

artikelen die primair politiek of diplomatiek gericht zijn, spreken de economie en in het bijzonder de handel en handelspolitiek een woordje mee. Zoals met dit soort bundels, ook al hebben ze één noemer, bijna altijd het geval is, bestrijken de artikelen een breed scala van onderwerpen; in dit geval zelfs een heel breed scala. Naast economie en politiek zijn ook de sociale, culturele en diplomatieke geschiedschrijving vertegenwoordigd.

Wat stijfjes, maar — naar ik hoop — wel informatief signaleer ik studies over de Poolse en Baltische graanhandel (respectievelijk 1500-1800 en in de achttiende eeuw), over de Hollands-Zweedse handel in de zeventiende eeuw, over de Hollands-Zweedse concurrentie in Azië (1731-1735), over de Engels-Hollandse concurrentie in Rusland aan het einde van de zestiende eeuw, over *bullion flow* en wisselkoersen tussen Amsterdam en Riga (1783-1785), over de Baltische handel en de achteruitgang van de economie in de Republiek gedurende de achttiende eeuw. Voorts zijn er artikelen betreffende de overdracht van windmolentechnologie uit de Nederlanden naar Noord-Oost Europa vanaf de zestiende tot in het begin van de negentiende eeuw, de werving van Hollandse scheepstimmerlieden voor de werf van de Admiraliteit van Karlskrona in 1718, de Hollandse maritieme cartografie van het Balticum in de zestiende eeuw, Hollandse invloed op Deense architectuur in de zeventiende eeuw en culturele relaties tussen Zweden en de Republiek gedurende het laatste kwart van de zeventiende eeuw. Op het terrein van de diplomatieke, politieke en militaire geschiedschrijving wordt er geschreven over Denemarken, de Nederlanden en Habsburg in het begin van de zestiende eeuw, over Frederik II van Denemarken, over Denemarken als bondgenoot van de Republiek (1674-1679), over Hollands-Baltische relaties in de jaren 1709-1711 en over Hollandse konvooien in het Baltisch gebied tijdens de Russisch-Zweedse Oorlog (1741-1743). Tenslotte is er een publikatie over de reis van Johannes Meerman naar Noord- en Noord-Oost Europa (1797-1800) en over boerenopstanden in de vroegmoderne tijd.

Nu we met de drie genoemde bundels en een aantal 'losse', al dan niet wat oudere studies van onder anderen De Buck, Klein en Lindblad (inclusief de nodige recente, buiten Nederland verschenen publikaties over de relaties met het Oostzeegebied) over een flink aantal detailstudies over de handel tussen de Republiek en het Balticum zijn gaan beschikken, dringt zich de vraag op of het niet de moeite waard loont, een meer synthetische studie in het bijzonder betreffende de handel op dit gebied te beproeven. Mede in het licht van de nogal provocerende recente stellingname van Jonathan Israel in diens inspirerende *Dutch primacy in world trade* (1989) inzake het belang van onze Baltische handel in massagoederen in het geheel van de handel van de Republiek (zijns inziens in de bestaande historiografie nogal overschat) een intellectueel avontuur en wel van de eerste rang: wetenschappelijk van een hoge orde, nationaal en internationaal van belangstelling verzekerd. Kortom, wie durft dit aan?

L. Noordegraaf

J. D. Tracy, *Holland under Habsburg rule, 1506-1566. The formation of a body politic* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-Oxford: University of California Press, 1990, ix + 330 blz., \$45,-, ISBN 0 520 06882 3); J. W. Koopmans, *De Staten van Holland en de Opstand. De ontwikkeling van hun functies en organisatie in de periode 1544-1588* (Dissertatie Groningen 1990, Hollandse historische reeks XIII; 's-Gravenhage: Stichting Hollandse historische reeks, 1990, 328 blz., f 59,-, ISBN 90 72627 04 0).

English historians have spent a great deal of energy during the last hundred and fifty years on the history of the English parliament and especially on the period of the sixteenth and the

seventeenth centuries, when England acquired a parliamentary regime. Even now, the issues debated in this history are far from dead, and the historiographical controversies which they have produced are as lively as ever, even if not quite as acrimonious as they have been in the past. We have all, long since, given up the 'whig interpretation' of parliamentary history, the idea that the triumph of parliament over the monarchy was a simple triumph of liberty and also that it was somehow inevitable. But parliamentary history has remained one of our central preoccupations, even if we have given up teleology and have somewhat downgraded the political importance of parliament before the eighteenth or nineteenth century—an exercise which, in my opinion, has not been as convincing as some historians have claimed.

To a British historian it is therefore at first sight surprising that this preoccupation with the history of parliament has no real parallel in the historiography of the Netherlands. There have of course been plenty of studies of the estates of different provinces. The Dutch-Belgian society 'Standen en Landen' has a most impressive list of fine scholarly publications on this topic. At least two distinguished Netherlands historians, Emile Lousse and Wim Blockmans, have constructed overall theories of the structure and role of the estates in late-medieval and early modern Europe — an exercise which insular and positivist British historians have tended to shy away from. But in the major histories of the early modern Netherlands, both united and divided, the estates have usually not been assigned the central role which the English parliament has been granted in English history.

The two books under review have now done this for the States of Holland in the sixteenth century. Chronologically they overlap for the later years of Charles V and the early years of Philip II. But in fact they are complementary; for Tracy concentrates on the earlier years of the reign of Charles V and has only a short chapter on the period from 1556 to 1566, while Koopmans, using 1572 as a 'hinge', concentrates on the reign of Philip II and on the early years of the revolt, up to the end of the Leicester period. The books are complementary, too, in their approach. Tracy uses the States of Holland as the key to an understanding of the development of the political community of the county, while Koopmans uses the more traditional approach of institutional and constitutional history. Both authors use Blockmans' taxonomy of representative assemblies and found that it fitted well. The States of Holland were representatives primarily of the towns and can be classed with Blockmans' Flanders as an 'urban parliament'. Between 1525 and 1529 the States of Holland were convened 21 times per year on average and, between 1542 and 1563 13,5 times. This compares with 34 times, on average, for the Four Members of Flanders between 1386 and 1506. After 1572, as we would expect, the number of sessions of the States of Holland sky-rocketed to over 200 a year. Such frequent meetings, as Tracy points out, are a good indicator of the degree to which the deputies were subject to the control of their principals, the *vroedschappen* of the towns. For the earlier period, again as Blockmans' model suggests, the primary concern of the States was economic matters.

Both Tracy and Koopmans are of course aware that Holland was a part of the complex political entity of the Burgundian-Habsburg Netherlands and of the greater Habsburg-Spanish empire. Neither, however, has developed Blockmans' schema to discuss systematically the position of representative institutions in a composite monarchy. This position affected the role of the States of Holland in the States General of the Netherlands and, naturally, both authors have a certain amount to say about this. Neither of them does so in any great detail. They seem to assume that the restricted powers of the delegates and their obligation to refer government proposals to their principals made the States General into little more than an extension of the provincial states. I think this is an oversimplification, even for the meetings of the States General before the famous

'joint' session of 1557-1559 which so much frightened Granvelle and Philip II. But, more important still, the condition of being a component part of a composite monarchy affected the role of the government in Brussels, its policy towards the States at any given time, and also the relations of the States of Holland with those of other provinces. This last is a topic on which much more work needs to be done. What is very clear is the inability of the Netherlands government to pursue consistent policies towards the States of the provinces. Blockmans, drawing his conclusions from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, could ignore these problems. For the sixteenth century and more especially for the Netherlands and for the other lands of the Habsburg monarchy this is not really possible. If Blockmans' typology is to be really illuminating for this later period, it will have to be modified and extended accordingly.

It is only fair to say that these two books provide a wealth of material precisely for making such modifications and extensions. Both are based on a thorough knowledge of the archives and of the relevant primary and secondary printed literature. Both authors are careful in their scholarship and judicious in their conclusions and neither is influenced by the mythologies of the older historiography of Holland. Tracy's theme is to show how the cities and different geographical areas of this highly urbanised county gradually overcame their ingrained separatist interests, which pitted fishing against manufacturing towns and these, in turn, against towns living mainly by international or by local, inland trade. Around 1500 they were held together by little more than their old tradition of loyalty to their prince, though I also think that, paradoxically, the party strife between Hoeks and Kabeljauws had at least some positive effects in making Hollanders think in terms of the whole county. The prince and his governments exploited the differences between the towns in the States. Where the French monarchy tamed its estates by sharing the taxes granted by them with the nobility, the Burgundian-Habsburg monarchy tried to tame the Dutch States by granting the towns of Holland differential *gratiën* for the ordinary *beden*. Andries Jacobszoon, the secretary of Amsterdam, commented disgustedly that the deputies were summoned town by town by the government's commissioners as if to 'auricular confession' and that they were granted the 'holy water' of *gratiën*, for 'every city looks out for itself, without thinking about the welfare of the land'.

Tracy sees two processes as mainly responsible for changing the Hollanders' attitude. The first was the long war with Guelders. When it started, only those parts of Holland directly affected by the plundering of the Gueldrian soldiers were willing to find money for defence. Gradually it became clear that a leak in one part of the ship endangered the whole. The second process was the growth of the sale of *renten* for the government, especially in the 1540s and 1550s. Tracy has already given us the details of this story in his book *A financial revolution in the Habsburg Netherlands* (1985). Here he concentrates on the political implications of this development. They were threefold: firstly, there was the growth of a political elite who were the principal investors in the *renten*. These included many of the usual deputies to the States. Secondly, the sale of *renten* encouraged cooperation between the States and members of the high nobility in the regent's councils, cooperation which included a good deal of discreet and not so discreet bribery. By the time of Margaret of Parma, great lords like Orange and Egmont had their own political and, from the king's point of view, sinister reasons for encouraging such cooperation. Thirdly, the States built up their own financial machinery to administer the *renten*. Historians have known about this process for some time; but Tracy makes the very convincing point that it gave Holland and its States the experience of administration which made their assumption of governmental functions after 1572 both thinkable and practicable.

Tracy does not think that these developments in politics, administrations and attitudes made

either the revolt or its eventual success inevitable. They were necessary rather than sufficient reasons. Very properly, he also discusses other developments, such as the Baltic trade and the North Sea fisheries (though I wish we could now lay to rest the old canard of the migration of the herring shoals, a case of oceanographers and economic historians mutually misunderstanding each other and constructing an elaborate theory on their misunderstanding). In the end one also has to allow for contingency, for *histoire événementielle*, as well as analyse long-term developments.

This is also the conclusion one must reach from Koopmans' book. In scholarly detail he expounds the structure and the functioning of the States of Holland and he adds excellent sociological and prosopographical details about the deputies. Particularly interesting is the development of the committees which, after 1572, took over many of the administrative functions previously exercised by the Hof of Holland. It is quite clear that no one had a blue print for parliamentary government or at first even thought that this was desirable. It was the practical problems of carrying on the war with the royalists and the Spaniards which forced the States to play their unplanned and unprecedented role. There is a distinct parallel here with the development of a parliamentary regime after the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688/1689. The house of Orange played a key role on both occasions, and it was probably only the contingency of William the Silent's assassination which prevented him from establishing a parliamentary monarchy in the Netherlands as his great-grandson did in Britain.

In both Holland and England there was as much continuity as change in the functioning of their parliaments across the great divides of 1572-1576 and 1688-1689 respectively. It is this dual topic of continuity and change which is Koopmans' concern. If his scholarly book lacks the grand sweep of Tracy's and is not as readable, this seems to be at least partly due to the difference in sources. Koopmans has used the Registers of the States of Holland and the town archives to good effect. What does not exist for his period, at least as far as I know, is a source as revealing of the attitudes of both the urban patricians and of the great lords and ministers of the government as Andries Jacobszoon's *Prothocolle* of 1522 to 1539. It is an incomparable document, with nothing quite like it in Europe, at least before the seventeenth century. May a British historian plead that it be made generally available in a modern, scholarly edition?

H. G. Koenigsberger

M. J. Rodriguez-Salgado, *The changing face of empire. Charles V, Philip II and Habsburg authority, 1551-1559* (Cambridge Studies in early modern history; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, xvi + 375 blz., ISBN 0 521 30346 x).

De meeste staten in de zestiende eeuw waren zogenaamde *composite monarchies*: samengestelde, multi-nationale eenheden, unies van gebiedsdelen die niets gemeenschappelijk hadden dan hun vorst en de verplichting diens buitenlandse politiek financieel te ondersteunen. Nederlandse historici zijn al lang vertrouwd met de gedachte dat de problemen van de Nederlanden, zelf al geen nationale eenheid, in de zestiende eeuw voor een groot deel voortkwamen uit hun positie in het internationale Habsburgse staatsbestel. Mía Rodríguez-Salgado beschrijft in deze studie hoe de problemen aan de top van dit rijk eruit zagen in een van de moeilijkste periodes van zijn bestaan: hoe de verschillende gebiedsdelen bijeen te houden, hoe de meestal tegengestelde belangen met elkaar te verzoenen, hoe een pretentieuze en agressieve buitenlandse politiek te financieren met altijd te weinig middelen.