Eenheid en verscheidenheid. De burgers van Haarlem in de Gouden Eeuw
Dorren, G.M.E.

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
Summary

Towards the end of the sixteenth century Haarlem had to deal with various sources of tension. The city had to overcome the consequences of the Spanish Siege (1572-1573) and a great fire (1576), while the number of inhabitants was rapidly increasing. In 1572 this number was estimated at 18,000, and by 1622 it had more than doubled. This growth was largely caused by an influx of refugees, especially after the Fall of Antwerp (1585). Not surprisingly, the population was by no means homogeneous, and also from a religious point of view there was not even the remotest resemblance of unity at the turn of the century.

Both individually and most certainly in combination with each other, these developments carried the seeds that could well lead to conflicts in the seventeenth century. The inevitable disputes ensued, but it never came to a point where the unity was actually jeopardized. How can this relative quiet be explained? After all, the religious diversity was dragging on after 1600. Following a period of economic prosperity in the first half of the century, the economy was deteriorating, especially from the 1670s onwards. The growth of the population kept pace with the economic development: around the middle of the seventeenth century the number of inhabitants had stabilized, but then the decrease set in. In those last decades the city continued to attract newcomers, although the policy on foreigners had grown considerably more stringent than it had been in the early seventeenth century, due to the pressure of economic problems.

This dissertation seeks the explanation of the absence of any serious conflicts in the way urban life was organized. The Haarlem inhabitants were united in a number of social structures, and there was a high degree of interaction between each of these structures and the city government. Haarlem was not unique in this respect. Every early-modern city consisted of such smaller communities, from which the inhabitants derived their identity. Anyone wishing to study what life was like for the inhabitants of a seventeenth-century city, will therefore have to look into the social structures in which those inhabitants were united. With its size and the heterogeneity of its population seventeenth-century Haarlem makes a pre-eminent subject for a historical approach of a city from various social structures simultaneously. Furthermore, the sources passed down
to us, render a description of Haarlem society from within possible, a description from the people that gave shape to that society and to whom it owed its dynamics.

This study deals with family, neighbourhoods, guilds, churches, citizen's militia, chambers of rhetoric and the city as an all-encompassing social structure in succession. The social structures were faced with the aforementioned sources of tension in different ways. Thus the Haarlem neighbourhoods had to cope with the growing number of inhabitants, while urban expansion was a long time coming. Consequently, people lived closely together, which caused neighbours to become more important in social life. The guilds felt the effect of the newcomers in the city; sometimes their arrival was a welcome impulse, sometimes the foreign craftsmen posed a threat. The churches had to find ways to deal with religious dissension. In addition, they were to find out that poor relief came under growing pressure in the late seventeenth century, when the city government transferred the greater part of this task to them. In the same period, the government called in the gebuurtten (neighbourhoods) to keep foreigners under surveillance. Order and public security were not only the responsibility of the city government. The institution that was the very symbol of the citizens' community, the militia, shared this responsibility.

Together, the social structures referred to above, shaped the urban community: they were interlocked, and they strengthened each other. Any discord among the Haarlemmers in one field could be neutralized by co-operation in another field. Every social structure provided a conciliation of differences at a low level, thus nipping any conflicts in the bud. The governors of the social structure in question acted as primary mediators. If they did not succeed in settling the issue, arbitration from a higher level was usually sought, or the burgomasters were notified. The four burgomasters were charged with the daily government and met three or four times a week to attend to current affairs. Haarlemmers mostly appeared before this college in relation with one of the social structures. The 'memorials of burgomasters,' containing the minutes of the sessions, and the 'documents received' that were discussed in the meetings, are marvellous sources, not in the least for the petitions included in them. The frequency with which the citizens turned to their burgomasters to demand justice, tells us something about their conception of their place in society. The regents on their part took their task of representing the community, which they belonged to themselves, seriously.

The high degree of consensus in Haarlem on what was to be considered desired behaviour and what undesired behaviour, is quite remarkable. This already became apparent at the level of community in its closest sense, the family. The 'little republic' was supposed to be governed by the head of the family, but if he failed and harmony was disrupted by a serious row or by adultery, the neighbours felt called upon to step in. Intervention by the government in marital crises was no exception and seems to have been acceptable from the perspective
that a lack of personal control could have implications for the peace of the urban community as a whole. So even at a level as low as that of the family, any threat to the unity was stopped at the earliest possible stage, either by intervention of the neighbours or church, or by the city taking action.

The authority that people were submitted to at the time, could vary per individual, but it also depended on the situation. Institutions that exercised authority over their own members, such as the church council and the neighbourhood and guild councils, were submitted to the authority of the city government. This entire structure of relationships, sometimes intersecting one another, sometimes overlapping or running parallel with each other, kept the city together.
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