By July 1610, the dispute between the more orthodox Calvinists, known as Gomarists, and the followers of the more liberal theologian Jacob Arminius had been festering for at least 15 years. In that month, 44 Reformed preachers submitted a Remonstrance to the States of Holland, with the support and participation of the Advocate of Holland, Johan van Oldenbarnevelt. The Remonstrance’s assertion of the authority of the State over the Church and its reaffirmation of Arminius’s theses on predestination incensed the partisans of Gomarus, who soon became known as Counter-Remonstrants. For the next few years, many towns of Holland, including Rotterdam and The Hague, were ruled by regents who were Remonstrants themselves or were sympathetic to their cause. Many of these regents, called libertines (libertijnen), were more concerned with the peace, order, and prosperity of the towns they ruled than with religious controversy. By contrast, Amsterdam was governed by a Council (Raad or Vroedschap) with a majority of Counter-Remonstrants, including the opportunists who supported them. The Counter-Remonstrant camp in Amsterdam was led by Burgomaster Reynier Pauw. Two broad generalizations about the people who sided with one or the other of these two factions are often invoked. First, that merchants engaged in foreign trade, who were in favor of the truce in the war with Spain signed in 1609, generally supported the Remonstrant faction or some sort of Erasmus-like position tolerant of dissent. Second, that many of the poor craftsmen in the textile and leather trades, who had immigrated from the Southern Netherlands, tended to be fiery Counter-Remonstrants. It was said to be among these people, collectively referred to as “the rabble” (het graauw) by their opponents, that crowds of activists who heckled Remonstrant preachers, attacked Remonstrant conventicles, and eventually sacked the homes of prominent Remonstrants were recruited. By early 1617, as Jonathan Israel recently capsuled the political situation, “there was an unmistakable note of rebellion in the air.”221 On 30 January of that year seventeen members of the Remonstrant party petitioned to have a Remonstrant preacher appointed in Amsterdam, where only Counter-Remonstrants had hitherto been allowed to preach. One of these was Abraham Anthonisz. (later in life named Recht), dealer in fats and candlemaker (1588-1664),222 remembered in art history for having commissioned Rembrandt to paint the portrait of the famous Remonstrant preacher Johannes Uyttenbogaert in 1633. He was married to Baefje Willems, a niece of Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop, also a prominent Remonstrant, and the brother of the Remon-
strant preacher Simon Episcopius. His sister Maria Anthonis would marry Daniel Arminius, the son of the Ur-Remonstrant Jacob Arminius, in 1634.223 Abraham Anthonisz. plays a major role in our subsequent story, as a minor functionary in the Orphan Chamber and as an influential buyer at auction. Among the other signatories to the letter, we find Henrick Henricksz. Eeckelboom (also a buyer), Pieter Joostens,224 Jan and Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop (the brothers of Episcopius), Arend de Bisschop (Rem Egbertsz.’s father-in-law), Jacob Lourensz. Reael, and the prosperous merchant Henrick Henricksz. (a buyer), all members of prominent Remonstrant families. On February 5, 250 people came to the house of Willem Sweerts to hear the Remonstrant predikant Sopingius preach. The house having been found too small, the crowd moved to a warehouse owned by a prominent merchant named Herman Rendorp,225 which could accommodate a thousand auditors. The warehouse was attacked by a crowd of Counter-Remonstrants who broke the glass rondels and smashed the wooden windows. Sopingius took refuge in the brewery of Pieter Evertsz. Hulft (a buyer). Jakob Lourensz. Reael and Esaias Hiole (a buyer),226 who was actually a member of the Walloon community, helped secure the warehouse from further depredations. Nevertheless, “the rabble” continued its assaults and threw out the chairs and the books they found in the warehouse. The entire house would have been destroyed if the Schout (the head of the city police) had not finally shown up and dispersed the crowd. Soon thereafter the house of Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop, which was located in a rich neighborhood, near the houses of several members of the Amsterdam Vroedschap, was attacked. Rem Egbertsz. sought the help of the Schout Willem van der Does (himself a staunch Counter-Remonstrant), who lent him grudging support with his soldiery. The books of Rem Egbertsz. were torn, his paintings were cut to pieces (in stukken gesneeden).227 The attackers pursued Abraham Anthonisz. and a biscuit-baker who had apparently attended a conventicle in the house. They climbed on the roof and fled for their lives, taking refuge in separate houses. The Amsterdam Vroedschap laid the blame on the Remonstrants for holding prohibited meetings. A fraudulent, anti-Vroedschap Pasquinade was prominently posted, which was supposed to have been written and signed by Abraham Anthonisz., but in fact had been concocted by a Counter-Remonstrant schoolmaster. In the aftermath, Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop and Jacob Laurensz. Reael, who still belonged to the Reformed Community, were ex-communicated, that is, were banned from attending evening Communion.228

The political situation became increasingly tense in the summer of 1617. A heated debate over the convening of a National Synod finally resulted in a bare majority of Holland towns voting to call a Synod in May 1618, against bitter Remonstrant opposition. On August 4, the States of Holland, led by the pro-Remonstrant Oldenbarnevelt, passed the “Sharp Resolution”, vehemently opposed by Amsterdam and other towns governed by Counter-Remonstrant majorities, authorizing towns that wished to do so to levy mercenaries (waardgelders) to defend them against Counter-Remonstrant disorders. Prince Maurits declared the Resolution “an affront to the
True Religion.” Even though he kept in close touch with Counter-Remonstrant regents, including Reynier Pauw of Amsterdam, he did not intervene until July 1618 when he oversaw the disarming of the *waardgelders* in Utrecht. Finally, on 28 August, the States General passed a resolution authorizing Maurits to “take necessary action for the security of the state”. Oldenbarnevelt, Hugo de Groot and some other prominent members of the Arminian faction were arrested the next day. On 2 November 1618, Prince Maurits visited Amsterdam where he was received by the entire *Vroedschap*, which he proceeded to disband. When the *Vroedschap* was resurrected a few days later, seven old members had been dismissed, including Harmen Gysbertsz. van de Poll, Jacob de Graef, Pieter Thijsz. (Schrijver), Dierick de Vlaming van Oudtshoorn, and Dr. Sebastiaen Egbertsz., all five of whom we shall again meet as masters of the Orphan Chamber. The seven new members were either Counter-Remonstrants or opportunists sympathetic to their cause. One of them was Simon van der Does, the son of the *Schout* who had somewhat reluctantly defended the house of Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop. Oldenbarnevelt was judged summarily, found guilty of treason on 12 May 1619 and executed the next day.

Already in the first months of 1617, political turmoil left an apparent mark on the auction market. Soon after the death of a well-off merchant named Andries de Graeuw (I), the Orphan Chamber ordered an inventory of his movable goods, which was taken on 30 January 1617 and in the next two days. The paintings in the inventory were appraised by the painters Abraham Verwer and Guillaume Basse. The appraisals took place either the same day as the house of Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop was sacked or within the next two days. The evaluations presumably did not yet reflect the ongoing turmoil. On 17 April of the same year, fourteen lots representing the more valuable paintings belonging to De Graeuw were sold at auction by the Orphan Chamber. Of these, 13 lots corresponded to 15 paintings in the January 1617 inventory (Appendix 8A). The 13 lots sold at auction brought 273.5 f. Their counterparts in the January inventory were evaluated at a total of 482 f. The auction total came to 56.7 percent of the sum of the evaluations. Every lot that I have been able to identify was sold below its evaluation. As far as I am aware, such a systematic and wide deviation of auction prices from their evaluations is without precedent. I conclude, at least tentatively, that the deteriorating political situation had scared away potential buyers.

The year 1619 marked a low point for the Amsterdam Remonstrants, whose conventicles were banned on July 3rd. Burgomaster Reynier Pauw, the leader of the Counter-Remonstrant party in Amsterdam, hedged in his opponents at every opportunity. The Remonstrants continued to hold illicit meetings, although they were at times disrupted by spies who alerted the police. A letter by Rem Egbertsz. Bisschop to the Remonstrant preacher Paulus Stochius, who had been in prison since 1618, was intercepted, in which Bisschop had written that “the fishing was fairly good here.” This transparently referred to the collection of funds for the support of the Remonstrant cause, including the payment of preachers. When he was interrogated about
the letter, Stochius pretended that he had indeed received 25 pounds of fish from the North Sea fisher and fish-dealer Adriaen Jacobsz. van Noord (who happened to be a fervent Remonstrant as well as being a frequent buyer at auction.) Rem Egbertsz., sought by the police, escaped but his wife Lysbeth was captured. She claimed that her husband was not at all a Remonstrant. She refused to disclose his whereabouts. On January 30, 1619, the police, after searching through Bisschop’s papers, summoned Abraham Anthonisz., Hendrick Eeckelboom, and Pieter Joosten, who had all taken part in Remonstrant gatherings in the past, and questioned them before the aldermen about the sums of money they had gathered. Eeckelboom conceded that he had collected 100 gulden which he had distributed to orphans and members of the Walloon community. Abraham Anthonisz. was defiant: “You can do with me what you wish. I am in your power.” Pieter Joosten refused to acknowledge that he had been present at Remonstrant meetings. The three men, nevertheless, were released.

Another Remonstrant who was sought by the police and had to go into hiding about this time was the predikant Dirck (Didericus) Camphuijsen, the father of the painter Govert Dircksz. Camphuijsen. After being dismissed from his pastoral position in 1619, he fled to Amsterdam and took refuge with a box- and frame-maker named Heere Jansz., who was himself a Mennonite but had broken with the Old Flemings faction of the Anabaptists and refused to ally himself with any church. Heere Jansz. was the father-in-law of the painter Jan Jansz. (I) who, if we may judge from the works of art in the sale that took place after his death, must have been fairly successful. Both Heere Jansz. and his son-in-law Jan Jansz. (I) were buyers at Orphan Chamber auctions. After he was denounced to the police by an informer, Camphuijsen left the box- and frame-maker and sought refuge with Willem Jansz. Blaeuw, the famous publisher and cartographer, who was also a “libertine” Mennonite without a church affiliation. Needless to say, Blaeuw bought works of art at Orphan Chamber auctions. The preacher succeeded in eluding the police. He was appointed in Dokkum where he died toward the end of 1623.

In 1620, the balance of power in the Amsterdam Vroedschap began to shift against the “True Calvinists” of Reynier Pauw’s party as some of Pauw’s more opportunistic allies defected to the Libertine camp or became neutral in the controversy. Toward the end of the year the struggle in the Vroedschap turned on the election of a new Schout to replace the elderly Willem van der Does. Pauw supported his own son, Dr. Reynier Pauw. The liberal faction canvassed votes for Dr. Jan ten Grootenhuys, who was actually elected on December 21, 1620. In February 1621, Reynier Pauw’s mandate as burgomaster ended. From that time on, although he continued to serve as a master of the Orphan Chamber, his influence in the Vroedschap waned. A year later, three new men were elected to the Vroedschap, two of whom – Geurt Dircksz. van Beuningen (a signatory of the 1628 Remonstrant petition and a buyer at auction) and Andries Bicker – were open partisans of a moderate course toward the Remonstrants.

Nevertheless, public displays of pro-Remonstrant sentiment were still repressed.
Abraham Anthonisz., “through his lack of thoughtfulness and his imprudent behavior” (Wagenaar), got into trouble with the police in 1622. He was building a new house on the corner of the Warmoesgracht and had decided to have some decorative figure carved in the keystone of an arch over the cellar of the house. The contractor, a carpenter, told the stone-carver that he should sculpt the head (tronie) of Oldenbarneveld. The stone-carver related this suggestion to Abraham Anthonisz. who said he had no objection and gave him a print that he could use to model the head of Oldenbarneveld. The head was sculpted. It stayed in place half a day, after which a crowd of angry Counter-Remonstrants pelted it with stones and forced its removal. The display of Oldenbarneveld’s tronie, it should be said, was an extraordinary provocation on the part of the candlemaker, and it was only thanks to the milder political circumstances which now prevailed that he did not suffer any serious consequences from his act.

The death of stadholder Maurits in April 1625 and his succession by the more liberal Prince Frederick Hendrick furthered the cause of moderation in Amsterdam. So much so that the liberal regent Albert Coenraadsz. Burgh, who was alderman in that year, could prompt a hesitant Joost van den Vondel to publish his tragedy Palamedes, which was a transparent apology for Oldenbarneveld.242 Pursued by the enmity of Dr. Reynier Pauw (the son of the burgomaster Reynier Pauw), who had sat in judgement over Oldenbarneveld, Vondel was summoned to appear before judges in The Hague. Burgomaster Dirck Bas, supported by Harmen van de Poll, who was said to be popular among the Regents even after his dismissal from the Vroedschap in 1618, upheld his cause.243 Despite the support he enjoyed among the liberal regents, Vondel deemed it prudent to take refuge in the house of his sister Clementia and of his mother Sara Cranen, but they refused to get involved, blaming him for neglecting his trade (as a silk merchant) and admonishing him to stop the scrivening that was getting him in trouble.244 He then went to the house of Laurens Joosten Baek (another buyer at auction), who received him warmly and protected him.245 Vondel finally had to pay a fine of 300 gulden but was not otherwise prosecuted. He published a poem not long afterwards in which he praised “Poll’s steadfast courage” (Pols oprechtigheid heel braef).

In 1627, the political prospects of the Remonstrants improved further. In a letter to Holland from his exile abroad, the prominent Remonstrant intellectual Hugo de Groot, welcomed the election of Simon de Rijck and of Jacob Jacobsz. Vinck to the Vroedschap. In his opinion, the four new Burgomasters elected in that year (Geurt Dircksz. van Beuningen, Dirck Bas, Antoni Oetgens, and Andries Bicker) were “the best that one could wish.”246 The liberal party finally won a decisive majority of the Vroedschap at the beginning of 1628. On 25 July of that year, 242 notables (aensienlijcke luijden) signed a petition to the Vroedschap for permission to found a church for the Remonstrants.247

I now turn to a central concern of this chapter, the analysis of the buyers of works of art at auction among the 242 signatories of the 1628 petition. To help in this analy-
sis, I make use of the data on the taxes on wealth levied in 1631, only three years after
the petition. The Kohier, I recall, constituted a record of the 0.5 percent tax on the
estimated wealth of tax on all Amsterdam residents with taxable assets in excess of
1,000 f (shown in table 6.3 above). I shall match this wealth distribution against the
list of signatories of the Remonstrant petition of 1628 with the aim of ascertaining
whether the relatively high percentage of buyers in this list can or cannot be ex-
plained by their wealth.

Of the 242 signatories of the 1628 petition to the Burgomasters of Amsterdam
pleading for the tolerance of the Remonstrant faction in the Reformed Church, I
have identified 65 who were buyers at Orphan Chamber auctions (including their
widows), or 26.9 percent. I have also found 137 signatories who paid taxes on their
assessed wealth in 1631. Of these, 50 were also buyers at Orphan Chamber auction.
Table 8.1 shows, in each tax bracket, the actual and the expected number of buyers,
where the expectation is based on the overall distribution of table 6.3. The technique
is the same I used in the analysis of the 1608 petition, which I compared to Amster-
dam residents who had bought shares in the 1602 subscription for the V.O.C.

### Table 8.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax paid</th>
<th>Number of Taxpayers</th>
<th>Expected Number of Buyers</th>
<th>Actual No. of Buyers/Signatories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 1,000 f.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999 f.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499 f.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399 f.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299 f.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199 f.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99 f.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-49 f.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All tax brackets</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example of method used:** There were 22 taxpayers in the 50-99 f bracket who signed
the 1628 petition. If they were representative of all taxpayers in this bracket, 13.4
percent of them or 2.9 should have been buyers (cf. table 6.3). There were actually 11
buyers in this tax bracket.

The number of actual buyers was not widely off the expected numbers in the tax
brackets above 400 f but in the lower brackets, it was appreciably greater than ex-
pected: the actual number was almost twice as great as expected for buyers who paid
200 to 399 f, 1.5 times the expected number for those who paid 100 to 199 f, 3.8
times the expected number for those who paid 50 to 99 f, and four times the expect-
ed number in the lowest bracket. For the distribution as a whole, the actual number
(50) was 3.4 times the expected number (14.9).
Unfortunately, I do not have a comparable sample for a sample of Counter-Remonstrants. All I can offer is a sample of 63 households (114 individuals) who were invited to a wedding in 1630, most of whom seemed to be in or close to the Counter-Remonstrant camp. The wedding guests included Domini Jacob Triglandius, Rudolph Petri, Hendrick Geldorpius, and Adriaen Smoutius (“Amsterdam’s most fervent Orthodox preacher” according to Israel). \(^{249}\) Ten out of 63 of the guests (counting one guest per household), or 15.8 percent were buyers at auction. The average tax paid per guest was 353.6 gulden (sample of 54), compared to 189.2 gulden per signatory of the petition. \(^{250}\) One would therefore have expected, other things equal, that the percentage of buyers would have been greater in the sample of guests than in the sample of signatories (I recall that 27.3 percent of the signatories were buyers, compared to 15.8 percent of the wedding guests). The evidence seems to bear out the proposition that a disproportionate percentage of Remonstrant and Remonstrant sympathizers were buyers at Orphan Chamber auctions.

What can we conclude from all this? Were Remonstrants and their allies more inclined to buy works of art than strict Calvinists and other religious groups, perhaps because they were more tolerant of art? This is quite possible but I would be hard pressed to find evidence for this proposition. \(^{251}\) I can, however, cite some socio-political factors that probably played a role in this matter.

I begin with the former alderman and member of the Amsterdam Vroedschap Harmen Gijsbertsz. van de Poll, who had been removed by Stadhouder Mauritius from that august body in 1618. As far as I am aware Van de Poll never joined the Remonstrants in any public way. In particular, he was not a signatory of the 1628 petition. But his sympathies in this regard were evident. And it was probably because of his Remonstrant leanings that Mauritius had removed him from the Vroedschap in 1618. This did not prevent him from being appointed as a master of the Orphan Chamber in 1625 after Reynier Pauw’s political power had begun to ebb. He was Master of the Chamber from 1625 to 1627 and again from 1635 to 1637. In 1629, Van de Poll’s prudence in not signing the petition of 1628 was awarded: he was reinstated to the Vroedschap in that year.

Van de Poll’s daughter Catharina married the wine dealer Anthony de Lange, who did sign the petition of 1628 (and was a buyer at auction). De Lange is known to have bought a parcel of land on the Keizersgracht in 1630 on behalf of the Remonstrant Church, on which parcel the Remonstrant Church was erected soon thereafter. \(^{252}\) Jan, the son of Harmen van de Poll, signed the petition and had one of his children baptized in the Remonstrant Church.

We saw earlier that Harmen van de Poll was dismissed from the Vroedschap in 1618 but was reappointed as Master of the Orphan Chamber in 1625. Appendix 8B gives the names of all the Masters of the Orphan Chamber from 1618 to 1638, the last year for which auction records of the Orphan Chamber have been preserved. In the critical years 1618 to 1620 when the strict Calvinist Reynier Pauw dominated the Vroedschap, two out of three of the masters of the Orphan Chamber were either
moderately or overtly liberal (only Roelof Egbertsz., who was a Master in 1618, was a strict Calvinist.) I could only find three years, 1623, 1624, and 1630, when the Calvinists may have been in a majority (for the first two of these years, depending on whether Dr. Dominicus van Heemskerck did or did not side with Reynier Pauw.) In 1629 and in 1631-1632, the two sides were about equally balanced (De Vry and Schellinger were strict Calvinists; Hasselaer and De Rijck were liberal.)

In addition to the masters of the Orphan Chamber, the boden must have exerted some influence on the appointment of guardians and other matters that may have influenced the clientèle of the auctions. We saw earlier that the Remonstrant Van Beuningen family had played a key role in the Orphan Chamber since 1617 when Jan Dircksz. had been appointed Bode of the Chamber and had been succeeded by his son Daniel Jansz. in 1627.

Thus, in most of these years, the liberal or pro-Remonstrant masters, including Harmen van de Poll, who was in office in 1618, 1619, 1625-1627, and 1634-1638, Pieter Thijsz. Schrijver, Jacob Poppe, Andries Bicker, Sijmon de Rijck, and Albert Coenraadsz. Burgh, who were probably most sympathetic to the Remonstrant cause, supported by one of the boden who was himself Remonstrant, could easily name Remonstrant guardians for orphaned children (who either did not have a guardian chosen in their parents’ will or needed one or more additional guardians.) We saw in Chapter 1 that regularly appointed guardians (the suppoosten already cited), were named for life by the Orphan Chamber. They received 2.5 percent of the sums brought to the Orphan Chamber on behalf of the orphaned children, which was a sufficiently attractive emolument to attract applicants. Three men seem to have received a disproportionate share of the guardianship appointments. The first was the merchant Nicolaes Cocqu (or Cocques), whose religious affiliation is unknown to me. The second was the Remonstrant boden Jan Dircksz. van Beuningen. The third, who was appointed far more often than Cocqu or Van Beuningen, was none other than the militant Remonstrant Abraham Anthonsz. Recht. My (partial) count, from 1615 to 1635, shows that he was appointed guardian on 22 occasions. Other Remonstrants who were appointed guardians of one or more orphans included Adolf Forckenbeeck, Jan van den Wouwer, Dr. Anthony Bruijnsz., Adriaen Jacobsz. van Noordt, and François Finson. All but Adolf Forckenbeeck were buyers at auction.

My tentative conclusion is that Remonstrants and their sympathizers came to the auctions of the Orphan Chamber in relatively large numbers because the Chamber offered them a congenial atmosphere where they met among friends and relatives. They were likely to know the boden, who belonged to their community, and many of the guardians, who, for one reason or another, tended to buy at the auctions of the parents of the orphans they were responsible for guarding. It is possible also, but hard to prove, that they were more favorably inclined toward art than their Calvinist opponents.
APPENDIX 8A
Evaluations and Auction Prices of Paintings Owned by Andries de Graeuw
(January and April 1617)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluated (January 1617)</th>
<th>Sold at auction (April 1617)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape of Emaus</td>
<td>Landscape of Emaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A temple by Paulus de Vries</td>
<td>A temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repentence (de boetveerdiechy in den rou)</td>
<td>Repentence (same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus and Vulcanus</td>
<td>Venus and Vulcanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The predication of St. John</td>
<td>The child with Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Maria with the child</td>
<td>Image of Maria with the child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A peasant bride and bridegroom</td>
<td>A peasant bride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>Susanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Christ Mass (kersnacht)</td>
<td>Christ Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The raising of Lazarus</td>
<td>The raising of Lazarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danae</td>
<td>Danae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tronie of Mercurius</td>
<td>Mars and Mercurius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man's tronie</td>
<td>A man's and a woman's tronien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman's tronie</td>
<td>A woman's tronie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *The first man’s tronie in the evaluated inventory seems to have been recognized by the clerk of the auction as a head of Mars. The second and third tronien, which were evaluated separately, were apparently sold as a lot at the auction.*

Sources: WK 5073/968, 30 and 31 January and 1 and 2 February 1617; WK 5073/947, 27 April 1617.

Appendix 8B
Masters of the Orphan Chamber and Their Political Inclination (1618 to 1638)

1618 - Roelof Egbertsz. (C) • Harmen van de Poll (L) • Pieter Gerritsz. Ruytenburgh (L)
1619 - Harmen van de Poll (L) • Pieter Vlaming van Oudshoorn (L) • Pieter Gerritsz. Ruytenburgh (L)
1620 - Jan Jacobsz. Huydecoper (L) • Jacob Poppen (L) • Pieter Gerritsz. Ruytenburgh (L)
1621 - Dr. Sebastiaen Egbertsz. (L), who died in that year and was replaced by Frederick de Vry (C) • Jacob Poppe, replaced after he became burgomaster by Volckert Overlander (L)
1622 - Bartholt Adriaensz. Cromhout (L) • Frederick de Vry (C) • Pieter Gerritzs. Ruytenburgh (L)
1623 - Reynier Pauw (C) • Frederick de Vry, replaced by Dr. Dominicus van Heemskerck (?) • Pieter Gerritzs. Ruytenburgh (L)
1624 - Reynier Pauw (C) • Dr. Dominicus van Heemskerck (?) • Pieter Gerritzs. Ruytenburgh (L)
1625 - Reynier Pauw (C) • Harmen Gysbertsz. van de Poll (L) • Pieter Jansz. Reael (L) • Pieter Gerritzs. Ruytenburgh (L)
1626 - Reynier Pauw (C) • Harmen Gysbertsz. van de Poll (L) • Pieter Jansz. Reael (L)
  • Pieter Gerritsz. Ruytenburgh (L)
1627 - Reynier Pauw (C) • Harmen Gysbertsz. van de Poll (L) • Pieter Jansz. Reael (L)
  • Pieter Gerritsz. Ruytenburgh (L) • Dirck de Vlaming van Oudtshoorn (L)
1628 - Reynier Pauw (C) • Pieter Mathijsz. (Thijsz.) (Schrijver) (L)
  • Dirck de Vlaming van Oudtshoorn (L) • Pieter Jansz. Reael (L)
1629 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Dirck de Vlaming van Oudtshoorn (L) • Pieter Jansz. Reael (L)
  • Claes Jacobsz. Harencarspel (C)
1630 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Dr. Andries Bicker Gerritsz. (L) • Hillebrand Schellinger (C)
  • Claes Jacobsz. Harencarspel (C) • Pieter Pietersz. Hasselaer (L)
1631 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Hillebrand Schellinger (C) • Pieter Pietersz. Hasselaer (L)
  • Sijmon de Rijck van den Gracht (L)
1632 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Hillebrand Schellinger (C) • Pieter Pietersz. Hasselaer (L)
  • Sijmon de Rijck (L)
1633 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Hillebrand Schellinger (C) • Sijmon de Rijck (L) • Laurens Reael (L)
1634 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Harmen van de Poll (L) • Sijmon de Rijck (L) • Pieter Jansz. Hooft (L)
1635 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Harmen van de Poll (L) • Sijmon de Rijck (L)
  • Dr. Albert Coenraadsz. Burgh (L)
1636 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Harmen van de Poll (L) • Sijmon de Rijck (L) • Cornelis Bicker (L)
1637 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Harmen van de Poll (L) • Sijmon de Rijck (L)
  • Albert Coenraadsz. Burgh (L)
1638 - Frederick de Vry (C) • Harmen van de Poll (L) • Sijmon de Rijck (L)
  • Jacob Pietersz. Hoogkamer ("fencesitter")

Note: The masters of the Orphan Chamber in this list have been divided into two basic groups denoted in parentheses: C for strict Calvinists, L for liberals or pro-Remonstrant. One, Jacob Pietersz. Hoogekamer, belonged to neither camp but was said to be a “waggelmus” (fencesitter) in 1627.