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Chapter 1: The humanist discourse in the Northern Netherlands

This chapter will characterize the discourse of the Leiden humanists in the first decade of the seventeenth century. This discourse was in many aspects identical to the discourse of the Republic of Letters. The first section will show how this humanist discourse found its place at Leiden University through the hands of Janus Dousa and others. This humanist discourse is a central point in this thesis and will be discussed and exemplified in the next sections (1.2 and 1.3). The following section (1.4) will show how the Leiden humanists, and especially the trio Heinsius, Scaliger, and Grotius, managed to achieve central positions within the Republic of Letters by pushing the conventional limits of this discourse even further. However, as this humanist discourse had become the voice of the Leiden humanists, it also became the vehicle for all sorts of connotations and intentions that were connected to the local political and cultural situation. Section 1.5 will show how these local ideals and expectations found their way in the poetry of Hugo Grotius and others.

1.1 Janus Dousa (1545-1604)

Before the foundation of Leiden University, the humanist tradition in the Northern Netherlands had particularly been located within the context of the Latin schools.\(^{30}\) It was in these schools that boys learned to read and write Latin, since the days of Erasmus and Hegius in accordance with the maxims of humanist education. When sufficiently gifted students wished to continue their studies after completing the curriculum of the Latin school at a university, they had to travel abroad. This situation seems to have worked well for most of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Students of well-to-do parents would travel abroad to Louvain, Paris, Orleans, Cologne, or even further to Italy. The time spent abroad was seen as a valuable experience for later professional life, bringing

\(^{30}\) With the famous exception, of course, of the so-called Aduard academy, see Akkerman and Vanderjagt, *Rodolphus Agricola Phrisius 1444-1485*; Bedaux, *Hegius poeta*; Akkerman and Vanderjagt, *Northern Humanism in European Context, 1469-1625*; Akkerman, *Rudolph Agricola*. 
many new contacts. For students who could not afford such a *peregrinatio academica*, there were other ways to visit these places and broaden their intellectual horizon, namely as a personal assistant or secretary, or even as tutor or governor on behalf of a travelling upper-class adolescent.

However, William of Orange seems to have felt that all these young men leaving the Northern Netherlands to study abroad had a diminishing effect on the prestige of the Northern Netherlands. Besides, the now officially allowed and recognized Dutch Reformed Church had an urgent need for sufficiently trained preachers. It is probably the combination of these three factors, namely the exit of talented young men, the shortage of preachers, and the prestige of a university that made William of Orange decide in favour of the foundation of a university in Holland. Moreover, a university would probably attract talent from abroad and as such add to the prestige of the future Republic.31 William of Orange’s plan came out and the Dutch Republic became a notable centre of humanist learning after the foundation of Leiden University in 1575. It was Janus Dousa who would fulfil a major role in the process of institutionalizing humanist learning within the body of Leiden University.32

Janus Dousa was a descendant of Dutch nobility. His family possessed an estate at the seaside, at Noordwijck. Dousa went abroad on his *peregrinatio academica* at the age of sixteen. First he went to Louvain and Douai, but the quality of education there was not satisfying to the young Dousa, and as many others did he travelled on to Paris. While studying law in Paris, he soon became involved in Neo-Latin poetry. It is generally assumed that it was his involvement with some of the Pléiade

---

poets in particular that would encourage him in his career as a Latin poet. Dousa seems to have taken courses with Jean Dorat, teacher of and inspiration for the Pléiade poets.\textsuperscript{33} It was the availability of classical examples at the University of Paris that prompted these poets to imitate and emulate these examples:

The principle motor for this enthusiasm seems to have been close encounters with Greek and Latin poetry. New editions were appearing thanks to French humanists such as Henri Estienne, and the whole antique corpus was by now becoming available for study in the University of Paris through the teaching of men like Dorat. Pléiade poetry is a direct consequence of humanist reform […].\textsuperscript{34}

Dousa was not only impressed by the humanist culture he encountered in France; he also seems to have been able to keep up with it and leave a profound impression on the poets he met there.\textsuperscript{35} However, Dousa was soon called back to Holland – his family felt he was old enough now to marry and take care of his estate, and he obeyed. He went back to Noordwijck, married, and took care of his business. Nonetheless, he managed in the meantime to stay in contact with the poets he had met in Paris and continued to write Latin poetry.

Had Dousa lived in a peaceful era, he might have spent the rest of his life writing letters and poetry and inspecting his lands. But now, with


\textsuperscript{34} Kay, \textit{A Short History of French Literature}, 129.

\textsuperscript{35} For example on Guillaume des Autelz: ‘Des Autelz’ poetic career ends as it had begun with Latin verse. His five poems to Janotus Douza which appeared in the \textit{Delitiae Poetarum Gallicorum} date from 1564, the year in which Douza the elder came to Paris to study at the age of 19. The epistles of Des Autelz show his affection and admiration for the Dutchman and reiterate the age-long complaint that devotion to letters has brought him no reward.’ Young, \textit{Guillaume des Autelz: a Study of His Life and Works}, 31/32. And: ‘The last group of poems by Des Autelz is addressed to Jean Douza the elder who visited Paris from 1564 to 1566 and met Des Autelz there, if he had not already done so in Flanders. These verses too are of some autobiographical interest; they are full of flattery but they express real affection and a deep longing for the company of his friend’. Young, \textit{Guillaume des Autelz: a Study of His Life and Works}, 182.
the threat of invading Sea Beggars, Dousa felt it was safer to move with his wife to a walled city, and he decided to go to Leiden. However, no sooner had they entered the city than it was besieged by Spanish forces. When, during one of the attacks, the commander-in-chief of the defenders was killed, Dousa was asked to fill his shoes. It seems odd that a poet with no military training to speak of was asked to defend a city, but apparently Dousa had learned in these years of managing his estate to deal with complex situations. It could also be that Dousa’s noble birth gave him sufficient credit and authority to lead the defence of the city. In any case, Dousa managed to lead the defence well, and Leiden withstood the Spanish siege. It is probable that the fact that Leiden had withstood the Spanish siege gave William of Orange the idea that a university would be a proper reward for a loyal city.

It is interesting to notice that the university was founded in

Ill. 4: Relief of Leiden, by Willem de Haen (1612-1614). The engraving shows the starving citizens of Leiden receiving food from the Sea Beggars.
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36 In the period 1669-1672, Sea Beggars repeatedly invaded Holland for plundering. Usually Roman Catholic institutions and known adherents of Alva were attacked, but also upper-class citizens and nobility: De Meij, De watergeuzen en de Nederlanden, 1568-1572, 131–132.
37 October 1573. See Heesakkers and Reinders, Genoeglijk bovenal zijn mij de muzen, 32.
38 The foundation of Leiden University has been described in detail by Otterspeer, Het bolwerk van de vrijheid.
uncertain times. Although the Revolt against Philip II of Spain certainly gained momentum after Leiden’s victory, the war was not yet won. William of Orange had a base now in Holland and West Frisia, but in these provinces both Amsterdam and Haarlem were still (or again) on the side of the King of Spain. The Prince had only recently lost a brother and a battle, at Mook. There was unmistakably still a long road ahead. This confirms the idea that the university was an important ideological beacon in the process of forming an identity for the future republic. For why would a country under siege invest time and energy in the foundation of something as impractical as a university? One reason is probably that William of Orange foresaw the need for sufficient trained state and Church officials, as mentioned in his letters. But the importance of the official installation of an independent intellectual body should not be underestimated.

It was clear from the onset that different visions existed about the purpose of the university. Especially in Calvinist circles the prevalent impression was that the primary purpose of the university was to train preachers for the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. This faction would keep contesting the views and the policy of Janus Dousa, who saw this foundation as a chance to plant in the Northern Netherlands a branch of Renaissance humanism as he had seen it among the pupils of Dorat. As Dousa was one of the directors of the new university and his fellow directors shared his ideas, he firmly cultivated the humanist character of the curriculum. Jan van Hout in particular should be mentioned in this context – he was the secretary of Leiden’s City Council and had stood at Dousa’s side during the siege of Leiden by Spanish forces. Immediately after the Relief of Leiden, Van Hout continued to support Dousa in his activities concerning the newborn university. Van Hout was strongly opposed to the orthodox Calvinists and did everything he could to support Dousa in the promotion of humanism in Leiden.40

Dousa understood that it was of central importance for his young university to have a humanist scholar of some stature attached. After three years of difficulties in finding both professors and students, Dousa

39 Otterspeer, Het bolwerk van de vrijheid, 61 and 62.
40 On Jan van Hout, see Koppenol, Leids healal.
managed to attract Justus Lipsius to Leiden.\footnote{Van den Hoorn, “On Course for Quality: Justus Lipsius and Leiden University”, 73-74.} Dousa had met Lipsius before and was very impressed by the young scholar. Lipsius had been trained by the Jesuits of Cologne, finished his studies in Louvain, and had acquired a sound reputation with the publication of his commentary on Tacitus.\footnote{See Otterspeer, *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid*, 110-111.} In Lipsius the university had found not only a professor who had developed clearly defined ideas about a classical curriculum but also a scholar with an extensive network in Europe. Lipsius had been secretary to Cardinal De Granvelle in Rome and had travelled throughout the European continent. He had held an appointment at the University of Jena. This meant that Lipsius had contacts both in the Catholic south and in the Northern Protestant provinces. The arrival of Lipsius at Leiden meant the introduction of Leiden University into the Republic of Letters.

The Republic of Letters was a peculiar phenomenon. It may be characterized as the virtual scholarly community of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Europe.\footnote{This means I am concentrating on the humanist respublica litteraria, instead of the French and / or vernacular Republic of Letters of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. A good critical survey on the concept of the Republic of Letters is Jaumann, “Respublica Litteraria / Republic of Letters. Concept and Perspectives of Research”. Also interesting is Waquet, “Qu’est-ce que la République des Lettres ?”, who sees the Republic of Letters as the direct precursor of modern academic communities.} The most conspicuous characteristic of this community is its internal communication – the Republic of Letters could only exist by means of intensive written correspondence between its various members. Letters were often an important means of self-presentation and self-fashioning, especially introductory letters. When relations were established, the letters could become less formal and more a purposeful means of sharing knowledge. Letters were in fact the most important means of exchanging knowledge. Another important means of strengthening ties in the Republic of Letters was by dedicating books to distinguished scholars, or by
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honouring a book with a liminary poem. This infrastructure is the basis of this community.

At least as important as these primary characteristics are the shared values. All members of the Republic of Letters shared a minimum set of values that can be equated to the basic humanist ideals. This meant that communication was in correct classical Latin and the shared point of reference was the classical world as known then. Scholarship meant either study of classical antiquity or conducting research as if in continuation of antiquity. For example, when in his introduction to *Aristarchus sacer*, Daniel Heinsius, wishes to explain the work of a textual and literary critic (*critès*), he presents himself as residing within a tradition that runs from Aristotle via the Alexandrian scholiasts to his own day. Ideal scholarship was scholarship as it had been performed in antiquity, at least in theory. Imitation of classical examples was also the centre of all education, according to the principle of *imitatio* and *aemulatio*. It was according to these shared values that members of the Republic of Letters measured each other.

Another important feature of this learned society are the mutual relations and the internal hierarchy among its members. The Republic of Letters was a virtual society that only existed because its members wanted it to exist. It had no official residence or bodies of administration. This meant that honour and authority were bestowed upon single members by the other members of this community, according to the criteria of the shared values. To ascend within the hierarchy of the Republic of Letters, it was of vital importance to invest in social relations with esteemed scholars and to share as much high-quality scholarship with them as possible without running the risk of becoming plagiarized. This meant that both social connections and thorough knowledge had to be cultivated if a scholar wished to further his career. These connections and relations were

44 Jaumann is even more explicit on this point: ‘Speaking of the *Republic of Letters*, we do not refer specifically to something like scholarly institutions themselves (universities, academies, cabinets, etc.) or to habits of scholarly practice like the exchange of letters, writing, criticizing and publishing books, etc., i.e. to real, concrete, material installations and behavior. In the sense of institutional concreteness we speak of something that as such never existed. What we are speaking of is first of all a normative idea (or ideal) and a few fragmentary realizations scattered through time and space of early modern history’. Jaumann, “Respublica Litteraria / Republic of Letters. Concept and Perspectives of Research”, 16. Less explicit but stimulating is Waquet, “L’espace de la République des Lettres.”
especially important for candidate members. As they had no social infrastructure of their own yet, candidates relied on the network of an esteemed and established member. New members could be introduced by their intellectual patrons to other members, either by means of letters, or by introductions, dedications, and liminary poetry in printed works.

However, as Van den Hoorn shows, Lipsius proved to be not only a good scholar and teacher but a good administrator as well. Soon he was made Rector Magnificus of Leiden University; henceforth he worked with all his might to build up this university to his own ideals. Lipsius’s vision corresponded well to that of Dousa. Lipsius placed great emphasis on a sound classical basis in the *artes* curriculum. The reading of authentic classical authors was particularly important to him.

When Lipsius left, the university lost no time in finding a replacement. After some searching and negotiating, Joseph Justus Scaliger was prepared to come to Leiden. But Scaliger was different from Lipsius. On the good side, he was a better-known scholar than Lipsius had been. Justus Lipsius was still in an early phase of his career when he came to Leiden – his reputation was mostly built on his stoic work *De constantia* and an edition of Tacitus. Scaliger, by contrast, already had a solid reputation when he arrived in Leiden. He had a vast knowledge of ancient cultures and civilizations, which he had displayed in his *De emendatione temporum*, and had procured several critical editions. If there had been a triumvirate in the Republic of Letters around the turn of the century, it would have been occupied by Casaubon, Lipsius, and Scaliger. With Scaliger’s name associated with the university, it now found itself at the heart of the humanist discourse. But as is well known Scaliger came only because he was paid handsomely, had no lecturing responsibilities, and was free to choose his own students. Scaliger would not, as Lipsius had done, add value to the university by taking on

---

47 Scaliger, *De emendatione temporum*.
functions and responsibilities. The only task required from Scaliger was to reside in Leiden and allow his fame to radiate from the university.

By now, around the turn of the century, Leiden University had found its own discourse and its own signature. In the Northern European Protestant lands in particular, Leiden became a popular place to study. Although not all members of the university were convinced Protestants, the university was seen as an attractive alternative to the universities in the Roman Catholic lands. The names of Lipsius and Scaliger attracted students and visitors from abroad and Leiden became a notable centre of learning in the Protestant lands. It is this humanist discourse as it had been planted and cultivated in the new university that will be discussed in the following sections. They will exemplify this humanist discourse and show how it became instrumental to the patriotic cause.

1.2 The Republic of Letters in Leiden – the young Hugo Grotius

One of the most characterizing features of the international Republic of Letters is probably the way new members could find their way into this discourse. The following sections will discuss how Scaliger helped his students to enter this discourse and by doing so render Leiden University part of the Republic of Letters, exemplified in the cases of Daniel Heinsius and Hugo Grotius.

Grotius was born in 1583 as the son of Jan de Groot and Aeltje Borre van Overschie, both of them from patrician families in Delft.50 His father had received his magister artium in Douai and had studied law in Leiden, where he had become acquainted with Justus Lipsius, and even became a member of his collegium poeticum, an informal literary society devoted to humanist poetry. Jan de Groot would become curator of Leiden University and his brother Cornelis de Groot would be made director several times, as well as professor in several subjects.51 The family of Grotius’s father seems to have been liberal Protestant, his mother being said to have been Roman Catholic. Hugo de Groot received his initial

50 All biographical information is based on Nellen, Hugo de Groot: Een leven in strijd om de vrede, 1583-1645.
51 Otterspeer, Het bolwerk van de vrijheid, 75–76; 105–106.
education from his father and subsequently went to the Latin school in Delft. In 1594, at the age of eleven, Grotius matriculated at Leiden University to study philosophy and law. Here he became a student of such figures as Scaliger, Vulcanius, and Junius. In 1598, Grotius accompanied Van Oldenbarnevelt on a diplomatic mission to France. During the journey, he saw the chance to obtain a doctoral degree in Orleans, in law.

Soon after his return, Grotius published his first scholarly work, the Martiani Capellae Satyricon. This late classical textbook had been very popular during the Middle Ages as an introduction to the seven liberal arts, but had been corrupted in its textual transmission. Already in 534 Securus Melior Felix complained about the poor condition of the texts he was using. The first edition had been made by Franciscus Vitalis Bodianus and was printed in Vicenza in 1499. Grotius’s edition was the seventh. In the words of Stahl: ‘The outstanding edition before the nineteenth century, that produced by the sixteen-year-old prodigy Hugo Grotius, was

---

52 On Bonaventura Vulcanius (1538-1614), see: Van Dam, “‘The Honour of Letters’: Bonaventura Vulcanius, Scholar and Poet”.
53 On Franciscus Junius the Elder (1545-1602), see Venemans, Franciscus Junius en zijn Eirenicum de pace ecclesiae catholicae; Rademaker, “Young Franciscus Junius: 1591-1621”.
54 His formal title was now doctor utriusque iuris. The story has been described in detail in Ridderikhoff, “De universitaire studies van Hugo de Groot”, 22–27 and Den Tex, Oldenbarnevelt: II. Oorlog 1588-1609, 291–321.
56 Stahl, Johnson, and Burge, Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts, 1:72. I fully rely on Stahl for my information on Martianus Capella and the printing of his book.
57 Capella, Opus Martiani Capelle de nuptiis Philologie et Mercurii libri duo: de grammatica, de dialectica, de rhetorica, de geometrica, de arithmetica, de astronomia, de musica libri septem.
published in Leiden in 1599. [...] [He] was undoubtedly assisted in his editing by Joseph Justus Scaliger, his mentor at Leiden. The edition is marred by many rash emendations, but it is greatly enhanced by the ingenuity of its editor or editors and by its use of one of the best Martianus manuscripts: Leidensis 88’.58 According to Van Dam, Grotius’s work is of an astonishing quality. He enhanced the understanding of Martianus Capella enormously with his notes on style, genre, and background information, sometimes agreeing with his master but often also differing from his views.59

Grotius dedicates the work to Henry II of Bourbon, Prince de Condé, whom he had met during his visit to France.60 His dedication of the Satyricon to the Prince is an interesting letter, as it is one of the first instances entailing Grotius making himself publicly known in print to the international scholarly world. As Grotius is still young here and apparently closely watched by Scaliger, it may be assumed that the dedication reflects much of what Scaliger saw as requirements of the international humanist discourse. Grotius’s edition of the Satyricon dovetails neatly with Scaliger’s view of the scholarly cursus honorum. To make one’s way into the Republic of Letters, it was of central importance to be introduced by someone who already held a position within this discourse. Both in the cases of Grotius and Heinsius, Scaliger vouches for them by letting them use his name or by providing liminary material. However, being well connected was not the only necessity for this discourse; it was also very important to exhibit knowledge and

58 Stahl, Johnson, and Burge, Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts, 1:77.
60 See Nellen, 2007, 52. The dedication has been printed in Grotius, Briefwisseling van Hugo Grotius, 17:8–13. It can be accessed at: http://grotius.huygens.knaw.nl/letters/0007A/receiver/bour010/. Grotius would also dedicate a theatre play to the Prince de Condé, in 1601, namely his Adamus exul; on this dedication, see: Bloemendal, “Topical Matters in Dedicatory Letters of Latin Plays in the Early Modern Netherlands”, 212–213.
dedication to the values thereof. The first step was to make a scholarly edition of a classical work. Here, in Grotius’s case, his family already owned a manuscript of the Satyricon. As the text was known to be corrupt, it provided a nice challenge for and his position within the Republic of Letters. However, making an edition of a text was also a useful way of strengthening certain ties, although it is not always possible to see why a book was dedicated to the individual to whom it was dedicated. In the present case, Grotius had met Prince Henry II of Bourbon, who was at that time the first in line for the French throne. It should, however, be borne in mind that the Prince (1588-1646) was about ten years old. What is more, Ridderikhoff suspects the De Condé family to have paid for Grotius’s doctoral degree in Orleans, which could naturally have been an additional reason for Grotius to show his allegiance to this family.\footnote{Ridderikhoff, “De universitaire studies van Hugo de Groot”, 23–25.}

It is possible to regard Grotius’s dedication as being tripartite. In the first part he compares the Prince to the Platonic ideal of a philosopher-king. The second part describes the content and the genre of the Satyricon itself. The last part informs the reader of Grotius’s dealings with the text and the edition. The first part in particular is clearly intended to please and praise the Prince. Grotius explains the Platonic concept that as humans surpass animals only by their ratio, it is evident that those who surpass their fellow men in their rational capacities should govern the others. Grotius proves this point by naming a long list of kings and emperors of classical Greece and Rome, who all seem to have followed this thread, or else should have,\footnote{Praeceptum itaque hoc secuti complures imperatorum, regum, principum, eoque tanquam Ariadnaeaei quodam filo ad adyta philosophiae scientarumque arcana deducti videntur. (‘Many kings and emperors seem to have followed this principle, and seem to have been led by it, as if by some Ariadnaean thread, to the more hidden mysteries of philosophy and science.’) Grotius, “To Henri II de Bourbon, Prince de Condé”.} from Dion II of Syracuse to Constantine the Great. However, why should he mention all these great names from antiquity (Sed quid multa antiquorum principum exemplum correogamus?) when the Prince himself is a great example, as Grotius had seen for himself when he met him: ‘I have seen in you, when I visited your France in the following of the diplomatic mission of Justinus Nassau and Johan of
Oldenbarnevelt, an intelligence beyond your age and an erudition beyond belief.\textsuperscript{63}

From here Grotius continues with the actual dedicating of the work to the Prince and explaining what it is exactly what he is offering by naming the seven liberal arts. However, the most personal part of the letter and also the most informative aspect of Grotius is the last part, where he complains about the difficulties of the text. As it was such a popular textbook for schools, the text, in itself already barely comprehensible, had been heavily corrupted by ignorant schoolmasters. Nonetheless, Grotius had set himself the task of cleansing it, ‘led by goodwill towards the [classical] authors. For the [classical] authors are to be emendated before anything else, so we may emendate our own ignorance of them’.\textsuperscript{64} Though he was led not only by these authors: ‘I was compelled by the suggestions of J. Scaliger, who added by the splendour of his brilliance, greater than any admiration, ornament to my literary studies and our Leiden University; for me, these suggestions have the force of commandments’.\textsuperscript{65}

This letter amply serves to demonstrate some important characteristics of the Republic of Letters. On a primary level, the dedicatory letter itself is an important characteristic of the humanist discourse. Letters were the basic infrastructure of the Republic of Letters and one of the most important means of communication. Moreover, as letters were usually not meant to be read exclusively in private, but shared with family, friends, and acquaintances, letters were one of the most important means of self-presentation.\textsuperscript{66} The same holds true, indeed even more so, for dedicatory letters. The paradoxical nature of dedicatory letters printed in books in fact show the public, perhaps even promotional,
nature of the humanist letter. Although the letter of Grotius to the Prince de Condé suggests a certain amount of intimacy, this suggestion is of course contradicted by the fact that it appeared in print. What this means is that the publicly suggested intimacy in fact only shows Grotius’s relationship to the Prince. The question may perhaps even be asked as to how much the ten-year-old boy understood the dedication.

However, perhaps the most important characteristic is the exclusive classical orientation of the letter. The letter has been written in elegant classical Latin, spiced with some Greek *je ne sais quoi*, an addition of elegance and erudition. The language itself is an aspect of this characteristic, but it is the combination of the language and the content that makes this characteristic probably the most important of the humanist discourse. Almost every sentence refers to a classical text, to a setting either in classical Greece or in classical Rome. It was the classical world (as perceived by the humanists) that provided all examples, all standards. The Prince is compared to the rulers of the ancient world, he is supposed to obtain his inspiration from Plato’s concept of the philosopher-king, and he should study the seven liberal arts for their popularity in antiquity. It could not have been too difficult for Grotius to find examples for inspiration in a more recent, even French past. Nonetheless, these examples would not have the same authority as the classical past.

The final characteristic is more difficult to grasp and has to do with power and authority. The first authority in this letter is the Prince, as Grotius thought it worthwhile to dedicate his work to him. The Prince has this power on account of his worldly status. Grotius explicitly mentions the Prince’s royal blood.\(^67\) This may very well have been inspired by Scaliger, who was very keen on his alleged noble descent.\(^68\) He is the second authority in this letter and receives the greatest praise, which confirms his status as *triumvир* in this discourse. The third authority is the one mentioned already, the classical world. The only person apparently without power is Grotius himself. However, he gains authority by his skillful handling of the maxims of this discourse – he shows his relation to Scaliger and his ability both in the Latin language, the art of letter-writing,

\(^67\) On the importance of nobility in 17\(^{th}\) century France, see De Smet, *Thuanus*, chap. Introduction.
and his references to the classical world. Being part of the humanist discourse or becoming a member of the Republic of Letters means automatically striving for authority by these criteria: connections, communications, and the exhibition of humanist skills.

1.3 The young Daniel Heinsius

Daniel Heinsius was born in Ghent on 9 June 1580 as the son of patrician Protestants Nicholaas Heins and Elisabeth Navegeer. His parents fled before the arrival of Alexander Farnese in 1583. After some travelling the family finally settled in Flushing (Vlissingen), where Daniel went to the Latin school and wrote his first Latin and Greek poetry. He enrolled at the University of Franeker to study law in 1596, which did not really capture his interest – the young Heinsius preferred reading and writing Greek and Latin poetry. When his studies did not proceed as might have been expected, his father called upon him to return home. Heinsius switched to Leiden University, but again he preferred classical literature to law. It seems that Scaliger himself convinced Heinsius Snr to allow his son to proceed on this path. Henceforth, Daniel Heinsius enjoyed rapid success. From 1603 he was allowed to lecture and in 1605 he was appointed extraordinary professor of Greek. For the rest of his career, Heinsius would remain connected to Leiden University, albeit often complaining and threatening to leave.69 Heinsius owed much of his rapid success to Joseph Scaliger. It is this connection in particular that will be discussed in relation to some of his laudatory poems. These appeared in the first edition of a text Heinsius prepared, the *Punica* of Silius Italicus (*ca* 26 – 101 AD), in combination with his commentary, the *Crepundia Siliana*.70 The text was printed at the Antwerp Plantin publishing house in 1600 and the commentary appeared a year later, also at Plantin’s. It is probable that Scaliger had advised Heinsius to use the *Punica* as his first scholarly project. We may wonder why Scaliger had chosen this text, as

---


70 Silius Italicus, *De secundo bello Punico*; Heinsius, *Crepundia Siliana*. Aside from the reason that both books often appear in one binding, I assume they were already thought of by Heinsius / the editors as one book, as the page numbering runs continuously through both books.
his father had described Silius Italicus as follows: quem equidem postremum bonorum poetarum existimo: quin ne poetam quidem. The poem tells us the story of the Second Punic war in a heavily mythologized way. The work has never been very popular and seems to have been forgotten during the Middle Ages. A first edition was published in Rome in 1471. Scaliger may have had pedagogical reasons for selecting this text for Heinsius. As the text was not really in favour, few manuscripts had survived, which may have made the collation easier.

The Punica has a dedicatory letter to Joseph Scaliger at the beginning and a poem by Scriverius at the end. The Crepundia has a dedicatory poem in Greek by Heinsius to Scaliger, another one in Latin, an introduction by Heinsius, and laudatory poems by, among others, Vulcanius, Bertius, Scriverius. There are no poems at the end of the book. What is most striking in Heinsius’s dedications is his reverence towards Scaliger. Heinsius writes the letter to the illustriissimo & incomparabili Heroi Iosepho Scaligero, he calls him Consul Reip. Literariae (consul of the Republic of Letters), sed sine collega, sed perpetuo (without a second consul, and forever, without a fixed period of time). Heinsius also makes clear (as did Grotius in the case of Martianus Capella) that Scaliger had shown him (part of) the way: Doctissimi igitur Modii codicem sequuti sumus ex authoritate tua & suasu (We have used according to your advice the codex of the most learned Modius). The same holds true for the poem at the beginning of the Crepundia. Daniel Heinsius dedicates the poem Ad Illustrem & incomparabilem

71 ‘Whom I consider as the last of the good poets – actually, hardly a poet.’ Scaliger, Poetica libri septem, 324. Cited in: Conte, Latin Literature, 492.
72 Conte, Latin Literature, 495.
73 Silius Italicus, De secundo bello Punico, 3.
74 Silius Italicus, De secundo bello Punico, 5. Franciscus Modius (1556-1597) had used an old Silius Italicus manuscript of the episcopal library in Cologne and published his findings in his Novantiquae lectiones.; however, this manuscript was lost in the middle of the seventeenth century. See Silius, Punica, LIV–LVI.
Iosephum Scaligerum Iuli. Caes. F. (To the celebrated and incomparable Joseph Scaliger, son of Julius Caesar [Scaliger -DK]). Except for a short reference to the content of the Punica, the poem is above all a four-page-long encomium Scaliger.

In a modern context Heinsius could be considered to be overdoing his cause, but apparently he did not, for a long and intimate relationship evolved between the two men. According to Sellin, Heinsius had only recently joined the close circle of students around Scaliger, probably in 1599, and immediately started working on the Punica. This work confirms what has already been attested in the previous case, namely that the mores of the Republic of Letters had become firmly rooted in Leiden. In order to gain access to the humanist discourse of the Republic of Letters, Heinsius exhibits his literary and linguistic skills in his edition and commentary, as Grotius had done in the Satiricon. At the same time, he demonstrated his connection to Scaliger by extensively naming and praising him.

1.4 Ascending Mount Helicon

The publication of Daniel Heinsius’s commentary on Theocritus can be seen as the next step in the cursus honorum that Scaliger planned for his pupils. Preparing a scholarly edition was an apposite means of demonstrating philological qualities and erudition. However, erudition could be shown not only in emendations but also, or perhaps even better, in poetry. Writing Latin poetry was the best way of showing you had mastered the language well, you had perfect knowledge of styles and registers. It also showed the extent to which you were able to rework themes from classical works in a new and creative way.

The Theocritus edition of Daniel Heinsius incorporates both aspects: it offers a learned commentary, but it also contains some poetry at the back of the work. Actually we have to distinguish between two subsequent editions Heinsius made, one in 1603 and the other in 1604. Heinsius himself suggests that things had gone wrong in the printing process. Whatever the case may have been, in 1604 an expanded and

---

75 Sellin, Daniel Heinsius and Stuart England, 14.
purgated edition appears. The 1603 edition had been designed as an appendix to the 1596 edition of Theocritus, Mosschus, Bion, and Simmias by Scaliger and Casaubon and thus only comprises Heinsius’s own Notae and the poetry at the end. The 1604 edition has been expanded with an emended Greek text, the scholia on these texts, translations in Latin adjacent to the text, and the 1596 emendations by Casaubon and Scaliger. Only then do Heinsius’s own Notae and the poems appear. The Greek dedication by Heinsius to Buzanval has been moved to the beginning of his own Notae, together with the dedicational poem in Latin. Instead, a new dedication to Buzanval in Latin appears at the beginning of the book, together with an Ad Lectorem. The poetry at the end of the book in both editions consists of Latin verse translations of some of Theocritus’s work by Grotius and Heinsius, two versions of Virgil’s tenth eclogue in Doric Greek, one by Scaliger and one by Heinsius, an Ecloga Bucolica by Heinsius to the honour of Janus Dousa, and the nautical eclogue Myrtilus by Grotius. These last four poems will be discussed here.

Without really telling us why, Heinsius publishes in the appendix of his work these two translations of Virgil’s tenth eclogue in Doric Greek, one made by Scaliger and one by himself. Apparently in the 1603 edition greater importance was given to these poems, as they were advertised on the front page of the 1603 edition and omitted from the front page in 1604. Both poems are line-by-line translations of Virgil’s eclogue and are often literal translations. There are quite a number of alterations in the 1604 edition compared to the 1603 edition. These are small changes: either the word order has been changed in the sentence or a word has been replaced by its synonym. The poems reveal Scaliger and Heinsius to be not necessarily creative poets, but rather diligent students of the Greek dialects and the idyllic language. This brings us to the question of where these poems actually belong. As shown extensively by Jeroen Jansen in his book Imitatio, translation was a common exercise in the humanist curriculum, after Cicero and Pliny. Translating classical texts from one language into another was only the first step on the road to imitation. What makes these poems special is, of course, that they were not simply Greek translations of Virgil, but translations into the Doric dialect. This

76 Paul Choart de Buzanval (1551-1607), was French ambassador to the Netherlands.
77 Jansen, Imitatio.
effect was amplified by the fact that Scaliger and Heinsius were able to make two different line-by-line translations of the same eclogue.

The Latin poems are original works and as such seem to tell more about the motives of the poets, but here too we do not really know enough about the origins of these poems. What is clear about them is that they are situated in a Dutch setting, close to the sea. As Eyffinger has shown, the poems have some common features – both poems feature unhappy lovers complaining to their mistresses.78 In addition, they each contain a part where the unhappy lover, like Ovid’s Cyclops, sums up his belongings (Haven’t I got …, etc.). Where the Greek poems can be seen as standing at the beginning of the humanist Imitatio curriculum, these two poems can be seen as the final goal of this process. Both poems are resounding with references to classical examples, but neither poem can be said to be an imitation of one specific poet or poem. They are new poems written by students who had acquired the full knowledge of the pastoral tradition, who knew their Latin and their poetry so well that they could ‘play’ with the genre and the language and, for example, transpose the bucolic setting to Dutch shores. According to Eyffinger, both poems may very well stem from the period when both men were still students.

The Doric Greek poems show how Scaliger and Heinsius are pushing the boundaries of the Republic of Letters back even further. It was common practice to imitate Latin poetry; it was, however, not that common to do the same with Greek poetry. If Heinsius had only been able to write Latin poetry well, that would have been sufficient to acquire a place within this discourse. Translating an eclogue into Doric Greek together with Joseph Scaliger was enough to acquire a central place within this discourse. Here the boundaries are crossed between a poet as an embodiment of a set of values, namely the values of the respublica litteraria, and the poet reflecting on these values and his culture. Through his translation, Heinsius affirms the values of the Republic of Letters, but also expands its territory to the Greek language.79

78 Grotius, De dichtwerken van Hugo Grotius, 316.
79 My impression that this translation is to be valued as an exceptional achievement, even within the circles of accomplished humanists, has found some ground in a remark made by Fridrich Taubmann in his commentary on Virgil: ‘Hanc autem eclogam Virgilii Jos. Scaliger, & Dan. Heinsius Doricè etiam reddiderunt.’ (However, this eclogue of Virgil was
The question as to why Heinsius and Scaliger chose to translate the tenth eclogue remains unclear. It is a poem that moves back and forth between on the one hand an idealized pastoral landscape, where the rural deities Pan and Silvanus appear and where Gallus seeks solace for his lost love, and on the other hand an historical contemporary reality, where Gallus is a real-life person and where his military campaigns are the subject of discussion. It presents a longing for ‘Arcadia’, for the pastoral life, but also connects with present-day world. My impression is that this reflects an ideal or expectation on the part of Heinsius and his contemporaries in Leiden: on the one hand there is a yearning for an Arcadia, but on the other hand there is the idea that they are living in a time when it is possible to realize these ideals, either within the smaller context of a university in its formative days, or within the wider context of a young republic that has yet to solve questions on governance of state. Where Heinsius operated more within the poetical and scholarly realm, Grotius (for example) worked in the political realm. It is this last, local connection that will be investigated further in the following examples.

1.5 Northern Arcadia

The characteristics mentioned above can be found in other poems by Grotius as well. The poetry of Grotius shows that the humanist ideals and mores of the Republic of Letters had become rooted within the context of Leiden University. This meant that the poet on the one hand had to stay true to classical examples as they were transmitted, and on the other hand had and would wish to show his originality and ability to adapt the format to the present-day situation. It was in terms of this balancing act that the humanist poet could exhibit his virtuosity. The two marriage poems, or *epithalamia*, by Grotius that will be discussed below show the limits within which Grotius was operating. Grotius seems to have immersed himself in the language and the imagery of examples that had acquired an almost canonical status. He had an extraordinary talent when it came to imitating these examples and to varying things within the limits these schemes presented. As Eyffinger mentions in his commentary on even paraphrased by J.J. Scaliger and D. Heinsius in the Doric dialect.) *P. Virgili Maronis Opera omnia*, 96.
these poems, \(^{80}\), the canonical examples were the *epithalamia* of Statius and Claudianus in particular. In both poems Grotius closely imitates the topical scheme of his examples. The poems, as Eyffinger again has shown, differ considerably in terms of the magnitude of variation and adaption Grotius allows himself. It is not clear why Grotius makes this distinction. As both poems were written in 1603, it is unlikely that his opinions on this matter had changed radically. It can only be assumed that he adapted his poems to contexts where they would be read aloud.

As Eyffinger has shown, the most important example for Grotius was the *Epithalamion in Stellam et Violentillam* of Publius Papinius Statius. In order to show how Grotius worked with this example, I wish to discuss the Statian text first and then compare both the poems by Grotius with this example.\(^{81}\) Statius starts his poem with the description of Venus leading a bride to her groom, accompanied by a mythical chorus of Apollo and the Muses. It is upon their arrival that the poet learns whose marriage it is, namely of the poet Stella, the groom, and his bride Violentilla. While the house is filling with crowds, the narrator asks the muse Erato to tell him how this marriage came about. Then we are told how Venus was laying in her bed in her palace somewhere in the Milky Way, when a troop of Amores entered her bedroom and pressed her for new orders. But one of these ‘whose deft hand ne’er sent his arrow amiss’,\(^{82}\) begged his mother for mercy with one of their earlier victims, this noble poet, who had been hit severely by Cupid’s arrows, while his mistress had only lightly been touched. Too long the poet is waiting and suffering now – even Apollo asks mercy for him. Venus answers with a lengthy description of the beauty of the beloved girl (had she been around, Theseus would have forsaken Ariadne and Daphne would have been safe from Phoebus, on her would Jupiter have descended in the form of a golden rain) and agrees to give her to the young man for whom Cupid asks. Venus then leaves her palace and travels in her chariot to the girl’s mansion (en passant it is

\(^{80}\) Grotius, *De dichtwerken van Hugo Grotius*, 452-453.

\(^{81}\) Although a detailed comparison has been made by Eyffinger, it seemed worthwhile repeating that exercise partly for the poems under discussion as I wish to emphasize different aspects. On verbal references / reminiscences in particular, see Eyffinger in Grotius, *De dichtwerken van Hugo Grotius*, 461-481.

mentioned that she has been married before). The beauty of the house is described. Venus holds a lengthy speech to the girl and urges her to agree to a marriage with Stella. And lo, already Violentilla is warming up to the young poet. As soon as rumour of the betrothal has spread, both Apollo and Bacchus start moving their choruses. The focus then returns to the moment where the story, inspired by Erato, began, and the narrator now describes the crowd in the house and the gods present to bless the marriage. The night has come that can only be praised in song by the groom himself. But the poet invites all other poets to praise this day with him and hints at the birth of a child in the tenth month from now.

This poem functioned as a framework, with poets such as Grotius producing variations thereon, sometimes more freely, sometimes adhering to the Roman examples with a greater degree of fidelity. In the case of the *epithalamia*, some characteristics had been imperative. Often, the poem starts off on the day of the marriage and the poet asks someone, a god or a muse, to tell him how the marriage came about. Whether the presence of the gods is already real in the first lines of the poem seems to differ, but as soon as the poet or god or muse starts to tell of the origin of the marriage, we enter the mythical realm, where gods, often Cupid and Venus, would be engaged in arranging the marriage. The discussions between the gods on the marriage give way to eulogies on the beauty and chastity of the future bride, the often more work-related qualities of the groom (ingenuity, loyalty, etc.), and the excellent families from which they stem. Usually Cupid is sent to make the couple fall in love, the man earlier (in the case of Stella much earlier) and often more deeply. Somewhere in the poem a description is given of the journey of Venus and her retinue to a location in the real world, where she addresses either the bride (Statius) or the couple on the day of the wedding itself. The end of the poem refers in one way or another to the wedding night and the promise of potential offspring. The length would be about 300 lines in dactylic hexameters.

Grotius’s *Epithalamion Casparis Kinschotii et Mariae de Cantraines Dictae Brouxaux* had been written on the occasion of the marriage of Caspar van Kinschot, General-Treasurer and Counsellor of Prince Maurice, and Marie de Chantraines in 1603. Both had been
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83 The poem, with a commentary by Eyffinger, can be found in Grotius, *De dichtwerken van Hugo Grotius*, 440-482.
married before; Van Kinschot would die soon after the wedding. The poem is important as Grotius himself seems to have been proud of it – he sent a copy of the poem together with a copy of his *Inauguratio Regis Britanniae* to the German diplomat Georg Michael Lingelsheim (1556-1636). The poem has clearly been modelled on examples of Statius and Claudianus. This becomes evident in the many verbal references to their epithalamia, as Eyffinger has shown, as well in the metre of the poem, the length (somewhere near the 300 lines), and the imagery. However, Grotius did not merely follow his examples; in contrast to Eyffinger, I would contend that Grotius is not slavish in his following of these examples, but instead was amply capable of varying things within the limits of the genre as he perceived them. I would also argue that the differences in Grotius’s imagery are telling.

In the *Epithalamion Kinschotii*, the poet asks in the first lines why the weather is so peaceful. The question is a rhetorical one – it is your wedding day, Kinschotius! Flushing, mistress of the sea and house of the Nereids, holds you as *pronuba*, she bred for you the beautiful Marie de Chantraines. Here we enter the mythical realm: the poet asks Triton to start the song about the origin of this marriage. The focus then switches to a *locus amoenus*, somewhere between Walcheren (in the province of Zeeland) and Brabant where the Scheldt and the Meuse meet. Here Venus has her (a?) palace filled with riches from all over the world. She returns one afternoon from her travels, espies the victorious vessels of the Batavians and the Spanish troops beleaguering Ostend (*Hispanos ad moenia tuta sedentes*), then enters her palace and falls asleep, while her troops of Amores playfully practise their shooting skills. But her sleep is soon disturbed by the sound of clapping and shouting, coming from Flushing. When Venus asks where the noise is coming from, her son Cupid, after a long description of his qualities, answers in mock that she seems to be the only one who does not know the cause of the hilarity and that it is his work (*meus iste labor*). Cupid then explains how and why he had arranged this marriage, which gives Grotius the opportunity to sing the virtues of bride and groom: their noble origin, Kinschotius’s professional capability and loyalty, the bride’s beauty, piety, and endurance. Cupid ends his speech urging his mother to hasten to the marriage. The goddess then quickly travels with her retinue to the
wedding party, where she finds the couple in the bedroom and she admonishes the couple to ‘play happily’ (*felices ludite*).

I think this poem is interesting for two reasons. The first reason is that it shows us Grotius’s virtuosity in the field of imitation and emulation of classical examples. As said above, Grotius absorbed the language and style of Statius and Claudianus, adhering in this poem close to the thematical scheme of the *epithalamium*, and still manages to write a new and original poem. This shows us that Italian humanism had arrived in the Northern Netherlands. But it also shows us how Grotius, even when he closely followed his examples, found ways of expressing his cultural or political views. The fact that he allowed Venus a palace near Walcheren seems telling. He could easily have made her come either from the stars or a Mediterranean *locus amoenus*, but apparently he finds Zeeland a suitable place for an ancient goddess. Here, in miniature, the specifically Dutch or perhaps even specifically Grotian version of the humanist discourse of the Republic of Letters can be found. This is even more the case in the next poem.

The *Epithalamium Cornelii vander Milen et Mariae ab Oldenbarnevelt* was also written in 1603, but differs considerably from the *Epithalamium Kinschotii*.\(^\text{84}\) Here, the poet opens by referring to the hard times of illness and death. But now the stars are making amends with this marriage, which again was made in heaven (*Connubia non haec mortales fecere manus*). Batavia herself had gone to the gods to arrange this marriage. Batavia’s entry to the heavenly sphere gives Grotius a nice opportunity to describe all the Batavian heroes residing among the demigods, among whom is William of Orange, accompanied by Adriaen van der Myle, father of the groom. To Neptune’s question as to why she has come and whether the Spanish or the British were bothering her again, Batavia answers that she has no complaints or fears with Van Oldenbarnevelt as Pensionary of the State.\(^\text{85}\) But Batavia wants the gods to make amends for all the hardship they have visited upon the Pensionary’s family. She wants a marriage for Maria, to secure future leaders for her country. Batavia praises the beauty and character of Maria and Van der

\(^{84}\) This poem can be found, with a commentary by Eyffinger, in Grotius, *De dichtwerken van Hugo Grotius*, 482-513.

\(^{85}\) *Custode quis illo / Pectore seguro neget indulgere sopori* (‘Who refuses to allow let himself to fall asleep with such a watchman?’), r. 152-153.
Myle’s origins and ambition. The gods agree, especially Venus, Hymen, Juno, and Jupiter himself. Cupid is sent to enflame both with his arrows and the marriage is arranged. The final 40 lines describe Batavia visiting the marriage ceremony itself. She admires the riches collected from all over the world. Then she blesses the young couple and wishes for offspring and future leaders for her people.

This poem is very interesting, as it shows us how much freedom a poet like Grotius could win for himself within the limits of the traditional genres. Although more free, this *epithalamium* still fits within the boundaries of the genre. But Grotius uses the freedom he has to convey a message. Here, it is not just a Venus and some cupids who bring about this marriage, purely for the sake of love; Grotius makes the marriage poem into a political text. Of course, he had good reason to do so in the present context as both marriage partners had families engaged in public administration during the Revolt. But the poem shows us the complexity of the humanist discourse, where the adoption and often close imitation of a classical example can still be used to convey an altogether different message to that of the example.

In our present poem, the *epithalamium* is still a marriage poem set in a mythical context, where bride and groom are extensively praised and the story of their betrothal is told. But the way Grotius tells us this story makes it almost a manifesto of his cultural and political views. This becomes particularly evident at the end, where Batavia’s main argument in favour of the marriage seems to be the creation of capable leaders for her lands. But more important is the personification of the Northern Netherlands as a goddess called Batavia. In what is probably a rather arbitrary way to our modern eyes, Grotius creates a powerful common denominator for something that can hardly be called a unity. It is as if Grotius wants to show his public firstly that there is a unity — for how can there not be a unity if there is even a goddess to impersonate it? — and secondly, that they are fully entitled to revolt against Spain, for their uniqueness is not recognized by Spain! This message is underscored by the way Grotius depicts Batavia, her Minerva-like appearance, the pride with which she enters the heavenly sphere and addresses the gods, the courtesy with which the other gods address her, and, very importantly, the location of all significant ‘Batavian’ heroes in the heavenly sphere, from Civilis to William of Orange!
Probably it is here we reach the most important conclusion about this discourse. Just as humanists everywhere, Grotius and his contemporaries saw themselves as legitimate inheritors of the classical tradition. That they were legitimate inheritors shows us the fact, as we have seen and will see, that they were perfectly able to imitate and emulate their predecessors in every genre imaginable. What makes this discourse unique is the cultural and political connotation with which it becomes associated within the Dutch (Leiden) context. The language and style of the Republic of Letters becomes the voice expressing a national view, where instead a Batavian republic is the rightful inheritor of classical Rome, and where also the Muses have found a new home within this envisioned ‘Batavian’ republic, where Leiden could function as a new Mount Helicon or as a temple dedicated to Apollo and his Muses.

1.6 Conclusion

By now we have discussed enough examples to be able to draw some conclusions about the discourse of the Leiden humanists. This discourse largely coheres with the international discourse of the European humanists in the Republic of Letters. This may seem somewhat obvious, but it is an important fact, as this discourse had not really permeated the Northern Netherlands on this scale before and would not do so again. So what we have here is the humanist discourse, apparently imported by Dousa and Scaliger from France. As we have seen, this discourse comprised many different aspects, among them the eloquent use of classical Latin, an ongoing dialogue with the classical world, either Greek or Roman, which gives the impression that these authors saw themselves as partaking in the exact same discourse as their classical precursors did, as if they are continuously trying to bridge both the temporal and spatial distances between themselves and their great examples. This is a general and well-known characteristic of the humanist discourse.

To this characteristic we could add the educational curriculum Scaliger used for his students, part of which was their introduction into the Republic of Letters by means of scholarly editions of classical texts. These were often accompanied by a laudatory liminary poem by Scaliger himself and poems or introductions addressed to Scaliger by the pupil. As the hierarchy within the Republic of Letters depended largely on the
esteem bestowed on its members by its members, laudatory poetry by an esteemed scholar was of great value. The same could be said of letter-writing. As letters were often read aloud in public and even circulated among friends and acquaintances, having a letter of a well-known humanist automatically increased the reputation of the receiver in his (or her) own circle. We can recognize this mechanism at work in the careers of Grotius and Heinsius, especially in their early editions, but also in Grotius’s letters.86

However, the humanist discourse in Leiden also had some unique characteristics of its own. One of them was that this discourse became strongly linked with the regent class of both nobility and patricians. This may seem rather straightforward, as (university) education was usually a privilege of the higher classes in society. But it was especially this higher segment of Dutch society that was most connected to the Remonstrant cause and the irenic movement. This meant that the humanist discourse in the Northern Netherlands too can be seen as a characteristic of the Remonstrants. Another characteristic of this discourse, which becomes especially evident in the work of Grotius, is the self-conscious nationalistic enthusiasm, which we have seen in his poems in the personification of Batavia. I think we may assume that these poems reflect something of the intellectual climate at Leiden University in the first decade of the seventeenth century. This can also be seen in the Collegium poeticum of Dousa, Van Hout, and others – colleagues and friends encouraged each other to write Latin and vernacular poetry. It may be realized that these unique characteristics of the intellectual climate at Leiden University at this time can easily be related to the circumstances surrounding the foundation of the university in 1575 – the university was part of a growing nationalist self-consciousness under William of Orange, probably as a reward for standing ground against the Spanish troops, brought into the world by a humanist nobleman, Janus Dousa. It is interesting to see that this cultural enthusiasm seems to precede the economic upsurge that would follow in the first half of the seventeenth century.

86 For example, Grotius’s early letters to De Thou and from Lipsius.