

fashion opposing Copernicanism and refusing to accept that such passages were concessions to prevailing popular misconceptions, has to do less with the principle as such, and the philosophical nuancing this implies, than with the importance of the topic and status of Scripture as divinely-inspired. If, held Voetius, the compilers of Scripture could not tell the truth with regard to the Sun's movements, 'the Word of God is not authentic'; if they did not want to tell the truth, they would be responsible for readers' misconceptions (see 136-137). Here as elsewhere, it was vital to both Voetius and Van Mastricht to keep philosophy firmly subordinate to theology.

Some of the most interesting passages with respect to Driessen concern the question of how he differed from Voetius and Van Mastricht on the subject of miracles. Goudriaan suggests that the general acceptance of miracles in Dutch as in other European culture in the mid seventeenth century was such that Voetius and Van Mastricht were less on the defensive on this point, indeed remained more anxious to show that the incidence of miracles had greatly declined since Biblical times than they were with defending the possibility of miracles as such. Driessen, however, viewing the scene from the perspective of the early eighteenth century, saw God's Providence as clashing full frontally with the view of those philosophers such as Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz who asserted the unchangeable and absolute quality of natural laws. Consequently, Driessen, is far more concerned than his predecessors to defend the possibility – in the present no less than in the past – of miracles as such.

In his brief but interesting conclusion, Goudriaan re-emphasizes the importance for these writers of the question of how to relate philosophy to theology. He draws up a kind of balance-sheet showing that while there was a large measure of doctrinal continuity linking all three Reformed theologians, including their common commitment to the overriding authority of Scripture, the differences of philosophical affiliation and perspective between them also introduced some substantial differences especially between Driessen and the other two. He concludes that Voetius and Van Mastricht were far more successful in combining Calvinist theology with Aristotelian-scholastic forms and terminology than was Driessen in combining it with strands taken both from Cartesianism and from his critique of the Leibnitio-Wolffian philosophy. It was precisely the effort to modernize Reformed theology in this instance that placed it in greatest danger.

Jonathan Israel

Onnekink, D., *The Anglo-Dutch Favourite. The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649-1709)* (Oorspronkelijk dissertatie Utrecht 2004, *Politics and Culture in North-Western Europe 1650-1720*; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007, xvii + 297 blz., £60,-, ISBN 978 0 7546 5545 9); Mijers, E., Onnekink, D., *Redifining William III. The Impact of the King-Stadholder in International Context (Politics and Culture in North-Western Europe 1650-1720*; Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007, xx + 293 blz., £55,-,

ISBN 978 0 7546 5028 7).

David Onnekink's *Anglo-Dutch Favourite* is a well-written, extremely competent study less of the life and career of Bentinck as such than of his role in the making of William III's career and major decisions, and as such is extremely welcome, filling a notorious gap in the literature and in our historical knowledge. The nature and exact forms of Anglo-Dutch collaboration and interaction during the years 1689-1702 when there existed in the world something like an Anglo-Dutch imperial complex, or multiple monarchy, have, as the author points out in his introduction, hardly ever been studied even to a minimal extent let alone fully investigated. As the most important of William III's 'Dutch' personal advisers, Bentinck's political and diplomatic career certainly provides an ideal vantage-point from which to begin filling the lacuna.

Accordingly, besides providing an excellent account of the system of 'favouritism' and informal advisers at William's court at The Hague, before 1688, the book supplies a great deal of new information about William III's international negotiations and diplomacy and especially about his complex dealings with the German states and the British aristocracy. His discussion of the religious factor in William III's and Bentinck's statecraft is nuanced and sensitive, and he convincingly shows that Bentinck was a more serious bearer of a distinctively Dutch Protestant ideology than the Prince himself probably was. At the same time he leaves the reader under no illusions as to Bentinck's cold, dry and intellectually-limited personality. A particularly valuable aspect of this study is the detailed and often innovative account of Bentinck's key role in Scottish and Irish affairs during the early 1690s and of Bentinck's success in integrating himself and his children into the English aristocracy. Very interesting and significant also, is his analysis of Bentinck's views on common Anglo-Dutch military strategy during the war against France from 1688 down to 1697 and how these differed from those of the king's English ministers, betraying what might justly be called a certain 'pro-Dutch bias' with a particular focus on the campaigns in the southern Netherlands.

The author has certainly succeeded in showing, on the one hand, as he puts it, that Bentinck played a key co-ordinating role in William's government of his four 'realms' in the 1690s and, on the other, how and why, to many or most of the English aristocracy and wider public he embodied what they saw as the evils of the Williamite settlement. In Britain he became and remained strikingly unpopular. There is a clear sense in which Bentinck's career and person personified Anglo-Dutch developments in the crucial decade after 1688. However, I do not myself think the author has substantiated his claims in one significant respect – his working towards what he suggests is a major reorientation in our understanding of the Dutch role in the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689.

Here, he begins by saying that 'to date, no satisfactory analysis of Dutch strategic considerations in 1688 has appeared' and that his aim is to re-orientate our interpretation by showing, in particular by reference to developments in Germany, how we can 'situate the decision to invade England within a

sequence of interlocking international and domestic events that can provide some explanation for Dutch policy' (37-38). But the relevance and intricacies of the Cologne affair, in 1688, which he emphasizes are by no means so ignored as he suggests and what he finally comes up with merely confirms the earlier view that emerged, through scholarly debates connected with the Tri-centenary celebrations in the late 1980s and early 1990s, that the point of the invasion of England, endorsed by the Amsterdam burgomasters and States of Holland in a series of secret decisions and resolutions, was to counter French military power in continental Europe and Louis XIV's use of France's ports and maritime power to damage Dutch trade. Indeed, the author is to be criticized, I would suggest, for allowing the inevitable military-courtly bias of any study of Bentinck to lead him to greatly underrate the overall importance of maritime and commercial considerations in the minds of Holland's regent patriciate as a factor in the making of Dutch policy in 1688.

The essays collected together in the volume edited by Esther Mijers and David Onnekink and also published by Ashgate in 2007 began life as a conference on William III's impact on political and cultural life viewed in international context held at Utrecht in December 2002. The collection focuses on trying to clear up the many mystifying and unresolved problems connected with interpreting William's career, impact and achievements. The introduction is jointly written by Mijers and Onnekink and explains the character and scope of these abiding difficulties briefly but effectively. The volume seeks to advance our knowledge of the overall picture by re-examining William's reign in both the Netherlands and the 'three kingdoms' of England, Scotland and Ireland using an ambitious comparative approach and the resources of art history, history of political thought, and book history as well as the usual methods of political, diplomatic and general history.

The chapters on the more strictly political, diplomatic and institutional side of the story, by Simon Groenveld, William A. Speck, Wout Troost (on Ireland), John Stapleton on the military organization of the new multiple monarchy, John Rule on the 'Partition treaties' of 1698-1700, Olaf Mörke on the Stadholder's court, and also those on William III and the Dutch Reformed Church, by Frits Broeyer, and on court propaganda by Tony Claydon, it has to be said, contain relatively little that is new and tend to restate already well-aided perspectives rather than open up fresh approaches, though it is also fair to say that Stapleton's essay is a most useful summary of recent research (much of it in Dutch) on William's army reforms and generally on the military and strategic aspects of the story.

Perhaps particularly worrying in Simon Groenveld's essay are the indications that the traditional Dutch historiographical tendency to minimize the extent of the political and institutional break in 1672, with the downfall of the De Witt regime and the restoration of the stadholderate continues here, even though the reader, on the evidence given in other parts of the volume, and in Onnekink's study of Bentinck, might well be forgiven for wondering whether in fact the new regime introduced by William III with its court favourites and 'agents' designed to subvert the power of the city governments and the States of Holland did not amount to a much more fundamental break and the

creation of a true aristocratic-court-military complex which largely replaced the republican machinery of the previous regime. Strangely enough, nowhere in this volume is there an essay which seeks to reconsider and reinterpret the Glorious Revolution, the pivotal and decisive event in the story.

A controversial and rather objectionable remark in Speck's essay occurs as part of his rebuke to those 'historians' who speak of a Dutch 'occupation' of London in 1688-1690. He agrees that on entering London, in December 1688, William sent away all the English regiments in the capital 'not least because English soldiers were rightly suspected of Jacobite sympathies' and that much of the population remained loyal to James and ambivalent, but nevertheless objects to the notion that London was 'occupied' by the Dutch army that encamped in Hyde Park and strategic points all around the city and protests that 'to talk of their deployment in London as occupying forces is to draw grotesque analogies with the Nazi invasions of European countries' (40). This is not the usual language of criticism, or charge of inaccuracy, that historical colleagues level against each other. It is understandable of course that the idea that William III 'invaded' England in 1688, though this is precisely what James II himself claimed, offends a long tradition of self-perception predominant in British culture and historiography. It is also true that William III had no wish for it to be said that he 'owed his crowns to Conquest'. But that is not the same as actually not owing them to Conquest. Moreover, if bringing an uninvited foreign army, under foreign commanders who spoke little or no English, into a neighbouring country's capital and securing all the strong points by military force is not an 'occupation' what then is it? Innumerable European cities are routinely spoken of by historians as having been 'occupied' by invading or marauding armies in early modern times, not least Utrecht and the cities of Gelderland and Overijssel by the – on the whole fairly well-behaved – French, in 1672, without anyone complaining about historians' introducing grotesque distortion by conjuring up images of 'Nazi invasions'.

It is thus arguably the essays approaching William III's impact from less familiar angles and dealing with hitherto little-studied aspects of the subject that are the essays in this volume which can most aptly be said to be 'redefining William III'. In the essay on Dutch republican defenses of the Glorious Revolution and in particular, Ericus Walten, Martin van Gelderen, agrees that Walten was rather radical in his views about religion, the Church and on the perniciousness of 'superstition' but argues that 'Walten went out of his way to deny that he favoured republican government, rejecting the view that monarchy should be banned' (153). Van Gelderen concludes that Walten's work raises 'important questions about how the development of radical reflections on the relationship between theology and philosophy were related to innovations in political thought' and shows what some of these are. Likewise, Charles-Edouard Levillain provides a most innovative and stimulating analysis, in part a study of French Catholic anti-Williamite propaganda but also much more than this, of the image of William III as a 'Cromwell Redivivus', in the cultural and propaganda life of the time. He uses his analysis convincingly to bring out and stress the 'paradoxical nature of William III's constitutional position after the Glorious Revolution'.

Another excellent piece is the contribution by Mark Goldie and Clare Jackson on 'Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites'. Not many of us, specialist historians included, have previously heard much about 'Whig Jacobites' so here is genuinely an opportunity to learn something new. Whig Jacobitism, intent on proclaiming the Glorious Revolution unfinished and flawed business which needed straightening and being carried further, expressed in some forty published pamphlets, especially in the years 1692-1695, was greatly aided by the fact that James himself was converted, albeit only temporarily, to their programme. In a declaration of April 1693, the Jacobite court in exile promised 'a free parliament, religious toleration, and bills for frequent parliaments and free elections'. It is a fascinating story. The most effective of the Whig Jacobites was the lawyer Charlwood Lawton, who personally evaded identification and arrest but whose publisher, William Anderton, was executed in 1693 for publishing his anti-Williamite tracts. For Lawton, the Revolution was 'the greatest advantage lost, that perhaps the nation ever had' (181).

Other essays worthy of being singled out for their originality and novel perspectives are Allan I. Macinnes' essay on the Williamite regime in Scotland which innovates by considering the Scottish experience in the context of an impressive range of trans-Atlantic developments stretching far beyond Scotland and not just the still troubled relationship between England and Scotland, and Andrew Barclays' essay 'William's Court as King' which demonstrates the role of the British as well as Dutch courtiers, favourites and sinecure-holders in William's household. Finally, in his study of the image of William in contemporary prints, Hugh Dunthorne provides a welcome evaluation of a large, not to say vast, body of visual material relating the reign. He comes to the interesting conclusion that 'pictorially speaking, William III stands in a kind of twilight zone, a transitional point midway between the age of Van Dyck on the one hand and the age of Gillray on the other'.

Jonathan Israel

Wall, E. G. E. van der, Wessels, L. H. M., *Een veelzijdige verstandhouding. Religie en Verlichting in Nederland 1650-1850* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2007, 454 blz., €29,90, ISBN 978 90 77503 73 7).

As is also the case with the Spanish, Scandinavian and Italian enlightenments, the Dutch *Verlichting* remains, both to the Dutch and to others, one of the least familiar of the important examples of European Enlightenment. Given the increasing cultural, political and also theological importance of the Enlightenment in the world today and the pressing need to make the Enlightenment a larger and more important element in the study of history not only in universities but also in schools, it is welcome news that a well-balanced 450-page survey volume of twenty-three essays such as this, devoted to the complex and sometime fraught relationship between religion and