused the audience's emotions to boil over. They cried out in anger at the executioner, threatened to kill him, and even physically charged after him. The crowd chased Adams from the scaffold, through the city streets, literally attempting to lynch him, until he finally barricaded himself in a wine house, where moments later and still clutching his bloody sword, he was rescued by an armed militia.¹⁰³⁷

Like all forms of public punishment in the Dutch Republic and in most of Europe for that matter, executions transformed the marketplace from a space of consumer consumption to one of political expediency and performance. The traditional view of capital punishment was that executions were imposed to deter criminal activity while reinforcing the state's own positional superiority. Through the phenomenological experience of witnessing an execution, the state ascribed to the public an understanding of the severity of the crime and the perceived need to punish it. Although public executions may have been implemented by the state, they were also used as a sort of catharsis for the citizenry by expelling the condemned from the community and from the realm of the living. In this performance, the role of the professional state-sponsored executioner was merely to provide a clean death to the condemned so that the sins of the accused might be washed away from the community.

Udinck's execution, however, offers a corrective to the aforementioned traditional views of capital punishment. As Mitchell Merback argues, the sight of a broken body invoked in the

¹⁰³⁶ Aantekening in het protocol "Een onhandige beul," 74.

¹⁰³⁷ Ibid.

audience not only shock, but also sympathy, making the punishment and the spectacle “dialectical halves of the same experiential mode.”¹⁰³⁸ Valentijn Adams’s lack of proficiency indicated that he was unable, or unwilling, to live up to his own personal responsibilities and social expectations, and the audience members were no mere silent observers. The approval of the audience was, first and foremost, vital for city leaders, who, despite their family lineages, still required the public’s passivity to legitimize their own authority. Audiences also acted according to their own nature, sharing their sympathies for the condemned, not only for political reasons, but also because of their religious convictions.¹⁰³⁹ As Merback writes, “the signs of the body in pain were . . . the focal point of comprehension which gave the spectacle its religious meaning.”¹⁰⁴⁰ But even executions had their limits. In moments of excessive punishment, such as when the sinner had sought repentance and forgiveness, the audience might be inclined to see the condemned as more of a Christian martyr than a sinful criminal. This seems to have been the case for Udinck and his audience, whose sympathies for him were undoubtedly reinforced as he was writhing in pain, screaming out for mercy, and actively dying. In this regard, Udinck’s performance exceeded the audience’s expectations. The same could not be said of the executioner or the city leaders who had sanctioned such an act.

It is also quite possible that some of the public anger directed at Udinck’s flawed killing may have actually stemmed from a simmering hostility toward the city leaders. Certainly some of those in the audience had supported, or even participated in, the guild riots of 1662. Some likely opposed the execution from the start. Others may have been willing to begrudgingly

¹⁰³⁸ Merback, *The Thief, the Cross and the Wheel*, 129.

¹⁰³⁹ Ibid., 117-119, 137, this experience was also tied to biblical narratives. The use of the wheel, for example, was sometimes compared to the *crurifragium*, an ancient Roman procedure described in the Gospel of John whereby soldiers would break the legs of the condemned on the cross in order to expedite their death.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Ibid., 152.

accept Udinck's fate by entertaining the idea that he may have tried to betray their city to Von Galen, but were unwilling to allow the convict die such a cruel death.

The lingering sympathy for the two public tribunes seems to have made the regents decide not to place the bodies of Dr. Lucas Harckens and Gerard Udinck on display. The city council surely did not want to reignite the anger of the mob. Instead, both were laid to rest that same evening and given remarkable honors for people who had been convicted of treason. Udinck's body was interned in the *Broerkerk* in Groningen, while Harckens's body was interned in cellar number 52 in the *Martinikerk* in Groningen, where it remains today.¹⁰⁴¹

¹⁰⁴¹ B. Lonsain, "Een onhandige beul" in "*Groningen*". *Tijdschrift voor de volkstaal, geschiedenis, volksleven enz. van de provincie Groningen Vol. 1* (Groningen: J.C. Mekel, 1916), 375; ¹⁰⁴¹ <http://www.dodenakkers.nl/begraafplaatsen/begraafplaatsen-in-groningen/321-groningenrk.html> accessed on 21 March 2018, The *Broerkerk* originated as a Franciscan cloister in the Middle Ages, but during the Dutch Revolt, it was converted to a Protestant church and incorporated into the University of Groningen in 1614. In the late nineteenth century, the *Broerkerk* was given back to the Catholic Church, but it was in such disrepair that the decision was made to have it demolished. The University of Groningen's library now occupies the spot where the *Broerkerk* once stood. The remains of those who had been buried in and around the *Broerkerk* - presumably this would include Udinck - were later transferred to Groningen's *Zuiderbegraafplaats*, a cemetery just south of the city proper.; Images of the cellar and some additional information regarding Harckens's grave is available on the website: http://www.redmeralma.nl/groningen_MK1.htm#1623 accessed on 12 March 2018. Harckens's wife passed away in 1670 and is interned there as well.

CONCLUSION

For almost three years, Udinck attempted to carve out a sustainable life in exile. And although his experiences were unfortunate, his diary shows little evidence of his faith having been rattled. If we can believe Van Aitzema's account, even in the final moments before death, Udinck maintained a high degree of stoicism. Presumably holding fast to his faith until the bitter end, Udinck must have convinced himself that through his suffering and loss, he would gain something even more valuable in return: complete redemption and validation that he had indeed been predestined to live forever as one of God's elect. It seems that redemption, along with the welfare of his family, were certainly the most pressing concerns for Udinck in the moments just before his death.

Here again, one is reminded of the two passages in the opening pages of his diary (see introduction), which emphasize notions of complete loss, redemption, solitude, and self-examination.¹⁰⁴² These were certainly not fortuitous remarks. On the contrary, they seem almost obligatory for someone like Udinck, who found himself trapped in a number of hostile confrontations. For historians, social tensions, like the one that plagued Udinck, help define the legal, political, economic, social, and cultural terrains through which early modern people were permitted to wander. For Udinck, and for other diarists in the seventeenth century, maintaining a journal was a form of escapism, a means to explore the world - God's creation - and even one's own imagination. Solitude and diary writing offered Udinck a refuge from the unrelenting effects

¹⁰⁴² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274.

of public life, from orthodoxy, from the maintenance of one's reputation, and from the attachments of family, neighbors, and the broader constraints of society. Yet diary writing, and solitude more broadly, are not necessarily about being anti-social. On the contrary, they are dependent upon interactions with society, even if the subject believes that happiness can only reside in those spaces that are free of social interference.

In many ways, Udinck's diary is a text about negotiating his own interiority, or inwardness (i.e., his desire for autonomy and recognition in the face of oppressive external normative systems).¹⁰⁴³ This is the primary conflict that defined Udinck's experience in exile. He sought to bring his house, his life, and his destiny into order, but in the course of his banishment, self-mastery would prove nearly unattainable. Gossip, plague, and war, as well as a lack of safety networks and clientage/patronage opportunities in northwestern Germany limited Udinck's socioeconomic opportunities. He lived on the margins, persisting in a negative space where he internalized the world around him. He turned his attention inward, a sort of meditation through which he assessed not only himself, but also himself in relation to the community and indeed all of the known world. It was a process through which he critiqued the visible spiritual and secular institutions of his day, all of which paled in comparison to his own "invisible church" (i.e., the interiority of his own beliefs).¹⁰⁴⁴

Like John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress from this world to that which is to come*, Udinck's diary describes a physical and spiritual journey from an earthly "City of Destruction," through a number of ordeals, or valleys, of "Humiliation" and "Death," before finally arriving in

¹⁰⁴³ Walter Albert Davis, *Inwardness and Existence: Subjectivity In/and Hegel, Heidegger, Marx, and Freud* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), 103.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Rüdiger Campe and Julia Weber, eds., *Rethinking Emotion: Interiority and Exteriority in Premodern, Modern and Contemporary Thought* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 1-2.

the “Celestial City,” a land of spiritual salvation and redemption.¹⁰⁴⁵ For Udinck, this journey exposed a number of flaws, not only in himself, but also among others in his community. As such, one might draw parallels between Udinck’s diary and Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s *Confessions*. But whereas Rousseau openly discussed matters that would have been frankly embarrassing, Udinck, who was writing a century earlier, could not take such bold steps, lest he jeopardize everything that he held dear.¹⁰⁴⁶ Therefore he kept them private. This is particularly evident in the opening pages where he writes: “[I] desire to know that after my death, this notebook will be burned in the fire, because there is nothing unusual in it, as [it] only served to dispel my time while in exile.”¹⁰⁴⁷ This ostensible request has nothing to do with pragmatism. Rather Udinck recognized that his diary was filled with stories of his own misfortune as well as unsavory commentaries about various military and political leaders. Naturally, this would bring additional dishonor and shame upon himself and his family.

Throughout his diary Udinck repeatedly displays an interest in time, weather, wealth, and geographical locations, subjects that simultaneously call attention to both the material and immaterial elements of his daily life. These often served as metaphors for the body and soul. Like the “fog and rain that had followed [him] from Groningen,” his fortune and misfortune were both material and immaterial, pervasive yet unable to be manipulated.¹⁰⁴⁸ For Udinck, fog and misfortune were likened to a spirit, lacking physical properties, but inexorably linked to the material world around him. Similar symbols of the material and immaterial world can be found

¹⁰⁴⁵ John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim’s progress from this world to that which is to come: delivered under the similitude of a dream, shewing the several difficulties and dangers he met with, and the many victories he obtained over the world, the flesh, and the Devil, together with his happy arrival at the celestial city, and the glory and joy he found to his eternal comfort: to which is added, The life and death of John Bunyan, author of the first and second part, this compleating the whole progress* (London: E. Millet, 1693).

¹⁰⁴⁶ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Confessions of J.J. Rousseau* (New York: Calvin Blanchard, 1856), 31-32.

¹⁰⁴⁷ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274.

¹⁰⁴⁸ GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 7 October 1664, 23 November 1664, 21 December 1664 recalling the events of 23 December 1662; and 1 April 1664.

in his entries about travel and wandering, many of which emphasize the impediments that restricted his freedom. They were reminders of his legal limitations as well as a commentary on his lack of social and economic mobility. His frustration with these impediments was not always explicit. More often than not it was complex and disguised in language of fear aimed at specific threats, and anxiety about the countless abstract insecurities in his world. For example, he feared the Münsterite army, but was anxious about his prospects for the future, whether in the Dutch Republic or in Germany.

Like the rain and fog, there were other aspects of Udinck's life in exile that were difficult, if not impossible, to control. For example, the questionable behavior of his family members, especially within a community that was more than willing to force out those who did not conform to strict moral standards. The gossip and ridicule that he experienced had a cascading effect on his trade, economic wellbeing, and social mobility. Even more significant to Udinck's eventual downfall were his longstanding connections to the financial, legal and political institutions within Groningen.

Politically, at least for Groningen's city council, Udinck and Harckens were no less than lifelong fugitives, orchestrators of the guild riots, and enemies of the state. They were connected, at least in the minds of the councilors, to the former patron of the guilds, the ringleader of the riots, and perhaps the most wanted man in Groningen, Johan Schulenborgh. Even after dismantling the guilds' ability to interfere with local politics, Groningen's city council remained deeply bitter about these topics and about Schulenborgh's escape, retention of his property, and service with Von Galen. It is impossible to know for sure how many times Udinck met or spoke with Schulenborgh while he was in exile as only one letter has survived. Indubitably then, there was some interaction between the two, even if the extent of it remains unclear. Still, regardless of

Udinck's sympathies, or lack thereof, for Schulenborgh, rehabilitation in Groningen was not an option for either man.

Perhaps Schulenborgh may have attempted to play Udinck as a pawn in his broader efforts to help Von Galen conquer Groningen. It very well may be that Udinck was as Fokko Veldman describes him: "a victim of a political game in which he could be abused because he did not fully recognize the consequences."¹⁰⁴⁹ Be that as it may, the broader historical circumstances surrounding Udinck's banishment, life in exile, flight, and execution are much more complicated than simply asserting, as Veldman does, that Udinck "perished because of his own rigidity and naiveté."¹⁰⁵⁰ Certainly, human agency is an important part of this story, but it is equally important to recognize the limitations that contemporary societies place on the choices available to individual actors. In other words, context matters. The hostility, bitterness, and lack of legal clarity in both Groningen as well as in the Republic as a whole, combined with the approach of Von Galen's violent mercenaries, compelled an already embattled Udinck to make a stark choice: expose himself to being plundered and even murdered by marauding troops, or try to escape them and seek refuge in the Republic. In both cases, his livelihood and property as well as his very life would be at risk. At this point, in his late 50s and after having been tethered to the city of Groningen for most of his life, he made a desperate decision to return, to collect as much money as he could, and then continue on to a safer province. His choices, like all human choices, did not emerge from a void, but rather from the unending negotiations that exists between one's self and one's society. The accusations leveled at him by the Groningen authorities that he was returning as part of, or colluding with, Von Galen's invasion seem preposterous and no material evidence has surfaced about Udinck's alleged treason.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Niebaum and Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap*, lxxiv.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Ibid.

In the interrogators' notes, it is only upon the use of torture that Udinck and Harckens confessed, and unfortunately, the finer details of their confessions remain opaque. Maresius's letters provide some additional clues. As is evidenced from Maresius's own letters, he and Udinck had long maintained a close friendship, both in Groningen and throughout his exile. As a theologian, and as a conservative Calvinist who developed ever more into a maverick, Maresius quarreled with just about everyone regarding religious subject matter. Udinck too was interested in religious debates, but there is no evidence in the archival record, at least that I have seen, that either of them had sympathies for the prince-bishop or for Catholicism more broadly. At best, the letters between these two men reveal that Udinck had indeed been instrumental in the earlier guild riots, and that Maresius had long known about Udinck's involvement in them, but offer little else regarding potential collusion with Münster. It seems likely that Udinck was simply caught in a zero sum game between two competing hegemonic powers, Groningen and Münster, to neither of which he could claim membership.

From late 1664 through 1665, as the pressure mounted from these two competing groups, there is a coinciding increase of existentialism evident in Udinck's diary entries. Even if he did not recognize it as such, Udinck's diary writing was indeed a form of philosophizing, and in the famous words of Montaigne, "to philosophize is to learn how to die."¹⁰⁵¹ In exile, there was no way for him to know for sure what would become of his life. He had witnessed plague, war, and other forms of death on a horrific scale. As the months dragged on, it seems that for Udinck, there was only the existence, the drama of the journey and the experience, which was simultaneously working towards some unpredictable, perhaps predestined, conclusion. This

¹⁰⁵¹ Michel de Montaigne, "That to Philosophize is to Learn how to Die," *Montaigne's Essays* (London: Dent, 1965).

uncertainty about the future was as much of an anxiety-producing element as any of the physical threats that surrounded him. He sometimes expressed this in terms of distance, from Steinfurt (or Neuenhaus) back to Groningen, or from exile to redemption, but it was more often expressed in terms of time. This presence of unrelenting time is everywhere in Udinck's diary. It is heard in his descriptions of his pocket watch, bells, clocks, and specific hours of the day, all of which served as reminders of the past and of the future, the passing of time, the brevity of life, and the ephemerality of worldly goods. Indeed, his experiences in exile seemed like a recurring *momento mori*.

For Udinck, diary writing was a means through which he could measure the merits of his life against the passage of time and the accumulation - or lack there of - of material wealth. In this regard, Udinck always sought the moral high ground. In October 1664, at the peak of the plague epidemic and as his last potential patron Willem Frederik laid on his death bed, Udinck attempted to reassure himself that material possessions did not matter, and that "one can live on hope alone."¹⁰⁵² This was easier said than done, however. By the summer of 1665, Udinck's sentiments had changed. He had become a desperate man, and this desperation was largely the result of his financial insecurity. His personal property was under threat from the approaching Münsterite soldiers, his investments in Groningen were illiquid and possibly even lost forever as the result of corruption in the Groningen financial offices and bitterness in the city council. Without children of his own, he attempted to push through a power of attorney and legal will that would ensure that his wife and niece would inherit his money and property. Udinck's tarnished reputation, physical distance, and shortage of patrons in Groningen, however, made this difficult

¹⁰⁵² GrA, Inv. 835, Catalogue 274, 20 October 1664.

to coordinate. If we follow Udinck's diary entries, these were his primary concerns in the weeks and months leading up to the invasion.

By the autumn of 1665, Udinck was devoid of money and honor, under the threat of plundering mercenaries, and tethered to Groningen by financial and familial obligations. Udinck pursued the only real path that was available to him; he traveled back to the Dutch Republic. It was a decision that some have described as naive, but I contend that such a judgement is overly simplistic. As Bedford and Davis have argued, the experience of war "is a universal one, from the Homeric epics to twentieth- and twenty-first-century," and the impact of war on the human psyche is perhaps best described as spawning "madness, drunkenness, moral anarchy, the abandonment of right judgement, and the dismemberment both of social relations and the self."¹⁰⁵³ In other words, trauma can illicit unexpected responses, and for every reason that he has been called naive, we can find at least as many reasons to call him courageous. His courage was perhaps best displayed in the final moments of his life. He defied a court order and violated the terms of his banishment in the face of overt hostility and the threat of death. After his second arrest, the interrogators complained that "he persists in the negative," a moment in which we might imagine Udinck taking solace in their frustration.¹⁰⁵⁴ On the scaffold, he demonstrated tremendous "courage," and at the moment of death he held fast, unwittingly inspiring an angry crowd to rise up against an incompetent executioner, and by extension, against the flawed legal authority and political oppression of Groningen's city council.¹⁰⁵⁵ Unwilling to conform to the

¹⁰⁵³ Bedford and Davis, *Early Modern English Lives*, 157.

¹⁰⁵⁴ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665 and 13 October 1665.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Van Aitzema, *Historie of Verael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh . . . Vyfde deel*, 668.

stifling and uncompromising restrictions of life in seventeenth-century Groningen, Udinck lived as he died, “persisting in the negative.”¹⁰⁵⁶

¹⁰⁵⁶ GrA, Toegang 2041, Inv. 661, Nr. 31, 5 October 1665 and 13 October 1665.

EPILOGUE:
FROM WAR TO DISASTER

In the days and weeks following the executions, many in the city remained convinced that Von Galen's soldiers were en route to Groningen. There were, however, a number of factors halting Von Galen's advance, such as depleted coffers, international pressure, and unfavorable terrain, all of which eventually helped Groningen to emerge relatively unscathed. Perhaps the most significant of these was the issue of pay. The agreement between Charles II and Von Galen, stipulated that the troops levied by Münster were to be paid for by England, but in an unexpected twist, an English shipwreck off Ostend, and improvements in the Dutch fleet, combined on several crucial moments to interfere with the transfer of these funds.¹⁰⁵⁷ Without consistent payments, Von Galen was constantly at risk of losing his mercenaries to disobedience and desertion. In addition, the Dutch had their own alliance with France, and had already been in negotiations with the leaders of Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Brunswick, and Brandenburg.¹⁰⁵⁸ There was a broad consensus among the German princes, both Protestant and Catholic alike, to bring the bishop to the negotiating table.¹⁰⁵⁹

There were also environmental conditions that were unfavorable to Von Galen. A host of unusual weather trends in the second half of the seventeenth century, most notably the increased

¹⁰⁵⁷ Brinkman, "Charles II and the Bishop of Münster," 686-698: 690-691.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Ibid., 686-698: 692-693; see also Rommelse, *The Second Anglo-Dutch War*, 143.

precipitation and colder than normal temperatures impeded troop movements.¹⁰⁶⁰ Von Galen's mercenaries had to traverse the rural areas of the eastern provinces where dirt roads and peat bogs already made travel slower than in more urbanized areas, and the increased rain only served to hamper these efforts.¹⁰⁶¹ Furthermore, Von Galen had earned a reputation for favoring the use of heavy artillery in his sieges. His troops were forced to haul this artillery through seemingly endless muddy quagmires, which not only stalled the advance, but also created additional dangers and expenses to an increasingly demoralized campaign. Von Galen's problems were exacerbated by the Dutch, who broke levies, windmills, and other forms of infrastructure, which caused significant flooding, as well as shortages of bread and beer. In addition, at Münster's headquarters in Winschoten, over 1,000 of Von Galen's mercenaries died from the plague.¹⁰⁶² All of these things occurred even before the presence of heavy international military pressure. Münster's last holdout in the Republic was at Wedde, a village in Groningen that fell on 8 January 1666.¹⁰⁶³ Over the following months, Dutch, French, and other allies marched east and took the fight to Münster, where they pillaged and burned a number of German towns and villages.¹⁰⁶⁴

Throughout the war, Groningen's leaders remained preoccupied with some of their old nemeses, particularly Maresius, Rengers, and Schulenborgh. As a result of Udinck's interrogations, Groningen authorities had new information, and therefore new forms of ammunition that they used against all three of these men. In former years, for example, the Groningen regents had tended to support Maresius in his theological conflicts with Voetius, but

¹⁰⁶⁰ Dagomar Degroot, "The Frigid Golden Age: Experiencing Climate Change in the Dutch Republic, 1560-1720," (Ph.D. Dissertation, York University, 2017), 332-334.

¹⁰⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶² K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

¹⁰⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Ibid.

after the content of his letters to Udinck were revealed, his standing among the city council declined rapidly.¹⁰⁶⁵ Following Udinck's trial, the regents shifted their support to favor one of Maresius's academic rivals, Jacob Alting. Having lost the trust of the council members, and having made enemies in both Groningen's political and academic circles, Maresius was increasingly confined to the relative safety of the church.¹⁰⁶⁶ In 1669, Maresius attempted to transfer to the University of Franeker, but his request was denied.¹⁰⁶⁷ In December 1672, he began experiencing severe cold-like symptoms - the first signs of the illness that would eventually take his life.¹⁰⁶⁸ He continued to work for another three months, at which time a tumor on his left leg forced him to remain in bed.¹⁰⁶⁹ He was finally offered a professorship at Leiden University in 1673, but his failing health prevented him from being able fill that position.¹⁰⁷⁰ He died on 18 May 1673.¹⁰⁷¹

Rengers continued to grapple with the city authorities until the end of his life. His most significant contest came in 1672, when he was accused of treason. The main witness against him was an eighteen-year-old girl names Sophia van der Camp, who had claimed that she had overheard Rengers telling others about a conspiracy with the King of France to overthrow Groningen.¹⁰⁷² These accusations were bolstered by Rengers's associations with members of the French elite born of his membership in the Order of St. Michael and his friendship - and later familial connections - with the lawyer Henric Piccardt (1636-1712) who was a regular attendee

¹⁰⁶⁵ Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 399-401.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Van Berkel, *Universiteit van het Noorden*, 242.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 400.

¹⁰⁶⁸ *Ibid*, 400-401.

¹⁰⁶⁹ *Ibid*, 401.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Roger Ariew, Dennis des Chene, Douglas M. Jesseph, Tad M. Schmaltz, Theo Verbeek, *Historical Dictionary of Descartes and Cartesian Philosophy* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 221.

¹⁰⁷¹ Nauta, *Samuel Maresius*, 401.

¹⁰⁷² K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

at the French court.¹⁰⁷³ As a result, he was arrested, imprisoned in the *Poelepoort*, and put to the rack.¹⁰⁷⁴ Even under heavy torture, Rengers never confessed, so the Groningen authorities denied him access to his family and withheld legal documents from his lawyers.¹⁰⁷⁵ During his trial, Rengers - much like Udinck, Schulenborgh, Harckens and Warendorp - faced a Groningen court that was politically biased and full of personal enemies from the city council.¹⁰⁷⁶ In 1677, a pamphlet was published objecting to the city government's handling of Rengers's case, and the lack of evidence against him, prompting Willem III to intervene.¹⁰⁷⁷ With Willem III's help, Rengers was finally released in 1678, but he died the following year.¹⁰⁷⁸

For the Groningen authorities, any new information regarding Schulenborgh was used to reinforce what they already knew to be true: he was a traitor bent on the destruction of Groningen. Schulenborgh remained in Münster and in the service of Von Galen's retinue until the prince-bishop's death in 1678, after which, and somewhat remarkably, he moved to Holland.¹⁰⁷⁹ This, of course, was much to the chagrin of the Groningen authorities, who repeatedly tried to have him extradited. In 1680, he was living in The Hague, and the court there informed Groningen that the stadholder, Willem III, "had taken the matter into consideration," but nothing came of it.¹⁰⁸⁰ Schulenborgh lived out his days in The Hague with his wife Grietien, who died in 1689, and he in 1692.¹⁰⁸¹ Adding insult to injury for the Groningers, Schulenborgh received a lavish stately funeral procession through the streets of The Hague on 14 August 1692,

¹⁰⁷³ Henric Piccardt later married the daughter of Osebrand Johan Rengers, Anna Elisabeth Rengers (1657-1704).

¹⁰⁷⁴ K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

¹⁰⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁶ De Bruin, *Geheimhouding en Verraad*, 569-570.

¹⁰⁷⁷ K. ter Laan, *Groninger Encyclopedie* (Groningen, 1954/55).

¹⁰⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Poelman, "Johan Schulenborch," 67-68.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Ibid..

¹⁰⁸¹ Ibid.

before his corpse was laid to rest in cellar number 42 in the *Nieuwe Kerk*, where it remains today.¹⁰⁸²

While the lives of Maresius, Rengers, and Schulenborgh are well recorded in the archives, there are far fewer records regarding the leading women from this story. Janneke Jason, for example, does not appear again in the Groningen archives. Maria, however, appears in a number of church records and a handful of secondary sources, although these are almost entirely focused on her marriage and children. Following her uncle's execution, Maria remained in the city of Groningen. In 1667, she married the secretary to the Admiralty Jan Laman and together they had at least four children: Paulus (1668-1747), Janneke (b. 1672), Philippus (b. 1674), and Gerhard (b. 1677).¹⁰⁸³ Paulus, in particular, would go on to play an important role in Groningen's legal and political realms. He attended the University of Groningen, where he completed his doctorate in law in 1689, at the ripe old age of twenty-one.¹⁰⁸⁴ Afterwards, he worked as a lawyer, served on the *Gezwoeren Gemeente*, was a member of the city council, authored at least three books, and quite remarkably, became mayor of Groningen.¹⁰⁸⁵ His success was a sign of the times. Like so many other ambitious young men in the city, including his late uncle-in-law Gerard Udinck, Paulus Laman was also a *homo novus*, who achieved more than most could imagine.

¹⁰⁸² Ibid..

¹⁰⁸³ GrA, 124, inv. 147 and inv. 148, the other children include Philippus (b. 1674), Janneke (b. 1672), and Gerhard (b. 1677).

¹⁰⁸⁴ Hendrikus Oktavius Feith, *Het Groninger beklemregt; of Verzameling van staats-resolutie, en andere, tot het beklemregt betrekkelijke, stukken, uitgegeven, en met aantekeningen voorzien door Mr. H.O. Feith, advokaat*, Volume 1 (Groningen: W. Zuidema, 1828), 5-6.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Ibid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS

Groninger Archieven (Groningen Municipal Archives)

- Toegang 2041, Inv. 835, no. 274, Gerard Udinck's Diary, December 1662-October 1665
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 140, Declaration by the eighteen guilds regarding Udinck's role in the municipal government, 16 December 1662
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 144, Sentencing of Warendorp, Harckens and Udinck, 16 January 1663
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 145, Order for Udinck to leave Groningen within ten days, 19 January 1663
- Toegang 2041, Inventory 1200, Public notice prohibiting Schulenborgh's *Prodromus Schulenburgicae defensionis* and announcing that copies will be burned by the city's executioner, 29 August 1663
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 2086, Resolution from the mayors and city council regarding the restrictions placed on Catholics within the city, October 1665
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 662, no. 32, Letter from A. van Nijeveen in Zwolle to Groningen regarding troop movements, October 1665
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 2091, no. 60, Letter from Maresius to the Groningen authorities regarding Udinck's arrest, October 1665
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 661-666, Interrogators' notes regarding Gerard Udinck, Janneke Jason, Maria Jason, Dr. Lucas Harckens, Lucas Harckens (son), and Henricus Woest, 5-14 October 1665
- Toegang 2041, Inv. 668, records regarding the *Sauvegarde*.
- Toegang 2073, Inv. 72, Various letters from Maresius to Udinck, and one from Schulenborgh to Udinck, 1663-1664
- Toegang 2169, *Anwysinge Van dat De pennigen soo uit de Provinciale Cassa werden vermisst, sijn wegh gekoomen door de quaade administratie van de gewesene Commijs Jeremias Mees Ende Clercq Geert Lubberts Dienende tot justificatie van den Afgetreden Ontfanger Hendrick van Royen, Dat hy gene Provinciale pennigen tot sijn profijt hebbe ge-diverteert* (Groningen, 1665).
- Toegang 2170, *Kort en oprecht verhael van t' gene, wegen de suyveringe der provinciale ontfangers Reekieninge voor de Ed. Moog. Heeren Gecommitteerde Staten van Stadt en Lande, en anders tusschen den afgetreden ontfanger Hendrick van Royen en Jeremias Mees en Geert Lubbertsz. Weduwe is voorgevallen* (Groningen: Jan Draper, 1665).
- Aantekening in het protocol van uitgaande brieven van Gedeputeerde Staten van Stad en Lande, "Een onhandige beul," in Groningsche Volksalmanak*, (Groningen, Erven B. van der Kamp, 1895).

Lijst van ontvangers-generaal
Stadbestuur, Stadrekening
Regeringsboek der provincie Groningen (Groningen: Oomken, 1850).
Hendrikus Oktavius Feith, *Register van het Archief van Groningen* (Groningen: A. L. Scholtens, 1856).

Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Royal Library in The Hague), Knuttel Collection

Knuttel 9163, *Copie van die Information, Confession-ende Sententien van die twee Vertraders ende Conspirateurs tegens de Steden Arnhem ende Doesburgh, consequentelick tegens den Staat der Vereenighde Nederlanden ondernomen* (Arnhem: Jacob van Biesen, 1665).

Knuttel 9201, Petit 3508, *Klare afbeeldinge van de staert-ster* (1665).

Knuttel 8748A, 24 January 1663, *Sententien by borgemesteren en raadt in Groningen, gepronuncieert tegens Johan van Emmen boumester der Achtijn Gilden, mitsgaders Geert Claessen olderman der Cramer Gilde, Volume 1* (Groningen: Frans Bronchorst, 1663).

Knuttel 8641, Anonymous, *t'Samen-spraecke, van een Advocaet, Boumeester der achteen Gilden ende een Borger der Stadt Groningen. Raeckende Den Oproer ende factien, soo onlanghs door't beleyt van eenige seditieufe Menschen zijn gepasseert* (1662).

Stadarchiv Münster (Münster City Archives)
Stadtgeschichtliche Dokumentation

OTHER PRIMARY SOURCES

Van Aitzema, Lieuwe, *Historie of Verael van Saken van staet en oorlogh, in ende omtrent de Vereenigde Nederlanden: Beginnende met het jaer 1657, ende eyndigende met het jaer 1663. Vierde deel.* ('s Gravenhaghe: Johan Veely, 1669).

_____, *Historie of Verael van Saken van staet en Oorlogh, in, ende ontrent de Vereenigde Nederlanden, Beginnende met het Jaer 1664, ende eyndigende met het Jaer 1666. Vyfde deel.* ('s Gravenhaghe: Johan Veely, 1670).

Alting, Bernhard, *De Pilaren Ende Peerlen van Groningen: Tractaet, betoonende waer op de Welvaert van in die Stadt is staende, ende waer door zy meest is geciert* (Groningen: Samuel Pieman, 1648).

Brandt, Gerard, *Het Leven en Bedryf van den Heere Michiel de Ruiter, Hertog, Ridder & L. Admiraal Generaal van Hollandt en Westvrieslandt* (Amsterdam, 1687).

Brown, Edward, *A Brief Account of Some Travels in Divers Parts of Europe, viz. Hungaria, Servia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Thessaly, Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Corniola, and Frivli, through a great part of Germany, and the Low-Countries, through Marca Trevisana, and Lombardy on both sides the Po. With some observations on the gold, silver, copper,*

quick-silver mines, and the baths and mineral waters in those parts. As also the description of many antiquities, habits, fortifications and remarkable places (London: B. Tooke, 1687).

Bunyan, John, *The Pilgrim's progress from this world to that which is to come: delivered under the similitude of a dream, shewing the several difficulties and dangers he met with, and the many victories he obtained over the world, the flesh, and the Devil, together with his happy arrival at the celestial city and the glory and joy he found to his eternal comfort: to which is added, The life and death of John Bunyan, author of the first and second part, this completing the whole progress* (London: E. Millet, 1693).

Calvin, John, *Commentary on Hosea* (Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library, 1816).

Estrades, Godefroï Louis (comte d'), Hugues de Lionne, France. Sovereign (1643-1715: Louis XIV), *Letters and Negotiations of the Count D'Estrades, Ambassador from Lewis XIV to the States-General of the United-Provinces of the Low-Countries from the Year 1663 to the Year 1669* (London: D. Browne, 1711).

Fonteyne, Claude, *De politycke kuyper onses tydts* (Leeuwarden: Claude Fonteyne, 1647).

Von Galen, Christoph Bernhard, *A Letter Sent by His Highness the Bishop & Prince of Munster to the Lords [of] the States General of the United Netherlands* (Command, 1665).

Van der Goes, Martin, Cornelis Boey, and W. van Strijen, *Deductie ofte kort verhael van 't gene voorgevallen is bij de provincie van stadt Groningen en Ommelanden en derselver gecommiteerde ter vergaderinghe van haer Ho. Mog. ontrent het tracteren ende sluyten van de vrede met de croon Portugal mitsgaders van eenige proceduiren, naderhant daerop gevolgt, alsmede het advys op dat subject bij neutrale rechtsghelerden ghegheven* (The Hague, 13 February 1662).

Von Grimmelshausen, Hans Jacob Christoffel, *The Runagate Courage*, translated by Robert L. Hiller and John C. Osborne, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1965).

_____, *The Life of Courage, the Notorious Thief, Whore and Vagabond*, translated by Mike Mitchell. Sawtry, (UK: Dedalus Limited, 2010).

_____. *Simplicissimus*, Translated by Mike Mitchell. Sawtry, (UK: Dedalus Limited, 2011).

Milton, John, *Paradise Lost* (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1850).

De Montaigne, Michel, *Montaigne's Essays* (London: Dent, 1965).

Picardt, Johan, *Korte Beschrijvinghe van Eenige Vergeten en verborgene antiquiteiten . . . waerbij gevoeght zijn annales Drenthiae* (Amsterdam: G. van Goedesbergh, 1660).

Reductie van de stad Groningen, 23 July 1594.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, *The Confessions of J. J. Rousseau* (New York: Calvin Blanchard, 1856).

Schouten, Wouter, *Woutern Schoutens Oost-Indische voyagie; vervattende veel voorname voorvallen en ongemeene vreemde geschiedenissen . . .* (Amsterdam: Jacob van Meurs en Johannes van Someren, 1676).

Sommair verhael ofte recueil van vragen en antwoorden, voorgevallen in de examinibus met jr. Osebrandt Jan Rengers van Slochteren (Amsterdam: Jan Claeszoon ten Hoorn, 1677).

Temple, Sir William, *Observations Upon the United Provinces of the Netherlands*, first published in 1668 (London: J. Tonson, Awnsham, and J. Churchil, 1705).

Turner, Sir James, *Pallas Armata: Military Essayes of the Ancient Grecian, Roman, and Modern Art of War* (London: M.W. for Richard Chiswell, 1683).

Van den Vondel, Joost, *Gysbreght van Aemstel*, Mieke B. Smits-Veldt ed., (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1994).

_____, *Lucifer*, translated by Noel Clark, (London: Oberon Books, 1990).

BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Aries, Philippe, *The Hour of Our Death*, translated by Helen Weaver (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1981).

Aston, Trevor, ed., *Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1967).

Bedford, Ronald and Lloyd Davis, *Early Modern English Lives: Autobiography and Self-Representation 1500-1660* (London: Routledge, 2007).

Bell, Esther, *The Brothers Le Nain: Painters of Seventeenth-Century France* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2016).

Van Berkel, Klaas, *Universiteit van het Noorden: vier eeuwen academisch leven in Groningen: Deel 1 De oude universiteit, 1614-1876* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2014).

Van Berkel, Klaas and Arjo Vanderjagt, eds., *The Book of Nature in Early Modern History* (Leuven, NL: Peeters, 2006).

Bieleman, Jan, *Boeren op het Drentse zand 1600-1910: Een nieuwe visie op de 'oude' landbouw* (Utrecht: HES Uitgevers BV, 1987).

- Blaak, Jeroen, *Literacy in Everyday Life: Reading and Writing in Early Modern Dutch Diaries* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- Blok, Petrus Johannes, *History of the People of the Netherlands* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1907).
- Boogman, J.C., "The Union of Utrecht: its Genesis and Consequences," *Low Countries Historical Review* 94, 3 (1979): 377-407.
- Boschiero, Luciano, "Giovanni Borelli and the Comets of 1664-65," *Journal for the History of Astronomy* 40 (2009): 11-30.
- Boulton, D'Arcy Jonathan Dacre, *The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520* (Rochester, NY: Boydell Press, 2000).
- Bourdieu, Pierre, "The Forms of Capital" (1986) in Imre Szeman and Timothy Kaposy, eds., *Cultural Theory: An Anthology* (Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2011).
- Boterbloem, Kees, *The Fiction and Reality of Jan Struys: A Seventeenth-Century Dutch Globetrotter* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
- Brandon, Pepijn, *War, Capital, and the Dutch State (1588-1795)* (Leiden: Brill, 2015).
- Brinkman, C., "Charles II and the Bishop of Münster in the Anglo-Dutch War of 1665-6," *The English Historical Review* 21, 84 (October 1906), 686-698.
- Van den Broek, Jan, *Groningen, een stad apart: over het verleden van een eigenzinnige stad (1000-1600)* (Groningen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2007).
- Broomhall, Susan and Jacqueline van Gent, *Gender, Power and Identity in the Early Modern House of Orange-Nassau* (London: Routledge, 2016).
- Bruijn, Jaap R. and Jan Lucassen, eds., *Op de schepen der Oost-Indische Compagnie: vijf artikelen van J. de Hullu* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff and Bouma's Boekhuis, 1980).
- De Bruin, G., *Geheimhouding en Verraad: De geheimhouding van staatszaken ten tijde van de Republiek (1600-1750)* ('s-Gravenhage: SDU Uitgeverij, 1991).
- Buursma, Albert, "*Dese bekommerlijke tijden*": *armenzorg, armen en armoede in de stad Groningen 1594-1795* (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum, 2009).
- Buvelot, Quentin, *Jacob van Ruisdael paints Bentheim* (Zwolle: Waanders Publishers, 2009).
- Campe, Rudiger and Julia Weber, eds., *Rethinking Emotion: Interiority and Exteriority in Premodern, Modern and Contemporary Thought* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014).

- Claydon, Tony, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Cook, Alexander Parma and Noble David Cook, *Good Faith and Truthful Ignorance: A Case of Transatlantic Bigamy* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991).
- D'Addario, Christopher, *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Darnton, Robert, "First Steps Toward a History of Reading," in Peter Burke, ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
- _____, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books: 2009).
- Davis, Natalie Zemon, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).
- Davis, Walter Albert, *Inwardness and Existence: Subjectivity In/and Hegel, Heidegger, Marx, and Freud* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).
- Dekker, Rudolf M., *Family, Culture and Society in the Diary of Constantijn Huygens Jr, Secretary to Stadholder-King William of Orange* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).
- _____, "Getting to the Source: Women in the Medieval and Early Modern Netherlands," *Journal of Women's History* 10, 2 (summer, 1998): 165-188.
- _____, *Holland in beroering: oproeren in de 17de en 18de eeuw* (Ambo, 1982).
- _____, *Humour in Dutch Culture of the Golden Age* (New York: Palgrave, 2001).
- _____, "Labour Conflicts and Working-Class Culture in Early Modern Holland," *International Review of Social History*, XXXV (1990).
- _____, "Sexuality, Elites, and Court Life in the Late Seventeenth Century: The Diaries of Constantijn Huygens, Jr.," *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 23, 3 (1999): 94-109.
- _____, "Women in Revolt: Popular Protest and Its Social Basis in Holland in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Theory and Society* 16 (1987): 337-362.
- Van Deursen, A.T., trans. by Maarten Ultee, *Plain lives in a golden age: popular culture, religion, and society in seventeenth-century Holland* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Van Dijk, H. and D. J. Roorda, "Social Mobility under the Regents of the Republic," in R. Baetens et al., *Acta Historiae Neerlandicae IX* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1976).

- Douglas, Alexander X., *Spinoza and Dutch Cartesianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).
- Downing, Roger and Gijs Rommelse, *A Fearful Gentleman: Sir George Downing in The Hague, 1658-1672* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011).
- Egmond, Florike, *In Bad Company: Organized Crime in the Dutch Countryside During the 17th and 18th Centuries* (Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 1991).
- Elias, Norbert, *Time: An Essay* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).
- Eßer, Raingard, *The Politics of Memory: The Writing of Partition in the Seventeenth-Century Low Countries* (Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- _____, "From Province to Nation: Immigration and the Dutch Republic in the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries," *Imagining Frontiers, Contesting Identities* 5, 2 (2007): 263-277.
- Feenstra, H., *Spinnen in het web: Groningse regenten in relatie tot het omringende platteland tijdens de Republiek* (Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2007).
- Feith, J.A., *Historisch Genootschap te Groningen, Historische avonden*, vol. 2 (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1907).
- Feith, J. A. and J. E. Heeres, *Groningsche Volksalmanak voor het jaar 1897* (Groningen: E.B. van der Kamp, 1896).
- Fokker, A. A., "De Scherpregher-ledenzetter, geschiedkundige bijdrage" in *Nederlandsch tijdschrift voor geneeskunde: tevens orgaan der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Geneeskunst*, vol. 21 (Amsterdam: A. Frijlink, 1870).
- Formsma, W. J., "De politieke toestand in het Noorden vóór de inval," in A. Westers ed., *Groningen Constant: Groningen-Münster, 1672* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1972).
- _____, ed., *Historie van Groningen. Stad en Land* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhof, 1981).
- Foucault, Michael, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 2012).
- Frijhoff, Willem and Marijke Spies, *Dutch Culture in a European Perspective, Vo. I: 1650, Hard-Won Unity* (Assen: Palgrave, 2004).
- Geijer, Erik Gustaf, *Geschichte Swedens*, vol. 1 (Friedrich Perthes, 1832).
- Van Gelder, Roelof, *Zeepost: nooit bezorgde brieven uit de 17de en 18de eeuw* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Atlas, 2008).

- Van Gemert, G. A., *Om niet aan onwetendheid en barbarij te bezwijken: Groningse geleerden 1614-1989* (Groningen: Uitgeverij Verloren, 1989).
- Geyl, Pieter, *The Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century, Part Two, 1648-1715* (London: Ernest Benn, 1964).
- Ginzburg, Carlo, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992).
- Goubert, Pierre, *Louis XIV and Twenty Million Frenchmen* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970).
- Gramsci, Antonio, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith), (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971).
- Grever, John H., "The Dutch Assemblies and the Renewal of the French Alliance," *Parliaments, Estates & Representation* 17, 1 (1997): 81-87.
- _____, "Louis XIV and the Dutch Assemblies: The Conflict about the Hague," *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 7, 2 (May, 1982): 235-249.
- _____, "The Schulenborgh Affair and Provincial Politics in Groningen," in Robert S. Kirsner, ed., *The Low Countries and Beyond* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1993).
- _____, "The Structure of Decision-Making in the States General of the Dutch Republic 1660-68," *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* 2 (December, 1982): 125-153.
- Griessinger, Andreas, *Das symbolische Kapital der Ehre: Streikbewegungen und kollektives Bewusstsein deutscher Handwerksgesellen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Ullstein, 1981).
- De Groot, Jan, G. Warnars, et al., *Tegenwoordige staat de Vereenigde Nederlanden; een en twintigste deel; Vervattende het vervolg der Beschryving van Stad en Lande* (Netherlands: Shouten, 1794).
- Van de Haar, Cornelis, *De Diplomatieke Betrekkingen Tussen de Republiek en Portugal, 1640-1661* (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1961).
- Hacker, Barton C., "Women and Military Institutions in Early Modern Europe: A Reconnaissance." *Signs* 6 (1981): 643-671.
- Hazard, Paul, *The Crisis of the European Mind, 1680-1715* (New York: New York Review of Books, 2013).
- Heidegger, Martin and Joan Stambaugh, *Being and Time: A Translation of Sein Und Zeit* (Albany: State University of New York, 1996).

- Van der Heijden, Manon and Danielle van den Heuvel, "Sailors' Families and the Urban Institutional Framework in Early Modern Holland," *The History of the Family* 12 (2007): 296-309.
- 't Hart, Marjolein, *The Dutch Wars of Independence: Warfare and Commerce in the Netherlands, 1570-1680* (New York: Routledge, 2014).
- _____, "Rules and Repertoires: The Revolt of a Farmers' Republic in the Early-Modern Netherlands" in Michael P. Hanagan, Leslie Page Moch, and Wayne te Brake, eds., *Challenging Authority: The Historical Study of Contentious Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998).
- _____, "Town and Country in the Dutch Republic, 1550-1800," in S.R. Epstein, ed., *Town and Country in Europe, 1300-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Helfferrich, Tryntje, *The Iron Princess: Amalia Elisabeth and the Thirty Years War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013).
- Hobsbawm, Eric J., *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movements in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1965).
- Hochstadt, Steve, "Migration in Preindustrial Germany," *Central European History* 16, 3 (1983): 195-224.
- Hsia, R. Po-chia, "Civic Wills as Sources for the Study of Piety in Muenster, 1530-1618," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 14, 3 (1983): 321-348.
- Hsia, R. Po-chia and Bojia Xia, *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535-1618* (New Haven, CT: Yale University of Press, 1984).
- Hsia, R. Po-Chia and H. F. K. van Nierop, eds., *Calvinism and Religious Toleration in the Dutch Golden Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Johan Huizinga, *Dutch Civilization in the 17th Century and Other Essays* (London: Collins, 1968).
- _____, *Verzamelde werken, vol. II* (Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1948).
- Israel, Jonathan I., *Dutch Primacy in World Trade, 1585-1740* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- _____, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- Janssen, Geert H., translated by J.C. Grayson, *Princely Power in the Dutch Republic: Patronage and William Frederick of Nassau (1613-64)* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008).

- Jones, J.R., *The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Longman, 1996).
- Jorink, Eric, *Het 'Boeck der Natuere' Nederlandse geleerden en de wonderen van Gods schepping 1575-1715* (Leiden: Primavera Pers, 2006).
- Kagan, Richard L., *Lucrecia's Dreams: Politics and Prophecy in Sixteenth-Century Spain* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990).
- Kettering, Sharon, "Patronage and Kinship in Early Modern France," *French Historical Studies* 16, 2 (1989): 408-435.
- Kohl, Wilhelm, *Christoph Bernhard Von Galen: Politische Geschichte des Fürstbistums Münster, 1650-1678* (Münster: Verlag Regensburg, 1964).
- Kuijpers, Erika, *Migrantenstad: Immigratie en Sociale verhoudingen in 17e-eeuws Amsterdam* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2005).
- , "Poor, Illiterate and Superstitious? Social and Cultural Characteristics of the 'Noordse Natie' in the Amsterdam Lutheran Church in the Seventeenth Century," in Louis Sickling, Harry de Bles, Erlend des Bouvrie, eds., *Dutch Light in the "Norwegian Night": Maritime Relations and Migration Across the North Sea in Early Modern Times* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2004).
- Kuijpers, Erika, Judith Pollmann, Johannes Müller, Jasper van der Steen, eds. *Memory before Modernity: Practices of Memory in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill, 2013).
- Kunzle, David, *From Criminal to Courtier: The Soldier in Netherlandish Art, 1550-1672* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Kuske, Bruno, Köln, *Der Rhein und das Reich; Beiträge aus fünf Jahrzehnten wirtschaftsgeschichtlicher Forschung* (Köln: Böhlau-Verlag Köln, 1956).
- Ter Laan, K., *Groninger Encyclopedie 2 Delen* (Groningen, 1954-1955).
- Van der Laan, Harry, *Het Groninger boekbedrijf: drukkers, uitgevers, en boekhandelaren in Groningen tot het eind van de negentiende eeuw* (Assen: Uitgeverij Van Gorcum, 2005).
- Lahrkamp, Helmut, ed. *Münsters Bevölkerung um 1685, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Münster, Neue Folge 5* (Münster: Band, 1972).
- Leech, Peter, "Musicians in the Catholic Chapel of Catherine of Braganza, 1662-92," *Early Music* 29, 4 (November, 2001): 570-587.

- Lepore, Jill, "Historians Who Love Too Much: Reflections on Microhistory and Biography" *The Journal of American History* 88, 1 (June, 2001): 129-144.
- Levi, Giovanni, "On Microhistory," in Peter Burke ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 2001).
- Van der Linde, Benjamin, *Das Leibregiment der friesischen Statthalter: Kriegsgerichte, Offizierslaufbahnen und militärische Lebenswelten in den Garnisonsstädten Leeuwarden, Groningen und Emden, 1666-1752* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2016).
- Van der Linden, David, *Experiencing Exile: Huguenot Refugees in the Dutch Republic, 1680-1700* (Farnham: Ashgate Publishing, 2015).
- Lonsain, B., "Een onhandige beul" in "Groningen," *Tijdschrift voor de volkstaal, geschiedenis, volksleven enz. Van de provincie Groningen*, vol. 1 (Groningen: J.C. Mekel, 1916).
- Lorgion, Everard Jan Diest, *Geschiedkundige Beschrijving der Stad Groningen*, vol. 1 (Groningen: Rolfsema, 1857).
- Lucassen, Leo, "Poepen, Knoeten, Mieren en Mofen: Beeldvorming over Duitse immigranten en trekarbeiders in zeventiende- en achttiende- eeuwse kluchten," in Jan Erik Dubbelman and Jaap Tanja, eds., *Vreemd Gespuis* (Amsterdam: Ambo/Novib, 1987).
- Lucassen, Jan, "Die Hollandgänger," *Vortrag Stift Obernkirchen*, 14 December 2005.
- _____, "A Multinational and its Labor Force: The Dutch East India Company, 1595-1795," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 66, (2004), 12-39.
- Mak, Geert, *The Many Lives of Jan Six: A Portrait of an Amsterdam Dynasty* (Amsterdam: Atlant Contact, 2017).
- Mascuch, Michael, Rudolf Dekker, and Arianne Baggerman, "Egodocuments and History: A Short Account of the Longue Durée," *The Historian* 79, 1 (spring, 2016): 11-56.
- McCants, Anne E. C., *Civic Charity in a Golden Age: Orphan Care in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1997).
- Medick, Hans and Benjamin Marschke, *Experiencing the Thirty Years War: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2013).
- Mekel, J.C., *Groningen*, vol. 1 (Groningen, 1916).
- Menzel, Wolfgang, *Geschichte der Deutschen bis auf die neuesten Tage* (Cotta, 1834).
- Merback, Mitchell, *The Thief, the Cross and the Wheel: Pain and the Spectacle of Punishment in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001).

- Meuwese, Mark, *Brothers in Arms, Partners in Trade: Dutch-Indigenous Alliances in the Atlantic World, 1595-1674* (Leiden: Brill, 2011).
- Misztal, Barbara A., *Theories of Social Remembering* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003).
- Molhuysen, P.C. and P.J. Blok, eds., *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek Deel 3* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1914).
- _____, eds., *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek Deel 5* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1921).
- _____, eds., *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek Deel 10* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1937).
- Muir, Edward, *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Muller, Pieter, *Onze Gouden Eeuw: de Republiek der Vereenigde Nederlanden in haar bloeitijd* (Leiden: Sijthoff, 1908).
- Nauta, Doede, *Samuel Maresius* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1935).
- De Nederlandsche Leeuw, jaargang 42* (The Hague: Koninklijk Nederlandsch Genootschap voor Geslacht- en Wapenkunde, 1924).
- Niebaum, Herman, “hammen statt schincken. Zur adressatenorientierten variantenauswahl in der ausgehenden Korrespondenz eines Groninger Gildevorstehers aus der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts” in Jan Goossen, ed., *Franco-Saxonica: Münstersche Studien zur niederländischen und niederdeutschen Philologie* (Neumünster: Karl Wachholtz Verlag, 1990).
- Niebaum, Hermann and Fokko Veldman, *Tot tijdverdrijf in ballingschap (1663-1665)* (Groningen, the Netherlands: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1988).
- Van Nienes, A. P. and M. Bruggeman, *Archieven van de Friese stadhouders inventarissen van de archieven van de Friese stadhouders van Willem Lodewijk tot en met Willem V, 1584-1795* (Friesland: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2002).
- Nieuwe Drentsche Volksalmanak* vol. 20 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1902).
- Van Nimwegen, Olaf, *The Dutch Army and the Military Revolutions, 1588-1688* (Rochester: Boydell Press, 2010).
- Von der Osten, Gert and Horst Vey, *Painting and Sculpture in Germany and the Netherlands, 1500 to 1600* (London: Penguin Books, 1969).

- Parker, Geoffrey, *The Army of Flanders and the Spanish Road, 1567-1659 Second Edition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).
- Parrott, David, *The Business of War: Military Enterprise and Military Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- Peters, Jan (Hrsg.), *Peter Hagendorf - Tagebuch eines Söldners aus dem Dreißigjährigen Krieg* (Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2012).
- Poelman, H.A., "Johan Schulenborch," in *Groningsche Volksalmanak: voor het jaar 1920* (Groningen: Erven B. van der Kamp, 1919).
- Van de Pol, Lotte, *The Burgher and the Whore: Prostitution in Early Modern Amsterdam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Poppen, B.D., "De Gilde-Rolle der Molenaers Gilde in de stad Groningen van 1652," *Vrienden van de Stad Groningen* 50, (2007): 8-11.
- Prak, Maarten, Catharina Lis, Jan Lucassen, and Hugo Soly, eds., *Craft Guilds in the Early Modern Low Countries: Work, Power and Representation* (London: Routledge, 2016).
- Prak, Maarten, *Citizens without Nations: Urban Citizenship in Europe and the World c.1000-1878* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
- _____, *The Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).
- Price, J.L., *Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (London: Reaktion Books, 2011).
- Van ten Post, Johan Rengers, *Werken van den Ommelander Edelman Johan Rengers van ten Post*, vol. 1 (Groningen: Mr. H. O. Feith, 1852).
- Roberts, Benjamin, "Drinking like a Man: the Paradox of Excessive Drinking for Seventeenth-Century Dutch Youths," *Journal of Family History* 29, 3 (2004): 237-252.
- _____, "The "Marlboro Men" of the Early Seventeenth Century: Masculine Role Models for Dutch Youths in the Golden Age?" *Men and Masculinities* 9, 1 (2006): 76-94.
- Roberts, Benjamin and Leendert Groenendijk, "Moral Panic and Holland's Libertine Youth of the late 1650s and 1660s," *Journal of Family History* 30, 4 (2005): 327-346.
- Roberts, Hugh Gerald Arthur, *Dog's Tales: Representations of Ancient Cynicism in French Renaissance Texts* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2006).

- Rommelse, Gijs, *The Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-1667): Raison D'état, Mercantilism and Maritime Strife* (Uitgeverij Verloren, 2006).
- Roorda, D.J., *Partij en factie. De oproeren van 1672 in de steden van Holland en Zeeland, een krachtmeting tussen partijen en facties* (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1978).
- Rosen, Jochai, *Soldiers at Leisure: The Guardroom Scene in Dutch Genre Painting of the Golden Age* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010).
- Rowen, H., *Johan de Witt: Statesman of the "True Freedom"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Schama, Simon, *The Embarrassment of Riches: an Interpretation of Dutch Culture in the Golden Age* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1988).
- Smith, A. J., "De eerste Bisschoppelijke Invasie" in *Groningsche volksalmanak voor het jaar 1903* (Groningen: E.B. van der Kamp, 1902).
- Spierenburg, Pieter, *The Spectacle of Suffering: Executions and the Evolution of Repression from a Preindustrial Metropolis to the European Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
- Stratingh, D. G. Acker, M. H. O. Feith, and M. W. B. S. Boeles, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis en oudheidkunde, inzonderheid in de provincie Groningen*, Volumes 6-7 (Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1869).
- Stuart, Kathy, *Defiled Trades and Social Outcasts: Honor and Ritual Pollution in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Sundsback, Kariin, *Zelfstandige vrouwen in Meppel en Coevorden, 1600-1800*, from *Drentse Historische Reeks 15* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2010).
- Swartz, David, *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012).
- Tonckens, N., "Het proces-Schulenburg (1662) in het licht van de stadhouderlijke politiek in Stad en Lande," in *Groningse Volksalmanak* (Groningen, 1963).
- Visch, Wessel Friedrich, *Geschiedenis van het graafschap Bentheim* (Zwolle: J.L. Zeehuisen, 1820).
- Visser, J., "Het huwelijk van Willem Frederik en wat er aan voorafging," *De Vrije Fries* 47 (1966): 5-39.
- Van Vliet, A.P., 'vriendelijke groetenisse': *brieven van het thuisfront aan de vloot van De Ruyter (1664-1665)* (Den Haag: Uitgeverij Van Wijnen, 2007).

- De Vries, Jan, *The Economy of Europe in an Age of Crisis, 1600-1750* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).
- De Vries, Jan and Ad van der Woude, *The First Modern Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
- Van der Wall, E.G.E., *De mystieke chilast Petrus Serrarius (1600-1669) en zijn wereld* (Leiden: 1987).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel, *The Modern World-System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011).
- Warnecke, H. J., "Die Räte des Grafen Arnold IV. von Bentheim und ihre Familien," in *Beiträge zur westfälischen Familienforschung* 36, 37 (1978/1979): 217-241.
- Weertz, Jan, Els Weertz, and C.J. Duffin, "Possible Sources of Therapeutic Stone Powder from North West Europe," *Pharmaceutical Historian* 44, 2 (2014): 27-32.
- Weiß, Helmuth, *Graftschaft Bentheim: Ein Portrait* (Bremen: Edition Temmen, 2005).
- Wiesner-Hanks, Merry E., *Early Modern Europe, 1450-1789* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- _____, *Gender, Church and State in Early Modern Germany* (London: Longman, 1998).
- Wilson, Peter H., *The Thirty Years War: A Sourcebook* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- _____, *The Thirty Years War: Europe's Tragedy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
- Van Winter, Pieter Jan, *De Westindische Compagnie ter kamer Stad en Lande* ('s-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978).
- Wunderli, Richard and Gerald Broce, "The Final Moment before Death in Early Modern England," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 20, 2 (summer, 1989): 259-275.
- Zika, Charles, *Exercising Our Demons: Magic, Witchcraft and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).